



Working together for clean water

Community Readiness Assessment Report

5th House Consulting
December 2020



TABLE OF CONTENTS

About the Community Readiness Model	2
Explanation of Tools and Method	3
The Gallatin Watershed Community Readiness Scores	4
Dimension A: Community Knowledge of Efforts	7
Dimension B: Leadership	9
Dimension C: Community Climate	10
Dimension D: Community Knowledge of Issue	11
Dimension E: Resources	12
Actions for Increasing Readiness Levels	13
Appendix A: Interview Questions	15
Appendix B: Rating Scales for Scoring	21
Appendix C: Stages and Dimensions of Community Readiness	26
Appendix D: Dimensions of Community Readiness	27
Appendix E: References	28

"This project has been funded wholly or in part by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) under assistance agreement BG-99861315/ L17AC00376 to the Montana Department of Environmental Quality. The contents of this document do not necessarily reflect the views and policies of the EPA, nor does the EPA endorse trade names or recommend the use of commercial products mentioned in this document."

Community Readiness Final Report for Gallatin Watershed Council

Issue: Nonpoint Source (NPS) Pollution in the Lower Gallatin Watershed
Community: The Lower Gallatin Watershed
Date: December 2020

About the Community Readiness Model

The Community Readiness Model was developed at the Tri-Ethnic Center for Prevention Research at Colorado State University to help communities assess their community's level of readiness to address a particular issue and to develop and implement actions to increase these readiness levels.

Researchers at the Tri-Ethnic Center for Prevention Research (Oetting, Donnermeyer, Plested, Edwards, Kelly, and Beauvais, 1995) studied The Transtheoretical Model of Behavior Change (Prochaska and DiClemente, 1992), also called the Stages of Change Model. Their research showed how communities are a lot like individuals in the sense that they move through stages before they are ready to implement programs, develop and deliver interventions, and take other actions to address an issue in the community.

Communities, similar to individual behavior change, can be at different levels of readiness to address issues and make changes. Actions matched to the community's readiness level will help move communities forward in addressing an issue. In other words, matching a community intervention to the community's level of readiness is key to achieving success. If your community is not ready for your efforts, failure or frustration is likely. For example, the community may deny there is a problem, and thus your efforts will meet with resistance or even hostility. The community may not understand the issue, leading your efforts to meet with indifference. Your community leaders may not be willing to provide the resources needed to effectively implement new programs or activities. No matter the reason for this lack of readiness, efforts will have gone for naught. (E. R. Oetting, B. A. Plested, R. W. Edwards, P. J. Thurman, K. J. Kelly, Stanley, L. and F. Beauvais, 2014)

The community readiness model defines 9 stages of readiness:

1. No awareness
2. Denial/resistance
3. Vague awareness
4. Preplanning
5. Preparation
6. Initiation
7. Stabilization
8. Confirmation/Expansion
9. High Level of Community Ownership

See Appendix C for a brief explanation of these stages.

Explanation of Tool and Methods

The CRA is comprised of up to 36 questions that ask questions in regard to 5 dimensions of readiness: community knowledge of the efforts, leadership, community climate, community knowledge of the issue, and resources. This questionnaire was created to be adjusted to communities' needs, and it is not required that you ask all 36 questions or inquire about all 5 dimensions. The Gallatin Watershed Council's questionnaire was comprised of 28 questions and focused on 5 dimensions of readiness: community knowledge of the efforts, leadership, community climate, community knowledge of the issue and resources. The interview questions dealing with the 5 dimensions of community readiness can be found in Appendix A.

The steps taken to assess community readiness included the following:

1. Identify and clearly define the issue.
2. Identify and clearly define and delineate the community.
3. Prepare interview questions.
4. Choose key respondents.
5. Conduct and transcribe interviews.
6. Score the interviews.
7. Calculate average dimension scores.

Phone interviews were conducted with 10 community leaders that represented the following sectors of the community: Agriculture, Active Citizens, University/Education, For Profit Businesses, Nonprofit Conservation Groups, City Municipalities, Government Agencies, Developers, County Commission, and the Recreation/Tourism Industry. Interviews were transcribed and independently scored by research associates of 5th House Consulting using anchored rating scales of readiness to assign scores ranging from 1 to 9 for each of the five dimensions. For each dimension, there are anchored rating scales representing the lowest stage/level of readiness (1 = *no awareness*) to the highest stage/level of readiness (9 = *high level of community ownership*). The scorers completed their independent scoring and then met to reach consensus on differing scores. Once consensus was reached, the resulting scores are summed and an overall mean score of the community's stage of readiness calculated.

Based on key respondent interviews, a level of readiness from 1 to 9 is assigned to each dimension. Actions for increasing community readiness rely on these community readiness scores, with dimensions with the lowest levels of readiness typically being addressed first.

The key questions for each dimension are as follows:

Community Knowledge of Efforts

How much does the community know about current programs and activities?

Leadership

What is leadership's attitude toward addressing the issue?

Community Climate

What is the community's attitude toward addressing the issue?

Community Knowledge of the Issue

How much does the community know about the issue?

Resources

To what extent are local resources – people, time, money, space, etc. – available to support efforts?

The Lower Gallatin Watershed Community Readiness Scores

The table below gives the scores for each dimension of readiness of the Lower Gallatin Watershed to address nonpoint source pollution. These scores are explained in more detail below.

Scores by Dimension

	Readiness Level	Readiness Stage	Description
Dimension A (Community Knowledge of Efforts)	3.27	Vague Awareness	A few community members have at least heard about local efforts, but know little about them. For example, they know local efforts exist and may recognize their names, but they have little other knowledge
Dimension B (Leadership)	4.30	Preplanning	Leadership believes that this issue is a concern in the community and that some type of effort is needed to address it. Although most may be passively supportive of current efforts, few are involved in developing, improving or implementing efforts.
Dimension C (Community Climate)	3.38	Vague Awareness	Some community members believe that this issue may be a concern in the community, but it is not seen as a priority. They show no motivation to act.
Dimension D (Community Knowledge of Issue)	3.04	Vague Awareness	At least some community members have vague knowledge about the issue, having heard of the issue, but little else. Among some community members, there may be misconceptions about the issue. Community members may be somewhat aware that the issue occurs locally.
Dimension E (Resources Related to the Issue)	3.63	Vague Awareness	Current efforts may be funded, but the funding is not necessarily stable or continuing. There are limited resources (such as a community room) identified that could be used for further efforts to address the issue. There is little motivation to allocate these resources to this issue.
Average	3.52	Vague Awareness	Most feel that there is a local concern, but there is no immediate motivation to do anything about it.

Individual Interview Scores

Dimensions	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8	#9	#10	CRA Score
Knowledge of Efforts	3.4	6.9	2.2	4.3	4.0	2.9	4.3	2.0	-	2.7	3.27
Leadership	5	5	3.0	4.0	5.5	4.0	5.0	3.2	3.5	4.8	4.3
Community Climate	4	5	2.0	3.5	2.0	4.0	3.5	2.5	3.5	3.8	3.38
Knowledge of Issue	3.9	4	2.0	2.9	3.0	3.8	2.8	2.1	3.9	2.0	3.04
Resources for Efforts	4	3.5	2.9	3.8	5.0	4.5	4.8	3.3	-	4.5	3.63
								Overall CR Score			3.52

Overall Community Readiness Score: 3.52 Vague Awareness

Most feel that there is a local concern, but there is no immediate motivation to do anything about it.

Statements that are often true for communities at this stage include the following.

- **A few** community members have at least heard about local efforts but **know little about them**.
- Leadership and community members **believe that this issue may be a concern in the community**. They show no immediate motivation to act.
- Community members have only **vague knowledge** about the issue (e.g. they have some awareness that the issue can be problem and why it may occur).
- There are **limited resources** (such as a community room) identified that could be used for further efforts to address the issue.

“Something should probably be done, but what? Maybe someone else will work on this.”

The results of this report give the community readiness levels for the issue as well as goals and general strategies appropriate for each level in order to move prevention efforts forward.

The score for **Leadership** is greater than the other dimensions, indicating that the leaders are more aware of the issue than the general public, and they are more supportive. The score for **Community Knowledge of the Issue** was the lowest. This means that although Leadership is aware of the issue, the community is not particularly knowledgeable about the issue of nonpoint source water pollution.

Comments about the Priority for the Community

Key informants generally felt that NPS pollution was not a primary concern for community members in the lower Gallatin watershed. Reasons for this included a lack of knowledge and publicity about the issue.

“I think that most of the community probably doesn’t consider Nonpoint sources of pollution as a concern right now, I think they’re more focused on ... definite point sources and discharges... At this time, I don’t think it’s been publicized to the point where people are really concerned about it.”

“It’s the descriptor that goes with the NPS and what the focus is that changes, I believe, people’s attitude towards willingness and ability to be involved, cause nonpoint source means a lot of things to a lot of different people.”

Despite this, key informants shared how important water is to the Gallatin Valley and were generally optimistic about opportunities to raise awareness and concern about this issue.

“Because the river is really important to the valley here, ...economically and [for] quality of life. So I think it’s much more important than average because it affects everything from housing development, where you can put homes, and water for agriculture.”

A. Community Knowledge of the Efforts

(To what extent do community members know about local efforts and their purpose and effectiveness?)

Score: 3.27

Readiness Stage: Vague Awareness

A few community members have at least heard about local efforts but know little about them. For example, they know local efforts exist and may recognize their names, but they have little other knowledge.

Findings from interviews:

Key informants report the following as known efforts:

- Education and outreach for storm water utility
- Stream work related to fisheries
- National Water Quality Initiative
- Bank stabilization
- Water quality tracking
- General restoration work
- Education and outreach from the Gallatin Watershed Council
- Gallatin Stream Teams
- Water in the West Symposium

None of these efforts were named consistently by multiple informants. In fact, informants generally agreed that most community members are only vaguely aware of such efforts.

While some informants named education and outreach as current efforts, others attributed this lack of awareness to a lack of advertising and outreach efforts.

One informant described, *“We in our community are preaching to the choir, and there needs to be a broader general audience....If you are directly involved in something like that, you’re going to be aware, but otherwise you’re going to be not aware.”*

Another informant said,

“Well, it takes, I think a chorale of voices, to be speaking the same language and trying to hit target audiences with that message in order to inform the community that this is in fact an issue and it’s a time and resources, thing...But it all begins with awareness, that what you do at an individual level does in fact have an impact on water quality here in the Lower Gallatin.”

Other informants also noted that NPS pollution is a broad term, and a scientific term, so sometimes it is hard to describe and can mean different things to different people. The types of specific NPS pollution issues discussed in the interviews varied, and included:

- Storm water runoff, including construction storm water
- Pesticides and herbicides applied in agriculture operations as well as residentially
- Pollution from sewage and dog excrement

More information about lack of knowledge of NPS is described in the *D. Community Knowledge about Issue* section.

Successful outreach initiatives were mentioned as examples for opportunities where signage and outreach has created a culture shift,

"I think people are more knowledgeable about [dog excrement], for example, because I think the signage has been really effective, and bags, and all that. And so the culture has responded in a way that I think has picked up a lot of steam.... And then the drains too, the storm drains and those things are becoming more and more obvious as you walk around town and see these things, but the more of that, the better."

Policy efforts to address NPS were also addressed. Many informants could not name specific policies and felt the general public were not very aware of them either. Permitting requirements and regulations related to agriculture were mentioned; as was the fact that community members that had to deal with those regulations or permitting requirements were likely very aware of those policies. While such policies may help increase awareness of the issue since they require particular actions, informants were generally split on if they felt more regulations were needed, as the following quotes illustrate.

"Our community is divided in extremes, and I'd say there's probably half that say, 'We don't need any more regulation and laws and there are probably half that would say, 'We need a lot more.'"

"Is there a necessity for more rules and regulations? I'm sure there are. It's how it gets sold to the public that would be the challenge, I guess."

"You'll get further on voluntary and educational approaches than with increased regulatory."

"Grassroots only grow so deep. And I think the scope and the scale of the non-point source problem in Montana is large enough where the legislature really should take a hard look at enforcing it, but there's gonna be an enormous amount of push back"

B. Leadership

(To what extent are appointed leaders and influential community members supportive of the issue?)

Score: 4.30

Readiness Stage: Preplanning

In general, a score in Preplanning stage for this dimension means: Leadership believes that this issue is a concern in the community and that some type of effort is needed to address it. Although most may be passively supportive of current efforts, few are involved in developing, improving or implementing efforts.

Findings from interviews:

Informants generally discussed how leadership believes NPS pollution is a concern in the community and that some type of effort is needed to address it. However, they also noted that this concern may be overshadowed by other priorities elected leadership has to deal with and what their perspective on regulation is.

"I think amongst the leaders that there is knowledge of water issues and that it is a concern. Now, is it as big a concern as housing or roads? Hard to say. Maybe not, but I think it's a concern. And they're aware of it."

"I don't know if they're necessarily against water quality versus having someone... Someone else tell them what water quality we should be working towards... I think there's some other things that are more of a priority, so as long as efforts to work on non-point source pollution didn't take away from other programs, that they would be more liable to support that. But if it was one versus the other... It would depend on what the other item was, but they might be less inclined."

Generally, key informants felt positive about how leadership supports the issue and identified a few opportunities. One informant named several key leaders as potential allies in addressing this issue.

"I feel like there's a lot of good people, we just need to connect the dots on how we can use that as an asset, not just this myriad of different people thinking about different things."

Another informant felt that with more information and examples of success, leadership may become more active.

"I think initially it's gonna be passive support, but that will pivot into more active support for sure, once groups become established and show that they can effectively tackle these kind of projects and issues, and at that point, then I think these kind of leader entities that you speak of would be more willing to provide additional resources in the form of money and people."

C. Community Climate

(What is the prevailing attitude of the community toward the issue?)

Score: 3.38

Readiness Stage: Vague Awareness

In general, for this dimension, a score in this stage means: Some community members believe that this issue may be a concern in the community, but it is not seen as a priority. They show no motivation to act.

Findings from interviews:

Key informants spoke of contrasting levels of concern about NPS pollution in the community, as well as interest in actually tackling the problem.

"I think it is a priority or maybe not a priority. I think there's interest in the community to tackle the issue from a conceptual level, ... but conceptually being supportive of these kinds of improvements and actually figuring out ways to get them done are two different questions."

"I think there's some community members that take it very seriously and it's an important thing in their lives, and there's some that don't have any concern about it at all."

One key informant shared the following misconception which could explain why some people may not have any concern about the issue:

"I think the misconception is we live in Montana and we have beautiful clean water bodies and ... and that can be true in some places, but in the developing urban high growth county areas, these kinds of water resources are more at risk."

Informants felt the community climate could be improved with greater education and strong relationship building among the many entities involved in the issue, taking care not to "point fingers" at one particular group.

"I think if people are made aware of the nonpoint pollution threats that they will be more actively engaged. Again, it's one of these more sneaky problems, it's not as obvious as, say, not having water at all."

"I think the biggest caution and the biggest opportunity on these types of projects is how interaction occurs with the different groups within the community. So you're going to have the fisheries folks, you're going to have the guides, you're going to have the Cities and Towns, you're going to have the development community, you're going to have agriculture, and if any one of those entities is too, how do I say this, robust or too out there, I really feel like the other groups that might feel like the finger's being pointed at them, will dig their heels in and just push back, rather than work toward solutions."

D. Community Knowledge About the Issue

(To what extent do community members know about the causes and consequences of the problem?)

Score: 3.04

Readiness Stage: Vague Awareness

In general, for this dimension, a score in this stage means: At least some community members have vague knowledge about the issue, having heard of the issue, but little else. Among some community members, there may be misconceptions about the issue. Community members may be somewhat aware that the issue occurs locally.

Findings from interviews:

Informants commented that there is general knowledge in the community about pollution in their streams and watershed but most community members are unlikely to know much more about the issue.

Two reasons for this dynamic were shared: information that is available about the issue being too “scientific” and general misconceptions about the scope of the problem.

“Science has a bit of a marketing problem. And what I mean by that is not coming across as being a know-it-all elitist, which I think science has done for a number of years.... Education obviously is always a huge issue, but it’s how to educate, how to get people to understand the severity of the topic and not to scare them, but not speak down to them or refer over their head either.”

“From very much a lay person’s perspective, there aren’t... At least from what I’ve seen in thinking about talking to other folks, maybe they’re a little bit more technical in nature.”

Informants felt there were opportunities to find ways of conveying information about NPS pollution that would appeal to a more general audience, *“Making [information] available to a range of audiences and demographics and ages and again...making it easily understandable, digestible, making it engaging.”*

Misconceptions about NPS pollution centered around lack of knowledge about the scope of the problem and everyone’s part in it, as these direct quotes illustrate,

“I think a lot of people think that water quality is linked to agriculture and grazing and things like that, and I don’t think they realize a lot of it starts in their own backyard.”

“Well, I think people generally don’t distinguish between pollution and nonpoint pollution...If they know that their water doesn’t have a high quality there, I’m not sure... if they would know the difference. And I think there’s a misconception about how that impacts someone living within a more urban environment versus a more rural environment, and not making the connection between still being a water user and still experiencing some of those impacts.”

E. Resources Related to the Issue

(To what extent are local resources, e.g., people, time, money, space available to support efforts?)

Score: 3.63

Readiness Stage: Vague Awareness

In general, for this dimension, a score in this stage means: Current efforts may be funded, but the funding is not necessarily stable or continuing. There are **limited** resources (such as a community room) identified that could be used for further efforts to address the issue. There is little motivation to allocate these resources to this issue.

Findings from interviews:

Key informants felt the Gallatin Valley was rich in local experts, and had some other resources, such as volunteers and funding, available to address NPS pollution. They were unsure about the stability of funding for current efforts and did not see a lot of active work towards ensuring more resources are secured for future efforts.

Actions for increasing the readiness levels

In determining actions for increasing community readiness, it is generally best to focus on actions that address the dimensions with the lowest scores. The dimension with the lowest score is ***Knowledge of the Issue (3.04)***. Taking advantage of those areas with the highest scores can often help raise the lower scores. The dimension with the highest score is *Leadership*. So, for example, the leaders of those efforts could be used as resources to improve the community's knowledge of the issue.

Since there is general sentiment that water pollution may be a concern, residents of the Gallatin Valley watershed may be ready to absorb information about NPS pollution through public outreach initiatives. Key informants noted the abundance of local experts in the area. In addition to leaders, these experts can also be used as resources. Disseminating engaging information about the scope, consequences, and solutions for nonpoint source pollution could be effective in increasing the community's knowledge and improving the community climate toward this issue.

Stage 1: No Awareness

Goal: Raise awareness of the issue

- Identify key local stakeholders, including organizations, small groups, community leaders, and community members, within multiple sectors that the issue affects
- Build and maintain a list or database of identified stakeholders, along with their contact information (documenting this information now will come in handy in the future)
- Publish a report that summarizes local and scientific data pertaining to the issue (or find a relevant report that has already been published)
- Conduct brief phone calls or visits with targeted stakeholders to discuss the issue. If there is a report, share it with them. Pay particular attention to the details of these visits (message, communicator, etc.). Also, observe reactions and listen for feedback when providing information
- Get individuals in your social network excited and solicit their support – be creative! Give them ideas and information that they can post on their Facebook page or other outlets.
- Collect stories of local people who have been affected by this issue in this community and find creative ways to disseminate these.

Stage 2: Denial/Resistance

Goal: Raise awareness that the problem or issue exists in this community

- Continue actions from previous stage
- Scan for media articles that describe local critical incidents. Post them on social media and other places likely to be seen
- Reach out to local reporters who report on related issues and start to build a relationship with them
- Assess effective communication channels, messengers, and message. Develop a strategic communication plan to increase general public awareness
- Begin tracking City Council agendas and meetings to get informed on the local decision makers and how they may relate to your issue. Provide public comment about the problem or issue

Stage 3: Vague Awareness

Goal: Raise awareness that the community can do something

- Continue actions from previous stages
- Conduct informal local surveys or interviews to gauge interest and perspectives on the issue
- Gather key stakeholders to discuss issue together and assess if there is interest in forming a local coalition
- Get on agendas to present information at local community events and to unrelated community groups, using your effective messaging strategy
- Begin to initiate your own small, informal events to present information on this issue. They should tie in with the issue, be fun, and/or have other benefits to potential attendees.
- Publish newspaper editorials, including opinion pieces, letters to the editor, and news releases. Provide general information but always relate the information to the local situation. Utilize relationships with local reporters to get stories published
- Develop a communications plan to address broad public outreach
- Conduct a formal or informal power analysis to recognize the decision makers related to your issue at the local, state and/or federal levels

Stage 4: Preplanning

Goal: Raise awareness with concrete ideas to combat condition

- Continue actions from previous stages
- Continue periodic meetings of stakeholders to inform and invite discussion about the issue and ideas for solutions. If forming a coalition, decide on an appropriate structure and purpose for the coalition
- Review the existing efforts in community (e.g., curriculum, programs, activities) to determine who benefits and the degree of success
- Conduct informal surveys of local experience related to the issue by phone or door to door
- Conduct local focus groups to discuss issues and develop strategies
- Identify other stakeholder engagement opportunities and recruit volunteers
- Begin to visit local leaders identified through your power analysis to inform and invest them in the cause
- Increase media exposure through radio and TV public service announcements and other forms of social media.

Appendix A: Interview Questions for Gallatin Watershed Council

Community Readiness Interview Questions

Interview checklist

1. Show powerpoint slide of boundary map of the Lower Gallatin Watershed and definition of NPS Pollution on shared zoom screen
2. Start recording on zoom, start recording on iPhone just in case

Pre-Interview script

- We really appreciate your time, thank you so much. This should take about an hour, I'll start recording in a minute here, but first I'm going to share my screen and give a brief background on what we're doing this if that's okay.
- My name is _____ and I'm calling on behalf of the Gallatin Watershed Council in Bozeman. _____ who we work with a lot on projects gave me your contact info, do you work pretty closely with the city parks on your development projects?
- Through a DEQ sponsored grant, GWC is working with a consulting group called 5th House Consulting to conduct a Community Readiness Assessment, or CRA, to help prepare our watershed for DEQ's incoming focus watershed funding.
- The Community Readiness Assessment (CRA), developed by researchers at the Tri-Ethnic Center for Prevention Research, measures the degree to which a community, in our case, the Lower Gallatin Watershed, is willing and prepared to take action on an issue. Our issue is nonpoint source pollution. Conducting a CRA will directly help GWC move forward and be more successful in its watershed health initiatives.... through providing a measurement of community readiness, identifying our community's strengths, weaknesses and obstacles, and recommending appropriate actions that match our readiness level. The model measures the attitudes, beliefs, efforts, and knowledge of community members and leadership in order to assess a community's readiness to address an issue.
- As part of this process, we are interviewing key people in our watershed to gain their perspective on what the community thinks, in order to better understand the community's readiness. This method is supposed to be more effective than say sending out a survey to the entire community, researchers found that by doing a few key informant interviews, you can get results pretty close to the results that would you get if every community member in our watershed were to fill out a survey.
- As you can see on the slide, our community is defined as the boundaries of the LGW and the issue is nonpoint source pollution, which is further defined on the slide. *Read off NPS definition.
- The questions are going to seem a bit robotic so I apologize in advance, but the main thing is to try to answer the questions not from your personal perspective but from the community's perspective. It's normal to speak on behalf of the community that you know, we're not asking you to speak about the perspective of the entire watershed, but rather the perspective of the specific sector within the watershed that you may interact with the most.
- So, some of these questions might not be particularly relevant to your specific community, but just keep in mind that there are right answers, and we're just trying to engage a diverse community perspective and have varying sectors within our watershed community represented.
- Do you have any questions?
- I'll be recording the interview, and all of the content of the interview will remain confidential.

1. For the following question, please answer keeping in mind your perspective of what community members believe and not what you personally believe.

On a scale from 1-10, how much of a concern is nonpoint source pollution to members of the lower Gallatin watershed, with 1 being “not a concern at all” and 10 being “a very great concern”?

(Scorer note: Community Climate)

Can you tell me why you think it’s at that level?

Interviewer: Please ensure that the respondent answers this question in regards to **community members** not in regards to themselves or what they think it should be.

COMMUNITY KNOWLEDGE OF EFFORTS

I’m going to ask you about current community efforts to address nonpoint source pollution in our watershed. By efforts, I mean any programs, activities, or services in our community that address nonpoint source pollution.

2. Are there efforts in the Lower Gallatin Watershed that address nonpoint source pollution?

If **Yes**, continue to question 3; if **No**, skip to question 16.

3. Can you briefly describe each of these efforts?

4. About how many community members are aware of each of the following aspects of the efforts - none, a few, some, many, or most?

- Have heard of efforts?
- Can name efforts?
- Know the purpose of the efforts?
- Know who the efforts are for?
- Know how the efforts work (e.g. activities or how they’re implemented)?
- Know the effectiveness of the efforts?

5. Thinking back to your answers, why do you think members of your community have this amount of knowledge?

6. Are there misconceptions or incorrect information among community members about the current efforts? If yes: What are these?

7. What are the obstacles to individuals participating in these efforts?

8. What are the strengths of these efforts?

9. What planning for additional efforts to address nonpoint source pollution is going on in the lower Gallatin watershed?

Only ask #10 if the respondent answered "No" to #2 or was unsure.

- 10. Is anyone in the lower Gallatin watershed trying to get something started to address nonpoint source pollution? Can you tell me about that?**

LEADERSHIP

Now I'm going to ask you how the leadership in the lower Gallatin watershed perceives nonpoint source pollution. By leadership, we are referring to those who could affect the outcome of this issue and those who have influence in the community and/or who lead the community in helping it achieve its goals.

- 11. Using a scale from 1-10, how much of a concern is nonpoint source pollution to the leadership within the lower Gallatin watershed, with 1 being "not a concern at all" and 10 being "a very great concern"?**

Can you tell me why you say it's a ____?

- 12. How much of a priority is addressing nonpoint source pollution to leadership?**

Can you explain why you say this?

- 13. I'm going to read a list of ways that community leaders might show their support or their lack of support for current, expanded, or new community efforts to address nonpoint source pollution.**

Can you please tell me whether none, a few, some, many or most leaders would or do show their support in this way? Also, feel free to explain your responses as we move through the list.

How many community leaders...

- Speak out publicly in favor of efforts, for example at council meetings or in the media?
- Participate in developing, improving or implementing efforts, for example by attending committee or group meetings that are working toward these efforts?
- Play a key role as a leader or driving force in planning, developing or implementing efforts?
- Silently support efforts without being active in that support?
- Support allocating resources to fund community efforts?
- Play a key role in ensuring the long-term viability of community efforts?
- Actively oppose community efforts, for example, by speaking out against them?
- Silently oppose community efforts?

- 14. Would the leadership support expanded efforts in the community to address nonpoint source pollution?**

If yes: How might they show this support? For example, by passively supporting, by being involved in developing the efforts, or by being a driving force or key player in achieving these expanded efforts?

COMMUNITY CLIMATE

The next section is about community climate. For the following questions, again please answer keeping in mind your perspective of what community members believe and not what you personally believe.

15. How much of a priority is addressing the issue of nonpoint source pollution to community members?

Can you explain your answer?

16. I'm going to read a list of ways that community members might show their support or their lack of support for community efforts to address nonpoint source pollution.

Can you please tell me whether none, a few, some, many or most community members would or do show their support in this way? Also, feel free to explain your responses as we move through the list.

How many community members...

- Silently or passively support community efforts without being active in that support?
- Speak out publicly in favor of community efforts?
- Volunteer for community efforts?
- Participate in developing, improving or implementing efforts, for example by attending committee or group meetings that are working toward these efforts?
- Are willing to pay more in taxes to help fund community efforts?
- Donate money to help fund efforts?
- Actively oppose community efforts, for example, by speaking out against them?
- Silently oppose community efforts?

17. About how many community members would support expanding efforts in the community to address nonpoint source pollution? Would you say none, a few, some, many or most?

If more than none: How might they show this support? For example, by passively supporting or by being actively involved in developing the efforts?

KNOWLEDGE ABOUT THE ISSUE- second to last section

This next section focuses on community knowledge about the issue.

18. On a scale of 1 to 10 where a 1 is no knowledge and a 10 is detailed knowledge, how much do community members know about nonpoint source pollution?

Only ask if not talkative: Why do you say it's a ____?

19. Would you say that community members know nothing, a little, some or a lot about each of the following as they pertain to nonpoint source pollution? *(After each item, have them answer.)*
- nonpoint source pollution, in general *(Prompt as needed with “nothing, a little, some or a lot”.)*
 - the signs and symptoms
 - the causes
 - the consequences
 - how prevalent nonpoint source pollution is in our waterways
 - what can be done to prevent or treat nonpoint source pollution
 - the effects of nonpoint source pollution on community members?
20. What are the misconceptions among community members about nonpoint source pollution, e.g., why it occurs, how much it occurs locally, or what the consequences are?

Last section RESOURCES FOR EFFORTS *(time, money, people, space, etc.)*

Now we will talk about resources for local efforts.

If there are efforts to address the issue locally, begin with question 21. If there are no efforts, go to question 25.

21. How are current efforts funded? Is this funding likely to continue into the future?
22. I’m now going to read you a list of resources that could be used to address nonpoint source pollution in your community. For each of these, please indicate whether there is none, a little, some or a lot of that resource available in your community that could be used to address nonpoint source pollution.
- Volunteers? (none, a little, some, a lot)
 - Financial donations from organizations and/or businesses?
 - Grant funding? quantity and money amount of grants
 - Experts?
23. Would community members and leadership support using these resources to address nonpoint source pollution? Please explain.
24. On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is no effort and 5 is a great effort, how much effort are community members and/or leadership putting into doing each of the following things to increase the resources going toward addressing nonpoint source pollution in your community?
- Seeking volunteers for current or future efforts to address nonpoint source pollution
 - Soliciting donations from businesses or other organizations to fund current or expanded community efforts.
 - Writing grant proposals to obtain funding to address nonpoint source pollution
 - Training community members to become experts.
 - Recruiting experts to the community.

25. Are you aware of any proposals or action plans that have been submitted for funding to address nonpoint source pollution in the lower Gallatin watershed?

If Yes: Please explain.

Additional policy-related questions:

26. What formal policies and laws related to nonpoint source pollution are in place in your community?
27. Is there a need to expand these policies and laws? If so, are there plans to expand them? Please explain.
28. Is the community aware of these policies and laws?
If yes, how does the community view these policies and laws?

that was last question, do you have anything else to add before i stop recording?

**** End of survey****

Thank you so much for your time. We hope to have the interviews finished by November and will be publishing an action plan early in 2020, we can share the final report with you if you are interested.

Appendix B: Rating Scales Used for Scoring

Dimension A. Community Knowledge of Current Efforts

Note: If there are no efforts, this dimension receives a N/A (not applicable).

(Those directly involved in local efforts are not included in the definition of “community members”)

- 1 Community has no knowledge about local efforts addressing the issue.
-
-
-
- 2 Community members have misconceptions or incorrect knowledge about current efforts.
-
-
-
- 3 **A few** community members have at least heard about local efforts, but **know little about them**.
For example, they know local efforts exist and may recognize their names, but they have little other knowledge.
-
-
-
- 4 **Some** community members have at least heard about local efforts, but **know little about them**.
For example, they know local efforts exist and may recognize their names, but they have little other knowledge.
-
-
-
- 5 **Most** community members have at least heard about local efforts. For example, they know local efforts exist and may recognize their names, but they have little other knowledge.
-
-
-
- 6 **Most** community members have at least **basic** knowledge of local efforts. For example, they can identify specific efforts and their basic purposes.
-
-
-
- 7 **Most** community members have **more than basic** knowledge of local efforts, including names of specific efforts, basic purposes, target audiences, and other specific information about the efforts.
-
-
-
- 8 **Most** community members have **considerable** knowledge of local efforts, including the level of program effectiveness.
-
-
-
- 9 **Most** community members have **considerable and detailed** knowledge of local efforts, including the level of program effectiveness and evaluation data on how well the different local efforts are working and their benefits and limitations.

Dimension B. Leadership

(includes elected and appointed leaders & influential community members)

- 1 Leadership believes that the issue **is not** a concern.
-
-
-
- 2 Leadership believes that this issue **is** a concern, in general, but believes that it **is not** a concern in this community.
OR
Leadership believes that this issue is a concern in this community, but **doesn't think it can or should be addressed**.
-
-
-
- 3 Leadership **believes that this issue may be a concern in the community**. They show no immediate motivation to act. It may not be seen as a priority.
-
-
-
- 4 Leadership **acknowledges that this issue is a concern in the community** and that some type of effort is needed to address it. They may be supportive of current efforts. They are not involved in work to develop, evaluate, or improve efforts.
-
-
-
- 5 Leadership is **actively supportive of continuing or improving current efforts** or in developing new efforts (possibly attending committee or group meetings that are working toward these efforts). They are not key players or driving forces in these activities.
-
-
-
- 6 Leadership **plays a key role in planning, developing and/or implementing new, modified, or increased efforts**, possibly as key players in groups or committees, as public proponents, and/or as driving forces behind these activities.
-
-
-
- 7 Leadership is **actively involved** in ensuring or improving the **long-term viability** of the efforts to address this issue.
-
-
-
- 8 Leadership **plays a key role in expanding and improving efforts**, through evaluating and modifying efforts, seeking new resources, and/or helping develop and implement new efforts.
-
-
-
- 9 Leadership is continually reviewing evaluation results of the efforts and is modifying financial support accordingly.

Dimension C. Community Climate

(Those directly involved in local efforts are not included in the definition of “community members”.)

- 1 The community believes that the issue is not a concern.
-
-
-
- 2 The community believes that this issue **is** a concern, in general, but believes that it **is not** a concern in this community.
OR
Community believes that this issue is a concern in this community, but doesn’t think it can or should be addressed.
-
-
-
- 3 The community **believes that this issue may be a concern in the community**. They show no immediate motivation to act. It may not be seen as a priority.
-
-
-
- 4 The community **acknowledges that this issue is a concern in the community** and that some type of effort is needed to address it. They may be passively supportive of current efforts. They may feel as if current efforts are sufficient to address the issue.
-
-
-
- 5 The attitude in the community is “**We are concerned** about this and **we want to do** something about it”. They may believe that current efforts are not sufficient to address the issue or that current efforts should be improved.
-
-
-
- 6 The attitude in the community is “**This is our responsibility**”, and some community members are **involved** in addressing the issue through planning, developing and/or implementing new, modified, or increased efforts.
-
-
-
- 7 The attitude in the community is “We **have taken** responsibility”. There is **ongoing** community involvement in addressing the issue.
-
-
-
- 8 The majority of the community **strongly** supports efforts or the need for efforts. Participation level is high. “We need to continue our efforts and make sure what we are doing is effective.”
-
-
-
- 9 **Most** major segments of the community are highly supportive. Community members are actively involved in evaluating and improving efforts and they demand accountability.

Dimension D. Community Knowledge about the Issue

(Those directly involved in local efforts are not included in the definition of “community members”.)

- 1 Community members have **no** knowledge about the issue.
-
-
- 2 **Only a few** community members have **knowledge** about the issue. There may be many misconceptions among community members about the issue, how and where it occurs, and why it needs addressing. There may be little knowledge among community members about its occurrence locally or why it may be a problem locally.
-
-
- 3 Community members have only **vague knowledge** about the issue (e.g. they have some awareness that the issue can be problem and why it may occur). Among some community members, there may be misconceptions about the issue, how and where it occurs, and why it needs addressing.
-
-
- 4 Community members have **limited knowledge** about the issue. For example, they have some awareness that the issue can be problem and they know some limited information about causes, consequences, signs and symptoms. They may know that the issue occurs locally, but they may have little knowledge about how much it occurs locally and/or its causes and consequences.
-
-
- 5 Community members have **basic knowledge** about the issue. For example, they are aware of why the issue is a problem, and they have some basic knowledge about causes, consequences, signs and symptoms. They are aware that the issue occurs locally, but they may **have little knowledge about how much it occurs locally** and/or what can be done to address it.
-
-
- 6 Community members have **basic knowledge** about the issue. For example, they are aware of why the issue is a problem, and they have some basic knowledge about causes, consequences, signs and symptoms. They are **aware that the issue occurs locally**, and they have some knowledge about how much it occurs locally, its effect on the community, and/or what can be done to address it.
-
-
- 7 Community members have **more than basic** knowledge about the issue. For example, they understand the causes, consequences, signs and symptoms. They are **aware that the issue occurs locally**, and they have some knowledge about how much it occurs locally, its effect on the community, and/or what can be done to address it.
-
-
- 8 Community members have **more than basic** knowledge about the issue (e.g., they understand the causes, consequences, signs and symptoms). They also have **significant** knowledge about **local prevalence**, its effect on the community, and/or what can be done to address it.
-
-
- 9 Community members have **detailed** knowledge about the issue, are **aware** of its effect on the community, and have **significant** knowledge about **local prevalence**.

Dimension E. Resources Related to the Issue

(people, money, time, space, etc.)

- 1 There are **no** resources available for dealing with the issue.
-
-
-
- 2 Community members and/or leaders do not support using available resources to address this issue.
-
-
-
- 3 Current efforts may be funded, but the funding is not necessarily stable or continuing. There are **limited** resources (such as a community room) identified that could be used for further efforts to address the issue. There is little motivation to allocate these resources to this issue.
-
-
-
- 4 Current efforts may be funded, but the funding may not be stable or continuing. There are **limited** resources identified that could be used for further efforts to address the issue. Some community members or leaders are looking into using these resources to address the issue.
-
-
-
- 5 There are **some** resources identified that could be used for further efforts to address the issue. Some community members or leaders are actively working to secure these resources; for example, they may be soliciting donations, writing grant proposals, and seeking volunteers. Current efforts may be funded, but the funding may not be stable or continuing.
-
-
-
- 6 Resources have been obtained and/or allocated to support further efforts to address this issue.
-
-
-
- 7 A considerable part of allocated resources for efforts are from sources that are expected to provide **continuous** support.
-
-
-
- 8 A considerable part of allocated resources are from sources that are expected to provide **continuous** support. Community members are looking into **additional** support to implement **new** efforts.
-
-
-
- 9 Diversified resources and funds are secured, and efforts are expected to be ongoing. There is **additional** support for **new** efforts.

Appendix C: Stages and Dimensions of Community Readiness

Stages Of Readiness

Stage	Description
1. No Awareness	Issue is not generally recognized by the community or leaders as a problem (or it may truly not be an issue).
2. Denial / Resistance	At least some community members recognize that it is a concern, but there is little recognition that it might be occurring locally.
3. Vague Awareness	Most feel that there is a local concern, but there is no immediate motivation to do anything about it.
4. Preplanning	There is clear recognition that something must be done, and there may even be a group addressing it. However, efforts are not focused or detailed.
5. Preparation	Active leaders begin planning in earnest. Community offers modest support of efforts.
6. Initiation	Enough information is available to justify efforts. Activities are underway.
7. Stabilization	Activities are supported by administrators or community decision makers. Staff are trained and experienced.
8. Confirmation/ Expansion	Efforts are in place. Community members feel comfortable using services, and they support expansions. Local data are regularly obtained.
9. High Level of Community Ownership	Detailed and sophisticated knowledge exists about prevalence, causes, and consequences. Effective evaluation guides new directions. Model is applied to other issues.

Appendix D: Dimensions Of Readiness

Dimensions of readiness are key factors that influence your community's preparedness to take action on an issue. The five dimensions identified and measured in the Community Readiness Model are very comprehensive in nature. They are an excellent tool for diagnosing your community's needs and for developing strategies that meet those needs.

- A. **Community Knowledge of the Efforts**: To what extent do community members know about local efforts and their effectiveness, and are the efforts accessible to all segments of the community?
- B. **Leadership**: To what extent are appointed leaders and influential community members supportive of the issue?
- C. **Community Climate**: What is the prevailing attitude of the community toward the issue? Is it one of helplessness or one of responsibility and empowerment?
- D. **Community Knowledge about the Issue**: To what extent do community members know about the causes of the problem, consequences, and how it impacts your community?
- E. **Resources Related to the Issue**: To what extent are local resources – people, time, money, space, etc. – available to support efforts?

Your community's status with respect to each of the dimensions forms the basis of the overall level of community readiness.

Appendix E: References

Oetting, E. R., Donnermeyer, J. F., Plested, B. A., Edwards, K. K., & Beauvals, F. (1995). Assessing community readiness for prevention. *The International Journal of the Addiction*, 30(6), 659–683.

Oetting ER, Plested B, Edwards RW, Thurman PJ, Kelly KJ, Beauvais F. Community readiness for community change: Tri-Ethnic Center community readiness handbook. Edited by Stanley L, 2nd edn: Colorado State University; 2014.

Prochaska, J. O., DiClemente, C. C., & Norcross, J. C. (1992). In search of how people change: Applications to addictive behaviors. *American Psychologist*, 47(9), 1102–1114.