

On this tab are the survey respondents' self-identified stakeholder classification.

Respondents by Stakeholder Groups	Respondents
Municipal Official (Town with less than 5,000 residents)	37
Municipal Official (Town with between 5,000 and 15,000 residents)	24
Municipal Official (Town with more than 15,000 residents)	8
Regional	40
Statewide	29
National	12
Sovereign	0
Elected Official	11
Public Sector	26
Private Sector	35
Quasi-Public	8
Nonprofit or NGO	14
Waste-To-Energy	28
Landfill	27
Transfer Station	42
Hauler	15
Environmental Group	10
Recycling	69
Organics	40
Construction Demo Debris	30
Large Institution	1
Academic	10
Citizen/Taxpayer Only	31

On this tab are the percentages for respondents that were against a given policy (either "actively oppose" or "not in favor of") or for a given policy (either "actively advocate" or "in favor of"). There is also the basic count by each of the five options. A heat chart was used to help highlight the options with the highest rankings. Darker red means a high percentage or count, darker blue means a low percentage or count, and white means a moderate level.

	% Against	or	For		Count by response option				
	Against (both actively or slightly)		For (both actively or slightly)		Actively Oppose	Not in favor	Neutral	In favor	Actively Advocate
Organics Planning and Management									
No separation of organics from the waste stream in Maine	61%		20%		40	55	30	17	15
Mandatory source separation of organics from the waste stream in Maine	31%		53%		10	38	26	57	26
Disposal ban for large volume generators of organics	20%		54%		11	20	41	62	21
Subsidies for entities and companies that divert organics	29%		43%		14	30	43	56	10
Investing in infrastructure to manage organics	11%		72%		3	15	27	83	30
A comprehensive state plan to increase organic diversion	9%		78%		3	11	20	91	33
Product Stewardship and the Bottle Bill									
Product Stewardship for carpets	14%		66%		4	18	31	79	24
Product Stewardship for mattresses	13%		69%		5	15	28	85	23
Product Stewardship for packaging	12%		68%		5	14	31	83	22
Adding items to the Bottle Bill	29%		50%		18	28	33	59	20
Removing items from the Bottle Bill	65%		18%		40	61	27	15	13
Removal of the ENTIRE Bottle Bill	73%		14%		69	44	20	9	13

On this tab are the percentages for respondents that were against a given policy (either "actively oppose" or "not in favor of") or for a given policy (either "actively advocate" or "in favor of"). There is also the basic count by each of the five options. A heat chart was used to help highlight the options with the highest rankings. Darker red means a high percentage or count, darker blue means a low percentage or count, and white means a moderate level.

	% Against	or For		Count by response option				
	Against (both actively or slightly)	For (both actively or slightly)		Actively Oppose	Not in favor	Neutral	In favor	Actively Advocate
Landfill Planning and Management								
Expansion of current landfills	39%	41%		11	48	30	55	7
Siting new landfills	45%	28%		14	55	40	39	4
Reducing the demand for landfills	6%	85%		1	8	14	92	38
Removal of all landfill disposal fees	69%	15%		38	66	23	21	2
Creation of landfill disposal fees	22%	51%		14	20	41	67	12
Removal of current landfill disposal fee exemptions	21%	47%		8	24	48	59	12
Other Programs	Against (both actively or slightly)	For (both actively or slightly)		Actively Oppose	Not in favor	Neutral	In favor	Actively Advocate
Polystyrene foam ban	24%	57%		7	30	29	72	16
Single-use bag fees	29%	56%		13	31	23	70	15
Adjusting the state recycling goal of 50%	16%	54%		6	19	47	72	11
Changing the recycling and waste metrics	8%	49%		5	7	63	57	15
Support for waste volume reducing technologies	5%	83%		1	6	19	107	20
Incentives for companies that use Maine recycled materials	10%	77%		5	10	21	101	18
Recyclable materials landfill ban	24%	61%		10	26	24	69	24
Changing the waste hierarchy	22%	32%		11	22	70	41	7
Waste reduction targets for state agencies	7%	77%		3	8	24	105	13
Minimum tipping fees for solid waste disposal	22%	48%		10	24	46	64	10

On this tab are the percentages for respondents that were against a given policy (either "actively oppose" or "not in favor of") or for a given policy (either "actively advocate" or "in favor of"). There is also the basic count by each of the five options. A heat chart was used to help highlight the options with the highest rankings. Darker red means a high percentage or count, darker blue means a low percentage or count, and white means a moderate level.

	% Against or For			Count by response option				
Funding	Against (both actively or slightly)	For (both actively or slightly)		Actively Oppose	Not in favor	Neutral	In favor	Actively Advocate
No additional state-level funding for materials and solid waste management programs	62%	19%		14	80	28	26	3
Funding for organics diversion	19%	63%		5	24	28	86	11
Funding for facilities, such as transfer stations upgrades and expansion	19%	63%		6	22	28	87	8
Funding for reuse organizations or collection centers	18%	61%		5	23	31	84	9
Funding for regional cooperatives	15%	64%		4	19	32	85	11
Funding for educational tools for communities on materials management	14%	75%		2	19	18	101	13
Funding to incorporate materials management into K-12 education	11%	78%		4	13	17	101	18

On this tab is the percentage of individuals that were in favor of a given program or policy ***excluding the individuals that responded they were neutral for the policy in question*** . The first column (B) is for those who were in support of the program to any degree, the second column (C) was those who specifically would "actively advocate for" the program or policy. Darker red means a high percentage or count, darker blue means a low percentage or count, and white means a moderate level.

	% For (excluding Neutral)	
	All in Favor of	Only Actively Advocate
Organics Planning and Management		
No separation of organics from the waste stream in Maine	25%	12%
Mandatory source separation of organics from the waste stream in Maine	63%	20%
Disposal ban for large volume generators of organics	73%	18%
Subsidies for entities and companies that divert organics	60%	9%
Investing in infrastructure to manage organics	86%	23%
A comprehensive state plan to increase organic diversion	90%	24%
Product Stewardship and the Bottle Bill	All in Favor of	Only Actively Advocate
Product Stewardship for carpets	82%	19%
Product Stewardship for mattresses	84%	18%
Product Stewardship for packaging	85%	18%
Adding items to the Bottle Bill	63%	16%
Removing items from the Bottle Bill	22%	10%
Removal of the ENTIRE Bottle Bill	16%	10%
Landfill Planning and Management	All in Favor of	Only Actively Advocate
Expansion of current landfills	51%	6%
Siting new landfills	38%	4%
Reducing the demand for landfills	94%	27%
Removal of all landfill disposal fees	18%	2%
Creation of landfill disposal fees	70%	11%
Removal of current landfill disposal fee exemptions	69%	12%

On this tab is the percentage of individuals that were in favor of a given program or policy ***excluding the individuals that responded they were neutral for the policy in question*** . The first column (B) is for those who were in support of the program to any degree, the second column (C) was those who specifically would "actively advocate for" the program or policy. Darker red means a high percentage or count, darker blue means a low percentage or count, and white means a moderate level.

	% For (excluding Neutral)	
	All in Favor of	Only Actively Advocate
Other Programs		
Polystyrene foam ban	70%	13%
Single-use bag fees	66%	12%
Adjusting the state recycling goal of 50%	77%	10%
Changing the recycling and waste metrics	86%	18%
Support for waste volume reducing technologies	95%	15%
Incentives for companies that use Maine recycled materials	89%	13%
Recyclable materials landfill ban	72%	19%
Changing the waste hierarchy	59%	9%
Waste reduction targets for state agencies	91%	10%
Minimum tipping fees for solid waste disposal	69%	9%
Funding	All in Favor of	Only Actively Advocate
No additional state-level funding for materials and solid waste management programs	24%	2%
Funding for organics diversion	77%	9%
Funding for facilities, such as transfer stations upgrades and expansion	77%	7%
Funding for reuse organizations or collection centers	77%	7%
Funding for regional cooperatives	81%	9%
Funding for educational tools for communities on materials management	84%	10%
Funding to incorporate materials management into K-12 education	88%	13%

On this tab you will find the respondents' rank preferences for different sources of funding for materials and solid waste management.

	We should not fund materials and solid waste programs	Earmarked state funds (tax base)	Solid waste disposal fees	Statewide Pay-As-You-Throw	Unclaimed Bottle Bill deposits
Average Rank	3.93	3.06	2.38	2.58	3.06

	We should not fund materials and solid waste programs	Earmarked state funds (tax base)	Solid waste disposal fees	Statewide Pay-As-You-Throw	Unclaimed Bottle Bill deposits
Priority Level					
Highest	19	15	44	39	26
	11	33	37	39	23
Middle	13	39	35	25	31
	18	41	18	23	43
Lowest	82	15	9	17	20

	We should not fund materials and solid waste programs	Earmarked state funds (tax base)	Solid waste disposal fees	Statewide Pay-As-You-Throw	Unclaimed Bottle Bill deposits
Priority Level					
Highest	13.3%	10.5%	30.8%	27.3%	18.2%
	7.7%	23.1%	25.9%	27.3%	16.1%
Middle	9.1%	27.3%	24.5%	17.5%	21.7%
	12.6%	28.7%	12.6%	16.1%	30.1%
Lowest	57.3%	10.5%	6.3%	11.9%	14.0%

On this tab you will find the respondents' rank preferences for the importance of addressing each of the following materials and solid waste management topics.

	Organics management and planning	Addressing hard-to-manage items (Product Stewardship, The Bottle Bil, polystyrene ban, disposable bag fees)	Landfill management and planning	Funding for materials and solid waste programs (facilities, education, reuse, cooperatives, etc.)	Adjusting the data and metrics for measuring outcomes (recycling rate, waste generation, etc.)
Average Rank	2.39	2.68	3.13	2.94	3.85

	Organics management and planning	Addressing hard-to-manage items (Product Stewardship, The Bottle Bil, polystyrene ban, disposable bag fees)	Landfill management and planning	Funding for materials and solid waste programs (facilities, education, reuse, cooperatives, etc.)	Adjusting the data and metrics for measuring outcomes (recycling rate, waste generation, etc.)
Priority Level					
Highest	40	27	20	31	17
	40	33	29	23	10
Middle	28	41	24	26	16
	17	22	38	32	26
Lowest	10	12	24	23	66

	Organics management and planning	Addressing hard-to-manage items (Product Stewardship, The Bottle Bil, polystyrene ban, disposable bag fees)	Landfill management and planning	Funding for materials and solid waste programs (facilities, education, reuse, cooperatives, etc.)	Adjusting the data and metrics for measuring outcomes (recycling rate, waste generation, etc.)
Priority Level					
Highest	29.6%	20.0%	14.8%	23.0%	12.6%
	29.6%	24.4%	21.5%	17.0%	7.4%
Middle	20.7%	30.4%	17.8%	19.3%	11.9%
	12.6%	16.3%	28.1%	23.7%	19.3%
Lowest	7.4%	8.9%	17.8%	17.0%	48.9%

% of Non-Neutral for a given program/policy
By Service Area

Stakeholder Group		Municipal-Small	Municipal-Medium	Municipal-Large	Municipal-All	Regional	Statewide	National	ALL Responses
Count		37	24	8	69	40	29	12	174
Organics Management and Planning									
Mandatory source separation of organics from the waste stream in Maine	Oppose	48%	35%	50%	43%	38%	27%	22%	37%
	Support	52%	65%	50%	57%	62%	73%	78%	63%
	# Neutral	5	5	3	13	2	2	2	26
Disposal ban for large volume generators of organics	Oppose	38%	14%	33%	29%	25%	20%	0%	27%
	Support	62%	86%	67%	71%	75%	80%	100%	73%
	# Neutral	13	7	1	21	11	3	4	41
Subsidies for entities and companies that divert organics	Oppose	46%	36%	100%	46%	53%	29%	50%	40%
	Support	54%	64%	0%	54%	47%	71%	50%	60%
	# Neutral	8	10	5	23	8	6	2	43
Investing in infrastructure to manage organics	Oppose	34%	0%	0%	19%	8%	7%	10%	14%
	Support	66%	100%	100%	81%	92%	93%	90%	86%
	# Neutral	6	3	3	12	4	0	1	27
A comprehensive state plan to increase organic diversion	Oppose	16%	20%	0%	16%	16%	7%	10%	10%
	Support	84%	80%	100%	84%	84%	93%	90%	90%
	# Neutral	10	1	2	13	3	0	1	20
Product Stewardship and the Bottle Bill									
Product Stewardship for carpets	Oppose	25%	26%	33%	25%	18%	12%	0%	18%
	Support	75%	74%	67%	75%	82%	88%	100%	82%
	# Neutral	12	3	1	16	6	2	2	31
Product Stewardship for mattresses	Oppose	18%	21%	33%	19%	18%	12%	0%	16%
	Support	82%	79%	67%	81%	82%	88%	100%	84%
	# Neutral	8	3	1	12	6	3	2	28
Product Stewardship for packaging	Oppose	18%	13%	14%	14%	11%	12%	0%	15%
	Support	82%	87%	86%	86%	89%	88%	100%	85%
	# Neutral	7	7	0	14	10	2	1	31

% of Non-Netural for a given program/policy

By Service Area

Stakeholder Group		Municipal-Small	Municipal-Medium	Municipal-Large	Municipal-All	Regional	Statewide	National	ALL Responses
Landfill Management and Planning									
Expansion of current landfills	Oppose	41%	25%	40%	35%	41%	44%	75%	49%
	Support	59%	75%	60%	65%	59%	56%	25%	51%
	# Neutral	4	6	2	12	9	7	4	30
Siting new landfills	Oppose	44%	62%	67%	51%	62%	67%	67%	62%
	Support	56%	38%	33%	49%	38%	33%	33%	38%
	# Neutral	9	9	1	19	10	7	2	40
Reducing the demand for landfills	Oppose	9%	5%	0%	7%	0%	8%	0%	6%
	Support	91%	95%	100%	93%	100%	92%	100%	94%
	# Neutral	5	3	1	9	4	2	0	14
Removal of all landfill disposal fees	Oppose	76%	89%	71%	80%	80%	92%	100%	82%
	Support	24%	11%	29%	20%	20%	8%	0%	18%
	# Neutral	7	3	0	10	6	2	2	23
Creation of landfill disposal fees	Oppose	24%	38%	33%	28%	48%	29%	17%	30%
	Support	76%	63%	67%	72%	52%	71%	83%	70%
	# Neutral	11	6	1	18	10	6	3	41
Other Programs									
Polystyrene foam ban	Oppose	44%	19%	17%	33%	28%	29%	40%	30%
	Support	56%	81%	83%	67%	72%	71%	60%	70%
	# Neutral	11	5	0	16	6	6	1	29
Single-use bag fees	Oppose	40%	20%	29%	29%	19%	36%	33%	34%
	Support	60%	80%	71%	71%	81%	64%	67%	66%
	# Neutral	9	1	0	10	5	5	1	23
Adjusting the state recycling goal of 50%	Oppose	19%	15%	60%	23%	16%	21%	0%	23%
	Support	81%	85%	40%	77%	84%	79%	100%	77%
	# Neutral	5	9	2	16	14	8	4	47
Changing the recycling and waste metrics	Oppose	25%	15%	40%	21%	18%	13%	0%	14%
	Support	75%	85%	60%	79%	82%	88%	100%	86%
	# Neutral	18	8	1	27	13	9	5	63
Support for waste volume reducing technologies	Oppose	9%	0%	0%	5%	6%	4%	17%	5%
	Support	91%	100%	100%	95%	94%	96%	83%	95%
	# Neutral	4	1	1	6	5	3	4	19

% of Non-Neutral for a given program/policy

By Service Area

Stakeholder Group		Municipal-Small	Municipal-Medium	Municipal-Large	Municipal-All	Regional	Statewide	National	ALL Responses
Incentives for companies that use Maine recycled materials	Oppose	13%	11%	33%	15%	16%	8%	18%	11%
	Support	87%	89%	67%	85%	84%	92%	82%	89%
	# Neutral	6	3	1	10	2	4	0	21
Recyclable materials landfill ban	Oppose	38%	12%	60%	32%	33%	26%	22%	28%
	Support	62%	88%	40%	68%	67%	74%	78%	72%
	# Neutral	6	5	2	13	4	2	0	24
Changing the waste hierarchy	Oppose	47%	50%	67%	48%	43%	47%	33%	41%
	Support	53%	50%	33%	52%	57%	53%	67%	59%
	# Neutral	16	12	4	32	13	10	6	70
Waste reduction targets for state agencies	Oppose	10%	13%	33%	14%	10%	9%	11%	9%
	Support	90%	87%	67%	86%	90%	91%	89%	91%
	# Neutral	7	7	1	15	7	3	1	24
Minimum tipping fees for solid waste disposal	Oppose	29%	25%	100%	33%	35%	35%	22%	31%
	Support	71%	75%	0%	67%	65%	65%	78%	69%
	# Neutral	7	6	4	17	8	5	2	46
Funding									
Funding for organics diversion	Oppose	24%	13%	29%	20%	24%	8%	11%	23%
	Support	76%	87%	71%	80%	76%	92%	89%	77%
	# Neutral	11	6	0	17	5	3	2	28
Funding for facilities, such as transfer stations upgrades and expansion	Oppose	15%	20%	57%	22%	30%	10%	0%	23%
	Support	85%	80%	43%	78%	70%	90%	100%	77%
	# Neutral	2	6	0	8	9	8	4	28
Funding for reuse organizations or collection centers	Oppose	24%	13%	43%	24%	23%	16%	14%	23%
	Support	76%	87%	57%	76%	77%	84%	86%	77%
	# Neutral	7	6	0	13	7	8	3	31
Funding for regional cooperatives	Oppose	19%	6%	29%	16%	16%	15%	17%	19%
	Support	81%	94%	71%	84%	84%	85%	83%	81%
	# Neutral	9	4	0	13	6	7	3	32
Funding for educational tools for communities on materials management	Oppose	15%	13%	17%	15%	12%	12%	0%	16%
	Support	85%	88%	83%	85%	88%	88%	100%	84%
	# Neutral	2	5	1	8	5	3	0	18
Funding to incorporate MM into K-12 education	Oppose	9%	12%	33%	13%	9%	12%	0%	13%
	Support	91%	88%	67%	87%	91%	88%	100%	88%

% of Non-Netural for a given program/policy
By Disposal Facility and Organization Type

Stakeholder Group		Landfill	Waste-To-Energy	Private Sector	Public Sector	Quasi-Public	Nonprofit or NGO	ALL Responses
Count		27	28	35	26	8	14	174
Organics Management and Planning								
Mandatory source separation of organics from the waste stream in Maine	Oppose	40%	33%	48%	30%	33%	18%	37%
	Support	60%	67%	52%	70%	67%	82%	63%
	# Neutral	2	0	5	3	1	2	26
Disposal ban for large volume generators of organics	Oppose	30%	29%	41%	19%	17%	15%	27%
	Support	70%	71%	59%	81%	83%	85%	73%
	# Neutral	4	4	6	5	2	1	41
Subsidies for entities and companies that divert organics	Oppose	48%	30%	48%	38%	29%	0%	40%
	Support	52%	70%	52%	62%	71%	100%	60%
	# Neutral	6	5	8	12	1	3	43
Investing in infrastructure to manage organics	Oppose	13%	8%	15%	4%	0%	8%	14%
	Support	87%	92%	85%	96%	100%	92%	86%
	# Neutral	4	2	8	2	0	1	27
A comprehensive state plan to increase organic diversion	Oppose	8%	12%	10%	4%	0%	8%	10%
	Support	92%	88%	90%	96%	100%	92%	90%
	# Neutral	2	1	4	2	1	1	20
Product Stewardship and the Bottle Bill								
Product Stewardship for carpets	Oppose	23%	22%	17%	10%	40%	27%	18%
	Support	77%	78%	83%	90%	60%	73%	82%
	# Neutral	3	2	4	5	3	3	31
Product Stewardship for mattresses	Oppose	14%	17%	17%	10%	40%	27%	16%
	Support	86%	83%	83%	90%	60%	73%	84%
	# Neutral	3	1	5	4	3	3	28
Product Stewardship for packaging	Oppose	5%	15%	19%	5%	25%	25%	15%
	Support	95%	85%	81%	95%	75%	75%	85%
	# Neutral	6	4	7	4	4	6	31

% of Non-Neutral for a given program/policy
By Disposal Facility and Organization Type

Stakeholder Group		Landfill	Waste-To-Energy	Private Sector	Public Sector	Quasi-Public	Nonprofit or NGO	ALL Responses
Landfill Management and Planning								
Expansion of current landfills	Oppose	33%	53%	42%	62%	60%	56%	49%
	Support	67%	47%	58%	38%	40%	44%	51%
	# Neutral	7	5	6	11	2	3	30
Siting new landfills	Oppose	50%	61%	60%	85%	57%	60%	62%
	Support	50%	39%	40%	15%	43%	40%	38%
	# Neutral	9	6	7	11	1	3	40
Reducing the demand for landfills	Oppose	14%	8%	7%	0%	0%	0%	6%
	Support	86%	92%	93%	100%	100%	100%	94%
	# Neutral	3	1	3	0	0	1	14
Removal of all landfill disposal fees	Oppose	77%	85%	77%	83%	71%	100%	82%
	Support	23%	15%	23%	17%	29%	0%	18%
	# Neutral	2	2	5	1	1	2	23
Creation of landfill disposal fees	Oppose	45%	21%	48%	19%	50%	10%	30%
	Support	55%	79%	52%	81%	50%	90%	70%
	# Neutral	5	5	8	4	4	4	41
Other Programs								
Polystyrene foam ban	Oppose	18%	29%	43%	29%	50%	23%	30%
	Support	82%	71%	57%	71%	50%	77%	70%
	# Neutral	7	2	4	4	2	1	29
Single-use bag fees	Oppose	15%	23%	46%	18%	33%	31%	34%
	Support	85%	77%	54%	82%	67%	69%	66%
	# Neutral	4	2	8	3	2	1	23
Adjusting the state recycling goal of 50%	Oppose	28%	33%	33%	35%	60%	11%	23%
	Support	72%	67%	67%	65%	40%	89%	77%
	# Neutral	7	7	10	8	3	5	47
Changing the recycling and waste metrics	Oppose	18%	29%	0%	23%	50%	0%	14%
	Support	82%	71%	100%	77%	50%	100%	86%
	# Neutral	6	7	12	9	4	4	63
Support for waste volume reducing technologies	Oppose	8%	0%	11%	0%	0%	0%	5%
	Support	92%	100%	89%	100%	100%	100%	95%
	# Neutral	1	3	6	3	0	5	19

% of Non-Neutral for a given program/policy
By Disposal Facility and Organization Type

Stakeholder Group		Landfill	Waste-To-Energy	Private Sector	Public Sector	Quasi-Public	Nonprofit or NGO	ALL Responses
Incentives for companies that use Maine recycled materials	Oppose	17%	13%	18%	5%	13%	8%	11%
	Support	83%	88%	82%	95%	88%	92%	89%
	# Neutral	2	2	6	4	0	1	21
Recyclable materials landfill ban	Oppose	22%	27%	41%	24%	14%	11%	28%
	Support	78%	73%	59%	76%	86%	89%	72%
	# Neutral	2	2	1	3	1	4	24
Changing the waste hierarchy	Oppose	31%	46%	26%	31%	50%	55%	41%
	Support	69%	54%	74%	69%	50%	45%	59%
	# Neutral	8	10	14	11	2	2	70
Waste reduction targets for state agencies	Oppose	10%	4%	3%	10%	14%	0%	9%
	Support	90%	96%	97%	90%	86%	100%	91%
	# Neutral	4	1	4	3	1	3	24
Minimum tipping fees for solid waste disposal	Oppose	43%	26%	35%	22%	60%	10%	31%
	Support	57%	74%	65%	78%	40%	90%	69%
	# Neutral	5	7	11	7	3	4	46
Funding								
Funding for organics diversion	Oppose	23%	21%	39%	10%	14%	8%	23%
	Support	77%	79%	61%	90%	86%	92%	77%
	# Neutral	4	1	5	4	1	2	28
Funding for facilities, such as transfer stations upgrades and expansion	Oppose	28%	21%	24%	15%	29%	18%	23%
	Support	72%	79%	76%	85%	71%	82%	77%
	# Neutral	7	2	4	5	1	3	28
Funding for reuse organizations or collection centers	Oppose	16%	19%	29%	18%	17%	20%	23%
	Support	84%	81%	71%	82%	83%	80%	77%
	# Neutral	6	4	9	7	2	4	31
Funding for regional cooperatives	Oppose	20%	18%	33%	10%	14%	8%	19%
	Support	80%	82%	67%	90%	86%	92%	81%
	# Neutral	6	3	9	4	1	2	32
Funding for educational tools for communities on materials management	Oppose	0%	15%	17%	13%	14%	8%	16%
	Support	100%	85%	83%	87%	86%	92%	84%
	# Neutral	4	0	3	2	1	2	18
Funding to incorporate MM into K-12 education	Oppose	4%	13%	13%	9%	14%	10%	13%
	Support	96%	88%	88%	91%	86%	90%	88%

% of Non-Netural for a given program/policy
By Professional Grouping

Stakeholder Group		Transfer Station	Hauler	Recycling	Organics	Construction Demo Debris	Environmental Group	ALL Responses
Count		42	15	69	40	30	10	174
Organics Management and Planning								
Mandatory source separation of organics from the waste stream in Maine	Oppose	41%	64%	41%	31%	37%	10%	37%
	Support	59%	36%	59%	69%	63%	90%	63%
	# Neutral	3	0	9	3	3	0	26
Disposal ban for large volume generators of organics	Oppose	19%	45%	27%	16%	14%	0%	27%
	Support	81%	55%	73%	84%	86%	100%	73%
	# Neutral	9	2	14	7	6	1	41
Subsidies for entities and companies that divert organics	Oppose	39%	50%	39%	40%	43%	13%	40%
	Support	61%	50%	61%	60%	57%	88%	60%
	# Neutral	12	3	16	8	7	1	43
Investing in infrastructure to manage organics	Oppose	14%	33%	7%	5%	7%	0%	14%
	Support	86%	67%	93%	95%	93%	100%	86%
	# Neutral	4	1	9	2	2	0	27
A comprehensive state plan to increase organic diversion	Oppose	8%	0%	7%	8%	7%	10%	10%
	Support	92%	100%	93%	92%	93%	90%	90%
	# Neutral	3	1	6	2	1	0	20
Product Stewardship and the Bottle Bill								
Product Stewardship for carpets	Oppose	18%	27%	19%	15%	24%	11%	18%
	Support	82%	73%	81%	85%	76%	89%	82%
	# Neutral	6	2	13	3	4	0	31
Product Stewardship for mattresses	Oppose	14%	25%	15%	13%	16%	11%	16%
	Support	86%	75%	85%	88%	84%	89%	84%
	# Neutral	4	1	11	4	4	0	28
Product Stewardship for packaging	Oppose	10%	25%	14%	10%	13%	0%	15%
	Support	90%	75%	86%	90%	87%	100%	85%
	# Neutral	9	1	15	6	5	2	31

% of Non-Netural for a given program/policy
By Professional Grouping

Stakeholder Group		Transfer Station	Hauler	Recycling	Organics	Construction Demo Debris	Environmental Group	ALL Responses
Landfill Management and Planning								
Expansion of current landfills	Oppose	39%	30%	40%	38%	41%	100%	49%
	Support	61%	70%	60%	63%	59%	0%	51%
	# Neutral	10	4	15	10	10	3	30
Siting new landfills	Oppose	52%	50%	65%	76%	65%	100%	62%
	Support	48%	50%	35%	24%	35%	0%	38%
	# Neutral	12	4	21	10	8	1	40
Reducing the demand for landfills	Oppose	11%	21%	7%	6%	4%	0%	6%
	Support	89%	79%	93%	94%	96%	100%	94%
	# Neutral	3	0	5	2	1	0	14
Removal of all landfill disposal fees	Oppose	91%	75%	82%	87%	92%	100%	82%
	Support	9%	25%	18%	13%	8%	0%	18%
	# Neutral	6	1	7	3	3	1	23
Creation of landfill disposal fees	Oppose	38%	58%	38%	38%	37%	0%	30%
	Support	62%	42%	62%	63%	63%	100%	70%
	# Neutral	13	2	18	11	9	2	41
Other Programs								
Polystyrene foam ban	Oppose	11%	27%	22%	13%	21%	11%	30%
	Support	89%	73%	78%	87%	79%	89%	70%
	# Neutral	11	3	12	6	5	0	29
Single-use bag fees	Oppose	15%	27%	22%	15%	12%	0%	34%
	Support	85%	73%	78%	85%	88%	100%	66%
	# Neutral	6	3	10	2	3	0	23
Adjusting the state recycling goal of 50%	Oppose	21%	14%	30%	38%	28%	17%	23%
	Support	79%	86%	70%	62%	72%	83%	77%
	# Neutral	11	7	23	16	12	3	47
Changing the recycling and waste metrics	Oppose	13%	18%	13%	9%	12%	0%	14%
	Support	87%	82%	87%	91%	88%	100%	86%
	# Neutral	12	3	22	9	9	2	63
Support for waste volume reducing technologies	Oppose	5%	8%	2%	3%	4%	17%	5%
	Support	95%	92%	98%	97%	96%	83%	95%
	# Neutral	2	2	11	7	3	2	19

% of Non-Netural for a given program/policy
By Professional Grouping

Stakeholder Group		Transfer Station	Hauler	Recycling	Organics	Construction Demo Debris	Environmental Group	ALL Responses
Incentives for companies that use Maine recycled materials	Oppose	6%	9%	8%	9%	7%	11%	11%
	Support	94%	91%	92%	91%	93%	89%	89%
	# Neutral	5	3	8	5	3	0	21
Recyclable materials landfill ban	Oppose	16%	36%	22%	23%	19%	13%	28%
	Support	84%	64%	78%	77%	81%	88%	72%
	# Neutral	7	0	10	5	3	0	24
Changing the waste hierarchy	Oppose	38%	13%	44%	55%	53%	71%	41%
	Support	62%	88%	56%	45%	47%	29%	59%
	# Neutral	17	6	28	16	10	1	70
Waste reduction targets for state agencies	Oppose	9%	8%	7%	8%	7%	0%	9%
	Support	91%	92%	93%	92%	93%	100%	91%
	# Neutral	4	2	9	1	2	0	24
Minimum tipping fees for solid waste disposal	Oppose	26%	44%	28%	25%	25%	0%	31%
	Support	74%	56%	72%	75%	75%	100%	69%
	# Neutral	13	5	20	13	10	3	46
Funding								
Funding for organics diversion	Oppose	22%	55%	25%	18%	22%	0%	23%
	Support	78%	45%	75%	82%	78%	100%	77%
	# Neutral	8	3	14	3	2	0	28
Funding for facilities, such as transfer stations upgrades and expansion	Oppose	22%	50%	20%	26%	26%	14%	23%
	Support	78%	50%	80%	74%	74%	86%	77%
	# Neutral	9	4	16	10	6	2	28
Funding for reuse organizations or collection centers	Oppose	24%	50%	21%	21%	21%	13%	23%
	Support	76%	50%	79%	79%	79%	88%	77%
	# Neutral	11	4	17	12	10	1	31
Funding for regional cooperatives	Oppose	26%	64%	22%	21%	26%	11%	19%
	Support	74%	36%	78%	79%	74%	89%	81%
	# Neutral	8	3	20	7	6	0	32
Funding for educational tools for communities on materials management	Oppose	16%	31%	16%	14%	19%	0%	16%
	Support	84%	69%	84%	86%	81%	100%	84%
	# Neutral	3	1	9	2	3	1	18
Funding to incorporate MM into K- 12 education	Oppose	11%	17%	12%	12%	15%	0%	13%
	Support	89%	83%	88%	88%	85%	100%	88%

Are there other strategies for managing materials and solid waste that are not being considered?

Adopt EPA 2012 waste hierarchy; more and better education before regulation; curbside recycling; make recycling as easy as possible
Any bans should include incineration as well as landfills
Bottle bill is a problematic management technique. The 5 cent fee doesn't seem like enough now. For people have access to recyclable collection, like me, I just put all glass containers in the bin, and don't worry about the lost income. It is probably helpful for the tourists or drivers who have some incentive to return them, and the stores usually do, so that's good. If there was a good collection system, a fee may not be important.
Capturing more material within the recycling infrastructure and expanding curbside. Provide incentives for increasing curbside recycling and make curbside recycling comprehensive.
consider moving to franchise system for cities/towns/counties. if it works for residential sector it can work for entire municipality. best recycling communities have this
creating more jobs in Maine by encouraging businesses that used recycled materials generated in Maine to come here.
Creating regional facilities to better manage bulky items and construction debris vs every town having a transfer station. Very inefficient
Education
Extraction of materials/energy from waste stream
Favor adjusting recycling goal downward. Favor changing hierarchy to move landfilling up
Focus should be on an integrated waste management system that follows the hierarchy.
I would like to note that some items I would be in favor of IF other things were in place, i.e. removal of the bottle bill IF we had EPR for all packaging at curbside for all residents.
Increasing the use of biosolids on Maine farms
Making a useable product from organics
Mandatory adoption of pay as you throw for municipalities. Phased-in landfill bans for disposal of recyclables and organics. Grant funding to implement.
Mandatory recycling and expanding access to recycling collection, particularly in rural areas
Mixed waste processing
Nothing to a landfill that hasn't been recycled.
Provide more free opportunities at locations convenient to every municipality and/or region for Maine citizens to dispose of used electronics and fluorescent light bulbs.
Reducing regulatory barriers towards biosolids reuse.
Statewide support center with resources for towns, municipals, and large institutions and business to reduce waste and increase diversion.
Statewide support for a unified recycling and diversion rate metrics, with both a requirement and some financial or administrative support, would enable recycling goals to be expanded beyond the MSW stream. Commercial and industrial waste should be equally considered, alongside residential waste, in creating diversion goals.
Support for repair and reuse strategies
Support for reuse - swaps, goodwill type enterprises, difficult to recover/recycle items, support for repair and rehab industries
support public policy to better allow for compliance with the waste hierarchy
Tax waste use proceeds to reimburse those who recycle more
Unit based pricing, waste diversion subsidies funded through tipping fees, state funded public education; public examination of European waste management models
Waste to energy for smaller quantities, gasification, pyrolysis

Are there other strategies for managing materials and solid waste that are not being considered?

We need a bond issue to fund solid waste needs across the state, after a thorough study of what the needs are in each region.

why are we so focused on bags and bottles? together they make up no more than 8% of the waste stream (if that)

Please leave any comments on your rankings listed above or general comments

A funding source missing from the prior page is a 1/2 cent recycling fee on all large containers coming out of the bottle bill that will no longer be subject to a handling fee. If that recycling fee were in place for 5 years it would raise approximately \$3 million.
above groupings not quite descriptive enough to make informed choices.
Education on these things take time.
funds generated by product stewardship fees etc. should go toward materials management.
Going for long term band for buck....
Good survey thank you
I was surprised to not find the funding option offered in a bill this year of industry money into a fund for increasing recycling at the municipal level, with the removal of large items in the bottle bill. With so much discussion on that bill, I thought it would be here as an option for people to weigh in on...also, no option of straight EPR for products to help pay for solid waste management in the State.
If we address the first three, the landfill issues will become a lot less
I'm not sure if I did this correctly
Issue is, and remains, the reality that each municipality operates its own solid waste program, so any state level effort is going to have to work about this issue
It was difficult to move these around
Mandatory source separation of organics would be a huge mistake in Maine, since needs vary so much by region. and compost and other low-level products have so little value.
Organics are the largest category of materials in the waste stream. We will get the biggest bang for our buck by finding a way to divert them from the waste stream.
pay as you throw and regional hauling franchises will improve recycling rates
Pay-As-You throw should be mandated by state law for all Maine municipalities to implement. No state monies should be spent
Prioritize policies that allow compliance with the waste hierarchy
The use of the word "no" in your choices is confusing and unnecessary.
These are all very important and difficult to rank.
These groupings are too general to rank definitively. For example, what is meant by "landfill management and planning?"
We need to fund educational programs on Reduce, Reuse, Recycle. Not fund a Towns facility.
When you apply stats (like 15% organics from 30% participating households) the numbers are very small. There's an awful lot of attention on residential organics when the opportunity is very small.
With a goal of increased diversion rates, we should focus on the programs that are likely to result in the most impact. Data and metrics are likely to expand the breadth of what waste is considered in calculating diversion rates (inclusion of commercial waste, etc), while organics management promises to be a low-hanging fruit. Funding additional facilities and solid waste programs, particularly cooperatives, is likely to make existing programs more cost effective, especially in lower density areas. Hard-to-manage item management is high-profile, but only amounts for a small percentage of the total waste stream. If the first four items are adequately addressed, landfill expansions should be largely unnecessary.
Would adjust data to better measure reduction first. 3-5 would not address
There should have been more questions specifically about WTE.
*There is a possibility that municipal representatives misinterpreted the term "solid waste disposal fees" and were actually thinking about "special waste fees" and "bulky waste fees" that individuals pay at a transfer station.