

MISSOURI SWMD DISTRICT ANNUAL REPORT

FISCAL PERIOD: JULY 1ST - (PREVIOUS YEAR) TO JUNE 30TH - (CURRENT YEAR) | 2016

District R - Southeast Missouri Solid Waste Management District

SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT DISTRICT ANNUAL REPORT

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

Continuing a tradition in place since its inception, the Southeast Missouri Solid Waste Management District (District R) continues to have, as its central goal, the support of State of Missouri efforts to reduce material going into landfills by 40%. This is accomplished by providing grants-in-aid to local organizations engaged in recycling efforts. There have been some region wide efforts exemplified by providing funding to MRC to cover the fees normally associated with accepting older tube type televisions. Preliminary investigations into the possibility of a region-wide HHW effort have also been undertaken. The core of the District R program remains providing funding to local organizations.

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

Working from the theory of "if it ain't broke don't fix it," District R will continue what it views as a successful program. When approximately \$100,000 is in the District's "account" with the Missouri Department of Natural Resources (DNR) a grant call will be made. If history is a guide there will be significantly more requests for funding than funds available. Those projects with the best scores will be funded. District R updated its Solid Waste Management Plan a few years ago and the most significant change was an increased emphasis on education. To that end the District has funded an education program that has been successful with other Districts in Missouri. The primary goal continues to be to support State of Missouri efforts to reduce materials destined for landfills by at least 40%.

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

	GOAL:	ACTION:
1	Continue supporting efforts by the State of Missouri to reduce material going into landfills by 40%	<p>1. The District has never quantified recycling goals. Rather, support for local efforts with a special emphasis on new programs when they develop, continues to be the focus. Following revision of the solid Waste Management Plan in 2011 a slightly greater emphasis on education programs has been incorporated into the proposal evaluation procedures.</p> <p>2. The primary action of District R continued to be to provide funding to local efforts when those efforts were consistent with the District and State goals. All applications are carefully reviewed by DNR staff as a backup to ensure that all relevant terms and conditions are met.</p>

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

District R fully intends to continue what they view as a successful program. There has been a slight shift in emphasis toward education with a grant made to In-the-Green productions, an agency specializing in elementary level educational programs. This grant was renewed for the current year. A grant was offered to a construction material recycling firm but that was subsequently declined. Staff will continue working toward a regional approach to HHW events.

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

The District continues to have, as the central goal, working to achieve the State of Missouri's long standing goal of reducing materials going into landfills by 40%.

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

The District has never set specific goals in terms of "tons of materials." Rather, the District continues what it believes is a very successful program and provides funding to the projects that score highest on the evaluation system reflecting the goals outline in the Solid Waste Management Plan as revised and adopted in 2011.

4. Summarize the types of projects and results during the fiscal year, including previous fiscal years as part of the 5 year reporting. (add additional rows if needed)

	PROJECT #: *	NAME OF PROJECT RESULTING IN TONNAGE DIVERSION FROM LANDFILLS:	COST OF PROJECT:	NUMBER OF TONS DIVERTED:	AVERAGE COST PER TON DIVERTED:
1	R2015-2	City of Cape Girardeau HHW Collection Event	29,719.50	15.2400	1,950.00
2	R2015-3	City of Fredericktown	6,605.02	129.3200	51.08
3	R2015-4	MRC Regional E-Waste Collection	25,000.00	200.0000	125.00
4	R2015-5	Bollinger County Operations	2,290.00	31.6000	72.47
5	R2015-8	Ste. Genevieve County/Holcim HHW Event	30,360.71	41.0000	740.50
6	R2015-9	Perry County HHW Collection Event	18,838.43	3.3800	5,573.00
7	R2016-4	City of Cape Girardeau Purchase of Roll-off bins	7,317.00	216.2700	33.84
8	R2016-8	Ste. Genevieve Recycling Center Purchase of Fork Lift	21,993.12	82.5600	266.39
9	R2012-2	VIP Purchase Equipment	10,000.00	1,851.5100	5.40
10	R2012-3	Ste. Genevieve County/Holcim HHW Event	10,000.00	49.3000	202.84
11	R2012-5	Bollinger County Purchase Forklift	14,797.50	31.6000	468.28
12	R2012-6	City of Fredericktown Covered roof and recycling bags	10,361.25	129.3200	80.12
13	R2012-7	Perry County Recycling building expansion	14,625.00	2,071.6000	7.06
14	R2012-8	MRC E-Waste Subsidy	20,000.00	200.0000	100.00
15	R2014-2	MRC E-Waste Subsidy	20,000.00	200.0000	100.00
16	R2014-3	City of Jackson Purchase Forklift	17,460.71	573.0000	30.47

17	R2014-4	Ste. Genevieve County/Holcim HHW Collection	20,000.00	41.0000	487.80
18	R2014-5	Bollinger County Recycling Operations	1,087.50	31.6000	34.41
19	R2014-6	City of Fredericktown Purchase of Baler	9,382.50	129.3200	72.55
20	R2014-7	City of Cape Girardeau HHW Event	20,000.00	1,208.5000	16.55
21	R2014-10	Bollinger County Concrete pad	5,250.00	31.6000	166.14

5. Summarize projects not resulting in Tonnage Diversion

	LIST PROJECTS BY NUMBER AND NAME NOT RESULTING IN TONNAGE DIVERSION FROM LANDFILLS.	COST OF PROJECT:	MEASURABLE OUTCOMES ACHIEVED FOR THESE PROJECTS:
1	R2015-6	3,000.00	County owned building houses Bollinger County Recycling, Inc. operations. This grant was for needed improvements supporting the diversion results noted above at R2015-5.
2	R2015-7	15,000.00	Educational program for primary schools. Project resulted in 25 programs presented to a total of 5,956 students
3	R2016-2	43,275.00	Project is a one-time HHW collection event scheduled for October, 2016.
4	R2016-3	4,000.00	Grant to St. Joe State Park for purchase and installation of recycling "pod." Not implemented yet.
5	R2016-6	975.00	Water improvements to the recycling facility used by Bollinger County Recycling, Inc. Diversion reported in R2016-5.
6	R2016-7	12,000.00	Educational program for primary schools. Project scheduled for the coming school year.

6. Identify separate statistics for items banned from landfills:

	LIST PROJECTS BY NUMBER AND NAME RESULTING IN TONNAGE DIVERSION FROM LANDFILLS.	LIST COST OF PROJECT RESULTING IN TONNAGE DIVERSION:	NUMBER OF TONS DIVERTED FROM PROJECT:	AVERAGE COST PER TON DIVERTED:	MEASURABLE OUTCOMES ACHIEVED FOR THESE PROJECTS:
--	---	--	---------------------------------------	--------------------------------	--

7. Identify separate statistics for items NOT banned from landfills:

LIST PROJECTS BY NUMBER AND NAME RESULTING IN TONNAGE DIVERSION FROM LANDFILLS.	LIST COST OF PROJECT RESULTING IN TONNAGE DIVERSION:	NUMBER OF TONS DIVERTED FROM PROJECT:	AVERAGE COST PER TON DIVERTED:
---	--	---------------------------------------	--------------------------------

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

A grant call is authorized by the Board of Directors. All Counties and Cities with a population of 500 or more are notified directly. A formal Public Notice is placed in the newspaper of record in each County. Beside these "required" steps, a press release is prepared and sent to all local media. In addition, direct email notification is provided to anyone who has indicated an interest in SWMD funding. Once the deadline has passed, and at least a month is always allowed for the application process, a Proposal Review Committee reviews the proposals and "scores" them using the Evaluation Sheet included as Attachment 2 below. In cases where the Proposal Review Committee recommends less than full funding of a project the applicant is notified of this and asked if they will be able to proceed at the reduced funding level. The Proposal Review Committee then offers its recommendations at the following Board of Directors meeting. Once the Board of Directors makes its final decision staff initiates the process of approval through DNR, the preparation and implementation of Financial Assistance Agreements, and beginning work on the project.

Upload File:

[FY 2015-16 District R Annual Report.pdf](#) *Maximum of 5 mb file size*

 AUDIT ONLY

District comments

 AUDIT ONLY

DNR Comments:

Response created on: Sep 27, 2016 at 01:33 PM CDT by dgrimes@semorpc.org

Response last updated on: Oct 12, 2016 at 10:18 AM CDT by dgrimes@semorpc.org