

# Compostable Products Advisory Committee Meeting Summary

Meeting #9: Tuesday June 4<sup>th</sup>, 2024 | 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM

Location: Zoom

## Attendance

Members of the Advisory Council, Washington Department of Ecology (Ecology), Cascadia Consulting Group (Cascadia), and the public attended the meeting.

19 out of 27 Advisory Committee members attended (those who attended are marked with \*):

Name	Affiliation	Name	Affiliation
Alex Truelove*	BPI	Mark Chidester*	City of Richland
Amy Clow	WSDA	Reingard Rieger	Tilth Alliance
Patti Stacey	Kittitas County	Ron Jones	City of Olympia
Jill Reeves*	City of Spokane	Samantha Louderback*	Washington Hospitality Association
Dan Corum	City of Tacoma	Samantha Winkle*	Waste Connections
Gena Jain*	City of Kirkland	Scott Deatherage*	Barr-Tech
Heather Trim*	Zero Waste Washington	Shannon Pinc*	NatureWorks
Janet Thoman*	CMA	Alli Kingfisher*	Ecology
Jay Blazey*	Cedar Grove	Wendy Weiker*	Republic Services
Jenny Slepian	Eco Products	Peter Godlewski*	Association of WA Businesses
Kate Kurtz*	City of Seattle	Zonell Tateishi	Yakima County
Liv Johansson*	WORC	Rod Whittaker*	WRRRA
Lewis Griffith*	City of Tacoma	Brandon Housekeeper*	NW Grocers Association
Ryan Dicks	Pierce County		

3 Washington Department of Ecology (Ecology) members attended, but did not participate as Advisory Committee members:

- Cullen Naumoff
- Chery Sullivan
- Patrick Merscher

3 staff from Cascadia Consulting Group (Cascadia) attended as meeting facilitators and support:

- Maddie Seibert
- Hannah Swee
- Taylor Magee

3 members of the public attended.

## Meeting goals

- Generate solutions for remaining four challenge themes
- Consider full set of solutions generated
- Prepare for MURAL voting exercise between June and July meetings

## Agenda

Duration	Agenda Item
10 min	Welcome, agenda, & objectives
5 min	Where we've been and where we're headed
45 min	Solutions discussion
10 min	Break
30 min	Discuss full set of solutions
5 min	Public comment
5 min	Closing remarks and preview next steps

## Where We've Been & Where We're Headed

- Maddie oriented the group to where we are in the AC process, noting that we will be finish identifying potential solutions in this meeting. Between the June and July AC meetings, AC members will be asked to review the list of draft strategies and solutions before the final vote in July.
- Hannah presented the identified gaps and opportunities for future research – both those gaps identified through research and those identified by the Committee:
  - Gaps and opportunities for future research:
    - Food waste diversion: Data on impact of compostable products and amount of food waste diverted at city, county, or statewide level – including diversion impact by type of product.
    - Commercial sector organics composition: Lack of detail by generator type in commercial organics characterization data.
    - Statewide capture rates: Percentage of amount and types of compostable products generated statewide recovered by organic materials management facilities.
    - Labeling laws impact: Statewide labeling laws are new, and data is not yet available on the impact on reducing contamination.
    - Microplastics: Facilities do not measure or report the amount of microplastics or presence of toxic chemicals in finished compost.
  - Gaps and opportunities identified by the AC:
    - Additional opportunities to understand impacts to the business community, rural communities, and others.
    - Do compostable products encourage food waste diversion?
      - Does refusing compostable products hinder diversion?
      - Do certain products encourage more food waste diversion than others?
    - Better understanding of the costs to facilities that accept compostable products
    - More research needed on reusables.

- Microplastics associated with reusables.
- Reusables vs. compostables.
- Impacts to the recycling stream from contamination of compostable products.
- Questions:
  - Alex Truelove commented that there is a study from Chicago that demonstrates increased diversion outside of a closed loop system.
  - Shannon Pinc commented that most composters aren't measuring for microplastics because that technology is not widely available. When testing is done, methodologies are showing only fossil-based microplastics and not bio-based.
  - Alex Truelove commented that he hasn't heard of compostable products increasing volume or creating volume concerns, would like to know how that's measured.
  - Lewis Griffith commented that the goal of including compostable products in the compost stream is to increase volumes that are diverted to compost.
  - Kate Kurtz commented (in the chat): FYI: WORC will be hosting a webinar on microplastics and compost on August 27th. Markus Flury from WSU has done some excellent work on this topic, and he will be presenting. I see now that we need to get the date on the website, but registration information is on the WORC website: <https://www.compostwashington.org/2024-webinars-1>

## Solutions Discussion

- **Presentation:** Maddie reminded the group of the scope of recommendation for HB 1033. She then presented the list of challenges and draft strategies and actions for discussion. The AC committee reviewed the remaining four challenge themes and initial solutions:

Challenge	Solution Statement	Initial Solutions
<b>2. Existing facilities may not have capacity to accept compostable products and food waste.</b> Adding new feedstock will increase the volumes of material at facilities, compostable products increase processing times, and it is difficult to site new facilities.	2. Increase facility capacity to accept compostable products and food waste.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Give facilities more control over what they receive</li> <li>• Add funding to increase capacity</li> </ul>
<b>3. It is not clear how well compostable products increase food diversion rates.</b>	3. Increase understanding of how compostable products impact food diversion rates.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conduct commercial and residential outreach</li> <li>• Provide technical assistance</li> <li>• Conduct further research in a municipal setting. Do some compostables support diversion more than others?</li> </ul>
<b>5. Compostable products do not break down in all facilities and processing types.</b> Standards for compostable products not	5. Better align accepted compostable products with facility conditions and processing types.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conduct testing in a wide variety of compost processes</li> <li>• Align compostable standards with WA compost facilities</li> </ul>

inclusive of all processing types and facility conditions.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensure definition of compostable products reflects products that work in Washington's system</li> </ul>
<b>7. Some areas in the state lack access to local compost programs.</b> Collection inefficiency in some jurisdictions and inaccessibility of programs in rural areas.	7. Improve statewide access to local compost programs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>No initial solutions identified.</i></li> </ul>

### MURAL Discussion: Solutions

- The Committee transitioned to MURAL to discuss these remaining four challenges and solutions, building out strategies and actions. The AC had a robust conversation and suggested many changes/alterations to the initial strategies. The Facilitation team used these edits to revise the set of strategies and actions in a separate document sent to the AC prior to the first round of voting. ***Please see Appendix A for the complete list of revised strategies and actions, and see Appendix B for the MURAL exercise with Committee responses and solutions generated.***

### Discuss Full set of Solutions

- Presentation:** Maddie introduced the next discussion item, where AC members reviewed the full list of initial strategies and actions that they had identified.
- Questions:
  - Heather Trim raised concerns about bin colors/bin labeling not being related to the management of compostable products.
  - Shannon Pinc pointed to a misconception on the MURAL which noted compostable products made from corn and soy being separated as food at compost facilities, noting these items are not food. The corn and soy used for the production of compostable products is different.

### MURAL Discussion: Solutions

- The Committee transitioned to MURAL to discuss the full set of solutions. The AC had a robust conversation and suggested many changes/alterations to the challenge themes. The Facilitation team used these edits to revise the set of strategies and actions in a separate document sent to the AC prior to the first round of voting. ***Please see Appendix A for the complete list of revised strategies and actions, and see Appendix B for the MURAL exercise.***

### Preview MURAL Voting Exercise

- Maddie provided a preview to the MURAL voting, which will be used for the initial round of voting on draft solutions and the round of voting on final solutions.
- Questions:
  - Heather Trim asked for space provided to comment on each solution during the voting process.

## Compostable Products Advisory Committee Meeting #9

- Kate Kurtz asked if the list of solutions and strategies will be edited/ refined before voting on the draft solutions. She noted that the current list is more of a brainstorm, with some strategies mis-categorized.
  - Maddie replied that the list will be edited and refined, also noting that the language is not as refined as we would like for the legislature.
- Heather asked what the next steps were after voting.
  - Maddie replied that voting on the draft solutions between the June and July meetings will provide the project team with an idea of how to adjust the solutions before the July meeting. The project team will follow up with AC members if appropriate. Then the AC will vote on the final set of solutions during the July meeting.

### Public Comment

- No public comments.

### Next Steps

**The May AC meeting will take place on July 2, from 10:00am-12:00pm.**

## Appendix A. Draft Strategies and Actions Presented for Feedback Before Initial Round of Voting.

These draft strategies and actions, organized by theme, were further revised before the first round of voting based on feedback received from the Committee and Department of Ecology.

# Address consumer confusion around compostable products

## DRAFT SOLUTIONS

### Education and outreach

1. State-wide or regional campaigns teaching the public how to identify compostable products
2. Need funding for education campaigns
3. Simplify the system- use visuals/graphics
4. Consider supporting EPR as a funding source

### Consistent cart and bin colors

1. Bin colors will not help with compostables; residents are confused on what products go in compost vs. Recycling, better targeted with education
2. Cost considerations for adoption
3. Rather than bin colors, consider bin labels on what is accepted
4. Green or brown for organics only; blue for recycling; black or grey for garbage

### Stronger labeling standards

1. Address lookalikes and their labeling/coloring
2. Advocate at a federal level on this issue

### Consistent enforcement to reduce contamination

1. Who will pay for enforcement?
2. Clear process to report bad actors
3. Notification of widely distributed reported products
4. Incorporate feedback from haulers and compost facilities
5. Active enforcement (beyond complaint-based)
6. Clearly define where the responsibility lies, whether that's producer, broker, etc.

### Ban lookalikes

1. Ban single-use plastic foodware, with cups as possible exception
2. Focus on deliberately misleading products
3. Need to further define this as a solution

# Increase facility capacity to accept compostable products and food waste

## DRAFT SOLUTIONS

### Add funding to increase capacity

1. Fund improved screening equipment. Focus on equipment that doesn't generate microplastics
2. Fund facility upgrades
3. Support EPR to include funding for composters
4. Funding without mandates
5. Need markets
6. Costs for composting is higher than landfill disposal in some jurisdictions, additional facility capacity costs will need to be subsidized as there is not a market incentive to invest in this

### Fund research

1. Fund research to better understand which processing conditions best break down compostable products
2. Consolidate research

### Allow facilities to maintain control over what they receive

1. Require facilities to set contamination thresholds and reject loads.
2. Ban compostable products that facilities can't accept
3. Ban lookalikes statewide
4. Understand the costs and logistics associated with allowing/requiring facilities to reject loads
5. Provide facilities with data about which products have more lookalikes

### Streamline/expedite permitting

1. Expedite permit modifications
2. Streamline permitting generally

# Increase understanding of how compostable products impact food diversion rates

## DRAFT SOLUTIONS

### Specified commercial and residential outreach

1. Funding from the state
2. Fund outreach campaign to educate consumers on labeling law and how to report noncompliant products
3. Statewide campaign research (Similar to Use Food Well)
4. Statewide toolkit customized for different stakeholders (commercial to in-house, jurisdictions to residents, etc.)
5. Comprehensive enforcement mechanisms for businesses and residents
6. Uniformity in food packaging requirements and policies

#### **Technical assistance**

1. Education for the general public of what compostable means and what it doesn't mean

#### **Further research about compostable products' impacts on food waste diversion and overall environmental benefit**

1. Does the lack of some products being compostable inhibit food waste composting (e.g., produce stickers, collection bags)?
2. Anecdotally, Cedar Grove finds that education helps people divert food waste using compostables.
3. Evaluate if certain compostable products are more effective in different streams – residential, commercial
4. Is research needed? Seems intuitive that compostables divert food waste.
5. Study: What are the real life cycle benefits of compostable products? Does including them in organics collection improve overall environmental outcomes?

#### **Conduct research about alternatives to compostable products.**

1. Understand the risks of alternatives (conventional plastic, etc.)
2. Understand risk of depackaging equipment generating microplastics if products are conventional
3. Understand the role of reusables – whether preferable to or complementary to compostable products.
4. Explore bans on single-use plastics at grocery stores.

## **Clarify enforcement of compostable product labeling and/or use of products**

### **DRAFT SOLUTIONS**

#### **Provide technical assistance and tools to jurisdictions for enforcement.**

1. Create and publish comprehensive lists of acceptable products.
2. Model enforcement or standards for local jurisdictions to adopt, produced by DOE.
3. Allocate additional funds for staff enforcement at local and state levels.



4. Provide education tools to local jurisdictions to better understand requirements.
5. Create an easy reporting form that is easily accessible to those intended to use it.
6. Define who is responsible for enforcement.
7. Clarify the role of local/municipal ordinances and laws.

#### **Funding for jurisdictions' enforcement**

1. Fund overs testing to help accelerate identification
2. Consider prioritizing funding for jurisdictions that accept compostable products.
3. Ensure that state and local governments have enough capacity for enforcement; consider providing funding for this capacity.

#### **Enforcement of non-compliant products sold in WA state**

1. Identify examples of non-compliant items for education purposes.
2. Work with other states with similar guidelines to help create a multi-state enforcement effort.
3. Work to achieve active enforcement; find/report products sold in WA that do not meet standards and contact sellers.
4. Provide ECY with tools to be proactive.

#### **Equity analysis**

1. Understand: Who is bearing the burden of potential enforcement solutions? Which communities are negatively impacted?

## **Clarify enforcement of compostable product labeling and/or use of products**

### **DRAFT SOLUTIONS**

#### **Testing in a wide variety of compost processes**

1. Continued emphasis on field testing
2. Do research and/or collect data on items that are problematic to break down at facilities
3. Conduct research to better understand the processing conditions that promote breakdown of these products

#### **Align compostable standards with WA compost facilities**

1. Develop a statewide list of compostable products that are accepted by 50% of facilities
2. Setting up rules now may present unintended consequences later
3. Update statewide list periodically
4. Set standards for compost facilities

5. Ban specific compostable products (such as products not widely accepted at all facilities)
6. Ban lookalike products
7. When evaluating if certain products are not accepted by a percentage of compost facilities, only include facilities that are accepting compostable products in that evaluation.
8. Create a WA compostable standard that is more stringent than industry standards, that for example requires compostable products to fully break down in 45 days
9. Develop & adhere to a set of ideal processing conditions for facilities in WA

## **Support marketability of compost that has food waste and compostable products as feedstocks**

### **DRAFT SOLUTIONS**

#### **Assurance of end markets**

1. Update finished compost standards
2. State/local budget for compost procurement
3. Clarification is needed about how much anticipated supply in excess of demand there will be.
4. Encouraging use in appropriate applications
5. Ensure compliance of CPOs, grow those overtime

#### **Details/data on end markets**

1. What is the demand for compost? Supply/demand data
2. What are the barriers to expanding compost markets?
3. Clarification/assurance about farmer incentives for compost use
4. Access to affordable compost spreading/transportation equipment

#### **Data about how much compost is clean and marketable**

1. Clearer insight into consumer/end user standards for “clean” compost- may be different for different applications.
2. Provide funding for contamination reduction equipment

## **Improve statewide access to local compost programs**

### **DRAFT SOLUTIONS**

Local implementation/phase-in

## Compostable Products Advisory Committee Meeting #9

1. Allow local govt to phase in services to allow for maximum education, preparation, and participation. Start with education.
2. Multi-family is particularly challenging and requires time window for education/start up
3. Statewide goals / local implementation
4. Provide funding for new and expanding compost facilities
5. Require local governments without access to a compost facility to put out an RFI/RFQ/RFP every x years to inquire about potential new programs or facilities.

## Appendix B. MURAL from June 4<sup>th</sup> Committee Meeting

Committee members considered the full set of solutions generated by theme and provided comments to inform revisions.

### 1. Address consumer confusion around compostable products

**1 Consider Strategies & Actions**

**Stronger Labeling Standards**

1. Address lookalikes and their labeling/coloring
2. Concerned over the idea of patchwork state standards- federal government working on this issue

**Education and outreach**

1. State-wide or regional campaigns teaching the public how to identify compostable products
2. Need funding for education campaigns
3. Simplify the system- use visuals/graphics
4. Consider supporting EPR as a funding source

**Consistent cart and bin colors**

1. Bin colors will not help with compostables; residents are confused on what products go in compost vs. Recycling, better targeted with education
2. Cost considerations for adoption
3. Rather than bin colors, consider bin labels on what is accepted
4. Green or brown for organics only; blue for recycling; black or grey for garbage

**Consistent enforcement to reduce contamination**

1. Who will pay for enforcement?
2. Clear process to report bad actors
3. Notification of widely distributed reported products
4. Incorporate feedback from haulers and compost facilities
5. Active enforcement (beyond complaint-based)
6. Clearly define where the responsibility lies, whether that's producer, broker, etc.

**Ban lookalikes**

1. Ban single-use plastic foodware, with cups as possible exception
2. Focus on deliberately misleading products

**2**

**Comments**

<b>Strong, proactive Enforcement the labelling standards is needed and will help</b>	Cost / effectiveness evaluation needed for bin colors vs. bin labels. Bin colors is a huge investment across the entire state with no data to show effectiveness	On stronger labeling standards- State by state regulation may be unavoidable. Compostable in WA should mean compostable at WA facilities	<b>Easier/clearer way to report bad actors (i.e. products making misleading claims)</b>	bin colors should help a lot with contamination, but is not be directly related to compostable products	
If enforcement is seen as a solution, there would need to be dedicated funding for enforcement. It will not pay for itself with penalties.	Clarify: enforce on who? Producers? Businesses distributing/using bad product? n Compost facilities for accepting material? On compost facilities for producing contaminated product? So many places where there could be enforcement.			<b>Bin color not related to this project</b>	

2. Increase facility capacity to accept compostable products and food waste.

## 2. Increase facility capacity to accept compostable products and food waste.

### 1 Consider Strategies & Actions

#### Allow facilities to maintain control over what they receive

- Require facilities to set contamination thresholds and reject loads.
  - Ban compostable products that facilities can't accept
  - Ban lookalikes statewide
- Understand the costs and logistics associated with allowing/requiring facilities to reject loads
- Provide facilities with data about which products have more lookalikes

#### Add funding to increase capacity

- Fund improved screening equipment. Focus on equipment that doesn't generate microplastics
  - Fund facility upgrades
  - Support EPR to include funding for composters
  - Funding without mandates
  - Need markets
- Costs for composting is higher than landfill disposal in some jurisdictions, additional facility capacity costs will need to be subsidized

#### Fund research to better understand which processing conditions best break down compostable products

- Fund research
- Consolidate research

#### Streamline/expedite permitting

- Expedite permitting modifications

### 2 Comments

providing funding for new facility development and/or facility upgrades to accept food waste and/or compostables is a needed

Providing funding to jurisdictions to help fund food waste diversion programs would be very helpful

The issue of facility capacity is a top priority issue that needs to be addressed if there is any requirement recommended that will require facilities to process compostable products

Supporting EPR to fund composters accepting compostables is needed

This is potentially a huge cost and will require new funding sources - is there the political will to spend on this? Would there be an EPR model or other tax related to food products that could fund this? Composting is more expensive than landfilling in many areas so there is no longer a market driver for profit driven investment in this infrastructure

For a facility to claim it cannot accept a compostable product, its needs to show management practices and prove (lab test) that its overs are in fact compostable. Anecdotal evidence is not sufficient

Create incentives but not mandates

Curious to understand more permitting as it would drive facility capacity statewide- this could be an area for further research

Within this conversation, capacity should only apply to facilities accepting and processing compostable products. Otherwise, they're outside the scope.

How to determine what facilities can't accept? Are we referring to what they cannot process? Who determines this and how?

### 3. Increase understanding of how compostable products impact food diversion rates.

## 3. Increase understanding of how compostable products impact food diversion rates.

### 1 Consider Strategies & Actions

#### Specified commercial and residential outreach

funding from state	Fund outreach campaign to educate consumers on labeling law and how to report noncompliant products	statewide campaign research (similar to Use Food Well)	statewide toolkit customized for different stakeholders (commercial to in house, jurisdictions to residents, etc.)	Comprehensive enforcement mechanisms for businesses and residents	Uniformity in food packaging requirements and policies
--------------------	---	--	--	---	--

#### Technical assistance

Education for general public of what compostable means and what it doesn't mean.

#### Further research about compostable products' impacts on food waste diversion and overall environmental benefit

Does the lack of some products being compostable inhibit food waste composting (e.g. produce stickers, collection bags)?	Anecdotally, Cedar Grove finds that education helps people divert food waste using compostables	evaluate if certain compostable products are more effective in the different streams - residential and commercial	Is research needed? Seems very intuitive that compostables divert food waste	Study: What are the real life-cycle benefits of compostable products? Does including them in organics collection improve overall environmental outcomes?
--	---	---	--	--

#### Conduct research about alternatives to compostable products

Understand the risks of alternatives (conventional plastic, etc.)	Understand risk of depackaging equipment generating microplastics if products are conventional	Understand the role of reusables - whether preferable to or complementary to compostable products	Explore bans on single-use plastics at grocery stores
---	--	---	---

### 2 Comments

Potentially there is are different models that are most effective for residential and commercial compost streams

Life cycle analysis will help answer the question of what does his accomplish? Is it worth the investment?

LCAs will also need to explore WHICH compostable products divert appreciable volumes of food waste

Further research on the TYPE and USE CASE (ie: fruit clamshells in grocery retail vs. a food boat at a food truck) of compostable products that appreciably diverts food waste from the landfill

The comparison would be with reusable containers

Reuse studies (as a comparison) need to include loss rates, microplastic shedding, toxicity, and transportation costs

Compostable products are most often bio-based (plastic and paper)...are the feedstock benefits v fossil plastics taken into account?

When compostables are made of soy and corn are we accounting for those items being removed from the system as food

Note that these things might be used for different products. Food? Part of LCA of items.

4. Clarify enforcement of compostable products labeling and/or use of products.

## 4. Clarify enforcement of compostable products labeling and/or use of products.

### 1 Consider Strategies & Actions

#### Technical assistance from ECY to jurisdictions

1. Create and publish comprehensive lists of acceptable products; easier to see what you can buy than what you can't
2. Model enforcement or standards for local jurisdictions to adopt, produced by DOE
3. Allocate additional funds for staff enforcement at local and state levels
4. Education tools from ECY to local jurisdictions o better understand requirements
5. Education before enforcement

#### An easy reporting form

1. Form needs to be promoted to public; if it's not promoted who will report?

#### Clear direction about enforcement to jurisdictions

1. Define who is responsible for enforcement
2. Clarify the role of local/municipal ordinances and laws. May become confusing to understand which laws to follow

#### Funding for jurisdictions enforcement

1. State-funding overs testing to help accelerate identification
2. Should funding prioritize jurisdictions that accept compostable products?
3. Can penalties help offset costs?
4. What departments will handle this? What is there capacity?

#### Enforcement of non-compliant products sold in WA state

1. Identify example of non-compliant items for education purposes
2. Work with other states with similar guidelines to help create a multi-state enforcement effort
3. Enforcement should be proactive beyond complaint based; find/report products sold in WA that do not meet standards, contact seller
4. Provide ECY with tools to be proactive

### 2

## Comments

Active, non-complaint based enforcement to proactively identify problem products

Penalties will not offset costs of enforcement.

with such a minimal part of the waste stream, not sure the legislature will be interested in investing in enforcement education

This should be a little more focused on what products are allowed or not allowed to be sold in WA

5. Better align accepted compostable products with facility conditions and processing types.

## 5. Better align accepted compostable products with facility conditions and processing types.

### 1 Consider Strategies & Actions

#### Testing in a wide variety of compost processes

Continued emphasis on field testing

do research and/or collect data on items that are problematic to breakdown at facilities

conduct scientific research to better understand the processing conditions that promote the breakdown of these products

#### Align compostable standards with WA compost facilities

California develops a statewide list of compostable products accepted by 50% of facilities. A similar standard approach could be used for WA

Setting up rules now may present unintended consequences later-stuck with rules not flexible to future innovation

Update statewide list periodically

NEED standards for compost facilities

Ban specific compostable products (such as products not widely accepted at all facilities) (CA proposal)

ban look alike products

when evaluating if certain products are not accepted by a percentage of compost facilities, only include facilities that are accepting compostable products in that evaluation.

create WA state compostable standard that is more stringent than industry standards, that for example requires compostable products to fully break down in 45 days

Develop & adhere to a set of ideal processing conditions for facilities in WA

### 2 Comments

The definition of Compostable in WA should reflect what is compostable at WA facilities, similar to the CA law Section 17989.5 -

Need to collect data on compostable products that are problematic. Systemize a way to report and collect data.

Evaluate existing data on performance of compostable products at WA and other facilities.

Evaluation of more than one source for determining appropriateness of products for different processes.

How is Washington's system different? Biology is the same no matter the state...should best practices for composting conditions differ?

Could a recommendation be that "we" develop KPIs for facilities to report/ provide feedback from facilities related to compostable products, in tandem with additional data, so that we gain more information to make more informed action on.

WA has a robust list of compostable products that have been vetted for disintegration in in-vessel covered system.

Acceptance thresholds are outside the scope, they don't address the issue of conditions and breakdown.

Use CA approach for allowing products to be sold in WA (50% threshold)



**6.Support marketability of compost that has food waste and compostable products as feedstocks.**

## 6.Support marketability of compost that has food waste and compostable products as feedstocks.

### 1 Consider Strategies & Actions

#### Assurance of end markets:

1. Update finished compost standards
2. State/local budget for compost procurement
3. Clarification is needed about how much anticipated supply in excess of demand there will be.
4. Encouraging use in appropriate applications
5. Ensure compliance of CPOs, grow those overtime

#### Details/data on end markets:

1. What is the demand for compost? Supply/demand data
2. What are the barriers to expanding compost markets?
3. Clarification/assurance about farmer incentives for compost use
4. Access to affordable compost spreading/transportation equipment

#### Data about how much compost is clean and marketable:

1. Clearer insight into consumer/end user standards for "clean" compost- may be different for different applications.
2. Provide funding for contamination reduction equipment

### 2

## Comments

The marketability of compost is inextricably tied to upstream contamination. This must start upstream with education and mechanisms for meaningful enforcement. Facilities must not be punished for rejecting contaminated loads.

Consider market development and procurement by government partners

Local budget for compost procurement could be for jurisdictions that allow compostable products in their system, and is paid for by the product manufacturers

A market study that outlines market opportunities for compost generally, and that includes differentiation between compost made w/ and without compostable products could be a great recommendation

7. Improve statewide access to local compost programs

## 7. Improve statewide access to local compost programs

### 1 Consider Strategies & Actions

#### Local Implementation / Phase in

1. Allow local govt to phase in services to allow for maximum education, preparation, and participation. Start with education.
2. Multi-family is particularly challenging and requires time window for education/start up
3. Statewide goals / local implementation
4. provide funding for new and expanding compost facilities
5. require local governments without access to a compost facility to put out an RFI/RFQ/RFP every x years to inquire about potential new programs or facilities.

### 2 Comments

This is a lower priority challenge as it relates to compostable products - other issues need to be addressed first

Not directly related to compostable products

not related to this project

while this is needed for better food waste diversion, it is tangential to compostable products

Liked the suggestion about supporting jurisdictions develop RFIs/RFPs to attract an organics entrepreneur / hauler to expand organics capacity

[insert revised strategy/actions list]