

Director's Roundtable: Connecting with Citizens

Final Report and Action Plan

Jeffrey Koenings, Ph.D., Director

January, 2002

Contents

Introduction	Page 1
Director’s Roundtable process	Page 2
Highlights of results	Page 4
Action Plan	Page 7
Roundtable summaries	Page 12
Roundtable participants	Page 17
Citizen survey	Page 20
WDFW employee discussions	Page 28
Employee survey	Page 30

Appendices: *Specific comments from Citizen Survey questions*

- Appendix 1:** Comments in response to #1f
- Appendix 2:** Comments in response to #2e
- Appendix 3:** Comments in response to #3c
- Appendix 4:** Comments in response to #4

Introduction

When I became director of the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife three years ago, one of my goals was to improve the way the agency interacted with citizens. How did we inform citizens about our activities? Which of our information products were people using, and which ones were they ignoring? Were we giving people enough of an opportunity to be involved in our deliberative processes? Were we providing them with the technical and other information they wanted at the local level?

To answer these questions and formulate a plan to make improvements in the way we do business, I convened a series of informal discussions around the state. The discussions, called “Director’s Roundtables: Connecting With Citizens,” were held in the fall of 2001 in each of the Department’s six administrative regions and Olympia. The agency’s regional directors and I established citizen panels representing a wide range of fish and wildlife interests to insure the Department heard from a cross-section of Washington citizens.

The discussions were overseen by an impartial, private facilitator, and focused on three specific areas: interpersonal communications, public involvement and information products. To help them prepare, panelists were provided background material on WDFW’s efforts in those three areas. Once the discussions began, citizens were encouraged to provide feedback on their perceptions of the Department’s performance in these three areas, and to recommend improvements. While the Roundtables were underway, a citizen survey on the same topics was posted on the Department’s Internet website so that citizens at large could express their opinions.

Simultaneously, meetings were held in each region and Olympia with Department employees to get their opinions and ideas on how we could make improvements in public communications. Employees were also asked to complete a survey.

I’m pleased to report that the Roundtables were a success. Participation was good, and the comments received were extremely helpful. Much of the feedback confirmed that the Department is doing many things right, and employees were roundly praised by citizens for their high degree of professionalism and dedication. A number of comments shed insight on how we might improve the way we interact with citizens, while other comments identified challenges that the Department hadn’t focused on before. All the input helped identify short-term and long-term action plans for improvement.

Included in this report are the results of the Roundtable discussions and surveys and our action plans. I am confident this effort has helped us look at ourselves in ways we might not have otherwise, and helped us grow as an agency. For that, I thank all of you who took the time to participate.

Jeffrey Koenings, Ph.D., Director
Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife

Director's Roundtable process

The Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) "Director's Roundtable: Connecting With Citizens" effort was undertaken in the fall of 2001 for the public to critique the effectiveness of WDFW's public outreach efforts and make suggestions for improvement.

The core of the Roundtable effort was an opportunity for Washington citizens from a wide range of occupations and interests to talk candidly with WDFW Director Jeffrey Koenings, specifically about interpersonal communication, public involvement, and information products. These discussions were conducted by Director Koenings in seven meetings during October and November 2001, one each in WDFW's six administrative regions across the state and a seventh statewide session in Olympia. The Roundtable discussion panels were composed of invited participants representing diverse fish and wildlife interests to insure hearing a wide range of opinions. The meetings were open to the public, but the discussions focused on the invited participants.

Roundtable participants represented agriculture, animal welfare, business, civic groups, local government, education, environmental groups, fishers, hunters, landowners, wildlife viewers and other resource users. WDFW regional directors nominated participants from their areas and eight to 12 of those individuals were selected by Director Koenings for each Roundtable. Individuals representing statewide interest groups were selected for the Olympia Roundtable panel. Those who agreed to participate were provided with information packets detailing WDFW's current efforts in interpersonal communication, public involvement and information products.

A total of 68 individuals, from among 75 invited, participated in the seven roundtables. Each Roundtable discussion ran approximately three hours. (*Roundtable dates, locations, participants and non-attending invitees are listed in Appendix A of this report.*)

The Roundtable discussions addressed the current status of and future improvements to interpersonal communications with the public, public involvement processes, and information products. They were facilitated by Vicki King of Triangle Associates, a Seattle public involvement consulting firm contracted by WDFW. Assisting in the discussion were WDFW regional directors. Participant comments were recorded and displayed by a notetaker at each meeting, then posted on WDFW's Internet website along with Director Koenings' own summary of each discussion (<http://www.wa.gov/wdfw/roundtable/>).

Concurrent with the Roundtable discussions, a citizen survey was posted on the WDFW Internet website. The citizen survey, while not scientifically structured for statistical analysis, was created by WDFW staff and the project facilitator to collect feedback on the effectiveness of WDFW outreach efforts. The survey was also available in paper form at the Roundtable meetings. A total of 173 citizens completed the survey. (*Citizen survey results are included in this report; complete comments are available on the website.*)

Following the Roundtables, meetings were held with WDFW employees in regional offices and Olympia headquarters. The meetings were conducted by Director Koenings, who briefed

employees on citizen remarks from the preceding Roundtable sessions. Employees worked in small groups of 8 to 12, led by the project facilitator, to develop ideas for improvement in WDFW interpersonal communications, public involvement and information products. More than half the Department's 1,600 employees were able to attend the meetings.

An employee survey on the Roundtable topics was created with assistance from the project facilitator. The survey was posted on WDFW's Intranet (internal website) and made available in paper form at the employee meetings. A total of 280 employees completed the survey. *(Results of the employee survey are included in this report.)*

Highlights of results

The Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) is doing a fairly good job in communicating with the people it serves, especially considering staff limitations, but there's room for improvement.

That was the common theme of comments from WDFW's "Director's Roundtable: Connecting With Citizens" effort, including discussions with invited participants, a citizen survey, meetings with employees, and an employee survey.

The opinions were collected in an effort to gauge the effectiveness of WDFW's interpersonal communications, public involvement and information products and to collect suggestions for improvement.

Regarding **interpersonal communications**, a majority of both citizens and employees felt response to public inquiries is fairly good, but that more staff is needed throughout the Department. Regional roundtable participants, in particular, noted the value of field staff who understand and respond to local issues and concerns. Citizens said WDFW employees should aim for quicker response time, more positive attitudes about customer service and providing more consistent information. They also recommended a staff directory, in both electronic and paper form, that provides contact numbers to help citizens expedite their requests for information.

WDFW employees echoed those sentiments and suggested other ways to improve interpersonal communications. A majority noted that WDFW first needs to improve internal Department communications, with more complete and consistent information exchange and team work among programs and between headquarters and the field. Most said WDFW should provide public relations and communication training for many, if not all employees. Many also said WDFW needs to make public service a priority of every employee's job, allocating time in work plans for more public interaction, setting public service standards, and ultimately instilling a strong public service ethic in the work force.

Employees ranked customer service and field contacts as the top two interpersonal communications priorities. Most thought WDFW current customer service is highly effective, but only about a third ranked current field contacts as highly effective.

Both citizens and employees praised WDFW's education programs and said the Department should do more in that area. NatureMapping projects using Geographical Information System (GIS) technology, and other education efforts that give students hands-on experience while providing valuable data for WDFW, were especially commended.

Citizens said WDFW should be more open to help from outside the agency, especially in financially difficult times when adding staff is not possible. More partnerships and use of volunteers were strongly encouraged.

In the area of **public involvement**, citizens had differing views on whether their input is heard and used in a timely way, or whether they have access to adequate information. Some indicated they don't believe WDFW genuinely wants their input and suspect decisions are made before public opinions are sought. Hunting and fishing license vendors represented at three of the seven roundtables insisted they be more involved to be more effective in helping WDFW with customer service.

Most employees, on the other hand, felt the public is adequately involved. Most felt the regulation-setting process is the most important way for citizens to be involved, and most ranked that effort as moderately to highly effective.

Citizens suggested that more "roundtable" type sessions be conducted, especially at the regional level where they feel most connected to the agency. A majority asked for more Internet website surveys and earlier notification of meetings and deadlines for public comment.

Employees recommended expanding volunteer opportunities to involve the public and reaching out to "non-traditional" constituencies rather than seeking input solely from traditional fishing and hunting constituencies. Some also suggested more informal public input sessions be conducted in the field, not just when the Department needs input for regulations, but also to allow the public to get to know staff better.

Concerning **information products**, WDFW's website was far and away considered the most popular and effective tool by both citizens and employees. It was highly praised in the Roundtable discussions and was ranked moderately to highly effective by 81 percent of citizen survey respondents and by 96 percent of employee survey respondents. Expanding and improving the website was a high priority. Developing interactive features for regulation information and providing more down-loadable scientific documents were stressed.

Citizens were divided in their views on the effectiveness of fishing and hunting regulation pamphlets. Comments from the roundtables and survey questions indicated a high need for these products but dissatisfaction with them. Simplifying or otherwise improving regulation pamphlets were common suggestions.

Most employees (83 percent) ranked regulation pamphlets as a high priority, but only 30 percent ranked them as highly effective. Pamphlet improvement was second only to website maintenance as most frequently noted suggestion by employees.

Most citizens wanted more hunting and fishing information provided through the Internet website or e-mail listserves. Many also wanted explanations of regulations, WDFW budget information, and maps of public lands.

Employees cited many of the same priorities and noted a need to have information products available both electronically and in printed form for easier distribution and posting. Many employees also noted a need for more information on individual WDFW properties or facilities, more technical assistance and advice for property owners, a printed magazine and more use of the news media.

Action Plan

Based on the Roundtable discussions and surveys, WDFW will implement a number of key recommendations within the next year. In addition, the Department has identified recommendations that will be implemented over a longer period of time.

It is expected that both the short-term and long-term action plans will be supplemented with additional citizen suggestions emanating from Regional Roundtable meetings held in 2002.

The Department's goal is to implement as many citizen suggestions as feasible.

SHORT-TERM ACTION ITEMS

ISSUE: Regional operations

Regional operations and interpersonal relationships were repeatedly cited as essential building blocks to good constituent relations. Whether providing technical assistance or other services to the public, strong regional operations were ranked as WDFW's most important asset in dealing with constituents. It was suggested that Regional Roundtable meetings, similar to the Director Roundtable sessions, be held to further explore ways to strengthen relations between regional staff and constituents.

ACTION:

Regional Directors will organize Regional Roundtable meetings this year to identify ways to improve constituent relations and develop plans to implement improvements. The meetings will be conducted in a similar fashion to the Director Roundtable meetings, with invited participants but also open to the public.

ISSUE: License vendor communications

License vendors who participated in the Director's Roundtables expressed frustration over several issues, and suggested there needs to be a systematic way for them to communicate with the Department. Since they deal with fishers, hunters and other recreationists seeking licensing and other services on a regular basis, vendors said they could more effectively assist WDFW if they could share their experiences and opinions on a regular, routine basis with WDFW and other vendors.

ACTION:

A permanent advisory group comprised of license vendors from across the state will be appointed by the Director to work with WDFW personnel. The group is expected to address existing and emerging issues, and will meet at least once each year. Membership will rotate on a schedule to be determined by the advisory group.

ISSUE: Vendor distribution of WDFW information products

Many Roundtable participants suggested that license vendors be used to distribute more WDFW information products.

ACTION:

The newly-formed License Advisory Group will consider this suggestion as soon as possible to determine its feasibility.

ISSUE: Information delivery

At all Roundtable meetings, WDFW's website was praised for the information it provides. Many people were appreciative of the website as a means to retrieve Department news, fact sheets, technical papers and other information. However, participants strongly recommended development of electronic mailing lists to target specific information to interested constituents. For example, anglers could enter their names on a WDFW e-mail list and automatically be alerted when new fishing regulation information becomes available. Such electronic mailing lists would allow individuals to forego searching the Department's entire website to locate information on subjects of particular interest.

ACTION:

WDFW Information Services will work with resource programs to develop electronic mailing lists. In addition, the resource programs themselves will work with their own constituent groups to encourage the groups to use their own e-mail lists to disseminate WDFW information products. During the Roundtable meetings, representatives of a number of groups said they would gladly provide this service to WDFW.

ISSUE: Accessibility of regulation information

While fishing and hunting regulation information is presently posted on the Department's website, some participants said it can be difficult to find and retrieve specific information. Some participants, including WDFW's own customer service specialists, urged development of an "interactive" website that would allow users to obtain such information with greater ease.

ACTION:

WDFW's Information Services Program will identify the resources needed to post regulation information interactively.

ISSUE: Staff directory

Many citizens and employees asked for an electronic directory of WDFW staff e-mail addresses, organized by program, project or area of expertise. Such a directory would ease the workload of customer service staff, reduce the time involved in reaching a particular employee and generally expedite information searches.

ACTION:

Information Services will develop a staff contact directory for the Department's website.

ISSUE: Building stronger partnerships

Many Roundtable participants suggested WDFW work to develop stronger partnerships to (a) develop informational products about recreational activities offered by the Department and promote public participation in those activities; and (b) assist in resource management tasks such as the collection of field data.

ACTION:

The Director's Office recently re-organized its Outreach and Education staff to emphasize a focus on building partnerships through its "Go Play Outside" initiative. The initiative, already underway, will bring together a broad spectrum of constituent groups to inform the public about recreational activities provided by the Department, and promote public involvement in those activities. At the same time, WDFW resource data and survey managers will develop standards and guidelines for field staff to more consistently use volunteer partners in data collection efforts.

ISSUE : Need for maps

A frequently heard recommendation during the Roundtable discussions was the need for the Department to develop easy-to-read maps to assist constituents in finding and navigating WDFW lands, and the activities available on those lands.

ACTION:

WDFW's Wildlife Program, which manages Department lands, will set aside the necessary funding to begin producing maps this year.

ISSUE: Public involvement calendar

A number of Roundtable participants said there was a strong need for a public involvement calendar posted on the Department's website, and available in printed form at WDFW offices and license vendors.

ACTION:

Public Affairs, working in conjunction with resource programs, will develop such a calendar.

LONG-TERM ACTION ITEMS**ISSUE: Need for more information posted on website**

Roundtable participants expressed a need for WDFW's website to post more resource program information in general, particularly scientific reports and other documents.

ACTION:

The Department's webmaster, working in conjunction with Information Services and the resource programs, will develop a website strategic plan for the Director's Office to insure the Department's website evolves to reflect constituent needs and new technology.

ISSUE: Improved internal communications

A number of Roundtable participants noted the need for improved internal communications, particularly between field personnel and those working in Olympia.

ACTION:

WDFW's Management Team will explore strategies to improve internal communications and insure policies and decisions emanating from those policies are clearly communicated to all employees throughout the agency.

ISSUE: Communications training

Citizens and employees suggested more training for WDFW staff in interpersonal communications and public relations.

ACTION:

WDFW's Personnel Office will examine the availability of such programs and publicize offerings to employees.

ISSUE: Need for additional regional staffing

One of the most common opinions expressed by both citizens and employees was the need for more regional staff to respond to the unique resource challenges faced in each region.

ACTION:

At present, approximately 52 % of WDFW staff are assigned to the Department's six regions, and the agency's budget is not sufficient to add regional staff in the short term. However, management will continue to study staffing levels to determine hiring priorities for the future.

Roundtable Summaries

Director's notes from Roundtable sessions

Ephrata, Oct. 22, 2001

- C Roundtable participants felt the most effective interpersonal communications with WDFW staff occurred at the local level. Interaction with local staff constituted the most consistent contact with the Department, and participants viewed service as generally excellent.
- C The biggest concern voiced was related to problem wildlife –both dangerous wildlife (cougars and bears), as well as crop damage (deer and elk).
- C Public involvement in the Conservation Resource Management process appears to have broken down over the issue of grazing on Pygmy Rabbit habitat. At least one participant felt WDFW managers were unwilling to have meaningful dialogue on the issue.
- C A number of participants said the best communication vehicles are the WDFW web site and e-mail. One suggestion: look at instituting list serves to target constituents with information pertinent to their specific interests.
- C Some participants said there is a big need to get youth involved in - and knowledgeable about - responsible resource use and management. Several said we should consider involving Educational Service Districts in this activity.
- C Several in attendance said they found the Roundtable to be extremely useful as a communications tool, and suggested the Department conduct regional Roundtable discussions with stakeholders and volunteers.

Olympia, Oct. 26, 2001

- C Several participants said WDFW needs to improve its response time to both legislative and biological information requests. Customer service is spotty, especially with regard to returning phone calls.
- C While partnerships are working well on both fish and wildlife issues, there is a perception that WDFW staff are reluctant to accept outside sources of expertise.
- C Local, district and regional staff are good to work with, and they are fully engaged in local processes. However, there seems to be less clarity when local issues are conveyed to Olympia staff.
- C It is important to have continuity with WDFW staff and constituents if initiatives are to work and solutions are to move forward.
- C Use of the WDFW web site is crucial to communication, as is the use of e-mail. Suggestion: investigate list serves to improve the agency's ability to deliver information.

- C Several participants felt their advice and recommendations were seldom followed, or they were not informed or made aware of what happened to their recommendations. Overall, participants desired meaningful input into WDFW processes and decisions where possible.

Spokane, Nov. 1, 2001

- C WDFW does not have enough staff to do the job in this region, yet when staff has the time to get engaged they are excellent to work with. Overall, we would like to see additional staff. Suggestion: it would be good to have all WDFW staff recognizable as such, especially, when out in the field.
- C Regional staff has an excellent attitude toward full, equal sharing partnerships with the public. They do respect and use expertise outside the agency and, in general, give prompt responses to requests.
- C Staff involvement in educational efforts both at the K-12 school curriculum level, as well as, at the university level is very good. Staff exhibits a solid professionalism at both levels of involvement. An expressed general consensus was that the WDFW does/has good science in both the fish and wildlife areas.
- C There is an existing/continuing frustration over dangerous wildlife issues, especially cougars, as well as over the negative impact of wildlife on agricultural crops.
- C Communications could be improved by using the WDFW website as an interactive tool---put out information and get feedback. Suggestion: follow-up on public feedback is important to make people aware that they indeed have been listened to.
- C The Fish & Wildlife's Commission's practice of traveling around the state to get public input is very valuable. Also, groups can be more effective advocates if they are involved upfront in an issue, and have more of a role in formulating solutions.
- C There is the lingering issue over the complicated nature of the fishing and hunting pamphlets. The rules are hard to figure out so you do not have confidence that you are indeed legal. Suggestion: more signs placed in strategic areas, especially in more remote areas would do a lot of good.
- C This is the Department of Fish and Wildlife and there is a need for providing services to both the hunting and non-hunting communities. This has to be a balancing act as "one persons pet can be another's meal".

Everett, Nov. 5, 2001

- C WDFW needs to be both better able to engage private landowners and be more flexible in dealing with landowners. Suggestion: approach the issue from the position of being a good neighbor.
- C Have the "right" people, both in terms of knowledge and authority, at the table during discussions so that decisions can be made. Clearly define roles of technical versus policy staff, and then target meetings with staff having the "right" authorities.
- C WDFW needs to provide clear expectations about the desired outcomes of meetings prior to the meetings e.g., separate informational discussions from decision making agendas. Get citizen involvement up front so that they can have a meaningful input into WDFW's decision-making process.

- C Expand WDFW's information/outreach capacities, and reach out to adults as well as to youths. When doing so, all staff needs to consider themselves as part of the WDFW outreach efforts.
- C Many positive statements directed toward the WDFW staff from the very diverse clientele around the table. For example, WDFW staff is always listening and includes them in discussions about issues to the point that they feel their input is meaningful. The WDFW's "quiet diplomacy" has been successful and much appreciated by some members around the table.
- C Look at carrying out WDFW's resource management responsibilities from more of a ecosystem context. In the past, some of WDFW'S policy direction depended on what individual program you are talking with at the time rather than from a departmental perspective. When developing management decisions base them on science backed with good data.
- C Communications with constituents are good and should continue to utilize the WDFW website as well as news releases and newspapers. Yet, despite these efforts, the WDFW is not reaching the vast majority of people who do care about wildlife-sort of the silent majority. Suggestion: partner with groups to get message out e.g., user groups own websites can be used to spread the WDFW's messages.

Yakima, Nov. 6, 2001

- C Regional staff is the primary contact with WDFW and those contact have been very good. The desire is to have more staff to deal with the issues as the present staff is so busy. Overall the message is that personal contact is important and the WDFW needs to maintain that commitment.
- C Framework the decision making process with good, up to date technical work i.e., base decisions on science. Get input from advisory groups up front and that has been working in the region. The input from advisory groups is "meaningful" in terms of affecting the outcomes as the WDFW staff listen to outside expertise and experience.
- C Education is an important function of the WDFW relative to scientific resource management. Staff should help communicate alternatives on resource issues to the public and not just hand off a dictum to the counties to implement, for example, and then step out of the way.
- C As an education philosophy, involve the students in the "actual". Examples: use the hunting and fishing regulations in technical reading classes; involve theme directly in the gathering of technical information so they know how it can be used.
- C Simplify the communications with the public e.g., the biggest example is the indecipherable hunting and fishing pamphlets. Suggestions: use the internet as an interactive tool, use partnerships to increase the reach of the WDFW to upgrade signs especially in rural areas, and use the newspapers (make a contact and be consistent about providing information).
- C Make more use of technical "white papers" to explain the science on issues and to give management options. This would enable progress to be made on issues rather than just process. There has to be outcomes implemented---good management includes the right process as well as timely outcomes.
- C Ethics are a very important part of hunting and fishing activities---perhaps we need to get at this through the education of our youth.

- C The WDFW needs to learn how to effectively interact with private landowners---make those contacts early in the process. There are issues dealing with both the impacts of wildlife (dangerous wildlife and crop damage) as well as hunters on private lands. On the other hand, WDFW needs to contact non-traditional users of fish and wildlife and diversify our thinking to include those users-it could be WDFW's future.

Olympia, Nov. 13, 2001

- C Interactions with staff are, in general, very positive and professional. Advisory group processes are effective, when they occur and when the process is followed, and advice is taken by staff--- results have been better processes like North of Falcon, Willapa Bay plan etc. However, commercial sector representatives would like to reinstate quarterly meetings.
- C Vendors or license dealers feel left out of the advisory process---fish and wildlife groups have workable advisory groups, but the vendors have no similar type of representation. There is no forum to share successes or failures---peer training would also be an outcome of a WDFW organized forum that would allow interaction with appropriate WDFW licensing staff.
- C The WDFW internet website is very good to excellent. E-mail could be used more effectively to contact people as response time is often faster than trying to run somebody down by phone. Need to get staff e-mail addresses, phone numbers, organized by areas of expertise.
- C The WDFW technical assistance and the WDFW's emphasis on science and good data needs to continue. WDFW also needs to keep its documents current perhaps through more use of a document section on its website.
- C There appears to be disconnects between regional/area staff and policy direction out of Olympia-- "Some biologists seek to undermine the rules". Also, in the sport fishing rule proposal process, the ability to affect the outcome is poor, and staff proposals seem to take precedence over user-based proposals.
- C Partnerships should be encouraged in order to extend WDFW's "reach" into the areas consistent with addressing WDFW's mission. Partnerships should be formed to allow volunteers to do what the WDFW can no longer do. Suggestion: WDFW needs to recognize outside expertise and experience.
- C Provide feedback on public comments to plans in order for participants to feel that their involvement is meaningful, and that it effects some directional change to the WDFW's plans.
- C Watchable Wildlife is an important component for economic input into local, rural communities. Linkage to historical sites and areas can be made which can be a tremendous draw for tourists. WDFW should work to promote good maps and site identification to guide people.
- C Education/outreach activities of the WDFW are excellent, especially those directed at the K-12 school system. WDFW needs to continue to connect with our children, but the department also needs to do a better job of reaching the general public. Suggestion: use volunteer groups to disseminate WDFW information e.g., clubs can be used to help in the WDFW's education mission.

Vancouver, Nov. 15, 2001

- C In general, regional staff is very informative and friendly when responding to questions from the public. They provide services after hours and in a very professional manner. Phone calls are returned in a timely manner and, again, are returned by good, professional people. The problem is not having enough of them to go around.
- C There is a high amount of frustration within the vendor community over the implementation of the WILD system. Vendors are not satisfied with feedback from either MCI or from WDFW. Responses from both are generally not consistent, they are inaccurate, and at times are not consistent with current regulations.
- C Advice, in some arenas, has been solicited by WDFW and has been fairly considered by staff. Involvement of the public has effected subsequent WDFW actions. In other cases, public input has been requested, but meetings, for example, are set in time or places seemingly to preclude participation.
- C It did/does appear that decisions are often made by WDFW prior to asking for input -- WDFW comes to the meeting with answers and then asks questions to justify a preconceived outcome. WDFW needs to get peoples involved upfront, before decisions are made.
- C Partnerships are something the WDFW should invest in. There are a lot of people who are interested in helping the WDFW to succeed. Suggestion: use volunteers to increase staff "reach" on fish and wildlife issues. Provide training to volunteers so they can give timely, accurate, and up-to-date information to the public.
- C Push funding dollars down to the local level-this could enhance communications. Establish a regional advisory group to take advantage of local input and local knowledge and expertise.
- C Use the WDFW internet website to improve information transfer-examples would be getting good science out to the public and putting regulation updates out regularly and in a timely fashion. Suggestions: electronic transfer of information is cheaper than paper copies, put a "cost" to paper versions; use the internet as an interactive tool to get feedback in real time (perhaps a way to simplify hunting and fishing regulations); and take advantage of developed user group e-mail list serves to get WDFW information out.
- C Education remains an important function of the WDFW. In general, educational materials developed by the WDFW are excellent and are widely used by the school system. WDFW education efforts need to include, as a focus, our youth as they are the resource users and stewards of the future.

Roundtable participants

Ephrata (North-central Region), Oct. 22, 2001

Wendall Black, Entiat, Upper Columbia RC&D
Jim Cherf, Ephrata, City of Ephrata manager
Dick Erickson, Othello, East Columbia Basin Irrigation District
Nick Fox, Wenatchee, orchardist
Jerry Gutzwiler, Wenatchee, Wenatchee Sportsmen's Association
Mary Hunt, Waterville, Douglas County Commission
Mike Meseberg, Othello, Potholes Reservoir Mardon Resort
Allen Miller, Mansfield, rancher
Carl Miller, Winthrop, Methow Conservancy
Teri Piper, Moses Lake, Central Washington Audubon Society
Rick Smith, Wenatchee, Wenatchee Reclamation District
Nancy Warner, Wenatchee, Nature Conservancy
Invited, not attending: Dale Gies, Moses Lake, Pheasants Forever

Olympia (Statewide), Oct. 26, 2001

Tom Buckley, Pendleton, Defenders of Wildlife
Helen Engle, University Place, National Audubon Society
Liz Hamilton, Vancouver, Northwest Sportfishing Industry Association
James Hulbert, Longview, Ducks Unlimited
Terry Hunt, Olympia, Washington State Grange
Ed Owens, Olympia, Coalition of Coastal Fisheries
Shirley Solomon, Mt. Vernon, Skagit Watershed Council
Bill Robinson, Olympia, Washington Council of Trout Unlimited
Alison Studley, Mount Vernon, Skagit Fisheries Enhancement Group
Frank Urabeck, Federal Way, Northwest Marine Trade Association
Invited, not attending: Gary Kasowski, Maple Valley, Washington Hunter Education Instructors Assn.

Spokane (Eastern Region), Nov. 1, 2001

Chris Kroupa, Curlew, recreational fisher
Jamie Layman, Spokane, Inland Northwest Wildlife Council
Wayne Madson, Colville, Washington State University Cooperative Extension Service
Tom Moore, Spokane, West Valley School District
Shirley Muse, Walla Walla, Blue Mountains Audubon Society
Mark Pinch, Liberty Lake, business
John Roskelley, Spokane County Commission
Al Scholz, Cheney, EWU biology professor
Invited, not attending: Read Smith, St. John, National Association of Conservation Districts

Everett (North Puget Sound Region), Nov. 5, 2001

Rone Brewer, Stanwood, Washington Waterfowl Association
Ken Dahlstedt, Mount Vernon, Skagit County Commission
David Hoopes, Friday Harbor, San Juan County Conservation District
Michael Kern, Seattle, Long Live the Kings (in place of Barbara Cairns)
Steve Ketz, Enumclaw, Weyerhaeuser Co.
Bob Rose, Mount Veron, Skagitonians to Preserve Farmland
Ron Tingley, Sedro Woolley, Wildcat Steelhead Club
Lisa Wathne, Seattle, Humane Society of the United States
Invited, not attending: Larry Carpenter, Mount Vernon, Northwest Marine Trade Association
Bill Hill, Redmond, Microsoft Corporation
Kirk Thomson, Seattle, The Boeing Company

Yakima (Southcentral Region), Nov. 6, 2001

Don Cocheba, Ellensburg, Eastern Washington University Economics Professor

Howard Gardner, Richland, Richland Rod and Gun Club

Jim Lewis, Yakima, Yakima County Commission

Nick Martinez, Moxee, rancher/landowner

Brenda McMurrey, Yakima, Yakima Audubon Society

Evelyn Nelson, Cle Elum, Cle Elum School District superintendent

Bill Orr, Yakima, Walleye Unlimited of the Northwest

Roger Reynolds, Vantage, waterfowl hunting guide

Jim Trull, Sunnyside, Sunnyside Valley Irrigation District

Invited, not attending: Jesse Palacios, Yakima, Yakima County Commission

Olympia (Coastal/South Puget Sound Region), Nov. 13, 2001

Raydean Bledsoe, Montesano, license vendor

Dan Boeholt, Aberdeen, hunter

Jim Crotts, Cosmopolis, Weyerhaeuser Co.

Warren Dawes, Shelton, Southwest Puget Sound Watershed Council

Chris Endresen, Port Orchard, Kitsap County Board of Commissioners

Clyde McBrayer, Olympia, recreational fisher

Kip Parker, Lynnwood, Progressive Animal Welfare Society

Chris Parsons, Tumwater, Tumwater City Council

Bill Walsh, Westport, business

Neil Werner, Belfair, Hood Canal Watershed Project Center

Vancouver, Southwest Region (Lee VanTussenbrook, Regional Director), Nov. 15, 2001

John Akers, Vancouver, Evergreen School District

Dan Boes, Chehalis, hunter

Bill Dygert, Vancouver, business

Richard Fazio, Vancouver, agriculture

Glen Lamb, Vancouver, Columbia Land Trust

Craig T. Lynch, Ridgefield, recreational fisher

Bart Phillips, Vancouver, Columbia River Economic Development Council

Bob Schecht, Longview, license vendor

Mark Smith, Toutle, volunteer/environmentalist

Robert Sudar, Longview, commercial fisher

Dean Sutherland, Vancouver, Clark Public Utilities District

Invited, not attending: Joan Frye, Goldendale, Klickitat County Commission

Citizen Survey Results

(173 responses)

Interpersonal Communications

1. Have you contacted, or been contacted by, the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife within the last year?

Yes	78%
No	22%

1a. If so, where?

Olympia headquarters	57%
Regional or district office	48%
Field (not WDFW office)	40%
Public meeting	24%
Other	14%

1b. How?

In person	67%
Telephone	54%
E-mail	51%
Letter	38%

1c. What was the nature of the contact?

Policy/rule making	40%
Scientific/academic information	37%
Recreational information	36%
Enforcement check	31%
Permitting	29%
Other	29%
Licensing	29%
Complaint	23%

1d. Was WDFW's response to your request(s) timely and courteous?

Yes	80%
No	20%

1e. Was the WDFW contact and interaction positive?

Yes	73%
No	27%

1f. Based on your experience(s), how could WDFW improve its interpersonal communications and professional public service?

(Similar comments are summarized and grouped in order of frequency, with the total number of comments listed in parentheses; actual comments can be viewed on WDFW's website Roundtable page in Appendix 1.)

- C Return phone calls, respond to e-mail and other requests in timely way (14)
- C Have a more positive, less arrogant attitude (14)
- C WDFW is doing a good job now (12)
- C Train customer service staff and other employees in public relations skills and WDFW issues and information (7)
- C Accept and encourage input and help from groups and others outside the agency (7)
- C Need more staff, specifically customer service specialists, enforcement officers, field staff (7)
- C WDFW needs a higher profile in general (more staff interaction with public, more public presentations, more field offices, etc.) (5)
- C Need an electronic personnel roster/key contact list by specialty area, especially at regional level and for scientific data (4)
- C Need consistency in responses (3)
- C Improve communications with retired employees. We would like to share our insights on current issues.
- C Continue to improve and expand Environmental Education programs, including especially the Salmon in the Classroom program. The new Science and Civics WILD program should be given high priority throughout the state. It would be extremely helpful if similar programs at an adult level could be made available, especially to state legislators, county commissioners, and planning and permitting departments in local jurisdictions throughout the state. Lawmakers and regulatory agencies need to know more about the consequences of their actions.
- C Continue to work closely with teachers and district curriculum directors to integrate fish and wildlife stewardship skills. Provide continued outreach to local agencies with shared goals.

Public Involvement

2. Have you attempted to participate on any level in WDFW's public involvement processes within the last year?

Yes	68%
No	32%

2a. If yes, how were you involved?

Letter, e-mail, telephone call or personal contact	69%
Completed a WDFW survey	59%
Attended a public meeting	44%
Submitted a regulation proposal(s)	35%
Worked with regional fish group/watershed stewardship team	35%
Served as member of a citizen advisory group	13%

2b. Do you feel your views were adequately heard and acknowledged?

Yes	23%
No	33%
Somewhat	44%

2c. Were you offered adequate background information?

Yes	54%
No	46%

2d. Was your opinion sought in a timely manner?

Yes	55%
No	45%

2e. Would you participate again in other WDFW public involvement processes?

Yes	83%
No	17%

If no, why?

(Similar comments are summarized and grouped in order of frequency, with the number of comments listed in parentheses; actual comments can be viewed on WDFW's website Roundtable page in Appendix 2.)

- C Input is not genuinely desired by WDFW, which ignores all but a few, doesn't listen because decisions are already made, is just going through the motions, plays political games, etc. (10)
- C It's obvious from recent Commission action on the roבודuck issue, contrary to Internet survey responses, that input is not really wanted. (7)

- C Meetings are not conducive to everyone's input (5)
- C WDFW doesn't respond to public opinion survey results (3)
- C Can't give up (2)
- C While your field representatives seem to understand our frustrations, they seem overwhelmed by the politics of your department.
- C The Commission seems to only care about what's in their best interest politically, not what would be best for fish and wildlife and those who pursue them.
- C This department is ineffective at the current time. It is interesting to note that you want public input, when no action is taken when citizens ask for help. I am going to be contacting the Sierra Club and the Nature Conservancy to make them more aware of the current lack of action by the Wildlife Department at this time. Something needs to be done about their lack of public effectiveness.
- C It would be nice to have a representative from each area on the Commission; maybe increase the size of the Commission to include someone from every voting district or something like that. That way the rules could be applied more evenly.
- C More information contributed by tribal co-managers, if it is asked for (Hood Canal crab meetings)

2f. How could WDFW make it easier for you to become involved?

Conduct more Internet surveys	66%
Offer earlier notification for input	54%
Convene citizen advisory groups and rotate membership more often	46%
Standardize regulations for longer periods so they are reviewed less often	30%

Other suggestions:

- C Conduct forums in the rural parts of the state during times other than big game hunting seasons
- C Improve system for notifying potential participants of important meetings, surveys, etc.
- C Make background material more available
- C Make a more honest effort to reach agreement with volunteer salmon recovery groups

2g. What day/time would you be most likely to attend public meetings?

Evening	61%	Morning	17%
Any weekday	39%	Afternoon	12%
Any day/time	29%	Weekend	10%

Information Products

3. Have you sought or received a WDFW information product within the last year?

Yes	91%
No	9%

3a. Which WDFW products have you used?

Website	85%
Regulation pamphlet	82%
News releases	60%
Recreational information	51%
Reports	51%
Brochures/factsheets	43%
Newsletter	21%
Science magazine	19%
Other*	10%
TV show	5%

*Other information products used : Upland restoration program maps, Fish ID booklets, Volunteer materials, Enforcement Reserve Officer items, Budget data, Specific disclosure requests, Gold mining regulations /“Gold and Fish” booklet, Invasive species long-term program for wildlife lands, Fish plants, Legislative factsheet, Bird count surveys, Crossing Paths newsletter, Hunter survey, Maps of wildlife area road system, NatureMapping activities for teachers, other education materials

3b. How would you evaluate the timeliness, value and convenience of each product?

	High	Moderate	Low	No response
WDFW website	45%	36%	3%	15%
Regulation pamphlet	35%	25%	19%	21%
News releases	28%	28%	9%	34%
Recreational information	19%	33%	6%	42%
Reports	12%	38%	10%	40%
Newsletter	11%	30%	4%	55%
Brochures/factsheets	11%	30%	8%	52%
Science magazine	9%	18%	7%	66%
TV show	3%	9%	12%	76%
Other *	1%	1%	6%	

**Other information products evaluated/other comments:*

- C Upland restoration maps and the program in general are suspect.
- C Hunting regulation pamphlet went way downhill on readability this year.
- C Invasive species are invading all our wildlife areas; this needs to be addressed
- C WDFW email simply sucks
- C Want information more quickly
- C Legislation that affects WDFW
- C Bird surveys--would be nice to do this on-line
- C Actual scientific background as a basis for regulations
- C Monthly magazine or TV program
- C Educational resources
- C Never heard of "Wild about Washington" TV show

3c. What information would you like to see available from WDFW?

(Responses are summarized and grouped in order of frequency, with number of comments listed in parentheses; actual comments can be viewed on WDFW's website Roundtable page in Appendix 3.)

- C Hunting information, including pre-season prospects, game check data, harvest reports, access information, etc. (14)*
- C Fishing information, including catch counts, creel checks, openings/closings, stocking, water levels, how-to's, etc. (11)*
- C Website improvements (8) *
- C Simplified regulation pamphlets;better use of pamphlets with other info (8) *
- C Explanation of regulations (7) *
- C Budget information (7) *
- C Maps of public lands, hunting lands, etc. (7) *
- C Wildlife population information (5) *
- C Personnel directories, etc. (5) *
- C Tribal hunting/fishing information (4) *
- C More scientific reports (3) *
- C Legislation regarding fish and wildlife (3) *
- C Fish habitat information (3) *
- C Land and habitat issues (3) *
- C Future regulations (3) *
- C Toxics and wildlife (3) *
- C News media use/emphasis (3) *

- C More regionally-specific information (2) *
- C More volunteer opportunities (2) *
- C TV program (2) *
- C Recreation reports (2) *
- C Posters (2)
- C Better and faster information on changes in regulations. i.e. emergency changes.
- C Monthly magazine
- C More outreach materials more readily available.
- C More education of the non-hunting public in the roles of hunters as conservationists and sportsman.
- C How WDFW intends to protect, perpetuate, and preserve our fishing and wildlife resources and fishing and hunting opportunities for all each year with 2 million additional people predicted to enter our state in the next 20 years. Further, how will WDFW maintain, if not increase fish and wildlife habitat. Also, how will WDFW ensure access that ensures maximum fishing and hunting recreational opportunity will continue to occur?
- C More information on how WDFW is supporting recovery and response to criticism of policies

3d. In what form would you like new information products? (107 responses)

C	Electronically through Internet website or e-mail*	59%
C	Paper copy	30%
C	News media, particularly newspapers	8%
C	Any form	3%
C	Personal contact, phone call, or letter	<1%

* Many respondents requested both electronic and hard copy formats

4. Do you have any other advice on how WDFW can improve communications with you?

(Similar responses are summarized and grouped in order of frequency with number of comments listed in parentheses; actual comments can be viewed on WDFW's website Roundtable page in Appendix 4.)

- C Improve staff responsiveness, attitude, access, etc. (24)
- C Continue improving website (post more information, use e-mail, list-serves, etc.) (20)
- C Improve Roundtable participation, public involvement/input, feedback, etc. (19)
- C Hunting issues (specific recommendations, etc.) (11)
- C Use news media more (6)
- C Fishing issues (wild vs. hatchery, commercial, etc.) (5)
- C Simplify regulations pamphlets (3)

- C Improve consistency of information (3)
- C Improve data collection, science, etc. (3)
- C Produce more information products (3)

Other comments:

- C Perhaps groups who are not happy with the outcome on issues are the ones stressing the need for this review and are hoping to see a way to influence the commission and WDFW decision-making as public opinion process rather than science based. Example is the hunting and trapping initiatives plus salmon recovery and other similar issues. If the WDFW biologists and other professional staff are given greater credibility by the Director and the Commission maybe the Department would also have greater respect and acceptance by the public. I am not a employee of the WDFW, just a person who cares about the future of wildlife and the future of hunting in this state.
- C Conduct field tours or meetings so the public can see projects and programs WDFW is working on. Also WDFW can hear and understand projects and programs that are needed to be better neighbors to us all.
- C Notification of the need for new commissioners. the chairman was just reelected. Never heard of anyone else trying to get someone to fill his spot. I know of people who have applied and never heard anything back
- C In the RFEG/WDFW/Advisory Board Strategic plan, we have identified several goals, objectives and tasks to improve communications. Please get this from WDFW's LEAP division and enter in the record. We spent all last year working on this very issue!
- C Crossing Paths is my only link at this point.
- C Can WDFW prevent a sewage treatment site being chosen near the heronry at the Edmonds Marsh? We only have 5 heronries in King County and the one at Discovery Park is nearly decimated.
- C Are wildlife sanctuaries(backyard) managers allowed to protect all wildlife from human predators and hunters?
- C Protect public resources for all the public to enjoy (whether hunting, fishing, or viewing) and do not allow private interests to sell or control these resources in a manner or prices that excludes all that wish to participate
- C In general I think you are doing a good job. Just explain why in all formats.
- C I think communications are good.
- C Thank you for this opportunity.

WDFW employee discussions

Employees provided input on the Roundtable topics in about 70 small group work sessions at seven meetings across the state. The following is a categorized summary of the ideas that were discussed and recorded, in order of frequency.

Interpersonal communications

- Improve timeliness and quality of response to public inquiries (32)
- Provide staff directories for public and internal use (21)
- Improve/expand “information/education/outreach” functions/positions (19)
- Improve information exchange and communication within agency (18)
- Improve/expand customer service through recruitment, training, better pay scale, etc. (13)
- Maintain/expand agency website as communications tool (12)
- Develop agency public service ethic with better orientation, public relations training (10)
- Take time to listen, have positive attitude, be respectful, honest, etc. (10)
- Work with landowners, others (5)
- Improve phone information service (4)
- Other (including accuracy-of-information checking, employee uniforms, etc.)

Public involvement:

- Encourage, expand, improve volunteer opportunities (27)
- Improve public meetings (facilitation, earlier notice, better locations, etc.) (25)
- Maintain, develop more non-governmental organization and landowner partnerships (13)
- Advertise need for public involvement more (12)
- Educate public first for improved public involvement (10)
- Improve/expand citizen advisory groups (10)
- Reach out to non-traditional users (5)
- Poll public electronically (4)
- Improve Commission role (3)
- Hold more roundtables (3)
- Other (including one-on-one “public involvement,” transmitting public opinion from the field accurately, general public opinion surveying, agency speakers bureau, etc.)

Information products:

- Internet and Intranet website maintenance/improvements: (40)
- Regulation pamphlet improvements: (23)
- Fact-sheets, brochures, etc.: (11)
- Field site efforts/displays/products/tours, etc.: (10)
- Distribution ideas/needs: (10)
- Broadcast media: (9)
- Maps: (9)
- Magazine/Newsletter: (9)
- Marketing/advertising/promotional products: (8)
- Education materials: (8)
- Directories: (7)
- Explanation of management, science, etc. products: (5)
- Presentation materials: (4)
- Other (staff to answer questions, non-Internet forms of information, etc.)

WDFW employee survey

(Total 280 responses)

Rank the following functions in terms of priority and effectiveness:

	<u>Priority</u>			<u>Effectiveness</u>		
	High	Moderate	Low	High	Moderate	Low
<u>Interpersonal communications:</u>						
Customer service	86%	12%	2%	52%	40%	8%
Field contacts	83%	15%	2%	36%	50%	14%
Education programs	60%	34%	6%	20%	46%	34%
Fairs/Festivals/trade shows	21%	49%	30%	10%	54%	36%
Speeches	17%	49%	34%	11%	48%	41%
Technical assistance	61%	34%	5%	22%	53%	25%
Volunteers	35%	49%	16%	18%	51%	31%
<u>Public Involvement processes</u>						
Citizen advisory groups	38%	54%	8%	14%	59%	27%
Public meetings	54%	39%	7%	12%	53%	35%
Regulation setting	61%	31%	8%	20%	53%	27%
<u>Information products</u>						
Website	71%	25%	4%	54%	38%	8%
Brochures/factsheets	46%	46%	8%	22%	51%	27%
Newsletters	23%	55%	22%	11%	56%	33%
News releases	62%	33%	5%	30%	50%	20%
Public disclosure request response	31%	46%	23%	12%	56%	32%
Recreational information (ie. "Weekender")	32%	45%	23%	25%	48%	27%
Regulation pamphlets/rule changes	83%	13%	4%	30%	44%	26%
Reports (annual, program status, etc.)	42%	46%	12%	10%	53%	37%
Science magazine (on-line)	29%	42%	29%	16%	48%	36%
"Wild About Washington" TV show	28%	39%	33%	18%	40%	42%

1. How much does your current position bring you into contact with the public?

All the time	61%
Occasionally	18%
Varies	15%
Rarely	6%

2. How would you characterize your experiences in responding to public comments or questions?

Generally satisfactory	49%
Quite positive	41%
Could have been better	6%
Not applicable	4%

3. Do you think overall WDFW response to public inquiries is timely, courteous, and complete?

Always	3%
Mostly	70%
Sometimes	24%
Rarely	3%

4. How could WDFW improve its interpersonal communications and professional public service?

(Comments summarized, categorized, and listed in order of response frequency (number of comments noted in parentheses))

- C Hire more staff, especially in field, customer service, outreach, public affairs, etc. (43)
- C Improve internal communications first; need better, more consistent information exchange and teamwork between management and staff, between Olympia and the field (37)
- C Maintain and expand website as our best public communication tool; make more interactive, especially with regulation pamphlets; include on-line employee directory with contact numbers, etc. for both internal and external use, make sure all employees have access and e-mail (37)
- C Respond to public requests more quickly, personally (not automated systems) (34)
- C Provide employee training in public relations, interpersonal communications, customer service, conflict avoidance, etc. (32)
- C Make public service a priority of every employee's job, allocate time in work plans for more public interaction, have public service guidelines and standards (31)
- C Provide more information/outreach products/efforts beyond website (maps, technical help for landowners, handouts for kids, public presentation support materials, fair/festival/show display materials, field site kiosks/reader boards, toll-free hotlines, accurate/timely regulation pamphlets, season changes, explanations of decisions/rules, answers for FAQs, factsheets, magazine) (30)

- C Increase contacts with all resource/user groups, including non-consumptive, use more volunteers, partnerships, citizen advisory boards, be open to public help (15)
- C Improve attitude toward public, be flexible, open, listen, less arrogance (13)
- C Set up more district/regional offices in key places with public contact staff and public Internet access (12)
- C Conduct more public meetings/interface (use when needed for rule-proposal input, but also for non-issue/non-crisis updating, building rapport, etc.), and promote/advertise well in advance (8)
- C Use all news media more, including editorial boards, and promote good things we do (5)
- C Identify employees to public with uniforms (4)

5. Is training adequate for dealing with the public?

Yes	33%
No	67%

If no, what's needed?

Comments summarized, categorized and listed in order of response frequency (number of comments noted in parentheses)

- C Training in public relations/interpersonal communications for all employees, and specifically for customer service staff (81)
- C Improved internal, cross-program information exchange/updating on laws, policies, issues, programs, procedures, licensing, regulation changes, etc. (44)
- C WDFW orientation training for all (including temps), with emphasis on public service as “job one” for everyone, and staff directories by programs/projects/issues for public inquiry referrals; maintain guidelines/standards/expectations to develop public service ethic (36)
- C Training to deal with hostile publics, conflict avoidance, personal safety, self-defense, etc (21)
- C Courses in public speaking (7)
- C Hiring people who like working with the public and have professional communications skills (5)
- C Training to work with news media (2)

6. How aware do you feel you are of WDFW's public outreach and involvement activities?

Know a lot	12%
Know something about them	47%
Not too well informed	40%
Not applicable	1%

7. Does the Department adequately involve the public in discussion of issues?

Yes	57%
No	43%

If not, how can that opportunity be improved?

Comments summarized, categorized and listed in order of response frequency (number of comments noted in parentheses.)

- C Involve those we usually don't, avoid more talking to the "choir", reach out to Chamber of Commerce, business, non-consumptive users, etc.; more "Roundtables" (17)
- C Hold more regular, informal "town hall" type meetings, local forums in regions, open houses, "Meet WDFW staff" sessions, etc., not just when legally required to solicit public opinion, but to update, build rapport, involve in policy discussion early-on , etc. (13)
- C Change public perception that WDFW has already made decisions before asking for input (5)
- C Use Internet surveys more and make website more interactive (5)
- C We reach out to a lot of people already; it's only a minority who complain (3)
- C Follow up after input is taken (2)

Other individual comments (summarized):

- C Bring general public up to speed on subjects before asking opinions
- C Spend more time scheduling meetings well in advance
- C Use media more to increase awareness of opportunities
- C Form more short-term citizen advisory groups
- C Increase watershed stewardship team staff

8. What additional information products should be available?

Comments summarized, categorized, and listed in order of response frequency (number of comments noted in parentheses.)

- C Expanded, updated and well-advertised website, including interactive regulations, more reports/documents (that can be downloaded and printed, if necessary for non-Internet users), archive/list of everything, staff phone/e-mail directory, use of e-mail listserves, etc. (36)
- C Education/outreach/promotional products, including presentation/display materials, "Go Play Outside" event materials, videos, posters, CD-Roms, classroom-use skull/pelt collections, kids' handouts, items for sale such as t-shirts, caps, calendars, etc. (35)
- C Maps of WDFW property, GMUs, etc. (34)
- C Printed brochures/factsheets on issues, programs, projects, properties, (including hunting/fishing/watching available by wildlife area), facilities (including for each fish hatchery), wildlife-human conflicts, species, etc. (33)

- C Technical/regulatory assistance information, including BMPs, PHS data and management recommendations, fish & wildlife friendly construction advice (including workshops on same), permit procedures, “how-to’s” on application completion, etc. (24)
- C Printed Fish & Wildlife magazine (23)
- C Better regulation pamphlets (accurate, easier to read, timely, multi-lingual, with explanations of rules, different ones for different kinds of fishing, hunting, etc.) and regulation changes in formats easy to post and distribute (22)
- C More use of news media; broadcast public service announcements (ie.,NPR “Stardate”-like radio spots); weekly newspaper columns; expanded TV show on network or PBS affiliate station (not just on cable) (16)
- C Agency overall (mission, G&Os, budget income/expenditure, etc.) brochure/ annual report (10)
- C More professional, peer-reviewed scientific publications, progress reports of research, executive summaries, etc. (10)
- C Broader distribution of current materials, including use of license dealers for more than regulation pamphlets (6)
- C On-site field signs for fishing/hunting rules, season changes, etc. (5)
- C Information on tribal fishing/hunting (3)
- C Toll-free telephone hotlines for season, regulation changes, etc. (2)

Other individual comments (summarized):

- C Suggestion form available at license dealers
- C Field-sturdy (laminated) fishing regulations by marine area
- C Calendar of watchable wildlife opportunities
- C Calendar of upcoming public involvement opportunities
- C Commercial licensing information
- C ESA listed species
- C Uniform Hunter Education program
- C List of citizen advisory group members
- C Information on how to turn in a poacher
- C Information system that responds to public needs

9. In what form should that new information be provided?

(Many responses recommended both electronic (website/e-mail) and paper formats, but the preference was electronic.)

- C Website/electronic (95)
- C Paper (70)

- C Regulation pamphlets (16)
- C For posting in regional offices, at license dealers (9)
- C Maps (3)
- C For direct mailing (3)
- C Scientific journals, technical publications (3)
- C News media: TV, Radio, newspapers (26)
- C Signs/reader boards/kiosks (4)
- C Photos (2)
- C Clinics/workshops (2)

*Other:*Power Point type slide presentations; Educational materials; Films, slides, video; Book; Hands-on opportunities for information sharing; Personal communication

10. Do you have any other advice about how WDFW can improve the quality of public services, interpersonal communication, information products, and public involvement?

(Comments summarized, categorized and listed in order of response frequency (number of comments noted in parentheses.)

- C More staff needed (customer service, public affairs, outreach, field biologists) to provide better public service (25)
- C More time allocated in work plans for public involvement, including local meetings and interaction with public beyond legal requirements or crisis management (12)
- C Increase profile of WDFW through more marketing and promotion (10)
- C Increase teamwork, cross-program communication, etc. (9)
- C Provide more general public information/education products (9)
- C Continue expanding, improving the website (8)
- C Public service needs to be all-employee priority (7)
- C Improve public inquiry response time, manner (7)
- C Improve employee orientation and training (6)
- C Use news media more (6)
- C Continue and expand education programs (6)
- C Improve, simplify regulation pamphlets (6)
- C Increase outreach to non-traditional constituent (5)
- C Remember that resource work is public service (4)

- C Improve attitudes toward public (4)
- C Explain regulations, policies, etc. (4)
- C Manage by science (3)
- C Use volunteers more (3)
- C Use field staff more effectively (3)
- C Publish a magazine (3)
- C Provide staff directory for public use (3)

Appendix 1: Specific comments from Citizen Survey question #1f

Return phone calls, etc.

- Some WDFW employees don't return phone calls. What is your policy about this?
- Remember who the customer is and make sure to return calls the first time, not days later. Accountability would be a nice thing.
- Olympia people, especially LEAP staff do not return phone calls! They must be required to return ALL phone calls within 24 hours!
- Continuing request for HPA issuances in targeted areas has not been carried forward.
- Always respond to comments/requests/questions in a timely and informative manner. This requires much time and personnel involvement, but is necessary since the WDFW exists to serve the people of this state.
- I should note some correspondence to the director and commission was not answered in a timely manner, and sometimes, not at all.
- The e-mail contact was slow because of the load of e-mail that you probably receive. The telephone contact was very informative and the person gave other information that helped answer the question
- Address questions in a more timely manner - it took two weeks, plus.
- Phone calls were not responded to so I had to go up in person . Personal contact was positive ,but there was no follow up information sent to me on the corrections made for the failure to get my applications in the drawing process on moose and Toutle elk.
- Your department made no effort at all to solve the problem of poaching and reckless shooting in our area. I had to contact Sen. Harold Hochstatter to get a message though to the Wildlife Dept. I contacted the district office in Yakima and they did less than nothing. I was told a local game agent would contact me, but he did not. I finally lodged a complaint with the Kittitas County 911 people, who sent out a county deputy to check up on the hunters. The game department sells licenses and gives permission to hunt, with absolutely no protection to land owners and other citizens. It would be better to have no hunting than the unsupervised chaos we now have!!!
- Not all WDFW contacts have been negative, just majority with Olympia and Montesano staff, primarily in info or data requests, even from large conservation orgs
- If you are going to offer e-mail as a form of communication it should be answered in a timely manner. Waiting weeks for an e-mail is not positive.
- Share all information that is public information...comply with State law and stop hiding behind excuses of it takes to much time to get people their requests. Or the public is left to take legal action. This should not have to be.
- Return all phone calls and use e-mail more

Have more positive, less arrogant attitude

- Be fair, above board, and less of the attitude, "We are right and If you don't like it that's just too darn bad."
- Quit acting like gestapo storm troopers and get back to being courteous to the public. It is not an "us against them " situation
- Get better at acknowledging that you are not the boss, the public is.
- I could send you the email I was sent and then it would be obvious to you that a person like this should be fired!
- Take the charm course
- Be more polite
- Lack of finesse by the cop
- Every time I have encountered an enforcement officer in the field, they act is as if you are already guilty of some infraction and you immediately have to prove yourself innocent. They want to see your license and tags before they will even talk to you.
- Consider all factors of said communication, with an open mind.
- I spoke to one of the upper level employees. He was evasive and unresponsive on the issue (Hood Canal crabbing restrictions). He was afraid to discuss it. OUR employees, at that level, could better serve us if they had actual on site experience and were forthright in their response.

- Do more for service. Help people enjoy their experiences in the outdoors. They make you feel like criminals when you find out that they run police checks on vehicles when visiting our elk camps. Oregon and Idaho both do a better job in making you feel welcome.
- More Enforcement officers in the field with a friendly attitude toward sportsman.
- There is a need to avoid professional arrogance.
- My contact was twofold: first, the contact that I had at a policy meeting was very positive. Secondly, the field check that I went through was not. The enforcement officer never told me why I was pulled over, never asked for a hunting license was verbally abusive and let me know, "...that I'm lucky not to get a ticket." I am still puzzled by the episode, its purpose, my rights, etc.

WDFW is doing a good job now

- In my experiences, the WDFW has been very good in regard to interpersonal communication and professional public service. My contacts have yet to be unfavorable.
- Attitude, knowledge and demeanor was friendly and professional. Being a hunter, fisher and outdoors person who also has an interest in protecting and enhancing wildlife habitat I believe these people are dedicated and really care about what they do.
- All seems to be working well.
- Been good so far for personal experience.
- Your personnel do their best to be friendly and cooperative.
- Tracy was great! He sealed our bobcat for us and I was able to bring it in to Olympia and save time and it was more convenient for us. Excellent customer service!
- I have always found WDFW personnel to be responsive, professional, and helpful. WDFW personnel in the Mill Creek office are wonderful! They've helped with several of my children's school projects and given us advice about nest boxes.
- This year your field officers were very polite and willing to take whatever time it took answer questions we had. Field checks were quick and courteous.
- Field people are great - no improvement needed.
- Most of the employees we encounter are positive. There are still some who would rather not have citizen involvement. As far as communication- I think the WDFW website is incredibly informative. You are constantly adding new things and I think it's very positive.
- My contact was twofold: first, the contact that I had at a policy meeting was very positive. Secondly, the field check that I went through was not. The enforcement officer never told me why I was pulled over, never asked for a hunting license was verbally abusive and let me know, "...that I'm lucky not to get a ticket." I am still puzzled by the episode, its purpose, my rights, etc.
- Keep up the good work

Train customer service staff, etc.:

- I suggest that the people handling the telephones take refresher courses in customer service skills
- Better develop a matrix that tells receptionist who is responsible for a specific permit.(i.e., HPAs for recreational prospecting).
- By having more experience and training in the area of deer depredation. My enforcement contacts seemed to know little about depredation, and were not helpful.
- Hire an entirely new set of license counter staff. The current staff are rude and unprofessional. You need staff that are a credit to the human race and state government. Customers are always right and should be treated like gods. Also your license fees are way too high. The fish and wildlife of the state should be free to the people to use in any way they want. There should be no bag limits or seasons. Simple supply and demand should rule. Also the new license sales system sucks.....I don't admit to having a social security number and so I don't give it to anyone including your nasty agency. You all are probably building large databases shared with the CIA that will be used to control our lives in the future. Power to the people I say!!!! I could go on and on and on.
- Better training on the WILD system

- Give them all course in dealing with out of State visitors
- Make it mandatory that all WDFW personnel will be required to hunt with their hands tied behind their backs and blindfolded, just as we are required to do.

Accept and encourage input, etc.

- Accept input from recognized expert sources that may differ from WDFW paradigms. Example: The requirement of 200 feet spacing between individuals to pan or hand-sluice for gold, YET any number of people are allowed to fish, canoe, or whatever, any time of the year, as close to each other as they desire. No scientific evidence is given for this decision, even though it has been requested many times. How can I not feel that this is an arbitrary decision?
- Encourage dialog and correspondence between interested citizens and groups. Solicit input from interested citizens and groups who represent their interests; like sportsmens clubs, fishing clubs, special interests like bow hunters, muzzleloaders, fly fishers, bird hunters, salmon and steelhead fishers and their groups.
- The agency could be more pro-active with volunteer groups. We are after the same results; to promote fish & wildlife enhancement. The agency's attitude concerning volunteer groups, such as Fish First, should be one of assisting the groups, rather than discouraging groups with departmental barriers.
- Treat sportsmen as though they might have something of value to contribute.
- The local offices should cooperate more with local conservation groups in setting salmon recovery policies and harvest rules. We see far too much professional arrogance, basically telling us we as volunteers cannot change or influence WDFW policies which are made by professionals.
- WDFW treats the sportsman groups as adversaries not as allies. They need to realize that sportsman groups want to help. We are generally very busy people. However we are the ones who step up and help out with rabbit counts, feed elk in the winter, etc. So when we e-mail with a concern or a complaint, it is something that is very important to us. We look at wildlife as something more than a political battlefield or a something that requires a cultural change. We see it as our heritage, something to be managed and passed on the next generation in mind. Instead we are often treated like blood thirsty bubbas by the people who we entrust to make the management decisions.
- WDFW should work more cooperatively with volunteer groups

WDFW needs higher profile, etc.

- WDFW has too low a profile. Department activities are huge parts of recreation in WA, but you wouldn't know it by the media coverage. And few politicians realize the economic impact of all that recreation. In days of limited resources, the WDFW is not tooting its horn on the wide variety of resources it manages. Instead, the messages the public gets tend to be negative ones, those about property rights being impinged upon by endangered species concerns, closures, etc. Funding the WDFW with only license revenue is not fair. All who enjoy wildlife need to contribute, and realize the impact of their contribution. Make every WDFW employee a Public Involvement specialist. Have them submit regular columns to the local newspapers. Have them make weekly guest spots on local radio and television stations. Have them seek out local clubs and offer talks on WDFW activities and positions. Groom your public, the public that will support or undercut your mission. We don't know you, except as bureaucrats who say "no", bureaucrats who, for all we know, don't hunt or fish. Show the people that you are dedicated folks, just like we are, and doing the best you can with all the limitations you have to deal with. Embracing your using public will ensure adequate funding and support long into the future. Alienating your using public will guarantee continual struggles to keep programs going.
- I would like to see increased interaction in the field especially in a passive hunter/fisherman check process. I was stopped two times in two weeks and neither time felt accosted or intimidated (which surprised me). I readily shared information about what/when/where I observed game and other hunters. This type of interaction really changes citizen perception in a positive way
- Establish an office in Whatcom County. No one answers phone for general info in La Conner. Most all of Whatcom Co WDFW people work out of their homes and are unsupervised "lone rangers." They are often of different opinions on projects. There is no public presence for WDFW in Whatcom Co other than hunting and fishing booklets at fishing license sales points. This has resulted in lack of respect for WDFW on behalf of the public and tribal co-managers. Also some WDFW employees are essentially unsupervised

in Whatcom County. We have had some employees not show up to meetings that they were supposed to present at. WDFW has not responded when we have written letters to get co-manager advice/buy-in on projects. The two tribes in Whatcom Co always respond and so this has caused a bad image for WDFW. When they fail to perform, there is no follow-up or supervisor to deal with the problem.

- I am a member of Puget Sound anglers South sound chapter. We have tried to get WDFW Reps to Speak on our meetings 1st Thursday of the month. As far As I am aware this has never been available. Most fish related subjects are of interest. actual and political. We are a small portion of a growing club. And are always intrested in helping at various levels and always want fish related information.
- My main "beef" is lack of attn to the No. Olympic Peninsula, e.g., no Roundtable meetings or FWC meetings here

Need consistency in responses

- When I e-mailed the Montesano office with a question they answered politely and the person there gave me his phone number directly to call him so he could explain his answer more. I thought that was great. When I went into the Vancouver office with a question, I felt like I was troubling the lady there to get out of her chair to walk up to the counter to see what I wanted. Which she only lasted at the most 10 seconds there before she went to go sit back down. I just wanted to report my deer kill and I new you could call in but I was in the area. So I stopped and I asked if I could still report it here, she said no call the number on the back and went and sat down. That was rude. So the staff needs to be more friendly.
- I find the research end of the organization much easier to get information from than the enforcement. I have had several very disappointing contacts with enforcement officers in the field. These individuals and the department in general need to speak with a more consistent voice.
- Have a better understanding of the regulations and there intent. I've found some differences of interpretation between enforcement in the field and Olympia.

Appendix 2: Specific comments from Citizen Survey question #2e

Q: Would you participate again in other WDFW public involvement processes? If not, why not?

Input not genuinely desired, etc.

- I have to answer yes, but the process is very frustrating. WDFW Olympia staff do not listen and constantly play political games.
- WDFW does not generally listen to the public and pursues its own objectives. Further, WDFW staff (not all) often discount valuable information, knowledge, insights of the public. This must stop before you will gain any trust of the public.
- Department is more interested in organized special interest groups.
- Not in the same way. WDFW seems to miss or ignore the simple and easy ways to enhance outdoor recreation, opting for the more expensive alleged solutions.
- Seems like a secret society which you cannot break into. Members of the public really mean nothing to the people who value the ability to fish and hunt. Many bad decisions have been made in the name of science and politics.
- As a long time community leader and supporter of your organization, after just one contact with your officers I am left with the impression that your people will do as they please with little or no regard for we citizens.
- I feel the department already has its mind made up prior to any outside involvement.
- It is only a smoke-screen to cover already decided issues.
- Your people have your boilerplate excuses in hand and don't seem to want to change them anytime soon.
- Waste of time, energy and effort

Commission on roboduck

- The commission already had its mind made up about robo duck decoys, based on inaccurate information.
- Because I don't think my voice mattered to a group of folks that didn't think we should be using motorized decoys for ducks, citing traditionalistic views on duck hunting. This is shown by the record that the staff members voted to remove motorized decoys from the state reg with their mind already set before the vote was taken Be more open minded to public input.
- Don't mislead the public that their input is important and could influence the Board (Commission). The Board (Commission) arrives at its meetings with their minds already made up, irregardless of public comments. This was very obvious at the Board (Commission) meeting in Twisp.
- The action taken by the Commission to remove mechanical decoys this year was very much under publicized. This the type of action that should have some solid data behind it, not something that should have been decided by input from anti hunting groups. In addition, this should have been done federally. It makes no sense to see them fluttering on the Oregon side of the river, and the hunters to the South of us that can still use them applaud your decision. If there is good science that indicates a problem with them, then the feds should have dumped them nationwide.
- I need to know that it will be taken as valid. The commission thought the survey (on roboducks) could be slammed and therefore not reliable and should not be taken into consideration. Then why send out mailing, ask for input on the web and from others and then totally disregard? How would you feel? We do not need any more courtesy input to feel as though they have solicited input and then make decisions without scientific evidence that it was needed.
- We did the survey for the commission for their August meeting, testified, and they ignored the overwhelming desire for the state to allow robo ducks, with no scientific evidence they would hinder the resource. The over all take for the state and as a nation was down last year, with robos being used extensively. This is not good public service, when the commissions web site says they are to be the voice of the people and they choose their own voice, or the voice of some politically correct people who are not the majority.

- The majority of those making the rules don't hunt and fish. They tell us what they consider ethical and just cause other states don't consider that action unethical we aren't changing our policies.

Meetings not conducive, etc.

- Commission needs to conduct meeting in Eastern WA
- It seems that the agenda of the meetings is totally one-sided. The attitude is if you don't like the program just leave and don't come back.
- More public meetings with plenty of advance notice of time and date.
- The WDFW holds public meetings at only a few places in the state, most of which the average working people cannot attend. These should be held all over the state.
- I went to the round table meeting in Spokane, it's a joke. All it is, is a bunch of selected wannabes telling each other how good they've done. If you want real input have public meetings with regular Joe Blow hunters that don't belong to gun clubs and private hunting lands. Then hear what we have to say, you will learn a lot more.

WDFW doesn't respond to surveys

- Got no response what so ever from WDFW
- You didn't listen to last year's survey
- I have taken your surveys and you people have your minds made up before you submit them.

Can't give up

- Well, you've got to keep trying, what else can you do?
- Yes, because we will not give up.

Appendix 3: Specific comments from Citizen Survey question #3

Q: What information would you like to see available from WDFW that currently is not?

Hunting information

- Here it is the second week of modern deer season and nothing on the website about deer. You are still posting week-and-a-half old info about razor clamming
- Game check data for the current season.. Current meaning within a week or 10 days of the check.
- Info on access to Hunt By Written Permission - where land is located and how to contact for permission
- Best opportunities for harvest of fish and game vs. old news of past successes
- More big game records (ie., antler size), better and more refined GMU descriptions and special hunt information.
- Complete information on hunter turnout and animals taken by gmus on website and same for fish punch cards
- Harvest rates for deer and elk on a per county basis.
- Let's see some Public Refuge daily harvest reports. The artificially high daily limits certainly don't appear to support public hunting areas.
- More information on deer and elk hunting in general to improve success rates
- More timely harvest report of big game for general hunting seasons vs permit hunts.
- A more readily available statistical breakdown of hunting results for big game/weapon.
- A lot better access to game trails mag ...very hard to locate ...any cant find date they come out
- Take a look at Nebraska's or Nevada's informational packet for hunters. Take the hint on public information and advertising
- I was trying to find out if a specific model of black powder rifle was legal and was told that it wasn't possible to keep up on all the new models and therefore a list of legal muzzleloader rifles was not available. I could have accepted this answer had I not been inquiring about a five year old, very popular model. If you're going to be so picky about what is legal and what is not you should be able to tell people which models qualify and which don't providing they have been on the market for more than a year. Better yet, why not make the muzzleloader season what it was first intended to be before all the manufacturers started making high tech muzzleloading rifles

Fishing information

- Up to date shellfish creel census data, especially Puget Sound and Hood Canal
- Accurate numbers for gillnetter catch rates, updated at least weekly when actively fishing. Akin to the Buoy 10 catch rates and sampling frequency.
- Creel check data for the current season
- Best opportunities for harvest of fish and game vs. old news of past successes
- Reports of hunting/fishing successes(or not!) on the web site.
- Fish count and river water level
- More information on flyfishing in Wa.
- More information about bank fishing, either in lakes or along rivers, as most people, like myself, do not own a boat.
- Announce the opening or lengthening of fisheries more than a couple of days out. This would make it easier for the merchants and the sportfishers to better prepare and plan.
- Commercial fish harvest and by-catch in pounds by month and what is being done to reduce by-catch

- In-season fishing changes

Website improvements

- Your website is the only access I have to what's going on. To get crabbing info, for example, I need to search around the site to find it. If I didn't use your site every weekend, I would be lost.
- Update the website on a more frequent basis
- An email listserv for news releases
- Website listing of available reports
- Possibly a link to a website with pass conditions
- Better access to the pamphlets and recreation in Washington
- Website listing applications for HPAs, when issued or denied and date by which administrative appeals may be filed.
- More thorough meeting notes including names who post suggestions

Simplified regulation pamphlets, etc

- Less complicated regulation booklets. All my life I've heard that you have to be some kind of lawyer to interpret the reg book. and this has been my direct experience, for the most part.
- Clearer regulations. Current regs are overly confusing
- Regulations on hunting and fishing are too complex, you do too much management of the hunters and fishermen and too little of the resources.
- Prepare your regulation booklet with less ambiguous language. Salmon are trout, salmon are foodfish, but salmon are not always trout in special regs - make up your minds which it's going to be.
- You have some good information. However your timing is sometimes tardy. You need to get the fishing/hunting regs out sooner.
- Simple schedules, simple rules.
- I was really impressed with Florida's salt water fishing regulation pamphlet which combined the concept of a glossy, information magazine with the regulation information. The pamphlet included interesting articles about fish and wildlife, habitat and where to volunteer to be involved with conservation projects as well as the fishing rules

Explanations of regulations

- Reasons and explanations for the regulations in the Gold and Fish booklet
- Science as it relates to gold and fish magazine
- The information in general is good However Decisions are made. The logic/forces behind the information Is needed to be known to prevent a lot of the animosity between Fishermen/Indian/commercial/nonfishing people.
- Rationale behind the regulations. Example: Why are there winter blackmouth restrictions. It absolutely baffles me why the few boats that go out in January have any negative impact on the salmon population that would result in closures to eg. Area 10. We reluctantly live by some of these regs but if we had some rationale as to why they are necessary it may help to get us "on board" and be more supportive of the regulations.
- Information used to set waterfowl limits and decoy restrictions.
- An evaluation of why you consider the modern Muzzeloder a primitive weapon. The reasoning behind salmon retention limits. For example, why blackmouth fishing is limited to one fish. We could probably use one summary listing of current which areas are currently open and closed for crabbing. During the season, special closures occur but we must read through all the notices to dig out the information we need. If we had one page which covered all areas for being open or closed and the limit

changes (Area 8-2, for example, went down to 3 crabs), it would be very simple for everyone to be up-to-date.

Budget information

- All AFRS Budgets and revenue information on the website
- Let the public know how you are spending the money from license sales, waterfowl stamps, upland bird permits, etc. And not after the fact, but what is being planned and why, and what is currently taking place.
- A list of programs funded by the department.
- How to influence the license fee structure
- How we can get the money that used to be used for hunting and fishing enhancement and was provided by sportsman through sales of sporting goods back to their intended use? Like get those moneys out of the general fund?
how we can get the money that used to be used for hunting and fishing enhancement and was provided by sportsman through sales of sporting goods back to their intended use? Like get those moneys out of the general fund?
- Annual angler trips and days by State and Region and fiscal information relating to the fisheries in the same format.

Maps of public lands, hunting lands, etc.

- Better maps of fishing areas
- Locations and maps of accessible state lands other than just "access spots." It took considerable research to locate BLM maps that showed state land open to hunting and its specific location. Comments on specific state wildlife area (SLWMA & LT Murray) by the local biologists or enforcement officials on conditions/goals/pressure/etc
- I would like to have high quality maps of wildlife areas and access areas. How about a map so I can take a canoe trip on the Frenchman Hill's wasteway in Grant County and look for shorebirds and waterfowl?
- On-line maps

Wildlife population information

- A list of cougar sightings/encounters
- A black bear population map, and a map showing the Grizzly bear habitat area.
- A copy of the Olympic Mountain Goat study.
- I would like to see more forecasts of the upland bird populations. (chukars)
- Deer and Elk population estimates

Personnel directories, etc.

- Roster of the regional biologists responsible for HPA, by phone number, address and e-mail
- Who makes the rules, as in the Person Responsible
- An honest address and a way to get replies from game agents involved in problems.
- Local numbers (pager) of enforcement agents. landowners that cooperate with WDFW by allowing hunters access.

Tribal hunting/fishing information

- I would like to see disclosure of case law pertaining to WDFW vs. various tribes regarding hunting and fishing enforcement on tribal lands. This is a very gray area, and one that I believe WDFW takes advantage of. I think WDFW should take it upon itself to post some of the rulings that have been handed down.
- More detail on both the science of fish harvest quotas (sport/tribal) and the legal implications of both.

- More info relating to commercial and tribal fishing seasons. When and where are they going to be fishing.
- Tribal fishing regulations

More scientific reports

- Other documents like State of the Salmon report that school classes can use
- I believe that there probably is a great deal of information available, but the format is not very user friendly. For example, I receive lake survey reports with essentially raw data, but few qualifying comments or conclusions. For example, the recent report on 2000 Angler Diary Returns was woefully lacking in supportive information. I can get a high school student to put together the information presented. I expect biologists to note the extremely small sample size reported, the modal catches, the seasonal variations, the reliability and validity of annual comparisons (they're not), etc. As a former Federal biologist, I know of which I speak. Raw data only sets you up for anyone's interpretation, and they can give your fits. I have seen your personnel try to defend a conclusion based on less than ten fish in the Mid-Columbia River--now that is ridiculous. It only destroys your credibility as an agency. It is no wonder that some highly placed folks believe that you do not have the skill to conduct research. I know better, eg. your Warmwater team is doing a pretty darned good job. I began coordinating research projects with the Department back in 1978. They didn't want to follow the rules then, and often it still looks like they want to do it their own way, in spite of many of the biologists having MS degrees and knowing the right way to approach research. Do it right, admit when you are weak or don't know, qualify your findings--make integrity the watchword.

Legislation regarding fish and wildlife

- Hunters need to be informed of legislative decisions that affect them such as House Bill 1752
- Any public input referencing legislation that will affect how WDFW does business, and/or affects hunters/fisherman

Fish habitat information

- Information on projects that are funded for beach and stream restoration in this area .Also, the proposals for the projects that were approved, and any follow-up studies and review of the projects.
- How to obtain WDFW publications that inform the public about current positive/negative activities that impact steelhead and salmon .
- More information about the impact of hatchery operations on wild salmon and more information about the percentage of wild fish harvested in ocean and river fisheries. Current science we have seen says wild populations cannot be recovery at current high harvest rates.

Land and habitat issues

- Inform the public of the research projects, land purchases, habitat enhancement/restoration projects that are currently taking place, who is involved (WDFW personnel, other agencies & organizations) and who to contact regarding input about a current project
- Programs and projects wildlife areas are working on, so adjacent neighbors can join in and all become better neighbors. The deer impact on the adjacent lands is devastating; more deer on farmed lands than on wildlife lands must be addressed.
- Land acquisition plans, priorities properties, ongoing protective efforts

Future regulations

- Discussion on next year's regs for stream fishing. Polling of citizens about C&R and NO KILL seasons.

- Future regulation plans (season and harvest limits) in an abbreviated form so the public can help form the regs.
- All new issues coming up for current or next following year

Toxics and wildlife

- News releases on the toxicity of pesticides, particularly in urban settings.
- Encouraging nurseries and home improvement centers to prominently display environmentally-friendly alternatives. Send one-page info sheets to the above businesses to display with their environmentally-friendly products.
- Do more to make the public aware of the ineffectiveness and damage done by commercial pesticides and herbicides particularly in urban environments.

News media use

- More obvious fish and wildlife information in the newspapers
- Utilize the media more effectively to tell your story; utilize technology to reach and connect with citizens - especially those who are not your traditional supporters
- Emergency Rule Changes available in local newspapers/radio stations.

More volunteer opportunities

- A much expanded volunteer program with your agency
- More volunteer opportunities on website

Appendix 4: Specific comments from Citizen Survey question #4

Q: Do you have any other advice on how WDFW can improve the quality of communications with you?

Improve staff responsiveness, attitude, access, etc. (24)

- More staff personally interacting with the public.
- Be more responsive (better staff levels) at regional/field offices. Provide public access at LaConner office
- Give the enforcement personnel better training in depredation work, or get different personnel to handle depredation complaints.
- Tell your agents to tell the damn truth when asked a question. I ask a warden, and a wildlife area manager, who were sitting and talking to each other, if they had seen any turkeys. Both said NO. I told them they were liars, because of all the driving around they do do. Then the manager said he had seen a few. Are you people going to do anything about the rudeness and the false statements? I doubt it
- Timeliness and direct answers to questions and concerns would be the best advice I can give.
- Remind your speakers that most people who review your communications, much prefer that they speak in plain english and leave all the academic language at school. Plain speak promotes an honest exchange of ideas.
- Listen for a change.
- I'm a free-lance outdoor writer and I find all contact with the WDFW very positive
- Be less GOVERNMENT, and more people oriented.
- Be more prompt in replying
- Better hunting in Michigan, nicer enforcement types
- More timely, not after the fact.
- Fix the e-mail time lapse!
- Permit information and draw results processed more quickly. Not enough time to schedule vacation or out of state plans.
- Yes, currently you do not reply to problems at all. The current attitude at WDFW is, "If we wait long enough, the problem will go away!" Any action has got to be better than the do nothing attitude you have now!!!
- Do a better job in the field with public relations. There are so many rule and regulations, one simple mistake can make a bad experince for a life time. I have never been cited but felt uneasy when question. I am an AHE.
- Direct phone no with out all that press 1,2,3,*,# system
- Would appreciate phone calls returned in a more timely manner. Some are not returned at all.
- Have Enforcement officers greet people on more of a helpful way instead or confrontational
- Quicker response to reply to email questions or concerns. The concerns I've mentioned are minor...overall I've had VERY GOOD success with the WDFW, but there is always ways to improve business. Thank you for the opportunity to be heard.
- Return phone calls, use e-mail more
- An appeal process when your officers wrongly accuse honest citizens of mis-deeds.
- On several occasions I have brought my complaint to your department and was summarily dismissed. It is my opinion that you are a group of Good Old Boys protection one another from criticism.
- Return phone calls, use e-mail more

Continue improving website (post more information, use e-mail, list-serves, etc.) (20*)

- Listing of current harvest reports on Internet site

- Continue to work on web site and update more regularly by field level personnel, more positive field interaction
- E-mail- newsletter. Maybe an interactive message board on the website.
- Since I am an interested party, I am primarily the one to initiate any communication besides browsing the website. Targeted e-mail to me requesting my opinion or suggestion would be answered promptly and would give me a chance to know when areas in which I have concerns are getting Commission and Department attention. I would like to have input early and directly on big game issues like seasons, methods, special hunts, special permits and enforcement issues. I would like this as an individual as well as in my capacity as Secretary of the Cascade Mountainmen, a traditional muzzleloading group in the Puget Sound area.
- More offices having email addresses
- Continue to add to the science available on the Web site. Perhaps add some links like the Fish Passage Center. That information is exciting to know about. As a fisherman, I like to know about projected return rates for rivers so I can plan ahead for my fishing trip. Now, I read in the newspaper about how it was last weekend instead of when the peak run is expected and its size. I seem to always be in a quandry regarding when the Humptulips turns on for big Kings or the Cowlitz for Coho. I think your Web site is your most cost-effective avenue for communication.
- Have e-mail at web site
- Have a "ask WDFW" on your website. Ususally all you see on these sites is a way to contact the webmaster.
- I would like to subscribe to receive all WDFW news releases via e-mail.
- The web site is very confusing, I have a hard time finding the info I am looking for.
- Keep updating the website. I check it at least twice a week.
- Start a forum on your website so that we could see what issues are being discussed. That way, you wouldn't get tons of E-mail on each issue.
- Have an e-mail alert that would notify registered e-mails of specific midseason changes related to their sport.
- Subscription e-mail notices
- Use e-mails.
- I am not sure that the WDW is ready for web based communications. Answers are slow. There have been too many mistakes -- loss of special permit points. There have been too many dropped links on the web page. The use of Internet surveys is not scientific fact gathering. Rather it is opinion gathering of individuals that the WDW has no method of tracking or understanding their personal agendas. Web based information/services are great if handled correctly. Handled incorrectly they will open up a can of worms that neither the WDW or the hunters of Washington want or deserve.
- Keep up the good work on the website.
- The NatureMapping website is very useful and honors my interest in wildlife and makes student observations relevant.
- Like to learn more about the agency by mail or email.
- Keep up the good work on the website

Improve Roundtable participation, public involvement/input, feedback, etc. (19*)

- Invite some people from the north olympic peninsula to the roundtables
- The quality of communications is fine. I just have some questions on how the regulations in the Gold and Fish booklet were arrived at. And the 'Director's Roundtable Participants' I do not see anyone from the recreational prospecting community. What is the reason for this? I would be interested in an answer
- Involve retired employees. Communication is the key.
- Just ask what we would like to say, not ask us to choose an answer that you think we should want to give

- I have lots of ideas on how to do things better, but it is hard to get ideas thru if you are not a member of one of the big hunting interests. I would love to be part of a round table and share ideas on the pamphlet, rules, unit descriptions and harvest goals.
- Explain how the public input you receive has enlightened you. What changes have been made as a result of public input. What misperceptions do you see the public as having.
- Query the public on what they envision as proper use of OUR fishery/wildlife resources.
- More surveys on web site, questionnaires at retail location with drop box at the site. Not everyone has a computer. Not every one feels that a "mailer" does any good. Drop boxes at rotating retail sites would encourage participation.
- More opportunities for the "average" sportsman, who is not part of an organized group, to participate and be listened to.
- Remember to "dance with the one that brung ya." The hunters and anglers chose to be regulated and taxed to form the Department. They have been the primary source of conservation policy and labor for the last century. In efforts to be "inclusive", don't forget that contribution. There are a lot of individuals and organizations seeking to influence the Department which have no investment in the habitat and wildlife resources. Their focus is not, and has not been, on wildlife, but modification of human behavior to the exclusion of other animals. It is up to the Department to maintain its focus on wildlife!
- Contact those who use the areas per punch cards and harvest cards to help make the decisions for the areas with the people who really use them.
- Communicate with the "locals" of certain areas; specific game units; knowledge of herds, animals, and changes in ecosystems.
- Hold public input on legislation affecting all of us including the department. Not just you nor legislators should make decisions affecting all of us. When a new legislation is introduced let the public know this is going on!
- I'm satisfied with the quality now. I would be concerned with public involvement if it meant that wildlife management policies were influenced from it. For example the initiative process that trashed the bear and cougar management programs.
- Many times in the past, I have spoken in front of the commission or to WDFW personnel in meetings or other forums. Some are real good. Others are arrogant and so busy defending what they do or don't do that they don't listen. They seem to feel that no one but them has a good idea. Another problem is that input is given to the Dept. and there is no followup. For example, many of us have been begging for better access along the lower Yakima River and at Vernita Bridge for years, even decades. We get acknowledgement of the needs, but nothing else. After a while, we just give up and don't even bother to go to meetings or submit input. When issues like that are identified, the Dept. ought to put something in the local paper to explain what is going on with that issue, even if to explain barriers to proposals. Leave us in the dark, and we assume that you didn't listen, didn't care, or both. And then, when important issues come up on the ballot, WDFW wonders why fish and wildlife come out on the short end of the deal. Respect us. Respond to us in a meaningful way. Be a central rallying point for your public. Educate all the public. Work with us in a manner reflective of the symbiotic relationship between WDFW and the using public. Both must support the other; too often that doesn't happen. Working together, we can accomplish much more than working separately. Public involvement, information, and education should be the number one priority of WDFW. When that is working right, everything else will fall into place, and there will be plenty of support for most programs.
- I would like to see the F&WC meeting minutes posted sooner. Most of all, more attention (meetings) should be arranged for the No. Olympic Peninsula area.
- Tell the commission not to treat people who give testimony like second rate people. We are the customer and when asked a question please respond.
- Not enough time provided at Roundtable meetings for general public input; favored few dominated
- As I have experienced in the past, you request input from the public, while you have no intention of following up on input given. We (participants) can clearly see that you have an agenda and you only have these meetings so that you can say that the citizens were involved while you implement the regulations that you wished in the first place. You must actually use unbiased scientific

information to formulate and show this information on how you reached your decisions. You must also consider scientific studies that have been done by other agencies ie; EPA, Army corps of engineers, other state studies, and NOT those of individual groups known as NGO's- non governmental organizations for they will be no doubt extremely biased toward their point of view. Don't be shallow or attempt to placate the citizens, we can see it and take notice. Thank you.

Hunting issues (specific recommendations, etc.) (11*)

- How about just making hunting seasons the same length of time for all hunters. Some currently get a month and others get only 9 days. Make hunting season later in the year.
- We need to promote youth hunting thru youth hunts, both deer and elk. The youth and disabled hunt in gmu 248 was a large success that should be continued. Consideration of a elk hunt of with this same type should be considered
- I have become most disenchanted with the total lack of season and hunting opportunity afforded to modern hunters. I will be voting with my wallet. as in :not hunting or fishing in this state next year.I have hunted and fished for 20 years and see our seasons become more and more restricted. Like one agent told me at a game check: we would rather have deer and elk killed by cars than have you modern hunters get them. We don't have any pull with the liberal establishment in this state so I guess I will be spending my money and time in Montana or Id.
- Just remember sportsmen and women are your team mates not your adversary.
- One thought to ponder.... Why have members of PETA and HSUS on your advisory board if their main goal is the ending of all sport hunting and fishing? They want to remove your best proven tool for game management. Does this kind of politics have any place in scientific game management?
- The eastern wa. elk season should start on the first of November no matter what day of the week it falls on. The weather has changed...
- Why do you insist on killing off any elk herd north of Hwy 2. I've been told officially that you don't have a policy like this but all a person has to do is look at the regulations for the past ten years and it is very clear.
- Quit moving eastside elk seasons earlier every year on east side, the hunt starts to early and I have yet to talk to a hunter that likes any of the changes made to the elk seasons at least those of us who have 20 or more years experience.
- Better access especially on state & federal land
- The field agent was courteous and agreed with the nature of my complaint. I do however disagree with the WDFW policy that continues to allow hunters to use high powered rifles in rural neighborhoods even when the hunters cannot physically meet the parameters spelled out in the hunters pamphlet. The rhetoric that it is unenforceable is unacceptable. Please close these rural neighborhoods to hunting with rifles. WDFW is assuming liability if they continue to allow this practice to continue with out making every effort to keep high powered rifles from rural residences on the Enumclaw Plateau.
- I want to be able to report poachers and have them apprehended

Use news media more (6*)

- Have TV & Radio stations fill some of their public service spots with WDFW info.
- Get news releases to local newspapers and radio stations.
- For me personally, I believe using the newspaper as your number one communications resource you will reach the largest audience. I believe there are many like myself who do not have a TV or Internet access. I suggest distributing information/fact sheets to sporting goods stores and other outlets frequented by the people you wish to reach.
- More frequent press releases in the larger papers Times, PI...
- I usually don't get much information until something controversial happens and it shows up in the newspaper.
- A regular column in the PI or Times.

Fishing issues (wild vs. hatchery, commercial, etc.): (5*)

- I am not sure that this information belongs here, but I have an opinion regarding the wild vs. hatchery fish philosophy as well as the planted trout program. I am a recent transplant from California and a retired officer of Pacific Bell. I have watched my old state and the hardships it and the commission went through and how it had to adapt. I see similar trends in this beautiful state as well, and I think both its residents and the Commission need to adapt. Support of wild fish is an empty hole to through money into and which will eventually alienate sportsman. Get on with it raise as many salmon and steelhead of the highest quality available. Look to what this has done on the Sacramento River for best practices. I would also suggest that to get our young folks involved in the outdoors that you need to have planted trout where ever there is a possibility of a young person wanting to fish. Our state is way behind the curve in my opinion on the planting side of the issue. Lakes like Kachess, Kaachelus and Cle Elum should be swimming with opportunity not supporting a generation of "wild fish" or specialized fishing...that has seen their time...better yet what about improving the Kokanee that are there with shrimp as in Orgeon's Laek Wallolwa. I guess my message is adapt to the times... Washington is beautiful and needs to go down proven roads to be successful.... the new environment can be just as exciting as the old.... I get just as much thrill in catching a Hatchery steelhead as a wild one... but I would like to have an opportunity to have my grandson catch something on the Green River other than a stray whitefish. Let's adapt, enhance our existing environment and bring in additional revenue and license fees. The elitist notion of wild fish needs to be put to a vote of the general population... my guess is that will go the same as it did in California and other places. Thanks for taking the time to read this and good luck in your efforts. They are appreciated I am willing to volunteer as appropriate....a proud new 3 year resident of the best place to live in the world!
- Give up on the totally worthless commercial fishery in this state; no commercial fisher in this state makes a full time living fishing. The last wild animal harvested for the market in this state is fish. It's time to stop!
- You did not say how much of your funding came from commercial fishing licenses
- Establish a real dialogue with local conservation groups to develop fisheries management policies that will ensure salmon recovery. We are convinced current policies will drive all wild stocks to extinction.
- Show you are more concerned with real salmon recovery than protecting your turf and focusing on maximizing harvest. Not enough time provided at Roundtable meeting for general public input; favored few dominated input.

Simplify regulations pamphlets (3*)

- I would like to see the regulations simplified even more. The reason that many people do not hunt anymore is because the regulations are so confusing. They are wordy and misleading. I would like to see better maps of the GMUs that show the real boundaries. The old regs in the 70's used to show them and that was a real help. (this alone would increase the amount of hunters that are not participating today)these are simple requests that would have a huge impact. Plus PLEASE ALLOW THE TAKING OF BIG BULLS FOR THE ARCHERS, I'm tired of hunting cows and spikes I hunt GMU 335 (archery) and I only went on opening day this year and I "live" to hunt.
- Make the game laws simpler.
- Make the hunting regs easier to understand. Certain areas seem to me to be quite confusing

Improve consistency of information (3*)

- Regional offices should, at least 4 time per year, get the habitat folks, watershed stewards, fish production people, and RFEGs in their area together so that we can coordinate information, policies, projects, personnel issues. We have people in the Olympia office, the Mill Creek office, and the LaConner office all giving us conflicting information and advice.
- Quit changing the regulations every five minutes, be consistent.

Improve data collection, science, etc. (3*)

- Listen to all related science as it relates to mineral extraction from this state

- Set up either a internet or phone based survey system, to gather more up to date counts on fish and crab harvests. You have to keep it simple for the masses.
- Sound biological decisions and less emphasis on communication

Produce more information products (3*)

- More map and GIS products in user friendly formats - i.e. hard copy or easy to download and print
- A Washington. wildlife magazine would be terrific I'd buy it !!!!!!!
- The NatureMapping website is very useful and honors my interest in wildlife and makes student observations relevant