

# Pierce and Pepin Counties Apartment Recycling Program Survey: Summer 2005



**Shelly Hadley**

**Denise Parks**

**David Trechter**

**Survey Research Center Report 2005/15**

**October, 2005**

***In cooperation with:***

***Terry J. Mesch, Recycling/Solid Waste Coordinator of Pepin County***

***Steve Melstrom, Solid Waste Administrator and David Murphy, MRF Supervisor of Pierce County Solid Waste Department***

---

Students working for the Survey Research Center were instrumental in the completion of this study. Lindsey Thompson and Kristi Sirinek contacted all of the apartment managers/owners, conducted the site visits, and collected data over the phone. Lindsey, Kristi, and Danielle Rogers entered and verified the data. Danielle, Lindsey, and Kristi proofread earlier drafts of the study. Their hard work and dedication are gratefully acknowledged. The SRC would like to give a special thank you to Darlene Dailey from Pierce County Solid Waste and Recycling for her assistance.

**Table of Contents**

<b>Chapter 1. Executive Summary.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Chapter 2. Survey Data Collection Methods.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Chapter 3. Summary of Findings – Pepin County.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Chapter 4. Summary of Findings – Pierce County.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Appendix A. Participant Comments.....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Appendix B. Counties Combined Survey Results.....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Appendix C. Survey Instrument.....</b>	<b>28</b>

---



*Figure 1* Recycling Area at Apartment Complex

# Chapter 1. Executive Summary

## Overview

To help owners/managers of multifamily housing properties with five or more units comply with state and county recycling regulations, the County Recycling Departments of Pierce and Pepin Counties commissioned the Survey Research Center (SRC) at the University of Wisconsin – River Falls to do a survey of these properties.<sup>1</sup> The goals of the survey, which was conducted during the summer of 2005, were to:

- determine current recycling practices
- gauge the level of understanding of and compliance with owner/manager responsibilities regarding recycling
- identify barriers to recycling in apartment complexes
- do a general assessment of recycling facilities in apartment complexes

Those surveyed claimed primary or shared responsibility for handling the garbage and recyclables at their particular apartment complex.

This report summarizes the results of the 2005 survey and is organized into four main chapters. Chapter 1 provides an executive summary of the survey, while Chapter 2 summarizes the methodology used. Chapter 3 summarizes key findings from the Pepin County survey and Chapter 4 summarizes key findings from the Pierce County survey. Appendices follow the main body of this report and include survey participant comments, the combined survey results for both counties, and the survey instrument.

The survey focused on three major areas of inquiry:

- **apartment complex and tenant information**
- **apartment complex recycling practices**
- **site visits**

---

<sup>1</sup> **Regulations** - Wisconsin's Waste Reduction and Recycling Law and local ordinances require the owners (or designated agents) of all multi-family buildings and facilities to do the following with respect to recycling:

- Provide adequate, separate containers for recyclable materials.
- Notify tenants in writing at time of renting or leasing the dwelling and at least semiannually thereafter about the program.
- Provide for the collection of recyclable materials separated from the solid waste by the tenants and the delivery of the recyclable materials to a recycling facility.
- Notify tenants of reasons to reduce and recycle solid waste, which materials are collected, how to prepare recyclable materials in order to meet the processing requirements, collection methods or sites, locations and hours of operation and a contact person or company, including a name, address and phone number.

## Summary of Results

### Apartment Complex Recycling

#### Pepin County:

- Pepin County's apartment managers/owners believe that 100 percent of their residents recycle.
- 82 percent of Pepin County managers said they were 'very satisfied' with their haulers
- The survey found Pepin County managers/owners to be remiss in their notifying tenants about their apartment complex recycling program with 82 percent not notifying their tenants at the time of renting in writing of their recycling program
- All of the Pepin County managers/owners stated that they provide information to their tenants about the location of their recycling area.
- Pepin County managers/owners had an average of 15 units per complex and none reported lack of room to be a 'very important' or 'somewhat important' barrier to recycling efforts at their complex

#### Pierce County:

- Pierce County managers/owners report that 68 percent of tenants recycle.
- 62 percent of Pierce County managers said they were 'very satisfied' with their haulers.
- 63 percent of Pierce County manager/owners do not notify their tenants about their recycling program in writing
- According to the survey, 58 percent of the Pierce County managers/owners provide information to their tenants about the location of the recycling area at their complex.
- 28 percent of Pierce County managers/owners (with an average of 19 units per complex) stated that lack of room was either a 'very important' or 'somewhat important' barrier to recycling at their complex.

### Apartment Complex and Tenant Information

#### Pepin County

- The average age of Pepin County apartment complexes participating in the survey is 20 years old and has 15 units.
- Sixty-four percent of managers/owners in Pepin County characterize their tenants' incomes as 'low' defined as less than \$25,000/yr. None described their tenants as having high incomes (more than \$75,000/yr.)
- Pepin County managers/owners state that their tenant population averages to 1.55 tenants per unit and their tenants are predominantly retired (80 percent) with only 2 percent having children.

### Pierce County

- Pierce County apartment complexes are an average of 27 years old and have 18 units.
- 69 percent in Pierce County characterize their tenants' incomes as 'low' defined as \$<25,000/yr. No managers/owners described their tenants as having 'high' incomes defined as \$75,000+/yr.
- Pierce County complexes have an average of 2.09 tenants/unit and over one-third are students (35 percent.)

### Site Visits

#### Pepin County

- Three-fourths of Pepin County recycling area sites were assessed 'good' by the SRC staff.
- The approximate distance of the recycling area from the furthest apartment at a complex averaged 125 paces at the Pepin County sites
- During site visits to the complexes, SRC staff reported that signage to recycling areas was virtually non-existent.

#### Pierce County

- All of the recycling areas (100%) visited by the SRC staff in Pierce County were rated in the 'good' category.
- At the Pierce County sites, the average distance from the furthest apartment to the recycling area was approximately 148 paces.

### **Key Recommendations**

#### **For Managers/Owners**

- Improve quantity and quality of information provided about what and where to recycle.
- Efforts to get current non-recyclers recycling should take into account the particular characteristics and concerns of this group. Namely they are more likely to be: students or retirees who have lower income (<\$25,000/yr).

#### **For County Recycling/Solid Waste Departments**

- Develop working relationships with property managers/owners.
- Identify properties with low performing recycling activities and provide services to address problem areas.
- Offer a countywide clean up day targeting multifamily properties.
- Expand and enhance communication to residents about the proper ways to dispose of items that cannot or should not be put in the trash (electronics, appliances, etc.)

#### **For Solid Waste Haulers/Recyclers**

- Annually give their customers a complete list of disposal services and rates.

## **Conclusion**

In most cases, the managers/owners participating in the survey from Pepin County satisfy the responsibilities required by the state's recycling laws and local ordinances. In only one instance, (providing information to tenants about the location of the recycling area) did the majority (58%) of Pierce County manager/owners participate. In both Counties, a majority of managers/owners are 'very satisfied' with their waste hauler. They are, however, frustrated by a perceived lack of tenant interest in recycling. Data from this survey also suggests where more emphasis needs to be placed – expanding and enhancing communication to tenants about recycling activities. Only 18 percent of Pepin County managers/owners provide recycling information in writing to their tenants at the time of renting and 37 percent of the Pierce County managers/owners provide recycling information in writing to their tenants at the time of renting.

## **Chapter 2. Summary of Data Collection Methods**

This chapter summarizes key elements of the survey methodology.

### **Survey Population and Sample Size**

The participants in the recycling survey had primary or shared responsibility for handling the garbage and recyclables at their apartment complex. Usually the respondent was the manager or housing owner. The respondents included 70 apartment owner/managers in Pierce County and 8 apartment owner/managers in Pepin County. Some of the respondents were owner/managers of multiple sites. Of the 110 sites included in the survey, 96 (87%) were in Pierce County and 14 (13%) were in Pepin County.

The overall population size of 110 sites with 63 completed surveys yields a confidence interval of +/- 8 percent, which means that if 50 percent of a sample picks an answer you can be "sure" that had you asked the question of the entire relevant population no fewer than 42 percent (50%-8%) and no more than 58 percent (50%+8%) would have picked that answer. The breakdown of the Counties confidence intervals are as follows: Pepin County had an overall population size of 14 sites with 11 completed surveys yielding a confidence interval of +/- 14percent. Pierce County had an overall population size of 96 sites with 52 completed surveys yielding a confidence interval of +/- 9 percent.

### **Survey Design**

An initial meeting was held in Ellsworth, Wisconsin with representatives of both Pierce and Pepin Counties Recycling and Solid Waste Departments and staff from the Survey Research Center (SRC) at the University of Wisconsin – River Falls to discuss the implementation of the survey. The survey questionnaire was developed by the SRC, Terry J. Mesch, Coordinator of the Pepin County Recycling/Solid Waste Department and Steve Melstrom, Administrator of the Pierce County Solid Waste Department, and their boards of directors. Letters and informational materials were sent to all relevant apartment complexes informing them of the upcoming survey and requesting their cooperation.

### **Survey Objective**

The overall purpose of this research is to assist owners/manager of multifamily housing properties of five units or more in complying with state and county recycling regulations. The information collected will be used to develop educational materials for owners/managers and tenants to improve recycling awareness and participation.



## Survey Dates and Contact Process

The survey commenced in June 2005 and site-visits concluded on September 1, 2005. The SRC gathered apartment recycling information in multiple ways (telephone, mail, site visits)<sup>2</sup> The SRC contacted housing owners/managers of multifamily housing units to request an appointment to see their property and complete the survey questionnaire. If a mutually agreeable time could not be arranged, a survey was completed on the phone or mailed to the participant and permission was requested to complete a site visit without the owner/manager being present. Sixty-five telephone interviews (11 for Pepin County sites and 54 for Pierce County) were conducted and 71 surveys were mailed (5 to Pepin County contacts and 66 to Pierce County contacts.) Sixty-nine on-site visits were completed (13 Pepin County visits and 56 Pierce County visits). We were unable to connect with twenty-four owner/managers (31 sites). Table 1 shows the final recycling counts by site and Table 2 shows the final recycling counts by individuals interviewed.

	Total	Pierce County	Pepin County
#of sites	110	96	14
# phone contacts	79	65	14
# interviews completed	65	54	11
# sites checked	69	56	13
# mailed surveys	71	66	5
# no contact	31	31	0
# refused participation	4	4	0
# completed surveys	63	52	11
percent completed	57%	54%	79%

	Total	Pierce County	Pepin County
#of sites	78	70	8
# phone contacts	54	46	8
# interviews completed	42	36	6
# sites checked	50	43	7
# mailed surveys	54	49	5
# no contact	24	24	0
# refused participation	4	4	0
# completed surveys	42	36	6
percent completed	54%	51%	75%

<sup>2</sup> Several approaches were used when no contact was established with managers/owners. Each contact was called 10 or more times in order to schedule an interview or request permission to go on-site. For contacts that could not be reached by telephone, or for those contacts that could not be interviewed directly, a survey was sent by mail (two times). The SRC was still unable to complete surveys or even connect with some of the owner/managers.

## **Chapter 3. Summary of Findings – Pepin County**

This chapter presents a summary of findings from the 2005 Pepin County Apartment Recycling Program Survey.

### **Apartment Complex and Tenant Information**

Apartment Complex Characteristics. The average age of Pepin County apartment complexes participating in the survey is 20 years old. Of the 11 complexes for which we have data, only one was built more recently than 18 years ago and the oldest was built 26 years ago. So, almost all apartment complexes in the County are of a very similar age.

The apartment complexes in Pepin County are relatively small. The average complex has 15 apartments; the smallest has 8 and the largest 26. So, not only are apartment complexes in Pepin of a similar vintage, they are also quite similar in size. In addition, apartment complexes in the county have very high occupancy rates; all were at least 90 percent full and 2 of 11 were completely full.

Tenant Characteristics. Sixty-four percent of managers/owners in Pepin County characterized their tenants' income as 'low' (less than \$25,000/yr). No managers/owners from Pepin County described their tenants as having 'high' incomes defined as \$75,000+.

According to the survey, Pepin County managers/owners report that an average of only 7 percent of their tenants turnover per year. In all but two complexes managers said that at least 90 percent of their tenants are retirees, which probably accounts for the relatively low tenant turnover rate.

Pepin County managers/owners estimated that their tenant population averages 1.55 tenants per unit and, not surprisingly given the nature of their tenant population, very few of their tenants are children; only 1 complex reported having children among their tenant population.

### **Apartment Complex Recycling**

Tenant Awareness and Practice. Pepin County's apartment managers/owners believe that 100 percent of their tenants are aware of recycling and that 100 percent of their residents recycle.

Waste Hauler Issues. Pepin County apartment complex managers/owners report a high overall satisfaction with their recycling/waste hauler. Eighty-two percent of Pepin County managers said they were 'very satisfied' with their hauler. No waste hauler was reported to handle hazardous waste.

Based on survey responses, the average amount paid per month for waste hauling is \$68 in Pepin County. Eleven percent of Pepin County managers/owners stated that hauling costs are a 'very' important barrier to their recycling efforts but sixty-seven percent said that hauling costs were of 'little' importance as a barrier to recycling efforts.

Compliance with Wisconsin’s Waste Reduction and Recycling Laws and Local Ordinances. Respondents were asked a series of questions pertaining to Wisconsin’s waste reduction and recycling laws and local ordinances. Their responses are highlighted in Table 3.



Managers/Owners appear remiss in their notifying tenants about their apartment complex recycling program with only 18 percent saying that their tenants receive written notification of their recycling program at the time of renting. Only twenty percent of Pepin County complexes reported having signage to recycling areas. During on-site visits to apartment complexes, the SRC staff rarely found signage directing tenants to recycling areas (this was true in Pierce County as well).

Responsibilities	Yes	No
Notify tenants at time of renting of recycling program	18.2%	81.8%
Have signage directing tenants to recycling area	20.0%	80.0%
Remind tenants semi-annually of recycling program	63.6%	36.4%
Provide info about why to recycle	70.0%	30.0%
Provide info about hours of the recycling area	77.8%	22.2%
Provide tenants info about how to prepare recycling	80.0%	20.0%
Provide tenants info about what is recyclable	90.0%	10.0%
Provide info about location of the recycling area	100.0%	0.0%

Roughly two-thirds or more of all managers/owners report complying with all other state and local recycling ordinances. Sixty-four percent of Pepin County managers/owners said that they remind their tenants semi-annually of the recycling program at their complex. Between 70 percent and 80 percent say that they provide their tenants information about why to recycle, the hours of their recycling area, and how to prepare their recycling. Ninety percent or more said that they provide information to their residents about what is recyclable and about the location of the recycling area at their complex.

Potential Barriers to Recycling. We also asked owners/managers how serious a number of potential barriers are to recycling at their complex. Table 4 summarizes these results. The good news in Table 4 is that almost all of the things about which we asked are seen as having little impact on recycling practices at Pepin County apartment complexes. Two-thirds or more of Pepin County respondents said that hauling costs, a lack of information, insufficient room at the complex, concerns about messiness, odor problems, or concern about vermin were of “little” or “very little” importance as a barrier to recycling.

By far, the barrier of most concern to owners/managers was *confusing information* about recycling. Over three-fourths of respondents report that confusing recycling information is either a ‘very’ important barrier or a ‘somewhat’ important barrier to recycling. Nuisance issues such as smell, messiness, and concern about vermin were of ‘little’ or ‘very little’ importance as potential barriers to recycling for a majority of respondents.

Potential Barrier	#	Very	Somewhat	Neutral	Little	Very Little
<b>Confusing information</b>	9	11.1 %	66.7 %	11.1 %	11.1 %	0.0 %
<b>Hauling costs</b>	9	11.1 %	0.0 %	22.2 %	66.7 %	0.0 %
<b>Lack of Information</b>	9	11.1 %	0.0 %	11.1 %	77.8 %	0.0 %
<b>Demand on mgr's time</b>	9	0.0 %	11.1 %	11.1 %	66.7 %	11.1 %
<b>Limits on accepted materials</b>	9	0.0 %	0.0 %	77.8 %	0.0 %	22.2 %
<b>Lack of room</b>	9	0.0 %	0.0 %	22.2 %	77.8 %	0.0 %
<b>Concern about messiness</b>	9	0.0 %	0.0 %	22.2 %	66.7 %	11.1 %
<b>Smell</b>	9	0.0 %	0.0 %	11.1 %	66.7 %	22.2 %
<b>Concern about vermin</b>	9	0.0 %	0.0 %	11.1 %	66.7 %	22.2 %
<b>Other Barrier:</b>	0	0.0%	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0%	0.0 %

Respondent Comments about Recycling. The survey asked respondents to make additional comments concerning recycling issues. Specifically, participants were asked, "Do you have any comments you'd like to make about recycling or this survey," and "What could the County do to make recycling better/easier for you?" Comments regarding the lack of tenant interest in recycling and recycling confusion surfaced. Respondents mentioned things such as dealing with resident recycling apathy (n=2 Pepin), and the need for more recycling information (n=2 Pepin). Participant comments in their entirety can be viewed in Appendix A.

### Site Visits

During site visits, the SRC staff assessed the recycling area at the complex in terms of approximate size, location, number of bins, approximate distance from the furthest apartment, and signage to the recycling area.

The smallest recycling area observed was a 2 foot x 5 foot area in front of a garage at a Pepin County site. The largest Pepin County recycling area was approximately 15 feet x 15 feet in size. Recycling sizes of 10 feet x 5 feet and 10 feet x 8 feet appear to be the most popular (2/each observed in Pepin County). The average size of waste recycling areas in Pepin County was 9' x 10'.

Fifty-eight percent of Pepin County sites had recycling areas located inside a building. Three-fourths of the Pepin County sites were rated as 'good' by the SRC staff and none were rated poor.



Both the number of waste and recycling bins at a complex were counted. The average number of waste bins at the Pepin County complexes was three and the average number of recycling bins was seven.

The approximate distance of the recycling area from the furthest apartment averaged 125 paces at the Pepin County

sites. In no case was the distance less than 100 paces nor more than 160 paces. During site visits to the complexes, SRC staff reported that signage to recycling areas was virtually non-existent. In contrast, signage in the recycling area itself was more variable, with some complexes having very clear and nicely labeled bins and others having little or no signage in the area.

Conclusions. The owners/managers of multifamily housing properties in Pepin County report that 100 percent of their tenants recycle. Results also suggest that owners/managers need additional recycling information, particularly information concerning recycling compliance requirements and responsibilities. Less than one-fifth of respondents report notifying tenants in writing about the recycling program at their complex and only 20 percent report having signage directing tenants to the recycling areas. Although a small sample size, (11 respondents) the vast majority of Pepin County apartment complex managers/owners report overall satisfaction with their recycling/waste hauler. Eighty-two percent of Pepin County managers said they were ‘very satisfied’ with their waste hauler.

## **Chapter 4. Summary of Findings – Pierce County**

This chapter presents a summary of findings of the 2005 Pierce County Apartment Recycling Program Survey.

### **Apartment Complex and Tenant Information**

The number of apartments in Pierce County (96) is substantially greater than in Pepin County (14), so it is not surprising that the sample size for Pierce is also substantially greater (data from 67 complexes).

Apartment Complex Characteristics. Pierce County apartment complexes are an average of 27 years old. Seventy percent of apartment complexes in Pierce County have been built within the past 30 years. At the other end of the spectrum, 5 percent were built 80 or more years ago. More than half (52 percent) of the sample is composed of apartments in River Falls. Another 15 percent of respondents were in Prescott and 13 percent in Ellsworth. The remaining 19 percent are distributed between Spring Valley (7 percent), Elmwood (7 percent) and other villages in the county (Plum City and Bay City).

The average apartment complex in Pierce County has 18 units and most are relatively small. Eighty-nine percent of all complexes in the county report having 30 or fewer apartments. The smallest complex for which we collected data has 4 units and the largest has 60. In general, occupancy rates in Pierce County apartments are high, averaging 94 percent; none are less than 80 percent full and 21 said they are completely full.

Tenant Characteristics. Sixty-nine percent of managers/owners in Pierce County would County described their tenants as having ‘high’ incomes defined as \$75,000+ and none said their tenants’ income was \$25,000 or less per year.

The composition of tenants in Pierce County is quite fluid with a tenant turnover rate of more than one-third per year. The tenant turn-over rate (36 percent) correlates closely with the percentage of tenants that are students (35 percent).

The complexes average 2.09 tenants per unit. As noted, many of their tenants are students. Roughly two-thirds of Pierce County respondents said that retirees and families with children make up 10 percent or less of their tenant population.

### **Apartment Complex Recycling**

Tenant Awareness and Practice. Pierce County managers/owners believe that virtually all (96 percent) of their tenants are aware of recycling, but, on average, only 68 percent were reported to actually recycle. Few apartment complexes in Pierce County supply their tenants with recycling totes (8.5 percent said their tenants have such totes). Only 9 of the 67 complexes for which we have data provided an estimate of the percentage of tenant waste that is recycled and these ranged from 0 percent to 100 percent.

Waste Hauler Issues. Most apartment complex owners/managers are satisfied with the services they receive from their waste/recycling hauler. Sixty-two percent of Pierce County managers said they were very satisfied with their waste haulers and an additional 30 percent said they are satisfied. The few who were dissatisfied with their hauler tended to identify pricing issues as the cause of their concern. Nineteen percent of owners/managers report that their waste hauler handles hazardous waste. Most complexes in Pierce County (71 percent) use Waste Management, Inc for their waste/recycling hauling, 17 percent use Onyx and the remaining 13 percent have a variety of other arrangements.

The survey found the average amount paid per month to waste haulers in Pierce County is \$124. In addition, 33 percent of Pierce County managers/owners stated that hauling costs were an important or very important barrier to their recycling efforts while 50 percent stated that hauling costs were of ‘little’ or ‘very little’ importance as a potential barrier to recycling at their complex.

Compliance of Wisconsin’s Waste Reduction and Recycling Laws and local ordinances. Respondents were asked a series of questions pertaining to Wisconsin’s Waste Reduction and Recycling Laws and local ordinances. Their responses are highlighted in Table 5. According to the survey, over half (58 percent) of the Pierce County managers/owners provide information to their tenants about the location of the recycling area at their complex. The survey found Pierce County tenants were notified in writing 37 percent of the time about their apartment complex recycling program at the time of renting. Slightly over one-fourth of managers/owners provide tenants with information about what items are recyclable, semi annual reminders of the recycling program, and how to prepare recycling.

Responsibilities	Yes	No
Provide info about location of the recycling area	58%	42%
Notify tenants at time of renting of recycling program	37%	63%
Provide tenants info about what is recyclable	27%	73%
Remind tenants semi-annually of recycling program	26%	74%
Provide tenants info about how to prepare recycling	26%	74%
Provide info about hours of the recycling area	22%	78%
Provide info about why to recycle	15%	85%
Have signage directing tenants to recycling area	4%	96%

Eighty-five percent of owner/managers do not provide their tenants with information about why they should recycle and seventy-eight percent do not provide information about the operating hours of the complex’ recycling area. Only four percent of the Pierce County managers/owners report having signage directing tenants to the recycling area.<sup>3</sup>

Potential Barriers to Recycling. Table 6 summarizes the importance of potential barriers to recycling as felt by the managers/owners. None of the potential barriers about which we

<sup>3</sup> During on-site visits to apartment complexes in both Pierce and Pepin Counties, the SRC staff rarely found signage directing tenants to recycling areas.

inquired was considered to be very or somewhat important by a majority of respondents. The largest barrier, as reported by owners/managers, is waste hauling costs. One-third of respondents report hauling costs as being either a ‘very’ important barrier or ‘somewhat’ important barrier to recycling. Twenty-eight percent of Pierce County managers/owners (with an average of 19 units per complex) stated that lack of room was either a ‘very’ important or ‘somewhat’ important barrier to recycling at their complex. Nuisance issues such as smell, concern about messiness, and concern about vermin were very or somewhat important to more than one-quarter of the respondents. Seven respondents identified a variety of other barriers to recycling (an outside facility that is cold in winter, lack of tenant interest, etc.). For a full listing of these comments, see Appendix A of this report.

<b>Potential Barrier</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>Very</b>	<b>Somewhat</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Little</b>	<b>Very Little</b>
<b>Hauling costs</b>	30	23.3 %	10.0 %	16.7 %	10.0 %	40.0 %
<b>Concern about messiness</b>	30	20.0 %	10.0 %	10.0 %	20.0 %	40.0 %
<b>Concern about vermin</b>	28	17.9 %	7.1 %	10.7 %	28.6 %	35.7 %
<b>Lack of room</b>	32	12.5 %	15.6 %	15.6 %	15.6 %	40.6 %
<b>Limits on accepted materials</b>	27	7.4 %	22.2 %	18.5 %	18.5 %	37.0 %
<b>Lack of Information</b>	29	6.9 %	13.8 %	24.1 %	13.8 %	41.4 %
<b>Smell</b>	30	6.7 %	13.3 %	16.7 %	20.0 %	43.3 %
<b>Demand on mgr’s time</b>	30	6.7 %	10.0 %	13.3 %	26.7 %	43.3 %
<b>Confusing information</b>	29	0.0 %	6.9 %	37.9 %	13.8 %	41.4 %
<b>Other Barrier:</b>	11	63.6 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	36.4 %	0.0 %

Respondent Comments: Q34 and Q35. The survey asked respondents to make additional comments concerning recycling issues. Specifically, in question 34 participants were asked, "Do you have any comments you’d like to make about recycling or this survey." They provided both positive comments about recycling the recycling program (9 comments), negative comments (many dealing with tenant apathy), and suggestions (commingling of recyclables, provide free containers, facilitate distribution of recycling brochures, etc).

Question 35 asks, “What could the County do to make recycling better/easier for you?” Specific suggestions included broadening the things that can be recycled (batteries, oil, appliances), expanding the hours when recycling facilities can be used, and providing more information about recycling. Participant comments in their entirety can be viewed in Appendix A.

**Site Visits**

During visits to each site, the SRC staff reported their observations of the current recycling area at the complex. These assessments included: size approximations, recycling location, number of bins, approximate distance from the furthest apartment, and rating the signage to the recycling area.



The smallest recycling area observed was a 3 x 3 area at a Pierce County site. A recycling size of 10 x 5 appears to be the most popular with five sites in Pierce County described to be that approximate size. The average size of waste recycling areas at Pierce County complexes was 11' x 6'. SRC staff reported that signage to recycling areas was virtually non-existent.



Pierce County sites were overwhelmingly (89%) located outdoors. All of the recycling areas (100%) visited by the SRC staff in Pierce County were rated in the 'good' category.

The numbers of bins at complexes were reported in the following way: numbers were calculated for both waste bins and recycling bins a definitive definition was difficult. At Pierce County sites, the average number of waste bins was one and the average number of recycling bins was three.

The approximate distance of the recycling area from the furthest apartment averaged approximately 148 paces.

Conclusions. The owners/managers of multifamily housing properties in Pierce County report that 68 percent of their tenants recycle. Results also suggest that owners/managers need additional recycling information, particularly information concerning recycling compliance requirements and responsibilities. Of the eight regulations asked about in the survey, only one regulation (providing information about the location of the recycling area) was being fulfilled by a majority (58%) of Pierce County managers/owners. Only 37 percent of respondents report notifying tenants in writing about the recycling program at their complex and only 4 percent report having signage directly tenants to the recycling areas. Sixty-two percent of Pepin County managers said they were 'very satisfied' with their waste hauler. All of the Pierce County apartment complex recycling facilities visited were deemed to be good.

## APPENDIX A Participant Comments – Pepin County

### Q14 Type Recycling Bins:

- ❖ Cans-7x
- ❖ tubs
- ❖ One for each item-aluminum cans, plastic, metal cans, glass jars and bottles, brown and green glass, and shelf space for boxes
- ❖ aluminum, glass, paper

### Q19 Who hauls your recycling away?

- ❖ Contractor-5x
- ❖ Durand Sanatition-3x
- ❖ Caretaker
- ❖ John Bahr
- ❖ Jan Traxler

### Q23 If “somewhat” or “very dissatisfied”, why?

- ❖ He feels he is getting ripped off because there is a monopoly of who does recycling. Onyx can't haul for him because of county/city regulations.

### Key Themes - Respondent Comments: Q34 and Q35

The survey asked respondents to make additional comments concerning recycling issues. Comments regarding the lack of interest in recycling and recycling confusion surfaced. Respondents mentioned things such as dealing with resident recycling apathy (n=2/Pepin) and the need for more recycling information (n=2/Pepin). See respondent comments in their entirety below.

### Q34 Do you have any comments you'd like to make about recycling or this survey?

- ❖ We do it because we have to. There is a lot of confusion of what is and what isn't recyclable. But we know it is a "good thing to do".
- ❖ He just bought the building 2 months prior to interview. Is very upset with how things are run in Durand in connection with recycling and waste. The costs are way too high and unreasonable. "People don't care about recycling and they don't want to do it" There needs to be more cost efficient options available.
- ❖ They wish more people would recycle. "Always believed in recycling, grew up with recycling being accepted. Built recycling building on property in 1979.

### Q35 What could the County do to make recycling better/easier for you?

- ❖ Resend any explanation papers or brochures to clear up the confusion of what is or isn't recyclable.-2x
- ❖ We are happy as is.
- ❖ Model a new County program after other programs such as Eau Claire's, Dunn's, or Chippewa's.
- ❖ "Don't like the rule that if you have under four units you get free recycling, it's not fair".

**Q36: Could you please show us your recycling area?**

**Things to note about recycling area:**

**Q36a Size:**

- ❖ 10x8-2x
- ❖ 10x5-2x
- ❖ 12 x 5
- ❖ 13 x 13
- ❖ 8 x 8
- ❖ 10 x 10
- ❖ 2 x 5 (front of garage)
- ❖ 2 x 15
- ❖ 12x12
- ❖ 15x15

**General Comments (written by SRC staff during site visits):**

- ❖ Recycling in little shed in parking lot.-3x
- ❖ The signs were folded and old. The cans had dents, old and unclean.
- ❖ Signs for each bin above the bin. There is a big box for paper or cardboard products.
- ❖ Same as other properties owned by Housing authority.
- ❖ There isn't really a program for recycling here. They all as a group set the recycling in a bin outside on the curb every other week. Otherwise there is a dumpster for trash. We talked to the manager who wasn't able to provide some information. Mostly older people living here.
- ❖ The owner was really unhappy about the situation. He felt that the county representatives were really unhelpful and uncooperative. In general they were hard to work with.
- ❖ They used customized license plates above each can to define what goes in each can.
- ❖ Very nicely labeled cans, nice enclosed building specifically for recycling attached to garage-even had windows.
- ❖ Dirty, unorganized, no labels on containers.
- ❖ Fenced in.
- ❖ Fenced in area with spaces above cans for totes.

## APPENDIX A Participant Comments – Pierce County

### Q14 -Type of Recycling Bins:

- Paper, commingled-5x
- Cans-5x
- Paper, cardboard, and mixed-3x
- Individual-2x
- Glass and paper dumpsters-2x
- Commingled, paper dumpsters-2x
- Can/dumpster-2x
- Paper, glass/plastic-2x
- Commingled, paper receptacles-2x
- 2 yard cardboard, 3 glass ½ yards-2x
- Cardboard
- Plastic
- Paper and glass
- 1 commingled
- Aluminum, glass, paper
- Rubbermaid bins
- Commingled, paper dumpsters
- Paper and non-paper
- Dumpsters
- Paper dumpster, commingled receptacle
- Standard

### Q19 Who hauls your recycling away?

- Waste Management-34x
- ONYX-8x
- Marilyn Gallagher-2x
- Waste Management (hauls waste and tenants haul own recycling)
- P.I.G.
- Durand Sanitation Service, LLC

### Q23 If “somewhat” or “very dissatisfied”, why?

- Charged for couches/TVs, etc. Nonresidents often use dumpsters. Recycling/waste doesn't get hauled enough.-2x
- He does a good job. Whenever anything is needed or needs o be done, he's more than helpful.
- Always on schedule.
- Price keeps going up.
- Mix recycling with garbage.
- Inefficient.

### Q25 How important are the following potential barriers to recycling at your complex:

#### (j). Other:

- Area is outside and is cold in the winter-4x
- Not available by hauler
- Dumpsters get full
- People's attitude
- Tenant interest
- Don't want to
- Time and space

### **Key Themes - Respondent Comments: Q34 & Q35**

The survey asked respondents to make additional comments concerning recycling issues and what the County could do to make recycling easier. The comment mentioned most often was overall satisfaction with recycling services (n=8 Pierce County). Comments regarding the lack of interest in recycling (n=5/Pierce) and recycling confusion also surfaced (n=3/Pierce). Managers/owners are very interested in increased information about recycling (n=5 Pierce County.) See respondent comments in their entirety below.

### **Q34 Do you have any comments you'd like to make about recycling or this survey?**

#### **Positive comments:**

- The program works-satisfied-5x
- Although we don't notify tenants in writing of the recycling program, we do notify them personally.-2x
- Like the village system. Don't let the county complicate things, which is what they like to do.
- I have no complaints from any tenants.

#### **Negative Comments**

- Tried to get people to recycle but they won't, so stopped trying. Won't do it unless they have incentive-get paid.2x
- Encourage recycling, but it's difficult to enforce. Open to suggestions.-2x
- There is little or no interest in recycling. Who would sort and make sure what's in the recycling bins?
- People need to be encouraged-it's a way of life now.
- I can't get anyone to do it. Public recycling area is 3 blocks away in town.
- Expensive-especially large electronic items (microwaves, computers.)
- Hard to discipline.
- I just bought the building last year from Sawdust City. I just kept the same dumpster and company they had. I don't know anything about recycling. My student tenants and low income residents can't even get their garbage in the dumpster. No way would they be able to handle recycling.
- They can't.
- I must say that I believe there is no one that can say they don't know about recycling and conservation. However, as far as paper is concerned, I had a tote in the entry for a year and the use of it was pretty low. I noticed that the excess shoppers and papers that were put in the entry was all that were put in it, mostly when I put them there. Not that many of the tenants seem to get daily papers. The paper that is there and available to recycle I take home and throw them in the town recycle centers when built up. The tenants in some cases do bring their cans and glass to the Econo parking lot. The biggest problem has little to do with recycling. There is often outside dumping of beds, couches, refrigerators, electronic equipment, etc. which results in extra costs to me. If there are clean outside containers available for some reasonable methods I wouldn't be opposed to them, however. Recycling is great but it should not be a mess and cost me more than it already does. I personally don't wish to be part of a garbage police situation. We need personal responsibility, for it is the only way that it can work. I think most people do recycle at least somewhat. As far as personal opinion goes I feel that the younger generation seems less concerned. I hope the University can instill desire to do so for future generations. The university should set a furniture recycle center for the students and other local residents if they are idealistic enough to do so. The trouble with that is the sum for anyone else. It generally is not cost effective, messy, physically problematic, and not fun. Most of this regards River Falls' problems, so I think that other county methods apply to other areas.

### Suggestions

- Allowing commingled receptacles makes things easier. I hand out the green Pierce Co. recycling flyer to tenants.
- Please provide containers and info to give tenants so they don't think it's the owner's rule, but know it's the law.
- No-Included handout.
- If there is info out there, I have not pursued it. I purchased this building 9-10 months ago. Hopefully the city or county would look at property sales of any type and sent out a basic letter giving sources for further info-containers, description of acceptable materials, ordinances that pertain, etc. The info with this packet is the first I've seen. Thank you! It's exactly what I was looking for.
- Need an easy way to obtain brochures to give tenants regarding recycling.
- Students seem to have very little garbage. Downstairs tenants have their own recycling bins.

### *Q35 What could the County do to make recycling better/easier for you?*

- Good. 2x
- Create a transportation/pickup program in Spring Valley for recycling. Many of the tenants are elderly and cannot carry very much, very far. So limited storage in a central location and pickup on a regular basis would be needed.
- Accessibility of how to dispose of unique items (i.e. batteries). More communications (esp. to St Croix Cty.) For smaller buildings access to smaller containers and clearer labeling. Red ink would be nice. Labeling could definitely improve both do's and don'ts. (\*\*Note ink they are talking about is Waste Management's)
- Could use a program for recycling at reasonable price for appliances and tires, etc.
- Better or more convenient hours for working person recycling used motor oil. 10-12 on Saturday only is not convenient for anyone.
- Easier recycling of used appliances, oil, batteries, paint, etc.
- Provide info, bins, etc.
- Provide info/newsletter available in quantities for apartment managers to include with move-in packet.
- Need to do more to educate tenants! Both parties need to be involved. Landlords can only do so much.
- Provide waterproof central container for recyclable material.
- Steam the bins (for the smell), but otherwise good.
- Give information, but people don't participate. Difficult to enforce.
- Decrease costs.
- Larger recycling bins; cans/glass separation; hard to enforce; limited space.
- Charge me any amount to separate my garbage, cost is not an issue. Tenant's skills are an issue. Many years ago when I owned a different building I paid to have recycling bins. They always put all trash into glass and plastic bin. It was a joke.
- Have hauler supply bins and pick-up recyclables.

**Q36: Could you please show us your recycling area?**

**Things to note about recycling area:**

**Q36a Size:**

- None visible – 23x
- 10 x 5 – 5x
- 15 x 5 – 4x
- 8 x 3 – 4x
- 10 x 10 – 3x
- 10 x 8 – 3x
- 8 x 5-2x
- 15 x 10 – 2x
- 12 x 4 – 2x
- 10 x 4 – 2x
- 20 x 3
- 15 x 8
- 12 x 12
- 12 x 3
- 8 x 8
- 3 x 3
- 2 dumpsters (1 trash, 1 empty)
- No site available to look at

*General Comments (written by SRC staff during site visits):*

- Verbally give info about recycling at time of rent, "generally either people recycle or don't-all matter of personal effort to do so, if they don't it's generally just because they're lazy."-5x
- None visible - individual garbage & recycling.-4x
- area was corralled/fenced in.-5x
- None visible - 1 dumpster only.-4x
- None Visible – apartment upstairs of business?-4x
- Recycling center in town.-3x
- Gemini Apartments owned by Steve Trebus share recycling/dumpsters-2x
- No actual recycling area-Individually have totes and trash cans-2x
- Against wall - trash cans - labeled w/material hanging from string above designated recycle bin.-2x
- None visible - 1 dumpster only-2x
- 2 cans for recycling cans in a shed. Both buildings owned by Roger Nelson share the recycling/dumpster-2x
- Site Check only-2x
- None visible - Individual garbage cans outside apartments.
- We only saw a dumpster that was empty. We didn't see any other bins/ or containers.
- He would really like to note that he likes having a good village recycling center. It makes thing easy.
- Sign Only.
- Personal Garages-maybe individual responsibility.
- Edgewater Apartments shares with Riverview Manor.
- Labels hard to read.
- Cans BEHIND dumpster, difficult to access (in corral.)
- None visible -limited space.
- None Visible - 1 dumpster only (Tri County Disposal.)
- 1 recycling area for 315 & 347 each.
- Individual recycling in garages, the area is fenced in.



## APPENDIX B

### Pierce and Pepin Counties Combined Survey Results

#### 10. Approximate age of complex

Years	0-10	11-20	21-30	31-40	41-50	81-90	91-100
<b>Pepin County</b>	9.1%	54.5%	36.4%	0	0	0	0
<b>Pierce County</b>	13.2%	30.2%	28.3%	18.9%	3.8%	1.9%	3.8%

#### 11. Number of apartment units

Units	0-10	11-20	21-30	31-40	41-50	51-60
<b>Pepin County</b>	44.4%	33.3%	22.2%	0	0	0
<b>Pierce County</b>	34.0%	30.2%	24.5%	3.8%	3.8%	3.8%

#### 12. Number of waste bins

\*The 26 represents 26 individual units at 1 complex.

	Count	Avg. # of bins/site	Range of # of bins/site
<b>Pepin County</b>	10	2.50	1 - 4
<b>Pierce County</b>	54	2.54	1 - 26*

#### 13. Number of recycling bins provided

\*The 26 represents 26 individual units at 1 complex.

	Count	Avg. # of bins/site	Range of number of bins per site
<b>Pepin County</b>	11	5.55	3 - 8
<b>Pierce County</b>	52	3.40	0 - 26*

#### 14. Type of recycling bins

<b>Pepin County</b>		<b>Pierce County</b>	
#	Type	#	Type
7	cans	12	commingled, paper dumpsters/receptacles
1	aluminum, glass, paper	5	cans
1	tubs	3	paper, cardboard, and mixed
1	one each: aluminum cans, plastic, metal cans, glass jars & bottles, brown & green glass, shelf space for boxes	2	bins on rollers with paper/cardboard and glass/plastic/tin can/dumpster
		2	2 yard cardboard, 3 glass 1/2 yards
		2	glass and paper dumpsters
		2	individual
		2	glass and paper dumpsters
		2	individual
		2	paper, glass/plastic
		1	paper and non paper
		1	standard
		1	rollers
		1	plastic
		1	recycling bins
		1	paper and glass
		1	rubbermaid bins

#### 15. Tenants have recycling totes?

	Count	Yes	No
<b>Pepin County</b>	11	9.1 %	90.9 %
<b>Pierce County</b>	47	8.5 %	91.5 %

16. Percent of tenants aware of recycling?

	Count	91-100%		
<b>Pepin County</b>	11	100 %		
	Count	21-30 %	61-70 %	91-100%
<b>Pierce County</b>	45	4.4%	2.2%	93.3%

17. Percent of tenants who recycle?

	Count	91-100%							
<b>Pepin County</b>	9	100 %							
	Count	0-10 %	11-20 %	21-30 %	41-50 %	61-70 %	71-80 %	81-90 %	91-100%
<b>Pierce County</b>	36	13.9 %	5.6 %	8.3 %	8.3 %	2.8 %	5.6 %	11.1 %	44.4 %

18. Percent of tenant waste recycled?

	Count	91-100%				
<b>Pepin County</b>	1	100 %				
	Count	0-10 %	11-20 %	21-30 %	51-60 %	91-100%
<b>Pierce County</b>	9	22.2 %	11.1 %	11.1%	11.1 %	44.4% %

19. Who hauls your recycling away?

<b>Pepin County</b>	Count = 11
Contractor	5
Durand Sanitation	3
Caretaker	1
John Bahr	1
Jan Traxler	1
<b>Pierce County</b>	Count = 47
Waste Mgmt.	35
Onyx	8
Marilyn Gallagher	2
P.I.G.	1
Durand Sanitation	1

20. Does hauler handle hazardous waste?

	Count	Yes	No
<b>Pepin County</b>	11	0.0 %	100.0 %
<b>Pierce County</b>	16	18.8 %	81.3 %

21. How much do you pay per month?

	<u>0-\$25</u>	<u>\$26-50</u>	<u>\$51-75</u>	<u>\$76-100</u>	<u>\$101-125</u>	<u>\$126-150</u>	<u>\$151-175</u>	<u>\$201-225</u>
<b>Pepin Co.</b>	0	0	71.4%	14.3%	14.3%	0	0	0
<b>Pierce Co.</b>	9.1%	4.5%	9.1%	18.2%	13.6%	18.2%	9.1%	18.2%

22. How satisfied are you with your hauler: **very satisfied**    **somewhat satisfied**    **neutral**    **somewhat dissatisfied**    **very dissatisfied**

<b>Pepin Co.</b> Response = 11	81.8%	0	9.1%	0	9.1%
<b>Pierce Co.</b> Response = 45	62.2%	28.9%	4.4%	0	4.4%

23. If “somewhat” or “very dissatisfied”, why? *\*See Appendix A for participant comments.*

24. Do you:

a. at the time of renting notify tenants in writing of your recycling program?	<b>yes</b>	<b>no</b>
<b>Pepin Co.</b> Response = 11	18.2%	81.8%
<b>Pierce Co.</b> Response = 52	36.5%	63.5%
b. remind them semi-annually of the recycling program at your complex?	<b>yes</b>	<b>no</b>
<b>Pepin Co.</b> Response = 11	63.6%	36.4%
<b>Pierce Co.</b> Response = 50	26.0%	74.0%
c. provide tenants with information about what is recyclable?	<b>yes</b>	<b>no</b>
<b>Pepin Co.</b> Response = 11	63.6%	36.4%
<b>Pierce Co.</b> Response = 49	26.5%	73.5%
d. provide tenants with information about how to prepare recyclables?	<b>yes</b>	<b>no</b>
<b>Pepin Co.</b> Response = 10	80.0%	20.0%
<b>Pierce Co.</b> Response = 47	25.5%	74.5%
e. provide information about why to recycle?	<b>yes</b>	<b>no</b>
<b>Pepin Co.</b> Response = 10	70.0%	30.0%
<b>Pierce Co.</b> Response = 46	15.2%	84.8%
f. provide info about location of the recycling area at your complex	<b>yes</b>	<b>no</b>
<b>Pepin Co.</b> Response = 10	100%	0
<b>Pierce Co.</b> Response = 50	58.0%	42.0%
g. provide info about hours of the recycling are operations at your complex	<b>yes</b>	<b>no</b>
<b>Pepin Co.</b> Response = 9	77.8%	22.2%
<b>Pierce Co.</b> Response = 49	22.4%	77.6%
h. have signage directing tenants to your recycling area	<b>yes</b>	<b>no</b>
<b>Pepin Co.</b> Response = 10	20.0%	80.0%
<b>Pierce Co.</b> Response = 48	4.2%	95.8%

25. How important are the following potential barriers to recycling at your complex:

i. Lack of information	<b>very</b>	<b>somewhat</b>	<b>neutral</b>	<b>little</b>	<b>very little</b>
<b>Pepin</b> Count = 9	11.1 %	0.0 %	11.1 %	77.8 %	0.0 %
<b>Pierce</b> Count = 29	6.9 %	13.8 %	24.1 %	13.8 %	41.4 %
j. Confusing information	<b>very</b>	<b>somewhat</b>	<b>neutral</b>	<b>little</b>	<b>very little</b>
<b>Pepin</b> Count = 9	11.1 %	66.7 %	11.1 %	11.1 %	0.0 %
<b>Pierce</b> Count = 29	0.0 %	6.9 %	37.9 %	13.8 %	41.4 %
k. Lack of room	<b>very</b>	<b>somewhat</b>	<b>neutral</b>	<b>little</b>	<b>very little</b>
<b>Pepin</b> Count = 9	0.0 %	0.0 %	22.2 %	77.8 %	0.0 %
<b>Pierce</b> Count = 32	12.5 %	15.6 %	15.6 %	15.6 %	40.6 %

		<b>very</b>	<b>somewhat</b>	<b>neutral</b>	<b>little</b>	<b>very little</b>
<b>l. Hauling costs</b>						
<b>Pepin</b> Count = 9		11.1 %	0.0 %	22.2 %	66.7 %	0.0 %
<b>Pierce</b> Count = 30		23.3 %	10.0 %	16.7 %	10.0 %	40.0 %
<b>m. Smell</b>						
<b>Pepin</b> Count = 9		0.0 %	0.0 %	11.1 %	66.7 %	22.2 %
<b>Pierce</b> Count = 30		6.7 %	13.3 %	16.7 %	20.0 %	43.3 %
<b>n. Concern about messiness</b>						
<b>Pepin</b> Count = 9		0.0 %	0.0 %	22.2 %	66.7 %	11.1 %
<b>Pierce</b> Count = 30		20.0 %	10.0 %	10.0 %	20.0 %	40.0 %
<b>o. Concern about vermin</b>						
<b>Pepin</b> Count = 9		0.0 %	0.0 %	11.1 %	66.7 %	22.2 %
<b>Pierce</b> Count = 28		17.9 %	7.1 %	10.7 %	28.6 %	35.7 %
<b>p. Limits on accepted materials</b>						
<b>Pepin</b> Count = 9		0.0 %	0.0 %	77.8 %	0.0 %	22.2 %
<b>Pierce</b> Count = 27		7.4 %	22.2 %	18.5 %	18.5 %	37.0 %
<b>q. Demand on manager's time</b>						
<b>Pepin</b> Count = 9		0.0 %	11.1 %	11.1 %	66.7 %	11.1 %
<b>Pierce</b> Count = 30		6.7 %	10.0 %	13.3 %	26.7 %	43.3 %
<b>r. Other</b>						
<b>Pepin</b> Count = 0		0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %
<b>Pierce</b> Count = 11		63.6 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	36.4 %	0.0 %

26. Of the items listed above, which is the biggest barrier to recycling at your complex?

<b>Pepin</b>	Count = 7
Confusing Information	6
Hauling Costs	1
<b>Pierce</b>	Count = 22
Lack of Room	3
Hauling Costs	3
Lack of Information	2
Smell	1
Concern about Messiness	1
Limits Accepted Materials	1
Demand on Mgrs. Time	1
Other	10

27. Approximate % of tenant turnover per year

<b>Pepin County</b>	7 %
<b>Pierce County</b>	36.3%

28. Approximate number of tenants per apartment

<b>Pepin County</b>	1.55
<b>Pierce County</b>	2.09

29. Approximate % of tenants who have children

<b>Pepin County</b>	2 %
<b>Pierce County</b>	14.1%

30. Approximate % of tenants who are retired

<b>Pepin County</b>	80 %
<b>Pierce County</b>	27.6%

31. Approximate % of tenants who are students

<b>Pepin County</b>	0
<b>Pierce County</b>	35%

32. Approximate % occupancy during year

<b>Pepin County</b>	96%
<b>Pierce County</b>	94%

33. Would you characterize your tenants' income as:

	<b>Count</b>	<b>high (\$75,000+)</b>	<b>medium</b>	<b>low (&lt;\$25,000)</b>
<b>Pepin Co.</b>	11	0.0 %	36.4 %	63.6 %
<b>Pierce Co.</b>	52	0.0 %	30.8 %	69.2 %

34. Do you have any comments you'd like to make about recycling or this survey? *\*See Appendix A for comments.*

35. What could the County do to make recycling better/easier for you? *\*See Appendix A for comments.*

36. Could you please show us your recycling area?                      a. Approximate size (e.g. 10 feet by 10 feet):

**Pepin-** The average size of waste recycling areas in Pepin County was 9 x 10.

10 x 8-2x	8 x 8	12x12
10 x 5-2x	10 x 10	15x15
12 x 5	2 x 5 (front of garage)	
13 x 13	2 x 15	

**Pierce County** The average size of waste recycling areas in Pierce County was 11 x 6.

None visible – 23x	8 x 5-2x	12 x 12
10 x 5 – 5x	15 x 10 – 2x	12 x 3
15 x 5 – 4x	12 x 4 – 2x	8 x 8
8 x 3 – 4x	10 x 4 – 2x	3 x 3
10 x 10 – 3x	20 x 3	2 dumpsters (1 trash, 1 empty)
10 x 8 – 3x	15 x 8	No site available to look at

b. Recycling area is:                      **inside building**                      **outside building**

	<b>Count</b>		
<b>Pepin County</b>	11	58.3%	41.7%
<b>Pierce County</b>	37	10.6%	89.2%

c. Condition of recycling area            **good**            **fair**            **poor**

	<b>Count</b>			
<b>Pepin County</b>	12	75.0%	25.0%	0
<b>Pierce County</b>	36	100%	0	0

d. Number of Bins: *Waste bins/Recycle bins: \*Bin not defined on survey*

	<b>Count</b>	<b>Avg. # of Waste/Recycling bins/site</b>	<b>Range of # of Waste/Recycling bins/site</b>
<b>Waste - Pepin</b>	8	2.63	1 - 4
<b>Waste - Pierce</b>	25	1.40	1 - 3
<b>Recycle - Pepin</b>	12	6.75	4 - 10
<b>Recycle - Pierce</b>	26	3.12	1 - 8

e. Approximate distance from furthest apartment (e.g. number of paces):

	<b>0-50 Paces</b>	<b>51-100</b>	<b>101-150</b>	<b>151-200</b>	<b>201-250</b>	<b>251-300</b>
<b>Pepin Co.</b>	0	33.3%	58.3%	8.3%	0	0
<b>Pierce Co.</b>	19.4%	19.4%	27.8%	11.1%	13.9%	8.3%

f. Signage to the area:                            good            fair            poor

*Signage to the area*

*\* Only one site (in Pierce County) had visible signage to the recycling area. The signage was in good condition.*

**APPENDIX C Survey Instrument**  
Pierce and Pepin Counties Apartment Recycling Program Survey

**In the first part of this survey we will verify/gather information about this apartment complex.**

- 1. Building/Complex name: \_\_\_\_\_
- 2. Building/Complex address: \_\_\_\_\_
- 3. Manager Name: \_\_\_\_\_
- 4. Manager Address: \_\_\_\_\_
- 5. Manager Phone: \_\_\_\_\_
- 6. Manager Fax: \_\_\_\_\_
- 7. Manager email: \_\_\_\_\_
- 8. Owner Name: \_\_\_\_\_
- 9. Owner Address: \_\_\_\_\_
- 10. Approximate age of complex \_\_\_\_\_
- 11. Number of apartment units \_\_\_\_\_
- 12. Number of waste bins \_\_\_\_\_

**We will now ask you about recycling at your apartment complex**

- 13. Number of recycling bins provided \_\_\_\_\_
- 14. Type of recycling bins \_\_\_\_\_
- 15. Tenants have recycling totes? \_\_\_\_\_
- 16. Percent of tenants aware of recycling? \_\_\_\_\_
- 17. Percent of tenants who recycle? \_\_\_\_\_
- 18. Percent of tenant waste recycled? \_\_\_\_\_
- 19. Who hauls your recycling away? \_\_\_\_\_
- 20. Does hauler handle hazardous waste? \_\_\_\_\_
- 21. How much do you pay per month? \_\_\_\_\_
- 22. How satisfied are you with your hauler:   very      somewhat      neutral      somewhat      very  
  satisfied      satisfied                               dissatisfied   dissatisfied
- 23. If "somewhat" or "very dissatisfied", why? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

24. Do you:

- |   |     |    |
|---|-----|----|
| s. at the time of renting notify tenants in writing of your recycling program?  | yes | no |
| t. remind them semi-annually of the recycling program at your complex?          | yes | no |
| u. provide tenants with information about what is recyclable?                   | yes | no |
| <u>If yes, can I have a copy of what you provide?</u>                           |     |    |
| v. provide tenants with information about how to prepare recyclables?           | yes | no |
| <u>If yes, can I have a copy of what you provide (if different than 24.c.)?</u> |     |    |
| w. provide information about why to recycle?                                    | yes | no |
| x. provide info about location of the recycling area at your complex            | yes | no |
| y. provide info about hours of the recycling are operations at your complex     | yes | no |
| z. have signage directing tenants to your recycling area                        | yes | no |

25. How important are the following potential barriers to recycling at your complex:

- |                                  |      |          |         |        |             |
|----------------------------------|------|----------|---------|--------|-------------|
| aa. Lack of information          | very | somewhat | neutral | little | very little |
| bb. Confusing information        | very | somewhat | neutral | little | very little |
| cc. Lack of room                 | very | somewhat | neutral | little | very little |
| dd. Hauling costs                | very | somewhat | neutral | little | very little |
| ee. Smell                        | very | somewhat | neutral | little | very little |
| ff. Concern about messiness      | very | somewhat | neutral | little | very little |
| gg. Concern about vermin         | very | somewhat | neutral | little | very little |
| hh. Limits on accepted materials | very | somewhat | neutral | little | very little |
| ii. Demand on manager's time     | very | somewhat | neutral | little | very little |
| jj. Other _____                  | very | somewhat | neutral | little | very little |

26. Of the items listed above, which is the biggest barrier to recycling at your complex? \_\_\_\_\_

27. Approximate % of tenant turnover per year \_\_\_\_\_

28. Approximate number of tenants per apartment \_\_\_\_\_

29. Approximate % of tenants who have children \_\_\_\_\_

30. Approximate % of tenants who are retired \_\_\_\_\_

31. Approximate % of tenants who are students \_\_\_\_\_

32. Approximate % occupancy during year \_\_\_\_\_

33. Would you characterize your tenants' income as:      high (\$75,000+)      medium      low (<\$25,000)



34. Do you have any comments you'd like to make about recycling or this survey?

35. What could the County do to make recycling better/easier for you?

36. Could you please show us your recycling area?

Things to note about recycling area:

a. Approximate size (e.g. 10 feet by 10 feet):

b. Recycling area is:                      inside building                      outside building

c. Condition of recycling area              good              fair              poor

d. Number of Bins:

e. Approximate distance from furthest apartment (e.g. number of paces):

f. Signage to the area:                      good              fair              poor

General Comments: