



Responsible Recycling Task Force Meeting #8

November 15, 2018 - 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

Bothell City Hall, 18415 101st Ave NE, Bothell, WA

Members Present:

April	Atwood	Seattle University, SWAC Vice Chair
Stacey	Auer	City of Redmond
Elaine	Borjeson	City of Bellevue
Sabrina	Combs	City of Bothell
Susan	Fife-Ferris	SPU
Cynthia	Foley	Sound Cities Association
Jeff	Gaisford	KCSWD
Mason	Giem	City of SeaTac
Sego	Jackson	SPU
Karissa	Johnson	Republic Services
Phillippa	Kassover	City of Lake Forest Park, SWAC
Kevin	Kelly	Recology, SWAC Chair
Linda	Knight	City of Renton, MSWMAC Vice Chair
John	MacGillivray	City of Kirkland
Ken	Marshall	KC, SWAC
Josh	Metcalf	Waste Connections
Emily	Newcomer	Waste Management
Joyce	Nichols	City of Bellevue
Lisa	Sepanski	KCSWD
Penny	Sweet	Councilmember, MSWMAC Chair
Hans	VanDusen	SPU

Guests:

Kim Carswell, Presenter, Target

Consultants:

Julie Colehour, Facilitator, C+C

Colette Marien, Meeting Coordinator and Notetaker, C+C

Agenda Item #1: Welcome & Introduction (*called to order at 10:00am by Julie Colehour*)

- *Julie Colehour* welcomes the room and reminds everyone that it is America Recycles Day.
- The following new attendees in the room introduce themselves:



- *Elaine Borjeson* who is filling in for *Stephanie Schwenger*, City of Bellevue, while she is on maternity leave.
- *Karissa Johnson*, who is filling in for *Janet Prichard* from Republic Services.
- *Josh Metcalf*, District Manager with Waste Connections.
- *Julie Colehour* reviews the days agenda:
 - Welcome & Introduction
 - Creating Demand for Recycled Content: Target and the Demand Champions – *Kim Carswell*, Packaging Director at Target, will be presenting virtually.
 - RRTF Final Outcome – Recommendations Report Review
 - Wrap Up & Next Steps
- *Julie Colehour* informs the room that, after *Kim Carswell's* presentation, the rest of the meeting will be spent talking about recommendations for the final outcome report that is slated to be completed by the end of 2018.
- *Julie Colehour* reminds the room of the Responsible Recycling Task Force goals, outcomes, and role of task force:
 - **Short Term Goal:** To help identify near-, mid- and long-term actions in response to reduction in export markets for mixed recyclable materials due to China National Sword policies.
 - **Longer Term Goal:** To help establish commitment across the region to responsible recycling and domestic sorting/processing of curbside recyclables.
 - **Outcomes:** Prepare a report with actionable items and recommendations for future action by all; if possible, develop interim tools for communications and other topics that are more immediately available.
 - **Role of Task Force:** Not to make decisions, rather to learn about the problem, understand activities that are being implemented elsewhere and opportunities for change. They will provide guidance on next steps that will be brought back to county advisory committees and decision makers.
- *Julie Colehour* informs the room that the meeting minutes from the October 26th meeting were sent out via email and that no comments were received, therefore the minutes are approved.

Agenda Item #2: Creating Demand for Recycled Content: Target and the Demand Champions (*called to order at 10:03 am by Julie Colehour*)

- *Julie Colehour* introduces *Kim Carswell*, Director of Packaging at Target, who will be presenting on Target and their role and aspirations for creating demand for recycled products.

Kim Carswell's Presentation:

- *Kim Carswell* notes that she works out of Minneapolis and begins by informing the room of what she'll talk about, including:
 - Why is Target doing work around creating demand?
 - What information is shaping Target's thinking?
 - What is Target doing to create demand?
 - What is Target looking at/planning next?
- The Why: Rising Consumer Expectations



- Target's customers are become more purpose driven
- 84% of millennials will consider a brand's values before making a purchase.
- At the end of the day, people are expecting companies to help them lead more sustainable lives.
- "Packaging is the first thing a consumer sees and the last thing they touch" – Kelly Murosky, *Seventh Generation*
 - The first thing that consumers touch is packaging and Target wants their packaging to work hard to catch consumer's eye while also making them feel good about recycling that package.
- Next, *Kim Carswell* shares statistics from third parties who have helped shape Target's decisions to work on creating demand:
 - Consumers believe recycling is one key thing they can actually do to help the planet.
 - 94% of consumers expect to recycle
 - 90% of consumers believe that recycling is important
 - 95% of consumers believe that recycling helps the environment
 - 91 of consumers expect food and beverage brands to take actions to increase the recycling of their packaging.
 - Target is aware that consumers really want to recycle.
 - Millennials and Packaging:
 - Millennials are Target's future and current guests, and 84% of them consider a brand's public and implied values before making a purchase – what is that brand doing to help them align with their values?
 - Millennials want to buy into something, not buy something.
 - Millennials are skeptical – 1/3rd are not sure that what they put in the recycling bin is actually getting recycled – this skepticism is something that Target is keen to work on.
 - All brands have evolving customers who are becoming more purpose driven.
 - Recycling in the U.S. is facing significant challenges today.
 - Over \$11 billion of recyclable packaging ends up in landfills every year. (*Per As You Sow*)
 - Less than 75% of American's have access to curbside recycling. (*Per The Recycling Partnership*)
 - Packaging is a physical manifestation of a brand that becomes branded litter- it's a risk for brands.
 - The business case to recycle needs help.
 - Target can help people by using How2Recycle labels and placing collection bins in their stores, but if there is no reason for people to collect and make money from those materials it won't advance. Target is working to figure out how to help in this space.
- Target's aspirational vision is that one day all packaging will be recyclable at the curb
- Target's Sustainable Packaging Goals:
 - Source all owned brand paper-based packaging from sustainable managed forests by 2022.
 - Work to eliminate expanded polystyrene from Target's owned brand packaging by 2022.
 - Add the How2Recycle label to all owned brand packaging by 2020 (where space allows).
 - Support The Recycling Partnership's mission to improve how more than 25% of the U.S. population recycles by 2020.



- Create more demand for recycled packaging by creating three new end markets for recycled materials by 2020.
- Where is Target engaging in industry?
 - They are thinking about educating and engaging consumers
 - They are using the How2Recycle label
 - They are a funding member of The Recycling Partnership because they truly believe The Recycling Partnership is helping communities to recycle better.
 - They are a member of The Association of Plastic Recyclers and are learning about how design can advance the recyclability of materials.
 - They are members of Materials Recovery for the Future (MRFF), who are looking at what it would take to recycle flexible materials like coffee bags.
 - MRFF is in the third stage of their flexible packaging project and are doing a demonstration project in Pennsylvania that looks at optical sorting equipment. Their goal is to be able to tell MRFs by 2020 that they can put flexible packaging in the bin.
 - They are working with JP Mascaro and the American Chemistry Council on this demonstration project
 - Target is also funding some work that The Recycling Partnership and the Sustainable Packaging Coalition is working on to understand what kind of issues are being faced from a MRFs perspective.
 - They joined the Demand Champions last year and signed up again in 2019.
- Recycling Requires Collaboration:
 - The Sustainable Packaging Coalition (SPC), The Recycling Partnership, MRFF and APR are four groups that complement each other in the following ways:
 - SPC empowers consumers with How2Recycle and helps brands design for recycling.
 - The Recycling Partnership engages communities and MRFs to grow access and improve recycling rates.
 - The MRFF project focuses on what it will take to recycled multi material flexible packaging
 - APR guides brands to design for recyclability and utilize recovered plastics in new products.
- How Target plans to reach their goal to create three new end markets by 2020:
 - Becoming an APR Demand Champion:
 - This was an easy decision for Target as it aligns exactly with their goal to create new end markets.
 - Companies that make the independent and voluntary commitment to join the Demand Champions recognize that:
 - Consistent, reliable demand for recycled plastic is critical for recycling to be mature, vibrant and sustainable.
 - A strong “demand-pull” for recycled plastics is needed to maintain and continue the building of a robust plastic recycling supply chain.
 - APR Recycling Demand Champions commit to purchase new volume PCR through “work in process” (WIP) durable goods, or other applications for PCR, and thereby play a prominent role in expanding the market for mixed residential plastics, driving



investment, increasing supply and producing more high-quality PCR. This campaign also includes any and all new applications for PCR.

- APR Demand Champions include a number of different members across the value chain:
 - P&G
 - Clean Tech Incorporated
 - Plastipak
 - Berry
 - Target
 - Campbell's
 - Denton Plastics Inc.
 - Keurig
 - KW
 - Nestle
 - Envision Plastics
 - Merlin Plastics
 - Coca Cola
 - Champion Polymer Recycling
- Last year, Target used some of their bags and pallet stretch wraps to make benches, tables and garbage cans for soccer grants in the community
- Target recently signed the Ellen MacArthur Foundation's New Plastics Economy (NPE) commitment to address the challenges with plastic waste and pollution at its source.
- The Ellen MacArthur Foundation has a global vision that includes members from across the value chain. The six key points of the vision are:
 - Elimination of problematic or unnecessary plastic packaging through redesign, innovation and new delivery models is a priority
 - Reuse models are applied where relevant, reducing the need for single-use packaging
 - All plastic packaging is 100% reusable, recyclable, or compostable
 - All plastic packaging is reused, recycled, or composted in practice
 - The use of plastic is fully decoupled from the consumption of finite resources
 - All plastic packaging is free of hazardous chemicals, and the health, safety, and rights of all people involved are respected.
- Target is a part of the American Chemistry Council's WRAP Program
 - Target offers bag/film recycling in all of their 1,800 stores across the US, a great additional offer to Target customers.
 - Target is included on the WRAP website as a location to recycle bags and film.
 - Target has a waste team that is looking at ways to use recycled bag and film materials in new, higher value ways.
- Key takeaways:



- As a retailer and brand owner, find out what your consumers expect and want. Target wants their customers to know what Target is doing to be sustainable, since they know that their customers care.
- Listen and learn.
- Share your learnings and keep learning.
- Collaborate.

Q&A:

- *Penny Sweet* thanks *Kim Carswell* for the presentation and notes that she has never shopped at Target but now plans to.
- *Kim Carswell* thanks *Penny Sweet* and comments that this is a great example of the connections made through Target's program.
- *Phillippa Kassover* notes that she is thrilled to hear what Target is doing and asks if other major retailers who are also producers have joined Target in their efforts.
- *Kim Carswell* replies that there are a lot of other retailers doing similar work.
- *Linda Knight* thanks *Kim* for her presentation and asks what some of the challenges are of reaching the goals that *Kim* highlighted.
- *Kim Carswell* shares the following challenges:
 - Challenges related to developing processes for implementing How2Recycle artwork into packaging include including adding the label into current processes
 - Challenges related to eliminating polystyrene from Target brand packaging include finding alternatives that perform well to protect products, are available at an acceptable cost and can be recycled at the curb.
 - Another challenge is related to the higher costs of using sustainable products.
- *Lisa Sepanski* notes that Washington has been looking at implementing a WRAP program for years and asks if *Kim* could provide any advice on getting the program off the ground in a meaningful way.
- *Kim Carswell* replies that if you can lead with what consumers want and look at the research to support the desire for a program like WRAP, it will make it easier to launch. *Kim* adds that it is also important to find the right person within the retailer to talk to.
- *Julie Colehour* thanks *Kim* for her time and wraps up.
- *Kim Carswell* thanks the room for having her and encourages everyone to stay in touch and keep the conversation going.

Agenda Item #3: RRTF Final Outcome – Recommendations Report Review (*called to order by Julie Colehour at 10:34am*)

- *Julie Colehour* provides the room with the following details and context to help guide the recommendation review and discussion:
 - Prior to the meeting, the RRTF planning team reorganized the recommendations based on a comment made by *Phillippa Kassover* during the October 26 meeting.



- Recommendations are now organized into four categories:
 - Regional Policy Alignment
 - Infrastructure
 - Statewide Policy
 - Design for Recycling
- Suggested action items have been added for each recommendation based on feedback that the group wanted more specifics.
- The goal of the day's discussion is to review and come to closure on the recommendations and action items. *Julie* reminds the group that the purpose is to decide if the RRTF as a group is comfortable giving these recommendations to decision makers.
- The group will utilize a voting system to decide if a recommendation is approved (majority indicates thumbs up), is not approved (majority indicates thumbs down), or is in need of further discussion (majority indicates thumb sideways).
- Prior to the meeting, the planning team highlighted goals, recommendations, and action items in green that they felt have already been agreed upon. For purposes of the day's meeting, the group will not focus on the green items unless anyone feels strongly that they need to be further discussed.
- The room agrees to the proposed process for review and begins discussing the recommendations.

Category #1: Regional Policy Alignment – Discussion

- *Julie Colehour* introduces **Clean and Marketable Feedstocks**, the first goal under Regional Policy Alignment. The recommendation (noted A on the chart) to achieve the goal is as follows:
 - *Local governments and their service providers should require that the collecting, sorting and processing of recyclable materials does not contribute to environmental pollution or endanger human health and safety and that materials are clean and suitable for remanufacture before being exported.*
- *Julie Colehour* notes that both the goal of Clean and Marketable Feedstocks and recommendation A have been marked green as they have been previously discussed with the group and agreed upon. There are seven action items for the recommendation, five of which require discussion and two of which have been turned green.
- The first action item for review is **A1: Update City and County Recycling Contracts and Codes to:**
 - ***Prioritize that sorting and processing take place in the US or Canada***
 - ***Require that no mixed bales that contain non-recyclable materials are exported***
 - ***Require downstream due diligence, document sale to end market***
 - ***Consider risk sharing on commodity prices***
- *Julie Colehour* notes that the first bullet has been turned green as it has been discussed, but asks the room for thoughts on the next three bullets, which have not yet been discussed.



- *John MacGillivray* offers a general suggestion that the rate of difficulty in enacting the suggested actions be indicated on the chart, noting that are some actions that are more challenging than others and it would be helpful to have that indicated.
- *Julie Colehour* confirms that some indication of the level of difficulty will be included in the next iteration of the chart.
- *Julie Colehour* asks the room to vote on action item A1, to which a majority of the room provides a thumbs up and two people indicate thumbs sideways, or in need of discussion.
- *Penny Sweet* asks if a discussion around the practicality of the action is needed as everyone has different contracts.
- *Julie Colehour* notes that this is something that would happen over time.
- *Emily Newcomer* notes that there is a need in explaining the time frame.
- *Kevin Kelly* asks what would happen if a market place with equivalent environmental health and safety standards as we have in the US and Canada is found to have a better market rate.
- *Linda Knight* notes that there is a lot of liability potential in opening up contracts so the timeline for doing so could be 10-14 years down the road, which would not be considered short-term. *Linda* adds that it's not possible to know what innovation will happen in that timeframe or if other countries will decide that they want to collect our materials, therefore assumes contracts would be flexible, even if working towards the common goal and intent of not exporting mixed bales of recyclables.
- *Susan Fife-Ferris* comments that she likes the structure of the recommendation chart and thinks that A1 gets to the heart of why the RRTF exists. *Susan* adds that we've been confronted with an international issue that has thrown markets into a tizzy and that options to send materials to other countries that have the standards we are looking for may come along, and that can be captured in our contracts. For now, this provides a framework for staff and council people to decide if there are topics that they want to discuss with their vendor, which is why she gave the action item a thumbs up.
- *Penny Sweet* agrees with *Susan* and suggests finding a way to shorten the timeline by including language that limits the timeframe, noting that 14 years is just too long to wait. *Penny* adds that opening up contracts is difficult but that the recommendation to open up contracts while also being flexible with evolving technology is important. *Penny* notes that *Kim Carswell* showed in her presentation how to be flexible as times change.
- *Ken Marshall* points out that there are currently many processing limitations in the US due to China Sword but in the near there will be processing plants available, therefore *Ken* doesn't see this as an extreme action item in the future, but today it does limit the haulers a lot.
- *Lisa Sepanski* notes that the third bullet should also include worker safety and suggests clarifying that inclusion and proving that worker health and safety standards are comparable would solve the issue.
- *Kevin Kelly* suggests identifying the desired outcome and starting there.
- *Jeff Gaisford* notes that A5 (**Develop a methodology for documenting the chain of custody to monitor adherence to recognized environmental and human health and safety standards**) looks at whether we want to have a way to track and monitor and asks if figuring out how to track materials would be of interest to the room. The room confirms interest in knowing where materials are going.



- *Phillippa Kassover* comments that she was also interested in A5 and suggests adding “all markets that meet” to A1. *Phillippa* adds that she agrees with *Susan* and *Penny* that, while contracts are not easy, as an elected official it is her job to ensure that her city is meeting the aspirational goals of her citizens, and her citizens want to improve recycling.
- *Linda Knight* agrees that there are goals and aspirations that we all want to do and notes that she’d like to find out if there is a different way to frame the action that does not bind people to something specific when things can change.
- *Susan Fife-Ferris* suggests changing the column title to “Recommended Actions to Achieve” rather than “Actions to Achieve” since that is more in-line with the listed actions.
- *Julie Colehour* summarizes the feedback, noting that changes will be made to clarify that the action is not for everyone to go open up their contracts, rather doing so should be considered on a rolling basis. In addition, something needs to be added about flexibility to use other markets that have the right standards.
- *Julie Colehour* introduces the next action item for review: **A2: Measure real recycling by tracking and documenting MRF residuals**, and asks the room to vote.
- A majority of the room votes thumbs up.
- *Jeff Gaisford* adds that this action has been included since it is currently not happening in an organized way and that this action would look at developing a methodology for tracking and documenting materials at MRFs.
- *Ken Marshall* comments that it is his understanding that Seattle’s 3rd and Lander location is already tracking residual numbers.
- *Susan Fife-Ferris* comments that Seattle is tracking residuals but doesn’t believe that others are tracking in the same way.
- *Phillippa Kassover* proposes a change to the language so that the issue is not to measure but to develop a process to measure, noting that this would be a task that could be given to King County and Seattle.
- *Susan Fife-Ferris* agrees that the goal is to develop a process and shares her concern that what ultimately needs to happen is measurement, therefore we don’t want to develop a process and then not use it. *Susan* suggests that if we change the language to developing a process, we should also note the need to then use that process to measure.
- *Julie Colehour* introduces the next action item for review: **A3: Track recyclable materials market price and conditions on a monthly basis**
- *Jeff Gaisford* notes that this is something that would help forecast upcoming market changes.
- *John MacGillivray* notes that he’s been tracking commodities for years and confirms that it has been helpful for him to see where certain commodities are and thinks it would be helpful for the region.
- *Kevin Kelly* agrees and notes that this is something that can be started right away.
- The room votes in favor of A3.
- *Julie Colehour* introduces the next action item for review: **A4: Conduct periodic MRF materials characterization studies**.



- *Jeff Gaisford* comments that King County does these types of studies regularly and has once looked at incoming and outgoing material streams. *Jeff* asks the room if this is something that we would want to do on a regular basis.
- *Phillippa Kassover* replies yes and notes that it would provide info that could be used to encourage and promote better practice or additional recycling goals to the public. *Phillippa* adds that she was struck by the research that Target provided, specifically related to millennials who want to know that they are doing well and that what they are doing is making a difference. A4 will help to tell the story to keep them engaged.
- *Penny Sweet* notes her concern about the cost of the studies and who will bear it.
- *Jeff Gaisford* replies, noting that we need to clarify costs and that this is a topic that will be discussed in December.
- *Susan Fife-Ferris* notes that Seattle and King County does characterization studies every few years to look at different segments and they are expensive. *Susan* adds that this action is not to say that everyone has to do them, rather that some cities and the county will conduct the studies for everyone to benefit from.
- *Lisa Sepanski* adds that these action items will go to the advisory committees where they will be further prioritized and then work will be done to figure out how to put the actions into schedule and budget.
- The room votes in favor of A4.

- *Julie Colehour* introduces the next action for review: **A5: Develop a methodology for documenting the chain of custody to monitor adherence to recognized environmental and human health and safety standards.**
- The room votes in favor of A5, no discussion needed.

- *Julie Colehour* introduces the next goal under Regional Policy Alignment: **Harmonized Recycling Programs and Messaging.** The recommendation (noted B on the chart) to achieve the goal is as follows:
 - *All regional curbside programs should use consistent messaging about what is recyclable and not recyclable in the curbside recycling bin*
- *Julie Colehour* reminds the room that this recommendation, as well as action B1 (**Continue the Communications Consortium to develop and implement consistent, regional messaging around “empty, clean and dry” and for removing materials from the curbside bin and other future changes to the system**) has been made green as the group has already agreed that the Communication Consortium should continue.

- *Julie Colehour* introduces the next action for review: **B2: Develop criteria and a process for adding/removing materials in the curbside recycling programs. Discuss annually at SWAC and MSWMAC:**
 - **Include a process to evaluate the benefits and costs for when there is a cost associated with collecting/sorting/processing a recyclable material (example: #3-7 plastics).**
- *Jeff Gaisford* comments that this action comes from King County’s solid waste plan and that preliminary discussions have been had with the advisory committees about setting up a process and discussing how the process is going annually.
- *Linda Knight* comments that she likes the action but recommends wordsmithing so it’s clear that the annual discussion is about how the process is going, not about getting the process set up.



- *Sego Jackson* comments that Seattle has talked about running a parallel process as King County so that when items go to King County SWAC they would then come to Seattle SWAC for discussion as well.
- *Julie Colehour* notes that action B3 touches on Seattle's involvement and asks if they should expand on B3, to which *Sego* replies that an additional bullet point should be added to B3 to make it more specific.
- The room votes in favor of B2.
- *Julie Colehour* introduces the next action item for review: **B3: Establish a mechanism to continue coordination with the City of Seattle on harmonization of materials and messaging.**
- The room votes in favor of B3 and in adding an additional bullet point to more specifically outline the City of Seattle's involved.

Category #2: Infrastructure – Discussion

- *Julie Colehour* introduces **Local Recycling Infrastructure**, the first goal under Infrastructure. The recommendation (noted C on the chart) to achieve the goal is as follows:
 - *Our region should support the development of our local recycling infrastructure to build resiliency, create local jobs, minimize greenhouse gases from transportation and production, and increase the ability to document and measure real recycling.*
- *Julie Colehour* notes that both the goal of Local Recycling Infrastructure and recommendation C have been marked green as they have been previously discussed with the group and agreed upon. There are three action items for the recommendation, all which require discussion.
- The first action item for review is **C1: Prioritize that sorting and processing take place in the US or Canada.**
 - **Conduct a pilot program to process #3-7 plastics at viable sorter/processors, such as Renewlogy and Merlin Plastics to test the feasibility of sorting and processing plastics domestically.**
- *Jeff Gaisford* notes that prioritization of sorting and processing to take place in the US or Canada has been discussed already, so the piece up for discussion is whether or not a pilot needs to be happening.
- *Penny Sweet* asks if a pilot is happening yet.
- *Lisa Sepanski* asks if any MRFs in the room are sending materials to Renewlogy or Merlin Plastics.
- *Kevin Kelly* replies that Recology has sent material to Merlin Plastics but not to Renewlogy.
- *Susan Fife-Ferris* notes that some materials have been sent from Seattle and she believes a pilot would be appropriate.
- *Kevin Kelly* suggests that, rather than saying which companies to use, the language be updated to specify capabilities that a facility should have in order to be included in the pilot.
- *Lisa Sepanski* confirms that the language will be updated so it's clear that use of Renewlogy or Merlin Plastics are examples and not mandatory.
- The room votes in favor of C1, with the assumption that changes to language will be made as noted.
- *Julie Colehour* introduces the next action item for review: **C2: Support legislation that creates local recycling infrastructure and market development (such as the WA Recycling Development Center legislation).**



- *Penny Sweet* asks if this is referring to Representative Smith’s legislation that she spoke about at the September RRTF meeting.
- *Lisa Sepanski* replies that this legislation is different – it refers to legislation that encourages support of recycling market development and coordination. An example is legislation that the Department of Ecology is working on to restart an initiative similar to the Clean Washington Center.
- *Phillippa Kassover* asks for clarification on what the Clean Washington Center would do.
- *Lisa Sepanski* replies that the legislation is currently vague and notes that this is why it would be good for the RRTF to be specific about what should be included in the legislation.
- *Penny Sweet* suggests removing “such as the WA Recycling Development Center legislation”
- *Phillippa Kassover* proposes that we say “encourage and support,” noting that it will take public resources to get these types of industries going.
- The room votes in favor of C2, with the assumption that the above noted changes be made.

- *Julie Colehour* introduces the next action item for review: **C3: Increase resources to assist with development of markets of paper, plastic and compost.**
- *Jeff Gaisford* notes that King County currently has a program called LinkUp that works on market development. The program has focused mostly on developing new markets for materials like mattresses, asphalt, textiles, etc., so this action item is proposing that some of the funds for those materials be redirected back to the basics of plastic, paper and compost.
- *Phillippa Kassover* asks if that means that end markets for the other materials would no longer be explored.
- *Linda Knight* asks if the action item really means to say that resources are being redirected.
- *Susan Fife-Ferris* suggests that the action item says “Ensure” rather than “Increase” or “Redirect.”
- The room votes in favor of C3, with the changes noted above.

- *Julie Colehour* introduces **Increased Demand for Recyclable Materials**, the second goal under Infrastructure. The recommendation (noted D on the chart) to achieve the goal is as follows:
 - *Our region should create demand for products made with recyclable commodities.*
- *Julie Colehour* notes that both the goal of Increased Demand for Recyclable Materials and recommendation D have been marked green as they have been previously discussed with the group and agreed upon. There are two action items for the recommendation, both which require discussion.

- *Julie Colehour* introduces the first action item for review: **D1: Establish procurement ordinances that require the purchase of products made with post-consumer recyclable materials.**
- *Jeff Gaisford* comments that the county recently updated the framework of their policy and this action item is recommending that others dust off and reexamine their procurement policies as well.
- *Susan Fife-Ferris* comments that she’d love to also see some kind of training done for staff to ensure they know how to make correct purchase decisions, noting that sometimes marketing/branding on products can be misleading.
- *Lisa Sepanski* confirms that an additional bullet point will be added to the action about staff training.



- *Linda Knight* notes that she likes this action item and agrees that a bullet point about training should be included.
- The room votes in favor of D1, with the changes made that are noted above.
- *Julie Colehour* introduces the next action item for review: **D2: Establish recycled content legislation that requires that certain products be made with a certain amount of recyclable materials.**
- *April Atwood* asks if we mean to say recycled or recyclable?
- *Julie Colehour* replies that it should say “recycled” in the goal, recommendation and action items and confirms that the wording will be updated.
- *Lisa Sepanski* notes that another mechanism that might be easier than going through the procurement ordinance is to suggest that everyone becomes Demand Champions.
- *Julie Colehour* suggests that an additional action item could be added elsewhere to become members of the Demand Champions.
- *Penny Sweet* asks what it means to “establish legislation,” to which *Jeff Gaisford* replies that it means to pass the legislation.
- *Lisa Sepanski* notes that California has a good example of legislation that requires certain content in their packaging materials.
- *Penny Sweet* comments that, at some point, a discussion about legislation should be had.
- *Julie Colehour* replies that the next category is focused on Statewide Policy and suggests that this action may need to be moved to that section.
- The room votes in favor of D2, assuming the action will be moved to the Statewide Policy category and an additional action item to explore the Demand Champions be added.

Category #3: Statewide Policy – Discussion

- *Julie Colehour* introduces **Responsible Recycling Policies**, the first goal under Statewide Policy. The recommendation (noted E on the chart) to achieve the goal is as follows:
 - *Our region should support, create, and advocate for policies that establish a statewide system of responsible recycling.*
- *Julie Colehour* notes that both the goal of Responsible Recycling Policies and recommendation E have been marked green as they have been previously discussed with the group and agreed upon. There are seven action items for the recommendation, three which are marked green and three that are up for discussion.
- The first action item for review is **E3: Support legislation that promotes the use of innovative technologies/processes to help develop and build local recycling infrastructure.**
- *Jeff Gaisford* notes that the presentation from Renewlogy on chemical recycling at a previous task force meeting is an example of the type of innovation that this action item is referring to.
- *Sego Jackson* adds that innovation could take a number of forms, such as the Recycling Development Center legislation, Plastic Packaging Product Stewardship legislation, etc.



- *Lisa Sepanski* notes that this action is somewhat similar to C2 (**Support legislation that creates local recycling infrastructure and market development (such as the WA Recycling Development Center legislation)**) and asks if E3 should be combined with C2.
- The room agrees that C2 be moved into Statewide Policy and combined with E3, as it will be easier to understand.
- *Phillippa Kassover* comments that C2 and E3 are not duplicative and suggests moving C2 into Statewide Policy but as its own action.
- *Julie Colehour* confirms that C2 will be moved to Statewide Policy as its own action
- The room votes in favor of E3 and in moving C2 to Statewide Policy.

- *Julie Colehour* introduces the next action item for review: **E4: Explore the feasibility of beverage stewardship/deposit legislation/programing in Washington similar to the OBRC model.**
- *Susan Fife-Ferris* asks if the OBRC acronym can be spelled out
- *Ken Marshall* asks who will collect and pay for the program
- *April Atwood* comments that the words “explore” and “feasibility” are very tentative
- *Julie Colehour* asks if the wording should be changed to say something stronger than “explored”
- *Phillippa Kassover* suggests using “Establish task force to explore,” commenting that the next phase may be to develop a task force to look into a bottle program.
- *Susan Fife-Ferris* comments that the implementing parties should be at the state level rather than county level.
- *Linda Knight* expresses caution in creating too many task forces rather than do active work.
- *Ken Marshall* points out that it would be helpful to have a larger brand partner in our corner if we want to institute a beverage program.
- *Penny Sweet* notes that there is some interest in a bottle program in the legislature
- *Julie Colehour* asks if there is already a statewide task force that exists that could take this on or if a new task force would have to be created.
- *Lisa Sepanski* replies that there is the statewide Steering Committee, who is looking at adopting a similar problem statement as the RRTF and suggests that this could be a topic of their conversations.
- *Linda Knight* suggests changing “explore feasibility” to “advocate” or “support” so that it shows intent
- *Susan Fife-Ferris* suggests saying “Develop a feasible model for beverage stewardship”
- The room votes in favor of E4, with the assumption that “Develop a feasible model for beverage stewardship” will be used and OBRC will be written out.
- *Sego Jackson* adds that often times people talk about doing wither a container composite or product stewardship, and notes that BC are doing both in tandem.

- *Julie Colehour* introduces the next action item for review: **E6: Support Reusable Bag legislation to reduce the amount of plastic bags entering the system.**
- The room votes in favor of E6, no discussion needed.



- *Julie Colehour* introduces the next action item for review: **E7: Advocate for the WRAP bag/film recycling program to capture remaining bags/film.**
- The room votes in favor of E7, no discussion needed.

Category #4: Design for Recycling – Discussion

- *Julie Colehour* introduces **Improved Upstream Design**, the first goal under Design for Recycling. The recommendation (noted F on the chart) to achieve the goal is as follows:
 - *Local government and organizations should engage producers in developing product messaging and package design that supports a system of responsible recycling.*
- *Julie Colehour* notes that both the goal of Improved Upstream Design and recommendation F have been marked green as they have been previously discussed with the group and agreed upon. There are two action items for the recommendation, both which are up for discussion.
- The first action item for review is **F1: Engage with the Sustainable Packaging Coalition and their How2Recycle brands to help educate brands and package designers on:**
 - **The types of packaging that can and cannot be sorted and processed.**
 - **Promote the use of recycled feedstock in packaging**
 - **Promote materials that are less toxic and more recyclable (no PVC plastic for example)**
- *Phillippa Kassover* asks if SPC is a nationwide group, to which *Julie Colehour* confirms
- *Sego Jackson* comments that the City of Seattle already does this and that he isn't entirely clear what all the individual roles might be to accomplish this action item. *Sego* adds that *Nina Goodrich*, Executive Director of SPC, has moved to Washington State for the time being and will be attending the SPC conference taking place in Seattle in April 2019.
- *Linda Knight* comments that she is on board with the action item but would like to know more about timing.
- *Lisa Sepanski* comments that short term could include attending the SPC conference, noting that the conference is a great place to engage producers.
- *Sego Jackson* confirms that he met Kim Carswell at the SPC conference
- The room votes in favor of F1
- *Julie Colehour* introduces the next action item for review: **F2: Establish recycled content legislation that requires that certain products be made with a certain amount of recyclable materials**
- *Julie Colehour* notes that this is a duplicate of an action reviewed earlier and will be moved into Statewide Policy. No vote is needed.
- *Julie Colehour* introduces the next recommendation that falls under **Improved Upstream Design**, which is a new recommendation that came as a result from the days meeting. The recommendation (noted G in the chart) to achieve the goal is as follows:
 - *Local government should partner with national groups to get local companies to commit to purchase new products made with recycled materials thereby expanding the market for recycled*



materials, driving investment, increasing supply and producing more high-quality recyclable and recycled materials.

- The first action item for review is **G1: Work with the Demand Champions program to develop a plan for engaging King County companies in the program.**
- *Susan Fife-Ferris* asks for more information on what the Demand Champions are
- *Sego Jackson* replies that the Demand Champions is an organization that is part of the American Chemistry Council and includes corporations who have committed to using recycled content in their pallets, garbage cans, etc. *Sego* adds that this action item is focused on how to work with the program to encourage local and national companies based in King County to participate.
- *Susan Fife-Ferris* suggests that the action be to work with group “such as” the Demand Champions
- *Sego Jackson* replies that the Demand Champions are the only group of its kind
- *Linda Knight* suggests saying “like” the Demand Champions and that a second action be to identify other coalitions/group like the Demand Champions
- *April Atwood* asks if the Demand Champions only work with plastic, which is confirmed
- *Lisa Sepanski* notes that opportunities like the Demand Champions for materials that are not plastic should be explored.
- *Phillippa Kassover* comments that F1 talks about the SPC and notes that G should look at actually building ways to engage local corporations to adopt some of the same aspirations as Target shared earlier in the day and should work to inform elected leaders of these types of programs.
- *Sego Jackson* comments that the Demand Champions are an established group that can offer a more immediate solution for major corporations.
- *Phillippa Kassover* shares her hope that the recommendations chart will be spread to the state level and ultimately covered by the media, which will help engage elected leaders to learn and understand more about the topic.
- *Lisa Sepanski* asks if engaging our leaders and elected officials should be an additional action item under G, as well as if exploration of other programs similar to the Demand Champions should be an additional action item, to which the room confirms yes.
- *Julie Colehour* confirms that recommendation G and its action items will be revised and updated in the next iteration of the recommendation chart.

Agenda Item #4: Wrap Up & Next Steps (*called to order at 11:52 by Julie Colehour*)

- *Julie Colehour* thanks the room for working through the recommendations and action items and *Phillippa Kassover* for her suggestion to reorganize.
- *Julie Colehour* shares next steps, which include:
 - Drafting the full report and sending to the task force for review in advance of the December meeting



- The goal of the December meeting, which is the final RRTF meeting scheduled for December 14, is to finalize the recommendations and report.
- *Lisa Sepanski* asks the room if they liked the format of the recommendation chart for the final report or if people would like to see the chart written out in a text format. The room likes the chart but agrees that implementation detail need also be provided in text.
- *Phillippa Kassover* suggests that a cover memo talking about what the task force has been through be provided as well for context
- *Jeff Gaisford* confirms that the plan is to begin teeing up these issues to the advisory groups in January
- *Julie Colehour* adds that an Executive Summary will be included in the beginning of the report to summarize the findings
- *Ken Marshall* adds that it would be helpful to list the presenters, topics, etc.
- *April Atwood* comments on the use of “Recycling is Not Free” in the chart and the Responsible Recycling framework, noting that it would be better to frame this as virgin resources that don’t have to be mined or drilled rather than “Recycling is Not Free” as this speaks more to the benefits
- *Kevin Kelly* comments that adding a column about difficulty to the chart would also help indicate the cost and environmental impacts
- *Julie Colehour* confirms that impact and difficulty will be added in an additional column and adjourns the meeting