

Recycling Reform Advisory Council

Statewide Lists Subcommittee

Meeting Notes

July 22, 2026, 1:00-3:00pm PT

[Meeting Slide Deck Link](#)

- I. Welcome (1:00-1:10)
 - a. Housekeeping and Attendance

Member	Affiliation	Attendance
Alissa Campbell	Recology	X
Becci Piepel	Douglas County Solid Waste	X
Delegate: Kent Kovalenko	Okanogan County	
Danielle Waterfield	AMERIPEN	X
Delegate: Gregory Melkonian		
Grant Williams	Tribal Solid Waste Advisory Network	X
Jay Blazey	Cedar Grove	X
Jeff Zillich	WM	X
Julie Gilbertson	Circular Action Alliance	X
Karen Hultgren	Pierce County	X
McKenna Morrigan	Seattle Public Utilities	X
Megan Daum	American Beverage Association	X
Michael Liptack	Friday Harbor	X
Moji Igun	Zero Waste Washington	X
Rick Vahl	Waste Connections	X

- b. Review of Meeting Agenda
 - i. **Desired Meeting Outcome:** Validate and/or provide input on preliminary list assignments and identify ways to strengthen the technical basis for the statewide lists.
 - c. Conflicts of Interest
 - i. Call for disclosure of conflicts of interest related to today's meeting agenda
 - 1. Gregory Melkonian flagged a perceived conflict since he works for a trade association
 - 2. Megan Daum flagged a perceived conflict since he works for a trade association
- II. Statewide List Preliminary Evaluation (1:10-2:40)
 - a. Subcommittee members were encouraged to review documents prior to meeting
 - 1. [Statewide List Review Memo](#)

2. [Statewide List Companion Document](#)
 3. [Statewide List for Review V1](#)
- b. Overview presentation – Joel Schoening, RRS [[Presentation Available](#)]
- i. Subcommittee Member: Clarification on glass recommendation – is the recommendation that glass be a separate collection throughout the state (like Portland, OR) – on both residential and the public place list?
 1. Joel: Yes, it is separate collection. We took it off the public place list because the separate collection was challenging. Right now, it's designated for residential separate. If it's not on the public place list, it would go in the trash.
 - ii. Subcommittee Member: For items that need further evaluation, what is the timeline and pathway forward for evaluating that?
 1. Joel: The timeline is to bring it to the next meeting to fill in the rest and complete the list. The pathway is the same evaluation flow chart – it's just that some materials require a deeper dive than others.
 - iii. Subcommittee Member: On the needs for their evaluation poly coated paper, how does the evaluation consider like gable top, for example, also being a type of poly coat? Was that equally complex in the evaluation process?
 1. Joel: Poly coated is a broader category with broader variables, which is why it landed on needs evaluation while others got designations.
 - iv. Subcommittee Member: After the list is completed in October, what is the process for adding and subtracting to the list after it's finalized as a group?
 1. Ecology: The full needs assessment has requirements where the list is to be evaluated in several different ways. We aren't going to redo the entire evaluation for all materials, but as we are evaluating the system and looking at which materials work or may not work and what capacities may need to be built out through the needs assessment process, there is a potential that it could be altered slightly. This is called in statute the initial list. This is our starting point where we'll start the evaluation for the needs assessment after the full needs assessment is published, which we'll turn over to CAA. CAA will have an opportunity through the program plan to propose additions, on-ramping, subtractions, etc. and then Ecology will have final approval. 30 days after approval, Ecology will post the final statewide collection list, so there are iterations. In future needs assessment discussions with the subcommittee and the full Advisory Council, we can discuss further.
- c. Discussion Questions (1:25-2:40)
- i. Are there material categories—or specific material formats—that should be assigned differently? If so, based on what criteria and supporting evidence?
 - ii. Are there criterion evaluations that should be reconsidered? If so, what evidence or technical information supports an alternative evaluation?

- iii. Would additional subdivision of certain material categories improve the statewide lists?
- iv. Subcommittee comments on materials to discuss: [\[Summary of List\]](#)
 - 1. PET (#26 on list) should be on public space list
 - a. Ecology: Updated draft will have PET. That was an oversight.
 - 2. Would like to discuss glass (#82) being omitted from public space list
 - 3. #82 Glass Bottle and Containers - why on separate?
 - 4. #s 17, 63, 79, 85 (HHW packaging) may need to move to alternative collection lists.
 - 5. #82 Glass Bottles & Containers - Residential Recycling – Commingled
 - 6. Can we confirm if PP and fiber CUPS are included/not included on residential recycling and public space?
 - a. Ecology: They are both needing further evaluation before being included on either list
 - 7. #2, #4, and #5 Plastic Products (#64) – Alt. Collection - I don't think it's appropriate to include non-covered materials on Alternative Collection list.
 - 8. #94 Clean Wood & Dimensional Lumber should not be on the residential compositing list. It needs preprocessing, and I have put comments from Pierce County into the spreadsheet regarding preprocessing needs and increased costs.
 - 9. #44 #5 PP Cups - Residential Recycling – Commingled
 - 10. Where do Nursery pots (Black Plastic) fall in the lists?
 - 11. There were numerous categories on the residential collection list not pulled over to the public place list, can that be elaborated on?
 - a. Gable Top Containers
 - b. Glass Bottles & Containers
 - c. #2 Lids and Handles >2"
 - d. #5 Lids >2"
 - e. #5 PP Bottles & Containers
 - f. #5 PP Large Containers
 - g. Aluminum & Bi-metal Food Packaging
 - h. Aseptic Containers
 - i. Joel Schoening, RRS: The operating assumption is that public space collection has a higher bar in terms of consumer education and preparation for recycling at home. It should be only those things that are going to be comingled no matter what. We didn't assume that public space collection could have 3 bins or something similar in a public space collection receptacle.
 - 12. Item #49 - would love to discuss #6 EPS food packaging in Alternative collection. Concerned about contamination
 - 13. #43 PP Bottles & Containers - wondering why not on public place list.

14. #8 - molded pulp - why public
 15. #82 - Glass - comingled
 16. #85 - HHW glass - for alt collection
 17. #95 & #96 textiles - for alt collection
 18. Would ask that RRS and DoE hear from Closed Loop on PP and fiber cups, which they have great data on after NextGen
 - a. Ecology: Thanks Megan! We have met with them several times and are meeting with them again soon
 19. If glass is designated residential recycling - can it be collected mixed or separate?
 - a. Joel: Yes, via the petition process.
 20. I heard it noted the producer would need to petition; can the collector petition as well since the infrastructure costs would fall there too?
 21. I understand the higher bar for public places and would like to see more consistency between residential and public place, especially as we consider public education/re-education. That might be something we fold into our evaluation criteria, perhaps?
 22. In most if not all cases – the public place recycling materials will be mixed with the residential collection material at a MRF. Supports the idea of having the same list?
 - a. I agree, we would be creating a separate stream with differential collection and sorting. Again, this increases collection costs as collection runs would be separate.
 23. Clarifying question for Ecology, the location specific ACP is not-PRO led, correct?
 24. Glass – rural collection. In some markets - mixed recycling is baled for transport to a MRF. How does glass mixed in this bale affect processing at the MRF?
 25. #43 PP Bottles/Containers - similar to the PET bottles, can those also be considered for public place list since they are on the residential comingled one? And it will make it easier for consumers to avoid identification.
 26. I sorry, but did we discuss Aseptic and Cartons enough? Looking for any other perspective on this.
 27. To Alyssa's question. It appears pizza boxes does not meet 70A.455 RCW (i.e., category 1) would it be considered recyclable?
 28. If compostables are on the list - it MUST be collected?
 - a. Ecology: Yes.
- v. Subcommittee Discussion on Residential Recycling List
1. #82 Glass

- a. Understand the proposal to do residential separate collection for glass but would like to discuss why glass was off the public place list. Guess is because it's expensive, but worry about then having something that is accepted as recyclable like that causing consumer confusion.
- b. Concerned that when you have glass on a separate list like this, you're increasing the cost of collection. As somebody who runs a team that does that collection, that means two trips to every place. If we're putting it separately, want to know we're increasing the cost to pick this up. Right now, in many places, everything is comingled. If you add a separate item, you're still adding cost.
 - i. Would note that there are places in Washington where glass is picked up separately within the same truck (e.g., City of Vancouver).
 - ii. Even if glass gets designated for residential separate, does that necessarily mean it would have to be separated if it was on the public list? Could you do it comingled public?
 - iii. The option is it potentially goes to trash if it's not on the residential list, which is what we're trying to avoid. With the implementation of this, it's an opportunity to increase recycling. I think it belongs on the curbside collection list to be a part of programs, and then we can work from there to determine how we address rural and more urban areas. Also concerns about cost and access, and what that structure looks like if it's completely listed separately.
- c. In agreement that glass should stay as a curbside collected item. I think that it's getting collected successfully in the comingled bin, so I think that should still be evaluated. One potential flaw in evaluation is identification and preparation because if many people are disposing of glass in a curbside comingled bin right now, we're not sure what the nuance would be in whether they'd be able to use an additional bin and if they would still be putting glass in their comingled bin. Would like to see some more commentary on the evaluation side to see what the impact would be if we were changing that particular strategy.
- d. Regarding the comingled versus separate, and the list being different, changes that we're going to be making to the residential recycling statewide are going to require a lot of education. If we have separate ones for public versus residential, that's going to add to that hurdle of folks learning the difference between the two.
 - i. Joel Schoening, RRS: Part of the thinking on glass was that there are costs and quality issues on the sortation side with comingled

glass. Interested in hearing thoughts from the sortation side and the trade-offs and shrinking the residential list to be more aligned.

- e. I'm going to speak up for glass being separate, which is how it's done in Pierce County, and the reason is one of quality. I think the Advisory Council needs to be mindful of whether we're talking about high-quality material or lesser quality more material. Ecology's Recycling Development Center really delved into glass and what happens to glass in the state of Washington and one of the recommendations was more source-separated glass. I know there's lots of folks who would like to have it in the commingled bin, but I'm just trying to speak up for keeping it separate, understanding that there are additional costs, etc. We have to decide if we want to capture all of it or if we want to capture clean, reusable glass.
- f. ERG (Ecology consultants) are looking at current systems today, specific for public place recycling. Did they look at the nuance of what is accepted in today's residential recycling program as part of the criteria for evaluation?
 - i. Joel: The strongest factors in determining what landed on the public place list was, we started with the comingled list and then selected from the list what was suitable for public space. The most prominent factor was the likelihood of bringing contamination and sortation. Current harmonization wasn't a very strong factor, but we can reconsider that.
- g. Would like to hear from the glass folks. Also, would like to reiterate the comment of having the list mirror other is really important for educational purposes.
- h. City of Seattle runs one of the most robust public place collection recycling programs maybe nationally with over 150 public place recycling containers that we service throughout the city. They're paired with garbage containers, and we don't really educate about them. We just provide them to folks in public places and that material gets collected by our contractors and processed with the MRF at our other materials. It's such a minuscule amount of material compared to our residential materials, and we, at least so far, we've never like sampled that specifically to see how the composition differs, but it's not been flagged as a thing that like creates significant contamination or processing concerns from our contractor. It's effectively being sorted in the same way that all of our residential materials are being sorted.
- i. I think that the facilities that are in place throughout the state of Washington, particularly a lot of the single stream facilities, have highly advanced technology that can sort residential glass out of the

residential stream. The REM standard component means that we're going to have to find a home for all the glass that's processed. Concerns on if we get to the point where we lose a large component of the stream, we're not doing any favors by reducing the amount of recyclables being produced.

- j. If glass is on the residential list in different markets across the state, can it be collected mixed, or on the side? Is it just a different mechanism for how it's collected at the household? How does multifamily fit in?
 - i. In terms of the law, like the way that the lists are described and what the different services are, residential is inclusive of both single family and multifamily services. So the residential lists apply to both.
 - ii. Ecology: There is a developing situation currently. There is a mechanism in the law that allows for a group of producers to petition for what would essentially become an alternative collection program where, depending on the geographic area, the mode of collection could differ by geographic area. The law allows for that. It requires a petition from a group of producers, which then must be approved by Ecology, which then goes through the full needs assessment. There is a theoretical scenario where glass could not be collected in one area and collected in a different area, or it could be collected curbside on the side or comingled.
 - iii. Ecology: To reiterate, this is the initial list. There's a lot of work that needs to be done to sort out glass. The idea of it being called out separately to me as this residential recycling separate is emphasizing, from Ecology's perspective, the importance of collecting glass. We do want glass to be on the residential recycling list. We have concerns about it being commingled statewide. I'm also being considerate of the full state, imagining rural programs that do not currently have any glass recycling now adding commingled glass to a program that doesn't even have a curbside program.

2. #43 Polypropylene cups

- a. Knowing WM facilities throughout the state that are collecting, processing, and shipping them – we're looking at an extensive list of over almost 100 items and looking for things that can be recycled. Polypropylene number 5 is something that could go on the residential recycling list since we have good end markets. Maybe we have a carve out that just lists cups itself as its own category rather than including it in the food category.

- i. Seconding this and understand that next-gen and closed-loop partners have extensive data on both the polypro and fiber cups.
- ii. Seattle's done some close look at that as we're updated our new recyclables processing contract and felt confident about the recyclability and end markets on polypropylene cups.

3. #92-94 Residential composting

- a. Pierce County has concerns about including the dimensional lumber in the residential composting program. You're going to get treated lumber; painted lumber; nails, fasteners, and metal all going through a grinder, which you don't want in the mix when you're focused on food waste and yard waste. The preferred path for it would be to take it to some sort of C&D facility where it can be looked at and then possibly be pulled for reuse. Metals can get pulled out before it's turned into a clean wood product. And then if at that point, if there is not another higher value market for it, it could then go into the residential compost stream, but we would really need it to be pre-processed before entering our facility.
 - i. Cedar Grove does take dimensional lumber – not a lot of it. Our grinders can handle small pieces of dimensional lumber and we don't want those fasteners either. Almost all these items we talk about bear the risk. There's an educational component.
 - ii. Seattle does take small dimensional lumber in our residential organics program and we've communicated that to residents for a long time and it's not something that we have an issue with.
 - iii. Ecology: Dimensional lumber is not a covered material, so this more of a guidance.
- b. Paper is not included and concerned about food service corrugated cardboard. Pizza boxes are listed as an example in there, but thinking about MRFs, and the fact that we get a lot of pizza boxes that have actual pizza in them. Curious about the possibility that we could have an inclusion of this material for compost evaluation.
 - i. Pizza boxes are on the recyclable list for residential recycling. That's the higher use of it. Contamination is a huge issue. You're going to get pizza, plastic, and contaminants. We don't want that in our composting stream at all.
 - ii. Ecology: If you were to put pizza boxes on a residential composting list, then programs that do not take food waste at all would then be required to take them. And so that would be programs that only take yard waste would then be required to take a compostable packaging. Our concerns are mandating statewide compostable

collection or calling that compostable in this case, like paper, in programs they do not want compostables or even food waste. That doesn't solve for the food contamination. If you evaluate purely on the recyclability, fully appreciate the food contamination, which applies to every food packaging category.

- iii. Ecology: The language in the law says that service providers must provide for the collection of materials on the list. If a compostable product makes the list, it must be collected. There's language that says you cannot collect a material in your recycling program that is not on the list. By not putting it on the list, it doesn't mean UCL could not add it to your program, like, separately. So, Ecology's current interpretation is you cannot add recyclables to your list if they didn't make it. You can add compostables to your list if they didn't make it.
 - 1. It is my understanding that with the new organics laws, most of the big cities will be taking food waste soon, so that seems like a short-term criteria and probably shouldn't be as big as a factor.
 - a. Ecology: It's not statewide to the degree that the requirements for organics collection are extending. We are being mindful of our rural programs and our rural composters. We have estimated maybe 10 to 15 compost facilities that will not be taking food waste or compostables, even in a post-2030 world. Coming back to if we put those materials on the list, we are then mandating their collection and then requiring a number of compost facilities to collect them that don't want it. But if you really want to add pizza boxes to your compost program, which is a lower use of that material, I'd point out, recycling it is a better use of that material, but if you really didn't want it in your recycling bin, well, you'd have to put it in both, then, in this.
 - 2. Clarification about covered and non-covered materials, and implications of adding something in jurisdiction that is not on the list. For example, composting nursery pots in a separate program not reimbursed by CAA – would we be precluded from doing this?
 - a. Ecology: You can add materials to your organics collection program. The law does not prevent that. That is informing our choice to be more conservative statewide with which covered materials put on the

organics list because jurisdictions have the freedom to add those materials. There are implications not figured out yet with CAA about how that affects producer fees because whether a material makes the list or not is a determining factor in how much producers pay for that material. If that material does not make the statewide list, but then a number of programs were to add it, it complicates the relationship but is allowed in the law. If you are participating in the program and receiving reimbursement, you must follow the stipulations of the law. If you're not going to participate, you could just continue operating and many requirements would not apply.

- b. There are two places where the requirement for residential recycling programs to align with the statewide list shows up: covered materials in the RRA and planning jurisdictions with their designated recyclables list.
- c. Ecology: There will be a model plan amendment language, but if you don't adopt one yourself, the list defaults into recycling plans.

- iv. Pizza boxes work really well in Cedar Grove's composting program. They tend to include some food waste.

vi. Subcommittee Discussion on Alternative Collection List

1. #54 Black nursery pots (Black plastic)

- a. Joel Schoening, RRS: The brief summary would be that black plastic has sortation challenges and can be a contamination issue when mixed with other colors. It is potentially recyclable, so that it's designated alternative in the sense. Our ratings generally that have either alternative or separate – materials landed there that had potential. Black plastic falls into this category in the sense that we understand it to be recyclable. We understand that to be sort of technically recyclable and feasibly recyclable if there are end markets, but it wasn't well suited for commingled.

2. HHW packages

- a. Clarification that all HHW packaging is not listed, but we have a program approved to collect it.
 - i. Joel Schoening, RRS: My understanding is that a material that is going through the alternative collection pathway, different from the petitions process we talked about for. The multi-mode collection with that is a whole other program.

- ii. Ecology: This is something we can put on the list because the idea is if it makes the list, it must be provided for. If there is no Interchange 360, it would fall on CAA to provide for the collection of that material. If we think that material should be on there, it should make the list regardless. Even assuming the presence of an Interchange, it should just make the list and the current assumption is that they will account for those materials. If it changes, CAA would account for the rest.
- b. As a follow-up, are you just listing the Interchange materials and then leaving the rest of the HHW unlisted or are you saying to list everything, because not sure about going that far.
 - i. Ecology: Objectively, we're determining the suitability for an alternative collection program. We weren't fully factoring this level of detail when we came up with the material list, but we'll try to figure out how best to account for material type.
 - ii. Should there be greater subdivision? This feels like one of those areas where that is needed.
 - 1. Ecology: Agree. The idea that we would put some materials on the list and then Interchange exists and manages these, but by leaving them out, CAA is obligated to provide alternative collection for the remainder of them is not the scenario we want.
- 3. #49 Styrofoam food service packaging
 - a. Wondering why it was included on this list considering a lot of the criteria shown as challenging or concerning with food contamination.
 - i. Joel: Similar to black plastics, there are potential end markets for this if a group of producers was motivated to set that program up. It's something that could theoretically exist, so rather than designated as not collected, we parked it here as a potential for those programs.
 - 1. As a follow up to this, does that include the EPS material categories that are banned?
 - a. Ecology: As a broad category, it encompasses more than what was banned because there are items (i.e., egg cartons and noodle cups) that were not banned, so would assume the volume of this material out in the world is reduced significantly due to the ban.
- 4. #64 – #2, #4, and #5 Plastic Products
 - a. That's really important for residential programs where at curbside, we might be collecting some additional non-covered materials that are these products. It struck me as odd to include a non-covered material

in the alternative collection list when that list category is explicitly supposed to be the responsibility of the PRO. I don't think you can make the PRO responsible for non-covered materials.

- i. Ecology: Good flag. I think we'll likely just be able to remove that. I can't think of why there'd be any potential covered materials in that category.

vii. Additional subcommittee feedback

1. #12-13 Aseptics

- a. We should discuss the impacts of potential inclusion on the recycling list. They probably should be included, but the REM impacts on what that means for overall movement merits more discussion.
- 2. Not listed for collection list can be revisited in future meetings
- 3. In next round of the list, further denoting covered and non-covered materials with an asterisk, so CAA can clearly understand what's reimbursable and what is out of scope
 - a. Also request that the next version delineate materials by material class, so the subcommittee can look at paper materials and plastic and glass and metal
 - b. Calling out that in the evaluation matrix, the numbering is there, but would like to see that flow through the rest of the list since there are so many materials

III. Public Comment (2:40-2:50)

- a. Alex Truelove (BPI): Compostables are in a unique situation and there's obviously consequences to putting compostable product categories on the list when some composters aren't in a position to accept them. In the case that was described earlier – if a composter wants to accept the pizza box or the pots or the food scrap collection bags and they're not on the list, does that unlock funding? Is there an incentive through EPR for them to do that?
 - i. Ecology: As covered materials, the cost to manage those materials will be covered. If it's not on the list and you didn't want that material, you'd be managing it as a contaminant, so you could be reimbursed to manage that material as a contaminant. If it's going into your program and you want it composted, you're not managing it then as a contaminant, so it'd be a small amount that make up the composition of the organic stream, so that portion would be reimbursable. How it's managed and how you work with your relationship with CAA to report out how you're managing that is to be determined.
- b. Johan Kalala-Kasanda (UTC): Has the advisory board thought about the impacts to rate payers. If we add more pick-ups this means more costs for trucks, and bins and labor.

- i. Ecology: The basics of the program are that the PRO will reimburse the ratepayers for these services progressively up to 90% of ratepayer costs for covered services. These costs are intended to be shifted to the PRO, not the ratepayer. We're trying to design the best program for these materials and for the state. It's a valid concern and seems that it should be more of a concern for CAA than for the local program. We are very mindful of how this is going to impact ratepayers.

IV. Preview of Next Meetings Content (2:50-3:00)

- a. Feedback due by July 24th
 - i. Feedback to be included in the excel document per the instruction in the Review Memo
- b. August 4 (1:00-3:00pm)
 - i. Continued discussion regarding materials and lists (includes review of V2)
- c. August 10 (10:00-12:00pm)
 - i. Finalize list discussions
 - ii. Create content the sub-committee wants to bring to full RRA Advisory Council meeting on 8/13

V. Adjourn