

Dear Sirs

I read in today's JEP that you have invited members of the public to get in touch with their suggestions for addressing the reduction of plastic used in Jersey.

Much time was spent on the closely related question of reducing plastic and other litter eight years ago by the Stop the Drop group ably led by Margaret Holland Prior, of which I was a member.

Our efforts came to nothing because, we felt, of the States' disappointing complacency. Now Sir David Attenborough has spoken out and the States are finally taking this matter more seriously. Therefore in the hope of greater success this time round I attach for re-submission to Scrutiny the key documents we prepared in 2010, a submission document addressed to Scrutiny and a text drawn up in support of a PowerPoint type presentation.

In a nutshell we argued that it was time to stop faffing about with public awareness campaigns and introduce, among other measures and like our fellow Commonwealth jurisdiction Barbados, a bottle bill imposing a deposit on single use drinks containers which still constitute a disproportionately large element of the litter to be found in Jersey. If the deposit is set high enough plastic bottles will lose their appeal, but ideally there needs to be a deposit, perhaps lower, on tins and glass as well to encourage recycling and prevent litter. Back then cardboard coffee cups and their lids were less of an issue than they have now become, but something could surely be done to include them too.

The Nordic countries are way ahead of the British Isles in this area. I am sure the authorities in, for example, St Helier's twin town Bad Wurzach would be only too happy to explain to us how the system works there. For example when in Germany I have seen in the shops reverse vending machines which accept empties and issue cash or credits in return. Perhaps they can form part of a general move away from plastic.

Yours sincerely,

Christopher Scholefield.

Stop the Drop

Submission to the Parks and Beaches Sub Panel of the Planning and Environment Scrutiny Panel.

October 2010

Who are we?

STD is an Island wide anti-litter initiative. It is a group of about 15 people who meet under the chairmanship of Margaret Holland Prior about once a month to suggest and implement ways of curing Jersey's growing litter problem. It consists of politicians, civil servants, tourism representatives and concerned members of the public.

It emerged from St Brelade's participation in the Parish in Bloom competition, an annual awards programme run by Jersey Tourism based on the Britain in Bloom competition. These competitions emphasise community involvement in improving the appearance of the public domain, which includes the perennial problem of litter. In this way our concerns coincide with yours.

Litter in Jersey.

The litter problem in Jersey, whilst not yet as bad as in the UK, is getting worse because;

- Prosperity has led to a growth in the consumption of take away food and drink supplied in non-degradable containers such as Pet plastic bottles, Styrofoam cups and containers, foil based bags or wrappers and traditional ring pull cans.
- The smoking ban in indoor public places has increased the cigarette debris and chewing gum found on the roads and pavements as smokers move outside to smoke and discard their butts before returning indoors, without really thinking of them as litter.
- There is a trend, despite the modern emphasis on environmental awareness, among the public at large and especially the young towards accepting litter is an inevitable part of our surroundings, until someone else who is paid to do so clears it up.
- The decline in the price of alcohol has led to an increase in its consumption, especially among the young who often congregate in public parks and on the beaches. Disinhibited by alcohol, keen to seem carefree and sophisticated and aware that the penalties for breach are never enforced they disregard their civic duty to clear up after themselves, even if they are aware of it.
- The relevant legislation is a dead letter. Littering is often done covertly but even if the offender is seen it can take three hours to process the personal details of anyone found littering by the Honorary or States Police. This seems disproportionate for what will probably just result in a caution in the Parish Hall. Those in authority (who may personally consider growing levels of litter to be inevitable) feel this is not good time management and

- that they have more important things to do. There has not been a prosecution before the Magistrates' Court in living memory.
- Modern society lays emphasis upon people's rights, but civic responsibilities are not emphasized, either because they relate to things for which we feel excused, having paid our taxes, or because even to those in authority with budgets to manage pointing them out can appear paternalistic and hectoring and so counter productive.

What is this costing us?

The cost of clearing litter falls on us all, through the expenditure of The States and our Parishes, on rubbish collection and street cleaning. Clearing litter from our public places has been estimated to cost our community at least £1.3 million every year.

There must also be indirect costs arising from the associated environmental degradation and a declining visitor perception of Jersey as an unusually clean and attractive place. There is no doubt that litter is harmful to wildlife and that anything that can reasonably be done to control the spread of plastics into the environment at large should be considered, and will enjoy wide spread public support

So what is to be done?

This is a time of financial constraint. STD believes it is time to end the waste of time and money spent *clearing up* litter. The States should take a proactive stance and devote resources to *preventing* litter in the first place. This will save money, be good for the environment, encourage tourism and be good for our pride in our island.

We set out below a list of initiatives for the States to consider. Some are very simple and others would require a big change in public behaviour. We are encouraged by the public's willingness to adapt its behaviour, once given a lead, as with the swift conversion to reusable shopping bags. We have only included proposals that will save money, or are largely self-financing, and that have been successfully introduced elsewhere.

We believe that by adopting all or most of the following Jersey would attract favourable publicity for itself as a community whose leaders have grasped the nettle and acted imaginatively for the good of its residents, its visitors, and the environment at large.

Take away food business licencing conditions

- a) Takeaway businesses licenced under the Places of Refreshment Law should be required as a condition of their licence;
 - i) Clearly to identify, (eg with sticky labels,) all food containers and drinks containers provided by them not covered by the deposit scheme described

below so as to provide evidence of whose premises nuisance litter is coming from.

ii) At closing time to conduct a litter patrol for an area within a given radius of their premises.

iii) Prominently to display notices setting out the penalties for litter and the location of adjacent litter disposal facilities

The branding requirement will allow the authorities to identify whose customers are causing the most litter and target enforcement measures under accordingly

On the spot fines

b) Conduct an awareness campaign in the local media prior to introducing a zero-tolerance policy; to be enforced by the introduction of On the Spot fines for those caught littering. The UK Legislation on the same issues is attached. This will require new law but there is a precedent in Jersey for an on the spot penalty system for parking offenders. An on the spot traffic fine system is also envisaged to cut the cost of prosecuting road traffic offences, so this could be done at the same time. Authority to issue fines would be granted to the parking wardens, and members of the Honorary and States Police forces.

The City of London introduced such a scheme in 2009, and it has enjoyed a good success rate. The City has 10 environment officers who are empowered to fine irresponsible smokers and other litterers £80. Those who give false details are fined £1,000.

A bottle bill.

c) Introduce a sealed beverage container deposit scheme, or "Bottle Bill". Most European and many Commonwealth jurisdictions have these. Barbados is a small island state that has one. Milk is nearly always excluded from such schemes, which cover both alcoholic and soft drinks. Placing value in the form of a deposit on empty beverage bottles and tins ensures they are no longer be discarded along the island's highways or across its beaches and countryside. It is in effect a financially incentivized recycling scheme with collection running in tandem with distribution across the retail network.

In brief, the deposit is levied at the place of import into the island and passed from wholesaler to retailer to consumer. Such deposit schemes are these days made easier for retailers to participate in if they have on their premises Reverse Vending machines, which exchange empty bottles for tokens redeemable in the retailer's premises. Retailers can accept returned bottles manually; those who decline to participate may see a drop in custom. The retailer's IT system submits a claim for the deposit, which at that stage is still in the government's deposit fund. Since virtually all beverage retailers have liquor licences, one way to counter retailer opposition could be to require retailers to provide reverse vending facilities as a condition of the renewal of their liquor licences.

Containers not redeemed can be expected make a significant profit for the government, which can defray set up costs or be spent assisting smaller retailers with the leasing costs of reverse vending machines. The authorities can also expect to make savings on litter clearing activities, as henceforth nearly all bottles will be available to collect crushed and bailed from the reverse vending machines.

Non bio degradable packaging prohibition

d) Introduce, after due warning to consume existing stocks, a ban on certain particularly non bio degradable but commonly used take away food packaging, especially white Styrofoam "clam shells" and beverage cups. This has already been done under municipal legislation in certain communities on the Pacific coast of North America.

Alcohol Free Areas in town and on the beaches:

e) Many areas around the world have adopted alcohol free areas, either in their parks and or on the beaches. New Zealand has whole villages and towns, which become alcohol-free zones during public holidays. This will achieve many things but among them should be a reduction in litter as irresponsible behaviour in public places should decline.

Discarded chewing gum control.

f) New forms of less polluting gum are believed to be close to production. Pending and after its arrival could the infrastructure for the charging of GST be adapted to allow for a special increased rate of tax on chewing gum? This would be a proto-type environmental tax for Jersey and the sum raised would be devoted to the cost of discarded gum removal, but not of course charged on the new cleaner variety.

Smokers' litter

g) Since the health authorities of the Channel Islands are already intervening to place their own health warnings on local cigarette packaging could these warnings be supplemented by information to smokers in Jersey about the fines to which they are liable if they illegally discard their butts, their packets or their cellophane wrappers?

Community service resource

h) Clearly consultation with the unions is required, but there would be great public support for the use of the Community Service scheme to provide litter-monitors, particularly to clear black spots identified by a public anti litter hot line. If there is concern that the punishment should not unduly stigmatize the offenders their interventions could be managed discreetly, or this issue should be kept under review. A change in the climate of opinion about litter may change the perception that clearing it is an obviously demeaning activity

STD offers these proposals for further consideration and would be happy to appear before Scrutiny to expand upon them if so requested.

MHP 14 10 10.

“STOP THE DROP” LEGISLATION SUB-COMMITTEE

Draft Presentation
SHOULD JERSEY HAVE A BOTTLE BILL?

**FRAMEWORK FOR A PRESENTATION TO STATES OF JERSEY AND
THE MEDIA, AS SHARED WITH MEMBERS OF THE STANDING
CONFERENCE OF WOMENS’ ORGANISATIONS**

SLIDE	IMAGE	TEXT CONTENTS
1.	Image of a typically littered roadside with 20p coins scattered about.	<p>Q: What causes litter?</p> <p>A: Items of no value in the possession of persons with insufficient concern for the well being of their community or its wildlife.</p> <p>Therefore: Address 1/ the responsibility deficit and 2/ the value to their owners of the items which end up as litter. How many 20p coins do you see lying around waiting to be picked up?</p>
2.	Old glass Le Masurier’s lemonade bottle next to its modern equivalent	We are currently in an anomalous situation where drinks containers, once subject to a deposit, now have no value & so aggravate the litter problem, especially aluminium cans and the “one-way” polyethylene terephthalate or PET bottle.
3.	Bottles	<p>Q: Is litter a problem in Jersey?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">❖ TTS spends £ 990,000 pa on cleaning lavatories and collecting litter in Jersey.❖ This budget is frozen.❖ No one has appeared in court for breaking Jersey’s litter laws in living memory.❖ There’s no money allocated to litter prevention, as opposed to cure.❖ TTS are “not ...aware of” any green issues arising from litter prevention.❖ Plastic bottles represent about 26% of the litter collected in Jersey.

4.	Graphic of question marks.	<p>Q: So, how do you;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Divert litter-clearing costs from the general public to the consumers of litter generating items? ❖ Reduce the appearance of litter? ❖ Increase re-cycling? ❖ Keep waste pet bottles out of landfill? ❖ Save green house gas on smelting new aluminium? ❖ Avoid injury from discarded broken glass? 	
5.	Mock up first page of the “Beverage Containers (Mandatory Deposit) (Jersey) Law 2010”	<p>A: You introduce a bottle bill.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ This introduces a mandatory deposit payable on sealed beverage containers at the place of import by the importer to the Impôts. This is passed on to the retailer and by him to the consumer. The consumer redeems the deposit when he returns the container to a retailer’s “reverse vending” machine which issue him with an in store credit chit. The machine’s software screens out bottles not bought in Jersey. The retailers’ records of chits issued are submitted by them to Impôts who issue a payment. ❖ Profits (container deposits not redeemed by consumers) subsidise the cost of reverse vending machine rental and operation. ❖ Containers have value and are litter no more. ❖ Imagine if you could extend this to crisp packets! 	
6.	Map of EU with Bottle Bill countries highlighted.	<p>www.bottlebill.org 12 US states - including New Jersey. 11 Canadian provinces including an Island province like Prince Edward Island. 9 EU member states</p>	
7.	Juxtapose outline maps of Jersey and Barbados.	<p>But what about a small island state?</p> <p><u>Barbados</u> Pop 281,968 GDP per capita 2008 \$19,000 Bottle bill ? Yes, Returnable Containers Act.</p>	<p><u>Jersey</u> Pop 91,533 GDP per capita 2005 \$57,000 Bottle bill ? No, nothing done.</p>

8.	Illustration of a Reverse Vending machine.	<p>Could it work?</p> <p>Jersey has shown with the cycle helmet law and votes for 16 year olds that it is not afraid of acting in advance of legislation in the UK.</p> <p>We have a government department resourced to propose and promote environmental initiatives of this sort, eg the Environment Dept at the Howard Davis Farm.</p> <p>The support of the retailers is critical. However they have CSR agendas to fulfil and are sensitive to what consumers - who you represent - want.</p> <p>To those who say “oh no not another tax!” we reply “show us the tax which you are given back”</p> <p>Organ donor shortfalls (1000 unnecessary deaths per annum in the UK) prove that for some good ideas - like bottle recycling - voluntary schemes are not enough. The financial incentive to hand the bottle back needs to be reinstated</p>	
9.	Graphic of money’s circular flow	<p>When in doubt, follow the money.</p> <p>Impôts charges Importer</p> <p>Importer charges Wholesaler</p> <p>Wholesale charges Retailer</p> <p>Retailer charges Consumer</p> <p>Consumer is paid back by Retailer</p> <p>Retailer seeks refund from money held by Impôts</p> <p>Other points.</p> <p>Unrefunded deposits means scheme can make a profit to cover its costs</p> <p>Material conveniently recovered – plastic and aluminium also has a value as scrap</p> <p>Government saves some money on litter management and disposal</p>	
10.	Smiley face?	<p>Will it be popular?</p> <p>Good publicity for Jersey to seize this initiative</p> <p>Popular with the residents, as it need cost them nothing but gives them an incentive to recycle and feel they are doing something really eco-active</p> <p>Popular with visitors as the island will look tidier and</p>	

		<p>for British visitors the scheme may be a talking point of the “ now <i>that’s</i> a good idea “ variety, like the filter in turn.</p> <p>Popular with Charities who can organise fund raisers by having volunteers pick up litter</p> <p>Popular with TTS who will have less litter to manage</p> <p>Popular with retailers whose can turn people returning containers into customers</p> <p>Popular with government because of the profit retained from unredeemed containers</p> <p>Popular with recycling companies who can obtain supplies by emptying the reverse vending machines</p>
--	--	--