



University of Hawaii at Manoa

Environmental Center

A Unit of Water Resources Research Center
Crawford 317 • 2550 Campus Road • Honolulu, Hawaii 96822
Telephone: (808) 956-7361

RL:01018

HB 2519 RELATING TO GLASS RECOVERY

House Committees on
Energy and Environmental Protection
Judiciary
Intergovernmental Relations and International Affairs
Housing

Public Hearing - January 30, 1992
8:30 am, 1310

By
John Harrison, Environmental Center
Alyssa Miller, Urban and Regional Planning
Nancy Kanyuk, Arts and Sciences

HB 2519 would encourage implementation of glass recovery programs through the establishment of a special incentive fund to be supported by a wholesalers advanced disposal fee.

Our statement on this bill does not represent an institutional position of the University of Hawaii.

In general, we agree with the intent of this bill in that it advocates an advanced disposal fee of 2 cents on glass containers entering the state. Previous bills proposing deposit systems have been opposed due to the constraints of time and space faced by retailers in implementing such systems. The wholesaler's advanced disposal fee seems to avoid these constraints.

While we support the bill, we have concerns over certain aspects, particularly the apparently unnecessary complexity of the measure. For example, what is the intent of augmenting the mandated automobile liability levelson Pages 3 and 4, section (c)? Historically, glass recovery entrepreneurs have entered business as small, low budget operations. Mandating such expenses would seem to offer unnecessary obstacles to the creation of these businesses. Also, on Page 5, Section (g), why not just add these revenues to the special incentive fund. We recognize that administrative costs of licensing will be incurred, but it seems appropriate that the program should benefit from any revenues generated. On Page 6, Section (b), are there any empirical data that would support program goals of 25 and 50%, respectively during the first two years' operation? These

figures seem rather arbitrary. Section (c), same page: is this charge in addition to the advanced disposal fee described earlier? The distinction and rationale here is not clear.

This bill is commendable in that it addresses the issue of developing processing intermediaries for glass recovery. However, there still needs to be attention given to development of secondary markets for the recovered glass. In addition, the major obstacle to completing the recovery cycle is the lack of incentives to motivate the individual behavioral changes needed to encourage people to make the effort to separate out their recoverable glass. This is a good start; perhaps in conjunction with other bills and appropriate amendments, effective glass recovery might become a reality.