



Oregon Department of Environmental Quality

System Expansion:

Funding and Reimbursement for Collection and Recycling of the Uniform Statewide Collection List

Checklist for Recycling Council program plan review:

- Subcommittee Members: Dylan de Thomas, Steve Kramer, Laura Leebrick, and Angie Marzano
- DEQ support person: Arianne Sperry
- Focal plan section: Operations plan: Collection and recycling of USCL materials

	DEQ feedback	Council feedback
Overall Feedback on Plan Section:	<p>With respect to system expansion funding (ORS 459A.890(5)): In multiple areas more detail is needed, but the Oregon Recycling System Optimization Project could deliver this detail in an updated draft. Ideally the DEQ and Recycling Council reviews will provide clarity to CAA for level of detail expected in the second draft.</p> <p>With respect to transportation reimbursement (ORS 459A.890(2)): The use of standard rates per mile may not deliver desired rural-urban equity, and we have concerns about the need to pre-approve shipments. More detail is also needed with respect to the reimbursement calculation methodology.</p> <p>Finally, regarding other reimbursements to local governments (i.e., ORS 459A.890(3)-(4) and (6)): The second draft is an opportunity to include updates and fill in missing details.</p>	

Plan Component	Statute or Rule Citation	Is the requirement met? (yes, no, conditionally)	DEQ feedback	Council feedback
A schedule for implementing collection program expansions and improvements throughout the state.¹	ORS 459A.875(2)(p)(A) and OAR 340-090-0790(1)(a)		A schedule is laid out on pg 21 but it does not specify that all eligible costs will be funded by end of 2027. Add priority level and funding amount per local government to Table 2 on p. 22.	
The proposed approach for funding eligible costs identified in the needs assessment in a way that upholds the prioritization laid out in rule, with funding offered to local governments in higher tiers of priority before it is offered to local governments in lower tiers of priority	OAR 340-090-0790(1)(b)		The plan reflects an approach that is intended to deliver funding in order of prioritization in rule. When Table 2 on p 22 is populated to show exactly where each LG is fitting into the prioritization (envisioned in draft 2), then it will be possible to verify that the approach is delivering the intended prioritization and approve this element.	
A description of how the use of existing infrastructure will be maximized.	ORS 459A.875(2)(a)(C)		CAA has included this piece as a criterion in the ORSOP, but how this will be assessed and achieved at the individual LG basis is not spelled out.	

¹ The schedule should fund all eligible expenses from the first needs assessment within the program plan period.

Plan Component	Statute or Rule Citation	Is the requirement met? (yes, no, conditionally)	DEQ feedback	Council feedback
The estimated amount of funding to be disbursed, overall.²	OAR 340-090-0790(2)(b) and OAR 340-090-0790(1)(e)		Ranges only provided in first draft – see pg 22, Table 1. When updated in second draft and ranges are replaced with single numeric estimates this could be approved.	
The estimated amount of funding to be disbursed to individual local governments.			This is missing and is presumably envisioned for the second draft.	
Methods for calculating reimbursement amounts for transportation costs in accordance with established requirements, including:	OAR 340-090-0780(1)		<p>CAA proposes to use standardized rates per ton per mile for these reimbursements. DEQ has concerns with this approach, which could penalize rural communities relative to urban ones, especially those distant from the major trucking corridors (I-5 and I-84, Hwy 97).</p> <p>The proposed method also entails, per pg 28, pre-approval of eligible shipments. This is inconsistent with intent and the basic concept of “reimbursement”. Why is pre-approval necessary? It has the potential of slowing down</p>	

² Note: for the first draft of the plan submitted to the department, a PRO could submit rough estimates—for example, estimates expressed as ranges—or could wait until its second draft submission to indicate the per-government estimates.

Plan Component	Statute or Rule Citation	Is the requirement met? (yes, no, conditionally)	DEQ feedback	Council feedback
			shipments and disrupting operations, unless CAA can guarantee near-instantaneous review and approval of requests.	
an approach for enabling fluctuations in input costs, such as fuel, to automatically factor into the reimbursement amounts over time;	OAR 340-090-0780(1)(a)		The intent to account for fluctuations in input costs in the reimbursement rates is noted, but the approach to doing so is not described in detail. In the second draft, provide calculation methodology, including data sources, and process/schedule for updating standard rates per mile.	
a voluntary option that allows local governments or service providers and a producer responsibility organization to agree to transfer some or all transportation responsibilities to the producer responsibility organization or coordinating body;	OAR 340-090-0780(1)(b)		CAA proposes to provide such an option on pg. 29-30.	
a means of accounting for proximity to an appropriate commingled recycling processing facility or responsible end market that has capacity to process or	OAR 340-090-0780(1)(c)		A general methodology is laid out in page 27-29 and it accounts for multiple factors (different loads including mixed loads, distances), but it is silent on how PRO will determine whether a	

Plan Component	Statute or Rule Citation	Is the requirement met? (yes, no, conditionally)	DEQ feedback	Council feedback
recycle the material and other factors that could affect transportation costs.			closer facility (that a community bypasses) has "capacity."	
a description of the mandatory consultations with local governments and service providers that informed the development of the methods; and	OAR 340-090-0780(1)(d)		CAA has conducted preliminary consultations that informed its approach, but consultations on the detailed methods are foreseen for later as part of the ORSOP. In the second draft, list LGs and SPs consulted to indicate representation throughout the state and describe feedback received.	
a description of opportunities that were identified for increasing efficiency and achieving full transport loads (e.g. an approach for balancing the environmental benefits of transportation efficiency with the environmental impacts of baling ³)		n/a	The section entitled "Material Compaction" on pg 30 addresses this issue; however, it does not clearly state what options for compaction will be allowed/disallowed or incentivized/disincentivized.	
Methods for advance funding and reimbursements to local governments, a local government's service provider or other person	ORS 459A.875(2)(o)		-Add in section on contamination evaluation (ORS 459A.890(3)) -Update contamination reduction programming funding to account for draft proposed rules	

³ To address these trade-offs, the prospective PRO could indicate in this section whether or not materials will be baled at recycling depot or reload facilities and provide a justification for the proposed approach.

Plan Component	Statute or Rule Citation	Is the requirement met? (yes, no, conditionally)	DEQ feedback	Council feedback
<p>authorized by the local government to receive payment under ORS 459A.890⁴, including</p>			<p>- On pg 24 it is indicated that efficiency measures “may be developed for considering applications for funding.” That would imply that CAA either intends to offer additional (non-statutorily required) funding, or intends to apply some screening criteria to its statutorily-mandated funding requirements. The former case is curious (would like to know more), while the latter could risk failure to fund eligible costs. Either way, the statement raises questions and more detail should be provided.</p>	
<p>a method for determining funding or reimbursement amounts under ORS 459A.890(5), including</p>	<p>OAR 340-090-0790(1)(d) OAR 340-090-0810</p>		<p>The approach to determining reimbursement amounts for 890(5) funding is laid out on pg 23-25. It includes a section regarding dispute settlement that involves the convening of a multistakeholder working group that will confirm types of expenses eligible for compensation. Such a working group may serve a useful</p>	

⁴ Herein included is funding for local governments/service providers periodic contamination evaluation (ORS 459A.890(3)), and contamination reduction programming (ORS 459A.890(4)). Considerations with respect to funding methods include how the order of funding will be prioritized and how equity considerations therein have been taken into account.

Plan Component	Statute or Rule Citation	Is the requirement met? (yes, no, conditionally)	DEQ feedback	Council feedback
			purpose, but statute (ORS 459A.875(2)(e)) does require the program plan to lay out a clear pathway for effective resolution of conflicts; the working group proposal is insufficient. As such, additional detail is needed here in the second draft.	
sample invoicing forms with details to be included in reimbursement or advanced funding requests from local governments or their authorized service providers.	OAR 340-090-0790(1)(f)		CAA needs to provide in second draft.	
Any additional funding to local governments or other measures for the purpose of protecting ratepayers from increased costs	ORS 459A.875(2)(k)		CAA on page 33 proposes to provide local governments with an annual summary of RMA funding in relation to materials collected in their jurisdictions so that these amounts can be reviewed by local governments when conducting recycling ratepayer reviews.	
A method for estimating and reimbursing the possible additional costs of local government compliance with ORS 459A.908 (the requirement that all roll carts	ORS 459A.890(6)		More detail could be provided here – what are the specific requirements for local governments to make claims for payment to cover the possible price premium between 10%+	

Plan Component	Statute or Rule Citation	Is the requirement met? (yes, no, conditionally)	DEQ feedback	Council feedback
purchased after January 1, 2026, must contain at least 10% post-consumer recycled content).			PCR content roll carts and virgin-material carts.	

Translation and other formats

[Español](#) | [한국어](#) | [繁體中文](#) | [Русский](#) | [Tiếng Việt](#) | [العربية](#)

800-452-4011 | TTY: 711 | deqinfo@deq.oregon.gov

Non-discrimination statement

DEQ does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, disability, age or sex in administration of its programs or activities. Visit DEQ's [Civil Rights and Environmental Justice page](#)