

1 This is a pre-publication copy of:

2 Fetner H, Miller SA, Environmental payback periods of reusable alternatives to single-use plastic
3 kitchenware products, *The International Journal of Life Cycle Assessment*, 2021, 8: 1-17.
4 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11367-021-01946-6>
5
6

7 **TITLE:** Environmental Payback Periods of Reusable Alternatives to Single-Use
8 Plastic Kitchenware Products
9

10 **AUTHORS:**

11 Hannah Fetner¹, Shelie A. Miller^{1,2}

12 ¹ Center for Sustainable Systems, School for Environment and Sustainability,
13 University of Michigan, 440 Church Street, Ann Arbor, MI 48109, United States

14 ² Program in the Environment, University of Michigan, 440 Church Street, Ann
15 Arbor, MI 48109, United States
16

17 **CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:**

18 Hannah Fetner, fetnerhn@umich.edu, (989) 488-0013
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

Abstract

Purpose

Many consumers are transitioning away from single-use plastic products and instead turning to reusable alternatives, such as bamboo straws or beeswax wrap. Oftentimes this change is being made with the assumption that these alternatives have fewer environmental impacts; however, reusable products are frequently made from more environmentally intensive materials and require examination of the full life cycle to understand total relative environmental impact. This study used life cycle assessment (LCA) to look at the global warming potential (GWP), water use and energy use associated with reusable alternatives for single-use plastic kitchenware products, and determined environmental payback periods.

Methods

The environmental impacts for each reusable alternative are calculated on the functional units of 1 use, 1 year (5 uses/week), and 5 years (5 uses/week). Payback periods are calculated for each reusable alternative and defined as the number of times a consumer must re-use an alternative in order for the environmental impact per use to be equivalent to the environmental impact for the single-use product. The research explored the sensitivity of the results to different consumer washing and reuse behaviors, as well as local conditions such as overall transportation distances and the carbon intensity of different electricity grids. Product types studied included straws (4 reusable, 2 single-use), sandwich storage (2 reusable, 3 single-use), coffee cups (3 reusable, 2 single-use) and forks (1 single-use, 3 reusable).

Results and discussion

Environmental impacts associated with the reusable alternatives were highly dependent on the use phase due to dishwashing, making payback period highly sensitive to washing frequency, method of washing, and for GWP, carbon intensity of the energy grid (used for water heating). For single-use products, material and manufacturing was the largest contributor to overall impacts. Using Monte Carlo Analysis, it was found that 9 of the 12 reusable alternatives were able to breakeven when washed after every use. The silicone straw and ceramic mug had the lowest payback periods for their product types. For the forks, all three reusable alternatives had payback periods of

under 12 uses for all three impact categories. Both of the sandwich storage reusable alternatives did not breakeven in any scenario.

Conclusions

The research found that reusable alternatives can payback the environmental impacts associated with their more resource intensive materials, but it is dependent on number of uses, consumer behavior and for GWP, carbon intensity of the energy grid. A key takeaway is that consumer behavior and use patterns influence the ultimate environmental impact of reusable kitchenware products.

Recommendations

A few recommendations for consumers looking to reduce the overall impact of kitchenware products includes:

- 1) Not always assuming reusable is the best option.
- 2) Extending product lifetime.
- 3) Researching which reusable option has the lowest impact.
- 4) Machine washing, instead of manually washing.
- 5) Not washing products after every use.
- 6) Advocating for integration of renewables into the local energy grid.
- 7) Reducing overall consumption of these product types (reusable or single-use).

1.0 Introduction

Reusable alternatives have quickly become a popular solution for replacing single-use products and combatting the ubiquity of disposable plastic (European, 2018; Schnurr et al., 2018; UNEP, 2018; Godfrey, 2019). However, reusable alternatives come with their own environmental impacts (Herberz et al., 2020), as reusable items are often made with more resource intensive materials and have use-phase impacts, such as water and energy use, associated with washing (Blanca-Alcubilla et al., 2020; Milà-i-Canals, L. et al., 2020). This study compares the use of reusable and single-use products, and determines the number of re-uses necessary to payback the environmental impacts associated with these more resource-intensive products.

Multiple indicators show that there is increased consumer interest in reusable products. In a recent survey of 6,000 people in 11 countries, 83% of respondents said it is important for companies to design reusable or recyclable products (Cantwell et al., 2019). Additionally, forecasted markets for alternatives to single-use plastic reflect this shift. One study valued the market for sustainable packaging at ~\$225 billion in 2018 and forecasted a compound annual growth rate (CAGR) of 5.7% from 2019-2024 (MarketInsightsReport, 2019). Another report looking at the drinking straw market also expects a CAGR of ~6%, with a shift in consumer preference for reusable or biodegradable products (Budholiya, 2019). Additionally, certain reusable products have gained increased media attention, such as straws, sandwich bags and travel utensils (Ro, L., 2020; Englishman, K. O., 2020; Kitts, K. & Conti, M., 2020).

While many consumers are transitioning to reusable alternatives with the hopes of being more sustainable, research has shown that consumer perception of what makes a product sustainable does not always reflect actual life cycle assessment (LCA) results (Boesen & Niero, 2019; Steenis et al., 2017). This means some consumers might be inaccurately thinking they are making the most sustainable choices when another alternative is environmentally preferable. Currently, there are many LCA studies on everyday consumer products such as plastic carrier bags (Edwards, 1998; Greene, 2011; Kimmel et al., 2014; Bisinella, 2018), disposable cups (Openbare, 2006; Ligthart & Ansems, 2007; Van der Harst & Potting, 2013; Cottafava, D. et al., 2020), plates (Postacchini et al., 2016), take-away containers (Madival, S. et al., 2009; Accorsi et al., 2014; Bortolini, M. et al., 2018; Gallego-Schmidt et al., 2019) and other food packaging options (Franklin Associates, 2018). These papers demonstrate the complexity of

product sustainability, the nuances of the environmental impact of reusable items, and the number of factors and behaviors results are dependent on. These contingencies for environmental favorability are further explored in recent research identifying common misperceptions associated with single-use plastic solutions (Miller, 2020).

In order to better communicate the environmental impact per use of reusable products to consumers, this study looks at popular and highly advertised reusable alternatives and uses the concept of payback period to communicate the environmental impact. In this paper, payback period is defined as the number of uses required to have equivalent environmental impacts per use between the reusable and single-use product on a life cycle basis, which includes resource extraction, manufacturing, transportation, use and disposal (Cherif & Belhadj, 2018). Payback period is calculated as a ratio between overall emissions of single-use products versus a reusable alternative for the same number of uses. Some advantages of using payback period is that it is both easily understandable to the average consumer (Alton & Underwood, 2003; Saoutert & Andreasen, 2006) and provides a specific action that can be taken (Jensen & Schnack, 1997; Breiting & Mogensen, 1999; Robelia et al., 2011).

Payback period is commonly associated with a monetary calculation, but previous research has used environmental payback to optimize scenarios such as air conditioner, refrigerator, freezer, and automobile replacement (De Kleine, 2009; Horie, 2004; Spitzley et al., 2005). Many of these studies have shown how environmental favorability is highly contingent on product lifetime, consumer behaviors and local conditions. An example of the impact of consumer behavior on optimal replacement was presented in a 2006 study on washing machines where payback calculations resulted in recommendations on washer replacement that varied between replacing only once to three times within a 35 year period depending on the user's choice to wash their clothes with cold or hot water, and the choice to hang-dry versus machine-dry (Bole, 2006). A meta-analysis conducted by the UN Environment Programme showed that local conditions such as land-use change from production and extraction stages, and local waste management practices affected the environmental payback of reusable bags. The report found that GHG emission payback period of a reusable polyethylene bag varied between 4 – 20 uses when compared to a traditional single-use plastic bag (UNEP, 2020). With this in mind, the current study assesses how consumer behavior and local condition factors impact the number of uses before environmental payback for reusable products might occur.

The overall objectives of this research are:

- (1) Identify the number of re-uses necessary to payback the environmental impacts associated with reusable products,
- (2) Determine consumer behaviors and local conditions which impact payback period.

Using LCA, the paper analyzes single-use and reusable alternatives for four common kitchenware product groups: drinking straws, sandwich storage, coffee cups, and utensils. These alternatives were selected due to media and consumer popularity (Brown, N., 2019; Leighton, M., 2019; Wells, K., 2019). Although some LCA studies have

been done on these products (Razza, F. et al., 2009, Takou, V. et al., 2019; Chitaka, T.Y. et al., 2020), many are location specific or evaluate few alternatives, leaving room for supplementary research to be done.

The study compares reusable and single use products on the basis of global warming potential, water consumption and primary nonrenewable energy use. Different scenarios are used to investigate how assumptions can impact the payback period for each product group. The payback period is determined for each reusable item and sensitivity analysis is conducted with respect to changes in material emissions, transportation distance, consumer behavior during the use phase, disposal scenarios, and local conditions such as carbon intensity of the energy grid and type of water heater in the home. In some scenarios, a payback period cannot be calculated since the environmental impacts of the reusable item are unable to break even with the environmental impacts of a single-use item, which occurs when the use phase impacts associated with washing the reusable item are greater than the total life cycle impact of the single-use item.

2.0 Materials and Methods

This study utilized an LCA framework and followed the standard four-step approach defined in ISO14040/14044 (International Organization for Standardization [ISO], 2006). Specific assumptions and methodological choices for each of the four stages of the LCA are detailed in each section.


2.1 Goal and Scope Definition

The goal of the study is to estimate the life cycle global warming potential (GWP), water consumption, and primary energy use associated with single-use kitchenware products and their reusable alternatives and determine the environmental payback period in each impact category for the reusable alternatives. Payback period is defined as the number of times a consumer must re-use an alternative in order for the environmental impact per use to be equivalent to the environmental impact for the single-use product. GWP, water consumption, and primary nonrenewable energy use were selected as environmental indicators to reflect an appropriate range of indicators relevant to these products and overall data availability (van der Harst & Potting, 2013). The analysis also explores how different consumer behaviors may impact results.

The environmental impact of reusable products change with respect to the number of uses, so for example with GWP, kg CO₂-eq/one use is different than the kg CO₂-eq/1000 uses. Although the purpose of the paper is to calculate the environmental payback period which identifies the number of uses for the reusable and single use products to have equivalent environmental impact, illustrative functional unit scenarios of 1 use, 1 year, and 5 years are calculated to demonstrate the general trend in results with increased number of uses. These scenarios correspond to using a product a single time, using it 5 times per week for a year, and using it 5 times per week for 5 years. (remove:Potting & van der Hurst, 2015).

A generic system boundary diagram for each of the products includes the impacts associated with material extraction, manufacturing, transportation, use, and end-of-life for each product (Figure 1). Production and disposal of transportation vehicles and other capital equipment is not included. For the use phase, energy, detergent and water consumed by washing reusable products are included in the analysis (Porrás et al., 2020). Impacts associated with production and disposal of the dishwasher, sink and water heater are excluded. Lastly for the end-of-life phase, Ecoinvent 3 system model – allocation cut-off by classification was followed, meaning waste treatment such as landfill or combustion is included, but burdens or credits from the recycle or compost process are attributed to the production of secondary material, not the primary (“Allocation”). (Remove:EPA, 2016).

Figure 1: System boundary of single-use and reusable products. Processes highlighted in red are only associated with reusable products.



2.2 Product Selection

Four common consumer product categories were compared, each of which have commercial reusable alternatives available: drinking straws (5 alternatives), sandwich storage (4 alternatives), coffee cups (4 alternatives), and forks (3 alternatives). Specific products used for the analysis are included below, otherwise a generic version was modeled.

Drinking Straws

- Bamboo Straw: *Jungle Straws – Organic 8” Reusable Bamboo Drinking Straws*
- Glass Straw: *One Ocean Straw Kit – 9” Regular Glass Straw*
- Metal Straw: *Manna Stainless Steel Straw – 9.5”*

- Paper Straw
- Plastic Straw
- Silicone Straw: 8.25" *Softy Silicone Straw – Slender Size BPA Free Non-Rubber Silicon* Reusable

Sandwich Storage

- Beeswax Wrap: *Chef Sous Chef Homemade Reusable Beeswax Wrap (14" x 14")*
- Plastic Wrap: *Gland Brand Cling Wrap*
- Plastic Bag: *Ziploc Brand Sandwich Bags – Easy Open Tabs*
- Silicone Bag: *Stasher Reusable Silicone Sandwich Bag*
- Aluminum Foil

Coffee Cups

- Paper Coffee Cup with Plastic Lid
- Metal Mug: *Yeti 14 oz Rambler Mug*
- Reusable Plastic Mug: *Tervis Clear and Colorful 16 oz Mug with Tervis Travel Lid*
- Foam Coffee Cup with Plastic Lid
- Ceramic Mug

Forks

- Plastic: *Up & Up Premium Plastic Fork*
- Bamboo: *BlueApeBlades Zero Waste Wooden Utensil Set (Fork)*
- Reusable Plastic: *Add*
- Metal: *Add*

Comparative analysis is conducted within each product type. Throughout the study, products will be referenced as their product type (e.g. plastic bag), instead of by their specific brand and name (e.g. Ziploc Bag).

2.3 Life Cycle Inventory and Impact Assessment

The following section outlines the assumptions associated with the Life Cycle Inventory (LCI) and the Life Cycle Impact Assessment (LCIA). For the LCI, the majority of product characteristics, such as materials used, and the product manufacturing processes were found on product websites, or through publicly available internet sources describing an industry. The mass of materials used was either found on product websites or measured using a mass balance. For data pertaining to the LCI for the transportation, use, and EoL life cycle stages, data was collected from peer-reviewed studies and product websites as documented in the supporting information. This includes method of transportation, transportation distance, dishwashing method, lifespan and EoL disposal methods.

Environmental impact was determined using Ecoinvent 3 – Allocation, cut off by classification – system, accessed via Simapro v9.1.0.11, along with data obtained through literature review. For GWP, values are reported in kg CO₂ equivalent (kg CO₂e) with a 100-year timeframe based on the 2013 Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) report, except for dishwashing data, which used the 2001 IPCC report, due to disaggregated emissions data

being unavailable. ReCiPe 2016 Midpoint (H) was used to calculate water consumption, which is the **CITE PAPER + DEFINITION**. For primary nonrenewable energy use, IMPACT2002+ was used. The models for both the LCI and LCIA were constructed using Microsoft Excel.

2.3.1 Material and Manufacturing

A summary of the materials and amounts used to model each product can be found in the supplemental material table **SX**. For all products, dyes were not included due to insufficient data surrounding the type, amount, and environmental impact of the dye used during the specific manufacturing process. Additional manufacturing process step(s) were incorporated for the majority of products and can also be found in the supplemental material. The average emissions, water consumption and primary energy use factors associated with the majority of both the materials and manufacturing steps were quantified using Ecoinvent 3.6 - Allocation, cut off by classification – system, with academic literature used when data was not available.

2.3.2 Transportation

The researchers chose an average overall transportation distance of 250 miles or 402.33 km using a transport, freight lorry >32 metric ton for the base case scenarios. This distance was selected based off of research showing that most goods in the U.S. are transported less than 250 miles (U.S. DOT, 2017). Trucking was selected as the transportation method in the model because it is responsible for moving ~66% of goods in the U.S. (U.S. DOT, 2017). Environmental impact was estimated using the same Ecoinvent 3- Allocation, cut off by classification – system.

2.3.3 Use

In order to estimate the environmental burden from washing reusable products, values from Porras et al., 2020 were used to calculate the average GWP values of 0.00016 kg CO₂e/in² dish for dishwashers and 0.000431 kg CO₂e/in² dish for manual washing. Emission values from this study were found to be consistent with other academic literature (Vivian et al., 2011). **List values for Water consumption or energy and try to find comparisons?**

2.3.4 End-of-Life (EoL)

Lastly, the EPA Advancing Sustainable Materials Management: 2017 Fact Sheet was used to determine the average disposal rates for material types (EPA, 2019). The model bases the percentage of waste going towards each disposal method (landfill, combustion, compost, recycle) off of these figures. **Used Cut-off (EPA, 2016)**.

2.4 Sensitivity Analysis

In order to determine how sensitive the results are to different variables, a sensitivity analysis and Monte Carlo simulation were conducted on the GWP results. Sensitivity analysis was confined to GWP due to lack of distribution data for the other impact categories. For the sensitivity analysis, the material emission factor, manufacturing emission factor, transportation emission factor, transportation distance, dishwashing emission factor and disposal emission factor were varied by +/- 50%.

For the Monte Carlo, 10,000 trials were run. Table 1 shows the parameters varied, their distribution types and the ranges. Because ranges were not available for all materials and manufacturing processes, a range of +/- 10% was used for all materials/manufacturing in order to maintain uniformity between products. For transportation, a triangular distribution was modeled and a range of 160.93 – 1609.34 miles was used (U.S. DOT, 2017). Changes in dishwashing emission factors reflect changes in carbon intensity of the grid, and the use of an electric versus natural gas water heater (Porrás et al., 2020). Calculations for these different dishwashing emission factor scenarios can be found in SX. Lastly, EoL models show disposal rates ranging from 0 – 100% for all applicable disposal scenarios per material (landfill, combustion, compost, recycle).

Table 1: Monte Carlo Allocation Table

Key Parameters	Distribution Type	Ranges
Material/Manufacturing Emission Factor	Triangular Distribution	+/- 10% for both material and manufacturing emission factors
Transportation Distance		Most common: 402.34 miles Range: 160.93 – 1609.34 miles
Use Phase – Machine Dishwashing Emission Factor		Most common : 1.60×10^{-4} Range: $1.09 - 2.98 \times 10^{-4}$ (Unit: kg CO _{2e} /in2 dish)
Use Phase – Manual Dishwashing Emission Factor		Most common: 4.31×10^{-4} Range: $2.67 - 8.96 \times 10^{-4}$ (Unit: kg CO _{2e} /in2 dish)
EoL Disposal Scenario Percentage		Most common disposal percentages: Varied by material Range: 0 -100% of each disposal scenario

3.0 Results

Each of the six straws analyzed were made out of a single material and had masses ranging from 0.00071 kg (plastic) to 0.015 kg (glass). The metal, plastic and silicone straws all had additional manufacturing stages after material production. Manufacturing impacts were included in the model used for the material phase of the glass straw. The carbon intensity for material, processing and manufacturing of stainless steel was the highest (7.01 kg CO_{2e} / kg material), whereas bamboo had the lowest associated emissions (0.581 kg CO_{2e} / kg material). On the other hand, bamboo had the highest water consumption (1.6 m³ / kg material), while glass had the lowest (0.016 m³ / kg material). Lastly, the plastic straw used the most primary energy (87.4 MJ primary / kg material), while the bamboo straw used the least (19.3 MJ primary / kg material).


For the five sandwich storage options, beeswax wrap was modeled using cotton, beeswax, resin and jojoba oil. Due to lack of emission factors on specific materials, the emissions factor for honey was used in place of beeswax, epoxy resin was used in place of resin and cottonseed oil was used in place of jojoba oil. The plastic wrap was made of LDPE, whereas the plastic bag consisted of equal parts LDPE and LLDPE. The silicone bag and aluminum foil were each made of one material, silicone and aluminum, respectively. The plastic wrap, plastic bag, silicone bag, and aluminum foil required additional processing. Including manufacturing, aluminum was the most carbon intensive per kg product (22.41 kg CO₂e / kg product), while plastic bag was the least carbon intensive (3.35 kg CO₂e / kg product). The beeswax wrap used the most water per kg material (1.34 m³ / kg material), whereas the plastic wrap used the least (0.047 m³ / kg material). Lastly, aluminum foil was the most energy intensive (234.2 MJ primary / kg material), while silicone was the least (77.2 MJ primary / kg material).

For the coffee cup models, both the reusable plastic and ceramic mugs were made of a single material. Masses varied from 0.0041 kg (foam) to 0.32 kg (ceramic). All the products except the ceramic mug required additional processing. The metal mug, reusable plastic mug and foam coffee cup were the most carbon intensive products, with emission factors of 6.51, 4.18, and 4.01 kg CO₂e / kg product. Meanwhile, the paper coffee cup (1.97 kg CO₂e / kg product) and ceramic mug (0.80 kg CO₂e / kg product) had significantly lower emission factors. Looking at the other environmental indicators, the foam cup used the most water per kg material (0.078 m³ / kg material), while the reusable plastic mug used the most energy per kg material (96.1 MJ primary / kg material). On the other hand, the ceramic mug used the least water (0.006 m³ / kg material), and the least energy (11.6 MJ primary / kg material).


Lastly, looking at the forks modeled, the metal, reusable plastic and bamboo forks were all made of a single material. The plastic, metal and reusable plastic forks had additional manufacturing impacts after material production. Looking at the bamboo fork, it was the least carbon intensive (1.31 kg CO₂e / kg material), least energy intensive (19.3 MJ primary / kg material), but most water intensive (1.6 m³ / kg material). The metal fork was most carbon intensive (7.01 kg CO₂e / kg material), but least water intensive (0.036 m³ / kg material). The single-use plastic fork was the most energy intensive per kg material (98.9 MJ primary / kg material). For all twenty products modeled, there was not a single material that conclusively dominated a product type, in other words, no product had the lowest GWP, water use and energy use per kg material.

Next overall impacts were analyzed, and it was found different phases were responsible for the majority of impacts in single-use and reusable products. Figure 2 breaks down the overall impacts of each product into the four life cycle phases for two different use scenarios, 1 Use and 1 Year. The 5 Year scenario was modeled, but results were very similar to the 1 Year scenario and therefore are not included below. Average impact factors, disposal rates and transportation distance were used in both use scenarios. Figure 2a shows the impacts for a functional unit of one use for both the reusable and single-use options. Figure 2b depicts a functional unit of 1 Year or 260 uses, which corresponds to 260 single-use products and reusable products that are used 260 times. For all products except the

361 bamboo straw, Figure 2b corresponds to a single unit that is reused 260 times. Because the bamboo straw has a life
362 expectancy of only 6 months or ~183 uses, Figure 2b depicts the results for 2 units.
363
364 Figure 2: Breakdown of percent contributed to overall impacts by each life cycle phase. A) Functional Unit: 1 Use;
365 B) Functional Unit: 1 Year (5 Uses/Week)



a.



b.

It can be seen that for single-use products, the material and manufacturing phase dominates impact regardless of number of uses. This is supported by another study which found the majority of impact to occur in the production stage for disposable items (Blanca-Albubilla et al., 2020).


On the other hand, the majority of reusable products are initially dominated by the material and manufacturing phase for the first use, but as they are used at a higher frequency, the upstream impacts become less of a factor and the use phase quickly becomes the largest contributor. The bamboo straw has a higher contribution to GWP and Primary Energy Use from the use phase for the single-use scenario than the other reusable alternatives, because impacts from handwashing before using the first time are similar in scale to total material and manufacturing impacts of growing and processing the bamboo. All products with stainless steel (metal straw, metal mug, metal fork) saw high contributions from the disposal phase for water use due to sanitary landfilling's water use factor being an order of magnitude larger per kg material than the material/manufacturing phase. Multiple other studies have found similar results on the influence of dishwashing on the overall environmental impact (Ligthart & Ansems, 2007; Woods & Bakshi, 2014). A 2007 study on reusable cups concluded that as number of uses increased, the overall importance of washing also increases. The study also found that other life cycle stages were negligible compared to fabrication and washing of reusables (Garrido & del Castillo, 2007).


To further demonstrate this effect, Figure 3 shows the data for straws in absolute terms of kg CO₂e/use, m³/use and MJ primary/use for scenarios of 1 use, 1 Year and 5 Years. It is important to emphasize that because the y-axis unit for this graph is impact per use instead of total environmental impact, the single-use product's impacts per use remain constant while the reusable product impact change with the number of uses. If the graph were total overall impact, using 1300 (5 Year scenario) plastic straws would have much higher impacts than using one plastic straw. Impact per use was selected as the most appropriate y-axis functional unit in order to show that as you use reusable products, even though total impacts increase due to washing, impacts per use decrease.

Looking at Figure 3a, which shows GWP per use for straws, the plastic straw was found to have the lowest GWP when used only once, but is surpassed by the glass, metal and silicone straws by the 1 Year scenario. This means three of the four reusables are favorable in terms of GWP to the single-use plastic straw if used for 1 Year.

Emissions for the bamboo straws were unable to reach a payback period within 5 Years because their use phase emissions in the average scenario increased more rapidly than the overall emissions of the plastic straw. In Figure 3b it can be seen that all four reusable alternatives still used more water per use than the plastic straw even in the 5 Year scenario due to high water use in the washing phase. Lastly, in Figure 3c, paper straws were found to have the lowest primary energy use per use. Similar to the results for GWP, the glass, metal and silicone straws had lower energy use per use than the plastic straw by the 1 Year scenario, whereas the bamboo straw was not able to reach a payback period.

Figure 3: Environmental impact per use for straw products at functional units of 1 Use, 1 Year (5 uses/week) and 5 Years (5 uses/week). A) GWP B) Water Use C) Primary Energy Use





c.

Equivalent analysis and graphs for the three other product types can be found in the supplemental material tables S28, S29 and S30. To summarize, neither reusable sandwich bag option was able to reach a payback period for GWP, water use or energy use compared to the plastic bag or plastic wrap. This was driven by the high use phase impacts associated with both beeswax wrap and silicone bags. Beeswax wrap's impacts were especially high because it must be manually washed, and has a large cleaning surface area. Aluminum foil had the highest GWP, water and energy use of the three single-use products, followed by the plastic bag. Plastic wrap impacts per use were approximately two times smaller than impacts per use for plastic bags. This reflected the fact that the mass of the plastic wrap necessary to wrap a sandwich is half as much as a plastic bag.

Looking at the single-use coffee cup products, the foam cup had the lowest impacts for all three indicators. This is supported by other studies which also found foam cups to have lower impacts than paper cup variations (Franklin Associates, 2011; Jung et al., 2011). The single-use paper cup was favorable to all reusable products when used only once, but by the 1 Year scenario, all three reusable products had lower GWP per use than the paper cup. By the 5 Year scenario, all three reusable products had lower primary energy use per use than the paper cup, and the ceramic mug had lower water use. The metal cup and reusable plastic cup still had higher water use per use in the 5 Year scenario than the paper cup. Of the reusables, the ceramic mug had the lowest emissions for all scenarios, and the metal cup the highest.

Lastly, when looking at the fork products, the bamboo fork has lower GWP per use and energy use per use than the plastic fork with just a single use. The water use per use for the bamboo fork became less than the plastic fork by the 1 Year scenario. Both the reusable plastic and metal forks become favorable to the plastic fork in GWP per use, water use per use, and energy use per use by the 1 Year scenario.

Evaluating all of the single-use products shows that one of the key factors in overall impacts is the mass of the product. For the three product types with more than one single-use product (straws, sandwich bags, and coffee cups),

the single-use product with the lower mass had lower GWP, water use and energy use. The only exception to this was the plastic straw used more energy than the paper straw. Key factors for reusable products are the cleaning surface area and the washing method (manual vs. auto). Products that had to be manually washed, such as the bamboo straw and beeswax wrap, had higher impacts than those that could be placed in a dishwasher. These results are supported by another study, which found for reusable cups, dishwashing was the highest contributor to overall impacts, whereas for disposable cups, impacts from production were one of the largest contributors (Ligthart & Ansems, 2007).

Using base case values for impact factors, transportation distance and EoL disposal method percentages, initial results for payback period of each reusable product was calculated, shown in Table 2. The analysis showed that many of the reusable alternatives never broke-even when compared to the single-use product for water use. The only exceptions to this were the ceramic mug and all three reusable fork options. The bamboo straw, beeswax wrap and silicone bag did not breakeven for any of the three impact categories, due to high washing emissions from either hand washing or large surface areas. For the straws, the silicone straw had the shortest payback period for both GWP and energy use, at 70 and 16 uses, respectively. The metal straw on the other hand had the longest payback period for these two impact categories at 229 and 37 uses, respectively. For the coffee cups, the ceramic mug had the shortest payback period for GWP, water use and energy use, while metal had the longest.

For the forks, all three reusable products reached a payback period for all three impact categories. The bamboo fork was more favorable than the plastic fork with just a single use for GWP and energy use, but had to be used 37 times before it broke-even for water use. The payback period for the reusable plastic fork was 4-5 uses for all three categories. Lastly, the metal fork broke even in 8 uses for GWP, 11 uses for water use and 4 uses for energy use.

Table 2. Payback period for GWP, Water Use and Energy Use of Reusable Alternatives

Straws				
	Bamboo	Glass	Metal	Silicone
GWP	Did Not Breakeven	163	229	70
Water Use	Did Not Breakeven	Did Not Breakeven	Did Not Breakeven	Did Not Breakeven
Energy Use	Did Not Breakeven	20	37	16
Sandwich Bags				
	Beeswax Wrap	Silicone		
GWP	Did Not Breakeven	Did Not Breakeven		
Water Use	Did Not Breakeven	Did Not Breakeven		
Energy Use	Did Not Breakeven	Did Not Breakeven		
Coffee Cups				
	Metal	Reusable Plastic	Ceramic	
GWP	111	43	16	
Water Use	Did Not Breakeven	Did Not Breakeven	67	

Energy Use	288	210	32
-------------------	-----	-----	----

Forks

	Bamboo	Reusable Plastic	Metal
GWP	1	4	8
Water Use	37	4	11
Energy Use	1	5	4

Analysis of these results showed a few interesting details. The authors hypothesized the payback periods for forks and straws would be similar, due to similar materials being used. In reality the forks broke even much faster than the straws because the ratio of mass between the single-use and reusable product was much lower. The reusable straws were 6.18 – 21.28 times the mass of the plastic straw, whereas the reusable forks were 1.75 – 4.75 times the mass of the plastic fork. Additionally, the results found that the metal reusable alternative of each product type (straw, coffee cup, and fork) had to be used the most in order to breakeven. Lastly, it can be seen that the silicone straw and the ceramic mug were the two reusable products which dominated a product type in all three impact categories (i.e. had the lowest payback period).

Other studies had varying results for payback periods of similar products. A recent study on straws in South Africa showed glass and metal reusable straws to have payback periods of 23 and 37 uses for GWP, respectively, when compared to a polypropylene straw produced in South Africa (Chitaka & von Blottnitz, 2020). These results are considerably lower for two main reasons. The first is that polypropylene production in South Africa is significantly more carbon intensive than in North America and Europe. In South Africa, coal is the primary feedstock for polypropylene (9.67 kg CO₂e/kg PP), whereas in North America and Europe crude oil and natural gas are used (1.82 – 1.97 kg CO₂e/kg PP) (Chitaka & von Blottnitz, 2020). Secondly, the study assumed users were washing in cold water. The use of hot water saw a 38% and 42% increase in emissions for glass and steel straws respectively (Chitaka & von Blottnitz, 2020). This shows that there are many factors, including local conditions, that may impact payback period. These will be explored further in the sensitivity analysis.

4.0 Sensitivity Analysis


A sensitivity analysis was conducted in order to determine the drivers of the overall impact. Due to limited space, the researchers chose to focus on GWP. Variables that were considered include the transportation distance, and material, manufacturing, transportation, dishwashing and disposal emission factor. Because overall GWP was being evaluated, not payback period, only variables for the specific product were changed. The average change for reusable products and single-use products can be seen in Figure 4.

Analysis was done on the 1 Year (260 uses) scenario, and showed that on average, for the reusable product, GHG emissions were highly sensitive to dishwasher emission factor, shown in Figure 4a. This is consistent with results from Figure 2, where the use phase was the highest contributor to overall emissions. Looking at individual products it can be seen that when the dishwashing emission factor was varied by +/- 50%, overall emissions were impacted

by 25% - 50%. On the other hand, the model was not sensitive to either transportation emission factor, disposal emission factor, or distance transported. On average, when disposal emission factor was varied by +/-50%, results were only impact by 0.3%. Emissions were even less sensitive to distance transported, with a +/-50% variance only resulting in an average change of 0.05%.

For the single-use products and a 1 Year (260 products) scenario, shown in Figure 4b, overall emissions were most sensitive to the material emission factor, again consistent with findings from Figure 2. When varied by +/- 50%, emissions for plastic single-use products were impacted by 28% - 48%. Single-use products were also fairly sensitive to manufacturing and disposal emission factor, with a +/-50% change resulting in ~8% increase or decrease in emissions. The model was least sensitive to transportation emission factor and distance transported, with an average change of only 0.47% when varied by 50%.



Figure 4: Sensitivity analysis showing percent changes in overall GWP for products in 1 Year (260 use) scenario when variables were ranged by +/- 50% A) Reusable Products B) Single-Use Products



In addition, Monte Carlo analysis was completed in order to determine the payback periods for a range of conditions varied at the same time. The reusable products were compared to the plastic straw, plastic bag, paper cup and plastic fork, as the researchers determined these were the most common single-use products in their area. In addition, for the straw and fork product types, the single-use product selected had the lowest emissions of all single-use options, which allows the more optimistic break even scenario to be calculated. Seen in Figure 4a, when washed after every use, a payback period is unable to be calculated for the bamboo straw, silicone bag and beeswax wrap since the GHG emissions during a single wash are greater than the total life cycle GHG emissions of the relevant disposable product. Products with large surface areas or that had to be manually washed were more likely to not breakeven. The silicone straw, glass straw, metal straw, metal mug, plastic cup and ceramic mug all had trials where the reusable product did not breakeven. The reusable fork options always broke-even, with the payback period for the bamboo fork and reusable plastic fork being between 0 – 5 uses for 100% and 98% of the trials, respectively. The metal fork had a payback period between 5 – 10 uses for almost 99% of the trials.

When washed every other use, seen in Figure 4b, silicone bags and beeswax wrap are still unable to reach a payback period. Bamboo straws now are able to breakeven for 33% of trials. All other reusable alternatives breakeven for 100% of trials. The most common payback period range for these reusable products are: 10-25 uses (glass straw), 50-100 uses (metal straw), 10-25 uses (silicone straw), 50-100 uses (metal mug), 25-50 uses (plastic mug), 10-25 uses (ceramic mug), 0-5 uses (bamboo fork), 0-5 uses (reusable plastic fork) and 5-10 uses (metal fork).

Figure 5: Monte Carlo Analysis Results – Percent of Trials in each Payback Period category when a) washed after every use and b) when washed after every other use



These results show that payback period is highly sensitive to use phase emissions. When switching from washing every use to every other use, many of the reusable products (silicone straw, glass straw, metal straw, metal mug, plastic cup and ceramic mug) went from having trials not reaching a payback period to having all 10,000 trials reach payback periods of under 200 uses.

In this Monte Carlo Analysis, the silicone straw, ceramic mug, and bamboo fork had the fastest average payback periods for their respective product types, while the bamboo straw, metal mug and metal fork had the longest on average. Both the silicone straw and ceramic mug had the surface area being washed of the products in their respective product type being machine washed. Neither sandwich storage alternative reached a payback period.

5.0 Discussion

Results from this study can impact how producers and consumers move forward and reduce the environmental impacts associated with these common kitchenware products. On the single-use side, we see how sensitive overall

551 impacts, especially GWP, are to the material and manufacturing phase. For these products, a large part of
552 sustainability efforts should be manufacturers focusing on optimization of the production process. After the material
553 and manufacturing phase, the second most influential phase was EoL disposal. Improving this phase to minimize
554 impacts will take a joint effort between producers and consumers. Producers must research which disposal option is
555 best for their product, and then assure that this disposal method is accessible for consumers. It is then up to
556 consumers to properly dispose of these products. One difficulty throughout this study was modeling EoL for single-
557 use products, as we know many do not end up in traditional waste streams, and instead are found in aquatic and
558 terrestrial ecosystems. TALK ABOUT MICROPLASTICS/OCEAN PLASTIC MORE

559
560 Minimization of environmental impacts associated with reusable products should focus on maximizing the number
561 of uses and mitigating impacts from the use phase, which overall impacts, especially GWP, are most sensitive. Other
562 research has suggested that use phase impacts associated with dishwashing can be minimized by practicing optimal
563 loading, using rinse aid and high-quality detergent packs, and cleaning the interior of the machine periodically. Best
564 practices for manual washing include using a two-basin method, where dishes are soaked and scrubbed in hot water,
565 then rinsed in cold water, and lastly air dried (Porras et al., 2020).

566
567 Results also showed that not washing after every use can have a large impact on payback period, and makes reusable
568 alternatives more favorable. Although there might be hesitation due to societal perception of personal cleanliness of
569 washing less frequently, a study actually found that average washing frequency in an office ranged from one to ten
570 mug uses, with four uses being the average (Ligthart & Ansems, 2007). PUT SENTENCE ABOUT HYGIENE This
571 logic can also be applied in reverse to the single-use products. Reusing items intended for single-use without
572 washing in between would effectively cut emissions per use in half. This would cause the payback period for
573 reusable alternatives to significantly increase, and would make it more difficult for these alternative products to be
574 favorable.

575
576 It is also important to remember when trying to minimize overall impacts, both with single-use or reusable products,
577 not all goods are created equal. As previously mentioned, certain single-use products outperformed others in
578 different environmental impact categories. This is the same for reusable products. SUMMARIZE REUSABLE
579 RESULTS.

580
581 In terms of consumer choice between reusable and single-use, this research found that although some reusable
582 alternatives were able to have lower impacts per use than their single-use counterpart, not all broke even within their
583 lifetime. As a consumer, this means reusable is not always the best option and that there is more nuance to single-
584 use products than a default assumption that reusable is always better (Miller, 2020). Doing research before you
585 purchase a new alternative can reduce your personal environmental impact, though relative to food consumption
586 choices, transportation emissions, and overall household energy use, the environmental impacts of the kitchenware
587 products analyzed in this study are likely small.

Consumers should also determine the actual need for the product. In terms of the 3Rs, with reduce being the most important, if a consumer can reduce overall consumption of a specific kind of product, they can also reduce overall environmental impacts. For example, while some people need and benefit from straws, other consumers could consider not using a straw whatsoever.

It is also important to point out that the study assumes that consumers use the product until the end of its useful life. If a consumer loses or replaces the reusable before the requisite number of uses to break even, this will also increase impact.

This study also has implications for governments considering implementation of single-use plastic bans. Although these bans have positive effects on public awareness and some environmental indicators, such as waste and littering, results show that a complete transition away from single-use could have negative impacts in other areas, such as GWP. Policy makers should take this into account during policy development and attempt to minimize overall impact by looking at which products a ban makes sense for.

Because the dishwashing emission factor was the largest driver of the GWP, it is important to recognize that researchers of this study found allocation on an in² dish being washed to be the most representative. Other options for allocation could be by mass, area taken up in the dishwasher or time it takes to wash. Future studies could explore how changing allocation changes overall results. For example, both sandwich storage alternatives had surface areas of over 200 in², compared to the average coffee cup size of 136 in², average straw size of 12.7 in² and average fork size of 3.2 in². They were also the two reusable options that never broke even. Allocating on a different factor unit such as time to wash may reduce use phase impacts for sandwich storage, but increase use phase impacts for straws, since it can be difficult to wash the inside.

Another important point to consider is that this study only looked at GWP, water use and primary nonrenewable energy use. Other environmental impacts such as the amount of waste to landfill, ecotoxicity, eutrophication and acidification potential were not included. These are also significant indicators of the environmental impact of each product. Future research should focus on modeling processes for different environmental indicators in order to better understand the overall environmental impact. **TALK MORE ABOUT SOLID WASTE**

5.0 Conclusion

Overall the study concludes that reusable alternatives have the ability to payback the environmental impacts associated with their more environmentally-intensive materials and use phase impacts, but it is highly dependent on number of uses, consumer behavior, product material, and dishwashing. These results were consistently seen in initial impact calculations, the Monte Carlo Analysis and sensitivity analysis, as well as supported by other peer-

reviewed studies. The findings from this study should be used to minimize environmental impacts associated with these product categories.

For the single-use products, it was determined that the material and manufacturing phase was the largest contributor to overall impact. Further analysis also showed that GWP specifically was most sensitive to the material and manufacturing emission factor, followed by disposal emission factor. Other studies on single-use products have also found similar results on the factors that influence the GWP. A review of ten studies found that the impact of disposable cups was highly influenced by cup mass, material, production and waste processing (van der Harst & Potting, 2013). These findings are consistent with the current study.

On the other hand, impacts for reusable products were initially dominated by the material and manufacturing phase, but after being used more than once, the use phase quickly became the largest contributor. The large impact of the use phase could be seen when determining payback period for GWP, which was found to decrease significantly as frequency of washing was also decreased. Additionally, during the sensitivity analysis, results showed that emissions for reusable products were highly sensitive to changes in dishwashing emission factor. This aligns with research by Potting and van der Harst, which concluded that impact results for a reusable cup were highly dependent on the amount of hot water, soap and paper towel used during the washing phase (Potting & van der Harst, 2015).

A key takeaway from this study is that consumer behavior does have an impact and can help minimize overall environmental impacts associated with kitchenware products. For reusable products, many of the most impactful behavior changes will occur in the use phase. The list below quickly summarizes actions consumers can take to reduce their footprint associated with reusable products:

- 1) Don't always assume reusable is the best option. There is a great deal of nuance to the perception that reusable products have less impact than single-use products. In some cases, the impact of washing a reusable product is greater than the life cycle impacts of a single-use product.
- 2) For products that do breakeven, extend product lifetime. The more times you use a product, the smaller your footprint.
- 3) Research products before purchase, since not all reusable alternatives are equal. Some have larger impacts than others.
- 4) Give preference to machine washing over manual washing. Other behaviors that can reduce use phase impacts include completely filling the dishwasher, buying energy efficient appliances, and not pre-rinsing dishes.
- 5) Try not to wash products after every use if practical. For example if you are having plain black coffee or tea, do a quick rinse of your mug/cup and use again the next day.
- 6) Advocate for integration of renewables into your local energy grid. The lower the carbon intensity and nonrenewable energy use of the grid, the lower the environmental impact of dishwashing.

And lastly, the best consumption is no consumption. Minimizing consumer purchasing minimizes overall environmental footprint.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Geoffrey Lewis for his frequent guidance on LCA, and everyone at the Center for Sustainable Systems for their support.

687 Accorsi, R., Cascini, A., Cholette, S., Manzini, R., & Mora, C. (2014). Economic and environmental assessment of
688 reusable plastic containers: A food catering supply chain case study. *INT J PROD ECON*, 152, 88-101.

689 “Allocation Cut-off by Classification.” Cut-Off System Model, [www.ecoinvent.org/database/system-models-in-](http://www.ecoinvent.org/database/system-models-in-ecoinvent-3/cut-off-system-model/allocation-cut-off-by-classification.html)
690 [ecoinvent-3/cut-off-system-model/allocation-cut-off-by-classification.html](http://www.ecoinvent.org/database/system-models-in-ecoinvent-3/cut-off-system-model/allocation-cut-off-by-classification.html).

691 Alton, C. C., & Underwood, P. B. (2003). Let us make impact assessment more accessible. *ENVIRON IMPACT*
692 *ASSES*, 23(2), 141-153. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0195-9255\(02\)00093-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0195-9255(02)00093-8)

693 Bisinella V, Albizzati PF, Astrup TF, Damgaard A, 2018. Life cycle assessment of grocery carrier bags. Danish
694 Environmental Protection Agency, Copenhagen.

695 Blanca-Alcubilla, G., Bala, A., de Castro, N., Colomé, R., & Fullana-i-Palmer, P. (2020). Is the reusable tableware
696 the best option? Analysis of the aviation catering sector with a life cycle approach. *SCI TOTAL ENVIRON*,
697 708, 135121. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2019.135121>

698 Boesen, S., Bey, N., & Niero, M. (2019). Environmental sustainability of liquid food packaging: Is there a gap
699 between Danish consumers' perception and learnings from life cycle assessment?. *J CLEAN PROD*, 210,
700 1193-1206. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.11.055>

701 Bole, R. (2006). Life Cycle Optimization of Residential Clothes Washer Replacements (Doctoral dissertation).
702 <http://hdl.handle.net/2027.42/36308>

703 Bortolini, M., Galizia, F. G., Mora, C., Botti, L., & Rosano, M. (2018). Bi-objective design of fresh food supply
704 chain networks with reusable and disposable packaging containers. *J CLEAN PROD*, 184, 375-388.

705 Breiting, S., & Mogensen, F. (1999). Action competence and environmental education. *CAMB J EDUC*, 29(3), 349-
706 353. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0305764990290305>

707 Brown, Natalie. “20 Cheap Products To Replace A Whole Bunch Of Disposable Plastic.” BuzzFeed, BuzzFeed, 23
708 Feb. 2019, www.buzzfeed.com/nataliebrown/cheap-use-less-disposable-single-use-plastic.

709 Budholiya, Abhishek (2019). “Straw Market Is Estimated to Expand at a CAGR of Nearly 6% during 2019 to 2029 -
710 Future Market Insights.” PR Newswire: News Distribution, Targeting and Monitoring. Retrieved from
711 [www.prnewswire.com/news-releases/straw-market-is-estimated-to-expand-at-a-cagr-of-nearly-6-during-](http://www.prnewswire.com/news-releases/straw-market-is-estimated-to-expand-at-a-cagr-of-nearly-6-during-2019-to-2029--future-market-insights-300854913.html)
712 [2019-to-2029--future-market-insights-300854913.html](http://www.prnewswire.com/news-releases/straw-market-is-estimated-to-expand-at-a-cagr-of-nearly-6-during-2019-to-2029--future-market-insights-300854913.html).

713 Cantwell, G., Nolan, M., Corser, M. (2019). More than Half of Consumers Would Pay More for Sustainable
714 Products Designed to Be Reused or Recycled, Accenture Survey Finds. Retrieved from

715 [https://newsroom.accenture.com/news/more-than-half-of-consumers-would-pay-more-for-sustainable-](https://newsroom.accenture.com/news/more-than-half-of-consumers-would-pay-more-for-sustainable-products-designed-to-be-reused-or-recycled-accenture-survey-finds.htm)
716 [products-designed-to-be-reused-or-recycled-accenture-survey-finds.htm](https://newsroom.accenture.com/news/more-than-half-of-consumers-would-pay-more-for-sustainable-products-designed-to-be-reused-or-recycled-accenture-survey-finds.htm).

717 Cherif, H., & Belhadj, J. (2018). Environmental Life Cycle Analysis of Water Desalination Processes. In
718 Sustainable Desalination Handbook (pp. 527-559). Butterworth-Heinemann. [https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-](https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-809240-8.00015-0)
719 [12-809240-8.00015-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-809240-8.00015-0)

720 Chitaka, T. Y., Russo, V., & von Blottnitz, H. (2020). In pursuit of environmentally friendly straws: a comparative
721 life cycle assessment of five straw material options in South Africa. *INT J LIFE CYCLE ASS*, 25(9), 1818-
722 1832. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11367-020-01786-w>

723 Cottafava, D., Costamagna, M., Baricco, M., Corazza, L., Miceli, D., & Riccardo, L. E. (2020). Assessment of the
724 environmental break-even point for deposit return systems through an LCA analysis of single-use and reusable
725 cups. *Sustainable Production and Consumption*, 27, 228-241.

726 De Kleine, R. (2009). Life cycle optimization of residential air conditioner replacement (Doctoral dissertation).
727 <http://hdl.handle.net/2027.42/64483>

728 Edwards, D. C. (Environmental A. (1998). *Life cycle assessment of supermarket carrier bags: a review of the bags*
729 *available in 2006*. *J PHOTOCH PHOTOBIO B* (Vol. 46). [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1011-1344\(98\)00196-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1011-1344(98)00196-1)

730 Englishman, Katherine Oakes. "10 Plastic-Free Kitchen Essentials To Help You Go Zero Waste On A Budget." The
731 Good Trade, The Good Trade, 22 Apr. 2020, [www.thegoodtrade.com/features/plastic-free-kitchen-essentials-](http://www.thegoodtrade.com/features/plastic-free-kitchen-essentials-on-a-budget)
732 [on-a-budget](http://www.thegoodtrade.com/features/plastic-free-kitchen-essentials-on-a-budget).

733 EPA. (2016). WARM Containers, Packaging, and Non-Durable Good Materials Chapters, (February). Retrieved
734 from [https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2016-03/documents/warm_v14_containers_packaging_non-](https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2016-03/documents/warm_v14_containers_packaging_non-durable_goods_materials.pdf)
735 [durable_goods_materials.pdf](https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2016-03/documents/warm_v14_containers_packaging_non-durable_goods_materials.pdf)

736 EPA. (2019). Advancing Sustainable Materials Management: Facts and Figures Report. *United States*
737 *Environmental Protection Agency*, (November). Retrieved from [https://www.epa.gov/facts-and-figures-about-](https://www.epa.gov/facts-and-figures-about-materials-waste-and-recycling/advancing-sustainable-materials-management%0Ahttps://www.epa.gov/smm/advancing-sustainable-materials-management-facts-and-figureures-report)
738 [materials-waste-and-recycling/advancing-sustainable-materials-](https://www.epa.gov/facts-and-figures-about-materials-waste-and-recycling/advancing-sustainable-materials-management%0Ahttps://www.epa.gov/smm/advancing-sustainable-materials-management-facts-and-figureures-report)
739 [management%0Ahttps://www.epa.gov/smm/advancing-sustainable-materials-management-facts-and-](https://www.epa.gov/facts-and-figures-about-materials-waste-and-recycling/advancing-sustainable-materials-management%0Ahttps://www.epa.gov/smm/advancing-sustainable-materials-management-facts-and-figureures-report)
740 [Figureures-report](https://www.epa.gov/facts-and-figures-about-materials-waste-and-recycling/advancing-sustainable-materials-management%0Ahttps://www.epa.gov/smm/advancing-sustainable-materials-management-facts-and-figureures-report)

741 European Commission. (2018). A European Strategy for Plastics in a Circular Economy. *COM(2018) 28 Final*,
742 *SWD(2018)(1)*, 1–18. Retrieved from [https://ec.europa.eu/environment/circular-economy/pdf/plastics-](https://ec.europa.eu/environment/circular-economy/pdf/plastics-strategy.pdf)
743 [strategy.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/environment/circular-economy/pdf/plastics-strategy.pdf)

Franklin Associates. (2018). Life Cycle Impacts of Plastic Packaging Compared to Substitutes in the United States and Canada: Theoretical Substitution Analysis. <https://www.plasticpackagingfacts.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/Life-Cycle-Impacts-of-Plastic-Packaging-Compared-to-Substitutes-in-the-United-States-and-Canada.pdf>

Franklin Associates. (2011). Life Cycle Inventory of Foam Polystyrene, Paper-based, and PLA Food Service Products. Retrieved from https://www.plasticfoodservicefacts.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/Peer_Reviewed_Foodservice_LCA_Study-2011.pdf

Gallego-Schmid, A., Mendoza, J. M. F., & Azapagic, A. (2019). Environmental impacts of takeaway food containers. *J CLEAN PROD*, 211, 417-427.

Garrido, N., & Del Castillo, M. D. A. (2007). Environmental evaluation of single-use and reusable cups. *INT J LIFE CYCLE ASS*, 12(4), 252-256. <https://doi.org/10.1065/lca2007.05.334>

Godfrey, L. (2019). Waste plastic, the challenge facing developing countries—ban it, change it, collect it?. *RECYCL*, 4(1), 3. <https://doi.org/10.3390/recycling4010003>

Greene, J. (2011). Life cycle assessment of reusable and single-use plastic bags in California. California State University. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Joseph_Greene2/publication/268297813_Life_Cycle_Assessment_of_Reusable_and_Single-use_Plastic_Bags_in_California/links/556cca2408aeccd7773be900/Life-Cycle-Assessment-of-Reusable-and-Single-use-Plastic-Bags-in-California.pdf

Herberz, T., Barlow, C., Finkbeiner, M. 2020. "Sustainability Assessment of a Single-Use Plastics Ban" *Sustainability* 12, no. 9: 3746.

Horie, Y. A. (2004). Life Cycle Optimization of Household Refrigerator-Freezer Replacement. Center for Sustainable Systems.

Insights, Future Market. "Straw Market Is Estimated to Expand at a CAGR of Nearly 6% during 2019 to 2029 - Future Market Insights." PR Newswire: News Distribution, Targeting and Monitoring, 22 May 2019, www.prnewswire.com/news-releases/straw-market-is-estimated-to-expand-at-a-cagr-of-nearly-6-during-2019-to-2029--future-market-insights-300854913.html.

International Organization for Standardization. (2006). Environmental management — Life cycle assessment — Principles and framework (ISO/DIS Standard No. 14040). Retrieved from <https://www.iso.org/standard/37456.html>

773 International Organization for Standardization. (2006). Environmental management — Life cycle assessment —
 774 Requirements and guidelines (ISO/DIS Standard No. 14044). Retrieved
 775 from <https://www.iso.org/standard/38498.html>

776 Jensen, B. B., & Schnack, K. (1997). The action competence approach in environmental education. *ENVIRON*
 777 *EDUC RES*, 3(2), 163-178. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1350462970030205>

778 Jung, L. W., Al-Shehhi, M. R., Saffarini, R., Warshay, B., & Arafat, H. A. (2011). Paper or Plastic? Clearing
 779 Misconceptions on Environmental Impacts of Coffee Cups Using Life Cycle Assessment (LCA). *on Water,*
 780 *Energy and Environment* 2011, 563.

781 Kimmel, Sc.D., Robert M., "Life Cycle Assessment of Grocery Bags in Common Use in the United States" (2014).
 782 *Environmental Studies*. 6. https://tigerprints.clemson.edu/cudp_environment/6

783 Kitts, Kayla, and Maria Conti. "13 Zero-Waste Kitchen Buys Under \$20." HGTV, 21 Sept. 2020,
 784 www.hgtv.com/lifestyle/clean-and-organize/reusable-home-products.

785 Leighton, Mara. "24 Cheap and Easy Replacements for Plastic in Your Home and Kitchen." *Business Insider*,
 786 *Business Insider*, 9 July 2019, [www.businessinsider.com/household-plastic-alternatives-eco-](http://www.businessinsider.com/household-plastic-alternatives-eco-friendly-2018-8#washable-mesh-produce-bags-1)
 787 [friendly-2018-8#washable-mesh-produce-bags-1](http://www.businessinsider.com/household-plastic-alternatives-eco-friendly-2018-8#washable-mesh-produce-bags-1).

788 Ligthart, T. N., & Ansems, A. M. M. (2007). Single-use cups or reusable (coffee) drinking systems: an
 789 environmental comparison. TNO, Apeldoorn.

790 Madival, S., Auras, R., Singh, S. P., & Narayan, R. (2009). Assessment of the environmental profile of PLA, PET
 791 and PS clamshell containers using LCA methodology. *J CLEAN PROD*, 17(13), 1183-1194.

792 MarketInsightsReports (2019). Green Packaging Market - Growth, Trends, And Forecasts (2019 - 2024). Retrieved
 793 from [https://www.marketinsightsreports.com/reports/04021169060/green-packaging-market-growth-trends-](https://www.marketinsightsreports.com/reports/04021169060/green-packaging-market-growth-trends-and-forecasts-2019-2024)
 794 [and-forecasts-2019-2024](https://www.marketinsightsreports.com/reports/04021169060/green-packaging-market-growth-trends-and-forecasts-2019-2024)

795 Milà-i-Canals, L., Lewis, Y., Notten, P., Virdin, J., Chiaroni-Clarke, R., Gerrard, J., & Pye, T. (2020). Addressing
 796 Single-Use Plastic Products Pollution using a Life Cycle Approach. Life Cycle Initiative.
 797 [https://www.lifecycleinitiative.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/Webinar-SUPP-Series-A-](https://www.lifecycleinitiative.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/Webinar-SUPP-Series-A-Webinar-1-6-October.pdf)
 798 [Webinar-1-6-October.pdf](https://www.lifecycleinitiative.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/Webinar-SUPP-Series-A-Webinar-1-6-October.pdf)

799 Miller, S. A. (2020). Five Misperceptions Surrounding the Environmental Impacts of Single-Use Plastic. *ENVIRON*
 800 *SCI TECHNOL*. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.0c05295>

801 Openbare Afvalstoffenmaatschappij voor het Vlaamse Gewest. (2006). Comparative LCA of 4 types of drinking
802 cups used at events. Retrieved from [https://www.natureworksllc.com/~media/Files/NatureWorks/What-is-](https://www.natureworksllc.com/~media/Files/NatureWorks/What-is-Ingeo/Why-it-Matters/LCA/OVAM_Cup_ComparativeLCA_FullReport_0206_pdf.pdf)
803 [Ingeo/Why-it-Matters/LCA/OVAM_Cup_ComparativeLCA_FullReport_0206_pdf.pdf](https://www.natureworksllc.com/~media/Files/NatureWorks/What-is-Ingeo/Why-it-Matters/LCA/OVAM_Cup_ComparativeLCA_FullReport_0206_pdf.pdf)

804 Porras, G. Y., Keoleian, G. A., Lewis, G. M., & Seeba, N. (2020). A guide to household manual and machine
805 dishwashing through a life cycle perspective. *ENVIRON RES COMMUN*, 2(2), 021004.
806 <https://doi.org/10.1088/2515-7620/ab716b>

807 Postacchini L, Bevilacqua M, Paciarotti C, Mazzuto G., 2016. LCA methodology applied to the realisation of a
808 domestic plate: confrontation among the use of three different raw materials. *Int J Prod Qual Manag*, 18, 325-
809 346.

810 Potting, J., & van der Harst, E. (2015). Facility arrangements and the environmental performance of disposable and
811 reusable cups. *INT J LIFE CYCLE ASS*, 20(8), 1143-1154. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11367-015-0914-7>

812 Razza, F., Fieschi, M., Degli Innocenti, F., & Bastioli, C. (2009). Compostable cutlery and waste management: An
813 LCA approach. *Waste management*, 29(4), 1424-1433.

814 Ro, Lauren. "The Best Products for a Sustainable Kitchen, According to Experts." *The Strategist*, The Strategist, 12
815 Mar. 2020, nymag.com/strategist/article/best-eco-friendly-sustainable-kitchen-items-reusable.html.

816 Robelia, B. A., Greenhow, C., & Burton, L. (2011). Environmental learning in online social networks: Adopting
817 environmentally responsible behaviors. *ENVIRON EDUC RES*, 17(4), 553-575.
818 <https://doi.org/10.1080/13504622.2011.565118>

819 Saouter, E., & Andreasent, I. (2006). Costs and benefits of communicating product safety information to the public
820 via the internet. *INTEGR ENVIRON ASSES*, 2(2), 191-195. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ieam.5630020212>

821 Schnurr, R. E., Alboiu, V., Chaudhary, M., Corbett, R. A., Quanz, M. E., Sankar, K., ... & Walker, T. R. (2018).
822 Reducing marine pollution from single-use plastics (SUPs): A review. *MAR POLLUT BULL*, 137, 157-171.
823 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2018.10.001>

824 Singh, A. K., Singh, A., & Engelhardt, M. (1997). The lognormal distribution in environmental applications. In
825 Technology Support Center Issue Paper.

826 Spitzley, D. V., Grande, D. E., Keoleian, G. A., & Kim, H. C. (2005). Life cycle optimization of ownership costs
827 and emissions reduction in US vehicle retirement decisions. *TRANSPORT RES D-TR E*, 10(2), 161-175.
828 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trd.2004.12.003>

829 Steenis, N. D., van Herpen, E., van der Lans, I. A., Ligthart, T. N., & van Trijp, H. C. (2017). Consumer response to
830 packaging design: The role of packaging materials and graphics in sustainability perceptions and product
831 evaluations. *J CLEAN PROD*, 162, 286-298. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.06.036>

832 Takou, V., Boldrin, A., Astrup, T. F., & Damgaard, A. (2019). LCA of Single Use Plastic Products in Denmark.

833 UNEP. (2018). Single-Use Plastic: A Roadmap for Sustainability. United Nation Environment Programme.

834 UNEP. (2020). Single-use plastic bags and their alternatives. Recommendations from Life Cycle Assessments, 76.

835 U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) & Bureau of Transportation Statistics (2017). Freight Facts and Figures.

836 van der Harst, E., & Potting, J. (2013). A critical comparison of ten disposable cup LCAs. *ENVIRON IMPACT*
837 *ASSES*, 43, 86-96. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eiar.2013.06.006>

838 Wells, Kaitlyn. "How to Break Your Single-Use Plastics Habit." *The New York Times*, *The New York Times*, 16
839 Apr. 2019, [www.nytimes.com/2019/04/16/smarter-living/wirecutter/stop-using-single-use-](http://www.nytimes.com/2019/04/16/smarter-living/wirecutter/stop-using-single-use-plastics.html)
840 [plastics.html](http://www.nytimes.com/2019/04/16/smarter-living/wirecutter/stop-using-single-use-plastics.html).

841 Woods, L., & Bakshi, B. R. (2014). Reusable vs. disposable cups revisited: guidance in life cycle comparisons
842 addressing scenario, model, and parameter uncertainties for the US consumer. *INT J LIFE CYCLE ASS*,
843 19(4), 931-940. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11367-013-0697-7>

844

845


846

847

848

Figures

Figure 1: System boundary of single-use and reusable products. Processes highlighted in red are only associated with reusable products.



871 Figure 2: Breakdown of percent contributed to overall impacts by each life cycle phase. A) Functional Unit: 1 Use;
872 B) Functional Unit: 1 Year (5 Uses/Week)




Figure 3: Environmental impact per use for straw products at functional units of 1 Use, 1 Year (5 uses/week) and 5 Years (5 uses/week). A) GWP B) Water Use C) Primary Energy Use




Table 1. Payback period for GWP, Water Use and Energy Use of Reusable Alternatives

Straws				
	Bamboo	Glass	Metal	Silicone
GWP	Did Not Breakeven	163	229	70
Water Use	Did Not Breakeven	Did Not Breakeven	Did Not Breakeven	Did Not Breakeven
Energy Use	Did Not Breakeven	20	37	16
Sandwich Bags				
	Beeswax Wrap	Silicone		
GWP	Did Not Breakeven	Did Not Breakeven		
Water Use	Did Not Breakeven	Did Not Breakeven		
Energy Use	Did Not Breakeven	Did Not Breakeven		
Coffee Cups				
	Metal	Reusable Plastic	Ceramic	
GWP	111	43	16	
Water Use	Did Not Breakeven	Did Not Breakeven	67	
Energy Use	288	210	32	
Forks				
	Bamboo	Reusable Plastic	Metal	
GWP	1	4	8	
Water Use	37	4	11	
Energy Use	1	5	4	

Figure 4: Sensitivity analysis showing percent changes in overall GWP for products in 1 Year (260 use) scenario when variables were ranged by +/- 50% A) Reusable Products B) Single-Use Products






Figure 5: Monte Carlo Analysis Results – Percent of Trials in each Payback Period category when a) washed after every use and b) when washed after every other use



a.



b.

Supplemental Material

S1. Product List

Straws	• Bamboo Straw: Jungle Straws – Organic 8” Reusable Bamboo Drinking Straws • Glass Straw: One Ocean Straw Kit – 9” Regular Glass Straw • Metal Straw: Manna Stainless Steel Straw – 9.5” • Paper Straw • Plastic Straw • Silicone Straw: 8.25” Softy Silicone Straw – Slender Size BPA Free Non-Rubber Silicon Reusable
Sandwich Bags	• Beeswax Wrap: Chef Sous Chef Homemade Reusable Beeswax Wraps (14” x 14”) • Plastic Wrap: • Plastic Bag: Ziploc Brand Sandwich Bags – Easy Open Tabs • Silicone Bag: Stasher reusable silicone sandwich bag • Aluminum Foil:
Coffee Cups	• Paper Coffee Cup • Metal Mug: Yeti 14 oz Rambler Mug • Reusable Plastic Mug: Tervis Clear and Colorful 16 oz Mug with Tervis Travel Lid • Foam Coffee Cup • Ceramic Mug
Forks	• Plastic Fork • Bamboo Fork • Reusable Plastic Fork • Metal Fork

949 S2. Product Lifespans
950

Product	Lifespan
Bamboo Straw	6 months
Glass Straw	Lifetime
Metal Straw	Lifetime
Paper Straw	Single Use
Plastic Straw	Single Use
Silicone Straw	Lifetime
Beeswax Wrap	1 year
Plastic Wrap	Single Use
Plastic Bag	Single Use
Silicone Bag	Lifetime
Aluminum Foil	Single Use
Paper Coffee Cup	Single Use
Metal Mug	Lifetime
Reusable Plastic Mug	Lifetime
Foam Coffee Cup	Single Use
Ceramic Mug	Lifetime
Plastic Fork	Single Use
Bamboo Fork	3 years
Reusable Plastic Fork	Lifetime
Metal Fork	Lifetime

951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964

965 S3. Material Allocation

966

967 Life Cycle Inventory of Input Material Flow (unit: kg)

Straws						
	Bamboo Straw	Glass Straw	Metal Straw*	Paper Straw	Plastic Straw*	Silicone Straw*
Bamboo Pole	0.0044					
Borosilicate Glass Tube		0.015				
Chromium Steel 18/8			0.011			
Kraft Paper				0.0011		
Polypropylene					0.00071	
Silicone						0.0053
Sandwich Bags						
	Beeswax Wrap	Plastic Wrap*	Plastic Bag*	Silicone Bag*	Aluminum Foil*	
Cotton	0.026					
Beeswax ¹	0.075					
Resin ²	0.020					
Jojoba Oil ³	0.028					
LDPE		0.001	0.001			
LLDPE			0.001			
Silicone				0.073		
Aluminum					0.006	
Coffee Cups						
	Paper Coffee Cup*	Metal Mug*	Reusable Plastic Mug*	Foam Coffee Cup*	Ceramic Mug	
Packaging Board	0.0097					
HDPE	0.0004					
Polystyrene	0.0026			0.0026		
Chromium Steel 18/8		0.18				
PET		0.038	0.12			
Polystyrene EPS				0.0015		
Ceramic Tile					0.32	
Forks						
	Plastic Fork*	Bamboo Fork	Reusable Plastic Fork*	Metal Fork*		
Bamboo Pole		0.007				
Chromium Steel 18/8				0.019		
Polypropylene	0.002		0.017			
Polystyrene	0.002					

968

969 *Additional manufacturing process step(s) were included in the model

970 Due to lack of emission factor data on specific materials:

971 ¹Emissions factor for honey is used for Beeswax

972 ²Emissions factor for Epoxy Resin is used for Resin

973 ³Emissions factor for Cottonseed Oil is used for Jojoba Oil

974

Material	Source	Item
Bamboo	Escamilla, E. Z., et al., 2014	Bamboo Pole
Glass	Ecoinvent 3 - allocation, cut-off by classification, system	Glass tube, borosilicate {RoW} production, cut-off, S
Steel	Ecoinvent 3 - Allocation, cut-off by classification - system	Steel, chromium steel 18/8 {GLO} market for Cut-off, S
Paper	Ecoinvent 3 - Allocation, cut-off by classification - system	Kraft paper, bleached {GLO} market for cut off, s
Polypropylene	Ecoinvent 3 - Allocation, cut-off by classification - system	Polypropylene, granulate {GLO} market for Cut-off, S
Silicone	Ecoinvent 3 - Allocation, cut-off by classification - system	Silicone product {RoW} market for silicone product cut-off, S
Cotton	Ecoinvent 3 - Allocation, cut-off by classification - system	Textile, woven cotton {GLO} market for cut-off, s
Honey	World Food LCA Database	Honey, raw, large-scale production, unpackaged, at farm (WFLDB)/US U
Epoxy Resin	Ecoinvent 3 - Allocation, cut-off by classification - system	Epoxy resin, liquid {RoW} market for epoxy resin, liquid cut-off, s
Cottonseed Oil	Ecoinvent 3 - Allocation, cut-off by classification - system	Cottonseed Oil, refined {GLO} market for Cut-off, S
LDPE	Ecoinvent 3 - Allocation, cut-off by classification - system	Polyethylene, low density, granulate {GLO} market for cut-off, S
LLDPE	Ecoinvent 3 - Allocation, cut-off by classification - system	Polethylene, linear low density, granulate {GLO} market for cut-off, S
Aluminum	Ecoinvent 3 - Allocation, cut-off by classification - system	Aluminum, primary, cast alloy slab from continuous casting {GLO} market for cut-off, s
Paperboard	Ecoinvent 3 - Allocation, cut-off by classification - system	Solid bleached board {GLO} market for cut-off s
HDPE	Ecoinvent 3 - Allocation, cut-off by classification - system	Polyethylene, high density, granulate {GLO} market for cut-off, s
Polystyrene	Ecoinvent 3 - Allocation, cut-off by classification - system	Polystyrene, general purpose {GLO} market for cut-off, S
PET	Ecoinvent 3 - Allocation, cut-off by classification - system	Polyethylene terephthalate, granulate, bottle grade {GLO} market for Cut-off, S
Polystyrene EPS	Ecoinvent 3 - Allocation, cut-off by classification - system	polystyrene, expandable {GLO} market for cut-off, s
Ceramic Tile	Ecoinvent 3 - Allocation, cut-off by classification - system	Ceramic tile {GLO} market for cut-off S
Nylon	Ecoinvent 3 - Allocation, cut-off by classification - system	Nylon 6-6 {RoW} market for nylon 6-6 cut-off s

983 S5. Material GWP Emissions Factors

984

Units: KG	Emissions	Unit
Bamboo	1.31	kg CO ₂ e / kg bamboo pole
Glass	2.25	kg CO ₂ e / kg glass tube
Steel	4.4	kg CO ₂ e / kg stainless steel
Paper	1.46	kg CO ₂ e / kg paper
Polypropylene	2.3	kg CO ₂ e / kg PP
Silicone	3.28	kg CO ₂ e / kg silicone
Cotton	10.9	kg CO ₂ e /kg textile
Honey	0.971	kg CO ₂ e / kg honey
Epoxy Resin	5.15	kg CO ₂ e / kg resin
Cottonseed Oil	3.25	kg CO ₂ e / kg oil
LDPE	2.5	kg CO ₂ e/ kg LDPE
LLDPE	2.3	kg CO ₂ e / kg LLDPE
Aluminum	18.5	kg CO ₂ e / kg aluminum
Paperboard	1.26	kg CO ₂ e / kg paperboard
HDPE	2.32	kg CO ₂ e / kg HDPE
Polystyrene	3.76	kg CO ₂ e /kg polystyrene
PET	2.9	kg CO ₂ e / kg PET
Polystyrene EPS	3.64	kg CO ₂ e / kg EPS
Ceramic Tile	0.797	kg CO ₂ e / kg ceramic tile
Nylon	8.34	kg CO ₂ e / kg nylon

985

986

987

988

989

990

991

992

993

994

995

996

997

998

999

1000 S6. Material Water Use Factors

1001

Material	Water Use	Unit
Bamboo	1.6	m ³ / kg bamboo
Glass	0.0155	m ³ / kg glass tube
Steel	0.0198	m ³ / kg steel
Paper	0.0458	m ³ / kg paper
Polypropylene	0.0207	m ³ / kg PP
Silicone	0.118	m ³ / kg silicone
Cotton	5.51	m ³ / kg cotton
Honey	0.0608	m ³ / kg honey
Epoxy Resin	0.0654	m ³ / kg epoxy resin
Cottonseed Oil	1.82	m ³ / kg cottonseed oil
LDPE	0.0321	m ³ / kg LDPE
LLDPE	0.0471	m ³ / kg LLDPE
Aluminum	0.104	m ³ / kg aluminum
Paperboard	0.0333	m ³ / kg paperbaord
HDPE	0.0238	m ³ / kg HDPE
Polystyrene	0.0525	m ³ / kg PS
PET	0.034	m ³ / kg PET
Polystyrene EPS	0.065	m ³ / kg EPS
Ceramic Tile	0.00642	m ³ / kg ceramic
Nylon	0.226	m ³ / kg nylon

1002

1003

1004

1005

1006

1007

1008

1009

1010

1011

1012

1013

1014

1015

1016

1017 S7. Material Energy Use Factors

1018

Material	Energy	Unit
Bamboo	19.3	MJ primary/ kg bamboo stem
Glass	29.3	MJ primary/ kg glass tube
Steel	51.2	MJ primary/ kg stainless steel
Paper	21.9	MJ primary/kg paper
Polypropylene	81.2	MJ primary/ kg PP
Silicone	55	MJ primary/ kg silicone
Cotton	116	MJ primary/ kg textile
Honey	13.9	MJ primary/ kg honey
Epoxy Resin	104	MJ primary/ kg resin
Cottonseed Oil	28.7	MJ primary/ kg oil
LDPE	81.7	MJ primary/ kg LDPE
LLDPE	78.9	MJ primary/ kg LLDPE
Aluminum	189	MJ primary/ kg aluminum
Paperboard	17.6	MJ primary/ kg paperboard
HDPE	79.4	MJ primary/ kg HDPE
Polystyrene	88.8	MJ primary/ kg polystyrene
PET	74.1	MJ primary/ kg PET
Polystyrene EPS	90.4	MJ primary/ kg EPS
Ceramic Tile	11.6	MJ primary/ kg ceramic
Nylon	137	MJ primary/kg nylon

1019

1020

1021

1022

1023

1024

1025

1026

1027

1028

1029

1030

1031

1032

1033

1034 S8. Manufacturing Allocation

1035

	Metal Straw	Plastic Straw	Silicone Straw	Plastic Wrap	Plastic Bag	Silicone Bag	Aluminum Foil	Paper Cup	Metal Mug	Reusable Plastic Mug	Foam Cup	Plastic Fork	Reusable Plastic Fork	Metal Fork
Steel Product Manufacturing	X								X					X
Plastic Extrusion (PP)		X												
Injection Molding (Silicone)			X			X								
Blow Molding (LDPE)				X	X									
Extrusion (LLDPE)					X									
Aluminum Product Manufacturing							X							
Thermoforming (PS)								X			X	X		
Injection Molding (PET)									X	X				
Thermoforming (PP)												X	X	
Blow Molding (LLDPE)														

1036

1037

1038

1039

1040

1041

1042

1043

1044

1045

1046

1047

1048

1049

1050

1051

S9. Manufacturing Sources

Process	Source	Item
Steel Product Manufacturing	Ecoinvent 3 - Allocation, cut-off by classification - system	Metal working, average for chromium steel product manufacturing {GLO} market for, cut-off S
Plastic Extrusion (PP)	Ecoinvent 3 - Allocation, cut-off by classification - system	Extrusion, plastic pipes {GLO} market for cut-off, s
Injection Molding (Silicone)	Ecoinvent 3 - Allocation, cut-off by classification - system	Injection Moulding {GLO} market for cut-off, s
Blow Molding (LDPE)	Ecoinvent 3 - Allocation, cut-off by classification - system	Blow Moulding {GLO} market for cut-off, S
Extrusion (LLDPE)	Ecoinvent 3 - Allocation, cut-off by classification - system	Extrusion, plastic film {GLO} market for, cut-off S
Aluminum Product Manufacturing	Ecoinvent 3 - Allocation, cut-off by classification - system	Metal working, average for aluminum product manufacturing {GLO} market for, cut-off S
Thermoforming (PS)	Ecoinvent 3 - Allocation, cut-off by classification - system	Thermoforming, with calendering {GLO} market for cut-off, s
Injection Molding (PET)	Ecoinvent 3 - Allocation, cut-off by classification - system	Injection Moulding {GLO} market for cut-off, s
Thermoforming (PP)	Ecoinvent 3 - Allocation, cut-off by classification - system	Thermoforming, with calendering {GLO} market for cut-off, s
Blow Molding (LLDPE)	Ecoinvent 3 - Allocation, cut-off by classification - system	Blow Moulding {GLO} market for cut-off, S

S10. Manufacturing GWP Emission Factors

Process	Emissions	Unit
Steel Product Manufacturing	2.61	kg CO ₂ e / kg steel processed
Plastic Extrusion (PP)	0.439	kg CO ₂ e / kg plastic extruded
Injection Molding (Silicone)	1.29	kg CO ₂ e / kg silicone moulded
Blow Molding (LDPE)	1.33	kg CO ₂ e / kg LDPE moulded
Extrusion (LLDPE)	0.571	kg CO ₂ e / kg LLDPE extruded
Aluminum Product Manufacturing	3.91	kg CO ₂ e / kg aluminum processed
Thermoforming (PS)	0.876	kg CO ₂ e / kg PS processed
Injection Molding (PET)	1.28	kg CO ₂ e / kg PET processed
Thermoforming (PP)	0.876	kg CO ₂ e / kg PP processed
Blow Molding (LLDPE)	1.33	kg CO ₂ e / kg LLDPE processed

1062 S11. Manufacturing Water Use Factors

Process	Water Use	Unit
Steel Product Manufacturing	0.0165	m ³ / kg steel processed
Plastic Extrusion (PP)	0.0108	m ³ / kg plastic extruded
Injection Molding (Silicone)	0.014	m ³ / kg silicone moulded
Blow Molding (LDPE)	0.0144	m ³ / kg LDPE moulded
Extrusion (LLDPE)	0.0217	m ³ / kg LLDPE extruded
Aluminum Product Manufacturing	0.028	m ³ / kg aluminum processed
Thermoforming (PS)	0.0478	m ³ / kg PS processed
Injection Molding (PET)	0.0139	m ³ / kg PET processed
Thermoforming (PP)	0.0478	m ³ / kg PP processed
Blow Molding (LLDPE)	0.0144	m ³ / kg LLDPE processed

1063
1064 S12. Manufacturing Energy Use Factors

Process	Energy	Unit
Steel Product Manufacturing	33.1	MJ primary/ kg steel processed
Plastic Extrusion (PP)	6.15	MJ primary/ kg plastic extruded
Injection Molding (Silicone)	22.2	MJ primary/ kg silicone moulded
Blow Molding (LDPE)	20.8	MJ primary/ kg LDPE moulded
Extrusion (LLDPE)	8.31	MJ primary/ kg LLDPE extruded
Aluminum Product Manufacturing	45.2	MJ primary/ kg aluminum processed
Thermoforming (PS)	13.9	MJ primary/ kg PS processed
Injection Molding (PET)	22	MJ primary/ kg PET processed
Thermoforming (PP)	13.9	MJ primary/ kg PP processed
Blow Molding (LLDPE)	20.8	MJ primary/ kg LLDPE processed

1066
1067
1068
1069
1070
1071
1072
1073
1074
1075
1076
1077

S13. Transportation Environmental Impact Factors, Distance and Sources

Transport	Source	Item
Freight	Ecoinvent 3 - Allocation, cut-off by classification - system	Transport, freight lorry >32 metric ton, euro4 {RoW} market for, transport, freight, lorry >32 metric ton, euro4 cut-off, S

Transport	Emissions	Unit
Freight	9.23E-05	kg Co2e/ kgkm

Transport	Water Use	Unit
Freight	1.74E-07	m ³ / kgkm

Transport	Energy	Unit
Freight	0.00152	MJ primary/ kgkm

Transport	Source	Distance
Freight	U.S. DOT, 2017	402.336 km

1104 S14. Use Phase Allocation

1105

Product	Dishwashing Method
Bamboo Straw	Manual
Glass Straw	Machine
Metal Straw	Machine
Paper Straw	N/A
Plastic Straw	N/A
Silicone Straw	Machine
Beeswax Wrap	Manual
Plastic Wrap	N/A
Plastic Bag	N/A
Silicone Bag	Machine
Aluminum Foil	N/A
Paper Coffee Cup	N/A
Metal Mug	Machine
Reusable Plastic Mug	Machine
Foam Coffee Cup	N/A
Ceramic Mug	Machine
Plastic Fork	N/A
Bamboo Fork	Manual
Reusable Plastic Fork	Machine
Metal Fork	Machine

1106

1107

1108

1109

1110

1111

1112

1113

1114

1115

1116

1117

1118

1119

1120 S15. Use Phase Source and Environmental Impact Factors

1121

Dishwashing Method	Source
Machine	Porras et al., 2020
Manual	Porras et al., 2020

1122

Dishwashing Method	GWP	Unit
Machine	0.000160137	kg CO ₂ e /in ²
Manual	0.000430608	kg CO ₂ e /in ²

1123

Dishwashing Method	Water Use	Unit
Machine	0.00000472766	m ³ /in ²
Manual	0.00000991939	m ³ /in ²

1124

Dishwashing Method	Energy Use	Unit
Machine	0.00292147	MJ primary /in ²
Manual	0.007263028	MJ primary /in ²

1125

1126

1127

1128

1129

1130

1131

1132

1133

1134

1135

1136

1137

1138

1139

1140

1141

1142

1143

1144

1145 S16. Product Surface Area Calculations

1146

Product	Surface Area (in ²)
Bamboo Straw	12.06
Glass Straw	13.57
Metal Straw	12.81
Silicone Straw	12.44
Beeswax Wrap	392
Silicone Bag	210
Metal Mug	144.51
Reusable Plastic Mug	144.51
Ceramic Mug	119.38
Bamboo Fork	3.16
Reusable Plastic Fork	3.3
Metal Fork	3.12

1147

Product	Equation	R (in)	H (in)	X (in)	Y (in)	Assumptions
Bamboo Straw	$2\pi RH*2$	0.12	8			No difference between inner and outer radius
Glass Straw	$2\pi RH*2$	0.12	9			No difference between inner and outer radius
Metal Straw	$2\pi RH*2$	0.12	8.5			No difference between inner and outer radius
Silicone Straw	$2\pi RH*2$	0.12	8.25			No difference between inner and outer radius
Beeswax Wrap	$2*XY$			14	14	www.chefsouschef.com
Silicone Bag	$2*XY$			7	7.5	www.stasherbag.com
Metal Mug	$(2*(2\pi R^2+2\pi RH))$	2	3.75			www.yeti.com
Reusable Plastic Mug	$(2*(2\pi R^2+2\pi RH))$	2	3.75			Assumed same size as Yeti
Ceramic Mug	$2\pi R^2+(2*2\pi RH)$	2	3.75			Assumed same size as Yeti (minus lid)

1148

Bamboo Fork	$2*(\text{Handle}+\text{Neck}+\text{Tines})$	Handle (4in x .2in), Neck (1in x .9in), Tines (1.1in x .15in)
Reusable Plastic Fork	$2*(\text{Handle}+\text{Neck}+\text{Tines})$	Handle (4in x .25in), Neck (.8in x .8in), Tines (1.1in x .15in)
Metal Fork	$2*(\text{Handle}+\text{Neck}+\text{Tines})$	Handle (4in x .2in), Neck (1in x .9in), Tines (1in x .155in)

1149 S17. Use Phase Emission Factor Calculation
 1150
 1151 Estimation of Dishes Used in Porras et al., 2020 Study
 1152

Dish Type	Quantity	Surface Area (in ²)
Dinner Plate	8	157.08
Bread and Butter Plate	8	71.57
Fruit Bowl	8	59.69
Cup	8	43.39
Saucer	8	56.55
Serving Bowl	1	70.69
Platter	2	462.60
Glass – Iced Tea	8	110.04
Flatware- Knife	8	8.76
Flatware – Dinner Fork	4	7.3
Flatware – Salad Fork	3	5.54
Flatware - Teaspoon	7	20.54
Flatware – Serving Fork	1	10.13
Flatware – Serving Spoon	1	95.98
Plastic Bowl	2	123.84
Spatula	1	34.4
Baking Dish	1	440
TOTAL	79	6070.37

1153

	Manual Dishwashing	Machine Dishwashing
Total Emissions for 2150 loads (kg CO ₂ e)	5620	2090
Emissions Factor (kg CO ₂ e /in ² dish)	0.000430608	0.000160137

1154

	Manual Dishwashing	Machine Dishwashing
Total Water Use for 2150 loads (m ³)	34200	16300
Water Use Factor (m ³ /in ² dish)	0.00000991939	0.00000472766

1155

	Manual Dishwashing	Machine Dishwashing
Total Energy Use for 2150 loads (MJ primary)	94792	38129
Energy Use Factor (MJ primary /in ² dish)	0.007263028	0.00292147

1156

1157 S18. Use Alternate Scenario GWP Emission Factor Calculations

1158

	Washing Type	Grid	Water Heater Type	Percent Change	Emissions (kg CO ₂ e per 2150 loads)	Emissions (kg CO ₂ e /in ²)
Base Case	Machine	Average US Electric Grid	natural gas heater	N/A	2090	0.00016014
Base Case	Manual	Average US Electric Grid	natural gas heater	N/A	5620	0.00043061
Cleaner Grid	Machine	NYUP Grid	natural gas heater	-29%	1483.9	0.0001137
Cleaner Grid	Manual	NYUP Grid	natural gas heater	0%	5620	0.00043061
Dirty Grid	Machine	MROE Grid	natural gas heater	26%	2633.4	0.00020177
Dirty Grid	Manual	MROE Grid	natural gas heater	0%	5620	0.00043061
Electric heater	Machine	Average US Electric Grid	electric heater	30%	2717	0.00020818
Electric heater	Manual	Average US Electric Grid	electric heater	38%	7755.6	0.00059424
Clean grid electric heater	Machine	NYUP Grid	electric heater	-32%	1421.2	0.00010889
Clean grid electric heater	Manual	NYUP Grid	electric heater	-38%	3484.4	0.00026698
Dirty grid electric heater	Machine	MROE Grid	electric heater	86%	3887.4	0.00029786
Dirty grid electric heater	Manual	MROE Grid	electric heater	108%	11689.6	0.00089567

1159

1160 S19. Use Alternate Scenario Water Use Factor Calculations

1161

	Washing Type	Grid	Water Heater Type	Percent Change	Water Use (m ³ per 2150 loads)	Water Use (m ³ /in ^{^2})
Base Case	Machine	Average US Electric Grid	natural gas heater	N/A	16300	0.00000472766
Base Case	Manual	Average US Electric Grid	natural gas heater	N/A	34200	0.00000991939
Cleaner Grid	Machine	NYUP Grid	natural gas heater	-29%	12877	0.00000373485
Cleaner Grid	Manual	NYUP Grid	natural gas heater	0%	34200	0.00000991939
Dirty Grid	Machine	MROE Grid	natural gas heater	26%	20538	0.00000595686
Dirty Grid	Manual	MROE Grid	natural gas heater	0%	34200	0.00000991939
Electric heater	Machine	Average US Electric Grid	electric heater	30%	21190	0.00000614596
Electric heater	Manual	Average US Electric Grid	electric heater	38%	47196	0.0000136888
Clean grid electric heater	Machine	NYUP Grid	electric heater	-32%	11084	0.00000321481
Clean grid electric heater	Manual	NYUP Grid	electric heater	-38%	21204	0.00000615002
Dirty grid electric heater	Machine	MROE Grid	electric heater	86%	30318	0.00000879345
Dirty grid electric heater	Manual	MROE Grid	electric heater	108%	71136	0.0000206323

1162

1163

	Washing Type	Grid	Water Heater Type	Percent Change	Energy Use (MJ primary per 2150 loads)	Energy Use (MJ primary /in^2)
Base Case	Machine	Average US Electric Grid	natural gas heater	N/A	38129	0.00292147
Base Case	Manual	Average US Electric Grid	natural gas heater	N/A	94792	0.007263028
Cleaner Grid	Machine	NYUP Grid	natural gas heater	-29%	27072	0.00207428
Cleaner Grid	Manual	NYUP Grid	natural gas heater	0%	94792	0.00726303
Dirty Grid	Machine	MROE Grid	natural gas heater	26%	48043	0.00368109
Dirty Grid	Manual	MROE Grid	natural gas heater	0%	94792	0.00726303
Electric heater	Machine	Average US Electric Grid	electric heater	30%	49568	0.00379793
Electric heater	Manual	Average US Electric Grid	electric heater	38%	130813	0.01002298
Clean grid electric heater	Machine	NYUP Grid	electric heater	-32%	25928	0.00198662
Clean grid electric heater	Manual	NYUP Grid	electric heater	-38%	58771	0.00450307
Dirty grid electric heater	Machine	MROE Grid	electric heater	86%	70920	0.00543394
Dirty grid electric heater	Manual	MROE Grid	electric heater	108%	197167	0.01510707

1167 S21. EoL Average Percentages

1168

Item	% Landfilled	% Recycled	% Composted	% Combusted
Organic Matter	75.31%	N/A	6.30%	18.37%
Glass	60.37%	26.60%	N/A	13.01%
Steel (or stainless steel)	55.21%	32.70%	N/A	12.12%
Paper	27.38%	65.90%	N/A	6.70%
Polypropylene	75.83%	8.40%	N/A	15.80%
Silicone	72.67%	N/A	N/A	27.33%
Polyethylene	75.83%	8.40%	N/A	15.80%
Polystyrene	75.83%	8.40%	N/A	15.80%
PET	75.83%	8.40%	N/A	15.80%
General Plastic	75.83%	8.40%	N/A	15.80%
Ceramic	100.00%	N/A	N/A	N/A
Textile	66.02%	15.20%	N/A	18.77%
Aluminum	69.19%	16.20%	N/A	14.62%

1169 Source - Advancing Sustainable Materials Management: 2017 Fact Sheet

1170

1171

1172

1173

1174

1175

1176

1177

1178

1179

1180

1181

1182

1183

1184

1185

1186

1187

1188

1189

Disposal	Source	Item
Compost Biowaste	Ecoinvent 3 - Allocation, cut-off by classification - system	Compost {CH} treatment of biowaste, industrial composting cut-off, S
Sanitary Landfill - Wood	Ecoinvent 3 - Allocation, cut-off by classification - system	Waste wood, untreated {RoW} treatment of, sanitary landfill, cut-off, S
Incineration - Wood	Ecoinvent 3 - Allocation, cut-off by classification - system	Waste wood, untreated {RoW} treatment of waste wood, untreated, municipal incineration, cut-off, S
Recycle - Glass	Ecoinvent 3 - Allocation, cut-off by classification - system	Packaging glass, white (waste treatment) {GLO} recycling of packaging glass, white cut-off, S
Sanitary Landfill - Glass	Ecoinvent 3 - Allocation, cut-off by classification - system	Inert waste {RoW} treatment of, sanitary landfill, cut-off, S
Incineration - Glass	Ecoinvent 3 - Allocation, cut-off by classification - system	Waste glass {RoW} treatment of waste glass, municipal incineration cut-off, S
Recycle - Steel	Ecoinvent 3 - Allocation, cut-off by classification - system	Steel and iron (waste treatment) {GLO} recycling of steel and iron, cut-off, S
Sanitary Landfill - Steel	Ecoinvent 3 - Allocation, cut-off by classification - system	Inert waste {RoW} treatment of, sanitary landfill, cut-off, S
Incineration - Steel	Ecoinvent 3 - Allocation, cut-off by classification - system	Scrap Steel {CH} treatment of, municipal incineration, cut-off, S
Sanitary Landfill - Paperboard	Ecoinvent 3 - Allocation, cut-off by classification - system	Waste paperboard {RoW} treatment of, sanitary landfill cut-off, S
Incineration - Paperboard	Ecoinvent 3 - Allocation, cut-off by classification - system	Waste paperboard {RoW} treatment of, municipal incineration, cut-off, S
Recycle - PP	Ecoinvent 3 - Allocation, cut-off by classification - system	PP (waste treatment) {GLO} recycling of PP cut-off, s
Sanitary Landfill - PP	Ecoinvent 3 - Allocation, cut-off by classification - system	Waste polypropylene {RoW} treatment of waste polypropylene, sanitary landfill, cut-off, S
Incineration - PP	Ecoinvent 3 - Allocation, cut-off by classification - system	Waste polypropylene {RoW} treatment of waste polypropylene, municipal incineration, cut-off, S
Sanitary Landfill - Silicone	Ecoinvent 3 - Allocation, cut-off by classification - system	Waste plastic, mixture {RoW} treatment of waste plastic, mixture, sanitary landfill, cut-off, S
Incineration - Silicone	Ecoinvent 3 - Allocation, cut-off by classification - system	Waste plastic, mixture {RoW} treatment of waste plastic, mixture, municipal incineration, cut-off, S
Landfill - Textile	Ecoinvent 3 - Allocation, cut-off by classification - system	Waste textile, soiled {RoW} market for waste textile, soiled, cut-off, S
Incineration - Textile	Ecoinvent 3 - Allocation, cut-off by classification - system	Waste textile, soiled {RoW} treatment of, municipal incineration, cut-off, S
Recycle - PE	Ecoinvent 3 - Allocation, cut-off by classification - system	PE (waste treatment) {GLO} recycling of PE, cut-off, S
Landfill - PE	Ecoinvent 3 - Allocation, cut-off by classification - system	Waste polyethylene {RoW} treatment of waste polyethylene, sanitary landfill, cut-off, S
Incineration - PE	Ecoinvent 3 - Allocation, cut-off by classification - system	Waste polyethylene {RoW} treatment of waste polyethylene, municipal solid waste, cut-off, S

Recycle - Aluminum	Ecoinvent 3 - Allocation, cut-off by classification - system	Aluminum (waste treatment) {GLO} recycling of aluminum, cut-off, S
Landfill - Aluminum	Ecoinvent 3 - Allocation, cut-off by classification - system	Waste aluminum {RoW} treatment of waste aluminum, sanitary landfill, cut-off, S
Incineration - Aluminum	Ecoinvent 3 - Allocation, cut-off by classification - system	Scrap aluminum {RoW} treatment of, municipal incineration, cut-off, S
Recycle - PS	Ecoinvent 3 - Allocation, cut-off by classification - system	PS (waste treatment) {GLO} recycling of PS, cut-off, S
Landfill - PS	Ecoinvent 3 - Allocation, cut-off by classification - system	Waste polystyrene {RoW} treatment of waste polystyrene, sanitary landfill, cut-off, S
Incineration - PS	Ecoinvent 3 - Allocation, cut-off by classification - system	Waste polystyrene {RoW} treatment of waste polystyrene, municipal incineration, cut-off, S
Recycle - PET	Ecoinvent 3 - Allocation, cut-off by classification - system	PET (waste treatment) {GLO} recycling of PET, cut-off, S
Landfill - PET	Ecoinvent 3 - Allocation, cut-off by classification - system	Waste polyethylene {RoW} treatment of waste polyethylene, sanitary landfill, cut-off, S
Incineration - PET	Ecoinvent 3 - Allocation, cut-off by classification - system	Waste polyethylene {RoW} treatment of waste polyethylene, municipal incineration, cut-off, S
Landfill - Ceramic	Ecoinvent 3 - Allocation, cut-off by classification - system	Inert waste {RoW} treatment of, sanitary landfill, cut-off, S
Incineration - EPS	Ecoinvent 3 - Allocation, cut-off by classification - system	Waste expanded polystyrene {RoW} treatment of, municipal incineration, cut-off, S

1191
1192
1193
1194
1195
1196
1197
1198
1199
1200
1201
1202
1203
1204
1205
1206
1207
1208
1209
1210
1211
1212

1213 S23. EoL Emission Factors

Disposal	Emissions	Unit
Compost Biowaste	0	kg CO ₂ e / kg composted
Sanitary Landfill - Wood	0.0748	kg CO ₂ e / kg landfilled
Incineration - Wood	0.0138	kg CO ₂ e / kg incinerated
Recycle - Glass	0	kg CO ₂ e / kg recycled
Sanitary Landfill - Glass	0.0104	kg CO ₂ e / kg landfilled
Incineration - Glass	0.0177	kg CO ₂ e / kg incinerated
Recycle - Steel	0	kg CO ₂ e / kg recycled
Sanitary Landfill - Steel	0.0104	kg CO ₂ e / kg landfilled
Incineration - Steel	0.00987	kg CO ₂ e / kg incinerated
Sanitary Landfill - Paperboard	1.52	kg CO ₂ e / kg landfilled
Incineration - Paperboard	0.0307	kg CO ₂ e / kg incinerated
Recycle - PP	0	kg CO ₂ e / kg recycled
Sanitary Landfill - PP	0.11	kg CO ₂ e / kg landfilled
Incineration - PP	2.55	kg CO ₂ e / kg incinerated
Sanitary Landfill - Silicone	0.102	kg CO ₂ e / kg landfilled
Incineration - Silicone	2.37	kg CO ₂ e / kg incinerated
Landfill - Textile	0.729	kg CO ₂ e / kg landfilled
Incineration - Textile	0.733	kg CO ₂ e / kg incinerated
Recycle - PE	0	kg CO ₂ e / kg recycled
Landfill - PE	0.128	kg CO ₂ e / kg landfilled
Incineration - PE	3.02	kg CO ₂ e / kg incinerated
Recycle - Aluminum	0	kg CO ₂ e / kg recycled
Landfill - Aluminum	0.0391	kg CO ₂ e / kg landfilled
Incineration - Aluminum	0.0142	kg CO ₂ e / kg incinerated
Recycle - PS	0	kg CO ₂ e / kg recycled
Landfill - PS	0.135	kg CO ₂ e / kg landfilled
Incineration - PS	3.19	kg CO ₂ e / kg incinerated
Recycle - PET	0	kg CO ₂ e / kg recycled
Landfill - PET	0.128	kg CO ₂ e / kg landfilled
Incineration - PET	3.02	kg CO ₂ e / kg incinerated
Landfill - Ceramic	0.0104	kg CO ₂ e / kg landfilled
Incineration - EPS	3.18	kg CO ₂ e / kg incinerated

1214
1215
1216
1217
1218

1219 S24. EoL Water Use Factors

Disposal	Water Use	Unit
Compost Biowaste	0	m ³ / kg composted
Sanitary Landfill - Wood	0.000262	m ³ / kg landfilled
Incineration - Wood	-0.000212	m ³ / kg incinerated
Recycle - Glass	0	m ³ / kg recycled
Sanitary Landfill - Glass	0.00026	m ³ / kg landfilled
Incineration - Glass	-0.000119	m ³ / kg incinerated
Recycle - Steel	0	m ³ / kg recycled
Sanitary Landfill - Steel	0.263	m ³ / kg landfilled
Incineration - Steel	0.000594	m ³ / kg incinerated
Sanitary Landfill - Paperboard	0.000333	m ³ / kg landfilled
Incineration - Paperboard	0.00124	m ³ / kg incinerated
Recycle - PP	0	m ³ / kg recycled
Sanitary Landfill - PP	0.000262	m ³ / kg landfilled
Incineration - PP	0.000163	m ³ / kg incinerated
Sanitary Landfill - Silicone	0.000265	m ³ / kg landfilled
Incineration - Silicone	0.000352	m ³ / kg incinerated
Landfill - Textile	0.00138	m ³ / kg landfilled
Incineration - Textile	0.00139	m ³ / kg incinerated
Recycle - PE	0	m ³ / kg recycled
Landfill - PE	0.000262	m ³ / kg landfilled
Incineration - PE	0.000274	m ³ / kg incinerated
Recycle - Aluminum	0	m ³ / kg recycled
Landfill - Aluminum	0.000424	m ³ / kg landfilled
Incineration - Aluminum	-0.000206	m ³ / kg incinerated
Recycle - PS	0	m ³ / kg recycled
Landfill - PS	0.000262	m ³ / kg landfilled
Incineration - PS	0.000271	m ³ / kg incinerated
Recycle - PET	0	m ³ / kg recycled
Landfill - PET	0.000262	m ³ / kg landfilled
Incineration - PET	0.000274	m ³ / kg incinerated
Landfill - Ceramic	0.00026	m ³ / kg landfilled
Incineration - EPS	0.000811	m ³ / kg incinerated

1220
1221
1222
1223
1224

1225 S25. EoL Energy Use Factors

Disposal	Energy	Unit
Compost Biowaste	0	MJ primary/ kg composted
Sanitary Landfill - Wood	0.266	MJ primary/ kg landfilled
Incineration - Wood	0.000424	MJ primary/ kg incinerated
Recycle - Glass	0	MJ primary/ kg recycled
Sanitary Landfill - Glass	0.263	MJ primary/ kg landfilled
Incineration - Glass	0.369	MJ primary/ kg incinerated
Recycle - Steel	0	MJ primary/ kg recycled
Sanitary Landfill - Steel	0.263	MJ primary/ kg landfilled
Incineration - Steel	0.185	MJ primary/ kg incinerated
Sanitary Landfill - Paperboard	0.397	MJ primary/ kg landfilled
Incineration - Paperboard	0.24	MJ primary/ kg incinerated
Recycle - PP	0	MJ primary/ kg recycled
Sanitary Landfill - PP	0.266	MJ primary/ kg landfilled
Incineration - PP	0.259	MJ primary/ kg incinerated
Sanitary Landfill - Silicone	0.272	MJ primary/ kg landfilled
Incineration - Silicone	0.47	MJ primary/ kg incinerated
Landfill - Textile	1.68	MJ primary/ kg landfilled
Incineration - Textile	1.65	MJ primary/ kg incinerated
Recycle - PE	0	MJ primary/ kg recycled
Landfill - PE	0.267	MJ primary/ kg landfilled
Incineration - PE	0.298	MJ primary/ kg incinerated
Recycle - Aluminum	0	MJ primary/ kg recycled
Landfill - Aluminum	0.599	MJ primary/ kg landfilled
Incineration - Aluminum	0.282	MJ primary/ kg incinerated
Recycle - PS	0	MJ primary/ kg recycled
Landfill - PS	0.268	MJ primary/ kg landfilled
Incineration - PS	0.293	MJ primary/ kg incinerated
Recycle - PET	0	MJ primary/ kg recycled
Landfill - PET	0.267	MJ primary/ kg landfilled
Incineration - PET	0.298	MJ primary/ kg incinerated
Landfill - Ceramic	0.263	MJ primary/ kg landfilled
Incineration - EPS	0.309	MJ primary/ kg incinerated

1226
1227
1228
1229
1230

1231 S26. EoL Allocation

	Bamboo Straw	Glass Straw	Metal Straw	Paper Straw	Plastic Straw	Silicone Straw
Compost Biowaste	X					
Sanitary Landfill - Wood	X					
Incineration - Wood	X					
Recycle - Glass		X				
Sanitary Landfill - Glass		X				
Incineration - Glass		X				
Recycle - Steel			X			
Sanitary Landfill - Steel			X			
Incineration - Steel			X			
Sanitary Landfill - Paperboard				X		
Incineration - Paperboard				X		
Sanitary Landfill - PP					X	
Incineration - PP					X	
Sanitary Landfill - Silicone						X
Incineration - Silicone						X

1232

1233

1234

1235

1236

1237

1238

1239

1240

1241

1242

1243

	Beeswax Wrap	Plastic Wrap	Plastic Bag	Silicone Bag	Aluminum Foil
Compost Biowaste	X				
Sanitary Landfill - Silicone				X	
Incineration - Silicone				X	
Landfill - Textile	X				
Incineration - Textile	X				
Recycle - PE		X	X		
Landfill - PE		X	X		
Incineration - PE		X	X		
Recycle - Aluminum					X
Landfill - Aluminum					X
Incineration - Aluminum					X

1244
1245
1246
1247
1248
1249
1250
1251
1252
1253
1254
1255
1256
1257
1258

	Paper Coffee Cup	Metal Mug	Reusable Plastic Mug	Foam Cup	Ceramic Mug
Recycle – Steel		X			
Sanitary Landfill – Steel		X			
Incineration – Steel		X			
Sanitary Landfill – Paperboard	X				
Incineration - Paperboard	X				
Landfill – PE	X				
Incineration – PE	X				
Recycle – PS	X			X	
Landfill – PS	X			X	
Incineration – PS	X			X	
Recycle – PET		X	X		
Landfill – PET		X	X		
Incineration – PET		X	X		
Landfill – Ceramic					X
Incineration - EPS				X	

1259
1260
1261
1262
1263
1264
1265
1266
1267
1268

	Plastic Fork	Bamboo Fork	Reusable Plastic Fork	Metal Fork
Compost Biowaste		X		
Sanitary Landfill – Wood		X		
Incineration - Wood		X		
Recycle – Steel				X
Sanitary Landfill – Steel				X
Incineration – Steel				X
Recycle - PP	X		X	
Sanitary Landfill – PP	X		X	
Incineration – PP	X		X	
Recycle – PS	X			
Landfill – PS	X			
Incineration - PS	X			

1269
1270
1271
1272
1273
1274
1275
1276
1277
1278
1279
1280
1281
1282
1283
1284
1285
1286
1287
1288

S27. Environmental Impact Calculations

The procedure for calculating GHG emissions for reusable and single-use products, and the payback period is summarized below.

$$E_O = E_M + E_T + E_U + E_E \quad (1)$$

where E_O is the overall emissions (kg CO₂e) associated with the product(s) necessary to reach the functional unit usage requirements defined in each scenario.

E_M is the overall material emissions (kg CO₂e) associated with material extraction and manufacturing of the product(s). It is defined as follows:

$$E_M = \sum M_{EN} * MA_N * X \quad (2)$$

where M_E is the material emissions factor for N material $\left(\frac{kg\ CO_2e}{kg\ material}\right)$, MA_N is the mass of N material per product $\left(\frac{kg\ N\ material}{product}\right)$, and X is the number of products being used in the scenario.

E_T is the transportation emissions (kg CO₂e) for moving the product system. This is determined by:

$$E_T = T_E * MA_T * X * D \quad (3)$$

where T_E is the transportation method emissions factor $\left(\frac{kg\ CO_2e}{kg*km}\right)$, MA_T is total mass per product $\left(\frac{kg}{product}\right)$, X is number of products being transported, and D is distance traveled (km).

E_U is the use phase emissions (kg CO₂e) associated with the washing of the reusable product. For single-use products, the emissions from this life cycle stage will be zero. Use phase emissions can be calculated:

$$E_U = DW_E * X * U * SA \quad (4)$$

where DW_E is the dishwashing emissions factor per square inch of dish $\left(\frac{kg\ CO_2e}{in^2\ dish}\right)$, X is the number of products, U is the number of times a product is used (and therefore washed), and SA is the surface area per product $\left(\frac{in^2}{product}\right)$.

E_E is the end-of-life emissions (kg CO₂e). Products may be landfilled, composted, combusted or recycled. This is found by doing a summation of the different applicable disposal methods:

$$E_E = \sum DE_{ZN} * MA_N * X * \overline{DM_{ZN}} \quad (5)$$

where DE_Z is disposal method emissions factor for Z disposal scenario of N material $\left(\frac{kg\ CO2e}{kg\ N\ material}\right)$, MA_N is the mass of N material per product $\left(\frac{kg\ N\ material}{product}\right)$, X is the number of products, and $\overline{DM}$ is the average percentage of material that goes towards Z disposal method.

Using these equations payback period can be calculated. The subscript R is used to designate reusables, and S is used for single-use.

$$\begin{aligned} 1. \quad & E_{RM} + E_{RT} + E_{RU} + E_{RE} = E_{SM} + E_{ST} + E_{SE} \\ 2. \quad & M_{RE} * MA_R + T_E * MA_R * D + DW_E * U * SA_R + DE_R * MA_R * DM_R = M_{SE} * MA_S * U + T_E * MA_S * \\ & D * U + DE_S * MA_S * DM_S * U \end{aligned}$$


where M_{RE} is the material emissions factor for the reusable product $\left(\frac{kg\ CO2e}{product}\right)$; MA_R is the mass of the reusable product $\left(\frac{kg}{product}\right)$; T_E is transportation method emissions factor $\left(\frac{kg\ CO2e}{kg*km}\right)$; D is the distance transported (km); DW_E is the dishwasher emissions factor per inch squared of renewable product $\left(\frac{kg\ CO2e}{in^2\ dish}\right)$; U is the number of uses or the payback period (uses); SA_R is the surface area of the renewable product $\left(\frac{in^2}{product}\right)$; DE_R is the disposal method emissions factor for the renewable product $\left(\frac{kg\ CO2e}{product}\right)$; DM_R is the average disposal method percentages for the reusable product; M_{SE} is the material emissions factor for the single-use product $\left(\frac{kg\ CO2e}{product}\right)$; MA_S is the mass per single-use product $\left(\frac{kg\ N\ material}{product}\right)$; DE_S is the disposal method emissions factor for the single-use product $\left(\frac{kg\ CO2e}{product}\right)$; and DM_R is the average disposal method percentages for the single-use product.

Then solve for U.


$$U = \frac{M_{RE} * MA_R + T_E * MA_R * D + DE_R * MA_R * DM_R}{M_{SE} * MA_S + T_E * MA_S * D + DE_S * MA_S * DM_S - DW_E * SA_R} \quad (6)$$

S28. Sandwich Bag Environmental Impact Per Use Results


a) GWP



b) Water Use




c) Primary Nonrenewable Energy Use




S29. Coffee Cup Environmental Impact Per Use Results


a) GWP



b) Water Use




c) Primary Nonrenewable Energy Use




S30. Fork Environmental Impact Per Use Results


a) GWP



b) Water Use



c) Primary Nonrenewable Energy Use



1409 S31. Monte Carlo Material Ranges

	Low Emissions Factor Value	Average Emissions Factor Value	High Emissions Factor Value	Emissions Unit
Bamboo	1.179	1.31	1.441	kg CO ₂ e/kg bamboo
Glass	2.025	2.25	2.475	kg CO ₂ e/kg glass
Steel	3.96	4.4	4.84	kg CO ₂ e/kg steel
Paper	1.314	1.46	1.606	kg CO ₂ e/kg paper
Polypropylene	2.07	2.3	2.53	kg CO ₂ e/kg PP
Silicone	2.952	3.28	3.608	kg CO ₂ e/kg silicone
Cotton	9.81	10.9	11.99	kg CO ₂ e/kg cotton
Honey	0.8739	0.971	1.0681	kg CO ₂ e/kg honey
Epoxy Resin	4.635	5.15	5.665	kg CO ₂ e/kg resin
Cottonseed Oil	2.925	3.25	3.575	kg CO ₂ e/kg oil
LDPE	2.25	2.5	2.75	kg CO ₂ e/kg LDPE
LLDPE	2.07	2.3	2.53	kg CO ₂ e/kg LLDPE
Aluminum	16.65	18.5	20.35	kg CO ₂ e/kg aluminum
Paperboard	1.134	1.26	1.386	kg CO ₂ e/kg paperboard
HDPE	2.088	2.32	2.552	kg CO ₂ e/kg HDPE
Polystyrene	3.384	3.76	4.136	kg CO ₂ e/kg PS
PET	2.61	2.9	3.19	kg CO ₂ e/kg PET
Polystyrene EPS	3.276	3.64	4.004	kg CO ₂ e/kg EPS
Ceramic Tile	0.7173	0.797	0.8767	kg CO ₂ e/kg ceramic
Nylon	7.506	8.34	9.174	kg CO ₂ e/kg nylon

1410

1411 *Because ranges were not available for all materials, a range of +/- 10% was ran for all materials in order to

1412 maintain uniformity between products.

1413

1414

1415

1416

1417

1418

1419

1420

1421

1422

1423

1424

S32. Monte Carlo Manufacturing Ranges

	Low Emissions Factor Value	Average Emissions Factor Value	High Emissions Factor Value	Emissions Unit
Steel Product Manufacturing	2.349	2.61	2.871	kg CO ₂ e/kg steel
Plastic Extrusion (PP)	0.3951	0.439	0.4829	kg CO ₂ e/kg PP
Injection Molding (Silicone)	1.161	1.29	1.419	kg CO ₂ e/kg silicone
Blow Molding (LDPE)	1.197	1.33	1.463	kg CO ₂ e/kg LDPE
Extrusion (LLDPE)	0.5139	0.571	0.6281	kg CO ₂ e/kg LLDPE
Aluminum Product Manufacturing	3.519	3.91	4.301	kg CO ₂ e/kg aluminum
Thermoforming (PS)	0.7884	0.876	0.9636	kg CO ₂ e/kg PS
Injection Molding (PET)	1.152	1.28	1.408	kg CO ₂ e/kg PET
Thermoforming (PP)	0.7884	0.876	0.9636	kg CO ₂ e/kg PP
Blow Molding (LLDPE)	1.197	1.33	1.463	kg CO ₂ e/kg LLDPE

S33. Monte Carlo Transportation Distance Ranges

	Low Distance	Average Distance	High Distance	Unit
Transportation Distance	160.93	402.34	1609.34	km

Source: U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) & Bureau of Transportation Statistics (2017). Freight Facts and Figures.

1447 S34. Monte Carlo EoL Ranges

1448

	Low Emissions Factor Value	Average Emissions Factor Value	High Emissions Factor Value	Emissions Unit
Bamboo Straw	0	0.05886694	0.0748	kg CO ₂ e/kg disposed
Glass Straw	0	0.00858125	0.0177	kg CO ₂ e/kg disposed
Metal Straw	0	0.006938084	0.0104	kg CO ₂ e/kg disposed
Silicone Straw	0.102	0.7218444	2.37	kg CO ₂ e/kg disposed
Plastic Straw	0	0.486313	2.55	kg CO ₂ e/kg disposed
Beeswax Wrap	0	0.683662	0.733	kg CO ₂ e/kg disposed
Silicone Bag	0.102	0.7218444	2.37	kg CO ₂ e/kg disposed
Plastic Bag	0	0.5742224	3.02	kg CO ₂ e/kg disposed
Metal Mug	0	0.105822506	0.535009174	kg CO ₂ e/kg disposed
Reusable Plastic Mug	0	0.5742224	3.02	kg CO ₂ e/kg disposed
Ceramic Mug	0.104	0.104	0.104	kg CO ₂ e/kg disposed
Paper Coffee Cup	0.027618909	0.85700467	1.904545455	kg CO ₂ e/kg disposed
Bamboo Fork	0	0.05886694	0.0748	kg CO ₂ e/kg disposed
Reusable Plastic Fork	0	0.486313	2.55	kg CO ₂ e/kg disposed
Metal Fork	0	0.006938084	0.0104	kg CO ₂ e/kg disposed
Plastic Fork	0	2.186611	2.87	kg CO ₂ e/kg disposed

1449

1450

1451

1452

1453

1454

1455

1456

1457

1458

1459

1460

1461

1462

1463

1464

1465