

**Draft Summary of the NEPSI Infrastructure Subgroup Conference Call**  
**April 18, 2002**  
**3:00 - 4:00 PM EST**

**Members in Attendance:**

Wayne Rifer, WEPSI (facilitator)	Scott Klag, Metro
Julie Rhodes, ReDO	Butch Teglas, Philips
Lynn Rubenstein, NERC	Sego Jackson, Snohomish County
Ed Nevins, JVC	Gordon Hui, EPA OSW
Heather Bowman, Electronic Industries Alliance	Kevin McCarthy, Waste Management
Reggie Caudill, NJIT	David White, Nokia
Sheila Davis, Materials for the Future	David Stizhal, WEPSI
Garth Hinkle, Minnesota OEA	Colleen Campbell, ERG (notetaker)

The participants of the NEPSI Infrastructure Subgroup met via conference call on April 18, 2002, from 3:00 to 4:00 PM EST. This document briefly summarizes the major topics covered during the subgroup's discussions, and highlights the agreements that were reached.

**Purpose of Call**

The purpose of this conference call was to complete a draft of the Base Service document as well as to review Reggie's model. However, because the discussion on the Base Service document ran for the length of the call, Wayne Rifer suggested that an additional Infrastructure subgroup conference call take place on April 25 at 3:00 PM EST. The call will focus on both the completion of the Base Service document draft and the review of Reggie's model.

**Base Service Document**

Wayne Rifer began the discussion by suggesting that the subgroup develop a basic consensus document with non-majority opinions noted. The subgroup agreed that it was important to get a draft of the document out to the other subgroups to aid them in their discussions. It was also agreed that the draft document will include notations for issues still under discussion. The notations will include a brief statement of opposing viewpoints.

**Retailer Collection**

The subgroup began discussion of the Base Service document with comments on the language describing basic service standards for retailer collection. Butch Teglas pointed out that it may be difficult to force retailers to cooperate. Scott Klag suggested that the document should be drafted as a concept for a good system. He noted that the discussion has not progressed to the point where it is clear how the concept will be achieved. Another subgroup member pointed out that the document gives a menu for shared responsibility.

Heather Bowman suggested removing the prescriptive language from the document. She said that the retailers need to be a part of the NEPSI discussion, and that without any input from the retailers there is a very limited perspective on what they are capable of doing or willing to do. She also pointed out that small retailers may not have room for collection.

Another participant pointed to the language for shared responsibility and suggested that retailers should be responsible for the products that they put into the market. It was noted that retailer collection is involved in a number of the models discussed by the subgroup.

Scott Klag noted that the document provides retailers with options. He suggested that the document should be looked at as delineating an ideal workable system. Sego Jackson suggested that including retailers in the language will bring them to the table, whereas removing them from the language would essentially reward them for not participating. Heather Bowmann said that the more people who have to handle the money, the bigger the system has to be, and that it is necessary to keep costs at a reasonable level.

It was noted that there seemed to be some confusion regarding what the document represents. The subgroup agreed that the document should represent guidance of what a good system should consist of and

that other changes can be made throughout the process. It was also suggested that the document should provide guidance for a third-party organization.

Wayne Rifer and Garth Hinkle will edit the document to get rid of the prescriptive language, as well as add qualifiers to retailer collection and other portions of the document flagged as issues in need of further discussion.

Ed Nevins expressed concern about the language involving 25 percent sales figures. He noted that the rest of the document does not use specific numbers, and therefore the percent sales language might also be changed. He said that Walmart may do a smaller percentage of NEPSI equipment sales than a Radio Shack, but that they should not be excluded because of it. He suggested loosening the language (i.e. "big box stores").

### **Rural Collection**

The next item for discussion was rural collection. One subgroup member asked whether the subgroup wanted to replace the current "X% of population" with a percentage they can all agree on, or whether they wanted to leave the value open for future consideration by the TPO.

Reggie Caudill volunteered to work up some numbers regarding the number of households within each urban drop-off perimeter.

The rural collection question was noted as an issue warranting further discussion.

### **Mail-back Service**

Heather Bowman raised the question of why customers are not being charged for mail-back service. She noted that when people opt to have items shipped to them, they pay the shipping fees as a matter of convenience, and she questioned why this logic would not be applied to the return of items as well. Another subgroup member pointed out that the intention of the mail-back system is to provide an option for rural customers who lack other options.

The discussion then turned to the first bullet point, which states that vendors who sell NEPSI products by mail should provide a no-charge recycling service by mail to mail-order customers.

Butch Teglas made the point that companies such as HP are already performing mail-back services where the customer pays the mail back fee, and noted that it would be difficult to recommend that they alter their system so that they now incur the costs. Another participant noted that the mail-back option was estimated to be a small percentage of returns. It was pointed out that the intention is to provide examples of how the system can be structured.

Mail-back service was flagged as an issue needing further discussion.

### **Next Conference Call**

At the end of the call, Wayne Rifer said that he and Garth Hinkle would rework the document with these suggestions and send new drafts out to the group to be discussed in the next conference call.

The next Infrastructure Subgroup conference call is scheduled for April 25, 2002, at 3:30 PM EST.