



Recycling Steering Committee

Modernizing Oregon's recycling system with support from Oregon Consensus

Recycling System Steering Committee Meeting Summary

Via Zoom

ACTION ITEMS:

ACTION	BY WHOM?	BY WHEN?
RSC Members will share any updated or relevant data sources that could inform the infrastructure scenario analysis directly to Cascadia (if sensitive/private), or on the feedback form included in the Share Point folder.	RSC	Wednesday, June 17 th , 2020
For questions or feedback regarding the environmental or social cost assessment, RSC members were invited to provide those directly to David Allaway via email	RSC	Wednesday, June 17 th , 2020

June 10th, 2020

Meeting Attendees:

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

Facilitation Team: Robin Harkless, Amy Delahanty and Jennah Stillman

Cascadia Consulting Team: Jessica Branom-Zwick, Chris Bell, Tim Buwalda

DEQ Staff: Martin Brown, Sanne Stienstra, Justin Gast, Peter Spendelow, Brian Stafki, Brian Fuller, and Steve Siegel.

Registered Participants: Lauren Aguilar, Kristen Bartels, Blake Bennett, Sarah Bloomquist, Janine Bogar, Peter Canepa, Contracia Carrier, Dave Claugus, Paul Cosgrove, Shannon Crawford, Tommy Crenshaw, Josie Cummings, Thomas Cuomo, Calli Daly, Resa Dimino, Steve Frank, Pete Guttchen, Emily Ham, Jeanette Hanna, Bryce Hesterman, John Hite, Randi Jandt, Dean Kampfer, Scott Klag, Dave Larmouth, Cindy Leichner, Kristin Leichner, Amity Lumper, Audrey O'Brien, Jordan Palmeri, Garry Penning, Sal Peralta, Jerry Powell, Cat Rhoades, Keith Ristau, Julie Roberston, Heather Robertson, Grey Ryan, Tina Schaefer, Lisa Sepaski, David Skakel, Eric



Recycling Steering Committee

Modernizing Oregon's recycling system with support from Oregon Consensus

Stephens, James Toner, Beth Vargas Duncan, Mary Vihstadt, Katherine Walton, Dan Weston, David White, and Rick Winterhalter.

MEETING SUMMARY:

Welcome and Agenda Review

Facilitator Robin Harkless, Oregon Consensus, welcomed the group and Recycling Steering Committee (RSC) members gave brief introductions. She then reviewed the proposed agenda and intended goals of the meeting with the group, which were for RSC members to review and discuss the results of Cascadia Consulting Group's first round of infrastructure scenario analysis, and review preliminary results of DEQ's environmental and cost analysis. She noted there will be opportunities for RSC members to ask clarifying questions about the research and how it will be used, as well as some opportunity to ask about assumptions in the models.

Dylan de Thomas shared a brief announcement with RSC members. He noted the Recycling Partnership's West Coast Contamination Initiative Report—briefly referenced during RSC meetings—reported a contamination rate that was larger than one reported by a Metro report. Recycling Partnership received feedback from many stakeholders, and upon further review of the study, decided to remove the two references of the contamination rate. The report will be reissued without those references.

Infrastructure Scenario Analysis Presentation and Discussion

Brian Stafki, DEQ, reminded the group on the arc of the Cascadia-led infrastructure research and the high-level research objectives. He shared that the primary purpose of the infrastructure research will be to inform the RSC about possible costs, benefits, impacts, and other trade-offs associated with different types of program changes and investments. The infrastructure research will help identify possible improvements for the RSC to consider that help fulfill some of the RSC's objectives including:

- Lists of materials for collection programs with an understanding of environmental and economic impacts and understanding of regional differences.
- Optimal collection methods that can supply clean materials and are cost-effective.
- Models for materials sorting and processing infrastructure for the state and region including facilities, processes and technology that can effectively and efficiently sort and market recyclable materials.
- Effective education materials and enforcement methods that encourage residents and businesses to recycle correctly and reduce contamination.

He reminded the group that in fall 2019 and winter 2020, Cascadia conducted preliminary research, which was informed by the RSC and infrastructure subcommittee feedback and guidance. The research included an evaluation of customer engagement, collection and processing methods, as well as Oregon's baseline system. The research



Recycling Steering Committee

Modernizing Oregon's recycling system with support from Oregon Consensus

helped to inform and define the four initial infrastructure scenarios. Brian reminded the group of the evaluation criteria that the RSC confirmed which were used to evaluate the scenarios against the baseline.

Brian then briefly reviewed the scenarios (see below table) and highlighted the following key points:

S0	O	Baseline with pre-National Sword lists
S1	A	Single-stream with post-National Sword lists, contamination reduction efforts, and modernized paper side of MRFs
S2	A+	Single-stream with expanded lists, contamination reduction efforts, and modern MRFs (advanced container sorting at one MRF)
S3	B	Single-stream with expanded lists, contamination reduction efforts, and transfer of plastic containers to out-of-state CRF
S4	C	Dual-stream with expanded list applied consistently statewide, contamination reduction efforts, and one container MRF

- Each of the scenarios include additional customer engagement methods.
- Based on available data from DEQ, the baseline represents the system pre-National Sword and reflects a more ambitious list of materials than are currently accepted in some areas.
- Scenario A represents a single-stream collection system with glass on the side and upgrades to MRFs. The list of materials reflects the spectrum of current accepted materials around the state.
- Scenario A+ makes similar improvements as A, and expands the list of materials collected on route and at depots.
- Scenario B uses the same lists from A+, but sends mixed containers out of state for further processing.
- Scenario C changes the collection method to dual stream, where containers are collected separately from fibers, with glass on the side. Processing is upgraded and adapted to dual-stream collection feeds. Expanded material lists from Scenario A+/B are collected consistently statewide where recycling collection is provided.

Jessica Branon-Zwick, Cascadia Consulting, provided a presentation of infrastructure scenario analysis. Presentation topics included a review of the evaluation criteria, analysis inputs, scenarios, and models. (For additional detail, please see [Cascadia's PPT](#).) During the presentation, RSC members were invited to discuss the content of the presentation and ask clarifying questions. There were



Recycling Steering Committee

Modernizing Oregon's recycling system with support from Oregon Consensus

questions related to the quantitative and qualitative data sources that were used to inform the research; bale tonnages; capital costs; cost savings from reduced garbage formula; costs associated with a dual stream system; and employment FTEs. Additionally, the following general themes were surfaced:

- Some RSC members raised concerns about the underlying assumptions in the research for inbound, outbound, and paper bale contamination rates. The members suggested the RSC should take a deeper look at the data, if the research will be used to inform future decision making. Cascadia encouraged members who are willing to share more updated or accurate data (publicly or privately), to share those with the research team. Jay Simmons offered to provide relevant data of paper bale contamination rates to inform the models.
- Several members shared confusion about the language and shorthand included in the research. Some suggested the scenarios should 1.) include a reference of the contamination reduction efforts included in the applicable scenarios, and 2.) revise the 'cost savings from reduced garbage' to 'cost savings from diversion'.
(Facilitator note Cascadia updated the scenario shorthand to include 'contamination reduction efforts' to each of the applicable scenarios (Scenarios 1-4), and 'transfer of plastic containers to out-of-state CRF' to Scenario 3.)*
- Several RSC members shared a desire to isolate the impacts of processing infrastructure improvements from other factors such as generator-facing contamination reduction efforts; and were interested in a scenario that had greater consistency in what is collected statewide.

ACTION ITEM: Cascadia invited additional feedback or questions related to assumptions or other inputs to the model, with a deadline of COB June 17. Jessica committed the team will do their best to respond or incorporate these offerings into their model. RSC Members will share any updated or relevant data sources that could inform the infrastructure scenario analysis directly to Cascadia (if sensitive/private), or on the feedback form included in the SharePoint folder.

—Lunch Break—

Environmental Impacts and Social Costs of Recycling Presentation and Discussion

Martin Brown and David Allaway, DEQ, provided draft results from their preliminary assessment of the environmental consequences and social costs of the different infrastructure scenarios ([see PPT for additional detail](#)). David noted that on June 2nd, RSC members were invited to attend an optional information session held by DEQ regarding life cycle assessment, DEQ's waste impact calculator, and social cost



Recycling Steering Committee

Modernizing Oregon's recycling system with support from Oregon Consensus

assessment. The [meeting was recorded](#) for members who could not attend. As a reminder, David noted DEQ entered the tonnages from Cascadia's model into DEQ's Waste Impact Calculator, and used those results to estimate a variety of life cycle environmental impacts for different infrastructure scenarios. Changes (from the base case) in environmental impacts were then converted to "social costs" for comparison alongside traditional transactional costs (fuel, labor, etc.). He highlighted that estimates of transactional costs are relatively complete, while the estimates of environmental impacts and social costs are not, given limitations in data and methodologies; environmental benefits are likely under-estimated. David and Martin then shared some of the results with the group. In summary, the following key points were shared:

- The assessment shows that any and all of the first four infrastructure scenarios evaluated by Cascadia will generate greater social benefits than they will cost.
- All activities have marginal costs, and as society pursues ever-higher recovery goals, the marginal costs of recovery increase and the marginal benefits decrease. Eventually, the last extra ton of recycling will not be worth it anymore, but the assessment shows that Oregon is not at that point yet.
- The assessment demonstrates that a modest expansion of Oregon's recycling system, including investments in contamination reduction, improved processing, and collection of additional materials is worth doing.

Following the presentation, RSC members were invited to discuss the content of the presentation and ask clarifying questions. Members asked clarifying questions and comments related to main drivers of the social and environmental impacts; impacts of certain materials; inputs used in Cascadia's research e.g. plastic tonnages; and underlying assumptions in the analysis. David Allaway shared that DEQ and Cascadia will work to improve Cascadia's model to generate results by August, and answer and address some of the RSC's concerns.

There was then a brief discussion about the unknown error range referenced in Cascadia's research. A couple of members raised concerns about Cascadia's 'unknown error range' disclaimer in Cascadia's work. They noted that it should give the RSC pause if the research will be extrapolated to inform decision making. Martin Brown then addressed common ways to quantify statistical errors in research and discussed the nature of uncertainty in research studies.

Public Comment:

Dave Claugus shared he was troubled that the contamination reduction was applied to all scenarios except the baseline. He shared that he thinks if the scenarios that include contamination reduction are compared against the baseline that does not include it, it creates a distortion in the analysis and overstates the benefits of the four new scenarios.



Recycling Steering Committee

Modernizing Oregon's recycling system with support from Oregon Consensus

Kristin Leichner shared she has not been receiving timely RSC notifications of meetings from DEQ's distribution list. She also requested any supporting material sent to RSC via email should also be posted online in advance of the meeting, as well as receive meeting notifications prior to the meeting. She requested DEQ to improve the transparency in the process. (*UPDATE: DEQ followed up and determined that there is a 'weekly digest' option for people on their distribution list for this project; and as such recipients choosing that option do not necessarily receive all notices in advance of the meetings. DEQ worked with Kristin to rectify the situation.)

Wrap Up and Next Steps

RSC members reviewed next steps for the research. Cascadia will rerun the four scenarios presented today with suggested inputs from RSC members. The results of the second round of scenario analysis is anticipated to be shared with the RSC mid-to-late August. For feedback, Cascadia has added a document in the shared folder where the models reside. Members were encouraged to add any feedback or additional questions using that document by the close of business Wednesday, June 17. For questions or feedback regarding the environmental or social cost assessment, RSC members were invited to provide those directly to David Allaway via email.

Robin reviewed the proposed June 12th agenda with the Group. She shared the RSC will have an opportunity to discuss two additional scenarios for evaluation and confirm the approach of the second round of research in the morning, and discuss EPR for markets in the afternoon. The RSC will be broken out into small groups to more easily engender conversation and deliberation.

With that, the group thanked the Cascadia Consulting Group for their work and the meeting adjourned.



Recycling Steering Committee

Modernizing Oregon's recycling system with support from Oregon Consensus

Recycling System Steering Committee Meeting Summary

Via Zoom

ACTION ITEMS:

ACTION	BY WHOM?	BY WHEN?
Pam Peck to share Metro's recently completed study of the costs of infrastructure improvements to multi-family recycling.	Pam Peck	As available.
RSC members to share technical comments on the existing models.	RSC	Wednesday, June 17th.
DEQ will inform the RSC of the new additional scenarios once contract negotiations with Cascadia are complete.	DEQ	As available.
Cascadia will provide revised modeling results of the existing and new scenarios.	Cascadia/DEQ	August 2020
DEQ will share revised social and environmental cost analysis for all of the scenarios.	DEQ	August 2020
DEQ will provide an exposition on the topic of uncertainty and decision making.	DEQ	August 2020

June 12th, 2020

Meeting Attendees:

Steering Committee Members: David Allaway, Abby Boudouris, Dylan de Thomas, Sarah Grimm, Nicole Janssen, Scott Keller, Matt Stern, Vinod Singh, Kristan Mitchell, Jeff Murray, Pam Peck, Timm Schimke, Jay Simmons, Jody Snyder (for Jason Hudson), Ali Briggs Ungerer (for Amy Roth), Bruce Walker, and Laura Lebrick

Facilitation Team: Robin Harkless, Amy Delahanty and Jennah Stillman

Cascadia Consulting Team: Jessica Branom-Zwick

DEQ Staff: Martin Brown, Sanne Stienstra, Justin Gast, Peter Spendelow, Brian Stafki, Loretta Pickerell, Brian Fuller, and Steve Siegel.



Recycling Steering Committee

Modernizing Oregon's recycling system with support from Oregon Consensus

Registered Participants: Lauren Aguilar, Susan Baker, Denise Barnes, Tino Barreras, Kristen Bartels, Blake Bennett, Sarah Bloomquist, Kathleen Boutin-Pasterz, Cathy Brown, Peter Canepa, Contracia Carrier, Taylor Cass Talbott, Dave Claugus, Paul Cosgrove, Shannon Crawford, Tommy Crenshaw, Josie Cummings, Thomas Cuomo, Calli Daly, Johnny Dea, Resa Dimino, Aaron Donley, Jeff Epstein, Nick Fahey, Stanley Girard, Emily Ham, Jeanette Hanna, Bryce Hesterman, John Hite, Julie Jackson, Scott Klag, Cindy Leichner, Kristin Leichner, Jean Lofy, Amity Lumper, Mike McCracken, Garry Penning, Sal Peralta, Jerry Powell, Katie Reilly, Cat Rhoades, Keith Ristau, Julie Roberston, Heather Robinson, Grey Ryan, Tina Schaefer, David Skakel, Eric Stephens, Adrian Tan, James Toner, Beth Vargas Duncan, Mary Vihstadt, Dan Weston, Rick Winterhalter, and Pete Youknow.

MEETING SUMMARY:

Welcome and Agenda Review

Facilitator Robin Harkless, Oregon Consensus, welcomed the group and Recycling Steering Committee (RSC) members gave brief introductions. She then reviewed the proposed agenda and intended goals of the meeting with the group, which were for the RSC to review and discuss options for additional infrastructure scenarios for study; hear next steps in the infrastructure research; and engage in a discussion about EPR at the market stage. Robin noted that at the end of the meeting on June 10, there was a member of the public who was having trouble accessing the materials and notices. Robin shared that DEQ investigated the issue, and found that person had signed up for 'weekly updates' rather than more frequent notices. Robin encouraged members to check their DEQ distribution list preferences and change from weekly, to more frequent.

Review and Discuss Options for Additional Infrastructure Scenarios

David Allaway, DEQ, reminded the RSC that the group designed this research effort back in November of last year in order to provide information that will be useful to the RSC and others. The process and flow were impacted by the disruption from coronavirus, but DEQ hopes that the research remains informative. David shared that the value of the research depends in part on the quality of the information that goes into the model. DEQ and Cascadia appreciate the suggestions for improvements the RSC has shared and looks forward to more by June 17th. He then noted the results of the infrastructure research may be used to justify investments in generator-facing contamination reduction programming, further investments in processing infrastructure, and/or inform an understanding of how much investments might cost. David emphasized that even if the costs can't be estimated with precision, the RSC will have planning-level estimates that are reasonably close and directionally correct. The following additional key points were shared:



Recycling Steering Committee

Modernizing Oregon's recycling system with support from Oregon Consensus

- DEQ's contract with Cascadia allows for the evaluation of two additional scenarios. DEQ heard specific requests at the June 10th RSC meeting, and based on that, they have provided thoughts about how to proceed for the RSC's consideration.
- DEQ heard on June 10th the RSC had significant interest in a scenario that consists of enhanced generator-facing contamination reduction programming only; a continued interest in having greater consistency in what is collected statewide; desire to isolate the impacts of processing infrastructure improvements from other factors; bring recycling collection opportunities to populations that currently lack them; and a skepticism regarding making investments given uncertainty in the models.
- To address the above desires and questions, it will require modeling at least three new scenarios. The contract with Cascadia only allows for two. DEQ is working with Cascadia to see if there's any way we can evaluate more than two.

David then reviewed the potential new additional scenarios for RSC feedback and input (revised baseline, Scenarios A-, revised A+ and D):

Revised Baseline	Baseline revised to reflect collection lists from 2018 (vs. 2017).
A-	Revised baseline collection system, coupled with extensive generator-facing contamination reduction programming. No other changes are made.
Revised A+	Single-stream with longer and standardized statewide list, contamination reduction efforts, and upgraded fiber & container sortation.
D	Single-stream with longer and standardized statewide list, contamination reduction efforts, larger and upgraded fiber & container sortation, and extended collection opportunities (closer to "parallel access", where recycling is provided wherever garbage collection is provided). Extended collection could include additional collection for generators and in communities that currently lack collection, as well as for generators such as multi-family that are located in communities with service but are not currently served.

The group then engaged in a discussion about the proposed new scenarios and offered feedback and input to DEQ and Cascadia.

- There was general support for isolating generator-facing customer feedback (Scenario A-).



Recycling Steering Committee

Modernizing Oregon's recycling system with support from Oregon Consensus

- Several members expressed interest and support of analyzing Scenario D in an effort to address improvements to the multi-family recycling sector, as the other four scenarios only include robust customer engagement, not an expansion of recycling service multi-family generators. Pam Peck shared that Metro recently commissioned a study by Chris Bell that researches the costs of making multi-family infrastructure improvements, which she will share with the RSC. She noted this may be able to provide the information that this scenario is hoping to achieve. Additionally, Laura offered there are other ways to provide collection of materials from multi-family other than commingled recycling e.g. source-segregated, etc. Pam also noted that there are still other ways to provide collection, such as return to retail, mobile depots, and expanded drop-off.
- One member shared that communities are considering changes to their stream and rates and wondered if that had been considered in the baseline scenario. It was noted that many permutations and changes could happen between now and 2025, and the baseline is a snapshot of a point-in-time. The revised baseline could get closer to the current state by integrating 2018 data.
- Another member wondered whether scenario A+ assumes changes in MRFs operational capabilities based on cleaner materials. Cascadia stated that is correct. DEQ clarified the scenario assumes an investment in *current* MRFs, not construction of new MRFs.

Robin then invited members to provide any additional suggestions or refinements for Scenarios to study. Generally, members were supportive of analyzing the proposed additional scenarios. DEQ then shared next steps for the infrastructure research. David shared in August, the revised modeling results of the existing and new scenarios will be available; DEQ will share revised social and environmental cost analysis for all of the scenarios; and DEQ will provide an exposition on the topic of uncertainty and decision making.

ACTION ITEM: RSC members to share technical comments on the existing models and environmental/social cost assessment by COB Wednesday, June 17th.

ACTION ITEM: DEQ will inform the RSC of the new additional scenarios once contract negotiations with Cascadia are complete.

Frameworks: EPR at Market Stage

David Allaway, DEQ, began with opening thoughts about Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) for the market phase of the recycling system from DEQ's perspective (*please see PPT for additional detail.*). He shared that DEQ has given some thought to the different ways in which producer responsibility might be extended to the end markets element of Oregon's recycling system, and the agency has identified several options. He then reviewed the different types of materials that could be subject



Recycling Steering Committee

Modernizing Oregon's recycling system with support from Oregon Consensus

to EPR. They were the following: 1.) all printed paper and packaging; 2.) defined types of printed paper and packaging; 3.) materials that are recoverable, but difficult to market or recover; 4.) materials that contribute to system contamination. David shared that while DEQ has thought of four options of EPR for markets, each could be combined by mixing and matching materials with the different responsibilities. The following EPR for market options were shared with the group:

- “Classic” EPR
- Finance-only EPR
- Hybrid (classic + financial)
- “Rates and dates”

Following David's brief presentation, the group paused for public comment.

Public Comment:

Robin shared the following email missive sent on behalf of David Skakel to RSC members: “On the one hand a RSC Member at the 5/29/20 RSC meeting claimed that the Recycle B.C. model did not result in any expansion of recycling collection. On the other hand (while many wastesheds in Oregon have recently stopped collecting #3-7's), this 2/26/19 [Resource Recycling article](#) reported that Merlin Plastics' B.C facility was expanding its capacity 15-20% by installing a new sort line intended to handle mixed bales of #3-7 plastics from throughout the Northwest. Question: Can we get a verifiable comparison between Oregon and B.C. on several key indicators (including recycling diversion rates, contamination, etc.) at several key points (before Recycle B.C. implementation, during “great recession”, post “National Sword”, etc.)? Comparable data might help folks in Oregon figure out whether/where to attribute any results to which policies or programs.”

Frameworks: EPR at Market Stage Discussion

RSC members were invited to discuss the content of the EPR for market presentation, and discuss amongst each other potential benefits, tradeoffs and uncertainties with regard to integrating EPR at the market phase; and alternatives that could meet the same desired functions of EPR at this stage. The RSC continued the conversation in small break out groups. Following this, the break out groups reported out their discussion:

Group 1 (David Allaway, Matt Stern, Timm Schimke, Dylan de Thomas):

- The benefit of market stage EPR is the financial contributions of the producers. The PROs would provide funds to pay for improvements to the system.



Recycling Steering Committee

Modernizing Oregon's recycling system with support from Oregon Consensus

- One group member shared that plastic producers are not an end market, which is in contrast to other end markets (metals, paper, etc.). Plastic producers are disconnected as a recycling end market.
- There was a conversation about whether producers have to be the end market, or mandate a producer to create an end market e.g. thermoforms, chemical recycling, etc.
- Several members expressed that the system did not need to be changed for a relatively small percentage of the material stream.

Group 2 (Jay Simmons, Bruce Walker, Vinod Singh, Abby Boudouris, Sarah Grimm):

- The group felt that options three and four was engaging because it has a way of incentivizing packaging changes towards something that is recoverable or not problematic.
- Regarding materials that could be subject to EPR: one member pointed out EPR doesn't seem to level the playing field, because some material types cause more contamination than others.
- The group also discussed the EPR hybrid and financial only system. Some members shared the financial only system discussed that may be most digestible in terms of how a floor price works, and how it might incentivize some move towards creating markets.
- The group also talked further about 'floor prices' e.g. how it may/may not work. There was an idea to create a rainy day fund.
- The hardest struggle was to look at the market phase separate from other parts of the whole system.

Group 3 (Laura Leebrick, Jeff Murray, Pam Peck, Justin Gast, and Nicole Janssen):

- The group leaned more towards EPR options 3&4, though it was mentioned there could be some similarities in option 2 & 3 depending. They noted that the role of the producer would be more financial versus running the program. There could be a level of responsibility for the producers for the hard to market materials.
- The group wanted more time to discuss EPR options.
- One member pointed out the distinction between control and responsibility noting that just because a producer is obligated to do something by law, does not mean that they are in control. The law and the state would be in control of what happens.

Group 4 (Sanne Steinstra, Kristan Mitchell, Scott Keller, Ali Briggs Ungerer):

- There was agreement from this group there was a benefit of sharing the financial burden and ensuring markets. There was a desire to make sure those markets stay in place and do not go away.



Recycling Steering Committee

Modernizing Oregon's recycling system with support from Oregon Consensus

- There was some discussion about the financial-only EPR. Some were drawn to that option, while others wanted to know more about the other options before taking anything off the table.
- There were comments about not wanting to just be drawing on producers to fund things without an end. This may also have equity implications of systems in the sense that if producers raise the cost of products in the U.S., is that going to be felt or experienced uniformly across consumers/public, which raises equity concerns.
- A question was raised about the expectation of producers to have some 'control' or authority, if they are paying in to the system.
- How do existing programs in Oregon match up to the EPR options described? E.g. ecycles, paintcare, and bottle bill.

The large group resumed the discussion in the large group amongst each other.

General key discussion points included the following:

- There was a desire among some to continue the discussion of EPR options and the role of producers. Generally, members shared that it is challenging to have a discussion about EPR in isolated stages, and want to engage in a broader, system-wide view discussion.
- A couple of members spoke to a stepwise or phased approach to implementing EPR. They suggested starting with 'low hanging fruit' to see if the interventions get Oregon to desired goals, then more towards more bold action as needed to meet desired goals.
- The RSC has signaled that transparency and mechanisms of accountability around sending materials to appropriate markets is important. Different options of EPR will address those desires at different levels. Some members noted that there are regulations, standards, and licensing that could be put in place to address transparency in the system, which wouldn't require Oregon to have EPR.
- Some members shared they could support an EPR program that covers the gaps in the current system. Those members shared they don't see a need for a 'classic' EPR system, but would be open to other EPR options.
- There was discussion among some members about the 'rates and dates' ideas, particularly floor prices.
- Several members expressed surprise that the group wasn't expressing more enthusiasm for the idea of guaranteed floor prices, as these were accepted in the past (1990s plastic industry floor price for plastic from the Garten PRF) and would address volatility in system costs.

Next Steps



Recycling Steering Committee

Modernizing Oregon's recycling system with support from Oregon Consensus

Robin reviewed the next steps and proposed agenda for the next RSC meeting on **June 18th, 2-5pm.**

EPR for Processing: She shared that the group will continue the next EPR discussion in a similar format (large and small break out group discussions). The June 18 topics for discussion will be EPR for processing; and a beginning discussion about the role of a producer responsibility organization (PRO). EPR source materials will be added to the RSC Google Drive folder and shared back out to the group ahead of the next meeting along with any high level pieces on EPR processing from DEQ.

Ad hoc work: The RSC will also hear progress reports from several ad hoc work groups. Robin reminded members that the RSC meetings will serve as checkpoints at which ad hoc groups will provide updates, options and/or recommendations for preliminary consensus checks. The target for finalizing any work of the ad hoc group is early to mid-August.

Robin paused for final suggestions or questions. One group member suggested the processing ad hoc group work be shared on June 18 to help inform the group's EPR for processing discussion. Another member requested the RSC look at different examples of existing EPR programs currently happening in Oregon to see whether those models can be more broadly applied.

With that, the meeting was adjourned.