

Recycling Reform Advisory Council

Meeting Notes

June 11, 2026, 9-11:00am PT

[Meeting Slide Deck](#)

- I. Welcome (9:00-9:10)
 - a. Review of meeting agenda
 - b. Attendance

Name	Organization	Attendance
Alissa Campbell	Recology	Y
Amanda Dalton	Northwest Grocery Retail Association	N
Becci Piepel	Douglas County Solid Waste	Y
Casey Bouchard	Methow Recycles	Y
Danielle Waterfield	AMERIPEN	Y
Grant Williams	Tribal Solid Waste Advisory Network	Y
Jay Blazey	Cedar Grove	Y
Jeff Zillich	WM	Y
Delegate: Chris Reigelsperger		
Jocelyn Quarrell	Bold Reuse	Y
Julie Gilbertson	Circular Action Alliance (Non-voting)	Y
Karen Hultgren	Pierce County	Y
McKenna Morigan	Seattle Public Utilities	Y
Megan Daum	American Beverage Association	Y
Michael Liptack	Friday Harbor	Y
Ming-Ming Tung-Edelman	CareMakers Collective	Y
Moji Igun	Zero Waste Washington	Y
Peter Lyon	Washington State Department of Ecology (Non-voting)	Y
Rick Vahl	Waste Connections	Y
Trace Bradburn	City of Spokane	Y

- c. Call for disclosure of conflicts of interest related to today's meeting agenda
 - i. No conflicts of interest disclosed
 - d. [Solicitation of comments on meeting notes](#)
 - i. No comments on meeting notes
- II. Feedback Agenda Items (9:10-9:15)
- III. Ecology Updates (9:15-9:35) [\[Update slides\]](#)
 - a. Overall timeline – Dan Weston, Ecology
 - i. Questions

1. AC Member: On needs assessment and survey process, are the consultants also looking at publicly available information (e.g., company websites, Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission [UTC])?
 - a. Ecology: Consultants are looking at other information available, including digging into UTC information for contract information and talking to local governments. Documentation in the Request for Information (RFI) listed data sources where information was pulling from.
 2. AC Member: Regarding the RFI and wanting current information, what does the process look like if people want to submit more current information? How does that fit into the timeline?
 - a. Ecology: We will always accept more current information. When we receive it will impact when we can incorporate it, but if we receive something, even if it doesn't go into the preliminary needs assessment, it will be taken into account for the full needs assessment. The same goes for the statewide lists.
 3. AC Member: How will tech memos get published or shared out to the advisory council and the public?
 - a. Ecology: There aren't plans to do a full public review on tech memos because they will function as appendices to the needs assessment. Will want needs assessment subcommittee to review and provide comments. It will be posted on the website and shared to the public, but there won't be a formal public comment period.
- b. Recycling Refund Study – Kara Steward, Ecology
- i. [The Ecology Recycling Reform Act website provides more details](#)
 - ii. Questions
 1. AC Member: On bottle deposit survey, who was that sent to and how was word gotten out about the survey?
 - a. Ecology: ERG was given a long list of engagement folks and conducted additional research on the side. If there is interest in having a conversation with ERG and Cascadia, Ecology can connect them.
- c. Rulemaking – Kara Steward, Ecology
- i. [You can sign up for regular email updates on their Recycling Reform Act newsletter](#)
 - ii. [Rulemaking webpage](#)
 - iii. [Draft rule language comment portal](#)
 - iv. [Questions/Comments](#)
- IV. Producer Responsibility Organization (PRO) Updates (9:35-10:05) [[Presentation available](#)]
- a. Producer Journey – Jim Velky, Circular Action Alliance (CAA)
 - i. AC Member: Do you have an estimated "universe" of the number of producers that you think should be registered in Washington?
 1. Jim: We would expect between 3,000 and 3,500 once the rules are finalized and adopted. Subsequently, we will continue to reach out to producers to ensure all are re-engaged.
 - ii. CAA Producer Webinars:
 1. [101: Producer Onboarding with CAA](#)

- i. [RCW 70A.455.040](#): Requirements for a product labeled "compostable"
 - ii. AC Member: Re. the Material Evaluation Process Flow Chart – What does the initial step assessing suitability for composting vs. recycling look like? Is there a similar assessment for suitability for reuse/refill?
 - iii. AC Member: Clarification on where the criteria for composting can be found.
 - 1. RRS: Criteria are all detailed in the companion document and there is language that specifically calls out composting.
 - a. [\[Link to companion document here\]](#)
 - iv. AC Member: Clarification on interpretation of end market and what it means since it's a critical determinant in evaluation
 - 1. RRS: Criteria detailed in the companion document, including specific rating factors for end markets. Rating factors for end markets are stability, maturity, accessibility, and long-term viability.
 - v. AC Member: Follow up to companion document presenting criteria of materials as a rating (i.e., graded on weak to strong) but in the flow chart is presented in a yes/no, exist/does not exist method to determine where materials flow
 - 1. RRS: A material that doesn't get a strong rating on the initial pass doesn't mean it won't and can make its way back on the collection list. The flow chart aids with prioritization. A material with a lower rating still gets evaluated and team will look closely at the rating factor such as how strong a track record that end market has. If there is a reason to believe that a single entity end market is robust, has enough capacity, and is economically and financially durable long-term, the material could still make the public, residential collection list even if there isn't a strong score.
 - vi. AC Member: How often do you plan to review these designations (i.e., scheduled or ad hoc)?
 - 1. Ecology: Potentially annual intermittent and then every 5 years. As part of the needs assessment, we evaluate the criteria we used to develop the statewide list. Every year, the PRO will put in the proposal their list, which is then finalized as a part of approving the plan, so the list could change. As part of the annual report, the PRO can propose changes to the lists, but because it's yearly, it may be an ad hoc evaluation of a material or whatever is proposed each year. Needs assessment needs to happen every 5 years.
 - vii. AC Member: Does RRS know which specific materials aren't going to be rated across all criteria?
 - 1. RRS: Some examples like aluminum cans have very strong records of meeting criteria in multiple states.
- b. [\[Candidate Materials List & Companion Document\]](#)
- VI. Subcommittee Updates (10:35-10:45)
- a. Statewide Lists Subcommittee – status update
 - i. Next series of meetings will focus on reviewing the preliminary list documents published in early July in preparation for full AC meeting August 13:
 - 1. July 22, August 4, August 10

- ii. September 10 meeting is a placeholder and a calendar hold will be sent out to subcommittee members
 - b. Needs Assessment Subcommittee – status update
 - i. [RFI responses available on Box](#)
 - ii. Until draft needs assessment is available, no reason to meet until September. Subcommittee and AC will be alerted to technical memos when available
 - c. Equity Subcommittee – status update
 - i. Identified a gap in multifamily collection representation and will be adding Socorro Medina to the subcommittee
- VII. Public Questions and Public Comment (10:45-10:55)
 - a. Heather Trim, Zero Waste Washington: I'm hoping that those needs assessment technical memos will come out to the public at the same time that they're coming to the Advisory Committee.
 - b. Amanda B.: Will CAA be giving information on WA early producer fees soon? And when can we expect the early fee release date?
 - i. Julie Gilbertson, CAA: Thank you for your question. Specific to Washington, CAA is analyzing producer simplified reporting data supplied this spring for Washington to evaluate early fees (pre-program plan) and will publish fees once determined in October, as Aaron noted.
 - c. Adam Ellner: Re. the Material Evaluation Process Flow Chart – What does the initial step assessing suitability for composting vs. recycling look like? Is there a similar assessment for suitability for reuse/refill? Thanks in advance.
 - i. Jessica Branom-Zwick, Cascadia: We are evaluating materials for composting (1) in the Organics & Wood Packaging class, (2) certified compostable materials (meaning legally allowed to be labeled compostable in Washington), (3) paper uncoated food service materials in the Paper class, and (4) molded pulp packaging. Food service cardboard (pizza boxes) and other molded pulp packaging (egg cartons but not Chipotle bowls) will be evaluated for both composting and recycling. All other materials will be assessed for recycling. Our statewide list process does not address suitability for reuse/refill.
 - 1. Adam Ellner: Got it, Thanks Jessica. So if I'm interpreting this correctly, the second flow chart decision point (if yes on the first one) only applies to food service cardboard and other molded pulp packaging. Is that correct?
 - a. Jessica Branom-Zwick, Cascadia: To avoid confusion about box numbering: First we assessed whether a material was more suitable for composting than recycling. Most material were clear, but we decided to evaluate food service cardboard and other molded pulp packaging for both composting and recycling. Does this answer what you are asking? So those materials will be assessed on relevant criteria separately for composting and for recycling to see how they score.
 - d. Dan Leif: If a material is one of the eight noted in Phase 2, is it safe to assume it is not on the "obvious" list?

- i. Joel Schoening, RRS: Technically, the two things are distinct. The 8 materials for phase 2 were selected for the range of characteristics, not their expected evaluations, but yeah, your logic would follow.
 - e. Steven Day: The question was just related to updates to the covered materials list, it seemed like maybe interested parties who are familiar with the material handling could propose updates to the list. So I was just asking if that could be a possibility.
 - i. Lauren DiRe, Ecology: There will be a public comment period for the collection lists.
- VIII. Preview of Next Meeting Content (10:55-11:00)
 - a. In-person meeting & MRF tour in Spokane
 - b. Statewide Lists Discussion
 - c. Needs Assessment Technical Memos
 - d. Deposit return system (DRS) study
- IX. Adjourn