United States
Environmental Protection
Agency

Solid Waste and
Emergency Response
(5305W)

EPA530-R-96-003
May 1996

EPA

Summary of Comments On the Proposed Paper Products Recovered Materials Advisory Notice (RMAN)

Photocopied on recycled paper that contains at least 50 % recycled fiber

CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF COMMENTERS 1

INTRODUCTION 4

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS BY TOPIC

Section

1 General Comments 5

2 Comments on EPA's Objectives 12

3 Comments on EPA's Approach 15

4 Comments on EPA's Methodology 19

5 Comments on EPA's Content Recommendations for Designated Paper Products 20

Printing and Writing Paper 20

Coated Printing and Writing Paper 25

Bristols 27

Newsprint 28

Tissue Products 29

Paperboard and Packaging Products 32

Miscellaneous Paper Products 36

6 Comments on Measurement, Specifications, and Recyclability 37

7 Comments on Definitions 43

Postconsumer 43

Waste Paper, Recovered Fiber, and Clarification on Repulping Requirements 47

Mill Broke 50

8 Miscellaneous Comments 55

Further Delineating or Deleting Designated Items 55

Recovered Material Certification and Verification 56

Sawdust as Recovered Fiber 57

Energy Issues and Cost/Benefit Implications of Paper Recycling 58

Recovered Fiber Supply Shortage 59

Information on Tray Liners 62

Information on Greeting Card Stock 62

Information on Specialty Tissue Products 62

Information on Paperboard and Packaging 63

COMMENTERS

Docket Tracking Number	Organization	Type of Business/Organization
1	HMSO Paper	British government printing organization
2	Mohawk Paper Mills, Inc.	Printing-writing producer
3	Repap Wisconsin, Inc.	Tissue producer
4	International Paper	Printing-writing, paperboard producer
5	Wisconsin Tissue/Chesapeake Corp.	Tissue producer
6	Union Camp Corporation	Printing-writing, paperboard producer
7	Appleton Papers, Inc.	Carbonless producer
8	Conservatree Information Services	Recycling advocacy organization
9	International Paper	Printing-writing, paperboard producer
10	James River Corporation	Printing-writing, tissue, paperboard producer
11	Scott Paper Company	Tissue producer
12	Fort Howard Corporation	Tissue producer
13	Potlatch Corporation	Printing-writing, tissue, paperboard producer
14	Chesapeake Paper Products Company	Containerboard producer
15	Mead Corporation	Paperboard producer
16	Markets for Recycled Products	Recycling advocate
17	Magazine Publishers of America	Trade association
18	City of San Diego, CA Waste Management Department	City government
19	Riverwood International Corporation	Paperboard producer
20	Kimberly-Clark Corporation	Tissue producer
21	Bowater Incorporated	Newsprint, printing-writing producer

Docket Tracking Number	Organization	Type of Business/Organization
22	Newspaper Association of America	Trade association
23	American Forest & Paper Association Containerboard & Kraft Paper Group	Trade association
24	Union Camp Corporation, Packaging Division	Paperboard producer
25	American Forest & Paper Association Printing-Writing Paper Division	Trade association
26	American Forest & Paper Association Recycled Paperboard Division	Trade association
27	American Forest & Paper Association Bleached Paperboard Division	Trade association
28	American Forest & Paper Association	Trade association
29	American Forest & Paper Association Newsprint Division	Trade association
30	American Forest & Paper Association Tissue Division	Trade association
31	Northeast Maryland Waste Disposal Authority	Local government
32	Rainy River Forest Products U.S. Corporation	Newsprint, printing-writing producer
33	Finch, Pruyn & Company, Inc.	Printing-writing producer
34	Procter & Gamble Company	Packaged goods manufacturer
35	International Paper, Fine Business Papers	Printing-writing producer
36	Lincoln Pulp & Paper Co., Inc.	Pulp, printing-writing producer
37	Georgia-Pacific Corporation	Printing-writing, tissue, paperboard producer
38	Canadian Pulp & Paper Association	Trade association
39	James River Corporation	Printing-writing, tissue, paperboard producer
40	Paperboard Packaging Council	Trade association
41	Tennessee Valley Authority	Federal agency
42	Random House, Inc.	Book publisher

Docket Tracking Number	Organization	Type of Business/Organization
43	Tissue Producers Coalition on the EPA Procurement Guidelines	Industry coalition
44	Jeff Lindsay	Individual
45	Lindenmeyr Paper Company	Fine paper merchant
L1	National Recycling Coalition	Environmental advocacy group
L2	Chesapeake Paper Products Co.	Containerboard producer
L3	Tissue Producers Coalition	Industry coalition
L4	Direct Marketing Association	Trade association
L5	Paper Recycling Coalition	Industry coalition

INTRODUCTION

This document summarizes comments by topic on the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA's) *Draft Paper Products Recovered Materials Advisory Notice* (RMAN), which was published in the *Federal Register* on March 15, 1995. Within each topic, comments are listed according to the order in which they were received.

EPA invited public comment on the draft paper products RMAN for a 60-day period and received 45 comments during that period, as well as five comments after the end of the comment period. Public comments and relevant documents are available for viewing in the RCRA Information Center (RIC), located in Room M2616 at the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street, SW., Washington, DC 20460, in docket number F-95-PPRN-FFFFF. The RIC is open from 9 a.m. to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, except federal holidays. To review document materials, the public must make an appointment by calling 202 260-9327. Materials may be copied for $0.15 a page.

For copies of the draft paper products RMAN and related supporting analyses, call the RCRA Hotline at 800 424-9346 or, in the Washington, DC, metropolitan area, 703 412-9810. These documents are also accessible through EPA's Public Access Server on the Internet, at gopher.epa.gov. For technical information on the draft paper products RMAN, contact Dana Arnold of the Recycling Section in EPA's Office of Solid Waste at 703 308-7279.

SECTION 1

GENERAL COMMENTS

Mohawk Paper Mills, Inc. (#2) disagrees with the proposed recycled content standards for printing and writing papers because the recommended levels would place nonintegrated manufacturers of text and cover papers at a severe disadvantage in markets that treat text, cover, and offset papers as interchangeable products. It also questions whether current technology can adequately deink mixed office waste.

Wisconsin Tissue/Chesapeake Corp. (#5) does not support government intervention in establishing these guidelines. It believes that recovered paper utilization should be dictated by market forces rather than government mandates. It also states that the collection of postconsumer paper is not keeping up with U.S. and global demand, so manufacturers need to have the flexibility to alter their utilization of postconsumer fiber in response to these market conditions.

Conservatree Information Services (#8) supports the proposed revisions to the 1988 EPA paper guideline as welcome corrections to previously flawed guidelines for high-grade papers. It suggests that to maintain a healthy market, it is crucial to provide incentives for manufacturers to keep making printing and writing papers at higher content levels.

International Paper (IP, #9) disagrees with the guidelines and would like EPA to emphasize that the content levels in the RMAN are recommendations for use solely by federal agencies. It does not agree with further government intervention in paper recycling, because specifying content levels is a demand-side management tool that is detrimental to the industry. Encouraging the use of these content levels in the private sector shows a complete lack of understanding of customer end-use requirements, fiber availability, supply shortage, global economic trends, cost, manufacturing capabilities, and the complex interaction of these variables. Most of the major world economies do not distinguish between pre- and postconsumer sources of fiber, so the content standards would put the U.S. paper industry at a competitive disadvantage in international markets. The company is also concerned that a cost analysis was not done to assess the financial impact of the guidelines. IP, however, does applaud EPA's inclusion of the

grades matrix which clarifies different grades and eliminates confusion. To create a single definition of recycled paper, it also supports the categorization of most common office-use papers as requiring 20 percent postconsumer and 80 percent virgin fiber.

Potlatch (#13) disagrees with an increase in postconsumer recovered fiber content because the price increases in the paper market will spread through the commercial market, causing significant negative economic impacts.

Chesapeake Paper Products (#14) opposes further increases in recovered fiber content because new incentives to recover more fiber are simply not needed in competitive global paper markets.

Mead (#15) strongly opposes the concept of government-imposed recycled content requirements. It states that the guidelines effect the energy balance, because virgin fiber mills are very efficient in converting waste material into energy. Use of recycled fiber, however, reduces the amount of these waste products and increases use of nonrenewable energy sources. In addition, current demand has driven prices upward, so EPA should include in the RMAN a candid discussion on whether the environmental benefits expected to occur with the adoption of these guidelines offset the potential economic costs to consumers.

Markets for Recycled Products (#16) states that the proposed RMAN does not recognize that paper and paperboard are made with ingredients that are not fiber. Virgin chemical and mineral additives are used commonly in paper, which can create a manufacturing problem if EPA recommends 100 percent recycled content levels.

Magazine Publishers of America (#17) requests that EPA confine the scope of its guidelines to paper purchases by federal agencies without suggesting that the private sector adopt these recovered fiber content levels. Given the limited availability and high cost of many paper products containing postconsumer fiber, there could be significant negative financial impacts if the private sector adopted these recommendations. EPA needs to undertake a much more extensive analysis of market conditions and financial impacts before making any recommendations of postconsumer and recovered fiber content levels for use by the private sector.

The **City of San Diego, CA** (#18) believes that the RMAN recommendations would greatly strengthen markets for postconsumer recycled paper by raising the standards of minimum postconsumer content for a variety of paper products.

Kimberly-Clark (#20) believes that the RMAN is unnecessary in light of current recycling levels and initiatives under way in the marketplace. The proposals for recovered material ranges will stifle innovation and reduce the flexibility that manufacturers need to be competitive in the marketplace.

Bowater (#21) believes that the RMAN exceeds statutory authority and intent and is an unconstitutional restraint on commercial speech. Congress's objective of diverting waste from landfills is needlessly jeopardized by the draft RMAN's narrow definition of "preconsumer" and "postconsumer" waste. Bowater contends that its employees will have a difficult time distinguishing between postconsumer and preconsumer waste old magazines (OMG), making the recovery process so complex that Bowater would have to cease producing its computer forms paper from recovered material.

The **Newspaper Association of America** (#22) believes that the proposed guidelines are unnecessary, and that EPA should focus its efforts on working with industry and local governments to maximize the recovery of old newspaper and other recovered papers. Furthermore, it encourages EPA to postpone revisions to the procurement guidelines for newsprint until it becomes clear that sufficient supplies of recovered fiber are available to meet the current and anticipated long-term needs of newsprint manufacturers.

Union Camp (#24) is opposed to arbitrary mandatory recycled content levels because they are unmindful of local concerns, and they add costs and destabilize markets without meaningfully enhancing recycling or recycling markets. The RMAN also negates the efficient channeling of paper waste and undermines industry competitiveness.

The **Printing-Writing Paper Division** of the **American Forest & Paper Association** (#25) supports efforts to revise the guidelines because the markets have changed since the previous guidelines went into effect. The RMAN is correct in suggesting lower recycled content levels for printing-writing grades achievable both by large and small mills, assuming sufficient supplies of recovered fiber are available. In light of tight markets for recovered fiber, virgin pulps, and paper products, however, printing-writing paper manufacturers strongly urge EPA to clearly indicate that the RMAN applies to federal government purchases only.

The **Recycled Paperboard Division** of the **American Forest & Paper Association** (RPD, #26) takes strong exception to EPA's goal to have its content standards adopted by the private marketplace, at least until the marketplace can respond to the demand for recovered paper. Given the current fiber supply shortages, mills will only add capacity when they can be assured that they will have an adequate supply of fiber at reasonable cost. RPD also believes that it is irrelevant whether EPA uses the term recycled content "standards" or "levels," because the effects will be the same. RPD questions how many more minimum content levels EPA will seek to recommend, because it is already micromanaging the industry.

American Forest & Paper Association (AF&PA, #28) supports the use of content levels for federal agencies but does not support the use of content levels in the private sector/consumer market. It states that the guideline should be based on data reflecting current market conditions, that recovered paper markets have matured, and that EPA should instead focus on removing the overarching barriers to increased recovery and recycling because content levels would be counterproductive unless there was assurance of adequate recovered fiber supply. AF&PA also asserts that distinguishing between pre- and postconsumer paper puts the United States at a competitive disadvantage in the world economy, and that EPA should perform a financial impact analysis before making final recommendations.

The **Newsprint Division** of the **American Forest & Paper Association** (#29) states that the key issue is not stimulating markets for recovered paper but rather extending recovery. With a shortage in supply, any policy that stimulates demand will result in businesses reducing investment in using recovered fiber. It is also inappropriate for EPA to establish procurement guidelines for the broad market because the current tightness in recovered paper markets would be exacerbated and recycling would be hurt over the long term.

The **Tissue Division** of the **American Forest & Paper Association** (#30) states that the key issue is not stimulating markets for recovered paper but extending recovery. With a shortage in supply, any policy that stimulates demand will result in businesses reducing investment in using recovered fiber. In addition, the recent surge of recovered paper prices has increased the raw material costs of tissue producers that rely heavily on recovered paper. As a result, three companies have been forced to close their doors.

The **Northeast Maryland Waste Disposal Authority** (#31) commends EPA for its efforts to increase purchases of recycled products by government agencies and believes that these revisions to the guidelines will help in this regard.

Rainy River Forest Products (#32) disagrees with the distinction between pre- and postconsumer materials. Because no world market distinguishes between pre- and postconsumer sources of recovered paper, doing so puts the United States at a competitive disadvantage. In addition, the use of EPA content levels by the private sector falls outside the scope of its statutory mandate, and without a cost benefit analysis EPA needs to carefully contrast federal versus private marketplace standards.

Procter & Gamble (#34) states that the RMAN does not pay adequate attention to the benefits of source reduction, and it suggests that tissue and towel products with EPA-approved source reduction features should be deemed co-equal with those products that utilize postconsumer fiber. Any reference to private sector activity should be deleted from the RMAN because it exceeds the statute and because the marketplace has made federal intervention unnecessary.

Georgia-Pacific (#37) questions the need for new procurement guidelines. Because paper mills are already negatively affected by the increased cost and supply shortage of recovered paper, the guidelines will exacerbate the problem. It is also concerned about EPA's legal authority to propose guidelines to the private sector.

The **Canadian Pulp and Paper Association** (#38) believes that the influence of the specifications will extend well beyond U.S. borders, and the guidelines fail to take into account the changes that have transpired over the past six to seven years in recovered paper markets. In addition, collection systems need to be improved and expanded rather than introducing stricter policies that would continue to place the entire burden on paper mills. Government initiatives should be focused on generating economic supplies and incentives so that recycling goals can be achieved.

James River (#39) believes that in light of the dramatic reversal that the proposed guidelines represent and the complexity of its potential impacts on the market, the 60-day period for public comment was unreasonably short.

Paperboard Packaging Council (#40) questions the appropriateness of stimulating demand even further by the adoption of increased recycled content standards for federal procurement of paper products. It is concerned because current and projected supplies of recovered paper and paperboard are inadequate to meet market needs.

Tissue Producers Coalition (#43) does not object to recycled content guidelines but was shocked at the extent of the changes put forth in the new guidelines. It believes these changes will have serious detrimental effects on its industry and the use of recovered fiber in the United States. It notes a lack of any clear statutory authority for establishing new guidelines for the consumer segment. In addition, it finds it contradictory that EPA emphasizes the importance of recognizing the energy balances and operating economics in setting postconsumer-only standards for printing and writing grades, while ignoring these same considerations for tissue grades.

National Recycling Coalition (#L1) generally applauds EPA's efforts in the development of the RMAN and believes that it will greatly improve the ability of public and private sector procurement officials to purchase recycled paper products at competitive prices. However, it encourages EPA to consider efforts to monitor the implementation of affirmative procurement programs for recycled products within each federal agency.

Direct Marketing Association (#L4) believes that it is crucial that the guidelines apply only to federal agencies, not to the private sector. The continuing shortages of recovered fiber and high prices create substantial concerns about the potential impact of the guidelines on the availability of recovered fiber for private-sector paper purchasers.

Paper Recycling Coalition (#L5) believes that EPA should not be trying to spur the demand for recycled paper when it is lacking reliable data on the amount of material available to be recovered, and when the recycling industry is overwhelmingly concerned about shortages and future supply of recovered paper. EPA should not encourage state and local agencies and private industry to utilize the RMAN without first determining that there is existing mill capacity and recovered paper supply available to meet the potential demand.

SECTION 2

COMMENTS ON EPA'S OBJECTIVES

Repap Wisconsin (#3) states that, with rising waste paper prices, a narrow postconsumer definition will further intensify cost factors and will discourage increased usage of postconsumer fiber.

Union Camp (#6) states that, with the continued expansion of facilities that utilize postconsumer waste, the market will clearly tighten and the supply will decrease.

International Paper (#9) contends that growth in demand for paper products and additional recycling capacity result in a tight supply of both recovered and virgin market pulp. This, coupled with the increased costs of recovered paper, will be reflected in the price of recycled content products. In addition, specific mandated content levels will put rural mills in a potentially noncompetitive situation, which would work contrary to the RMAN objective of not compromising competition or product performance.

James River (#10) disagrees with EPA's attempt to stimulate the market, because any increased demand in a market that faces a supply shortage will be detrimental. If all commercial towel and tissue products were manufactured with 100 percent recovered fiber content, the shortfall of fiber would result in higher prices, which could drive companies out of business.

Scott Paper (#11) disagrees with EPA's goal of maximizing recycled content in individual products. Current utilization of recycled fiber is very uneven among the major tissue manufacturers. Instead, EPA should focus on encouraging companies to invest in equipment that directly contributes towards achieving the highest recovery goal.

Fort Howard (#12) states that high prices for postconsumer fiber will not generate more supply of recycled paper products. Manufacturers will simply determine that they are unable to purchase waste paper because they would be unable to sell their end products at a competitive price.

Potlatch (#13), commenting generally about all grades of paper, believes that EPA's goal to ensure the use of recovered fiber is already being met under the present levels of postconsumer fiber content. Raising the levels, as EPA suggests, would only have an inflationary, negative impact on the economy.

Mead (#15) acknowledges that EPA's objectives are worthwhile but believes that, for corrugated containers, the goals have already been reached. Mead claims that government intervention is unnecessary and unwanted. If it must occur, however, the objective should be to reduce the amount of paper and paperboard ending up in landfills.

Markets for Recycled Products (#16) states that the two-part fiber content levels could inhibit achieving the objective to increase use of postconsumer fiber.

Riverwood International (#19) believes that, in striving to reach the stated objectives, EPA should consider the scarcity and expense in obtaining suitable secondary fiber. Research into the availability and price of recovered fiber, the physical location of the vast majority of mills using a high percentage of virgin fiber, and the comparative energy efficiency of present operations should play a part in setting EPA's objectives.

Bowater (#21) claims that the RMAN's rigid fiber content levels for printing and writing papers will not achieve the goals set forth in the stated objectives because the levels will result in fewer suppliers and higher prices. The higher prices could even cause government procurers to back away from the use of recovered-content paper products.

The **Containerboard and Kraft Paper Group** of the **American Forest & Paper Association** (#23) believes that, with the current acute shortage of recovered fiber and with collection rates at historical highs, there would seem to be no need to specify recovered fiber content levels. The postconsumer fiber content requirement does not, and will not, encourage recovered fiber use in corrugated containers.

The **Printing & Writing Paper Division** of the **American Forest & Paper Association** (#25) states that text and cover fiber content levels should be grouped with papers covered under Section 504(a) [of the Executive Order] at the singular 20 percent postconsumer fiber levels.

The **Recycled Paperboard Division** of the **American Forest & Paper Association** (#26) claims that the two objectives set forth by EPA have already been met, and that the issuance of high recycled content recommendations at this time will not advance the objectives and may, in fact, hinder them.

American Forest & Paper Association (#28) states that the distinctions between recovered and postconsumer fibers will not lead to more recycling of postconsumer paper.

The **Newsprint Division** of the **American Forest & Paper Association** (#29) believes that classification of certain inked paper as preconsumer fiber runs contrary to the RMAN's stated purpose of keeping solid waste from landfills.

The **Tissue Producers Coalition** (#43) claims that the inclusion of consumer tissue in the RMAN goes against the stated objectives and will have a detrimental effect by arbitrarily increasing the price of recycled products rather than broadly extending recycled content into all brands, as intended.

The **National Recycling Coalition** (#L1) agrees that the draft RMAN will help to achieve the objective of RCRA Section 6002 to maximize the purchase of paper products containing postconsumer fiber by governmental procurement agencies and contractors.

The **Paper Recycling Coalition** (#L5) believes that EPA must provide a more clearly defined objective for a quasi-regulatory exercise that may have a dramatic impact on the nature of many institutions and businesses. The coalition offers several interpretations and scenarios for the stated objectives, and concludes that every possibility is either irresponsible or ineffective.

SECTION 3

COMMENTS ON EPA'S APPROACH

Repap Wisconsin, Inc. (#3) supports the proposed two-tiered approach. Repap also believes that recommending the same level for both recovered and postconsumer fiber does not create a true two-tiered structure because manufacturers are not required to use recovered fiber beyond the specified postconsumer amount.

Union Camp (#6) states that the ranges proposed for recovered and postconsumer fiber require clarification and suggests that EPA should specify the minimum in the marketplace and allow market forces to work to encourage supplies to offer higher levels.

Conservatree Information Services (#8) supports EPA's proposed two-part content level approach and agrees that this approach will assure demand for all recovered materials. Conservatree also agrees with EPA's use of ranges. It supports setting the low end of the range so that it is meaningful and feasible, and the high end of the range to show the highest content levels available, even when products at those levels are not widely available.

Scott Paper (#11) does not support a two-tiered structure because it represents an additional impediment to new investments. Scott believes that a postconsumer-only standard is needed to encourage greater investment in deinking capacity.

Fort Howard (#12) supports recovered fiber content levels for tissue products but contends that it is not necessary to establish separate postconsumer fiber content levels. Fort Howard believes that recovered fiber levels, by themselves, are sufficient to spur greater collection and recycling of postconsumer materials. If EPA deems postconsumer fiber levels necessary, Fort Howard recommends establishing only minimum levels, thereby providing the market with an incentive to increase postconsumer fiber use to the extent feasible.

Mead (#15) supports a single recovered fiber content level rather than a dual standard, because both recovered fiber and postconsumer fiber must be processed and deinked in the same manner. This commenter feels that a single standard would simplify accounting and reporting requirements.

Markets for Recycled Products (#16) believes that a single, postconsumer-only level should be used, because new and planned capacity is designed for postconsumer feedstocks. A dual standard creates greater compliance and accounting complexity.

The **City of San Diego** (#18) recommends the establishment of a single postconsumer fiber content level. By recommending recovered fiber content levels, industry is not given the flexibility to use other resources to their greatest efficiency. San Diego also disagrees with the use of ranges because many purchasing agents are likely to comply only with standards that are clear and simply stated. While this commenter suggested that no top ranges be established, it suggests that preference be given to products that contain the highest content levels. San Diego believes that this will help ensure that manufacturers continue to expand the use of recovered fibers.

Riverwood International (#19) supports the use of ranges and agrees with EPA's cautionary advice that products will tend to be more widely and economically available at the lower end of the range.

Newspaper Association of America (#22) does not believe a two-part content level is appropriate in the context of newsprint recycling. This commenter states that recovered materials from many sources are routinely mixed during collection and processing, because both recovered and postconsumer fibers are often equivalent in quality and appearance. As a result, it is difficult and costly for a newsprint mill to distinguish between them.

The **Recycled Paperboard Division** of the **American Forest & Paper Association** (#26) supports the use of recommended ranges for broad paper categories, rather than the minimum-content approach. This commenter also states that a two-part content level, while preferable to the use of a postconsumer-only standard, should be replaced by a one-part standard based on total recovered fiber. This commenter opposes setting a distinction between pre- and postconsumer fiber.

The **Containerboard & Kraft Paper Group** of the **American Forest & Paper Association** (#23) states that the approach taken, which assigns across-the-board recovered fiber levels for broad paperboard categories, unfairly penalizes purchasers and manufacturers of products with properties not easily developed from recycled furnishes. In addition, required recovered fiber content levels would put rural mills at a potentially severe competitive disadvantage to urban mills. This commenter also believes that content requirements would very likely give a competitive advantage to recycled containerboard imported from countries that do not have such requirements because foreign producers could offer their products at a lower price.

American Forest & Paper Association (#28) suggests that recovered fiber is the best recycled-content standard. Tracking the use of pre- and postconsumer fiber is an unnecessary burden that will not lead to more recycling of postconsumer paper than would otherwise occur.

Northeast Maryland Waste Disposal Authority (#31) supports the use of both pre- and postconsumer requirements where appropriate. The Authority recommends, however, that one minimum-contend standard be set for each product (containing postconsumer and recovered fiber standards as appropriate). This commenter believes that the use of ranges will not lead to the maximum use of recovered materials, in part because agencies seeking paper products at or near the high end of the ranges might find little or no availability at this level and return to virgin sources. In addition, evidence for some of the higher ends of the ranges appears to be limited.

Canadian Pulp and Paper Association (#38) believes that minimum recycled-content levels are unnecessary, suggesting instead the use of an average recycled-content level that permits the purchase of a wide range of recovered paper while achieving the overall goal.

Paperboard Packaging Council (#40) contends that EPA should focus on increasing the supply of recovered and recycled paper through public education and financial support of collection programs rather than revising the recycled-content levels to further stimulate demand.

Tennessee Valley Authority (#41) supports the use of ranges in the proposed guidelines because this approach provides the Authority with flexibility to make its own determination about the most appropriate recycled-content levels for the different paper products it purchases, based on considerations of availability and cost-effectiveness.

National Recycling Coalition (NRC, #L1) supports the establishment of two-part content levels and agrees that it is necessary to specify a certain percentage of postconsumer content to encourage increased investment in deinking capacity. NRC supports the use of ranges, which allows purchasing officials to factor in the cost and availability of products that fall within the recommended ranges. In addition, NRC suggests that the standards might include a "preferred" content level for all products based on EPA's research on the cost and availability of specific products.

Paper Recycling Coalition (#L5) supports the use of a two-part content level, holding that in order to maximize the recovery of postconsumer materials, it is necessary to encourage the use of all types of recovered materials in products. While the Coalition feels that the distinction between pre- and postconsumer recovered paper is a burdensome and costly requirement for the industry, the Coalition agrees that RCRA statutory requirements might preclude adopting a one-tiered, recovered-materials-only standard. This commenter also noted that the adoption of content ranges, while an improvement over minimum content standards, is not the most efficient means of increasing the utilization of recovered paper. The levels will become, in practice, minimum content standards. The Coalition recommends establishing aggregate recovered paper utilization goals rather than sheet-by-sheet content goals.

SECTION 4

COMMENTS ON EPA'S METHODOLOGY

National Recycling Coalition (#L1) supports the establishment of procurement guidelines for the various coated and uncoated printing and writing papers, the creation of a new guideline under that category for bristols, and most of the content levels proposed. The draft RMAN does an excellent job of clarifying the different paper products covered by the procurement guidelines.

Paper Recycling Coalition (#L5) believes that EPA's commitment to survey the industry and revise the RMAN in the future to reflect changes in the market is an appropriate response to changing markets and technologies.

SECTION 5

COMMENTS ON EPA'S CONTENT RECOMMENDATIONS FOR DESIGNATED PAPER PRODUCTS

PRINTING AND WRITING PAPER

General Comments

Conservatree Information Services (#8) believes that it is essential to use ranges for high grade papers, consistent with the use of ranges for other paper grades, and that the White House Executive Order standard should be the lowest end of the range. Conservatree also asserts that, because fiber weight measurement requires less fiber than measurement by sheet weight, content requirements for high grade papers must be higher (than those for sheet weight measurements) to be meaningful.

Markets for Recycled Products (#16) disagrees with the proposed recommendations for printing paper because EPA should include the higher recycled content levels required by the Executive Order as of December 31, 1998.

The **City of San Diego** (#18) supports the levels set for postconsumer fiber content in uncoated printing and writing paper.

The **Printing-Writing Division** of the **American Forest & Paper Association** (#25) disagrees with the proposed recovered and postconsumer fiber content levels for printing and writing papers. If the levels were lower, more manufacturers would be encouraged to use some recovered fiber because doing so would be more cost-effective and the fiber would be more readily available.

Northeast Maryland Waste Disposal Authority (#31) supports many of the recommendations in the RMAN, including the 20 percent postconsumer content level for uncoated printing and writing papers. The Authority does, however, suggest that EPA set either postconsumer or recovered fiber content levels and include a footnote stating that the levels will be raised to 30 percent postconsumer by December 31, 1998.

Finch, Pruyn & Company (#33) agrees with EPA's recommendation for recovered and postconsumer fiber content levels for uncoated printing and writing papers. It believes that text and cover papers, however, should have the same levels as other products in the category.

International Paper (#35) suggests that EPA promote only a recovered content level of 20 percent for printing and writing papers, with no postconsumer content recommendation.

National Recycling Coalition, Inc. (#L1) suggests that EPA go beyond the Executive Order and reinstate a recovered fiber content level for printing and writing papers. EPA should consult with states that have such a standard to determine the potential impact of a federal guideline that does not include a recovered fiber content standard.

Reprographic Paper

Conservatree Information Services (#8) disagrees with the proposed recovered and postconsumer fiber content levels for reprographic paper. Conservatree recommends a 20 to 100 percent range for recovered fiber and a 20 to 50 percent range for postconsumer fiber because the levels are measured by fiber weight rather than sheet weight.

Offset Paper

Conservatree Information Services (#8) questions the proposed recovered and postconsumer fiber content levels for offset paper, and recommends a 20 to 100 percent range

for recovered fiber and a 20 to 50 percent range for postconsumer fiber because the levels are measured by fiber weight rather than sheet weight.

Mead (#15) recommends that papeterie papers be included in the category of "offset" paper and provides information about that grade, which is used for greeting cards.

Magazine Publishers of America (#17) claims that offset papers (specifically, uncoated groundwood paper) should have the same levels of recovered and postconsumer fibers as supercalendered and coated papers because all three are used in magazine publishing. Any differences among these grades could create market imbalances detrimental to the magazine publishing industry.

The **Printing & Writing Paper Division** of the **American Forest & Paper Association** (P&WPD, #25) believes that papeterie papers should be included under uncoated printing-writing papers as a type of "offset" paper.

Tablet Paper

Conservatree Information Services (#8) disagrees with the proposed recovered and postconsumer fiber content levels for tablet paper, and recommends a 20 to 100 percent range for recovered fiber and a 20 to 100 percent range for postconsumer fiber.

Forms Bond

Conservatree Information Services (#8) disagrees with the proposed recovered and postconsumer fiber content levels for forms bond, and recommends a 20 to 100 percent range for recovered fiber and a 20 to 50 percent range for postconsumer fiber.

Envelope Paper

Conservatree Information Services (#8) believes that wove envelopes should have 20 to 100 percent recovered fiber and 20 to 50 postconsumer fiber, rather than EPA's proposed levels. It agrees with the proposed postconsumer fiber level for white/colored kraft envelopes but believes that they should have a 10 to 100 recovered fiber content. It also disagrees with the proposed unbleached kraft envelope levels, and recommends that they contain 10 to 100 percent recovered fiber and 10 to 30 percent postconsumer fiber.

Cotton Fiber Paper

Conservatree Information Services (#8) disagrees with the proposed recovered and postconsumer fiber content levels for cotton fiber paper, and instead suggests a 50 to 100 percent range for recovered fiber and a 20 to 100 percent range for postconsumer fiber.

International Paper (#9) agrees with the proposed recovered fiber content level for cotton fiber paper.

Mead (#15) believes that a 20 percent recovered fiber content level would be appropriate, to offset the loss in acceptable material created by the proposed definitions of "recovered" and "postconsumer" fiber. The company states that the proposed 50 percent level is too high.

The **Printing and Writing Paper Division** of the **American Forest & Paper Association** (#25) accepts EPA's recommendations for recovered and postconsumer fiber content levels in cotton fiber paper.

Text and Cover Paper

Mohawk Paper Mills (#2) believes that the proposed recycled content standards will place non-integrated producers of text and cover papers at a severe disadvantage in markets that treat text, cover, and offset papers as interchangeable products. Under the proposed standards, integrated manufacturers will be allowed to use a high percentage of virgin fiber, which is cheaper than postconsumer market pulp. This will give them a cost and quality advantage over non-integrated producers of text and cover papers.

Conservatree Information Services (#8) disagrees with the proposed recovered and postconsumer fiber content levels for text and cover paper, and recommends a 50 to 100 percent range for recovered fiber and a 20 to 100 percent range for postconsumer fiber.

International Paper (#9) claims that the proposed recovered fiber content levels for text and cover papers are too high. The company recommends that the levels match those for most other kinds of uncoated paper (20 percent recovered fiber) because the higher levels will compromise product quality.

The **Printing and Writing Paper Division** of the **American Forest & Paper Association** (#25) believes that text and cover paper should be classified, along with the majority of other printing and writing papers, at recovered and postconsumer fiber levels of 20 percent.

Finch, Pruyn & Company (#33) disapproves of the recovered and postconsumer fiber percentages for text and cover paper because they would raise fiber procurement and energy costs to a prohibitively high level.

Supercalendered Paper

Magazine Publishers of America (#17) agrees with the proposed recovered and postconsumer fiber content level for supercalendered paper.

The **Printing and Writing Paper Division** of the **American Forest & Paper Association** (#25) supports the recommended postconsumer fiber content level for supercalendered paper.

Check Safety Paper

The **Printing & Writing Paper Division** of the **American Forest & Paper Association** (P&WPD, #25) believes that the presence of florescence and contaminants should exempt safety paper from the RMAN, which recommends a 10 percent recovered and postconsumer fiber content level. It is extremely difficult for mills to source a consistent supply of fiber that does not contain fluorescent dyes.

Coated Printing and Writing Paper

General Comments

Potlatch (#13) agrees that coated printing and writing paper should have recovered and postconsumer fiber content levels of 10 percent, supporting EPA's recommendation.

The **City of San Diego** (#18) supports the postconsumer fiber levels for all types of coated printing and writing paper.

Coated Printing Paper

Conservatree Information Services (#8) applauds the inclusion of coated printing papers in the guidelines, but believes that the content levels should range from 10 to 100 percent for recovered fiber and from 10 to 30 percent for postconsumer fiber, because EPA supports measuring by fiber weight rather than by sheet weight. Many coated sheets already contain recycled content higher than the 10 percent proposed.

International Paper (#9) supports EPA's recommendations for recovered and postconsumer fiber content levels for coated printing papers.

Potlatch Corporation (#13) agrees with the proposed recovered and postconsumer fiber content levels for coated printing papers.

Magazine Publishers of America (#17) agrees with the proposed recovered and postconsumer fiber content levels for coated printing papers.

The **Printing and Writing Paper Division** of the **American Forest & Paper Association** (#25) strongly supports the recommended recovered and postconsumer fiber content levels for coated printing paper.

Carbonless

Conservatree Information Services (#8) disagrees with the proposed recovered and postconsumer fiber content levels for carbonless paper. Instead, it recommends a 20-100 percent range for recovered fiber and a 20-50 percent range for postconsumer fiber.

The **Printing and Writing Paper Division** of the **American Forest & Paper Association** (#25) believes that the recommended recovered and postconsumer fiber content levels for carbonless paper are realistic.

Bristols

General Comments

International Paper (#9) disagrees with the proposed levels for bristols. Instead (because products are not generally available at those levels), the company recommends 10 percent recovered and postconsumer fiber content for bristols.

The **City of San Diego** (#18) believes that the recommended content levels for postconsumer materials are adequate for all types of bristols.

The **Printing and Writing Paper Division** of the **American Forest & Paper Association** (#25) disagrees with the proposed levels for bristols, and recommends a range of 10-20 percent postconsumer fiber for all products in this category.

File Folders

International Paper (#9) claims that the proposed recovered and postconsumer fiber content levels for file folders are too high because any level higher than 10 percent recovered fiber will affect product quality.

Cards

International Paper (#9) disagrees with the proposed recovered and postconsumer fiber content levels for index, postal, and other cards. While large companies such as IP have the capacity to produce card stock in sufficient quantities to meet customer demand for large quantities (such as the U.S. Postal Service), they cannot use 50 percent recovered fiber. Several smaller companies can use 50 percent but do not have the capacity to fill large-volume orders. IP suggests that a 10 percent recovered and postconsumer fiber content level be adopted, instead of the proposed levels.

Tags and Tickets

International Paper (#9), operating under the assumption that tabulating cards are included in the tag and ticket category, disagrees with the proposed postconsumer fiber content level, because the current customer specifications for tabulating cards are very demanding, and it is unlikely that they can still be met with a 20 percent postconsumer content sheet.

Newsprint

The **City of San Diego** (#18) supports the proposed postconsumer fiber content levels for newsprint.

Newspaper Association of America (NAA, #22) disapproves of the recommended content levels for recovered and postconsumer fibers in newsprint. NAA feels that it is unnecessary and unwise to set such high levels, because the supply of recycled newsprint is small.

Northeast Maryland Waste Disposal Authority (#31) disagrees with the recommended recovered and postconsumer fiber content levels for newsprint because the cost of adding recovered fiber would be prohibitive. It suggests a lower level of 25 percent recovered and postconsumer fiber.

Canadian Pulp and Paper Association (#38) claims that the recommended levels for newsprint will drive up the demand for old newspapers, and consequently the price of this commodity to mills. This will discourage expansion of recycling capacity, which is contrary to the original objective of these draft guidelines.

National Recycling Coalition (#L1) supports the proposed ranges of recovered and postconsumer fiber levels for newsprint.

Paper Recycling Coalition (#L5) questions the recommended postconsumer fiber percentages for newsprint, because it is likely that overissue newspaper and magazines have been counted as postconsumer content. Because EPA's definition of "postconsumer" does not include overissue, the recommended postconsumer levels should be reexamined.

TISSUE PRODUCTS

General Comments

James River (#10) does not support the RMAN as proposed because the shortage of recovered material will force it to expand its search for fiber, thereby increasing both collection costs and the amount of nonrenewable fuel used for transportation. As recycling increases, the company also must appropriately dispose of greater amounts of deinked residue. Overall, James River believes that EPA should not finalize the proposed guidelines in the towel and tissue area because the industry is already overstimulated and in short supply of recovered fiber.

Scott Paper (#11) disagrees with the proposed standards for tissue products, because they will gridlock further investment as many existing large mills will delay their investments due to uncertainty, especially in light of recent price and availability problems for wastepaper. It states that the market is overstimulated, a fact that EPA does not understand because it has not properly researched the consumer market.

Fort Howard (#12) supports the proposed levels of recovered fiber content for all tissue products, but believes that the differentiation between recovered fiber and postconsumer fiber is unnecessary and potentially harmful. If EPA must include postconsumer levels, they should be no higher than those levels prescribed in EPA's existing paper guideline.

Markets for Recycled Products (#16) believes that the postconsumer levels for tissue products are feasible and push the market just enough. This commenter disagrees, however, with the recovered fiber levels for commercial tissue (and target for consumer tissue) because they simply reward certain companies without allowing room to expand, while they close others out of federal and other markets. Lower percentages would also remove the requirement to calculate percentages of virgin and recovered fiber in mill broke and would allow for nonfiber virgin additives.

The **City of San Diego** (#18) disagrees with the proposed postconsumer fiber content levels for tissue products and believes that the standards should be stated as the lowest acceptable postconsumer content percentage.

The **Tissue Division** of the **American Forest & Paper** (#30) questions the need to revise the percentages for tissue products, given the effectiveness of the 1988 guidelines.

Northeast Maryland Waste Disposal Authority (#31) believes that the low ends of the recovered and postconsumer fiber level ranges are appropriate but is concerned that the high end of the range will limit the number of manufacturers that can provide such products.

Georgia-Pacific (#37) questions the need to change the standards for tissue products, because these products already contain such high levels of recovered fiber. The strong market for "recycled" tissue has already forced several small manufacturers out of business, and the new recommendations will only worsen the situation.

Tissue Producers Coalition (#43) takes issue with the levels recommended for tissue products and states that EPA should maintain the commercial tissue products content levels as established in 1988. The coalition suggests lowering the percentages for commercial products to more realistic levels.

National Recycling Coalition (#L1) believes that EPA's recommended levels for recovered and postconsumer fiber levels are too low. NRC believes that the lowest range for postconsumer fiber in commercial and consumer tissue should be 40 percent.

Designating consumer tissue products

James River (#10) states that EPA has no legal basis and should not attempt to provide guidelines for consumer products, thereby removing consumer choice, dictating manufacturing technologies, and fueling the recovered fiber crisis facing the industry today.

Scott Paper (#11) strongly believes that EPA should abandon content standards for consumer tissue products and should explicitly state that the RMAN is not intended for consumer products.

Fort Howard (#12) believes that establishing different levels for commercial and consumer tissue products is unnecessary and potentially harmful because the same types of products are sold into both markets. One EPA recommendation for tissue products would be sufficient. Furthermore, Fort Howard does not believe that EPA should influence the purchasing preferences of government personnel for products used in the home.

Potlatch (#13) states that extending the guidelines to the consumer market will cause disruption in the market, increase fiber costs, and decrease product quality. This commenter infers that consumer products should not be designated.

The **Tissue Division** of the **American Forest & Paper Association** (#30) opposes including consumer tissue products in the RMAN.

Tissue Producers Coalition (#43) suggests removing consumer tissue products from the RMAN.

Bathroom tissue

Potlatch (#13) disagrees with the proposed recovered and postconsumer fiber content levels for consumer bathroom tissue. High recovered fiber content in consumer tissue products will give them a poor market reputation from which it might take years to recover.

Industrial Wipers

Kimberly-Clark (#20) believes that this category should be divided into General Purpose Wipers and Specialty Wipers. If EPA accepts this change, the proposed content levels are achievable and practical for the general purpose category. In the specialty use category, the company suggests a recovered fiber percentage of 0 to 100 percent and a postconsumer fiber percentage of 0 to 40 percent.

PAPERBOARD AND PACKAGING PRODUCTS

General Comments

The **City of San Diego** (#18) believes that the proposed postconsumer content levels for paperboard and packaging products are adequate, except for brown paper.

The **Containerboard & Kraft Paper Group** of the **American Forest & Paper Association** (#23) believes that forcing all containerboard to contain some arbitrary level of recovered and postconsumer fibers restricts their freedom to tailor products to individual customers and uses.

The **Recycled Paperboard Division** of the **American Forest & Paper Association** (#26) states that the specific percentages for all products in the paperboard and packaging category are too high, given the current and expected conditions in the recovered fiber supply market. It also disagrees with the need to set individual content levels for the different kinds of paperboard products because the vast majority already incorporate 100-percent recovered materials.

Paper Recycling Coalition (#L5) requests that the statement referencing "food grade uses of paperboard" and "footnote 2" be stricken from the document, because the casual reader might not distinguish among the different food packaging requirements and conclude that it is unsafe to package food in recycled or recycled content paperboard. It also objects to the separate listing of carrierboard and cautions against setting separate requirements for all potential end uses of paperboard, especially for applications where the government is not a major purchaser.

Corrugated Containers

International Paper (#9) disagrees with the proposed recovered and postconsumer fiber content levels for corrugated containers (<300 psi), because they do not appear to be economically or logistically feasible. The company urges EPA not to set any specific minimum recovered content levels for corrugated containers.

Chesapeake Paper Products (#14) asserts that recovered and postconsumer fiber content levels for corrugated containers should be 0 percent. The company believes that incentives to use recovered fibers are no longer required.

Mead (#15) disagrees with the proposed recovered and postconsumer fiber content levels for corrugated containers. The company suggests 25 percent for both recovered and postconsumer fiber content.

The **Containerboard & Kraft Paper Group** of the **American Forest & Paper Association** (#23) believes that the proposed content levels for corrugated containers are impossible to reach industrywide. These levels ignore the fundamental requirements of the finished product, disturb the industry's competitive environment, promote inefficient use of raw materials, and encourage imports.

Union Camp Corporation (#24) disagrees with the proposed recovered and postconsumer fiber content levels for corrugated containers. The company states that the levels are impractical, jeopardize quality, and increase costs.

National Recycling Coalition (#L1) applauds EPA for suggesting high recovered and postconsumer content ranges but feels that some flexibility is warranted because of current supply shortages and increasing fiber prices.

Folding Cartons

The **Recycled Paperboard Division** of the **American Forest & Paper Association** (RPD, #26) believes that EPA should remove the footnote to Table A-4, which indicates that the recovered fiber content ranges for folding cartons "are not applicable to all types of paperboard." RPD believes that the footnote undermines both EPA's goal to encourage purchases of paper products at the highest level of recovered fiber and its decision to rename the entire category "Paperboard" rather than "Recycled Paperboard." RPD also believes that EPA should not recommend separate content levels for solid bleached paperboard.

The **Bleached Paperboard Division** of the **American Forest & Paper Association** (#27) does not believe that EPA should recommend content levels for solid bleached sulfate.

Carrierboard

Mead (#15) disagrees with the proposed fiber content levels for carrierboard, and recommends 10 to 100 percent recovered fiber content and 10 percent postconsumer fiber content levels.

Riverwood International (#19) supports the inclusion of recovered content levels for carrierboard and believes that they have been set at reasonable and technically achievable levels. Riverwood believes, however, that a better suggestion would be ranges of 15 to 25 percent recovered and 10 to 15 percent postconsumer fiber content to give manufacturers some flexibility as technology changes.

Brown Papers

International Paper (#9) disagrees with the proposed recovered and postconsumer fiber content level for brown papers. The company urges EPA not to set any specific minimum recovered and postconsumer fiber content limits because they will only exaggerate the problems associated with the current demand/supply imbalance in recovered paper grades.

Chesapeake Paper Products (#14) disagrees with the proposed recovered and postconsumer fiber content levels for brown papers. The company believes that such high levels will lead to poor product quality.

The **City of San Diego** (#18) believes that the postconsumer level for brown paper should be set at 10 percent.

MISCELLANEOUS PAPER PRODUCTS

General Comments

The **City of San Diego** (#18) supports EPA's recommended content levels for postconsumer materials in miscellaneous paper products.

Tray Liners

International Paper (#9) disagrees with the proposed postconsumer fiber content level for tray liners because the definition of postconsumer fiber excludes printed, unread materials. IP suggests retaining the 100 percent recovered fiber content level but lowering the postconsumer level to 50 percent.

SECTION 6

COMMENTS ON MEASUREMENT, SPECIFICATIONS, AND RECYCLABILITY

COMMENTS ON MEASURING BY FIBER WEIGHT AND COUNTING THE RECOVERED MATERIAL PORTION OF MILL BROKE

Repap Wisconsin (#3) agrees that recycled fiber percentages should be based on the fiber weight of a sheet of paper rather than the total weight of the paper.

Union Camp (#6) agrees with a fiber-weight calculation of postconsumer and recovered fiber content but points out the need for additional clarification, because some fillers are not fully removed in the repulping and cleaning process. Union Camp strongly recommends that the numerator of the calculated fiber weight fraction allow for the inclusion of whatever material is carried with the actual fiber from a fiber recycling facility.

Appleton Papers (#7) supports counting mill broke generated in a papermaking process using postconsumer and/or recovered fiber as a feedstock towards postconsumer fiber or recovered fiber content.

Conservatree Information Services (#8) agrees with EPA's proposed fiber weight basis for recovered material content measurement. Fiber weight measurement, however, requires less fiber in high grade papers; therefore, Conservatree contends that content requirements must be set at higher levels than those previously used for sheet weight measurements to be meaningful.

International Paper (#9) strongly supports EPA's recommendation to measure recycled content based on fiber weight.

Fort Howard (#12) supports EPA's determination to use a fiber weight method for calculating recovered and postconsumer fiber content levels. Fort Howard also strongly agrees that mill broke generated from recovered and postconsumer fiber feedstocks should count towards recovered and postconsumer content in the end product.

Mead (#15) supports EPA's use of fiber weight as the basis for calculating recycled content. Mead also supports the change that would allow mills to count broke from recovered fiber feedstocks into the total calculation of recycled content.

Markets for Recycled Products (#16) believes that the fiber-weight basis for calculating recycled content poses a few problems. Recovered paper and paperboard contain additives that are carried through in the repulping process and are retained in the finished paper. This commenter encourages EPA to allow for such "nonfiber furnish" and suggests the following language be added to the measurement section in the RMAN:

> Nonfiber materials that are introduced into the paper manufacturing process as integral components of the recovered or postconsumer fiber furnish and that are retained in the finished product shall count toward the total percentage of fiber weight when calculating recycled content.

This commenter also opposes crediting mill broke generated from recovered feedstocks because calculating the proportion that should be credited would be difficult for mills that use both virgin and recovered feedstocks. This calculation would also create additional recordkeeping requirements, increase costs, and invite dishonesty. Markets for Recycled Products encourages EPA to set recovered fiber levels low enough so that mills can use their broke wherever it is most cost effective, rather than setting recovered fiber standards at 100 percent (which precludes broke from being credited even as a nonrecovered component of the furnish).

The **Magazine Publishers of America** (MPA, #17) agrees with EPA's methodology for calculating recovered fiber content based on total fiber weight. MPA believes that this measurement should exclude other materials used in the manufacture of paper, including coatings, additives, inks, laminates, and fillers, because commercially viable technologies do not currently exist to recover these other ingredients of paper.

The **City of San Diego** (#18) concurs with EPA's recommendation that recycled content should be measured as a percentage of the weight of the fiber in paper or a paper product. This commenter disagrees, however, that broke from postconsumer feedstocks should be credited towards postconsumer content because this would not help improve markets for recycled paper and would greatly complicate the verification and tracking process for postconsumer content claims.

The **Recycled Paperboard Division** of the **American Forest & Paper Association** (RPD, #26) strongly supports EPA's use of a relative comparison of weight of recovered fiber to total fiber because it ensures that the calculation of recycled content is made on the basis of the pertinent raw material rather than on the basis of the extraneous weight of non-fibrous additives. RPD also supports EPA's proposal to credit the recovered fiber and postconsumer fiber portion of mill broke in content calculations.

The **American Forest & Paper Association** (#28) strongly supports EPA's recommendation on measurement of recovered fiber content by a relative comparison of weight of recovered fiber to total fiber.

The **National Recycling Coalition** (NRC, #L1) supports the methodology proposed in the draft RMAN for calculating the recovered fiber content of mill broke. NRC also supports EPA's decision to base the calculation of recovered fiber and postconsumer fiber on a percentage of fiber weight as opposed to total product weight.

The **Direct Marketing Association** (#L4) strongly supports EPA's confirmation that fiber weight should be the standard for measuring recycled content.

The **Paper Recycling Coalition** (PRC, #L5) commends EPA for adopting standard industry practices with respect to the measurement of recycled content based on fiber weight. PRC also praises EPA for acknowledging that the recycled content of mill broke can legitimately be counted as recycled content.

COMMENTS ON SPECIFICATIONS

Appleton Papers (#7) agrees that specifications should be revised if they impede the use of postconsumer and recovered fiber but do not impede reasonable performance. Appleton also suggests that EPA streamline the specification process to eliminate redundant and duplicative GSA and GPO specifications.

COMMENTS ON RECYCLABILITY

Union Camp (#6) states that industrial practices and the marketplace should emphasize the recyclability of waste paper. While this commenter expresses hope that RMAN implementation will encourage the development of glues and adhesives that make recycling easier, Union Camp does not endorse using a regulatory approach to address recyclability issues.

Appleton Papers (#7) strongly urges EPA to add recyclability as the third objective of the RMAN. EPA should discourage purchase of paper products that are not recyclable in the normal office-paper waste stream. Appleton points out that over half of federal agency purchases of multiple-part forms specify a nonrecyclable bond and carbon construction. The carbon tissue can compose between 20 and 40 percent of a form, by weight. Carbon paper, however, is not readily available with recycled content nor is it normally recyclable, and significantly degrades the value of the office-paper waste stream.

International Paper (#9) believes that the wording of Section A-6 on recyclability implies that the purchase of groundwood-containing printing and writing paper will reduce the recyclability and/or dollar value of the Agency's office-paper recycling program. IP believes that this language is specifically aimed at its Springhill Incentive 100 and Hammermill Unity products. It provides information on the recyclability of these products, and states that they are priced competitively with their virgin counterparts and are substantially lower in cost than other brighter, partially recycled content grades. IP requests that the wording of Section A-6 in the RMAN be expanded so that agencies are instructed to consider the overall economics of their paper choices. IP also cautions EPA that, in encouraging agencies to assess the impact of paper

purchases on their overall contribution to the solid waste stream, that the recyclability issue could quickly turn into a life cycle assessment debate, an issue that goes beyond the scope of purchasing guidelines. IP further suggests that EPA revise Section A-6 on recyclability to read as follows:

> EPA recommends that procuring agencies consider the effect of a procurement of a paper product containing recovered and postconsumer fiber on their paper collection programs by assessing the impact of their decision on their overall contribution to the solid waste stream. As an example, paper products with a high groundwood content may result in a lower receipt price for office wastepaper sales. However, if the original paper product was economically priced, the entire transaction may be viewed as beneficial. This is particularly true if the original paper product had postconsumer fiber content exceeding that required by these procurement guidelines.

The **Recycled Paperboard Division** of the **American Forest & Paper Association** (RPD, #26) agrees that recyclability is one of several factors that procuring agencies consider when making purchasing decisions, but cautions that it should not be the sole determinant in the purchasing decision. RPD does not believe that procuring agencies will have difficulty finding markets for their recyclable paper.

Northeast Maryland Waste Disposal Authority (#31) supports EPA's recommendations to consider recyclability.

American Forest & Paper Association (#28) encourages EPA to focus its recyclability efforts on the traditional contaminants that occur in collection programs, such as laminated, waxed, or coated labels, food waste and paper covered with food residue; glass; hazardous materials; rubber; metal; and plastic wraps, films, and tapes.

National Recycling Coalition (NRC, #L1) supports the notion that procurement officials should consider the recyclability of paper products in addition to recycled content. NRC also believes that the purchasing decision should reflect the "upstream" environmental benefits of recycling as well as the waste reduction benefits.

Paper Recycling Coalition (PRC, #L5) believes that it is appropriate for EPA to provide guidance on the need to consider recyclability in purchasing decisions. In addition to citing copier paper made with recovered groundwood papers as an example of a product that could undermine paper recovery programs, PRC encourages EPA to provide guidance about other contaminants, including glues and adhesives, which downgrade the quality of recovered paper.

SECTION 7

COMMENTS ON DEFINITIONS

"POSTCONSUMER"

Repap Wisconsin (#3) favors the Recycling Advisory Council definition of "postconsumer equivalent" that includes printed and/or materials requiring deinking. Repap believes that EPA's proposed narrow postconsumer definition will increase costs and discourage increased use of postconsumer fiber.

Union Camp (#6) believes that the proposed postconsumer definition misses the opportunity to recover printed or converted materials that require full processing in order to be used in a finished product. This commenter argues that materials such as printer overruns and fully converted materials that must be repulped, screened, deinked, and reprocessed should qualify as postconsumer materials. In addition, Union Camp states that the more complex the definition of postconsumer, the more difficult it will be for an infrastructure to supply future feedstocks and ensure the removal of good fiber from landfills.

Conservatree Information Services (#8) agrees with the proposed postconsumer definition because it is appropriately consistent with the definitions contained in RCRA and in Executive Order 12873. Conservatree opposes expanding the definition to include preconsumer deinking categories.

International Paper (IP, #9) cautions that EPA's specific elimination of overissue publications from the definition of postconsumer fiber is unnecessary and may result in additional waste moving to landfills. Denying postconsumer status to newsstand returns would render these materials as less valuable in recycling efforts. IP cites previous industry attempts to persuade EPA to adopt the term "processed recovered fiber" to address this issue. This commenter also believes that publishers' practice of producing enough magazines and newspapers to meet anticipated customer demand is a competitive marketing decision beyond EPA's purview, but that EPA should ensure a market for returns that can be economically collected for deinking.

Fort Howard (#12) strongly opposes excluding overissue publications from the definition of "postconsumer." This commenter argues that RCRA 6002 (h) does not limit consumers to individuals or households, but rather includes businesses as consumers. It further argues that excess or obsolete inventories of publications have fulfilled their intended end use by having been available for review or distribution, and that conceptually, over-issue publications are no different from unused letterhead paper or envelopes that have become obsolete. Fort Howard requests that, at the very least, EPA clarify what it means by "over-issue" publications so that it does not harmfully restrict sources of postconsumer fiber.

Potlatch (#13) believes that the proposed postconsumer definition makes little sense because recovered paper from the converting plant at the tissue mill would be mill broke, while the same material at a separate converting plant would be recovered fiber.

Markets for Recycled Products (#16) supports the statutory definition of postconsumer as well as the proposed clarification. Together, they remove all ambiguity and agree with the postconsumer definition used for other products and materials in EPA's Comprehensive Procurement Guideline.

Magazine Publishers of America (MPA, #17) believes that a broad interpretation of postconsumer fiber is needed to encourage increased investment in recycling capacity, especially in view of current and anticipated shortages in recycled pulp supplies. MPA also opposes any distinction between preconsumer and postconsumer materials because it serves no purpose. Limiting the definition reduces manufacturers' ability to obtain recovered fiber that can be counted towards postconsumer content.

The **City of San Diego** (#18) supports the proposed postconsumer definition and agrees that it should not include preconsumer materials that require deinking or contaminant removal.

Bowater (#21) believes that excluding printers' overruns, converters' scrap and/or overissue publications from consideration as postconsumer materials clearly violates the statute [RCRA] and tramples protected speech. Bowater asserts that EPA's proposed definition contradicts codified Congressional objectives of keeping solid waste from landfills, promoting improved resource recovery, and establishing cooperation between government and private enterprise. This commenter contends that Congress clearly stated that discarded overissue magazines are postconsumer materials, because they are papers that enter and are collected from the municipal solid waste stream. Bowater suggests that EPA revise the RMAN to state that paper consumed in the publication process has reached its end use as a consumer item, either when it is purchased and discarded by a reader or when it is returned from the newsstand or printer as outdated. Bowater further asks EPA to clarify that paper consumed in the printing process and either discarded or diverted from the solid waste stream has also reached its end use, and therefore constitutes postconsumer waste.

Newspaper Association of America (NAA, #22) believes that distinguishing between pre- and postconsumer sources of recovered paper is an unnecessary, unworkable, and burdensome step that has outlived its intended purpose.

The **Containerboard and Kraft Paper Group** of the **American Forest & Paper Association** (#23) opposes any distinction between pre- and postconsumer recovered fibers because they both come out of the waste stream, have similar properties, appear identical under a microscope, and cannot be separated by any known scientific test.

The **Recycled Paperboard Division** of the **American Forest & Paper Association** (RPD, #26) asserts that any definition of "postconsumer" is arbitrary.

The **Newsprint Division** of the **American Forest & Paper Association** (#29) believes that EPA's proposed definition should be revised so that paper consumed in the publication process is counted as postconsumer fiber, because such paper has reached its end use as a consumer item, either when it is purchased and discarded by a reader or when it is returned from the newsstand or printer as outdated. EPA should also clarify that paper consumed in the printing process and either discarded or diverted from the solid waste stream has also reached its end use and should be considered as postconsumer waste.

Northeast Maryland Waste Disposal Authority (#31) agrees with the narrow definition of postconsumer and that fiber derived from printers over-runs, converters scrap and overissue publications is not postconsumer fiber.

Random House (#42) believes that overissue publications should be considered as postconsumer, arguing that such a classification is necessary to make book recovery cost-efficient and worthwhile.

The **Tissue Producers Coalition** (#43) maintains that separate categories for pre- and postconsumer waste are not necessary. The distinction has no real meaning in a recovered paper market already utilizing all available supplies of preconsumer recovered materials.

Lindenmeyr Paper (45) strongly urges EPA to classify overproduced books as postconsumer material. Lindenmeyr believes that, by excluding overissue publications, EPA reduces the waste value of a publisher's unsold inventory, thereby increasing the chance that such inventory would be landfilled. EPA's narrow definition also deprives the book publishing industry of a source of potential postconsumer fiber.

National Recycling Coalition (NRC, #L1) recommends that EPA's postconsumer definition be expanded to include "comparable" materials as defined in the Recycling Advisory Council's report, such as overissue publications and printers' scrap with printing or dye. NRC cautions that EPA's proposed, narrow definition will increase the costs to produce recycled paper and therefore discourage its use. NRC further asserts that conforming to the postconsumer definition in Executive Order 12873 is not sufficient rationale for retaining a narrow definition in the RMAN.

Paper Recycling Coalition (PRC, #L5) believes that the distinction between postconsumer and recovered paper is arbitrary, and contends that the only legitimate source-based paper distinction is between virgin fiber and recovered fiber. PRC cautions that EPA's clarification of the definition might have unintended consequences, because many manufacturers have been classifying overissue as postconsumer and have reported it as such to EPA. Thus, postconsumer-content figures might be inflated because they include overissue. While PRC opposes a postconsumer distinction altogether, for the sake of clarity it suggests the following modifications to EPA's proposed postconsumer definition:

- The word "waste" should be removed from the term "mixed waste paper." The term "mixed paper" is sufficiently clear. Waste implies garbage, something that must be landfilled or incinerated.
- The term "fibrous wastes" should be changed to "fibrous materials" to avoid implying that materials recovered from the municipal waste stream for recycling are still waste products.

"WASTE PAPER," "RECOVERED FIBER," AND CLARIFICATION ON REPULPING REQUIREMENTS

Repap Wisconsin (#3) comments, "the statement that 'material must be repulped' is confusing, unless the intent is that rolls/sheets *are not* repulped in water again and therefore cannot be considered recovered fiber."

Conservatree Information Services (#8) agrees with eliminating the waste paper categories in the existing paper guideline and observes that waste paper often includes inappropriate mill broke materials. This commenter also agrees that materials must be repulped, and that recovered fiber should exclude materials such as obsolete inventory and off-specification products generated at the mill after the papermaking process ends. Conservatree also agrees with the explicit exclusion of forest residues.

James River (#10) agrees that material must be repulped to count as recovered fiber. The company believes, however, that the proposed mill broke and recovered fiber definitions are confusing because mill-generated materials would be excluded, while equivalent materials from paper merchants, wholesalers, dealers, printers, converters, or consumers would count as recovered fiber. James River suggests that EPA consider adopting a draft ASTM definition of recycled fiber that reads: "fiber derived from recovered material, excluding wood residues and sawmilling residues, which has been repulped or reintroduced into the paper manufacturing process and made into a product or form usable in the manufacturing process."

Mead (#15) disagrees with the proposed definition of recovered fiber and suggests that EPA adopt the RCRA 6002(h) definition of "recovered material," which includes fiber waste generated after the paper machine rewinder. Mead suggests adding a caveat, if needed, requiring that recovered fiber be repulped in order to be counted.

Markets for Recycled Products (#16) supports the proposed recovered fiber definition and agrees that non-repulped paper should be excluded, along with sawdust and forest residues.

The **City of San Diego** (#18) applauds EPA's use of the term recovered fiber in lieu of waste paper as a means of communicating the value of the materials. San Diego also concurs with the requirement that materials must be repulped.

The **Containerboard and Kraft Paper Group** of the **American Forest & Paper Association** (CKPG, #23) has no objection to the proposed definition of recovered fiber, but does oppose the exclusion of materials currently considered recovered that would be reclassified as mill broke under the proposed broke definition.

The **Printing-Writing Paper Division** of the **American Forest & Paper Association** (#25) recommends that EPA should continued to use the definition of recovered materials in RCRA 6002(h) to create uniformity with the Executive Order and establish a clear understanding of where mill broke ends and recovered fiber begins.

The **Recycled Paperboard Division** of the **American Forest & Paper Association** (RPD, #26) applauds eliminating the term waste paper. RPD also agrees with EPA's clarification that recovered fiber must be repulped and not just recovered, to count toward recovered fiber content, and that forest residues do not count toward recovered fiber content.

American Forest & Paper Association (#28) believes that EPA should continue to use the well-established RCRA definition of recovered materials.

The **Tissue Producers Coalition** (#43) suggests that EPA should add a statement under recovered fiber that only repulped fiber can be classified as recovered fiber for recycled content claims.

National Recycling Coalition (NRC, #L1) strongly supports EPA's proposal to discontinue using the term waste paper in favor of recovered fiber. NRC also supports excluding side trimmings, culls, end rolls, butt rolls, rejected stock, and obsolete inventories of unfinished paper from the definition of recovered fiber. NRC believes, however, that converting scrap and obsolete inventories of finished product generated outside of the paper manufacturing process should qualify as recovered fiber.

Direct Marketing Association (DMA, #L4) concurs with and supports EPA's proposed terminology change from waste paper to recovered fiber. DMA also recommends that EPA retain the RCRA definition for recovered fiber (e.g., recovered materials) to create uniformity with the Executive Order and to establish a clear understanding of the point at which mill broke ends and recovered fiber begins.

Paper Recycling Coalition (PRC, #L5) commends EPA for ending its use of the term waste paper because it implies a second-rate product and is a barrier to recycling. PRC also supports the clarification that materials must be repulped, not just recovered, to count toward recovered fiber content. PRC also agrees with clarifying that forest residues do not quality as recovered fiber, and asks EPA to eliminate any allowances for sawdust. PRC also suggests the following modifications to EPA's proposed definition of recovered fiber:

- The word "waste" should be removed from the term "mixed waste paper." The term "mixed paper" is sufficiently clear. Waste implies garbage, something that must be landfilled or incinerated.
- The term "fibrous wastes" should be changed to "fibrous materials" to avoid implying that materials recovered from the municipal waste stream for recycling are still waste products.

MILL BROKE

Mohawk Paper Mills (#2) opposes the proposed expanded definition of mill broke because it will disqualify materials that have previously served as sources of preconsumer fiber.

Wisconsin Tissue (#5) believes that EPA's revised definition is too broad. This commenter suggests using the proposed definition developed by ASTM, as follows: "Any paper generated in a paper mill prior to the completion of the paper manufacturing process which is unsuitable for subsequent application but can be reused in the paper manufacturing process."

Conservatree Information Services (#8) agrees with expanding the definition to include many of the materials generated in mill-based finishing processes.

International Paper (#9) believes that the existing definition of mill broke is easily understood and universally accepted within the industry. It urges EPA not to change from the 1988 definition of the papermaking process [a component of the mill broke definition]. This commenter believes that the proposed broader definition is unnecessarily confusing, because obsolete inventories from paper manufacturers and recovered fiber generated in paper mill finishing operations would be considered as mill broke, while equivalent materials from paper merchants, converters, wholesalers, and others would qualify as recovered fiber.

James River (#10) disagrees with EPA's proposed changes to "mill broke" because scrap materials generated in finishing operations often include wet strength additives, coatings, dyes, and inks that require extra processing prior to reuse. These materials are recovered or diverted from solid waste and are repulped to be reused as recycled fiber. James River also believes that the proposed "mill broke" and "recovered fiber" definitions are confusing because mill-generated materials would be considered as broke, while equivalent materials from paper merchants, wholesalers, dealers, printers, converters, or consumers would count as recovered fiber. This commenter urges EPA not to change the current definition of this term and to consider adopting the draft ASTM definition that reflects general consensus: "any paper generated in a paper mill prior to the completion of the paper manufacturing process which is unsuitable for subsequent application but can be reused in the paper manufacturing process."

Scott Paper (#11) supports and incorporates by reference the specific recommendations offered by the American Forest & Paper Association on this topic.

Mead (#15) disagrees with the proposed definition and suggests that EPA adopt the RCRA 6002 (h) definition.

Markets for Recycled Products (#16) supports the proposed definition, stating that it is a fair compromise because most types of easily measured paper mill scrap are excluded.

The **Containerboard and Kraft Paper Group** of the **American Forest & Paper Association** (CKPG, #23) strongly opposes the proposed broadening of the definition because it is confusing, unfair, and unenforceable. CKPG strongly encourages EPA to continue to use the mill broke definition found in RCRA, which is also used in the Executive Order.

The **Printing-Writing Paper Division** of the **American Forest & Paper Association** (#25) recommends that EPA should continued to use the definition for mill broke in RCRA 6002(h) to create uniformity with the Executive Order and to establish a clear understanding of where mill broke ends and recovered fiber begins.

The **Recycled Paperboard Division** of the **American Forest & Paper Association** (#26) objects to the proposed expansion of the mill broke definition. It believes that the existing definition is easily understood and universally used within the paper industry and that introducing a new definition would be unfair and unwarranted.

American Forest & Paper Association (AF&PA, #28) believes that EPA should continue to use the well-established definition of mill broke because it is easily understood and universally used within the industry. AF&PA also contends that introducing a new definition after seven years of education and widespread use would be unfair. In addition, the proposed broadened definition is confusing because it would include fiber generated in a paper mill that is equivalent to recovered materials generated by converters and others. AF&PA also believes that it is arbitrary to consider obsolete inventories from paper manufacturers as broke, while obsolete inventories of the same paper grades held by paper merchants, wholesalers, and others would qualify as recovered fiber.

The **Newsprint Division** of the **American Forest & Paper Association** (#29) believes that the current RCRA definition of mill broke should be retained. The proposed definition is confusing because it includes items that are equivalent to converting scrap and other materials that clearly count as recovered fiber. The newsprint industry has also made substantial investments in education and capital based on the existing definitions.

The **Tissue Division** of the **American Forest & Paper Association** (#30) believes that the current RCRA definition of mill broke should be retained. The proposed, expanded definition is confusing because it includes items that are equivalent to converting scrap and other materials that clearly count as recovered fiber. The tissue industry has also made substantial investments in education and capital based on the existing definitions.

Northeast Maryland Waste Disposal Authority (#31) supports excluding the specific items identified by EPA as mill broke from counting as recovered fiber.

Rainy River Forest Products (#32) supports the existing definition of mill broke because it is easily understood and widely used within the industry.

International Papers, Fine Business Papers (#35) believes that excluding mill broke does not accomplish anything. Not allowing mill-generated broke to count as recovered material would result in landfilling much of it. In addition, mills cannot afford to produce recycled business papers without using their own broke.

Georgia-Pacific (#37) takes strong exception to EPA's proposed changes to mill broke and questions why EPA would propose something that would raise the costs associated with recycling while do nothing about recovering more paper for recycling.

The **Tissue Producers Coalition** (#43) believes that the current mill broke definition should be retained.

National Recycling Coalition (NRC, #L1) supports the proposed broader definition of mill broke and the exclusion of side trimmings, culls, end rolls, butt rolls, rejected stock, and obsolete inventories of unfinished paper from the definition of recovered fiber. NRC believes, however, that converting scrap and obsolete inventories of finished product generated outside of the paper manufacturing process should qualify as recovered fiber.

Direct Marketing Association (#L4) recommends that EPA retain the RCRA definition of mill broke to create uniformity with the Executive Order and to establish a clear understanding of the point at which mill broke ends and recovered fiber begins.

Paper Recycling Coalition (PRC, #L5) asserts that the proposed revision to the mill broke definition is vague and potentially troublesome for the paper industry. The definition has the potential to cause confusion because it does not specifically distinguish between mill-site byproducts and offsite byproducts. PRC also believes that classifying byproducts of the finishing operation as mill broke is a problem, because certain converting operations might also be considered "finishing" operations. PRC suggests further clarification that only the byproducts of finishing at the mill will be classified as mill broke. PRC also suggests that the definition of mill broke should specifically state that the recycled content of mill broke can be counted in determining the recycled content of the finished product. As drafted, the definition does not accurately reflect the guidance provided in Table 13, which clearly distinguishes between fiber recovered from the mill and fiber recovered from outside the mill. Similarly, PRC suggests that EPA distinguish between finishing operations that take place within the mill from similar operations undertaken in a converting process at a separate location.

SECTION 8

MISCELLANEOUS COMMENTS

FURTHER DELINEATING OR DELETING DESIGNATED ITEMS

International Paper (IP, #4) requests clarification on the scope of items covered in the "supercalendered" category. IP's Nicolet Division produces a line of supercalendered papers for pressure-sensitive backing papers and glassine. The backing papers are used for pressure sensitive labels, and the glassine is used for envelope windows and direct food contact packaging. IP also requests that EPA exclude tabulating cards. IP asserts that, due to exacting physical requirements (particularly dimensional stability requirements), this grade can only accommodate limited amounts of recovered materials (primarily forest residues), and no postconsumer fiber.

James River (#10) takes issue with the fact that EPA has proposed only 10 percent total/postconsumer content for supercalendered but proposes 20 percent for uncoated groundwood specialties, because these grades compete with each other. James River recommends that the recycled content for all groundwood printing and writing papers purchased by the U.S. Government be set at a minimum of 10 percent postconsumer fiber. For groundwood forms bond, however, James River believes that there may be a valid reason to set the level at 20 percent.

The **Containerboard & Kraft Paper Group** of the **American Forest & Paper Association** (#23) believes that multiwall paper sacks, retail and fast food bags, grocery bags, and wrapping papers should not be lumped together under "brown papers" because they all have different functional requirements and can accommodate different amounts of recovered fiber. Likewise, tubes, cores, drums, and cans are different products and should not be lumped together.

The **Printing & Writing Paper Division** of the **American Forest & Paper Association** (P&WPD, #25) believes that machine finished (MF) uncoated groundwood papers should carry a 10 percent postconsumer fiber content level for technical and competitive reasons.

RECOVERED MATERIAL CERTIFICATION AND VERIFICATION

Union Camp (#6) questions EPA's statement that the level of information in the marketplace is adequate to track postconsumer and preconsumer materials. This commenter asks for EPA to explicitly state that the "operating standards" that are defined (presumably by a producer of pulp or paper claiming recovered material content) should suffice for defining the fraction of postconsumer material in a given feedstock. Union Camp believes that such clarification is necessary to avoid misinterpretation and possible legal implications.

International Paper (#9) contends that, because there is no test to distinguish pre- and postconsumer fiber, extensive and costly reporting and recordkeeping are required by all involved parties.

Scott Paper (#10) recommends that EPA clarify the measurement and time requirements for the certification of recycled content. Scott points out that the 1988 paper guidelines assume that all paper products are made-to-order. Tissue products, however, are made-to-stock and the actual recovered fiber content varies with normal operating conditions. Without EPA guidance, there is no assurance that content is measured in a uniform manner through the marketplace. Scott recommends a quarterly certification that requires achieving at least 80 percent of the standard per quarter, with 100 percent achievement over a four-quarter average.

Mead (#15) observes that mills cannot control the amount of usable recycled fiber that is utilized in each roll of paper, and asks EPA to clarify the issue of recycled content certification. Mead recommends that mills be allowed to provide certification based on a documentable 90-day average, but suspects that federal procurement law may restrict the use of reasonable averaging.

Bowater (#21) believes that EPA is optimistic in stating that there is sufficient information for mills to track postconsumer material to certify recycled content. The RMAN definition of postconsumer will require tracking that will result in higher costs for some mills, according to Bowater.

The **Newsprint Division** of the **American Forest & Paper Association** (#29) states that by adopting the RMAN definition of postconsumer, EPA would require that mills add costly tracking and sorting steps to paper procurement to ensure that they are meeting the postconsumer content requirement.

SAWDUST AS RECOVERED FIBER

Conservatree Information Services (#8) believes that the substitution of sawdust for postconsumer content allowed in the Executive Order and the current EPA guideline should be eliminated.

James River (#10) finds a discrepancy between EPA and Executive Order 12873 on how forest residues, including sawdust, are considered with regard to recycled content, and urges EPA to clarify its guidance regarding these recovered materials.

Lincoln Pulp & Paper Co. (#36) reiterates support for the alternative materials provision in Executive Order 12873. Lincoln also provides information on its use of wet sawdust to make recycled paper and states that such use has essentially eliminated new waste sawdust piles in Maine.

National Recycling Coalition (#L1) opposes allowing sawdust and other alternative materials to count towards recovered fiber content.

Paper Recycling Coalition (#L5) urges EPA to seek elimination of any allowances for sawdust.

ENERGY ISSUES AND COST/BENEFIT IMPLICATIONS OF PAPER RECYCLING

James River (#10) believes that there is adequate and substantiating evidence indicating that paper-to-energy is a viable and good method of disposal for some streams of recovered paper materials that cannot be economically recycled. James River believes that EPA should consider the energy impacts of its RMAN recommendations.

Potlatch (#13) believes that EPA should explicitly address studies conducted by the U.S. Department of Energy on the environmental impacts of recycling paper versus using recovered paper as a fuel.

Riverwood International, Inc. (#19) says that it takes more fossil fuel to produce recycled paperboard than it does for Riverwood to produce solid unbleached sulphate.

The **Containerboard & Kraft Paper Group** of the **American Forest & Paper Association** (#23) believes that source reduction is itself a worthy environmental goal. In addition, this commenter also observes that kraft (virgin) pulping creates large amounts of energy from a renewable resource.

Canadian Pulp & Paper Association (#38) suggests that some RMAN levels may actually have negative environmental implications if the depletion of nonrenewable resources used in transport are taken into consideration.

Jeff Lindsay (#44) believes that an environmental cost-benefit study should be published to justify the belief that an increase in recycled content will result in a better use of resources.

Chesapeake Paper Products (#L2) provided a technical paper on life cycle assessment that apparently contradicts the positive benefits that EPA anticipates in promulgating the paper products RMAN. Chesapeake requests EPA's review of the paper and further comment on the environmental and economic benefits of mandating recycled fiber content.

RECOVERED FIBER SUPPLY SHORTAGE

Scott Paper (#11) states that, in light of recent wastepaper price and availability problems, EPA's proposed standards will gridlock further investment in paper recycling. This commenter cites a 275 percent price increase for the staple postconsumer grades used for recycled tissue products.

Fort Howard (#12) believes that the high end of the postconsumer ranges recommended in the RMAN will worsen the unprecedented turmoil currently afflicting wastepaper markets.

Potlatch (#13) contends that postconsumer content regulations contribute to higher prices for recovered fiber, causing a disruption in the paper recycling infrastructure. Potlatch observed that in the past year, three recycled tissue manufacturers declared bankruptcy because of reported cash flow problems related to fiber markets.

Chesapeake Paper Products (#14) states that increasing demands for old corrugated containers (OCC) have pushed prices considerably above those of virgin pulp, clearly indicating that further recovery incentives are not needed.

Magazine Publishers of America (#17) believes that current and anticipated recycled pulp supply shortages indicate a need for a broader interpretation of postconsumer fiber.

The **City of San Diego** (#18) believes that it is unlikely that the current fiber shortage will continue indefinitely, and that the standards recommended in the proposed RMAN will challenge industry to maximize use of recycled fiber.

Riverwood International (#19) states that supply of acceptable postconsumer fiber is severely limited and therefore recommends a low-end range for carrierboard. In addition, the fiber shortage makes it difficult to incorporate a predictable amount of postconsumer fiber.

Newspaper Association of America (#22) says that many newsprint mills are having difficulty obtaining new supplies of recovered old newspapers and magazines to meet their raw material needs.

The **Containerboard & Kraft Paper Group** of the **American Forest & Paper Association** (#23) believes that there is no need to specify recovered fiber content levels in corrugated containers because of the current fiber shortage and high collection rate for OCC.

The **Recycled Paperboard Division** of the **American Forest & Paper Association** (RPD, #26) believes that the recycled content levels in the draft RMAN will exacerbate the tight fiber supply. Current fiber shortages exemplify the need to abolish the postconsumer mandates included in the RMAN. RPD cautions that mills will reduce postconsumer content or stop using recovered paper because of escalating costs.

The **Bleached Paperboard Division** of the **American Forest & Paper Association** (#27) commented that it does not seem reasonable to recommend recycled content levels in bleached paperboard when the availability of suitable recovered fiber is already limited.

American Forest & Paper Association (#28) contends that government-imposed numerical guidelines exacerbate stressed recovered paper markets by causing different industry segments to compete against each other, a scenario that gives higher value end products a commanding advantage. In addition, now is not the proper time to tighten standards, when fiber supplies are stressed.

The **Newsprint Division** of the **American Forest & Paper Association** (#29) cites enormous price increases for old newspapers and old magazines and expects even tighter supplies in the future. Eliminating the distinction between pre- and postconsumer fiber would help ease the fiber supply problem.

Northeast Maryland Waste Disposal Authority (#31) believes that the fiber shortage will result in a temporary tightening of availability of some recycled paper products, but that EPA should resist reacting to the current market situation. Instead, EPA should help increase recovery of fiber needed to make recycled paper products.

Procter & Gamble (#34) believes that EPA should be stimulating supply (of recovered fiber) rather than demand, and should reconsider the approach taken in the RMAN.

Canadian Pulp & Paper Association (#38) states that it is becoming increasingly uneconomical for paper producers to use recycled fiber because supply is insufficient to meet needs, causing skyrocketing prices.

Tissue Producers Coalition (#43) comments on the current fiber shortage and resulting high prices for recovered paper, particularly for sorted office paper and sorted colored ledger. It cites a recent study showing that, even with no change in federal guidelines, there will be a one million ton shortfall in recovered paper by 1997.

Direct Marketing Association (DMA, #L4) observes that the RMAN does not recognize the recovered fiber supply shortage. DMA urges EPA to state that the RMAN applies to the federal government only and not to the private sector because to do so would only exacerbate an already difficult recycled paper products market. DMA also condones EPA for postponing action on guidelines that would take effect in 1998.

Paper Recycling Coalition (#L5) states that the current fiber shortages exemplify the negative impact of the postconsumer requirements of RCRA Section 6002 because they artificially constrain the supply of available fiber and provide disincentives for increased investment in additional recycling capacity.

INFORMATION ON TRAY LINERS

Fort Howard (#12) believes that GSA's apparent concern with the use of postconsumer fiber in food tray liners is unfounded. This commenter contends that these products can be made with recovered and/or postconsumer fiber without posing any meaningful risk to human health or safety.

INFORMATION ON GREETING CARD STOCK

Mead (#15) provides information on papeteries, a unique paper grade used for greeting cards. Mead suggests that papeteries be categories as a type of "offset" paper.

Markets for Recycled Products (#16) suggests that Recycled Paper Products, Inc., a manufacturer of greeting cards with high postconsumer content, should be contacted to gather additional information on this topic.

The **Printing & Writing Division** of the **American Forest & Paper Association** (#25) provided additional information about greeting card stock, pointing out that several paper grades can be used to manufacture greeting cards.

Lincoln Pulp & Paper (#36) states that the President, Vice President, and probably other government officials send many greeting card and that it is consistent that EPA add postconsumer and recovered fiber content recommendations for greeting cards. Lincoln produces paper containing 50 percent recovered/20 percent postconsumer content for greeting card manufacture.

INFORMATION ON SPECIALTY TISSUE PRODUCTS

Markets for Recycled Products (#16) provides information on one producer of wrapping tissue (Paper Service Ltd., Hinsdale, NH) that uses 100 percent postconsumer fiber.

INFORMATION ON PAPERBOARD AND PACKAGING

International Paper (IP, #9) provides additional information on solid bleached sulfate (SBS). Over 90 percent of SBS goes into packaging for fluids, into food service items, or into folding cartons for ice cream, butter, frozen foods, and other retail goods. Direct content food packaging must meet strict consumer safety regulations such as FDA 176.260. IP believes that setting any recycled content levels for SBS represents an unwarranted regulatory intrusion into industry production and policy, and strongly urges EPA not to initiate any recommendations with regard to SBS until after an extensive review of all related issues.

Mead (#15) provided information on paperboard and packaging, responding to many questions posed by EPA in the RMAN.

Markets for Recycled Products (#16) observes that the footnote on page 20 of the RMAN contains an error. The footnote reads, "limited availability of suitable material precludes widespread use of recovered or postconsumer fiber in food-grade paper products." This commenter points out that the limitation pertains only to wet and oily foods, and that dry foods have been packaged in coated boxboard for many years. This commenter also discusses use of double-lined kraft clippings in both linerboard and corrugating medium, and provides information on content levels for miscellaneous paperboard products. She also observes that Westvaco's Covington, VA, mill uses recovered fiber in SBS.

The **Containerboard & Kraft Paper Group** of the **American Forest & Paper Association** (#23) provides answers to some of EPA's questions about corrugated containers.

The **Recycled Paperboard Division** of the **American Forest & Paper Association** (RPD, #26) believes that EPA gives an incomplete and misleading picture of the current situation regarding the use of recycled fiber in food grade paper and paperboard. This commenter cautions that its members have been producing 100 percent recycled paperboard for food packaging for decades, and that market and technology changes are creating new food packaging opportunities for the grade. RPD suggests that EPA needs to better understand the regulations regarding use of recovered fiber in food grade paperboard and to distinguish between packaging for dry foods versus packaging for fatty and aqueous products.

RPD provides additional information on coated paperboard, indicating that coating *per se* is not a determinant of postconsumer fiber use in folding cartons, and that individual content levels for coated and uncoated folding cartons are not necessary. In addition, RPD states that EPA should not recommend separate content levels for SBS and should eliminate the footnote to Table A-4.

Paper Recycling Coalition (#L5) provides additional information on paperboard and generally comments that EPA should not recommend different content levels for industrial paperboard products.