

2000 School District Waste Reduction Survey

Final Report

August 2002

Executive Summary

Introduction

In California, there are 1,054 school districts and 8,563 schools serving 5,951,612 students. It is estimated these students dispose of over 700,000 tons of material per year! In an effort to facilitate the reduction of solid waste generated and disposed by school districts, Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 42621 requires the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) to develop and implement a waste prevention and recycling program for school districts. One element of this program is to conduct a survey of school districts throughout the State to determine which districts have implemented waste prevention and recycling programs and to identify those school districts that need assistance developing such programs.

In 2000, the CIWMB conducted a survey of California school districts to assess their waste reduction efforts. This report summarizes the 2000 survey results, outlines the history of the survey, includes an analysis of the survey data, and discusses future CIWMB efforts related to the survey.

2000 School District Waste Reduction Survey Results

Of the school districts surveyed statewide, approximately 50 percent responded with information regarding their solid waste management program. Although few of the responding school districts reported implementing formal district-wide waste reduction programs, most districts reported that some or all of their schools participated in a number of waste prevention and/or recycling activities. The following is a summary of the survey results.

Waste Prevention

Nine percent of reporting school districts, have a formal waste prevention plan/policy. Independent of a formal waste prevention policy, 98% of the responding school districts indicated participation in some type of waste prevention activity. The most commonly reported waste prevention activities include:

- 79% - Double-sided copying
- 77% - Use of electronic mail and/or fax
- 62% - Reuse of paper
- 61% - Use of bulletin boards (opposed to individual announcements)
- 58% - Offer vs. Serve lunch program.

Buy Recycled

Eight percent of participating school districts reported having a written policy for the procurement of recycled-content products. Of the reporting school districts, 75% indicated that they purchase some type of recycled-content products. The most commonly reported buy recycled activities include:

- 80% - Purchasing recycled-content office paper
- 48% - Purchasing other recycled-content paper products (e.g. toilet paper, paper towels, etc.)
- 40% - Use of mulch and/or compost generated from district grounds.

Recycling

Of the responding districts, 36% reported that the district office coordinates district-wide recycling activities. 95% of the reporting school districts indicated that some or all of their schools are engaged in various levels of recycling. The most commonly reported recycled materials include:

- 87% - Aluminum cans
- 73% - Cardboard
- 73% - White paper
- 66% - Mixed office paper
- 65% - Computer paper
- 58% - Newspaper

Composting

Fifty-two percent of the school districts reported having implemented some type of on-site composting program. The most commonly reported composting material types include:

- 79% - Grass clippings
- 67% - Brush or tree trimmings
- 22% - Food scraps
- 17% - Paper
- 9% - Milk cartons

Barriers

Of the participating school districts, 87% reported experiencing some type of barrier in their recycling efforts. The primary barriers identified by reporting school districts include:

- 69% - Staffing and/or supervision
- 59% - Storage of recyclables
- 47% - On-site collection
- 46% - Motivating staff and students to participate
- 42% - Sanitation or safety concerns
- 41% - Transportation of recyclables to market
- 40% - Lack of markets
- 38% - Funding or start-up costs
- 36% - Resistance to change
- 33% - Training

Construction

Sixty-four percent of the responding school districts reported planned construction in the next two years. This planned construction could include new buildings and/or renovations.

Curriculum

Fifty-nine percent of the school districts responding to the survey requested to receive information on the CIWMB's curriculum and teacher training program.

Comparison of 1996 and 2000 School District Waste Reduction Survey Results

Prior to the 2000 school district waste reduction survey, the CIWMB conducted a similar survey in 1996 to assess school districts' waste prevention and recycling program efforts. The following table represents an overview of data collected in 1996 compared to those collected in 2000.

Overall, there has been an increase in the number of school districts that have implemented formal district-wide recycling programs, as well as various recycling and composting activities. The slight decrease in the implementation of formal waste prevention and procurement policies, however, may be a result of the lower response rate to the 2000 survey (50% in 2000 opposed to 96% in 1996)³ rather than the actual elimination of these policies. The survey data indicate that most school districts are implementing waste prevention, recycling and composting programs independent of having a specific school board policy codifying and supporting these programs. In order to facilitate the development of school board policies to institutionalize districtwide waste reduction programs, the CIWMB partnered with the California School Boards Association to develop a model integrated waste management policy and provides examples of specific school district policies and school board resolutions. As a result, it is anticipated that these numbers will increase over the coming years.

Districts with Formal Policies	1996	2000
District-wide recycling program	21%	36%
Waste Prevention Plan/Policy	11%	9%
"Green" Procurement Policy	9%	8%
Districts participating in Waste Reduction Activities	1996	2000
Recycling	49%	95%
Composting	14%	52%

Future Efforts

This information and specific survey data will be provided to school districts and local jurisdictions to facilitate networking between the districts and local jurisdiction waste reduction programs. Specific survey data can serve as a tool for school districts and local jurisdictions as they partner to identify waste reduction efforts the school district has already accomplished and any additional opportunities that may exist. Additionally, these data can be used by individual school districts as a peer-matching tool to investigate the types of waste reduction programs similar or nearby districts have implemented for modeling purposes. For these and other networking and partnership purposes, the survey data for each reporting school district identify the district staff responsible for waste reduction programs.

This information will also help CIWMB staff to assist local jurisdictions in identifying and prioritizing which school districts need assistance with waste reduction program implementation and/or expansion and how to best assist these school districts. The CWIMB's Office of Integrated Education is also responding to each of the school districts that requested information regarding its environmental education program.

Additionally, as a result of the passage of Senate Bill 373 (Torlakson, Chapter 926, Statutes of 2001), PRC Section 42646 requires the CIWMB on or before January 1, 2004, to evaluate the implementation of school waste reduction programs in the State. If this evaluation demonstrates that less than 75 percent of schools have implemented such programs, the CIWMB is required to recommend to the Legislature those statutory changes needed to require schools to implement such a program. Information about this and future surveys will be provided on the CIWMB's School Waste Management Education and Assistance web pages.

Endnotes

1. Based on the statewide school profile data from California Department of Education. The number of districts, number of schools and student enrollment includes county offices and California Youth Authority, which were not in the populations for this waste reduction survey.
2. Based on generation data from the City of Los Angeles' Solid Waste Generation Study (0.12 tons per student per year).
3. In 1996, follow-up phone calls were made to all non-respondents in an effort to obtain survey data from all school districts. This intensive follow-up was not conducted for all non-respondents in 2000.
4. These data represent survey results received as of 6/30/01.

Historical Perspective--Previous Surveys

In 1992, the CIWMB surveyed K-12 public schools to identify those schools with waste prevention and recycling programs and those in need of such programs. Surveys were sent directly to schools because preliminary research revealed that schools were generally engaged in waste prevention and recycling efforts independent of school districts. A 24% survey response rate was achieved; and, of the responding schools, 82% reported practicing some form of waste prevention. The CIWMB found, however, that just four percent of the reporting schools engaged in district-wide recycling programs. The survey results indicated that existing recycling programs were typically organized by an enthusiastic teacher or through an environmental club. School-wide, and certainly district-wide, programs were rare. Through the analysis of these data, CIWMB staff concluded that if school districts were going to divert large amounts of waste, programs would need to include the cooperation of the entire district.

The CIWMB again conducted a survey in 1994 to identify school-related waste prevention and recycling programs, this time focusing on the efforts of school districts rather than individual school sites. Thirteen percent of the school districts responded to the survey, and, of those, 34% stated they had initiated a district-wide recycling program. In addition, 68% of the school districts

reporting requested some level of technical assistance from the CIWMB. These requests varied from providing solutions to issues, such as contamination of recyclables; to assisting with developing, implementing and expanding the school district's waste prevention and recycling program.

In 1996, the CIWMB initiated another school district survey to identify those districts with waste prevention and recycling programs and to analyze any waste reduction trends in the public school system. A 96% survey response rate was achieved, and of the 964 responding school districts, 27% reported recycling more than four different material types. Additionally, 21% of the responding school districts reported having a district-wide recycling program, 11% reported having a district-wide waste reduction policy and 9% indicated that they have a formal policy for purchasing recycled-content products (see table above). Additionally, 39% of the school districts reported that their district would like to receive information on solid waste management curriculum.

Survey Analysis

The following is the analysis of the data gathered from the 2000 School District Waste Reduction Survey for results received as of 6/30/01.

School Districts by Enrollment

Enrollment Category	< 2500 students	2,501 to 5,000 students	5,001 to 10,000 students	> 10,000 students
Number of School Districts	570	132	131	152

Waste Prevention Activities (Questions 1 and 7)

Percent of School Districts that Reported Having Implemented the Following Waste Prevention Programs	< 2500 students	2,501 to 5,000 students	5,001 to 10,000 students	> 10,000 students
Does the District Have a Waste Reduction Plan or Policy?	8.74%	10.87%	11.67%	6.45%
Donate or Reuse Supplies and/or Equipment	43.69%	41.30%	58.33%	46.77%
Donate to Food Bank or Rescue	14.24%	10.87%	21.67%	17.74%
Double Sided Copying	79.61%	65.22%	83.33%	70.97%
Grasscycling	55.34%	41.30%	55.00%	51.61%
Mulch Tree Trimmings	34.95%	34.78%	46.67%	45.16%
Offer vs. Serve Lunch Program	52.43%	52.17%	76.67%	58.06%
On-site Composting/Vermicomposting (compost with worms)	22.98%	17.39%	28.33%	14.52%
Require Minimal Packaging from Vendors	18.45%	15.22%	30.00%	17.74%
Reuse Paper	65.37%	41.30%	56.67%	56.45%
Route Memos to Reduce Paper Use	45.95%	43.48%	68.33%	58.06%
Send Back Toner Cartridges	50.81%	60.87%	66.67%	62.90%
Use Bulletin Boards vs. Individual Announcements	56.31%	54.35%	75.00%	62.90%
Use E-mail & Electronic Faxes	71.52%	78.26%	88.33%	82.26%
Vendors Take Back or Reuse Packaging Material	30.42%	54.35%	66.67%	54.84%
Wash Reusable Trays, Dishes or Flatware	53.72%	41.30%	43.33%	46.77%

Analysis of Waste Prevention Efforts

1. Of the responding school districts, 9% reported having a formal waste reduction policy or plan. Approximately 98% of school districts responded, however, that while they did not have a written policy or plan, they had informally incorporated waste reduction activities into their regular business practices.
2. The top waste prevention activities reported were primarily office related (i.e., paper waste reduction activities) such as double-sided copying, reuse of paper and electronic mail and faxes. This is not surprising considering that paper waste is one of the largest components of the school waste stream. The next most widely implemented waste prevention activities addressed landscape waste and food waste, making up the next largest component of the school waste stream (i.e., organic waste).
3. A greater percentage of the responding school districts with enrollment between 5,001 and 10,000 reported implementing most of the waste prevention programs listed above compared to school districts in the other three enrollment categories. This was the case for each program with the exception of use of reusable trays, dishes or flatware, paper reuse and grasscycling.
4. The lowest percentage of school districts implementing the waste prevention programs listed above were reported by school districts with student enrollment between 2,501 and 5,000 when compared to school districts in higher or lower enrollment categories. This was true for each of the waste prevention programs listed above, with the exception of adopting a procurement policy, sending back toner cartridges, e-mail and electronic faxes, and requiring vendor take-back or reuse of packaging material.

Buy Recycled (Questions 2 and 8)

Percent of School Districts that Reported Having Implemented the Following Buying Recycled Programs	< 2500 students	2,501 to 5,000 students	5,001 to 10,000 students	> 10,000 students
Does the School District Have a Written Policy to Purchase Recycled-Content Products	5.18%	10.87%	11.67%	12.90%
Purchase of Recycled-Content Paper Products	57.28%	60.87%	71.67%	59.68%
Purchase of Recycled-Content Products Other than Paper	30.10%	34.78%	56.67%	46.77%
Purchase of Re-refined Oil for Vehicles, Buses, etc.	9.06%	6.52%	15.00%	11.29%
Use Mulch/Compost Generated from District	27.51%	26.09%	45.00%	29.03%

Analysis of Buy Recycled Activities

1. Of the reporting school districts, 8% indicated that they have implemented a formal policy to purchase recycled-content products. The majority of school districts, however, did respond that, while they do not have a formal written policy with respect to purchasing recycled-content products, they do purchase recycled-content materials at the district level.
2. The most frequently reported buy recycled activities included the purchasing of recycled-content paper as well as purchasing other recycled-content paper products (i.e. paper towels, toilet paper, etc.)
3. The highest percentage of participation in each of the buy recycled programs listed above was reported for school districts with student enrollment between 5,001 and 10,000 compared to school districts in the other enrollment categories, with the exception of those having a formal policy.
4. The percentage of districts implementing a districtwide buy-recycled or environmentally preferable purchasing policy appears to relate to the size of the school with respect to enrollment. Specifically, more districts within the largest student enrollment category reported adopting such a policy, while a lower percentage of districts within each of the smaller enrollment categories reported adopting such a policy.

Recycling Practices (Questions 3 and 9)

Percent of School Districts that Reported Having Implemented the Following Recycling Programs	< 2500 students	2,501 to 5,000 students	5,001 to 10,000 students	> 10,000 students
Does the District Office Coordinate Districtwide Recycling Activities?	31.72%	34.78%	45.00%	46.77%
Aluminum Cans	81.55%	84.78%	86.67%	79.03%
Aluminum Trays	14.56%	17.39%	33.33%	20.97%
Cardboard	63.11%	78.26%	76.67%	82.26%
Computer Paper	54.37%	67.39%	76.67%	74.19%
Computers	25.89%	43.48%	36.67%	40.32%
Food Scraps	14.89%	13.04%	5.00%	8.06%
Glass	24.27%	30.43%	25.00%	25.81%
Magazines	38.19%	50.00%	58.33%	53.23%
Milk Cartons	11.97%	10.87%	11.67%	19.35%
Mixed Office Paper	55.99%	69.57%	78.33%	72.58%
Newspaper	49.19%	63.04%	73.33%	61.29%
Phone Books	45.95%	58.70%	71.67%	61.29%
#1 Plastic (PETE)	23.30%	26.09%	30.00%	19.35%
#2 Plastic (HDPE)	19.42%	17.39%	26.67%	19.35%
Polystyrene	11.00%	15.22%	20.00%	25.81%
Scrap Metal	26.21%	58.70%	65.00%	64.52%
Steel/Tin Cans	20.39%	34.78%	35.00%	37.10%
Tree Trimmings	30.10%	21.74%	46.67%	46.77%
White Paper	62.46%	73.91%	78.33%	85.48%

Analysis of Recycling Practices

1. Of the responding school districts, 36% reported having a formal district-wide recycling program.
2. Approximately 95% of reporting school districts stated that they engaged in some level of recycling regardless of the implementation of a formal districtwide policy.
3. The most commonly reported recycled items include paper products (office papers and cardboard) and metals (aluminum and scrap metal). Again it is not surprising to see that a higher percentage of school districts are implementing paper recycling, as paper waste is one of the largest components of the school waste stream. Additionally, many local recycling programs offer paper recycling, which makes program implementation more convenient. This is also often the case with respect to aluminum cans and scrap metal, both of which can also generate revenue for the school district.

On-Site Composting (Question 5)

Percent of School Districts that Reported Having Implemented the Following Composting Programs	< 2500 students	2,501 to 5,000 students	5,001 to 10,000 students	> 10,000 students
Bush/Tree Clippings	35.60%	23.91%	45.00%	27.42%
Food Scraps	13.92%	10.87%	5.00%	4.84%
Grass Clippings	44.98%	30.43%	45.00%	24.19%
Milk Cartons	4.85%	2.17%	1.67%	8.06%
Paper	9.06%	8.70%	10.00%	8.06%

Analysis of On-Site Composting Activities

1. Over one-half of the reporting school districts (52%) have implemented some type of an on-site composting program.
2. The most common composted material types included grass clippings, bush or tree trimmings, and food scraps.
3. Although none of the enrollment categories consistently had the highest or lowest percentage of school districts participating in all or most of the composting programs listed above, a higher percentage of school districts with fewer than 2,500 students reported participating in each of these activities (i.e., either the highest percentage or second highest).

Recyclable Collections (Questions 4 and 10)

Percent of School Districts that Reported Having Implemented the Following Hauling Programs	< 2500 students	2,501 - 5,000 students	5,001 - 10,000 students	> 10,000 students
Does the School District Have a Contract for Solid Waste Hauling?	61.17%	63.04%	80.00%	74.19%
Backhaul Recyclables (picked up when new product is delivered)	3.88%	2.17%	11.67%	14.52%
Recycle Through a Local Recycler (not hauler)	16.50%	21.74%	25.00%	32.26%
Recycle Through a Non-Profit (e.g. Scouts)	11.65%	10.87%	11.67%	17.74%
Recycle Through a Private Hauler	42.07%	63.04%	65.00%	64.52%
Recycle Through the City/County	8.09%	10.87%	21.67%	12.90%
Self-haul Recyclables	54.69%	36.96%	43.33%	46.77%

Analysis of Recyclable Transportation

1. Approximately 65% of the reporting school districts contract for solid waste hauling.
2. Most of the responding school districts indicated that they recycle through the same company that provides refuse collection or on their own (i.e., transport materials themselves to a local recycler).
3. Fewer districts appear to be partnering with local recycling centers and non-profit organizations (e.g., Scouts, local conservation corps).

Barriers (Question 6)

Percent of School Districts that Reported Having Implemented the Following Hauling Programs	< 2500 students	2,501 - 5,000 students	5,001 - 10,000 students	> 10,000 students
Sanitation or safety concerns	33.33%	32.61%	48.33%	45.16%
On-site collection	35.92%	47.83%	41.67%	58.06%
Staffing and supervision	56.96%	60.87%	68.33%	64.52%
Funding or start up costs	29.77%	34.78%	40.00%	43.55%
Resistance to change	25.89%	36.96%	36.67%	51.61%
Transportation of recycled materials to markets	37.22%	30.43%	26.67%	38.71%
Lack of markets within a school district's region	34.63%	36.96%	26.67%	38.71%
Storage of materials	52.10%	52.17%	50.00%	50.00%
Motivating staff and students to participate	33.98%	45.65%	53.33%	50.00%
Training	23.30%	34.78%	48.33%	35.48%

1. Approximately 87% of the school districts reported experiencing some type of barrier in their recycling efforts. The most commonly reported barriers included staffing and/or supervision, storage of recyclables, on-site collection, and motivation of staff and students.

2. Additionally, many of the barriers that the districts identified appear to be interrelated. For example, funding concerns are often related to staffing and training concerns. The same holds true for many school districts with respect to sanitation concerns, storage, and a lack of markets.

Planned Construction or Renovation (Question 11)

64% of the reporting districts stated that they planned construction or renovation to begin within the next two years. The proposed work could include new buildings as well as renovations.

Environmental Education (Question 12)

59% of the school districts that returned the survey requested information on new student curriculum as well as other educational tools from the CIWMB Board's curriculum and teacher training programs.

School District Contact for Waste Reduction Activities (Question 13)

Of the responding school districts, the district contact for waste reduction programs & activities varied among a number of different positions, including:

- Administrative Assistant
- Assistant Superintendent
- Business Manager
- Director of Maintenance & Operations
- Maintenance Supervisor
- Personnel Director
- Plant Manager
- Principals
- Purchasing Director
- Recycling Coordinator
- Safety & Risk Manager
- Superintendent
- Teachers

Future Board Efforts

The survey data and information are very useful in helping the CIWMB obtain a sense of how school districts are progressing in their efforts to reduce waste. The survey results will also help the CIWMB tailor its assistance to school districts and local jurisdictions to increase the overall implementation of districtwide waste reduction programs and their effectiveness. For example, the CIWMB developed the first stage of a web based profile of schools and school districts statewide. This profile database provides summary data on school and school district waste composition along with general information about each school district (enrollment, number of schools, contact information, etc.). This tool also provides summary information on assistance provided by the CIWMB (e.g., grants, awards, teacher training and curriculum programs), contacts for more information, and links to school-related sites internal and external to the CIWMB.

The 2000 School District Waste Reduction Survey results will soon be added to this profile database. The inclusion of the survey data will provide a convenient opportunity for local jurisdictions to assess the progress of their school districts with respect to waste reduction program implementation, to acknowledge those districts that deserve recognition, and to assist those that need help. This will also allow school districts and local jurisdictions to view what similar or nearby districts have accomplished to reduce waste and provide a tool for peer matching.

In addition, CIWMB staff recently developed web-based resources for school district waste reduction to provide school districts and local jurisdictions with information about school waste composition, specific waste reduction strategies for each district department, model programs, funding opportunities, and more! This tool will also eventually be linked to the aforementioned CIWMB profiles database.

In an effort to disseminate the information in these resources and to increase the implementation of school district waste reduction programs, CIWMB staff will also be providing internal staff training as well as regional training workshops for school districts and local jurisdictions. These trainings sessions will focus on how to assist school districts in implementing new and expanding existing waste reduction programs. CIWMB staff are also collaborating with a number of school-related professional

associations and organizations (e.g., California School Boards Association, California Association of School Business Officials, Association of California School Administrators) to inform school district decision makers about the benefits and value of districtwide waste reduction programs. These outreach efforts include participating in statewide conferences and publishing articles for journals, newsletters, web sites, etc. Through these and other coordinated efforts, it is anticipated that there will be an increase in the overall implementation of school district waste reduction programs.

Again to measure the progress of such programs, the CIWMB will conduct another School District Waste Reduction Survey in 2003. Senate Bill 373 (Torlakson, Chapter 926, Statutes of 2001), PRC Section 42646 requires the CIWMB on or before January 1, 2004, to evaluate the implementation of school waste reduction programs in the State. If this evaluation demonstrates that less than 75 percent of schools have implemented such programs, the CIWMB is required to recommend to the Legislature those statutory changes needed to require schools to implement such a program. Information about this and future surveys will be provided on the CIWMB's School Waste Management Education and Assistance web pages.

School District Waste Reduction Questionnaire 2000

Please mark "All" or "Some" if the question applies to all or some schools within the district; otherwise leave blank.

1. Which, if any, of the following WASTE PREVENTION activities are practiced in your school district?

All	Some	
		"Offer vs. serve" lunch program
		Wash cafeteria trays, dishes, or reusable flatware
		Donate to food banks/rescue programs
		On-site composting/vermicomposting (compost w/worms)
		Grasycle (leave grass clippings vs. collecting)
		Mulch tree trimmings
		Vendors take back or reuse packaging material (e.g. pallets)
		Require minimal packaging from vendors

All	Some	
		Route memos to reduce paper
		Use bulletin boards vs. individual announcements
		Use e-mail & electronic faxes
		Reuse of paper
		Double sided copying
		Donate or reuse supplies and/or equipment
		Send back toner cartridges for refill
		Other _____

2. Are any of the following purchasing options practiced in the District?

All	Some	
		Use mulch/compost generated from the district
		Purchase of recycled-content paper products

All	Some	
		Purchase recycled-content products other than paper
		Purchase rerefined oil for vehicles, buses, etc

3. Mark any of the following materials that are collected for recycling within the school district:

All	Some	
		Cardboard
		White paper
		Computer paper
		Mixed office paper
		Newspaper
		Magazines
		Phone books
		Aluminum cans
		Aluminum trays
		Steel/tin cans

All	Some	
		Scrap metal
		Glass
		Polystyrene
		#1 plastic (PETE)
		#2 plastic (HDPE)
		Milk Cartons
		Computers
		Tree trimmings
		Food Scraps
		Other _____

4. Who transports the district's recyclables to market?

All	Some	
		Private hauler, same one that hauls the garbage
		Recycler, different from garbage hauler
		City/county
		Non-profit organization (e.g. scouts, local shelter)
		Self haul (e.g. teacher, janitor, volunteer)
		Backhauling (picked up when new product is delivered)
		Other _____

Company Name/City _____
 Company Name/City _____
 (if more than one hauler provides services to the district please include the information on an additional sheet)

5. What materials are composted within the school district?

All	Some	
		Grass clippings
		Bush/tree clippings
		Milk Cartons

All	Some	
		Paper
		Food scraps
		Other _____

6. What barriers has the district encountered in implementing waste reduction activities?

All	Some	
		Sanitation or safety concerns
		On-site collection
		Staffing and/or supervision
		Funding or start-up costs
		Resistance to change
		Other _____

All	Some	
		Transportation of recycled materials to markets
		Lack of markets within the district's region
		Storage of materials
		Motivating staff and students to participate
		Training staff and students about the program

- 7. Does the school district have a WRITTEN waste prevention plan or policy?
- 8. Does the school district have a WRITTEN policy to purchase recycled-content products?
- 9. Does the district office coordinate district-wide recycling activities?
- 10. Does the school district have a contract for solid waste hauling?
- 11. Is any renovation/construction planned for school buildings within the next two years?
- 12. Would you like to receive information on NEW student curriculum for solid waste management, used oil, or "closing the loop"?

Yes	No

13. Who is the district contact for waste reduction/recycling activities? Please Write Name, Phone # and E-mail Here:

Name: _____ Phone (area code, #): _____ e-mail: _____

District Mailing Address: _____

14. Who completed the questionnaire (if different from above)?

Name: _____ Title: _____ Phone: _____

Thank you so much for completing this questionnaire! Please return by fax to (916) 341-6678. If you have any questions please call Corbett Cutts @ (916) 341-6234

FAX # (916) 341-6678