

**X.1 POLICY/LEGISLATION**

<b>X.1a</b>	<b>Institute a System of Container Deposit for Beverage Containers – Bottle Bill</b>
Description	Minnesota Legislature should adopt a Container deposit law that requires retailers and distributors to collect a \$.10 refundable deposit on beverage containers. The deposit is paid when the container is purchased, and refunded when the container is returned for recycling. Bottle bills have proven to be highly effective in reducing litter and waste and promoting recycling.
Measurement Method	
Timeframe/Mileposts	2011
Implementation Parties	MN Legislature, MPCA, MN Department of Commerce, Private sector retailers, distributors, beverage manufacturers, redemption centers, national trade associations
Costs	
Funding Mechanisms	Creates own funding mechanism through money from unredeemed deposits
Barriers/Issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strong opposition from retailers, distributors, beverage manufacturers, Beverage Association of Minnesota</li> <li>• Will take time to create a network of redemption centers</li> <li>• Will have impacts on current curbside collection programs (less collection costs but also less revenue from materials collected, i.e. aluminum)</li> <li>• Unredeemed deposits</li> <li>• Impacts of market fluctuations</li> </ul>
Opportunities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Creates a privately funded infrastructure for the collection of beverage containers</li> <li>• Achieves 66%-96% capture rates for containers covered by deposits in states that have passed legislation</li> <li>• More glass recovered through color separation at collection points, making it possible to recycle back into glass bottles</li> <li>• Deposit-return programs have much higher recycling rates than municipal recycling programs because of the economic incentive to recycle offered to the consumer who gets money back for the containers.</li> <li>• Bottle bills creates a privately-funded collection infrastructure for beverage containers and make producers and consumers (rather than taxpayers) responsible for their packaging waste.</li> <li>• In Canada, domestically produced beer is sold in standardized bottles and 97% of the bottles come back to the producer to be refilled.</li> <li>• Creates jobs</li> <li>• Inspires innovation in packaging (similar to EPR above) especially when redesigning containers so they will be reusable</li> <li>• Containers collected (especially glass) are cleaner and provide a higher quality feedstock to manufacturers</li> <li>• Reduces litter</li> <li>• Reduces the incidence of glass lacerations among urban children (American Journal of Public Health, October 1986. v.</li> </ul>

## MINNESOTA>ENVIRONMENTAL<INITIATIVE

	76, no. 10) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>National trade associations are adopting high recycling goals and have indicated a willingness to partner on initiatives that may include bottle bills</li> </ul>				
Feasibility	Very feasible but very politically sensitive. Eleven U.S. states and eight of Canada's ten provinces have "bottle bills" requiring deposit-return programs for beverage containers.				
General Comments	Only 20-25% of used beverage containers in Minnesota are recycled. We have this low recycling rate despite widespread access to residential curbside recycling and widespread educational efforts.				
<b>Centroid Information</b>	<b>Twin Cities</b>	<b>Duluth</b>	<b>St. Cloud</b>	<b>Rochester</b>	<b>Total</b>
Cumulative GHG Reduction Potential					
Priority					
Centroid-Specific Comments					

# MINNESOTA>ENVIRONMENTAL<INITIATIVE

## X.2 FINANCIAL INCENTIVES

X.2a	Incentivizing Behavior Change through Unit Based Pricing				
Description	Require cities and counties to adopt and implement Pay-as-You-Throw (PAYT) ordinances where incremental price increases are proportional to container size increases as well as to the frequency of service.				
Measurement Method	Local units of government would need to have licensing requirements that would ensure compliance				
Timeframe/Mileposts	2011				
Implementation Parties	MPCA, Regional/local governments (counties, SWMCB, WLSSD, cities and townships), non-profits, private sector, private haulers				
Costs	Low to municipalities, however: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some legislative or ordinance change and some enforcement</li> <li>• Costs paid by consumers</li> </ul>				
Funding Mechanisms					
Barriers/Issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enforcement and compliance would be challenging</li> <li>• Private sector haulers will be concerned about proprietary pricing information</li> <li>• Public will have concerns about increased costs for current levels of service</li> <li>• Capital costs to haulers to provide new carts of different sizes to customers</li> <li>• Resistance to change or perception of change</li> <li>• Application in multi-family units with central disposal</li> <li>• Additional administration, enforcement and compliance</li> </ul>				
Opportunities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Creates recognizable price incentives for reducing refuse service and source reduction efforts</li> <li>• Allows for customers to financial benefit by diverting waste into recycling streams</li> <li>• This could also include provisions that require transparency in pricing</li> <li>• Source reduction increases documented 6%</li> <li>• Recycling and composting increases 17% and higher</li> <li>• Cost based on generation (reduced cost for disposal as waste reduces)</li> <li>• Transparent and equitable</li> </ul>				
Feasibility	Feasible to implement – enforcement challenge. There is already legislation that requires some generational pricing but it is not specific or effective.				
General Comments	Rate differentials need to be no less than 70-80% higher for double the service to have impact.				
Centroid Information	Twin Cities	Duluth	St. Cloud	Rochester	Total
Cumulative GHG Reduction Potential					
Priority					
Centroid-Specific Comments					

## MINNESOTA>ENVIRONMENTAL<INITIATIVE

### X.5 COLLECTIONS AND PROCESSING

X.5a	Organized Collection
Description	Promote the implementation of organized collection of MSW services through lessening the requirements and timeframes governmental units to implement organized collections, as well as to encourage joint purchasing efforts/cooperatives for the procurement of waste services.
Measurement Method	In organized collection programs, reporting of all materials collected would/could be a requirement of all contracts allowing for accurate measurement of tons captured.
Timeframe/Mileposts	2011
Implementation Parties	MN Legislature, MPCA, MN Dept of Commerce, Regional/local governments (counties, SWMCB, WLSSD, economic development agencies, cities and townships), non-profits, private haulers, private sector
Costs	Low costs/medium costs. Legal and administrative costs paid by municipalities to follow the current mandated organizing statute process. However, must recognize that it is transferring costs currently paid by residents directly to their hauler to the local unit of government to pay. Per household costs generally are less in organized programs than under non-organized collection programs.
Funding Mechanisms	This is usually done through either property tax or service fee increases.
Barriers/Issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Private haulers strongly oppose organized collection. Small haulers fear it will limit their opportunities to compete. Large haulers believe that if their market share grows too large they may face additional government scrutiny/regulation</li> <li>• This should be done through public/private partnerships</li> <li>• Vocal groups of residents protest to elected officials saying they like the ability to choose their hauler for themselves. Creates political issues for city councils, etc.</li> <li>• There exist other ways to address opportunities (i.e. citywide licensing, etc)</li> <li>• Creates monopolies</li> <li>• Puts small haulers out of business</li> <li>• The organized collection process is quite long and onerous for all parties involved. Currently the process to follow the organized collection statute takes a municipality approximately one year to complete</li> </ul>
Opportunities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Creates opportunity to provide community wide education about the program</li> <li>• Can increase overall capture of materials by providing consistent service to all residents.</li> <li>• Can provide for multiple haulers to provide services by splitting cities into regions or allowing different haulers to collect each stream.</li> <li>• Licensing requirement, citizen mandate as alternative to organized collection</li> <li>• One hauler may be able to take over the market</li> <li>• Allows the city to control the waste contract for the entire community, possibly meaning more opportunities for WMC.</li> <li>• Gives waste generators flow control so they can designate that waste be managed by a method higher in the hierarchy.</li> </ul>

## MINNESOTA>ENVIRONMENTAL<INITIATIVE

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lengthens street life because of decreased heavy truck traffic, thus allowing cities to reduce or delay property tax assessments for road maintenance or replacement.</li> <li>• Allows cities to negotiate rates with haulers and thus create greater price differentials between different levels of service and influence residents to reduce their waste and recycle more of their waste.</li> <li>• Decreased diesel truck traffic decreases particle emissions resulting in cleaner air.</li> <li>• Route efficiency decreases greenhouse gas emissions.</li> <li>• Route efficiency results in less neighborhood noise pollution.</li> <li>• Decreased number of trucks on residential streets reduces the odds of accidents occurring.</li> <li>• Gives cities greater control over determining the best provision of service to their residents. Currently there is an artificially high threshold for switching to organized garbage service - a threshold that does not exist when cities consider organizing other services such as recycling and Wi-Fi.</li> <li>• Allows for transparency and consistency in pricing.</li> <li>• Associated educational efforts expand and enhance resident's knowledge about the full range of services and costs for waste disposal and recycling.</li> <li>• Can guarantee market share for small haulers that are part of a consortium.</li> <li>• Reduces confusion for new residents unsure how and what criteria to use to pick a garbage hauler.</li> <li>• Would create the densities of materials to make collection programs more affordable, as well as to provide opportunities for all residents to participate.</li> <li>• Municipalities would also have the pricing controls to then incentivize the diversion of SSOM out of the garbage can and into an organics container.</li> </ul>				
Feasibility	Very feasible but politically sensitive – difficult politically to enact at Legislature				
General Comments					
<b>Centroid Information</b>	<b>Twin Cities</b>	<b>Duluth</b>	<b>St. Cloud</b>	<b>Rochester</b>	<b>Total</b>
Cumulative GHG Reduction Potential					
Priority					
Centroid-Specific Comments					

## MINNESOTA>ENVIRONMENTAL<INITIATIVE

X.5b	New Licensing Requirements and City Ordinances				
Description	Cities pass ordinances to mandate the collection of recyclable and source separated organic materials or require all licensed haulers to provide recycling and source separated organic material collection as a condition of licensing. Cities must require that all haulers be licensed in their communities.				
Measurement Method	Requirement of licensing would be annual reporting of materials collected				
Timeframe/Mileposts					
Implementation Parties	Regional/local governments (counties, SWMCB, WLSSD, economic development agencies, cities and townships), private haulers.				
Costs	Low costs.				
Funding Mechanisms	Service costs would be paid directly by residents to their hauler				
Barriers/Issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Only requires haulers to offer services, but not to provide to all customers</li> <li>• Cities are already required to ensure that residents have the opportunity to recycle curbside unless too small.</li> <li>• Does not require cities to mandate services, only an option</li> <li>• Minimizes education opportunities that city –wide uniform services offer</li> </ul>				
Opportunities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can provide for multiple haulers opportunity to provide services</li> <li>• Expedites implementation</li> <li>• This will allow haulers in the market to decide if they want to compete or these services.</li> </ul>				
Feasibility	Very feasible				
General Comments					
Centroid Information	Twin Cities	Duluth	St. Cloud	Rochester	Total
Cumulative GHG Reduction Potential					
Priority					
Centroid-Specific Comments					