



Recycling Steering Committee

Modernizing Oregon's recycling system with support from Oregon Consensus

Frameworks Subcommittee Meeting

April 26, 2019

10 a.m.-noon

Agenda

Oregon Refuse and Recycling Association, 727 Center Street NE, Salem, First Floor Conference Room

Note from Kristan: Free parking in any "visitor" space in either lot surrounding the building (on east side or north sides), or in reserved spaces 44-51 on the east side. The building is always locked – I'll keep an eye out for people, or they can use the doorbell to be buzzed in (say you are with ORRA), or call my cell: 503-931-6924.

Proposed Agenda

10:00 Housekeeping, Frame for the Day

10:15 Gap Analysis: How does the current Oregon recycling system compare to the identified optimal functions of a 2050 Vision system? What are the critical gaps that might lead to system changes? This will guide frameworks research.

- Using a worksheet the group will create a gap analysis to inform key areas for research.

11:15 Review research scope of work: any changes based on today's analysis?

11:30 Break to grab lunch

11:40 Wrap up/Next Steps

- Identify next steps with RFP
- Assign homework
- Presentation to Steering Committee on May 10: What? Who?
- Next Subcommittee meeting date and location

12:00 Adjourn

Meeting Summary

Subcommittee Members Present:

Kristan Mitchell, Pam Peck, Loretta Pickerell, Amy Roth, Kristin Leichner, Dave Larmouth, Sarah Grimm, Shannon Martin, and Timm Schimke

Not Present: Michael Wisth

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>.**

DEQ Staff: Justin Gast, Steve Siegel, and Peter Spendelow

Members of the Public: None

Facilitation Team: Robin Harkless and Amy Delahanty

Robin welcomed the group and introductions were made. Robin shared the goal of the meeting was to undergo a gap analysis exercise to understand how well Oregon's current system meets the desired future state key functions described and agreed to at the previous SC meeting. This information will be used to help inform the research and information gathering to determine if other frameworks perform those functions well and how they might be applied in Oregon. Robin noted it's anticipated the contractor's report will show the group different ways a framework can achieve those functions and the SC will identify what options for frameworks are most appropriate for Oregon. Following this, the group was invited to begin the exercise determining 1.) If the desired function is currently happening; 2) if so, how it performs; and 3.) any need for improvement?

Goals and Measures: *Uses goals and metrics to measure progress and support ongoing improvement.*

How well does it perform the function: B/ B-

Is this function currently happening? Yes, but...

- The goals and metrics are not in place system wide.
- The goals and metrics vary across the system.
- Right now the metrics are weight based, rather than based on the goals articulated in the 2050 vision.

Materials Collected: *Identifies beneficial materials acceptable for collection programs.*

How well does it perform the function: C

Is this function currently happening? Yes, but...

- There is no common understanding of what "beneficial" means in this context and there are different approaches across programs regarding what is considered a beneficial material.
- Materials collected are mixed across the system and there is a lack of uniform criteria / standard.
- We are far from meeting environmental benefits described in the 2050 vision and there is a disconnect between environmental values and economic values.
- Generally, the state is doing well collecting materials that are considered high value (e.g. paper, metals, and some plastics), but not doing well on keeping low value materials out.

Potential future research questions/needs identified:

- How do other systems define and measure “beneficial materials.”
- How do other system frameworks do materials collection?
- Economic analysis of the Oregon recycling system

Collection: *Collects clean, acceptable materials for processing.*

Currently happening, but...

- Room for improvement re: education and what is on the list.
- Varied contamination reduction plans across programs.
- 10% contamination co-mingle: but facilities have consistently been able to take materials.
- **See: Education/Outreach**

Education and Outreach: *Educates and encourages residents and businesses to use the system properly; Engages the public to understand the benefits and the costs of recycling, preventing waste and reducing impacts of materials throughout their life cycles.*

How well does it perform the function: A on volume of education and outreach; C for effectiveness.

Is this function currently happening? Yes, but...

- There is inconsistent education and outreach to consumers, dependent on relationship, financial and staff resources.
- Education is not well coordinated or “harmonized” across the (Metro) region. There are many outreach campaigns happening, but there seems to be redundancies in the system.
- No clear best practices for effective engagement strategies.
- No cost benefit analysis to determine how much resources to put into education and outreach.
- New awareness re: contamination -- no clear strategy.

Future research questions/needs:

- Cost/benefit analysis of education and outreach
- Effective education strategies to influence behavior change

Transparency and Accountability: *Ensures materials are managed responsibly from collection through end markets; ensures all players in the system perform responsibly.*

How well does it perform the function: Transparency through collection is A. Transparency through processors B. End markets – F

Is this function currently happening? Yes, but...

- No transparency through end markets.
- The system is weak on reporting requirements regarding where materials go after they are collected at the curb. (It was noted that as of January 1, Metro will require high level of reporting from the MRFs in that jurisdiction.
- Feedback loops are inconsistent; not clear or easy to show what rates/rate increases pay for.

Future research questions/needs:

- How do you get a system that has a secondary processor?
- What are the types of incentives that create the right level of cooperation needed to make a change?
- How do you operationalize collection systems?
- What are the responsibilities of all the players?
- What are the different types of contractual arrangements that might be applied in Oregon?

Potential tradeoff question to the public:

- Would you pay more if your recyclables stayed within a domestic market?

Processing: *Ensures processing facilities receive clean materials and in sufficient volumes.*

Produces quality materials that reach end markets.

The group determined they could offer initial perspective but need voice of processors to weigh in on this piece of the analysis.

- What does the public value? Not calibrated to public's needs
- Sufficient volumes for processors difficult because there are 6 processors.

- No current control; not clear where we want end markets to be.

Needs more study. See next steps below.

Next steps.

Robin shared the group will meet on May 3rd at ORRA Headquarters to continue the gap analysis exercise. She noted the subcommittee co-chairs will share the group's progress and draft research RFP for the Steering Committee's awareness at its May 10th meeting for feedback. Robin confirmed the Steering Committee will not be asked to do a consensus check on the draft research RFP document, but rather, be given an update and offer suggested feedback and comments to liaisons.

- Several group members recognized each of the end markets/processors have varying perspectives on processing within the system. It was suggested the group attempt to address the function in the gap analysis, while also encouraging the selected consultant individually interview the processors in the system for additional information.

Resource database. Kristan Mitchell, ORRA, shared the compiled index of information and associated timeline of past research from ORRA's files. She hoped the database of resources might help inform the subcommittee's future conversations as well as the contractor research to avoid reinventing the wheel on certain aspects. She then invited members to provide any feedback to the timeline document after the meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 12:30 p.m.