

Appendix G – Benefits and drawbacks of proposed options

The following outlines the implications for the options deemed to be most viable for reducing the TDSB's distribution of single-use plastics. The costs listed below are approximate and assume that consumption practices remain the same as they were in 2018/19.

1. Plastic straws

- a. Deplete the Distribution Centre's existing plastic straw stock and replenish with paper straws for general consumption.

Implications	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 437,500 plastic straws will no longer be distributed by the TDSB.• Cost increase of \$0.027/unit for end user.• If consumption practices remain the same as they were in 2018/19, the total difference in price for all straws purchased from the Distribution Centre would be \$11,615.
--------------	--

- b. Deplete the Science and Technology Resource Program's existing plastic straw stock and replenish with alternative (e.g., paper straw with plastic insert).

Implications	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 635,000 plastic straws will no longer be distributed by the TDSB.• Straws will still need to be placed in the garbage, as they will contain traces of plastic.• Cost increase of \$2,611 to the TDSB.
--------------	---

2. Plastic water bottles

- a. Eliminate plastic water bottles in vending machines.

Implications	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 9,445 plastic water bottles will no longer be distributed by vending machines at the TDSB.• Revenue loss of \$1,905 annually to the TDSB.• Could result in the elimination of beverage vending machines from the system.
--------------	--

- b. Eliminate plastic water bottles in cafeterias and replace with water in alternative packaging (e.g., cartons).

Note: For health and safety reasons, glass bottles are not considered a viable alternative due to the susceptibility of breaking.

Implications	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 117,161 plastic water bottles will no longer be distributed in TDSB cafeterias.• 330 mL would be replaced with a 200 mL carton for the same cost to the end user.• External caterers could expect a relief through reduced commissions if there is an impact on their revenue.• Revenue loss of \$9,960 to the TDSB if consumption practices remain the same.• Rebate loss of \$3,715.• Could result in the closure of cafeterias that are already struggling financially.
--------------	---

3. Plastic juice bottles

- a. Eliminate plastic juice bottles from vending machines.

Implications	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 7,391 plastic juice bottles will no longer be distributed by vending machines at the TDSB.• Revenue loss of \$2,146 annually to the TDSB if consumption practices remain the same.
--------------	---

- b. Eliminate plastic juice bottles from cafeterias and replace with a juice product in alternative packaging (e.g., cartons).

Implications	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 60,162 plastic juice bottles will no longer be distributed in TDSB cafeterias.• Could result in the closure of cafeterias that are already struggling financially.• 300 mL could be replaced with a 200 mL carton at a decreased cost to consumer.• External caterers could expect a relief through reduced commissions if there is an impact on their revenue.• Revenue loss of \$19,512 for the TDSB if consumption practices remain the same.• Rebate loss of \$5,486 annually.
--------------	---

- c. Continue to encourage student nutrition programs to provide fresh fruit instead of juice in plastic bottles.

Implications	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Higher nutritional value.• Alternative will come at a higher cost to student nutrition programs.• Challenging to enforce.
--------------	---

4. Plastic milk bottles

- a. Eliminate plastic milk bottles from vending machines.

Implications	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 2,780 plastic milk bottles will no longer be distributed by vending machines at the TDSB.• Revenue loss of \$687 annually to the TDSB
--------------	--

5. Plastic cups

- a. Deplete existing stock of plastic cups in cafeterias and replace with alternative (e.g., paper cups lined with plastic)

Implications	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 1,156 plastic cups will no longer be distributed in TDSB cafeterias.• Paper cups will need to be placed in the garbage.• Cost decrease of \$57 for the TDSB.
--------------	--

- b. Deplete Science and Technology Resource Program's existing stock of plastic cups and replace with alternative (e.g., paper cups lined with bio-plastic).

Implications	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 64,000 plastic cups will no longer be distributed by Science and Technology Resource kits.• Paper cups will need to be placed in the garbage.• Cost increase of \$3,502 for the TDSB.
--------------	---

6. Pre-packaged food

- a. Encourage all student nutrition program sites with appropriate facilities (e.g., two-compartment sink/dishwasher and dedicated hand-washing sink) to purchase food in bulk and prepare on-site.

Note: Since student nutrition programs are considered food premises, they are currently subject to the requirements of the Ontario Food Premises Regulation, which stipulates structural and/or equipment requirements for food preparation.

Implications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Food purchased in bulk and prepared on-site is more cost effective and offers better nutritional value. • Food preparation would require more volunteer time. • Challenging to enforce.
--------------	---

- b. Subject to available funding and where possible, retrofit approximately 60 student nutrition program sites with “limited facilities” to allow the preparation of food on site.

Note: In October 2019, the [Ministry of Health announced](#) that the province will be revisiting its facility regulations for charities involved in community feeding such as student nutrition programs. The province’s intent is to remove unnecessary barriers related to structural and/or equipment requirements for these programs. The Ontario Food Premises regulation was amended in late December 2019 to allow some exemptions to sites that offer “low-risk food items”. However, additional clarification regarding what is considered a “low-risk food item” is being sought from the Ministry of Health.

Implications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost increase currently unknown. Without formally assessing the needs of each individual site, it is not possible to generate an accurate cost estimate. Some sites may only require modest modifications, whereas others could require a complete drainage upsize.
--------------	---