

Recycling Reform Advisory Council

Statewide List Subcommittee

Meeting Notes

August 4, 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	Y
Becci Piepel	Douglas County Solid Waste	Y
Danielle Waterfield	AMERIPEN	Y
Grant Williams	Tribal Solid Waste Advisory Network	N
Jay Blazey	Cedar Grove	Y
Jeff Zillich	WM	Y
Julie Gilbertson	Circular Action Alliance	Y
Karen Hultgren	Pierce County	Y
McKenna Morigan	Seattle Public Utilities	Y
Megan Daum	American Beverage Association	Y
Michael Liptack	Friday Harbor	Y
Moji Igoun	Zero Waste Washington	Y
Rick Vahl	Waste Connections	Y

- 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. Specific focus topics for this meeting include:
 - 1. Materials from the “further evaluation needed” list from v.1 or that had list assignments change from v.1 (if any)
 - 2. Materials from the “Not Listed for Collection” list
 - 3. Materials/topics flagged for additional discussion during 7/22 mtg.:
 - a. #12-13 Aseptic & Gabletop
 - b. #82 Glass Bottles & Containers
 - c. PET / thermoforms
 - d. Alignment of Residential Recycling v. Public Place Lists
 - c. Conflicts of Interest
 - i. Call for disclosure of conflicts of interest related to today’s meeting agenda
 - 1. No conflicts of interest disclosed
- II. Continue Statewide List Preliminary Evaluation (1:10-2:40)

- a. Subcommittee members were encouraged to review documents prior to meeting
- b. Brief summary of newly assigned materials – Joel Schoening, RRS [[Presentation slides available](#)]
 - i. Would like to ensure that the non-specification for commingled vs. separate glass allows for the flexibility for communities that don't source separate glass and those that do.
 - 1. Joel: Did not want to determine collection mode at this stage for flexibility, but still want glass collected.
 - ii. Clarification about what it means to put a material on the residential collection list.
 - 1. Ecology: The items currently on the list by October 1 will move forward with needs assessment to assess the investments needed for these materials to be included in a future program and whether it's viable.
 - iii. Looking at justification for #6 (Uncoated food service and molded pulp), would like to better understand how food contact is less of an issue and what is included. Imagining takeout, uncoated, food service-type packaging.
 - 1. Joel: The category includes egg cartons, 4-cup coffee carrier, protective packaging in electronics box, etc.
 - 2. Subcommittee Member: Includes single-use food service paper wrappers, uncoated food service containers (including molded pulp), uncoated serviceware that meet the requirements to be labeled compostable in accordance with 70A.455 RCW; Examples: uncoated paper sandwich wrapper, uncoated pulp food service clamshell, uncoated paper food tray, uncoated plates, uncoated bowls.
 - 3. Subcommittee Member: It sounds like coated vs. uncoated molded pulp will require a strong education campaign for the public.
 - iv. Would like deeper discussion on lids versus caps and understanding that process.
 - 1. Joel: The small format versus 2 inches is a big differentiator there. There are going to be lids, which are mostly flat, and caps, which are mostly threaded, but there are likely some lids that are smaller than 2 inches and threaded caps larger than 2 inches (e.g., mayonnaise jar).
 - a. Subcommittee: Follow up on above comment, would like to make sure we're not making a subcategory for bottle caps and not designating away from work with APR.
 - i. Ecology: Not included on the list is messaging and what we're going to tell people.
- c. Discussion Questions [[Summary of List](#)]
 - i. For newly assigned materials (from the "Further Evaluation Needed" list from v.1) or whose list assignments changed from v.1: Are there material categories—or specific material formats—that should be assigned differently or

that you generally want to discuss? As with last mtg., most helpful if you can frame comments in context of evaluation criteria and supporting evidence.

1. Molded packaging (and pizza boxes) has molded fiber to protect it. We might want to consider it separately from food and non-food because of the contamination issue. Was there consideration on potentially separating them out?
 - a. Jessica Branom-Zwick, Cascadia: List started with waste characterization and there are limitations. We want to think about stuff that is going to be in contact with food because it's food service versus not.
 - b. Ecology: #8 (Other Molded Pulp Packaging) doesn't define coated or uncoated and is just a catch-all other molded pulp packaging.
2. Think we should look into the description of the categories a little bit more. Food service and food soiling across the category is a concern. For example, don't really think of egg cartons as food service, but instead food packaging. Is there a concern about transporting packaging that's molded fiber?
 - a. Subcommittee Member: Want to underscore that it's important we talk about the aspect of food service as it relates to something that is potentially recyclable. A robust educational campaign to make sure that people don't recycle remnants of food with their paper fiber is amazing but want to be realistic when attaching words like food service and anything related to food with them.
 - b. Ecology: Through the next comment period, would be helpful to get a formal perspective about food contamination from your buyers.
 - c. Ecology: On difference between domestic and international markets, it is indeterminate. Domestic producers and industry groups often not talking to international buyers of those materials.
3. #6 (Uncoated Food Service Paper and Molded Pulp Packaging) – composters won't want, unclear for recyclers. My comment is whether we may want to consider non-food uses separately.
4. It sounds like molded vs unmolded pulp will require a strong education campaign for the public. This would also be the case for pizza boxes ("foodservice corrugated cardboard") as well, given all major providers don't have this on the recycle list currently and instead on compost list. Still have concerns over recyclability for non-US processors as well.
 - a. Subcommittee Member: I think food "service" is what I am getting stuck on. Service makes me think about takeout food or material that is intended to be eaten off of.
 - b. Subcommittee Member: Are we evaluating food contamination based on actual processor and end-market specifications, or are we making

a general assumption that the underlying material remains recyclable?

- c. Subcommittee Member: Clarification on what amount/type of (mostly food-related) contamination is acceptable would be very helpful!
- d. Jessica: Published studies found/shared via RFI
 - i. [FPI+Food+Residue+Study+2022.pdf](#)
 - ii. [How Clean Is Clean Enough? - Sustainable Packaging Coalition](#)
 - iii. Webinars: [FPI Webinar Food Residue 2026](#) & [FPI Food Residue Webinar 2016](#)

5. Looking at the full list, that brings up a question about item #10 (Polycoated Fiber Food Packaging). Are these brown paper takeout boxes and what's the justification for including these in the recycling bin when we consider high contamination?

- a. Subcommittee Member: I also had major questions about polycoated fiber food packaging being "on the list" when its rated "challenging" for access and has many "concerning ratings". But I'm happy for it to go through the needs assessment process. This is one that I would flag for a potential "on-ramp" in the future and not on the initial 2030 list when the program launches.

ii. For materials from the "Not Listed for Collection" list: Are there material categories—or specific material formats—that should be assigned differently or that you generally want to discuss? As with last mtg., most helpful if you can frame comments in context of evaluation criteria and supporting evidence.

1. Alternative collection list

- a. Asked for clarification on #76 (Other Ferrous Packaging) and small-format metal packaging
 - i. Jessica Branom-Zwick, Cascadia: #76 covers ferrous packaging not captured elsewhere (e.g., cookie tins) – not a steel can, aerosol can, compressed gas cylinder, small format, or HHW item.
 - ii. Joel Schoening, RRS: Will follow up on the specific scoring behind #76; general logic across alternative collection materials is weighing contamination risk to the stream against end-market availability.
 - iii. Joel: Small-format metal is at higher risk of falling through before reaching a magnet and becoming residual, so it may be more reliably recovered through alternative collection.
- b. Suggested ERG/Ecology consult CMI on aerosol design standards before finalizing ferrous/non-ferrous aerosol placement; offered to make the introduction.

- c. Concerned that assigning materials like ferrous packaging to alternative collection implies the PRO must stand up collection for them, which could compete with existing private-market recyclers; requested clearer definitions of “covered” materials.
 - i. Ecology: Alternative collection would only be established for covered materials – coverage status is a separate question from whether the system exists at all.
 - ii. Subcommittee Member: Agreed definitions need refining but flagged real safety concerns (e.g., compressed gas cylinders) that justify excluding some items from the standard stream.
 - iii. Subcommittee Member: Shared Seattle’s experience that some of these materials (e.g., compressed gas cylinders) are highly recyclable but too costly/risky to manage curbside – a private market doesn’t fully solve residents’ access problem.
 - iv. Jessica: By cookie tin we meant a metal container sold as packaging for cookies.

2. Not listed for collection

- a. #3 (Coated Corrugated Cardboard): Was it considered when what coatings are or aren’t recyclable that are coating the cardboard (e.g., cardboard without plastic; compostable; recyclable)?
 - i. Joel: There is a small percentage of coated corrugated in the system and wax coating is most problematic. Aware that multiple coatings exist, but the ability to educate around that seems a high bar, so these remain a category together.
- b. #29 (#1 PET Tinted/Pigmented Other Containers)/#31 (#1 PET Tinted/Pigmented Large Containers): Backstory on assessment –why are they not listed for collection?
 - i. Joel: If there is additional data on tinted versus pigmented, there are terminology variations. Would welcome more conversations about breaking these out further and if it’s worth it in terms of what the recovery and system benefits in needs assessment.
- c. #54 (#1-#7 Black Pigmented Rigid Plastic Packaging): What is the justification for not collecting at all?
 - i. Joel: Oregon does collect some black nursery pots. Another category that can be broken out for deeper evaluation. The way our rating system added up, all black plastics ended up grouped together.
- d. #87 (Other Fiber or Bio-based Packaging): Similarity to compostable packaging, why on this list and not “up for discussion” list?

- i. Joel: Goal was to designate as many things to a list as possible knowing there is potential for change based on feedback. Assessment because they don't mix well with some materials; mandating compost over and above yard waste in communities only collecting yard waste; don't blend well in end markets with other plastics.
 - 1. What does that leave food service businesses within the compostable category? What packaging can they use if we're limiting their options for collection?
 - a. Joel: They can use these materials, but they just aren't recyclable. It also doesn't prevent local jurisdictions from adding it to their recyclables list.
- e. #62 (Other & Composite Plastic Packaging)/#67 (Other Film & Flexible Packaging): What do you mean by the word "other?" Concerned that it could be used to keep out materials that could be recycled using non-mechanical recycling techniques that are approved. Could be parsed out a bit more.
 - i. Jessica: "Other" means all the materials that left from the defined plastic categories. "Composite" means mixed materials.
 - ii. Ecology: It doesn't preclude it from being added to a composting list. The law does disallow individual programs to add materials to their recycling programs. If a material does not make the recycling list, it can't be added individually.
 - iii. Ecology: We can take a look at what all was grouped into these categories to see if it's worth discussing.
- f. #72 (Other Non-ferrous Metal Packaging) - not sure what "other" non-ferrous metal packaging means. It would help to have some further clarification on what is thought to be "other" for this category.
- g. #86-91 (Wooden & Other Bio-based Food Serviceware; Other Fiber or Bio-based Packaging; Wooden & Other Bio-based Single-use Utensils; Bulky Wooden Packaging; Other & Composite Wood Packaging) – It seems there might be some missing information on these items and I was wondering if this is going to be explored further with additional information gathering.
- h. #66 (PE Bag and Film Food Packaging) – This was a bit confusing. Is it food contamination that is the issue? What if there was an in-store drop off program that was required to have set cleaning standards? This might make it able to tap into existing programs and promote consumer education.

- iii. Flagged from 7/22 mtg.: #12-13 Aseptic & Gabletop – not addressed; deferred to 8/10 meeting
 - iv. Flagged from 7/22 mtg.: #82 Glass Bottles & Jars
 - 1. Ecology: Confirmed the residential list is intentionally silent on collection mode (commingled vs. source-separated) for now – the needs assessment (section 110-4F) will recommend collection methods later.
 - 2. Ecology: Noted the mode decision has major downstream implications for glass specifically, including potential impacts on drop-off-only county programs and stranded-asset risk at MRFs; flagged as a topic to bring a fuller synthesis to the full Advisory Council.
 - v. Flagged from 7/22 mtg.: Alignment of Residential Recycling & Public Place lists
 - 1. Asked for a formal consensus check that residential and public-place lists should be fully aligned, since v.2 reflects that change but the Subcommittee hadn't formally confirmed it – wanted to bring a clear recommendation to the full Advisory Council
 - a. Supportive – alignment reduces public confusion and simplifies education.
 - b. Supportive, noting most public-place material is already mixed at the MRF; flagged that “empty, clean, and dry” is harder to maintain in public bins and marketing materials may need to look different in public spaces.
 - c. Noted persistent public confusion about pizza boxes specifically, underscoring the need for continued education regardless of list alignment.
- III. Public Comment (2:40-2:50)
 - a. Adrian Tan, King County: When is the public comment period for the revised lists?
 - i. Ecology: Formal public comment period on the statewide lists opens 8/5 and runs through 8/19, giving organizations a second, more formal opportunity for feedback beyond what the Subcommittee has already provided
- IV. Preview of Next Meetings Content (2:50-3:00)
 - a. August 10 (10:00-12:00)
 - i. Finalize list discussions
 - ii. Create content the sub-committee wants to bring to full RRA Advisory Council meeting on 8/13
 - iii. Goal will be to agree as a Subcommittee on how to summarize the lists' status and any specific asks/recommendations for the full Advisory Council
 - 1. A starting point is to explain that in order for a material to be evaluated through the needs assessment it has to be "on the list" at least preliminarily. That was not clear to me until today.
 - b. August 13 Advisory Council meeting has been moved to virtual due to wildfire conditions near Spokane
- V. Adjourn