

## Sustainable Harvest Focus Groups

Our forests are natural assets. They are also a resource we can use and re-use with the right technology, the right balance between recreation and harvest, and the right timing.

What are the people thinking about Washington's forests and the people who manage them? Washington's conscientious citizens think the forests are being well managed. It might be that we have learned the lesson of balance – no more clear-cuts and no more strident anti-harvesting strategies. People don't want "either/or" conclusions. They generally think we do forest management better here than most other places in the world, and they're no longer willing to see the spotted owl or salmon used as a poster child for reducing harvests. What they want to see is technology and reasonable formulas for harvests.

Our citizens are not greedy, nor put into neat little boxes labeled "more harvests" or "no more harvests." Our citizens want access to forests for more recreational pursuits, but our citizens also believe that there ought to be restrictions on who can use what state lands for what kind of fun. Our citizens think our impact on the forests has already reached the point of no return: we must keep and improve our involvement in the natural scheme of things. And, our citizens want to re-examine the dependence on our state forests for primary funding of school construction, though they don't want our schools to suffer any shortfall in the transition to new funding avenues.

More than any single factor revealed in the three focus groups, Washington's citizens realized that "balance" is no easy matter. The popularity of "balance" is unquestioned, but whose balance should be the state's formula? The people with whom we spoke recognized that balance is elusive. It looks like less clear-cutting (though they understand most clear cuts fall on private lands); it looks like more individual responsibility in not trashing nor wearing out our recreation lands (though we pay for those lands so there should be a place for everyone's sports somewhere); it looks like reasonable increases in harvests as long as the increase is dictated by technology and making better use of forests lands; and it looks like keeping what timber jobs we now have just as long as we don't harvest so much that it jeopardizes our kids' capacity to enjoy and profit from our forests.

Our people love our forests, but lucky for us, they don't see the forests just for the trees.

## **Table of Contents**

|   |    |
|---|----|
| <i>Executive Summary</i> .....  | 1  |
| <i>Table of Contents</i> .....  | 2  |
| <i>Report Summary</i> .....   | 3  |
| <i>Problematics</i> .....   | 4  |
| <i>Participant Notes (Note on Demographics)</i> .....                   | 6  |
| Focus Group (Kirkland):.....  | 6  |
| Focus Group (Vancouver): .....  | 7  |
| Focus Group (Olympia):.....   | 9  |
| <i>Analysis</i> .....   | 11 |
| General Outlook.....  | 11 |
| Perceptions of the Department of Natural Resources .....                | 14 |
| Balancing Responsibilities: Trusts vs. Recreation vs. Environment ..... | 20 |
| Closing/Communications.....   | 35 |
| <i>Appendix I. Tables</i> .....   | 36 |
| Perceptions of the Department of Natural Resources .....                | 36 |
| Balancing Responsibilities: Trusts vs. Recreation vs. Environment ..... | 37 |

## Report Summary

This report is a summary and analysis of findings from the focus groups performed for Washington State Department of Natural Resources on the following dates:

- March 4<sup>th</sup>, 2002 – Kirkland
- March 19<sup>th</sup>, 2002 – Portland, OR
- March 30<sup>th</sup>, 2002 – Olympia, WA

These are the final impressions we have observed from the focus groups and should serve as an analytical report from which to build a more comprehensive understanding of the public opinion surrounding timber harvesting issues. Please use this document to assist you in developing a sound strategic communications plan.

The Connections Group looks forward to assisting the Department of Natural Resources in interpreting and assisting in the planning of objective steps recommended in this report.

## Methodology

Three focus groups were conducted throughout the month of March 2002 in separate locations throughout the Pacific Northwest.

*Focus Group #1: Random Selection* – March 4<sup>th</sup>, 2002 at 6:00 PM  
This group consisted of a random spread of voters who resided within King County.

*Focus Group #2: Random Sampling* – March 19<sup>th</sup>, 2002 at 1:00 PM  
This group was comprised of primarily Clark County and Vancouver, WA residents who voted at least once in the last four major primary and general elections.

*Focus Group #3: Random Sampling with Political Tag* – March 30<sup>th</sup>, 2002 at 12:00 PM  
This group is composed of Thurston County residents who voted at least once in the last four major elections. Additionally, the respondents identified themselves as liberal, moderate, conservative, or independent.

Participants were paid an incentive of \$50.00. Discussions lasted just under 2 hours apiece, and were facilitated by Cathy Allen of The Connections Group.

## **Problematics**

Using a communications analysis technique called “problematics” developed by Professor Alex Edelstein, PhD, former chair of the University of Washington School of Communications, participant answers were parsed into a series of categories. These categories accurately reflect a participant’s state of mind during the focus group process and quantitative analyses of these data allow for a more intensive understanding of public opinion. While focus group sample sizes are generally too small to draw an accurate conclusion of representation for the population-at-large, they are excellent tools for examining answers more intensively to better understand the undercurrents, contexts, and logical reasoning of an opinion.

This report will include a number of terms used in focus group analysis. We feel a discussion on terminology is appropriate.

### *1. “Blocking”*

The respondent feels there are agents at work, which selectively prohibit him or her from resolving a problem. These agents can be external (ie. politicians in Olympia) or internal (ie. I have no time), which the respondent identifies by name. Blocking answers are like: “Those politicians at Department of Natural Resources don’t tell us anything” or “I have no time to follow everything DNR does.”

- Blocking statements are important in that they allow the policy-maker to hone in on which things frustrate a particular respondent and provide insight on what hurdles need to be overcome to achieve a specific goal.

### *2. “Indeterminacy/Ambivalence”*

Indeterminate or ambivalent answers are an expression of confusion, frustration, and doubt. Respondents answering in this fashion do not know how to address a specific problem and are unable to frame a response about how to resolve the issue. Indeterminate/ambivalent answers often disappear when the moderator or other participant provides the respondent with additional information. Indeterminate answers are like: “I don’t know what DNR does” or “School construction is paid for by timber sales?”

- For the policy-maker, indeterminate/ambivalent answers suggest a need to further educate the respondent about the topic.

### *3. “Steps”*

The respondent feels steps have been taken by an agent, but the progress is not sufficient to have resolved a specific problem. For the policy-maker, step

answers indicate the respondent has a general positive attitude about the way things are currently going, but there needs to be continued work to resolve the issue. Answers include: “We slowed down harvesting a few years ago, but it’s not enough to protect the spotted owl habitat.”

- By emphasizing current and existing work on the topic, policy-makers can build upon existing goodwill.

#### 4. *“Resolution”*

The respondent feels that the problem has already been resolved. Answers include: “Thanks to efforts from environmentalists and DNR, the spotted owl is no longer an endangered species.” [if true]

- These comments give policy-makers a victory that can be emphasized for effect.

#### 5. *“Denial”*

The respondent feels there is no problem or the problem lies elsewhere. Unfortunately, denial answers can be caused by a number of issues. Denial answers are the most difficult to assess because they can be caused by a respondent accepting misinformation or following a logical fallacy. Denial answers can lead to the hardening of argumentative political positions. Answers include: “New recreation technology, like noise dampeners, have eliminated the environmental damage that off-road vehicles used to create.” [if false]

- For the policy-maker, denial answers can sometimes be combated with further education, but respondent may resist this additional information out of pride or fear of being shamed.

#### 6. *“Need for Value”*

The respondent expresses a need for some kind of value, which has not been achieved under the given circumstances. Because the respondent is able to identify this need, they have a more positive feeling that the issue can be resolved. Need answers are often positive and pro-active. Answers include: “We need to stop clear-cutting” or “Let’s work together to figure out a solution.”

- Policy-makers can take ‘need’ answers as an expression of a ‘to-do’ list. Often, there is no ability to fill the need, but identifying with the respondent’s point of view can be effective. There is a good chance of building a cooperative relationship with this respondent.

### 7. “Loss/Lack of Value”

The respondent either feels there was value in the past and has been lost, or that there was never any value in the first place. Loss/lack answers are negative responses and suggest the respondent is not likely to pursue answers. Loss/lack answers can sometimes be interpreted as ‘cynical’. Answers are like: “Fifty years ago, we were cutting down forests without any problem, but now we don’t have any more forests!”

- For policy-makers, loss/lack answers suggest the respondent has given up or unwilling to pursue a solution. Respondents who express this answer require the most convincing to overcome their initial reaction.

## **Participant Notes (Note on Demographics)**

### **Focus Group (Kirkland):**

By far the most diverse focus group demographically, the Kirkland focus group consisted of a wide range of participants. There were a strikingly large number of parents who home-schooled their children. Politically, this group was the most centrist of the three and seemed to be moderately informed on most issues.

| <b>No.</b> | <b>Name</b> | <b>Gender</b> | <b>Age</b> | <b>#<br/>TIMES<br/>VOTED</b> | <b>Income</b> | <b>Ethnicity</b> | <b>Zip Code</b> |
|------------|-------------|---------------|------------|------------------------------|---------------|------------------|-----------------|
| 1          | Sara G.     | F             | 44         | 4                            | \$50-75 k     | Caucasian        | 98005           |
| 2          | Mike Z.     | M             | 38         | 4                            | \$50-75 k     | Caucasian        | 98034           |
| 3          | Mark V.     | M             | 31         | 4                            | \$25-50 k     | Hispanic         | 98029           |
| 4          | Judy E.     | F             | 38         | 2                            | \$75 k +      | Caucasian        | 98056           |
| 5          | Denny B.    | M             | 48         | 4                            | \$75 k +      | Caucasian        | 98052           |
| 6          | Diana H.    | F             | 56         | 4                            | \$75 k +      | Caucasian        | 98072           |
| 7          | Sandy V.    | F             | 59         | 3                            | \$75 k +      | Caucasian        | 98005           |
| 8          | Dionne S.   | F             | 33         | 2                            | \$75 k +      | African-Amer     | 98056           |
| 9          | Joy J.      | F             | 35         | 2                            | \$50-75 k     | Asian            | 98034           |
| 10         | William B.  | M             | 49         | 4                            | \$50-75 k     | Caucasian        | 98052           |
| 11         | Clark R.    | M             | 53         | 4                            | \$75 k +      | Caucasian        | 98008           |
| 12         | Katrina K.  | F             | 20         | 1                            | \$50-75 k     | African-Amer     | 98074           |

1. **Sarah G.** - stay-at-home mom, degree in EE, worked for Puget Sound Power & Light, grew up in Hawaii
2. **Mike Z.** - retired educator, now in medical field, married, grandchildren, passion is travel
3. **Mark V.** - H2O global workplaces, admin assistant to 40 companies, newly married, passion is arts, music, and people
4. **Judy E.** - has daughter, real estate, passion is family, hobby is 'get at the truth'
5. **Denny B.** – VP for development company, home schooling youngest child
6. **Diana H.** - sensory analyst, food scientist, passion is outdoor sports/cycling
7. **Sandy V.** - married, retired, takes care of granddaughter, daughter moved back in, trying to keep head above water, busy
8. **Dionne S.** - machinist for 13 years, laid off in December, decided to go back to school, wife massage therapist
9. **Joy J.** - attorney for small practice in Redmond, 4 kids, passion is family
10. **William B.** - married 3 kids, ages 5, 3, and 7 months, home schooling, passion is family and travel
11. **Clark R.** - production for Genie Industries, passion is his four kids
12. **Katrina K.** - counselor, work in healthcare field, two young kids, passion is anything fun, especially outdoor baseball

### ***Focus Group (Vancouver):***

Both geographically and politically, this focus group seemed the most distanced from state government. Residing near the border, the Vancouver group was greatly influenced by Portland's out-of-state media outlets, leading to a sense of political discontinuity with Olympia. Economically, this group appeared to have been hit the hardest by the economic recession, further enhancing the division between them and core politics of the Puget Sound region.

| <b>No.</b> | <b>Name</b> | <b>Gender</b> | <b>Age</b> | <b># TIMES VOTED</b> | <b>Income</b> | <b>Ethnicity</b> | <b>Zip Code</b> |
|------------|-------------|---------------|------------|----------------------|---------------|------------------|-----------------|
| 1          | JoAnn M.    | F             | 74         | 4                    | \$25K-\$50K   | Caucasian        | 98664           |
| 2          | Jean B.     | F             | 60         | 4                    | \$50K-\$75K   | Caucasian        | 98661           |
| 3          | Karen W.    | F             | 47         | 2                    | \$25K-\$50K   | Caucasian        | 98661           |
| 4          | Kenneth W.  | M             | 45         | 4                    | \$25K-\$50K   | Caucasian        | 98683           |
| 5          | Roy M.      | M             | 39         | 2                    | \$50K-\$75K   | Caucasian        | 98682           |
| 6          | Dave T.     | M             | 38         | 4                    | \$25K-\$50K   | Caucasian        | 98682           |
| 7          | John C.     | M             | 42         | 4                    | \$75K+        | Caucasian        | 98683           |
| 8          | R. B. M.    | M             | 54         | 2                    | \$50K-\$75K   | Caucasian        | 98685           |
| 9          | Jane G.     | F             | 51         | 4                    | \$50K-\$75K   | Caucasian        | 98662           |
| 10         | Joyce E.    | F             | 54         | 4                    | \$50K-\$75K   | African Am       | 98665           |
| 11         | Janet F.    | F             | 37         | 0                    | \$25K-\$50K   | Canadian         | 98682           |
| 12         | Norm C.     | M             | 75         | 3                    | \$25K         | Caucasian        | 98661           |

1. **JoAnn M.** – loves art, a great-grandparent, has two daughters
2. **Jean B.** – has son in high school, husband, used to work as legal secretary, loves quilting
3. **Karen W.** – Vancouver resident, two grown children, two grandchildren
4. **Kenneth W.** – two almost-grown children, works in petroleum industry as senior sales exec with Quaker State
5. **Roy M.** – Vancouver resident, works for Ann Mill International, works with iron piping, commercial wastewater/water treatment, married 5 years, enjoys woodworking
6. **Dave T.** – academic advisor, Clark County resident, single dad for 14 years
7. **John C.** – works for Hewlett Packard, enjoys photography and hiking
8. **R.B. M.** – Vancouver resident, 11yr old daughter, chief engineer for commercial building center, plays golf and softball
9. **Jane G.** – homemaker, two children, retired from hospitality industry, former catering manager at Harbor Club in Seattle, volunteers at senior club in Vancouver
10. **Joyce E.** – resident of Clark County, works in investigations, two adult children, couple of grandchildren, limited sports, loves to bake.



11. **Janet F.** – married 18 1/2 years, mother of 15 yr old student ambassador at UW, fulltime Clark College student, struggling
12. **Norm C.** – 10 children, passions are piano and photography; retired, enjoys ballroom dancing and playing bagpipes

### ***Focus Group (Olympia):***

In terms of political acumen, the Olympia focus group was the best informed about the issues facing the Department of Natural Resources. Politically, the Olympians tended to identify themselves as liberals and they tended to skew on the high end of the economic scale. Olympians seemed to be the most insulated from the economic recession, which may be a reflection of the high number of government-related jobs in the region.

The results from the tabulation of the handouts indicated Olympians skewed much more green than the other two groups, although there were some surprising answers when they were pressed for more information. Olympians were also very polarized in their opinions – there was not much waffling in this group, every respondent defended his or her opinion well.

| <b>No.</b> | <b>Name</b> | <b>Gender</b> | <b># Times Voted</b> | <b>Politics</b> | <b>Age</b> | <b>County</b> | <b>Income</b> | <b>Race</b>   |
|------------|-------------|---------------|----------------------|-----------------|------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| 1          | John J.     | M             | 4                    | Moderate        | 33         | Thurston      | \$75 k +      | Caucasian     |
| 2          | Jeanne J.   | F             | 4                    | Liberal         | 50         | Thurston      | \$50-75 k     | Caucasian     |
| 3          | Vanessa     | F             | 4                    | Moderate        | 38         | Thurston      | \$25k-50k     | African-Amer. |
| 4          | Susan Z.    | F             | 4                    | Independent     | 42         | Thurston      | \$75 k +      | Caucasian     |
| 5          | Latonja H.  | F             | 3                    | Independent     | 34         | Thurston      | \$75 k +      | African-Amer. |
| 6          | John M.     | M             | 4                    | Moderate        | 44         | Thurston      | \$50-75 k     | Caucasian     |
| 7          | Jey S.      | F             | 3                    | Moderate        | 44         | Thurston      | \$25-50 k     | African-Amer. |
| 8          | Barbara J.  | F             | 3                    | Liberal         | 47         | Thurston      | \$75 k +      | Caucasian     |
| 9          | Frank A.    | M             | 4                    | Moderate        | 65         | Thurston      | \$75 k +      | Caucasian     |
| 10         | Dan K.      | M             | 4                    | Conservative    | 78         | Thurston      | \$25-50 k     | Caucasian     |
| 11         | Rebecca C.  | F             | 4                    | Liberal         | 44         | Thurston      | \$25-50 k     | Hispanic      |

1. **John J.** – attorney
2. **Jeanne J.** – 2nd grade teacher, not much family here anymore, constantly moving, planning on moving to Southwest
3. **Vanessa** – passion is family, 2 kids: 12 yr old, 15 mo old; works in human resources, new to Olympia, from Federal Way
4. **Susan Z.** – Nurse at St Peter Hospital
5. **Latonja H.** – work at home mom. Passions are: God first, family second. Top issues: quality of life, good health care system, protection of clean air.
6. **John M.** – passion is his beautiful grandkids, works as building maintenance supervisor
7. **Jey S.** – concerned about quality of life
8. **Barbara J.** – works at clinical pharmacy in Madigan Hospital, lives in Lacey, kids have moved out of house, preparing for retirement, bought land in Wenatchee
9. **Frank A.** – lives in Olympia, retired from OFM, landscape person who never followed that career, works halftime, concerned about health of the environment
10. **Dan K.** – lived in NYC, came out WWII, California spent 35-50 years here, county probation officer, now retired, wanted fresh air, nice people, volunteer at St. Peters since 1986
11. **Rebecca C.** – single mom, concerned about kids safety, environment, health issues, having a state job, safe environment

## Analysis

This section will break down the focus group answers based upon their order in the protocol. Individual focus group comments will be examined and a discussion of overall trends in the answers will help you understand differences and similarities amongst the respondents.

### General Outlook

#### **1. How do you feel things are going in your life? Do you feel better now than a year ago?**

**Focus Group (Kirkland)** – There was generally a mixed response in this group, regardless of gender, ethnicity, or income. While some were feeling the pinch of the downturn in the economy, others felt that the time they were spending away from work was worthwhile – allowing them more time to spend at home with the family. Amongst those who expressed concern about the economy, Kirkland residents often responded with ‘need for value’ comments, which suggested they were cautiously optimistic about their economic future.

*“My daughter is home from Washington, DC. It’s good to have her back.”*

**Focus Group (Vancouver)** – Amongst the three focus groups, this group of participants was hit the hardest by the recession. No single demographic group seemed to feel the effects more acutely than any other; they were all affected by the economic downturn. Vancouver residents tended to fixate on the negative aspects of the recession when asked about the general direction of their lives. Participants often responded with ‘loss of value’ comments, suggesting they did not see any change in their condition within the near future.

*“I recently graduated Clark College and will now be attending WSU – I’m taking more classes, have less money, and everything is harder.”*

**Focus Group (Olympia)** – Olympians were the most insulated from the recession and were very optimistic about their future. When asked about how they felt, they focused on a more international perspective, feeling that things were going well in their personal lives, but poorly globally. Olympians often answered with “steps” comments, indicating they felt

there was no real difficult issue they were currently facing which wasn't in the process of being addressed.

*"Personally, things are better than they were a year ago. Globally, I'm more aware of things going on since 9-11."*

### **Overall**

The results of this question were not too surprising. The Olympia group was most likely shielded from the worst of the recession with stable retirement plans and government jobs. With experience in speaking about policy and government, they focused more on international news and global events rather than local concerns. Kirkland residents were employed primarily by the private sector and felt the impact of the economic downturn much more strongly, while Vancouver respondents, who were lower on the income scale than their Kirkland counterparts, internalized the effects of the recession and spoke most strongly about its personal impact.

## **2. Now in regards to Washington, what do you think is the most important issue facing the state today?**

### **Focus Group (Kirkland)**

For the most part, Kirkland residents worried about one thing – traffic. Most felt that the traffic problem had not been solved, although they varied in their response on how to tackle the issue. Some residents expressed 'lack of value' sentiments, suggesting they did not think the problem was going to be fixed any time soon, while others evoked much more optimistic 'need for value' comments. Two respondents spoke about the sorry condition of the state budget, the economy, and the war in Afghanistan.

*"Transportation. It's the roads. Why they can't fix them is beyond me."*

*"I think they purposefully make them slow. Drive down the 167 corridor, I drove from Everett for the first year I worked – every time they make an improvement, it's worse."*

### **Focus Group (Vancouver)**

The Vancouver group had entirely different concerns. In fact, they had a number of different concerns within the same group. Some suggested high taxes were the number one issue, while others felt it was the lack of handicapped spaces, the inability of government to create infrastructure for growth, or the need for a stronger economy. The answers were too diverse to generalize.

*“Clark County needs to have a more solid economic base.”*

### **Focus Group (Olympia)**

Olympians were also split on what they thought was the most important issue facing them today. However, the two issues they focused on were taxes and the budget, and the lack of available healthcare. Respondents expressed ‘lack of value’ comments on both taxes and healthcare – they were frustrated and did not feel these issues would be resolved soon. One respondent expressed ‘denial’ over the perception of traffic congestion and suggested Washington roads were the best he’s ever driven on.

*“Medicaid. There should be much better health care for them, seniors. Christ, every time it goes up [the cost of health insurance coverage], it doesn’t matter if they live in Seattle.”*

### **Overall**

In general, it seemed men were more skeptical about the ability of government to resolve the issues they faced. Sometimes they expressed this skepticism as suspicion, feeling that government actively ‘blocked’ them from solving the issue.

*“I think they purposefully make them slow.”*

On the other hand, women seemed to express more ‘indeterminacy and ambivalence’ answers and ‘need for value’ answers. They tended to offer less criticism of government in general and felt there was an opportunity to work together to solve issues.

*“Having unemployment that is the highest in the nation is scary to me. I don’t know, to me that is just alarming.”*

### **3. Tell me your thoughts about our state’s leadership. Who is doing a good job? A bad job?**

#### **Focus Group (Kirkland)**

The Kirkland group identified two local state legislators who were doing a good job and generally seemed very knowledgeable about their local elected officials. Kirkland was split on whether or not the Governor was doing well. While they did not feel ‘blocked’ by the Governor, they felt he needed to be stronger to get the job done.

*“He’s got control of two houses and he can’t do squat.”*

#### **Focus Group (Vancouver)**

Vancouver residents identified a local state legislator and expressed concern over the direction of the state’s gubernatorial leadership. Vancouver residents felt they were politically distant from state government. Several respondents stated they felt the ‘lack of value’ was the absence of any major Washington media outlet in their region – they tended to identify more with Oregon politics and current events.

*“I follow Oregon politics more than Washington.”*

#### **Focus Group (Olympia)**

Olympia respondents specifically identified the Attorney General and local state legislator as officials who were doing a good job. Olympians were critical of the Governor, feeling he was running into some difficulty in managing the state government. They are also frustrated by the State Legislature and don’t feel that the House of Representatives is doing a good job.

*“They fight all session long about everything at the end of each session, and that illustrates they don’t get what everyone is doing. “*

#### **Overall**

All groups were able to identify at least one local leader, although their feelings about the governor were mixed. In two different groups, the state Attorney General was mentioned as a strong leader for Washington State. For the most part, these focus group answers followed larger trends – local leaders, while less known, tended to rate more favorably with respondents, while state-wide elected officials and national leaders did not rate as well.

## **Perceptions of the Department of Natural Resources**

***4. Tell me what you think about Washington’s forests and natural resources. Have you heard anything about forests lately? If so, where?***

#### **Focus Group (Kirkland)**

The Kirkland focus group often exhibited ‘indeterminacy’ and expressed themselves in terms of doubt and frustration – they were open to many

different suggestions. The Kirkland group did not identify any specific recent events regarding forests, but mentioned 'clearcuts' a number of times. Residents were often unsure of who was actually doing the logging, and when pressed with new information from knowledgeable focus group members, respondents did not immediately make the differentiation between clearcuts on private lands versus timber harvesting on public lands. Many comments indicated respondents were ill-informed about recent events regarding DNR and the state's forests.

*"Where do you draw the line? All the clear-cuts out on the Cascades – are they getting shipped overseas?"*

*"Forestry services are logging our land. Where's the money go specifically, and if there's land for preservation of resources, why do we log it?"*

### **Focus Group (Vancouver)**

For the Vancouver group, respondents immediately seized on the notion of natural resources and equated it with the hydroelectric dams on the Columbia. Over half of the answers in this section dealt with electricity rates and hydropower – even though the question did not specify such. On hydroelectricity and dams, respondents tended to answer with 'needs for value' responses, indicating there was still hope for a solution to the high cost of electricity.

When it came to talking about forests, respondents were extremely sensitive about the amount of timber harvesting that was already going on – perhaps with one or two dissenters. Most felt a sense of deprivation or 'loss of value' when it came to driving on the road and seeing large stands of forest cut down. The aesthetic argument was particularly effective with this group on this particular question.

*"We're losing it. Driving down 157<sup>th</sup>, it's gone. The drive used to be so relaxing."*

### **Focus Group (Olympia)**

The Olympia group also did not identify any specific recent events regarding DNR and state natural resources, although they tended to speak about timber harvests from a more 'managerial' standpoint. Olympians tended to answer with more "step" answers, indicating they felt DNR has been progressing in its role, but not having yet resolved difficult issues about things like clear-cuts in its forest management practices.

*"It's a huge job. They have to manage it all, from recreation to state trust lands."*

*"Maybe we're past that stage of corporate cut and run."*

### **Overall**

Overall, participants had difficulty in naming any particular thing DNR was involved in recently. However, they were most aware of clearcuts along major roadways, but were not cognizant of whether or not those clearcuts were actually on private land or public land. When did they not know, they assumed the cuts were on state land, thereby saddling the Department of Natural Resources with a kind of associative baggage.

### **5. Now tell me what you think about the Department of Natural Resources. What is the role of DNR? What does it do? How much of the state of Washington is state-owned land?**

#### **Focus Group (Kirkland)**

Kirklanders identified the roles of DNR as including: forest and other resource management, maximizing resources, and making money for the state. Some cited 'clean water', parks management, and watching for forest fires as important functions of the department. For the most part, Kirklanders seemed to be accurate, although there were enough answers which indicated a further need for more information. Kirklanders primarily answered the query and did not indicate problems. One member of the group suggested one-third of the state was owned by the public.

*"To manage resources, when to use, when to preserve, I think there are people there who are supposed to be sensitive to the state."*

#### **Focus Group (Vancouver)**

Vancouverites seemed to be worried about government regulations and resented whatever role DNR appeared to have. Without being pressed for specific information, respondents fell back into political cynicism, although some echoed their Kirkland counterparts and suggested DNR's roles included: making efficient use of natural resources, improving air quality, and keeping a lid on overaggressive government regulations. Additionally, Vancouverites expressed their disdain for Olympia with many 'blocking' statements targeted toward environmental groups, feeling they have been victims of the 'extreme' environmentalists, and did not feel DNR would be capable of striking a balance as long as they kept listening to the extremes.



*"I hate to see when they get carried away. I'd hate to see a job get lost for one fish."*

### **Focus Group (Olympia)**

Olympians tended to be very familiar with DNR, two members of the focus group having worked at the Department years ago. They were the only group to mention shoreline protection as a function of the agency, and also reasonably explained the relationship between timber harvesting and school construction. Olympians identified 'about 2 million acres' as state-owned land.

*They have a huge job. They have to manage it all, from recreational issues to school trust lands."*

### **Overall**

This was the best question to test the knowledge of the different focus groups. As expected, the Olympia group was the most familiar with the role of the Department of Natural Resources, although it was surprising to discover the lack of knowledge expressed by the Kirkland group. While Kirklanders floundered for answers, Vancouverites immediately fell back into their political cynicism and tended to cast more blame on government and non-government groups, like environmental special interests.

### **6. Take a look at the following list, which of the following things would you rate is the most important function of DNR?**

| <b>Role of DNR</b>                   | <b>Kirkland</b> | <b>Vancouver</b> | <b>Olympia</b> | <b>Total</b> |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------|------------------|----------------|--------------|
| Maintain Low Risk to Environment     | 2               | 1                |                | 3            |
| Strike a Balance: Enviro/Development | 8               | 7                | 7              | 22           |
| Do What Intended, Don't Overstep     |                 |                  |                |              |
| Help Use/Protect Our Forests         | 1               | 1                |                | 2            |
| Lead As Good Example                 |                 |                  |                |              |
| Further Enviro. Research             |                 |                  | 1              | 1            |
| Make Money for Schools               |                 |                  |                |              |

|                      |   |   |   |   |
|----------------------|---|---|---|---|
| Stop the Recession   |   |   |   |   |
| Safeguard Resources  | 1 | 3 | 2 | 6 |
| Many Concurrent Uses |   |   |   |   |

### **Focus Group (Kirkland)**

Kirklanders really liked the term ‘strike a balance’, and favored the selection above all the others. They also keyed into ‘maintaining a low level of risk’ and seemed to feel as if the Department of Natural Resources was moving in the right direction. Kirkland’s group is characterized by ‘step’ comments. However, the group was mystified about the connection between school construction and timber harvests – they were not aware that one directly led to the other. From their comments, it appeared as if the Kirkland group wanted things to continue in the current direction, with little or no risk-taking as possible.

*“How can they make money for schools? It’s not their job.”*

### **Focus Group (Vancouver)**

Vancouverites also liked the terms ‘strike a balance’ and ‘maintaining a low level of risk’, but they also really liked the long-term approach of ‘safeguarding our resources’ for the future. There was a strong conservationist streak in the Vancouver group, which highly valued recycling, conserving, and a sense of volunteerism for the community. Respondents in this group exhibited strong ‘need for value’ comments, suggesting that they are willing to look for answers when it comes to environmental concerns. Furthermore, Vancouverites were much more highly suspicious of education management in the state than natural resource management – they felt that DNR was capable of providing the necessary dollars to fund school construction, but they did not think building schools should cost so much.

*“With development, we need to be careful about how to build. The environment might be able to produce later on.”*

*“If that’s true [that money from timber harvests go to school construction], how come state education is so expensive in Washington?”*

### **Focus Group (Olympia)**

Olympians gave much credit to the way the Department of Natural Resources was handling things. Instead of discussing which of the roles DNR should be playing, focus group participants used the time to

comment on how well the agency was doing. They felt agency management was doing well when it came to forest management and salmon protection, although there were limits on how much a new administration could actually do. Most believed nothing much was 'going on' with DNR. Olympians typically answered with 'resolution' statements, which suggest they don't feel there are any pressing environmental issues – they express trust in the agency's leadership to make the right choices.

*"There's nothing much going on. They're doing pretty well."*

### **Overall**

Across the board, respondents felt that 'striking a balance' was the most important key phrase to emphasize. For the most part, they thought that things were moving in the right direction and that the state's natural resources were in good hands. They wanted to continue that trend far into the future so that the next generation would also have the opportunity to make the same decisions.

To that end, respondents felt the Department of Natural Resources should pursue a low risk strategy for timber harvesting. Overall, respondents did not necessarily feel that state government should intervene aggressively in reformulating radical new policies. They felt comfortable in making small changes and taking the baby steps required to tweak management practices – not to overhaul the entire system.

Even the most politically-cynical of the three groups, Vancouver, was willing to work with Department of Natural Resources officials to deal with timber harvesting issues. Overall, DNR received very high marks on this question, in terms of fulfilling many of these duties.

## **Balancing Responsibilities: Trusts vs. Recreation vs. Environment**

*(Note: Due to changes in the protocol and handouts from the Kirkland group, we have adjusted the tabulations to more accurately fit the focus group responses.)*

7.

|  |  |
|--|--|
| I believe timber harvesting can be done responsibly, benefiting the people of Washington by providing approximately one-third of school construction costs and still can promote healthy ecosystems. | I believe we cannot simultaneously provide significant funding for school construction through timber harvests and still protect healthy ecosystems. |
|--|--|

1                      2                      3                      4                      5

| <i>Question #7</i> | <i>1</i> | <i>2</i> | <i>3</i> | <i>4</i> | <i>5</i> | <i>N/A</i> |
|--------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|------------|
| Kirkland           | 2        | 6        | 1        | 1        | 1        | 1          |
| Vancouver          | 1        | 6        | 3        | 1        | 1        |            |
| Olympia            | 3        | 3        |          | 3        |          |            |
| Total              | 6        | 15       | 4        | 5        | 2        | 1          |

### **Focus Group (Kirkland)**

The Kirkland focus group overwhelmingly felt timber harvests could be done responsibly and still provide enough revenue for one-third of school construction costs. Some respondents expressed confusion over the question; they did not understand the linkage between harvest sales and school construction funding. When forced to come to grips with this knowledge, the idea of funding school construction with timber sales was not well received. Respondents often spoke about finding other ways to fund these projects. The high level of 'ambivalence' statements clearly suggests Kirklanders need more information about this particular topic.

*"I just don't believe natural resources and funding for schools are a match."*

### **Focus Group (Vancouver)**

This group skewed strongly towards responsible harvest management. They firmly believed that it would be possible to harvest timber as well as pay for school construction. They did not believe it was an either-or proposition. As we will note several times in the report, Vancouverites

keyed onto the term “responsible” and responded extremely favorably to it. Moreover, they did not necessarily believe that harvests on private lands were better managed than on state-owned land.

*“If it’s turned over to a private company, they will mis-harvest it.”*

### Focus Group (Olympia)

Although the majority of Olympians felt that timber harvests could be done responsibly, there were a few outspoken folks who were more pessimistic about the ability of the government to balance both priorities. Olympians were less surprised about the linking between schools and trees, and for some, seemed to already have discounted it as an inadequate method to fund construction.

*“I believe timber industry has become quite a science, people who manage our forests are professional, they work through universities and other agencies, things that happened in my lifetime that I've seen that allow for healthier ecosystems and sustainable harvests.”*

### Overall

The data indicates that a strong majority of respondents leaned towards the optimistic viewpoint that timber harvesting can be done responsibly and still provide enough revenue for one-third of school construction costs. Coupled with the knowledge that most focus group participants liked the idea of ‘striking a balance’ as a catchphrase, suggests people are willing to work towards a compromise on this issue.

8.

|   |   |
|---|---|
| I believe that nature has survived without us, and nature manages better than people; we should be passive stewards of our forests. | I believe interaction between people and nature is inevitable and unavoidable in managing our forest. We should be active stewards of our forests and make forests more healthy and productive. |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>  |
| <b>3</b>  | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>5</b>  |   |

| <b>Question #8</b> | <b>1</b> | <b>2</b> | <b>3</b> | <b>4</b> | <b>5</b> | <b>N/A</b> |
|--------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|------------|
| Kirkland           |          |          | 2        | 6        | 4        |            |
| Vancouver          | 1        | 1        | 2        | 4        | 4        |            |
| Olympia            |          |          |          | 5        | 4        |            |
| Total              | 1        | 1        | 4        | 15       | 12       |            |

**Focus Group (Kirkland)**

What we find is that Kirklanders strongly support the idea of managed natural resources and managed forests. They were concerned about being able to find the right balance between just protecting the forests and 'vigorous advocacy' of the forests.

*"I just think people and nature can find a balance, we can find it again."*

**Focus Group (Vancouver)**

Like the Kirkland group, Vancouverites strongly supported the idea of managed natural resources. They did not think that passive stewardship would be flexible enough to allow for the rapid changes in population growth.

*"There are too many people in the world to simply ignore the forests than to let it go natural."*

**Focus Group (Olympia)**

Participants strongly felt that state government had a role in actively managing the state's natural resources. For them, the stakes were too high to let Mother Nature handle herself and only active stewardship would be sufficient to strike the balance between human consumption and environmental protection. They believe that forest management has proceeded so far as a science that it is our responsibility to oversee the management of all forests.

*"It goes beyond what it can control, a certain area is clearcut to prevent crowning from forest fires. Fires are occasionally healthy to encourage soils, seeds are broadcast over a wide range of land."*

**Overall**

Respondents, regardless of demographic or locale, strongly felt that we should be active stewards of our forests and natural resources. Supporters of active stewardship outvoted their opponents by a margin of 27-2, indicating extremely strong sentiment towards having DNR continue in its present form.

**9.**

|  |   |
|--|---|
| I believe we should limit state harvest activity – in part to lead the way for others, in part to compensate for others. And, it's the right thing to do, even if we are among the few governments doing so. | I believe timber harvesting is done more responsibly here than in most other parts of the world. We should harvest here rather than import wood from other places where there may be more harmful environmental impact. |
|--|---|

**1                      2                      3                      4                      5**

| <i>Question #9</i> | <i>1</i> | <i>2</i> | <i>3</i> | <i>4</i> | <i>5</i> | <i>N/A</i> |
|--------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|------------|
| Kirkland           |          | 3        | 6        | 3        |          |            |
| Vancouver          | 1        | 2        | 4        | 3        | 2        |            |
| Olympia            | 1        | 1        |          | 4        | 3        |            |
| Total              | 2        | 6        | 10       | 10       | 5        |            |

**Focus Group (Kirkland)**

The data indicates that Kirklanders displayed a great deal of ambivalence about this question. Typically, residents who live east of Lake Washington tend to lean towards supporting more pro free-trade, but as the data indicates – not strong enough to outweigh those who are interested in more local production of timber. The three respondents who felt timber harvesting should be done at home were also the most vocal in answering the question.

*"I'd rather see forests cycled here and replanted, then the Brazilian Rain Forest cut down."*

**Focus Group (Vancouver)**

Perhaps the results should not be surprising for Vancouver, which has the third largest port in the State of Washington, that Vancouverites should take a global perspective. However, its strong blue-collar roots still appear to predominate in the answers – Vancouverites tended to slightly favor harvesting at home.

*"I get irritated when I see timber from Mexico and Canada. We're already spending beaucoup money for gas, we can be getting logs from here."*

**Focus Group (Olympia)**

Olympians greatly favored more timber harvests at home and limiting exposure to trade abroad. The political lean of the South Puget Sound group, which tends to skew towards more left-leaning and union-heavy voters, believes that forestry jobs are important for the economy of the

state. The Olympia group was also greener – they felt that Washington State has the least environmentally damaging forestry practices in the world and that it would be disastrous if foreign countries created ecological disasters to feed US demand for wood imports.

*“I think there are forests who should be actively managed, such as wildlife, should be forests that should be left alone - let nature do what it will.”*

### Overall

There was quite a bit of ambivalence over this question, indicating participants were open to more information. By a margin of 15-8, people felt that timber harvesting and sales should be done locally, and less emphasis on international and interstate trade. Most respondents leaned towards protecting local interests, suggesting economic concerns were very important factors.

### 10.

|   |  |
|---|--|
| I believe timber harvesting to benefit schools, local government and others is a priority even if there is a risk that our harvesting will cause some disruption to our wildlife. | I believe we should not be harvesting anywhere that forces wildlife to move out of a region where they traditionally have existed. |
| 1   | 2  |
| 3   | 4  |
| 5   | 5  |

| Question #10 | 1 | 2 | 3  | 4  | 5 | N/A |
|--------------|---|---|----|----|---|-----|
| Kirkland     |   | 3 | 5  | 2  | 1 | 1   |
| Vancouver    |   | 3 | 4  | 5  |   |     |
| Olympia      | 1 | 1 | 1  | 3  | 3 |     |
| Total        | 1 | 7 | 10 | 10 | 4 | 1   |

### Focus Group (Kirkland)

Kirklanders were evenly split between wanting to benefit schools and being concerned about the risk to moving wildlife from their traditional habitat. Some felt there was already too much disruption already, and that additional harvesting to fund schools should not greatly exacerbate the problem.

*“I’m all for schools and everything, but why harvest somewhere when we have to move out the wildlife?”*



**Focus Group (Vancouver)**

Vancouverites, for the most part, were not willing to commit to either extreme viewpoint on this issue. There was a sense of exhaustion in this group when it came to dealing with controversial practices such as wildlife relocation. After all, the Portland and Vancouver areas were well-familiar with the Spotted Owl and Salmon battles of recent years. It could very well be that residents in the area have had enough controversial environment/development battles to last a while. When questioned with generalities, respondents often fell back into their political corners, but were willing to compromise when pressed.

*“I’m really for the wildlife. There has to be some way of working it out.”*

**Focus Group (Olympia)**

Olympians lean green in this statement. They generally feel that we should not be harvesting in areas that force wildlife to move out of their traditional habitat. The Olympia group expressed many ‘loss of value’ comments, suggesting that they feel pessimistic about the deteriorating condition of natural animal habitats.

*“Lumber is no longer like it was 20 years ago, we have the crappy lumber, we’re sending all of our fine lumber overseas.”*

**Overall**

By a margin of 14-8, those who wanted to protect traditional habitats outnumbered those who believed schools were more important. Again, there was a large contingent of people who did not wish to commit to one statement or the other. With such a large number of undecided respondents, the data suggests that people are open to more information and need additional knowledge before they form a political opinion.

11.

|  |  |   |   |   |
|--|--|---|---|---|
| <p>I believe timber harvesting makes sense: the risk of environmental damage from harvests is low. I believe that we’re going to use more lumber and paper products in the future.</p> | <p>I believe timber harvesting should be limited. I’m willing to do more to reduce the amount of paper and lumber I use. For example, I would consider living in a smaller house the next time I move.</p> |   |   |   |
| 1  | 2  | 3 | 4 | 5 |

| <i>Question #11</i> | <i>1</i> | <i>2</i> | <i>3</i> | <i>4</i> | <i>5</i> | <i>N/A</i> |
|---------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|------------|
| Kirkland            | 1        | 4        | 2        | 4        | 1        |            |
| Vancouver           |          | 4        | 1        | 5        | 2        |            |
| Olympia             | 1        |          |          | 5        | 3        |            |
| Total               | 2        | 8        | 3        | 14       | 6        |            |

### **Focus Group (Kirkland)**

A surprising number of Kirklanders did not feel that the risks of timber harvesting were great enough to limit personal consumption of paper products. Although the terms 'recycling' and 'conservation' ranked very highly with this group, as it did with the other focus groups, making a commitment to higher rates of conservation was difficult.

Kirklanders have a very great positive belief in the ability of technology to reduce the amount of paper consumption. In particular, they noted several technological advances which would ultimately reduce the amount of wood consumption: particle boards, laminate wood, cotton trees, and soybeans used to make plastic.

The high degree of 'steps'-related answers indicate that many respondents felt wood consumption was already going down, or that technologies have been developed which could positively alter the amount of wood usage. For them, the issue became how to apply that know-how more effectively.

*"The technology is there - we can come up with creative ways to use it."*

*"I don't think it's about housing, I think it's the paper, just be aware of how you're using your resources."*

### **Focus Group (Vancouver)**

The Vancouver group loved to talk about recycling. They cited the local recycling program as an extremely successful venture and gave high marks to themselves as frequent recyclers. Consequently, when it came to timber harvesting, the term 'renewable' was still a hot buzzword for the group and they compared timber harvesting with the positive aspects of recycling.

*"I've been recycling since it started - I'm a big believer in recycling. It has to make sense. Have to use timber, have to use resources."*

**Focus Group (Olympia)**

Olympians strongly felt that timber harvesting should be reduced and virtually all of the respondents would take on specific and aggressive conservation measures to reduce their consumption.

*"I've got three children and grandchildren, yes I'm going to say yes to that."*

**Overall**

There were a surprising number of participants who stated they were willing to commit themselves to lowering their own levels of timber consumption. By a margin of 20-10, respondents said they would decrease their own usage, perhaps even considering moving into a smaller house. However, as previous focus groups have indicated, getting a person to say what he/she will do is easier than actually changing behavior patterns.

**12.**

|  |   |
|--|---|
| I believe the increasing number of hikers, bikers, snowmobilers and others visiting state lands is creating significant wear and tear on trails, forests, streams, and wildlife. | I believe we can enjoy many types of recreation on state lands without causing major or even minor negative environmental impacts to wildlife, streams or trails. |
|--|---|

**1                      2                      3                      4                      5**

| <i>Question #12</i> | <i>1</i> | <i>2</i> | <i>3</i> | <i>4</i> | <i>5</i> | <i>N/A</i> |
|---------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|------------|
| Kirkland            |          | 4        | 2        | 5        | 1        |            |
| Vancouver           | 1        | 3        | 1        | 3        | 3        |            |
| Olympia             | 1        | 3        |          | 2        | 3        |            |
| Total               | 2        | 10       | 3        | 10       | 7        |            |

**Focus Group (Kirkland)**

People tended to have strong feelings about this question, and most of the answers respondents suggested exhibited 'loss of value' characteristics. Rather than blaming state government or officials, respondents tended to blame the growing number of users of trails for the deterioration and impact on the environment. There were two respondents, however, who suggested 'blocking' statements, who felt that the government's policy on parks/trails spending was not sufficient to maintain the upkeep.

*"Yellowstone has been suffering a lot of damage from winter snowmobiles."*

**Focus Group (Vancouver)**

Similar to the Kirkland group, the Vancouver group expressed strong feelings about this question. The group was split between those who felt hikers, snowmobilers, and bikers could create significant wear and tear on trails – and those who didn't. Many believed that individual responsibility had to be taken to ensure that deterioration to recreation grounds could be minimized. It was the personal responsibility of the hiker or snowmobiler to make sure they did not impact the environment.

*“We can still use resources and take care of them at the same time.”*

**Focus Group (Olympia)**

Olympians were split on this issue, but they tended to believe that recreation was possible without damaging the environment. Although a large number believed that invasive recreational activities like snowmobiling did significant damage to trails and forests, many downplayed the extent of the damage.

*“Maybe we should have areas for motorcycles and motorized vehicles, find areas where motorcycles have little impact.”*

**Overall**

This is a litmus test question. People tended to have very strong opinions either way regarding whether or not they thought hikers and snowmobilers did too much damage to the environment. Although there was a margin of 17-12 in favor of those believing we could enjoy recreation without causing great damage to the land, there was still considerable concern over the opposite statement. As a 'blame' type of question, it is not entirely surprising that respondents would formulate more passionate answers.

**13.**

|  |  |   |   |   |
|--|--|---|---|---|
| I believe people in Washington have a right to enjoy their state lands and should have more access to hike, snowmobile, paraglide and ride off-road vehicles in state forests and on state land. | I believe we should allow recreation only if it has little adverse environmental impact. |   |   |   |
| 1  | 2  | 3 | 4 | 5 |

| <i>Question #13</i> | <i>1</i> | <i>2</i> | <i>3</i> | <i>4</i> | <i>5</i> | <i>N/A</i> |
|---------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|------------|
| Kirkland            |          | 1        | 8        | 2        | 2        |            |
| Vancouver           | 1        | 2        | 4        | 3        | 2        |            |
| Olympia             | 3        | 2        |          | 1        | 3        |            |
| Total               | 4        | 5        | 12       | 6        | 7        |            |

### **Focus Group (Kirkland)**

Respondents were ambivalent about answering this question. Although some felt they indeed had a right to enjoy Washington State lands, there were a sizable proportion of individuals who believed that recreation with little or no adverse impact should be allowed. Respondents seemed to be unclear about the comparison. Whether this meant they did not know what 'more access' entailed or what the ranges of 'environmental impacts' were, respondents wanted a tighter definition of the choices.

*"Step on a twig, you got environmental impact."*

### **Focus Group (Vancouver)**

Again, some Vancouverites keyed on the notion of individual responsibility and suggested that people had the right to enjoy recreational activities on state lands, even if they had environmental impacts, if there was a degree of responsibility taken by the individual. However, there were a number of respondents who felt that these activities should only be allowed if there were little or no adverse impacts.

*"I think we can be out in the forest and act responsibly."*

### **Focus Group (Olympia)**

Olympians were polarized on this issue. Half felt that people had the right to enjoy their state lands, even if it meant using motorized sporting equipment. Others felt that no recreational activities should take place if it has adverse environmental impact.

*"Why doesn't DNR consider privatizing recreation opportunities and close some state lands to machines, like ATV parks – I'm not sure there's a right to go snowmobiling on state lands."*

### **Overall**

In general, respondents did not want to commit either way on this question. With a slight 13-9 advantage, people tended towards wanting to

limit damaging recreational activities. This question meshes well with the previous one, suggesting that there are a lot of people who enjoy the outdoors and feel that individual responsibility is as at least as important as government regulations in maintaining Pacific Northwest recreation grounds.

**14.**

|   |   |
|---|---|
| I believe recreation can be done responsibly and with little environmental impact. I want our state lands to continue to be available for a variety of types of recreation. | I believe recreation could have an adverse environmental impact on our state lands. I think limits should be placed on where we can go and what we can do to limit environmental impacts. |
|---|---|

1                      2                      3                      4                      5

| <i>Question #14</i> | <i>1</i> | <i>2</i> | <i>3</i> | <i>4</i> | <i>5</i> | <i>N/A</i> |
|---------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|------------|
| Kirkland            | 1        | 2        | 3        | 3        | 2        | 1          |
| Vancouver           | 3        | 4        | 2        | 3        |          |            |
| Olympia             | 2        | 2        | 1        | 3        | 1        |            |
| Total               | 6        | 8        | 6        | 9        | 3        | 1          |

**Focus Group (Kirkland)**

Kirklanders were again split on this question. While many felt recreation could be done responsibly, they were also supportive of limiting activities which could have harmful environmental impacts. They expressed many 'need for value' statements, which indicate the respondents were looking for DNR or another state agency to clearly lay out restricted and unrestricted activities on particular state lands.

*"It's a tough one, that word 'responsible' says a lot. . .to me that means there's some limits"*

**Focus Group (Vancouver)**

While this question is extremely similar to the previous question, Vancouverites balked at the notion that the state would set limits and regulations on activities. When introduced to a phrase with empowering words such as "allowed," Vancouverites appear to be much more likely to support the statement. Alternately, when faced with restrictive phrases like "limit", they expressed themselves through more "blocking" statements.

*"I agree with the statement, recreation can be done responsibly. Some areas should be set aside for less destructive activities."*

### Focus Group (Olympia)

Similar to the last question, Olympians were split on the issue. Many felt stronger limitations should be placed on the types of recreational activities that could happen on state lands.

*"There's always going to be areas that are near population. There are areas in the deep forest, which always have people who want to leave no trace."*

### Overall

People tended to be all over the picture on this question, not providing a clear picture of public opinion on the issue. By a margin of 14-12, respondents believed that recreation could still be done with minimal impact. To this point, all three recreation value statements have yielded mixed results, indicating that people have a diversity of opinions on the topic. The large number of undecided respondents also indicates they are open to more information from the Department of Natural Resources.

### 15.

|  |  |
|--|--|
| I believe school overcrowding is serious. One third of school construction costs comes from state land trusts set aside for timber harvesting. Funding school construction is to the community – even if harvest areas are visible and unattractive. | I believe timber harvests that are visible to the community are unattractive and shouldn't occur even if it means reducing funds available for schools in the community. |
|--|--|

**1                      2                      3                      4                      5**

| <i>Question #15</i> | <i>1</i> | <i>2</i> | <i>3</i> | <i>4</i> | <i>5</i> | <i>N/A</i> |
|---------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|------------|
| Kirkland            |          | 5        | 6        | 1        |          |            |
| Vancouver           |          | 4        | 5        | 2        | 1        |            |
| Olympia             | 1        | 4        |          | 4        |          |            |
| Total               | 1        | 13       | 11       | 7        | 1        |            |

### Focus Group (Kirkland)

In general, Kirklanders tended to believe that school overcrowding was a serious issue and leaned heavily towards the construction of new schools, despite the risks of creating unattractive clearcuts. Nevertheless, a large

number of people were undecided, suggesting that the commitment to schools did not necessarily trump the needs of the environment.

*“I’m big on the school thing, there’s always going to be controversy about something.”*

**Focus Group (Vancouver)**

Vancouverites were decidedly split on this issue, but tended to lean towards more school construction. They were adverse to visible clearcuts, enough to indicate there would be a significant portion of respondents who would oppose them – even in the face of lost revenue for building schools.

*“I don’t like to see the money going to schools. I think they should be more responsible. The whole administration of the school system needs to be changed.”*

**Focus Group (Olympia)**

Once again, Olympians tended to diverge on opinion. While they believe school overcrowding is serious, many did not want to have unattractive clearcuts within viewable distance of the community.

*“See what causes more erosion, the hiking thing I don’t have a problem – even biking, but four-wheelers and ATV’s. . . yes I have a problem.”*

**Overall**

Most respondents generally believed that school overcrowding was serious. By a margin of 14-8, people thought that timber should be harvested for school construction, even though it may be visible from the community. Nevertheless, the margin is not wide enough to indicate that people definitively favored schools over aesthetically-pleasing forests; indeed, protecting the environment still ranked as an extremely important value to respondents.

**16.**

|   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| <p>I believe we should get the best value from timber harvests today even if it means we limit future revenues.</p> | <p>I believe there may be opportunities to earn revenue from timber in other ways in the future and we should not foreclose options even if it means we get less now or that the future revenues never materialize.</p> |   |   |   |
| 1   | 2   | 3 | 4 | 5 |



| <b>Question #16</b> | <b>1</b> | <b>2</b> | <b>3</b> | <b>4</b> | <b>5</b> | <b>N/A</b> |
|---------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|------------|
| Kirkland            |          | 1        | 7        | 3        | 1        |            |
| Vancouver           |          | 1        | 2        | 7        | 2        |            |
| Olympia             |          |          |          | 7        | 2        |            |
| Total               |          | 2        | 9        | 17       | 5        |            |

### **Focus Group (Kirkland)**

The Kirkland group was generally open-minded and undecided. For many of them, however, the idea of foreclosing future options was an untenable position. They did not want to close down entire avenues of potential revenue-producing assets for short-term gain. Although most put down 'neutral' as their preferred position on this issue, some respondents argued for taking the short-term profit.

*"You should never limit future options to earn revenue."*

### **Focus Group (Vancouver)**

Vancouverites were much more decisive about this topic. They were clear about not wanting to see long-term assets sacrificed for short-term gain. They felt that the value of the timber was critical to maintain for future generations and that by taking it away now, could cost the state untold amounts of potential new revenue.

*"You've got to leave all the possibilities there. Leave something for the future."*

### **Focus Group (Olympia)**

Everyone in the Olympia group agreed that short-term benefits should not outweigh long-term possibilities of greater gain. Every respondent believed that holding onto timber assets was extremely important and should not be sacrificed for immediate gains.

*"Education money for schools is dismal, if we take back money on trust lands, we won't have any money left."*

### **Overall**

By far the most-lopsided value preference, respondents believed by a whopping margin of 22-2 that the Department of Natural Resources needed to conserve its forest assets and save them for a later date. At the root of the issue was the belief that forest assets needed to be

safeguarded for future generations and most respondents considered forests an investment for the long-term future.

**17.**

|  |   |
|--|---|
| I believe timber harvesting needs to be reasonable but I accept that some harvesting may be done in visible areas. I also don't mind if areas near harvests have to be closed to recreation from time to time. | I believe timber harvesting should be limited – even if it limits recreation as well. And, I prefer we find other sources of funding for school construction. |
|--|---|

**1                      2                      3                      4                      5**

| <i>Question #17</i> | <i>1</i> | <i>2</i> | <i>3</i> | <i>4</i> | <i>5</i> | <i>N/A</i> |
|---------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|------------|
| Kirkland            | 3        | 5        | 3        | 1        |          |            |
| Vancouver           |          | 6        | 2        | 2        | 2        |            |
| Olympia             | 1        | 4        |          | 4        |          |            |
| Total               | 4        | 15       | 5        | 7        | 2        |            |

**Focus Group (Kirkland)**

Respondents came back again to the concept of a responsible balance. Most of them favored at least some kind of limited harvesting if it meant the money was going to support education. They did not feel the environmental damage during some timber harvesting was enough to offset the gains of revenue for schools. When set against the backdrop of recreation grounds, they were willing to sacrifice recreational areas for the benefit of schools.

*“There are a lot of qualifiers. It seems like a very moderate proposal. . .it appears to allow strike a balance between human/environmental needs.”*

**Focus Group (Vancouver)**

Similar to their Kirkland counterparts, the group believed there was a reasonable and acceptable level of harvesting which can occur near recreation areas. Some dissenters felt we needed to find other sources of school construction, however.

*“I think 'reasonable' is 'acceptable' when it comes to harvesting. I'm not sitting, looking out my window at clearcuts. I'm at work.”*

**Focus Group (Olympia)**

Olympians were again split on this issue, however they leaned slightly towards eliminating certain recreational areas if the timber there could be harvested for school construction.

*“Education money for schools is dismal, if we take back money on trust lands, we won't have any money left.”*

**Overall**

Despite the respondents' earlier desire for aesthetically-pleasing woodlands, when faced with a more moderate-sounding plan that included terms such as 'reasonable' and 'responsible', they moved towards protecting school construction by a margin of 19-9. This question tested the pitch of the message, and as the data indicates, the three R's of: 'responsible', 'reasonable' and 'renewable' were surefire winners with the participants.

**Closing/Communications****18.**

**In closing, what would you say is the important issue in resource management that faces the Department of Natural Resources today? Do you have any suggestions about how DNR could resolve that issue?**

One of the critical resource management issues facing DNR today is how to link school construction with timber harvests in the public eye. Nearly all of the respondents in all the focus groups had questions regarding the amount of money going from timber sales into school construction, how that mechanism works and is financed, and who ultimately is in control of those dollars.

**19.**

**Is there anything else you'd like to say about the Department of Natural Resources? Is there anything else on your mind?**

Some respondents from the Olympia focus group suggested that a state income tax be considered as a better revenue model for funding school construction, but an equal number of state income tax opponents were vocal in dismissing the idea.

## Appendix I. Tables

### Perceptions of the Department of Natural Resources

#### Question #7:

Take a look at the following list, which of the following things would you rate is the most important function of DNR?

| <i>Role of DNR</i>                   | <i>Kirkland</i> | <i>Vancouver</i> | <i>Olympia</i> | <i>Total</i> |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------|------------------|----------------|--------------|
| Maintain Low Risk to Environment     | 2               | 1                |                | 3            |
| Strike a Balance: Enviro/Development | 8               | 7                | 7              | 22           |
| Do What Intended, Don't Overstep     |                 |                  |                |              |
| Help Use/Protect Our Forests         | 1               | 1                |                | 2            |
| Lead As Good Example                 |                 |                  |                |              |
| Further Enviro. Research             |                 |                  | 1              | 1            |
| Make Money for Schools               |                 |                  |                |              |
| Stop the Recession                   |                 |                  |                |              |
| Safeguard Resources                  | 1               | 3                | 2              | 6            |
| Many Concurrent Uses                 |                 |                  |                |              |

## **Balancing Responsibilities: Trusts vs. Recreation vs. Environment**

### ***Question #7:***

|  |  |
|--|--|
| I believe timber harvesting can be done responsibly, benefiting the people of Washington by providing approximately one-third of school construction costs and still can promote healthy ecosystems. | I believe we cannot simultaneously provide significant funding for school construction through timber harvests and still protect healthy ecosystems. |
|--|--|

| <b><i>Question #7</i></b> | <b><i>1</i></b> | <b><i>2</i></b> | <b><i>3</i></b> | <b><i>4</i></b> | <b><i>5</i></b> | <b><i>N/A</i></b> |
|---------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| Kirkland                  | 2               | 6               | 1               | 1               | 1               | 1                 |
| Vancouver                 | 1               | 6               | 3               | 1               | 1               |                   |
| Olympia                   | 3               | 3               |                 | 3               |                 |                   |
| Total                     | 6               | 15              | 4               | 5               | 2               | 1                 |

### ***Question #8:***

|   |   |
|---|---|
| I believe that nature has survived without us, and nature manages better than people; we should be passive stewards of our forests. | I believe interaction between people and nature is inevitable and unavoidable in managing our forest. We should be active stewards of our forests and make forests more healthy and productive. |
|---|---|

| <b><i>Question #8</i></b> | <b><i>1</i></b> | <b><i>2</i></b> | <b><i>3</i></b> | <b><i>4</i></b> | <b><i>5</i></b> | <b><i>N/A</i></b> |
|---------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| Kirkland                  |                 |                 | 2               | 6               | 4               |                   |
| Vancouver                 | 1               | 1               | 2               | 4               | 4               |                   |
| Olympia                   |                 |                 |                 | 5               | 4               |                   |
| Total                     | 1               | 1               | 4               | 15              | 12              |                   |

### ***Question #9:***

|  |   |
|--|---|
| I believe we should limit state harvest activity – in part to lead the way for others, in part to compensate for others. And, it's the right thing to do, even if we are among the few governments doing so. | I believe timber harvesting is done more responsibly here than in most other parts of the world. We should harvest here rather than import wood from other places where there may be more harmful environmental impact. |
|--|---|

| <b>Question #9</b> | <b>1</b> | <b>2</b> | <b>3</b> | <b>4</b> | <b>5</b> | <b>N/A</b> |
|--------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|------------|
| Kirkland           |          | 3        | 6        | 3        |          |            |
| Vancouver          | 1        | 2        | 4        | 3        | 2        |            |
| Olympia            | 1        | 1        |          | 4        | 3        |            |
| Total              | 2        | 6        | 10       | 10       | 5        |            |

**Question #10:**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| I believe timber harvesting to benefit schools, local government and others is a priority even if there is a risk that our harvesting will cause some disruption to our wildlife. | I believe we should not be harvesting anywhere that forces wildlife to move out of a region where they traditionally have existed. |
|---|--|

| <b>Question #10</b> | <b>1</b> | <b>2</b> | <b>3</b> | <b>4</b> | <b>5</b> | <b>N/A</b> |
|---------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|------------|
| Kirkland            |          | 3        | 5        | 2        | 1        | 1          |
| Vancouver           |          | 3        | 4        | 5        |          |            |
| Olympia             | 1        | 1        | 1        | 3        | 3        |            |
| Total               | 1        | 7        | 10       | 10       | 4        | 1          |

**Question #11:**

|   |   |
|---|---|
| I believe timber harvesting makes sense: the risk of environmental damage from harvests is low. I believe that we're going to use more lumber and paper products in the future. | I believe timber harvesting should be limited. I'm willing to do more to reduce the amount of paper and lumber I use. For example, I would consider living in a smaller house the next time I move. |
|---|---|

| <b>Question #11</b> | <b>1</b> | <b>2</b> | <b>3</b> | <b>4</b> | <b>5</b> | <b>N/A</b> |
|---------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|------------|
| Kirkland            | 1        | 4        | 2        | 4        | 1        |            |
| Vancouver           |          | 4        | 1        | 5        | 2        |            |
| Olympia             | 1        |          |          | 5        | 3        |            |
| Total               | 2        | 8        | 3        | 14       | 6        |            |

**Question #12:**

|  |   |
|--|---|
| I believe the increasing number of hikers, bikers, snowmobilers and others visiting state lands is creating significant wear and tear on trails, forests, streams, and wildlife. | I believe we can enjoy many types of recreation on state lands without causing major or even minor negative environmental impacts to wildlife, streams or trails. |
|--|---|

| <b>Question #12</b> | <b>1</b> | <b>2</b> | <b>3</b> | <b>4</b> | <b>5</b> | <b>N/A</b> |
|---------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|------------|
| Kirkland            |          | 4        | 2        | 5        | 1        |            |
| Vancouver           | 1        | 3        | 1        | 3        | 3        |            |
| Olympia             | 1        | 3        |          | 2        | 3        |            |
| Total               | 2        | 10       | 3        | 10       | 7        |            |

**Question #13:**

|  |  |
|--|--|
| I believe people in Washington have a right to enjoy their state lands and should have more access to hike, snowmobile, paraglide and ride off-road vehicles in state forests and on state land. | I believe we should allow recreation only if it has little adverse environmental impact. |
|--|--|

| <b>Question #13</b> | <b>1</b> | <b>2</b> | <b>3</b> | <b>4</b> | <b>5</b> | <b>N/A</b> |
|---------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|------------|
| Kirkland            |          | 1        | 8        | 2        | 2        |            |
| Vancouver           | 1        | 2        | 4        | 3        | 2        |            |
| Olympia             | 3        | 2        |          | 1        | 3        |            |
| Total               | 4        | 5        | 12       | 6        | 7        |            |

**Question #14:**

|   |   |
|---|---|
| I believe recreation can be done responsibly and with little environmental impact. I want our state lands to continue to be available for a variety of types of recreation. | I believe recreation could have an adverse environmental impact on our state lands. I think limits should be placed on where we can go and what we can do to limit environmental impacts. |
|---|---|

| <i>Question #14</i> | <i>1</i> | <i>2</i> | <i>3</i> | <i>4</i> | <i>5</i> | <i>N/A</i> |
|---------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|------------|
| Kirkland            | 1        | 2        | 3        | 3        | 2        | 1          |
| Vancouver           | 3        | 4        | 2        | 3        |          |            |
| Olympia             | 2        | 2        | 1        | 3        | 1        |            |
| Total               | 6        | 8        | 6        | 9        | 3        | 1          |

**Question #15:**

|  |  |
|--|--|
| I believe school overcrowding is serious. One third of school construction costs comes from state land trusts set aside for timber harvesting. Funding school construction is to the community – even if harvest areas are visible and unattractive. | I believe timber harvests that are visible to the community are unattractive and shouldn't occur even if it means reducing funds available for schools in the community. |
|--|--|

| <i>Question #15</i> | <i>1</i> | <i>2</i> | <i>3</i> | <i>4</i> | <i>5</i> | <i>N/A</i> |
|---------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|------------|
| Kirkland            |          | 5        | 6        | 1        |          |            |
| Vancouver           |          | 4        | 5        | 2        | 1        |            |
| Olympia             | 1        | 4        |          | 4        |          |            |
| Total               | 1        | 13       | 11       | 7        | 1        |            |

**Question #16:**

|  |  |
|--|--|
| I believe we should get the best value from timber harvests today even if it means we limit future revenues. | I believe there may be opportunities to earn revenue from timber in other ways in the future and we should not foreclose options even if it means we get less now or that the future revenues never materialize. |
|--|--|

| <i>Question #16</i> | <i>1</i> | <i>2</i> | <i>3</i> | <i>4</i> | <i>5</i> | <i>N/A</i> |
|---------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|------------|
| Kirkland            |          | 1        | 7        | 3        | 1        |            |
| Vancouver           |          | 1        | 2        | 7        | 2        |            |
| Olympia             |          |          |          | 7        | 2        |            |
| Total               |          | 2        | 9        | 17       | 5        |            |



**Question #17:**

|  |   |
|--|---|
| I believe timber harvesting needs to be reasonable but I accept that some harvesting may be done in visible areas. I also don't mind if areas near harvests have to be closed to recreation from time to time. | I believe timber harvesting should be limited – even if it limits recreation as well. And, I prefer we find other sources of funding for school construction. |
|--|---|

| <b>Question #17</b> | <b>1</b> | <b>2</b> | <b>3</b> | <b>4</b> | <b>5</b> | <b>N/A</b> |
|---------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|------------|
| Kirkland            | 3        | 5        | 3        | 1        |          |            |
| Vancouver           |          | 6        | 2        | 2        | 2        |            |
| Olympia             | 1        | 4        |          | 4        |          |            |
| Total               | 4        | 15       | 5        | 7        | 2        |            |