PROPER FUNCTIONING CONDITION (PFC) WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT EVALUATION

National Riparian Service Team

USDI, Bureau of Land Management • USDA, Forest Service
In Partnership With USDA, Natural Resources Conservation Service
National Riparian Service Team

The National Riparian Service Team is in the process of conducting a program evaluation of the Proper Functioning Condition (PFC) Workshops that are held each year in various western states as part of an interagency strategy for accelerating cooperative riparian restoration and management. We are interested in obtaining feedback regarding your satisfaction with the workshop(s) you attended, and your opinion regarding its effectiveness. Knowing who is participating in the PFC workshops, and how participants view these workshops is vital to instructors, coordinators, program managers and others who are charged with implementing this program.

As a PFC workshop participant, you are being asked to help evaluate the success of this program. Your name was drawn randomly from a list of all PFC workshop participants. To ensure the results of this study truly represent the people who have attended the various workshops, it is important that each questionnaire be completed and returned.

I would be happy to answer any questions you may have about this study. Please write, call (406) 243-4128 or email me at Laura167@msn.com. Thank you very much for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Laura Van Riper
NRST Program Evaluator

The Privacy Act of 1974 and the regulations at 43 CFR 2.48(d) provide that we furnish you the following information:

Your participation in this survey is voluntary. There are no penalties for not answering some or all of the questions. Your cooperation is extremely important, since each interviewed person will represent many others who will not be surveyed. An identification label used on mailout questionnaires is for mailing purposes only. We will summarize the results to the answers you provide. We will keep your answers, name, and address confidential to the extent permissible by law. We will not use the information beyond the purposes of this study.

The Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 requires us to inform you that:

- BLM will use the comments you provide to improve the NRST and the extended riparian network.
- Your response is voluntary, and there is no effect for not providing the information.
- You do not have to respond to this or any other Federal-agency sponsored information collection which does not display a valid OMB control number.

Public reporting burden for this survey is estimated to average 25 minutes per respondent, including the time for reviewing instructions, gathering and maintaining the data, and completing and reviewing the survey. Direct comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspects of this survey to: U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, Bureau Clearance Officer (WO-630) (1004-0195), 1849 C Street, NW, Mail Stop 401LS, Washington, DC 20240.

OMB # 1004-0195 Exp. 02/29/2004

YOUR PARTICIPATION IN THE PROPER FUNCTIONING CONDITION (PFC) WORKSHOP

1. Who provided the instruction at the PFC workshop(s) that you attended? (Check *all* that apply)

27% The National Riparian Service Team
43% State Training Cadre
17% Combination
20% I don't know

2. **Please indicate which state(s) the event was held in:**

31% Oregon
29% Idaho
11% Colorado
10% Washington
5% Montana
5% New Mexico
3% Wyoming
1% South Dakota

3. **Please indicate which year(s) you participated (Check *all* that apply):**

23% 1996
32% 1997
30% 1998
26% 1999
5% 2000

4. **What was your primary reason for attending the session? (Check one)**

1% to address a specific problem at a particular location
43% to learn more about riparian areas and their function
0% to learn more about the riparian areas where I live
6% to learn how to assess the condition of a riparian area on my property
25% to better understand the tools that government agencies use to assess riparian areas
13% to fulfill a job requirement
13% other

CUSTOMER SATISFACTION

5. **Please rate your satisfaction with the following attributes of the instructors who presented the PFC workshop. Please circle the appropriate number.**

		ED	**SWD**	**SLD**	**SLS**	**SWS**	**ES**
	SCALE*	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
	(MEAN)						
Knowledge	***(5.28)***	1%	1%	1%	12%	37%	48%
Availability	***(5.15)***	0%	2%	2%	15%	42%	39%
Ability/willingness to participate in a two-way exchange of ideas	***(5.27)***	0%	2%	7%	7%	32%	53%
Professionalism	***(5.41)***	0%	1%	2%	11%	29%	57%

*ED = extremely dissatisfied, SWD = somewhat dissatisfied, SLD = slightly dissatisfied, SLS = slightly satisfied, SWS = somewhat satisfied, ES = extremely satisfied

6. **Please indicate whether you agree with the following statements about the State Cadre/NRST. Please circle the appropriate number.**

		SDA	SWDA	SLDA	SLA	SWA	SA	DK
	SCALE[8]	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**
	(MEAN)							
Their outreach efforts are effective	***(5.13)***	0%	2%	4%	10%	31%	34%	20%
They are committed to providing quality conservation education	***(5.55)***	0%	2%	0%	4%	25%	62%	6%
They are committed to working cooperatively	***(5.45)***	0%	1%	4%	4%	28%	55%	9%

* SDA = strongly disagree, SWDA = somewhat disagree, SLDA = slightly disagree, SLA = slightly agree, SWA = somewhat agree, SA = strongly agree, DK = don't know

7. **Please indicate whether you agree with the following statements regarding the PFC workshop(s) that you attended. Please circle the appropriate**

number.

		SDA	SWDA	SLDA	SLA	SWA	SA
	SCALE*	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
	(MEAN)						
The event was structured in a way that enabled me to participate	***(5.32)***	0%	2%	3%	8%	34%	53%
My input and interests were valued and respected during this process	***(5.13)***	1%	3%	1%	15%	38%	42%
The State Cadre/NRST does a good job of targeting information to its audience	***(5.11)***	0%	1%	4%	13%	45%	37%
The PFC method was understandable	***(5.09)***	0%	4%	4%	12%	43%	38%
PFC is a good tool for assessing riparian areas	***(4.64)***	3%	6%	9%	17%	38%	27%
PFC is a good tool for developing a common language between people with diverse interests	***(4.86)***	2%	2%	6%	21%	38%	32%
The State Cadre/NRST provides technically accurate information	***(5.17)***	1%	2%	4%	12%	36%	46%

		SDA	SWDA	SLDA	SLA	SWA	SA
	SCALE*	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
	(MEAN)						
The PFC workshop met my needs	***(4.75)***	2%	4%	6%	20%	39%	28%

* SDA = strongly disagree, SWDA = somewhat disagree, SLDA = slightly disagree, SLA = slightly agree, SWA = somewhat agree, SA = strongly agree, DK = don't know

8. **Please use this space to make any further comments or recommendations concerning your satisfaction with the State Cadre/NRST and/or the PFC training workshops.**

PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

We have identified six (6) objectives of the PFC Workshop. Each objective is identified below, and a series of 4 questions are asked.

9a. **Before participating in a PFC workshop, did you understand the relationship between the attributes and processes of the hydrology, vegetation and soil/landform within a riparian area?**

78% Yes
22% No

9b. **Do you feel that the PFC workshop increased your understanding of the relationship between the attributes and processes of the hydrology, vegetation and soil/landform within a riparian area?** ***[If you answered No skip to Q 10a]***

86% Yes
14% No

9c. **How often do you find yourself using the information regarding the relationship between the attributes and processes of the hydrology, vegetation and soil/landform within a riparian area that was presented in the workshop?**

5% never
6% once per year or less
38% a few times per year
22% monthly
22% weekly
6% daily

9d. **If your answer to 9c was never, please explain why:**

10a. **Before participating in a PFC workshop, did you know how to determine a functionality rating for the existing condition of a riparian area using the PFC checklist?**

16% Yes
84% No

10b. **Do you feel that the PFC workshop increased your knowledge of how to determine a functionality rating for the existing condition of a riparian area?** ***[If you answered No skip to Q 11a]***

91% Yes
9% No

10c. **How often do you find yourself using the information on how to determine a functionality rating for the existing condition of a riparian area that was presented in the workshop?**

19% never
13% once per year or less
39% a few times per year
19% monthly
7% weekly
3% daily

10d. **If your answer to 10c was never, please explain why:**

11a. **Before participating in a PFC workshop, did you know how to determine the minimum conditions required for a riparian area to function properly relative to its potential and capability?**

36% Yes
64% No

11b. **Do you feel that the PFC workshop increased your knowledge of how to determine the minimum conditions required for a riparian area to function properly relative to its potential and capability?** ***[If you answered No skip to Q 12a]***

92% Yes
8% No

11c. **How often do you find yourself using the information on how to determine the minimum conditions required for a riparian area to function properly relative to its potential and capability that was presented in the workshop?**

14% never
17% once per year or less
38% a few times per year
21% monthly
8% weekly
2% daily

11d. **If your answer to 11c was never, please explain why:**

12a. **Before participating in a PFC workshop, did you know how to design monitoring strategies to assess progress toward the maintenance of proper functioning**

condition?

38% Yes
62% No

12b. **Do you feel that the PFC workshop increased your knowledge of how to design monitoring strategies to assess progress toward the maintenance of proper functioning condition?** ***[If you answered No skip to Q 13a]***

80% Yes
20% No

12c. **How often do you find yourself using the information on how to design a monitoring strategy to assess progress toward the maintenance of proper functioning condition that was presented in the workshop?**

19% never
18% once per year or less
42% a few times per year
14% monthly
6% weekly
2% daily

12d. **If your answer to 12c was never, please explain why:**

13a. **Before participating in a PFC workshop, did you understand why a journey level, interdisciplinary team is needed to adequately determine a functionality rating for a riparian area?**

59% Yes
41% No

13b. **Do you feel that the PFC workshop increased your understanding of why a journey level, interdisciplinary team is needed to adequately determine a functionality rating**

for a riparian area? ***[If you answered No skip to Q 14a]***

78% Yes
22% No

13c. **How often do you find yourself using the information regarding why a journey level, interdisciplinary team is needed to adequately determine a functionality rating for a riparian area that was presented in the workshop?**

15% never
24% once per year or less
35% a few times per year
13% monthly
5% weekly
2% daily

13d. **If your answer to 13c was never, please explain why:**

14a. **Before participating in a PFC workshop, did you understand the relationship between riparian function and the attainment of specific values (e.g., wildlife habitat, forage, water quantity/quality)?**

83% Yes
17% No

14b. **Do you feel that the PFC workshop increased your understanding of the relationship between riparian function and the attainment of specific values?** ***[If you answered No skip to Q 15]***

79% Yes
21% No

14c. **How often do you find yourself using the information regarding the relationship between riparian function and the attainment of specific values that was presented**

in the workshop?

5% never
11% once per year or less
39% a few times per year
25% monthly
17% weekly
4% daily

14d. **If your answer to 14c was never, please explain why:**

15. **Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with the statements below. Circle the appropriate number.**

		SDA	**SWDA**	**SLDA**	**SLA**	**SWA**	**SA**
	SCALE*	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
	(MEAN)						
It is important to understand how historical and current social, economic and political factors impact riparian areas	***(5.51)***	2%	0%	1%	6%	22%	69%
It is important to cooperatively manage watersheds	***(5.64)***	2%	0%	0%	6%	15%	78%
A focus on riparian function makes it possible to discuss watershed issues with people who have	***(5.14)***	2%	0%	3%	15%	37%	43%

		SDA	SWDA	SLDA	SLA	SWA	SA
	SCALE*	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
	(MEAN)						
diverse interests and differing levels of knowledge							
A focus on riparian function makes it possible to develop a common vision/goals with people who values riparian areas for different reasons	***(5.03)***	2%	1%	3%	16%	45%	34%
After participating in the PFC workshop, I am more willing to cooperate with others	***(4.19)***	9%	8%	9%	23%	30%	21%
The PFC workshops have increased local cooperation within my area	***(3.61)***	10%	13%	11%	41%	17%	6%

* SDA = strongly disagree, SWDA = somewhat disagree, SLDA = slightly disagree, SLA = slightly agree, SWA = somewhat agree, SA = strongly agree, DK = don't know

16. **Please identify and explain specific occasions or projects where you found yourself using the skills/information that were presented in the PFC workshop(s) that you attended:**

Use of the PFC method in a watershed context has four identifiable steps: (1) conduct a PFC assessment with a journey-level, interdisciplinary team; (2)

cooperatively design and impement a plan to restore an area to 'Proper Functioning Condition';(3) cooperatively design and implement a plan to manage for specific riparian values, while maintaining the 'Proper Functioning Condition' of an area; and (4) use the PFC checklist to guide the development of a cooperative monitoring plan.

17. **Have you participated in the in a PFC assessment that was conducted by a journey-level, interdisciplinary team?**

49% Yes **51%** No

18. **Have you participated in the design/implementation of cooperative restoration plans (plans designed to restore an area to 'Proper Functioning Condition')?**

50% Yes **50%** No

19. **Have you participated in the design/implementation of cooperative management plans (plans designed to manage for specific riparian values, once an area is in 'Proper Functioning Condition')?**

40% Yes **60%** No

20. **Have you participated in the design/implementation of cooperative monitoring plans using the PFC checklist?**

25% Yes **75%** No

21. **In your opinion, what factors present the most serious barriers to cooperative riparian restoration and management using the PFC method? Please rate each individual item from extremely serious to not at all serious. Circle the appropriate number.**

		ES	SWS	SLS	NS	DK

	SCALE*	1	2	3	4	5
	(MEAN)					
Lack of communication and/or trust	***(2.11)***	36%	34%	18%	9%	4%
Personality differences	***(2.77)***	9%	32%	37%	16%	6%
Technical and scientific issues	***(2.86)***	8%	27%	40%	22%	4%
Conflicting objectives	***(2.09)***	33%	36%	21%	7%	3%
Public opposition	***(2.88)***	12%	25%	34%	22%	8%
Fundamental differences that separate stakeholders	***(2.20)***	28%	40%	21%	6%	5%
Power imbalances	***(2.87)***	13%	31%	27%	11%	17%
Lack of process management or interpersonal skills	***(2.86)***	9%	26%	43%	15%	7%
Resistance to cooperative management styles	***(2.67)***	11%	32%	41%	12%	4%
Difficulty securing the involvement of all stakeholders	***(2.26)***	23%	43%	24%	7%	4%
Intergroup attitudes and stereotypes	***(2.46)***	16%	39%	32%	9%	4%
Polarization arising from traditional process	***(2.58)***	17%	34%	31%	9%	9%
Politics	***(2.34)***	31%	28%	25%	9%	7%
Limited understanding of PFC method for watershed management	***(2.59)***	11%	41%	29%	16%	4%
Lack of ownership in PFC process	***(2.49)***	22%	33%	29%	10%	7%

		ES	SWS	SLS	NS	DK
	SCALE*	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
	(MEAN)					
Conflicting agency goals and missions	***(2.51)***	16%	40%	24%	16%	4%
Agency culture and norms	***(2.72)***	9%	37%	34%	14%	6%
Lack of agency support to cooperative watershed management	***(2.79)***	16%	24%	31%	23%	6%
Resource constraints (e.g., funding, experienced workforce)	***(2.05)***	36%	38%	17%	4%	5%
Government policies and procedures	***(2.66)***	16%	30%	32%	15%	7%
Differing decision-making authority among participants	***(2.73)***	12%	29%	42%	9%	8%

*ES = extremely serious, SWS = somewhat serious, SLS = slightly serious, NS = not at all serious, DK = don't know

OTHERS?

22. **Please use this space to make any further comments or recommendations regarding the effectiveness of the PFC workshop(s) or the PFC assessment method:**

In order to make comparisons between the many kinds of people who participate in PFC training sessions, we would like some general information about you. Included are some standard demographic questions commonly used in this type of survey. Remember, all information is confidential and will not be identified with your name.

		NI	SI	SWI	VI	EI
	SCALE*	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
	(MEAN)					
23. How important is riparian restoration/ management to you personally?	***(4.34)***	0 %	3 %	8%	41%	48%
24. How important is it to you that you are involved in the decision making process regarding the restoration/management of riparian areas?	***(3.78)***	6 %	4 %	21%	42%	27%
25. How important is it to you that all of the interested parties are involved in the decision making process regarding the restoration/ management of riparian areas?	***(4.00)***	1 %	4 %	18%	50%	28%

* NI = not at all important, SI = slightly important, SWI = somewhat important, VI = very important, EI = extremely important

26. **Which categories best describe your interests as they relate to riparian areas. (Check *all* that apply)**

69% water quality
60% vegetation
58% hydrology
55% ecology
54% wildlife
53% range management
48% fish biology
46% agriculture
45% cooperative watershed management
44% biology
44% soil
33% protection
30% recreation
25% forestry
19% fire/fuels
16% community development
15% engineering
11% geology
10% wilderness
10% other
3% realty

27. **If you are affiliated with specific conservation/agricultural/watershed organizations, please list them:**

28. **What is your age?**

5% 20s
19% 30s
47% 40s
26% 50s
1% 60s
1% 70s

29. **What is your gender?**

71% male
29% female

30. **Are you presently:**

98% Employed

1% Unemployed
1% Retired
0% Full-time homemaker
0% Student

31. **If you are employed, what is your occupation?**
TITLE:
KIND OF WORK:
KIND OF COMPANY OR BUSINESS:

32. **If you are a government employee, who are you employed by?**

79% Federal government
18% State government
3% Local government
0% Tribal government

NAME OF AGENCY/TRIBE:

33. **Which type of area best describes where you grew up?**

22% farm or ranch
12% in the country, but not farm/ranch
15% in a small town (2,500 or less people)
22% in a town or small city (2,500 to 25,000 people)
15% in a city (25,000 to 100,000 people)
7% in a suburb of a large city
9% in a large city (over 100,000 people)

34. **Which type of area best describes where you live now?**

12% farm or ranch
21% in the country, but not farm/ranch
16% in a small town (2,500 or less people)
23% in a town or small city (2,500 to 25,000 people)
14% in a city (25,000 to 100,000 people)
3% in a suburb of a large city
12% in a large city (over 100,000 people)

35. **What is the highest level of education you have completed?**

0% Eighth grade or less
0% Some high school
1% High school graduate or GED
2% Trade school, some college
46% College graduate
21% Some graduate school
30% Master, PhD, or Professional Degree

36. **In what ethnic group would you place yourself?**

1% Hispanic or Latino
99% Not Hispanic or Latino

37. **What is your race? (mark one or more)**

3% American Indian or Alaska Native
0% Black or African American
91% White
1% Asian
0% Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander

38. **What was your total household income (before taxes) in 1999?**

0% Less than $10,000
0% $10,000 to $19,999
5% $20,000 to $29,999
14% $30,000 to $39,999
28% $40,000 to $49,999
21% $50,000 to $59,999
12% $60,000 to $69,999
10% $70,000 to $79,999
0% $80,000 to $89,999
9% over $90,000

ANY ADDITIONAL COMMENTS?

Please return the survey by October 8, 2001. To return the completed survey, please fold the back cover over and attach with a staple or tape.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME.
A summary of the results of this survey will be posted on the NRST website (http://www.or.blm.gov/NRST).

Laura Van Riper
Bureau of Land Management
P.O. Box 550
3050 N.E. Third Street
Prineville, OR 97754

Laura Van Riper
NRST Program Evaluator
School of Forestry
University of Montana
Missoula, MT 59812

Laura Van Riper
NRST Program Evaluator
School of Forestry
University of Montana
Missoula, MT 59812

RESPONDENT'S
MAILING ADDRESS