

**MISSOURI
SOLID WASTE ADVISORY BOARD**

ANNUAL REPORT FOR CALENDAR YEAR 2016

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	1
Annual Report Requirement	1
What’s in this Report	1
Prior SWAB Recommendations for Joint Committee Consideration	1
1.0 Technical Assistance Program	2
2.0 Solid Waste Management Issues.....	3
Funding.....	3
Recycling Infrastructure and Markets	3
Lack of Incentives to Invest in Recycling.....	3
Increase Investment to Develop End-Use Markets	4
Materials	4
Tires	4
Household Hazardous Waste (HHW)	4
Electronic Waste	5
Pharmaceuticals.....	5
Shingles	5
Glass.....	6
3.0 Proposed Rules and Regulations	6
4.0 Grant Award Criteria.....	7
Grant Award Criteria	7
Recycling Program Benefits.....	7
5.0 Waste Management Issues.....	7
Inadequate Resources to Address Closed Landfills with Environmental Issues.....	8
Collection Delays	8
6.0 New Technologies and Improved Methods.....	9
Local and State Policies	9
Food Waste	9



Organic Waste	9
Extended Producer Responsibility/Product Stewardship	9
7.0 Unfunded Solid Waste Management Projects	10
8.0 Other Matters	10
Extend Disposal Fee to Cover DNR Expenses	10
Local Control	10
Waste Diversion Goal	11
Maintain the Ban on Yard Waste in Landfills	11

Attachment A FY2015 District Funded Projects

Attachment B FY2015 District Unfunded Projects



INTRODUCTION

ANNUAL REPORT REQUIREMENT

With the passage of SB 445, the Legislature established a requirement that the Solid Waste Advisory Board (SWAB)¹ submit an annual report to the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) on a number of subjects, including unfunded solid waste management projects. The act also requires the Board to prepare an annual report to committees in the General Assembly regarding solid waste. This report is intended to serve both purposes.

The statute requires that this report be prepared and issued on or before January 1st.

WHAT'S IN THIS REPORT

SWAB is required to submit a report to DNR or any standing, statutory, interim, or select committee or task force of the general assembly having jurisdiction over solid waste regarding:

- (1) The efficacy of its technical assistance program;
- (2) Solid waste management problems experienced by solid waste management districts;
- (3) The effects of proposed rules and regulations upon solid waste management within the districts;
- (4) Criteria to be used in awarding grants pursuant to section 260.335;
- (5) Waste management issues pertinent to the districts;
- (6) The development of improved methods of solid waste minimization, recycling and resource recovery;
- (7) Unfunded solid waste management projects; and
- (8) Such other matters as the advisory board may determine.

PRIOR SWAB RECOMMENDATIONS FOR JOINT COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

SWAB previously identified selected issues for discussion and action by the Joint Committee. These issues, which were transmitted to the Joint Committee in January 2016, highlighted some of the more pressing challenges and opportunities facing the districts, and identify opportunities for expanding recycling in Missouri. These initial issues are repeated within this document.

¹ The Solid Waste Advisory Board (SWAB) is made up of the chairperson of each of the 20 Solid Waste Management Districts. Five additional members are appointed by the director of the Missouri Department of Natural Resources. Two represent the solid waste management industry, one represents the composting or recycling industry and the two remaining members are public members who have demonstrated interest in solid waste management issues.



1.0 TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Since the passage of SB 530, the solid waste management districts have developed expertise and understanding around local solid waste management needs. However, waste management and recycling are national and global efforts. Many areas of the country, and the world, are ahead of Missouri in setting the tone for the future of the waste and recycling. From anaerobic digestion to zero waste initiatives, other countries and U.S. cities and businesses are identifying new and innovative ways to manage wastes and advance the concept of a circular economy. To continue to advance planning in Missouri, it is essential that national and global trends be tracked and data disseminated.

DNR can play a vital role in ensuring that the districts have the research and data needed for good planning and implementation at the local level. State leadership is critical on two levels:

1. Regulatory issues like illegal dumping, permitting for solid waste disposal and processing facilities, and enforcement actions.
2. Analysis of data, trends and innovations in all areas of integrated solid waste management, not only landfills.

DNR does not currently have a technical assistance program for waste reduction and recycling programs, which could be highly beneficial for both districts and recycling in general. Individual districts do not have the resources to conduct this research and create this programming on their own. With over 50% of Missouri waste now being managed by means other than landfilling, there are significant benefits that could occur through an active Technical Assistance Program.

Within a Technical Assistance Program, DNR could:

- Conduct research
- Collect and disseminate program data
- Provide training and certifications
- Conduct educational programs
- Investigate best practices for recycling issues, promote public awareness
- Maintain database and informational resources

SWAB recommends that DNR begin to establish a program during 2017. The first step would be to establish a Waste Reduction and Recycling Unit within the DNR Solid Waste Management Program. As a suggestion, the unit could include two recycling specialists, planner II, research analyst, and a unit chief. This would greatly increase the ability of DNR to be proactive in providing information and assistance to support Districts and others working to expand recycling throughout the state.

Establishing a recycling unit and creating the associated positions would allow DNR to better accomplish its mission to expand waste reduction and recycling in Missouri. SWAB encourages DNR to initiate an effective and efficient waste reduction and recycling technical assistance program. Statewide solid waste planning and technical assistance could be further enhanced by establishing deliberate policy, planning and outreach linkages with other statewide programs related to topics such as air and water quality, energy efficiency and conservation and natural hazard mitigation.



2.0 SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT ISSUES

The districts were each asked to select one or two waste management issues facing their district for inclusion in this report. Most of the issues identified by the districts fall into the following categories:

- Funding
- Recycling infrastructure and markets
- Material specific issues

FUNDING

The current Missouri tonnage fee of \$2.11 per ton is a sustainable commitment that funds the recycling and waste reduction activities of the districts. The fee was initially set at \$1.50 per ton, with a Consumer Price Index (CPI) adjustment for inflation. By 2005, the fee had risen to \$2.11 per ton, but the CPI adjustment was frozen through additional legislation and will continue to remain at \$2.11 per ton until 2027.

Of the total tonnage fee, only \$1.28 is currently available to support the recycling and waste reduction efforts of the state, with the remaining going towards regulation and enforcement activities of DNR.

Like many other public agencies, the districts are consistently being asked to do more with less. This is especially true in rural areas where the quantity of recyclable materials and logistics make collecting and processing recyclables difficult. The end result is that geographically, large areas of the state are left without reasonable means to recycle and the districts have inadequate resources and staff to support the necessary infrastructure.

One method of maintaining the power of solid waste funds would be to index the tipping fee to the Consumer Price Index. This action, which would represent a return to previous solid waste policy, will provide the districts and DNR with a hedge against inflation and rising operation expenses.

RECYCLING INFRASTRUCTURE AND MARKETS

LACK OF INCENTIVES TO INVEST IN RECYCLING

Recycling only works when there are businesses to buy the collected materials and reprocess them. Much of the material collected in Missouri is delivered to markets outside of the state. National recycling markets have experience a downward trend, depressing the business of recycling and driving some recycling enterprises out of business.

Several of the more rural districts are dealing with aging infrastructure and often the local sheltered workshop serves as the recycling processor for the region. In many instances, the sheltered workshops have stopped accepting certain recyclable materials; limiting the list of materials they accept to paper, cardboard and aluminum.

The depressed market, along with the lack of infrastructure, creates limited financial incentives for businesses to expand their recycling efforts. There simply is nowhere to take what is collected.



INCREASE INVESTMENT TO DEVELOP END-USE MARKETS

Making new products from recycled materials is a strong economic development opportunity that can generate good-paying Missouri jobs. However, the Missouri Market Development Program has very limited funding. Program resources should be significantly increased to support the growth of end-users in Missouri. Recycling produces commodities that feed into a global marketplace, and are subject to fluctuations in price and demand. Developing strong, local end-use markets for recovered materials generated in Missouri would help recyclers weather market fluctuations. Expanding the Missouri Market Development program administered by the Environmental Improvement and Energy Resources Authority (EIERA) would create local jobs and provide a significant return on investment. The Market Development Program needs much greater resources to help recycling continue to grow through the creation of value-added products made in Missouri.

MATERIALS

The districts have often provided the only opportunity to the general public for the safe and environmentally responsible disposal of tires, household hazardous waste, electronics, and other items not appropriate to landfill. In general, these materials are difficult to manage, expensive to properly take care of, and lack the needed policies and/or fees to create incentives for residents and the solid waste industry to properly handle them. This situation leaves the cost of proper disposal on the districts, local governments, and the state. The districts identified the following materials as problematic.

TIRES

Illegal disposal of scrap tires continues to be an issue for the state. Scrap tire stockpiles are unsightly, pose a fire hazard, and provide breeding grounds for mosquitoes and vermin. While DNR works with charitable, fraternal, and other nonprofit organizations to complete the necessary cleanup work for sites with less than 500 tires; illegal scrap tire stockpiles cost municipalities and private property owners significant dollars each year to clean up.

The elimination of the Scrap Tire Roundup Program in April of 2016 was distressing to many of the rural districts. The districts continue to address scrap tires as best they can, but as end markets for scrap tires continue to dry up, it is likely that scrap tires will continue to remain an issue for the districts with stockpiles growing and no ways or means to address the problem.

HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE (HHW)

There is a continued need across the state for convenient access to programs for the proper management of HHW, which includes products such as household cleaners, lawn and garden products, automotive fluids, paints and paint-related products.

Several districts currently provide HHW collection programs to varying degrees ranging from one-day collection events to semi-permanent and permanent facilities. Most districts also agree that one-day collection events can be costly and offer a very limited window of opportunity for participation. Districts that do not offer programs often find it difficult to find locations, support and funding for facilities and events.

Those districts that offer HHW collection programs find that latex and oil based paints often make up the greatest HHW expense. Paint creates issues for all HHW facilities in the state and each facility has had to deal with it in



different ways. Nine states have adopted product stewardship legislation for paint via an industry backed and funded organization, Paintcare. Implementing product stewardship legislation and programming would free up funds for other waste diversion activities, make paint recycling more convenient for residents, and help Missouri gain experience with a successful product stewardship program.

ELECTRONIC WASTE

Electronic waste continues to be a growing problem. Rapid advances in technology mean that electronic products are becoming obsolete more quickly. This, coupled with explosive sales in consumer electronics, means that more products are being disposed, even if they still work.

Recycling electronics is not like recycling traditional recyclables. These products are not easy to recycle. For example, monitors and televisions made with tubes (not flat panels) contain lead and proper and safe recycling is costly.

In rural areas, the cost associated with electronics recycling is a hindrance for many residents. As stated by one district “there are too many opportunities to store or dump the materials on one’s property.”

For the past few years, the Missouri Recycling Association (MORA) has been developing the “Electronic Products Recycling and Reuse Act,” which relies on extended producer responsibility (EPR) to offset the costs of electronic waste recycling. With an EPR strategy, electronics manufacturers would be responsible for partially financing a collection and recycling infrastructure in Missouri.

The SWAB supports MORA in its efforts to develop this legislation.

PHARMACEUTICALS

The proper disposal of pharmaceuticals is becoming an issue in some regions, particularly those with numerous medical centers and an aging population. Almost all medicines can be safely disposed of through U.S. Drug Enforcement Agency (DEA)-authorized collection events; however, these events are periodic and may not reach all areas of the state. Other options for pharmaceutical management, such as HHW collection programs are not well known to residents, are costly for districts to fund, and cannot accept all pharmaceuticals such as narcotics and opiates due to federal drug enforcement rules.

SHINGLES

Asphalt is one of the most common materials used in roofing shingles and as such shingles have the potential for reuse in public paving projects. Where options exist for shingle recycling, the districts are challenged to promote these programs, because from a roofer’s perspective, recycling shingles is more expensive and time consuming than taking them to the area landfills.

However, some of the districts are noting an increase in shingle disposal. Some of the asphalt companies have decreased the amount of shingles they purchase or have eliminated the purchase of shingles altogether. While the reason for the decline is not fully known, it is likely that:

- The decline in oil prices has reduced incentives to incorporate shingles into paving mixes.



- The paving industry has not rebounded quite as fast as construction, in general.

This also points to a larger challenge – construction/demolition waste, in general. Some components of this waste stream (drywall, some wood, metals) are well managed – other aspects, such as shingles, still need attention.

GLASS

Glass is increasingly being eliminated from single-stream recycling programs due to the added expense of glass contamination in other recyclables and equipment damage.

While the Kansas City metro has a viable option for glass recycling, many of the rural districts report that there is no outlet for them. There is little revenue for glass locally and transportation costs due to weight and distance are a deterrent for many of the rural districts.

Since glass continues to remain the packaging of choice for many products, glass recycling will continue to remain an issue in the future.

3.0 PROPOSED RULES AND REGULATIONS

There are currently no solid waste management rules in development. The Solid Waste Management Program (SWMP) will soon begin a formal rulemaking process to implement the federal coal combustion residuals (CCR) regulations. The districts do not anticipate that this rulemaking will affect the solid waste management districts.

The SWMP has started to revise its regulations governing municipal solid waste landfills, demolition landfills, and processing facilities in accordance with Section 536.175 of Missouri state statute. The SWMP has stated that the review of the rules governing solid waste management districts will occur at a later time.

The districts request that when SWMP reviews these rules, that SWMP look to ease the administrative burden on districts. The amount of paper, forms, reports, and duplication can become both a distraction from focusing on our mission and a deterrent to potential grant applicants. Streamlining DNR SWMP and district requirements and policies has the potential to create efficiencies, improve accountability, increase partnership between districts and SWMP, and create a more engaged workforce with more time to focus on the mission of SWMP.

In 2017, the districts plan to review the rules and procedures that govern how a solid waste district receives and manages its portion of the Missouri Solid Waste Management Fund (aka, “The District Grant Rule”) and provide comment to DNR.



4.0 GRANT AWARD CRITERIA

GRANT AWARD CRITERIA

The grant award criteria are established in state statute and include 19 criteria that districts must consider when awarding grants. SWAB does not have recommendations at this time for revision of the criteria.

Current criteria for awarding grants is established in 10 CSR 80-9.040(5)(C) and include the following core criteria:

1. Conformance with the integrated waste management hierarchy as described in the Missouri Policy on Resource Recovery, as incorporated by reference in this rule;
2. Conformance with the State Targeted Materials List;
3. Degree to which the project contributes to community based economic development;
4. Degree to which funding to the project will adversely affect existing entities in the market segment;
5. Degree to which the project promotes waste reduction or recycling through the proposed process;
6. Demonstration of cooperative efforts through a public/private partnership or among political subdivisions;
7. Compliance with federal, state or local requirements;
8. Transferability of results;
9. The statewide need for the information;
10. Technical ability of the applicant;
11. Managerial ability of the applicant;
12. Ability to implement in a timely manner;
13. Technical feasibility;
14. Availability of commitments necessary to conduct the project;
15. Level of commitment for financing;
16. Type of contribution by applicant;
17. Effectiveness and quality of marketing strategy;
18. Quality of budget; and
19. Selected financial ratios.

RECYCLING PROGRAM BENEFITS

There tends to be an emphasis on tonnages diverted from landfilling when evaluating the success of recycling programs. Other measurable impacts include participation rates, jobs created and jobs maintained, state and local tax revenues generated, landfill volume reductions, greenhouse gas reductions, resources conserved, etc. The number of tons diverted from disposal has been the only program measure for many years, and it has become insufficient as the only measure. There are numerous other ways to measure the benefits of recycling programs, and it is time to implement additional ways to measure program benefits.

5.0 WASTE MANAGEMENT ISSUES

The districts were each asked to select one or two waste management issues facing their district for inclusion in this report. The issues identified by the districts include:

- Closed landfills
- Collection delays
- Affordable recovery and recycling of illegally dumped tires



INADEQUATE RESOURCES TO ADDRESS CLOSED LANDFILLS WITH ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

Currently, landfills permitted in Missouri are required to include closure plans and provide financial assurance mechanisms to properly close the landfill and provide for post-closure maintenance and monitoring. However, many older landfills or “dumps,” which have been closed or abandoned for years, do not have these mechanisms in place to mitigate risks to the public and the environment.

Furthermore, many of these older sites have yet to be identified and the risks categorized by DNR. It is likely; however, that each county in Missouri has a legacy of closed and abandoned landfill sites.

There has been much discussion of late to establish a fund to enable DNR to remediate hazards posed by these closed or abandoned landfills. SWAB will continue to be a part of the discussion as to how this fund could be created; how a complete inventory of closed/abandoned disposal sites throughout Missouri can be created; and the role of various organizations in creating a fund, administering resources, and mitigating hazards.

COLLECTION DELAYS

The Kansas City metropolitan region has been experiencing significant delays with trash and recycling collection, which in turn has sparked numerous customer and municipal complaints. The two major collection companies are attributing these delays to a nationwide shortage of qualified drivers (i.e., those with a commercial driver’s license who can pass federally mandated physicals and drug tests). Both companies are struggling to fill vacancies. In the meantime, a few municipalities are using city fleet vehicles or providing supplemental workers to expedite collection for their residents. Some municipalities with collection contracts have been able to use enforcement provisions to leverage collection for their residents, but residents relying on subscription services must often wait for the hauler to get back on schedule.

The two-year notice statute, governing how local governments inform private haulers of their intention to provide solid waste services, continues to provide a disincentive for municipalities to contract for solid waste and recycling services. As local governments evaluate measures to increase the efficiency of solid waste management and recycling and reduce the impact of hauling operations on local infrastructure, the current law restricts local authority to provide for quality and affordable services to residents in a timely manner.

As noted earlier, private collection companies are failing to provide the trash collection and recycling services that are expected of them. Local governments need relief to meet community expectations for services when the private sector fails. When there are documented performance failures by the private sector, there should be a mechanism in place that would allow local governments to proceed with contracting with a service provider. The public good is not well served by the two-year notice statute.

AFFORDABLE RECOVERY AND RECYCLING OF ILLEGALLY DUMPED TIRES

The end of the Missouri Vocational Enterprises (MVE) recycling program and MDNR’s Scrap Tire Roundup program have had a very negative impact on many of the districts that used these programs. The state needs to consider reinstating these or similar programs in order to address the need for affordable tire recovery and recycling. The state also should take steps to develop markets for scrap tires in order to make these viable programs. The state generates 5 million scrap tires a year. These old tires pose a number of risks including fire and disease (including Zika).



6.0 NEW TECHNOLOGIES AND IMPROVED METHODS

New technologies and improved methods to use or recycle materials that would otherwise be waste must be part of a continued discussion in Missouri.

LOCAL AND STATE POLICIES

Recycling and waste minimization have an inherent economic disadvantage to landfilling in Missouri, for an average resident it is simply easier and cheaper to landfill items that could otherwise be diverted to a better use. Policies, fees, regulations, and incentives create a more level playing field for waste reduction, from product stewardship legislation to local governments including curbside recycling in their solid waste fee instead of offering it as a separate and optional service. Relying on people's good intentions, more convenient recycling, and new technology to increase waste diversion will only go so far. Monetary incentives and enforcement are needed to change behavior, such as, pay as you throw programs and landfill bans for both residents and businesses for certain materials. We will continue to see a slow growth rate for waste diversion until state and local governments begin implementing legislation, policies, and programs that make waste diversion a priority.

FOOD WASTE

The national movement to reduce food waste presents an opportunity for waste diversion and economic growth in Missouri. Missouri has institutions and businesses that produce large amounts of food waste and plenty of rural areas ideal for composting operations and opportunity for distributing products to farming operations. These factors coupled with the growing popularity of local and organic produce create an untapped opportunity for Missouri.

The districts and DNR should be working together to identify strategies for households, businesses, and government to reduce food waste and to provide recommendations for state and local government for setting targets for reduction, providing direction and infrastructure to enable food waste prevention programs, creating incentives for donation programs, and providing education about prevention.

ORGANIC WASTE

Organic waste, both food and yard waste, is one of the few recoverable materials that can be collected in our state, processed into a product in our state, and sold to customers in our state. It is important for Missouri to continue to develop and expand organics markets to allow organics processing to remain competitive with disposal.

The ban on landfilling of yard waste has made a significant contribution to helping the state achieve its waste diversion goals. The districts support continuation of this yard waste ban, effective since 1992, to divert yard waste materials from landfills and support the organics recycling industry to achieve greater diversion of these and other organic materials through recycling and composting.

EXTENDED PRODUCER RESPONSIBILITY/PRODUCT STEWARDSHIP

Product stewardship is where environmental, health, and safety protection centers on the product itself. Everyone involved in the lifespan of the product—manufacturers, retailers, users, and disposers—are responsible for its



environmental, health, and safety impacts. For manufacturers, this includes planning for, and if necessary, paying for the recycling or disposal of the product at the end of its useful life. For retailers and consumers, this means taking an active role in ensuring the proper disposal or recycling a product at end of life. For example, in Missouri, when an individual purchases new tires or a new automotive battery, he simultaneously pays for the disposal of those tires and that battery. Product Stewardship provides an infrastructure for the disposal or recycling of the product.

Missouri has an opportunity to foster product stewardship, especially as it relates to waste management by undertaking cooperative efforts with manufacturers, retailers and others to increase recycling of discarded products such as electronics, mattresses, carpet, paint, pharmaceuticals, fluorescent lighting, and mercury thermostats. Missouri can learn from other states that have developed, or are developing take-back mandates for selected products leading to cost-effective approaches to handling problem products and wastes. This approach will reduce the burden on Missouri taxpayers to manage these problem wastes at the expense of local governments by building a sustainable infrastructure to dispose of these items at the end of their usable life funded and managed by the manufacturers and retailers.

7.0 UNFUNDED SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PROJECTS

In FY2015, the districts funded 208 projects totaling more than \$6,220,400. The districts also leveraged more than \$2,146,500 in match and project funds. For the same time period, the districts report that 23 projects requesting more than \$2,895,200 were unfunded. Many of these projects were not funded because the districts determined that the grant applications were incomplete or the projects would not lead to significant diversion of recyclable materials. The districts reported that three projects requesting \$138,353 were unfunded due to insufficient resources available to the district. However, not all districts reported a reason for not funding some projects and many projects were partially funded as a means to stretch grant resources.

A summary of district funded and unfunded projects is provided as an attachment to this report.

8.0 OTHER MATTERS

EXTEND DISPOSAL FEE TO COVER DNR EXPENSES

DNR spends millions of dollars per year regulating utility waste landfills and other facilities that currently do not contribute to the Solid Waste Management Fund. Recycling funds continue being diverted to fund DNR regulatory oversight of these non-paying facilities. All regulated facilities should contribute to the fund to cover regulatory expenses and allow the recycling funds to be used for their intended purpose. Recycling program grant requests exceed available funds, and the ongoing diversion of funds has severely curtailed the growth of Missouri's recycling industry.

LOCAL CONTROL

Local support of recycling through regional solid waste management districts has been a key factor in the growth and success of recycling in Missouri. Maintaining and strengthening local control will ensure the best use of resources and the implementation of projects best suited for local needs in a highly diverse state like Missouri. Local control and development is especially important for sustaining recycling programs in the rural areas of the state where economies of scale, transportation costs and smaller populations make recycling and waste reduction



programs especially challenging. SWAB believes that many Missouri citizens wish to have the opportunity to recycle and additional efforts need to be made to find innovative ways to foster the growth of rural waste reduction, composting, and recycling programs.

WASTE DIVERSION GOAL

In 1990, Missouri established a 40 percent waste diversion goal. Recycling has become a significant statewide industry that has created thousands of jobs, in addition to improving communities and protecting our environment. Increasing our diversion goal to 75 percent will generate additional economic growth and improve communities across Missouri. Missouri has about 25,000 recycling jobs, and increased recycling can create thousands of additional jobs.

MAINTAIN THE BAN ON YARD WASTE IN LANDFILLS

Composting has tremendous environmental benefits, and also has created thousands of Missouri jobs. Organic materials in landfills emit millions of tons of methane every year in Missouri, and composting greatly reduces this huge pollution source. Allowing yard waste back into landfills would have tremendous negative impacts on the environment and economy in Missouri. Keeping other organic wastes out of the landfills would also create additional economic opportunities for Missouri, and further reduce toxic landfill gas emissions.



ATTACHMENT A

FY2015 DISTRICT FUNDED PROJECTS



Funded Grant Projects

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
A	Worth County School Composting	\$9,975	\$9,975	\$2,000	\$0	\$11,975	Funds to purchase an Earth Tub composter.	Grant was declined by sub-grantee due to a 30% increase in cost.
A	Reduce Your Paw Print: Weigh It	\$2,503	\$2,503	\$1,351	\$0	\$3,853	Weigh bars to be purchased to weigh paper and cardboard collection container at Pellet Plant at Northwest Missouri State University.	
A	Nodaway and Holt County Household Hazardous Waste Collections	\$17,000	\$15,000	\$4,250	\$0	\$19,250	Funding for two regional HHW Collections held in Nodaway and Holt Counties.	
A	Albany Curbside Recycling	\$19,026	\$11,798	\$2,796	\$0	\$14,594	Rolling Hills Creative Living residents providing curbside collection for Albany's recycling program.	
A	Stanberry Park Expansion Project	\$6,187	\$3,200	\$10,744	\$0	\$13,944	Recycled rubber surface purchased for fall zones for expansion of Stanberry's city park.	
A	WildKat Track Project	\$10,000	\$5,000	\$25,000	\$0	\$30,000	Contribution to help pay for installation of recycled rubber surface for new track.	
A	NW MO Regional Council of Governments	\$7,500	\$7,500	\$0	\$0	\$7,500	Plan implementation grant used for two education projects, website updates, press releases and public outreach.	
B	Region B	\$26,500	\$26,500	\$0	\$0	\$26,500	Plan implementation grant.	
B	City of Marceline	\$3,245	\$3,245	\$0	\$0	\$3,245	Cardboard trailer.	
B	Region B	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$0	\$0	\$20,000	Banned and special items collections.	

Funded Grant Projects (continued)

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
C	City of Kirksville	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$11,667	\$0	\$46,667	To construct a facility to begin glass collection	
C	Industrial Opportunities, Inc.	\$33,327	\$33,327	\$0	\$0	\$33,327	Purchase equipment and pay salary to start curb-side recycling	
C	Community Opportunities, Inc.	\$19,275	\$19,275	\$0	\$0	\$19,275	Purchase compartmentalized trailer & 50 recycling tubs	
C	City of Canton	\$11,800	\$11,800	\$1,560	\$0	\$13,360	Purchase Baler	
C	City of Memphis	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$13,150	\$0	\$48,150	Purchase Equipment for cardboard collection	
C	Adair County Family YMCA	\$28,060	\$28,060	\$10,630	\$0	\$38,690	Purchase recycled content playground equipment/handicap playground	
D	City of Cameron Recycling Program	\$12,000	\$8,250	\$64,275	\$0	\$72,525	Purchase recycling bags and bins for their curbside program and recycling center containers.	Grantee voluntarily reduced the amount of funding.
D	City of Stewartville Recycling Bins & Rock	\$995	\$995	\$351	\$0	\$1,346	Purchase additional bins for the drop-off center for the Styrofoam, paper, cardboard and plastic, which fill quickly. Also, purchase 2 loads of rock for the drive at the drop-off center.	
D	Clinco Replacement Forklift Tires and Bins	\$6,773	\$4,645	\$753	\$0	\$5,397	Purchase forklift tires to replace worn tires. Replacement bins for processing all the recycling programs recyclables	
D	Region D	\$6,275	\$3,925	\$0	\$0	\$3,925	Fund a subcontractor to provide 40 education programs. Also purchase materials for the programs.	

Funded Grant Projects (continued)

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
D	Region D	\$16,710	\$16,710	\$0	\$0	\$16,710	Fund all aspects of conducting an electronics recycling event. Laborers, advertising, contractor, and direct mail expenses.	
D	Region D	\$29,790	\$29,790	\$0	\$0	\$29,790	Fund all aspects of conducting an HHW & Ag Waste collection. Laborers, advertising, contractor, supplies and direct mail expenses.	
D	Region D	\$25,488	\$25,488	\$0	\$0	\$25,488	Plan implementation grant to fund half-time employee, board meeting supplies, two MORA memberships and MORA Conference expenses and public notice for grant calls	
E	Region E	\$42,491	\$42,491	\$4,674	\$0	\$47,165	Regional household hazardous waste program.	
E	Region E	\$163,827	\$163,827	\$7,172	\$0	\$170,999	Public education and outreach.	
E	Region E	\$4,403	\$4,403	\$171	\$0	\$4,574	Solid waste management planning.	
E	MORA	\$20,000	\$12,000	\$3,000	\$0	\$15,000	2015 MORA Conference: Funding requested to support costs for the keynote speaker, a construction and demolition training session, and AV expenses for the annual conference. The training is omitted from the final funding recommendation.	The district did not und the construction and demolition debris training.
E	The Rehabilitation Institute	\$81,521	\$80,000	\$20,000	\$0	\$100,000	Durable Medical Equipment Project: Funding requested to support the startup costs for a district -wide reuse and recycling project for durable medical equipment.	The district did not fund the full amount requested due to mistakes in the budget that was submitted by the applicant.

Funded Grant Projects (continued)

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
E	Missouri Organic Recycling	\$4,000	\$4,000	\$1,000	\$0	\$5,000	UMKC Paper Towel Composting: Funding requested to pay for 36 carts to transport paper towels from rest - rooms to composting area.	
E	City of Kearney	\$5,700	\$5,700	\$2,500	\$0	\$8,200	Electronics Recycling Container: Funding requested to purchase container for collecting electronics at drop - off recycling center.	
E	Avenue of Life	\$234,976	\$203,492	\$51,499	\$0	\$254,991	Mattress Recycling Project: Funding requested to continue to support costs for region -wide mattress recycling facility, including salary, equipment and supplies.	The district did not fund some requested items: snow plow attachment for a truck and payment for utilities.
E	Meredith Used Car Sales & Recycling	\$19,917	\$19,917	\$5,320	\$0	\$25,237	Cass County E-Waste Collection: Funding requested to support cost for trailer and advertising to hold 10 electronic waste collection events in Cass County.	
E	Truman Heritage Habitat for Humanity	\$49,434	\$49,434	\$12,358	\$0	\$61,792	Las Chance Waste Diversion Program: Funding requested to support costs for truck and staffing to stage at Lee's Summit landfill to collect reusable material for resale at Habitat ReStore in Independence and Blue Springs..	
E	Sleepyhead Beds	\$7,000	\$7,000	\$2,200	\$0	\$9,200	North of the River Mattress Reuse Project: Funding requested to support costs for an intern and to hold six mattress collection events and six presentations.	

Funded Grant Projects (continued)

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
E	Trozzolo Communications	\$226,102	\$226,102	\$0	\$0	\$226,102	Recycling Education Campaign Extension: Funding requested to extend 2014 project on the District -wide recycling education campaign.	District board specifically exempted grantee from providing match.
E	Project Central	\$47,044	\$47,044	\$11,940	\$0	\$58,984	Recycling and Composting in KC Area Schools: Funding requested to support the implementation of recycling and composting at 5 schools.	
E	Southeast Enterprises	\$12,000	\$12,000	\$3,000	\$0	\$15,000	Holiday Light Recycling Drive: Funding requested to purchase strip machines that separate plastic from copper wires on holiday lights. Transportation is included.	
E	Kansas City Design Center	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$7,500	\$0	\$37,500	Vision Study for Downtown Area Recycling: Funding requested to support a vision study for a comprehensive recycling system in downtown Kansas City.	
E	Bridging The Gap	\$79,740	\$79,740	\$19,934	\$0	\$99,674	Business Recycling & Composting Project: Funding requested to support the implementation of recycling and composting at 15 businesses.	
F	Region F	\$22,000	\$22,000	\$0	\$0	\$22,000	Plan implementation grant.	
F	Region F	\$58,700	\$58,700	\$1,200	\$0	\$59,900	Regional HHW.	
F	City of Slater	\$4,939	\$4,939	\$872	\$0	\$5,811		
F	Stover Playground	\$16,104	\$16,104	\$2,843	\$0	\$18,947		
F	The Recycling Center	\$43,000	\$43,000	\$6,450	\$0	\$49,450		

Funded Grant Projects (continued)

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
F	Pettis County Feasibility Study	\$20,400	\$20,400	\$3,600	\$0	\$24,000		
F	Ozark Recycling	\$16,237	\$16,237	\$2,436	\$0	\$18,673		
G	Monroe City Sheltered Workshop	\$36,076	\$36,076	\$4,008	\$0	\$40,085	Recycling Box Truck- purchase new truck to pick up recycling product.	
G	City of Moberly	\$3,314	\$3,314	\$386	\$0	\$3,700	Household Hazardous Waste Facility- purchase of scale and an aerosol can recycler	
G	Pike County	\$44,130	\$39,080	\$4,342	\$0	\$43,422	Pike County Recycling- a recycling trailer and recycling containers will be purchased.	
G	Macon County Sheltered Industries	\$67,500	\$67,500	\$7,500	\$0	\$75,000	Box Truck & Holiday Light Equipment- Tools & Equipment to process holiday lights and a new truck will be purchased.	
G	Paris School District	\$15,903	\$15,903	\$1,767	\$0	\$17,670	Paris R-II School District Promoting Recycling- Two trailers, signs and recycling bins will be purchased.	
G	NEMO Sheltered Industries	\$48,269	\$48,259	\$5,362	\$0	\$53,621	NEMO Rebuild- Sorting tables, collection containers and 2 engine replaced with allocated funds.	
G	Mark Twain COG	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$8,333	\$0	\$83,333	Regional HHW- funding used for HHW and E-Waste collections	
H	MMSWMD	\$78,900	\$78,900	\$0	\$0	\$78,900	Plan Implementation	
H	City of Columbia	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$7,000	\$0	\$12,000	Recycling Trailer Project: Purchase of a 14-20 yd. roll off recycling trailer to be used at Columbia special events.	

Funded Grant Projects (continued)

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
H	City of Holts Summit	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$2,513	\$0	\$7,513	Hibernia Station Park & Greenway Park Fall Zone: Tire mulch placed under swings at both parks	
H	Randolph County Sheltered Industries	\$4,565	\$4,565	\$1,613	\$0	\$6,178	Recycling Bins for Sturgeon Schools and Community	
H	City of Jefferson	\$63,623	\$63,623	\$21,208	\$0	\$84,830	Support Local Glass Recycling Program: Wheel loader with solid tires used to move glass from consolidation point, storage, and transport.	
H	City of Columbia	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$25,000	\$0	\$100,000	Commercial Recycling Compactors: Five compactors to be placed at facilities that generate large recyclable volume.	
H	Boonslick Industries	\$70,580	\$70,580	\$25,024	\$0	\$95,604	Plastic, Metal, and Glass Container Collection: Two ProTainer trailers and a 4WD truck for hauling larger, more efficient loads of recyclables. Also allowed for expanded routes.	
H	Handi-Shop, Inc.	\$54,162	\$54,162	\$18,054	\$0	\$72,216	More Awareness=More Recycle Processing: Granted assisted in the purchase of an updated baler to replace a dilapidated one.	
H	Kingdom Projects, Inc.	\$36,000	\$36,000	\$12,000	\$0	\$48,000	Turn it Around @ KPI: Fork lift and recycling containers to make sorting, lifting, and handling practices safer and more efficient.	
H	Boonslick Industries	\$3,793	\$3,793	\$2,122	\$0	\$5,915	Paper Sorting Volume Increase: Additional carts, totes, & pallet jack to make sorting, lifting, and handling practices safer and more efficient.	

Funded Grant Projects (continued)

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
H	City of Columbia	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$10,000	\$0	\$15,000	Front Loading Recycling Containers: Eighteen 4 - 6 yd roll off containers to place at facilities that have limited space for a recycling container.	
H	City of Columbia	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$10,000	\$0	\$15,000	Apartment Recycling Drop-off Bins: Three 14 yd roll offs purchased and placed into rotation for the city's apartment recycling program.	
H	3M	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$6,750	\$0	\$11,750	Purchase & Installation of Vertical Baler to Enable Recycle of LDPE	
I	East Central Missouri Recycling Center	\$68,000	\$68,000	\$38,276	\$0	\$106,276	Recycling center operations.	
J		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		No grant funding was awarded in FY15 to save funding for larger projects.
K	Phelps County	\$11,730	\$11,730	\$0	\$0	\$11,730	Tough on Trash X-litter control and illegal dumping cleanup program with emphasis on recycling materials collected and recruiting volunteers for adopt a road programs.	
K	Waynesville R-VI School District	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$19,476	\$0	\$39,476	Go green tiger recycling III-school district-wide recycling and food waste composting program including environmental education.	
K	Wallis Companies'	\$7,000	\$7,000	\$0	\$0	\$7,000	Recycling Initiative-business and community event recycling (paper, plastic, cardboard, aluminum) also made recycling available to employees to bring from home.	

Funded Grant Projects (continued)

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
K	Maries County	\$6,842	\$6,842	\$0	\$0	\$6,842	Recycling for environmental excellence- litter control and illegal dump cleanup program using community service workers with emphasis on recycling materials collected.	
K	Phelps County	\$6,542	\$6,542	\$0	\$0	\$6,542	Courthouse recycling-establishing office recycling in the Phelps County courthouse with bins/education (paper, cardboard, plastic).	
K	MRPC	\$32,625	\$32,625	\$0	\$0	\$32,625	Rolla-St. Robert HHW collections- joint program with district to provide HHW satellite collection points in district and promote proper reuse, recycling and disposal of HHW. Free to all district residents.	
K	MRPC	\$14,851	\$14,851	\$0	\$0	\$14,851	Compost education program in schools –providing curriculum, assembly presentations and classroom instruction on composting and food waste reduction to schools in the region.	
K	MRPC	\$20,096	\$20,096	\$0	\$0	\$20,096	Illegal dump cleanup program – working with volunteers to cleanup and monitor illegal dumpsites; funding included for school field trips to solid waste facilities; assistance to local governments on recycling illegally dumped tires.	
K	MRPC	\$22,086	\$22,086	\$0	\$0	\$22,086	Special waste collections (appliance, ewaste, tires) provide four or more one-day special collections around the region for appliances, electronics and tires.	
K	MRPC	\$21,483	\$21,483	\$0	\$0	\$21,483	Solid waste management plan update – review and update of the district’s solid waste management plan.	

Funded Grant Projects (continued)

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
K	MRPC	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$0	\$0	\$5,000	Community outreach and assistance – assistance on small projects requested outside of the grant cycle. Examples – printing brochures; purchasing supplies for school based recycling education; debris management after a disaster.	
K	Dixon High School	\$5,100	\$5,100	\$0	\$0	\$5,100	The choice is yours-Waste it or recycle it – school based recycling and education program.	
K	City of Salem	\$22,809	\$22,809	\$26,052	\$0	\$48,861	Recycling – providing recycling services to the city of Salem and transportation of recovered materials to Rolla Recycling Center.	
L	Always Green Recycling, Inc.	\$110,206	\$80,000	\$27,551	\$0	\$107,551	Collection and recycling of recyclable and compost materials	
L	Bicycle Works of St. Louis (DBA Bworks)	\$37,020	\$20,000	\$5,000	\$7,000	\$32,000	Bicycle re-use and recycling	
L	Central Paper Stock Company	\$95,400	\$35,000	\$23,850	\$0	\$58,850	Collection and processing of recyclables	
L	City of Brentwood	\$117,258	\$75,000	\$100,476	\$0	\$175,476	Residential recycling participation education	
L	City of Byrnes Mill	\$26,329	\$25,000	\$6,162	\$0	\$31,162	Drop-off center and transportation	
L	City of Clayton	\$41,689	\$15,000	\$6,400	\$0	\$21,400	Park recycling	
L	City of Hazelwood	\$5,614	\$5,000	\$3,084	\$8,545	\$16,629	Drop-off recycling event	
L	City of Maplewood	\$11,000	\$8,000	\$1,228	\$0	\$9,228	Recycling and composting for area-specific businesses	
L	City of O'Fallon	\$41,660	\$5,000	\$4,500	\$0	\$9,500	Educational materials to increase participation	

Funded Grant Projects (continued)

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
L	City of St. Louis Refuse Division	\$248,832	\$50,000	\$59,328	\$78,680	\$188,008	Collect cardboard/paper recycling	
L	City of University City	\$47,036	\$45,000	\$12,032	\$23,500	\$80,532	C&D resale non-profit	
L	City of Wentzville	\$184,894	\$20,000	\$24,596	\$1,525	\$46,121	Composters for single-stream in public areas	
L	Flooring Systems Inc.	\$47,750	\$35,000	\$5,200	\$18,150	\$58,350	Carpet recycling	
L	FRC Recycling, LLC	\$119,183	\$60,000	\$13,243	\$0	\$73,243	Remanufactured lumber using 100% recycled plastic	
L	Habitat for Humanity of St. Charles County Restore	\$57,315	\$50,000	\$14,040	\$0	\$64,040	Resale facility for C&D recycling	
L	Hansen's RAS, LLC	\$250,104	\$64,500	\$166,737	\$0	\$231,237	Asphalt shingle recycling	
L	Harlin Mitauer Recycling LLC	\$43,198	\$30,000	\$4,840	\$0	\$34,840	Scrap metal recycling	
L	INC Environmental Recycling	\$206,346	\$120,000	\$36,400	\$0	\$156,400	Single-Stream C&D	
L	Jack Kaufmann	\$30,000	\$25,000	\$4,000	\$0	\$29,000	Elementary school recycling education via music presentation	

Funded Grant Projects (continued)

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
L	Leftovers, Etc. (Resource Recovery Project, Inc.)	\$75,430	\$50,000	\$11,759	\$99,055	\$160,814	Community based education and outreach facility	
L	Lens Masters, Inc.	\$70,729	\$15,000	\$7,859	\$0	\$22,859	Fluorescent lamp and ballast recycling and reuse	
L	Mercy Health Foundation St. Louis	\$76,577	\$12,000	\$8,509	\$0	\$20,509	Collection and recycling of multiple materials	
L	MERS/Missouri Goodwill Industries	\$29,681	\$29,681	\$208,114	\$0	\$237,795	eWaste Manufacturing operation	
L	Midwest Shingle Recycling, LLC	\$135,000	\$64,500	\$21,010	\$0	\$85,510	Shingle grinding	
L	Missouri Botanical Garden - EarthWays Center	\$64,840	\$57,000	\$13,989	\$0	\$70,989	Education projects	
L	Missouri Recycling Association (MORA)	\$43,631	\$30,000	\$6,120	\$0	\$36,120	State-wide educational support	
L	MRC1 LLC (DBA MRC Recycling)	\$90,000	\$70,000	\$18,000	\$0	\$88,000	e-waste collection events for recycling/reuse and resale	
L	Operation Brightside	\$27,662	\$25,000	\$8,235	\$460	\$33,695	Recycling education and outreach to city residents	
L	Operation Food Search	\$74,949	\$45,000	\$10,605	\$0	\$55,605	Food collection and diversion	

Funded Grant Projects (continued)

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
L	Pallet Logistics, Inc. - PLM (USA Recycling, Inc.)	\$138,000	\$50,000	\$17,000	\$0	\$67,000	OCC and plastic film collection and processing	
L	Parkway School District	\$43,339	\$10,000	\$5,000	\$0	\$15,000	Recycling and composting district-wide	
L	Pattonville School District	\$39,446	\$25,000	\$29,900	\$0	\$54,900	Organics composting district-wide	
L	Perennial	\$35,584	\$25,000	\$10,140	\$0	\$35,140	Educational DIY community recycling projects	
L	Pro Computers & Consulting	\$40,000	\$30,000	\$6,500	\$0	\$36,500	Offer no-cost CRT/TV collection	
L	Refab	\$135,000	\$80,000	\$15,000	\$10,582	\$105,582	C&D deconstruction and resale	
L	Remains, Inc.	\$111,280	\$75,000	\$30,210	\$0	\$105,210	Plastics and burlap bag recycling and processing	
L	Schnuck Markets, Inc.	\$43,860	\$35,000	\$5,000	\$0	\$40,000	On-site multi-media recycling presentations at schools	
L	Shred and Protect Document Services	\$5,000	\$4,736	\$550	\$0	\$5,286	Collection and shredding of recyclable paper	
L	Spectrum Ecycle Solutions, Inc.	\$19,391	\$19,000	\$2,155	\$0	\$21,155	e-waste collection and recycling events	
L	St. Charles County Government	\$61,600	\$50,000	\$13,730	\$0	\$63,730	Two HHW drop-off facilities	
L	St. Louis American Foundation	\$54,380	\$40,000	\$151,612	\$0	\$191,612	e-waste remanufacturing operation	

Funded Grant Projects (continued)

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
L	St. Louis Cardinals, LLC	\$17,770	\$15,000	\$2,500	\$0	\$17,500	Container recycling at Busch stadium	
L	St. Louis Composting, Inc.	\$24,856	\$15,000	\$3,050	\$0	\$18,050	Food waste composting education	
L	St. Louis Earth Day	\$155,530	\$85,000	\$23,423	\$7,060	\$115,483	Recycling on the Go	
L	St. Louis Earth Day	\$140,323	\$70,000	\$47,056	\$6,400	\$123,456	Green Dining Alliance	
L	St. Louis Health Equipment Lending Program, Inc. (STL HELP)	\$46,955	\$40,000	\$21,475	\$0	\$61,475	Medical equipment recycling/refurbishing for reuse	
L	St. Louis Produce Market, Inc.	\$177,766	\$120,000	\$17,776	\$0	\$137,776	Composting of pre-consumer organic waste	
L	St. Louis Teachers' Recycle Center	\$146,476	\$50,000	\$57,600	\$0	\$107,600	Center for teachers and community reuse of industrial overage materials	
L	St. Louis Zoo	\$44,461	\$35,000	\$7,000	\$10,997	\$52,997	Post-consumer food waste at restaurants and special events	
L	Total Organics Recycling, Inc.	\$35,933	\$30,000	\$12,640	\$0	\$42,640	Recycling horticulture plastic	
L	U.S. Green Building Council - Missouri Gateway Chapter	\$24,048	\$20,000	\$5,500	\$0	\$25,500	LEED certificates and Green Schools Quest Waste Audit Kits	

Funded Grant Projects (continued)

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
L	University of MO - Curators of the University	\$20,609	\$18,000	\$3,235	\$0	\$21,235	Campus recycling	
L	USAgain, LLC	\$26,624	\$13,000	\$40,677	\$0	\$53,677	Textile collection and recycling	
L	Wellston Scrap & Metal, LLC	\$49,920	\$35,000	\$12,772	\$0	\$47,772	Scrap metal recycling	
M	Region M	\$115,124	\$115,124	\$0	\$0	\$115,124	Public education and MORA	
M	Region M	\$115,049	\$115,049	\$0	\$0	\$115,049	Ewaste, HHW, White Goods	
M	City of Seneca	\$7,000	\$7,000	\$0	\$0	\$7,000	Recycling center	
M	City of Sheldon	\$9,000	\$9,000	\$0	\$0	\$9,000	Recycling center	
M	City of Granby	\$12,500	\$12,500	\$0	\$0	\$12,500	Recycling center	
M	City of Carthage	\$16,900	\$16,900	\$0	\$0	\$16,900	Recycling center	
M	City of Joplin	\$19,314	\$19,314	\$0	\$0	\$19,314	Recycling center	
M	City of Neosho	\$25,148	\$25,148	\$0	\$0	\$25,148	Recycling center	
M	Vernon County	\$28,000	\$28,000	\$0	\$0	\$28,000	Recycling center	
M	Noel-McDonald County	\$28,000	\$28,000	\$0	\$0	\$28,000	Recycling center	
M	Sheldon School District	\$7,252	\$7,252	\$0	\$0	\$7,252		
M	Lamar Enterprises	\$17,500	\$17,500	\$0	\$0	\$17,500		

Funded Grant Projects (continued)

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
M	Joplin Area Habitat for Humanity	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$0	\$0	\$25,000		
M	Triple R Recycling	\$16,000	\$16,000	\$0	\$0	\$16,000		
M	Joplin Waste Paper	\$19,000	\$19,000	\$0	\$0	\$19,000		
M	McDonald County	\$12,504	\$12,504	\$0	\$0	\$12,504	Litter Control	
M	Newton County	\$13,796	\$13,796	\$0	\$0	\$13,796	Litter Control	
M	Jasper County	\$20,550	\$20,550	\$0	\$0	\$20,550	Litter Control	
N	Tantone Industries, Inc. (sheltered workshop)	\$35,600	\$35,600	\$0	\$0	\$35,600	Sort line/conveyor for Recycle Center	
N	Tantone Industries, Inc. (sheltered workshop)	\$4,995	\$4,995	\$0	\$0	\$4,995	Establish Electronic & Small Appliance Recycling & Bins for Sorting Electronic Recycling	
N	City of Branson - Branson Regional Recycling Center	\$3,912	\$3,912	\$0	\$0	\$3,912	Fencing for Recycling Center	
N	Green Paws via Forsyth Schools	\$2,845	\$2,845	\$0	\$0	\$2,845	(Put Plastic in its Place) Recycling bins for the school, school sports areas, and the city of Forsyth.	
N	City of Crane	\$15,674	\$15,674	\$0	\$0	\$15,674	Spring & Fall E-Cycle & HHW Collections	

Funded Grant Projects (continued)

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
N	All Points Recycling, LLC	\$16,000	\$4,000	\$0	\$0	\$4,000	Used Drop Trailers for Recycling Collection	Only partially funded due to a shortage of funds. The district is minimally funded.
N	EarthWise Recycling Center at Reeds Spring School	\$9,615	\$5,478	\$0	\$0	\$5,478	Electronic Waste Collection Expansion & Power washer for Food Waste Composter	Only partially funded due to a shortage of funds. The district is minimally funded.
N	Hansen's Tree Service Recycling Center	\$23,750	\$5,478	\$0	\$0	\$5,478	Crossbelt Magnet for Composter	Only partially funded due to a shortage of funds. The district is minimally funded.
O	Christian County Enterprises	\$4,995	\$4,995	\$0	\$0	\$4,995	Computer Recycling	
O	City of Springfield	\$28,859	\$28,859	\$0	\$0	\$28,859	City Recycling Enhancement Program	
O	Solid Waste District O	\$18,000	\$18,000	\$0	\$0	\$18,000	HHW Project	
O	Web-Co Custom Industries	\$4,995	\$4,995	\$0	\$0	\$4,995	E-Waste Recycling	
O	City of Springfield	\$49,300	\$49,300	\$0	\$0	\$49,300	Glass Recycling Bunker	
O	Computer Recycling Center	\$44,955	\$38,781	\$0	\$0	\$38,781	Electronic & Universal Waste Collection Bins	
O	City of Ash Grove	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$0	\$0	\$35,000	City Recycling Center, Phase II	
O	Urban Roots Farm	\$38,747	\$38,747	\$0	\$0	\$38,747	Composting Collective	

Funded Grant Projects (continued)

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
O	Webster County	\$9,890	\$9,890	\$0	\$0	\$9,890	Webster County Energy Recovery Project	
O	Springfield Greene County Office of Emergency Management	\$39,639	\$39,639	\$0	\$0	\$39,639	PSC Recycling Program	
O	Hansen's Tree Service	\$50,000	\$43,826	\$0	\$0	\$43,826	Hansen's Demolition Waste Recycling Center	
P	Region P	\$37,690	\$37,690	\$0	\$0	\$37,690	Plan implementation grant.	
P	Mountain View Recycling	\$9,000	\$6,000	\$0	\$0	\$6,000	Baler Grant	
P	Ozark County Recycling	\$9,000	\$6,000	\$0	\$0	\$6,000	Baler Grant	
P	Douglas County Recycling	\$14,400	\$14,400	\$0	\$0	\$14,400	DOCO Wages	
P	Oregon County Recycling	\$20,000	\$15,000	\$0	\$0	\$15,000	Forklift	
P	Texas County	\$18,480	\$18,480	\$0	\$0	\$18,480	Garrett Recycling	
P	Oregon County Recycling	\$15,912	\$15,912	\$0	\$0	\$15,912	Wages	
P	Ozark County Recycling	\$14,560	\$14,560	\$0	\$0	\$14,560	Wages	
P	Shannon County Recycling	\$10,944	\$10,944	\$1,200	\$0	\$12,144	Wages +	

Funded Grant Projects (continued)

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
P	Region P	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$0	\$0	\$10,000	Electronic Waste Collections	
P	Region P	\$30,000	\$10,000	\$0	\$0	\$10,000	Household Hazardous Waste	
P	Region P	\$20,000	\$10,000	\$0	\$0	\$10,000	Illegal Dumping Clean-up	
P	City of West Plains	\$12,000	\$3,500	\$0	\$0	\$3,500	Baler Award	
P	Missouri State University	\$22,000	\$11,610	\$0	\$0	\$11,610	Recycle Bins	
Q	Ozark Foothills Regional Planning Commission	\$126,234	\$126,234	\$126,554	\$0	\$252,788	Funds provided to operate a regional recycling center serving Butler, Carter, Reynolds, Ripley and Wayne Counties.	
Q	Region Q	\$13,674	\$13,674	\$0	\$0	\$13,674	Funds utilized for district operations.	
R	City of Cape Girardeau	\$29,720	\$29,720	\$9,907	\$0	\$39,627	HHW	
R	City of Fredericktown	\$6,605	\$6,605	\$2,202	\$0	\$8,807	Recycling bags	
R	Holcim/Ste. Genevieve County	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$6,667	\$0	\$26,667	HHW	
R	MRC	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$8,333	\$0	\$33,333	E-Waste Waste Subsidy and hoppers	
R	Bollinger County Recycling, Inc.	\$2,290	\$2,290	\$763	\$0	\$3,053	Operation and purchase of equipment	
R	Bollinger County Safety Upgrades	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$1,000	\$0	\$4,000	Needed safety railings.	

Funded Grant Projects (continued)

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
R	In-the-Green Education Program	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$5,000	\$0	\$20,000	Education Program for presentation to local schools	
R	Holcim/Ste. Genevieve County	\$30,361	\$30,361	\$10,120	\$0	\$40,481	HHW	
R	Perry County	\$18,838	\$18,838	\$6,280	\$0	\$25,118	HHW	
S	Scott County	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$0	\$0	\$10,000	Illegal dumping ditches/roadside	
S	City of Portageville	\$6,909	\$6,909	\$0	\$0	\$6,909	Transport trailer to SW in another County	
S	Mississippi	\$19,998	\$19,998	\$0	\$0	\$19,998	Two recycling trailers	
S	Cotton Boll S/Workshop	\$45,200	\$45,200	\$0	\$0	\$45,200	Off set labor cost	
S	PPI Sheltered Workshop	\$41,696	\$41,696	\$0	\$0	\$41,696	Off set labor cost	
S	Region S	\$18,000	\$18,000	\$0	\$0	\$18,000	Pick up E-waste in selected locations	
T	City of Osage Beach	\$2,100	\$2,100	\$822	\$0	\$2,922		
T	Palmer Recycling	\$18,000	\$18,000	\$2,000	\$0	\$20,000		
T	Ozarks Recycling	\$22,275	\$22,275	\$2,326	\$0	\$24,601		

Funded Grant Projects (continued)

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
T	Camdenton Recycling	\$8,928	\$8,928	\$992	\$0	\$9,920		
T	Laclede Industries	\$13,000	\$13,000	\$13,000	\$0	\$26,000		

ATTACHMENT B

FY2015 DISTRICT UNFUNDED PROJECTS

Unfunded Grant Projects

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
A	Albany Warrior Recycling and Education	\$7,974	\$0	Grant to fund expansion of elementary school recycling program.	Project did not score high enough to be funded.
A	Scientific Inquiry of Composting in the Classroom	\$16,400	\$0	Grant written to fund scientific study of composting in science classes. Most of the grant funds to be spent on classroom equipment.	Board felt the focus was on science education; not solid waste goals for composting. They did not score the application because it did not meet the basic criteria of a composting program.
B	None				
C	None				
D	Clinton County	\$5,883	\$0	Mileage for recycling routes and employee costs.	The grant application did not score well enough to be considered.
D	Monster Energy	\$14,500	\$0	Purchase truck and trailer for a community outreach tire recycling program. Truck and trailer would be used to transport tires collected through community tire pick up programs.	The grant application did not score well enough to be considered.
D	Monster Energy	\$21,000	\$0	Purchase equipment for the purpose of recycling semi-tires.	The grant application did not score well enough to be considered.
E	CASCO	\$190,078	\$0	Recycling Drop-Off Enhancements: Funding requested to add enhancements to existing drop-off center and to pay for advertising.	The grant committee did not recommend funding because the enhancements would not lead to an increase in diversion.

Unfunded Grant Projects (continued)

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
E	City of Lee's Summit	\$183,174	\$0	Swap Shop/HHW Facility: Funding requested to support development of new HHW facility.	The application was deemed incomplete.
E	Waste Recycling Advocacy Partnership	\$35,970	\$0	Waste Recycling Advocacy Partnership: Funding requested to purchase a baler and support staffing for a non-profit to collect paper and cardboard recycling from local businesses.	The project was considered by the grant committee to be unsustainable and competed against entities already providing similar services.
E	Kansas City Public Schools	\$100,000	\$0	KCPS Recycles: Funding requested to support the implementation of recycling programs at 25 elementary schools.	The application was not well thought out and the grant committee deemed it to be incomplete.
E	Kansas City Public Schools	\$97,112	\$0	KCPS Smart ReUSE: Funding requested to pay for a contractor and staff to manage the school district's surplus material.	The grant committee believed that the school district could make revenue on the sale of material and did not require district assistance.
E	The Surplus Exchange	\$99,280	\$0	Expanded E-Waste Recycling Program: Funding requested to support a recycling coordinator to market e-waste recycling.	The application was not focused and was also deemed incomplete by the grant committee.
F	None				
G	None				
H	None				
I	None				

Unfunded Grant Projects (continued)

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
J	None were funded				No grant funding was awarded in FY15 to save funding for larger projects.
K	In-the-Green Productions Presents Jack Kaufmann	\$9,000	\$0		
L	Circle of Light Associates DBA The COLA STEM Initiative	\$4,430	\$0		
L	Hansen's Tree, Lawn and Landscaping Services, Inc.	\$525,000	\$0		
L	L.E.D.R. LLC	\$455,076	\$0		
L	Schroeder Sod Farms	\$931,570	\$0		
N	None				
L	St. Louis Post-Dispatch	\$49,376	\$0		
M	None				
O	Dallas County Recycling	\$50,000	\$0	Requested funds for a metal recycling center in Dallas County.	Not funded due to limited resources. Project did not score high enough during the evaluation process.
O	Breast Cancer Foundation of the Ozarks [BCFO]	\$49,700	\$0	Requested funds for e-waste recycling.	Not funded due to limited resources. Project did not score high enough during the evaluation process.
O	Community Partnership of the Ozarks [CPO]	\$38,653	\$0	Requested funds for glass recycling, in which bottles would be transformed into drinking glasses.	Not funded due to limited resources. Grant committee also felt that the cost of the machinery needed for the project would outweigh the actual benefit.

Unfunded Grant Projects (continued)

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
P	City of Willow Springs	\$8,030	\$0	glass crusher	
P	Willow Springs School System	\$1,580	\$0	manpower	
P	City of Willow Springs	\$1,500	\$0	city-wide cleanup	
Q	Did not report				
R	None				
S	None				
T	None				