

## Real World Data Shows That There is No Correlation between EPR for Packaging and Consumer Prices

**Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) for Packaging is the single most effective policy tool we can use to reduce waste, increase recycling, and save taxpayer money.**

- Countries and provinces with EPR regularly achieve recycling rates above 50%<sup>1</sup> without raising the overall cost of recycling—producer-funded recycling programs are undoubtedly more efficient than taxpayer-funded programs.
- Maine’s taxpayers currently spend at least \$16 million a year just to manage packaging waste, and we have a low recycling rate of 36% and declining.
- It costs 67% more to recycle than dispose of waste on average—which makes it hard for Maine’s municipalities to maintain recycling programs.

**We do not need to rely on “studies” that model the consumer price impacts of EPR for Packaging laws because we can look at real world evidence from more than 50 functioning programs, including five Canadian provinces and every country in the EU.**

- Clorox funded the York University “study,” which concluded that EPR will raise consumer prices up to 6% and is purposefully being used to kill EPR bills. This paper was not peer-reviewed, and the author makes only one citation—to himself. The outrageous assumptions made were used to inflate the result, and all data sources are supplied by industry opponents. The sample size was nine.
- In contrast, there was another, more legitimate study done in the UK by a group of producers, that concluded: *"Our calculations show that, with the arrival of EPR, the cost associated with an average shopping basket of goods may rise by up to 0.6%."*

**Again, EPR for Packaging already exists all over the world, and there is no evidence that it affects consumer prices.**

- Resource Recycling Systems analyzed consumer prices across Canada and found no correlation between price and the existence of an EPR policy<sup>2</sup>. In their analysis, they state: *"Given the lack of clear correlation between higher prices and the existence of EPR policy, it is likely that pricing is more influenced by other economic factors, such as energy or labor costs, local taxes, distance from distribution hubs, competition, or other operating expense differences."*
- Product prices are the same in Nova Scotia, which does not have EPR, as they are in Quebec, which does benefit from EPR<sup>3</sup>.
- EPR program costs are extremely low to producers; typically fractions of a penny per container—see reverse for examples. Total costs are between 0 and 1% of a company’s gross revenue.
- Bottle bill programs cost more for beverage companies than EPR, yet there is no difference in the price of beverages in states with a bottle bill and states without.

---

<sup>1</sup> Product Stewardship Institute: <https://www.productstewardship.us/page/Packaging>

<sup>2</sup> Oregon Department of Environmental Quality: <https://www.oregon.gov/deq/recycling/Documents/rscRRSconsumer.pdf>

<sup>3</sup> Nova Scotia Federation of Governments: <https://www.nsfm.ca/extended-producer-responsibility.html>

## EPR for Packaging Law Stewardship Fee Estimations

Per ton fees for materials amount to negligible per package costs for producers; but will provide critical support to municipal recycling programs.

Sample Packaging Material Categories		Packaging Example*	Weight (g)	Packages Per Ton	Quebec Fees 2020 USD \$/ton	Stewardship Fee** Per Package in Quebec 2020
<b>Paper/ Cardboard</b>	Corrugated carton and kraft paper	<b>Large Corrugated Shoe Box</b>	216	4,200	\$132.89	\$0.032
	Boxboard and other paper packaging	<b>Large Tissue Box</b>	46	19,721	\$145.62	\$0.007
	Gable-top containers	<b>Half Gallon Milk Carton</b>	63	14,400	\$138.55	\$0.010
	Aseptic Containers	<b>Box of Soup</b>	32	28,350	\$169.97	\$0.006
	Laminated Paper	<b>Pringles Can</b>	40	22,680	\$208.53	\$0.009
<b>Plastic</b>	PET Bottles & containers	<b>Large Peanut Butter Jar</b>	59	15,376	\$206.09	\$0.013
	HDPE bottles & containers <5L	<b>Rigid Can Carrier- 4 Pack</b>	12	75,599	\$78.87	\$0.001
	Film, bags, laminates	<b>Large Potato Chip Bag</b>	11	82,471	\$342.88	\$0.004
	PVC, PLA, and polystyrenes	<b>Single Serving Yogurt Cup</b>	14	64,799	\$574.10	\$0.009
	Other Plastics	<b>Large Hand Cream Tube</b>	51	17,788	\$208.13	\$0.012
<b>Aluminum</b>	Aluminum	<b>Maple Ham Spread Can</b>	31	29,264	\$130.81	\$0.004
<b>Steel</b>	Steel	<b>Large Coffee Can</b>	146	6,214	\$124.81	\$0.020
<b>Glass</b>	Clear Glass	<b>Medium Pickle Jar</b>	239	3,796	\$125.22	\$0.033
	Colored Glass	<b>Large Olive Oil Bottle</b>	426	2,130	\$125.28	\$0.059

\* Examples are for empty containers. Container weights were collected in grams by the Natural Resources Council of Maine

\*\*Fee estimations are based on the 2020 fee schedule for Eco Enterprises Quebec, the Product Stewardship Organization in the province of Quebec, CA. Fees and weights have been converted to U.S. Dollars and pounds, respectively. Source: [https://www.eeq.ca/en/for-companies/fee-structure/contribution-table/#tab\\_2020](https://www.eeq.ca/en/for-companies/fee-structure/contribution-table/#tab_2020)