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## Benefits of deposit systems:

- High recycling rates: $80 \%$ for beverage containers
- Produce clean recycled materials for manufacturing
- Create jobs and new businesses
- Shift end of life costs for used beverage containers to producers (EPR)
- Reduce litter
- Conserve energy and natural resources
- Reduce greenhouse gas emissions
- Adding wine and non-carbonated beverages in Vermont would reduce GHG emissions equivalent to taking nearly 1,600 cars off the road.
- Prevent pollution from manufacturing new containers from virgin materials


www.container-recycling.org


## PET plastic water bottles are the primary source of beverage sales growth


"Plastic Bottled Water" defined as domestic, non-sparkling water packaged in plastic containers that are 1 gallon or less. Prior to 2015, this also excludes flavored, enhanced, and sweetened waters (3.2 billion units in 2014). Derived from Beverage Marketing Corporation data, 2002-2021.
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## Deposit Amount and Coverage by State


U.S. Nominal Recycling Rates by Deposit Status, 2019*
(All Containers)


Includes all beverages packaged in aluminum cans, PET \& HDPE plastic bottles, glass bottles, gable-top cartons, aseptic boxes, and foil pouches. Non-deposit containers include all containers in states without bottle bills, and all non-deposit beverage containers in states without non-modernized bottle bills. Source: 2019 Beverage Market Data Analysis.

## VT Recycling Rate Calculations for Deposit Material and Non-Deposit Material (tons)

|  | Total "Containers" from 2018 DSM report | Bottle Bill Containers | Remainder = Non Bottle Bill Containers |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Disposed | 34,112 (corrected) | 2,765 (corrected) | 31,347 (corrected) |
| Recycled | 30,183 (corrected) | 18,096 | 12,087 (corrected) |
| Total | 64,295 (corrected) | 20,861 (corrected) | 43,434 (corrected) |
| Recycling Rate | 47\% (corrected) | 87\% (corrected) | 28\% |
| Sources | 2018 DSM report, corrected | Disposal from 2018 report, Table 11; Recycling from 3/4/13 DSM report | Calculated from 2 previous columns |

## Curbside Theoretical Maximum

- CRI estimates that the theoretical maximum (best case scenario beverage container recycling rate achievable by curbside recycling alone) is $\mathbf{3 8 \%}$.
- Best case scenario: 100\% of residents have curbside access; 100\% participate in the program faithfully (no skipping).

| Total beverage container waste generated$100 \%$ |  | Proportion of tons |  | Retentio |  | ter material es: |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | residential sector |  | Sorting |  | Processing |  | Recycling |
|  | X | 63\% | x | 86\% | x | 71\% | = |  |
|  |  | $37 \%$ <br> Away-from-home consumption |  | $\begin{aligned} & 14 \% \\ & \text { loss } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 29 \% \\ & \text { loss } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |

## Cost Savings for Municipalities from Container Deposit Laws

Without deposits, 25\% of Beverage Containers are Recycled. Municipalities save on:
■ Collection costs for recyclables
■ Processing costs for recyclables
Without Deposits, 75\% of Beverage Containers are Disposed or Littered.
Municipalities save on:
■ Collection costs for disposal: 75\% of the containers
■ Landfill tipping fees
■ Litter collection pick-up costs

- Collection from public litter bins
$\square$ Storm drain (or waterway) cleanup costs
■ Costs due to injuries, damage to farms and farm animals

REVENUE LOST from minority of containers that are recycled:
$\square$ Sale of recyclables (scrap value)
$\square 33$ studies have found cost savings for municipalities through implementation of deposit programs https://www.reloopplatform.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/Fact-Sheet-Economic-Savings-for-Municipalities-8FEB2021.pdf

## Financial Impacts in Vermont: MRFs and Households

- There would be no change to aluminum containers in MRFs, because the vast majority of aluminum beverage containers are already in the current law.
- A recent study by NWRA found that an expansion of the law, as proposed in VT, would add $\$ 2$ per year in costs per household, or 17 cents per household per month. However, we also calculate that a slightly higher amount would be saved in landfill tipping fees per household. These cancel each other out.
- CRI's study in MA in 2016 found that the existing bottle bill was saving cities and towns $\$ 20$ million per year.


## Deposit scrap is more valuable.

Single-stream curbside material is more contaminated, low quality vs. clean, separated deposit material.

- PET plastic from curbside programs: $\mathbf{\$ 2 3 0 / t o n}$ PET plastic from deposit programs: $\$ 380 /$ ton (PRCC, 2/23)
- Curbside glass costs $\$ 20 /$ ton to recycle - when markets can be found for it at all-versus deposit glass that has a \$20/ton scrap value.
- Aluminum: spec and off-spec

Beyond immediate impacts, we must consider the catastrophic long-term economic, environmental and societal impacts resulting from plastic pollution, marine debris and climate change if we do not do our part to create a more circular economy.
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## Thank You!

## Learn

Main Website www.container-recycling.org
Bottle Bill Website www.bottlebill.org

## Connect

Facebook www.facebook.com/container.recycling
Twitter @CRI_recycle Linkedln www.linkedin.com/company/container-recyclinginstitute
Contact
Tel (310) 559-7451
Email scollins@container-recycling.org


