



Coordinated Prevention Grants (CPG)

Local Toxics Control Account Dollars At Work Results of the 1998-99 Grant Cycle

March 2000
Publication No. 00-07-019

 *printed on recycled paper*

Coordinated Prevention Grants (CPG)

Local Toxics Control Account Dollars At Work Results of the 1998-99 Grant Cycle

Prepared by:
Washington State Department of Ecology
Solid Waste and Financial Assistance Program

March 2000
Publication No. 00-07-019

Letter from Cullen
Keep a page for this

Acknowledgements

Prepared by Steve Loftness with the assistance of the following Ecology Staff:

CPG Officers	Mikel Baxter Peter Christiansen Mike Drumright Glenn Duncan Dan Koroma Sally Safioles Marni Solheim Steven Williams
--------------	--

HQ Staff	Jim Bill Suzanne Crouch Gloria Dreyer Annette Gregor Michelle Payne Jay Shepard
----------	--

Local government staff who reported their statistics

Table of Contents

Overview	1
Program Highlights by Category.....	3
Household Hazardous Waste Collection and Disposal (HWCD)	3
Waste Reduction and Recycling Activities (WRRRA)	4
Solid Waste Enforcement (SWE).....	6
Waste Reduction and Recycling –Capital (WRRC)	7
Small Quantity Generator Implementation (SQGI)	7
Household Hazardous Waste Implementation (HHWI).....	8
Solid Waste Planning (SWP)	8
Ground Water Monitoring Wells (GWMW).....	9
Moderate Risk Waste Capital (MRWC)	9
Hazardous Waste Planning (HWP).....	9

Overview

The Model Toxics Control Act was established through a referendum by a vote of the public. The Act generates funds through a tax on hazardous substances sold in the state. Of that tax, 53% is deposited into the Local Toxics Control Account (LTCA). The Department of Ecology is directed by the Act to provide grants or loans to local government from funds in the LTCA for the following purposes in this priority order:

- Cleanup of hazardous waste sites;
- Implementation of local hazardous waste plans and programs; and
- Implementation of local solid waste plans and programs.

The Department has designated 60% of the funds to go to the cleanup of hazardous waste sites, leaving 40% for the other two priorities. The 40% provides the funding for Coordinated Prevention Grants (CPG). In a normal two-year appropriation cycle, this results in approximately \$16,000,000 being allocated to CPG.

As currently operated by the Department, the aim of the grant program is to help local governments develop, implement, and enforce their local solid and moderate risk waste management plans. The “Prevention” in the title of the program refers to activities that help ensure that generation and disposal of hazardous and solid wastes will not contaminate our air, land, and water. “Coordinated” refers to the structure or rules which encourage local governments to work together to examine their waste management needs and decide the activities they will propose for grant funding. In the past it also referred to separate sources of grant funding with coordinated guidelines, but currently LTCA is the only fund source. Ecology allocates the available funds by county, to be split among eligible jurisdictions within the counties (see Table 2). For the 1998-1999 cycle a formula based on the previous grant cycle award level was used. (Solid waste enforcement funds are allocated separately, see page x.) For the 2000-2001 cycle a fixed amount plus per-capita formula was used. This formula funding is not an entitlement program; local governments must submit satisfactory applications that meet eligibility requirements.

Grant recipients provide a cash match equaling 25 to 40 percent of the total eligible costs of their projects. The lower amount is available to economically disadvantaged counties.

Under the 1998-1999 grant cycle, a total of \$16,834,059 was awarded. The grants leveraged local matching funds to support an estimated \$26 million worth of solid and moderate risk waste projects (nearly \$25 million billed as of 3/23/00).

The waste management categories that the CPG Program funded for the 1998-1999 grant cycle were broken down into the following categories:

Household Hazardous Waste Collection and Disposal	\$5,069,196
Waste Reduction and Recycling—Activities	\$4,222,349
Solid Waste Enforcement	\$2,234,362
Waste Reduction and Recycling—Capital	\$1,285,413
Small Quantity Generator Implementation	\$ 949,586
Household Hazardous Waste Implementation	\$ 581,971
Solid Waste Planning	\$ 369,788
Ground Water Monitoring Wells	\$ 50,245
Moderate Risk Waste--Capital	\$ 50,624
Hazardous Waste Planning	<u>\$ 21,562</u>
TOTAL (state share invoiced by 3/23/00)	\$14,780,096

Program Highlights by Category

Household Hazardous Waste Collection and Disposal (HWCD)

State Share Budgeted	\$5,339,759
Spent (95%)	\$5,069,196

Nearly all counties and several cities and towns reported activities in this category. Grant funds were used to pay for operating costs of fixed moderate risk waste (MRW) collection and disposal facilities, for collection events at other locations, and even for mobile collection. Moderate risk waste is defined as “(a) any waste that exhibits any of the properties of hazardous waste but is exempt from regulation under Chapter 70.105 RCW solely because the waste is generated in quantities below the threshold for regulation, and (b) any household wastes that are generated from the disposal of substances identified by the Department as hazardous household substances or substances that exhibit any of the properties of hazardous waste”.

Significant Statistics

The Spokane Regional Solid Waste System reported collection of 2,108,134 lbs. of household hazardous waste (HHW). Sixty-three percent of the total was recycled. Used oil accounted for 58% of the collection volume and 71% of the recycled volume. Other items collected included auto batteries (345,395 lbs.), household batteries (140,595 lbs.), antifreeze, oil and latex paint, solvents, pesticides, acids, and bases. This was accomplished using \$370,870 in grant funds.

Snohomish County spent \$692,416 in grant funds in this category and collected 2,905,247 lbs. of HHW. Seventy-two percent of the total was recycled. Materials collected and proportions of the total were similar to Spokane’s. Skagit County used \$100,681 in grant funds and collected 493,586 lbs. of HHW and recycled 69% of the total. Franklin County was a leader in efficiency with a total of 216,473 lbs. of HHW for an outlay of \$27,094 in grant funds.

Clark County reported the collection of 1,433,316 lbs. of HHW, using grant funds in the amount of \$284, 846. The City of Tacoma used \$54,902 in grant funds and collected 486,094 lbs. of HHW, mostly in used oil, which was all recycled. Cowlitz County used \$126,859 in grant funds to collect 866,207 lbs. of HHW in a wide range of categories, and reported recycling over 90% of the total. Yakima County spent \$293,329 in grant funds and collected 1,011,693 lbs. of HHW, 73% of that was recycled.

Counties with smaller populations also reported solid efforts that contributed to the impressive state total of 16,634,673 lbs. of HHW collected, 66% of which was recycled.

Innovations

The Seattle-King County Department of Public Health began a hazardous waste exchange program for latex paint, dramatically increasing the amount of latex paint recycled from previous levels. Instead of disposing of the latex paint, it is given back to interested parties. If it is not directly recyclable it is processed into other coating products. In 1999, 20 tons of paint was returned to the public as a result of this project.

Douglas County added containers for pesticide collection at its drop box facilities, and added door-to-door service for collecting HHW from seniors and the disabled.

Waste Reduction and Recycling Activities (WRR)

State Share Budgeted	\$4,725,654
Spent (89%)	\$4,222,349

In the WRR category, recipients promoted public education and involvement, through such activities as conducting presentations and workshops, training volunteer educators, creating and maintaining school programs and award programs, equipping and staffing resource centers and hotlines, and providing technical assistance and on-site visits to businesses and individuals. Other eligible activities paid for included recycling program development, recycled materials market development, and promotional and equipment costs for special collection events.

Significant Statistics

A major CPG success was the Grasscycling Campaign in King, Snohomish, and Pierce counties. This was a cooperative effort with several grantees using their state funds and local match to purchase electric mulching mowers and offer them at cost to the public. Participants were the cities of Bellevue, Everett, Federal Way, Kirkland, Seattle and Tacoma along with the King County Solid Waste Division. The goal of the project was to reduce the amount of grass clippings handled by landfills and regional composting facilities. Promotion used paid radio and print advertising in conjunction with telephone hotlines, but received extensive free publicity through television news. A total of 8,000 electric mulching mowers were distributed at eight events (4 per year), and approximately 5,500 used mowers were recycled. Besides volume reduction at solid waste facilities, benefits included the reduced use of fertilizer and reduced air pollution.

Through the efforts of its Waste Reduction and Recycling Coordinator/staff and a grant of \$50,505, the City of Kent achieved a 72% recycling participation rate among single and multi-family residents and businesses. Kent was the only

jurisdiction in King County that reported reaching the 65% recycling goal by the year 2000.

Pierce County Public Works Department used a grant of \$506,673 to work in cooperation with private haulers to promote curbside recycling and yard waste collection throughout the county. Grant funds paid for newsletters, news releases, brochure reprints, posters, doorhangers, reply cards, bin packets, schedules, and stickers. The grantee also developed, designed, and utilized new exhibits and displays to be used at special events, shows, and fairs to demonstrate recycling options.

Clark County Public Works used a grant of \$162,302 to continue operating the Environmental Information Center, which provides information and educational resources to the public, educators, and students. The grantee conducted a Master Composter program and an environmental school program for K-13 grade levels. A recycling directory was updated and distributed to county and city residents. A construction/demolition education program for homebuilders was designed and implemented.

Spokane County used \$371,303 in grant funds for a variety of recycling activities, including multiple presentations at schools and community events, production of a mulching video, and numerous business waste audits.

Walla Walla and Columbia counties combined to use \$52,273 to implement a waste reduction and recycling program. Components included a master-recycle (Earth Care) program, county co-op recycling program, neighborhood program and Green Seal program. Sixty thousand brochures were distributed, including 13,000 for Spanish-speaking residents.

Solid Waste Enforcement (SWE)

State Share Budgeted	\$2,812,466
Spent (79%)	\$2,234,362

Solid waste enforcement grants are used by local health agencies for inspection, enforcement, and investigation of solid waste sites and facilities, and also for investigation of illegal dump complaints. The SWE funds are separate and are not available for other uses under the grants.

Allocations for enforcement activities are \$100,000 per single county health department, and \$150,000 per multi-county health district. This allocation formula is sometimes a barrier to the complete utilization of the funds, because counties with smaller populations often apply for and receive grants far in excess of their actual needs or ability to match with their own funds. If the initial allocation is not spoken for, the money can be redirected in a supplemental funding process to the larger jurisdictions, but this is not a complete solution to the problem. Previous proposals by the Department to improve the allocation formula were not supported by local governments.

Reporting of Solid Waste Enforcement activities is a routine compilation of the number of initial and follow-up investigations of illegal dumping, numbers of cases resolved and pending, permit applications reviewed and permits issued, numbers of solid waste facility inspections, operational plan reviews, and other technical assistance.

Significant Statistics

Illegal dumping is especially a problem in areas with a combination of low income, sparse population, and lightly used roads in forested areas. Mason County used its grant to set up a dumper-identification program and institute substantial fines by ordinance. Lewis County started a “Dump Stoppers” program by coordinating the Health Department with the Sheriff’s Office. Klickitat County was successful in tracing some especially egregious violators and forcing them to pay for cleanup. Skagit County Health Department worked with a group of high school visual arts students to produce six 30-second public service announcement videos about illegal dumping to be aired on the local cable network. The students also developed posters to support the anti-illegal dump message.

Waste Reduction and Recycling –Capital (WRRC)

State Share Budgeted	\$1,592,975
Spent (81%)	\$1,285,413

These funds are used for the planning, permitting, design and construction of facilities to store, sort, process, or compost recyclables. Operational expenses are not grant eligible. Recycling collection equipment including rolling stock is eligible, as are other equipment items used to store, sort, process, or compost recyclables. Equipment or rolling stock used for regular solid waste collection and disposal is not eligible, nor are replacements for items previously purchased with grant funds.

Significant Statistics

Chelan County designed and built a chipping and composting site, and purchased a tub grinder, trailer and forklift with the help of \$35,099 in state funds. The City of Shoreline also completed construction of a yard waste recycling facility, using \$67,873 in 1998-1999 funds to complete a project started in the previous biennium. Spokane County used \$34,663 in state funds to purchase equipment for collecting recyclables. Seattle Public Utilities distributed over 5,000 compost bins, and other grantees in King County added 2,000 more. Cowlitz County purchased 3,000 backyard compost bins and distributed them to residents. Other jurisdictions that used funds for compost bins include City of Longview, Ferry County, Pacific County, Thurston County, Kittitas County, and Klickitat County.

Small Quantity Generator Implementation (SQGI)

State Share Budgeted	\$998,481
Spent (95%)	\$949,586

This grant category is directed at the management of hazardous waste generated in quantities small enough to meet the moderate risk waste definition. The target of activities under this category is the small business community. Grant eligible items include information and education components such as seminars, workshops, and information exchanges; technical assistance such as waste consultations, surveys, and audits; and regulatory action such as developing, revising, and implementing ordinances and regulations.

Significant Statistics

Clark County used \$60,000 in state funds to provide small business with waste audits and technical assistance, and also to manage and coordinate a reduced cost consolidated collection service of waste and recyclable materials.

Bremerton-Kitsap County Health Department used \$90,253 in state funds to help pay for staff to provide on-site consultations to businesses, helping them reach compliance without the threat of penalty. They also recognized successful businesses through the Envirostars program, and produced a “Hazardous Waste Guide for Businesses in Kitsap County”.

Household Hazardous Waste Implementation (HHWI)

State Share Budgeted	\$739,415
Spent (79%)	\$581,971

Grant activities in this category include efforts to promote HHW education and compliance such as resource centers and hotlines, publicity, printed and audio-visual materials and tasks such as developing and implementing ordinances and regulations. Also eligible are the preparation of moderate risk waste emergency response plans and providing training for local government staff in handling moderate risk waste.

Much of the grant funding is spent in making the public aware of the benefits to the environment of separating moderate risk waste from normal solid waste, and making the effort to dispose of it at special facilities. Without such promotional efforts, volumes at the fixed collection centers or collection events would not justify their operation.

Significant Statistics

Tacoma-Pierce County Health Department used \$79,735 in state funds to provide education and information on household hazardous waste disposal, used oil and antifreeze recycling, and use of alternative products. Methods for communication were regional events such as fairs and garden shows, an 800 telephone line, a web site, and a resource library.

Clark County used \$20,428 in state funds to increase awareness of the use and storage of hazardous materials, and promoted safer alternatives to the public, realtors, child care providers, and garage and estate sale operators. Presentations, brochures, flyers, and workshops were used to get the message out.

Whitman County used \$6,347 in state funds to develop HHW educational videos on alternatives and disposal options for airing on public access TV.

Thurston County Environmental Health Division used \$5,000 in state funds to conduct a pesticide reduction campaign using newspaper, radio, transit ads, billboards, and television.

Several counties combined the HHW education with the waste reduction recycling education and even the small quantity generator education using the some of the same materials and communications methods.

Solid Waste Planning (SWP)

State Share Budgeted	\$383,123
Spent (97%)	\$369,788

Local governments are required by the state's Solid Waste Management law to review their comprehensive solid waste management plans every five years and update them as necessary. Grant funding for updates is limited to those elements needing revision.

Significant Statistics

Adams County required only \$1,850 in grant funds to complete the update of its Comprehensive Solid Waste Plan. Grant County used \$9,844 to complete a disposal options study for alternatives to their current sites and practices. Island County used \$11,505 for a comprehensive plan update. Benton County used \$12,916 for a revised Solid Waste Plan. Clark County spent \$60,000 in state funds on its update. Pierce County Public Works spent \$100,800 in state funds for the same task.

Ground Water Monitoring Wells (GMMW)

Ground water monitoring wells are required at closed municipal solid waste landfills in order to provide assurance that contaminants are not migrating from the waste to the environment.

State Share
Budgeted **\$53,945**
Spent (93%) **\$50,245**

Significant Statistics

Ground water monitoring well grants were used by Pend Oreille County (\$25,548) for two monitoring wells at its closed Ione and Deer Valley landfills. The City of Port Angeles (\$20,596) used its grant to drill wells in anticipation of the closure of its landfill. Garfield County (\$4,101) also received a grant.

Moderate Risk Waste Capital (MRWC)

All capital costs associated with HWCD grants are eligible under this category.

State Share
Budgeted **\$119,969**
Spent (42%) **\$50,624**

Significant Statistics

Moderate risk waste capital grants were used by Franklin County (\$1,156), Stevens county (\$21,779), Jefferson County (\$10,548), Tacoma-Pierce County Health Department (\$8,021), and Thurston County (\$9,120) to improve their moderate risk waste collection facilities.

Hazardous Waste Planning (HWP)

Ecology encourages local governments to periodically review and update their local hazardous waste/moderate risk waste plans.

State Share
Budgeted **\$68,272**
Spent (32%) **\$21,562**

Significant Statistics

Hazardous waste planning grants were used for plan development and updating by Klickitat County (\$611), Franklin County (\$711), San Juan County (\$183), Clallam County (\$5,269) and the Tacoma-Pierce County Health Department (\$14,788). Others were awarded funds in this category but did not spend the money.

Coordinated Prevention Grants Disbursements Spent to Date

Recipient	Grant #	State Share	Disbursed to 3/23/00	Percentage Spent
<u>Central Region</u>				
Benton County	G9800097	354,991.00	344,022.00	96.91%
Benton-Franklin Health Dept	G9800099	150,000.00	95,875.02	63.92%
Chelan County	G9800163	144,284.00	144,284.00	100.00%
Chelan-Douglas Health District	G9800114	150,000.00	132,598.71	88.40%
Douglas County	G9800176	113,665.00	113,222.88	99.61%
Kittitas County Health Department	G9800164	100,000.00	32,379.84	32.38%
Kittitas County Solid Waste	G9800152	168,829.00	168,829.00	100.00%
Klickitat County	G9800175	273,776.00	209,819.21	76.64%
Klickitat County Health Dept	G9800168	100,000.00	47,953.13	47.95%
Okanogan County	G9800129	78,602.00	43,995.28	55.97%
Okanogan County Health District	G9800115	99,750.00	57,711.42	57.86%
Yakima County	G9800177	385,636.00	326,328.58	84.62%
Yakima County Health District	G9800178	100,000.00	90,629.40	90.63%
		2,219,533.00	1,807,648.47	81.44%
<u>Eastern Region</u>				
Adams County Health District	G9800219	50,333.00	50,333.00	100.00%
Adams County Solid Waste	G9800220	116,655.00	76,504.66	65.58%
Asotin County	G9900092	60,600.00	42,591.16	70.28%
Asotin County Health District	G9800203	60,000.00	5,196.07	8.66%
Asotin County Landfill	G9800202	87,714.00	87,714.00	100.00%
Ferry County	G9800221	104,180.00	49,547.33	47.56%
Franklin County	G9800264	172,319.00	170,532.23	98.96%
Franklin County	G9900178	41,431.00	26,451.71	63.85%
Garfield County	G9800218	30,063.00	26,363.35	87.69%
Grant Co Health District	G9800210	63,317.00	55,401.93	87.50%
Grant Co Public Works	G9800209	161,175.00	140,517.64	87.18%
Lincoln Co Health District	G9800159	39,000.00	20,181.56	51.75%
Lincoln Co Public Works Dept	G9800207	97,658.00	97,576.04	99.92%
Northeast Tri-County Health District	G9900094	53,809.00	15,544.90	28.89%
Pend Oreille County	G9800158	96,801.00	72,439.19	74.83%
Spokane Regional Health District	G9800174	102,000.00	102,000.00	100.00%
Spokane Regional SW System	G9800208	897,860.00	868,598.47	96.74%
Stevens County	G9800206	174,309.00	162,390.74	93.16%
Walla Walla & Columbia Counties	G9800153	324,841.00	309,707.94	95.34%
Whitman County	G9800239	110,671.00	83,937.00	75.84%
Whitman County Health Dept	G9800238	28,437.00	14,758.35	51.90%
		2,873,173.00	2,478,287.27	86.26%

Recipient	Grant #	State Share	Disbursed to 3/23/00	Percentage Spent
<u>Northwest Region</u>				
Arlington City of	G9800121	0.00	0.00	
Bellevue City of	G9800126	140,108.00	92,974.85	66.36%
Bremerton-Kitsap Co Health Dist	G9800130	205,224.00	205,221.33	100.00%
Burien City of	G9800214	38,814.00	37,981.20	97.85%
Covington City of	G9800191	17,990.00	17,989.80	100.00%
Des Moines City of	G9800190	24,397.00	24,397.00	100.00%
Duvall City of	G9800257	20,128.00	11,686.82	58.06%
Edmonds City of	G9800144	34,783.00	34,783.00	100.00%
Enumclaw City of	G9800181	14,916.00	5,935.80	39.79%
Everett City of	G9800173	82,500.00	82,500.00	100.00%
Federal Way City of	G9800223	101,827.00	84,453.75	82.94%
Island County	G9800169	151,661.00	151,661.00	100.00%
Island County Health Department	G9800145	100,000.00	91,450.38	91.45%
Issaquah City of	G9800193	13,756.00	9,739.95	70.81%
Kent City of	G9800109	83,305.00	50,505.02	60.63%
King County Solid Waste Division	G9800217	605,960.00	605,959.80	100.00%
Kirkland City of	G9800189	60,193.00	60,193.00	100.00%
Kitsap County	G9800197	406,791.00	406,791.00	100.00%
Lake Forest Park City of	G9800149	17,620.00	17,438.92	98.97%
Lynnwood City of	G9800146	32,429.00	30,179.32	93.06%
Marysville Parks Dept City of	G9800122	12,372.00	8,585.17	69.39%
Monroe City of	G9800120	27,313.00	27,313.00	100.00%
Mountlake Terrace City of	G9800143	19,966.00	19,966.00	100.00%
Newcastle City of	G9800194	12,263.00	12,263.00	100.00%
Normandy Park City of	G9800195	10,454.00	0.00	
Oak Harbor City of	G9900040	33,352.00	33,320.38	99.91%
Pacific City of	G9800180	8,228.00	0.00	
Redmond City of	G9800258	57,055.00	43,661.62	76.53%
Renton City of	G9800256	61,953.00	23,977.30	38.70%
San Juan Co Health & Community Services	G9800171	64,610.00	42,283.35	65.44%
San Juan County	G9800213	139,516.38	85,736.50	61.45%
San Juan County	G9800271	10,140.00	0.00	
Seatac City of	G9800125	31,798.00	29,885.60	93.99%
Seattle Public Utilities	G9800128	739,094.00	647,763.10	87.64%
Seattle-King Co Public Health Dept	G9800147	100,000.00	90,392.15	90.39%
Seattle-King Co Public Health Dept	G9800148	1,220,291.00	1,220,291.00	100.00%
Shoreline City of	G9800216	67,873.00	67,873.00	100.00%
Skagit County	G9800172	237,838.00	236,048.81	99.25%
Skagit County Health Department	G9800142	102,500.00	102,500.00	100.00%
Snohomish Co Health District	G9800170	199,500.00	184,730.33	92.60%
Snohomish County	G9800198	868,856.00	868,856.00	100.00%
Tukwila City of	G9800124	20,047.00	2,697.35	13.46%
Whatcom County	G9800123	491,929.00	439,037.71	89.25%
Woodinville City of	G9800196	14,247.00	8,980.00	63.03%
		<u>6,703,597.38</u>	<u>6,218,003.31</u>	<u>92.76%</u>

Recipient	Grant #	State Share	Disbursed to 3/23/00	Percentage Spent
<u>Southwest Region</u>				
Clallam Co Dept of Community Development	G9800134	165,825.00	113,409.12	68.39%
Clallam County Road Department	G9800136	20,370.00	16,364.44	80.34%
Clark County	G9800139	665,429.00	588,627.79	88.46%
Cowlitz County	G9800103	179,948.00	167,699.78	93.19%
Cowlitz County Health Department	G9800100	100,000.00	52,814.96	52.81%
Grays Harbor County	G9800131	100,000.00	100,000.00	100.00%
Grays Harbor County	G9800140	214,025.00	214,025.00	100.00%
Jefferson Co Health & Human Services	G9800133	60,690.00	36,347.97	59.89%
Jefferson County	G9800132	135,467.00	135,467.00	100.00%
Kelso City of	G9800105	23,573.00	10,980.25	46.58%
Lewis County	G9800116	260,179.00	233,295.87	89.67%
Longview City of	G9800101	67,091.00	0.00	
Longview City of	G9900183	27,497.00	27,492.60	99.98%
Mason Co Dept of Community Development	G9900026	18,000.00	17,766.82	98.70%
Mason County	G9800106	98,437.00	62,329.18	63.32%
Mason County Health Department	G9800102	100,000.00	97,828.94	97.83%
Pacific County	G9800113	219,236.00	219,204.51	99.99%
Pierce Co Public Works & Utilities	G9800154	749,073.00	749,073.00	100.00%
Port Angeles City of	G9800135	85,980.00	82,647.96	96.12%
Shelton City of	G9800104	40,000.00	39,997.02	99.99%
Skamania County	G9900156	72,254.00	33,542.84	46.42%
SW Washington Health District	G9800204	150,000.00	123,358.09	82.24%
Tacoma City of	G9800205	400,956.00	349,734.35	87.23%
Tacoma-Pierce Co Health Department	G9800155	206,670.00	156,034.70	75.50%
Tacoma-Pierce Co Health Department	G9800156	124,220.00	124,199.21	99.98%
Thurston Co Water & Waste Mgmt Dept	G9800095	210,804.00	119,745.29	56.80%
Thurston Co Water & Waste Mgmt Dept	G9800301	226,238.00	99,820.24	44.12%
Thurston County Public Health	G9800098	320,805.00	320,805.00	100.00%
Woodland City of	G9900162	39,594.00	39,556.89	99.91%
		5,082,361.00	4,332,168.82	85.24%
Grand total for All Regions:		16,878,664	14,836,106	87.90%

* A = Active

I = Inactive/closed

Coordinated Prevention Grants by County

Original Amounts 97-99 Biennium

COUNTY	NUMBER OF CPG	AMOUNT
Adams	2	156,656
Asotin	3	208,314
Benton	2*	417,075
Chelan	2*	228,183
Clallam	3	260,805
Clark	2*	749,025
Columbia	1*	104,560
Cowlitz	4	358,664
Douglas	2*	177,985
Ferry	2*	122,116
Franklin	2*	236,345
Garfield	1	30,063
Grant	2	224,492
Grays Harbor	2	302,552
Island	3	273,508
Jefferson	2	185,609
King	24	3,434,977
Kitsap	2	597,047
Kittitas	2	258,168
Klickitat	2	373,776
Lewis	1	248,735
Lincoln	2	126,450
Mason	4	245,404
Okanogan	2	167,549
Pacific	1	208,780
Pend Oreille	2*	114,738
Pierce	4	1,456,699
San Juan	3	159,455
Skagit	2	328,278
Skamania	1*	50,000
Snohomish	10	1,256,030
Spokane	2	981,069
Stevens	2*	181,421
Thurston	3	743,642
Wahkiakum	0	
Walla Walla	1*	209,120
Whatcom	1	478,666
Whitman	2	139,108
Yakima	2	470,990
TOTALS:	110	16,266,054

Asterisks (*) indicate counties that share a grant.

Benton-Franklin Health Dist

Southwest Washington Health Dist (Clark, Skamania) Northeast

Tricounty Health Dist (Ferry, Stevens, Pend Oreille) Walla Walla &

Columbia Counties

For these grants, the dollar amount is divided between the counties, so the total dollars shown are correct.

However, the grant is counted once in each county impacted, so the total number of grants exceed the actual number written.