

Beyond Waste IWG Meeting Summary
Meeting #6: October 7, 2008, 1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.
REI Flagship Store, Seattle

In AttendanceCo-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

Tim Croll, Seattle Public Utilities (via phone)

Jeff Gage, Swanson Bark and Wood Products

Preston Horne-Brine, Washington State Recycling Association

Kevin Kiernan, King County Solid Waste

John Leber, Swanson Bark and Wood Products

Brad Lovaas, Washington Refuse & Recycling Association

Suellen Mele, Washington Citizens for Resource Conservation

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

Susan Robinson, Waste Management

Charlie Scott, Cascadia Consulting Group

Cheryl Smith, CTED

David Stitzhal, Northwest Product Stewardship Council

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

Observers:

Vicki Austin, WRRRI

Brad Oswell, Waste Management

Dave Sjoding, WSU Energy Extension

Support:

Elizabeth McManus, Ross & Associates Environmental Consulting, Ltd.

Andy Chinn, Ross & Associates Environmental Consulting, Ltd.

Roel Hammerschlag, Stockholm Environment Institute

Absent:

Sally Brown, UW

David Dougherty, Dougherty Group

Robyn du Pre, ReStore

Gene Eckhardt, WA UTC (via phone)

Tiffany Hatch, Goodwill Industries

Jim Jensen, Environmental Credit Corp.

Ken Johnson, Weyerhaeuser

Bart Kale, Nucor Steel

Chris Martin, CleanScapes
David Quigg, Grays Harbor Paper
Scott Robertson, Yakima Waste Systems
Tom Walter, Washington Organics Recycling Council

Background Documents (available [online](#))

- Agenda
- Beyond Waste template draft
- Environmentally responsible purchasing – one pager
- Collection – one pager
- Organics – one pager
- Retailer collaboration – one pager
- Product stewardship – one pager
- Product stewardship draft framework legislation
- Product stewardship mercury florescent lights draft
- IWG narrative
- Revised draft full IWG report
- Supporting information on quantification

Discussion Items and Key Issues

IWG Status and CAT Schedule

Elizabeth McManus, the facilitator, provided IWG members with an update on the work of the Climate Action Team (CAT) and timeline for finalization of the IWG's recommendations. The CAT will meet on October 14 and 15 to review changes to IWG recommendations since September and discuss the content of its final report. Following the CAT meeting, the Beyond Waste co-leads will put finishing touches on the IWG's reports, which will include: 1) The Next 50%, including any appendices; 2) one-page summaries of each recommendation; 3) quantification of emissions reductions and cost analysis. IWG members provided the following comments:

- Recent information from the Western Climate Initiative (WCI) suggests that implementation of certain legislative action around climate change could be delayed so that it coincides/complements WCI implementation. The IWG's final report should include a simple statement such as "Dates and timelines should be considered in the context of WCI", with an emphasis on the complementary nature of the IWG's recommendations.

Final Package of Recommendations

IWG members briefly reviewed each component within the final package of recommendations, with emphasis on key changes since the previous IWG meeting:

Organics

The goal of the organics proposal is to provide end uses for organics that have been diverted from the waste stream, with an emphasis on optimizing value and developing markets for diverted materials. The most significant change to the organics proposal is to disengage any state taxes from the proposal. This change was made based on feedback from the CAT. IWG members provided the following comments:

- The proposal should include an example of a community in Washington that is currently employing organics practices described under the proposal.
- The proposal should specify that organics with heavy metals or toxics are excluded from the list of potentially recyclable materials. This could be accompanied by a reference to the protocols developed by Biosolids Northwest for determining which materials are appropriate for land application.

Environmentally Responsible Purchasing

The ERP proposal is to establish, via executive order, an intergovernmental working group to develop environmental performance as a fourth criterion for government purchases (in addition to performance, price, and availability). The cost to the government of immediate action will be the internal resources required for the group, and the outcome will be recommendations for the 2010 legislative session. Work could begin as soon as the executive order is signed. IWG members provided the following comments:

- The proposal should include language specifying that this is a low or no-cost action.
- Additional language in the proposal should discuss the potential impact at multiple levels of government, since there are state laws that delegate purchasing decisions to local government.

Retailer Collaboration

The retailer collaboration proposal is to draft a memorandum-of-understanding (MOU) between key retailers and the governor's office to set specific commitments to improve options to consumers and reduce product packaging. Within the product chain, retailers have both an upstream impact for what is on their shelves as well as downstream communications with consumers. The proposal includes examples of successful programs in the United Kingdom. IWG members provided the following comments:

- Using a MOU as the implementing mechanism is not completely settled, but is one suggestion.

Collection

The goal of the collection proposal is to reach 80% recycling rates by 2020 for recyclable materials and products, organic materials, and construction and demolition debris. The key strategy to achieve the goal is to require source separation of solid wastes by residential and commercial generators. Significantly, the proposal will require new funding from state and local governments for implementation. Commercial generators can choose their own service providers, but they must source separate. IWG members provided the following comments:

- The proposal mentions "small communities", which is difficult to define. The proposal should attempt to provide some type of usable definition.
- The proposal should include a statement that recycling has proven to be cost effective.
- The section that describes potential funding sources should be clarified to state that there is no clearly preferred funding source, only a list of potential options.

Product Stewardship

The draft product stewardship proposal includes multiple changes based on comments received at the most recent IWG meeting, as well as from the product stewardship subcommittee. Major changes include: A section that defines "producer"; language clarifying that a list of initial covered products has not yet been determined; additional criteria for product selection (including climate change impacts and benefits); and the ability for the public to petition Ecology to include selected products. The product

stewardship proposal includes draft legislation that has incorporated all of the comments from the IWG. IWG members provided the following comments:

- Business owners might interpret the proposal as an introduction of new and burdensome regulations.
- It would be helpful to include a reference to the recently passed electronics recycling bill, in particular using data collected from that bill's implementation to inform the product stewardship discussion.
- The proposal mandates that whatever is collected is reused or recycled; there should be an analysis of whether the current waste collection system and pricing is a viable option for those materials that cannot be reused or recycled.
- Manufacturers should be given some flexibility with respect to how they remove their products from the waste stream.

Defining Agreement in the Context of the Beyond Waste IWG

Elizabeth McManus, the facilitator, commented that IWG members' embrace of the package of recommendations moving forward to the CAT is similar to the CAT's next steps for the recommendations from all of the IWGs. The IWG and the CAT will affirm that the recommendations set the appropriate policy direction, while still keeping specific concerns on the table for discussion. The CAT report will be sent to the directors of Ecology and Community, Trade, and Economic Development (CTED); the directors will then work with the governor to develop their plan for the 2009 legislative session.

An IWG member commented that it is the co-leads' responsibility to inform the CAT which recommendations have more or less support.

Overall IWG Narrative

The co-leads presented a draft one-page narrative that ties together the IWG's work and presents the argument that significant GHG reductions can be obtained through waste reduction and recycling efforts. IWG members provided the following suggestions:

- Include "reduce" in the first paragraph, with recycle.
- Emphasize that the overall goal is to achieve an 80% recycling rate.
- Include a statement that not all of the estimated GHG reductions will be within Washington's borders.

Next Steps and Agreements

- The one-page summaries for each proposal will be revised based on feedback received and distributed to IWG members for review within 36 hours. The one-page summaries and the final report will be sent to the CAT on Friday, October 10. All of summaries will be labeled as "work in progress".
- Roel will update the GHG quantification estimates and distribute them to IWG members for inclusion in the one-page summaries.
- The co-leads will present the recommendations on behalf of the IWG at the upcoming CAT meeting (October 14 & 15).

Public Comment

There were no comments from members of the public.