



## **HUNTINGBURG COMMUNITY SURVEY: CITY WIDE TRASH PICK - UP**

*Prepared for:*  
**Denny Spinner, Mayor**  
**City of Huntingburg, Indiana**

*USI Research Team:*  
**Mary Hallock Morris Ph.D.**  
Research Director, Associate Professor, Department of Political Science  
and Public Administration

**Reghan Wetzel**  
Communications Intern, Center for Applied Research & Economic  
Development

**Taylor Gogel**  
Research Assistant, Center for Applied Research & Economic  
Development

Under the auspices of:

**USI Center for Applied Research & Economic Development**

# HUNTINGBURG COMMUNITY SURVEY

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary .....	3
Introduction .....	4
Survey Methodology .....	4
The Respondents: Demographic Data .....	5
Interest in City-Provided Residential Trash Service .....	6
Importance of Bi-Weekly Recycling Services .....	8
Current Garbage Disposal Practices .....	9
Rates: How Much People Are Willing to Pay for Trash Service .....	10
Reasons that Respondents Support City-Provided Trash Service .....	11
Reasons that Respondents Do Not Support City-Provided Trash Service .....	12
Conclusions and Recommendations .....	14
Appendices .....	15
Appendix A. Survey Questions, Huntingburg Community Survey .....	16
Appendix B. Narrative Comments .....	18
Appendix C. Age and Income Tables .....	22

# HUNTINGBURG COMMUNITY SURVEY

---

## FIGURES

Figure 1. Mayor’s Note and Description of Trash Service .....	4
Figure 2. Top Reason for Supporting Trash Service by Gender .....	12
Figure 3. Top Concern Regarding Trash Service by Gender .....	13
Table 1. Age of Respondent .....	6
Table 2. Total Family Income, 2013 .....	6
Table 3. Household Size .....	6
Table 4. Interest in Residential Trash Service .....	7
Table 5. Interest in Residential Trash Service by Gender .....	8
Table 6. Importance of Bi-Weekly Recycling Services .....	8
Table 7. Importance of Bi-Weekly Recycling Services by Gender .....	9
Table 8. How Much Residents Are Currently Paying for Trash Service per Month .....	9
Table 9. Current Disposal Practices.....	10
Table 10. How Much Residents Are Willing to Pay for Residential Trash Service .....	11
Table 11. Ranking: Number One Reason for Supporting Trash Service.....	11
Table 12. Ranking: Number One Reason for Not Supporting Residential Trash Service .....	13
Table 1C. Interest in Residential Trash Service by Age .....	22
Table 2C. Importance of Bi-Weekly Recycling Services by Age .....	22
Table 3C. How Much Residents are Willing to Pay for Residential Trash Service by Income .....	22
Table 4C. How Much Residents are Willing to Pay for Residential Trash Service by Household Size ...	23
Table 5C. Ranking: Number One Reason for Supporting Residential Trash Service by Age .....	23
Table 6C. Ranking: Number One Reason for Supporting Residential Trash Service by Income .....	24
Table 7C. Ranking: Number One Reason for Not Supporting Residential Trash Service by Age .....	24
Table 8C. Ranking: Number One Reason for Not Supporting Residential Trash Service by Income .....	25

# HUNTINGBURG COMMUNITY SURVEY

---

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- The City of Huntingburg contracted with the Center for Applied Research and Economic Development (CARED) at the University of Southern Indiana for the development and implementation of a community survey to gauge the level of interest in city-provided, residential trash service.
- An 11 question survey was developed and distributed with Huntingburg's utility bills during February 2014. The CARED office received 537 completed surveys, which were then coded and analyzed.
- The primary finding of interest is that there is not a clear mandate for or against city-provided residential trash service. Of the respondents, 50.1 percent stated they were very interested or somewhat interested in the service; 40.5 percent of respondents were not interested and 9.4 percent were neutral.
- A statistically significant relationship did not exist between age and interest in trash service; gender and interest in trash service; income and interest in trash service; or family size and interest in trash service.
- The mandate for a city-provided curbside recycling program was stronger with 57.7 percent of respondents stating that recycling was very important or somewhat important to them. Recycling services were slightly more important to men (61.2 percent) than to women (54.7 percent).
- Most survey respondents (81.7 percent) currently pay \$15 or less per month to dispose of their household's trash.
- Approximately three-quarters of respondents are not willing to pay more than \$15 per month for city-provided, residential trash service. There is a strong, positive correlation between how much an individual is currently paying for trash service and how much an individual is willing to pay for city-provided trash service.
- Overall, convenience was listed as an overall reason for supporting city-provided trash service (162 times), followed by the recycling feature (71 times), keeping the city cleaner (52 times), cost effectiveness or lower prices (47 times), creating jobs or income for the city and its residents (29 times), and a reduction in the number of garbage trucks on the road (26 times).
- Overall, the cost of the service was the major concern (281 times), followed by small households that did not generate a lot of trash (44 times), the cost of utility bills (22 times), concerns related to scheduling (21 times), and the potential restrictions on the service (19 times). Several anti-government statements (18 times) were included in the list, as well as, concerns about the cost for individuals on fixed incomes (15 times), and concerns that individuals would not put away their dumpsters (17 times).

# HUNTINGBURG COMMUNITY SURVEY

---

## INTRODUCTION

The City of Huntingburg, IN, is investigating the level of community interest in city-provided, residential trash pick-up. Currently, Huntingburg does not provide trash pick-up; instead, residents must bring their trash directly to the landfill/dumpster sites or contract with a local trash pick-up company. In order to gauge the community's interest, Huntingburg Mayor Denny Spinner contracted with the Center for Applied Research and Economic Development (CARED) at the University of Southern Indiana for the development and implementation of a community survey. The survey focused on five key concerns:

1. The level of community interest in city-provided, residential trash pick-up;
2. The level of community interest in a city-provided, curbside recycling program;
3. The amount residents are currently paying to dispose of their household trash;
4. The amount residents are willing to pay for city-provided, residential trash pick-up; and
5. The reasons why residents would (or would not) support city-provided, residential trash service.

In order to ensure a high response to the mail survey, CARED Intern Reghan Wetzel worked with the Huntingburg Mayor's office to design and implement a public relations campaign. This campaign used both press releases and the community's website to publicize the community survey. As a result, CARED received **537 completed surveys** from Huntingburg residents.

## SURVEY METHODOLOGY

In order to analyze the community's interest in city-provided, residential trash service, Dr. Mary Hallock Morris developed an 11 question survey which was distributed with Huntingburg's utility bills during the month of February 2014. These survey questions can be found in **Appendix A**. The survey included a note from Mayor Spinner and a description of the proposed service.

### **FIGURE 1. MAYOR'S NOTE AND DESCRIPTION OF TRASH SERVICE**

---

*Keeping our city clean was one of the greatest areas of concern for residents who attended the "Reviving the Pride" listening sessions in 2012. With this in mind, the trash collection process in Huntingburg is under study. Currently, there are multiple trash collection services that pick up trash for our residents, which means a variety of large vehicles are utilizing our streets on a weekly basis. We also recognize some people choose to take their own trash to the landfill. But what if all residents were offered weekly, curbside trash and a bi-weekly recycling collection service from a single source? The City of Huntingburg is considering this option. In order for the City Council to make an informed decision on this issue, we need your help! Thank you for your help. Your feedback through this survey is very important as we work together to make Huntingburg "A City Like No Other!" – Mayor Denny Spinner*

**Description of Proposed Trash Service: Weekly pick-up with bi-weekly, single-stream recycling. Each household would receive two 96 gallon dumpsters: one for trash, the other for recycling. Smaller dumpsters would be available upon request. The city would continue to provide its fall and spring "Clean Up Week" service.**

# HUNTINGBURG COMMUNITY SURVEY

---

Completed surveys were accepted through March 14, 2014, and were coded by Dr. Hallock Morris and CARED research assistant Taylor Gogel. The codes for the nine closed ended questions are shown in **Appendix A**.

Survey questions 6 and 7 asked the survey respondents for narrative comments related to the top reasons they would support (or would not support) city-provided, residential trash pick-up. Dr. Hallock Morris compiled these comments into a master list and used content analysis to categorize the comments into categories. A master list of these comments can be found in **Appendix B**. It should be noted that some comments were quite specific and could not be categorized; these comments are also included in **Appendix B**. The top reason listed on each survey (i.e. the top priority) was also coded for use in SPSS 21.0 (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) to augment the quantitative data analysis. This allowed the research team to analyze the top concerns by age, gender, income, and family size.

Furthermore, Question 4 asked for an additional explanation. If a survey respondent indicated that he or she takes the trash to the county landfill/dumpster site, s/he was prompted to tell us how many trips were made per month. If the respondent indicated that s/he used a private company, s/he was prompted to list the name of the company. If the respondent indicated that s/he used another form of trash disposal, s/he was prompted to give an additional explanation. Dr. Hallock Morris coded these narrative comments for use in the SPSS dataset.

The data collected was categorical data; thus, the analysis is based on frequencies and percentages. Crosstabulations were used to analyze differences based on demographic data (i.e. age, gender, and income). Correlations<sup>1</sup> were also used to see if there were any statistically significant relationships between the demographic variables and the dependent variables (i.e. interest in trash service, willingness to pay for trash service, support for curbside recycling, concerns about city-provided trash service, and support for city-provided trash service).

## THE RESPONDENTS: DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

A total of 537 surveys were received by the CARED research team. Of the 516 respondents who indicated their gender on the survey, 48.6 percent (251 respondents) were men and 51.4 percent (265 respondents) were women. The majority of respondents (371 individuals) came from small households consisting of one to two individuals. The majority of individuals who indicated their income on the survey (67.5 percent) had a family income of less than \$59,999 per year. The majority of individuals

---

<sup>1</sup> For the analysis, Pearson's *r* was used to measure the correlation between the dependent and independent variables. A correlation measures the strength of the relationship between two variables: for example, age and interest in trash service. An *r* value of +/- 1 would indicate a 100% correlation between the two variables, while a value of 0 would indicate no relationship between the variables. Where warranted, significance levels have been included in the analysis; these indicate the confidence that the research has in the validity of the data. Confidence levels of .01, .05, and .10 are commonly used. For example, when something has a confidence level of .01, it means the researcher is 99% confident that the statistic is accurate.

# HUNTINGBURG COMMUNITY SURVEY

(60.6 percent) who answered the survey were 56 or older. A more detailed demographic picture can be found in **Tables 1-3**.

## INTEREST IN CITY-PROVIDED, RESIDENTIAL TRASH SERVICE

Survey respondents hold mixed views when it comes to city-provided, residential trash service. Individuals were specifically asked “Are you interested in having the City of Huntingburg provide residential trash pick-up?” and were given four options: very interested, somewhat interested, neutral, or not interested. Of the 523 individuals who answered this question, 40.5 percent were not interested

**TABLE 1. AGE OF RESPONDENT**

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
25 years old or younger	9	1.7
26 - 35 years old	47	9.1
36 - 45 years old	55	10.7
46 - 55 years old	92	17.9
56 - 65 years old	119	23.1
66 years old or older	193	37.5

N = 515

**TABLE 2. TOTAL FAMILY INCOME, 2013**

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
\$19,999 or less	70	16.9
\$20,000 to \$39,999	122	29.4
\$40,000 to \$59,999	88	21.2
\$60,000 to \$79,999	70	16.9
\$80,000 to \$99,999	43	10.4
More than \$100,000	22	5.3

N = 415

**TABLE 3. HOUSEHOLD SIZE**

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
One	121	23.6
Two	250	48.8
Three	66	12.9
Four	45	8.8
Five	22	4.3
Six or more	8	1.6

N = 512

# HUNTINGBURG COMMUNITY SURVEY

in city-wide curbside residential trash service. However, 50.1 percent indicated that they were very interested or somewhat interested in trash service. This is approaching a bimodal distribution of the data and **indicates that there is not a clear mandate for or against the proposed service**. When analyzed based on gender, there was slightly more support for city-provided curbside residential service among men (54.2 percent of men versus 47.7 percent of women). However, the mode (i.e. the response selected most often) for both genders was “I am not interested in having city-wide curbside residential service” (Men = 36.3 percent; Women = 42.6 percent). **Tables 4 and 5** provide a detailed summary of the survey responses.

The not interested response was the mode for four of the six age categories (Under 26, 55.6 percent; 26–35, 48.9 percent; 46–55, 43.3 percent; Over 65, 41.6 percent). Furthermore, only two of the six age groups had the majority of their respondents select the very interested or somewhat interested categories (36–45, 60.8 percent; 56–65, 53.4 percent). **Table 1C** in **Appendix C** provides a detailed summary of the responses by age.

Finally, it is important to note that there is not a significant relationship between age and interest in trash service ( $r=0.009$ ); between gender and interest in trash service ( $r=0.058$ ); between income and interest in trash service ( $r=-0.067$ ); or between family size and interest in trash service ( $r=0.059$ ).

**TABLE 4. INTEREST IN RESIDENTIAL TRASH SERVICE**

	<b>Number of Respondents</b>	<b>Percentage of Respondents</b>
<b>I am very interested in having city-wide curbside residential trash service.</b>	172	32.9
<b>I am somewhat interested in having city-wide curbside residential trash service.</b>	90	17.2
<b>I am neutral to the idea of having city-wide curbside residential trash service.</b>	49	9.4
<b>I am not interested in having city-wide curbside residential trash service.<sup>M</sup></b>	212	40.5

Question: Are you interested in having the City of Huntingburg provide residential trash pick-up?

N = 523; <sup>M</sup> MODE

# HUNTINGBURG COMMUNITY SURVEY

**TABLE 5. INTEREST IN RESIDENTIAL TRASH SERVICE BY GENDER**

	Percentage of male respondents	Percentage of female respondents
I am very interested in having city-wide curbside residential trash service.	34.3	31.8
I am somewhat interested in having city-wide curbside residential trash service.	19.6	15.9
I am neutral to the idea of having city-wide curbside residential trash service.	9.8	9.7
I am not interested in having city-wide curbside residential trash service.	36.3	42.6

## IMPORTANCE OF BI-WEEKLY RECYCLING SERVICES

The mandate for a city-provided curbside recycling program was slightly stronger. Individuals were specifically asked “How important is bi-weekly recycling as a part of your residential trash service?” and were given three options: very important, somewhat important, and not important. Of the 475 individuals who answered this question, 57.7 percent (274 respondents) stated that recycling was very important or somewhat important to them. Recycling services were slightly more important to men than to women (61.2 percent of men versus 54.7 percent of women). **Tables 6 and 7** provide a detailed summary of the survey responses. Age does not appear to play a role in support for bi-weekly recycling services; five of the six age groups had the majority of their respondents select the very important or somewhat important categories (Under 26, 55.5 percent; 26–35, 59.6 percent; 36–45, 62.5 percent; 56–65, 59.6 percent; Over 64, 58.6 percent). The one exception was among 46 to 55 year olds who had a 50/50 split between very/somewhat important and not important. **Table 2C** in **Appendix C** provides a detailed summary of the responses by age.

Finally, it is important to note that there is not a significant relationship between age and importance of recycling ( $r=-0.017$ ); between gender and importance of recycling ( $r=0.055$ ); between income and importance of recycling ( $r=-0.095$ ); or between family size and importance of recycling ( $r=0.034$ ).

**TABLE 6. IMPORTANCE OF BI-WEEKLY RECYCLING SERVICES**

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Biweekly recycling service is very important to me	157	33.1
Biweekly recycling service is somewhat important to me	117	24.6
Biweekly recycling service is not important to me <sup>M</sup>	201	42.3

Question: How important is bi-weekly recycling as a part of your residential trash service?

N = 475; <sup>M</sup> MODE

# HUNTINGBURG COMMUNITY SURVEY

**TABLE 7. IMPORTANCE OF BI-WEEKLY RECYCLING SERVICES BY GENDER**

	Percentage of male respondents	Percentage of female respondents
Biweekly recycling service is very important to me	34.8	31.7
Biweekly recycling service is somewhat important to me	26.4	23
Biweekly recycling service is not important to me	38.8	45.2

## CURRENT GARBAGE DISPOSAL PRACTICES

Survey respondents were asked two questions related to their current garbage disposal practices. First, individuals were asked “How much are you currently paying per month for your trash service?” and were given five options: \$15 or less per month; \$16 – \$20 per month; \$21 – \$25 per month; \$26 – \$30 per month; or \$31 or more per month. Of the 492 individuals who answered this question, 81.7 percent paid \$15 or less per month. This figure includes both the individuals who selected this category and the nine individuals who wrote “zero” or “nothing” on their survey. **Table 8** provides a detailed summary of the survey responses.

Second, individuals were specifically asked “Who currently provides your trash service?” and were given three options: taking trash to the landfill, using a private contractor, or other. For each option, the respondents were asked for a narrative clarification. [See **Table 9**] Of the 509 individuals who answered this question, 55.6 percent (283 respondents) take their trash to the landfill/dumpsite. Those respondents who use the landfill were asked to stipulate how many trips they made per month. Most respondents stated that they made weekly or bi-weekly trips (4 times per month, 37.8 percent; two times per month, 32.9 percent). 15.3 percent of the landfill users make only one trip per month with another 6.4 percent making the trip more than four times per month.

Another 38.7 percent (197 respondents) use a private contractor. Of these individuals, 65.5 percent use Velpen Trucking and Disposal Co. Other popular choices include Advanced Disposal (24.3 percent) and Veolia Solid Waste (5.1 percent). Finally, 29 individuals (5.7 percent) stated that they use another trash disposal method. Of these respondents, 45 percent take their trash to work; another 30 percent take their trash to a friend or family member’s home.

**TABLE 8. HOW MUCH RESIDENTS ARE CURRENTLY PAYING FOR TRASH SERVICE PER MONTH**

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents*
\$15 or less per month <sup>M</sup>	393	79.9
\$16 - \$20 per month	30	6.1
\$21 - \$25 per month	35	7.1
\$26 - \$30 per month	11	2.2
\$31 or more per month	14	2.8

Question: How much are you currently paying per month for your trash service?

# HUNTINGBURG COMMUNITY SURVEY

N = 492; <sup>M</sup>MODE; \*An additional nine individuals wrote variants of “nothing” on the survey.

**TABLE 9. CURRENT DISPOSAL PRACTICES**

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
I take my trash to the county landfill <sup>M</sup>	283	55.6
I use a private contractor	197	38.7
Other	29	5.7

Question: Who currently provides your trash service?

N = 509; <sup>M</sup>MODE

## RATES: HOW MUCH PEOPLE ARE WILLING TO PAY FOR TRASH SERVICE

Survey respondents are not willing to pay more than \$15 per month for city-provided, residential trash service. Individuals were asked “How much would you be willing to pay for city-wide curbside residential trash pick-up?” and were given five options: \$15 or less per month; \$16 – \$20 per month; \$21 – \$25 per month; \$26 – \$30 per month; or \$31 or more per month. Of the 449 individuals who answered this question, 74.4 percent (334 respondents) stated that they would not be willing to pay more than \$15 per month. This figure includes the 20 individuals who wrote variants of “nothing” on the survey. **Table 10** provides a detailed summary of the survey responses.

Income does not appear to have an impact on how much an individual is willing to pay for city-provided, residential trash service. **Table 3C in Appendix C** demonstrates that the majority of respondents from all six income categories are only willing to pay up to \$15 per month for the service. In addition, there is not a statistically significant relationship between income and pricing ( $r=0.58$ ).

Family size also does not appear to have an impact on how much an individual is willing to pay for city-provided, residential trash service. **Table 4C in Appendix C** demonstrates that the majority of respondents from all six family size categories are only willing to pay up to \$15 per month for the service. In addition, there is not a significant relationship between family size and pricing ( $r=0.004$ ). Furthermore, there is not a significant relationship between age and pricing ( $r=-0.012$ ) or between gender and pricing ( $r=-0.003$ ).

One final note of importance: As one would expect, there was a strong positive correlation ( $r=0.682$ ; significant at the 0.01 level) between how much an individual is currently paying for trash service and how much an individual is willing to pay for city provided service. This may become a problem if the price point for the city-provided service is more than what Huntingburg residents are currently paying.

# HUNTINGBURG COMMUNITY SURVEY

**TABLE 10. HOW MUCH RESIDENTS ARE WILLING TO PAY FOR RESIDENTIAL TRASH SERVICE**

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents*
\$15 or less per month <sup>M</sup>	314	69.9
\$16 - \$20 per month	70	15.6
\$21-25 per month	35	7.8
\$26 - \$30 per month	8	1.8
\$31 or more per month	2	0.4

Question: How much would you be willing to pay for city-wide curbside residential trash pick-up?

N = 449; <sup>M</sup>MODE; \*An additional 20 individuals wrote variants of “nothing” on the survey.

## REASONS THAT RESPONDENTS SUPPORT CITY-PROVIDED TRASH SERVICE

Survey respondents were asked “What are the top three reasons you would support city-wide curbside residential trash pick-up?” and were given the chance to list their top three priorities. Of the 291 individuals who answered this question, 42.3 percent (123 respondents) listed convenience as their number one reason for supporting the service. Other top priorities included: lower prices/cost effectiveness, 10 percent (29 respondents); the recycling features linked to the program, 6.9 percent (20 respondents); keeping the city cleaner, 5.8 percent (17 respondents); providing jobs for residents or income for the city, 3.4 percent (10 respondents); and a reduction in the number of garbage trucks on the city streets, 3.4 percent (10 respondents). These rankings are summarized in **Table 11**. In addition, 42 respondents entered a “nonsupportive” comment under question 6. When creating the rankings, these comments were coded as “missing” and were not included in calculating the percentages or rankings.

**TABLE 11. RANKING: NUMBER ONE REASON FOR SUPPORTING TRASH SERVICE**

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
1. Convenience/Ease	123	42.3
2. Lower price/Cost effective	29	10.0
3. Recycling features of program	20	6.9
4. Help keep our city cleaner	17	5.8
5. Jobs for residents/income for city	10	3.4
6. Reduction in number of garbage trucks	10	3.4
7. Not having to drive to trash site/landfill	9	3.1
8. Eliminating trash buildup/storage of trash (personal, neighbors)	6	2.1
9. Time savings	6	2.1
10. Dependability of service	3	1.0
Other benefit	58	19.9

# HUNTINGBURG COMMUNITY SURVEY

**FIGURE 2. TOP REASON FOR SUPPORTING TRASH SERVICE BY GENDER**

Top Reasons, Male Respondents	Top Reasons, Female Respondents
1. Convenience/Ease	1. Convenience/Ease
2. Lower price/Cost effective	2. Lower price/Cost effective
3. Help keep our city cleaner	3. Recycling features of program
4. Recycling features of program	4. Help keep our city cleaner
5. Reduction in number of garbage trucks [TIE]	5. Jobs for residents/income for city
5. Not having to drive to trash site/landfill [TIE]	

Additional analysis of the data demonstrates that convenience is the top priority regardless of gender, age, or income. [See **Figure 2** and **Tables 5C and 6C** in **Appendix C.**] In fact, 48.1 percent of respondents over the age of 65 and 37.7 percent of respondents age 56—65 listed convenience as their top concern.

In addition to analyzing the top priority, a master list of all supportive comments (i.e., top three priorities) was compiled by the research team. Overall, convenience was listed the most on the survey (162 times), followed by the recycling feature (71 times), keeping the city cleaner (52 times), cost effectiveness or lower prices (47 times), creating jobs or income for the city and its residents (29 times), and a reduction in the number of garbage trucks on the road (26 times). A complete listing of these comments can be found in **Appendix B.**

### REASONS THAT RESPONDENTS DO NOT SUPPORT CITY-PROVIDED TRASH SERVICE

Survey respondents were asked “What are the top three reasons you would not support city-wide curbside residential trash pick-up?” and were given the opportunity to list their top three concerns. Of the 383 individuals who answered this question, 67.4 percent (258 respondents) indicated that the proposed service was either too expensive or cost more than the current rate. Other top concerns included: small households that do not generate a lot of trash, 5 percent (19 respondents); concerns about the size, storage, or movement of the 96 gallon dumpster, 4.2 percent (16 respondents); and concerns related to existing utility prices, 3.7 percent (14 respondents). These rankings are summarized in **Table 12.**

# HUNTINGBURG COMMUNITY SURVEY

**TABLE 12. RANKING: NUMBER ONE REASON FOR NOT SUPPORTING RESIDENTIAL TRASH SERVICE**

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
1. Too expensive/cost more than current rate	258	67.4
2. Small household/Not a lot of trash	19	5.0
3. Dumpster related concerns	16	4.2
4. Utilities are too expensive/Do not want extra monthly bill	14	3.7
5. Various anti-government statements	8	2.1
6. This service is not needed	5	1.3
7. Satisfied with current service	5	1.3
8. Individuals on fixed incomes cannot afford this service	3	0.8
9. Too many restrictions and limitations	2	0.5
Other concerns	53	13.9

Additional analysis of the data indicates that the expense associated with city-wide curbside residential trash pick-up is the top concern regardless of gender, age, or income. [See **Figure 3** and **Tables 7C and 8C** in **Appendix C.**]

In addition to analyzing the top concern, a master list of all concerns (i.e. top three statements) was compiled by the research team. Overall, the cost of the service was the major concern (281 times), followed by small households that did not generate a lot of trash (44 times), the cost of utility bills (22 times), concerns related to scheduling (21 times), and the potential restrictions on the service (19 times). Several anti-government statements (18 times) were included in the list, as well as, concerns about the cost for individuals on fixed incomes (15 times), and concerned that individuals would not put away their dumpsters (17 times). A complete listing of these comments can be found in **Appendix B.**

**FIGURE 3. TOP CONCERN REGARDING TRASH SERVICE BY GENDER**

Top Reasons, Male Respondents	Top Reasons, Female Respondents
1. Too expensive/cost more than current rate	1. Too expensive/cost more than current rate
2. Small household/Not a lot of trash	2. Utilities are too expensive
3. Dumpster related concerns	3. Dumpster related concerns
4. Various anti-government statements	4. Small household/Not a lot of trash
5. Satisfied with current service	5. Various anti-government statements

# HUNTINGBURG COMMUNITY SURVEY

---

## CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Given the fact that a substantial number of survey respondents (40.5 percent) were not in favor of city-provided trash service, it may be difficult to implement this program in Huntingburg. However, some of these concerns may be based on a misunderstanding of the city's intent. Several narrative comments focused on the high cost of the program when compared to the current cost of disposal at the county landfill. Other narrative comments focused on issues related to having city employees provide the service. Based on the information provided by this survey, the research team has made the following recommendations:

- **Focus on the neutrals:** Almost 10 percent of survey respondents indicated that they were neutral when it came to city-provided trash service. If the city can convince these individuals that the trash service is both convenient and cost-effective, it will have a stronger mandate for providing this service to the community.
- **Clear up the misinformation:** Inform residents that the program will not be staffed by city employees; instead, note that the city will hire a single contractor to provide the service to the community. In addition, discuss the proposed price for the service. Many respondents may have assumed that the price of the service will be approximately \$15 per month.
- **Discuss gas savings:** Approximately 56 percent of survey respondents take their household trash to the county's disposal site. The cost of this service is priced per bag and is relatively low for a household that does not have a lot of trash. However, the city could "reframe" the cost of the landfill service by focusing on rising gasoline prices and how much it costs to deliver the trash to the disposal site.
- **Size of dumpsters:** The size of the dumpsters was a concern for many older people. The city should clarify that smaller dumpsters are available by request.
- **Focus on recycling:** The curbside recycling feature was popular among survey respondents. This could be a key selling point for the city's proposal to provide curbside trash and recycling service.

# HUNTINGBURG COMMUNITY SURVEY

---

## APPENDICES

APPENDIX A. SURVEY QUESTIONS, HUNTINGBURG COMMUNITY SURVEY.....	16
APPENDIX B. NARRATIVE COMMENTS.....	18
APPENDIX C. AGE AND INCOME TABLES.....	22

# HUNTINGBURG COMMUNITY SURVEY

## APPENDIX A. SURVEY QUESTIONS, HUNTINGBURG COMMUNITY SURVEY

**1. Are you interested in having the City of Huntingburg provide residential trash pick-up?**

- I am very interested in having city-wide curbside residential trash service. [1]
- I am somewhat interested in having city-wide curbside residential trash service. [2]
- I am neutral to the idea of having city-wide curbside residential trash service. [3]
- I am not interested in having city-wide curbside residential trash service. [4]

**2. How much would you be willing to pay for city-wide curbside residential trash pick-up?**

- \$15 or less per month [1]
- \$16 – \$20 per month [2]
- \$21 – \$25 per month [3]
- \$26 – \$30 per month [4]
- \$31 or more per month [5]

**3. How much are you currently paying per month for your trash service (through a private contractor, at the county landfill, etc.)?**

- \$15 or less per month [1]
- \$16 – \$20 per month [2]
- \$21 – \$25 per month [3]
- \$26 – \$30 per month [4]
- \$31 or more per month [5]

**4. Who currently provides your trash service?**

- I take my trash to the county landfill [1]: How often? \_\_\_\_\_per month
- A private contractor [2]: Please list name of company \_\_\_\_\_
- Other [3]: Please list \_\_\_\_\_

**5. How important is bi-weekly recycling as a part of your residential trash service?**

- Biweekly recycling service is very important to me. [1]
- Biweekly recycling service is somewhat important to me. [2]
- Biweekly recycling service is not important to me. [3]

**6. What are the top three reasons you would support city-wide curbside residential trash pick-up?** [Narrative Answers, Up to 3]

## HUNTINGBURG COMMUNITY SURVEY

---

7. **What are the top three reasons you would not support city-wide curbside residential trash pick-up?** [Narrative Answers, Up to 3]
8. **What is your gender?**
- Male [1]
  - Female [2]
9. **What is your age?**
- 25 or younger [1]
  - 26 – 35 [2]
  - 36 – 45 [3]
  - 46 – 55 [4]
  - 56 – 65 [5]
  - 66 or older [6]
10. **How many people live in your home?**
- One [1]
  - Two [2]
  - Three [3]
  - Four [4]
  - Five [5]
  - Six or more [6]
11. **Thinking about your family's total income from all sources, which of the following income ranges is closest to your family's 2013 total income from all sources?**
- \$19,999 or less [1]
  - \$20,000 to \$39,999 [2]
  - \$40,000 to \$59,999 [3]
  - \$60,000 to \$79,999 [4]
  - \$80,000 to \$99,999 [5]
  - \$100,000 or more [6]

# HUNTINGBURG COMMUNITY SURVEY

## APPENDIX B: NARRATIVE COMMENTS

### SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO QUESTION 6

What are the top three reasons you would support city-wide curbside residential trash pick-up?

- Convenience/Ease of use/Simplicity (162 times)
- Recycling Feature (71 times)
- Help keep our city cleaner (52 times)
- Lower Price/Cost Effective (47 times)
- Localized trash service/Jobs for local residents/income for city (29 times)
- Reduction in number of garbage trucks/Better for roads (26 times)
- Not having to drive to trash site/landfill (18 times)
- Eliminating trash buildup/storage of trash (15 times)
- Picked up on a regular basis/dependability (15 times)
- Having trash bins/Convenient storage of trash/Keep animals out of trash (13 times)
- Time Savings (11 times)
- Use stickers/charge by bag/use-based service (8 times)
- As a service to individuals who cannot transport their own trash (7 times)
- Similar price as what individual is currently paying/Reasonable cost (7 times)
- No trash bags in my car (7 times)
- It should include an option to "opt out"/Be a voluntary program (5 times)
- Keep the trash off the road/Reduce littering (4 times)
- Service to the Community (4 times)
- We had this service in the past but it was discontinued (4 times)
- Civic Pride (3 times)
- Consistent/Uniform Pricing (2 times)
- Pick up of larger items (2 times)
- Hours for the dump make it hard to go there (2 times)
- Efficiency (2 times)

#### **Additional Comments, General**

- We are not in trash business
- Would be nice to have billing on one bill
- I want only to recycle
- Would decrease amount of traffic at landfill
- Only if full biweekly recycling -- all items, not just a selective few
- Hope it would be cheaper for senior citizens
- in favor of a competitive bid contract
- Knowing which company is accountable for spills
- Self-sufficient, plus trash pickup could support city code enforcement
- Convenience - but would not support if more than \$10 a month
- Reduce landfill problems
- I'm new to town and haven't set up trash removal yet
- That it would be very good for residents
- Hopefully Huntingburg could negotiate a better price
- Easier to contact if problems or forgotten pickup

## HUNTINGBURG COMMUNITY SURVEY

---

- Having this service might be an amenity to attract growth
- Keep unnecessary items from going to the landfill
- Because it is the right thing for the city to do
- Make sure I don't get behind in trash/recycling
- Responsibility
- Only if it's by a contractor
- If it does not subsidize others
- I wouldn't have to ask my neighbor to take my trash with his
- Everyone have the same company for pickup
- Don't have to deal w/ renters
- Could this also include in-city churches?
- All this is about is another source of income
- I am a disabled senior citizen
- One less bill to remember
- Great idea
- No limit on what is picked up as long as in container
- I just moved here from a big city and this is a hassle
- I think some people have a lot of trash
- Makes sense to me for a city to have trash pick up
- But must take everything and smaller containers
- Wouldn't have to make sure I had trash sticker available
- Private enterprise is always cheaper and better
- We are older and is hard to get out at times
- I would not have to lift heavy trash bags
- It is important to most families
- Home Pick Up
- Coordination with limb and yard waste pickup
- Would lead to prompter cleanups
- Better for the environment/healthier
- Competitive Rates
- City can negotiate better rates
- Standardized routing
- Increased frequency of trash disposal

### **Additional Comments Related to Pricing:**

- Less than \$5 a month
- If it were under \$5/month
- We would support \$1/bag or \$1.50/bag
- If it was \$1/bag or \$1.50/bag
- Free
- If price is right I don't care who picks it up - if they do a good job.
- If city would provide services at no charge
- No cost to tax paying, legal citizens
- If you only had a little, it was either based on how often they picked up or was \$2 bucks a monthly (only) (Max \$5)

# HUNTINGBURG COMMUNITY SURVEY

---

## **Longer Narrative Statements, Negative:**

- If the people you annexed to the city still had the rights to decide what to do with their own trash pickup, the city is trying to make the decisions for the community on their own.
- It could give the boys in the shiny red trucks something to actually do instead of driving around all day.
- I am not in favor of this trash pickup service. I recycle everything I can. I take my trash to county dump. I go to the county dump once a month for \$1. I recycle the rest. I don't think you can do better than this monthly rate. Retired people don't need an added expense.
- We do not need this service, people have been able to find a way to get rid of their trash without the city for years. The city and county only need to provide collection points and people can get it there.
- If you would go back in time when we used to pick up trash in the city, you would find that there was less employees in the street department and the tax base was there to pay for trash pick up- when they quit trash pick up, since then we've hired more people to use up that money that was there for trash pick up. We all know how government works, you don't use it or spent it, you don't get it from taxes. This survey is too nose about personal income. Also, recycling is a waste of time and money if you don't have a place to take it beside landfill.
- I wouldn't - it wouldn't be fair to people like me who live alone and don't have much trash.

## **Longer Narrative Statements, Positive:**

- I think it's a good idea especially for those that have no way to take trash to the dumpsters. Also, when the city stopped trash pickup for cost savings, that savings was not passed on to the taxpayer.
- I would rather pay the city for trash pick-up instead of a private contractor. It works in Ferdinand at a very reasonable price so why wouldn't it work here.
- I would support it, but Otwell's trash pick-up is very good.

## **SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO QUESTION 7**

What are the top three reasons you would not support city-wide curbside residential trash pick-up?

- Too Expensive/cost more than current rate (281 times)
- Small household/Not a lot of trash (44 times)
- Utilities are too expensive (22 times)
- Scheduling/convenience concerns (21 times)
- Too many stipulations/restrictions /limitations (19 times)
- Dumpsters would make the streets look cluttered/left out all the time (17 times)
- Satisfied with current service (17 times)
- Anti-government statements (18 times)
- I recycle as much as possible (16 times)
- Individuals on fixed income cannot afford service (15 times)
- Program must include recycling (12 times)
- No place to store/park the dumpsters (11 times)
- This service is not needed (14 times)
- I am capable of taking my trash and recyclables to the landfill/recycling center (11 times)
- Animals in the trash/Smells/Insects/Other nuisances (12 times)
- Program should be use-based /not flat fee (10 times)

# HUNTINGBURG COMMUNITY SURVEY

---

- Capital commitment (re: money, time) for the city (10 times)
- City cannot afford to provide this program/city will lose money (10 times)
- City abandoned previous pick up program (9 times)
- Lack of dependable service/poor service/loss of service (8 times)
- Size/weight of new trash containers/dumpsters (7 times)
- Taking away citizen/consumer choice (8 times)
- Noise from trucks in neighborhood/Too many trucks on road (6 times)
- Difficulty taking dumpsters to the curb (6 times)
- The service will increase local tax rates (5 times)
- Concerns over future rate inflation (4 times)
- Program should not be mandatory (4 times)
- Will not clean up the city (4 times)
- Huntingburg residents already have private haulers (4 times)
- Do not want to take business away from private business (3 times)
- Program should be mandatory (3 times)
- Other container concerns (3 times)
- City focus/funds should be spent on other problems (3 times)
- Service should be free/should be covered by property taxes (2 times)

## Other Comments:

- Recycling contamination (due to container)
- The program should not require stickers
- If there was a long-term contract
- Do not want to overpay for services
- We would have to take it to the city's pick up and pay an additional charge
- This is a terrible idea
- What would I do with the 96 gal tote I have that I purchased?
- Personal responsibility - just because its more convenience doesn't mean everyone will be responsible
- Program must accept pet waste
- Because I take my trash to work
- Special bags - the landfills and private company let you use very large bags(39 gal)
- County trash and recycling is a convenience
- The possibility of someone having an easy access to garbage (identity theft!)
- We will still pay for containers even though they are given to us - nothing is free - how dumb do you think we are?
- Cost would be equal, those who conserve and recycle would be subsidizing those who are wasteful
- I do not think enough research has been done on this matter. The citizens of Huntingburg have not been given enough of the facts as to the costs of hiring additional personnel, equipment, etc.
- We could use another county site along with the one we have or a city trash location
- if the dumpster sites were closed - sometimes 1 week is too long for stinking trash
- I think the street department should pick it up

# HUNTINGBURG COMMUNITY SURVEY

## APPENDIX C: AGE AND INCOME TABLES

**TABLE 1C. INTEREST IN RESIDENTIAL TRASH SERVICE BY AGE**

	Under 26	26 – 35	36 – 45	46 – 55	56 – 65	Over 65
I am very interested in having city-wide curbside residential trash service.	33.3	27.7	45.1	34.4	33.6	30.0
I am somewhat interested in having city-wide curbside residential trash service.	11.1	19.1	15.7	14.4	19.8	17.9
I am neutral to the idea of having city-wide curbside residential trash service.	0.0	4.3	7.8	7.8	13.8	10.5
I am not interested in having city-wide curbside residential trash service.	55.6	48.9	31.4	43.3	32.8	41.6

**TABLE 2C. IMPORTANCE OF BI-WEEKLY RECYCLING SERVICES BY AGE**

	Under 26	26 – 35	36 – 45	46 – 55	56 – 65	Over 65
Biweekly recycling service is very important to me	33.3	28.6	35.4	31.0	33.0	34.8
Biweekly recycling service is somewhat important to me	22.2	31.0	27.1	19.0	26.6	23.8
Biweekly recycling service is not important to me	44.4	40.5	37.5	50.0	40.4	41.5

**TABLE 3C. HOW MUCH RESIDENTS ARE WILLING TO PAY FOR RESIDENTIAL TRASH SERVICE BY INCOME**

	\$19,999 or less	\$20,000 to \$39,999	\$40,000 to \$59,999	\$60,000 to \$79,999	\$80,000 to \$99,999	More than \$100,000
\$15 or less per month	75.0	72.9	75.3	68.1	74.3	61.2
\$16 - \$20 per month	19.6	16.5	13.6	19.7	8.6	22.2
\$21-25 per month	3.6	9.7	2.5	12.1	14.3	16.7
\$26 - \$30 per month	0.0	0.0	8.6	0.0	2.9	0.0
\$31 or more per month	1.8	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

# HUNTINGBURG COMMUNITY SURVEY

**TABLE 4C. HOW MUCH RESIDENTS ARE WILLING TO PAY FOR RESIDENTIAL TRASH SERVICE BY HOUSEHOLD SIZE**

	One	Two	Three	Four	Five	More than Five
\$15 or less per month	73.2	77.3	64.9	71.8	81.3	62.5
\$16 - \$20 per month	15.5	14.8	19.3	17.9	18.8	12.5
\$21-25 per month	8.2	5.1	14.0	10.3	0.0	25.0
\$26 - \$30 per month	2.1	2.3	1.8	0.0	0.0	0.0
\$31 or more per month	1.0	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

**TABLE 5C. RANKING: NUMBER ONE REASON FOR SUPPORTING RESIDENTIAL TRASH SERVICE BY AGE**

	Under 26	26 – 35	36 – 45	46 – 55	56 – 65	Over 65
1. Convenience/Ease	25.0	38.2	20.9	26.2	37.7	48.1
2. Lower price/Cost effective	**	11.8	11.6	10.8	11.6	4.6
3. Recycling features of program	25.0	**	4.7	6.2	10.1	5.6
4. Help keep our city cleaner	**	5.9	7.0	4.6	2.9	6.5
5. Jobs for residents/income for city	**	2.9	4.7	4.6	1.4	1.9
6. Reduction in number of garbage trucks	**	**	7.0	4.6	4.3	0.9
7. Not having to drive to trash site/landfill	**	**	7.0	3.1	2.9	0.9
8. Eliminating trash buildup/storage of trash	**	2.9	7.0	1.5	1.4	**
9. Time savings	**	5.9	**	4.6	1.4	**
10. Dependability of service	**	2.9	**	1.5	**	0.9
Other benefits	25.0	11.8	20.9	18.5	15.9	15.7
Nonsupportive Answer	25.0	17.6	9.3	13.8	10.1	14.9

## HUNTINGBURG COMMUNITY SURVEY

**TABLE 6C. RANKING: NUMBER ONE REASON FOR SUPPORTING RESIDENTIAL TRASH SERVICE BY INCOME**

	\$19,999 or less	\$20,000 to \$39,999	\$40,000 to \$59,999	\$60,000 to \$79,999	\$80,000 to \$99,999	More than \$100,000
1. Convenience/Ease	38.7	39.7	42.9	34.6	16.1	37.5
2. Lower price/Cost effective	3.2	11.5	10.7	9.6	12.9	12.5
3. Recycling features of program	9.7	6.4	3.6	9.6	3.2	6.3
4. Help keep our city cleaner	3.2	3.8	5.4	1.9	9.7	6.3
5. Jobs for residents/income for city	3.2	1.3	3.6	5.8	3.2	**
6. Reduction in number of garbage trucks	**	3.8	3.6	3.8	3.2	6.3
7. Not having to drive to trash site/landfill	3.2	**	5.4	1.9	3.2	**
8. Eliminating trash buildup/storage of trash	**	5.1	**	**	**	**
9. Time savings	**	2.6	**	1.9	6.5	6.3
10. Dependability of service	**	**	**	3.8	**	**
Other benefits	9.7	15.4	14.3	19.2	29.0	18.8
Nonsupportive Answer	29.0	10.3	10.7	7.7	12.9	6.3

**TABLE 7C. RANKING: NUMBER ONE REASON FOR NOT SUPPORTING RESIDENTIAL TRASH SERVICE BY AGE**

	Under 26	26 – 35	36 – 45	46 – 55	56 – 65	Over 65
10. Too expensive/cost more than current rate	80.0	75.8	67.6	74.6	70.2	60.3
11. Small household/Not a lot of trash	**	**	**	3.0	5.3	8.5
12. Dumpster related concerns	**	6.1	2.7	4.5	1.1	6.4
13. Utilities are too expensive	**	3.0	8.1	3.0	4.3	2.8
14. Various anti-government statements	**	**	**	3.0	5.3	0.7
15. This service is not needed	**	**	**	**	2.1	2.1
16. Satisfied with current service	**	3.0	2.7	**	**	2.1
17. Individuals on fixed incomes cannot afford	**	**	2.7	**	**	1.4
18. Too many restrictions and limitations	**	**	**	**	**	1.4
Other concerns	20.0	12.1	16.2	11.9	11.7	14.3

## HUNTINGBURG COMMUNITY SURVEY

**TABLE 8C. RANKING: NUMBER ONE REASON FOR NOT SUPPORTING RESIDENTIAL TRASH SERVICE BY INCOME**

	\$19,999 or less	\$20,000 to \$39,999	\$40,000 to \$59,999	\$60,000 to \$79,999	\$80,000 to \$99,999	More than \$100,000
1. Too expensive/cost more than current rate	57.7	72.0	73.8	78.8	63.3	58.8
2. Small household/Not a lot of trash	5.8	4.3	3.1	5.8	3.3	5.9
3. Dumpster related concerns	9.6	4.3	3.1	**	10.0	**
4. Utilities are too expensive	3.8	5.4	**	1.9	6.7	**
5. Various anti-government statements	3.8	**	1.5	1.9	6.7	**
6. This service is not needed	**	2.2	**	**	**	**
7. Satisfied with current service	**	1.1	**	**	**	5.9
8. Individuals on fixed incomes cannot afford	1.9	2.2	**	**	**	**
9. Too many restrictions and limitations	**	**	**	**	**	**
Other concerns	17.3	8.6	18.5	11.5	10.0	29.4