

**Beyond Waste IWG Meeting Summary**  
**Meeting #4: August 6, 2008, 9:15 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.**  
**REI Flagship Store, Seattle**

**In Attendance**Co-Leads:

Sego Jackson, Snohomish County

Jay Shepard, Department of Ecology

Jody Snyder, Pierce County Recycling, Composting and Disposal LLC, dba LRI

Workgroup Members:

Jerry Bartlett, Cedar Grove Compost

Sally Brown, University of Washington (via phone)

Tim Croll, Seattle Public Utilities

Gene Eckhardt, WA UTC (via phone)

Lisa Friend (for Robyn du Pre), ReStore

Jeff Gage, Swanson Bark and Wood Products

Preston Horne-Brine, Washington State Recycling Association

Ken Johnson, Weyerhaeuser

Bart Kale, Nucor Steel (via phone)

John Leber, Swanson Bark and Wood Products

Brad Lovaas, Washington Refuse & Recycling Association

Suellen Mele, Washington Citizens for Resource Conservation

Ashley Probart (for Tracey Farrell), Association of Washington Cities

Scott Robertson, Yakima Waste Systems (via phone)

Susan Robinson, Waste Management

Charlie Scott, Principal, Cascadia Consulting Group

Lisa Sepanski (for Kevin Kiernan), King County

Jerry Smedes, Basin Disposal, Inc.

Cheryl Smith, CTED

David Stitzhal, Northwest Product Stewardship Council

Suzanne Tresko (for Russ Menke), Spokane Regional Solid Waste System (via phone)

Tom Walter, Washington Organics Recycling Council

Observers:

Mark Fuchs, Department of Ecology

Support:

Elizabeth McManus, Ross & Associates Environmental Consulting, Ltd.

Andy Chinn, Ross & Associates Environmental Consulting, Ltd.

Roel Hammerschlag, Stockholm Environment Institute

**Absent:**

David Dougherty, Dougherty Group

Tiffany Hatch, Goodwill Industries

Jim Jensen, Environmental Credit Corp.

Chris Martin, CleanScapes  
David Quigg, Grays Harbor Paper

### **Background Documents (available [online](#))**

- Agenda
- Requiring Processing of Construction and Demolition Wastes Summary
- IWG hauling recommendation Option 2
- White Paper Draft: Optimizing the Current Collection System Document
- Response to Optimizing Current Collection System draft Document
- Straw Proposal: The Next 50%
- Organics Summary
- Product Stewardship summary
- Draft Product Stewardship Framework Overview
- Organics Summary: Digestion
- Organics: Increasing Recycled Organics Purchasing

### **Discussion Items and Key Issues**

#### **Summary of Key Points from July 25 Climate Action Team Meeting**

Sego Jackson provided a summary of feedback from Climate Action Team members on the Beyond Waste presentation during the July 25 Climate Action Team meeting in Spokane. CAT members cautioned the Beyond Waste IWG against relying too heavily on EPA's WARM model. CAT members also pointed out the odor issues that have arisen in Snohomish County from organic composting facilities. Jay Manning, CAT Co-Chair, reminded the IWG not to lose sight of the ancillary benefits from the various proposals and to remain tightly focused and disciplined.

An IWG member commented that some of the stakeholders for the IWG's topics are not at the table, including certain groups which are most likely to oppose certain issues. It will be important to identify those groups for future work. Sego pointed out that there were a number of stakeholders lobbying to participate on the various IWGs, and because of size constraints they were not added.

#### **Discussion of Basic Framework Strategy to Present to the CAT**

Jay Shepard introduced the basic framework strategy and suggested that IWG members consider it throughout the meeting as the group discussed various proposals. The framework document states the goal of the IWG: "To significantly expand source reduction, reuse and recycling for greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction." The framework contains three ideas that the co-leads believe are the most ready to bring forward in the 2009 legislative session. The remaining proposals are contained in the document, however from the perspective of an implementation timeline they require more work before moving forward. IWG members had the following comments:

- The B&O tax proposal and the Product Design Center proposal should be reflected in a manner other than purely incentives for industry.
- Product stewardship legislation is complementary to the collection language that the group is discussing.

- The IWG will provide the CAT with suggested statutory language and background documents as well as a strategic discussion of all items on the table and next steps.

### Collection

During the Collection subgroup's most recent call, members discussed the Pierce County's successful collection model, which involves mandatory payment and voluntary subscription. The current proposal from the subgroup includes collection of materials from commercial entities, and staggered implementation dates beginning in urban areas and moving to less densely populated areas. Rate payers would benefit, since building the infrastructure for universal collection will theoretically lower unit costs. The proposal includes disincentives for self-hauling, GHG and recycling rate reporting mechanisms, and enforcement mechanisms. The implementation strategy is state-level legislation for local governments to have mandatory collection ordinances (amending RCW 70.95 to say that source separation is "mandatory", not "preferred"), with individual plans left to the local jurisdiction. IWG members had the following comments:

- As the state shifts from garbage to source-separated utilization of materials, the funding source for infrastructure will have to come from a source other than tipping fees.
- Cities are generally supportive of the collection proposal, but with respect to the infrastructure revenue account, cities support neutrality and do not want to see a decrease in the revenue stream.
- Under a product stewardship framework, many products will be moving outside the world of curbside recycling. In British Columbia, for example, bottles and cans are no longer recycled at curbside.
- For commercial and other waste streams, the proposal does not discuss or incentivize the commercial collectors and processors that are doing  $\frac{3}{4}$  of the collection work in the state.

### Organics

The organics subgroup tried to take a holistic approach, recognizing that it is not sufficient to just remove organics from landfills and that a life-cycle analysis approach is important. In high density areas, anaerobic digestion makes more sense, whereas in rural areas composting is the preferred alternative. David Sjoding of WSU has conducted a significant amount of research on anaerobic digestion and believes the technology is ready to be implemented on a commercial scale. The primary barrier is financial feasibility which could be remedied to some extent by a feed-in tariff and wheeling capability to remove obstacles to energy transfer. The subgroup did not include co-gen power in its proposal because of concerns around the multiple end-uses for materials with higher solids content. Greenhouse gas reduction in the organics sector is primarily achieved through methane avoidance, and the Chicago Climate Exchange (CCX) is due to issue a protocol on methane avoidance for highly putrescible materials. Other benefits to composting include the generation of green energy through methane capture; the replacement of fossil fuel based fertilizers, and reduced water use for irrigation. IWG members had the following comments:

- The Agriculture Sector Working Group and the Beyond Waste IWG will continue to communicate on organics.

### Construction and Demolition

The C&D task group used a model from San Diego County to develop its proposal. The San Diego County ordinance required contractors to submit a waste and recycling plan with their permit application, and

put down a deposit which is refunded when they demonstrate they have achieved 50% of their recycling plan. The subgroup believes the San Diego model is over-prescriptive, and modified it to state that “local governments should determine the program that they want to implement”. IWG members had the following comments:

- The program should require fail-safe mechanisms to prevent the contractor from passing on the permit fees to the client.
- The subgroup should address the issue of mandating that all C&D waste be sent to a processing facility, since a certain amount of C&D waste cannot be processed and should be sent directly to a landfill.
- There is a significant amount of C&D recycling starting to occur at construction sites, which would eliminate the need for C&D waste to be sent to an intermediary facility.
- Listing specific materials as C&D waste might be an important component to the proposal.
- Market development for certain recycled C&D commodities is an important consideration.

### **Product Stewardship**

The Product Stewardship subgroup’s proposal aims to minimize environmental and health impacts of products throughout their life cycle by requiring producers to arrange and pay for recycling programs for their products. Since the financing comes from product producers, there would be some state oversight that would require funding. The proposal also envisions utilizing existing infrastructure which would complement the collection and C&D proposals. IWG members had the following comments:

- The subgroup should explicitly define “producers” in the context of the proposal.
- The subgroup should make it clear that the framework legislation will not automatically apply to all products.
- The subgroup should include language that provides an outlet to Ecology that allows the agency to report to the legislature that they are not selecting a product or products.
- It may be prudent under “criteria for selection” to have GHG listed first.
- Not utilizing the current curbside collection system is a potential missed opportunity.

### **Environmentally Responsible Purchasing (ERP)**

The ERP subgroup is developing a proposed workplan to align various state procurement laws, but given the number of procurement laws it will take time to develop the proposal. IWG members had the following comments:

- State agencies should also consider environmental impacts when they purchase services.
- The subgroup should think clearly about providing useful guidance to the agencies to prevent the proposal from becoming an unfunded mandate.

### **Retailer Collaboration**

The retailer collaboration proposal does not require legislative action but it will be reported to the CAT. The proposal is an opportunity for willing retailers to participate, and early discussions with the retail association and the food industry association were positive. IWG members had the following comments:

- Representatives from the Association of Washington Businesses should be invited to discuss the proposal.

- Retailers were involved in the discussion around the recent plastic bag ban. They accepted the rationale for that program and were strong advocates of collaborative solutions.

### Sequencing of IWG Recommendations

IWG members discussed the overall package of recommendations that the group is considering forwarding to the CAT. Members agreed that Collection, Product Stewardship, and Organics should be the primary recommendations, with the additional proposals included as important elements for later implementation. The three primary recommendations should be articulated in sufficient detail for the CAT, including the type of action required (administrative, local government, etc.), a preliminary discussion of financing, and identification of additional stakeholders. The final report to the CAT will also include a short section on next steps and a review of the connection of the recommendations to the work of the 2007 Climate Advisory Team's work.

IWG member had the following comments and observations regarding the final report from the IWG to the CAT:

- None of the IWG's recommendations specifically mention a prevention program, which is a large gap given the potential for GHG reduction through waste prevention.
- Creation of a Sustainable Product Design Center could happen independently of any CAT recommendation; it will be important for the IWG to mention its support.
- The final report from the IWG to the CAT could include an education component that would be financially attractive this biennium.
- In terms of the political viability of any recommendation it would be wise for this group or a subgroup to check for any unintended increase in GHG.
- The report should express that this was the IWG's best work given the time constraint, and other ideas that may arise related to waste are potentially valid.

### Public Comment Period

There were no comments from members of the public.

### Next Steps and Agreements:

The subgroups will revise their proposals based upon feedback received. Over the next two weeks, the package of recommendations will emerge that will be transmitted to the Climate Action Team. Detailed next steps for each subgroup are listed below:

- Collection
  - Subgroup will further develop a phased implementation approach with a more aggressive timeline than currently drafted
- Organics
  - Dave Sjoding and John Leber will discuss wood fired co-gen power
  - Subgroup will look into how EQIP priorities are changed (legislation or other method)
  - Subgroup will research other sources of funding, such as the state conservation commission.
- C&D
  - Subgroup will include language to recognize that not all C&D waste is recyclable.
  - Subgroup will include language to recognize on-site sorting

- Subgroup will discuss whether or not to include performance goals
- Subgroup will specific material reuse or recovery
- Subgroup will revise the language to make it clear that it is not a ban on C&D waste to landfills
- Product Stewardship
  - Subgroup will revise language to define “producers”
  - Subgroup will revise language to define “voluntary collection”
  - Subgroup will include toxicity/contamination as a criteria for stewardship
  - Subgroup will revise language to make the requirement for a product statement every two years less rigid
  - Subgroup will move “carbon footprint” higher on list of selection criteria
  - Subgroup will clarify language on recycling
  - Subgroup will include language on possible discretion for Ecology to set goals
  - Subgroup will revise language to ensure consistency with respect to how a product takeback program relates to curbside hauling
  - Subgroup will revise language to include maximizing the collection/hauling system
  - Subgroup will include language to address markets

### **Next Meeting**

The next scheduled Beyond Waste IWG meeting will be a face-to-face meeting on Tuesday, August 26.