

Decision-Making Analysis on the Mode of Municipal Solid Waste Transfer-Nantun County as an Example

游乙祥、李康文

E-mail: 9608202@mail.dyu.edu.tw

ABSTRACT

In reviewing the result of national garbage disposal project of 2003, the Environmental Protection Administration (EPA) set out to launch in the following year a “ 3-Year Action Plan Toward Environmental Protection Policy ” in order to establish national waste management policy in a new direction of “ Reduction of Waste Source and Recycling of Resources. ” By adopting the strategy of “ All Garbage Sorting and Zero Waste, ” the new action plan aims to recycle and utilize reusable resources through green production and consumption, reducing of garbage source, recycling and reuse of resources. The EPA ’ s goal is to attain a nationwide full garbage recovery and zero waste. Although the construction of initially planned incineration plant to be located at Jiji Township of Nantou County had been terminated under the administrative order issued by the Executive Yuan on May 25, 2004, problems relating to ineffective disposal of garbage are now breeding out of the general waste continuously generated in Nantou County. Existing landfill sites in all neighboring townships and villages in the county are reaching full capacity and destined to be closed for further operation. The results are unreasonable high cost of garbage clearance and transport, traffic jam caused by frequent garbage trucks to and fro outside county disposal plant, and the worsening living quality suffered by residents along the traffic routes. Therefore, the planning and establishment of garbage transit stations and incorporating them into the whole clearance-and-transport system is imperative if we are to expect more efficient disposal and recovery of garbage, lower cost and smooth flow of traffic. Targeting Nantou County, this study intends to conduct analysis on the feasibility, technical and economic cost efficiency of establishing garbage transit stations, and to establish a specific methodology and theoretical framework. To understand issues involved in the economic efficiency of two projects (a central singular county transit stations and three regional transit stations), Internal Rate of Return (IRR) of both projects are then assessed with feasibility of financial planning. All resultant contents of assessment are compiled in the questionnaire of expert survey to provide reference for surveyed experts and scholars to make comparison between various economic factors before filling in answers. Finally, after integrating all returned questionnaires, Expert Choice and Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) are employed to conduct synthetic analysis on the strength and weakness of the two projects Findings drawn from financial feasibility analysis indicate that charge imposed by singular transit station with an IRR range between 0%~20% is estimated to be NTD 1,100~ 1,220 per ton; while charge per ton for regional transit stations is NTD 1,470~1,1720. Results of investment efficiency analysis indicate that singular transit station is a more favorable option producing higher economic and investment efficiency, when financial issue is the sole consideration for government ’ s decision-making between public-owned operation style and build-operate-transfer (BOT) style. Furthermore, this study uses four evaluating factors: environmental technology, economic element, social element, and policy condition; and eight criteria: engineering technique, second potential pollution, engineering construction cost, operational cost, locals ’ acceptance, land acquisition, waste management policy and integration of regional development to design and construct questionnaire of expert survey. All responses collected from returned questionnaires are used to construct a pairwise comparison matrix. Computed outcomes from AHP software Expert Choice show that singular transit station (0.698) operation mode is a relatively favorable choice compared to regional transit stations (0.302). Among all options chose by experts, singular transit station tops as the foremost consideration. In future decision-making process of general waste transit mode, Nantou County government should rank “ Locals ’ acceptance ” under the category of “ Social element ” as the topmost consideration in choosing station site. Among all items under the category of “ Policy condition, ” “ Waste management policy ” should be served as the basis in their seeking for a project with the most economic efficiency. Then they should put in effort to tackle with engineering problems accompanied the selected project and map out quality public facilities, to solve garbage disposal problems existing in the county. Keywords: Garbage Transit Station, Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP), Internal Rate of Return

Keywords : 垃圾轉運站 ; 分析層級程序法(AHP) ; 內部投資報酬率(IRR)

Table of Contents

封面內頁 簽名頁 授權書.....	iii 中文摘要.....
..... iv 英文摘要.....	vi 誌謝.....

ix 目錄.....	xii 圖目錄.....
xv 表目錄.....	xviii 第一章 緒論.....
1 1.1 研究背景與動機.....	1 1.2 研究目的及範圍.....
3 1.3 研究限制.....	4 第二章 文獻回顧.....
6 2.1 台灣地區廢棄物處理政策演變.....	6 2.2 台灣地區一般廢棄物清理政策.....
14 2.3 全分類、零廢棄政策之擬定.....	19 2.4 國內外轉運案例.....
27 2.4.1 垃圾轉運壓縮之前置作業.....	33 2.4.2 垃圾轉運站之形式.....
34 2.4.3 轉運車輛及貨櫃.....	37 2.4.4 垃圾轉運壓縮機.....
39 2.4.5 轉運設施移動地台.....	42 2.4.6 台中市垃圾轉運站.....
44 2.4.7 台北縣八里垃圾轉運站.....	45 2.4.8 台中縣垃圾轉運站.....
45 2.4.9 香港港島東廢棄物轉運站.....	46 2.4.10 聖地牙哥垃圾轉運站.....
48 2.5 南投縣背景說明與清理現況.....	49 2.5.1 南投縣背景說明.....
49 2.5.2 南投縣垃圾清運概況分析及推估.....	51 2.5.3 南投縣各鄉鎮垃圾產出分析.....
57 2.5.4 調查南投縣境內一般廢棄物處理設施.....	61 第三章 研究方法.....
64 3.1 研究架構與流程.....	64 3.2 分析層級程序.....
66 3.2.1 AHP基本原理.....	66 3.2.2 AHP應用案例.....
80 3.2.3 評估準則選取與方案架構建立.....	85 3.2.4 評估準則架構.....
87 3.3 投資專案經濟評估.....	92 3.3.1 投資專案經濟評估指標.....
92 3.3.2 投資效益分析.....	95 第四章 案例分析.....
101 4.1 垃圾轉運站之經濟性評估.....	101 4.1.1 垃圾轉運站轉運模式背景說明.....
101 4.1.2 評估重點.....	103 4.1.3 財務評估架構及內容.....
104 4.1.4 基本財務參數假設.....	104 4.1.5 財務成本與收益.....
108 4.1.6 現金流量分析.....	110 4.2 財務可行性評估.....
123 4.2.1 自償率分析.....	123 4.2.2 投資效益分析.....
124 4.2.3 融資可行性分析.....	124 4.2.4 敏感性分析.....
126 4.2.5 投資效益分析.....	128 4.3 專家問卷調查.....
132 4.3.1 南投縣一般廢棄物轉運模式分析專家問卷權重結果.....	132 4.3.2 評選因素權重.....
134 4.3.3 評選準則權重.....	135 4.3.4 評估方案權重評估.....
141 4.3.5 評選方案之選擇.....	142 4.3.6 一致性檢定.....
145 4.3.7 敏感度分析.....	146 4.3.8 專家問卷調查結果分析.....
155 第五章 結論與建議.....	157 5.1 結論.....
157 5.2 建議.....	159 參考文獻.....
160 附錄 南投縣一般廢棄物轉運模式分析AHP專家問卷調查表...163	

REFERENCES

- 1.行政院環保署，垃圾處理方案之檢討與展望，2003。
- 2.行政院環保署，統計資料庫 <http://210.69.101.88/>，2007。
- 3.南投縣環保局，一般廢棄物全分類零廢棄規劃評估作業，期末報告，2005。
- 4.行政院環保署，垃圾全分類零廢棄群組行動計畫，2004。
- 5.行政院環保署，台灣地區垃圾資源回收廠興建計畫，1990。
- 6.李康文、黃卿爾、陳慧憶，台灣地區生活垃圾管理發展趨勢之評析，海峽兩岸科學技術研討會，2004。
- 7.環保署環境保護人員訓練所，事業廢棄物貯存清除技術，1999。
- 8.行政院環保署，垃圾轉運站設置及執行規範，2001。
- 9.楊明昌，高雄捷運BOT計畫廠站聯合開發之財務評估與風險分析--以南機廠開發計畫為例，義守大學管理科學研究所碩士論文，2002。
- 10.漢銘工程顧問有限公司，區域性垃圾轉運站興建工程服務建議書，2005年。
- 11.晶淨科技股份有限公司，南投縣一般廢棄物全分類零廢棄規劃評估作業服務建議書，2005年。
- 12.南投縣政府，南投縣綜合發展計畫-總體發展計畫，2002。
- 13.「專家的選擇」公司網站，<http://www.expertchoice.com/>，2007。
- 14.Zahedi,F., The Analytic Hierarch Process-A Survey of the Method and its Applications, Interefaces, 16(4),96-108,1986.
- 15.Saaty, T. L., Risk-Its Priority and Probability: The Analytic Hierarch Process, Risk Analysis, 7(2), 159-172,1986.
- 16.黃子健，台灣地區垃圾清除處理費收費模式最適化評估，大葉大學環境工程學系碩士論文，2006。
- 17.黃卿爾，垃圾費隨袋徵收制度優先執行縣市評選，大葉大學環境工程學系碩士論文，2004。
- 18.江培根，台灣中部地區垃圾焚化爐灰渣集中管理之量化模式探討，大葉大學環境工程學系碩士論文，2006。
- 19.行政院公共工程委員會，民間參與公共建設財務評估模式規劃，2001。
- 20.李康文，environmental project development，大葉大學環境工程學系，環境專案開發課程講義，2005。
- 21.馮正民、李穗玲，由決策習慣探討AHP之評估方法。
- 22.行政院環保署，台灣地區垃圾處理後續計畫，2004。
- 23.黃仁予，垃圾轉運政策研擬及設置可行性研究，元智大學機械工程學系碩士論文，2004。
- 24.陳俊村，板橋市垃圾集運系統設置轉運站之研究，中興大學環境工程學系碩士論文，1992。
- 25.康城工程顧問股份有限公司，一般廢棄物全分類零廢棄推動計畫，2005。
- 26.仲禹工程顧問股份有限公司，八德市垃圾處理場設施改善工

程計畫服務建議書，2005。27.曾國雄、鄧振源，層級分析法(AHP)的內涵特性與應用，1998。28.高燕忠，我國電動機車發展之決策分析，碩士論文，大葉大學，2004。29.行政院環保署，鼓勵公民營機構興建營運垃圾焚化廠推動方案，1900。30.台中縣環保局，烏日BOT垃圾資源回收廠收運垃圾進廠焚化應繳處理費用一覽表，2006。