

LITTER POLLUTION MONITORING SYSTEM

LOCAL AUTHORITY QUARTERLY INFORMATION UPDATE #1

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
Aims	1
Structure	1
CONFERENCE FOLLOW-UP	2
Conference Agenda	2
Conference Workshops	2
Local Authority Feedback	2
GIS Requirements	3
The LGCSB	3
Identification of Litter Generators	4
The GeoDirectory	4
Value-added Resellers	5
Survey Resources	5
SYSTEM IMPLEMENTATION	6
Timetable for Year 1	8
Timetable for Year 2 Onwards	8
THE MONITORING MANUAL	9
Manual Circulation	9
MAPPING TRIALS	10
BEST PRACTICE REVIEW	10
LOCAL AUTHORITY CASE STUDY	11

1. INTRODUCTION

As an integral part of its programme of activities, the Litter Monitoring Body will prepare and issue Information Updates, on a quarterly basis, to the country's 88 local authorities.

Aims

The aims of these Updates are to:

1. Provide a summary of the key activities undertaken by the Litter Monitoring Body in the preceding quarter;
 2. Describe the progress of implementation of the National Litter Pollution Monitoring System (e.g. percentage of local authorities who have completed their mapping exercise, and the results of Litter Quantification Surveys and Litter Pollution Surveys);
 3. Address any issues which arise during the systems' implementation;
 4. Facilitate information dissemination between local authorities. This will comprise a series of case studies or success stories from around the country. Practical information on costings, set-up requirements and results will be provided, as well as contact information for the relevant authority.
- Of the many successful initiatives undertaken across the country by local authorities, Cork County Council has kindly agreed to write an article on the highly-successful Cork Anti-Litter Challenge for the first issue of the Information Update. Future issues will also contain articles written by local authorities who have volunteered to provide information. To this end, local authorities are requested to send articles to the Litter Monitoring Body in time for the next issue; and
5. Provide additional information and request feedback as required.

Structure

This Information Update, the first in the series, describes the activities which have

been undertaken in the period since the National Litter Conference of September 1999. In particular, the approach which has been adopted to address the concerns of the delegates who attended that conference is described.

The timetable for implementation of the Monitoring System by the local authorities is provided, as is a summary of the key activities required of each authority during that implementation process.

Finally, a case study on the 'Inter Town and Village Litter Challenge' implemented by Cork County Council over the past years is presented.

CONFERENCE FOLLOW-UP

109 local authority delegates attended the National Litter Conference, which was held on the 23rd and 24th September 1999 in the Rochestown Park Hotel, Cork. The Litter Monitoring Body would like to take this opportunity to thank all those who attended on that occasion. Your participation and detailed feedback was greatly appreciated.

Conference Agenda

To recap, the agenda for the conference was divided into two main sessions. The first, held on the 23rd September 1999, involved the presentation of the proposed Litter Monitoring System to the delegates by the Monitoring Body. The results of the trials undertaken during the summer months by Carlow and Waterford County Councils were also described. The second session, held on the 24th September, required that the delegates divide into five workgroups. Each workgroup was assigned a local authority moderator to chair the session, and a Monitoring Body rapporteur to record and report on the discussions of the workshop.

Conference Workshops

The workshops were designed in such a way that specific and detailed feedback was obtained from the local authority representatives on each of the individual elements of the Monitoring System. The Monitoring Body consequently took that feedback into careful consideration during the finalisation of the monitoring methodology. Indeed, this consultation exercise has very much guided the final stages of the development of the litter survey methodology.

Local Authority Feedback

The results of the workshop discussions indicated that the delegates had identified two main problem areas, namely:

1. The perceived complexity of the Potential Litter Generator¹ surveying and mapping exercise; and
2. The issue of resources – both for the once-off mapping and for the ongoing surveys.

The Litter Monitoring Body has considered these two issues carefully and has now developed an approach which, it is felt, will help to bypass these difficulties. There are two main modifications to the proposed system – the first relates to the Potential Litter Generator mapping and the second to the frequency of ongoing surveys.

Mapping Complexity and Resources – GIS Requirements

The production of locally-specific Litter Generation Potential Maps² is one of the

¹ *Potential Litter Generator* is the collective term given to premises, sites or activities which are likely to give rise to litter pollution. Examples include fast-food outlets, derelict land, tourist attractions and secondary schools.

core elements of the monitoring methodology developed by the Monitoring Body. Not least because they are key to the choosing of locations for the ongoing local authority Litter Pollution Surveys.

The approach adopted by the Monitoring Body has been to transfer the complexity of the mapping exercise from the authorities to another party. The most obvious choice for the latter was the Local Government Computer Services Board (LGCSB) which has already gained significant experience with such a mapping approach during the development of the Road Accidents GIS Package. There is considerable similarity between the latter and the Potential Litter Generator mapping – both involve the mapping of locally-relevant items and both sets of maps are then used for the identification of relationships between the items mapped.

Litter Quantification Survey = a survey which assesses the origin and type of litter pollution prevailing in an authority's area and involves a litter item counting exercise.

Litter Pollution Survey = a visual inspection of a 50m stretch of footpath to determine the extent and severity of any litter pollution observed. Three types of area are assessed during the Litter Pollution Survey – namely **a)** High-risk Survey Areas; **b)** Random Survey Areas and **c)** locations which are felt by the authorities to merit observation.

² *Litter Generation Potential Maps* are GIS (Geographical Information System) maps which identify clusters or 'hotspots' of premises which are traditionally associated with litter pollution.

The Local Government Computer Services Board

The LGCSB has thus been commissioned to develop and test a customised Litter Monitoring GIS System. The latter will allow all local authorities to map their specific Potential Litter Generators in a standardised manner (i.e. consistent symbols placed at a consistent point within each building).

The GIS application will subsequently calculate the Litter Generation Potential Score³ for every District Electoral Division or Ward and produce a league table for each authority indicating the relative Litter Generation Potential scores of their DEDs.

Finally, the system will undertake cluster analysis so that the 'hottest' spots (i.e. those locations which demonstrate the greatest potential to produce litter) in each DED, in each authority functional area, and across the entire country can be identified.

The development of the package will greatly reduce the amount of GIS-personnel time and expertise required by each local authority – although a small amount of specialist training on the package will still be required (and provided by the LGCSB). In addition, it is hoped that, by transferring the complexity of the GIS aspects of the mapping to the LGCSB, the local authorities themselves will be able to focus on the customisation of their Litter Generation Potential Maps.

For example, it will (eventually) be possible to map the location of a number of important aspects of each local authority's Litter Management System. In particular:

³ A score assigned to each DED within a given authority area. It provides a rough measure of the likelihood of litter pollution occurring in each DED. The formula used to calculate the score combines population density, number of Potential Litter Generators and tourism levels.

- Litter bins (provided by both the local authority and by private parties);
- Cleansing and Litter Warden routes;
- Premises which have been the subject of prosecutions or convictions;
- The locations of Litter Control Areas; and
- The locations of survey areas which have scored particularly poorly in Litter Pollution Surveys.

As such, the Litter Generation Potential Maps will form a key element of the local authorities' litter management programmes – effectively comprising a constantly-updated management tool, which will be used to formalise the accumulated knowledge of the authorities and assist in the pro-active tackling of the litter problem.

The LGCSB has identified six authorities to conduct trials on the first phase of the GIS software (Cork Corporation, Dublin Corporation, Galway County Council, Meath County Council, Waterford County Council and Westmeath County Council). Once these short trials have been completed, the Phase 1 software will be circulated nation-wide (expected in May 2000).

Progress on the development of the software will be reported in the next Information Update.

Mapping Complexity and Resources – Identification of Potential Litter Generators

The next most time-consuming element of the system set-up is the identification of locally-specific Potential Litter Generators. The Monitoring Body has been actively searching for ways in which this exercise

might be made easier for the local authorities. It may be recalled that a number of possible Litter Generator identification options were presented at the National Litter Conference. These included visual surveys in rural areas and the purchase of business datasets (with or without maps) from companies such as IRIS Ltd. for urban areas.

The GeoDirectory

Discussions have subsequently been held with An Post/ Ordnance Survey of Ireland with respect to their national address database – known as *GeoDirectory*. This database allows the x,y co-ordinates of any building within a given functional area to be located and mapped in a very short time. Once linked to a series of maps, such as those held by each authority for their functional area, the GeoDirectory will locate a given building on GIS maps at the touch of a button – further simplifying the mapping process.

It should be noted that the GeoDirectory is quite similar to the products already available from IRIS Ltd. The key differences are that the LGCSB believes that the GeoDirectory will become the national industry standard. In addition, the GeoDirectory includes residential addresses as well as commercial – an aspect of the database which may make it useful for other local authority activities (e.g. planning and applying service charges).

In addition, the GeoDirectory is based on standard OS maps instead of privately-developed maps – making it more compatible with existing local authority mapping. It will be updated on an ongoing basis and updates provided to the purchaser free-of-charge. Finally, it should be noted that the GeoDirectory will cover both urban and rural areas of the country (with the rural areas due to be completed in May 2000),

unlike the IRIS system which covers only the larger urban centres.

Value-added Resellers

There is one drawback to the GeoDirectory as sold by An Post, however, and this relates to the availability of information on the specific use of each building. At this time, the database is supplied to customers without building usage information – obviously rendering it useless for Potential Litter Generator mapping which requires information on the location of, for example, takeaways and newsagents. The GeoDirectory, with the specific building usage information required for the mapping procedure, may however be purchased in the near future from a number of Value-Added Resellers (VARs) of the GeoDirectory.

These VARs include Kompass Ireland and Gamma Ltd. Sample information is currently being sourced from both Kompass Ireland and IRIS Ltd. and will be directly compared by the LGCSB. The results of that comparison will be communicated in Information Update #2. Information on the exact costings of buying information from these VARs is currently being compiled by the companies in question – although the final costs will be very dependent on the size of the authority area and the types of additional information requested⁴.

Survey Resources

The second issue highlighted by the local authority delegates at the National Litter Conference in September concerned the resources required for the relatively-high frequency proposed for the ongoing litter surveys. Those proposed frequencies have subsequently been re-assessed and a greatly-

⁴ For example, data fields relating to employee numbers, ISO status, contact details, turnover levels and manufacturing activities can be supplied.

reduced frequency adopted. Details of each local authority's survey obligations will be circulated as part of the Monitoring Manual which is currently being prepared by the Litter Monitoring Body.

2. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NATIONAL LITTER POLLUTION MONITORING SYSTEM

There are three distinct phases involved in the implementation of the National Monitoring System by the local authorities. These are:

1. The **Set-up Phase**. This once-off phase, completed only in the year 2000, involves the identification of Potential Litter Generators and the mapping of their locations using specially-designed GIS software. This results in the preparation of a set of Litter Generation Potential Maps for each authority. The maps are then used in the year 2000 and following years to identify locations for litter surveys;
2. The **Benchmark Phase**. The first Litter Quantification and Litter Pollution Surveys (see steps 4-9 of Phase Two overleaf) will be the benchmark surveys for each authority. For the purpose of the national system, the results of each year's litter surveys will be compared not only with the preceding years' surveys, but with the first ever survey results.

Benchmark Performance = The results of the first-ever series of Litter Quantification and Pollution Surveys carried out by a particular authority. All future survey results are compared with the benchmark performance for that authority, in order to measure change.

3. The **Survey Phase**. Litter Quantification Surveys and Litter Pollution Surveys will be carried out each year using locations chosen from the Litter Generation Potential Maps. The results of these surveys will then be compared with the results obtained in the Phase Two (benchmark) surveys.

In the year 2000, the implementation year, Phases One and Two are undertaken. Once the Monitoring System has been implemented, however, Phase Three *only* is repeated annually.

The specific activities involved in each of the three phases are outlined below.

<i>PHASE ONE: SET-UP PHASE</i>	
<u>Step</u>	<u>Description</u>
1.	Identify Potential Litter Generators.
2.	Log x,y co-ordinates of Generators onto basic digital maps.
3.	Produce the Litter Generation Potential Maps using the Litter Monitoring GIS Software.

PHASE TWO: BENCHMARK PHASE

<u>Step</u>	<u>Description</u>
4.	Consult tables provided in Monitoring Manual to identify the number of surveys required.
5.	Identify (from the Litter Generation Potential Maps) suitable High-Risk Survey Areas ⁵ .
6.	Identify (using the GIS Application and the Litter Generation Potential Maps) a number of Random Survey Areas ⁶ .
7.	Choose a number of locations which are deemed to merit detailed observation (e.g. known problem areas).
8.	Carry out between two and 12 Benchmark Litter Quantification Surveys.
9.	Carry out a pre-set number of Benchmark Litter Pollution Surveys over the summer/autumn months.
10.	Enter Litter Survey Results into Microsoft Access Database ⁷ .
11.	Electronically transmit the results to the Litter Monitoring Body for central analysis and the production of national litter survey reports.

⁵ These locations, which represent the areas which are most likely to be littered, are assessed during the Litter Pollution Surveys.

⁶ These locations are surveyed during the Litter Pollution Surveys to ensure that representative coverage of each authority's area is obtained.

⁷ The format for this database will be circulated to the authorities by the Monitoring Body as part of the Monitoring Manual.

PHASE THREE: SURVEY PHASE

<u>Step</u>	<u>Description</u>
12.	Identify (from the Litter Generation Potential Maps) suitable High-Risk Survey Areas .
13.	Identify (using the GIS Application and the Litter Generation Potential Maps) a number of Random Survey Areas .
14.	Choose a number of survey areas which are deemed to merit detailed observation (e.g. known problem areas).
15.	Carry out between two and 12 Litter Quantification Surveys.
16.	Carry out a pre-set number of Litter Pollution Surveys over the summer/autumn months.
17.	Enter Litter Survey Results into Microsoft Access Database.
18.	Electronically transmit the results to the Litter Monitoring Body for central analysis and the production of national litter survey reports.

For this first year (i.e. 2000), the steps shown in Phases One and Two above cannot be completed sequentially.

This reflects the fact that the LGCSB requires several months to develop and test the Litter GIS Application. If we were to hold off the implementation of the system until the GIS was fully developed we would miss the summer/ autumn 2000 litter survey window. Rather than do that, the

Monitoring System will be implemented via a number of steps which, although they do not reflect the exact order of events described above, allow the local authorities to progress their activities while giving the LGCSB the development time it requires.

The following paragraphs outline the implementation timetable for the Monitoring System. Two separate timetables are provided – the first is for Year One only, whereas the second applies to all years thereafter.

Timetable 1 – Year One Only (2000)

The following is the envisaged implementation timetable for the **first year** of the National Litter Pollution Monitoring System only⁸.

<u>Date</u>	<u>Step(s)</u>
May - July	1
May - End July	2
June - August	4, 6, 7, 8, 9*
August - September	3, 10, 11
September - November	5, 9*
November - December	10, 11

* To allow the LGCSB the necessary GIS software development time, it is necessary to split the Benchmark Litter Pollution

⁸ It should be noted that this timetable will differ for the five City Corporations. In light of the extensive numbers of properties within their functional areas, it is envisaged that the urbans will, as their first implementation activity, prepare an Implementation Timetable. That timetable will outline the methodology by which Potential Litter Generators will be identified and the estimated completion dates for each stage of the mapping procedure. The timetables will be prepared in consultation with the Litter Monitoring Body

Surveys into two separate rounds. The first will involve the authorities surveying randomly-chosen locations and those which they want to survey themselves. The second round will involve the surveying of high-risk areas (which can only be identified from the Litter Generation Potential Maps).

Timetable 2 – Year Two Onwards

The following is the timetable for all ensuing years (i.e. from 2001 onwards).

<u>Date</u>	<u>Step(s)</u>
May - June	12, 13, 14, 15
May - October	16
October - November	17,18

3. THE LITTER MONITORING MANUAL

The Litter Monitoring Manual describes the main elements of the Monitoring System, clearly identifying the responsibilities of the local authorities, and outlining the deliverables expected of them.

The Manual will be issued in three separate parts as follows:

- Part One** – This will be comprised of an *Introduction Section* and a section describing the *Identification of Potential Litter Generators*. The introduction will provide an overview of the Monitoring System and will explain the rationale behind the choices made for the system;
- Part Two** – This will include a detailed description of the methodology to be utilised in the set-up of the project – i.e. the once-off mapping exercise to produce *Litter Generation Potential Maps*,

as well as outlining the exact methodology to be used for the *Litter Quantification Surveys*; and

- Part Three** – This will detail the exact methodology to be utilised for the *Litter Pollution Surveys*. Reporting procedures will also be addressed in this section of the manual.

Manual Circulation

Phased circulation of the Monitoring Manual has been chosen as a result of the need for some element of continuous promotion of the System – particularly during the first six to nine months of implementation. Each of the three parts of the manual will only be issued to the local authorities once the deliverables of the preceding part have been successfully progressed. In this way, the impetus of the project will be maintained, with the authorities being required to complete a small number of discrete tasks within a specified time, rather than having to complete all of the different elements of the system from beginning to end on a timetable identified by themselves. It should thus be easier for the Monitoring Body to monitor and guide the progress of the implementation process by the local authorities.

It is envisaged that the three parts of the Manual will be issued on the following provisional dates:

Part One: April 2000

Part Two: May 2000

Part Three: June 2000.

The first part of the manual will be accompanied by a Circular Letter from the Department of the Environment and Local Government outlining the timetable for the completion of the various local authority activities.

It should be noted that it is our intention to circulate the manual in an A5 format, to be bound in a ring-binder. Each of the individual parts will be pre-punched for easy inclusion in the binder. This approach should facilitate possible future changes to the manual arising from feedback obtained from the local authorities themselves.

4. LOCAL AUTHORITY MAPPING TRIALS

As suggested at the National Conference, Carlow and Waterford County Councils have been requested to expand the trial mapping exercise undertaken over the summer to cover all of the DEDs in their functional areas. The information obtained from this full-scale mapping will allow us to better estimate the amount of time required, and the costs involved for the once-off preparation of Litter Generation Potential Maps by each local authority.

Carlow County Council has already finished the surveying exercise, with Waterford nearing completion. Both authorities chose to use visual surveys for this exercise. Waterford chose to utilise the services of FÁS technicians to carry out the majority of the visual surveying required, although members of the engineering staff are also closely involved. Carlow, on the other hand, decided to carry out the visual surveys exclusively in-house.

Carlow and Waterford County Councils have estimated the costs of the entire mapping exercise to be approximately £5,000 and £5,841, respectively. It should be noted that Carlow's visual survey took approximately three weeks for one full-time person to complete (with a further week being required for Carlow Urban).

5. REVIEW OF INTERNATIONAL BEST PRACTICE AS REGARDS LITTER MANAGEMENT

An additional aspect of the Litter Monitoring Body's role is to obtain information on international litter management best practice. Detailed requests for litter-related information have thus been sent to the Environment Departments of each of the countries in continental Europe.

Very little information has been received from these requests, however, as many countries do not even recognise the word 'litter'. To overcome this difficulty, the information request was translated into each of the appropriate European languages in order to bypass the problem of terminology. Very few of the countries responded to the request and those who did provided us with little or no useful information.

This paucity of information would appear to reflect a number of factors such as the absence of specific litter-related legislation and guidance in these countries (with the exception of the UK and the Netherlands). Instead, it would appear that litter is covered under the broader heading of 'waste' in most countries. In addition, the specific management of litter seems to have been decentralised almost completely to the authorities responsible for municipalities and provinces and is not guided by a national strategy.

It should be noted that Internet searches on international litter management experience have also been undertaken by the Litter Monitoring Body, as well as direct requests for information from the US and Singapore. Useful information has not, however, been forthcoming from these sources. It is thus the conclusion of the Litter Monitoring Body that there is little or no experience of litter pollution monitoring in the international context (with the exception of the UK), and that litter management efforts are almost always co-ordinated and

controlled by municipal authorities rather than by central governments.

The Litter Monitoring Body would like to hear about any examples of successful best practice known to the local authorities – either in the Irish or international context. Anyone with relevant information should contact *Bernie Collins* at the Litter Monitoring Body (Tobin Environmental Services Ltd., 23 Ballsbridge Terrace, Ballsbridge, Dublin 4; 01 660 6471; tes@iol.ie).

6. LOCAL AUTHORITY CASE STUDY

The aim of this section of the Information Update is to facilitate the dissemination of litter-related information between local authorities. The Case Studies are designed to be as informative as possible, and to provide useful and practical guidance as to how another local authority might adapt a similar measure. The information chosen for inclusion should, in addition, enable local authorities to assess the suitability of such an approach in their own functional area. Information must thus be provided on:

- a) Set-up requirements;
- b) Financial costs and funding mechanisms;
- c) Personnel and resources requirements;
- d) Public awareness and publicity elements;
- e) Watch-out points and learnings; and
- f) Practical details such as the content of questionnaires and public awareness literature.

Each Information Update will incorporate Case Studies from around the country, and local authorities who would like to have an overview of their litter-related activities included in future issues should contact *Bernie Collins* at the Litter Monitoring Body (Tobin Environmental Services Ltd., 23

Ballsbridge Terrace, Ballsbridge, Dublin 4; 01 660 6471; tes@iol.ie).

We would like to thank Cork County Council, and in particular Mairead Lucey, for providing the following Case Study.

CASE STUDY #1 – THE CORK COUNTY COUNCIL INTER TOWN AND VILLAGE CHALLENGE

Introduction

The Litter Pollution Act, 1997 introduced tougher litter laws, including enforcement measures, in order to combat the problems of litter pollution. The Act also requires Local Authorities to encourage public awareness in respect of litter control.

As part of its anti-litter campaign, Cork County Council initiated an anti-litter competition – the Litter Challenge in 1997, on a pilot basis.

The response from the participating Tidy Towns Committees and from the public was so positive that in 1998 the Litter Challenge was extended to ten towns and a category for villages was also introduced to the competition.

In 1999, there was a total of 16 towns participating in the Inter-Towns Challenge and 36 villages in the Inter-Village Challenge.

Purpose of the Initiative

The purpose of the initiative is primarily to encourage local participation in the eradication of litter in towns and villages in the county. It is hoped that the competition raises awareness of the extent and effect of litter in local communities.

Structure of the Competition

The 16 towns were divided into two groups and the winners from these two groups took part in a grand final play-off in order to find the Most Litter-Free Town in County Cork in 1999.

The 36 villages were divided into five groups. The winners from each of these five groups

entered a play-off in order to find the most Litter-Free Village in County Cork in 1999. This structure was chosen for ease of judging and also to save time.

Judging the Competition

Towns

The Inter-Town Challenge competition is different from other tidy town competitions in that each town competes against all the other participants in its category of the competition.

The competition is organised on a “league” basis and each week the sixteen towns produced eight “matches”.

Marks are awarded out of a maximum of 200 so as to produce a winner of each match. (See Attachment 1 for a copy of the judging guidelines used in the Inter-Town Challenge). The marks are accumulated each week and the results are used to form a “league table” of the competitors. After the competitors have completed all their matches, the town at the top of their respective league table will be declared the winner.

In the Towns category of the Challenge, a handicap system was introduced (i.e. extra marks were given for larger towns) in recognition of the fact that the smaller towns enjoy a certain advantage over the larger towns in relation to litter control.

The towns were divided into geographical sections and two of these sections represented the town each week. This gave every resident the chance to do their bit for the town’s chance in the competition.

1.1 Villages

The villages are judged in their entirety for each week of the competition. The villages are generally judged on the area that lies within the speed limit.

The villages are marked out of one hundred points every week. Total marks

are accumulated so as to form a league table. (See Attachment 2 for a copy of the judging guidelines developed for the Inter-Village Challenge.)

In recognition of the different sizes of competing villages and of the increased difficulty in controlling litter in bigger villages, a handicap system was applied to certain villages.

1.2 General

Cork County Council staff carried out the weekly judging. A mixture of technical and administrative staff of all grades including litter wardens volunteered to undertake the judging. It should be noted that some members of the judging team have been judging this competition since it began in 1997. Each judge was given guidelines on how to judge the competition.

The marks were awarded entirely for litter, with no marks being awarded for streetscapes, flower arrangements or architecture. (A copy of a judge’s report can be seen in Attachment 3).

Co-ordination with Tidy Town Committees

The Litter Challenge was run on a pilot basis in 1997 with eight towns taking part. In 1998, a village category was introduced. Not all of the villages who took part had a Tidy Towns Committee in place so the contact point was a Community Council, a Development Group or Residents Group in these cases.

The participating towns and villages were informed of their forthcoming “matches” at the start of the Challenge

and the towns were also notified of which sections were to be judged each week.

The results of each round of the challenge as well as the judge's report were notified to the committees. These were made available on a weekly basis so that any weak spots could be remedied in time for the next judging.

During the course of the competition, the Tidy Towns Committees in many of the towns and villages established close working relations with the local Urban District Council staff and with the Area Engineers. In some cases, weekly meetings were held with Council staff for the duration of the Litter Challenge. Cork County Council has a small in-house printing section. It was therefore able to further help out the Tidy Town Committees by producing leaflets specific to each participating Town and Village.

These leaflets were sent to each committee so that they could distribute them to each household in their area. The leaflets gave general information about the competition and also some useful hints for litter prevention. (See Attachment 4 for an example of such a leaflet). A prize-giving evening was held at the end of the competition.

Co-ordination with the Media

A large part of the success of the initiative depends on the Litter Challenge receiving publicity. Thus a press release was given by Cork County Council at the beginning of the competition for promotional purposes. Members of the council staff sent the results of the competition to local

newspapers and the regional radio station on a weekly basis. The results were subsequently published or broadcast to give the Challenge a great deal of coverage on the position of the participating towns and villages in the league tables.

Cork County Council's Experience

As the competition was run over a nine-week period, the Tidy Towns Committees had to remain focused on presenting their areas in the best possible light for most of the summer.

The feedback from the judges indicated that, contrary to what they might have expected, the level of litter that was encountered was often minimal. It was felt that the "Get bitter about litter" message was getting through.

It also became apparent as the competition progressed that participants were anxious to avoid doing badly in the published league tables. When judges' reports pointed out litter blackspots every effort was made to ensure that it would be cleaned in time for the next judging visit.

There was often friendly rivalry between participants, which reflected the friendly spirit of the competition. Several of the newer Tidy Towns Committees asked to be put in touch with the more established Committees during the course of the Litter Challenge in order to discuss how best to motivate residents and to improve the fight against litter.

Several participants have mentioned that the Litter Challenge helped them to attain better marks in the Litter category of the marking of the Tidy Towns and

Villages Competition during 1999, and have requested that they be entered in the challenge in 2000.

Cost of Competition

The main cost of the competition was the prize money. Every participant received a contribution of at least £150. The maximum prizes were £1,400 for the overall winner in the town's category and £1,100 in the village category.

The total prize money amounted to £15,500. The estimated cost of judging expenses and administration expenses was £12,000.

Cork County Council was awarded a grant of £15,000 by the Department of the Environment and Local Government as part of their anti-litter initiative. The remaining costs were taken from their annual budget for litter abatement.

For further details on the Inter Town and Village Challenge, contact Mairead Lucey, Sanitary Department, Cork County Council, Floor 7, County Hall, Cork, or telephone: 021 285313/285311.

Attachment 1:

Judging Guidelines – Inter-Town Challenge

1. Judges should note the following information:

- a) The competition is a serious effort on the council's part and is intended to maintain interest in the litter problem in the towns concerned over a period of two months. It is also designed in a way, which gives everyone in the town an opportunity to get involved, and indeed challenges them to get involved.***
- b) The Tidy Town Committees in each of the competing towns have agreed to***

participate and indeed are enthusiastic about the idea.

- c) If the competition is to succeed in its objectives it is absolutely essential that the integrity the judging system be maintained. In particular each town must be judged at the proper time and must also be judged thoroughly and fairly.***
 - d) The results of the competition will be published each week in the local press and hopefully in the Evening Echo.***
- 2. The competition week extends from Thursday to the following Wednesday.***
- a) Each of the pair of towns must be judged under similar circumstances as possible. This means that:***
 - b) The visit to the second town must be immediately after the visit to the first town.***
 - c) Visits should be avoided on any day on which there is a special event (e.g. mart day or casual trading day)***
 - d) Towns that are far apart e.g. Youghal and Mallow should not be judged at times when large quantities of litter usually arise i.e. early on a Monday morning, because of the difficulty of seeing the 2nd town in a similar condition***
 - e) Subject to (b) and (c) judging can take place at any time or on any day of the week including Saturdays and Sundays.***
- 3. Judges should have regard to the relative condition of the town. Some towns are bigger than others and could as a result have a greater absolute quantity of litter although relatively they might be cleaner***
- 4. An assistant should accompany Judges if possible. However, where this happens each town and each section of the town should be inspected together. Under no circumstances should the two towns or sections or any of the two towns be divided up between the judge and his/ her assistant.***
- 5. Two sections of each town are to be judged each week, one of which will be Town Centre, Maps will be provided to the judges showing the extent of each section. A list of the streets involved will also be provided.***

6. Each section can obtain a maximum of 100 marks each; i.e. the town cannot be awarded more than 200 marks.

7. **Marks can be awarded for litter control only.** Under no circumstances should marks be granted for well kept open spaces or well presented buildings etc. Similarly, marks should not be deducted for dereliction etc

8. When considering Litter Control:

- a) Judges should start off on the assumption that there is no litter, i.e. the section of the Town starts with 100 marks. Marks should then be deducted depending on the extent of litter found.
- b) Judges should not penalise the town in respect to litter caused by building work unless the building work is being carried on in an irresponsible manner, in which case marks should be deducted.
- c) All litter should be penalised including small items of litter such as cigarette butts and chewing gum. Fly posting should also be penalised. However, election literature on poles etc. should not be penalised before 19th June it should be penalised fully.
- d) For the purposes of the competition kerbside weeds are to be regarded as litter.
- d) Marking should be strict and consistent.

9. Judges should:

- a) Walk if possible around all parts of the section being judged. Small laneways and public walks and steps should be inspected.
- b) Take a note of areas, which are particularly good or particularly bad. These areas should be mentioned by name in the judges written report. It is intended that these areas will be highlighted in the weekly newspaper reports on the competition.
- c) If possible take a photograph of bad examples of litter and submit these with the written report.
- d) Include in the written report a general comment about the litter problem in the town. Judges should

avoid any temptation to flatter the town. If criticism is deserved it should be made.

- e) Avoid any temptation to arrive at a draw between the towns. When the first town is judged the report form should be completed with the marks being awarded. The report should not be changed or indeed consulted when the second town is being marked.
- f) Lodge their report on the Thursday following the judging.

10. The names of the judge will be kept confidential

Competition Format

Sixteen towns will complete in two groups as follows:

Group 1: Mitchelstown, Cobh, Fermoy, Mallow, Midleton, Youghal, Charleville, and Ballincollig.

Group 2: Bandon, Carrigaline, Kinsale, Macroom, Clonakilty, Skibbereen, Bantry, and Dunmanway.

The competition will be run on a league basis, i.e. each of the participating towns will complete against all of the other towns in its group on successive.

Each town will be divided into sections. Two of these sections will be judged each week. The section, which includes the town centre, must be judged each week. Each of the other sections must be judged at least once during the competition.

Marks will be awarded for litter control only.

The maximum marks to be awarded for each section being judged will be 100, i.e. a maximum for the town of 200.

In recognition of the different sizes of competing towns and of the difficulty, which this entails for bigger towns, a handicapping system will apply under which 10 extra marks weekly will be awarded to Ballincollig and Carrigaline each week. The medium sized towns of Youghal, Cobh, Midleton, Mallow, Bandon, Fermoy, will receive 5 extra marks weekly.

After the judges have awarded marks and the "handicap" marks are added the percentage of the total marks awarded to each town will be

calculated. This percentage will accumulate each week as the competition proceeds. The accumulated percentage will determine the position of each town in the league table. Where the percentage points awarded to two or more towns are equal, marks awarded will be used to determine which town is highest in the league table.

Example:

Week 1: Youghal =156 Fermoy =146
Total marks awarded: 302

Youghal would be awarded 52 points (i.e.156/*100) and Fermoy would be awarded 48

Week 2: Youghal =138 Midleton = 175
Total marks awarded: 313

Youghal would be awarded 44 (i.e.138/313*100) and Midleton would be awarded 56.

After Week 2 Youghal would have a total of 96 points.

The town with the highest accumulated percentage points at the end of the competition will be declared the group winner

A county final will then be held between the winners of each group

Prizes will be presented to the group winners and to the overall winners by Cork County Council after the competition has been completed.

Attachment 2:

Judging Guidelines – Inter-Village Challenge

1. Judges should note the following background information:

- a) The competition is a serious effort on the council's part and is intended to maintain interest in the litter problem in the villages concerned over a period of two months. It is also designed in a way, which gives everyone in the village an opportunity to get involved, and indeed challenges them to get involved.
- b) The Tidy Town Committees in each of the competing villages have agreed to participate and indeed enthusiastic about the idea.

- c) If the competition is to succeed in its objectives it is absolutely essential that the integrity of the judging system be maintained. In particular each village must be judged at the proper time and must also be judged thoroughly and fairly.
- d) The results of the competition will be published each week in the local press and hopefully in the Evening Echo.

2. The Competition week extends from Thursday to the following Wednesday.

3. All villages must be judged under as similar circumstances as possible. This means that:

- a) All villages must be judged on the same day.
- b) Visits should be avoided on any day which there is a special event e.g. mart day or casual trading day.
- c) Subject to (a) and (b) judging can take place at any time or any day of the week including Saturdays and Sundays.

4. Judges should have regard to the relative condition of the village. Some villages are bigger than others and could as a result have a greater absolute quantity of litter although relatively they might be cleaner.

5. An assistant should accompany judges if possible. However, where this happens each village should be inspected together. Under no circumstances should the village be divided up between the judge and his/ her assistant.

6. The whole of the built up area of the village should be judged. Generally this means the area within the speed limits.

7. **Marks can be awarded for litter control only.** Under no circumstances should marks be granted for well kept open spaces or well presented buildings etc. Similarly marks should not be deducted for dereliction etc.

8. When considering litter control:

- a) Judges should start off on the assumption that there is no litter, i.e. the Village starts with 100 marks. Marks should then be deducted depending on the extent of litter found.
- b) Judges should not penalise the village in respect litter caused by building work unless the building work is being carried on in an irresponsible manner, in which case marks should be deducted.
- c) All litter should be penalised including small items of litter such as cigarette butts and chewing gum. Fly posting should also be penalised. However, election literature on poles etc. should not be penalised before 19th June it should be penalised fully.
- d) For the purposes of the competition kerbside weeds are to be regarded as litter.
- e) Litter in private premises, which is visible to the public, should be penalised.
- f) Marking should be strict and consistent.

9. Judges should:

- a) Walk if possible around all parts of the village being judged.
- b) Take a note of areas, which are particularly good or particularly bad. These areas should be mentioned by name in the judges written report. It is intended that these areas will be highlighted in the weekly newspaper reports on the competition.
- c) If possible take a photograph of bad examples of litter and submit these with the written report.
- d) Include in the written report a general comment about the litter problem in the village. Judges should avoid any temptation to flatter the village. If criticism is deserved it should be made.
- e) Prepare a separate report for each of the villages being judged.
- f) Lodge the report on the Thursday following the judging.

10. The names of the judges will be kept confidential.

Attachment 3:
Sample of Completed Judge's Report

Town: Fermoy

Marks Awarded Town Centre: 88
Area 2: 90
Total: 178

Town Centre:

Litter inside fence of building site next to Cavanaghs Garage on Quay.
Litter in verge on Mill Road at junction with Fitzgeralds Place
Area by Courthouse excellent
In general, the town was very good with only occasional pieces of litter.

Area 2:

Litter in gutter at Clancy Street.
Posters advertising the Wolfe Tones on ESB poles.
John Redmond Street and Emmet Street were excellent.
Chapel Square and Chapel Hill were excellent.
Quarry Lane and McDonagh Terrace were excellent.
Small amount of litter at junction of Duntaheen Road and Cork Road.
Some litter in places at Liam MacGearailt Place, otherwise good.
Glenabo Heights and Corrinview were excellent.
John Anderson Place was excellent
Small amounts of litter in places on Cork Road.

CORK INTER-TOWN LITTER CHALLENGE
- JUDGES REPORT SHEET

TOWN: _____ **DATE** _____
JUDGED: _____

MARKS AWARDED

Ton Centre:
Area:
Total:

JUDGES COMMENTS

Town _____ **Centre** _____

Area: _____

Signed: _____

Date: _____

Attachment 4:

Text of Leaflet Issued to Tidy Towns Committees

Inchigeela will be competing in the Cork Villages anti Litter League starting on 3rd June. For the following 7 weeks we will compete against 5 other villages based on how litter free we are. Each week there will be 100 marks to be fought for. Our marks will accumulate to form a league table. It is essential that we are at the top of this table at the end of July.

A judge from Cork County Council will visit the village each week unannounced.

If we win we will then compete in a County Final against the winners of 5 other areas in the county.

*Our initial competitors are **Blarney, Ballingeary, Coachford, Kilmurry, and Ballyourney/ Ballymakeera.** Everyone can play their part. Don't leave it all to others. Show your pride in our village. Try to adopt the suggestions on the right.*

At the very least it is expected that everyone in the village will refrain from causing litter.

***Inchigeela's** reputation depends on you.*

- f) Dispose of domestic refuse properly. Dumping of refuse anywhere other than at a licensed site is not only illegal but also disgraceful.*
 - g) Do not place domestic refuse in public litter bins. This is illegal and prevents others from using the bin.*
 - h) Why not join our Tidy Towns Group?*
-
- a) Clean the footpath and roadway outside your premises daily.*
 - b) Make sure that litter within your premises is not visible. Such litter will lose marks.*
 - c) Make sure that your dog or pet does not spoil the footpath or road.*
 - d) Don't allow others to cause litter. Remind them of their responsibilities if they do.*
 - e) Remember that even small items e.g. cigarette butts or chewing gum, are litter and will cost us valuable marks.*