



people's panel



People's Panel Survey Report Summary

Auckland Council Waste Management and Minimisation Plan and Solid Waste Bylaw Review

Date 06/07/2011

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| Draft Report..... | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| Table of Contents..... | 2 |
| 1 Introduction | 3 |
| 1.1 Survey background and objectives..... | 3 |
| 1.2 About the People’s Panel | 3 |
| 2 Methodology..... | 4 |
| 2.1 People’s Panel online survey..... | 4 |
| 3 Findings | 5 |
| 3.1 Household waste disposal – current behaviours | 5 |
| 3.1.1 Kerbside recycling collections | 5 |
| 3.1.2 Inorganic collections..... | 5 |
| 3.1.3 Garden waste | 6 |
| 3.1.4 Organic waste..... | 7 |
| 3.2 Attitudes towards collection approaches | 8 |
| 3.2.1 Wheelie bins vs. bags | 8 |
| 3.2.2 Organic collections | 10 |
| 3.2.3 Frequency of organic collection | 12 |
| 3.3 Attitudes towards funding of household waste collections | 13 |
| 3.3.1 Funding of waste collections | 13 |
| 3.4 Attitudes towards other waste-related issues..... | 15 |
| 3.4.1 Illegal dumping | 15 |
| 3.4.2 Abandoned supermarket trolleys..... | 17 |
| 3.4.3 Junk mail..... | 17 |
| 3.4.4 Litter | 18 |
| 3.4.5 Small deposit on recyclable containers..... | 19 |
| 3.4.6 Illegal dumping of tyres..... | 20 |
| 3.4.7 Additional comments..... | 21 |
| Appendix I Questionnaire..... | 22 |
| Appendix II Respondent profile | 31 |

1 Introduction

1.1 Survey background and objectives

Auckland Council has inherited the waste management plans from the seven former territorial local authorities in the region. Different practices and systems are operating in different parts of the city. At present there are different contractor arrangements offering some roles and responsibilities, differing methods of charging households and businesses and various methods of sorting, recycling and re-using waste materials. The inherited plans are operative until Auckland Council adopts a new waste management and minimisation plan (WMMP).

Auckland Council is required by law to have a single waste management and minimisation plan (WMMP) and a solid waste bylaw finalised and adopted by July 2012. The new WMMP must conform to the objectives and requirements laid down in the Waste Minimisation Act 2008 and have regard for the New Zealand Waste Strategy 2010.

In March 2010, three options for the approach council should take with its work on development of the WMMP were presented, with the third option being the preferred option: to continue with the present approach and also establish new systems to collect and recycle garden and food wastes, which make up 40-50% of the household waste stream. Option three has two important implications. Firstly, it allows the council to assume operational control or influence over the refuse transfer station network. Secondly, this means that the collection and disposal of commercial and industrial waste will come under council control.

There are three stages in the implementation process of the WMMP. Stakeholder and public participation will be encouraged through stages two and three:

Stage 1: Operational strategy and overarching approach

Stage 2: Pre-Statutory communications and consultation phase

Stage 3: Statutory communications and consultation phase.

This report presents the results of consultation with the public carried out as part of Stage 2, specifically the People's Panel survey.

The overall objective of this survey was to obtain feedback from the People's Panel. It was also intended that the feedback obtained will provide guidance on public sentiment during the early stages of writing the draft plan.

1.2 About the People's Panel

The People's Panel aims to provide a representative sample of the Auckland resident population who are encouraged to get involved with a range of council issues, giving feedback by regularly completing online surveys and getting involved with focus groups and other activities as needed.

The panel ideally supplements other research, consultation and engagement activities used to provide public perceptions to help inform decision-making processes. Panellists are recruited to be 'typical' members of the public – that is, they include members of the public who come from a range of backgrounds and a range of levels of involvement with the council.

At the time of surveying, there were approximately 5,500 people registered with the panel, with representation from residents of each local board area, and by age group and ethnicity. However, the People's Panel is not yet representative of Auckland and further recruitment is under way to improve participation levels from particular areas, age groups and ethnicities.

For more information about the People's Panel visit: www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/peoplespanel

2 Overall methodology

In order to understand the views and attitudes of residents across the wider Auckland region and to understand the views of specific groups, a mixed method approach was utilised comprising an online survey, focus groups and in-depth interviews. An online survey was sent to randomly selected general residents across the Auckland region, and to all members of Auckland Council's People's Panel. This report delivers the results of the People's Panel online survey only.

2.1 People's Panel online survey

The survey was sent out to 5562 People's Panel members and had 1914 responses, giving a margin of error of +/- 1.81%. The survey was live between 20 May 2011 and 2 June 2011, and one reminder was sent to boost the response rate. The average time taken to complete the survey was 15 minutes.

It should be noted that participation in People's Panel surveys are voluntary. As such, the demographic and geographic distribution of panellists responding to this survey does not reflect the general population of Auckland. For this reason, results should not be considered strictly representative. We do, however, emphasise the value of the feedback presented in this report from a larger scale consultation and engagement perspective.

For a full breakdown of respondent demographics, please see Appendix II.

Please note: a fully demographically representative survey (i.e. an online survey that was sent to randomly selected general residents across the Auckland region) on this issue was also conducted and is presented as a separate document.

Please note that results may not sum to 100% due to rounding in tables presented in this report.

3 Findings

3.1 Household waste disposal – current behaviours

Panellists were asked first about their current waste disposal behaviours.

Current behaviours – summary of key findings

- **94%** of panellists **use Council’s kerbside recycling service** on a regular basis
- **88%** are **aware or extremely aware** of what can be **put into their recycling collection service**
- **61%** of panellists **have used Council’s inorganic collection service** in the last 18 months
- **35%** of panellists **have a garden bin, bag or both** that is collected by an independent organisation
- Of those who don’t have a garden bin/bag (65%) – **59%** said that they **compost their garden waste**

3.1.1 Kerbside recycling collections

Most panellists (94%) said that they regularly use Council’s kerbside recycling service. Half said they are extremely aware and a further 38% said they are aware of what can be put into their recycling collection service. Only 2% of panellists said they are not aware of what to put into their recycling collection service.

| Do you regularly use Council’s kerbside recycling service? | People’s Panel N=1914 % |
|--|-------------------------------|
| Yes | 94 |
| No | 3 |
| No kerbside recycling service in the area | 3 |

Base: People’s Panellists responding to WMMP survey

| How aware are you of what can be put into your recycling collection service? | People’s Panel N=1914 % |
|--|-------------------------------|
| 1 Not at all aware | 0 |
| 2 | 2 |
| 3 | 9 |
| 4 | 38 |
| 5 Extremely aware | 50 |
| Not applicable | 1 |

Base: People’s Panellists responding to WMMP survey

3.1.2 Inorganic collections

Just under two-thirds (61%) of panellists have used Council’s inorganic collection service in the last 18 months.

| Have you used Council’s inorganic collection service in the last 18 months? | People’s Panel N=1914 % |
|---|-------------------------------|
| Yes | 61 |
| No | 20 |
| No inorganic collection in the area | 17 |
| Unsure | 2 |

Base: People’s Panellists responding to WMMP survey

3.1.3 Garden waste

Thirty five percent (35%) of panellists have a garden bin and/or bag that they pay to have collected by a private contractor, with 70% having that bin or bag collected on a monthly basis.

| Do you currently have a garden waste bin or bag? | People's Panel N=1914 % |
|--|-------------------------------|
| Yes – garden bin | 23 |
| Yes – garden bag | 10 |
| Yes – bin and bag | 2 |
| No | 65 |
| Unsure | 0 |

Base: People's Panellists responding to WMMP survey

| How frequently is your garden waste collected? | People's Panel N=667 % |
|--|------------------------------|
| Weekly | 3 |
| Fortnightly | 5 |
| Monthly | 70 |
| Once a year | 1 |
| Other | 16 |
| Unsure | 4 |

Base: People's Panellists responding to WMMP survey

The annual cost of garden waste collections varied but almost half of panellists (45%) paid \$90 or more per year.

| How much does your garden waste collection cost you each year? | People's Panel N=667 % |
|--|------------------------------|
| Under \$10 | 2 |
| Between \$10 and \$29 | 4 |
| Between \$30 and \$49 | 5 |
| Between \$50 and \$69 | 14 |
| Between \$70 and \$89 | 13 |
| \$90 or more per year | 45 |
| I am not sure | 16 |

Base: People's Panellists responding to WMMP survey

Of those that have no garden bin or bag (65% of panellists), over half (59%) said that they compost their garden waste. Seventeen percent put their garden waste into their normal household waste bin or bag.

| What do you currently do with your garden waste (if no garden bag or bin)? You may select more than one answer here.* | People's Panel N=1247 % |
|--|-------------------------------|
| I don't have any garden waste/I don't have a garden | 9 |
| I have a gardener/gardening company that disposes of it for me | 6 |
| I put it in my normal rubbish bin or bag | 17 |
| I leave it in the garden/I don't do any gardening | 13 |
| I compost my garden waste | 59 |
| Other | 7 |

Base: People's Panellists who do not have a garden bag or bin

*Please note as this question was a multiple response question so percentages don't add to 100%

3.1.4 Organic waste

Forty-six percent of all panellists said they compost over half their organic waste (food and garden waste) at home, while a third do not compost any organic waste.

| How much, if any, of your organic waste (food and garden waste) do you compost at home? | People's Panel N=1914 % |
|---|-------------------------------|
| I have no organic waste at home | 4 |
| None of it | 33 |
| Less than 50% | 17 |
| More than 50%, but not all of it | 23 |
| All of it | 23 |
| I am not sure | 1 |

Base: People's Panellists responding to WMMP survey

Just under half (46%) have a waste disposal unit, and of these 58% said they regularly use it.

| Do you have a kitchen waste disposal unit or insinkerator? | People's Panel N=1914 % |
|--|-------------------------------|
| Yes | 46 |
| No | 54 |

Base: People's Panellists responding to WMMP survey

| Do you <u>regularly</u> use your kitchen waste disposal unit or insinkerator to dispose of your food waste? | People's Panel N=874 % |
|---|------------------------------|
| Yes | 58 |
| No | 41 |
| I am not sure | 0 |

Base: People's Panellists who have a kitchen waste disposal unit or insinkerator

3.2 Attitudes towards collection approaches

Introduction

Panellists were informed that the Council is in the process of developing a Waste Management and Minimisation Plan and that the Council was interested in their views about what a new waste management and minimisation approach should be like. Panellists were asked a series of questions about their preferences around the collection of household waste for the future.

Attitudes towards collection approaches – summary of key findings

- **70%** of panellists prefer a **wheelie bin** for general household waste, **17%** prefer **bags**
- **Bins** preferred because: **cleaner and more secure, easier to handle, easier to store, limits the amount of household waste**
- **Bags** preferred because: **convenient for those with little or lots of waste, easier to transport if living a distance from the collection point, user pays, limits amount of household waste**
- **57%** of panellists would be **interested** in an **separate organic collection** for food and garden waste
- **39%** of panellists would preferred a **weekly** organic collection if it were to be introduced, **23% fortnightly** and **21%** did not want any separate organic collection

3.2.1 Wheelie bins vs. bags

Panellists were asked whether they would prefer a wheelie bin or a bag for their general household rubbish. They were advised to disregard any cost implications in their answer as both methods could be funded either through rates or by user pays.

Most people said that they would prefer a wheelie bin (70%) while considerably fewer (17%) specifically said that they would prefer a bag.

| Would you prefer to use a wheelie bin or bag(s) for your general household rubbish/waste? (Not recycling) | People's Panel N=1914 % |
|---|-------------------------------|
| A wheelie bin | 70 |
| Bag(s) | 17 |
| I don't mind either a bin or bag(s) | 10 |
| I am not sure | 2 |

Base: People's Panellists responding to WMMP survey

There were six key themes evident among those who said they would **prefer a bin**:

Bins are considered to be cleaner and more secure than bags

- Bags can rip and contents can spill out once the bags are out on the road
- Animals can rip bags – and again the contents can spill out over the road
- Bins smell less than bags – there is a perception that once the lid is closed, the rubbish is less likely to smell than if left in a bag

Bins are more convenient to transport than bags

- It is easier to wheel a bin than to carry a bag (even if the bin weighs more than each bag)
- One bin means you only have to make one trip out to the kerbside – as opposed to more than one trip with bags

Bins are more tidy to store

- One bin outside of a house is preferable to more than one bag
- Bags are also considered to look messier

Bins are safer than bags

- There is no danger of sharp items causing damage either to the household or to the people collecting the rubbish

Bins limit the amount of rubbish each household can dispose of

- Bags can encourage increased waste because people can simply purchase as many as they need to

Bins are more convenient

- You don't need to remember to purchase them (i.e. households can run out of bags).

In many cases, participants mentioned a combination of the above when asked why they prefer bins. In some instances, panellists also regarded bins as more environmentally-friendly (given that most rubbish bags are plastic).

Prefer bins - selection of verbatim comments

- *"I prefer bins because the rubbish is contained and stored outside. When it is collected it stays in the bin and keeps the streets clean. Dogs can easily get into bags or they break and leave a mess."*
- *"Bin holds decent amount. Does not collapse, does not matter if it gets wet, is not attacked by animals, can be sanitised, is easy to move to kerb, does not require special holders, transporters."*
- *"Tidier and less damage from birds and dogs when bag left out overnight."*
- *"With a wheelie bin there is a restriction on the amount of waste that each household can put out, unlike the bag system, which means some households put out large numbers of bags each week. This is important to minimise landfill."*
- *"Being a rural property the flimsy plastic bags used for rubbish collection are left on the corner of our property - sometimes up to 5 days prior to the nominated collection day. Needless to say rodents and birds rip open the bags. The guys on the rubbish truck do try to pick up most of the rubbish that spills out but can't chase the wind blown rubbish or clean up thoroughly. Bins for each property would be far better."*
- *"I find the wheelie bin is really reliable and doesn't leak or smell. It's also easier to wheel it up our drive than having to carry a heavy bag. Also it is reusable - we don't have to use a new bag every time our waste gets collected."*
- *"Wheelie bins are solid therefore don't blow away; Don't have to worry about buying the right bags for rubbish collection - have more flexibility in budget about what bags to get; Hassle factor a lot less with Wheelie bins."*

The reasons for **preferring bags** varied and were sometimes based on panellists' individual household circumstances:

Easier to handle and transport

- Easier to carry a bag when there was a long or steep driveway
- Bags can be taken in the car when the collection point was a distance from the house

Better for households with small amounts of waste

- Not have enough waste to fill a bin each week

Allows more flexibility

- Can vary the number of bags used depending on amount of rubbish to be disposed of each week.

Note – panellists that were more likely to prefer bags were those who were already currently using bags.

| Prefer bags - selection of verbatim comments |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “We have a long, steep drive. A bin would not be practical as it wouldn't fit in my small car. We only put out a rubbish bag about once every two months.” • “I live in a "private road" and collection vehicles do not come down our street .It is already a hassle to get our recycling bin to kerbside but the frequency required is reasonable so the use of bags for rubbish are more convenient to transport to the kerbside pick up position.” • “As a pensioner on a steep section I am unable to handle a wheelie bin.” • “Because we do not have a large amount of waste and a wheelie bin would take to long to fill causing unwanted smell etc.” • “Bags are good, sometimes I need one other times two so I can vary the quantity. Don't need cleaning like a wheelie bin either.” • “Bins are too small, and choosing a size doesn't work out when your amount varies from 2 to 6 bags depending on the amount of trash made.” • “Cleaner, less bulky, encourages less waste because of smaller size.” |

3.2.2 Organic collections

Over half of all panellists (57%) said that they were extremely interested (41%) or interested (16%) in an organic collection for both their food and garden waste at a subsidised cost. Twenty-eight percent said that they would not be interested in a separate organic collection.

| At present your general household rubbish (the rubbish you put in bags or in your normal, non-recycling wheelie bin) goes to landfill. How interested would you be in having a separate collection for your organic waste (this includes food and garden waste that you may currently put into your normal wheelie bin or bag) at a subsidised cost? This waste would not go to landfill but would either be composted or put to some other beneficial use. This would mean you would be putting out less general household waste into your normal wheelie bin or bags (which would reduce the cost of that collection). Please use a scale from 1-5, where 1 is not at all interested in having a separate collection for your organic waste and 5 is extremely interested. | People's Panel N=1914 % |
|--|-------------------------------|
| 1 Not at all interested | 19 |
| 2 | 9 |
| 3 | 12 |
| 4 | 16 |
| 5 Extremely interested | 41 |
| Don't know/Not applicable | 3 |

Base: People's Panellists responding to WMMP survey

Reasons given for **being interested** in a separate organic collection at a subsidised cost:

Environmental concerns

- A general interest in waste minimisation and environmentally-friendly behaviours
- A wish to see organic material composted when unable/reluctant to compost themselves

Cost savings

- The opportunity to save costs overall/no longer have to pay for a garden bin.

Some people who currently compost were interested in this as an 'overflow' option.

| Interested in a separate organic collection – selection of verbatim comments |
|---|
| <p>More environmentally-friendly</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“I am very keen to be more environmentally friendly. Landfills should be a last resort.”</i> • <i>“Makes sense. We have been meaning to start composting at home for about a year, but just haven't gotten around to it. Yet... Providing a service like this for people that don't want to - or don't know how to - compost themselves sounds great.”</i> • <i>“More sustainable to have a collective organic waste management process – especially if it is composted and re used.”</i> • <i>“Less rubbish going into landfills, so less landfill sites required in the long term.”</i> • <i>“I feel terrible that we don't do a better job of composting ourselves however do not want the hassle/smell etc of composting at home as we have no real use for the compost anyway.”</i> • <i>“I have no need for compost, and I want a more environmentally friendly option rather than putting my green waste in with landfill waste.”</i> |
| <p>Save costs/general cost-related</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“Less going into landfill and more being composted. The compost can be sold as well, bring dumping costs down.”</i> • <i>“Apart from the major reason being environmental benefit, this could potentially save money, depending on the plan proposed.”</i> • <i>“I would assume the rates can be reduced as it should be a money making venture to sell the compost.”</i> • <i>“I don't like the idea of landfill. Reducing the cost of waste disposal would be welcome.”</i> • <i>“Our compost bin isn't quite big enough for all the garden waste, so in spring time when there is a lot of grass clippings or autumn when there are a lot of leaves it would be good to have the option of garden waste. Also some weeds I don't want in the compost bin. I would only use it a couple of times a year, but it is very expensive to take garden waste to the tip.”</i> • <i>“I routinely store my garden waste and periodically dispose of it in a hired mini-skip. I estimate I spend \$150-200 per year doing this. I know it costs the skip-man almost nothing to dispose of garden waste so I think there are opportunities here for the council to generate economies of scale that save me and my neighbours considerable money.”</i> • <i>“Don't have a good solution for garden waste currently. Small garden so not worth a private paid service. Will reduce temptation to put garden waste in bags.”</i> |
| <p>General</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“Would be great to follow the Christchurch model where this waste is composted and sold back to the public as compost.”</i> • <i>“I think this is a great idea because it will encourage people to sort their rubbish into compostable/non. We compost a lot but it would be nice to know we have the option.”</i> |

Reasons given for **not being interested** in a separate organic collection (28% of panellists):

Already dispose of organic waste

- Already compost or dispose of organic waste in another way (e.g. feed to hens) so no need for a separate collection

Cost

- Unwillingness to pay for another waste disposal method
- Feeling that people should be encouraged to compost themselves. Unwilling to subsidise those who do not

Too much hassle

- Too time consuming/ too much hassle to sort out organic waste for separate disposal

Unhygienic

- Concern that such a collection would be unhygienic and attract vermin.

| No interest in a separate organic collection – selection of verbatim comments (contd) | |
|---|---|
| Already composting | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“My organic waste is much too valuable to give away. All such waste is composted and recycled on the property to produce excellent vegetables and fruit.”</i> • <i>“Because I use the Bokashi system for kitchen waste and a larger compost heap for garden rubbish this question does not pertain to my systems.”</i> • <i>“I do my own compost at home and in this current difficult time I cannot afford to have it collected at any costs what so ever.”</i> |
| Unwilling to pay additional cost | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“I already pay way too much for my rates at it is - not interested in further costs for a service that I wouldn't use anyway.”</i> • <i>“I wouldn't be for paying for another service and I would dislike having to drag two bins down to the kerb.”</i> • <i>“I do not need this service as I have a compost bin. I do not agree with subsidising other people's compostable waste.”</i> • <i>“It's not worth any extra cost to have yet another collection type. Any efforts in this area should be spent on getting people to use organic waste in their own gardens to minimise overall waste that need to be collected.”</i> |
| Additional hassle | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“Too much hassle to remove organic waste. Hard to keep unpleasant odours away.”</i> • <i>“That is just too complicated and time consuming to sort...due to being a very active mother, sports person and fulltime student I don't have time to sort. I just place all rubbish regardless of what it is in to the rubbish and my recyclables into recycling.”</i> • <i>“That would mean I would have to put three wheelie bins out each week. Too much hassle plus definitely not enough room on the kerbside for all these bins.”</i> • <i>“Already too lazy to filter waste under current system. Household not taking present recycling seriously.”</i> |
| Hygiene | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“I have heard of this idea before and am concerned as to vermin and general health and hygiene of home and streets.”</i> • <i>“The smell will attract dogs and flies... plus the stench from this bin is not healthy for all concerns.”</i> |

3.2.3 Frequency of organic collection

If an organic collection were introduced, 39% of panellists said they would prefer a weekly collection, 29% preferred a fortnightly collection and 21% said that they did not want a separate inorganic collection at all.

| If an organic waste collection was introduced – how often would you want this organic waste to be collected? | People's Panel N=1914 % |
|--|-------------------------------|
| Weekly | 39 |
| Fortnightly | 23 |
| Monthly | 11 |
| Other | 6 |
| I do not want a separate inorganic collection | 21 |

Base: People's Panellists responding to WMMP survey

3.3 Attitudes towards funding of household waste collections

Survey participants were asked to give their views on how different sorts of waste collection – general household, inorganic, recycling and organic – should be funded.

3.3.1 Funding of waste collections

| Funding of waste collections – summary of key findings | |
|--|--|
| • | 54% think there should be a uniform charge for general household waste – and 41% think it should be user-pays |
| • | 80% think there should be a uniform charge for recycling collections – and 13% think it should be user-pays |
| • | 52% think there should be a uniform charge for organic collections – and 35% think it should be user-pays |
| • | 51% think there should be a uniform charge for inorganic collections – and 38% think it should be user-pays |

| How do you think household rubbish/waste collections should be funded? | People’s Panel N=1914 % | | | |
|--|-------------------------------|-----------|-------------|--------|
| | Rates funded (uniform charge) | User pays | Another way | Unsure |
| General household rubbish (not recycling) | 54 | 41 | 2 | 3 |
| Recycling collections (glass, plastic, tins etc) | 80 | 13 | 4 | 2 |
| Organic collections (food and garden waste) - if introduced | 52 | 35 | 6 | 7 |
| Inorganic collections (e.g. furniture, whiteware, TVs) | 51 | 38 | 5 | 6 |

Base: People’s Panellists responding to WMMP survey

Small percentages of people suggested **other ways of funding** waste collections. Examples included:

- Each household having a certain amount of ‘free’ collections and then all other collections charged
- More recovery centres for inorganic waste – where items can be left, removed or swapped for something else
- Charges to manufacturers e.g. because of excess packaging that needs to be disposed of.

There were three themes in terms of **preferring a uniform charge** across all types of collections:

Uniform charge is simpler and cheaper to administer

- Including the cost in the rates is easier for the individual and for the Council

A user-pays system will encourage people to look for alternative ways to dispose of their household waste

- Will encourage illegal dumping
- People will use other people’s bins to dispose of their rubbish

Waste is a community responsibility

- Charges should be shared evenly across residents, regardless of the amount of waste generated.

| Preference for waste collections to be funded by a uniform charge – selection of verbatim comments |
|---|
| <p>Perceived difficulties of charging/hassles with payment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“It just makes it simpler for everyone, one charge to include all of the above.”</i> • <i>“While a user pays would probably be cheaper for my household as we don't have a lot of waste, I prefer a rates funded charge as it is much simpler.”</i> |
| <p>Discourage dumping and other inappropriate behaviours</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“I think that a user pays system could lead to people avoiding the charge by dumping or using another person's facility.”</i> • <i>“User pays will result in all rubbish going to the cheapest option, not taking the responsible option.”</i> • <i>“It would provide simplification in my own life - which is already crazy busy. Plus it would mean we don't get pockets of the community getting creative in their rubbish disposal because they don't want to fork out their money to have it collected properly.”</i> |
| <p>Collective responsibility/fairer overall</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“I chose uniform charge because recycling & reducing pollution needs to be encouraged and it is a community issue -if it is user pays then many people may not participate fully.”</i> • <i>“Though I put out little rubbish of any sort in comparison with some other families, I see myself as part of a community and am prepared to share expenses to support larger families who may not be able to afford a user pays system.”</i> |

There were two main themes in terms of **preferring user-pays** across all types of collections:

Encourages waste minimisation

- User pays for general household waste will encourage more recycling behaviours (if recycling collections have a uniform charge)
- User pays will make people think more carefully about the waste they are disposing of

Fairer system

- Unwillingness to subsidise households who put out larger quantities of waste.

| Preference for waste collections to be funded by user pays – selection of verbatim comments |
|---|
| <p>Encourages waste minimisation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“User pays promotes having less rubbish. It makes people think about what they throw out.”</i> • <i>“Hit them where they feel it, in their pocket. Far too long council has tolerated poor recycling attempts by households.”</i> • <i>“If you pay for your rubbish to be collected and don't pay (a uniform charge doesn't feel like paying) it encourages people to recycle more and put out less rubbish.”</i> |
| <p>Fairer system</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“I'm fed up with paying for services that I don't need and/or don't use and/or aren't available where I live.”</i> • <i>“User pays is fair to everyone.”</i> • <i>“As a single occupant of my dwelling I use the waste collection services less often than others. Why therefore should I pay the same amount as those that use it more often. I put rubbish out about every two to three weeks, yet I am being charged the same as someone putting out rubbish every week. I don't put organic into the rubbish. I either compost or put into a green bin that I pay for.”</i> • <i>“A household of say five creates more waste than one person alone so why shouldn't they pay. A lot of elderly people alone could not afford the same a large households.”</i> • <i>“I feel that home occupiers should contribute to the rubbish collections as well as homeowners or ratepayers, there being many, many tenanted properties from which occupiers do not pay.”</i> |

Eighty percent of panellists support the idea of recycling collections to be funded by rates (uniform charge).

| Funding of recyclable waste collection– selection of verbatim comments |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “User pays for rubbish will assist in encouraging reduction in rubbish. Recycling should be encouraged so uniform charge is appropriate.” • “Recycling should be included in rates and rubbish should be user pays so as to encourage people to recycle, as the more they recycle the less they have to pay extra for the user pays rubbish collection. Organic waste should be user pays also because if it is rates funded there is no incentive left for people to do their own composting.” • “Recycling has wider community benefit and should be encouraged through being rates funding. With other waste having a user pays system encourages waste minimisation which is eco-friendly.” |

3.4 Attitudes towards other waste-related issues

Panellists were asked their views on other waste related issues, such as illegal dumping, junk mail and litter, and to comment on some of Council’s ideas for addressing these problems. These related issues were included in the survey so that feedback and results can inform and provide insight to the waste and bylaw business units.

| Attitudes towards other waste-related issues – summary of key findings |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 45% think a \$400 instant fine for illegal dumping is fair – 46% think it should be higher • 43% think Council should do more to stop illegal dumping, 49% are not sure • 43% think Council should force supermarkets to ensure their trolleys were not removed from their premises, 41% do not think Council should do this • 47% don’t like junk mail, 13% don’t mind it but usually throw it away without reading it and 34% like getting it or usually check through it • 32% agree that there is a litter problem in their area, 39% disagree |

3.4.1 Illegal dumping

Just under half of panellists (45%) felt that an instant fine of \$400 is fair for someone caught illegally dumping – slightly more (46%) think that the fine should be higher. Ninety percent of panellists either thought that Council needs to be doing more to stop illegal dumping or don’t know whether enough is being done (and perhaps what the Council is doing at the moment on this issue).

| Central government legislation provides for Council to impose an instant fine of up to \$400 for illegal dumping. Illegal dumping is when someone disposes of rubbish on public land without permission. This can include dumping rubbish in the bush, in parks, in streams and at beaches. What are your views on the fine of \$400 for illegal dumping? | People’s Panel N=1914 % |
|--|-------------------------------|
| A fine of \$400 is too much for someone caught illegally dumping | 4 |
| A \$400 fine is fair for someone caught illegally dumping | 45 |
| A \$400 fine is not enough for someone caught illegally dumping | 46 |
| I am not sure | 5 |

Base: People’s Panellists responding to WMMP survey

| Do you think enough is being done by Council to stop illegal dumping? | People's Panel N=1914 % |
|---|-------------------------------|
| Yes - enough is being done to stop illegal dumping | 7 |
| No - more needs to be done to stop illegal dumping | 43 |
| I am not sure | 49 |

Base: People's Panellists responding to WMMP survey

The most commonly expressed view regarding council's responsibilities to illegal dumping was lack of policing. The majority of participants acknowledged that it does occur and that it is a problem. Others commented that there are wider socio-economic issues impacting on illegal dumping that need to be dealt with and that the amount of the fine should depend on the extent and nature of the illegal dumping (i.e. what is being dumped, how often and how much).

| Illegal dumping – selection of verbatim comments |
|--|
| <p>Fines for illegal dumping are not adequately enforced/general policing issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>"Never seen anybody policing this issue."</i> • <i>"I have myself witnessed people dumping rubbish while out walking in our area. Also after the forestry has been felled, there are a number of dumped car bodies etc. I don't think the fringe areas are well policed if at all and that is where people drive to dump rubbish."</i> • <i>"A higher fine would deter illegal dumping, and council need extra staff specifically to monitor illegal dumping."</i> • <i>"Because when identification is sent through confirming an illegal dumper, NOTHING is done."</i> • <i>"Not enough are being caught, e.g. councils could use cameras."</i> • <i>"I see rubbish dumped and I have laid a complaint with details of the dumper and council has not followed this up. In my opinion dumping is done by cheap/nasty businesses and tradesmen rather than residents i.e. tyre people, building industry, those jobs which have lots of waste."</i> • <i>"I've never heard or seen of a case of prosecution, perhaps the media need to highlight the issues more."</i> |
| <p>Wider socio-economic issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>"No because if you can't afford to pay the dump fee of course it is going to end up in our ranges or other quiet spot."</i> • <i>"I think someone that is dumping may be hard up, and would most likely not pay a fine anyway."</i> • <i>"A complex issue. There is too much rubbish on our streets and in our waterways. People need to be penalised when they dump rubbish. Often the dumping of rubbish is related to people not understanding the recycling system so they have too much for their general rubbish wheelie bin. Leads to fly tipping or also open burning of rubbish in backyards. Education, reward and consistent enforcement programme is needed."</i> • <i>"I am no expert on illegal dumping. The only way to address it is to know why this is occurring in the first place - then address that problem."</i> • <i>"If the illegal dumper is a corporate entity the fine should be much higher - reflecting the cost of appropriate disposal plus a penalty."</i> |
| <p>General</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>"I would like illegal dumpers to be punished, but I know it's almost impossible to catch them in the act. Better to provide public facilities which can be used instead."</i> • <i>"From some of the items I have seen dumped it would cost the council a lot more than \$400 dollars to clean up, the fine should be more like \$1000. This can then fund the council to do more to stop illegal dumping, visits to common areas, surveillance cameras, marketing etc."</i> • <i>"\$400 is pathetic for someone who blatantly decides to dump rubbish. \$2000 will instantly make someone think twice."</i> |

3.4.2 Abandoned supermarket trolleys

Panellists were divided over how Council should address the problem of abandoned shopping trolleys. Forty-three percent thought Council should force supermarkets to ensure trolleys were not taken from their premises by charging customers a deposit for their use or by other methods, while 41% thought Council should not force supermarkets to take such measures.

| Do you think Council should force supermarkets to make sure that the trolleys don't leave their premises by charging customers a deposit to use them or by any other method? | People's Panel N=1914 % |
|--|-------------------------------|
| Yes | 43 |
| No | 41 |
| I am not sure | 16 |

Base: People's Panellists responding to WMMP survey

3.4.3 Junk mail

Attitudes towards junk mail were mixed – with 47% saying they didn't like it, 13% saying they didn't mind it but usually threw it away unread, and a third saying they either like getting it or usually checked through it. However, almost all panellists (96%) agreed that a "no junk mail" sticker on a letterbox should be adhered to.

| Which of the following best describes your attitudes towards junk mail? | People's Panel N=1914 % |
|--|-------------------------------|
| I do not like junk mail and I have a 'no junk mail' (or similar) sticker on my letterbox | 28 |
| I do not like junk mail but I do not have a 'no junk mail' sticker on my letterbox | 19 |
| I don't mind junk mail but usually throw it away without reading it | 13 |
| I don't mind junk mail and usually check to see what's there | 31 |
| I like getting junk mail | 4 |
| Other | 5 |

Base: People's Panellists responding to WMMP survey

| Do you think that if someone has a no junk mail sticker on their letterbox, that this should be adhered to by people delivering junk mail/brochures, etc.? | People's Panel N=1914 % |
|--|-------------------------------|
| Yes | 96 |
| No | 2 |
| I am not sure | 2 |

Base: People's Panellists responding to WMMP survey

3.4.4 Litter

Attitudes varied regarding the extent to which litter is a problem in the panellists' local areas. Thirty-two percent agreed or strongly agreed that there is a litter problem in their local area, while 39% disagreed. Satisfaction with Council's efforts to discourage and prevent littering was also mixed.

| How much do you agree or disagree that there is a problem with litter on the streets/roads in the area where you live? Please use a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 is strongly disagree (that there is a problem with litter in your local area) and 5 is strongly agree | People's Panel N=1914 % |
|---|-------------------------------|
| 1 Strongly disagree | 9 |
| 2 | 30 |
| 3 | 26 |
| 4 | 18 |
| 5 Strongly agree | 16 |
| I do not know | 1 |

Base: People's Panellists responding to WMMP survey

| How satisfied are you that Auckland Council is doing enough to discourage/prevent littering in your area? Please use a scale from 1 to 5 where 1 is extremely dissatisfied with what is being done and 5 is extremely satisfied. | People's Panel N=1914 % |
|---|-------------------------------|
| 1 Extremely dissatisfied | 9 |
| 2 | 21 |
| 3 | 29 |
| 4 | 22 |
| 5 Extremely satisfied | 6 |
| I do not know | 13 |

Base: People's Panellists responding to WMMP survey

| Litter– selection of Verbatim comments |
|--|
| <p>Satisfied Council is doing enough to discourage litter</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> “The council is great at always clearing & cleaning the litter off the streets of Auckland but people need to change their attitude and be responsible for letting go of the rubbish from their hand.” “I see people on motor bikes picking up rubbish quite often. The public rubbish bins are emptied daily and it's only in very busy summer months that the park bins overflow.” “I think the council is really doing a great job, the verges are trimmed and the roads are swept on a fairly regular basis. We are very lucky.” “There does not appear to be a widespread problem. Some litter will always happen but it does not appear to accumulate. I see works cleaning the streets footpaths etc and emptying the street bins regularly. I don't see a problem. The only exception is around antisocial venues such as brothels and drinking dens. Here there is often not only a litter problem, in terms of quantity, but the litter is offensive and dangerous. Bus stops can sometimes be an issue, but I think that is more a matter of the speed which it can accumulate at.” |
| <p>Not satisfied Council is doing enough to discourage litter</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> “We live near a council car park, which is always filthy with litter. No help when calling ACC. If you were half as good with litter as you were with the tow trucks - now THAT would be something!” “Auckland Council used to send people down the main streets to clean rubbish - now there is one man on a motorbike who does bugger all. Very lazy and leaves half the rubbish behind.” “The council don't do anything about it has their hands are tied. If someone is littering the streets then they should be charged and prosecuted.” “I wasn't aware that the council did ANYTHING to discourage littering. There is not exactly a plethora of tidy kiwi signs or provision of rubbish bins is there.” |

3.4.5 Small deposit on recyclable containers

Over a third (35%) strongly agreed and further 13% agreed with the concept of a small deposit being added to the cost of all recyclable containers to encourage greater reuse and recycling. Just under a quarter (23%) strongly disagreed with this idea. Fifty-seven percent said that they would be likely or extremely likely to return containers themselves or give them to someone else to return, in order to have the deposit refunded.

| How much do you agree or disagree that a small deposit of 10c to 20c should be added to the cost of all recyclable containers (drink cans, plastic bottles, glass bottles, etc.)? This would be refunded when you returned the containers to a depot to encourage greater reuse and recycling. Please use a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 is strongly disagree (that a small deposit should be charged) and 5 is strongly agree | People's Panel N=1914 % |
|---|-------------------------------|
| 1 Strongly disagree | 23 |
| 2 | 12 |
| 3 | 13 |
| 4 | 13 |
| 5 Strongly agree | 35 |
| I do not know | 4 |

Base: People's Panellists responding to WMMP survey

| If a small deposit was put on the cost of all recyclable containers (drink cans, plastic bottles, glass bottles, etc.), how likely would you be to return them to get your deposit refunded or give them to someone else to get the refund? Please use a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 is not at all likely and 5 is extremely likely | People's Panel N=1914 % |
|---|-------------------------------|
| 1 Not at all likely | 17 |
| 2 | 11 |
| 3 | 11 |
| 4 | 14 |
| 5 Extremely likely | 43 |
| I do not know | 4 |

Base: People's Panellists responding to WMMP survey

Those who **agreed** with the idea of a refundable deposit on recyclable containers thought it would encourage recycling and help reduce litter. Some saw it as a good source of pocket money or supplementary income. Others pointed to the success of similar schemes in the past or overseas.

Panellist who **disagreed** with the idea gave a variety of reasons. They thought a small refund of 10c – 20c wouldn't be enough to encourage people to return the containers to a depot, that having individuals returning items to a depot was an inefficient means of recycling, that the scheme would be costly to administer and that a deposit on all recyclable containers would further increase the cost of living .

Small refundable deposit for recyclable containers– selection of verbatim comments

- Agree with idea of refundable deposit**
- *“This would be a great incentive for people to recycle their own containers, and to collect other containers for recycling too (and may help reduce littering, particularly at events). In particular, it may reduce peoples' tendency to throw away recyclable containers they have purchased while away from home (e.g. during lunch at work).”*
 - *“Not only can this become pocket money or an adjunct to income it creates an awareness of the problem. In our area, it is cans and bottles thrown out of passing cars.”*
 - *“This makes sense to me. We used to get refunds on glass returns when I was younger. It seemed to work very well.”*
 - *“Yes!!!! Have seen it work wonderfully overseas. Why not here?”*

- Disagree with idea of refundable deposit**
- *“Cost does not justify the inconvenience of having to save up your bottles and take them to the depot. I would just put them in my recycling bin instead.”*
 - *“10 -20 cents wouldn't encourage people to take them to be recycled.”*
 - *“A waste of time, this would be an extraordinarily inefficient and wasteful way to recycle.”*
 - *“It would be a hassle to return different items to different areas. I would rather pay for a recycling service.”*
 - *“With all the plastic and glass bottles that everyone uses the cost would definitely be way too high.”*
 - *“The rise in cost of living is a major problem for many.”*
 - *“Better to 'police' what goes into the bins in the first place. Think of all the extra petrol and emissions for all the extra car trips to return containers and get the refunds.”*

3.4.6 Illegal dumping of tyres

Half of panellists strongly agreed and a further 15% agreed that a \$5 charge should be added to the price of tyres to cover the cost of free, convenient disposal, in order to encourage recycling and discourage illegal dumping.

| Given that you currently pay for the disposal of tyres to landfill, how much do you agree or disagree that a small charge of \$5 should be added to the cost of tyres, which would enable tyres to be recycled? This would mean that you could dispose of your tyre at a depot or to the place you bought it from for free and it would be recycled. Please use a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 is strongly disagree (that a small deposit should be charged) and 5 is strongly agree. | People's Panel N=1914 % |
|---|-------------------------------|
| 1 Strongly disagree | 13 |
| 2 | 6 |
| 3 | 9 |
| 4 | 15 |
| 5 Strongly agree | 50 |
| I do not know | 5 |
| This is not applicable to me | 3 |

Base: People's Panellists responding to WMMP survey

3.4.7 Additional comments

At the conclusion of the survey, panellists were asked if they had any other comments either on the topics already covered or on waste management in general. The comments often further discussed points they had already made. We have included below a selection of comments giving views not already expressed in the report.

Additional comments – selection of verbatim comments

- *“Most people are ignorant of the environmental impact of waste disposal. Council have a role to advise and educate before they collect.”*
- *“More should be done to raise awareness of recycling , targets to recycle waste should be set and school children should be included in any awareness training and prizes given for the best schools who adopt their own recycling programme.”*
- *“Get on and do it; the biggest problem with all the past and current councils is not the lack of ideas, but getting the ideas done .. just do it.”*
- *“One comment, is that it's confusing that " big " recycling bins are for rural areas that get fortnightly collections, and " little " bins are for urban or community areas where there are weekly collections. Some folks don't realize that the bins should stay with the house / dwelling when they move, so big bins end up in the urban areas and our contractor refuses to collect them as he contracts to collect small bins !!!”*
- *“I think I have made my feeling quite clear. What we need is Leadership, not just more mindless rules that are top-heavy in administration. If you must legislate, then give it real teeth and show us that it works. All the time. You will do far more by getting people on side with it than constantly kicking people in the rear when they transgress, Making littering a Socially Unacceptable Act will almost eliminate it. Just like drink-driving - the public at large pay only lip service because there is no real stigma to being caught. The same with rubbish. The old saying - "You can sell anything at all, if you package it correctly" is as true here as anywhere else. It would still surprise me if anyone actually reads these comments.”*
- *“I think the garbage men do a horrid job really well and deserve to be well paid and respected for it. Imagine what the city would look like without them. I have this overseas and it is not nice!”*
- *“I think the amount of packing is a disgrace. You can't buy anything anymore without heaps of packing. I am not sure why they don't tax packing at source; i.e. tax the manufacture of it so that products with lot's of packaging would cost more.”*
- *“I know that it sounds perhaps arrogant but education against littering and disposal has worked for me and most of my friends. That plus general provision of easy means of getting rid of litter and general waste plus the development of general ideas of recycling. Unfortunately the growth in volume and variety of stuff that you cannot re use (packaging mainly) has complicated even good intentions. Re use and recycling has not kept up with this. I am not sure where management starts - perhaps it starts with the manufacturer and distributor. It may have to end with some highly modern system for destruction with something else as a useful by-product.”*
- *“Reduce, Recycle, Reuse. Households can achieve zero waste. Promote less packaging, and penalize excessive packaging. Come down hard on littering and dumping. People need to realize it is a privilege to live in this amazing city.”*

Appendix I Questionnaire

The questionnaire below provides an overview of all the questions asked in the WMMP survey:

Waste Management and Minimisation – Public Consultation

FINAL Survey – May 2011

Introduction

This is a survey about **your views** on **household** waste management (in other words, **your household rubbish**, which **includes organic waste** (e.g. food, garden waste), **recyclables** (plastic, glass, tins, etc.) and **inorganic waste** (bulky items like furniture, appliances, TVs etc.). This survey also includes some questions about other waste related topics such as litter and junk mail.

The first few questions are about what you currently do with your household waste.

Q.1 Do you regularly use Council’s kerbside recycling collection service?

| | |
|--|--|
| Yes | |
| No | |
| We do not have a Council recycling collection service in the area where I live | |

Q.2 How aware are you about which items can be put out in your recycling collection service?

Please use a scale from 1 – 5, where 1 is you are not at all aware and 5 is you are extremely aware. Includes N/A option.

Q.3 Have you used the Council’s inorganic collection service in the last 18 months?

| | |
|--|--|
| Yes | |
| No | |
| We do not have a Council inorganic collection in the area where I live | |

Not sure/Can’t remember?

Q.4 Do you currently have a **garden waste bin or bag** – this would be a bin or bag that **you pay a private company** to collect?

| | |
|------------------------------------|-------------|
| Yes – I have a garden bin | Continue |
| Yes – I have a garden bag | Continue |
| Yes – I have both a bin and bag(s) | Continue |
| No | Skip to Q.5 |
| I am not sure | Skip to Q.5 |

Q.4a How frequently is your garden waste collected?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| Weekly | |
| Fortnightly | |
| Monthly | |
| Once a year | |
| Other – please tell us how often? | |
| I am not sure | |

Q.4b How much does your garden waste collection cost you each year?

| | |
|-----------------------|-------------|
| Under \$10 | Skip to Q.6 |
| Between \$10 and \$29 | |
| Between \$30 and \$49 | |
| Between \$50 and \$69 | |
| Between \$70 and \$89 | |
| \$90 or more per year | |
| I am not sure | |

Q.5 What do you currently do with your **garden waste** (e.g. lawn and other clippings, leaves, weeds etc.). You may select more than one answer here.

| | |
|---|----------|
| I don't have any garden waste/don't have a garden etc. | CONTINUE |
| I have a gardener/gardening company who disposes of it for me | |
| I put it in my normal rubbish bin or bag | |
| I leave it in the garden/I don't do any gardening | |
| I compost my garden waste | Continue |
| Or, something else – please tell us what? | Continue |

Q.6 How much, if any, of your organic waste (food and garden waste) do you compost at home?

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| I have no organic waste at home | |
| None of it | |
| Less than 50% | |
| More than 50%, but not all of it | |
| All of it | |
| I am not sure | |

Q.6a Do you have a kitchen waste disposal unit or insinkerator?

| | |
|-----|-------------|
| Yes | Continue |
| No | Skip to Q.7 |

Q.6b Do you regularly use your kitchen waste disposal unit or insinkerator to dispose of your food waste?

| | |
|-----|--|
| Yes | |
| No | |

I am not sure

At present, each of the **previous local council areas** (Auckland City, North Shore, Manukau, Waitakere, Papakura, Rodney and Franklin) have different approaches for the collection of household waste/rubbish.

The new Auckland Council is in the process of developing a Waste Management and Minimisation Plan (WWMP), which aims to standardise household waste management collection across the new Auckland Council area. In this next set of questions, we are interested in your views about what a new waste management and minimisation approach should be like.

At present some areas have wheelie bins for general household waste and some have bags – and in some areas households are charged **through their rates** and in others, they purchase bags themselves (i.e. **it is user-pays**). We are interested in whether you would prefer to use a wheelie bin or bag. However, **please disregard any cost implications** at this stage **because both bags and wheelie bins could be funded/charged in the same way – either** through rates **or** as user-pays. At this stage we just want to know whether you prefer wheelie bins or bags for rubbish.

Q.7 Would you **prefer** to use a **wheelie bin or bag(s)** for your **general household rubbish/waste** (note that we are not talking about recycling here – just general household waste that isn't recyclable)?

| | |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| A wheelie bin | |
| Bag(s) | |
| I don't mind either a bin or bag(s) | |
| I am not sure | |

Q.8 Please tell us the reason for your answer.

Text box for open-ended response

Q.9 At present, your general household rubbish (the rubbish you put in bags or in your normal, non-recycling wheelie bin) goes to landfill.

How interested would you be in having a separate collection for your **organic waste** (this includes food and garden waste that you may currently put into your normal wheelie bin or bag) at a subsidised cost? This waste would not go to landfill but would be either composted or put to some other beneficial use. This would mean you would be putting out less general household waste into your normal wheelie bin or bags (which would reduce the cost of that collection).

Please use a scale from 1-5, where 1 is not at all interested in having a separate collection for your organic waste and 5 is extremely interested. Includes a don't know/not applicable option.

Q.10 Please tell us the reason for your answer.

Text box for open-ended response

Q.11 If an organic waste collection was introduced, how often would you want this organic waste to be collected?

| | |
|---|--|
| Weekly | |
| Fortnightly | |
| Monthly | |
| Other – please tell us how often? | |
| I do not want a separate organic waste collection | |

Having a **uniform charge** included in the annual rates bill means that everyone pays the same amount via their rates regardless of how much rubbish they put out for collection. **User pays** means that you pay for only the rubbish/waste that you are disposing of.

Q.12 How do you think household rubbish/waste collections **should be funded** (including general household waste and recyclables)?

| | Rates Funded (uniform charge) | User Pays | I am not sure | Another way – please tell us how |
|--|----------------------------------|-----------|---------------|--|
| General household rubbish (not recyclables) | | | | |
| Inorganic collections (e.g. furniture, whiteware, TVs) | | | | |
| Recycling collections (glass, plastic, tins etc.) | | | | |
| Organic collections (food and garden waste) – if introduced | | | | |

Q.13 Please tell us the reason for your answers.

Text box for open-ended response

Q.14 Do you have any other comments or suggestions about household waste collections – including what they should include and how they should be funded?

Text box for open-ended response

In the next set of questions we are interested in your views on a number of other waste and litter related issues (e.g. litter and junk mail).

Q.15 Central government legislation provides for Council to impose an instant fine of up to \$400 for illegal dumping. Illegal dumping is when someone disposes of rubbish on public land without permission. This can include dumping rubbish in the bush, in parks, in streams and at beaches.

What are your views on the fine of \$400 for illegal dumping?

| | |
|---|--|
| A \$400 fine is too much for someone caught illegally dumping | |
| A \$400 fine is fair for someone caught illegally dumping | |
| A \$400 fine is not enough for someone caught illegally dumping | |
| I am not sure | |

Q.16 Do you think that enough is being done by Council to stop illegal dumping?

| | |
|--|--|
| Yes – enough is being done to stop illegal dumping | |
| No – more needs to be done to stop illegal dumping | |
| I am not sure | |

Q.16a Please tell us the reason for your answers.

Text box for open-ended response

Q.17 In some areas there is a problem with abandoned shopping trolleys. This is where someone takes a shopping trolley home from the supermarket and leaves it somewhere (e.g. in a park, on a street etc.). These end up being an environmental and cost issue for Council as they pollute streams and other waterways, and in some instances can damage parked cars.

Do you think Council should force supermarkets to make sure that the trolleys don't leave their premises by charging customers a deposit to use them or by any other method?

| | |
|---------------|--|
| Yes | |
| No | |
| I am not sure | |

Q.18 Please tell us the reason for your answer.

Text box for open-ended response

Q.19 Which of the following best describes your attitude towards junk mail?

| | |
|--|--|
| I do not like junk mail and I have a 'no junk mail' (or similar) sticker on my letterbox | |
| I do not like junk mail but I do not have a 'no junk mail' sticker on my letterbox | |
| I don't mind junk mail but usually throw it away without reading it | |
| I don't mind junk mail and usually check to see what's there | |
| I like getting junk mail | |
| Or, something else – please tell us what? | |

Q.20 Do you think that if someone has a '**no junk mail**' sticker on their letterbox, that this should be adhered to by people delivering junk mail/brochures etc.?

| | |
|---------------|--|
| Yes | |
| No | |
| I am not sure | |

Q.21 How much do you agree or disagree that there is a **problem with litter** on the streets/roads in the area where you live?

Please use a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 is strongly disagree (that there is a problem with litter in your local area) and 5 is strongly agree. Include don't know option.

Q.22 How satisfied are you that **Auckland Council is doing enough** to discourage/prevent littering in your area?

Please use a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 is extremely dissatisfied with what is being done and 5 is extremely satisfied. Includes don't know option.

Q.22a Please tell us the reason for your answers.

Text box for open-ended response

Q.23 How much do you agree or disagree that a small deposit of 10c to 20c should be added to the cost of all recyclable containers (drink cans, plastic bottles, glass bottles etc.)? This would be refunded when you returned the containers to a depot to encourage greater re-use and recycling.

Please use a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 is strongly disagree (that a small deposit should be charged) and 5 is strongly agree. Includes don't know option.

Q.24 Please tell us the reason for your answer.

Text box for open-ended response

Q.25 If a small deposit was put on the cost of all recyclable containers (drink cans, plastic bottles, glass bottles etc.), how likely would you be to return them to get your deposit refunded or give them to someone else to get the refund?

Please use a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 is not at all likely and 5 is extremely likely. Include don't know option.

Q.26 Illegal dumping of tyres is a significant environmental and cost issue for Council. Dumped tyres pollute waterways, can provide perfect breeding grounds for unwanted disease carrying mosquitoes, rats and other vermin, as well as creating a constant fire threat that needs to be eliminated as quickly as possible.

Given that you currently pay for the disposal of tyres to landfill, how much do you agree or disagree that a small charge of \$5 should be added to the cost of tyres, which would enable tyres to be recycled? This would mean that you could dispose of your tyre at a depot or to the place you bought it from for free and it would be recycled.

Please use a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 is strongly disagree (that a small despite should be charged) and 5 is there is strongly agree. Includes don't know option and N/A.

Q.27 Do you have any other comments you would like to make about any of the topics in this survey or any comments to do with waste management in general?

Text box for open-ended response

Finally, just a few questions about you. These are just to ensure that we speak to a wide range of people in this survey.

Q.28 Are you:

| | | | |
|--------------------|---|------|---|
| Female | 1 | Male | 2 |
| I'd rather not say | | | |

Q.29 Which age group do you fall into?

| | | | |
|-------------|---|--------------------|---|
| 18-19 years | 1 | 40-49 years | 4 |
| 20-29 years | 2 | 50-64 years | 5 |
| 30-39 years | 3 | 65 years or over | 6 |
| | | I'd rather not say | |

Q.30 Which of the following best describes your ethnicity?

| | | | | | |
|----------------|---|-----------------------|----|-------------------------------------|----|
| NZ European | 1 | Fijian | 9 | Middle Eastern | 16 |
| Other European | 2 | Other Pacific Peoples | 10 | Latin American | 17 |
| Maori | 3 | Chinese | 11 | African | 18 |
| Samoan | 4 | Indian | 12 | Other – please tell us what that is | 19 |

| | | | | | |
|--------------------|---|------------------|----|--------------------|----|
| | | | | | |
| Cook Islands Maori | 5 | Korean | 13 | I'd rather not say | 20 |
| Tongan | 6 | South East Asian | 14 | | |
| Niuean | 7 | Other Asian | 15 | | |
| Tokelauan | 8 | | | | |

Q.31 Which of the following best describes your income level?

| | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|----|
| Less than \$20,000 per year | 1 | Between \$60,000 and \$79,999 | 6 |
| Between \$20,000 and \$29,999 | 2 | Between \$80,000 and \$99,999 | 7 |
| Between \$30,000 and \$39,999 | 3 | Between \$100,000 and \$250,000 | 8 |
| Between \$40,000 and \$49,999 | 4 | More than \$250,000 per year | 9 |
| Between \$50,000 and \$59,999 | 5 | I'd rather not say | 10 |

Q.32 Which of the following best describes you?

| | | | |
|--------------------------------------|----|-------------------------|----|
| Paid employee | 1 | Not in the labour force | 6 |
| Employer | 2 | Other employed | 7 |
| Self-employed without employees | 3 | Other not employed | 8 |
| Unpaid family worker | 4 | Student | 9 |
| Unemployed and actively seeking work | 5 | Other – please specify | 10 |
| I'd rather not say | 11 | | |

Q.33 Which of the following best describes the type of household you live in?

| | | | |
|--|---|------------------------------------|---|
| One person living alone | 1 | One parent family | 5 |
| Couple only with no children living at home | 2 | Non family household e.g. flatting | 6 |
| Two parent family with one or two children living at home | 3 | Extended family arrangement | 7 |
| Two parent family with three or more children living at home | 4 | Other – please specify | 8 |
| I'd rather not say | 9 | | |

Q.34 And which of the following suburbs do you live in?

Add Other – please specify

Add I'd rather not say

Drop down box of suburbs

"Placenames NZ" layer from council GIS:

sde:sqlserver:ACALGISDBP01.arc.govt\gisdata.OWNER.PlaceNamesNZ

Sourced from LINZ

Thanks for taking the time to complete this survey – your feedback is appreciated.

Focus Group Recruitment Questions

Auckland Council will be conducting a series of focus group discussions in order to get a more in-depth understanding of some of the topics in this survey. Focus groups are relaxed, informal discussions with 8-9 participants in each group and a facilitator.

Each group would be held in early June, and would be approximately 2 hours in duration, starting at 6.00pm. You would be compensated for your time.

We are looking for a mix of different people, so if you think you might be interested in taking part please complete the following questions.

Would you be interested in taking part in a focus group?

Yes

No

Which of the following best describes your living accommodation?

| | |
|--|--|
| An apartment - in an apartment building | |
| Housing New Zealand accommodation | |
| A flat (not an apartment) – sharing with other flatmates | |
| A house with garden | |
| Or something else – please tell us what? | |

Which of the following best describes your recycling behaviour?

| | |
|---|--|
| I always use my recycling bin and recycle as much as I can | |
| I use my recycling bin for some things but there is more I could be recycling | |
| I sometimes use my recycling bin not always | |
| I rarely or never use my recycling bin | |
| Or something else – please tell us what? | |

Your name

Contact phone number

Email

Thank you – you may be contacted in the next few weeks about attending one of our focus groups.

Appendix II Respondent profile

The table below provides a demographic breakdown of People's Panellists who responded to the WMMP survey:

| | People's Panel Number of responses (n=1914) | People's Panel Percentages (%) (n=1914) | Statistics NZ Percentages (%) 2006 census data |
|--|--|---|--|
| Gender | | | |
| Female | 1,060 | 55 | 51 |
| Male | 843 | 44 | 49 |
| Prefer not to say | 11 | 1 | - |
| Age | | | |
| 18-19 years | 15 | 1 | 3 |
| 20-29 years | 135 | 7 | 14 |
| 30-39 years | 332 | 17 | 16 |
| 40-49 years | 432 | 23 | 15 |
| 50-64 years | 623 | 33 | 6 |
| 65 years or over | 352 | 18 | 10 |
| Prefer not to say | 25 | 1 | |
| Ethnicity* | | | |
| European | 1623 | 85 | 57 |
| Māori | 76 | 4 | 11 |
| Pacific Peoples | 49 | 3 | 14 |
| Asian | 85 | 4 | 19 |
| Middle Eastern/Latin American/African | 14 | 1 | 1 |
| Other Ethnicity | 116 | 6 | 8 |
| Prefer not to say | 33 | 2 | |
| <i>*Please note as this question was multiple response percentages don't add to 100%</i> | | | |
| Local Board | | | |
| Albert-Eden | 219 | 11 | 7 |
| Devonport-Takapuna | 76 | 4 | 4 |
| Franklin | 85 | 4 | 4 |
| Great Barrier | 2 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Henderson-Massey | 101 | 5 | 8 |
| Hibiscus and Bays | 145 | 8 | 6 |
| Howick | 111 | 6 | 9 |
| Kaipatiki | 126 | 7 | 6 |
| Mangere-Otahuhu | 37 | 2 | 5 |
| Manurewa | 37 | 2 | 6 |
| Maungakiekie-Tamaki | 84 | 4 | 5 |
| Orakei | 164 | 9 | 6 |
| Otara-Papatoetoe | 23 | 1 | 6 |
| Papakura | 42 | 2 | 3 |
| Puketapapa | 57 | 3 | 4 |
| Rodney | 132 | 7 | 4 |
| Upper Harbour | 45 | 2 | 3 |
| Waiheke | 22 | 1 | 1 |
| Waitakere Ranges | 87 | 5 | 3 |
| Waitemata | 214 | 11 | 5 |
| Whau | 101 | 5 | 5 |
| Other | 2 | 0.1 | |
| I'd rather not say | 2 | 0.1 | |
| <i>From: "Which of the following suburbs do you live in"?</i> | | | |