



Handwritten initials and a circled number '26'.

DEPARTMENT OF  
PUBLIC WORKS

CITY OF SACRAMENTO  
CALIFORNIA

CITY HALL  
ROOM 207  
915 I STREET  
SACRAMENTO, CA  
95814-2673

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR

September 12, 1989

916-449-5283

Transportation and Community Development/  
Budget and Finance Committees  
Sacramento, California

Honorable Members in Session:

SUBJECT: **GARDEN REFUSE CUSTOMER SATISFACTION SURVEY**

**SUMMARY**

This report provides the City Council with information obtained from a "Garden Refuse Customer Satisfaction Survey." The report indicates that approximately 90% of the residents are satisfied with their garden refuse pickup service, while approximately 66% are satisfied with the street sweeping service. This report is continued from June 7, 1989.

**BACKGROUND**

During the City Council meeting on November 9, 1988, the Director of Public Works requested, and was granted, the authority to commission a survey to determine the extent to which City residents were satisfied with their garden refuse pickup service. The objectives included assessing satisfaction with street sweeping services, exploring possible problem areas, locating areas in which these services might be enhanced, and determining willingness to pay for more frequent street sweeping.

J. D. Franz Research, a local firm, was selected to perform a telephone survey. Planning and pretesting for the survey took place during February and March 1989. The actual dates for the survey interviews were March 22 to April 13, 1989. Completed interviews totaled 1,153. The total sample size for this survey permits the findings to be generalized at the 95% confidence level, with a tolerance of  $\pm 2.9\%$ . That is, the results can be said to have a 95% chance of being within approximately three percentage points of the findings one would have obtained had one interviewed every Sacramento City resident.

The survey methods, findings, and conclusions are presented in the final report, which is attached. The survey findings indicate that:

1. Approximately nine-tenths of the residents are satisfied with their garden refuse pickup service.
2. The main reasons for satisfaction are that the collectors come when they are supposed to, and they are efficient.
3. The primary reasons for dissatisfaction are that the collectors leave a mess (they "drag the refuse around the street") and delay in responding to missed service.
4. Approximately two-thirds of the residents are satisfied with the street sweeping service near their homes.

9  
7  
4

5. The main reason for satisfaction is that the street sweepers "do a good job."
6. Dissatisfaction centers on three complaints: the streets are not well swept, the streets are not swept often enough, and residents rarely or never see the street sweepers.
7. Of those who have curb and gutter garden refuse collection, only 12% would be willing to pay more for twice-monthly street sweeping service. Five percent (5%) would be willing to pay more for street sweeping service four times a month.
8. Less than half of the residents would favor the posting of no parking signs for the times when the streets are to be swept.
9. The importance of sweeping the streets the same day as the garden refuse is picked up is minimal, according to residents.

Special areas identified by the survey as reasons for dissatisfaction will assist staff in identifying and correcting these problem areas. The Department of Public Works' Street Division will be studying the areas of customer dissatisfaction and will report back on them within 90 days.

**FINANCIAL DATA**

This report requires no financial decision.

**POLICY MATTERS**

No policy changes are recommended according to the findings of this report.

**MBE/WBE**

The "Garden Refuse Customer Satisfaction Survey" was conducted by J. D. Franz Research, a woman owned business enterprise (WBE).

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends the Joint Committee accept the final report on "Garden Refuse Customer Satisfaction Survey" prepared by J. D. Franz Research and forward it to the full City Council for information.

Respectfully submitted,

*for Reginald Young*  
Reginald Young  
Deputy Director of Public Works

Recommendation Approved:

*Solon Wisham, Jr.*  
Solon Wisham, Jr.  
Assistant City Manager

Approved:

*for Reginald Young*  
Reginald Young  
Deputy Director of Public Works

All Districts

924

CITY OF SACRAMENTO  
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS  
STREETS DIVISION  
GARDEN REFUSE CUSTOMER  
SATISFACTION SURVEY

FINAL REPORT

May 8, 1989

52

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. METHODS	2
III. FINDINGS	13
IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	35
APPENDIX: SURVEY INSTRUMENT	

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

9  
2  
4

### Introduction

- . The survey of Sacramento city garden refuse pick-up service customers that is the subject of this report was commissioned by the City's Department of Public Works, Streets Division, from the Sacramento-based public opinion and marketing research firm of J.D. Franz Research on January 12, 1989.
- . Planning and pre-testing for the survey took place during February and March. The actual dates for the survey interviews, which were conducted by telephone, were March 22 to April 13.

### Methods

- . The instrument that was used in conducting the survey was designed by the President of J.D. Franz Research on the basis of questions posed by representatives of the Department of Public Works, including the Streets Division.
- . The sample for the survey was a computer-generated random digit dialing sample designed to obtain responses generalizable to the City as a whole within predetermined statistical limits.
- . Potential respondents at the numbers sampled were screened for residence within City limits and responsibility for disposing of their own garden refuse. A total of four screening questions were used to ensure that residents of the unincorporated areas surrounding the City and those whose garden refuse is handled by a landlord or property manager were excluded from the sample.
- . Within households, the individual to be interviewed was selected via the "youngest male adult - youngest female adult" technique.
- . All of the interviewers who administered the survey underwent intensive training and briefing prior to conducting any actual interviews.
- . Calling for the survey was conducted from a central location under continuous supervision.

- 6  
2  
4
- . Up to three attempts were made to reach an eligible respondent at each number in the sample. In order to ensure that people working various shifts and individuals with differing lifestyles were adequately represented, calls were proportionately distributed among afternoon and evening hours.
  - . The overall response rate for the survey was 78 percent.
  - . Given a sample of this size (n=1,153), the findings can be generalized to the population as a whole at the 95 percent confidence level with a margin of error of  $\pm 2.9$  percent.
  - . The resulting sample appears to be within the margin of error relative to the population on some characteristics and to be outside of it on others. Specifically, those in the middle and uppermost age and income groups, whites, and women may be over-represented, while those in the youngest age groups, the lower income groups, Blacks, Hispanics, and males may be under-represented. With the possible exception of the age distribution, which may actually represent the target population, however, the differences are of insufficient size noticeably to affect the results.

### Findings

- . Close to nine-tenths of residents are satisfied with their garden refuse pick-up service.
- . The main reasons for satisfaction are that the garden refuse collectors come when they are supposed to and that they are efficient.
- . Primary reasons for dissatisfaction are that the collectors leave a mess and that they "drag the refuse around the street."
- . Approximately two-thirds of residents are satisfied with the street-sweeping service near their homes.
- . By far the most prominent reason for satisfaction is that the street-sweepers "do a good job."
- . Among those who are dissatisfied, three complaints are prevalent: the streets are not well-swept; the streets are not swept often enough; and residents rarely or never see the street sweepers.

- 4  
2  
4
- . Twelve percent of residents indicated that the City had at some point failed to pick up their garden refuse. Most of these residents did not know why the pick-up failure had occurred, and most also did not call the City to ask them to pick the refuse up.
  - . When residents did call to ask that their missed garden refuse be picked up, the City responded with a pick-up in approximately two-thirds of cases.
  - . Residents are roughly evenly divided among those who are of the opinion that the garden refuse collectors sometimes, rarely, or never leave a mess; the smallest group believes that the collectors usually leave a mess. When the individual responses are summed, they indicate that close to three-fifths of residents feel the garden refuse collectors rarely or never leave a mess.
  - . The majority of residents believe that the garden refuse trucks have either a good or a fair appearance. The second most prevalent answer to this question was "Don't Know," however, and approximately a tenth simply said words to the effect of, "Who cares?" or, "They look like garden refuse trucks."
  - . Relatively few residents have called the City's garden refuse pick-up service on the telephone. Of those who have, the majority were very satisfied with the outcomes of their calls.
  - . Over four-fifths of residents believe that the City is doing an excellent or good job of collecting residents' garden refuse.
  - . A small majority of residents believe that the City is doing an excellent or good job of sweeping the streets near residents' homes.
  - . Of those who have curb-and-gutter garden refuse collection service, only twelve percent would be willing to pay more for twice-monthly street-sweeping service, and only five percent would be willing to pay more for street-sweeping service four times a month.
  - . Less than half of residents would strongly favor or favor the posting of no-parking signs for the times when the streets are to be swept.
  - . The importance of sweeping the streets the same day as the garden refuse is picked up appears to be fairly minimal, with close to two-thirds of residents finding this approach either not at all important or not too important.

9  
2  
4

## Responses by City Council District

- . Only three questions exhibited statistically significant differences by City Council District: general satisfaction with the garden refuse pick-up service; general satisfaction with the street-sweeping service; and assessments of the job the City is doing in picking up residents' garden refuse.
- . Analyses of the data by Council District should be treated with caution, as the numbers on which they are based are relatively small.
- . Responses concerning satisfaction, both with the garden refuse collection service and with the street-sweeping service, show a virtually identical pattern: residents of Ms. Mueller's and Mr. Pope's districts are the most likely to be very satisfied, while residents of Ms. Ferris' district are the least likely to be very satisfied.
- . Insofar as assessments of the job the City is doing in picking up residents' garden refuse are concerned, residents of Mr. Chin's and Ms. Mueller's districts gave the most "excellent" evaluations, while those in Ms. Ferris' and Mr. Serna's districts gave the fewest "excellent" evaluations.

## Conclusions and Recommendations

- . The vast majority of Sacramento city residents are satisfied with their residential garden refuse pick-up service, and most are also satisfied with the street-sweeping service near their homes. When the two services are compared, however, it is apparent that the garden refuse service is substantially more satisfactory than the street-sweeping service.
- . It seems logical to conclude that more frequent sweeping would be welcome. Yet however welcome this apparent solution might be, the vast majority of residents are not willing to pay for any additional service.
- . Perhaps curiously, residents were at best lukewarm in their reactions to two proposals that presumably would improve the quality of the street sweeping: posting no-parking signs for the days on which the streets are to be swept; and sweeping on the same days as the garden refuse is collected.

9  
2  
4

. One is forced to conclude, although with some hesitation as the question was not directly asked, that the public believes solutions other than those offered are either available or possible. If such solutions actually exist and are within the City's financial reach, they merit serious attention.

. Insofar as the garden refuse pick-up service is concerned, dissatisfaction is markedly less. There are, however, three areas that suggest the need for further investigation or a search for possible solutions: the extent to which the collectors are perceived as leaving a mess; the level of missed pick-ups; and the apparent failure of the City uniformly to respond to these misses with a second trip.

## I. INTRODUCTION

The survey of Sacramento City garden refuse pick-up service customers that is the subject of this report was commissioned by the City's Department of Public Works, Streets Division, from the Sacramento-based public opinion and marketing research firm of J.D. Franz Research on January 12, 1989. The primary purpose of the survey was to determine the extent to which residents are satisfied with their garden refuse pick-up service. Secondary objectives included assessing satisfaction with street-sweeping services, exploring possible problem areas with respect to both of the Division's major services, ascertaining areas in which these services might be enhanced, and determining willingness to pay for more frequent street sweeping.

Planning for the survey took place in February, 1989 and involved the Deputy Director of Public Works, the Manager of the Street Division, the Assistant Street Manager, the Division's Administrative Assistant, the Street Cleaning Supervisor, the President of J.D. Franz Research, and the research firm's Project Manager for this effort. Survey design and pretesting were completed by March 7, 1989. Actual dates for the survey interviews, which were conducted by telephone, were March 22 to April 13. A detailed discussion of the methods used in conducting the survey can be found in Section II of this report.

Following this Introduction and the above-mentioned Methods section, the report is divided into two additional sections. Section III contains the survey Findings, and Section IV presents the research firm's Conclusions and Recommendations.

## II. METHODS

### Instrument Design

The instrument that was used in conducting the survey was designed by the President of J.D. Franz Research on the basis of questions posed by representatives of the Streets Division. Revisions were made as a result of reviews by Division staff and members of the City Council. A final draft was then pre-tested among a random sample of City residents, further minor modifications were made, and the instrument was submitted to the Division for approval.

### Sample Selection

The sample for the survey was a computer-generated random digit dialing sample designed to obtain responses generalizable to the City as a whole within predetermined statistical limits. Random digit dialing, the most sophisticated and accurate method of telephone interview sample selection, has the advantage over directory sampling of including households with unlisted, too new to be listed, or inaccurately listed numbers. This approach permits the results to be generalized to all telephone-owning households in the designated areas.

Prefixes for the sample (the first three digits of a telephone number) had been previously selected by the Solid Waste Division for use in a survey concerning residential garbage collection. These prefixes were then randomly assigned the remaining four digits of a telephone number by computer, and the resulting seven-digit numbers were printed out onto call record sheets designed to facilitate interviewers' recording of their progress toward full sample implementation.

Potential respondents at the numbers thus selected were further screened for residence within the City limits and responsibility for disposing of their own garden refuse. A total of four

9  
2  
4

screening questions were used to ensure that residents of the unincorporated areas surrounding the City and those whose garden refuse is handled by a landlord or property manager were excluded from the sample.

Within households, the individual to be interviewed was selected via the "youngest male adult - youngest female adult" technique. This respondent selection technique is relatively simple for interviewers to implement and has been demonstrated to achieve an age-sex distribution that approximates population parameters. In implementing this technique, the interviewer merely concludes the introduction to the survey by asking to interview the youngest male of a specified age (or older) who is at home. If there is no male in residence or available, the interviewer asks to interview the youngest female within the specified age parameters who is at home. The extent to which use of this technique during the garden refuse collection survey achieved its purpose is discussed in the subsection entitled "Generalizability of the Findings" beginning on page 6.

#### Interviewer Training

All of the interviewers who administered the survey underwent intensive training and briefing prior to conducting any actual interviews. Training included instruction in interviewing techniques, orientation to the mechanics of sample selection and recording, and extensive practice with the survey instrument as well as with a systematic approach to answering respondents' inquiries. The briefing specific to this particular survey was conducted by the President of J.D. Franz Research.

#### Survey Implementation

Calling for the survey was conducted from a central location under continuous supervision. Upon completion of each interview, a supervisor immediately checked the survey for accuracy, clarity, and completeness so that any problem areas could be

discussed with the interviewer while the conversation was still remembered.

Up to three attempts were made to reach an eligible respondent at each number in the sample. In order to ensure that people working various shifts and individuals with differing lifestyles were adequately represented, calls were proportionately distributed among afternoon and evening hours. Callbacks to any given number were made on different days of the week and at different times of day in order to maximize the probability of finding an eligible individual at home. The results of the calling for all numbers in the sample are portrayed in Figure 1 on the following page.

19  
47

FIGURE 1  
RESULTS OF CALLING

TOTAL NUMBERS DIALED ONE OR MORE TIMES = 11,195

Less:

Numbers Not Assigned Or Not Working = 4,623  
 Business Numbers = 2,445 7,723  
 Numbers Not In Target Population = 655

Equals:

Potentially Usable Numbers = 3,472

Less:

Numbers At Which There Was No Appropriate  
 Contact at Up to Three Attempts

No Answer, Busy Signal, Answering  
 Machine = 1,781  
 No Adult At Home = 21 1,989  
 Communication Barrier  
 (Foreign Language; Hearing Impaired) = 126  
 Scheduled Callback - No Answer = 61

Equals:

Numbers At Which Appropriate Contact  
 was Made = 1,483

Less:

Refusals = 304 330  
 Interviewers Terminated In Progress = 26

Equals:

Completed Interviews = 1,153

---

Completed Interviews As A Percentage Of  
 Appropriate Contacts = 78%

Refusals And Terminations As A Percentage  
 Of Appropriate Contacts = 22%

A  
A  
A

### Data Coding and Analysis

Coding of the survey's closed-ended questions was accomplished by the interviewers as they conducted the interviews. A coding team comprised of the Project Manager and experienced interviewing staff then coded the survey's open-ended questions following the completion of all survey interviews. In order to achieve consistency, the coding team worked in pairs and as a group, checking each others' work and fully discussing any debatable responses prior to coding them.

The resulting data were key-entered into the data analytic software SPSS/PC+ using SPSS Data Entry and then computer-checked for accuracy, adherence to the pre-established coding scheme, and internal logic. Any erroneous data were compared to the original source documents before being corrected. Finally, tabulations and cross-tabulations were prepared and analyzed using SPSS/PC+.

### Generalizability of the Findings

The total sample size for this survey of n=1,153 permits the findings to be generalized at the 95 percent confidence level with a tolerance of  $\pm 2.9$  percent. That is, the results can be said to have a 95 percent chance of being within approximately three percentage points of the findings one would have obtained had one interviewed every Sacramento City resident.

Further evidence for the representativeness of the sample can be derived from comparisons of respondents' demographic characteristics to the characteristics of the City's population. These comparisons are portrayed in Tables 1, 2, and 3. Considerable caution should be exercised in interpreting these data, as the City resident characteristics they reflect (i.e., those developed during the 1980 United States Census) are substantially dated. They may, however, serve as indicators of the extent to which the sample is representative of the population.

Insofar as respondents' and residents' ages are concerned (see Table 1), the sample is within the margin of error for three of the subgroups portrayed and somewhat above or below it for the remaining four. Those between the ages of 18 and 29 may be under-represented in the sample, while those between 35 and 44 years of age as well as those 65 years old and older may be over-represented. It is quite possible, however, that these differences reflect differences between apartment-dwellers and those residing in single-family homes rather than differences attributable to sampling.

TABLE 1  
RESPONDENTS' AGES COMPARED  
TO CITY RESIDENTS' AGES  
ACCORDING TO THE 1980 UNITED STATES CENSUS

Age Group	Distribution of Respondents		Distribution of Residents*
	Frequency	Percentage	
18 - 24 Years Old	67	5.8%	17.7%
25 - 29 Years Old	92	8.0	12.8
30 - 34 Years Old	126	10.9	10.6
35 - 44 Years Old	228	19.8	13.5
45 - 54 Years Old	125	10.8	13.2
55 - 64 Years Old	173	15.0	14.2
65 Years Old Or Older	297	25.8	18.0
Refused	45	3.9	-
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>1,153</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

\* As percentages of those aged 18 and older.

Respondents' ethnicity as compared to residents' ethnicity (please see Table 2) shows representation differentials for all three major ethnic groups. Blacks and Hispanics are somewhat under-represented, while whites are somewhat over-represented. In all probability, this is due to the difficulty of reaching low income respondents during the course of any type of survey in

9  
24

combination with the high correlation between ethnicity and income. It should also be noted, however, that the differentials are not large and that their magnitude is insufficient to have any substantial impact on the results.

TABLE 2  
RESPONDENTS ETHNICITY COMPARED  
TO CITY RESIDENTS' ETHNICITY  
ACCORDING TO THE 1980 UNITED STATES CENSUS

Ethnicity	Distribution of Respondents		Distribution of Residents
	Frequency	Percentage	
White (Non-Hispanic)	785	68.1%	62.3%
Black (Non-Hispanic)	100	8.7	13.1
Hispanic	89	7.7	13.6
Asian	72	6.2	7.6
American Indian	12	1.0	1.2
Filipino	14	1.2	1.1
Other	37	3.2	1.1
Refused	44	3.8	-
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>1,153</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

With respect to the gender of respondents versus residents (please see Table 3), an over-representation of women is apparent. Although standard within-household respondent selection techniques were used in order to minimize the impact of women's tendency to be more available to survey researchers, it would appear that these techniques were not completely successful. Again, however, the differential is too small to have any substantive effect on the overall results.

CP 9

TABLE 3

RESPONDENTS' GENDER COMPARED  
TO CITY RESIDENTS' GENDER  
ACCORDING TO THE 1980 UNITED STATES CENSUS

Gender	Distribution of Respondents		Distribution of Residents
	.Frequency	Percentage	
Male	479	41.5%	48.0%
Female	674	58.5	52.0
TOTALS	1,153	100.0%	100.0%

In sum, the sample appears to be within the margin of error relative to the population on some characteristics and outside of it on others. Specifically, those in the middle and uppermost age groups, whites, and women are over-represented, while those in the youngest age groups, Blacks, Hispanics, and males are under-represented. With the possible exception of the age distribution (which, it should be reiterated, may actually represent the target population), however, the differences are of insufficient size noticeably to affect the results.

Respondents' household incomes are portrayed in Table 4. Although these data are not compared to United States Census data because the latter are no longer of any validity with respect to this characteristic, they are compared to the current median income for the County, which is approximately \$30,000 per household per year. This is an imprecise measure at best given the unique nature of the City relative to the County as a whole, but it is the best information presently available.

4  
2  
4

TABLE 4

RESPONDENTS' HOUSEHOLD INCOMES  
COMPARED TO THE COUNTY MEDIAN

Income Level	Frequency	Percentage	Percentage Above and Below Median
Less Than \$15,000	145	12.6%	
\$15,000 - \$29,999	263	22.8	35.4%
\$30,000 - \$44,999	257	22.3	
\$45,000 - Or More	262	22.7	45.0%
Don't Know	40	3.5	
Refused	186	16.0	-
TOTALS	1,153	100.0%	

As Table 4 indicates, the sample would appear to over-represent those in the higher income groups. While this is not surprising given the difficulty of including those in the lowest income groups in surveys or polls, it does suggest some caution. It should perhaps also be noted, however, that approximately a fifth of the sample did not answer this question; where these respondents might fall in the distribution is not known. Some of the survey research literature suggests that low-income respondents are the most inclined to refuse this question.

Finally, there were two demographic characteristics ascertained during the course of the survey for which we have no comparative information: ZIP Code, which is displayed in Table 5, and City Council District of residence, which is displayed in Table 6. As this latter distribution was constructed on the basis of the former, any imbalances in one will be reflected in the other. Further, some Council Districts overlap ZIP Codes, with the

result that 30 percent of the sample could not be assigned to a particular District. Be that as it may, we would be pleased to include comparisons in a supplement to our report if the City can provide population information relative to these two variables.

4  
5

TABLE 5  
DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY ZIP CODE

Zip Code	Frequency	Percentage
95810	1	0.1
95813	2	0.2
95814	19	1.6
95815	71	6.2
95816	55	4.8
95817	60	5.2
95818	90	7.8
95819	101	8.8
95820	132	11.4
95821	5	0.4
95822	150	13.0
95823	64	5.6
95824	44	3.8
95825	8	0.7
95826	35	3.0
95827	2	0.2
95828	20	1.7
95829	1	0.1
95830	1	0.1
95831	96	8.3
95832	10	0.9
95833	81	7.0
95834	16	1.4
95835	1	0.1
95837	1	0.1
95838	73	6.3
95842	2	0.2
95871	1	0.1
98520	1	0.1
98538	1	0.2
Don't Know	2	0.2
Refused	7	0.6
TOTALS	1,153	100.0%

4  
2  
4

TABLE 6  
DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT

District Number	Council Member	Frequency	Percentage
1	Shore	120	10.4
2	Ferris	154	13.4
3	Pope	109	9.5
4	Chinn	91	7.9
5	Serna	60	5.2
6	Mueller	94	8.2
7	Kastanis	69	6.0
8	Robie	97	8.4

---

Shared ZIP Codes	Council Members	Frequency	Percentage
95816	Shore - 33%	55	4.8
	Pope - 33%		
	Chinn - 33%		
95820	Serna - 50%	133	11.5
	Mueller - 50%		
95822	Serna - 25%	150	13.0
	Kastanis - 50%		
	Robie - 25%		
95832	Kastanis - 50%	10	0.9
	Robie - 50%		
Don't Know/Refused		11	0.9
TOTALS	-	1,153	100.0%

A  
P  
-4-

### III. FINDINGS

This section of the report presents the actual survey findings. For the reader's convenience in following the logic of the survey instrument and considering the precise phrasing of the inquiries, the data have been arranged in the same order as the survey questions. Data for the total respondent population are discussed first; this discussion is then followed by an analysis of the responses by City Council District.

#### Total Population Responses

Residents' general level of satisfaction with their garden refuse collection service is portrayed in Table 7. Three-fifths are very satisfied, while another somewhat over a quarter are somewhat satisfied. When these two values are summed, satisfied customers represent close to nine-tenths (88.4 percent) of the total.

TABLE 7

EXTENT TO WHICH RESIDENTS ARE SATISFIED WITH THEIR  
GARDEN REFUSE PICK-UP SERVICE

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Very Satisfied	696	60.4%
Somewhat Satisfied	323	28.0
Somewhat Dissatisfied	77	6.7
Very Dissatisfied	46	4.0
Don't Know	10	0.9
No Response	1	0.1
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>1,153</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

24

Residents' reasons for expressing various levels of satisfaction and dissatisfaction are displayed in Table 8. Foremost among the reasons for satisfaction are that the garden refuse collectors come when they are supposed to and that they are efficient. Primary reasons for dissatisfaction are that the collectors leave a mess and that they "drag the refuse around the street."

TABLE 8

REASONS FOR RESIDENTS' LEVELS OF SATISFACTION WITH THEIR GARDEN REFUSE COLLECTION SERVICE

Reason	Percentage of Those Who Are*			
	Very Sat.	Somewhat Sat.	Somewhat Dissat.	Very Dissat.
Come When They're Supposed To	40.5%	16.1%	2.6%	4.3%
Do a Good Job/Efficient	28.3	12.1	2.6	
Convenient/They Pick up	17.1	8.4		
No Problems/Complaints	16.1	6.8		2.2
Pick Up Everything I Put Out	9.6	1.9	1.3	
Don't Leave a Mess	8.3	5.0	1.3	
"Good Service"	5.6	1.9	1.3	2.2
Street/Gutters Are Clean	4.9	1.9		
Like The Big Cans	3.7	2.2		2.2
It's Ok/Satisfactory	2.6	7.1		
Like The Drivers	1.4			
Leave a Mess/Poor Job	1.0	29.1	45.5	37.0
Because We Have The Service	0.9			
They Do The Best They Can	0.6	0.9		2.2
Don't Pick up Everything	0.6	5.6	9.1	6.5
Like Day of Pickup	0.6	0.3		
They're Quite	0.4			
Drive Too Fast	0.3	1.9	5.2	
Just Because	0.3	0.6		
Claw Scrapes/Ruins Streets	0.3	1.5	6.5	4.3
Have To Clean Up After Them	0.3	1.2	11.7	2.2
Drag Refuse Around Street	0.3	8.0	16.9	15.2

(CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

9  
4

Don't Like Cans	0.3	0.9	3.9	4.3
Don't Use Service	0.3	0.6	3.9	4.3
Not on a Regular Day	0.3	1.9	2.6	2.2
Too Noisy	0.1	1.5		
Cars In The Way	0.1	0.3		
Should Pick Up Recyclables	0.1	0.3		
Should Sweep After	0.1	1.9	1.3	
Don't Come Often Enough		1.5	1.3	
Not On Time		0.9		
Want a Can		0.3		
Miss Pick Up		2.8	5.2	10.9
Don't Like Dumping In Street		1.2	2.6	10.9
Waste of Time/Money		1.2	5.2	8.7
Problems Making Phone		0.3		2.2
Drivers Are Rude/ Discourteous		0.3	1.3	
Other	4.2	5.0	5.2	17.4

---

\* Percentages are of those who answered the initial question in the manner indicated. Figures will add to more than 100 percent due to multiple responses.

General levels of satisfaction with the street-sweeping service near residents' homes are shown in Table 9. In this instance, approximately a third each are very and somewhat satisfied. Again summing these values, satisfied customers represent 65.4 percent of the total; 21.9 percent are to some degree dissatisfied.

4 P 4

TABLE 9

EXTENT TO WHICH RESIDENTS ARE SATISFIED WITH THE STREET-SWEEPING SERVICE NEAR THEIR HOMES

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Very Satisfied	384	33.3%
Somewhat Satisfied	370	32.1
Somewhat Dissatisfied	128	11.1
Very Dissatisfied	124	10.8
Don't Know	146	12.7
No Response	1	0.1
TOTALS	1,153	100.0%

Reasons for residents' expressions of satisfaction and dissatisfaction with the street-sweeping service are displayed in Table 10. By far the most prominent reason for satisfaction is simply that the street-sweepers "do a good job." Among those who are dissatisfied, three complaints are prevalent: the streets are not well-swept; the streets are not swept often enough; and residents rarely or never see the street-sweepers.

24

TABLE 10

REASONS FOR RESIDENTS' LEVELS OF SATISFACTION  
WITH THE STREET-SWEEPING SERVICE NEAR  
THEIR HOMES

Reason	Percentage of Those Who Are*			
	Very Sat.	Somewhat Sat.	Somewhat Dissat.	Very Dissat.
Do a Good Job	73.2%	0.2%	2.3%	1.6
Come On Regular Basis	15.9	3.5		
Satisfied/No Complaints	12.2	5.9		
It's OK	3.1	8.6	1.6	
Street Not Swept Well	2.3	23.2	29.7	35.5
Extra Good Job	2.1			
Never/Rarely See Them	1.6	11.4	20.3	27.4
Cars Parked In The Way	1.6	4.3	3.1	5.6
Convenient	1.6	0.5		
Don't Come Often Enough	1.3	22.7	28.9	23.4
Miss Sometimes	0.5	3.0	3.9	2.4
Use Can/No Mess	0.5			
Not Noisy	0.5			
Have To Sweep After Them	0.3	2.2	4.7	8.1
Scatter Debris Over Street	0.3	4.1	7.0	8.1
Come Too Late at Night	0.3	0.3	1.6	0.8
Waste Of Time/Money	0.3	0.5	1.6	2.4
Like The Drivers	0.3			
Not Aware Of Service		0.8	1.6	9.7
Come At Inappropriate Times	1.4	0.8	3.2	
Other	3.7	6.2	7.0	8.1

\* Percentages are of those who answered the question in the manner indicated. Figures will add to more than 100 percent due to multiple responses.

Twelve percent of residents indicated that the City had at some point failed to pick up their garden refuse, as shown in Table 11. Of these, as displayed in Table 12, close to two-fifths said their refuse had not been picked up once in the past year, somewhat over a quarter said their refuse had not been picked up twice in the past year, a tenth said their refuse had not been picked up three times in the past year, and thirteen percent said

97  
4

their refuse had not been picked up four or more times in the past year. For nine percent, on the other hand, the failure had occurred in prior years only.

TABLE 11

EXTENT TO WHICH THE CITY HAS EVER FAILED TO PICK UP RESIDENTS' GARDEN REFUSE

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Yes, Has Failed	142	12.3
No, Has Not Fail	985	85.4
Don't Know	26	2.3
TOTALS	1,153	100.0

TABLE 12

NUMBER OF TIMES GARDEN REFUSE HAS NOT PICKED UP IN THE PAST YEAR

Number of Times	Frequency	Percentage of Total	Percentage of Those Whose Garden Refuse Has Not Been Picked Up
Once	56	4.9%	39.4%
Twice	40	3.5	28.2
Three Times	14	1.2	9.9
Four or More Times	18	1.6	12.7
Not in the Past Year	12	1.0	8.5
Don't Know	2	0.2	1.4
TOTALS	142	12.4%	100.0%

4  
2  
4

Reasons residents recalled for their garden refuse not being picked up are portrayed in Table 13. By far the most prevalent reasons here are "don't know" and "they just missed us" - that is, most of these respondents have no idea why their refuse was not picked up.

TABLE 13  
REASONS WHY RESIDENTS'  
GARDEN REFUSE WAS NOT PICKED UP

Reason	Frequency	Percentage of Those Whose Garden Refuse Was Not Picked Up
Just Missed Us	17	12.0%
Busy Season	9	6.3
Cars in The Way	7	4.9
Holiday	6	4.2
Unacceptable Refuse	6	4.2
Not Properly Placed	6	4.2
Bad Weather	5	3.5
Trees Not Cut Up Right	5	3.5
New Driver	4	2.8
Too Much Refuse	4	2.8
Truck Broke Down	2	1.4
Other	4	2.8
Don't Know	60	42.3

Most of those whose garden refuse was not picked up did not call the City and ask them to pick it up, as Table 13 indicates. Two-fifths, on the other hand, did place a call to the City.

9  
2  
4

TABLE 14

EXTENT TO WHICH RESIDENTS WHOSE GARDEN REFUSE WAS NOT PICKED UP CALLED THE CITY

Response	Frequency	Percentage of Those Whose Garden Refuse Was Not Picked Up
Called	58	40.8%
Did Not Call	78	54.9
Don't Recall	6	4.2
TOTALS	142	100.0%

Table 15 shows that among those who did call and request that the garden refuse be picked up, slightly over two-thirds reported that the City came and picked it up when they said they would. Approximately a quarter, on the other hand, indicated that the City did not come, while the balance were not sure.

TABLE 15

EXTENT TO WHICH THE CITY CAME TO PICK UP THE MISSED GARDEN REFUSE AFTER A CALL

Responses	Frequency	Percentage of Those Who Called
City Came	39	67.2%
City Did Not Come	15	25.9
Don't Recall	4	6.9
TOTALS	58	100.0%

5  
2  
4

Residents are roughly evenly divided among those who are of the opinion that the garden refuse collectors sometimes, rarely, or never leave a mess; the smallest group believes that the collectors usually leave a mess. When these data are summed, they indicate that close to three-fifths of residents (59.3 percent) feel that the garden refuse collectors rarely or never leave a mess.

---

TABLE 16  
EXTENT TO WHICH THE PEOPLE WHO PICK UP RESIDENTS'  
GARDEN REFUSE LEAVE A MESS

---

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Usually	174	15.1%
Sometimes	278	24.1
Rarely	343	29.7
Never	341	29.6
Don't Know	17	1.5
<hr/>		
TOTALS	1,153	100.0%

---

Most residents believe that the garden refuse trucks have either a good or a fair appearance, as shown in Table 17. "Don't know" responses represent the second most prevalent answer to this question, however, and approximately a tenth simply said words to the effect of, "Who cares?" or "They look like garden refuse trucks."

9  
2  
4

TABLE 17  
EVALUATION OF THE GARDEN REFUSE TRUCKS' APPEARANCE

Evaluation	Frequency	Percentage
Excellent Appearance	112	9.7%
Good Appearance	479	41.5
Fair Appearance	181	15.7
Poor Appearance	9	0.8
Who Cares/They Look Like Garden Refuse Trucks	113	9.8
Don't Know	259	22.5
TOTALS	1,153	100.0%

Relatively few residents have called the City's garden refuse pick-up service on the telephone, as Table 18 indicates. Of those who have called, shown in Table 19, the majority were very satisfied with the outcomes of their calls and another fifth were somewhat satisfied, for a total satisfaction level of 77.1 percent.

TABLE 18  
EXTENT TO WHICH RESIDENTS' HOUSEHOLDS HAVE CALLED  
THE CITY'S GARDEN REFUSE PICK-UP SERVICE

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Have Called	175	15.2%
Have Not Called	955	82.8
Don't Recall	18	1.6
No Response	5	0.4
TOTALS	1,153	100.0

9  
DL  
4

TABLE 19

RESPONDENTS' LEVEL OF SATISFACTION  
WITH THE OUTCOMES OF THEIR CALLS

	Frequency	Respondents' Level of Satisfaction With the Outcomes of Their Calls
Very Satisfied	100	57.1%
Somewhat Satisfied	35	20.0
Somewhat Dissatisfied	14	8.0
Very Dissatisfied	19	10.9
Don't Know	7	4.0
TOTALS	175	100.0%

Reasons for some residents' dissatisfaction with the outcomes of their calls are displayed in Table 20. First among these is that the City did not come out when requested, while the second is that the City's response was not timely.

9  
D  
4

TABLE 20  
REASONS WHY RESIDENTS WHO CALLED WERE DISSATISFIED  
WITH THE OUTCOMES OF THEIR CALLS

Percentage of Respondents Who Were		
Reason	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
Wouldn't Come Out	50.0%	36.8%
Response Not Timely	21.4	10.5
Hard Time Getting Through	14.3	10.5
Called Many Times before		10.5
Rude/Bad Attitude		10.5
Didn't Come Out As Told		10.5
Billing Problems Not Resolved		5.3
Other	21.4	5.3

Almost half of the City's residents believe that the City is doing a good job of collecting their garden refuse, as shown in Table 21, and another somewhat over a third believe the City is doing an excellent job. When these two figures are summed, they indicate an approval rating of 84.3 percent.

TABLE 21  
GENERAL ASSESSMENT OF THE JOB THE CITY IS DOING IN  
PICK-UP RESIDENTS' GARDEN REFUSE

Assessment	Frequency	Percent
Excellent	413	35.8%
Good	559	48.5
Fair	127	11.0
Poor	45	3.9
Don't Know	9	0.8
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>1,153</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

9  
7  
4

Responses with respect to the City's street-sweeping services were somewhat less positive, as Table 22 indicates. In this instance, somewhat over a third find the job the City is doing to be good and approximately a fifth find it to be excellent. The sum of these two figures, 55.3 percent, represents a majority, but not a strong one. "Fair" and "poor" responses to this question, on the other hand, represent well over a third of residents (37.5 percent).

TABLE 22  
GENERAL ASSESSMENT OF THE JOB THE CITY IS DOING IN  
SWEEPING THE STREETS NEAR RESIDENTS' HOMES

Assessment	Frequency	Percent
Excellent	220	19.1%
Good	417	36.2
Fair	245	21.2
Poor	188	16.3
Don't Know	83	7.2
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>1,153</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Somewhat over four-fifths of responding residents have curb-and-gutter garden refuse collection service, as shown in Table 23. Of these, only twelve percent would be willing to pay more for twice-monthly street-sweeping service, as Table 24 indicates.

9  
7  
4

TABLE 23  
TYPE OF GARDEN REFUSE PICK-UP SERVICE  
RECEIVED BY RESPONDENTS

Service Type	Frequency	Percent
Curb-and-Gutter	955	82.8%
Container	186	16.1
Don't Know	11	1.0
No Response	1	0.1
TOTALS	1,153	100.0%

TABLE 24  
EXTENT TO WHICH CURB-AND-GUTTER SERVICE RECIPIENTS WOULD PAY MORE  
FOR TWICE-MONTHLY STREET SWEEPING

Response	Frequency	Percentage of Those With This Service
Would Pay More	116	12.1%
Would Not Pay More	759	79.5
It Depends	39	4.1
Don't Know	41	4.3
TOTALS	955	100.0%

The additional amounts those willing to pay for twice-monthly service would be willing to pay are displayed in Table 25. Although the range of these responses is substantial, from twenty-five cents to 15 dollars per month, by far the majority lie between 50 cents and two dollars. It may also be worth

noting that the most frequent answer to this question was "Don't Know."

4  
2  
4

TABLE 25  
ADDITIONAL AMOUNT WILLING RESIDENTS WOULD PAY MONTHLY  
FOR TWICE-MONTHLY SWEEPING

Amount	Frequency	Percentage of Those Who Would Pay More
\$ 0.25	2	1.3%
0.44	1	0.6
0.50	21	13.5
1.00	38	24.5
1.10	1	0.6
1.50	4	2.6
2.00	22	14.2
2.50	2	1.3
3.00	8	5.2
4.00	2	1.3
5.00	8	5.2
6.00	1	0.6
8.00	1	0.6
10.00	1	0.6
15.00	1	0.6
Don't Know	42	27.1
TOTALS	165	100.0

Responses to the question concerning sweeping of the streets four times per month, a question that was asked only of those possibly willing to pay for twice-monthly sweeping, are portrayed in Table 26. Slightly less than a quarter of those who responded to this question, or only 4.9 percent of all residents with curb-and-gutter service, answered in the affirmative.

474

TABLE 26

EXTENT TO WHICH CURB-AND-GUTTER SERVICE RECIPIENTS  
WHO MIGHT PAY MORE FOR TWICE-WEEKLY STREET SWEEPING  
WOULD PAY MORE FOR SWEEPING FOUR TIMES A MONTH

Value Label	Frequency	Percentage of All Curb-and-Gutter Service Recipients	Percentage of Those Who Might Pay More for Twice- Monthly Sweeping
Would Pay More	47	4.9%	24.0%
Would Not Pay More	103	10.8	52.6
It Depends	7	0.7	3.6
Don't Know	37	3.9	18.9
No Response	2	0.2	
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>20.5%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

When asked what they might be willing to pay to have the streets swept four times a month, those who were interested in this service again gave a substantial range of responses, as Table 27 indicates. Beyond "Don't Know," however, the most frequent answer was two dollars per month, with other answers falling almost evenly along the entire response continuum.

9  
24

TABLE 27  
 ADDITIONAL AMOUNT WILLING RESIDENTS WOULD PAY FOR  
 STREET SWEEPING FOUR TIMES A MONTH

Amount	Frequency	Percentage of Those Who would Pay More
\$ 0.50	4	7.4%
0.75	1	1.9
1.00	2	3.7
1.50	3	5.6
2.00	13	24.1
3.00	4	7.4
4.00	6	11.1
4.50	1	1.9
5.00	3	5.6
10.00	1	1.9
15.00	1	1.9
17.50	1	1.9
Don't Know	14	25.9
<b>TOTALS</b>		<b>100.0%</b>

Insofar as posting no-parking signs for the times when the streets are to be swept is concerned, residents are less than enthusiastic, as Table 28 suggests. Less than half (40.0 percent) would strongly favor or favor this measure, and close to half (47.6 percent) would strongly oppose or oppose it.

24

TABLE 28  
RESIDENTS' REACTIONS TO THE POSTING OF  
NO-PARKING SIGNS FOR STREET-SWEEPING DAYS

Reaction	Frequency	Percentage of Those With Curb-and-and Gutter Service
Strongly Oppose	163	17.1%
Oppose	291	30.5
Favor	239	25.0
Strongly Favor	143	15.0
Don't Know	118	12.4
No Response	1	0.1
TOTAL	1,153	100.0%

Finally, the importance of sweeping the streets the same day as the garden refuse is picked up appears to be fairly minimal, as Table 29 indicates. For over a quarter of residents this would be not at all important and for a third it would be not too important. These "not important" reactions, when summed, represent close to two-thirds (62.2 percent) of all residents.

19  
D  
4

TABLE 29  
IMPORTANCE OF SWEEPING THE STREETS THE SAME DAY AS THE  
GARDEN REFUSE IS PICKED UP

Response	Frequency	Percentage of Those with Curb-and-Gutter Service
Not At all Important	274	28.7%
Not Too Important	320	33.5
Somewhat Important	156	16.3
Very Important	159	16.6
Don't Know	45	4.7
No Response	1	0.1
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1153</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Responses by City Council District

In order to determine whether residents' perceptions of their garden refuse pick-up and street-sweeping services differed by City Council District, responses were cross-tabulated by District for thirteen questions: general satisfaction with the garden refuse pick-up service; general satisfaction with the street-sweeping service; the degree to which the garden refuse collectors leave a mess; the extent to which residents called when their garden refuse was not picked up; the extent to which the City returned to pick up the refuse upon receiving a call; evaluations of the garden refuse trucks' appearance; satisfaction with the outcomes of calls to the garden refuse pick-up service; assessments of the job the City is doing in picking up residents' garden refuse; assessments of the job the City is doing in sweeping the streets near residents' homes; willingness to pay for twice-monthly street-sweeping service; willingness to pay for street sweeping four times a month; reactions to the posting of

9  
2  
4

no-parking signs for the times when the streets are swept; and the importance of same-day street sweeping. These data were then analyzed using the chi-square statistic ( $x^2$ ) to test for significant differences among the Districts.

Of all the questions analyzed in this manner, only three displayed statistically significant differences among Council Districts: general satisfaction with the garden refuse pick-up service; general satisfaction with the street-sweeping service; and assessments of the job the City is doing in picking up residents' garden refuse. Moreover, few of even these differences appear to be of much practical importance - i.e., most of the differences are not particularly pronounced. Finally, it should be noted that the analyses are based on the fairly small numbers that result when 1,153 residents are divided among eight Council Districts, ZIP codes shared by more than one Council member, and "Don't Know/No Response." Accordingly, it would be appropriate to treat these data with caution.

That having been said, there are in fact differences among respondents' perceptions by Council District. The pertinent data are displayed in Table 30 (general satisfaction with the garden-refuse pick-up service), Table 31 (general satisfaction with the street-sweeping service), and Table 32 (assessments of the job the City is doing in collecting residents' garden refuse).

Responses concerning satisfaction with the garden refuse indicate that residents of Ms. Mueller's and Mr. Pope's districts were the most likely to be "very satisfied," while residents of Ms. Ferris' and Mr. Kastanis' districts were the least likely to be "very satisfied." Insofar as satisfaction with the street-sweeping service is concerned, residents seem to be approximately equally likely to be "very satisfied" across district with the exception the those in Ms. Ferris', Mr. Shore's, and Mr. Serna's districts, who were somewhat less likely to be very satisfied.

9  
2  
4

TABLE 30

EXTENT TO WHICH RESIDENTS ARE SATISFIED  
WITH THEIR GARDEN REFUSE PICK-UP SERVICE  
BY CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT

Response	Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Dis-Satisfied	Very Dis-Satisfied	Don't Know	Totals
1. Shore	57.1%	30.3%	5.0%	4.2%	3.4%	100.0%
2. Farris	47.4	37.0	7.1	7.1	1.3	100.0
3. Pope	67.9	20.2	8.3	3.7	-	100.0
4. Chinn	62.6	24.2	12.1	1.1	-	100.0
5. Serna	65.0	26.7	8.3	-	-	100.0
6. Mueller	69.1	22.3	4.3	4.3	-	100.0
7. Kastanis	52.2	29.0	13.0	5.8	-	100.0
8. Robie	64.9	25.8	6.2	3.1	-	100.0
Shared Areas	61.2	29.3	4.6	3.7	1.1	100.0

TABLE 31

EXTENT TO WHICH RESIDENTS ARE SATISFIED WITH THE  
STREET-SWEEPING SERVICE NEAR THEIR HOMES BY  
CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT

Response	Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Dis-Satisfied	Very Dis-Satisfied	Don't Know	Totals
1. Shore	26.9%	31.9%	11.8%	16.0%	13.4	100.0%
2. Farris	19.5	30.5	9.7	15.6	24.7	100.0
3. Pope	38.5	30.3	7.3	11.0	12.8	100.0
6. Chinn	37.4	31.9	13.2	8.8	8.8	100.0
5. Serna	28.3	31.7	5.0	15.0	20.0	100.0
6. Mueller	36.2	34.0	13.8	5.3	10.6	100.0
7. Kastanis	39.1	27.5	11.6	7.2	14.5	100.0
8. Robie	36.1	35.1	13.4	7.2	8.2	100.0
Shared Areas	36.8	33.6	11.5	9.5	8.6	100.0

9  
D  
4

With respect to assessments of the job the city is doing in picking up residents; garden refuse, response were somewhat more varied across districts. Resident of Mr. Chinn's and Ms. Mueller's districts were the most likely to give "excellent" ratings, however, while those in Ms. Ferris' and Mr. Serna's districts were the least likely to do so.

TABLE 32  
GENERAL ASSESSMENT OF THE JOB THE CITY IS  
DOING IN PICKING UP  
RESIDENTS' GARDEN REFUSE

Response	Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Dis-Satisfied	Very Dis-Satisfied	Don't Know	Totals
1. Shore	35.0%	44.2%	16.7%	2.5%	1.7%	100.0%
2. Farris	21.4	55.2	14.3	8.4	0.6	100.0
3. Pope	34.9	49.5	9.2	5.5	0.9	100.0
Chinn	46.2	46.2	5.5	1.1	1.1	100.0
Serna	25.0	60.0	10.0	5.0	-	100.0
Mueller	43.6	42.6	12.8	-	-	100.0
7. Kastanis	34.8	50.7	11.6	2.9	-	100.0
8. Robie	42.3	45.4	5.2	6.2	1.0	100.0
Shared Areas	37.9	48.3	10.1	3.2	0.6	100.0

4

#### IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The vast majority of Sacramento City residents are satisfied with their residential garden refuse pick-up service, and most are also satisfied with the street-sweeping service near their homes. When the two services are compared, however, it is apparent that the garden refuse service is substantially more satisfactory than the street sweeping service.

Dissatisfaction with the street-sweeping service, to the extent it is present, appears to derive from two primary sources: the belief that the streets are not swept well enough, and the perception that they are not swept often enough. Residents' third most prevalent concern, that they rarely or never see the street-sweepers, is in all probability related to the opinion that street-sweeping is too infrequent.

Given these responses, it seems logical to conclude that more frequent sweeping would be welcome. Yet however welcome this apparent solution might be, the vast majority of residents are not willing to pay for any additional service. Given budget constraints, then, increased sweeping frequency would appear to be impossible. To the extent that the City can improve the quality of the street-sweeping absent increases in quantity, however, satisfaction can be expected to increase.

Perhaps curiously given the above considerations, residents were at best lukewarm in their reactions to two proposals that presumably would improve the quality of the street sweeping: posting no-parking signs for days on which the streets are to be swept; and sweeping on the same day as the garden refuse is collected. At least in the public's mind, these strategies

apparently either do not represent solutions to the problem (presumably, in the case of same-day sweeping) or represent

unacceptable solutions (presumably, in the case of no parking signs.)

The fact remains, however, that the City's street-sweeping activities are less than fully acceptable to more residents than the municipality might wish. One is forced to conclude, albeit with some hesitation as the question was not directly asked, that the public believes solutions other than those offered are either available or possible. If such solutions actually exist and are within the City's financial reach, they merit serious investigation.

Insofar as the garden refuse pick-up service is concerned, dissatisfaction is markedly less, as indicated earlier. It may be worth noting, however, that approximately one in ten residents is either very or somewhat dissatisfied with this service. Although this level of dissatisfaction is scarcely a cause for major concern, it does appear to merit some attention.

By far the most prevalent issue in this regard is residents' opinion that the garden refuse collectors leave a mess. Over all possible response categories relative to level of satisfaction, thirteen percent of residents, or somewhat more than one in eight, volunteered messy collections as being problematic. Moreover, approximately two-fifths of residents responded to a direct question by saying that the garden refuse collectors sometimes or usually leave a mess. Again, to the degree that the City can improve the quality of this service absent increased revenues, satisfaction should increase.

Another problem with respect to garden refuse pick-up concerns missed pick-ups and the City's response to these failures. Approximately one in eight households have experienced garden refuse pick-up failures, and over ninety percent of these have had such an experience in the past year. Although these missed

D  
4

pick-ups may be the fault of residents due to such things as parked cars or unacceptable refuse (and it should be noted that most residents simply do not know why they were missed), the perception of failure on the part of the City cannot be ignored.

To the extent that residents are at fault, the City might wish to consider a public information campaign relative to this service and the manner in which residents can make certain that they routinely enjoy its benefits. If the City is in fact missing garden refuse through no fault of those paying the bill, however, the situation deserves more immediate and concerted attention.

A second and perhaps even more critical aspect of this problem is the perception that the City does not necessarily respond to calls when garden refuse is missed. Among all of those whose garden refuse was missed and who called to ask that it be picked up, a full quarter said the City did not come out to do so.

Although the numbers here are admittedly small because less than half of those who were missed placed a call, across the entire population of the City they represent a substantial number of households. Further, in an era in which public sector credibility is at a perhaps less than optimal level, responsiveness on the part of municipal services would appear to be essential.

It should also be noted in this regard, on the other hand, that by far the majority of residents were satisfied with the outcomes of their calls when they did call the garden refuse pick-up service for whatever reason (a missed pick-up among many). Although identifying the source of this apparent disparity in responses call for some speculation, the answers suggest that residents are being well-treated over the telephone and that the problem lies primarily in follow-through. This speculation is to some extent supported by responses concerning reasons for

9  
2  
4

residents' dissatisfaction with the outcomes of their calls, among which the unwillingness or failure to come out clearly predominates noticeably.

In sum, residents of the City of Sacramento are clearly satisfied with their garden refuse pick-up service, but somewhat less than fully satisfied with their street-sweeping service. Improvements would definitely appear to be in order with respect to the latter - but at no additional cost and without no-parking signs. If changes in schedules would actually lead to improvements, they would undoubtedly be welcomed, yet most residents appear not to believe that they would have a positive impact. The actual alternatives are beyond the knowledge of a research firm, but any options would seem to merit serious attention.

Garden refuse pick-up fares considerably better in the public's eye than street sweeping, yet improvements or changes are probably in order here as well. The source of messes would appear to warrant investigation, with appropriate remedies being instituted depending on the cause (and to the extent possible given financial limitations). Pick-up failures seem to be somewhat excessive, as do failures to follow through when the original failures are reported. Both of these areas should benefit from further study to identify causes and possible solutions.

Responses with respect to assessments of the job the City is doing also follow an exceedingly similar pattern across Districts, although the pattern differs from that of the previous two questions. In this case, residents of Mr. Chin's and Ms. Mueller's districts give the most "excellent" evaluations, while those in Ms. Ferris' and Mr. Serna's districts give the fewest "excellent" evaluations. Again, residents of the other members' districts fall between these extremes, which are somewhat more pronounced than those concerning satisfaction.

9  
2  
4

APPENDIX  
Survey Instrument

4  
R  
C

CITY OF SACRAMENTO, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS  
STREET DIVISION  
RESIDENTIAL GARDEN REFUSE PICK-UP  
CUSTOMER SATISFACTION SURVEY

ID #  
CODES ONLY

INTERVIEW

1. In general, how satisfied are you with your garden refuse pick-up service? Would you say that you are ...

- 4 = very satisfied
- 3 = somewhat satisfied
- 2 = somewhat dissatisfied
- or 1 = very dissatisfied?
- 9 = DON'T KNOW/NO OPINION

2. And why would you say that you are \_\_\_\_\_?  
(PROBE FOR SPECIFICS. PROBE FOR OTHER REASONS. RECORD VERBATIM. DO NOT CODE.)

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

3. Also in general, how satisfied are you with the street-sweeping service near your home? Would you say that you are...

- 4 = very satisfied
- 3 = somewhat satisfied
- 2 = somewhat dissatisfied
- or 1 = very dissatisfied
- 9 = DON'T KNOW/NO OPINION

4. And why would you say that you are \_\_\_\_\_?  
(PROBE FOR SPECIFICS. PROBE FOR OTHER REASONS. RECORD VERBATIM. DO NOT CODE.)

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

4

5. Has the City ever failed to pick up your garden refuse on your regular collection day?

- 1 = YES (CONTINUE)
- 2 = NO (SKIP TO Q #10)
- 9 = DON'T KNOW (SKIP TO Q #10)

IF YES, ASK:

6. About how many times has your garden refuse not been picked up in the past year? \_\_\_\_\_

- 1 = ONCE
- 2 = TWICE
- 3 = THREE TIMES
- 4 = FOUR OR MORE TIMES
- 5 = NOT IN PAST YEAR

7. Thinking about the most recent time the City failed to pick up your garden refuse... do you remember what the reason was? (PROBE FOR SPECIFICS. RECORD VERBATIM. DO NOT CODE EXCEPT DON'T KNOW, REFUSED, OR SKIPPED.)

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

8. When your garden refuse was not picked up on your regular collection day, did you call the City and ask them to pick it up?

- 1 = YES (CONTINUE)
- 2 = NO (SKIP TO Q #10)
- 9 = DON'T RECALL (SKIP TO Q #10)

IF CALLED, ASK:

9. Did they come to pick it up when they said they would?

- 1 = YES
- 2 = NO
- 9 = DON'T KNOW

10. (And) do the people who pick up your garden refuse...

- (or)  1 = usually
- 2 = sometimes leave a mess?
- 3 = rarely
- (or)  4 = never
- 9 = DON'T KNOW/NO OPINION

11. How would you evaluate the appearance of the trucks that pick up the garden refuse? Would you say that they have ...

4 = an excellent appearance

3 = a good appearance

2 = a fair appearance

or 1 = a poor appearance?

8 = WHO CARES/THEY LOOK LIKE REFUSE TRUCKS

9 = NO OPINION

12. Have you or has anyone else in your household ever called the City's garden refuse pick-up service on the phone?

1 = YES (CONTINUE)

2 = NO (SKIP TO Q #15)

9 = DON'T KNOW/RECALL (SKIP TO Q #15)

IF YES, ASK:

13. How satisfied were you with the outcome of your call? Were you...

4 = Very satisfied (SKIP TO Q #15)

3 = Somewhat satisfied (SKIP TO Q #15)

2 = Somewhat dissatisfied (CONTINUE)

1 = Very dissatisfied (CONTINUE)

9 = DON'T KNOW (SKIP TO Q #15)

IF VERY OR SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED:

14. And why were you (very) (somewhat) dissatisfied? (PROBE FOR SPECIFICS. PROBE FOR OTHER REASONS. RECORD VERBATIM. DO NOT CODE.)

---

---

---

15. In general, would you say that the City is doing an excellent, good, fair, or poor job of picking up residents' garden refuse?

4 = EXCELLENT

3 = GOOD

2 = FAIR

1 = POOR

9 = DON'T KNOW/NO OPINION

16. Also in general, would you say that the City is doing an excellent, good, fair, or poor job of sweeping the streets near your home?

- 4 = EXCELLENT
- 3 = GOOD
- 2 = FAIR
- 1 = POOR
- 9 = DON'T KNOW/NO OPINION

17. Do you have curb-and-gutter garden refuse pick-up service - that is, can you put your garden refuse in the gutter loose - or do you have to put your garden refuse in some sort of container? (Which of these types of service do you have?)

- 1 = CURB-AND-GUTTER (CONTINUE)
- 2 = CONTAINER (SKIP TO INTRODUCTION TO Q #24)
- 9 = DON'T KNOW (SKIP TO INTRODUCTION TO Q #24)

IF CURB-AND-GUTTER, ASK:

18. At present, the City sweeps the streets near your home once a month. Would you be interested in paying more every month in order to have the streets swept twice a month?

- 1 = YES (CONTINUE)
- 2 = NO (SKIP TO Q #22)
- 3 = IT DEPENDS (CONTINUE)
- 9 = DON'T KNOW (SKIP TO Q #20)

IF YES OR IT DEPENDS, ASK:

19. (Well,) about how much more per month would you be willing to pay for this service? \$\_\_\_\_\_

20. (And) would you be interested in paying more every month in order to have the streets swept four times a month?

- 1 = YES (CONTINUE)
- 2 = NO (SKIPS TO Q #22)
- 3 = IT DEPENDS (CONTINUE)
- 9 = DON'T KNOW (SKIP TO Q #22)

IF YES OR IT DEPENDS, ASK:

21. (Well,) (And) about how much more per month would you be willing to pay for this service? \$\_\_\_\_\_

2  
4

22. Also at present, the City does not post signs that prohibit parking on the street during the time it is being swept. How would you feel if the City posted such signs, recognizing both that parking would be prohibited on only one side of the street at a time, and that those who parked on that side when it was prohibited would be subject to fines? Would you strongly favor, favor, oppose, or strongly oppose the posting of such signs?

- 4 = STRONGLY FAVOR
- 3 = FAVOR
- 2 = OPPOSE
- 1 = STRONGLY OPPOSE
- 9 = DON'T KNOW/NO OPINION

23. Finally, the City currently sweeps the streets near your home the day after the garden refuse is picked up. How important would it be to you to have the streets swept the same day the garden refuse is picked up? Would you say that it would be...

- 4 = very important to you
- 3 = somewhat important to you
- 2 = not too important to you
- or 1 = not at all important to you
- 9 = DON'T KNOW/NO OPINION

Now in order to classify your responses along with others, I need to ask a few questions about you ...

24. First, what is your ZIP Code? \_\_\_\_\_

25. And what is your age? \_\_\_\_\_

26. We would also like to know your racial or ethnic background. Are you Caucasian, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian, Filipino, or some other ethnicity?

- 1 = CAUCASIAN/WHITE
- 2 = BLACK
- 3 = HISPANIC
- 4 = ASIAN
- 5 = AMERICAN INDIAN
- 6 = FILIPINO
- 8 = OTHER: \_\_\_\_\_

4

27. What was the approximate total annual income for all members of your household before taxes in 1988... Was it \$30,000 or more, or was it less than \$30,000?

IF LESS THAN \$30,000, ASK:

IF \$30,000 OR MORE, ASK:

a. Was it under or over \$15,000?

b. Was it under or over \$45,000?

1 = UNDER \$15,000

3 = \$30,000 - \$44,999

2 = \$15,000 - \$29,999

4 = \$45,000 OR MORE

28. RECORD RESPONDENT'S SEX:

1 = MALE 2 = FEMALE

29. RECORD CALL ATTEMPT: \_\_\_\_\_

30. INTERVIEWER NUMBER: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

THANK RESPONDENT

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

TIME: \_\_\_\_\_

INITIALS: \_\_\_\_\_