# **Russian River** Watershed Association



R U S S I A N R I V E R WATERSHED ASSOCIATION

## Storm Water & Watershed Awareness Tracking Survey

For Effective Public Outreach & Education

January 28, 2010

Prepared by



Public Outreach Consultants

239 Windsor River Road, Windsor, CA 95492 Phone: (707) 836-0300 Fax: (707) 836-0842

INTRODUCTION & BACKGROUND	1
Research Purpose & Objectives	1
Methodology	2
Sample Description	2
Report Conventions	4
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	
Core Findings	6
Conclusions & Recommendations	
SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS	
Total Survey Area	10
DETAILED ANALYSIS	
Household Activity Behavior & Knowledge Car Washing	<b>13</b>
Dog Waste Disposal	
Motor Oil Disposal Vard Fertilizer Runoff	
Draining Pool or Spa	
Yard Waste Disposal	
Watershed Knowledge	26
Where the Water Goes	
What is a Watershed?	
Your Watershed	
INDIVIDUAL SUMMARY ANALYSES	32
	22
Debrert Derk	52
	42
Windsor	52
Unincorporated Sonoma County	62
2009 QUESTIONNAIRE	
2009 TABULATED DATA	

## **INTRODUCTION & BACKGROUND**

## **Research Purpose & Objectives**

This research project was undertaken by the Russian River Watershed Association (RRWA) to provide an accurate and statistically valid representation of community awareness of, and opinions about, issues related to storm water and storm water pollution within the individual geographical areas of the four participating RRWA member agencies. This analysis compares the results of the 2009 survey to data collected in a 2005 baseline study as a means of measuring the effectiveness over time of public education and outreach programs for the following agencies/areas:

- Unincorporated Sonoma County
- Healdsburg
- Windsor
- Rohnert Park

The 2005 survey covered those same four geographic areas and also included Ukiah and unincorporated Mendocino County. However, for this analysis, data from Ukiah and unincorporated Mendocino County have been filtered out of the 2005 data set for comparison purposes. Therefore, percentages shown for 2005 in this report differ slightly from those shown in the 2005 Baseline Survey Report published in May 2005.

Working with the RRWA, the Data Instincts team developed a questionnaire designed to elicit candid and useful responses from the sample population. The survey was only slightly modified from the previous 2005 survey and covers the following broad topics with the intent of establishing a baseline measure of residents' knowledge of their watershed and issues that affect it:

- Demographics
- Type of residence (SFD, apartment, condo, etc.)
- Habits related to car washing, motor oil disposal, lawn/yard care, yard waste disposal, dog waste pick-up, and pool & spa maintenance
- Knowledge related to the most environmentally friendly methods of car washing, motor oil disposal, lawn/yard care, yard waste disposal, dog waste disposal, and pool & spa maintenance
- Knowledge of watershed creeks and rivers
- Information sources for storm water issue awareness

The survey is divided into two informational components: 1) resident behavior and knowledge with regard to specific household activities that can affect the health of the Russian River Watershed and 2) resident knowledge of their watershed area. Additionally, demographic information was obtained for analytical purposes.

To measure behavior and knowledge, questions were posed first to determine which household activities the respondents participated in at least occasionally. Then respondents were asked how they performed those tasks (usually related to disposal issues), and, finally, what they believe is the best way to perform said tasks while protecting the health of the environment.

To measure general watershed knowledge a series of questions were posed to test respondent awareness and to determine where they currently get most of their information.

It should be noted that, with regard to behavior associated with some household activities, not all residents are adhering to public policy. Though those instances are evident in the analysis, this report is focused on behavior and knowledge that have a direct effect on the health of storm drains and the watershed.

## Methodology

The telephone surveys were conducted from October 23 through November 3, 2009 by Mountain West Research Center in Pocatello, Idaho. To achieve statistically significant and reliable data, the following methods were used:

- Final TOTAL sample size 502 completed surveys (+/- 4.4% confidence interval at a confidence level of 95%), yielding 125+ completed surveys for each of the four geographical regions (confidence interval ranging from +/-8.69 to 8.76 for each area).
- Survey length did not exceed 10 minutes (to prevent respondent fatigue and dropouts).
- Spanish translation was provided as needed.
- Interviewers asked to speak to person 18 years of age or older who had the most recent birthday among those present in household (to yield a broad demographic cross-section of the population).
- Interviewing was conducted during evening hours and on weekends to ensure greater participation among all demographic groups.
- Random sampling methods were employed, using zip codes to define the regions in the sample universe.

## Sample Description

For this analysis, the combined sample from the four regions will be referred to as the "total Russian River Watershed survey area" or "total sample"; that sample is described here. Sample descriptions for each individual city or county can be found in the Individual Summary Analyses section of this report.

For each geographic area the following quotas were enforced:

- A total of 125 interviews per geographic area
- No more than 60% Female
- No fewer than 10% 18-24 year-olds (to ensure representation)
- No more than 18% multi-unit dwellers (defined as apartments, condominiums, retirement or student housing)

As was the case in 2005, the total sample of 502 interviews yielded a gender balance of 41% male to 59% female. The following graph depicts the age distribution of the final sample, which tracks very closely to that of the 2005 survey (shown in parentheses).



Incomes and education levels are distributed as follows:

INCOME	2009	2005	EDUCATION	2009	2005
Less than \$35K	20%	19%	High school or less	28%	26%
\$35K to \$55K	16	20	Some college/vocational	29	31
\$55K to \$75K	15	13	College grad (Bach.)	28	28
\$75K to \$100K	13	16	Post grad (Masters, PhD)	14	12
More than \$100K	17	17			
Refused	19	15	Refused	2	3

Homeowners make up 67% of the final sample and 32% are renters, compared to 68% and 31% respectively in the 2005 baseline sample. The percentage of respondents that occupy various types of housing is identical to the 2005 baseline sample. This year's figures are shown below with 2005's percentages shown in parentheses:



The following chart shows the racial mix of the final sample with figures from 2005 in parentheses:



## **Report Conventions**

Because the larger sample size for the aggregated survey area yields the most statistically reliable data, the Detailed Analysis section of this report approaches the data from that perspective. In that section, each question is looked at by geographical area as well as by any significant demographic breaks, which are also more reliable due to the sample size.

In the Individual Summary Analyses section, each survey area is individually summarized. Because of the smaller sample size (n=125) for each area, these individual analyses look only at the total samples, they are not broken out by demographics. Still, in some cases, as the survey focuses on individuals who participate in certain household

activities, the sample sizes become too small to be considered statistically reliable. For that reason, smaller sample sizes are cited throughout the analysis.

Many of the graphical depictions of the data do not add up to 100%. This is because, to simplify the layout, certain responses like "other" or "none of the above" were left out when deemed to be of lesser value to the reader.

The Tabulated Data section contains a data set segmented by each geographical area and various demographic measures. Occasionally, the reader will find that numbers in the data do not exactly correspond to numbers cited in the analysis. In most cases, this will be due to moving some responses, which were recorded as "other" responses (verbatim), into the quantified data when deemed appropriate by the analyst.

## Terminology

Unless otherwise specified, references to "total sample" mean the aggregated n=500 sample.

For the purposes of this report, a multi-unit dwelling is defined as an apartment, condominium, retirement housing or student housing. Duplexes, four-plexes and mobile homes are included as single-family dwellings (SFD) because their occupants are more likely to participate in similar kinds of household activities as those who live in detached houses.

In the data set, unincorporated Sonoma County is referred to as Sonoma County.

## Other

One survey question asked respondents for their e-mail addresses if they would like to receive periodic messages about what they can do around their homes to positively affect the water quality in their area. Out of the total sample, 133 (or 26%) offered their e-mail addresses; for each interview area, the number of email addresses received is as follows:

Healdsburg	36
Rohnert Park	33
Windsor	31
Unincorporated Sonoma County	33

These e-mail addresses are listed for each area beginning on page 147 in the Tabulated Data section of this report. The addresses will also be made available in Excel spreadsheet format to each participating municipality or county.

The Data Instincts team would like to thank the Russian River Watershed Association for the opportunity to work on this survey.

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

## **Core Findings**

In the 2005 baseline survey, when measuring respondent behavior and knowledge, car washing and fertilizing the yard emerged as the areas of greatest concern with regard to storm drain and watershed health. This is because a relatively large percentage of the watershed population engaged in these activities – with many doing so in ways that were not environmentally sound.

This year, the number of home car washers has decreased slightly to 51% from 58% in 2005; and those washing on an unpaved surface, which is safer for the environment, has increased from 15% to 23%. While that is an improvement, 75% of this year's home car washers are still washing on a paved surface and nearly a quarter of those believe that doing so is better for the environment (another improvement compared to 32% in 2005).

Similarly, slightly fewer watershed residents report using fertilizer on their lawns or gardens: 48% compared to 54% in 2005. But about a quarter of those who do fertilize also let runoff occur, which has essentially remained the same from 2005 to 2009.

In addition to many residents simply not knowing the best way to protect the environment while washing their cars or fertilizing their gardens, there are also those who are aware that what they are doing is hazardous to the environment, but do so in spite of that knowledge. This is particularly a concern regarding runoff after fertilizing, wherein 63% of those who have noticeable runoff after fertilizing are aware that it is hazardous for the environment – yet they continue the practice. This finding is essentially unchanged from the 2005 baseline study.

Another trouble spot is among those who maintain home pools or spas. Though far fewer residents (only 17% of the watershed population in both survey years) participate in this task compared to other measured tasks, 21% of them use an algaecide other than chlorine or bromine, and 12% drain directly into storm drains. These measurements have not changed since the 2005 survey. However, this year, only 7% of pool/spa maintainers believe draining into a storm drain, drainage ditch or creek is best for the environment, which is an improvement compared to 14% in the baseline survey.

Resident *behavior* in two of the tested activities remained very good between 2005 and 2009: dog waste and yard waste disposal.

While more dog owners this year report picking up their dogs' waste while on a walk (84% compared to 74% in 2005), there was little change in the percentage that pick up pet waste from their yards (around 90% in both study years).

No one in either survey year reported disposing of dog waste into storm drains. However, though almost no one believes the storm drain is the best disposal method, the data

suggests there is some confusion about which pet waste disposal methods are the most environmentally sound.

A large percentage of watershed residents (75% in both study years) perform yard work and none of them in either 2005 or 2009 dispose of their yard waste into the storm drain system. Further, almost no one believes that to be the environmentally sound method of disposing of yard waste (only one respondent in 2009; none in 2005).

Also relatively unchanged are the measurements regarding motor oil disposal. In both survey years, 20% of the population changes motor oil at home. Among them, fewer than 2% report pouring the used oil into a storm drain. In 2009 one person said that method is the environmentally best way to dispose of motor oil, compared to no one in 2005.

Between 2005 and 2009, there has been some improvement with regard to watershed knowledge. This year, 53% of the total population understands that water entering gutters and storm drains goes directly into a river or other waterway, compared to only 42% in 2005; only 18% believe the water goes to a sewage treatment plant, compared to 27% in the previous survey.

Still, 21% simply don't know where the water goes, which is only a slight improvement over 28% in 2005. And, this year, about the same percentage (42%) understands that a watershed is a land area that drains into a specific body of water, compared to 38% in 2005. In both study years, only about a third of watershed residents understand that they live in a watershed.

This year, just over half (52%) of the watershed population feels they are, personally, getting enough information about what they can do to protect the water quality in the watershed; this is an improvement over the 44% in 2005. Only 26% expressed an interest in receiving periodic e-mail messages about things they could do to positively affect the water quality in their area. This is similar to the 22% in 2005.

Finally, though somewhat lacking in knowledge, people do feel empowered. In both study years, when the total sample was asked if they think that they, personally, can have any effect on protecting the water quality in the Russian River or its tributaries, 76% said they could.

## **Conclusions & Recommendations**

It should be noted that, with regard to behavior associated with some household activities, not all residents are adhering to public policy. Though those instances are evident in the analysis, this report is focused on behavior and knowledge that have a direct effect on the health of storm drains and the watershed.

The data indicates that certainly no ground has been lost, and there are signs of improvement in some measures, such as the knowledge of the Russian River Watershed population regarding their watershed and how their activities might affect the environmental health of local waterways.

Essentially, our specific recommendations are similar to those from 2005, with some updates and new insights

People who are homeowners and/or living in single-family dwellings are more likely to perform the household activities tested in this survey.

Education programs focused on the trouble-prone areas of car washing and fertilizer runoff should be targeted at the above audience, specifically people who live in single-family dwellings, which is likely the common denominator. Because pool and spa owners are so few in number, efforts could be made to reach them through pool/spa maintenance providers, sellers and installers, as well as retailers who sell pool/spa supplies.

Because such a large percentage of people who fertilize their yards are allowing tainted runoff to occur even though they know it poses a hazard to the environment, educational efforts should emphasize what the specific hazards are and offer simple alternatives to fertilizing and/or ways to eliminate runoff.

Education and outreach programs focused on general watershed knowledge should:

- Make the connection between how certain household activities are performed and their effect on the health of the watershed.
- Drive home the point that water going into gutters and storm drains goes directly into waterways and NOT to a treatment facility.

Because 44% of watershed residents get most of their water quality information from newspapers, the local papers should be a major component of any educational program or outreach effort. Preparing a press release highlighting some of the findings of this survey might be a good place to start.

Additionally, programs should be developed to send periodic informational messages to the 26% of respondents who gave their e-mail addresses this year and the 22% from 2005. This is a cost-effective method of outreach that will likely reach your target. Again, sending highlights from this report, perhaps one or two findings per week, accompanied by a related educational message, could be part of that communication strategy.

Since many more people report having e-mail access (and presumably Internet access) this year than in 2005 and because the Internet made it into the top five watershed information resources, the power of the Internet should not be ignored. The Russian River Watershed Association, and its participating agencies, have Web pages dedicated to educating the public about their watershed and what they can do to protect it. All other educational efforts and materials should direct recipients to the Web site(s) for more detailed information. The Web site(s) should be updated to encourage visitors to get on an e-mail list in order to receive helpful tips and watershed/storm water related news.

Lastly, the RRWA should share this report with the Sonoma County Waste Management Agency and continue its collaborative public education efforts with that agency.

## SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS

## **Total Survey Area**

#### Household Activity Behavior & Knowledge

To establish a baseline, in 2005 respondent behavior and knowledge was measured with regard to some ordinary household activities, which, if performed improperly, can have a negative effect on the watershed: car washing, dog waste disposal, motor-oil disposal, fertilizing the yard, maintaining a pool or spa, and yard waste disposal. This year, a follow-up survey was conducted to track any changes that have occurred since the baseline study.

In measuring overall watershed knowledge and the household activity knowledge and behaviors that specifically relate to storm drain health, there have been only minimal changes from 2005 to 2009. When a statistically significant change has occurred from year to year, we will note it in the following summary:

- 1.1. Those who fall into one or more of the following subgroups are more likely to perform the tested household activities: homeowners, living in single-family dwellings.
- 1.2. As far as the storm drains and the health of the watershed are concerned, resident *behavior* in two of these activities gets a completely positive report: dog waste and yard waste disposal. In other words, no one reports putting dog waste or yard waste into the storm drains.
- 1.3. When measuring resident *knowledge*, respondents who need to dispose of dog waste were asked which disposal method is best for the environment, less than 1% said putting it into a storm drain or gutter. However, 11% either did not know the best method or said it does not matter
- 1.4. Less than 1% of respondents believe putting yard waste into the storm drain is best for the environment; 3% to 4% of those who perform yard work either don't know the best method of disposal or said it does not matter.
- 1.5. Those who change motor oil at home do pretty well with regard to keeping used or excess oil away from the waterways and knowing that pouring oil into storm drains is not environmentally healthy. Only 20% of the population changes motor oil at home and, among them, only 1% to 2% reports pouring the used oil into a storm drain. One percent of home motor oil changers said that method is the environmentally best way to dispose of motor oil.
- 1.6. The following three household activities emerged as areas of greater concern with regard to storm drain and watershed health: car washing, fertilizing the yard, and pool/spa maintenance.
- 1.7. Though still a concern, home car washing has experienced the most improvement with regard to resident behavior. This year fewer people are washing their cars at home at least occasionally: 51% compared to 58% in 2005. This year, about 38% of the total population washes on a paved surface, an improvement over the 48% in 2005. Residents in cities are more likely to wash on a paved surface than those

who live in the unincorporated areas, where there are more unpaved surfaces available.

- 1.8. This year, when home car washers were asked if it is better for the environment to wash on a paved or unpaved surface, 32% recognize that washing on an unpaved surface is preferable, compared to only 19% in 2005. However, in both years, about half of home car washers said they did not know the environmentally preferable car washing method or that it did not make any difference where they wash their car.
- 1.9. About half of those surveyed use fertilizer on their lawns or gardens at least occasionally and, among them, about one-fourth experiences runoff.
- 1.10. Though many residents allow fertilizer-tainted runoff to occur, when asked if it poses a hazard to the environment, about three-quarters of those who use fertilizer answered in the affirmative. About two-thirds of those who allow tainted runoff to occur, do so knowing that it is hazardous to the environment.
- 1.11. Though only 17% of the total population maintains a pool or spa at home, among them, 21% percent uses an algaecide other than chlorine or bromine and 12% of pool/spa maintainers drain their pools or spas into a storm drain.
- 1.12. Pool/spa maintainers have improved on the knowledge measure. In 2005, 14% said it is best for the environment to drain into a storm drain; in 2009, only 7% gave that response. When you take into account that in both study years 27% to 34% of pool/spa maintainers say they have never drained their pool or spa, there is concern about where they will drain to, when they do.

#### Watershed Knowledge

- 2.1. This year 53% of respondents understand that water entering into storm drains goes directly into a river or other waterways that lead to a river; this is an improvement over the 42% in 2005. Eighteen percent (18%) believe it goes to a treatment plant compared to 27% in 2005. Twenty-one percent (21%) this year, compared to 28% in 2005, say they don't know where the water goes.
- 2.2. Only 38% to 42% of the total population knows that a watershed is a land area that drains into a specific body of water.
- 2.3. Only about one-third of the population recognizes that they live in a watershed, with people living in cities generally being further removed from that knowledge than those living in unincorporated county areas.
- 2.4. When those who know they live in a watershed were asked to name that watershed, 40% to 43% named the Russian River, more than a third said they do not know, and about one-fourth named a watershed other than the Russian River.
- 2.5. Though somewhat lacking in knowledge, people do feel empowered. When the total sample was asked if they think they, personally, can have any effect on protecting the water quality in the Russian River or its tributaries, more than two-thirds said they could.

- 2.6. More people, this year, feel they are, personally, getting enough information about what they can do to protect the water quality in the Russian River and its tributaries: 52% compared to 44% in 2005. But only about one-fourth are interested in receiving periodic e-mail messages about things they can do around the house to positively affect the water quality in their area.
- 2.7. Far more watershed residents reported that they did not have access to e-mail in 2005 (22%), compared to 2009 (12%).
- 2.8. This year, the top sources of information about water quality or water pollution, and the percentage of mentions they received (multiple responses possible), are:
  - o Newspapers (44%)
  - o Water Department/District (18%)
  - o Television (14%)
  - o Internet (13%)
  - o Utility bill inserts (9%)
  - o Word of mouth (9%)
- 2.9. Though newspapers are still the top information sources for watershed residents, fewer people this year (44%) are relying on their newspapers for water quality information, compared to 2005 (52%).
- 2.10. Additionally, more residents are turning to their water departments for information (18% compared to 3% in 2005) and the Internet has become a much bigger player since the 2005 baseline survey, with 13% of respondents naming that as one of their information sources, compared to only 4% in the previous survey.

## **DETAILED ANALYSIS**

## Household Activity Behavior & Knowledge

## **Car Washing**

Fifty-one percent (51%) of the total sample wash their motor vehicles at home at least occasionally, which is down from 58% in 2005. In 2009, 42% of Rohnert Park residents wash their cars at home compared to 58% of those from unincorporated Sonoma County, 53% from Windsor and 52% from Healdsburg. Three of four of the areas surveyed have fewer home car washers in 2009 than in 2005; only Windsor shows little change. Though fewer residents in that town report washing their cars at home on a regular basis than in 2005, the percentage that does so at least occasionally (53%) is identical to the previous study.



#### Year-to-Year Comparison: Frequency of Washing Car at Home

This year, fifty-five percent (55%) of those living in single-family dwellings wash their cars at home compared to 21% of those living in apartments or condominiums. Fifty-six percent (56%) of 18-34 year olds and 53% of those aged 35-54 wash their cars at home compared to 47% of those 55 and over.

#### **Behavior: Car Washing Method Used**

	TOTAL		HLD	HLDSBG		RP		WNDSR		CO
	2009	2005	2009	2005	2009	2005	2009	2005	2009	2005
Paved surface	75%	82%	82%	85%	85%	98%	85%	91%	51%	58%
Unpaved surface	23	15	15	12	11	0	12	8	49	37
Don't know	2	3	3	2	4	2	3	2	0	5
BASE	257	290	65	82	53	64	67	66	72	78

Among the 257 respondents who wash their cars at home in 2009, 75% report doing so on a paved surface and 23% on an unpaved surface. This is an improvement compared to 2005 when 82% washed on a paved surface and 15% on an unpaved surface. More of those living within the city limits of Rohnert Park (85%), Windsor (85%) and Healdsburg (82%) wash on a paved surface than do people living in the unincorporated areas of Sonoma County (51%).

	TOTAL		HLDSBG		RP		WNDSR		SO	CO
	2009	2005	2009	2005	2009	2005	2009	2005	2009	2005
Paved surface	24%	32%	25%	34%	32%	38%	22%	42%	18%	15%
Unpaved surface	32	19	32	18	34	19	36	14	28	26
No difference	32	36	31	38	23	34	31	29	40	41
Don't know	12	13	12	10	11	9	10	15	14	18
BASE	257	290	65	82	53	64	67	66	72	78

#### Knowledge: Car Washing Method Best for the Environment

Twenty-four percent (24%) of home car washers believe washing on a paved surface is preferable compared to 32% in 2005; 32% recognize that washing their car on an unpaved surface is better for the environment, a marked improvement over the 19% in 2005; and another 32% of those who wash their cars at home said it does not make any difference where they wash their cars (36% in 2005). In both studies, around 12% of the total sample was unsure which method is best for the environment.

It is interesting to note that, though a far greater percentage of respondents from unincorporated Sonoma County report that they wash on an unpaved surface, when asked what is best for the environment a relatively large percentage (40%) of those same respondents say it does not make a difference, compared to 31% of those in both Healdsburg and Windsor and 23% in Rohnert Park.

This year, thirty-seven percent (37%) of respondents whose annual household income is greater than \$35K know that washing a car on an unpaved surface is better for the environment compared to 26% of those who earn less than \$35K. Forty-one percent (41%) of college graduates share that knowledge compared to 22% of those with high school or less education. And 40% of the male respondents compared to 28% of females said that washing a car on an unpaved surface was preferable.

In 2009, 46% of those who wash on an unpaved surface know it is the environmentally preferred method, compared to 32% in 2005. Among those who wash on a paved surface, 28% know that unpaved is best, compared to 18% in 2005.

## **Dog Waste Disposal**

This year, 45% percent of the total sample walks their dog(s) at least occasionally, compared to 40% in 2005. Compared to the 2005 baseline survey, the percentage of dog walkers went up in Healdsburg (42% compared to 38%), Rohnert Park (46% compared to 39%), and Windsor (47% compared to 34%); and there was just about the same percentage of dog walkers in unincorporated Sonoma County this year compared to the last survey (44% compared to 46% in 2005).



#### Year-to-Year Comparison: Frequency of Walking a Dog

Fewer people living in multi-family dwellings (22%) walk their dogs at least occasionally compared to those living in single-family dwellings (48%). And fewer of those earning less than \$35,000 per year (29%) are dog walkers compared to those earning over that amount (52%)

#### Year-to-Year Comparison: Frequency of Picking Up Dog Waste on Walk



■% Always □% Usually

In 2009, among the respondents who walk their dog at least occasionally, 84% report that their dog's droppings are always or usually picked up during the walk compared to 74% in 2005; 4% this year compared to 6% in 2005 sometimes pick up dog waste; 10% rarely or never pick the droppings up, compared to 17% in 2005.

This year, compared to those from within city limits, respondents living in unincorporated Sonoma County are less likely to pick up dog droppings when they walk their dogs, with 27% reporting that they rarely or never do so. That is compared to 5% of Windsor and Rohnert Park residents and 2% of those living in Healdsburg.

Year-to-Year Comparison: Frequency of Picking Up Dog Waste From Yard



Among the same respondents that walk their dogs, the percentage that say the dog droppings are picked up from their yards at least occasionally are essentially unchanged from year to year (90% in 2009; 89% in 2005). Again, people living in unincorporated Sonoma County are far less likely to pick up dog droppings from their yard at least occasionally: 71% compared to 94% of Healdsburg residents, 93% from Windsor and 100% of Rohnert Park residents.

	TO	TOTAL		HLDSBG		RP	WNDSR		SO CO	
	2009	2005	2009	2005	2009	2005	2009	2005	2009	2005
Trash	70%	70%	75%	66%	74%	86%	75%	84%	54%	47%
Composted	10	19	4	17	5	10	7	9	26	37
Yard waste can	8	1	10	4	7	0	12	0	2	0
Pet waste container	4	2	2	0	5	0	2	0	7	2
Toilet	3	3	6	6	2	2	0	5	7	0
Buried	2	2	2	2	3	2	0	0	4	2
Other/Don't know	2	3	2	5	4	0	4	1	0	12
BASE	213	190	52	47	58	49	57	43	46	51

#### **Behavior: Dog Waste Disposal Method Used**

Among those who either pick up their dog's droppings when walking or pick them up from their yard, or both, 70% say they dispose of the droppings into the trash (also 70% in 2005), 10% report that they compost the droppings (19% in 2005), and 8% put them in the yard waste can (1% in 2005). In both years, a handful of respondents variously said they bury, flush or use a specially designated pet waste container. Nobody in either year reported that they wash dog waste into the street gutter or storm drain.

In both study years, residents of unincorporated Sonoma County were the least likely to put their pet waste into the trash and most likely to compost it, compared to those living within the city limits of Healdsburg, Rohnert Park and Windsor.

	TO	TOTAL		HLDSBG		RP	WNDSR		SO CO	
	2009	2005	2009	2005	2009	2005	2009	2005	2009	2005
Composted	37%	33%	33%	26%	36%	29%	35%	30%	46%	45%
Trash	36	39	35	38	36	47	39	42	33	31
Toilet	15	14	15	23	16	14	16	9	11	10
Gutter/Stormdrain	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0
None of above	2	1	4	2	0	0	0	0	4	2
No difference	5	4	8	2	3	2	7	5	0	8
Don't know	6	7	6	9	9	8	4	9	7	4
BASE	213	190	52	47	58	49	57	43	46	51

#### Knowledge: Dog Waste Disposal Method Best for Environment

When read a list of dog-waste disposal alternatives and asked which is best for the environment, the responses were nearly evenly divided between composting (37%) and putting it in the trash (36%). This finding is similar to that in 2005: 33% and 39% respectively.

Fifteen percent think flushing it down the toilet is best for the environment (14% in 2005); 5% don't think it makes any difference how dog waste is disposed of (4% in 2005) and 6% said they are unsure (7% in 2005). No respondents this year, compared to only 1% in 2005, think that washing dog waste into the street gutter or storm drain is the best method of disposal for the environment.

## Motor Oil Disposal

In both survey years, 20% of respondents reported changing their motor vehicle oil at home at least occasionally. Also in both years, a greater percentage of those living in unincorporated Sonoma County are home motor oil changers than their in-town counterparts: 26% compared to 19% respectively. However, since 2005, the percentage of home-oil changers in unincorporated Sonoma County has slightly declined from 33% to 26% this year; while the same measurement for those living within city limits increased very slightly from 16% in 2005 to 19% this year.



#### Year-to-Year Comparison: Frequency of Changing Motor Oil at Home

Far more of those living in single-family dwellings are home motor oil changers (21%) compared to those living in multi-family homes (12%). More men (27%) compared to women (16%) change their motor oil at home. And a greater percentage of those under the age of 54 (24%) compared to their older counterparts (14%) change their own motor oil. And 24% of those with a high school education are home oil changers compared to just 13% of those with post-graduate degrees.

NOTE: Out of the total sample of 502 respondents, only 102 change their motor oil at home. Because of this small sample size, we will not attempt to analyze or compare respondent behavior and knowledge measurements by the various geographical or demographic subsets.

#### Behavior: Used Motor Oil Disposal Method Used

	TC	TAL
	2009	2005
Recycling facility	47%	2%
Hazardous waste collection event	17	50
Auto parts store	16	6
Curbside recycling	6	_24
Trash	2	0
Gutter/Storm drain	2	1
Landfill/Dump	2	3
Stored indefinitely	1	1
Other/Don't know	7	13
BASE	102	103

When home motor-oil changers were asked how they dispose of their used motor oil, the responses this year were quite different from those in 2005. Nearly half (47%) take the used oil to a recycling facility; this is a big change from the 2% that gave that response in 2005. This year, only 17% take their used motor oil to a hazardous collection site, compared to 50% in 2005. Sixteen percent (16%) take it to an auto parts store compared to 6% in 2005; and 6% put it out for curbside recycling/pick-up compared to 24% in the previous survey. This year, 2% (or two people) report pouring the old oil into a storm drain, compared to 1% in 2005.

	TO	TAL
	2009	2005
Hazardous waste collection site	62%	65
Curbside recycling	26	28
Trash	1	0
Gutter/Storm drain	1	0
Landfill/Dump	2	3
Sink/Drain	1	1
None of above	4	2
Makes no difference	1	0
Don't know	2	1
BASE	102	103

#### Knowledge: Used Motor Oil Disposal Method Best for Environment

When read a list of disposal methods and asked which is best for the environment, the responses tracked closely with those of the 2005 baseline survey: 62% of those who change their oil at home picked hazardous waste collection site (65% in 2005) and 26% selected curbside recycling (28% in 2005). This year and in 2005, one person thought pouring it down the sink or drain is best for the environment. And one person this year thought pouring the oil into the gutter or storm drain was the environmentally best method of disposal. Nobody gave that response in 2005.

#### Yard Fertilizer Runoff

Forty-eight percent (48%) of the total sample uses fertilizer on their lawn or garden at least occasionally, compared to 54% in 2005. Fertilizer usage has slightly declined in each of the surveyed geographical areas, with the exception of Windsor, which saw a slight increase.



#### Year-to-Year Comparison: Frequency of Using Fertilizer

More people aged 35 and older (51%) say they use fertilizer than their 18-34 year-old (37%) counterparts. More homeowners (57%) compared to renters (28%) use fertilizer and only 19% of multi-unit dwellings use fertilizer compared to 52% of those who live in single-family dwellings.

	TOTAL		HLDSBG		RP		WNDSR		SO CO	
	2009	2005	2009	2005	2009	2005	2009	2005	2009	2005
Runoff Occurs	24%	27%	28%	33%	30%	17%	26%	41%	9%	15%
No runoff	74	71	69	65	70	80	71	58	89	83
Don't know	2	2	3	1	0	3	3	2	2	2
BASE	241	272	64	75	53	66	69	66	55	65

#### **Behavior: Occurrence of Runoff after Fertilizing**

Among those who fertilize at least occasionally, 74% say they experience <u>no</u> noticeable runoff from water hitting the driveway/sidewalk, running off the lawn or plants or running into the street or gutter. This finding is similar to the 71% in 2005. This year, 24% do experience some kind of runoff (27% in 2005).

While the results of this measure tracked closely year-to-year for the Healdsburg and unincorporated Sonoma County samples, there were significant changes for both Rohnert Park and Windsor. In 2009, 30% of Rohnert Park respondents said they experience runoff, which is significantly worse than 17% in 2005. In 2009, 26% of Windsor respondents said they experience runoff, which is a significant improvement over 41% in 2009.

	TOTAL		HLD	HLDSBG		RP		WNDSR		CO
	2009	2005	2009	2005	2009	2005	2009	2005	2009	2005
Poses hazard	75%	77%	84%	76%	68%	73%	72%	86%	73%	72%
Not hazardous	18	16	9	19	25	15	19	11	22	18
Don't know	7	7	6	5	8	12	9	3	5	9
BASE	241	272	64	75	53	66	69	66	55	65

#### Knowledge: Is Runoff after Fertilizing Hazardous to the Environment?

When asked if it poses a hazard to the environment to allow water to run into the gutter or storm drain after fertilizing, 75% of respondents recognize that it does (77% in 2005).

Relative to other geographical areas in the survey, a higher percentage of Healdsburg respondents know that runoff poses a hazard to the environment: 84% compared to unincorporated Sonoma County (73%), Windsor (72%) and Rohnert Park (62%). Healdsburg also showed a significant improvement in this measure from year-to-year, with 84% recognizing that runoff is hazardous, compared to 76% in 2005.

While fewer Windsor residents report that runoff occurs this year (26% compared to 41% in 2005), fewer also know that it is hazardous for the environment to allow runoff (72% compared to 86% in 2005).

In comparing knowledge with behavior, we find that 63% of those who experience some kind of runoff after fertilizing their yard realize it poses a hazard to the environment. Among those who do not experience runoff, 77% recognize the hazards, 15% do not believe it is hazardous to the environment, and 7% don't know.

## **Draining Pool or Spa**

In both study years, only 17% of the total samples at least occasionally maintained a pool or spa located in their yard. Twenty-five percent (25%) of residents from unincorporated Sonoma County report partaking in pool/spa maintenance activities, followed by Windsor (21%), Rohnert Park (12%) and Healdsburg (11%).

The percentage of Rohnert Park pool/spa maintainers went down since 2005 (12% in 2009 compared to 21% in 2005); while the percentage of unincorporated Sonoma County pool/spa maintainers went up (25% in 2009 compared to 17% in 2005). Changes in Windsor and Healdsburg were minimal and not statistically significant.

A higher percentage of those earning more than \$75,000 a year are pool/spa maintainers (27% compared to 10% of those earning less). Not surprisingly most pool/spa maintainers are homeowners (88%) living in single-family dwellings (100%).



#### Year-to-Year Comparison: Frequency of Maintaining Pool or Spa

Algaecide usage has remained steady from year-to-year, with 21% of the 85 pool/spa maintainers saying they do use an algaecide besides chorine or bromine; around 68% saying they do not; and about 11% not sure.



#### Year-to-Year Comparison: Algaecide Use among Pool/Spa Maintainers

■% of pool/spa maintainers that algaecides besides chlorine or bromine

NOTE: Out of the total sample of 502 respondents, only 85 maintain a pool or spa at home. Because of this small sample size, we will not attempt to analyze or compare respondent behavior and knowledge measurements by the various geographical or demographic subsets.

#### **Behavior: Where Drain Pool or Spa**

	ТО	TAL
	2009	2005
Yard/Landscaping	44%	33%
Never drained	27	34
Storm drain/gutter	12	12
Sewer line cleanout	9	7
Drainage ditch/Creek	2	0
Other	2	3
Don't know	4	10
BASE	85	86

When the pool/spa maintainers were asked where they drain their pool or spa, 44% said into their yards or landscaping (33% in 2005), 9% into a sewer line clean out (7% in 2005), and 2% to a drainage ditch or creek (0% in 2005). Twenty-seven percent (27%) say they have never drained their pool or spa, compared to 34% in 2005. In both years, **12% report draining their pool or spa into a storm drain or gutter.** 

Of the ten individuals, in 2009, who drain into a storm drain or gutter, five are from Windsor, two each are from Rohnert Park and unincorporated Sonoma County, and one is from Healdsburg. Two individuals who drain to into a storm drain also use an algaecide other than chlorine or bromine.

	Т	OTAL
	2009	2005
Yard landscaping	61%	35%
Sewer line cleanout	12	29
Storm drain/gutter	7	14
Drainage ditch/Creek	4	2
None of the above	2	7
Makes no difference	9	3
Don't know	5	9
BASE	85	86

#### Knowledge: Where Best for Environment to Drain Pool or Spa?

When the pool/spa maintainers were read a list of possible places to drain a pool or spa and asked which was the best for the environment, 61% said into the yard or landscaping (35% in 2005), 12% into a sewer line clean out (29% in 2005), 4% into a drainage ditch or creek (2% in 2005), 9% said it does not make any difference where you drain it (3% in 2005), and 5% were unsure (9% in 2005). Only 7% said into a storm drain or gutter, which is a significant improvement over the 14% in 2005.

Of the 6 individuals who think it is best for the environment if they empty their pool or spa into a storm drain or creek, half (3) are from Windsor, two from Healdsburg, and one from unincorporated Sonoma and Mendocino counties. Three individuals who think it is best for the environment to drain into a storm drain also use an algaecide other than chlorine or bromine.

## Yard Waste Disposal

In both study years three-fourths (75%) of the total sample engage in yard work like mowing the lawn or cleaning up leaves on a regular or occasional basis. Yard workers are fairly evenly distributed across the geographic areas included in the survey.

This year 4% of the total sample uses a professional service for their yard work, which works out to be 7% of Windsor respondents, 3% each Healdsburg and Rohnert Park, and 2% unincorporated Sonoma County. This tracks closely with the 2005 baseline survey.



#### Year-to-Year Comparison: Frequency of Performing Yard Work

Eighty-one percent (81%) of homeowners do yard work at least occasionally, compared to 63% of renters. And 83% of those living in single-family dwellings, compared to 27% of those living in multi-family housing, perform yard work at least occasionally. Finally, only 61% of those earning less than \$35,000 per year are yard workers compared to 79% in the \$35,000 to \$75,000 income level and 83% of those in the over \$75,000 income level.

#### **Behavior: Yard Waste Disposal Method Used**

	TO	ΓAL	HLD	SBG	F	RP	WN	DSR	SO	CO
	2009	2005	2009	2005	2009	2005	2009	2005	2009	2005
Yard waste can	58%	53%	61%	49%	77%	76%	69%	70%	29%	23%
Compost	27	27	26	28	17	14	18	11	46	52
Trash can	6	8	5	7	6	7	8	12	3	7
Landfill/Dump	3	3	3	5	0	0	1	2	6	4
Other	4	8	3	7	0	3	2	4	13	13
Don't know	2	1	2	3	0	0	2	1	3	1
BASE	380	375	<i>94</i>	96	87	88	101	93	<i>98</i>	98

As you can see in the previous table, the methods of yard waste disposal track very closely from year to year. This year, of the 380 respondents who do yard work, 58% say they dispose of the waste in their yard waste cans (53% in 2005), 27% compost it in their yards or open space (27% in 2005), 6% put it in their trash cans (8% in 2005), and 3% take it to a landfill (3% in 2005). **Nobody reported sweeping or blowing yard waste into the street or gutter.** 

More of those living in the unincorporated areas of the county are yard waste composters (46%), compared to those living within the city limits of Healdsburg (26%), Rohnert Park (17%) or Windsor (18%).

	TO	ΓAL	HLD	SBG	F	RP	WN	DSR	SO	CO
	2009	2005	2009	2005	2009	2005	2009	2005	2009	2005
Composting	48%	49%	50%	53%	38%	38%	40%	41%	64%	62%
Yard waste can	40	34	40	27	51	47	49	45	20	20
Trash can	3	5	3	7	2	3	3	6	3	4
Landfill/Dump	3	5	1	6	2	6	2	4	5	5
Burning it	1	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	3	3
Street or gutter	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
None of the above	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	2
No difference	2	2	1	2	3	0	1	2	3	2
Don't know	1	2	1	2	1	3	2	0	0	1
BASE	380	375	94	96	87	88	101	93	<i>98</i>	98

#### Knowledge: Yard Waste Disposal Method Best for the Environment

When respondents were read a list of possible places/ways to dispose of yard waste and asked which is best for the environment, the results tracked very closely to those in the 2005 baseline survey. Most residents believe that either composting or using a yard waste can is preferable. Other than one 2009 **Healdsburg respondent saying that sweeping into the street or gutter was environmentally preferable, no one gave that response in either study year.** 

## Watershed Knowledge

### Where the Water Goes

Respondents were read four descriptions of what might happen to water that goes into gutters and storm drains; then they were asked which one they believe to be true:

- 1. Does it go directly into a river or other waterways that lead to a river;
- 2. Does it go to a sewage treatment plant, like the water that goes through your household drains;
- 3. Does it just soak into the ground;
- 4. Or does it go someplace else?

In 2005, "Does it just soak into the ground" was not included as an answer choice. It was added this year based on the number of people who gave that verbatim response in a follow-up question after they responded that it went "someplace else" in the previous survey.

	TOT	ΓAL	HLD	SBG	F	RР	WN	DSR	SO	CO
	2009	2005	2009	2005	2009	2005	2009	2005	2009	2005
River	53%	42%	63%	44%	44%	38%	49%	38%	54%	50%
Treatment plant	18	27	21	30	21	30	19	32	10	16
Soaks into ground	7	1	2	1	6	0	4	1	18	2
Someplace else	1	2	0	1	2	1	2	2	2	4
Don't know	21	28	14	25	27	31	26	28	17	28
BASE	502	500	126	125	125	125	126	125	125	125

#### Year-to-Year Comparison: Where Does Storm Drain Water Go?

This year, 53% of respondents understand that the water goes to a river or other waterway; that is a significant improvement over 42% in 2005. All areas surveyed showed some improvement, with Healdsburg experiencing the most dramatic increase in giving the correct response (63% compared to 44% in 2005), followed by Windsor (49% compared to 38% in 2005), Rohnert Park (44% compared to 38% in 2005) and, with the least change, unincorporated Sonoma County (54% compared to 50% in 2005).

This year, more people living in single-family dwellings (54%) had the correct answer compared to the number of multi-unit dwellers (44%). Fifty-nine percent (59%) of the men knew where the water goes compared to only 48% women. Twenty-four percent (24%) of women admitted they did not know where the water goes. Fifty-eight percent (58%) of those aged 35-54 had the correct response, compared to around 48% of their younger and older counterparts.

Sixty-one percent (61%) of those earning more than \$75,000 said it goes into a waterway compared to those earning less (51%). Sixty percent (60%) of college graduates and those with advanced degrees had the correct answer compared to only 50% of those with less than a college degree.

## What is a Watershed?

Respondents were read the following three descriptions and asked to chose the correct definition of a watershed:

- 1. An area that retains water like a swamp or a marsh
- 2. A land area that drains into a specific body of water
- 3. A water intake area that feeds a water treatment plant

On this measure, there was only slight improvement: This year, 42% of the total sample understands that a watershed is a land area that drains into a specific body of water, compared to 38% in 2005. Seventeen percent (17%) said it is a swamp or marsh, compared to 14% in 2005. Twelve percent (12%) said it is a water intake area that feeds a water treatment plant, compared to 14% in the previous survey. A combined 30% said none of the above or don't know, compared to 34% in 2005.

	TOT	ΓAL	HLD	SBG	F	RΡ	WN	DSR	SO	CO
	2009	2005	2009	2005	2009	2005	2009	2005	2009	2005
Land area	42%	38%	50%	42%	34%	35%	40%	29%	43%	45%
Swamp/Marsh	17	14	14	11	20	14	13	18	20	13
Water intake	12	14	6	18	18	14	15	19	10	6
None of above	15	14	16	10	16	17	13	10	14	21
Don't know	15	20	13	20	13	20	18	23	14	16
BASE	502	500	126	125	125	125	126	125	125	125

#### Year-to-Year Comparison: What is a Watershed?

The biggest improvement was among residents of Windsor: This year 40% had the correct response, compared to only 29% in 2005. Healdsburg also enjoyed a significant uptick in the measure, with 50% giving the correct response this year, compared to 42% in 2005.

This year, 45% of homeowners understand what a watershed is, compared to 36% of renters. Forty-four percent (44%) of people 35 years old and over knew the correct response, compared to 33% of those under 35.

Fifty-six percent (56%) of people with incomes over \$75K knew the correct answer compared to those earning \$35K-\$75K (36%) and less than \$35K (28%). Sixty-five percent (65%) of post-graduates could correctly define a watershed compared to college graduates (53%), people with some college (35%) and those with a high school education or less (27%). And 46% of Caucasians got the right answer, compared to 30% Hispanics, and 26% of other races.

## **Your Watershed**

Respondents were asked, "As far as you know, do you live in a watershed?"

Only one-third (33%) of the total sample knows that they live in a watershed, 44% said they do not, and 23% don't know. These results track very closely with the 2005 baseline

survey, with the most notable improvement being among Windsor residents -- this year 28% got the right answer, compared to only 17% in 2005.





Forty-three percent (43%) of unincorporated Sonoma County residents know they live in a watershed, a slight dip from the 47% in 2005; 37% of Healdsburg respondents know the correct response, compared to 31% in 2005. And 25% of those in Rohnert Park got the right answer, compared to 19% in the previous survey.

This year, 39% of men compared to 28% of women are aware that they live in a watershed. As are 37% of people aged 35 and over, compared to 20% of those aged 18-34. Forty-one percent (41%) of people with incomes over \$75K say they live in a watershed, compared to those earning \$35K-\$75K (34%) and less than \$35K (25%). As do 50% of post graduates, compared to 41% college grads, 31% of those with some college, and 20% of people with high school educations or less. And 38% of Caucasians know they live in a watershed, compared to 18% of other (non-Hispanic) races and 13% Hispanics.

When respondents who know they live in a watershed were asked to name the watershed, 40% responded with Russian River, compared to 43% in 2005. Thirty-seven percent (37%) said they do not know the name of their watershed, compared to 34% in 2005. And 23% in both years named a watershed other than the Russian River, whether correctly or incorrectly.



Year-to-Year Comparison: What is the Name of the Watershed in Which You Live?

When the total sample of 502 were asked if they think they, personally, can have any effect on protecting the water quality in the Russian River or its tributaries, 76% said yes, 18% said no, and 6% did not know. These results are nearly identical to those in 2005, with only Healdsburg showing a significant change: This year, 87% of respondents from that city feel they can have an effect, compared to 79% in 2005.



Year-to-Year Comparison: Can You Have an Effect on the Russian River? (% Yes)

This year, seventy-seven percent (77%) of single-family dwellers answered in the affirmative, compared to only 68% of those living in apartments or condos. Eighty-three percent (83%) of people earning more than \$35K answered yes, compared to 61% of those

earning less. Eighty-three percent (83%) of college grads and post grads said yes, compared to 77% of folks with some college and only 65% of people with high school educations or less. And 79% of Caucasians answered in the affirmative compared to 66% of Hispanics and other races, combined.

## **Information Sources**

The following are the top information sources named by respondents when asked where they get most of their information about water quality or water pollution.

NEWSPAPERS	2009	2005	OTHER SOURCES	2009	2005
Press Democrat	27%	37%	Water Department/District	18%	3%
Healdsburg Tribune	7	4	Television	14	12
Windsor Times	3	2	Internet	13	4
Community Voice	2	1	Utility bill inserts	9	8
Other/Unspecified	5	8	Word of mouth	9	8
			City or county newsletters	8	16
			City Hall/City Council	7	1
			Brochures or letters mailed to the home	7	10
			In school	3	3
			Radio	3	5
			At work	2	3
			Other	10	13

It appears fewer residents are turning to their regional newspaper for information about water quality or water pollution. More are getting information from their Water Department or District and far more this year than last are relying on the Internet for their water quality information.

When asked if they think they are, personally, getting enough information about what they could do to protect the water quality in the Russian River, more than half (52%) of the total sample said yes, compared to 44% in 2005.

Except for Rohnert Park, which realized a 1-point increase, all areas surveyed improved by 10 points on this measure:

- Healdsburg 53% this year, compared to 43% in 2005
- Windsor 54% this year, compared to 44% in 2005
- Unincorporated Sonoma County 56% this year, compared to 46% in 2005



Year-to-Year Comparison: Are You Getting Enough Information? (% Yes)

This year, single-family dwellers (53%) and homeowners (56%) score higher than their counterparts: multi-family dwellers (41%) and renters (40%). Men are feeling better informed than women: 57% to 48%. As are those 35 and over (54%) compared to 43% of 18-34 year olds. Fifty-four percent (54%) of those earning more than \$75K per year feel they are getting enough information compared to 45% of those earning \$75K and less. And 65% of post graduates feel they are getting enough information, compared to 49% of those with lesser education levels.

Only 26% of all respondents are interested in receiving periodic e-mail messages from the city or county about things they can do around the house to positively affect the water quality in their area. This is similar to the 22% in 2005. Sixty percent (60%) refused the offer this year compared to 55% in 2005; and only 12% said they do not have e-mail access, which is a big change from the 22% who did not have e-mail access in 2005. The e-mail addresses that were offered by respondents will be broken out by geographic area and given to the appropriate agency in electronic format.

#### Year-to-Year Comparison: Interest in Receiving Email



## INDIVIDUAL SUMMARY ANALYSES

## Healdsburg

#### Sample Description

For Healdsburg the following quotas were enforced:

- A total of at least 125 interviews (for a confidence interval of +/- 8.77)
- No more than 60% Female
- No fewer than 10% 18-24 year-olds (to ensure representation)
- No more than 18% multi-unit dwellers (defined as apartments, condominiums, retirement or student housing)

The following sample description is for the Healdsburg survey area.

The total sample of 126 interviews yielded the same gender balance as the 2005 baseline study: 40% male to 60% female. The following graph depicts the age distribution of the final sample, which tracks very closely to that of the 2005 survey (shown in parentheses).



This year, the Healdsburg sample is more evenly distributed across income levels than in 2005, which had heavier representation (29%) in the \$35,000 to \$55,000 income bracket. And in 2009, more respondents are college graduates and post graduates (54% combined), compared to 2005 (39% combined). Incomes and education levels for the final samples of the two surveys are distributed as follows:

INCOME	2009	2005	EDUCATION	2009	2005
Less than \$35K	17%	16%	High school or less	23%	26%
\$35K to \$55K	16	29	Some college/vocational	22	30
\$55K to \$75K	15	14	College grad (Bach.)	33	23
\$75K to \$100K	14	14	Post grad (Masters, PhD)	21	16
More than \$100K	19	14			
Refused	18	14	Refused	1	5

Homeowners make up 60% of the final sample and 37% are renters, compared to 62% and 35% respectively in the 2005 baseline sample. The percentage of respondents that occupy various types of housing is very comparable to the 2005 baseline sample. This year's figures are shown below with 2005's percentages shown in parentheses:



Seventy-six percent (76%) of the Healdsburg sample is Caucasian, 13% Hispanic, 1% American Indian, 1% African American, 2% Asian, 2% other, and 6% refused to answer the question. Two individuals required Spanish translation compared to six people in 2005. The following chart shows the racial mix of the final sample with figures from 2005 in parentheses for comparison purposes.


# **Summary Analysis**

# Household Activity Behavior & Knowledge

# Car Washing Runoff

Fifty-two percent (52%) of the 126 residents surveyed in Healdsburg wash their motor vehicles at home, compared to 66% in 2005. Among the home car washers, 82% wash on a paved surface, which is statistically the same as the 85% that reported doing so in 2005.

That means 42% of the total Healdsburg population, this year, are incorrectly washing their cars on a paved surface, which is an improvement over the 56% in 2005.

When asked if washing on a paved or unpaved surface is better for the environment far more people this year recognize that an unpaved surface is preferable: 32% compared to only 18% in 2005. Still, in both years, nearly half of respondents either think it makes no difference where they wash their car or they just do not know the environmentally preferable place to do so. Here are the percentages for both study years:

Better for the environment	2009	2005
Paved surface	25%	34%
Unpaved surface	32	18
No difference	31	38
Unsure/Don't know	12	10
BASE	65	82

Bottom Line: In 2009, only 15% of the home car washers in Healdsburg wash their vehicles on an unpaved surface though 32% understand it is the environmentally best method. Sixty-eight percent (68%) of Healdsburg home car washers are either mistaken or just don't know the environmentally best method for washing their cars at home, which is an improvement over 82% in 2005.

# Dog Waste Disposal

This year, 42% of Healdsburg respondents report walking their dogs at least occasionally, which tracks closely with 38% in 2005. Among them, 88% always or usually pick up their dog's waste, compared to 83% in 2005. Among those same dog-walkers, 94% at least occasionally pick up dog waste from their yard, which is the same as in 2005.

Here is how those who pick up their dog's waste either on a walk or from the yard or both report disposing of it in 2009 compared to 2005:

Method of disposal	2009	2005
Put in trash	75%	66%
Put in yard waste can	10	4
Flushed down toilet	6	6
Composted in yard	4	17
Pet waste container/"Doggy Loo"	2	0
Buried	2	2
Other	2	5
BASE	52	47

When read a list of pet waste disposal methods and asked which they thought was best for the environment, here is what respondents said, across both study years:

Best for environment	2009	2005
Putting in trash	35%	38%
Composting in yard	33	26
Flushing down toilet	15	23
Washing into street or storm drain	0	0
None of the above	4	2
Makes no difference	8	2
Don't know	6	9
BASE	52	47

Bottom Line: While, nobody in either year reports putting their pet waste into the street or storm drain, there continues to be some confusion among dog owners in Healdsburg about the environmentally best methods for disposing their pets' waste. And, this year, a greater percentage of those who walk their dogs believe it does not make any difference how they dispose their pet's waste: 8% compared to 2% in 2005.

#### Motor Oil Disposal

Only 24 Healdsburg residents (or 19%) change their motor vehicle oil at home at least occasionally, compared to 20 people (or 16%) in 2005. Because of these low numbers, year-to-year comparisons are dubious.

However, the combined data from both surveys (2005 and 2009) indicates that 86% of Healdsburg residents rely on some kind of recycling or hazardous waste collection to dispose of their used motor oil. The remainder use methods of disposal that may be less desirable -- particularly the 5% who report that they pour used motor oil into the gutter or storm drain.

When read a list of possible places to dispose of used motor oil and asked which is best for the environment, again, a large percentage (89%) indicated some kind of recycling or hazardous waste collection. However, 2% said pouring it into a gutter/storm drain is the environmentally best way to dispose of used motor oil.

Here are their responses to the two questions based on the combined data from the 2005 and 2009 surveys:

	2005/
Disposal Method Used	2009
Take to hazardous waste site	30%
Take to auto parts store/gas station	20
Put out for curbside recycling	20
Take to recycling center	16
Pour into gutter/storm drain	5
Put into trash	2
Take to landfill/dump	2
Store indefinitely	2
Don't know	2
BASE	44

	2005/
Best for Environment	2009
Take to hazardous waste site	48%
Put out for curbside recycling	41
Pour down sink or drain	2
Pour into gutter/storm drain	2
Take to landfill/dump	2
None of the above	4
Makes no difference	0
Don't know	0
BASE	44

Bottom Line: While most Healdsburg home oil changers adhere to safe motor oil disposal methods, a small number rely on the storm drain system and some think it is the best method of disposal.

# Fertilizer Runoff

This year, fewer Healdsburg residents are applying fertilizer to their yards compared to 2005: 51% to 60%. Among them, 69% say they experience no noticeable runoff when they water after fertilizing and 3% are unsure, compared to 65% and 1% in 2005.

That means 28% of those who fertilize do have some runoff. That amounts to 14% of the total Healdsburg population who experience noticeable runoff after fertilizing their yards this year, which is indicates an improvement over the 20% in 2005.

When asked if allowing water to run into a storm drain or gutter after fertilizing poses a hazard to the environment, this year 84% of those who fertilize recognize that it does; this is an improvement over the 76% who gave that response in 2005.

Bottom Line: This year, though 84% of Healdsburg residents who fertilize their yards know that runoff into a storm drain after fertilizing is harmful to the environment, more than one-fourth (28%) allow runoff to occur.

# Draining Pool or Spa

Only 14 of the 126 Healdsburg respondents in this year's survey report that they maintain a pool or spa; that is 11% of the sample. Similarly, the 2005 baseline study captured only 15 pool/spa maintainers. Because these numbers are so low, year-to-year comparisons are dubious.

However, looking at combined data from both surveys, we can say that approximately 38% of pool/spa maintainers use algaecides besides chlorine or bromine and 17% drain into a storm drain, drainage ditch or creek. Another 17% have never drained their pool or spa.

When read a list of possible places to drain to and asked which one is the best for the environment, 14% of the combined 2005/2009 pool/spa maintainers said into a storm drain or gutter.

	2005/		2005/
Where drain to	2009	Best for environment	2009
Yard/Landscaping	31%	Yard/Landscaping	41%
Sewer line cleanout	17	Sewer line cleanout	21
Storm drain/street/gutter	10	Storm drain/street/gutter	14
Drainage ditch/creek	7	Drainage ditch/creek	0
Never have drained	17	None of the above	7
Other	7	Does not make any difference	10
Don't know	10	Don't know	7
BASE	29	BASE	29

Bottom line: Few Healdsburg pool/spa maintainers are using their sewer line cleanout for draining their pools or spas and not many more know that it is the environmentally optimal place to drain to. A number do drain into the storm drain system and some think it is the environmentally preferable method of draining.

# Yard Waste Disposal

Seventy-five percent (75%) of the Healdsburg respondents engage in yard work like mowing the lawn or cleaning up leaves at least occasionally, which closely tracks with 77% of the 2005 baseline sample. When asked how they dispose of their yard waste, no respondents in either survey year reported that they sweep or blow their yard waste into the street or gutter. Here is how their responses compare from one year to the other.

Method of disposal	2009	2005
Put into yard waste can	61%	49%
Compost in yard or open space	26	28
Put into trash/garbage can	5	7
Take to landfill or dump	3	5
Other	3	7
Unsure	2	3
BASE	94	96

When read a list of ways to dispose of yard waste and asked which is best for the environment, only 1% said blowing or sweeping it into the street or gutter. Nobody in Healdsburg gave that response in 2005. Here is how they responded, year-to-year.

Best for the environment	2009	2005
Compost in yard or open space	50%	53%
Put into yard waste can	40	27
Put into trash/garbage can	3	7
Blowing or sweeping into street/gutter	1	0
Take to landfill or dump	1	6
None of above/Don't know	3	4
Does not make a difference	1	2
BASE	94	96

Bottom line: This year, more of those who perform yard work know that composting or using the yard waste can are the best ways to dispose of yard waste (90% compared to 80% in 2005), and more of them are using one of those methods (87% compared to 77% in 2005). Though, this year, only one person reports sweeping their yard waste into the street or gutter, about 9% of Healdsburg yard workers are unable to identify the best methods of yard waste disposal, which is an improvement over the 19% in 2005.

# Watershed Knowledge

Healdsburg respondents were read the following list of possible places that gutters and storm drains lead to and asked to choose the correct response:

Does it go directly into a river or other waterways that lead to a river, Does it go to a sewage treatment plant like the water that goes through your household drains, Does it just soak into the ground, Does it go someplace else, Or, Are you not sure?

This year's survey shows a great improvement over the 2005 baseline survey. Nearly two-thirds (63%) of Healdsburg respondents know that gutters and storm drains lead directly to a river and other waterways, compared to only 44% in 2005. Twenty-one percent (21%) compared to 30% in 2005, believe water entering the storm drain goes to a sewage treatment plant, and 2% believe the water just soaks into the ground compared to 1% in 2005. Also an improvement, only 14% say they don't know where the water goes, compared to 25% in 2005.

Next, respondents were asked which statement best describes what they believe a watershed to be:

An area that retains water like a swamp or a marsh, A land area that drains into a specific water body, A water intake area that feeds a water treatment plant, Or, none of the above

Half of Healdsburg residents (50%) know that a watershed is a land area that drains into a specific water body, a slight improvement compared to 42% in 2005. Fourteen percent (14%) believe it is an area that retains water like a swamp or marsh (11% in 2005); 6% believe it is a water intake area that feeds a water treatment plant (18% in 2005); 16% said none of the above (10% in 2005); and 13% don't know (20% in 2005).

When asked if they live in a watershed, there was some improvement over results of the 2005 baseline survey: 37% recognize that they do live in a watershed, compared to 31% in the previous study. This year, 44% said they <u>do not</u> live in a watershed, compared to 39% in 2005; and 19% don't know whether they live in a watershed or not (30% in 2005).

Among the Healdsburg respondents who are aware that they live in a watershed, 65% were able to identify by name, correctly or incorrectly, the watershed in which they believe they live, compared to 82% in 2005.

	2009	2005
Russian River	61%	74%
Dry Creek	2	5
Fitch Mountain	2	0
Healdsburg Basin	0	3
Don't know	34	18
BASE	46	39

# What is the name of the watershed you live in?

However, due to the difference in base sizes (46 respondents in 2009 compared to 39 in 2005 who know they live in a watershed and were, therefore, asked this follow-up question), this result tracks more closely year-to-year than it appears to at first glance. Viewed from a wider perspective, the measure can be stated as such: This year 24% of the total Healdsburg sample of 126 respondents knows they live in a watershed and can name it, correctly or incorrectly, compared to 26% in 2005.

When the 126 respondents were asked if they thought they could personally have an effect on protecting the water quality in the Russian River and its tributaries, there was some improvement over the 2005 baseline study: 87% said they could (79% in 2005), 11% thought they could not (14% in 2005) and 2% were unsure (7% in 2005).

# Bottom Line: Overall, there has been some improvement in watershed knowledge measurements among Healdsburg residents since the 2005 baseline survey, particularly with regard to understanding that the storm drain system leads to a specific water body.

# **Information Sources**

More people this year believe they are getting enough information about what they can do to protect the water quality in the Russian River and its tributaries: 53% compared to 43% in 2005.

When asked if they were interested in receiving periodic e-mail messages from a city or county agency about things they can do around their homes to positively affect the water quality in the area, 29% said yes and offered their e-mail addresses, compared to 23% in 2005. More than half (58%) were not interested (51% in 2005) and only 10% said they do not have access to e-mail, compared to 24% in 2005.

When the total Healdsburg sample was asked where they get most of their information about water quality and water pollution in the local area, here is how their responses were distributed compared to 2005 (multiple responses allowed both years):

NEWSPAPERS	2009	2005	OTHER SOURCES	2009	2005
Press Democrat	29%	38%	Internet	15%	2%
Healdsburg Tribune	25	13	Water Department/District	14	0
Windsor Times	2	0	Utility bill inserts	10	12
Russian Riverkeeper	2	0	Television	10	6
SF Chronicle	1	0	Word of mouth	10	10
Other/Unspecified	2	6	City Hall/City Council	10	2
			City or county newsletters	8	24
			Brochures or letters mailed to the home	6	7
			At work	3	2
			Presentations or booths	2	2
			Radio	2	3
			Other	7	9

Bottom Line: The Internet, water department and local paper have gained ground as information sources about water quality and water pollution in the area. However, just over half the Healdsburg population feels they are getting enough information about what they can do to protect the water quality in the Russian River and its tributaries.

# Rohnert Park

# Sample Description

For Rohnert Park the following quotas were enforced:

- A total of at least 125 interviews (for a confidence interval of +/- 8.77)
- No more than 60% Female
- No fewer than 10% 18-24 year-olds (to ensure representation)
- No more than 18% multi-unit dwellers (defined as apartments, condominiums, retirement or student housing)

The following sample description is for the Rohnert Park survey area.

The total sample of 125 interviews yielded a gender balance of 42% male to 58% female, which essentially identical to 41% male / 59% female in 2005. The following graph depicts the age distribution of the final sample, which tracks very closely to that of the 2005 survey (shown in parentheses).



Income levels for the Rohnert Park 2009 sample tracks fairly closely with 2005, though that year had heavier representation (21% compared to 11% this year) at the \$35,000 to \$55,000 income level. And, this year's sample is skewed more toward those with high school or less education compared to the 2005 sample, which included more people with at least some college. Incomes and education levels for the final samples of the two surveys are distributed as follows:

INCOME	2009	2005	EDUCATION	2009	2005
Less than \$35K	23%	21%	High school or less	34%	20%
\$35K to \$55K	11	21	Some college/vocational	31	38
\$55K to \$75K	14	14	College grad (Bach.)	23	30
\$75K to \$100K	15	18	Post grad (Masters, PhD)	8	9
More than \$100K	19	16			
Refused	17	10	Refused	3	3

Homeowners make up 69% of the final sample and 30% are renters, which is identical to the 2005 baseline sample. The percentage of respondents that occupy various types of housing is very comparable to the 2005 baseline sample. This year's figures are shown below with 2005's percentages in parentheses:



Seventy percent (70%) of the Rohnert Park sample is Caucasian, 9% Hispanic, 2% American Indian, 4% African American, 5% Asian, 2% other, and 9% refused to answer the question. Two individuals required Spanish translation compared to none in 2005.

The following chart shows the racial mix of the final sample with figures from 2005 in parentheses for comparison purposes.



# Summary Analysis

# Household Activity Behavior & Knowledge

# Car Washing Runoff

Forty-two percent (42%) of the 125 residents surveyed in Rohnert Park wash their motor vehicles at home, compared to 51% in 2005. Among the home car washers, 85% wash on a paved surface, which is an improvement over the 98% that reported doing so in 2005.

That means 36% of the total Rohnert Park population, this year, are incorrectly washing their cars on a paved surface, which, again, is an improvement over the 50% in 2005.

When asked if washing on a paved or unpaved surface is better for the environment, far more people this year recognize that an unpaved surface is preferable: 34% compared to only 19% in 2005. Though it is an improvement, 34% of respondents still either think it makes no difference where they wash their car or they just do not know the environmentally preferable place to do so, compared to 43% in 2005.

Here are the percentages for both study years:

Better for the environment	2009	2005
Paved surface	32%	38%
Unpaved surface	34	19
No difference	23	34
Unsure/Don't know	11	9
BASE	53	64

Bottom Line: This year, only 11% of the home car washers in Rohnert Park wash their vehicles on an unpaved surface though 34% understand it is the environmentally best method. Sixty-six percent (66%) of Rohnert Park home car washers are either mistaken or just don't know the environmentally best method for washing their cars at home, which is an improvement over 81% in 2005.

#### Dog Waste Disposal

This year, 46% of Rohnert Park respondents report walking their dogs at least occasionally, compared to 39% in 2005. Among them, 88% always or usually pick up their dog's waste, compared to 81% in 2005. Among those same dog-walkers, all of them at least occasionally pick up dog waste from their yard, compared to 98% in 2005.

Among those who pick up their dog's waste either on a walk or from the yard or both, here is how they report disposing of it in 2009 compared to 2005:

Method of disposal	2009	2005
Put in trash	74%	86%
Put in yard waste can	7	0
Composted in yard	5	10
Pet waste container/"Doggy Loo"	5	0
Buried	3	2
Flushed down toilet	2	2
Other/Don't know	4	0
BASE	58	49

When read a list of pet waste disposal methods and asked which they thought was best for the environment, here is what respondents said, across both study years:

		1
Best for environment	2009	2005
Putting in trash	36%	47%
Composting in yard	36	29
Flushing down toilet	16	14
Washing into street or storm drain	0	0
Makes no difference	3	2
Don't know	9	8
BASE	58	49

Bottom Line: While, nobody in either year reported putting their pet waste into the street or storm drain, there continues to be some confusion among dog owners in Rohnert Park about the environmentally best methods for disposing their pets' waste.

# Motor Oil Disposal

This year 26 Rohnert Park respondents (or 21%) change their motor vehicle oil at home at least occasionally, compared to 23 people (or 18%) in 2005. Because of these low numbers, year-to-year comparisons are dubious.

However, the combined data from both surveys (2005 and 2009) indicates that 81% of Rohnert Park residents rely on some kind of recycling or hazardous waste collection to dispose of their used motor oil. The remainder use methods of disposal that may be less desirable or don't know which method they use. However, no one reported putting their used oil in the storm drain.

When read a list of possible places to dispose of used motor oil and asked which is best for the environment, again a large percentage (95%) indicated some kind of recycling or hazardous waste collection.

Here are their responses to the two questions based on the combined data from the 2005 and 2009 surveys:

	2005/
Disposal Method Used	2009
Take to recycling center	35%
Take to hazardous waste site	24
Put out for curbside recycling	14
Take to auto parts store/gas station	8
Pour into gutter/storm drain	0
Put into trash	2
Store indefinitely	2
Don't know	14
BASE	49

	2005/
Best for Environment	2009
Take to hazardous waste site	71%
Put out for curbside recycling	24
Take to landfill/dump	2
Pour down sink or drain	0
Pour into gutter/storm drain	0
None of the above	2
Makes no difference	0
Don't know	0
BASE	49

Bottom Line: Most Rohnert Park home oil changers adhere to safe motor oil disposal practices and none rely on the storm drain system or think it is the best method of disposal.

# Fertilizer Runoff

This year, fewer Rohnert Park residents are applying fertilizer to their yards compared to 2005: 42% to 53%. Among them, 70% say they experience no noticeable runoff when they water after fertilizing, compared to 80% in 2005.

That means 30% of those who fertilize do have some runoff. That amounts to 13% of the total Rohnert Park population who experience noticeable runoff after fertilizing their yards this year, which is not much different that the 9% in 2005.

When asked if allowing water to run into a storm drain or gutter after fertilizing poses a hazard to the environment, 68% of those who fertilize recognize that it does; this is similar to the 73% who gave that response in 2005.

Bottom Line: This year, 68% of Rohnert Park residents who fertilize their yards know that runoff into a storm drain after fertilizing is harmful to the environment and 30% allow runoff to occur.

# Draining Pool or Spa

Only 14 of the 125 Rohnert Park respondents in this year's survey report that they maintain a pool or spa; that is 11% of the sample and a significant dip from the 26 pool/spa maintainers (21% of the sample) captured in 2005. Because these numbers are so low, year-to-year comparisons are dubious.

However, looking at combined data from both surveys, we can say that approximately 20% of Rohnert Park pool/spa maintainers use algaecides besides chlorine or bromine and 13% drain into a storm drain. Another 32% have never drained their pool or spa.

When read a list of possible places to drain to and asked which one is the best for the environment, 6% of the combined 2005/2009 pool/spa maintainers said into a storm drain/gutter or drainage ditch/creek.

	2005/		2005/
Where drain to	2009	Best for environment	2009
Yard/Landscaping	43%	Yard/Landscaping	50%
Storm drain/street/gutter	13	Sewer line cleanout	25
Sewer line cleanout	8	Storm drain/street/gutter	3
Drainage ditch/creek	0	Drainage ditch/creek	3
Never have drained	32	None of the above	3
Other	4	Does not make any difference	5
Don't know	0	Don't know	13
BASE	40	BASE	40

Bottom line: Few Rohnert Park pool/spa maintainers are using their sewer line cleanout for draining their pools or spas and not many more know that it is the environmentally optimal place to drain to. A number do drain into the storm drain system and some think it is the environmentally preferable method of draining.

# Yard Waste Disposal

Sixty-nine percent (69%) of Rohnert Park respondents engage in yard work like mowing the lawn or cleaning up leaves at least occasionally, which closely tracks with 71% of the 2005 baseline sample. When asked how they dispose of their yard waste, no respondents

reported that they sweep or blow their yard waste into the street or gutter. Here is how their responses compared from one year to the other.

Method of disposal	2009	2005
Put into yard waste can	77%	76%
Compost in yard or open space	17	14
Put into trash/garbage can	6	7
Take to landfill or dump	0	0
Other	0	3
Unsure	0	0
BASE	87	88

When Rohnert Park residents were read a list of ways to dispose of yard waste and asked which is best for the environment, no one in either year said blowing or sweeping it into the street or gutter. Here is how they responded, year-to-year.

Best for the environment	2009	2005
Put into yard waste can	51%	47%
Compost in yard or open space	38	38
Put into trash/garbage can	2	3
Blowing or sweeping into street/gutter	0	0
Take to landfill or dump	2	6
Other/None of above/Don't know	3	6
Does not make a difference	3	0
BASE	87	88

Bottom Line: This year, there has not been a significant change in the percentages of those who perform yard work and also know that composting or using the yard waste can are the best ways to dispose of yard waste (89% compared to 85% in 2005); nor has there been a significant change in the percentage of Rohnert Park yard workers who are using one of those methods (94% compared to 90% in 2005). No one in either year reported blowing or sweeping their yard waste into the storm water system.

#### Watershed Knowledge

Rohnert Park respondents were read the following list of possible places that gutters and storm drains lead to and asked to choose the correct response:

Does it go directly into a river or other waterways that lead to a river, Does it go to a sewage treatment plant like the water that goes through your household drains, Does it just soak into the ground, Does it go someplace else, Or, Are you not sure? This year's survey shows only a slight improvement over the 2005 baseline survey. Forty-four percent (44%) of respondents know that gutters and storm drains lead directly to a river and other waterways, compared to 38% in 2005. Twenty-one percent (21%) this year compared to 30% in 2005 believe water entering the storm drain goes to a sewage treatment plant, and 6% think the water just soaks into the ground (no one gave that response in 2005). Twenty-seven percent (27%) are not sure where the water goes, compared to 31% in 2005.

Next, respondents were asked which statement best describes what they believe a watershed to be:

An area that retains water like a swamp or a marsh, A land area that drains into a specific water body, A water intake area that feeds a water treatment plant, Or, none of the above

Again there was little significant change in this measure: About one third (34%) know that a watershed is a land area that drains into a specific water body, which is essentially the same as the 35% that gave that response in 2005. Twenty percent (20%) believe it is an area that retains water like a swamp or marsh (14% in 2005); 18% believe it is a water intake area that feeds a water treatment plant (14% in 2005); 16% said none of the above (17% in 2005); and 13% don't know (20% in 2005).

When asked if they live in a watershed, there was slight improvement over results of the 2005 baseline survey: 25% recognize that they do live in a watershed, compared to 19% in the previous study. This year, 48% said they <u>do not</u> live in a watershed, compared to 58% in 2005; and 27% are unsure if they live in a watershed (23% in 2005).

Among the Rohnert Park respondents who are aware that they live in a watershed, only 41% were able to identify by name, correctly or incorrectly, the watershed in which they believe they live compared to 50% in 2005.

	2009	2005
Russian River	19%	25%
Laguna de Santa Rosa	13	4
Santa Rosa	6	13
Petaluma River	3	8
Don't know	58	50
BASE	31	24

# What is the name of the watershed you live in?

When stated as follows, we can see there is no change in this measure: This year only 10% of the total Rohnert Park sample of 125 knows they live in a watershed and can name it, correctly or incorrectly, compared to 10% of the total sample in 2005.

When the 125 respondents were asked if they thought they could personally have an effect on protecting the water quality in the Russian River and its tributaries, there was a slight decline compared to the 2005 baseline study: 68% said they could (73% in 2005), 23% thought they could not (16% in 2005) and 9% were unsure (11% in 2005).

# Bottom Line: Overall, there is little change in watershed knowledge measurements among Rohnert Park residents since the 2005 baseline survey.

#### **Information Sources**

There is very little change from year to year when Rohnert Park residents were asked if they believe they are getting enough information about what they can do to protect the water quality in the Russian River and its tributaries: 43% say they are, compared to 42% in 2005.

When asked if they are interested in receiving periodic e-mail messages from a city or county agency about things they can do around their homes to positively affect the water quality in the area, 26% said yes and offered their e-mail addresses, compared to 27% in 2005. More than half (56%) were not interested (58% in 2005) and 14% said they do not have access to e-mail, which was the same in 2005.

When the total Rohnert Park sample was asked where they get most of their information about water quality and water pollution in the local area, here is how their responses were distributed compared to 2005 (multiple responses allowed both years):

NEWSPAPERS	2009	2005	OTHER SOURCES	2009	2005
Press Democrat	31%	34%	Internet	13%	6%
Community Voice	5	5	Water Department/Department	14	2
Healdsburg Tribune	1	0	Utility bill inserts	9	4
Other/Unspecified	2	5	Television	21	17
			Word of mouth	6	6
			City Hall/City Council	4	2
			City or county newsletters	7	18
			Brochures or letters mailed to the home	7	11
			At work	1	4
			Presentations or booths	2	2
			Radio	3	5
			School	2	8
			Other	6	18

Bottom Line: The Internet and water department have gained ground as information sources about water quality and water pollution in the area. However, fewer than half of the Rohnert Park population feels they are getting enough information about what they can do to protect the water quality in the Russian River and its tributaries.

# Windsor

# Sample Description

For Windsor the following quotas were enforced:

- A total of at least 125 interviews (for a confidence interval of +/- 8.77)
- No more than 60% Female
- No fewer than 10% 18-24 year-olds (to ensure representation)
- No more than 18% multi-unit dwellers (defined as apartments, condominiums, retirement or student housing)

The following sample description is for the Windsor survey area.

The total sample of 126 interviews yielded a gender balance of 41% male to 59% female, which essentially identical to 40% male/60% female in 2005. The following graph depicts the age distribution of the final sample, which tracks fairly closely to that of the 2005 survey (shown in parentheses).



Income levels for the Windsor 2009 sample track fairly closely with 2005, though those with incomes in the \$35K to \$75K are better represented in this year's sample, with less representation in the under \$35K income category compared to 2005. Education levels are very similar across both study years. Income and education levels for the final samples of the two surveys are distributed as follows:

INCOME	2009	2005	EDUCATION	2009	2005
Less than \$35K	13%	20%	High school or less	33%	32%
\$35K to \$55K	20	13	Some college/vocational	24	29
\$55K to \$75K	15	10	College grad (Bach.)	31	30
\$75K to \$100K	16	15	Post grad (Masters, PhD)	11	8
More than \$100K	17	22			
Refused	18	19	Refused	2	1

Homeowners make up 74% of the final sample and 25% are renters, which is identical to the 2005 baseline sample. The percentage of respondents that occupy various types of housing tracks closely with the 2005 baseline sample. This year's figures are shown below with 2005's percentages in parentheses:



Seventy-two percent (72%) of the Windsor sample is Caucasian, 14% Hispanic, 2% American Indian, 1% African American, 3% Asian, 1% other, and 7% refused to answer the question. One individual required Spanish translation compared to eight in 2005.

The following chart shows the racial mix of the final sample with figures from 2005 in parentheses for comparison purposes.



# **Summary Analysis**

# Household Activity Behavior & Knowledge

# Car Washing Runoff

Fifty-three percent (53%) of the 126 residents surveyed in Windsor wash their motor vehicles at home, which is identical to the 2005 baseline survey. Among the home car washers, 85% wash on a paved surface, which is a slight improvement from the 91% that reported doing so in 2005.

That means 45% of the total Windsor population, this year, are incorrectly washing their cars on a paved surface, which is essentially the same as the 48% in 2005.

When asked if washing on a paved or unpaved surface is better for the environment far more people this year recognize that an unpaved surface is preferable: 36% compared to only 14% in 2005. Though it is an improvement, in both years 41% to 44% of respondents either think it makes no difference where they wash their car or they responded that they do not know the environmentally preferable place to do so.

Here are the percentages for both study years:

Better for the environment	2009	2005
Paved surface	22%	42%
Unpaved surface	36	14
No difference	31	29
Unsure/Don't know	10	15
BASE	67	66

Bottom Line: In 2009, only 12% of the home car washers in Windsor wash their vehicles on an unpaved surface though 36% understand it is the environmentally best method. Sixty-three percent (63%) of Windsor home car washers are either mistaken or just don't know the environmentally best method for washing their cars at home, which is an improvement over 86% in 2005.

#### Dog Waste Disposal

This year, 47% of Windsor respondents report walking their dogs at least occasionally, compared to 34% in 2005. Among them, 87% always or usually pick up their dog's waste, compared to 79% in 2005. Among those same dog-walkers, 93% at least occasionally pick up dog waste from their yard, compared to 98% in 2005.

Among those who pick up their dog's waste either on a walk or from the yard or both here is how they report disposing of it in 2009 compared to 2005:

Method of disposal	2009	2005
Put in trash	75%	84%
Put in yard waste can	12	0
Composted in yard	7	9
Pet waste container/"Doggy Loo"	2	0
Buried	0	1
Flushed down toilet	0	5
Other/Don't know	4	1
BASE	57	43

When read a list of pet waste disposal methods and asked which they thought was best for the environment, here is what respondents said, across both study years:

Best for environment	2009	2005
Putting in trash	39%	42%
Composting in yard	35	30
Flushing down toilet	16	9
Washing into street or storm drain	0	5
Makes no difference	7	5
Don't know	4	9
BASE	57	43

In 2005, 5% of those who walk their dogs (or two people) said that washing their dogs' waste into the street or storm drain is environmentally the best method of disposal; this year, no one chose that option. Additionally, nobody in either year reported actually putting their pet waste into the street or storm drain; however, there may be some confusion among dog owners in Windsor about the environmentally best methods for disposing their pets' waste.

# Motor Oil Disposal

Sixteen percent (16%) of Windsor respondents change their motor vehicle oil at home at least occasionally, which is nearly identical to the 15% in 2005. Because of these low numbers, year-to-year comparisons are dubious.

However, the combined data from both surveys (2005 and 2009) indicates that 74% of Windsor residents rely on their auto parts stores or hazardous waste collection to dispose of their used motor oil. The remainder use methods of disposal that may be less desirable or don't know which method they use.

Thirteen percent (13%) say they put it out for curbside recycling, though that service is not available in Windsor for used motor oil. It should be noted, however, that all those responses came from the 2005 baseline survey; no Windsor respondents said they put their motor oil out for curbside pickup in 2009. And no one in either year reported putting their used oil in the storm drain.

When read a list of possible places to dispose of used motor oil and asked which is best for the environment, again a large percentage (82%) indicated hazardous waste collection site. Five percent (5%) did not like any of the answer choices given. And, again, 13% selected curbside recycling as best for the environment, though that service is not available in Windsor for motor oil products.

Here are their responses to the two questions based on the combined data from the 2005 and 2009 surveys:

	2005/		2005/
Disposal Method Used	2009	Best for Environment	2009
Take to recycling center	56%	Take to hazardous waste site	82%
Take to auto parts store/gas station	18	Put out for curbside recycling	13
Put out for curbside recycling	13	Take to landfill/dump	0
Take to hazardous waste site	3	Pour down sink or drain	0
Pour into gutter/storm drain	0	Pour into gutter/storm drain	0
Other	2	None of the above	5
Don't know	8	Makes no difference	0
		Don't know	0
BASE	39	BASE	39

Bottom Line: Most Windsor home oil changers adhere to safe motor oil disposal methods and none rely on the storm drain system or think it is the best method of disposal.

# Fertilizer Runoff

This year, about the same percentage of Windsor residents are applying fertilizer to their yards compared to 2005: 55% to 53%. Among them, 71% say they experience no noticeable runoff when they water after fertilizing, which is an improvement compared to 58% in 2005. This year, 3% are unsure if they experience runoff, compared to 2% in 2005.

That means 26% of those who fertilize do experience some runoff. That amounts to 14% of the total Windsor population who experience noticeable runoff after fertilizing their yards this year, which is an improvement over the 21% in 2005.

When asked if allowing water to run into a storm drain or gutter after fertilizing poses a hazard to the environment, 72% of those who fertilize recognize that it does; this is a significant decline from the 86% who gave that response in 2005.

# Bottom Line: This year, 72% of Windsor residents who fertilize their yards know that runoff into a storm drain after fertilizing is harmful to the environment and 26% allow runoff to occur.

# Draining Pool or Spa

Only 26 of the 126 Windsor respondents in this year's survey report that they maintain a pool or spa; that is 21% of the sample, which is similar to the 23 pool/spa maintainers (18% of the sample) captured in 2005. Because these numbers are so low, year-to-year comparisons are dubious.

However, looking at combined data from both surveys, we can say that approximately 14% of Windsor pool/spa maintainers use algaecides besides chlorine or bromine and 22% drain into a storm drain. Another 18% have never drained their pool or spa.

When read a list of possible places to drain to and asked which one is the best for the environment, 28% of the combined 2005/2009 pool/spa maintainers said into a storm drain/gutter or drainage ditch/creek.

	2005/		2005/
Where drain to	2009	Best for environment	2009
Yard/Landscaping	33%	Yard/Landscaping	37%
Storm drain/street/gutter	22	Sewer line cleanout	22
Sewer line cleanout	12	Storm drain/street/gutter	20
Drainage ditch/creek	0	Drainage ditch/creek	8
Never have drained	18	None of the above	0
Other	0	Does not make any difference	6
Don't know	14	Don't know	6
BASE	<i>49</i>	BASE	<i>49</i>

Bottom line: Few Windsor pool/spa maintainers are using their sewer line cleanout for draining their pools or spas though nearly twice as many know that it is the environmentally optimal method. Nearly a quarter drains into the storm drain system and about the same percentage think it is the environmentally preferable place to drain to.

# Yard Waste Disposal

Eighty percent (80%) of the Windsor respondents engage in yard work like mowing the lawn or cleaning up leaves at least occasionally, which closely tracks with 74% of the 2005 baseline sample. When asked how they dispose of their yard waste, no respondents reported that they sweep or blow their yard waste into the street or gutter. Here is how their responses compared from one year to the other.

Method of disposal	2009	2005
Put into yard waste can	69%	70%
Compost in yard or open space	18	11
Put into trash/garbage can	8	12
Gardner takes it	2	0
Take to landfill or dump	1	2
Other	0	4
Unsure	2	1
BASE	101	93

When Windsor residents were read a list of ways to dispose of yard waste and asked which is best for the environment, no one in either year said blowing or sweeping it into the street or gutter. Here is how they responded, year-to-year.

Best for the environment	2009	2005
Put into yard waste can	49%	45%
Compost in yard or open space	40	41
Put into trash/garbage can	3	6
Take to landfill or dump	2	4
Blowing or sweeping into street/gutter	0	0
Other/None of the above/Don't know	6	1
Does not make a difference	1	2
BASE	101	93

Bottom Line: Between this year and 2005, there has not been a significant change among those who perform yard work and know that composting or using the yard waste can are the best ways to dispose of yard waste (89% compared to 86% in 2005); there has been a slight improvement in the percentage of Windsor yard workers who are using one of those methods (87% compared to 81% in 2005). No one in either year reported blowing or sweeping their yard waste into the storm water system.

#### Watershed Knowledge

Windsor respondents were read the following list of possible places that gutters and storm drains lead to and asked to choose the correct response:

Does it go directly into a river or other waterways that lead to a river, Does it go to a sewage treatment plant like the water that goes through your household drains, Does it just soak into the ground, Does it go someplace else, Or, Are you not sure?

This year's survey shows an improvement over the 2005 baseline survey. Forty-nine percent (49%) of respondents know that gutters and storm drains lead directly to a river and other waterways, compared to 38% in 2005. Nineteen percent (19%) this year compared to 32% in 2005 believe water entering the storm drain goes to a sewage treatment plant, and 4% think the water just soaks into the ground, compared to 1% in 2005. Twenty-six percent (26%) are not sure where the water goes, compared to 28% in 2005.

Next, respondents were asked which statement best describes what they believe a watershed to be:

An area that retains water like a swamp or a marsh, A land area that drains into a specific water body, A water intake area that feeds a water treatment plant, Or, none of the above

Again there was improvement in this measure: 40% know that a watershed is a land area that drains into a specific water body, compared to only 29% in 2005. Thirteen percent (13%) believe it is an area that retains water like a swamp or marsh (18% in 2005); 15% believe it is a water intake area that feeds a water treatment plant (19% in 2005); 13% said none of the above (10% in 2005); and 18% don't know (23% in 2005).

When asked if they live in a watershed, the results were better than those of the 2005 baseline survey: 28% recognize that they do live in a watershed, compared to 17% in the previous study. This year, 44% said they <u>do not</u> live in a watershed, compared to 57% in 2005; and 28% are unsure whether they live in a watershed or not (26% in 2005).

Among the Windsor respondents who are aware that they live in a watershed, 71% were able to identify by name, correctly or incorrectly, the watershed in which they believe they live compared to 57% in 2005.

	2009	2005
Russian River	54%	43%
Laguna de Santa Rosa	3	0
Sonoma Creek	3	0
Other	11	14
Don't know	29	43
BASE	35	21

# What is the name of the watershed you live in?

When stated as follows, we can see there is significant improvement in this measure: This year 20% of the total Windsor sample of 126 knows they live in a watershed and can name it, correctly or incorrectly, compared to only 10% of the total sample in 2005.

When the 126 respondents were asked if they thought they could personally have an effect on protecting the water quality in the Russian River and its tributaries, the results were essentially unchanged compared to the 2005 baseline study: 78% said they could (76% in 2005), 15% thought they could not (19% in 2005) and 7% were unsure (5% in 2005).

# Bottom Line: Overall, in most measures, there has been improvement in watershed knowledge measurements among Windsor residents since the 2005 baseline survey.

# **Information Sources**

There is improvement in the measure when residents are asked if they believe they are getting enough information about what they can do to protect the water quality in the Russian River and its tributaries: 54% say they are, compared to only 44% in 2005.

When asked if they are interested in receiving periodic e-mail messages from a city or county agency about things they can do around their homes to positively affect the water quality in the area, 25% said yes and offered their e-mail addresses, which is an improvement compared to only 18% in 2005. Well over half (63%) were not interested (59% in 2005) and 10% said they do not have access to e-mail, compared to 22% in 2005.

When the total Windsor sample was asked where they get most of their information about water quality and water pollution in the local area, here is how their responses were distributed compared to 2005 (multiple responses allowed both years):

NEWSPAPERS	2009	2005	OTHER SOURCES	2009	2005
Press Democrat	24%	39%	Water Department/District	26%	5%
Windsor Times	9	8	Internet	14	4
Healdsburg Tribune	2	0	City Hall/Town Council	11	0
SF Chronicle	2	1	Television	10	14
Community Voice	2	0	Brochures or letters mailed to the home	10	14
Other/Unspecified	2	2	Utility bill inserts	9	11
			Word of mouth	5	6
			City or county newsletters	7	13
			Presentations or booths	1	1
			Radio	2	4
			School	2	2
			Other	11	10

Bottom Line: The Internet, water department and town council have gained ground as information sources about water quality and water pollution in the area. However, just over half the Windsor population feels they are getting enough information about what they can do to protect the water quality in the Russian River and its tributaries.

# Unincorporated Sonoma County

# **Sample Description**

For unincorporated Sonoma County the following quotas were enforced:

- A total of at least 125 interviews (for a confidence interval of +/- 8.77)
- No more than 60% Female
- No fewer than 10% 18-24 year-olds (to ensure representation)
- No more than 18% multi-unit dwellers (defined as apartments, condominiums, retirement or student housing)

The following sample description is for the unincorporated Sonoma County survey area.

The total sample of 125 interviews yielded a gender balance of 42% male to 58% female, which is identical to the sample in 2005. The following graph depicts the age distribution of the final sample, which tracks closely to that of the 2005 survey (shown in parentheses).



Income levels for the unincorporated 2009 sample track fairly closely with 2005, though the 2009 sample includes more people earning less than \$35,000 a year and fewer people earning between \$75,000 and \$100,000. The education levels for both years track reasonably closely from year to year, though people with some college are better represented this year. Incomes and education levels for the final samples of the two surveys are distributed as follows:

INCOME	2009	2005	EDUCATION	2009	2005
Less than \$35K	26%	20%	High school or less	21%	27%
\$35K to \$55K	18	18	Some college/vocational	38	27
\$55K to \$75K	14	14	College grad (Bach.)	26	30
\$75K to \$100K	7	16	Post grad (Masters, PhD)	14	14
More than \$100K	14	14			
Refused	22	18	Refused	2	2

Homeowners make up 66% of the final sample and 34% are renters, which is nearly identical to the 2005 baseline sample (66% and 33%, respectively). The percentage of respondents that occupy various types of housing tracks closely with the 2005 baseline sample. This year's figures are shown below with 2005's percentages in parentheses:



Eighty-one percent (81%) of the unincorporated Sonoma County sample is Caucasian, 1% Hispanic, 3% American Indian, 2% Asian, 2% other, and 11% refused to answer the question. No one in the unincorporated Sonoma County sample required Spanish translation compared to four people in 2005.

The following chart shows the racial mix of the final sample with figures from 2005 in parentheses for comparison purposes.



# **Summary Analysis**

#### Household Activity Behavior & Knowledge

# Car Washing Runoff

Fifty-eight percent (58%) of the 125 residents surveyed in unincorporated Sonoma County wash their motor vehicles at home, which is a slight dip from the 63% who reported doing so in 2005. Among the home car washers, 49% wash on an unpaved surface, which is an improvement from the 37% that reported doing so in 2005.

That means 30% of the total unincorporated Sonoma County population, this year, are incorrectly washing their cars on a paved surface, which could indicate a slight improvement over the 36% in 2005.

Though far more unincorporated county residents wash on an unpaved surface than do the residents surveyed within the incorporated areas, when asked if washing on a paved or unpaved surface is better for the environment, only 28% chose unpaved surface as the correct response. This is about the same percentage as in 2005 (26%). Additionally, in both years 54% to 59% of respondents either thought it made no difference, environmentally, where they wash their car or just did not know.

Better for the environment	2009	2005
Paved surface	18%	15%
Unpaved surface	28	26
No difference	40	41
Unsure/Don't know	14	18
BASE	72	78

Here are the percentages for both study years:

Bottom line: In 2009, 49% of the home car washers in unincorporated Sonoma County wash their vehicles on an unpaved surface but only 28% understand it is the environmentally best method. Seventy-two percent (72%) of unincorporated Sonoma County home car washers are either mistaken or don't know what is the environmentally best method for washing their cars at home, which is not a significant change from 74% in 2005.

# Dog Waste Disposal

This year, 44% of unincorporated Sonoma County respondents report walking their dogs at least occasionally, which is nearly equal to the 46% in 2005. Among them, 71% always or usually pick up their dog's waste, which is a significant improvement compared to only 55% in 2005. Among those same dog-walkers, 71% at least occasionally pick up dog waste from their yard, compared to 70% in 2005.

Among those who pick up their dog's waste either on a walk or from the yard or both here is how they report disposing of it in 2009 compared to 2005:

Method of disposal	2009	2005
Put in trash	54%	47%
Composted in yard	26	37
Pet waste container/"Doggy Loo"	7	2
Flushed down toilet	7	0
Buried	4	2
Put in yard waste can	2	0
Other/Don't know	0	12
BASE	46	51

When read a list of pet waste disposal methods and asked which they thought was best for the environment, here is what respondents said, across both study years:

Best for environment	2009	2005
Composting in yard	46%	45%
Putting in trash	33	31
Flushing down toilet	11	10
Washing into street or storm drain	0	0
None of the above	4	2
Makes no difference	0	8
Don't know	7	4
BASE	46	51

Bottom Line: Among unincorporated Sonoma County dog walkers, none in either survey year said that washing their dogs' waste into the street or storm drain is the environmentally best method of disposal. Additionally, nobody in either year reported actually putting their pet waste into the street or storm drain; however, there may be some confusion among dog owners the unincorporated county areas about the environmentally best methods for disposing their pets' waste.

# Motor Oil Disposal

Thirty-two unincorporated Sonoma County respondents (or 26%) change their motor vehicle oil at home at least occasionally, which may indicate a slight improvement over the 41 people (or 33%) in 2005. Because of these low numbers, year-to-year comparisons are dubious.

However, the combined data from both surveys (2005 and 2009) indicates that 83% of unincorporated Sonoma County residents rely on some kind of recycling or hazardous waste collection to dispose of their used motor oil. The remainder use methods of disposal that may be less desirable or don't know which method they use. In 2009, no one reported putting their used oil in the storm drain; one person reported doing so in 2005.

When read a list of possible places to dispose of used motor oil and asked which is best for the environment, again a large percentage (86%) indicated some kind of recycling or hazardous waste collection. The remaining 14% either don't know, think it makes no difference or chose questionable practices as being the best for the environment for motor oil disposal.

Here are their responses to the two questions	based on the combined data from the 2005
and 2009 surveys:	

	2005/
Disposal Method Used	2009
Take to hazardous waste site	44%
Take to recycling center	21
Put out for curbside recycling	14
Take to auto parts store/gas station	4
Taken to a landfill or dump	5
Pour into gutter/storm drain	1
Other	6
Don't know	4
BASE	73

	2005/
Best for Environment	2009
Take to hazardous waste site	57%
Put out for curbside recycling	29
Take to landfill/dump	4
Pour down sink or drain	2
Pour into gutter/storm drain	0
None of the above	2
Makes no difference	2
Don't know	4
BASE	73

Bottom Line: Most Unincorporated Sonoma County home oil changers adhere to safe motor oil disposal methods. In 2005 one respondent said they pour their used motor oil into the gutter; no one said that in 2009. No one in either study year said they think the storm drain or gutter is the environmentally best method of disposal.

# Fertilizer Runoff

This year, fewer unincorporated Sonoma County residents are applying fertilizer to their yards compared to 2005: 44% to 52%. Among them, 89% say they experience no noticeable runoff when they water after fertilizing, compared to 83% in 2005. And 2% in both study years were unsure if they experience runoff.

That means 9% of those who fertilize do have some runoff, which amounts to 4% of the total unincorporated Sonoma County population who experience noticeable runoff after fertilizing their yards this year, compared to 8% in 2005.

When asked if allowing water to run into a storm drain or gutter after fertilizing poses a hazard to the environment, 73% of those who fertilize recognize that it does; this is essentially unchanged from the 72% who gave that response in 2005.

Bottom Line: This year, 73% of unincorporated Sonoma County residents who fertilize their yards know that runoff into a storm drain after fertilizing is harmful to the environment and only 9% allow runoff to occur.

# Draining Pool or Spa

Only 31 of the 125 unincorporated Sonoma County respondents in this year's survey report that they maintain a pool or spa; that is 25% of the sample, which is an increase over the 22 pool/spa maintainers (17% of the sample) captured in 2005. Because these numbers are so low, year-to-year comparisons are dubious.

However, looking at combined data from both surveys, we can say that approximately 19% of unincorporated Sonoma County pool/spa maintainers use algaecides besides chlorine or bromine and 4% drain into a storm drain. Another 47% have never drained their pool or spa.

When read a list of possible places to drain to and asked which one is the best for the environment, 6% of the combined 2005/2009 pool/spa maintainers said into a storm drain/gutter.

	2005/		2005/
Where drain to	2009	Best for environment	2009
Yard/Landscaping	43%	Yard/Landscaping	60%
Storm drain/street/gutter	4	Sewer line cleanout	15
Sewer line cleanout	0	Storm drain/street/gutter	6
Drainage ditch/creek	0	Drainage ditch/creek	0
Never have drained	47	None of the above	9
Other	2	Does not make any difference	6
Don't know	4	Don't know	4
BASE	53	BASE	53

Bottom Line: No unincorporated Sonoma County pool/spa maintainers are using their sewer line cleanout for draining their pools or spas though 15% know that it is the environmentally optimal method. A few residents drain into the storm drain system and a few more think it is the environmentally preferable place to drain to.

# Yard Waste Disposal

Seventy-eight percent (78%) of the unincorporated Sonoma County respondents engage in yard work like mowing the lawn or cleaning up leaves at least occasionally, which is unchanged since the 2005 baseline survey. When asked how they dispose of their yard waste, no respondents reported that they sweep or blow it into the street or gutter. However, one respondent throws it in a creek. Here is how their responses compared from one year to the other.

Method of disposal	2009	2005
Compost in yard or open space	46%	52%
Put into yard waste can	29	23
Don't dispose/Leave in yard	7	7
Take to landfill or dump	6	4
Put into trash/garbage can	3	7
Feed it to livestock	2	2
Throw it in a creek	1	0
Other	3	3
Unsure	3	1
BASE	<i>98</i>	98

When unincorporated Sonoma County residents were read a list of ways to dispose of yard waste and asked which is best for the environment, no one in either year said blowing or sweeping it into the street or gutter. Here is how they responded, year-to-year.

Best for the environment	2009	2005
Compost in yard or open space	64%	62%
Put into yard waste can	20	20
Put into trash/garbage can	3	4
Take to landfill or dump	5	5
Burning it	3	3
Blowing or sweeping into street/gutter	0	0
Other/None of the above/Don't know	1	3
Does not make a difference	3	2
BASE	<i>98</i>	98

Bottom Line: This year, there has not been a significant change in yard workers who know that composting or using the yard waste can are the best ways to dispose of yard waste (84% compared to 82% in 2005); and there is no change in the percentage of unincorporated Sonoma County yard workers who are using one of those methods (75% in both years). No one in either year reported blowing or sweeping their yard waste into a street or gutter, though, this year, one respondent said it is thrown it into a creek. No one said it was best for the environment to blow or sweep yard waste into a street or gutter.

#### Watershed Knowledge

Unincorporated Sonoma County respondents were read the following list of possible places that gutters and storm drains lead to and asked to choose the correct response:

Does it go directly into a river or other waterways that lead to a river, Does it go to a sewage treatment plant like the water that goes through your household drains, Does it just soak into the ground, \* Does it go someplace else, Or, Are you not sure?

This year, about the same percentage of respondents know that gutters and storm drains lead directly to a river and other waterways (54% compared to 50% in 2005). Ten percent (10%) this year compared to 16% in 2005 believe water entering the storm drain goes to a sewage treatment plant, and 18% think the water just soaks into the ground, compared to 2%\* in 2005. Seventeen percent (17%) are not sure where the water goes, compared to 28% in 2005.

Next, respondents were asked which statement best describes what they believe a watershed to be:

An area that retains water like a swamp or a marsh, A land area that drains into a specific water body, A water intake area that feeds a water treatment plant, Or, none of the above

Forty-three percent (43%) know that a watershed is a land area that drains into a specific water body, compared to 45% in 2005. Twenty percent (20%) believe it is an area that retains water like a swamp or marsh (13% in 2005); 10% believe it is a water intake area that feeds a water treatment plant (6% in 2005); 14% said none of the above (21% in 2005); and 14% don't know (16% in 2005).

When asked if they live in a watershed, there was a slight decline in the percentage that answered in the affirmative: 43% this year compared to 47% in 2005. This year, 39% said they <u>do not</u> live in a watershed, compared to 36% in 2005; and 18% are unsure whether they live in a watershed or not (17% in 2005).

Among the unincorporated Sonoma County respondents who are aware that they live in a watershed, 67% were able to identify by name, correctly or incorrectly, the watershed in which they believe they live compared to 66% in 2005.

<sup>\* &</sup>quot;Just soaks into the ground" was added to the answer choices this year, based on number of times it was mentioned in the 2005 survey as an "Other" response.
#### What is the name of the watershed you live in?

	2009	2005
Russian River	24%	29%
Dry Creek	9	5
Sonoma Creek	6	5
Other	28	27
Don't know	33	34
BASE	54	59

When stated as follows, we can confirm there is little change in this measure: This year 29% of the total unincorporated Sonoma County sample of 125 knows they live in a watershed and can name it, correctly or incorrectly, compared to 31% of the total sample in 2005.

When the 125 respondents were asked if they thought they could personally have an effect on protecting the water quality in the Russian River and its tributaries, there was a slight decline in the number who answered in the affirmative, compared to the 2005 baseline study: 71% compared to 77% in 2005. Twenty-four percent (24%) thought they could not (18% in 2005) and 5% were unsure (5% in 2005).

# Bottom Line: Overall, there has been little change in watershed knowledge measurements among unincorporated Sonoma County residents since the 2005 baseline survey.

#### **Information Sources**

There is improvement when unincorporated Sonoma County residents are asked if they believe they are getting enough information about what they can do to protect the water quality in the Russian River and its tributaries: 56% say they are, compared to only 46% in 2005.

When asked if they are interested in receiving periodic e-mail messages from a city or county agency about things they can do around their homes to positively affect the water quality in the area, 26% said yes and offered their e-mail addresses, which is an improvement compared to only 19% in 2005. Well over half (61%) were not interested (52% in 2005) and 13% said they do not have access to e-mail, compared to 28% in 2005.

When the total unincorporated Sonoma County sample was asked where they get most of their information about water quality and water pollution in the local area, here is how their responses were distributed compared to 2005 (multiple responses allowed both years):

NEWSPAPERS	2009	2005	OTHER SOURCES	2009	2005
Press Democrat	25%	33%	Water Department/District	17%	5%
Sonoma Index Tribune	4	2	Word of mouth	15	13
Healdsburg Tribune	2	4	Internet	14	5
Windsor Times	2	0	Television	14	10
Other/Unspecified	9	17	City or county newsletters	8	8
			Utility bill inserts	7	6
			Radio	6	6
			School	6	2
			City Hall/City Council	5	2
			At work	2	4
			Other	9	17
			1		

Bottom Line: The water department and Internet have gained ground as information sources about water quality and water pollution in the area. However, only 56% of the unincorporated Sonoma County population feels they are getting enough information about what they can do to protect the water quality in the Russian River and its tributaries.

# **2009 QUESTIONNAIRE**

### **Russian River Watershed Baseline Survey**

INTRODUCTION: Hello, my name is \_\_\_\_\_\_. I'm calling from Mountain West Research Center in Pocatello, Idaho. We are conducting a survey about some issues in your area and would like to include your opinions. Local government agencies are looking for input to help guide them in getting information out to the public. The survey will take only a few minutes. (**IF ASKED ABOUT TOPIC**): The questions relate to household activities and your understanding of issues that can affect the environment.

- Q1. First, in order to get a random sample, we are asking to speak to the person 18 years or older currently present in the household who LAST had their birthday. Is that you? May I speak to that person? (**REINTRODUCE, IF NECESSARY**)
- Q2. (IF INDICATED BY ACCENT): Would you prefer that we speak in English or Spanish?
  - 1 English
  - 2 Spanish (**USE SPANISH VERSION**)

### Q3.Gender (RECORD. DO NOT ASK)

- 1 Male
- 2 Female (NO MORE THAN 60% WITHIN EACH GEOGRAPHICAL AREA)
- Q3A. For classification purposes, please tell me when I get to the category that contains your age? (**RECORD**)

1 – 18-24	
2 – 25-34	
3 - 35-44	SEE PAGE 12 FOR AGE QUOTAS
4 - 45-54	AREA
5 - 55-64	
6-65+	)
9 – REFUS	ED

Now I have just a few questions about where you live:

Q4. In what county do you live?

- 1 Sonoma
- 2 Other (THANK & TERMINATE)

Q5. In what city or town do you live?

1 – Healdsburg 2 – Rohnert Park 3 – Windsor 4 – Petaluma 5 – Cloverdale 6 – Cotati 7 – Santa Rosa 8 – Sebastopol 9 – Sonoma (ASK Q5B)

#### 10 – Other (RECORD AS "UNINCORPORATED SONOMA" IN GEO SUMMARY)

- Q5A. Do you live within the (**INSERT Q5 RESPONSE**) city limits or in the unincorporated area surrounding the city?
  - 1 Within city limits (RECORD AS [Q5 RESPONSE] IN GEO SUMMARY)
  - 2 Unincorporated county (RECORD AS "UNINCORPORATED SONOMA CO." IN GEO SUMMARY)
  - 9 Other/Don't know (THANK & TERMINATE)
- Q5B. Do you live within the (**INSERT Q5 RESPONSE**) city limits or in the unincorporated area surrounding the city?
  - 1 Within city limits (**THANK & TERMINATE**)
  - 2 Unincorporated county (RECORD AS "UNINCORPORATED SONOMA CO." IN GEO SUMMARY)
  - 9 Other/Don't know (THANK & TERMINATE)

## GEOGRAPHICAL AREA SUMMARY BOX (RECORD AND CHECK QUOTAS)

QUOTAS: 125 COMPLETES IN EACH GEOGRAPHICAL AREA FOR A TOTAL OF 500 INTERVIEWS. -1-HEALDSBURG

- 2 ROHNERT PARK
- $\preceq$  3-WINDSOR

✓ 4 – UNINCOPORATED SONOMA COUNTY

## (NOTE: THIS SURVEY WILL YIELD A TOTAL OF 500 INTERVIEWS)

## (ASK ALL)

Q6. Please tell me what kind of dwelling you live in, such as a house, apartment, condominium, and so forth. (DO NOT READ)

QUOTA: NO MORE THAN 18%, <u>COMBINED (1-4)</u>, WITHIN EACH GEO AREA 1. Apartment

2. Condominium/Condo/Townhouse

- 3. Retirement home/Senior housing/Assisted Living
- 4. Student housing/Dormitory/Campus housing
- 5. Duplex
- 6. Fourplex
- 7. House/Single-family dwelling
- 8. Mobile home/Trailer
- 9. Other <u>(SPECIFY)</u>

(**IF TERMINATING ON QUOTAS**): Unfortunately, we have filled our quota of interviews in your area, but we appreciate your willingness to participate and thank you for your time.

\_\_\_\_\_

#### (QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS: QUOTAS CHECKED, DATA RECORDED AND SAVED)

Q7. Now I'd like to ask you a few questions about some of your household activities; please tell me if you, or another member of your household, engages in the following activities regularly, occasionally or never. (INTERVIEWER: GO THROUGH ENTIRE LIST, THEN ASK APPROPRIATE FOLLOWUP SERIES OF QUESTIONS. RECORD "PROF SVC" IF RESPONDENT INDICATES THEY USE A PROFESSIONAL SERVICE)

			PROF	DK/
	<u>REG</u> OCC	NEVR	<b>SVC</b>	NA
A. Washing motor vehicles at home	1 2 (ASK SERIES 8)	3	4	5
B. Walking your dog	1 2 (ASK SERIES 9)	3	4	5
C. Changing your vehicle's motor oil at home	1 2 (ASK SERIES 10)	3	4	5
D. Using fertilizer on your lawn or garden	1 2 (ASK SERIES 11)	3	4	5
E. Maintaining a pool or spa located in your yard	1 2 (ASK SERIES 12)	3	4	5
F. Yard work like mowing the lawn or cleaning up leaves	1 2 (ASK SERIES 13)	3	4	5
		IF PU TO AL	JNCH 3 L, SKIP	, 4 or 5 TO Q14

#### (SERIES 8)

- Q8. Do you (or does someone in your household) usually wash your motor vehicle on a paved surface, such as the driveway or street, or on an unpaved area, such as a lawn or dirt area?
  - 1 Paved surface
  - 2 Unpaved surface
  - 9 Unsure/DK
- Q8A. Do you think it is better for the environment to wash your motor vehicle on a paved surface, an unpaved surface, or does it not make a difference?
  - 1 Paved surface
  - 2 Unpaved surface
  - 3 No difference
  - 9 Unsure/DK

#### (SERIES 9)

Q9. Would you say that whoever walks the dog, picks up the dog droppings ... (READ LIST)

- 1 always,
- 2 usually,
- 3 sometimes,
- 4 rarely, or
- 5 never
- 9 DK (DO NOT READ)

Q9A. Would you say that the dog droppings from your yard are picked up ... (READ LIST)

- 1 regularly
- 2-occasionally, or
- 3-never
- 9 DK (DO NOT READ)

## (ASK 9B & 9C IF Q9 AND/OR 9A INDICATE DROPPINGS ARE PICKED UP)

Q9B. In general, how is your pet's waste usually disposed of? (DO NOT READ)

- 1 Put into the trash
- 2 Put into yard waste can
- 3 Buried
- 4 Put in special pet waste container/"Doggy Loo"
- 5 Flushed down the toilet
- 6 Washed into street gutter/storm drain
- 7 Composted in yard/neighboring yard/open space
- 8 Other <u>(SPECIFY)</u>
- 9 DK

- Q9C. Which of the following methods of dog waste disposal do you think is <u>best</u> for the environment, or does it not make any difference? (**READ LIST, RANDOMIZE 1-4**)
  - 1 Putting it in the trash
  - 2 Flushing it down the toilet
  - 3 Washing it into street gutter or storm drain
  - 4 Composting it in your yard or an open space
  - 5 None of the above (**DO NOT READ**)
  - 6 Doesn't make any difference (DO NOT READ)
  - 9 Unsure/DK (DO NOT READ)

#### (SERIES 10)

- Q10. When you, or someone in your household, changes the oil in your motor vehicle, how is the old oil usually disposed of? (**DO NOT READ**)
  - 1 Drained onto the ground
  - 2 Put into trash
  - 3 Poured down sink or drain
  - 4 Poured into gutter or storm drain
  - 5 Put out for curbside recycling
  - 6 Taken to recycling center / facility
  - 7 Taken to auto parts store / gas station / mechanic
  - 8 Taken to hazardous waste collection site / event
  - 9 Taken to landfill / dump
  - 10 Buried in yard
  - 11 Stored in garage or shed, indefinitely
  - 12 Other <u>(SPECIFY)</u>
  - 99– UNSURE/DK

Q10A. Which of the following methods of motor oil disposal do you think is <u>best</u> for the environment, or does it not make any difference? (**READ LIST, RANDOMIZE 1-6**)

- 1 Putting it into the trash
- 2 Pouring it down a sink or drain
- 3 Pouring it into a gutter or storm drain
- 4 Taking it to a household hazardous waste collection site
- 5 Putting it out for curbside recycling
- 6 Taking it to a landfill or dump
- 7 None of the above (**DO NOT READ**)
- 8 Does not make any difference (DO NOT READ)
- 9- UNSURE/DK (DO NOT READ)

#### (SERIES 11)

- Q11. Now I'm going to read a list of things that could happen when watering your lawn or outdoor plants. Please let me know if any of these situations occur when you water <u>after</u> fertilizing your yard. You can give more than one answer. (READ LIST. MULTIPLE RESPONSE ALLOWED)
  - 1 A noticeable amount of water hits the sidewalk, patio or driveway
  - 2 A noticeable amount of water runs off the lawn or the plants themselves
  - 3 A noticeable amount of water runs into the street or gutter
  - 4 None of those occur
  - 9 Unsure/DK (DO NOT READ)
- Q11A. Do you think that allowing water to run into the gutter or storm drain after fertilizing your yard poses a hazard to the environment, or not?
  - 1 Yes, it poses a hazard
  - 2 No, it does not pose a hazard
  - 9 UNSURE/DK

#### (SERIES 12)

- Q12. Earlier you mentioned you have a pool or spa. Do you use an algaecide (al-ja-side) to treat it, besides chlorine or bromine?
  - 1 Yes
  - 2 No
  - 9 UNSURE/DK
- Q12A. When you drain your pool or spa, where do you usually drain it to? (DO NOT READ)
  - 1 Sewer line clean out/Specific drain for that purpose
  - 2 Septic tank
  - 3 Yard / landscaping
  - 4 Storm drain / gutter /street
  - 5 Drainage ditch or creek
  - 6 Never have drained pool or spa
  - 7 Other <u>(SPECIFY)</u>
  - 9 UNSURE/DK
- Q12B. Which of the following places to drain your pool or spa do you think is <u>best</u> for the environment, or does it not make any difference? (**READ LIST, RANDOMIZE 1-4**)
  - 1 Into a sewer line clean out
  - 2 Into your yard or landscaping
  - 3 Into a storm drain or gutter
  - 4 Into a drainage ditch or creek
  - 5 None of the above (**DO NOT READ**)
  - 6 Does not make any difference (**DO NOT READ**)
  - 9 UNSURE/DK (DO NOT READ)

### (SERIES 13)

- Q13. Thinking about doing yard work, what do you usually do to dispose of your lawn clippings, leaves or other yard waste? (**DO NOT READ**)
  - 1 Compost it in yard or open space
  - 2 Put into yard waste can
  - 3 Put into the trash / garbage can
  - 4 Gardner takes it
  - 5 Bury it
  - 6 Blow or sweep into the street or gutter
  - 7 Take to landfill or dump
  - 8 Feed it to livestock (horses, cattle, etc.)
  - 9 Burn it
  - 10 Don't dispose of it / leave it in yard
  - 11 Other <u>(SPECIFY)</u>
  - 99 –UNSURE/DK
- Q13A. Which of the following methods of yard waste disposal do you think is <u>best</u> for the environment, or does it not make any difference? (**READ LIST, RANDOMIZE 1-6**)
  - 1 Composting it in your yard or open space
  - 2 Putting it into your yard waste can
  - 3 Putting it into your trash or garbage can
  - 4 Blowing or sweeping it into the street or gutter
  - 5 Taking it to a landfill or dump
  - 6 Burning it
  - 7 None of the above (**DO NOT READ**)
  - 8 Does not make any difference (DO NOT READ)
  - 9 UNSURE/DK (DO NOT READ)

## (ASK ALL)

- Q14. As far as you know, which <u>best</u> describes what happens to the water that goes into our gutters and storm drains ... (**READ LIST, RANDOMIZE 1 3 ONLY**)
  - 1 Does it go directly into a river or other waterways that lead to a river,
  - 2 Does it go to a treatment plant like the water that goes through your household drains,
  - 3 Does it just soak into the ground,
  - 4 Does it go someplace else, or <u>(SPECIFY)</u>
  - 5 Are you not sure?
  - 9 REFUSED (DO NOT READ)
- Q15. Which of these statements <u>best</u> describes what you believe a watershed to be ... (READ LIST, RANDOMIZE 1-3 ONLY)
  - 1 An area that retains water like a swamp or a marsh,
  - 2 A land area that drains into a specific water body,
  - 3 A water intake area that feeds a water treatment plant,
  - 4 -Or none of the above?
  - 9 DK/REFUSED (DO NOT READ)

Q16. As far as you know, do you live in a watershed?

- 1 Yes 2 – No (**SKIP TO 18**) 9 – **DK/REFUSED (SKIP TO 18**)
- Q17. What is the name of the watershed you live in?
  - 1 Russian River
  - 2 Mark West Creek
  - 3 Sonoma Creek
  - 4 Petaluma River
  - 5 Other <u>(SPECIFY)</u>
  - 9 DK/REFUSED
- Q18. Do you think you, personally, can have any effect on protecting the water quality in the Russian River and its tributaries? (IF RESPONDENT SAYS THEY DO NOT LIVE NEAR THE RUSSIAN RIVER, ASK: Do you think you can have any effect on protecting the water quality in the rivers, creeks and tributaries in your area?)

1 – Yes 2 – No **9– DK/REFUSED** 

- Q19. Where do you get most of your information about water quality or water pollution in your local area? (DO NOT READ, PROBE FOR UP TO 3 RESPONSES)
  - 1 Press Democrat Newspaper
  - 2 The Community Voice
  - 3 Healdsburg Tribune Newspaper
  - 4 Windsor Times Newspaper
  - 5 La Voz (Spanish language local paper)
  - 6 Other newspapers (SPECIFY)
  - 7 Radio
  - 8 Television
  - 9 City or county newsletters
  - 10 Utility bill inserts (information that comes with your utility bills)
  - 11 Brochures or letters mailed to the home
  - 12 Water district/water agency/water company/water department
  - 13 City or Town Hall / City or Town Council
  - 14 Presentations or information booths at events
  - 15 At work
  - 16 In school
  - 17 Internet
  - 18 Word of mouth
  - 19 Other (SPECIFY)
  - 99– DK/REFUSED

Q20. Do you think you, personally, are getting enough information about what you could do to protect the water quality in the Russian River and its tributaries?

1 – Yes 2 – No **9– DK/REFUSED** 

- Q21. Are you interested in receiving periodic e-mail messages from a city or county agency about things you can do around your home to positively affect the water quality in your area? You will also receive highlights from the results of this survey.
  - 1 Yes (ASK FOR AND RECORD E-MAIL ADDRESS)
  - 2 No

3 - I don't have e-mail access

9– DK/REFUSED

The following questions are for classification purposes only...

- Q22. How long have you lived in your current community? (RECORD CUMULATIVE YEARS IF THERE IS A GAP IN THEIR RESIDENCE WITHIN THAT COMMUNITY/CITY)
  - 1 Less than 10 years
  - 2 10 to 20 years
  - 3-21 or more years

#### 99–DK/REFUSED

- Q23. Do you own your own home, or are you renting or leasing it?
  - 1 Own/Paying mortgage
  - 2 Rent/Lease/Other

#### 9– DK/REF

- Q24. Please stop me when I get to the income group that best represents your total annual household income before taxes? (**READ LIST**)
  - 1 Less than \$35,000
  - 2 \$35,000 to \$55,000
  - 3 \$55,000 to \$75,000
  - 4 \$75,000 to \$100,000
  - 5 More than \$100,000
  - 9 REFUSED/DK (DO NOT READ)

Q25. What is the highest grade or year of school that you have completed and received credit for... (**READ LIST**)

- 1 High school diploma or less
- 2 Some college or vocational school
- 3 College graduate (Bachelor's degree)
- 4 Post graduate degree (Master's or PhD)

#### 9 – REFUSED (DO NOT READ)

Q26. So that we can represent all people fairly in this survey, what is your race or ethnicity? (**DO NOT READ**)

- 1 White/Caucasian
- 2 Black/African American
- 3 Latino/Hispanic
- 4 American Indian
- 5 Asian
- 6 Other <u>(SPECIFY)</u>
- 9 REFUSED

#### **RECORD LANGUAGE OF INTERVIEW:**

- 1 English
- 2 Spanish

Those are all the questions I have. In case my supervisor should need to verify this interview, may I have just your first name or initials?

RECORD NAME \_\_\_\_\_ RECORD PHONE NUMBER \_\_\_\_\_

Thank you for your help on this survey!

# 2009 TABULATED DATA

(2005 data will be made available in a separate Word document)

 Table 1: Q1. First, in order to get a random sample, we are asking to speak to the person 18 years or older currently present in the household who LAST had their birthday. Is that you? May I speak to that person?

375

100%

68

100%

39 100%

46

100%

188

100%

155

100%

156

100%

						DWEI TY	LING PF	НО	DME GENDER			AGE		
	Total	Hld	RP	Wndr	SoCo	Multi	SED	Own	Rent	Male	Fe- male	18- 34	35- 54	55+
Base	502	126	125	126	125	63	439	337	159	207	295	115	210	177
Yes	502 100%	126 100%	125 100%	126 100%	125 100%	63 100%	439 100%	337 100%	159 100%	207 100%	295 100%	115 100%	210 100%	177 100%
			NCOME			EDUC	ATION			RACE		HOW L	ONG IN	AREA
	Total	<35K	35K- 75K	>75K	H.S. or less	Some Coll	Coll. Grad	Post Grad	Wht	Hisp	Other	<10 Yrs	10-20 Yrs	21+ Yrs
Base	502	100	155	153	139	144	142	68	375	46	39	188	155	156

144

100%

142

100%

100 100% 155

100%

153

100%

139

100%

502

100%

Yes

# Table 2: Q2. Would you prefer that we speak in English or Spanish?

							LING							
			LOCA	TION		TY	PE	НО	ME	GEN	DER		AGE	
											Fe-	18-	35-	
	Total	Hld	RP	Wndr	SoCo	Multi	SFD	Own	Rent	Male	male	34	54	55+
Base	502	126	125	126	125	63	439	337	159	207	295	115	210	177
English	497	124	123	125	125	62	435	335	156	205	292	112	208	177
-	99%	98%	98%	99%	100%	98%	99%	99%	98%	99%	99%	97%	99%	100%
Spanish	5	2	2	1	-	1	4	2	3	2	3	3	2	-
'	1%	28	2%	1%	-	2%	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	3%	1%	-
		I	NCOME			EDUC	ATION			RACE		HOW L	ONG IN	AREA
			35K-		H.S.	Some	Coll.	Post				<10	10-20	21+
	Total	<35K	75K	>75K	or less	Coll	Grad	Grad	Wht	Hisp	Other	Yrs	Yrs	Yrs
Base	502	100	155	153	139	144	142	68	375	46	39	188	155	156
English	497	99	153	152	135	143	142	68	375	41	39	187	151	156
	99%	99%	99%	99%	97%	99%	100%	100%	100%	89%	100%	99%	97%	100%
Spanish	5	1	2	1	4	1	-	-	-	5	-	1	4	-
	1%	1%	1%	1%	3%	1%	-	-		11%	-	1%	3%	-

# Table 3: Q3. Gender:

						DWEL	LING							
			LOCA	TION		TY	PE	HO	ME	GEN	DER		AGE	
											Fe-	18-	35-	
	Total	Hld	RP	Wndr	SoCo	Multi	SFD	Own	Rent	Male	male	34	54	55+
Base	502	126	125	126	125	63	439	337	159	207	295	115	210	177
Male	207	50	53	52	52	23	184	142	62	207	-	48	83	76
	41%	40%	42%	41%	42%	37%	42%	42%	39%	100%	-	42%	40%	43%
Female	295	76	72	74	73	40	255	195	97	-	295	67	127	101
	59%	60%	58%	59%	58%	63%	58%	58%	61%	-	100%	58%	60%	57%
			-											
			NCOME	-		EDUC	ATION			RACE		HOW L	ONG IN	AREA
			35K-		H.S.	Some	Coll.	Post				<10	10-20	21+
	Total	<35K	75K	>75K	or less	Coll	Grad	Grad	Wht	Hisp	Other	Yrs	Yrs	Yrs
Base	502	100	155	153	139	144	142	68	375	46	39	188	155	156
Male	207	35	67	69	68	50	56	30	153	19	18	80	64	63
	41%	35%	43%	45%	49%	35%	39%	44%	41%	41%	46%	43%	41%	40%
Lamala														
гетае	295	65	88	84	71	94	86	38	222	27	21	108	91	93

		l				DWEI	LING							
	1	L	LOCA	<b>TION</b>		TY	PE	HO	ME	GEN	DER		AGE	
		1 I	1	'	'	1	1	1 '	, I	1 '	Fe-	18-	35-	i.
	Total	Hld	RP	Wndr	SoCo	Multi	SFD	Own	Rent	Male	male	34	54	55+
Base	502	126	125	126	125	63	439	337	159	207	295	115	210	177
18-24	55	12	14	16	13	10	45	28	26	30	25	55	-	
	11%	10%	11%	13%	10%	16%	10%	88	16%	14%	88	48%		-
25-34	60	10	16	23	11	7	53	26	34	18	42	60	-	-
	12%	8%	13%	18%	9%	11%	12%	8%	21%	98	14%	52%		-
35-44	93	22	27	24	20	9	84	56	35	48	45	-	93	-
	19%	17%	22%	19%	16%	14%	19%	17%	22%	23%	15%	-	44%	-
45-54	117	28	34	26	29	18	99	89	27	35	82	-	117	-
	23%	22%	27%	21%	23%	29%	23%	26%	17%	17%	28%	-	56%	-
55-64	77	28	17	12	20	6	71	56	20	36	41	-	-	77
	15%	22%	14%	10%	16%	10%	16%	17%	13%	17%	14%	-		44%
65+	100	26	17	25	32	13	87	82	17	40	60	-	-	100
	20%	21%	14%	20%	26%	21%	20%	24%	11%	19%	20%	-		56%

Table 4:	Q3A. For	classification	purposes,	please te	ell me v	when I	get to the	e category	y that	contains	your age	?

			NCOME			EDUC	ATION			RACE		HOW LONG IN AREA		
			35K-		H.S.	Some	Coll.	Post				<10	10-20	21+
	Total	<35K	75K	>75K	or less	Coll	Grad	Grad	Wht	Hisp	Other	Yrs	Yrs	Yrs
Base	502	100	155	153	139	144	142	68	375	46	39	188	155	156
18-24	55	19	17	10	33	13	4	4	27	11	9	26	21	8
	11%	19%	11%	7%	24%	98	3%	6%	7%	24%	23%	14%	14%	5%
25-34	60	14	22	21	23	15	17	5	41	14	3	42	9	9
	12%	14%	14%	14%	17%	10%	12%	7%	11%	30%	8%	22%	6%	6%
35-44	93	12	28	40	22	25	31	12	60	16	7	43	33	15
	19%	12%	18%	26%	16%	17%	22%	18%	16%	35%	18%	23%	21%	10%
45-54	117	18	29	47	24	34	41	16	100	1	10	33	39	45
	23%	18%	19%	31%	17%	24%	29%	24%	27%	2%	26%	18%	25%	29%
55-64	77	16	24	21	11	34	16	15	62	2	4	25	20	32
	15%	16%	15%	14%	88	24%	11%	22%	17%	4%	10%	13%	13%	21%
65+	100	21	35	14	26	23	33	16	85	2	6	19	33	47
	20%	21%	23%	98	19%	16%	23%	24%	23%	4%	15%	10%	21%	30%

# Table 5: Q4. In what county do you live?

			LOCA	TION		DWEL TY	LING PE	НО	ME	GEN	DER		AGE	
	Total	Hld	RP	Wndr	SoCo	Multi	SFD	Own	Rent	Male	Fe- male	18- 34	35- 54	55+
Base	502	126	125	126	125	63	439	337	159	207	295	115	210	177
Sonoma	502 100%	126 100%	125 100%	126 100%	125 100%	63 100%	439 100%	337 100%	159 100%	207 100%	295 100%	115 100%	210 100%	177 100%

		I	NCOME			EDUC/	ATION			RACE		HOW L	ONG IN	AREA
			35K-		H.S.	Some	Coll.	Post				<10	10-20	21+
	Total	<35K	75K	>75K	or less	Coll	Grad	Grad	Wht	Hisp	Other	Yrs	Yrs	Yrs
Base	502	100	155	153	139	144	142	68	375	46	39	188	155	156
Sonoma	502	100	155	153	139	144	142	68	375	46	39	188	155	156
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

# Table 6: Q5. In what city or town do you live?

						DWEL	LING							
			LOCA	TION		TY	PE	HO	ME	GEN	DER		AGE	
											Fe-	18-	35-	
	Total	Hld	RP	Wndr	SoCo	Multi	SFD	Own	Rent	Male	male	34	54	55+
Base	502	126	125	126	125	63	439	337	159	207	295	115	210	177
Healdsburg	145	126	-	-	19	18	127	89	53	63	82	25	58	62
3	29%	100%	-	-	15%	29%	29%	26%	33%	30%	28%	22%	28%	35%
Rohnert Park	126	-	125	-	1	23	103	87	38	54	72	30	62	34
	25%	-	100%	-	1%	37%	23%	26%	24%	26%	24%	26%	30%	19%
Windsor	132	-	-	126	6	15	117	96	35	53	79	43	51	38
	26%	-	-	100%	5%	24%	27%	28%	22%	26%	27%	37%	24%	21%
Petaluma	4	-	-	-	4	-	4	3	1	1	3	2	2	-
	1%	-	-	-	3%	-	1%	1%	1%	0%	1%	2%	1%	-
Cotati	3	-	-	-	3	1	2	3	-	1	2	-	1	2
	1%	-	-	-	2%	2%	0%	1%	-	0%	1%	-	0%	1%
Santa Rosa	20	-	-	-	20	-	20	14	6	12	8	4	4	12
	4%	-	-	-	16%	-	5%	4%	4%	6%	3%	3%	2%	7%
Sebastopol	9	-	-	-	9	-	9	5	4	5	4	-	5	4
	2%	-	-	-	7%	-	2%	1%	3%	2%	1%	-	2%	2%
Sonoma	16	-	-	-	16	1	15	11	5	5	11	1	6	9
	3%	-	-	-	13%	2%	3%	3%	3%	2%	4%	1%	3%	5%
Other	47	-	-	-	47	5	42	29	17	13	34	10	21	16
	9%	-	-	-	38%	8%	10%	9%	11%	6%	12%	9%	10%	9%

		I	NCOME			EDUC	ATION			RACE		HOW L	ONG IN	AREA
			35K-		H.S.	Some	Coll.	Post				<10	10-20	21+
	Total	<35K	75K	>75K	or less	Coll	Grad	Grad	Wht	Hisp	Other	Yrs	Yrs	Yrs
Base	502	100	155	153	139	144	142	68	375	46	39	188	155	156
Healdsburg	145	24	46	48	33	31	49	31	111	16	10	48	45	52
5	29%	24%	30%	31%	24%	22%	35%	46%	30%	35%	26%	26%	29%	33%
Rohnert Park	126	29	32	44	43	39	30	10	88	11	16	48	42	34
	25%	29%	21%	29%	31%	27%	21%	15%	23%	24%	41%	26%	27%	22%
Windsor	132	20	44	45	42	34	39	15	96	18	9	60	47	25
	26%	20%	28%	29%	30%	24%	27%	22%	26%	39%	23%	32%	30%	16%
Petaluma	4	1	3	-	1	2	-	1	3	-	-	3	-	1
	1%	1%	2%	I	1%	1%	-	1%	1%	-	-	2%	-	1%
Cotati	3	2	-	-	-	1	1	1	3	-	-	1	-	2
	1%	2%	-	-	-	1%	1%	1%	1%	-	-	1%	-	1%
Santa Rosa	20	8	5	3	6	б	5	2	16	1	1	7	б	7
	4%	8%	3%	2%	4%	4%	4%	3%	4%	2%	3%	4%	4%	4%
Sebastopol	9	4	2	2	2	4	3	-	8	-	-	2	3	4
-	2%	48	18	1%	1%	38	2%	-	28	-	-	18	2%	3%
Sonoma	16	1	8	4	2	5	7	2	13	-	-	3	4	9
	3%	18	5%	3%	1%	38	5%	3%	38	-	-	28	3%	6%
Other	47	11	15	7	10	22	8	6	37	-	3	16	8	22
	9%	11%	10%	5%	7%	15%	6%	9%	10%	-	8%	98	5%	14%

Table 7:	O5A. Do	you live within	n the city li	imits or in the	unincorporated	area surrounding	the city you	live in?
						C	,	

			LOCATION				_LING PE	но	ME	GEN	DER		AGE	
	Total	Hld	RP	Wndr	SoCo	Multi	SFD	Own	Rent	Male	Fe- male	18- 34	35- 54	55+
Base	403	126	125	126	26	56	347	272	126	170	233	98	171	134
Within city limits	377 94%	126 100%	125 100%	126 100%	-	55 98%	322 93%	255 94%	117 93%	155 91%	222 95%	91 93%	161 94%	125 93%
Unincorporated county	26 6%		-	-	26 100%	1 2%	25 7%	17 6%	9 7%	15 9%	11 5%	7 78	10 6%	9 7%

		I	INCOME			EDUC	ATION			RACE		HOW L	ONG IN	AREA
			35K-		H.S.	Some	Coll.	Post				<10	10-20	21+
	Total	<35K	75K	>75K	or less	Coll	Grad	Grad	Wht	Hisp	Other	Yrs	Yrs	Yrs
Base	403	73	122	137	118	104	118	56	295	45	35	156	134	111
Within city limits	377	68	115	127	113	97	110	50	274	45	30	147	128	100
	948	938	948	938	968	938	938	898	938	100%	80%	948	968	908
Unincorporated	26	5	7	10	5	7	8	6	21	-	5	9	б	11
county	6%	7%	6%	7%	4%	7%	7%	11%	7%	-	14%	6%	4%	10%

## Table 8: GEOGRAPHICAL SUMMARY BOX:

		LOCATION				DWEL TY	LING PE	HO	ME	GEN	DER		AGE	
	Total	Hld	RP	Wndr	SoCo	Multi	SFD	Own	Rent	Male	Fe- male	18- 34	35- 54	55+
Base	502	126	125	126	125	63	439	337	159	207	295	115	210	177
Healdsburg	126 25%	126 100%	-	-	-	17 27%	109 25%	76 23%	47 30%	50 24%	76 26%	22 19%	50 24%	54 31%
Rohnert Park	125 25%	-	125 100%	-	-	23 37%	102 23%	86 26%	38 24%	53 26%	72 24%	30 26%	61 29%	34 19%
Windsor	126 25%	-	-	126 100%	-	15 24%	111 25%	93 28%	32 20%	52 25%	74 25%	39 34%	50 24%	37 21%
Unincorporated Sonoma County	125 25%		-	-	125 100%	8 13%	117 27%	82 24%	42 26%	52 25%	73 25%	24 21%	49 23%	52 29%

		I	INCOME			EDUC	ATION			RACE		HOW L	ONG IN	AREA
			35K-		H.S.	Some	Coll.	Post				<10	10-20	21+
	Total	<35K	75K	>75K	or less	Coll	Grad	Grad	Wht	Hisp	Other	Yrs	Yrs	Yrs
Base	502	100	155	153	139	144	142	68	375	46	39	188	155	156
Healdsburg	126	22	39	42	29	28	42	26	96	16	б	42	40	44
5	25%	22%	25%	27%	21%	19%	30%	38%	26%	35%	15%	22%	26%	28%
Rohnert Park	125	29	32	43	43	39	29	10	87	11	16	47	42	34
	25%	29%	21%	28%	31%	27%	20%	15%	23%	24%	41%	25%	27%	22%
Windsor	126	17	44	42	41	30	39	14	91	18	8	58	46	22
	25%	17%	28%	27%	29%	21%	27%	21%	24%	39%	21%	31%	30%	14%
Unincorporated	125	32	40	26	26	47	32	18	101	1	9	41	27	56
Sonoma County	25%	32%	26%	17%	19%	33%	23%	26%	27%	2%	23%	22%	17%	36%

	OC D1 / 11	1 1 1 1 1	1 C 1 11'	1	1 1		1 • •	1 C (1
I ANIE Y	Ob Please fell	l me what kin	nd of dwelling va	11 11VA 10 S	uch as a house	anartment	condominium	and so torth
Tuble 5.	Q0. I lease ten	me what kin	ia or awening ye	u nve m, s	uch as a nouse,	apartment,	condominium,	and so torun.

			LOCA	<b>ATION</b>		DWEL TY	_LING PE	но	ME	GEN	DER		AGE	
	Total	Hld	RP	Wndr	SoCo	Multi	SFD	Own	Rent	Male	Fe- male	18- 34	35- 54	55+
Base	502	126	125	126	125	63	439	337	159	207	295	115	210	177
Apartment	40 8%	12 10%	13 10%	9 7%	6 5%	40 63%	-	_	40 25%	14 7%	26 9%	11 10%	17 8%	12 7%
Condominium/Tow nhouse	21 4%	4 3%	10 8%	5 4%	2 2%	21 33%	-	12 4%	9 6%	9 4%	12 4%	6 5%	9 4%	6 3%
Retirement home/Senior housing/Assisted living	1 0%		_	1 1%	_	1 2%	-	-	1 1%		1 0%	-	-	1 1%
Student housing/Dormitory/ Campus housing	1 0%	1 1%		-	-	1 2%	-	1 0%	-	-	1 0%	-	1 0%	 
Duplex	9 2%	6 5%	1	2 2%			9 2%	2 1%	7 4%	3 1%	6 2%	1 1%	4 2%	4 2%
House/Single- family dwelling	404 80%	99 79%	93 74%	106 84%	106 85%		404 92%	303 90%	95 60%	168 81%	236 80%	91 79%	175 83%	138 78%
Mobile home/Trailer	25 5%	3 2%	8 6%	3 2%	11 9%		25 6%	18 5%	7 48	12 6%	13 4%	6 5%	4 2%	15 8%
Other/Refused	1 0%	1 1%	-	-	_	-	1 0%	1 0%	-	1 0%			-	1 1%

T - I- I - O.	OC D1 (11	1 / 1 * 1 C	1 11'	1 1	1		1 • •	1 C (1
I ANIE Y	()6 Please fell me	what kind of	dwelling vou	live in such	as a house a	anartment	condominium	and so torth
Tuble 0.	Q0. I lease ten me	what King Of	uwening you	nve m, suen	as a nouse, a	apartment,	condominant,	and so torun.

		INCOME				EDUC	ATION			RACE		HOW L	ONG IN	AREA
			35K-		H.S.	Some	Coll.	Post				<10	10-20	21+
	Total	<35K	75K	>75K	or less	Coll	Grad	Grad	Wht	Hisp	Other	Yrs	Yrs	Yrs
Base	502	100	155	153	139	144	142	68	375	46	39	188	155	156
Apartment	40	24	10	1	19	11	8	2	24	7	6	25	11	4
	8%	24%	6%	1%	14%	8%	6%	3%	6%	15%	15%	13%	7%	3%
Condominium/Tow	21	5	8	3	5	5	9	2	14	3	1	9	8	4
nhous	4%	5%	5%	2%	4%	3%	6%	3%	4%	78	3%	5%	5%	3%
Retirement	1	1	_	_	-	-	1	_	-	-	1	-	-	1
home/Senior	0%	1%	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	3%	-	-	1%
housing/Assisted														
	1			1			1		1				1	
Student	1	_		⊥ 1 ջ	_	_	1 S	_	1	_	_	_	1 S	-
housing/Dormitory/	05	-	-	1.9	_	-	10	-	03	_	-	_	Τ.0	-
Campus housing														
Duplex	9	2	4	1	3	2	3	1	7	1	1	3	3	3
	2%	2%	3%	1%	2%	1%	2%	1%	2%	2%	3%	2%	2%	2%
House/Single-	404	53	123	147	102	118	116	60	307	34	28	138	125	138
family dwelling	80%	53%	79%	96%	73%	82%	82%	88%	82%	74%	72%	73%	81%	88%
Mobile	25	15	10	-	10	8	4	2	21	1	2	13	7	5
home/Trailer	5%	15%	6%	-	7%	6%	3%	3%	6%	2%	5%	7%	5%	3%
Other/Refused	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	1
	06	_	_	_	_	-	-	ΤQ	0.2	_	_	_	_	ΤQ

Table 10:	Q7A. Please tell me if you, or another member of your household, engages in the following activity regularly, occasionally or never:
	Washing your motor vehicles at home.

						DWEL	LING							
			LOCATION				PE	HO	ME	GEN	DER		AGE	
											Fe-	18-	35-	
	Total	Hld	RP	Wndr	SoCo	Multi	SFD	Own	Rent	Male	male	34	54	55+
Base	502	126	125	126	125	63	439	337	159	207	295	115	210	177
Regularly	42	10	8	13	11	1	41	33	8	19	23	16	16	10
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	8%	88	6%	10%	9%	2%	9%	10%	5%	98	8%	14%	8%	6%
Occasionally	215	55	45	54	61	12	203	156	57	82	133	48	95	72
, i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i	43%	44%	36%	43%	49%	19%	46%	46%	36%	40%	45%	42%	45%	41%
Never	241	59	71	59	52	48	193	148	90	104	137	51	98	92
	48%	47%	57%	47%	42%	76%	44%	44%	57%	50%	46%	44%	47%	52%
Professional	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	1	-	-	-	1
service	0%	1%	-	-	-	-	0%	-	1%	0%	-	-	-	1%
Don't know/NA	3	1	1	-	1	2	1	-	3	1	2	-	1	2
	1%	1%	1%	-	1%	3%	0%	-	2%	0%	1%	-	0%	1%

		INCOME				EDUC	ATION			RACE		HOW LONG IN AREA			
			35K-		H.S.	Some	Coll.	Post				<10	10-20	21+	
	Total	<35K	75K	>75K	or less	Coll	Grad	Grad	Wht	Hisp	Other	Yrs	Yrs	Yrs	
Base	502	100	155	153	139	144	142	68	375	46	39	188	155	156	
Regularly	42	7	12	17	11	13	15	2	31	4	4	17	5	20	
- 3 5	8%	7%	8%	11%	8%	9%	11%	3%	8%	98	10%	9%	3%	13%	
Occasionally	215	39	64	76	48	73	57	33	163	19	10	76	64	75	
,	43%	39%	41%	50%	35%	51%	40%	49%	43%	41%	26%	40%	41%	48%	
Never	241	51	79	60	78	56	70	33	178	23	25	95	83	60	
	48%	51%	51%	39%	56%	39%	49%	49%	47%	50%	64%	51%	54%	38%	
Professional	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	
service	0%	1%	-	-	1%	-	-	-	0%	-	-	-	1%	-	
Don't know/NA	3	2	-	-	1	2	-	-	2	-	-	-	2	1	
	1%	2%	-	-	1%	1%	-	-	1%	-	-	-	1%	1%	

Table 11:	27B. Please tell me if you, or another member of your household, engages in the following activity regularly, occasionally or never	••
	Walking your dog.	

						DWEL	LING							
			LOCA	TION		TYPE HOME			ME	GEN	DER		AGE	
											Fe-	18-	35-	
	Total	Hld	RP	Wndr	SoCo	Multi	SFD	Own	Rent	Male	male	34	54	55+
Base	502	126	125	126	125	63	439	337	159	207	295	115	210	177
Regularly	156	39	35	45	37	10	146	120	34	52	104	37	74	45
0,	31%	31%	28%	36%	30%	16%	33%	36%	21%	25%	35%	32%	35%	25%
Occasionally	69	14	23	14	18	4	65	47	21	31	38	19	29	21
,	14%	11%	18%	11%	14%	6%	15%	14%	13%	15%	13%	17%	14%	12%
Never	208	56	50	51	51	34	174	132	73	93	115	47	75	86
	41%	44%	40%	40%	41%	54%	40%	39%	46%	45%	39%	41%	36%	49%
Don't know/NA	69	17	17	16	19	15	54	38	31	31	38	12	32	25
	14%	13%	14%	13%	15%	24%	12%	11%	19%	15%	13%	10%	15%	14%

		INCOME				EDUC	ATION			RACE		HOW LONG IN AREA			
			35K-		H.S.	Some	Coll.	Post				<10	10-20	21+	
	Total	<35K	75K	>75K	or less	Coll	Grad	Grad	Wht	Hisp	Other	Yrs	Yrs	Yrs	
Base	502	100	155	153	139	144	142	68	375	46	39	188	155	156	
	150	1.0	10				10				1.0		10		
Regularly	156	18	49	63	39	49	43	23	119	12	12	56	49	50	
	31%	18%	32%	41%	28%	34%	30%	34%	32%	26%	31%	30%	32%	32%	
Occasionally	69	11	19	29	22	25	16	6	57	5	2	19	23	27	
, i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i	14%	11%	12%	19%	16%	17%	11%	9%	15%	11%	5%	10%	15%	17%	
Never	208	52	64	46	64	47	63	29	149	23	18	86	60	61	
	41%	52%	41%	30%	46%	33%	44%	43%	40%	50%	46%	46%	39%	39%	
Don't know/NA	69	19	23	15	14	23	20	10	50	б	7	27	23	18	
	14%	19%	15%	10%	10%	16%	14%	15%	13%	13%	18%	14%	15%	12%	

Table 12:	Q7C. Please tell me if you, or another member of your household, engages in the following activity regularly, occasionally or never:
	Changing your vehicle's motor oil at home.

			LOCA	TION		DWEI TY	DWELLING TYPE		HOME		DER	AGE		
	Total		חח	Madr	S-C-	N /1 I.4.;		0	Dent	Mala	Fe-	18-	35-	<b>FF</b> .
Basa	10iai 502	⊓iu 126	125	126	125	INUILI 63	3FD 439	237	159	207	111ale 295	34 115	210	<u>- 177</u>
Dase	502	120	120	120	125	05	155	557	100	207	275	115	210	111
Regularly	46	11	9	11	15	1	45	29	16	26	20	16	21	9
- 3 ,	98	9%	7왕	98	12%	28	10%	9%	10%	13%	7%	14%	10%	5%
Occasionally	56	13	17	9	17	6	50	35	21	29	27	13	27	16
, ,	11%	10%	14%	7왕	14%	10%	11%	10%	13%	14%	9%	11%	13%	9%
Never	382	98	98	100	86	51	331	264	113	145	237	84	152	146
	76%	78%	78%	79%	69%	81%	75%	78%	71%	70%	80%	73%	72%	82%
Professional	12	3	-	4	5	2	10	7	5	4	8	2	6	4
service	2%	28	-	3%	4%	3%	2%	28	3%	2%	3%	28	3%	2%
Don't know/NA	6	1	1	2	2	3	3	2	4	3	3	-	4	2
	1%	1%	1%	2%	2%	5%	1%	1%	3%	1%	1%	-	2%	1%

		INCOME				EDUC	ATION			RACE		HOW LONG IN AREA			
			35K-		H.S.	Some	Coll.	Post				<10	10-20	21+	
	Total	<35K	75K	>75K	or less	Coll	Grad	Grad	Wht	Hisp	Other	Yrs	Yrs	Yrs	
Base	502	100	155	153	139	144	142	68	375	46	39	188	155	156	
Regularly	46	11	15	15	16	10	14	4	31	7	4	18	15	13	
	9%	11%	10%	10%	12%	7%	10%	6%	8%	15%	10%	10%	10%	8%	
Occasionally	56	13	17	22	17	19	14	5	39	6	4	19	13	24	
,	11%	13%	11%	14%	12%	13%	10%	7왕	10%	13%	10%	10%	8%	15%	
Never	382	71	117	114	101	108	111	57	291	32	30	148	119	112	
	76%	71%	75%	75%	73%	75%	78%	84%	78%	70%	77%	79%	77%	72%	
Professional	12	3	4	2	3	5	2	1	10	1	-	2	5	5	
service	2%	3%	3%	1%	2%	3%	1%	1%	38	2%	-	1%	3%	3%	
Don't know/NA	б	2	2	-	2	2	1	1	4	-	1	1	3	2	
	1%	2%	1%	-	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	-	3%	1%	2%	1%	

 Table 13:
 Q7D. Please tell me if you, or another member of your household, engages in the following activity regularly, occasionally or never:

 Using fertilizer on your lawn or garden.

						DWEI	LING							
			LOCA	TION		TY	PE	HO	ME	GEN	DER		AGE	
											Fe-	18-	35-	
	Total	Hld	RP	Wndr	SoCo	Multi	SFD	Own	Rent	Male	male	34	54	55+
Base	502	126	125	126	125	63	439	337	159	207	295	115	210	177
Regularly	55	18	8	14	15	3	52	45	9	22	33	11	22	22
,	11%	14%	6%	11%	12%	5%	12%	13%	6%	11%	11%	10%	10%	12%
Occasionally	186	46	45	55	40	9	177	149	35	79	107	31	83	72
	37%	37%	36%	44%	32%	14%	40%	44%	22%	38%	36%	27%	40%	41%
Never	244	61	68	51	64	50	194	134	107	101	143	70	101	73
	49%	48%	54%	40%	51%	79%	44%	40%	67%	49%	48%	61%	48%	41%
Professional	9	-	2	6	1	-	9	7	2	3	6	1	1	7
service	28	-	2%	5%	1%	-	2%	28	1%	1%	2%	1%	0%	4%
Don't know/NA	8	1	2	-	5	1	7	2	б	2	б	2	3	3
	2%	1%	2%	-	4%	2%	2%	1%	4%	1%	2%	2%	1%	2%

		INCOME				EDUC	ATION			RACE		HOW LONG IN AREA			
			35K-		H.S.	Some	Coll.	Post				<10	10-20	21+	
	Total	<35K	75K	>75K	or less	Coll	Grad	Grad	Wht	Hisp	Other	Yrs	Yrs	Yrs	
Base	502	100	155	153	139	144	142	68	375	46	39	188	155	156	
Regularly	55	б	12	25	11	17	15	11	41	б	3	11	15	29	
- <u></u>	11%	6%	8%	16%	88	12%	11%	16%	11%	13%	88	6%	10%	19%	
Occasionally	186	21	58	70	46	54	54	27	140	14	13	60	64	61	
,	37%	21%	37%	46%	33%	38%	38%	40%	37%	30%	33%	32%	41%	39%	
Never	244	70	83	53	80	64	68	30	181	26	23	111	69	62	
	49%	70%	54%	35%	58%	44%	48%	44%	48%	57%	59%	59%	45%	40%	
Professional	9	-	1	4	1	3	5	-	9	-	-	4	3	2	
service	2%	-	1%	3%	1%	28	4%	-	28	-	-	28	2%	1%	
Don't know/NA	8	3	1	1	1	6	-	-	4	-	-	2	4	2	
	2%	38	1%	1%	1%	4%	-	-	1%	-	-	1%	3%	1%	

Table 14:	Q7E. Please tell me if you, or another member of your household, engages in the following activity regularly, occasionally or never:
	Maintaining a pool or spa located in your yard.

						DWEL	LING							
			LOCA	TION		TY	PE	HO	ME	GEN	DER		AGE	
											Fe-	18-	35-	
	Total	Hld	RP	Wndr	SoCo	Multi	SFD	Own	Rent	Male	male	34	54	55+
Base	502	126	125	126	125	63	439	337	159	207	295	115	210	177
Regularly	65	8	12	19	26	-	65	59	6	25	40	11	31	23
	13%	6%	10%	15%	21%	-	15%	18%	4%	12%	14%	10%	15%	13%
Occasionally	20	6	2	7	5	-	20	16	4	10	10	3	7	10
	4%	5%	2%	6%	4%	-	5%	5%	3%	5%	3%	3%	3%	6%
Never	379	106	102	90	81	58	321	239	134	157	222	96	156	127
	75%	84%	82%	71%	65%	92%	73%	71%	84%	76%	75%	83%	74%	72%
Professional	2	-	-	-	2	1	1	1	1	-	2	-	-	2
service	0%	-	-	-	2%	28	0%	0%	1%	-	1%	-	-	1%
Don't know/NA	36	6	9	10	11	4	32	22	14	15	21	5	16	15
	7왕	5%	7왕	8%	9%	6%	7%	7왕	9%	7%	7%	4%	8%	8%

		I	NCOME			EDUC	ATION			RACE		HOW L	ONG IN	AREA
			35K-		H.S.	Some	Coll.	Post				<10	10-20	21+
	Total	<35K	75K	>75K	or less	Coll	Grad	Grad	Wht	Hisp	Other	Yrs	Yrs	Yrs
Base	502	100	155	153	139	144	142	68	375	46	39	188	155	156
Regularly	65	5	12	33	4	28	24	9	53	3	4	15	21	29
- <u></u>	13%	5%	88	22%	3%	19%	17%	13%	14%	78	10%	88	14%	19%
Occasionally	20	2	7	7	5	8	2	5	14	3	-	5	4	11
,	4%	28	5%	5%	4%	6%	1%	7%	4%	7왕	-	3%	3%	7%
Never	379	81	124	104	121	95	106	49	279	39	31	155	116	105
	75%	81%	80%	68%	87%	66%	75%	72%	74%	85%	79%	82%	75%	67%
Professional	2	1	1	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	1
service	0%	1%	1%	-	-	1%	-	-	0%	-	-	-	1%	1%
Don't know/NA	36	11	11	9	9	11	10	5	28	1	4	13	13	10
	7응	11%	7왕	6%	6%	88	7응	7%	7%	28	10%	7%	8%	6%

Table 15:	7F. Please tell me if you, or another member of your household, engages in the following activity regularly, occasionally or new	ver:
	ard work like mowing the lawn or cleaning up leaves.	

						DWEL	LING							
			LOCA	TION		TY	PE	HO	ME	GEN	DER		AGE	
											Fe-	18-	35-	
	Total	Hld	RP	Wndr	SoCo	Multi	SFD	Own	Rent	Male	male	34	54	55+
Base	502	126	125	126	125	63	439	337	159	207	295	115	210	177
Regularly	273	68	59	78	68	10	263	206	62	110	163	60	122	91
- <u></u>	54%	54%	47%	62%	54%	16%	60%	61%	39%	53%	55%	52%	58%	51%
Occasionally	107	26	28	23	30	7	100	69	38	50	57	28	42	37
,	21%	21%	22%	18%	24%	11%	23%	20%	24%	24%	19%	24%	20%	21%
Never	94	26	32	16	20	44	50	43	50	38	56	22	41	31
	19%	21%	26%	13%	16%	70%	11%	13%	31%	18%	19%	19%	20%	18%
Professional	20	4	4	9	3	2	18	14	б	б	14	4	2	14
service	4%	3%	38	7%	2%	3%	4%	48	4%	3%	5%	3%	1%	88
Don't know/NA	8	2	2	-	4	-	8	5	3	3	5	1	3	4
	2%	2%	2%	-	3%	-	2%	1%	2%	1%	2%	1%	1%	2%

		I	NCOME			EDUC	ATION			RACE		HOW L	ONG IN	AREA
			35K-		H.S.	Some	Coll.	Post				<10	10-20	21+
	Total	<35K	75K	>75K	or less	Coll	Grad	Grad	Wht	Hisp	Other	Yrs	Yrs	Yrs
Base	502	100	155	153	139	144	142	68	375	46	39	188	155	156
Regularly	273	33	86	101	68	79	75	44	206	25	15	93	85	94
	54%	33%	55%	66%	49%	55%	53%	65%	55%	54%	38%	49%	55%	60%
Occasionally	107	28	37	26	32	31	32	11	81	9	12	41	34	32
· · · · · ,	21%	28%	24%	17%	23%	22%	23%	16%	22%	20%	31%	22%	22%	21%
Never	94	34	26	18	33	24	28	8	64	12	10	43	27	22
	19%	34%	17%	12%	24%	17%	20%	12%	17%	26%	26%	23%	17%	14%
Professional	20	4	5	7	4	7	7	2	19	-	-	9	7	4
service	4%	4%	38	5%	3%	5%	5%	3%	5%	-	-	5%	5%	3%
Don't know/NA	8	1	1	1	2	3	-	3	5	-	2	2	2	4
	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%	-	4%	1%	-	5%	1%	1%	3%

 Table 16:
 Q8. Do you (or does someone in your household) usually wash your motor vehicle on a paved surface, such as the driveway or street, or on an unpaved area, such as a lawn or dirt area?

						DWEI	LING						-	
		l	LOCA	<b>TION</b>		TY	PE	HO	ME	GEN	DER	l	AGE	
		[	i				<u>ا ا</u>	[ '			Fe-	18-	35-	, I
	Total	Hld	RP	Wndr	SoCo	Multi	SFD	Own	Rent	Male	male	34	54	55+
Base	257	65	53	67	72	13	244	189	65	101	156	64	111	82
Paved surface	192	53	45	57	37	10	182	154	36	72	120	48	82	62
	75%	82%	85%	85%	51%	77%	75%	81%	55%	71%	77%	75%	74%	76%
Unpaved surface	59	10	6	8	35	2	57	34	24	27	32	16	26	17
	23%	15%	11%	12%	49%	15%	23%	18%	37%	27%	21%	25%	23%	21%
Unsure/DK	6	2	2	2	-	1	5	1	5	2	4	-	3	3
	2%	3%	4%	3%		88	2%	1%	88	28	3%		38	48
		l l	NCOME	-		EDUC	ATION			RACE		HOW L	ONG IN	AREA
			35K-		H.S.	Some	Coll.	Post				<10	10-20	21+

			NCOME			EDUC	ATION			RACE				AREA
			35K-		H.S.	Some	Coll.	Post				<10	10-20	21+
	Total	<35K	75K	>75K	or less	Coll	Grad	Grad	Wht	Hisp	Other	Yrs	Yrs	Yrs
Base	257	46	76	93	59	86	72	35	194	23	14	93	69	95
Paved surface	192	26	60	76	41	65	57	25	147	18	9	68	56	68
	75%	57%	79%	82%	69%	76%	79%	71%	76%	78%	64%	73%	81%	72%
Unpaved surface	59	18	15	16	18	20	12	9	42	5	5	21	12	26
	23%	39%	20%	17%	31%	23%	17%	26%	22%	22%	36%	23%	17%	27%
Unsure/DK	6	2	1	1	-	1	3	1	5	-	-	4	1	1
	2%	48	1%	1%		1%	4%	3%	3%	-	-	48	1%	18

Table 17: Q8A. Do you think it is better for the environment to wash your motor vehicle on a paved surface, an unpaved surface, or does it not make a difference?

						DWEI	LING							
			LOCA	TION		TY	PE	HO	ME	GEN	DER		AGE	
											Fe-	18-	35-	
	Total	Hld	RP	Wndr	SoCo	Multi	SFD	Own	Rent	Male	male	34	54	55+
Base	257	65	53	67	72	13	244	189	65	101	156	64	111	82
Paved surface	61	16	17	15	13	5	56	43	18	21	40	21	19	21
	24%	25%	32%	22%	18%	38%	23%	23%	28%	21%	26%	33%	17%	26%
Unpaved surface	83	21	18	24	20	5	78	62	19	40	43	17	39	27
	32%	32%	34%	36%	28%	38%	32%	33%	29%	40%	28%	27%	35%	33%
No difference	82	20	12	21	29	3	79	59	22	32	50	21	42	19
	32%	31%	23%	31%	40%	23%	32%	31%	34%	32%	32%	33%	38%	23%
Unsure/DK	31	8	б	7	10	-	31	25	6	8	23	5	11	15
	12%	12%	11%	10%	14%	-	13%	13%	98	88	15%	8%	10%	18%
r														
			NCOME			EDUC	ATION			RACE		HOW L	ONG IN	AREA
			35K-		H.S.	Some	Coll.	Post				<10	10-20	21+
	Total	<35K	75K	>75K	or less	Coll	Grad	Grad	Wht	Hisp	Other	Yrs	Yrs	Yrs
Base	257	46	76	93	59	86	72	35	194	23	14	93	69	95
Paved surface	61	11	22	21	16	21	13	10	35	15	5	19	23	19
	24%	24%	29%	23%	27%	24%	18%	29%	18%	65%	36%	20%	33%	20%
Unpaved surface	83	12	27	36	13	26	30	14	70	3	3	33	19	31
	32%	26%	36%	39%	22%	30%	42%	40%	36%	13%	21%	35%	28%	33%
No difference	82	20	19	24	23	28	20	9	63	4	6	31	19	32
	32%	43%	25%	26%	39%	33%	28%	26%	32%	17%	43%	33%	28%	34%
Unsure/DK	31	3	8	12	7	11	9	2	26	1	-	10	8	13
	122	7%	11%	13%	128	13%	13%	6%	13%	48	-	11%	12%	14%

						DWEI	LING							
			LOCA	TION		TY	PE	HO	ME	GEN	DER		AGE	
											Fe-	18-	35-	
	Total	Hld	RP	Wndr	SoCo	Multi	SFD	Own	Rent	Male	male	34	54	55+
Base	225	53	58	59	55	14	211	167	55	83	142	56	103	66
always	161	42	41	47	31	8	153	121	39	55	106	34	84	43
,	72%	79%	71%	80%	56%	57%	73%	72%	71%	66%	75%	61%	82%	65%
usually	27	5	10	4	8	3	24	21	б	9	18	10	9	8
,	12%	98	17%	7왕	15%	21%	11%	13%	11%	11%	13%	18%	9%	12%
sometimes	9	1	3	5	-	1	8	5	3	7	2	4	1	4
	4%	2%	5%	88	-	7왕	4%	3%	5%	8%	1%	7%	1%	6%
rarely	4	1	-	-	3	-	4	3	1	3	1	-	1	3
, ,	28	2%	-	-	5%	-	28	28	28	4%	1%	-	1%	5%
never	19	1	3	3	12	1	18	16	3	6	13	5	7	7
	88	2%	5%	5%	22%	7웅	9%	10%	5%	7%	9%	9%	7%	11%
DK	5	3	1	-	1	1	4	1	3	3	2	3	1	1
	2%	6%	28	-	2%	7왕	2%	1%	5%	4%	1%	5%	1%	2%

 Table 18:
 Q9. Would you say that whoever walks the dog, picks up the dog droppings ...

		_	NCOME			EDUC/	ATION			RACE		HOW L	ONG IN	AREA
			35K-		H.S.	Some	Coll.	Post				<10	10-20	21+
	Total	<35K	75K	>75K	or less	Coll	Grad	Grad	Wht	Hisp	Other	Yrs	Yrs	Yrs
Base	225	29	68	92	61	74	59	29	176	17	14	75	72	77
always	161	19	46	69	42	52	44	22	130	11	7	54	49	57
,	72%	66%	68%	75%	69%	70%	75%	76%	74%	65%	50%	72%	68%	74%
usuallv	27	5	9	12	9	9	6	3	23	-	4	8	12	7
· · · · · J	12%	17%	13%	13%	15%	12%	10%	10%	13%	-	29%	11%	17%	98
sometimes	9	2	4	3	3	1	3	2	5	3	1	5	2	2
	4%	7%	6%	3%	5%	1%	5%	7왕	3%	18%	7%	7왕	3%	38
rarely	4	1	1	1	1	2	1	-	4	-	-	-	2	2
,	2%	3%	1%	1%	2%	3%	2%	-	2%	-	-	-	3%	38
never	19	1	7	6	4	7	5	2	12	3	1	7	5	7
	8%	3%	10%	7%	7%	9%	8%	7%	7%	18%	7%	9%	7%	9%
DK	5	1	1	1	2	3	-	-	2	-	1	1	2	2
	28	3%	1%	1%	3%	4%	-	-	18	-	7%	1%	3%	3%

 Table 19:
 Q9A. Would you say that the dog droppings from your yard are picked up ...

						DWEL	LING							
			LOCA	TION	-	TY	PE	HO	ME	GEN	DER		AGE	
											Fe-	18-	35-	
	Total	Hld	RP	Wndr	SoCo	Multi	SFD	Own	Rent	Male	male	34	54	55+
Base	225	53	58	59	55	14	211	167	55	83	142	56	103	66
regularly	171	42	46	52	31	13	158	128	41	60	111	37	88	46
	76%	79%	79%	88%	56%	93%	75%	77%	75%	72%	78%	66%	85%	70%
occasionally	31	8	12	3	8	1	30	21	10	16	15	14	5	12
-	14%	15%	21%	5%	15%	7왕	14%	13%	18%	19%	11%	25%	5%	18%
never	19	2	-	3	14	-	19	15	4	7	12	4	8	7
	8%	4%	-	5%	25%	-	98	9%	7왕	8%	8%	7%	8%	11%
DK	4	1	-	1	2	-	4	3	-	-	4	1	2	1
	28	2%	-	28	48	-	28	28	-	-	3%	2%	2%	2%
	-								-					
			NCOME			EDUC	ATION			RACE		HOW L	ONG IN	AREA
			35K-		H.S.	Some	Coll.	Post				<10	10-20	21+
	Iotal	<35K	/5K	>/5K	or less	Coll	Grad	Grad	Wht	Hisp	Other	Yrs	Yrs	Yrs
Base	225	29	68	92	61	74	59	29	176	17	14	75	72	77
regularly	171	22	46	76	45	54	48	23	135	13	8	57	55	59
•••	76%	76%	68%	83%	74%	73%	81%	79%	77%	76%	57%	76%	76%	77%
occasionally	31	5	14	9	13	9	4	5	24	3	4	11	10	10
	14%	17%	21%	10%	21%	12%	7%	17%	14%	18%	29%	15%	14%	13%
never	19	2	7	б	3	9	б	1	15	-	2	5	6	8
	88	7%	10%	7%	5%	12%	10%	3%	98	-	14%	7왕	8%	10%
DK	4	-	1	1	-	2	1	-	2	1	-	2	1	-
	28	-	18	T≶T	-	38	28	-	18	68	-	38	1%	-

			LOCA			DWEI TY	LING PE	НО	ME	GEN	DER		AGE	
	Total	Hld	RP	Wndr	SoCo	Multi	SFD	Own	Rent	Male	Fe- male	18- 34	35- 54	55+
Base	213	52	58	57	46	14	199	156	54	79	134	54	99	60
Put into the trash	150 70%	39 75%	43 74%	43 75%	25 54%	13 93%	137 69%	108 69%	40 74%	51 65%	99 74%	39 72%	71 72%	40 67%
Put into yard waste can	17 8%	5 10%	4 78	7 12%	1 2%	1 7%	16 8%	12 8%	4 7%	7 9%	10 7%	5 9%	8 % 8	4 7%
Buried	5 2%	1 2%	2 3%	_	2 4%	-	5 3%	5 3%		2 3%	3 2%	-	3%	2 3%
Put in special pet waste container/"Doggy Loo"	8 4%	1 2%	3 5%	1 2%	3 7%	-	8 4%	6 4%	2 4%	4 5%	4 3%	1 2%	3 3%	4 7%
Flushed down the toilet	7 3%	3 6%	1 2%	-	3 7%		7 48	4 3%	3 6%	2 3%	5 4%		3 3%	4 7%
Composted in yard/neighboring yard/open space	21 10%	2 4%	3 5%	4 7%	12 26%	-	21 11%	16 10%	5 9%	10 13%	11 8%	7 13%	10 10%	4 7%
Other	1 0%	-	1 2%	-	_	-	1 1%	1 18	_	1 18	-	-		1 2%
Don't know	4 2%	1 2%	1 2%	2 4%		-	4 2%	4 3%	_	2 3%	2 1%	2 4%	1 1%	1 2%

### Table 20: Q9B. In general, how is your pet's waste usually disposed of?

		INCOME			EDUCATION				RACE			HOW LONG IN AREA		
			35K-		H.S.	Some	Coll.	Post				<10	10-20	21+
	Total	<35K	75K	>75K	or less	Coll	Grad	Grad	Wht	Hisp	Other	Yrs	Yrs	Yrs
Base	213	29	62	89	60	67	56	28	167	16	14	71	70	71
Put into the trash	150 70%	20 69%	38 61%	67 75%	42 70%	45 67%	40 71%	21 75%	117 70%	12 75%	6 43%	54 76%	48 69%	47 66%
Put into yard waste can	17 8%	4 14%	6 10%	4 4%	7 12%	7 10%	3 5%	-	13 8%	2 13%	2 14%	8 11%	4 6%	5 7%
Buried	5 2%		4 6%	1 1%	1 2%	3 4%	1 2%	-	5 3%	-	-	-	2 3%	3 4%
Put in special pet waste container/"Doggy Loo"	8 4%	1 3%	3 5%	3 3%	1 2%	4 6%	2 4%	1 4%	6 4%	1 6%	1 7%	3 4%	3 4%	2 3%
Flushed down the toilet	7 3%	2 7%	4 6%	1 1%	2 3%	3 4%	1 2%	1 4%	7 4%	-	-	-	5 7%	2 3%
Composted in yard/neighboring yard/open space	21 10%	2 7%	7 11%	10 11%	5 8%	3 4%	8 14%	5 18%	16 10%	1 6%	4 29%	6 8%	5 7%	10 14%
Other	1 0%		-	1 1%	1 2%	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-	-	1 1%	-
Don't know	4 2%	-	-	2 2%	1 2%	2 3%	1 2%	-	2 1%	-	1 7%	-	2 3%	2 3%

 Table 20:
 Q9B. In general, how is your pet's waste usually disposed of?

 Table 21: Q9B. Other methods of dog dropping disposal.

#### Rohnert Park

TAKEN TO A PLACE OUTSIDE THE HOME
Table 22:	29C. Which of the following methods of dog waste disposal do you think is <u>best</u> for the environment, or does it not make any
	lifference?

						DWEL	LING							
			LOCA	TION		TY	PE	HO	ME	GEN	DER		AGE	
											Fe-	18-	35-	
	Total	Hld	RP	Wndr	SoCo	Multi	SFD	Own	Rent	Male	male	34	54	55+
Base	213	52	58	57	46	14	199	156	54	79	134	54	99	60
Putting it in the	76	18	21	22	15	4	72	60	15	29	47	16	34	26
trash	36%	35%	36%	39%	33%	29%	36%	38%	28%	37%	35%	30%	34%	43%
Flushing it down	31	8	9	9	5	2	29	22	9	11	20	4	16	11
the toilet	15%	15%	16%	16%	11%	14%	15%	14%	17%	14%	15%	7%	16%	18%
Composting it in	79	17	21	20	21	6	73	57	21	28	51	27	35	17
your yard or open	37%	33%	36%	35%	46%	43%	37%	37%	39%	35%	38%	50%	35%	28%
space														
None of the above	4	2	-	-	2	-	4	3	1	1	3	-	3	1
	2%	4%	-	-	4%	-	2%	2%	2%	1%	2%	-	3%	2%
Does not make	10	4	2	4	-	-	10	б	3	7	3	5	4	1
any difference	5%	8%	3%	7%	-	-	5%	4%	6%	9%	2%	98	4%	2%
Unsure/DK	13	3	5	2	3	2	11	8	5	3	10	2	7	4
	6%	6%	98	4%	7%	14%	6%	5%	98	4%	7%	4%	7%	7%

Table 22:	Q9C. Which of the following methods of dog waste disposal do you think is <u>best</u> for the environment, or does it not make any
	difference?

		I	NCOME			EDUC	ATION			RACE		HOW LONG IN AREA			
			35K-		H.S.	Some	Coll.	Post				<10	10-20	21+	
	Total	<35K	75K	>75K	or less	Coll	Grad	Grad	Wht	Hisp	Other	Yrs	Yrs	Yrs	
Base	213	29	62	89	60	67	56	28	167	16	14	71	70	71	
Putting it in the	76	9	20	32	26	21	19	9	59	б	5	25	28	23	
trash	36%	31%	32%	36%	43%	31%	34%	32%	35%	38%	36%	35%	40%	32%	
Flushing it down	31	7	8	13	8	11	7	5	26	2	2	13	12	б	
the toilet	15%	24%	13%	15%	13%	16%	13%	18%	16%	13%	14%	18%	17%	88	
Composting it in	79	8	26	38	19	26	22	11	64	5	7	25	21	32	
your yard or open	37%	28%	42%	43%	32%	39%	39%	39%	38%	31%	50%	35%	30%	45%	
None of the above	4	_	2	_	_	1	2	1	4	_	_	-	1	3	
	2%	-	3%	-	-	1%	48	4%	2%	-	-	-	1%	4%	
Does not make	10	2	2	3	3	5	2	-	7	2	-	3	3	4	
any difference	5%	7%	3%	3%	5%	7%	4%	-	4%	13%	-	4%	4%	6%	
Unsure/DK	13	3	4	3	4	3	4	2	7	1	_	5	5	3	
	6%	10%	6%	3%	7%	48	7%	7%	48	6%	_	7%	78	48	

						DWEL	LING							
			LOCA	TION		TY	PE	HO	ME	GEN	DER	10	AGE	
	Total	Hld	RP	Wndr	SoCo	Multi	SFD	Own	Rent	Male	re- male	34	35- 54	55+
Base	102	24	26	20	32	7	95	64	37	55	47	29	48	25
Put into the trash	2 2%	1 4%	1 48	-	-	1 14%	1 1%	1 2%	1 3%	-	2 4%	2 7%	-	-
Poured into gutter or storm drain	2 2%	2 8%	-	-		-	2 2%	-	2 5%	2 4%	-	1 3%	1 2%	
Put out for curbside recycling	6 6%	1 4%	2 8%	-	3 9%	1 14%	5 5%	2 3%	4 11%	3 5%	3 6%	1 3%	4 8%	1 4%
Taken to recycling center / facility	48 47%	7 29%	15 58%	11 55%	15 47%	2 29%	46 48%	31 48%	16 43%	26 47%	22 47%	9 31%	29 60%	10 40%
Taken to auto parts store / gas station / mechanic	16 16%	5 21%	2 8%	6 30%	3 9%	2 29%	14 15%	13 20%	3 8%	13 24%	3 6%	6 21%	3 6%	7 28%
Taken to hazardous waste collection site / event	17 17%	6 25%	2 8%	1 5%	8 25%	-	17 18%	10 16%	7 19%	7 13%	10 21%	2 7%	10 21%	5 20%
Taken to landfill / dump	2 2%	1 4%	-	-	1 3%	-	2 2%	1 2%	1 3%	2 4%	-	1 3%	-	1 4%
Stored in garage or shed, indefinitely	1 1%	1 4%	-	-	-		1 1%		1 3%	1 2%	-		1 2%	
UNSURE/DK	8 8%	-	4 15%	2 10%	2 6%	1 14%	7 7%	6 9%	2 5%	1 2%	7 15%	7 24%	-	1 4%

Table 23: Q10. When you, or someone in your household, changes the oil in your motor vehicle, how is the old oil usually disposed of?

-108-

		I	NCOME			EDUC	ATION			RACE		HOW L	ONG IN	AREA
			35K-		H.S.	Some	Coll.	Post				<10	10-20	21+
	Total	<35K	75K	>75K	or less	Coll	Grad	Grad	Wht	Hisp	Other	Yrs	Yrs	Yrs
Base	102	24	32	37	33	29	28	9	70	13	8	37	28	37
Put into the trash	2 2%	1 4%	1 3%	-	2 6%	-	-	-	-	1 8%	-	1 3%	1 4%	-
Poured into gutter or storm drain	2 2%	-	-	2 5%	1 3%	-	1 4%	-	-	-	2 25%	1 3%	-	1 38
Put out for curbside recycling	6 6%	2 8%	2 6%	1 3%	-	3 10%	2 7%	-	5 7%	-	-	2 5%	1 4%	3 88
Taken to recycling center / facility	48 47%	10 42%	9 28%	24 65%	12 36%	17 59%	13 46%	4 44%	36 51%	4 31%	2 25%	17 46%	12 43%	19 51%
Taken to auto parts store / gas station / mechanic	16 16%	4 17%	10 31%	1 3%	7 21%	1 3%	7 25%	1 11%	9 13%	4 31%	1 13%	3 8%	8 29%	5 148
Taken to hazardous waste collection site / event	17 17%	3 13%	7 22%	6 16%	5 15%	6 21%	2 7%	4 44%	12 17%	3 23%	1 13%	7 19%	5 18%	5 14%
Taken to landfill / dump	2 2%	1 4%	1 3%	-	1 3%	-	1 4%	-	2 3%	-	-	-	-	2 5%
Stored in garage or shed, indefinitely	1 1%	-	1 3%	-	-	-	1 4%	-	1 1%	-	-	-	1 4%	-
UNSURE/DK	8 8%	3 13%	1 3%	3 8%	5 15%	2 7%	1 4%	-	5 7%	1 8%	2 25%	6 16%	-	2 5%

Table 23: Q10. When you, or someone in your household, changes the oil in your motor vehicle, how is the old oil usually disposed of?

Table 25:	Q10A. Which of the following methods of motor oil disposal do you think is <b><u>best</u></b> for the environment, or does it not make any
	difference?

					DWELLING									
			LOCA	TION		TY	PE	HO	ME	GEN	DER		AGE	
											Fe-	18-	35-	
	Total	Hld	RP	Wndr	SoCo	Multi	SFD	Own	Rent	Male	male	34	54	55+
Base	102	24	26	20	32	7	95	64	37	55	47	29	48	25
Putting it into the	1	-	-	-	1	-	1	1	-	-	1	1	-	_
trash	1%	-	-	-	3%	-	1%	2%	-	-	2%	3%	-	-
Pouring it down	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	1	-	-	1	-
sink or drain	1%	4%	-	-	-	-	1%	-	3%	2%	-	-	2%	-
Pouring it into	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	1	-	1	-	-
gutter or storm drain	1%	48	-	-	-	-	1%	-	3%	2%	-	3%	-	-
Taking it to	63	12	19	15	17	5	58	39	23	30	33	18	30	15
hazardous waste collection site	62%	50%	73%	75%	53%	71%	61%	61%	62%	55%	70%	62%	63%	60%
Putting it out for	27	8	б	3	10	2	25	18	9	17	10	8	11	8
curbside recycling	26%	33%	23%	15%	31%	29%	26%	28%	24%	31%	21%	28%	23%	32%
Taking it to landfill	2	-	1	-	1	-	2	2	-	1	1	1	-	1
or dump	2%	-	4%	-	3%	-	2%	3%	-	2%	2%	3%	-	4%
None of the above	4	2	-	2	-	-	4	2	2	3	1	-	4	_
	4%	8%	-	10%	-	-	4%	3%	5%	5%	2%	-	8%	-
Does not make	1	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	1	-
any difference	1%	-	-	-	3%	-	18	-	3%	-	2%	-	2%	-
Unsure/DK	2	-	-	-	2	-	2	2	-	2	-	-	1	1
	2%	-	-	-	6%	_	28	3%	-	4%	-	-	2%	48

Table 25:	Q10A. Which of the following methods of motor oil disposal do you think is <b><u>best</u></b> for the environment, or does it not make any
	difference?

			NCOME	-		EDUC	ATION			RACE		HOW LONG IN AREA			
			35K-		H.S.	Some	Coll.	Post				<10	10-20	21+	
	Total	<35K	75K	>75K	or less	Coll	Grad	Grad	Wht	Hisp	Other	Yrs	Yrs	Yrs	
Base	102	24	32	37	33	29	28	9	70	13	8	37	28	37	
Putting it into the trash	1 1%	1 4%	-	-	1 3%		-	-	-	-	1 13%	-		1 3%	
Pouring it down sink or drain	1 1%	-	-	1 3%	-		1 4%	-	-	-	1 13%	1 3%	-		
Pouring it into gutter or storm drain	1 1%	-	-	1 3%	1 3%	-	-	-		-	1 13%	-	-	1 3%	
Taking it to hazardous waste collection site	63 62%	14 58%	18 56%	25 68%	22 67%	17 59%	17 61%	5 56%	45 64%	8 62%	4 50%	26 70%	17 61%	20 54%	
Putting it out for curbside recycling	27 26%	7 29%	12 38%	6 16%	7 21%	10 34%	6 21%	3 33%	19 27%	3 23%	-	6 16%	10 36%	11 30%	
Taking it to landfill or dump	2 2%	2 8%	-	_	1 3%		1 4%	-	1 18	1 8%	-	1 3%	-	1 3%	
None of the above	4 4%	-	1 3%	2 5%	1 3%	-	3 11%	-	2 3%	1 8%	1 13%	1 3%	1 4%	2 5%	
Does not make any difference	1 1%		1 3%	-		1 3%	-	-	1 1%	-	-	1 3%	_	-	
Unsure/DK	2 2%	-	-	2 5%	_	1 3%	-	1 11%	2 3%	-	-	1 3%	-	1 3%	

						DWEL	LING					AGE		
			LOCA	TION		TY	PE	HO	ME	GEN		10	AGE	
	Total	Hld	RP	Wndr	SoCo	Multi	SFD	Own	Rent	Male	⊢e- male	18- 34	35- 54	55+
Base	241	64	53	69	55	12	229	194	44	101	140	42	105	94
A noticeable amount of water hits the sidewalk, patio or driveway	40 17%	11 17%	12 23%	15 22%	2 4%	3 25%	37 16%	29 15%	10 23%	15 15%	25 18%	8 19%	20 19%	12 13%
A noticeable amount of water runs off the lawn or the plants themselves	26 11%	8 13%	10 19%	7 10%	1 2%	2 17%	24 10%	20 10%	6 14%	10 10%	16 11%	12 29%	9 9%	5 5%
A noticeable amount of water runs into the street or gutter	16 7%	5 8%	6 11%	3 4%	2 4%	-	16 7%	12 6%	4 9%	7 7%	9 6%	6 14%	6 6%	4 4%
None of those occur	179 74%	44 69%	37 70%	49 71%	49 89%	7 58%	172 75%	152 78%	25 57%	76 75%	103 74%	25 60%	80 76%	74 79%
Unsure/DK	5 2%	2 3%		2 3%	1 2%	1 8%	4 2%	2 1%	3 7%	3%	2 1%	1 2%	2 2%	2 2%

 Table 26:
 Q11. When watering your lawn or outdoor plants <u>after</u> fertilizing, do any of the following happen?

		INCOME EDUCATION							RACE		HOW LONG IN AREA			
			35K-		H.S.	Some	Coll.	Post				<10	10-20	21+
	Total	<35K	75K	>75K	or less	Coll	Grad	Grad	Wht	Hisp	Other	Yrs	Yrs	Yrs
Base	241	27	70	95	57	71	69	38	181	20	16	71	79	90
A noticeable amount of water hits the sidewalk, patio or driveway	40 17%	2 7%	13 19%	18 19%	8 14%	13 18%	12 17%	4 11%	28 15%	6 30%	2 13%	14 20%	14 18%	11 12%
A noticeable amount of water runs off the lawn or the plants themselves	26 11%	3 11%	10 14%	10 11%	9 16%	6 8%	8 12%	3 8%	18 10%	3 15%	1 6%	9 13%	8 10%	9 10%
A noticeable amount of water runs into the street or gutter	16 7%	1 4%	5 7%	8 8%	2 4%	5 7%	4 6%	4 11%	9 5%	2 10%	3 19%	9 13%	3 4%	4 4%
None of those occur	179 74%	21 78%	48 69%	69 73%	41 72%	54 76%	51 74%	31 82%	140 77%	10 50%	12 75%	48 68%	58 73%	73 81%
Unsure/DK	5 2%	1 4%	1	2 2%	1 2%	1 1%	2 3%	1 3%	3 2%	2 10%	-	3 4%	2 3%	-

 Table 26:
 Q11. When watering your lawn or outdoor plants <u>after</u> fertilizing, do any of the following happen?

 Table 27:
 Q11A. Do you think that allowing water to run into the gutter or storm drain after fertilizing your lawn poses a hazard to the environment, or not?

			LOCATION				LING PE	НО	ME	GEN	DER		AGE	
	Total	Hld	RP	Wndr	SoCo	Multi	SFD	Own	Rent	Male	Fe- male	18- 34	35- 54	55+
Base	241	64	53	69	55	12	229	194	44	101	140	42	105	94
Yes, it poses a	180	54	36	50	40	8	172	149	31	69	111	26	80	74
hazard	75%	84%	68%	72%	73%	67%	75%	77%	70%	68%	79%	62%	76%	79%
No, it does not	44	6	13	13	12	3	41	32	10	22	22	13	17	14
pose a hazard	18%	9%	25%	19%	22%	25%	18%	16%	23%	22%	16%	31%	16%	15%
Unsure/DK	17	4	4	6	3	1	16	13	3	10	7	3	8	б
	7%	6%	8%	98	5%	8%	7%	7%	7%	10%	5%	7%	8%	6%

			NCOME			EDUC	ATION			RACE		HOW L	ONG IN	AREA
			35K-		H.S.	Some	Coll.	Post				<10	10-20	21+
	Total	<35K	75K	>75K	or less	Coll	Grad	Grad	Wht	Hisp	Other	Yrs	Yrs	Yrs
Base	241	27	70	95	57	71	69	38	181	20	16	71	79	90
Yes, it poses a	180	17	50	81	34	57	56	31	138	12	13	48	64	68
hazard	75%	63%	71%	85%	60%	80%	81%	82%	76%	60%	81%	68%	81%	76%
No, it does not	44	9	17	8	17	11	9	5	30	б	2	15	11	17
pose a hazard	18%	33%	24%	88	30%	15%	13%	13%	17%	30%	13%	21%	14%	19%
Unsure/DK	17	1	3	6	б	3	4	2	13	2	1	8	4	5
	7왕	4%	4%	6%	11%	4%	6%	5%	7왕	10%	6%	11%	5%	6%

						DWEL	LING							
			LOCA	TION	-	TY	PE	HO	ME	GEN	DER		AGE	
											Fe-	18-	35-	
	Total	Hld	RP	Wndr	SoCo	Multi	SFD	Own	Rent	Male	male	34	54	55+
Base	85	14	14	26	31	0	85	75	10	35	50	14	38	33
Yes	18	5	2	5	6	-	18	16	2	4	14	-	6	12
	21%	36%	14%	19%	19%	-	21%	21%	20%	11%	28%	-	16%	36%
No	58	8	10	17	23	-	58	51	7	28	30	12	29	17
	68%	57%	71%	65%	74%	-	68%	68%	70%	80%	60%	86%	76%	52%
Unsure/DK	9	1	2	4	2	-	9	8	1	3	б	2	3	4
	11%	7%	14%	15%	6%	-	11%	11%	10%	9%	12%	14%	8%	12%
			NCOME			EDUC	ATION			RACE		HOW L	ONG IN	AREA
			35K-		H.S.	Some	Coll.	Post				<10	10-20	21+
	Total	<35K	75K	>75K	or less	Coll	Grad	Grad	Wht	Hisp	Other	Yrs	Yrs	Yrs
Base	85	7	19	40	9	36	26	14	67	6	4	20	25	40
Yes	18	2	6	5	-	10	5	3	17	1	-	4	5	9
	21%	29%	32%	13%	-	28%	19%	21%	25%	17%	-	20%	20%	23%
No	58	5	11	30	9	21	19	9	45	3	4	13	19	26
	68%	71%	58%	75%	100%	58%	73%	64%	67%	50%	100%	65%	76%	65%
Unsure/DK	9	-	2	5	-	5	2	2	5	2	-	3	1	5
	11%	-	11%	13%	-	14%	8%	14%	78	33%	-	15%	4%	13%

Table 28: Q12. Earlier you mentioned you have a pool or spa. Do you use an algaecide (al-ja-side) to treat it, besides chlorine or bromine?

			LOCA			DWEI TY	LING PE	но	ME	GEN	DER		AGE	
	Total	Hld	RP	Wndr	SoCo	Multi	SFD	Own	Rent	Male	Fe- male	18- 34	35- 54	55+
Base	85	14	14	26	31	0	85	75	10	35	50	14	38	33
Sewer line clean	8	3	1	4	-	-	8	8	-	2	б	1	4	3
out/Specific drain	9%	21%	7왕	15%	-	-	9%	11%	-	6%	12%	7%	11%	9%
for that purpose														
Yard / landscaping	37	б	8	9	14	-	37	32	5	14	23	3	21	13
1 0	44%	43%	57%	35%	45%	-	44%	43%	50%	40%	46%	21%	55%	39%
Storm drain / gutter	10	1	2	5	2	-	10	9	1	6	4	3	4	3
/ street	12%	7%	14%	19%	6%	-	12%	12%	10%	17%	8%	21%	11%	9%
Drainage ditch or	2	2	-	-	-	-	2	2	-	1	1	-	2	-
creek	2%	14%	-	-	-	-	2%	3%	-	3%	2%	-	5%	-
Never have	23	1	3	5	14	-	23	22	1	9	14	4	7	12
drained pool or spa	27%	7%	21%	19%	45%	-	27%	29%	10%	26%	28%	29%	18%	36%
Other	2 2%	1 7%	-		1 3%		2 2%	1 1%	1 10%	2 6%	-	-		2 6%
Unsure / DK	3 4%	-	-	3 12%	-	-	3 4%	1 1%	2 20%	1 3%	2 4%	3 21%	-	-

 Table 29:
 Q12A. When you drain your pool or spa, where do you usually drain it to?

		I	NCOME			EDUC	ATION			RACE		HOW L	ONG IN	AREA
			35K-		H.S.	Some	Coll.	Post				<10	10-20	21+
	Total	<35K	75K	>75K	or less	Coll	Grad	Grad	Wht	Hisp	Other	Yrs	Yrs	Yrs
Base	85	7	19	40	9	36	26	14	67	6	4	20	25	40
Sewer line clean	8	-	-	4	-	4	2	2	б	1	-	1	2	5
out/Specific drain	9%	-	-	10%	-	11%	8%	14%	9%	17%	-	5%	8%	13%
for that purpose														
Yard / landscaping	37	2	14	12	4	18	10	5	29	3	2	8	10	19
	44%	29%	74%	30%	44%	50%	38%	36%	43%	50%	50%	40%	40%	48%
Storm drain / gutter	10	-	1	9	1	3	5	1	10	-	-	4	5	1
/ street	12%	-	5%	23%	11%	88	19%	7%	15%	-	-	20%	20%	3%
Drainage ditch or	2	-	-	1	-	-	1	1	2	-	-	1	1	-
creek	2%	-	-	3%	-	-	4%	7%	3%	-	-	5%	4%	-
Never have	23	3	3	12	3	8	8	4	17	-	2	4	б	13
drained pool or spa	27%	43%	16%	30%	33%	22%	31%	29%	25%	-	50%	20%	24%	33%
Other	2	1	-	1	1	-	-	1	2	-	-	-	1	1
	2%	14%	-	3%	11%	-	-	7%	3%	-	-	-	4%	3%
Unsure / DK	3	1	1	1	-	3	-	_	1	2	-	2	-	1
	4%	14%	5%	38	-	8%	-	-	1%	33%	_	10%	-	3%

 Table 29:
 Q12A. When you drain your pool or spa, where do you usually drain it to?

Table 30: Q12A. Other places mentioned to drain pool or spa.

# <u>Healdsburg</u>

HOLDING TANK THEN USE IT FOR WATERING THE SHRUBS

# **Unincorporated Sonoma County**

VINEYARD

#### RUSSIAN RIVER WATERSHED TRACKING SURVEY -- OCT/NOV 2009

Table 31:	Q12B. Which of the following places to drain your pool or spa do you think is <b>best</b> for the environment, or does it not make any
	difference?

						DWEI	LING							
			LOCA	TION		TY	PE	HO	ME	GEN	DER		AGE	
											Fe-	18-	35-	
	Total	Hld	RP	Wndr	SoCo	Multi	SFD	Own	Rent	Male	male	34	54	55+
Base	85	14	14	26	31	0	85	75	10	35	50	14	38	33
Into a sewer line	10	-	3	5	2	-	10	8	2	3	7	3	4	3
clean out	12%	-	21%	19%	68	-	12%	11%	20%	98	14%	21%	11%	98
Into your yard or	52	9	9	12	22	-	52	46	6	24	28	6	24	22
landscaping	61%	64%	64%	46%	71%	-	61%	61%	60%	69%	56%	43%	63%	67%
Into a storm drain	6	2	-	3	1	-	6	6	-	2	4	1	3	2
or gutter	7왕	14%	-	12%	3%	-	7%	88	-	6%	8%	7응	88	6%
Into a drainage	3	-	1	2	-	-	3	2	1	1	2	1	2	-
ditch or creek	4%	-	7%	88	-	-	4%	3%	10%	3%	4%	7응	5%	-
None of the above	2	-	-	-	2	-	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	-
	2%	-	-	-	6%	-	2%	1%	10%	3%	2%	7왕	38	-
Does not make	8	3	-	3	2	-	8	8	-	3	5	2	3	3
any difference	98	21%	-	12%	68	-	98	11%	-	98	10%	14%	88	98
Unsure/DK	4	-	1	1	2	-	4	4	-	1	3	-	1	3
	5%	-	7%	48	6%	-	5%	5%	-	3%	6%	-	3%	9%

		INCO				EDUC	ATION			RACE		HOW L	ONG IN	AREA
			35K-		H.S.	Some	Coll.	Post				<10	10-20	21+
	Total	<35K	75K	>75K	or less	Coll	Grad	Grad	Wht	Hisp	Other	Yrs	Yrs	Yrs
Base	85	7	19	40	9	36	26	14	67	6	4	20	25	40
Into a sewer line	10	2	1	5	2	4	2	2	8	1	-	3	3	4
clean out	12%	29%	5%	13%	22%	11%	88	14%	12%	17%	-	15%	12%	10%
Into your yard or	52	4	15	23	6	24	14	8	41	4	4	10	13	29
landscaping	61%	57%	79%	58%	67%	67%	54%	57%	61%	67%	100%	50%	52%	73%
Into a storm drain	6	-	-	4	-	2	3	1	5	-	-	1	2	3
or gutter	7%	-	-	10%	-	6%	12%	7왕	7%	-	-	5%	8%	8%
Into a drainage	3	-	-	1	-	1	2	-	2	1	-	2	1	-
ditch or creek	4%	-	-	3%	-	3%	8%	-	3%	17%	-	10%	4%	-
None of the above	2	1	-	-	-	1	-	1	1	-	-	1	-	1
	2%	14%	-	-	-	3%	-	7%	18	-	-	5%	-	3%
Does not make	8	-	1	5	1	1	5	1	6	-	-	2	4	2
any difference	98	-	5%	13%	11%	3%	19%	7왕	9%	-	-	10%	16%	5%
Unsure/DK	4	-	2	2	-	3	-	1	4	-	-	1	2	1
	5%	-	11%	5%	-	8%	-	7왕	6%	-	-	5%	8%	3%

					DWEI	LING								
		1	LOCA	ATION		TY	PE	HO	ME	GEN	DER	l I	AGE	
	Total	Hld	RP	Wndr	SoCo	Multi	SFD	Own	Rent	Male	Fe- male	18- 34	35- 54	55+
Base	380	94	87	101	98	17	363	275	100	160	220	88	164	128
Compost it in yard or open space	102 27%	24 26%	15 17%	18 18%	45 46%	2 12%	100 28%	76 28%	25 25%	44 28%	58 26%	21 24%	47 29%	34 27%
Put into yard waste can	222 58%	57 61%	67 77%	70 69%	28 29%	8 47%	214 59%	165 60%	53 53%	89 56%	133 60%	47 53%	102 62%	73 57%
Put into the trash / garbage can	21 6%	5 5%	5 6%	8 8%	3 3%	4 24%	17 5%	10 4%	11 11%	10 6%	11 5%	8 9%	5 3%	8 6%
Gardner takes it	3 1%	1 1%	 	2 2%	-	-	3 1%	3 1%	-	-	3 1%	-	1 1%	2 2%
Take to landfill or dump	10 3%	3 3%	 	1	6 6%	1 6%	9 2%	6 2%	4 48	5 3%	5 2%	4 5%	2 1%	4 3%
Feed it to livestock (horses, cattle, etc.)	2 1%	_		-	2 2%	-	2 1%	1 0%	1 1%	2 1%	-	-	1 1%	1 1%
Burn it	2 1%	1 1%		-	1 1%	-	2 1%	2 1%	-	1 1%	1 0%	1 1%	1 1%	
Don't dispose of it / leave it in yard	8 2%	1 1%	- -	-	7 7%	1 6%	7 2%	6 2%	2 2%	6 4%	2 1%	3 3%	2 1%	3 2%
Other	3 1%		-	-	3 3%	-	3 1%	2 1%	1 1%	1 1%	2 1%	1 1%	1 1%	1 1%
UNSURE/DK	7 2%	2 2%	- -	2 2%	3 3%	1 6%	6 2%	4 1%	3 3%	2 1%	5 2%	3% 3%	2 1%	2 2%

Table 32:         Q13. What do you usually do to dispose of your lawn clippings, leaves or other yard was	ste?
---	------

## RUSSIAN RIVER WATERSHED TRACKING SURVEY -- OCT/NOV 2009

			INCOME			EDUC	ATION			RACE		HOW L	ONG IN	AREA
			35K-		H.S.	Some	Coll.	Post				<10	10-20	21+
	Total	<35K	75K	>75K	or less	Coll	Grad	Grad	Wht	Hisp	Other	Yrs	Yrs	Yrs
Base	380	61	123	127	100	110	107	55	287	34	27	134	119	126
Compost it in yard	102	13	40	34	22	26	32	20	79	7	8	30	29	42
or open space	27%	21%	33%	27%	22%	24%	30%	36%	28%	21%	30%	22%	24%	33%
Put into yard waste	222	35	68	79	56	66	67	28	173	18	12	87	70	65
can	58%	57%	55%	62%	56%	60%	63%	51%	60%	53%	44%	65%	59%	52%
Put into the trash /	21	5	5	б	9	б	4	2	11	б	3	9	9	3
garbage can	6%	8%	4%	5%	9%	5%	4%	4%	4%	18%	11%	7%	8%	2%
Gardner takes it	3	1	-	-	2	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	2	1
	1%	2%	-	-	2%	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	2%	1%
Take to landfill or	10	2	5	2	4	3	2	1	5	3	-	2	4	4
dump	3%	3%	4%	2%	4%	3%	2%	2%	2%	9%	-	18	3%	3%
Feed it to livestock	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	2	2	-	-	1	-	1
(horses, cattle, etc.)	1%	-	2%	-	-	-	-	4%	1%	-	-	1%	-	18
Burn it	2	1	-	1	2	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	2
	18	28	-	1%	2%	-	-	-	0%	-	4%	-	-	2%
Don't dispose of it /	8	3	2	2	1	4	2	1	8	-	-	3	1	4
leave it in yard	2%	5%	2%	2%	1%	48	2%	2%	3%	-	-	2%	18	38
Other	3	1	-	1	1	2	-	-	2	_	1	-	2	1
	1%	28	-	1%	1%	28	-	-	1%	-	4%	-	2%	1%
UNSURE/DK	7 2%	-	1 1%	2 2%	3 3%	3 3%	-	1 2%	4 1%	-	2 7%	2 1%	2 2%	3 2%

Table 32: Q13. What do you usually do to dispose of your lawn clippings, leaves or other yard waste?

Table 33: Q13. Other places yard waste is disposed.

Unincorporated Sonoma County

THROW IT DOWN THE CREEK.

PUTS IT IN THE WOODS

THROW IT FOR FERTILIZER IN THE VINEYARD

			LOCA	TION		DWEL TY	LING PE	HO	ME	GEN	DER		AGE	
											Fe-	18-	35-	
	Total	Hld	RP	Wndr	SoCo	Multi	SFD	Own	Rent	Male	male	34	54	55+
Base	380	94	87	101	98	17	363	275	100	160	220	88	164	128
Composting it in	183	47	33	40	63	8	175	134	49	71	112	47	78	58
your yard or open space	48%	50%	38%	40%	64%	47%	48%	49%	49%	44%	51%	53%	48%	45%
Putting into your	151	38	44	49	20	4	147	109	39	62	89	29	65	57
yard waste can	40%	40%	51%	49%	20%	24%	40%	40%	39%	39%	40%	33%	40%	45%
Putting it into your	11	3	2	3	3	1	10	8	2	5	6	2	4	5
the trash or garbage can	3%	3%	2%	3%	3%	6%	3%	3%	2%	3%	3%	2%	2%	4%
Blowing or sweeping it into the street or gutter	1 0%	1 1%	-		-	-	1 0%	-	1 1%	1 1%	-	1 1%	-	-
Taking it to a landfill or dump	10 3%	1 1%	2 2%	2 2%	5 5%	1 6%	9 2%	6 2%	4 48	4 3%	6 3%	2 2%	5 3%	3 2%
Burning it	5 1%	-	-	2 2%	3%	1 6%	4 1%	4 1%	1 1%	3 2%	2 1%	1 1%	3 2%	1 1%
None of the above	7 2%	2 2%	2 2%	2 2%	1 1%	1 6%	6 2%	3 1%	3 3%	7 4%	-	1 1%	5 3%	1 1%
Does not make any difference	8 2%	1 1%	3 3%	1 1%	30 V	1 6%	7 2%	7 3%	1 18	6 4%	2 1%	4 5%	2 1%	2 2%
Unsure/DK	4 1%	1 1%	1 1%	2 2%	_	-	4 1%	4 1%	-	1 1%	3 1%	1 1%	2 1%	1 1%

 Table 34:
 Q13A. Which of the following methods of yard waste disposal do you think is <u>best</u> for the environment, or does it not make any difference?

Table 34:	Q13A. Which of the following methods of yard waste disposal do you think is <b>best</b> for the environment, or does it not make any
	difference?

		I	INCOME			EDUC	ATION			RACE		HOW L	ONG IN	AREA
			35K-		H.S.	Some	Coll.	Post				<10	10-20	21+
	Total	<35K	75K	>75K	or less	Coll	Grad	Grad	Wht	Hisp	Other	Yrs	Yrs	Yrs
Base	380	61	123	127	100	110	107	55	287	34	27	134	119	126
Composting it in	183	28	60	61	34	55	59	33	147	10	14	65	58	60
your vard or open	48%	46%	49%	48%	34%	50%	55%	60%	51%	29%	52%	49%	49%	48%
space														
Putting into your	151	24	46	53	50	45	38	13	108	18	9	57	49	45
yard waste can	40%	39%	37%	42%	50%	41%	36%	24%	38%	53%	33%	43%	41%	36%
Putting it into your	11	3	3	1	2	5	2	1	б	2	-	3	2	5
the trash or	3%	5%	2%	1%	2%	5%	2%	2%	2%	6%	-	2%	2%	4%
garbage can														
Blowing or	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1
sweeping it into the	0%	-	-	1%	1%	-	-	-	-	-	4%	-	-	1%
street or gutter														
Taking it to a	10	2	6	2	6	3	1	-	7	3	-	3	2	5
landfill or dump	3%	3%	5%	2%	6%	3%	1%	-	2%	9%	-	2%	2%	4%
Burning it	5	1	2	2	2	-	1	2	4	-	1	2	1	2
J. J	1%	2%	2%	2%	2%	-	1%	48	1%	-	4%	1%	1%	2%
None of the above	7	1	3	1	-	1	3	3	б	-	1	1	4	2
	2%	2%	2%	1%	-	1%	3%	5%	2%	-	4%	1%	3%	2%
Does not make	8	2	2	4	4	1	2	1	6	-	1	3	1	4
any difference	2%	3%	2%	38	4%	1%	2%	2%	2%	-	4%	2%	1%	38
Unsure/DK	4	-	1	2	1	-	1	2	3	1	-	-	2	2
	1%	-	1%	2%	1%	-	1%	4%	1%	3%	-	-	2%	2%

			LOCA			DWEL TY	LING PE	НО	ME	GEN	DER		AGE	
	Total	Hld	RP	Wndr	SoCo	Multi	SFD	Own	Rent	Male	Fe- male	18- 34	35- 54	55+
Base	502	126	125	126	125	63	439	337	159	207	295	115	210	177
Does it go directly into a river or other waterways that lead to a river	264 53%	80 63%	55 44%	62 49%	67 54%	28 44%	236 54%	176 52%	85 53%	122 59%	142 48%	55 48%	122 58%	87 49%
Does it go to a sewage treatment plant like the water that goes through your household drains	88 18%	26 21%	26 21%	24 19%	12 10%	16 25%	72 16%	65 19%	22 14%	34 16%	54 18%	18 16%	34 16%	36 20%
Does it just soak into the ground	37 7%	2 2%	8 6%	5 4%	22 18%	2 3%	35 8%	24 78	12 8%	14 7%	23 8%	7 6%	15 7%	15 8%
Does it go someplace else	7 18	-	2 2%	2 2%	3 2%	2 3%	5 1%	3 1%	4 3%	3 1%	4 1%	3 3%	2 1%	2 1%
Are you not sure	106 21%	18 14%	34 27%	33 26%	21 17%	15 24%	91 21%	69 20%	36 23%	34 16%	72 24%	32 28%	37 18%	37 21%

Table 35: Q14. As far as you know, which <u>best</u> describes what happens to the water that goes into our gutters and storm drains ...

		INCOME				EDUC	ATION			RACE		HOW L	ONG IN	AREA
			35K-		H.S.	Some	Coll.	Post				<10	10-20	21+
	Total	<35K	75K	>75K	or less	Coll	Grad	Grad	Wht	Hisp	Other	Yrs	Yrs	Yrs
Base	502	100	155	153	139	144	142	68	375	46	39	188	155	156
Does it go directly	264	51	79	94	63	72	82	44	211	21	15	99	79	85
into a river or other	53%	51%	51%	61%	45%	50%	58%	65%	56%	46%	38%	53%	51%	54%
waterways that			1											
lead to a river														
Does it go to a	88	14	34	23	20	25	27	15	59	10	7	33	28	26
sewage treatment	18%	14%	22%	15%	14%	17%	19%	22%	16%	22%	18%	18%	18%	17%
plant like the water														
that goes through														
your household														
drains														
Does it just soak	37	7	12	10	11	13	7	5	27	1	7	14	8	14
into the ground	7%	7%	8%	7%	8%	9%	5%	7%	7%	2%	18%	7%	5%	9%
5			1											
Does it go	7	3	1	-	4	1	2	-	4	1	1	3	2	2
someplace else	1%	3%	18	-	3%	1%	1%	-	1%	2%	3%	2%	1%	1%
			1											
Are you not sure	106	25	29	26	41	33	24	4	74	13	9	39	38	29
	21%	25%	19%	17%	29%	23%	17%	6%	20%	28%	23%	21%	25%	19%
			ļ											
			1											

Table 35: Q14. As far as you know, which <u>best</u> describes what happens to the water that goes into our gutters and storm drains ...

Table 36: Q14. Other places the water goes.

# Rohnert Park

IT DOESN'T GO ANYWHERE. IT JUST FLOODS OUR STREET.

OCEAN

## <u>Windsor</u>

GOES INTO THE STREETS AND GETS CONTAMINATED

TO ANOTHER WATER SOURCE

#### **Unincorporated Sonoma County**

BACK INTO OUR WELL

NONE OF THE ABOVE

LEACH FIELD

						DWEL	LING							
			LOCA	TION		TY	PE	HO	ME	GEN	DER		AGE	
	Total	ни	PD	W/ndr	SoCo	Multi	SED	Own	Ront	Mala	Fe-	18- 34	35- 54	55+
Base	502	126	125	126	125	63	439	337	159	207	295	115	210	177
An area that	85	18	25	17	25	11	74	59	25	44	41	18	37	30
retains water like a	17%	14%	20%	13%	20%	17%	17%	18%	16%	21%	14%	16%	18%	17%
swamp or a marsh														
A land area that	209	63	42	50	54	21	188	150	58	90	119	38	96	75
drains into a	42%	50%	34%	40%	43%	33%	43%	45%	36%	43%	40%	33%	46%	42%
specific water body														
A water intake	61	8	22	19	12	8	53	40	20	13	48	21	23	17
area that feeds a	12%	6%	18%	15%	10%	13%	12%	12%	13%	6%	16%	18%	11%	10%
water treatment														
plant														
Or none of the	74	20	20	17	17	12	62	38	33	37	37	18	32	24
above	15%	16%	16%	13%	14%	19%	14%	11%	21%	18%	13%	16%	15%	14%
DK/Refused	73	17	16	23	17	11	62	50	23	23	50	20	22	31
	15%	13%	13%	18%	14%	17%	14%	15%	14%	11%	17%	17%	10%	18%

Table 37: Q15. Which of these statements <u>best</u> describes what you believe a watershed to be ...

		I	NCOME			EDUC	ATION			RACE		HOW L	ONG IN	AREA
			35K-		H.S.	Some	Coll.	Post				<10	10-20	21+
	Total	<35K	75K	>75K	or less	Coll	Grad	Grad	Wht	Hisp	Other	Yrs	Yrs	Yrs
Base	502	100	155	153	139	144	142	68	375	46	39	188	155	156
An area that	85	23	18	32	18	29	28	8	70	3	б	26	27	32
retains water like a	17%	23%	12%	21%	13%	20%	20%	12%	19%	7%	15%	14%	17%	21%
swamp or a marsh														
A land area that	209	28	56	85	38	50	75	44	172	14	10	80	68	61
drains into a	42%	28%	36%	56%	27%	35%	53%	65%	46%	30%	26%	43%	44%	39%
specific water body														
A water intake	61	13	26	16	22	22	12	4	42	4	8	23	17	20
area that feeds a	12%	13%	17%	10%	16%	15%	8%	6%	11%	9%	21%	12%	11%	13%
water treatment														
plant														
Or none of the	74	18	28	10	32	19	18	2	41	15	8	25	21	27
above	15%	18%	18%	7%	23%	13%	13%	3%	11%	33%	21%	13%	14%	17%
DK/Refused	73	18	27	10	29	24	9	10	50	10	7	34	22	16
	15%	18%	17%	7%	21%	17%	6%	15%	13%	22%	18%	18%	14%	10%

Table 37: Q15. Which of these statements <u>best</u> describes what you believe a watershed to be ...

 Table 38:
 Q16. As far as you know, do you live in a watershed?

						DWEI	LING							
			LOCA	TION		TY	PE	HO	ME	GEN	DER		AGE	
											Fe-	18-	35-	
	Total	Hld	RP	Wndr	SoCo	Multi	SFD	Own	Rent	Male	male	34	54	55+
Base	502	126	125	126	125	63	439	337	159	207	295	115	210	177
Yes	166	46	31	35	54	14	152	118	45	81	85	23	82	61
	33%	37%	25%	28%	43%	22%	35%	35%	28%	39%	29%	20%	39%	34%
No	221	56	60	56	49	30	191	144	74	90	131	73	82	66
	44%	44%	48%	44%	39%	48%	44%	43%	47%	43%	44%	63%	39%	37%
DK/Refused	115	24	34	35	22	19	96	75	40	36	79	19	46	50
	23%	19%	27%	28%	18%	30%	22%	22%	25%	17%	27%	17%	22%	28%
			NCOME			EDUC	ATION			RACE		HOW L	ONG IN	AREA
			35K-		H.S.	Some	Coll.	Post				<10	10-20	21+
	Total	<35K	75K	>75K	or less	Coll	Grad	Grad	Wht	Hisp	Other	Yrs	Yrs	Yrs
Base	502	100	155	153	139	144	142	68	375	46	39	188	155	156
Yes	166	25	52	62	28	45	58	34	141	6	7	58	56	51
	33%	25%	34%	41%	20%	31%	41%	50%	38%	13%	18%	31%	36%	33%
No	221	45	67	63	76	61	57	23	148	28	21	92	58	69
	44%	45%	43%	41%	55%	42%	40%	34%	39%	61%	54%	49%	37%	44%
DK/Refused	115	30	36	28	35	38	27	11	86	12	11	38	41	36
	23%	30%	23%	18%	25%	26%	19%	16%	23%	26%	28%	20%	26%	23%

Table 39:Q17. What is the name of the watershed you live in?

			LOCA	TION		DWEL TY	LING PE	НО	ME	GEN	DER		AGE	
	Total	Hld	RP	Wndr	SoCo	Multi	SED	Own	Rent	Male	Fe- male	18- 34	35- 54	55+
Base	166	46	31	35	54	14	152	118	45	81	85	23	82	61
Russian River	66 40%	28 61%	6 19%	19 54%	13 24%	4 29%	62 41%	50 42%	15 33%	39 48%	27 32%	9 39%	32 39%	25 41%
Sonoma Creek	4 2%		-	1 3%	3 6%	1 7%	3 2%	2 2%	2 4%		4 5%		3 4%	1 2%
Petaluma River	3 2%	-	1 3%		2 4%	1 7%	2 1%	3 3%	-	1 1%	2 2%	1 4%	2 2%	-
Laguna de Santa Rosa	6 4%		4 13%	1 3%	1 2%		6 4%	5 4%	1 2%	4 5%	2 2%	1 4%	2 2%	3 5%
Dry Creek	6 4%	1 2%	-		5 9%		6 4%	4 3%	2 4%	3 4%	3 4%		3 4%	3 5%
Other	20 12%	2 4%	2 6%	4 11%	12 22%	2 14%	18 12%	11 9%	8 18%	10 12%	10 12%	4 17%	11 13%	5 8%
DK/Refused	61 37%	15 33%	18 58%	10 29%	18 33%	6 43%	55 36%	43 36%	17 38%	24 30%	37 44%	8 35%	29 35%	24 39%

Table 39:	Q17. What	is the name	of the	watershed	you live	in?
-----------	-----------	-------------	--------	-----------	----------	-----

		I	NCOME			EDUC	ATION			RACE		HOW L	ONG IN	AREA
			35K-		H.S.	Some	Coll.	Post				<10	10-20	21+
	Total	<35K	75K	>75K	or less	Coll	Grad	Grad	Wht	Hisp	Other	Yrs	Yrs	Yrs
Base	166	25	52	62	28	45	58	34	141	6	7	58	56	51
Russian River	66	5	25	28	11	11	26	18	60	1	2	24	22	20
	40%	20%	48%	45%	39%	24%	45%	53%	43%	17%	29%	41%	39%	39%
Sonoma Creek	4	1	1	2	-	1	3	-	2	-	1	1	1	2
	28	4%	2%	3%	-	28	5%	-	1%	-	14%	28	2%	4%
Petaluma River	3	-	1	-	1	1	1	1	3	-	-	1	1	1
	2%	-	2%	-	4%	-	2%	3%	2%	-	-	2%	2%	2%
Laguna de Santa	б	3	2	1	-	3	3	-	5	-	-	2	1	3
Rosa	4%	12%	4%	2%	-	7왕	5%	-	4%	-	-	3%	2%	6%
Dry Creek	б	-	1	4	-	-	5	1	4	-	2	2	2	2
5	4%	-	28	6%	-	-	98	3%	3%	-	29%	3%	4%	4%
Other	20	6	5	7	4	8	5	2	16	1	-	7	5	7
	12%	24%	10%	11%	14%	18%	9%	6%	11%	17%	-	12%	9%	14%
DK/Refused	61	10	17	20	12	22	15	12	51	4	2	21	24	16
	37%	40%	33%	32%	43%	49%	26%	35%	36%	67%	29%	36%	43%	31%

## **RUSSIAN RIVER WATERSHED BASELINE SURVEY -- OCT/NOV 2009**

Table 40: Q17. Other watersheds mentioned.

## <u>Healdsburg</u>

FITCH MOUNTAIN

FOAM

## **Rohnert Park**

MACOS SANTA ROSA WATERSHED

SANTA ROSA WATER SHED

## **Windsor**

WAKULA

LAKE SONOMA

WINDSOR WATER AND SEWER

SIERRA WATER BASIN

# Unincorporated Sonoma County

BELMONT TERRACE	UPPER WARD CREEK	SALMON CREEK
GLEN ELLEN	GUALALA RIVER	SWEETWATER WATERSHED
MAYACAMAS WATERSHED AREA	DUTCH BILL CREEK	AUSTIN CREEK
LUTHER VALLEY	AUSTIN CREEK	SALMON CREEK

2009 Tabulated Data

						DWEL	LING							
			LOCA	TION		TY	PE	HO	ME	GEN	DER		AGE	
	Tatal	1.11.41		\A/m alm	0.00	N 414:		0	Dant	Mala	Fe-	18-	35-	FF .
	Total	HIQ	RP	vvnar	5000	IVIUITI	SFD	Own	Rent	iviale	male	34	54	55+
Base	502	126	125	126	125	63	439	337	159	207	295	115	210	177
Yes	381	109	85	98	89	43	338	261	118	148	233	84	165	132
	76%	87%	68%	78%	71%	68%	77%	77%	74%	71%	79%	73%	79%	75%
No	92	14	29	19	30	13	79	59	31	49	43	24	37	31
	18%	11%	23%	15%	24%	21%	18%	18%	19%	24%	15%	21%	18%	18%
DK/Refused	29	3	11	9	6	7	22	17	10	10	19	7	8	14
	6%	2%	98	7%	5%	11%	5%	5%	6%	5%	6%	6%	4%	8%
			NCOME			EDUC	ATION			RACE		HOW L	ONG IN	AREA
			35K-		H.S.	Some	Coll.	Post				<10	10-20	21+
	Total	<35K	75K	>75K	or less	Coll	Grad	Grad	Wht	Hisp	Other	Yrs	Yrs	Yrs
Base	502	100	155	153	139	144	142	68	375	46	39	188	155	156
Yes	381	61	128	127	90	111	116	58	295	31	25	142	119	119
	76%	61%	83%	83%	65%	77%	82%	85%	79%	67%	64%	76%	77%	76%
No	92	27	25	20	38	23	22	8	63	11	10	36	26	29
	18%	27%	16%	13%	27%	16%	15%	12%	17%	24%	26%	19%	17%	19%
DK/Refused	29	12	2	6	11	10	4	2	17	4	4	10	10	8
	6%	12%	1%	4%	8%	7%	3%	3%	5%	98	10%	5%	6%	5%

Table 41: Q18. Do you think you, personally, can have any effect on protecting the water quality in the Russian River and its tributaries?

			1.004			DWEL	DWELLING				ACE			
			LOCA	TION		IY	TTPE HOME		GENDER		10	AGE		
	Total	Hld	RP	Wndr	SoCo	Multi	SFD	Own	Rent	Male	re- male	18- 34	35- 54	55+
Base	502	126	125	126	125	63	439	337	159	207	295	115	210	177
Press Democrat newspaper	136 27%	36 29%	39 31%	30 24%	31 25%	20 32%	116 26%	98 29%	37 23%	60 29%	76 26%	13 11%	61 29%	62 35%
The Community Voice	9 2%	-	6 5%	2 2%	1 1%	-	9 2%	9 3%	-	4 2%	5 2%	2 2%	3 1%	4 2%
Healdsburg Tribune	37 7%	31 25%	1 1%	2 2%	3 2%	4 6%	33 8%	27 8%	9 6%	11 5%	26 9%	4 3%	18 9%	15 8%
Windsor Times	15 3%	2 2%	-	11 9%	2 2%	2 3%	13 3%	12 4%	3 2%	5 2%	10 3%	5 4%	7 3%	3 2%
La Voz	1 0%	-	-	-	1 1%	-	1 0%	1 0%	-	-	1 0%		1 0%	-
Sonoma Index Tribune	5 1%		-	_	5 4%	-	5 1%	4 1%	1 1%	1 0%	4 1%	-	3 1%	2 1%
Russian Riverkeeper	3 1%	3 2%	-	-	-	-	3 1%	2 1%	1 1%	1 0%	2 1%	-	-	3 2%
San Francisco Chronicle	3 1%	1 1%	-	1	1	-	3 1%	2 1%	1 1%	1 0%	2 1%	-	1 0%	2 1%
Other Newspapers	13 3%	2 2%	2 2%	1 1%	8 6%	1 2%	12 3%	9 3%	4 3%	4 2%	9 3%	1 1%	9 4%	3 2%

		· · · · · ·								r	,	· · · · · ·		
			LOCA	TION		DWEL TY	LING PE	но	ME	GEN	DER		AGE	
	Total	Hld	RP	Wndr	SoCo	Multi	SFD	Own	Rent	Male	Fe- male	18- 34	35- 54	55+
Base	502	126	125	126	125	63	439	337	159	207	295	115	210	177
City or county	38	10	9	9	10	3	35	26	11	20	18	5	18	15
newsletters	88	8%	78	78	88	5%	8%	8%	78	10%	6%	4%	9%	88
Utility bill inserts	44	13	11	11	9	2	42	38	6	9	35	8	20	16
(information that	9%	10%	98	9%	7%	3%	10%	11%	4%	4%	12%	7%	10%	98
comes with your utility bills)			l											
Brochures or	37	8	9	13	7	2	35	31	6	10	27	7	21	9
letters mailed to the home	7%	6%	7%	10%	6%	3%	88	98	48	5%	98	6%	10%	5%
Water district /	89	18	17	33	21	9	80	69	20	31	58	10	33	46
water agency /	18%	14%	14%	26%	17%	14%	18%	20%	13%	15%	20%	9%	16%	26%
water company / water department														
City or Town Hall /	37	12	5	14	6	1	36	26	9	16	21	6	19	12
City or Town	7%	10%	4%	11%	5%	2%	8%	8%	6%	8%	7%	5%	9%	7%
Council			l											
Presentations or	6	2	3	1	-	-	6	4	2	2	4	2	2	2
information booths at events	1%	2%	28	1%	-	-	18	1%	1%	18	18	2%	1%	18

2009 Tabulated Data

								ЦО		GEN			AGE		
	Total	Hld	RP	Wndr	SoCo	Multi	SFD	Own	Rent	Male	Fe- male	18- 34	35- 54	55+	
Base	502	126	125	126	125	63	439	337	159	207	295	115	210	177	
Radio	16	2	4	3	7	2	14	10	6	9	7	5	3	8	
	3%	2%	3%	2%	6%	3%	3%	3%	4%	4%	2%	4%	1%	5%	
Television	68	12	26	13	17	13	55	39	28	29	39	21	30	17	
	14%	10%	21%	10%	14%	21%	13%	12%	18%	14%	13%	18%	14%	10%	
At work	8	4	1	1	2	2	6	6	2	4	4	1	4	3	
	2%	3%	1%	1%	2%	3%	1%	2%	1%	2%	1%	1%	2%	2%	
In school	13 3%	-	3 2%	3 2%	7 6%	1 2%	12 3%	8 2%	5 3%	5 2%	8 3%	8 7%	4 2%	1	
Internet	65	19	16	13	17	8	57	41	23	26	39	19	31	15	
	13%	15%	13%	10%	14%	13%	13%	12%	14%	13%	13%	17%	15%	8%	
Word of mouth	45	13	7	6	19	2	43	29	15	21	24	12	23	10	
	9%	10%	6%	5%	15%	3%	10%	9%	9%	10%	8%	10%	11%	6%	
Other Sources	42	9	8	14	11	5	37	20	21	23	19	17	16	9	
	8%	7%	6%	11%	9%	8%	8%	6%	13%	11%	6%	15%	8%	5%	
DK/REFUSED	50	9	16	12	13	8	42	29	21	23	27	18	14	18	
	10%	7%	13%	10%	10%	13%	10%	9%	13%	11%	9%	16%	78	10%	

			NCOME	-	EDUCATION					RACE		HOW LONG IN AREA			
			35K-		H.S.	Some	Coll.	Post				<10	10-20	21+	
	Total	<35K	75K	>75K	or less	Coll	Grad	Grad	Wht	Hisp	Other	Yrs	Yrs	Yrs	
Base	502	100	155	153	139	144	142	68	375	46	39	188	155	156	
Press Democrat	136	19	38	56	19	38	53	23	117	6	5	46	41	48	
newspaper	27%	19%	25%	37%	14%	26%	37%	34%	31%	13%	13%	24%	26%	31%	
The Community	9	2	4	3	2	1	5	1	7	_	1	5	2	2	
Voice	2%	2%	3%	2%	1%	1%	4%	1%	2%	-	3%	3%	1%	1%	
Healdsburg	37	3	7	18	4	7	16	10	30	1	4	14	13	10	
Tribune	7%	3%	5%	12%	3%	5%	11%	15%	88	2%	10%	7%	8%	6%	
Windsor Times	15	5	4	5	6	3	5	1	10	3	-	5	5	5	
	3%	5%	3%	38	4%	2%	4%	1%	38	7%	_	3%	3%	3%	
La Voz	1 0%		-	1 1%	-	1 1%	-	-	1 0%	-	-	-	1 1%	-	
O a martina da si	F		2			2	2	1	2			1	1	2	
Sonoma Index Tribune	5 1%	-	3 2%	1%	-	18	18	18	3	-	-	18	1%	2%	
Russian	3	-	-	1	_	_	2	1	3	_	_	2	_	1	
Riverkeeper	1%	_	-	18	-	-	1%	1%	18	-	-	1%	-	18	
San Francisco	3	1	1	-	-	3	-	-	3	-	-	1	1	1	
Chronicle	1%	1%	18	-	-	2%	-	-	1%	-	-	1%	1%	1%	
Other Newspapers	13	4	2 1 %	4	3	3	4	2	12	-	-	6 29	1	6 19	
	50	70	10	50	26	26	26	50	50	_	_	50	10	70	

			NCOME			EDUCATION			RACE			HOW LONG IN AREA		
			35K-		H.S.	Some	Coll.	Post				<10	10-20	21+
	Total	<35K	75K	>75K	or less	Coll	Grad	Grad	Wht	Hisp	Other	Yrs	Yrs	Yrs
Base	502	100	155	153	139	144	142	68	375	46	39	188	155	156
City or county	38	8	9	11	9	13	8	7	24	5	4	12	13	13
newsletters	88	8%	6%	7%	6%	9%	6%	10%	6%	118	10%	6%	8%	8%
Utility bill inserts	44	5	17	15	10	14	11	8	33	2	5	13	16	15
(information that comes with your utility bills)	9%	5%	11%	10%	7%	10%	8%	12%	9%	4%	13%	7%	10%	10%
Brochures or	37	4	12	12	7	10	11	8	23	4	8	11	10	16
letters mailed to the home	7%	4%	8%	88	5%	7%	8%	12%	6%	98	21%	6%	6%	10%
Water district /	89	10	30	26	19	27	24	16	68	б	5	30	29	30
water agency / water company / water department	18%	10%	19%	17%	14%	19%	17%	24%	18%	13%	13%	16%	19%	19%
City or Town Hall /	37	8	11	11	10	4	13	9	28	4	3	15	13	8
City or Town Council	7%	89	78	7%	7%	3%	98	13%	7%	98	8%	8%	8%	5%
Presentations or	6	-	2	4	1	1	4	-	6	-	-	2	2	2
information booths at events	1%	-	1%	3%	1%	1%	3%	-	2%	-	-	1%	1%	18

 Table 42:
 Q19. Where do you get most of your information about water quality or water pollution in your local area?

		I	NCOME			EDUC	ATION			RACE		HOW LONG IN AREA			
			35K-		H.S.	Some	Coll.	Post				<10	10-20	21+	
	Total	<35K	75K	>75K	or less	Coll	Grad	Grad	Wht	Hisp	Other	Yrs	Yrs	Yrs	
Base	502	100	155	153	139	144	142	68	375	46	39	188	155	156	
Radio	16 3%	4 4%	8 5%	2 1%	5 4%	5 3%	5 4%	1 1%	12 3%	2 4%	2 5%	7 4%	3 2%	6 4%	
Television	68 14%	21 21%	20 13%	14 9%	29 21%	20 14%	17 12%	2	45 12%	9 20%	9 23%	30 16%	24 15%	14 9%	
At work	8 2%	2 2%	1	4	3 2%	3 2%	11	1	5 1%	1 2%	-	3 2%	5 3%		
In school	13 3%	6 6%	4 3%	2 1%	6 4%	5 3%	1		8 2%	1 2%	1 3%	6 3%	5 3%	2 1%	
Internet	65 13%	6 6%	19 12%	31 20%	8	23 16%	28 20%	6 9%	54 14%	2 4%	6 15%	26 14%	22 14%	17 11%	
Word of mouth	45 9%	7 7%	23 15%	9 6%	13 9%	15 10%	13 9%	4 6%	36 10%	4 9%	4 10%	17 9%	9 6%	19 12%	
Other Sources	42 8%	8 8%	17 11%	13 8%	10 7%	16 11%	12 8%	4 6%	31 8%	3 7%	5 13%	17 9%	11 7%	14 9%	
DK/REFUSED	50 10%	15 15%	12 8%	10 7%	29 21%	10 7%	7 5%	4 6%	34 9%	7 15%	5 13%	22 12%	12 8%	15 10%	

 Table 42:
 Q19. Where do you get most of your information about water quality or water pollution in your local area?

Table 43: Q19. Other information sources: Newspapers

#### **Healdsburg**

NEWSPAPER ARTICLES

LOCAL PAPER

### **Rohnert Park**

SMALL COMMUNITY PAPER, DON'T KNOW THE NAME

SONOMA COUNTY CONSERVATION GROUP

#### <u>Windsor</u>

LOCAL PAPER

## **Unincorporated Sonoma County**

FARM BUREAU PAPER

WEST COUNTY

LOCAL NEWSPAPERS

INDEPENDENT COAST OBSERVER

SONOMA COUNTY GAZETTE

RUSSIAN RIVER GAZETTE AND THE BOHEMIAN

WEST COUNTY GAZETTE

SONOMA COUNTY NEWS AND THE GAZETTE

Table 44: Q19. Other information sources: General

	<u>Healdsburg</u>
NONPROFIT CITIZEN GROUPS	
ANTIPOLLUTION GROUPS	COMMON SENSE
SONOMA COUNTY CONSERVATION ALLIES	PERSONAL OBSERVATION
	A CHARITY CALLED RIVER WATCH
T DO NOT LOOK UP INFORMATION ABOUT IT.	FROM WATER CONSERVATION CLASSES
THE LOCAL NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATION	

## Rohnert Park

RECYCLING FLYER

DON'T RESEARCH IT, HAVE NO INFORMATION SOURCES

TEACHERS AND ACTIVISTS

COMMON SENSE

I DON'T RECEIVE ANY

FLYERS ON DOORS

I RAN A NURSERY AND GOT INFORMATION FOR THAT.

TRI-CITY TIMES

Table 44: Q19. Other information sources: General

Windsor						
ENVIRONMENTAL GROUP						
BILLBOARDS	IT IS COMMON SENSE.					
SEE WHAT IS IN THE RIVER WHEN I GO THERE TO FISH	WASTE MANAGEMENT AGENCY, SANTA ROSA					
REPORT FROM WASTE MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT	SELF EXPERIENCE					
COMMON SENSE	WINE GRAPE INDUSTRY					
HOME TEST	SUSTAINABLE EDUCATION COURSES					
	I DO NOT GET THAT INFORMATION.					
COMMON SENSE	I HAVE A VAST KNOWLEDGE OF EVERYTHING.					
Unincorporated Sonoma	County					
RECYCLING AREAS	SONOMA COUNTY CONSERVATION ACT					
SONOMA ECOLOGY CENTER	WE DO NOT GET INFORMATION SINCE WE HAVE A WELL.					
COUNTY	PERSONAL OBSERVATION					
NEIGHBORHOODS POSTINGS ABOUT LOCAL MEETINGS	FISH AND GAME DEPARTMENT					
I SPEAK FREQUENTLY TO EXPERTS.	HEALTH CLASSES IN HIGH SCHOOL					
PRIVATE AGENCY						
Table 45:
 Q20. Do you think you, personally, are getting enough information about what you could do to protect the water quality in the Russian River and its tributaries?

						DWELLING TYPE			HOME			AGE		
	1		LOOF							OLIN	Fe-	18-	35-	
	Total	Hld	RP	Wndr	SoCo	Multi	SFD	Own	Rent	Male	male	34	54	55+
Base	502	126	125	126	125	63	439	337	159	207	295	115	210	177
Yes	259	67	54	68	70	26	233	190	64	118	141	50	109	100
	52%	53%	43%	54%	56%	41%	53%	56%	40%	57%	48%	43%	52%	56%
No	218	54	64	52	48	35	183	130	88	74	144	62	90	66
	43%	43%	51%	41%	38%	56%	42%	39%	55%	36%	49%	54%	43%	37%
DK/REFUSED	25	5	7	6	7	2	23	17	7	15	10	3	11	11
	5%	4%	6%	5%	6%	3%	5%	5%	4%	7%	3%	3%	5%	6%
			NCOME			EDUC	ATION			RACE		HOW L	ONG IN	AREA
			35K-		H.S.	Some	Coll.	Post				<10	10-20	21+

			35K-		н.5.	Some	Coll.	Post				<10	10-20	21+
	Total	<35K	75K	>75K	or less	Coll	Grad	Grad	Wht	Hisp	Other	Yrs	Yrs	Yrs
Base	502	100	155	153	139	144	142	68	375	46	39	188	155	156
Yes	259	44	71	83	67	66	74	44	195	22	22	87	77	93
	52%	44%	46%	54%	48%	46%	52%	65%	52%	48%	56%	46%	50%	60%
No	218	51	80	63	64	73	60	21	164	23	15	95	68	55
	43%	51%	52%	41%	46%	51%	42%	31%	44%	50%	38%	51%	44%	35%
DK/REFUSED	25	5	4	7	8	5	8	3	16	1	2	б	10	8
	5%	5%	3%	5%	6%	3%	6%	4%	4%	28	5%	3%	6%	5%

 Table 46:
 Q21. Are you interested in receiving periodic e-mail messages from a city or county agency about things you can do around your home to positively affect the water quality in your area? You will also receive highlights from the results of this survey.

			LOCA			DWEI TY	DWELLING TYPE		HOME		GENDER		AGE	
	Total	Hld	RP	Wndr	SoCo	Multi	SFD	Own	Rent	Male	Fe- male	18- 34	35- 54	55+
Base	502	126	125	126	125	63	439	337	159	207	295	115	210	177
Yes	133 26%	36 29%	33 26%	31 25%	33 26%	20 32%	113 26%	81 24%	51 32%	43 21%	90 31%	34 30%	68 32%	31 18%
No	299 60%	73 58%	70 56%	80 63%	76 61%	26 41%	273 62%	211 63%	83 52%	129 62%	170 58%	66 57%	119 57%	114 64%
I don't have e-mail access	60 12%	13 10%	18 14%	13 10%	16 13%	14 22%	46 10%	39 12%	21 13%	32 15%	28 9%	14 12%	17 8%	29 16%
DK/Refused	10 2%	4 3%	4 3%	2 2%		3 5%	7 2%	6 2%	4 3%	3 1%	7 2%	1 1%	6 3%	3 2%

		I	NCOME			EDUC	ATION			RACE		HOW LONG IN AREA			
			35K-		H.S.	Some	Coll.	Post				<10	10-20	21+	
	Total	<35K	75K	>75K	or less	Coll	Grad	Grad	Wht	Hisp	Other	Yrs	Yrs	Yrs	
Base	502	100	155	153	139	144	142	68	375	46	39	188	155	156	
Yes	133	29	46	50	33	41	41	18	107	12	9	60	42	31	
	26%	29%	30%	33%	24%	28%	29%	26%	29%	26%	23%	32%	27%	20%	
No	299	42	86	98	71	83	91	46	227	19	20	108	87	101	
	60%	42%	55%	64%	51%	58%	64%	68%	61%	41%	51%	57%	56%	65%	
I don't have e-mail	60	28	18	4	31	18	8	2	34	14	8	14	23	23	
access	12%	28%	12%	3%	22%	13%	6%	3%	9%	30%	21%	7%	15%	15%	
DK/Refused	10	1	5	1	4	2	2	2	7	1	2	6	3	1	
	28	1%	3%	1%	3%	1%	1%	3%	2%	2%	5%	3%	28	1%	

Table 47: Q21. E-Mail addresses:

# <u>Healdsburg</u>

WATANABE@SONIC.NET	SALOTTICE@SBC.GLOBAL.NET	CIORCAL@NAC.COM
COMRADEBERRY@YAHOO.COM	DRJAKEKT@COMCAST.NET	EGRANTDOUGLAS@SBCGLOBAL.NET
ROZLINE@COMCAST.NET	TARA.HARRELL@GMAIL.COM	KELLEYPEREZ@MAC.COM
R-NFAGIN@PRODIGY.NET	ERIKAF@SONIC.NET	A32COP@SONIC.NET
K_HILGERT@COMCAST.NET	TASTEMAKERCASH@GMAIL.COM	ANGBERANSE@YAHOO.COM
DALLEN068@ATT.NET	JASONHINDE2002@YAHOO.COM	KATEFB@SONIC.NET
CARO1EE@YAHOO.COM	CAROLNOCK@COMCAST.NET	IVYHEART@AOL.COM
GAIL@GAILJONAS.COM	ALBIKES@ATT.NET	MJCHISM@SONIC.NET
MARICSPINOZA13@YAHOO.COM	CYNDEK1010@AOL.COM	MABERLERBENER@SONIC.NET
MJACKSON@HUSD.COM	LA.SANTUCCI@COMCAST.NET	JSOEPH1142@SPCGLOBAL.NET
RICARDO0309@GMAIL.COM	DMERDADO09@LIVE.COM	BHRASKRKA@ROCKETMAIL.COM
JWORDEN@JORDENARCH.COM	NICOL_CHAPIS@HOTMAIL.COM	MPFSYLENCER707@YAHOO.COM

Table 47: Q21. E-Mail addresses:

#### **Rohnert Park**

EM21MAIL@GMAIL.COM	ELROYSTEELE@GMAIL.COM
ANNEANDROB40@HOTMAIL.COM	MATLET@COMCAST.NET
AMYRICHARDS@COMCAST.NET	JAYM116@HOTMAIL.COM
ANNKILLEEN@EARTHLINK.NET	BBALLMANBASKETBALL@YAHOO.COM
MAILROBC@ATT.NET	LORIKENNEDY59@COMCAST.NET
PAPRONSTROLLER@YAHOO.COM	RKING1226@AOL.COM
PEACHESSRR@AOL.COM	MAMAMIA1961@SBCGLOBAL.NET
JKHELLFIRE@ATT.NET	FENVIRO@SONIC.NET
HUNTER@HUNTERFINCH.COM	BENOITGOESSENS@EARTHLINK.NET
MAXIEKING@JUNO.COM	WALKER.MITCH@GMAIL.COM
CREAPEURSELS88@GMAIL.COM	SAMDIMOND@LIVE.COM
	BCASTANEDA1@GMAIL.COM

BEAR\_N\_JOJO@YAHOO.COM VVS511@HOTMAIL.COM SCRIBE0066@AOL.COM GIZMO\_NATTIE@YAHOO.COM KERRIE\_LITTLE@YAHOO.COM MAINSTREETFRANK@SBCGOBAL.NET NIKKIGREENPETERSON@YAHOO.COM BUTRRFLIES@SBCGLOBAL.NET JIMW@BRACCOS.NET BWOLFVWOLF@HOTMAIL.COM Table 47: Q21. E-Mail addresses

# <u>Windsor</u>

TYLERFIVE@COMCAST.NET	DICKDEPAO@AOL.COM	LARI.PARSONS@ATT.NET
NEHONDA@EARTHLINK.NET	NOYBMAIL-LOOKING@YAHOO.COM	CARL.SEELY@ATT.NET
COKEY52@COMCAST.NET	JANICESEXTON@COMCAST.NET	GAITEN4@COMCAST.NET
WENDYANDSCOTT85@AOL.COM	WINOS@SBCGLOBAL.NET	KENDRA2913@YAHOO.COM
HAIGHJ@EARTHLINK.NET	LESLIEMILLER676@COMCAST.NET	CORYN617@MSN.COM
CJJEWETT@YAHOO.COM	THEDOG1989@HOTMAIL.COM	BORY@SLCELLARS.COM
PDQUILP@COMCAST.NET	MONIQUE_CHANTE@YAHOO.COM	JHONCOOK395@LIVE.COM
JPMJCO@COMCAST.NET	VALENTINEGOMORA@COMCAST.NET	HPYGRL34@AOL.COM
WEELITTLEKINGS@AOL.COM	ARELI_AGUILERA@ATT.NET	IRWWITHHEATHER@HOTMAIL.COM
CHARLESWC@COMCAST.NET	SHAYNEMCCLOUD@YAHOO.COM	BRICK10@COMCAST.NET

# Table 47: Q21. E-Mail addresses:

### **Unincorporated Sonoma County**

GA9497@HOTMAIL.COM	SMITHALOT@TMAIL.COM
IRENA.KOVIOL@GMAIL.COM	MOMSJEEP93@YAHOO.COM
LSPALETTA@YAHOO.COM	PEGGY@PEGGYDAY.COM
SARAHJ.CARLIS@GMAIL.COM	IGOHIGH@YAHOO.COM
MUSTANGLIZZ@ATT.NET	DEALMAKER10000@COMCAST.NET
EVEJNAVARRO@MAC.COM	AV_SWOOP@YAHOO.COM
PETE@PACIFICAPPRAISALS.COM	KALACAT211@YAHOO.COM
RIONIDO104@COMCAST.NET	MAUREEEN@RUCKUS.ORG
TLUSTER@SONOMACOUNTY.COM	CALLVELA@YAHOO.COM
TURBODIESELTOY@YAHOO.COM	ECAMP123@LIVE.COM
BABEANDBABE@SBCGLOBAL.NET	DATHTOSHORTY@YAHOO.COM
ODALOLLY@SONIT.NET	KATIEDQ7@AOL.COM
CEALABBE@AOL.COM	CHICUV14@SBCGLOBAL.NET
MCCONLOGUE2002@YAHOO.COM	MISSSBOBEI@YAHOOC.OM
MLANDE@YAHOO.COM	HT_MARTIN@YAHOO.COM
HEIDEMEYER@MAILSTATION.COM	HOGHUNTR@HOTMAIL.COM

#### KYLEBELERIN@YAHOO.COM

-147-

2009 Tabulated Data

						DWEI	LING							
			LOCA	TION		TY	PE	HO	ME	GEN	DER		AGE	
											Fe-	18-	35-	
	Total	Hld	RP	Wndr	SoCo	Multi	SFD	Own	Rent	Male	male	34	54	55+
Base	502	126	125	126	125	63	439	337	159	207	295	115	210	177
													L	
Less than 10 years	188	42	47	58	41	34	154	95	92	80	108	68	76	44
-	37%	33%	38%	46%	33%	54%	35%	28%	58%	39%	37%	59%	36%	25%
10 to 20 vears	155	40	42	46	27	20	135	113	40	64	91	30	72	53
- · · · <b>,</b>	31%	32%	34%	37%	22%	32%	31%	34%	25%	31%	31%	26%	34%	30%
21 or more vears	156	44	34	22	56	9	147	128	27	63	93	17	60	79
	31%	35%	27%	17%	45%	14%	33%	38%	17%	30%	32%	15%	29%	45%
Refused	3	-	2	-	1	-	3	1	-	-	3	-	2	1
	1%	-	2%	-	1%	-	1%	0%	-	-	1%	-	1%	1%
		I	NCOME			EDUC	ATION			RACE		HOW L	ONG IN	AREA
			35K-		H.S.	Some	Coll.	Post				<10	10-20	21+

 Table 48:
 Q22. How long have you lived in your current community?

			NCOME			EDUC	ATION			RACE		HOW LONG IN AREA			
			35K-		H.S.	Some	Coll.	Post				<10	10-20	21+	
	Total	<35K	75K	>75K	or less	Coll	Grad	Grad	Wht	Hisp	Other	Yrs	Yrs	Yrs	
Base	502	100	155	153	139	144	142	68	375	46	39	188	155	156	
Less than 10 years	188	42	63	58	61	47	53	25	143	19	16	188	-	-	
2	37%	42%	41%	38%	44%	33%	37%	37%	38%	41%	41%	100%	-	-	
10 to 20 years	155	28	44	52	45	37	49	21	109	19	10	-	155	-	
	31%	28%	28%	34%	32%	26%	35%	31%	29%	41%	26%	-	100%	-	
21 or more vears	156	30	48	43	32	60	40	22	123	8	13	-	-	156	
· · · <b>,</b> · · ·	31%	30%	31%	28%	23%	42%	28%	32%	33%	17%	33%	-	-	100%	
Refused	3	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	1%	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	

			LOCA			DWEI TY	LING PE	HOME		GENDER		AGE		
	Total	Hld	RP	Wndr	SoCo	Multi	SFD	Own	Rent	Male	Fe- male	18- 34	35- 54	55+
Base	502	126	125	126	125	63	439	337	159	207	295	115	210	177
Own/Paying	337	76	86	93	82	13	324	337	-	142	195	54	145	138
mortgage	67%	60%	69%	74%	66%	21%	74%	100%	-	69%	66%	47%	69%	78%
Rent/Lease/Other	159	47	38	32	42	50	109	-	159	62	97	60	62	37
	32%	37%	30%	25%	34%	79%	25%	-	100%	30%	33%	52%	30%	21%
DK/REFUSED	6	3	1	1	1	-	6	-	-	3	3	1	3	2
	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%	-	1%	-	-	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%

 Table 49:
 Q23. Do you own your own home, or are you renting or leasing it?

		I	NCOME			EDUC	ATION			RACE		HOW LONG IN AREA			
			35K-		H.S.	Some	Coll.	Post				<10	10-20	21+	
	Total	<35K	75K	>75K	or less	Coll	Grad	Grad	Wht	Hisp	Other	Yrs	Yrs	Yrs	
Base	502	100	155	153	139	144	142	68	375	46	39	188	155	156	
Own/Paying	337	31	106	128	72	96	104	58	261	22	23	95	113	128	
mortgage	67%	31%	68%	84%	52%	67%	73%	85%	70%	48%	59%	51%	73%	82%	
Rent/Lease/Other	159	68	49	25	66	46	37	10	110	24	16	92	40	27	
	32%	68%	32%	16%	47%	32%	26%	15%	29%	52%	41%	49%	26%	17%	
DK/REFUSED	6	1	-	-	1	2	1	-	4	-	-	1	2	1	
	1%	1%	-	-	1%	1%	1%	-	1%	-	-	1%	1%	1%	

							DWELLING TYPE		HOME		GENDER		AGE			
										01.1	Fe-	18-	35-			
	Total	Hld	RP	Wndr	SoCo	Multi	SFD	Own	Rent	Male	male	34	54	55+		
Base	502	126	125	126	125	63	439	337	159	207	295	115	210	177		
Less than \$35,000	100	22	29	17	32	30	70	31	68	35	65	33	30	37		
	20%	17%	23%	13%	26%	48%	16%	98	43%	17%	22%	29%	14%	21%		
\$35,000 to	81	20	14	25	22	12	69	52	29	36	45	17	26	38		
\$55,000	16%	16%	11%	20%	18%	19%	16%	15%	18%	17%	15%	15%	12%	21%		
\$55,000 to	74	19	18	19	18	б	68	54	20	31	43	22	31	21		
\$75,000	15%	15%	14%	15%	14%	10%	15%	16%	13%	15%	15%	19%	15%	12%		
\$75,000 to	66	18	19	20	9	3	63	49	17	27	39	15	30	21		
\$100,000	13%	14%	15%	16%	7%	5%	14%	15%	11%	13%	13%	13%	14%	12%		
More than	87	24	24	22	17	2	85	79	8	42	45	16	57	14		
\$100,000	17%	19%	19%	17%	14%	3%	19%	23%	5%	20%	15%	14%	27%	88		
Refused/DK	94	23	21	23	27	10	84	72	17	36	58	12	36	46		
	19%	18%	17%	18%	22%	16%	19%	21%	11%	17%	20%	10%	17%	26%		

 Table 50:
 Q24. Please stop me when I get to the income group that best represents your total annual household income before taxes?

			INCOME			EDUC	ATION			RACE		HOW LONG IN AREA			
			35K-		H.S.	Some	Coll.	Post				<10	10-20	21+	
	Total	<35K	75K	>75K	or less	Coll	Grad	Grad	Wht	Hisp	Other	Yrs	Yrs	Yrs	
Base	502	100	155	153	139	144	142	68	375	46	39	188	155	156	
Less than \$35,000	100	100	-	-	42	39	16	2	72	13	8	42	28	30	
. ,	20%	100%	-	-	30%	27%	11%	3%	19%	28%	21%	22%	18%	19%	
\$35,000 to	81	-	81	-	34	21	15	11	60	12	6	33	21	27	
\$55,000	16%	-	52%	-	24%	15%	11%	16%	16%	26%	15%	18%	14%	17%	
\$55,000 to	74	-	74	-	20	25	20	9	62	3	7	30	23	21	
\$75,000	15%	-	48%	-	14%	17%	14%	13%	17%	7%	18%	16%	15%	13%	
\$75,000 to	66	-	-	66	8	18	31	9	50	8	3	28	22	16	
\$100,000	13%	-	-	43%	6%	13%	22%	13%	13%	17%	8%	15%	14%	10%	
More than	87	-	-	87	14	22	32	19	69	б	7	30	30	27	
\$100,000	17%	-	-	57%	10%	15%	23%	28%	18%	13%	18%	16%	19%	17%	
Refused/DK	94	-	-	-	21	19	28	18	62	4	8	25	31	35	
	19%	-	-	-	15%	13%	20%	26%	17%	98	21%	13%	20%	22%	

			LOCATION				DWELLING TYPE F			GENDER		AGE		
	Total	HId	RP	Wndr	SoCo	Multi	SED	Own	Rent	Male	Fe- male	18- 34	35- 54	55+
Base	502	126	125	126	125	63	439	337	159	207	295	115	210	177
High school	139	29	43	41	26	24	115	72	66	68	71	56	46	37
diploma or less	28%	23%	34%	33%	21%	38%	26%	21%	42%	33%	24%	49%	22%	21%
Some college or	144	28	39	30	47	16	128	96	46	50	94	28	59	57
vocational school	29%	22%	31%	24%	38%	25%	29%	28%	29%	24%	32%	24%	28%	32%
College graduate	142	42	29	39	32	19	123	104	37	56	86	21	72	49
(Bachelor's degree)	28%	33%	23%	31%	26%	30%	28%	31%	23%	27%	29%	18%	34%	28%
Post Graduate	68	26	10	14	18	4	64	58	10	30	38	9	28	31
degree (Master's or PhD)	14%	21%	8%	11%	14%	6%	15%	17%	6%	14%	13%	8%	13%	18%
Refused	9 2%	1 1%	4 3%	2 2%	2 2%	-	9 2%	7 2%	-	3 1%	6 2%	1 1%	5 2%	3 28
1				1					1					

 Table 51: Q25. What is the highest grade or year of school that you have completed and received credit for...

		INCOME				EDUC	ATION			RACE		HOW LONG IN AREA			
			35K-		H.S.	Some	Coll.	Post				<10	10-20	21+	
	Total	<35K	75K	>75K	or less	Coll	Grad	Grad	Wht	Hisp	Other	Yrs	Yrs	Yrs	
Base	502	100	155	153	139	144	142	68	375	46	39	188	155	156	
High school	139	42	54	22	139	-	-	-	85	26	16	61	45	32	
diploma or less	28%	42%	35%	14%	100%	-	-	-	23%	57%	41%	32%	29%	21%	
Some college or	144	39	46	40	-	144	-	-	120	10	7	47	37	60	
vocational school	29%	39%	30%	26%	_	100%	-	_	32%	22%	18%	25%	24%	38%	
College graduate	142	16	35	63	-	-	142	-	112	8	12	53	49	40	
(Bachelor's degree)	28%	16%	23%	41%	-	-	100%	-	30%	17%	31%	28%	32%	26%	
Post Graduate	68	2	20	28	-	-	-	68	56	2	4	25	21	22	
degree (Master's or PhD)	14%	2%	13%	18%	_	-	-	100%	15%	48	10%	13%	14%	14%	
Refused	9	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	2	3	2	
	2%	18	-	-	_	-	-	-	1%	_	-	1%	2%	1%	

						DWELLING								
			LOCA	TION		TY	PE	HO	ME	GEN	DER		AGE	
											Fe-	18-	35-	
	Total	Hld	RP	Wndr	SoCo	Multi	SFD	Own	Rent	Male	male	34	54	55+
Base	502	126	125	126	125	63	439	337	159	207	295	115	210	177
White/Caucasian	375	96	87	91	101	39	336	261	110	153	222	68	160	147
	75%	76%	70%	72%	81%	62%	77%	77%	69%	74%	75%	59%	76%	83%
Black/African	7	1	5	1	-	2	5	3	4	2	5	5	1	1
American	1%	1%	4%	1%	-	3%	1%	1%	3%	1%	2%	4%	0%	1%
Latino/Hispanic	46	16	11	18	1	10	36	22	24	19	27	25	17	4
	9%	13%	9%	14%	1%	16%	88	7웅	15%	98	9%	22%	8%	28
American Indian	10	1	3	2	4	1	9	5	5	б	4	4	4	2
	2%	1%	2%	2%	3%	2%	2%	1%	3%	3%	1%	3%	2%	1%
Asian	14	2	б	4	2	4	10	9	5	8	6	3	8	3
	3%	2%	5%	3%	2%	6%	2%	3%	3%	4%	2%	3%	4%	2%
Other	8	2	2	1	3	1	7	б	2	2	6	-	4	4
	2%	2%	2%	1%	2%	2%	2%	2%	1%	1%	2%	-	2%	2%
Refused	42	8	11	9	14	б	36	31	9	17	25	10	16	16
	8%	6%	9%	7%	11%	10%	8%	98	6%	8%	8%	9%	8%	9%

Table 52:Q26. What is your race or ethnicity?

			INCOME			EDUC	ATION			RACE		HOW LONG IN AREA			
			35K-		H.S.	Some	Coll.	Post				<10	10-20	21+	
	Total	<35K	75K	>75K	or less	Coll	Grad	Grad	Wht	Hisp	Other	Yrs	Yrs	Yrs	
Base	502	100	155	153	139	144	142	68	375	46	39	188	155	156	
White/Caucasian	375	72	122	119	85	120	112	56	375	-	-	143	109	123	
	75%	72%	79%	78%	61%	83%	79%	82%	100%	-	-	76%	70%	79%	
Black/African	7	1	2	2	5	1	-	1	-	-	7	4	-	3	
American	1%	1%	1%	1%	4%	1%	-	1%	-	-	18%	2%	-	2%	
Latino/Hispanic	46	13	15	14	26	10	8	2	-	46	-	19	19	8	
	98	13%	10%	9%	19%	7%	6%	3%	-	100%	-	10%	12%	5%	
American Indian	10	3	4	1	7	-	3	-	-	-	10	4	2	4	
	2%	3%	3%	1%	5%	-	2%	-	-	-	26%	2%	1%	3%	
Asian	14	1	5	6	2	5	6	1	-	-	14	8	6	-	
	3%	1%	3%	4%	1%	3%	4%	1%	-	-	36%	4%	4%	-	
Other	8	3	2	1	2	1	3	2	-	-	8	-	2	6	
	2%	3%	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%	3%	-	-	21%		1%	4%	
Refused	42	7	5	10	12	7	10	б	-	-	-	10	17	12	
	8%	7%	3%	7%	9%	5%	7%	9%	-	-	-	5%	11%	8%	

Table 53: Other race:

### <u>Healdsburg</u>

EUROPEAN

AMERICAN

# Rohnert Park

PORTUGUESE

CELTIC

# <u>Windsor</u>

MIXED

### Unincorporated Sonoma County

INDETERMINATE MIXED RACE

ITALIAN

#### AMERICAN