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Audience Research

- Between 2009 and 2017, 7 different sets of audience research were conducted to determine how to increase the voluntary adoption of water quality BMPs on private land.

- Studies focused on shoreline landowners and were conducted in rural areas in the South Puget Sound and Hood Canal regions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Audience</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Exploration of Barriers and Motivators to Adopting Recommended Practices for Septic and Livestock Management in the Oakland Bay Watershed</td>
<td>Oakland Bay</td>
<td>Homeowners with septic throughout watershed</td>
<td>158 Phone interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Exploration of Shoreline Property Owner Knowledge and Awareness of Shoreline Management and Habitat Issues</td>
<td>Hood Canal</td>
<td>Shoreline property owners</td>
<td>15 focus group participants; 9 individual interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Increasing Beneficial Vegetation on Hood Canal - Homeowner Knowledge, Awareness and Motivation for Planting Along Their Shoreline</td>
<td>Hood Canal</td>
<td>Shoreline property owners</td>
<td>16 participants in 2 focus groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Home and Livestock Owner Willingness To Request BMP Site Visits</td>
<td>Key Peninsula</td>
<td>Shoreline property owners</td>
<td>32 Phone interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Hood Canal Regional Pollution Identification and Correction Program: Outreach and Education Project 2016 - Audience Research Report</td>
<td>Hood Canal</td>
<td>Shoreline property owners</td>
<td>15 Phone interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Hood Canal Regional Pollution Identification and Correction Program Outreach and Education Project 2016 – Supplemental Evaluation of 2015 Site Visits</td>
<td>Hood Canal</td>
<td>Landowners who received a site visit one year prior</td>
<td>16 Phone interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Hood Canal Regional Pollution Identification and Correction Program: Outreach and Education Project 2016 – Site Visit Report</td>
<td>Hood Canal</td>
<td>Landowners who didn’t respond to previous contact</td>
<td>34 home site visits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Oakland Bay Watershed
Recommended Practices for Septic system maintenance:

- Inspected every 3 – 5 years, depending on the type of system
- Pumped when inspection indicates that it is needed
- Repaired as needed

Recommended Practices for Livestock manure management:

In the pasture:
- Fence animals out of streams, ditches, ponds, wetlands and saltwater

In and around the barn and/or confinement area:
- Pick up manure at least twice a week
- Store in a covered manner
- Use as fertilizer or mulch, during appropriate times of year, away from water
- Haul off property
Purpose:

• Identify the barriers and motivators for septic and livestock owners for BMP implementation

• Identify how to overcome barriers including what types of appeals, delivery methods and incentives would be most effective.
Septic BMPs – 158 phone interviews (10 min.)
Livestock BMPs – 32 phone interviews (10 min.)

Key Findings
Participants were mostly not aware of the problems in Oakland Bay. They were interested in water quality, but did not make the connection of home practices to pollution in the Bay.

In both cases lack of concern regarding that connection was a greater issue than lack of knowledge or cost.
• Didn’t know the recommended schedule for septic inspection
• Low awareness of water quality problems in the Bay
• Did not connect water quality problems with their practices at home
Both groups were most motivated by statements that made the problem personal and local:

- Immediate health impact to their family, pets or livestock
- Impacts to local economy and property values
- Restrictions on recreational uses
- Discounts for maintenance
- Manuals
- Low interest loans
- List of service providers
- Free tank risers
Incentives - Livestock

- Manuals/factsheets
- Volunteer or free assistance
- Contact information for haulers/composters
- Free manure covers
- Equipment loan
Direct Mail

Least interested in having government employees come onto their property or calling their home
Results

Upgrade of 720 acres of shellfish beds from conditionally approved to approved status in 2012.
Target Audience: Residents within 250 feet of marine shorelines and their upland tributaries
Priority BMPs

1. Have your septic system professionally inspected at least every 3 years, and make repairs as needed
2. Pick up, bag and dispose of dog waste in garbage
3. Contain, collect, and cover livestock waste
4. Manage water runoff and wet areas
5. Install plantings to absorb and filter water

Target Behavior

Agree to a site visit with a water or farm resources advisor.
Purpose

1) Understand target audience barriers, benefits, and motivators for agreeing to a site visit

2) Obtain audience reactions to various ways of describing and communicating about a potential site visit and services we could provide.
Methodology

In-depth telephone interviews were conducted with 32 people who own property within 250 feet of the marine shoreline or its upland tributaries:
11 Marine and 11 upland property owners
10 Livestock owners

Participants were asked a series of open-ended questions.

During the call, they were also sent an email with program ideas and options which they were asked to react and rank in order of preference.
Summary of Key Findings

There is strong support, with some caveats, for WSU Extension and local conservation districts to offer educational site visits.

The majority of respondents – 24 out of 32 – were very or somewhat interested in having a site visit.

Property owners most likely to request a site visit are those who:

- Have storm water drainage concerns due to nearby development, something that their neighbors have done that impacts their property, or concerns about storm water runoff from roads
- Are concerned about area waters and want education and advice on the latest recommendations
• **Cost.** Although the visit is free, the recommendations could be costly and something they can’t afford to address promptly.

• **Fear of regulatory consequences.** People want to be reassured that the advice they get won’t become mandatory or incur fines, and they won’t be forced to act before they can balance their budget.

• **Logistics and sponsorship.** Who is the sponsoring agency? Who is the “expert” and what are their qualifications? How long will the visit take?

• **Perceive they are compliant or don’t need advice.** Some legitimately don’t have mud, storm water or drainage issues, while others don’t perceive that their practices are a problem. Several who are in compliance with all of the BMPs said they don’t want to waste your time (or theirs).
Motivators

1. Getting free, confidential, customized site-specific recommendations

2. Concerns about nearby waters – Do their part to improve and protect Key Peninsula and Burley-area waters

3. Health reasons – if my septic system fails it can make my family, pets and even my neighbors sick

4. Learning about financial incentives to help implement recommended practices on my property

**Most popular incentives** – rebates for septic inspection and pumping – were the most popular across all three groups: marine, upland and livestock owners.
Contact Preferences

• Direct Mail

• Least interested in having government employees come onto their property or calling their home
Shoreline landowners have a deep connection to their place.

Because of this, a nexus between the land they value, their actions, and water quality can be key in securing behavior changes.
Conclusions

Key elements for effective messaging included:

- Connecting behavior to a local water quality problem.
- Focusing on personal and family health.
- Keeping information local and specific.
- Presenting the message in a clearly understood and positive manner.
- Providing a viable and achievable solution to a real problem.
Conclusions

Key elements for effective messaging included:

- Using a credible and trusted source to deliver the message.

- Offering discounted or free goods and services that relate to a BMP as an incentive, such as discounted septic inspection or free plants.

- Selecting direct mail as the initial contact method, accompanied with supporting materials.

(Simmons, et al. 2018, submitted)
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## Comparison of Views on Planting BMPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Views on planting BMP</th>
<th>Hood Canal</th>
<th>Key Peninsula</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New and surprising</td>
<td></td>
<td>New and surprising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want help with erosion</td>
<td></td>
<td>Concerned about storm water runoff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want to preserve way of life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers to performing planting BMP</th>
<th>Hood Canal</th>
<th>Key Peninsula</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy: Have tried and failed</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of knowledge: Didn’t know that planting along bulkhead could help fish and wildlife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivators to performing BMPs</th>
<th>Hood Canal</th>
<th>Key Peninsula</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Erosion control</td>
<td></td>
<td>Knowing more about planting to absorb and filter runoff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve fish and wildlife habitat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowing what to plant in Hood Canal “microclimate”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Comparison of Views on Septic BMPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study participants</th>
<th>Oakland Bay</th>
<th>Hood Canal</th>
<th>Key Peninsula</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noncompliant</td>
<td>Mix of compliant &amp; noncompliant</td>
<td>Mix of compliant &amp; noncompliant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>households</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Barriers to performing septic BMP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Oakland Bay</th>
<th>Hood Canal</th>
<th>Key Peninsula</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Didn’t know the</td>
<td>Didn’t know the recommended schedule</td>
<td>Make the connection between septic failure and fecal coliform in Hood Canal</td>
<td>High awareness of beach closures but don’t connect them to practices at home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recommended</td>
<td>Low awareness of water quality problems</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hearing conflicting recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>schedule</td>
<td>Did not connect water quality problems with their practices at home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Motivators to performing BMPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Oakland Bay</th>
<th>Hood Canal</th>
<th>Key Peninsula</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Making the</td>
<td>Making the</td>
<td>Making the impact specific to Hood Canal:</td>
<td>Making the impact specific to local bay:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impact personal</td>
<td>impact</td>
<td>Failing septic could</td>
<td>Failing septic could</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and local:</td>
<td>specific to Hood Canal:</td>
<td>Failing septic could</td>
<td>Failing septic could</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failing septic</td>
<td>Making the</td>
<td>1. Impact family’s health</td>
<td>1. Impact family’s health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>could</td>
<td>impact</td>
<td>2. Lower property value</td>
<td>2. Lower property value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Cause</td>
<td>specific to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recreation and</td>
<td>Hood Canal:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shellfish</td>
<td>Failing septic could</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>closures</td>
<td>1. Impact family’s health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Impact family health and local economy/jobs</td>
<td>2. Lower property value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Lower property values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>