

Organizing Committee Plus Other Stakeholders
Western Electronic Product Stewardship Initiative (WEPSI-NW)
9/4/01, 1 – 4 p.m.
Marriott Hotel (Eugene Room), Portland

Attending: Jennifer Allen (OECDD), Shirli Axelrod (City of Seattle), Larry Chalfan (ZWA), Lesli Daniel (Sonoma County Waste Management Agency), Sharon Dowell (Santa Clara County), Cate Gable (GFF), Garth Hickle (MN), Segoe Jackson (Snohomish County), Kathy Hudson Kerns (PSU), Scott Klag (Metro), George Lundberg (Epson), Betty Patton (WEPSI Project Team), Wayne Rifer (WEPSI Project Manager), Tanya Schaefer (RA), Lisa Sepanski (King County), Steve Sharp (EPA R10), Lori Stole (WEPSI Project Team), Shirley Willd-Wagner (CA Integrated Waste Management Board), Jan Whitworth (OR DEQ)

Attending via phone: Chipper Hervieux (WA DOE), Vicky Salazar (EPA R10)

1. Wayne expressed appreciation for King County's and WA DOE's financial support of the 9/25 meeting, and Epson's financial support for future multi-stakeholder meetings.
2. Multi-stakeholder Meeting Plan: Wayne reviewed the meeting plan. WEPSI is planning to hold its meetings about a week prior to NEPSI's meetings, but NEPSI meeting dates beyond the November meeting are subject to change.

WEPSI Multi-stakeholder Meeting Schedule:

M-S #2: September 25 (Embassy Suites Hotel, Seattle)

M-S #3: October 30 (Portland)

M-S #4: December 12 (Seattle)

M-S #5: February 6 (Portland)

M-S #6: March 27 (Seattle)

Note: EPR2 has been moved from April to March 13-14, 2002, in Washington, D.C.

We will wait to select specific locations until the 9/25 meeting. Wayne will investigate the Natural Capital Center as a meeting site in Portland, and we will evaluate Embassy Suites as a site at the 9/25 meeting. Final decisions will be made no later than 9/25.

3. Recommendation for stakeholder subgroups:

Subgroup topics:

Recycling System: This subgroup would examine the existing recycling system for electronic products in the Northwest and needs for the future, including: economic and practical realities of e-scrap recycling; collection, transport and recycling costs; environmentally sound recycling practices; and overseas waste shipment.

Regulatory System: This subgroup would look at how governmental regulations do and/or should govern recovery of e-scrap, including: CRT regulations; landfill bans; controls on environmentally sound recycling and overseas waste shipment.

Product Design: This subgroup would consider how products could be designed for effective end-of-life management and toxics reduction, e.g. design for X, where X is disassembly, demanufacturing, component recovery, recycling, etc.

Financing and Market Drivers: This subgroup would look at how methods of financing and market drivers could be structured to motivate companies to participate in the recovery system and to design products for environmental friendliness: who pays; environmentally preferable purchasing; public education and labeling.

Subgroup tasks:

It is important for each group to look at the problem both nationally and regionally. Perhaps we should present a list of considerations to the tasks that each group is to do, such as regional v. national and/or give each group a charge. The questions to be used to evaluate the models could be used in performing the SWOT.

Analysis:

Wayne and Cate will put together an example of a SWOT and further define what we want from the subgroups for discussion at the 9/20 organizing committee meeting.

Project staff from WEPSI-NW will support each group (Patton (recycling), Rifer (financing/market drivers), Stitzhal (product design-tentative) and Stole (regulations/policy)). The group discussed the additional needs of leading and facilitating in each subgroup. Each staffer will be prepared to facilitate their subgroup at the 9/25 meeting, and will ensure that each group establishes its ground rules. Organizing committee members may be asked to take on a leadership role in a subgroup. Wayne will ask members what their interests are prior to the 9/20 meeting. We will ask people to self-select, keeping in mind that we want balanced groups. We could encourage stakeholders to participate in more than one group.

Each staffer will prepare a background paper for their subgroup; Wayne will devise a format.

In general, the group felt that these are the right subgroup topics. We need to clarify the differences between the recycling system and financing/market drivers. The names of the subgroup topics may be changed.

Straw poll to gauge organizing committee member interest in subgroups:

Recycling - Axelrod

Regulatory - Whitworth, Axelrod, Allen, Hervieux

Product Design - Lundberg, Chalfan, Salazar

Financing/Market Drivers - Klag, Jackson, Axelrod

4. How to present and discuss system models with stakeholder participants at 9/25 meeting:

Cate noted that the very existence of system models is an example of the WEPSI process catalyzing NEPSI's thinking about the models. The models were first discussed in the Santa Clara M-S meeting.

NEPSI began with 12 models, and model numbers 4 and 9 were chosen (based on participant interest) to focus on first. The other ten models have not been dropped from consideration. NEPSI called stakeholders and interviewed them regarding their views of the models, after the models were graphically categorized. The next NEPSI meeting's goal is to reduce the number of models under consideration. WEPSI model B-2 is most like NEPSI 4, and WEPSI C-2 is most like NEPSI 9.

There was concern that at least some of the illustrations are not truly models for product stewardship. The system model packet will be renamed to reflect this.

Wayne reviewed the system model illustrations: There are five different methods based on how the money flows; in each model, product flows the same way (each of the 12 NEPSI models is based on the financing system).

Model A (general tax base): Financed entirely by the solid waste system; money flows through general public to government and government pays for the system.

Model B: Financed through an advanced recovery fee (ARF); the product purchaser pays the retailer at the time of purchase, and the money either goes to the producer or to a fund manager, and then flows back to cover the costs of the recovery system.

Model C: Same as B, but there is a partial refund to encourage the user to bring the product back.

Model D (back-end fee): Financed through an end-of-life (EOL) fee; user pays EOL recovery fee which goes to the collection center.

Model E: Financed by producer with a fully internalized fee, which flows through the retailer to the producer.

Double-funding systems:

Model B-2: An ARF funds transportation and collection, and an internalized fee funds recycling process.

Model C-2: A deposit system with partial refund to the user funds transportation and collection, and an internalized fee funds the recycling system.

Notes on the models: There are no arrows representing information flow, and potential impacts are not shown. The group discussed what the purpose of a system model discussion would be at the 9/25 meeting, and in what format models should be presented. The group agreed that the system model discussion should be limited in scope and time. The discussion should focus on the three broad policy categories (tax-based, back-end fee, front-end fee) presented in multiple formats (graphic, text) along with real-world examples.

Wayne will redistribute the NEPSI models and policies summary.

Scott moved that WEPSI provide the following input to NEPSI: WEPSI likes the models that are under the third category (front-end fee), and urges NEPSI to prioritize the investigation of those. All members present agreed.

5. The next organizing committee meeting is September 20 from 9 to 11 a.m. at Oregon DEQ, Room 6A. As we do not have a call-in number for this meeting, members who plan to attend via phone must RSVP to Tanya at tk@hevanet.com with a phone number at which they can be reached on 9/20.