



Stakeholder Meeting

A detailed summary of DTSC's successful October 1999 Stakeholder Advisory Group (Stakeholder Meeting) Meeting follows. Meeting notes along with a list of attendees will be placed on the ETV Web site.

DTSC's October 17, 1999 Stakeholder Meeting focused on alternative futures for the Pilot. The agenda included speakers from several state programs interspersed with comments from the variety of participants (from industry, nonprofit research and public interest groups, and a variety of state and federal agencies). DTSC's Jim Allen, Chief of OPPTD and meeting facilitator, opened by stating that the Program is facing a funding limitation as the EPA Cooperative Agreement funding expires October 2000. Therefore, it will need input on future program alternatives such as continuing to use state staff, partnering with others, or spinning off into the private sector.

Norma Lewis of U.S. EPA presented an overall update on ETV. A major report is due on the ETV Program to Congress in 2001 which will focus on the value provided by the ETV Program. Summaries of lessons learned and feedback from vendors were followed by input from vendors present. Although the vendors wanted more marketing, it was generally agreed that marketing of the whole program was most appropriate. Public interest representatives noted that increasing awareness of new technologies was particularly important for site cleanups.

Greg Williams of DTSC described the differences between U.S. EPA Verification and Cal/EPA Certification. He also described the objectives of certification, and two recently verified/certified technologies; Rayovac's rechargeable alkaline battery system and SMarTsonic's aqueous printed circuit board stencil cleaning system. He mentioned both an existing partnership with the Interstate Technology and Regulatory Working Group (ITRC), and provided handouts describing actions taken since the last stakeholders meeting.

Terry Escarda of DTSC briefly outlined potential funding sources for the state program. These include small fees on consumer items that eventually become hazardous waste, such as batteries or fluorescent tubes. Advantages: polluter pays, easy to collect, address problematic waste streams, and precedents already exist (e.g. motor oil fee, tire fee, bottle deposits).

Michael Jacobson reviewed the variety of environmental technology verification programs and funding mechanisms in use. Programs vary in their structures (from in-house to contracted-out reviews) and in funding. Most have more outside funding than California. This includes the Massachusetts Strategic Technology Evaluation Program (MassSTEP) model which relies on state funding. Mr. Jacobson recommended focusing on the value added of evaluation.

Public interest representatives said a major barrier to cleanups is community acceptance of technologies; nonetheless, others said that ETV is voluntary. Some said verification/certification should collect data needed by state permittees. Improving program efficiency is difficult although partnerships, outsourcing and generic protocols were mentioned.

Claire Barker described the MassSTEP as more technology commercialization than verification. It provides technical, business, regulatory, and technology transfer activities to help get promising technologies to market. Clients support the program, which is funded by the legislature. The program involves university/agency partnerships.

Nancy Uziemblo of Washington State said their program was started to help clean up U.S. DOE's Hanford radioactive waste site. Technology demonstrations/competitions, and multi-state/agency cooperation all focus on deploying good technologies. Public interest representatives were concerned about the use of such processes (e.g. plasma arc) and emphasized the need for public

involvement.

DTSC's Wolfgang Fuhs described ISO Guide 65 and reciprocity issues. He discussed goals, alternative governing structures, and staffing for certifications and quality management. He also listed the pros and cons of the certification body being 1. within the agency; 2. independent; or 3. private, not for profit entities. Dr. Fuhs concluded that compliance with ISO was desirable and mentioned steps (additional documentation and performance monitoring) to achieve that.

General discussion followed on: using Technology Development staff to assist other state programs (e.g. site mitigation with arsenic in water), program marketing (industry supported) via state agencies, and deployment via nonverification services.

Conclusions:

- High level support is needed; the California program should not dilute its quality because of funding problems.
- Public interest representatives recommended greater public involvement in selecting technologies for addressing problems, especially remediation.
- Strategic partnerships were strongly recommended (Universities and California Trade and Commerce Agency).
- Increased marketing would be helpful.