

College Campus Toolkit

Protect Your Right to Purchase Bottled Water

The Healthiest Packaged Beverage Choice



October 2016

Contents

How to Use This Toolkit	3
Important Facts About Bottled Water	4
Planning Meetings With Interest Groups	6
Where to Find the Facts	7
How to Start a Petition	8
Using Social Networks	9
Letter to Editor (LTE) Template	10
Sample LTEs	14
Bottled Water Facts (PDF)	22

HOW TO USE THIS TOOLKIT

A few colleges have restricted or banned access to bottled water on their campuses. This action, while on the surface might seem well-intended, will have negative health and environmental consequences, and are not in the public interest. New research shows when bottled water is not available in a vending machine, people choose other packaged beverages, which may contain sugar, caffeine, and other additives. They don't necessarily go looking for a drinking water fountain. The results of a new UVM bottled water sales ban study supports that conclusion.

The study: "[The Unintended Consequences of Changes in Beverage Options and the Removal of Bottled Water on a University Campus](#)," published this month in AJPH, concluded that the bottled water sales ban at the University of Vermont (UVM) resulted in a significant increase (33 percent) in the consumption of sugary drinks and an increase (6 percent) in the amount of plastic bottles entering the waste stream.

The International Bottled Water Association (IBWA) has developed this helpful toolkit to assist IBWA members, college students and staff, and private citizens in protecting their right to choose bottled water – a convenient, safe, and healthy packaged beverage.

This toolkit is designed to give you a suite of tools and messages that can help you take action in a number of ways, including: educating your peers and decision makers, starting a petition, writing letters, and using social networks. Taking action and getting the fact out front let people know that you do not support policies that take away your right to choose bottled water.

Take a look at the following pages and consider how you might use this information and these examples to let your voice be heard.

And, if I can be of any assistance, please feel free to contact me.



Chris Hogan
Vice-President Communications
International Bottled Water Association
chogan@bottledwater.org

IMPORTANT FACTS ABOUT BOTTLED WATER

People need to drink more water. The consumption of water, whether from the bottle or the tap, is a good thing and any actions that discourage people from drinking bottled water are not in the public interest. Banning or restricting access to bottled water on college campuses directly impacts the right of people to choose the healthiest beverage on the shelf. And for many, bottled water is a critical alternative to other packaged beverages, which are often less healthy. Bottled water must therefore be available wherever packaged beverages are sold.

Important Facts about Bottled Water

✓ **Bottled water is the smart choice for healthy hydration**

For those who want to eliminate or moderate calories, sugar, caffeine, artificial flavors or colors, and other ingredients from their diet, choosing bottled water is the right move. *In fact, since 1998, approximately 73% of the growth in bottled water consumption has come from people switching from carbonated soft drinks, juices, and milk.*

Choosing bottled water is a smart decision and a healthy choice when it comes to beverage options. People choose bottled water for several reasons, including its refreshing taste, reliable quality, zero calories and additives, and convenience. Removing bottled water from campuses will result in consumers choosing less healthy beverages.

✓ **Bottled water is a key resource for helping to reduce obesity**

One-third of American adults are overweight and another one-third is obese. Drinking zero-calorie beverages, such as water, instead of sugary drinks is regularly cited as a key component of a more healthful lifestyle. For example, even though it promotes greater consumption of tap water, the University of California, Berkley, decided *not* to ban bottled water because of concerns that it would cause students to drink less healthy, sweetened beverages. The University of Michigan opted to invest in expanding access to hydration stations in addition to keeping bottled water available on its campus. "We're not considering a ban," said Andy Berki, manager of campus sustainability. "We're just working hard on increasing the infrastructure so that people can make a choice."

✓ **Bottled water is the best hydration source when either tap water or consumer health is compromised**

The bottled water industry supports a strong public water system. However, the water from public water systems is often compromised after emergency situations or natural disasters (e.g., hurricanes, floods, tornados, fires, or boil alerts). During these times, bottled water is a necessary and reliable "second source" option to deliver clean, safe drinking water.

Certain students, faculty members, and staff on college campuses may require reliable access to bottled water due to medical issues, such as compromised immune systems, allergies, cancer, or other significant health conditions. In fact, the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention recommends that individuals with compromised immune systems drink bottled water.

✓ **Bottled water's environmental footprint is the lowest of all packaged beverages**

Banning bottled water from campuses will just shift consumption to other beverage products whose containers are made of the same material as bottled water. It will not, therefore, reduce the amount of plastic bottles in the waste stream.

In fact, many bottled water companies are already using up to 50% recycled material in their plastic bottles. Carbonated soft drinks are less able to significantly reduce the amount of plastic in their containers because the thinner plastic isn't able to contain the drink's carbonation.

Making PET plastic bottles from recycled plastic (rPET) uses 84 percent less energy than those made from virgin material. It also saves more than \$8 million in landfill dumping fees every year. While bottled water is just one of thousands of consumer items packaged in plastic, many bottled water companies already use bottles made from 50, 75, and in some cases, 100 percent rPET.

According to the Beverage Marketing Corporation (BMC), between 2000 and 2014, the average weight of a 16.9-ounce (half-liter) PET plastic bottled water container declined 51 percent. This resulted in a savings of 6.2 billion pounds of PET resin since 2000.

All bottled water containers are 100% recyclable, and PET plastic bottled water containers are the single most recycled item in nationwide curbside collection programs.

70 percent of what people drink these days comes in some sort of packaging. See the appendix of this toolkit for an infographic on drink packaging and landfills. This graphic shows that bottled water containers, measured in tons of landfill space, make up just 3.3 percent of all beverage containers that end up in landfills. The waste percentage numbers are much higher for the glass (66.7 percent), aluminum (7.9 percent), and soda bottles (13.3 percent) that end up in landfills.

Recycling is important to many communities' bottom line. More than 70 percent of what Americans throw in the trash is actually recyclable. And cities and towns end up paying \$6.7 billion each year in landfill dumping fees; but we don't need to. If we just recycled more often, our towns and cities could save an astonishing \$4.6 billion each year.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) figures demonstrate that plastic water bottles make up less than 0.03% of the U.S. waste stream. Recycling rates for single serve bottled water containers are on the rise, doubling in the last five years. And, while the bottled water industry supports strong campus and community recycling initiatives, a continued focus on increased recycling is critical.

✓ **Bottled water is comprehensively regulated and consistently reliable**

Bottled water is comprehensively regulated by the United States Food and Drug Administration (FDA) as a packaged food product and it provides a consistently safe and reliable source of drinking water. By federal law, the FDA regulations governing the safety and quality of bottled water must be at least as stringent as the EPA regulations that govern tap water. In some cases, the bottled water regulations are more stringent. And, in some very important cases like lead, coliform bacteria, and E. coli, bottled water regulations are substantially more stringent.

All bottled water products - whether from groundwater or public water sources - are produced utilizing a multi-barrier approach. From source to finished product, a multi-barrier approach helps prevent possible harmful contamination to the finished product as well as storage, production, and transportation equipment. Measures in a multi-barrier approach may include one or more of the following: source protection, source monitoring, reverse osmosis, distillation, micro-filtration, carbon filtration, ozonation, and ultraviolet (UV) light.

As a result of comprehensive government regulation and the effective multi-barrier production system, bottled water provides a safe, consistent source of clean drinking water. There is, however, an inherent variability in public water system quality due to its method of delivery (i.e., through a piped distribution

system and not in a sealed container).

✓ **Bottled water has an important economic role in campus life**

Most colleges and universities derive significant revenues from the sale of bottled water and other beverages. Banning or restricting bottled water sales could jeopardize the funding of important academic programs and faculty positions.

Those forced to leave campus to buy bottled water will likely bundle that purchase with other products normally bought on campus. This will result in even more revenue loss for those colleges and universities, further jeopardizing academic programs and faculty positions.

PLANNING MEETINGS WITH INTEREST GROUPS

Meeting with school administrators, student groups, alumni organizations, vendors, and the local community can help to spread the message about bottled water's role in living a healthier lifestyle. Educating others and asking for their active support can help to broaden your base, increase your voice, and strengthen your impact.

- Take time to plan ahead
- Identify school administrators who can help
- Ask sympathetic staff members to help circulate petitions, flyers, and newsletters
- Write letters to and make an appointment with key school administrators; present them with petition signatures
- Organize a letter-writing campaign or campus rally, in addition to a petition
- Get the community involved
- Do your research and base your arguments and claims on facts, not opinions. Bring copies of supporting articles and studies to your meetings and events.
- Remain open to discussion and debate on your issues. Open communication with administrators, students, community, and vendors is vital to a balanced and educational discussion.

WHERE TO FIND THE FACTS

Start a conversation by starting with the facts.

Work to educate others about the importance of recycling, making healthy beverage choices, the facts about bottled water, and the facts about bottled water regulations and safety. For more information about IBWA and bottled water, please visit:

- **IBWA's Main Website:** www.BottledWater.org
- **Bottled Water Matters' Website:** www.BottledWaterMatters.org

You can learn even more about these important issues at the following websites. Share them with your friends, colleagues, and classmates.

- **The Recycling Partnership:** <http://recyclingpartnership.org/>
- **FDA's Bottled Water Page:** <http://bit.ly/FDABottledWater>
- **Learn about FDA Regulation of Bottled Water:** <http://bit.ly/FederalRegulations>
- **Learn about Regulation of Bottled Water Labels:** <http://bit.ly/BottledWaterLabeling>
- **Learn about FEMA Bottled Water Guidelines:** <http://bit.ly/FEMAWaterGuidelines>

HOW TO START A PETITION

Starting a petition is a great way to help people become more aware about the important role bottled water makes in maintaining a healthy lifestyle and making smart packaged beverage decisions.

Luckily, creating a petition is not as difficult as you may think. Here is a quick checklist for getting started.

- What do you want to accomplish?

Decide on a realistic, achievable goal. Being clear about what you want to accomplish, and explaining is succinctly will make it easier for people to support your effort. Having too many goals can make it hard to communicate your point and may confuse people, so make the petition straightforward and specific.

- Identifying people who can help you

Figuring out which people or organizations can help you achieve your goal is an important first step. A good rule of thumb is to target decision makers who have the most influence over the issue you want to address, including:

- ✓ Campus Administrators
- ✓ Campus Procurement Officials
- ✓ Faculty Members
- ✓ Community Officials
- ✓ Local Media
- ✓ Local Businesses
- ✓ Members of the Student Body Council

- How best to get people involved?

Making a clear case about how your cause directly influences their lives will help people understand, support, and endorse your effort.

- What makes a compelling petition?

- ✓ A good petition is focused, short, authoritative, and respectful
- ✓ It clearly explains why people should get involved and why they are signing
- ✓ It provides accurate supporting facts and clearly states the petition's purpose
- ✓ Carefully edit, run spellcheck, and ensure that your grammar is correct. A sloppy petition will make you look sloppy and unreliable.

- Consider an online petition

Creating an online petition is a great way to reach a broad audience and increase your potential reach. An online petition will help you get signatures quickly and easily. It can be a crowded market out there for eyeballs, so make sure your issues' synopsis is attention grabbing and clearly stated.

USING SOCIAL NETWORKS

Take advantage of social networks to promote your effort. Create an online home for your campaign. If you can develop your own website, go for it! If you need an easier place to start, nothing is better than Facebook when it comes to getting out your message. If you have the skills – or the friends – why not develop your own mobile app?

Even plain old Email can be a great way to widely disseminate information, documents, and links to your audience. And remember, when it comes to communication, many professionals and administrators still rely on traditional Email more than social media tools and text messaging.

Post your petition, get the facts out about bottled water, create an event, upload a video; just get started and things will grow from there. Social media tools are incredibly powerful, easy to access and can help you customize your messages and reach your target audiences.

So get started today!

Facebook: <https://www.facebook.com/>

You Tube: <https://www.youtube.com/>

Twitter: <https://twitter.com/#!/>

Linked In: <http://www.linkedin.com/>

Tumblr: <https://www.tumblr.com/>

LETTER TO EDITOR (LTE), PURPOSE, SAMPLE & TEMPLATES

Letters to editors appear on the editorial or opinion pages of most newspapers and are among the most read pages in newspapers today. These pages are powerful tools that let individuals talk about issues important to them and to foster discussions on matter affecting society at large. As bottled water continues to be in the news and the remains a subject of controversy and misinformation, it is important that we take opportunities, such as writing a letters to the editor, to inform the public about bottled water facts.

Letters should be written in the first person, be brief and succinct. Most newspapers will only publish 200 words or less. Always assume that if it's more than 200 words, you letter will likely be edited down in size, so at the most plan to submit fewer than 500 words.

SAMPLE LTE RE: BOTTLED WATER BANS

[Sender's Company letterhead]

[Sender's name]

[Title, position, or company]

[Sender's email or telephone]

[Editor's name ~or~ "Editor"]

[Publication]

[Address and/or email]

Dear *[Editor's name]*,

Re: [Topic, i.e.: Banning bottled water]

Bottled water is a valuable choice from a health and safety perspective. The idea of banning it, however well-intentioned, would remove an important, and sometimes critical beverage choice for consumers.

From a health standpoint, bottled water is essential to helping reverse the obesity epidemic. People need convenience in their busy lives, so a majority (70 percent) of what they drink comes out of a package. Bottled water is already making a difference as people switch from sweetened, caloric drinks. Replacing just one 12-ounce sugared beverage with a bottle of water each day for a year can trim more than 50,000 calories from a person's annual diet. That's a real contribution to a healthier lifestyle.

From a safety standpoint, bottled water protects people and can even save lives. When tap water is disrupted by anything from a power outage to a pipe breach to a disaster, bottled water provides a reliable source of safe drinking water. In addition, the sealed container provides a promise of quality. In fact, federal health officials recommend bottled water for people with weakened immune systems.

From an environmental standpoint, when people choose a bottle of water compared to any other canned or bottled beverage, they are choosing less packaging, less energy, and less use of natural resources. What's more, recycling the bottle can cut that impact by an additional fifty percent, if it is re-used to replace virgin PET. Additionally, nearly all of the bottled water sold in the U.S. is sourced domestically. Imported bottled water accounts for only 1.5 percent of the U.S. market.

The bottom line: People should be drinking more water, whether it comes from a bottle, the tap, or a filtration system – but that the choice should be theirs. Bottled water must therefore be available wherever packaged beverages are sold. When people want a packaged beverage or have special needs, having easy access to bottled water has real value for both health and safety.

Sincerely,
[Sender's Name]
[Sender's title or position]
[Sender's company]

The sample LTE template below focuses on correcting misinformation provides you with a variety of subject matter options that address many issues. Simply follow the general format and use the language most appropriate to your letter. We have highlighted key areas for personalization.

SAMPLE LTE RE: CORRECTING MISINFORMATION

[Sender's Company letterhead]
[Sender's name]
[Title, position, or company]
[Sender's email or telephone]

[Editor's name ~or~ "Editor"]
[Publication]
[Address and/or email]

Dear [Editor's name],

Re: [Topic, i.e.: Correcting information about bottled water]

I read with interest [reporter/columnist author's name] piece, "[story name]", published on [site and story link] on [date], and wanted to provide you with facts about bottled water that will help inform your readers about this safe, convenient product.

Bottled water [then choose from list of issues below and insert here.]

Tap Water vs. Bottled Water

- Bottled water is a packaged food product. Tap water is a utility commodity distributed through underground pipes. Less than 4/10ths of 1 % of utility water is used for drinking. The bottled water industry supports a strong municipal water system.

Regulations

- Bottled water is comprehensively regulated by the United States Food and Drug Administration (FDA) as a packaged food product and it provides a consistently safe and reliable source of drinking water. By federal law, the FDA regulations governing the safety and quality of bottled water are as stringent as the EPA regulations that govern tap water. In some cases, the bottled water regulations are more stringent. And, in some very important cases like with lead, bottled water regulations are substantially more stringent.

Water Quality

- All bottled water products - whether from groundwater or public water sources - are produced utilizing a multi-barrier approach. From source to finished product, a multi-barrier approach helps prevent possible harmful contamination to the finished product as well as storage, production, and transportation equipment. Many of the steps in a multi-barrier system are effective in safeguarding bottled water from microbiological and other contamination. Measures in a multi-barrier approach may include one or more of the following: source protection, source monitoring, reverse osmosis, distillation, micro-filtration, carbon filtration, ozonation, and ultraviolet (UV) light.

[Or]

- Consumers who choose to drink bottled water can rely on its consistent record of safety and quality. In testimony before the U.S. Congress in 2009, the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) stated that the agency is aware of no major outbreaks of illness or serious safety concerns associated with bottled water in the past decade. At that same hearing, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) made public its report on bottled water, which found that based on a survey of water quality and health protection officials in all 50 states and the District of Columbia there was no evidence that bottled water caused any illnesses during the previous five years. (See United States Government Accountability Office Report on Bottled Water, GAO-09-610, June 2009.) In contrast, EPA scientists and researchers have estimated that tap water consumption is the cause of over 16 million cases of acute gastrointestinal illness (vomiting and diarrhea) in the United States each year (Messner M., et al., Journal of Water and Health, 2006; 4(Suppl 2):201-40).

Healthy Lifestyle

- According to the Institute of Medicine and the American Journal of Preventative Medicine, two-thirds of American adults are overweight with one-third of those individuals being obese. In addition, over the last 30 years, children's obesity rates have climbed from 5 percent to 17 percent. Drinking zero-calorie beverages, such as water, instead of sugary drinks is regularly cited as a key component of a more healthful lifestyle. Research shows that if bottled water isn't available, 63 percent of people will choose soda or another sweetened beverage. Promoting greater consumption of water from all sources, including bottled water, will support the efforts of communities striving for a healthier lifestyle.

Bottles/ BPA

- PET plastic, the material from which single serve bottled water containers, commonly small, portable 16.9 (half-liter) and 24-ounce sizes, is made, is considered safe and reliable for food contact use. PET is used in a variety of packaging for many foods, including everything from peanut butter, soft drinks, and juices to beer, wine, and spirits. PET is approved as safe for food and beverage contact by the FDA and similar regulatory agencies throughout the world, and has been for over 30 years. PET plastic does not contain bisphenol A (BPA).

[OR]

- It is important to point out that while PET plastic does not contain bisphenol A (BPA), regulatory agencies in several countries and the FDA have ruled favorably on the safety of BPA. The consensus among these international regulatory agencies is that the current levels of exposure

to BPA through food packaging do not pose an immediate health risk to the general population."

Environmental Footprint

- The PET plastic used in single-serve bottled water containers is made using naphtha, a petroleum byproduct, not barrels of virgin oil. All PET containers are 100 percent recyclable and use of recycled PET (rPET) in bottled water containers is on the rise. Data derived from EPA figures demonstrates that plastic water bottles make up less than one-third of one percent of the U.S. waste stream. Compared to all other packaged drinks, bottled water has the lightest environmental footprint, lowest water usage ratio, highest curbside recycling rates of all beverages, and has significantly reduced the amount of plastic used in its packaging.

Economic Impact of Bottled Water

Bottled water companies directly employ 160,000 Americans and generate an additional 295,000 jobs in supplier and ancillary industries. In fact, the bottled water industry is responsible for as much as \$115.73 billion in economic activity. Bottled water is a community industry, with local brands coming from nearly every state in the union. These brands employ local people in jobs that can't be outsourced and who have a vested interest in protecting their resources. Each year, the bottled water industry pays over \$10 billion in property, income and sales taxes.

Campus Examples of Healthy Decisions

- The University of California, Berkley, decided not to ban bottled water because of concerns that it would cause students to drink less healthy, sweetened beverages.
- The University of Michigan opted to invest in expanding access to hydration stations in addition to keeping bottled water available on its campus. In fact, the administration did not even entertain the idea of banning bottled water, "We're not considering a ban," said Andy Berki, manager of campus sustainability. "We're just working hard on increasing the infrastructure so that people can make a choice," he added.

The current assault on the bottled water industry by anti-bottled water activists toys with peoples' emotions making them believed that by getting rid of bottled water they will be doing something good for the environment. However, when you take a close look at the environmental impact, you see that bottled water:

- Has as the lightest environmental footprint of all packaged drinks.
- Has the lowest water footprint of all packaged drinks.
- Has the highest curbside recycling rates of all beverages.
- Has significantly reduced plastic used in its packaging.

Bottled water is also the healthiest drink on the shelf. Any effort to discourage people from drinking water is not in the public's interest.

Sincerely,

[Sender's Name]

[Sender's title or position]

[Sender's company]

SAMPLE LTEs AND NEWS ARTICLES

The articles and letters below present arguments and positions in support of bottled water. They provide some good examples of potential talking points and messaging, including the importance of consumer choice and the availability of healthy beverage options.

College Campus Ban-Related

The Loyola Phoenix: “A final argument against the water bottle ban”

<http://www.loyolaphoenix.com/a-final-argument-against-the-water-bottle-ban>

Last week’s Phoenix issue contained a well-written article regarding the bottled water referendum that is being voted on this Wednesday, March 28. As a vocal opponent of the ban and was one of the Senators who voted against it, I have the following comments.

- 1) The Student Environmental Association (SEA) claims that bottled water is a human right and social justice issue. But how is social justice defined? In all my time on campus I have yet to hear a definition provided. Personally, I do not define true justice as equality, although the ban tries to equate the two. Justice is not taking from the people who ‘have’ in order to help the people who ‘have not.’ Justice is giving each person their due; that’s why criminals get punishments that fit the crimes; nothing more, nothing less. Is taking bottled water away from us true justice? I’m inclined to say no. Taking bottled water away from us is forcing equality upon us. The ban takes from those who ‘have’ – the students and their bottled water – in order to help (or try to help) a group of ‘have-nots’ – people who have been victims of water privatization. The bottled water ban is not true justice, – it is forced equality.
- 2) The freedom to choose is a human right. To prove this point I made a little three-step proof: 1) To be free is a human right. 2) To choose is to be free. 3) Therefore, to choose is a human right. Opponents of this line of thinking say that students can still choose to buy bottled water; they just can’t buy it on campus. That’s true, but it ignores the bigger point: human rights are universal. They have no boundaries. A human right in one place is a human right in all places. Human rights are not restricted to a certain time and certain place. Thus, our right to choose applies to campus as well. Loyola’s campus is part of the very same earth that victims of water privatization live on. Those victims have a right to water, I’m not denying that. But we, too, have a right and that right is the right to choose what water we want. We do not lose that right when we step on Loyola’s campus. The ban on bottled water ignores those facts.
- 3) My last point is not an argument against the ban. It’s a point I want to make to the readership of The Phoenix: there is another side to this issue. SEA is a large and popular organization; there is no denying that. But they do not speak for everyone on campus. I am against this ban, as are the nine other Senators who voted with me against the Uncap Loyola Resolution back in December. Supporters of the ban have been very vocal about their cause, and that’s not a bad thing in the least. But the pro-ban voices have drowned out the anti-ban voices on campus, leading to a lack of dialogue between the different viewpoints and giving the impression that everyone wants to see bottled water gone. I encourage you to investigate both sides and draw your own conclusion.

After careful consideration of both sides of the issue, my vote on the bottled water ban will be a firm no. I encourage the readership of the Loyola Phoenix to weigh both sides and come to their own conclusions and vote today on whether or not they want to ban bottled water from our campus.

by Dominic Lynch

BostInno.com: "Why College Campuses Shouldn't be Banning Bottled Water"

<http://bostinno.com/2012/03/14/why-college-campuses-shouldnt-be-banning-bottled-water/>

Two years ago, Brown banned all water bottle sales, after having previously sold 320,000 bottles a year, according to [Bloomberg](#). Harvard, Dartmouth and Princeton have now started installing "hydration stations" (left) into their newer buildings, welcoming in students with reusable Nalgene instead of bottled up Poland Spring.

Beyond those Ivy League schools, there are still more than 85 campuses banning the sale or trying to restrict the use of plastic water bottles. What gives?

In 2007, Americans consumed over 50 billion single-serve bottles of water. About 30-40 million of those bottles, however, ended up in landfills, according to [Ban the Bottle](#), a blog devoted to "banning plastic water bottles and staying hydrated." The blog also claims it takes 17 million barrels of oil per year to make the United States' plastic water bottles — enough oil to fuel 1.3 million cars for a year.

All that said: I get it. I understand why there are more than a dozen schools banning bottles of water. But, does it even make sense?

No. Schools are essentially banning the healthiest drink they sell on their shelves. That's less than ideal, considering 68.3 percent of adults ages 20 years and over are either obese or overweight, according to the [Centers for Disease Control and Prevention](#). Tie those statistics into this chart from [WebMD](#), and tell me what you think.

Beverage	Serving Size	Calories
Soda	12 ounces	124-189
Diet soda	12 ounces	0-7
Bottled sweet tea	12 ounces	129-143
Brewed tea, unsweet	12 ounces	4
Orange juice, unsweetened	12 ounces	157-168
Apple juice, unsweetened	12 ounces	169-175
Tomato/Vegetable juice	12 ounces	80
Cranberry juice cocktail	12 ounces	205
Whole Milk	12 ounces	220
2% low-fat milk	12 ounces	183
1% low-fat milk	12 ounces	154
Nonfat milk	12 ounces	125
Soy milk	12 ounces	147-191
Coffee, black	12 ounces	0-4
Coffee with cream (2 tablespoons half and half)	12 ounces	39-43
Coffee with whipped cream (2 tablespoons from can)	12 ounces	15-19
Coffee with heavy whipping cream (2 tablespoons)	12 ounces	104-108
Caffe Latte, whole milk (Starbucks)	12 ounces	200
Caffe Latte, nonfat (Starbucks)	12 ounces	120
Sports drink (like Gatorade)	12 ounces	94
Energy drink (like Red Bull)	12 ounces	160
Beer	12 ounces	153
Red wine	5 ounces	125
White wine	5 ounces	122
Hard liquor (vodka, rum, whiskey, gin; 80 proof)	1.5 ounces	96

When an insatiable thirst hits, what do you think students will do if they're not around a hydration station? I bet a vending machine won't be too far. Oh wait — if there's a ban, students have no other option but to reach for juice, soda or an energy drink. Now you've seen the calories. A health services official from the University of California, Berkley told Bloomberg the school opted against banning bottled water because of their concern it would, indeed, drive students to more sugary beverages.

Nestlé Waters North America (NwNA) also completed a life cycle assessment, which one Harvard student actually helped commission. What the company found is that water has the lightest environmental footprint of all packaged beverages. So, while we can spout off daunting numbers — remember the 17 million barrels of oil? — are we aware of what we're promoting instead?

Now, trying to restrict sales is one thing. I'm all for green education. But is an all-out ban logical? Columbia University told Bloomberg they haven't banned bottled water either, because they knew students would then just buy it elsewhere.

My suggestion is this: Promote your hydration stations. Make sure your Nalgene bottles are closer to the \$5 mark. Find a way to bring the local company Greenbean Recycle to your campus, because they know how to at least make recycling fun. **But**, don't flat-out ban plastic water bottles. In the grand scheme of things, it doesn't make a whole lot of sense.

The Vermont Cynic: "Letter to the editor: UVM, water you thinking?"

Dear editor,

I was dismayed to learn the other day that VSTEP had finally won the battle to ban bottled water on campus, a classic display of great intentions turned into worst possible outcome. Don't get me wrong. I

do sympathize with the cause — saving the world. It's great. I love it. The best. I'm on board. But a ban on bottled water? Eh. I'm not so in to it. Here's why:

First of all, the ban stinks of paternalism. Restrictions made on my freedom for "my own future" make me uneasy, especially when the benefits of those restrictions aren't clearly demonstrated.

Second, the ban will achieve no net reduction in waste. If the idea is to reduce the amount of plastic bottle waste produced on campus, then get rid of all the plastic bottled beverages, not just water. The empty shelf space is going to be filled with other drinks. And guess what? Those drinks come in plastic bottles, too.

Where's the study that links the absence of bottled water on a college campus with fewer bottled beverages consumed overall? I bet VSTEP a Dasani to a Nalgene that it doesn't exist. And if people are going to substitute, what is actually being accomplished?

Third, a ban on bottled water is effectively a promotion of other less healthy bottled drinks. UVM is basically saying that they don't believe in selling drinks that are good for their students on campus, only those that are demonstrably terrible. And a few others, maybe, that aren't as terrible. My last point is a question. What is the first ingredient in almost every other bottled drink besides water? That's right, it's also water!

UVM is banning bottled water, at an enormous expense to its student body, and replacing the bottled water with more bottled water. Except the new bottled water is enhanced with sugar and food coloring. Simply mind blowing.

The way to reduce bottled water consumption is through long-term, grassroots education. And even then, success isn't certain.

A plan hinged on prohibition is a bad idea and won't work to accomplish its intended goals. It just doesn't hold water.

Joe Collier, Class of 2008

City or Town, Consumer Access-Related

Bottled water sales ban in America's national parks makes no sense

<http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/healthcare/247946-bottled-water-sales-ban-in-americas-national-parks-makes-no>

By Rachel K. Johnson, PhD, MPH, RD

Can you imagine that thousands of visitors to America's national parks this summer may not be able to buy bottled water on their hikes, camping trips, and adventure excursions? In 2011, the National Park Service (NPS) adopted a policy that allows individual national parks to ban the sale of bottled water in plastic containers. The policy was established due to concerns about plastic waste left behind by visitors. In the meantime, soft drinks, sports drinks, juice drinks, and other sugary packaged beverages, which are unhealthy options and generally use more plastic, remain on the shelves in NPS concession shops, in vending machines, and in restaurants.

However, on July 7, 2015, the House of Representatives voted to prohibit the NPS from using any funds to implement or maintain bans on the sale of bottled water at any national park.

My university banned bottled water sales for the same well-intentioned reasons as the NPS. Unfortunately, the ban did not turn out as expected. In January 2013, the University of Vermont (UVM), adopted a bottled water sales ban. As a professor of Nutrition at UVM, I took an interest in and decided to research what I saw as contradictory policies which required university dining facilities and vending machines to stock a 30 percent “healthy beverage” ratio, but then banned the sale of one of the healthiest packaged beverages: bottled water.

The results of the research that I, along with my co-author, conducted made clear that UVM’s decision to remove bottled water drove our students, faculty, staff, and visitors to purchase more unhealthy sugary drinks. At the same time, the number of plastic beverage containers shipped to campus did not decrease. This happened even though the university provided free reusable water bottles at campus events, retrofitted 68 water fountains to allow for the refilling of reusable water bottles, and conducted an educational campaign to inform students about the effort.

“The Unintended Consequences of Changes in Beverage Options and the Removal of Bottled Water on a University Campus,” published July 2015 in the American Journal of Public Health, concluded that the UVM bottled water sales ban resulted in a 33 percent increase in the number of unhealthy sugary drinks shipped and a 6 percent increase in the number of bottles shipped to campus and thus entering the waste stream.

We collected three semesters’ worth of detailed information about packaged beverage shipments to UVM’s campus before and after the implementation of the 30 percent healthy beverage requirement and the bottled water sales ban. The data showed that shipments of unhealthy, sugary drinks increased significantly when the option of bottled water was removed, while shipments of healthy beverages declined significantly. At the same time, the overall number of plastic bottles shipped to campus was not reduced.

Consumer marketing research supports our study’s finding. When asked what alternative beverage, if any, consumers would choose if their preferred choice of plain bottled water was not available, 63 percent of people said they would choose an unhealthy soda or other sugary drink, 7 percent would choose a bottled sparkling water or seltzer, 13 percent would not replace the bottled water at all, and only 16 percent said they would opt for tap water.

As with the NPS bottled water sales ban, the UVM policy was well-intentioned and meant to encourage our campus community to carry reusable water bottles that could be filled with tap water. At least during the semester when the ban was implemented, that did not happen. The bottled water sales ban in place in our national parks, which is currently being examined in Congress, has the potential to have the same unintended consequences. The recent action by the House to prohibit the NPS from using any funds to implement or maintain bans on the sale of bottled water at any national park is one step in the right direction. The Senate must still include and approve the provision in its Parks Service funding bill to end this misguided policy.

Our study shows that these sorts of policies, regardless of the motivation behind their adoption, may result in the consumption of more calories and more added sugars, a perpetuation of unhealthy dietary choices, and — ironically — an increase in plastic waste. Our study clearly suggests that the NPS bottled water sales ban has the potential to undermine efforts to encourage healthy food and beverage choices and may be environmentally counterproductive.

Johnson is Bickford Green and Gold Professor of Nutrition at the University of Vermont.

Los Angeles Times “A misfire in the war over plastic drinking bottles”

<http://articles.latimes.com/2012/sep/13/opinion/la-ed-plastic-bottles-ban-concord-20120913>

Woe to the thirsty of Concord, Mass. Under a bylaw born of convoluted reasoning, a person who heads into a store in that town for some hydration will be able to buy a plastic bottle of soda, but not a similar bottle of what dietitians say should be the drink of choice: water.

That's because Concord has become the first city in the United States to ban the sale of serving-size bottled water. It's enough to make New York Mayor Michael Bloomberg , whose proposed ban on the sale of large servings of soda was approved this week, weep.

Yet the two ideas have a lot in common. Both represent sincere attempts to fight social ills. Both also suffer from a lack of consistency (the soda law would allow big servings of other drinks with even more calories) and are an unwelcome interference in the marketplace. Both involve campaigns with national ambitions.

Bottled water owes its popularity to a variety of factors: a misconception that all bottled water is safer or purer than the stuff that flows from the tap; convenience; flavor; concerns about the chlorination or fluoridation of tap water; and marketing. Americans guzzle from 2.5 million plastic bottles an hour, according to Boston University , NASA and other sources; more than 70 percent of those are thrown away rather than recycled. We certainly could be doing better.

Some towns provide recycling bins next to or on top of sidewalk trash cans. Cities that do their own sorting of household trash glean more recyclables than those that depend on residents to do the job. Well-maintained public drinking fountains and vending machines that dispense single servings of cold, filtered water would encourage more reuse of bottles. Bigger deposits on bottles would help.

But Concord's new bylaw is unnecessarily intrusive and problematically inconsistent. A plastic bottle that holds soda is no less damaging to the environment than one that holds water. Why force a convenience-seeking customer who forgot his reusable bottle to choose a less-healthy option? This isn't a policy we'd like to see travel cross-country.

Boston Herald “Concord’s costly bylaw”

Concord residents are out of luck if they want to buy a bottle of water to go with their meatball sub. But now they may have the added insult of seeing their tax dollars wasted to defend a lawsuit over the ridiculous town bylaw that bans the sale of bottled water in plastic containers smaller than one liter.

The International Bottled Water Association, which represents bottlers, distributors and suppliers, is “exploring all available options to continue to oppose the [Concord] bylaw,” the Herald reported on Thursday. The ban is scheduled to take effect Jan. 1.

But that's just fine with Concord resident and anti-bottled-water zealot Jean Hill, who seems to think it would be a badge of honor for the town to be sued.

"They'll threaten to sue, and they may even sue but. . . it won't do them any good," said Hill, who apparently has insight into the civil claims process that the average citizen does not. "Actually it will give them a worse name than they already have."

Goodness — a worse name!

That and tens of thousands of dollars in revenue from property taxes — dollars that might otherwise be spent on schools, playgrounds or a new fire engine — might begin to pay the legal bills for this arrogant bit of green folly.

Of course the people of Concord are the ones who approved the bylaw in the first place (by a mere 39 votes, after three attempts), so if they are content to see their tax dollars go to line the pockets of lawyers, that is their very expensive problem.

Boston Globe, "Concord bottled water ban would cap freedom of choice"

http://www.boston.com/yourtown/news/concord/2012/04/opinion_concord_bottled_water.html?comments=all#readerComm

Concord has long been hailed the birthplace of liberty in America; a state holiday, Patriots' Day, celebrates the history of Paul Revere's ride and the minutemen's first stand against the British in 1775 each year in the historic town. And yet among this culture of embracing freedom, a misguided campaign threatens one of our most basic civil liberties: consumer choice.

This is the third consecutive year of debate on banning the sale of bottled water in the Town of Concord. The proposal was defeated by Town residents last year and a similar attempt was struck down by Attorney General Coakley two years ago. Proponents of the ban will tell you bottled water is wasteful and harmful to the environment, and banning its sale will reduce unnecessary waste. Unfortunately, this over-reaching measure is returning for a Town vote without proponents considering some important long-term implications. As a concerned parent and resident of Concord, I want to bring some of these concerns to light.

First and foremost, this ban is un-American and a very clear example of government control of commerce. It is not each and every individual town government's role to decide what products, deemed safe for consumption by the FDA, are available for purchase. If we allow special interest groups to dictate such aspects of our free-market economy, what product is next on the chopping block? Prohibition is heavy handed and goes too far. If you don't like the idea of bottled water, don't buy it.

Armed with boatloads of wishful thinking, proponents of the ban have offered absolutely no evidence that this would alleviate the waste they seek to address. Neither environmental nor economic impact studies have been done on this issue. What we do know is that Concord is environmentally conscious already, with a recycling rate in the top 13% in Massachusetts, according to a presentation by Concord Public Works in 2010. That rate continues to improve and reflects a strong culture of personal responsibility in the Town.

As well intentioned as it is, this fanciful idea that banning bottled water's sale will wipe out its existence in Concord also excludes the many people seeking bottled water who will drive to stores outside of

Concord, burning more fossil fuels and going against the “Keep it local!” message supported by so many environmentalists.

Banning the sale of a safe, legal product puts retailers within town limits at a competitive disadvantage. Customers like the taste, healthiness and convenience of bottled water and will go elsewhere to find it. They will inevitably buy other items outside of Concord, hurting local businesses. It is short-sighted to ignore economic considerations.

Proponents of the ban also ignore how much proposed “filling stations” for reusable bottles will cost the Town. The National Park Service just spent \$290,000 installing 10 filling stations in Grand Canyon National Park. Will a similar burden befall Concord tax payers, who would simultaneously lose sales taxes that once contributed to our tax base?

What’s more, this limitation of consumer choice takes the most healthy beverage option off store shelves in a time where we face obesity and diabetes epidemics nationwide. Having raised five children, I cringe at the idea of school children being forced to drink sugar-laden drinks such as soda and juice because of restricted choices.

Other beverage options also typically come in more plastic-intensive packaging. The bottled water industry is a known leader in “lightweighting,” or designing products that use less material to achieve the same purpose, and yet we are singling this product out for ostensibly environmental reasons. Plastic packaging is here to stay; Concord residents’ time, and our Town resources, would be better spent on education and promotion of recycling programs.

Last, but not least, don’t forget about disaster preparedness. You may recall the water main break in Boston less than two years ago that left nearly 2 million Massachusetts residents without potable drinking water. The bottled water industry responded with lightning speed to deliver free, donated water. What message of appreciation does this send? Will bottled water be so easy to acquire if it is banned in town?

Though the proposed ban cites a carve-out for emergency situations, I have little confidence in the Town’s ability to handle such a situation and can only imagine the enormous expense of such a wasteful exercise.

Enough is enough. This ban is not an appropriate avenue for attaining sustainability and infringes on our rights. When this issue comes to a vote in April, I hope each resident of Concord will come show their support for basic civil liberties and common sense, and vote against the ban on bottled water.

Concord Monitor, “A Drop Less Freedom”

Nothing seems to anger the modern environmentalist more than an empty plastic water bottle. You'd think our otherwise empty landfills were overflowing with Poland Spring and Dasani litter, and you might as well strangle a sea turtle with your bare hands as open an Aquafina. Last week, Phillips Exeter Academy joined the anti-bottled water movement, blocking its sale on campus. Exeter joins Harvard, the University of Vermont and growing list of other cloistered campuses in taking a symbolic stand against a product that more than half of all Americans buy.

According to the New Hampshire Union Leader, the University of New Hampshire's Ecosystem Task Force has installed 40 hydration stations across campus, while Dartmouth College officials are trying to reduce student demand for bottled water. UC Berkeley opted against a ban after concluding that students would simply buy iced tea and soda if they couldn't buy bottled water.

According to the ban-the-bottle campaign, buying a clean, cold bottle of water whenever you want is a wasteful extravagance. But so is most of modern life. We don't need most of our modern conveniences any more than we need a beverage we could have brought from home.

Bottled water opponents miss the point. Sure, we can get the water for almost nothing, but we're not really buying the water. We're buying the bottle. We're paying someone else to store and refrigerate our water, which we can pick up when we're thirsty. We're purchasing a portable and disposable container instead of worrying about packing, cleaning and refilling it.

Are plastic water bottles really that bad for the planet? Aren't they dwarfed by thousands of other beverages containers and food packages? Are Vitamin Water, Sprite, and Mountain Dew drinkers just as irresponsible in their choices? How many gallons of water and tons of coal do we use washing Nalgene bottles?

According to the ban-the-bottle campaign, non-recycled water bottles account for 3 billion pounds of solid waste each year, which sounds like a lot. The EPA calculates that the U.S. generates 254 million tons of solid waste each year, 12 percent of which is plastic. If every plastic water bottle in the country ceased to exist, we'd cut the amount of plastic waste by less than ½ of 1 percent. Casting water bottles as an unmitigated ecological menace is just silly.

I'll readily admit that we should recycle more of our plastic bottles. There's no better way to reduce waste than to turn it into an input for another product, and that's certainly preferable to blocking their sale. Every choice we make has a cost. Half of all Americans think there's value in buying bottled water. I shouldn't be able to stop them from buying products that I find it overly extravagant.

Richmond Review (BC, Canada), "My Right to Drink Bottled Water"

There comes a point in time when the big picture should include everyone and not just a select few. Let's consider that water is critical to our health. Let's consider that for years now, we have been bombarded with the importance of replacing pop and other sugary drinks in refreshment machines with bottled water. Why? Because in order to improve the health of every man, woman and child in Richmond—they need to drink as much water as possible as often as possible.

Now, after that hard won message and change has permeated throughout Richmond schools, community centres, and municipal buildings—there is now a fight to remove access to bottled water?

I know a lot of people who simply will not drink tap water and I know many more who do walk around with an empty container everywhere they go. Think about the kids on hockey and soccer fields who rely on their coaches to have coolers filled with bottled water. Think about busy people who stop off to work out on the way home and depend on the ability to grab a bottle of water at the community centre before exercising. And think about the vast number of people who no longer having access to bottled water in municipal vending machines simply switch back to sugary drinks. Not only that, bottled water tastes significantly better than Richmond's tap water to many people. Why don't those of you who are attempting to take away my easy access to the water I prefer to drink, explain to me why you feel obliged to impinge upon my right to choose the best beverage for my health wherever I am?

And while you are at it, why don't you tell me exactly what is in tap water before you insist that I must drink it?

Denise Tester, Richmond, BC