

LINDA LINGLE
GOVERNOR OF HAWAII



STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
P.O. Box 3378
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96801-3378

Bill No. 2427

WRITTEN TESTIMONY ONLY
Support Y N

Date 2/1
CHIYOME LEINAALA FUKINO, M.D.
DIRECTOR OF HEALTH

Time 1621

Cat AF AS AX BC

In reply, please refer to:
Type 1 2 WI

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

H.B. 2427, RELATING TO SOLID WASTE

Testimony of Chiyome Leinaala Fukino, M.D.
Director of Health

February 2, 2010
8:30 a.m.

- 1 **Department's Position:** The Department of Health supports this bill with suggestions.
- 2 **Fiscal Implications:** Cost savings for the counties of between \$100,000 to \$200,000 for one plan
3 revision process.
- 4 **Purpose and Justification:** This bill proposes to amend the frequency in which counties are required to
5 amend their Integrated Solid Waste Management (ISWM) plans from five to ten years.
- 6 The counties currently revise their ISWM plans on a frequency of between five and ten years for
7 several reasons. First, the revision process is costly in both its development and implementation.
- 8 Consultants are usually hired to conduct the planning process and to draft the plan document. These
9 contracts have cost the counties between \$100,000 and \$200,000, and in some cases exceeded this
10 amount. Second, the revised plans also usually contain significant Capital Improvement Projects (CIP)
11 which in and of themselves require years of debate and planning before actual implementation. Third,
12 because of the political nature of many elements of ISWM plans, the plan revision process is often a
13 lengthy one. Several of the counties have taken the better part of two years to conduct their most recent
14 plan revisions.

1 It is for these reasons we believe that extending the required revision period to ten years is
2 reasonable with the added requirement of an interim status report on plan implementation made to the
3 DOH at the 5-year point. We also suggest removing "...and as necessary." from the proposed language.
4 The open wording is ambiguous in that it does not define who makes the determination of "necessity"
5 and the basis on which the determination is to be made.

6 Thank you for the opportunity to testify on this bill.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24