

Washington State Department of Ecology

Stakeholder Involvement Meeting Notes

Simpson Tacoma Kraft Paper Mill

Tuesday, October 9, 2007

6:30-9:30 pm

- I. Welcome and Introductions
 - 1) Ecology
 - 2) Earth Economics
 - 3) Simpson Tacoma Kraft Company

- II. Current mill activities
 - 1) Comments from Don Johnson
 - 2) Simpson presentation by Greg Narum
 - i) History
 - ii) Odor causing gas (H₂S and MeSH) reductions
 - iii) Fresh water consumption reduction
 - iv) Particulate emissions reduction
 - v) Greenhouse gas reductions
 - (a) Comment – Kyoto/Climate Change 1990 levels, mill is currently operating below that
 - vi) Energy conservation
 - vii) Air emissions
 - viii) Water discharges
 - ix) Waste reduction, highlighted ash reuse
 - x) Moving forward
 - (a) Cogeneration project

- III. Overview of meeting agenda

- IV. Introduction of the project
 - 1) What is it?
 - i) A comprehensive analysis of an industrial facility's impact on the community
 - ii) An analysis in the form of a scoring system for the Pulp and Paper industry
 - 2) An analysis of another sector is planned
 - i) We have been contacted by and discussed the opportunity with Glacier NW, a concrete/asphalt/aggregate company
 - 3) Energy Challenge
 - i) Initially was just going to look at electricity usage, but is now going to be a carbon footprint analysis
 - 4) Final Report

- i) Will include recommendations for future efforts utilizing the information that we learn and the analysis we create
- 5) Budget
 - i) Total budget is \$254,265 with \$182,105 of that amount funded by an EPA grant and \$72,160 funded by Ecology. Of the total amount, the consultant team contract is \$100,000.
- 6) Milestones
- 7) Web page
 - i) Contains background information, most recent quarterly reports to EPA and the full milestone chart
- V. General question and answer session
 - 1) What is the purpose of the project? Who is the project for/who will benefit?
 - i) Help Ecology set priorities, working beyond compliance, for the mills to be better stewards to the environment and their community. This will be used as a template for other industrial sectors as well.
 - 2) When it is done, what will a footprint look like?
 - i) We will add the indicators we are here to talk with you about tonight together to get a score. This will be the baseline footprint. A year or so down the road, we will do another analysis, and our goal is to have the overall footprint of the mill demonstrate reduction. There may be shifts in the footprint as changes are made, where changes in one area will impact and perhaps increase the footprint of another indicator, but our goal is a reduction of the overall footprint.
 - 3) Will recycling be included in the footprint?
 - i) Yes, it will.
- VI. Participation in indicator development
 - 1) Description on indicator concept and examples
 - i) The indicators are groups or sets of impacts that the mill has, socially, environmentally and economically. We are going to come up with big picture concepts that are indicators, but we need to break those down into measurable pieces.
 - ii) Examples of moving from ideas to *measurable* indicators:
 - (a) Social – for assessment of how well mill performance meets needs of employees/community, a potential indicator would be percentage of stakeholders “satisfied” with performance.
 - (b) Environmental – for evaluating the extent to which mill performance contributes to global climate change, a potential indicator would be total carbon emissions/footprint.
 - (c) Economic – for determining the extent to which the mill helps to build the local economy, a potential indicator would be the number of local jobs provided.
 - (d) For each of these three categories there are many other possible areas of assessment or analysis, each standing as a *set* of several potential

indicators (e.g. for example C above another indicator in the set might be % of supply chain from local sources).

- 2) Task clarification and discussion
 - i) Question: How do we define and “economic indicator”? Just economics for the mill or how the community is affected by the mill’s presence? This has both social and economic implications. How are we going to define those cross-overs?
 - (a) Answer: Local is being defined as “Washington State”. We need representative indicators for the community. Some indicators may not be used. We are more than likely going to be doing a phased approach.
- 3) Small group brainstorming (see Appendix A below for brainstorm results).
 - i) Social Indicators
 - ii) Environmental Indicators
 - iii) Economic Indicators
- 4) Report back to large group
 - i) Ron Stuart for group 1
 - ii) Dave McEntee for group 2

VII. Break

VIII. Presentation of the Industrial Footprint Project’s draft indicator list created by collaboration between Ecology and Earth Economics.

IX. Collaborative preference ranking of indicators

- 1) This portion of the event provided an opportunity to review the combined list of indicators including both the indicators brainstormed by stakeholders earlier in the agenda and the draft indicator list prepared by the Department of Ecology in discussion with mill representatives and the Earth Economics consultants. Participants were each provided with six (6) dot stickers, two (2) for each indicator category (social, environmental, economic) that were then applied to those indicators that each stakeholder felt was most important for reporting (see Appendix A below for combined list of indicators with rankings noted). Stakeholder participants were asked not to place more than one dot per indicator.

X. Full group discussion

- 1) What other issues or opportunities do you see for mill participation in the Industrial Footprint Project?
 - i) Indicator scoring and tracking change over time
 - (a) What is the clear purpose of indicators?
 - (b) Importance of scoring matrix and transparency of it
 - (c) Question: How will this process influence management, permitting, etc.?
 1. We want to see the negative impacts of an industry reduced and the positive impacts increased
 - ii) Proposed strategies for performance improvement

- iii) Index or group of indicator categories preferred?
 - (a) Would like to see a compilation of both.
 - iv) Other possibilities for sustainability innovation?
 - v) Any improvement strategies?
- 2) Summary and conclusion
 - 3) Reviewed progress of the evening.
 - 4) Web page updates
 - i) The web page is regularly updated. If you would like to be contacted when updates are made, please make sure that your information is on the sign-up sheet by the door.
 - ii) Our contact information is on the web page. If you have questions or comments that you would like to make about the project or the meeting, please feel free to contact us.
 - 5) Survey/Online comment form
 - i) This will be posted on October 31, 2007.

XI. Thanks and closing

For more information, the latest project updates and links to our online survey or to contact project representatives, please visit the Industrial Footprint project page on the Washington State Department of Ecology web site:

<http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/swfa/industrial/IndFootprint.html>

Industrial Footprint Project
Simpson Tacoma Kraft

Appendix A – Combined Indicator List (Draft List and Stakeholder Brainstorm)

The following indicator data represents indicators from (a) the Industrial Footprint Project draft indicator list, and (b) stakeholder brainstorming at the Simpson Tacoma Kraft Paper Mill event. Indicators have been sorted first by these two sources, then by indicatory category, noted “SOC” for social, “ENV” for environmental and “ECO” for economic. Indicator sets were not noted by stakeholders in every case, as is the case for indicators from the draft indicator list. Further stages of data analysis and integration will include development of an indicator set typology.

The rank column values denote the number of participants who place a high level of importance on a particular indicator through the dot ranking process described in stakeholder involvement meeting minutes; as such, higher numbers indicate a greater level of importance from the a general stakeholder perspective. In total, social indicators were most commonly noted for importance with 18 instances of stakeholder ranking, economic following with 17 instances and environmental with 16 instances of stakeholders noting importance of specific indicators.

| Source | Category | Indicator Set | Indicator Parameter | Rank |
|--------------|----------|-------------------------------|---|------|
| stakeholders | SOC | | community | 1 |
| stakeholders | SOC | Corporate Code of Conduct | health/safety preparedness | 2 |
| stakeholders | SOC | Education | internships | |
| stakeholders | SOC | Education | inspiration | |
| stakeholders | SOC | Education | mentorships | |
| stakeholders | SOC | Education | technical awareness | |
| stakeholders | SOC | Employees | turnover rate | |
| stakeholders | SOC | Employees | personal satisfaction | 2 |
| stakeholders | SOC | Employees | donating time to the community | |
| stakeholders | SOC | Employees | retirement and health benefits | 1 |
| stakeholders | SOC | Outreach | CAG | |
| stakeholders | SOC | | support of community welfare | 1 |
| stakeholders | SOC | | student/teacher internships | 1 |
| stakeholders | SOC | | labor relations | |
| stakeholders | SOC | | safety performance | |
| stakeholders | SOC | | training employees | |
| stakeholders | SOC | | culture - home | |
| stakeholders | SOC | | newsletter communication to community | |
| stakeholders | SOC | | contribution to local visual aesthetics | |
| stakeholders | SOC | | volunteer hours | 2 |
| stakeholders | SOC | | Boards | |
| stakeholders | SOC | | leadership | 3 |
| stakeholders | SOC | | \$ contributions | |
| stakeholders | SOC | | health/safety commitment | |
| stakeholders | SOC | | healthcare provider awareness | |
| stakeholders | SOC | | diversity | |
| stakeholders | SOC | | ethical | |
| stakeholders | SOC | | community right to know | |
| stakeholders | ENV | Climate | greenhouse gas emissions | 2 |
| stakeholders | ENV | Climate | energy use and renewables | |
| stakeholders | ENV | Climate | sequestration | |
| stakeholders | ENV | Compliance | unhealthy air days | |
| stakeholders | ENV | Puget Sound Partnership goals | water | 2 |
| stakeholders | ENV | Puget Sound Partnership goals | emissions | |
| stakeholders | ENV | Puget Sound Partnership goals | remediation/habitat | |
| stakeholders | ENV | Puget Sound Partnership goals | brownfield | |
| stakeholders | ENV | Sustainability | raw materials | 2 |
| stakeholders | ENV | Sustainability | energy | |

Industrial Footprint Project
Simpson Tacoma Kraft

| | | | | |
|--------------|-----|------------------------|---|---|
| stakeholders | ENV | Sustainability | products | |
| stakeholders | ENV | | all environmental emissions | |
| stakeholders | ENV | | energy generation and consumption based on production | 2 |
| stakeholders | ENV | | beneficial reuse based on value of reuse | 4 |
| stakeholders | ENV | | distance to acquire raw material | |
| stakeholders | ENV | | internal recycling (water, fuels, chemicals) | 1 |
| stakeholders | ENV | | biodiversity of ecosystem | |
| stakeholders | ENV | | toxic release inventory emissions | |
| stakeholders | ENV | | reduce/reuse/recycle | |
| stakeholders | ENV | | technology innovation | |
| stakeholders | ENV | | 5 or 10 year compliance performance | |
| stakeholders | ENV | | purchase/use of less hazardous chemicals | |
| stakeholders | ENV | | consumption of recycled products | |
| stakeholders | ENV | | bio-friendly fuels | |
| stakeholders | ENV | | carpooling | |
| stakeholders | ECO | Indirect benefits | jobs | |
| stakeholders | ECO | Indirect benefits | income | |
| stakeholders | ECO | Indirect benefits | tax base | |
| stakeholders | ECO | | max. raw materials | |
| stakeholders | ECO | | min. Waste | |
| stakeholders | ECO | | waste to beneficial reuse | |
| stakeholders | ECO | | produces more than consumes | |
| stakeholders | ECO | | wealth generation | |
| stakeholders | ECO | | move toward sustainability | 1 |
| stakeholders | ECO | | assure long-term business success | 1 |
| stakeholders | ECO | | sustainability of economic model | |
| stakeholders | ECO | | production of better environmental results | |
| stakeholders | ECO | | productivity per unit labor - sustainability | |
| stakeholders | ECO | | investment | |
| stakeholders | ECO | | opportunity cost | |
| stakeholders | ECO | | payroll | 4 |
| stakeholders | ECO | | taxes paid | 2 |
| stakeholders | ECO | | local purchases | 1 |
| stakeholders | ECO | | outside contractors | |
| stakeholders | ECO | | value of exported product | |
| stakeholders | ECO | | "Tacoma pork" - maximized use of tax dollars | |
| stakeholders | ECO | | ratio of domestic to exported product | |
| stakeholders | ECO | | value added to raw materials | 1 |
| stakeholders | ECO | | trickle down economics | 2 |
| stakeholders | ECO | | number of jobs | |
| stakeholders | ECO | | average wage | |
| stakeholders | ECO | | encouragement of economic development | |
| stakeholders | ECO | | supporting local schools or trade schools | |
| stakeholders | ECO | | manager hiring | |
| stakeholders | ECO | | scholarships/grants | |
| draft list | SOC | Environmental justice | environmental justice | |
| draft list | SOC | Environmental nuisance | traffic | 1 |
| draft list | SOC | Environmental nuisance | noise | |
| draft list | SOC | Environmental nuisance | odor | |
| draft list | SOC | Environmental nuisance | dust | |
| draft list | SOC | Environmental nuisance | lights | |
| draft list | SOC | Environmental nuisance | vibrations | |

Industrial Footprint Project
Simpson Tacoma Kraft

| | | | | |
|------------|-----|---------------------------------|--|---|
| draft list | SOC | Human rights | good and fair treatment of employees | 3 |
| draft list | SOC | Human rights | ethical behavior | |
| draft list | SOC | Human rights | equal opportunity employment | |
| draft list | SOC | Labor practices and decent work | jobs provided to community | |
| draft list | SOC | Labor practices and decent work | wage and employee benefits | 1 |
| draft list | SOC | Labor practices and decent work | turn over rate | |
| draft list | SOC | Labor practices and decent work | diversity | |
| draft list | SOC | Labor practices and decent work | internal advancement versus external hire | |
| draft list | SOC | Labor practices and decent work | employee input on changes implemented | |
| draft list | SOC | Safety | number of accidents | |
| draft list | SOC | Safety | lost time due to injury | |
| draft list | SOC | Safety | history of OSHA compliance | |
| draft list | SOC | Safety | exercise room on site | |
| draft list | SOC | Social awards | received for social, ethical and environmental performance | |
| draft list | ENV | Air | greenhouse gases | |
| draft list | ENV | Air | SOX | |
| draft list | ENV | Air | NOX | |
| draft list | ENV | Biodiversity | natural habitat protection | |
| draft list | ENV | Biodiversity | conservation | |
| draft list | ENV | Biodiversity | restoration | |
| draft list | ENV | Energy | electricity usage | 1 |
| draft list | ENV | Energy | renewable sources | |
| draft list | ENV | Energy | efficiency | |
| draft list | ENV | Energy | conservation | |
| draft list | ENV | Energy | cogeneration | |
| draft list | ENV | Materials | local origin | |
| draft list | ENV | Materials | certified forest products | |
| draft list | ENV | Materials | recycled/reused materials | |
| draft list | ENV | Regulatory | compliance | |
| draft list | ENV | Remediation | projects | |
| draft list | ENV | Waste | amount produced | |
| draft list | ENV | Waste | proportion recycled/composted | |
| draft list | ENV | Waste | hazardous waste | 1 |
| draft list | ENV | Water | water usage | 1 |
| draft list | ENV | Water | impact on ecosystems | |
| draft list | ENV | Water | TSS | |
| draft list | ENV | Water | AOX | |
| draft list | ENV | Water | BOD | |
| draft list | ECO | Community Involvement | donations | |
| draft list | ECO | Community Involvement | contributions to non-profits | 1 |
| draft list | ECO | Community Involvement | education to local community | |
| draft list | ECO | Community Involvement | internships | |
| draft list | ECO | Community Involvement | membership in local committees | |
| draft list | ECO | Community Involvement | support of mill families | |
| draft list | ECO | Cost of goods/services | total cost of goods/services | 1 |
| draft list | ECO | Cost of goods/services | % goods/services procured locally | 3 |
| draft list | ECO | Cost of goods/services | payroll | |
| draft list | ECO | Cost of goods/services | benefits | |
| draft list | ECO | Cost of goods/services | taxes | |
| draft list | ECO | Cost of goods/services | financing | |

