

# PPSReview

**Product & Packaging  
Stewardship Review**

**MANAGING WASTE RESPONSIBLY**

**An information service for municipal governments**

**Vol 7, Issue 1, November 2006**

## The gloves are coming off in Ontario *Brewers lambaste WDO for "vexatious" request*

The war of words started by the Ontario Government's recent decision from nowhere to bring in deposits for wine and liquor containers is heating up and battle lines are being drawn.

It has never been a secret that the interests represented by the majority of the members of the Waste Diversion Ontario (WDO) Board of Directors were contrary to the interests of the minority, dominated as it is by Stewardship Ontario members.

But since Premier Dalton McGuinty's September 10 announcement that deposits will be applied to LCBO containers, the gloves have well and truly been removed.

### TWO NEWS RELEASES

The day before, in anticipation of the Premier's LCBO statement, Stewardship Ontario issued two news releases opposing the move. By the end of the day that his actual announcement was made, what has proved to be a very controversial joint news release was being sent out under the banners of Stewardship Ontario and WDO (see Page 4/8).

As a result of the LCBO decision, which it said placed a proposed mixed glass processing project in jeopardy, the Stewardship Ontario Board suspended market development work for all materials (not just glass) lest the work be undermined by another government

decision, according to a Stewardship Ontario spokesman.

In October, the WDO Board, against the wishes of the three municipal representatives and the

"This and other situations where the WDO name has been used for flagrantly inappropriate political purposes by certain interests on the Board make it clear that there is a compelling and immediate need for the Province to reconsider the governance structure and membership of the WDO Board."

*- Jeff Newton,  
Canada's National Brewers*

environmental group representative attending, approved the removal of \$7 million of stewards payments from 2007.

The decision was made despite a suggestion that the WDO wait until more is known about the actual cost savings from the removal of LCBO containers.

This, in turn, has led to a letter from the Association of Municipalities of Ontario to Ontario Environment Minister Laurel Broten, criticizing the WDO decision and urging no cuts to funding (See Page 3/8).

### HARSH RESPONSE

Now a request from the WDO Board to the Brewers of Ontario questioning

aspects of its 2005-2006 annual report has received a harsh response from Canada's National Brewers Eastern Canada President Jeff Newton.

In a letter sent to WDO Board Chair Gemma Zecchini, November 7, and copied to Minister Broten, Minister of Public Infrastructure and Renewal David Caplan, the Premier's Office and all WDO board members, Mr. Newton issued a stinging rebuke to the WDO's request. The letter also calls for a review of how the board is constituted and runs its affairs.

The Beer Store (TBS), he notes, "is only required to provide the WDO with a copy of its annual packaging stewardship report and to make that report public."

*See Brewers respond,  
Page 3/8*

### **INSIDE THIS EIGHT-PAGE ISSUE**

<b>News in Brief</b>	<b>2/8</b>
<b>AMO's math lesson</b>	<b>3/8</b>
<b>BC Milk plan panned</b>	<b>6/8</b>
<b>Award for PPSR</b>	<b>7/8</b>
<b>Torpedoes Ahead!</b>	<b>8/8</b>

# Briefly...

## ASDA'S ZERO WASTE STORE

UK grocery chain ASDA has announced that one of its stores is to be a zero waste generator and others will follow. ASDA's Canford Heath supermarket in the County of Dorset currently recycles around 20% of its general waste (mostly cardboard and plastic), with the rest going into landfill. In the coming weeks the store's waste bakery products will be sent for composting, followed by animal by-products in the coming months. In July, ASDA committed to send nothing to landfill from any of its stores or depots by 2010. About 65% of all the general waste produced by 313 ASDA's stores could be composted each year—equivalent to 58,000 tonnes nationwide. The company said it will use specially-designed composting units to take all the waste food from the back of the store and turn it into organic material. The company already recovers or recycles around 140,000 tonnes of cardboard packaging and 5,500 tonnes of plastic packaging each year

*letsrecycle.com, October 25, 2006*

## BAG TAX IDEA DIES IN SCOTLAND

Scottish MP Mike Pringle has withdrawn his bill for a tax on plastic bags in Scotland after the Scottish Environment and Rural Development Committee recommended in September the bill be rejected. But despite withdrawing the bill, the MP said it is not the end of the process. Mr. Pringle will continue to work towards "a massive decrease" in the use of plastic bags in Scotland, adding he will reintroduce his bill if it doesn't happen.

*BBC News, October 24, 2006*

## .....AND IN BRITISH COLUMBIA

Delegates to the Union of British Columbia Municipalities convention in Victoria have voted to defer a plastic bag tax resolution, calling for "further study". After the bag tax idea was suggested earlier this year there was an aggressive campaign against it by the plastics industry (see *PPSReview* September 2006). In 2002, the Republic of Eire imposed a 15-cent surcharge on plastic bags provided for purchases at

stores. Advocates claim it reduced plastic bag use. Industry said it did not reduce the amount of plastic being used to make bags as new thicker plastic bags were being sold and they used more plastic.

*www.tricitynews.com October 29, 2006*

## SAINSBURY'S LOOKS TO CORN

UK supermarket giant Sainsbury's says 150 million plastic trays and bags used for its ready meals and organic food will be replaced with compostable packaging within one year. The packaging will be replaced by the use of maize, sugar-cane or starch packaging. The company claims the move will save 4,010,000 tonnes of fossil fuel (3,550t of plastic) from Sainsbury's output alone every year. Sainsbury's will also be changing packaging guidelines for food labels, e.g. "Sorry, not recyclable" or "Please recycle" to make it much clearer to customers what they can do to recycle or compost.

*www.packaging-technology.com,  
September 18, 2006*

## MORATORIUM ON PLA URGED

A halt on new polylactic acid (PLA) products has been urged by a coalition of recycling companies and research organizations. PLA, a bio-based plastic developed by NatureWorks, is a plastic resin made from corn, and the company claims it is compostable, making it ideal for use in plastic serviceware, which is not usually recycled. The material is also being used for other applications, like bottles, and this is a cause for concern. Members of the coalition, which includes Eco-Cycle (CO), Eureka Recycling (MN), Ecology Center (CA), the Plastic Redesign Project (multi-state), the Institute for Local Self-Reliance (DC), the Center for a Competitive Waste Industry (WI) and the GrassRoots Recycling Network (CA), are concerned that there has not been enough testing for recyclability. They are worried the increasing appearance of the PLA products in recycling streams could be detrimental to the systems designed for polyethyleneterephthalate (PET), the dominant plastic used in recyclable bottles.

*Waste Age, October, 2006*

**Product & Packaging Stewardship Review** is published by Ben Bennett Communications as part of the Fair Comment Project. It is emailed as a communications service aimed at providing a broad range of stewardship and associated information from Canada, the United States and overseas.

The current issue of *PPSReview*, and past issues, are available for viewing on the Internet ([www.productstewardship.org](http://www.productstewardship.org)).

Anyone wishing to support the Fair Comment Project may email Ben Bennett ([bbc@albedo.net](mailto:bbc@albedo.net)). Confidentiality is guaranteed.

© Ben Bennett Communications, 2006

NOTICE: THIS PUBLICATION, AND THE VIEWS EXPRESSED, HAVE NO CONNECTION WITH THE ASSOCIATION OF MUNICIPAL RECYCLING COORDINATORS OF GUELPH, ONTARIO.

**PPS  
Review  
November  
2006**

**Page 2/8**

# AMO questions the math on LCBO \$ and offers its own funding formula

The Liquor Control Board of Ontario (LCBO) should still contribute to the blue box until the cost reductions from removing wine and liquor containers next February are known, says the Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO).

In a letter to Ontario Environment Minister Laurel Broten, November 2, AMO president Doug Reycraft criticizes the Waste Diversion Ontario (WDO) Board decision October 18 to remove \$7 million from municipal funding, calling it "contrary to established practice".

The funding cut "will diminish the principle of stewardship in Ontario," Mr. Reycraft writes.

"I am sure you share our understanding that this was never the intent of this important initiative."

The LCBO \$5 million payment should not change, AMO suggests, as the effect of the LCBO deposit system

will not be known until the blue box cost, revenue and tonnage data are completed in 2008.

## DE MINIMUS

AMO recommends the LCBO remain a full steward until its materials reach the 10% *de minimus* level (at which point stewards are not required to pay) and any change to steward payments be based on audited WDO financial datacall figures for 2007.

It proposes that for every 10% in measured LCBO deposit return performance in 2007, LCBO blue box payment be reduced. At the 90% level, the payments would cease entirely.

## NO OBLIGATION TO PAY?

At the WDO meeting in October, it was noted the legal consequences if the 2007 fees are not approved by the end of the year are unknown. It had been suggested, *PPSReview* has learned, that the issue of fees be deferred, but a

Stewardship Ontario representative had said that if the stewards were not informed of their obligations by the year's end, there would be no obligation to pay.

Before the LCBO announcement was made, WDO had assessed the stewards' portion of the blue box system costs at \$62,017,482. After a series of complex calculations that include using average costs for all materials, allowing for revenues and applying a three-year rolling average principle, that figure was reduced by \$6,969,316 to \$55,048,166.

The calculations and background to the recommendation to cut almost \$7 million are contained in *Item 4.2a*, a report from the executive director dated October 6, 2006. The report concludes with the following statement:

"Note: It is recommended that the motion and report not be posted and a press release not be issued."

A copy of that report is available at the *PPSReview* website ([www.productstewardship.org](http://www.productstewardship.org)).

When the vote was called the motion to confirm the revised net system cost was passed with five industry votes in favour, three municipal representatives (one was absent) and the Recycling Council of Ontario rep voting against, with the LCBO abstaining.

The use of the average overall cost to make the LCBO calculations was questioned at the same meeting and the Stewardship Ontario reps were asked if there were more accurate data on material costs. They indicated they had offered to work with AMO to come up with better numbers on LCBO

## Brewers respond to WDO letter

from Page 1/8

The wording of Section 35 of the Waste Diversion Act "was carefully and deliberately crafted with significant input from the beer industry to avoid TBS being subject to oversight and regulation by a biased and conflicted organization dominated and controlled by commercial interests openly opposed to our preferred method of managing our consumer packaging – a deposit return system," said Mr. Newton, who sits on the WDO Board.

He said the September press release issued jointly by WDO and Stewardship Ontario "only serves to confirm that the intent behind the wording of section 35 was both wise and appropriate."

That release was issued without the required approval of the WDO Board and in direct contravention of the WDO's operating agreement with

the Ministry of Environment, said Mr. Newton.

"This and other situations where the WDO name has been used for flagrantly inappropriate political purposes by certain interests on the Board make it clear that there is a compelling and immediate need for the Province to reconsider the governance structure and membership of the WDO as it completes its five-year review of the WDA and before new programs are subject to its questionable oversight and control," he added.

The Beer Store, said Mr. Newton, is always prepared "to entertain constructive comments" about its packaging stewardship report. As a matter of policy, however, TBS "does not respond to requests or demands that are clearly competitively vexatious in nature."

**PPS  
Review  
November  
2006  
Page 3/8**

# Other stewards are subsidizing cost of LCBO containers, says WDO rep

Waste Diversion Ontario (WDO) executive director Glenda Gies has explained how the organization plans to adjust funding for municipalities in 2007 to allow for the removal of wine and spirit containers from the blue box.

Speaking at the Ontario Recyclers Workshop, November 2 in Toronto, Ms Gies said that while the obligation to stewards was effective from the day the program plan started in 2004, and the costs assessed are based on the costs for

two years back, the obligation is for the current year.

There is a lot of uncertainty as to whether Stewardship Ontario can levy 2007 fees on the LCBO, so the WDO decided to assume they cannot and will calculate 2007 stewards fees on total costs that do not include wine and spirit container recovery in the blue box.

It was a “worst cost scenario” for the stewards, she said.

Using average net cost numbers

referred to by the Association of Municipalities of Ontario in a recent discussion paper, and adjusting the figures to cover the three-year rolling average applied in previous calculations, WDO estimates total net costs will decrease by \$14 million a year, meaning \$7 million will be removed from payments to municipalities for 2007.

“I’m sure this is not welcome news to municipalities,” said Ms Gies.

The “good news story”, she said, is that funding can now flow in 2007 now that the uncertainty has been removed.

WDO’s October 18 decision confirming the net system cost for the purpose of setting 2007 steward fees was “to separate uncertainty from the 2007 fee calculation process,” she said.

At the recycler workshop it was noted that \$7 million was being removed but the LCBO had only been paying \$5 million each year.

Ms Gies explained that under the three-factor formula, those stewards who enjoy higher rates of recovery are in effect subsidized by those who have lower recovery rates.

“It’s what the fee-setting methodology was intended to do,” said Guy Perry of Stewardship Ontario.

“We encourage municipalities to get involved and understand the fee-setting process as much as possible,” he said, noting the stewards had met that very morning to discuss fees and just one municipal representative was present.

(See also *AMO questions the math* on Page 3/8.)

## Joint WDO/SO news release raises eyebrows; board reviews PR policy

Waste Diversion Ontario (WDO)’s press release policy was the subject of some discussion at its October 18 meeting.

*PPSReview* has learned that the discussion was prompted by concerns that a joint news release from Stewardship Ontario and the WDO, issued right after Ontario Premier Dalton McGuinty announced the LCBO deposit return system, could be construed as criticizing the government.

The release in question was issued September 10, hours after the LCBO announcement, under the heading, “*Blue Box organizations wonder why they weren’t consulted on impacts of LCBO deposit-return plan—seek explanations*”

The news release opened with, “*Two Ontario organizations are wondering why the Liberal government did not consult with them about the potential impacts of its sudden decision to pull LCBO alcohol and spirit bottles out of the blue box and put them into a deposit return system, especially since the government has expressed support for a strong blue box system.*”

The news release also reiterates the concern expressed in a separate Stewardship Ontario new release the day before about the LCBO decision’s

impact on a proposed new glass processing facility. (Both are available at the Stewardship Ontario website ([www.stewardshipontario.ca/media/releases.htm](http://www.stewardshipontario.ca/media/releases.htm)).

Joint news releases, the WDO meeting was told, require agreement from both parties on the wording, as opposed to WDO releases which can be issued directly by the executive director. And there is a protocol under which the Ministry of the Environment (MOE) is supposed to be able to review press releases where time permits and to get a copy in the event there is no time for a review.

In the case of the joint release with Stewardship Ontario, the executive director did check with the WDO chair before it was issued and a copy was sent to the MOE. It was noted that the only thing in the news release that could be interpreted as criticism was the complaint that WDO was not consulted.

The MOE rep said the Ministry may want to review the notification process in the WDO operating agreement to require an effort be made to contact the Ministry before news releases are issued. It was ultimately agreed the chair and vice-chair be consulted before news releases on sensitive topics, and copies sent to the rest of the board for their information.

## THE INDUSTRY VIEW DOWN UNDER

# A major drinks company urges deposits for Australian liquor

*Editor's note: Diageo is one of the world's leading premium drinks companies. Its brands include Smirnoff, Johnnie Walker, Guinness, Baileys, J&B, Captain Morgan, Cuervo, Tanqueray, Crown Royal, and Beaulieu Vineyard and Sterling Vineyards wines. The following is extracted from a position paper Diageo submitted in*

*August to the Western Australia Government's inquiry into container deposits.*

Container deposits immediately raise emotional argument from both sides of the debate – often completely missing the logical and rational support for such a mechanism.

When considering arguments within the deposit debate, the primary motivation for the debate should be considered. It appears that both sides support a reduction in beverage container litter and improvement in resource recovery of containers consumed away-from-home. After all, who would argue that we should have more litter or less recycling? This context is important when debating different options for delivering desired outcomes, including increased curbside recycling, public place recycling, regulation, and incentive schemes.

Curbside recycling makes a valuable contribution to resource recovery and Diageo applauds the efforts made by Australian jurisdictions in improving the performance of curbside recycling. However curbside is not a perfect system in-and-of itself. For example it does not address beverage container litter. Litter is an away-from-home activity by definition as very little litter occurs in people's literal backyards.

Additionally, curbside recycling does not address resource recovery of containers consumed away from home. Public place recycling infrastructure with

accompanying education is often presented as the solution.

Putting aside considerable capital and operational costs of public-place recycling, no incentive is provided

**“Container deposits immediately raise emotional argument from both sides of the debate – often completely missing the logical and rational support for such a mechanism.”**

(other than civic duty) for people to correctly use the recycling bins provided.

Accompanying regulation and enforcement is required to ensure that people use the recycling facilities correctly and do not litter.

However, instead of educating and regulating to change attitudes and behaviour in using public place recycling, a more ecological approach would be systemic behavioural change through an immediate motivator, in this case the refund of a monetary deposit. Changing consumer behaviour this way also provides the action learning that will result in changed attitudes.

Diageo prefers this style of incentive based approach. Deposits provide consumers an incentive to return their beverage containers for recycling as opposed to externalizing end-of-life management costs of litter and waste onto broader society. The “waste” beverage container now has a direct value. Container deposits thus increase recovery of wasted beverage containers and reduce litter.

The fact that deposit/refund systems achieve this “double dividend” is not in dispute.

Even the Productivity Commission recognizes that deposits achieve “improved recovery of beverage containers” and “reduced beverage container litter”. However Diageo would disagree with the Commission's

negative conclusion on container deposit effectiveness.

We would highlight that:

- curbside recycling does not cover resource recovery from public place consumption
- schemes that seek to minimize the litter of beverage containers should not be assessed as a mechanism to cover all litter
- volumetric based

assessments of litter data (as opposed to single item counts) reveal that beverage containers comprise over half of the litter stream, except in South Australia (where there are deposits), where beverage container litter is less than 20%

- implementing an alternative system to deposits has significant cost, such as public-place recycling infrastructure, education and regulation with its associated requirements for increased litter inspectors, deficiencies of “hit and miss” enforcement, and follow up prosecutions (penalty deterrence is not enough to change behaviour)

From Diageo's perspective it is clear that container deposit/refund systems have a proven track record in reducing beverage container litter and increasing the recovery of containers consumed away from home.

Issues regarding the cost effectiveness of deposit systems are of importance as design considerations for Western Australia when deciding between different models of operation.

ALTHOUGH IT HAS NO DEPOSIT

# New milk jug take-back program “meets expectations” says BC minister

After many years of lobbying by environmentalists and municipalities, a new take-back program for milk jugs in British Columbia began in October – except that there is no incentive to take the empties back.

The Recycling Council of British Columbia (RCBC) was not consulted about the plan and was taken by surprise by the announcement.

“What does that say about the plan?” wondered RCBC executive director Brock Macdonald.

The fact that the announcement came on a Friday, the day media consultants say is the best day to bury a story, “spoke volumes”, he said

Many organizations, including RCBC had formally requested that milk containers be included in the deposit-refund system, a position supported widely by the municipalities.

At the program’s launch in Chilliwack, BC Environment Minister

Barry Penner said the program “meets the government’s expectations for shared product stewardship while respecting British Columbia’s diverse recycling infrastructures and maintaining affordability for consumers.”

RCBC begs to differ.

“Looking at this voluntary, non-deposit program through the lens of extended producer responsibility (EPR) it fails to meet both the spirit and the letter of BC’s current EPR programs. There’s no return to retail, and since not all communities are served by a depot, it does not provide universal accessibility,” said Mr. Macdonald.

## NO TRANSFER OF COST

“It does not transfer the cost from taxpayers to industry as empty milk containers will still end up in the blue box or the landfill. With no set capture rates there is no way to measure the

success or failure of this undertaking.”

In the past, one of the BC Government’s expectations has been that a deposit would be used to encourage people to bring back the empties. Unlike all the other containers returned to Encorp depots, no deposit will have been levied at the time of the milk jug’s purchase and thus none will be returned when the containers are returned to the depot.

The BC Dairy Council said while participation in the program is voluntary, “all indications are that participation will be high.”

## LOBBIED FOR A REPRIEVE

When BC’s expanded deposit-refund system for beverage containers was introduced eight years ago, the dairy industry lobbied for a reprieve from the regulation and was exempted from participating. As a result high-density polyethylene (HDPE) milk containers are still being collected in curbside recycling programs rather than through deposit-refund system.

“As this plan does not include deposits, it opens the door for regulated producers to question why their products are subject to a deposit system,” noted Mr. Macdonald.

“What this plan does do is provide the Dairy Council with yet another tactic to delay the inclusion of milk containers in BC’s EPR regulation under which every other beverage producer must operate. It’s not fair, it’s not effective and it’s not EPR.”

The program rollout will be in three phases, starting October 2006 with completion slated for mid-2007.

## New EPSC report focuses on design for the environment

A new report focusing on improvements in environmental design was released by Electronics Product Stewardship Canada (EPSC) in October. *Designing for the Environment* was launched at the E-Scrap 2006 conference in Austin, Texas, North America’s largest gathering of the electronics recycling community.

The six-page report covers five areas where manufacturers say they have shown significant advances in recent years: chemical management, energy efficiency, materials management, design for recycling and product expandability.

It outlines how companies have reduced environmentally sensitive chemicals in their products, and developed and incorporated power-saving features. Advancements in

technology and the miniaturization of components have reduced the amount of resources required to produce electronic products, and some difficult to recycle plastics are being replaced with lighter, more durable metals that are recyclable.

Other companies have developed products that snap apart for ease of recycling, doing away with the need for glue, while others have eliminated paint and varnish on plastics.

Multi-functional devices, such as all-in-one printers, can perform an array of tasks, reducing the total number of products that need to be manufactured, shipped and responsibly recycled at end-of-life, reducing the overall environmental impact.

A downloadable pdf version of the report is available at the EPSC website ([www.epsc.ca/dfe](http://www.epsc.ca/dfe)).

**PPS  
Review  
November  
2006  
Page 6/8**

## October 12 webcast slides now online

Presentations from the Canadian Stewardship webcast October 12 are available from the event's website ([www.canadianstewardship.com](http://www.canadianstewardship.com)).

Available presentations include speakers Ken Friesen, Earthbound Environmental Inc. (Environmental Stewardship in Manitoba); Ginette Bureau, program and operating vice-president of Recyc-Quebec; Chris Benedetti, vice-president of the Sussex Strategy Group; Christina Seidel, executive director of the Recycling Council of Alberta; Neil Hastie, president and CEO of Encorp Pacific; Dan Wong, chair of Encorp Pacific, and Bill Ring, chief operating officer of the Resource Recovery Fund Board in Nova Scotia.

## RCO Award for *PPSReview*

*PPSReview* was recognized for "excellence and commitment to a sustainable environment" last month at the Recycling Council of Ontario's 2007 Waste Minimization Awards (Media section).

The following are extracted from the citation from the eastern Canada nominator Ken Donnelly.

*Although the Masthead of the periodical states that each issue is "an information service for municipal governments", it is in reality much more than that. Consultants like myself, provincial government officials and many more people look forward to the delivery of their copies of PPSReview in their inboxes every other month...*

*Very important decisions regarding solid waste management are made behind closed doors in Ontario, and the results have had a huge impact on waste management over the years...*

*Until PPSReview began publishing, there was little information circulating about the decisions being made behind closed doors. PPSReview has filled an important gap, as the investigative journalism that is conducted allows municipal representatives and other readers the opportunity to find out things which they might not have otherwise been aware. Further, such issues as funding for WDO, the status of tire stewardship programs and HHW programs, and the positions of industry on funding are rarely covered by the mainstream media. PPSReview provides an important window into the decisions that are made... and not made... by the Ontario waste management power brokers...*

*I would also ask the reviewers to consider the fact that it is delivered electronically, and does not take up any room in a Blue Box. For this reason, the publication's producers are indebted to municipalities for 50% of \$0.00... that is, if the stewardship program is ever properly implemented.*

## COMING EVENTS

### November 18

Ontario Southwest Municipal Conference  
London, ON  
(877) 426-6527 (x. 330)  
[www.amo.on.ca](http://www.amo.on.ca)

### November 27-30

Association of Manitoba Municipalities Annual Convention, Winnipeg, MN  
(204) 856-2365  
[www.amm.mb.ca](http://www.amm.mb.ca)

### November 29-30

Canadian Waste & Recycling Expo  
Toronto, ON  
(905) 426-9313  
[www.cari.recycling.org](http://www.cari.recycling.org)

### February 5-6, 2007

Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association convention and Municipal Marketplace Tradeshow  
Saskatoon, SK  
(306) 525-3727  
[www.suma.org](http://www.suma.org)

### February 14-16, 2007

AMRC Spring Workshop & AGM  
Hockley Valley, ON  
(519) 823-1990  
[www.amrc.ca](http://www.amrc.ca)

### February 25-28, 2007

OGRA/ROMA Combined Conferences  
Toronto, ON  
(905) 795-2555  
[www.amo.on.ca](http://www.amo.on.ca)

### March 21-23, 2007

Coast Waste Management Association Annual Conference  
Victoria, BC  
(250) 244-4200  
[www.cwma.bc.ca](http://www.cwma.bc.ca)

**PPS  
Review  
November  
2006**

**Page 7/8**

# Opinion Piece

The opinions expressed in this column are not necessarily those of PPSReview

## Watch out for the torpedoes after LCBO take-back plan is launched

By Jay Arthur

It has been two months now since Dalton's Big Announcement (known in some circles as "the events of 9/10"), and we all wait eagerly for the report about how it will work.

Well, okay, not all of us.

For most people, the only real change to their lives in Ontario in February will be that they load empty booze bottles into the trunk along with the beer bottles when it's time to take the empties back.

For the 10% or so who don't frequent the beer palace once in a while, I have no doubt there will be no shortage of charities lined up to accept the LCBO empties at a convenient location, or even at the door now that bottle drives have suddenly started looking good again.

I used the overly dramatic reference to a real tragedy in the opening paragraph because there has been so much hyperbole about this decision that it got me thinking.

If you only got your information from the CSR: Corporations Supporting Recycling website ([www.csr.org](http://www.csr.org)), you'd be getting ready for Armageddon itself.

The troops were fully engaged even before the ink was dry—heck, even before the deal was done.

There was the general himself on TVs across the networks assuring us our beloved blue box was in peril, and that to say glass was being landfilled—oh, the sacrilege!—was garbage. (The municipalities had said that, but what do *they* know?)

In addition to the electronic media appearances, not one, but two press releases were quickly sent off. And all this on a weekend. Boy, how much did *that* cost?

All this, one assumes, was designed to convince the Premier that if he had any plans to embrace deposits, as he had hinted earlier in the week, the sky would fall, and he'd better think again. Evidently, he did not think again and by the early evening news on Sunday the idea was a reality.

And once announced, the deposit train would be hard to stop.

Nonetheless, more golf games were eschewed and the majority CSR

own way.

It was bad enough that the municipalities were getting uppity, issuing position papers and challenging the industry gospel.

Now they had the ear of the Premier, a position strictly reserved for industry lobbyists.

Something had to be done.

And this is why some folks are waiting anxiously to see the LCBO plan for next year's take-back launch.

They will be looking to send a torpedo or two in its direction. Because if it works, there will inevitably be pressure on the other containers in the blue box. If it fails, then the whole notion of deposits in Ontario will be besmirched.

With British Columbia happily operating a blue box program virtually without containers, and enjoying high diversion numbers, there would need to be some major problems in Ontario to ignore such a shining example of efficiency.

And so the pressure is very much on the Province, too.

Having stepped out on this very popular vote-getting deposit limb, it is very much in the Liberals' interest to make sure it works well.

And if that means taking a hard look at the entire Waste Diversion Act and the flawed platform on which it was built, then so be it.

**"Setting aside the misinformation, one thing is clear from all this. The ace lobbyists were out-lobbied, and that must have hurt."**

members had no trouble getting WDO to co-sign a press release complaining that they weren't advised.

I note in *Recycling Canada* that another CSR spokesperson said there would be an increase in scavenging, dumpster-diving and *litter*.

Notwithstanding the curious logic that sees deposits increasing litter, as opposed to decreasing it, the message was clearly telling us that the hordes would be at the door.

She also said what at least two press releases had been suggesting been saying, that plans for a new glass processing plant were being shelved, which is interesting. My spies tell me the guy behind that project told a workshop crowd in Toronto in October that he intends to go ahead.

Setting aside the misinformation, one thing is clear from all this. The ace lobbyists were out-lobbied, and that must have hurt. And this, I think, is the reason for all this fear and loathing that we are seeing.

These guys are used to getting their

**PPS  
Review  
November  
2006  
Page 8/8**