

HB

862



DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

RECYCLING INFORMATION OFFICE

1234 S.W. MORRISON STREET • PORTLAND, ORE. 97205 • Telephone (503) 229- 5119

ROBERT W. STRAUB
GOVERNOR

Mr. Doug Schoenberg
House Health, Education & Social Services
Alaska State Legislature
Pouch V
Juneau, Alaska 99801

Dear Doug:

It was a pleasure to talk to you. Here is the material I promised to send. I am including a recent memo from this office to Governor Straub's office answering the innacurate statements by Alcoa aluminum. There are also a copy of the bill, two sheets from a publication by Don Waggoner of the Oregon Environmental Council, and a summary of the effects of the bill which has some attachments showing research reports obtainable, litter data, etc. I hope these will be helpful to you and to Representative Sullivan.

As I said on the phone, in response to your question about "our difficulties with the bill," we have no difficulties whatever with the bill. I think the greatest evidence of this is the ADS study survey of public opinion which showed that 95% of those interviewed had an opinion and and of those 95% approved of the law. To me, this means that the bottle bill is working very well indeed.

Please give my best regards to all our friends in and around the Alaska Legislature. Let us know if you need any more information.

Sincerely,

Loren Kramer, Director

Jane Cease
Public Information Representative

JC





State of Oregon
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

INTEROFFICE MEMO

To: Keith Burns, Assistant to the Governor

Date: April 22, 1976

From: Bill Bree, Recycling Information Office

Subject: Inaccurate statements about the Oregon Bottle Bill

Following is a brief analysis of the advertising statements being used in other states about the Oregon Bottle Bill which you forwarded to this office. They are, to say the least, highly inaccurate.

Statement: "Total roadside beverage container litter has increased since the passage of the Bottle Bill."

Fact: This is not true. Beverage container litter has been reduced by over 70% the first year and over 80% the second year after passage of the Bottle Bill. This sharp decrease in litter has been clearly recorded in the three year litter collection and survey undertaken by the State of Oregon.

Example: Here are the actual beverage container litter counts from 18 different highway litter survey sites for the months of February through August.

| 1972 | 1973 | 1974 |
|-------------------|-------|-------|
| 14,770 containers | 2,950 | 2,349 |

Statement: "Beverage prices have gone up because of the Bottle Bill."

Fact: The Bottle Bill has not contributed to the inflationary rises in beer and soft drink prices. The costs of sugar, energy, and labor across the nation have been responsible for major price increases. These national trends mask any cost savings which are a result of the Bottle Bill.

Example: The following information is from an Oregon Liquor Control Commission survey of beverage prices taken one and one-half years after passage of the Oregon Bottle Bill. Prices were surveyed in Portland, Oregon and Vancouver, Washington.

| Supermarket prices | | Vanc. | Port. |
|--------------------|------------------------|--------|--------|
| | 6 pack 11 oz. stubbies | \$1.34 | \$1.13 |
| | 24 pack 11 oz. | 5.13 | 4.48 |
| Convenience stores | 6 pack 11 oz. | 1.42 | 1.35 |
| | 6 pack 11 oz. | 1.38 | 1.27 |
| | 24 pack 11 oz. | 4.92 | 4.87 |
| | 32 oz. quart | .58 | .49 |
| | 32 oz. | .54 | .45 |

Soft drink prices, while more variable, have the same price relationship.

Memo to Keith Burns
April 22, 1976
Page 2

Statement: "Beverage sales are lower since passage of the Bottle Bill."

Fact: Beverage sales have continued their traditional growth in Oregon.

Example: Oregon beer consumption:

| | |
|------|----------------------|
| 1971 | 40.6 million gallons |
| 1972 | 44.8 |
| 1973 | 46.3 |
| 1974 | 46.5 |
| 1975 | 48.5 |

Per capita consumption in Oregon:

| | |
|------|--------------|
| 1964 | 16.1 gallons |
| 1975 | 24.1 |

Data on soft drink sales and consumption is not available to the public for analysis.

Statement: "The Bottle Bill has deprived Oregonians of the freedom of choice.

Fact: Beverages of all types are still available in glass bottles, "tin" cans, bimetal cans, steel cans, and all aluminum cans.

Oregonians have a free choice to purchase what they wish and to throw away or to return containers for refunds.

Statement: "Oregon has lost the aluminum can."

Fact: Beer and soft drinks are available in Oregon in aluminum cans.

Brewers and bottlers have a free choice to use the type and size of container in which they want to market their product.

WRE: jr

STATEMENT OF DONALD W. WEBSTER, DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION,
STATE OF VERMONT, MONTPELIER, VERMONT 05602

TO: (Through Congressman James Jeffords)
Subcommittee on the Environment
House Commerce Committee

My name is Donald W. Webster. I am Director of Environmental Protec . within the Agency of Environmental Conservation of the State of Vermont. I am the principal State official involved in the administration of Vermont's Beverage Container Law.

While Vermont's existing law is a mandatory deposit law only, current pending legislation would ban non-refillable glass containers, flip-top cans, and plastic ring connectors. This legislation has passed our House of Representatives by an overwhelming margin (110 - 31) and is currently pending before the Vermont Senate, where unanimous approval was voted by its Natural Resources Committee.

Vermont's experience with a mandatory deposit law, which does not mandate the use of refillable containers, clearly indicates that this imperfection will not accomplish all of the objectives of proper beverage container legislation. Indeed, the lack of a mandatory refillable provision has permitted the national beverage and container industries to employ various measures to undercut the full effectiveness of the Law's intention, and to utilize Vermont as a battleground to teach the insurgents a lesson.

These industries, with the active consort and participation of the Vermont Retail Grocers Association, have engaged in a campaign of resistance, mis-information, coercion and distortion, not only in Vermont, but in all other parts of the country where similar legislation might be considered. To this end, they have succeeded in propagandizing their claims outside of Vermont, although their efforts in Vermont have not met with acceptance -- indeed defections from their ranks (largely due to their efforts, as well as the true success of the Law) are increasing of late.

Before discussing the proposal currently under your consideration, let me discuss some implications and experiences under the Vermont Law.

1. Impact and trend:

First, a small State such as Vermont, without actually mandating the use of refillable containers, cannot, of itself, influence a return to refillable containers by national producers. The economies of cost; which have induced local producers to utilize refillable containers, with significant economic benefit; cannot, by virtue of scale, act as a persuasion on national firms. Rather, the relative small scale of importance of the Vermont marketplace has resulted in a campaign of obfuscation and resistance far above Vermont's relative national importance.

However, despite these efforts, there has been, and there continues to be, overwhelming public support for the present law and for the mandating of the use of refillable containers.

2. Economic experience:

Much has been made, by detractors, of adverse economic impact of the Law upon Vermont.

However, before assumptions are to be drawn, more explanation is in order. It is true that during the initial phases of the implementation of the present Law, a loss in revenues from malt beverage taxes did occur. It is equally true that one of the reasons for its occurrence was "border-jumping" to neighboring States which did not have similar legislation -- particularly New Hampshire. However, other factors were of significant import, if not more meaningful:

1. Prior to the implementation of the Law, wholesalers and retailers stocked up with merchandise which was exempted from the Law by a regulatory "gentlemen's agreement". This action both inflated the

previous year's receipts (F.Y. 1973) and deflated the receipts for first year under the Law (F.Y. 1974).

2. Vermont experienced a disastrous flood on June 30, 1973, the day before the effective date of the Act, which seriously curtailed the Summer tourist and recreation industry.
3. The energy crisis commenced in Vermont in October 1973 and extended through May 1974. Despite Federal Energy Office claims of parity, the withdrawal of two national oil firms from the Vermont marketplace cut available motor vehicle fuel. Prices of 75¢ a gallon or higher, and gas-less stations at mid-month were not uncommon.
4. A dearth of snowfall seriously impacted the Vermont ski industry, with receipts declining 25%-50% during the first four months of 1974. Two major ski areas in Vermont have subsequently entered bankruptcy.
5. Highway traffic counts were off 16%-22% monthly during the period July 1973 - November 1974.
6. There are other important marketing practices and differences between Vermont and its neighbors, not related to the Beverage Container Deposit Law, particularly with New Hampshire. It is of much more importance vis-a-vis New Hampshire than with other neighbors because of a larger market population proximate to that State than with others.

First, Vermont's Malt Beverage Tax amounts to 56.25¢ per case, compared with New Hampshire's 25¢ per case. This, of itself, presents a less favorable market pricing to Vermont merchants. Secondly, New Hampshire wholesalers are permitted a post-off of price on merchandise in lots of 100 or more case purchases,

resulting in significant market advantage to New Hampshire merchants, as this practice is not permitted in Vermont. Vermont's reticence here is to protect small grocers against larger competitors.

Thirdly, New Hampshire merchants can use malt beverages as a loss leader to lure consumers. Vermont merchants cannot sell at less than wholesale price.

Fourthly, Vermont has a retail Sales Tax, New Hampshire does not -- and experience since Vermont's enactment of its Sales Tax has indicated that "border-jumping" occurs for this reason.

It should therefore be clearly discernible that these factors have been major factors in "border-jumping", and it is impossible to differentiate the relative impact of each contributory influence.

Much has been made of by the Law's detractors that Vermont's Rooms and Meals Taxes increased 9% during a comparable period. While the Malt Beverage Tax is a fixed tax based on gallonage, the Rooms and Meals Tax is a floating tax based on price. As Rooms and Meals prices during July 1, 1973 - November 1, 1974 increased in the range of 25%-30%, a 9% increase in receipts represents an actual 16%-21% decrease in actual customer contacts -- a figure which, coincidentally or not, closely parallels the decline in highway traffic during the same period.

3. Highway litter:

Highway litter has been significantly reduced -- the beverage container portion having declined 76.1%, with a spin-off impact in reducing other forms of litter.

Detractors note that actual litter collection costs have declined only \$45,000.00. This is true. However, it is impossible to measure aesthetic benefits to the environment, particularly in a State whose economy is so highly geared to

tourism and recreation as is Vermont's. Additionally, the intangible, but real, benefits to agriculture cannot be assigned an economic dollar value, although the agricultural community has truly benefitted.

4. Trend toward refillables:

Although the two largest domestic brewers have firmly resisted the return to refillable containers, some of the regional brands and Canadian producers have begun to make refillables available in the retail trade. All brands are available in refillable containers for in-house consumption in Bars and Clubs.

No less than eleven brands, foreign and domestic, are available in refillable bottles at the retail level. Conspicuously absent, generally, are Budweiser and Schlitz, the two largest producers -- although refillables of these brands have occasionally appeared.

Soft drink bottlers in Northern and Central Vermont have discontinued the use of non-returnable bottles and returned to refillables with encouraging results. Coca-Cola of Barre, Vermont, reports a return rate of 94% (16.67 uses) while Pepsi-Cola of Burlington, Vermont, reports a return rate of 98%.

5. Customer acceptance:

With a total return rate in excess of 90% (and higher in refillables, as previously indicated), customer acceptance is clearly indicated. A straw poll conducted by a Vermont State Senator indicates overwhelming public support.

6. Industry and consumer savings:

Coca-Cola of Barre, Vermont has reported a 54¢ a case operational savings, which permitted them to forestall price increases which sugar and syrup price increases would otherwise have necessitated.

Malt beverages are 35¢ a case cheaper in refillables. Doubtless, this differential would increase with a total refillable system. However, part of the cost of the use of non-refillables has no doubt absorbed some of the additional

savings which would otherwise have accrued.

7. Employment:

Vermont has no container manufacturers, and any adversity in this activity has not occurred. Gains in employment have occurred in the bottling, wholesale and retail trades.

The industry has been reticent in supplying employment figures. However, by extrapolating results of economic studies in other States, employment may have increased in the neighborhood of 150+- persons. This figure is based on a container return rate of 80%, and is no doubt conservative.

8. Recent experience:

Commencing in November of 1974, highway traffic counts in Vermont, for the first time since the inception of the Beverage Container Law, equalled historic figures. This is significant as Malt Beverage Tax Revenues for December 1974 were 16% over the previous year. This fiscal year, Malt Beverage Revenues (free of previous economic deterrents previously cited) are up 9.5% over fiscal 1974 (July 1, 1973 to June 30, 1974) and are running ahead of fiscal 1973 (despite that year's figures being inflated by "stocking-up" actions of wholesalers and retailers).

The legislation pending before you would be of tremendous importance to the Nation in the conservation of its basic natural resources and of its energy resources, as well as contributing to the solution of the ever-growing problems of solid waste.

Detailed analyses of these factors have been completed by the States of Oregon, Maryland, Michigan, New York and Connecticut; the Province of Ontario, Canada; LaBatt Brewery of Montreal, P.Q., Canada; Migros Cooperatives of Switzerland; and the Academy of Science in Sweden. Each report corroborates the others -- and the significant conclusions are as follows:

1. Basic material savings of 70%+- will be realized over the present usage of non-refillable containers.
2. Energy usage will be cut in half; such saving is comparable to that realized in the adoption of the national speed limit of 55 Miles Per Hour. Measures such as this are absolutely necessary if there is to be any hope of realizing "PROJECT INDEPENDENCE" by 1985.
3. Highway litter from beverage containers will be reduced by two-thirds, or more.
4. Employment and payrolls will be increased.
5. Material cost savings will be realized by consumers-- and cash flow in retail trade will be increased.

The reasons, and imperativeness, for the adoption of the legislation pending before you are clearly apparent -- and I add my endorsement to your favorable and expeditious action.

The time for action is NOW, and if this Nation is to move forward in the resolution of its internal concerns, favorable action on this pending legislation will be one step that is truly a "giant leap for mankind".

DWW:fmt



STATE OF VERMONT
DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS
MONTPELIER

05602

July 29, 1975

Mr. Stephen Pobin
Assistant Commonwealth Attorney
20 East Market Street
Leesburg, Virginia 22075

Dear Mr. Robin:

As per phone conversation, please find attached the summary sheets of a special litter evaluation project made in conjunction with the implementation of Vermont's "Bottle Law".

The evaluation project was conducted on thirty-five selected sections of roadway, on each of the four roadway classes (Interstate, 2-lane primary, state aid, and town highways) in each of our nine Highway Districts. A total of 177.8 miles is involved, or nominally five miles per roadway section.

One day each month was spent in litter cleaning and classifying retrieved material on each of the roadway types.

Classification consisted of sorting beverage containers by initial content and composition: beer cans, beer bottles, soda cans, soda bottles; all "other litter" was measured by "barrels", the "barrel" being a fifty-five gallon drum.

In order to equate the volume of beverage containers collected to barrels of "other litter", it was determined that the "average barrel" consisted of 260 bottles or 310 cans. Also, there are nominally 4 barrels to the cubic yard.

Initial litter pick ups were made in the months of June, 1973 and 1974, and these pick ups were made more for ridding the selected areas of winter dross than for comparative significance; a June comparison is made, however, on one of the attached summary sheets, and it is interesting to note the 62% increase in "other litter" in June, 1974.

On this same summary sheet you will note a comparison of total containers by type and roadway classification for the three month period, July through September for the years 1973 and 1974; the apparent effects of "the law" are glaringly obvious.

A second summary sheet, attached, is a comparison of "returnable" and "non-returnable" beverage containers by type, roadway class, and Highway District for the four month period, June through September 1974.

A "returnable" container is one on which a five cent deposit is required by Statute; that is to say, it is a Vermont sold container.

It is more than significant to note that Highway District 06 has the highest percent of "returnable" containers collected; District 06 (the Montpelier area) is the only Highway District which does not abut a neighboring state or the Province of Quebec.

Further evidence of the effectiveness of the law may be had by a cost comparison for routine litter cleaning on Vermont Highways; in fiscal year 1973, which ended in June, 1973, the cost for litter cleaning was \$250,346; the cost for fiscal year 1974 was \$205,239; this is an 18 percent reduction in cost which suggests cleaner highways.

If we can be of further assistance to you in this matter, please do not hesitate to call or write this office.

Sincerely,

John A. Durkee
Maintenance Management Engineer



By: R. W. Fraser
Assistant Maintenance Management Engineer

JAD/RWF/11b

Attach:

cc: Central Files
File Copy

SPECIAL LITTER CONTROL PROJECT SUMMARY

1974

N= NON-RETURNABLES
R= RETURNABLES

| DISTRICT NO. | | BEER CANS | | | | BEER BOTTLES | | | | SODA CANS | | | | SODA BOTTLES | | | | TOTALS | RET. |
|--------------|---|-----------------|------|------|-----|-----------------|------|-----|-----|-----------------|-----|-----|-----|----------------|-----|-----|-----|--------|------|
| | | 4 LANE | SS | SA | TH | 4 LANE | SS | SA | TH | 4 LANE | SS | SA | TH | 4 LANE | SS | SA | TH | | |
| 1 | N | - | 124 | 368 | 9 | - | 37 | 64 | 23 | - | 27 | 21 | 7 | - | 18 | 30 | 7 | 735 | |
| | R | - | 37 | 67 | 3 | - | 14 | 32 | 8 | - | 6 | 7 | 1 | - | 7 | 8 | 0 | 190 | 25 |
| 2 | N | 182 | 150 | 219 | 51 | 101 | 60 | 241 | 61 | 94 | 41 | 46 | 20 | 30 | 7 | 41 | 13 | 1357 | |
| | R | 61 | 28 | 38 | 28 | 30 | 15 | 28 | 24 | 57 | 22 | 25 | 15 | 29 | 3 | 14 | 12 | 450 | 33 |
| 3 | N | 550 | 420 | 120 | 235 | 355 | 299 | 82 | 127 | 137 | 165 | 41 | 41 | 51 | 58 | 27 | 28 | 2936 | |
| | R | 32 | 63 | 43 | 34 | 55 | 47 | 23 | 24 | 70 | 22 | 21 | 7 | 21 | 21 | 3 | 4 | 570 | 20 |
| 4 | N | 198 | 184 | 67 | 57 | 105 | 171 | 37 | 56 | 87 | 101 | 10 | 13 | 14 | 35 | 14 | 6 | 1156 | |
| | R | 29 | 29 | 6 | 5 | 19 | 13 | 6 | 2 | 34 | 34 | 5 | 2 | 27 | 18 | 4 | 5 | 217 | 20 |
| 5 | N | 129 | 172 | 66 | 80 | 141 | 379 | 66 | 63 | 58 | 99 | 20 | 21 | 47 | 83 | 22 | 13 | 1419 | |
| | R | 47 | 25 | 12 | 5 | 46 | 35 | 7 | 24 | 56 | 22 | 4 | 0 | 12 | 10 | 3 | 1 | 310 | 21 |
| 6 | N | 214 | 53 | 115 | 122 | 171 | 50 | 105 | 62 | 98 | 57 | 22 | 61 | 45 | 15 | 31 | 2 | 1252 | |
| | R | 79 | 57 | 14 | 9 | 70 | 63 | 35 | 3 | 51 | 42 | 5 | 1 | 22 | 12 | 16 | 2 | 481 | 38 |
| 7 | N | 143 | 210 | 293 | 126 | 17 | 187 | 127 | 156 | 72 | 73 | 36 | 20 | 26 | 25 | 25 | 17 | 1503 | |
| | R | 62 | 19 | 42 | 0 | 30 | 33 | 35 | 14 | 25 | 10 | 28 | 0 | 15 | 23 | 8 | 3 | 331 | 23 |
| 8 | N | 162 | 42 | 11 | 153 | 112 | 96 | 8 | 131 | 54 | 19 | 2 | 26 | 24 | 35 | 6 | 33 | 914 | |
| | R | 81 | 9 | 5 | 8 | 42 | 20 | 1 | 13 | 41 | 9 | 5 | 5 | 23 | 15 | 2 | 2 | 281 | 30 |
| 9 | N | 57 | 32 | 39 | 119 | 50 | 58 | 40 | 137 | 21 | 29 | 28 | 15 | 24 | 28 | 13 | 42 | 728 | |
| | R | 15 | 13 | 8 | 19 | 20 | 18 | 10 | 18 | 8 | 9 | 9 | 4 | 5 | 7 | 10 | 4 | 182 | 25 |
| TOTALS | N | 1740 | 1337 | 1190 | 952 | 1233 | 1356 | 770 | 816 | 521 | 611 | 226 | 224 | 261 | 304 | 214 | 161 | 11915 | |
| | R | 456 | 234 | 255 | 111 | 347 | 259 | 178 | 130 | 352 | 176 | 109 | 35 | 154 | 119 | 68 | 33 | 3061 | 25 |
| | | 5222 = 29.37% R | | | | 4775 = 22.77% R | | | | 1682 = 20.05% R | | | | 940 = 22.22% R | | | | | |

STATE OF VERMONT
SPECIAL HIGHWAY LITTER EVALUATION PROJECT
SUMMARY

| | BEER CANS | | | | BEER BOTTLES | | | | SODA CANS | | | | SODA BOTTLES | | | | OTHER LITTER (BARRELS) | | | | TOTAL "B" | | |
|------------------------------|-----------|--------|-------|-------|--------------|-------|-------|-------|-----------|--------|-------|-------|--------------|------------------------|-------|-------|------------------------|-------|-------|---------------|-----------|-------|-------|
| | 4 LANE | SS | SA | TH | 4 LANE | SS | SA | TH | 4 LANE | SS | SA | TH | 4 LANE | SS | SA | TH | 4 LANE | SS | SA | TH | 4 LANE | SS | |
| JUNE | 1973 | 1563 | 1774 | 1778 | 2074 | 902 | 1185 | 2208 | 1867 | 755 | 679 | 806 | 420 | 208 | 277 | 447 | 295 | 24.6 | 17.6 | 20.6 | 11.9 | 55.0 | 71.2 |
| | 1974 | 1174 | 951 | 878 | 901 | 947 | 1016 | 534 | 666 | 795 | 447 | 207 | 202 | 233 | 237 | 195 | 120 | 43.5 | 26.1 | 30.8 | 20.6 | 52.9 | 35.1 |
| PERCENT INCREASE OR DECREASE | | -27.4 | -51.7 | -77.4 | -51.4 | +18.1 | -14.7 | -76.8 | -64.6 | -47.7 | -36.0 | -74.2 | -51.0 | +12.0 | -14.4 | -56.6 | -59.3 | +76.8 | +48.7 | +49.5 | +73.1 | +46.0 | -12.0 |
| | | -57.7 | | | | -48.6 | | | | -53.7 | | | | -76.1 | | | | +62.0 | | | | | |
| JULY | 1973 | 779 | 379 | 1135 | 980 | 364 | 549 | 574 | 977 | 570 | 594 | 294 | 248 | 158 | 255 | 253 | 163 | 16.7 | 11.2 | 6.4 | 7.7 | 22.9 | 18.7 |
| | 1974 | 702 | 252 | 141 | 93 | 132 | 150 | 60 | 71 | 198 | 107 | 27 | 21 | 35 | 33 | 18 | 18 | 14.7 | 13.2 | 7.3 | 6.5 | 15.9 | 15.1 |
| AUG | 1973 | 923 | 1184 | 1347 | 850 | 561 | 696 | 964 | 812 | 603 | 687 | 467 | 263 | 177 | 222 | 253 | 178 | 15.7 | 9.2 | 7.3 | 7.6 | 27.0 | 18.7 |
| | 1974 | 326 | 263 | 154 | 124 | 131 | 255 | 129 | 134 | 178 | 134 | 49 | 19 | 67 | 97 | 24 | 49 | 13.4 | 11.3 | 9.1 | 3.8 | 15.8 | 16.7 |
| SEPT | 1973 | 516 | 645 | 992 | 811 | 314 | 348 | 557 | 765 | 245 | 360 | 272 | 180 | 155 | 165 | 184 | 165 | 19.7 | 11.1 | 12.2 | 6.6 | 26.7 | 16.7 |
| | 1974 | 475 | 283 | 261 | 65 | 195 | 174 | 225 | 75 | 202 | 99 | 51 | 17 | 80 | 56 | 45 | 16 | 17.4 | 12.2 | 8.9 | 5.4 | 20.6 | 14.7 |
| TOTAL | 1973 | 2253 | 2703 | 3455 | 2541 | 1279 | 1593 | 2077 | 2454 | 1348 | 1641 | 1033 | 606 | 490 | 642 | 690 | 508 | 51.7 | 31.5 | 28.9 | 21.7 | 67.9 | 53.7 |
| | 1974 | 1764 | 987 | 556 | 272 | 458 | 599 | 414 | 280 | 573 | 340 | 127 | 57 | 182 | 185 | 87 | 74 | 45.5 | 35.7 | 24.7 | 20.7 | 57.7 | 33.7 |
| PERCENT REDUCTION | 1973 | 15,570 | | | | 9,711 | | | | 25,403 | | | | OTHER LITTER (BARRELS) | | | | 131.8 | | TOTAL BARRELS | | | |
| | 1974 | 3,902 | | | | 2,230 | | | | 6,092 | | | | (BARRELS) | | | | 127.2 | | | | | |
| | | 75.8 | | | | 76.5 | | | | 76.1 | | | | 4.9 | | | | | | 32.9 | | | |

* 1 Barrel = 257 1/2
310 C