Hazardous Waste Generators Focus Group Summary for Beyond Waste Project

Prepared for:
Washington State Department of Ecology
Hazardous Waste and Toxics Reduction Program
November 6, 2003

Prepared by:

agreement dynamics inc
relationships, agreements, results.

Publication Number 04-04-004

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 Hazardous Waste Generators
Focus Groups Summary

Introduction

In August and September 2003, Agreement Dynamics, Inc. facilitated a series of focus groups for the Department of Ecology's Hazardous and Toxic Waste Reduction Program. The focus groups were designed to gather a variety of information from stakeholders that generate or handle hazardous waste in order to further develop the Beyond Waste Project. This summary was composed from notes taken by Agreement Dynamics at the focus groups and is divided into nine sections, with two appendices:

1. Introduction
2. General Information on the Focus Groups
3. Beyond Waste Project Background Information
4. General Themes Voiced By Focus Group Participants on the Current Business Climate in Washington State
5. Representatives' Thoughts on Ecology's Possible Strategies to Reduce Hazardous Material Use and Waste
6. Thoughts from Focus Group Participants on the Results of the Washington State Industrial Waste Generator Survey
7. Participants' Ideas for Partnering with Business
8. Sample of Representatives' Ideas for Improvements Within Ecology
9. Recommendations and Conclusions

This summary will be distributed to the focus group participants as well as used by Ecology in the Beyond Waste Project.

General Information on the Focus Groups

The Department of Ecology ("Ecology") hosted a total of nine focus groups across Washington State, including seven in Western Washington (one transfer, storage, and disposal ("TSD") group, and two each of small quantity generator ("SQG"), medium quantity generator ("MQG") and large quantity generator ("LQG") and two in Spokane (mixed generator status). These classifications are established by the state hazardous waste laws and regulation. These focus groups were held between August 19, 2003 and September 10, 2003.

Fifty-nine representatives of businesses and other organizations affected by Ecology's hazardous waste regulations attended the focus group sessions. A list of organizations represented at the focus group sessions follows as Appendix C.

With the exception of the two sessions held in Spokane,[1] the focus groups were divided into two, two-hour sessions about one week apart. In the first session, the participants provided some information on the current business climate, especially with respect to environmental management. They were given a presentation on the Beyond Waste Project and asked for initial reactions to the five initiatives. At the end of the first session, participants were given a rating tool to provide feedback on seven strategies that Ecology is considering for reducing hazardous material use and waste in the industrial sector.

During the second session, the groups posted their ratings of the strategies, and then discussed their rationale for the ratings. They were also asked to suggest other strategies for Ecology to consider. The groups discussed some key questions that Ecology had about results from the Washington State Industrial Waste Generator Survey. The sessions concluded with a discussion of how Ecology could best communicate and partner with businesses to further reduce hazardous material use and waste in the future. Participants who wanted to continue their involvement in the Beyond Waste Project were given a sign-up sheet for future communications. The agenda that was used for the two-day sessions is attached as Appendix A

Each focus group's discussion focused on slightly different topics, although similar themes did emerge from many of the groups. All sessions were highly interactive and informative. A number of participants expressed satisfaction that Ecology chose to hold the sessions.

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 been working on the Beyond Waste Project for the past few 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 is divided into five initiatives:

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

[1] The focus group sessions held in Spokane were four-hour sessions with a short lunch break. The agenda for the Spokane groups was the same as the agenda for the Western Washington groups, but with a short lunch break instead of a week separating the two sessions.

Initiative 2: Establish a viable closed-loop reuse and recycling system for capturing organic materials.
Initiative 3: Encourage a green-built environment by making sustainable building the norm in Washington.
Initiative 4: Reduce and prevent moderate-risk waste (hazardous wastes from households and small businesses).
Initiative 5: Track overall progress toward the Beyond Waste vision through performance measures and improved data tracking.

Throughout the planning process, Ecology intends to involve various stakeholder groups to further develop the ideas in the Beyond Waste Project. In order to involve stakeholders in the industrial sector, Ecology sent a survey in June 2003 regarding hazardous and toxic material use and waste to approximately 1000 waste generators throughout the state. Two hundred thirty organizations responded to the survey, providing the program with substantial, but purely quantitative data. This series of focus groups was designed to supply more qualitative information for the state Hazardous Waste plan. This series of focus groups comprises one of the first steps in an ongoing process to partner with businesses in Washington State in order to achieve the Beyond Waste vision. In order to develop an idea of the context in which businesses currently operate, the first item on the agenda was a discussion of the current business climate in Washington State.

General Themes Voiced By Focus Group Participants on the Current Business Climate in Washington State

Following are themes voiced repeatedly by focus group participants when asked to give Ecology thoughts about the current business climate and its impact on environmental management:

- The impact of additional regulations will cause serious problems for organizations in Washington for the following reasons:
    - Economy and budgets are tight; most entities have downsized recently.
    - The global economy is a serious concern; most manufacturers have or are considering moving to other states or overseas.
    - Washington has some of the most stringent environmental and worker safety regulations in the country, as well as a high minimum wage and unemployment compensation rates.
    - Business isn't good. The need for economic relief is acute.

- Current Ecology programs receive mixed reviews from businesses and other organizations impacted by regulations:
    - In some instances, Ecology inspectors may be perceived as somewhat inflexible. Although some participants had high praise for individual technical assistance efforts, generally participants talked about the fear of having government personnel visit their sites and voiced concerns about whether Ecology personnel would partner with them in future.

- Certain Ecology efforts are greatly appreciated: TREE, some P2 assistance, workshops, and Shop-Sweep type of campaigns were singled out as effective programs.
- Most business representatives believe most or all of the "low hanging fruit" has been picked with P2 efforts, and that the paperwork involved is too complicated and time consuming.

- A centralized information source for various environmental management issues would be helpful for many businesses:
  - Lack of good information on recycling opportunities, regulations and reporting requirements is still a significant barrier to further reducing waste.
  - Most environmental managers and safety coordinators want to do the right thing and are frustrated by the lack of reduction and recycling opportunities and the low availability of effective, non-toxic products.

- It is difficult to move away from the status quo in a business environment:
  - Old habits are hard to break within organizations; workers can be resistant to change, despite overwhelming evidence that changing a practice or material would be beneficial.
  - Upper-level managers look primarily at bottom-line costs vs. benefits, and are reluctant to try alternatives to existing waste management strategies.

After discussion of the current business climate, the participants were given a presentation on the Beyond Waste Project. Many participants expressed optimism at the prospect of moving toward the Beyond Waste vision. During the second session, the participants gave specific feedback on the seven strategies that Ecology is considering for working to reduce hazardous material use and waste.

Representatives' Thoughts on Ecology's Possible Strategies to Reduce Hazardous Material Use and Waste in the Industrial Sector

During the focus group sessions, the participants rated the following strategies on a scale of "highly ineffective" to "highly effective." The resulting charts of ratings follow in Appendix B. **These numeric ratings are not statistically significant, nor should they be used to prioritize the seven strategies. The ratings were used as discussion starting points only.** Following are some of the recurrent themes recorded by Agreement Dynamics during the focus group sessions:

1. <u>Education programs targeted at consumers and other businesses to encourage them to buy products that contain fewer hazardous materials.</u>
   - This should be a focused program done in connection with other strategies.
   - A degree of separation should be maintained between Ecology and businesses to avoid trust issues.
   - Education on lifecycle ("cradle to grave") costs is important to change consumer and business behavior.

- Education programs, while sometimes helpful, often are ineffective and inefficient uses of resources.
- Education will always take a back seat to bottom-line cost.
- The education programs need to be tailored to their audiences.
- A more effective risk-related labeling system for products containing hazardous and toxic materials would be an effective way to change consumers' purchasing patterns.

2. A statewide technical assistance and recognition program, such as the Envirostars program.
    - Makes sense for smaller businesses in the service industry, such as drycleaners and auto repair shops.
    - To be effective, the majority of businesses in a geographic area must participate.

3. Reduce regulatory burdens for hazardous waste generators that voluntarily practice "beyond compliance" behaviors and/or achieve environmental outcomes that exceed mandatory standards.
    - This strategy was more attractive for larger businesses that have staff dedicated to hazardous waste handling.
    - Some specific suggestions from the groups included: reduced paperwork, reduced number of inspections, waivers for regulations that don't make sense for their type of businesses, and leniency for compliance violations based on past good behavior.
    - The regulatory relief would have to be substantial to justify the additional cost to adopt beyond compliance behaviors.
    - This would require written assurances against hazardous waste enforcement.

4. A rebate program for organizations that achieve a high level of waste reduction coupled with increased fees charged by government for hazardous substance use and/or waste generation.
    - Concerns about rebates being "one time only" while increased fees would occur every year.
    - Participants were concerned with the amount of paperwork that would be required to get the rebate.
    - Makes sense to combine this strategy with other strategies, such as funding low-interest loans with the increased fee funds.
    - Many businesses have reached a plateau in waste reduction; further reduction would be exponentially more expensive.
    - Some businesses (and lawmakers) would strongly oppose this strategy due to increased fees.

5. Low interest loans for organizations investing in processes and/or equipment to reduce hazardous waste generation.

- Most applicable to smaller businesses. Very little interest from larger businesses.
- Business loans for small and/or new businesses are difficult to get and are typically high interest: up to 15%.
- Very few would oppose this strategy.
- The loans should be used specifically for equipment and technology to reach beyond compliance or Beyond Waste-type practices.

6. A negotiated process with industry resulting in the phase out over time of selected highly hazardous substances (e.g. the 7-year phase out of CFCs).
    - Many participants mentioned the difference between the technical feasibility of alternatives versus practical feasibility of implementing new practices and materials.
    - In order to be acceptable, the proposed alternative must be comparably effective.
    - Some participants questioned whether Ecology was capable of achieving this task, since it would probably need to reach outside of the state.
    - Participants also advised Ecology to be sure that any proposed alternative material or process is actually better for the environment.
    - Impact of the global economy is a concern here; therefore this strategy is more applicable to a type of business that will not move out of state or has to compete with out of state businesses.
    - Only applicable for a few selected wastes.
    - Reasonable support for this strategy.

7. Assistance with the design of your organization's product or processes to minimize or eliminate hazardous substance use and waste.
    - Participants noted that assistance staff must have no connection with compliance efforts. Some suggested that this might be best achieved with subcontractors, since many businesses have a history of mistrust of government agencies.
    - Experts would have to have specialized knowledge of the specific industry that they assist.
    - Assistance staff members need to be on the "same page" as compliance staff. Recommendations from assistance staff should be put in writing and should not put business in jeopardy of enforcement action.
    - More applicable for small to mid-size businesses who do not have internal design and development staff.
    - A Best Management Practice resource would be helpful for businesses to share non-proprietary practices.

Overall Comments

- Opinions ranged considerably with no clear consensus by size of business or generator status.

- Participants appreciated this opportunity to voice their opinions, and would like to be involved in the future.
- Participants noted several linkages among the seven strategies.
- Ecology should take on more of an informative role for waste management issues.
- "Bad Actors" need to be addressed so that businesses that operate within the law do not have to bear the cost burden of illegal business.
- Current compliance practices should focus more heavily on the "big picture" and less on minor mistakes ("crossing T's and dotting I's").

After the discussion of the seven possible strategies, the participants provided business insight into some of the results of the Industrial Generator Survey.

Thoughts from Focus Group Participants on the Results of the Washington State Industrial Waste Generator Survey

Some of the trends that emerged from the Washington State Industrial Waste Generator Survey were surprising to Ecology. In order to better understand the reasons for respondents' answers, the focus groups discussed several of the trends. (These trends are in italics below.) Following is a summary of the comments made by focus group participants on these trends:

1. *Although most responders felt that their organizations would benefit from reducing the use of hazardous substances or waste generation, many also felt that it is not feasible to redesign their products or processes to not use hazardous substances or generate hazardous waste. Why would organizations say this?*

    - The technology is not yet available to change products or processes without sacrificing quality.
    - The expense outweighs the benefit of further waste reduction.
    - "If it ain't broke, don't fix it" mentality could be at play: even if there were a potential benefit, managers would be hesitant to change current practice to try new techniques.

2. *The top 5 successfully reduced wastes involve: used oil, solvent, paint-related products, antifreeze and batteries. The 5 most difficult to reduce involved: solvent, paint-related products, mercury, used oil and batteries. Why did some end up on both lists?*

    - Some companies have a hard time recycling certain materials, while others have found a good way to do it. There is no central information system to educate business on how to deal with certain materials.
    - The size of the respondents might have affected the lists; small business would have a harder time dealing with solvents if they did not recycle them in-house.
    - It is possible for something to be difficult and still be successful.

- Used oil and other similar products are easy to recycle as long as it is not contaminated. Products, such as used oil, that may be contaminated with other chemicals are very difficult to recycle.
- Some types of batteries are easy to recycle; other types of batteries are hard to recycle.

3. *Most responders felt that the primary barrier to reducing hazardous materials use/waste is that there are no effective non-toxic alternatives. Why would responders say this?*

    - Most alternatives are either very costly or not as effective, or both.

4. *Most responders felt that production levels and hazardous materials use/waste generation would remain at current levels for the next 3-5 years. Why?*

    - This may be a reflection of the lack of good non-toxic alternatives.
    - People tend to assume the status quo.
    - Organizations take time to change, and 3-5 years is not very long.

5. *The top five factors motivating responders to reduce hazardous materials use/waste generation are:*
    a. *Saves money*
    b. *Serves public interest; it's the right thing to do*
    c. *Worker safety*
    d. *Compliance with government regulations*
    e. *Reduces liability*

What are your comments regarding these priorities stated by a majority of responders?

- Participants had a wide variety of reactions to this list.
- Some suggested that "serves the public interest…" might have appeared high on the list because it seemed like the right answer. Others suggested that it was ranked highly because the respondents (who took the time and effort to complete the survey) were more likely to care about doing the right thing than those who did not respond to the survey.
- The general consensus of the participants was that money is always the major driver: worker safety, compliance, and liability are all monetary issues.

6. *"Gaining a competitive advantage" is not a strong motivator. Why would responders say this?*

    - Some participants were puzzled by this response.
    - Most participants noted that reducing waste simply does not translate into a competitive advantage; costs of reduction almost always outweigh financial benefits.

After reviewing and discussing the survey results, the participants suggested some ways in which Ecology could more effectively partner with businesses in reducing wastes.

Participants' Ideas for Partnering with Business

Participants provided many ideas for ways in which Ecology could develop partnerships with businesses in Washington State. These are the recurrent themes:

- Work with associations whenever possible, especially with small businesses that do not have dedicated waste management staff.
- Put more emphasis on making sure interpretations of the regulations are consistent with sister agencies through joint letters, focus sheets and joint inspections.
- Update the Ecology website to be even more waste- or material-specific with information on compliance regulations, Best Management Practices, recycling companies, etc. (Many companies are fearful to call directly on Ecology staff).
- Most participants want to receive communiqués from Ecology, but they had varied preferences for media: fax, email, web, and postal mail were all listed as the best, although several participants voiced objections to email and postal mail.
- An addition to *Shop Talk* with updates on the Beyond Waste Project was a recurring suggestion.

In addition to the items on the agenda, participants suggested several internal changes for Ecology. Even though this was not an agenda item, several of the ideas were repeated in many of the groups and may be helpful for Ecology's continuing partnership with businesses.

Sample of Representatives' Ideas for Improvements Within Ecology

- Ecology should act and think more like a business and less like a governing body.
    - Inspectors should have business experience and training.
    - Ecology needs to understand current pressures on businesses.
    - Spills can happen outside of business hours; make a list of EPA numbers available 24 hours per day.
- Increase consistency between:
    - Inspectors and technical assistance staff,
    - Different state agencies,
    - Ecology and the EPA.
- Reconsider what is regulated as hazardous material or waste.
    - Fish bioassay tests should be examined, especially for facilities far from waterways.
    - Neutralized chemicals should not be treated purely as hazardous waste.
- Ecology should be more information-oriented.
    - Ecology website should have information on reducing and recycling hazardous materials and wastes.
    - Ecology should be a clearinghouse for Best Management Practices.

- P2 plans should be revamped.
    - P2 paperwork is overly complex, and still does not fit all types of businesses.
    - P2 plans take a long time to develop, which costs businesses money.
    - Without implementation requirements, P2 plans are somewhat useless.
    - There should be an easier "out" for the P2 plan requirement.
- Ecology needs to be more customer service-oriented.
    - Inspectors are currently inflexible and seem to seek out miniscule infractions to justify time spent at a site.
    - Honest efforts and honest mistakes need to be recognized as such.
    - Focus less on "dotting I's and crossing T's."
    - Simplify paperwork.

Recommendations and Conclusions

The participants in the focus groups generally were very appreciative of Ecology's efforts to reach out to the business community in an effort to be a more effective partner in reducing hazardous materials and waste. The poor economic climate has hurt many businesses, but many are still interested in and willing to work toward with the Beyond Waste Project. The information gathered from these focus groups should be considered in the planning stages of the Project, but should not take the place of an ongoing dialogue between waste generators and the Department of Ecology. The ongoing partnership between Ecology, Washington State businesses, and other agencies will rely on regular communication initiated by Ecology.

Appendix A

WDOE Beyond Waste Project
Hazardous Waste Focus Group Sessions
Agenda

Purpose: To get feedback from the business community regarding Ecology's Beyond Waste Plan, especially with respect to its industrial waste initiative.

Meeting # 1 Desired Outcomes:

- Initial feedback from business regarding current business climate
- Understanding of Beyond Waste initiatives related to industrial waste
- Initial responses to initiatives

Time	**Topic**
5 minutes	Welcome and introductions
10 minutes	Agenda Review and Focus Group Purpose • Role of focus groups within larger process • Feedback to group participants • Opportunities for additional involvement

45 minutes	Discussion of Business Climate and Environmental Management
	• What is changing in your organizations that would be helpful for Ecology to keep in mind?
	  o Markets
	  o Customers
	  o Operations
	  o Organization's perspective on environmental management

45 minutes	Introduction to Beyond Waste Initiatives • Presentation by Ecology staff • Questions and answers • Group discussion: initial reactions
15 minutes	Closing • Review of next week's agenda • Rating instrument "homework"—Ecology's proposed strategies

Meeting # 2: Desired Outcomes

- Feedback on Ecology's strategies to reduce industrial wastes
- More in-depth feedback on key survey questions
- Advice on working productively with business to make plan successful

5 minutes	Welcome • Agenda review • Posting of your ratings
75 minutes	Discussion of results • Discussion of why participants rated strategies as they did • Participant ideas on additional strategies and tools • Thoughts on key questions coming out of business survey
30 minutes	Discussion of How Ecology can Work with Businesses • Participants' advice regarding how Ecology should communicate with businesses through this process
10 minutes	Closure • Next steps • How can you remain involved if you so wish?

Appendix B

Hazardous Waste Focus Group Rating Instrument: All Groups Combined

	1 Highly Ineffective	2 Somewhat Effective	3 Unsure/ Neutral	4 Somewhat Effective	5 Highly Effective
1. *Education programs targeted at consumers and other businesses to encourage them to buy products that contain fewer hazardous materials.*	1	4	11	27	8
2. *A statewide technical assistance and recognition program, such as the Envirostars program.*	1	7	12	27	4
3. *Reduce regulatory burdens for hazardous waste generators that voluntarily practice "beyond compliance" behaviors and/or achieve environmental outcomes that exceed mandatory standards.*			15	18	15
4. *A rebate program for organizations that achieve a high level of waste reduction coupled with increased fees charged by government for hazardous substance use and/or waste generation.*	3	7	10	23	8
5. *Low interest loans for organizations investing in processes and/or equipment to reduce hazardous waste generation.*	3	7	7	21	12
6. *A negotiated process with industry resulting in the phase out over time of selected highly hazardous substances (e.g. the 7-year phase out of CFCs).*	1	2	13	21	13
7. *Assistance with the design of your organization's product or processes to minimize or eliminate hazardous substance use and waste.*	2	4	7	26	12

Hazardous Waste Focus Group Rating Instrument:
SQG Groups Only

	1 Highly Ineffective	2 Somewhat Effective	3 Unsure/ Neutral	4 Somewhat Effective	5 Highly Effective
1. *Education programs targeted at consumers and other businesses to encourage them to buy products that contain fewer hazardous materials.*			2	3	3
2. *A statewide technical assistance and recognition program, such as the Envirostars program.*			1	6	1
3. *Reduce regulatory burdens for hazardous waste generators that voluntarily practice "beyond compliance" behaviors and/or achieve environmental outcomes that exceed mandatory standards.*			5	2	1
4. *A rebate program for organizations that achieve a high level of waste reduction coupled with increased fees charged by government for hazardous substance use and/or waste generation.*			3	4	1
5. *Low interest loans for organizations investing in processes and/or equipment to reduce hazardous waste generation.*			1	5	2
6. *A negotiated process with industry resulting in the phase out over time of selected highly hazardous substances (e.g. the 7-year phase out of CFCs).*			2	2	4
7. *Assistance with the design of your organization's product or processes to minimize or eliminate hazardous substance use and waste.*			1	5	2

Hazardous Waste Focus Group Rating Instrument:
MQG Groups Only

	1 Highly Ineffective	2 Somewhat Effective	3 Unsure/ Neutral	4 Somewhat Effective	5 Highly Effective
1. *Education programs targeted at consumers and other businesses to encourage them to buy products that contain fewer hazardous materials.*	1		2	4	1
2. *A statewide technical assistance and recognition program, such as the Envirostars program.*	1		2	5	1
3. *Reduce regulatory burdens for hazardous waste generators that voluntarily practice "beyond compliance" behaviors and/or achieve environmental outcomes that exceed mandatory standards.*			1	4	3
4. *A rebate program for organizations that achieve a high level of waste reduction coupled with increased fees charged by government for hazardous substance use and/or waste generation.*				4	4
5. *Low interest loans for organizations investing in processes and/or equipment to reduce hazardous waste generation.*	2	1	1	1	3
6. *A negotiated process with industry resulting in the phase out over time of selected highly hazardous substances (e.g. the 7-year phase out of CFCs).*	1		2	3	2
7. *Assistance with the design of your organization's product or processes to minimize or eliminate hazardous substance use and waste.*	1		1	3	3

Hazardous Waste Focus Group Rating Instrument:
LQG Groups Only

	1 Highly Ineffective	2 Somewhat Effective	3 Unsure/ Neutral	4 Somewhat Effective	5 Highly Effective
1. *Education programs targeted at consumers and other businesses to encourage them to buy products that contain fewer hazardous materials.*		3	1	5	1
2. *A statewide technical assistance and recognition program, such as the Envirostars program.*		3	3	2	2
3. *Reduce regulatory burdens for hazardous waste generators that voluntarily practice "beyond compliance" behaviors and/or achieve environmental outcomes that exceed mandatory standards.*			2	3	5
4. *A rebate program for organizations that achieve a high level of waste reduction coupled with increased fees charged by government for hazardous substance use and/or waste generation.*	1	2	2	4	1
5. *Low interest loans for organizations investing in processes and/or equipment to reduce hazardous waste generation.*			2	5	2
6. *A negotiated process with industry resulting in the phase out over time of selected highly hazardous substances (e.g. the 7-year phase out of CFCs).*			3	4	3
7. *Assistance with the design of your organization's product or processes to minimize or eliminate hazardous substance use and waste.*	1	1	1	1	6

Hazardous Waste Focus Group Rating Instrument:
TSD Group Only

	1 Highly Ineffective	2 Somewhat Effective	3 Unsure/ Neutral	4 Somewhat Effective	5 Highly Effective
1. *Education programs targeted at consumers and other businesses to encourage them to buy products that contain fewer hazardous materials.*			1	5	1
2. *A statewide technical assistance and recognition program, such as the Envirostars program.*		2	1	3	1
3. *Reduce regulatory burdens for hazardous waste generators that voluntarily practice "beyond compliance" behaviors and/or achieve environmental outcomes that exceed mandatory standards.*			1	4	2
4. *A rebate program for organizations that achieve a high level of waste reduction coupled with increased fees charged by government for hazardous substance use and/or waste generation.*	1	1	2	2	1
5. *Low interest loans for organizations investing in processes and/or equipment to reduce hazardous waste generation.*	1	2	1	1	2
6. *A negotiated process with industry resulting in the phase out over time of selected highly hazardous substances (e.g. the 7-year phase out of CFCs).*		2		4	
7. *Assistance with the design of your organization's product or processes to minimize or eliminate hazardous substance use and waste.*		1	2	3	1

Hazardous Waste Focus Group Rating Instrument:
Spokane Groups Only

	1 Highly Ineffective	2 Somewhat Effective	3 Unsure/ Neutral	4 Somewhat Effective	5 Highly Effective
1. *Education programs targeted at consumers and other businesses to encourage them to buy products that contain fewer hazardous materials.*		1	3	7	2
2. *A statewide technical assistance and recognition program, such as the Envirostars program.*		2	5	6	
3. *Reduce regulatory burdens for hazardous waste generators that voluntarily practice "beyond compliance" behaviors and/or achieve environmental outcomes that exceed mandatory standards.*			3	4	5
4. *A rebate program for organizations that achieve a high level of waste reduction coupled with increased fees charged by government for hazardous substance use and/or waste generation.*	1	4	1	7	
5. *Low interest loans for organizations investing in processes and/or equipment to reduce hazardous waste generation.*		4	2	6	1
6. *A negotiated process with industry resulting in the phase out over time of selected highly hazardous substances (e.g. the 7-year phase out of CFCs).*			3	9	1
7. *Assistance with the design of your organization's product or processes to minimize or eliminate hazardous substance use and waste.*		2	2	9	

Appendix C

List of Organizations Represented at the Hazardous Waste Focus Groups

WA Community Colleges of Spokane SCC
Sunshine Disposal, Inc.
North Creek Analytical
WSU Pullman Camp
Wagstaff, Inc.
Triumph Composite Systems, Inc.
Gonzaga University – Boone Ave E
BF Goodrich Aerospace Spokane Plant
Spokane Metal Finishing
Seneca Foods Corp. Dayton
Schweitzer Engineering Labs
Novation Inc.
General Dynamics OTS
American Reinforced Plastics
Westmark Products, Inc.
Matsushita Kotobuki Electronics Industries of America, Inc.
Tveten's Auto Clinic
Albany International
Fife Printing
Stowe Woodward
Rainier Ballistics
General Plastics Manufacturing
Joseph Simon & Sons, Inc.
Northwest Etch Technology, Inc.
Coast Engine & Equipment
The Boeing Company
SQG Specialists
Total Reclaim
Univar
Nuwc-Keyport
Emerald Services
Smedes & Associates
Hallmark Refining
Seattle Port Terminal 5
Highline School District
Lithia Dodge Chrysler Jeep
KC Solid Waste Cedar Hills Landfill
Metro KC DOT
Cascade Pole
Seattle City Light
UW Environmental Programs
Philip Environmental
USCG Integrated Support Command
King County DOT Road Services Division
UPS Seattle HUB
King County Environmental Lab
All Star Cleaning & Preservation
North Kitsap Auto Rebuild, Inc.
Daly's Inc.
Ballinger Homes
Olympic Pipe Line Co.
Kurdzeil Industrial Coatings Co WA
ECR, Inc.
Lake Washington Technical College Kirkland
Edmonds Community College
Seattle University