

# **LICENSED ANGLER ASSESSMENT OF THE FISHERIES PROGRAM**

## **A Report on the Outcomes Assessment Project, Phase II: Licensed Angler Survey**

**Prepared by:**

**David N. Koons, Fisheries Intern  
Robert Brooks, Bioeconomist, MFWP  
Dana Dolsen, Sociologist, MFWP**

## Report highlights

- \* Resident Licensed Anglers (426) were surveyed by telephone in September of 1997. A response rate of 62% was obtained, with a minimum of 3 call backs to maintain the representativeness of the sample.
- \* 27% of the licensed anglers said they have low or very low knowledge of the Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks agency. *See page 4.*
- \* 28% are very satisfied and 41% are somewhat satisfied with the agency's protection and enhancement of Montana's ecosystems and the diversity of species inhabiting them. *See page 5.*
- \* 48% perceive the quality of aquatic habitat in Montana to be good, and 16% think it is very good. *See page 6.*
- \* 62% are: very/somewhat satisfied with current programs designed to prevent the introduction or spread of fish disease. *See page 10.*
- \* 30% are very satisfied and 42% are somewhat satisfied with the agency's enforcement of fishing regulations. *See page 12.*
- \* 69% are very/somewhat satisfied with the diversity of fishing opportunities that MFWP fishing access sites provide. *See page 14.*
- \* When asked to rate their understanding of the Fisheries Program decision-making process, 50% of the respondents gave a "neutral" or "don't know" answer. *See page 15.*
- \* 33% of licensed anglers are from 31-45 years of age, and 28% are from 46-61 years of age. *See page 19.*
- \* 57% of the licensed anglers have lived in Montana for 21 years or more. *See page 19.*
- \* 54% of licensed anglers have completed high school and gone on to further their education. *See page 20.*

## Table of Contents

Report Highlights.....	i
Table of Contents.....	ii
List of Figures.....	iii
Acknowledgments.....	v
I. Introduction.....	1
II. Methodology.....	1
Sampling Plan and Interviewing Procedures.....	1
Research Design.....	1
Statistical Analysis.....	2
Limitations and Assumptions.....	2
III. Results.....	3
Department Wide.....	3
Habitat Protection/Enhancement.....	6
Fisheries Management.....	8
Fishing Access.....	14
Aquatic Education/Public Information.....	15
Demographics.....	19
IV. Conclusions and Recommendations.....	22
V. Appendices.....	23
Survey Questions.....	23
Program Outcomes.....	24
Matrix.....	28
VI. Literature Cited/Bibliography.....	29

<u>Figure #</u>		<u>Page</u>
1.	Overall Knowledge of Agency	4
2.	FWP Management of Fisheries Resources and Public Needs	4
3.	Opportunity for Citizen Participation in Protection of MT Natural Resources	5
4.	Agency Management of Ecosystems & Species	5
5.	Quality of Aquatic Habitat	6
6.	Fisheries Program Protection of Aquatic Habitat	6
7.	Fisheries Program Restoration of Aquatic Habitat	7
8.	Management of Stream Flow	7
9.	Management of Reservoir Levels	8
10.	Agency Management of Fisheries	8
11.	Fisheries Program Management of Native Fish	9
12.	Performance in Providing Angling opportunities for Wild Fish Species	9
13.	Fishing Opportunities Provided by Hatcheries	10
14.	Agency Efforts Toward Prevention of Fish Disease	10
15.	Lake Fishing Opportunities	11
16.	Stream & River Fishing Opportunities	11
17.	Enforcement of Fishing Regulations	12
18.	Enforcement of Boating Regulations	12
19.	Recreation Upheld Through Agency Protection of Aquatic Resources	13
20.	Fishing Regulations are Clear & Easy to Understand	13
21.	Diversity of Fishing Opportunities at FAS	14
22.	Number of FAS	14
23.	Maintenance & Upkeep at Agency FAS	15
24.	Understanding of Fisheries Program Decision-making Process	15
25.	Opportunity to Become Involved in FWP Decision-making Process	16
26.	Importance of Personal Involvement in Decision-making Process	16
27.	Fisheries Educational Programs That Focus on Aquatic Ecosystems & Fisheries Management	17
28.	Provisions of Educational Materials Related to Aquatic Habitat	17
29.	Number of Educational Programs That Focus On Improving Angling Skills, Knowledge & Ethics	18

## **List of Figures**

<b><u>Figure #</u></b>		<b><u>Page</u></b>
30.	Number of Fisheries Educational Programs for Children	18
31.	Age	19
32.	Years Lived in Montana	19
33.	Place of Residence	20
34.	Highest Education Level Completed	20
35.	Gender	21

We would like to thank: Zoe King, Karlee Smith, and Bob McFarland with MFWP for their work on the project; Mark D. Duda with the National Responsive Management Unit for his help in directing the focus groups; and Rick Fink (Wildlife Intern) for his hard work and input on the project throughout its entirety; and all the licensed anglers who responded to the survey.

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

This survey was conducted by Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks (MFWP) as one component of the MFWP's Program Outcomes Assessment Project ( POAP). Additional surveys conducted under POAP were of hunters, parks passport purchasers and residents. The Fisheries Program survey was designed to assess angler satisfaction with the outcomes defined for the Fisheries Program. In addition, the Fisheries survey will assist in evaluating how well MFWP has met the overall goals of the agency's Vision Statement.

The Fisheries Program defined four program elements as important components of the overall program. The four elements are: 1) Habitat Protection/Enhancement, 2) Fisheries Management, 3) Fishing Access, and 4) Aquatic Education/Public Information. These four program elements and the outcomes associated with each provided the basis for the angler survey.

## **II. METHODOLOGY**

### **Sampling Plan and Interviewing Procedures**

The survey was developed by the Responsive Management Unit and Fisheries Program staff. The sample was comprised of 850 randomly chosen resident anglers who had purchased a fishing license from March 1996 through February of 1997. After removing disconnects, answering machines, and refusals, 426 completed calls resulted for a response rate of 62%. Telephone calls had were conducted over a four week period with a minimum of 3 call backs to maintain the representativeness of the sample.

Interviewers were trained using CATI (computer-assisted telephone interview) techniques and informed about the study goals, handling of survey questions, interview length, reading of instructions, the survey questions, and clarifying techniques for specific questions. Telephone calls were made from 6:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. Monday through Friday and from 10:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. on the weekends, during August and September, 1997.

### **Research Design**

This study utilized a computer-assisted telephone interviewing system called QPL for data collection. QPL provides the researcher a number of options, such as branching to a subset of questions given a respondents answer to a particular question. The data is entered into a computer file as the information is collected which allows for analysis of the data much sooner than if manual data entry is used.

A set of four universal questions were included on the angler, hunter, park passport purchaser and resident surveys. The inclusion of these questions on all surveys allows for comparison of results across all samples - anglers, hunters, park passport holders, and the general public.

## Statistical Analysis

The data from the Fisheries Survey was analyzed using SAS. Frequency analysis and cross-tabulations of specific variables were also ran to provide a better understanding of the data. The frequency information is presented graphically in the results section of this report.

As with any study attempting to gather quantitative and qualitative data, this study has some limitations. Even though this survey was constructed in a manner to eliminate or control as many limitations as possible, a few are worth mentioning.

One limitation is the fact that there was no “true” pretest conducted on the survey instrument. “Pretests are necessary to evaluate question wording and question sequence and to test techniques by which responses are to be recorded” (Frey, 1989).

A similar limitation can be found in the terminology used. A few respondents complained that some of the terminology used was too similar and confusing to delineate. There seemed to be confusion of the differences between *Division* and *Department*. Some thought they were the same and may have answered accordingly.

As with the wording limitation aforementioned, the effects of confusing terminology on the final data results is not known. It is assumed all responses are an accurate reflection of the respondent’s opinion and that each respondent fully understood the essence of the question and answered accordingly.

Another limitation is the possibility of Interviewer Effects/Bias. (Frey, 1989) The use of a Computer Assisted Telephone Interview (CATI) system was employed to minimize this bias as much as possible.


The interviewers were clearly instructed how to read the questions and properly record responses. The effects, if any, of interviewer bias/human error on the study’s final results is unknown. It is assumed all responses are unbiased and accurate, in that they accurately reflect the true opinions of the respondents.

Missing data are the result of any unanswered questions and cause the number in the sample to vary from question to question. For example, 423 individuals may have replied to a particular question asked out of the 426 respondents who completed a questionnaire. Those questions answered incorrectly may be due to carelessness, misinterpreting the question or its directions, and so forth. Such occurrences are treated as response errors and result in small data inconsistencies. A final limitation of this study may be its’ overall length and the time required to complete it. It is assumed that all responses and questions elicited an equal level of accuracy and enthusiasm.

...by using the generally accepted techniques of questionnaire formatting, question wording and sequencing, interviewing techniques, the CATI system, etc., that these unseen limitations are eliminated and/or minimized to a degree that bears no statistical effect on the final results.

### III. RESULTS

**DEPARTMENT WIDE**--The next four questions dealt with resident angler satisfaction with overall agency outcomes.




**Figure 1 Overall Knowledge of Agency**

This question was designed to assess Montanans' overall knowledge of our agency; interestingly enough, the question received the highest frequency of a "low/very low" answer than any other question in our survey with 27 percent of the respondents responding low/very low.

When this question was compared with the place of residence of the respondent we found no differences among the size of residence and the answers given by people in them. Comparing this question with the number of years the respondents have lived in Montana we found that a greater percentage of the people that have lived in Montana for five years or less answered

low/very low to the question than did people from the other categories for years lived in Montana. Compared to the same question in the Statewide Resident Survey more people answered high/very high than did the people in our survey of anglers.




**Figure 2 FWP Management of Fisheries Resources and Public Needs**

respondents have lived in Montana we found that a lesser percentage of people that have lived in Montana for at least 21 years answered "don't know" to the question than did people from the other categories of years lived in Montana. These results are similar to those found in the Statewide Resident Survey.

This question addresses how well MFWP balances the needs of the public and the resources the agency manages. Forty-five percent of anglers said that MFWP management of fisheries resources and public needs is good to very good.

When this question was compared with the place of residence of the respondent we found that a smaller percentage of people from a large city answered poor/very poor to the question than did people from other classifications of residence. We also found that a greater percentage of people from cities answered "don't know" to the question than did people from a small town, farm, or ranch. When this question was compared with number of years the



**Figure 3 Opportunity for Citizen Participation in Protection of MT Natural Resources**


Anglers were generally satisfied, (49%), with the opportunity for citizen participation in the protection of Montana's natural resources.

When compared with the place of residence of the respondent we found results similar to those in the previous question. We found that far less people that have lived here for five years or less answered very/somewhat dissatisfied than did people that have lived in Montana for more than five years.

The majority (69%) of the responding anglers were satisfied with MFWP programs that are directed at the protection and enhancement of Montana's ecosystems and the diversity of species inhabiting them.


Very similar results were found for the same question in the Statewide Resident Survey. When this question was compared with the place of residence of the respondent we found that a greater percentage of people from a farm or ranch were more dissatisfied. When compared with the number of years the respondents have lived in Montana we found that a greater percentage of people that have lived here for five years or less

answered "don't know" to the question than did people from the other categories of years lived in



**Figure 4 Agency Management of Ecosystems & Species**


pertaining to the quality of aquatic habitat, and the protection and enhancement of these aquatic habitats.




The objective of asking this question was to find out how the licensed angler perceives the aquatic habitat in Montana, which they use for fishing. Almost two-thirds (64%) of the respondents perceived the quality of aquatic habitat to be good/very good in Montana.

**Figure 5**      **Quality of Aquatic Habitat**

Fifty-six percent of anglers were satisfied with the Program's protection of aquatic habitat. When compared to a similar question from the 1993 Montana Survey of Fishing And Associated Water Recreation (McFarland & Brooks, 1993) satisfaction with the protection of aquatic habitat had risen by 15%.




**Figure 6**      **Fisheries Program Protection of Aquatic Habitat**




**Figure 7 Fisheries Program Restoration of Aquatic Habitat**

This question assessed how satisfied anglers were with the Fisheries Program restoration of aquatic habitat. In this report, 54% were very to somewhat satisfied with aquatic habitat restoration programs compared with the results from the 1993 Statewide Resident Survey when 82% "supported" such programs. Figure 7 shows that 9% were very to somewhat dissatisfied with these programs; in 1993, only 6% "opposed" such programs.

Approximately 26% of the respondents answered "don't know" to this question about managing stream flow, ranking this question third for "don't know" responses amongst the questions in our survey.



**Figure 8 Management of Stream Flow**




This question assesses licensed angler satisfaction with the Fisheries Program management of reservoir water levels; 48% of the respondents were somewhat/ very satisfied, with 12% very/somewhat dissatisfied.

**Figure 9 Management of Reservoir Levels**


## FISHERIES MANAGEMENT

**Fisheries Management Element-** The next eleven questions address the outcomes dealing with fishing opportunities which are directly dependent upon the management of native, wild, and hatchery fish.

This question can be used to assess how well MFWP is managing the fisheries in Montana. Fifty-eight percent of the respondents were very/somewhat satisfied with MFWP's management of the fisheries.




**Figure 10 Agency Management of Fisheries**




Fifty-eight percent of the respondents perceived the Fisheries Program management of native fish species to be good/very good.

**Figure 11 Fisheries Program Management of Native Fish**

This question attempts to assess if there are enough angling opportunities for wild fish in this state. Fifty-six percent of the respondents said there are good/very good angling opportunities for wild fish in Montana.




**Figure 12 Performance in Providing Angling Opportunities for Wild Fish Species**



**Figure 13 Fishing Opportunities Provided by Hatcheries**


Sixty percent of the licensed angler respondents were very/somewhat satisfied with the fishing opportunities provided by the fish hatchery program in Montana.

A majority (62%) of the respondents were very/somewhat satisfied with current programs designed to prevent the introduction or spread of fish disease.



**Figure 14 Agency Efforts Toward Prevention of Fish Disease**

Sixty-three percent of the respondents were very/somewhat satisfied with the lake fishing opportunities in Montana.




n = 416

FQ6

**Figure 15 Lake Fishing Opportunities**


Similarly, 67% of the respondents were very/somewhat satisfied with the lake fishing opportunities in Montana.



n = 416


FQ7

**Figure 16 Stream & River Fishing Opportunities**




**Figure 16 Enforcement of Fishing Regulations**

A high percentage (25%) of the respondents answered "don't know" to this question, it was the second most common answer to this question.



**Figure 17 Enforcement of Boating Regulations**

Almost three-fourths (72%) of the respondents were very/somewhat satisfied with the fair and equitable enforcement of fishing regulations, compared to the rest of the questions in this study, this can be considered a very high rate of satisfaction.




n=416

FQ9

**Figure 18 Recreation Upheld Through Agency Protection of Aquatic Resources**

level of protection of aquatic resources provided through regulation and enforcement to ensure equitable outdoor recreation opportunities.

More than two-thirds (68%) of anglers agreed that the fishing regulations are clear and easy to understand. The Statewide Resident Survey found similar results to this question as we did for our survey of Montana anglers. Since the 1993 survey, satisfaction with understandable fishing regulations has risen by 13%.




n = 414

FQ10

**Figure 19 Fishing Regulations are Clear & Easy to Understand**


enjoy a diversity of fishing opportunities through MFWP fishing access sites.




Nearly 70% of the responding anglers were very/somewhat satisfied with the diversity of fishing opportunities that MFWP access sites provide.

**Figure 20 Diversity of Fishing Opportunities at FAS**

The majority of the respondents (42%) considered the number of MFWP fishing access sites to be high/very high. However, there were 53% who either didn't know, thought the number of FAS units were neither high nor low or thought there were low to very low FAS units.



**Figure 21 Number of FAS**




very/somewhat satisfied with the maintenance and upkeep of MFWP fishing access sites.

**Figure 22 Maintenance & Upkeep at Agency FAS**


## **AQUATIC EDUCATION/PUBLIC INFORMATION**

**Aquatic Education/Public Information Element-** The following seven questions pertain to the outcomes that address MFWP's decision-making process; public awareness of aquatic resources, aquatic habitats, their protection, restoration and management; and that youth and beginning anglers have an opportunity to participate in angler education events.

This question ranked second highest with respect to the frequency of respondents answering poor/very poor at 26%. A high percentage (23%) of the respondents answered "don't know" to this question; it was the second most common response behind "neutral" for this particular question.




**Figure 23 Understanding of Fisheries Program Decision-making Process**




**Figure 25 Opportunity to Become Involved in FWP Decision-making Process**

The most common answer to this question was "don't know" (29%), ranking this question second with respect to this answer amongst all the questions in the survey. The results were comparable to those of a similar question asked in the Statewide Resident Survey.

Twenty-six percent of anglers said that their personal involvement in the agency's decision-making process was unimportant. When this question was compared with age we found that a greater percentage of people aged 18 or under answered very/somewhat important than did the other categories of age.



**Figure 26 Importance of Personal Involvement in Decision-making Process**




n = 413

PQ4

**Figure 27 Fisheries Educational Programs That Focus on Aquatic Ecosystems & Fisheries Management**

When asked to rate their satisfaction with fisheries educational programs that focus on "increasing the publics understanding and appreciation of aquatic ecosystems and fisheries management programs" 43% of the respondents said that they were very/somewhat satisfied with the educational programs. Thus, 57% were not very to somewhat satisfied, indicating room for improvement.


The purpose of this question was to find out if the agency is doing a good job at providing educational material related to aquatic habitat. Forty-five percent of the angler respondents were very/somewhat satisfied with the provision of educational material related to aquatic habitat by MFWP.



n = 413


PQ5

**Figure 28 Provisions of Educational Materials Related to Aquatic Habitat**



**Figure 29** Number of Education Programs That Focus On Improving Angling Skills, Knowledge & Ethics


The most common answer to this question was "don't know" at 32%, ranking this question number one with respect to the answer "don't know" amongst all the questions in the survey. When this question was compared to age we found that a greater percentage of people aged 18 or less answered very/somewhat satisfied than did the other categories of age. The Statewide Resident Survey had a greater percentage of people answer very/somewhat satisfied than our survey.



**Figure 30** Number of Fisheries Educational Programs for Children


The most common answer to this question was "don't know" at 24%. Since 1993 the satisfaction with the number of fishing educational programs has actually decreased by 8%.

Almost 35% of the respondents were in the 31-45 year age group.




**Figure 31** Age

The majority (57%) of the respondents have lived in Montana for 21 years or more.




**Figure 32** Years Lived in Montana




Nearly 40% of the respondents live in one of Montana's large cities.

**Figure 33** Place of Residence

People from all education levels were part of our sample; as expected the large majority (78%) of the sample have either completed some high school or some college.



**Figure 34** Highest Education Level Completed



Eighty percent of our licensed angler respondents were males, while 20% were females; which is similar to previous studies done by MFWP.

**Figure 34** Gender

The results of the Licensed Resident Anglers Assessment of the Fisheries Program study reveal that overall, anglers are satisfied with the Fisheries Program's efforts to manage the fisheries resource and provide recreational opportunities. The four outcome areas measured through the survey included 1) habitat enhancement and protection, 2) fisheries management, 3) fishing access, and 4) aquatic education/public information. While the overall assessment shows that anglers are satisfied with the Fisheries Program in general; the results also reveal that there are areas where changes can improve the level of satisfaction and awareness.

This study provides benchmark information for the Fisheries Program in assessing how well the Program is meeting its outcome goals and objectives. While useful, this baseline data does not demonstrate if angler satisfaction is changing due to the goals and objectives defined by Fisheries personnel. This type of evaluation will occur when the outcomes are revisited at some future date. A study completed in 1993 by the Fisheries Program illustrates this point.

The study, Montana Survey of Fishing and Associated Water Recreation by McFarland and Brooks 1993, asked current anglers how they rated the Fisheries Program in terms of providing understandable fishing regulations, fish habitat protection/improvement, fishing access, and fisheries education. The responses from that survey, when compared with similar questions from the current study, indicate how well the Fisheries Program has done in these areas according to the users. There is a higher percentage of anglers who are satisfied with the Fisheries Program in the areas of habitat protection, fishing regulations, and fishing access today than they were in 1993. A notable exception is in the area of fisheries education; results indicate that anglers do not think the Fisheries Program is doing as good a job today as in 1993.

Looking at the individual outcome areas provides more specific information to MFWP fisheries managers regarding satisfaction levels by anglers. The information in this assessment will help provide direction to individual programs and projects.

### *Habitat Protection*

Anglers are generally satisfied with the Fisheries Program in managing aquatic habitat and stream flows. More than half the anglers who answered the questions in this section were very or somewhat satisfied with the programs designed to restore and protect habitat.

### *Fisheries Management*

Overall anglers are very satisfied with the Program's management of the fisheries in Montana. There is a high level of satisfaction with the job the State is doing in managing native species as well as the job they are doing in providing angling opportunities for wild trout. Fish disease is an issue in the state at this time due to the discovery of whirling disease. A majority (62%) of anglers are satisfied with the programs to detect and/or prevent fish disease. Easy to understand fishing regulations and the enforcement of these regulations are always a concern for anglers. The results indicate that users are satisfied with the Fisheries Programs effort in these areas.

### *Fishing Access*

All the questions pertaining to the fishing access outcome received high rates of satisfaction. Anglers were satisfied with the overall number of fishing access sites and with the diversity of fishing

in the decision-making process. While dissatisfaction was higher overall than in other outcome areas, less than 20% of anglers were dissatisfied with educational programs and materials related to fisheries.

The information provided by this survey provides benchmark information for the Fisheries Program about their management direction. The comparisons with the 1993 survey results for certain outcome questions provide that direction now.

A number of recommendations are suggested here that the authors think will improve future efforts in measuring angler satisfaction with the Fisheries Program outcomes. First, pretest future survey instruments for question content and understandability. Respondents had a difficult time with the question regarding protection of aquatic resources through regulations and enforcement as an example. Second, ask more detail in ascertaining respondents' knowledge of, involvement with, and desire to be involved with the decision-making detail will help provide direction for efforts to educate them about their opportunities in these areas. Third, the Fisheries Program needs to develop education programs that the public and anglers will use and benefit from on a broad scale. A comparison of the 1993 study and the results of the current survey, reveals that the efforts by the Fisheries Program to increase the level of satisfaction with educational programs by the angling public, has not been met with much success. This is a real opportunity for the agency to improve the publics' awareness of the Fisheries Program as a whole.

## **Appendix I. The Questionnaire**

### **-Department Wide**

**DQ1. How high or low would you rate your knowledge of FWP.**

**DQ2. How good or poor is FWP at equitably balancing the needs and interests of the general public, special interest groups, outdoor recreationists, landowners, and the resources it manages?**

**DQ3. Please rate your satisfaction with the level of opportunity provided by FWP for citizen participation in the long-term protection and enhancement of Montana's natural resources.**

**DQ4. Overall, are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the programs provided by FWP which are directed at the protection and enhancement of Montana's ecosystems and the diversity of species inhabiting them?**

### **-Habitat Protection/Enhancement Element**

**HQ1. How good or poor would you rate the quality of aquatic habitat in Montana?**

**HQ2. Please rate your overall satisfaction with the current Fisheries Program performance in protecting aquatic habitats in Montana.**  
(Prompt List: Must go through a permitting process if you are going to alter the habitat in any way.)

**HQ3. Please rate your overall satisfaction with programs designed to restore and enhance important aquatic habitat in Montana.**  
(Prompt List: Installing spawning channels  
Stream bank restoration  
Adding structure to lakes)

**HQ4a. Please rate your overall satisfaction with current programs designed to manage stream flow.**  
(Prompt List: Minimum stream flow regulations.)

**HQ4b. Please rate your overall satisfaction with current programs designed to manage reservoir water levels.**  
(Prompt List: Minimum pool level regulations.)

**FQ2. How good or poor would you rate the Fisheries Program performance in protecting, maintaining and/or restoring native fish species?**

**(Prompt List: Native species: Cutthroat, Bull trout, Grayling, Paddlefish, and Sturgeon.)**

**FQ3. How good or poor would you rate the Fisheries Program performance in providing angling opportunities for wild fish species?**

**FQ4. Please rate your satisfaction with the fish hatchery program in providing fishing opportunities in Montana.**

**FQ5. Please rate your overall satisfaction with programs designed to prevent the introduction or spread of fish disease.**

**(Prompt List: program requires import permits and the testing of imported fish; disease testing of hatchery fish.)**

**FQ6. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with lake fishing opportunities?**

**FQ7. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with stream and river fishing opportunities?**

**FQ8a. Please rate your overall satisfaction with the fair and equitable enforcement of fishing regulations.**

**FQ8b. Please rate your overall satisfaction with the fair and equitable enforcement of boating regulations.**

**FQ9. Please rate your overall satisfaction with the level of protection of aquatic resources provided through regulation and enforcement to ensure equitable outdoor recreation opportunities.**

**FQ10. Do you agree or disagree that the fishing regulations are written in a way that are clear and easy to understand?**

### **-Fishing Access Element**

**AQ1. Please rate your overall satisfaction with the diversity of fishing opportunities that FWP access sites provide.**

**(Prompt List: FWP access sites have beige and brown signs with a hook and fish on them.)**

**(Diversity refers to the diversity of access across warm water, cool water, lakes, reservoirs, and streams.)**

**AQ2. Are the number of FWP fishing access sites very high, high, neutral, low, or very low?**

## **-Aquatic Education/Public Information Element**

PQ1. On a scale of 1 to 5, with one being very good and five being very poor, please rate your understanding of the Fisheries Program decision-making process?

PQ2. How good or poor is the opportunity to get involved in the FWP's decision-making process in your area?

PQ3. How important or unimportant is it for yourself to be involved in the decision-making process?

PQ4. Please rate your satisfaction with fisheries educational programs that focus on increasing the public's understanding and appreciation of aquatic ecosystems and fisheries management programs.

PQ5. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the provision of educational material related to aquatic habitat?

PQ6a. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the number of educational programs that focus on improving angling skills, knowledge and ethics?

PQ6b. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the number of fisheries educational programs for children?

## **-Demographics**

GQ1. How old are you?

GQ2. How many years have you lived in Montana?

GQ3. Do you consider your place of residence to be in a large city, city, small town, farm or ranch?

GQ4. What is the highest education level you have completed?

GQ5. Observe and record gender.

their habitats, while maintaining our commitments to Montana's hunting and fishing heritage.

A.1. Outcome: FWP recreational opportunities provided are consistent with ecologically sound and sustainable management practices that are within funding capabilities.

A.1.1. The public enjoys a diversity of high quality fisheries which are directly Dependent upon habitat quality.

A.2. Outcome: Public satisfaction with FWP programs directed at the protection and enhancement of Montana's ecosystems and the diversity of species inhabiting them.

A.2.1. The public supports ongoing efforts to restore, protect and maintain high quality aquatic habitat.

A.2.2. The public supports ongoing efforts to restore, maintain and protect native aquatic species.

B. Goal B: Provide increased opportunities for public enjoyment of Fish, Wildlife and Parks resources, while maintaining our commitment to improve landowner/sports person/departments relationships.

B.1. Outcome: The public is satisfied that when making management decisions FWP equitably balances the needs and interests of the general public, special interest groups, outdoor recreationists, landowners and the resources FWP manages.

B.3. Outcome: Outdoor recreationists are satisfied they are being provided with diverse and equitable opportunities to use public and private lands.

B.3.1. Anglers enjoy a diversity of fishing opportunities through access to locations throughout the state.

B.4. Outcome: Outdoor recreationists are satisfied that opportunities and services provided by FWP meet or exceed expectations.

B.4.1. The public enjoys a diversity of fishing opportunities which are directly dependent on wild fish management and the use of hatchery fish.

B.4.2. Fishing access sites provide the public with a variety of non-angling recreation opportunities throughout the state; consistent with available funding.

B.6. Outcome: The public is satisfied that all regulations are enforced fairly and equitably.

- D.1. Outcome: Citizens understand FWP's decision-making process and how to participate in those processes.**
  - D.1.1. Anglers understand FWP's decision-making processes and how to provide input into those processes.**
- D.2. Outcome: Public satisfaction with FWP efforts to increase awareness and appreciation of Montana's fish, wildlife, cultural, historic and natural resources, and FWP's role in the protection, restoration and management of those resources.**
  - D.2.1. The public has an awareness and appreciation of Montana's aquatic resources, aquatic habitats, and their protection, restoration and management.**
- D.3. Outcome: Public satisfaction with the level of educational opportunities FWP offers youth and beginning hunters, anglers and other outdoor recreationists, and with their opportunities to participate in educational events directed at these interests.**
- D.4. Outcome: Public satisfaction with FWP effort in developing and/or fostering high standards of outdoor behavior by outdoor recreationists participating in FWP regulated activities.**
  - D.4.1. Youth and beginning anglers have an opportunity to participate in angler education events.**

Question	Outcome
DQ1.	[D]
DQ2.	[B.1]
DQ3.	[D]
DQ4.	[A.2]

### **Habitat Protection/Enhancement Element**

HQ1.	[D. 2.1 & A.1]
HQ2.	[A.2]
HQ3.	[A. 2.1]
HQ4a.	[A. 2.1]
HQ4b.	[A. 2.1]

### **Fisheries Management Element**

FQ1.	[A. 1.1]
FQ2.	[A. 2.2]
FQ3.	[A. 1.1]
FQ4.	[B. 4.1]
FQ5.	[A. 2.2]
FQ6.	[A. 1.1]
FQ7.	[A. 1.1]
FQ8a.	[B.6]
FQ8b.	[B.6]
FQ9.	[B.6]
FQ10.	[D. 2.1]

### **Fishing Access Element**

AQ1.	[B. 3.1]
AQ2.	[B. 3.1]
AQ3.	[B. 4.2]

### **Aquatic Education/Public Information Element**

PQ1.	[D. 1.1]
PQ2.	[D. 1.1]
PQ3.	[D. 1.1]
PQ4.	[D.3]
PQ5.	[D.3]
PQ6a.	[D.4]
PQ6b.	[D. 4.1]

Duda, Mark D. 1997. "Program Outcomes Assessment Project Research" Responsive Management National Office.

Frey, James H. 1989. Survey Research by Telephone, Second Edition; Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications (pp. 2-4).

McFarland, Robert and Brooks, Robert. 1993. Montana Survey of Fishing And Associated Water Recreation. Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks.

### **Literature Referenced**

Fisheries Division Outcomes; Unpublished 1997

Schaeffer, Richard L.; Mendenhall III, William; Ott, Lyman R. 1996. Elementary Survey Sampling. Fifth Edition, Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company