

# MEETING SUMMARY

## Western Electronic Product Stewardship Initiative

Multi-Stakeholder Meeting #1

July 18, 2001, 11 a.m. - 3 p.m.

Portland, Oregon

### WEPSI Stakeholder Participants

The following list includes the individuals who are considered WEPSI Stakeholder Participants. Participants will receive meeting notifications, minutes and other documentation, generally by e-mail. The list includes first those who attended the 7/18 meeting, and second people who did not attend but who have asked to be involved.

Contact information for Participants will be available on the WEPSI website. IF YOU DO NOT WANT YOUR NAME LISTED, PLEASE CONTACT TANYA AT: [tanyaschaefer@aol.com](mailto:tanyaschaefer@aol.com) or 503-777-0909.

### 7/18 Meeting Attendee List:

Jennifer Allen (OECD)	George Lundberg (Epson)
Shirli Axelrod (City of Seattle)	Frank Marella (Sharp)
Jeff Bickford (Marion Co Solid Waste Dept.)	Kevin McCarthy (Waste Management)
Heather Bowman (EIA)	Tim Northern (Hallmark Refining)
John Bryan (Association of Oregon Recyclers)	Margaret Nover (City of Portland)
Paul Burnet (OR DEQ)	Betty Patton (Environmental Practices)
Pat Campbell (Lewis Co. Solid Waste Utility)	Ted Reichelt (Intel)
Melanie Case (Lewis Co. Solid Waste Utility)	Wayne Rifer (WEPSI Project Manager)
Larry Chalfan (Zero Waste Alliance)	Susan Robinson (Waste Management)
John Chilcott (Earth Protection Services)	Vicky Salazar (EPA Region 10)
Jim Craven (AEA)	Greg Sampson (Students Recycling Used Tech.)
Michelle Crim (Matsushita Kotobuki)	Tanya Schaefer (Recycling Advocates)
Jennifer DuBose (Climate Neutral Network)	Dick Schmidt (City of Portland)
Kent Dunn (Quantum Resource Recovery)	Lisa Sepanski (King County)
Dean Ehlert (ID DEQ)	Doug Smith (Sony)
Cate Gable (Global Futures Foundation)	Eric Stevens (Matsushita Kotobuki)
Denis Gochanour (State of WA Purchasing)	David Stitzhal (NWPS)
Lesa Grant (Sharp)	Lori Stole (Recycling Advocates)
Jane Haley (OR Center for Enviro. Health)	Chris Taylor (OR DEQ)
John Hefferman (Computers for Kids)	Larry Wallace (Gless IIC)
Chipper Hervieux (WA DOE)	Jan Whitworth (OR DEQ)
Sego Jackson (Snohomish County)	Gary Wivag (Gless IIC)
Marcy Jacobs (OECD)	Susan Ziolk (by alternate Clackamas County)
Patricia Jatzak (WA DOE)	Oso (Free Geek)
Kathy Kiwala (Clark County)	
Scott Klag (Metro)	

### Stakeholder Participants who did not attend 7/18:

Cody Augustine, Matsushita Kotobuki	Maureen Kirk, OSPIRG
Gordon Brown, Benton Co Enviro Health	Matt Korot, City of Gresham
David Cauchi, NxtCycle	Gerri O'Rourke, Laurel Hill Center
Jay Celorie, Hewlett-Packard	Morgan Rider, LSI Logic
Lisa Collins, DMC Electronics Recycling	Bill Smith, City of Tacoma Waste Management
Douglas DuVon, Bechtel Hanford	Lynne Storz, Washington County
Marcy Eastman, Hewlett-Packard	Cindy Tatham, Washington County
Erin Gately, Hewlett-Packard	Bruce Walker, City of Portland
Jessica Hamilton, Congressman Wu's Office	

## 1. Welcome and Introductions

Wayne Rifer briefly introduced the Western Electronic Product Stewardship Initiative (WEPSI) and the National Electronic Product Stewardship Initiative (NEPSI) as multi-stakeholder dialogues that will run in parallel. He noted that the product list that they are addressing includes

- Computer CPUs and monitors
- Small and large peripherals, and
- Televisions.

Cate Gable, the WEPSI meeting facilitator, noted that we will use a modified consensus process. We will strive for full consensus, however, no single individual can block the process from going forward. She also noted that the participating stakeholders fall into four major groups – industry, recyclers, advocacy groups, and government. We are aware that some stakeholder groups are missing (see 5. Next Steps).

Rifer identified WEPSI's desired outcomes:

- 1) An action plan for how electronics product stewardship can work in the Pacific Northwest and
- 2) Input to NEPSI.

Wayne and David Stitzhal are representing WEPSI in the NEPSI process. NEPSI participants attending this WEPSI meeting also include: Heather Bowman (EIA), Chipper Hervieux (WA DOE), Sego Jackson (Snohomish County), George Lundberg (Epson), Frank Marella (Sharp), Kevin McCarthy (Waste Management), Doug Smith (Sony), and Chris Taylor (OR DEQ).

All attendees introduced themselves, their affiliation, and briefly stated their interest in attending.

**2. Press attendance** – An issue arose regarding press attendance at WEPSI meetings. Press had expressed an interest and were informed of the meetings. Two reporters were in attendance and the group discussed whether they should be present. Due to a widespread concern that press attendance could impede open discussion, the reporters were asked to leave and they did so voluntarily.

For future meetings press will be informed of the meetings but asked not to attend. It will be explained that their presence could impede open discussion and so they might have a negative effect on the outcome. However, press will be given briefings without quoting individuals and will be provided access to individual participants who choose. We wish to be open and responsive to the growing public interest in the issue, while protecting the ability of participants to fully explore options that are in the public interest.

This will be summarized in a press policy and press contacts will be referred to Wayne Rifer.

**3. & 4. Stakeholder perspectives on the problem/challenge and Items for future action** – This section combines two portions of the meeting. In the first attendees expressed their perception of the problems created by electronic waste and the environmental impacts of product design. These are summarized in seven issue areas. A document listing all comments that were recorded will be posted on the WEPSI website. In the second portion attendees self-selected into five groups to discuss five of the seven issue areas. Following is a synopsis of comments, and does not represent consensus.

### **Issue 1 – Collection/Transportation:**

#### *Perceptions of the Problem:*

A collection/transportation infrastructure is lacking that:

- is convenient for the public.
- maximizes repair and reuse.
- is environmentally sound.
- incentivizes consumers to bring product back.

#### *Action Items:*

Consider several feasible models that could be funded by industry:

- curbside, drop-off, retail stores, outreach/pick-up, events, lease option.

Need to develop processing capacity at a regional level.

## **Issue 2 – Environmentally preferable purchasing/Design/Education:**

### *Perceptions of the Problem:*

There is lacking a credible certification system that:

- establishes criteria for purchasing contracts.
- identifies products that are designed to be recycled, use less toxic materials or include recycled content.
- includes manufacturers as members.
- provides information to consumers.
- influences companies to adopt sustainable practices.

### *Action Items:*

Need to educate consumers about what is happening now.

Need to open communication between stakeholders to educate each other.

Need a collaborative effort to develop inclusive specifications, possibly a labeling program.

## **Issue 3 – Regulatory Issues:**

### *Perceptions of the Problem:*

The current regulatory system needs to be improved so that it:

- provides clarity and national consistency.
- creates a level playing field.
- provides appropriate, flexible incentives for good management and better design.
- encourages reuse and recycling.
- is a market approach with shared responsibility.

### *Action Items:*

Ideally, EPA could establish national rules. Then, states develop universal waste rules.

Establish guidelines for enforcement discretion and/or interim guidelines.

Provide feedback to agencies that this is a priority.

Stakeholders need to be involved early to shape the process.

## **Issue 4 – Environmentally sound recycling:**

### *Perceptions of the Problem:*

A recycling system should:

- reduce costs of handling as hazardous waste and protect environment.
- lengthen product life and encourage reuse.
- minimize both the environmental impact of materials and expense of system.
- prevent the release, manufacture and use of chemicals that disrupt natural systems and have a negative impact on human health.

### *Action Items:*

Establish certification/rating system including standards/ratings for environmental performance of e-products.

Draft a proposal for an environmentally sound recycling system.

Research is needed on:

- What impact does an e-product have on the environment?
- What is happening with overseas materials?

- Where are materials going and what is being done with them?
- What are the toxics, and what quantity of toxics is in products and the production process?
- What is happening in Europe regarding recycling?

### **Issue 5 – Economics/Market Drivers:**

#### *Perceptions of the Problem:*

The economics of an electronics product stewardship system should:

- be sustainable.
- cause no inflation of prices, e.g. a recycling tax.
- be structured as a business, providing new supply of raw material at competitive price.
- provide cost recovery for e-waste buried in loads.
- cover costs of looming TV waste with the upcoming conversion to digital.
- provide reuse/recycling opportunities for small rural areas.
- foster competition among recyclers to reduce prices.
- have a very low or no cost at time of disposal.
- be powered by the economic self-interest of industry and government.
- not cause costs to fall on government/taxpayers.
- have shared responsibilities.

#### *Action Items:*

Focus on identifying whether there is a market.

Itemize costs and revenue options.

Are there opportunities to develop market-based businesses/partnerships here?

### **Issue 6 – Education:**

#### *Perceptions of the Problem:*

The public (consumers) and politicians lack information regarding:

- low recycling rates.
- environmental attributes of products.
- hazards of disposal.

*Action Items:* An action subgroup was not formed on this topic.

### **Issue 7 – Product Design:**

#### *Perceptions of the Problem:*

Market incentives are lacking that:

- motivate green design and eol responsibilities.
- motivate making upgradeable or repairable products.
- internalize environmental costs and impacts that are presently external.
- encourage production of products that are faster to disassemble and have higher residual value.

*Action Items:* An action subgroup was not formed on this topic.

**5. Next Steps:** The group discussion focused on what WEPSI should do next. The following points were recorded. See also the Plan for WEPSI multi-stakeholder activities.

The following data needs were identified:

- Obtain public survey data regarding consumer needs/preferences.
- Invite Federal Asset Recovery outside of Sacramento to speak at a future meeting to clarify what the overseas e-waste option really looks like.

The following work items were identified:

- Perform a regional SWOT (Strengths/Weaknesses/Opportunities/Threats analysis).
- Use a university to review models, provide economic analysis.
- Develop a regulatory fact sheet (national, western and global).
- Hold theme-specific meetings.

Other stakeholders that should be involved:

- Retailers, plastics recyclers/manufacturers, labor, repair industry, software industry, academics.

#### **6. Wrap Up:**

Almost all in attendance indicated that they would like to continue to be involved. Anyone who has an interest in being more closely involved or has time to spend on specific questions should contact Wayne.

#### **SPECIAL THANKS:**

We wish to express gratitude to Waste Management/Recycle America, which provided lunch for all participants, and to PGE, which provided the meeting space.