

Governments across the USA are considering regulations on the use of plastic bags. In 2018, the [NYS Task Force on Plastic Bags](#) gave a range of recommendations on different legislative actions. New York has passed a statewide ban on plastic bags effective by March 2020, making it the second state after California to regulate plastic bags at the state level.

## Plastic Bags are Not Free

Every year, the USA consumes [380 billion](#) plastic bags. Merely [12.8%](#) of plastic bags, wraps and sacks get recycled. As of 2004, San Francisco spent [\\$8.49 million/year, roughly 17 cents/bag](#) on landfill, collection-disposal, and litter cleanup. Bag disposal costs NYC \$12.5 million/year. Single-use plastic bags are one of the most problematic materials in a city's waste stream. Further, they are a threat to public health and the environment. This study assesses the legislative responses to curb plastic bag use. We conducted secondary research of regulations at the state and local levels, and interviews with public officials to understand the rationale behind legislative responses.

## Regulatory Response: Bans Do Not Work

### Fee Works Better than Ban

Bans are a popular choice to regulate plastic bags. As of 2018, out of 372 municipalities regulating plastic bags, 348 imposed bans. But bans do not necessarily lead to a reduction in use. Chicago's ban on single-use plastic bags did not result in reduced plastic bag use, as retailers moved to a thicker variant. The city replaced this ban with a 7-cent tax on bags that led to a 42% reduction in bag use.

### Hybrid Ban-Fee Model Works Best

Bans fail to work when retailers adopt alternatives like thicker plastic bags or paper bags. These alternatives have a large environmental impact. Los Angeles supplemented its plastic bag ban with a 10-cent fee on these alternatives. This combination, 'hybrid' model, led to a 94% reduction in consumption of plastic bags and a 25% reduction in paper bags. Thus, it discourages workarounds.

## Regulatory Options

There is no absolute solution. The tradeoffs for each response are discussed below:

	Benefits	Drawbacks
Ban	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Few customer complaints</li> <li>- Easy to implement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Less reduction in use</li> <li>- Increased use of reusable bags</li> <li>- Manufacturer / retailer pushback</li> </ul>
Fee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Revenue for waste management/ litter cleanup</li> <li>- Reduction in use</li> <li>- Sharing revenue incentivizes retailer</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Impacts poor communities</li> </ul>
Hybrid	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Creates market for recycling and reusables</li> <li>- Alternative bags are discouraged.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Manufacturer / retailer pushback</li> <li>- Job loss in plastic bag manufacturing units</li> </ul>

## Strategies to Overcome Drawbacks

1

### Provide free reusable bags to poor communities

This reduces the negative impact of fees. Eg. New Paltz Village, NY; Washington, D.C.

2

**Manufacturers prefer fees over bans** as bans affect their business. The Food Industry Alliance sued Hastings-on-Hudson, NY for its ban, but were willing to accept a 5-cent fee imposed by Long Beach, NY.

3

### Retailers need time to adapt to bag regulations.

They oppose bans due to the stock of plastic bags they have already bought. Buy-in time between passing a law and implementing it, gives retailers time to use their stock. Eg. Washington, D.C. had a buy-in time of 10 months.

4

### Incentives can prevent job losses.

Governments can provide financial incentives to local plastic bag manufacturers, conditional on retaining their workforce as they adapt their businesses to manufacture alternative bags.



