



February 9, 2026

**RE: OPPOSE House Bill 4030 and HB 4030-1**

Dear Chair Lively and Committee Members,

We write to express our strong opposition to HB 4030 and its proposed amendments, which would permanently exempt certain packaging from the extended producer responsibility (EPR) program established by the Recycling Modernization Act (RMA, SB 582). HB 4030 and HB 4030-1 would undermine the policy objectives that led to the creation of the RMA, are unnecessary given processes already in place in the law and would shift costs back to Oregonians.

**HB4030 undermines the goals and principles of the RMA:**

This bill would fundamentally undermine the core principles and goals of Oregon’s groundbreaking law to hold producers accountable for the “environmental, social, economic and health impacts” of their packaging (SB 582, §1(4)). Oregon passed the RMA to address the growing crisis of plastic pollution and packaging waste, which have significant environmental impacts on our communities, waterways, and ecosystems. Globally, 11 million metric tons of plastic pollution enter the ocean each year, choking marine life, damaging critical ecosystems, and entering vital food supplies.<sup>1</sup> Packaging represents approximately 40 percent of annual plastic production and a disproportionate amount of pollution found on beaches and waterways worldwide.<sup>2</sup> Taking into account ecosystem damages, tourism losses, impacts to fisheries, the shipping industry, and other economic benefits of the ocean, plastic pollution is estimated to cost between \$500 billion and \$2.5 trillion to the global economy every year.<sup>3</sup>

The RMA was passed with the clear intent to hold plastic and other packaging producers responsible for the high cost of their materials to the environment and communities. HB 4030 would permanently exempt certain berry packaging and all noncompostable packaging that

<sup>1</sup> The Pew Charitable Trusts. (2025) “[Breaking the Plastic Wave 2025.](#)”

<sup>2</sup> Geyer, R., et al. (2017). [Science Advances.](#)

<sup>3</sup> Beaumont, N.J., et al. (2019). [Marine Pollution Bulletin.](#)

comes in direct contact with fresh or processed meat, poultry, fish, or seafood and HB 4030-1 would exclude all business-to-business packaging, which represents a significant proportion of the materials that make up Oregon's waste stream. By carving out entire categories of packaging materials, HB 4030 and HB 4030-1 would shift that burden back onto Oregon communities and taxpayers.

**HB 4030 is unnecessary and redundant of an existing process in the RMA:**

The RMA already provides a pathway for identifying materials that should be excluded through an open and transparent regulatory rulemaking process after consultation with the Oregon Recycling System Advisory Council. This existing provision allows for thoughtful, evidence-based exclusions with a robust stakeholder process. The piecemeal approach put forward in HB 4030 and HB 4030-1 is unnecessary and redundant of this existing pathway. Moreover, a permanent exclusion with no provision for re-review means Oregon would be locked into exempting these materials even as better alternatives become available.

Oregon's law does not impose design requirements on covered materials, making these exclusions unnecessary. The inclusion of berry and meat/seafood packaging in the Recycling Modernization Act does not mandate specific packaging changes. Rather, it requires producers to contribute to the responsible management of the end-of-life of these materials, like all other producers selling into Oregon. Producers of the proposed to-be-exempted products have the same opportunities as all other producers to reduce their EPR compliance fees such as by transitioning to reusable materials or undertaking a lifecycle assessment (LCA) on their materials.

**HB 4030 would increase costs to Oregonians and producers still in the program:**

The significant reduction in covered materials proposed in HB 4030 would create a problematic free rider problem within the EPR system, increasing costs for producers still in the program and Oregonians. Producers of proposed-to-be exempted materials would benefit from the recycling infrastructure and consumer awareness created by the program without contributing their fair share.

Moreover, the packaging to be exempted under HB 4030 are not entire material types, for example, the berry clamshells for strawberries, blueberries, and cane berries (proposed to be excluded under HB 4030) are identical to clamshell packaging used for another berry type, or even used for bakery items. This could create significant operational challenges, complicate compliance, and increase administrative workload, all of which would lead to increased costs for Oregonians and the producers still in the EPR program. This creates a situation where:

- Producers of covered products still in the system will face higher costs as the financial burden is spread across fewer participants.
- Rate payers and taxpayers will continue to bear the high costs of waste management for these excluded items.
- Communities will continue to struggle with the disposal and environmental impacts of these materials without producer support.

EPR is a decades old policy and there is no evidence that EPR increases consumer costs. A study commissioned by DEQ in the development of the RMA, found no correlation between the existence of an EPR for packaging program and consumer prices across provinces in Canada with and without EPR.<sup>4</sup> Another study by Columbia University found that there were no discernible impacts on consumer prices from an EPR requirement.<sup>5</sup> This makes sense as packaging accounts for less than 2% of a product's cost. Increasing exemptions will lead to additional operation challenges and complicated compliance that could lead to higher costs for Oregonians.

HB 4030 would be a step backward for Oregon's environmental leadership and undermines a carefully crafted program before it has had adequate time to demonstrate its effectiveness. The piecemeal approach will shift costs to the public and producers still in the program, fundamentally contradicting the policy goals that led to the creation of Oregon's EPR program, and create a dangerous precedent of weakening the ambition of the RMA. We encourage a more thoughtful approach that includes a robust public process when considering any changes to this program. **We urge you to oppose HB 4030 and HB 4030-1.**

Respectfully,

Anja Brandon, Ph.D.  
Director, Plastics Policy  
Ocean Conservancy

Jamie Pang  
Director of Programs  
Oregon Just Transition Alliance

Celeste Meiffren-Swango  
State Director  
Environment Oregon

Angie R. Marzano  
Waste Reduction Program Supervisor  
Lane County Government

Charlie Plybon  
Oregon Sr. Policy Manager  
Surfrider Foundation

Adrienne Wallace  
Board President  
Waste-Free Advocates

Sonya Carlson  
Executive Director  
BRING

Charlie Fisher  
State Director  
OSPIRG

Sydney Harris  
Policy Director  
Upstream

Tom Egleston  
Legislative Chair  
Association of Oregon Recyclers

Dylan de Thomas  
VP of Public Policy & Government Affairs  
The Recycling Partnership

---

<sup>4</sup> RRS (2021). "[Impacts of EPR Fees for PPP on Price of Consumer Packaged Goods.](#)"

<sup>5</sup> Bose, S. (2022). "[Economic impacts to consumers from extended producer responsibility \(EPR\) regulation in the consumer packaged goods sector.](#)"