DIVISION OF LITTER PREVENTION AND RECYCLING

ORIGINS

The Division of Litter Prevention and Recycling, originally created as the Office of Litter Control, was born out of the intense electoral, media, and legislative debates which surrounded the defeat of Issue One, “the Bottle Bill,” in November 1979. The Bottle Bill, which would have required a deposit of ten cents on beverage containers sold in Ohio, was placed on the ballot through initiative petition by a coalition of environmental, hunting, fishing, and conservation groups led by the Ohio Alliance for Returnables. Opposition to Issue One was led by Ohioans for a Practical Litter Law (OPLL), a coalition of industry and labor organizations made up primarily of container, soft drink and beer manufacturers, retail merchants, and affected unions. Support for the group came from Ohioans as well as national organizations, which viewed the Ohio initiative as a critical test for initiatives in other states. Early polls indicated that the public favored the initiative by a 70 to 20 margin but it failed in November by a 72 percent to 27 percent margin—the largest margin of defeat this century for an initiative petition in Ohio.

The issues raised to reverse public opinion included the realities that the litter problem involved far more than bottles and cans; that a more comprehensive law was needed involving litter prevention, removal, and recycling; that head-of-household jobs would be lost; and that consumer costs would rise. The phrase, “A Litter Law That Works,” became a campaign standard. It remains a yardstick against which supporters and opponents gauge the program.

Having defeated the initiative, OPLL and its supporters in the General Assembly faced the challenge of designing a litter law that truly would work. An editorial in the Cincinnati Post summarized the viewpoint of the attentive media: “The legislature has a clear-cut responsibility to come up with an effective, fair measure that will stand up in court.”

Even before Issue One’s defeat, a proposed comprehensive alternative bill, which had as its mission to reduce all forms of litter, was making its way through the Ohio House of Representatives. While the legislation was fairly comprehensive in its approach from the beginning, some legislators advocated that it be solely a roadside litter pick up program or a grants program to local governments with little or no State requirements or administration. The bill underwent major amendments in the Senate Agriculture, Conservation and Environment Committee. From November 1979 until April 1980, House Bill 361 was scrutinized in subcommittee. When it came to the Senate floor on 23 April 1980, it was declared that the bill keeps faith with the voters who defeated the mandatory deposit law on last
November’s ballot.” Believing that the legislature could draft a better solution, The Cleveland Plain Dealer responded to its enactment with an editorial that the new program would be watched closely and “whether progress will be made in reduction of litter remains to be shown.”

In addition to the legislative leaders, the press, and the Issue One proponents and opponents, the other key actor in the development of House Bill 361, which became the Ohio Litter Control Law, was the Ohio Department of Natural Resources. This Department had the characteristics sought by legislative leaders and labor and industry lobbyists: credibility with the press, the public, and the General Assembly; a reputation for professionalism and good management; experience in administering grant programs and working with local officials; and a positive image. ODNR was willing to create a separate operating unit for the litter control and recycling program, and to give it priority program status, if two conditions were met. First, the statute had to be funded adequately; and second, it had to authorize broad, substantive statewide and local programs. The Department was not willing to lend its credibility to the program unless it had the capacity to be “a litter law that works.”

After nearly six months in the Senate Agriculture, Conservation and Environment Committee, House Bill 361 passed the Senate easily by a vote of 30-3. There were, however, major controversies brewing between the House and Senate. As reported in an editorial by the Toledo Blade on 26 June 1980, “Shortly before a final vote, a coalition of legislators favoring a bottle bill approach and those opposed to any kind of tax increase rejected the measure on the House floor.” The second controversy centered around how much revenue the new taxes would generate. Key legislators were concerned whether its revenue sources would be sufficient to fund the comprehensive program to which OPLL, its successor group — Labor and Industry for a Cleaner Ohio (LICO)—and the legislative leaders had committed. The final version of the bill authorized $49 million over six years. The appropriations were graduated with the realistic expectation that it would take a few years before the State and local governments’ programs would be mature enough to require full funding.

No single factor was more critical to the early success of the Ohio litter control effort than the funding mechanism and authorizations established by House Bill 361. As enacted, the law imposed a two-tier addition to the corporate franchise tax with the second and higher tier paid only by “litter stream” industries. The new taxes generated about $10 million per year in a relatively painless way.

Of equal importance was the bill’s provision which earmarked the funds exclusively for the new program. This enabled the program to concentrate on accomplishing statutory objectives rather than being distracted by repeated funding crises. The earmarked funds were doubly important from 1980 to 1982, a time of recession, a $189-million State deficit, and repeated across-the-board reductions for general revenue funded agencies in Ohio.

As signed by Governor James A. Rhodes on 14 July 1980, the bill finally contained the most effective and relevant elements found in other states’ litter laws and all the elements cited by ODNR as essential for an effective program. The enacted legislation called upon the Director of ODNR to implement a comprehensive litter control and recycling program that included the following broad provisions:

1) Establishing litter prevention and recycling educational campaigns.
2) Strengthening enforcement of local litter laws.
3) Administering community grants programs.
4) Funding nonprofit community recycling centers.
5) Conducting litter surveys.

The Act also established a nine-member Litter Control and Recycling Advisory Council representing all the major groups involved in lobbying on the bill: agriculture, labor, manufacturing, wholesale and retail, industry, and recycling. A representative of the public was also to serve on the Council. This body not only served in an advisory capacity, but provided high quality technical and political expertise, and deflected assaults on the program from skeptical members of the press and of the General Assembly. This
shield function was especially valuable during the program's formative years. The Council was committed to make the Ohio program the most successful one in the country, and included the following members: Robert A. Manning, Chair, Counsel for the Ohio Railroad Association; Stephen Grossman, Vice Chair, President of Grossman International, Inc.; Ghay Holcomb, Secretary, Legislative Director of the United Steel Workers of America; George L. Forbes, President of Cleveland City Council; James G. Ayres, President of Great Lakes Distributors, Inc.; William E. Spengler, President of Domestic Operations of Owens-Illinois, Inc.; C. William Swank, Executive Vice President of Ohio Farm Bureau Federation, Inc.; Phillip Wayt, Executive Director of Ohio Wholesale Beer and Wine Association; and William M. Williams, Chair of Akron Coca-Cola Bottling Company.

INITIAL PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION, 1980-1982

On 25 September 1980, nearly a year after the voters had defeated Issue One, Governor Rhodes announced the appointment of Denise Franz King (Fig. 18.1) as the first Chief of ODNR's Office of Litter Control (OLC). Mrs. King had served previously as ODNR's Legislative Liaison and was familiar with the history of House Bill 361 and the expectations of legislators, interest groups, the Department, and the often impatient and skeptical press.

The Office, which always functioned like an operating Division, was under formidable pressure to establish itself as credible, professional, and substantive. To hasten its implementation, ODNR Director Teater named the Litter Control Program to the list of priority programs within the Department. A special task force of personnel, financial, and procurement administrators was appointed to eliminate bureaucratic bottle-necks which could have slowed the agency’s formation. From the beginning, the new Office received excellent cooperation and encouragement from other ODNR Offices and Divisions. The Office was organized into three sections: 1) Community Grants; 2) Public Education; 3) Technical Assistance; and an administrative support unit. The respective section heads, Bruce McPherson, Carol Krotje, David Ross, and Harriett Neuswanger, were experienced ODNR administrators which strengthened communications and cooperation with other ODNR Divisions and accelerated the pace at which the Office could implement its agenda.

By January 1981, OLC with a small staff was already moving rapidly. While the sunset clause in House Bill 361 gave ODNR until 1986 to prove Ohio had a “litter law that works,” the reality was that if it were not implemented rapidly, the General Assembly could terminate the Office earlier. OLC developed a detailed set of goals and objectives which planned a series of highly visible successes in the short run thereby allowing the substantive long-range education, law enforcement, recycling, and grants programs an opportunity to develop and became effective. The long-term strategies were targeted toward: 1) assisting and monitoring communities which received grants in the development of effective, comprehensive, broad-based local programs; and 2) providing an array of technical materials and assistance to impact all Ohioans. A specific effort was made to see that the program met the needs of rural as well as urban communities.

In carrying out its mandate, the Office was operating under a definition that essentially defined litter as misplaced solid waste. Specifically, Section 1502.01 of the Ohio Revised Code defined “litter” as items which had been “thrown, dropped, discarded, placed or deposited by a person on public property, on private property not owned by him, or on the waters of the state . . .” Responsibility for solid waste collection and management remained separately with the Ohio Environmental Protection Agency.

Community Grants

The majority of the Office’s funds were awarded as grants to communities to establish their own litter prevention and recycling programs. The Community Grants Section was responsible for soliciting, recommending, and administering these grants to counties, cities, townships, and State agencies. The first litter control grants were
awarded in June 1981. Local grant programs were encouraged and later required to include all of the following: clean-up campaigns, litter containment projects, educational programs in the schools, public awareness programs, improved law enforcement, and recycling. The “Clean Up Ohio Community Guide” was produced as a self-help guide for communities desiring to develop comprehensive litter control and recycling programs (Fig. 18.2). It, like many OLC services, was available to recipients of grants as well as other communities.

Public Education

Broadly defined, the Public Education Section was responsible for the in-school and mass-media public awareness campaigns, volunteer coordination, and the Speakers Bureau. A series of education packets called “Looking Good in Ohio’s Schools,” a teachers guide, curriculum integrated work sheets, and a film strip were produced and distributed for grades K-6. A separate “Educator’s Guide” for grades 7-12 brought the message of litter control and recycling awareness into the high school classroom. Book covers carrying a litter prevention and recycling message were first provided to schools in 1982 by the Black River Chapter of The Izaak Walton League of America through a joint effort with OLC. In 1985, through a special grant from OLC, the Ohio Conservation and Outdoor Education Association produced a book cover focusing on sixth graders in Ohio (see Plate 21).

A consultant was retained to develop a media plan, to assist in the development of and production of commercials and public service announcements (PSA’s), and to purchase commercial air time and negotiate for the donation of PSA time. During the two-year period of this contract, more than ten times the value of the purchased media time was donated to the program in free PSA’s which made the program’s message even more visible.

The task of coordinating industrial advertising and promotional campaigns also was assigned to this Section. At the request of the Office, grocery chains, milk carton manufacturers, soft drink and beer distributors, and scores of other businesses printed the program logo and slogans on a vast array of advertising and consumer materials. The Litter Prevention and Recycling Advisory Council members were instrumental in creating the wave of industrial and commercial support that made this effort so successful.

Promotion and coordination of Clean Up Ohio Day (see Plate 22), an annual statewide volunteer cleanup, the Litter Letter program, and the Speakers Bureau were also coordinated by the Public Education Section. In one six-month period in 1982, Chief King completed over 100 radio and television talk shows, interviews, and conferences with reporters or editorial boards. The policy paid dividends in terms of extensive and positive coverage. A 1982 editorial in the Columbus Citizen Journal, which had previously been critical of Ohio’s approach to litter reduction, lauded the “capable and enthusiastic” staff and conceded that Ohio “has advanced on several fronts on its war on careless littering and illegal dumping.”

Technical Assistance

The Technical Assistance Section, like the Public Education Section, provided materials and expertise to communities and groups regardless of their involvement in the grants program. The Law Enforcement Unit developed a model ordinance to promote successful enforcement of littering statutes and illegal dumping, worked with the courts and law enforcement organizations to heighten their
involvement in litter prosecutions, and encouraged the courts to sentence violators to clean up public areas. The Recycling Unit established a recycling hot line, helped develop business plans for new or expanded recycling ventures, inaugurated an office paper and aluminum recycling system for the ODNR central office, and conducted research on the barriers to increased recycling.

Summer Youth Litter Corps

As a part of OLC’s ongoing goal-setting process, and in response to repeated calls from segments of the media, the General Assembly, and the public for a major roadway cleanup effort, Chief King made it a high priority to have a Summer Youth Litter Corps (SYLC) in action by 1982. The Chief and ODNR Director Teater shared the philosophy that having the government picking up after people was not an effective way to teach people not to litter. These policymakers always insisted that House Bill 361 was vastly more than “just a pickup program.” However, farmers wanted the litter out of their fields, the program’s political backers wanted the public to “see cleanup,” and there were many youth in need of employment. The concept of creating summer jobs to remove roadside litter (Fig. 18.3) also provided an opportunity to educate the public on the scope of the problem and to work cooperatively with local governments not already involved in the grants program.

After studying the Boston and Washington State roadside cleanup programs, the Department enthusiastically adopted its own SYLC. The program was jointly planned by the Division of Civilian Conservation (DCC) and OLC. During 1982, its first year, implementation and management of the program were carried out by DCC which had the trained staff and equipment for this type of operation.

During this first year, the program employed nearly 500 youths to conduct the program in seventeen agricultural counties and nineteen cities. The youth participating in the program were recruited and paid the minimum wage with funding through the Job Training Partnership Act program of the United States Department of Labor. The SYLC program operated for eight 40-hour weeks between June and August.

Work leaders, coordinating staff, and crew members were provided identifiable T-shirts and caps. Staff wages (excluding crew members), transportation expenses, and administrative overhead approximated $7000 per unit. The cooperative structure of SYLC represented government at its best—teamwork among local, state, and federal agencies in cooperation with private industry enhancing the lives of youths, while they worked to improve the quality of our environment.

National Recognition

In December 1982, Keep America Beautiful, Inc. presented the Office of Litter Control a First Place Award in the State Programs category, recognizing it as a national model. In its first two hectic years, OLC had designed and implemented one of the nation’s most comprehensive, substantive, and professional litter control and recycling programs. It had experienced remarkable progress toward changing the habits and attitudes of Ohioans to prevent litter, promote recycling, and remove litter from public areas and roadways. The delicate and difficult job of inaugurating the program was complete. The equally challenging task of keeping the momentum rolling toward success was about to begin.
OLC experienced its first change of administration in 1983 upon the election of Governor Richard F. Celeste, and Mary L. Wiard (Fig 18.4) was appointed Chief. With the new administration, came a careful review and evaluation of Ohio’s Litter Control Program. This evaluation process produced a set of detailed three-year goals and objectives for attacking the litter problem. Building on the sound planning and development of the program in its initial years, the program adopted a more aggressive approach, emphasizing the individual’s responsibility in the litter problem. This theme was echoed in the 1983 media campaign, “Don’t Litter Ohio, It Gets You Right Where You Live.” While the program actively continued to support cleanup efforts, increased emphasis was directed toward litter law enforcement, the problem of illegal dumping, and household recycling. Several new grant assistance options were also established.

Awareness

The program’s major goal was to change the attitude and behavior of litterers. To accomplish this, it was essential to reach Ohioans repeatedly with litter prevention and recycling messages. The size and scope of OLC media campaigns and awareness efforts during this four-year period were exceeded only by the State’s Travel and Tourism promotions. Both were the source of heated controversy in the media and the General Assembly. Every available medium was tapped—paid advertising, PSA’s, newspapers, editorials, radio, television, and billboards. Different years reflected different approaches.

Replacing the original slogans, “Clean Up Ohio ... Literally” and “If You Litter, Fine ... Up to $500,” major themes such as “Don’t Litter Ohio, It Gets You Right Where You Live,” were employed as well as targeted messages such as the very effective enforcement advertisement, “Don’t Litter—It’s Just Not Worth It.” Clean Up Ohio Week and Ohio Recycle Week ad promotions were also produced. Awareness continued to increase by use of displays at fairs, festivals, conferences, organizations annual meetings, and special events; live and taped talk-show interviews; and numerous articles published in a variety of magazines and newsletters including OLC’s own “Clean Ohio Report” (formerly, “Litterally Speaking”) and “Community Exchange” newsletters.

Education

Education is recognized as the key to providing a lasting solution to litter and littering. An educator’s survey was conducted to gather information on which type of activities, presentations, equipment mediums, and aids were felt to be most effective in reaching school-age children and youth. The information was then used to determine the type of educational materials and assistance OLC needed to provide in its statewide in-school education objectives. As a result of this study, OLC shifted its emphasis in providing educational efforts from local grant program education specialists to the school administrators and teachers themselves.

A Teacher Stipend Program was offered to involve classroom teachers in the actual development of education curriculum materials and classroom approaches. This resulted in 1988 in the publication of a new comprehensive litter prevention and recycling education curriculum guide for classroom use entitled “Super Saver Investigators.” Education workshops such as “Project Wild” and “Away with Waste,” teacher aids, films and filmstrips, plays, skits, and video programs were also provided in addition to the basic activity packets developed during the first years of the program.

The emphasis in education also was broadened to include youth opportunities outside the classroom. OLC encouraged local programs in other youth settings such as libraries, summer camps, recreation centers, and fairs. The Ohio Cooperative Extension Service was awarded grants to reach youth through the 4-H Program. Litter puppet shows attracted thousands of young visitors at the Ohio State Fair. Exhibits and demonstrations funded at the Center of Science and Industry in Columbus provided another avenue for
educational outreach. In 1986, OLC was successful in interesting The Ohio Academy of Science in developing a series of litter prevention and recycling science fair project ideas for use in junior and senior high school science fairs. State-level science fair awards for outstanding litter prevention and recycling projects were also established (Fig. 18.5).

Law Enforcement

In the 1984 Litter Attitude Study, 85 percent of those Ohioans polled indicated that more emphasis should be placed on tougher enforcement of litter laws. To improve the enforcement of Ohio’s litter laws and ordinances, OLC worked with local communities and their enforcement agencies in a number of ways. Grants provided funds to increase enforcement activities, and training programs for law enforcement officers were conducted to improve litter law enforcement techniques. Agreements with the Governor’s Office of Criminal Justice Services, the Ohio Crime Prevention Association, the Ohio Highway Patrol, and the Buckeye State Sheriff’s Association enabled the Division to establish a network that reaches all police and sheriff departments in Ohio with litter prevention information.

Early litter enforcement efforts frequently involved the appointment of law enforcement officers whose sole responsibility was to enforce litter laws. As technical expertise improved, OLC recommended moving away from full-time special litter enforcement officers to programs using larger numbers of police officers or sheriff’s deputies on an overtime or off-duty basis. These programs are targeted to address specific litter problem areas during peak littering times.

The implementation of these types of local programs served to increase officer/agency participation and awareness, local enforcement efficiency, frequency of violator contacts, and the number of communities receiving litter law enforcement assistance. Because of that approach, no significant increase in OLC’s enforcement budget was necessary, and enforcement activities dramatically increased. Litter enforcement activities focused primarily on illegal dumping (Fig. 18.6), casual littering by pedestrians and motorists, and unsecured or uncovered truck loads. A legislative enactment establishing littering from a motor vehicle as a minor misdemeanor offense, which allows for “littering tickets” similar to traffic tickets, and the enactment of a “Tarp Law” in 1987 requiring all vehicle loads to be secured or covered properly, greatly increased the effectiveness of litter law enforcement efforts.
Figure 18.7. A nonprofit community recycling center in Toledo, September 1987.

Figure 18.8. Students and teacher at Cox Elementary School in Xenia were joined by Governor Richard F. Celeste and Office of Litter Control (OLC) staff in support of the first Ohio Recycle Week. From left to right, front row: Harold Burge, Jonmarc Lippincott, Kelly Grooms, Tracey Wylie, Tisha Blair, Jay Snyder, Janice Dice, Matt Richardson, April Davis, and Michelle Koogler. Back row: Bruce McPherson (OLC), Governor Celeste, Floyd Flexton (Owens-Illinois Glass, Inc.), Barbara Johnson (Teacher), Randee Becker (Greene County Recycling Program Manager), and Betsy Gesner-Sepko (OLC). October 1984.

Figure 18.9. ODNR Director Shoemaker (front row, third from left) commended the supervisors of the Summer Youth Litter Corps and staff of the Office of Litter Control regarding the importance of their work. Fountain Square Complex, Columbus, 1983.
Recycling

Recycling is an important part of Ohio’s litter prevention and recycling program. It saves landfill space by reducing the volume of materials thrown away, thus reducing the environmental damage caused by landfills and lowering waste-disposal costs. Recycling also creates jobs, conserves natural resources, saves energy, and helps reduce litter. Using recycled materials in the manufacturing process produces fewer pollutants and is, therefore, cleaner than using raw materials.

Emphasis of the program was to increase recycling of common household items such as aluminum cans, newspaper, and glass. OLC provided funds and technical assistance for planning or expanding nonprofit community recycling centers (Fig. 18.7), collection drives, and recycling promotion.

Recognizing Ohio’s efforts in recycling, the National Recycling Coalition (NRC) chose Columbus as the site of its 1985 National Recycling Congress. This fourth annual recycling congress, cosponsored by OLC, attracted government officials, industry leaders, and concerned organizations and individuals from across the country. Governor Celeste was awarded the annual Outstanding Government Leader Award by NRC for his active role in expanding recycling in Ohio.

Following an early feasibility and demonstration project, OLC in 1984 initiated an expanded recycling program for office paper at ODNR Headquarters. The program “PAPERCYCLE” began with the collection of white paper only because it represents about 75 percent of ODNR’s recyclable paper, it has the greatest value, and it would make the biggest impact on reducing waste paper. Because of the pilot program’s success, a report was published on PAPERCYCLE to serve as a guide for use by other State agencies in establishing similar programs. OLC also initiated a test program to determine the use of recycled paper and to encourage State agencies to increase the purchase and use of products manufactured from recycled materials.

Thousands of Ohioans discovered the ease and benefits of household recycling during the first “Ohio Recycle Week” promoted in 1984 (Fig. 18.8). The success achieved with this first statewide recycling promotion led to its establishment as an annual event. In 1987, it grew to be “Ohio Recycle Month.”

Summer Youth Litter Corps

In 1983, the total operation of SYLC was transferred from DCC to OLC (Fig. 18.9). The ultimate goal of SYLC, to achieve local autonomy and self-sufficiency, was given a boost in 1985 when the program shifted to a minigrant operation. The minigrant system provided participating counties $2500 per crew toward the cost of transportation, disposal of collected litter, tools, and safety equipment. The minigrant operation enabled OLC to expand the program into many more counties and to make administration of the program more efficient.

Data collected during 1985 and 1986 revealed that there was less litter on Ohio’s highways. The thousands of full white litter bags lining the highways created an awareness of the litter problem to motorists. The media generously joined in the crusade. During 1986, over 8000 square inches of newsprint positively reported the efforts of OLC in its battle against littering. Television and radio also gave positive coverage to the programs.

The 1986 and 1987 SYLC programs closed with the innovative Summer Youth Litter Corps Olympics conducted during the Ohio State Fair. One team from each of the ten regions came to the Fair to participate in this competitive event which tested each participant’s skill, agility, and speed in collecting litter. It created public awareness of the litter problem in Ohio and provided a new dimension of reward for the participating youth.

As the program gained acceptance, more elected officials supported it. Citations were received from township trustees, county commissioners, mayors, the Ohio Senate, and the Governor. It received Certificates of Recognition from the Ohio Association of County Commissioners, Ohio Employment and Training Association, and United Auto Workers Local 549. In 1986, SYLC was a runner-up in the Take Pride in America national competition, and in 1987, it was named a first place winner in the Take Pride in
America Program in a ceremony on the South Lawn of the White House hosted by President Ronald Reagan.

During its seven years of operation, the SYLC program operated in 87 of Ohio’s 88 counties and in all seven of the major cities. A total of 457 crews of six-to-ten young people each collected more than 405,000 30-gallon bags of litter from more than 77,000 miles of roadway. More than 4000 young people ranging in age from 14 to 21 years worked over 500,000 hours and were afforded a meaningful work/earn/learn/share experience and exposure to the antilitter ethic.

Community Grant Assistance

OLC revamped its 1983 grants program to increase local government participation. Three major types of grants were awarded—Phased Comprehensive Program Grants, Single Project Grants, and State Agency Grants. The Phased Comprehensive Program Grants became the central element in the grants program and received priority commitment and emphasis in terms of available funding and staff assistance. There were three phases of participation in the Comprehensive Program Grants—Program Development (one year), Program Implementation (three years), and Continuing Program Assistance (succeeding years). The Continuing Assistance Phase was to be transitional and ultimately to lead to local program self-sufficiency.

Single Project Grants were also established to encourage townships and smaller communities who were not interested in developing comprehensive programs to carry out limited cleanup, litter containment, or recycling projects. State agencies, including State colleges and universities, were also eligible to receive grants.

In 1987, funding of nonprofit recycling center grant activities were separated from the phased litter control grants and a separate Recycling Operations Grants Program was initiated. The three types of Phased Litter Control Grants were then combined into one Comprehensive Litter Prevention Grants Program. This streamlined administration of the grants at both the local and State government level. Figure 18.10 summarizes the growth and magnitude of the litter prevention and recycling grants program since its beginning in 1981 through 1989.

New Initiatives

In 1985, the Office of Litter Control changed its name to the Office of Litter Prevention and Recycling (OLPR) to emphasize what had always been the program’s primary objectives—litter prevention and recycling. The Office received new life from the General Assembly in July 1985 with a program and funding reauthorization through June 1991. The original legislation had included a June 1986 sunset provision.

By 1986, Ohio’s litter prevention and recycling program was well established as a national model for comprehensive statewide litter prevention and recycling programs, and as a successful alternative to mandatory deposit or “bottle bill” type programs. In November 1986, Governor Celeste designated Ohio as a Keep America Beautiful (KAB) State Program. In the early years of Ohio’s program, the Office had worked cooperatively with KAB but maintained a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of communities recycling grants</th>
<th>Total grant dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>$1,350,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>4,128,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>7,367,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>7,710,652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>182*</td>
<td>8,378,710*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>248*</td>
<td>8,484,247*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>255*</td>
<td>8,386,344*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>224*</td>
<td>7,890,940*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>7,542,630</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes Summer Youth Corps Litter minigrants

Figure 18.10. Activity levels of the litter prevention and recycling grants program as indicated by the number of communities receiving grants and the total amount of funds awarded, 1981-1989.
separate identity and sought a more comprehensive approach to litter prevention. The KAB State Program designation along with Ohio’s first statewide Clean Community Awards Program were initiated in 1986 at Ohio’s National Litter Prevention Conference held in Cincinnati. This was the first state-sponsored nationwide conference on litter prevention. In 1987, Ohio’s program received a Special Merit Award from KAB in recognition of its statewide comprehensive approach to litter prevention and recycling (Fig. 18.11).

In 1986, legislation to change OLPR to a Division and to amend, for the first time, Ohio’s litter law was submitted to the General Assembly for enactment. This legislation moved quickly through the House and through Senate committee hearings, but the session ended before the bill could be addressed on the Senate floor. It was reintroduced at the beginning of the 1987 session as House Bill 333 and was passed in July. On 20 October 1987, its effective date, the Office of Litter Prevention and Recycling officially became the Division of Litter Prevention and Recycling (DLPR). The law also included provisions which:

1) Expanded the Advisory Council from nine to eleven members by adding recycling business and environmental representation, and provided for staggered terms.

2) Added park districts and local boards of education to the list of eligible grant recipients.

3) Clarified authorization to operate a Summer Youth Litter Corps program and address proper litter containment.

4) Expanded recycling authorizations to allow special demonstration or pilot program grants for local government recycling programs such as curbside collection of recyclables.

5) Established littering from a motor vehicle as a minor misdemeanor offense which allows for “littering tickets” similar to traffic tickets.

6) Extended the life of the program and the tax requirements through June 1993.

NEW AND BROADENED DIRECTION, 1988-1990

Building on its past successes, the program is now evolving to accept new and broader challenges. DLPR has always actively supported and promoted recycling, but increased emphasis on recycling as an environmentally desirable alternative for solid waste management became essential. In 1988, DLPR undertook an ambitious research program to provide waste management planners up-to-date information on recycling methods. The Division is working with other State agencies to establish office paper recycling programs and is encouraging increased purchasing of products made from recycled materials. The Division is providing grants to assist local governments in recycling planning, and in 1989, it was authorized to fund local government-implemented recycling projects to assist integration of recycling technology into their solid waste management systems.

DLPR will also continue to provide leadership and grant assistance for comprehensive litter prevention. These grant funds are carefully targeted to improve litter prevention in rural areas, to develop new approaches for litter prevention programs in cities, and to provide a modest incentive for long-term litter programs primarily sustained by local government and business support through newly established requirements for local matching funds.

The Division continues to encourage membership and
active participation in the Keep America Beautiful Program as an excellent mechanism for broadening and sustaining both public and private support for litter prevention and local beautification initiatives. Legislation enacted in 1988 created the Keep Ohio Beautiful Commission to work with communities and the Division in promoting and coordinating Keep Ohio Beautiful activities. In 1989, Ohio was recognized by Keep America Beautiful, at its annual awards ceremony, as having the best statewide litter prevention and recycling program in the nation.

After having achieved its objectives, the SYLC was replaced in 1989 with a new and unique initiative to address rural litter concerns jointly implemented by DLPR and the Ohio Farm Bureau in a team effort with local litter programs (Fig. 18.12). This initiative, known as the pilot Rural Litter Project, first operated in ten counties on a demonstration basis. The project relies on citizens to notify, through an Ohio Farm Bureau promoted toll-free telephone number, their county litter prevention program of litter and illegal dumping problems in their area. The project is designed to provide an efficient and coordinated response through a network of cooperating local agencies to clean up the litter and, where possible, apprehend the prime offenders (Fig. 18.13). The DLPR and Ohio Farm Bureau partnership provides additional opportunities for joint litter prevention and household recycling awareness efforts.

Ohio is now visibly cleaner than in 1980 when the Office of Litter Control was established. The Division’s mission will not be accomplished until all Ohioans participate in managing waste responsibly—by reducing waste, reusing materials, recycling, and using proper disposal methods. Ohio is a beautiful state with bountiful resources. DLPR is proud to participate in the preservation of Ohio’s resources and the restoration of Ohio’s beauty.