

**Second Annual Evaluation Report
1995 Executive Order
for
Recreational Fisheries
(No. 12962)**

To the National Recreational Fisheries Coordination Council

By: The Sport Fishing and Boating
Partnership Council
June 2, 1997

- I EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
- II BACKGROUND
- III THE NATIONAL CONSERVATION PLAN
- IV AGENCY PLANS
- V AGENCY ACCOMPLISHMENT REPORTS
- VI ESA/RECREATIONAL FISHING
- VII THE STAKEHOLDER INPUT AND REVIEW
- VIII FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
- IX THE LOOMIS REPORT
- X APPENDIX
 - ▶ Summary of individual agency strategic plans and reports

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Sport Fishing and Boating Partnership Council reviewed the national Recreational Fishery Resources Conservation Plan, the agency-specific plans prepared for its implementation, and the summaries of agency accomplishments, information obtained by the stakeholder input and review process, and reached the following conclusions.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT

- ***U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)*** - The most responsive of any bureau in government, with good interaction with stakeholders, an aggressive plan which uses existing and new resources, and impressive accomplishments, including resolving conflicts between the Endangered Species Act and Fisheries Management objectives.
- ***Bureau of Land Management (BLM)*** - Developed a plan with cooperation of stakeholders and expanded fishery work by building on three resource initiatives. Failed to report in terms of core set of outputs as required in Conservation Plan.
- ***Bureau of Reclamation (BOR)*** - Many projects are described, most of which seem to have been included as original project features. Difficult to ascertain which, if any, activities instituted in response to Executive Order. Accomplishment report is a status report of each project.
- ***National Park Service (NPS)*** - Does a good job of providing for the resources, but lacks the professional expertise to handle today's complex water quality and fishery management issues. Plan proposes useful actions, but outputs will not be consistent with those identified in the core set of outputs in the Conservation Plan.
- ***Biological Resources Division of U. S. Geological Survey (USGS)*** - Is conducting important research in response to needs of other bureaus. Research results cannot be reported in terms of the core set of agency outputs identified in the Conservation Plan.
- ***Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA)*** - No plan developed. Important potential exists, but it is not being developed. Limiting factors were identified.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

- ***National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS)*** - Has taken action to improve habitats and provide for more recreational fisheries, including resolving conflicts between the Endangered Species Act and Fisheries Management objectives. Most accomplishments are not measured in terms of the core set of outputs identified in the Conservation Plan.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

- *U. S. Forest Service (USFS)* - Plan has quantifiable objectives and good progress was made through an active program. Accomplishments reported as required in Conservation Plan. Identified specific challenges which impair ability to deliver on Executive Order objectives.
- *Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS)* - Ongoing program reduces soil erosion and improves water quality at the local level. Accomplishments of the existing program were reported in quantifiable terms.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE (DOD)

- *Army, Navy and Air Force* - Specific objectives were contained in the plan, quantified progress was made on military installations, and reported consistent with the Conservation Plan.
- *Corps of Engineers (COE)* - Plan directed an aggressive approach, and numerous quantified results were reported; accomplishments were reported consistent with the Conservation Plan. Stakeholders indicated Corps was divesting responsibilities for boat ramps and other recreational facilities.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY AND ENERGY-RELATED AGENCIES

- *Department of Energy (DOE)* - Plan and report are primarily of BPA projects, with minor involvement of Southwestern Power Administration, Western Area Power Administration, and Federal Energy Regulatory Commission; FERC role in recreational facilities is explained, but not water flows and fish passage. Accomplishments report is primarily a status report on each project, without quantifiable output measures identified in the core set of measures in the Conservation Plan.
- *Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA)* - Plan and accomplishment report reflect TVA approach to working with others to improve water quality and fishery resources; stakeholders report, however, TVA efforts to divest responsibility for boat ramps and other recreational facilities.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (DOT)

- *U. S. Coast Guard (USCG) and Federal Highway Administration* - Prepared joint plan and

accomplishment report which primarily explained existing program, and did not quantify accomplishments in terms of the core set of outputs identified in the Conservation Plan.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY (EPA)

- **EPA** - Plan and accomplishment report described extensive work with states, tribes, communities, and other partners, to improve water quality and biological resources, and reported on state fish consumption advisories and national water quality.

II. BACKGROUND

Executive Order Number 12962 on Recreational Fisheries was signed by President Clinton on June 7, 1995. The President ordered his executive agencies to the extent permitted by law and where practicable, and in cooperation with the States and Tribes, **to improve the quantity, function, sustainable productivity and distribution of U.S. aquatic resources for increased recreational fishing opportunities.**

The Executive Order established a National Recreational Fisheries Coordination Council (Coordination Council), consisting of seven members, one designated by each of the following Secretaries - Interior, Commerce, Agriculture, Energy, Transportation and Defense and one by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency. The President directed the Coordination Council to: a) ensure that the social and economic values of healthy aquatic systems that support recreational fisheries are considered by Federal agencies in the course of their actions; b) reduce duplicative and cost-inefficient programs among Federal agencies involved in conserving or managing recreational fisheries; c) share the latest resource information and management technologies to assist in the conservation and management of recreational fisheries; d) assess the implementation of the Conservation Plan required under section 3 of the Executive Order; and e) develop a biennial report of accomplishments of the Conservation Plan.

The Executive Order also required the development of a Recreational Fishery Resources Conservation Plan (Conservation Plan) and a Joint Policy for Administering the Endangered Species Act of 1973, and gave the federally chartered Sport Fishing and Boating Partnership Council (Partnership Council) a responsibility to: a) monitor specific Federal activities affecting aquatic systems and the recreational fisheries they support; b) review and evaluate the relation of Federal policies and activities to the status and conditions of recreational fishery resources; and c) prepare an annual report of its activities, findings, and recommendations for submission to the Coordination Council.

The Partnership Council charged its Technical Work Group to review the Conservation Plan, the agency-specific implementation plans, the agency accomplishment reports and to ground truth these documents by contacting stakeholders to obtain independent evaluations of agency

outreach and partnership efforts. The Technical Work Group utilized additional expertise in the initial evaluation of plans and reports, and in obtaining input from 280 stakeholders. In addition, Helen Sevier, Chair of the Partnership Council, and her staff wrote to each agency urging active participation.

After review by the Technical Work Group, the Partnership Council prepared this report as the second annual evaluation report on the Executive Order.

III. THE NATIONAL CONSERVATION PLAN

The Conservation Plan was developed by the Coordination Council. It contains the national goal and strategies which the agencies address in their specific plans. It was published and distributed in June 1996, and was supplemented by agency-specific plans, as required by the Conservation Plan:

Each Federal agency will develop by December 31, 1996, an agency specific plan that details the actions that will be taken to meet the goal of the Conservation Plan. Agency specific plans, to the extent practicable, will be integrated with existing plans and programs. This document plus the appended agency plans will constitute the Recreational Fishery Resources Conservation Plan.

Agencies will seek opportunities to engage in projects designed to accomplish one or more of the strategies listed on page 4. Agencies may revise their plans at any time.

Each agency will provide a summary of its accomplishments under the Conservation Plan to the Coordination Council by March 31 of each year beginning in 1997. Agencies will report accomplishments using the output measures defined in agency-specific plans, and describe the sources and reliability of data used.

The Conservation Plan identified as the national goal:

Provide for increased recreational fishing opportunities nationwide through the conservation, restoration, and enhancement of aquatic systems and fish populations, and by increasing fishing access, education and outreach, and partnership opportunities.

Four implementation strategies were identified to achieve the national goal:

Strategy 1. Conserve, enhance, and restore recreational fisheries habitats and fish stocks, emphasizing self-sustaining fish stocks where feasible.

- Strategy 2. Develop and maintain recreational fishing facilities and access.*
- Strategy 3. Promote public education and support aquatic resource conservation and ethics, recreational angling, and safety.*
- Strategy 4. Work collaboratively with State and tribal management partners, industry, anglers, and conservation groups.*

Success indicators were described and agency output measures were identified. Each Federal agency was to develop by December 31, 1996, a strategic plan that details the agency's proposed actions to meet the goal of the Conservation Plan. A summary of each of these plans is provided as an appendix to this report (Section X).

IV. AGENCY PLANS

Fourteen Federal agencies (BLM, BOR, COE, DOD, DOT, EPA, NMFS, NPS, NRCS, TVA, USFS, USFWS, and USGS) submitted agency-specific plans which are summarized in Section X. BIA indicated interest in participating, and provided a statement, but not a plan. BIA explained that its mission is not to establish goals and objectives or set funding priorities for the individual tribes, but rather to strengthen self-government of the tribes. BIA identified factors which limit accomplishment.

The DOE plan identified anticipated projects by the Southwestern Power Administration, The Western Area Power Administration, Bonneville Power Administration, and the FERC. The Commission views its role as receiving recommendations from applicants, government agencies and others and making final decisions on license applications based on all evidence submitted. The USFWS and NMFS serve as advocates for the fishery resources and propose actions related to water flows and fish passage to FERC.

The DOT plan identified proposed actions by the USCG. It also indicated that most Federal Highway Administration actions are carried out by State Departments of Transportation which analyze proposed projects and make decisions on avoidance, mitigation, and enhancement measures. Recreational areas are often an element of highway projects that cross or run adjacent to a water resource, and the Federal Highway Administration will monitor the number of these projects. The Federal Highway Administration did not identify any actions they would take with State Departments of Transportation to meet the goal of the Conservation Plan.

The USFS provided good guiding principles, specific objectives, times and accountability, half of which are to be accomplished by December 31, 1997 and also identified specific challenges which impair their ability to accomplish Executive Order objectives. The BLM and BOR plans identify projects on a state-by-state basis. The BOR Plan is for Fiscal Year 1997; the BLM Plan is multi-year and includes both funded and unfunded projects. The DOE plan

includes numerous on-site and off-site projects, mainly for BPA. The COE identifies many project modifications.

The recommendations of stakeholders incorporated into the USFWS plan are important objectives to accomplish, but difficult to quantify in terms of the success indicators and agency outputs identified in the Conservation Plan. The seven responsibilities included broad objectives such as "administer the Federal Aid program," and "provide technical support and research." These broad recommendations were translated into more specific, measurable objectives.

The USGS submitted a plan and a report. The Biological Resources Division of USGS was formed by taking the research, survey and inventory capabilities from other Interior bureaus and consolidating them into one organization. This is a research division which conducts research requested by other Interior Bureaus, and does not independently establish research projects.

Overview of Plans

Eight Federal agencies (BLM, BOR, COE, DOD, NPS, TVA, USFS, and USFWS) own or control significant amounts of land or water resources; BIA, DOE, DOT, EPA, NMFS, NRCS and USGS do not. The plans for each of the eight include commitments for all four strategies on these lands and waters. Several of the other agencies (DOE, EPA, NMFS and NRCS) though without significant land ownership and thus little opportunity to directly provide recreational fishing facilities and access, identified significant anticipated action on the other three strategies. DOE and NMFS also facilitate access through the actions of other organizations.

Most agencies incorporated the goals, objectives and strategies of the Conservation Plan into their own planning and budgeting processes. For this reason it is difficult to determine the planned increases in activity resulting from the President's Executive Order that go beyond those previously planned. No baseline was identified as to what action agencies would have taken in the absence of the Executive Order, and therefore plans included a mix of existing plans and new initiatives.

Several agencies, however, recognized the Executive Order as an opportunity to work with stakeholders to learn of their priorities and to work in partnership to enhance efforts at setting new goals and objectives. Several agencies worked with stakeholders to develop their plans. The USFWS, for example, held national, regional, and state stakeholder meetings attended by more than 460 people (170 state, 90 conservation groups, 40 businesses, 30 tribes and other Federal agencies). The BLM involved stakeholders in developing their agency-specific plan. The USFS and NMFS solicited external comments in developing their plans.

Several of the agency plans, while addressing important needs and using good approaches, may make significant accomplishments which are difficult to quantify. The approach used by EPA, for example, is based on providing guidance and data, often as models and GIS displays,.

on a watershed basis. These products enable States, Tribes, corporations, communities and individuals to help set water quality and biological objectives and determine actions necessary to maintain, restore, or enhance aquatic resources. This approach is consistent with agency responsibilities, and is strong on delegating authority, providing guidance, data, analyses, financial assistance for consensus building, and cost-sharing of technical assistance. It also conveys a strong sense of partnership. EPA provides stakeholders with the information and means for them to accomplish desired goals. Outputs are amounts of data provided, coordination efforts underway, and other activities that may result in improved habitat and fish stocks, increased access, education, outreach, and partnerships. EPA also reports on state advisories on contaminated fish and on water quality.

Many plans lack specific timetables and do not identify or make program managers accountable.

V. AGENCY ACCOMPLISHMENT REPORTS

All fifteen agencies provided reports of accomplishments. These reports, summarized in Section XI, indicate that agencies made important accomplishments in the past year. In some cases the activities had been planned before the Executive Order was issued; in other cases they were new initiatives specifically in response to the Executive Order.

The Conservation Plan had four component strategies and identified anticipated agency outputs. "Agency outputs" represent a measurable description of what each Federal agency is contributing to the Conservation Plan goal. They provide insight to agency activities and accomplishments related to each of the four implementation strategies. Aggregated, they provide useful information on the efforts being expended by Federal agencies and their partners to meet the Conservation Plan goal. Each Federal agency is expected to report its own outputs. The agency outputs specified in the Conservation Plan represent a core set of accomplishments that each Federal agency will report annually. If a particular output is not applicable to the reporting agency, or the agency has nothing to report, the agency should so state in its report. An agency may report additional outputs that support the Conservation Plan. A list of additional agency outputs was developed by a joint Metrics Technical Working Group of the Coordination Council and the Partnership Council. That list is provided in the Conservation Plan and should have been considered as individual agencies developed their specific action plans. Although all agencies provided evidence of partnerships (strategy 4), only five agencies (DOD, COE, NRCS, USFWS, and USFS) quantified outputs in terms of miles/acres, or other quantifiable metrics for the other three strategies. Five agencies (EPA, NMFS, NPS, TVA, and USGS) reported important accomplishments, but with less emphasis on miles or acres. DOE, BOR, DOT, and BLM focused on the status and quantity of projects implemented or accomplished during the past year.

The USFWS responded to recommendations made at numerous stakeholder meetings and formulated initiatives to implement the national and agency-specific plans. Significant activities

were undertaken on all four strategies. Funds were redirected and new budget initiatives were prepared. The program was specific, active, and aggressive.

The USFS provided quantified responses to all four strategies. Significant amounts of flat water and streams were enhanced, barriers to fish movement were removed; self-sustaining fishable populations established, and riparian habitat restored. Access was provided or improved to many areas, and facilities were constructed. Many aquatic education events were held, aquatic interpretive sites added or improved, and multimedia products produced and used. These education efforts reached over 3.4 million people. Most of these benefits were accomplished through partnership projects. Easements or agreements were obtained from landowners to improve recreational fishing access.

The NMFS created a new office of Intergovernmental and Recreational Fisheries, took important actions to protect habitats and fish stocks and to facilitate recreational fishing. They funded many projects and worked to eliminate conflicts between the Endangered Species Act and fisheries management objectives.

The BLM funded 34 recreational fisheries projects and continued implementation of important partnership projects with Trout Unlimited. The report described the Bring Back the Natives program jointly funded with Trout Unlimited and the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation.

The EPA is active in involving States, Tribes, corporations, communities, and individuals in setting resource goals and standards, and in helping accomplish them. They are providing data in useful Geographic Information System (GIS) format and models and are providing guidance and funding to encourage involvement and consensus building. An inventory of water conditions of the U.S. was completed and a summary of 1995 State-issued fish consumption advisories was distributed.

The USGS (Biological Resources Division) is the biological research arm of the Interior Department, and conducts research needed for other Interior bureaus and other government organizations with stewardship responsibilities. It provided essential research, monitoring, status reports, techniques, standards, and worked in partnership with states, universities and other Federal agencies.

The NPS has recently added fishery and aquatic biologists to 9 national park areas. Active fisheries and related projects are underway in 88 parks. Fish stocks were restored and habitat was improved in several parks, and a Recreational Fisheries Database was completed for units of the National Park System. There was good outreach with 48 parks participating in National Fishing Week, 73 parks providing educational and interpretive programs about aquatic resources, and participation in the Fisheries Information Network in the Southeast region.

The DOD provided summarized data relative to the agency outputs requested in the

Conservation Plan (acres/miles restored, and other quantifiable parameters). Many military installations had active programs and allowed public use of natural resources. Many had undertaken important actions to improve fishery resources and water quality. Several installations provided success stories.

The COE provided an extensive summary of numerous actions taken involving water control, habitat improvements, and structural modifications. Efforts were undertaken to establish and restore 46 populations of 21 species; 26 access areas were provided to tailwaters. Numerous public outreach programs were presented; numerous facilities were constructed; and 137 partnership agreements were made.

The TVA completed retrofitting 16 dams to improve dissolved oxygen in over 300 miles of tailwaters; conducted numerous resource assessments and habitat improvements; maintained many boat ramps and other facilities, and had extensive outreach; and involved 52 groups in planning restoration and protection efforts.

The DOE mainly provided status reports on the various BPA on-site and off-site projects funded at about \$250 million annually and conducted in cooperation with dozens of agencies. They also reported on some Southwestern Power Administration and Western Area Power Administration projects, and described FERC activities to require recreation facilities at FERC-licensed projects, and to make the public aware of their existence.

The DOT reported that the U.S. Coast Guard has expanded its safe boating week into a year-long campaign, distributed the recreational boating safety funds to the States, and provided funds for nonprofit organizations to improve safety in boating.

The NRCS described progress in several programs to protect habitat and improve water quality on private lands across the nation. The accomplishments included salmon habitat recovery, restoration of abandoned mine sites, salinity control in the Colorado River basin, improving water quality, reducing agricultural nonpoint source pollution, and reduction in wetland losses.

The BOR provided a status report for each of dozens of projects. The projects involve maintaining conservation pools, minimum flows, water rights, access, biological studies, boat ramps and docks, reduced shoreline erosion, improved fish passage and student education programs.

The BIA identified a large number of acres of lakes and miles of streams that could be enhanced to improve recreational fishing, but indicated little could happen without new base funding, technical assistance, and broadening communication with the Tribes.

Summary of Agency Accomplishment Reports

Significant improvements have been made in the availability of computerized data, and the usefulness of it. Essentially every agency now has a WEB-site home page, and data available on individual watersheds. Some provide automated data on lake levels and river levels, and real-time data on such things as distribution of the exotic zebra mussel.

The accomplishment reports indicate that important activities have taken place. Since most agencies have land and water management responsibilities, many activities focused on on-site improvements in these resources. Many accomplishments have been presented. Some agencies have used challenge cost-share funds to work with partners, and some have shifted existing funds or prepared budget initiatives to accomplish objectives of the Executive Order.

Several agencies especially EPA, TVA and NRCS, are working with States, Tribes, corporation, communities and individuals to provide data, and then to help accomplish resource improvement goals established by local groups.

The responsibilities of most agencies relate to their respective land and water management authorities. Impacts of agency activities are expanded by working with private landowners within the watershed and in several outreach approaches to provide resource information. Some agencies, especially USFWS, NMFS, and EPA have some regulatory responsibilities that may extend to most public waters. Their programs appropriately extend to status of stocks and conservation measures of regional or national importance.

VI. ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT AND RECREATIONAL FISHING

In response to the Executive Order, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service produced a joint "Policy for Conserving Species Listed or Proposed for Listing Under the Endangered Species Act While Providing and Enhancing Recreational Fisheries Opportunities." The report was published and distributed on June 3, 1996.

Both agencies have taken important actions that have apparently reduced the conflicts. Numerous examples were provided of potential problems that were avoided through determined efforts to find compatible solutions.

No problem has been identified, and therefore the policy seems to be adequate and is being effectively implemented.

VII. STAKEHOLDER INPUT AND REVIEW

A review of stakeholder's subjective perceptions was made by Dr. David K. Loomis of the Department of Forestry and Wildlife Management at the University of Massachusetts-Amherst. It was an evaluation of the Plan's success indicators #10 (public attitudes) and #12 (partnerships) and over-all accomplishment of the national goal. It is attached as section VIII. The evaluation instrument was designed to provide information that would indicate the extent to which the individual stakeholders being interviewed felt 18 Federal agencies were successfully accomplishing the goal of the Conservation Plan, and how successful the agencies' efforts were in establishing effective partnerships.

The telephone contacts were made before most agency-specific plans had even been completed and thus it was too soon to expect resource changes. The sample size (N=280) was small relative to the potential quantity of partners for all 18 Federal agencies. The information can be helpful, however, in understanding the opinions of stakeholders relative to each agency. The results are intended to focus on the partnership component of the Conservation Plan, and should be helpful to agencies in developing partnerships to address concerns of our partners.

The 18 Federal agencies or Departments evaluated were:

Bonneville Power Administration	BPA
Bureau of Indian Affairs	BIA
Bureau of Land Management	BLM
Bureau of Reclamation	BOR
U.S. Air Force	Air Force
U.S. Army	Army
U.S. Navy	Navy
Department of Transportation	DOT
Environmental Protection Agency	EPA
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	FERC
National Marine Fisheries Service	NMFS
National Park Service	NPS
Natural Resource Conservation Service	NRCS
Tennessee Valley Authority	TVA
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	COE
U.S. Coast Guard	USCG
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	FWS
U.S. Forest Service	USFS

This review of 18 agencies or departments was completed in March, before all plans and reports were received. Several organizational units subsequently provided consolidated plans and reports (BPA and FERC were consolidated with other components into a single DOE plan and report; the USCG was incorporated into the DOT plan and report; the Air Force, Army and

Navy were consolidated into a single DOD plan and report) and the USGS was added. Because of these changes, all other parts of this report are based on 15 organizational units.

This evaluation was completed in March 1997. An effort was made to interview 410 individuals collectively representing ten different government agencies, fishery management councils, conservation organizations, and sportfishing industry representatives. The procedure resulted in 280 completed interviews, or a 68.3% overall response rate.

The frequency distribution of individuals responding by organization represented in this evaluation was:

29	American Sportfishing Association	ASA
19	Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission	ASMFC
33	Bass Anglers Sportsman Society	BASS
19	Great Lakes Fisheries Commission	GLFC
11	Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission	GSMFC
27	Izaak Walton League	IWL
36	Native Americans Fish and Wildlife Society	NAFWS
28	Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission	PSMFC
56	State Fish Chiefs (Freshwater and Marine)	STATE
<u>22</u>	Trout Unlimited	TU
280	Total	

Overall Evaluation

Respondents were asked to indicate if they felt each of the 18 Federal agencies was doing an "excellent," "fair" or "poor" job of accomplishing the National Goal as stated in the Conservation Plan. Respondents also had the option of indicating for each agency that they "did not know," or that for them the question was "not applicable."

Results of this overall evaluation showed that more respondents felt the USFWS was doing an "excellent" job (39.4% of respondents) than any other agency. When "fair" and "excellent" categories were combined, the percentages were 78.4% for the USFWS, 63.3% for the EPA, 61.1% for the USFS, 59.1% for the NPS, and 56.6% for the NMFS.

The second general observation is the very high proportion of "don't know" responses for many of the agencies. Individuals being interviewed gave this response when they did not know what progress an agency was making toward achieving the national goal stated in the Conservation Plan and thus could not make an informed judgement. The proportion of "don't know" responses exceeded 50% for 11 of the agencies, indicating an important need for greater outreach.

Best and Worst Federal Agencies According to Specific Goals

The Conservation Plan contains within it four specific goals: 1) to enhance aquatic systems and fish populations, 2) to increase fishing access, 3) to increase education and outreach, and 4) to increase partnership opportunities with the States, Tribal management partners, industry, anglers and conservation groups. Respondents were asked to indicate, for each of these goals, which two Federal agencies they believed are doing the best job, and which two agencies are doing the worst job, in meeting each of these specific goals.

Summary of Best and Worst Federal Agencies According to Specific Goals

The agency most often named as doing the best job of meeting the four individual strategies is the USFWS. Other agencies consistently among those named most often as doing the best job of meeting these strategies are the USFS, NMFS and the EPA. The COE was named most often and the FERC was named second most often as the agency doing the worst job of meeting each of the individual strategies.

Impacts Associated with Administration of Endangered Species Act

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service have enacted a policy designed to minimize the impacts of the Endangered Species Act on efforts to enhance recreational fisheries. One purpose of this evaluation was to determine the effectiveness of this policy. Respondents were first asked to indicate if their fish conservation or management efforts were negatively impacted by activities involving endangered, threatened or species proposed for listing under the Endangered Species Act. Those who answered Yes were then asked if the USFWS or NMFS had worked with them to reduce or minimize these impacts to their program. If the response to this question was Yes, the respondent was asked overall, how successful the actions of the USFWS or NMFS had been in reducing or minimizing the impacts to their program.

Responses to this set of three questions indicates that overall, relatively few respondents (n=79, 28%) felt their organization had been negatively impacted by activities involving endangered, threatened, or species proposed for listing under the Endangered Species Act. Of these 79 respondents, 49 (62%) indicated that either the USFWS or the NMFS had worked with them to minimize these impacts. Nearly 80% of these 49 respondents reported that the actions of the USFWS and NMFS had been at least somewhat successful.

Statements of Suggested Recommendations

Respondents were asked to indicate, in one sentence, what one thing they felt the various Federal agencies mentioned during the telephone interview could do to best meet the national goal as stated in the Conservation Plan, irrespective of any partnerships between their

organization and any of the Federal agencies. Respondents were not expected to comment on all 18 Federal agencies, but rather only those for which they had a working interest and knowledge. Respondents were provided four opportunities to provide one-sentence comments on the Federal agency of their choice. There were 20 or less comments directed at most agencies, but EPA received 35, USFS 41, NMFS 56, COE 59 and USFWS 114.

The comments varied widely, but there were often recurring themes for an agency. For EPA the comments were mainly about needing aggressive enforcement of water quality standards. For the USFS concerns were mainly about water quality, more cooperation, too much timber dominance, and the need for increased access. For the NMFS the most frequent suggestions were for a better balance between recreational and commercial interests, the need for better data, and more cooperation. For the COE the suggestions were mainly about a better balance in favor of water quality, quantity and fishing in relation to competing demands. Comments for the USFWS emphasized the need for more cooperation, greater protection and restoration of fish and their habitats, and increased education efforts. Comments about FERC involved better balance in favor of water flows and fish habitats, for BIA the comments were about working with others and increasing technical assistance; for BLM the comments were mainly about protecting habitat, and for NPS they were about increased cooperation. Comments for other agencies were too few or lacked sufficient focus to draw conclusion.

The evaluation report by David Loomis provides important insights as to how agencies are viewed in accomplishing the goals of the Conservation Plan. Since the plans of many agencies had not been completed and distributed at the time of the evaluation, it appears that those interviewed were providing an opinion as to how agencies are viewed as resource stewards and their over-all attitude toward assisting recreational fishing. In the cases of USFWS, BLM, USFS, and NMFS, however, the outreach efforts made in plan development were significant and perhaps were reflected in the evaluation.

VIII. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

FINDING: THE PLANS AND AGENCY REPORTS ARE A GOOD START TOWARD ACCOMPLISHING THE GOAL OF THE EXECUTIVE ORDER.

The partnership between the Partnership Council and the Coordination Council is working and we are learning together. The Executive Order has resulted in many agencies operating in a more coordinated manner as well as providing increased attention and effort to recreational fisheries. The Partnership Council continues to fulfill its role by building consensus and making positive recommendations for national fisheries policy.

RECOMMENDATION: *The Partnership Council's Federal charter expires in September, 1997. The Secretary of the Interior must renew the charter.*

FINDING: THERE IS UNANTICIPATED AGENCY CONFUSION ABOUT THE INTERPRETATION AND IMPORTANCE OF THE EXECUTIVE ORDER.

Though several agencies have correctly interpreted the Executive Order as a charge to enhance the level of activities to improve recreational fisheries, other agencies have interpreted it as only requiring documentation of status quo. This has resulted in several plans and reports that do little more than document the status quo. The Partnership Council believes the President fully expected his agencies to improve the quality of fishery resources nationwide and increase recreational fishing opportunities.

RECOMMENDATION: *It is essential for the co-Chairs of the Coordination Council to reaffirm the intent and requirements of the Executive Order as intended by the President.*

FINDING: BECAUSE OF FINDING #2 THE PLANS AND ANNUAL REPORTS SUBMITTED BY MANY AGENCIES ARE INADEQUATE.

They only describe status quo, do not address quantifiable outcomes as originally agreed, fail to identify decreases in agency programs, and do not identify barriers which prevent future accomplishments. Direction and guidance by the Coordination Council to each agency is essential to improve the plans and reports, and to accomplish change directed by the President.

RECOMMENDATION: *The Coordination Council Chairs shall direct the agencies to work with the Partnership Council to develop and/or define reporting formats allowing tabulation of measurable outputs. The Coordination Council should develop a process to annually identify and rank fishery resource needs. Agencies should be alert for opportunities to use this list of resource needs to justify their annual strategies and to support budget initiatives.*

FINDING: THE U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE AND NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE JOINT POLICY TO RESOLVE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT AND RECREATIONAL FISHERIES OBJECTIVES IS WORKING.

Both agencies have taken significant steps to resolve problems.

RECOMMENDATION: Both agencies should be commended and urged to maintain the diligence required for continued success.

FINDING: THE SUBJECTIVE VIEWS OF 280 STAKEHOLDERS INDICATED WIDE AGENCY VARIATION AMONG THEIR OUTREACH AND PARTNERSHIP EFFORTS.

Though information provided by 280 non-Federal partners may contain biases and is not a comprehensive assessment, it provides important insight as to how agencies are perceived by stakeholders. We found that the agencies that most aggressively sought stakeholder involvement were regarded more positively than agencies that had not engaged their partners. Two agencies specifically requested more partnerships (EPA and COE). Regular meetings with stakeholders at the state or regional level are essential to understanding needs and communicating accomplishments.

RECOMMENDATION: The Coordination Council, in consultation with the Partnership Council will facilitate stakeholder meetings and meaningful partnerships. Each agency will work to increase communication, develop partnerships, and overcome misperceptions.

FINDING: THE OBJECTIVES OF THE EXECUTIVE ORDER ARE ON A SEPARATE TRACK, PARALLEL TO THAT OF THE GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE AND RESULTS ACT (GPRA).

The GPRA is the system which the Federal government will use for planning, budgeting, and evaluation of agency accomplishment.

RECOMMENDATION: The Coordination Council must assure that the recreational fisheries plans and reports become incorporated into the GPRA process.

IX THE LOOMIS REPORT

**1997 Evaluation of the
Recreational Fishery Resources Conservation Plan**

Submitted to:

**Doug Alcorn
Coordinator
Sport Fishing and Boating Partnership Council
1033 N. Fairfax Street, Suite 200
Alexandria, VA 22314**

Submitted by

**David K. Loomis, Ph.D.
Department of Forestry and Wildlife Management
University of Massachusetts—Amherst
Amherst, MA 01003-4210**

April 11, 1997

Table of Contents

	Page
Introduction	6
Methods	6
Data Collection.....	6
Evaluation Instrument.....	7
Results	8
Response Rate	8
Evaluation of Federal Agencies in Accomplishing the National Goal	8
Overall Evaluation	8
Overall Evaluation According to Respondent Organization	9
Bonneville Power Administration.....	9
Bureau of Indian Affairs	10
Bureau of Land Management.....	10
Bureau of Reclamation.....	10
Department of the Air Force	10
Department of the Army	10
Department of the Navy	11
Department of Transportation.....	11
Environmental Protection Agency	11
Federal Energy Regulatory Agency	11
National Marine Fisheries Service.....	12
National Park Service.....	12
National Resource Conservation Service.....	12
Tennessee Valley Authority.....	12
Corp. of Engineers	12
United States Coast Guard	13
United States Fish and Wildlife Service	13
United States Forest Service	13
Best and Worst Federal Agencies According to Specific Goals.....	13
Enhancement of Aquatic Systems and Fish Populations	14
Increased Fishing Access.....	14
Increased Education and Outreach	15
Increased Partnership Opportunities.....	15
Summary of Best and Worst Federal Agencies According to Specific Goals.....	15
Impacts Associated with Administration of Endangered Species Act.....	16
Statements of Suggested Recommendations.....	16
Appendix A—Tables	18
Appendix B--Statements of Suggested Recommendations	39
Appendix C--Evaluation Instrument	54

List of Tables

Table 1. Organizations represented in the Recreational Fishery Resources Conservation Plan evaluation.....	18
Table 2. Telephone interview response rate.....	18
Table 3. Frequency distribution of respondents according to State of residence.....	19
Table 4. Frequency distribution of individuals according to organization represented in evaluation.....	19
Table 5. Evaluation of overall progress made by the various Federal Agencies in accomplishing the National Goal of the Conservation Plan.	20
Table 6. Evaluation of overall progress made by the Bonneville Power Administration in accomplishing the National Goal of the Conservation Plan, according to organizational affiliation.....	21
Table 7. Evaluation of overall progress made by the Bureau of Indian Affairs in accomplishing the National Goal of the Conservation Plan, according to organizational affiliation.	21
Table 8. Evaluation of overall progress made by the Bureau of Land Management in accomplishing the National Goal of the Conservation Plan, according to organizational affiliation.	22
Table 9. Evaluation of overall progress made by the Bureau of Reclamation in accomplishing the National Goal of the Conservation Plan, according to organizational affiliation.	22
Table 10. Evaluation of overall progress made by the U.S. Air Force in accomplishing the National Goal of the Conservation Plan, according to organizational affiliation.	23
Table 11. Evaluation of overall progress made by the U.S. Army in accomplishing the National Goal of the Conservation Plan, according to organizational affiliation.	23
Table 12. Evaluation of overall progress made by the U.S. Navy in accomplishing the National Goal of the Conservation Plan, according to organizational affiliation.	24
Table 13. Evaluation of overall progress made by the Department of Transportation in accomplishing the National Goal of the Conservation Plan, according to organizational affiliation.....	24

Table 14. Evaluation of overall progress made by the Environmental Protection Agency in accomplishing the National Goal of the Conservation Plan, according to organizational affiliation.	25
Table 15. Evaluation of overall progress made by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission in accomplishing the National Goal of the Conservation Plan, according to organizational affiliation.	25
Table 16. Evaluation of overall progress made by the National Marine Fisheries Service in accomplishing the National Goal of the Conservation Plan, according to organizational affiliation.	26
Table 17. Evaluation of overall progress made by the National Park Service in accomplishing the National Goal of the Conservation Plan, according to organizational affiliation.	26
Table 18. Evaluation of overall progress made by the National Resource Conservation Service in accomplishing the National Goal of the Conservation Plan, according to organizational affiliation.	27
Table 19. Evaluation of overall progress made by the Tennessee Valley Authority in accomplishing the National Goal of the Conservation Plan, according to organizational affiliation.	27
Table 20. Evaluation of overall progress made by the U.S. Army Corp. of Engineers in accomplishing the National Goal of the Conservation Plan, according to organizational affiliation.	28
Table 21. Evaluation of overall progress made by the U.S. Coast Guard in accomplishing the National Goal of the Conservation Plan, according to organizational affiliation.	28
Table 22. Evaluation of overall progress made by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in accomplishing the National Goal of the Conservation Plan, according to organizational affiliation.	29
Table 23. Evaluation of overall progress made by the U.S. Forest Service in accomplishing the National Goal of the Conservation Plan, according to organizational affiliation.	29
Table 24. Frequency distribution of the two Agencies doing the best job of working toward the Conservation Plan goal of enhancing aquatic systems and fish populations.	30
Table 25. Frequency distribution of the two Agencies doing the worst job of working toward the Conservation Plan goal of enhancing aquatic systems and fish populations.	31

Table 26. Frequency distribution of the two Agencies doing the best job of working toward the Conservation Plan goal of increasing fishing access.....	32
Table 27. Frequency distribution of the two Agencies doing the worst job of working toward the Conservation Plan goal of increasing fishing access.....	33
Table 28. Frequency distribution of the two Agencies doing the best job of working toward the Conservation Plan goal of increasing education and outreach.....	34
Table 29. Frequency distribution of the two Agencies doing the worst job of working toward the Conservation Plan goal of increasing education and outreach.....	35
Table 30. Frequency distribution of the two Agencies doing the best job of working toward the Conservation Plan goal of increasing partnership opportunities with the States, Tribal management partners, industry, anglers and conservation groups.....	36
Table 31. Frequency distribution of the two Agencies doing the worst job of working toward the Conservation Plan goal of increasing partnership opportunities with the States, Tribal management partners, industry, anglers and conservation groups.....	37
Table 32. Percent of respondents indicating that Yes, their organizations fish conservation or management efforts are negatively impacted by activities involving endangered, threatened or species proposed for listing under the Endangered Species Act.....	37
Table 33. Percent of respondents indicating that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service or the National Marine Fisheries Service has worked with them to reduce or minimize the negative impacts on their fish conservation or management efforts due to activities involving endangered, threatened or species proposed for listing under the Endangered Species Act.....	38
Table 34. Frequency distribution of how successful the actions of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service or the National Marine Fisheries Service have been in reducing or minimizing the negative impacts on fish conservation or management efforts due to activities involving endangered, threatened or species proposed for listing under the Endangered Species Act.....	39

Introduction

On June 7, 1995, President Clinton signed Executive Order 12962. This Executive Order, which recognized the “social, cultural, and economic importance of recreational fisheries,” called on the Departments of Interior, Commerce, Agriculture, Transportation, Defense, and Energy, and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to develop a five-year Conservation Plan for Recreational Fishery Resources. This plan was completed in 1996. The National Goal of the “Recreational Fishery Resources Conservation Plan” is:

“Provide for increased recreational fishing opportunities nationwide through the conservation, restoration, and enhancement of aquatic systems and fish populations, and by increasing fishing access, education and outreach, and partnership opportunities.”

Four Implementation Strategies were outlined in the Conservation Plan, each speaking to a specific part of the National Goal. In addition, twelve Success Indicators were identified. These indicators provide trend information relative to the National Goal and the Implementation Strategies, and a means for evaluating the extent to which the goals and strategies of the Conservation Plan are being successfully accomplished.

The responsibility for evaluating the extent to which the goals of the Conservation Plan are being successfully accomplished is established in Executive Order 12962. It requires the federally chartered Sport Fishing and Boating Partnership Council to monitor Federal activities affecting aquatic systems and the recreational fisheries they support, review and evaluate the efforts of various Federal Agencies to implement the Conservation Plan, and to prepare an annual report for submission to the Coordination Council and President. The Partnership Council is to obtain information pertinent to the Success Indicators, and using this information evaluate the progress made in achieving the National Goal of the Conservation Plan

The information called for in most of the Success Indicators is available in regularly prepared reports and documents. However, some of the information required (notably Indicators #10 and #12) is more subjective in nature and not readily available in the reports and documents noted above. Therefore, it was necessary to independently compile information on these two Success Indicators as they relate to the implementation of the Conservation Plan. This document presents the results (methods, analysis, findings) of the effort to obtain and interpret the information necessary for properly evaluating the extent to which these aspects of the Conservation Plan are being implemented and accomplished.

Methods

Data Collection

Data for this evaluation were collected through a telephone interview procedure administered to 410 individuals. These individuals collectively represented ten different government agencies, fishery management councils, and conservation organizations (Table 1). It was expected that this group of individuals and organizations would be robust in their knowledge, involvement, experience and interest in recreational fishery management issues, and as a result could provide meaningful insight into the degree to which the Recreational Fishery Resources Conservation

Plan is being successfully implemented. The size of the group to be interviewed, 410, is also important in that it will allow some degree of sub-group analysis.

Prior to implementing the telephone interview procedure, each of the 410 individuals was mailed a package of materials. Included in this package was a copy of the Recreational Fishery Resources Conservation Plan, a copy of the policy enacted between the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service designed to identify and minimize the impacts associated with administration of the Endangered Species Act on those attempting to enhance recreational fisheries, a copy of the evaluation instrument containing the questions they would be asked during the telephone interview, and a personalized cover letter. The cover letter explained the purpose of the evaluation being conducted, asked for their assistance, and informed them about when they could expect a call for their interview. The letter also informed the person that it was their responses that were being sought, not some other person in their organization. The basic purpose of sending this package was to provide each individual with some background information on the Conservation Plan, and to allow them to prepare for the interview. It was hoped that this would reduce the time required, and the burden imposed, on each person in completing the interview. In turn, this was expected to improve the overall response rate.

The telephone interview procedure was conducted by Teleforce, an independent market research firm. Teleforce was provided with the names and phone numbers of the 410 individuals to be interviewed, and a copy of the evaluation instrument containing the questions to be asked of each individual. The basic procedure was to call each individual on the list during the working day (8am - 5pm local time) from Monday through Friday. If the individual was successfully contacted, the interview was initiated. If the person was not contacted on that attempt, additional calls were made until the individual was contacted, or until it was determined that the individual could not be reached and the phone number was declared "dead." In many cases up to eight attempts were made at a given phone number. In addition to direct calling efforts, Teleforce left their toll-free 800 number on the individuals answering machine or with their receptionist. This allowed the person to call back at a time convenient to their schedule. It is estimated that approximately 50% of the completed interviews were accomplished by employing the 800 number.

Evaluation Instrument

The evaluation instrument was designed to provide information that would indicate the extent to which the individuals being interviewed felt 18 Federal Agencies were successfully implementing the Recreational Fishery Resources Conservation Plan (Appendix C). Through this instrument they were asked to 1) evaluate the overall progress of the 18 agencies in accomplishing the National Goal of the Plan, 2) identify the two agencies doing the best and worst jobs in meeting the four specific goals identified in the plan, 3) evaluate the effectiveness of the policy enacted between the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service in minimizing the impacts of the Endangered Species Act on efforts to enhance recreational fisheries, and 4) to state in one sentence the one thing each Agency could do to best meet the National Goals as stated in the Recreational Fishery Resources Conservation Plan.

Results

Response Rate

The telephone interview procedure resulted in 280 completed interviews, or a 68.3% overall response rate (Table 2). Of the 130 individuals from whom an interview could not be obtained, 102 could not be contacted, 17 refused to be interviewed, six said they should speak with another person, and 5 said they had no idea why they were being contacted. The vast majority of those who could not be contacted were out of town (business or vacation) and unavailable during the time interviews were being conducted. There was broad geographic coverage, with interview respondents being located in 48 states, the District of Columbia and Ontario, Canada (Table 3). Similarly, each of the ten organizations are represented by the respondents (Table 4).

Evaluation of Federal Agencies in Accomplishing the National Goal

Overall Evaluation

Respondents were asked to indicate, overall, if they felt each of the 18 Federal Agencies was doing an "excellent," "fair" or "poor" job of accomplishing the National Goal as stated in the Recreational Fishery Resources Conservation Plan. Respondents also had the option of indicating for each Agency that they "did not know," or that for them the question was "not applicable." Of these five response categories, only the first four are included in the descriptive analysis reported in Table 5. The first four categories are relevant to an understanding of the perceived progress toward accomplishing the National Goal, while the last category (not applicable) is not.

Results of this overall evaluation provide two general insights. First, none of the Federal agencies are viewed by the respondents as making "excellent" progress toward accomplishing the National Goal of the Conservation Plan (Table 5). The proportion of "excellent" responses is quite low (less than 10%) for 11 of the 18 agencies (BPA, BIA, BOR, AIR FORCE, ARMY, NAVY, DOT, FERC, TVA, COE, BLM). For six of the agencies, the proportion of "excellent" responses is between 14% and 24% (EPA, NMFS, NPS, NRCS, USCG, USFS). The USFWS received the highest proportion of "excellent" responses at only 39.4%. Ten of the 18 agencies had a higher proportion of "poor" responses than "excellent" responses (BPA, BIA, BOR, AIR FORCE, ARMY, NAVY, DOT, FERC, COE, BLM). Exceptions to this general finding are five agencies that appear to be making "fair" to "excellent" progress in accomplishing the National Goal. The proportion of respondents indicating "fair" or "excellent" progress, combined, was 78.4% for the USFWS, 63.3% for the EPA, 61.1% for the USFS, 59.1% for the NPS, and 56.6% for the NMFS.

The second general observation is the very high proportion of "don't know" responses for many of the agencies. Individuals being interviewed gave this response when they did not know what progress an Agency was making toward achieving the National Goal stated in the Conservation Plan and thus could not make an informed judgement. The proportion of "don't know" responses exceeded 50% for 11 of the 18 Agencies. This finding leads to the question of why these Agencies have such high proportions of "don't know" responses. It is possible that these Agencies are doing little or nothing to accomplish the National Goal, and thus there is nothing for the respondents to know of or to evaluate. A second possibility is that these agencies have

been active and are making progress toward the National Goal, but that this progress is not widely known. Third, the Conservation Plan has been in place a relatively short period of time, and the respondents are not yet aware of the activities of these Agencies, or that the Agencies have not yet fully begun their efforts. Finally, recreational fisheries management is outside what is normally expected of these Agencies and thus the respondents could not reasonably be expected to know of their activities. But, although this might be the case for agencies such as the Air Force, Army, or the Navy, it is not the case for the BPA, TVA, or BLM. The actual reason for the high proportion of “don’t know” responses is likely to be some combination of the above stated possibilities. Unfortunately, the ability to determine the specific reason at this time is beyond the scope of the available data and this evaluation.

However, despite any possible explanations for the high proportion of “don’t know” responses, the Recreational Fishery Resources Conservation Plan specifically calls for these agencies to engage in public education, and to enter into partnerships with State and Tribal management partners, industry, anglers, and conservation groups. Where these 18 Federal Agencies actively engage in public education and enter into partnerships, the proportion of “don’t know” responses should be low. Where they do not, the proportion of “don’t know” responses will be high. Therefore, these results indicate that those agencies with a high proportion of “don’t know” responses are not making good progress toward accomplishing the National Goal as stated in the Recreational Fishery Resources Conservation Plan.

Overall Evaluation According to Respondent Organization

The 280 individuals from whom completed interviews were obtained represent ten different organizations. It is likely that differences will exist between these individuals based on their organizational affiliation, and that their responses provided for this evaluation will in turn differ. To better account for the possibility of such organization-related differences, an evaluation of progress toward accomplishing the National Goal of the Conservation Plan was done according to Federal Agency and respondent organization. Unlike the above overall evaluation, however, only the proportion of “poor,” “fair” and “excellent” response categories were considered in the discussion. The number of respondents in the “don’t know” or “not applicable” categories are provided only for reference, and the reader is advised to consider these numbers. The issue of the large proportion of “don’t know” responses has been discussed, and in the following analysis only those responses that speak directly to an evaluation of the progress made toward the National Goal are reviewed. The reasoning behind this decision is that the information contained in the “poor,” “fair,” and “excellent” response categories is the only certain information on which the activities of the 18 Federal Agencies can be evaluated. Therefore, the following discussion is limited to only that subset of respondents. For specific data on the proportion of “don’t know” responses for a given Federal Agency, the reader is directed to Table 5 for that information.

Bonneville Power Administration

Of those individuals expressing a specific opinion on the progress made by BPA toward the National Goal, 32 (56.4%) indicated the Agency was making “poor” progress (Table 6). Over half of the responses in the “poor” category (17) came from individuals affiliated with the PSMFC. This represents 81% of the PSMFC members who responded to this item. The overall

evaluation that the BPA is making poor progress toward achieving the National Goal of the Conservation Plan is largely driven by these 17 respondents. The sample size is otherwise too small to make additional judgments.

Bureau of Indian Affairs

Respondents appear to be relatively consistent in their evaluation of the BIA, regardless of organizational affiliation (Table 7). Between 33% and 59% of the respondents from each of the ten organizations rated BIA as making “poor” progress toward accomplishing the National Goal, with the overall proportion of “poor” responses being 47.7%. There is a similar pattern for those rating BIA’s progress as “fair” (the overall proportion of “fair” responses was 43.2%). No organizational affiliation stands out as being particularly polarized in their evaluation.

Bureau of Land Management

The overall evaluation of the BLM is that they are making “poor” (28.9%) to “fair” (54.6%) progress (Table 8). Respondents from the NAFWS and the State Fish Chiefs are strongly of the opinion that the Agency is making “fair” progress, with their proportion of “fair” responses being in excess of 70%. In contrast, those affiliated with the PSMFC are more inclined to evaluate the BLM as making “poor” progress (52.6%).

Bureau of Reclamation

In general, respondents across all ten organizations indicated that the BOR is making “fair” (67.0%) progress toward the National Goal (Table 9). No organization-related differences appear to exist.

Department of the Air Force

Of the 280 respondents, only 38 (13.6% overall) felt it was appropriate for them to evaluate the progress being made by the Air Force toward accomplishing the National Goal of the Conservation Plan (Table 10). This sample is too small to allow a meaningful evaluation of any organization-related differences or any related discussion. Overall, however, those respondents expressing an opinion on the progress being made by the Air Force toward accomplishing the National Goal of the Conservation Plan indicated that they feel the Department is making “poor” (36.8%) to “fair” (47.4%) progress.

Department of the Army

Of the 280 respondents, only 62 (22.1% overall) felt it was appropriate for them to evaluate the progress being made by the Army towards accomplishing the National Goal of the Conservation Plan (Table 11). This sample is too small to allow a meaningful evaluation of any organization-related differences or any related discussion. Those who did respond to this item, however, present a generally mixed picture on the progress the Department is making toward the National

Goal, with a slightly higher proportion of responses in the “fair” category (40.3%) than in the “poor” category (35.5%).

Department of the Navy

Of the 280 respondents, only 43 (15.4% overall) felt it was appropriate for them to evaluate the progress being made by the Navy towards accomplishing the National Goal of the Conservation Plan (Table 12). This sample is too small to allow a meaningful evaluation of any organization-related differences or any related discussion. The overall evaluation is slightly different from that for the Air Force and Army, with a slightly higher proportion of responses in the “poor” (39.5%) than in the “fair” (34.9%) categories.

Department of Transportation

About the same number of respondents overall felt the DOT was making “poor” progress (43.5%) as felt the Agency was making “fair” progress (44.6%) (Table 13). Respondents affiliated with two organizations, GLFC and TU, appear to depart from this pattern, with a significantly higher proportion of individuals in each (approximately 70%) giving the DOT a “poor” evaluation. However, the sample size in this analysis is small and this result should be viewed with caution.

Environmental Protection Agency

Overall, the EPA is viewed by a strong majority of respondents as making “fair” progress (67.3%) toward accomplishing the National Goal (Table 14). It is notable that none of the respondents affiliated with two organizations, ASMFC and NAFWS, evaluated the Agency as making “poor” progress. One group of respondents that departs somewhat from the overall distribution of responses are those affiliated with the GSMFC. About 44% of these individuals felt the EPA was making “excellent” progress, which compares to an overall 18.6% proportion of responses in the “excellent” category. In general, the proportion of responses by those in other organizations in the “excellent” category was much lower than this.

Federal Energy Regulatory Agency

The overall evaluation of the FERC was that they were making “poor” (34.3%) to “fair” (54.0%) progress toward achieving the National Goal of the Conservation Plan (Table 15). There were several organization-related differences, however. For example, a considerably higher proportion of respondents affiliated with the GLFC or the IWL evaluated the Agency as making “fair” progress (approximately 75%) than did respondents affiliated with the other organizations. In contrast, most respondents affiliated with the NAFWS (53.3%) evaluated the EPA as making “poor” progress. Respondents affiliated with the other seven organizations were otherwise fairly consistent in their evaluation of the FERC.

National Marine Fisheries Service

The NMFS is making “fair” (50.9%) to “excellent” (35.1%) progress toward achieving the National Goal of the Conservation Plan (Table 16). There are two organization-related departures from this general evaluation that are worth noting. First, a clear majority of respondents affiliated with ASA (64.7%) stated that NMFS is making “excellent” progress. This is a higher proportion of “excellent” responses than for the other organizations in general (35.1%). Second, respondents affiliated with the PSMFC evaluated NMFS differently, indicating that the Agency was making “poor” (42.3%) to “fair” (42.3%) progress. This is a lower evaluation than for the other organizations in general (proportion of “poor” = 14%).

National Park Service

The NPS is evaluated as making “fair” (51.7%) to “excellent” (35.0%) progress (Table 17). However, respondents from three organizations differed in their evaluation as compared to the general evaluation. A majority of the respondents associated with the GLFC viewed the NPS as making “excellent” progress (56.3%), a much higher rate than for the overall evaluation. The same is true for respondents affiliated with TU (61.1% responded “excellent”). Finally, a large majority of respondents affiliated with the NAFWS viewed the NPS as making only “fair” progress (72.7%).

National Resource Conservation Service

The general evaluation of the NRCS is that the Agency is making “fair” (54.2%) to “excellent” (31.7%) progress in achieving the National Goal (Table 18). An exception to this general finding is the response of those who are affiliated with the ASA, where 75% of the respondents felt the Agency is making “excellent” progress.

Tennessee Valley Authority

Of the 280 respondents, only 73 (26.1% overall) felt it was appropriate for them to evaluate the progress being made by the TVA towards accomplishing the National Goal of the Conservation Plan (Table 19). This sample is too small to allow a meaningful evaluation of any organization-related differences or any related discussion. The collective, or general evaluation of the Agency is that they are making “fair” (50.0%) to “excellent” (31.9%) progress overall.

Corp. of Engineers

The overall evaluation of the COE is that they are making “poor” (43.4%) to “fair” (44.7%) progress toward accomplishing the National Goal of the Conservation Plan (Table 20). This view is consistent and uniform across respondents from all ten organizations. This finding is strengthened by the relatively small number of “don’t know” and “not applicable” responses.

United States Coast Guard

Overall, the USCG is viewed as making “fair” (47.4%) to “excellent” (44.0%) progress toward achieving the National Goal (Table 21). The pattern of responses is fairly consistent across the ten organizations, although the sample size is somewhat small and this result should be viewed with some caution.

United States Fish and Wildlife Service

The USFWS is making “fair” (44.1%) to “excellent” (44.5%) progress toward accomplishing the National Goal as stated in the Conservation Plan (Table 23). This general perspective is shared by respondents affiliated with all of the organizations represented, with the possible exception of those affiliated with the GSMFC, where a high proportion of these individuals evaluated the USFWS as making “poor” progress (42.9%). This is nearly four times higher than the overall proportion of respondents evaluating the USFWS as making “poor” progress (11.4%). The general and consistent findings concerning the USFWS can be viewed with confidence due to the low number (only 35) of “don’t know” and “not applicable” responses.

United States Forest Service

The USFS, like the USFWS is evaluated as making “fair” (56.2%) to “excellent” (28.9%) progress toward accomplishing the National Goal as stated in the Conservation Plan (Table 21). However, there is some diversity across respondents according to organizational affiliation. Respondents affiliated with ASA, for example, are generally evenly divided across the three response categories, with perhaps a slight shift toward the “poor” progress category. Thus, those individuals affiliated with the ASA view the progress of the USFS as being not quite as good as do respondents affiliated with other organizations. Second, respondents affiliated with BASS, the GLFC or the IWL had a higher proportion of responses in the “excellent” category than respondent affiliated with other organizations. Thus they evaluated the progress of the USFS as being higher than did the other respondents. Finally, only one respondent affiliated with the PSMFC felt the USFS was making “excellent” progress, while six respondents affiliated with the same organization indicated the Agency was making “poor” progress. Their view is more consistent with that of respondents affiliated with the ASA.

Best and Worst Federal Agencies According to Specific Goals

The National Goal as stated in the Conservation Plan contains within it four specific goals: 1) to enhance aquatic systems and fish populations, 2) to increasing fishing access, 3) to increase education and outreach, and 4) to increase partnership opportunities with the States, Tribal management partners, industry, anglers and conservation groups. Respondents were asked to indicate, for each of these goals, which two Federal Agencies they feel are doing the best job, and which two Agencies are doing the worst job, in meeting each of these specific goals. There was no particular ranking or order asked for, as in first best or second best. For a particular goal, best was best, whether it was the first or second Agency they named. The information obtained was analyzed by determining the number of times an Agency was named as one of the two best, or worst, for a given goal, and then summing these numbers for that goal. The Agency named

the most times as the best or worst for a given goal was then defined as being the best or worst for that goal.

Enhancement of Aquatic Systems and Fish Populations

The Agency viewed by the respondents as doing the best job of enhancing aquatic systems and fish populations is the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Table 24). They were named 143 times as doing the best job. Following the USFWS was the NMFS (named 57 times), USFS (named 52 times) and the EPA (named 34 times). The four agencies named least often as doing the best job of enhancing aquatic systems and fish populations are the DOT (named zero times), the Department of the Navy and the Department of the Army (named once each), the Department of the Air Force (named twice), and the BPA (named three times).

Respondents named the COE most often as doing the worst job of enhancing aquatic systems and fish populations (named 68 times) (Table 25). The COE was followed by the FERC (named 28 times), the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (named 23 times) the EPA (named 20 times) and the BIA (named 19 times). It is interesting to note that the USFWS was identified by 28 respondents as doing the worst job of enhancing aquatic systems and fish populations, while at the same time being named 143 times as doing the best job of enhancing aquatic systems and fish populations. Also, the Agencies named least often as doing the worst job of enhancing aquatic systems and fish populations (TVA, USCG, Department of the Navy, Department of the Army and Department of the Air Force) were also among those named least often as doing the best job of enhancing aquatic systems and fish populations.

Increased Fishing Access

When respondents were asked to identify the Agencies doing the best job of increasing fishing access, the USFWS was again named most often (93 times) (Table 26). The USFS was also among the Agencies named as doing the best job (named 63 times). The COE was the Agency named third most often (48 times) and the NPS was named fourth most often (40 times). The pattern of Agencies named least often as doing the best job of increasing fishing access is similar to that of the agencies named least often as doing the best job of enhancing aquatic systems and fish populations (Table 26). The Department of the Navy was named zero times, the USCG was named one time, and the DOT, Department of the Army, Department of the Air Force and the BPA were named just twice each.

The Agencies identified most often as doing the worst job of increasing fishing access was the COE (named 35 times), followed by the FERC, NPS, and the USFWS (named 17 times each) (Table 27). Named least often as doing the worst job of increasing fishing access was the TVA and Department of the Navy (four times each), the Department of the Air Force (named five times) and the USCG and the Department of the Army (named 7 times each). This result is similar (a similar set of Agencies) to the finding for the Agencies named least often as doing the best job of enhancing aquatic systems and fish populations.

Increased Education and Outreach

As with the previous two goals, the USFWS was named most often (132 times) as the Agency doing the best job of working toward the goal of increasing education and outreach (Table 28). Following the USFWS in this goal are the USFS (named 60 times), the NMFS (named 38 times), and the EPA and NPS, named 27 times each. Again, the Agencies named least often as doing the best job of working toward the goal of increasing education and outreach are the Departments of the Army and Air Force (named zero times), the BOR, DOT, and Department of the Navy (named only one time each) and the FERC, named three times.

The two Agencies identified most often as doing the worst job of increasing education and outreach are the COE (named 48 times) and the FERC (named 23 times) (Table 29). The EPA was identified third most often (21 times) and the BIA fourth most often (named 19 times). Agencies names least often as doing the worst job of increasing education and outreach are the TVA (named once), the NRCS and the Department of the Navy (named four times each) and the USCG (named five times).

Increasing Partnership Opportunities

The pattern of the USFWS, the USFS, and the NMFS being among the agencies most often named as doing the best job continues for the goal of increasing partnership opportunities with the States, Tribal management partners, industry, anglers and conservation groups. The USFWS was named as the Agency doing the best job of increasing these partnership opportunities 116 times (Table 30). The USFS was named second most often (59 times), followed by the NMFS (31 times). The Agencies named least often as doing the best job of increasing partnership opportunities were the Department of the Air Force (named zero times), the USCG and the DOT (named one time each) and the Departments of the Navy and the Army (named twice each).

As with the three previous goals, the COE (named 46 times) and the FERC (named 24 times) were named most often as doing the worst job of increasing partnership opportunities (Table 31). They were followed by the EPA (named 21 times) and the BIA (named 20 times) as doing the worst job of increasing partnership opportunities. Named least often as the Agency doing the worst job of increasing partnership opportunities was the USCG (one time), followed by the NRCS (named four times) and the TVA and the Department of the Air Force (named five times each).

Summary of Best and Worst Federal Agencies According to Specific Goals

The Agency most often named as doing the best job of meeting the four individual goals is the USFWS (Table 24, 26, 18, 30). Other Agencies consistently among those named most often as doing the best job of meeting these goals are the USFS, NMFS and the EPA. This finding is consistent with the evaluation of overall progress made by the 18 Federal Agencies in accomplishing the National Goal of the Conservation Plan (Table 5).

The COE was named most often as the Agency doing the Worst Job of Meeting each of the individual Goals (Table 25, 27, 29, 31). The FERC was the Agency named second most often.

Again, this is consistent with the evaluation of overall progress being made by these Agencies toward accomplishing the National Goal (Table 5).

Based on the above evidence, there is consistency in who is doing the best and worst jobs. The USFWS appears to be the Agency doing the best job of accomplishing the goals stated in the Recreational Fishery Resources Conservation Plan. Other Agencies making good progress include the USFS, NMFS, EPA and the NPS. The two Agencies viewed as doing the worst job of accomplishing the goals stated in the Conservation Plan are COE and FERC.

Impacts Associated with Administration of Endangered Species Act

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service have enacted a policy designed to minimize the impacts of the Endangered Species Act on efforts to enhance recreational fisheries. One purpose of this evaluation is to determine the effectiveness of this policy. Respondents were first asked to indicate if their fish conservation or management efforts were negatively impacted by activities involving endangered, threatened or species proposed for listing under the Endangered Species Act. Those who answered Yes were then asked if the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service or the National Marine Fisheries Service had worked with them to reduce or minimize these impacts to their program. If the response to this question was Yes, the respondent was asked overall, how successful had the actions of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service or the National Marine Fisheries Service been in reducing or minimizing the impacts to your program.

Responses to this set of three questions indicates that overall, relatively few respondents (n=79, 28%) felt their organization had been negatively impacted by activities involving endangered, threatened or species proposed for listing under the Endangered Species Act (Table 32). Of these 79 respondents, 49 (62%) indicated that either the USFWS or the NMFS had worked with them to minimize these impacts (Table 34). Nearly 80% of these 49 respondents reported that the actions of the USFWS and NMFS had been at least somewhat successful (Table 35).

These results suggest that the fish conservation or management efforts of some organizations have been negatively impacted by activities involving endangered, threatened or species proposed for listing under the Endangered Species Act. However, these impacts appear to be limited, and that in about half of these cases the policy enacted between the USFWS and NMFS has been at least somewhat successful in reducing or minimizing the impacts.

Statements of Suggested Recommendations

Appendix B contains verbatim responses to questions 9 through 16 on the evaluation instrument. Respondents were asked to indicate, in one sentence, what one thing they felt the various federal agencies mentioned during the telephone interview could do to best meet the National Goals as stated in the Recreational Fishery Resources Conservation Plan, irrespective of any partnerships between their organization and any of the federal agencies. Respondents were not expected to comment on all eighteen federal agencies, but rather only those for which they had a working interest in and had knowledge of. In addition, they were asked to indicate the National Goal they felt their one-sentence comment best related to.

Goal 1 refers to enhancing aquatic systems and fish populations.
Goal 2 refers to the goal of increasing fishing access.
Goal 3 refers to the goal of increasing education and outreach.

Because respondents were asked to provide their one-sentence comments irrespective of any partnerships between their organization and any of the federal agencies, the fourth National Goal, to increase partnership opportunities with the States, Tribal management partners, industry, anglers and conservation groups, was not included among the Goal response categories.

Respondents were provided four opportunities to provide one-sentence comments on the federal agencies of their choice. Therefore, Appendix B is divided into four sections, with each section containing responses to each of the four opportunities. There is no special meaning to be inferred from a comment being in one section rather than another. Each section is arranged according to the federal Agency the comment is about, the organization the respondent is affiliated with, and finally National Goal, in that order.

Appendix A

Tables

Table 1. Organizations represented in the Recreational Fishery Resources Conservation Plan evaluation.

American Sportfishing Association (ASA)
Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission (ASMFC)
Bass Anglers Sportsmen's Society (BASS)
Great Lakes Fisheries Commission (GLFC)
Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission (GSMFC)
Izaak Walton league (IWL)
Native Americans Fish and Wildlife Society (NAFWS)
Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission (PSMFC)
State Fish Chiefs (STATE)
Trout Unlimited (TU)

Table 2. Telephone interview response rate.

	<u>N</u>
Initial sample	410
Non-contacts	102
Refusals	17
Contact other person	6
Wrong person to interview	5
Interviews completed	280
Final response rate	68.3%

Table 3. Frequency distribution of respondents according to State of residence.

Count	Pct.	State	Count	Pct.	State
4	1.4	Alabama	5	1.8	Nebraska
6	2.1	Arizona	6	2.1	Nevada
2	.7	Arkansas	1	.4	New Hampshire
13	4.6	California	6	2.1	New Jersey
8	2.9	Colorado	6	2.1	New Mexico
2	.7	Connecticut	7	2.5	New York
3	1.1	Delaware	4	1.4	North Carolina
1	.4	District of Columbia	2	.7	North Dakota
10	3.6	Florida	5	1.8	Ohio
4	1.4	Georgia	5	1.8	Oklahoma
4	1.4	Hawaii	19	6.8	Oregon
5	1.8	Idaho	7	2.5	Pennsylvania
5	1.8	Illinois	3	1.1	Rhode Island
6	2.1	Indiana	6	2.1	South Carolina
3	1.1	Iowa	2	.7	South Dakota
2	.7	Kansas	4	1.4	Tennessee
2	.7	Kentucky	2	.7	Texas
6	2.1	Louisiana	4	1.4	Utah
4	1.4	Maine	6	2.1	Vermont
7	2.5	Maryland	15	5.4	Virginia
8	2.9	Massachusetts	12	4.3	Washington
13	4.6	Michigan	10	3.6	Wisconsin
4	1.4	Minnesota	1	.4	Wyoming
6	2.1	Mississippi	1	.4	Ontario, Canada
4	1.4	Missouri	280	100.0	TOTAL
9	3.2	Montana			

Table 4. Frequency distribution of individuals according to organization represented in evaluation.

Count	Pct	Organization
29	10.4	ASA
19	6.8	ASMFC
33	11.8	BASS
19	6.8	GLFC
11	3.9	GSMFC
27	9.6	IWL
36	12.9	NAFWS
28	10.0	PSMFC
56	20.0	STATE
22	7.9	TU
280	100.0	TOTAL

Table 5. Evaluation of overall progress made by the various Federal Agencies in accomplishing the National Goal of the Conservation Plan.

	<u>Poor</u> N (%)	<u>Fair</u> N (%)	<u>Excellent</u> N (%)	<u>Don't Know</u> N (%)	<u>Not Applicable</u> N	Σ N
BPA	31 (15.2)	21 (10.3)	3 (1.5)	149 (73.0)	76	280
BIA	53 (21.6)	48 (19.6)	10 (4.1)	134 (54.7)	35	280
BOR	27 (10.7)	77 (30.4)	11 (4.3)	138 (54.5)	27	280
AIR FORCE	14 (5.9)	18 (7.6)	6 (2.5)	198 (83.9)	44	280
ARMY	22 (9.1)	25 (10.3)	15 (6.2)	181 (74.5)	37	280
NAVY	17 (7.2)	15 (6.3)	11 (4.6)	194 (81.9)	43	280
DOT	40 (15.4)	41 (15.8)	11 (4.2)	167 (64.5)	21	280
EPA	28 (10.4)	134 (49.6)	37 (13.7)	71 (26.3)	10	280
FERC	47 (17.9)	74 (28.2)	16 (6.1)	125 (47.7)	18	280
NMFS	24 (9.2)	87 (33.5)	60 (23.1)	89 (34.2)	20	280
NPS	24 (9.1)	93 (35.2)	63 (23.9)	84 (31.8)	16	280
NRCS	17 (6.4)	65 (24.6)	38 (14.4)	144 (54.5)	16	280
TVA	13 (5.8)	35 (15.7)	22 (9.9)	153 (68.6)	57	280
COE	95 (35.1)	98 (36.2)	26 (9.6)	52 (19.2)	9	280
USCG	10 (4.1)	55 (22.4)	51 (20.8)	129 (52.7)	35	280
USFWS	28 (10.1)	108 (39.0)	109 (39.4)	32 (11.6)	3	280
USFS	29 (10.7)	109 (40.4)	56 (20.7)	76 (28.1)	10	280
BLM	28 (13.5)	53 (25.5)	16 (7.7)	111 (53.4)	25	233 ¹

¹Total does not equal 280 due to 47 missing cases.

Table 6. Evaluation of overall progress made by the Bonneville Power Administration in accomplishing the National Goal of the Conservation Plan, according to organizational affiliation.

	<u>Poor</u> N (%)	<u>Fair</u> N (%)	<u>Excellent</u> N (%)	<u>Don't Know</u> N	<u>Not Applicable</u> N	Σ N
ASA	2 (66.7)	1 (33.3)	0 (0.0)	15	11	29
ASMFC	0 (0.0)	2 (66.7)	1 (33.3)	12	4	19
BASS	1 (20.0)	4 (80.0)	0 (0.0)	21	7	33
GLFC	1 (50.0)	1 (50.0)	0 (0.0)	13	4	19
GSMFC	1 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	7	3	11
IWL	1 (33.3)	2 (66.7)	0 (0.0)	15	9	27
NAFWS	1 (14.3)	5 (71.4)	1 (14.3)	20	9	36
PSMFC	17 (81.0)	4 (19.0)	0 (0.0)	5	2	28
STATE	2 (50.0)	1 (25.0)	1 (25.0)	33	19	56
TU	5 (83.3)	1 (16.7)	0 (0.0)	8	8	22
TOTAL	31 (56.4)	21 (38.2)	3 (5.5)	149	76	280

Table 7. Evaluation of overall progress made by the Bureau of Indian Affairs in accomplishing the National Goal of the Conservation Plan, according to organizational affiliation.

	<u>Poor</u> N (%)	<u>Fair</u> N (%)	<u>Excellent</u> N (%)	<u>Don't Know</u> N	<u>Not Applicable</u> N	Σ N
ASA	6 (50.0)	5 (41.7)	1 (8.3)	15	2	29
ASMFC	1 (33.3)	2 (66.7)	0 (0.0)	13	3	19
BASS	6 (54.5)	3 (27.3)	2 (18.2)	17	5	33
GLFC	5 (50.0)	5 (50.0)	0 (0.0)	8	1	19
GSMFC	1 (50.0)	1 (50.0)	0 (0.0)	8	1	11
IWL	4 (40.0)	6 (60.0)	0 (0.0)	17	0	27
NAFWS	13 (43.3)	13 (43.3)	4 (13.3)	6	0	36
PSMFC	10 (58.8)	6 (35.3)	1 (5.9)	8	3	28
STATE	4 (57.1)	1 (14.3)	2 (28.6)	35	14	56
TU	3 (33.3)	6 (66.7)	0 (0.0)	7	6	22
TOTAL	53 (47.7)	48 (43.2)	10 (9.0)	134	35	280

Table 8. Evaluation of overall progress made by the Bureau of Land Management in accomplishing the National Goal of the Conservation Plan, according to organizational affiliation.

	<u>Poor</u> N (%)	<u>Fair</u> N (%)	<u>Excellent</u> N (%)	<u>Don't Know</u> N	<u>Not Applicable</u> N	Σ N
ASA	3 (37.5)	3 (37.5)	2 (25.0)	15	0	23
ASMFC	2 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	8	3	13
BASS	1 (8.3)	7 (58.3)	4 (33.3)	10	1	23
GLFC	1 (16.7)	4 (66.7)	1 (16.7)	9	0	15
GSMFC	1 (33.3)	2 (66.7)	0 (0.0)	6	1	10
IWL	1 (10.0)	4 (40.0)	5 (50.0)	12	0	22
NAFWS	2 (18.2)	8 (72.7)	1 (9.1)	9	5	25
PSMFC	10 (52.6)	8 (42.1)	1 (5.3)	5	2	26
STATE	3 (20.0)	11 (73.3)	1 (6.7)	30	9	54
TU	4 (36.4)	6 (54.5)	1 (9.1)	7	4	22
TOTAL	28 (28.9)	53 (54.6)	16 (16.5)	111	25	233*

*Total N does not equal 280 due to 47 missing cases.

Table 9. Evaluation of overall progress made by the Bureau of Reclamation in accomplishing the National Goal of the Conservation Plan, according to organizational affiliation.

	<u>Poor</u> N (%)	<u>Fair</u> N (%)	<u>Excellent</u> N (%)	<u>Don't Know</u> N	<u>Not Applicable</u> N	Σ N
ASA	2 (22.2)	7 (77.8)	0 (0.0)	19	1	29
ASMFC	0 (0.0)	4 (80.0)	1 (20.0)	12	2	19
BASS	0 (0.0)	10 (71.4)	4 (28.6)	14	5	33
GLFC	1 (25.0)	3 (75.0)	0 (0.0)	15	0	19
GSMFC	0 (0.0)	1 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	9	1	11
IWL	4 (28.6)	9 (64.3)	1 (7.1)	1	13	27
NAFWS	4 (18.2)	14 (63.6)	4 (18.2)	11	3	36
PSMFC	7 (36.8)	12 (63.2)	0 (0.0)	8	1	28
STATE	4 (25.0)	11 (68.8)	1 (6.3)	30	10	56
TU	5 (45.5)	6 (54.5)	0 (0.0)	7	4	22
TOTAL	27 (23.5)	77 (67.0)	11 (9.6)	138	27	280

Table 10. Evaluation of overall progress made by the U.S. Air Force in accomplishing the National Goal of the Conservation Plan, according to organizational affiliation.

	<u>Poor</u> N (%)	<u>Fair</u> N (%)	<u>Excellent</u> N (%)	<u>Don't Know</u> N	<u>Not Applicable</u> N	Σ N
ASA	1 (33.3)	2 (66.7)	0 (0.0)	23	3	29
ASMFC	1 (33.3)	1 (33.3)	1 (33.3)	13	3	19
BASS	0 (0.0)	4 (66.7)	2 (33.3)	20	7	33
GLFC	2 (50.0)	1 (25.0)	1 (25.0)	14	1	19
GSMFC	0 (0.0)	1 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	8	2	11
IWL	3 (60.0)	2 (40.0)	0 (0.0)	20	2	27
NAFWS	3 (75.0)	1 (25.0)	0 (0.0)	24	8	36
PSMFC	1 (50.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.0)	23	3	28
STATE	2 (22.2)	6 (66.7)	1 (11.1)	39	8	56
TU	1 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	14	7	22
TOTAL	14 (36.8)	18 (47.4)	6 (15.8)	198	44	280

Table 11. Evaluation of overall progress made by the U.S. Army in accomplishing the National Goal of the Conservation Plan, according to organizational affiliation.

	<u>Poor</u> N (%)	<u>Fair</u> N (%)	<u>Excellent</u> N (%)	<u>Don't Know</u> N	<u>Not Applicable</u> N	Σ N
ASA	1 (50.0)	1 (50.0)	0 (0.0)	24	3	29
ASMFC	2 (40.0)	0 (0.0)	3 (60.0)	12	2	19
BASS	1 (12.5)	5 (62.5)	2 (25.0)	19	6	33
GLFC	3 (42.9)	2 (28.6)	2 (28.6)	11	1	19
GSMFC	2 (66.7)	1 (33.3)	0 (0.0)	7	1	11
IWL	3 (50.0)	2 (33.3)	1 (16.7)	19	2	27
NAFWS	5 (71.4)	2 (28.6)	0 (0.0)	21	8	36
PSMFC	1 (33.3)	1 (33.3)	1 (33.3)	23	2	28
STATE	2 (11.8)	9 (52.9)	6 (35.3)	33	6	56
TU	2 (50.0)	2 (50.0)	0 (0.0)	12	6	22
TOTAL	22 (35.5)	25 (40.3)	15 (24.2)	181	37	280

Table 12. Evaluation of overall progress made by the U.S. Navy in accomplishing the National Goal of the Conservation Plan, according to organizational affiliation.

	<u>Poor</u> N (%)	<u>Fair</u> N (%)	<u>Excellent</u> N (%)	<u>Don't Know</u> N	<u>Not Applicable</u> N	Σ N
ASA	2 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	24	3	29
ASMFC	2 (50.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (50.0)	13	2	19
BASS	0 (0.0)	4 (50.0)	4 (50.0)	18	7	33
GLFC	2 (50.0)	2 (50.0)	0 (0.0)	14	1	19
GSMFC	1 (50.0)	1 (50.0)	0 (0.0)	8	1	11
IWL	3 (50.0)	2 (33.3)	1 (16.7)	19	2	27
NAFWS	4 (66.7)	2 (33.3)	0 (0.0)	22	8	36
PSMFC	1 (25.0)	1 (25.0)	2 (50.0)	22	2	28
STATE	1 (16.7)	3 (50.0)	2 (33.3)	40	10	56
TU	1 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	14	7	22
TOTAL	17 (39.5)	15 (34.9)	11 (25.6)	194	43	280

Table 13. Evaluation of overall progress made by the Department of Transportation in accomplishing the National Goal of the Conservation Plan, according to organizational affiliation.

	<u>Poor</u> N (%)	<u>Fair</u> N (%)	<u>Excellent</u> N (%)	<u>Don't Know</u> N	<u>Not Applicable</u> N	Σ N
ASA	0 (0.0)	3 (75.0)	1 (25.0)	23	2	29
ASMFC	1 (16.7)	3 (50.0)	2 (33.3)	12	1	19
BASS	5 (45.5)	5 (45.5)	1 (9.1)	20	2	33
GLFC	7 (70.0)	3 (30.0)	0 (0.0)	9	0	19
GSMFC	1 (20.0)	3 (60.0)	1 (20.0)	6	0	11
IWL	5 (41.7)	6 (50.0)	1 (8.3)	15	0	27
NAFWS	5 (35.7)	8 (57.1)	1 (7.1)	17	5	36
PSMFC	4 (44.4)	3 (33.3)	2 (22.2)	17	2	28
STATE	7 (50.0)	5 (35.7)	2 (14.3)	37	5	56
TU	5 (71.4)	2 (28.6)	0 (0.0)	11	4	22
TOTAL	40 (43.5)	41 (44.6)	11 (12.0)	167	21	280

Table 14. Evaluation of overall progress made by the Environmental Protection Agency in accomplishing the National Goal of the Conservation Plan, according to organizational affiliation.

	<u>Poor</u> N (%)	<u>Fair</u> N (%)	<u>Excellent</u> N (%)	<u>Don't Know</u> N	<u>Not Applicable</u> N	Σ N
ASA	2 (13.3)	9 (60.0)	4 (26.7)	13	1	29
ASMFC	0 (0.0)	15 (93.8)	1 (6.3)	1	2	19
BASS	6 (24.0)	14 (56.0)	5 (20.0)	7	1	33
GLFC	5 (33.3)	8 (53.3)	2 (13.3)	4	0	19
GSMFC	1 (11.1)	4 (44.4)	4 (44.4)	2	0	11
IWL	4 (20.0)	13 (65.0)	3 (15)	7	0	27
NAFWS	0 (0.0)	18 (72.0)	7 (28.0)	7	4	36
PSMFC	6 (26.1)	15 (65.2)	2 (8.7)	5	0	28
STATE	2 (5.9)	27 (79.4)	5 (14.7)	21	1	56
TU	2 (11.8)	11 (64.7)	4 (23.5)	4	1	22
TOTAL	28 (14.1)	134 (67.3)	37 (18.6)	71	10	280

Table 15. Evaluation of overall progress made by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission in accomplishing the National Goal of the Conservation Plan, according to organizational affiliation.

	<u>Poor</u> N (%)	<u>Fair</u> N (%)	<u>Excellent</u> N (%)	<u>Don't Know</u> N	<u>Not Applicable</u> N	Σ N
ASA	1 (14.3)	4 (57.1)	2 (28.6)	20	2	29
ASMFC	4 (44.4)	3 (33.3)	2 (22.2)	8	2	19
BASS	7 (33.3)	12 (57.1)	2 (9.5)	11	1	33
GLFC	1 (9.1)	8 (72.7)	2 (18.2)	8	0	19
GSMFC	2 (50.0)	2 (50.0)	0 (0.0)	5	2	11
IWL	2 (22.2)	7 (77.8)	0 (0.0)	16	2	27
NAFWS	8 (53.3)	5 (33.3)	2 (13.3)	15	6	36
PSMFC	7 (43.8)	8 (50.0)	1 (6.3)	12	0	28
STATE	8 (26.7)	17 (56.7)	5 (16.7)	26	0	56
TU	7 (46.7)	8 (53.3)	0 (0.0)	4	3	22
TOTAL	47 (34.3)	74 (54.0)	16 (11.7)	125	18	280

Table 16. Evaluation of overall progress made by the National Marine Fisheries Service in accomplishing the National Goal of the Conservation Plan, according to organizational affiliation.

	<u>Poor</u> N (%)	<u>Fair</u> N (%)	<u>Excellent</u> N (%)	<u>Don't Know</u> N	<u>Not Applicable</u> N	Σ N
ASA	0 (0.0)	6 (35.3)	11 (64.7)	11	1	29
ASMFC	0 (0.0)	10 (62.5)	6 (37.5)	2	1	19
BASS	2 (9.5)	10 (47.6)	9 (42.9)	10	2	33
GLFC	0 (0.0)	7 (63.6)	4 (36.4)	6	2	19
GSMFC	3 (30.0)	4 (40.0)	3 (30.0)	1	0	11
IWL	2 (20.0)	3 (30.0)	5 (50.0)	16	1	27
NAFWS	1 (6.7)	11 (73.3)	3 (20.0)	16	5	36
PSMFC	11 (42.3)	11 (42.3)	4 (15.4)	2	0	28
STATE	4 (11.4)	18 (51.4)	13 (37.1)	16	5	56
TU	1 (10.0)	7 (70.0)	2 (20.0)	9	3	22
TOTAL	24 (14.0)	87 (50.9)	60 (35.1)	89	20	280

Table 17. Evaluation of overall progress made by the National Park Service in accomplishing the National Goal of the Conservation Plan, according to organizational affiliation.

	<u>Poor</u> N (%)	<u>Fair</u> N (%)	<u>Excellent</u> N (%)	<u>Don't Know</u> N	<u>Not Applicable</u> N	Σ N
ASA	1 (6.3)	7 (43.8)	8 (50.0)	12	1	29
ASMFC	0 (0.0)	8 (66.7)	4 (33.3)	5	2	19
BASS	4 (14.8)	14 (51.9)	9 (33.3)	5	1	33
GLFC	1 (6.3)	6 (37.5)	9 (56.3)	2	1	19
GSMFC	1 (25.0)	2 (50.0)	1 (25.0)	6	1	11
IWL	2 (11.8)	9 (52.9)	6 (35.3)	8	2	27
NAFWS	4 (18.2)	16 (72.7)	2 (9.1)	9	5	36
PSMFC	3 (17.6)	8 (47.1)	6 (35.3)	10	1	28
STATE	6 (19.4)	18 (58.1)	7 (22.6)	24	1	56
TU	2 (11.1)	5 (27.8)	11 (61.1)	3	1	22
TOTAL	24 (13.3)	93 (51.7)	63 (35.0)	84	14	280

Table 18. Evaluation of overall progress made by the National Resource Conservation Service in accomplishing the National Goal of the Conservation Plan, according to organizational affiliation.

	<u>Poor</u> N (%)	<u>Fair</u> N (%)	<u>Excellent</u> N (%)	<u>Don't Know</u> N	<u>Not Applicable</u> N	Σ N
ASA	1 (12.5)	1 (12.5)	6 (75.0)	20	1	29
ASMFC	1 (10.0)	6 (60.0)	3 (30.0)	8	1	19
BASS	2 (10.0)	11 (55.0)	7 (35.0)	11	2	33
GLFC	1 (12.5)	6 (75.0)	1 (12.5)	11	0	19
GSMFC	2 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	8	1	11
IWL	1 (11.1)	4 (44.4)	4 (44.4)	16	2	27
NAFWS	1 (5.3)	12 (63.2)	6 (31.6)	14	3	36
PSMFC	2 (15.4)	8 (61.5)	3 (23.1)	14	1	28
STATE	6 (23.1)	14 (53.8)	6 (23.1)	29	1	56
TU	0 (0.0)	3 (60.0)	2 (40.0)	13	4	22
TOTAL	17 (14.2)	65 (54.2)	38 (31.7)	144	16	280

Table 19. Evaluation of overall progress made by the Tennessee Valley Authority in accomplishing the National Goal of the Conservation Plan, according to organizational affiliation.

	<u>Poor</u> N (%)	<u>Fair</u> N (%)	<u>Excellent</u> N (%)	<u>Don't Know</u> N	<u>Not Applicable</u> N	Σ N
ASA	2 (25.0)	4 (50.0)	2 (25.0)	17	4	29
ASMFC	2 (40.0)	2 (40.0)	1 (20.0)	10	4	19
BASS	2 (15.4)	8 (61.5)	3 (23.1)	16	4	33
GLFC	0 (0.0)	3 (60.0)	2 (40.0)	12	2	19
GSMFC	0 (0.0)	2 (66.7)	1 (33.3)	8	0	11
IWL	2 (25.0)	4 (50.0)	2 (25.0)	16	3	27
NAFWS	1 (50.0)	1 (50.0)	0 (0.0)	23	11	36
PSMFC	3 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	17	8	28
STATE	0 (0.0)	5 (41.7)	7 (58.3)	29	15	56
TU	1 (9.1)	6 (54.5)	4 (36.4)	5	6	22
TOTAL	13 (18.6)	35 (50.0)	22 (31.4)	153	57	280

Table 20. Evaluation of overall progress made by the U.S. Army Corp. of Engineers in accomplishing the National Goal of the Conservation Plan, according to organizational affiliation.

	<u>Poor</u> N (%)	<u>Fair</u> N (%)	<u>Excellent</u> N (%)	<u>Don't Know</u> N	<u>Not Applicable</u> N	Σ N
ASA	4 (26.7)	9 (60.0)	2 (13.3)	12	2	29
ASMFC	5 (31.3)	10 (62.5)	1 (6.3)	3	0	19
BASS	14 (46.7)	13 (43.3)	3 (10.0)	3	0	33
GLFC	6 (35.3)	9 (52.9)	2 (11.8)	2	0	19
GSMFC	5 (55.6)	3 (33.3)	1 (11.1)	2	0	11
IWL	8 (40.0)	9 (45.0)	3 (15.0)	7	0	27
NAFWS	8 (36.4)	10 (45.5)	4 (18.2)	8	6	36
PSMFC	16 (64.0)	7 (28.0)	2 (8.0)	3	0	28
STATE	19 (40.4)	21 (44.7)	7 (14.9)	9	0	56
TU	10 (55.6)	7 (38.9)	1 (5.6)	3	1	22
TOTAL	95 (43.4)	98 (44.7)	26 (11.9)	52	9	280

Table 21. Evaluation of overall progress made by the U.S. Coast Guard in accomplishing the National Goal of the Conservation Plan, according to organizational affiliation.

	<u>Poor</u> N (%)	<u>Fair</u> N (%)	<u>Excellent</u> N (%)	<u>Don't Know</u> N	<u>Not Applicable</u> N	Σ N
ASA	0 (0.0)	3 (33.3)	6 (66.7)	19	1	29
ASMFC	0 (0.0)	6 (54.5)	5 (45.5)	7	1	19
BASS	0 (0.0)	5 (31.3)	11 (68.8)	14	3	33
GLFC	2 (13.3)	7 (46.7)	6 (40.0)	4	0	19
GSMFC	1 (20.0)	2 (40.0)	2 (40.0)	6	0	11
IWL	1 (8.3)	8 (66.7)	3 (25.0)	14	1	27
NAFWS	1 (10.0)	7 (70.0)	2 (20.0)	16	10	36
PSMFC	2 (13.3)	5 (33.3)	8 (53.3)	10	3	28
STATE	3 (13.6)	11 (50.0)	8 (36.4)	27	7	56
TU	0 (0.0)	1 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	12	9	22
TOTAL	10 (8.6)	55 (47.4)	51 (44.0)	129	35	280

Table 22. Evaluation of overall progress made by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in accomplishing the National Goal of the Conservation Plan, according to organizational affiliation.

	<u>Poor</u> N (%)	<u>Fair</u> N (%)	<u>Excellent</u> N (%)	<u>Don't Know</u> N	<u>Not Applicable</u> N	Σ N
ASA	2 (9.5)	8 (38.1)	11 (52.4)	7	1	29
ASMFC	2 (11.1)	4 (22.2)	12 (66.7)	12	1	19
BASS	5 (16.7)	11 (36.7)	14 (46.7)	2	1	33
GLFC	3 (17.6)	3 (17.6)	11 (64.7)	2	0	19
GSMFC	3 (42.9)	1 (14.3)	3 (42.9)	4	0	11
IWL	1 (4.8)	8 (38.1)	12 (57.1)	6	0	27
NAFWS	4 (13.3)	11 (36.7)	15 (50.0)	5	1	36
PSMFC	4 (15.4)	14 (53.8)	8 (30.8)	2	0	28
STATE	4 (7.4)	34 (63.0)	16 (29.6)	2	0	56
TU	0 (0.0)	14 (66.7)	7 (33.3)	1	0	22
TOTAL	28 (11.4)	108 (44.1)	109 (44.5)	32	3	280

Table 23. Evaluation of overall progress made by the U.S. Forest Service in accomplishing the National Goal of the Conservation Plan, according to organizational affiliation.

	<u>Poor</u> N (%)	<u>Fair</u> N (%)	<u>Excellent</u> N (%)	<u>Don't Know</u> N	<u>Not Applicable</u> N	Σ N
ASA	5 (35.7)	5 (35.7)	4 (28.6)	14	1	29
ASMFC	2 (33.3)	2 (33.3)	2 (33.3)	11	2	19
BASS	4 (15.4)	12 (46.2)	10 (38.5)	6	1	33
GLFC	2 (11.8)	8 (47.1)	7 (41.2)	7	2	19
GSMFC	0 (0.0)	2 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	8	1	11
IWL	2 (11.8)	5 (29.4)	10 (58.8)	10	0	27
NAFWS	3 (11.1)	17 (63.0)	7 (25.9)	6	3	36
PSMFC	6 (24.0)	18 (72.0)	1 (4.0)	2	1	28
STATE	3 (7.5)	26 (65.0)	11 (27.5)	15	1	56
TU	2 (10.0)	14 (70.0)	4 (20.0)	2	0	22
TOTAL	29 (14.9)	109 (56.2)	56 (28.9)	76	10	280

Table 24. Frequency distribution of the two Agencies doing the *best* job of working toward the Conservation Plan goal of enhancing aquatic systems and fish populations.

<u>Agency</u>	<u>First Agency¹</u>	<u>Second Agency¹</u>	<u>Combined Ranking²</u>
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	96	47	143
National Marine Fisheries Service	28	29	57
U.S. Forest Service	29	23	52
Environmental Protection Agency	17	17	34
National Park Service	10	14	24
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	8	15	23
Natural Resource Conservation Service	9	8	17
Tennessee Valley Authority	9	4	13
Federal Energy Regulatory Comm.	6	6	12
Bureau of Indian Affairs	4	3	7
U.S. Coast Guard	2	5	7
Bureau of Land Management	0	6	6
Bureau of Reclamation	3	3	6
Bonneville Power Administration	1	2	3
Department of the Air Force	1	1	2
Department of the Army	0	1	1
Department of the Navy	0	1	1
Department of Transportation	0	0	0
Missing	57	95	152
Total	280	280	

¹Respondents were asked to identify the two agencies doing the best job, but in no particular order.

²The combined ranking indicates the number of times an Agency was identified by a respondent as one of the two doing the best job.

Table 25. Frequency distribution of the two Agencies doing the *worst* job of working toward the Conservation Plan goal of enhancing aquatic systems and fish populations.

<u>Agency</u>	<u>First Agency¹</u>	<u>Second Agency¹</u>	<u>Combined Ranking²</u>
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	44	24	68
Federal Energy Regulatory Comm.	15	13	28
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	17	6	23
Environmental Protection Agency	9	11	20
Bureau of Indian Affairs	11	8	19
Bonneville Power Administration	13	5	18
National Marine Fisheries Service	13	5	18
Department of Transportation	9	7	16
Bureau of Land Management	5	9	14
U.S. Forest Service	5	9	14
Bureau of Reclamation	5	8	13
National Park Service	4	7	11
Natural Resource Conservation Service	3	4	7
Department of the Air Force	1	4	5
Department of the Army	3	2	5
Department of the Navy	1	4	5
U.S. Coast Guard	2	3	5
Tennessee Valley Authority	2	2	4
Missing	118	149	267
Total	280	280	

¹Respondents were asked to identify the two agencies doing the best job, but in no particular order.

²The combined ranking indicates the number of times an Agency was identified by a respondent as one of the two doing the best job.

Table 26. Frequency distribution of the two Agencies doing the *best* job of working toward the Conservation Plan goal of increasing fishing access.

<u>Agency</u>	<u>First Agency¹</u>	<u>Second Agency¹</u>	<u>Combined Ranking²</u>
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	72	21	93
U.S. Forest Service	29	34	63
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	31	17	48
National Park Service	16	24	40
National Marine Fisheries Service	9	11	20
Environmental Protection Agency	7	5	12
Bureau of Reclamation	4	7	11
Tennessee Valley Authority	7	4	11
Bureau of Land Management	0	11	11
Federal Energy Regulatory Comm.	6	4	10
Natural Resource Conservation Service	5	3	8
Bureau of Indian Affairs	4	3	7
Bonneville Power Administration	2	0	2
Department of the Air Force	1	1	2
Department of the Army	1	1	2
Department of Transportation	2	0	2
U.S. Coast Guard	0	1	1
Department of the Navy	0	0	0
Missing	84	133	217
Total	280	280	

¹Respondents were asked to identify the two agencies doing the best job, but in no particular order.

²The combined ranking indicates the number of times an Agency was identified by a respondent as one of the two doing the best job.

Table 27. Frequency distribution of the two Agencies doing the *worst* job of working toward the Conservation Plan goal of increasing fishing access.

<u>Agency</u>	<u>First Agency¹</u>	<u>Second Agency¹</u>	<u>Combined Ranking²</u>
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	24	11	35
Federal Energy Regulatory Comm.	11	6	17
National Park Service	9	8	17
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	12	5	17
Department of Transportation	10	6	16
Environmental Protection Agency	10	6	16
Bureau of Indian Affairs	11	4	15
National Marine Fisheries Service	10	4	14
U.S. Forest Service	11	1	12
Bureau of Land Management	4	7	11
Bonneville Power Administration	5	4	9
Bureau of Reclamation	2	6	8
Natural Resource Conservation Service	2	6	8
Department of the Army	3	4	7
U.S. Coast Guard	1	6	7
Department of the Air Force	3	2	5
Department of the Navy	0	4	4
Tennessee Valley Authority	1	3	4
Missing	151	187	338
Total	280	280	

¹Respondents were asked to identify the two agencies doing the best job, but in no particular order.

²The combined ranking indicates the number of times an Agency was identified by a respondent as one of the two doing the best job.

Table 28. Frequency distribution of the two Agencies doing the *best* job of working toward the Conservation Plan goal of increasing education and outreach.

<u>Agency</u>	<u>First Agency¹</u>	<u>Second Agency¹</u>	<u>Combined Ranking²</u>
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	99	33	132
U.S. Forest Service	23	37	60
National Marine Fisheries Service	10	28	38
Environmental Protection Agency	12	15	27
National Park Service	15	12	27
Natural Resource Conservation Service	9	6	15
Tennessee Valley Authority	7	5	12
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	3	6	9
Bureau of Land Management	2	6	8
Bonneville Power Administration	4	3	7
Bureau of Indian Affairs	3	4	7
U.S. Coast Guard	5	2	7
Federal Energy Regulatory Comm.	0	3	3
Department of the Navy	0	1	1
Department of Transportation	0	1	1
Bureau of Reclamation	0	1	1
Department of the Air Force	0	0	0
Department of the Army	0	0	0
Missing	88	117	205
Total	280	280	

¹Respondents were asked to identify the two agencies doing the best job, but in no particular order.

²The combined ranking indicates the number of times an Agency was identified by a respondent as one of the two doing the best job.

Table 29. Frequency distribution of the two Agencies doing the *worst* job of working toward the Conservation Plan goal of increasing education and outreach.

<u>Agency</u>	<u>First Agency¹</u>	<u>Second Agency¹</u>	<u>Combined Ranking²</u>
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	30	18	48
Federal Energy Regulatory Comm.	14	9	23
Environmental Protection Agency	10	11	21
Bureau of Indian Affairs	14	5	19
National Marine Fisheries Service	6	8	14
Bureau of Reclamation	5	7	12
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	9	3	12
Department of Transportation	7	4	11
National Park Service	6	5	11
U.S. Forest Service	5	4	9
Department of the Air Force	4	3	7
Department of the Army	3	4	7
Bureau of Land Management	1	6	7
Bonneville Power Administration	6	0	6
U.S. Coast Guard	2	3	5
Department of the Navy	0	4	4
Natural Resource Conservation Service	2	2	4
Tennessee Valley Authority	1	0	1
Missing	155	184	339
Total	280	280	

¹Respondents were asked to identify the two agencies doing the best job, but in no particular order.

²The combined ranking indicates the number of times an Agency was identified by a respondent as one of the two doing the best job.

Table 30. Frequency distribution of the two Agencies doing the *best* job of working toward the Conservation Plan goal of increasing partnership opportunities with the States, Tribal management partners, industry, anglers and conservation groups.

<u>Agency</u>	<u>First Agency¹</u>	<u>Second Agency¹</u>	<u>Combined Ranking²</u>
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	84	32	116
U.S. Forest Service	35	24	59
National Marine Fisheries Service	11	20	31
Environmental Protection Agency	10	9	19
Natural Resource Conservation Service	10	6	16
National Park Service	8	7	15
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	5	10	15
Bureau of Land Management	1	14	15
Bureau of Reclamation	3	10	13
Tennessee Valley Authority	7	6	13
Bureau of Indian Affairs	5	3	8
Bonneville Power Administration	2	3	5
Federal Energy Regulatory Comm.	0	4	4
Department of the Army	0	2	2
Department of the Navy	2	0	2
Department of Transportation	1	0	1
U.S. Coast Guard	0	1	1
Department of the Air Force	0	0	0
Missing	96	129	225
Total	280	280	

¹Respondents were asked to identify the two agencies doing the best job, but in no particular order.

²The combined ranking indicates the number of times an Agency was identified by a respondent as one of the two doing the best job.

Table 31. Frequency distribution of the two Agencies doing the *worst* job of working toward the Conservation Plan goal of increasing partnership opportunities with the States, Tribal management partners, industry, anglers and conservation groups.

<u>Agency</u>	<u>First Agency¹</u>	<u>Second Agency¹</u>	<u>Combined Ranking²</u>
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	25	21	46
Federal Energy Regulatory Comm.	13	11	24
Environmental Protection Agency	13	8	21
Bureau of Indian Affairs	15	5	20
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	12	4	16
National Marine Fisheries Service	10	5	15
National Park Service	7	5	12
Bureau of Reclamation	4	5	9
Department of Transportation	4	4	8
Bureau of Land Management	1	6	7
Department of the Army	3	4	7
U.S. Forest Service	4	3	7
Department of the Navy	3	3	6
Bonneville Power Administration	4	2	6
Department of the Air Force	2	3	5
Tennessee Valley Authority	3	2	5
Natural Resource Conservation Service	0	4	4
U.S. Coast Guard	0	1	1
Missing	157	184	341
Total	280	280	

¹Respondents were asked to identify the two agencies doing the best job, but in no particular order.

²The combined ranking indicates the number of times an Agency was identified by a respondent as one of the two doing the best job.

Table 32. Percent of respondents indicating that Yes, their organizations fish conservation or management efforts are negatively impacted by activities involving endangered, threatened or species proposed for listing under the Endangered Species Act.

	<u>Percent</u>	<u>N</u>
Yes, activities are negatively impacted	28.2	79
No, activities are not negatively impacted	71.8	201
Total	100.0	280

Table 33. Percent of respondents indicating that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service or the National Marine Fisheries Service has worked with them to reduce or minimize the negative impacts on their fish conservation or management efforts due to activities involving endangered, threatened or species proposed for listing under the Endangered Species Act.

	<u>Percent</u>	<u>N</u>
Yes	62.0	49
No	38.0	30
Total	100.0	79

Note: only those respondents who answered yes to the question in Table 32 (n=79) are included in the analysis presented in this table.

Table 34. Frequency distribution of how successful the actions of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service or the National Marine Fisheries Service have been in reducing or minimizing the negative impacts on fish conservation or management efforts due to activities involving endangered, threatened or species proposed for listing under the Endangered Species Act.

	<u>Percent</u>	<u>N</u>
Very Successful	18.4	9
Somewhat successful	61.2	30
Not successful at all	20.4	10
Total	100.0	49

Note: only those respondents who answered yes to the question in Table 33 (n=49) are included in the analysis presented in this table.

Appendix B

Statements of Suggested Recommendations

Agency	Organiz.	Goal	One-Sentence Statement
			Follow the laws.
			To let our department, the state, make more of the fish management strategies on the New and Gauley Rivers.
			It seems they are getting out of the business of providing fishing access which may be due to budget cuts.
			Quit being a voice for irrigators, concentrate more energy on protecting recreational fisheries.
			Increase their priority the recreation.
			I am currently in litigation with them need to learn a reasonable measure to save fish.
			Report state agencies more rather than the developers who sometime are doing things for their own personal interest.
	ASA		Streamline communications, never send out long verbiage reports, they are not read.
	ASA		All the agencies are spending a lot of money on things we don't really need to get to the end results that we want.
	ASMFC		Start listening to the public.
	GLFC		US Fish and Wildlife in all fifty states.
	IWL		There are way too many to mention, but all of them should do something.
	IWL		To work on development and implementation of a non point-source to deal with water pollution.
	PSMFC		Stronger levels of funding and support staff - directly enhancing the ecosystem and fish population, coupled with stronger education.
	STATE		I don't believe that federal agencies are going to work; it should be up to the state agencies; goals are nice to have but it won't really work.
AFOR	GLFC	1	Protect and enhance aquatic habitat.
BIA	ASA		Basically they need to work with state and federal agencies to improve recreational fishing in Nevada.
BIA	ASA	2	They have different rules for different people.
BIA	ASA	2	Recreate your independent tribal interest but balance them with the needs of resources and other users.
BIA	ASA	3	Are only worried about making money and putting it in their own pockets.
BIA	BASS	1	Getting more involved and don't eliminate fisheries.
BIA	BASS	1	The BIA has little or no authority with tribal self-determination.
BIA	GLFC	1	They need to cooperate more with recreational fishing groups.
BIA	GLFC	1	They must become global in their thinking instead of just being concerned about their own little territories and their own concerns; they need to work with and communicate with other people and agencies.
BIA	NAFWS		Providing the forum to define issues with concern and increase understanding and permit progress made on meeting National Goals.
BIA	NAFWS	1	They need more money.
BIA	NAFWS	1	They need to address their involvement in natural resources much more.
BIA	NAFWS	1	Put on more staff to handle this type of issue.
BIA	NAFWS	1	They should be providing more federal aid to help the tribes do things to enhance the fishing population.

BIA	NAFWS	2	Assist providing access to different lakes and maintaining water levels.
BIA	NAFWS	3	Provide better technology to the tribes to develop better fisheries.
BIA	NAFWS	3	Work together with the tribes to enhance recreational activities on the reservations.
BIA	NAFWS	3	Need to make it a priority to work with the fish and wildlife programs.
BIA	NAFWS	3	Need to educate the general public on enhancement to fish population.
BIA	PSMFC	2	The tribes do a lot of talking but they do more lawsuits.
BIA	TU	1	Regarding our salmon fishing - they have the science and they need to stop studying it to death before all the fish die off.
BIA	TU	1	They need to look to the future of our fisheries and realize the impact of their fishing on future watersheds.
BLM	ASA	1	Trying to improve the fish population but is in many instances they are inhibited by the Endangered Species Act.
BLM	BASS	3	They need to be more involved in the disapproval of authority permits issued for wetlands and fisheries.
BLM	BASS	3	Need to spend more energy in increasing cooperation and partnership for fisheries enhancement.
BLM	GLFC	1	Sometimes it seems like forests are the priority and they forget about everything else.
BLM	IWL	1	Need more money for projects in cleaning up pollution and solving problems that arise.
BLM	IWL	2	Pending legislation on grazing rights in the west.
BLM	IWL	3	Allowing the better use of distribution of land to public and private citizens.
BLM	PSMFC	1	Again comply with the law which they also do not do.
BLM	PSMFC	1	They could act much more aggressively and implement actions more quickly.
BLM	STATE	1	Regularly schedule joint meetings to discuss sports management goals.
BLM	STATE	2	Provide more operational for on the ground of funding.
BLM	TU	3	Enforce the laws as they're on the book fairly and evenly.
BLM	USFWS	1	Do more to increase and protect the habitat of the fish.
BOR	BASS	2	They have done.
BOR	BASS	3	Improperly funded for the programs they are to do.
BOR	NAFWS	2	Involve tribal governments as equal partners in resource management.
BOR	PSMFC	1	Take action to meet Miller bill; entrain requirements of 800,000 acre feet per year of the Ceval Project Improvement Act for water, fish and wildlife enhancement in California and not allow ag groups to direct the bureau from achieving that requirement.
BOR	PSMFC	1	They need to depend on scientific methods.
BOR	PSMFC	1	They could act much more aggressively and implement actions more quickly.
BOR	STATE	1	They do something to proactively acknowledge they are aware of this policy and work towards it.
BOR	STATE	1	Regularly schedule joint meetings to discuss sports management goals.
BOR	TU	1	They need to be more aware of all the people they impact with their projects and make sure all people and all property involved are considered.
BOR	TU	1	Minimize damage to fishery habitats under their jurisdiction.
BPA	ASA		They could enhance fishing opportunities by managing the waters they control to allow for up-Stream and down-stream migration.

BPA	ASA	1	To be more cooperative with the public and be a bit more sensitive to the public's feeling and thinking on the issues.
BPA	ASMFC	1	If they would support the recovery instead of managing the fish resource it won't help the fish management.
BPA	BASS	2	Be more receptive to fish programs.
BPA	PSMFC	1	Comply with the law, which they don't currently do.
BPA	PSMFC	1	Needs to comply with the Endangered Species Act.
BPA	STATE	1	They need to understand that sport fishing is to be a part of their operation.
COE	ASA	1	Work closer with the state in regulating water levels so it will be more beneficial to fish, not just navigation.
COE	ASA	1	More cooperative with the sport fishing population instead of doing what they want to do without getting much input from the public.
COE	ASA	1	More focus on fishing in the waters they control.
COE	ASA	1	They could force the BPA to do some of those things - management that allows for up and down stream migration.
COE	ASA	1	Some of their river management programs are counter-productive in increasing fishing population and maybe they could do less engineering and let nature take it's course.
COE	ASA	1	A lot of what they do is to perpetuate their own agenda and the public concern is not always their main consideration.
COE	ASA	3	Keep trying to save the wetlands.
COE	ASMFC	2	They could be hiring more fish biologists.
COE	ASMFC	2	Increases and continue working relationship with tribes projects for recreational activities and fishing access to public.
COE	BASS	1	The way they regulate and control the lowering of the water is hurting the fishing.
COE	BASS	1	They sometimes try to take away from other agencies and their plans.
COE	BASS	1	Initiate a program to work with states along the Ohio River recover backwaters and acreage lost to non point-source pollution for the purpose of regaining critical spawning habitat.
COE	BASS	1	Stop dodging and filling.
COE	BASS	2	Need to become more consumer friendly.
COE	BASS	2	They need to continue to manage shore lines on the Missouri land system.
COE	BASS	2	It is assisting us in developing handicapped facilities as well as restoring habit at some sites.
COE	BASS	3	They need to create control with the ship traffic on the major rivers, the ships destroy the fishing beds.
COE	GLFC	1	Most of their efforts are geared toward commercial aspects without considering recreational fishing.
COE	GLFC	1	Some of their districts are easy to work with and other districts are not it seems like very little continuity among the districts.
COE	GLFC	1	Need to involve fishery people before they go about their many habitual altering projects.
COE	GLFC	2	They need to do a better job in considering excess issues for Great Lakes peer anglers.
COE	GLFC	2	Actually I think they usually do a poor job.
COE	GLFC	2	While working around lakes, oceans, streams, please take as much care as to keep the natural environment at construction fronts.
COE	GLFC	2	They have impeded management of streams with the Hungerford Water Beetle and wood turtles and concern for the sturgeon on the great lakes and tributary streams.

COE	GLFC	2	Building access roads to federal waters and to watch to see if their rules are followed.
COE	GSMFC	2	Increase of artifact reef development.
COE	GSMFC	2	Should direct their activities and thinking towards enhancing marine fisheries productivity and availability.
COE	IWL	1	Reduce or eliminate the magnitude of dams, levies, canals, ditches, etc., that impact the release of water.
COE	IWL	1	They need to lay out all the pros and cons and have public input before getting into projects.
COE	IWL	1	They try to put up a good conservation image but then go off and do things without authorization; doing things that the public does not agree with.
COE	NAFWS		They should enter into agreement with the tribes on a partnership basis to address tribal issues and concerns with the goal being to increase education and outreach.
COE	NAFWS	2	They will not give us any access to the lake, there is a lot of silting in the lake that the Corps is causing or at least not remedying.
COE	PSMFC	1	Abide by the directives given to them.
COE	PSMFC	1	Work closer with the state agencies as there is more the Corps should take into consideration when regulating water levels that would be helpful to fishing.
COE	PSMFC	1	They need to do things that benefit everyone, not just a few industries and certain people.
COE	PSMFC	1	Natural fishing habitat - fish populations are maintained by opening the facilities.
COE	PSMFC	3	Have a defined narrow mission and stay in that narrow scope, not interacting with the public.
COE	PSMFC	3	They do very little to try to receive input on their water flow and they need to publicize more because their outreach is bad.
COE	STATE	1	For the Upper Mississippi Environmental Program they should ask for the full funding of the authorized \$196 million instead of the \$14 million they actually asked for.
COE	STATE	1	Improve on all four of the stated goals; I don't see them doing anything in any of those areas.
COE	STATE	1	Take responsibility of maintaining adequate access to reserves, enforce Section 404 of CWA, improve efforts to restore or mitigate lost fish habitat in Missouri and Mississippi rivers.
COE	STATE	1	Quit projects that are harming the wetlands, rivers and streams, and start providing recreational things by building, not destroying.
COE	STATE	1	Improve water flow and water quality downstream of the dams.
COE	STATE	1	Improving water quality at hydro stations.
COE	STATE	1	The only thing they should provide is funding for biological work and leave opinions to Fish and Wildlife Service.
COE	STATE	1	Providing excess for fishing excess.
COE	STATE	1	Recognize the importance and habitat of producing healthy sustainable fisheries and assist in balancing land use and habitat issues with other interests.
COE	STATE	1	They need to do more with certain states regarding to it natural surrounding.
COE	STATE	1	Consider the economics and social benefits of recreational fishing on a level playing field with navigation in the Missouri river and its viable products of enhanced aquatic habitat through the 1135 program.

COE	STATE	2	Don't close the Midwestern states fishing access down.
COE	STATE	2	To improve water quality below Corps of Engineers reservoirs.
COE	STATE	3	They really need to make an overhaul.
COE	STATE	3	They need to be more receptive to the anglers needs and to requests to goals of the plan national.
COE	STATE	3	They need to work harder to include recreational fisheries and to respond to these projects.
COE	TU	1	They need to cooperate more with various other agencies when they build dams as they are doing things that kill off fish.
COE	TU	1	Give more priority to fisheries and environment instead of priority on politics.
COE	TU	1	More emphasis on minimum flows and increasing dissolved oxygen in tail waters.
COE	TU	1	Honestly open their decision making process to true public involved.
COE	TU	1	No more dams, because building homes and building should not occur if they get flooded, it's their own fault.
DOT	ASMFC	2	To require contractors to dispose of materials in artificial reef programs and provide safe access to abandoned bridge road beds for fishing.
DOT	GLFC	1	Concentrate on issues that truly reflect important impacts on aquatic system fish consumption advisories.
DOT	IWL	1	They put too much salt on the roads which eventually washes into the streams.
DOT	STATE	1	No communication - meet with the state fish and wildlife to discuss how to minimize impact on aquatic system with new highways.
DOT	STATE	1	They need to do more with certain states regarding to it natural surrounding.
DOT	STATE	2	They could do a better job of providing access to fishing areas, especially in the immediate area of where they have to build bridges.
DOT	TU	1	Never log within at least 200 feet of trout streams, or roads that will affect them.
DOT	TU	3	Make the public more aware of what they're doing as far as the quality of streams and public access.
DOT	TU	3	To adhere to the field reports of the EPA, when evaluating highway projects.
EPA	ASA	2	Just restoring of the habitat and cleaning up of rivers, lakes and streams.
EPA	ASMFC		Protect and enhance critical aquatic habitats.
EPA	ASMFC	3	Continues with tech assistance and working relationships with tribes for the development of wet lands on the watershed that lead into Lake Sakakawea.
EPA	BASS		To increase sport fishing opportunities the Service should exercise much more latitude when exercising perspective attitude under the ESA.
EPA	BASS	1	In large industrial areas they should do a better job of ensuring better water quality.
EPA	BASS	1	No special deals.
EPA	BASS	3	They need to better educate the public concerning fishing opportunities.
EPA	BASS	3	Better ears to listen to what people say instead of just talking.
EPA	BASS	3	I think they need to work closer with states and other groups.
EPA	BASS	3	They should have more forceful hand with congress to protect the nations clean water.
EPA	GLFC	1	Overall they always do a high quality job.
EPA	GLFC	1	Should streamline and move more rapidly on their process of developing and implementing their overall management plans of the Great Lakes.

EPA	GLFC	1	They just need to develop a sensitivity to natural resources.
EPA	IWL	1	They don't do enough good research before coming up with solutions and regulations.
EPA	NAFWS	1	They could provide better follow up studies enhancing programs to the tribes.
EPA	NAFWS	1	They need to have more involvement in maintaining water quality in this area.
EPA	NAFWS	2	More money for work plans.
EPA	NAFWS	3	Federal partnerships they've updated - policies good but need more training for people in these areas.
EPA	PSMFC	1	Stay out of the fishing business rather than get into it.
EPA	PSMFC	1	Has set new water quality standards now to need to stick by them instead of giving in to the timber company.
EPA	PSMFC	1	Protect the temperature of streams, the industrial waste, non-point source of pollution from farming.
EPA	PSMFC	1	Expand partnership programs in the area of ecosystem evaluation and goal setting and remedial action.
EPA	STATE	1	Strict enforcement of the minimum water quality standards.
EPA	STATE	1	They need to do a better job in cooperating with or coordinating with the state.
EPA	STATE	1	They have been good at funding streams, the restoration projects and water quality.
EPA	STATE	1	Maintain full funding of Section 314 Clean Lakes Program.
EPA	STATE	2	Coming out with rules like prohibiting lead sinkers and its a mistake.
EPA	STATE	3	Need to cooperate with the FDA to develop a more acceptable fish consumption advisory concerning mercury content.
EPA	STATE	3	They need to have more leadership with some of the projects.
EPA	STATE	3	Again, look farther into the state's rights to manage fish and wildlife rights.
EPA	TU	1	They need to continue the fight to reduce acid deposition into clean air and save native brook trout streams.
EPA	TU	1	Vigorously enforce clean water laws and regulations.
EPA	TU	3	They need to administer the law numbers written requiring other federal and state agencies to comply.
EPA	TU	3	Less research more action.
EPA	TU	3	Educate the public to take proper care of our watersheds, (e.g.; septic tanks, fertilizer, etc.).
FERC	BASS	1	Mandatory screens to protect fish population.
FERC	GLFC	1	Be able to let fish passes at dams, pressure the natural habitat of lakes, and streams.
FERC	IWL	1	More regulations in regard to waste disposal from atomic energy plants.
FERC	IWL	3	Coalition of different groups to get together in doing the same things.
FERC	NAFWS	1	Acknowledge fisheries goals and activities.
FERC	NAFWS	2	Need to restrict licensing process in favor of improving public fisheries.
FERC	PSMFC	1	Utilize existing state law to implement much needed restoration program.
FERC	PSMFC	2	Prepare to move and balance recreational and power generated needs.
FERC	STATE	1	They devalue state fishery resources in studies by using the lowest possible value for per fish replacement, which in turn lowers the cost benefit analysis for projects.
FERC	STATE	1	Consider the economist and social benefits or recreational fishing on level playing field with threatened and endangered species regarding project re-

			authorized.
FERC	STATE	1	Take stronger stand on incorporating aquatic resources needs into project's permit conditions.
FERC	TU	1	Wish would require minimum flows at all times for regulated dams.
FERC	TU	1	Has been unlogically one sided.
FERC	TU	1	Listening to anglers using their opinions and goals, decreasing amount claims.
FERC	TU	1	Needs to amend their current process on citizen input to allow sufficient input by parties other than power generators.
FERC	TU	1	Define the minimum flow and water quality for hydropower facility and enforce compliance by utilities.
FERC	TU	1	They need to stop studying it and do something before all the fish die off.
FERC	TU	1	Continue to broaden management decisions to place increasing value on recreational concerns versus economic or business.
FERC	TU	3	They need plans that truly enforce the licensing of dams, opposed to projects suggested by special interest groups.
FERC	USFWS	1	Must engage its partners in the next two decades of hydropower relicensing to ensure adequate flows for fish below these licensed facilities.
NAVY	ASMFC	1	To make surplus military heavy equipment available for artificial reef programs.
NAVY	ASMFC	1	I'd like to see the Department of Defense put more effort into the artificial reef program.
NMFS	ASA	1	Focus on true data gathering on various stock status so that effective fisheries' management plans can be developed and partnership with recreational and commercial industries.
NMFS	ASA	1	The commercial fisheries have a real vise grip on a lot of issues, politically; therefore, this agency is not doing the best it could for recreational fishing.
NMFS	ASMFC	2	To implement a strong recreational fisheries office at the national level.
NMFS	ASMFC	3	They should do a lot more in the area of education - maybe it would take more money.
NMFS	ASMFC	3	They could improve their recreation fishing data base and better inform the public how they come about their regulations they put out.
NMFS	BASS	1	To increase sport fishing opportunities the service should exercise much more latitude when exercising perspective attitude under the ESA.
NMFS	BASS	1	If they ever want to do what's right for the salmon they need to listen to the biologists.
NMFS	BASS	1	Need to overcome a poor reputation and lack of action and to focus on threatened or endangered species.
NMFS	BASS	3	If some policy, rule, or regulation gets approved or passed at the top, it needs to get passed down so everyone in the agency knows about it.
NMFS	BASS	3	They need to better educate the public concerning fishing opportunities.
NMFS	GLFC	2	Accurately measuring present population sizes and distribution.
NMFS	GSMFC		Develop stronger true partnerships with the states and coordinate more with the states.
NMFS	GSMFC	1	Does an excellent job of accounting for fisheries stock, more funding and personnel would make them even better.
NMFS	GSMFC	1	Focus on the recreational fishing industry to de-emphasize its commercial emphasis.
NMFS	GSMFC	1	To be against or towards the commercial sector.
NMFS	GSMFC	1	They contracted with a private company or organization to gather marine

			recreational statistics for them but they would be better off working with the state on this than going outside to someone private.
NMFS	GSMFC	1	Rewrite their regulations and actually manage their fisheries on national and international levels for higher populations which would enhance recreational fishing.
NMFS	GSMFC	1	Design their programs to include concerns for recreational fishing, not just commercial fishing.
NMFS	IWL	1	They could be more aware of and more helpful in helping state agencies in their fishery plans.
NMFS	IWL	3	They could get out more information and education to the public.
NMFS	IWL	3	Work with local grassroots to enhance the local fisheries and wildlife.
NMFS	NAFWS	1	Very under staffed and under mandated.
NMFS	NAFWS	1	Loosen control, they are too much in charge.
NMFS	NAFWS	1	Take into consideration the whole ecological system and not do something that may be good in one place but be cause harm much further downstream.
NMFS	NAFWS	1	Need to better manage commercial exploitation.
NMFS	NAFWS	3	Should give local and tribal more say, investigate cultural areas, look into management plans of local tribal needs.
NMFS	PSMFC	1	Protect the fish population's natural environment - the natural population is adaptive to the natural environment.
NMFS	PSMFC	1	The state of Oregon has plans for improving the salmon industry and they either need to work with us or let us alone so we can get the job done.
NMFS	PSMFC	1	They need to cooperate much more with the state in some of the good programs and plans the state is already working on.
NMFS	PSMFC	1	Their should be more emphasis on the fisheries themselves rather than just the habitats.
NMFS	PSMFC	1	Need to work better with recreational fishing community in bringing back endangered fish.
NMFS	PSMFC	1	Give scientific agencies information on political pressure, let policies be made in a policies arena.
NMFS	PSMFC	1	They could act much more aggressively and implement actions more quickly.
NMFS	PSMFC	1	Move rapidly to declare salmon and steelhead population endangered or threatened in California so remedial actions are forced upon state and local governments as well as private enterprise.
NMFS	PSMFC	1	Is understaffed but have good intentions and directions just have a problem meeting mandated dates.
NMFS	PSMFC	2	Reach out to the recreational fishermen and help them restore the fish and stop the poaching of fish.
NMFS	PSMFC	2	The primary culprit not implementing policy to obtain a better balance between endangered species and recreational fishing.
NMFS	PSMFC	3	They need to get grass roots support from local people for fish that are endangered.
NMFS	PSMFC	3	Will Stelle Jr. should meet more with sport fishing community leaders.
NMFS	PSMFC	3	They need to become a little more high profile - communicate how high and powerful they really are - work with federal and state agencies.
NMFS	STATE	1	Did a lot for the state.
NMFS	STATE	1	I think they need to recognize recreational fisheries, develop process to allow state conservation agency to use Section 7 instead of Section 10.
NMFS	STATE	1	Need to risk sticking their necks outside of the Endangered Species Act box.

NMFS	STATE	1	I don't think they know about this plan or its goals as they are doing nothing in these areas.
NMFS	STATE	1	Recognize the importance and habitat of producing healthy sustainable fisheries and assist in balancing land use and habitat issues with other interests.
NMFS	STATE	1	Limited perspective they are more concerned with meeting specific deadlines than the long term commitment to achieving a goal.
NMFS	STATE	1	Need more personal to collect statistics and biological samples.
NMFS	STATE	2	Give a more fair effort towards recreational fisheries versus commercial fisheries.
NMFS	STATE	2	Pay more attention to recreation instead of commercial.
NMFS	STATE	2	To succeed they need to work more closely with state agencies by supporting them.
NMFS	STATE	3	Provide funding for state marine education program and assist with posters materials, etc..
NMFS	TU	1	Override the Atlantic State Marine Fisheries Commission decision to adopt to Amendment 5 for striped bass management.
NMFS	TU	1	Same thing: they already have the science and they need to stop just studying because all the fish are dying off.
NMFS	TU	1	Consider the state by state economic value for recreational fishing in you decisions.
NMFS	TU	3	Conduct and publish studies to define the economic value for boats and recreational and commercial fishing for each state.
NMFS	USFWS	3	Needs to elevate its efforts to quantify the social and economic benefits derived from recreational fisheries and compare findings with economics of commercial fishing.
NPS	ASA	2	Truly open opportunities for fishing and boating, not being subjected or dictorialized in management decisions.
NPS	BASS	1	Doing an excellent job to meet all three goals, given the restraints on these agencies in terms of budget and manpower.
NPS	BASS	1	They need to work us closer regarding controlling the water in the C and O Channel.
NPS	BASS	3	They have probably been the best at keeping us informed about fishing in South Dakota.
NPS	GLFC	1	Rehabilitation of native species at the cost of maintaining management potential for other species.
NPS	GLFC	3	Increase your personnel.
NPS	IWL	1	Too many people fishing and too many diseases, put more effort into controlling diseases, and the need of more money to stop pollution and disease.
NPS	IWL	3	Work with local grass roots to enhance the local fisheries and wildlife.
NPS	NAFWS	3	Have a better relationship with the reservationists.
NPS	PSMFC	1	The attitude that the park is only for preservation and therefore no fishing is allowable, when in fact that would be biologically good.
NPS	PSMFC	3	Promote understanding and partnership between so called consumptive and non-consumptive users and manage accordingly.
NPS	STATE	3	Should go farther into the states rights to manage fish and wildlife rights rather than hiding behind the policies looking for states' rights.
NPS	STATE	3	They should do more in the area of education.
NPS	STATE	3	They should regulate stricter rules, some they already have are not even needed.
NPS	TU	2	More access along National Scenic Riverways for fisherman and less

			elaborate facilities for canoe liveries.
NPS	USFWS	1	Do more to increase and protect the habitat of the fish.
NRCS	BASS	1	The no responses is very essential in stream work, but they should be accountable as a result of floods.
NRCS	IWL	3	They could put out information that is educational, to all student level children on how to protect them and use them.
NRCS	STATE	1	Stop destroying fisheries and habitat, (by removing woody debris from stream) extensively to mitigate flood damage.
NRCS	STATE	1	Need to work with land owners to reduce destruction of vegetation on stream banks.
NRCS	STATE	1	Enhance the long term set aside provisions for highly erodible soils.
NRCS	STATE	3	Make the connection between watershed management and the quality of water bodies downstream and the quality of fishing in their programs.
NRCS	STATE	3	Inform field personnel that recreational fisheries enhancement is a goal of the present administration, reduce paperwork requirements and provide prompt service to landowners, focus more on watershed management and restoration in conjunction with states.
NRCS	TU	1	They need more funding, personnel, and emphasis on repairing, it's vital to streams.
TVA	ASA	1	They're the worst federal bureaucracy; they are influenced a lot by big money.
TVA	ASMFC	1	Continues with tech assistance and working relationships with tribes for the development of wetlands on the watershed that lead into Lake Sakakawea.
TVA	BASS	1	Looking for engineering projects for engineers instead of the water resources they have available.
TVA	BASS	1	Stop shore line development in the shore line management initiative because more home development decreases public access and creates potential harm to fish and wildlife habitat and water quality.
TVA	BASS	2	Doing an excellent job to meet all three goals, given the restraints on these agencies in terms of budget and man power.
TVA	BASS	3	They also need to work closer with other states and groups.
TVA	IWL	1	They often get involved in projects they perhaps shouldn't; I think they just like to protect their own jobs and the agency likes to grow bigger and bigger.
TVA	PSMFC	1	Needs to comply with the Endangered Species Act.
TVA	STATE		To keep the us Wolf Creek under operation and control.
TVA	STATE	1	Be more creative in use of dried spoils in for aquatic habitat restoration.
TVA	STATE	2	Agency needs consistency funding to complete their mission.
TVA	STATE	3	Retain that part of their organization that deals with the fish resources and outreach.
TVA	TU	1	They are doing and excellent job keep up the good work.
TVA	TU	1	Stop their population.
TVA	TU	1	Continue work on retrofitting existing dams for dissolved oxygen and better water quality.
TVA	TU	3	Although they do an excellent educational access they need to manage there are dams consideration of the valuable recreational fisheries below them.
TVA	USFWS	1	The Corps and Bureau of Reclamation as well as water management agencies should consider recreational users as equal to the original purpose for which the facilities were made.
USCG	ASMFC	3	They need to provide additional training for the personnel in regards to

			fisheries.
USCG	GLFC	2	Fantastic job of education and access to federal waters.
USCG	GLFC	3	Enhance by more contact and more routine coordination meetings.
USFS			The need to reduce sediment from logging operations that are entering the streams.
USFS	ASA	1	They should not allow clear cutting in areas of rivers and lakes.
USFS	ASMFC	3	Increase outreach with tribal fisheries to help better the understanding of the tribal fisheries management.
USFS	BASS	1	Change attitude and join efforts to enhance recreation fisheries with connection with the management of sensitive or endangered species.
USFS	BASS	1	Doing an excellent job to meet all three goals, given the restraints on these agencies in terms of budget and manpower.
USFS	BASS	3	They should create stricter penalties for the people who hurt the lakes and rivers, people get away with too much.
USFS	BASS	3	The funds are not sufficient for mandated programs.
USFS	BASS	3	They need to better educate the public concerning fishing opportunities.
USFS	GLFC	1	Water quality, natural habitat enhancing natural resources.
USFS	GLFC	1	They need to cooperate with states and the public and not just push their own agenda.
USFS	GLFC	3	Enhanced by more contact and more routine coordination meetings.
USFS	IWL	1	Stop clear cutting - and if they do so, they need to replant immediately.
USFS	IWL	3	Like to see them provide more access to public hunting and fishing.
USFS	IWL	3	Work with local grass roots to enhance the local fisheries and wildlife.
USFS	PSMFC		Concentrate on efforts to increase improvement of habitat and providing sport fishing opportunities.
USFS	PSMFC	1	Have new recreation projects but funding limitations find timber coming before fisheries and water quality.
USFS	PSMFC	2	They are restricting fishing access in various areas.
USFS	STATE	1	Provide more operational for on the ground of funding.
USFS	STATE	1	Like to see them give resource specialists authority over road building and timber states to reduce adverse impact.
USFS	STATE	1	Regularly schedule joint meetings to discuss sports management goals.
USFS	STATE	1	Assisted in the fishery protection and enhancement of streams.
USFS	STATE	2	They could be doing more; increasing fishing access to waters on national forests .
USFS	STATE	2	Continue with habitat protection and enhancement.
USFS	STATE	2	Maintain diligence in using land management priorities with contributions to habitat repair zones and good stream water quality; minimize ATV impact and fight for funds to repair recreational access and remote campgrounds.
USFS	STATE	3	Do more education and advertising about the habitat and fishing opportunities.
USFS	STATE	3	Need to devote more resources to fisheries; more people and money to accomplish fishery management objectives.
USFS	STATE	3	Again, look farther into the state's rights to manage fish and wildlife rights.
USFS	STATE	3	Have been the best in outreach and education.
USFS	STATE	3	The job they are currently doing is fine, they have good programs and they should continue with what they are doing.
USFS	TU	1	Increase the use of biodiversity studies for evaluating the impacts of logging oil and gas and highway on federal lands.

USFS	TU	1	Policies must be implemented to place the value of aquatic ecosystems for recreational use at and eco or higher with abstracted uses especially grazing timber harvest and mineral development.
USFS	TU	1	Enforce the laws as they're on the book fairly and evenly.
USFS	TU	1	More forward on stream restoration and access versus focus on grazing and timber permits.
USFS	TU	1	Use the whole watershed protection system when allowing timber cutting.
USFS	TU	1	Get their funding away from trying to be self-sustaining.
USFS	TU	1	The Forest Service needs to be more willing to take unpopular positions with congress.
USFS	TU	2	Wish would provide more stream side access in carry in and out areas by trout streams.
USFS	TU	3	Work with local and statewide agencies to promote access and public awareness.
USFS	TU	3	Need to consider their overall value of the fisheries on a recreational standpoint.
USFS	USFWS		Can place a higher priority on land steward and conservation and not yield to a powerful but small number, for example land or resource users including cotton growers and timber harvesters.
USFS	USFWS	1	Do more to increase and protect the habitat of the fish.
USFWS	ASA		I guess I can't think of anything right now, research on improving the fisheries in the US and making sure the waterways are protected.
USFWS	ASA	1	Balance between excess opportunities and the support and enhancement of hatcheries and aquatic habitat.
USFWS	ASA	2	Maintain an increase in dialogue between all parties who have an invested interest in the fisheries.
USFWS	ASMFC		Cut down on the politics and the bureaucracy involved and more could be accomplished.
USFWS	ASMFC	1	Do more to protect the habitat and the environment.
USFWS	ASMFC	1	Restoring fish stocks.
USFWS	ASMFC	1	They do very little in any area of marine fisheries they need to put more staff resources into this.
USFWS	ASMFC	2	Continue to administer the Sportfish Restoration Program with strong emphasis on the states proposed project.
USFWS	ASMFC	3	They need to provide more staff to help with the fisheries.
USFWS	ASMFC	3	They should do a lot more in the area of education.
USFWS	ASMFC	3	Develop programs with tribes as mandated by their national policies.
USFWS	BASS		It provides accessibility.
USFWS	BASS	1	Begin to respond to the needs of the resources.
USFWS	BASS	1	To increase sport fishing opportunities the service should exercise much more latitude when exercising perspective attitude under the ESA.
USFWS	BASS	1	Continue to implement the plans set and keep other agencies to continue help and sending information and keep lines of communication open.
USFWS	BASS	1	They need to listen to the fishing public too, not just certain environmental groups.
USFWS	BASS	1	Don't stop the excellent work.
USFWS	BASS	2	Improperly funded to do the job they are supposed to do, given mandate but no funding.
USFWS	BASS	2	They should keep open water for hunting.
USFWS	BASS	3	If some policy, rule, or regulation gets approved or passed at the top, it needs to get passed down so everyone in the agency knows about it.
USFWS	BASS	3	They should help ensure the continued use of Wallop-Breux money.

USFWS	BASS	3	Being more organized so all their agencies or franchises know what each other are doing.
USFWS	BASS	3	Become more involved on local issues to prevent degradation down stream.
USFWS	BASS	3	Better educate the public.
USFWS	BASS	3	They need to better educate the public concerning fishing opportunities.
USFWS	BASS	3	Do a better job of educating the public and being receptive to feedback from the public.
USFWS	BASS	3	They should as well control ships on major riverways because they also damage fish beds and tare away grass.
USFWS	BASS	3	Doing an excellent job to meet all three goals, given the restraints on these agencies in terms of budget and manpower.
USFWS	GLFC	1	I just think they do the best job because they have the best standards.
USFWS	GLFC	1	They should stop talking about partnerships and demonstrate some commitment to setting up partnerships and stay out of state fishery management issues and responsibilities.
USFWS	GLFC	1	The attitude remains that navigation piers remain for commercial purposes only with the failure to recognize them for the recreational potential that the piers themselves provide.
USFWS	GLFC	1	Lean towards diversified fisheries which people like problem with Lake Superior too much emphasis put on lake trout which is the native fish.
USFWS	GLFC	1	Do better in developing partnerships with the states rather than pursuing their own agenda.
USFWS	GLFC	1	Limiting access and fisheries management potential on lands under their control.
USFWS	GLFC	1	They could do more if they had more funds.
USFWS	GLFC	1	The US Fish and Wildlife funding for patrol must be insured.
USFWS	GLFC	3	To increase their education outreach program.
USFWS	GLFC	3	Enhance by more contact and more routine coordination meetings.
USFWS	GSMFC	1	Conservation provide leadership investigation in guide enhancement and assessment fishery resources.
USFWS	GSMFC	1	Bring back a priority and emphasis on fish.
USFWS	GSMFC	1	Stronger enforcement in regards to fishing violations.
USFWS	GSMFC	3	The Fish and Wildlife Service needs to provide leadership on fisheries' resource issues.
USFWS	IWL	1	We need warm water hatcheries in New Mexico (NM).
USFWS	IWL	3	Work with local grass roots to enhance the local fisheries and wildlife.
USFWS	NAFWS	1	Regional fishing - how to approach the problem of getting salmon back to the Columbia River.
USFWS	NAFWS	1	To action their policies statement.
USFWS	NAFWS	1	More in depth communications and consultations with the tribes.
USFWS	NAFWS	1	More efforts in providing funding to the tribe; the tribe does most of these programs on their own.
USFWS	NAFWS	1	They should be providing more Federal Aid to help the tribes do things to enhance the fishing population.
USFWS	NAFWS	1	Develop, nurture and enhance a working relationship with potential partners; we need not be adversaries; we can be cooperators.
USFWS	NAFWS	1	Need clear communication through personal.
USFWS	NAFWS	1	They need more money.
USFWS	NAFWS	1	Take more of a leadership role and become part of the solution rather than the problem.

USFWS	NAFWS	1	Do better in working with states and tribal agencies in understanding what each ones role is.
USFWS	NAFWS	2	The public needs more access sites to all fisheries.
USFWS	NAFWS	3	Generally speaking all of the above agencies should work together more respecting the others.
USFWS	NAFWS	3	More personal interaction with tribal agencies.
USFWS	NAFWS	3	Focus more on the younger people.
USFWS	NAFWS	3	Because of mandate starting to work with us and approaching us.
USFWS	NAFWS	3	Actively worked to incorporate tribal concerns into fish and wildlife management.
USFWS	NAFWS	3	They need to fix the systems instead of talking to the tribes; they do too much talking and not enough fixing; we need deep fixes, not just on the surfaces.
USFWS	NAFWS	3	Good policies, but need more training for people.
USFWS	NAFWS	3	Schools and education.
USFWS	NAFWS	3	Get more input on their part dealing with education for the reservations.
USFWS	NAFWS	3	I don't know.
USFWS	PSMFC	1	Continue and expand support of state fishery agencies in research and pollution evaluation.
USFWS	PSMFC	1	They could act much more aggressively and implement actions more quickly.
USFWS	PSMFC	1	They have too much of a preservationist attitude.
USFWS	PSMFC	1	They have made outstanding efforts to work with sport fishing industries in the pacific northwest.
USFWS	PSMFC	2	They have made the situation worse; there is no balance between the fisheries and restoration of endangered species, given so much consideration other species suffer as a result.
USFWS	PSMFC	2	Aggressively pursue your agenda, your job is not to balance conflicting needs it's to protect fish and wildlife.
USFWS	PSMFC	3	Need to be a little more high profile in the rest of the country instead of just in Oregon, Washington and California.
USFWS	STATE		The research capability that was diverted away from the Fish and Wildlife Service should be brought back to them.
USFWS	STATE		The way they deal with us is though the state agencies and they are very different and at odds with federal and state levels.
USFWS	STATE		Stay focused and do the same thing for two years in a row.
USFWS	STATE		Stay on course.
USFWS	STATE		Need to reprioritize programs to increase expenditure on Federal Aid and federal assistance and lower amount of spending on endangered species.
USFWS	STATE	1	Continue the hatcheries operations.
USFWS	STATE	1	Listen to the state agencies and cooperate with them more.
USFWS	STATE	1	Do a better job in developing partnership with recreational fishing communities.
USFWS	STATE	1	Make more sincere effort to foster these partnerships with states and cooperate better with the states.
USFWS	STATE	1	They have not done a good job with their partnerships and often make unilateral decisions.
USFWS	STATE	1	Limited perspective they are more concerned with meeting specific deadlines than the long term commitment to achieving a goal.
USFWS	STATE	1	Working better with all states to improve recreational fishing just in general better cooperation and coordination.
USFWS	STATE	1	Allow state control of fisheries resource management issues with open

			access to federal lands for use.
USFWS	STATE	1	Regularly schedule joint meetings to discuss sports management goals.
USFWS	STATE	1	I think they are trying to phase out one of their hatcheries in our State.
USFWS	STATE	1	Keep funding going.
USFWS	STATE	1	The Service places a low priority on fish for the Upper Mississippi refuges despite the fact that 73% of the users are recreational anglers.
USFWS	STATE	1	Recognize the importance and habitat of producing healthy sustainable fisheries and assist in balancing land use and habitat issues with other interests.
USFWS	STATE	1	Consider states rights and allow the state conservation agencies to manage the waters and land in their state with less federal interference.
USFWS	STATE	1	It seems to be that their main goals or mission does not include recreational fishing.
USFWS	STATE	1	Need to better support the national fish hatchery system and the role it plays in restoring recreational fishing.
USFWS	STATE	2	The thing they could do is form effective partnerships with state wildlife services to achieve mutually beneficial objectives.
USFWS	STATE	2	To successfully carry out any of the goals they have to work more closely with state agencies and help to support these agencies.
USFWS	STATE	2	To implement the divisions of the ban on national wildlife refuges.
USFWS	STATE	2	They need to have more flexible standards as far as the land goes.
USFWS	STATE	2	Improve timeline for acquisition and development projects on federal aid.
USFWS	STATE	2	Provide more operational for the ground of funding.
USFWS	STATE	3	Re-evaluate the eco-system management program.
USFWS	STATE	3	They could be providing funding to states to help in developing and implementing a fishing licensing, marketing and promotion plan.
USFWS	STATE	3	The right thing to include all the agencies and let us know what is going on, no one has contacted us.
USFWS	STATE	3	Some of the work they do with states does need to be avoided.
USFWS	STATE	3	Assist National Marine Fisheries Service.
USFWS	STATE	3	Be a leader in a team effort with industry and the states to develop a marketing strategy for recreational fishing.
USFWS	STATE	3	Again, look farther into the state's rights to manage fish and wildlife rights.
USFWS	TU	1	Minimize the damage to fisheries habitats in their jurisdiction.
USFWS	TU	1	Make sure that equal access is provided for all and that we plan well for the future of our watersheds.
USFWS	TU	1	The Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act should be implemented to improve sport fishing not just support the species.
USFWS	TU	1	Minimize the damage to the fisheries habitats under their control.
USFWS	TU	1	They need to ensure the public is more aware of the ability to access partnership programs.
USFWS	TU	1	Wish they would continue partnership program with Trout Unlimited.
USFWS	TU	3	Help educate youngsters more on what they know and how to help.
USFWS	USFWS	1	Do more to increase and protect the habitat of the fish.

Appendix C

Evaluation Instrument

1997 Evaluation of the Recreational Fishery Resources Conservation Plan Evaluation Worksheet

In June, 1995, the President issued Executive Order No. 12962, which required various federal agencies to develop a five-year Recreational Fishery Resources Conservation Plan. The plan was completed in June, 1996. The Sport Fishing and Boating Partnership Council is charged with the responsibility of evaluating the Plan's implementation. Specifically, the evaluation is to determine the extent to which goals of the Conservation Plan are being achieved.

The National Goal as stated in the Recreational Fishery Resources Conservation Plan is to:

"Provide for increased recreational fishing opportunities nationwide through the conservation, restoration, and enhancement of aquatic systems and fish populations, and by increasing fishing access, education and outreach, and partnership opportunities."

In answering the following questions, please keep this National Goal in mind.

- 1) How would you evaluate the overall progress of the following federal agencies in accomplishing the National Goal as stated above?

<u>Federal Agency</u>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Excellent</i>	<i>Don't Know</i>	<i>Not Applicable</i>
Bonneville Power Administration	1	2	3	4	5
Bureau of Indian Affairs	1	2	3	4	5
Bureau of Reclamation	1	2	3	4	5
Department of the Air Force (Military)	1	2	3	4	5
Department of the Army (Military)	1	2	3	4	5
Department of the Navy (Military)	1	2	3	4	5
Department of Transportation	1	2	3	4	5
Environmental Protection Agency	1	2	3	4	5
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	1	2	3	4	5
National Marine Fisheries Service	1	2	3	4	5
National Park Service	1	2	3	4	5
Natural Resource Conservation Service	1	2	3	4	5
Tennessee Valley Authority	1	2	3	4	5
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	1	2	3	4	5
U.S. Coast Guard	1	2	3	4	5
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	1	2	3	4	5
U.S. Forest Service	1	2	3	4	5

The National Goal calls for each of the above federal agencies to 1) enhance aquatic systems and fish populations, 2) increase fishing access, 3) increase education and outreach, and 4) increase partnership opportunities with the States, Tribal management partners, industry, anglers and conservation groups.

In the following questions, please tell us which two of the above agencies you feel are doing the best job in meeting each of these specific goals, and which two agencies are doing the worst job in meeting each of the specific goals.

- 2) With specific reference to the goal of *enhancing aquatic systems and fish populations*, which two agencies are doing the best job, and which two agencies are doing the worst job?

Best two agencies: 1) _____ 2) _____

Worst two agencies: 1) _____ 2) _____

- 3) With specific reference to the goal of *increasing fishing access*, which two agencies are doing the best job, and which two agencies are doing the worst job?

Best two agencies: 1) _____ 2) _____

Worst two agencies: 1) _____ 2) _____

- 4) With specific reference to the goal of *increasing education and outreach*, which two agencies are doing the best job, and which two agencies are doing the worst job?

Best two agencies: 1) _____ 2) _____

Worst two agencies: 1) _____ 2) _____

- 5) With specific reference to the goal of *increasing partnership opportunities with the States, Tribal management partners, industry, anglers and conservation groups*, which two agencies are doing the best job, and which two agencies are doing the worst job?

Best two agencies: 1) _____ 2) _____

Worst two agencies: 1) _____ 2) _____

A recent policy was agreed to and enacted between the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service. The purpose of the policy is to identify and minimize the impacts associated with administration of the Endangered Species Act on those attempting to enhance recreational fisheries. The next few questions focus on the impacts associated with the requirements of the Endangered Species Act, and the effectiveness of the agreement between the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service.

- 6) Are your fish conservation or management efforts negatively impacted by activities involving endangered, threatened or species proposed for listing under the Endangered Species Act?

Yes

No - If No, please go to Question #9.

- 7) Has the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service or the National Marine Fisheries Service worked with you to reduce or minimize these impacts to your program?

Yes

No - If No, please go to Question #9.

- 8) Overall, how successful have the actions of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service or the National Marine Fisheries Service been in reducing or minimizing the impacts to your program?

Very successful

Somewhat successful

Not successful at all

In this final set of questions, please state, *in one sentence*, what one thing you feel the above mentioned federal agencies could do to best meet the National Goals as stated in the Recreational Fishery Resources Conservation Plan, irrespective of partnerships between your organization and any of the agencies. You need not comment on all of the agencies, only those for which you have a working interest in and have knowledge of.

- 9) Federal agency: _____

One sentence statement: _____

- 10) Do you feel your above comment best relates to the goal of 1) enhancing aquatic systems and fish populations, 2) the goal of increasing fishing access, or 3) the goal of increasing education and outreach?

Goal: _____

11) Federal agency: _____

One sentence statement: _____

12) Do you feel your above comment best relates to the goal of 1) enhancing aquatic systems and fish populations, 2) the goal of increasing fishing access, or 3) the goal of increasing education and outreach?

Goal: _____

13) Federal agency: _____

One sentence statement: _____

14) Do you feel your above comment best relates to the goal of 1) enhancing aquatic systems and fish populations, 2) the goal of increasing fishing access, or 3) the goal of increasing education and outreach?

Goal: _____

15) Federal agency: _____

One sentence statement: _____

16) Do you feel your above comment best relates to the goal of 1) enhancing aquatic systems and fish populations, 2) the goal of increasing fishing access, or 3) the goal of increasing education and outreach?

Goal: _____

If you would like to comment on additional agencies, please write them on additional sheets of paper so as to have them ready when called for your interview.

This completes the evaluation. Thank you for your time.

