

MassDEP Reduce & Reuse (R&R) Workgroup Virtual Meeting

Topic: Reduce & Reuse Action Plan methodology, prioritization and outline

Wednesday, January 27, 2021 | 10:00 AM – 11:00 AM | Meeting Summary

The R&R Working Group is a forum for discussion of source reduction and reuse regulations, policies, and programs in Massachusetts. The group was established to help in the development of a MassDEP Strategic Reduce and Reuse Action Plan as outlined in the [2030 Solid Waste Master Plan](#). To learn more about the working group and find past meeting materials, visit: [MassDEP Reduce & Reuse Working Group](#)

This meeting was held virtually and facilitated by Erin Victor, Environmental Analyst, MassDEP erin.victor@mass.gov. A total of 76 people participated in the 1/27/2021 meeting. The discussion sections reflect both written and spoken comments and questions from participants.

Agenda

- 10:00 AM – Welcome & Background
- 10:15 AM – Developing the R&R Action Plan
 - Prioritizing Strategies
 - Working Group Survey
 - Measuring Progress
- 11:40 AM – Q&A and Open Dialogue
- 11:55 AM – Announcements
- 11:00 AM – Adjourn

Meeting Recording and Presentation:

- Recording of the 1/27/2021 meeting can be found at: https://youtu.be/7E5_dnWKF8
- The presentation slide deck can be found at: <https://www.mass.gov/doc/presentation-reduce-reuse-action-plan/download>

Meeting Summary

- Erin Victor, MassDEP provided brief background on MassDEP Reduce & Reuse Working Group's goals, objectives, and previous working group meetings. Archived meeting materials can be found at: <https://www.mass.gov/lists/reduce-reuse-rr-working-group-archive>
- Outlined next steps for developing the Reduce & Reuse Action Plan, focused on the proposed methodology for narrowing down and prioritizing all the strategies discussed throughout the nine meetings held throughout 2020.
- **Proposed Prioritization Matrix:**

Criteria	Scale
Impact If this initiative is successfully implemented, how impactful will it be towards achieving our waste prevention and reuse goals?	High-Medium-Low
Feasibility What is the probability that the initiative will be successfully implemented and adopted given institutional and cultural barriers?	High-Medium-Low
Stakeholder Support What is the level of stakeholder support for this initiative?	High-Medium-Low

- **Impact:** If this initiative is successfully implemented, how impactful will it be towards achieving our waste prevention and reuse goals?
 - **Questions to consider:**
 - Does the initiative focus “upstream” – i.e. does it change the choice environment or mandate a change that applies to all entities or is it focused on individual consumers/companies/residents/organizations to voluntarily choose to opt-in
 - Is the initiative likely to significantly reduce the disposal of targeted material?
 - **Example:** A plastic bag ban that applies to all stores is more impactful than an educational campaign reminding people to bring reusable bags.
- **Feasibility:** What is the probability that the initiative will be successfully implemented or adopted given institutional, financial and cultural barriers?
 - **Questions to consider:**
 - How heavy of a lift is the action for the consumer/organization to adopt?
 - Does DEP have the authority and influence to implement?
 - Does it require legislation or a regulation change?
 - How large is the target audience and how does the scale impact the likelihood that the project will successfully be implemented?

- How administratively burdensome is the action for DEP staff – is it a one-time thing? Is it an ongoing initiative that needs maintaining over time?
 - How costly is this initiative considering both the initial start-up costs and any ongoing maintenance costs?
 - **Example:** A reuse directory similar to Choose To Reuse from Hennepin County, Minnesota that requires staff to keep and maintain an updated list of organizations and what items they accept/sell would require more staff time/resources than partnering with OSD to develop guidelines for durability in institutional procurement which would not require the same level of ongoing maintenance.
- **Stakeholder Support** – What is the level of stakeholder support for this initiative?
 - **Questions to Consider:**
 - Have R&R working group participants expressed strong support for this initiative?
 - Is this initiative one that will likely receive a lot of opposition or backlash – either from working group participants or other stakeholders?
- Outlined how the Reduce & Reuse Action Plan would be a “living document” and demonstrated the application that would allow people to filter the strategies and see progress updates in real time.
<https://airtable.com/shrU8oI1ZS7o6UVEZ/tblI7njLSccI0zTLK>
- Discussed how MassDEP will post all of the discussed strategies, including those that do not make it into the Reduce & Reuse Action Plan at this time. Invited Working Group participants to collaborate and consider taking on some of the valuable strategy ideas generated throughout the planning process
- Presented proposed measures for determining progress made on MassDEP’s Reduce & Reuse goals:

Performance Measures

Measuring the support MassDEP provides for reuse initiatives provided through Recycling Works, Recycling Business Development Grant (RBDG), Recycling Loan Fund, Micro-Grants, and SMRP Grant programs:

- **Proposed Measures**
 - # organizations supported (grant awards and technical assistance)
 - Total grant money requested and awarded to reduce/reuse initiatives
 - # of technical assistance requests for waste prevention or reuse support (indicator of demand)
 - # RecyclingWorks hotline calls related to waste prevention and reuse (indicator of demand)

- # of Recycling Loan Funds requested and total loan funding provided related to Reduce/Reuse

Outcome Measures (short term)

Proposed Measures:

- Results from Reuse Micro-Grants
- Results from Reuse related RDBG and SMRP Grants*
- % communities with access to a Library of Things/ Tool Lending Libraries
- % communities with access to regular Repair Events
- % communities with access to Swap Shops
- % communities with access to Zero Waste Events

Reporting Period:

- Updated every year (*or depending on grant period)

Outcome Measures (long term)

Proposed Measures:

- Survey of resident's attitudes and behaviors related to reduce and reuse
- Economic "health" of the reuse sector (Tufts Urban Environmental Policy project)
- Reduction in waste disposed (SWMP goal) - **reduce disposal by 30% by 2030 and 90% by 2050** (based on 2018 baseline measures)
- Reductions in the waste characterization based on priority materials (% and total disposal) – Spring 2023/Spring 2026

Reporting Period:

- Updated every 3-5 years

Discussion:

- Miriam Gordon, UPSTREAM shared comments sent to the authors of the federal BFFPP Act that provide some new ideas about how to get all business sectors that contribute single-use packaging to the waste stream to start transitioning to reusable or refillable packaging by 2030. This is a good model for state legislation and regulation. (See attached pdf appended to end of meeting summary)
 - How can states have the most impact on driving waste prevention? We realized we need to identify the business sectors that generate the most waste/single use packaging and then create performance metrics and outcome goals. UPSTREAM's recommendation is that states develop plans for addressing single use packaging and set up performance measures (i.e. achieve 5 percent reduction by 2026, 10% by 2030, etc) (it's analogous to TURA). Each year, you bring in more business sectors into the equation. The UPSTREAM Government Reuse Forum (GRF) has identified five sectors to target first: food

- service/takeout/delivery of prepared meals; consumer food and beverage products (grocery store); cleaning products, consumer personal care products; transportation/shipping of wholesale or retail goods.
 - They asked EPA to ask states to target these sectors first. But these five sectors are a guess; we need to do research on what actually are the five biggest contributors.
- Miriam Gordon also shared UPSTREAM's reuse directory here: <https://upstreamsolutions.org/reuse-businesses-directory>
- Kelley Dennings, Center for Biological Diversity: can we measure waste disposed per capita?
 - Yes, through our annual SWMP data updates.
 - Brooke Nash, MassDEP -Here are the annual solid waste disposal reports that DEP posts: <https://www.mass.gov/guides/solid-waste-master-plan#-solid-waste-data-updates->
 - Will Mbah, MassDEP - <https://www.mass.gov/doc/smrp-municipal-grant-application-guidelines/download>
 - Rachel Smith, MassDEP - Here is the PAYT map: <https://www.mass.gov/doc/map-how-much-trash-did-we-throw-out-in-2019/download>
- Janet Domenitz, MASSPIRG - In one of the first slides, it listed priority materials, and I don't think food/organics was one of them. If that's correct, why not? Organics are a large part of what's being disposed of.
 - Yes, food waste/organics is a priority under the 2030 SWMP. However, there is a separate Organics Work Group that is addressing waste prevention of this material stream in the Organics Working Plan which is why the R&R working group didn't tackle this topic as to not duplicate efforts.
 - <https://www.mass.gov/doc/massachusetts-organics-study-action-plan-february-2017/download>
 - <https://www.mass.gov/service-details/massdep-organics-subcommittee>
- Fritzie Nace - Is there a legislative advocacy group for waste reduction along the lines of 350.MA?
- Miriam Gordon, UPSTREAM - UPSTREAM and Conservation Law Foundation are launching Reuse Coalitions in Boston, Providence, VT and other parts of New England. If you want to learn more, please contact me. These will be advocacy organizations for reuse and source reduction
- Will Mbah, MassDEP - <https://www.mass.gov/doc/smrp-municipal-grant-application>
- Mark Auterio, Habitat for Humanity ReStore -Is there an educational component for companies doing business in the state? Materials letting them know easy ways that they can cut back on waste within their industries and how to calculate the waste reduced?
- Irene Congdon, central mass MAC - The Living document is great.
- Khrysti Barry, CET - RecyclingWorks has business sector assistance info: <https://recyclingworksma.com/how-to/business-sector-guidance/>

- Irene Congdon, Central Mass MAC - Idea for measuring - Leading - add webinars/networking opportunities - how many reuse groups are joining each year. Leading - having a contact list there are some organizations that are established and do not get grants or need assistance
- Khrysti Barry, CET - what about incorporating our many repair businesses (appliance repair, tailors, etc) into the mix to ask for quarterly reporting on how many Xs and Ys they repaired in that quarter to get some idea of numbers for how often people choose to pay for repair instead of disposal (b/c we generally have at least some disposal numbers for a lot of the materials I think) and/or some sort of incentive for those businesses to participate in this reporting
 - Erin Victor, MassDEP - This would be a great way to measure reuse, however would be difficult to collect. While # of items repaired would be quite difficult, with the economic reuse study and potential reuse directory – it may be possible to measure the number of repair businesses in the state.
 - Camilla Elvis, Cambridge DPW - For the reuse directory - you could ask when the business opened to get some idea of the rate vs. added to the directory. (though I bet it would be incomplete data)
 - From Peter Mui Fixit Clinic - Fixit Clinic is part of a global initiative to collect repair data <https://openrepair.org/news/open-repair-data-standard-version-0-1/>
 - We collect through this "Broken Item" form: <http://bit.ly/brokenitemreport>
- Irene Congdon, central mass MAC - Outcome measure- short term. Suggest adding not just community access but local access. Add furniture and building materials. We have some big organizations that are on state contract, they have numbers they keep, it would be great if they could fill out a re-trac annual survey.
- Peter Mui Fixit Clinic- France has just instituted a product “reliability index”, we hope to use consumer-reported repair data to audit/challenge the manufacturer-reported ratings.
- Irene Congdon, central mass MAC -outcome measure- long-term. Add a survey to targeted groups like haulers, Chambers and others
- Miriam Gordon, UPSTREAM - Some thoughts on performance metrics- how we measure for ourselves.... # of people served by a reuse program, # of businesses served, quantity of units of products transitioned from single-use to reuse, or eliminated. Also, the per capita measure that Kelly suggested is a good baseline for the state. It is weight-based. We need to be careful that performance metrics don't incentivize reducing waste by light-weighting because it results in more plastics- so the baseline measure in weight is useful, but the requirements should be to reduce waste by units.
- Louise Amyot -In my simple life as a retired person, the bulk of non-recyclable materials is the supermarket. Meat, fish, even veggies and fruit, especially organic produce, are almost all packaged in plastics, often foam plastics which cannot be recycled. Isn't this an area that should be considered for action?
- Charlie Flammer -The Massachusetts 2050 Roadmap bill addresses climate change by not only reducing greenhouse gas emissions but also depends on sequestering carbon in

our forests. Because preserving forests plays an important role, it's important to reduce demand for wood. What is being done to be more effective at recycling wood rather than incinerating or landfilling it? Incineration not only creates more demand for wood products but generates carbon dioxide. How effective are transfer stations at recycling wood?

- Maryam Kamangar, Goodwill of Berkshires -raised concern about grants that do not provide funds up front. They looked at MassDEP RBDG grants and micro grants; we closed for 3 months as a non-essential business but people didn't stop dropping stuff off in their parking lot. We had to warehouse this stuff; then sort after we reopened 3 months later; but we had to adhere to Covid guidelines (40%, then 25% capacity for employees). We couldn't sort fast enough to get through backlog and manage continuing inbound stream of donations. We had to rent 2 other warehouses to store materials. We are using our own savings to manage this material. Unlike restaurants, which closed and didn't incur costs, we closed but kept receiving goods (without any cash flow). Are there any grants to help orgs like GW to offset our costs? Please email me with any ideas mkamangar@goodwill-berkshires.org.
- Mark Auterio, Habitat for Humanity: sales are way up (about 50% over last year, because donations are way up); I'm concerned about educating the public; we try to educate our customers about repair, reuse, repurposing. Will the SWMP address this need?
- Peter Mui, Fixit Clinic -@Maryam Kaman-gar at Goodwill brings up an interesting question: when are "donations" = illegal dumping?
- Sharon Martens, Household Goods -At Household Goods we post signs saying that leaving donations when we are closed is illegal dumping.
- Khrysti Barry, CET - good point... does encouraging reuse via donation = putting more onus on donation centers to filter household "trash", and therefore should there be some public waste money available for them for that role.
- Aimee Giroux, Greater Springfield Habitat for Humanity - Our ReStores have the same issues as the Goodwill with illegal dumping and need for additional funds and storage to process donations
- Mark Auterio, Habitat for Humanity ReStore - My Habitat store also had so much stuff left in the parking lot that our cost went off the charts for dumping. We had had to rent trailers for a bit.

Next Meeting:

Date: Wednesday, February 24, 2021

Time: 10AM – 12 PM

Topic: Review barriers & strategies from 2020 working group meetings

Location: Virtual,

Register: <https://zoom.us/meeting/register/tJ0tc-GprTsjGNS7FcjJE05OqC18nzBRs98y>

Announcements:

Valentine's Day Virtual Fixit Clinic

February 13, 2021 @ 1PM EST

hosted by Harvard University

[https://urldefense.com/v3/_https://www.facebook.com/events/194779578759858/_;!!CUhgQOZqV7M!y3cmPIE0YJqyEgYBWdNIwZVnzm_GlkVJ-yuHK4uYYCLGvNBxYr_geRYcmNkj1V9d8iY\\$](https://urldefense.com/v3/_https://www.facebook.com/events/194779578759858/_;!!CUhgQOZqV7M!y3cmPIE0YJqyEgYBWdNIwZVnzm_GlkVJ-yuHK4uYYCLGvNBxYr_geRYcmNkj1V9d8iY$)

Upcoming Zoom Fixit Clinics:

2021-02-13 Harvard University Cambridge MA US 1PM EST

2021-03-13 University of Minnesota Minneapolis MN US 1PM EST

2021-04-17 San Leandro Public Library San Leandro CA US 2PM EST

2021-05-15 Brampton Library / Repair Café Toronto Brampton Ontario

Reduce & Reuse Working Group Networking Resources:

Reduce & Reuse Working Group participants are encouraged to connect with other members in-between meetings to collaborate, share resources, ideas, best practices, fact sheets and more.

R&R Working Group Directory

- Interested in joining the R&R workgroup? Sign up [here](#).
- Need to update your contact information? Email: erin.victor@mass.gov

Massachusetts Reduce & Reuse Network Listserv (Google Group)

- Join by emailing: ReduceReuseNetwork-MA+subscribe@googlegroups.com
- Email the listserv: ReduceReuseNetwork-MA@googlegroups.com

Contact

To learn more about the R&R Working Group, visit: <https://www.mass.gov/service-details/massdep-reduce-reuse-rr-working-group>

For questions, contact:

Erin Victor at erin.victor@mass.gov



January 26, 2021

Dear Senator Merkley and Representative Lowenthal:

Thank you for your leadership on the plastic pollution crisis and championing solutions with the Break Free From Plastic Pollution Act of 2020 (H.R. 5845 and S. 3263). The bill, as introduced, proposes many laudable strategies for reducing plastic pollution and is already the strongest plastics legislation introduced at the federal level in the U.S.

We met with staff from your and Senator Udall's offices in late 2020 to discuss amendments that would strengthen the protections to human health and the environment. Our organizations were invited to provide specific proposals and have already provided suggested language on the toxic substances and plastic bag ban language. In this letter, we are submitting recommendations on how to make source reduction a higher priority in the bill.

Source reduction embodies the concepts of reduce and reuse from the 3Rs solid waste hierarchy: Reduce, Reuse, Recycle. "Reduce" refers to preventing products from being generated that will become waste; whereas "reuse" means products used multiple times. In the 3Rs hierarchy, reducing and reusing are preferred to recycling and other waste management options since these actions reduce waste (and embedded resources) at the source and thus have the greatest impact.

In our throwaway culture, source reduction requires changing the status quo of systems that provide consumer goods and services. We are proposing provisions that will spur innovation to reduce the use of single-use packaging and spur a much needed transition to a new reuse and

refill economy that creates jobs, minimizes plastic and toxic chemicals, reduces litter and waste, and saves businesses money.

We are already seeing marketplace innovation towards more reuse and refill systems for consumer products. This legislation provides an opportunity to signal to producers to reinforce and expand early phase reuse/refill innovations. Without greater support for source reduction, the BFFPPP Act may perpetuate the status quo—a recycling and waste management approach, which has largely proven unsuccessful for plastic in particular. We offer the proposed amendments below to begin a conversation on the best strategies to shift away from a throwaway economy.

(1) Add New Requirements to Build a Reuse Economy In Part II of the Act, which Addresses the Reduction of Single-Use Products

We recommend adding a new section (12204) to Part II of the Act that establishes source reduction requirements for all business sectors, prompting them to move away from single-use materials and towards reusable or refillable products and systems. This section would:

- **Require states to create source reduction plans that achieve targets for reduction, reuse, and refill.** The Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) requires the EPA to sign off on state solid waste management plans. We propose amendments such that the EPA can only approve such plans if they demonstrate how certain industries will meet mandatory targets for reduction, reuse, and refill set forth in the next section.
- **Create requirements for reusable packaging and products.**
 - For the following 5 business sectors where reuse systems have already emerged and are accelerating in the marketplace, each individual company in that sector must use reusable packaging that is incorporated into a reuse/refill system at the following rates: 10% by 2024 and 20% by 2028. These sectors include (i) food service: take out, delivery of prepared meals, meal kits; (ii) consumer food and beverage products; (iii) consumer cleaning products; (iv) consumer personal care products; (v) transportation/shipping of wholesale and retail goods.
 - Within 2 years of the bill's enactment, the EPA must issue a report that identifies all the business sectors that contribute single-use packaging to the marketplace and estimates the share contributed by each sector. The report shall also identify: (i) options for transition to reusable systems over 2 and 5 year periods; and (ii) business sectors most able to transition to reuse/refill systems most expeditiously.
 - The EPA shall update the regulations every 2 years after enactment, incorporating additional business sectors into the reuse/refill requirements and establishing timelines for compliance. The EPA will continue updating such regulations every 2 years until all business sectors that place single-use packaging into the market have been regulated under this provision, but all business sectors will be included in these regulations by no later than 2030.
 - At the end of 2028 and every 4 years thereafter, the EPA must review and update the reuse/refill rates and timelines for compliance for business sectors currently under regulation. The required reuse/refill rates shall be gradually increased over time until single-use packaging is effectively eliminated.

Historically, performance metrics that lump reuse and recycling together allow producers to comply by focusing on recycling rather than on the more important but more challenging source reduction actions. For this reason, we believe the source reduction requirements should be included in Part II of the Act and separated from the producer responsibility program outlined in Part I.

(2) Modify the Definition of “Reusable” to Ensure actual Reuse and Avoid Toxic Chemicals

The current definition of “reusable” in the bill should be modified to account for the following key factors:

- **Durability.** We recommend requiring a design standard that sends a signal to the marketplace to move towards higher durability and higher reuse.
- **Actual use.** It’s not enough for products to be reusable, they must actually be reused. Otherwise, a producer can put durable products on the market that are designed as reusable without offering a return option, resulting in higher environmental impacts.
- **Non-toxic.** It is important to ensure that the transition to reusable materials does not increase exposure to toxic chemicals; any reusable packaging must be free of toxic substances as defined in the updated language previously submitted to your offices.
- **Washability.** Reuse is not possible in many sectors without the ability to properly wash and sanitize.
- **Recyclability.** In a circular system, products should be recyclable at the end of life, even reusable ones. But technical recyclability is meaningless if it can’t actually be recycled in a local system; a real world test is therefore needed for the recycling requirement.
- **Recycled Content.** Minimum post-consumer recycled content requirements should be included to support recycling markets.

We propose the following changes (additions in italics and deletions in strikethrough) to the current definition of reusable in section 12001 to address the issues described above:

“(18) REUSABLE —The term ‘reusable’ means, with respect to a covered product, *package*, or beverage container, that the covered product, *package*, or beverage container is— ~~“(A) technically feasible to reuse or refill in United States market conditions; (B) and~~
(A) designed to be Reusable reusable or refillable for such number of washing and sanitizing cycles, as the Administrator determines to be appropriate for the covered product, package or beverage container; and
(B) in a return program, whereby the product is returned to the retailer or producer to be reused or refilled in a system for such number of cycles (but not less than 20) as the Administrator determines to be appropriate for the covered product, package or beverage container; and
(C) shall not contain toxic substances; and
(D) safe for washing and sanitizing according to applicable laws; and
(E) capable of being recycled at the end of use in the local jurisdiction where the user resides where the user resides , with the exception of ceramic products; and
(F) shall contain minimum post-consumer recycled content as set out in Section 12302, with the exception of ceramic products.

We recommend you delete the phrase “technically feasible to reuse or refill in United States market conditions” because it provides an easy opt-out for producers. First, reuse or refill could be technically feasible without actually taking place, i.e. if reuse or refill systems are not put in place, just as “recyclability” does not ensure that recycling happens. An emerging marketplace of reusable consumer products delivery, like LoopStore™, or reuse systems for take-out food and beverages, and reusable transportation packaging is on the rise, but they are not yet widely available.¹ Second, we believe this legislation should be “technology forcing” and catalyze the growth of reuse as part of the new green economy.

In addition, the definition of the term “packaging” in section 12001 of the bill must be updated such that it is synchronized with the new reusability definition and concepts recommended in this letter. Simply excluding packaging with a 5 year lifespan from the bill could result in the use of more durable materials that aren’t *actually* reused.

(3) Add Additional Provisions to Further Encourage A Reduction in Plastic Usage

We believe the BFFPPA should include additional measures to further address the need for a reduction in plastic usage (the first “R” in the solid waste hierarchy of Reduce, Reuse, Recycle). These measures include:

A. Modifying the plastic bag ban and bag tax structures.

Please refer to the language previously submitted to your offices that would prevent a shift from thin plastic to thick plastic bags, limit reusable bags that are made of plastic, and ensure that bag tax structures effectively promote source reduction.

B. Strengthen Section 12202 to Ensure Reduction of Other Single-Use Products

Section 12202 (a) and (b) currently only address straws and utensils. We suggest that these sections encompass a wider range of foodware accessories including: utensils, chopsticks, napkins, condiment cups and packets, straws, stirrers, splash sticks, and cocktail sticks, designed for a single-use.

C. Create Financial Incentives for Unpackaging

Unpackaging is an impactful form of source reduction that includes such actions as (i) bulk product distribution; (ii) dewatering of products that can be rewatered by consumers after purchase; and (iii) the shipping of products purchased via e-commerce in their original packaging. We recommend that the Act create regulatory incentives for such kinds of unpackaging and similar source reduction measures. For example, the Act could impose a federal transportation tax based on volume and/or liquid weight, with the revenue flowing to a waste reduction fund.

Alternatively, the Act could include a tax break for companies that engage in unpackaging their products. For example, Section 12102(b)(3)(B)(v)(II) regarding producer responsibility organizations outlines considerations for the lower costs of managing containers and other covered products that are specifically designed to be reusable or refillable; and have a high reuse or refill rate. We suggest fleshing this

¹ A growing directory of reuse businesses can be found at: <https://upstreamolutions.org/reuse-businesses-directory>

section out more by providing specific incentives to producers for investments into reuse and refill systems. No matter how unpackaging incentives are structured, it's important to avoid light-weighting by transitioning to plastic as packaging "reduction."

In closing, we believe that the BFFPP Act can pave the way for reducing waste before it's ever created, as well as banning certain plastics and forcing producers to achieve higher recycling rates. To date, no producer responsibility law for packaging has ever achieved any meaningful source reduction. By adding in provisions that direct business sectors to achieve specific reuse requirements, this legislation can help to launch the transition away from a throw away to a reusable economy. We are available at your earliest convenience to discuss these recommendations.

Sincerely,

Kate Bailey , Founding Member
Alliance of Mission Based Recyclers

Judith Enck, President
Beyond Plastics

Nisreen Hussain, Senior Advocacy & Research Manager
BRINGiT

Grace Lee, ReThink Disposable Program Director
Clean Water Fund

Kathi King, Director of Outreach and Education
Community Environmental Council - Central Coast of California

Crystal Dreisbach, Executive Director
Don't Waste Durham

Sandra Ann Harris, Founder and CEO
ECOlunchbox

Denise Patel, U.S. Canada Program Director
Global Alliance for Incinerator Alternatives

Christy Leavitt, Plastics Campaign Director
Oceana

Sarah Doll, National Director
Safer States

Shell Cleave, Founder
Sea Hugger

Jennie Romer, Legal Associate - Plastic Pollution Initiative
Surfrider Foundation

Jan Dell , Founder
The Last Beach Cleanup

Leigh Williams, Co-founder
Toward Zero Waste NC

Miriam Gordon, Policy Director
Upstream

Alex Truelove, Zero Waste Director
U.S. PIRG

Derek Neilson, Chief Impact Officer
USEFULL

Heather Trim, Executive Director
Zero Waste Washington