1. **Introductory remarks**: Mr. Jon White, Chair

2. **Approval of minutes from January 19, 2018 SWAC meeting**: Mr. Jon White, Chair

3. **CAPCOG Solid Waste Program Update**: Ken May, CAPCOG Regional Programs Coordinator; Andrew Hoekzema, CAPCOG Director of Regional Services

4. **Presentation and Discussion on City of Austin – Austin Resource Recovery Landfill Criteria Matrix**: TBD, City of Austin

5. **Regional Solid Waste Management Plan Subcommittee Update**: Ken May, CAPCOG Regional Programs Coordinator, Christiane Alepuz, CAPCOG Natural Resource Program Specialist

6. **ACTION ITEM: Consider and Take Appropriate Action on Proposed Update to Conformance Review Procedures**: Andrew Hoekzema, CAPCOG Director of Regional Services

7. **Presentation on Interactive Regional Illegal Dumping Map**: Christiane Alepuz, CAPCOG Natural Resource Program Specialist

8. **Other Business, Adjourn**
Solid Waste Advisory Committee | Summary Minutes

January 19, 2018 – 9:00 AM
CAPCOG Pecan Room
6800 Burleson Road
Building 310, Suite 165
Austin, TX 78744

Present (20)
Mr. Richard McHale, Chair, City of Austin
Mr. Jon White, Vice Chair, Travis County
Mr. Gerry Acuna, City of Austin
Mr. Phillip Merino, Bastrop County
Commissioner Paul Granberg, Blanco County
Commissioner Bill Wall, Burnet County
Commissioner Joe Roland, Caldwell County
Commissioner Tom Muras, Fayette County
Commissioner Debbie Ingalsbe, Hays County
Mr. Steve Shannon, Hays County
Commissioner Linda Raschke, Llano County
Ms. Emily Ackland, Travis County
Mr. R. Lynn Lantrip, Williamson County
Ms. Rachel Herring, Cooperative Teamwork & Recycling Assistance, Citizen/Environmental Representative
Mr. Joey Crumley, Educational Representative
Mr. Steve Jacobs, Waste Management, Private Industry Representative
Mr. Adam Gregory, Texas Disposal Systems, Private Industry Representative
Mr. Michael Mnoian, Central Waste & Recycling, Private Industry Representative
Mr. Jack Ranney, Stericycle PSC, At-large Member w/HHW Expertise
Mr. Matthew Smith, Hill Country Recycling, Private Industry Representative

Absent (2)
Commissioner Maurice Pitts, Lee County
Mr. Pete Correa, Williamson County

CAPCOG Staff
Andrew Hoekzema, Director of Regional Services
Kate Barrett, Administrative Assistant
Ken May, Regional Programs Coordinator
Christiane Alepuz, Natural Resources Program Specialist

Call to Order – 9 a.m. with a quorum.

1. **Introductory remarks and welcome to new members:** Mr. Richard McHale, Chair

   Mr. McHale confirmed the quorum and welcomed and thanked everyone for attending. He asked new members Commissioner Ingalsbe, Mr. Shannon and Ms. Herring to introduce themselves.

2. **Approval of minutes from September 15, 2017 SWAC meeting:** Mr. Jon White, Vice Chair

   Mr. McHale asked for a consideration of the September 15, 2017, meeting minutes. Mr. Ranney questioned his opposing vote on agenda item 8. Mr. May and Mr. Hoekzema both confirmed that was his motion on the item. Mr. Ranney expressed regret over voting that way. Commissioner Raschke motioned to approve the minutes of the September 15, 2017, meeting and Mr. Lantrip seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

3. **Officer elections for 2018:** Mr. Jon White, Vice Chair
Mr. McHale asked for nominations for Chair and Vice Chair for 2018. Mr. Gregory motioned to nominate Mr. White for Chair and Commissioner Raschke for Vice Chair. Mr. Lantrip seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

4. **Update on Bastrop transfer station**: Andrew Hoekzema, CAPCOG Director of Regional Services

Mr. Hoekzema provided an update and a timeline of events regarding the MSW No. 40291 Bastrop County transfer station registration. He referred to the document titled “Update on Bastrop County Transfer Station Registration”.

There was discussion about the Bastrop County transfer station registration, the recent CAPCOG and Bastrop County’s motions to overturn the TCEQ’s Executive Director’s decision to approve the registration and Bastrop County’s filing for judicial review of the TCEQ’s action.

5. **ACTION ITEM: Recommendation to CAPCOG Executive Committee on conformance review of Williamson County transfer station permit application (MSW permit application No. 2398)**: Ken May, CAPCOG Regional Programs Coordinator

Mr. May stated CAPCOG staff obtained information by email for this review by requesting information from Williamson County and the City of Hutto about the transfer station permit application. Copies of the responses were provided to the Conformance Review Subcommittee when they met on December 5, 2017. After review of the application and the responses to the information staff requested, the subcommittee made a recommendation of non-conformance. The subcommittee made a determination that MSW permit application No. 2398 does not conform to CAPCOG’s Regional Solid Waste Management Plan (RSWMP) and recommended that the TCEQ deny the permit application. Mr. May explained the subcommittee’s reasons for non-conformance and referred the Board to the document titled “CAPCOG Solid Waste Advisory Committee Conformance Review Subcommittee Report on MSW Permit No. 2398”.

There was a discussion about the subcommittee’s report and reasons for non-conformance for MSW permit application No. 2398.

Mr. Mnoian motioned to accept the Conformance Review Subcommittee’s recommendation of non-conformance to the CAPCOG Executive Committee and Commissioner Wall seconded the motion. The motion passed with abstentions from Mr. Acuna, Mr. Shannon, Mr. Gregory, and Mr. Jacobs.

6. **ACTION ITEM: Recommendation to Executive Committee on FY 2018-2019 Solid Waste Grants**: Ken May, CAPCOG Regional Programs Coordinator

Mr. May explained several things about the scoring process. First, he explained the scoring process and when a SWAC member should abstain from scoring due to any potential conflict of interest and how SWAC members should note these; and second he explained the two tiers of applications based on the applicant’s prioritization of projects. Mr. May referred to the document titled “FY 2018-2019 Solid Waste Grant Applications Scoring Guidance”. There was a discussion about the scoring, potential conflict of interest, and private industry considerations.

The following organizations provided a 3-minute verbal presentation of their FY 2018-2019 Solid Waste Grant Application projects:
A. Bastrop County – Household Hazardous Waste (HHW) Management Project. Requests $46,250 to continue efforts in providing solid waste services at its Bastrop County Household Hazardous Waste Facility (BCHHWF) which serves Bastrop and Lee County residents. Mr. Merino abstained from scoring.

B. City of Smithville – Source Reduction and Recycling (SRR) Project. Requests $6,500 to replace the building structure that houses cardboard and plastics at the recycling center.

C. Blanco County – HHW Management Project. Requests $12,000 to hold a HHW Collection event in September 2018. Commissioner Granberg and Mr. Ranney abstained from scoring.

D. City of Buda – HHW Management Project. Requests $10,500 to hold a HHW Collection event in the fall of 2018. Mr. Ranney abstained from scoring.

E. City of Buda – SRR Project. Requests $5,500 to purchase a recycling trailer and carts to be used at community events in the City of Buda. Mr. Gregory abstained from scoring.

F. Burnet County – HHW Management Project. Requests $35,000 to hold a HHW Collection event and public awareness activities. Mr. Gregory abstained from scoring.

G. Burnet County – Environmental Local Enforcement (LE) Project. Requests $35,541.81 to help establish the Burnet County Illegal Dumping Enforcement Program.

H. Caldwell County – Litter and Illegal Dumping Clean-Up and Community Collection Events (LIDC-CCE) Project. Requests $11,360.05 to hold four, precinct-based, community collection events and one scrap tire collection event.

I. City of Granite Shoals – LIDC-CCE Project. Requests $6,450 to hold a city-wide clean up event.

J. City of Granite Shoals – LIDC-CCE Project. Requests $6,450 to hold a city-wide clean up event.

K. City of Lago Vista – HHW Management Project. Requests $17,400 to hold a HHW collection event. Mr. Shannon and Mr. Ranney abstained from scoring.

L. City of Lakeway – HHW Management Project. Requests $12,500 to purchase a used forklift for the HHW facility in western Travis County.

M. Llano County – HHW Management Project. Requests $20,000 to hold a BOPATE collection event. Mr. Ranney abstained from scoring.

N. City of Lockhart – HHW Management Project. Requests $16,000 to hold a HHW collection event. Mr. Ranney abstained from scoring.

With the $177,766 in Solid Waste funding available, there were nine projects that were fully funded for implementation. There was a discussion about the ranking of the applicants.

Mr. Crumley motioned to make a recommendation to the Executive Committee to fund the projects in which they were ranked with no partial funding and authorizing awarding of funding of any projects below the funding line in rank order if additional funding is available. Mr. Ranney seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

7. Other Business, Adjourn

There was a discussion about updating the RSWMP and the conformance review process and procedures. Discussion also included holding more SWAC meetings in 2018. CAPCOG is contractually required to hold at least two SWAC meetings but with the need to update the RSWMP and conformance review process and procedures, it was decided to hold more meetings. The Board decided to hold meetings in April, July and October.

With no other business to discuss, Mr. White adjourned the meeting at 12 p.m.
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1. Welcome & Introductions

Introductions and discussions on current plans, planning process, conformance reviews, and future needs to be incorporated into our plan (specificity), long-term goals, short-term goals, questionnaires, research, data gathering, GIS analysis, voluntary participation.

Stakeholder comments:

- When complete, who reads it? Document needs to relevant to our delegates, COGs, the State, and private industry.
- Service level survey can be done in-house.
- Data limitations, base data may be at generation level and back into waste diversion rates without publishing solid waste facility specific data.
- Q: goals and objectives are not specifically identified to be in priority order, are CAPCOG’s? versus, short term 1-5 years, goals 1 to 8; mid-term, long-term.
- Should we review the priorities? End-use market development monies, these are the only funding source for such and there has been very little infrastructure development. Should we be moving toward use of these monies for more end-use market development.
- Public participation component. This is required, was utilized in the original design elements of the plan, and is recommended, but not until we have a draft of the plan with updated demographic data at a minimum.
- Green fence aspects, end-use markets development, and exporting resources to another country, this will all back-fire on the US soon, and may lead to a situation where recycling is no longer deemed economically feasible.
- How to leverage the dollars we do have, may be a waste of these grant dollars to use them to promoted end-use markets, as there is too little money available through this program
- COG-Managed Projects to conduct technical studies, perhaps we should use these to advance region-wide priorities, e.g., Waste Characterization in CAPCOG Region.
- Annual surveys?
• **Policy position:** recognizing need for public information and market development, participation with STAR and other Non-profits to support end-use market development.

• **Reverse pitch, incubators, resource recovery programs, guidance with data driven tools on macro level for consideration at the micro level.** Tie into overall statewide goals.

• **Update data and demographics.**

2. **Review State Requirements and Rules for Regional Solid Waste Management Plans (RSWMP)**
   a. Statutory Requirements (Texas Health and Safety Code Chapter 363)
   b. TCEQ Rules (Title 30, Texas Administrative Code 330, Subchapter O)
   c. CAPCOG Contract & TCEQ Administrative Procedures

3. **What Does the RSWMP Plan Actually Do?**
   a. Provide Information on and Assessment of the Region’s Solid Waste Management System
   b. Guide CAPCOG Solid Waste Staff Work and Priorities
   c. Guide CAPCOG Implementation Grant Prioritization
   d. Otherwise Guide Solid Waste Management Activities Within the Region
   e. Establish Conformance Review Procedures and Criteria
   f. Provide a Structure for Regional Coordination

4. **Review Current CAPCOG RSWMP and the NCTCOG, H-GAC, and AACOG RSWMPs**
   a. Volume I: “Regional Solid Waste Management Plan” — approved by Commission
   b. Volume II: “Regional Solid Waste Management Implementation Plan Guideline” — approved by ED
   c. Review Other COGs’ RSWMPs

5. **Discuss Scope of Plan Updates**
   a. Updated Data and Information? — *first steps. Take care of the musts before entertaining wants.*
      Develop and distribute service surveys, accrue results, follow-up with non-participants.
   b. CAPCOG Research Projects?
   c. Updates to Funding Guidelines?
   d. Updates to Conformance Review Procedures? — *later in the process*
   e. Goals and Objectives? — *consensus is to include updates to these in the overall process, in a later step*
   f. Accounting for Urban/Suburban/Rural Issues?

6. **Discuss Specific Potential Plan Revisions/Updates**

7. **ACTION ITEM: Recommendation for Scope of Update and Timeline for Completion**

8. **Plan for Future Meetings**

9. **Adjournment**

Request for list of research projects:
1. Demographic data
2. Disposal rates
3. Service gap analysis
4. Resource recovery programs
5. Waste stream analysis to establish base line rates
6. Transportation system analysis, drive time studies
7. Study of end-markets, business analysis, frame work analysis (what exists on national level that could be canned and brought to CAPCOG?), literature review (what currently exists and what practices are currently being utilized)
8. Next meetings expectations: compendium of research articles and/or relevant information (email your input to CAPCOG staff with short synopsis of relevance). Ask of rural representatives, considerations of rural perspectives. Start acquiring demographic data sets. Scope of new service survey.
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1. Welcome & Introductions, Ken May, CAPCOG

2. Update on resource literature review, Ken May, CAPCOG

   To be distributed to subcommittee members with copy of the RSWMP. Members mentioned additional studies

   Subcommittee members identified an LCRA Tire Study that may be beneficial to include in our research studies.

3. Solid Waste Services questionnaire of local government, Ken May, CAPCOG
   - Services provided
   - Service areas
   - Service fees
   - Special collections

   Subcommittee members discussed issues with surveys, e.g., low response rates, gaps in data, difficulty representing full picture of region without accurate and complete responses to data surveys. Staff discussed use of an online survey to promote local government responses, taking survey to CAPCOG Exec to gain buy-in for completing surveys from the top down. CAPCOG conducted a survey in ~2010 that had a response rate of ~20%. Subcommittee agreed CAPCOG staff should present a draft survey at the next subcommittee meeting.

4. Model ordinance as reference point in Conformance Review Process, Ken May, CAPCOG
Subcommittee were introduced to a concept where CAPCOG’s Model Solid Waste Facility Siting Ordinance may be used as a benchmark for conformance with the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan. This topic was only an introduction to a concept which CAPCOG staff are entertaining. Members were informed about ongoing issue of concern with Counties in the region adopting “NIMBY” ordinance language that does not meet the intent of statute. Issue was presented on how we may utilize the guidance as a benchmark for statements of conformance where a county does not have such solid waste facility siting ordinances.

5. **Spatial Analysis: Needs Assessment & Suitability, Christian Alepuz, CAPCOG.**
   - **Type I, II, IV, and Type V Landfills – Central Texas (Includes all adjacent COGs)**
     - Subcommittee members voiced benefit in identifying which facilities are government versus private industry owned and operated, which facilities charge a fee and which provide recycling services to constituents for free.
     - Members noted a private recycler in Williamson County, a City of Johnson City Recycling Facility in Blanco County, and a Lonestar Transfer Station operating just south of the City of Bastrop in Bastrop County.
     - Need to reduce legend to allow display of Mesquite Landfill in Comal County.
   - **Type V MSW Transfer Stations – Central Texas (Includes all adjacent COGs)**
     - Range where TS becomes necessary, ~ 20 to 30 miles from area landfills
   - **Citizen Collection Stations – survey of service areas, identify areas where CCS becomes beneficial (>10 to 15-mile radius)**
     - Members identified Transfer Station on RR 1431, and a CCS on Bee Caves Rd., that were not depicted.
   - **Permanent HHW Facilities – locations in region, operational hours, materials accepted, areas of need.**
     - Subcommittee confirmed a 15-mile radius as an accurate representation of preferred service area for HHW, and stated it is their opinion that the CAPCOG region is grossly underserved.
     - Research States of Florida, Wisconsin, and Kansas, which member report have good HHW Management Progams.
     - **Discussion on how the use of above maps and analysis may promote the development of solid waste infrastructure in areas of need and the most efficient use of existing infrastructure.**

6. **Recommendation for Scope of Update and Timeline for Completion, Ken May, CAPCOG**

   Subcommittee members discussed need for a timeline to help drive the many components of updating the plan. CAPCOG staff committed to presenting a draft timeline during the June subcommittee meeting.

7. **Plan for Future Meetings**

   Subcommittee members agreed to try and meet again in June 2018. CAPCOG staff will send a doodle poll to all subcommittee members targeting dates in June 2018 that they may be available to attend a third subcommittee meeting.

   Subcommittee members discussed future agenda items, such as:
   - Conducting a tour of our region’s solid waste facilities
   - Identify end-use markets, and promote Texas centric end-use markets
• Establish percentage of pass-through grant monies and designate for market development
• Seek legislation (lobby) establishing end-use market economic development funding
• Use of enterprise funds as incentives for star-ups
  ▪ Federal
  ▪ State
    • Discussions led to need to identify or establish funding as is done for other industry in Texas, and pointing out that no such enterprise funds, nor state funding assistance is provided to the Solid Waste industry, as is for oil & gas, wind energy, solar energy, transportation, etc.
• Promote development of grants programs for end-use market infrastructure
• Establish a business council to help identify end-use market development in Texas
• Identify obstacles to developing end-use markets
  • China blockade
  • Loss of worldwide markets
  • Reduced revenues for recyclable materials
• Promote the entire solid waste hierarchy
  • Waste to energy
  • Burning of waste before disposal
• Identify alternative ways to improve solid waste diversion in Texas
  • Regulate solid waste industry as a utility
  • Develop solid waste management authorities statewide, per COG area
    ▪ Split COG into quarters and manage via contracts
    ▪ Control solid waste collection by contract
    ▪ Control solid waste diversion by contract
      • May promote best available technology and best available cost amongst state’s solid waste service providers, e.g., Brazos Valley Solid Waste Management Authority, North Texas Municipal Utility District, Kaufman County COOP.
      • Consider funding a feasibility study to entertain possibility of alternative methods identified.

8. Adjournment
The Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) requires that all municipal solid waste (MSW) facilities proposed for siting in the CAPCOG region conform to CAPCOG's Regional Solid Waste Management Plan (RSWMP). (Texas Health and Safety Code §363.066; 30 TAC §330.635.) TCEQ's permitting procedures state that "It is the responsibility of the applicant to demonstrate conformance to the RSWMP. (30 TAC §330.61(p))."

CAPCOG, with the assistance of its Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC), will review permit and registration applications filed with the TCEQ to determine their conformance to the RSWMP. All applicants must complete this Solid Waste Plan Conformance Checklist, and submit it to CAPCOG along with the items described in Chapter III of Volume II of the RSWMP, to assist CAPCOG in making this determination.

The applicant's representative must complete the Checklist to the best of his or her ability to demonstrate how the proposed facility will help in promoting the goals and objectives of the RSWMP. CAPCOG's Solid Waste Program Coordinator will return an incomplete Checklist to the applicant with a written explanation of its deficiencies. The applicant may resubmit the Checklist when all the deficiencies are corrected. As required under 30 TAC §330.57(e)(2), the applicant must submit any amendments to part I or II of application to CAPCOG. If the applicant amends parts I or II of the application, the applicant must also submit an updated conformance review checklist with a cover letter explaining the changes. Failure to provide amended applications and checklists may be grounds for a non-conformance determination by CAPCOG.

If you need additional space to answer a Checklist question, or the question requires an attachment, attach letter-size continuation sheets, reduce or fold attachments to letter size if possible, and insert each continuation sheet and attachment following the Checklist page it supplements. Include the Checklist question number on the continuation sheet and attachment, and number the sheets in sequence—for example, the continuation sheets answering a question on Checklist page 3 should be numbered 3-1, 3-2, etc. The grade sheet that the SWAC will use to evaluate your responses to the Checklist is attached for your information.

Submit the completed Checklist to:

Capital Area Council of Governments
Attn: Regional Program Coordinator
6800 Burleson Road, Building 310, Suite 165
Austin, TX 78744
Section 1: General Applicant Information

1.1 Applicant’s Name:________________________________________________________

1.2 Location of proposed facility
   Nearest City: __________________________ County: _________________________

1.3 ☐ New facility  or  ☐ Amendment to current permit/registration

1.4 Is this a permit or a registration application?
   ☐ Permit No. _____  ☐ Registration No. _____

1.5 What type of MSW facility is being registered or permitted?
   ☐ Type I Landfill  ☐ Type I AE Landfill  ☐ Type IV Landfill
   ☐ Type IV AE Landfill  ☐ Type V Facility  ☐ Other (please describe)
   Describe “Other” below:

1.6 What types of waste(s) will be accepted at your facility?

1.7 Do you currently or plan to accept special or industrial waste? If yes, which classes? If no, write “No.”

1.8 Do you currently or do you plan on accepting treatment plant sludge, treated sewage or any other potentially odorous wastes? ☐ Yes  ☐ No

1.9 What entity or entities in the CAPCOG Region is this facility intended to serve?

1.10 Does your facility have an operating or host agreement with any CAPCOG entity or entities? If so, please provide a copy. If not, do you plan to enter into one?

1.11 If the proposed facility is other than a landfill, where will the stored or processed wastes be taken for disposal?
Section 2: Conformance to Regional Goals and Objectives

The following questions assess conformance to the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan. These questions are based on CAPCOG’s Regional Goals and Objectives, which include land use compatibility and local community concerns.

2.1. What measures do you plan to take to make your facility accessible to the general public? (e.g., citizens collection station, inclement weather plan, posted fee scales, map availability, public advertising methods, etc.)

2.2. Describe your plans to deter illegal dumping through initiatives such as community cleanup events, free or reduced rate events, public education, etc.

2.3. If applicable, how will your facility manage scrap/used tires? Please explain in detail.

2.4. What are your plans for managing yard waste and brush? Please explain in detail.

2.5. Will any of the following items be diverted for recycling or reuse?

- [ ] Electronics
- [ ] White Goods
- [ ] Construction/Demolition Debris
- [ ] Tires
- [ ] Yard waste & brush
- [ ] Scrap Metal
- [ ] Other (please describe)

2.6. If the proposed facility is other than a landfill, what, if any, measures will be taken to minimize, reduce, or recycle the waste before it is hauled off for disposal?

2.7. If the proposed authorization is a registration, how does the application qualify for a registration rather than a permit, and why – in light of the more limited opportunities for members of the public to contest a registration compared to a permit – a registration for this facility would better serve the public interest than a permit?

2.8. Is the site of your proposed facility subject to zoning or siting restrictions by federal, state or local governments? Please note that you must mark “yes” to this question if any local government with jurisdiction over the proposed location has adopted a MSW facility siting ordinance adopted pursuant to Texas Health and Safety Code §363.112 or §364 and or adopted any floodplain regulations adopted pursuant to Texas Water Code §16.315, regardless of whether
or not the applicant believes that the ordinance applies to the proposed facility. □ Yes □ No

2.8-2.9. The applicant must demonstrate compliance with local land use regulations by (i) providing a written list of all local land use regulations relevant to the MSW facility, and (ii) providing documentation from the applicable zoning or siting entity stating that the proposed facility will be in compliance with its regulations. Make sure to include consideration of any MSW facility siting ordinances and floodplain management ordinances adopted by the local government with jurisdiction over the proposed site. If the applicant believes that any such local ordinances do not apply to the facility, it must provide an explanation and verification of this claim from all local governments with jurisdiction over the proposed location.

2.10. Please identify the number of residences and business establishments, as well as environmentally sensitive features including but not limited to wetlands, floodplains, water supply aquifer recharge zones and state and federally listed species localities or habitat within a 1-mile radius of the outer boundary of the proposed facility site.

2.11. Would the facility adhere to the following set-back-distances?:

a. Perimeter located at least 2,640 feet from a school? □ Yes □ No
b. Perimeter located at least 2,640 feet from public or private water wells? □ Yes □ No
c. Perimeter located at least 2,640 feet from neighborhoods? □ Yes □ No
d. Perimeter located at least 2,640 feet from individual residences? □ Yes □ No
e. Perimeter located at least 2,640 feet from day care facilities? □ Yes □ No
f. Perimeter located at least 2,640 feet from places of worship? □ Yes □ No
g. Perimeter located at least 5,280 feet from areas of direct drainage to any public surface drinking supply? □ Yes □ No
h. Perimeter located at least 2,640 feet from a historic site? □ Yes □ No
i. Perimeter located at least 2,640 feet from health care facilities? □ Yes □ No
j. Perimeter located at least 1,000 feet from areas of direct drainage to any recharge aquifers? □ Yes □ No
k. Perimeter located at least 500 feet from the boundary of a 100-year floodplain (as determined by the local jurisdiction)? □ Yes □ No
l. Perimeter located at least 2,640 from a park? □ Yes □ No
m. Perimeter located at least 2,640 feet from a tourist attraction? □ Yes □ No
n. Not visible from a road designated as a scenic road? □ Yes □ No
o. Perimeter located at least 5,900 feet from the end of any airport runway used by piston-driven aircraft? □ Yes □ No
p. Perimeter located at least 10,000 feet from the end of any airport runway used by turbojet-powered aircraft? □ Yes □ No
q. Perimeter located outside the boundaries of any wetland area? □ Yes □ No
r. Perimeter located at least 200 feet away from any fault areas that have shifted since the last Ice Age? □ Yes □ No
s. Perimeter located outside a seismic impact zone? □ Yes □ No
2.12. If “No” is marked for any of the items listed under question 2.10, does a local MSW siting ordinance otherwise allow the type of MSW handling (disposal or processing) proposed for this location? (Under Vol. II of CAPCOG’s RSWMP, if a local government has a MSW siting ordinance in place designating the proposed site as suitable for the proposed use, CAPCOG’s RSWMP will not contradict it)

2.9-2.13. The applicant must demonstrate that it has adequately addressed the risk of nuisance conditions from a MSW facility impacting nearby persons, property, or land uses by providing a written plan containing reasonable and appropriate measures to avoid if possible or minimize if avoidance is not possible such conditions through (i) controlling litter blown from the MSW facility or released from the operator’s vehicles going to or from the MSW facility, (ii) managing the quantity and quality of stormwater from the facility, (iii) controlling birds and disease vectors from the facility, (iv) controlling odor from the MSW facility through the use of daily cover and other means, (v) controlling excessive noise or light pollution, and (vi) establishing appropriate buffers and setbacks. Note that for any Type V facility, full enclosure of the location where waste would be stored and processed and operation of active odor controls are presumed to be “reasonable” and “appropriate” measures to avoid or minimize odor conditions for any Type V facility.

2.10-2.14. The applicant must demonstrate that road, drainage, and other infrastructure needs and/or problems created by a MSW facility have been fully addressed by providing documentation from appropriate governmental entities that such needs and problems have been addressed. At a minimum, this must include documentation from the County and school district in which the facility would be located, and, if the proposed facility is located within the extra-territorial jurisdiction (ETJ) or city limits of a city government, documentation from the applicable city government as well. In the event that such documentation cannot be obtained by the applicant, the applicant must present evidence that it has made a reasonable and good-faith effort to obtain such documentation.

2.11-2.15. The applicant must demonstrate compatibility with existing and planned land uses in the vicinity of the MSW facility by providing documentation from appropriate governmental entities that the facility is not incompatible with existing and planned land uses. At a minimum, this must include documentation from the County and school district in which the facility would be located, and, if the proposed facility is located within the extra-territorial jurisdiction (ETJ) or city limits of a city government, documentation from the applicable city government as well. In the event that such documentation cannot be obtained by the applicant, the applicant must present evidence that it has made a reasonable and good-faith effort to obtain such documentation.

2.12-2.16. The applicant must demonstrate that it has addressed the likely visual and aesthetic
impacts from a MSW facility on nearby persons, property, and land uses by providing a written plan for including reasonable buffers and setbacks, landscaping, or other “context sensitive” measures that the applicant will employ to minimize such impacts.

2.13. If the proposed facility is a landfill, what will be the maximum permitted and maximum potential (theoretical geometric calculation) fill height of the facility? (Please provide a final contour map of the proposed facility.)

______ Feet above existing grade and ______ feet above mean sea level

2.14. If the permit or registration that is the subject of the application would raise the elevation of either an existing MSW facility or natural ground, the applicant must demonstrate that it has assessed potential impacts on the natural landscape by providing a written statement that identifies the highest elevation natural feature within two miles of the facility and a demonstration that the proposed elevation will not cause adverse off-site flooding impacts.

2.15. Please provide compliance history for the past five years of all permitted or registered facilities operated by the applicant in Texas, using TCEQ records. Please explain what corrective actions have been taken to prevent recurrent violations, if any violations occurred. Please list the number of Notices of Violations (NOVs) received in the past 5 years for each permitted or registered facility operated in Texas. Please list the number of corrective actions taken in response to NOVs in the past 5 years for each permitted or registered facility operated in Texas. Please list all Enforcement Actions (EAs) for each permitted or registered facility operated in Texas. Please list all fines, settlements, or other outcomes of NOV or EA events at all permitted or registered facilities operating in Texas.

Section 3: Certification

I certify that I read and understood the requirements of this Checklist; that I am authorized to make this certification on behalf of the Applicant; and that, to the best of my knowledge, the information supplied by the Applicant for this Checklist is correct and complete.

______________________________
Name of Applicant

By ____________________________
Signature
For each item, the SWAC will rate the response as either conforming or deficient. For each item rated deficient, the SWAC will detail the deficiency, including indicating which aspect of the RSWMP the response may indicate non-conformance, and where appropriate,
The SWAC may make suggestions as to potential remedy. The SWAC may also add comments and/or specific information that would be helpful in determining conformance. Any comments or suggestions by the SWAC are for guidance and do not relieve the applicant of responsibility for demonstrating conformance. This grade sheet is intended to help the SWAC in its conformance review recommendation to CAPCOG’s Executive Committee.

A grade of “YES” or “NO” on any item or items does not constrain the SWAC in its review and recommendation to the CAPCOG Executive Committee. CAPCOG reserves the right to present any information to the SWAC and Executive Committee that could be relevant assessing conformance to CAPCOG’s RSWMP, not just the information provided by the applicant in this checklist or in parts I and II of the application. If, after the SWAC has made a recommendation to the Executive Committee, CAPCOG staff or SWAC members become aware of other relevant information not considered by the SWAC in making its recommendation, CAPCOG staff reserves the right to bring that information to the SWAC to reconsider their recommendation or to present that information directly to the Executive Committee for their consideration. It is therefore in the best interests of all parties involved that the applicant be as thorough and comprehensive in providing the requested information as early as possible. The CAPCOG Executive Committee will make the final determination of conformance.
MSW Facilities serving the CAPCOG Region

- **Type I Landfill**
- **Type IV Landfill**
- **Type V Transfer Stations**

**Local Government Citizens Collection Stations**
- ▲ Recycling Only
- ▲▲ Recycling and MSW
- ▲▲▲ MSW Only

**CAPCOG Counties**

Map as of 4/16/2018
MSW Landfills and Transfer Stations serving the CAPCOG Region

30 Mile Coverage Area

Map as of 4/16/2018
Local Government Citizens Collection Stations serving the CAPCOG Region

Map as of 4/16/2018
Permanent HHW Facilities serving the CAPCOG Region

Area within 15 miles of a HHW Facility

HHW Facility
15 mi. HHW Facility Buffer
CAPCOG Counties

Households/Square Mile
0 - 50
51 - 170
171 - 250
251 - 500
501 - 1,000
1,001 - 5,000
5,001 - 10,000

Households Outside of Buffer: 95,349
Area Outside of Buffer: 2,796.83 sq. mi.

Map as of 4/16/2018
Sources for RSWMP Update Maps

All MSW Facilities in CAPCOG Map

• Data Sources
  o “msw-facilities-texas.xls” from TCEQ’s Data on Municipal Solid Waste Facilities in Texas
  o Utilized the sources from the “Citizens Collection Stations serving the CAPCOG Region” Map

MSW Landfills and Transfer Stations serving the CAPCOG Region, 20 and 30 mile Maps

• Study used to determine maximum radii for buffers
  o HGAC’s Transfer Station Best Management Practices
• Data Source
  o “msw-facilities-texas.xls” from TCEQ’s Data on Municipal Solid Waste Facilities in Texas

Citizens Collection Stations serving the CAPCOG Region Map

• Study used to determine maximum radii for buffers
  o NCTCOG’s 2003 Rural & Underserved Area Disposal Needs Study
• Data Sources
  o Bastrop Co
    ▪ “msw-facilities-texas.xls” from TCEQ’s Data on Municipal Solid Waste Facilities in Texas
    ▪ http://www.co.bastrop.tx.us/upload/page/0089/docs/price_list.pdf
  o Blanco Co
    ▪ https://www.hillcountrypassport.com/blanco/article/20553/recycling-plastics
    ▪ https://www.johnsoncitytx.org/1082/Recycling-Services
  o Caldwell Co
    ▪ http://www.lockhart-tx.org/page/public_works_recycling
  o Hays Co
    ▪ http://www.greenguyrecycling.com/what-we-accept/
  o Fayette Co
  o Llano Co
    ▪ “msw-facilities-texas.xls” from TCEQ’s Data on Municipal Solid Waste Facilities in Texas
    ▪ http://www.cityofllano.com/Facilities/Facility/Details/Citizen-Collection-Station-Recycle-Cente-1
    ▪ https://www.horseshoe-bay-tx.gov/183/Solid-Waste-Services
Permanent HHW Facilities serving the CAPCOG Region Map

- Study used to determine 15-mile radius and population density
  - Household Hazardous Waste Facility Feasibility Study, Peoria County, IL
- Data Sources
  - Travis Co
    - ARR Recycle and Reuse Drop-Off Center
      - http://www.austintexas.gov/dropoff
    - Lake Travis Regional Reuse & Recycling Center
      - http://www.wcid17.org/services/reuse-recycling-hhw/
  - Bastrop Co
    - Bastrop Co. HHW Facility
      - http://www.co.bastrop.tx.us/page/ds.household_waste
  - Hays County
    - City of San Marcos HHW Facility
  - Fayette County
    - No record online, information from Ken May, CAPCOG
  - Williamson Co
    - City of Round Rock Recycling Center
    - Williamson County Recycling Center
      - http://www.mytexashhw.com/