

2011 CBFWA Survey For MAG Review

Executive Summary

Survey Respondents

Survey sent to 170 individuals

- 96 completed the survey
- 64 fish and wildlife managers, 15 BPA or Council employees, and 17 others
- 55 CBFWA members participated
- Policy- and technical-level professionals participated with 49 individuals active at both levels within their organization
 - >14 individuals from each BPA-funded regional coordination organization participated in survey
- 90% of respondents participated in CBFWA meetings during 2010
 - >11 individuals from each CBFWA forum participated in survey

CBFWA Organization

63% of the respondents believe the current role of CBFWA is to facilitate discussions among the agencies and tribes

- rather than to advocate or inform decision makers

60% of the respondents are satisfied with the 2010 CBFWA workplan

- 85% of the participants agree that the workplan provided opportunities to develop useful technical documents
- 85% of the participants agree that the workplan provided opportunities to address policy-oriented issues

89% of the participants rated their overall experience with CBFWA as average or above

- 92% of the respondents indicated that CBFWA was average or better in comparison to other coordination organizations
 - 54% rating the experience as above average or excellent

80% of the respondents indicated that if the CBFWA coordination services were terminated, there would be at least some impact to their organization's ability to coordinate, at a technical- and policy-level, with fish and wildlife entities from throughout the basin and to address or participate in NPCC Program issues and processes

- 67% of the respondents rated the value of their CBFWA membership as average or better
- 55% of those individuals indicating that the value was good to excellent

CBFWA Forums

There was a high level of satisfaction and value for the CBFWA committees in general; however,

- 23% of the respondents indicated that Member level coordination services were not valuable
- 18% of respondents were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with the Members meetings

CBFWA Websites

88% of the respondents indicated that the CBFWA website provides valuable and useful information

- 54% of the respondents indicated that they use the website to stay informed and conduct business
- Most users of the website (65%), use it from time-to-time (once per month)
- 97% of the respondents rated the website as average or better

67% of the respondents have visited the SOTR website

- 99% of the respondents found the site to be somewhat to very easy to use
- 98% found the site to be somewhat to very informative

CBFWA Staff

95% of the respondents rated the service provided by the CBFWA staff as good to excellent

- of the respondents that had contacted CBFWA staff, 99% indicated that their request was handled to their satisfaction and they valued the interactions and support

65% of the members are satisfied with the extent to which the staff keeps them informed on important activities

- 85% were satisfied with the quality of the work of the staff
- 65% of the participants rated the staff as effective in meeting the needs of the membership
- 29% of the respondents were neutral in their assessment of the effectiveness of the staff

Former CBFWA Members

100% of the former-CBFWA members indicated that there is nothing that the CBFWA could change to regain their membership

General Comments

Regional coordination is definitely needed. Unfortunately, now that two states and several tribes have, or plan to, withdraw from CBFWA, the authority is no longer the regional forum it once was. This is no fault of the CBFWA staff, but rather it reflects the fact that CBFWA's most important function, to prioritize projects and balance the budget, is no longer performed by CBFWA. Also, for the last year or so, CBFWA's efforts have focused on portions of the Fish and Wildlife Program that are not very relevant to my state/agency. The question is who will make sure the F&W Program is implemented properly if not CBFWA?

It had its time, but that no longer is the case - especially with States and larger Tribes. In fact, several years ago, CBFWA petitioning for Fish and Wildlife needs was more of a poison pill than anything; we were treated pretty poorly by the Council. With the Accords, much of the funding issues that CBFWA pushed are resolved. There are also other forums for coordination, and they seem to be working alright. The problem is that if CBFWA is dissolved, can it be reconstituted?

I see no connection between products being generated in RFAC and on-the-ground improvements for fish and wildlife. When we do complete a plan or document that gives guidance to habitat improvements or mitigation for lost resources, we are told "there is no money." Until funding is available or we can produce something that physically benefits habitat or fish populations; participation on this committee is low priority.

Overall CWBFA has been helpful to my duties, but it seems more could be done to bridge the information gap between project managers and Portland based agencies. One area of potential improvement would be to keep project leads informed as to when the next solicitation process is starting, or a rough schedule/outline.

I have found the CBFWA staff to be very helpful and efficient. I don't feel that the particular committee we participate in has been effective but it is not due to any issues at CBFWA but rather issues associated with one member having ultimate control over the outcomes.

CBFWA provides good information about activities in the Basin, particularly scheduled meetings and events. It provides an excellent forum for management entities to collaborate and see the big picture. It also provides a means for managers to develop consensus positions on important management issues.

We have several tribal coordination groups but not many options for coordination with various states. To me this was one of CBFWA strongest coordination values.

I feel that the measures of this survey will focus survey takers on the diminished capacity of CBFWA as it stands now rather than how it has performed in the past when it was funded and capable and operating at a higher capacity. There should be some measure of before and after to provide perspective.

My only involvement with CBFWA is through the LTWG. I have found the LTWG to be a useful, perhaps critical, forum for discussing important lamprey management and research issues that span the Columbia Basin.

CBFWA and its committees provide more value to the region than anyone realizes. As CBFWA Members, we need to do whatever it takes to retain, and fully support the CBFWA organization, the charter, and the technical expertise of the staff. However, I'm not advocating for more of the same. We may need a structurally different CBFWA than has existed over the past 30 years. These changes need to reflect the changing "landscape" of the Columbia Basin. It isn't the same Columbia Basin as 15 years ago, so CBFWA will need to change as well. To that end, we have not yet outlined a vision for the future of CBFWA. That's a work-in-progress, but we need to continue our internal discussions.

The need for all F&W managers to be able to come together through a common organization will always be a high priority. Only CBFWA serves this purpose. The need and general purpose will not change but annual scope of work should be adaptive based on changing priorities.

With the Accords in place the role of CBFWA has been diminished over an already diminished role created by the Gorton amendment. My limited exposure to CBFWA during the Bush administration is that the Fed agencies blocked any strong positions that Tribe would like to see from rolling out. We have not been plugged in enough to determine the value of CBFWA in a re-invented role. Staff resources that I have that could make use of CBFWA are more useful in Accord implementation.

Highest value to me has been interactions with other co-managers.

CBFWA has a very difficult coordination job and the staff conducts themselves professionally and develops high quality products.

This entity strongly supports CBFWA to continue its role as an effective consensus voice for the F&W co-managers.

Although I have not been able to attend all of the CBFWA meetings I have seen it pull the region together. I am very disappointed that the funding is being pulled away and members are now using the funds themselves. Although with all the budget cuts members are fighting to keep their projects going. I still believe that CBFWA can be a great regional coordinating organization.

The value of CBFWA needs to be considered in a long-term context, rather than specifics that are happening this instant. There is no other forum in the region that compares to CBFWA relative to providing the fish and wildlife managers with an opportunity to jointly engage the Fish and Wildlife Program and related regional programs.