

Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) Cost Impacts are Minimal or Non-existent

- Economic research shows that impact on consumer costs is **minimal or non-existent**.
- The York University (Ontario) study on EPR consumer costs is based on incorrect assumptions and has been debunked by a Columbia University (New York) study on consumer-cost impacts.
- A further study by the State of Oregon of consumer goods costs comparing EPR and non-EPR provinces and states [showed no evidence of impact at all](#).¹
- Experience and data in Canada and Europe show that the impact of packaging fees on consumers prices are negligible because fees are only one very minor factor (never more than 2%) affecting the market price of packaged goods. There is never a case where brands pass 100% of an added cost to consumers.
- A worst-case scenario is illustrated by Columbia University that *if nationwide* packaging EPR was adopted and *if* the packaging costs were *doubled*: the **highest consuming households** could see 0% to 0.69% increase in their purchases per month equaling \$0-4.
- The Columbia University study does not examine how EPR would displace how recycling is paid for today, which in most communities, is paid for almost entirely by households through property taxes or service provider bills that would be **greatly reduced or eliminated**.
- A basic premise of EPR, as the Columbia study points out, is to reduce overall system costs by creating efficiency. A more efficient recycling system delivers **increases recycling rates, reduces greenhouse gas emissions** from original production, and increases jobs, with local economic and environmental benefits.

The Recycling Partnership blog post:

<https://recyclingpartnership.org/economicresearch/>

1. <https://www.oregon.gov/deq/recycling/Documents/rscRRSconsumer.pdf>