



Recycling Steering Committee

Modernizing Oregon's recycling system with support from Oregon Consensus

Legal and Relational Framework Subcommittee Meeting

September 12, 2019

11 a.m. – 1 p.m.

Webinar: <https://zoom.us/j/2348602747>

Phone: 1 (669) 900-6833 Meeting ID: 2348602747#

Agenda

Purpose of meeting

- Update subcommittee on contract phase of the project.
- Inform and receive feedback on frameworks Resource Recycling Systems (RRS) will evaluate.
- Inform and receive feedback on deliverables timeline associated with frameworks research.

11 a.m. Provide housekeeping and frame for the day

11:15 a.m. Update on contract phase of the project

OBJECTIVES

- Subcommittee members are informed of contract phase of the project.

11:20 a.m. Recycling system frameworks to be evaluated by RRS

OBJECTIVES

- Subcommittee members are informed of, and have provided feedback on, frameworks to be evaluated.
- Questions from subcommittee members have been addressed.

12:10 p.m. Deliverables timeline associated with recycling systems framework research

OBJECTIVES

- Subcommittee members are informed of, and have provided feedback on, the timeline of notable meetings and deliverables associated with the project.
- Questions from subcommittee members have been addressed.

12:45 p.m. Wrap up

- Prep for 9/25 Recycling Steering Committee meeting.
- Summarize next steps and any deliverables.

OBJECTIVES

- If needed, homework is determined and deliverables and responsibilities are listed.

1 p.m. Adjourn

The Recycling Steering Committee is a collaborative of representation from the Assoc. of Oregon Counties, Assoc. of Oregon Recyclers, Assoc. of Plastics Recyclers/Denton Plastics, EFI, Far West Recycling, Lane County, League of Oregon Cities, Metro, NORPAC, Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, Oregon Refuse & Recycling Assoc., City of Portland, Recycling Partnership, Rogue Disposal & Recycling, Waste Connections, and Waste Management. For more information, visit <https://go.usa.gov/xmYYe>.

Meeting Summary

Subcommittee Members Present:

Kristan Mitchell, Pam Peck, David Allaway, Amy Roth, Kristin Leichner, Dave Larmouth, Shannon Martin, Timm Schimke, Shannon Martin, and Michael Wisth

DEQ Staff: Justin Gast, Abby Boudouris, Brian Staffki, and Loretta Pickerell

Facilitation Team: Robin Harkless and Amy Delahanty

ACTION ITEMS:

ACTION	BY WHOM?	BY WHEN?
<ul style="list-style-type: none">DEQ to provide updated process design and timeline for Legal/Relational Frameworks meetings / workshop(s)	DEQ Staff	October
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Circulate draft subcommittee notes to the group.	Oregon Consensus	Completed.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Steering Committee members on the Frameworks subcommittee to contact Justin Gast if they are able to present with DEQ on the subcommittee's activities/progress, as well as overview and deliverables of frameworks research at the upcoming September 25th Steering Committee meeting.	SC Members	9/20/19

Intros/Frame for the Day

Robin Harkless, Oregon Consensus, reviewed the agenda and goal for the day, which was for DEQ to update the subcommittee on the contract phase of the project; inform and receive feedback on the recycling system frameworks Resource Recycling Systems (RRS) will evaluate; and receive feedback on deliverables timeline associated with the Recycling System Frameworks research.

Contract/ Research Process and Timeline

Justin Gast (DEQ) provided an update on the updated research process and tentative timeline. It was shared that there had been a small delay in contracting (due to an insurance concern), but the issue was anticipated to be resolved within the week. Other updates were as follows:

- The subcommittee will plan to reconvene in October to review any additional functions or additional evaluation criteria and evaluation methods. (When asked a question regarding RRS' methodology, DEQ shared they are leaning towards a qualitative analysis for the first round of evaluation.)
- In late November/early December 2019, RRS will provide the subcommittee and Steering Committee (SC) members a draft report which will include the results of the evaluation of 11 frameworks. Following this, the full SC will attend additional meetings with RRS to digest the frameworks and confirm a next round of framework scenarios for more detailed evaluation. DEQ suggested there will be progressively more opportunity for direct stakeholder involvement through this process to assist the Steering Committee in their deliberations in its workshop session(s) and to take a "no surprises approach". It was noted the process design will need to be

further discussed with RRS and refined. Oregon Consensus will work with DEQ and RRS on this, and DEQ will look to provide additional detail to subcommittee and SC members in the coming weeks.

Frameworks Review

Justin then reviewed each of the proposed 11 frameworks RRS will evaluate with the group (*see Frameworks for Evaluation for additional details*). It was noted the 11th framework is Oregon's system, and will be considered the "baseline" for analysis purposes. Throughout the overview, minimal feedback was provided by subcommittee members. A couple questions were asked related to: 1.) frameworks that include contracting with multiple MRFs; and 2.) if there was a structural element of the statewide framework example to which Justin said he could find an answer. Additionally, there was a suggestion to look for a US example of public/private partnerships.

Robin shared there will be an update regarding the Legal/Relational Frameworks Subcommittee at the upcoming SC meeting on September 25th. The update will include the subcommittee process; products to date; information about the RRS contractor team; frameworks to be evaluated; and an overview of the proposed timeline for research and deliverables, including upcoming meetings and workshops. Justin invited SC members on the subcommittee to present alongside him. Those that are interested should contact Justin directly.

Next Steps

DEQ will work with the contractor committee to finalize the Legal and Relational Frameworks contract. The next subcommittee meeting will be held on **October 8th or October 22 11:00-12:00p.m.** to review functions, research approach and method of evaluation.

Frameworks to be evaluated

1. Local government programs utilizing comprehensive policy and contractual tools (Possible models include: Tompkins County, NY; Alameda county, CA; San Jose, CA; Solid Waste Authority of Lake County, IL)
2. State Contracting / Certifying MRFs (**Onondaga County, NY**)
3. Comprehensive statewide system, including policy, planning and infrastructure (**Vermont**)
4. Sustainable Materials Management Public-Private Authority – infrastructure funding (Possible models include: Resource Productivity and Recovery Authority (RPRA), Ontario, Twin Cities Solid Waste Coordinating Board)
5. Extended producer responsibility for processing / marketing only (Possible models include: Modification of British Columbia, Slovenia)
6. Shared responsibility framework where producers cover a proportion of system costs (**Manitoba**)
7. Full extended producer responsibility system (**British Columbia**)
8. Full extended producer responsibility system with elements to incentivize reduction of upstream impacts / design for recycling (**France**)
9. Full extended producer responsibility system where municipalities deliver services and producers cover costs (**Quebec**)
10. Full extended producer responsibility system with competitive PRO's (**Austria**)
11. Baseline (**Oregon**)