

Attitudes and Opinions of Bismarck Residents on Recycling

Produced for

The City of Bismarck, North Dakota

By

**The Bureau of Governmental Affairs
University of North Dakota
August, 2008**

**Prepared by:
Dr. Robert S. Wood
Director, Bureau of Governmental Affairs
Department of Political Science and Public Administration
robert.wood@und.nodak.edu
701-777-3546**

Attitudes and Opinions of Bismarck Residents on Recycling

Survey Methodology

Between May 25th and July 5th, 2008, the Bureau of Governmental Affairs conducted a phone survey of 382 randomly selected residents of the City of Bismarck over the age of eighteen to determine the distribution of attitudes and opinions among citizens on the subject of recycling. The questionnaire was developed by Bismarck city officials with minor input from the Bureau. The survey instrument consisted of 28 questions designed to gather information on garbage and recycling practices, yard waste practices, attitudes toward recycling, and satisfaction with current services. Several questions were also included to measure certain demographic characteristics of the respondents.

The sample was drawn from randomly generated telephone numbers purchased by the Bureau from Qwest Communications. Most calls were made between 6:00 PM and 9:00 PM in the evening and respondents were limited to those who currently reside within the city boundaries. The size of the sample was calculated to produce estimates of the opinions of the population as a whole within a range of plus or minus 4% in 95 out of 100 samples. In other words, we are 95 percent confident that the opinion of the true population will be no more than 4% higher or 4% lower than the numbers reported in the sample. This level of statistical confidence meets or exceeds the standards commonly used in opinion polling today and may be considered a reliable indicator of the actual opinions of the citizens of Bismarck at the time the survey was conducted.

SURVEY RESULTS


This report includes a copy of the survey and printouts providing the percentage of responses for each question on the survey. To facilitate interpretation however, key data have been organized and presented into tables for this report. In the first section, the demographic characteristics of the sample are presented to give the reader an understanding of who responded and who did not. The remaining results are organized into four sections. The first discusses the level of acceptance and participation in the current recycling program, the second summarizes questions related to whether residents believe they can do more, the third covers their satisfaction current service, and the fourth covers the level of support for improvements in recycling and trash reduction.

Demographics:

The primary demographic characteristics for this sample were age, gender, income, number of family members, type of home, home ownership, and length of residence at this location¹. The age of respondents in the sample is shown in the figure below, and shows the characteristics of a normal distribution. The age of respondents ranged from 19 to 91, with an average age of 56. The gender breakdown among respondents was 39 percent male and 61 percent female. Most of the families surveyed were small; 65% of respondents reported a family size of 1 or 2, 28% reported 3 or 4 members of their family, and 7% reported families over 5 members. A substantial majority of respondents own their own home (83%) and live in detached single family dwellings (66%).

¹ For complete information on the responses to each question, please refer to the frequency tables provided in Appendix B at the end of this report.

Histogram



Income distribution within the sample is displayed in Table 1 below. It is interesting to note that over a third of the respondents declined to answer this question, making inferences based on income more challenging. Among those who did provide an answer, the average income range was between \$50,000 and \$75,000.

Table 1: Which of the following best describes your combined annual household income?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Under \$20,000	32	8.4	8.4	8.4
\$20,000 - \$29,999	23	6.0	6.0	14.4
\$30,000 - \$39,999	34	8.9	8.9	23.3
\$40,000 - \$49,999	37	9.7	9.7	33.0
\$50,000 - \$74,999	48	12.6	12.6	45.5
\$75,000 - \$99,999	47	12.3	12.3	57.9
Over \$100,000	24	6.3	6.3	64.1
Dont Know/ Refused	137	35.9	35.9	100.0
Total	382	100.0	100.0	

Current Participation:

Of those polled, 45.5% indicated that they currently recycle, while 54.5% indicated that they do not. Among those who do not participate, 50% said it was too much effort and that they didn't have the time required to participate. Another third (33.5%) said they don't have enough

recyclables to be worth the effort. These answers correspond well to the most common answers to the open-ended question “How can Bismarck help you recycle more?” offered at the conclusion of the survey. Many of the responses to this question were related to either making recycling easier (curbside collection or adding more drop-off locations) or providing more education on recycling. The data suggest that more than 80% of those not currently participating would be willing if one or both of these conditions were addressed. In fact, 51.4% of non-participants indicated that they would be willing to pay more on their garbage bill to help the city meet its recycling goals, while less than 10% indicated an ideological opposition to recycling. The data clearly suggest a willingness to participate, provided the current barriers can be properly identified and removed.

Table 2: Why do you choose not to participate in recycling?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No time/ too much effort	103	27.0	50.0	50.0
	Dont have enough recyclables	69	18.1	33.5	83.5
	No interest in participating	18	4.7	8.7	92.2
	Dont believe in recycling	2	.5	1.0	93.2
	Other	14	3.7	6.8	100.0
	Total	206	53.9	100.0	
Missing	System	176	46.1		
Total		382	100.0		

The correlation between age and non-participation presented in Table 3 suggests that older residents are more likely to believe they have few recyclables, while younger residents are split between those who say they don’t have time to recycle and those who have little interest or don’t believe in recycling. Since respondents were asked to specify a single reason for not participating, there is no way to know from these data whether there is overlap between these categories, but there is clearly a relationship between the reason for non-participation and the age of the respondent.

Table 3: Correlations between age and rationale for non-participation

		Age range	No time	No recyclables	Don't believe/ no interest
Age range	Pearson Correlation	1	-.200(**)	.169(**)	-.133(*)
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.001	.011
	N	366	366	366	366
No time	Pearson Correlation	-.200(**)	1	-.285(**)	-.143(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.005
	N	366	382	382	382
No recyclables	Pearson Correlation	.169(**)	-.285(**)	1	-.110(*)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.000		.031
	N	366	382	382	382
Don 't believe/ no interest	Pearson Correlation	-.133(*)	-.143(**)	-.110(*)	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.011	.005	.031	
	N	366	382	382	382

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

To examine the relationship between age and participation more generally, a difference of

means test was conducted to compare the ages of those who recycle with those who do not. The results showed that age does make a statistically significant difference on participation. The mean age among respondents who recycle is 58 while the mean among non-recyclers is 54. Statistically speaking therefore, those who recycle are actually slightly older than those who do not. When asked what materials they recycle, 72% answered yes for paper and cardboard, 44% answered yes for plastics, and 71% answered yes for aluminum and steel cans. At first glance, this seems to suggest a broad base of support for all material types, but as the correlation data in Table 4 below demonstrate, there is actually a more complex relationship present in the data.

Table 4: Correlations between recyclable materials

		Which of these items does your family recycle?	Which of these items does your family recycle?	Which of these items does your family recycle?
Which of these items does your family recycle (paper/cardboard)?	Pearson Correlation	1	.268(**)	-.319(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000
	N	174	174	174
Which of these items does your family recycle (plastics)?	Pearson Correlation	.268(**)	1	.058
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.448
	N	174	174	174
Which of these items does your family recycle (aluminum/steel cans)?	Pearson Correlation	-.319(**)	.058	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.448	
	N	174	174	174

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The Pearson correlations shown in the table can range between 0 and 1 in either a positive or negative direction. The strength of the relationship between the two variables is indicated by the size of the coefficient, while the statistical significance of the relationship is indicated by asterisks. The positive relationship between paper and plastics indicates that the same people who are recycling paper are also recycling plastics. The .268 correlation is moderately strong, and the relationship overall fits the expectation that residents who recycle one type of material would be more likely to also recycle the other. The relationship between plastics and cans is very small and statistically insignificant, indicating that there is no relationship in the data between those who recycle cans and those who recycle paper. But the strong negative relationship between paper and cans is statistically significant, and suggests that people who recycle paper are substantially less likely to recycle cans than those who do not.

From these data, these appear to be two distinct sets of participants with distinct motivations. Among the 46% of respondents who participate in the current recycling program, 61% use the publicly provided drop off trailers, 26% take their materials to private recyclers, and 10% report using both. Table 5 shows the relationship between these responses and the materials they recycle, and highlights the different participant groups in greater detail. Those who recycle paper are much more likely to use public facilities than private one (a positive correlation of .415 for public and a negative correlation of .476 for private), while those who recycle cans are more likely to use private facilities (-.360 for public and .294 for private). Together, these findings suggest that there are at least two types of active recyclers in Bismarck, those who are motivated to recycle for ideological reasons and those who are motivated by economic interest.

Table 5: Correlations between public and private recycling

		Which of these items does your family recycle?	Which of these items does your family recycle?	Which of these items does your family recycle?	public	private	both
Which of these items does your family recycle (paper)?	Pearson Correlation	1	.268**	-.319**	.415**	-.476**	.045
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000	.000	.557
	N	174	174	174	174	174	174
Which of these items does your family recycle (plastics)?	Pearson Correlation	.268**	1	.058	.088	-.176*	.157*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.448	.249	.020	.038
	N	174	174	174	174	174	174
Which of these items does your family recycle (cans)?	Pearson Correlation	-.319**	.058	1	-.360**	.294**	.177*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.448		.000	.000	.019
	N	174	174	174	174	174	174
public	Pearson Correlation	.415**	.088	-.360**	1	-.229**	-.138**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.249	.000		.000	.007
	N	174	174	174	382	382	382
private	Pearson Correlation	-.476**	-.176*	.294**	-.229**	1	-.082
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.020	.000	.000		.108
	N	174	174	174	382	382	382
both	Pearson Correlation	.045	.157*	.177*	-.138**	-.082	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.557	.038	.019	.007	.108	
	N	174	174	174	382	382	382

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

City residents vary in the frequency with which they use public drop-off trailers, with nearly three quarters of respondents visiting them either once or twice each month (see Table 6, below). Seventy five percent of respondents know where the city trailers are located, and Jaycee Park is the most popular drop off location (19%) followed by Arrowhead Plaza (14%). A full breakdown of drop-off locations may be found in Appendix B. Residents appear fairly knowledgeable about locations and programs, but few of them are obtaining this information from the city’s website. Only 23% of respondents say they have ever been to the city’s website, and of those, only a quarter (24.7%) went there to obtain information on garbage or recycling.

Table 6: How many times do you or someone from your household take materials to the recycling trailers in the city per month?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	25	6.5	14.4	14.4
	Once	85	22.3	48.9	63.2
	Twice	39	10.2	22.4	85.6
	Three times	6	1.6	3.4	89.1
	Four times	14	3.7	8.0	97.1
	More than four times	3	.8	1.7	98.9
	7	2	.5	1.1	100.0
	Total	174	45.5	100.0	
Missing	System	208	54.5		
Total		382	100.0		

For those who use private recyclers, the most common material by far is aluminum, with 82% of those who use private recycling centers indicating that they recycle aluminum. Newspapers and plastics are the next most common at 22% each, followed by metal at 19%, and magazines and office paper at 14% each. For many respondents however, aluminum is the only material they recycle, reinforcing the notion that some recycling is motivated more by economics than by ideology. In Table 7, a correlation matrix of these 6 materials is presented. Note that aluminum is not correlated with any other material, while plastics are positively correlated with nearly every other material. This suggests that residents who recycle aluminum recycle little else, while those who recycle plastics tend to recycle many other materials as well.

Table 7: Correlations between materials taken to private recycling centers.

		Aluminum	Newspaper	Office Paper	Magazines	Metal	Plastics
Aluminum	Pearson Correlation	1	.145	-.051	-.171	.010	-.156
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.256	.690	.181	.937	.221
	N	63	63	63	63	63	63
Newspaper	Pearson Correlation	.145	1	.546**	.546**	.324**	.449**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.256		.000	.000	.010	.000
	N	63	63	63	63	63	63
Office Paper	Pearson Correlation	-.051	.546**	1	.611**	.495**	.655**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.690	.000		.000	.000	.000
	N	63	63	63	63	63	63
Magazines	Pearson Correlation	-.171	.546**	.611**	1	.495**	.436**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.181	.000	.000		.000	.000
	N	63	63	63	63	63	63
Metal	Pearson Correlation	.010	.324**	.495**	.495**	1	.519**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.937	.010	.000	.000		.000
	N	63	63	63	63	63	63
Plastics	Pearson Correlation	-.156	.449**	.655**	.436**	.519**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.221	.000	.000	.000	.000	
	N	63	63	63	63	63	63

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Yard Waste Practices

When asked what they typically do with grass clippings and leaves, a full 30% indicated that they have contracted this service out to a landscape service and have limited direct interaction with their yard waste. Of those who cut their own lawn, 29% haul the clippings to the city dumpster and 21% leave the clippings on the lawn. Slightly more than 10% compost their yard waste and another 10% include it with their trash. This suggests that, assuming the landscape services are responsible in their disposal practices, nearly 90% of the city's yard waste is being diverted from the trash stream. The most popular drop-off sites are Hillside Park (14%) and Optimist Park (9%).

Table 8: What does your household most often do with grass clippings/leaves

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Leave clippings on lawn	78	20.4	20.5	20.5
	Compost	40	10.5	10.5	31.0
	self haul to grass dumpster recycling site	109	28.5	28.6	59.6
	landscape service	115	30.1	30.2	89.8
	put it out with the garbage	38	9.9	10.0	99.7
	Other	1	.3	.3	100.0
	Total	381	99.7	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.3		
Total		382	100.0		

When asked if they would be likely to support a curbside collection program for yard waste, respondents were unresponsive. More than half said they would be “not very likely” to use such a service. One might initially suppose that this result springs from opposition to additional fees, a finding that would certainly have implications for expanding the city’s recycling programs. A better explanation for this response is that together, the composters, those with a landscape service, and those who leave the clippings on their lawn account for 61% of the sample, and these groups truly would have little use for curbside yard waste collection.

Table 9: If there was a curbside program for collecting yard waste, and there was a small fee, how likely would you be to use the service?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very likely	34	8.9	9.0	9.0
	Likely	77	20.2	20.3	29.3
	Not very likely	201	52.6	53.0	82.3
	DK	40	10.5	10.6	92.9
	It depends	26	6.8	6.9	99.7
	DK/ NA	1	.3	.3	100.0
	Total	379	99.2	100.0	
Missing	System	3	.8		
Total		382	100.0		

Can You Do More?

Respondents were asked two questions on the survey directly related to whether they felt they could do more. The first focused specifically on recycling, and asked if they felt they could recycle more from their trash. Eighty eight percent indicated that they could either a little more or a lot more. Nearly 4 times as many respondents answered “a little more” than “a lot more” though it should be noted that this question was only asked of those respondents who had already indicated that they recycle. Presumably, if one included the 55% who are not currently recycling, the numbers would be substantially higher. In fact, only 20 people out of the 382 surveyed indicated that they are recycling and that they could not recycle more from their trash.

Table 10: Do you believe there is more you could recycle out of your trash?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes, a lot	36	9.4	20.7	20.7
	Yes, a little	118	30.9	67.8	88.5
	No	20	5.2	11.5	100.0
	Total	174	45.5	100.0	
Missing	System	208	54.5		
Total		382	100.0		

The second question, asked of all respondents, takes a more holistic approach. When asked how much of their personal waste they believe could be diverted from the garbage stream, 61% of respondents answered 0-25% (see Table 11, below). This is a surprising result from a sample where 55% of respondents do not recycle at all and 80% of those who do recycle believe they could do more. This finding should be investigated more thoroughly through follow-up research to better understand why so many respondents answered this way.

Table 11: Looking at your own personal waste, how much do you believe you could divert from the garbage stream - through recycling, reduction, and other means?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0-25%	233	61.0	61.0	61.0
	26 - 50%	79	20.7	20.7	81.7
	51-75%	19	5.0	5.0	86.6
	76-100%	8	2.1	2.1	88.7
	DK	43	11.3	11.3	100.0
	Total	382	100.0	100.0	

A third question on the survey relates to this issue since it provides insight into how much trash is being generated. When asked how many extra bags of trash they set out each week, 72% answered zero. This suggests that in Bismarck the current size of trash receptacles does little to motivate residents to divert their waste from the trash stream, perhaps leading them to believe that their waste is small enough already. The correlation between these two questions however, is not statistically significant, suggesting that the quantity of trash is not a factor in explaining this result.

Satisfaction Levels

Residents appear to be quite satisfied with their current level of service. When asked how satisfied they are with their current garbage service, 98% responded with either satisfied or very satisfied. When asked how reasonable their current garbage fees are, 84% replied that they are reasonable. Of the 23% of respondents who reported personal interaction with a member of the Bismarck Solid Waste staff, 98% described the customer service as either satisfactory or very satisfactory. By all indicators in these data, the residents of Bismarck are satisfied with the service they are receiving in this regard.

Support for Improvements

The final category surveyed asked residents whether they would support improvements to existing service in terms of recycling programs. As Table 12 shows, when asked if they would be willing to pay a little more on their bill to expand programs and meet the city’s recycling goals, 57% said that they would. When asked how much they would be willing to pay, 99% of these respondents were willing to pay at least 50 cents more, 74% would pay at least \$1.00 more, and 27% would pay up to \$3.00 more per month to improve recycling (Table 13).

Table 12: If recycling programs could be expanded to include more materials, or if it would cost a little more to achieve the City's recycling goal, would you be willing to pay a bit more on your garbage and recycling bill?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	216	56.5	56.5	56.5
	No	131	34.3	34.3	90.8
	Don't Know	34	8.9	8.9	99.7
	NA	1	.3	.3	100.0
	Total	382	100.0	100.0	

Table 13: Do you support City programs to increase recycling and diversion if it increases garbage and recycling costs by

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	50 cents per month	57	14.9	24.8	24.8
	One dollar per month	107	28.0	46.5	71.3
	Three dollars per month	63	16.5	27.4	98.7
	DK	3	.8	1.3	100.0
	Total	230	60.2	100.0	
Missing	System	152	39.8		
Total		382	100.0		

When these responses are broken down by age, the data shows that younger residents are generally more willing to pay more for recycling than their older counterparts. Table 14 shows this relationship clearly. Among 18-30 year olds, 42% would pay \$3.00 per month, compared to only 22% and 12% for the 60-70 and 70-80 year old ranges. No respondent over the age of 80 was willing to pay an additional \$3.00 per month. The \$1.00 per month level shows the broadest range of support, particularly if one assumes that those willing to pay \$3.00 would also accept a \$1.00 increase. In every age class under age 80, more respondents were willing to support a \$1.00 increase than any other amount.

Table 14: Support for Increasing Costs for Expanded Recycling by Age Group

Do you support City programs to increase recycling and diversion if it increases garbage and recycling costs by							
			50 cents per month	One dollar per month	Three dollars per month	DK	Total
agerange	18 to 30	Count	1	10	8	0	19
		% within agerange	5.3%	52.6%	42.1%	.0%	100.0%
	31 to 40	Count	6	10	9	0	25
		% within agerange	24.0%	40.0%	36.0%	.0%	100.0%
	41 to 50	Count	9	23	16	0	48
		% within agerange	18.8%	47.9%	33.3%	.0%	100.0%
	51 to 60	Count	14	29	19	0	62
		% within agerange	22.6%	46.8%	30.6%	.0%	100.0%
	61 to 70	Count	9	15	7	1	32
		% within agerange	28.1%	46.9%	21.9%	3.1%	100.0%
	71 to 80	Count	7	12	3	2	24
		% within agerange	29.2%	50.0%	12.5%	8.3%	100.0%
	over 80	Count	11	1	0	0	12
		% within agerange	91.7%	8.3%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	57	100	62	3	222
		% within agerange	25.7%	45.0%	27.9%	1.4%	100.0%

Conclusions

Based on these data, a number of conclusions and implications can be made about the potential for recycling in Bismarck. First, a majority of the residents are not currently recycling at all, but indicate a willingness to do so. They are highly satisfied with the garbage service they receive at present, and are well positioned to embrace program enhancements. There appears to be little support or need for a curbside yard waste collection program at this time, since nearly 90% of the yard waste is already being diverted from the garbage stream. Recycling, on the other hand, is both needed and supported by residents.

There appears to be significant support for curbside recycling, and/or additional trailers. More than half of respondents would support such a move, even if they incur additional costs. This support is not a product of too much trash, since most residents are able to fit their weekly waste into their current receptacle. One approach used in other cities to encourage recycling would be to reduce the size of trash cans and increase the fees for exceeding their trash limit.

The data also suggest that at least two types of recyclers are currently active. Those who primarily recycle aluminum cans with a private recycling center appear to have different characteristics and motivations from those who recycle other materials and generally use public drop-off facilities. One focus of a new program might be to find a way to motivate aluminum recyclers to expand their activities into other materials. Another might be to offer educational outreach to elderly residents who are less knowledgeable about the mechanics of recycling and are less supportive of recycling programs generally.

Overall, the data suggest that Bismarck residents are supportive of recycling, though many expressed concern that it had been tried before and failed. Most believe that something should be done and are willing to participate if a reasonable program can be implemented. The strong satisfaction levels in the community for the City are a plus and provide a well of social capital that can smooth out any initial hiccups in implementation. The only result that suggests caution is the low percentage of respondents that believe their personal waste stream can be substantially reduced. All other indicators suggest that the citizens of Bismarck would welcome and support an expanded program of recycling.

Bismarck Recycling Phone Questionnaire

INTRODUCTION:

The City of Bismarck is conducting a survey to explore issues about your garbage and recycling service & programs. All answers are strictly confidential. This is not a sales call of any kind. Your household was selected as part of a small random sample, and we really need your input! Do you have a few minutes now?

DEMOGRAPHICS

1. For this study, I need to speak to someone age 18 or older who handles garbage and recycling in your household. Would that be you?

1. Yes (continue)
2. No (Ask if that person is available?)
3. Refused (Thank and terminate call)

2. What is your age?

(Enter exact age number. Create a bell shaped curve from the respondents to achieve a normal population for the study.)

Group responses according to the following ranges:

1. Under 25
2. 25 – 34
3. 35 – 44
4. 45 – 54
5. 55 – 64
6. 65 and over

3. Record Gender (not a question, determine by voice of respondent)

1. Male
2. Female

4. How many people are in your family?

1. 1-2
2. 3-4
3. 5 or more

5. Which of the following housing types would you say best describes your home?

- a. Single family detached house
- b. Single family attached house (duplex, townhouse, condo)
- c. Apartment with 2 – 4 units
- d. Apartment building with 5 or more units
- e. Mobile, house trailer

6. Do you or members of your household own this home, do you rent, do you live rent-free, or some other arrangement?

- a. Own/buying
- b. Rent/lease
- c. Occupied without payment of rent
- d. Other arrangement

GARBAGE AND RECYCLING QUESTIONS

7. Does your family recycle?

a. (YES) ask which items are recycled

- 1. Paper/cardboard
- 2. Plastics
- 3. Aluminum and steel cans

How many times did you or someone from your household take materials to the recycling trailers in the city?

- a. Never
- b. Once
- c. Twice
- d. Three times
- e. Four Times
- f. More than four times

b. (If answer to previous question is NO)

Why do you choose not to participate in recycling?

- a. No time/too much effort
- b. Don't have enough recyclables
- c. No interest in participating.
- d. Don't believe in recycling

Skip to question #14

8. Where do you recycle?

- a. Drop off trailer
- b. Private recycling center
- c. Both

9. If the answer to #8 is "Private recycling center" ask: What types of recyclable materials do you take to the private recycling centers?

- a. Aluminum
- b. Newspaper
- c. Office Paper
- d. Magazines
- e. Metal
- f. Plastic

10. Do you know where the city's recycling drop-off trailers are located near your home?

- a. Yes
- b. No

11. Which recycling trailer site do you visit most often?

- a. Igoe Park
- b. Schamburg Ice Arena
- c. Optimist Park
- d. Jaycee Park
- e. Tatley Park
- f. Ave D and Hannifin St south of the old Hughes Middle School
- g. 26th street and Rosser – Loaf and Jug
- h. Edwards Ave by the BSC bowl
- i. Ash Coulee Road and North Washington Street next to water tower
- j. Hillside Park
- k. Sweet Ave and Hannifin street
- l. Arrowhead Plaza
- m. 19th street North of Oregon Ave
- n. Stonewall Dr and Penn's Lane

12. How many bags of trash do you place curbside weekly besides what is inside of your garbage can?

- 1. 1-2
- 2. 3-4
- 3. 5-6
- 4. More than 7

13. Do you believe there is more you could recycle out of your trash?
1. Yes, a lot
 2. Yes, a little
 3. No

YARD WASTE RECYCLING

14. What does your household most often do with grass clippings/ leaves?
- a. Leave clippings on lawn
 - b. Compost
 - c. Self haul to grass dumpster recycling site
 - d. Landscape service
 - e. Put it out with the garbage

(Any answer besides C, skip to question 16).

15. (If answer to question #14 was C), Which yard waste collection site do you visit most often?
- a. Cottonwood Soccer Fields at Santa Fe Ave and South 12th street
 - b. Sweet Ave and Hannifin St
 - c. Riverwood Golf Course parking lot
 - d. London Ave – west of Manchester street at the Waste Water Treatment Plant
 - e. Ash Coulee Road and North Washington street by water tower
 - f. Tyler Parkway and Valley Drive
 - g. Edwards Ave west of BSC bowl
 - h. Ave D and Hannifin St, across from old Hughes Middle School
 - i. Thayer Ave and Griffin street
 - j. State st and Divide Ave frontage road
 - k. Optimist Park
 - l. Hillside Park
 - m. Divide Ave west of Channel Dr
 - n. Landfill
 - o. 20th street and Thayer ave – Senior Center
 - p. Tatley Park
 - q. Missouri Valley Fairgrounds
 - r. Georgia Street and Park Ave
 - s. Riverwood Drive Archery range
 - t. South 3rd street south of Ascension Church
 - u. 19th street north of Oregon Ave
 - v. Stonewall Dr and Penn's Lane
 - w. Northbrook Shopping Center

16. If there was a curbside program for collecting yard waste, and there was a small fee, how likely would you be to use the service?
- a. Very likely
 - b. Likely
 - c. Not very likely
 - d. Don't know
 - e. It depends

SATISFACTION QUESTIONS

17. Have you ever visited the City of Bismarck website?
- a. Yes
 - b. No
18. Have you visited the City of Bismarck website to obtain information about garbage service and recycling?
- a. yes
 - b. no
19. How satisfied are you with your garbage service?
- a. Very satisfied
 - b. Satisfied
 - c. Somewhat satisfied
 - d. Neutral to very dissatisfy
20. Have you ever had contact with staff from Bismarck's Solid Waste Division, such as on the phone, at a special event or at the landfill?
- a. Yes
 - b. No
 - c. Refused
21. How satisfied were you with the level of customer service you received?
- a. Very satisfied
 - b. Satisfied
 - c. Somewhat satisfied
 - d. Neutral to very dissatisfied
22. Would you say your garbage fees are?
- a. Much to high for what you get
 - b. About right, reasonable for what you get
 - c. A little too high for what you get
- (Bismarck's residential garbage fee is \$5.95/mnth for collection and \$3.60/mnth for the landfill/disposal, \$9.55 total/mnth.)

RECYCLING

23. Looking at your own personal waste, how much do you believe you could divert from the garbage stream – through recycling, reduction, and other means? Include any waste that you currently recycle in this estimate.

- a. 0-25%
- b. 26 – 50%
- c. 51-75%
- d. 76 – 100%
- e. Don't know

CLASSIFICATION

24. How many years have you lived at your present residence?

- a. Less than 3 years
- b. 3 – 5 years
- c. 6 – 10 years
- d. 11 – 20 years
- e. More than 20 years

25. Which of the following best describes your combined annual household income?

- a. Under \$20,000
- b. \$20,000 - \$29,999
- c. \$30,000 - \$39,999
- d. \$40,000 - \$49,999
- e. \$50,000 - \$74,999
- f. \$75,000 - \$99,999
- g. \$100,000 +
- h. Don't know/refused

SERVICE CHANGES/PREFERENCES

26. If recycling programs could be expanded to include more materials, or if it would cost a little more to achieve the City's recycling goal, would you be willing to pay a bit more on your garbage and recycling bill?

- a. Yes
- b. No
- c. Don't know

27. Currently, the City's residents recycle and divert about 40% of the waste stream. Do you support City programs to increase recycling and diversion if it increases garbage and recycling costs by:

- a. 50 cents per month
- b. One dollar per month
- c. Three dollars per month

28. How can Bismarck help you recycle more?

Appendix B: Frequency Tables

Age by Range

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	18 to 30	30	7.9	8.2	8.2
	31 to 40	39	10.2	10.7	18.9
	41 to 50	77	20.2	21.0	39.9
	51 to 60	82	21.5	22.4	62.3
	61 to 70	58	15.2	15.8	78.1
	71 to 80	50	13.1	13.7	91.8
	over 80	30	7.9	8.2	100.0
	Total	366	95.8	100.0	
Missing	System	16	4.2		
Total		382	100.0		

Gender

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	148	38.7	38.7	38.7
	Female	234	61.3	61.3	100.0
	Total	382	100.0	100.0	

How many people are in your family?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1-2	250	65.4	65.4	65.4
	3-4	105	27.5	27.5	92.9
	5 or more	26	6.8	6.8	99.7
	5	1	.3	.3	100.0
	Total	382	100.0	100.0	

Which of the following housing types would you say best describes your home?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Single family detached house	251	65.7	65.9	65.9
	Single family attached house (duplex, townhouse, condo)	63	16.5	16.5	82.4
	Apartment with 2 - 4 units	11	2.9	2.9	85.3
	Apartment building with 5 or more units	32	8.4	8.4	93.7
	Mobile, house trailer	24	6.3	6.3	100.0
	Total	381	99.7	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.3		
Total		382	100.0		

Do you or members of your household own this home, do you rent, do you live rent-free, or some other arrangement?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Own/ buying	314	82.2	82.6	82.6
	Rent/ lease	63	16.5	16.6	99.2
	Occupied without payment of rent	1	.3	.3	99.5
	Other arrangement	1	.3	.3	99.7
	refused/ NA	1	.3	.3	100.0
	Total	380	99.5	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.5		
Total		382	100.0		

Does your family recycle?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	174	45.5	45.5	45.5
	No	208	54.5	54.5	100.0
Total		382	100.0	100.0	

Which of these items does your family recycle? Paper/Cardboard

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	49	12.8	28.2	28.2
	Yes	125	32.7	71.8	100.0
	Total	174	45.5	100.0	
Missing	System	208	54.5		
Total		382	100.0		

Which of these items does your family recycle? Plastic

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	98	25.7	56.3	56.3
	Yes	76	19.9	43.7	100.0
	Total	174	45.5	100.0	
Missing	System	208	54.5		
Total		382	100.0		

Which of these items does your family recycle? Aluminum & Steel Cans

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	51	13.4	29.3	29.3
	Yes	123	32.2	70.7	100.0
	Total	174	45.5	100.0	
Missing	Svstem	208	54.5		
Total		382	100.0		

How many times do you or someone from your household take materials to the recycling trailers in the city per month?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	25	6.5	14.4	14.4
	Once	85	22.3	48.9	63.2
	Twice	39	10.2	22.4	85.6
	Three times	6	1.6	3.4	89.1
	Four times	14	3.7	8.0	97.1
	More than four times	3	.8	1.7	98.9
	7	2	.5	1.1	100.0
	Total	174	45.5	100.0	
Missing	Svstem	208	54.5		
Total		382	100.0		

Why do you choose not to participate in recycling?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No time/ too much effort	103	27.0	50.0	50.0
	Dont have enough recyclables	69	18.1	33.5	83.5
	No interest in participating	18	4.7	8.7	92.2
	Dont believe in recycling	2	.5	1.0	93.2
	Other	14	3.7	6.8	100.0
	Total	206	53.9	100.0	
Missing	System	176	46.1		
Total		382	100.0		

Where do you recycle?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Drop off trailer	106	27.7	60.9	60.9
	Private recycling center	46	12.0	26.4	87.4
	Both	18	4.7	10.3	97.7
	DK/NA	4	1.0	2.3	100.0
	Total	174	45.5	100.0	
Missing	System	208	54.5		
Total		382	100.0		

What types of recyclable materials do you take to the private recycling centers? Aluminum

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	11	2.9	17.5	17.5
	Yes	52	13.6	82.5	100.0
	Total	63	16.5	100.0	
Missing	System	319	83.5		
Total		382	100.0		

What types of recyclable materials do you take to the private recycling centers? Newspaper

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	49	12.8	77.8	77.8
	Yes	14	3.7	22.2	100.0
	Total	63	16.5	100.0	
Missing	System	319	83.5		
Total		382	100.0		

What types of recyclable materials do you take to the private recycling centers? Office Paper

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	54	14.1	85.7	85.7
	Yes	9	2.4	14.3	100.0
	Total	63	16.5	100.0	
Missing	System	319	83.5		
Total		382	100.0		

What types of recyclable materials do you take to the private recycling centers? Magazines

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	54	14.1	85.7	85.7
	Yes	9	2.4	14.3	100.0
	Total	63	16.5	100.0	
Missing	System	319	83.5		
Total		382	100.0		

What types of recyclable materials do you take to the private recycling centers? Metal

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	51	13.4	81.0	81.0
	Yes	12	3.1	19.0	100.0
	Total	63	16.5	100.0	
Missing	System	319	83.5		
Total		382	100.0		

What types of recyclable materials do you take to the private recycling centers? Plastic

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	49	12.8	77.8	77.8
	Yes	14	3.7	22.2	100.0
	Total	63	16.5	100.0	
Missing	System	319	83.5		
Total		382	100.0		

Do you know where the city's recycling drop-off trailers are located near your home?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	131	34.3	75.3	75.3
	No	43	11.3	24.7	100.0
	Total	174	45.5	100.0	
Missing	System	208	54.5		
Total		382	100.0		

Which recycling trailer site do you visit most often?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Igoe Park	4	1.0	2.8	2.8
	Schamburg Ice Arena	10	2.6	7.1	9.9
	Optimist Park	14	3.7	9.9	19.9
	Jaycee Park	27	7.1	19.1	39.0
	Tatley Park	5	1.3	3.5	42.6
	Ave D and Hannifin St, south of the old Hughes Middle School	4	1.0	2.8	45.4
	26th Street and Rossser - Loaf and Jug	7	1.8	5.0	50.4
	Edwards Ave by the BSC Bowl	4	1.0	2.8	53.2
	Ash Coulee Road and North Washington Street next to water tower	2	.5	1.4	54.6
	Hillside Park	14	3.7	9.9	64.5
	Sweet Ave and Hannifin Street	2	.5	1.4	66.0
	Arrowhead Plaza	19	5.0	13.5	79.4
	19th Street Norht of Oregon Ave	6	1.6	4.3	83.7
	Other	18	4.7	12.8	96.5
	DK/ No Answer	5	1.3	3.5	100.0
	Total	141	36.9	100.0	
Missing	System	241	63.1		
Total		382	100.0		

How many bags of trash do you place curbside weekly besides what is inside of your garbage can?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Zero	125	32.7	71.8	71.8
	1-2	37	9.7	21.3	93.1
	3-4	9	2.4	5.2	98.3
	5-6	2	.5	1.1	99.4
	5	1	.3	.6	100.0
	Total	174	45.5	100.0	
Missing	System	208	54.5		
Total		382	100.0		

Do you believe there is more you could recycle out of your trash?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes, a lot	36	9.4	20.7	20.7
	Yes, a little	118	30.9	67.8	88.5
	No	20	5.2	11.5	100.0
	Total	174	45.5	100.0	
Missing	System	208	54.5		
Total		382	100.0		

What does your household most often do with grass clippings/leaves

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Leave clippings on lawn	78	20.4	20.5	20.5
	compost	40	10.5	10.5	31.0
	self haul to grass dumpster recvclina site	109	28.5	28.6	59.6
	landscape service	115	30.1	30.2	89.8
	put it out with the garbage	38	9.9	10.0	99.7
	6	1	.3	.3	100.0
	Total	381	99.7	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.3		
Total		382	100.0		

Which yard waste collection site do you visit most often?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Cottonwood Soccer Fields at Santa Fe Ave and South 12th street	6	1.6	5.5	5.5
	Sweet Ave and Hannifin St	4	1.0	3.6	9.1
	Riverwood Golf Course parking lot	1	.3	.9	10.0
	London Ave- west of Manchester street at the Waste Water treatment Plant	5	1.3	4.5	14.5
	Ash Coulee Road and North Washington street by water tower	4	1.0	3.6	18.2
	Tyler parkway and Valley Drive	5	1.3	4.5	22.7
	Edwards Ave west of BSC bowl	1	.3	.9	23.6
	Ave D and Hannifin St, across from old Hughes Middle School	4	1.0	3.6	27.3
	State St and Divide Ave frontage road	5	1.3	4.5	31.8
	Optimist Park	10	2.6	9.1	40.9
	Hillside Park	15	3.9	13.6	54.5
	Divide Ave west of Channel Dr	1	.3	.9	55.5
	Landfill	2	.5	1.8	57.3
	20th Street and Thayer ave- Senior Center	1	.3	.9	58.2
	Tatley Park	3	.8	2.7	60.9
	Georgia Street and Park Ave	2	.5	1.8	62.7
	Riverwood Drive Archery Range	1	.3	.9	63.6
	South 3rd Street south of Ascension Church	9	2.4	8.2	71.8
	19th Street north of Oregon Ave	6	1.6	5.5	77.3
	Stonewall Dr and Penn's Lane	1	.3	.9	78.2
	Northbrook Shopping Center	2	.5	1.8	80.0
	Other/ DK	21	5.5	19.1	99.1
	25	1	.3	.9	100.0
	Total	110	28.8	100.0	
Missing	System	272	71.2		
Total		382	100.0		

If there was a curbside program for collecting yard waste, and there was a small fee, how likely would you be to use the service?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very likely	34	8.9	9.0	9.0
	Likely	77	20.2	20.3	29.3
	Not very likely	201	52.6	53.0	82.3
	DK	40	10.5	10.6	92.9
	It depends	26	6.8	6.9	99.7
	DK/ NA	1	.3	.3	100.0
	Total	379	99.2	100.0	
Missing	System	3	.8		
Total		382	100.0		

Have you ever visited the City of Bismarck website?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	88	23.0	23.0	23.0
	No	293	76.7	76.7	99.7
	3	1	.3	.3	100.0
Total		382	100.0	100.0	

Have you visited the City of Bismarck website to obtain information about garbage service and recycling?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	22	5.8	24.7	24.7
	No	67	17.5	75.3	100.0
	Total	89	23.3	100.0	
Missing	System	293	76.7		
Total		382	100.0		

How satisfied are you with your garbage service?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Satisfied	219	57.3	57.6	57.6
	Satisfied	155	40.6	40.8	98.4
	Somewhat Satisfied	3	.8	.8	99.2
	Neutral to very dissatisfied	2	.5	.5	99.7
	DK/ NA	1	.3	.3	100.0
	Total	380	99.5	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.5		
Total		382	100.0		

Have you ever had contact with staff from Bismarck's Solid Waste Division, such as on the phone, at a special event, or at the landfill?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	88	23.0	23.0	23.0
	No	294	77.0	77.0	100.0
	Total	382	100.0	100.0	

How satisfied were you with the level of customer service you received?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Satisfied	44	11.5	50.6	50.6
	Satisfied	41	10.7	47.1	97.7
	Somewhat Satisfied	2	.5	2.3	100.0
	Total	87	22.8	100.0	
Missing	System	295	77.2		
Total		382	100.0		

How would you say your garbage fees are?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Much too high for what you get	6	1.6	1.6	1.6
	A little too high for what you get	39	10.2	10.3	11.8
	About right, reasonable for what you get	318	83.2	83.7	95.5
	DK/NA	17	4.5	4.5	100.0
	Total	380	99.5	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.5		
Total		382	100.0		

Looking at your own personal waste, how much do you believe you could divert from the garbage stream - through recycling, reduction, and other means?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0-25%	233	61.0	61.0	61.0
	26 - 50%	79	20.7	20.7	81.7
	51-75%	19	5.0	5.0	86.6
	76-100%	8	2.1	2.1	88.7
	DK	43	11.3	11.3	100.0
	Total	382	100.0	100.0	

How many years have you lived at your present residence?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Less than 3 years	64	16.8	16.8	16.8
	3-5 years	68	17.8	17.8	34.6
	6-10 Years	81	21.2	21.3	55.9
	11-20 Years	89	23.3	23.4	79.3
	More than 20 years	79	20.7	20.7	100.0
	Total	381	99.7	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.3		
Total		382	100.0		

Which of the following best describes your combined annual household income?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Under \$20,000	32	8.4	8.4	8.4
	\$20,000 - \$29,999	23	6.0	6.0	14.4
	\$30,000 - \$39,999	34	8.9	8.9	23.3
	\$40,000 - \$49,999	37	9.7	9.7	33.0
	\$50,000 - \$74,999	48	12.6	12.6	45.5
	\$75,000 - \$99,999	47	12.3	12.3	57.9
	Over \$100,000	24	6.3	6.3	64.1
	Dont Know/ Refused	137	35.9	35.9	100.0
	Total	382	100.0	100.0	

If recycling programs could be expanded to include more materials, or if it would cost a little more to achieve the City's recycling goal, would you be will to pay a bit more on your garbage and recycling bill?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	216	56.5	56.5	56.5
	No	131	34.3	34.3	90.8
	Don't Know	34	8.9	8.9	99.7
	8	1	.3	.3	100.0
	Total	382	100.0	100.0	

Do you support City programs to increase recycling and diversion if it increases garbage and recycling costs by

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	50 cents per month	57	14.9	24.8	24.8
	One dollar per month	107	28.0	46.5	71.3
	Three dollars per month	63	16.5	27.4	98.7
	DK	3	.8	1.3	100.0
	Total	230	60.2	100.0	
Missing	System	152	39.8		
Total		382	100.0		

How can Bismarck help you recycle more?

1. If we had separate bins I would use them
2. more trailers
3. curb side pickup
4. No collection for glass, Higher number of plastics
5. I don't use enough
6. closer bins/ more bins
7. Where does it go and how do they benefit. When they have drop offs for different stuff. More options.
Computer waste
8. more convenient
9. They do a good job
10. More Trailers
11. move ads where to take recyclables
12. can pick up
13. more trailers
14. Recycling, Glass, Curbside, wider variety of plastic recycling
15. Took more items, All plastics and Magazines
16. curbside
17. curbside
18. binds and household pick up
19. more information on everything - locations, acceptable items, ex
20. More trailers and more items
21. better advertising, more bins
22. more trailers
23. More bins
24. more trailers, curbside pickup
25. Advertising
26. curbside pickup
27. curbside pickup
28. more info
29. curbside pickup
30. more info, more trailers
31. more advertising
32. glass should be recycled
33. recycle more electronics and home appliances
34. curbside pickup
35. curbside pickup
36. advertising
37. curbside pickup
38. curbside pickup
39. curbside pickup
40. more bins
41. more bins
42. curbside pickup
43. curbside pickup, more info
44. curbside pickup
45. curbside pickup
46. by providing/ collecting more recyclables such as glass and plastics
47. curbside pickup
48. curbside pickup
49. curbside pickup
50. recycle more things
51. more things could be recycled

52. Thinks they are doing well
53. Give a helping hand - don't know - be specific on places/ a spot where you could take it - to help recycling more. Metal should be recycled - There should be a place to put metal in.
54. We live out of town. Convenience - like if someone picked it up. It would help
55. Finding out where you take the recycle
56. pick up
57. More locations/ Pick up
58. curbside bins & pick up
59. have no idea
60. Don't know - thinks recycling all she can - can't help recycle more
61. I think they can provide more recycling locations for people and provide more programs/ locations for rural people - rural people don't live that far away.
62. curbside
63. curbside
64. more recyclibles (Glass)
65. Well, I don't know - they tried different things on the curb but that didn't work to well, so they could have more locations - didn't really know.
66. curbside - pickup
67. more trailers
68. pick up
69. more drop off spots/ pick up
70. Give me what I need to do it - I would be very happy to do it if I had the recyclables to do it and someone took care of them for me
71. Don't know - Recycling locations for trailer parks
72. pick up
73. more info, recycle appliances
74. If we knew what to recycle and where to take it
75. Make it easier/ more convenient - more bins - more accessible - not sure
76. It's nice that they have things to put cardboard, lawn clippings, and newspaper - don't see how they can help her particularly recycle more because she's blind and cannot take recycling anywhere
77. curbside program
78. more efficient
79. curbside
80. pick up
81. curbside pickup
82. mandatory
83. By having the stuff more available for us.
84. Live closer to Lincoln, not even offered, just offering would be a start
85. They can put garbage dumpsters by Kirkwood, Gateway, and all grocery stores for recycling purposes
86. They tried a few years ago and no one did it - they need to be specific - certain recyclables need to go in certain bins and certain bins need to be in locations and picked up frequently
87. curbside
88. curbside
89. curbside
90. curbside
91. pick-up stuff, have bins available to pick up stuff - a curbside program
92. pickup service - recycle more things
93. more info, expand program
94. curbside
95. curbside
96. curbside
97. put a program in for recycling - Include more recycling/ trash trucks that pick-up paper. Also a curbside program would help
98. put out more advertising in the tribune
99. don't think they can
100. pick up more often at trailer sites or larger bins

101. curbside
102. empty trailers more often
103. curbside
104. curbside
105. curbside pickup - moved from portland oregon - had to bins like here - the bigger one was for recycle and the smaller was one for garbage - overtime got more used to it
106. don't know - they tried it once before
107. curbside
108. Never have given it much thought - don't know
109. curbside
110. curbside
111. Thinks if they had more recycling trailers that would help
112. curbside pickup
113. curbside
114. curbside
115. curbside
116. If they had everything down and it's too hard to get down on 19th st and oregon ave
117. Probably just make the opportunity more available - gives bins so I wouldn't have to drive several miles and drop recycling off
118. Info on how recycled material is used
119. curbside pickup
120. curbside
121. It's been a problem - They tried it on the eastern side of the city with bins and it didn't work - don't know - but something needs to be done
122. They can't because I don't want to
123. curbside pickup
124. more advertising
125. Incentive Programs, curbside
126. curbside pickup
127. Just, well, work it out so I can have more time to do it.
128. curbside
129. If we had different containers
130. curbside
131. prove it makes sense (money wise etc)
132. Empty more often - curbside
133. lower rates
134. curbside
135. empty trailers more
136. Being how I don't recycle I don't know too much about it so it wouldn't hurt to provide education materials so I could learn more
137. More trailers - curbside
138. curbside
139. more trailers
140. curbside pickup
141. curbside pickup
142. pickup recycling from drop sites more frequently so it doesn't overflow
143. have programs that educate people on where drop-off locations are
144. more information on what can be recycled
145. curbside pickup
146. more convenient locations
147. curbside pickup, recycle more plastics
148. curbside pickup
149. I don't know where any drop-off locations are, recycling should be more convenient
150. pickup plastic from the curb
151. more drop-off locations
152. convenience and education

153. make it easier to know where drop off sites are especially for those without internet
154. expand program to be able to recycle all materials, ie glass, type 2 or 3 plastics and magazines
155. curbside pickup
156. curbside pickup
157. more locations and curbside pickup
158. curbside pickup
159. have more collection sites
160. recycle glass, packaging and more plastics
161. give elderly a little more information on what can be recycled
162. curbside program, accept more types of material, increased communication/education on the need to recycle
163. I don't know - can't move bins closer - doing the best - don't know what the answer
164. Making it easier for me to do it at home
165. Don't know if Bismarck can help - The numbers on the plastic bottles are harder to read as i get older
166. curbside
167. curbside
168. curbside
169. curbside pickup
170. more locations
171. I think it would keep garbage out of the lawns - people would recycle instead of throwing it out on the ground
172. curbside pickup
173. They need to put more accessible places not just one on the north and south - need to push recycling more - need to sperate the recylce better
174. They can pay me to recylce or reduce my garbage and recycling bill
175. don't know
176. Easier to recycle, more items
177. curbside
178. pretty satisfied - I like the bins are better - less in to recycling now that I'm older
179. picking up recyclables - curbside program
180. Don't know - They should do something but I don't know what
181. Limit the amount of things that can be thrown out, impose laws
182. Curbside pickup, colored bins
183. have recycling place
184. more recycling units
185. more advertising
186. more info, curbside pickup
187. curbside pickup
188. curbside pickup
189. curbside pickup
190. curbside pickup
191. more bins
192. curbside pickup, more info
193. curbside pickup
194. more info
195. advertising, more locations
196. curbside pickup
197. Make everyone do it
198. curbside pickup
199. by making us more aware of what can be recycled
200. make it more convenient
201. Make it more convient
202. curbside
203. curbside
204. curbside service
205. curbside
206. curbside pickup
207. Don't know - just putting stuff out - not taking labels off - blc gives a headache

208. curbside pick up
209. curbside
210. curbside
211. pick up bins
212. don't know - make it more convenient - I guess
213. curbside
214. curbside
215. more bins and not have to sort curbside
216. more sites, expand materials accepted
217. curbside, make garbage cans smaller
218. probably several/seven years ago they had bins for cans and etc but not sure why they stopped
219. more info. More locations
220. curbside, more trailers
221. curbside pickup
222. curbside
223. curbside
224. Offer more programs and opportunities to do it
225. curbside
226. I think the only way I would recycle is if I would get paid more to recycle
227. curbside
228. put out more recycling bins
229. curbside - more trailers
230. curbside
231. curbside
232. curbside
233. curbside pickup
234. curbside pickup, increase awareness, make recycling mandatory
235. make it easier to recycle
236. have bins for people to recycle things at picnics
237. curbside pickup
238. curbside pickup
239. curbside pickup
240. curbside pickup
241. curbside
242. curbside
243. curbside
244. curbside pickup
245. curbside
246. Recycle more materials
247. curbside