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Goal

DEQ seeks to engage with national and state stakeholders to identify and analyze options for modernizing the Oregon E-Cycles Program through legislation to be introduced in 2023.
Purpose of Today’s Workshop

Objective 1: Dive deeper into issues raised during the first Workshop.

Objective 2: Review and seek feedback on Proposals for modernizing Oregon E-Cycles.
Trends in Electronics EPR

• **Covered Materials** – Electronics are becoming lighter, less durable, and more dependent on rechargeable/embedded batteries.

• **Convenience** – There is a growing focus on the convenience standard and not on weight-based performance goals.

• **Program Funding and Administration** – Less involvement from states in direct implementation of the program.
Oregon E-Cycles: What Works

- E-Cycles covers collection, transportation, and recycling cost.
- Convenient statewide collection service.
- Network of engaged collectors.
- Broad group of covered entities can use E-Cycles.
- E-Cycles has a high level of transparency for all stakeholders.
- High per capita rate of collection.
E-Cycles: Opportunities for Modernization

- Create a more robust and stable collection infrastructure.
- Expand scope of covered materials.
- Address limitations of relying heavily on performance goal.
- Reduce administrative burden for PROs and OR DEQ.
Workshop 1 Summary

Covered Materials
- Interest in expansion and exploring embedded batteries.

Program Administration
- Understanding the changes DEQ is interested in.

Convenience Standard
- Desire to maintain current infrastructure and pursue criteria for collection sites.

Reuse
- Interest in figuring out how E-Cycles can better support reuse.
https://nypost.com/2022/06/07/mayor-adams-must-act-on-e-bikes-before-nyc-sees-a-mass-casualty-fire/
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Modernizing OR E-Cycles
Covered Electronic Devices
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Covered Materials List</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oregon</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TVs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Monitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laptops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Peripherals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video Cassette Recorder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portable Digital Music Player</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Video Disc Player</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video Game Console</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scanners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Converter Boxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cable Receivers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satellite Receivers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Video Disc Recorders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-scale Servers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Electrical and electronic equipment’ or ‘EEE’ means equipment which is dependent on electric currents or electromagnetic fields in order to work properly and equipment for the generation, transfer and measurement of such currents and fields and designed for use with a voltage rating not exceeding 1000 volts for alternating current and 1500 volts for direct current)”
Proposed Covered Electronic Devices (CEDS)

• Expand coverage to include peripherals for computers, gaming consoles, and TVs.
• List similar to IL’s program.
• Phased-in approach for new CEDs.
Peripherals

• Part of a device’s “eco-system.”
• Computers: mice, keyboards, speakers, external hard drives, 3-D printers, etc.
• TVs: speakers, remotes, DVD/Blu Ray Players, Rokus, etc.
• Gaming Consoles: controllers, headphones.
• Definite list or ability to modify/interpret by DEQ and manufacturers?
Peripherals
Peripherals
Feedback
Embedded Batteries

What about batteries?
  • Related but very different materials management issue.
  • Different manufacturers.
  • Not present in most CEDs.

What about embedded batteries?
  • Approaching embedded batteries as part of the devices design.
  • CA considering adding embedded devices as a CED.
  • Will require more research and discussion to understand the best place to approach this issue.
  • Potentially a manufacturer funded study.
Collection Convenience
Current E-Cycles Collection Network

• Current infrastructure relies on minimum convenience, PRO contracting for collection, multiple programs, and meeting annual collection determination goal set by DEQ.

• Goal uses past year’s collections to determine next year’s goal.
  • Difficult to predict collection weight (Covid, consumer trends, changes in tech)

• As electronics get lighter: less weight = lower goal = less need for the additional collection sites to meet the performance goal.

• Much of the current infrastructure dependent on the performance goal.

• Less weight does not = less devices or less need for collection sites.
Minimum Collection Convenience

• The current convenience standard sets a minimum of one site per county and one site for any city with a population greater than 10,000.

• The current minimum convenience standard would require approximately 58 sites in OR.

• There are currently 184 collection sites.
Proposed Convenience Standard

• One site per County
• One site per city with a population of 4,000
• One additional site per 20,000 residents in a city.
• Collection services for cities under 4,000 and unincorporated areas.
• Must include willing permitted facilities as sites.
• Minimum of 185 sites (number of sites in 2022)
• Each PRO must meet the minimum convenience standard or agree to work together to meet the standard.
### Proposed Conveniences Standard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Option</th>
<th>Total Number of Sites under Proposed Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Existing Sites (2022)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Site per Incorporated City with population of 4,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One additional site per additional 20,000 in population</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One site in each remaining county (e.g. counties w/out a city of 4,000 or more)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>87*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91*</td>
<td>7*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Number of collection sites estimated
Feedback
Proposed Collection Site Criteria

• Fair compensation for collection costs
• PRO enters into agreement with sites willing to do reuse/repair
• PRO must consult with local gov’t on location of sites
• Basic operations standards for sites
  • Adequate storage for collected material
Feedback
Performance Goals
Proposed Performance Goals

• PRO must develop goal for evaluating program (weight, users, etc.).
• PRO goals must incentivize continuous improvement.
• PRO must achieve high level of public awareness that is measured regularly. (Including culturally specific and tailored outreach for certain populations/communities.)
• Goals = enforceable provision of an approved plan.
• Regular Performance Evaluation of the program, including adequacy of covered devices (funded by PROs).
Feedback
Program Administration
State Contractor Program
Current Role

• Provides 77 collection sites currently in the program.
• Acts as the default program for manufacturers.
• Program creates an administrative burden – does not reflect current best practices in EPR programs.
Proposed Administrative Changes

Current Program (keep):
• Allows for multiple PROs.
• Each PRO must meet the minimum convenience standard or agree to work together to meet the standard.

Proposal:
• Eliminate current State Contractor Program
• Set a timeline and process for phase-out of the program.
• De minimis exemption and/or flat fee for smaller manufacturers.
• PROs required to register manufacturers and collect fees.

Other Approaches:
• Clearinghouse coordinating multiple PROs to meet the convenience standard.
Clearinghouse – What is it?

• 3rd party that coordinates and manages multiple PROs
  • Funded by Producers
  • Organize data collection, distribute costs/responsibilities
  • Reduce administrative work for State.
  • Give producers a choice in PRO by creating a more competitive market.
Feedback
Reuse and Repair
Proposal for Encouraging Reuse

Current Reuse
• Already happening at some collection sites and reported to DEQ.
• Issue with reuse once a CED reaches a processor.

Proposal
• Allow processors to reuse/resell CEDs.
• Consider ability to reuse CEDs in criteria for selecting collection sites.
• Require program plans to include goal for reuse.
Feedback
What are we missing?

What other components of OR E-Cycles could benefit from updates and changes?
Next Steps

• Review your input from today
• Legislative next steps
• Send additional comments to:
  Lelande Rehard
  Leland@productstewardship.us
  Michael Lee
  Michael.LEE@deq.Oregon.gov
Thank You!
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