**Memorandum In Opposition**
**Bottle Bill**
**HB 1679 (Murray)**

On behalf of the Northern New England chapter of the National Waste and Recycling Association (NWRA), we submit this memo in strong opposition to proposed legislation that would introduce a Bottle Bill in New Hampshire. This legislation would introduce container deposits of ten cents.

Modern recycling infrastructure has rendered deposit systems largely outdated. Expanding the bottle bill would divert materials like PET plastic and aluminum—currently recycled through curbside programs with positive commodity value—into a separate stream. This diversion undermines the financial viability of local recycling operations by removing valuable materials that help offset processing costs.

With fewer high-value recyclables in the curbside stream, the cost to municipalities—and ultimately taxpayers—will rise. Granite State residents already fund local recycling programs; forcing them to pay deposits on nearly all beverage containers amounts to double payment, or effectively, a hidden tax.

There is no requirement in the legislation that revenue from unclaimed deposits be reinvested in environmental programs. Lawmakers would have broad discretion to direct those funds elsewhere. Without transparency and earmarking, there's no assurance this expansion would benefit recycling or sustainability efforts.

Deposit systems cost up to three times more to operate than traditional curbside recycling. This opens the door to escalating costs for consumers over time. Rather than duplicating efforts, the state should focus on addressing truly hard-to-recycle materials such as film plastics, flexible packaging, textiles, mattresses, batteries, and solar panels—items that are not currently handled by either the Bottle Bill or MRFs.

**Increased Costs to Consumers with Limited Environmental Benefit**

Under the proposed proposal, New Hampshire residents would be required to pay an upfront $0.10 deposit on beverage containers while continuing to fund curbside recycling services through local taxes or fees. In addition to the deposit, consumers would face indirect price increases on groceries as producers pass on the handling and compliance costs associated with the expanded program.

Despite the intention to promote recycling, a redeemed container is not guaranteed to be recycled. Many still end up in landfills due to contamination or logistical issues. Redirecting funds from unclaimed deposits toward infrastructure improvements, education campaigns, enforcement, litter cleanup, and municipal recycling assistance

would deliver more meaningful and measurable environmental outcomes.

The containers targeted by the Bottle Bill—primarily aluminum and PET plastic—are among the most valuable commodities in the curbside recycling stream. Their removal will undermine the financial model that supports local recycling programs. Without this revenue, municipalities will struggle to cover the costs of collection and processing, resulting in increased financial burdens for taxpayers.

An NWRA study analyzing the impact of bottle bills on MRFs found that while redemption programs may boost container recovery rates, they also significantly reduce MRF revenues and increase operational costs. Depending on the deposit model implemented, municipalities could face an estimated increase of $2.50 to $5.00 per household per year in recycling costs.

The proposed Bottle Bill law would create a duplicative, inefficient recycling system while imposing new costs on consumers, municipalities, and recycling operations. Rather than revisiting outdated models, New Hampshire should invest in modernizing and supporting comprehensive recycling infrastructure that addresses today's challenges.

We urge lawmakers to reject this proposal and instead focus on integrated, forward-thinking solutions that improve sustainability and resource recovery for all New Hampshire residents.

Based on the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that this legislation does not receive favorable consideration.