

Sustainable Statewide Waste Backhaul February 11, 2016 Meeting Summary

Participation The meeting was well attended and well-represented by communities and agencies, with a total of 51 participants from all Alaska regions except North Slope, five transporter/recycler industries, five State agencies, and ten federal. An attendance list with affiliations is attached.

Description The day started off with an introduction on the need for backhaul, focusing on health risks and the financial/logistical basis for a practical lack of other options for hazardous wastes. Next, a summary of efforts towards backhaul was presented, and finally the framework for a statewide program was reviewed, including the 5 precepts. The early morning session was very well received, with a number of attendees new to the waste issues that rural villages face.

For the second half of the morning, attendees broke into roundtables to brainstorm different solutions to some of the main problems that stymie a statewide program and/or contribute significantly to the issue. In particular agency ideas were sought to incorporate, modify, or support the framework. After lunch, a report-out of the morning breakouts was presented, followed by a presentation by Dennis McLerran on the importance of agency partnerships, the critical need for backhaul, the belief that a sustainable backhaul program is possible with that collaboration, and the high priority that Region 10 EPA, and he personally placed on such a program. Attendees were then randomly assigned to two additional roundtables in the afternoon that focused on agency coordination and the ways in which agencies particularly could contribute to the framework. At the end of the day, groups were assigned the task of writing down the action items they felt necessary to developing the program.

Comments in general Participants liked the Framework. There were no substantive arguments against any of its tenets. Many of the breakout table comments simply reiterated the Framework, and the bulk provided thoughtful ideas to help plan and execute it. Multiple parties expressed great enthusiasm for the effort in general, and the meeting and the momentum it created in specific. A common theme in plenary discussions was “to keep the conversation going”.

Concerns expressed were mainly economic in nature – whether the program could become sustainable for various reasons. For example, concerns as to the commodity market condition and the ability to bring any revenue to the program were expressed. The fact that federal equipment could not be used for solid waste services or in-kind was a concern, as was the fluctuating ability of industry to provide discounted services. Doubt surfaced as well whether sufficient donations could be found-- if the Native Corporations would not buy in. Finally, one agency representative asked whether it was the agencies who had the role of assisting communities via grants, in-kind services, or other help and, while fully supporting the idea of a statewide program, the Framework, and agency responsibility for agency waste generation, felt the burden of funding, or seeking private funding, should fall solely on communities.

Specific comments These fell into six main categories that can form the basis for a plan.

- 1. Communication/Education** The consensus was nearly every sector needed education and outreach, whether it was the communities on how commodities worked for more efficient staging, transporters and contractors on the health and environmental risks avoided by backhaul, Interior Department on their stake in backhaul, or Native corporations on the needs of communities in making the program a reality. Several comments were given regarding renaming the Control Tower to Watch Tower or Logistics Broker, and rebranding the entire program as an Arctic Strategy.
- 2. Planning and Structuring of the Program:** A number of suggestions emerged that are helpful or could be promising, such as the State potentially creating its own re-use market for materials where there is no market (e.g. waste tires to roads), exploring a more prominent role for the schools as reliable facilities with internet, staff, infrastructure, changing GSA procurement, and rewarding the Tower with a % of profits. The importance of maximizing revenue from commodities that have market value to help pay for the program was stressed by industry. A question was raised as to whether the tower or program itself should be a for-profit corporation primarily for this reason. Although the larger consensus was that the program should be operated efficiently to maximize revenue, but that tax deductions for donors were essential. Many participants incidentally agreed in various voiced ways that C& D waste from projects should not be the community's burden and that either through

contracts or State or Federal policies, waste backhaul or disposal should be included as a project cost. Finally the need itself for a plan was expressed, for action direction and funding purposes.

- 3. Implementation Stage:** A number of sensible suggestions were posited with no common theme. These included resources for the Tower, a shared certified worker for neighboring villages, and a hands-on, field heavy role as needed for the regional coordinator.
- 4. Funding** A number of funding suggestions were policy related and require long-term work, such as tax credits, fees on material importation, business licensing, and Cradle to Grave, and will require long-term work. Others suggestions focused on local community actions such as user fees, project fees, right of way fees, and local entity partnerships. Promising opportunities were suggested with USACE and Airforce training, USACE help with NALEMPS partnering, Federal agency payment to villages for waste management services.
- 5. Partnering** Promising partnering opportunities discussed include fish processing plants, USPS Blue Earth (for Federal facilities) and printing services, Regional non-profits, Housing authority contracts, National Guard, Air Force.
- 6. Collaboration among agencies** Ideas brought up included forming an inter-agency workgroup or expanding on the one essentially started at the meeting, developing MOU's, coordination leads by Denali Commission or the Federal Executive Association, Convening a high level meeting that among other tasks ensures a waste clause in GSA procurement, and the use of a shared database.

Action Items The below action items as ranked by 22 respondents to a followup survey denoted as community or agency, are green-shaded for top-five rank and orange-shaded for 6th – 10th rank. Top actions overall revolve around planning for and piloting the program and engaging the Native Corporations for funding. Agency and Community representatives differed quite a bit, and markedly so on some actions that are denoted in blue font. The full action list and ranking results are attached.

Action Item	Community Rank (9 total)	Agency Rank (10 total)	Overall Rank
Decide What Type of Entity will be Control Tower	1	16	6
Keep the Conversation going	13	7	9
Research, develop checklist for village preparedness	9	3	3
Develop and test run standardized training (use Village Checklist, Packaging requirements, vetting).	3	1	1
Develop a Train the Trainer (including test run) component	29	9	15
Start backhaul pilot. (Suggest with an existing regional program, half villages w/o need, half with need.)	5	5	5
High Level Agency Meeting to discuss issue and implement policies	10	29	20
Write Business Plan (with Return on Investment)	23	5	13
Send short email updates on backhaul project, use single Point of Contact both ways.	8	12	10
Create a compelling story PSA -- sort of like "Save the Children"	27	4	12
Organize Local communities in preparation of launching this plan	5	7	7
Engage Native Corps and approach for their support	4	2	1
Find an existing organization or create a new one that can accept donations and donations are managed by 3rd party.	13	9	8
Develop a Regional Coordinator job description that can be used by regions now to support/hire someone, and by the statewide backhaul program when ready.	2	12	4
Create an agency coordination workgroup -- Backhaul POC's	5	16	11

Survey performed courtesy of Zender Environmental and the Solid Waste Alaska Taskforce

February 11 Meeting Summary

Appendix A Meeting Attendance

Participant demographics : 51 people attended, including 10 regional backhaul program participants, representing every region except North Slope, 8 from Zender or SWAT, 5 from industry, 9 from EPA (including keynote), and 17 from other state and federal agencies for a total of 15 agencies (including EPA). Additionally, 3 participants sent same day regrets due to illness or travel restrictions, and asked to be included in all correspondence and next steps. Two other participants had RSVP'd attendance and did not attend.

Attendee List:

Lynn Zender	Zender
Kristin K'eit	Zender
Sean Peterson	Zender
Desirae Roehl	ANTHC/SWAT
Trisha Bower	DEC/SWAT
Rebecca Colvin	DEC/SWAT
Stephen Price	DEC
Anahma Shannon	Kawerak Region/SWAT
Ted Jacobson	RURALCAP/SWAT
Stan Tomaszewski	Maniilaq
Ranya Aboras	Lake and Peninsula Borough
Tyler Kornelis	Kodiak Area Native Association
Scott Anderson	Native Village of Port Heiden/BBNA region
Nathan Elswick	Anvik Tribal Council/Semi-regional backhaul lead/TCC region
Michael Ophiem	Seldovia Village Tribe/Chugachmiut region
Ava Marie-Grey Bear	Copper River Native Association
Victoria Kontangan	Unalakleet/National Tribal Caucus
Chris Price	QawalanginTribe of Unalaska/APIA region
Reilly Kozinski	Total Reclaim/Southeast region Backhaul
La'ona DeWilde	Interior Greenstar/TCC region/Central Recycling
Larry Zirkle	Total Reclaim
Don Hansen	AML/Adopt a barge
Nate Kruk	Central Recycling
Endil Moore	Crowley Marine
Paul Gillett	Naniq Global Logistics
Wenona Wilson	EPA
Sherry Kimmons	EPA
Tami Fordham	EPA
Dennis McLerran	EPA
Kathleen Salyer	EPA
Dianne Soderlund	EPA

Janice Sims	EPA
David Allnutt	EPA
Kim Katonica	EPA
Todd Hanley	AKDOT (State)
Robert Blankenburg	DEC (State)
Colleen Bickford	HUD
Charles D. Grant	FWS
Larry Phyfe	USACE
Jerry Ouzts	USACE
Givey Kochanowski	DOE
Melissa Taylor	DCRA (State)
Dave Worrell	DCCED (State)
John Anderson	AHFC Quasi-State)
Tracey Henga	FAA
Gary Meaders	FAA
Bill Heubner	NPS
Christopher Wilcox	NPS
Tasha Deardorff	USDA RD
Mark Eppihimer	USPS
Joe Sarcone	ATSDR/CDC

Appendix B Full ranking results for post-meeting on-line prioritization by 22 survey takers. (Courtesy of Zender Environmental and the Solid Waste Alaska Taskforce)

Answer Options	Community Rank (9 total)	Agency Rank (10 total)	Transporter Rank (1 total)	SWAT Rank (2 total)	Group Rank	Short-term (0 to 1.5 years)	Medium (1.5 - 4 years)	Long-Term (4+ years)
Decide What Type of Entity will be Control Tower	1	16		3	6	10	5	0
Identify Core Components (what adds the most value in the system, what aspects are most essential to good outcomes).	11	23		5	16	6	6	0
Write Elevator Speech for C-level (what is the short version that will bring them to the table and have them commit?)	27	33	5	5	30	6	4	0
High level GSA Discussion to discuss and implement policies on procurement	17	29		23	23	3	5	2
SWAT get a facebook page	23	26		26	27	7	2	1
Keep the Conversation going	13	7	5	23	9	10	1	1
Research, develop checklist for village preparedness	9	3	1	23	3	12	4	0
Develop and test run standardized training (use Village Checklist, Packaging requirements, vetting).	3	1	5	5	1	11	9	0
Develop a Train the Trainer (including test run) component	29	9	5	11	15	6	6	1
Start backhaul pilot. (Suggest with an existing regional program, half villages w/o need, half with need.)	5	5	1	5	5	7	8	0
Create chart of trainings and tap into trainings Associated General Contractors can provide	17	22		17	20	5	5	2
Federal programs and other eligible entities start using Blue Earth and Terra Cycle. Each POC find out who should initiate its use in their program/agency.	32	14		11	24	5	5	2

High Level Agency Meeting to discuss issue and implement policies	10	29		17	20	5	5	1
Write Business Plan (with Return on Investment)	23	5		30	13	6	6	0
Implement small fee in Right of Entry clauses to help with contracts.	30	29		11	31	3	5	3
State and federal agencies prioritize (better) their sharing information with villages on projects that can create wastes.	23	24		11	24	5	6	1
Send short email updates on backhaul project, use single Point of Contact both ways.	8	12		17	10	11	3	1
Make the procurement process include C & D wastes every time.	11	19		1	13	7	4	3
Create a compelling story PSA -- sort of like "Save the Children"	27	4		11	12	8	4	1
Organize Local communities in preparation of launching this plan	5	7	5	11	7	9	7	1
Engage Native Corps and approach for their support	4	2	1	3	1	13	3	1
Get Health Corporations to give in-kind of the environmental health staff	33	16		26	31	4	5	2
Make the procurement process include C & D wastes every time for State also (research how, organize meetings, information needed to do so.	31	24		5	31	4	5	2
Develop database that agencies can upload information to and access other agency info on that community. Password protectd	19	26		30	27	1	7	4
Have a central project plan depository such as at Alaska Community Database for all state, federal, tribal, city to use.	21	26		26	24	0	7	5
Get DOI agencies involved (BLM, BIA) due to large federal land holdings	13	19		30	18	6	2	3

Find an existing organization or create a new one that can accept donations and donations are managed by 3rd party.	13	9		2	8	6	7	1
Approach the Alaska Federal Executive Association to assist in organizing, galvanizing federal agencies.	21	19		5	20	4	7	0
Get Denali Commission to organize agency backhaul coordination and efforts.	26	11		17	18	2	6	3
Develop a Regional Coordinator job description that can be used by regions now to support/hire someone, and by the statewide backhaul program when ready.	2	12		17	4	10	5	2
Create an agency coordination workgroup -- Backhaul POC's	5	16		26	11	8	5	2
Reduce wharfage fees (this is an individual port effort that can be influenced by the right efforts)	19	32		17	27	6	4	2
Approach legislators to introduce tax credit for shippers and recyclers.	13	15		30	16	4	8	1
<i>Other suggested by survey taker:</i> Creating a rural Alaska representatives workgroup (not agency based).		34		34				
<i>Other suggested by survey taker:</i> Work with Alaska DEC to better manage waste in municipalities.		34		34				
<i>Other suggested by survey taker:</i> 1. Communicate 2. Educate 3. Begin Training		34		34				