



RESIDENTIAL RUBBISH & RECYCLING COLLECTION SURVEY

For City of University Heights
Commissioned by Cuyahoga County Solid Waste District



AGENDA

- Background and Purpose
- Methodology
- Results and Discussion
- Conclusions/Observations
- Questions and Answers



BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE

- The Cuyahoga County Solid Waste District (District) hired RRS to prepare a survey and collect survey results for the City of University Heights solid waste management collection system (current) versus alternative collection systems.
- The District funded a survey of residents who receive service from the City of University Heights.
- The results of RRS's survey on the City's rubbish and recycling collection program will enable the administration and Council to objectively evaluate existing systems against alternative collection systems that embrace best practices and industry standards.

METHODOLOGY

- A mailing list was obtained from the City which included addresses by parcel and zoning code.
- Zoning codes U-1 and U-2 utilize City sanitation services, while zoning codes U-4 (apartments), U-5 (public uses), and U-7 (retail) do not.
- RRS sent a survey postcard to a total of 4,220 addresses within zoning codes U-1 and U-2.
- The 2020 census estimated 4,470 households in the City of University Heights with an average of 2.5 persons per household.
- A postcard with the link and QR to the online survey (Appendix B) were delivered to the mail house (production/postage) on August 15, 2022.
- Printer services and postage were contracted through RRS as a part of the contract between RRS and the Cuyahoga County Solid Waste District.
- The link to the survey was shared on the City's social media platforms (Facebook, Instagram, City E-News, and ReadyNotify).
- The published closing date for the survey was Friday, September 9, 2022, and the online survey was closed at 11:59pm on Sunday, September 11, 2022.





SURVEY QUALIFICATION

A total of 1,204 survey submissions were captured by the SurveyMonkey online survey.

Qualified surveys:

- 1,018 survey submissions were used in the analysis below.

Disqualified surveys:

- 6 survey submissions were removed because addresses reported was not in University Heights: 5 Cleveland Heights, 1 South Euclid.
- 32 survey submissions were removed because the address reported was not classified as zoning code U-1 or U-2.
- 132 survey submissions were removed because of multiple survey submissions were from the same reported address. The last survey submission from each address was counted in the analysis.
- 12 survey submissions were removed because of incomplete survey submissions such as: full address not reported, zero (“0”) residents reported, or no ages reported.

A total of 182 survey submissions disqualified were not included in the survey analysis and the data were saved for records.

The following assumptions were identified and undertaken:

- If multiple survey submissions were from the same reported address only the last survey submission from each address was counted in the analysis.
- For purposes of classification, each survey was assigned an age group according to the oldest reported household resident.
- There were no households whose oldest resident was reported in “under 18” category, and the category will not be included in the analysis.
- For the weighted population distribution, a total of 1,178 people representing John Carroll University students living on campus was removed from the 18-34 years old age category. This number was obtained from Residence Life at John Carroll University.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

TABLE 7 QUESTION #8 ON SURVEY: DO YOU FIND IT IMPORTANT TO RECYCLE IN YOUR HOUSEHOLD?

Question #8	Survey Data				Total	%	Weighted Population Distribution				Total	%
	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+			18-34	35-49	50-64	65+		
Very important	113	175	163	212	663	65%	2,139	1,338	1,192	982	5,651	64%
Somewhat important	40	56	36	61	193	19%	757	428	263	283	1,731	20%
Undecided	12	19	24	17	72	7%	227	145	176	79	627	7%
Somewhat unimportant	2	9	11	9	31	3%	38	69	80	42	229	3%
Not important	17	14	12	16	59	6%	322	107	88	74	591	7%
Total	184	273	246	315	1,018	100%	3,483	2,088	1,799	1,459	8,829	100%
Percentage	18%	27%	24%	31%	100%		39%	24%	20%	17%	100%	

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

COLLECTION METHOD OPTIONS IN QUESTIONS 11 AND 12

Collection options included ones in the “2020 Solid Waste Collection Analysis” **plus** one additional for current rubbish collection plus a cart option for recycling (Option D)

OPTION	COST per household per month:
Option A: Current backdoor/side door rubbish manual with backdoor/side door blue/clear bag recycle manual collection.	\$25.49
Option B: Curbside rubbish manual with curbside blue/clear bag recycling manual collection.	\$22.56
Option C: Backdoor/side door rubbish manual with curbside recycling manual bin/tote collection.	\$27.34
Option D: Backdoor/side door rubbish manual with curbside recycling semi-automated wheeled cart collection.	\$27.90
Option E: Curbside rubbish semi-automated wheeled cart with curbside recycling semi-automated wheeled cart collection.	\$23.92
Option F: Curbside rubbish automated wheeled cart with curbside recycling automated wheeled cart collection.	\$22.04

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

TABLE 11 QUESTION #12 ON SURVEY: WHAT IS YOUR OVERALL PREFERRED COLLECTION METHOD?

Question #12	Survey Data				Total	%	Weighted Population Distribution				Total	%
	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+			18-34	35-49	50-64	65+		
Option A: Current backdoor rubbish / Current backdoor recycling	46	81	124	191	442	49%	971	690	1,000	1,002	3,664	42%
Option B: Curbside manual rubbish/ Curbside manual recycling	3	5	6	14	28	3%	63	43	48	73	228	3%
Option C: Current backdoor rubbish/ Curbside Manual recycling	8	14	8	9	39	4%	169	119	65	47	400	5%
Option D: Current backdoor rubbish/ Curbside semi-auto recycling	8	18	3	7	36	4%	169	153	24	37	383	4%
Option E: Semi-auto curbside rubbish/ Semi-auto curbside recycling	21	20	9	6	56	6%	443	170	73	31	718	8%
Option F: Automated curbside rubbish/ Automated curbside recycling	79	107	73	51	310	34%	1,668	912	589	268	3,436	39%
Total	165	245	223	278	911	100%	3,483	2,088	1,799	1,459	8,829	100%
Percentage	18%	27%	24%	31%	100%		39%	24%	20%	17%	100%	

CONCLUSIONS/OBSERVATIONS

- **Table 1: Qualified Survey Count Compared to Census Data.**

- Each survey was assigned an age group according to the oldest reported household resident.
- The 65+ age group is 15% of adult Census population, and 17% of the adjusted 8,829 adult Census population.
- The survey age category with the highest survey submission rate was the 65+ age group which included 315 survey submissions or 31%. Of the 315 survey submissions, there were 240 survey submissions or 76% which did not have any other age groups listed as residing in the household.

- **Table 2: How many people reside in your household?**

- The survey submissions reported in the 65+ age category represented the greatest portion of all qualified survey submissions at 31%.
- A plurality of households have only 2 people residing at 43% followed by 1 person households at 18%.

- **Table 3: Typically, how many blue/clear bags (10-30 gallons) of RECYCLING do you place for collection weekly?**

- 47% of respondents place one recycling bag for weekly collection while 23% do not place any.

- **Table 4: Typically, how many SPECIAL pickups do you request per year?**

- 36% of respondents use the City's special pickups request collection once per year while 39% do not use this service.

- **Table 5: Do you know what can and cannot be collected for RUBBISH?**

- A majority of respondents know what can and cannot be collected for rubbish with 37% reporting "Yes, I know every item that can or can't be collected" and 51% reporting "Somewhat know".

- **Table 6: Do you know what can and cannot be collected for RECYCLING?**

- A majority of respondents know what can and cannot be collected for recycling with 36% reporting "Yes, I know every item that can or can't be collected" and 49% reporting "Somewhat know".

- **Table 7: Do you find it important to RECYCLE in your household?**

- Recycling is important to 84% of University Heights residents, with 65% reporting that recycling was "Very important" and 19% reporting it was "Somewhat important".



CONCLUSIONS/OBSERVATIONS

- **Table 8: What are STRENGTHS of the current collection system?**

- The required response on Question 9 allowed for the Service Department to receive feedback on strengths of the current program.
- The top strength was “Convenient”
- Second strength was "Reliable collection"
- Third strength was "Clutter free tree lawn"
- The survey results and individual comments will serve as a guide for the development of future education and outreach programs for rubbish and recycling collection.

- **Table 9: What are WEAKNESSES of the current collection system?**

- The top weakness was “Rate of recycling (currently below average for Cuyahoga communities).”
- Second weakness was typed in “Other” comments
- Third weakness was "Not efficient"
- The survey results and individual comments will serve as a guide for the development of future education and outreach programs for rubbish and recycling collection.

CONCLUSIONS/OBSERVATIONS

- **Table 10: Choose your preference for each option.**
 - Most preferred options by years-of-age category follows the trend of options as presented in Question 12 or Table 11.
- **Table 11: What is your overall preferred collection method?**
 - There were 911 answers provided by the 1,018 qualified surveys submissions with 107 or 10.5% which did not provide any response for their collection preference.
 - 51% of qualified survey submissions chose a different method option to the current collection system.
 - Out of the 911 qualified survey submissions, a plurality at 49% was Option A to keep the current collection system. The second highest response at 34% was Option F for a fully automated collection system. The third highest response at 6% was Option E for a semi-automated collection system.
 - 83% of respondents preferred either Option A current collection system or Option F for a fully automated collection system. The remaining options (B, C, D, and E) represented 17% of survey submissions.
 - When placed on a weighted population distribution, 42% chose to keep the current collection method and 58% chose a different method. The leading alternatives were curbside automated collection at 39% followed by curbside semi-automated collection at 8%, and the three remaining methods at 11%.
 - Five out of ten residents preferred a curbside method such as automated, semi-automated, or manual collection (Options F, E, and B).
 - Four out of ten residents preferred the current system with no changes (Option A).
 - One out of ten residents preferred backdoor rubbish collection with changes to recycling either manual or semi-automated curbside collection (Option C and D).



QUESTIONS?



ERIN OULTON

CONSULTANT
614.961.5203

EOULTON@RECYCLE.COM