

County of Hawai'i Integrated Solid Waste Management Plan Update

Administration and Funding

February 2-3, 2009



CH2MHILL
in association with

GA GEOMETRICIAN
ASSOCIATES

SKY VALLEY
ASSOCIATES

Agenda

- **Administration and Funding**
 - Existing conditions
 - Issues and concerns
 - Options

Existing Conditions Solid Waste Fund Revenues

Revenue Category	FY 2007-08 Actual	FY 2008-09 Budget
Federal Grants	27,260	0
State Grants		
Glass Recycling Program	155,000	155,000
Used Oil Collection/Disposal	67,500	67,500
Beverage Container Deposit Program	423,930	1,950,000
Landfill Tipping Fees and Permit Fees	8,355,200	10,614,000
General Fund		
General Fund Balance From Previous Year	0	3,046,290
Transfer from General Fund	17,352,730	19,147,720
Miscellaneous Revenue	33,750	0
Total Solid Waste Fund	26,415,370	34,980,510

3

Existing Conditions Other Programs

- **Abandoned vehicles**
 - \$12 on new vehicle license for administration, towing, and processing
- **Diversion incentive**
 - Tied to market prices
 - Pays for processing and shipping to markets
- **Residential hauler credit**
 - Tipping fee refund for documented address
 - Assumes 1.5 tons per household per year

4

**Existing Conditions
Solid Waste Fund Revenues
Percent of total**

	Percent of Total	
	FY 2008 Actual	FY 2009 Budget
General Fund	65%	65%
Tip Fees	32%	32%
Other	3%	3%
Total	100%	100%

5

**Existing Conditions
Solid Waste Fund Expenses**

	FY 2008 Actual	FY 2009 Budget	Percent of Total	
			FY 2008	FY 2009
Administration	\$1,226,555	\$1,402,869	5%	4%
Recycling	\$4,297,674	\$8,446,223	17%	24%
Transfer Stations	\$8,797,808	\$10,685,939	34%	31%
South Hilo Landfill	\$3,556,342	\$5,307,568	14%	15%
West Hawai'i Landfill	\$7,657,945	\$8,447,881	30%	24%
Closed Landfills	\$250,000	\$690,030	1%	2%
Total	\$25,786,324	\$34,980,510	100%	100%

Notes: FY 2009 figures have not been finalized by the County and are pending approval.
Totals may not add because of rounding.

6

Existing Conditions Projected Capital Improvements

Project	Estimated Cost (in thousands)					Total
	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	
S. Hilo Sanitary Landfill – H. Expansion	\$1,000	\$3,000	\$2,000			\$6,000
Rural Transfer Station Reconstruction	\$8,000	\$4,000	\$4,500	\$5,000	\$5,500	\$37,000
Equipment Maintenance Facility	\$1,000	\$8,000				\$9,000
Hilo Baseyard Facilities	\$2,000					\$2,000
West Hawai'i Materials Recovery (MRF)		\$7,000				\$7,000
Ocean View Recycling and Transfer St.		\$5,000				\$5,000
Old Closed Kailua Landfill Remediation			\$10,000			\$10,000
Remediate Old Kona Scrap Metal Yard			\$1,800			\$1,800
South Hilo Sanitary Landfill Closure						Beyond 2014
	\$12,000	\$27,000	\$18,300	\$5,000	\$5,500	\$86,800

7

Issues and Concerns

- **Two key issues:**
 - Moving toward zero waste
 - Reducing illegal dumping
- **Will require:**
 - Changes in policies
 - New legislation
 - Community outreach and education

8

Option 1: Establishing Solid Waste as an Enterprise Fund

- **A goal of the 2002 ISWMP Update**
- **Enterprise fund would make solid waste funding self-sufficient**
- **Disadvantages of using the general fund**
 - No financial incentive for residents to reduce waste
 - Property taxes don't correlate with waste generation (fairness issue)
 - The needs of other County programs can make funding stream less certain
- **Challenges**
 - Disproportionate burden on the poor?
 - Dramatic tip fee increase would be required (~\$120/ton); \$1.80 per bag if PAYT at recycling/transfer stations

9

Option 2: Separating Solid Waste as a Line Item on Property Tax Bill

- **Would provide a small measure of information and improved accountability**
- **Could provide 5-6 lines that show the cost of funding key elements of system**
- **Relatively simple to implement**

10

Option 3: Establish Pay-As-You-Throw (PAYT) System at County Recycling and Transfer Stations

- **Would be a major shift in how system is funded**
- **Best to do a bag or tag system and not have money change hands at stations**
- **Challenging to implement – would require phase-in period, communication, and education**

11

Option 4: Renewed Effort to Reduce Illegal Dumping

- **Illegal dumping is ongoing concern**
- **County code provides for:**
 - Fines of up to \$1,000
 - Up to 200 hours of community service
 - Cost recovery for clean up
- **Violations rarely prosecuted (not high priority for County police department)**
- **Particularly important if PAYT is implemented**

12

Option 4: Renewed Effort to Reduce Illegal Dumping (continued)

- **Steps the County could take:**
 - Improved signage, lighting, or beautification and known dump locations
 - Increased penalties for violations (\$25,000 in Pennsylvania)
 - Community outreach and involvement:
 - Special cleanup events
 - Crime stoppers
 - Advertising campaign
 - Illegal dumping hotline
 - Targeted enforcement – possibly adding a police department position
 - Enhanced tracking (mapping) and evaluation

13

Option 5: Policy and Legislation Related to Zero Waste

- **Zero waste implementation study suggests many policy and legislative changes. Examples include:**
 - Producer responsibility for manufactured product
 - Building permit codes that require recycling to be included as part of the design
 - Demolition permits that require deconstruction to be implemented to the extent practical during the project
 - Debris management plan requirements
 - Regulations pertaining to the storage and transfer of residential and commercial waste, including specific requirements relating to recycling and waste reduction practices
 - Definitions of residential, commercial, and industrial recyclable materials
 - Regulations requiring waste haulers to monitor and implement waste reduction-related programs such as multi-bin systems and materials bans
 - Rate regulations and structure of fee systems associated with waste reduction plans
 - Collector agreements including service areas, County rights with regard to setting of collection agreements, transfer of collector agreements, collector application terms and conditions, collector responsibilities.
 - Performance guarantees, including bonds to guarantee compliance with ordinances
 - Civil penalties for recovery of fees and damages, including enforcement provisions, citation authority, and right of entry.
 - Indemnifications language to protect the County from frivolous litigation.
 - County's rights to monitor, inspect, and enforce ordinances
 - Appeals and dispute resolution processes.

14

Options 6 and 7: Mandatory Recycling or Material Bans

- **Either option would require legislation to implement**
- **Mandatory recycling should be fairly simple to implement**
- **In 2008, ordinances were drafted to ban plastic bags and organics**
 - Implementation can be complex
 - Organics ban would require substantial facilities and other infrastructure at relatively high cost

15

Option 8: Opportunity to Recycle Ordinance

- **Would provide for recycling area in all new multi-family and commercial buildings**
- **Benefits are long-term**
- **A modest increase in construction costs**

16

Option 9: License garbage haulers

- **Could provide a measure of stability and County sanction**
- **Could also require residential haulers to provide a recycling service**
- **Would require some administration and staff to do safety checks**

17

Option 10: Curbside Collection

- **Administration and funding changes would be required**
- **Specifics would depend on type of program**
- **Funding options:**
 - Property taxes
 - Line item on property tax bill
 - Direct billing
 - Pay-as-you-throw

18

Next Steps

- **Specifics will depend on which options are recommended for implementation**
- **Chapter will be modified once implementation plan is outlined**
- **Implementation plan will include policy changes, funding methods, and legislation that may be required**