



Recycling Steering Committee

Modernizing Oregon's recycling system with support from Oregon Consensus

Recycling System Steering Committee Meeting Summary

Via Zoom

August 13, 2020

ACTION ITEMS:

ACTION	BY WHOM?	BY WHEN?
OC will send out a draft August 13 meeting summary to RSC members for feedback.	OC	8/21
RSC Local Government ad hoc members to share an updated framework proposal to RSC members.	Local Government ad hoc members	Complete.
Submit infrastructure research feedback or questions to Cascadia Consulting via their sharing folder.	RSC Members	8/19

Meeting Attendees:

Steering Committee Members: David Allaway, Abby Boudouris, Dylan de Thomas, Sarah Grimm, Nicole Janssen, Scott Keller, Matt Stern, Vinod Singh, Kristan Mitchell, Jeff Murray, Pam Peck, Timm Schimke, Jay Simmons, Bruce Walker, Amy Roth, and Laura Leebrick

Facilitation Team: Robin Harkless, Amy Delahanty, and Jennah Stillman.

DEQ Staff: Sanne Stienstra, Justin Gast, Peter Spendelow, Brian Stafki, Loretta Pickerell, Steve Siegel, Blake Bennett, Cathy Brown, Laurie Gordon, Cat Rhoades and Brian Fuller.

Cascadia Consulting: Jessica Branom-Zwick, Chris Bell, Amity Lumper, and McKenna Morrigan

Registered Participants: Lauren Aguilar, Sophia Ahn, Katie Bailey, Denise Barnes, Kristen Bartels, Sarah Bloomquist, Kathleen Boutin-Pasterz, Carole Branom, Dave Claugus, Paul Cosgrove, Thomas Cuomo, Resa Dimino, Aaron Donley, Thomas Egleston, Jeff Epstein, Nick Fahey, Anne Germain, Stanly Girard, Sabrina Gogol, Rosalynn Greene, Emily Ham, Jeanette Hanna, Kristin Hervin, Bryce Hesterman, Garth



Recycling Steering Committee

Modernizing Oregon's recycling system with support from Oregon Consensus

Hickle, Dean Kampfer, Scott Klag, Dave Larmouth, Cindy Leichner, Kristin Leichner, Brandon Lesowske, Brad Lovaas, Shannon Martin, Tess Milio, Angie Marzano, Brian May, Chaz Miller, Rob Mullens, Marie Novak, Garry Penning, Alan Pennington, Sal Peralta, Jerry Powell, Katie Reilly, Keith Ristau, Julie Robertson, Heather Robinson, Tina Schaefer, Raissa Scheller, David Skakel, Eric Stephens, Lindsay Stovall, Jeff Sturgis, Celine Swenson Harris, Heather Trim, Tachell van Woert, Beth Vargas Duncan, Mary Vihstadt, Dan Weston, David White, Rick Winterhalter, and Charlie Swick.

MEETING SUMMARY:

Welcome and Agenda Review

Facilitator Robin Harkless, Oregon Consensus, welcomed the group and Recycling Steering Committee (RSC) members gave brief introductions. She then reviewed the proposed agenda and intended goals of the meeting with the group, which were for the RSC to hear: high-level results of Cascadia's second round of infrastructure economic analysis; results of DEQ's social and environmental impacts analysis; updates or proposals from RSC ad hoc work; and a high level overview of a comprehensive framework concept from local government members of the RSC.

Infrastructure Research and Analysis Results

Robin acknowledged that over the last few months the RSC has focused much of its attention on the legal and relational frameworks. Today the group will return to the infrastructure and customer engagement research with Cascadia and DEQ. She reminded the group that the RSC heard the first round of scenario results from Cascadia back on June 10 and 12 and they had since made some updates to their analysis framework and provided a second round of analysis. She noted Cascadia will not delve into the assumptions behind the analysis, but rather share the results of their analysis and tee up five policy questions for further discussion by the RSC.

Jessica Branom-Zwick, Cascadia Consulting, then provided a presentation of the additional scenario modeling results on behalf of her research team. She thanked the RSC for the feedback they provided following the June meeting, as well additional data Cascadia received around bale quality. Jessica summarized there were a total of 11 modeling results (scenarios), two baseline models, and nine alternatives analyzed in the infrastructure research. For the purposes of this presentation, Cascadia focused their presentation on the revised baseline, five of the alternative scenarios, and the tonnage and cost impacts of each. Today's presentation was structured to show stepwise changes and impacts by adding individual elements one at a time. She noted that while the presentation will be focused primarily on the five policy questions, additional detail including evaluating the scenarios against all of the criteria the RSC approved are included in their report. (For additional detail please see [Cascadia's PPT](#) and supporting [materials](#).)



Recycling Steering Committee

Modernizing Oregon's recycling system with support from Oregon Consensus

Facilitator note: Alternative Recycling Infrastructure Scenario Definitions

- **REVISED Baseline: Post-Disruption List (S5):** Baseline system with a post-National Sword list of accepted materials, informed by 2018 recovery data provided by DEQ.
- **+ Customer Engagement (S6/A-):** Baseline system with a post-National Sword list of accepted materials and additional contamination reduction efforts on inbound collection and no improvements in other areas.
- **Engagement + Upgraded/Modern MRFs (S1/A):** Same as above with improvements to paper sorting at MRFs.
- **Engagement + MRFs + Expanded Lists (S2/A+):** Single-Stream with Modern MRFs and Expanded List — Single-stream/glass on side — expanded list that varies by grouping and modernized MRFs (for both paper and containers) in Metro Area (paper/containers).
- **Engagement + MRFs + Expanded + Statewide List (S7/A++):** Single-Stream with Modern MRFs and Expanded Statewide List — Single-stream/glass on side — expanded list that is standardized statewide and modernized MRFs in Metro Area (paper/containers).
- **Engagement + MRFs + Expanded + Statewide List + Expanded Collection (S8-10/D):** Single-Stream with Modern MRFs, Expanded Statewide List, and Expanded On-Route Collection — Single-stream/glass on side — expanded list that is standardized statewide and modernized MRFs in Metro Area (paper/containers). On-route collection is expanded in Grouping 4 to customers that currently have garbage collection (single-family, multi-family, and commercial) and in Groupings 1, 2, and 3, to additional multifamily customers. Additional investments in collection enclosures at multifamily properties. Multiple scenario numbers represent the uncertainty with how many customers will have recycling added (high, medium and low estimates).

The following policy questions were focused on and addressed during the presentation:

- **What happens if we conduct only customer engagement on contamination reduction?** + Engagement (A-)
- **What is the impact of making processing improvements?** + Improved Fiber MRFs (A)
- **What happens if we expand the list?** + Expanded Lists & Container line (A+)
- **What happens if we have a standardized statewide list?** + Statewide List (A++)
- **What if we expand collection opportunities to more communities and customers?** + Expanded Collection (D)



Recycling Steering Committee

Modernizing Oregon's recycling system with support from Oregon Consensus

Following this, one RSC member wondered whether customer engagement costs over time were factored in the research. Cascadia stated they factored in a number of cart-tagging campaigns per year for a number of customers (for single-family), and spread out the start up costs over ten years for commercial and multi daily technical assistance. Cascadia also confirmed that the scenario results showed a cumulative effect on costs from adding on to the previous scenario (so customer engagement, process improvements; and so on...)

Environmental Impacts and Social Costs of Recycling

David Allaway, DEQ, presented high-level modeling outcomes and results of DEQ's updated assessment of the environmental consequences and social costs of the different infrastructure scenarios ([see PPT](#) for additional detail). He noted that the environmental impacts and social costs of recycling framework was introduced to RSC members in an informational webinar on June 2nd and again at the June 10th RSC meeting. He reiterated that Cascadia's evaluation of material tonnage flows were entered into DEQ's Waste Impact Calculator, and used the results to estimate a variety of life cycle environmental impacts for different infrastructure scenarios. Differences in environmental impacts between scenarios were then evaluated for their marginal social costs using damage cost factors. Those social costs were added to estimates of transactional costs for a more complete accounting of the full social costs of the system.

David shared that DEQ expressed results as ranges, as opposed to points largely to reflect on the uncertainty in these estimates (worst and best case scenarios). The worst case and best-case estimates represent extremes and DEQ expects actual results to gravitate more towards the middle of the uncertainty ranges. The presentation then focused on high-level modeling outcomes and results following the same higher-level policy questions Cascadia modeled expressed in ranges. (For the full summary of the estimation, please see the attached [supplemental information](#).)

Following this, RSC members were invited to provide brief reactions or observations from the presentations. Questions and comments related to: the opportunity to analyze the true costs of contamination reduction efforts; degree to which the social and environmental impacts were focused on Oregon, or nationwide; opportunity to expand investments for improvements to end markets; and general appreciation for the analyses and presentations. The RSC was then invited to offer initial reactions to the research around the below two questions via the chat function. The following general themes were surfaced:

How do these results inform your thinking about investments in customer engagement improvements? What about processing improvements?



Recycling Steering Committee

Modernizing Oregon's recycling system with support from Oregon Consensus

- Generally most RSC members who weighed in shared support for both investments in customer engagement and processing. The group felt they both were essential to building a solid foundation to make other improvements and modernizing the system, but some were unclear what the optimal balance of the two investments was. A couple members expressed processing improvements are key to improving material and reducing negative system impacts. They wondered if MRF improvements are a better approach for dealing with generator confusion.
- Some acknowledged Oregon should invest in both areas, coupled with an appropriate level of evaluation to fine tune and adjust investments in the future. Specifically for customer engagement, there was support for investing in a robust evaluation of pilots to better understand costs and how long results hold.
- There should be adequate funding for Anti-Contamination Programming efforts and it would be appropriately funded by producers.
- One RSC member wondered if investments could expand into the end market improvements as well.
- A couple RSC members wanted to better understand the models and assumptions utilized to come up with the numbers.

What do you think about expanding and implementing a standardized statewide list with all this in mind? What do you now think about expanding collection opportunities to more communities and customers?

- RSC members generally agreed that pursuing a statewide list and expanded collection are very important to advancing equity in the system. Members shared that a consistent statewide list would enable a more uniform message that would reduce customer confusion, and in turn, enhance the equity of service availability and have some impact on minimizing increased costs.
- Underrepresented stakeholders and others have indicated a strong interest in expanding collection opportunities to generators currently lacking them; and modeling shows significant social cost benefits to both.
- Both a statewide list and expanded collection will be costly and require financial assistance to areas of the system (e.g. rural areas, staging/re-load, and transfer of materials collected). Financial assistance from producers could be appropriate for this aspect of the system. Another member felt it should be a local decision.
- A couple RSC members highlighted a need for a clear and standardized process to expand the statewide list.



Recycling Steering Committee

Modernizing Oregon's recycling system with support from Oregon Consensus

- There was a desire for more information among some RSC members. One asked for a cost benefit analysis in expanded depot options in sparsely populated areas versus curbside collection. Others shared a desire to learn more about current levels for on-route multifamily communities across the state; and what regions of the state are not currently being offered an opportunity to recycle.

-- Lunch Break --

Continue/Wrap Up Infrastructure Research Review

The RSC engaged in a large group dialogue regarding where the RSC sees the best investments for Oregon; what could be justified; and what aspects of the research are informing members' policy guidance to modernize Oregon's recycling system. The following comments were surfaced:

- Costs related to Oregon's recycling system are high and the RSC has identified additional improvements necessary to modernize the system, which will add to those costs. Cascadia and DEQ's analysis should inform how the RSC moves forward, but there is a question of how to generate those revenues. There are limitations to rate payer funding across the state. Passing along additional costs is challenging in many jurisdictions and there is a need to look more broadly to address other means of funding the system e.g. producer funding and Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR).
- There is a need to capture the benefits and resiliency impacts from various interventions that can't be monetized and find a way to communicate them to stakeholders.
- There was a brief discussion about Dr. Lakhan's presentation from 7/22 and information asserting EPR costs will impact the price of a product and several members provided differing perspectives during the conversation. Members raised considerations about who should pay for the system; how costs are distributed; and transparency of costs.
- Others shared the modeling and information affirms producer funding would be appropriate for aspects such as contamination reduction program; MRF upgrades; and offsetting the costs for expanded collection for generators who lack those opportunities.

Processing - transparency and accountability

(Matt Stern, Timm Schinke, Jay Simmons, Pam Peck, Sanne Stienstra, Jeff Murray, and Vinod Singh)

Jay Simmons provided a status update of the Processing ad hoc group work to RSC members. Jay shared that since the last ad hoc group update to the RSC, the group



Recycling Steering Committee

Modernizing Oregon's recycling system with support from Oregon Consensus

addressed equity considerations for processing and reviewed the following recommendation on behalf of the group ([please see here for additional information](#)):

Processing workforce equity:

The ad hoc group agrees Oregon should establish statewide equity standards or best practices for processing facilities doing business in Oregon (and/or handling material generated in Oregon) related to initiatives such as: workforce fair wages, worker health and safety, and good neighbor or community benefit agreements.

The ad hoc group agrees on these principles of equity:

- Advancing equity is a high priority for modernizing Oregon's recycling system, and as such needs to be supported by investments and funding.
- All processing facilities across the state should meet minimum equity standards or requirements, regardless of market impacts.
- Oregon's recycling system should seek to equitably distribute its benefits and burdens among the individuals and communities involved in or affected by the system.
- Advancing equity for workers, business owners and host communities can strengthen the system's resiliency and safety, and create benefits for all.
- Some standards may need to account for differences between processing facilities based on geography, markets, and business model.
- Workers should have access to wages and benefits to meet their basic needs, including stable housing, transportation and food.
- Workers should be able to work in a safe and healthy environment, free from bullying, harassment, injury and other negative health impacts.
- Host communities should be able to see processing facilities as a benefit not a burden, and should have a voice in decisions that affect them.
- The system should create opportunities for minority and women-owned businesses, and remove barriers to business ownership.
- Equity standards should be phased in over time to ensure they are achievable, and facilities should be required to implement plans for continuous improvement.

An RSC member asked whether the MRF baseline standards would be required statewide. Ad hoc members affirmed this and added certification standards would address MRFs located out of state to maintain a level playing field. There being no other comments or questions, Robin previewed the processing next steps beyond the RSC which were included in the document shared with the RSC from the ad hoc group. She



Recycling Steering Committee

Modernizing Oregon's recycling system with support from Oregon Consensus

noted Metro will use the approved recommendations as a starting point for development of local standards that could be incorporated into Metro's MRF license agreements. This work would include additional research and stakeholder engagement. The project scope will be shared with the RSC when completed. Metro and DEQ staff will discuss implementation details as part of the Metro project to ensure state and local regulatory roles are well coordinated and complementary.

Robin conducted a preliminary consensus check with RSC members on the processing workforce equity recommendation. **PRELIMINARY CONSENSUS AGREEMENT: The RSC confirmed general agreement on the recommendation for equity principles.** During the consensus check, a concern was raised about the practical application of the standards. *This standalone recommendation will be included in the consensus-alignment category for future discussion, and reviewed as a package for final consensus seeking.*

Generator Facing Anti-Contamination Programming

(Sarah Grimm, Timm Schinke, Scott Keller, Kristan Mitchell, Laura Leebrick, Dylan de Thomas, and Nicole Janssen)

Laura Leebrick shared the group had hoped to bring forth a recommendation to the RSC for a consensus check, but received feedback requesting clarity about what the group meant by "requiring of jurisdictions," e.g. whether the group meant for the recommendation to be an expansion of the existing CREP, or make it a requirement of jurisdictions and included in statute. She shared this feedback caused the group to pause and schedule an additional meeting to finalize their recommendation to the RSC. She briefly reviewed the framework (sent to RSC members in advance of the meeting) and RSC members briefly provided the following input:

- Hope the group can fold in the information presented from Cascadia and DEQ into its final recommendation.
- Appreciation for the including of ongoing auditing efforts and encouraged the group to address the associated costs and funding.
- Oregon doesn't currently know the optimal level of generator facing programming or best practices. It was advised that the group include the details of the requirement in administrative rule versus statute to provide a greater degree of flexibility for DEQ/EQC to revise or adapt requirements over time as more information is known. Statute change will be needed to empower local governments to do something, but the details of which could be worked out in administrative rule.
- There may be an opportunity through a mix of required and non-required elements to provide flexibility that won't compromise the quality of the interventions as long as there's funding associated with it. It was suggested the



Recycling Steering Committee

Modernizing Oregon's recycling system with support from Oregon Consensus

group think about a standard set of things jurisdictions can do as more information is made available.

- **Suggestion to clarify** that the proposal addresses “multifamily, commercial and residential” sectors.
- **Suggestion to be more explicit** for there to be feedback directly with the generator in the guiding principle.
- **Suggestion to include** “education, outreach and compliance/enforcement efforts must be responsive to and inclusive of diverse populations”.

The group then reviewed the guiding principles, which were as follows:

Generator Facing Contamination Reduction Programming is permanent and ongoing.

- There should be a statewide strategy.
- There should be system support to local jurisdictions to implement CREP.
- Statewide contamination reduction efforts are appropriately funded by producers.
- The goals and communication of “the problem” will be clearly articulated to generators.
- Generator-facing program efforts and actions being undertaken must be practical, measurable, and effective.
- There will be shared responsibility and accountability among all parts of the system. Effective feedback loops must occur between hauler, reload, and end-MRFs to support and sustain generator accountability.
- There will be consequences / enforcement measures that are understood and acceptable to all players that are consistently applied, effective and ongoing
- Contamination reduction program work may prioritize materials and sectors.
- Education and outreach efforts must be responsive to and inclusive of diverse populations.
- Contamination reduction program work will be evaluated on an ongoing basis.
- Decisions need to be informed by current, local data e.g. auditing/surveying to identify problem materials.
- Auditing protocols and standards will be set by DEQ, and informed by partners.

Robin conducted a preliminary consensus check with RSC members on the above Generator Facing Contamination Reduction Programming guiding principles.

PRELIMINARY CONSENSUS AGREEMENT: The RSC confirmed general agreement on the general principles. *This recommendation will be included in the consensus-alignment category for future discussion, and reviewed as a package for final consensus seeking.*

Truth in Labeling

(Matt Stern, Jason Hudson, Kristan Mitchell, David Allaway, Dylan de Thomas, and Sarah Grimm)



Recycling Steering Committee

Modernizing Oregon's recycling system with support from Oregon Consensus

Dylan de Thomas provided a status update of the Truth in Labeling ad hoc group work. Dylan shared the group's next steps will be to have additional conversation and confirm any proposed options for RSC preliminary consensus at its next and final meeting on August 20th.

Funding Sources (non-EPR) Group

(Scott Keller, Abby Boudouris, Vinod Singh, Laura Leebrick, Bruce Walker, Jeff Murray, Timm Schimke and support by Brian Stafki)

Vinod Singh provided a status update of the Funding Sources ad hoc group work. He shared that the group examined funding options through a lens of considerations they agreed are important for decision making regarding funding recycling system improvements and modernization. Through this process, they eliminated some options that did not meet thresholds for relevant, stable, or practical to implement. The ad hoc group explored considering these options within a shared responsibility (EPR) framework to meet some of the considerations and principles, including relieving the burden on ratepayers. Ultimately this group concluded that some "non-EPR" funding options would work best if integrated in an EPR financed system. There was then a comment and question about an Advance Disposal Fee, and whether it would be paid by consumers vs. part of an EPR system.

Local Government Group

(Sarah Grimm, Scott Keller, Pam Peck, Timm Schimke, and Bruce Walker)

Scott Keller shared that the local government RSC members have been meeting with a goal of developing a joint comprehensive framework to modernize Oregon's recycling system. He shared the group continues to make progress, but there is more work to do. Scott noted the group has met with RSC affinity groups to receive feedback on the proposal, and a second round of meetings will occur on August 17th for additional refinement. He said that a more detailed draft document that will be shared with members ahead of the next round of meetings. Scott then provided an overview of the local government concept ([For additional details, please see the attached PPT](#)) and noted a version of the PowerPoint was shared with the Association of Oregon Counties and League of Oregon Cities. After the presentation, there were suggestions and comments related to considering including producer obligations, accountability, and responsibilities; and defining performance measures (e.g. mandatory recovery rates) in the proposal.

Action Item: Local Government group to share draft framework document to RSC members by Friday, August 14th and bring forward a revised recommendation to the full RSC at the 8/27 meeting. *(Facilitator note: the framework was shared with RSC members following today's meeting.)*



Recycling Steering Committee

Modernizing Oregon's recycling system with support from Oregon Consensus

Public Comment

David Skakel (Tri-County Hazardous Waste and Recycling Program) shared earlier there was a lot of discussion about sequential societal costs and benefits with the infrastructure scenarios. David shared there needs to be sufficient and solid funding for the generator facing contamination reduction efforts. Relatedly, customer facing hauler is in the closest position to affect behavior change. Would encourage the ad hoc group to consider more requirements on wastesheds to follow through with contamination reduction outreach. David agreed there is a need for contamination data, but recognized the challenges of surveying contamination and wondered how and where it's best to do surveying. David then encouraged the generator facing anti contamination ad hoc group to think about what degree are producers responsible in performance measures and consider adding that in the guiding principles.

Kristan Leichner (Pride Disposal) wondered how an advance disposal fee is not considered EPR, when it seems similar to PaintCare. She recognized there's ongoing conversation regarding how traditional EPR may increase the cost to consumers, but believes PaintCare is an example of an EPR program and it is transparent about the increased costs to consumers. Abby Boudouris explained how the PaintCare program is EPR, and how that is different from a limited advance disposal fee (which for example may not assign any further producer obligations, and which might flow money directly to government).

Brandon Lesowske (Portland State University) shared appreciation to the RSC for taking the time to work collaboratively together, and believes collaboration is one of the main goals and outcomes that will make for better outcomes.

Wrap Up and Next Steps

Robin reviewed the updated RSC roadmap with RSC members. She acknowledged where the group has been since May 1st. She highlighted a lot of work has been done on behalf of the members and commended the group for the focus and energy.

Additional next steps included the following:

- OC will continue to work with ad hoc groups through August 20th.
- The RSC will try to wrap up consensus seeking on August 27th but there will be a final meeting on September 11 for any remaining items if needed.
- OC will draft an overall process report early September for RSC member review. The draft report will articulate the RSC process and outcomes and will be finalized by the end of September.