

**SOUTHWEST FLORIDA WATER MANAGEMENT DISTRICT**

**KING'S BAY/CRYSTAL RIVER WATERSHED EDUCATION  
PROGRAM TOWNHALL MEETING**

*RESEARCH RESULTS*  
*January 18, 2005*

# **SOUTHWEST FLORIDA WATER MANAGEMENT DISTRICT**

## **~ King's Bay/Crystal River Watershed Education Program Townhall Focus Session ~**

### **Introduction**

Decision Strategies Group (DSG) conducted a townhall focus session on January 15, 2005, to assist the Southwest Florida Water Management District's (SWFWMD) King's Bay/Crystal River Education Program. The goal of this townhall focus session was to gain a deeper, *quantitative and qualitative* understanding about four major sets of issues regarding residents in the Kings Bay/Crystal River Watershed area. They are:

1. Their knowledge base about the groundwater system
2. Their habits and sensitivities toward their watershed
3. Communications messages about their watershed that most resonated with them
4. Their preferred communications media for receiving educational messages about their watershed

DSG utilized an enhanced databased focus group technique designed to generate quantitative and qualitative data from each townhall focus session member, both before her/his opinions were influenced by group interaction and during group input to qualitative issues raised in the session. The acknowledged weakness of focus groups is that participants determine what their response and preference is by finding out what other people think is correct or desirable. Utilizing an individual voting system gave us significantly more precise information on the positioning statements (slogans) and ways to communicate educational messages.

### **Townhall Focus Session Research Results**

Decision Strategies Group conducted a townhall focus session to test, in more quantitative and qualitative detail, issues about Southwest Florida Water Management District's (SWFWMD's) King's Bay/Crystal River Watershed Education Program. The session was comprised of residents and business owners/managers in the King's Bay/Crystal River Watershed area who were at least 18 years of age.<sup>1</sup> DSG recruiters had a three-step recruitment process. First, we bought a listing of residential telephone numbers in the two targeted zip codes—34428 and 34429. We also received from SWFWMD a list of local businesses in this target area that had a direct role in the King's Bay/Crystal River watershed. Second, residents and businesspeople were contacted between 9:30 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. for recruitment purposes. We made 535 telephone contacts the first day and receiving only 55 verbal commitments to attend; we decided to take an ad out in the local newspaper and published a toll-free number that interested residents could call if they wished to participate in the focus session. In all, we contacted 1083 residents and businesses to reach our recruitment goal of 120 participants. All 120 participants were promised

---

<sup>1</sup> There was one exception to this, a participant who had been at a resident's home when Decision Strategies Group staff called to recruit participants. Apparently the resident on the phone asked this person if he was available to attend the townhall focus session and he agreed. While he was technically not in the targeted zip code, he actually lived just across the zip code line and his participation did not really contaminate the sample.

an honorarium of \$30 for their participation. Third, we then sent either a confirmation e-mail or letter to participants who had agreed to participate. By the Friday afternoon before the townhall focus session, we received 67 confirmations that residents would attend. A total of 45 residents and business people actually attended the session. While this was a much smaller number than we had anticipated, DSG spared no expense in the recruitment process. This said, the townhall focus session had more than 4 times the representation of a typical focus group and provided important quantitative and qualitative data to help guide SWFWMD's education efforts in the King's Bay/Crystal River watershed area.

### **Data Collection**

Using an "Issues Identification Questionnaire" with SWFWMD project staff, DSG developed a comprehensive list of issues that were of highest importance to SWFWMD's educational efforts in the King's Bay/Crystal River watershed area. In all, 42 questions were formulated for this research. We then divided the questions into three sets. The first set of questions was used in a questionnaire given to individual participants **before** the focus session actually started. These questions dealt with participants' "Knowledge Base" about the watershed and their "Watershed Habits & Sensitivities." The second set of questions dealt with participants' responses to a presentation by a County Extension Department staff person on "Florida-Friendly Landscaping." The third set of questions was developed to understand participants' reactions (how appealing each theme was to them and how much each theme made them want to actively conserve their watershed) to alternative education program themes. We followed these themes with questions about their preferences for a variety of communications media that could be used to educate them. All three sets of questions and the respective frequency data are presented in the Appendix of this report.

### **Knowledge Base and Watershed Habits**

The first 15 questions on the questionnaire dealt with watershed knowledge and habits issues. The questions were contained on a pencil and paper questionnaire and the results of each question are presented below.

#### **❖ THE VAST MAJORITY OF PARTICIPANTS (86%) KNEW THE CORRECT ANSWER TO WHAT A WATERSHED IS.**

This finding must be taken with some skepticism, however. SWFWMD staff decided to include this important question in the final version of the questionnaire. I cautioned them that asking it with a "Yes" –"No"—"Don't know" response had a huge demand characteristic. Since most people wouldn't want to appear stupid about such a fundamental question, the situation would demand they respond "Yes." To guard against this happening as best we could, we changed the question to a multiple choice format seeking to see if participants could pick out the correct answer from a list of possible alternatives. While this worked to some extent (14% selected the wrong answer, the correct answer was about twice as long and more technically sounding than the other answers and likely directed them to the correct answer. That said, by virtue of participants' attendance in the focus session, they are probably at the higher levels of citizen concern and knowledge about watershed conservation.

**❖ LAWN PESTICIDES/FERTILIZERS (48%) AND OIL/PETROLEUM PRODUCTS FROM CARS (27%) WERE SEEN BY PARTICIPANTS AS THE TWO WORST WATERSHED POLLUTERS.**

In the table below we rank the frequency of mention by participants of the 2 worst watershed pollutants:

<b>WATERSHED POLLUTANTS</b>	<b>%</b>
Lawn pesticides & fertilizers	48%
Oil/petroleum products from cars	27%
Septic tank leaching	17%
Storm water runoff	5%
Waste from boats	2%
Acid rain	1%

**❖ THE VAST MAJORITY OF PARTICIPANTS (86%) KNEW THAT STORM DRAIN RUNOFF FROM RAIN AND IRRIGATION GOES INTO LOCAL PONDS, LAKES & RIVERS.**

In the table below we rank the frequency of mention by participants of where storm drain runoff from rain and irrigation go:

<b>WHERE STORM DRAIN RUNOFF GOES</b>	<b>%</b>
Into local ponds, lakes & rivers	86%
Filters into the soil	9%
Into local waste treatment facilities	2%
Other	2%
Gets evaporated into the air	0%

**❖ THE LARGEST PERCENTAGE AND A CLEAR MAJORITY OF PARTICIPANTS (56%) THINK THE IMPACT OF RUNOFF ON THE KING’S BAY/CRYSTAL RIVER WATERSHED IS GREAT.**

We asked participants what they thought the impact of polluted runoff was on the King’s Bay/Crystal River watershed was. Fifty-six percent said it was “Great” while 40% said it was “Moderate.” Five percent said the impact was “Slight” and no one said there was “No” impact.

**❖ AN OVERWHELMING MAJORITY (95%) OF PARTICIPANTS SAID IT WAS “VERY IMPORTANT” TO THEM THAT LOCAL WATER BODIES HAVE CLEAN WATER.**

We asked participants how important it was to them that local bodies have clean water. Nearly a census (95%) said it was “Very important” while 5% said it was “Moderately important.” No one thought it was either “Slightly important” or “Not important.”

❖ **A CLEAR MAJORITY (60%) OF PARTICIPANTS FELT THE INFORMATION ON THE BACK OF FERTILIZER BAGS WASN'T UNDERSTANDABLE TO THE AVERAGE PERSON.**

Participants were asked whether they felt the content information on the back of fertilizer bags was understandable to the average person. Sixty percent said “No” it wasn’t while 24% said “Yes” it was understandable. Seventeen percent said they “Didn’t know” whether the information was understandable to the average person or not.

❖ **ABOUT ONE-IN-FOUR PARTICIPANTS KNEW THAT SEPTIC TANKS SHOULD BE INSPECTED EVERY 2-3 YEARS.**

A majority of participants thought septic tanks needed to be inspected more frequently than they actually do with 2% saying “Every 3 months,” 10% saying “Twice a year” and 43% saying “Once a year.” Twenty-four percent had the correct answer to this question, saying septic tanks need to be inspected “Every “2-3 years” and 21% said “Every 4-5 years.” Clearly there are a lot of public misconceptions about septic tank inspections.

❖ **NONE OF THE PARTICIPANTS AGREED WITH THE CONCEPT THAT “IF A LITTLE FERTILIZER IS GOOD FOR YOUR LAWN, A LOT IS BETTER.”**

Eighty-eight percent said the statement was “false” and selected the correct reason that “if the grass roots don’t use all the fertilizer, it will be washed below the roots and go into the aquifer.” Twelve percent thought the statement was “false” but had an incorrect reason that “the biggest danger is that fertilizer will sit on the grass blades and burn them.” Clearly participants know that over-fertilizing one’s lawn is harmful.

❖ **MORE THAN THREE-IN-FOUR PARTICIPANTS SAID IT WAS TRUE THAT DRY GRANULAR FERTILIZER IS SLOW-RELEASE FORM PROVIDES NUTRITION TO GRASS LONGER THAN LIQUID FERTILIZER.**

Seventy-six percent of participants believe that granular fertilizer, in its slow-release form, provides nutrition to grass longer than liquid fertilizer while 24% said it was false. Whether or not participants actually practice the behavior, the vast majority knew that dry granular fertilizer has greater benefits to your lawn than liquid fertilizer.

❖ **A FULL 80% OF PARTICIPANTS ALSO BELIEVE THAT DRY GRANULAR FERTILIZER IS SAFER FOR THE AQUIFER THAN LIQUID FERTILIZER WHILE 20% THOUGHT LIQUID WAS SAFER THAN DRY GRANULAR FERTILIZER.**

- ❖ **MORE THAN THREE-IN-FOUR PARTICIPANTS SAID THEY WERE EITHER VERY OR MODERATELY WILLING TO SPOT APPLY DRY GRANULAR FERTILIZER TO SPOT TREAT PROBLEM AREAS OF THEIR LAWN INSTEAD OF TREATING THE ENTIRE LAWN.**

Sixty-five percent of participants said they were “Very willing” to spot treat problem areas of their lawn with dry granular fertilizer and 19% said they were “Moderately willing” to do so. Nineteen percent said they were only slightly willing to spot treat their lawn with dry fertilizer and no one said they were “Not willing” to use the spot treatment method.

- ❖ **NEARLY NINE-OUT-OF-TEN PARTICIPANTS SAID THEY WERE EITHER “VERY” OR “MODERATELY” INTERESTED IN LEARNING MORE ABOUT APPROPRIATE FERTILIZER APPLICATION AND THIS WAS BEFORE BEING PRESENTED WITH THE “FLORIDA-FRIENDLY LANDSCAPING” SLIDE SHOW.**

Fifty-seven percent of participants were “Very interested,” 31% said they were “Moderately interested” and 12% said they were “Slightly interested” in learning more about appropriate fertilizer application.

- ❖ **A VERY LARGE MAJORITY (86%) OF PARTICIPANTS SAID THEY CONSIDER A PLANT’S WATER NEEDS BEFORE PLANTING IT WHILE 14% DID NOT.**
- ❖ **A VERY LARGE MAJORITY OF PARTICIPANTS (81%) SAID THEY HAD NEVER HEARD OF THE FLORIDA YARDS & NEIGHBORHOODS PROGRAM WHILE SLIGHTLY LESS THAN TWO-IN-TEN HAD HEARD OF IT.**
- ❖ **SLIGHTLY MORE THAN TWO-THIRDS OF PARTICIPANTS SAID THEY WERE WILLING TO LEARN MORE ABOUT USING THE RIGHT PLANTS IN THE RIGHT PLACES IN THEIR YARD.**

We ended the “Watershed Habits” section of the questionnaire by asking participants how willing they were to learn more about using the right plants in the right places in their yard. Sixty-seven percent said they were “Very willing” to learn more while another 26% said they were “Moderately willing” to learn more. Seven percent said they were only slightly willing to learn more about using the right plants in the right areas of their yard and no one said they weren’t willing to learn more. Clearly the learning climate in the King’s Bay/Crystal River Watershed area is ripe for SWFWMD’s educational program.

### **Watershed Sensitivities**

We asked participants a series of four questions to ascertain their sensitivities to the King’s Bay/Crystal River watershed. The results are presented below.

- ❖ **EVERY PARTICIPANT AGREED WITH THE STATEMENT THAT “EVERY HOMEOWNER/BUSINESS OWNER HAS A PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY TO PROTECT THE WATERSHED.”**

Fifty-one percent of participants “Strongly agreed” and 49% “Agreed” that every homeowner/business person has a personal responsibility to protect the watershed. No one disagreed with this statement. This was the third strongest response to the four “Watershed Sensitivities” questions.

❖ **EVERY PARTICIPANT ALSO AGREED WITH THE STATEMENT THAT “GOOD WATER QUALITY IS IMPORTANT TO THE LOCAL ECONOMY.”**

Seventy-two percent of participants “Strongly agreed” and 28% “Agreed” that good water quality is important to the local economy in this area. No one disagreed with this statement. This was the second strongest response to the four “Watershed Sensitivities” questions.

❖ **EVERY PARTICIPANT ALSO AGREED WITH THE STATEMENT THAT “GOOD WATER QUALITY IS IMPORTANT TO THE LIVES OF THE PEOPLE LIVING IN THIS AREA.”**

Seventy-four percent of participants “Strongly agreed” and 26% “Agreed” that good water is important to the lives of people in this area. No one disagreed with this statement. This was the strongest response to the four “Watershed Sensitivities” questions.

❖ **SLIGHTLY MORE THAN HALF THE PARTICIPANTS SAID THEY PAY A GREAT DEAL OF ATTENTION TO HOW THEIR ACTIONS MIGHT AFFECT THE AREA’S WATER QUALITY.**

Fifty-four percent of the participants said they pay a “Great deal of attention” to how their actions affect the area’s water quality while 33% said they pay “Moderate attention” and 9% said they pay “Slight attention.” An additional 5% said they pay “No attention” to how their actions affect the area’s water quality.

### **Florida-Friendly Landscaping Reactions**

After the 16-slide PowerPoint presentation on “Florida-Friendly Landscaping,” we asked participants two important questions.

The first question was “What would make you most interested in learning more about Florida-Friendly landscaping?” The results showed the vast majority (75%) said knowing “it will help protect their water resources” would make them most interested. Knowing “It will save them time” came in a distant second (11%) while 7% of the participants listed an “Other” response. Only 5% said that knowing “It will save them money” would make them most interested in learning more about Florida-Friendly landscaping, and 2% said, “I have no interest in knowing more.” In looking at the “Other” response category, the most frequently mentioned suggestions were having “more readily available information” and “making sure the information was ‘in your face’ as opposed to having to work to find it.” A number of people liked the idea that plants have “Florida-Friendly” tags on them with information about where they would best be planted in a yard. Some participants also said that homeowner’s associations need to learn about the value

and importance of Florida-Friendly landscaping so they can ease their restrictions against it. Everyone agreed that such information is missing at the bigger outlets like Home Depot and Wal-Mart. One person said that there was a small nursery in the area that did provide this kind of information on the plants they sold.

The second question concerned what was the biggest barrier to participants actually engaging in Florida-friendly landscaping? The largest proportion (43%) of participants chose the “Other” category. Most prominent among participants’ “other” factors were: 1) lack of knowledge about the concept; 2) the fact that plants don’t carry a “Florida-Friendly” label; 3) can’t find the FYN phone number; 4) the cost is/seems too prohibitive to retrofit their landscaping to Florida-Friendly standards; 5) neighborhood association restrictions against such landscaping; 6) no motivation to change; 7) attitudes that favor the status quo; 8) they don’t have the knowledge of what Florida-Friendly landscaping is or where it can be bought.

**Educational Themes & Communications Media**

We concluded the townhall focus session by asking participants to respond to seven educational themes that SWFWMD is considering using to headline its educational program in the King’s Bay/Crystal River Watershed area. Two questions were asked about each educational theme: 1) “How appealing is this theme to you?” 2) “How much does this theme make you want to actively conserve?” Since each theme was measured on a 4-point Likert-type scale, we are also able to compute a mean (average) score for both questions on each educational theme. By ranking each theme according to their respective mean scores, we can get a clear sense of participant preference for both “appeal” and “motivation.” The **lower** the mean score, the **more appealing** and motivating the theme. The results from this analysis are included in the table below:

**Educational Themes**

<b>EDUCATIONAL THEMES</b>	<b>Appeal Mean Score*</b>	<b>Conserve Mean Score*</b>
<i>Water Protection—A Way of Life</i>	1.75	1.98
<i>If We All Help We can Protect Our Watershed</i>	1.97	2.30
<i>A Watershed—Where We Work, Live and Play</i>	1.98	2.09
<i>My Watershed. My Choice. Our Future.</i>	2.00	2.18
<i>A Clean Watershed is Your Business</i>	2.14	2.42
<i>Be Good to Your Watershed</i>	2.61	2.84
<i>Watershed Protection for Life</i>	2.74	2.93

**\*Note: Scores are ranked from most to least appealing and motivating.**

The results of this analysis show a clear winner and a clear “Top 3” educational themes. “Water Protection—A Way of Life” has the greatest appeal to participants and motivates them most to want to actively conserve. It is the clear winner. “A Watershed—Where We Work, Live and Play” was ranked a close third in appeal, but did considerably better in motivating participants to actively conserve and is the second best theme. “My Watershed. My Choice. Our Future” came in very close to the previous two educational themes on appeal, and it came in third in motivating participants to actively conserve. For this reason I rank it the third best theme. Again,

participants strongly encouraged SWFWMD to educate the community about what a watershed is before they use the term in their education program.

In addition to this quantitative analysis, we also asked participants to suggest some additional educational themes that would resonate even more with them. Several participants suggested exploiting the term “life” in a theme. These people said they liked “Water Protection—A Way of Life” and suggested SWFWMD explore other themes that emphasized the importance of water to life. There appeared to be a growing consensus among participants that this was a worthwhile suggestion that would ensure the theme was successful in the King’s Bay/Crystal River Watershed community.

### **Communications Media**

After getting participants input on the seven educational themes presented in the previous section, we took the next step of asking them about their preferences for receiving educational information. As we know, people’s lives are inundated with communications across a wide array of platforms. The question to our audience was what is their preferred media to receive this information. We offered them nine different media and ended with a question that asked participants to select the “single most” preferred way to receive information about the King’s Bay/Crystal River Watershed.

As with the educational themes above, we measured each of the communication media on a 4-point Likert-type scale. This allowed us to compute a mean (average) score for each medium. By ranking each communications medium according to its respective mean scores, we can get a clear sense of participant preference. The **lower** the mean score, the **stronger** the preference for the medium. The data from this analysis is presented in the table below.

---

<b>COMMUNICATIONS MEDIA</b>	<b>Preference Mean Score</b>
Landscaping/irrigation retail outlets	1.40
Newspaper inserts	1.71
Direct mail campaigns	1.81
Workshops by community groups	2.02
Cable television programming	2.05*
Workshops by UF experts	2.05
A respected spokesperson	2.24
Environmental organization speaker	2.41
Information offered on the Internet	2.61

---

**\*Note: a U-F expert placed Cable television ahead of workshops because there were stronger extreme positives and fewer negatives despite both having the same mean score.**

We followed this question by asking participants what “other” ways they would like SWFWMD to communicate about the watershed educational program information to them. A

few suggested local talk radio shows or a 60-second radio ad. Others suggested using the following mechanisms: putting materials in lobby of the City of Crystal River building, publishing newspaper articles or ads with resource phone numbers, having information at public libraries, having landscaping demonstrations on Saturday mornings at the Home Depot landscaping area, and working through local schools to educate students and encourage them to bring educational materials home to their parents.

We also asked participants to choose their “single most preferred” communications medium to receive information about the King’s Bay/Crystal River Watershed. The results reinforce the analysis of the mean scores presented above, particularly the top and bottom choices. The table below presents the results of this analysis.

<b>COMMUNICATIONS MEDIA</b>	<b>% Most Preferred</b>
Landscaping/irrigation retail outlets	34%
Direct mail campaigns	22%
Newspaper inserts	17%
Workshops by U-F experts	10%
Workshops by community groups	7%
A respected spokesperson	7%
Cable television programming	2%
Environmental organization speaker	0%
Information offered on the Internet	0%

### **Conclusions & Recommendations**

With a great deal of effort we were able to gather a representative collection of 45 residents within the 33428 and 33429 zip codes representing the King’s Bay/Crystal River Watershed area. The fact that it took so much effort to attract these 45 residents to a meeting that offered them an honorarium for their participation, speaks to some of the challenges facing SWFWMD in their efforts to provide a watershed education program in this area. That said, we found the group to be very concerned about the quality and future of the King’s Bay/Crystal River Watershed area. They were also fairly knowledgeable about many of the conservation ideas and seemed very willing to change their habits and behaviors to improve watershed conservation in their area. The following recommendations are offered to SWFWMD as a means of helping their watershed education program optimally succeed in the King’s Bay/Crystal River Watershed area.

- While 86% of the participants could pick out the correct definition of watershed from a list of competing definitions, many suggested that the term was not well understood in the King’s Bay/Crystal River Watershed area. They suggested an initial educational program aimed at creating a greater understanding of the term would be a necessary and cost-effective first step.

- *Water Protection—A Way of Life* was the educational theme that had the most resonance with participants, both in its appeal and in making them want to actively conserve. Participants said they especially liked the link between water and life and suggested SWFWMD explore that link more when considering other educational themes.
- Participants preferred to get their information and messages about the King’s Bay/Crystal River Watershed via retail outlets that carry landscaping/irrigation. This is followed by direct mail and newspaper inserts (particularly the local newspaper). SWFWMD’s Internet site and various community group speakers and workshops are much less desirable to participants. Participants also offered a series of “less expensive” and “local” ways to get Watershed and “Florida-Friendly” information to residents and business owners and these are listed in the body of the report. One suggestion worth repeating is to target schools and give materials to students to bring home to their parents. One participant who was a teacher with a grade school child said: “If you get kind involved and interested and give them the tools, they will take these things home and influence their parents.”
- Participants were strongly impressed with the “Florida-Friendly Landscaping” slideshow. They suggested that the biggest barrier to people adopting these landscaping principles was the lack of adequate information about which landscaping materials are “Florida-Friendly.” They thought that this information should be placed in prominent positions at Home Depot and Wal-Mart and even put tags on “Florida-Friendly” landscape materials to help residents with their landscaping choices. Participants were also willing to change many of their old habits and embrace new behaviors like spot fertilizing with dry granules rather than spraying their entire lawns.
- Participants warned against several barriers to engaging in watershed conservation behavior. The most revealing of these are: 1) some homeowners’ associations don’t know about conservation and Florida-Friendly landscaping and actually have restrictions against such efforts; 2) people feel it is cost-prohibitive to convert to Florida-Friendly landscaping and they must either be encouraged through rebates or coupons or informed about how to make the conversion slowly, but effectively; 3) most participants didn’t know nor could they get the phone number of the FYN office and couldn’t ask conservation questions of someone knowledgeable about conservation and Florida-friendly landscaping. Promoting the FYN is important.

# SWFWMD Crystal River/Kings Bay "Townhall" Meeting Questionnaire

*Please circle the choice that you matches your knowledge or opinion on each subject*

1. Which of the following best describes a watershed?

- 0% a. A large pond of fresh water
- 14% b. Water runoff after a rain storm
- 0% c. Standing surface water
- 0% d. Where ducks and other waterfowl congregate
- 86% e. An area of land that water flows across as it moves toward stream, river, lake or coast

2. Please **circle** what you think are the 2 **worst** watershed pollutants in your area of Florida.

- 27% a. Oil/petroleum products from cars
- 17% e. Septic tanks leachate
- 1% b. Acid rain
- 2% f. Waste from boats
- 48% c. Lawn pesticides & fertilizers
- 0% g. Other \_\_\_\_\_(please write in)
- 5% d. Stormwater runoff

3. Where does the runoff from rain and irrigation go when it goes into the storm drain?

- 86% a. Into local ponds, lakes & rivers
- 9% d. Filters into the soil
- 2% b. Into the local waste treatment facility
- 2% e. Other
- 0% c. Gets evaporated into the air

4. What you think is the impact of polluted runoff on the Kings Bay watershed?

- 56% Great
- 40% Moderate
- 5% Slight
- 0% None at all

5. How important is it to you that local water bodies have clean water?

- 95% Very important
- 5% Moderately important
- 0% Slightly important
- 0% Not important

6. Do you think the instructions and content information on the back of a fertilizer bag are understandable to the average person?

- 24% YES
- 60% NO
- 17% DON'T KNOW

7. How often should a septic tank be inspected?

- 2% a. Every 3 months
- 24% d. Every 2-3 years
- 10% b. Twice a year
- 21% e. Every 4-5 years
- 43% c. Once a year

8. If a little fertilizer on your lawn is good, a lot is better:

- 0% a. True, but you could end up spending a lot of money buying more than you need.
- 0% b. True, the sand/soil will hold everything the grass roots don't need right away and the grass can use it later.
- 88% c. False, if the grass roots don't use it all, the rest will be washed below the roots and go into the aquifer.
- 12% d. False, the biggest danger is that fertilizer will sit on the grass blades and burn them.

9. A **dry** granular lawn fertilizer in a slow-release form will provide nutrition to the grass longer than liquid fertilizer. **76%**  
TRUE **24%**  
FALSE
10. A liquid fertilizer is safer for groundwater than a dry granular fertilizer. **20%**  
TRUE **80%**  
FALSE
11. How willing are you to spot apply environmentally-friendly pesticides to problem areas of your lawn instead of treating the entire lawn?  
**65%**  
Very willing
**14%**  
Moderately willing
**19%**  
Slightly willing
**2%**  
Not willing
12. How interested are you in learning more about appropriate fertilizer application?  
**57%**  
Very interested
**31%**  
Moderately interested
**12%**  
Slightly interested
**0%**  
Not interested
13. Do you consider a plant's water needs before deciding to plant it? **86%**  
YES **14%**  
NO
14. Have you ever heard of the Florida Yards & Neighborhoods Program? **19%**  
YES **81%**  
NO
15. How willing are you to **learn** about using the right plants in the right places in your yard?  
**67%**  
Very willing
**26%**  
Moderately willing
**7%**  
Slightly willing
**0%**  
Not willing

***To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?***

16. Every homeowner/business person has a personal responsibility to protect the watershed.  
**51%**  
Strongly agree
**49%**  
Agree
**0%**  
Disagree
**0%**  
Strongly disagree
17. Good water quality is important to the lives of people in the area.  
**74%**  
Strongly agree
**26%**  
Agree
**0%**  
Disagree
**0%**  
Strongly disagree
18. Good water quality is important to the local economy.  
**72%**  
Strongly agree
**28%**  
Agree
**0%**  
Disagree
**0%**  
Strongly disagree
19. How much attention do you pay to how your actions may affect the area's water quality.  
**54%**  
Great deal of attention
**33%**  
Moderate attention
**9%**  
Slight attention
**5%**  
No attention

***THANK YOU, WE WILL NOW MOVE ON TO THE FUN STUFF!***

