

**ATTACHMENT A - STATEMENT OF WORK  
Developing and Testing a Citizen Survey for the  
Indian River Lagoon National Estuary Program**

**I. INTRODUCTION**

An aware, concerned, and engaged citizenry will help create an ecologically resilient Indian River Lagoon. Active citizen support for policies, taxes, and regulations can put in place the restrictions and opportunities that can help protect and restore ecosystem health. Knowledgeable, motivated residents can undertake meaningful behaviors that reduce nonpoint source pollution and maintain buffers, among other activities.

Knowing what to do, however, is only one element of creating an aware, concerned, and engaged citizenry (De Young 2000) and it alone is not often a motivator (Schultz 2002). People often need to know who in their social circle believe the lagoon can be helped by their actions, that specific actions will achieve their goals, and that regular people can successfully undertake these actions (Ajzen 1985; Rogers 1995). Those who most easily grasp the importance of these actions and commit to them may be those who share an environmental identity, value the natural features in the region, regularly visit the lagoon, and are members of environmental organizations (Stern 2000; Kaiser and Shimoda 1999). While these committed individuals are essential for launching environmental projects, they alone will not restore the lagoon. Additional citizen support and action will be needed.

The Indian River Lagoon National Estuary Program has brought together a coalition of groups, agencies, organizations, and institutions working together to provide educational programs to increase awareness and motivation to restore the Indian River Lagoon. This comprehensive and collective approach to identifying and providing consistent messages, reminders, and opportunities should help activate and engage citizens of the region.

Effective education and communication programs begin by understanding the audience's perceptions and beliefs. Focus groups are an important tool to understanding experiences and ideas; surveys are useful to understand opinions of the population (Ernst, Monroe and Simmons 2009). As the coalition of agencies and organizations produce programs and engage their membership, changes in public awareness may occur over time. To detect such a change, survey items will need to be carefully crafted, pilot tested, and implemented in the same season each year.

The University of Florida (UF) suggests that the development of this survey be pilot tested with members of several environmental organizations, non-member visitors, and non-visitors in the same regions of each organization to best understand the perspectives of the general public in the Indian River Lagoon region. The Brevard Zoo will be an interesting first site for testing the survey and sampling diverse audiences in the region. Implementing the survey with the members and visitors of other IRL partner organizations, if possible, will also be valuable. Additionally, UF plans to sample audiences of multiple institutions across all five counties that border the

lagoon. Since perspectives of the IRL in the north might be different from those in the south, UF believes their job is to create a survey that can be useful across the entire region.

UF will conduct this project in collaboration and with advisement of the lead partners in the IRLNEP. They represent a rich source of insights and experiences, in addition to networks of individuals in the region. In addition, UF will link the UF/IFAS/Extension system into this project in a formal way, using two regional water faculty on the advisory board and working in collaboration with the five county Extension offices to identify and survey non-environmental citizens of the region.

## **II. OBJECTIVE**

This project has several components that will occur in three phases. The objectives of this project are:

1. To understand the goals and scope of the IRLNEP education vision, as articulated by IRLNEP partner organizations.
2. To design and pilot test a citizen survey.
3. To implement the survey with partner members and report results.

## **III. SCOPE**

UF will develop and test a citizen survey to assess beliefs and attitudes about the quality and future of the Indian River Lagoon.

## **IV. TASK IDENTIFICATION**

### **Phase 1: Understand the goals and scope of IRLNEP education vision January – March 2017**

From the time the contract is in place through March 2017, a team comprised of Martha Monroe, Lily Maynard and two student assistants will conduct a series of interviews and focus groups with the IRLNEP major partners, local scientists, Extension faculty, IRL users, and general public to understand the breadth and diversity of perspectives about the health of the lagoon and potential actions that can be taken. Some meetings will occur during the day in local offices and others will be organized as focus groups in local dining establishments. It will be important to listen to residents, youth, scientists, and educators in all five counties to understand their perceptions, concerns, and opportunities. UF will use the IRL partners and Extension offices to assist with the formation of these groups and engaging local stakeholders. UF will take notes and transcribe conversations, analyzing these data to identify themes. UF will also use this opportunity to reflect on the theoretical constructs that will be explored through this data collection opportunity; these research opportunities are related to organizational conservation identity and message distribution of the major partners and the degree to which nature experiences, connection to place, and knowledge motivate people to care about and take action to protect the IRL.

This period will also be an opportunity to establish an advisory group of three well-known educational researchers who can provide feedback on the development and implementation of the survey. UF will use these advisors and other colleagues to identify the advantages and disadvantages of several survey implementation schemes and provide a recommendation to IRLNEP about the number of respondents from each county and whether they should be the same respondents that are followed over a time period for the repeated citizen survey.

It will be particularly important to develop survey questions that are extremely specific, since detecting change in attitudes and beliefs can be extremely difficult. UF will attempt to create a “flea comb survey” rather than a typical “brush survey” – one that can snag very small changes. Taking the time, resources, and thorough input from experts will be vital to establish this effective survey that will detect small shifts over time to document the impacts of the coalition of environmental organizations in the IRLNEP.

At the end of the first phase of this study, UF will provide a summary of the concepts and constructs heard as the first deliverable.

## **Phase 2: Survey design and pilot test**

### **March – July 2017**

With input from the IRLNEP leadership based on our summary of the focus groups and interviews, UF will begin the process of creating survey items and pilot testing the survey with adult residents in all five counties. UF will meet with two groups of people in each county (environmentally aware advocates and non-aware residents) to listen to their thinking about each survey item, making sure the vocabulary is appropriate, that they perceive the question UF intends to ask, and that UF understands their response. UF will use IRL partners, Extension faculty, and public libraries to contact and meet residents.

Deliverables will be a working draft survey (for IRL partner input) and a final survey.

The survey will be able to answer questions such as:

- What are the concerns and opinions about the health of the Indian River Lagoon, by county, by high and low nature experience, and by partner membership?
- What misconceptions do residents hold about the lagoon?
- What are the easiest opportunities to help the lagoon that people are most knowledgeable about and most willing to engage in?
- What are the more challenging opportunities to help the lagoon and what are the perceived barriers to these actions?
- What types of residents are most likely to already be conducting Lagoon-helping behaviors and how often do they do them?
- What types of residents believe they could conduct lagoon-helping behaviors?
- What types of residents have no interest or knowledge in helping the lagoon, and why?
- From what organizations do people hear messages and information about lagoon health and protection?

**Phase 3: Survey implementation, analysis and report  
August – December 2017**

The final phase of the project will enable UF to implement the revised and approved survey with at least Brevard Zoo members, non-member visitors and non-visitor county residents. If UF has easy access to email addresses, UF may expand this survey to include other IRL partner memberships and non-member residents. UF recognizes the importance of collecting data and pilot testing the questions in multiple institutions to take into account potential differences in environmental organizations. Such differences can include the type of organization, varying audiences, differing IRL education and engagement strategies, and consequential differences in perceptions of the IRL in their audiences. To verify the strength of the survey, UF will implement the survey with the Brevard Zoo and other IRL partner organizations' audiences. UF is budgeting for a small sample to be reached by mail in the event that email addresses are not available.

The survey and reminders will be sent in August and September, gathering respondents' memories of summer experiences with the lagoon. UF will provide a draft report in November to IRL leadership, and final report in December when UF will present their findings to the IRLNEP partners.

UF will use these data to write academic articles about the relationships between theoretical constructs such as identity, collective messaging, connection to nature, environmental intent, and potentially others ideas. UF will offer draft articles to IRL leadership for comments in 2018. If IRL leadership would like to co-author a paper on the survey results about citizen attitudes, UF is amenable to partner on such publication.

**V. TIME FRAMES and DELIVERABLES**

All project Deliverables shall be sent to the IRL Council office located at: 1235 Main Street, Sebastian, FL 32958; Deliverables shall be addressed to the attention of Kathy Hill, Project Manager. *Electronic delivery is to:* [hill@ircouncil.org](mailto:hill@ircouncil.org)

<b>Time Period</b>	<b>Activity</b>
January – Feb 2017	Understand partner vision, establish advisory group, conduct interviews and focus groups
March – June 2017	Survey design
June – July 2017	Survey pilot testing
August – September 2017	Survey implementation
October – November 2017	Survey analysis
December 2017	Final report

**Deliverables:**

Draft model for survey constructs	March 31, 2017
Draft survey	May 1, 2017
Final survey	August 1, 2017
Draft report	November 15, 2017
Final report	December 15, 2017

**VI. BUDGET**

<b>Budget Item</b>	<b>Budget Detail</b>	<b>IRL Council Funding Amount</b>
Staff Time	Maynard .1 FTE	\$2,248
	Monroe .1 FTE	\$11,334
	Student Assistants: 2 people 25 hours phase 1, 40 hours phase 2 @ \$15/hour	\$1,950
	Student Assistant Data Entry, 40 hours @ \$20/hour	\$800
Fringe	Maynard @ 20.4%	\$459
	Monroe @ 26.9%	\$3,049
	Student Assistants @ 2.5%	\$69
Advisory Board	5 @ \$1,000	\$5,000
Extension Support	5 @ \$1,000	\$5,000
Travel: Gainesville to IRL (Vero Beach as mid-point)	Gas @ .44/mile for 8 trips @ 415 miles round trip	\$1,477
	2 hotel rooms for 10 nights @ \$150/night	\$3,000
	Food for 14 days for 4 people @ \$36/day	\$2,016
	Food for 3 days for 2 people @ \$36/day	\$216
Food & Refreshments for meetings	Phase 1: Dinners for 5 meetings for 10 people @ \$15/person	\$750
	Phase 1: Snacks for 5 focus groups for 10 people @ \$30/group	\$150
	Phase 2: Snacks for 10 meetings for 10 people @ \$30/meeting	\$300
Mail-in Surveys	Printing & Postage for local comparison group	\$5,000
NAAEE 2017 Conference	Travel & hotel for 1 person to present @ the 2017 North American Association for Environmental Education Conference, Puerto Rico	\$2,000
	<b>Total Direct Cost</b>	<b>\$44,818</b>
Indirect Costs	Indirect Costs @ 10%	\$4,482
	<b>Project Total Cost</b>	<b>\$49,300</b>

Within 30 days after the closing date of each calendar quarter (March 31, June 30, September 30 and December 31), UF shall submit an itemized invoice for the reimbursable expenses incurred during the previous quarter. Invoices shall be submitted in detail sufficient for proper pre-audit and post-audit review.

## References

- Ajzen, I. 1985. From intentions to actions: A theory of planned behavior. In Kuhl, J. and J. Beckman (eds) *Action-control: From cognition to behavior*. Heidelberg: Springer, pp 11-39.
- Davidson, E. J. 2004. *Evaluation methodology basics: The nuts and bolts of sound evaluation*. Sage, CA.
- De Young, Raymond. 2000. Expanding and evaluating motives for environmentally responsible behavior. *Journal of Social Issues*. 56 (3): 509-526.
- Ernst, J., M. C. Monroe, and D. Simmons. 2009. *Evaluating Your Environmental Education Programs*. Washington DC: NAAEE.
- Kaiser, F. and T. Shimoda. 1999. Responsibility as a predictor of ecological behavior. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*. 19, 243-253.
- Rogers, Everett. M. 1995. *Diffusion of Innovations*. New York: Free Press. Pages 1-37.
- Rubin, H. J. and Rubin, I. S. 1995. *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data*. Sage, CA.
- Schultz, P. Wesley. 2002. Knowledge, Information, and Household Recycling: Examining the knowledge-deficit model of behavior change. In Dietz, Thomas and Paul C. Stern (eds) *New Tools for environmental protection: Education, information, and voluntary measures*. Washington DC: National Academy Press, Pages 67-82.
- Stake, R. E. 2003. *Standards-based and responsive evaluation*. Sage, CA.
- Stern, Paul C. 2000. Toward a coherent theory of environmentally significant behavior. *Journal of Social Issues*. 56 (3): 407-424.

**ATTACHMENT B — COUNCIL’S SUPPLEMENTAL INSTRUCTIONS (sample)**  
**COUNCIL SUPPLEMENTAL INSTRUCTIONS #**

DATE:

TO:

FROM: \_\_\_\_\_, Project Manager

CONTRACT/PURCHASE ORDER NUMBER:

CONTRACT TITLE:

The Work shall be carried out in accordance with the following supplemental instruction issued in accordance with the Contract Documents without change in the Contract Sum or Contract Time. Prior to proceeding in accordance with these instructions, indicate your acceptance of these instructions for minor changes to the work as consistent with the Contract Documents and return to the Council’s Project Manager.

- 1. CONTRACTOR’S SUPPLEMENTAL INSTRUCTIONS:
- 2. DESCRIPTION OF WORK TO BE CHANGED:
- 3. DESCRIPTION OF SUPPLEMENTAL INSTRUCTION REQUIREMENTS: \_\_\_\_\_.

**Contractor’s approval: (choose one of the items below):**

Approved: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

(It is agreed that these instructions shall not result in a change in the Total Compensation or the Completion Date.)

Approved: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

(Contractor agrees to implement the Supplemental Instructions as requested, but reserves the right to seek a Change Order in accordance with the requirements of the Agreement.)

Approved: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_, Council Project Manager

Acknowledged: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_, Council Contracts Administrator

cc: Contract/Purchasing file