PUBLIC PARTICIPATION AND SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT; CHALLENGES AND PROSPECTS

A CASE STUDY OF KAMULI TOWN COUNCIL, KAMULI DISTRICT IN EASTERN UGANDA

BY

CHAKARIO JOMO

BU/UP/2012/597



A RESEARCH PROPOSAL SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWARD OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN NATURAL RESOURCE ECONOMICS OF BUSITEMA UNIVERSITY.

DECLARATION

I Chakario Jomo hereby declare that this report is my original work. It has never been submitted to any university or any higher institution of learning for any academic award. Therefore, I accept to be responsible for everything contained in it.

DATE. 12th 10 (2016)

CHAKARIO JOMO

BU/UP/2012/597

APPROVAL

This is to acknowledge that the work entitled public participation in solid waste management has been done under my supervision and is now ready for submission to the Faculty of Natural Resources and Environmental sciences.

SIGNATURE KM DATE 12/18/2016

Mr. KAKUNGULU MOSES

(SUPERVISOR)



DEDICATION

I dedicate this work to my family especially my parents Mr. and Mrs. Okwalinga and friends who sacrificed everything to ensure my academic success. Thank you for giving me such a moral foundation on which I have managed to come this far. God bless you abundantly

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I thank God for enabling me to reach this far in my academic struggles. My gratitude goes to my family for their support mentally, financially and morally. I am thankful to both my parents, Mr.Okwalinga Charles and Mrs. Lovisa Akiding for my child upbringing, inspiration, moral support, financial support and my education.

I am also grateful to my supervisor Mr. Kakungulu Moses for his patience and guidance that have helped me complete this research.

I would also like to extend my indebtedness to the staff of Busitema University Namasagali campus whose moral, friendly and academic support has enabled me to accomplish this work. Thank you very much for your encouragement, guidance and supervision.

I also extend my sincere gratitude to all my friends especially my classmates and everyone who has provided academic and friendly support during the hard times.

GOD BLESS YOU SO MUCH

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION	i
APPROVAL	, ii
DEDICATION	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iv
TABLE OF FIGURES	. x
LIST OF TABLES	хi
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS	xii
ABSTRACTx	iii
CHAPTER ONE GENERAL INTRODUCTION	. 1
1.0. Introduction	. 1
1.1. Background.	. 1
1.2. Statement of the problem	. 2
1.3. Objectives	. 3
1.3.1. General objectives	. 3
1.3.2. Specific objectives	. 3
1.4. Research Questions	. 3
1.5. Significance of the study	. 4
1.6. Scope of the study	. 4
1.7. Key Concepts and Terminologies	. 4
1,7.1. Waste	. 4
1.7.2. Solid Waste	. 4
1.7.3 (Solid) Waste Management	. 5
1.7.4 Public Participation	. 5
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW	. 7
2.0. Introduction	. 7
2.1. Review of related literature	. 7
2.1.1. Sustainable Development as a means and an end in itself	. 7
2.2. Waste management practices	. 8
2.2.1. An integrated strategy to solid waste management	1۸

2.2.2. Waste Prevention	
2.2.3. Recycling	
2.2.4. Composting	10
2.2.5. Combustion.	11
2.2.6. Land filling	11
2.2.7. How can the strategy work?	11
2.3. Significance of public participation in solid waste management	12
2.3.1. Could public participation be the missing link?	
2.4. The level of Participation in solid waste management	14
2.4.1. Social capital and participation in solid waste management	15
2.5. Role of the public in solid waste management	16
2.6. Challenge of involving the public in solid waste management	
2.7. Strategies for public participation	18
2.8. Overview of waste management in Uganda	20
2.8.1. Threats posed by solid waste	20
2.8.2 Weaknesses in the solid waste management system	22
2.9. Waste management Policy and Regulation in Uganda	22
2.10. Theoretical Framework	24
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY	26
3.0. Introduction	26
3.1. Study area	26
3.2. Research Design	27
3.3. The sample size and sampling procedure	27
3.4. Data types and collection methods/instruments	27
3.4.0 Data collection methods	27
3.4.1 Questionnaires	27
3.4.2 Interview	27
3.4.3 Observation	28
3.5 Data validity and reliability	28
3.6 Data entry	28

	3.7 Data Processing and Analysis	. 28
	3.8. Ethical issues	28
	3.9. Limitations	29
2	HAPTER FOUR: PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS	30
	4.0. Introduction	30
	4.1. Demographic characteristics of respondents	30
	4.1.0 The age of the respondents	30
	4.1.1 The sex of the respondents	31
	4.1.2 Marital status of the respondents	31
	4.1.3 Respondent's highest level of education	31
	4.1.4 Respondents by category/occupation	32
	4.1.5 Respondents by category and sex	33
	4.1.6 Ownership of the premises	33
	4.1.7 Time lived in Kamuli town council	33
	4.2. Ways of public participation in solid waste management	., 34
	4.2.0 Primary waste management.	34
	4.2.1 Significance of education level on use of container	35
	4.2.2 Waste sorting	
	4.2.3 Respondents' category with respect to waste sorting	36
	4.2.4 Significance of container possession on waste sorting	
	4.3 Waste disposal practices	37
	4.3.0 Consideration for waste re-use before disposal	37
	4.4Role of players in solid waste disposal	39
	4.5 Payment of solid waste collection fee	., 40
	4.6 Knowledge on where the solid waste is taken	40
	4.7 Significance of education level on knowledge about disposal areas	41
	4.8 Number of times waste is taken away for disposal	42
	4.9 Voluntary public responsibility on proper solid waste disposal	42
	4.10 How else the public can participate in solid waste management	43
	A 11 Possibility for waste reduction	43

4	4.12 Responses to whether it is possible to reduce on the amount of waste regenerated	. 43
	4.13 Waste items that were not reused	. 44
	4.14 Significance of waste sorting to the respondents	. 44
	4.15 Items respondents chose for recycling	. 45
	4.16 Commercialization of waste collection	. 45
	4.17 A cross tabulation of waste disposal areas over willingness to pay for collection in futu	
	<u></u>	. 46
4	4.18 Public's views about collaboration on solid waste management	. 47
•	4.19. Respondents' capability of managing waste alone without the town council	. 47
	4.20. Challenges of Public Participation in Solid Waste Management	. 48
	4.21. Respondents' attitude towards the town council	. 48
	4.22The town council officials' views	. 49
ž	4.23. Prospects of public participation in solid waste management	. 50
	4.24. Future collaboration between the public and the Town Council	. 50
	4.25. Need for formal waste collection and disposal facilities	. 50
	4.26. Legal instruments	. 51
	4.27. Awareness raising	. 52
	4.28. Monetary instrument	. 53
ZI	HAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS	., 55
	5.0. Introduction	. 55
	5.1. The level of public participation in solid waste management in Kamuli Town Council	. 55
	5.2. The prevalent participation	55
	5.3 Prospective participation	56
	5.4 The challenges of winning public participation	. 57
	5.4.1 Limited resources	. 57
	5.4.2 Illegal dumping	57
	5.5 Strategies f or future public participation	., 58
	5.5.1 Formal disposal facilities	
	5.5.2 Illegal instruments	58
	5.5.3 Awareness raising	

5.5.4 Monetary instruments	,,
CHAPTER SIX: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	61
6.0 conclusions	61
6.1 Recommendations	62
LIST OF REFERENCES	64
APPENDENCES	67
Appendix 1 showing data collection tools	67

TABLE OF FIGURES

Figure 1 showing public participation triangle
Figure 2 a map showing a study area
Figure 3 showing the age variation of the respondents
Figure 4 showing the sex of respondents interviewed
Figure 5 showing the highest level of education attained by the respondents
Figure 6 shows the respondents category/occupation
Figure 7 illustrating respondents ownership of their premises
Figure 8 shows respondents solid waste sorting practice
Figure 9 showing respondents reuse of waste items
Figure 10 individuals responsible for solid waste disposal
Figure 11 showing whether respondents paid for waste collection
Figure 12 shows respondents knowledge by category on where the solid waste is taken for disposal
Figure 13 showing the number of times in the week solid waste is taken away for disposal 42
Figure 14 shows respondents practice on waste found outside their premises
Figure 15 showing whether respondents sorted their waste before disposal
Figure 16 showing waste items respondents sorted for recycling
Figure 17 shows respondents willingness to pay for waste collection in future
Figure 18 showing respondents willingness to collaborate with their fellows in managing soli waste
Figure 19 shows whether respondents are capable of managing their own waste without the help of Town council
Figure 20 showing public responses about collaboration with the town council

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 shows the marital status of the respondents	51
Table 2 showing respondents' category by sex	33
Table 3 showing the time respondents had lived in the area.	34.
Table 4 showing possession of waste containers by category of respondents	34
Table 5 illustrating the significance of education level on container use	35
Table 6 shows the significance of waste sorting on category of the respondents	3.6
Table 7 showing the impact of possession of waste container on solid waste sorting tespondents	
Table 8 illustrating respondents' education level in knowing the waste disposal areas	‡ 1
Table 9 shows respondents' possibility to reduce waste generated4	43
Table 10 indicating whether respondents had reusable items that they did not reuse	14
Table 11 shows the relationship between willingness to pay for waste collection and where the waste is taken for disposal	

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

NEMA- National Environmental Management Authority

UNEP- United Nations Environmental Program

CET- Center of Ecological Technology

PSSP- purpose, structure, state and performance

SWM- Solid Waste Management

USEPA- United States Environmental Protection Agency

KSU- Kansas State University

KCC- Kampala City Council

USA- United States of America

KTC- Kamuli Town Council

NGO'S- Non-Governmental Organizations

UNBOS- Uganda National Bureau of statistics

GDP- Growth Domestic Product

ABSTRACT

Solid waste disposal and management is both an urban and rural problem and every person is a potential generator of waste, consequently a contributor to this problem. To generate waste is one thing, the type of waste generated is another and also the way the generated waste is managed or disposed of is quite a different issue. This study was carried out in Kamuli Town Council in Kamuli District in eastern Uganda.

The main objective of this study was to sight see the level of public participation in solid waste management in Kamuli Town Council, in light of the challenges and prospects for future management.

The study used a combination of both quantitative and qualitative methodologies in research. It therefore draws on the cross-sectional study design as explained by Bryman (2004) and also on aspects of a phenomenological research design as discussed by Blanche et al., (2006).

The findings revealed that the majority proportion of the public in Kamuli Town Council exhibited concern and an amount of sensitivity about solid waste though sorting of solid waste is less adopted. The level of item reuse is equally low in Kamuli Town Council and the people still think that they cannot do anything to reduce the volume of solid waste they generate. There are challenges of limited resources to manage the solid waste and illegal dumping in Kamuli Town Council. However, there are plans for formal disposal facilities, use of the legal instrument and awareness-raising as a way to deal with the challenges.

Consequently, because the level of public participation in solid waste management at present in Kamuli Town Council is low, the best way to start dealing with the problem is for the Town Council authorities to show the people that they are worth by involving them in the initial planning process.

CHAPTER ONE GENERAL INTRODUCTION

1.0. Introduction

Uganda like many countries in the world suffers from poor waste management. Poor waste management is increasingly becoming a big problem in many cities in sub-Saharan Africa and Kamuli is no exception.

This chapter covers the background of the study, problem statement, the general and specific objectives, research questions, scope of the study, and significance of the study.

1.1. Background

Solid waste disposal and management is both an urban and rural problem. Every person is a Potential generator of waste and therefore, a contributor to this problem. To generate waste is one thing, the type of waste generated is another and theway waste generated is managed or disposed of is quite a different issue. It has been more often not turned out that the rate at which solid waste is generated is far higher than the capacity to responsibly manage it. Waste is generated by and from different sectors; domestic, commercial, industry and others and in many instances; the waste management responsibility has been left to the government or administrative authorities.

There is growing consent that the immediate stakeholders in the issue of solid waste (i.e. the generators of waste) in this case the residents need to join hands with the authorities in dealing with this problem that has far-reaching environmental and human health effects.

Uganda is one of the countries in the world that are ranked low in urbanization but this anyhow, the urban population is growing. Actually, the urban population is growing faster (I.e. at 3.7%) than the national average which is at 3.4%. The implication of this growth is that pollution issues such as solid waste management and the provision of adequate safe water alongside acceptable levels of sanitation coverage will need closer attention, According to National Environment Management Authority (NEMA), 2005). As Uganda's urban areas increase in number and expand in geographical and population size, solid waste is expeditiously emerging as a significant issue in environmental management.

While there are established guidelines for solid waste management, there is need for clear legislation and preferably a national policy specifically on solid waste management (NEMA,

2005).

Principally, waste volumes have increased in urban area due to the growing urban population, concentration of industries, consumption of residents, and inadequate finance and facilities to manage waste collection and disposal as it's in NEMA 2007:276). This state of affairs has led to the volume of solid waste generated to go beyond what the available facilities can accommodate. One of the major factors that have contributed to poor waste collection and management in

LIST OF REFERENCES

Adams, W (2001) green development: Environment and sustainability in the third world, London and New York, Rutledge.

Barnes, M, (2005) the same old process? Older people, participation and deliberation, Ageing and society, 25, 245-249

<u>URL:http://journals.cambridge.org/download.php?file=%2FASO25</u> 02%2FS0144686X04002508a.pdf&code=2e471242a98e73df799cf8f41558175 accessed 5th august, 2008.

BARR, S. (2004) what we buy, what we throw away and how we use our voice. Sustainable Household waste management in UK. Sustainable development, 12, 32-44URL:http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/cgi_bin/fulltext/107062301/PDFSTARTAccessed 5thAugust, 2008

BEKIN, C., CARRIGAN, M, & SZMIGIN, I. (2007) beyond recycling: commons friendly waste reduction at new consumption communities. Journal of consumer behavior, 6, 271-286

BLACK, J, LAURA, CRESWELL, M, ANTHONY & LUNA, F., LUIS (2002), A Dynamic theory of collaboration: A Structural Approach to Facilitating. Intergovernmental use of Information Technology.36thHawaii International Conference on System Sciences (HICSS 03). Hawaii, IEEE Computer Society.

BLANCHE, T., MARTIN, DURRHEIM, K. & DESMOND, P. (Eds) (2006) Research in practice: Applied Science for Social Sciences, Cape Town, University of Cape Town Press.

BOURNAY, E. (2006) Waste Recyclers and recycled. In Planet in Perl: An Atlas of current Threats to people and the Environment. UNEP/GRID_Arendal and Le Monde diplomatique.

CIA (2006) World Facebook 2005.

COHEN, L, MANION, L. & MORRISON, K. (200) Research Methods in Education. London, Routledge.

COINTREAU-LEVINE, S. & COAD, A. (2002) Guidance Park: private sector participation in municipal solid waste, St. Gallen, SKAT: Swiss Center for development Cooperation in Technology and management.

<u>URL:http://rru.worldbank/org/Document/Toolkits/waste_fulltoolkit.pdf</u> accessed 24th April 2008

GOU (1995), The National Environmental Act, CAP 153, IN UGANDA, T.P.O (Ed).

GOU (1997) The Local Government Act, 1997. In UGANDA, P.O. (Ed).

GUPTA, S, K (2001) Rethinking Waste Management in India Humanscape magazine. In UNEP (2007) Global Environment Outlook 4. Environment for Development, United Nations Environmental Program

JORDAR, D., SOURO, D (2000) Urban Residential Solid Waste Management in India Issues Related to Institutional Arrangements. Public Works and Policy, 4, 3193>330. URL:http://pwm.sagepub.com/cgi/reprint/4/4/319 Accessed 5th august, 2008.

KANSA STATE UNIVERSITY (n.d) Lessons in solid Waste Management. For teachers Grades k 3. A school Enrichment program. Household hazardous waste.

<u>URL:HTTP://www.kdheks.gov/kdsi/teachers/curr k 3.pdf</u> accessed 24th April, 2008.

MACKNESS, C. (2005) Funky Style in Shades of Green Telegraph Weekend. In BEKIN, C, CARRIGAN, M. & SZMIGIN, I. (2007) Beyond recycling: Commons friendly Waste reduction at new consumption communities. Journal of consumer behavior, 6, 271-286

MAJERCAK, J, (2002) success story: turning garbage into Gold, Washington DC, United States Environmental Protection Agency: Solid Waste and Emergency Response.

MATOVU, G. (2002) City Consultation on Solid Waste Management and strategic Plan.

MUGAMBWA, E, KIZITO (2009) what is Waste management? <u>URL:http://www.nemaug.orgindex.phpoption=com</u> content& view=article&ig=69: what-is -waste-management &catid=: latest-news&Itemid-59 Accessed 25th April 2009.

NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY (2005) state of the Environment report for Uganda 2004/2005. Kampala, National Environment Authority.

NATIONAL ENVIRONMENT MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY (2007) state of the Environment Report for Uganda 2006/2007, Kampala, National Environment Authority.

OAKLEY, P. & MASDEN, D. (1984), approaches to participation in Rural Development, Geneva, and International Labor Organization.

PONGRACZ, E. (2009) through waste prevention towards corporate sustainability: Analysis of the concept of waste and a Review of attitudes towards waste prevention. Sustainable development, 17, 92-101.

MINISTRY OF NATURAL RESOURCES (1995) The National Environmental Action Plan for Uganda, June 1995, Ministry of Natural Resources, Kampala.

TSAI, T. H. (2007), The Impact of social Capital on Regional Waste Recycling. Sustainable development, 16, 44-45

UGANDA BUREAU OF STATISTICS & MACRO INTERNATIONAL INC. (2007) Uganda Demographic and Health Survey 2006, Calverton, Maryland, Uganda Bureau of statistics.

UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENT PROGRAM (2002) Global Environment Outlook 3: past, present and future perspectives, London, Earth scan.

UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENT PROGRAM (2007) Global Environment Outlook 4, Environment for Development, Valletta, United Nations Environmental Program.

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY (USEPA) (1993a) Criteria for Solid Waste Disposal Facilities. A Guide for Owners/Operators, Washington D.C, Solid Waste and Emergency Response.

URL:http://www.epa.gov/epaoswer/non=hwmuncpl/criteria/landbig.pdf Accessed 24th April 2008.

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY (USEPA) (1993b) Safer Disposal for Solid Waste: the Federal Regulations for Landfills, Washington D.C, Solid Waste and Emergency Response. <u>URL:http://www.epa.gov/epaoswer.non=hz.muncpl.safedis.pdf</u>
Accessed 24th April 2008

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAM AGENCY (USEPA) (1996) chapter 2: Guidance for Successful Public Participation Program. RCRA Public Participation Manual, 1996 Edition, Washington D.C, Solid Waste and Emergency Response.

<u>URL:http://www.epa.gov/epaoswer/hazwaste/permit/pubpart/chp 2.pdf</u> Accessed 24th April 2008.

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY (USEPA) (1998) Municipal Solid Waste Source Reduction: A Snapshot of state Initiatives, Washington D.C., Solid Waste and Emergency Response.