

TO: JOINT WASTE DISPOSAL BOARD
16th Dec 2010

JOINT WASTE DISPOSAL BOARD - PROJECT UPDATE
(Report by the Project Director)

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to inform the Joint Waste Disposal Board of the results of two user satisfaction surveys undertaken with firstly amongst public users of the Household Waste Recycling Centres (HWRC) and, secondly, of council and local charity users of the waste transfer stations.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 That Members note the findings of the independent User Satisfaction Survey of patrons at the Smallmead and Longshot Lane Household Waste Recycling Centres (HWRC).**
- 2.2 Members note the findings of the internal survey of Council users of the re3 facilities, carried out by the re3 PFI Project Team.**

3. SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Results of the 2010 User Satisfaction Survey at Smallmead and Longshot Lane HWRC's

- 3.1 The PFI contract requires that the Contractor carries out an annual user satisfaction survey at both Smallmead and Longshot Lane HWRC's.
- 3.2 Attached at Appendix 1 is a summary of the results of the 2011 survey and a brief commentary on the relationship to the survey's carried out in the preceding two years.
- 3.3 The survey was carried out between 29th September and 3rd October 2010 at both sites. During the survey period a total of 2,343 surveys were completed (1133 at Smallmead and 1,210 at Longshot Lane).
- 3.4 Both sites were rated highly, in overall terms, by users. Of those surveyed 97% of users rated Smallmead as 'good' or 'very good'. At Longshot Lane, 99% of surveyed users rated it as 'good' or 'very good'.
- 3.5 Staff at both sites were also identified as being helpful by users. At Smallmead, the survey showed that 95% of users thought staff members were helpful and at Longshot Lane the figure was 98%. Both were improvements on the previous year (91% and 88% respectively).
- 3.6 The number of people who are approached by a member of staff whilst on site appears to be rising. At Smallmead, since 2008, the percentage indicated by the survey rose from 41% to 75%. At Longshot Lane the percentage indicated by the survey rose from 27% to 50%.
- 3.7 Although we cannot assume there is a specific link between the results on 'helpfulness' described at 3.5 above and those on the number of patrons being approached at 3.6, when looked-at together they do not suggest that staff intervention is unappreciated.

- 3.8 The frequency of use appears to be dropping over the course of the surveys. Since 2008, those residents visiting once a week or more has come down from 15% to 9% at Smallmead and from 23% to 16% at Longshot Lane.
- 3.9 Overall, the results of the survey appear to support the view that both sites, and the staff engaged in operating them, continue to be appreciated by users.
- 3.10 The council's re3 PFI Project Team will further analyse the results and engage with the Contractor in order to seek to maintain a high level of performance and user satisfaction.
- 3.11 As in previous years, the User Satisfaction Survey incorporates a patronage survey to determine where users of the two sites are coming from. Details of the 2010 patronage survey are included within Appendix 1 below.

Results of the 2010 Transfer Station User Satisfaction Survey of Council Crews

- 3.12 The councils' re3 PFI Project Team surveyed colleagues who make regular use of the PFI facilities— principally, the transfer stations. This survey was conducted to assist with contract management; identifying any potential areas of improvement and making recommendations where necessary.
- 3.13 Between September and November 2010, the survey was carried out to gauge the views and experiences of council users (refuse, street cleansing and grounds maintenance crews), and some charity users, in relation to the waste transfer stations at Smallmead, Reading and Longshot Lane, Bracknell.
- 3.14 A total of 73 responses were received. These included most refuse, recycling, garden waste and street cleansing crews from Reading, Wokingham and Bracknell councils, as well as 16% of the approved charities and a number of other regular council users.
- 3.15 The main results from this survey are detailed below.
- 3.16 The survey report, attached at Appendix 2, contains a list of recommendations which the re3 PFI Project Team will now seek to address with the Contractor and, where appropriate, the individual councils.
- 3.17 Council vehicles using the Smallmead transfer station experience longer and more frequent periods of queuing when accessing the site, than visitors to Longshot. On the surveyed days, 32% of Smallmead visits and 24% of Longshot visits, began with a queue of more than five minutes. When asked how they rated this wait, the most common response at Smallmead was "ok", whilst the most common response at Longshot was "good". No one vehicle waited more than 15 minutes to access the sites on the surveyed days, despite half of all respondents claiming to do so at least once a week.
- 3.18 30% of all respondents said queuing to pass the first weighbridge was the biggest single factor affecting how long they spent on site. Those who provided comments indicated that they were often kept waiting behind private vehicles, some of whom are required to complete paperwork before accessing the site.
- 3.19 However, most crews were happy with the length of time they spend on site, with 70% of refuse, recycling and garden crews believing the contractual 20 minute turnaround policy to be about right. Of the remaining crews, 59% of Smallmead visitors and 88% of Longshot visitors rated the amount of time they spent on site as 'good' or 'excellent'.

- 3.20 51% of all respondents said that other users were the biggest single factor affecting how long they spent on site. Those who provided comments indicated that they were often kept waiting on site while an articulated vehicle was loaded.
- 3.21 Three Wokingham refuse/recycling drivers for whom English was not their first language, were unable to list the items of PPE required to access the site. All other respondents who were asked the survey through a face-to-face approach were able to provide a list. Of those who self-completed the questionnaire, only 36% responded to the question.
- 3.22 At both sites the drivers considered the floor in one or more parts of the site to be slippery.
- 3.23 Of those refuse and recycling drivers surveyed about their opinions of Smallmead, 44% made comments that the signage and direction on site needs to be improved. At Longshot these comments were mainly about the inconsistent use of the traffic lights on site.
- 3.24 At both sites, the level of staff helpfulness was rated highly and 83% of drivers believed that there were sufficient staff on site. Those who felt there should be more said that there should always be two people on the weighbridge and that more people were required to give instruction on when and where to tip.
- 3.25 A total of 94% of respondents believed the process for collecting their weighbridge ticket to be efficient.
- 3.26 A number of drivers had not received a weighbridge ticket on at least one occasion after tipping at one of the sites. These drivers were from across all three councils and services and totalled 13 from Longshot and two from Smallmead. In all but one of these cases, the drivers claimed to have had their ticket forwarded to their office later or had picked up their ticket when they next visited the weighbridge.
- 3.27 Wokingham crews rated the Longshot site more highly than the Smallmead site, with an average rating out of 10 being 7.7 for Smallmead and 9.1 for Longshot. The most common reason given for these results was that Smallmead is a bigger, and therefore busier site which tends to have more articulated vehicles and subsequently more queues.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Transfer Station – Regular User Satisfaction Survey Report (December 2010)

CONTACTS FOR FURTHER INFORMATION

Mark Moon, Project Director
0118 974 6308
Mark.moon@wokingham.gov.uk

Oliver Burt, Project Manager
0118 939 9990
oliver.burt@reading.gov.uk

APPENDIX 1

Results of 2010 User Satisfaction Survey at re3 Household Waste Recycling Centres.

Both sites ranked highly for 'overall rating of the centre'. At Smallmead 97% of users rating it as good or very good (98% in 2009 and 99% in 2008) while at Longshot Lane, 99% of users rating it as good or very good (98% in 2009 and 82% in 2008).

Three fifths (61%) of users at the Smallmead HWRC rated the centre as good or very good for 'onsite information and leaflets', this was a decrease compared to the previous years (94% in 2009 and 93% in 2008). Longshot Lane HWRC was ranked highly for 'onsite information and leaflets' with 86% of users rating it as good or very good, although this was a slight decrease compared to 2009 (91% in 2009 and 52% in 2008).

Users visiting the Smallmead HWRC that visit on a weekly basis have shown a decline (9%) compared to 2008 (15%). Similarly, users visiting Longshot Lane HWRC on a weekly basis has declined (16%) compared to 2008 (23%).

Similar to the previous years, users are more commonly visiting centres once a month at Smallmead it was 32% in 2008, 31% in 2009 and 31% in 2010. At Longshot Lane it was 33% in 2008, 36% in 2009 and 40% in 2010.

The percentage incorporating a visit to the centres as part of another trip has increased from 21% to 32% at Smallmead and from 16% in 2008 to 31% at Longshot Lane.

At both centres users being approached by staff members has increased compared to 2008 – from 41% to 75% in Smallmead and from 27% to 50% in Longshot Lane.

Users stating that staff members are helpful and polite has increased at both centres. Smallmead saw the largest increase (36%) of users stating that staff members are polite from 15% in 2008 to 51% in 2010. The largest increase for users stating staff members are 'helpful' was seen at the Longshot Lane centre from 83% in 2008 to 98% in 2010.

The percentage of general household rubbish being disposed of at both centres has increased at Smallmead there has been a steady increase from 42% in 2008, to 48% in 2009 and 53% in 2010. At Longshot Lane the increase has risen from 18% in 2008, to 57% in 2009 to 61% in 2010.

The percentage of garden waste being brought to Smallmead experienced a 30% decrease compared to the 2008 survey, from 43% in 2008 to 14% in 2010. Meanwhile Longshot Lane also decreased; from 33% in 2008 to 27% in 2010.

Recognition of the re3 partnership was fairly low at both centres (34% Smallmead and 37% Longshot Lane), these results are fairly similar to the 2009 survey. When asked if users knew where they can find out more information about the partnership, the internet was the most popular information source at both centres, at Smallmead 39% stated the 're3 website' and 24% stated the 'council website' and at Longshot Lane, 44% stating the 're3 website' and 29% stating the 'council website'.

Table 1 and 2 below present the key highlights from the survey while comparing this to the 2009 and 2008 results:

Table 1: Smallmead highlighted survey results

	2008	2009	2010
Rated the centre as good or very good for 'overall rating of the centre'	99%	98%	97%
Rated the centre as good or very good for 'onsite information and leaflets'	93%	94%	61%
Rated the centre as good or very good for 'cleanliness'	98%	97%	97%
Users visiting the centre weekly or more often	15%	14%	9%
Users visiting the centre once a month	32%	31%	31%
Users incorporating their visit to the centre as part of another trip	21%	29%	32%
Users approached by staff members	41%	40%	75%
Users stating staff members are helpful	94%	91%	95%
Users stating staff members are polite	15%	19%	51%

Table 2: Longshot Lane highlighted survey results

	2008	2009	2010
Rated the centre as good or very good for 'overall rating of the centre'	82%	98%	99 %
Rated the centre as good or very good for 'onsite information and leaflets'	52%	91%	86%
Rated the centre as good or very good for 'cleanliness'	85%	100%	99%
Users visiting the centre weekly or more often	23%	18%	16%
Users visiting the centre once a month	33%	36%	40%
Users incorporating their visit to the centre as part of another trip	16%	26%	32%
Users approached by staff members	27%	57%	50%
Users stating staff members are helpful	83%	88%	98%
Users stating staff members are polite	11%	10%	36%

Patronage Survey 2010

Smallmead HWRC

Authority	2010
Reading Borough Council	43.3%
Wokingham Borough Council	35.5%
West Berkshire Council	14.0%
South Oxfordshire District Council	1.6%
Basingstoke and Deane	0.4%
Hart District Council	0.3%
Windsor and Maidenhead Borough Council	0.3%
Bracknell Forest Borough Council	0.2%
Bradford MBC	0.1%
North Wiltshire	0.1%
Swindon Borough Council	0.1%
Unknown/ Illegitimate	4.1%
Total	100.0%

Longshot Lane HWRC

	2010
Bracknell Forest Council	56.6%
Wokingham Borough Council	36.9%
Windsor and Maidenhead	2.2%
West Berkshire Council	0.3%
Moray Council	0.1%
Reading Borough Council	0.1%
South Oxfordshire District Council	0.1%
Warwick District Council	0.0%
West Wiltshire District Council	0.0%
Unknown/ Illegitimate	3.7%
Total	100.0%