



Recycling Steering Committee

Modernizing Oregon's recycling system with support from Oregon Consensus

Frameworks Subcommittee Meeting

May 3, 2019, 10 a.m. -1 p.m.

Agenda

Location: Oregon Refuse & Recycling Association, 727 Center Street NE, Salem OR 9730, 1st Floor Conference Room

Conference call-in information: Dial 971-256-0996
Participant Code: 295264

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.
- **Whole System and Responsibility Functions:** Continue with worksheet exercise to create a gap analysis to inform key areas for research.
- 11:45 Break to grab lunch
- 12:00 Continue as needed with Gap Analysis
- 12:15 Review research scope of work: any changes based on today's analysis?
- 12:45 Wrap up/Next Steps
- Identify next steps with RFP
 - Assign homework
 - Presentation to Steering Committee on May 10: What? Who?
 - Next Frameworks Subcommittee meeting date and location
- 1:00 Adjourn

Meeting action item memo

Subcommittee Members Present:

Kristan Mitchell, Pam Peck, Loretta Pickerell, Amy Roth, Kristin Leichner, Dave Larmouth, Sarah

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>.**

Grimm, Shannon Martin, Michael Wisth, and Timm Schimke

DEQ Staff: Justin Gast and Peter Spendelow

Members of the Public: N/A

Facilitation Team: Robin Harkless and Amy Delahanty

ACTION ITEMS:

ACTION	BY WHOM?	BY WHEN?
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Send revised SOW to Oregon Consensus for Steering Committee review. Edits include “plain language” and ensuring DEQ address bias in its key qualifications language to proposers.	DEQ	5/6/2019
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Shannon Martin to present Gresham Rate Stabilization Fund to subcommittee members.	Shannon Martin	Future subcommittee meeting
<ul style="list-style-type: none">OC to send meeting summary to subcommittee members	OC	5/10/2019

Welcome & Meeting Purpose: Robin welcomed the group and introductions were made. Robin shared the goals of the meeting were to: continue with the 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; and review the draft Legal/Relational research scope of work. Robin shared the group wouldn’t be rating on an A-F scale how well the current system performs each function, but rather, the group would describe how it performs and identify areas for improvement. Following this, the group was invited to begin the exercise.

Whole System Design: *Optimizes the benefits of recycling considering life cycle-impacts and costs.*

Is this function currently happening? No.

- The system currently is not fully designed with life cycle analysis in mind. There are some best practices in place, but no policy directing the system to use DEQ’s Waste Impact Calculator model.

Resiliently adapts to changes in materials supply and end-market demand.

Is this function currently happening? No.

- Changes in the market create challenges for MRFs; investments in technology are costly and there is a reluctance to put in place long-term capital improvements with constant changes in the market.

- Collectors are not able to control the flow of materials. This leaves MRFs having to deal with the materials even if there is no market at all.
- Besides rate payers, there isn't a buffer to withstand the stress to the system.
- Uncertainty in the market makes it difficult for the system to stay resilient and nimble.
- Changes in accepted materials list poses a challenge for public education and behaviors.
- No risk sharing in the system to create buffers; e.g. no long-term contracts, statewide policies or priority investments, etc..
- Equity issue: not all prices are created equal for every hauler which also reflects inequities for ratepayers..

Provides equitable and sustainable financing for stable operations and capital investments.

Is this function currently happening? It's mixed.

- For collections there are franchise agreements that provide stable funding
- For processors, there are not equitable capital investments.
- There is no general economic development strategy or clear articulation of the desired capital investments needed over time.
- There is no designated fund for modernizing Oregon's recycling system to help with the recycling market volatility, such as Gresham's Rate Stabilization Fund.

ACTION ITEM/FUTURE AGENDA TOPIC: Shannon to share his presentation of the Gresham Rate Stabilization Fund.

Integrates system components to achieve overall system goals:

- Transparency challenges integration among the system players.
- Enforcement tools are applied inconsistently.
- There are communication gaps between MRFs and the haulers.
- There isn't the ability to have local control over the markets.
- There isn't an adequate amount of shared risk across the system.
- There aren't many system supports to MRFs.

Includes mechanisms to reduce impacts of materials.

- This function may be within the Steering Committee's scope of work if addressed through a Life Cycle Analysis (LCA) perspective. If looking through a LCA lens, it's not high functioning because LCA isn't yet the driver to reduce impacts of materials.
- There is a need to incorporate elements of LCA to help drive better system design.
- This is an opportunity to reframe recycling and articulate its benefits in terms of life-cycle thinking. This may lead to consumer behavior change and helping them to consume differently.

Designs for equity - examining the burdens and benefits across the state.

- Current infrastructure is not designed for equity.
- For multifamily units there is inconsistent access to services.
 - Owners of multifamily housing have a larger role in determining whether or not communities have access to recycling, rather than single family homes in the same jurisdiction.
- End markets have an impact on citizens.
- There is a difference between access and “convenient” access. No equity design for convenient access..
- There aren’t shared responsibilities across MRFs.
- There isn’t responsibility for producers in the system.
- There are unique challenges that impact rural communities. Decisions in recycling programs differ across rural communities and the ability to recycle and use collection drop offs are limited.
- There are conflicts to urban “neighbors” of MRFs.
- Economy - not equitable access to jobs/shares into the system.

Potential future research questions/needs identified:

- Look in to models that strike a balance between statewide standardization and local flexibility.
- What are the different mechanisms that help stabilize the recycling system when there’s volatility in the market?
- Could there be a regional approach /model legislation to develop guidelines to influence distributor packaging?
- Would businesses in Oregon be willing to buy one type of take out container? Are there other systems better addressing take out container / compost issues?
- What types of interventions most influence producers and distributors who are sending misleading messages to consumers?
- What types of partnerships exist that foster more transparency and accountability across the system?
- What about enforcement mechanisms to ensure transparency and accountability across the system?
- What are other financing models that can support economic development?

Inquiry to processors: What are the challenges you experience as a MRF and what would support you and/or be tolerable to you. Is there enough volume in material in Oregon for each MRF to be sustainable?

Responsibility - *Shares responsibility for the system among players including residents and businesses, producers, state and local governments and recycling industry.*

Is this function currently happening?

- Collectors and local governments do share responsibility well in the current system. Responsibilities between processors and end markets is not shared.
- There is no producer responsibility, involvement, or incentive to making it easier to recycle.
- There is an overburden on ratepayers.
- Decision making is not shared across the system.
- No capital investment strategy involving all parties.

Draft Research Scope of Work. Loretta Pickerell provided a brief overview of the Legal and Relational Framework Research scope of work; general approach to working with the selected contractor; and reviewed the tasks and definitions outlined in the RFP. Loretta underscored there is an expectation of an iterative process and that the contractor would interface with the subcommittee on each of the tasks outlined in the RFP. This would include the subcommittee working together to select the preferred models and/or components to be researched and potentially negotiating with the contractor prior to signing a contract.

There was a question about the reasoning behind the specificity in the number of frameworks (4-6) listed in the SOW. Loretta clarified DEQ wanted to provide flexibility in the contract to allow for variety in the types of components people cared about but also manage expectations about work load. There was then a small discussion about preferred qualities in the contractor selection. It was stressed that a balanced team of contractors is important, and the selection process should include subcommittee members. Finally, research results should be presented in “plain language”. Members felt it was important the language be clear, concise, well-organized, and appropriate for a non-technical audience.

Next steps in the RFP process includes:

- Following Steering Committee review at their May 10 meeting, DEQ will send the RFP to its business office and the process for 30 days.
- With DEQ, a select group of subcommittee members will review proposals.
- Mid-June: the subcommittee will work together to identify models and/or framework components they would like the contractor to study; and drafts of evaluation criteria to assist their review of models.
- Following negotiation with the contractor, DEQ will issue a notice to award the contract. (Expected timeframe August.)

AGREEMENT: Following this, the members present approved by consensus the draft research scope of work. There was **strong consensus** among the group (all 1s and 2s with the exception of one 3). One subcommittee member shared a concern about the complexity of the work and suggested the subcommittee help to simplify the workload by doing some of the work themselves.

Appendix A: Flip Charts

