



GROUP: POPPY & ASTORS

- 1) Features of Sustainable Alternatives
 - a) Strength- Protect product, 3 times handling capacity
 - b) Intefrity- proper outgas rate
 - c) Product safety- cleaning
 - d) Pesticide/toxic residue in source material
 - e) Usage ease/difficulty
 - (a) stackable
 - (b) fast cleaning
 - f) Cost
 - g) Merchandising at store level
 - (a) must be generic
 - (b) ust fit specific schematics *#3
 - h) Same capacity as current
- 2) Systems Conditions
 - a) Now: Driven by customer/retail/consumer demands
 - b) Changes needed:
 - i) Make a line item, Not made part of the pricing margin scheme

- (1) Ex: 5 cent clam shell cherry must get passed as 5 cents <u>not</u> 25 cents due to the Model- bottle bills/tax
- c) Laws
- d) Retailer championing the message to tell thr story for consumer buy-in
 i) POP materials
- 3) Impediments
 - a) Cost
 - b) Volume to share the agenda
 - i) Conventional <u>must</u> buy in
 - c) Small yet willing stores can't drive the changes
 - d) Misplaced Government sponsorship/subsidyi) Much like oil
 - e) Regulations against reusing containers

GROUP: BACHELOR BUTTONS

- 1) Reusable
 - i) Functionality/performance
 - (a) Withstand ice to product
 - ii) Recyclable non-waxed corrugated
 - iii) If forest fiber is used, should be 3rd party certified
 - iv) All must contain maximum post-consumer materials
 - v) Boxes should be standardized for use among all regions, easily stackable, small enough to prevent injury, traceable and returnable.
 - vi) Compostable at better cost than present
 - vii) Reusable containers become a regional currency
- 2) Buy-In
 - i) Fee-based return system
 - ii) Perhaps government (EPA, Farm Bill, etc.) assistance or lease operation or other investment
 - iii) Benefit/learn from current systems:
 - (a) Pallets, bottles, etc.
- 3) Customer Behavior
 - i) Food Safety
 - ii) Receiving/Accounting/Tracking
 - iii) Availability
 - iv) Perceived Costs

GROUP: COLUMBINE & SNAP DRAGON

- 1) Features of Sustainable Alternatives
 - i) Box hold up to moisture and high humidity
 - ii) Box hold up to heavy transportation
- 2) Systems Conditions
 - i) Reusable Plastic Containers
 - (a) Use on farm
 - (b) Inventory management of used plastic containers
 - (c) Cost of transportation
 - (d) Cleaning of plastic container
 - (e) Depends on distance between producer & retailers
 - (f) Could work at local level
 - ii) New technology for waxless box that can hold wet/iced product
- 3) Impediments: Costs
 - i) Customer acceptance
 - (a) Educate consumer
 - ii) Retailers as innovators
 - iii) Who shares cost- Retailer & shipper
 - iv) Solid waste utilities may raise prices
 - v) Tax breaks- incentives for recycling

GROUP: VERBENA

- 1) Poly Pro HDPE Containers
 - i) Peel-off liners
 - (a) High Temp
 - (b) Forced Air/Ice Cooling Capable
 - (c) Moisture
 - (d) Mechanical Damage
 - ii) Bag Products
- 2) Redemption Value
 - i) 1 to 6 on all products
 - (a) Regardless of material or shape
- 3) Costs
 - i) Practicality
 - ii) Adoption
 - iii) Marketability

GROUP: BEGONIA & SALVIA

- 1) Features
 - i) Strength & Durability
 - ii) Collapsibility (Plastic/Pulp)
 - iii) Ease/Efficiency to recycle/reuse without using much fuel/carbon
 - iv) Potential answer "SOLVAY" to coat corrugated
 - (a) Other alternatives: 100% post consumer materials
 - (b) Palm pulp, bulrush, or sugar cane or canaf pulp, etc.
 - (c) Polymers: ie. Polypropylene which can be recycled.
 - 1. I do not agree with merger govt. funding- we need to think of and use better systems/processes
- 2) Funding- internal financial decisions
 - i) Recovery
 - ii) Reuse Loop
 - iii) Retainer behavior- see #3
- 3) Cooperation to close the loop on:
 - i) Logistics
 - ii) Computerization/IT to track movement of RPCs
 - iii) Health/Sanitization facilities & storage area

GROUP: AFRICAN DAISY

- 1) Features
 - i) Inexpensive (case studies to show savings of reusable)
 - ii) Clear labeling with disposal instructions for TM education
 - iii) Uniforma sizes and stackability (perhaps modular system with standard base size but variable height)
 - iv) Collapsable or easily stackable for storage
 - v) Compostable if not reusable
- 2) Funding: perhaps govt. grant or indstry coalition
 - i) Splitting cost between supplier & retailer
 - ii) 3rd party service to amange reusable containers
 - iii) STANDARDIZE BOX SIZE!
 - iv) RFID tags to aid tracking & billing
 - v) Deposit or fee for non-returning
- 3) Impediments
 - i) Too much capitalistic "branding" differentiation creates lack of unifrmaity and sharing ability
 - ii) Too many people with own systems & processes
 - iii) Ease of use
 - iv) Difficulty of education all workers involved

GROUP: SALPIGLOSSIS & NICOTIANA

- 1) Performance Needs:
 - i) Reusable
 - ii) Recyclable
 - iii) Compostable
 - iv) Holds up to moisture and weight
 - v) Branding/sorting capabilities- a package that stands out
 - vi) Stackable
 - vii) ... because "nothing" is not an option
- 2) To replace waxed OCC with reusable boxes
 - i) Infrastructure for returning and washing containers would need to be developed nationwide
 (a) Leasting stations
 - (a) Localized washing stations
- Need to develop collaborative/cooperative partnerships to facilitate movement of reusable containers

GROUP: NO NAME

Features of Sustainable Alternatives

- 1) Reuse and/or Recycle
- 2) Cleanability
- 3) Traceability
- 4) Provides Proper Protection
- i) Functionable
- 5) Cost Effective
- 6) Incentive
- 7) Storage
- 8) Nutrient Rich Byproduct
- 9) Education- Statistics
 - i) Marketing Opportunity (to change behavior)

System Conditions

- 1) Fee/Incentive
- 2) Municipal Involvement?
 - i) Need to create infrastructure
 - ii) Public/Private Partnerships
 - iii) Making it attractive- Cost Benefit

3) Building Awareness and Support at Consumer Level

Impediments

- 1) Economics
- 2) Infrastructure
- 3) Identify Stakeholder & Involvement
- 4) Accurate Scientific Data
- 5) Holistic Evaluation
- 6) Education