This publication is a script, which may be used individually or in conjunction with a slide presentation, whose purpose is to support the use of returnable beverage containers. Major topics include costs, use of energy, recycling, depletion of resources, waste, existing legislation, and methods for supporting deposit legislation. The script was originally written for a particular location but it can be adapted to other areas. Information concerning accompanying slides and tape is included. (LS)
NO DEPOSIT -- NO RETURN ... WHAT'S IT COSTING ME?

*** A 17-minute slide presentation.

*** 57 slides with script or taped narration.

*** Easily adaptable to local situations, or useable anywhere as it is.

This fast moving, hard hitting slide presentation was developed to promote support for beverage container deposit legislation in Onondaga County and throughout New York State. It was produced for maximum flexibility of use. Portions can be excerpted for special informational needs (i.e., a TV appearance) and it may be adapted to local issues or not as objectives dictate.

The script was well researched and the illustrations, photography and narration are professionally produced. The story contrasts the "no-deposit, no-return" with the refillable beverage container. In outline the presentation covers:

1. Direct cost savings to the consumer
2. Use of energy
3. Recycling -- not the answer
4. Depletion of non-renewable resources (especially aluminum)
5. Litter and solid waste
6. Deposit legislation -- existing, in process.
7. Local testimony (mayor, county executive, parks manager) -- optional
8. Statement by Oregon Gov. Tom McCall
9. Summary of key issues -- EPA "environmentally best" -- "environmentally worst"
10. How the individual and organization can support deposit legislation.

This presentation is being offered at cost to other groups and individuals involved in "refillable vs. one-way beverage container" education programs.

✓ 17 page script only  $ 1.00*

script and 57 slides  $ 30.00*

script, slides, tape  $ 40.00*

*New York residents add 7% sales tax

Send orders with check or money order to:

D. L. Hanselman
208 Revere Road
DeWitt, New York 13214
Suggestions for using slide show

"NO DEPOSIT -- NO RETURN ... WHAT'S IT COSTING ME?"

You are receiving the presentation exactly as it was prepared for use in Onondaga County, New York. You will find that this presentation is easily altered to fit your style, your locale and your audience. Get to really know the presentation. Put it in your own words so it "feels comfortable"--not canned.

If you wish not to localize the presentation.

# 26 Even the most modern solid waste shredding and recovery operations usually do not recover cans or bottles. At one of the country's newest operation in Syracuse, New York, the bottle is reduced to sand, the can to a ball. Both go to landfills--lost forever. It's almost impossible to separate out any but ferrous metals--and there's usually no feasible market for aluminum cans anyway!

# 36 Let me share with you the results of a litter survey conducted by the people of Cayuga County, New York--currently, the only New York county that has enacted deposit legislation. I'm sure we could replicate their study in other towns, counties or states.

# 42 - 44 OMIT

# 45 Oregon is the only state where deposit legislation has been in effect long enough for evaluation. We asked Governor Tom McCall to comment. Let me quote his response, "Based upon... (STATEMENT)"

# 52 ALTER DEPENDING ON YOUR OBJECTIVES AND THE AUDIENCE. IF YOU DO NOT CONDUCT AN OPINION SURVEY, THEN NARRATION MAY BE: Whether you agree or not, I urge you to express yourselves to elected representatives who are pondering deposit legislation. I think you would be interested in knowing that several polls, including one by the League of Women Voters at the New York State Fair, show 65 to 85 per cent of the public in favor of deposit legislation.

If you wish to localize the presentation.

# 26 GET FACTS, FIGURES ON SOLID WASTE HANDLING IN YOUR COMMUNITY. YOU MAY WISH TO ADD A SLIDE OF YOUR LANDFILL (WITH CANS AND BOTTLES PROMINENTLY A MAJOR PROPORTION OF THE GARBAGE). THEN YOU MAY ALSO WISH TO USE EXISTING SLIDE # 26 AND NARRATION ABOVE.

# 36 SEE # 36 ABOVE. DEPENDING ON MOMENTUM OF LEGISLATION IN YOUR AREA, YOU MAY WISH TO INSERT A STATE OR REGIONAL MAP SHOWING STATUS OF DEPOSIT LEGISLATION IN YOUR AREA.

# 39 - 40 YOU MAY WISH TO SUBSTITUTE LOCAL EXAMPLE -- SLIDE AND NARRATION ACCORDINGLY

# 42 - 44 TRY TO GET STRONG SUPPORTIVE STATEMENTS FROM LEADERS. OPINION SURVEYS SHOWING WIDE PUBLIC SUPPORT HELP ELECTED OFFICIALS IN TAKING STANCE. DON'T RELY ON POLITICAL AND CIVIC LEADERS TO "HAVE THE FACTS". USE THE CONTACT TO GIVE THEM THE FACTS. BEST, (IF HANDLED WITH EXTREME TACT) HELP THEM DRAFT A STATEMENT. IF STATEMENT IS LONG, USE TWO OR MORE SLIDES AND/OR QUOTE RESPONSIBLY FROM THE STATEMENT.

# 52 SEE # 52 ABOVE.
Script -- slide presentation for beverage container deposit legislation promotion.

"NO DEPOSIT -- NO RETURN"

"WHAT'S IT COSTING ME?"

This slide presentation may be localized as needed: Read through the script and note places where local facts can be used. You may wish, for example, to ask your local mayor, county parks chief or other authority to comment on litter, solid waste or other problems of the one-way container. Try to get a succinct statement you can quote and insert a slide of the individual--perhaps looking at non-returnables with a member of your local committee. While this presentation may be used exactly as it appears here, it is suggested that each presenter put it in his or her own words--words that fit the individual delivering the presentation and the audience.

Follow through is critical. After the presentation entertain discussion (and this means you’ve got to know your facts!) and then ask the audience to sign the sheet and vote for or against the issue. A sample "vote sheet" is attached. (Note: Those developing this presentation felt that it would be more effective to show the proportion favoring the legislation than just those who would sign a petition. Visiting civic and service organizations is not an efficient way to gather large numbers of signers--better to stand in busy shopping areas for numbers.) Ask your audience for a resolution favoring deposit legislation. Send it to all legislative representatives. Other "what you can do" suggestions are in the script.

Equipment needed: an automatic slide projector (don't forget spare lamp!), projection stand, screen of appropriate size, extension cord. Also, be sure there is some small light near the front which will permit you to read script.

The credibility of this presentation rests not only upon the visuals, the facts and figures, but upon the effectiveness of the individual presenting the program. Practice the delivery so you can really deliver it -- not just read it. Arrive in plenty of time to set up your equipment and have everything ready to go. Be sure everyone can see and hear.

When taped narration is used: ¼" tape player, take-up reel, appropriate speaker and/or amplifier. The tape comes with two recorded narrations--one with audible signals for slide changes and one with tones to operate a Kodak synchronizer for automatic slide change. In the latter mode, a Kodak synchronizer, stereo tape player and appropriate connecting cords are necessary.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLIDE NUMBER</th>
<th>SLIDE DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>NARRATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>HAND AROUND A BEER CAN</td>
<td>You...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CHILDREN WITH SOFT DRINKS</td>
<td>...and the other members of your family...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>CARTOON AVERAGE FAMILY</td>
<td>...if you're an average American family...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>CARTOON FAMILY BURIED IN BOTTLES AND CANS</td>
<td>...consume 1,646 bottles or cans of beer and carbonated soft drinks each year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>HAND WITH MONEY AND GROCERY SLIPS</td>
<td>Have you ever figured out what that's costing you? Well, that's what I'd like to invite you to consider with me for the next few minutes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>(TITLE) &quot;NO DEPOSIT -- NO RETURN&quot; ... WHAT'S IT COSTING ME?</td>
<td>No deposit -- No return... It's costing you plenty!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>BEVERAGE DISPLAY</td>
<td>consumers are buying most of their beverages in non-returnable bottles and cans. And, if you'll look at the average beverage display, you'll see why -- they don't have much choice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>COKE IN DEPOSIT AND NO-DEPOSIT CONTAINERS (Syracuse, NY prices December, 1973)</td>
<td>The beverage industry has led us to believe that non-returnables are cheaper and more convenient than the deposit container.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>HAND THROWING CAN OUT CAR WINDOW</td>
<td>More convenient?... Well, maybe.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
But cheaper? No! Writing in *Beverage Industry* magazine, Sanford Bernstein said: "Packaging is the major factor in the production of beer. For all the big three, it comprises more than 50 per cent of the total cost of producing the product for marketing."

Mr. N. E. Norton, President of Royal Crown and Dr. Pepper Bottling Co. wrote: "The constant amazement to me is why so many bottlers cannot see the returnable bottle is the cheapest way to get our product to the consumer, and at the same time, help the litter and solid waste problems. A comparison which I frequently use is, 'Would you pay $15 for a pair of shoes and $30 for the box to bring them home in?'"

Well, that's exactly what you're being asked to do by the beverage industry. If we outlawed the non-returnables, and used deposit containers, the average family could save $44 per year in beverage purchases by eliminating the waste of non-refillable containers.
Now, if that $4.4 for the so-called convenience of one-way cans and bottles isn't bad enough, you're also being asked to bear some other costs—get out your checkbook—turn down your thermostat—the non-returnable isn't through with you yet!

Americans respond to crises—they pull together, discipline themselves and make the necessary sacrifices. They did in World Wars I and II—and they're doing it again now as the crunch of energy shortages presses in on every family. Why, it's just not patriotic to have a toasty warm house or to drive over 55 mph!

Here's another way to save energy: Put the beer and soft drinks back in refillable, deposit containers. Each time an aluminum can is used, we lose one-half kilowatt hour of energy—or, that's the same as burning a 100 watt light bulb for 5 hours. For many families they could light their house for the energy they waste in beverage cans.
7-BILLION KI: HOURS
OR 3-MILLION PEOPLE

Mannify this to the national picture and it looks like this: In 1970 7 billion kilowatt hours of energy were used to manufacture 440,000 tons of aluminum cans. This energy would meet the needs of 3 million people for a year. Shouldn't we be re-examining our priorities?

211 TRILLION BTU
OR HEAT 2-MILLION HOMES

And what about throw-away bottles? According to Crusade For A Cleaner Environment, the manufacture of one-way bottles wasted 211 trillion BTU's of energy in 1972. That's the energy spent over the amount needed to manufacture only returnables. It's also enough to supply 10 million Americans with electrical power for a year. Enough to heat 2-million three-bedroom brick homes in the Middle Atlantic states for a whole heating season. If your home is uncomfortably chilly aren't you a bit incensed by this allocation of precious energy? Refillable bottles would save at least 25% of the energy required to manufacture now ones.
For a quarter of a century, conservationists and environmentalists have warned us of fuel shortages -- but they were Cassandras -- Now we know differently. But are we listening to another dire warning? Non-renewable resources are being depleted at an alarming rate -- and as we have learned from the oil crisis, we cannot go on assuming that foreign resources shall flow to American shores at the beck and call of the U.S. dollar.

During this past year, warnings have come from several quarters...the U.S. Geological Survey analysis of mineral resources concluded its report warning of crises in the supply of raw materials with a statement deploring the extent to which steel, aluminum and other non-returnable resources are being used once, and lost forever.

And from the private sector, William Roesch, President of Jones and Laughlin Steel Corp. projects shortages of steel.
20 AUTO "GRAVEYARD"
With steel shortages in the offing, and prices rising, the feasibility of recycling auto corpses is at hand.

21 STACK NEWSPAPERS
And with demand for newsprint outstripping supply, and prices soaring on this paper product, technologically and economically paper recycling is practical in today's economy.

22 EMPTY CANS "FOR SALE -- CHEAP"
So, why not just recycle aluminum and steel beverage containers? We once thought this was the answer. But -- it hasn't worked -- it won't work -- Recycling is not the answer.

23 RECYCLING OPERATION
Massive industry efforts to encourage recycling centers for glass and cans are failing. It was great public relations for the beverage industry. But how audacious! The poor consumer was being asked to go to a lot of work and trouble to give back expensive containers. Then, the whole foolish cycle was repeated again.
Recycling beverage containers is neither practical -- nor profitable for consumer or for industry. Often, new materials are cheaper and recycling may require as much or more energy. At its peak in 1971, less than 4 per cent of the total non-refillables produced were recycled.

Even if aluminum cans do get back for recycling, they are undesirable because the material is very thin and painted or coated with lithographic advertising which causes rapid burning. This results in tremendous losses of metal due to oxidation. Also, the can is a high magnesium alloy -- almost worthless for anything but the production of more cans.

Even the most modern solid waste shredding and recovery operations usually do not recover cans or bottles. The new Onondaga County operation reduces the bottle to sand and the can to a ball--both go to land fills--lost forever. It's almost impossible to separate out any but ferrous metals--and there's no local market for aluminum cans anyway!
Recycling beverage containers is not the answer--and neither is the continuation of the one-way can. The industry uses 90% of bauxite--imported--to make a ton of aluminum which in turn makes only 48,000 beverage cans.

Every time we repeat this foolish one-way process, we rob the American economy of $200 of valuable metal, most of it contributing to U.S. trade deficits.

And, we lose 17,000 kilowatt hours of energy.

The logical challenge is, "but isn't this a drop in the bucket--compared to other aluminum uses?"

Absolutely not! According to 1970 data for the U.S. Aluminum industry, the production of cans is the number one use in a list of 72 categories.
Thus far, we have looked at 3 solid reasons to end the era of the non-returnable beverage container:

(1) Deposit containers could save the average family $4.44 a year in direct purchase costs.

(2) We can no longer waste the tremendous amount of energy we are spending today to produce no deposit--no return containers.

(3) And we have seen the cost and waste of aluminum--a precious, mostly imported--non-renewable natural resource.

But, we haven't touched on the major issue that has promoted deposit legislation in most of Canada, Oregon, Vermont and neighboring Cayuga County.

That is litter!
Let's back up to this illustration that I used a minute ago. Note items 5 and 6. The very reason aluminum is used so extensively for siding and for primary doors and windows is the stability of the metal and its longevity under most weather conditions. These characteristics are exactly what makes aluminum the wrong material from which to manufacture consumer containers. Aluminum doesn’t rust and oxidizes so slowly as to be measured in human lifetimes. Underwater—where a lot of cans end up—there is no measurable deterioration. Glass containers—they are as bad or worse. They last forever.

It was this one issue—litter—that prompted our Canadian neighbors to end the folly of throwaway beverage containers. Oregon pioneered in the U.S. Vermont has followed. Several cities and counties have enacted similar deposit legislation and legislation has been initiated in dozens of other municipalities and in several states.
Cayuga County, where we have New York's first enacted deposit law, passed the legislation largely on the litter issue. Proponents conducted an impressive litter study, repeatable here, I'm sure. Let me share it with you:

In May 1973, 202 miles of roadside were surveyed in the county. 93,000 cans and bottles were picked up. Laid end to end, they would reach the length of Owasco Lake - 17 1/4 miles.

If recycled, these containers would have been worth $72 hardly worth the effort of pick up. But if there had been a 5 cent deposit on them, they would have been worth $4,653, clearly an attractive source of pocket money for enterprising youngsters!

If we talk about litter in terms of clean up costs, we can cite example after costly example. Despite the fact that beer is not sold at all along the NYS Thruway, and most other beverages are consumed at rest stops, the Thruway Authority reports an annual litter clean up cost of $40,000; and half the litter is beverage containers.
We can quote the superintendent of a Central New York State park who says, "Disposable beverage containers are a never-ending problem for park people. They don't degrade and hence lay there--spoiling the beauty and all too often causing nasty injury to visitors. Litter pick-up costs about $16,000 a year in this park and despite the fact that we ban bottles and cans on the beach, and our concession sells soft drinks only in paper cups, a very high percentage of our litter is the disposable can and bottle."

Even the beverage industry's own public relations campaign--Keep America Beautiful--reports eye-popping costs: Americans are shelling out indirect costs of about ½ billion tax dollars for litter pick-up nationwide, and an equal amount in hidden costs to the butcher, the baker and the candlestick maker who must pass along their costs of litter pick-up to the consumer.
Locally, how do people feel about the non-returnable containers? We asked Syracuse Mayor Lee Alexander to comment. He noted that "Litter is among the most obvious problems on the streets..." and "In Syracuse we spend thousands of dollars each year to clean away trash..." He further stated that "By regulating wasteful use of our nation's resources, we can conserve the use of energy producing materials..." and stated that "...we need the cooperation of everyone, from the manufacturer to the consumer to reach this goal."

Onondaga County Executive John Mulroy was asked, "How serious a problem is litter in Onondaga County?" Let me read his response: "Onondaga County, like any other metropolitan county today, has a serious problem with park and highway litter, much of which is made up of beverage containers. The County is presently examining several avenues in the field of solid waste to either eliminate or turn this litter to a more valuable product."
Finally, we turned to Oregon—the only place where deposit legislation has been in effect long enough to evaluate its success. Here's the reply received from Governor Tom McCall: "Based upon early evidence, I would say the bill is a rip-roaring success.

The significant thing is that littering has been substantially decreased since the bill took effect.

The law continues to work with remarkable smoothness, has wide public support, and has brought a dramatic decrease in litter.

The energy crisis also should make us take a look at the Oregon concept, where if applied nationally energy savings equal to the electricity needs of nine million affluent Americans annually would be realized."

The Environmental Protection Agency and the Midwest Research Institute developed a means to determine the environmental cost of manufactured products. As we have done this (afternoon, evening) they calculate...
...energy...
...raw materials...
...pollution and solid waste.

Returnable glass beverage containers earned the best environmental rating. Throwaway glass bottles and aluminum cans earned the worst rating. Throwing away a throwaway is part of a life style that must change. We have been living with cheap energy, plentiful raw materials and boundless landscapes. Now we must adapt to life styles that reflect limited and costly energy, raw material and land resources. Let's intelligently cut out our most frivolous uses first. The throwaway beverage container should head the list!
If you agree, then I hope you will express yourselves in support of both county and state legislation which would require a five-cent deposit on beer and soft drink containers. Please express your opinion on the sheet I will circulate. You may be interested: If you vote "for" you will reflect the opinion of 76 per cent of New Yorkers according to a poll by the League of Women Voters.

Also, I appeal to (organization) to pass a resolution which can be forwarded to your elected representatives.

Personal letters are very important according to all legislators. Please, take the time to express your thoughts to your legislative representatives. Also, write your favorite brewers and bottlers--tell them you want their product in refillable deposit containers. Send a letter to the editor.
If these past few slides looked pretty much the same, it's intentional. The issue—whether we continue the problem—or solve it, is in your hands.

What sort of future will we place in our children's hands? We have squandered our environmental heritage and restitution can only start when we begin to change our life styles.

When it comes to the debate over throw-away containers versus refillable containers there is one point that even the beverage industry cannot challenge: The easiest problem to solve is one you never create in the first place.