

CALIFORNIA INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD8800 Cal Center Drive
Sacramento, California 95826

Kathy Neal, Chairwoman
Wesley Chesbro, Member
Michael Frost, Member

Wednesday, March 10, 1993
1:30 p.m.
meeting of the

LEGISLATION AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

of the
CALIFORNIA INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD

State Capitol, Rm. 127
Sacramento, CA 95814

AGENDA

Note: o Agenda items may be taken out of order.
 o If written comments are submitted, please provide 20
 two-sided copies.

Important Notice: The Board intends that Committee Meetings will constitute the time and place where the major discussion and deliberation of a listed matter will be initiated. After consideration by the Committee, matters requiring Board action will be placed on an upcoming Board Meeting Agenda. Discussion of matters on Board Meeting Agendas may be limited if the matters are placed on the Board's Consent Agenda by the Committee. Persons interested in commenting on an item being considered by a Board Committee or the full Board are advised to make comments at the Committee meeting where the matter is considered.

1. CONSIDERATION OF STATE LEGISLATION
2. CONSIDERATION OF FEDERAL LEGISLATION
3. CONSIDERATION OF STEEL CAN RECYCLING INSTITUTE PROPOSAL TO CO-SPONSOR PUBLIC AWARENESS PROGRAM WITH CIWMB
4. PRESENTATION OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS ACTIVITIES
5. UPDATE ON EDUCATION ACTIVITIES

6. OPEN DISCUSSION

7. ADJOURNMENT

Notice: The Committee may hold a closed session to discuss the appointment or employment of public employees and litigation under authority of Government Code Sections 11126 (a) and (q), respectively.

For further information contact:
INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD
8800 Cal Center Drive
Sacramento, CA 95826

Cathy Foreman
(916) 255-2156

CALIFORNIA INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD8800 Cal Center Drive
Sacramento, California 95826

Michael Frost, Chairman
Wesley Chesbro, Vice Chairman
Sam Egigian, Board Member
Jesse Huff, Board Member
Kathy Neal, Board Member
Paul Relis, Board Member

Meeting of the

CALIFORNIA INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD**SPECIAL BUSINESS MEETING**Tuesday, March 9, 1993
10:00 a.m.8800 Cal Center Drive
Sacramento, CA 95826**AGENDA**

- Note:**
- o Agenda items may be taken out of order.
 - o Persons interested in addressing the Board must fill out a speaker request form and present it to the Board's Administrative Assistant on the date of the meeting.
 - o If written comments are submitted, please provide 20 two-sided copies.

Important Notice: The Board intends that Committee Meetings will constitute the time and place where the major discussion and deliberation of a listed matter will be initiated. After consideration by the Committee, matters requiring Board action will be placed on an upcoming Board Meeting Agenda. Discussion of matters on Board Meeting Agendas may be limited if the matters are placed on the Board's Consent Agenda by the Committee. Persons interested in commenting on an item being considered by a Board Committee or the full Board are advised to make comments at the Committee meeting where the matter is first considered.

To comply with legal requirements, this Notice and Agenda may be published and mailed prior to a Committee Meeting where determinations are made regarding which items go to the Board for action. Some of the items listed below, therefore, may, upon recommendation of a Committee, be pulled from consideration by the full Board.

1. CONSIDERATION OF THE JOINT (SWRCB AND CIWMB) REPORT TO THE LEGISLATURE AND GOVERNOR AS REQUIRED BY AB 3348 (EASTIN): STREAMLINING THE CALIFORNIA SOLID WASTE REGULATORY PROCESS
2. OPEN DISCUSSION
3. ADJOURNMENT

Notice: The Board may hold a closed session to discuss the appointment or employment of public employees and litigation under authority of Government Code Sections 11126 (a) and (q), respectively.

For further information contact:
INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD
8800 Cal Center Drive
Sacramento, CA 95826

Cathy Foreman
(916) 255-2156

CALIFORNIA INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD

8800 Cal Center Drive
Sacramento, California 95826



Meeting of the
RECYCLING MARKET DEVELOPMENT ZONE LOAN COMMITTEE
of the
CALIFORNIA INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD
8800 Cal Center Drive
Sacramento, CA 95826.

March 25, 1993
9:00 a.m.

NOTICE and AGENDA

Note: California Code of Regulations Section 17931 (c) requires that the Board, upon recommendation of the Market Development Committee, appoint a Loan Committee of not more than seven members. The purpose of the Loan Committee is to consider staff analysis of loan requests to determine the financial soundness of prospective loans, as well as provide recommendations based on creditworthiness. The Committee will meet quarterly, and will submit a list of recommended projects to the Market Development Committee for final recommendation to the full Board.

1. WELCOME TO LOAN COMMITTEE MEMBERS BY JOHN SMITH, MANAGER MARKET DEVELOPMENT BRANCH
2. OVERVIEW OF LOAN PROGRAM AND ROLE OF LOAN COMMITTEE BY NGUYEN VAN HAHN, MANAGER INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT SECTION
3. PRESENTATION OF LOAN APPLICATIONS BY NADINE FORD, JILL LARNER AND KRISTIN YEE, INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT SECTION
4. OPEN DISCUSSION
5. ADJOURNMENT

For further information contact:

Nadine Ford
Market Development Branch
California Integrated Waste Management Board
8800 Cal Center Drive
Sacramento, CA 95826
(916) 255-2397

CIWMB SCHEDULE OF MEETINGS AND DEADLINES - MARCH 1993

Meeting Date	Agenda Title DOARs to Ralph/Don (noon)	Agenda Postmarked*	Pkt Items to Legal after Div. approval (noon)	Packets to Members (3 pm)**
ADMIN	(WILL MEET	UPON THE	CALL OF THE	CHAIR)
Tuesday, March 2 1:30 pm PLANNING	Wednesday, Feb. 10	*Friday, Feb. 19	Thursday, Feb. 18	Thursday, Feb. 25
Wednesday, March 3 10:00 am POLICY	Wednesday, Feb. 10	*Friday Feb. 19	Thursday, Feb. 18	Thursday, Feb. 25
Thursday, March 4 10:00 am MARKET DEVELOPMENT	Thursday, Feb. 11	*Monday, Feb. 22	Thursday, Feb. 18	Thursday, Feb. 25
Tuesday, March 9 1:30 pm LPAC CAPITOL	Friday, Feb. 19	*Friday, Feb. 26	Thursday, Feb. 25	Thursday, March 4
Wednesday, March 24 10:00 am PERMIT & ENFORCEMENT	Friday, March 5	*Friday, March 12	Thursday, March 11	Thursday, March 18
Wednesday, March 31 10:00 am BOARD MTG	Friday March 12	*Friday, March 19	Thursday, March 18	Thursday, March 25

1/29/93

By Cathy Foreman 255-2156

*Agendas must go to DGS one day before this date.

**Packets should go to ARB for reproduction two days in advance of this date.

REVISED CIWMB SCHEDULE OF MEETINGS AND DEADLINES-FEBRUARY 1993

Meeting Date	Agenda Title DOARs to Ralph/Don (noon)	Agenda Postmarked*	Pkt Items to Legal after Div. approval (noon)	Packets to Members (3 pm)**
Tuesday, Feb. 2 1:30 pm PLANNING	Thursday, Jan. 14	*Friday, Jan. 22	Thursday, Jan. 21	Thursday, Jan. 28
Wednesday, Feb. 3 10:00 am POLICY	Thursday, Jan. 14	*Friday, Jan. 22	Thursday, Jan. 21	Thursday, Jan. 28
Thursday, Feb. 4 10:00 a.m. MARKET DEV	Friday, Jan. 15	*Monday, Jan. 25	Thursday, Jan. 21	Thursday, Jan. 28
Tuesday, Feb. 9 1:30 pm LPAC CAPITOL	Friday, Jan. 22	*Friday, Jan. 29	Thursday, Jan. 28	Thursday, Feb. 4
Wednesday, Feb. 10 1:00 pm PERM & ENF SAN DIEGO	Friday, Jan. 22	*Friday, Jan. 29	Thursday, Jan. 28	Thursday, Feb. 4
Wednesday, Feb. 17 10:00 am PERM & ENF	Friday, Jan. 29	*Friday, Feb. 5	Thursday, Feb. 4	Thursday, Feb. 11
Monday, Feb. 22 2:00 pm ADMIN	Thursday, Feb. 4	*Thursday, Feb. 11	Tuesday, Feb. 9	Thursday, Feb. 18
Thurs.-Fri. Feb. 25-26 10:00 am BOARD MTG PALM SPRINGS	Thursday, Feb. 4	*Thursday, Feb. 11	Tuesday, Feb. 9	Thursday, Feb. 18

1/26/93

By Cathy Foreman 255-2156

*Agendas must go to DGS one day before this date.

**Packets should go to ARB for reproduction two days in advance of this date.

REVISED CIWMB SCHEDULE OF MEETINGS AND DEADLINES-FEBRUARY 1993

Meeting Date	Agenda Title DOARs to Ralph/Don (noon)	Agenda Postmarked*	Pkt Items to Legal after Div. approval (noon)	Packets to Members (3 pm)**
Tuesday, Feb. 2 1:30 pm PLANNING	Thursday, Jan. 14	*Friday, Jan. 22	Thursday, Jan. 21	Thursday, Jan. 28
Wednesday, Feb. 3 10:00 am POLICY	Thursday, Jan. 14	*Friday, Jan. 22	Thursday, Jan. 21	Thursday, Jan. 28
Thursday, Feb. 4 10:00 a.m. MARKET DEV	Friday, Jan. 15	*Monday, Jan. 25	Thursday, Jan. 21	Thursday, Jan. 28
Tuesday, Feb. 9 1:30 pm LPAC CAPITOL	Friday, Jan. 22	*Friday, Jan. 29	Thursday, Jan. 28	Thursday, Feb. 4
Wednesday, Feb. 10 1:00 pm PERM & ENF SAN DIEGO	Friday, Jan. 22	*Friday, Jan. 29	Thursday, Jan. 28	Thursday, Feb. 4
Wednesday, Feb. 17 10:00 am PERM & ENF	Friday, Jan. 29	*Friday, Feb. 5	Thursday, Feb. 4	Thursday, Feb. 11
Monday, Feb. 22 2:00 pm ADMIN	Thursday, Feb. 4	*Thursday, Feb. 11	Tuesday, Feb. 9	Thursday, Feb. 18
Thurs.-Fri. Feb. 25-26 10:00 am BOARD MTG PALM SPRINGS	Thursday, Feb. 4	*Thursday, Feb. 11	Tuesday, Feb. 9	Thursday, Feb. 18

1/26/93

By Cathy Foreman 255-2156

*Agendas must go to DGS one day before this date.

**Packets should go to ARB for reproduction two days in advance of this date.



CALIFORNIA INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD

8800 Cal Center Drive
Sacramento, California 95826



Kathy Neal, Chairwoman
Wesley Chesbro, Member
Michael Frost, Member

Wednesday, March 10, 1993
1:30 p.m.
meeting of the

LEGISLATION AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

of the
CALIFORNIA INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD

State Capitol, Rm. 127
Sacramento, CA 95814

AGENDA

Note: o Agenda items may be taken out of order.
o If written comments are submitted, please provide 20 two-sided copies.

Important Notice: The Board intends that Committee Meetings will constitute the time and place where the major discussion and deliberation of a listed matter will be initiated. After consideration by the Committee, matters requiring Board action will be placed on an upcoming Board Meeting Agenda. Discussion of matters on Board Meeting Agendas may be limited if the matters are placed on the Board's Consent Agenda by the Committee. Persons interested in commenting on an item being considered by a Board Committee or the full Board are advised to make comments at the Committee meeting where the matter is considered.

1. CONSIDERATION OF STATE LEGISLATION (not available until closer to meeting date)
2. CONSIDERATION OF FEDERAL LEGISLATION (not available until closer to meeting date)
3. CONSIDERATION OF STEEL CAN RECYCLING INSTITUTE PROPOSAL TO CO-SPONSOR PUBLIC AWARENESS PROGRAM WITH CIWMB
4. PRESENTATION OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS ACTIVITIES
5. UPDATE ON EDUCATION ACTIVITIES (oral report)

Page

1

3

6. OPEN DISCUSSION

7. ADJOURNMENT

Notice: The Committee may hold a closed session to discuss the appointment or employment of public employees and litigation under authority of Government Code Sections 11126 (a) and (q), respectively.

For further information contact:
INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD
8800 Cal Center Drive
Sacramento, CA 95826

Cathy Foreman
(916) 255-2156

CALIFORNIA INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD

Legislation and Public Affairs Committee
March 10, 1993

AGENDA ITEM 3

ITEM: Consideration of Steel Can Recycling Institute Proposal
to Cosponsor Public Awareness Program with CIWMB

BACKGROUND:

The CIWMB has been invited by the Steel Can Recycling Institute to cosponsor a public education campaign in California targeting diversion of steel cans.

The Steel Can Recycling Institute has worked during the last 12 months to develop tools for use throughout the nation. To date, Ohio, Maryland, and Pennsylvania have agreed to distribute the materials in a joint effort. The Steel Can Recycling Institute desires that these materials be distributed to local governments throughout California as a supplement to what they are currently doing to educate their consumers.

The kit includes the following:

- three television public service announcements
- a radio public service announcements
- reproducible information pamphlets/brochures
- artwork for billboards or bus placards
- newspaper/magazine/newsletter ads, posters.

The Steel Can Recycling Institute is asking that the Board distribute these kits to local governments and encourage its use.

ANALYSIS:

The Board's recently published Ferrous Scrap Metals Market Profile indicated that "the lack of public awareness of the recyclability of steel cans, coupled with the relatively low value for cans" may hamper the large scale recovery of steel cans. Steel cans count toward local government's diversion in meeting the 25 and 50 percent mandates. This campaign should help elevate public awareness and provide a larger supply of recoverable steel cans to processors in this state.

This program may specifically help one southern California steel can processor who is able to accept 1000 tons a day for melting, yet reported he is unable to obtain that quantity from current California programs.

Public Resource Code 42600 directs the Board to provide statewide public information and education programs on all aspects of integrated waste management. Section 42602 directs the Board to conduct paid advertising or solicit joint sponsorship of campaigns by private industry.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the Board join with the Steel Can Recycling Institute in offering these kits to local governments for their voluntary use.

The Board is providing information kits on waste reduction to local governments; we would be in a position to carry these additional kits to local governments and explain the elements of the program.

The next logical step in providing low-cost information to local governments is to target education campaigns geared to specific material types.

Staff recommends the Board pursue this opportunity and evaluate its effectiveness through followup polls to local government and to explore opportunities with other industries and nonprofit associations to conduct similar campaigns. The information gleaned from this first effort will be invaluable as the Board pursues education partnerships in the future with other nonprofit and industry-related associations.

COSTS: Other than staff time devoted to arranging kit dissemination, this campaign would not cost the Board any additional funds.

Prepared by: Pat Madat Date: 3/4/93

CALIFORNIA INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD

Legislation and Public Affairs Committee
March 10, 1993

AGENDA ITEM 4

ITEM: Presentation of Public Affairs Activities

I. OUTREACH ACTIVITIES

Board staffed booths in January at the Sacramento Valley Landscape & Nursery Expo at the Convention Center and the Oakland Curbside Recycling Kickoff at City Hall Plaza. In February, staff made two presentations at Ford Elementary School in Richmond.

Staff continued working with the California Resource Recovery Association Steering Committee to ensure that conference participants' needs on Board programs and activities are addressed. Tom Estes and Steve DeMello have attended steering and program committee meetings and provided input. Sherri Harris, who serves on the Steering Committee and Program Committee, has led the Board effort to ensure conference success.

II. MEDIA RELATIONS

Staff responded to over 75 media inquiries during the last two months. The majority of calls centered on the Board's tire grant and loan program, the household hazardous waste grants, the Battery Report, Landfill Capacity Report, and San Marcos Landfill.

On March 2nd, the press release on waste reduction was distributed to all California media. In Bakersfield, tv, radio and the Bakersfield Californian covered the story. Chairman Frost gave a statement to the media there. The Sacramento Bee wrote an article on the program.

News at a Glance went to the Governor and Legislature in January and February and covered the following Board accomplishments: the Battery Report results, Tire Fund program update, Appointments of Members Relis and Chesbro on national recycling committees.

III. GRAPHICS/PUBLICATIONS

A brochure and utility stuffer was completed on grasscycling for the Planning and Assistance Division.

The CIWMB Style Guide was printed and distributed; training sessions were held for various Divisions.

Household Hazardous Waste Fact Sheets -- in English and Spanish -- went to the printer; camera-ready slicks are being produced for distribution to local governments.

The Integrated Waste Management Statutes and camera-ready artwork was being formatted and will be completed by the end of March.

Layout and design for the 1992 Annual Report is underway. A total of 3,000 copies will be printed; we expect to meet the March 31 deadline.

Logos and signage are being developed for the Used Oil Program. We will be preparing certification signs, fact sheets, and brochures for the program kickoff.

A booklet for all staff on effective audio-visual presentations (slides, overheads, equipment usage) will be completed April 1.

The January/February edition of Waste Matters was published and mailed to those on the Board's mailing list.

EDUCATION ACTIVITIES

Schools: Two teacher review teams, one in Northern California and one in Southern California, evaluated integrated waste management instructional materials for the Board's Curriculum Compendium Project. Over 200 pieces of curricula were collected in a nationwide search.

Tricia Broddrick and Cathy Love assisted the teacher review teams in evaluating the best of these instructional materials using an evaluation tool developed with the assistance of the California Department of Education. One review was conducted in Sacramento on 2/19-22 and another in Anaheim on 2/26-28.

Final touches are being done on a school district newsletter to share information on IWM diversion and education approaches

Consumers: The Waste Reduction education campaign began on Thursday, March 4 with the airing of television and radio commercials in Sacramento and Bakersfield markets. 1-800-CA WASTE already received over 50 telephone calls on the first two days.

Staff received the final report from the research subcontractor regarding Californians' attitudes toward waste reduction. The research indicated over 70 percent of all Californians are more concerned about garbage today than they were a year ago. A total of 91 percent believe reducing their own garbage is moderately to very important.

They remain misinformed about the problem. Sixty five percent believe disposable diapers is the number one problem; 57 percent believe junk mail or catalogs are the problem. A total of 66 percent see recycling as the solution to the waste problem. One of the most significant findings is that consumers consider products made with recycled materials equal to products made from virgin materials. This survey will be used as a benchmark for the pilot education program. A post-survey will be conducted following the conclusion of the pilot program to estimate program effectiveness. A copy of the research report is attached.

Business: PAEO staff met with managers from Planning & Assistance Division regarding the Board's overall business education approach. It was agreed that staff would work together to develop a coordinated business education program. A meeting will be set up by PAEO for all staff involved in educating or disseminating information to business. Keep California Beautiful's work, combined with the research and analysis by DDB Needham, will be presented at the meeting and a coordinated workplan brought forward for committee consideration.

CONSUMER SERVICES/TOLLFREE HOTLINE

The 1-800-CA-WASTE phone line began taking calls during the week of March 1. Staff from all Divisions have volunteered to staff the special line. Concurrently, the Recycling Hotline continues to receive specific calls about the locations of recycling centers, used oil locations, etc. Operators on both lines are able to answer general questions about integrated waste management topics. During February, the hotline received 3,827 calls. Because of the press the Board received on the tire program, hotline staff answered over 50 calls on that topic.

The breakdown is as follows:

Glass	281	Telephone Books	209
Metal	352	CA Redemption.	38
Paper	666	Curbside	144
Oil	788	CalMax	83
Plastics	556	Gen. Info.	852
HHW	500		

Prepared by: *P. A. Watt*

Date: 3/4/93

LIEBERMAN RESEARCH

WEST INC.

1900 AVENUE OF THE STARS
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90067
(310) 553-0550 • FAX (310) 553-4607

PROJECT GREEN

PREPARED FOR:

DDB NEEDHAM ADVERTISING

PREPARED BY:

LIEBERMAN RESEARCH WEST, INC.

JANUARY, 1993

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES.....	1
METHODOLOGY.....	2
CONCLUSIONS.....	3
DETAILED FINDINGS	
CURRENT SITUATION.....	5
• Awareness of advertising and news articles	
• Impact of environmental actions	
• Concern about garbage or trash problem	
• Importance of reducing own trash	
• Perceived causes of garbage and trash problems in California	
• Amount of personal impact possible	
• Main factors in deciding between similar products	
• Ways to reduce garbage or trash	
PRODUCTS MADE FROM RECYCLED MATERIALS.....	19
• Awareness of products made from recycled materials	
• Price perceptions of recycled products	
• Quality perceptions of recycled products	
• Reasons for quality perception	
REACTION TO ENVIRONMENTAL CLAIMS AND CERTIFICATION	25
• Believability of "environmentally safe" product claims	
• Impact of "environmentally friendly" claims on product purchase	
• Reaction to seal of approval	
APPENDIX	
SAMPLE DEMOGRAPHICS	
QUESTIONNAIRE	

BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES

The California Integrated Waste Management Board is interested in increasing consumer awareness of and cooperation in controlling the trash and garbage situation in the state. To achieve these goals, the California Integrated Waste Management Board has charged DDB Needham, their advertising agency, with developing an advertising campaign targeted to consumers throughout the state which will meet these objectives. As a part of this process, a two wave research study was designed to:

In the Pre-Wave:

- Assess current awareness of the garbage and trash problem.
- Determine what actions, if any, consumers are currently taking to minimize the problem and the frequency with which these actions are taken.

In the Post-Wave:

- Measure changes in consumer awareness of the garbage and trash problem after advertising.
- Measure changes in the amount, types and frequency with which consumers take actions to minimize the problem.

METHODOLOGY

A total of 1100 telephone interviews were conducted in the pre-wave in three areas: Bakersfield (300), Sacramento (300) and the balance of California (500). The pre-wave of the research is designed to act as a benchmark, providing a snapshot of the current situation. The post-wave of the research will be conducted after the advertising has run for a prescribed period in the Sacramento and Bakersfield markets only. Interviews completed during the post-wave with consumers in the balance of California will be used as a "control" market for the research.

Qualified participants were males and females, 21 years old or older, who do most of the grocery shopping for their households. Additionally, participants were screened to ensure that those employed in related industries were not included in the research.

Data shown in this report have been weighted according to the population distribution within the state. However, unweighted bases are shown so that the reader may determine the statistical power of the results.

CONCLUSIONS

- In summary, it appears that Californians are in a good position to be taught how to have a more positive personal impact on the environment, especially in terms of the garbage problem. They are unaware to a certain extent how "best" to assist in alleviating the problem and appear as though they would be responsive to specific suggestions and information. In short, it would appear that most Californians have the desire to become part of the solution, but lack the knowledge of how to do so.
- While a majority of consumers are aware of the trash and garbage situation, most believe that actions performed on an individual level will not have a strong impact.
- Although most Californians are more concerned about the trash or garbage problem as compared to a year ago, a large minority (25-30%) are less concerned.
- Nearly one-third of Californians do not feel it is very important to reduce their trash output on a personal level.
- Disposable diapers, followed by junk mail and plastics are cited as the main culprits contributing to the trash and garbage situation in the state.
- Most consumers do not believe changes in their own purchase behavior, i.e., purchasing products with less packaging, products made with recycled materials and recyclable products, will have a strong impact on the amount of waste generated by their community.
 - Indeed, the primary factors taken into consideration when choosing between similar food and non-food products are price and quality. Environmental factors are only considered by a very few consumers.
- However, consumers are open to options for reducing the amount of waste they produce, including increasing recycling and buying environmentally friendly products.
- While awareness of products made from recycled products is virtually universal, 1 in 4 consumers believe recycled products are more expensive than other products, thereby introducing a strong barrier to purchase.
- The quality of products made from recycled products, however, is not an issue.
- The majority of consumers are skeptical of companies that say their products are environmentally friendly.

CONCLUSIONS (CONTINUED)

- However, everything else being equal, most would be more likely to buy a product which claims to be "environmentally friendly" over one that is not.
- Certification of products by a not-for-profit environmental agency appears to increase the propensity to buy "environmentally friendly" products among about half of those consumers not already positively disposed toward them.

CURRENT SITUATION

AWARENESS OF ADVERTISING AND NEWS ARTICLES

- The majority of Californians are aware of the garbage and trash situation.
 - 7 in 10 have seen or heard advertising and better than 8 in 10 have seen or heard news stories in the past year regarding these problems.
 - Awareness of the trash and garbage problems is consistent across all areas.

AWARENESS OF ADVERTISING AND NEWS ARTICLES REGARDING GARBAGE OR TRASH PROBLEMS

Base: Those Responding*	<u>Bakersfield</u>	<u>Sacramento</u>	<u>Balance Of California</u>
Have seen or heard any advertising in the past year regarding garbage or trash problems	70%	72%	71%
Have seen or heard any news articles or news stories in the past year regarding garbage or trash problems	81	84	84

**Bases differ for ad awareness and article awareness in each market. The questions were asked of all participants.*

IMPACT OF ENVIRONMENTAL ACTIONS

- Generally, Californians do not believe that activities taken individually will have a strong impact on the environment of the state.
 - At maximum, only about half of the consumers in the state believe any one of the activities measured will have a strong impact. Less than the majority of consumers participate regularly in more than half of these activities.
 - About 4 in 10 Californians believe that reducing the amount of garbage and trash they personally produce each day will strongly impact the environment, but only about four in ten of these people who believe there is an impact regularly respond to the issue.
 - Consumers in Sacramento have a slightly stronger belief that individual acts can have an impact on the state's environment. However, their personal activity is no more regular than their counterparts throughout the state.

(PERCENT RATING "10" ON A 10-POINT SCALE)

Base: Those Responding*	Bakersfield	Sacramento	Balance Of California
Returning tin or steel cans to a recycling center	53%	52%	51%
Contacting companies to get name removed from mailing lists of unwanted junk mail or catalogs	46	52	40
Using a reusable coffee cup instead of a disposable cup	44	49	45
Buying products in packages that can be recycled	43	50	42
Buying products made from or packaged in recycled materials	41	46	44
Using reusable food storage containers instead of plastic bags or food wraps	41	40	36
Reducing the amount of garbage or trash you personally produce each day	40	47	41
Buying products in packages that can be reused	39	43	38
Buying products in packages that can be refilled	35	42	35
Buying products with less packaging	34	39	34
Donating old magazines to needy organizations	34	36	29

**IMPACT OF ENVIRONMENTAL ACTIONS
(CONTINUED)**

(PERCENT RATING "10" ON A 10-POINT SCALE)

Base: Those Responding*

	<u>Bakersfield</u>	<u>Sacramento</u>	<u>Balance Of California</u>
Contacting companies to ask them to package their products in a more environmentally friendly way	28%	37%	28%
Buying products in larger sizes or in bulk instead of single serve packages	25	30	25
Refusing a shopping bag for your purchases	24	26	22
Contact an environmental agency for advice	19	22	16

**Bases differ for each action in each market. All participants asked to rate each action.*

REGULARLY ENGAGE IN ACTIVITY

(BASED ON THOSE GIVING IMPACT RATINGS OF 4 TO 10)

Base: Those Responding*	<u>Bakersfield</u>	<u>Sacramento</u>	<u>Balance Of California</u>
Using a reusable coffee cup instead of a disposable cup	81%	83%	80%
Returning tin or steel cans to a recycling center	70	75	70
Using reusable food storage containers instead of plastic bags or food wraps	61	66	61
Buying products in larger sizes or in bulk instead of single serve packages	60	58	54
Buying products in packages that can be recycled	53	58	53
Buying products made from or packaged in recycled materials	46	51	51
Buying products in packages that can be reused	44	38	41
Reducing the amount of garbage or trash you personally produce each day	44	53	54
Buying products with less packaging	42	42	37
Buying products in packages that can be refilled	38	38	35
Donating old magazines to needy organizations	31	35	37
Refusing a shopping bag for your purchases	28	26	23
Contacting companies to get name removed from mailing lists of unwanted junk mail or catalogs	16	12	9
Contacting companies to ask them to package their products in a more environmentally friendly way	5	5	6
Contact an environmental agency for advice	5	4	6

**Bases vary by action and by market. Question asked of those who believed each action would be impactful to very impactful (a 4-10 rating for impact).*

CONCERN ABOUT GARBAGE OR TRASH PROBLEM

- Despite the fact that 7 in 10 Californians are more concerned about the garbage and trash problem as compared to a year ago, a large minority (25-30%) are less concerned, suggesting that a somewhat blasé attitude may be forming toward the issue among the population.
- Additionally, while a larger proportion of consumers who are aware of advertising and news articles are more concerned about the garbage or trash problem than those unaware of media coverage, there is a large minority among this group who are less concerned as well.

CONCERN ABOUT GARBAGE OR TRASH PROBLEM AS COMPARED TO ONE YEAR AGO

Base: Those Responding	Bakersfield (300)	Sacramento (300)	Balance Of California (499)
More concerned about the garbage or trash problem	70%	68%	71%
Not any more or less concerned about the garbage or trash problem	2	2	4
Less concerned about the garbage or trash problem	27	30	25

**CONCERN ABOUT GARBAGE OR TRASH PROBLEM AS
 COMPARED TO ONE YEAR AGO**

	<u>Advertising</u>		<u>News Articles</u>	
	<u>Aware (769)</u>	<u>Not Aware (316)</u>	<u>Aware (907)</u>	<u>Not Aware (187)</u>
Base: Those Responding				
More concerned about the garbage or trash problem	72%	66%	72%	62%
Not any more or less concerned about the garbage or trash problem	2	9	3	11
Less concerned about the garbage or trash problem	26	25	25	28

IMPORTANCE OF REDUCING OWN GARBAGE OR TRASH

- Reiterating this decrease in concern about the garbage and trash situation, nearly one-third of Californians do not feel it is very important to reduce their trash output on a personal level.
- Consumers aware of media coverage of the garbage or trash problem are, however, somewhat more likely than their unaware counterparts to feel it is very important to reduce their own refuse.

IMPORTANCE OF REDUCING OWN GARBAGE OR TRASH

Base: Those Responding	Bakersfield (300)	Sacramento (300)	Balance Of California (498)
<u>Very/Moderately Important (Net)</u>	<u>90%</u>	<u>90%</u>	<u>92%</u>
Very important	68	65	72
Moderately important	21	24	20
<u>Slightly/Not Important (Net)</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>8</u>
Slightly important	8	7	5
Not important	2	3	3

IMPORTANCE OF REDUCING OWN GARBAGE OR TRASH

	Advertising		News Articles	
	Aware (768)	Not Aware (316)	Aware (906)	Not Aware (187)
Base: Those Responding				
<u>Very/Moderately Important (Net)</u>	<u>93%</u>	<u>88%</u>	<u>93%</u>	<u>83%</u>
Very important	73	68	74	60
Moderately important	20	20	19	23
<u>Slightly/Not Important (Net)</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>17</u>
Slightly important	5	6	4	10
Not important at all	2	6	2	7

PERCEIVED CAUSES OF GARBAGE AND TRASH PROBLEMS IN CALIFORNIA

- Consumers believe that disposable diapers, followed by junk mail and plastics are the main causes of the garbage and trash problem.
- Since a large number of consumers are not currently discarding disposable diapers, this may be one reason why they no longer personalize the problem.

(PERCENT RATING "5" ON A 5-POINT SCALE)

Base: Those Responding*	Bakersfield	Sacramento	Balance Of California
Disposable diapers	70%	67%	64%
Junk mail or catalogs	57	57	56
Plastic packaging	45	55	49
Plastic wraps	42	44	44
Plastic bottles	40	41	42
Large items, such as furniture or appliances	36	41	38
Tin cans	35	38	32
Newspapers	33	31	32
Glass bottles	32	31	32
Paper packaging	28	26	28
Paper plates, paper napkins	28	26	28
Individual or single servings	27	30	32
Aluminum cans/containers	26	29	29
Magazines	26	28	29
Grass clippings/yard waste	24	17	18
Food scraps	13	18	14
Composting	16	15	14

*Bases differ for each listed cause in each market. All participants asked to rate each cause.

AMOUNT OF PERSONAL IMPACT POSSIBLE

- At present, most consumers are not sold on the ability of changes in their own purchase behavior, such as buying products with less packaging, recyclables or products made with recycled materials, to have a strong impact on the amount of waste generated by their community.
 - Only about 3 in 10 believe their personal efforts will have a strong impact.

Base: Those Responding	Bakersfield (298)	Sacramento (299)	Balance Of California (492)
<u>A Strong/Moderate Impact (Net)</u>	<u>65%</u>	<u>62%</u>	<u>67%</u>
A strong impact	27	31	30
A moderate impact	38	31	37
<u>A Slight/No Impact At All (Net)</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>38</u>	<u>33</u>
A slight impact	30	32	27
No impact at all	5	6	5

MAIN FACTORS IN DECIDING BETWEEN SIMILAR PRODUCTS

- Indeed, when asked about the primary factors taken into consideration when shopping for similar food and non-food products, price and quality are the two main criteria.
- Environmental factors, including recyclables, are only considered by a very few (1-4%) consumers.

MAIN FACTORS IN DECIDING BETWEEN SIMILAR FOOD PRODUCTS

Base: Those Responding	Bakersfield (298)	Sacramento (295)	Balance Of California (491)
Price	73%	69%	71%
Quality	32	35	36
Ingredients	15	16	16
Brand name	13	15	14
Taste	6	5	6
Past experience	6	3	5
Family preference	6	6	3
Coupons	4	2	2
Specials	3	4	2
Quantity	2	2	1
Recyclables, recycled materials or reduced packaging	1	2	3
Environment	1	1	1
Health/nutrition	1	1	1
Need/necessity	1	*	—
Advertising	*	1	1
Freshness	*	1	*
Convenience	*	*	*
Appearance	*	*	*
Other mentions	1	2	1
None	1	1	2

**MAIN FACTORS IN DECIDING BETWEEN
SIMILAR NON-FOOD PRODUCTS**

Base: Those Responding	Bakersfield (292)	Sacramento (289)	Balance Of California (485)
Price	67%	68%	66%
Quality	32	32	29
Brand name	11	15	11
Past experience	10	5	7
Family preference	6	7	2
Ingredients	3	4	3
Coupons	3	2	3
Specials	3	2	2
Recyclables, recycled materials or reduced packaging	2	1	4
Environment	2	1	2
Advertising	2	1	2
Quantity	1	1	1
Convenience	*	1	1
Need/necessity	*	*	1
Taste	*	=	1
Made in U.S.A.	*	1	*
Appearance	—	1	1
Don't buy from grocery store	—	*	*
Other mentions	2	2	3
None	2	3	3

WAYS TO REDUCE GARBAGE OR TRASH

- However, when asked to think of specific ways to reduce their own waste, Californians most often cite increased recycling as their solution.
 - Buying products that are more environmentally friendly, i.e., recyclable, reusable and with less packaging, was also considered a viable option.

Base: Total Respondents	Bakersfield (300)	Sacramento (300)	Balance Of California (500)
<u>Recycle (Net)</u>	<u>48%</u>	<u>46%</u>	<u>46%</u>
<u>Quantity (Subnet)</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>36</u>	<u>28</u>
More	25	30	22
Everything	6	7	6
<u>Paper (Subnet)</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>9</u>
Newspaper/paper	9	5	9
Paper bags	*	—	1
Cans	7	5	9
Composting/use yard clippings	7	7	4
<u>Glass (Subnet)</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>6</u>
Bottles	4	1	3
Glass (Non-specific)	2	2	3
<u>Plastic (Subnet)</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>
Plastic (Non-specific)	3	2	3
Plastic bags	1	1	1
Other recycling mentions	3	1	2
<u>Buying Habits (Net)</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>
<u>Type Of Product (Subnet)</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>26</u>
Buy recyclable products	12	9	8
Buy reusable products	9	6	9
Buy unpacked products/less packaging	8	4	6
Not buying disposable products	3	7	4
Avoid plastics/Styrofoam products	3	3	3

WAYS TO REDUCE GARBAGE OR TRASH
(CONTINUED)

Base: Total Respondents	Bakersfield (300)	Sacramento (300)	Balance Of California (500)
<u>Quantity (Subnet)</u>	<u>9%</u>	<u>6%</u>	<u>6%</u>
Buy large size products/buy in bulk	8	6	6
Not buying single servings	*	1	1
Not buy prepared foods	1	1	*
<u>Miscellaneous</u>			
Waste less	5	6	5
Less junk mail	5	4	3
Burn it	2	6	2
Sort/separate garbage	4	3	2
Use garbage disposal	3	2	2
Eat less/not eat	3	2	2
Reuse bags	2	1	2
Don't subscribe to newspaper anymore	1	1	1
Watch what is thrown away	1	1	1
Raise awareness/government intervention	1	*	1
Give to others/Goodwill	1	*	1
Other miscellaneous mentions	2	4	4
Nothing	7	8	8
Don't know/no answer	8	9	12

PRODUCTS MADE FROM
RECYCLED MATERIALS

AWARENESS OF PRODUCTS MADE FROM RECYCLED MATERIALS

- Awareness of products made from recycled materials is nearly universal throughout the state.

RECYCLED PRODUCT AWARENESS

Base: Those Responding	Bakersfield (298)	Sacramento (300)	Balance Of California (499)
Are aware of products made from recycled materials	96%	93%	96%
Are not aware of products made from recycled materials	4	7	4

PRICE PERCEPTIONS OF RECYCLED PRODUCTS

- While about half of those aware of products made from recycled materials feel they are priced about the same as other products, 1 in 4 consumers believe they are more expensive. This perception is an obvious barrier to purchase, since as noted earlier, price is far and away the primary factor used to discriminate between similar products.

PERCEIVED PRICE OF RECYCLED PRODUCTS AS COMPARED TO THOSE NOT RECYCLED

Have Heard Of Base: Recycled Products	Bakersfield (286)	Sacramento (278)	Balance Of California (481)
More expensive	22%	27%	23%
About the same	49	47	52
Less expensive	24	18	17
Don't know	5	8	7

QUALITY PERCEPTIONS OF RECYCLED PRODUCTS

- Quality, however, of products made with recycled materials is not an issue.
 - 8 in 10 consumers who are aware of these types of products consider them to be as good as, if not better than, similar products.

PERCEIVED QUALITY OF RECYCLED PRODUCTS AS COMPARED TO THOSE NOT RECYCLED

Have Heard Of Base: Recycled Products	Bakersfield (286)	Sacramento (278)	Balance Of California (481)
Of better quality	8%	8%	10%
Of the same quality	72	76	73
Of lesser quality	15	11	13
Don't know/refused	5	5	4

REASONS FOR QUALITY PERCEPTION

- Those who consider products made from recycled materials to be of "better" quality consider their environmental aspects -- helping the environment and being recyclable -- to be the main factors that contribute to this increased perception of quality.
- The functionality of these products i.e., their ability to perform as well as similar products, also contributes to consumer perceptions of their quality.
- Consumers who feel products made with recycled materials are of lower quality cite specific aspects of the products as being inferior -- unappealing appearance, unsuitable texture or color and lack of substance.

REASONS FOR PERCEIVING RECYCLED PRODUCTS AS BEING OF BETTER QUALITY

	Bakersfield (24)*	Sacramento (23)*	Balance Of California (48)
Base: Perceives Better Quality			
<u>Environmental Mentions (Net)</u>	<u>41%</u>	<u>35%</u>	<u>52%</u>
Reusable/recyclable	17	13	31
Helps environment	21	22	17
Less trash	12	—	6
<u>Quality Mentions Positive (Net)</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>17</u>
Functional/get same use out of it	4	22	2
Seems as sturdy/strong	8	9	6
Same quality	4	9	4
Lasts longer	—	—	4
Looks same	4	—	—
Must meet same requirements	4	—	—
<u>Quality Negative (Net)</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>8</u>
Not the best/not first class	4	4	—
Not lasting	4	—	2
Lesser quality	4	—	2
Thinner	—	—	2
Breaks easily/falls apart	—	4	—
Paper harder to handle/use	—	—	2
<u>Quality Mentions Neutral (Net)</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>8</u>
No difference/does not affect it	4	9	8
<u>Miscellaneous</u>			
Previous experience/used them a lot	4	4	2
Other miscellaneous mentions	8	9	8
Nothing	—	—	2

**REASONS FOR PERCEIVING RECYCLED
PRODUCTS AS BEING OF SAME QUALITY**

	Bakersfield (205)	Sacramento (211)	Balance Of California (353)
Base: Perceives Same Quality			
<u>Quality Mentions Neutral (Net)</u>	<u>49%</u>	<u>53%</u>	<u>55%</u>
No difference/does not affect it	48	50	54
Paper is paper/no difference in paper	2	4	1
<u>Quality Mentions Positive (Net)</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>27</u>
Same quality	12	7	10
Functional/get same use out of it	12	9	8
Looks same	6	4	5
Seems as sturdy/strong	5	2	3
Same materials	3	2	3
Must meet same requirements	2	1	1
Lasts longer	—	1	*
<u>Quality Negative (Net)</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>4</u>
Not the best/not first class	2	2	1
Color differs	2	1	1
Lesser quality	1	1	1
Texture is different	1	—	*
Not as soft	1	*	1
Bags rip easily	1	*	*
Thinner	1	—	1
Not lasting	—	*	1
Paper harder to handle/use	—	*	*
Inferior appearance	1	—	—
Paper harder to write on	1	—	—
<u>Environmental Mentions (Net)</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>6</u>
Reusable/recyclable	2	2	5
Helps environment	3	*	1
Less trash	1	*	*
<u>Miscellaneous</u>			
Previous experience/used them a lot	5	9	3
Other miscellaneous mentions	1	1	2
Nothing	2	3	2
Don't know/no answer	5	7	5

*Less than 0.5%.

**REASONS FOR PERCEIVING RECYCLED MATERIALS
AS BEING OF LESSER QUALITY**

Base: Perceives Lesser Quality	Bakersfield (42)	Sacramento (31)	Balance Of California (63)
<u>Quality Negative (Net)</u>	<u>81%</u>	<u>52%</u>	<u>68%</u>
Lesser quality	36	16	16
Not the best/not first class	12	13	14
Inferior appearance	10	6	8
Texture is different	10	3	8
Breaks easily/falls apart	12	3	6
Paper harder to handle/use	7	3	10
Color differs	7	—	11
Thinner	5	—	10
Not as soft	7	—	5
Paper harder to write on	2	3	3
Bags rip easily	5	—	2
Not lasting	—	3	3
<u>Environmental Mentions (Net)</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>6</u>
Reusable/recyclable	2	10	2
Helps environment	2	—	3
Less trash	2	—	2
<u>Quality Mentions Positive (Net)</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>3</u>
Functional/get same use out of it	2	6	2
Same quality	2	—	2
Same materials	—	3	—
<u>Quality Mentions Neutral (Net)</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>8</u>
No difference/does not affect it	2	10	8
<u>Miscellaneous</u>			
Previous experience/used them a lot	2	6	8
Other miscellaneous mentions	5	3	3
Don't know/no answer	—	13	6

REACTION TO ENVIRONMENTAL
CLAIMS AND CERTIFICATION

BELIEVABILITY OF "ENVIRONMENTALLY SAFE" PRODUCT CLAIMS

- The majority of consumers (59-65%) are skeptical of companies when they say that their products are environmentally safe.
 - Another 10-16% do not believe these claims at all.
- People who are aware of the garbage and trash problem due to advertising and news articles are somewhat more skeptical of "environmentally safe" product claims than those not aware.

BELIEF IN COMPANIES' CLAIMS OF BEING ENVIRONMENTALLY SAFE

Base: Those Responding	Bakersfield (296)	Sacramento (290)	Balance Of California (493)
Completely believe them	7%	8%	7%
Are unsure, but think they are right	24	18	18
Are unsure, but are skeptical of their claims	59	59	65
Don't believe them at all	11	16	10

**BELIEF IN COMPANIES' CLAIMS OF
BEING ENVIRONMENTALLY SAFE**

	<u>Advertising</u>		<u>News Articles</u>	
	<u>Aware (753)</u>	<u>Not Aware (312)</u>	<u>Aware (890)</u>	<u>Not Aware (184)</u>
Base: Those Responding				
Completely believe them	7%	7%	6%	8%
Are unsure, but think they are right	17	20	18	20
Are unsure, but are skeptical of their claims	67	61	67	59
Don't believe them at all	9	13	9	13

IMPACT OF "ENVIRONMENTALLY FRIENDLY" CLAIMS ON PRODUCT PURCHASE

- If, however, everything else is equal, a majority of consumers (70-81%) state that they would be more likely to buy a product that claims to be "environmentally friendly" over one that is not.
- Not surprisingly, consumers who are aware of the trash or garbage problems due to media coverage are even more likely than those who are not as knowledgeable to buy a product that claims to be "environmentally friendly."

LIKELIHOOD OF BUYING A PRODUCT THAT CLAIMS TO BE "ENVIRONMENTALLY FRIENDLY"

Base: Those Responding	Bakersfield (297)	Sacramento (293)	Balance Of California (490)
More likely to buy	70%	81%	78%
Neither more nor less likely to buy	24	14	15
Less likely to buy	7	5	7

**LIKELIHOOD OF BUYING A PRODUCT THAT CLAIMS
TO BE ENVIRONMENTALLY FRIENDLY**

	<u>Advertising</u>		<u>News Articles</u>	
	<u>Aware (760)</u>	<u>Not Aware (307)</u>	<u>Aware (892)</u>	<u>Not Aware (183)</u>
Base: Those Responding				
More likely to buy	80%	73%	81%	65%
Neither more or less likely to buy	15	16	14	23
Less likely to buy	5	11	6	11

REACTION TO SEAL OF APPROVAL

- Certification of products by a not-for-profit environmental agency could potentially increase the propensity to buy "environmentally friendly" products among about half of those consumers who are not already disposed toward these products.

WHETHER SEAL OF APPROVAL FROM NOT-FOR-PROFIT ENVIRONMENTAL AGENCY WOULD INCREASE LIKELIHOOD TO BUY

	Not More Likely To Buy Based On	Bakersfield	Sacramento	Balance Of California
Base:	Product Claims	(79)	(50)	(92)
Yes		54%	42%	50%
No		45	58	50

SAMPLE DEMOGRAPHICS

AGE

Base: Total Respondents	Bakersfield (300)	Sacramento (300)	Balance Of California (500)
<u>21-34 (Net)</u>	<u>32%</u>	<u>30%</u>	<u>33%</u>
21-24	5	8	8
25-34	27	22	25
<u>35-54 (Net)</u>	<u>45</u>	<u>42</u>	<u>43</u>
35-44	27	23	27
45-54	18	19	16
<u>55 or Older (Net)</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>23</u>
55-65	9	12	12
66 or older	13	16	11
Mean	43.4	45.1	43.1

HOUSEHOLD SIZE

Base: Those Responding	Bakersfield (299)	Sacramento (292)	Balance Of California (490)
One	18%	17%	17%
Two	26	30	35
Three	21	22	20
Four or more	35	31	29
Mean	3.0	2.8	2.8

EMPLOYMENT STATUS

Base: Those Responding	Bakersfield (298)	Sacramento (296)	Balance Of California (493)
<u>Employed (Net)</u>	<u>64%</u>	<u>61%</u>	<u>63%</u>
Employed full-time (30+ hours)	56	46	53
Employed part-time	8	15	11
<u>Not Employed (Net)</u>	<u>36</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>37</u>
Retired	13	20	17
A homemaker	11	9	9
Unemployed	8	6	5
A student	3	4	5

EDUCATION

Base: Those Responding	Bakersfield (299)	Sacramento (296)	Balance Of California (493)
<u>Some College Or Less</u>	<u>78%</u>	<u>74%</u>	<u>59%</u>
Some grade school	2	*	1
Completed grade school	2	*	*
Some high school	9	10	6
Completed high school	35	29	22
Some college	30	33	29
<u>College Graduate Or More</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>41</u>
Completed college	15	18	30
Some graduate school or more	7	8	11

QUESTIONNAIRE

Lieberman Research West
 1900 Avenue of the Stars
 Los Angeles, CA 90067

Market	
Bakersfield.....	(1)
Sacramento.....	(2)
Other California.....	(3)

_____(1-4)
 (ID Number)

SCREENING QUESTIONNAIRE

LRW #147-2409

Green Products Survey - Pre-Wave

December, 1992

Respondent's Name: _____		Telephone: () _____
Address: _____		
City/Town: _____	State: _____	Zip Code: _____
Interviewer: _____	Date: _____	
Validated By: _____	Date: _____	
Time Started: _____	Time Ended: _____	Elapsed Time: _____

Hello, I'm _____ from Lieberman Research West. Today we are conducting a brief survey and would like to include your opinions.

A. Who does most of the grocery shopping for your household? (DO NOT READ LIST.)

Me (the respondent)	(1)	--> CONTINUE
Me and someone else equally	(2)	

Someone else	(1)	--> ASK TO SPEAK WITH THAT PERSON. SCHEDULE CALLBACK IF NECESSARY.
--------------	------	---

Q.A. TERMINATIONS:	
NOT RESPONSIBLE FOR SHOPPING	(0) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

B. Are you or is anyone in your household employed by an advertising agency or market research company or a manufacturer, distributor, wholesaler or retailer of consumer products?

Yes	(1)	--> TERMINATE. CIRCLE NEXT AVAILABLE NUMBER IN BOX BELOW. ERASE AND REUSE SCREENER.
-----	------	---

No	(1)	--> CONTINUE
----	------	--------------

Q.B. TERMINATIONS:	
OCCUPATION	(0) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

C. Please tell me into which of the following categories your age falls. (READ LIST.)

Under 21	<input type="checkbox"/>	--> TERMINATE. CIRCLE NEXT AVAILABLE NUMBER BELOW. ERASE AND REUSE SCREENER.
----------	--------------------------	--

21-24	<input type="checkbox"/>	--> CONTINUE
25-34	<input type="checkbox"/>	
35-44	<input type="checkbox"/>	
45-54	<input type="checkbox"/>	
55-65	<input type="checkbox"/>	
66 or older	<input type="checkbox"/>	

(DO NOT READ) Refused	<input type="checkbox"/>	--> TERMINATE. CIRCLE NEXT AVAILABLE NUMBER BELOW. ERASE AND REUSE SCREENER.
-----------------------	--------------------------	--

Q.C TERMINATIONS:	
UNDER 21/REFUSED	<input checked="" type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

(IF RESPONDENT REFUSES TO PARTICIPATE OR QUILTS IN THE MIDDLE, CIRCLE NEXT AVAILABLE NUMBER IN BOX BELOW. ERASE AND REUSE SCREENER.)

QBR/BREAKOFF	<input checked="" type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
--------------	--

Lieberman Research West
 1900 Avenue of the Stars
 Los Angeles, CA 90067

Market	
Bakersfield	1
Sacramento	2
Other California	3

(1-4)
 (ID Number)

MAIN QUESTIONNAIRE

LRW #147-2409

Green Products Study - Pre Wave

December, 1992

- Now I'd like to ask you about your grocery shopping. When you shop for food items at the grocery store, what are the main factors you think about when deciding between similar products? (PROBE) What else? (DO NOT READ LIST. * MAIN FACTORS ONLY IN GRID BELOW UNDER "Q.1 - Factors: Food Items".)
- When you shop for non-food items at the grocery store, what are the main factors you think about when deciding between similar products? (PROBE) What else? (DO NOT READ LIST. * MAIN FACTORS ONLY IN GRID BELOW UNDER "Q.2 - Factors: Non-Food Items".)

Q.1 Factors: Food Items	Q.2 Factors: Non-Food Items
-------------------------------	--------------------------------------

Price		
Specials		
Coupons		
Quality		
Ingredients		
Taste		
Brand name		
Family preference		
Advertising		
Past experience		
Environment		
Recyclables, recycled materials or reduced packaging		
Other (SPECIFY)		

3. Now, I'd like to ask you specifically about some environmental issues. How much of an impact do you think these activities taken individually have on the environment in California? Please rate them on a scale from 1 to 10, with 1 being "no impact at all" and 10 being "extremely impactful". Let's start with (INSERT "XD" STATEMENT).

On a scale of one to ten, how much of an impact do you think (INSERT STATEMENT) has on the environment in California? (RECORD IN GRID BELOW UNDER "Q.3 - Impact." CONTINUE UNTIL ALL STATEMENTS ARE RATED)

(ASK Q.4 FOR EACH STATEMENTS RATED 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, OR 10 IN Q.3, STARTING WITH "XD" STATEMENT. IF NO STATEMENTS RATED 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, OR 10, SKIP TO Q.5a.)

4. Which, if any, of these activities do you do regularly, occasionally or not at all? (READ LIST. "X" ALL THAT APPLY.)

START WITH:	Q.3- Impact	Q.4 - Activities			
		Regularly	Occasion-ally	Not At All	(DO NOT READ) Don't Know
<input type="checkbox"/>	Returning tin or steel cans to a recycling center	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Donating old magazines to needy organizations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Buying products made from or packaged in recycled materials	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Buying products in packages that can be refilled	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Buying products in packages that can be reused	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Contact an environmental agency for advice	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Buying products in packages that can be recycled	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Using reusable food storage containers instead of plastic bags or food wraps	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Buying products with less packaging	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Buying products in larger sizes or in bulk instead of single serve packages	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Reducing the amount of garbage or trash you personally produce each day	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Contacting companies to ask them to package their products in a more environmentally friendly way	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Using a reusable coffee cup instead of a disposable cup	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Refusing a shopping bag for your purchases	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Contacting companies to get name removed from mailing lists of unwanted junk mail or catalogs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

5a. Have you seen or heard any advertising in the past year regarding garbage or trash problems?

Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>

5b. Have you seen or heard any news articles or news stories in the past year regarding garbage or trash problems?

Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>

6. For each of following items, please tell me how much you think this item is a cause of garbage or trash problems in California. To do this, please use a five point scale where a one means "it is not a serious cause of the garbage or trash problem in California" and a 5 means "it is a very serious cause". Let's start with (INSERT "X" ITEM.)

Based on a scale from one to five, how much do you think (INSERT ITEM) is a cause of garbage and trash problems in California? (CONTINUED UNTIL ALL ITEMS RATED.)

START WITH:	Rating
<input type="checkbox"/> Newspapers	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> Grass clippings/yard waste	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> Disposable diapers	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> Glass bottles	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> Plastic bottles	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> Plastic wraps	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> Aluminum cans/containers	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> Junk mail or catalogs	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> Magazines	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> Individual or single servings	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> Tin cans	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> Paper packaging	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> Paper plates, paper napkins	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> Composting	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> Large items, such as furniture or appliances	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> Plastic packaging	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> Food scraps	_____

7. In comparison to one year ago, would you say you are...? (READ LIST.)

More concerned about the garbage or trash problem	<input type="checkbox"/>
Less concerned about the garbage or trash problem	<input type="checkbox"/>
or, Not any more or less concerned about the garbage or trash problem	<input type="checkbox"/>

8. How important do you think it is that you reduce your own amount of garbage or trash? Do you think it is...? (READ LIST.)

Very important	<input type="checkbox"/>
Moderately important	<input type="checkbox"/>
Slightly important	<input type="checkbox"/>
Not important at all	<input type="checkbox"/>

