

REPORT TO WILLIAMSON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' COURT

SEPTEMBER 22, 2009

(Additional Comments appropriate on items in **Bold**. Updated items in red.)

In Commissioners' Court, on October 30, 2007, Pete Correa and Orlynn Evans were nominated to represent the County on the Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC) of the Capital Area Council of Governments (CAPCOG). Pete Correa and Orlynn Evans first met with SWAC at the January 30, 2008 meeting. One or both have attended every meeting since. There are four basic types of SWAC meetings:

1. REGULAR MEETINGS:

- Scheduled quarterly but may meet more or less often as required.
- **Reports of SWAC sponsored/supported activities.**
- Planning for other/additional meetings.
- Action on agenda items.

2. GRANT SCORING MEETING:

- Copies of request for grants from TCEQ through CAPCOG are circulated several weeks in advance.
- Entities making requests are invited to explain, answer questions, and modify their grant requests.
- SWAC members score the proposals.

The scores are averaged.

Entities scoring 70 or above are put inline to receive grants until all funds are expended.

See **Attachment I for FY-2010 Scoring Criteria. (\$442,000 available for 2010)**

“Local commitment to project” was raised to 15 pts.

See Attachment II for FY-2008 Score Results.

See Attachment III for FY-2009 Score Results

- \$442,000 available for fiscal year 2010. (These funds come from Tipping Fees)

PROJECT CATEGORIES

LE	Local Enforcement
LIDC-CCE	Litter and Illegal Dumping Cleanup and Community Collection Events
SRR	Source Reduction and Recycling
LSWMP	Local Solid Waste Management Plans
CCS	Citizens' Collection Stations and “Small” Registered Transfer Stations
HHW	Household Hazardous Waste (HHW) Management
TS	Technical Studies
ET	Educational and Training Projects

3. ROUND TABLES

- Informational, (e.g. Recycling E-waste, **Cost to community of stores using plastic bags.**)
- Public encouraged to attend.

4. CONFORMANCE REVIEWS for compliance with the Regional Plan

- **TDS Registration as a Scrap Tire Storage Facility (To SWAC Technical Subcommittee.) ***
- Texas Organic Recovery (In SWAC Technical Subcommittee)*
- River City Recycles (In SWAC Technical Subcommittee)*
- BFI & WM at Giles Road and US-290E (9900 Giles Road) review was forwarded to TCEQ
(**BFI expansion has been approved. (Add 70 feet height, Close by 2015 ?)**)
- Williamson County Landfill expansion **was not** reviewed by SWAC.

* Pete Correa is on the current Conformance Review Committee.



CAPCOG

Solid Waste Advisory Committee (24 members + staff)

SWAC STAFF	Kelly Freeman, Solid Waste Program Coordinator Melanie Flores, Administrative Assistant	
TCEQ Representatives	Kenneth May, (non-voting) Kathy Roecker, (non-voting)	
COMMITTEE OFFICERS	Chair Vice Chair	Maurice Pitts (Lee County) Jack Ranney (LCRA)
VOTING MEMBERS (22)		
COUNTY REPRESENTATIVES (13) (Five are County Commissioners)	1- Bastrop: 2- Blanco: 3- Burnet: 4- Caldwell: 5- Fayette: 6- Hays: 7- Lee: 8- Llano: 9- Travis: 10- Williamson:	Ross Johnson Commissioner Paul Granberg Lynn Sheffield Commissioner Joe Roland Commissioner Tom Muras Jeff Haus & Richard Salmon Commissioner Maurice Pitts Commissioner Henry Parker Melinda Mallia & Jon White Pete Correa & Orlynn Evans
INDUSTRY REPRESENTATIVES (4)	Lee Kuhn Kyle Hahn Steve Jacobs Ralph Wueller	BFI (Allied Waste) Green Guy Recycling Waste Management Texas Disposal Systems
CITY OF AUSTIN REPRESENTATIVES (2)	Gerry Acuna Don Birkner Richard McHale (as of August 20, 2009)	
Other Representatives (3)	Jack Ranney Joey Crumley Melanie Howard	Lower Colorado River Authority Educational Representative Citizen/Public

Each member has a vested interest, but the committee dialogs under Robert's Rules of Order.

ATTACHMENT I

HOW PROPOSALS WILL BE CONSIDERED

Proposals will be reviewed by CAPCOG's Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC) at a meeting to be held **November 19, 2009**, at CAPCOG, 6800 Burleson Road, Building 310, Suite 165, Austin, Texas 78744. All grant applicants will have a representative available at the review meeting to present to the SWAC the intentions and benefits of the proposed project and to answer SWAC members' questions. The SWAC will review, score and rank all applications based on the following **scoring criteria**:

- Identified need/problem resolution – long term vs. short term 15pts
- *Is there an adequate explanation as to why the proposed project is needed?*
 - *Is the specific waste stream targeted by the project clearly identified?*
 - *Is the overall goal or objective of the proposed project clearly stated?*
 - *Does the project address a gap in services?*
- Well planned, organized and technically feasible project 15pts
- *Does the project include adequate levels of customer incentives (convenience, avoided disposal costs, etc.), public education, or public input, as appropriate to the particular project?*
 - *Are all of the major steps or tasks involved in the proposed project clearly presented and adequately described?*
 - *Are responsible entities for accomplishing each step or task identified?*
 - *Are all aspects of the proposed project described in sufficient detail to ensure its overall feasibility or workability?*
- Regional coordinated effort or public/private partnership 10pts
- *Where feasible, is there a plan for cooperation of effort with other entities/organizations in the region?*
 - *If a regional approach is not feasible, is an explanation offered? Have all opportunities for regional cooperation been explored?*
 - *Have steps been taken to avoid duplication of effort?*
 - *If appropriate, will program and equipment costs be shared with other organizations?*
 - *Does the project promote cooperation with private industries?*
- Cost effectiveness of project 10pts
- *Are the costs of the proposed project presented in unit terms, such as cost per ton, costs per customer, or cost per capita, as applicable?*
 - *Is the cost of effectiveness of the project supported with relevant data such as cost per ton, cost per customer, cost avoided, or cost per capita, as applicable?*
 - *For pilot or demonstration projects, how will higher initial costs contribute to long term offsets or market development?*
- Direct services vs. administrative overhead 10pts
- *What portion of the funding will go directly toward project expenses?*
 - *Are personnel costs for startup projects only?*
 - *If project costs are administrative is it fully demonstrated that those costs are integral and essential for program success?*
 - *Are administrative and overhead costs requested reasonable for execution of the project?*
- Sustainability of proposed project 15pts
- *To what extent has the applicant demonstrated ability and intent to sustain the program beyond the term of the grant?*
 - *Does applicant have a strategy or plan to reduce waste generation and/or the need for future assistance?*
- Local commitment to project 15pts
- *Has the applicant demonstrated a commitment to the success of the project through allocation of resources (personnel, equipment, funds, etc.)?*
 - *Has the applicant presented sufficient documentation of the success of previously funded projects in order to warrant further funding?*
- Innovative solution/approach 10pts
- *Does the project encompass an alternative or innovative solution to addressing a problem?*
 - *Does the project expand, improve upon or add solid waste or recycling services in the applying jurisdiction?*

Applicants must score a minimum of 70 points out of the possible 100 to be eligible for funding.

ATTACHMENT II

FY 2008 Solid Waste Grant Applicant Summary

Applicant	Project Type	Description	Amount Requested	Amount Recommended for Funding	Funding Remaining (of \$442,000)	Score
CAPCOG	LE	RETF coordination, hotline promotion, education and outreach	37,183.00	37,183.00	404,817.00	92.06
Fayette County	SRR	Baler	22,950.00	22,950.00	381,867.00	85.65
Burnet County	HHW	One day HHW, electronic waste and tire collection event and product exchange	39,700.00	39,700.00	342,167.00	82.24
Llano County	LE	Surveillance equipment	10,288.00	10,288.00	331,879.00	81.39
Bastrop County	HHW	One day HHW, electronic waste and tire collection event and product exchange	50,690.00	50,690.00	281,189.00	81.12
Liberty Hill, City of	LIDC-CCE	Community collection event	1,500.00	1,500.00	279,689.00	79.94
Lee County	SRR	Purchase of truck for transport of recyclables to market	24,500.00	24,500.00	255,189.00	79.76
Cedar Park, City of	HHW, LIDC-CCE, LE, ET	One day HHW and tire collection, cleanup event promotion, environmental education and local enforcement officer training	43,258.98	43,258.98	211,930.02	79.75
Lockhart, City of	HHW, SRR, LE	HHW event, baler and surveillance system for recycle center	29,977.00	29,977.00	181,953.02	78.83
Hays County	SRR	Building and equipment for third recycle center in east county	64,700.00	64,700.00	117,253.02	78.06
Austin, City of	HHW	One day collection event in North Austin	40,000.00	40,000.00	77,253.02	77.88
Blanco County	SRR	Concrete slab for glass pulverizer	14,000.00	14,000.00	63,253.02	77.76
Granite Shoals, City of	LE, LIDC-CCE	Collection event and surveillance equipment	22,050.00	22,050.00	41,203.02	77.00
Hutto, City of	SRR, ET	Promotion of curbside recycling program	14,580.00	12,780.00	28,423.02	76.94
Burnet County	SRR	Truck and trailer for County wide recyclable collection, and promotion/education campaign	78,365.00	28,423.02	0.00	75.88
Travis County TNR	LE	Supplies, equipment and training	31,356.00	0.00	0.00	74.63
Martindale, City of	LIDC-CCE	Community collection event for brush and bulky trash	37,000.00	0.00	0.00	73.78
Johnson City, City of	SRR	Truck and trailer for expansion of recyclable collection	32,430.00	0.00	0.00	72.67
La Grange, City of	SRR	Chipper	32,000.00	0.00	0.00	71.61
Georgetown, City of	SRR	Facility improvement, program expansion, outreach and education	72,533.30	0.00	0.00	68.17
Smithville, City of	SRR	Leaf vacuum and truck for curbside mulching program	55,260.00	0.00	0.00	62.11
Llano, City of	CCS	Scales and scale house at citizen collection station	63,129.00	0.00	0.00	57.11

Liberty Hill \$ 1,500.00 Score = 79.94
 Cedar Park \$ 43,258.98 Score = 79.75
 Hutto \$ 12,780.00 Score = 76.94
 Georgetown \$ 00.00 Score = 68.17

TOTAL Williamson Co \$ 57,538.98 (14.21%)

ATTACHMENT III

2009
FY 2008 Solid Waste Grant Applicant Summary

Applicant	Project Type	Description	Funding Requested	Amount Recommended for Funding	Funding Remaining (or Available) (\$48,747)	Score
-----------	--------------	-------------	-------------------	--------------------------------	---	-------

Projects Recommended for Funding

CAPCOG	LE	Continuation of RETF program	19,030.00	19,030.00	431,717.00	93.40
Austin, City of	LE	Surveillance camera	6,070.00	6,070.00	425,647.00	86.50
San Marcos, City of	HHW	HHW collection event	40,700.00	40,700.00	384,947.00	86.21
Travis County	SRR	Food waste diversion project	28,653.00	28,653.00	356,294.00	84.85
Bertram, City of	SRR	Recycling facility improvements	9,826.90	9,826.90	346,467.10	84.56
San Marcos, City of	LIDC-CCE	Supplies, advertising and contract divers for river clean-up	6,100.00	6,100.00	340,367.10	84.07
Blanco County	SRR	Grapple for handling bulky materials and scrap	4,500.00	4,500.00	335,867.10	83.17
Burnet County	SRR	Recycling containers and education	8,403.00	8,403.00	327,464.10	82.33
Fayette County	SRR	Recycling facility equipment	26,500.00	26,500.00	300,964.10	82.08
Burnet, City of	SRR	Recycling trailer and education	21,700.00	21,700.00	279,264.10	81.81
Johnson City, City of	SRR	Truck and recycling trailer	27,388.00	27,388.00	251,876.10	80.75
La Grange, City of	SRR	Chipper	25,000.00	25,000.00	226,876.10	80.56
Cedar Park, City of	LIDC-CCE	Printing, advertising and radios for community collection event	4,313.00	4,313.00	222,563.10	80.40
Caldwell County	LIDC-CCE	Truck, trailer and staff for litter and illegal dumping cleanup	52,770.00	52,770.00	169,793.10	80.06
Granite Shoals, City of	LIDC-CCE	Community collection event	18,384.00	18,384.00	151,409.10	79.75
Cedar Park, City of	ET	Educational kits for schools and training	8,398.00	8,398.00	143,011.10	79.60
Hutto, City of	HHW	HHW voucher program	34,400.00	34,400.00	108,611.10	77.31
Martindale, City of	LIDC-CCE	Hauling and disposal for clean-up and community collection event	25,000.00	25,000.00	83,611.10	77.06
Cedar Park, City of	LE	Training and camera for officers	9,165.00	9,165.00	74,446.10	76.80
Georgetown, City of	SRR	Recycling program expansion and promotion	28,651.16	25,117.88	49,328.22	76.19
Hutto, City of	SRR	Recycling trailers and education	17,800.00	17,800.00	31,528.22	76.13

Projects Not Recommended for Funding

Lakeway, City of	SRR	Tb grinder	36,000.00	0.00		61.94
------------------	-----	------------	-----------	------	--	-------

Cedar Park
Hutto
Georgetown

\$ 21,876.00 Scores: 80.40, 79.60, 76.80
\$ 52,200.00 Scores: 77.31, 76.13
\$ 28,117.88 Score: 76.19

TOTAL Williamson Co. \$102,193.88 (23.67%)