

## 1.4 Social Indicators Survey

The purpose of the social indicator survey was to identify the concerns citizens have regarding water quality in the Upper Iroquois Watershed. The steering committee identified two critical sub watershed areas (Figure 87 Top Two Contributing HUC 10 Subwatersheds) that received the survey. The choosing of these two watersheds was based on 2008 and 2010 303(d) waterway impairment listings along with preliminary desktop and windshield survey information. The results of the survey will serve to guide education efforts and verify and add to the current concerns list and problem statements. Relevant survey results are summarized by problem statement in Table 8 Social Indicator Results by Problem Statement.

Conducted in January and February of 2012, the target audience was divided into two groups. Landowners owning more than 2 acres were given a survey focused on agricultural practices and landowners owning less than 2 acres were given a survey focused on urban management practices, see Appendix 1 and 2 for surveys. A randomized mailing list was created, with each landowner being identifiable only by a response code in order to insure confidentiality. A total of 5,322 landowners from the Carpenter Creek and Curtis Creek watersheds were used to make up our total target audience, with 3,817 residents equaling urban and 1,505 residents equaling our Ag audience. Based off of these numbers a total of 349 urban respondents and 306 Ag respondents were needed to be statistically representative.

All of the information gathered from this social survey will help direct future planning towards education and outreach strategies. The interpretation of the survey results will enable us to:

- Use our analysis to refine our target audiences, finalize the management practices to promote, and develop social outcomes.
- Develop outreach and implementation strategies based on our environmental goals and social outcomes.
- Find out how much is already known about the practices, as well as identify the characteristics that will both facilitate or hinder practice adoption.

### 1.4.1 Agricultural Survey Summary Results

- 57.7% are Willing to Change Management Practices to Improve Water Quality
- Most Important Activities: Scenic Beauty, 40.3%, and Fish Habitat/eating locally caught fish, 18.9%
- Top Perceived Water Impairments: Trash or Debris and Sedimentation
- Top Perceived Sources of Pollution: Soil Erosion from Farm Fields and Manure from Farm Animals
- Lack of Information: 38.6% Don't Know if Combined Sewer Overflow is an issue, 34.8% Don't Know if Channelization is an issue, 35.9% Don't know about Improper disposal of used motor oil/and or antifreeze
- Top Constraint to Regular Septic System Servicing, Cover Crops and Riparian Fencing: Cost

- 78.6% of respondents have a septic system. 27% of them were installed in the 2000's and 11% were installed in the 1950's
- Septic System Servicing: 52.4% Already or Willing to adopt, 28.6% May be Willing
- Cover Crops: 44% Already or Willing to adopt, 31.5% May be willing
- Riparian Fencing: 50.6% Not Willing to adopt, 26.1% Already or Willing to adopt
- Conservation Tillage: 58% Already or Willing to adopt, 23.8% Not Willing to adopt
- Top two forms of information used: Newsletters/brochures/fact sheets 57.5%, Conversations with others 49.4%
- 67.2% regularly read the local newspaper


#### 1.4.2 Urban Survey Summary Results

- 50.2% are Willing to Change Lawn and Yard Practices to Improve Water Quality
- Most Important Activities: Scenic Beauty, 41%, and Fish Habitat, 17.6%
- Top Perceived Water Impairments: Sedimentation and Pesticides
- Top perceived Sources of Pollution: Littering/Illegal Dumping of Trash and Soil Erosion from Farm Fields
- Lack of Information: 49.6% Don't Know if Channelization is an issue, 46.9% Don't Know about Dredging of streams
- Top Constraint to Porous Pavement, Regular Septic System Servicing, and Roof Run-off Management: Cost
- Top Constraint to Grass Clipping Management: Time required
- Septic System Servicing: 37.1% Already or Willing to adopt, 40.7% Not willing to adopt
- Grass Clipping Management: 71.9% Already or Willing to adopt
- Porous Pavement: 45.7% May be willing, 28.1% Already or Willing to adopt
- Roof Run-off Management: 41.1% May be willing, 36.4% Already or Willing to adopt
- Top two forms of information used: Newsletter/brochures/factsheets 48.6%, Conversations with others 35.8%

The majority of respondents are elderly men.

- Ag Survey: Mean Age of Respondents: 61      Max Age of Respondents: 97  
Male: 75.9%      Female: 24.1%
- Urban Survey: Mean Age of Respondents: 59
- Max Age of Respondents: 92 Male: 61.7%      Female: 38.3%
- 7.6% of Jasper County Residents are 45-49 years old, only 5.8% between 60-64 years old (2010 US Census)
- 8.3% of Newton County Residents are 45-49 years old, only 6.0% between 60-64 (2010 US Census)

Figure 5 Social Indicators Survey Area



0 2.5 5 10 Miles N  
by Dan Perkins Jasper SWCD

UPPER IROQUOIS  
WATERSHED INITIATIVE  
CONNECTING PEOPLE FOR WATERSHED IMPROVEMENT

**Table 8 Social Indicator Results by Problem Statement**

Social Indicators Survey Summary by Problem Statement		
Problem	Survey	Results
The Iroquois River has undesirable high and low levels and flows of water that threaten our towns, agricultural land, and health of the river.	Ag	34.8% Don't Know if Channelization is an issue
	Ag	Top Constraint to Cover Crops and Riparian Fencing =Cost
	Ag	Cover Crops: 44% Already or Willing to adopt, 31.5% May be willing
	Urb	Top perceived Sources of Pollution: Littering/Illegal Dumping of Trash and Soil Erosion from Farm Fields
	Urb	Lack of Information: 49.6% Don't Know if Channelization is an issue, 46.9% Don't Know about Dredging of streams
The desirable native fish populations in the Iroquois River and surrounding waterways are suspected to be in decline.	Ag	Scenic Beauty, 40.3%, and Fish Habitat/eating locally caught fish, 18.9%
	Ag	Top Constraint to Cover Crops and Riparian Fencing =Cost
	Urb	50.2% are Willing to Change Lawn and Yard Practices to Improve Water Quality
	Urb	Most Important Activities: Scenic Beauty, 41%, and Fish Habitat, 17.6%
	Urb	Top perceived Sources of Pollution: Littering/Illegal Dumping of Trash and Soil Erosion from Farm Fields
Area streams within the watershed are very cloudy and turbid.	Ag	Top Constraint to Cover Crops and Riparian Fencing =Cost
	Ag	Cover Crops: 44% Already or Willing to adopt, 31.5% May be willing
	Ag	Riparian Fencing: 50.6% Not Willing to adopt, 26.1% Already or Willing to adopt
	Ag	Conservation Tillage: 58% Already or Willing to adopt, 23.8% Not Willing to adopt
	Urb	50.2% are Willing to Change Lawn and Yard Practices to Improve Water Quality
	Urb	Top Perceived Water Impairments: Sedimentation and Pesticides
	Urb	Top perceived Sources of Pollution: Littering/Illegal Dumping of Trash and Soil Erosion from Farm Fields
Widespread recreational use is prevented.	Ag	Scenic Beauty, 40.3%, and Fish Habitat/eating locally caught fish, 18.9%
	Ag	Top Constraint to Regular Septic System Servicing= cost
	Ag	Top Constraint to Cover Crops and Riparian Fencing =Cost
	Urb	50.2% are Willing to Change Lawn and Yard Practices to Improve Water Quality
	Urb	Most Important Activities: Scenic Beauty, 41%, and Fish Habitat, 17.6%
Urb	Top perceived Sources of Pollution: Littering/Illegal Dumping of Trash and Soil Erosion from Farm Fields	

Social Indicators Survey Summary by Problem Statement		
Problem	Survey	Results
The Iroquois River and its tributaries are listed on IDEM's 303(d) list for "excessive nutrients, e.coll, and IBI."	Ag	57.7% are Willing to Change Management Practices to Improve Water Quality
	Ag	Top Perceived Water Impairments: Trash or Debris and Sedimentation
	Ag	Top Perceived Sources of Pollution: Soil Erosion from Farm Fields and Manure from Farm Animals
	Ag	38.6% Don't Know if Combined Sewer Overflow is an issue
	Ag	35.9% Don't know about Improper disposal of used motor oil/and or antifreeze
	Ag	Top Constraint to Regular Septic System Servicing= cost
	Urb	Top Constraint to Cover Crops and Riparian Fencing =Cost
	Urb	Cover Crops: 44% Already or Willing to adopt, 31.5% May be willing
	Urb	Riparian Fencing: 50.6% Not Willing to adopt, 26.1% Already or Willing to adopt
	Urb	Conservation Tillage: 58% Already or Willing to adopt, 23.8% Not Willing to adopt
Urb	50.2% are Willing to Change Lawn and Yard Practices to Improve Water Quality	
Urb	Top Perceived Water Impairments: Sedimentation and Pesticides	
Urb	Top perceived Sources of Pollution: Littering/Illegal Dumping of Trash and Soil Erosion from Farm Fields	
General Notes of Importance		
Ag		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Top two forms of information used: Newsletters/brochures/factsheets 57.5%, Conversations with others 49.4%</li> <li>67.2% regularly read the local newspaper</li> </ul>
Urban		Top two forms of information used: Newsletter/brochures/factsheets 48.6%, Conversations with others 35.8%

**Ag BMP Willingness to Adopt**

- Top Constraint to Regular Septic System Servicing, Cover Crops and Riparian Fencing: Cost
- Cover Crops: 44% Already or Willing to adopt, 31.5% May be willing
- Riparian Fencing: 50.6% Not Willing to adopt, 26.1% Already or Willing to adopt
- Conservation Tillage: 58% Already or Willing to adopt, 23.8% Not Willing to adopt

**Urban BMP Willingness to Adopt**

- Top Constraint to Porous Pavement, Regular Septic System Servicing, and Roof Runoff Management: Cost
- Top Constraint to Grass Clipping Management: Time required
- Septic System Servicing: 37.1% Already or Willing to adopt, 40.7% Not willing to adopt
- Grass Clipping Management: 71.9% Already or Willing to adopt
- Porous Pavement: 45.7% May be willing, 28.1% Already or Willing to adopt
- Roof Runoff Management: 41.1% May be willing, 36.4% Already or Willing to adopt