



League of Women Voters of Minnesota Records

Copyright Notice:

This material may be protected by copyright law (U.S. Code, Title 17). Researchers are liable for any infringement. For more information, visit www.mnhs.org/copyright.

We the undersigned, urge the Minnesota Legislature to pass the container deposit law---S.F. 741 and H.F. 683---which would place a 5¢ deposit on all beverage containers sold in this state, in order to encourage energy conservation, reduce the waste stream, diminish litter, and create jobs and new industry.

NAMEADDRESS

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____
6. _____
7. _____
8. _____
9. _____
10. _____
11. _____
12. _____
13. _____
14. _____
15. _____
16. _____
17. _____
18. _____
19. _____
20. _____
21. _____
22. _____
23. _____
24. _____
25. _____
26. _____
27. _____
28. _____
29. _____
30. _____
31. _____
32. _____
33. _____
34. _____

Other States Have Gained Jobs Through Beverage Container Deposit Legislation

MINNESOTA NEEDS MORE JOBS!

CONSIDER WHAT HAS HAPPENED IN STATES THAT ALREADY HAVE CONTAINER DEPOSIT LAWS:

- *** In Michigan, the employment gain in recycling, handling, and bottling, has been estimated at 4,600. Many of these jobs involved unskilled labor at the retail level, but they also include skilled jobs in transportation, recycling, and operating and maintaining washers. Michigan's 30 bottlers have added 720 jobs since passage of the law.
- *** Within Oregon, employment showed a net increase of 365 jobs during the 2-year transition period after the law went into effect. The Increase was found within the transportation, warehouse, and handling sectors. However, the study did not include the increase in the number of jobs resulting from the expanding recycling industry.
- *** In Iowa, 379 new part-time jobs were added in the retail sector for the purpose of sorting. Additional jobs were required in the trucking industry for recycled containers.
- *** New York state, which passed a 5¢ deposit law in June, 1983, predicts that 5000 to 6000 jobs will be created in their state.
- *** In Vermont, which passed deposit legislation in 1973, distributors and some retailers have hired additional workers to handle and sort containers and to drive beverage trucks, all of which amounted to 150 full-time jobs. In addition, 100 redemption centers opened, creating 200-300 additional full-time jobs.

WHAT ABOUT JOB LOSS IN STATES THAT PASSED CONTAINER DEPOSIT LAWS?

Some jobs were lost in container industries in deposit states partly because of a lower deposit on refillable bottles than on cans or nonrefillables. (Michigan and Oregon suffered some initial job displacement because of this "two-tiered" deposit law, which placed a 5¢ deposit on certain varieties of refillable bottle, and 10¢ on nonrefillables.) The Minnesota proposal calls for a uniform deposit, which eliminates any economic incentive to purchase bottles over cans or nonrefillable bottles. According to the Dept. of Natural Resources in Michigan, their glass container industry is in better economic shape now than it was prior to passage of the deposit law.

For more information contact Representative Kathleen Vellenga or Senator Eric Petty.



S.F. 741 and H.F. 683

Contact: Jeanne Crampton, 926-8760 or Ginnie Black, 872-6407

Container Conservation Coalition

555 Wabasha

(612) 224-5445

St. Paul, MN. 55102

Beverage Container Deposit Legislation

S.F. 741

H.F. 683

is Needed to...

reduce litter

The Minnesota Department of Transportation spends \$900,000 on litter pick-up each year. Beverage containers are the highest volume, the most visible, and the longest-lasting part of roadside litter. States that have container deposit laws have all reported decreased litter of all kinds since enactment of such laws. Vermont reported a 35% decrease in litter, and a 31% decrease in litter pick-up costs. Perhaps more important than the actual percentage reduction is the fact that container litter is the most dangerous variety of litter. The Resource Conservation Committee, a nine-agency federal task force reported that at least 10-million dollars could be saved annually in medical bills through implementation of a national mandatory deposit law. Both Connecticut and Vermont repealed their litter tax laws after enactment of container deposit laws.

reduce solid waste

Siting of solid waste landfills has become very difficult---precisely at the moment we need to begin replacing older landfills, particularly in the Metro area. (Several will be filled by 1987.) Beverage containers account for about 30,000 tons of waste, and 5 to 6 percent of available space in Metro landfills. Containers are the least degradable portion of waste, decomposing at a much slower rate than food, fiber, and paper wastes, if they decompose at all. Most "waste to energy" facilities would perform as well, if not better, with the removal of beverage containers. Close to 100 percent of soft drink and beer containers are being recycled in Michigan each month, providing an income from the sale of materials, rather than a cost for disposal. It is estimated that Minnesota could gain 5 to 7 million dollars a year for aluminum scrap, and somewhat over 8 million dollars for glass, under a deposit law.

reduce energy consumption

Minnesota paid over 11 percent of its income for energy in 1981, and this is expected to rise to 12.4 percent in 1982 to 7.3 percent in 1985. Container deposit legislation provides an immediate recycling rate of 80 to 95 percent (as opposed to a high of 20 percent for voluntary recycling, taking all containers into consideration.) 95 percent energy is saved making cans from recycled aluminum, reusing glass saves 20 percent energy. The U.S. General Accounting Office has estimated that we could save 20-67 percent of the energy used to manufacture beverage containers, if those containers were recycled. This translates to 11 to 26 trillion BTUs yearly, countrywide. In comparison, appliance efficiency standards saves 10.2 trillion BTUs, and the 55 mph speed limit saves 1.4 trillion BTUs. It doesn't make sense to bury or burn a useable commodity!



Container Conservation Coalition

555 Wabasha

(612) 224-5445

St. Paul, MN. 55102

CONTAINER CONSERVATION COALITION
(C.C.C.)

League of Women Voters of Minnesota
Jeanne Crampton
555 Wabasha
St. Paul, MN. 55102
(612) 224-5445

Minnesota Audubon Council
Kevin Proescholdt
2929 Fourth Ave. S. Suite 0
Minneapolis, MN. 55408
(612) 827-4001

Minnesota Coalition of Bicyclists
2959 Garfield Ave. S.
Minneapolis, MN., 55408
(612) 824-9161
Eric Schulman (332-4977)

St. Paul Audubon
Sherry Dragula
1630 Marshall Ave.
St. Paul, MN. 55104
(612) 645-6767

Metropolitan Inter-County Assn.
Marie Silver
2305 Ford Parkway
St. Paul, MN. 55116
(612) 293-9223

Poor Richard Inc.
Richard Wybierala
400 Whitall St.
St. Paul, MN. 55101
(612) 776-6333; 774-1311

Sierra Club
Nelson French
2929 Fourth Ave. S. Suite N.
Minneapolis, MN. 55408
(612) 827-3859

Common Cause
Joyce Williams
555 Wabasha
St. Paul, MN. 55102
(612) 227-9139

White Bear Recycling
Mary E. Ayde
1201 N. Birch Lake Blvd.
White Bear Lake, MN. 55110
(612) 429-2397 (H), 429-7763 (W)

Minnesota Public Interest
Research Group- Marcia Janssen
2412 University Ave. SE
Minneapolis, MN. 55414
(612) 376-7554

Joint Religious Legislative
Coalition- Samuel I. Horowitz
122 W. Franklin Ave.
Minneapolis, MN. 55404
(612) 870-3670

S.P.E.A.C. (Student Group)
c/o Dr. Ray A. Nelson
Box 44, Bemidji State Univ.
Bemidji, MN. 56601
(218) 755-2850

Minnesota Conservation Federation
1034 Cleveland Ave. S.
St. Paul, MN., 55116
(W) 690-3077 (H) 824-9227
Diane J. Kelly

Izaak Walton League of America
3255 Hennepin Ave.
Minneapolis, MN. 55408
Ruth Saari 926-5587
Erica Sitz 421-8823

SUPPORTERS

Eagle Sanitation, Newport
Citizens Party of Minn.
Earl Hauge, Glenwood
Minnesotans Against Nonsensical
Use of Resources, Brainerd
St. Cloud Area Environmental Council
Wm. Mitchell Environmental Law Society
Robert Eikum, Moose Lake

SAVE (Save America's Vital
Energy, Inc.,) Henderson
Save Lake Superior Assn., Duluth
Northern Sun Alliance
Todd Bunde, St. Paul
Heather Kindem, Minneapolis
Duluth Chapter Izaak Walton League

CONTAINER CONSERVATION COALITION
League of Women Voters of Minnesota
Minnesota Audubon Council
Common Cause
Minnesota Coalition of Bicyclists
St. Paul Audubon
Metropolitan Inter-County Assn.
Poor Richard Inc.
Sierra Club-North Star
White Bear Recycling
Minnesota Public Interest Research Group
Joint Religious Legislative Coalition
S.P.E.A.C. (Student Group-Bemidji)
Minnesota Conservation Federation
Izaak Walton League of America

SUPPORTERS OF CONTAINER DEPOSIT LEGISLATION
Eagle Sanitation
Citizens Party of Minnesota
Earl Hauge
Minnesotans Against Nonsensical Use of
Resources
St. Cloud Area Environmental Council
Wm. Mitchell Environmental Law Society
Robert Eikum
Save America's Vital Energy, Inc.
Save Lake Superior Assn.
Northern Sun Alliance
Todd Bunde
Heather Kindem
Duluth Chapter Izaak Walton League

CONTAINER CONSERVATION COALITION
League of Women Voters of Minnesota
Minnesota Audubon Council
Common Cause
Minnesota Coalition of Bicyclists
St. Paul Audubon
Metropolitan Inter-County Assn.
Poor Richard Inc.
Sierra Club-North Star
White Bear Recycling
Minnesota Public Interest Research Group
Joint Religious Legislative Coalition
S.P.E.A.C. (Student Group-Bemidji)
Minnesota Conservation Federation
Izaak Walton League of America

SUPPORTERS OF CONTAINER DEPOSIT LEGISLATION
Eagle Sanitation
Citizens Party of Minnesota
Earl Hauge
Minnesotans Against Nonsensical Use of
Resources
St. Cloud Area Environmental Council
Wm. Mitchell Environmental Law Society
Robert Eikum
Save America's Vital Energy, Inc.
Save Lake Superior Assn.
Northern Sun Alliance
Todd Bunde
Heather Kindem
Duluth Chapter Izaak Walton League

CONTAINER CONSERVATION COALITION
League of Women Voters of Minnesota
Minnesota Audubon Council
Common Cause
Minnesota Coalition of Bicyclists
St. Paul Audubon
Metropolitan Inter-County Assn.
Poor Richard Inc.
Sierra Club-North Star
White Bear Recycling
Minnesota Public Interest Research Group
Joint Religious Legislative Coalition
S.P.E.A.C. (Student Group-Bemidji)
Minnesota Conservation Federation
Izaak Walton League of America

SUPPORTERS OF CONTAINER DEPOSIT LEGISLATION
Eagle Sanitation
Citizens Party of Minnesota
Earl Hauge
Minnesotans Against Nonsensical Use of
Resources
St. Cloud Area Environmental Council
Wm. Mitchell Environmental Law Society
Robert Eikum
Save America's Vital Energy, Inc.
Save Lake Superior Assn.
Northern Sun Alliance
Todd Bunde
Heather Kindem
Duluth Chapter Izaak Walton League

CONTAINER CONSERVATION COALITION

League of Women Voters of Minnesota

Minnesota Audubon Council

Common Cause

Minnesota Coalition of Bicyclists

St. Paul Audubon

Metropolitan Inter-County Assn.

Poor Richard Inc.

Sierra Club-North Star

White Bear Recycling

Minnesota Public Interest Research Group

Joint Religious Legislative Coalition

S.P.E.A.C. (Student Group-Bemidji)

Minnesota Conservation Federation

Izaak Walton League of America

SUPPORTERS OF CONTAINER DEPOSIT LEGISLATION

Eagle Sanitation

Citizens Party of Minnesota

Earl Hauge

Minnesotans Against Nonsensical Use of
Resources

St. Cloud Area Environmental Council

Wm. Mitchell Environmental Law Society

Robert Eikum

Save America's Vital Energy, Inc.

Save Lake Superior Assn.

Northern Sun Alliance

Todd Bunde

Heather Kindem

Duluth Chapter Izaak Walton League



Container Conservation Coalition

The League of Women Voters of Minnesota (LWVMN) and fourteen other organizations and individuals recently formed a coalition known as the CONTAINER CONSERVATION COALITION (CCC) to work for the passage of a container deposit law for Minnesota. Representative Kathleen Vellenga (DFL), District 64A, St. Paul and Senator Eric Petty (DFL), District 62, Minneapolis, will be chief authors of the bill.

The CCC is basing its campaign on the following points:

1. Information from other deposit states indicates there will be a net job gain following enactment of a deposit law.
2. There is a potential for the development of new industries to use the 80 to 92% return of material (glass, metal, plastic) that a deposit law engenders. (The return of material is much higher under a deposit law than it is under voluntary recycling.)
3. With a deposit law, costs for litter pickup and landfill expansion will be reduced, and energy to manufacture new containers will be conserved.
4. There will be no attempt to dictate to the marketplace the type or variety of beverage container to be used. (The deposits will be standard on all beverage containers that are nonrefillable and will remain as they are now on refillable containers.)

LWVMN recently published an eight-page report on container deposit laws that refutes some of the arguments used by the opposition in the past. We are convinced that a law mandating recycling and/or reuse of beverage containers makes sense and we believe a majority of Minnesotans agree with us.

The deposit bill we are urging be passed would place a five-cent deposit on soft drink and malt beverage containers (as it is in Iowa) and there would be a reimbursement for the redeemer (either retailer or recycler) to cover the costs of implementation.

We would be delighted to have you join with us in this effort. If you or your organization would like to support the Coalition, please return the attached response sheet, call LWVMN at (612) 224-5445 or use our WATS line (800) 642-9663. To date, the LWVMN has funded the Coalition's effort and Coalition members have donated their lobbying services. It is obvious that a campaign such as this needs a minimum amount of money for postage, reproduction and education of legislators if we are to combat the tactics of opponents with unlimited (it seems) funds. Checks should be made out to the Container Conservation Coalition, and sent in c/o LWVMN at 555 Wabasha, St. Paul, MN 55102.

Sincerely

Jeanne Crampton

Jeanne Crampton, Chair
Container Conservation Coalition

JC/rk

STATE COMMITTEE ON WASTE, RECYCLING, AND DEPOSIT LEGISLATION

Thursday, March 11, 1982, 9:30 a.m.

State LWVMN office
555 Wabasha
St. Paul, MN

Plan to attend - see Board Memo for further information. Please add anything we have forgotten! Nan Grimsby - 922-9403 or Jeanne Crampton - 926-8760.

PROPOSED AGENDA

- I. Information from states who have Deposit Legislation: (obtain copies of bills)
 - A. Michigan, Oregon, Vermont, Maine, Iowa, Massachusetts, Connecticut and Delaware (summer of '82).
 1. What is the deposit? Is there a range?
 2. How well is it working? (At least two sources of response.)
 3. Who is impacted?
 4. Where is the material going?
 5. What is the ratio of recyclables to refillables?
 6. On what containers is the deposit levied?
 7. How are the markets holding up for recycled material?
 8. How was legislation originally passed? (Legislature, referendum, etc.)
 9. Where was the support? How was it gained? Opposition?
 - B. Washington Litter Law: How is it working? What does it accomplish?
 - C. If possible, obtain the name of a contact in each state who is knowledgeable about the laws, and to whom we might speak on the telephone, if necessary.
- II. Is deposit legislation/mandatory recycling a viable concept for Minnesota?
 - A. Who would the opposition be? (Labor unions, food retailers, etc.)
 - B. Supporters?
 - C. What should the deposit be? (5¢ to 25¢, or a range?)
 1. Should it be on all beverage containers, or only pop and beer?
 2. Other containers, such as wine and liquor bottles? Milk?
 3. What about plastic bottles?
 - D. Who or what is the proper vehicle for redemption?
 1. Retailers?
 2. Recycling Centers?
 - a. Private?
 - b. Governmental?
 3. How financed?
- III. Alternatives to deposit legislation:
 - A. What other methods could encourage people to recycle?
 1. Increased landfill costs.
 2. Rebate on Garbage fees.
 - B. Woodbury, New Jersey: municipal ordinance that mandates the separation of paper, aluminum, mixed metals and glass. How well does it work? What is the cost? Income? Could it work here?
 - C. Report from St. Cloud: Demonstration program on mandatory source separation.



LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF MINNESOTA

555 WABASHA • ST. PAUL, MINNESOTA 55102

PHONE: (612) 224-5445

MEMO

TO: All Deposit Legislation/Recycling
Committee Members
FROM: Nancy Grimsby and Jeanne Crampton

SUBJECT: Meeting

DATE: May 4, 1982

Deposit Legislation/Recycling Committee Meeting
May 25, 1982
9:30 a.m.
State League Office

Attached you will find a list of persons who appeared at the first meeting of this committee on March 11th, plus three others who notified us that they wish to join. Those who agreed to investigate specific states or communities are identified as well. We hope that by now some information and answers are beginning to trickle in! (Joanne Englund got a quick response to her query to Columbia, Missouri. Michael R. Sanford, Deputy City Manager replied with, "I am the deposit law czar," and a lot of information. In reply to the question about who was unhappy with the law he said, "1. Those who like to drive around in pick-up trucks with rifles in the back who like to drink beer and throw cans out the windows; and 2., more importantly, the beverage industry."

Our next meeting will be May 25th. If it is at all possible, would you try and condense the information you have received into a readable or tellable report, with specific emphasis on information you feel you still need to receive, or that is unclear? If you have been given other names or locations to contact, please follow up. At that time we will regroup in light of what we know at that point and forge on.

I have received another copy of the Michigan Report (published by a Special Joint Legislative Committee) that studied the Impact of Michigan's Deposit Legislation. With this copy was included a "Minority Report" signed by Matthew McNeely, Speaker Pro Tempore, State Rep. 16th District, that I had not received before. Rep. McNeely queries some of the information in the original report and in some cases flatly says it is not true. I am now trying to sort out fact from fiction. Meantime, some of the points he brings up may be of help to you in asking questions of other areas:

1. Counts of containers returned to wholesalers from retailers. "...many wholesalers give refunds for 240 cans only to find less, or to find many foreign containers (not from Michigan) ...which have no refund value.
2. Decrease in the cost of scrap steel, "...well over 50% in the last year."
3. "The report advises that some aluminum companies have supplied can crushing equipment and storage units for distributors. The report fails to point out, however, that distributors must purchase glass crushers and sorters and trucks to haul the crushed glass (cull) to the processing plant."
4. Difficulty of retailers and wholesalers in providing for the storage of containers.
5. Sanitation problems. Containers returned have residue that breeds bacteria and attracts insect pests.
6. "The report says members of the committee have personally observed that Michigan roadsides appear to have less litter than those in neighboring states. Are all members of the committee willing to verify that they have personally checked Michigan roadsides and compared them with other states?" (Kind of picky! I have, and I'll have to side with the committee report.)
7. Some problem with green glass. "The situation was so bad that one Dearborn wholesaler was within one day of using a landfill to discard his green glass. The problem of finding appropriate waste redemption centers continues."

8. "After admitting there are increased costs for fuel, handling of bottles, and labor, the report states, '...it is likely that less energy overall is consumed under a deposit system...' There are no facts to support this statement." Has anyone gotten any information from another area that would indicate they did any study on this sort of thing? (We have a rather quick study done by a consulting firm for a MN Legislative Committee last year that has some assumptions.)
9. Problems with border locations. Mr. McNeely says that wholesalers are affected as well as retailers -- some say their business is down by as much as 50%.
10. "...I believe the notion of retailer agents, or regional recycling centers, would create an added burden for the consumer and a significant economic imposition on wholesalers who have already outlaid millions of dollars for the equipment necessary to implement the law in good faith. (ED. note -- evidently Michigan is talking about establishing recycling centers.) Keep in mind that a regional recycling center would have to do many of the things that wholesalers have already done in terms of capital outlay. In effect, the regional recycling center would be duplicating the efforts of wholesalers; again, at additional cost to the consumers. Ultimately, the regional recycling center would be picking up returnables from some retailers and wholesalers would be picking up from others."

I hope, without reading the Michigan Report itself, these criticisms give you some idea of the scope of the argument. I will be in Michigan from April 22 until May 5 or so, and hope to get some of this sorted out during that time.

Please be sure to keep track of any material you receive, since when we put our report together we will want to carefully footnote and identify any statistics or specifics that we use. I am hoping that we can come up with a really definitive study on the subject!

If you can't make the meeting on May 25th, would you let either Nan or I know ahead of time, and if you have a report, mail it in? We aren't worried about a slick presentation; rough drafts are fine.

See you in May, Jeanne Crampton, 926-8760
Nan Grimsby, 922-9403

STATE LWV DEPOSIT LEGISLATION/RECYCLING COMMITTEE

March 11, 1982

Marjory Adams
112333 Chatfield
Chaska, MN 55318
448-3356
Woodbury, N.J.

Charlotte Helseth
4311 Bloomington Avenue
Minneapolis, MN 55407
721-3901
Connecticut

Leola Rempel
1424 Belmont Lane
Roseville, MN 55113
631-1509
Recycling in St. Paul

Sheila Brunelle
1252 Ohio Street
West St. Paul, MN 55118
457-9230
Delaware

Dorothy Lace
7445 11th Avenue South
Richfield, MN 55423
866-5488
Iowa

Mary Lou Wheeler
2086 Iglehart
St. Paul, MN 55104
645-8746
Oregon

Lois Cheney
3156 Dakota Avenue South
St. Louis Park, MN 55416
929-5766

Joyce Lake
555 Wabasha
St. Paul, MN 55102
227-9139

Washington State Litter Law Common Cause

Mary Davies
1001 South 10th Street
Moorhead, MN 56560
(218) 233-2175
Suffolk County, New York

Eleanor Lipsohn
606 Main
Winona, MN 55987
(507) 454-6590

Joanne Englund
St. Paul Public Works
600 City Hall Annex
St. Paul, MN 55102
292-7264
Columbia, Missouri

Mertyce Mayne
1479 Hythe
St. Paul, MN 55108
645-4007

Karen Evens
1910 10th Avenue South, #4
St. Cloud, MN 56301
Leave Message: 253-5651
Maine

Connie Metcalf
860 W. Moore Lake Drive
Fridley, MN 55432
571-3596
Vermont

Katie Fournier
912 18th Avenue Southeast
Minneapolis, MN 55414
331-5615
Ontario

Linda Peck
Route #4
St. Cloud, MN 56301
685-3365
Massachusetts, National Deposit Legislation

Andrea Grix
8860 Lincoln Street Northeast
Blaine, MN 55434
784-6630

Michigan United Conservation Club

Above are listed participants in the League of Women Voters of Minnesota study committee on deposit legislation and recycling. Each person's area of investigation is listed below her name.

Jeanne Crampton
4330 Wooddale Avenue South
St. Louis Park, MN 55424
926-8760
Michigan

N.R. Co-chairs

Nancy Grimsby
5932 Wooddale Avenue
Edina, MN 55424
922-9403



LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF MINNESOTA

555 WABASHA • ST. PAUL, MINNESOTA 55102

PHONE: (612) 224-5445

MEMO

TO: Deposit/Recycling Committee

FROM: Nan Grimsby - Jean Crampton

SUBJECT: Report

DATE: June 17, 1982

Action taken 6/17/82:

1. Decision was made to write our own bill.
2. Report rough draft deadline June 30, 1982.
3. Next meeting Tuesday, August 17, 1982, 9:30 a.m., state office.

At this meeting the rough draft will be discussed (hopefully members will have it before the meeting) and edited.

4. If you were not at the meeting, but would like to help on the rough draft, please call Jeanne Crampton by June 24th. This will amount to only two or three paragraphs but may require some research. As of June 23, there will be a file established at the LWV office for use by the Committee.
5. New York State now has a Deposit Law! (As of 4 p.m. June 15, 1982.)
6. Please: If you have material pertinent to deposit legislation, recycling or litter laws, send it or drop it off at the office for the file mentioned above.

Jeanne Crampton, 926-8760

Nan Grimsby, 922-9403

*Send rough draft to Jeanne Crampton, Rt. #2, Box 297, Bear Lake, MI 49614. Allow 3 days to arrive.

DEPOSIT LAWS:

RECYCLING, VOLUNTARY AND MANDATORY:

LITTER LAWS:

WHO'S DOING WHAT?

HOW WELL DOES IT WORK?

Is the "throwaway" society finally coming to an end, evolving into the "maybe we'd better save it" community? In retrospect it seems incredible that Americans were so quickly and completely convinced, soon after World War II, that they could use goods and materials as if they were inexhaustible and that the day of reckoning would never come! It hasn't quite arrived but it is apparent that our resources are finite, and that humankind had better start thinking of garbase as a resource to be mined and extracted like any other ore - or better yet - extracted after use but before disposal.

At the present time there are a number of methods employed to achieve such recovery, nearly all of which can be catagorized under one of three headings: Deposit laws, (5¢ to 30¢ paid by redeemers for glass, metal or plastic containers returned for refilling or recycling); Recycling, (containers and other roducts, paper for example, collected for reuse as a raw material); Litter Laws, (usually includes a small tax on a variety of goods that end up in the waste stream to provide equipment/personnel for recovery from the environment and consumer education).

The following report by the LWV of Minnesota is an effort to provide an up-to-date, once-over-lightly, catalog of all three methods, as well as some commentary on how well each works, and what the pluses and minuses are. To encourage readability we have purposely tried to provide only a brief outline and pertinent commentary. For those needing more in-depth or extensive information, there is a bibliography included. Our file on the subject will be available for use in our office at 555 Wabasha, St. Paul, (612)22405445, 9:30 to 3:30 weekdays.

DEPOSIT LAWS:

Eight states, plus two communities and the national parks, at present have deposit laws. They are: Connecticut, Delaware, Iowa, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Oregon, the City of Columbia, Missouri and Suffolk County, N.Y. (New York State) California will be voting in the fall '82 election on a proposition that would establish a deposit law.

Because deposit laws are basically similar, it is easier to discuss their impacts generally rather than state by state. (For such a comparison, see the chart included in this report.)

One absolute verity is that deposit laws are supported by the general public and opposed by container industries, beverage companies and to a lesser degree, retail grocery associations. Once a state or community acquires a deposit law, the citizens are absolutely convinced of its desirability. Polls in Michigan (and there have been a number) show an average of 80 to 89% support, with only one poll show 68%. This in the face of price increases of nearly 19% in some cases. (Michigan is somewhat anomalous in this - most deposit states did not record that kind of price rise.) In Minnesota the AFL-CIO Labor group has traditionally opposed deposit legislation, although in other states labor (the Teamsters particularly) has supported its enactment.



LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF MINNESOTA

555 WABASHA • ST. PAUL, MINNESOTA 55102

PHONE: (612) 224-5445

MEMO

TO: Deposit/Recycling Committee

FROM: Nancy Grimsby/Jeanne Crampton

SUBJECT: Deposit Legislation Report

DATE: 8/17/82

At the meeting today the rough draft of the deposit report was distributed and discussed. It has been enclosed with this memo if you were not at the meeting. Another meeting will be held on Thursday, August 26th, at 9:30AM, State League Office. At that time we will revise and finalize the report. If you cannot attend, and have suggestions, mark your copy, or send a note, and we will consider your suggestions and criticisms. (NOTE: This copy does not have footnotes. This will be done by next week---we do intend to use them!) Consensus so far is that we go for broke in the next legislative session.

Estimated time schedule:

August 26: Finalize report

September 10: Report out to groups and organizations

October 1-10: Meeting of possible coalition group

November 15: Legislation written?

Please feel free to suggest any groups or organizations to whom you think the report should be sent. We will do as well as we can with the money available.

See you soon, J.C.

(This was not typed by office staff!)

We, the undersigned, urge the Minnesota Legislature to establish a law placing a minimum 10¢ deposit on all beverage containers sold in this state, in order to encourage energy conservation, reduce the waste stream and diminish litter.

NAME

ADDRESS

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____
6. _____
7. _____
8. _____
9. _____
10. _____
11. _____
12. _____
13. _____
14. _____
15. _____
16. _____
17. _____
18. _____
19. _____
20. _____
21. _____
22. _____
23. _____
24. _____
25. _____
26. _____
27. _____
28. _____
29. _____
30. _____
31. _____
32. _____
33. _____
34. _____

Memo To: Doug Gross
Memo From: Stephen W. Ballou
October 12, 1982
Page 4

From History and
Development of the
Beverage Container
Deposit Law---
Iowa Dept. Of Water
Air and Waste Mgmt.

Anticipated Problems

- 1) It was claimed that the law would drive whole product lines off the shelves. However, the Department has learned of only one product that was removed from the shelves because of the law. It was a 7 oz "throw-away" plastic shield bottle of mixer (the larger sized packages of the same product remain on the shelves). Since the law went into effect, many brands of imported beers have been introduced to the shelves as have generic beers and light wines.
- 2) It was claimed that the law would drive cans off the shelves, however, the Department knows of only one major packaging change occurring after the law was passed. Poly ethylene terephthalate soft plastic 2 liter pop bottles replaced 1 quart refillable glass bottles. The Department was informed that the law had no impact on this change. The Department has been told that cans hold approximately the same market share as before the law.
- 3) It was claimed that people would quit drinking pop and beer. Sales figures for beer from the Iowa Beer and Liquor Department (Appendix C) show no decline in sales.
- 4) It was claimed that people would lose their jobs because of the law. Its true that any of the first three concerns could have cost jobs if they materialized, however, they did not materialize. On the contrary, handling empty containers requires additional staff on the part of both the re-tailers and distributors in counting, sorting, redeeming and transporting empty containers.
- 5) It was claimed that the law would raise prices. Retail grocery store prices did go up 2 to 3.3¢/container more in central Iowa than in out-of-state stores in cities bordering Iowa over the eight months preceeding through the eight months following implementation of the law. However, priced differences were closing at the end of the study suggesting that the price differences were transitory. (Price Survey-Appendix E)
- 6) It was claimed that litter would not be significantly reduced by the law. An Iowa Department of Transportation survey indicated reductions of 79% in the number of containers found along primary and interstate highways. This constitutes a 61% reduction in the total volume of litter found along these highways. (Appendix F)
- 7) It was claimed that the public would not redeem empties for a mere nickel. An informal survey made by the Department indicates that redemption rates appear to be in the mid 90 percentile. (More accurate figures are not readily available)
- 8) It was claimed that the public would be so upset that a equally disruptive repeal would be called for. It's true that a certain amount of "social griping" occurs and some real disgruntlement exist. However, the overwhelming majority of people contacting the Department support the law and are either seeking clarification or seeking to assure it is honored.

To the Members of the Deposit Legislation Committee:

Sorry for the extended gap in communications--one half of the Natural Resources directorship developed a back problem after return from Michigan, and is only now upright again. To bring you up to date: The reports are out (included with this notice) with a cover letter/tear-off reply sheet (we have several back indicating support) to approximately 70 organizations or individuals whom we hope will form a loose coalition. A call to Senator Greg Dahl informed us that he preferred to wait until after the election to meet with us to discuss bill content and strategy. At the October 12 LWVMN board meeting, permission was granted to begin an informal petition drive indicating support for deposit legislation. (Petition forms went to local Leagues, along with the report in the recent 3rd class mailing from the office.)

MEETING NOTICE: Thursday, November 4, 1PM, LEAGUE OFFICE
is

Please note that this/less than a week off, and is an afternoon meeting. (The office wasn't available in the morning.) If you are unable to make this meeting, will you please call either Nan or Jeanne, since we really need a more or less full representation. If that time or date is poor for a number of persons, we'll consider changing it! (Jeanne, 926-8760; Nan, 922-9403) We do want to meet as soon as possible.

AGENDA

Suggestions to Local Leagues on Petitions
Proposed bill (Connie Metcalf)
Questions on Proposed bill (Katie Fournier)
Coalition Members - How will we operate?
Reaching the Legislators: When should we begin? What about a weekly "Fact about deposit legislation"? (In some kind of distinctive format?)
Reaching the public? Contacts with the media?
Committee sub-committees?
General purpose one-page, two-sided, fact sheet. (Format, information, etc.)
Any further suggestions as to whom the report might be sent?
Further suggestions of any kind?

See you on the 4th, or let us know you won't be able to attend!

MAYBE THIS IS THE YEAR! ! ! !

(P.S. Attended the St. Louis Park-Hopkins Candidates meeting last night, and all six candidates indicated they would support deposit legislation. For what that's worth at this point in time. J.C.)

MINNESOTA DEPOSIT LEGISLATION

TO: Members of the Legislature

FROM: Jeanne Crampton, Natural Resource Co-chair
Nan Grimsby, " " "

RE: Minnesota Deposit Legislation

DATE: November 5, 1982

Container deposit laws are now in effect in nine states. The League of Women Voters of Minnesota has supported such legislation for a number of years, and has actively worked for its implementation in Minnesota. During the 1983 session of the Legislature we, along with Common Cause and several other organizations, will once again work for the passage of such a bill. Senator Greg Dahl, (DFL-District 50) has agreed to sponsor such legislation and we are now drafting the bill and hope to have it ready for filing soon.

The recent defeat of deposit referenda in four western states reinforces a fact of life: opponents will work tirelessly and spend enormous amounts of money to ensure that such legislation does not come to fruition. (Opponents outspent proponents at a rate of 40 to 1 in the recent California referendum.) On the other hand, Massachusetts' voters upheld their deposit law, and it will go into effect as of January 1st. Maine and Vermont citizens had the opportunity, after a period during which deposit laws were in effect, to voice their opinion and in both cases, retained the deposit laws with a higher percentage of votes than in the original referenda.

With the concern in Minnesota over siting of landfills, and our relative lack of indigenous energy sources, keeping glass, aluminum, metal and plastic containers out of the waste stream makes sense. Within the next month, the League will deliver to your office a short report on the effects of deposit legislation in the areas that have already adopted it.

Please let us know if you have questions the report doesn't answer. Also keep in mind that you will be lobbied strongly by the opponents of container deposit laws, and no expense will be spared, from flying in "informed witnesses" to committee meetings to distributing glossy advertisements. The League of Women Voters and other citizen organizations have neither the money nor person power to refute such opposition.

We can only cite the facts as they have appeared in states that have deposit legislation: citizens like such laws; the laws seem to reduce all forms of litter; there has been no overwhelming change in containers available to consumers; job loss has been minimal; a number of minimum-wage jobs are created; price increases have been reasonable and; there are demonstratable energy savings.

TO: Members of the Legislature

FROM: Jeanne Crampton and Nan Grimsby, Natural Resources Co-Chairs

RE: Minnesota Deposit Legislation

DATE:

Container deposit laws are now in effect in nine states. The League of Women Voters of Minnesota has supported such legislation for a number of years, and has actively worked for its implementation in Minnesota. During the 1983 session of the Legislature we, along with Common Cause and several other organizations, will once again work for the passage of such a bill. Senator Greg Dahl, (DFL, District 50) has agreed to sponsor such legislation and we are now drafting the bill and hope to have it ready for filing soon.

X
The recent defeat of deposit referenda in four western states reinforces a fact of life: opponents will work tirelessly and spend enormous amounts of money to ensure that such legislation does not come to fruition. (Opponents outspent proponents at a rate of 40 to 1 in the recent California referendum.) On the other hand, Massachusetts' voters upheld their deposit law and it will go into effect as of January 1st. Maine and Vermont citizens had the opportunity, after a period during which deposit laws were in effect, to voice their opinion, and in both cases retained the deposit laws with a higher percentage of votes than in the original referenda.

With the concern in Minnesota over siting of landfills, and our relative lack of indigenous energy sources, keeping glass, aluminum, metal and plastic containers out of the waste stream makes sense.

Enclosed is a short report prepared by the League of Women Voters of Minnesota on the effects of deposit legislation in the areas that have already adopted it. Please let us know if you have questions the report doesn't answer.

Also keep in mind that you will be lobbied strongly by the opponents of container deposit laws and no expense will be spared, from flying in "informed witnesses" to committee meetings to distributing glossy advertisements. The League of Women Voters and other citizen organizations have neither the money nor person power to refute such opposition.

X
omit this paragraph
Some of
We can only cite the facts as they have appeared in states that have deposit legislation; citizens like such laws; the laws seem to reduce all forms of litter; there has been no overwhelming change in containers available to consumers; job loss has been minimal; a number of minimum wage jobs are created; price increases have been reasonable and; there are demonstratable energy savings.

Letterhead

For Legislators
11/5/82

To: Members of the Legislature
Hon. Jeanne Croston
New Albany

Date: 11/22/80

Re: Minnesota Deposit Legislation

Container deposit laws are now in effect in nine states, as well
as the National Parks and the city of Columbia, Missouri. The League
of Women Voters of Minnesota has supported such legislation for a
number of years, and has actively worked for its implementation in
Minnesota. During the 1983 session of the Legislature we, ~~will~~ along
with Common Cause and several other organizations, will once again
work for the passage of such a bill. ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~
~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ Senator Greg Dahl, (DFL, District 50) has agreed to sponsor such
legislation, and we are ~~presently drafting~~ now drafting the bill,
and hope to have it ready for filing soon.

The recent defeat of deposit referendums^a in four western states
reinforces a fact of life: opponents will work tirelessly and spend
enormous amounts of money to ensure that such legislation does not
come to fruition. (Opponents outspent proponents at a rate of 40 to
1 in the recent California referendum.) On the other hand, Massachusetts'
voters upheld their deposit law, and it will go into effect as of January
1. Maine and Vermont citizens ~~had~~ had the opportunity, after a period
during which deposit laws were in effect, to voice their opinion, and
in both cases retained the ~~depos~~ deposit laws with a higher percentage
of ~~more~~ votes than in the original referendums^a.

With the concern in Minnesota over siting of landfills, and our
relative lack of indigenous energy sources, keeping glass, aluminum,
metal, and plastic containers out of the waste stream makes sense.

Enclosed is
Within the next month, the League will deliver to your office a short
report on the effects of deposit legislation in the areas that have
already adopted it. ~~We hope you will take the time to read it, and~~
~~then ask questions~~

Please let us know if you have questions the report doesn't answer.

~~we may not know the answers, but we can usually find someone who does.~~

~~Also~~ Please keep in mind that you will be lobbied

strongly by the opponents of container deposit laws, and no expense

will be spared, from flying in "informed witnesses" to committee meetings,

to ^{distributing} glossy advertisements. The League of Women Voters and other citizen

organizations have neither the money nor person power to refute such

~~the front end of such small money~~

~~with the consumers of course, leaving~~

~~appears out to the manufacturers,~~

~~consumers with a sellable copy~~

~~Report of State for~~

opposition. We only ask that you keep an open mind until such time as

pertinent arguments can be made by both sides, and that you not be

We can only cite the facts as they have appeared in states that have
deposit legislation: ^{the laws} citizens like such laws; ~~they do seem~~ to reduce
all forms of litter; there has been no overwhelming change in containers
available to consumers; job loss has been minimal; a number of minimum-
wage jobs are created; ~~and many~~ price increases have ~~been met~~
been reasonable; and, there are demonstrable energy savings.

TO: Interested Individuals and Organizations
FROM: Jean Tews, President
Jeanne Crampton, Natural Resources Co-Chair
Nancy Grimsby, Natural Resources Co-Chair
RE: Container Deposit Legislation Report
DATE: October 13, 1982

Enclosed with this letter is a recent publication of the League of Women Voters of Minnesota (LWVMN) concerning container deposit legislation. As citizens of Minnesota become increasingly concerned about the siting of landfills and waste facilities, and energy costs continue to increase, the LWVMN and LWVUS are convinced that a law mandating either recycling and/or reuse of beverage containers makes sense----and we think a majority of Minnesotans agree with us.

We are in the process of designing legislation that may help to overcome some of the traditional arguments that have been used by anti-deposit forces in the past. We are not so optimistic to believe that deposit legislation, in any form, will escape the wrath of concerned industry and retail sales organizations. It is unfortunate that such groups prey on the legitimate fears of workers for their jobs. We feel there have been enough indications from states that do have deposit laws to indicate that job loss is minimal, and that those few workers whose jobs are threatened can be insulated from such loss. As is pointed out in the report, job losses occur much more frequently because of board room decisions --- such as the recent promotion of plastic pop bottles, which is certainly going to affect glass bottle production specifically.

Please take a look at the attached report, and let us know what you think. For your convenience, we've included a tear-off strip that can be filled in and returned to us. We hope you will consider joining forces with the LWVMN and others to enact this legislation during the 1983 legislative session.

YES---We want to join in! ☐
We aren't sure, but we're interested ☐
We're with you in spirit, but can't do anything right now ☐
No, we're not interested ☐

COMMENTS: _____

Organization: _____ Address: _____
Contact Name: _____ Phone: _____



LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF MINNESOTA

555 WABASHA • ST. PAUL, MINNESOTA 55102

PHONE: (612) 224-5445

MEMO

TO: Local Leagues

FROM: Jeanne Crampton, Nan Grimsby,
Natural Resources Co-Chairs

SUBJECT: Petitions for Deposit
Legislation

DATE: November 17, 1982

Please read the suggestions for deposit legislation petitions in the November State Board Memo. About the 1st of January, will you please send as many signatures as you have to the state office. Generally, if you can identify the Legislative District from which the majority of the signatures on each sheet came, it would be a help. (We realize there may be a mix - don't worry about it.) These are not petitions that that carry any formal, legal responsibility. They are merely a reflection of citizen interest and concern.

Please plan to continue the petition drive past the 1st of January. We expect that this campaign will take at least this entire session, if not longer. If any of you have good ideas on how to promulgate the petitions and/or deposit legislation with either the public, or the legislators, let us hear from you!

P.S. Container Deposit Legislation Report and Chart: Please make the following additions to the chart: Under "Refund Value" for Oregon, add 2¢ if *, 5¢ other. The * means "certified" bottles - universally refillable and this explanation should also be added.

BEVERAGE CONTAINER CONTROL LEGISLATION

State & Admin. Agency	Effective Date	Beverage				Container					Refund Value	Required Marking			Redeeming Locations		Acceptance Conditions	Handling Costs	Prohibitions	Enforcement	Impacts Reimbursements
		Soft Drinks	Soda/Mineral waters	Beer/Malt Lig.	Alcohol	Glass	Paper	Metal	Plastic	Carton	Other	Emboss	Stamp Label	Other	Dealer/Distributor	Redemption Centers					
Conn.: Dept. of Environmental Protection	10/1/79		✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓			5¢ or more	✓	✓	✓	(Quarter inch size)	✓	✓	1¢ by Distributors to Dealers/Centers	Fliptops	
Iowa: Environmental Quality Comm.	5¢ 7/79	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓			5¢ or more	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	1¢ by Distributors to Dealers, Centers	Poptop	
Maine: Dept. of Agriculture	1/1/78	✓	✓	✓		✓		✓	✓			5¢ or more	✓	✓	✓	(on top of metal)	✓	✓	2¢ by Distributor to Dealer/Center	Fliptop Non-degradable Connector	
Mass: Secretary of Environmental Affairs	1/17/83	✓	✓	✓		Non-biodegradable						Under 32 oz. 5¢ + 10¢	✓	✓	✓	Exemption: Permanent name on glass.	✓	✓	1¢ by Bottler or Distributor to Dealer/Center	Non-degradable Connector	Violations fines to \$1,000
Michigan: Liquor Control Comm.	12/78	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓			5¢ if * 10¢ non Refill	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Clean, if Deposit was Required	No metal Detachable Openings	Dealer, Distributor, Mfr. Violations fines to \$1,000
Oregon: Liquor Control Comm. & Dept. of Agr.	10/1/72	✓	✓	✓		*		✓	✓	✓	✓	?	✓	✓	✓	Exception: Permanent Brand Name	✓	✓	May refuse non-refund stamped	No metal detachable top	May revoke License
Vermont: Environmental Conservation Agency	7/1/75	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	5¢ or more	✓	✓	✓	Imprint on top of metal	✓	✓	Clean. Dealer may refuse if there is	No metal Detachable top. Non-degradable connectors	

DEPOSIT LEGISLATION ACTION COALITION MEETING NOTICE

Thursday, December 16, 1982, 9:30 a.m.

LOCATION: League of Women Voters of Minnesota office, 555 Wabasha, St. Paul.
Between 10th Street and Freeway #94, second floor.

PURPOSE: To discuss strategy regarding deposit legislation during the 1983 legislative session.

AGENDA

1. Introduction of those present.
2. Identification of groups or individuals indicating support or interest.
3. Proposed bill (as of 12/10/82 we do not yet have a formal bill ready for filing but we have a general outline.) Two questions still to be discussed: Should liquor and wine bottles be included? And, what entity should retain unredeemed deposits? (Should it remain with brewers or distributors - as in Michigan - or should it be retained by the state for alleviation of deposit impacts?)
4. Chief Author: Senator Greg Dahl is still interested in carrying the bill and is presently seeking house authors. We decided not to pursue contact with legislators until we could go with bill in hand. (The economic situation and special session has slowed things down somewhat!)
5. Division of labor: Who does what when?
6. Next meeting: January 6, 1983.
7. Adjourn by 11:45, noon at the latest.

Please call Nan Grimsby, 922-9403 or Jeanne Crampton, 926-8760, or LWV office, 224-5445 if you cannot attend.

To: Deposit Legislation Group
From: Jeanne Crampton, Nan Grimsby
Date: January 6, 1983

First, our apologies to anyone whom we didn't reach in time with news of the cancellation of the meeting. Evidently the weather was somewhat uneven in different parts of the cities; Nan and I had a quarter inch of ice on our driveways, and assumed others would be in the same situation, so we started calling about 8:15, but unfortunately did miss some of you.

Many of you know by now that Senator Greg Dahl felt he must decline as chief author of the deposit legislation bill. He may have the opportunity to carry the energy package for the Governor's office, and felt that he had to clear the decks for that possibility. We are now sorting out options and discussing potential solutions with other members of the legislature.

FLASH!: (Jan. 10) We have a house author for our bill: Representative Kathleen A. Vellenga, St. Paul, 63A (DFL), 288 State Office Bldg., 296-8799. A second-term legislator, Rep. Vellenga is committed to the concepts of recycling and believes deposit legislation can be an integral part of such endeavors.

In reviewing the legislative interviews it is apparent that the largest concern about such a bill is whether or not people will lose jobs---something we are all concerned about, and a question that is very hard to answer in a concrete manner. States switching to a deposit on bottles and cans have so far experienced minimal job loss, and it has been impossible in most cases to prove that it was due to deposit legislation. (Or that it wasn't.) There has been no wholesale change in the container mix in any state that adopted a deposit law, no switch to refillable bottles, etc., which would account for a reduction in jobs. On the other hand, there has been an increase in jobs (four to five thousand in Michigan) of the minimum wage variety. At this point it seems foolish to quibble over the kind of job available, particularly with our highest unemployment rate in the younger age group. It's not an answer that will satisfy the AFL-CIO, but it does seem better than a jobs program or welfare. If we write a bill that allows the state access to unredeemed deposits, then there would be money available to provide job retraining or financial support to persons who did happen to experience job displacement. Just as a matter of interest, and although the interviews are not complete, here are the figures on our question, "Would you support deposit legislation?": House, Yes: 23; No: 14; Maybe: 17. Senate: Yes: 10; No: 5; Maybe: 6.

Barring blizzard or ice storm, our next meeting will be Wednesday, Jan. 19, 9:30AM, League of Women Voters office (555 Wabasha), 224-5445. Please, if there is any question about the weather, call me at 926-8760, or Nan at 922-9403, to verify. In the meantime, if you have any suggestions about the above, do call. (On weekdays I'm always up by 6AM, so don't worry about calling too early.) I am planning on being at the Capitol much of the time next week (Jan. 10-14). If any of you would like to join me there for some lobbying, give me a call.

J.C.



LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF MINNESOTA

555 WABASHA • ST. PAUL, MINNESOTA 55102

PHONE: (612) 224-5445

MEMO

TO:

All Local Leagues

FROM:

Jeanne Crampton
Natural Resources Co-Chair

SUBJECT: Container Deposit Legislation

DATE:

3/30/83

At this point in time it is apparent that our deposit legislation (S.F. 741 and H.F. 683) will probably not be heard in Committee prior to the cutoff date of April 8. Senator Merriam (Chair, Ag. & Natural Resources Comm.) has expressed the desire to have the deposit bills and other recycling legislation heard during the interim period. (Summer or fall.) Rep. Munger (Chair, House Environmental Committee) declined to hear the House bill prior to passage in the Senate, since, as he put it, "The House has twice passed deposit legislation only to have it fail in the Senate." (One can see his point.)

Our chief authors, Rep. Kathleen Vellenga and Senator Eric Petty are as enthusiastic and supportive of the bills as ever, and while this delay is disappointing, it does also give us time to involve the general public to a greater degree. The Container Conservation Coalition has received donations of money for education and information projects, and this is still an extremely viable undertaking. Please take any opportunity you may have to discuss this subject with your legislators, and disseminate information in your community. (Bill numbers will remain the same through the 1984 legislative session.) Many thanks for your efforts on the petitions---we'll be sending out new petition forms shortly, but in the meantime, the other ones can be used as well---you might want to replace the 10¢ with 5¢. We are confident that deposit legislation can be passed in the next session---if we keep up the information flow to the legislature and the general public. (A few letters to the editor would be nice.)

Jeanne Crampton

Background on Container Deposit
Legislation

Contact: Jeanne Crampton, (612) 926-8760

January 21, 1983

Statement Issued at News Conference
Container Conservation Coalition, Jeanne Crampton, Chair

A container deposit law could be of great benefit to our state, particularly in the areas of solid waste reduction, energy conservation and job creation, says the League of Women Voters of Minnesota. The Container Conservation Coalition (C.C.C.), a group including the League of Women Voters, Common Cause, Minnesota Audubon Council and the Minnesota Coalition of Bicyclists, stated this week that removing beverage containers from the waste stream reduces solid waste needing land or alternative disposal by approximately 7 per cent. Recycling of metal, aluminum, glass and plastic containers conserves energy and virgin ores, as well as providing for development of new industries using those materials.

The League found, during a recent study that under container deposit laws more jobs are created than lost. After deposit legislation was enacted in Michigan, there was a net gain of approximately 4,000 jobs. Referring to a March, 1982 New York State study (Mandatory Deposit Legislation: Benefits and Costs for New York), League of Women Voters of Minnesota Natural Resources Co-Chair, Jeanne Crampton said that new jobs are gained in areas of trucking, recycling and redemption of containers.

"We are still in the process of refining sections of our bill, and comparing it to other state laws in order to gain the greatest share of economic and environmental benefit possible for the people of Minnesota," said Crampton.

"Creation of new industries for Minnesota is one of the possible positive results of deposit legislation," said Crampton. The large amounts of recyclables obtained under a deposit law could be the base for new industry. Minnesota could become a leader in the development of recycling industries, locating users of such material close to reclamation or redemption centers. Recycled plastic bottles are used to create the "fill" in some outdoor clothing and sleeping bags. Glass "cullet" (crushed glass) is 100 per cent reusable for new bottles and a deposit law would supply our glass

more

container manufacturers with a steady supply of raw material. Aluminum cans provide a 95 per cent saving in can production over the use of virgin ore.

"We hope," Crampton continued, "that industry and labor will support a law that makes so much sense. Not only would the law create jobs, it would conserve needed energy, and also remove a bulky, non-biodegradable item from the solid waste stream, extending landfill life and making resource recovery plants more effective."

The Container Conservation Coalition is urging citizens to contact their legislators and ask for support of container deposit legislation, saying that such a law would generate an 80 to 90 per cent return of material, as opposed to a high of 20 per cent from voluntary recycling. The League's eight-page Container Deposit Laws - Who Benefits: Who Pays? may be purchased from them at cost at 555 Wabasha, St. Paul, MN 55102, (612) 224-5445, for \$2 which includes postage.

Return to: CONTAINER CONSERVATION COALITION
c/o LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF MINNESOTA
Attn: Jeanne Crampton
555 Wabasha, St. Paul, MN. 55102

☐ YES, please list us as a supporter of container deposit legislation.

☐ Although we have included a donation to the Coalition, we do not wish to be publicly listed as supporters.

We would like to support the CONTAINER CONSERVATION COALITION's efforts and are enclosing _____ for its use in legislative and public education.

Name: _____

Contact Person (If organization): _____

Address: _____

_____ Tel. No.: _____

The enclosed information flyer may be used in newsletters and as a handout.

The bill numbers for container deposit legislation are:

Senate File: 741

House File: 683

The bill, as presently written, would:

- 1) Impose a 5¢ deposit on all nonrefillable glass, plastic, or metal carbonated or malt beverage containers. (Containers already carrying a deposit would remain as they are.)
- 2) Provide reimbursement to retailers, recycling or redemption centers, and distributors for handling redeemed containers. (one-half cent to redeemers, and one-half cent to distributors.)
- 3) Provide unemployment benefits, retraining, and/or relocation costs to any individual able to demonstrate job loss as an effect of the passage of this law. (Benefits to be paid from a fund established by state retention of unclaimed deposits.)
- 4) Provides that a redemption center may be licensed by a county, city, or town, or, if a local government chooses not to accept applications for licenses, the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) is enabled to issue licenses for that local area.
- 5) Requires the MPCA to develop model forms, guidelines, and ordinances for implementing a redemption center licensing program.
- 6) Provides a penalty for the deceptive use of labels or stamps for the purpose of obtaining refunds to which a person is not entitled.
- 7) Allows a redeemer to refuse to accept for redemption any container not in a sanitary condition.

For further information contact: Jeanne Crampton, 926-8760, or LWVMN office, (612) 224-5445.



LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF MINNESOTA

555 WABASHA • ST. PAUL, MINNESOTA 55102

PHONE: (612) 224-5445

MEMO

TO:

Sally

FROM:

Jeanne

SUBJECT:

DATE:

*Here's the one-sheet, both sides,
copy for the 3rd class mailing*

*white green
if enough*

100

CONTAINER CONSERVATION COALITION

Tuesday, January 24, 2PM, Room 112, State Capitol, Environmental Protection Subcommittee of the Senate Agriculture and Natural Resources Committee. Senator Chuck Davis, Chairman.

Beverage Container Deposit, S.F. 741 will be considered at the above meeting. If you or your organization would like to testify on this bill, please call Gerri Ulness, 296-2302 to register. If personal testimony is not possible, please write in care of the Committee Chair (Room G-24, State Capitol, St. Paul, 55155) and ask to have your letter distributed to the committee and entered in the hearing record.

Bad News first: At the local unveiling of the new reverse vending machines, Governor Perpich was quoted in the St. Paul Pioneer Press (and gave a similar interview on TV) saying, in regard to deposit legislation, "I can't see the need for that type of legislation in 1984. Our only interest is to get more recycling and lessen the use of landfills. One of the options is mandatory deposit." While not totally negative, it does leave us wondering about his response, should a deposit bill arrive on his desk. This governor counts his mail, pro and con. Let's get some letters into his office supporting deposit laws, or register your support by calling 296-3391.

Good News Dept.: We understand that Hennepin County Commissioners will soon reconsider a resolution supporting state adoption of a container deposit law. (It was turned down by them last year.) Concern about the problems glass bottles cause in waste burning facilities seems to have prompted the reconsideration.

A letter in the Star/Tribune on Jan. 14 from the League of Women Voters regarding reverse vending machines prompted two calls to an aide of Rep. Sikorski, 6th District Congressman. There actually is a bill calling for a national deposit law, but it hasn't surfaced in some time, one reason we are working for the adoption of a state law, to be passed in our own legislature.

REVERSE VENDING MACHINES: Don't panic. These machines should strengthen our arguments in favor of a deposit law. The retail grocers have opposed deposit laws on the basis of cleanliness, storage, and handling of returned containers. These machines make redemption easier, at least for aluminum cans, and they can return any amount of money per container, as their use in deposit states amply demonstrates. What they don't do (at least at present) is solve the problem of voluntary recycling of plastic and glass throwaways. Glass and plastic is still going to end up in landfills and on roadways. Also, once the novelty wears off reverse vending, it will be interesting to see if consumers will use the machines extensively for a return of $\frac{1}{2}$ ¢ per can.

According to Senator Eric Petty, S.F. 741 is undergoing a revision that should result in a cleaner, simpler bill. Since inclusion of an employment protection section in the bill did not allay Union fears, and research indicated that trying to implement such protection would be a bureaucratic nightmare, that section will be deleted. Communication with Russell Gossman, Conservation Dept., UAW, in Michigan indicated that they remained neutral on the deposit issue at the time of its passage there, but he now says that, "The deposit law has helped Michigan, and we would support it if it were to come up again. Everything is a lot cleaner, and job loss was minimal...lot of jobs were gained, as a matter of fact." Call Jeanne Crampton, (612)926-8760 for specifics on the new bill.

Please make the effort to contact your legislator or the governor's office and urge them to support deposit legislation. Ten letters on any given subject in one office are considered a constituent groundswell! But don't wait for the "other guy" to write or call!

FLASH...Full Committee Hearing (Ag.& Nat. Resources-Senate) Jan. 30, Monday. No further testimony will be taken after this hearing, vote will be taken after session begins.

Field & Forest

by Bennie
Bengtson



This litter problem

One spring a man looked around an Eskimo village and saw empty tins, fox carcasses, hides, old boxes and debris scattered everywhere. Gontran de Poncins concluded "that man was the most sordid animal in all creation," as he wrote in his book *Kabloona*.

gon law was operative, beverage can and bottle portion of litter was down by nearly 90%.

By 1979 it was down by 94% — only 6% of the roadside litter consisted of beverage containers. Some 90% now never throw cans away — they claim

Cardboard cases and six-pack holders are also recycled in large numbers. They are not a part of the deposit system, but are a bonus picked up in the process. So Oregon's bottle bill results in a cutting down of waste and in the saving of energy, something not to be overlooked. In this throwaway



Partially Scanned Material

The remainder of this page/item has not been digitized due to copyright considerations. The original can be viewed at the Minnesota Historical Society's Gale Family Library in Saint Paul, Minnesota. For more information, visit www.mnhs.org/library/.

"CASH NOT TRASH"

An Update on Beverage Container Deposit Legislation

SF 741 and HF 683 were filed during the last session of the legislature but were never heard in committee. On August 15th a joint House-Senate Subcommittee hearing was held in Duluth, providing the northeastern part of the state a chance to be heard. Both authors, Senator Eric Petty (DFL), Mpls. and Representative Kathleen Vellenga (DFL), St. Paul, attended and presented the bill to the committee.

Senator Petty presented an amendment to the bill that removes present language regarding the establishment of an unemployment compensation program funded by the state retrieving a portion of the unclaimed deposits. In its place the amendment would prohibit any switch in the container "mix" after the law goes into effect. That is, the industry could not switch from non-refillables to refillables after the law went into effect. While this may seem to defeat the purpose that many environmentalists saw in deposit legislation (going to refillable containers) LWVMN feels it may overcome legislative resistance to a deposit law, since only when the mix changes from nonrefillable to refillable does unemployment occur. Minnesota presently has a substantial percentage of refillables on marketplace shelves - higher than that in some deposit states - and these would remain as they are. The proposed deposit legislation was never conceived of as a "ban-the-can" bill (never, never use those words!) - it's meant to retrieve any container, refillable or nonrefillable, for reuse or recycling - insuring it doesn't end up in a landfill or on the roadside. It is doubtful that any deposit bill will gain labor's support but Senator Petty's amendment, which gets rid of the bureaucracy while at the same time more or less guaranteeing no job loss, should appeal to legislators. LWVMN feels the amendment is an adequate compromise. (See news story in August-September VOTER for more hearing information.)

Experience in deposit states indicates that there is a job gain in areas of retail handling, recycling and related industries. Michigan, for instance, gained over 4,000 jobs. Job loss occurs when there is a shift in the container mix, as indicated above. The proposed MN law offers no incentive and would indeed ban a switch if Senator Petty's amendment is adopted, so it seems unlikely there would be any particular job disruption. However, customer preference and industry decisions are more and more pointing to the use of PET plastic bottles - presently familiar as the large two-liter bottle, which is being marketed elsewhere as individual containers and is being considered for beer. (Beverage World, June, 1981) It was an industry decision to switch to nonrefillables twenty or thirty years ago and we must assume that a similar decision might be made to go to more intensive use of plastic containers. In a quote from the New York Times, August 8, 1983:

"H. Edward Schollmeyer, a packaging analyst at Paine Webber Mitchell Hutchins, predicts that sales of glass bottles will decline 2 to 5 percent a year from now until at least 1986. And he expects 'dramatic growth' for PET bottles over the same period."

In an article on the beverage packaging industry, the magazine Beverage World, 1982, quotes Continental Can as follows:

"We will continue to oppose mandatory deposit laws aggressively due to the fact that overall consumption of soft drinks and beer is adversely affected by such regressive and nonproductive legislation. However, we expect the can not only to survive but even to gain share in a deposit environment."

In the same article, American Can said:

"The can industry... has been very successful, especially in Iowa and Connecticut, in maintaining post-law can volume and share. The cans' inherent attributes (non-breakability, light weight and low package cost) not only continue to exist in a deposit environment but in fact are amplified."

These are hardly the gloom and doom statements one hears at deposit legislation hearings. The truth is that there has been no major switch to refillables in any state that enacted a deposit law, with the exception of Michigan which experienced an initial change because they adopted a "two-tiered" law that placed a lower deposit on certain certified refillables. Cans are regaining their pre-law share of the market even in Michigan. On balance then, it would seem that cans will at least retain their share of the market under a deposit law. Nonrefillable bottles would remain stable unless the industry switches to plastic - and deposit laws can't be blamed for upheaval caused by an industry or marketing decision. (Not that they don't try.)

The question of price is a complicated one. There is no question but that prices, particularly of beer, have risen in some deposit states, at least for an initial period. The question to ask, according to Sandie Nelson, Deposit Legislation Coordinator for Environmental Action, is: "Why, operating under the same law, are soft drink prices lower and beer industry prices higher? This situation occurred in both Massachusetts and Michigan, and a Michigan legislative review committee finally decided that, "Consumer prices cannot be used as a gauge for determining the degree of impact the deposit law has had on industry costs." At this point in time Michigan prices for soft drinks are roughly comparable to neighboring states, and beer is both higher or the same, depending on brand. A recent article in the Valley News, January 21, 1983, which serves both White River Jct., Vermont, and Lebanon/Hanover, N.H. (a non-deposit state) concludes: "Undoubtedly, it's true that handling returned bottles is an increased expense and inconvenience for Vermont markets but that expense does not appear to have made soft drinks any more expensive than they are just across the river, where containers are tossed into landfills or left on roadsides. Indeed, Vermont's bottle and can law looks like a bargain." The New York Report (written to guide legislators in their deliberations on the N.Y. law, which was passed in June, 1982) indicated that there would probably be an initial price rise of an average of 12¢ on a six-pack of beer, and 15¢ on a six-pack of soft drinks, in New York. The LWWMN is convinced that citizens are ready to consider a price increase as an integral part of packaging - to cover the cost of disposal as well as the production and filling of containers. At the same time, we are not at all convinced that price increases in deposit states are totally due to deposit law costs. There is no question but that increasing product price concurrent with deposit law implementation makes the law look bad - and the industry hasn't hesitated in the past to use such tactics. (For example, the day before the legislature was to vote in Iowa, a full-page ad appeared in a number of newspapers, with artistically drawn cockroaches all over it, and a statement to the effect that consumers would be bringing these creatures home from grocery stores if a deposit law were enacted!)

The question of sanitation in grocery stores accepting returned containers is somewhat similar to ERA and unisex toilets - for the most part a trumped-up smoke screen! We have a letter from the state of Michigan's Department of Agriculture which states categorically that sanitation has not been a problem, except for a few cases during the initial months after enactment. In over 5,000 inspections of grocery stores in Maine, not one sanitation violation was attributed to the deposit law. (May, 1982 Consumers Guide) Minnesota's proposed law allows any retailer to refuse to accept any container that is not clean.

Retailers are, of course, the group most impacted by a deposit law, particularly if they are identified as the only redeemers of containers. The MN law would allow other parties to become redeemers and to receive the handling fee described in the law. One fact that opponents to deposit legislation don't mention is that soft drink and beer industries stand ready to step in and give retailers all kinds of help in establishing a smooth routine for container handling, if and when a deposit law becomes a fact of life. We have copies of such information and will

be glad to get copies of it to any LWV that is interested - or to see that a legislator gets it. Last November Colorado held a referendum on a deposit law, which was voted down. In an ad that appeared five months after the referendum, a retailer encouraged "voluntary" recycling by offering to pay 1¢, at their store, for each glass, metal or plastic beer or pop container. The irony is that throughout the period prior to the referendum, retailers insisted that they couldn't handle the burden of returns. Five months later it's no problem! Also, at the price of 1¢ per container they must somehow be subsidizing glass and plastic recycling.

There is a new technology on the scene that may make many of the retailers arguments about deposit laws invalid. "Reverse vending" systems are machines into which recyclers can put empty cans (and bottles soon) and receive money, stamps and/or discount coupons. To quote from Beverage World, May, 1983:

"In deposit states reverse vending machines have reduced markedly the labor costs, space requirements and sanitation problems that plague returnable handling, according to observers in Oregon and Michigan. Furthermore, in non-deposit states, the machines are popular traffic builders."

These machines will make the operation of deposit legislation at the retail level easier because they simplify the collection, sorting, refunding and bookkeeping processes. Grocery stores in the New York area have already contracted with a consortium to install eight to ten thousand of the reverse vendors. They are hoping to have NR glass machines ready for this fall. At the low end of the technology scale are CoinBak machines which don't require electricity and can be used in "Mom and Pop" type stores.

The following three pages of material are excerpted from an update from Sandie Nelson, Environmental Action, Washington, D.C. This organization (and Sandie) deserves tons of credit for the yeoman labor they have put in on the side of container deposits. They act as a national clearinghouse for information and are unstinting with their help. They will soon have for sale, at copying cost, "resource packets" on different phases of deposit laws. When we receive the list, we'll pass it along, so that individual Leagues can order directly.

This update, plus our original report (October, 1982), "Container Deposit Laws: Who Benefits, Who Pays?" should give every League a good grasp on the pros and cons of container deposits. Please get your community interested in the subject; it's a good membership booster, and we will need help to get the law passed in Spring, 1984.

Jeanne Crampton
September, 1983

Citizens Against Waste

(Page 4)

PO BOX 16258, BALTIMORE, MD 21210

RETURN RATES FOR BEVERAGE CONTAINERS IN DEPOSIT STATES

**** Vermont: 5c minimum deposit

Overall (1981) 95%

Source: Phone conversation with Donald Webster, Director, Div. of Protection,
Agency of Environmental Conservation, Montpelier, Vermont 802-828-3357

**** Oregon: 5c on non-certified containers
2c on certified refillable bottles

Beer cans 95%
Beer bottles 92%
Soft drink cans and glass bottles "equally as high as beer"
Soft drink plastic bottles 80-90%

Source: Oregon's Bottle Bill: the 1982 Report, Oregon Dept. of Environmental
Quality, Solid Waste Division, PO Box 1760, Portland Oregon 97207 503-229-5913

**** Maine: 5c minimum deposit

Overall 93%
Soft drink refillable bottles 90-95%
"Cans and bottles appear to be returned at nearly the same rate".

Source: States Experience With Beverage Container Deposit Laws Shows Positive
Benefits, U.S. General Accounting Office report PAD 81-08, Dec. 1980. page 8.

**** Michigan: 10c on non-certified containers
5c on certified refillable bottles

Beer cans 97%
Beer bottles, non-refillable 96%
Beer bottles, refillable 96%
Soft drink cans 88%
Soft drink bottles, non-refillable 91%
Soft drink bottles, refillable 92%
Soft drink plastic bottles 85%

Source: States ... Benefits, op. Cit., page 16

**** Connecticut: 5c minimum deposit

Beer and soft drinks 90%

Source: Final Report of the Beverage Container Handling Fee Commission,
Dec. 1982, Environment Committee, Connecticut General Assembly.

**** Iowa: 5c minimum deposit

Overall 95%

Source: Phone conversation with George Welch, Iowa Dept. of Environmental
Quality. Figure is based on informal survey of distributors.

**** Delaware, Massachusetts, New York: no data as yet

DELAWARE:

In a last minute effort in June of 1982, the beverage industry succeeded in adding a one year exemption for aluminum cans. So, in January of this year with 2 litre plastic bottles permanently exempted and aluminum cans exempted for one year, Delaware's deposit law finally went into effect. All steel cans immediately disappeared off the shelves. An 11 member committee set up by the legislature studied the issue all spring and finally recommended that the aluminum can exemption be extended until Jan. 1, 1985 and that they would continue to monitor the effects on an on-going basis.

MASSACHUSETTS:

Here are some insights passed along by Dana Duxbury, president of the Mass. League of Women Voters, 4.5 months after the implementation of the deposit law.

- * There is already a noticeable reduction in litter.
- * The soft drink industry is bending over backwards helping the public to make the law work. Prices have remained stable.
- * The beer industry is fighting the law and has raised prices and is currently under investigation by the Attorney General for price fixing and other practices. 75% of the beer distributors have formed a third party redemption corporation called CRInc., which charges upwards of \$.60 per case for pick-up from the retailers. Competitors who are charging as low as \$.24 per case are not allowed to penetrate the exclusive beer market and are confined to soft drinks.
- * Retailers: a number of major supermarkets are only selling cans and plastics because of the ease of sorting. As a result, the Dayville, Conn. glass manufacturing plant's production has slumped by 25%. The switch may be temporary, however, and, if Vermont's experience is any guide, people will go to refillable glass in the long run.

NEW YORK:

The final amendments passed this spring allowed for a "phase in" implementation with manufacturers required to label containers as of July 1, distributors by Aug 1 and retailers to have their stock completely in deposit containers by September 12. So far, the implementation has been slow - it looks like there will not be a majority of deposit containers until the very last day!! NYC officials and citizen groups have worked hard to do "PR" and prepare for the law. There were also other technical amendments. We'll be watching the Big Apple closely!

VERMONT:

John Leader, President of the Vermont Soft Drink Association says that 90% of his plant's bottles and cans are recycled. He also said that changing from nonreturnables to returnables is expensive but after two or three years consumers, stores and bottlers get used to the return system and savings start to show up at the supermarket. Additionally, a recent letter from the state AFL-CIO says that if they were to vote today, in all likelihood they would vote to support their deposit law.

IOWA:

The Iowa Dept. of Environmental Quality's publication, Iowa's Bottle Bill Works, illustrates the law's success.

- * 90% of the 1.4 billion beverage containers (including wine and liquor) are returned for deposit.
- * No significant increase in beverage prices are attributed to the bottle bill.
- * Beverage container litter along Iowa roadways has been reduced by 80 to 90% and total litter has been reduced by 39%.
- * There is public support, there have been few complaints and no bureaucracy was created.

MINNESOTA

A bill introduced this spring was assigned to a study committee for the fall, so action is expected this winter.

An interesting note: while in St. Paul this spring, I visited one of the giant supermarket chain stores to check the fact that the MN Soft Drink Assn. claims only 4% NR glass in soft drinks (certainly low compared to most states). I believe from my spot check that the figure is probably accurate because there were approximately 35% refillables in their soft drink mix! However, while browsing in the beverage aisle I spoke with a Coca Cola representative standing there in his cute gold jacket with the red insignia. I told him I was appalled that the woman at the front counter where refillables are returned had just told me that when the store is remodeled in a few months they would be following the pattern of other stores in their chain and **discontinuing all refillables!** He said - and I will quote - "Yes, the company made that decision a number of months ago; they will be converting to all throwaways - 50% cans and 50% plastic." I wonder if anyone had told the glass workers who were busily testifying against the bottle bill only a few months before about this interesting decision??

WASHINGTON:

Daniel Syrek, who produced a highly controversial and disputed 1977 litter survey in Washington, was hired by the state in 1982 to do a follow up study. He failed to meet his deadline and has sought an extension, but he did release a preliminary study in September 1982. While the final results are not yet in, the beverage industry is spreading the questionable preliminary findings based on the same flawed stateistics used in the original report.

I think the following two quotes from Beverage Industry magazine give the most eloquent testimony to our work - and to our eventual success:

In a June, 1983 article, Dwight Reed, President of the NSDA (National Soft Drink Assn.), commented:

"We devote substantial resources and efforts in the development of packaging and package integrity, and that trend will not slacken; but society is telling us in unmistakable terms that we share, equally with the public, the responsibility for package retrieval and disposal. In the last two decades, this industry has spent hundreds of millions of dollars in capitol man-years, and non-productive effort in the attempt to dispute, deflect, or evade that message. It is interesting to speculate on the state of our public image, and our political fortunes had that same sum been devoted to disposal or retrieval technology."

And, Drew Davis, congressional affairs director of NSDA was quoted in the July 8, 1983 issue as saying that state referendums can become expensive lobbying propositions and "ultimately, we could end up spending more fighting the bills than it would cost to convert to the returnable system."

Senator Mark Hatfield of Oregon and Representative Jim Jeffords of Vermont have introduced S 1247 and HR 2960, the **National Beverage Container Reuse and Recycling Act**, into Congress. Senator Bob Packwood of Oregon is now chair of the Senate Commerce Committee through which the bill must begin its journey.

The time is soon - we at EA will be in touch with you when we need your help to make a national law a reality!

During the next session of the Legislature, a container deposit bill (SF 741 and HF 683) will be discussed, and, we hope, voted upon. (Hearings have been held in the Senate Agriculture and Natural Resources Committee, and they will vote shortly after March 6 on whether to put the question to the full Senate.)

The bill, as amended January 30, 1984, is very simple. It places a 5¢ deposit on any glass, metal, or plastic beer or carbonated beverage container. Redeemers (retailers or redemption centers) would be paid a 1¢ handling fee, and can refuse to redeem containers in an unsanitary condition. There is no additional state staff or administrative costs needed to oversee the law. The bill does include language to allow the use of "reverse vending machines" for container retrieval.

The League of Women Voters of Minnesota (LWVMN) and the Container Conservation Coalition (see attached list) have actively pursued passage of this legislation for the following reasons:

1. It would reduce the waste stream 4 to 6 percent. While not an overwhelming reduction, it does lead the way to encouraging the recycling ethos. Also, containers are the least biodegradable part of the waste in a landfill, and can cause problems in waste burners.
2. A deposit law will create jobs---in retailing, recycling, material handling, and transportation. Many of these jobs are unskilled and would provide work for some of the hardcore unemployed that seem to be such a problem at this point in time.
3. Litter on the roads and in recreation areas will decrease dramatically. Container litter is the most unsightly, long-lasting of the variety of litter we find on our roads. We tout our tourist business---and a clean-appearing state causes comment. Listen to the people who travel in places like Michigan, Iowa, Oregon, or Vermont. They can't all be indulging in fantasies! We remark about how "clean" the Scandinavian countries are; Denmark, for example, has a country-wide deposit law on beverage containers.

page 2

4. The return of recyclable material should fall in the 90 to 95 percent range. Metal, glass and plastic, in large quantities, could allow new industries to develop in Minnesota. At the moment, most of our recycled material is shipped out to other states for processing into other products. Why couldn't we keep it here, develop small to medium industries all over the state, and reap the benefits?

5. Energy Savings: Recycled material costs less to refabricate than to use virgin ore.

Attached is a portion of a report from Iowa, detailing their experience with deposit law enactment. We feel these eight statements answer most of the negative arguments offered by opponents.

Please help us make Minnesota the 10th state in the nation to adopt a deposit law - New York, Michigan, Iowa, Oregon, Vermont, Maine, Connecticut, Massachusetts, and Delaware already have.

Sincerely,

Jeanne Crampton

Jeanne Crampton
League of Women Voters of Minnesota
Natural Resources Co-Chair
Container Conservation Coalition Chair

Enclosures
C:m

Neenah Bond
100% COTTON FIBER

Minnesota Senate Standing Committee Membership

AGRICULTURE AND NATURAL RESOURCES

(18 members) T, Th, Rm 112, 3-6 p.m.

Merriam, Chairman

G-24 Capitol 296-4157

Davis, Vice Chairman

Berg	Frederickson	Peterson, C. C.
Bernhagen	Isackson	Peterson, R. W.
Bertram	Lajdig	Storm
Dahl	Lessard	Stumpf
Davis	Merriam	Wegscheid
DeCramer	Novak	Willet

If your Senator is on this list, please get some letters--or phone calls--to his office in support of S.F. 741 - the Container Deposit Bill--as amended. Urge him to vote the bill out of Committee, so that the full Senate can vote on it. (House bill is H.F. 683)

WHAT THE AMENDED BILL SAYS:

On January 30th the full Senate Agriculture and Natural Resources Committee voted to adopt a "delete everything after the enacting clause" amendment that simplifies the bill. The amended version places a 5¢ deposit on all beer and carbonated beverages in plastic, glass, or metal containers. Redeemers (re-

tailers or redemption centers, both are allowed) will receive 1¢ handling fee, and can refuse to accept unsanitary containers. State acquisition of unclaimed deposits and employment protection sections have been deleted. New language implementing the use of "reverse vending machines" has been inserted. In its present form the bill requires no appropriation, and should not require any other committee hearings before going to the floor.

WHAT WE NEED:

1. Letters/calls to the Senate Committee members---from individuals more than an "official" communication from the League---by March 6. (But we need the LWV letter, too!) Those with no Senator on the Committee may write the Committee Chair, with a copy to their own Senators, or vice versa.
2. Because time will be short between Committee referral (if they do) and a Senate Floor vote, we urge contact with all Senators within the next month.
3. Be prepared---if the Senate passes the bill---to contact House members quickly.
4. Jeanne Crampton has talked to the Governor about the Deposit bill---letters, calls, and copies of letters sent to his office will certainly help.

On the back of this sheet is a page reproduced from the Iowa Deposit Law Report----it lists eight possible problems and what actually happened---it should help to dispel some of the horror stories about what happens when a deposit law is enacted.

THINGS TO REMEMBER: A deposit law will: Reduce the waste stream 4 to 6 percent. While not an overwhelming reduction, it does lead the way to encouraging the recycling ethos. Also, containers are the least biodegradable part of the waste in a landfill, and can cause problems in waste burners. (2) A deposit law will create jobs--in re-tailing, recycling, material handling, and transportation. (3) Litter on roads and in recreation areas will decrease dramatically. Container litter is the most unsightly long-lasting of the litter we find on the roads. Tourists in states that have deposit laws (Michigan, Iowa, Oregon, Vermont, etc.) can't say enough about how "clean" it is. (4) The return of recyclable material should fall in the 90 to 95 percent range. That metal, glass and plastic, in large quantities, could allow new industries to develop in Minnesota. At the moment, most of our recycled material is shipped out to other states for processing into other products. Why couldn't we keep it here, develop small to medium industries all over the state, and reap the benefits? (5) Energy savings: Recycled material costs less to refabricate than to use virgin ore or minerals.

Although the container deposit bills (H.F. 683, Vellenga; S.F. 741, Petty) did not receive committee hearings during this session of the legislature, they are alive and kicking! Interim committee hearings have been promised, with final votes to be taken in the next session of the legislature (spring, 1984.)

The CONTAINER CONSERVATION COALITION (C.C.C.) reports additional supporters have joined the cause, and are ready to go to work. It appears that a deposit on beverage containers is a popular concept with the general public, and they are quite ready to accept the minor inconvenience of returning containers in exchange for cleaner highways and reduced solid waste. (Not to mention energy savings, and the creation of jobs.)

The delay in passage of the bills does give supporters time to do additional public education, and, more importantly, a chance to approach their legislators with facts and information during the interim. During the session, legislators are inundated with information on hundreds of topics, so only the most pressing items (those they are actually voting on) get more than a sketchy reading. C.C.C. members urge everyone to contact their legislators during the interim, either by letter or in person (save the phone for when time is very short.) Or write a letter of support for container deposit legislation to your local newspaper. The out-of-date, invalid arguments of our opponents need to be answered. For further information, call or write CONTAINER CONSERVATION COALITION, 555 Wabasha, St. Paul, MN. 55102, (612) 224-5445. Nine states now have deposit legislation. Let's make Minnesota the 10th!

Bicyclists suffer a unique and disproportionate burden as a direct result of broken glass on the streets. Broken glass means lost time and money, and potential injury. The Minnesota Coalition of Bicyclists strongly supports container deposit legislation, as do bike groups all across the country.

The League of American Wheelmen estimates bicyclists could save \$185 million per year if a national "bottle law" was in effect. The country-wide costs for bike tires and tubes is annually estimated to be \$370 million. Damage due to broken glass makes up about 50 percent of all causes for replacement of tires and tubes; in urban areas the proportion may be as high as 75 percent. Fifty percent of \$370 million is \$185 million per year, the direct cost to bicyclists of broken glass on the roads. Some states that have adopted a container deposit law report up to an 85 percent reduction in container litter volume.

A second economic cost is the time lost and inconvenience created by having to repair flats. People lose 20 million hours per year because of flats. This is using an extremely conservative figure of 60 million flats and assuming each one can be fixed in 20 minutes.

Bike riders are subject to spills and collisions with other vehicles when they try to avoid hitting broken glass on the roadside. Simple falls can result in lacerations when bikers hit glass on the pavement. Cyclists directly bear the burden of littered roadside glass. Members of the Minnesota Coalition of Bicyclists who have biked in deposit states (Vermont and Michigan, for instance) testify to the cleanliness of roadsides, and will be urging their legislators to make Minnesota the 10th state to adopt a deposit law.

(Tim Crampton, Pres., Minn. Coalition of Bicyclists)



Container Conservation Coalition

The Minnesota legislature is presently considering passage of a beverage container deposit law that would place a 5¢ deposit on the purchase of beer or carbonated beverages in any glass, plastic, or metal container.

Contact your legislator and urge passage of S.F. 741 or H.F. 683 during the upcoming session of the legislature. Send a copy of your letter to the Governor's office!

WILL A BEVERAGE CONTAINER DEPOSIT LAW...

...CLEAN UP ROADSIDES?

Yes. Beer and pop containers make up the most visible and long-lasting portion of roadside litter. Deposit states (Michigan and Vermont, for instance), reported reductions in all kinds of litter after enactment of their deposit laws.

...CAUSE INCONVENIENCE TO THE CONSUMER?

Container deposit legislation does not force anyone to return containers for redemption, but it does immediately tax any individual who places the container in the litter or waste stream. Thirty years ago nearly all beverage containers were returnable. At that time the industry shifted to throwaways by their own decision---not because consumers were complaining of inconvenience.

...REDUCE THE NEED FOR LANDFILLS?

5 to 6 percent of waste volume is beverage containers. Such containers are the least degradable part of the waste stream (they last for a long time in landfills.) In this day of dwindling natural resources and a need for energy conservation it doesn't make sense to bury these reusable materials!

...CAUSE UNSANITARY CONDITIONS IN REDEMPTION CENTERS OR RETAIL STORES?

The law proposed for Minnesota specifically allows any redeemer to refuse to accept any container that is in an unsanitary condition. States with such laws report little or no problem with such conditions.

**Small
deposit...**

**BIG
return**

WILL A BEVERAGE CONTAINER DEPOSIT LAW...

...BE A HELP TO THE RECYCLING INDUSTRY?

Under a deposit law, beverage containers are returned at a rate of 85 to 95 percent. Such a return allows recyclers to invest in capital-intensive handling equipment, and to establish long-term contracts with markets. The CCC supports recycling of all kinds, but recognizes that it may take a voluntary recycling program ten to twenty years to achieve a 90 percent return rate. There is a potential for the development of new products and industries using recycled materials.

...RAISE POP AND BEER PRICES?

Because container deposit legislation represents a shift to a labor-intensive system, there may be some initial cost increase. The proposed Minnesota bill attempts to lessen this impact by providing a $\frac{1}{2}$ ¢ handling fee per container for both the redeemer and the distributor, to be paid from container deposits not refunded. If a price increase should occur, it would probably be in the 12-16¢ range per six-pack. Industry decisions also affect prices, so it cannot be automatically assumed that an increase is due to deposit law passage. Price increases may also be offset by a decrease in taxes or service fees for solid waste handling or litter pickup.

...CAUSE JOB LOSS?

There should be no extensive job loss. Even in states that had job loss originally, we now see job gains in those areas. (In Michigan there was a net gain of over 4000 jobs.) Some jobs were lost in container industries in deposit states partly because of a lower deposit on refillable bottles than on cans or nonrefillables. The Minnesota proposal calls for a uniform deposit, which eliminates any economic incentive to purchase bottles over cans.

Automation, consolidation, and concentration in the beverage industry (including the shift to throwaway containers) has led to the shutdown of many brewing and soft drink companies. In 1935 there were 765 brewing plants in the U.S., reduced by 1974 to 99. Coca Cola has gone from 900 franchised plants to less than 100 centralized facilities. A recent industry decision to switch to plastic bottles will mean even more job losses. A container deposit law could protect the current ratio of refillable bottles to other containers in Minnesota, thus saving jobs in the glass industry.

...CAUSE PROBLEMS FOR RETAILERS?

Retailers do have to store and handle empty containers, but many have discovered that container deposit laws implement one of the first principles of marketing: Getting people into a place of business. Consumers returning containers frequently stay to spend their refunds and more!

PLEASE CONTACT YOUR LEGISLATOR AND URGE PASSAGE OF
SENATE FILE 741 and HOUSE FILE 683

These questions and answers have been simplified for the purpose of providing as many questions and answers as possible in a short space. Anyone wishing more detailed answers, or information on reports and studies is urged to contact Jeanne Crampton, 926-8760, or (612)224-5445.



Container Conservation Coalition

June 28, 1983

Dear Coalition members and newsletter editors:

Below you will find a news release for use in your next newsletter. We hope to get one of these to you every month for the next few months. Perhaps you can think of other newsletters which might appreciate our releases as well, to whom you can pass this article.

Co-op store newsletters might be interested, for instance. Let me know if you'd like extra copies.

Thanks,

Katie Fournier, Summer Press Coordinator
912 - 18th Avenue S.E.
Minneapolis, MN 55414 - 331-5615

LITTLE DEPOSIT, BIG RETURN

With vacation season upon us many of us will encounter unsightly litter along roadsides and in parks. Beverage containers are a significant part of this litter, as much as 70% of litter volume nationwide. Not only is this litter unsightly, it is harmful to pedestrians, bikers and farm machinery, and it is expensive to remove. The MN Dept. of Transportation spent over \$900,000 picking up roadside litter in 1980.

Container deposit legislation has been effective in reducing roadside litter of all kinds, not just cans and bottles. One year after deposit legislation passed in Michigan there was an 84% reduction in container litter. Overall litter was reduced by more than 40%. In Vermont an overall reduction in highway litter of 35% was reported with litter pick-up costs decreased by 31%.

Perhaps the best testimony to the effect deposit legislation has in reducing roadside litter comes from people who live in and travel through states where the law has passed. These people frequently comment on how clean "Bottle Bill" states look.

The Minnesota legislature will probably hold informational hearings on deposit fills in late summer or early fall. Let your legislator know you hope to see a deposit law enacted for Minnesota.

Container Conservation Coalition

555 Wabasha

(612) 224-5445

St. Paul, MN. 55102



NEWSLETTER RELEASE

AUGUST 2, 1983

SPECIAL NOTE: The first hearing on the container deposit bills (H.F. 683; S.F. 741) will be held on Monday, August 15, 7:30PM, in Duluth, at the St. Louis County Court-house. If you or any member of your organization would be able to testify, please contact Jacquelyn Rosholt, Committee Administrator, House Environment and Natural Resources Committee and request that your name be placed on the agenda. The hearing will be held by the Subcommittee on Environment-House Committee on Environment & Natural Resources, and the Subcommittee on Environmental Protection of the Senate Committee on Agriculture. Letters or written statements to the Subcommittees would also be helpful, and they can be sent either before or after the hearing. (House-298 State Office Bldg., Senate-Room 25, Capitol, St. Paul, 55155)

The following information appeared in the Michigan Natural Resources magazine, July-August edition, 1983. It reinforces what we've been saying---deposit laws do work, and as more states adopt them, and the statistics and reports come in, we'll wish we'd done it sooner!

Bottle Bill Is Working

Michigan's returnable bottle and can law has been effective in reducing roadside litter, according to a four-year study by the Michigan Department of Transportation. The law took effect in December 1978.

In the study, 36 plots of ground were marked off at selected points along the state's main highway system in the summer of 1977. Between 1977 and 1980, the litter found in each plot during the month of August was measured. Analysis of each year indicated a continuing trend of reduced litter, especially beverage containers. And by 1980, there was an over-all 87 percent reduction of beverage bottles and cans, both returnable and non-returnable, from the pre-bottle bill years of 1977 and 1978. More than half of the cans and bottles picked up in 1980 were non-returnables from other states.

If you would like more information about container deposit, or the CONTAINER CONSERVATION COALITION, please contact Jeanne Crampton at 555 Wabasha c/o League of Women Voters, St. Paul, MN. 55102

Michigan Natural Resources

July-Aug, 1983

Although the container deposit bills (H.F. 683, Vellenga; S.F. 741, Petty) did not receive committee hearings during this session of the legislature, they are alive and kicking! Interim committee hearings have been promised, with final votes to be taken in the next session of the legislature (spring, 1984.)

The CONTAINER CONSERVATION COALITION (C.C.C.) reports additional supporters have joined the cause, and are ready to go to work. It appears that a deposit on beverage containers is a popular concept with the general public, and they are quite ready to accept the minor inconvenience of returning containers in exchange for cleaner highways and reduced solid waste. (Not to mention energy savings, and the creation of jobs.)

The delay in passage of the bills does give supporters time to do additional public education, and, more importantly, a chance to approach their legislators with facts and information during the interim. During the session, legislators are inundated with information on hundreds of topics, so only the most pressing items (those they are actually voting on) get more than a sketchy reading. C.C.C. members urge everyone to contact their legislators during the interim, either by letter or in person (save the phone for when time is very short.) Or write a letter of support for container deposit legislation to your local newspaper. The out-of-date, invalid arguments of our opponents need to be answered. For further information, call or write CONTAINER CONSERVATION COALITION, 555 Wabasha, St. Paul, MN. 55102, (612) 224-5445. Nine states now have deposit legislation. Let's make Minnesota the 10th!

Newsletter Release: CONTAINER CONSERVATION COALITION June, 1983

Bicyclists suffer a unique and disproportionate burden as a direct result of broken glass on the streets. Broken glass means lost time and money, and potential injury. The Minnesota Coalition of Bicyclists strongly supports container deposit legislation, as do bike groups all across the country.

The League of American Wheelmen estimates bicyclists could save \$185 million per year if a national "bottle law" was in effect. The country-wide costs for bike tires and tubes is annually estimated to be \$370 million. Damage due to broken glass makes up about 50 percent of all causes for replacement of tires and tubes; in urban areas the proportion may be as high as 75 percent. Fifty percent of \$370 million is \$185 million per year, the direct cost to bicyclists of broken glass on the roads. Some states that have adopted a container deposit law report up to an 85 percent reduction in container litter volume.

A second economic cost is the time lost and inconvenience created by having to repair flats. People lose 20 million hours per year because of flats. This is using an extremely conservative figure of 60 million flats and assuming each one can be fixed in 20 minutes.

Bike riders are subject to spills and collisions with other vehicles when they try to avoid hitting broken glass on the roadside. Simple falls can result in lacerations when bikers hit glass on the pavement. Cyclists directly bear the burden of littered roadside glass. Members of the Minnesota Coalition of Bicyclists who have biked in deposit states (Vermont and Michigan, for instance) testify to the cleanliness of roadsides, and will be urging their legislators to make Minnesota the 10th state to adopt a deposit law.

(Tim Crampton, Pres., Minn. Coalition of Bicyclists)

D R A F T

CONTAINER DEPOSIT LAWS

WHO BENEFITS; WHO PAYS?

In June of 1982, New York State became the ninth state to adopt a container deposit law. States with such laws already in place are Oregon, Vermont, Michigan, Connecticut, Maine, Iowa, Massachusetts and Delaware. The city of Columbia, Missouri and the national parks also enforce a deposit law.

Even though a number of states have adopted container deposit laws, the controversy continues over whether such measures control litter, recover usable materials and conserve energy in a practical manner. Opponents cite job loss, consumer inconvenience and higher costs. Supporters tout cleaner roads and parks, new jobs and reduced solid waste.

Deposit legislation has failed at the ballot box in several states, but has never been rescinded in states that actually enacted it. When the deposit law was reconsidered in Maine, its citizens upheld their law by a greater percentage in a second referendum than when they adopted it in the first referendum. An alternative to deposit legislation, the litter tax, has been repealed in a number of states.

What follows is a summary of the effects of container deposit laws, based as much as possible on information from states which have enacted deposit laws. Particularly helpful in preparing this report was a work provided by the New York State Office of Development Planning, "Mandatory Deposit Legislation: Benefits and Costs for New York."

PUBLIC OPINION

Seventy percent of those polled by 1977 Minnesota Poll (Minneapolis Tribune) favored a deposit law for Minnesota. In addition, many citizen groups, including the League of Women Voters, Minnesota Jaycees, Council of Community Councils, Minnesota Public Interest Research Group, the Greater Metropolitan Council, Common Cause, Sierra Club, Izaak Walton

League, the Audubon Society and Farm Bureau, support the passage of a deposit law in Minnesota. Opponents of deposit legislation have included the AFL-CIO, beverage and bottling industries and the retail grocer associations. They are concerned that a Minnesota deposit law would cause loss of jobs, increase costs and inconvenience the consumer with only minimal reduction of litter. These arguments will be discussed further in other sections.

In Michigan, a state somewhat similar to Minnesota where a deposit law has been in effect since 1978, a poll conducted by the Business Development Center at Northern Michigan University showed that 56 percent of the respondents liked the deposit law; 78 percent believed it had helped clean up the environment; and 83 percent thought it conserved natural resources. A Detroit Free Press opinion survey (Nov. 30, 1979) indicated 89 percent of those surveyed would oppose replacing the bottle bill with a litter tax. Maine citizens overwhelmingly reaffirmed support of their deposit law (1981) by voting to retain it after industry interests petitioned to have it put on the ballot a second time. On the other hand, deposit laws have been defeated by referenda in a number of states, including Ohio, California and Colorado.

EMPLOYMENT GAINS AND LOSSES

Claims and counterclaims about job loss and gain are so numerous that the facts are difficult to determine. In an attempt at neutrality, let us quote the report prepared by the New York State Office of Development Planning for the New York Legislature. That office appears to have evaluated some of the common stories about jobs which are being heard around the country.

"Job Loss Experience in Other States"

"A great deal of misinformation has obscured rational discussion of job losses where "bottle Bills" have been debated. In Ohio, during a referendum on a deposit law, opponents claimed that 10,000 jobs in the

container industry would disappear. Yet only 3,600 people were employed in that industry in Ohio. Similarly, some estimates for job loss in New York have ranged as high as 7,000 to 8,800.* But according to the New York State Department of Commerce, only 4,600 people are employed in the State's container industry (2,887 in glass container plants - which manufacture all types of glass container - and 1,770 in metal can manufacture plants - which produce all types of metal cans)."

"The experience of these states indicates that job losses have not been as severe as originally predicted, and further indicates that deposit laws may have been used as a scapegoat for general industry trends, particularly production declines due to other causes.

-In Michigan, the National Can Company closed a plant in Livonia, Michigan, with a loss of 70 jobs 'as a direct result of the deposit law.' However, Stroh's Brewery had decided to produce its own cans instead of purchasing them from National, and opened a modernized competing facility in Fremont, Ohio. A contract loss cannot be attributed to the deposit law.

-Owens-Illinois, in Charlotte, Michigan attributed the loss of 161 jobs to the deposit law. However, ten months prior to this layoff, Owens hired 150 workers (including 110 temporary CETA employees) to produce the "float" needed to introduce the Michigan Standard Refillables into the container mix (that is, the company had to begin production of a new bottle type with employment at an artificially high level to prepare for their introduction).*

-At the Glass Container Corporation in Dayville, Connecticut, according to the New York Times, 700 workers lost their jobs because of the deposit law. In fact, the 700 were only laid off temporarily over two holiday weekends. Temporary lay-offs are not uncommon in the glass industry.*

-The Connecticut deposit law has also been blamed for the bankruptcy of Cott Beverages in New Haven. However, Cott had been experiencing financial difficulty well before the deposit law was passed. Cott, which purchases containers from Glass Container, also had an effect on the Dayville plant's production.

-In Massachusetts, where the deposit law controversy has raged for years, the American Can Company threatened to close its Needham plant in 1975 if such legislation were passed. The legislation failed.

The plant still closed the following month."...

"...Trends in the container industry must also be factored into this discussion. Free market forces, not deposit laws, have contributed to declines in glass container and can manufacturing quite independent of mandatory deposit laws. For example, the introduction of the plastic container has had a significant effect, and one which is rapidly accelerating. From 1970 to 1979, approximately 11,000 jobs were lost in glass container and can manufacturing. This trend is very likely to accelerate in the near future."

"Job Gains"

"Job increases following enactment of a deposit law, will also result, which will produce a net gain of approximately 5,000 to 6,000 jobs in New York State.*

"In Michigan, the employment gain in bottling and refilling, handling and recycling, which are labor intensive, has been estimated at 4,600. Many of these jobs involved unskilled labor at the retail level, but they also include skilled jobs in recycling and on the bottling lines to operate and maintain washers. Stroh's, in Michigan, reported a 2.5 percent job gain in 1979, attributable to the manpower needs of the refilling line. Michigan's 30 bottlers have added 720 jobs since passage of the law.* Alcoa and Reynolds have both set up aluminum recycling centers in the state and jobs were needed in the trucking industry to transport containers two

ways. The swap is not simply skilled jobs in a container manufacturing plant for unskilled ones counting bottles."

SOLID WASTE

Most Minnesota communities rely on sanitary landfills for disposal of their solid waste. Many landfills now in use are fast filling up, and must be replaced. Securing and developing new landfills has become costly and divisive because of public concern for safety, health and land use. Most current landfill facilities in the metro area will be full by 1985-86 and at least seven landfills in seven separate counties outside the metro area are in the same predicament or worse.*

An Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) report noted that beverage containers are the fastest growing category of municipal waste, increasing by 8 percent annually. They create nine million tons of trash each year nationally.*

The Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA), in a February 1981 report, estimated that in the previous 12 months, over 900 million nonreturnable beverage containers entered the Minnesota waste stream.* Discussing container deposit legislation in 1980, the MPCA estimated that such a law would reduce municipal waste 7 percent by volume - amounting to between 120,000 and 192,000 tons annually. There would also be a statewide recovery of at least 80,000 tons of glass, 120,000 tons of aluminum, 31,000 tons of steel. In 1978 only 7,000 tons total were recovered.*

During the first two years the Michigan deposit law was in place, there was a reported reduction of 8 percent, or 600,000 tons per year in the waste stream. Michigan estimated overall landfill and collection costs could be reduced up to \$18,000,000 per year.*

Private recyclers in Minnesota claim to recover 50 to 80% of the aluminum containers sold in the state. There seems to be some evidence that at least one recycler includes material shipped here from Iowa and Michigan (deposit states) in the totals for Minnesota.

Midland Glass Company of Shakopee claimed in 1983 that "83% of all beer and soft drink containers are already recycled or refilled." (Mpls. Star and Tribune, September 21, 1983) When questioned Midland admitted it was speaking of glass containers only (news release - Midland Glass Company, September 22, 1983.) Many glass containers require a deposit, so it is not surprising to find a high rate of return for them.

Voluntary recycling brings in the high-incentive items - those for which an adequate price is offered. Mandatory deposits will bring back beverage containers. When materials like plastic, for which there is not much market today, become available in quantity through mandatory deposits, the large volume creates a market. (footnote needed?)

ENERGY CONSERVATION

Deposit systems can take many forms ranging from mandated refillables to mandated deposit on any sort of container (intended to bring containers back for recycling rather than refilling). Energy savings will result from any type of deposit system. The amount of energy saved depends on the kind of system and on the container mix in a given state. Some examples of the energy conservation that might be expected from various deposit systems follow. The wide ranges in the estimates result from different deposit systems.

- A study done by the EPA in 1972 showed that national deposit legislation would save 131,000 barrels of gasoline daily, or enough to meet Maine's energy needs every day.*
- The New York Energy Office validated the figures and methodology of the EPA report cited above, and using that work, it estimated that New York State could save anywhere from 20 to 67 percent of the energy now used in the New York beverage industry. That means 11 to 26 trillion BTUs, or 2 to 4.3 million barrels of oil per year.*
- The MPCA's Division of Solid Waste estimated in 1980 that a deposit

system could save 2.2 trillion BTUs yearly. With that energy 11,300 Minnesota homes could be heated for a year.*

-The Michigan Public Service Commission estimated before the Michigan Deposit Law was enacted that a returnable system would save 8 to 12.7 trillion BTUs per year, or enough energy to heat 40,000 to 63,000 Michigan homes. Their study assessed the entire process of making, filling and distributing beverage containers from mining to eventual solid waste removal.*

-Now that it is in place, the Michigan system actually seems to save about 9 trillion BTUs.*

Voluntary recycling also saves energy, but cannot equal the savings of mandatory deposits. MSD Recycle calculates a recycling rate of 43% for Minnesota (by container) for all nonrefillables (News release, Minnesota Soft Drink Association, March 18, 1983). Deposit states all average return rates for all containers of over 90% (Citizens Against Waste, summary of information collected from state agencies, 1983).

RESOURCE RECOVERY

Recovery of beverage containers can provide a significant source of manufacturing materials. In 1980, over 41 billion aluminum beverage cans were produced, and the numbers continue to grow. Using recycled aluminum in place of bauxite ore yields an energy savings of 95 percent,* and since it takes roughly four tons of imported bauxite to make one ton of aluminum ore, using reclaimed aluminum means using a domestic resource instead of an imported one.

Reclaiming steel reduces air and water pollution and the solid waste by-products of the mining and smelting process. Glass recycling has some very definite benefits beyond removing it from the litter stream. The use of cullet (broken and recycled glass) in the manufacture of glass increases the heat gain and allows a reduction in fuel and furnace temperature, which

extends the life of the furnace lining and reduces air pollution.*

The market for plastic beverage bottles is expected to grow because of consumer acceptance and the energy savings in transporting these lightweight, unbreakable containers. They are manufactured from a resin of polyethylene terephthalate (PET), a petroleum-based product. PET containers cannot be recycled for food containers but they can be used for polyester fiberfill, clothing, toys or packing material. Recycling PET yields an energy savings of up to 97 percent over using virgin resin. Ninety-five percent of the PET material being recycled comes from the states with container deposit laws.* Voluntary recycling does not seem to produce enough volume of plastic material to provide a consistent market.

Deposit legislation would benefit all recycling operations. A problem in establishing successful long-term recycling centers is marketing the material collected. Investors are reluctant to invest money in equipment unless the supply of material is consistently available. States with deposit laws show return rates of over 90 percent. Such return rates assure reclaimers that materials for recycling will be available, making it worthwhile to negotiate long-term contracts.

Solid waste can also be burned for energy, another sort of "resource recovery." Waste burning plants are one alternative to landfilling of solid waste. Beverage container materials (glass, plastic) may cause problems in the burning of solid waste - clogging of the fire or burning too hot. Container deposits could reliably remove most of that material from the waste stream.

HEALTH AND SAFETY

Beverage containers present some health and safety problems. Broken glass or metal containers are a source of injury to swimmers, cyclists, children playing and anyone else who meets up with them. In Michigan, one recreation area manager reported that accident reports declined by 75 percent after the deposit law went into effect.* The Resource Conservation

Committee, a nine-agency federal task force, reported that at least \$10 million could be saved annually in medical bills through implementation of a national mandatory deposit law.*

Air pollution can also be reduced by increased use of recycled materials for manufacturing. This is true in both the aluminum and glass industries. The Glass Container Corporation of Connecticut saved the costs of smokestack scrubbers when it increased the percentage of recycled, crushed glass in its manufacturing process. (NY report, p. 7.)

Opponents of deposit laws, especially grocers, predict that stores will have pest and sanitation problems in storing returned containers. To alleviate this problem most deposit laws allow redeemers to reject unacceptable containers. Generally states have not recorded noticeable increases in unsanitary conditions after deposit legislation. Michigan says that with the exception of a few initial cases there have been no sanitation problems. (Jeanne's letter, referred to in yellow publication.) Maine attributed no violations to container storage in over 5,000 inspections.*

PRICES

What happens to the price of beer and soft drinks when a deposit law goes into effect? Prices in some categories will probably rise, not as much as opponents advertise but more than proponents sometimes maintain. The New York Deposit Report indicates an average 12¢ increase on a six-pack of beer and an average 15¢ increase on a six-pack of soft drink in New York State. Although the New York researchers conclude that prices will rise, they note that other costs, such as litter control and solid waste disposal, will decrease. (new footnote - p. 29 of New York report.) Capital costs for conversion to a returnable system appear to be manageable. The consumer will bear the cost of those investments. There is evidence that citizens are ready to consider price increases as an integral part of packaging - to cover cost of disposal as well as the production and filling

of the container.

(For a more complete discussion of prices and the effect of deposit laws, and particularly other factors involved in the steep increase in Michigan beer prices, the reader is urged to consult the New York Report.)

ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS

Recent conversations with staff people in states with deposit laws indicate that administrative costs have been negligible or nil. New York, where the law took effect in summer 1983 has had no costs. (Jeanne's conversation, Jan. 10, 1984) Michigan, where the law is several years old, also has no administrative costs. (Jeanne) Other states?

An alternative to deposit laws, the litter tax and clean-up program, usually does have administrative costs associated with it. In Washington, for instance, about half of the litter tax revenue is expended on a special "litter corps," administered by state employees.

LITTER AND AESTHETICS

The federal Environmental Protection Agency's statistics show that bottles and cans account for 20 percent of the total number of litter items and 70 percent of litter volume in the United States.

Studies conducted in the states of Michigan, Vermont and Oregon demonstrate that litter there was reduced after deposit legislation. The Michigan Department of Transportation concluded in a 1978 study that there were 176.5 cans per mile along Michigan highways prior to deposit legislation. One year after the bill passed, Michigan reported an 84 percent reduction in the container litter.* Oregon reported a rate of 10 percent litter reduction, but Oregon's container mix already included an unusually high proportion of refillables prior to enactment of their law. Vermont reported an overall 35 percent reduction in highway litter and indicates that litter pick-up costs have decreased by more than 31 percent. Nearly all states with deposit laws have reported a "spillover" effect: a decrease in all types of litter, not just container litter.*

Public perception supports the statistics. As a letter writer to the Minneapolis Tribune said, " _____

_____." (footnote: that letter which appeared last spring from the Iowa cyclist. Is it in the file somewhere?)

THE LITTER TAX

An alternative to deposit legislation is the "litter tax." Washington State enacted the "Model Litter Control Act" in 1971. It is administered by the Washington Department of Ecology and has two sources of funding: a fines system (\$10 for littering) and a tax of \$150 per \$1 million of sales (on food, groceries, tobacco products, carbonated beverages, newspapers, glass, metal and plastic containers, paper products, toiletries and non-drugstore sundries), generating approximately \$1.5 million per year, earmarked for litter control and recycling activities.

The New York report researchers attempted to evaluate claims about Washington's law. They note that the so-called packaging tax actually taxes food and grocery items more than packaging (75% of the receipts). Studies of litter reduction are clouded by the lack of a baseline for litter volume before the law. Comparative studies between Oregon and Washington show that Washington highways have seven times more container litter than Oregon highways.

Other states have also tried litter taxes. In most the laws have lapsed, been repealed, or the tax is not collected. Of nine states which enacted litter taxes (California, Colorado, Connecticut, Kentucky, Ohio, Vermont, Virginia, Washington and Arkansas), only Ohio, Virginia and Washington still seem to be using the tax. Alaska, Hawaii and South Carolina have litter control programs funded by private donations and general fund revenues.

SUMMARY

* *Letters to All Senators + Reps. won't go amiss from here on in!*

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF MINNESOTA



555 WABASHA • ST. PAUL, MINNESOTA 55102

PHONE: (612) 224-5445

MEMO

TO: Action Chairs, N.R. Chairs,
"Whomever!"

FROM: Jeanne Crampton, N.R. Co-Chair

SUBJECT: Container Deposit Legislation

DATE: 1/20/84

The attached material refers to a subcommittee hearing on January 24; shortly after getting that material out to interested parties, we received notice of a full committee hearing, to be held at 3PM, Monday, January 30, Room 112, the Capitol. We have been told that testimony will be taken at that hearing, but no vote. After the session begins March 6th, a vote will be taken, with no further testimony. So the immediate future of our deposit bills, S.F. 741, & H.F. 683, will be decided during the next ten days. If, after March 6, the bill (741) is voted out of committee, it could go to the Senate floor at any time, to be voted up or down. If it passes on the Senate floor, we are then faced with what will happen in the House. I'll worry about that later. Right now, we need to get it out of the full Committee---which gives us, in a sense, until March 6. If your Senator is on the adjacent list, and is either undecided or non-supportive of deposit legislation, generate some calls or action to his office. (I'll be checking legislative interviews, as well, for personal contact.) There is no better pressure than that from constituents---callers don't have to be LWV members - *or*

even use the LWV name. Thanks, J.C.,

AGRICULTURE AND NATURAL RESOURCES

(18 members) T, Th, Rm 112, 3-6 p.m.

Merriam, Chairman

G-24 Capitol 296-4157

Davis, Vice Chairman

Berg	Frederickson	Peterson, C. C.
Bernhagen	Isackson	Peterson, R. W.
Bertram	Lajdig	Storm
Dahl	Lessard	Stumpf
Davis	Merriam	Wegscheid
DeCramer	Novak	Willet

Staff:

Patt Becker 296-7593

Committee Administrative Assistant

Marge Collins 296-4157

Committee Secretary



Container Conservation Coalition

555 Wabasha, St. Paul, MN. 55102

(612)224-5445

NEWSLETTER RELEASE

August 22, 1983

BOTTLES AND CANS ARE MORE THAN UGLY!!

The ugliness of beverage container litter is what we are most aware of, but this litter is also dangerous to us. Personal injuries, damage to farm equipment and possible harm to domestic and wildlife must be considered.

Container litter, which is the least biodegradable type found in the litter stream, is very dangerous. It makes our parks and recreation areas hazardous and sometimes unusable. As early as 1953 Vermont farmers reported cows being cut by shattered bottles along the roadsides. The Resource Conservation Committee, a nine agency federal task force, reported that at least 10 million dollars could be saved annually in medical bills through implementation of a national deposit law. Litter studies in Michigan, Vermont and Oregon, where there are deposit laws, report up to 84% reduction in container litter after laws were enacted. Nearly all states with deposit laws report a "spillover" effect resulting in a decrease in all types of litter.

The Retail Grocer Association has complained that collection and storage of used beverage containers might contribute to pest infestation and odor in stores. This has not materialized. Iowa has reported some problems, but other states have not had any trouble with their bills. Maine, for instance, in over 5000 inspections of grocery stores, did not find one instance of unsanitary conditions that they felt could be the result of container storage. The proposed Minnesota deposit bill includes a provision that allows any redeemer to refuse any container if it is unsanitary. Contact your legislators, and let them know you think Minnesota would be cleaner and safer if we had a container deposit law.

Dear Coalition members and newsletter editors,

Above you'll find our current newsletter article for use in your next newsletter. Please pass it on to any newsletter that you think might be able to use it.

Jeanne Crampton who attended the House Environment Subcommittee hearings on deposit legislation in Duluth last week reports that supporters of deposit legislation made a good showing there, including a small demonstration as the legislators left the Duluth depot.

I've just checked with the House Environment Committee to see when the Twin Cities hearing is likely to be held, but no date is set yet.

*Kate Fournier 9/2 1844 Ave SE
Mpls 55414*

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE????

PLEASE PLAN TO ATTEND A MEETING ON THURSDAY, JUNE 7, 1984, 9:00AM,
ON BEVERAGE CONTAINER DEPOSIT LEGISLATION
AT 555 WABASHA, (SECOND FLOOR) LW OFFICE
(CORNER OF 10TH ST. AND WABASHA)
ST. PAUL, MN.
(PARKING IN LOT AT REAR OF BLDG., ENTER FROM 10TH)

OUR LEGISLATIVE AUTHORS, REP. KATHLEEN VELLENGA AND SEN. ERIC PETTY PLAN
TO BE PRESENT. SEE REVERSE FOR MORE INFORMATION.

Northstar Poll taps 918 adults

The Northstar Poll is a statewide public opinion survey conducted periodically by the St. Paul Pioneer Press and Dispatch, WCCO Television and WCCO Radio.

During the period from March 23 through April 1, 918 adults from throughout Minnesota were interviewed about issues before the Legislature.

Respondents were selected on a random basis and interviewed over the telephone by trained members of the Pioneer Press and Dispatch research staff. In the accompanying tables, percentages for some categories do not total 100 because of rounding.

The results are statistically reliable within a range of plus or minus three percentage points.

Q: To help reduce littering, would you favor or oppose a 5-cent deposit on bottles and cans?

	Total	Men	Women	18-34	35-54	55+	Metro.	Outstate
Yes	70%	71%	70%	77%	66%	68%	71%	70%
No	23	25	22	20	29	22	24	23
Don't Know	7	4	8	3	5	10	5	7

Mandatory deposits on bottles and cans were favored by 70 percent of those polled. Twenty-three percent were opposed and 7 percent had no opinion. Support for the 5-cent deposits was equally strong among men and women,

and among metropolitan and out-state residents.

However, young people were more likely to favor deposits. Three in four respondents under age 35 supported them, compared with two in three older persons:

ST. Paul/
Dispatch
4/10/84



Container Conservation Coalition

Dear Container Conservation Members and Supporters:

As all of you know by now, our container deposit bills received very short shrift in the Senate Agriculture and Natural Resources Committee. S.F.741 was voted down in a 10 to 4 vote on March 8, and was not considered in the House Comm. The Senate Committee vote was as follows:

YES: Dahl, Davis, Novak, Willet

NO: Berg, Bernhagen, Bertram, DeCramer, Fredrickson, Isackson, Laidig
Lessard, Storm, Wegscheid

ABSENT: Peterson, Collin; Peterson, Randy; Stumpf

CHAIR: Merriam (Presumed a "yes" vote)

A major reason for a defeat of such overwhelming proportions was the testimony of a Professor Richard Dague, an engineering professor from the University of Iowa, on February 23. While testifying in support of the Landfill Abatement Act (SF1312), Professor Dague stated that the container deposit law had cost Iowa about \$32 million dollars in the first year, and, "For subsequent years, the cost was estimated at \$24.2 million." I was not present, but as near as I can tell, there were no supporting particulars. In the written testimony that I read, the figures were footnoted with a reference to a masters thesis written by one of Dague's students. (See the letter to Senators included with this mailing.)

We are now faced with a decision regarding future passage of a Deposit bill in Minnesota. These are the options as I see them---perhaps you can suggest others:

1. Continue to reintroduce the bills each session, with a prior determination as to how much time and money we will allocate to a particular session. Keep in mind that the same Senate Committee will be in operation for the next two sessions. Unless Rep. Munger (Chair of the House Environment and Natural Resources Committee) changes his mind and allows the deposit bill to be heard in the House committee first, chances for passage may be slight. On the other hand, there is a good deal to be said for at least introducing the bills---it keeps the pressure on the industry to push recycling.

2. Senator Petty has suggested that next session might be a good time to pass some "enabling" legislation, such as outlawing non-biodegradable plastic can rings, etc., with re-consideration of container deposits in 1986 or 87.

3. No matter what option we elect, the one thing that must be done is to try and educate citizens as to the benefits of a deposit law, and to motivate them to contact legislators with their concerns. The only thing that is going to counteract the lobbying by labor and industry is a groundswell from the electorate.

On April 10th, the St. Paul Pioneer Press/Dispatch and WCCO conducted a "Northstar Poll," and question number 3 was: "To help reduce littering, would you favor or oppose a 5-cent deposit on bottles and cans?" 70 percent were in favor! (See reverse for breakdown.)

If you have suggestions or opinions on our future path, come to the meeting at the League of Women Voters office on June 7th. If you can't make the meeting, drop me a line, or call me at home. Many thanks to everyone for all the effort and support---although the bills didn't pass, I am convinced that we are keeping the industry on their toes in the recycling business!

Jeanne Crampton, (612) 926-8760
4330 Wooddale Ave. S., St. Louis Pk. 55424

This letter was sent to Senators who voted "no" on container deposits on the Ag. and Natural Resources Committee. It was written before the bill regarding the metro tipping fee tax was passed at the end of the session.

March 16, 1984

The League of Women Voters of Minnesota regrets that you did not feel able to support S.F. 741, the beverage container deposit bill. We understand, of course, that it is very hard to vote against the combined opposition of labor and industry on this particular issue, but we do hope that eventually it will become apparent that the arguments used by those groups are fallacious.

We are particularly disturbed that so much credence was given to the testimony of Prof. Richard Dague in his appearance on another bill on February 23. The cost figures quoted by Prof. Dague were outrageously high, and were not substantiated in any way--at least not in his written testimony. We tried to obtain a copy of the thesis from which he supposedly quoted, in order to determine on what basis the figures were developed, but as I indicated in my earlier memorandum, the thesis was unavailable at this time. A conversation with Mr. George Welch, of the Iowa Department of Water, Air, and Waste Management, elicited only the information that Prof. Dague was a well-known opponent of the deposit law, but that in Iowa, at least, no one took it too seriously. My question remains: If the cost is so terribly high in Iowa, who is paying it? The state agencies are adamant that there are no particular administrative costs to the state from the law, no taxes have been increased or added to cover its implementation. Consumers in Iowa report that beverage costs are generally the same as those in non-deposit states (also substantiated by state agency reports.) We can assume, I think, that the retailers and distributors are not absorbing the costs out of the goodness of their hearts. So who is paying these tremendous costs referred to by Prof. Dague?

As new landfills have to be sited, with the increased costs now required, we know that consumers are going to be shocked at the price. We, as consumers, are going to pay that price one place or another, whether it is a few pennies increase in the price of products, in our taxes, or as service fees. We are convinced that by starting now to reduce the amount that goes into a landfill, and by retrieving useable/saleable material from the waste stream, that we can even-out that economic shock. Admittedly, a deposit law affects only a 4 to 6 percent of the waste stream---but we aren't doing anything about it at this point in time. Mandatory recycling of useable materials makes sense---whether it starts with a deposit law, or goes further and mandates community retrieval of all containers, papers, metals, fabrics and plastics, and composts the rest, or uses a burning facility. We need to decide soon what path we will take and get on with it.

Sincerely,

Jeanne Crampton, Natural Resources Director

Can-deposit, landfill fund bills appear dead for this session

By Dean Rebuffoni
and Dan Oberdorfer
Staff Writers

A bill intended to reduce Minnesota's reliance on sanitary landfills was laid aside Thursday by House and Senate committees, virtually ending its chance for passage by the 1984 Legislature.



Minneapolis Star and Tribune
Fri., Mar. 9, 1984

• 9A

(MPCA officials confirmed Merriam's statement in interviews yesterday, saying monitoring wells sunk within the boundaries of the 13 landfills show at least traces of chemical contaminants. But they stressed that the wastes apparently have not seeped beyond the boundaries of the majority of those landfills, and that there is no immediate need for remedial action at most of the area's



Partially Scanned Material

The remainder of this page/item has not been digitized due to copyright considerations. The original can be viewed at the Minnesota Historical Society's Gale Family Library in Saint Paul, Minnesota. For more information, visit www.mnhs.org/library/.

CONTAINER CONSERVATION COALITION (C.C.C.)

League of Women Voters of Minnesota
Jeanne Crampton (926-8760)
555 Wabasha
St. Paul, MN. 55102
(612) 224-5445

Minnesota Audubon Council
Kevin Proescholdt 827-4001
2929 Fourth Ave. S. Suite O
Minneapolis, MN. 55408

St. Paul Audubon
Linda Cox (H)222-7571
579 Laurel Ave. Apt. 4
St. Paul, MN. 55102
(W)228-0115

Minnesota Coalition of Bicyclists
2959 Garfield Ave. S.
Minneapolis, MN. 55408
Tim Crampton - 824-1363

Metropolitan Inter-County Assn.
Sue Fries
114 Metro Square Bldg.- 7th & Robert
St. Paul, MN. 55101
(612) 293-9223

Common Cause
Joyce Williams
555 Wabasha
St. Paul, MN. 55102
(612)227-9139

North Star Chapter Sierra Club
Steve Snyder
2929 Fourth Ave. S. Suite N
Minneapolis, MN. 55408
(612) 827-3859

Izaak Walton League of America
Ruth Saari (926-5587)
5412 France Ave. S. Apt. H
Edina, MN 55410

Minnesota Conservation Federation
1036-B Cleveland Ave. S.
St. Paul, MN 55116
Ken Heimenz, President
Box 372
St. Joseph, MN. 56374

Minn. Public Interest Research Group
2412 University Ave. SE
Minneapolis, MN. 55414
(612)376-7554

American Assoc. of University
Women of Minnesota (AAUW)
Mary Doty (332-7853)
2215 Stevens Ave. S.
Minneapolis, MN. 55404

White Bear Recycling
Mary E. Ayde
1201 N. Birch Lake Blvd.
White Bear Lake, MN. 55110
(H)429-2397 (W)429-7763

Joint Religious Legislative
Coalition - Sam Horowitz
122 W. Franklin Ave.
Minneapolis, MN. 55404
(612)870-3670

Poor Richard Inc.
Richard Wybierala
400 Whitall St.
St. Paul, MN. 55101
(612)776-6333; 774-1311

S.P.E.A.C. - Dr. Ray Nelson
Box 44, Bemidji State U.
Bemidji MN. 56601
(218) 755-2850

SUPPORTERS:

Eagle Sanitation, Newport
Citizens Party of Minnesota
Earl Hauge, Glenwood
Minnesotans Against Nonsensical
Use of Resources, Brainerd
St. Cloud Area Environmental Council
Wm. Mitchell Environmental Law Society
Robert Eikum, Moose Lake
SAVE America's Vital Energy, Inc.
Save Lake Superior Association
Northern Sun Alliance
Duluth Chapter Izaak Walton League
Heather Kindem
Todd Bunde
Save Green Acres
Minnesota Farm Bureau

MET COUNCIL PROPOSES WASTE SEPARATION FOR RECYCLABLES, COMPOST :

Legislature Will Be Asked For Help

The Metropolitan Council wants to eliminate the use of landfills for most solid waste produced in the Twin Cities Area. In the years since the passage of the Waste Management Act in 1980, Council members have become frustrated with the job of approving sites for potentially harmful landfills—often on farm land—and slow progress toward alternative methods of waste management. During 1984 the Council resolved to systematically steer the region to a minimum use of landfills, as quickly as possible.

WHAT HAPPENS TO TRASH IN THE FUTURE?

Land disposal of trash in the Twin Cities Area will be cut back drastically to a minimal level over the next few years if the Metropolitan Council's recommendations on solid waste are taken up by the Minnesota Legislature. And landfills operating after 1990 would pose a smaller threat to the environment than those that now worry policy makers.

There is evidence that 13 of the region's 15 operating or closed landfills are contaminating the groundwater underneath them. The eight landfills currently operating in the area accept about 5,400 tons of trash daily, and will be full by the early 1990s if this level of dumping continues. Eventually most of the 18 potential landfill sites identified



Partially Scanned Material

The remainder of this page/item has not been digitized due to copyright considerations. The original can be viewed at the Minnesota Historical Society's Gale Family Library in Saint Paul, Minnesota. For more information, visit www.mnhs.org/library/.