Index

Access to waste reduction technology, IO4-105 Caustic soda, recycling of, 79 Acrylonitrile, and reduction of hazardous Center for Environmental Management (Tufts wastewater, 28, 29, 89, 90 University), 188 ADC Telecommunications, 220 Centers for Excellence (EPA), 185 Air and water regulatory programs, 53, 61; see Changing process technology, in waste also Clean Air Act, Clean Water Act reduction, 22, 28 Air Force, 189, 190 Chemical Manufacturers Association, 152 Air pollutants, 135, 140, 151-152, 154, 172-175, Chemicals 186; see also Air and water regulatory EPA regulation of, 181 programs; Clean Air Act Office of Toxic Substances inventory of, 181 proposed Federal survey of, 54-55, 72, 182 Alabama, 188, 204 Alternative Technologies Division (HWERL], State inventories of, 123-124 183-185 stripping, waste reduction technology and, 80 Amoco Chemicals Corp., 79 Toxic Substances and Control Act and, 122, Army, 189, 190 180-181 see also specific chemicals Aromatic hydrocarbons, 127 Auditing waste reduction, 92-94, 114-117, 184 Chesapeake Bay, toxic substances in, 18 Austria, waste reduction efforts by, 19, 239, Clean Air Act (CAA), 9, 11, 45, 46, 53, 65, 66, 240, 241 92, 99, 103, 118, 120, 134, 135, 139, 140, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 168, 169, 172-175 Best available technology economically Clean Water Act (CWA), 9, 11, 12, 45, 46, 53, achievable (BAT), 130, 177, 178, 179, 180 65, 92, 99, 103, 118, 120, 130, 134, 139, 146, Best conventional pollutant control technology 147, 148, 149, 150, 168, 169, 170-171, 173, (BCP), 177, 180 176-180 Best practicable control technology currently Cleo Wrap, 82 available (BPT), 177, 180 Code of Federal Regulations, 180 Bordon Chemical Co., 81, 91 Comprehensive Environmental Response, Bureau of Mines, 121, 183, 193, 194 Compensation, and Liabilities Act (CERCLA), see Superfund Cadmium Congressional Budget Office (CBO], 106 case study of, 132, 133-137 Connecticut, 35, 201, 202, 204, 205, 212, 215, industrial use of, 133 221 industry-level information on, 137 Cooling water, 90 legislation and regulations pertaining to, 133, Council on Environmental Quality, 146-147 134, 135-136 Cross-media approach to waste reduction, 18, national materials balance for, 136-137 51, 62, 124, 146, 147-148 substitutes for, 134-135 transport and transformation of, in the Daly-Herring Co., 81 environment, 135 Data and information, see under Waste California, 35, 159, 198, 201, 202, 205, 206, reduction 207-208, 209, 211, 212, 214, 219-220, 221, Defense Environmental Leadership Project 222 (DELP), 190, 191 California Hazardous Waste Reduction, Defense Logistics Agency (DLA), 190 Denmark, waste reduction efforts by, 240, 241 Recycling, and Treatment Research and Demonstration Act, 206, 213, 222 Department of Commerce (DOC), 175, 193 Canada, waste reduction efforts by, 19, 239 Department of Defense (DOD), 16, 27, 57, 97, Capital investment, in waste reduction 182, 189-191 technology, 30, 31, 32 Department of Energy (DOE), 182, 189, 191-192 Carbon adsorption, of solvents, 87-88 Department of Labor (DOL), 183, 192; see also Occupational Safety and Health Carrier Air Conditioning Co., 78-79 Case studies, of waste reduction, 85-86, 91-92, Administration 132-141, 166, 167, 191 Distillation/condensation, of solvents, 87-88

Diversified Printing Corp., 79
Domestic Sewage Exclusion, under RCRA, 170-171
Donnelley Printing Co., 79
Dow Chemical, 80, 83
Du Pent, 26, 78

Eaton Corp, 91
Economic considerations, of waste reduction,
5-6, 7-8, 14, 16, 18, 33, 38, 48, 50, 59-61, 63,
64, 65, 68-69, 70, 72, 83, 84-85, 93, 94, 96,
100-102, 103, 104, 116, 117, 153, 168, 169,
179, 183, 184-188, 191, 192, 209-210,
213-215

Effluent guidelines, under Clean Water Act, 177 End-of-pipe waste management, 62, 71, 83, 99, 113, 159, 176, 180, 186

End products (Approach 5), 82-83, 84, 86, 95 Environmental control media programs, analysis and comparisons of, 168-182 Environmental Fund (Europe), 238, 240 Environmental protection, under pollution control culture, 151-152

Environmental Protection Act (Sweden), 240, 241

Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), 5, 12, 14-18, 21, 27, 36, 39, 40, 45-73, 101, 119-123, 130-137, 140-141, 145-166, 169-186, 228

Environmental Quality Assessors, 212 Environmental research and development centers, State, 186-188

Europe

multilateral organizations in, 238 waste reduction efforts by, 19-20, 238-241 waste reduction efforts compared to United States, 19-20

European Council of Chemical Manufacturers' Federations, 238

European Seminar on Clean Technologies, 238 Exxon Chemical Americas, 81, 89

Federal chemical survey, proposed, 54-55, 72, 182

Federal Government, see U.S. Congress; U.S. Government; and specific Federal agencies, programs, and legislation

Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA), 147, 174, 181

Federal Register, 157, 159, 178

Federal Water Pollution Control Act, see Clean Water Act

Financial statements, reporting requirements for, 62-64

Florida, 204 France, waste reduction efforts by, 19, 239, 240,

Gallium arsenide (GaAs), 96
General Accounting Office, 151, 181
Georgia, 35, 201, 202, 209, 212, 213, 220, 221
Grants programs, for waste reduction, 59-61, 64, 70, 184, 185-186, 213-219, 221
Great Britain, waste reduction efforts by, 19, 230

Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments of 1984, see under Hazardous wastes and Resource Conservation and Recovery Act Hazardous Communication Standard, 192-193 Hazardous Materials Management and Resource Recovery Program (HAMMARR) (University of Alabama), 187-188 Hazardous Materials Transportation Act, 134, 139 Hazardous substances, 11, 24, 54-55, 62, 93,

Hazardous substances, 11, 24, 54-55, 62, 93, 114-116, 118, 119, 121, 123, 132-141, 167, 182; see *also* Hazardous wastes

Hazardous Waste Engineering Research Laboratory (HWERL), 183-185, 209

Hazardous wastes acrylonitrile and reduction of, 28, 29 approaches to reducing, 78-85 classification of, 62 composition of, 125 Federal policymaking and, 118-124

generic reduction of, 87-91 health effects of, 66-67 identification of sources of, 115-116 identification of types of, 114-115 lack of data on, 21, 113-114

land, disposal of, 34, 46, 49, 54, 105, 153, 167, 170-171, 183, 227, 228

measurement of waste reduction and, 23-24, 125-127

multimedia approach to, 4, 11, 18, 34, 50-51, 61, 62, 65

pollution control regulations and, 145-154 problems with definitions of, 3, 10-11, 101, 149, 155, 170

public attitudes toward, 100

and RCRA Amendments, 45-47, 102-103, 148, 149, 162, 163

statutory definitions of terms used for, 149 surveys of State facilities for, 168 taxation of, 56-57, 72 and waste reduction definitions, 8-10 see *also* Pollution control; Waste minimization; Waste reduction

Hazardous wastewater, acrylonitrile and reduction of, 28, 29 Health effects data on cadmium, 135-136 on trichloroethylene, 138, 140 Highlights of the Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments of 1984: The New RCRA Requirements, 162, 163 Hill Air Force Base, 80 Illinois, 35, 107, 188, 201, 202, 207, 212, 221 Illinois Hazardous Waste Research and Information Center, 188, 207 Impact analyses, for waste reduction, 53-54 In-process recycling (Approach 1), 78-79, 83, 84, 86, 95, 96, 105, 106, 227 In-process solvent recovery, 87-88 Incremental implementation of mandatory waste reduction, 56 Industrial Chemical Survey (New York), 54, 124 Industrial Waste Elimination Research Center (Illinois Institute of Technology and University of Notre Dame], 185 Industry air pollutant regulations for, 174-175 attitudes and opinions affecting, 100 compliance to waste minimization regulations by, 166-167 government procurement policies and, 57-58 government regulation as risk for, 29-32, 58 illustration of pollution control in, 150 implementation of waste reduction and compliance with pollution control regulations by, 24-25 lack of data as a barrier to action by, 24 new waste reduction legislation and, 60-61 OTA survey of waste reduction methods in, 27, 28, 34, 45, 47, 69, 78, 84, 86, 101, 106, 168, 227-237 potential for adverse effects on, by policy options, 72 potential for waste reduction opportunities in, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 90, 95; see also Case studies problems with measuring waste reduction data in, 20-24 problems with RCRA waste minimization amendments in, 15, 45-47 proposed approaches to waste reduction in, 78-83 proposed mandatory waste reduction in, 55-56 proposed research and dc~relopment in, 57 research and development in, 182-194 size, and corporate structure influences on,

97-98

status of clean water pretreatment standards in, 178 technology and information available to, 98-99 U.S. policy options, and, 37-41, 45-73 use of cadmium in, 133 use of trichloroethylene in, 138 use of water in, 89-91 voluntary waste reduction in, 32-33, 38-39, 40, 45, 55, 71, 73, 94 waste minimization plans in, 166-167 waste reduction auditing in, 93-94 waste reduction decisionmaking in, 92-103 waste reduction efforts by, 4-5, 12-16, 24-33, 45-47, 49-50, 60, 166-168 waste reduction information needs by, 114-117 ways to promote waste reduction in, 13 Industry/University Cooperative Research Center for Hazardous and Toxic Wastes (New Jersey Institute of Technology), 186-187, 188 Information and technology transfer, 31, 113-141, 182-194, 212-213, 215 Information and waste reduction, see under Waste reduction Inks, waste reduction technology and, 82, 105 Innovation waivers under Clean Air Act, 175 under Clean Water Act, 178 International considerations, 1!3-20, 57, 238-241 Inventory approach to waste reduction, 55 Investment-uncertainty barrier, to waste reduction, 84-85 Japan, waste reduction efforts by, 19, 239 Joint Logistics Commanders' Hazardous Waste Minimization Ad Hoc Working Group [JLC Working Group) (DOD), 189, 190-191

State waste reduction programs and, 197-223

Kentucky, 213

Lancey International, 79 Large businesses, OTA industry survey and, 227, 228 Legislation on cadmium, 133, 134, 135-136 definitions of hazardous waste terms by, 149 example of problems m'ith, in California, Z06 new, proposed for waste reduction, 61-62 on pollution control, 145-149 on trichloroethylene, 138, 139, 140 Superfund reauthorization, 122-123 see also U.S. Congress: U.S. Go\'ernment; and

specific acts of legislation

Ling, Joseph T., 7

Liquid processes, of waste reduction, 88-89 Literature, on waste reduction, 86, 91-92, 99,

116, 167 Loan programs, for waste reduction, 212, 215

Local governments, waste reduction efforts by, 14, 50, 59, 172, 198

Management, in waste reduction technology, 30, 31

Manifest system, for waste minimization, 155-156, 157, 158, 159, 164, 172

Maryland, 124

Mass balance calculations, 115, 121, 126, 127 Massachusetts, 201, 204, 205, 207, 208, 211, 212, 221

Massachusetts Source Reduction Program, 211 Materials handling, in plant operations, 81 Materials Safety Data Sheets (MSDS), 99, 121,

193

Materials substitution, 193

Measurement criteria, 125-127

Measurement, of waste reduction, 20-24, 124-130

Mechanical processes, of waste reduction, 88-89 Merck, Sharp & Dohme, 87

Michigan, 107, 204

Mine waste, EPA report to Congress on, 171 Minnesota, 35, 106, 107, 165, 197, 198, 201, 202, 204, 205-207, 208, 209, 210, 212-213, 214, 215, 220, 221, 222, 223, 241

Minnesota Hazardous Waste Reduction Grants, 213

Minnesota technical assistance program (MnTAP), 205-207, 208, 209, 214, 220, 221, 222

Minnesota Waste Management Board, 204, 214, 220

Monsanto, 83, 89, 125

Multimedia approach to waste reduction, 4, 11, 50-51, 61, 62, 65, 72, 73, 103, 152-154, 207, 216

National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS), 172-175

National Bureau of Standards, 183, 193-194 National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP), 172-175

National inventory of chemicals, 122-123, 124

National materials balance

for cadmium, 136-137

for trichloroethylene, 140-141

National Research Council, 24

National Science Foundation, 183, 193

Navy, 189, 190

Netherlands, waste reduction efforts by, 19, 240, 241

New Jersey, 106, 107, 122, 124, 165, 204, 205, 207

New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection, 222

New Jersey Hazardous Waste Facilities Siting Commission, 207, 222

New Jersey Industrial Chemical Survey, 122, 124

New Jersey Source Reduction and Recycling Task Force, 222

New source performance standards (NSPS), 172-174, 177

New York, 35, 106, 108, 197, 198, 201, 202, 205, 207, 212, 215, 220, 241

New York Industrial Financing Program, 215 New York Industrial Materials Recycling Program, 207

Nonregulatory framework, of State waste reduction programs, 211-212

Nonregulatory options, 131, 132

North Carolina, 34, 35, 36, 108, 197, 198, 201, 202, 205, 207, 209, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 218-219, 220, 222, 223, 241

North Carolina Department of Natural Resources and Community Development (DNRCD), 216-217

North Carolina Pollution Prevention Pays Program (NC3PP), 36

evolution of, 216

financial assistance under, 218

future of, 218-219

research and education under, 217-218 technical assistance under, 217

North Carolina Science and Technology Board, 217

North Carolina Technological Development Authority, 218

Norway, waste reduction efforts by, 19, 239-240, 241

Oak Ridge National Laboratory (Tennessee), 191, 192

Occupational Safety and Health Act (OSHA), 12, 66, 99, 121, 134, 139, 150, 181

Occupational Safety and Health Administration, 183, 189, 192-193

Off-the-shelf equipment, 99, 101-102

Office of Exploratory Research (EPA), 185

Office of Research and Development (ORD), 47-48, 57, 183, 209, 223

Office of Solid Waste (OSW), 47, 48, 64, 145, 153, 161-164, 183

Office of Technology Assessment (OTA) analysis of waste reduct ion audits by, 93-94, 99 analysis of waste reduction in the Federal Government, 145-194 analysis of waste reduction literature, 86, 116 case studies reviewed by, 132-141, 167 classification of types of waste reduction by, 115, 117-118, 180 industry surve~r by, 27, 28, 34, 45, 47, 69, 78, 84, 86, 101, 106, 168, 227-237 industry survey questionnaire used by, 230-234 Industr} Workshops held by, 227 issues and findings of, 20-41 summar~ and findings of, 3-41 results of State waste reduction survey. 199-200 survy of State waste reduction programs by, 197-223 and waste redu[;tion po]icy options, 48-73 Office of the Secretary (DOD], 190, 191 Office of Toxic Substances (OTS], 136, 181 Office of Waste Redu{:tion, proposed in EPA, 5, 40, ,58, 64, 69 Offic:e of Water Regulations arId Standards (OWRS], 135 Opcrating Gui(lan[:e FJ' 1987 (EPA), 126 OIJerations and 1)rI)du(:tion in ~vaste reduction technolog}r, 31, 77-78, 95 Organi(: sol~ents, replacement of, 87 Organization for Economic Cooperation and lle~relopment IO ECII], 238 $P_{[]11n}S_{]}, J_{17:111}i_{a}, \sim 35 106, 108, 172, 201, 203, 204,$ 2&J, 212, 215, 220, 241 Pennsyl\~ania Department of Environmental Resources, 172 Planning and reporting requirements for waste reduction, 52-53, 61, 62-64 Plant operations [Approach 3), 80-82, 86, 105 Plastic media paint stripping, waste reduction technology and, 80 Policy options (comparison of, 40-41, 71-73 congressional, 48-71 (:riteria for evacuating, 71-72 i nlprokr(~ regulator)' programs (Policy Option II], SII, 49, 52-58, 72, 73 new' strategy (Po] icy Option I 11], 39-40, 49, 58-71, 72, 73, 187 maintain (:urrent program (Pol icy Option I], 38-39, 49-52, 72, 73 sum marized, ~ 7-4 I

118-124 Pollutants, see Air pollutants; Pollution control; Water pollutants; and specific pollutants Pollution control air quality criteria for, 173 beginnings of, 146-147 Clean Air Act and, 172-175 Clean Water Act and, 176-180 cross-media shifts and, 146, 147-148 current system of, 148 evolution of a culture of, 145, 146 efforts by industry, 3, 4, 5, 24, 32, 55, 17LI-175 efforts by States, 3, 34, 69, 197-223 environmental protection under cult ure of, 151-152 Federal waste minimization policy and, 156 government spending on, iersus waste reduction, 153 illustration of, in industry, 150 primacy of waste reduction and, 7-19, 46, 104 proposed Office of Waste Reduction and, 64, RCRA and, 145-154, 168-172 regulation, and industrial implementation of waste reduction, 24, 32, 49-50, 51, 58, 102 regulations for air pollutants, 172-175 regulations for water pollutants, 176-180 and regulatory concessions for waste redu(; t ion compliance, 64-69 regulatory measures, 3-6, 7-8, 18, 21, 37, 48, 50, 55, 58, 61, 64-69, 100, 116, 118, 145-154 usefulness of current information on, 119 and waste reduction definitions. ~ see also Hazardous wastes: Waste minimization; Waste reduction Pollution Control Financing Guarantee (PCFG), Pollution prevention, 7-19, 58, 145-147, 152-154, 156, 173, 192, 197 pollution prevention pays program, North Carolina (NC3PP), 36, 216-219 Polyethylene, 103 Polyvinyl chloride (PVC), 12, 127, 134 Pre Manufacturing Notice (Phq N), 181 Preliminary Assessment Information RLIIc (PAIR), 122 Prescriptive approach to ~taste redu(; tion, :32-33, 38, 55, 56, 71, 178, 180 Pretreatment standards for clean water in industry, 178 \sim]_{rima}(;₁,, of \sim _{i[1}st₁, redu(:tiorl, 7-19, 34* 46 104~

Pri\ate organizations, grants program and, 60

Policymaking, Federal, information needed for,

168, 169

Process chemistry, mass balance calculations Santa Cruz County, California, 198 and, 126 Scovill, Inc., 82 Process inputs (Approach 4), 82, 83, 84, 96, 95 Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC), Process-specific waste reduction data, 127, 128 and reporting on waste reduction financial Process technology, 27-29, 30, 67, 77, 90, 95-97, statements, 62-64 Small Business Administration (SBA), 188, 187 Process technology and equipment (Approach Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) 2), 79-80, 83, 84, 86 Program, 185, 186 Process water, reducing the use of, 89-91 Small Business Innovative Development Act of Product/process redesign, 95-97 1982, 186 Production correlation, of waste reduction data, Small Business Investment Act, 187 Small Business Ombudsman Office (EPA), 209 Production technology, 77-78 Small Business/Small Quantity Generator Publicly operated treatment works (POTWs), 12, Initiative Program, 223 170-171, 176, 177 Small businesses OTA industry survey and, 227, 228 Recycling regulations, 171-172; see also Waste as target firms in State waste reduction recycling programs, 207-208 Regulatory concessions versus large businesses, 208 costs and benefits of, 68-69 waste reduction funding assistance for, 186, examples of, 67-68 State Waste Reduction Boards and, 69-71 Small quantity generators (SQGS), 159, 172, for waste reduction, 64-71 208-209, 212 Regulatory options, 131 Solvents Reporting procedures, for waste minimization, commercial equipment for recovery of, 87-88 155, 157, 158, 159, 164-165, 172 in-process recovery of, 87-88, 105 Research and development (R&D), in waste replacement of organic, 87 reduction technology, 30, 31, 39, 40, 52, 57, recycling of, 89 77, 83, 99, 173, 182-194, 227, 228 scrubbing of, 88 Research Centers Program (EPA), 185 trichloroethylene, 137-138 Research Grants Office (EPA), 185-186 Source reduction, 160, 172 Resource Conservation and Recovery Act Standard Industrial Classifications (SIC), 86, 227 Stanadyne Co., 22, 81, 125 (RCRA), 3, 5, 9, 10, 11, 17, 21, 24, 33, 89, 92, 124, 134, 139, 180, 182, 186, 189 State Waste Reduction Boards, proposed, 5, 40, effect of 1984 Amendments on States, 165-166 58-59, 69-71 EPA concern about flexibility in, 66 States highlights of new requirements under the biennial reporting of waste minimization by, 1984 Amendments, 162, 163 164-165, 222 and information collection, 120 budget size of waste reduction programs in, land disposal bans under, 170-171 209-210 pollution control and, 145-154, 168-172 chemical inventories by, 123-124 proposed to strengthen requirements of, 52-53 definitions of waste reduction provided by, recycling regulations under, 171-172 State waste reduction programs and, 201-219, effect of RCRA Amendments on, 15, 185-186 effectiveness of waste reduction programs in, 221-223 survey on hazardous wastes under, 152 219-221 waste minimization under, 15, 45-47, 49, 52, existing waste reduction programs and planning efforts by, 197, 198-201 102-103, 105, 113, 132, 154-166, 167, 172, facility siting and, 104 waste reduction forecasts and, 106 Federal cooperation in waste reduction programs in, 197, 221-223 Saco, Maine, 198 financial assistance by, 213-215 Safe Drinking Water Act, 12, 134, 139, 147, 150, funding for small businesses in, 209

funding for small quantity generators in, 209

generalizations about waste reduction programs in, 201-215 grants program in, ,59-61, 213-219, 221 i n formation and technical assistance by 212-213 information collection by, 215 i n format ion related t o waste reduction in, 106-108, 132 loan programs in, 212, 215 multi media a pp roach to waste reduction i n nonrcgulator~ fra metvork of waste reduction programs in, 211-212 North Carolina Pollution Prevention Pays Program as example of State programs, 36, 216-219 OTA industry survey and, 228 OTA surveyr of State waste reduction programs, 197-223 pollut ion control efforts by, 3, 34, 69, 197-223 potential waste reduction programs in, 204 proposed Office of Waste Reduction and, 64, RCRA and, 201-219, 221-223 research and develop ment activities in, 186-188 results of OTA survey, 199-200 siting issues in, 204 surveys of hazardous waste facilities in, 168 target firms for waste reduction programs in, technical assistance programs (TAPs) in, 205-207, 208, 209, 212-213, 214, 220, 221, 222 waste reduction definitions by, 205 waste reduction efforts by, 5, 7, 11, 14, 15, 16, 33-37, 49, 50, 51, 60, 69-71, 105, 106-108, 118, 162-163, 168, 172, 186-188, 197-223 waste reduction grants programs in, 213-214 waste reduction program needs by, 223 waste reduction regulation attempts by California and Massachusetts, 206, 211-212 see a)so State Waste Reduction Boards and specific States Substance-specific waste reduction data, 125-126, 128, 129 Superfund, 3, 11, 12, 47, 49, 54, 56-57, 61, 63, 102, 116, 118, 121, 122-123, 124, 134, 139, 147, 149, 168, 169, 170, 182, 210 Surveys, of waste reduction, 27, 28, 34, 45, 47, 69, 78, 84, 86, 101, 106, 167-168, 197-223, 227-237 Sweden, waste reduction efforts by, 19, 241

Taxation. of hazardous wastes, 56-57, 72 Technical assistance programs (TAPs), in States, 205-207, 208, 209, 212-2~3, 214, 220, 221, Technologies and Management Strategies for Hazardous Waste Control, 152, 155 Technology availability to industry, 98-10(1 diffusion of and access to, 104105 waste reduction d_{ei} ; isi_{on}s $a_{lij}i$, $7\sim$ _'109 waste reduction limitations i~~ 27-29, 166 see also Information and technology transfer Tennessee, 35, 172, 201, 203, 209, 213, 221 Tennessee Valley Authority (TV.4), 108, 182-183, 189, 192 Testing, in waste reduction technology, 30, 31 Thomas, Lee M., 148 Thread mercerization, to recy~lc caustic soda. 79 3M, 7, 37, 79, 82-83, 99 Toxic Substances Control Act ('I'SCA), 120, 121-122, 147, 149, 150, 168, 169, 174, 180-181, 193, 239 Toxic Substances Registry (Maryland), 124 Training, in waste production technology', 31 Treatnlent, storage, and disposal facilities ('I'SDFS), 117, 120, 157, 158, 159, 160, 1[;4, 165, 172 Trichl~jroethylene (TCE), 11, 12, 128 cnvi ;onmental emissions of, 141 haz,irdous characteristics and health effects of, 138, 140 ind[strial use of, 138 ind~strv-level information on, 141 legislation and regulations pertaining to, 138, .39, 140 national materials balance for, 190 release of, into the en~ironrnent, I LI I su~]stitutes for, 138 tr~Insport and transformation of, in the environment, 138-139 Uniform Hazardous Waste Manifest, 157, 164 United Kingdom, see Great Britain University Hazardous Substance Research Centers, 185 United Nations Economic Commission for Europe [ECE), 238 U.S. Congress EPA mine wastes report to, 171 EPA waste minimization study for, 156, 160

Tax rebates or credit for waste reduction, 57,

policy options of, 37-41, 48-71 and RCRA Amendments, 45-47, 154-156, 170 reasons for no waste reduction action by, recommendations for waste reduction efforts by, 4-5 Toxic Substances and Control Act and, 180 waste minimization and, 154-160, 161-162 waste reduction policy of, 5, 10, 13 see also U.S. Government and specific government agencies, programs, and legislation U.S. Government change in procurement policies of, 57-58 collection of waste reduction data by, 129-130 cooperation in State waste reduction programs, 197, 221-223 costs of environmental regulation by, 7-8 European waste reduction efforts compared to. 19-20 grants program by, 58, 59-61 information and technology transfer in, information needs for policymaking by, 118-124 information needs for waste reduction action by, 130-132 lack of waste generation data and, 24, 113, 119-121 and measurement of waste reduction, 20-24 new waste reduction legislation by, 58, 61-62 policy options for, 37-41, 45-73 poliution control regulation by, 146-154 problems with current efforts, 51-52 and proposed Office of Waste Reduction, 5, 40, 58, 64 and proposed State Waste Reduction Boards, 5, 40, 58-59, 69-71 regulatory concessions for compliance by, 58, reporting requirements for financial statements by, 58, 62-64 research and development activities of, 182-194 spending by, on pollution control versus waste reduction, 153 and State programs in waste reduction, 5, 33-37, 40, 58-59, 69-71 State waste reduction budgets and, 209-210 waste reduction decisionmaking and, 94-95 waste reduction efforts and regulatory measures by, 4-7, 11-12, 14, 15-18, 21, 26, 29-33, 37-41, 45-73, 94-97, 102-103, 118, 145-194 USS Chemicals, 127

Vapor Iosses, prevention of, 89 Volatile organic compounds (VOC), 137, 147, 151, 152, 175 Voluntary approach to waste reduction and waste minimization, 32-33, 38-39, 40, 45, 55, 71, 73, 94, 102, 103, 145, 159, 161, 166-168, 211 Washington, 59, 204 Waste-end taxes, 56-57 Waste generation, see Hazardous wastes; Waste reduction Waste management, 9-10, 17-19, 31, 33, 34, 38, 46, 49, 50, 62, 86, 94, 98, 100-101, 103, 104, 105-106, 116, 152, 155, 157, 167, 168-172, 182, 192, 197, 201, 204-205, 227; see also Pollution control; Waste minimization Waste minimization Air Force plans for, 189, 190 Army plans for, 189, 190 corporate plans for, 166-167 defined, 9, 14, 105, 152, 160, 164, 166, 167 Department of Energy plans for, 189, 191-192 Department of Defense plans for, 189-191 EPA implementation of, 48, 161-166, 183-186 EPA study of, 156, 160 as low-priority issue, 161-162, 183 manifest system for, 155-156, 157, 158, 159, 164, 172 Navy plans for, 189, 190 Oak Ridge National Laboratory plans for, 191, Office of the Secretary (DOD) plans for, 190, 191 oversight of, 161, 162-164 permits, condition of, 156, 157, 158, 159, 165-166, 172 under RCRA, 15, 45-47, 49, 52, 102-103, 105, 113, 132, 145, 153, 154-166, 172, 192 reporting procedures for, 155, 157, 158, 159, 164-165, 172 State waste reduction programs and, 204-207 Tennessee Valley Authority efforts on, 189, regulations and requirements, 154-160 surveys of, 167-168 U.S. Congress and, 154-160, 161-162 voluntary nature of Federal program for, 94, 159, 166-168 see also Hazardous wastes; Pollution control; Waste reduction Waste recycling, 9, 10, 17, 19, 27, 34, 65, 87-88,

89, 91 171-172, 184, 187, 206, 227

alternative methods of, 105-106

Waste reduction

analysis of feasible techniques for, 116 expanding literature on, 85-86 auditing, 92-94, 114-117, 184 facility siting bias and, 104 building toward an ethic on, 145-154 Federal and State cooperation in, 197, 221-223 case studies of, 85-86, 91-92, 132-141, 166, financial aid to small businesses, 186, 187 167, 191 formulas for measuring, 23 generalizations about State programs in, classes of, 27; see also End products; Inprocess recycling; Plant operations; Process 201-215 inputs; Process technology and equipment generic opportunities in, 87-91 Clean Air Act and, 174-175 goals for, 16-17, 62, 63, 109 Clean Water Act and, 178-180 government procurement policies and, 57-58 collection of data on, 127, 128-130 government spending on, versus pollution comparison of alternatives with waste control, 153 grants programs for, 59-61, 64, 70, 184, management options, 116 185-186, 213-219, 221 comparison of European and U.S, efforts in, illustrations of, 85-92 constraints and incentives affecting decisions imperfect data on, 129-130 on, 94-95 industry decisionmaking on, 92-103 influence of public opinion on, 100 corporate waste minimization plans and, 166-167 information and technology transfer in, 31, cross-media approach to, 18, 51, 62, 124, 146, 113-141, 182-194, 212-212, 215 147-148 information available to Federal Government, current EPA plans for, 47-48 119, 120-121 data and information for, 21, 22, 113-141 information, types of economic considerations, 5-6, 7-8, 14, 16, 18, economic, 115, 117, 118, 120, 131 33, 38, 48, 50, 59-61, 63, 64, 65, 68-69, 70, health and environmental, 115, 118, 120, 72, 83, 84-85, 93, 94, 96, 100-102, 103, 104, 121, 131 116, 117, 153, 168, 169, 179, 183, 184-188, production, 115, 117, 118, 120, 121, 131 191, 192, 209-210, 213-215 regulatory, 115, 118, 120, 131 effectiveness of State programs in, 219-221 technology, 115, 117-118, 120, 121, 131 efforts and regulation by U.S. Government, waste stream, 115, 117, 118, 120, 121, 129, 4-7, 11-12, 14, 15-18, 21, 26, 29-33, 37-41, 131, 227, 228 45-73, 94-97, 102-103, 105, 118, 145-194 international considerations, 19-20, 57, efforts by Austria, 19, 239, 240, 241 238-241 efforts by Canada, 19, 239 investment-uncertainty barrier to, 84-85 efforts by Denmark, 19, 240, 241 lack of data on, 4, 20-21, 24, 62, 91-92, 103, efforts by Europe, 19-20, 238-241 104, 113-114, 119-121, 180 efforts by France, 19, 239, 240, 241 lack of expertise in estimating, 104 efforts by Great Britain, 19, 239 literature on, 86, 91-92, 99, 167 efforts by industry, 4-5, 12-16, 24-33, 45-47, loan programs for, 215 49-50, 60, 166-168, 197-223 mandatory increased information collection efforts by Japan, 19, 239 on, 131-132 efforts by local governments, 14, 50, 59, 172, mandatory levels of, 130-131 measurement of, 20-24, 124-130 efforts by Norway, 19, 239-240, 241 model for standards and guidelines on, efforts by States, 5, 7, 11, 14, 16, 15, 33-37, 49, 178-180 50, 51, 60, 69-71, 105, 106-108, 118, 162-163, multimedia approach to, 4, 11, 50-51, 61, 62, 65, 72, 73, 103, 152-154, 207, 216 168, 172, 186-188 new EPA office proposed for, 5, 40, 58, 64 efforts by Sweden, 19, 241 efforts by West Germany, 19, 240, 241 new legislation proposed for, 60-62 efforts by The Netherlands, 19, 240-241 nonregulator framework in States, 211-212 environmental compliance and, 102 objectives, 6-7 establishment of targets for, 56 opportunities and problems with existing evaluation of the progress and success of media programs, 168-182 measures in, 117 OTA industry survey of, 27, 28, 34, 45, 47, 69, existing programs and planning efforts by 78, 84, 86, 101, 106, 168, 227-237 States in, 197, 198-201 percentages, 128-129

policy options for, see Policy options pooling data on, 128-129 potential sources of research and development for, 193-194 potential State programs in, 204 prescriptive approach to, 32-33, 38, 55, 56, 71, 178, 180 primacy of, 7-19, 34, 46, 104, 152, 206 problems with assessing costs and benefits of, problems with definition of and terms used to describe, 3-5, 8-10, 61, 85-86, 155, 161, 164, 201, 205 problems with forecasting, 103-104, 109 problems with measurement of, 20-24, 127-128 process-specific, 127, 128 product quality and, 83 proposal to mandate levels of, 55-58, 72 proposed grants program for, 59-61, 64, 70 proposed impact analyses of, 53-54 proposed planning and reporting requirements, 52-53, 61, 62-64 public and private roles in, 11-16; see aZso Industry; Local governments; States; U.S. Government regulatory concessions for compliance to, 64-71 research and development in, 30, 31, 39, 40, 52, 57, 77, 83, 99, 173, 182-194 review of current forecasts on, 106 setting priorities for, 116 spectrum of approaches to, 78-85 site-specific, 29-32, 66-67 State technical assistance programs in, 205-207, 208, 209, 212-213, 214, 220, 221, substance-specific, 125-126, 128, 129 surveys of, 27, 28, 34, 45, 47, 69, 78, 84, 86, 101, 106, 167-168, 197-223, 227-237

technological limitations as obstacle to, 27-29 technology and, 77-109 theoretical requirements for measuring, 125-127 types of, classified, 115, 117-118, 180 usefulness of current data on, 119-121 voluntary approach to, 32-33, 38-39, 40, 45, 55, 71, 73, 94, 102, 103, 145, 159, 161, 166-168, 211 voluntary versus prescriptive approaches to, 32-33, 38, 55, 71, 73, 102, 103, 145, 159, 161 see also Hazardous wastes; Pollution control; Waste minimization Waste reduction technology, 77-109, 106; see also Information and technology transfer; Technology Waste treatment, 17, 18, 19, 30, 46, 62, 65, 183, Wastewater, 28, 29, 81, 89-91, 129, 146, 147, 186 Water, use in industry, 89-91 Water pollutants, 152, 154, 176-180; see also Air and water regulatory programs; Clean Water Act; Wastewater Water regulatory programs, see Air and water regulatory programs West Germany, waste reduction efforts by, 19, 240, 241 Westat Survey, 120 Wisconsin, 35, 108, 201, 203, 205, 210, 214, 215 Wisconsin Waste Reduction and Recycling Demonstration Grant program, 214 Worker health and safety, regulatory

concessions in, 66
Working Party on Low- and Non-Waste
Technology and Re-utilization and
Recycling of Wastes (Europe), 238

OFFICE OF TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES WASHINGTON, D. C. 20510