

## Solid Waste Services

A set of questions was included in the survey to examine the respondent's satisfaction with curbside solid waste services. The services examined include garbage collection, recycling collection, yard waste collection, leaf collection, and Christmas Tree collection. A 9-point scale from very dissatisfied (1) to very satisfied (9) was used to rate these collection services. The solid waste services are discussed in order of ratings highest to lowest.

The results indicate the respondents were very satisfied with curbside garbage collection. The mean improved significantly this year to 8.58 compared to the 2008 mean of 8.19 (Table 57). This year's grades represent the highest overall rating to date for curbside garbage collection. The percentages on the "satisfied" side (above 5) of the scale were very impressive at 97.6% with 0.0% on the "dissatisfied" side (below 5). As a comparison, last year the percentages were 94.6% on the "satisfied" side and 1.5% on the "dissatisfied" side. This scaling is not traditionally a grading type scale, but if this mean was converted into a grade it would be an A.

The level of satisfaction with the curbside Christmas Tree collection was also exceptionally high this year (Table 58). This year the mean improved to 8.50. This represents a significant increase from the 2006 and 2004 ratings. Data was not collected on this service in 2008. If this were to be converted into a grade the mark would also be an A. Note the very impressive numbers this year with 96.3% of the respondents were on the "satisfied" side of the scale versus 0.0% on the "dissatisfied" side.

**Table 57. Satisfaction with Curbside Garbage Collection (n=373).**

Year	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
10	8.58	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.4	1.6	4.6	18.2	73.2	97.6
08	8.19	0.5	0.5	0.0	0.5	3.7	3.4	8.4	28.2	54.6	94.6
06	7.56	3.3	0.9	0.6	1.2	6.3	6.9	15.1	25.3	40.4	87.7
04	7.88	1.8	0.9	1.2	0.6	4.9	5.2	12.5	20.2	52.6	90.5

**Table 58. Satisfaction with Curbside Christmas Tree Collection (n=224).**

Year	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
10	8.50	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.6	2.2	7.1	14.7	72.3	96.3
08	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
06	7.60	1.3	1.0	1.3	1.3	5.3	5.6	19.6	24.9	39.5	89.6

04	7.70	1.6	1.2	1.2	1.6	7.7	6.1	10.9	22.7	47.0	86.7
----	------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	------	------	------	------

The level of satisfaction with curbside recycling has also increased significantly. The mean improved from 7.74 to 8.37 this year (Table 59). There were 94.9% of the responses on the “satisfied” side of the scale versus only 1.3% on the “dissatisfied” side. If converted to a grade, then the grade for curbside recycling would have improved from a B to an A- this year. Similarly, the mean for yard waste collection improved this year. The mean improved to 8.37 compared to 7.65 in 2006 (Table 60). Data was also not collected for this service in 2008. There were 95.1% on the “satisfied” side of the scale versus 1.2% on the “dissatisfied” side. This would convert to a grade of A- compared to the 2006 grade of B. Also earning very good marks this year was curbside leaf collection. The mean improved to 8.18 and this represents substantial gain from 2006 when the mean was only 7.49 (Table 61). Again, data was not collected for this service in 2008. There were 94.0% on the “satisfied” side of the scale versus 2.8% on the “dissatisfied” side. This would represent a grade improvement from a B- to an A-. Overall, all the solid waste services earned high marks that have shown significant improvement over previous years.

**Table 59. Satisfaction with Curbside Recycling (n=373).**

Year	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
10	8.37	0.5	0.0	0.5	0.3	3.8	2.4	7.2	17.7	67.6	94.9
08	7.74	0.8	1.6	1.3	1.9	4.3	5.1	16.7	24.7	43.5	90.0
06	7.61	3.8	1.2	1.5	0.3	4.7	5.0	14.0	28.4	41.2	88.6
04	7.91	1.2	1.8	1.5	1.8	4.6	2.1	8.3	26.3	52.3	89.0

**Table 60. Satisfaction with Curbside Yard Waste Collection (n=346).**

Year	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
10	8.37	0.0	0.9	0.0	0.3	3.8	2.3	8.1	17.1	67.6	95.1
08	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
06	7.65	1.3	1.0	1.3	1.3	5.3	5.6	19.6	24.9	39.5	89.6
04	7.72	1.4	0.6	1.4	2.0	5.2	8.0	12.9	23.2	45.3	89.4

**Table 61. Satisfaction with Curbside Leaf Collection (n=317).**

Year	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
------	------	------------------------	---	---	---	--------------	---	---	---	---------------------	--------------

<b>10</b>	<b>8.18</b>	<b>0.3</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.9</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>12.0</b>	<b>15.8</b>	<b>61.8</b>	<b>94.0</b>
08	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
06	7.49	0.9	0.9	4.7	2.3	4.7	5.1	16.3	20.5	44.7	86.6
04	7.40	1.9	1.9	1.6	2.3	6.1	9.4	16.2	24.6	35.9	86.1

### Solid Waste Services Crosstabulations

Crosstabulations were conducted for age, housing type, income, and years in Cary for the set of solid waste curbside services (Appendix B). The crosstabulations for curbside garbage collection are shown in Tables B372-B375. They were generally consistent and positive. The only subgroups with somewhat lower means were apartment dwellers (7.33) and \$30,001-\$50,000 income level (8.13). The mean for apartment dwellers was significantly lower and this pattern will continue through the other collection services. The crosstabulations for Christmas Tree collection are shown in Tables B376-B379. There were no exceptionally low means for this service with the exception of very small sample size groups. The crosstabulations for curbside recycling collection are shown in Tables B380-B383. The lowest means were for apartment dwellers (6.62), 0-1 year residents (7.71), and \$30,001-\$50,000 income level (7.87). Curbside yard waste collection crosstabulations are shown in Tables B384-B387. The only lower means were for apartment dwellers (7.30) and 0-1 year residents (7.93). Finally, the crosstabulations for curbside leaf collection are shown in Tables B388-B391. The lowest means were given by apartment dwellers (7.30), 0-1 year residents (7.40), \$30,001-\$50,000 income level (7.58), and over 65 age group (7.93).