Table 4. Calibrated WTP for select cities.

City	CRP Type	Raw WTP Estimate	Hypothetical bias Correction	Sample vs. Population Correction	Calibrated WTP Estimate
Tempe, AZ	M	7.89	–2.71	–0.06	5.12
Longmont, CO	M	7.52	–2.71	–0.05	4.75
Orem, UT	V	6.04	–2.31	+0.01	3.75
Wichita, KS	V	5.42	–2.31	+0.12	3.24
Fargo, ND	V	5.06	–2.31	+0.03	2.78
Abilene, TX	N	5.18	–2.96	+0.04	2.26
Palo Alto, CA	M	5.35	–2.71	–0.39	2.25
Escondido, CA	M	4.84	–2.71	+0.02	2.14
Peoria, AZ	N	5.13	–2.96	–0.05	2.13
Olathe, KS	V	4.41	–2.31	–0.11	1.99
Inglewood, CA	N	4.39	–2.96	+0.38	1.81
Newport Beach, CA	M	4.46	–2.71	–0.35	1.40

Note: Mandatory and voluntary CRP cities were selected due to the availability of cost data. Three representative non-CRP cities were chosen at random. The correction for differences between the sample and population demographics includes the variables: gender, age, education, household size, income, primary language, and race.

result, to determine whether it is an efficient use of society's resources, we need to evaluate curbside recycling on a city-by-city basis.

In Table 5, we take a closer look at the 12 communities included in Table 4. Calibrated WTP values from Table 4 and per-household costs from Table 1 are provided in columns 2 and 3. Column 4 presents the corresponding social net benefits of curbside recycling, which vary greatly across the 12 communities. For example, monthly net benefits in Tempe, AZ, are $3.50 per household, while in Palo Alto, CA, they are –$2.85. At their current populations and rates of CRP participation, this amounts to an annualized net benefit gain of $1.5 million in Tempe and an annualized net benefit loss in Palo Alto of $1.0 million.

To shed some light on the variation in community net benefits noted above, we dig deeper into the two communities located on opposite ends of the net-benefit spectrum—Tempe, AZ (high end), and Palo Alto, CA (low end). As indicated by the information contained in columns 2 and 3 of Table 5, the net-benefit difference between these two communities is due to differences in both the costs and benefits of curbside recycling. On the benefits side, Tempe has a nearly $3 higher adjusted benefit per household than Palo Alto. The majority of this difference is unexplained variation captured by our city dummy variable, while the remainder appears to be due to the fact that, all else equal, Tempe has a younger population, higher employment rate, and respondents were less likely to give refusals on the first call attempt.[23]

Although we can only conjecture on what may be driving the unexplained difference in WTP across the two communities, one possibility is the residents' perceptions regarding landfill constraints. For example, Tempe is more actively informing residents of landfill issues than is Palo Alto. The Tempe Public Works Department (2006) states on their Web site: "One thing is certain, in the next few years Tempe's

[23] The community dummy variables for Tempe and Palo Alto (not shown in Table 3) account for $2.15, or more than two-thirds of the total difference in WTP, across these two cities.