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Background

- Overview of recycling
- Challenges
- Goal and work of Oregon’s Recycling Steering Committee
- Scope: “traditional” recyclables (paper, glass, metal, plastic) collected from households and businesses
Benefits of recycling

• Provides local economic/social benefits

• Conserves resources
  • Equivalent to ~3% reduction of statewide energy use

• Reduces pollution
  • Equivalent to tailpipe greenhouse gases from ~750,000 average passenger cars
What is recycling?

Recycling Steering Committee
Modernizing Oregon’s recycling system with support from Oregon Consensus

WASTE GENERATORS
COLLECTION
PROCESSING
END USERS
Oregonians in 2050 produce and use materials responsibly
conserving resources • protecting the environment • living well
Oregon’s policy framework

• Strong focus on recycling collection

• Opportunity model, with primary responsibility assigned to local governments

• But only when the cost to recycle is less than the cost of disposal
Collection

Collection

• 1983 – 1997: Intensive material separation

• ~1997: Shift to “commingling”
Contamination makes the recycling system more expensive
Contamination reduces recycling by domestic industries
Contamination, if exported, directly harms the environment.

Photos: Megan Ponder
End markets are inconsistent
Producers have limited responsibility
Recycling is part of a larger system

Oregonians in 2050 produce and use materials responsibly
conserving resources • protecting the environment • living well
Exports . . . and “National Sword” (2017)
Oregon response to “National Sword”

- **Cities, counties and collectors:**
  - Dropped materials
  - Increased rates to pay for additional processing
  - Stepped up efforts to reduce contamination at the source

- **Processors and Metro:**
  - Invested in technology improvements

- **DEQ:**
  - Convened the Recycling Steering Committee
Recycling Steering Committee charter

Examine and make recommendations for modernizing recycling system in Oregon, in order to:

- Optimize the **environmental benefits** of managing materials using a lifecycle perspective
- Create a recovery system that is **strong and resilient** to changes
- Restore and maintain **public trust** in the system through education and engagement
Two major tracks of inquiry

- Legal and Relational Frameworks
- Infrastructure
Legal and relational frameworks

- Identified desired functions of a future system: Spring 2019
- Hired a contractor for framework evaluation: Summer 2019
- Confirmed & evaluated 10 frameworks for initial review: Fall 2019
- Evaluate 5 “hybrid” scenarios in more detail: January 2020
- Consensus seeking: March +
Recycling Steering Committee

- Legal and Relational Frameworks
- Infrastructure
- Whole-System Recommendations
- Implementation Planning

Modernizing Oregon’s recycling system with support from Oregon Consensus
Summary

- Oregon’s recycling policy was created for very different circumstances
- National Sword has revealed limitations in Oregon’s system
- Recycling continues today . . .
  - . . . but at a reduced scale and with higher uncertainty
- We have a generational opportunity to modernize our system
Packet of background materials

- Worksheet
- Infographic
- Key Concepts

Link to other materials, including the evaluation of five scenarios: https://go.usa.gov/xmYYe
Framework Scenario Review
Resa Dimino, Resource Recycling Systems
Wrap Up and Next Steps
Opportunities for feedback

• Fill out a worksheet (for those in the room today)
• Talk with individual Recycling Steering Committee members
• Local governments: Attend a DEQ/AOC/LOC listening session
• Speak during a public comment period at an RSC meeting
• Sign up for email notifications: https://go.usa.gov/xmYYe
• Provide written feedback to the Recycling Steering Committee: david.allaway@state.or.us
• Complete DEQ’s feedback survey
DEQ Survey

• DEQ survey closes February 21

• Email Tom Lang to receive a survey link: tom.lang@state.or.us
Thank you!
OREGON RECYCLING SYSTEM FRAMEWORKS RESEARCH: SCENARIO EVALUATION

Jan 31, 2020
WHAT WE DO

SINCE 1986, RRS has expanded its services throughout the value chain:

• Planning/Implementing recycling and composting programs.
• Planning/Implementing materials management and zero waste solutions.
• Waste and compliance training.
• Developing/Facilitating collaborations to increase commodity recovery.
• Analyzing the recyclability and compostability of packaging.
• Evaluating anaerobic digestion and biomass facilities.
• Food waste prevention and organics recovery planning.
• Reviewing/Negotiating hauler and MRF contracts.
• Designing/Permitting MRF and composting sites.
• Developing/Implementing multi-stakeholder communications and outreach.
AGENDA

• Process and Overview
• Evaluation of Government Managed Scenarios
• Evaluation of Producer Managed Scenarios
SCENARIO DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION PROCESS
THE RECYCLING STEERING COMMITTEE PROCESS TO DATE

RRS ENGAGED

Evaluation and report out (TODAY!) of 5 framework scenarios

Development of 5 framework scenarios

Evaluation of 10 alternative frameworks against functions and criteria

Gap Analysis: current framework against desired functions

Desired Functions of a Future Recycling System

THE RECYCLING STEERING COMMITTEE PROCESS TO DATE
WHAT IS A RECYCLING FRAMEWORK?

Collection of elements designed to meet certain functions

- Laws
- Policies
- Programs
- Agreements

*MRF stands for Material Recovery Facility. It is where the commingled curbside material is sorted and prepped for market.
WHAT IS A SCENARIO?

Hypothetical combination of elements designed to better meet certain functions
## What Are the Functions?

| A | **Optimization:** Optimizes the benefits of recycling considering life-cycle impacts and costs |
| B | **Resiliency:** Resiliently adapts to changes in material supply and end-market demand |
| C | **Financing:** Provides sustainable and equitable financing for stable operations and capital investments |
| D | **Integration:** Integrates system components to achieve overall system goals |
| E | **Upstream:** Includes mechanisms to reduce upstream impacts of materials |
| F | **Equity:** Designs for equity — examining the burdens and benefits across the state |
| G | **Shared Responsibility:** Shares responsibility for the system among players including residents and businesses, producers, state and local governments, and recycling industry |
| H | **Goals:** Uses goals and metrics to measure progress and support ongoing improvement |
| I | **Education:** Educates and encourages residents and businesses to use the system properly |
| J | **Understanding Impacts:** Engages the public to understand the benefits and the costs of recycling, preventing waste and reducing impacts of materials throughout their life-cycles |
| K | **Material Selection:** Identifies beneficial materials acceptable for collection programs |
| L | **Collection:** Collects clean, acceptable materials for processing |
| M | **Incoming Processing:** Ensures processing facilities receive clean materials and in sufficient volumes |
| N | **Outgoing Processing:** Produces quality materials that reach end markets |
| O | **Downstream:** Ensures materials are managed responsibly from collection through end markets |
| P | **Accountability:** Ensures all players in the system perform responsibly |
SCENARIO BUILDING PROCESS

FRAMEWORKS

FUNCTION / CRITERIA

ELEMENTS

SCENARIO
GOVERNMENT MANAGED

- Enhanced government management
- State government management with MRF contracts

EXISTED PRODUCER RESPONSIBILITY (EPR)

- Post collection EPR
- EPR with local control
- Full EPR

Existing Oregon Framework
ELEMENTS RECOMMENDED FOR ALL SCENARIOS*

• Parallel access to recycling
• Mandatory variable rate pricing
• MRF certification and reporting
• Life-cycle assessment (LCA) database to inform decision making
• Statewide list of recyclables
• Recyclables disposal ban

• Recycled content requirements and/or incentives
• Labeling standards
• Market development activities
• Enforceable performance and equity standards
• Expanded bottle bill (i.e. wine and spirits)
• Litter and waste prevention / upstream activities

*How these are applied and by whom will change among frameworks
SCENARIO EVALUATIONS

FUNCTION / CRITERIA
HOW DO THE SCENARIOS DIFFER?

FINANCE

OPERATIONS

GOVERNANCE
HOW DO THE SCENARIOS DIFFER?

• Finance
• Operations
• Governance

**SCENARIO 1**

**SCENARIO 2**

**SCENARIO 3**

**SCENARIO 4**

**SCENARIO 5**
### ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES WITHIN ALL FIVE SCENARIOS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCENARIOS</th>
<th>SETS MATERIALS LIST</th>
<th>PROVIDES COLLECTION</th>
<th>PROVIDES PROCESSING</th>
<th>PROVIDES MARKETS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced government managed</td>
<td>DEQ</td>
<td>RATEPAYER*</td>
<td>LOCAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>MRF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State government managed (MRF contracts)</td>
<td>DEQ</td>
<td>RATEPAYER*</td>
<td>LOCAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-collection producer responsibility</td>
<td>DEQ</td>
<td>RATEPAYER*</td>
<td>LOCAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>PRODUCER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Producer responsibility with local control</td>
<td>PRODUCER</td>
<td>PRODUCER</td>
<td>LOCAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>PRODUCER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full producer responsibility with optional local involvement</td>
<td>PRODUCER</td>
<td>PRODUCER</td>
<td>LOCAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>PRODUCER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*DEQ regulatory oversight included in all elements except those noted with an asterisk.
SCENARIO GROUP 1: ENHANCED GOVERNMENT-MANAGED MODELS
GOVERNMENT MANAGED SCENARIOS: KEY DISTINCTIONS

Baseline Oregon Framework

FINANCING
OPERATIONAL / CONTRACTUAL
STRATEGIC / REGULATORY AUTHORITY
GOVERNMENT MANAGED SCENARIOS: KEY DISTINCTIONS

1 - Enhanced government managed

- Additional Required Elements
- Additional Funding Needed

FINANCING  OPERATIONAL / CONTRACTUAL  STRATEGIC/ REGULATORY AUTHORITY
GOVERNMENT MANAGED SCENARIOS: KEY DISTINCTIONS

2 - State Government Managed (MRF Contracts)

- Everything from Scenario 1 plus MRF contracting
SCENARIO 1
Enhanced Government Managed System
SCENARIO 1: Enhanced Government Managed System

State has more authority

New financing needed

MRFs to be permitted or certified by state

Roles and relationships stay the same
Finance: Local ratepayers

Operations: Locally managed collection; open market post-collection

Governance: DEQ rules and regulations; local franchise/ license service agreements
ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: Enhanced Government Managed

STATE GOVERNMENT
- Regulate and oversee the system, including MRFs
- LCA research
- Create new recycling advisory committee
- Set statewide mandatory list of recyclables
- Require parallel recycling access and variable rate pricing

LOCAL GOVERNMENT
- Plan and implement recycling programs that meet new state requirements
- Update franchise/license agreements to comply with new policies

COLLECTOR
- Collect material in accordance with new requirements
- Deliver to permitted or certified MRF(s)

MRF
- Implement new operating and equity standards, reporting requirements and contamination targets

PRODUCER / PRO
- No specified role
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BENEFITS</th>
<th>CHALLENGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Maintains strength of existing system – collection opportunities</td>
<td>• Not all system players have responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Enhance system optimization, integration and accountability</td>
<td>• No platform to address upstream environmental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Formally address post-collection segments of the system</td>
<td>impacts and design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Limited impact on downstream decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Need for additional funding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SCENARIO 2
Enhanced State Government Managed System (MRF Contracts)
SCENARIO 2: Enhanced State Government Managed System (MRF Contracts)

- State has more authority including MRF contracting
- Significant new financing needed
- MRFs to be permitted or certified by state and contract with the state
- Roles and relationships stay the same on collection side but change for MRFs
WHY CONTRACT WITH MRFS?

• Provide equal access to processing for all parts of the state
• Greater ability to set environmental health and safety standards for material end markets
• Mitigate market risk for local programs and ratepayers
Finance: Local ratepayers fund collection; State funds processing*

Operations: Locally managed collection; state managed post-collection

Governance: DEQ rules and regulations; local franchise / license service agreements
# ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: Enhanced State Managed System (MRF Contracts)

## STATE GOVERNMENT
- Contract with MRFs for processing of program materials
- Regulate and oversee the system
- LCA research
- Create new recycling advisory committee
- Set statewide mandatory list
- Require parallel recycling access and variable rate pricing

## LOCAL GOVERNMENT
- Plan and implement recycling programs that meet new state requirements
- Update franchise / license agreements to comply with new policies

## COLLECTOR
- Collect material in accordance with new requirements
- Deliver to contracted MRF(s)

## MRF
- Compete for state contracts
- Implement operating and equity standards, reporting requirements and contamination targets

## PRODUCER / PRO
- No specified role
**BENEFITS**

- More engaged management of post-collection
- Equitable access to processing
- Mitigate market risk
- Maintain strengths of existing system
- Enhance system optimization, integration and accountability

**CHALLENGES**

- Substantial funding and authority required
- Significant departure from status quo in processing / marketing relationships
- Administratively complex
- Not all system players have responsibility
- No platform to address upstream environmental impacts and design
KEY CONSIDERATIONS FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF GOVERNMENT MANAGED SCENARIOS

- New legislation and rules
- Additional funding
- Complexities of MRF contracting process (Scenario 2)
- Shifting MRF business model (Scenario 2)
- Service would appear (mostly) seamless to ratepayers
WHAT THIS IS

• An opportunity to learn
• A chance to seek clarification

WHAT THIS IS NOT

• A time to debate
• A forum to express what you like and don’t like
• A poll to select a framework

QUESTIONS

Clarifying questions to round out understanding of the government managed scenarios
SCENARIO GROUP 2: EXTENDED PRODUCER RESPONSIBILITY MODELS
WHAT IS EXTENDED PRODUCER RESPONSIBILITY?

Extended producer responsibility is a practice and a policy approach in which producers take responsibility for management of the products and/or packaging they produce at the end of their useful life. Responsibility may be fiscal, physical, or a combination of the two.

WHO ARE THE PRODUCERS?
Brands / Retailers
WHAT ABOUT EPR FOR CURBSIDE MATERIALS?

PACKAGING EXTENDED PRODUCER RESPONSIBILITY (EPR)

Packaging EPR in 2000

Packaging EPR in 2019

Mandatory EPR in Effect
Voluntary EPR in Effect
EPR in Effect (province-level);
In Implementation (country-level)
In Implementation
(India and China expected by 2022)
Framework EPR Legislation

Source: EPI
DRIVERS FOR PRINTED PAPER AND PACKAGING (PPP) EPR

- Need for stable funding
- Market challenges
- Focus on circular economy
- Stagnant recycling rates
COMMON FEATURES RECOMMENDED FOR ALL EPR SCENARIOS:

Managed by a Producer Responsibility Organization (PRO)

Guided by a Program Plan

Uses Eco-Modulated Fees
WHAT IS A PRO?

- Represents brands / retailers
- Manages obligation
- Authorized in legislation
- Develops and implements Program Plan
- Sets and collects fees
WHAT IS A PROGRAM PLAN?

• Blueprint for meeting goals and obligations
  • Proposed list of recyclables
  • Collection / processing arrangements
  • Education and outreach
  • End market development
  • Waste reduction and litter abatement

• Must be approved by oversight entity (DEQ)
WHAT IS ECO MODULATION?

• Method of differentiating fees paid by brands / retailers
  • Incentivize environmental design
  • Penalize negative attributes

• Added or subtracted from base fee

• Based on DEQ LCA research

• Must be approved by DEQ
EPR SCENARIOS: KEY DISTINCTIONS

3 - Post collection Producer Responsibility

- Producers contract with MRFs to fund processing and marketing
4 - Producer Responsibility with Local Control

- Post-collection same as Scenario 3
- Producers fund local government collection systems
5 - Full Producer Responsibility with Optional Local Involvement

- System fully funded and managed by producers
SCENARIO 3
Post-Collection EPR
SCENARIO 3: Post-Collection EPR

Producers responsible for post-collection system

MRFs to be permitted or certified by state and contract with PRO(s)

Roles and relationships stay the same on collection side

DEQ a regulator and integrator
**Finance:** Local ratepayers fund collection; PRO(s) fund post-collection

**Operations:** Locally managed collection; PRO(s) managed post-collection

**Governance:** DEQ oversight and integration; local franchise / license service agreements; PRO-MRF contracts
**ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: POST-COLLECTION EPR**

**STATE GOVERNMENT**
- Expand authority matching Scenario 1 (including list)
- Negotiate, approve, oversee, and enforce producer’s program plan
- Integrate ratepayer-funded collection with producer funded post-collection activities

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT**
- Plan and implement recycling programs that meet new state requirements
- Update franchise/license agreements to comply with new policies

**COLLECTOR**
- Collect material in accordance with new requirements
- Deliver to contracted MRF(s)

**MRF**
- Compete for PRO(s) contract(s)
- Implement operating and equity standards, reporting requirements and contamination targets

**PRODUCER / PRO**
- Manage and fund post-collection
- Develop and implement program plan
- Report on results
**BENEFITS**

- Engages brands / retailers
- Reliable source of funding
- Equitable access to processing
- Addresses upstream and downstream impacts
- Mitigates market risk
- Maintain strengths of existing system
- Enhance system optimization, integration and accountability

**CHALLENGES**

- Changing dynamics incorporating new players
- Significant departure from status quo in processing and marketing
- Coordination between collection and processing systems
SCENARIO 4
Producer Responsibility with Local Control
SCENARIO 4: Producer Responsibility with Local Control

Producers responsible for funding and managing post-collection system and funding the collection system

MRFs to be permitted or certified by state and contract with PRO(s)

Relationship between local government and collectors remains the same

DEQ a regulator and arbiter of reimbursement process
**Finance:** PRO(s) funds collection and post-collection

**Operations:** Locally managed collection; PRO(s) managed post-collection

**Governance:** DEQ oversight and integration; local franchise / license service agreements; PRO-MRF contracts
# ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: PRODUCER RESPONSIBILITY WITH LOCAL CONTROL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE GOVERNMENT</th>
<th>LOCAL GOVERNMENT</th>
<th>COLLECTOR</th>
<th>MRF</th>
<th>PRODUCER / PRO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Expand authority matching Scenario 1 (except the list)</td>
<td>• Work with state and PRO(s) to obtain reimbursement for recycling program costs</td>
<td>• Collect material in accordance with new requirements</td>
<td>• Compete for PRO(s) contracts</td>
<td>• Manage and fund post-collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Negotiate, approve, oversee, and enforce producer’s program plan (including approval of list)</td>
<td>• Plan and implement recycling programs that meet new state requirements</td>
<td>• Deliver to contracted MRF(s)</td>
<td>• Implement operating and equity standards, reporting requirements and contamination targets</td>
<td>• Reimburse collection programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Oversee and coordinate reimbursement process</td>
<td>• Update franchise/license agreements to comply with new policies</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Develop and implement program plan</td>
<td>• Develop and implement program plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Report on results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**BENEFITS**

- Engages brands and retailers
- Reliable source of funding
- Equitable access to processing
- Addresses upstream and downstream impacts
- Mitigates market risk
- Maintain strengths of existing system
- Greater system optimization, integration and accountability

**CHALLENGES**

- Changing dynamics incorporating new players
- Coordination of collection program reimbursements
- Significant departure from status quo in processing and marketing
SCENARIO 5

Full Producer Responsibility with Optional Local Involvement
SCENARIO 5: Full Producer Responsibility With Optional Local Involvement

Producers responsible for collection and post-collection system

MRFs to be permitted or certified by state and contract with PRO(s)

Local government engagement optional

DEQ a regulator
**Finance:** PRO(s) fund entire system

**Operations:** PRO(s) manage collection and post-collection; optional local involvement

**Governance:** DEQ oversight; collection and post-collection PRO(s) contracts
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROLE</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **STATE GOVERNMENT** | • Expand authority matching Scenario 1 (except the list)  
• Negotiate, approve, oversee, and enforce producer’s program plan (including approval of list) |
| **LOCAL GOVERNMENT** | Choose to:  
• Opt-in to contract as collector for PRO(s)  
• Elect service by PRO(s)  
• Opt-out of system and receive no funding |
| **COLLECTOR** | • Contract either directly with PRO(s) or to a local government  
• Meet collection program requirements |
| **MRF** | • Compete for PRO(s) contracts  
• Implement operating and equity standards, reporting requirements and contamination targets |
| **PRODUCER / PRO** | • Finance and manage system  
• Develop and implement a program plan  
• Report on results |
**BENEFITS**

- Engages brands & retailers
- Reliable source of funding
- Equitable access to processing
- Mitigates market risk
- Addresses upstream and downstream impacts
- Greatest potential for optimization, integration and accountability

**CHALLENGES**

- Greatest change in dynamics incorporating new players
- Most significant departure from status quo
- Potentially significant shift in local government involvement
KEY CONSIDERATIONS FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF EPR SCENARIOS

- New legislation and rules
- Shifting business models
- Integration of collection and post-collection (Scenarios 3 and 4)
- Collection reimbursement process (Scenario 4)
- Changing role of local government (Scenario 5)
- Potential changes in collection service (Scenario 5)
## EVALUATION OF FIVE LEGAL AND RELATIONAL FRAMEWORK SCENARIOS

**A REPORT TO THE OREGON RECYCLING STEERING COMMITTEE**

January 29, 2020

---

### Appendix B: Scoring Matrix of the Five Scenarios Relative to the Desired Functions Defined by the RSC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Scenario 1</th>
<th>Scenario 2</th>
<th>Scenario 3</th>
<th>Scenario 4</th>
<th>Scenario 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Optimization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resiliency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upstream</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding Impacts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material Selection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incoming Processing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outsourcing Processing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downstream</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Some as current Oregon framework
- Slightly better than current Oregon framework
- Better than current Oregon framework
- Much better than current Oregon framework
- TBD
NEXT STEPS: STEERING COMMITTEE WILL TAKE IT FROM HERE
**QUESTIONS**

Clarifying questions to round out understanding of the EPR scenarios

---

**WHAT THIS IS**

- An opportunity to learn
- A chance to seek clarification

---

**WHAT THIS IS NOT**

- A time to debate
- A forum to express what you like and don’t like
- A poll to select a framework