



Recycling Steering Committee

Modernizing Oregon's recycling system with support from Oregon Consensus

Recycling System Steering Committee

Meeting Summary

January 17, 2020

10am - 3pm

DEQ Headquarters

700 NE Multnomah St, Portland, OR (Third floor conference room)

ACTION ITEMS:

ACTION	BY WHOM?	BY WHEN?
● Draft meeting summary to SC members	OC	Completed.
● Send any additional comments and questions regarding Task 1 Collection Case Study research to Brian Stafki.	ALL	January 22nd
● Provide any additional infrastructure elements for Cascadia to consider in building the first draft scenarios to Brian Stafki.	All	January 24th
● Provide feedback on the draft January 31 post-session survey to DEQ	ALL	January 27th at 8am

Meeting Attendees:

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

Facilitation Team: Robin Harkless and Amy Delahanty

DEQ Staff: Lydia Emer, Sanne Stienstra, Justin Gast, Brian Stafki

MEETING SUMMARY:

Welcome and Agenda Review

Facilitator Robin Harkless, Oregon Consensus, welcomed the group and Recycling Steering Committee (RSC) members provided brief introductions. Robin then reviewed the meeting agenda and purpose, which were for RSC members to have an opportunity to review the [preliminary results of Cascadia's collection infrastructure research](#); provide feedback and input to Cascadia to help guide their next steps for analysis; follow up on equity discussions from 12/17 RSC meeting; and do final preparations for the 1/31 Information Session.

Infrastructure Research (DEQ/Cascadia Consulting Research Team)

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 Recycling, Far West Recycling, Lane County, League of Oregon Cities, Metro, NORPAC, Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, Oregon Refuse & Recycling Assoc., City of Portland, The Recycling Partnership, Rogue Disposal & Recycling, Waste Connections, and Waste Management. **For more information, visit <https://go.usa.gov/xmYYe>.**



Recycling Steering Committee

Modernizing Oregon's recycling system with support from Oregon Consensus

Brian reviewed the updated infrastructure research scope and road map with RSC members. He noted that DEQ is closer to finalizing the contract with Cascadia for Phase II Task 5-6 (developing and evaluating the scenarios). Concurrently, Tasks 1-4 of the contract are underway and DEQ, the RSC and the Infrastructure Research Subcommittee have been working with Cascadia on these tasks to improve Oregon's recycling infrastructure.

(Facilitator's note: As a reminder, the general timeline of Phase II tasks for the research were generally as follows:

- Task 1: Looked into dual-stream collection. (Completed.)
- Task 2: Processing case study research — Will be presented at the February 13th Infrastructure Subcommittee meeting.
- Task 3: Education/compliance research literature review — parallel process, will feed into results during scenario development. Results expected February, 28th.
- Task 4: Baseline system cost and material modeling — Draft model to be presented at the March 12th Infrastructure Research Subcommittee meeting.
- Task 5-6: Scenario building. Assuming contract amendment can be completed, first round will begin in March with definitions anticipated to be confirmed February 28th. Second round expected to begin May 15th. Dates subject to change if DEQ can't execute the contract amendment in time.

Brian noted that Tasks 1 and 2 of the research are nearly complete. He reminded the group that the purpose of the collection case study research from Cascadia was an initial look at dual-stream options and not intended to be a comparison of dual versus single stream. The research is intended to inform the RSC in determining elements for study in infrastructure scenarios (Tasks 5&6).

Task 1 collection case studies results presentation and Q&A

Jessica Branom-Zwick (Cascadia Consulting Group) and subcontractor Chris Bell (Bell & Associates), introduced themselves to the RSC. Chris noted for this task, Cascadia researched two types of collection systems to understand the operations, costs, impacts, and changes necessary if Oregon were to migrate from the state's standard single-stream system with glass on the side to a dual-stream system (dual-stream of paper/fiber and mixed containers/other materials, with glass continuing to be collected separately). Again, the goal of this task was to provide the RSC with information on alternative collection methods that will help them decide which collection methods to include in scenario analysis. During the presentation, Chris provided an overview of the two-cart and split-cart systems highlighted for this case study research; discussed the benefits and drawbacks of single and dual-stream collection; and provided high-level recommendations for consideration (please see PPT for additional detail). Following Chris's presentation, the following questions and comments were shared by RSC members:



Recycling Steering Committee

Modernizing Oregon's recycling system with support from Oregon Consensus

Comment: On one study I saw, there was at least one number—that even with dual stream, in bound contamination—was 15%.

- *Cascadia Response:* I believe that was Mill Valley. For that case study, anecdotal research was provided. During the interview, the processor also suggested their contamination rate is less than 10%. A lot of that has to do with materials that they think are recyclable and do not have a market.

Comment: In the video that was shown during the presentation, everything that was going in the truck was bagged.

- *Cascadia Response:* That video was used as an example to show a split cart. The contents were garbage and compost, not dual-stream recycling.

Question: One program said they went to dual stream and cut processing costs by \$40 a ton. When was the study done which showed the savings?

- *Cascadia Response:* That happened in Marin County during the last quarter of 2018. Mill Valley Refuse used to take their materials to San Jose, and then took it to a MRF in Marin County.

Question: How were the savings calculated? Was a significant amount of that freight? Is it the value of material itself?

- *Cascadia (Follow-up) Response:* The savings that Mill Valley Refuse realized was the difference in processing cost between what they were paying for single stream processing in San Jose and what Marin Sanitation was charging for dual stream processing. The drive time cost from Mill Valley to San Jose was not part of the \$40 per ton savings.

Question: Wouldn't we have to collect weekly just to accommodate volumes of OCC?

- *Cascadia Response:* I think you would collect materials weekly to accommodate the level of materials being set out, with fibers, including OCC, collected one week and containers another week.

Question: Are you implying that we would have to go to a larger cart for OCC collection?

- *Cascadia Response:* For some, it might be a reasonable to provide 96 [gallons] for cardboard and 35 [gallons] for containers. That would be a good question.

Comment: This is helpful. I find that I come to a different conclusion of needing additional research. My takeaway is that split carts don't work functionally and dual carts have additional cost. I can't foresee a large, dense urban area where this option could be considered.

Question: We currently have a dual-stream system with glass. Other systems have higher glass and others have lower contamination. People have wishful recycling. What's the difference in those systems, with our system with wishful recycling?



Recycling Steering Committee

Modernizing Oregon's recycling system with support from Oregon Consensus

- *Cascadia Response:* Yes wishful recycling exists, and if you adjust to the right size of the garbage container, it may compel people to use the recycling cart correctly in Oregon. If you did do this system, there's a balance between outreach and education; size of the container; size of the recycling cart; and setting rates to accommodate size of recycling stream.

Comment: It's hard to determine whether contamination reduction was due to cart or due to education efforts that occurred at the same time. Do you think some of the improvement is due to a pilot project being initiated, or that education happened in parallel?

- *Cascadia Response:* I think it's both. When I spoke with Jim at Mill Valley, they spent a lot of time doing outreach. For example, drivers would flip the lid and if there was contamination, they would tag it and do that actively. Is it that much more costly to do a system like that versus automated collection? Without delving into a particular system, it is difficult to conclude the differential in costs for this type of system vs. automated collection.

Question: The State of California is incentivizing dual-stream collection in the state. Did the examples you provide in these case studies report any incentives to go to split cart system? Was that part of the decision-making?

- *Cascadia Response:* Incentives haven't gone into effect yet.

Question: I'm wondering about whether there were cameras on some of these trucks to monitor contamination levels?

- *Cascadia Response:* I think most trucks come with that option in the hopper. Some haulers in the Metro region help do that with their outreach efforts (e.g. Pride Disposal). As a general note, once the cart dumps in the tipper, they won't send a driver to get the contamination out. They assume most haulers will use the camera for contamination

Question: Was there any look of stackable bins for containers?

- *Cascadia Response:* I didn't look at any particular stackable container for that. (They also noted that in one case example, they switched away from stackables to accommodate more bin space.)

Question: For Mill Valley, they went from single stream with glass, to two stream?

- *Cascadia Response:* I believe so. I assume they mix everything in the container.
- *RSC Comment:* Without knowing that efforts to educate and enforce on contamination are consistent across the board, it is difficult to compare the effectiveness of different collection systems. It is not necessarily apples to apples.
- *Comment:* Cascadia also conducted a broader literature review that included research with larger sample sets (e.g. University of Miami and a study out of Ontario) that looked



Recycling Steering Committee

Modernizing Oregon's recycling system with support from Oregon Consensus

at multiple communities that did sample gathering. Were there efforts to control for the Hawthorne Effect?

- *Cascadia Response:* We can follow up to see whether or not those studies controlled for other factors.

ACTION ITEM: RSC will send any additional comments and questions regarding Task 1 Collection Case Study research to Brian Stafki (DEQ) by Wednesday, January 22nd.

Provide initial input on infrastructure elements for February scenario-building

Brian reiterated that the first three research projects (Tasks 1-3) are at a fairly high level of information. The next steps will be for the RSC to determine what, if any, additional information would be needed to be included in the scenarios for a more in-depth analysis. With regards to Tasks 5&6, given some administrative contracting challenges, the dates for scenario development are tentative, but DEQ and Cascadia will continue to work through these issues to try to stick with the current timeline. DEQ will keep the RSC apprised whether the February 28th meeting will occur for scenario development.

Jessica then provided an overview of what to expect for Tasks 5&6. She noted that the Cascadia team will propose four draft scenarios for the RSC's consideration. Cascadia will be building four draft scenario definitions based on the RSC's priorities, values, and suggested configurations, as well as the infrastructure research completed to date. Jessica noted that once the RSC has confirmed the four scenarios, Cascadia will model the scenarios, evaluate them against the evaluation criteria previously confirmed by the RSC; and compare the results to the baseline (Oregon's) system. The results of the evaluation will be a mix of quantitative information and qualitative narratives. RSC members will finalize the four proposed scenario definitions at the tentative February 28th session. (*Please see Cascadia PPT for additional details.*) Brian reminded RSC members that Task 4 will be developing the base case modeling and assumptions. He stated the RSC and Infrastructure Subcommittee members will be able to look "under the hood" at a Subcommittee meeting on March 12, 2020 to look at those assumptions and results. RSC comments and questions were as follows:

Comment & Question: Are you planning to take a holistic approach to employment evaluation?

- *Cascadia Response:* We won't be making value judgement regarding the "quality" of different types of jobs, but plan to report out number of jobs by type. We will be talking about FTEs and we will present the information with the context that we can. It will be up to the RSC to determine how you want to evaluate that as criteria.
- *Comment:* Building on the last comment, we want to know how much of the employment is temporary employment. We need to know the potential for jobs and good jobs moving



Recycling Steering Committee

Modernizing Oregon's recycling system with support from Oregon Consensus

forward. As we move forward, some tasks being done manually now could be automated in the future.

- *DEQ Response:* In a contracting conversation, DEQ and Cascadia talked about the different classifications of employment in processing. Cascadia made some distinctions.
- *Cascadia Response:* We have a meeting planned next week with MRF operators to discuss the level of input we can gather from them with regards to employment for setting the base case. This will inform how we are able to conduct our evaluation of employment. The RSC will then determine how they want to interpret this in evaluating scenarios.

Comment & Question: For the post-collection side, will you look at optical sorters?

- *Cascadia Response:* The scenario will be a snapshot of the whole system and every scenario will have processing. There will be different levels of processing technologies in every scenario depending on what the RSC wants have evaluated. For example, one scenario could leave collection untouched, and could be all about consumer facing interventions with no investments in MRFs. A second scenario could be to keep the current collection system and invest heavily in processing and nothing in consumer behavior or contamination prevention.

To initiate Cascadia's Task 5 (building the first round of scenarios) of the Infrastructure research, RSC members were then asked for suggestions of what elements they would like to see for study in a scenario, including: scope of materials collected for recycling; collection, transfer, and sorting/processing methods; scope of end markets; and customer facing intervention techniques. Cascadia also asked for feedback on which elements to show variations vs. uniformity across the state. The initial brainstormed list was provided:

- Geographic variations: urban-rural-distant rural, flexibility across the state
- Narrow statewide materials list (based on anticipated stable or secure end markets) — co-mingled only + depot + flexibility for communities to add
- More expansive depot network
- Collection events and mobile depots
- Collection — non co-mingled
- Differences across scope of acceptable/required materials list — expansive to narrow
- What markets are available for different materials? Baseline information needed
- Define “market”
- Statewide ceiling with ‘strong’ markets only. Compare to broader materials lists
- Consider printing and writing paper market forecasting. (Look at overall material trends at curb, market, and in R&D.)



Recycling Steering Committee

Modernizing Oregon's recycling system with support from Oregon Consensus

- Direct feedback, including using technology like hopper cameras, and enforcement interventions
- Consider “strong market” = strong mechanical recycling market
- Vary pricing structures based on quality as an intervention approach with haulers/customers
- Intervention — QA/QC team at MRFs

During the brainstorming session, several members discussed the importance of discussing and defining markets e.g. having a clear definition and location of end markets for specific materials. It was noted that some of the baseline information inquired about could be found in Cascadia's earlier research and DEQ stated they will share the summary of research with RSC members again to refresh their memory and understanding. It was suggested as an addition, a subgroup could discuss the definition of an end market, and it could feed into the research. Robin stated Oregon Consensus will discuss with DEQ and Cascadia a reasonable approach for getting end markets defined for the research, and circle back to RSC members regarding next steps.

ACTION: RSC members will provide any additional suggestions to the above list for Cascadia to consider in building the first draft scenarios **by Friday, January 24th**.

(Facilitator note: There will be some limited opportunity for the RSC and subcommittee members to provide additional input at the Feb. 13th Infrastructure Subcommittee meeting. That meeting might provide an opportunity to continue to discussion of what constitutes a “strong market”. The full RSC will be tasked to make any suggested refinements to the initial draft scenarios and confirm them at the Feb. 28th RSC meeting.)

Getting A Conversation Started About Equity (DEQ/RSC)

Sanne Stienstra, DEQ, engaged the RSC in a conversation about equity and how equity considerations may be incorporated into a modernized recycling system for Oregon (*see PPT for additional details*). During Sanne's presentation, there were several topics raised from RSC members, which included, but were not limited to equity versus equality; institutional racism; ways to incorporate equity considerations and measure progress in the system; fair wages; and preventing negative impacts on marginalized communities locally and abroad.

When discussing the RSC's role in advancing equity, the following comments and suggestions were provided:

- We use an equity lens to see how the various scenarios and decisions impact various communities.
- Great opportunity to talk about here and move this issue forward. Some of our agencies have mandated that we do this as we look at the system. How we are moving equity forward is really important. We need to keep bringing this discussion up.



Recycling Steering Committee

Modernizing Oregon's recycling system with support from Oregon Consensus

- We can do a lot of this through our frameworks discussion. We should contemplate how we include all of these concepts and ideas. There is the ability to use an equity lens going forward in the process. It will be important to talk about fairness and change the conversation about the system.
- We should use an equity lens every step of the way.
- There is a potential to “raise the floor” for equity in the processing sector. Sometimes addressing equity will increase costs, and MRFs are frequently under pressure to reduce costs. This has created a proverbial “race to the bottom” that government standards could address.
- People have the perception that some who “have” will become the “have nots.” There is an idea held among some that if someone else will get into an improved position, it will hurt them. We should make sure this gets addressed in our messaging: that we are working to improve things for others, but not taking away from the ones that have.

Robin observed from the conversation for the group that every member is committed and willing to bring equity into the work. Oregon Consensus and DEQ will commit to ensure equity is a topic on the agenda for future conversations, and noted equity is an important lens and criteria in the work the RSC is doing to modernizing the recycling system. Sanne then mentioned Association of Oregon Recyclers is providing a racial equity training to its members, happening on [February 6](#). Pam mentioned that the Government Alliance on Race and Equity is having its annual meeting in [Portland in April](#).

January 31st Info Session

Robin provided a brief update of the January 31 information session and revisited the meeting approach with RSC members. She reminded the group that the Information Session's primary audience is the RSC, and that additional stakeholders were being invited to accommodate the RSC's desire for them to have some direct interface with the RRS team and the analysis. The morning's presentation will be with the broader stakeholder group, followed by a short RSC meeting in the afternoon for members to have additional conversations with RRS. As such, she suggested preference should be given to the stakeholders in the morning to allow them to ask any clarifying questions. Robin noted this will be the last meeting between RSC members and the RRS team to take in the last round of analysis. She then requested that for the information session, RSC members gather and sit together at the front of the room so audience members know who is part of the Steering Committee.

Underrepresented Stakeholder Listening Sessions.

Sanne provided a brief update regarding the underrepresented stakeholder listening sessions and post-information session survey that she and members of the Stakeholder Engagement Subcommittee developed. The following key updates were shared:



Recycling Steering Committee

Modernizing Oregon's recycling system with support from Oregon Consensus

- The purpose of the listening sessions will be to incorporate views of recycling system stakeholders who are underrepresented, such as stakeholders who have historically lacked access to recycling and workforce interests. This effort is being led by the Stakeholder Engagement Subcommittee and is being co-designed and facilitated by Libby Barg Bakke (Barney & Worth).
- A post-information session survey will be shared after January 31. DEQ is requesting **feedback from the RSC on the draft survey by Monday, January 27th at 8 a.m.**

Following this, Sanne asked the RSC whether there should be a question about a statewide list on the survey. She noted that there were differing views in the Stakeholder Engagement Subcommittee regarding whether the question should be included, and requested input from the RSC on this matter. This led to a robust discussion among the RSC regarding the types of questions and feedback that will be asked and solicited from stakeholders. Several concerns were raised about how input would be integrated into the RSC process and how it will/will not inform decision making. It was suggested the survey focus on whether the process helped inform participants enough, rather than asking them to offer their opinions about the substantive content of the scenarios.

DEQ shared the purpose of the Information Session is for the RSC and others to learn more about the frameworks and to ask any follow-up questions. DEQ acknowledged the RSC is charged with making recommendations, not the general public. They felt it will be important to give stakeholders present at the meeting the opportunity to share their thoughts and feedback if they were interested and that the survey would provide a channel for that.

DEQ shared they will circulate the survey to RSC members on the 23rd for their input. They are requesting any suggested edits by January 27th at 8 a.m.

Public Comment:

Brandon Lesowske of Portland State University shared brief public comments. He pointed the RSC to operator certifications. He also requested the RSC to consider defining markets as ones that are stable and look for opportunities in markets where we have seen minimal decline. Brandon encouraged members to look at domestic markets as Oregon's first choice and seeing it as a local economic development opportunity. He shared that there is a value in baseline floor state list of materials that could be accepted. Brandon stated he agreed that other communities could increase or accept more materials through a mobile hub, or mobile transfer station.

Brandon noted the equity discussion in the afternoon was appreciated. He stated that equity is not defined at this table and encouraged members to reach out to those in the marginalized communities, like the efforts Metro did in Rosewood. He encouraged the RSC to bring



Recycling Steering Committee

Modernizing Oregon's recycling system with support from Oregon Consensus

marginalized communities into the fold to let them define equity. Brandon then shared appreciation for everyone's time and effort and that this is a pivotal moment, and large opportunity for the state.

January Presentation Outline and Graphic Concepts

Justin Gast, DEQ, and Robin briefly reviewed the January 31st presentation outline, packet materials, and proposed graphic concepts with the RSC. RSC members provided final feedback on the level of detail and format. During the discussion, the following were suggested edits provided by members:

- In the review of the format, one RSC member cautioned that the scenarios were not “endorsed by the committee.” The suggested language was that the suite of scenarios were **agreed on** for the purpose of further evaluation.
- Keep the scenarios in the similar progression as presented at the December 17th Frameworks meeting.
- Reference the arc of work of how the research came to the five scenarios.
- Change “producer oversight” to “producer managed” on PPT slide.

David Allaway, DEQ, then shared a brief update of the local government listening sessions. He noted the Agency will be co-hosting 10 meetings across the state with AOC, LOC and Metro. He stated that the meetings were intended to be opportunities to hear more from local governments, and provide them with an update on RSC-related activities. It was suggested that DEQ share the listening session meeting dates and locations to the RSC for general awareness.

Next Steps

Robin then reviewed next steps with the RSC. She emphasized that January 31st is a technical information session to present the results of the research. She emphasized that there will still be movable Lego blocks that the RSC will need to decide, that could look very different from the scenarios presented at the information session. To that end, Robin shared her hope that RSC members will begin reaching out to each other to determine areas of alignment and disagreement, and begin formulating scenario options prior to March 18th. RSC members were invited to connect with the facilitation team should they need assistance in those conversations.

Following this there were no further questions. The meeting adjourned at 3 p.m.



Recycling Steering Committee

Modernizing Oregon's recycling system with support from Oregon Consensus

Recycling Steering Committee Meeting Proposed Agenda

January 17, 2020

10 a.m. to 3 p.m.

DEQ Headquarters

700 NE Multnomah St, Portland, OR (Third floor conference room)

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://pdx.zoom.us/j/6182124864>

Dial by your location

+1 669 900 9128 US (San Jose)

+1 646 558 8656 US (New York)

Meeting ID: 618 212 4864

Meeting Purpose: Opportunity for the Recycling Steering Committee (RSC) to review preliminary results of collection infrastructure research and guide the next steps for analysis; follow up on equity discussions from 12/17 RSC meeting; and do final preparations for the 1/31 Information Session.

10 a.m. Welcome, Introductions, Housekeeping, Frame for the Day (Oregon Consensus/RSC)

10:15 a.m. Infrastructure Research (DEQ/Cascadia Consulting Research Team)

- Review updated infrastructure research scope and road map
- Review evaluation criteria for infrastructure scenarios
- Share Task 1 collection case studies results and Q&A
- Provide initial input on infrastructure elements for February scenario-building — RSC

Objective: The RSC has an understanding of the updated infrastructure research scope and timeline; has heard from the contractors the results of their first inquiry into dual-stream collection systems; and, has begun informing development of elements for later scenario analysis by the Cascadia team.

12 p.m. Break for Lunch

12:30 p.m. (Working Lunch) Continued Infrastructure Elements (RSC)

- Continue input on elements for analysis

1:05 p.m. Getting a Conversation Started About Equity (DEQ/RSC)

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 Recycling, Far West Recycling, Lane County, League of Oregon Cities, Metro, NORPAC, Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, Oregon Refuse & Recycling Assoc., City of Portland, The Recycling Partnership, Rogue Disposal & Recycling, Waste Connections, and Waste Management. **For more information, visit <https://go.usa.gov/xmYYe>.**

- Debrief homework assignment
- Facilitated group discussion

Objective: The RSC continues to examine how equity considerations may be incorporated into a modernized recycling system for Oregon.

1:50 p.m. Stakeholder Engagement Update (SE Subcommittee)

- Quick informational update on info session RSVPs, underrepresented stakeholder listening sessions, and post-info session survey

Objective: The RSC is aware of current stakeholder engagement activities and those interested are prepared to give input on the survey next week.

2 p.m. Prep for January 31 Legal/Relational Framework Scenarios Information Session

- Review list of materials that will be distributed (DEQ)
- Review presentation outline and graphic concepts, and provide feedback on level of detail/format (RSC)
- Tentative: Process beyond 1/31 (OC)

Objective: The RSC has provided final direction and input on 1/31 Information Session.

2:30 p.m. Public Comment:

Members of the public have an opportunity to ask questions or weigh in on the discussions (as needed to allow time for all who wish to speak, time may be limited to 2-3 minutes per person).

2:45 p.m. Wrap Up and Next Steps

Objective: There is an understanding of the overall RSC work plan/timeline and action items out of today's session as well as next steps are confirmed.

3 p.m. Adjourn



Recycling Steering Committee

Modernizing Oregon's recycling system with support from Oregon Consensus

Infrastructure Scenario Elements Menu

DRAFT — January 7, 2020

This list is not a complete list of all elements that could be included.

Grouping variations

1. Everything is same around the state
2. There are variations in approach to different generators (single-family, multifamily, businesses), materials, customer engagement and collection methods by group/category (see [Task 4 research plan](#) for complete description of groups)

Materials — list of curbside and depot-accepted materials (see Appendix 1 for potential materials)

1. Expansive list
2. Moderate list
3. Reduced list
4. Other?

Customer engagement

1. Audience-tailored outreach campaigns/tools
2. Broad media and outreach campaigns/tools
3. Direct customer feedback
4. Fines/fees/surcharges/incentives
5. Refusal/removal of service
6. Other?

Collection methods

1. Dual streams (fiber and containers collected separately) with glass on the side
2. Single stream with glass on the side
3. Depots (staff or unstaffed)
4. Other?

Processing methods

1. Processing for single-stream collection
 - a. Upgrades to primary MRFs
 - b. With a secondary MRF for low volume/value materials
 - c. With a secondary container recovery facility
2. Commercial dry mixed-waste MRF
3. Processing for dual-stream collection
4. Other?

Markets

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 Recycling, Far West Recycling, Lane County, League of Oregon Cities, Metro, NORPAC, Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, Oregon Refuse & Recycling Assoc., City of Portland, The Recycling Partnership, Rogue Disposal & Recycling, Waste Connections, and Waste Management. **For more information, visit <https://go.usa.gov/xmYYe>.**

1. Domestic markets
2. International markets
3. Mechanical recycling
4. Chemical recycling
5. Incineration with energy recovery
6. Other?

Appendix 1 — Materials Included in Phase 2 Research

- **Paper** — corrugated boxes, newsprint, paperboard including freezer boxes, printing-writing paper, gable-top cartons, and aseptic containers
- **Plastics** — PET bottles & jars, HDPE bottles & jars, PP bottles & jars, PP tubs, PP rigid packaging & products, PE film, PET tubs, PET thermoforms, HDPE tubs and pails, EPS, solid polystyrene
- **Glass** — glass containers
- **Metals** — aluminum cans, tinned cans, scrap metals, accepted other steel



Recycling Steering Committee

Modernizing Oregon's recycling system with support from Oregon Consensus

Getting a Conversation Started about Equity in the Recycling System

Homework for January 17, 2020 Meeting

Introduction:

Please read/watch the following resources in preparation for the January 17, 2020 Recycling Steering Committee Meeting. It will take you about 30 minutes to read/watch everything.

The Recycling Steering Committee has identified equity as one of the desired functions of Oregon's future recycling system, and the RSC has expressed its interest in diving deeper into the topic. The resources below are intended to lay some groundwork and get the conversation started as a group. There is a range of experience and understanding on the RSC about equity and the related topics covered here, so the intention is to build some shared language and background. There are many resources available on these topics, and the ones provided here are not meant to be comprehensive. At a future meeting, the RSC will build on this discussion by exploring what it means to incorporate equity into program design – specifically, into the design of Oregon's recycling system.

Please be ready on January 17 to discuss:

- What you learned or what surprised you
- What you found most resonant or important
- What you have questions about
- *Initial* thoughts about how this applies to recycling in Oregon

An important note: These resources have been compiled primarily to educate and inform a mostly white group of people. For anyone who does not identify as white, please use your discretion as to which resources may be most useful to you.

Resources:

1. [Justice, Equity, Diversity and Inclusion \(definitions\) – The Avarna Group](#) (7 slides)
2. [Systematic Inequality and Economic Opportunity – The Center for American Progress](#) (13 minute read)
3. [The Racist History of Portland, the Whitest City in America – The Atlantic](#) (9 minute read)
Note: Covers significant Oregon history, too.
4. [Using a Racial Equity Lens – Cynthia Muller, W.K. Kellogg Foundation](#) (2.5 minute video)
Note: Disregard mentions of the group called SOCAP near the end.
5. [Debunking the most common myths white people tell about race – Author Robin DiAngelo](#) (3.5 minute video)



Recycling Steering Committee

Modernizing Oregon's recycling system with support from Oregon Consensus

Recycling System Framework Scenarios for In-Depth Evaluation

The following is a summary of the five framework scenarios that Resource Recycling Systems (RRS) will evaluate in greater detail on behalf of the Recycling Steering Committee. Also included are system elements (i.e., policy-related elements) that could be included in any of the five framework scenarios. The Recycling Steering Committee and Legal & Relational Frameworks Subcommittee agreed on these scenarios and common elements on December 17, 2019.

Elements common to all scenarios*

- Parallel access for all sectors – single-family (SF), multi-family (MF), commercial, public spaces
- Mandatory variable pricing (“pay as you throw” – PAYT) for all sectors – SF, MF, commercial, public spaces
- Materials recovery facility (MRF) certification and reporting requirements
- Material-specific life cycle assessment database to support end-of-life (EOL) and design for the environment-based decisions
- Defined optimal material-specific EOL pathway (instead of hierarchy)
- Statewide list of designated recyclables and ban on disposal of those items
- Recycled content requirements and/or incentives
- Enforceable standards: Material-specific recycling rate; contamination rate; equity standards; minimum end-market environmental health and safety standards
- Labeling requirements
- Market development
- Expanded Bottle Bill: i.e. wine and spirits

* How these are applied and by whom will change between frameworks

Group A: Enhanced Government-Managed Scenario Models

Enhanced government-managed

Focus: High-performing state and local government programs

Key elements include, but are not limited to:

- Statewide list of recyclables designated for collection and banned from disposal
- Performance standards (material-specific recycling targets; inbound/outbound contamination targets)
- Equity standards (community benefit standards for processing facilities; minimum end market environmental health and safety standards)
- MRF registration / certification and reporting requirements, including downstream destinations (e.g., domestic, export, broker)
- Enhanced funding for markets and infrastructure (funding mechanism TBD)

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 Recycling, Far West Recycling, Lane County, League of Oregon Cities, Metro, NORPAC, Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, Oregon Refuse & Recycling Assoc., City of Portland, The Recycling Partnership, Rogue Disposal & Recycling, Waste Connections, and Waste Management. **For more information, visit <https://go.oregon.gov/xmYYe>.**

(over)

State government-managed (MRF contracts)

Focus: Includes all elements of Scenario 1 plus high-performing elements related to sales and disposal bans plus state contracting with MRFs

Examples of potential state government responsibilities include:

- Strategic infrastructure planning and coordination of public grant making and other investments, including public-private partnerships
- Regulatory authority to address products and/or packaging as it relates to the recycling system, including sales and disposal bans
- Oversight and / or execution of market development demonstration projects to further sustainable materials management
- Contracts with MRFs to provide consistent, low- or no-cost recycling services to local governments and set outbound contamination standards

Group B: Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) Scenario Models

Post-collection producer responsibility

Focus: Leverages strong points in existing Oregon framework (e.g., collection, education, etc.), plus adds the following elements:

- Financing of and responsibility for processing and marketing of materials
- Shared responsibility
- Optimization
- Resiliency
- Processing and downstream flow
- System integration

Key elements include but are not limited to:

- Local governments retain legal and financial responsibility for collection, including the ability to contract/franchise for collection services and set rates.
- Producer Responsibility Organization(s) (PRO) finances and coordinates the post-collection system. Responsibilities include but not limited to:
 - Fund processing, material marketing and necessary investments so collectors would have guaranteed recycling outlet with no gate fee for program materials delivered to participating MRFs, plus reimbursement of inbound transportation costs (to equalize recycling opportunities across the state)
 - Contract with or establish processing/marketing capacity necessary to manage materials
 - Report on fee structure and material flows

Producer responsibility with local control

Focus: Producers reimburse local governments for collection, and have financial and legal responsibility for processing and marketing. Integration role would be responsibility of producer responsibility organization (PRO) with state oversight

Key elements include but are not limited to:

- Local government responsibilities include but are not limited to:
 - Provide or contract/franchise for recycling collection and processing services
 - Lead education, outreach and enforcement efforts
- PRO(s) responsibilities include but are not limited to:
 - Reimburse local governments for their cost of collection.
 - Fund processing, material marketing and necessary investments so collectors would have guaranteed recycling outlet with no gate fee for program materials delivered to participating MRFs, plus reimbursement of inbound transportation costs (to equalize recycling opportunities across the state)
 - Contract with or establish processing/marketing capacity necessary to manage materials
 - Report on fee structure and material flows
 - Reimburse municipalities for a portion or entirety of costs associated with recycling education efforts

Full producer responsibility with optional local involvement

Focus: Operational coordination and responsibility shifts to producers along with responsibility for system financing. Integration role would be handled by PRO or PRO coordinating entity.

Key elements include but are not limited to:

- Local government responsibilities include but are not limited to:
 - Have the option to provide or contract/franchise for recycling collection services. Jurisdiction can also pass this responsibility to the PRO or opt out of the EPR program altogether
 - Partner with PRO on outreach and education efforts.
- PRO(s) responsibilities include but are not limited to:
 - Funds recycling programs (collection and processing) based on level of municipal participation:
 - Full opt-in – PRO(s) manages all recycling operations and covers all costs on behalf of municipalities
 - Partial opt-in – Municipalities maintain their program contracts for collection and receive a payment from PRO(s) that reimburses up to average municipal costs; PRO also has financial and legal responsibility for processing and marketing.
 - Opt-out – Municipalities chose “status quo” and receive no funding from PRO(s)
 - Leads and funds education and outreach efforts, but partners with local governments to provide educational assistance