

Mid-Missouri Solid Waste Management District
Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes
Wednesday, January 21, 2015, 1:00 p.m.
Daniel Boone Building, 701 East Broadway, Columbia, MO
Mezzanine Conference Room – OPEN MEETING

Members Present:

John Glascock	City of Columbia	Thaddeus Yonke	Boone County Planning
J.C. Miller	Callaway County	Patrick Steel	At Large
Marna Williams	Moniteau County	Gayla Neumeyer	At Large
Lauren Henry	Cole County	Bill Fountain	At Large
M.L. Cauthon	Cooper County	Angie Gehlert	At Large

Members Absent:

Howard McMillan	Howard County	John Glavin	Osage County
Rick Graham	City of Jefferson	Vacant	Cole County

Others Present:

DeAnna Trass, MMSWMD Manager	Jessica Sapp, MMSWMD Secretary
Geoff Shackelford, Boonslick Industries	Layli Terrill, City of Columbia

1. Call to Order and Introductions

Mr. Yonke called the meeting to order at 1:06 p.m. and began introductions.

2. Determination of Quorum

It was determined there was a quorum.

3. Approval of Agenda

Mr. Miller moved to approve the agenda; seconded by Ms. Gehlert. Unanimous voice vote of approval.

4. Review of Scoring Process for FY 2015 Applications and Funding Levels

The total amount requested in this large grant round is \$299,394.42. Mr. Yonke stated that there is \$187,884.85 to award this round. He then reminded the Committee that the total score on a grant needs to be 200 or higher to qualify for recommendation of funding to the Executive Board. After discussing each grant request, scoring will be done individually. Following this and a group discussion, it will be determined collectively as to whether or not to award bonus points and/or deductions from the total and what those numbers should be. During Staff review of the grant, recommendations are given and the Advisory Committee will take these into consideration when making their decision.

Mr. Yonke gave an overview the function of the Advisory Committee and its relationship with the Executive Board. The Committee was appointed by the Executive Board to review and score any grant requests that were submitted and make a recommendation of funding. Mr. Yonke went on to explain that in the category of Project Efficiency (cost/benefit), the weighted average has to be below a certain amount in order to score it with more than four points. Once District Staff receives a grant submission, it is reviewed and identified as to whether or not it can have a score higher than four.

Mr. Yonke reminded the committee that by scoring a grant, it is an affirmation that the member has read the grant and believes, in their opinion, that by giving a score to a grant and potentially funding it, they are affirming that it will not significantly adversely impact any operation within the District. Mr. Yonke

explained that this is a concern of MDNR, and the District has chosen to address their concern in this manner. Committee members would need to abstain from scoring a grant if there is a conflict of interest.

5. Discussion and scoring of FY 2015 District Grant Applications Round 2 (five large grant applications were received.)

1) H-15-06 City of Jefferson Support Local Glass Recycling Program

The City of Jefferson has a very successful glass recycling program. Total, they have four (4) drop-off locations throughout the city. Not only do the residents help make the program a success, so does a wheel loader dedicated to move collected glass from the consolidation point into the glass bunker. The current loaders' filled tires are shredded and worn due to running over glass while transitioning the glass from one place to the other.

If funded, the City of Jefferson would like to purchase a used front wheel loader and four solid tires for it. The "new" loader would also be larger than the current one so glass may be moved for efficiently. It also holds the potential to increase quantities of glass that is recycled. A front loader is a key component in the success of the City's glass recycling program.

Ms. Trass deferred to Ms. Henry in case she had additional comments on the grant request.

Mr. Yonke asked to confirm that this was not going to be a new loader, but a gently used one. Ms. Henry stated he was correct. The City of Jefferson didn't see the point in purchasing a brand new one since it was going to be dedicated to one program. Also, for this reason, they feel it will last them a while. Additionally, having it equipped with solid tires will be beneficial.

Ms. Henry shared they went out for bid to obtain the information for the application submission, but they are too high. If the grant is approved, the City of Jefferson will go out for bid again and change some of the wording hoping to find a loader without tires.

Ms. Neumeyer asked what solid tires were made of. Mr. Cauthon responded they were solid rubber all the way through.

Ms. Neumeyer moved to award 0 bonus points with no deductions; seconded by Ms. Williams. Roll call in favor of the motion was unanimous with Ms. Henry abstaining.

Bonus Points *Grant did not qualify for any bonus points or deductions*

2) H-15-07 City of Columbia Commercial Recycling Compactors

The City of Columbia would like to expand their commercial recycling program allowing them to accommodate higher volumes of fiber that businesses are accumulating. In adding more compactors, the City would also be able to accept new businesses for collection.

If this grant request is funded, the City would purchase two (2) 30-cubic yard compactors and three (3) 14-cubic yard compactors. These compactors would assist them in their recycling mission to divert waste from commercial, industrial, manufacturing, and institutional operations. If the need arises, the City is willing to place an appropriately sized compactor where it would be most effective.

Mr. Glascock added there is a lot of fiber to be recycled in Columbia. The City of Columbia would like to increase their recycling rate; which has been stagnant at 17%. The University of Missouri and Shelter Insurance would like to increase their recycling; as would the Downtown District.

Mr. Yonke asked Mr. Glascock if the City has a compactor placed at Columbia Public Schools. He responded there was not. With there being a letter of support in the grant, Mr. Yonke was curious of their interest to have one.

When she reviewed this grant, Ms. Neumeyer stated she took notice of the previous funding of grants and asked Ms. Trass about the payout of funds. There are a few that show nothing expended. Ms. Trass explained that typically, the City of Columbia does not ask for reimbursement on a project while it's in progress. They wait until it is complete and request full payout. One on the list closed between submission and grant review. However, the others remain on-going.

Mr. Cauthon moved to award 20 bonus points with no deductions; seconded by Ms. Gehlert. Roll call in favor of the motion was unanimous with Mr. Glascock abstaining.

Bonus Points +20 *Identify Community Needs – Priority #3*
 -0 *Deductions*
 20 pts

3) H-15-08 Boonslick Industries Plastic, Metal, and Glass Container Collection

Mr. Yonke said while he was reviewing this grant, the one thing that jumped out at him was the funding request that appears to be an all-purpose vehicle. The group has had discussions in the past about funding this type of equipment. He's sure they will want to address this.

Ms. Trass shared that Boonslick Industries (BII) is looking to streamline their collection process with Endless Options (EO) and expand services throughout their coverage area. To do this, they are asking for some equipment.

If funded, three Pro-Bin recycling trailers would be purchased; two with grant funding and the third being provided as part of their match. The trailers will allow EO to fill their containers for BII and house them on the trailer outdoors. This will allow for a more efficient and safer process for both BII and EO. It will also allow for more floor space for EO to accept more incoming material to be sorted for pick up twice a week by BII instead of once.

Another purchase, if grant funding is approved, is a four wheel drive pickup to replace the old, worn out truck they currently have. This type of vehicle is conducive for the navigation of the curvy, undulating; two lane roads that BII routinely makes to pick up material.

Geoff Shackleford, Recycling Manager for BII was present to answer any questions or clarify points in the grant.

Mr. Yonke commented that staff recommended bonus points for "identify community needs". However, the support letter was from Endless Options (EO); the location for the recycling trailer. This does not constitute a community need. Mr. Shackleford stated the trailer at EO is one of three being requested in the grant.

Mr. Yonke also asked about the pick-up truck requested in the grant; is it for EO to use or for BII. Mr. Shackleford responded that it was for BII to service their collection areas with the recycling trailers. Mr. Yonke stated that the group can discuss whether or not the bonus points actually fit "identify community needs" after they learn more about the grant. It appears to him that maybe EO is part of this grant and bonus should not be considered.

Ms. Gehlert asked Mr. Shackleford if the trailers had plastic gaylord containers inside, each accepting different materials. In response, Mr. Shackleford stated the receptacles are stand alone, steel structures that can be lifted easily by a fork lift when they are full and ready to be emptied. With the nature of BII's business in the workshop, this will help streamline the process without going fully automated.

Mr. Shackleford shared that BII is looking to expand their business. They have proven success with other ProBin trailer locations in California and Boonville Correctional Center. BII has reached out to several communities that may want to have a drop-off site, however, Mr. Shackleford states it's a hard sell when

the equipment hasn't been purchased yet. At this time Tipton, Versailles, Bunceton, and Arrow Rock are targeted areas of expansion.

Going back to Mr. Yonke's comments about the funding of a pick-up truck, Ms. Neumeyer asked Mr. Shackelford if there was a way to revise their budget to where the vehicle would become part of the match and all three trailers be purchased with grant funds. Mr. Shackelford feels it would skew the numbers a little bit. The trailers are about \$18,000 and the truck is about \$37,000; this would be twice as much and the match would go up quite a bit, but BII can certainly do that if necessary.

Mr. Yonke expanded that Region H has asked applicants in the past when they were asking for general purpose vehicles. It makes the committee more comfortable in recommending funding when a majority of the funding is put in stable items where use wasn't in question. He said there isn't anything that Region H could not fund anything like this, but the group always has this same discussion when an all purpose vehicle is involved.

Mr. Shackelford shared that with the routes they have, a truck like the one quoted in the grant will assist transporting the trailer in wintry conditions. BII currently has a one ton, crew cab truck that is pulling trailers and will be moved to become a multi-purpose vehicle. The new 4WD vehicle will allow BII drivers to maneuver curvy, winding roads in a safer manner allowing continued service to their clients when weather conditions are questionable.

Mr. Cauthon asked what the group thought about bonus priority four, "providing service to an underserved area". He stated that Mr. Shackelford shared BII wanting to expand services into Arrow Rock and Bunceton. Mr. Yonke said he didn't see a problem in considering priority four.

Mr. Glascock moved to award 40 bonus points with no deductions; seconded by Mr. Cauthon. Unanimous voice vote of approval.

<u>Bonus Points</u>	+20	Identify Community Needs – Priority #3
	+20	Providing Service to an underserved area – Priority #4
	-0	Deductions
	40 pts	

Before the group moved to the next grant discussion, Mr. Cauthon asked if they could have an update on BII and its progress from Mr. Shackelford; which he shared how BII rebuilt after the fire.

4) H-15-09 Handi-Shop, Inc. More Awareness=More Recycle Processing

Handi-Shop has eleven, 10-bin recycling trailers set up throughout Audrain County. They collect cans, cardboard, paper, plastic, etc. When ready, the trailer is transported to Handi-Shop where material is processed in one of their four balers.

One baler has needed some major repairs in past years. There is concern about how much longer it will last. If their grant is funded, Handi-Shop would purchase a horizontal baler to replace the dilapidated one.

Ms. Gehlert asked if the baler Region H would be replacing was really old? Do we know much Handi-Shop may have invested in repairs? Did we purchase it? Ms. Trass stated the baler being replaced is old. Region H granted Handi-Shop funding in FY2000 to purchase a baler, presumably the 1994 model was purchased with that funding. She does not know how much the applicant has spent on repairs of this unit over the years.

Ms. Henry stated that the group has discussed repeatedly funding the same entity to purchase/replace same equipment. That she'd like to see the entity expand their services and/or get creative and not repeatedly ask for funding of replacement equipment. Ms. Henry points out that Handi-Shop does not

bring funding requests to Region H as often as some entities, however, she questions the group funding a replacement baler.

Mr. Yonke agrees that funding a replacement baler for Handi-Shop isn't the optimal situation for Region H, but they don't come to MMSWMD for funding as often as others. This makes the situation more palatable. One could maybe say that this project (if funded) would be supporting Handi-Shops' ongoing operations, however, since they don't come to us for every little thing they need, creates a different situation.

Ms. Trass added on top of Handi-Shop not coming to Region H very often with grant requests, the projects that were awarded were spent wisely. Mr. Yonke does feel, from his point of view, that Handi-Shop is responsible and haven't asked for anything that they could not find a way on their own. They've needed what they've asked for.

Mr. Yonke moved to award 0 bonus points with no deductions; seconded by Mr. Glascock. Unanimous voice vote of approval.

Bonus Points *Grant did not qualify for any bonus points or deductions*

5) H-15-10 Kingdom Projects Turn It Around @ KPI

KPI is in the process of expanding their capacity for sorting and processing material. It will allow for an increase in the collection of recyclables and revenues.

If funded, this grant will purchase a forklift with rotational forks. This item will efficiently assist in the staging and processing of material. At this time, plastic bottles are dumped on the floor near the baler pit. They are then manually moved into it. With the use of the forklift, KPI would be able to take the bottles straight to the pit and dump them in. This would save time, improve safety, and allow more material to be processed.

Mr. Cauthon asked to clarify that KPI is expanding their capacity, not their clients or services. This was correct. Mr. Miller also added that there will be approximately ten (10) jobs added. The forklift will make the movement of recyclables more efficient, allowing for more volume and more employees needed to sort it.

Mr. Glascock moved to award 20 bonus points with no deductions; seconded by Ms. Neumeyer. Roll call in favor of the motion was unanimous with Mr. Miller abstaining.

Bonus Points +20 *Identify Community Needs – Priority #3*
 -0 *Deductions*
 20 pts

6. Recommendations for funding FY2015

Mr. Yonke reviewed the results of the scoring. The grants scored in the following ranking:

1. Kingdom Projects (Turning it Around @ KPI): 341 points
2. Boonslick Industries (Plastic, Metal, and Glass Container Collection): 330 points
3. City of Jefferson (Pyrolysis Machine for Making BioChar): 303 points
4. Handi-Shop, Inc. (More Awareness=More Recycle Processing): 298 points
5. City of Columbia (Commercial Recycling Compactors): 288 points

Mr. Yonke reminded the Committee that normal procedures dictate that the Advisory Committee only recommends funding grants that score 200 or above to the Executive Board. He also stated that it was the job of the Committee to recommend funding, not to make any funding decisions.

In looking at the grants and the order they ranked, Mr. Yonke stated if the Advisory Committee followed what they've always done, they could recommend fully funding the grants in order of score until funds are exhausted.

If the Committee votes to approve in order of the way the grants scored, grant #1 and part of #2 could be funded. At this time only \$149,400 is guaranteed to be awarded. However, the Executive Board may opt to use some money the district has that is unobligated.

Mr. Glascock moved to fund grants in order of rank until funds are depleted; seconded by Ms. Neumeyer. Steele. Unanimous voice vote of approval with Ms. Henry abstaining from the City of Jefferson grant, Mr. Glascock abstained from the City of Columbia grant, and Mr. Miller abstained from the Kingdom Projects grant.

7. Other Business

None

8. Schedule next meeting

If there is money left to grant another small round, the next meeting of the Advisory committee is April 15, 2015

9. Adjourn

Mr. Yonke moved to adjourn the meeting; seconded by Ms. Henry. Unanimous voice vote of approval.

The meeting adjourned at 2:27 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

APPROVED:

Jessica Sapp
Secretary, MMSWMD

Thaddeus Yonke
Chairman, MMSWMD Advisory Committee

DeAnna Trass
MMSWMD Manager