

Image Credit RitaE via Pixabay

The State of Recycling In Oregon

U.S. PIRG
Education Fund



ZERO WASTE

Written By:


Alex Truelove, U.S. PIRG Education Fund Zero Waste Program Director
Carrie Katan, U.S. PIRG Education Fund Zero Waste Program Associate

November 14th, 2019



Acknowledgements

The authors bear responsibility for any factual errors. The recommendations are those of U.S. PIRG Education Fund. The views expressed in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of our funders or those who provided review. 2

 U.S. PIRG Education Fund. Some Rights Reserved. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial No Derivatives 3.0 U.S. License. To view the terms of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/us>.

U.S. PIRG Education Fund: With public debate around important issues often dominated by special interests pursuing their own narrow agendas, U.S. PIRG Education Fund offers an independent voice that works on behalf of the public interest. U.S. PIRG Education Fund, a 501(c)(3) organization, works to protect consumers and promote good government. We investigate problems, craft solutions, educate the public, and offer meaningful opportunities for civic participation. For more information, please visit uspirgedfund.org.

Environment Oregon Research & Policy Center is a 501(c)(3) organization. We are dedicated to protecting our air, water and open spaces. We investigate problems, craft solutions, educate the public and decision-makers, and help the public make their voices heard in local, state and national debates over the quality of our environment and our lives.

Introduction	5
The State of Recycling In Oregon	6
The collapse of international recycling markets	6
Ongoing structural issues	6
Recycled materials lack markets	7
Producers aren't held responsible	7
Consumers lack opportunities to recycle and compost	7
Plastic production has increased	7
Consequences of our weak recycling system	8
Trash incinerators	8
Landfills	8
The need for more raw materials	9
State findings	9
Oregon battles with a false recycling solution	9
Solutions	11
References	12

Introduction

You toss your plastic water bottle in a recycling bin after coming home from a trip to the beach, hoping the plastic from that bottle will be in next year's plastic bottle, right? It most likely will not. Currently, plastic can only be re-manufactured a limited number of times, at best into a lower quality product because it degrades each time it is recycled.¹ The value of recycled plastic may be low enough that your bottle is instead burned in an incinerator or dumped into a landfill. A few years ago, that plastic might have been sold to China or another foreign nation. However, over the last few years, countries across the Pacific are putting restrictions on importing U.S. waste. Without these export markets, the U.S. recycling industry is in serious trouble, as exemplified by your plastic bottle's likely journey to a landfill or incinerator. Of course, using a reusable water bottle would have avoided this issue, and for that reason, reduction and reuse strategies are preferable to recycling, even when recycling works.

The State of Recycling In Oregon

Across the United States, our recycling system is faltering. Local governments from Jackson, Mississippi to Sierra Vista, Arizona are ending their curbside recycling programs. Many other municipalities have reduced the list of materials they will accept.^{2,3} Even when recycling does end up in a blue bin, it may be immediately landfilled or burned --until earlier this year roughly half of Philadelphia's collected recycling was being sent to incinerators.⁴ These are not isolated incidents but are increasingly our new normal. What went wrong? Why are we moving backwards on recycling, an important tool for fighting environmental pollution and climate change? And why is plastic to blame?

The collapse of international recycling markets

For decades, one of the United States' largest exports to East Asia by weight was waste.⁵ Rapid economic growth, high demand for materials and cheap labor made it economical for these Asian countries to sort through U.S. recyclables that were often commingled with low-value or unrecyclable materials.⁶ And from the U.S. perspective, exporting waste was easier than handling it domestically, so the U.S. sent its waste overseas in massive amounts and counted it as recycled.⁷ This arrangement was far from perfect, however. Once these countries had sorted out the valuable materials from the U.S.' recyclables, they would throw out or incinerate the rest—practices detrimental to both public health and the environment.^{8,9}

Starting in early 2018, East Asian governments began banning, limiting or more heavily regulating U.S. recyclable exports.¹⁰ The era of globalized waste trade came to a sudden end and the U.S. was left to deal with its flawed recycling system.

Ongoing structural issues

While many commentators have blamed East Asian import restrictions for our current struggles, the U.S. is at fault for becoming dependent on exporting its recyclables. The United States failed to curb the rise of plastic, failed to build domestic demand for recycled material, and failed to ensure that product designers considered the end life of their products.

Recycled materials lack markets

Recycling depends on the idea that the cost of collecting and sorting certain materials is rational because somebody will want to buy them to make something else. In reality, many plastics have no such market. Without domestic manufacturers creating more goods made from recycled material, we cannot fuel a functional recycling system. If we want to improve our recycling system, we need to use better materials and create a market that is fueled and funded in part by the manufacturers themselves.

Producers aren't held responsible

Currently, most product designers are under no obligation to consider how their products will be disposed of at the end of their useful life. This leads to the creation of unrecyclable products. For example, some flexible drink packaging combines plastic and metal and the two materials are too difficult to separate to be recycled.¹¹ Other products, like compostable plastic containers, may be technically recyclable or compostable, but they are often incompatible with most recycling and composting programs.¹²

Consumers lack opportunities to recycle and compost

Many municipalities lack curbside recycling, while in areas where it is provided, multi-unit apartments are often left out.¹³ As a result of the recent restrictions on recycling exports, additional municipalities have ended their recycling programs. Access to curbside compost is even worse. A 2017 study found that only 326 municipalities out of more than 19,000 had curbside pickup of food waste, less than 2%.¹⁴ For these activities to increase, recycling and composting must be as easy as tossing things into the trash.

Plastic production has increased

For materials like metal and cardboard, the recycling model has historically worked well. There is a healthy market for used cardboard and aluminum, which reduces the environmental impact of extracting and manufacturing new so-called “virgin” materials.¹⁵

Plastic is different. Plastic can only be recycled a few times, because it breaks down each time it's recycled. Recycling plastic is also an expensive and complicated process.¹⁶ As more non-recycled plastic has entered our waste stream, our recycling system has struggled to fund itself. Over the last three decades, the amount of plastic entering our recycling system has increased dramatically. In 1980, 20,000 tons of plastic was recycled. In 2015, that number skyrocketed to more than 3 million tons. And yet, that same year, more than 5 million tons of plastic was burned, while another 26 million tons was landfilled.¹⁷

Without a market, 8 million tons of plastic waste will continue to find its way into the ocean every year.¹⁸ Ultimately, the best way to handle our plastic waste problem is to dramatically reduce the amount of plastic being produced in the first place.

Consequences of our weak recycling system

In the absence of an effective recycling system, most U.S. waste is landfilled or incinerated instead of recycled, necessitating that new materials be extracted and manufactured.

Trash incinerators

In the wake of recycling export restrictions, many municipalities have begun incinerating their recycling streams instead, a process often termed “waste-to-energy.” While touted by supporters as a “renewable” energy source, incineration is extremely harmful to both the environment and local communities. For every metric ton of plastic burned in an incinerator, 1,980 pounds of carbon dioxide (CO₂) equivalent are released—nearly 15 times more than a ton of plastic waste that is landfilled.¹⁹

The public health effects of incineration are also grave. Emissions include carcinogens and neurotoxins, as well as contaminants that can cause or aggravate respiratory problems, particularly among children, the elderly, and those with pre-existing respiratory problems.²⁰

Landfills

Landfills are the most common way of getting rid of waste and, they also pose environmental and public health challenges. As waste, especially organic matter, breaks down in landfills, it generates the greenhouse gasses CO₂ and methane. Twenty percent of all human-caused methane, a greenhouse gas 84-87 times more potent than CO₂ over a 20-year period, has

come from landfills.^{21 22} In addition, landfills can leak fluid that contains a “wide variety of hazardous, toxic or carcinogenic chemical contaminants” into groundwater.”²³

The need for more raw materials

When materials are incinerated or landfilled, more virgin materials are needed to create new products. Using virgin materials often entails significant environmental degradation. For example, extracting and transporting natural gas in the U.S. for virgin plastic production emits an estimated 9.5–10.5 million metric tons of CO₂ equivalent per year.²⁴ Much of this natural gas also comes from fracking, which uses around 3 million gallons of water per well and has been shown to pollute groundwater.²⁵

State findings

In recent years, Oregon has been generating more waste and recycling less of it, with the exception of containers covered by the state’s bottle bill. In 2017, the latest year with available data, Oregon recycled 27.1% of its waste and composted 9.5%. The combined diversion rate of 36.6% is 0.4% less than the state’s 2016 rate and 4.8% less than its 2014 rate.^{26 27 28}

Additionally, Oregonians generated nearly 5% more waste in 2017 than in 2016. In 2017, Oregon generated 5,534,877 tons of municipal solid waste, or 7.3 pounds per person per day.²⁹ Since recycling rates were last gathered, Oregon’s recycling system has been heavily impacted by the foreign recycling restrictions. As of May 2019, the state had approved 26 requests to dispose of recyclables that the state’s recycling facilities could not handle.³⁰

Though overall recycling rates have decreased in Oregon in recent years, recycling rates of containers covered by the state’s bottle bill increased significantly in 2017. This is likely because in 2017, the state doubled the deposit that consumers receive for returning these bottles from 5 cents to 10 cents.³¹

Oregon battles with a false recycling solution

While all plastics present an environmental risk, polystyrene foam, popularly known as Styrofoam, is one of the most harmful. Its recycling options are even more limited than other common forms of plastic, and the substance often ends up as litter, eventually breaking down and polluting our land and oceans. This is why cities and states across the country are banning its use as a single-use food container.³²

Last year, a statewide polystyrene ban lost by a single vote in the Oregon Senate. The measure was heavily opposed by the company Agilyx, which claimed polystyrene waste could be recycled in their facility.³³ A closer look reveals that Agilyx and other companies like it are sometimes more akin to fossil-fuel generators than recyclers. Instead of extracting fossil fuels from the ground in Alaska or Saudi Arabia, Agilyx extracts fuel from plastics, a down-cycling process at best.³⁴

As an alternative, banning polystyrene foam products in favor of better alternatives would prevent this problem entirely. Plastic-to-fuel initiatives, rather than allowing Oregon to protect the environment, are preventing actions to reduce plastic waste.

False waste solutions have been around for a long time, and local and state governments across the country continue to support these processes, despite the problems they cause. Plastic-to-fuel is a new false solution which could hold policy makers back from needed reforms. Avoiding these bad policies requires a broader understanding of our waste system and its impact on public health and the environment, and a reminder that we need to reduce and reuse, before we recycle.

Solutions

Reduce, reuse, recycle.

It's important to remember that recycling is only our third best option. While recycling reduces our need to produce from virgin materials, it is also a manufacturing process that requires the use of water, energy, and other natural resources. For that reason, we need to redesign our systems to reduce and reuse, first and foremost. The following policies can help us towards reaching our goals:

Reduce	Reuse	Recycle
Ban unnecessary single use plastics such as plastic bags and polystyrene foam (commonly called Styrofoam) food containers.	Pass Right to Repair Laws, giving consumers and independent repair shops the ability to fix their stuff when it breaks.	Pass Extended Producer Responsibility Laws that make manufacturer responsible for dealing with the waste their products will become.
Require unnecessary single-use plastic accessories such as straws, utensils, and condiment packets, to be given only upon customer request	Encourage the use of reusable bags and bottles through customer rebates	Expand curbside recycling and composting efforts.
Oppose the creation of new plastic production infrastructure.	Require sit-down restaurants to use reusable plates and foodware.	Mandate new products contain a certain percentage of recycled material.
Enact "Pay As You Throw" programs that charge consumers less if they throw out less trash.		Ban food waste from landfills and encourage the creation of a comprehensive composting system.

References

1. Sedaghat, Lilly. "7 Things You Didn't Know About Plastic (and Recycling)." *National Geographic Society Newsroom*, 13 Apr. 2018, <https://blog.nationalgeographic.org/2018/04/04/7-things-you-didnt-know-about-plastic-and-recycling/>.
2. Rosengren, Cole. "Mississippi's Largest City Ends Recycling, Extends Waste Management Landfill Contract." *Waste Dive*, 19 Aug. 2019, <https://www.wastedive.com/news/jackson-mississippi-cancel-recycling-waste-management/560827/>.
3. Eubank, Johanna. "Curbside Recycling Comes to an End in Sierra Vista." *Arizona Daily Star*, 28 May 2019, https://tucson.com/news/local/curbside-recycling-comes-to-an-end-in-sierra-vista/article_c463d5c3-cfce-5e4e-a224-ec97eda00bae.html.
4. Kummer, Frank. "At Least Half of Philly's Recycling Goes Straight to an Incinerator.", *The Philadelphia Inquirer*, 26 Jan. 2019, <https://www.inquirer.com/science/climate/recycling-costs-philadelphia-incinerator-waste-to-energy-plant-20190125.html>.
5. 86-87, Minter, Adam. *Junkyard Planet: Travels in the Billion-Dollar Trash Trade*. Bloomsbury Press, 2013.
6. Ibid, page 147
7. Ibid, page 94
8. Ibid, page 154-158
9. McCormick, Erin, et al. "Americans' Plastic Recycling Is Dumped in Landfills, Investigation Shows." *The Guardian*, Guardian News and Media, 21 June 2019, <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2019/jun/21/us-plastic-recycling-landfills>.
10. Ives, Mike. "Recyclers Cringe as Southeast Asia Says It's Sick of the West's Trash." *New York Times*, 7 June 2019, <https://www.nytimes.com/2019/06/07/world/asia/asia-trash.html>.
11. See note 5, page 256
12. Peters, Adele. "Will Compostable Packaging Ever Be Able to Solve Our Waste Problem?" *Fast Company*, Fast Company, 30 Aug. 2019, <https://www.fastcompany.com/90393297/will-compostable-packaging-ever-be-able-to-solve-our-waste-problem>.
13. Marshal, Cody. *THE 2016 STATE OF CURBSIDE REPORT. THE RECYCLING PARTNERSHIP*, 2016. Online <https://recyclingpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/state-of-recycling-report-Jan2017.pdf>

14. Virginia Streeeter and Brenda Platt, "Residential Food Waste Collection Access in The U.S.," *BioCycle*, 58(11), December 2017.
15. Gelles, David. "Big Companies Put Their Money Where the Trash Is." *The New York Times*, The New York Times, 28 Nov. 2015, <https://www.nytimes.com/2015/11/29/business/energy-environment/big-companies-put-their-money-where-the-trash-is.html>.
16. Franklin-Wallis, Oliver. "'Plastic Recycling Is a Myth': What Really Happens to Your Rubbish?" *The Guardian*, Guardian News and Media, 17 Aug. 2019, <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2019/aug/17/plastic-recycling-myth-what-really-happens-your-rubbish>.
17. "Plastics: Material-Specific Data." *EPA*, Environmental Protection Agency, 7 May 2019, <https://www.epa.gov/facts-and-figures-about-materials-waste-and-recycling/plastics-material-specific-data>.
18. Parker, Laura. "The World's Plastic Pollution Crisis Explained." *National Geographic* , 7 June 2019, <https://www.nationalgeographic.com/environment/habitats/plastic-pollution/>.
19. Hamilton , Lisa Anne, and Steven Feit . *Plastic and Climate The Hidden Cost Of A Plastic Planet*. Center For Environmental Law , 2019.
20. Azoulay, David, et al. *Plastics and Health The Hidden Cost Of A Plastic Planet*. Center For Environmental Law , 2019.
21. Danthurebandara, Maheshi, et al. "Environmental and Socio-Economic Impacts of Landfills." *ResearchGate* , Jan. 2013, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/278738702_Environmental_and_socio-economic_impacts_of_landfills.
22. Voiland, Adam. "Methane Matters." *NASA*, NASA, 8 Mar. 2016, <https://earthobservatory.nasa.gov/features/MethaneMatters>.
23. See note 21
24. See note 19
25. Ridlington, Elizabeth, et al. *Fracking by the Numbers The Damage to Our Water, Land and Climate from a Decade of Dirty Drilling*. Environment America, 2019.
26. *2017 Oregon Material Recovery and Waste Generation Rates Report*. Materials Management Program Land Quality Division Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, 2019.
27. *2016 Oregon Material Recovery and Waste Generation Rates Report*. Materials Management Program Land Quality Division Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, 2017.

28. 2014 Oregon Material Recovery and Waste Generation Rates Report. Materials Management Program Land Quality Division Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, 2015.

29. See note 26

30. Rosengren. "How Recycling Is Changing in All 50 States." *Waste Dive*, 5 June 2019, <https://www.wastedive.com/news/what-chinese-import-policies-mean-for-all-50-states/510751>

31. See note 26

32. Ivanova, Irina. "States Declare War on Styrofoam - 'People Think It Breaks down.'" *CBS News*, CBS Interactive, 1 May 2019, <https://www.cbsnews.com/news/styrofoam-ban-states-declare-war-people-think-it-breaks-down/>.

33. VanderHart, Dirk. "Oregon Senators Shoot Down Ban On Foam Food Containers, Approve Bag Regulations." *Oregon Public Broadcasting*, OPB, 11 June 2019, <https://www.opb.org/news/article/oregon-foam-food-containers-ban-regulations-house-bill-2883/>

34. Johnson, Jim. "Agilyx Signs Waste-to-Fuel Deal with Delta." *Plastics News*, 19 Nov. 2018, <https://www.plasticsnews.com/article/20181119/NEWS/181119921/agilyx-signs-waste-to-fuel-deal-with-delta>.