

Organizing Committee Minutes

Western Electronic Product Stewardship Initiative (WEPSI-NW)

March 6, 2002, 9 - 11:00 a.m.

Oregon DEQ, Portland

Attending: Shirli Axelrod (Seattle), Betty Patton (Project Team), Wayne Rifer (Project Manager), Vicky Salazar (EPA R10), Tanya Schaefer (RA), Dick Schmidt (City of Portland), David Stitzhal (NWPSC), Lori Stole (RA, Project Team), Larry Chalfan (ZWA), Scott Klag (Metro), Patricia Jatzcak (WA DOE), Jan Whitworth (OR DEQ)

1. California Integrated Waste Management Board: Wayne spoke with Mark Kennedy; Mark wishes to become more involved in the WEPSI process. He has a travel issue in regards to our meetings, but would like to be more involved. Wayne advised Mark that he could incorporate a multi-stakeholder perspective at CIWMB meetings with local governments.

2. Topics for the 3/27 M-S meeting: Following the meeting, the project team will draft the agenda, and distribute it to WEPSI participants. The OC will finalize the agenda at the 3/20 meeting.

Wayne asked the following questions: Are there any questions or concerns about how the issues are laid out? Is this the right list? Are there other key priorities to be included? Are the priorities correct? Are the issues defined correctly?

An OC member asked how the issue areas related to the subgroups. In some cases, they are junctions of subgroups, e.g., Incentives for DfE and Feedback Loops from EOL Management comes out of the design subgroup and the market drivers subgroup. Some are subgroup topics, such as Environmentally Sound Management. The issue areas are a way to organize the substantive backbone of the Action Plan.

Concern was expressed about labeling issues as high, medium and low priorities. Some of the low priority items are ones that distinguish WEPSI from NEPSI. Priorities are just intended to signal the amount of time that will be spent at the multi-stakeholder meeting on the topic.

An OC member asked when WEPSI would consider the concept of establishing a base level of service for collection systems (coming out of NEPSI). This has been touched on in the reuse and recycling subgroup, but hasn't been studied in depth. This raises the question of how the infrastructure will be organized, such as the role of a TPO (third-party organization), the role of ASAs (accumulation, sorting and analysis centers), and the role of local government. This concept will be included in the Infrastructure Characterization discussion at the multi-stakeholder meeting.

3. Model validation exercise following the 3/27 meeting: The Polymer Alliance Zone of West Virginia has created a computerized simulation tool, originally intended to support its business plan. The PAZ is working under contract to SAIC and they are involved in business development around recovered plastics, with a focus on engineered plastics.

Their simulation tool could be incredibly valuable to NEPSI if it were broadened to be a model of the national system, with regional adaptations. PAZ needs to talk to the reuse and recycling industry to further develop the model, and they will present for 15 to 20 minutes at the 3/27 meeting. By going through the validation exercises in a multi-stakeholder context, all of the stakeholders will think together about how the whole system could work.

They then will hold a morning meeting on 3/28 with recyclers and reusers. The afternoon will consist of individual meetings. The OC suggested inviting government representatives who have sponsored collection events, and representatives from rural areas. Jan Whitworth will invite rural government representatives, St. Vincent de Paul, and Julie Daniel from BRING Recycling.

Shirli noted that there is a solid waste managers meeting on 3/28 in Yakima that could affect her, Seago and Lisa.

4. Invitations for 3/27 M-S meeting: The group agreed that we should again reach out to a large group of people for this meeting.

Wayne will draft an e-mail invitation for Patricia, Vicky and Jan to use. This will include meeting details, the call-in number and the draft agenda. He will contact Mark Kennedy. Vicky will contact John about inviting people in Region 9. Tanya noted that we do not have e-mails for the majority of people outside of Oregon and Washington.

5. 3/27 M-S meeting agenda, continued: We are not going to have subgroup meetings. The final subgroup meetings will be held via phone the week prior to the M-S meeting. Depending on the issue area, groups may form again, but the ability to do so will be affected by available resources.

The group agreed that Asian exports should be presented after the main ESM presentation.

In general, the discussion should stay focused on the Pacific Northwest.

Each leader will organize their discussion, and will share their outlines with the OC at the 3/20 meeting.

6. Environmental Design for Electronics Workshop: Larry and Wayne are organizing a workshop to be held May 9-10, under the auspices of the Zero Waste Alliance and Portland State University. Funding also will be obtained from corporate sponsors. The workshop features Ab Stevels from Phillips Electronics and Delft University in the Netherlands. He is a world expert in environmental design for electronic products. He is speaking in San Francisco at IEEE immediately prior to coming to Portland.

The workshop is a full day on May 9, and half day of hands-on disassembly on May 10. May 10 is limited to 30 people. Registration is \$95 a day. It was suggested that we specifically invite WEPSI industry stakeholders and perhaps EPA could comp the registration for any product designers to emphasize the importance of their attendance.

The OC granted permission to use the WEPSI participant e-mail list for the conference. Others volunteered lists of their own. Wayne will make the e-mail invitation available to the OC.

7. WEPSI Funding: Lisa and Shirli were able to come up with \$17,000 (\$10,000 from Seattle's CPG grant and \$7,000 from King County) to continue the WEPSI process.

This gets us through the next multi-stakeholder meeting. We also have a proposal in to OECD for \$12,000. We also are submitting a grant request targeted at producing the Action Plan through Clark County. Both of these proposals are for Phase 1 of WEPSI.

We also are submitting three full proposals to EPA for Phase 2.

Wayne expressed his appreciation for everyone's quick response to the funding situation, and asked everyone to check on available funding to complete Phase 1. Thanks go to Seattle, Portland, and King County for additional funding, and Sege is looking into additional funding from Snohomish County.

Tanya will contact Lisa about the room reservation for the May 22 M-S meeting, and the Seattle OC members will talk about food, equipment, etc. Seattle may be able to help with food again.

8. ESM: Lori asked the group if they felt the prison labor issue should be included in the ESM issue. In general, the OC felt that it should be noted as an issue and the stakeholder group should decide if it would be pursued. Lori then asked if it would be useful to present the Asian export and prison labor issues via a SWOT analysis. OC members wanted to avoid advocating for a certain ideal, and wanted all sides to be presented fairly.

9. NEPSI: The financing issue is being addressed very aggressively and productively. It is hoped that industry will come forward with a proposal for a financing system.

10. The next meeting is March 20, 2002, 9-11 a.m. at Oregon DEQ, Room 6A. Call-in number is 206-553-4602.