

Euclid Creek Environmental Awareness Survey Results
Report Generated: February 3, 2010
Date Range of Survey: September 2008-December 2009

Primary Residence of Respondents

- 243 people answered this question and 48 skipped it
 - Beachwood – 4 [7 respondents to Tinkers Creek Environmental Survey]
 - Cleveland - 21
 - Euclid - 35
 - Highland Hts. - 15
 - Lyndhurst - 22 [81 respondents to Tinkers Creek Environmental Survey]
 - Mayfield Hts. – 24
 - Mayfield Village - 2
 - Richmond Hts. – 26
 - South Euclid – 66
 - Willoughby Hills – 2
 - Non-Euclid Creek Watershed communities - 26

Demographics

Gender:

- A total of 291 people responded to the survey
- The respondents consisted of **52% (133) females** & 45% (116) males
- 7 skipped the question of “Gender”

Age:

- 2% (4) were 18-24 years old
- 12% (30) were 25-34 years old
- 20% (50) were 35-44 years old
- **24% (62) were 45-54 years old**
- 24% (60) were 55-64 years old
- 16% (41) were 65 years old or older
- 8 skipped the question of “Age”

Education Level:

- 0% (0) 8th grade or less
- .4% (1) some high school
- 4% (10) graduated high school
- 1% (3) vocational/tech school
- 22% (56) some college
- **38% (96) graduated college**
- 32% (82) advanced degree

Racial/Ethnic Background:

- 2% (4) Asian
- 6% (16) African-American
- 0% (0) Hispanic
- **83% (214) Caucasian**
- 7% (18) Declined to answer

Marital Status:

- 21% (52) Single
- **58% (147) Married**
- 5% (12) Widowed
- 9% (24) Divorced, Separated
- 8% (19) Declined to answer

Total Annual household income:

- 2% (4) Under \$15,000
- 2.4% (6) \$15,001-\$25,000
- 7% (17) \$25,001-\$35,000
- 16% (39) \$35,001-\$50,000
- 15% (39) \$50,001-\$75,000
- 27% (67) \$75,001-\$100,000
- 16% (41) Over \$100,000
- 27% (67) declined to answer

Water Resource Knowledge

- 78% (220) of respondents knew the definition of a watershed
- 91% (198) responded that they do live in a watershed
- 63% (180) knew which watershed they lived in and 37% (107) did not
- 76% (203) believe storm water runoff goes into a “Nearby stream/river/lake” after it flows into a storm drain; 17% (45) believe it flows to a “treatment plant”; and 8% (21) were “unsure”
- 91% (244) agree that storm water runoff contains pollutants that could adversely affect water quality; 4% (11) disagreed; and 5% (13) were unsure
- 92% (247) agreed that it is illegal to dump, throw or discharge anything into a creek or storm drain other than storm water runoff ; 3% (7) disagreed; and 6% (16) were unsure
- When asked if their community had an illegal dumping hotline...
 - 10% (27) said yes
 - 14% (39) said no
 - 76% (204) were unsure

Recommendations:

1. Of residents who responded, the majority knew the definition and name of their watershed. They also have a good understanding about where storm water flows and that pollutants in storm water can adversely affect storm water. The Watershed program should continue basic watershed education, but should focus efforts on ways to reduce storm water runoff since respondents understood the basics of water resource knowledge.
2. Respondents know that dumping of anything but storm water down a storm drain is illegal, but did not know if their community had an illegal dumping hotline. So the Euclid Creek Watershed Public Involvement & Public Education (PIPE) program should focus education efforts on the topic of Illegal dumping resources in the watershed communities.

Yard Care

- 94% (252) of respondents have a yard, and of those...
 - % of yard covered by turf grass:
 - 6% (14)said 0-20%
 - 14% (36)said 21-40%
 - 31% (77) said 41-60%
 - **32% (81) said 61-80%**
 - 18% (44) said 81-100%
 - 62% (158) knew what a rain garden was; 23% (58) did not and 15% (37) were unsure
 - 70% (176) converted portions of their lawn into a landscaped area
 - 61% (152) said they'd be willing to reduce the amount of grass in their yard by installing a rain garden or other landscaped feature; 10% (26) said they would not and 29% (73) said they'd need more information
 - 75% (186) said they'd be willing to use native vegetation in their lawn; 6% (14) would not and 19% (48) said they would need more information
 - 91% (230) knew what a rain barrel was
 - 15% (34) had installed a rain barrel in the last 5 years and 85% (197) had not

- 21% (52) utilize a lawn care company
 - #1 reason the lawn care company was chosen – “environmentally friendly”
 - #2 reason the lawn care company was chosen – “reputation for high quality”
- 77% (195) take care of their lawn themselves, and of those...
- 48% (120) fertilize their own lawn and 51% (127) do not;
 - in deciding how much fertilizer to use:
 - 79% (85) consult the product label
 - 27% (29) decide on their own
 - 16% (17) consult a garden center
 - 10% (11) consult friends/neighbors
 - 6% (6) heed government agency recommendations
- Only 12% (14) of respondents are sure they had a soil nutrient test performed in past 5 years
- 60% (142) mulch or compost their yard waste; 39% (93) in the garbage; 37% (89) leave it for the City to recycle; 2% (4) rake it into a stream/river/wetland or natural drainage feature; and .8% (2) rake it into a ditch or storm drain
- 90% (221) knew if their community had leaf/yard waste pick-up; 7% (16) were unsure; and 4% (10) said their community did not have the service
- 35% (86) of respondents had applied pesticides in the past year
 - #1 decision affecting how much to apply – product labels
 - #2 decision affecting how much to apply – consult garden center
- 40% (98) recall receiving lawn care educational info, of those, 55% (53) found it useful
- “When applying pesticides and fertilizers, excess amounts can be a source of water pollution as storm water carries the polluted runoff into nearby water bodies.”
 - 80% (199) of respondents strongly agreed with the above statement
 - 15% (38) somewhat agreed
 - 2% (5) somewhat disagreed
 - .8% (2) strongly disagreed
 - 2% (5) were unsure

Recommendations:

3. 60% of respondents do not recall receiving educational information about yard care. Therefore, the Euclid Creek Watershed PIPE program should provide general educational information about lawn care related issues and their impact on water quality to watershed residents, via preferred dissemination methods (discussed below in the *Future Outreach* section).
4. Specific topics should include but not be limited to:
 - a. Rain gardens or alternate landscaping features to reduce the amount of grass in their yard
 - b. Native plant information; benefits of and where to get plants locally
 - c. Benefits of and reasons for soil testing
 - d. Alternative environmentally sensitive lawn care management practices and products
 - e. Continue to promote easy acquisition of rain barrels

Stream Care

- 24% (64) of respondents owned property bordering a stream river, wetland or natural drainage feature
- In describing their property 25-50' adjacent to the water resource (riparian area)
 - **47% (31) described it as natural/undisturbed**
 - 21% (14) described it as lawn
 - 10% (7) described it as a landscaped area
 - 4% (3) described is as man-made structures
 - 3% (2) described it as bare soil
 -
- 23% (15) tried to stabilize their stream using boulders, concrete, etc. to prevent erosion

Recommendations:

5. 53% of respondents describe their riparian area as modified. Therefore, the Euclid Creek Watershed PIPE program should provide general educational information to streamside owners about the importance of keeping these areas natural/undisturbed.

Pet Wastes

- 57% (153) of respondents own at least one dog, and of those...
 - 70% (106) let their pet relieve itself outdoors and of those...
 - 54% (58) clean up after their dog “all of the time”
 - Of the 56% (49) who do not clean up after their dog “all of the time”...
 - 40% (16) indicated the addition of convenient disposal locations would encourage them to do so
 - 40% (16) indicated utilizing a sanitary collection method (e.g., a pooper scooper) would encourage them to do so
 - 94% (100) said they dispose of soiled pet litter/bedding or pet waste in the garbage or flush down the toilet; 7.5% (8) bury, dump or compost waste on their property
 - 56% (85) do not “strongly agree” that pet waste can be a source of nutrients and bacteria for local water resources
 - 18% (43) recall receiving educational information regarding pet waste related issues from the City in the past 5 years, and of those, 71% (40) found it useful (more people answered that question than had animals, thus the numbers discrepancy)

Recommendations:

6. Nearly 1/2 of respondents that own dogs do not strongly agree that pet wastes can degrade local water resources, and 56% do not clean up their wastes all of the time. The Euclid Creek Watershed program should continue providing general educational information about the appropriate handling of pet wastes and its impact on water quality, via preferred dissemination methods.
7. Because a high percentage of respondents indicated the addition of convenient disposal locations would encourage them to properly dispose of pet wastes, a better understanding of where residents walk their dogs would help assess where placement of such features would be most appropriate.

Vehicle Maintenance

- 96% (251) of respondents own or lease one or more vehicles, and of those...
 - 85% (215) indicated their oil is changed by a service garage
 - Of the 15% (37) who change their own oil
 - Only 1 respondent did not dispose of used oil via an acceptable drop off location
 - 53% (134) wash their vehicle(s) at a commercial or self-serve carwash facility
 - 40% (103) wash their vehicle(s) at a private residence, and of those...
 - 65% (65) dispose of the rinse water by allowing it to drain directly to a storm sewer in the street, road ditch or a nearby drain
 - 32% (80) do not “strongly agree” that proper disposal of vehicle fluids and rinse water from car washing is necessary to protect the quality of local water resources
 - 31% (76) recall receiving educational information regarding vehicle maintenance related issues, and 59% (43) of those found it useful

Recommendations:

1. Residents appear to be well-educated with regard to the proper disposal of used motor oil. Only 31% of those recall receiving educational information in the past, therefore, the Euclid Creek Watershed PIPE program should continue providing general educational information about used motor oil disposal, in addition to all other vehicle fluids, and its impact on water quality, via preferred dissemination methods.
2. With regard to rinse water resulting from car washing activities, there is room for improvement. Rinse water is not just composed of soapy water, but it also includes the residue that is washed off the vehicle (e.g., oil, grease, brake dust, etc.). Residents who wash their vehicles at their homes should be encouraged to wash their vehicles in a location where rinse water can be diverted to their lawn (e.g., stretch an old hose diagonally across the driveway), or wash them directly on their lawn. Directing it to garage floor drains would also be advised, assuming the drain connects to a sanitary sewer.

Future Outreach

- Respondents indicated the following methods would be the 6 most effective in attracting their attention and providing them with information about protecting water quality (#1 being most effective):
 1. Community newsletter articles - 70% (171)
 2. Demonstration project in the neighborhood - 65% (159)
 3. Emailed news article / conservation tip – 63% (154)
 4. Literature mailed to your home – 59% (144)
 5. An internet website – 58% (142)
 6. A regular newspaper column – 55% (135)

all other responses were below 50%

Euclid Creek Environmental Awareness Survey Results Summary

Date Range of Survey: September 2008-December 2009

A total of 291 people responded to the survey

Primary Residence of Respondents:

- 243 people answered this question and 48 skipped it
 - Beachwood – 4 [7 respondents to Tinkers Creek Environmental Survey]
 - Cleveland - 21
 - Euclid - 35
 - Highland Hts. - 15
 - Lyndhurst - 22 [81 respondents to Tinkers Creek Environmental Survey]
 - Mayfield Hts. – 24
 - Mayfield Village - 2
 - Richmond Hts. – 26
 - South Euclid – 66
 - Willoughby Hills – 2
 - Non-Euclid Creek Watershed communities – 26

Water Resource Knowledge Recommendations:

- Of residents who responded, the majority knew the definition and name of their watershed. They also have a good understanding about where storm water flows and that pollutants in storm water can adversely affect storm water. The Watershed program should continue basic watershed education, but should focus efforts on ways to reduce storm water runoff since respondents understood the basics of water resource knowledge.
- Respondents know that dumping of anything but storm water down a storm drain is illegal, but did not know if their community had an illegal dumping hotline. So the Euclid Creek Watershed Public Involvement & Public Education (PIPE) program should focus education efforts on the topic of illegal dumping resources in the watershed communities.

Yard Care Recommendations:

- 60% of respondents do not recall receiving educational information about yard care. Therefore, the Euclid Creek Watershed PIPE program should provide general educational information about lawn care related issues and their impact on water quality to watershed residents, via preferred dissemination methods (discussed below in the *Future Outreach* section).
- Specific topics should include but not be limited to:
 - a. Rain gardens or alternate landscaping features to reduce the amount of grass in their yard
 - b. Native plant information; benefits of and where to get plants locally
 - c. Benefits of and reasons for soil testing
 - d. Alternative environmentally sensitive lawn care management practices and products
 - e. Continue to promote easy acquisition of rain barrels

Stream Care Recommendations:

- 53% of respondents describe their riparian area as modified. Therefore, the Euclid Creek Watershed PIPE program should provide general educational information to streamside owners about the importance of keeping these areas natural/undisturbed.

Pet Wastes Recommendations:

- Nearly 1/2 of respondents that own dogs do not strongly agree that pet wastes can degrade local water resources, and 56% do not clean up their wastes all of the time. The Euclid Creek Watershed program should continue providing general educational information about the appropriate handling of pet wastes and its impact on water quality, via preferred dissemination methods.
- Because a high percentage of respondents indicated the addition of convenient disposal locations would encourage them to properly dispose of pet wastes, a better understanding of where residents walk their dogs would help assess where placement of such features would be most appropriate.

Vehicle Maintenance Recommendations:

- Residents appear to be well-educated with regard to the proper disposal of used motor oil. Only 31% of those recall receiving educational information in the past, therefore, the Euclid Creek Watershed PIPE program should continue providing general educational information about used motor oil disposal, in addition to all other vehicle fluids, and its impact on water quality, via preferred dissemination methods.
- With regard to rinse water resulting from car washing activities, there is room for improvement. Rinse water is not just composed of soapy water, but it also includes the residue that is washed off the vehicle (e.g., oil, grease, brake dust, etc.). Residents who wash their vehicles at their homes should be encouraged to wash their vehicles in a location where rinse water can be diverted to their lawn (e.g., stretch an old hose diagonally across the driveway), or wash them directly on their lawn. Directing it to garage floor drains would also be advised, assuming the drain connects to a sanitary sewer.

Future Outreach Recommendations:

- Respondents indicated the following methods would be the 6 most effective in attracting their attention and providing them with information about protecting water quality: community newsletter articles; demonstration project in the neighborhood; emailed news article / conservation tip; literature mailed to your home; Internet website; and regular newspaper column.