



# Alachua County Environmental Protection Department

Chris Bird, Director

November 4, 2009

Sally Adkins  
City of Gainesville  
Public Works, M.S. 58  
P.O. Box 490  
Gainesville, FL 32602-0490

RE: ILLICIT DISCHARGE DETECTION AND ELIMINATION PROGRAM QUARTERLY  
REPORT. JULY - SEPTEMBER, 2009. FY 2009 – FOURTH QUARTER

Dear Ms. Adkins:

In accordance with the Interlocal Agreement between Alachua County and the City of Gainesville for the Establishment of an Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination Program, enclosed please find the Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination Report for the Fourth Quarter of Fiscal Year 2009 (July - September, 2009).

Please contact me at 264-6806 if you have any questions or need additional information.

Sincerely,

Agustin Olmos, P.E.

Water Resources Supervisor

cc: Chris Bird (email)  
Dave Cerlanek (email)  
Ha Nguyen (email)  
Stewart Pearson (email)  
Alan Obaigbena (email)  
Anthony Dennis (email)  
Anthony Cunningham (email)

# **ILLICIT DISCHARGE DETECTION AND ELIMINATION PROGRAM QUARTERLY REPORT**

**JULY - SEPTEMBER 2009  
FOURTH QUARTER – FY 2009**

## **SECTION 1: PROGRAM DESCRIPTION**

On September 20<sup>th</sup>, 2001 Alachua County, the City of Gainesville, and the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) signed an interlocal agreement for the joint implementation of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Phase II Municipal Separate Stormwater Systems (MS4) program in the Gainesville Urbanized Area. The agreement presented a financial plan for the implementation of the minimum control measures, including mapping requirements, public outreach, operations best management practices and illicit discharge detection and elimination program, required by the NPDES Phase II MS4 program. The agreement established the City of Gainesville as the lead agency for the joint implementation of the program.

On August 27<sup>th</sup>, 2002 Alachua County adopted the Water Quality Code. The Water Quality Code provided the regulatory framework for the implementation of the illicit discharge detection and elimination program in Alachua County. Specifically, Section 77.10 contained regulations regarding prohibitions on non-stormwater discharges into the MS4 system. The Water Quality Code became effective on January 1<sup>st</sup>, 2003.

On June 24<sup>th</sup>, 2003 Alachua County and the City of Gainesville signed an interlocal agreement for the establishment of the illicit discharge detection and elimination program. As part of the agreement, the Alachua County Environmental Protection Department (ACEPD) became the agency responsible for the implementation of the illicit discharge detection and elimination program to satisfy the NPDES Phase II MS4 permit requirements of Alachua County, City of Gainesville and FDOT. Individual NPDES Phase II MS4 permits were obtained by Alachua County on July 8<sup>th</sup>, 2003, City of Gainesville on July 8<sup>th</sup>, 2003, and FDOT on June 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2003.

This report presents a summary of the activities conducted during the Fourth Quarter of Fiscal Year 2009 (July - September 2009) by ACEPD staff as part of the illicit discharge detection and elimination program implementation for Alachua County, the City of Gainesville and FDOT as required by their respective NPDES Phase II MS4 permits.

## **SECTION 2: BMP 3C-03. FACILITY INSPECTION PROGRAM**

In order to comply with condition BMP3 C-03 of the NPDES permit, ACEPD expanded its existing Hazardous Materials Management Code (HMMC) and Small Quantity Generator (SQG) inspection program to include compliance with the requirements of Section 77.10 of the Alachua County Water Quality Code. The expanded inspection program included visual inspection of storm drains and storm water management system in the vicinity of each facility, visual inspection of floor drains inside the facility and when necessary collection of water quality samples.

Between July - September, 2009, ACEPD staff conducted a total of 198 inspections, including 154 routine and 44 follow-up inspections. Table 2.1 shows a summary of the inspections by ZIP code and Table 2.2 shows a summary of the inspection by Standard Industrial Category (SIC). No violations of the Alachua County Water Quality Code were observed during the compliance inspections. ACEPD recorded the latitude and longitude coordinates of each facility inspected for mapping purposes.

**Table 2.1 Facility Inspections by ZIP Code**

<b>Zip Code</b>	<b>Inspections</b>
32609	42
32643	24
32606	22
32608	19
32653	17
32601	15
32669	14
32615	13
32640	7
32618	6
32641	6
32607	3
32667	3
32605	2
32616	2
32655	2
32658	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>198</b>

**Table 2.2 Facility Inspections by SIC Code**

<b>SIC Code</b>	<b>Inspections</b>
4813	19
4931	10
7532	9
4899	8
7538	7
8021	7
5211	6
7699	6
7533	5
7549	5

<b>SIC Code</b>	<b>Inspections</b>
9229	5
742	4
2759	4
2869	4
5511	4
2951	3
3084	3
3273	3
4812	3
5531	3
6513	3
7692	3
8011	3
8734	3
781	2
1541	2
1771	2
2396	2
2731	2
3411	2
3845	2
4953	2
7011	2
7231	2
7261	2
7359	2
7542	2
8062	2
8211	2
1629	1
1711	1
1721	1
1731	1
1761	1
1799	1
2082	1
2434	1
2833	1
3241	1
3715	1

<b>SIC Code</b>	<b>Inspections</b>
4952	1
5012	1
5088	1
5091	1
5093	1
5099	1
5169	1
5171	1
5172	1
5231	1
5251	1
5261	1
5541	1
5571	1
5989	1
7021	1
7384	1
7513	1
7539	1
7629	1
7933	1
9512	1
9661	1
9985	1
9991	1
9997	1
9998	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>198</b>

**SECTION 3: BMP 3C-04. COMPLAINT & SPILL RESPONSE PROGRAM**

In order to comply with condition BMP3 C-04 of the NPDES permit, ACEPD expanded its existing complaint and spill investigation program to include compliance with the requirements of Section 77.10 of the Alachua County Water Quality Code. In addition to the complaints received via phone and email, ACEPD staff is also part of the Alachua County notification system that provides 24-hours a day response to spills in the County.

Between July - September, 2009, ACEPD staff responded to a total of 18 water quality related complaints and spills. Table 3.1 shows a summary of the complaints and spills investigated by Type and Table 3.2 shows a summary of the complaints and spills by ZIP code. Investigation of the above referenced incidents resulted in the issuance of 4 written

warnings. ACEPD recorded the latitude and longitude coordinates of each incident investigated for future mapping purposes.

**Table 3.1 Complaints by Type**

<b>Type</b>	<b>Investigations</b>
WasteWater	7
Hazmat	6
Water Quality	3
E & S	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>18</b>

**Table 3.2 Complaints by Zip Code**

<b>Zip Code</b>	<b>Investigations</b>
32606	3
32615	3
32643	3
32608	2
32609	2
32601	1
32603	1
32640	1
32641	1
32653	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>18</b>

**SECTION 4: BMP 3C-05. PUBLIC OUTREACH**

In order to comply with condition BMP3 C-05 of the NPDES permit ACEPD staff provided compliance assistance information and distributed Best Management Practices fact sheets as part of the facility inspection and complaint and spill investigation programs. ACEPD also participates in numerous public outreach events.

On July 1 staff led a water quality session focused on how children can minimize their impact on our local waterways with the Super Summer Camp. In July the seventh issue of the Wader, which focused on monitoring programs, was released and sent to almost 400 citizens. The Wader is an electronic newsletter with a focus on outreach efforts of ACEPD and its partnering organizations. On July 29 staff worked with the Environmental Ambassadors on minimizing their pollution and how to detect and eliminate pollution sources. On August 14 the “Gardening in a Minute” segment on NPR featured a discussion on pet wastes written in conjunction with ACEPD staff. On September 12 pet waste packets were passed out to registered participants in the Dog Days Run. A table top display on pet wastes was featured at the Low Cost Veterinarian Clinic on September 19.

ACEPD staff worked with Cellini Graphic Design, hired by the Gainesville Clean Water Partnership, to edit and redesign the following BMPs:

- Landscaping and Lawn Care
- Swimming Pool Maintenance
- Outdoor Car Washes
- Painters and Home Improvement Projects
- Pressure Washing
- Apartment Complexes
- Erosion and Sediment Control and Construction Sites
- Food Service Industry
- Laundry Services.

The following is a list of the existing fact sheets and BMPs distributed by ACEPD and partners:

- Water Quality Code Fact Sheet
- BMP for Erosion and Sedimentation Control at Construction Sites
- BMP for Controlling Runoff from Car Wash Fundraisers
- BMP for Controlling Runoff from Gas Stations
- BMP for Controlling Runoff from Commercial Outdoor Car Washing
- BMP for Water Quality Protection at Apartment Complexes
- BMP for Landscaping & Lawn Maintenance Services
- BMP for Controlling Runoff during the Remediation of Contaminated Sites
- BMP for Private Collection Systems
- Residential Swimming Pool Maintenance
- Pressure Washing Activities
- Laundry Services
- Food Service Industry
- Paint contractor
- Construction Project Erosion and Sediment Control
- Codes/Building Inspector Erosion and Sediment Control BMP
- Pet Waste and Water Quality
- Septic Tank BMP
- Water Conservation BMP

## **SECTION 5: SPECIAL PROJECTS**

### **Microbial Hot Spot Testing**

A Hot Spots Stakeholder group has formed to implement source detection and elimination strategies in the hot spots. The stakeholders include ACEPD, COG, GRU, and FDEP. The partners presented an update on their efforts at the September 11 OCB Working Group meeting.

ACEPD is conducting outfall surveys in the hot spots areas. Fecal coliform samples were collected from flowing stormwater manholes in the Elizabeth, Rattlesnake, and HOGGHSN hot spot watersheds. A reconnaissance of Rosewood Branch occurred in the late summer of 2009. Sweetwater Branch is currently being investigated by staff.

#### **Pet Waste**

ACEPD is conducting The Gainesville Clean Water Partnership funded social marketing based public outreach campaign designed to convince citizens to pick up after their pets. The campaign is called the Scoop the Poop campaign and the tagline is, "Scoop it, bag it, trash it!" The post-campaign telephone survey indicates that the campaign has been successful. A final report explaining the campaign has been written and is attached as an appendix to this report.

#### **Stream and Rainfall Gage Contractual Services**

The existing stream and rainfall gage network is as follows:

Hogtown Creek near Gainesville - at NW 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue

Hogtown Creek near Arredondo - at SW 24<sup>th</sup> Avenue (CR 30) through September 30, 2009  
Tumblin Creek near Gainesville - at SW 13<sup>th</sup> Street

Possum Creek in Gainesville - at NW 16th Avenue

Little Hatchet Creek near Gainesville - at SR-24 (Waldo Road)

Rain gage No. 2 at NE 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue and SR-24 (Waldo Road)

Rain gage No. 3 at SR-20 and SE 27<sup>th</sup> Street (formerly No.1 located at SE 1<sup>st</sup> St. and SE 5<sup>th</sup> Ave.)

Alachua County contracted with Hydrologic Data Collection, Inc. for continued rainfall and stream gage services for fiscal year 2009. Data collection for all gages (stream and rainfall) continued throughout the remainder of the fiscal year at a total cost of \$17,727.00. Stage data is collected from the recorders approximately every two months. Stage and discharge computations are delivered within 30 days of each data collection period. Computations include mean daily stage and discharge and unit values of the same at 15-minute intervals. Rainfall data is also collected on 15-minute intervals. For stream stations with only a stage recorder, efforts are being made by the contractor to conduct manual discharge measurements under a variety of flow conditions to facilitate development of an accurate rating curve.

On July 7, 2009, staff met with SJRWMD representatives at Paynes Prairie Preserve State Park to discuss the water management district gages upstream of Alachua Sink. At the meeting it was decided that SJRWMD would keep these gages and take over the existing streamflow gage site at Hogtown Creek near Arredondo (CR30). Hydrologic Data Collection, Inc. was subsequently instructed to remove this stream gage at the end of September so that SJRWMD could install their equipment. It was also decided that the partnership would fund installation and maintenance of a new gage (stage or water level) at Haile Sink. The cost of installation of the gage at Haile Sink is \$2,703.38. The total

cost for servicing the remaining four stream gages, the stage gage at Haile Sink, and the two rain gages for fiscal year 2010 is \$16,827.00.

On October 21, 2009, Hydrologic Data Collection, Inc. submitted computations of mean daily stage, discharge and rainfall for October 1, 2008 through September 30, 2009, for the seven stations listed above. The data provided for stream gages included the following information: unit values (15-minute interval date, gage height and discharge), primary computations (hourly stage as max, min, and mean and mean discharge), mean daily discharge and stage, hydrograph, and a daily values table. Data for rainfall stations included unit values (in 15-minute intervals) and a summary table of daily values. These data are available from ACEPD and summary data for the stations will be available on our website in the near future. A summary of the stream data (as daily values) for the entire period or record for each site through early August 2009 were provided to the City of Gainesville on October 20, 2009.



## **Alachua County Scoop the Poop Campaign**

**Final Report, September 2009**

### **Introduction**

The Alachua County Scoop the Poop Campaign was funded by the Gainesville Clean Water Partnership (Alachua County Public Works Department, City of Gainesville Public Works, and the Florida Department of Transportation) and was designed and implemented by the Alachua County Environmental Protection Department (ACEPD). The goal of the 2009 campaign was to motivate citizens to scoop, bag, and trash pet wastes at home and around the community. The ultimate goal is for this behavior to become the social norm, so that citizens will sustain this behavior and reduce the fecal coliform levels in Gainesville's urban creeks.

Many of the Gainesville urban creeks are on the Florida Department of Environmental Protection's Impaired Waters list, and Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDL) have been set to reduce the fecal coliform levels. Common sources of this fecal pollution includes: leaky wastewater infrastructure, failing septic systems, urban campers, pet wastes, and wildlife. Sources such as wildlife are almost impossible to control, while faulty wastewater infrastructure and septic systems can be difficult to locate and expensive to repair. Pet waste is a source that can be significantly reduced by modifying the behavior of pet owners.

The environmental community has recently embraced social marketing in their public outreach campaigns. Social marketing is the use of traditional marketing techniques to influence specific behaviors to benefit society. ACEPD researched pet waste social marketing programs implemented in other regions including: Sohomish County, WA; Austin, TX; and Tampa Bay, FL. To conserve limited funds, ACEPD assumed that the benefits and barriers of picking up pet wastes identified by past studies would be similar to those in Alachua County.

### **Methods**

ACEPD contracted with Group Five and Associates and adopted the tagline of Scoop it, Bag it, Trash it. This message clearly and directly outlines the desired behavior promoted by the campaign. Group Five designed a logo, two posters, a pledge, and a pamphlet and produced two fifteen second commercials.

To address the barrier of not having bags available while walking dogs, bag dispensers for leashes were purchased. Tiny key chain flashlights were purchased to address the barrier of not being able to see pet wastes at night, which was identified by Sohomish County. Magnets were distributed to serve as a

prompt, reminding citizen of the desired behavior. The Scoop it, Bag it, Trash it logo and the Alachua County website address were on all of the promotional materials. A pet waste page addressing the common myths about pet waste was created on the Alachua County website ([www.AlachuaCountyWater.org](http://www.AlachuaCountyWater.org)).

Promotional items were given away at public outreach events and were instrumental in getting citizens to visit the Scoop the Poop booth at community events. Citizens appreciated the items and several reported that they would give the bag dispensers to neighbors that were not picking up after their dogs. This social diffusion and peer pressure is essential to creating social norms. Citizens that were not interested in the items often said that they lived in rural areas and do not need to clean up after their pets. As far as stormwater pollution is concerned, it is not essential that these rural residents remove pet waste from their yards.

Two posters (Figure 1) were designed that were each very similar to one of the two commercials. The first features a dog longingly looking at a toilet with the text, "Dogs Can't Flush" over the image. The picture and theme were borrowed, with permission, from the Sohomish County campaign because it was the citizens' favorite in market tests. The second theme reinforces one of the commonly cited benefits of scooping poop: if you scoop, you won't step in it later. This "stink foot" commercial highlighted this point as a little girl jumped across the screen shouting for her mommy after stepping in some pet waste that was not scooped. The corresponding poster has an image of a boot with dog waste on it with a caption reading, "This footwear is never in fashion."



*Figure 1: Two posters were created and distributed to veterinarian offices and to citizens.*

The commercial was shown at 1,446 showings. The "Stink Foot" commercial was also aired at the two largest

movie theaters in Gainesville before every movie shown between July 3, 2009 and July 30, 2009 for a total of 3,360 viewings. The commercials were only 15 seconds each and were simple and to the point. The commercials won the 2009 People's Choice Awards at the National Nonpoint and Stormwater Outreach Conference in Portland, OR.

ACEPD recognized that the messenger can be just as important as the message and that citizens are more likely to clean up after their pets if encouraged to do so by professionals that they trust for information regarding their pets. ACEPD attended an Alachua County Veterinarian Association meeting to explain the campaign and to ask for assistance. Following this meeting, staff visited all of the local practices to drop off pamphlets, magnets, and posters. Most offices were supportive of the campaign and accepted the promotional materials. ACEPD staff will keep these offices stocked with Scoop the Poop materials, while supplies last. Local adoption centers were another valuable partner for getting the message out. Dog adoption agencies put the bag containers and pamphlets in their adoption packets that go home with new dog owners. This is a perfect partnership, as it is easiest to get people to adopt new behaviors while they are already changing their habits.

Another partner potential is apartment complex managers, as they often struggle with pet waste issues at the properties they manage. A mailing with an explanation letter, a sample poster and pamphlet, information on ordering pet waste disposal stations and bag containers for leashes (potential promotional item for the complexes) was sent out to 258 Gainesville apartment complexes. Only 10 complexes contacted ACEPD for additional pamphlets and posters to distribute to their residents. However, at the Apartment Complex Trade Association meeting one manager told staff that she received the mailing and then used the information to purchase disposal stations for her property. Without considerable follow up efforts, it is difficult to measure the effectiveness of this mailing.

## **Results**

To measure the effectiveness of the Scoop the Poop campaign a telephone survey was conducted by the University of Florida Bureau of Business and Economic Research to determine the self reported behaviors and attitudes of participants before and after the campaign was launched (Appendix 1). Prior to the release of any of the campaign materials, telephone surveys were completed by 185 dog owners with Gainesville mailing addresses between February 11, 2009 and March 12, 2009. After most of the major campaign elements were conducted, 112 of these same dog owners completed the follow up interview between June 29, 2009 and August 13, 2009. The "Stink Foot" commercial was still airing in the movie theaters during the post campaign survey, so the messages may have been fresher in the minds of movie goers that were included in the survey.

. The following trends were identified in the surveys:

- 33% of the pre-campaign respondents reported never getting rid of their dogs' wastes compared to 27% in the post-campaign survey.
- Of the respondents that get rid of their dog's waste, 48% of the pre-campaign and 57% of the post-campaign reported putting the waste in the trash.

- There was a 9% increase in participants reporting that they disposed of dog waste in the trash in the post-campaign survey compared to the pre-campaign.
- 77% of pre-campaign respondents had heard that it is important to pick up dog wastes. This increased by 8% to 85% in the post-campaign survey.
- In the pre-campaign survey the top two reasons for cleaning up dog wastes were “not wanting to step in it” and “because it is the right thing to do”, each representing 28% of respondents.
- 39% of the post-campaign survey respondents recalled the Scoop the Poop campaign. Of these respondents, 21% sited learning about the campaign from the television and 10% heard about it from their veterinarian.
- 10% of the post-campaign respondents that recalled the campaign reported changing their behavior as a result of it.

### **Future Efforts**

The survey results indicate that the campaign was successful in increasing the number of people disposing of dog waste in the trash can. Respondents recalled the campaign, and the television commercials and veterinarian offices seemed to be good outlets for the campaign. The barrier of the negative perception of pet waste in landfills still exists. When asked if it is worse to put dog waste in a plastic bag in the landfill compared to leaving it on the ground, 28% of the pre-campaign and 22% of the post-campaign respondents strongly agreed with this statement. This barrier should be specifically addressed in future efforts.

To maintain positive behavior change and to continue the process of social diffusion, elements of this campaign should be continued. ACEPD staff should look for opportunities to strengthen the relationship with the veterinarians and continue to keep their offices stocked with pamphlets, at the very least. The television commercials were effective in getting the message out and should be re-aired for short periods of time over the next couple of years. It is less expensive to air the commercials at the movie theaters, but this media outlet was not thoroughly evaluated in the survey so there is no data on the effectiveness of this method for this campaign.

The relationship with Apartment Complexes should be explored in future efforts, as they often have high concentrations of pets and young residents that may be more willing to adopt the desired behavior. Several survey respondents reported hearing that it is important to clean up after pets from their homeowners associations. ACEPD staff could work with these organizations to increase their effectiveness in getting the message out.

Appendix 1  
**Alachua County Pet Waste Perception Survey**  
**Pet Waste Survey**

**Goals:**

- Establish a public knowledge benchmark of Alachua County Pet Waste Disposal

**Survey Summary:**

189 completed surveys

1459 total records in the random sample

**Time 1 Data collection:**

Start: February 11, 2009

End: March 12, 2009

Call back survey dates:

August 1, 2009

August 13, 2009

**Q2: How many dogs live in this home?**

<b>Time1</b>			<b>Time2</b>		
# of dogs	Freq.	%	# of dogs	Freq.	%
1	92	50 %	1	53	47 %
2	54	29 %	2	39	35 %
3	18	9.5 %	3	12	11 %
4	10	5.5 %	4	1	1 %
5	7	4 %	5	4	3.5 %
6	3	1.5 %	6	3	2.5 %
13	1	.5 %			

**Q3: How often do you get rid of the dog's waste?**

- 1 Never
- 2 Every time they produce waste
- 3 Daily
- 4 Several times per week
- 5 Once a week
- 6 Every other week
- 7 Monthly
- 8 A few times a year
- 9 Once a year
- 10 Other (specify \_\_\_\_\_)
- 8 Don't Know
- 9 Refused

	<b>Time1</b>			<b>Time2</b>		
	Freq.	%		Freq.	%	
Never	62	33.5 %		Never	30	27 %
Every time	19	10 %		Every time	8	7 %
Daily	32	17.5 %		Daily	21	19 %
Several times/wk	19	10 %		Several times/wk	12	11 %
Once a/wk	21	11.5 %		Once a/wk	23	20.5 %
Every other /wk	7	4 %		Every other /wk	4	3.5 %
Monthly	8	4.5 %		Monthly	7	6 %
Few times a year	7	4 %		Few times a year	1	1 %
Once a year	2	1		Once a year	0	0
Other	3	1.5 %		Other	5	4.5 %
Don't know	3	1.5 %		Don't know	0	0 %
Refused	2	1 %		Refused	1	1 %

**Q4:** Generally speaking, how do you get rid of the dog's waste?

- 1 Throw it in the trash
- 2 Leave it on the grass
- 3 Bury it underground
- 4 Flush down the toilet
- 5 Put in home composting
- 6 Put in flower beds
- 7 Hose into the ground
- 8 Other (specify \_\_\_\_\_)
- 8 Don't Know
- 9 Refused

	<b>Time1</b>			<b>Time2</b>	
	Freq.	%		Freq.	%
Throw in trash	59	43.5 %	Throw in trash	47	57 %
Leave on grass	15	11 %	Leave on grass	3	4 %
Bury underground	12	9 %	Bury underground	8	10 %
Flush down toilet	5	3.5 %	Flush down toilet	1	1 %
Put in compost	12	9 %	Put in compost	7	9 %
Put in flower bed	9	6.5 %	Put in flower bed	4	5 %
Hose into ground	10	7.5 %	Hose into ground	0	0 %
Other	14	10 %	Other	11	13 %
Don't Know	0	0 %	Don't Know	0	0 %
Refused	0	0 %	Refused	1	1 %

**Q5: Why do you dispose of the dog's waste? (check all that apply)**

- It is the right thing to do
- I don't want to step in it
- It smells bad
- It is bad for the environment
- My kids can get sick from it
- My dog can get sick from it
- It is the law
- I don't want my neighbors to see me leaving it on the ground
- My friends and/or family do it
- Other (specify \_\_\_\_\_)
- Don't Know
- Refused

	Time1			Time2	
	Freq.	%		Freq.	%
Right thing to do	61	45 %	Right thing to do	37	45 %
Don't want to step in it	85	62.5 %	Don't want to step in it	50	61 %
Smells bad	58	42.5 %	Smells bad	38	46 %
Bad for environment	33	24 %	Bad for environment	25	31 %
Kids can get sick	30	22 %	Kids can get sick	18	22 %
Dog can get sick	38	28 %	Dog can get sick	21	26 %
It's the law	29	21 %	It's the law	20	25 %
Don't want neighbors see	34	25 %	Don't want neighbors see	25	31 %
Friends and family do it	24	17.5 %	Friends and family do it	18	22 %
Other	19	14 %	Other	32	32 %
Don't Know	3	2 %	Don't Know	0	0 %
Refused	0	0 %	Refused	0	0 %

**Q5A:** Out of the choices you selected, which is the number one reason (for disposing the dog's waste)?

- 1 It is the right thing to do
- 2 I don't want to step in it
- 3 It smells bad
- 4 It is bad for the environment
- 5 My kids can get sick from it
- 6 My dog can get sick from it
- 7 It is the law
- 8 I don't want my neighbors to see me leaving it on the ground
- 9 My friends and/or family do it
- 10 Other (specify \_\_\_\_\_)
- 8 Don't Know
- 9 Refused

	Time1			Time2	
	Freq.	%		Freq.	%
Right thing to do	24	34.5 %	Right thing to do	37	45 %
Don't want to step in it	16	23 %	Don't want to step in it	50	61 %
Smells bad	4	6 %	Smells bad	38	46 %
Bad for environment	4	6 %	Bad for environment	25	31 %
Kids can get sick	4	6 %	Kids can get sick	18	22 %
Dog can get sick	5	7 %	Dog can get sick	21	26 %
It's the law	2	3 %	It's the law	20	25 %
Don't want neighbors see	1	1.5 %	Don't want neighbors see	25	31 %
Friends and family do it	1	1.5 %	Friends and family do it	18	22 %
Other	5	7 %	Other	32	32 %
Don't Know	2	3 %	Don't Know	0	0 %
Refused	1	1.5 %	Refused	0	0 %

**Q6A:** I am going to read you a set of statements. Please rate each one on a scale of 1 to 10 where 1 is strongly DISAGREE and 10 is strongly AGREE.

Dogs can get sick from dog waste left on the ground?

	<b>Time1</b>			<b>Time2</b>	
	Freq.	%		Freq.	%
1	11	6 %	1	6	5 %
2	9	5 %	2	4	4.5 %
3	11	6 %	3	5	4.5 %
4	9	5 %	4	5	4 %
5	38	20.5 %	5	32	28.5 %
6	11	6 %	6	7	6 %
7	12	6.5 %	7	6	5 %
8	20	10.5 %	8	5	4.5 %
9	5	2.5 %	9	5	4.5 %
10	46	25 %	10	33	29.5 %
Don't Know	12	6.5 %	Don't Know	4	4 %
Refused	1	.5 %	Refused	0	0 %

**Q6B:** (I am going to read you a set of statements. Please rate each one on a scale of 1 to 10 where 1 is strongly DISAGREE and 10 is strongly AGREE.)

Dog waste can serve as a fertilizer.

	Time1			Time2	
	Freq.	%		Freq.	%
1	31	17 %	1	25	22 %
2	10	5.5 %	2	10	9 %
3	12	6.5 %	3	5	4.5 %
4	5	2.5 %	4	2	2 %
5	29	15.5 %	5	27	24 %
6	12	6.5 %	6	6	5 %
7	10	5.5 %	7	7	6 %
8	18	10 %	8	7	6 %
9	5	2.5 %	9	4	3.5 %
10	44	24 %	10	18	16 %
Don't Know	8	4 %	Don't Know	1	1 %
Refused	1	.5 %	Refused	0	0 %

**Q6C:** I am going to read you a set of statements. Please rate each one on a scale of 1 to 10 where 1 is strongly DISAGREE and 10 is strongly AGREE.

Dog waste can harm local water bodies.

	Time1			Time2	
	Freq.	%		Freq.	%
1	16	8.5 %	1	6	5 %
2	9	5 %	2	3	3 %
3	8	4.5 %	3	5	4.5 %
4	5	2.5 %	4	4	3.5 %
5	28	15 %	5	19	17 %
6	9	5 %	6	4	3.5 %
7	13	7 %	7	7	6 %
8	25	13.5 %	8	15	13 %
9	5	2.5 %	9	5	4.5 %
10	58	31.5 %	10	38	34 %
Don't Know	7	4 %	Don't Know	4	4 %
Refused	2	1 %	Refused	2	2 %

**Q6D:** I am going to read you a set of statements. Please rate each one on a scale of 1 to 10 where 1 is strongly DISAGREE and 10 is strongly AGREE.

Humans can get sick from dog waste.

	Time1			Time2	
	Freq.	%		Freq.	%
1	10	5.5 %	1	2	2 %
2	7	4 %	2	3	2.5 %
3	8	4 %	3	4	3.5 %
4	3	1.5 %	4	3	2.5 %
5	27	14.5 %	5	22	19.5 %
6	7	4 %	6	5	4.5 %
7	12	6.5 %	7	3	2.5 %
8	22	12 %	8	18	16 %
9	10	5.5 %	9	7	6 %
10	74	40 %	10	42	37.5 %
Don't Know	5	2.5 %	Don't Know	3	3 %
Refused	0	0 %	Refused	0	0 %

**Q6E:** I am going to read you a set of statements. Please rate each one on a scale of 1 to 10 where 1 is strongly DISAGREE and 10 is strongly AGREE.

Putting dog waste in plastic bags to put in landfills is worse for the environment than leaving it on the ground.

	Time1			Time2	
	Freq.	%		Freq.	%
1	23	12.5 %	1	19	17 %
2	4	2 %	2	5	4.5 %
3	6	3.25 %	3	7	6 %
4	8	4.5 %	4	3	2.5 %
5	30	16 %	5	22	19.5 %
6	6	3.25 %	6	4	3.5 %
7	10	5.5 %	7	8	7 %
8	24	13 %	8	14	12.5 %
9	7	4 %	9	2	2 %
10	52	28 %	10	24	21.5 %
Don't Know	15	8 %	Don't Know	3	3 %
Refused	0	0 %	Refused	1	1 %

**Q7: Have you heard that it is important to pick up your pet's waste?**

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 8 Don't Know
- 9 Refused

	Time1			Time2	
	Freq.	%		Freq.	%
Yes	142	77 %	Yes	95	85 %
No	41	22 %	No	17	15 %
Don't Know	1	.5 %	Don't Know	0	0 %
Refused	1	.5 %	Refused	0	0 %

**NewQ8: Why do you dispose of the dog's waste? (check all that apply)**  
 \*DO NOT READ LIST (Time2 only)

- Television
- Radio
- Newspaper
- Flyer/Poster
- Word-of-Mouth (from friends or family)
- Heard it from my veterinarian
- Websites
- Signs
- Info booth
- Heard it from my Apartment complex (Time2 only)
- Other (specify \_\_\_\_\_)
- Don't know
- Refused

	Time1			Time2	
	Freq.	%		Freq.	%
Television	21	15 %	Television	19	20 %
Radio	7	5 %	Radio	1	1 %
Newspaper	17	12 %	Newspaper	8	8.5 %
Flyer	5	3.5 %	Flyer/Poster	2	2 %
Word-of-Mouth	53	37.5 %	Word-of-Mouth	18	19 %
Heard from veterinarian	21	15 %	Heard from veterinarian	2	2 %
Websites	5	3.5 %	Websites	0	0 %
Signs	23	16 %	Signs	4	4 %
Info booth	7	5 %	Info booth	1	1 %
			Heard from Apt complex	3	3 %
Other	49	34.5 %	Other	46	48 %
Don't Know	8	5.5 %	Don't Know	9	9 %
Refused	0	0 %	Refused	0	0 %

**Q8A:** Do you recall being exposed to Alachua County's Scoop the Poop campaign?

- 1 Yes
- 2 NO
- 8 Don't Know
- 9 Refused

	Time2 (only)	
	Freq.	%
Yes	32	39 %
No	50	61 %
Don't Know	0	0 %
Refused	0	0 %

**Q8B:** How did you hear this message? (check all that apply)  
 \*DO NOT READ LIST

- Television
- Radio
- Newspaper
- Flyer/Poster
- Word-of-Mouth (from friends or family)
- Heard it from my veterinarian
- Websites
- Signs
- Info booth
- Heard it from my Apartment complex
- Other (specify \_\_\_\_\_)
- Don't know
- Refused

	Time2 (only)	
	Freq.	%
Television	12	37.5 %
Radio	4	12.5 %
Newspaper	2	6 %
Flyer/Poster	6	19 %
Word-of-Mouth	2	6 %
Heard from my veterinarian	6	19 %
Websites	2	6 %
Signs	1	3 %
Info booth	4	12.5 %
Heard from Apt complex	5	15.5 %
Other	0	0 %
Don't Know	14	44 %
Refused	0	0 %

**Q8C:** Have you changed how you dispose of your pet's waste since you heard about this campaign?

- 1 Yes
- 2 NO
- 8 Don't Know
- 9 Refused

**Time2 CB only**

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	3	10 %
No	27	90 %
Don't Know	0	0 %
Refused	0	0 %

**PLACE:** What kind of housing unit do you live in?

- 1 Building with 2-4 apartments or condos
- 2 Building with 5 or more apartments or condos
- 3 Mobile home on less than one acre
- 4 A house on less than one acre
- 5 Mobile home on one acre or greater
- 6 A house on one acre or greater
- 7 Hotel/motel
- 8 Van/RV
- 9 Boat
- 10 Other (specify \_\_\_\_\_)
- 8 Don't Know
- 9 Refused

**Time1**

**Time2**

	Time1			Time2	
	Freq.	%		Freq.	%
Building w/2-4 apts	9	9.5 %	Building w/2-4 apts	2	2 %
Building w/5+ apts	4	4 %	Building w/5+ apts	5	4.5 %
Mobile on less than acre	4	4 %	Mobile on less than acre	5	4.5 %
House on less than acre	46	47.5 %	House on less than acre	74	66 %
Mobile on more than acre	5	5 %	Mobile on more than acre	3	2.5 %
House on more than acre	26	27 %	House on more than acre	20	18 %
Hotel/motel	0	0 %	Hotel/motel	0	0 %
Van/RV	0	0 %	Van/RV	0	0 %
Boat	0	0 %	Boat	0	0 %
Other	0	0 %	Other	3	2.5 %
Don't know	2	2 %	Don't know	0	0 %
Refused	1	1 %	Refused	0	0 %

**Q9:** Are you currently married, separated, divorced, widowed or have you never been married?

- 1 Now married
- 2 Now widowed
- 3 Never married
- 4 Divorced or separated
- 8 Don't Know
- 9 Refused

	Time1			Time2	
	Freq.	%		Freq.	%
Married	95	51.5 %	Married	63	56 %
Widowed	12	6.5 %	Widowed	9	8 %
Never married	44	24 %	Never married	24	21.5 %
Divorced/separated	30	16 %	Divorced/separated	14	12.5 %
Don't Know	2	1 %	Don't Know	1	1 %
Refused	2	1 %	Refused	1	1 %

**Q10:** Are you of Spanish or Hispanic origin?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 8 Don't Know
- 9 Refused

	Time1			Time2	
	Freq.	%		Freq.	%
Yes	9	5 %	Yes	3	2.5 %
No	172	93 %	No	108	96.5 %
Don't Know	2	1 %	Don't Know	0	0 %
Refused	2	1 %	Refused	1	1 %

**Q11:** What race do you consider yourself?

- 1 White (Caucasian)
- 2 Black (African-American)
- 3 Asian or Pacific Islander
- 4 American Indian or Alaska native
- 5 Other (specify, \_\_\_\_\_ include multi-racial or mixed)
- 8 Don't Know
- 9 Refused

	Time1			Time2	
	Freq.	%		Freq.	%
White	150	81 %	White	99	88.5 %
Black	7	4 %	Black	2	2 %
Asian	1	.5 %	Asian	1	1 %
American Indian	2	1 %	American Indian	0	0 %
Other	16	8.5 %	Other	6	5 %
Don't Know	2	1 %	Don't Know	0	0 %
Refused	7	4 %	Refused	4	3.5 %

**Q12:** What is the highest grade of school or year in college you yourself completed?

- 0 None.....
- 1 Elementary
- 2 Elementary
- 3 Elementary
- 4 Elementary
- 5 Elementary
- 6 Elementary
- 7 Elementary
- 8 Elementary
- 9 High School
- 10 High School
- 11 High School
- 12 High School
- 13 College
- 14 College
- 15 College
- 16 College
- 17 Some Graduate School
- 18 Graduate/Prof. Degree
- 8 Don't know
- 9 Refused

**Time1**

	Freq.	%		Freq.	%
0 None	0	0 %	11 High School	2	1 %
1 Elementary	0	0 %	12 High School	29	15.5 %
2 Elementary	0	0 %	13 College	14	7.5 %
3 Elementary	1	.5 %	14 College	28	15 %
4 Elementary	0	0 %	15 College	11	6 %
5 Elementary	0	0 %	16 College	46	25 %
6 Elementary	0	0 %	17 Some Grad	7	4 %
7 Elementary	0	0 %	18 Grad/Prof	46	25 %
8 Elementary	0	0 %			
9 High School	0	0 %	-8 Don't know	0	0 %
10 High School	0	0 %	-9 Refused	1	.5 %

**Time2**

	Freq.	%		Freq.	%
0 None	0	0 %	11 High School	0	0 %
1 Elementary	0	0 %	12 High School	12	11 %
2 Elementary	2	2 %	13 College	6	5 %
3 Elementary	0	0 %	14 College	17	15 %
4 Elementary	1	1 %	15 College	2	2 %
5 Elementary	0	0 %	16 College	31	27.5 %
6 Elementary	0	0 %	17 Some Grad	5	4.5 %
7 Elementary	0	0 %	18 Grad/Prof	32	28.5 %
8 Elementary	0	0 %			
9 High School	0	0 %	-8 Don't know	0	0 %
10 High School	0	0 %	-9 Refused	4	3.5 %

**Q13:** Now consider your family's household income from all sources. As I read a list, please stop me when I get to the income level that best describes your household income in (Before Taxes)

- 1 less than \$10,000
- 2 \$10,000 to \$19,999
- 3 \$20,000 to \$29,999
- 4 \$30,000 to \$39,999
- 5 \$40,000 to \$49,999
- 6 \$50,000 to \$59,999
- 7 \$60,000 to \$79,999
- 8 \$80,000 to \$99,999
- 9 \$100,000 to \$150,000
- 10 Over \$150,000
- 8 Don't Know
- 9 Refused

	Time1			Time2	
	Freq.	%		Freq.	%
1 Less than \$10,000	8	4 %	1 Less than \$10,000	2	2 %
2 \$10,000 to \$19,999	15	8 %	2 \$10,000 to \$19,999	3	2.5 %
3 \$20,000 to \$29,999	9	5 %	3 \$20,000 to \$29,999	4	3.5 %
4 \$30,000 to \$39,999	20	11 %	4 \$30,000 to \$39,999	3	2.5 %
5 \$40,000 to \$49,999	22	12 %	5 \$40,000 to \$49,999	22	19.5 %
6 \$50,000 to \$59,999	17	9 %	6 \$50,000 to \$59,999	5	4.5 %
7 \$60,000 to \$79,999	10	5.5 %	7 \$60,000 to \$79,999	3	2.5 %
8 \$80,000 to \$99,999	19	10.5 %	8 \$80,000 to \$99,999	18	16 %
9 \$100,000 to \$150,000	18	10 %	9 \$100,000 to \$150,000	7	6 %
10 Over \$150,000	14	7.5 %	10 Over \$150,000	42	37.5 %
-8 Don't Know	8	1.5 %	-8 Don't Know	3	3 %
-9 Refused	30	16 %	-9 Refused	0	0 %