

Stakeholder Review of 1999 HHW Plan Update Process

June 7th Stakeholder Meeting Summary

Overview

On June 7, 2005 Cascadia Consulting Group and DEQ presented findings from Oregon's 1999 HHW Plan update process to nearly 20 stakeholders. The purpose of the meeting was to present stakeholders with the work completed to date on the 1999 Plan update and to obtain feedback from stakeholders on their preference of plan goals, scenarios, and menu of plan options. In addition, Cascadia presented findings from the on-line stakeholder survey conducted in February 2005. DEQ sought input from stakeholders on the following questions:

- Do stakeholders concur with the findings from the current program assessment and 1999 Plan?
- Are stakeholders' views accurately captured in the stakeholder survey results?
- Which plan goals do stakeholders believe are most important?
- Which of the four plan scenarios are preferred?
- Should any other issues or options be examined?

Stakeholders who could not attend the meeting were sent a form via email with which they could comment on and rank their preferred plan goals, scenarios, and menu of options. Ten stakeholders submitted comments to DEQ via email.

Stakeholder Perspectives

Detailed notes from the meeting are presented in Attachment A. Email responses are presented in Attachment B. Key outcomes and stakeholder perspectives include:

- **Stakeholders were generally pleased** with the review and assessment of the 1999 HHW Plan.
- **Survey results accurately captured stakeholder viewpoints**, although only one third of the stakeholders at the meeting had completed the on-line survey.
- **Concern over the small number (27) of survey respondents** and the lack of stakeholders at the meeting who represented counties outside of the Willamette Valley area. (Ten additional stakeholders provided comments on the plan scenarios and goals via email – see Attachment B).
- General **agreement with the recommended four Core Activities**. Some stakeholders cautioned DEQ about spending too many resources on needs and program performance studies.
- Most stakeholders chose “**reduce generation of HHW waste and associated risks**” as their first choice for the plan goal, followed by “ensure provision of HHW collection and education services to address the highest risks” and “maintain and strengthen partnerships with local governments.”

- The 2005 HHW Plan should move the program forward and not maintain status quo. Most **stakeholders preferred the High Risk and Waste Prevention First scenarios**, although several questions were raised about the risk study and the level of education and collection that would occur under these two plan scenarios.
- **Stakeholders had differing support for the four plan scenarios.**
 - Stakeholders were split between the High Risk Focus and Waste Prevention First scenarios. While most stakeholders chose High Risk or Waste Prevention First (17), some stakeholders preferred the Basic Collection scenario (5).
 - The majority of stakeholders chose the Status Quo scenario as their least preferred scenario.
 - When asked to select their first choice scenario, most stakeholders (7) chose Waste Prevention First. Five stakeholders chose the High Risk Focus and three chose basic collection. During this exercise, no one chose Status Quo.
 - Stakeholders who completed the email survey were split between the Waste Prevention First scenario and the Basic Collection scenario. The majority chose Status Quo as the fourth scenario (7).
- Some **stakeholders supported a hybrid scenario** of High Risk and Waste Prevention First.
- **Stakeholders favored the following six plan options:**
 - Fund local plans that target high-risk hot spots and the management of high-hazard materials;
 - Target education and outreach to high-hazard materials and high-risk populations and geographic areas – including waste prevention education;
 - Develop a comprehensive program to reduce the use of hazardous products and generation of hazardous wastes;
 - Engage manufacturers and retailers to assist with educational efforts and to modify the HHW content of their products;
 - Provide grants, technical support, and other incentives to local governments to facilitate implementation of their HHW plans and support their collection programs; and
 - Explore lower-cost options for integrating HHW collection with municipal solid waste collection (e.g., lockers at transfer stations).
- **Stakeholders did not want the following options** included in the plan:
 - Limit DEQ collection events exclusively to high-hazard materials in high-risk locations;
 - Limit the facility reimbursement program to out-of-area wastes that are high-hazard only;
 - Increase the use of the statewide hotline through better promotion; and
 - Focus educational efforts on proper disposal and locations – less emphasis on prevention and reduction.
- Stakeholders **did not want to limit HHW events or collection opportunities.**
- Options preferred by stakeholders responding via email include:
 - Provide local governments with specialized technical assistance to support local education and outreach efforts.

- Apply the principles of community-based social marketing to develop a comprehensive program to reduce the use of hazardous products and generation of hazardous wastes.
- Provide grants, technical support, and other incentives to local governments to facilitate implementation of their HHW plans and to provide support for their collection programs.
- Provide grants for collection trucks or other options to serve outlying areas.
- Explore lower-cost options for integrating HHW collection with municipal solid waste collection – e.g., lockers at transfer stations.

Attachment A
June 7th Stakeholder Meeting
Meeting Notes and Stakeholder Comments

The purpose of the stakeholder meeting was to present and receive feedback from stakeholders on: the results from the on-line stakeholder survey, the 2005 HHW Plan process, the 1999 HHW Plan assessment, and the potential 2005 HHW Plan goals, scenarios, and menu of options.

Abby Boudouris welcomed the group of nearly 20 stakeholders, many of whom were from the Willamette Valley area. After stakeholder introductions, Marc Daudon presented DEQ's work shaping the 2005 HHW Plan and facilitated stakeholder questions and discussion.

The following stakeholders attended the meeting:

David Allaway, DEQ*	Scott Klag, Metro
Bob Barrows, DEQ	Leslie Kochan, DEQ
Jeff Bickford, Marion County	Dean Large, Waste Connections
Gordon Brown, Benton County	Bruce Lumper, DEQ*
Abby Boudouris, DEQ*	Tom Manton, Douglas County
Maggie Conley, DEQ*	Sheri Matheson, Yamhill County
Cathie Davidson, DEQ	John McEvoy, Linn County
Pamela Dawelek, Waste Connections	Loretta Pickerell, DEQ*
Sean DeHan, MSE Environmental	Joe Powell, Douglas County
Carol Dion, Allied Waste	Jim Solvedt, Polk County
Brian Fuller, DEQ	Rick Volpel, DEQ*
Larry Gibbs, Lane County	Jan Whitworth, DEQ*

(*DEQ employees that did not participate in the plan goal and scenario voting exercises.)

1. Comments from Presentation

Stakeholder Survey Results

- Just under one third of the meeting attendees completed the online survey in February.
- How did DEQ define product stewardship in the survey? One stakeholder suggested that many people have different definitions for product stewardship. Another stakeholder said that it is common sense and that product stewardship resonates with people – in general, he said that people know what it means.
- Concern over the low number of survey respondents – also concerned about the representation in the room – largely Willamette Valley folks.
- Still working on educating people not to burn their garbage – how can we convince them to handle HHW properly?
- Rural communities do not have resources to cover a comprehensive program – they are spread thin and education in its current form is lacking. Once facilities or more collection opportunities are available – communities may be better equipped to tackle waste prevention and education.
- Education part is the tough part – getting people to change their buying habits is difficult – putting out brochures doesn't work. Offering service to dispose of HHW is easier than launching an education campaign.

- Are collection events successful? One stakeholder asked if there were limited or no collection events – would the public store their HHW to wait for a collection event or would they throw it in the garbage.
- People do not want to stockpile HHW and wait for an event – they need to get rid of it immediately. Another person commented that getting rid of HHW is an impulse – without facilities that are accessible, this will be a problem.
- Have there been studies on environmental justice or studies to determine how income and collection service are related? (Answer is no). One stakeholder said that traditionally, better educated people tend to use program. He doesn't think there is less awareness among different socioeconomic classes – he thinks lower economic classes also have an awareness of HHW and see the need to dispose of it properly.
- Clarification that we do not know if we are meeting needs of customers.
- Clarification that Lane, Metro, Marion, Wasco, Hood River facilities will also have collection events.
- Will the plan include numbers of people who attend events? One stakeholder thought it will be useful to compile collection event information. Abby explained that there is no total for event participation or materials collected on a state level (other than DEQ-funded events).
- Are there any quantity data for HHW that is being used and stored in homes? David explained that good sales data is difficult to obtain. He said that the state's best HHW program, Metro, has participation rates around 5% of the population - this is county with "best" service. Programs are not capturing HHW out there – large majority is going unmanaged.
- Are participation rates flat, decreasing, or increasing as you add events? Metro: participation seems to be constantly rising – as they provide collection, people use the service. Metro hasn't seen a drop-off in participation and has been looking at whether or not they are accommodating disposal, rather than prevention, because collection/disposal has been so convenient for residents. Maggie said that participation at state collection events is increasing and that in some cases volume of material collected are increasing as well.
- What are waste composition studies finding in terms of HHW? DEQ: the portion of the total waste stream that is HHW is very small and the data do not capture any of the materials that leave their containers. David says data is not particularly useful.

Defining DEQ Customers, Partners, and Stakeholders

- How are we determining what the needs of the customers are?
- Definitions make sense in terms of HHW as a subset of solid waste management because local governments are responsible for collection.
- Looking at the end of pipe management is local governments' responsibility – but local government shouldn't provide everything. Metro is not assuming it's their responsibility to deal with *all* collection. How does stewardship fit into this model?
- From a customer standpoint – it's a social responsibility. Need to educate children through education campaigns in schools. DEQ is not going to reach all residents by advertising in the newspaper. The best way to reach people is through HHW education in schools. Metro has an education campaign for schools.

Core Activities

- Basic education should be expanded - just distributing brochures will not work. Greater need for more education effort – more emphasis on teaching children.
- In terms of gathering information on program needs and performance – Metro looked at trying to do this and it was very difficult. Encourage DEQ to look at what other

groups/governments have done to collect this information and not to spend a lot of resources on this activity. The activity “continue to assist governments assume responsibility” could be reworded. As it is written, the activity sounds like local government takes full responsibility for HHW. Language should be crafted in terms of local governments assuming a share of the responsibility.

Scenario 1: High Risk Focus

- Confusion about how money is allocated to local governments in this scenario and the core activities. Abby explained that DEQ wants to continue the grant program.
- Will DEQ be able to shift funds if more than one community wants a plan or facility in one year?
- Would some of these high risk resources go to legislative action or a regulatory scenario approach?

Scenario 2: Waste Prevention First

- Is the budget adequate for this scenario? Abby said that she is unsure; however and pointed out that education and outreach may take different forms than a media campaign. David said that \$600,000 is not enough to solve HHW problems through education, but it's also not enough money to solve the problems only through collection.
- Some activities are more FTE intensive – promoting programs, transforming markets, adopting environmental preferable products. Suggestion to separate this scenario into two kinds of outreach: outreach to consumers and outreach to retailers/manufacturers. Even King County doesn't spend \$800,000 on behavior change. The scenario should clearly define that there is a product stewardship component, in addition to education.
- How would money be divided between local governments and DEQ? Abby said DEQ is not sure at this time and that funding allocation depends largely on the scenario chosen.
- Does the state hotline provide information on alternative products? Answer: only for Metro region; not for out of region calls.

Scenario 3: Basic Collection Service

- Question about what defines the basic level of collection – could be defined by every household has the opportunity to take materials to a certain place, within a certain distance, in a certain time period.
- Plan should continue to fund grants for collection events, plans, and facilities.

2. Dot Game Results

Stakeholders were each given 15 dots, 13 green and 2 red, to vote for their preferred plan goal, scenario, and menu of options. In some cases, stakeholders did not vote or voted twice for the same goal or scenario.

Plan Goal

Stakeholders each had three green dots to select their top three choices for the plan goal. The top three goals (in order) were:

- 1) Reduce Generation of HHW waste and associated risks;
- 2) Ensure provision of HHW collection and education services to address the highest risks; and
- 3) Maintain and strengthen partnerships with local governments.

Plan Goal	1	2	3
Reduce generation of HHW waste and associated risks.	8		
Ensure provision of HHW collection and education services to address the highest risks (materials, populations, environments).	4	3	3
Provide services in an efficient and cost-effective manner while maintaining high quality standards.	1	5	
Ensure minimum service levels for collecting HHW & educating customers.	1	2	5
Engage manufacturers and retailers in HHW prevention & management.		4	2
Maintain and strengthen partnerships with local governments.	4	1	3

Plan Goal - Discussion

- Need to weight the responses.
- How good will the “bang for the buck” be if the plan goal is engaging manufacturers and retailers?
- Goals are worded differently; some seem to be goals, while others are strategies or methods to reach the goal.

Plan Scenario

Stakeholders each had four green dots to rank the scenarios (A = first choice, D = last choice) that they wanted to be included in the plan. At the end of the meeting stakeholders were given one red dot to choose the scenario they liked the most (represented in the following table by numbers in parentheses).

- No clear consensus on the preferred plan scenario; although Status Quo seemed to be most stakeholder’s last choice.
- When given only once choice, more stakeholders chose Waste Prevention First as their first choice. However, when stakeholders ranked the scenarios, more people chose Waste Prevention First as their fourth choice than High Risk or Basic Collection.

Scenario	A	B	C	D
(1) High Risk Focus. Focus HHW programs on those materials and situations that represent the highest risk to human health and the environment.	8 (5)	5	4	2
(2) Waste Prevention First. DEQ funds education, promotion, and product stewardship activities designed to achieve behavior and market change.	9 (7)	5	4	5
(3) Basic Collection Service. DEQ determines acceptable minimum service levels and provides needs-based support for local governments and allocation of DEQ HHW collection events.	5 (3)	6	3	3
(4) Status Quo/Baseline. DEQ focuses on meeting the request of local governments for collection events, grants, and technical assistance. Services are based on local government demand.	2	3	4	8

Plan Scenario - Discussion

- Need to have some type of collection if education does not work out.
- Would like a hybrid scenario of high risk and waste prevention (one person said this and others nodded their heads).
- A two-tiered approach would be useful, depending on the existing opportunities in the community. The plan should include more assistance for continuing operational expenses.
- Waste prevention is a logical strategy, however, without convenient and stable disposal alternatives for HHW materials – it won't be a successful strategy. Go for waste prevention in counties with facilities and focus on basic services for other counties.
- One stakeholder said he put one dot on collection and one on high risk. He said if there is a high risk and no existing collection, then either DEQ or the local government will provide collection.
- The high risk scenario may be arbitrary and confusing for many Oregonians.
- More emphasis should be placed on product stewardship and less on behavior modification.
- DEQ should pay attention to high risk problems and effective ways to reduce those risks.
- Another stakeholder said he thinks the High Risk Focus should be the top priority, and gave Waste Prevention the second priority because education and product stewardship initiatives are a long process and in the short-term we need to focus on high risk hazardous waste.
- Scenario 3 and 4 lack the focus necessary for the program to effectively support achievement of DEQ's Priority 3: protecting human health and the environment from toxics.
- Plan should maybe be a composition of these scenarios because finite funding cannot solve all of the problems – need to have some type of baseline service to address needs. Education/outreach is a much longer timeframe – benefit of collection event is immediate (waste contractor comment).
- How does high risk get determined? What if someone brings in non high risk material to a collection event? Do you not take it? This would be difficult to explain to a customer.

Abby explained that DEQ would look at population, environment, and materials to determine risk. The stakeholder said that DEQ will likely find that they cannot determine high risk or that there are only a few high risk areas and questioned if the priority assessment was an efficient use of resources.

- David: Over the next five years DEQ will spend 2 million supporting collection. DEQ still collects latex paint at almost all events and in many circumstances it is not hazardous. Current program marginally reflects risks. David suggests that right now the HHW program makes decisions based on risks. If DEQ can improve the HHW program (achieve 10% improvement) by reducing the hazard per dollar spent, it would be like adding 10% to budget. David thinks they could do better, closer to 20% or 30% improvement, which would be like adding \$400,000 or \$500,000 to the budget. This justifies spending \$50,000 on the priority assessment.
- Are we looking at acute pesticide issues or long-term chronic exposures – how will DEQ measure human health risks? David: DEQ will not be able to measure risk directly, that would be much too complicated; however, DEQ can use tools developed that allow for relative evaluation of relative impacts of certain wastes. Even if it's not a precise risk calculation, DEQ may be able to determine generally where money would be most effective.
- It is important to develop services in certain parts of the state; however, communities are looking at the state's role and want to know what can DEQ do that will be helpful to our area? For metro – the state's involvement in waste prevention would help the most and provide the best return. Metro is looking at how DEQ's direction could help Metro reduce their costs and thinks that other counties will look towards Metro for the same. Sees a lot of leverage around waste prevention.
- Counties with collection process in place will have much different priorities than counties without permanent collection facilities. Abby explained that DEQ is trying to determine how to serve all communities or how to make decisions on which communities to serve; she said this is one of the questions DEQ is asking stakeholders.

Menu of Options

Stakeholders were each given six green dots and two red dots to choose their most preferred options. Stakeholders used red dots to signify options that they did *not* want included in the plan. The options that stakeholders preferred the most include:

- Fund local plans that target high-risk hot spots and the management of high-hazard materials;
- Target education and outreach to high-hazard materials and high-risk populations and geographic areas – including waste prevention education;
- Develop a comprehensive program to reduce the use of hazardous products and generation of hazardous wastes;
- Engage manufacturers and retailers to assist with educational efforts and to modify the HHW content of their products;
- Provide grants, technical support, and other incentives to local governments to facilitate implementation of their HHW plans and support their collection programs; and
- Explore lower-cost options for integrating HHW collection with municipal solid waste collection (e.g., lockers at transfer stations).

Options that stakeholders expressed the most reservations about include:

- Limit DEQ collection events exclusively to high-hazard materials in high-risk locations;
- Limit the facility reimbursement program to out-of-area wastes that are high-hazard only;
- Increase the use of the statewide hotline through better promotion (although the hotline was clearly not well understood by many stakeholders); and
- Focus educational efforts on proper disposal and locations – less emphasis on prevention and reduction.

In the following tables, numbers in parentheses represent options that stakeholders expressed opposition to (red dots).

Scenario 1: High Risk Focus – Menu of Options

Potential Options	
1. Conduct a study to establish funding and program priorities based on relative risks to human health and the environment, considering such factors as material toxicity, vulnerable & highly exposed populations, sensitive ecosystems, routes of exposure, and geographic areas.	2
2. Fund local plans that target high-risk hot spots and the management of high-hazard materials.	10
3. Fund facilities that collect high-hazard materials from geographic hot spots.	0
4. Limit DEQ collection events exclusively to high-hazard materials in high-risk locations	(6)
5. Purchase and distribute lockers to collect high-hazard materials in remote locations.	(1)
6. Limit the facility reimbursement program to out-of-area wastes that are high-hazard only.	(5)
7. Expand the mercury collection program.	2
8. Target education and outreach to high-hazard materials and high-risk populations and geographic areas – including waste prevention education.	8
9. Continue or expand product stewardship initiatives that focus on high-hazard materials (e.g., mercury).	7

Scenario 2: Waste Prevention First – Menu of Options

Potential Options	
1. Apply the principles of community-based social marketing to develop a comprehensive program to reduce the use of hazardous products and generation of hazardous wastes.	10
2. Provide local governments with specialized technical assistance to support local education and outreach efforts.	6
3. Increase use of the statewide hotline through better promotion.	(3)
4. Engage manufacturers and retailers to assist with educational efforts and to modify the HHW content of their products.	8 (1)
5. Evaluate effectiveness of educational programs and modifies efforts as needed by conducting surveys of household awareness & behavior.	3

Scenario 3: Basic Collection – Menu of Options

Potential Options	
1. Establish need-based criteria for selecting DEQ collection events, including frequency provisions, convenience, materials to cover, and population served.	4
2. Provide grants, technical support, and other incentives to local governments to facilitate implementation of their HHW plans and to provide support for their collection programs.	8
3. Facilitate intergovernmental agreements for HHW disposal.	3 (1)
4. Provide limited reimbursements for accepting out-of-area wastes.	6
5. Modify state contract to help provide cost-effective contractor support for permanent local collection facilities	2
6. Focus educational efforts on proper disposal, locations, etc. (how-to); less emphasis on prevention/reduction in use.	(3)
7. Engage manufacturers and retailers to help support collection services, including take-back programs and other retailer-based initiatives.	6 (1)
8. Explore lower-cost options for integrating HHW collection with municipal solid waste collection – e.g., lockers at transfer stations.	8

Menu of Options – Discussion

- The hotline is a great reference tool.
- People may be less likely to use the phone than a website to obtain HHW information.
Scott said that the Metro hotline receives over 100,000 calls per year. A lot of people use the web, including small businesses - they prefer using the web to the hotline. For residents, having a service 6 days per week with a live person at the other end is valuable. Metro watches the hotline information closely – think they are offering a high quality service.
- Need to get manufacturers and retailers invested in the management of wastes they produce and sell.
- Disposal bans should be included in these strategies and should be drivers of the HHW program.
- Limited reimbursements for out-of-area waste sounds like a recipe for having local elected officials opposing service to neighboring jurisdictions.
- Stakeholders don't like the word limit and do not want to limit collection. If paint or similar materials are not allowed at collection events, then the public will be discouraged from bringing in smaller amounts of more toxic materials. This is why one stakeholder does not want to limit collection. If people cannot bring in latex paint it may limit participation at collection events.
- What materials are considered high risk – pesticides and mercury? What materials are excluded from high risk?
- If DEQ cannot quantify risk then HHW collection should not be limited.
- Collection events should not be limited because people will illegally dump where there are no collection events.
- Need to account for people moving around the state. People need to be able to identify risks from use, storage, and disposal of HHW – DEQ should focus on education rather than disposal.
- Target HHW – separate out other materials such as agricultural waste.

Attachment B
June 7th Stakeholder Meeting
Stakeholder Comments Via Email

Stakeholders who did not attend the June 7th meeting in Salem were sent a brief survey by email to obtain feedback on their preference for the plan goal, scenario, and menu of options. The following stakeholders provided feedback via email:

John Beane, Coos County
 Susan Christensen, DEQ
 Scott Fairley, DEQ
 Shari Harris-Dunning, DEQ
 Mike House, Klamath Regional Disposal

Lucie La Bonte, Curry County
 Terri Peterson, Douglas County
 Mike Riley, Non-profit
 Timm Schimke, Deschutes County
 Cheryl Westgaard, Coos County

Stakeholders were asked which of the four plan scenarios they preferred – “A” representing the most preferred scenario and “D” representing the least preferred scenario.

Scenario	A	B	C	D
(1) High Risk Focus. Focus HHW programs on those materials and situations that represent the highest risk to human health and the environment.	2	3	2	3
(2) Waste Prevention First. DEQ funds education, promotion, and product stewardship activities designed to achieve behavior and market change.	4	3	3	
(3) Basic Collection Service. DEQ determines acceptable minimum service levels and provides needs-based support for local governments and allocation of DEQ HHW collection events.	4	3	2	
(4) Status Quo/Baseline. DEQ focuses on meeting the request of local governments for collection events, grants, and technical assistance. Services are based on local government demand.	1	1	2	7

Stakeholders were asked to choose options under each scenario that they preferred (in black) and options to which they were opposed (in parenthesis). There was no limit to the number of options under each scenario that stakeholders could choose.

Scenario 1: High Risk Focus

Potential Options	
1. Conduct a study to establish funding and program priorities based on relative risks to human health and the environment, considering such factors as material toxicity, vulnerable & highly exposed populations, sensitive ecosystems, routes of exposure, and geographic areas.	2(2)
2. Fund local plans that target high-risk hot spots and the management of high-hazard materials.	5 (1)
3. Fund facilities that collect high-hazard materials from geographic hot spots.	3 (1)
4. Limit DEQ collection events exclusively to high-hazard materials in high-risk locations	1(4)
5. Purchase and distribute lockers to collect high-hazard materials in remote locations.	5 (1)
6. Limit the facility reimbursement program to out-of-area wastes that are high-hazard only.	2(3)
7. Expand the mercury collection program.	4
8. Target education and outreach to high-hazard materials and high-risk populations and geographic areas – including waste prevention education.	4 (1)
9. Continue or expand product stewardship initiatives that focus on high-hazard materials (e.g., mercury).	6

Scenario 2: Waste Prevention First

Potential Options	
1. Apply the principles of community-based social marketing to develop a comprehensive program to reduce the use of hazardous products and generation of hazardous wastes.	7
2. Provide local governments with specialized technical assistance to support local education and outreach efforts.	8
3. Increase use of the statewide hotline through better promotion.	3 (2)
4. Engage manufacturers and retailers to assist with educational efforts and to modify the HHW content of their products.	5
5. Evaluate effectiveness of educational programs and modifies efforts as needed by conducting surveys of household awareness & behavior.	5

Scenario 3: Basic Collection Service

Potential Options	
1. Establish need-based criteria for selecting DEQ collection events, including frequency provisions, convenience, materials to cover, and population served.	5 (1)
2. Provide grants, technical support, and other incentives to local governments to facilitate implementation of their HHW plans and to provide support for their collection programs.	7
3. Provide grants for collection trucks or other options to serve outlying areas.	7
4. Facilitate intergovernmental agreements for HHW disposal.	5
5. Provide limited reimbursements for accepting out-of-area wastes.	2 (2)
6. Modify state contract to help provide cost-effective contractor support for permanent local collection facilities	4 (1)
7. Focus educational efforts on proper disposal, locations, etc. (how-to); less emphasis on prevention/reduction in use.	3 (1)
8. Engage manufacturers and retailers to help support collection services, including take-back programs and other retailer-based initiatives.	5
9. Explore lower-cost options for integrating HHW collection with municipal solid waste collection – e.g., lockers at transfer stations.	7