

# Recycling Reform Advisory Council Needs Assessment Subcommittee Meeting Notes

May 20, 2026, 10:00-11:00am PT

[Meeting Slide Deck Link](#)

---

I. Welcome

a. Attendance

Name	Organization	Attendance
Rick Vahl (Chair)	Waste Connections	Y
Alissa Campbell	Recology	Y
Casey Bouchard	Methow Recycles	Y
Danielle Waterfield	AMERIPEN	Y
Grant Williams	Tribal Solid Waste Advisory Network	Y
Jocelyn Quarrell	Bold Reuse	Y
Julie Gilbertson	CAA	Y
McKenna Morrigan	Seattle Public Utilities	Y
Megan Daum	American Beverage Association	Y

b. Review of meeting agenda

c. Call for disclosure of conflicts of interest related to today's meeting agenda

II. [Ecology Updates – Dan Weston, Ecology](#)

a. Needs assessments timeline

i. Ecology: Reviewed process and purpose of preliminary needs assessment and “full needs assessment”

1. Ecology: Clarified that primary work for preliminary needs assessment will take place in 2026 and primary work for full needs assessment will take place in 2027, but main data collection effort for both needs assessments is happening now through surveys and interviews

- a. Ecology: If there were changes between 2026-2029, CAA could help in addressing individual concerns

ii. AC member: Flagged that current data collection is a snapshot in time that might miss things that are evolving over time (e.g., haulers who have never done any curbside recycling program may have been missed in service provider registration or are unaware of surveys) and asked about mechanisms to make sure no one is overlooked

1. Ecology: Has a comprehensive list of where services are provided by regulated facilities, and emphasized that this current data collection period is time to collect information and would welcome input from anyone who hasn't provided data or missed service provider registration
2. HDR: Making sure to contact everyone that should be responding to the surveys and working with WRRRA to review contact list and identify any gaps

iii. AC member: Aware that aside from RFI, there's also been research based on publicly available information that's been submitted to Ecology for other purposes and wanted to clarify that Ecology is utilizing that public information to help corroborate what is being sent from surveys

1. Ecology: Shared service provider registration and annual report data with consultant team to help form baseline tonnage information
  2. HDR: Using survey data gives an opportunity for data to be more consistent and up-to-date and will turn to data to help fill in gaps identified through survey effort; hoping to use survey as primary source of data so it's consistent throughout the state
- iv. HDR: These surveys are main outreach effort for data collection for both preliminary and full needs assessment and expect there will be supplemental data collection over the next year, including survey facilities about materials processed and capacity
  - v. AC member: Would like to confirm that there will be a separate study to capture infrastructure that supports reuse and believes that's how it was explained in last March's advisory meeting
    1. HDR: Confirmed that this study will also look at infrastructure reuse and refill infrastructure that exists and will be a component of the preliminary needs assessment
  - vi. AC member: How local communities or companies operating other services in that community can influence collection methods and service design recommendations to bridge gap between data collection and real-world implementation
    1. Ecology: Surveys are collecting information on services, cost, and amount of materials; Advisory Council, subcommittee, and public comment period also provide opportunity to review recommendations; On-site visits and supplemental data collection
    2. HDR: Plan to conduct a gap analysis using GIS and mapping recycling and compost collection visually assess access
      - a. HDR: Provided more context into the preliminary needs assessment process and that baseline understanding of current state rolls up to a regional level and surveys allow for additional proprietary information to ensure everyone's information is represented and allow HDR to model out collection costs to provide access to services
  - vii. Ecology: Updated timeline does not have specific dates yet targeted, but makes sense to strategically time meetings around deliverables for robust discussion
- b. Initial service provider registration reporting
    - i. Ecology: Collected as required in statute, but didn't get great data for service provider registration due to timing and unavailable information, but hopes will improve in the future as service providers know what to expect in January as information is requested annually
    - ii. Ecology: 137 entities registered as service providers, including local governments, private haulers, MRFs, nonprofit entities – many reporting on behalf of multiple jurisdictions
  - c. Survey results (to-date)
    - i. Ecology: Targeted surveys are out, including surveys from CAA, Interchange 360, and service providers (e.g., haulers, MRFs)
    - ii. Ecology: Addressed concerns about timeline and in response, extended deadlines on surveys to June 12, which will be communicated to all survey recipients

- iii. HDR: Offered to hop on a call to help fill out survey
- iv. AC Member: Expect that gap may remain at end of the timelines for surveys to be completed and offered a potential solution that in the State of California, the consulting group ended up looking into more information broadly that is available related to service costs and kind of create an assessment that was reviewable by stakeholders and service providers
  - 1. Ecology: Recognized that California's approach is a backup plan, but a Washington focused needs assessment with preliminary data would be more robust and accurate
- d. RFI responses
  - 1. Ecology: [RFIs available publicly](#)
  - 2. Ecology: Consultants are also preparing a summary of responses with information about information into the needs assessment and statewide lists
- e. Technical memos
  - i. AC Member: Clarified that first draft in September will be where subcommittee has the most opportunity to raise questions, review, and provide input
- III. Subcommittee Discussion (10:25-10:45)
- IV. Public Comment (10:45-10:50)
  - a. No public comment provided at this time
- V. Next Steps (10:50-11:00)
  - a. Recommendations for full AC engagement on June 11 meeting
    - i. Chair reiterated extension on survey and encouraged anyone involved in survey results to take up HDR on opportunity to have a discussion
  - b. Review timeline for Subcommittee tasks & associated meetings
- VI. Adjourn