

2020-R-

**BUDGET AMENDMENT REQUEST****BAR# 20-045**

TO: Seminole County Board of County Commissioners

FROM: Department of Resource Management

SUBJECT: Budget Amendment Resolution

Dept / Program: Leisure Services - Business Office

Fund(s): General Fund

RM Recommendation	
<b>JDH</b>	<b>3/9/2020</b>
Budget Analyst	Date
Budget Manager	Date
Director	Date

**PURPOSE:**

This BAR allocates funding for the second phase of the Natural Lands and Parks bond referendum.

**ACTION:** Approval and authorization for the Chairman to execute Budget Amendment Resolution.

In accordance with Section 129.06(2), Florida Statutes, it is recommended that the following accounts in the County budget be adjusted by the amounts set forth herein for the purpose described.

Type	Fund	Business Unit	Object Account	Sub-sidiary	Account Type	Subledger	Long Item No	Amount
Revenue								
Revenue								
Revenue								
Revenue								
<b>Total Sources</b>								<b>\$ -</b>
Expenditure	00100	02004040	530310		PROFESSIONAL SERVICES		3109999901	\$ 25,000
Expenditure								
Expenditure								
Expenditure								
Expenditure								
Expenditure								
Expenditure								
Expenditure								
Expenditure								
<b>Expenditure Sub-Total</b>								<b>\$ 25,000</b>
Reserve	00100	999901	599998		RESERVE - CONTINGENCIES		9989999901	\$ (25,000)
Reserve								
<b>Reserve Sub-Total</b>								<b>\$ (25,000)</b>
<b>Total Uses</b>								<b>\$ -</b>

**BUDGET AMENDMENT RESOLUTION**

This Resolution, 2020-R-\_\_\_\_\_approving the above requested budget amendment, was adopted at the regular meeting of the Board of County Commissioners of Seminole County, Florida\_\_\_\_\_as reflected in the minutes of this meeting.

Attest:

By:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Grant Maloy, Clerk to the Board of County Commissioners\_\_\_\_\_  
Jay Zembower, Chairman

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

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

Entered by the Office of Management and Budget

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

Posted by the County Comptroller's Office

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



Orlando Office  
618 East South Street  
Suite 700  
Orlando, Florida 32801

T 407.423.8398  
F 407.843.1070

April 10, 2020  
Project A180676.02

Richard E. Durr, Jr., CPRP, PLA, AICP  
Director of Leisure Services  
Seminole County Leisure Services Department  
100 East First Street - 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Sanford, Florida 32771

**Scope of Services**  
**Bond Preparation Support and Research: Part 2 Poll**  
**Seminole County, Florida**

Dear Mr. Durr:

In accordance with the Contract Master Services Agreement for Development services (RFP-1932-18/TAD) dated October 29<sup>th</sup>, 2018, GAI Consultants, Inc. (GAI) will provide a poll to prepare for the parks bond education program. We will partner with our subconsultants Hill Research and Consensus Communications (CC) on this project.

**Project Understanding**

Seminole County Leisure Services intends to place a general obligation (GO) bond question on the November 2020 ballot. This GO bond is anticipated to be \$85,000,000 to support Public and Natural Lands in Seminole County. This scope of services will provide the poll to inform the GO bond education program in 2020.

**Scope of Services**

Based on our understanding of the project requirements/criteria provided to date by Seminole County, GAI will perform the following described Scope of Services:

**Task 1 – Bond Measure Specific Poll**

The poll presented is geared towards designing a successful ballot measure. We recommend and have included the pricing for the n=400 (12 minute) option as it allows for larger subsamples of targets, e.g., geographic areas, age cohorts, partisan groups, etc. to analyze. Virtual meetings to support the poll include: a preliminary discussion with County staff to develop the content of the poll, attendance at a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting, and a Board of County Commissioners meeting. Please see Exhibit B for the full scope of services, which include:

- Specific provisions of the proposal. After the first ballot, we explain that the details of the measure have not been finalized. Then we ask for approval or disapproval of each specific provision or part of the measure, especially the specific objects of spending with levy revenues.
- Goals and objectives. We typically ask voters to approve or disapprove of a list of goals and objectives of a ballot measure.
- Credibility of arguments. We ask voters to say how convincing various arguments are – both for and against a proposed ballot measure.
- Consumer confidence and tax burden. We ask voters questions related to their perceived ability to pay higher taxes mandated by a proposed ballot measure.

- Classification items. We ask household demographic questions to us in analysis of the data, and to make tactical and strategic recommendations for action.

## Schedule

GAI will begin work upon receipt of a copy of this Proposal executed and authorized below. GAI will endeavor to complete its Scope of Services and deliver the project deliverable by July 1, 2020 subject to excused delay occasioned by factors beyond GAI's reasonable control.

## Payment

GAI will prepare invoices monthly and payment will be due within thirty (30) days of the date of the invoice.

Please do not hesitate to contact me at 321.319.3161 if you have any questions or wish to discuss this Proposal. If this Proposal is acceptable, please sign where indicated below and return one copy for our file. Services will be performed in accordance with the Contract Master Services Agreement for Development services (RFP-1932-18/TAD) dated October 29<sup>th</sup>, 2018.

Sincerely,  
**GAI Consultants, Inc.**

Kristin Caborn, CPRE  
Senior Planning Manager

Frank Bellomo, PLA  
Assistant Vice President

KC/PCS/cl

Attachment: Table 1 – Estimated Cost Summary  
Exhibit A – Fee Spreadsheet  
Exhibit B – Polling Scope

**Table 1**  
**Estimated Cost Summary**  
**Proposal**  
**Bond Preparation Support and Research: Part 2 Poll**  
**Seminole County, Florida**  
Seminole County Leisure Services Department

Task	Total
1.0: Bond Measure Specific Poll	\$24,804.02
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$24,804.02</b>

## **EXHIBIT A**

### **Fee Spreadsheet**

<b>Project Name: 2020.04.10 Seminole County Parks Bond Part 2</b>				
<b>Project A180676.02 GAI Consultants</b>				
	Principal Planner	Subconsultant /Consensus	Subconsultant /Hill Research	labor + expenses
Hourly Rate	\$ 188.79			
<b>1.0 Poll</b>				
poll	10	\$1,813.12	\$21,103.00	
<b>Task 1 Fee</b>	\$ 1,887.90	\$1,813.12	\$21,103.00	\$ 24,804.02
<b>Sub TOTAL</b>	\$ 1,887.90	\$ 1,813.12	\$21,103.00	
<b>TOTAL</b>				\$ 24,804.02

## **EXHIBIT B**

### **Polling Scope**



# **Proposal for research**

Prepared for Seminole County  
October, 2019



## Introduction

### THE CHALLENGE FACING SEMINOLE COUNTY

To find out the opinion of residents as it relates to a revenue-raising ballot measure that could help fund parks and open space, among other priorities.

Hill Research Consultants (HRC) is uniquely qualified to help Seminole County understand these opinions, given our...

- Extensive research of other ballot measures to fund parks, open space, and land conservation;
- Unrivalled commitment to methodological excellence;
- Unique statistical and analytical capabilities; and our
- Proven record of professional performance for ballot measure campaigns.



On the pages that follow, please find more information about the unique value HRC can bring to your project.

## Experience

### WE KNOW PARKS AND OPEN SPACE

- HRC has undertaken local tax measures for parks or open space in numerous venues:
  - Texas sporting goods sales tax (for parks), 2000-2019
  - HRC polling drove successful efforts in Charleston, South Carolina to raise sales taxes for parks, open space and other purposes in 2001 and 2016
  - Harris County, Texas, park bonds, 2015
  - Montgomery County, Texas open space, 2015

- El Paso County, Colorado Parks, 2010
- Estes Park, Colorado Parks and Recreation, 2008
- St. Louis Metro area (Missouri and Illinois) parks, 2000
- Broward County open space, Florida 2000
- Jefferson County Colorado open space, 1998

#### OUR LEADERSHIP: WE “GET” THE UNIQUE CIVIC CULTURE

The public affairs, civic, and policy arenas are unique and sometimes very different from traditional partisan politics and political research, or even market research; our knowledge of this civic opinion landscape is invaluable to our clients. This is especially important given the divisive political backdrop today. Successful public affairs, civic, and policy initiatives must have carefully-crafted strategies to educate residents about the facts of the proposal.

- HRC was established in 1988 in The Woodlands, Texas—a suburb north of Houston—by **Dr. David Hill**, a former tenured professor and Director of the Public Policy Resources Laboratory and Texas Poll at Texas A&M University. Dr. Hill received his Ph.D. from Florida State University and did post-doctoral study at the University of Michigan’s Survey Research Center. He has also been a member of the faculties of Kansas State University and Florida Atlantic University. In the past 5 years he has been an invited lecturer at the University of Florida and Stanford University. Dr. Hill is in charge of research design, questionnaire development, and report preparation and presentation. He is also the primary contact for clientele.
- HRC’s Assistant Director, Dr. Stephen White, received his Ph.D. in economics from Texas A&M University in 1985, and has continued to work with Dr. Hill ever since. Dr. White is responsible for sample design and acquisition as well as data analysis. He has pioneered numerous proprietary analytical techniques and has successfully developed numerous innovative visual approaches to presenting complex data and research results.
- From the time of our founding three decades ago, HRC has conducted a wide variety of public affairs and public policy research projects across the nation.

- We have helped hundreds of counties, municipalities, and public school systems across the nation build a reservoir of good will in the communities they serve;
- State government agencies including Departments of Transportation, Secretaries of State, Departments of Human Services, Parks and Wildlife Departments, and a State Board of Accountancy; and
- Issues-based research concerning public policies for transportation, education, economic development, water resources, criminal justice policies, utilities, energy production, renewable energy resources, taxes, construction, local governance, environment, conservation, tourism, professional sports, gaming, and healthcare.

## Professionalism

### WE ARE TRUSTWORTHY PARTNERS

Seminole County deserves a team that is both committed to and capable of excellence.

- Capitalizing on a special commitment to teamwork and collective problem-solving, HRC works effectively with the most demanding clients and their partners, outside agencies and consultants.
- Every member of our team works diligently to render conscientious, congenial service to every client. Principals of the firm handle all matters personally, and we respond quickly to client crises and deadlines.
- Client's needs are individually determined, with special care devoted to selecting the best research design for quick and efficient collection of data at the lowest possible cost.

## Methodology

### BEST PRACTICES WE PROPOSE

Based on our considerable experience, we believe your research should incorporate several attributes —

- **Mixed-mode data collection**, preferably 60% of interviews will be conducted on cell phones, 20% on land-line phones and 20% online.

- Developing a **sample frame built around active voters**, with a proven vote history on official voter rolls. There are several rationale for this suggestion. First, using lists of registered and active voters allows us to carefully select a sample that closely reflects or mirrors the known population of potential voters, allowing precise percentages by age, geography, and gender, as well as other criteria. Second, focusing on active voters allows us to understand the population most likely to be engaged in any public policy dialogue. Bear in mind that after data collection is complete, we can pare down the sample to the “most likely voters” for some strategic analyses.
- A **week-long field interviewing period** to allow multiple attempts to reach each originally sampled respondent, and to substitute respondents only when necessary. Research increasingly shows that longer field periods that include more call-backs as well as weekend, daytime, and evening calls are more apt to produce reliable and representative samples than are two-to-three day field periods of evening-only calls where respondent substitution is too often required, creating a “convenience sample” of those with nothing better to do during a short interviewing window.
- **Mixed-mode interviewing** is necessary to reach a cross-section of the population today. This is because there are strong skews or biases to certain interviewing modes. For example, land-line phones are skewed to older and less educated respondents. Online interviewing reaches some younger, more affluent, and better educated respondents that will never answer their phone. Only by using each potential means of interviewing can we achieve a truly representative, cross-sectional sample.
- We recommend **weighting of final results** to match the known characteristics of the population sampled. (This is another justification for using voter registration as a base, because we have solid information about the composition of the electorate.) There will always be variations in polling cooperation rates—willingness to do an interview—and we must do some weighting of results to compensate for this. For example, in some locale it is difficult to reach younger persons, say 18-29 years of age. If we find that to be the case in Seminole County, the results can be adjusted or weighted to ensure that younger opinion is proportionately represented in the final results.

- Consider a **sample size of 300 or 400 interviews**. This would provide a reasonable tradeoff between costs and accuracy in each part of the county. To do less than this would not do justice to your “need to know” and even cloud the credibility of the survey results in the minds of skeptics. As conventionally presented, the sample of 300 would have a margin of error of  $\pm 5.7\%$  for results of the whole sample, and the sample of 400,  $\pm 4.9\%$ . The most practical advantage for the 400 sample is solely in improving accuracy of results for smaller sub-parts of the county.

## Preliminary sample segmentation

Below are counts for a sample segmentation for the county. The geographical breaks can be adjusted according to local preferences.

### Active voter sample frame

Sample segment by Commissioner District	Active voters	% of voters	Quota <i>n</i> =300	Quota <i>n</i> =400
District 1	48,193	20.8%	62	83
District 2	49,020	21.2%	63	85
District 3	44,609	19.3%	58	77
District 4	43,412	18.7%	57	75
District 5	46,423	20.0%	60	80
<i>Total</i>	231,657	100.0%	300	400

## Questionnaire development

Questionnaires are developed in close cooperation with the client. Our experience informs us that batteries of question in each of these categories are essential:

- **Specific provisions of the proposal.** After the first ballot, we explain that the details of the measure have not been finalized. Then we ask for approval or disapproval of each specific provision or part of the measure, especially the specific objects of spending with levy revenues.
- **Goals and objectives.** We typically ask voters to approve or disapprove of a list of goals and objectives of a ballot measure.
- **Credibility of arguments.** We ask voters to say how convincing various arguments are—both for and against a proposed ballot measure.
- **Consumer confidence and tax burden.** We ask voters questions related to their perceived ability to pay higher taxes mandated by a proposed ballot measure.
- **Classification items.** We ask household demographic questions to use in analysis of the data, and to make tactical and strategic recommendations for action.

## Survey Pricing

### FACTORS

Survey costs are based on three factors—(1) the number of interviews completed; (2) ratio of cell, landline and online interview; (3) the average interview length.

### NUMBER OF INTERVIEWS

Setting an appropriate sample size is a function of statistics, purpose and social convention.

- The respondent pool must be large enough to reduce the margin of error to acceptable levels, but beyond a certain point such reductions are not justified by the additional cost.
- Potential consumers of your data—whether in media, government, the private sector, or the general public—have developed expectations of what constitutes a legitimate sample size.

Based on our preliminary understanding of your research needs, HRC expects that a sample size of between  $n=300$  to  $n=400$  respondents would be appropriate.

### INTERVIEW LENGTH

Our experience is that respondents can be asked and answer about 2.4 to 3 fixed-choice questions (or one open-ended item) per minute, depending on the length (number of words) and complexity of the question text. Another way to calculate length is approximately 125-130 words of text per minute of interviewing.

Based on these factors, a benchmark survey for your project can be expected to cost between \$16,530 to \$24,910. The variations are presented below.

### COST QUOTATION – FOR SAMPLE SIZES AND 3 INTERVIEW LENGTHS

SAMPLE SIZE	AVERAGE INTERVIEW LENGTH	TOTAL COST (\$)
n=300	12 minutes	16,530
n=300	15 minutes	18,126
n=300	18 minutes	19,261
n=400	12 minutes	21,103

n=400	15 minutes	23,314
n=400	18 minutes	24,910

#### NOTES

When comparing HRC's price quotes to our competitors, it is important to note the following.

- HRC's prices are ***all-inclusive*** of the crafting, revision, fielding, analysis, report writing, in-person presentation of results to clients, generation of printable deliverables and follow-up telephone consultations.
- There are no monthly retainers required, nor are additional fees charged for "consulting" or "message development."
- Web-based presentation of results to key decision-makers and stakeholders are provided gratis.
- One on-site meeting or presentation is provided gratis. Any additional on-site presentations or meetings requiring travel are charged at the rate of \$750 per day, plus out-of-pocket travel expenses incurred.
- As the crafting of the survey-instrument reaches an advanced stage, drafts are timed, allowing for revisions to be made as desired and appropriate for budgetary purposes.
- Once a final questionnaire is approved, you are given a firm quotation of the interview length and price.
- Only after you accept this quotation are you obligated to any expenditure.



## Timeline - assuming 30-day completion

Our experience suggests that the greatest potential for variation in time required is in the questionnaire development process. Two weeks is typical. If it takes longer, we have some slack time at the end of the 40-days to compensate.

CALENDAR DAYS	ACTIVITIES
1-14	Questionnaire development and review; complete sample design and acquire sample resources
12-14	Programming and testing telephone and online questionnaires
15-22	Interviewing
23	Topline/preliminary results to client
24-29	Detailed computing and analysis of data
29-30	Finalizing PowerPoint presentation, including recommendations for action and further research
30	Final report submission

## References

### WILL ABBERGER

- Vice President, Conservation Finance  
The Trust for Public Land (based in Tallahassee, FL)  
850-294-2006  
[will.abberger@tpl.org](mailto:will.abberger@tpl.org)

HRC research has assisted Mr. Abberger and his Trust for Public Land on numerous occasions, including on three campaigns for approval of a transportation tax for the greater Charleston, SC area.

### WENDY HOLMES

- Director of Public Affairs  
Douglas County (CO)  
303.660.7358  
[wholmes@douglas.co.us](mailto:wholmes@douglas.co.us)

For nearly a decade, HRC has worked with Ms. Holmes to conduct annual polls on transportation priority proposals, and both citizen sentiment and “community visioning” surveys for Douglas County Colorado (pop. 292,167).

### TAMRA WARD

- Tamra J. Ward, Principal Taloma Partners (Formerly Senior Vice President of Public Affairs, Denver Metro Chamber of Commerce—Denver CO)  
303.324.8021  
[tamra.ward@talomapartners.com](mailto:tamra.ward@talomapartners.com)

HRC conducted numerous projects for The Metro Denver Chamber during her tenure there.