

NOTICE OF OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET ACTION

Diana Hynek 12/20/2002
Departmental Paperwork Clearance Officer
Office of the Chief Information Officer
14th and Constitution Ave. NW.
Room 6625
Washington, DC 20230

In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act, OMB has taken the following action on your request for approval of the reinstatement of an information collection received on 10/16/2002.

TITLE: Survey to Measure Effectiveness of
Community-Oriented Policing for ESA Enforcement

AGENCY FORM NUMBER(S): None

ACTION : APPROVED WITHOUT CHANGE
OMB NO.: 0648-0435
EXPIRATION DATE: 12/31/2005

BURDEN:	RESPONSES	HOURS	COSTS(\$,000)
Previous	0	0	0
New	787	316	0
Difference	787	316	0
Program Change		316	0
Adjustment		0	0

TERMS OF CLEARANCE: None

OMB Authorizing Official Title

Donald R. Arbuckle Deputy Administrator, Office of
Information and Regulatory Affairs

PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT SUBMISSION

Please read the instructions before completing this form. For additional forms or assistance in completing this form, contact your agency's Paperwork Clearance Officer. Send two copies of this form, the collection instrument to be reviewed, the supporting statement, and any additional documentation to: Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, Docket Library, Room 10102, 725 17th Street NW, Washington, DC 20503.

<p>1. Agency/Subagency originating request</p>	<p>2. OMB control number b. <input type="checkbox"/> None a. _____ - _____</p>
<p>3. Type of information collection (<i>check one</i>)</p> <p>a. <input type="checkbox"/> New Collection</p> <p>b. <input type="checkbox"/> Revision of a currently approved collection</p> <p>c. <input type="checkbox"/> Extension of a currently approved collection</p> <p>d. <input type="checkbox"/> Reinstatement, without change, of a previously approved collection for which approval has expired</p> <p>e. <input type="checkbox"/> Reinstatement, with change, of a previously approved collection for which approval has expired</p> <p>f. <input type="checkbox"/> Existing collection in use without an OMB control number</p> <p>For b-f, note Item A2 of Supporting Statement instructions</p>	<p>4. Type of review requested (<i>check one</i>)</p> <p>a. <input type="checkbox"/> Regular submission</p> <p>b. <input type="checkbox"/> Emergency - Approval requested by _____ / _____ / _____</p> <p>c. <input type="checkbox"/> Delegated</p>
	<p>5. Small entities Will this information collection have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
	<p>6. Requested expiration date</p> <p>a. <input type="checkbox"/> Three years from approval date b. <input type="checkbox"/> Other Specify: _____ / _____</p>
<p>7. Title</p>	
<p>8. Agency form number(s) (<i>if applicable</i>)</p>	
<p>9. Keywords</p>	
<p>10. Abstract</p>	
<p>11. Affected public (<i>Mark primary with "P" and all others that apply with "x"</i>)</p> <p>a. <input type="checkbox"/> Individuals or households d. <input type="checkbox"/> Farms</p> <p>b. <input type="checkbox"/> Business or other for-profit e. <input type="checkbox"/> Federal Government</p> <p>c. <input type="checkbox"/> Not-for-profit institutions f. <input type="checkbox"/> State, Local or Tribal Government</p>	<p>12. Obligation to respond (<i>check one</i>)</p> <p>a. <input type="checkbox"/> Voluntary</p> <p>b. <input type="checkbox"/> Required to obtain or retain benefits</p> <p>c. <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory</p>
<p>13. Annual recordkeeping and reporting burden</p> <p>a. Number of respondents _____</p> <p>b. Total annual responses _____</p> <p> 1. Percentage of these responses collected electronically _____ %</p> <p>c. Total annual hours requested _____</p> <p>d. Current OMB inventory _____</p> <p>e. Difference _____</p> <p>f. Explanation of difference</p> <p> 1. Program change _____</p> <p> 2. Adjustment _____</p>	<p>14. Annual reporting and recordkeeping cost burden (<i>in thousands of dollars</i>)</p> <p>a. Total annualized capital/startup costs _____</p> <p>b. Total annual costs (O&M) _____</p> <p>c. Total annualized cost requested _____</p> <p>d. Current OMB inventory _____</p> <p>e. Difference _____</p> <p>f. Explanation of difference</p> <p> 1. Program change _____</p> <p> 2. Adjustment _____</p>
<p>15. Purpose of information collection (<i>Mark primary with "P" and all others that apply with "X"</i>)</p> <p>a. <input type="checkbox"/> Application for benefits e. <input type="checkbox"/> Program planning or management</p> <p>b. <input type="checkbox"/> Program evaluation f. <input type="checkbox"/> Research</p> <p>c. <input type="checkbox"/> General purpose statistics g. <input type="checkbox"/> Regulatory or compliance</p> <p>d. <input type="checkbox"/> Audit</p>	<p>16. Frequency of recordkeeping or reporting (<i>check all that apply</i>)</p> <p>a. <input type="checkbox"/> Recordkeeping b. <input type="checkbox"/> Third party disclosure</p> <p>c. <input type="checkbox"/> Reporting</p> <p> 1. <input type="checkbox"/> On occasion 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Weekly 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Monthly</p> <p> 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Quarterly 5. <input type="checkbox"/> Semi-annually 6. <input type="checkbox"/> Annually</p> <p> 7. <input type="checkbox"/> Biennially 8. <input type="checkbox"/> Other (describe) _____</p>
<p>17. Statistical methods</p> <p>Does this information collection employ statistical methods</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>18. Agency Contact (person who can best answer questions regarding the content of this submission)</p> <p>Name: _____</p> <p>Phone: _____</p>

19. Certification for Paperwork Reduction Act Submissions

On behalf of this Federal Agency, I certify that the collection of information encompassed by this request complies with 5 CFR 1320.9

NOTE: The text of 5 CFR 1320.9, and the related provisions of 5 CFR 1320.8(b)(3), appear at the end of the instructions. *The certification is to be made with reference to those regulatory provisions as set forth in the instructions.*

The following is a summary of the topics, regarding the proposed collection of information, that the certification covers:

- (a) It is necessary for the proper performance of agency functions;
- (b) It avoids unnecessary duplication;
- (c) It reduces burden on small entities;
- (d) It used plain, coherent, and unambiguous terminology that is understandable to respondents;
- (e) Its implementation will be consistent and compatible with current reporting and recordkeeping practices;
- (f) It indicates the retention period for recordkeeping requirements;
- (g) It informs respondents of the information called for under 5 CFR 1320.8(b)(3):
 - (i) Why the information is being collected;
 - (ii) Use of information;
 - (iii) Burden estimate;
 - (iv) Nature of response (voluntary, required for a benefit, mandatory);
 - (v) Nature and extent of confidentiality; and
 - (vi) Need to display currently valid OMB control number;
- (h) It was developed by an office that has planned and allocated resources for the efficient and effective management and use of the information to be collected (see note in Item 19 of instructions);
- (i) It uses effective and efficient statistical survey methodology; and
- (j) It makes appropriate use of information technology.

If you are unable to certify compliance with any of the provisions, identify the item below and explain the reason in Item 18 of the Supporting Statement.

Signature of Senior Official or designee

Date

Agency Certification (signature of Assistant Administrator, Deputy Assistant Administrator, Line Office Chief Information Officer, head of MB staff for L.O.s, or of the Director of a Program or StaffOffice)

Signature

Date

Signature of NOAA Clearance Officer

Signature

Date

**SUPPORTING STATEMENT
SURVEY TO MEASURE EFFECTIVENESS OF COMMUNITY-ORIENTED POLICING
FOR ESA ENFORCEMENT
OMB CONTROL NO. 0648-0435**

A. JUSTIFICATION

1. Explain the circumstances that make the collection of information necessary.

This request is for extension of an emergency clearance given on April 24,2002. There are no changes in the requirements proposed. The justification is essentially unchanged.

Reversing the downward spiral of anadromous fish populations in Washington State and responding to requirements of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) are high priorities for the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) and the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). In support of federal and state efforts to recover ESA-listed species in Washington, NMFS and WDFW resource managers have called upon the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife Enforcement Program and the NOAA Fisheries Office for Law Enforcement Northwest Division (OLE) to expand their roles in enforcing the ESA and providing protection for listed anadromous fish and their critical habitats.

The ESA objectives of NOAA Fisheries are articulated within the NOAA Strategic Plan as: (1) Recover and maintain protected species populations; (2) Reduce conflicts that involve protected species; and (3) Protect, conserve, and restore living marine resource habitat and bio-diversity. For the OLE, achieving these objectives will require a comprehensive strategic approach, using a combination of traditional and nontraditional law enforcement approaches with emphasis on prevention, as well as close partnerships with state, tribal, and local agencies, other stakeholders, and the public at large.

Enforcing the unlawful take of listed anadromous species through habitat loss and/or habitat degradation is problematic. Compliance alone will not solve the problem. Restoration of degraded habitat is also necessary. The laws regarding take are not understood by the public and not supported in many areas of impact. Non-compliance is not simple to define, nor is it readily recognized by the public or those tasked with protecting natural resources. Unable to recognize the violation, the public is unable to report the violation, and often times even enables the violator. Violators neither fear arrest nor fear the consequences for their actions. This assessment indicates a problem-solving, non-traditional approach is needed. Within the policing profession this problem solving approach is referred to as community-oriented policing (COP) or community-oriented policing and problem solving (COPPS).

Community-oriented policing (COP) is a pro-active philosophy that promotes solving problems that are violations or crimes and affect our quality of life, as well as related to other community issues. COP encourages using various resources and policing-community partnerships for developing strategies to identify, analyze, and address community problems at their source. The

NOAA Fisheries Office for Law Enforcement believes community input will better focus enforcement activities. With better information, agents will be able to respond more effectively in their enforcement actions.

Community-oriented policing (COP) has been widely heralded as the most promising contemporary policing philosophy. But with this boast come high expectations among political officials and many citizens. Such building of expectations will be problematic for the policing agencies if these expectations are not met. Unfortunately, no comprehensive measures are currently available for evaluating the success of COP programs addressing natural resource issues.

Recognizing the significant role non-traditional enforcement efforts will play in ESA enforcement in the Northwest, a new measurement tool has been developed by OLE, WDFW and Washington State University (WSU) to ensure that the performance outcomes of these non-traditional enforcement (COPPS) efforts are effectively measured. Through this instrument, COPPS efforts can be evaluated for success and elements essential for achieving successful outcomes in future programs can be identified and quantified.

Last year surveys were conducted on the Methow Valley of Washington. The results were valuable, but additional surveys are needed for other parts of the state.

2. Explain how, by whom, how frequently, and for what purpose the information will be used.

The WSU Division of Governmental Studies and Services will conduct a citizen survey of residents in the Walla Walla River Basin in Washington, and will conduct surveys and interviews of principal actors in the Walla Walla River and Cherry Creek/Snohomish River Basins who are involved in the intergovernmental negotiations of measures designed to address the listing of anadromous fish species as threatened in the areas watershed. This is the second in a planned series of similar local collaborations which the OLE and WDFW plan to conduct in Washington in order to maximize the pro-active measures of state and local government and private sector interests in preventing future loss of threatened and endangered fish species and hastening Pacific salmon recovery efforts in the Northwest.

This survey contains several separate sets of questions involving participation levels in water resource planning processes. The survey contains numerous items taken from a recent Columbia River Basin Area Survey, which will allow WSU researchers to assess the degree to which Walla Walla residents are “typical” of (or very unique among) citizens in the Pacific Northwest.

Various news and other organizations have made great efforts to inform the public on the issues and on the positions being taken by the various participants in the process of coming to agreement among the agencies of the county, state, and Federal governments involved. Questions in the Awareness and Knowledge section seek to determine the degree to which these efforts were successful in disseminating relevant information to the citizens of the area. In the

Perception section questions seek to determine how participants judge their conduct in the planning process and to assess thoughts on the advisability of including local input in salmon habitat planning where endangered species listings occur. A third section on General Views on Civic and Public Affairs will check local demographics against available census and related demographic information for the Walla Walla River Basin to make certain survey findings can be generalized to the whole population of the Walla Walla River and Cherry Creek/Snohomish River Basins. Section 4 will accomplish the same using personal background demographics.

For NMFS and WDFW enforcement staff, a self-assessment survey solicits evidence on the application of the COPPS philosophy employed in this program from the perspective of the staff that are implementing the program. It includes the collection of examples of behaviors consistent with COPPS. Additionally, a performance evaluation of line officers will be completed by supervisors to solicit evidence on the application of the COPPS philosophy employed in this program from the perspective of the supervisors responsible for implementing the program.

3. Describe whether, and to what extent, the collection of information involves the use of automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological techniques or other forms of information technology.

Both the size of the survey and anticipated intermittent Internet access make electronic submission of responses impractical. Some of the surveys are being done as interviews, which are expected to produce the most useful results. The results of the study will be made available on the OLE web site upon completion of the study.

4. Describe efforts to identify duplication.

This unique research is being conducted in collaboration between OLE, WDFW, and WSU Division of Governmental Studies and Services, Program for Local Government Education. We have done considerable research on COPPS strategies, and have determined that no studies similar to this have been done in the past.

5. If the collection of information involves small businesses or other small entities, describe the methods used to minimize burden.

This survey is completely voluntary with no impact on small entities.

6. Describe the consequences to the Federal program or policy activities if the collection is not conducted or is conducted less frequently.

Without this survey, OLE and WDFW have no ability to measure the community-oriented policing strategy being implemented in the Walla Walla River and Cherry Creek/Snohomish River Basins for protection and recovery of listed threatened species. With no ability to legitimately evaluate the program or to justify current or future funding of the program, the agencies will be forced to rely on conjecture as to the effectiveness of this program.

7. Explain any special circumstances that require the collection to be conducted in a manner inconsistent with OMB guidelines.

None.

8. Provide a copy of the PRA Federal Register notice that solicited public comments on the information collection prior to this submission. Summarize the public comments received in response to that notice and describe the actions taken by the agency in response to those comments. Describe the efforts to consult with persons outside the agency to obtain their views on the availability of data, frequency of collection, the clarity of instructions and recordkeeping, disclosure, or reporting format (if any), and on the data elements to be recorded, disclosed, or reported.

A Federal Register notice (copy attached) solicited public comment. None was received.

9. Explain any decisions to provide payments or gifts to respondents, other than remuneration of contractors or grantees.

None.

10. Describe any assurance of confidentiality provided to respondents and the basis for assurance in statute, regulation, or agency policy.

Survey participation is completely voluntary. In accordance with WSU guidelines for the protection of the rights of human subjects in university-sanctioned research, answers on the survey will be completely confidential. WSU will be the sole recipient and custodian of the individual responses to the surveys contemplated in this study. Only summary results and analysis will be provided to NMFS, WDFW, or any other party. Provisions for the safeguarding of personal identifier information is a prerequisite and an absolute condition to the granting of institutional approval for surveys such as those planned. Additionally, the survey instruments promise confidentiality and make completion of the questionnaire conditional upon WSU maintaining the data files and preserving the confidentiality of survey respondents.

11. Provide additional justification for any questions of a sensitive nature, such as sexual behavior and attitudes, religious beliefs, and other matters that are commonly considered private.

In order to determine how typical (or unique) the citizens of the Walla Walla River and Cherry Creek/Snohomish River Basins are in comparison to citizens of the region, it is necessary to ask participants a few questions taken from an earlier survey (conducted by Oregon State University in the mid-1990's for the Department of Interior) of residents of the Columbia/Snake River Basins and King/Snohomish County areas. These questions deal with attitudes on the environment, general involvement in civic affairs, and some political preferences (see section 3 of the survey).

In order to check out how representative survey returns are of the citizens of the Walla Walla River and Cherry Creek/Snohomish River Basins, background information is needed. The

personal background statistics from the survey will be checked against available census and related demographic information for the Walla Walla River and Cherry Creek/Snohomish River Basins to make certain information from the survey can be generalized to the whole population of the Walla Walla River and Cherry Creek/Snohomish River Basins.

12. Provide an estimate in hours of the burden of the collection of information.

Information will be collected from National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) personnel, Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) personnel, county government officials and key community actors in the Walla Walla River Basin area (Walla Walla County, WA), and a random cross-section of households. The citizens and NMFS and WDFW personnel will be asked to complete mail survey questionnaires **one-time only**, and questionnaire completion (involving a short, 8-page survey instrument for citizens and a 12-page survey for NMFS and WDFW personnel) will require an average of 20 minutes per citizen survey and 45 minutes for NMFS and WDFW personnel. A number of key persons (agency managers, county commissioners, prominently stakeholders) will be interviewed at length either in person or on the telephone, and those interviews will last an average of one hour. (Note: although surveys of NMFS personnel are included in the description to better portray the overall effort, copies of those surveys are not attached to this clearance request.)

In King Co. WA – in the Cherry Creek area (Cities of Duvall and Mill Creek) – key participants in a collaborative salmon recovery effort will be interviewed. The interviewees will be city, county, federal agency and private landholder representatives.

The following listing provides a fairly accurate estimate of burden of the project’s survey and interview activities.

Type of Respondent	# of Respondents expected	Frequency of contact	# of Responses expected	Ave. Time	Total Hours
Walla Walla Area					
<i>NMFS & WDFW personnel (survey)</i>	25	One contact	22 complete contacts	45 minutes	17 hrs
<i>Public Officials, NMFS and WDFW Managers/officials, & key stakeholders</i>	40	One contact	35 complete contacts	60 minutes	35 hrs
<i>Citizens of Walla Walla Co.</i>	1,000	One contact	700 completed surveys	20 minutes	234 hrs
Cherry Creek Area					
<i>Public Officials, NMFS and WDFW Managers/officials, & key stakeholders</i>	35	One contact	30 complete contacts	60 minutes	30 hrs

Total Respondents = 787, Total Responses = 787, Total Hours = 316 hours

13. Provide an estimate of the total annual cost burden to the respondents or record-keepers resulting from the collection.

Preface: None of the participants in the numerous survey and interview situations will be required to purchase any new equipment or materials, nor will they have to secure services from any party. Return postage will be guaranteed. The questions in the survey and topics explored in the interviews will pertain to recent effects involving collaborative problem-solving around salmon protection issues and ESA listings. Respondents will be relying solely upon their own perceptions and personal experiences to answer the questions posed to them.

The following are estimates of annual cost burden associated with the projects survey and interview activities.

Capitol and Start-up component	= NONE
Operations, maintenance and purchase of services	= NONE

14. Provide estimates of annualized cost to the Federal government.

The cost of survey collection and analysis services to the National Marine Fisheries Service provided by the Division of Governmental Studies and Services at Washington State University is \$30,000.

15. Explain the reasons for any program changes or adjustments reported in Items 13 or 14 of the OMB 83-I.

No changes are requested.

16. For collections whose results will be published, outline the plans for tabulation and publication.

Publication will consist of less than 50 hard copies of the report. At \$6.00 each, estimated publication costs are \$300. Publication and distribution of the completed study will rely heavily on electronic publication, e-mail and web site Internet access. Reference to this study in future articles in peer-reviewed journals is also a possibility.

17. If seeking approval to not display the expiration date for OMB approval of the information collection, explain the reasons why display would be inappropriate.

N/A.

18. Explain each exception to the certification statement identified in Item 19 of the OMB 83-I.

None

B. COLLECTIONS OF INFORMATION EMPLOYING STATISTICAL METHODS

1. Describe (including a numerical estimate) the potential respondent universe and any sampling or other respondent selection method to be used. Data on the number of entities (e.g. establishments, State and local governmental units, households, or persons) in the universe and the corresponding sample are to be provided in tabular form. The tabulation must also include expected response rates for the collection as a whole. If the collection has been conducted before, provide the actual response rate achieved.

The **entire population** of NMFS and WDFW officers and supervisors who have been involved in the Walla Walla River Basin and Cherry Creek/Snohomish River Basin federal, state and local government collaboration for salmon habitat protection will be surveyed (approximately 35 persons), and a cross-section of area public officials and key community actors will be surveyed (approximately 40 persons).

A **random sample** of local households will be drawn from digitized files purchased from Survey Sampling, Inc. (N=1000). [The universe of households for portions of Walla Walla County is 21,840]

<u>Study Pop.</u>	<u>Universe</u>	<u>Sample</u>	<u>Expected Response Rate</u>
<i>Agency Personnel</i>	35	Entire Pop.	88%
<i>Public Officials & key actors</i>	60	Entire Pop.	88%
<i>Household Survey</i>	21,840	1,000 sample	70%

2. Describe the procedures for the collection, including: the statistical methodology for stratification and sample selection; the estimation procedure; the degree of accuracy needed for the purpose described in the justification; any unusual problems requiring specialized sampling procedures; and any use of periodic (less frequent than annual) data collection cycles to reduce burden.

The sample selection for households will be that of random selection by Survey Sampling, Inc. Standard statistical guidelines will be used to estimate ranges of error in survey results [=/- 4% for n=700 at 95% level]. The collection burden will be minimal in that this is a one-day only administration of the survey.

3. Describe the methods used to maximize response rates and to deal with nonresponse. The accuracy and reliability of the information collected must be shown to be adequate for the intended uses. For collections based on sampling, a special justification must be provided if they will not yield "reliable" data that can be generalized to the universe studied.

A modified ADillman Total Design Method® will be used to maximize the rate of return on the mail survey. This method entails the use of cognitive pre-testing of survey instruments, the

careful layout of questions, and the use of multiple mailings to non-respondents until a satisfactory rate of return(70% for an 8-page survey) is achieved. This method of administration has been used in many previous surveys in Washington conducted by the Division of Governmental Studies and Services at Washington State University, and has regularly produced outcomes featuring both a high rate of return and a proportionate representation of socio-economic sub-populations among survey respondents. The results of the survey will be reliable.

4. Describe any tests of procedures or methods to be undertaken. Tests are encouraged as effective means to refine collections, but if ten or more test respondents are involved OMB must give prior approval.

All of the methods and procedures used will be established social science practices which have been pre-tested in previous work. No testing of new methods or procedures is planned. The mail survey and the personal interviews will follow conventional procedures for social science research, with all appropriate protections of human subjects being observed. The Washington State University Institutional Review Board, responsible for overseeing all funded research taking place at the university to insure compliance with Federal and state laws regarding the protection of the rights of human subjects of research, has approved the methods and procedures to be employed in this project.

5. Provide the name and telephone number of individuals consulted on the statistical aspects of the design, and the name of the agency unit, contractor(s), grantee(s), or other person(s) who will actually collect and/or analyze the information for the agency.

The unit collecting the data for this project is the Division of Governmental Studies and Services at Washington State university. This unit has been in operation since 1965, and conducts an average of ten mail surveys per year on grants from foundations and on applied research contracts with federal, state, and local government agencies. Prof. Nicholas P. Lovrich is the Director of that unit, and he serves as the Claudius O. and Mary W. Johnson Distinguished Professor of Political Science. Pertinent contact information on the Division is as follows:

Division of Governmental Studies and Services
Washington State University
PO Box 644870
Pullman, WA 99164-4870

Director:	Nicholas P. Lovrich, Ph.D.
Research Coordinator	Michael Gaffney, J.D.
Program Coordinator	Ruth Self, C.P.A.
Research Faculty	Edward Weber, PhD.
Phone:	509/335-3329
FAX:	509/335-2362
E-mail	faclovri@wsu.edu (Lovrich)
	911@wsu.edu (Gaffney)
	self@wsu.edu (Self)
	edweber@mail.wsu.edu (Weber)



LEARNING FROM THE WALLA WALLA RIVER BASIN SALMON RECOVERY EFFORT

CITIZEN SURVEY: Winter 2002

Over the past couple of years citizens in Walla Walla County farming communities have been direct witnesses to an ongoing process of problem solving aimed at devising a *locally based* response to the listing in of bull trout (1998) and steelhead (1999) as *threatened species* in the Walla Walla River Basin. This process has involved numerous agencies of the federal, state, county, and city governments, tribal governments, irrigators, the Farm Bureau, local farmers, and virtually the entire community to one degree or another. Because the Walla Walla River Basin Salmon Recovery Effort is one of the earliest of numerous anticipated, locally-based efforts to address fish habitat issues, we are very interested in learning as much as possible about how you and other randomly selected citizens in this area view these recent events. We are particularly interested to know if you had sufficient access to relevant information over this time period, how you size up the roles played by various participants in the problem solving effort, and what improvements you might suggest for the future based on your assessment of the Walla Walla River Basin experience.

This *independent* survey is being conducted by faculty researchers at Washington State University associated with the *Program for Local Government Education* (PLGE). This program brings together faculty in the Department of Political Science and Cooperative Extension to work on issues of importance to Washington's local governments. The role of local government is clearly a major one in this area, particularly in light of the watershed planning duties of county government. PLGE represents an active partnership between WSU Cooperative Extension and the state's local government associations. The costs of this survey (and interviews with major planning process participants) are being borne by affected federal and state agencies, and by WSU. This survey is seen as a significant element of citizen participation and commentary on this important locally-based effort.

Your participation in this survey is completely **VOLUNTARY**. In accordance with university guidelines for the protection of the rights of human subjects in university-sanctioned research, your answers on the survey will be *completely confidential*, and all results will be reported only in aggregated summaries. The number at the bottom of this page is used to coordinate multiple mailings **only**, and no permanent record of your identity will be retained once the survey is completed. If you have any questions regarding survey security issues please call the WSU Institutional Review Board at 509 335-9661. For information on the survey or PLGE, please contact either Professor Lovrich or Professor Weber at the numbers listed below.

Thanks in advance for your attention to this request for your opinions and observations.

Nicholas Lovrich
Local Government Specialist
(509)335-3329 (faclovri@wsu.edu)

Edward Weber
Professor of Political Science
(509)335-2455 (weber@wsu.edu)

Note: The ID number on this questionnaire is used only to coordinate mailings. When you return your survey, your number is checked off our mailing list and you will not be bothered by follow-up contacts.

ID# _____

DIRECTIONS AND OVERVIEW

This survey contains several separate sets of questions about your perceptions of the Walla Walla River Basin Salmon Recovery Effort. In addition to those questions, the survey contains numerous items taken from a recent Columbia River Basin Area Survey which will allow WSU researchers to assess the degree to which Walla Walla River Basin area residents are "typical" of (or very unique among) citizens in the Pacific Northwest.

Please comment on any questions in the survey that you believe deserve additional attention. Enclose additional sheets if you need them, or use empty space on the last page of the questionnaire to record your remarks and observations.

YOUR ANSWERS AND COMMENTS THROUGHOUT ARE CONFIDENTIAL

PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT STATEMENT: A Federal agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. Public burden for the collection of this information is estimated to average 20 minutes per response. Comments regarding this collection of information should be directed to: Dayna Matthews, West Coast Coordinator, National Marine Fisheries Services, 510 Desmond Drive S.E., Suite 103, Lacey, WA 98503; (360)753-4409. OMB Control # 0648-0435 Expires _____

SECTION 1

Awareness and Knowledge of ESA Listing and Salmon Recovery Issues

The local press and broadcast media have made an effort to inform the public on the issues involved in the Walla Walla River Basin Salmon Recovery Effort and on the positions being taken by the various participants in the process of coming to agreement among the city, county, state and federal government agencies involved. The five questions included in this section seek to assess the degree to which journalists and others were successful in their efforts to disseminate relevant information to the citizens of the area.

Q1.1 Please describe the *level of information* you have about the Salmon Recovery Effort?

- | | | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Not well informed | Somewhat informed | Uncertain | Well informed | Very well informed |

Q1.2 Please check all those *sources of information* you made use of on this subject.

- Newspaper coverage
- Discussions with friends and neighbors
- Public meetings or "workshops" held by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife and the National Marine Fisheries Service on the subject
- Meetings of the Walla Walla County Commissioners
- Public meetings held by the Walla Walla Basin Watershed Council
- Mailings or reports by groups or government agencies

Q1.3 A number of participants have been involved in addressing salmon recovery issues in your area. Please check off all of the *agencies* whose involvement you are aware of:

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> City of Walla Walla | <input type="checkbox"/> U.S. Natural Resource Conservation Service |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Walla Walla County | <input type="checkbox"/> Wa. Department of Fish and Wildlife |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Walla Walla County Conservation District | <input type="checkbox"/> Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Wa. Department of Ecology | <input type="checkbox"/> National Marine Fisheries Service |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Wa. Superintendent of Public Instruction | <input type="checkbox"/> U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service |
| <input type="checkbox"/> U.S. Department of Education | <input type="checkbox"/> Umatilla Confederated Tribes |

Q1.4 In the discussion of salmon recovery issues in the Walla Walla River Basin, a number of somewhat specialized *technical terms* and *legal references* have been used repeatedly. Please indicate your level of familiarity with each of the following terms and abbreviations as used in those discussions:

	Don't Know the term	Heard of the term, but don't know it	Know term
Endangered Species Act	()	()	()
Salmonid	()	()	()
Water right	()	()	()
Instream flow	()	()	()
Acidification	()	()	()
cfs	()	()	()
strontium testing	()	()	()
WRIA	()	()	()
HB2514	()	()	()
HCP	()	()	()
Incidental take	()	()	()
Kurtosis	()	()	()
Fish screen	()	()	()
Screen criteria	()	()	()

Q1.5 A few agencies and groups took the lead in providing information to the local public during the process of developing agreements for salmon recovery in the Walla Walla River Basin. How much *trust* do you have in the information provided by each of the following:

	<u>Trust Level</u>				
	None	Very Little	Uncertain	Considerable	Great Deal
Walla Walla County Commisioners	()	()	()	()	()
W.W. Basin Watershed Council	()	()	()	()	()
Wa. Dept. of Fish & Wildlife	()	()	()	()	()
Wa. Department of Ecology	()	()	()	()	()
National Marine Fisheries Service	()	()	()	()	()
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service	()	()	()	()	()
Bonneville Power Administration	()	()	()	()	()
Local Fish & Wildlife Officers	()	()	()	()	()
Environmental interest groups	()	()	()	()	()
Local area irrigators	()	()	()	()	()
W. W. Co. Conservation District	()	()	()	()	()
US Natural Resources Conservation Service	()	()	()	()	()

SECTION 2

Perceptions of the Walla Walla River Basin Salmon Recovery Effort

The several agencies of the county, state and federal governments involved in the salmon recovery effort have been engaged in a long process of negotiation over how to proceed in their collective efforts. The five questions in this section seek to determine how you judge their conduct in those efforts, and to assess your feelings about the advisability of including local input in salmon recovery efforts resulting from endangered species listings. The Endangered Species Act *does not require* such local government involvement, hence it is important to learn how citizens who have observed a process like the Walla Walla Basin effort evaluate it from their perspective.

Q2.1 In the case of the application of the Endangered Species Act to *salmon recovery* in our state, it is clear that some quite difficult tradeoffs will have to be made. Where would you locate yourself on the following scale with respect to the economic and environmental tradeoffs involved? [Circle the number best reflecting your view.]

1 ----- 2 ----- 3 ----- 4 ----- 5 ----- 6 ----- 7

The highest priority should be given to salmon recovery , even if there are negative economic consequences	Salmon recovery and economic factors should be given equal priority	The highest priority should be given to economic considerations , even if there are negative consequences for salmon recovery
--	--	---

Q2.2 In the Walla Walla River Basin salmon recovery effort, what is your impression of the “good faith bargaining” [honest attempt to find agreement] shown by the following?

Agency bargained in:	Bad Faith	Uncertain	Good Faith
Walla Walla County Commissioners	()	()	()
City of Walla Walla	()	()	()
Wa. Dept. of Ecology	()	()	()
Wa. Dept. of Fish and Wildlife	()	()	()
US Fish & Wildlife Service	()	()	()
National Marine Fisheries Service	()	()	()
Local WDFW Fish & Wildlife Officers	()	()	()
Army Corps of Engineers	()	()	()

Q2.3 In general, which of the following differing opinions regarding the enforcement of the *Endangered Species Act* would you consider to be the closest to your own view?

- This law should be enforced directly by agents of the **federal government**
- This federal law should be enforced primarily through **state government** agencies
- This federal law should be enforced by seeking **maximum cooperation between federal, state and local levels of government**
- This federal law represents **bad legislation**; it should be rescinded

Q2.4 How has the experience of the Walla Walla River Basin Salmon Recovery Effort affected your views on the Endangered Species Act?

- My opinion of the law became **more supportive**
- My view **did not change**
- My opinion of the law became **less supportive**

Q2.5 This process of the negotiation of fish habitat protection agreements affecting water rights and other economic interests among federal, state and local government agencies is likely to be repeated elsewhere in Washington. From your knowledge of the Walla Walla River Basin process, what is your opinion of the utility of this approach in other areas of the state? [Check your most preferred option.]

- The process has not produced progress toward acceptable results in the Walla Walla River Basin. It should not be tried elsewhere either.
- The process has not produced progress toward acceptable results in the Walla Walla River Basin, but it might work better in other areas of the state.
- The process has produced progress toward acceptable results in the Walla Walla River Basin, but it is unlikely to produce such favorable outcomes elsewhere.
- The process has produced progress toward acceptable results in the Walla Walla River Basin, and it should work just as well elsewhere in the state

SECTION 3
General Views on Civic and Public Affairs

To determine how typical (or unique) the citizens of the Walla Walla River Basin area are in comparison to citizens of the Pacific Northwest region, it is necessary to ask you a few questions taken from a recent survey of the entire Columbia River Basin area. These questions deal with attitudes on the environment, your involvement in civic affairs, and some political preferences.

Q3.1 The following five statements relate to the *relationship* you believe ought to exist *between people and the environment*. For each question please **circle** the response that most closely represents your views.

	Strongly Agree		Neutral		Strongly Disagree
Plants and animals exist primarily for human use.	1	2	3	4	5
Humankind was created to rule over the rest of nature.	1	2	3	4	5
Humans have an ethical obligation to protect plant and animal species.	1	2	3	4	5
The earth should have far fewer people on it	1	2	3	4	5
Wildlife, plants and humans have equal rights to live and develop on the earth.	1	2	3	4	5

Q3.2 With regard to your *active involvement in community affairs*, please check each of the following that applied to you over the course of the *past year*:

- Attended a public meeting on town or school affairs
- Attended a public meeting on watershed issues
- Involved as a member of a club or organization
- Served as an officer of some club or organization
- Served on a committee for a local club or organization
- Signed a petition
- Wrote a letter to a legislator or government official
- Worked on a community project
- Wrote a letter to the Editor of local newspaper

Q3.3 In regard to *following public affairs* and being engaged in civic activities, please indicate which of the following are typical of your activity.

	Yes	No
Read newspaper daily	()	()
Talk about public affairs with other folks	()	()
Do volunteer work in the community	()	()
Am interested in politics	()	()
Attend church regularly (once a month or more)	()	()

Q3.4 In the area of *general outlook on life*, please place yourself on each of the following five-point scales.

Most people can be trusted	1-----2-----3-----4-----5	You can't be too careful in dealing with people
	Undecided	
Most people are honest	1-----2-----3-----4-----5	People are always cheating to get ahead
	Undecided	

Q3.5 People have different ideas about the government in Washington, D.C. These ideas don't refer to the Democrats or Republicans, but just to the GOVERNMENT IN GENERAL. We want to see how you feel about these ideas in the following four questions:

How much of the time do you think you can trust the government in Washington DC to do what is right?

- Just about always Most of the time Only some of the time

Would you say government is:

- Pretty much run by a few big interests looking out for themselves
 Run for the benefit of the people

I don't think public officials care much what people like me think

- Strongly agree Agree Uncertain Disagree Strongly Disagree

Voting is the only way that people like me can have any say about how the government runs things.

- Strongly agree Agree Uncertain Disagree Strongly Disagree

Q3.6 In your opinion, what would be a realistic role for THE PUBLIC in natural resource management issues?

- NONE; let resource management professionals decide what's best
 PROVIDE SUGGESTIONS, and let the professionals decide
 SERVE ON ADVISORY BOARDS, and make public comments on what professionals do
 ACT AS A FULL AND EQUAL PARTNER with natural resource professionals
 THE PUBLIC SHOULD DECIDE WHAT'S BEST, and natural resource professionals should carry out what's decided

SECTION 4

Personal Background Demographics

In order to be sure that our survey returns are representative of the citizens of the Walla Walla River Basin area we need to collect some information on your background. We want to make certain that our survey includes a wide range of citizens – male and female, young and old, highly educated and less formally schooled, liberals and conservatives, high income and average income, etc. in proportion to their presence in the community. The personal background statistics from the survey will be checked against available census and related demographic information for the Walla Walla River Basin area to make certain we can generalize from our survey findings to the whole population of the area.

Please recall that all of your responses to the survey will remain *completely confidential*. If, however, you do not wish to answer any particular question, please skip over that item and move on to the next one.

Q4.1 Year you were born _____

Q4.2 Sex: Female Male

Q4.3 What ethnicity or racial origin do you consider yourself?

Ethnicity: Hispanic or Latino Not Hispanic or Latino

Race: American Indian or Alaska Native Black or African-American
(Select one or more) Asian Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
 White

Q4.4 Please indicate your highest level of education. [Check one]

- Some grade school Some college, trade school
- Completed grade school Completed 4-year degree
- Some high school Some graduate work
- Completed high school Hold an advanced degree

Q4.5 Please indicate your approximate family income before taxes in 2000.

- less than \$4,000 \$10,000-\$14,999 \$25,000-\$29,999
- \$4,000-\$6,999 \$15,000-\$19,999 \$30,000-\$49,999
- \$7,000-\$9,999 \$20,000-\$24,999 \$50,000-\$69,999
- \$70,000+

Q4.6 What is your present occupation? If retired, please put an X in this space [] and mark your former occupation.

- | SELF-EMPLOYED | EMPLOYED | OTHER |
|--|---|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Farmer or rancher | <input type="checkbox"/> Blue collar worker | <input type="checkbox"/> Homemaker |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Lawyer, doctor, teacher | <input type="checkbox"/> Office worker | <input type="checkbox"/> Student |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Business owner | <input type="checkbox"/> Office manager | <input type="checkbox"/> Unemployed |

If none of these categories seem to fit your occupation, please describe what you do for a living here:

Q4.7 On *fiscal policy issues* (taxes, government spending), where would you locate yourself on the following continuum? [Circle one number.]

Very Conservative 1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7 Very Liberal
Moderate

Q4.8 On *social policy issues* (such as women's rights, gay rights, doctor-assisted suicide), where would you locate yourself on the following continuum? [Circle one number.]

Very Conservative 1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7 Very Liberal
Moderate

Q4.9 With respect to *political party affiliation*, where would you locate yourself on the following continuum? [Circle one number on the continuum or check the alternative box provided.]

Strong Republican 1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7 Strong Democrat
Middle of the Road
(independent)

Identify with another party (e.g., Reform, Green, Libertarian)

Q4.10 There is much talk these days about what our country's goals should be for the next ten years. Listed below are some of the goals that different people say should be given top priority. Please mark the goal you consider to be the most important (1st choice) in the long run. What would be your 2nd choice? Please mark that 2nd choice as well. [select two]

	1 st Choice	2 nd Choice
Protecting national security and public safety	()	()
Giving people more say in important governmental decisions	()	()
Protecting property rights	()	()
Protecting freedom of speech	()	()

Q4.11 How long have you lived in:

The Walla Walla Basin?	_____ years
Washington State?	_____ years
The Pacific Northwest?	_____ years

Q4.12 Where (in what state) were you born? _____
 [If born outside of the US, please record country of your birth: _____]

Q4.13 Do you have any personal involvement or direct economic stake in the Walla Walla River Basin Salmon Recovery Effort? For example, are you a farmer using irrigation water, or do you sport fish in local streams and rivers, or do you have a water claim, or are you someone who has plans to drill a well? Whatever the nature of your direct connections to this issue, please describe those for us in brief terms.

Q4.14 How would you describe your connection to *sport fishing* in the Walla Walla River Basin watershed?

() Not a fisherman () Occasionally fish () Avid fisherman

We are very much interested in any **COMMENTS** you might have on this survey. Please record any comments you'd like to share with us here. Attach additional sheets of paper if necessary.

THIS COMPLETES THE SURVEY. THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION

If you wish to receive a **copy of the summary of survey results**, please check this box

WRITTEN CONSENT FORM

**LEARNING FROM THE WALLA WALLA RIVER BASIN
SALMON RECOVERY EFFORT**

KEY PARTICIPANT INTERVIEW

This interview is part of a study of the efforts made to come to agreement among the federal, state and local governments on the question of salmon recovery in the Walla Walla River Basin after the listing of Bull Trout (1998) and Steelhead (1999) as threatened under provisions of the Endangered Species Act. As a key figure in this issue area, you are being asked to submit to a 40 to 50-minute interview on this subject along with another 10 or so other key individuals.

It is important that you understand fully that your participation in this interview is completely voluntary. This means that even if you agree to participate in the interview, you are free to withdraw from it at any time. Your identity will not be associated in any way with your observations recorded in the interview; the interview session itself will be considered confidential. Your remarks will be consolidated with those of other interviewees in the preparation of an overall listing of themes and issues identified in the interviews.

The questions you will be asked will be confined to the salmon recovery effort taking place in this area, and to closely related issues. You need no special materials, documents or reports; we are primarily interested in your views of how the fish habitat protection effort took shape from your vantage point.

Thank you for your time and cooperation.

Dr. Nicholas Lovrich
Director

Dr. Edward Weber
Researcher

**Division of Governmental Studies & Services
701 Johnson Tower
Washington State University
(509) 335-4611**

I have read this document and agree to participate in this project. I understand that if I have any questions or concerns regarding this project I can contact either of the researchers listed above, or I can contact the WSU Institutional Review Board at (509) 335-9661

(signature)

PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT STATEMENT: A Federal agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. Public burden for the collection of this information is estimated to average 60 minutes per response. Comments regarding this collection of information should be directed to: Dayna Matthews, West Coast Coordinator, National Marine Fisheries Service, 510 Desmond Drive S.E., Suite 103, Lacey, WA 98503: (360) 753-4409

LEARNING FROM THE WALLA WALLA RIVER BASIN SALMON RECOVERY EFFORT

KEY PARTICIPANT INTERVIEW

Interview Question Set

Introduction

This interview is part of a study of the efforts made to come to agreement among the federal, state and local governments on the question of salmon recovery in the Walla Walla River Basin after the listing of Bull Trout (1998) and Steelhead (1999) as threatened under provisions of the Endangered Species Act. As a key figure in this issue area, you are being asked to submit to a 40 to 50-minute interview on this subject along with another 10 or so other key individuals.

The questions you will be asked will be confined to the fish protection effort taking place in this area, and to closely related issues. You need no special materials, documents or reports; we are primarily interested in your views of how the salmon recovery effort took shape from your own vantage point.

QUESTIONS

1. Would you please describe **your role** in the salmon recovery effort?
2. How long have you been involved (only if not obvious from the previous answer)?
3. What would you consider to be the **main issues** in dispute in this effort?
4. What would you consider to be the **main areas of agreement** between ALL the parties? (ask interviewee to describe and give examples)
5. To what extent were the **other participants** in the salmon recovery effort making a “good faith effort” to reach agreement? (ask interviewee to describe and give examples)
6. How would you **assess the efforts made** in the fish habitat protection effort of each of the following: [ask for reasoning, and get examples]
 - Walla Walla County Officials
 - Walla Walla County Conservation District Officials
 - City of Walla Walla Officials
 - Washington State officials from headquarters
 - Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife officers
 - Federal officials from the Army Corps of Engineers
 - Federal officials from the National Marine Fisheries Service
 - Federal official from the US Natural Resources Conservation Service

7. What are the **prospects for ultimate success** – that is, the achievement of agreement on a salmon recovery plan all sides can live with – of this process?
What promising aspects are present?
What troublesome aspects are present?
8. How useful would you say this type of ESA planning process would be for **other areas** of Washington and the Northwest? (ask for specifics)
9. What were the most difficult obstacles to deal with in the Walla Walla River Basin Salmon Recovery Effort?
10. If you could start the process over again – starting from scratch – what would **you** do differently in order to help ensure a successful outcome?
11. Do you have any specific advice for any of the players in the Walla Walla River Basin Salmon Recovery Effort with regard to what they could do better if everyone could start from scratch?
12. Over the course of the past couple of years, how has your level of **trust** in each of the following changed – that is, gone down, stayed the same, or gone up?

Walla Walla County Officials
City of Walla Walla Officials
Walla Walla County Conservation District
Washington State officials from Headquarters
Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
Federal officials from the Army Corps of Engineers
Federal officials from the National Marine Fisheries Service
Federal officials from the US Natural Resources Conservation Service

13. Is there anything that you think I missed, or anything else you think I should know about the Walla Walla River Basin Salmon Recovery Effort?
14. Who else would be good to talk to about this?



LEARNING FROM THE WALLA WALLA RIVER BASIN SALMON RECOVERY EFFORT

Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife Staff Survey: Winter 2002

Over the past couple of years the citizens of the Walla Walla River Basin have been witness to a complex, ongoing process directed toward fashioning a *locally based* response to the listing of steelhead (1999) and bull trout (1998) as threatened fish species in the Walla Walla River Basin watershed. This process has involved agencies of the federal, state and county government, irrigators, local businesses, and virtually the entire community to one degree or another. Because the process is among the first of numerous collaborative efforts being made to deal with the challenge of salmon recovery in Washington, we are very interested in learning as much as possible about how key participants such as you and how a randomly selected sample of citizens view these recent events. We are particularly interested to know if you had sufficient access to relevant information over this time period, how you size up the roles played by various participants, and what improvements you might suggest for the future based on your assessment of the Walla Walla River Basin Salmon Recovery Effort experience. Finally, the Interagency ESA/ROE program of NMFS and the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife represents an application of the COPPS philosophy; one section of this survey asks you to assess your own performance against criteria relevant to the implementation of COPPS in the Walla Walla River Basin setting.

This *independent* survey is being conducted by faculty researchers at Washington State University associated with the *Program for Local Government Education* (PLGE). This program brings together faculty in the Dept. of Political Science and Cooperative Extension to work on issues of importance to local government. The role of local government is clearly a major one in this area, particularly in light of the watershed planning duties of county government being carried out by local government agencies in the Walla Walla River Basin area. PLGE represents a partnership between WSU Cooperative Extension and the state's local government associations. The costs of this survey (and additional surveys of process participants) are being shared by affected federal and state agencies and WSU, proportionately. This survey is seen as an important aspect of citizen participation and commentary on this complex and important process.

Your participation in this survey is completely *VOLUNTARY*. In accordance with university guidelines for the protection of the rights of human subjects in university-sanctioned research, your answers on the survey will be *completely confidential*, and all results will be reported only in aggregated summaries. The number at the bottom of this page is used to coordinate multiple mailings only, and no permanent record of your identity will be retained once the survey is completed. If you have any questions regarding survey security issues please call the WSU Institutional Review Board at 509 335-9661. For information on the survey or PLGE, please contact either Professor Lovrich or Professor Weber at the numbers listed below.

Thanks in advance for your attention to this request for your opinions and observations.

Nicholas Lovrich
Local Government Specialist
(509)335-3329 (faclovri@wsu.edu)

Edward Weber
Professor of Political Science
(509)335-2455 (weber@wsu.edu)

Mailing Tracking # _____

DIRECTIONS AND OVERVIEW

This survey contains several separate sets of questions about your perceptions of the Walla Walla River Basin Salmon Recovery Effort. In addition to those questions, the survey contains numerous items taken from a recent *Columbia River Basin Area Survey* which will allow WSU researchers to assess the degree to which WDFW staff and Walla Walla River Basin residents are “typical” of (or very unique among) citizens in the Pacific Northwest.

Please comment on any question in the survey that you believe deserves additional attention. Enclose additional sheets if you need them, or use empty space on the last page of the questionnaire to record your remarks and observations.

*YOUR ANSWERS AND COMMENTS ARE **CONFIDENTIAL** THROUGHOUT.*

PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT STATEMENT: A Federal agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. Public burden for the collection of this information is estimated to average 45 minutes per response. Comments regarding this collection of information should be directed to: Dayna Matthews, West Coast Coordinator, National Marine Fisheries Services, 510 Desmond Drive S.E., Suite 103, Lacey, WA 98503; (360)753-4409.

OMB Control #0648-0435 Expires

SECTION 1

Awareness and Knowledge of ESA Listing and Planning Issues

The local press and a number of organizations in the area made some effort to inform the public on the issues and on the positions being taken by the various participants in the process of coming to agreement among the agencies of the county, state and federal governments involved. The five questions in this section seek to determine the degree to which they were successful in their efforts to disseminate relevant information to the citizens of the area.

Q1.1 How would you describe the public's *level of information* about the Walla Walla River Basin Salmon Recovery Effort?

 Not well informed Somewhat informed Uncertain Well informed Very well informed

Q1.2 Please check all those *sources of information* you made use of on this subject.

- Newspaper coverage
- Discussions with friends and neighbors
- Public meetings or "workshops" held by National Marine Fisheries Service and the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife on the subject
- Meetings of the Walla Walla County Commissioners
- Public meetings held by the Walla Walla County Conservation District
- Public meetings held by the US Natural Resource Conservation Service
- Mailings or reports by groups or government agencies

Q1.3 A number of participants have been involved in the Walla Walla River Basin Salmon Recovery Effort. Please check off all of the *agencies* whose involvement you are aware of:

- Walla Walla County
- Spokane County
- Washington Department of Ecology
- Washington. Superintendent of Public Instruction
- Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
- U.S. Forest Service
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- U.S. Department of Education
- Bonneville Power Administration (BPA)

Q1.4 In the discussion of salmon recovery issues a number of somewhat specialized *technical terms* and *legal references* have been used repeatedly. Please indicate your level of familiarity with each of the following terms and abbreviations:

	Don't Know the term	Heard of the term, but don't know it	Know term
Endangered Species Act	()	()	()
Salmonid	()	()	()
Water right	()	()	()
Instream flow	()	()	()
Acidification	()	()	()
cfs	()	()	()
strontium testing	()	()	()
WRIA 48	()	()	()
HB2514	()	()	()
HCP	()	()	()
Incidental take	()	()	()
Kurtosis	()	()	()
Fish screen	()	()	()
Screen criteria	()	()	()

Q1.5 A few agencies and groups took the lead in providing information to the public during the process of developing an agreement for salmon recovery in the Walla Walla River Basin. How much *trust* do you think the average citizen has in the information provided by each of the following:

	<u>Trust Level</u>				
	None	Very Little	Uncertain	Considerable	Great Deal
Walla Walla Co. Commissioners	()	()	()	()	()
Walla Walla Co. Conservation Dist.	()	()	()	()	()
Wa. Dept. of Fish & Wildlife	()	()	()	()	()
Wa. Department of Ecology	()	()	()	()	()
National Marine Fisheries Service	()	()	()	()	()
US Fish & Wildlife Service	()	()	()	()	()
US Natural Resource Conserv Serv	()	()	()	()	()
Local Fish & Wildlife Officers	()	()	()	()	()
Environmental interest groups	()	()	()	()	()
Local area irrigators	()	()	()	()	()

SECTION 2

Perceptions of the Walla Walla River Basin Salmon Recovery Effort

The several agencies of the county, state and federal governments involved in the salmon recovery effort have been engaged in a long and complex process of negotiation. The five questions in this section seek to determine how you judged their conduct in those negotiations, and to assess your feelings about the advisability of including local input in salmon recovery efforts where threatened fish species listings occur. The Endangered Species Act *does not require* such local government involvement, hence it is very important to learn how WDFW staff and local citizens who have observed the process evaluate it from their own perspectives.

Q2.1 In the case of the application of the Endangered Species Act to *salmon recovery* in our state, it is clear that some quite difficult tradeoffs will have to be made. Where would you locate yourself on the following scale with respect to the economic and environmental tradeoffs involved? [Circle the number best reflecting your view.]

1 -----	2 -----	3 -----	4 -----	5 -----	6 -----	7
The highest priority should be given to salmon recovery , even if there are negative economic consequences		Salmon recovery and economic factors should be given equal priority			The highest priority should be given to economic considerations , even if there are negative consequences for salmon recovery	

Q2.2 In the case of the Walla Walla River Basin Salmon Recovery Effort, what is your impression of the “good faith bargaining” [honest attempt to find agreement] exhibited by each of the principal agencies and officials?

Agency bargained in:	Bad Faith	Uncertain	Good Faith
Walla Walla County Commissioners	()	()	()
Washington Dept. of Ecology	()	()	()
Washington Dept. of Fish and Wildlife	()	()	()
US Fish & Wildlife Service	()	()	()
National Marine Fisheries Service	()	()	()
Local WDFW Fish & Wildlife Officers	()	()	()
Army Corps of Engineers	()	()	()

Q2.3 In general, which of the following differing opinions regarding the enforcement of the *Endangered Species Act* would you consider to be the closest to your own view?

- () This law should be enforced directly by agents of the **federal government**
- () This federal law should be enforced primarily through **state government** environmental and natural resource agency actions
- () This federal law should be enforced by seeking **maximum cooperation between federal, state and local levels of government**
- () This federal law represents **bad legislation**; it should be rescinded

- Q2.4 How has the experience of the Walla Walla River Basin Salmon Recovery Effort affected your views on the Endangered Species Act?
- My opinion of the law became **more supportive**
 - My view **did not change**
 - My opinion of the law became **less supportive**
- Q2.5 This process of the negotiation of salmon habitat protection agreements affecting water rights and other economic interests among federal, state and local government agencies is likely to be repeated elsewhere in Washington. From your knowledge of the Walla Walla River Basin experience, what is your opinion of the utility of this approach in other areas of the state? [Check your most preferred option.]
- The process has not produced progress toward acceptable results in the Walla Walla River Basin. It should not be tried elsewhere either.
 - The process has not produced progress toward acceptable results in the Walla Walla River Basin, but it might work better in other areas of the state.
 - The process has produced progress toward acceptable results in the Walla Walla River Basin, but it is unlikely to produce such favorable outcomes elsewhere.
 - The process has produced progress toward acceptable results in the Walla Walla River Basin, and it should work just as well elsewhere in the state.

SECTION 3

General Views on Civic and Public Affairs

In order to determine how typical (or unique) the citizens of the Walla Walla River Basin area are in comparison to citizens of the region, it is necessary to ask you a few questions taken from an earlier survey of the Columbia River Basin area. These questions deal with attitudes on the environment, your general involvement in civic affairs, and some political preferences.

- Q3.1 The following five statements relate to the *relationship* you believe ought to exist *between people and the environment*. For each question please **circle** the response that most closely represents your views.

	Strongly Agree		Neutral		Strongly Disagree
Plants and animals exist primarily for human use.	1	2	3	4	5
Humankind was created to rule over the rest of nature.	1	2	3	4	5
Humans have an ethical obligation to protect plant and animal species.	1	2	3	4	5
The earth should have far fewer people on it	1	2	3	4	5
Wildlife, plants and humans have equal rights to live and develop on the earth.	1	2	3	4	5

Q3.2 With regard to your *active involvement in community affairs*, please check each of the following that applied to you over the course of the *past year*:

- Attended a public meeting on town or school affairs
- Attended a public meeting on watershed issues
- Involved as a member of a club or organization
- Served as an officer of some club or organization
- Served on a committee for a local club or organization
- Signed a petition
- Wrote a letter to a legislator
- Worked on a community project

Q3.3 In regard to *following public affairs* and being engaged in civic activities, please indicate which of the following are typical of your activity.

	Yes	No
Read newspaper daily	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Talk about public affairs with other folks	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Do volunteer work in the community	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Am interested in politics	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Attend church regularly (once a month or more)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q3.4 In the area of *general outlook on life*, please place yourself on the following two five-point scales.

Most people can be trusted	1-----2-----3-----4-----5	You can't be too careful in dealing with people
	Undecided	
Most people are honest	1-----2-----3-----4-----5	People are always cheating to get ahead
	Undecided	

Q3.5 People have different ideas about the government in Washington. These ideas don't refer to the Democrats or Republicans, but just to the GOVERNMENT IN GENERAL. We want to see how you feel about these ideas in the following four questions:

How much of the time can the government in Washington DC be trusted to do what is right?

- Just about always Most of the time Only some of the time

Would you say government is:

- Pretty much run by a few big interests looking out for themselves
 Run for the benefit of the people

I don't think public officials care much what people like me think

- Strongly agree Agree Uncertain Disagree Strongly Disagree

Voting is the only way that people can have any say about how the government runs things.

- Strongly agree Agree Uncertain Disagree Strongly Disagree

Q3.6 In your opinion, what would be a realistic role for THE PUBLIC in natural resource management issues?

- () NONE; let resource management professionals decide what’s best
- () PROVIDE SUGGESTIONS, and let the professionals decide
- () SERVE ON ADVISORY BOARDS, and make public comments on what professionals do
- () ACT AS A FULL AND EQUAL PARTNER with natural resource professionals
- () THE PUBLIC SHOULD DECIDE WHAT’S BEST, and natural resource professionals should carry out what’s decided

Q3.7 On *fiscal policy issues* (taxes, government spending), where would you locate yourself on the following continuum? [Circle one number.]

Very Conservative 1 ----- 2 ----- 3 ----- 4 ----- 5 ----- 6 ----- 7 Very Liberal

Moderate

Q3.8 On *social policy issues* (such as women’s rights, gay rights, doctor-assisted suicide), where would you locate yourself on the following continuum? [Circle one number.]

Very Conservative 1 ----- 2 ----- 3 ----- 4 ----- 5 ----- 6 ----- 7 Very Liberal

Moderate

Q3.9 With respect to *political party affiliation*, where would you locate yourself on the following continuum? [Circle one number on the continuum or check the alternative box provided.]

Strong Republican 1 ----- 2 ----- 3 ----- 4 ----- 5 ----- 6 ----- 7 Strong Democrat

Middle of the Road
(independent)

Identify with another party (e.g., Reform, Green, Libertarian)

Q3.10 There is a lot of talk these days about what our country’s goals should be for the next ten years. Listed below are some of the goals that different people say should be given top priority. Please mark the goal you yourself consider to be the most important (1st choice) in the long run. What would be your second choice? Please mark that second choice as well. [select two]

	1 st Choice	2 nd Choice
Protecting national security and public safety	()	()
Giving people more say in important governmental decisions	()	()
Protecting property rights	()	()
Protecting freedom of speech	()	()

Q3.11 How long have you lived in: The Walla Walla area? _____years

Washington State? _____years

Pacific Northwest? _____years

Q3.12 Where (in what state) were you born? _____

Q3.13 How would you describe your connection to sport fishing in the Walla Walla River Basin watershed?

- () Not a fisherman () Occasionally fish () Avid fisherman

SECTION 4

Staff Self Assessment

The following set of nine questions and comment box will be used to gather data on the self-assessment of the WDFW and NMFS enforcement personnel who participated in the Walla Walla River Basin Interagency ESA/ROE Program for the Upper Columbia ESU. This evaluation will be completed by all line, supervisory and management staff in the two cooperating agencies. This instrument solicits evidence on the application of the COPPS (Community Oriented Policing and Problem Solving) philosophy employed in this program from the perspective of the staff that are implementing the program. It includes the collection of examples of behaviors consistent with COPPS. Please recall that all of your responses to the survey will remain *completely confidential*. If, however, you do not wish to answer any particular question, please skip over that item and move on to the next one.

Directions: Using the 5-point scale ranging from Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (5), circle the response that most closely reflects your personal assessment of your own performance and/or professional conduct over the course of the Walla Walla River Basin Interagency ESA/ROE Program. [Please circle NA where the question does not apply to you.] Please provide as many examples as possible under each question that does apply to you.

Q4.1 I have exhibited a professional appearance while interacting with citizens, other agency staff, and other WDFW enforcement staff.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree	NA
1	2	3	4	5	

Example: _____

Q4.2 I have been adaptable and flexible in dealing with the public, peers, and management.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree	NA
1	2	3	4	5	

Example: _____

Q4.3 I have taken concrete steps in improving my skills in employing the COPPS philosophy.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree	NA
1	2	3	4	5	

Example: _____

Q4.4 I have supported my agency's mission, goals, and objectives in my professional actions.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree	NA
1	2	3	4	5	

Example: _____

Q4.5 I have expressed myself effectively and interacted well with the public, peers and management.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree	NA
1	2	3	4	5	

Example: _____

Q4.6 I have used my uncommitted time effectively promoting the COPPS philosophy.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree	NA
1	2	3	4	5	

Example: _____

Q4.7 Working with the community, peers and management, I have identified problems and concerns in my area and formulated an appropriate plan of action that involves the participation of citizens in the community.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree	NA
1	2	3	4	5	

Example: _____

Q4.8 I have provided evaluation/feedback information to the community, peers and management regarding the plans of action I have implemented.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree	NA
1	2	3	4	5	

Example: _____

Q4.9 What additional training do you feel you should receive to implement the COPPS philosophy in your enforcement work?

If you wish to receive a **copy of the summary of survey results**, please enclose a separate card or piece of paper with your name and address on it. We will file that request separately from your survey and mail you a copy of that summary as soon as it is available.

We are very much interested in any **COMMENTS** you might have on the survey. We are particularly interested in any suggestions you might have for how the process of local citizen involvement in salmon recovery might be improved in light of the experience of the Walla Walla River Basin Salmon Recovery Effort. Please record any comments you'd like to share with us here. Attach additional sheets of paper if necessary.

THIS COMPLETES THE SURVEY. THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION.



LEARNING FROM THE WALLA WALLA RIVER BASIN SALMON RECOVERY EFFORT

Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife Supervisor's Survey: Winter 2002

Over the past couple of years the citizens of the Walla Walla River Basin have been witness to a complex, ongoing process directed toward fashioning a *locally based* response to the listing of steelhead (1999) and bull trout (1998) as threatened fish species in the Walla Walla River Basin watershed. This process has involved agencies of the federal, state and county government, irrigators, local businesses, and virtually the entire community to one degree or another. Because the process is among the first of numerous collaborative efforts being made to deal with the challenge of salmon recovery in Washington, we are very interested in learning as much as possible about how key participants such as you and how a randomly selected sample of citizens view these recent events. We are particularly interested to know if you had sufficient access to relevant information over this time period, how you size up the roles played by various participants, and what improvements you might suggest for the future based on your assessment of the Walla Walla River Basin Salmon Recovery Effort experience. Finally, the Interagency ESA/ROE program of WDFW and NMFS represents an application of the COPPS philosophy; one section of this survey asks you to assess your officers' performance against criteria relevant to the implementation of COPPS in the Walla Walla River Basin setting.

This *independent* survey is being conducted by faculty researchers at Washington State University associated with the *Program for Local Government Education* (PLGE). This program brings together faculty in the Dept. of Political Science and Cooperative Extension to work on issues of importance to local government. The role of local government is clearly a major one in this area, particularly in light of the watershed planning duties of county government. PLGE represents an active partnership between WSU Cooperative Extension and the state's local government associations. The costs of this survey (and additional surveys of process participants) are being shared by affected federal and state agencies and WSU, proportionately. This survey is seen as an important aspect of citizen participation and commentary on this complex and important process.

Your participation in this survey is completely *VOLUNTARY*. In accordance with university guidelines for the protection of the rights of human subjects in university-sanctioned research, your answers on the survey will be *completely confidential*, and all results will be reported only in aggregated summaries. The number at the bottom of this page is used to coordinate multiple mailings only, and no permanent record of your identity will be retained once the survey is completed. If you have any questions regarding survey security issues please call the WSU Institutional Review Board at 509 335-9661. For information on the survey or PLGE, please contact either Professor Lovrich or Professor Weber at the numbers listed below.

Thanks in advance for your attention to this request for your opinions and observations.

Nicholas Lovrich
Local Government Specialist
(509)335-3329 (faclovri@wsu.edu)

Edward Weber
Professor of Political Science
(509)335-2455 (weber@wsu.edu)

Mailing Tracking # _____

DIRECTIONS AND OVERVIEW

This survey contains several separate sets of questions about your perceptions of the Walla Walla River Basin Salmon Recovery Effort. In addition to those questions, the survey contains numerous items taken from a recent *Columbia River Basin Area Survey* which will allow WSU researchers to assess the degree to which WDFW staff and Walla Walla River Basin residents are “typical” of (or very unique among) citizens in the Pacific Northwest.

Please comment on any question in the survey that you believe deserves additional attention. Enclose additional sheets if you need them, or use empty space on the last page of the questionnaire to record your remarks and observations.

*YOUR ANSWERS AND COMMENTS ARE **CONFIDENTIAL** THROUGHOUT.*

PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT STATEMENT: A Federal agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. Public burden for the collection of this information is estimated to average 60 minutes per response. Comments regarding this collection of information should be directed to: Dayna Matthews, West Coast Coordinator, National Marine Fisheries Services, 510 Desmond Drive S.E., Suite 103, Lacey, WA 98503; (360)753-4409.

OMB Control #0648-0435 Expires:

SECTION 1

Awareness and Knowledge of ESA Listing and Planning Issues

The local press and a number of organizations in the area made some effort to inform the public on the issues and on the positions being taken by the various participants in the process of coming to agreement among the agencies of the county, state and federal governments involved. The five questions in this section seek to determine the degree to which they were successful in their efforts to disseminate relevant information to the citizens of the area.

Q1.1 How would you describe the public's *level of information* about the Walla Walla River Basin Salmon Recovery Effort?

 Not well informed Somewhat informed Uncertain Well informed Very well informed

Q1.2 Please check all those *sources of information* you made use of on this subject.

- Newspaper coverage
- Discussions with friends and neighbors
- Public meetings or "workshops" held by National Marine Fisheries Service and the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife on the subject
- Meetings of the Walla Walla County Commissioners
- Public meetings held by the Walla Walla County Conservation District
- Public meetings held by the US Natural Resource Conservation Service
- Mailings or reports by groups or government agencies

Q1.3 A number of participants have been involved in Walla Walla River Basin Salmon Recovery Effort. Please check off all of the *agencies* whose involvement you are aware of:

- Walla Walla County
- Spokane County
- Washington Department of Ecology
- Washington Superintendent of Public Instruction
- Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
- U.S. Forest Service
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- U.S. Department of Education
- Bonneville Power Administration (BPA)

Q1.4 In the discussion of salmon habitat issues a number of somewhat specialized *technical terms* and *legal references* have been used repeatedly. Please indicate your level of familiarity with each of the following terms and abbreviations:

	Don't Know the term	Heard of the term, but don't know it	Know term
Endangered Species Act	()	()	()
Salmonid	()	()	()
Water right	()	()	()
Instream flow	()	()	()
Acidification	()	()	()
cfs	()	()	()
strontium testing	()	()	()
WRIA 48	()	()	()
HB2514	()	()	()
HCP	()	()	()
Incidental take	()	()	()
Kurtosis	()	()	()
Fish screen	()	()	()
Screen criteria	()	()	()

Q1.5 A few agencies and groups took the lead in providing information to the public during the process of developing an agreement for salmon recovery in the Walla Walla River Basin. How much *trust* do you think the average citizen has in the information provided by each of the following:

	<u>Trust Level</u>				
	None	Very Little	Uncertain	Considerable	Great Deal
Walla Walla Co. Commissioners	()	()	()	()	()
Walla Walla Co. Conservation Dist.	()	()	()	()	()
Wa. Dept. of Fish & Wildlife	()	()	()	()	()
Wa. Department of Ecology	()	()	()	()	()
National Marine Fisheries Service	()	()	()	()	()
US Fish & Wildlife Service	()	()	()	()	()
US Natural Resource Conserv Serv	()	()	()	()	()
Local Fish & Wildlife Officers	()	()	()	()	()
Environmental interest groups	()	()	()	()	()
Local area irrigators	()	()	()	()	()

SECTION 2

Perceptions of the Walla Walla River Basin Recovery Effort

The several agencies of the county, state and federal governments involved in the salmon recovery effort have been engaged in a long and complex process of negotiation. The five questions in this section seek to determine how you judged their conduct in those negotiations, and to assess your feelings about the advisability of including local input in salmon recovery efforts where threatened fish species listings occur. The Endangered Species Act *does not require* such local government involvement, hence it is very important to learn how WDFW staff and local citizens who have observed the process evaluate it from their own perspectives.

Q2.1 In the case of the application of the Endangered Species Act to *salmon recovery* in our state, it is clear that some quite difficult tradeoffs will have to be made. Where would you locate yourself on the following continuum with respect to the economic and environmental tradeoffs involved? [Circle the number best reflecting your view.]

1 -----	2 -----	3 -----	4 -----	5 -----	6 -----	7
The highest priority should be given to salmon recovery , even if there are negative economic consequences		Salmon recovery and economic factors should be given equal priority			The highest priority should be given to economic considerations , even if there are negative con- sequences for salmon recovery	

Q2.2 In the case of the Walla Walla River Basin Salmon Recovery Effort, what is your impression of the “good faith bargaining” [honest attempt to find agreement] exhibited by each of the principal agencies and officials?

Agency bargained in:	Bad Faith	Uncertain	Good Faith
Walla Walla County Commissioners	()	()	()
Washington Dept. of Ecology	()	()	()
Washington Dept. of Fish and Wildlife	()	()	()
US Fish & Wildlife Service	()	()	()
National Marine Fisheries Service	()	()	()
Local WDFW Fish & Wildlife Officers	()	()	()
Army Corps of Engineers	()	()	()

Q2.3 In general, which of the following differing opinions regarding the enforcement of the *Endangered Species Act* would you consider to be the closest to your own view?

- This law should be enforced directly by agents of the **federal government**
- This federal law should be enforced primarily through **state government** environmental and natural resource agency actions
- This federal law should be enforced by seeking **maximum cooperation between federal, state and local levels of government**
- This federal law represents **bad legislation**; it should be rescinded

Q2.4 How has the experience of the negotiation process for the Walla Walla River Basin Salmon Recovery Effort affected your views on the Endangered Species Act?

- My opinion of the law became **more supportive**
- My view **did not change**
- My opinion of the law became **less supportive**

Q2.5 This process of the negotiation of salmon habitat protection agreements affecting water rights and other economic interests among federal, state and local government agencies is likely to be repeated elsewhere in Washington. From your knowledge of the Walla Walla River Basin experience, what is your opinion of the utility of this approach in other areas of the state? [Check your most preferred option.]

- The process has not produced progress toward acceptable results in the Walla Walla River Basin. It should not be tried elsewhere either.
- The process has not produced progress toward acceptable results in the Walla Walla River Basin, but it might work better in other areas of the state.
- The process has produced progress toward acceptable results in the Walla Walla River Basin, but it is unlikely to produce such favorable outcomes elsewhere.
- The process has produced progress toward acceptable results in the Walla Walla River Basin, and it should work just as well elsewhere in the state.

SECTION 3

General Views on Civic and Public Affairs

In order to determine how typical (or unique) the citizens of the Walla Walla River Basin area are in comparison to citizens of the region, it is necessary to ask you a few questions taken from an earlier survey of the Columbia River Basin area. These questions deal with attitudes on the environment, your general involvement in civic affairs, and some political preferences.

Q3.1 The following five statements relate to the *relationship* you believe ought to exist *between people and the environment*. For each question please **circle** the response that most closely represents your views.

	Strongly Agree		Neutral		Strongly Disagree
Plants and animals exist primarily for human use.	1	2	3	4	5
Humankind was created to rule over the rest of nature.	1	2	3	4	5
Humans have an ethical obligation to protect plant and animal species.	1	2	3	4	5
The earth should have far fewer people on it	1	2	3	4	5
Wildlife, plants and humans have equal rights to live and develop on the earth.	1	2	3	4	5

Q3.2 With regard to your *active involvement in community affairs*, please check each of the following that applied to you over the course of the *past year*:

- Attended a public meeting on town or school affairs
- Attended a public meeting on watershed issues
- Involved as a member of a club or organization
- Served as an officer of some club or organization
- Served on a committee for a local club or organization
- Signed a petition
- Wrote a letter to a legislator
- Worked on a community project

Q3.3 In regard to *following public affairs* and being engaged in civic activities, please indicate which of the following are typical of your activity.

	Yes	No
Read newspaper daily	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Talk about public affairs with other folks	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Do volunteer work in the community	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Am interested in politics	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Attend church regularly (once a month or more)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q3.4 In the area of *general outlook on life*, please place yourself on the following two five-point scales.

Most people can be trusted	1-----2-----3-----4-----5 Undecided	You can't be too careful in dealing with people
Most people are honest	1-----2-----3-----4-----5 Undecided	People are always cheating to get ahead

Q3.5 People have different ideas about the government in Washington. These ideas don't refer to the Democrats or Republicans, but just to the GOVERNMENT IN GENERAL. We want to see how you feel about these ideas in the following four questions:

How much of the time do you think you can trust the government in Washington DC to do what is right?

- Just about always Most of the time Only some of the time

Would you say government is:

- Pretty much run by a few big interests looking out for themselves
 Run for the benefit of the people

I don't think public officials care much what people like me think

- Strongly agree Agree Uncertain Disagree Strongly Disagree

Voting is the only way that people like me can have any say about how the government runs things.

- Strongly agree Agree Uncertain Disagree Strongly Disagree

Q3.6 In your opinion, what would be a realistic role for THE PUBLIC in natural resource management issues?

- () NONE; let resource management professionals decide what's best
- () PROVIDE SUGGESTIONS, and let the professionals decide
- () SERVE ON ADVISORY BOARDS, and make public comments on what professionals do
- () ACT AS A FULL AND EQUAL PARTNER with natural resource professionals
- () THE PUBLIC SHOULD DECIDE WHAT'S BEST, and natural resource professionals should carry out what's decided

Q3.7 On *fiscal policy issues* (taxes, government spending), where would you locate yourself on the following continuum? [Circle one number.]

Very Conservative 1 ----- 2 ----- 3 ----- 4 ----- 5 ----- 6 ----- 7 Very Liberal
 Moderate

Q3.8 On *social policy issues* (such as women's rights, gay rights, doctor-assisted suicide), where would you locate yourself on the following continuum? [Circle one number.]

Very Conservative 1 ----- 2 ----- 3 ----- 4 ----- 5 ----- 6 ----- 7 Very Liberal
 Moderate

Q3.9 With respect to *political party affiliation*, where would you locate yourself on the following continuum? [Circle one number on the continuum or check the alternative box provided.]

Strong Republican 1 ----- 2 ----- 3 ----- 4 ----- 5 ----- 6 ----- 7 Strong Democrat
 Middle of the Road
 (independent)

Identify with another party (e.g., Reform, Green, Libertarian)

Q3.10 There is a lot of talk these days about what our country's goals should be for the next ten years. Listed below are some of the goals that different people say should be given top priority. Please mark the goal you yourself consider to be the most important (1st choice) in the long run. What would be your second choice? Please mark that second choice as well. [select two]

	1st Choice	2nd Choice
Protecting national security and public safety	()	()
Giving people more say in important governmental decisions	()	()
Protecting property rights	()	()
Protecting freedom of speech	()	()

Q3.11 How long have you lived in: The Walla Walla area? _____ years
 Washington State? _____ years
 Pacific Northwest? _____ years

Q3.12 Where (in what state) were you born? _____

Q3.13 How would you describe your connection to sport fishing in the Walla Walla River Basin watershed?

- () Not a fisherman () Occasionally fish () Avid fisherman

SECTION 4

Staff Self Assessment

The following set of twenty-six questions and comment box will be used to gather performance assessment data on the NMFS and WDFW enforcement personnel who participated in the Walla Walla River Basin Interagency ESA/ROE Program for the Upper Columbia ESU. This **performance evaluation of line officers** will be completed by supervisory staff in the two cooperating agencies. This instrument solicits evidence on the application of the COPPS (Community Oriented Policing and Problem Solving) philosophy employed in this program from the perspective of the supervisors responsible for implementing the program. Please recall that all of your responses to the survey will remain *completely confidential*. If, however, you do not wish to answer any particular question, please skip over that item and move on to the next one.

Directions: Using the 5-point scale ranging from Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (5), circle the response that most closely reflects **your assessment of your average officer's performance** and/or professional conduct over the course of the implementation of the Walla Walla River Basin Interagency ESA/ROE Program. [Please circle NA where the question does not apply to the personnel you supervise.] Please use the comment box to record any observations you think are warranted with respect to the ESA/ROE Program performance of your officers.

Q4.1 My officers consistently exhibited a professional appearance while interacting with citizens, other agency staff, and other WDFW enforcement staff.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree	NA
1	2	3	4	5	

Q4.2 My officers displayed adaptability and flexibility while working with the public.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree	NA
1	2	3	4	5	

Q4.3 My officers demonstrated initiative in improving their own skills, and in helping citizens and other staff associated with the ESA/ROE Program improve they own skills.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree	NA
1	2	3	4	5	

Q4.4 My officers demonstrated prudent care and use of equipment entrusted to them.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree	NA
1	2	3	4	5	

Q4.5 My officers demonstrated good working knowledge of laws relevant to their work.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree	NA
1	2	3	4	5	

Q4.6 My officers demonstrated good working knowledge of general directives.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree	NA
1	2	3	4	5	

Q4.7 My officers demonstrated good working knowledge of patrol/investigative tactics.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree	NA
1	2	3	4	5	

Q4.8 My officers expressed themselves well verbally in their COPPS activities.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree	NA
1	2	3	4	5	

Q4.9 My officers interacted successfully with other officers and agents.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree	NA
1	2	3	4	5	

Q4.10 My officers consistently built teamwork with other officers and agents (through maintaining contacts, scheduling joint activities, spending time with together).

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree	NA
1	2	3	4	5	

Q4.11 My officers established and maintained constructive rapport with citizens.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree	NA
1	2	3	4	5	

Q4.12 My officers managed their uncommitted time efficiently to support the ESA/ROE Program.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree	NA
1	2	3	4	5	

Q4.13 My officers effectively engaged the public in the identification of problems and concerns in their respective areas.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree	NA
1	2	3	4	5	

Q4.14 My officers formulated appropriate plans of action in conjunction with the public.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree	NA
1	2	3	4	5	

Q4.15 My officers effectively implemented *plans of action* which made effective use of WDFW, NMFS and other agency personnel along with the public.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree	NA
1	2	3	4	5	

Q4.16 My officers managed their patrol/investigative time efficiently.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree	NA
1	2	3	4	5	

Q4.17 My officers consistently prepared complete reports and paperwork which were submitted in a timely manner.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree	NA
1	2	3	4	5	

Q4.18 My officers completed quality follow-up investigations.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree	NA
1	2	3	4	5	

Q4.19 My officers exercised proper judgment in handling requests for service.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree	NA
1	2	3	4	5	

Q4.20 My officers employed due caution and good judgment in dealing with suspects and with violators.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree	NA
1	2	3	4	5	

Q4.21 My officers maintained their self-control in stressful situations.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree	NA
1	2	3	4	5	

Q4.22 My officers made proficient use of communications equipment.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree	NA
1	2	3	4	5	

Q4.23 My officers proficiently recruited resources from outside of the enforcement division.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree	NA
1	2	3	4	5	

Q4.24 My officers actively participated in *in-service training*.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree	NA
1	2	3	4	5	

Q4.25 My officers demonstrated a proactive orientation toward problem solving.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree	NA
1	2	3	4	5	

Q4.26 My officers supported the mission, objectives and goals of the enforcement division in their COPPS activities.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree	NA
1	2	3	4	5	

If you wish to receive a **copy of the summary of survey results**, please enclose a separate card or piece of paper with your name and address on it. We will file that request separately from your survey and mail you a copy of that summary as soon as it is available.

We are very much interested in any **COMMENTS** you might have on the survey. We are particularly interested in any suggestions you might have for how the process of local citizen involvement in salmon habitat protection planning might be improved in light of the experience of the Walla Walla River Basin process. Please record any comments you'd like to share with us here. Attach additional sheets of paper if necessary.

THIS COMPLETES THE SURVEY. THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION

WRITTEN CONSENT FORM

**LEARNING FROM THE CHERRY CREEK/SNOHOMISH RIVER
BASIN SALMON RECOVERY EFFORT**

KEY PARTICIPANT INTERVIEW

This interview is part of a study of the efforts made to come to agreement among the federal, state and local governments and private sector interests on the question of salmon recovery in the Cheery Creek/Snohomish River Basin after the listing of Chinook (1999) as threatened under provisions of the Endangered Species Act. As a key figure in this issue area, you are being asked to submit to a 40 to 50-minute interview on this subject along with another 20 or so other key individuals.

It is important that you understand fully that your participation in this interview is completely voluntary. This means that even if you agree to participate in the interview, you are free to withdraw from it at any time. Your identity will not be associated in any way with your observations recorded in the interview; the interview session itself will be considered confidential. Your remarks will be consolidated with those of other interviewees in the preparation of an overall listing of themes and issues identified in the interviews.

The questions you will be asked will be confined to the salmon recovery effort taking place in this area, and to closely related issues. You need no special materials, documents or reports; we are primarily interested in your views of how the fish habitat protection effort took shape from your vantage point.

Thank you for your time and cooperation.

Dr. Nicholas Lovrich
Director

Dr. Edward Weber
Researcher

**Division of Governmental Studies & Services
701 Johnson Tower
Washington State University
(509) 335-4611**

I have read this document and agree to participate in this project. I understand that if I have any questions or concerns regarding this project I can contact either of the researchers listed above, or I can contact the WSU Institutional Review Board at (509) 335-9661

(signature)

PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT STATEMENT: A Federal agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. Public burden for the collection of this information is estimated to average 60 minutes per response. Comments regarding this collection of information should be directed to: Dayna Matthews, West Coast Coordinator, National Marine Fisheries Service, 510 Desmond Drive S.E., Suite 103, Lacey, WA 98503: (360) 753-4409 OMB Control #0648-0435 Expires

LEARNING FROM THE CHERRY CREEK/SNOHOMISH RIVER BASIN SALMON RECOVERY EFFORT

KEY PARTICIPANT INTERVIEW

Interview Question Set

Introduction

This interview is part of a study of the efforts made to come to agreement among the federal, state, and local governments and private sector interests on the question of salmon recovery in the Cherry Creek/Snohomish River Basin after the listing of Chinook (1999) as threatened under provisions of the Endangered Species Act. As a key figure in this issue area, you are being asked to submit to a 40 to 50-minute interview on this subject along with another 20 or so other key individuals.

The questions you will be asked will be confined to the fish protection effort taking place in this area, and to closely related issues. You need no special materials, documents or reports; we are primarily interested in your views of how the salmon recovery effort took shape from your own vantage point.

QUESTIONS

1. Would you please describe **your role** in the salmon recovery effort?
2. How long have you been involved (only if not obvious from the previous answer)?
3. What would you consider to be the **main issues** in dispute in this effort?
4. What would you consider to be the **main areas of agreement** between ALL the parties? (ask interviewee to describe and give examples)
5. To what extent were the **other participants** in the salmon recovery effort making a “good faith effort” to reach agreement? (ask interviewee to describe and give examples)
6. How would you **assess the efforts made** in the fish habitat protection effort of each of the following: [ask for reasoning, and get examples]
 - King County Officials
 - King County Conservation District Officials
 - King County Drainage District Officials
 - City of Duvall Officials
 - City of Mill Creek (regional office) Officials
 - Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife officers
 - Federal officials from the National Marine Fisheries Service
 - Federal official from the US Natural Resources Conservation Service
 - Washington Trout

7. What are the **prospects for ultimate success** – that is, the achievement of agreement on a salmon recovery plan all sides can live with – of this process?
What promising aspects are present?
What troublesome aspects are present?
8. How useful would you say this type of ESA planning process would be for **other areas** of Washington and the Northwest? (ask for specifics)
9. What were the most difficult obstacles to deal with in the Cherry Creek Salmon Recovery Effort?
10. If you could start the process over again – starting from scratch – what would **you** do differently in order to help ensure a successful outcome?
11. Do you have any specific advice for any of the players in the Cherry Creek Salmon Recovery Effort with regard to what they could do better if everyone could start from scratch?
12. Over the course of the past couple of years, how has your level of **trust** in each of the following changed – that is, gone down, stayed the same, or gone up?

King County Officials
King County Conservation District Officials
King County Drainage District Officials
City of Duvall Officials
City of Mill Creek (regional office) Officials
Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife officers
Federal officials from the National Marine Fisheries Service
Federal official from the US Natural Resources Conservation Service
Washington Trout
13. Is there anything that you think I missed, or anything else you think I should know about the Cherry Creek Salmon Recovery Effort?
14. Who else would be good to talk to about this?

Sec. 1540. Penalties and enforcement

- (a) Civil penalties
 - (1) Any person who knowingly violates, and any person engaged in business as an importer or exporter of fish, wildlife, or plants who violates, any provision of this chapter, or any provision of any permit or certificate issued hereunder, or of any regulation issued in order to implement subsection (a)(1)(A), (B), (C), (D), regulation relating to recordkeeping or filing of reports), (f) or
- (g) of section [1538](#) of this title, may be assessed a civil penalty by the Secretary of not more than \$25,000 for each violation. Any person who knowingly violates, and any person engaged in business as an importer or exporter of fish, wildlife, or plants who violates, any provision of any other regulation issued under this chapter may be assessed a civil penalty by the Secretary of not more than \$12,000 for each such violation. Any person who otherwise violates any provision of this chapter, or any regulation, permit, or certificate issued hereunder, may be assessed a civil penalty by the Secretary of not more than \$500 for each such violation. No penalty may be assessed under this subsection unless such person is given notice and opportunity for a hearing with respect to such violation. Each violation shall be a separate offense. Any such civil penalty may be remitted or mitigated by the Secretary. Upon any failure to pay a penalty assessed under this subsection, the Secretary may request the Attorney General to institute a civil action in a district court of the United States for any district in which such person is found, resides, or transacts business to collect the penalty and such court shall have jurisdiction to hear and decide any such action. The court shall hear such action on the record made before the Secretary and shall sustain his action if it is supported by substantial evidence on the record considered as a whole.
 - (2) Hearings held during proceedings for the assessment of civil penalties authorized by paragraph (1) of this subsection shall be conducted in accordance with section [554](#) of title 5. The Secretary may issue subpoenas for the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of relevant papers, books, and documents, and administer oaths. Witnesses summoned shall be paid the same fees and mileage that are paid to witnesses in the courts of the United States. In case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpoena served upon any person pursuant to this paragraph, the district court of the United States for any district in which such person is found or resides or transacts business, upon application by the United States and after notice to such person, shall have jurisdiction to issue an order requiring such person to appear and give testimony before the Secretary or to appear and produce documents before the Secretary, or both, and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof.
 - (3) Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, no civil penalty shall be imposed if it can be shown by a preponderance of the evidence that the defendant committed an act based on a good faith belief that he was acting to protect himself or herself, a member of his or her family, or any other individual from bodily harm, from any endangered or threatened species.
- (b) Criminal violations
 - (1) Any person who knowingly violates any provision of this chapter, of any permit or certificate issued hereunder, or of any regulation issued in order to implement subsection (a)(1)(A), (B), than a regulation relating to recordkeeping, or filing of reports),

- () Any person who knowingly violates any provision of this be fined not more than \$50,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both. Any person who knowingly violates any provision of any other regulation issued under this chapter shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than \$25,000 or imprisoned for not more than six months, or both.
 - (2) The head of any Federal agency which has issued a lease, license, permit, or other agreement authorizing a person to import or export fish, wildlife, or plants, or to operate a quarantine station for imported wildlife, or authorizing the use of Federal lands, including grazing of domestic livestock, to any person who is convicted of a criminal violation of this chapter or any regulation, permit, or certificate issued hereunder may immediately modify, suspend, or revoke each lease, license, permit, or other agreement. The Secretary shall also suspend for a period of up to one year, or cancel, any Federal hunting or fishing permits or stamps issued to any person who is convicted of a criminal violation of any provision of this chapter or any regulation, permit, or certificate issued hereunder. The United States shall not be liable for the payments of any compensation, reimbursement, or damages in connection with the modification, suspension, or revocation of any leases, licenses, permits, stamps, or other agreements pursuant to this section.
 - (3) Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, it shall be a defense to prosecution under this subsection if the defendant committed the offense based on a good faith belief that he was acting to protect himself or herself, a member of his or her family, or any other individual, from bodily harm from any endangered or threatened species.
- (c) District court jurisdiction
The several district courts of the United States, including the courts enumerated in section [460](#) of title 28, shall have jurisdiction over any actions arising under this chapter. For the purpose of this chapter, American Samoa shall be included within the judicial district of the District Court of the United States for the District of Hawaii.
 - (d) Rewards and incidental expenses
The Secretary or the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay, from sums received as penalties, fines, or forfeitures of property for any violation of this chapter or any regulation issued hereunder
 - (1) a reward to any person who furnishes information which leads to an arrest, a criminal conviction, civil penalty assessment, or forfeiture of property for any violation of this chapter or any regulation issued hereunder. The amount of the reward, if any, is to be designated by the Secretary or the Secretary of the Treasury, as appropriate. Any officer or employee of the United States or any State or local government who furnishes information or renders service in the performance of his official duties is ineligible for payment under this subsection, and (2) the reasonable and necessary costs incurred by any person in providing temporary care for any fish, wildlife, or plant pending the disposition of any civil or criminal proceeding alleging a violation of this chapter with respect to that fish, wildlife, or plant. Whenever the balance of sums received under this section and section [3375](#)(d) of this title, as penalties or fines, or from forfeitures of property, exceed \$500,000, the Secretary of

the Treasury shall deposit an amount equal to such excess balance in the cooperative endangered species conservation fund established under section [1535\(i\)](#) of this title.

○ (e) Enforcement

- (1) The provisions of this chapter and any regulations or permits issued pursuant thereto shall be enforced by the Secretary, the Secretary of the Treasury, or the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating, or all such Secretaries. Each such Secretary may utilize by agreement, with or without reimbursement, the personnel, services, and facilities of any other Federal agency or any State agency for purposes of enforcing this chapter.
- (2) The judges of the district courts of the United States and the United States magistrate judges may, within their respective jurisdictions, upon proper oath or affirmation showing probable cause, issue such warrants or other process as may be required for enforcement of this chapter and any regulation issued thereunder.
- (3) Any person authorized by the Secretary, the Secretary of the Treasury, or the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating, to enforce this chapter may detain for inspection and inspect any package, crate, or other container, including its contents, and all accompanying documents, upon importation or exportation. Such person may make arrests without a warrant for any violation of this chapter if he has reasonable grounds to believe that the person to be arrested is committing the violation in his presence or view, and may execute and serve any arrest warrant, search warrant, or other warrant or civil or criminal process issued by any officer or court of competent jurisdiction for enforcement of this chapter. Such person so authorized may search and seize, with or without a warrant, as authorized by law. Any fish, wildlife, property, or item so seized shall be held by any person authorized by the Secretary, the Secretary of the Treasury, or the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating pending disposition of civil or criminal proceedings, or the institution of an action in rem for forfeiture of such fish, wildlife, property, or item pursuant to paragraph (4) of this subsection; except that the Secretary may, in lieu of holding such fish, wildlife, property, or item, permit the owner or consignee to post a bond or other surety satisfactory to the Secretary, but upon forfeiture of any such property to the United States, or the abandonment or waiver of any claim to any such property, it shall be disposed of (other than by sale to the general public) by the Secretary in such a manner, consistent with the purposes of this chapter, as the Secretary shall by regulation prescribe.
- (4)
 - (A) All fish or wildlife or plants taken, possessed, sold, purchased, offered for sale or purchase, transported, delivered, received, carried, shipped, exported, or imported contrary to the provisions of this chapter, any regulation made pursuant thereto, or any permit or certificate issued hereunder shall be subject to forfeiture to the United States.
 - (B) All guns, traps, nets, and other equipment, vessels, vehicles, aircraft, and other means of transportation used to aid the taking, possessing, selling, purchasing, offering for sale or purchase, transporting, delivering, receiving, carrying, shipping, exporting, or importing of any fish or wildlife or plants in

violation of this chapter, any regulation made pursuant thereto, or any permit or certificate issued thereunder shall be subject to forfeiture to the United States upon conviction of a criminal violation pursuant to subsection (b)(1) of this section.

- (5) All provisions of law relating to the seizure, forfeiture, and condemnation of a vessel for violation of the customs laws, the disposition of such vessel or the proceeds from the sale thereof, and the remission or mitigation of such forfeiture, shall apply to the seizures and forfeitures incurred, or alleged to have been incurred, under the provisions of this chapter, insofar as such provisions of law are applicable and not inconsistent with the provisions of this chapter; except that all powers, rights, and duties conferred or imposed by the customs laws upon any officer or employee of the Treasury Department shall, for the purposes of this chapter, be exercised or performed by the Secretary or by such persons as he may designate.
 - (6) The Attorney General of the United States may seek to enjoin any person who is alleged to be in violation of any provision of this chapter or regulation issued under authority thereof.
- (f) Regulations
- The Secretary, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating, are authorized to promulgate such regulations as may be appropriate to enforce this chapter, and charge reasonable fees for expenses to the Government connected with permits or certificates authorized by this chapter including processing applications and reasonable inspections, and with the transfer, board, handling, or storage of fish or wildlife or plants and evidentiary items seized and forfeited under this chapter. All such fees collected pursuant to this subsection shall be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of the appropriation which is current and chargeable for the cost of furnishing the services. Appropriated funds may be expended pending reimbursement from parties in interest.
- (g) Citizen suits
- (1) Except as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection any person may commence a civil suit on his own behalf -
 - (A) to enjoin any person, including the United States and any other governmental instrumentality or agency (to the extent permitted by the eleventh amendment to the Constitution), who is alleged to be in violation of any provision of this chapter or regulation issued under the authority thereof; or
 - (B) to compel the Secretary to apply, pursuant to section 1535(g)(2)(B)(ii) of this title, the prohibitions set forth in or authorized pursuant to section [1533\(d\)](#) or 1538(a)(1)(B) of this title with respect to the taking of any resident endangered species or threatened species within any State; or
 - (C) against the Secretary where there is alleged a failure of the Secretary to perform any act or duty under section 1533 of this title which is not discretionary with the Secretary. The district courts shall

have jurisdiction, without regard to the amount in controversy or the citizenship of the parties, to enforce any such provision or regulation, or to order the Secretary to perform such act or duty, as the case may be. In any civil suit commenced under subparagraph (B) the district court shall compel the Secretary to apply the prohibition sought if the court finds that the allegation that an emergency exists is supported by substantial evidence.

- (2)
 - (A) No action may be commenced under subparagraph (1)(A) of this section -
 - (i) prior to sixty days after written notice of the violation has been given to the Secretary, and to any alleged violator of any such provision or regulation;
 - (ii) if the Secretary has commenced action to impose a penalty pursuant to subsection (a) of this section; or
 - (iii) if the United States has commenced and is diligently prosecuting a criminal action in a court of the United States or a State to redress a violation of any such provision or regulation.
 - (B) No action may be commenced under subparagraph (1)(B) of this section -
 - (i) prior to sixty days after written notice has been given to the Secretary setting forth the reasons why an emergency is thought to exist with respect to an endangered species or a threatened species in the State concerned; or
 - (ii) if the Secretary has commenced and is diligently prosecuting action under section [1535\(g\)\(2\)\(B\)\(ii\)](#) of this title to determine whether any such emergency exists.
 - (C) No action may be commenced under subparagraph (1)(C) of this section prior to sixty days after written notice has been given to the Secretary; except that such action may be brought immediately after such notification in the case of an action under this section respecting an emergency posing a significant risk to the well-being of any species of fish or wildlife or plants.
- (3)
 - (A) Any suit under this subsection may be brought in the judicial district in which the violation occurs.
 - (B) In any such suit under this subsection in which the United States is not a party, the Attorney General, at the request of the Secretary, may intervene on behalf of the United States as a matter of right.
- (4) The court, in issuing any final order in any suit brought pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection, may award costs of litigation (including reasonable attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, whenever the court determines such award is appropriate.
- (5) The injunctive relief provided by this subsection shall not restrict any right which any person (or class of persons) may have under any statute or common law to seek

enforcement of any standard or limitation or to seek any other relief (including relief against the Secretary or a State agency).

○ (h) Coordination with other laws

The Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary shall provide for appropriate coordination of the administration of this chapter with the administration of the animal quarantine laws (21 U.S.C. 101-105, 111-135b, and 612-614) and section 306 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1306). Nothing in this chapter or any amendment made by this chapter shall be construed as superseding or limiting in any manner the functions of the Secretary of Agriculture under any other law relating to prohibited or restricted importations or possession of animals and other articles and no proceeding or determination under this chapter shall preclude any proceeding or be considered determinative of any issue of fact or law in any proceeding under any Act administered by the Secretary of Agriculture. Nothing in this chapter shall be construed as superseding or limiting in any manner the functions and responsibilities of the Secretary of the Treasury under the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1202 et seq.), including, without limitation, section 527 of that Act (19 U.S.C. 1527), relating to the importation of wildlife taken, killed, possessed, or exported to the United States in violation of the laws or regulations of a foreign country.

between sales at different levels of trade in the comparison market. Therefore, and LOT adjustment is not possible for comparisons of EP sales to home market sales.

Currency Conversion

We made currency conversions into U.S. dollars based on the exchange rates in effect on the dates of the U.S. sales, as certified by the Federal Reserve Bank, in accordance with section 773A(a) of the Act.

Verification

As provided in section 782(i) of the Act, we intend to verify all information relied upon in making our final determination.

The All Others Rate

Because the Department investigated one company, Sidor, we used Sidor's margin in this investigation as the all-others rate.

Suspension of Liquidation

In accordance with section 733(d) of the Act, we are directing the Customs Service to suspend liquidation of all imports of subject merchandise that are entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**. We will instruct the Customs Service to require a cash deposit or the posting of a bond equal to the weighted-average amount by which the NV exceeds the export price, as indicated below. These suspension-of-liquidation instructions will remain in effect until further notice. The weighted-average dumping margins are as follows:

Exporter/manufacturer	Weighted-average margin (percent)
Sidor	72.81
All Others	72.81

ITC Notification

In accordance with section 733(f) of the Act, we have notified the ITC of our determination. If our final determination is affirmative, the ITC will determine before the later of 120 days after the date of this preliminary determination or 45 days after our final determination whether imports of cold-rolled steel are materially injuring, or threaten material injury to, the U.S. industry.

Public Comment

Case briefs or other written comments may be submitted to the Assistant Secretary for Import Administration no later than fifty days after the date of

publication of this notice, and rebuttal briefs, limited to issues raised in case briefs, no later than fifty-five days after the date of publication of this preliminary determination. A list of authorities used and an executive summary of issues should accompany any briefs submitted to the Department. This summary should be limited to five pages total, including footnotes. In accordance with section 774 of the Act, we will hold a public hearing, if requested, to afford interested parties an opportunity to comment on arguments raised in case or rebuttal briefs.

Tentatively, any hearing will be held fifty-seven days after publication of this notice at the U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230, at a time and location to be determined. Parties should confirm by telephone the date, time, and location of the hearing 48 hours before the scheduled time.

Interested parties who wish to request a hearing, or to participate if one is requested, must submit a written request to the Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Room 1870, within 30 days of the date of publication of this notice. Requests should contain: (1) The party's name, address, and telephone number; (2) the number of participants; and (3) a list of the issues to be discussed. At the hearing, each party may make an affirmative presentation only on issues raised in that party's case brief, and may make rebuttal presentations only on arguments included in that party's rebuttal brief. See 19 CFR 351.310(c). We will issue our final determination in this investigation no later than 135 days after the date of publication in the **Federal Register** of the preliminary determination.

This determination is issued and published in accordance with sections 733(f) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: April 26, 2002.

Faryar Shirzad,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 02-11201 Filed 5-8-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

[I.D. 050602A]

Proposed Information Collection; Comment Request; Survey to Measure Effectiveness of Community-Oriented Policing for ESA Enforcement

AGENCY: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, invites the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on proposed and/or continuing information collections, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Pub. L. 104-13 (44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A)).

DATES: Written comments must be submitted on or before July 8, 2002.

ADDRESSES: Direct all written comments to Madeleine Clayton, Departmental Paperwork Clearance Officer, Department of Commerce, Room 6608, 14th and Constitution Avenue NW, Washington DC 20230 (or via the Internet at Mclayton@doc.gov).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Requests for additional information or copies of the information collection instrument(s) and instructions should be directed to Dayna Matthews, National Marine Fisheries Service, 510 Desmond Drive S.E. Suite 103, Lacey, WA 98503.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Abstract

Community-oriented policing promotes the use of various resources and policing-community partnerships for developing strategies to identify, analyze, and address community law enforcement problems at their source. Recognizing the significant role non-traditional enforcement efforts play in Endangered Species Act (ESA) enforcement in the Northwest, the National Marine Fisheries Service proposes to conduct a survey to evaluate the success of its Office for Law Enforcement's community-oriented policing program for ESA enforcement for anadromous species in the Pacific Northwest.

II. Method of Collection

Information will be gathered through both voluntary self-administered surveys and in-depth interviews.

III. Data

OMB Number: 0648-0435.

Form Number: None.

Type of Review: Regular submission.

Affected Public: Individuals or households; Federal Government, State and Local Government.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 787.

Estimated Time Per Response: 20 minutes per survey; 60 minutes per interview.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 316 hours.

Estimated Total Annual Cost to Public: \$0 (estimate does not include valuation of the burden hours).

IV. Request for Comments

Comments are invited on: (a) whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden (including hours and cost) of the proposed collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology. Comments submitted in response to this notice will be summarized and/or included in the request for OMB approval of this information collection; they also will become a matter of public record.

Dated: May 2, 2002.

Madeleine Clayton,

Departmental Paperwork Clearance Officer,
Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 02-11634 Filed 5-8-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-22-S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration**

[I.D. 043002C]

Taking and Importing of Marine Mammals

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Request for nominations.

SUMMARY: The Secretary of Commerce is required by the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) to conduct specified scientific research and, by

December 31, 2002, to make a finding based on the results of that research, on information obtained under the International Dolphin Conservation Program (IDCP), and on any other relevant information as to whether the intentional deployment on or the encirclement of dolphins with purse seine nets is having a "significant adverse impact" on any depleted dolphin stock in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean (ETP). A proposed organized decision process (ODP) and request for public comment were published in the **Federal Register** on Feb. 15, 2002 describing information the Secretary will consider for the final finding and outlining two expert panels that will assess this information.

This notice solicits nominations for scientists to serve on two expert panels referenced in the proposed ODP: the Ecosystem Expert Panel and the Indirect Effects Expert Panel. It also describes the process NMFS will carry out to solicit nominations, select five qualified scientists for each panel, and recommend them for appointment by the Secretary. The expert panels are scheduled to meet September 4-6, 2002, in La Jolla, CA. Each expert panel will assess peer-reviewed scientific studies and other information and individually provide scientific advice to address specific issues the Secretary will be considering in making his final finding.

DATES: Nominations must be received by June 24, 2002.

ADDRESSES: Nominations should be sent to the Director, NMFS Office of Science and Technology, F/ST, 1315 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, MD, 20910. Nominations may also be sent via facsimile at 301-713-1875.

Nominations will not be accepted if submitted via electronic mail or the Internet.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Nicole R. Le Boeuf, Office of Protected Resources, NMFS, 301-713-2322.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**Background**

The MMPA, 16 U.S.C. 1361 *et seq.*, as amended by the International Dolphin Conservation Program Act (IDCPA), (Public Law 105-42), requires the Secretary of Commerce to conduct scientific research on depleted dolphin stocks in the ETP. The Dolphin Protection Consumer Information Act (16 U.S.C. 1385), as amended by the IDCPA, requires the Secretary to make a finding by December 31, 2002, based on the scientific research, information obtained under the IDCP, and any other relevant information, as to whether the intentional deployment on or

encirclement of dolphins with purse seine nets is having a "significant adverse impact" on any depleted dolphin stock in the ETP. There are three depleted dolphin stocks in the ETP: northeastern offshore spotted, eastern spinner, and coastal spotted.

The Organized Decision Process

The proposed ODP provides the Secretary with a systematic approach for evaluating multiple types of data. The ODP guides the Secretary through four separate questions regarding the extent of fishery and environmental effects on depleted dolphin stocks to assist in the final decision. These questions focus on (1) the ETP Ecosystem, (2) Direct Fishing Mortality, (3) Indirect Effects, and (4) Dolphin Stock Status and Trends.

Questions and Charge to the Ecosystem Panel

The questions for the Ecosystem Panel are: during the period of the fishery, has the carrying capacity of the ETP for the three depleted dolphin stocks declined, or has the ecological structure of the ETP changed in a manner or to an extent that could impede depleted dolphin stocks from growing at rates expected in a stable ecosystem? Or has the carrying capacity increased substantially or the ecological structure changed in any way that could promote the three depleted dolphin stocks to grow at rates faster than expected in a static ecosystem?

To determine the answer to these questions, the Secretary will consider scientific information collected and/or evaluated by NMFS, as well as information rendered individually from members of a panel of independent scientific experts in biological oceanography and ecology (the Ecosystem Panel). The panel members' assessments will be based on their review of relevant oceanographic and ecosystem data (physical and biological habitat and distribution, abundance, and ecology of other organisms in the ETP) from the period of the fishery.

Question and Charge to the Indirect Effects Panel

The question for the Indirect Effects Panel is: for each depleted dolphin stock, is the estimated number of dolphins affected by the tuna fishery (considering data on sets per year, mortality attributable to the fishery, indicators of stress in blood, skin and other tissues, cow-calf separation, and other relevant indirect effects information) at a level that is cause for concern (how and to what degree)?

To determine the answer to these questions, the Secretary will consider