Materials Management Program

Recycling Modernization Act: Material List Technical Workgroup

Meeting Summary: Meeting #1

March 23, 2022

Zoom

List of Technical Workgroup Members in attendance

- Brian May
- Dan Weston
- Dave Claugus
- Dave Larmouth
- David McCall
- Jerry Powell
- Kate Eagles
- Kim Holmes
- Laura Leebrick
- Nicole Willett

- Rosalynn Greene
- Steve Miller
- Wayne Jackson

DEQ project staff

- David Allaway
- Justin Gast
- Peter Canepa
- Peter Spendelow



Materials Management

700 NE Multnomah St., Suite 600 Portland, OR 97232

Phone: 503-229-5479 Contact: David Allaway

www.oregon.gov/DEQ

DEQ is a leader in restoring, maintaining and enhancing the quality of Oregon's air, land and water.

Time	Topic
8:30 a.m.	Welcome, agenda review, introductions Justin Gast and David Allaway welcomed and thanked Technical Workgroup members. David noted that the Workgroup members represent a variety of perspectives and bring a wealth of information and perspective from Oregon, other states, and Canada. Members and DEQ staff introduced themselves.
8:50 a.m.	Roadmap and Charter; Questions and Answers David Allaway provided an overview of ORS 459A.914, and described the steps that will conclude with an administrative rulemaking that will define material lists for local government and producer responsibility organization recycling obligations. He noted that the law allows for ongoing evaluation and revisions to those lists even after the first rulemaking is complete. He noted several different consequences of the material lists to local governments, commingled processing facilities, and producer responsibility organizations. He then outlined 5 different methods that DEQ will use to gather information to evaluate materials against the statutory criteria contained in ORS 459A.914(3) and shared several of DEQ's expectations for that evaluation. He then invited questions about the charter of this Technical Workgroup.
9:15 a.m.	Evaluation criteria and first draft of evaluation matrix DEQ invited questions and feedback on a document describing an evaluation rubric including definitions of criteria, and a very incomplete list and draft evaluation of materials. Staff noted that the list would grow in advance of future meetings as DEQ continues to gather information and evaluate additional materials.

Comments/questions included the following. DEQ responded to all questions – those noted with an asterisk are being further evaluated by DEQ. Several topics generated responses and discussion between Workgroup members.

- Is DEQ planning for the markets and infrastructure in Oregon today, or the markets and infrastructure that could happen in the future? Will Oregon exclude materials just because area MRFs currently can't handle them?
- Is it desirable to plan on the likelihood of removing materials (by rule) from rule-adopted lists if markets fail to materialize (or disappear), or is it better to take a more cautious/conservative approach?
- How are "responsible end markets" defined?*
- Does chemical recycling count?
- Does "yield loss" account for materials not separated by the generators?
- Should there be a criterion to address the practicality of collectors identifying material?*
- Why do OCC and plastics have a "5" for "practicalities of sorting"?* Moisture
 and exposure to sunlight could be a problem if these materials are stored
 outdoors.
- Should we assume that materials ever are stored outdoors? Are they?
- How much of Oregon's plastics go to Asia?* Given lack of transparency in downstream processes, how confident is DEQ in draft evaluation scores for plastics?*
- Is it a problem if materials are exported?

Drop-off recycling

Justin Gast and Peter Canepa introduced this topic with short presentations. Justin noted that ORS 459A.914(1)(b) allows the Environmental Quality Commission to identify materials that PROs must collect via depots or mobile collection events. DEQ surveyed depot program operations around Oregon and the US to better understand what makes for successful depot collection. Peter Canepa introduced DEQ's plans to evaluate drop-off/depot collection using life cycle assessment and social cost assessment, and noted the potential importance of – and lack of data involving – user behavior (transportation/delivery impacts). Staff invited Workgroup members to share data, best practices, and questions.

T 1 / 1

Workgroup members shared several ideas including:

- Indoor/covered areas are best, especially in windy/rainy areas.
- Supervision or the "illusion of supervision" helps to reduce contamination.
- Depot services have declined in the Metro region in recent years.
- Rogue Disposal operates a successful depot system for glass.
- Glass might be a good candidate to remove from on-route collection especially if the bottle bill is expanded.
- 90% of recycling in Tillamook County is depot-based; users bring smaller volumes and make more frequent visits if driving shorter distances; users bring larger volumes if driving longer distances.
- Canada relies on staffed depots; cameras/staffing and bins that require sorting (vs. commingled) reduce contamination.
- Marion County relies heavily on transfer stations. Unstaffed locations are problematic; illegal dumping is resulting in the closure of Garten Service's

10:00 a.m.

	 public drop-off. Rural areas such as upper Santiam Canyon want depots but they generate small volumes. There may be some opportunities to collect some data from users. 	
10:30 a.m.	Proposed scenarios for economic and environmental evaluation David Allaway introduced DEQ's plans to contract with Cascadia Consulting Group and to update an analytical framework that was first developed for the Recycling Steering Committee. The framework is a scenario modeling tool that can be used to evaluate transactional costs, environmental impacts, and full social costs. David then introduced twenty different scenarios that DEQ is proposing to task Cascadia to evaluate during the Technical Workgroup phase of this larger project, and invited questions and feedback on those scenarios.	
	 Discussion among Workgroup members included the following topics: How is "mixed paper" defined and communicated to the public? Will the state allow for more than one uniform statewide collection list? For example, one list for the Willamette Valley, and a simpler list elsewhere? Will mobile collection events be modeled? Will cities with populations under 4,000 be eligible for PRO funding? 	
11:10 a.m.	Public input Gary Panknin of PakTech expressed his hope that the Recycling Modernization Act will result in an improvement in recycling infrastructure. His company produces a plastic beverage can holder that is collected at more than 550 retail drop-offs. But volumes are low and logistics are difficult. Could this material be collected on-route? DEQ and Workgroup members discussed some of the practicalities/challenges of doir so, as well as an expanded "more plastics" depot/drop-off option.	
11:25 a.m.	Next steps David and Justin thanked the group for their engaged participation and noted that DE will send out a doodle poll to schedule the next meeting. David noted that the pace ar length of meetings will increase as the spring and summer progresses.	
11:30 a.m.	Adjourn.	

List of other attendees

Abby Boudouris Andriana Kontrovrakis Ashley Elzinga Brennan Georgianni Bryce Hesterman Carolina Paez Carol Patterson Chris Bell Colette Bazirgan Elena Bertocci Evyan Andries	Gary Oxley Gary Panknin Heather Trim Hugh Ady Isabelle Borkowski Jeff Newgard Jennifer Dresler Jessica Branon-Zwick Joel Baxter John Bush John Laughead Jordan Bice	Jordan Fengel Katy McDowell KJ Lewis Lauren Aguilar Matt Markee Monica DeBaca Nicholas Georges Nicole Mann Rachel Perlman Sabrina Correll Sam Schlaich
---	---	--

Samantha Siegner Steve Alexander Shannon Crawford Thomas Cuomo

Alternative formats

DEQ can provide documents in an alternate format or a language other than English upon request. Call DEQ at 800-452-4011 or email $\underline{deqinfo@deq.state.or.us}$.