



MISSOURI
SOLID WASTE ADVISORY BOARD

PO Box 176
JEFFERSON CITY, MO 65102

PHONE 573-751-5401
FAX 573-526-3902

Mr. Chris Nagel
Solid Waste Management Program
P.O. Box 176
Jefferson City, MO 65102

December 12, 2017

Dear Mr. Nagel,

On behalf of the Missouri Solid Waste Advisory Board (SWAB), I am pleased to transmit a copy of the *Annual Report for Calendar Year 2017*. This report has been prepared in accordance with Section 260.345 of the Missouri Revised Statute and covers the subjects listed in subdivisions (1) to (8) of subsection 1. This annual report was approved at the November 1, 2017 SWAB meeting.

SWAB is willing to work with you and your staff to discuss the issues identified in the annual report in greater detail. I'd like to thank you for your willingness to work with us to expand Missouri's recycling industry and improve solid waste management practices. Your involvement and leadership is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Brady Wilson, Chairman
Missouri Solid Waste Advisory Board

MISSOURI
SOLID WASTE ADVISORY BOARD

ANNUAL REPORT FOR CALENDAR YEAR 2017

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
Lithium Ion Batteries.....	6
3.0 Proposed Rules and Regulations	6
4.0 Grant Award Criteria.....	7
Grant Award Criteria	7
Recycling Program Benefits.....	8
5.0 Waste Management Issues.....	8
Inadequate Resources to Address Closed Landfills with Environmental Issues.....	8
Affordable recovery and recycling of illegally dumped tires.....	9



Right to Repair.....	9
6.0 New Technologies and Improved Methods.....	9
Local and State Policies	9
Food Waste	10
Organic Waste.....	10
Extended Producer Responsibility/Product Stewardship	10
7.0 Unfunded Solid Waste Management Projects	11
8.0 Other Matters.....	11
Extend Disposal Fee to Cover DNR Expenses	11
Local Control	11
Waste Diversion Goal.....	11
Waste Diversion Measurement.....	12
Maintain the Ban on Yard Waste in Landfills	12
Attachment A FY2017 District Funded Projects	
Attachment B FY2017 District Unfunded Projects	
Attachment C Proposed Revisions: 10 CSR 80-9.050 Solid Waste Management Fund—District Grants	



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 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

In the 2016 annual report, SWAB recommended that DNR begin to establish a program during 2017. The following recommendations are again repeated in this report.

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 purchasing 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.

The global recycling market is also expected to suffer due to actions taken by China. Chinese authorities announced that the country will ban the import of mixed paper and most scrap plastics by the end of 2017. China is one of the world's foremost importers of recyclable material and our domestic markets will not be able to absorb the materials that will be banned. This ban could adversely affect recycling programs across the U.S. and in Missouri until the recycling industry is able to adjust and find other domestic and international markets.

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 and a decrease in shingle recycling. 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.

LITHIUM ION BATTERIES

Lithium-ion batteries are rechargeable batteries and are used as a source of power primarily in electronics such as smartphones, laptops and tablets. Their share of the battery market is growing due to the increasing demand for portable consumer electronics. Their market share is also expected to continue to grow because of their potential use in the automotive sector (electric/hybrid vehicles).

Safety of lithium-based batteries, however, has attracted much attention over the past few years. They have caused fires in hoverboards, laptops and phones.

As the use of these batteries grows, their presence in the waste stream is expected to grow. Their safety risk also extends to disposal. Because lithium-ion batteries retain some amount of charge when they are “dead,” they have been suspected of causing fires in the back of trash and recycling trucks, where the batteries can be damaged during transport and exposed to other chemicals. Known as “hot loads,” these incidences can jeopardize the health and safety of the driver and public, and can damage personal property and collection vehicles. They also pose a threat to a landfill, if undetected.

SWAB is evaluating the need for legislative action to manage the risks of lithium-ion battery disposal.

3.0 PROPOSED RULES AND REGULATIONS

The Solid Waste Management Program (SWMP) has begun the process to promulgate a rule revision to adopt the Federal coal combustion residuals (CCR) rules. 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.



In January 2017, Governor Greitens signed Executive Order 17-03, requiring Missouri agencies to conduct a review of all existing and proposed regulations. In July, Governor Greitens announced the launch of an initiative (NoMORedTape) for Missourians to submit recommendations for action to cut government red tape.

In this spirit of reducing red tape, the districts reviewed 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”).

In reviewing the grant rule, the districts looked to ease the administrative burden on districts and to update outdated regulatory language. 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.

The revisions suggested by SWAB are provided as an attachment to this report. They have also been submitted to the NoMORedTape initiative through DNR SWMP.

4.0 GRANT AWARD CRITERIA

GRANT AWARD CRITERIA

The grant award criteria are established in state regulations and include 19 criteria that districts must consider when awarding grants.

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.

SWAB has reviewed the criteria and suggests:



- Rewriting criterion number 4 to make it easier to evaluate: Degree to which the project will result in improvement or expansion of services. Districts do not have the ability to forecast how the market segment of an existing entity will be impacted by a grant award.
- Eliminating criterion number 6. While partnerships can be beneficial, they are not always necessary for the success of a project. This criterion can be detrimental to the scoring single-entity projects.
- Eliminating criterion number 8. Missouri is a diverse state and not all projects will show potential for transferability to other regions. While transferability can be beneficial, it should not be necessary.
- Eliminating criterion number 9. When asked, most districts did not understand the criterion or how it should be applied when evaluating grant applications.
- Combining criterion 9 with criterion 10, which eliminates the need for a separate evaluation of an applicant’s technical and managerial abilities.
- Eliminating criterion 16. Not all districts require match funding from applicants.
- Eliminating criterion 17. Not all grants require a marketing strategy.
- Eliminating criterion 19. Districts are required to obtain bond ratings from cities and three years of financial reports from applicants seeking funding over \$50,000. This requirement is vague and provides no guidance as to its implementation.

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
- Affordable recovery and recycling of illegally dumped tires
- Right to Repair

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.

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).

RIGHT TO REPAIR

It's inevitable. The things we own stop working or break. Getting broken items repaired is becoming more challenging as consumers rarely have the ability to repair their own items or have them repaired at an independent repair shop. While many manufactures allow consumers and local repair shops to fix their products, there are others that are making it more difficult by not releasing repair manuals, using proprietary fasteners or not making parts available.

Making repairs difficult means that many consumers will choose to replace the item and send the broken item to the landfill.

Right to repair laws typically require manufacturers to publish repair manuals and sell the parts, diagnostic software, and tools needed to fix their products. The goal of these laws is to ensure consumers can repair their own items, or pay an independent repair shop to do so. Several states over the past year, Missouri included, introduced legislation that would require manufacturers of electronic equipment to sell repair parts and release service information to consumers.

SWAB is supportive of actions that improve access to repair to keep products in service and out of the waste stream.

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 FY2017, the districts funded 197 projects totaling more than \$5,310,000. The districts also leveraged more than \$2,780,000 in match and project funds. For the same time period, the districts report that 37 projects requesting more than \$1,950,000 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 20 projects requesting more than \$1,270,000 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.

Actions to move Missouri towards the 75 percent diversion goal include:



- Education and outreach that focuses on the opportunity that increased waste diversion brings to Missouri. Efforts should target solid waste districts, municipal decision makers, legislators, businesses and the public.
- Emphasis on specific items in the waste stream that can provide the greatest impact. Five large-volume commodities have been identified that, when diverted, will add considerable additional tonnage toward the goal of 75 percent. Extensive research has been completed by the Missouri Recycling Association to identify current infrastructure and potential strategies for diversion of each of five commodities that include e-scrap, construction and demolition waste, paint, textiles, and organics. Education and outreach will focus on the opportunities that increasing waste diversion brings to Missouri and by working with stakeholder groups, we can collectively determine the best strategies for each of the targeted commodities. These strategies include producer responsibility programs, growing end markets, education and outreach, and promoting participating in other state and national programs. A common element for each commodity will be action steps that both businesses and individuals can take to reduce, reuse and minimize the need to landfill each target commodity. This component is especially important in rural regions where recycling options are limited or non-existent.

WASTE DIVERSION MEASUREMENT

In 1990, Missouri adopted a statewide waste diversion goal of 40% by 1998. According to measurements by DNR, the state achieved 40% diversion in 2001. DNR measures diversion through a calculation of the amount of waste that would be expected to be placed in final disposal (i.e., generated) compared to the amount actually placed in final disposal.

For the disposal estimate, DNR tracks the amount of waste disposed in Missouri landfills, waste transported out of state for disposal, and estimates the amount of waste imported into the state for disposal.

The most challenging aspect of determining waste diversion estimates continues to be the accurate assessment of the amount of waste generated. DNR has used two methods to estimate the amount of waste generated:

- From 1990 to 1999, DNR used a fixed generation rate of 1.47 tons/person multiplied by annual population estimates to determine waste generation. Using this methodology, the state calculated the diversion rate to be 24% in 1999.
- In 1999, DNR switched to a variable generation rate that reflects the state of the economy. The variable generation rate uses Personal Consumption Expenditures (PCE) in which waste generated in 1990 was divided by PCE for 1990 to derive an index by which subsequent years' PCE values may be multiplied. The 1999 diversion rate was recalculated by DNR to be 36% in 1999 using the variable generation rate. The 2017 diversion rate has been calculated to be approximately 63%.

SWAB believes that the current waste diversion rate methodology used by DNR overestimates the state's diversion rate. SWAB encourages DNR to re-evaluate the methodology.

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

FY2017 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	Nodaway County	\$15,340	\$15,340	\$3,400	\$0	\$18,740	Regional permanent HHW collection site set up in Nodaway County.	Carryover funding
A	NW MO Regional Council of Governments	\$9,651	\$9,651	\$0	\$0	\$9,651	Household hazardous waste annual pick-up. Funding part of joint contract with Districts B, C, D and F for pick-up by Clean Harbors.	
A	NW Technical School Technical Honor Society	\$446	\$446	\$23	\$0	\$469	Recycling plastic bottles in Maryville Schools.	Carryover funding
A	Rolling Hills Creative Living	\$9,711	\$9,711	\$2,516	\$0	\$12,227	Grant City curbside recycling conducted by Rolling Hills Creative Living, giving jobs to their residents.	
B	Region B	\$26,500	\$26,500	\$0	\$0	\$26,500	Plan Implementation:	
C	City of Canton	\$15,153	\$15,153	\$5,503	\$0	\$20,657	Loading ramp at city recycling center	
C	City of Canton	\$24,272	\$24,262	\$4,914	\$0	\$29,176	Fork-Lift, pick-up truck & pallet jack scale for recycling program	
C	City of Kirksville	\$22,163	\$22,163	\$7,388	\$0	\$29,551	Recycled content tables & benches in city recreation areas	
C	City of Kirksville	\$27,837	\$27,837	\$9,279	\$0	\$37,116	Purchase totes for city curbside glass recycling program	
C	City of Memphis	\$30,087	\$30,087	\$10,028	\$0	\$40,115	Building & equipment to expand city recycling program	
C	Community Opportunities Inc	\$4,425	\$4,425	\$0	\$0	\$4,425	New Tilt Trucks to replace old at Sheltered Workshop	
D	Andrew County	\$8,500	\$8,500	\$2,400	\$0	\$10,900	Purchase forklift to load and unload bins from trailer at recycling center and deliver to Clinco	
D	Buchanan County	\$9,123	\$9,123	\$1,250	\$0	\$10,373	Purchase cargo container to be used as a collection and storage container for HHW. Supplies for the container and training for operators	
D	City of Cameron	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$39,621	\$0	\$59,621	Purchase truck for curbside recycling collections	
D	Clinco	\$18,724	\$18,724	\$2,080	\$0	\$20,804	Smaller forklift to stack baled recyclables	
D	Region D	\$16,701	\$16,701	\$0	\$0	\$16,701	All costs associated with e-waste recycling; ads, labor and fees to certified recycler. 9 sites	

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	\$16,461	\$16,461	\$0	\$0	\$16,461	Disposal fees associated with container, operator wages, ads, and extra supplies.	
D	Stewartsville	\$3,589	\$3,589	\$1,261	\$0	\$4,850	Purchase a 28' trailer to haul more bins at one time to Clinco, reducing the number of trips to Clinco	
E	Avenue of Life	\$73,488	\$59,428	\$14,857	\$0	\$74,285	Mattress recycling capacity. Funding supports one baler, two staff members, four spinning tables and four rotary shears for deconstruction of mattresses for recycling.	Supplies were not funded.
E	Bridging The Gap	\$81,187	\$81,187	\$20,615	\$0	\$101,802	Support for one-on-one consultations with a minimum of 15 businesses. Emphasis on multi-family dwellings.	
E	Composting and Organics Association of Missouri	\$8,202	\$8,202	\$2,509	\$0	\$10,711	A composting workshop featuring two speakers.	
E	Folk Alliance International	\$21,066	\$3,608	\$1,065	\$0	\$4,673	Staffing, signage, and recycling and composting bags for annual conference at the Westin Hotel in Kansas City.	Partially funded because grant applicant was requesting items that would not lead to significant diversion.
E	Independence Avenue Community Improvement District	\$82,500	\$17,500	\$4,600	\$0	\$22,100	Purchase of 20 outdoor recycling containers, education, and bags for recycling on Independence Avenue in Kansas City.	Request included trash containers and extended work with businesses on the avenue. District wanted to ensure success and recommended to start smaller
E	Mid-America Regional Council	\$48,267	\$48,267	\$25,684	\$0	\$73,951	Funding supports the Recycle More education campaign.	

Funded Grant Projects (continued)

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
E	Project Central	\$140,593	\$120,708	\$48,400	\$0	\$169,108	Food waste composting and education for 10 new schools, and continuation of support for existing programs at eight schools. Grantee will create an online guide to lunch room composting, and an e-newsletter.	Indirect costs were eliminated to reduce the grant amount.
E	Region E	\$213,845	\$213,845	\$0	\$0	\$213,845	Plan implementation for district outreach activities.	
E	Region E	\$26,319	\$26,319	\$0	\$0	\$26,319	Plan implementation for district sponsorship program.	
E	Region E	\$76,144	\$76,144	\$0	\$0	\$76,144	Plan implementation for regional HHW program.	
E	Scraps KC	\$49,298	\$10,881	\$2,722	\$0	\$13,603	Signage, web development, start up supplies, mileage, and internet and phone for newly opened creative reuse store.	Rent, accounting services and insurance were eliminated. District chose to fund only costs directly related to waste diversion
E	The City of Grandview	\$122,976	\$23,625	\$5,906	\$0	\$29,531	Provides a recycling trailer for city events and staffing for management and education.	Partially funded because grant applicant was requesting funding for items that would not lead to increased diversion.
E	The Kansas City Chiefs	\$31,981	\$21,981	\$10,000	\$0	\$31,981	Dual containers to collect compostables and recyclables from fans.	
E	The Rehabilitation Institute	\$45,016	\$11,759	\$2,940	\$0	\$14,699	Funding will provide two scanners, one laptop with software, and one staff member to support online sale of reused books.	A craft component of the project was eliminated.
F	City of Marshall	\$25,500	\$25,500	\$4,500	\$0	\$30,000	Concrete grinding	
F	City of Sedalia	\$23,772	\$23,772	\$4,345	\$0	\$28,117	Recycling Center (forklift, glass recycling containers, refrigerator recover equip.)	

F	City of Waverly	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$7,442	\$0	\$37,442	Playground
F	Gilliam C-4 School	\$19,465	\$19,465	\$3,435	\$0	\$22,900	Playground

Funded Grant Projects (continued)

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
F	Leeton R-X School District	\$11,560	\$11,560	\$2,040	\$0	\$13,600	Recycling program transportation/dumping charges	
F	Missouri Recycling Association	\$8,540	\$8,540	\$1,506	\$0	\$10,046	Strive for 75% Campaign Phase II (MO State Fair & Billboards)	
F	Odessa Parks & Rec	\$21,758	\$21,758	\$3,840	\$0	\$25,598	Playground	
F	Region F	\$37,000	\$37,000	\$0	\$0	\$37,000	Plan Implementation, which includes educational projects such as illegal dumping awareness, professional development, a MO State Fair booth, and other educational activities or presentations.	
F	Region F	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$0	\$0	\$20,000	Regional HHW	
F	Region F	\$9,775	\$9,775	\$1,725	\$0	\$11,500	5 Year Plan	
G	Bowling Green School	\$24,000	\$40,000	\$4,444	\$0	\$44,444	Funding for the purchase of surface material under a playground structure.	
G	Granuband	\$75,000	\$65,000	\$7,222	\$0	\$72,222	Funds will be used to purchase a granulator to be used in processing tires.	
G	Macon County Sheltered Industries	\$67,500	\$1,537	\$7,500	\$0	\$9,037	collection bins will be purchased and utilized for collection of recyclables.	
G	NEMO Sheltered Industries	\$44,728	\$30,000	\$3,333	\$0	\$33,333	Purchase collection bins to collect recyclables and a forklift used to move the recyclables.	
G	Press Journal Printing	\$11,000	\$11,000	\$1,222	\$0	\$12,222	Funds will be used to purchase a baler to be used to move recycled paper.	
G	Region G	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$0	\$0	\$75,000	Funding for collection of HHW and E-Waste at the semi-permanent containers.	

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	\$30,427	\$30,427	\$10,166	\$0	\$40,593	The City will purchase eight (8) mini commercial cardboard balers. These balers do not take up much space and would offer businesses an alternative to their current recycling practices. The City has set parameters to measure whether a business qualifies to have a baler installed. Once installed, city staff will provide operational instructions and training on how to use the baler. The business will bale their cardboard and mixed fiber and store it until they've run out of space. Upon being contacted, the Columbia's Solid Waste Department would pick-up the bales for recycling.	
H	3M Company	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$7,270	\$0	\$12,270	3M would purchase and install a vertical baler to recycle Polyurethane Foam in house. 3M expects program income to be generated from the sale of the PF bales at about \$1490/annually, with an additional savings of \$484/annually for Landfill diversion.	
H	Boonslick Industries	\$23,378	\$23,378	\$11,611	\$0	\$34,989	Boonslick Industries (BII) would like to purchase (178) Big Bottle Recyclers to be placed in and around ball fields, tennis courts, locker rooms, gymnasiums, etc. With the Big Bottle Recycler looking like a large plastic soda bottle, it's easy to recognize its purpose. BII feels them pursuing this request in lieu of the individual school districts would help give them incentive to participate. BII will, of course, be the one to collect and process the material when a pick-up is needed.	

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 Centralia	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$2,838	\$0	\$7,838	<p>The City of Centralia is requesting funds to re-institute the drop off recycling container that has been absent for the last 10 years. This container would be added to the Boone County recycling program and it would be serviced exclusively by the City of Columbia as per their cost structure. This container would replace the existing 1 cubic yard bag program which is cumbersome and not sustainable due to difficulty sourcing bags. The City of Centralia is willing to pay the costs associated with the service and tonnage fees because they believe it will be less than current expenditures. \$141.35/pull fee plus \$45.76/ton.</p> <p>A citizen survey was completed in 2015 which showed that a recycling drop off would increase the amount of citizens who recycled in their households.</p>	
H	Food Bank for Central and NE Missouri	\$65,584	\$65,584	\$21,862	\$0	\$87,445	<p>Due to lack of cool storage space, The Food Bank produces approximately 1,500 pounds of food waste per week. They have formulated a plan to create more cool storage space allowing them to reach their four goals. Applicant will purchase a 53-foot refrigerated trailer that will be parked outside Central Pantry. This trailer will allow for an additional 12,000 to 15,000 pounds of food refrigerated at a time. In addition to the refrigerated trailer, The Food Bank will give it an upgrade and install an Airocide unit. This unit will extend the shelf life of stored produce by up to five days. It breaks down naturally occurring molds and biological gases and converts it to water vapor.</p>	

Funded Grant Projects (continued)

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
H	IMS, LLC	\$57,570	\$57,570	\$19,190	\$0	\$76,760	IMS has steadily grown their clientele since 2008. Additionally, they currently hold a one year contract with the State of Missouri for shredding and recycling services. IMS would like to purchase an auto-tie baler to replace their manual-tie baler. The manual-tie baler will move to baling cardboard, while the auto-tie will be used for paper products. Obtaining an auto-tie baler will allow IMS to increase the speed of the process and reduce the labor associated in manually tying. They anticipate a 20% increase in productivity and diversion.	
H	IMS, LLC	\$3,749	\$3,749	\$1,250	\$0	\$4,999	IMS is a safe and secure way for state and local governments, schools, and private companies to manage their document disposal. IMS provides services to collect, shred, and recycle paper. If funded, IMS will purchase locking roll carts and provide them to new and existing businesses. They keep sensitive documents secure while at the business, during transport to IMS, and while awaiting the shred process. Contents are only accessible by authorized personnel.	
H	IMS, LLC	\$3,749	\$3,749	\$1,250	\$0	\$4,999	IMS is a safe and secure way for state and local governments, schools, and private companies to manage their document disposal. IMS provides services to collect, shred, and recycle paper. If funded, IMS will purchase locking consoles and provide them to new and existing businesses. They keep sensitive documents secure while at the business, during transport to IMS, and while awaiting the shred process. Contents are only accessible by authorized personnel.	

Funded Grant Projects (continued)

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
H	MORA	\$4,822	\$4,822	\$1,650	\$0	\$6,472	The Missouri Recycling Association (MORA) is requesting grant funds to offer a 6 hour zero waste training to take place on August 8th, 2017, the day before the MORA conference. Funds will cover the cost of the Zero Waste trainer's fee, equipment rental, and accommodations.	
H	Region H	\$93,066	\$93,066		\$0	\$93,066	Plan implementation project includes: Statistically valid survey of Region H residents in regards to recycling awareness and services, HHW/E-Waste/Tire Collection Program, Tire Disposal for illegally dumped tires collected by Region H Public Works Departments, Sponsorship funding for Region H Schools, Events, and Non-profits, HHW Safety Training subsidy for Region H HHW facility managers, half of the District Planner's salary and benefits, Educational Materials, Promotion of Services.	
H	River Relief, Inc.	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$9,859	\$0	\$14,859	River Relief is coordinating a one day river clean up that will span five miles of the Missouri River with locations in Boone, Callaway, and Cole County. Grant will pay for coordination, boat usage with crew. Volunteers will remove trash, plastic, aluminum, glass, tires, appliances, etc. from the river and dispose/recycle collected items responsibly.	
H	Rock Bridge High School	\$4,953	\$4,953	\$5,541	\$0	\$10,493	Rock Bridge High School is taking steps to update and revitalize their internal recycling process. After conducting a waste audit, they saw the need for additional recycling can locations and education for the student body. A recycling committee, comprised of 25 students, has already been formed. This committee will provide more than sufficient labor for the project.	

Funded Grant Projects (continued)

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
H	Space Shark Studios	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$9,216	\$0	\$14,216	WasteCraft is a player survival game that educates its users by rewarding them for proper collection and refinement/recycling of normal household waste and turning improperly processed materials into enemy combatants that will damage the player's encampment.	
H	University of Missouri	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$76,631	\$0	\$176,631	MU will purchase a baler with conveyor that will be installed in their Resource Recovery Center. They will also acquire 96 gallon roll carts from the City of Columbia. MU will collect and bale paper from campus offices and store them until there is enough for a pick-up. A commodity vendor will retrieve the bales and pay MU the current market rate per ton. The project will be self-sustaining, with long term benefits. It's projected that at least one full time employee will be added as a result of in house recycling.	
H	Willow Fork Pallet, LLC	\$33,750	\$33,750	\$11,250	\$0	\$45,000	Willow Fork Pallet (WFP) is in the business of building, selling and repairing pallets. They also mulch the leftover pallet material into mulch. It is colored, bagged, and sold at local retailers. They have identified several ways to gather plenty of wood scrap to produce the volume of mulch they do. WFP currently uses a small skid steer to load waste into the mulcher for processing then moving the completed product for bagging. This equipment limits the amount of waste that can be moved at a time. WFP would purchase one large wheel loader allowing them to move more material at a time, thus increasing production and reducing the time it takes to complete a bag of mulch for sale.	

Funded Grant Projects (continued)

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
I	Boonslick Regional Planning Commission	\$68,000	\$68,000	\$38,276		\$106,276	Continued operation of the East Central Missouri Recycling Center which serves all counties in the Region I SWMD.	
J	Bates County Industries	\$3,718	\$3,718	\$0	\$0	\$3,718	Recycling Bin Replacement	
J	Evan's Drug	\$4,640	\$4,640	\$0	\$0	\$4,640	Recycling Collection Project in El Dorado Springs	
J	Jack Kaufmann	\$9,600	\$9,600	\$0	\$0	\$9,600	Recycling Education Presentation for elementary and middle school students	
J	Meredith Recycling	\$38,000	\$38,000	\$0	\$0	\$38,000	Equipment for processing electronics for recycling	
K	Bourbon High School	\$9,537	\$9,537	\$0	\$0	\$9,537	Food waste composting and vermicomposting - a pilot project for a school-based program for composting the school's kitchen waste in tumblers and vermicomposting.	
K	Dixon Area Recycling Center	\$30,137	\$28,637	\$0	\$0	\$28,637	Community Recycling Drop-off Center: funding for expanding operations including equipment, supplies, salary and transportation of materials.	Funding was reduced in order to provide additional funding for other projects.
K	Dixon High School Key Club	\$6,950	\$4,850	\$0	\$0	\$4,850	The Choice is Yours- Waste it or Recycle It! - a school based recycling program providing recycling and education to schools and the Dixon community. Students collect all materials and bail cardboard.	Funding was reduced in order to provide additional funding for other projects.
K	Jack Kaufmann - In the Green Productions	\$7,200	\$5,400	\$0	\$0	\$5,400	Multi-media environmental education presented through school-wide assemblies for primary and secondary schools.	Funding was reduced in order to provide additional funding for other projects.
K	Maries County	\$6,480	\$5,980	\$0	\$0	\$5,980	Recycling for Environmental Excellence - litter control and illegal dump cleanup program using community service workers with emphasis on recycling the collected materials.	Funding was reduced in order to provide additional funding for other projects.

Funded Grant Projects (continued)

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
K	Meramec Regional Planning Commission	\$40,161	\$37,161	\$0	\$0	\$37,161	HHW Satellite Collection Centers - the cities of Rolla and St. Robert collaboration with the district to provide HHW services through two satellite collection points while promoting proper reuse, recycling and disposal of HHW. These services are free to all district residents. Community HHW presentations are also made available through this funding.	Grantee voluntarily reduced the amount of funding.
K	Meramec Regional Planning Commission	\$27,997	\$27,997	\$0	\$0	\$27,997	Special Waste Collections (appliances, e-scrap, tires) provide the region with four or more one-day special collections with subsidized fees for tires, Freon appliances and TVs/monitors. Electronics recycling education for school-aged youth is also provided regionally to educators through this funding.	
K	Meramec Regional Planning Commission	\$20,000	\$5,000	\$0	\$0	\$5,000	Community Outreach & Assistance Fund - provides for requests made outside of the grant cycle or for small projects. Examples include debris disposal after a disaster, supplies for school based recycling education, or printing recycling brochures.	Grantee voluntarily reduced the amount of funding.
K	Meramec Regional Planning Commission	\$20,288	\$8,911	\$0	\$0	\$8,911	Illegal Dump Cleanup Program - primarily working with volunteers to monitor and cleanup illegal dumpsites and assistance to local governments for recycling illegally dumped tires collected along roadways. Also provides funding for school field trips to solid waste facilities.	Grantee voluntarily reduced the amount of funding.
K	Meramec Regional Planning Commission	\$38,054	\$33,554	\$0	\$0	\$33,554	Education, Public Awareness & Business Outreach-expands education and public outreach programs that includes composting and food waste reduction assemblies for primary and secondary schools.	Grantee voluntarily reduced the amount of funding.
K	Phelps County Tough on Trash	\$9,970	\$8,970	\$0	\$0	\$8,970	Tough on Trash XI-litter control and illegal dumping cleanup program with emphasis on recycling materials collected and recruiting volunteers for adopt-a-road programs.	Funding was reduced in order to provide additional funding for other projects.

Funded Grant Projects (continued)

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
K	Region K	\$36,400	\$36,400	\$0	\$0	\$36,400	District Plan Implementation with general plan implementation, Annual Earth Day Project, illegal dump surveillance camera program and maintenance of the district website.	
L	Adonis Holdings LLC	\$26,460	\$15,000	\$2,940	\$0	\$17,940	Equipment - Hard Drive Shredder. Additional equipment to be used for expanding electronic scrap recycling.	
L	Always Green Recycling, Inc.	\$90,770	\$30,000	\$16,326	\$18,720	\$65,046	Always Green Recycling Inc. 2017. Expanding the collection and processing of recyclable and compostable materials with support for the purchase of an 8 yard, rear-load truck.	
L	B&G Industries LLC	\$44,415	\$20,000	\$4,935	\$0	\$24,935	B&G Business Expansion. B & G Industries will expand wood pallet recycling/reuse through the purchase of additional processing equipment.	
L	Central Paper Stock Company, Inc.	\$76,464	\$40,000	\$204,696	\$0	\$244,696	Feed Me. Central Paper Stock will increase collection and processing of newsprint and corrugated cardboard with the purchase of additional collection containers.	
L	City of Brentwood	\$9,825	\$7,000	\$1,297	\$0	\$8,297	Recycling Carts. The city will increase curb-side residential recycling participation with the purchase of 65-gallon recycling roll carts.	
L	City of Byrnes Mill	\$32,040	\$28,000	\$9,163	\$0	\$37,163	Recycling Drop-Off Project. Operational support enables the city to provide a regional drop-off recycling center serving residents of Jefferson County.	
L	City of Eureka	\$36,461	\$30,000	\$4,051	\$0	\$34,051	65 Gallon Single-Stream Recycling Program 2017. Eureka will increase single-stream, curb side recycling rates with the purchase of 65-gallon recycling roll carts.	
L	City of Hazelwood	\$11,400	\$10,000	\$3,747	\$8,700	\$22,447	Seventh Annual Recycle Day, Sept. 16, 2017. Hazelwood will host a single, drop-off recycling event for hard-to-recycle materials in September 2017.	

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 Kirkwood	\$29,507	\$20,000	\$4,530	\$0	\$24,530	Hopper and Conveyor System. Kirkwood will increase recyclables processing efficiency at a city owned MRF with the purchase of a hopper and conveyor system to feed existing compaction equipment.	
L	City of O'Fallon	\$95,000	\$60,000	\$30,023	\$0	\$90,023	2017 Recycle Cart Replacement Program. Municipal curbside recycling program participation will improve with support for recycling roll cart replacement and upsizing.	
L	City of St. Louis Refuse Division	\$49,897	\$35,000	\$7,767	\$0	\$42,767	CLEAR Solutions. Increase recycling participation in the City of St. Louis with additional recycling containers and promotion through neighborhood education.	
L	City of St. Peters - Health & Environmental Services	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$3,472	\$0	\$13,472	Glass Crusher. A new glass crusher will increase the efficiency of glass recycling in St. Peters.	
L	City of University City	\$104,654	\$50,000	\$35,106	\$0	\$85,106	Recycling Cart Upgrade. University City will increase curbside recycling participation with new recycling roll carts and an educational campaign.	
L	City of Wentzville	\$31,700	\$30,000	\$8,573	\$0	\$38,573	Residential Recycling Incentive Program. Wentzville will increase residential recycling with educational programming.	
L	Composting & Organics Association of Missouri	\$5,968	\$5,000	\$1,004	\$0	\$6,004	COAM Grant 2017. COAM will conduct an educational workshop to train compost operators throughout the state.	
L	Davidson Surface/Air Inc.	\$97,225	\$40,000	\$97,225	\$6,040	\$143,265	A Davidson Recycling Commitment. Will increase internal collection/recycling of cardboard with the purchase of an auto-tie baler.	
L	Didion Orf Recycling	\$205,650	\$45,000	\$22,850	\$0	\$67,850	DORI Project 2017. Additional equipment will help Didion expand electronic scrap recycling in the region.	

Funded Grant Projects (continued)

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
L	Flooring Systems Inc.	\$44,000	\$25,000	\$5,000	\$0	\$30,000	Carpet Reclamation Program Phase VII. Operational support for carpet and PVC recycling collection events.	
L	FRC Recycling, LLC	\$77,857	\$55,000	\$85,000	\$0	\$140,000	Manufacturing 100% Recycled Lumber. Reclaiming, recycling and marketing of plastic lumber manufactured using 100% recycled materials.	
L	Grace Hauling, Inc.	\$21,221	\$15,000	\$3,000	\$0	\$18,000	Go Green with Grace. Grace will increase residential curb-side recycling with the purchase of 96-gallon recycling roll carts.	
L	Habitat for Humanity of St. Charles County Restore	\$68,466	\$45,000	\$7,569	\$0	\$52,569	St Charles County ReStore. Operational support for the ReStore with support for personnel and direct costs.	
L	Habitat for Humanity of St. Louis ReStore	\$59,239	\$35,000	\$14,809	\$0	\$49,809	Flex Plan. Operational support through support for new full-time personnel positions.	
L	Hansen's Tree, Lawn and Landscaping Services, Inc.	\$100,850	\$34,000	\$13,000	\$0	\$47,000	C & D Upgrade. Expansion of C&D recycling with the purchase of a wind-sifter and stacker.	
L	INC Environmental Recycling	\$200,299	\$74,194	\$55,025	\$0	\$129,219	Bale Out. Increase mixed-load recycling/processing with the purchase of an auto-tie, horizontal baler with conveyor and truck weight scale.	
L	Jack Kaufmann	\$30,000	\$10,000	\$4,000	\$0	\$14,000	In-The-Green Productions Presents Jack Kaufmann. Operational support for multi-media educational programs at elementary schools.	
L	JAK & CO	\$20,925	\$20,000	\$2,325	\$0	\$22,325	CRT Tube Recycling. Expand electronics collection and recycling with support for subcontracted CRT/TV transportation and disposal.	
L	Jefferson County Solid Waste Division	\$66,110	\$55,000	\$7,445	\$0	\$62,445	Pilot Program Phase 2 "2017-2018". Expansion of drop-off recycling sites with the purchase of a truck; subcontracted recycling vendor, continuation of HHW and composting workshops, and direct costs.	

Funded Grant Projects (continued)

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
L	L.E.D.R. LLC	\$105,000	\$60,000	\$20,000	\$0	\$80,000	Infeed Conveyor. Expansion of recycling of C&D debris (concrete, metal, wire, paper/cardboard and wood) with the purchase of an in-feed conveyor.	
L	Leftovers, Etc. (Resource Recovery Project, Inc.)	\$80,792	\$40,000	\$17,606	\$0	\$57,606	Leftovers, etc. Resource and Learning Center. Operational support for community based education and outreach center through support for direct costs and personnel.	
L	Lens Masters, Inc.	\$18,082	\$13,000	\$2,010	\$0	\$15,010	St. Louis Consolidation Center. Operational support for fluorescent lamp and ballast collection with support for direct costs of specialty printed and branded shipping boxes.	
L	Midwest Material Recovery	\$42,438	\$20,000	\$5,787	\$0	\$25,787	Electronic Recycling. Expansion of electronics collection and processing with support for the purchase of a flat belt conveyor and direct cost of current belts, poly belts, shaft rings and radio advertising.	
L	Missouri Botanical Garden - EarthWays Center	\$69,334	\$55,000	\$11,780	\$0	\$66,780	EWC Recycling Education: Multiplying Impact, Creating Change. Operational support for multi-faceted educational program activities.	
L	Missouri Kids Unplugged	\$30,900	\$15,000	\$7,000	\$0	\$22,000	MKU Recycling Road Show. Operational support for children's educational project focused on alternatives to electronics usage.	
L	Missouri Recycling Association (MORA)	\$44,385	\$35,000	\$14,600	\$0	\$49,600	Strive for 75% by 2025 - Phase III Think Outside the Bin. Continuation of operational support for state-wide recycling membership non-profit that provides education, information and technical assistance to members across the region.	
L	Missouri River Relief	\$4,500	\$4,500	\$1,200	\$0	\$5,700	River Clean-ups. Provide two river clean-up events that recycle recovered materials and remediate illegal dumping.	
L	MRC1 LLC (DBA MRC Recycling)	\$86,900	\$45,000	\$12,000	\$0	\$57,000	Mobilization and Equipment Procurement Subsidy. Operational support for e-waste collection/recycling events.	

Funded Grant Projects (continued)

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
L	Operation Brightside	\$55,784	\$40,000	\$6,208	\$0	\$46,208	Bins Breaking Barriers. Increase residential recycling participation in the City of St. Louis through community events and education using direct costs.	
L	Operation Food Search	\$160,000	\$40,000	\$34,258	\$0	\$74,258	OFS Food Rescue Vehicle. Operation Food Search will expand food collection/diversion with support for equipment.	
L	Pedro's Planet, Inc.	\$44,500	\$25,000	\$4,700	\$0	\$29,700	Delivery and PickUp Truck - Commercial Reuse and Recycling. Pedro's will increase commercial recycling collection with the purchase of a box truck with lift gate.	
L	Perennial	\$35,000	\$20,000	\$29,760	\$0	\$49,760	Perennial. Support for fee-based workshops, Do-It-Yourself demos and participation in community events in the creative and practical reuse of discarded items.	
L	Refab	\$47,175	\$35,000	\$144,398	\$0	\$179,398	Refab Lab. Refab will purchase equipment to produce value-added products from recovered materials coming from deconstruction sites.	
L	Republic Services	\$402,526	\$150,000	\$412,606	\$0	\$562,606	Republic/Ripple Glass Recovery Joint Effort. Increase productivity and end-user acceptability of glass cullett created from collected, recyclable material with purchase of processing equipment.	
L	Rockwood School District	\$64,136	\$31,000	\$11,459	\$0	\$42,459	Fuel Wash U. Rockwood Schools will collect waste kitchen oil and produce biodiesel fuel and soap for both internal use and external sale.	
L	Rummage Express	\$41,200	\$30,000	\$8,000	\$0	\$38,000	Pick Up Service Expansion Phase II. Rummage Express will expand its non-profit reuse/resale/recycling storefront with support for personnel, equipment and direct costs.	
L	Spectrum Ecycle Solutions, Inc.	\$32,580	\$25,000	\$3,620	\$0	\$28,620	Residential CRT and TV Recycling. Expansion of electronics collection and processing through reduced cost of CRT/TV disposal.	

Funded Grant Projects (continued)

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
L	St. Charles County Government	\$69,200	\$55,000	\$7,297	\$0	\$62,297	2017 St. Charles County Equipment and Recycling Project. Equipment and operational support will assist two drop-off HHW and E-Waste sites serving county residents.	
L	St. Louis Composting, Inc.	\$49,500	\$25,000	\$9,000	\$0	\$34,000	Baler Recycling Project. Operational efficiency of composting will be improved with the purchase of a horizontal baler for processing separated recyclables.	
L	St. Louis County - Department of Health	\$70,000	\$50,000	\$91,260	\$0	\$141,260	St. Louis Household Hazardous - Regional Collection Program. Operational support for two drop off sites through support for transportation/disposal costs of HHW for St. Louis City and Jefferson County.	
L	St. Louis Earth Day	\$94,721	\$60,000	\$32,130	\$18,885	\$111,015	Green Dining Alliance. Operational support for Green Dining Alliance to expand the number of restaurants participating in the program.	
L	St. Louis Earth Day	\$125,789	\$60,000	\$21,500	\$62,811	\$144,311	Recycling on the Go. Operational support will assist the Recycling on the Go program to continue to provide recycling collection at public events.	
L	St. Louis Health Equipment Lending Program, Inc. (STL HELP)	\$98,270	\$45,000	\$16,666	\$0	\$61,666	HELP Satellite Facility in Jefferson County. Support for medical equipment recycling and refurbishment through personnel and direct costs.	
L	St. Louis Recycling and Waste Solutions	\$108,475	\$54,000	\$26,614	\$0	\$80,614	Recycling Dumpster Containers and Commercial Mobile Paper Shredding Truck. St. Louis Recycling will increase commercial recyclable collection and processing with the purchase of a mobile paper shredding truck and collection containers.	
L	St. Louis Teachers' Recycle Center	\$80,642	\$40,000	\$66,000	\$0	\$106,000	Building a Respectful and Resourceful Community. Operational support for community based education and outreach center utilizing industrial and household discards.	

Funded Grant Projects (continued)

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
L	St. Patrick Center	\$85,700	\$25,000	\$9,427	\$205,569	\$239,996	Go Green. Operational support for Go Green! jobs training program to assist program participants in securing jobs benefitting both the economy and the environment.	
L	Total Organics Recycling, Inc.	\$20,147	\$10,000	\$2,822	\$0	\$12,822	Composting Expansion Program. Expand food waste collection and processing with additional of 64-gallon roll carts.	
L	Tower Grove Park	\$4,148	\$4,000	\$7,745	\$0	\$11,745	Pilot Recycling Program in Tower Grove Park. Tower Grove Park will implement recycling as part of its ongoing park operations.	
L	U.S. Green Building Council - Missouri Gateway Chapter	\$24,942	\$20,000	\$5,394	\$0	\$25,394	Education & Outreach to Support Waste Minimization. USGBC will conduct educational events and programs and subcontracted LEED prep courses.	
L	University of MO - Curators of the University	\$23,650	\$20,000	\$11,568	\$0	\$31,568	A New Look & New Way of Doing Things: Recycling Initiatives at UMSL. Operational support to maintain and expand waste reduction and recycling efforts for the University.	
L	Webster University	\$26,987	\$10,000	\$3,380	\$0	\$13,380	Cardboard Solar Compactor Installation. Webster University will increase on-campus recycling with the installation of solar-powered recycling compactors.	
M	City of Carthage	\$14,100	\$14,100	\$0	\$0	\$14,100	Wages & fringes for recycling attendant	
M	City of Granby	\$24,400	\$24,400	\$1,582	\$0	\$25,982	Wages & fringes for recycling attendant and purchase of another cardboard trailer	
M	City of Joplin Recycling	\$15,642	\$15,642	\$16,733	\$0	\$32,375	Wages & fringes for recycling attendant	
M	City of Neosho Recycling	\$35,209	\$35,209	\$0	\$0	\$35,209	Wages & fringes for recycling attendant	
M	City of Seneca	\$7,020	\$7,020	\$0	\$0	\$7,020	Wages for recycling attendant	
M	City of Sheldon Recycling	\$10,185	\$10,185	\$0	\$0	\$10,185	Wages & fringes for recycling attendant, fencing for recycling center, supplies	

Funded Grant Projects (continued)

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
M	Jasper County Litter Control	\$22,453	\$22,453	\$0	\$0	\$22,453	Wages for supervisors of County-wide litter pick up by community service/inmates & supplies	
M	Lamar Enterprises Inc.	\$23,789	\$23,789	\$0	\$0	\$23,789	Sheltered workshop funding for recycling: wages, equipment (trailers)	
M	McDonald County Litter	\$12,152	\$12,152	\$0	\$0	\$12,152	Wages for County wide litter control for community service/inmates & supplies	
M	McDonald County/City of Noel	\$72,960	\$24,960	\$0	\$0	\$24,960	3 PTE for recycling center	Rejected during 1st round. Partially-Funded after 2nd scoring round. Chosen due to highest score of initially rejected applicants.
M	Newton County Litter Control	\$14,517	\$14,517	\$0	\$0	\$14,517	Wages for supervisors of County-wide litter pick up by community service/inmates & supplies	
M	Region M	\$24,000	\$24,000	\$0	\$0	\$24,000	Region M Plan Implementation. Public Education and support for the Missouri Recycling Association.	
M	Region M	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$0	\$0	\$30,000	Region M Plan Implementation. E-waste, HHW, White Goods.	
M	Sheldon Schools Y2	\$7,365	\$7,365	\$0	\$0	\$7,365	Wages & fringes, trailer, supplies, bins	
M	Vernon County Recycling Center	\$23,763	\$23,763	\$0	\$0	\$23,763	Wages for recycling attendant, collection bins, cardboard trailer	
N	All Points Recycling, LLC	\$19,500	\$18,052		\$4,948	\$23,000	Semi-Tractor to be used for collection/pickup of recyclables and to deliver processed recycled material for sale.	Grant was partially funded - due to limited funds of the District.
N	City of Aurora	\$6,930	\$6,930		\$0	\$6,930	Two Electronic Collection events - this was the first electronic recycling event to be held in the city.	

Funded Grant Projects (continued)

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
N	EarthWise Recycling Center @ Reeds Spring School	\$16,300	\$16,300		\$0	\$16,300	Two Recycling Balers to be used to bale recycled material. EarthWise is a non-profit organization which collaborates with volunteers and the Reeds Spring School District to operate a recycling center and an in-vessel food waste composter.	
N	Hansen's Tree Service - Recycling Center	\$6,916	\$5,469		\$1,448	\$6,916	Clearspan Building - This grant partially funded the purchase of a Clearspan building to be used for finished compost to stay dry and contaminate free which will increase their diversion of organic waste.	Grant was partially funded - due to limited funds of the District.
N	Purdy School District	\$6,374	\$6,374		\$1,571	\$7,945	Loading Ramp/Dock for Recycling Center at the Purdy School District. The loading ramp/dock will allow students to load the semi-trailer safely using pallets jacks while being supervised. Prior to this loading ramp/dock, recycled material had to be manually loaded.	
N	Region N	\$2,970	\$2,970		\$0	\$2,970	Region N Education Program - Project to fund 18 recycling educational programs/presentations for students in the school systems and for local organizations.	
O	BedHead Mattress Recycling	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$0	\$0	\$50,000	Equipment Procurement: Grant supports the purchase of various items for use in mattress recycling.	
O	Big Dog Recycling	\$49,283	\$49,283	\$0	\$0	\$49,283	Recycling Containers: Grant supports purchase of additional recycling collection containers for expansion of an ongoing program.	
O	City of Springfield	\$29,582	\$29,582	\$0	\$0	\$29,582	Recycling Enhancement Program: Grant provides additional bins for various City locations to expand access for employees and the public.	
O	Complete Electronics Recycling	\$12,498	\$12,498	\$0	\$0	\$12,498	Vertical Baler: Grant supports the purchase of a vertical baler for cardboard.	
O	Computer Recycling Center	\$24,000	\$24,000	\$0	\$0	\$24,000	Collection Bins: Grant supports purchase of additional collection bins for e-waste recycling.	

Funded Grant Projects (continued)

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
O	Greenway Recycling	\$15,500	\$15,500	\$0	\$0	\$15,500	Office Paper Collection Carts: Grant supports the purchase of collection carts to expand office paper recycling opportunities.	
O	Habitat for Humanity	\$29,250	\$4,483	\$0	\$0	\$4,483	Forklift Acquisition: Grant supports purchase of a newer forklift for use at the Habitat for Humanity ReStore.	Partial funding: Due to grant evaluation ranking, grantee was offered remainder of funds.
O	Hansen's Tree Service	\$26,850	\$26,850	\$0	\$0	\$26,850	Doppstadt SM720 Windsifter: Grant supports the purchase of a Windsifter to sort mulch material	
O	Urban Districts Alliance	\$41,564	\$41,564	\$0	\$0	\$41,564	Downtown Springfield Glass Recycling: Grant supports a glass recycling program for downtown businesses.	
O	Web-Co Custom Industries	\$18,000	\$18,000	\$0	\$0	\$18,000	Collection Bins: Grant supports purchase of additional collection bins for Web-Co's recycling program.	
P	American Recycling Center	\$30,000	\$11,000		\$0	\$11,000	Equipment: baler and gooseneck trailer	
P	Bryant Plastics, Inc.	\$30,000	\$15,000	\$0	\$0	\$15,000	Equipment: extruder parts	
P	Kevin Garrett (TX Cnty) Recycling Program	\$18,840	\$18,840	\$0	\$0	\$18,840	Manpower: wages, rent & fuel	
P	Oregon County Recycling Association	\$20,912	\$20,912	\$0	\$0	\$20,912	Manpower: wages & repairs	
P	Ozark County Recycling Center	\$15,000	\$16,000	\$0	\$0	\$16,000	Equipment: forklift	Executive Board approved \$1,000 increase in grant so applicant could purchase forklift preferred

P	Ozark County Recycling Center	\$14,560	\$14,560	\$0	\$0	\$14,560	Manpower: wages
---	-------------------------------	----------	----------	-----	-----	----------	-----------------

Funded Grant Projects (continued)

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
P	Ozark Neighborly Exchange	\$15,000	\$10,000	\$0	\$0	\$10,000	Equipment: wood chipper	
P	Shannon County Recycling Program	\$10,944	\$10,944	\$2,400	\$0	\$13,344	Manpower: wages & fuel	
Q	Ozark Foothills Regional Planning Commission	\$88,105	\$88,105	\$0	\$118,655	\$206,760	Funding is provided to operate a regional recycling program	
R								No grant funding was awarded in FY17 to save funding for larger projects for next fiscal year.
S	Cotton Boll Sheltered Workshop	\$48,405	\$48,405	\$0	\$0	\$48,405	Wages Sheltered Workshop	
S	Pemiscot Progressive Inc.	\$47,907	\$47,907	\$0	\$0	\$47,907	Wages Sheltered Workshop	
S	Pemiscot Shredder	\$18,267	\$18,267	\$0	\$0	\$18,267	Shredder for County courthouse and Justice Center	
S	Portageville Recycling	\$6,685	\$6,685	\$0	\$0	\$6,685	Off set cost of pulling trailer to adjacent county	
S	Region S	\$11,689	\$11,689	\$0	\$0	\$11,689	E-Waste Roundup Events	
S	Scott County Recycling	\$10,070	\$10,070	\$0	\$0	\$10,070	Clean up ditches and roadways	
S	Stoddard County Workshop	\$37,390	\$37,390	\$0	\$0	\$37,390	Wages Sheltered Workshop	
T	City of Lebanon	\$37,078	\$37,078	\$30,990	\$0	\$68,068	Year around HHW District Wide	
T	Gateway Industries	\$11,134	\$11,134	\$41,080	\$0	\$52,214	Ford Transit Van for picking up recyclables and collapsible baskets	

Funded Grant Projects (continued)

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
T	Lake Area Industries	\$18,630	\$9,315	\$7,185	\$0	\$16,500	Auger for Foam Densifier	Lack of funds caused this to only be partially funded
T	Ozark Recycling Center	\$31,796	\$31,796	\$3,533	\$0	\$35,329	Purchase of a new Can Densifier	
T	School of the Osage	\$10,000	\$5,655	\$5,345	\$0	\$11,000	Oil Burning Furnace for Transportation Building	Lack of funds caused this to only be partially funded

ATTACHMENT B

FY2017 DISTRICT UNFUNDED PROJECTS

Unfunded Grant Projects

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
A	No unfunded grants				
B	No unfunded grants				
C	No unfunded grants				
D	No unfunded grants				
E	Antioch Urban Growers	\$49,930	\$0	Biomass resource recovery project.	Too many questions regarding the scope of the grant application.
E	Avenue of Life	\$36,750	\$0	Reuse of mattress components.	Project would not lead to additional diversion.
E	Bridging The Gap	\$28,231	\$0	Consulting and signage for recycling drop-off centers.	The applicant did not provide adequate letters of support to demonstrate sufficient local interest in the project.
E	Cs1 Little Lion	\$50,000	\$0	Vinyl banner recycling.	Incomplete application.
E	Lensmaster	\$116,800	\$0	Expansion of services for the collection of fluorescent lights.	The profit and loss statement did not indicate need for funding. Partners already exist to provide service. Business competes with other contractors and HHW program.
E	Truman Heritage Habitat for Humanity	\$47,150	\$0	ReStore expansion	Staff that applied for grant left the organization for no additional contact information provided. Application was deemed incomplete.
F	St. Paul's Lutheran School	\$30,000	\$0	Playground	Denied by DNR - parochial school
F	The Recycling Center of Laurie	\$1,485	\$0	Banding/Crimper/Tensioner/Seal	Lack of funds.*
F	City of Slater	\$11,496	\$0	Pool restroom partitions	Lack of funds.*
F	City of Alma	\$13,805	\$0	Park benches & tables	Lack of funds.*
G	No unfunded grants				
H	No unfunded grants				
I	No unfunded grants				
J	Josiah Town	\$48,620	\$0	Cardboard Recycling Project	Request equipment for start-up

Unfunded Grant Projects (continued)

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
K	The Curators of the University of Missouri	\$10,640	\$0	Campus recycling containers	The grant application did not receive the minimum score required for funding.
K	Didion Orf, St. James	\$49,800	\$0	Horizontal bailer	The grant application did not receive the minimum score required for funding.
K	Cedar Valley Components, Rosebud	\$41,350	\$0	Equipment and facility modifications	The grant application did not receive the minimum score required for funding.
K	Tacony Manufacturing, St. James	\$47,500	\$0	Equipment	The grant application did not receive the minimum score required for funding.
L	Adonis Holdings LLC	\$46,926	\$0	Recycling Personnel Expenses	Insufficient funds available.*
L	Affordable Mattresses	\$138,500	\$0	Affordable	Insufficient funds available.*
L	Environmental Recycling Facility LLC	\$98,500	\$0	Driving System	Insufficient funds available.*
L	Fair Shares CCSA	\$25,830	\$0	Fair Shares Delivers	Insufficient funds available.*
L	Hansen's RAS, LLC	\$218,294	\$0	Expansion of Shingles Recycle Operation	Insufficient funds available.*
L	Home Sweet Home	\$41,000	\$0	Warehouse Space	Insufficient funds available.*
L	Refab	\$209,053	\$0	Deconstruction Program	Insufficient funds available.*
L	Ritenour Co-Care	\$40,060	\$0	Permanent Part-Time Personnel	Insufficient funds available.*
L	Washington University in St. Louis	\$209,440	\$0	Materials Recovery Program, Phase I	Insufficient funds available.*
L	World Wide Technology, Inc.	\$47,200	\$0	Recycling Program Development - New WWT HQ Bldg.	Insufficient funds available.*
M	Joplin Area Habitat for Humanity ReStore	\$22,880	\$0	ReStore full time driver salary	Scored low on targeted materials list and long term effectiveness of program
M	Spiva Center for the Arts	\$14,003	\$0	Education/collection project to include salary, supplies, publications, transport to recycle center	Scored low due to overall poorly worded application and commitment to diversion conflicts with main thrust of organization (art).

Unfunded Grant Projects (continued)

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
M	Fiberlite Technologies, Inc.	\$20,000	\$0	Forklift for material handling	No letters of support, funding request not reasonable for the amount/type of materials diverted. No jobs created.
M	Eastern Shawnee Tribe of Oklahoma	\$46,748	\$0	Collection, salaries, education, equipment (bins), other supplies	No local jobs created/economic development, project not entirely in Missouri.
M	Triple R Recycling	\$20,750	\$0	Collection bins	Scored 90 in first round but then was disqualified due to reports and ensuing investigation of violating GT&C clause regarding competing with existing business.
N	No unfunded grants				
O	Complete Electronics Recycling	\$24,999	\$0	Forklift Acquisition: Project would have funded a forklift for use at their facility.	Not funded due to shortage of funds.*
O	Catholic Charities of Southern Missouri	\$29,686	\$0	Recycling Project: Project would have initiated a recycling program for Catholic Charities offices	Not funded due to shortage of funds.*
O	Computer Recycling Center	\$24,875	\$0	Household CRT Collection: Project would have provided assistance to offset the cost of recycling CRTs.	Not funded due to shortage of funds.*
O	Community Partnership of the Ozarks	\$34,900	\$0	Box Truck: Project would have funded the purchase of a box truck to collect reusable items from neighborhood cleanup events.	Not funded due to shortage of funds.*
P	No unfunded grants				
Q	No unfunded grants				
R	No grant funding was awarded in FY17 to save funding for larger projects for next fiscal year.				
S	No unfunded grants				

Unfunded Grant Projects (continued)

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
T	MORA	\$29,231	\$0	MORA Conference	Lack of funds.*
T	City of Osage Beach	\$2,100	\$0	Annual White Goods Collection	Lack of funds.*
T	LOWA	\$25,207	\$0	HHW Event	Lack of Funds.*

*All available funds at the time of review were awarded to higher scoring projects. Applicants receive feedback and coaching for resubmission during the next grant call. The District begins the administrative process to draw down the funds for approved projects, while additional funds are also accruing for the next grant call.

ATTACHMENT C

PROPOSED REVISIONS

10 CSR 80-9.050 SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT FUND—DISTRICT GRANTS

Rules of Department of Natural Resources Division 80—Solid Waste Management Chapter 9—Solid Waste Management Fund

10 CSR 80-9.050 Solid Waste Management Fund—District Grants

Title 10—DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

Division 80—Solid Waste Management

Chapter 9—Solid Waste Management Fund

10 CSR 80-9.050 Solid Waste Management Fund—District Grants

PURPOSE: This rule contains procedures and provisions for solid waste management districts to qualify for grant funds from the Solid Waste Management Fund as provided for in section 260.335.2, RSMo.

PUBLISHER'S NOTE: The publication of the full text of the material that the adopting agency has incorporated by reference in this rule would be unduly cumbersome or expensive. Therefore, the full text of that material will be made available to any interested person at both the Office of the Secretary of State and the office of the adopting agency, pursuant to section 536.031.4, RSMo. Such material will be provided at the cost established by state law.

(1) Definitions. Definitions for key words used in this rule may be found in 10 CSR 80- 2.010. Additional definitions specific to this rule are as follows:

(A) Allocated district funds. Monies from the Solid Waste Management Fund that are set aside to be disbursed to each district by the department;

(B) Competitive bid process. Procurement of goods or services that follows the guidelines outlined in 1 CSR 40;

(C) Disbursed district funds. District funds paid to each district or ~~subgrantee~~grantee;

(D) Disposal cost. Fees charged to collect, transport or deposit solid waste in a landfill, transfer station or other approved facility;

~~(E) District administrative grant. Planning and organizational grants disbursed by the department to each district prior to August 28, 2004;~~

(F) District carryover. Any remaining district funds of any completed grants that have been disbursed by the department to each district for ~~district administrative grants~~, district operations grants, plan implementation grants or district ~~subgrants~~grants;

(G) District funds. The revenue generated from the solid waste tonnage fee collected and deposited in the Solid Waste Management Fund and allocated to each district pursuant to section 260.335.2, RSMo, plus district carryover, and interest income earned ~~and state required local match funds~~;

(H) Executive board. The board established by each district's solid waste management council or by the alternative management structure chosen by a district as provided for in section 260.315.4(2), RSMo;

(I) Interest income. All interest earned by each district from the holding of revenue generated from the Solid Waste Management Fund;

(J) Project. All approved components of an organized undertaking described in a proposal, including any supporting documents as required by project type;

(K) Solid Waste Management Fund. The fund created in section 260.330, RSMo, to receive the tonnage fee charges submitted by sanitary and demolition landfills for waste disposed of in Missouri and transfer stations for waste transported out of state for disposal;

(L) State required local match funds. Funds committed by local governments to each district as match for district administrative grants; and

(M) Unencumbered district funds. District funds that have not been obligated by the executive board for goods and services in the form of purchase orders, contracts or other form of documentation.

(2) Eligibility.

(A) Applicability. This rule applies to the members of the executive boards of all department-recognized solid waste management districts in Missouri.

(B) Projects. The district funds are to be allocated for projects in accordance with the following provisions:

~~1. Grant monies made available by this rule shall be allocated by the district for projects contained within the district's approved solid waste management plan.~~ These funds will be used for solid waste management projects as approved by the ~~department~~executive board.

However, no grant funds will be made available for incineration without energy recovery;

~~2. In the event that the district solid waste management plan has not been submitted to the department, any eligible projects approved by the district and allocated monies made available by this rule shall be included in the district's solid waste management plan prior to submission;~~

~~3. In the event that the district solid waste management plan has been submitted to the department, any eligible projects approved by the district and allocated monies made available by this rule, but not contained within the plan, shall be considered an addenda to the plan. The addenda will be evidenced in quarterly and final project reports required under subsection (6)(B) of this rule. Projects serving as addenda to the plan in this manner must be included in any documents required by the department to be submitted by the districts that update the plan or that verify implementation of the plan pursuant to section 260.325.5, RSMo;~~

4. District funds shall not be awarded for a project whose applicant is directly involved in the evaluation and ranking of that particular project;

5. District funds shall not be awarded for a project that displaces existing resource recovery services, unless the proposed project demonstrates how it will result in improvement or expansion of service; and

6. District funds shall not be awarded for a project that collects curbside municipal solid wastesolid-waste for disposal on a continuous basis.

(C) Grant Funds Funding:

1. As determined by statute, an amount of the revenue generated from the solid waste tonnage fee collected and deposited in the Solid Waste Management Fund shall be allocated ~~annually~~ to the executive board of each officially recognized solid waste management district for district grants. Further, each officially recognized solid waste management district shall be allocated, upon appropriation, a minimum amount for district grants pursuant to section 260.335.2, RSMo.

~~2. The district shall enter into a financial assistance agreement with the department prior to the disbursement of district funds.~~ The financial assistance agreement shall, at a minimum, specify that all district funds will be managed in accordance with statute and this rule. Financial assistance agreements shall be provided to the districts by the department at the beginning of the state fiscal year.

3. Quarterly the department shall ~~notify~~transfer to the executive board of each district of the amount of grant funds for which the district is eligible. Upon request, the department will provide to a district the reported tonnages and tonnage fees paid into the Solid Waste Management Fund. The Districts shall utilize funds in accordance with state statute and this rule.

~~4. Grant money available to a district under subsection (2)(C) of this rule within a fiscal year may be allocated for district operations, projects that further plan implementation and subgranteegrantee projects of cities and counties within the district pursuant to section 260.335.2, RSMo.~~

~~5. Any district funds allocated to a district but not requested by the district following the procedures outlined in this rule within twenty-four (24) months of the end of the state fiscal year in which it was allocated may be reallocated by the department pursuant to section 260.335.2, RSMo.~~

6. At the end of a district's fiscal year, any district carryover funds from closed district grants and interest income in excess of twenty thousand dollars (\$20,000) shall be allocated for projects other than district operations in the district's next request for project proposals in accordance with section 260.335, RSMo, unless approved by the department.

7. A solid waste management district may elect to use more than one fiscal year's allocation of funds to finance a project. Prior to the department encumbering funds for this project, the district shall notify ~~submit a request to~~ the department, ~~for approval that provides justification and financial supporting documentation. Following the department's approval, the district may request that these funds be transmitted to the district. All interest income earned by the district shall be obligated to this project until the total amount needed is reached.~~

8. All district funds shall be used for ~~implementation of a solid waste management plan, district operations and~~ solid waste management, waste reduction, recycling and related services waste reduction, recycling and related servicesgrants and plan implementation projects as approved by the district executive board ~~and the department.~~

(D) Costs. In general, the following paragraphs list eligible and ineligible costs for district funds. Items not listed in this section or in subsections (3)(A) and (4)(B) ~~should~~may be ~~discussed with the department~~approved by the district executive board, after discussions with the department.

1. Eligible costs. Applicants can request monetary assistance in the operation of eligible projects for the following types of costs. Eligible costs may vary depending on the services, materials and activities, as specified in the grant application:

- A. Collection, processing, manufacturing or hauling equipment;
- B. Materials and labor for construction of buildings;
- C. Engineering or consulting fees;
- D. Salaries and related fringe benefits directly related to the project;
- E. Equipment installation costs including installation, freight or retrofitting of the equipment;
- F. Development and distribution of informational materials;
- G. Planning and implementation of informational forums including, but not limited to, workshops;
- H. Travel as necessary for project completion;

- I. Overhead costs directly related to the project;
 - J. Laboratory analysis costs; and
 - K. Professional services.
2. Ineligible costs. The following costs are considered ineligible for district grant funding:
- A. Operating expenses, such as salaries and expenses that are not directly related to district operations or the project activities;
 - B. Costs incurred before the project start date or after the project end date;
 - C. ~~State Sales~~ Taxes;
 - D. Legal costs;
 - E. Contingency funds;
 - F. Land acquisition;
 - G. Gifts;
 - H. Disposal costs, except for electronics, household hazardous waste, or other diversion projects as deemed appropriate by district executive boards, projects as indicated in paragraph (2)(B)6. of this rule;
 - I. Fines and penalties;
 - J. Food and beverages for district employees, board members or grantssubgranteegrantees at non-working meetings;
 - K. Memorial donations for board members, district employees, or grantssubgranteegrantees;
 - L. Office decorations, except as indicated in paragraph (3)(A)4. of this rule; and
 - M. Lobbyists, pursuant to section 105.470, RSMo.

(3) District Operations.

(A) Eligible Costs. The department shall allocate funding for the costs that are reasonable and necessary for proper and efficient performance and administration of the district. District operations costs must be specifically for the purpose of district operations and may include:

- 1. Salaries and related fringe benefits of employees;
- 2. Cost of materials and supplies acquired, consumed or expended;
- 3. Rental or leasing of office space;
- 4. Office decorations costing less than five hundred dollars (\$500) per year;
- 5. Equipment and other capital expenditures;
- 6. Travel expenses incurred;
- 7. The cost of utilities, insurance, security, janitorial services, upkeep of grounds, normal repairs and alterations and the like to the extent that they keep property at an efficient operating condition, do not add to the permanent value of property or appreciably prolong the intended life and are not otherwise included in rental or other charges for space;
- 8. Contracted services for eligible costs acquired through a competitive bid process;
- 9. Non-cash service awards which are reasonable in cost; and
- 10. Legal costs for contract review and other costs directly related to the district ~~grant~~ administration.

(B) ~~District Operations Budget~~Grant Application. Districts eligible to Expend receive district operations ~~grant~~ funding shall Provide submit a written notice request to the department, on forms provided by the department, that includes:

- 1. A completed district operations budget, containing such detail as specified by the department, that has been approved by the executive board, including an executive summary and list of tasks for the budget period.
- 2. Copies of any contracts in effect for district operations services.
- ~~3. If applicable, documentation of the bidding process used to procure district operations services.~~
- 4. The grant and budget period shall cover up to a one (1)-year time period, unless otherwise approved by the department.
- 5. Districts may apply-submit for district operations funds at any time during the year, provided that all requirements outlined in this section are followed.

(4) Plan Implementation Projects.

(A) Projects. The ~~department-district executive board may shall~~ allocate plan implementation funds for projects in accordance with the following provisions:

- 1. ~~Grant monies~~Funds made available by this rule shall be allocated by the district for projects contained within the district's solid waste management plan or which enable the district to plan and implement activities pursuant to section 260.325, RSMo;
- 2. Projects shall be conducted by district staff or through a contract with the district. Contracted services must be procured through a competitive bid process;
- ~~3. Projects should benefit the counties or cities who are members of the district; and~~
- 4. A project period shall be determined that allows for the purpose of the project to be accomplished and for adequate reporting of the results of the project to determine if the project met its intended goals. Project and budget periods may allow for up to a two (2)-year time period for project completion. An extension may be approved beyond

~~the 2-year time period by the district executive board. maximum of one (1) six (6)-month extension may be allowed beyond the two (2) years when approved by the executive board. Any extension of the project or budget periods beyond two (2) years and six (6) months must have the prior approval of the executive board and the department.~~

(B) Eligible Costs. Districts may ~~request monetary assistance~~allocate funds in the operation of eligible plan implementation projects for the types of costs listed in paragraph (2)(D)1. of this rule. Eligible costs may also include costs associated with revising the district's solid waste management plan.

(C) ~~Grant Application Budgets~~. Districts eligible to receive plan implementation ~~grant~~ funding shall submit ~~a written request notice~~ to the department that includes copies of all plan implementation project proposals approved by the executive board as documented in meeting minutes. At a minimum, project proposals must include:

1. An executive summary of the project objectives and the problem to be solved, referencing the district's solid waste management plan, if applicable, component to which it applies;
2. The location of the project, project name, and the project number assigned by the district;
3. A work plan which identifies project tasks, the key personnel and their qualifications;
4. A timetable showing anticipated dates for major planned activities and expenditures, including the submittal of ~~quarterly a final reports and the final report~~;
5. A budget that includes an estimate of the costs for conducting the project. Estimates shall be provided for all major planned activities or purchases by category;
6. Documentation that all required proposal content has been received and reviewed by the district executive board including cost estimates, verification that all applicable federal, state and local permits, approvals, licenses or waivers necessary to implement the project are either not needed or have been applied for, and demonstration of compliance with local zoning ordinances;
7. The type of waste and estimated tonnage to be diverted from landfills or other measurable outcomes;
8. A description of the evaluation procedures to be used throughout the project to measure the success or benefit of the project;
9. For projects involving awards over fifty thousand dollars (~~\$50100,000~~), supporting documentation must be provided to demonstrate technical feasibility, including a preliminary project design, preliminary engineering plans and specifications for any facilities and equipment required for a proposed project, if applicable; and ~~10. If requested by the department, copies of any or all approved project proposals and supporting documents.~~

(5) District ~~Grant~~Subgrantee~~Grantee~~ Procedures.

(A) Notification by the Districts. The district executive boards shall request project proposals by giving written notification to the governing officials of each member county and city over five hundred (500) in population, ~~and by publishing a notice in a newspaper officially designated by the chief elected official of each member county, for public notices for every member county and city with a population over five hundred (500) within the district. The district executive board shall provide the written notification and newspaper notice at least thirty (30) days prior to when proposals are due. If the district executive board will request project proposals more often than annually, the district executive board may issue the written notification and newspaper notice annually specifying when the district will be accepting project proposals for the upcoming year.~~

(B) Proposal Content and Supporting Documents. The districts shall, as appropriate, require the proposals to include but not be limited to the following information:

1. An executive summary of the project objectives and the problem to be solved, referencing the district's solid waste management plan component to which it applies;
2. The location of the project and name, address and phone number of the official subgrant recipient(s);
3. A work plan which identifies project tasks, the key personnel and their qualifications;
4. A timetable showing anticipated dates for major planned activities and expenditures, including the submittal of ~~quarterly reports and~~ the final report;
5. A budget that includes an estimate of the costs for conducting the project. Estimates shall be provided for all major planned activities or purchases by category and shall be supported by documentation showing how each cost estimate was determined. If the project includes matching funds, the budget must delineate the percentages and dollar amounts of the total project costs for both district funds and applicant contributions;
6. Verification that all applicable federal, state and local permits, approvals, licenses or waivers necessary to implement the project are either not needed or have been obtained or applied for and will be obtained prior to an award;
7. Demonstration of compliance with local zoning ordinances;
8. A description of the evaluation procedures to be used throughout the project to quantitatively and qualitatively measure the success or benefit of the project;
9. Documentation that shows a commitment for the match, if applicable;
10. The following supporting documents for projects, except education projects, involving allocations over fifty thousand dollars (~~\$50100,000~~), if applicable:
 - A. To demonstrate technical feasibility, a preliminary project design, preliminary engineering plans and specifications for any facilities and equipment required for a proposed project, if applicable;
 - B. A financial report including:

(I) A three (3)-year business or strategic plan for the proposed project. ~~For projects involving recycling and reuse technologies, the plan shall include a market analysis with information demonstrating that the applicant has secured the supply of and demand for recovered material and recycled products necessary for sustained business activity;~~

(II) A description of project financing, including projected revenue from the project; and

(III) A confidential credit history; and/or up to three (3) years' previous financial statements or reports; or for governmental entities a bond rating;

11. Confidential business information and availability of information. Any person may assert a claim of business confidentiality covering a part or all of that information by including a letter with the information which requests protection of specific information from disclosure. Confidentiality shall be determined or granted in accordance with Chapter 610, RSMo. However, if no claim accompanies the information when it is received by the department/district, the information may be made available to the public without further notice to the person submitting it; and

12. In the event that more than one (1) solid waste management district proposes to participate in a project as joint subgrantee/grantees, each participating district's responsibilities will be outlined in the subgrantee/grantee Financial Assistance Agreement. One (1) of the participating districts must be designated as project manager. The project will be administered as provided for in sections (5) and (6) of this rule.

(C) A project period shall be determined that will allow an adequate time period for the subgrantee/grantee to accomplish the purpose of the project and provide reporting of the results and accomplishments. Project and budget periods may allow for up to a two (2) year time period for project completion. A n extension may be approved beyond the 2-year time period by the district executive board. maximum of one (1) six (6) month extension may be allowed beyond the two (2) years when approved by the executive board. Any extension of the project or budget periods beyond two (2) years and six (6) months must have the prior approval of the executive board and the department.

(D) Proposal Review and Evaluation. The executive boards must review, rank and approve proposals as outlined in this subsection. The executive board may appoint a committee to review and rank proposals. The executive board shall make final approval.

1. Review for eligibility and completeness. For all proposals received by the deadline as established in their public notices to the media, the board shall determine the eligibility of the applicant, the eligibility of the proposed project, the eligibility of the costs identified in the proposal and the completeness of the proposal.

2. Notice of eligibility and completeness. If the district executive board determines that the applicant or the project is ineligible or incomplete, the board may reject the proposal and shall notify the applicant. A project may be resubmitted up to the application deadline.

3. Proposal evaluation. The executive board or their appointed committee shall evaluate each proposal that is determined to be eligible and complete. The board will develop a District Targeted Materials List to be used as one of the evaluation criteria. The evaluation method will include the following criteria, as appropriate per project category:

A. Conformance with the integrated waste management hierarchy as described in the *Missouri Policy on Resource Recovery*, as incorporated by reference in this rule;

B. Conformance with the District Targeted Materials List;

C. Degree to which the project contributes to community-based economic development;

D. District funds shall not be awarded for a project that displaces existing resource recovery services, unless the proposed project demonstrates how it will result in improvement or expansion of service. Degree to which funding to the project will adversely affect existing private entities in the market segment; ~~(re-write to cater to eval criteria)~~

E. Degree to which the project promotes waste reduction or recycling or results in an environmental benefit related to solid waste management through the proposed process;

~~F. Demonstrates cooperative efforts through a public/private partnership or among political subdivisions;~~

G. Compliance with federal, state or local requirements;

~~H. Transferability of results;~~

~~I. The need for the information;~~

J. Technical and managerial ability of the applicant;

~~K. Managerial ability of the applicant;~~

L. Ability to implement in a timely manner;

M. Technical feasibility;

N. Availability of feedstock;

O. Level of commitment for financing; and

~~P. Type of contribution by applicant;~~

~~Q. Effectiveness of marketing strategy;~~

R. Quality of budget; and

~~S. Selected financial ratios.~~

4. The executive board shall develop minimum criteria for the approval of project grant funding.

(6) District Documentation.

(A) ~~Grant~~Subgrantee Proposals. The following documentation must be submitted by the district to the department as part of the grant ~~application documentation~~ process:

1. A completed project request summary form provided by the department that includes, at a minimum, the following information:

A. Copies of the executive summaries of the eligible proposals submitted to the executive board, or narratives prepared by the district, that describe the location of project, project objectives, tasks and general timeline of each eligible proposal;

B. For each project approved for an award by the executive board indicate the name of the project, the project number assigned by the district and:

(I) The total amount awarded to each project, what amount is awarded from the current undisbursed allocation funding, any carryover from previous awards by the district and the source of the carryover, and any interest accrued by the district;

(II) The project budget by category;

(III) The type of waste and estimated tonnage to be diverted from landfills or other measurable outcomes;

(IV) The project start and stop dates; and

(V) ~~Application checklist shall serve as d~~Documentation that all required proposal content has been received and reviewed by the district;

2. The aggregate executive board rankings for each of the eligible proposals or documentation that the proposals meet the minimum criteria for funding set by the executive board using the evaluation criteria as described in paragraph (5)(D)3.;

~~3. If requested by the department, copies of any or all approved project proposals and supporting documents;~~

4. A copy of the notices given to the governing bodies ~~and published in the newspapers within the district~~within the district;

5. A copy of the ~~subgrantee~~grantee(s) financial assistance agreement between the district and ~~subgrantee~~grantee(s), any amendments made to the ~~subgrantee~~grantee(s) financial assistance agreement indicated in subsection (7)(H) of this rule and invoice; and

6. Documentation that the executive board discussions and votes for approved ~~subgrants~~grants took place in open session, in accordance with sections 610.010 to 610.200 of the Missouri Sunshine Law.

(B) ~~Quarterly Reports~~Semi-annual Status Reports. On ~~quarterly status~~semi-annual report forms provided by the department, the district shall submit the following information to the department thirty (30) days after the end of each ~~6-month period~~state fiscal year quarter:

1. Project status. For each ~~plan implementation and~~ district ~~subgrantee~~grantee project in progress the district shall provide:

A. The details of progress addressing the project tasks outlined in the ~~plan implementation application or~~ ~~subgrantee~~grantee financial assistance agreement;

B. Problems encountered in project execution;

C. Budget adjustments made within budget categories, with justifications;

D. The weight in tons of waste diverted for each type of recovered material utilized in the project for the most recent ~~quarter~~6-month period following the implementation of the diversion activity or other measurable outcomes, as appropriate;

E. A copy of an amended ~~subgrantee~~grantee financial assistance agreement, if appropriate; and

F. Other information necessary for proper evaluation of the progress of the projects.

2. In the event that a time period for a project is less than a full year, only ~~quarterly~~semi-annual information appropriate to the project time period need be included in the district report.

3. Project financial summary. For each ~~grant~~ (district operations, plan implementation and district ~~subgrantee~~grantee project) the district shall provide:

A. The original award amount taken from the accrued allocation ~~held by the department~~;

B. Any district carryover used to fund a project or district operations;

C. Any accrued interest income used to fund a project or district operations;

D. Total grant award for that project or district operation (total of subparagraphs (6)(B)3.A., B., and C. of this rule);

E. Cumulative amount of district disbursement of funds to each ~~subgrantee~~grantee or to the district during that reporting period;

F. Balance of that project or district operations during that reporting period;

G. Any carryover funding held by the district that has not been obligated for projects or district operations; and

H. Any accrued interest income held by the district that has not been obligated for projects or district operations.

4. Final project reports. The district shall submit to the department a final report for each plan implementation or district ~~subgrantee~~grantee project that shall contain the same information as described for project status in paragraph

(6)(B)1. of this rule, as well as a comparison of actual accomplishments to the goals established and a description as to how goals were either met, not met or were exceeded.

5. District operations status:

A. The details of progress in completing the district operations tasks outlined in the district operations

~~budget application;~~

B. Problems encountered in district operations;

C. Required budget amendments; and

~~D. Other information necessary for proper evaluation of district operations.~~

(C) District Annual Report. The district shall submit to the department within one hundred twenty (120) days of the end of the state fiscal year a report covering the following information for the state fiscal year:

1. Goals and accomplishments. A description of the district solid waste management goals, actions taken to achieve those goals and the goals that have been set for the upcoming state fiscal year;

2. Types of projects and results, including:

A. A summary of the projects that included goals to divert solid waste tonnage from landfills, including number and costs of projects, tons diverted and average cost per ton diverted, and other measurable outcomes achieved;

B. A summary of the projects that did not have waste diversion goals, including number and costs of projects, and measurable outcomes achieved; and

C. Separate statistics for items banned by statute from landfills and items that are not banned from landfills;

3. A description of the district's grant proposal evaluation process; and

4. A list of district council and executive board members, including their affiliation(s).

(7) Executive Board Accountability.

(A) The executive board shall comply with the department's reporting requirements, pursuant to section (6) of this rule.

(B) An executive board receiving funds from the Solid Waste Management Fund for district grants shall themselves maintain, and require recipients of financial assistance to maintain, an accounting system according to generally accepted accounting principles that accurately reflects all fiscal transactions, incorporates appropriate controls and safeguards, and provides clear references to the project as agreed to in the Financial Assistance Agreement. Accounting records must be supported by source documentation such as cancelled checks, paid bills, payrolls, time and attendance records, contract, and agreement award documents.

(C) The executive board shall adopt a conflict of interest policy regarding grants ~~to subgrantees~~. This policy shall include a requirement that any non-governmental member of the executive board, or the business or institution to which the member is affiliated, who applies for district grants shall not review, score, rank or approve any of the ~~subgrantee grant~~ applications for the same grant call.

(D) Payments to grant recipients shall be on a reimbursement basis. The executive board shall retain fifteen percent (15%) of the funds from the recipient until the project is complete. A project shall be deemed complete when the project period has ended and the board gives approval to the grant recipient's final report and the final accounting of project expenditures. The district may make payment directly to a vendor instead of reimbursing the grant recipient provided the executive board approves the direct payment, goods or services being purchased by the grant recipient have been received, and the executive board retains fifteen percent (15%) of the funds until completion of the grant project. For reimbursements or direct payments, the district may release the fifteen percent (15%) retainage prior to completion of the grant project with prior approval of the executive board and the department.

(E) Retention and Custodial Requirements for Records.

1. The executive board shall retain all records and supporting documents directly related to the funds and projects for a period of three (3) years from the date of submission of the final status report and make them available to the department for audit or examination.

2. If any litigation, claim, negotiation, audit or other action involving the records has been started before the expiration of the three (3)-year period, the records must be retained until completion of the action and resolution of all issues which arise from it, or until the end of the regular three (3)-year period, whichever is later.

(F) All general and special terms and conditions of the ~~department district~~ applicable to the project will be applicable to recipients of awards made available by this chapter.

(G) The executive board shall address all deficiencies identified in a district's audit to the satisfaction of the department. Districts failing to adequately address deficiencies identified in the audit may have funds withheld or may be required to repay any and all disbursements of funds in accordance with section (9) of this rule.

~~(H) Funding for approved subgrants will be forwarded to the districts upon receipt of a completed, signed and dated invoice and subgrantee financial assistance agreement for each individual subgrant.~~

~~(I) Except as otherwise provided by law, within eighteen (18) months after the effective date of this rule, the executive board shall use a competitive bid process to obtain administrative services, office space rental, and other district operations services, except for employees who are directly employed by the district. Contracts shall not exceed five (5) years in duration.~~

(J) The executive board shall have their records audited by a certified public accountant or firm of certified public accountants pursuant to section 260.325, RSMo. Districts shall arrange to have the audit conducted and submit to

the department a complete audit report prepared by the certified public accountant or firm of certified public accountants within one hundred eighty (180) days of the end of the period covered by the audit. ~~(re-write to reflect current statutes)~~

(K) For capital assets over ~~ten~~five thousand dollars (\$~~105~~,000) purchased in whole or in part with district funds and in which a security interest is held, the executive board must maintain property records. At a minimum these records shall include a description of the equipment, a serial number or other identification number, ~~the source of the property~~the name of the seller, the acquisition date, cost of the property, percentage of state funds used in the cost of the property, and the location, use and condition of the property.

(L) The executive board shall insure that a physical inventory is conducted of property purchased with district funds and the results reconciled with the property records at least once every two (2) years.

(M) For capital assets over ~~ten~~five thousand dollars (\$~~105~~,000) purchased in whole or in part with district funds, by the district or ~~subgrantee~~grantee, the executive board shall ensure that insurance is procured and maintained that will cover loss or damage to the capital assets with financially sound and reputable insurance companies or through self-insurance, in such amounts and covering such risks as are usually carried by companies engaged in the same or similar business and similarly situated.

(N) Pursuant to section 260.320.3, RSMo, the executive board ~~shall~~may appoint one (1) or more advisory committees and ensure that the advisory committee(s) meet annually, at a minimum.

~~(O) Planning Requirements. Pursuant to section 260.325, RSMo, the board shall review the district's solid waste management plan at least every twenty-four (24) months for the purpose of evaluating the district's progress in meeting the requirements and goals of the plan, and shall submit plan revisions to the department and council. At a minimum, the executive board shall submit plan revisions by April 1 of each odd-numbered year that include, but are not limited to:~~

~~— 1. An inventory of solid waste services in the planning area on forms provided by the department. Service information shall include:~~

~~— A. The solid waste collection services available to residential and commercial customers;~~

~~— B. The recycling services available to residential and commercial customers;~~

~~— C. The services available for management of items banned from Missouri landfills, pursuant to section 260.250, RSMo; and~~

~~— D. The services available for management of household hazardous wastes;~~

~~— 2. Pursuant to section 260.320.3, RSMo, a list of advisory boards, members of each and documentation of meetings; and~~

~~— 3. A description of illegal dumping identification, public education and household hazardous waste activities and programs established by the executive board, pursuant to section 260.320.3, RSMo.~~

(8) Awards.

(A) District Awards. All district ~~grant awards~~ funds are subject to the state appropriation process will be disbursed to ~~the~~. District grant awards will be disbursed to the district as provided for in subsection (2)(C) of this rule within thirty (30) days of the receipt by the department of all applicable applications and documentation per sections (3), (4), and (6) of this rule from the executive board of the district. In the case of questions regarding specific costs contained in the district operations application, the funds for costs not in question will be disbursed to the district.

(B) District ~~Subgrantee~~Grant Project Awards.

1. All district ~~subgrantee~~ grant awards are subject to the appropriation process.

2. Before the districts distribute awarded funds to a ~~subgrantee~~grantee, the ~~subgrantee~~grantee shall do the following:

A. Obtain all applicable federal, state and local permits, approvals, licenses or waivers required by law and necessary to implement the project;

B. Enter into a ~~subgrantee~~grantee financial assistance agreement, or an amended ~~subgrantee~~grantee financial assistance agreement if appropriate, issued by the district which is consistent with the Solid Waste Management Law and department rules and all terms and conditions of the district's financial assistance agreement; and

C. ~~Are in compliance with reporting requirements. Submit all required quarterly and final reports.~~

(9) Withholding of District Funds.

(A) The department may withhold or reduce district grant awards until the district is in compliance with the following:

1. Solid Waste Management Law and regulations;

~~2. Planning requirements pursuant to section 260.325, RSMo;~~

3. All general and special terms and conditions of the district's financial assistance agreement;

4. Audit requirements;

5. Resolution of significant audit findings ~~and questioned costs~~; and

6. All reporting requirements ~~and plan revisions~~ indicated in this rule.

(B) The department shall provide written notice of noncompliance prior to the withholding of funds, unless the severity of a significant audit finding requires the immediate withholding of funds. Such notice shall allow a minimum

of thirty (30) days for the district to submit the documentation or conduct other tasks as indicated in the department's notice.

(C) If a district fails to submit to the department a complete ~~quarterly semi-annual~~ report, annual report or ~~plan revision~~ by the due date indicated in the department's notice of noncompliance, the department ~~shall may~~ withhold and reallocate funds equal to one ~~percent (1%) hundred dollars \$100.00 of the district's most recent quarterly allocation~~ for each day past the notice due date, unless these provisions have been met:

1. The district has requested an extension prior to the notice due date and the department has granted an extension;

2. The district has submitted a complete report by the date indicated in the department approved extension; and

3. The department shall use the postmark date as the date submitted by the district. If no postmark date is available, the department shall use the date the department receives the report.

(D) For ~~questioned-ineligible costs identified through the audit process costs that the department determines to be inappropriate or unnecessary~~, the district shall repay the department or the department shall withhold from the district's allocation the amount of the cost, following the department's written request.

(E) For funds withheld from a district or ~~repaid~~ by a district, ~~the department shall reallocate~~ these funds ~~shall be reallocated~~ to all districts that, at the time of the reallocation, are in compliance with all requirements and have addressed all deficiencies identified in a district's audit ~~to the satisfaction of the department~~. The reallocation shall be made to districts in accordance with the allocation criteria pursuant to section 260.335, RSMo

(10) Dispute Resolution. The district and the ~~department~~ shall attempt to resolve disagreements concerning the administration or performance of the district. If an agreement cannot be reached within ninety (90) days of the issuance of the notice of noncompliance, the department's Solid Waste Management Program director will provide a written decision. The Solid Waste Management Program director may consult with the Solid Waste Advisory Board prior to providing this decision. Such decision of the program director shall be final unless a request for review is submitted to the ~~Division of Environmental Quality director~~ Administrative Hearing Commission (AHC) within thirty (30) days of the receipt of the program director's decision. ~~A district requesting AHC review shall follow the administrative procedures of the AHC. The division director shall provide a final decision within thirty (30) days of the receipt of the district's request. A decision by the division director shall constitute final department action. Such request shall include:~~

~~-(A) A copy of the program director's written decision;~~

~~-(B) A statement of the amount in dispute;~~

~~-(C) A brief description of the issue(s) involved; and~~

~~-(D) A concise statement of the objections to the final decision.~~

*AUTHORITY: sections 260.225, RSMo 2000 and 260.335, RSMo Supp. 2006. * Emergency rule filed Dec. 2, 1992, effective Dec. 12, 1992, expired April 11, 1993. Original rule filed Dec. 2, 1992, effective Aug. 9, 1993. Amended: Filed Dec. 14, 1999, effective Aug. 30, 2000. Amended: Filed Jan. 5, 2007, effective Oct. 30, 2007. *Original authority: 260.225, RSMo 1972, amended 1975, 1986, 1988, 1990, 1993, 1995 and 260.335, RSMo 1990, 1993, 1995, 2004, 2005.*

Other comments:

Definitions need to be reviewed.

Top of page 7, C2 solicited vs unsolicited projects. These refer to targeted grants that have been rescinded. Leave in, in case they need these.

Page 8 number E, do not need district administrative grant.

L, State required local match funds.

Terms and Conditions, change 5 year security interest to 3 year security interest.

Change advisory committee requirement in the law.