



2004

**Public Outreach Meetings
on the Beyond Waste Initiative
– A Summary**

Prepared by:

Agreement Dynamics, Inc.

For:

Washington State Department of Ecology

Publication No. 04-04-022

If you need this information in an alternate format, please call the Hazardous Waste and Toxics Reduction Program at 360-407-6700. If you are a person with a speech or hearing impairment, call 711, or 800-833-6388 for TTY.

Department of Ecology Beyond Waste Plans
2004 Public Outreach Meetings Summary
Prepared by Agreement Dynamics, Inc.

Introduction

In May and June 2004, Agreement Dynamics, Inc. designed and facilitated a series of public meetings to gather input and feedback for the Department of Ecology ("Ecology") on the draft Long-Range Solid and Hazardous Waste Plans ("Beyond Waste Plans"), which were issued in May 2004. The public meetings were designed to gather input from stakeholders and interested members of the public to further refine the Beyond Waste Plans. This summary was composed from notes taken by Agreement Dynamics and Ecology facilitators and is divided into six sections, with six attachments:

1. Introduction
2. Beyond Waste Project Background Information
3. General Information on the Public Meetings
4. General Themes Voiced By Public Meeting Participants
5. Themes Specific to Breakout Discussion Session Topics
6. Recommendations and Conclusions

Attachment A: Meeting Agenda

Attachments B-E: Transcribed Meeting Flip Chart Notes

Attachment F: Summary of Meeting Evaluations

This summary will be made available to the public via the Ecology website as well as used by Ecology in further development of the Beyond Waste Plans.

Beyond Waste Project Background Information

The purpose of the Beyond Waste Project is to develop long-range statewide plans for reducing and managing hazardous and solid wastes in Washington. State law requires regularly updated, statewide strategic plans for both hazardous and solid waste. The latest solid waste state plan was issued in 1992, and the most recent hazardous waste plan update was completed in 1994.

Ecology has developed the Beyond Waste Project over the past four years. The project began with a stakeholder discussion centered on the long-term future of Washington's hazardous and solid waste management system. A long-range vision statement evolved from these discussions: *"We can transition to a society where waste is viewed as inefficient, and where most wastes and toxic substances have been eliminated. This will contribute to economic, social and environmental vitality."*

The Beyond Waste Project encompasses both the hazardous and solid waste plans, and—in addition to addressing current issues within both systems—includes five major initiatives designed to realize the vision:

Initiative 1: Eliminate industrial wastes through partnerships with industry sectors.

Initiative 2: Reduce and prevent small volume hazardous wastes (hazardous wastes from households and small businesses, also known as “MRW, or moderate-risk waste”).

Initiative 3: Establish a viable closed-loop reuse and recycling system for capturing organic materials

Initiative 4: Encourage a green-built environment by making sustainable building the norm in Washington.

Initiative 5: Track overall progress toward the Beyond Waste vision through performance measures and improved data tracking.

Throughout the planning process, Ecology has engaged various stakeholder groups to further develop the ideas in the Beyond Waste Project. Over the past two years, Ecology has convened a variety of formal and informal meetings to discuss solid and hazardous waste issues prior to the issuance of the draft plans in May 2004. Groups consulted included: regulated businesses; solid waste haulers and landfill owners; environmental advocacy and education groups; city and county waste managers; recyclers and others.

Following the issuance of the draft Beyond Waste Plans, Ecology posted the draft on its website and notified hundreds of stakeholders and other interested parties. The Agency provided a number of avenues for input on the draft. These included: informal meetings; responses via e-mail, postal service and telephone; and a series of public meetings described below. Ecology will be taking input until August 13, 2004.

General Information on the Public Meetings

The Department of Ecology (“Ecology”) hosted a total of seven public meetings across Washington State, including three in Western Washington (one in Lacey and two in Lynnwood) and four in Eastern Washington (two in Ellensburg and two in Cheney). The public meetings were held between May 25, 2004 and June 10, 2004.

The desired outcomes for these meetings were for:

- Interested members of the public to:
 - a. Get their questions answered regarding Ecology’s long-range plans;
 - b. Have the opportunity to comment on the draft plans; and
 - c. Walk away with a sense that the process is fair and that the Beyond Waste initiatives are well conceived.

- Ecology to:
 - a. Get a sense of the level of public support for the draft plans; and
 - b. Receive quality input for the final plans.

99 people attended the public meetings. Participants included local solid waste managers and staff, local health jurisdiction managers and staff, representatives from environmental

organizations, business owners and employees, state and federal agency employees, and concerned citizens.

Ecology hosted two meetings per day at each location with the exception of Lacey, where Ecology hosted only one evening meeting. The afternoon meetings ran from 1:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. and the evening meetings ran from 6:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. A meeting agenda is included as Attachment A.

The public meetings were designed to cover a wide variety of topics in a relatively short period of time. Beyond Waste Project Managers Cheryl Smith and Chris Chapman presented an overview of the Beyond Waste Plans to begin each meeting. After a brief question and answer period, the group generally broke into smaller discussion groups focused on individual sections of the Beyond Waste Plans.¹ Each feedback group was set up at a separate station and included a facilitator and a content expert from Ecology. There were two feedback sessions of approximately 30 minutes each and the sessions provided opportunities for participants to give feedback in the following areas:

- Small volume hazardous wastes (Initiative #2, formerly known as “moderate risk waste,” or “MRW”);
- General hazardous waste issues;
- General solid waste issues;
- Ways of measuring progress toward Beyond Waste goals (Initiative #5);
- Green building (Initiative #4);
- Closed loop organics recycling (Initiative #3);
- Industrial wastes (Initiative #1); and
- Overall input on the Beyond Waste Plans.

The facilitator encouraged the participants to use “the rule of two feet” by moving from station to station as they pleased. The meetings concluded with a general feedback and question and answer session with the entire group.

General Themes Voiced By Public Meeting Participants

Attached to this report are raw flip chart notes recorded by the facilitators at each of the sessions. Of course, flip chart notes are not a refined information tool in and of themselves. Accordingly, Agreement Dynamics facilitators reviewed the notes in light of their personal observations at the meetings. Based on this review, following are themes voiced repeatedly by meeting participants when asked to give Ecology thoughts about the Beyond Waste Plans:

- “Beyond Waste” is an important and valuable goal toward which to head.

¹ The exception to this pattern occurred when fewer than 15 participants came to a meeting. In meetings with smaller numbers, all discussions occurred with the entire group.

- Continued partnership and communication with stakeholder groups will be a key aspect of achieving the Beyond Waste Vision.
- Market-driven change is a very desirable approach to many of the issues addressed by the draft plans.
- Political support is important to the success of Beyond Waste.
- “Sham recycling” is a growing problem in several waste streams and may become more prominent, especially if regulation is decreased. As Beyond Waste fosters higher levels of recycling through its initiatives, Ecology must address this issue.
- It should not necessarily be a goal to have less regulation, as it may be important to use targeted regulation in some areas (to stop sham recycling, for example).
- Local jurisdiction representatives expressed concern with the transition to Beyond Waste.
 - Certain local representatives voiced a perception that some recommendations might turn into “unfunded mandates”.
 - Some participants questioned how the existing waste system infrastructure could be changed to achieve Beyond Waste goals.
- Businesses with high levels of investment in waste-related industry expressed concern regarding how they might successfully transition their businesses to a “beyond waste” environment
- Urban and rural areas should not be treated in the same way; they have different challenges (for example, rural areas seem to have greater challenges surrounding collection systems)
- Looking “upstream” to reduce wastes (such as excess packaging and toxic components in products) is necessary for Beyond Waste to become reality.
- Many of the waste-related issues are the result of national and international factors (e.g., products made in other parts of the country or world). Some questions were raised about Washington's influence on products that are not made in the state.
- There are strong linkages among the five major initiatives; they will tend to work synergistically.
- The importance of education was underscored

Themes Specific to Breakout Discussion Session Topics
--

Facilitators and content experts recorded comments and questions from participants at each of the small breakout discussions (Attachments B – E). Following are the recurring themes heard in discussions throughout the state, by topic area.

Current Hazardous Waste Issues

- Materials of varying toxicity should be regulated on the level of risk they pose.
- Regulation is necessary, but market-based change will be more effective in reducing overall waste.

- Education of business and the general public is important. Ecology needs to step up education and information efforts.
- Respect business interests by being consistent with regulation and considerate of financial investments.

Current Solid Waste Issues

- Transitioning from the current tip-fee supported waste system will be challenging. We need alternate funding sources.
- Businesses need certainty, stability, and firm guidelines to be able to transition to Beyond Waste.
- Be aware that the solid waste system crosses state boundaries; Idaho, Oregon, California, and China all play significant roles.
- The cost of recycling needs to be addressed—the public has the perception that recycling is efficient and inexpensive.
- Increased infrastructure (e.g. more collection trucks) brings with it more pollution and cost. Beware of unintended consequences when shifting from disposal to recycling.
- Closed and abandoned landfills need to be cleaned up soon. Regulations for current landfills should be enforced consistently.
- There is a need for technical assistance to local jurisdictions.

Beyond Waste Initiatives: Overall Input

- Beyond Waste is a great idea.
- Partnerships with other entities will be essential for success.
- Education and outreach will continue to be important.
- Public apathy and inertia will need to be overcome. It's so easy to get rid of waste that most people may be unmotivated to look at ways to reduce waste and toxic substances
- Funding for many aspects of Beyond Waste will be challenging since the current system is funded through the transport and disposal of waste.
- Smaller counties voiced concern that Beyond Waste initiatives might divert funds needed for basic services, thus hampering their ability to deliver these services.
- Some participants had varying opinions regarding whether the Beyond Waste initiatives were too broad to be effective or too narrowly focused to be effective.

Industrial Initiative (Initiative # 1)

- Make economics the main driver for this initiative. Remember that Washington is already a difficult place to run some businesses.
- Develop a list of successful examples that businesses can use as models for reducing industrial waste.
- Tax and fee incentives are important to businesses.

- Environmental Management Systems (EMS) is a good way for businesses to make progress in reducing/eliminating wastes; Ecology should continue to promote this model.
- Low cost, effective alternatives to many toxics are not currently available.
- Consumer education and product labeling will help drive market-based change.

Small Volume Hazardous Wastes Initiative (Initiative # 2)

- Beware of unintended consequences—a banned material may be replaced by something even worse.
- The list of hazardous materials needs to stay flexible to allow for mid-course corrections.
- PBDE's (brominated flame retardants) should be specifically named and addressed in the initiative.
- Recycling infrastructures and materials are very different in Eastern and Western Washington. There can be no “one size fits all” solution.
- Local governments need flexibility to address issues that are pressing in their jurisdictions.
- Pharmaceuticals are going to become an important hazardous waste issue in the near future.
- The linkages between this initiative and the organics and green building initiatives are very strong (i.e. increased use of organic material will decrease use of chemical fertilizers and pesticides, and green-built homes contain fewer hazardous materials).
- Consumer education is an important aspect of reducing household hazardous wastes.
- Prioritization of hazardous materials will be important in the implementation phase.
- Product stewardship should be encouraged to reduce hazardous materials at the manufacturing level, and to reduce wastes in municipal waste streams.

Organics Initiative (Initiative # 3)

- Accurately labeling organic products is essential to assure public confidence in these products.
- Testing for contents and quality of organic materials should be mandatory.
- Some participants strongly favored promoting on-site composting, while others strongly favored setting up additional collection infrastructure.
- The term “organics” is too vague: it is easily confused with USDA Organic, or with organic compounds.
- The quality and usability of biosolids should be addressed.
- Fats, oils, and grease can be recycled, and should be mentioned in the initiative.
- Permitting and zoning regulations need to be firmly enforced for public health and product quality reasons; however, these regulations result in prohibitive siting and operating costs for organic facilities. We need creative solutions to this dilemma.

- Consider straw bales for construction materials; possibly link this with the Green Building Initiative.
- Promote the economic benefits of using organic materials, especially in agriculture and public projects such as DOT roadwork.

Green Building Initiative (Initiative # 4)

- Education of consumers, architects, builders, and developers will be necessary for increasing green building practices. This may include success stories, demonstration projects, school partnerships and the like.
- Promote the economic benefits of green building (e.g., energy cost savings).
- Availability of green building materials is a barrier in some areas.
- Incentives for green building such as expedited permitting would be helpful for builders and developers.
- The deconstruction industry is facing a number of problems that need to be addressed: high overhead due to L&I pay standards, short timelines for deconstruction/demolition, lack of infrastructure and markets.
- Public buildings should be used as examples of successful green building projects. Public officials have said “we couldn’t afford *not* to build green.”
- Most participants voiced a high level of support for this initiative.

Measuring Progress Toward Beyond Waste Initiative (Initiative # 5)

- Although most participants agreed that measuring progress is important, there was disagreement regarding the level of resources that should be devoted to measurement.
- Timing of progress reports should be considered carefully- too often, and it might seem as though progress has stalled; too seldom would allow people (especially elected officials) to forget the cause.
- Consistency with measurements (e.g. between different jurisdictions) has been a problem in the past. Find some ways of creating consistent data so that we are comparing “apples to apples”.
- Look to colleges and universities as possible partners for obtaining data and analysis.
- Measuring events that are not happening, such as waste reduction, is very difficult.
- Participants voiced both support and concern over the use of body burdens as a measure of success for Beyond Waste. Some thought body burden to be a highly effective measure as it “speaks” to people and health; others thought that too many factors other than waste issues influence body burden.
- Measurements are a good avenue to publicize Beyond Waste and educate the public.
- Looking to other states and nations for measurements (and/or programs) would be valuable.

Conclusion

Based on the overwhelmingly positive responses to the workshop evaluations (Attachment F), it is apparent that Ecology achieved the desired outcomes listed above. Participants generally felt heard and came away with a better understanding of the Beyond Waste initiatives and other elements of the long-range plans. For its part, Ecology should have both new ideas to consider for the final plans as well as confirmation with respect to many aspects already included in the draft. Finally, many participants left contact information so that Ecology could keep them apprised of proceedings and some even volunteered to assist in assuring success for the Beyond Waste project.

On reflection, the one disappointing aspect of the public meeting process was that some meetings were not well attended. One meeting, in Ellensburg, Washington, was cancelled due to lack of attendance; another, in Cheney, had only one active participant. Other meetings brought in between 35 and 50 participants each, which was Ecology's expectation for most meetings.

For future non-traditional public meetings of this sort, following are some suggestions to improve overall meeting attendance:

- Consider increasing publicity for the meetings. Ecology placed articles in 23 trade and other publications; sent e-mails to hundreds of interested stakeholders; and included the dates and times in materials sent to over 100 local solid waste and health department representatives. However, although there were numerous announcements of the meetings, it is our understanding that there were few "public relations" pieces that might generate additional interest.
- Do follow up "check in" calls with key stakeholders. Although it would be difficult to have "RSVPs" to public meetings, Ecology staff could consider doing check in calls to groups that have voiced interest in Beyond Waste to generate some additional attendance.
- Hold fewer meetings. Ecology wanted to assure that people who could not come during the day had an opportunity to attend a public meeting. Accordingly, in all but one location, two meetings were held (1-4 p.m. and 6-9 p.m.). The highest attendance occurred at the location where only one meeting was held. Although holding fewer meetings would not generate more attendance, it could reduce costs for the public meetings somewhat and would facilitate larger crowds at the remaining meetings.

Despite several meetings with low attendance, it is important to remember that the public meetings were but one of many ways to participate in the Beyond Waste process from its inception to the present comment period. Overall, Ecology should be pleased with its outreach efforts with respect to this project. The Department is already seeing the results of this effort in the creativity contained in the plans and, hopefully, in the degree of support that the final plans will garner.

Attachment A--Meeting Agenda

Washington State
Department of Ecology
Beyond Waste Plans
Public Meeting Agenda

- 1:00 Introduction
- 1:15 Beyond Waste Presentation
- 1:55 Feedback Session Instructions
- 2:00 Session One
- 2:30 Break
- 2:40 Session Two
- 3:10 Discussion of Overall Plan, Next Steps and Meeting Evaluation
- 4:00 Adjourn**

Attachment B
Beyond Waste Public Meetings
Lacey Flip Charts
May 25, 2004

Flip chart notes were transcribed after the meetings and edited minimally for clarity, in order to preserve the intent of recorded comments.

GENERAL/DATA

- What baselines do we want to establish in short order?
- Goals are lofty
- Moving target – not a lot of good indicators
- Costly to do it well
- High profile litter campaign
- How do we sustain integrated waste management in current funding structure?
- Current \$ levels inadequate for Beyond Waste
- Tip fees would have to be verified
- Consistency in data reporting is important (eg., one city reports everything, more than Ecology requires)
- Quantity and quality of data is problem
- Work with DOH and other state agencies to develop data/information
- Pounds of waste generated can do but how can we tie to more measuring in metrics?
- CPG measures will have to be close to Beyond Waste – critical for next 2-4 years of grant cycles
- Resent being boxed into corner by grant requirements – not for things I'm responsible to accomplish
- Help me learn how to measure prevention – how do you measure what hasn't happened?
- Measure toxic inputs?
- Business has issues (competitive issues)
- Huge amounts of data but it may not be the right data or accurate data
- Tension between grant recipients and Ecology
- Lots of investments in infrastructure (e.g. MRW)
- With producer responsibility, shifting from government being sole responsible party
- Focus on measuring commercial – need a way to do this
- Issue county is facing – standards for data so that they can be shared across agencies

- Recommendations are valid – Body burden is good measure
- If plan will need marketing campaign
- Have to change large paradigm?
- Marketing shift of business taking lead – there’s also a shift in individuals taking the lead – market to general public
- Small county – I don’t see them getting to Beyond Waste – basic needs
- Small county – how to incorporate BW plan in small steps? Help needed from Ecology planners
- Large amounts of waste generated
- Need to educate people in misconceptions (myths)
- How will we measure impact – if talking to people will change their minds, how can we show it?
- How will you deal with toxic materials in products – such big thing!
- Ecology’s backing Green Building will be much more effective than local efforts

HAZARDOUS WASTE ISSUES

P2 Plan

1. Incentives for use of less toxic materials –
 - ECY could post substitutions
 - Concern for national competition and follow-up to ensure bans/regs are complied with
2. Lean manufacturing – define what we mean since there are several models called “lean manufacturing”
3. If we drive more wastes to recycling we need to ensure that the facilities that are the recyclers are in compliance and they have financial assurance for closure.
4. Same NAIC code facilities could re-use def. of SW rule – track and adding to WAC to encourage or provide opportunity for companies within state lines to reuse recycle wastes.
5. More emphasis to check compliance on small generators.
6. (If?) Every county have a Haz-O-House state would have to help fund.
7. Closure/cost – operators can’t access it – only for intended purpose – ensure legitimacy of this fund.
8. Explore the ability for recyclers to build-up closure funds if starting a new business.
9. Equitable financial assurance estimates for large and small facilities – level playing field.

GREEN BUILDING

- Goals seem attainable
- What incentives are there, especially on the demolition side?
- Deconstruction services are available on west coast; it’s cheaper to take apart by hand, sell to reseller and take tax break.
- Creates Deconstruction creates jobs, too

- From deconstructors' perspective on average they're able to salvage 85% of a house
- For home builder and developer, if you consider tax deduction it reduces cost (Habitat for Humanity)
- Used building materials can be sold
- What are the incentives to industry to recycle building materials and products that are reusable?
- Some materials that are recycled are actually more beautiful, e.g., old fir
- Building standards are being developed, e.g. State govt.
- Inconvenience of finding GB green building products can be a disincentive for homeowners
- From reusable reuse building material industry standpoint, these are great goals
- #46B: How will Ecology identify those shortfalls? Materials can be hard to find, landfills are likely sites to look for materials (the attendees evaluated? Hawks Prairie landfill)
- Where will funding come from for looking for reusable materials at landfills?
- Ask landfills to give space for folks to leave their recycled materials
- There are not enough colleges teaching green building – focus on next generation—for example:
- Construction management and architecture programs city planning (so govt. can lead by example) civil engineering programs
- Trade industries, unions, vocational schools
- Need to train those who enforce/write codes and zoning
- Sweet! Milestones are sweet! To get success, de-constructors need financial incentives
- De-constructors industry:
 - Use “deconstruction” terminology in plan – match what’s out in industry
(summary document may lack that term)
 - Drop-off stations not financially viable at this point. Need financial assistance to staff drop-off stations in order to maintain them and keep as a reliable resource
 - So far, most work in drop-off stations is done by volunteers
 - Some stations are staffed; some are not
- Having Ecology talk to county building officials to get them on Board with Beyond Waste (e.g., Lewis Co./ and other rural jurisdictions)
- Prevailing wage requirements for deconstructing a publicly owned building is a barrier, so many green materials resources are lost.
- Other demolition contractors use prevailing wage machinery operators on machines, which costs less, so hand deconstructors can't compete.
- Is there a GB green-building association or resource that can provide tech assistance to those don't have GB green building programs (e.g., Lewis Co.)?
- L&I's rules are dictating prevailing wage, which prevents deconstructors from being competitive on public buildings

- Educate public about products/building materials, e.g.-___?___ (one participant cited her experience) TREX decking material is decomposing – poor quality
- “truth in labeling” needs to happen for green building products
- The Olympia Tour of Homes didn’t have enough green builders to do a full city town tour
- Support a Green building Tour of Homes

INDUSTRIES

Goals:

1. Control the impact of unsafe materials – relates to economic vitality goal – control impact of products with very toxic materials in them – look at other nation’s standards that are more stringent and possibly align with them;
2. Government aligning messages could be very powerful;
3. Information for consumers – work with the retail sector – ex: Best Buy has a green canopy over the “green” electronics at their store;
4. Thanks for the initiative;
5. MRW ties with this sector that links with local government;
6. HW program be involved with MRW rule analysis – the expertise already exists here – don’t duplicate efforts;
7. Mercury – Use BAT (Best Available technology) to remove mercury from wastewater sludge – Also remove/ban mercury upstream such as with dental fillings, crematoriums, coal fired power plants;
8. Web-site would have information on recyclers that would be a “report card” to help consumers/businesses make good choices on use of vendors;
9. Consumer labeling – more, more, more.

SOLID WASTE – CURRENT ISSUES

- What is waste reduction?
 - a definition would be helpful
- What is Ecology’s role, and what is the role of this plan within the state?
 - what are the barriers to implementation of the Plan?
- Since price is often the determining factor, some implementation could be tough.
- What timeframes?
 - Will there be incentives in place for local governments to implement BW – type programs?
 - Counties and locals are competing for money →SW is a revenue stream (via tip fees)
- With decreased disposal and increased recycling, will locals end up doing more in-house processing? (vs. sending recycling out)
- As haulers increase recycling diversion, income drops due to static overhead (staffing, miles driven)
- We have told the public for years that recycling is the right thing to do – how do we convey that there is a cost to this?

- Could a tiered cost for disposal be used to inform and educate the public?
- Closed, abandoned landfills
 - support!
 - Change “informed eval” to FORMAL
 - don’t put it on the list, don't rank it, just deal with it
- Could Ecology facilitate and provide consultants for incorporating BW into county and regional plans?
 - coordinated regional plans would be great (Ecology leads/initiates)

ORGANICS

- Organic products (compost, topsoil) need to be high quality
- Producer responsibility is key
- Producers need to drive markets
- Greater numbers of companies are needed
- “Truth in advertising” labeling requirements
 - for example, vegetarian compost should not include chicken
- Soil manufacturing should be included in addition to composting. (There was disagreement from the participants on this.)
- Where does home composting fit in the plan?
- Are there measures in place for determining effectiveness of these projects for CPGs?
- Post-consumer food, oil (FOG) should be addressed as a possible recycling stream
- Address vermin in composting processes
 - Small-scale operations
- We need to be on the same page regarding units such as the “Green Zone”
- Emphasize ease and fool-proof ness of composting
 - The worst case – dump it in the garbage
- Feedback from Puyallup fair-goers “composting didn’t work for us”
 - They have a lot of unusable waste now
- Regarding – clopyralid Issue
 - How can the state be more proactive on this type of issue?
- Cost and facilities permitting is prohibitive – we could collect a lot of food waste if we had the facilities
- Collection can be a problem – restaurants may not be able to store and control quality of their food waste
- This may need to be mandated in order to be effective.
- “Lead by example” needs to be action-based, not just rhetorical leadership.
- What about disincentives?
 - Where is the HAMMER?
 - Voluntary programs tend to carry less weight
 - Programs that are mandated tend to actually happen.
- We need to look at different ways to regulate
 - The plan seems to view regulations as barriers to the organics cause
 - In some instances, regulations need to be tougher

- Cost of sitting and operating new facilities is too high.
- More creative partnerships to drive the organics initiative
 - E.g. organics to rural counties, technical nutrients to more urban counties.

SMALL VOLUME HAZ WASTES (aka MRW)

- Regarding the goals, “What’s not to like – these are good things to have happen”
- Goals may be different for East/West WA/Eastern versus Western Washington
 - Pesticides prevention is more of an issue on in East Eastern Washington WA
 - Electronics is more of an issue in Western Washington
- Recycling infrastructure in Western Washington different than Eastern Washington because of larger population and potentially greater demand
- Distance to markets are different a barrier, especially in rural areas, e.g., Lewis County; 20 miles makes a difference – affects economics
- Dramatic shift from old approach of managing waste versus looking upstream -- Good!
- What if something comes up that turns out to be worse than mercury? . . .
- Is there an ability to change priorities if we need to?
- How do we get people to change their consumption of hazardous waste? We need incentives, education for households, businesses (e.g. rose pesticides and paint thinner).
- Disposal costs are not reflected in the cost of the product – e.g., paint thinner - 99¢ too cheap!
- Good goal is for consumers to only have non-toxic products to buy
- Labels need to reflect more accurately the toxics inside.
- To accomplish goals, Ecology has to work outside their box (work with federal and local governments, etc.)
- We need to educate society more with better, accurate information, e.g., get farmers to produce more efficiently and balancing balance impacts and consequences
- All recommendations (mercury, PBDE and paint) are well known about. It would be great to have HWTR program commit resources/people to compliment SW program. Dedicate resources; make people available as – part of their work plan.
- Recommendation #8 Evaluate risk of materials being collected as household hazardous waste so we quit collecting stuff that’s not high risk (e.g., latex paint) and focus on more toxic stuff.
- Recommendation #1: Add PVC plastics as a potential priority, because if PVC is burned it creates dioxin.
- New recommendations (See also #8 in part) revamp existing 350 and 303 regulations; –
- 303 as hazardous waste isn’t appropriate – gets in the way of meaningful progress
- Some PBDEs are not so dangerous—the danger depends upon form it’s in, (check the regulations and evaluate risk levels)
- The focus of Recommendation #3 should be in getting PBDEs out of new products because PBDEs may be accumulating in fish and ending up in our food

- Add to PBDE initiative
 - Whatever substitutes are recommended for flame retardant PBDEs, make sure they're not as hazardous
 - Need to look at all brominated flame retardants rather than just PBDE
- Overall, use and expand existing infrastructure before building new

Need to be careful about conflicting messages/goals/unintended consequences, e.g. – telling farmers we don't want to use too much land for agriculture, but need to feed growing population; don't want to use toxic pesticides, so some farmers planting genetically modified seed products, which may create other issues and affect the marketability of their products – need to find a balance; solving one problem may create another

Attachment C
Beyond Waste Public Meetings
Cheney Flip Charts
May 27, 2004

Flip chart notes were transcribed after the meetings and edited minimally for clarity, in order to preserve the intent of recorded comments.

GENERAL SOLID WASTE

- Specific plans to make technical nutrient cycle more efficient economically
- Spokane is subsidized (same issues on collection system – need more efficiency – not just adding trucks)
- Spokane ships much out – less efficient; wants to see more local recycling opportunities, products with recycled content and market development (which needs right players on board) – this needs incentives and push to get people to realize they need to go with the change.
- Government – impact through contract specs – that’s how to get businesses to use more recycled content materials (How to bring people together)
- Programs are working today in other areas – what are the barriers in other areas? Perception? Scale?
- R&D is essential for systems and technologies to recycle wastes we have here – and then potentially exporting
- Go back to why it’s waste in first place – engineering.
- Tremendous inertia – need \$ to overcome inertia
- *Local plans could use processes to look into how to incorporate these principles . . . some say need clearer direction to do so. How can Ecology help?
- Lack of understanding and resources that help (i.e., local Planning Commission) of how to “think” green → how to reduce waste, market dev.
- Local plan has to deal with what’s in operation, which is different than non-specific state plan; good example of specificity is mercury, etc. – lists of what to work on.
- Also, needs to recognize current situations
 - Current solid waste plans focus on current practice, not 30-year vision. Please address current and specific issues
- How Ecology can help – plans don’t really get reviewed thoroughly and on a regular basis
- Some things need to be regulatory; we can still get CPG grants and approval if we don’t comply with principles/guidelines; mixed messages – other juris. must comply with requirements in certain areas;
- Ecy staff so downsized that they can’t provide adequate help

- Ecy could play huge role in helping to facilitate (Impartial leader) and guide local solid waste planning process; if process goes the way it is now, will end up being too specific to be visionary and take advantage of opportunities; also is important to manage implementation of plan – track its progress, not let it sit on shelf. Ecy could help with integration struggles
- Regulatory can be through incentives – doesn't always have to be penalties/compliance, etc., rewarding can be good too – sometimes need the penalties to get results
- Part of the incentive is to incorporate complete costs as we know them into the solid waste system – why do we have to wait for the long-term, like 30 years?
- We often “preach to the choir” in these discussions by attracting mostly waste managers and regulators – where is industry?
- Need to understand what is needed to influence changes in business
- Need to also recognize how large business is – harder to influence the Wal-Marts and Minute Maids
- Programs like Green DOT influence change
- Does BW look at bans?

INDUSTRIES

- Look at lesson learned from past campaigns
- Include profitability as an economic indicator
- Target sectors for the right reasons
- Highlight successes with sectors
- Promote EMS with
- Promote low interest loans
- Waste targeting may be difficult in processes not generated each year
- Assist companies in being profitable by showcasing successes
- Modify goal to include profitability
- Focus on job creation
- What to be done differently to encourage materials exchange programs (goal 12)
- Don't penalize for growth with fees and taxes
- Make sure goals are realistic focus on profitability of systems first not generating waste; then recycling
- Design for not reducing waste is not featured in a five year goal
- Increase market access of “safe” products

GENERAL/DATA INITIATIVE

General

- Need integrated waste man. system, need hierarchy, lot of conflicts green building vs. building code, etc. Not using funding, etc., properly, such as education, need more combined integrated efforts.

- We can do a little more recycling ... Spokane doing waste to energy which is better than land filling. Solution is not hauling 250 miles away ... Need priorities, but don't want to damage our progress. Initiatives need to be well-funded and then move forward.
- Goodwill spends about ½ million in Spokane to dispose of the stuff they can't recycle. This takes away from their goals.
- Disagree that Spokane has done everything it can regarding recycling, interested in feasibility study – what existing models are we using: Likes Goodwill, etc., likes “wasted resources”
- I would love to see Ecology help us develop markets – how can we combine resources to encourage market, invite new businesses that help us recycle more, etc. Need more partnerships for other products, similar to paper markets work together to get a better price
- We throw so much out . . . It is so easy to throw things away
- Barriers: “Sexy to consume” Manufacturers lobby, also apathy
- Education is important for overcoming some barriers
- We reduce haz waste by 60% by recycling office paper, etc., but he has to pay for some of this (minimal amount)
- Fantastic idea
- *Public doesn't want to do this, especially household, etc.
- One way to address this is make it easy/convenient for folks; also, approach businesses about not making certain products
- Education important
- Build job market around this (healthy jobs, etc.)
- Mentality of using paper, but that will change in 20 years
- *Recognition of resources running out
- Generation growing up with recycling and that will make a difference
- Implement college programs of recycling – you learn your ideas in college
- One idea – compost piles, next to dumpster at apartment buildings
- Another idea – put recycling center next to college campuses/1-800-RECYCLE up on college bulletin boards

Data

- Would this happened anyway or is it a result of Beyond Waste
- How important is measurement? It doesn't help the environment
- Legislature wants us to be more performance-based
- Limit expense to 5% of Beyond Waste budget – there is intuitive types of knowledge
- Measuring is really important – bad data is worse, need to put honest effort into good data.
- Activity tracking may be between . . .
- *Need to identify important indicators
- Should Ecology itself measure or should it be farmed out, eg., a University?
- Don't be afraid of using statistics -- sometimes this is very cost-effective . . . take samples of waste and then project . . .

- Need measure energy and resource use
- More people need to realize the amount of chemicals in our food.
- We should look internationally on ways to measure “BW”
- *Numbers will go up with education
- Look at concept “Eco-parts” (comp. recycling centers next to industrial centers to encourage more recycling, etc.)
- Financing – how this impact taxes
- Data – nice beginning, more clear over time
- How we measure organic foods consumption
- Use website to give progress reports
- C & D important to measure
- Also measure what is growing – organic foods, green jobs, green buildings
- Economic stability vs. decrease of waste – can we correlate? Can WA resident personally benefit for this - % of money going here vs. tangible benefit (quality of life)
- People will move to Washington due to our env. health here
- May want to measure disposal and recycling of fluorescent light bulbs – compare less mercury ones vs. high mercury

General

SMALL VOLUME HAZ WASTES (AKA MRW)

Comments on goals including:

Economic vitality provides ability to create with holistic progress instead of just environmental only focus.

- Good to have this up front
- Can encourage business involvement
- More jobs, bottom line improved

Less regulations down the road provides incentive to engage

Safer Products → need for ongoing public education

→ chemical threats in our homes is a good message

Comments on recommendations

- How do you know what compounds are in our products and what impact they may have on us? Where to go to find this on a list or hotline?
- Producer take-back – in cooperation with retailer, easier the better for the public
- Incentives to encourage manufacturers to provide move information about chemicals with hazards to public
 - Perhaps using www
 - E.g. energy star
 - “endorsements by a third party

E-waste

- Pay for disposal at point of purchase
- Recycle ability of products by design, need infrastructure for recycling
- Market for old e-waste components in new products
- Needs to be coordinated market for materials
- Help support second uses of good computers and associated e-waste as original function and materials reuse for obsolete items

Pesticides

- Education as with paint
- HHW higher levels of info on chemical threats is needed
- State agencies collaborate in developing criteria for priority pesticides is a good approach
- How were the priorities of Rec. #1 developed? (e.g., why we have the first 5)
- Clarify that the next wave of priorities will be done. The “prioritized approach” is yet to be developed
- The first list can also be done with industry and public at the same time
- How closely has Ecology worked with Dept. of Education?
- Training needs to occur for kids – consider reinstating curriculum program
- Fund scholarships for environmentally friendly chemists
- Need to research alternatives to flame-retardants and other problem, bio-accumulative substances.

HAZARDOUS WASTE

- Flexible rules to allow for process changes; took 3 years for exemption (pharmaceuticals)
- Government and private partnerships are key
- Speculation accumulation needs to be flexible
- Env. Goals have to apply to imports as well
- Business goals have to consider international markets
- Incentives should be used to encourage P2 plans implementation.
- Lower P2 Planning threshold - positive incentives (loans, assistance) to implement P2

COMPLIANCE

- Make sure rules do what they are intended to do
- Try technical assistance guidance – staff needs to be knowledgeable; achieve goals before doing rules
- Weighted toward TA but...
- Prioritize inspection toward highest risk
- Use staff to research alternatives
- Provide certainty to business over long term so they can commit to it and know goals won't change

- Measurement effectiveness of initiatives over long term important but may not be accurate

ORGANICS

? What are the options for people who e.g. live in apartments?

- If San Francisco can do it, why can't we? (rec#2)
- We need to keep contaminants out of feed stocks
- We need to test finished products for contaminated toxics
- Local collection and processing is good – curbside especially
- Making it easy- collection is helpful
- We need to separate organics from rest of waste stream at every level (e.g. wet/dry separation) for collection and processing
- Rec #2 is high priority, esp. curbside
- Rec #4 also should be priority
- Need to have testing for pesticides, herbicides/toxics/metals at each level of input, ex: manure, ss., at feed stock stage
- Education for elementary schools on organics recycling
 - Also other aspects of BW project
- Implement organic recycling on college campuses
- Make organics recycling mandatory once the infrastructure is in place
- *What are the barriers to using recycled org. on organic farms?
- Must have regulations requiring labels for compost.
- Try to find another name for “organic materials” – look at Guelph Canada did with their program
- Remember costs and environmental impacts of collection programs
 - Consider co-collection

? Why is it bad to put organics in the landfill?

- wasting organic materials (as compost it's a resource)
- inefficient use of those materials
- Leachate
- Organics in landfills can increase the toxicity of other wastes over time.
- methane is BRL is inefficient compared to other
- clean up/closure costs inefficient
- We need to showcase successful operations that make \$ from composting.
- Organics recycling has to be profitable
- Bring agricultural community into the fold, e.g. 3 Mile Canyon; urban-rural connecting
- We need both Backyard and collection/processing
- Backyard composting should be a priority where possible
 - Use incentives, i.e. bin give-aways.
 - Need education/outreach
- Ex. of compost bins at public works “Clark Co. public worms Dept.”

GREEN BUILDING

- * Green Building term not known to all – maybe needs to be more education about what it entails
- * Incorporate GB principles into Universities, etc. – to train the next generation
- * If it costs more to build green, could be a barrier; GB needs to be competitive
- * It already is more than competitive, but builders don't always have that information. Rebar Council is one effective way to educate people in various facets of industry – it's a fairly localized effort, need to move this into other areas (Yakima, Clarkston) in areas large enough to have enough building going on
- Include in partnership:
 - Look at local building codes
 - Public perception – important, but difficult to attack
- Could sign/advertise at building sites using GB methods
- *Look to legislature to property tax incentives for building green
- Education needs to happen before anything – lots of misperception!
- * Build models to use as education and demo projects
- Also have displays that emphasize the success stories
- *Newsletter – share the good stuff
- Lots of emphasis on building industry; individual consumers need more info (complete info) about GB materials and techniques
- Target retail sites that provide GB materials
- Retailers need to have well-trained, well informed employees
- * Resid program – one way to promote is conference with developers, _____ TV programs – HGTV, trading spaces GB episode, public TV conference should be open to public – ways for consumers to access products
- Get media attention on success stories (benefits and long-term payback)
- * Market demand needs to drive industry
- #4 Find more/better ways to divert const. “scrap” materials toward reuse
- New regs last year elim. Inert/demo landfills – now inert only, so cost to dispose of demolition materials will↑, which will serve as an incentive to recycle those materials.
- #7 Technology is changing; unclear that there's anything state can do, but incentives will be responded to by business –
- Would like to do more local fairs/events and also a brochure to give to customers at landfill
- There is interest in starting a deconstruction business in Stevens Co.
- Big state-wide **FREE** conference – innovative ideas, materials and success stories – would really help
- Home and Garden Shows – good place to advertise success
- Would help for people to visit small rural communities to better understand the challenges

* Ecology Staff Comment

Attachment D
Beyond Waste Public Meetings
Ellensburg Flip Charts
June 8, 2004

Flip chart notes were transcribed after the meetings and edited minimally for clarity, in order to preserve the intent of recorded comments.

SOLID WASTE ISSUES

- Public landfills have been allowed to not be in compliance and privates held to higher standard
 - A lot of inconsistencies
 - Different application of standards = variable
 - Difference with health district admin.
 - Intra-county conflicts, (e.g. Spokane Co.)
 - Waste planning documents are POLITICAL
 - Changes you make impact a system that's political
 - The plan can impact millions \$ private industry has invested in infrastructure, and now goes a different direction?!! E.g.: re-tooling an industry built on/based on wastes that exist today -
 - and, have no assurance this plan will work!
 - WA ≠ CA or NY, therefore need really strong external allies
 - Recognize the commitment we have made
 - E.g., the relaxed standard ↑ sham, which ↓ \$ to the collectors and regional solid waste system!!
 - Be cautious, that plan does not ↑ financial burden
- if change rules and playing field can have (-) impact on system and infrastructure
- Fine line between landfill and implementing BW
 - Won't have \$ to implement @ start
 - Partnerships during transition = critical
 - How pay if make \$ by waste?

SMALL VOLUME HAZ WASTES (aka MRW)

- What does this mean with respect to CPG program?
- Likes differentiating waste management in relation to risk (high vs. low toxicity) [spending a lot of \$ managing materials that are not that hazardous]--Rec #8
- Concerned about unfunded mandates – do we do plan updates with new \$ or with same old CPG \$? We don't have the \$--Rec #9

Rec #10

- Clarify who for? Financial assurance requirements? (“TSD-like” quantities)
- Unfunded mandates –

Rec #9

- Implement existing plans but may need other monies
- How spend \$ = a local decision (e.g. in SQG events)

→ How funding controlled/applied to local program → ordinances = Law and priorities, but links to state plan? State plan ↔ local authority

- Can look like not implementing a plan that is locally mandated (ordinance)

→ concern = shifting of funds to support state plan’s priorities

→ concern = local control may be diluted

also, may be able to leverage local plans to support our state goals.

ORGANICS

Rec #2

- Potential conflict between back yard composting vs. collection and processing
- Hierarchy would be helpful – which materials & how to recycle – promote backyard
- “↑ recycling” = a “bit scary [example – 6 different collection trucks for different wastes every day, i.e. cardboard, organics, etc.
- Rural ≠ Urban – they have different issues (e.g. Portland vs. Yakima)
 - Need as many options as we can get
- This is the best written chapter in the plan
- Organic Orchards can’t retain “organic” certification if use biosolids
- Get different agencies together – state agencies so we can comply with “organics”
- Different markets for application of compost, but
 - rules must allow it
 - public perception must allow it

→ Look at the PRODUCTION and UTILIZATION SYSTEM

- stimulate; enhance organic food producing markets – as user of compost (“manufacturer responsibility”)
- perception! Perception can kill - fear of compost stigma – need to TRUST the product

GREEN BUILDING

* This goes beyond CDL *

- with new rule – “new recyclers”
 - seeing more companies (illegal haulers)

→ “diverted” from official recyclers [not recycled, really]

- “sham recyclers”

lower rate\$

- then can be less regulated if go to “recycling” facility
- good intention, but reality
- Financial incentive for deconstruction – how?

PERFORMANCE MEASURES

- How align/integrate data when different jurisdictions measure different variables?
 - Waste stream characterization different between counties – can’t determine where you are unless do a characterization (=)
 - Ecy did pay for Grant and Okanogan Counties’ characterizations
 - Measurements come at a cost to counties and haulers/management co.’s
 - No unfunded mandates (including measurements)
 - If Ecy doesn’t use the data, then why are you making us produce it?
- Before ask for new stuff (data) what are you doing with old existing data?
- Compare our “S”(sustainability) indicators with those being used by other states/cities

INDUSTRIES

- How balance risks and benefits?
 - ↓fire
 - ↓toxicity
 - ↑recycling
- How to incentivize vs. enforcementize?
- Define EMS better (in text, and in glossary?)
- Any regulation changes?
- How ↓ environmental impact of products not manufactured in WA?
- Be mindful that WA is already tough for business!

ONGOING

- Incorporate concerns as they emerge during development
- Follow up, continued work
- Build this into the plan

OVERALL

- Budget for this plan?

Attachment E
Beyond Waste Public Meetings
Edmonds Flip Charts
June 10, 2004

Flip chart notes were transcribed after the meetings and edited minimally for clarity, in order to preserve the intent of recorded comments.

ORGANICS

- ↑ ag. ~ ↑ farmer business opportunities by alternative management of residues, ex: straw → construction materials ~ link air quality benefits, ex. Straw burning

- ? What's driving biomass E processing
 - concern that these processes are down cycling and would replace "returning OM to the soil"
 - need prioritizing on various technologies (hierarchy)
- * coordinate various E projects so we get "best bang for buck"
- Prevention and waste reduction are not represented in the title of the initiation
 - Education in total food cycle
 - OSPI projects
 - Legal requirements for kids to be served food they don't like → this leads to food waste
 - Multiple issues related to food waste in school
- How do we educate children about food loop and reduced waste
- ↑ This should apply to all society
 - need to emphasize "waste reduction"
- Include info on economic benefits to persuade people
 - Org. recycling can save \$
- Need economic incentives for creating markets, ex: state sponsored low cost loans
- Home composting needs to include info on potential challenges especially with i.e. rodents/odor, food scraps
- Be clear about home composting vs. collection and processing (specific to food scraps)
- Education programs need to be very clear about food scrap composting
- *Partnerships with WWTP on education about garbage disposals, food and fog's (fats, oils and grease) (also county back-yard programs)
- County and city land-use codes restrict business opportunities in facilities
- Need more technical cooperation among org. processors
- Need "state" sponsored on-going testing of compost quality to support consumer confidence.

GREEN BUILDING

- Green Building materials need to be widely available – this should be a priority
- Need more focus on how Nest to use materials and land use considerations
- People need to know what is contributing to the problem – life cycle look – need checklist
- Lifecycle anal. Cost need to be apparent – this would be an incentive to green building – use this as a way to market
- Building departments need to be up to speed – fire marshal (wide streets ≠ green building)
- Costs are disincentives
 - Overcome perception of higher cost
 - Demonstrate with real data cost savings
 - Case studies and fact sheets and marketing angle “we couldn’t afford not to build green”←elected officials say this
 - Take out of env. terms
- Also need to educate voters on public building projects – about benefits
- UW library may be a case study of why we can’t afford not to build green
- “Green” stands for \$ saved
- Bad building awards – Brown Building
- Give out awards for good products and buildings
- Building users are a potential partner because as a user they provide a unique perspective to the green building process for example a user would put operable windows as a high priority.
- Green Roofs very interesting strategy
- Is there info for consumers which outline elements for building greenly?
- Tax credits for building green
- Education priority for home owners
- Government buildings are very visible and should be examples
- Emphasize cost savings – you must for to leaders with operation cost figures also
- We need data on productivity benefits
- Transfer stations should include options for diversion of reusable materials – south transfer station
- Planning requirement for equal opportunities in each county
- Government need to provide lead time so deconstruction is an option
- Outreach/education is very important

SMALL VOLUME HAZ WASTES (aka MRW)

- Federal government is stockpiling mercury (Hg)
 - For over 50 years
 - Low market value \$4.70/lb. – can cost \$7,000 to recycle mercury
- Put it in the ground in a safe way – sequester surplus into earth,
→ Remove mercury from all products
→ Hg export is not safe in some cases

*Recommendation #5 Wording to replace “use lowest risk of pesticides or alternatives” “eliminate and reduce, other pesticides – get rid or “ensure proper” language – focus on household use, they need training and/or restrictions – Shelf labeling of selected pesticides as called for by ruling needs to be implemented; Support through funding for school districts and other public entities for P2 low-interest loans/grants

- What’s going on to reduce PBDE? What are product alternatives?
- What products are PBDEs used in?
- Education on PBDEs and involve the international community
- Why aren’t cleaning supplies and personal care products on the list? (see www.EWG.org)
- * Can we evaluate, screen and prevent products for MRWs before products get on market? Is this addressed in any of the initiatives?
- How do we intentionally advocate for national and international issues and provide the resources to make this happen?
- Capture a higher proportion of MRW
- Need to account for costs to move and process and reuse materials. Recycling efficiency must include costs of transportation. Energy costs are high.

INDUSTRIES

- How are you developing tools to help industries be successful?
- Logistics→complicated and labor is often more \$ than disposal
- The more complicated the alternative is, harder to implement
 - Simple and consistent options are better
- Consider total life cycle –
 - Esp. energy
 - Product longevity
 - Labor time
 - Risk shifting?
 - Dilution? Concentrate waste (don’t just change filters more often)
- Likes PBTs focus
 - Consider them as low level ores
 - Try not to use it in first place (rather than recycle)
 - Is recycling valuable
 - How much energy to do it (e.g. reclaim mercury) ? Worth removing it?
- Economic development and incentives → spend some serious energy on this (e.g. tax break for purchasing green products)
- Scale the planning fee according to waste amounts (the cap is too low)
- Public website where you post co’s “S” plans (e.g.: EPA’s resource consv’n challenge)
- Likes EMS, no big changes; please, leave it’s flexibility intact (or↑it)
- Create a Governor’s Corporate Env’l Council - have top 15-20 WA industries be on team, have hard core strategy, serious work on the transformation that’ll work for the bus. Sector

- Sector-specific legal tools, e.g. third party organizations (example: to help with product take-back) to empower industry to work with competitors – to solve env'l problems e.g. product take-back from compete→cooperate; Legally, not anti-trust
- Regulatory barriers to recycle (e.g. distillation) want to do things right but if costs too much

→ flexibility for a sector, e.g.: MOU (work with EPA)

- Careful what measurements you ask for costs and time to get data, for what value?
- Ecy be responsive to ind. Needs
- How push-product longevity?
 - ↓ packaging?

HW ISSUES

#2HW

- likes EMS . To P2 plan How push-product longevity?
 - Iso 14001 = sellable on market
 - The iso/EMS system stays “alive” revitalizes (P2 plans wither)
 - Saves \$ and time by not re-inventing programs

#2HW

- Be careful of how restrictive you're being in the EMS
- Good to leverage lean mfg.
- Iso 14K and lean work well together

#4HW

- Good direction to have good relationships
- Confidential bus. Info – important concern

#6HW

- Find ways to have fewer regs. on less toxic material
 - Bus. Needs to spend less \$ on compliance; e.g.: went from perchloroethylene to less toxic, (and this was an ↑cost of material) and still costs as much to regulate!! (cuz state-only even tho toxicity)
- Organic carbonaceous waste rule needs to address polymerized mat'ls (eg PVC)
- Doesn't like having to do form 2 before doing TBG (treatment by generator), have to re-submit Form 2 for each new activity before hand.
 - Toss a lot of DW that could be treated as used (e.g. 2 part epoxies) where's the line and scale.

PERFORMANCE MEASURES

- Look at “clean tech” sector
- Antioch project – cross industry project on sustainable businesses (Julie Peterson-Boeing) good source for ideas on measurement
- Environmental MBA program (Bainbridge graduate institute) might have good measurement ideas.
- Of info groups, just i.d. critical ones so as not to impose lots of costs on industry

- Focus forums with industry to discuss how to get a sampling of their wastes
- Don't see communication goals – getting info into hands of people who can act on it
- Performance indicator – have international focus (commonality) – eg SERA 3-13 chemicals – easier for businesses to id
- Don't get us (business) involved in designing an indicator – just tell us what's toxic
- Use indicators to publicize Beyond Waste progress
- Interesting to see focus on industry, but answer is changing people's behavior – Is there way to focus on toxics, it is not perceived as business problem.
- Quality of products – poor quality create waste – better consumer choice – public education and involvement problem
- Purchasing decisions based on education (measure this)
- Performance indicators for communities
 - Giving ratings to communities
- Ways of life-span of products (standard labeling on products) touches people's pocket books
- Recognition for counties and cities, i.e., “Envirostar”
- *See number measurements – how does this relate to me
- Overall indicator – “this is a more environmental airplane” – environmental report (State of New Mexico – Green Zia program)
- Learn from other countries

SW ISSUES

- State could make available contract of technical advisors that local governments can use in planning for the future (many example – engineers, economists) this is a good way to help locals – Ecy do the contracting. CWC is a good one – brought a level of expertise to local government that they could otherwise not access – people who can really help locals and businesses with recycling and waste reduction.
- Transition from waste-based system means a huge economic system transition – need specific plans for how to successfully manage and execute that transition – what specific steps to take and when – need help looking at the long term
- “What does flipping the system need to look like for the next 10-50 years”
- How can we work toward putting ourselves out of business successfully – financially whole
- With grant money disappearing, how will locals replace aging recycling infrastructure? Revolving loan funds; investors, etc. – whatever we did to build this in the first place, can we do that again?
- Transition
 - Outline expectations/timelines and
 - Communicate that to business community

Engineering the transition vs. letting the marketplace work on its own; without doing this, businesses with investments in the current system are likely to oppose Beyond Waste direction.

- Transition – need to help people see the benefits and opportunities for future value – help people see what their business can do
- BW Plan now overemphasizes ↓ regulation – what we need is fairness, predictability, level playing field; Some industries can use certainty in standards, requirements to plan for investments; it also provides level playing field; use regulation as leverage point, trigger point to set a standard; use as a tool for marketplace to operate
- Look at regional recycling markets – X-state boundaries, too – look for opps for efficiencies. Much is happening that forces waste to go across borders – How are/are not we going to allow that to occur. Don't ignore econs and surrounding states (keep in mind Calif.)
 - Two separate issues:
 - How to improve recycling
 - Look at flow control issues for trad. recyclables as well as recyclable or recurrent products (returned products)
- Are there comparable federal efforts? Issue is X-state consistency; lack of fed can lead to inconsistencies, etc.
- Make sure we don't confuse issues re: disposal fee-based system needs and opportunities with "PAYT – advance recovery fees – two separate issues
- Land filling is much cheaper than recycling – statement in disposal section is not correct.

BEYOND WASTE GENERAL

- Nice idea but is it realistic? It feels like too little too late – should be more stringent regulation of business
- Big levers – education at all levels (from consumer society to society whole plant focus; corporate education to balance profit with environment) The Soul of Capitalism.
- Ecology is only on state level – maybe we can lead the nation. (New Apollo Energy Project Jay Inslee is leading it)
 - Creating jobs
 - Reducing reliance on mid east oil
 - Alternative energy sources
- Plan needs to work in conjunction with our state's visions of energy , water, salmon – make sure it's properly balanced (e.g. chromium needed on airplanes – nothing else works)
- If we focus overly on getting rid of all toxics, we may not focus on other things that will help environment more – how multi-media can you make this Plan?
- The more tools you can offer, the better (e.g., easy ways to id lower toxic materials)
- Work on manufacturer responsibility
- Promote companies to use recycled – create markets, provide incentives

- Work with natural partners to create natural policy of reducing waste
- Focus on clean energy
- What about biodiesel fuels?
- At P2 workshop, we were talking about Ecology coming to help – fear about getting violations while Ecology was there – create an independent group to help? (ECOS – non-profit that can help businesses improve processes)
- *Beyond Waste is great – Ecology needs to balance its resources (permits, inspection, beyond waste – a lot to do! – hard and will have to be done in baby steps)
- King County, City of Seattle, etc. will be partners
- Summit of public sector partners – see who can help – how can help?
- Sometimes, it feels as if we're trying to do too much – ½ initiatives
- Green Building – big lever
- P2/change to EMS – systems mapping approach is very effective
- Let's start moving into Eastern Washington
- Need to promote recycled feedstock

* Ecology staff statement

Attachment F---Summary of Meeting Evaluations

**Beyond Waste Public Meetings
Meeting Participant Evaluations
May-June 04**

Meeting Evaluations 63 evaluation forms were completed

Meeting Review	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
The meeting facilities were adequate	38	19	5	1	0
The facilitators were helpful in keeping the discussions on track	37	23	1	1	0
The Beyond Waste presentations gave me a better understanding of the project	25	24	7	0	0
Opportunities for input are adequate	32	24	4	1	0

Comments from evaluation forms

Meeting Amenities

- Poor location – not convenient.
- Parking hard to find.
- Discussions should be held in more urban communities.
- Very hard to hear in small groups.
- Room was cold.
- Chairs hurt.

Presentation of Meeting

- Needs an extra session to bring it all together.
- Relationships between issues and themes need to be emphasized.
- Good Summary on Beyond Waste by Cheryl and Chris.
- Great Job!
- Adequate for Government officials but I don't think Joe Citizen will get involved – if you would like their comments; do a PR campaign requesting their written input.
- Thank you for letting me voice my comments as a group later via the internet.

- Could use more time in discussion groups.
- Good format – “Opportunities for input on plan”.
- Discussions not kept on track.
- Involve WA’s organic farmers.
- More info. - Beyond Waste.
- Access to written material before meeting would be helpful.
- Little white comment sheets – helpful.
- Positive energy was communicated through the facilitators.
- Small group discussion helpful.
- Staff were very responsive and receptive – not defensive.
- Nice job! Impressed that you were able to provide enough information about each topic in such a short time.
- Plan is a great idea and a step in the right direction.
- Hopes that Ecology recognizes the work being done on at a local level and with the business community.
- Great to discuss these issues with people from different interests.
- Really like overall concept – keep at it!
- Really appreciate the work of Dee, Cheryl, and Chris in keeping things moving without stepping on toes.