

Modernizing Oregon's Bottle Bill
Assoc. of Oregon Recyclers
December 6, 2006

Oregon Consensus Program

- Mission
 - To move Oregon to more effective and collaborative approaches to public decision-making, implementation and conflict resolution
- Located in the Hatfield School of Government at Portland State University

OCP Feasibility Assessment

- Initiated and funded by AOR
- Is it feasible to use a consensus process to update Oregon's container deposit legislation?
 - Are the issues amenable to resolution by consensus?
 - Will stakeholders participate?

Assessment Process

- OCP provided neutral assessment services
- Stakeholder interviews in 2004-2005
 - Distributors
 - Retailers
 - Recyclers
 - Consumers
 - State agencies (DEQ and OLCC)
- Responses were anonymous
- Report released in 2005

Key Issues

- Definition of “beverage container”
 - Which containers should the redemption system cover
 - Flexibility to address future changes in the marketplace
- Unredeemed deposits
 - Allocation of money from unredeemed deposits
 - Differing opinions on redemption rates
- Refund value
 - Is a nickel still an effective incentive for consumers

Key Issues

- “Return to retail” redemption option
 - Burden on retailer
 - Compensation for retailers
 - Alternative redemption options
- Curbside recycling
 - More containers are recycled via curbside
 - Increases the amount of unredeemed deposits
 - Affects quality of paper fibers destined for regional paper mills

Key Issues

- Consumer issues
 - Frustration with reverse vending machines
 - Recycling convenience

Assessment Conclusions

- Are the issues amenable to resolution by consensus
 - YES!
 - Issues are intertwined
 - Addressing one stakeholder's concern affects the interests of other stakeholders
 - Initiative measure or legislation focusing on the concerns of only one stakeholder is unlikely to succeed
 - Consensus process provides opportunity to address concerns of all stakeholders

Conclusions

- Will stakeholders participate in a consensus process?
 - Some stakeholders are reluctant to participate
 - BATNA = **B**est **A**lternative **T**o a **N**egotiated **A**greement
 - Some stakeholders view the status quo as their BATNA
 - Fear that a negotiated agreement might detrimentally affect their interests

Promoting a Collaborative Approach – Options to Consider

- Who takes the leadership to convene
 - Political leader(s)
 - Jointly convened by several stakeholders
 - University or other neutral party
- Funding
 - Commitment of resources to support a collaborative process

Promoting a Collaborative Approach

- Encourage stakeholder participation by;
 - Narrowing or broadening the scope of the issues
 - Reframing the question
 - Examples:
 - Retain existing system for containers currently covered
 - Create a new system for containers added to the redemption system
 - Convene a process around the broader question of how to increase beverage container recycling
 - Other?

Promoting a Collaborative Approach

- Timing
 - Convene process in the interim between legislative sessions

How OCP Can Help

- Neutral forum for convening stakeholders
- Provide convening assistance
 - Getting parties to the table
 - Designing the process
- Provide neutral, experienced facilitators and mediators
 - Work with stakeholders to select the best neutral for the process
- Seek funding to support the process

Contact OCP

Elaine Hallmark, Director
Oregon Consensus Program, Hatfield
School of Government
Portland State University
670B Urban Center
503-725-9070
e-mail elaineh@pdx.edu
www.orconsensus.pdx.edu