



fpOnline Q3 2024 Baseline User Experience & Partner Survey Sept - Oct, 2024

fpOnline quarterly survey - Sept - Oct (Q3 2024)

- Total n=147
- Halcyon Northwest prepared the survey and analyzed the results
- Collected Sept 30 - Oct 18, 2024
- Heat maps represent the percentage of people who agreed or strongly agreed with each statement



All Responses- Opening Questions

** The other columns do not add up to 147 because some respondents completed the “overall” questions, but did not complete the group questions, and some respondent groups were too small to include.*

Overall Questions	All Responses	FP Permit Specialists	FP Foresters	FP Managers	Large Landowner Reps	Forestry Consultants	Small Forest Land-owners	State Agency Reviewers	Tribal Reviewers
The current FPA process is easy for me.	65%	80%	59%	67%	67%	71%	60%	40%	89%
The current FPA process is efficient.	43%	30%	53%	43%	45%	35%	60%	20%	56%
The current FPA process is consistent.	60%	40%	94%	57%	59%	47%	60%	50%	89%
The current FPA process is intuitive.	25%	10%	47%	24%	24%	29%	40%	10%	33%
The current FPA process works smoothly.	50%	50%	76%	43%	51%	53%	60%	20%	44%
The current FPA process helps me do my job effectively.	50%	60%	82%	48%	41%	41%	60%	30%	78%
I feel knowledgeable about how the current FPA process works.	79%	90%	88%	81%	84%	82%	80%	40%	67%
I know where to go for help when I have questions regarding the current FPA process.	89%	100%	94%	86%	100%	88%	80%	60%	89%
The mapping tools that DNR makes available are effective for the current process.	56%	70%	65%	62%	57%	53%	80%	20%	56%
The FPA instructions are easy to find.	65%	70%	53%	62%	76%	76%	80%	20%	78%
The FPA instructions are easy to understand.	52%	50%	41%	52%	57%	59%	80%	20%	78%
Number of respondents	147*	10	17	21	49	17	5	10	9



FP Permit Specialists - Overall

The current FPA process is easy for me	80%
The current FPA process is efficient	30%
The current FPA process is consistent	40%
The current FPA process is intuitive	10%
The current FPA process works smoothly	50%
The current FPA process helps me do my job effectively	60%
I feel knowledgeable about how the current FPA process works	90%
I know where to go for help when I have questions regarding the current FPA process	100%
The mapping tools that DNR makes available are effective for the current process	70%
The FPA instructions are easy to find.	70%
The FPA instructions are easy to understand.	50%

Total respondents = 10

Source: fpOnline Q3 2024 Baseline User Experience & Partner Survey, N=147, Sept 30 - Oct 18, 2024



FP Permit Specialists - Specific

The FPA office checklist is all-inclusive.	60%
The FPA office checklist is easy to complete.	70%
It is easy for me to review FPA(s)/WTMF(s)/ENF(s).	50%
It is easy for me to find the information that I am looking for in an FPA/WTMF/ENF.	30%
It is easy for me to edit enforcement forms.	30%
It is easy for me to notify ID team participants when requested by FP Forester/District Manager.	40%
It is easy for me to attach updated picture documentation to an FPA/WTMF/Enforcement form that was submitted in paper.	40%
It is easy for me to attach updated picture documentation to an FPA/WTMF/Enforcement form after it has been submitted.	30%
It is easy for me to document questions I have for the proponent.	40%

Total respondents = 10

Source: fpOnline Q3 2024 Baseline User Experience & Partner Survey, N=147, Sept 30 - Oct 18, 2024



FP Permit Specialists - Specific (continued)

It is easy for me to deliver questions I have for the proponent.	40%
It is easy for me to get responses from a proponent to my questions.	30%
It is easy for me to comment on FPA(s)/WTMF(s)/ENF(s) that have been submitted on paper.	20%
It is easy for me to add changed information to FPA(s)/WTMF(s)/ENF(s) that have been submitted on paper.	50%
It is easy for me to track FPA/WTMF/ENF due dates/workflow.	60%
It is easy for me to track enforcement follow-up work dates.	30%
It is easy for me to add notes of my review regarding an FPA/WTMF/ENF.	30%
It is easy for me to add external comments/complaints received regarding an FPA/WTMF/ENF.	30%
It easy for me to assign unique identifiers on FPAs/WTMFs/Enforcement documents.	50%

Total respondents = 10

Source: fpOnline Q3 2024 Baseline User Experience & Partner Survey, N=147, Sept 30 - Oct 18, 2024



FP Permit Specialists Open-Ended Responses

Note: 3 responded

“Tracking due dates and documenting comments, etc., are not difficult for me, but happen almost entirely outside of the FPARS/FPETS system, which is why I have provided the above responses re: FPARS. Additionally, some of my responses are "neutral" because, for instance, it is easy for me to find information in an FPA, it's possible (but not always easy) to find information in the WTM system, and it is usually difficult to find what I'm looking for when it comes to Enforcement Documents.”

“Stream Buffers are essential in entire the FPA process. These should be set distance layers that the users can turn on and off to create better maps.”

“Questions were difficult to answer truthfully; FPARS doesn't have any capabilities other than data collection and search.”



FP Foresters - Overall

The current FPA process is easy for me	59%
The current FPA process is efficient	53%
The current FPA process is consistent	94%
The current FPA process is intuitive	47%
The current FPA process works smoothly	76%
The current FPA process helps me do my job effectively	82%
I feel knowledgeable about how the current FPA process works	88%
I know where to go for help when I have questions regarding the current FPA process	94%
The mapping tools that DNR makes available are effective for the current process	65%
The FPA instructions are easy to find.	53%

Total respondents = 17



FP Foresters - Specific In the Field

It is easy for me to review FPA(s)/WTMF(s).	65%
It is easy for me to find the information that I am looking for in an FPA/WTMF.	53%
It is easy for me to create/fill out enforcement forms.	47%
It is easy for me to deliver enforcement forms to the landowner and/or operator.	47%
It is easy for me to attach picture documentation to an FPA/WTMF/Enforcement form.	47%
It is easy for me to document and deliver questions I have to the proponent.	71%
It is easy for me to get responses to my questions from a proponent.	47%
It is easy for me to comment, add conditions, approve/disapprove, and concur/non-concur to FPA(s)/WTMF(s).	76%
It is easy for me to track FPA/WTMF/ENF due dates/workflow.	59%
It is easy for me to track enforcement follow-up work dates.	41%
It is easy for me to add notes of my review regarding an FPA/WTMF/ENF document.	53%
It is easy for me to add comments/complaints received regarding an FPA/WTMF/ENF document during the review period.	53%
It is easy for me to assign unique identifiers on FPAs/WTMFs/Enforcement documents.	53%

Total respondents = 17



FP Foresters - Specific In the Office

It is easy for me to find the information that I am looking for in an FPA/WTMF.	82%
It is easy for me to create/fill out enforcement forms.	76%
It is easy for me to deliver enforcement forms to the landowner and/or operator.	53%
It is easy for me to attach picture documentation to an FPA/WTMF/Enforcement form.	53%
It is easy for me to find the information that I am looking for in an FPA/WTMF.	47%
It is easy for me to create/fill out enforcement forms.	71%
It is easy for me to deliver enforcement forms to the landowner and/or operator.	53%
It is easy for me to attach picture documentation to an FPA/WTMF/Enforcement form.	76%
It is easy for me to find the information that I am looking for in an FPA/WTMF.	71%
It is easy for me to track enforcement follow-up dates.	47%
It is easy for me to add notes of my review regarding an FPA/WTMF/ENF.	71%
It is easy for me to add comments/complaints received regarding an FPA/WTMF/ENF.	71%
It easy for me to assign unique identifiers on FPAs/WTMFs/Enforcement documents.	59%

Total respondents = 17



FP Foresters Open-Ended Responses

Note: 2 responded

“Documenting FPA reviews, compliance checks, and enforcement in survey 123 has been a major improvement for efficiency both in the office review and in the field, as is the associated mobile mapping tool. So, I really hope those tools can be integrated into the new FP Online process. The FPA and its process feels easy for me overall, but I do hear consistently from SFLs/first time harvesters that the permit and overall process are confusing and overwhelming. I think one thing that could help this demographic dramatically would be if the online application presents one question at a time and then goes to the next applicable question depending on how they answer. In the same format it would also be super helpful to have a “help” link at each step that led to the applicable section of the instructions. As far as WTMFs and Enforcement documents that current process feels more clunky from my perspective as a FPF than the FPA review/compliance process. Currently we have to document summaries of WTMFs and enforcement actions/ICNs in survey 123 and in WTA and FPETS, respectively. The survey 123 side is easy because it can be done in the field and office on the same document and adding pictures and locations is as easy as clicking a button in the app, but then we have to duplicate the info in WTA for water mods and for enforcement/ICNs on their own official documents and then again into FPETS. Both of those processes are clunky and duplicative, so if there is a way to link those actions to survey123 or another system we can access offline in the field to populate the FP Online system that would be a major efficiency boost in field reviews. Additionally for enforcement docs/ICNs, if I don’t have service its difficult to look up and assign a identifier in the field so an auto generated number would be helpful.”



FP Foresters Open-Ended Responses

Note: 2 responded

“Current FPARS system works well so make sure you keep all current processing methods FPAs and WTMs available and at the ready. Reason, there are a lot of 20 acre exempt and SFLO who will not have electronic access to fp online. It will frustrate them for sure. And what has happened to the county doing away with hard copy land clearing permits has created land clearing activities with no permits. the fpOnline can go down easily and power go out. Then what. The current WTM email notification to TFW, EVERY WEEK FOR THE SAME EXACT WTM SEGMENT IS OVERKILL. This excessive notification confuses and pollutes all our emails...Just notify ONCE !!!! PLEASE.”



FP Managers- Overall

The current FPA process is easy for me	67%
The current FPA process is efficient	43%
The current FPA process is consistent	57%
The current FPA process is intuitive	24%
The current FPA process works smoothly	43%
The current FPA process helps me do my job effectively	48%
I feel knowledgeable about how the current FPA process works	81%
I know where to go for help when I have questions regarding the current FPA process	86%
The mapping tools that DNR makes available are effective for the current process	62%
The FPA instructions are easy to find.	62%
The FPA instructions are easy to understand	52%

Total respondents = 21

Source: fpOnline Q3 2024 Baseline User Experience & Partner Survey, N=147, Sept 30 - Oct 18, 2024



FP Managers - Specific

It is easy for me to run my own reports in the current systems.	12%
It is easy for me to track the FPA work of my staff.	41%
It is easy for me to track the WTMF work of my staff.	47%
It is easy for me to track the Enforcement work of my staff.	18%
It is easy for me to find out the status of an individual FPA form.	59%
It is easy for me to find out the status of an individual WTMF form.	41%
It is easy for me to find out the status of an individual Enforcement form.	29%
It is easy for me to review all relevant and/or supplemental information that has been provided for an FPA.	71%
It is easy for me to review all relevant and/or supplemental information that has been provided for an WTMF form.	59%
It is easy for me to review all relevant and/or supplemental information that has been provided for an Enforcement form.	35%
It is easy for me to provide edits/comments/recommendations to my staff on an FPA/WTMF/Enforcement form.	29%

Total respondents = 21

Source: fpOnline Q3 2024 Baseline User Experience & Partner Survey, N=147, Sept 30 - Oct 18, 2024



FP Managers

Open-Ended Responses

Note: 2 responded

“It is not easy for me to search for and include FPAs with specific attributes for our needs because many attributes are not available in the FPA layer downloadable from the DNR OpenData site or to our project managers. There are many items in the FPA that do not end up as attributes in the FPA database that but are important to research, which then requires hours and hours of manual FPA review to develop data needed for evaluation of FP rules. Relying on FP to digitize harvest units rather than using GIS polygons provided by landowners is inefficient and leaves room for errors and omissions. That is not meant to imply hand drawn maps should be disallowed from some landowners or that the existing paper versions, often with hand details, should be disallowed. Just that when landowners have created GIS polygons for the harvest unit, they could submit those to DNR (with specified limited attributes to simplify DNR process) as shapefiles along with the other FPA documentation.”

“I’m generally reviewing information in a combined PDF created by my team in the systems.”



Large landowner Representatives - Overall

The current FPA process is easy for me	67%
The current FPA process is efficient	45%
The current FPA process is consistent	59%
The current FPA process is intuitive	24%
The current FPA process works smoothly	51%
The current FPA process helps me do my job effectively	41%
I feel knowledgeable about how the current FPA process works	84%
I know where to go for help when I have questions regarding the current FPA process	100%
The mapping tools that DNR makes available are effective for the current process	57%
The FPA instructions are easy to find.	76%
The FPA instructions are easy to understand.	57%

Total respondents = 49

Source: fpOnline Q3 2024 Baseline User Experience & Partner Survey, N=147, Sept 30 - Oct 18, 2024



Large landowner Representatives - Specific

I have familiarized myself with the FPA/WTMF instructions before or while filling out forms I'm submitting.	96%
It is easy for me to fill out an FPA/WTMF form.	76%
It is easy for me to provide all of the information requested on an FPA/WTMF.	73%
It is easy to know which forms are required before I submit my FPA/WTMF.	73%
It is easy for me to submit an FPA/WTMF.	69%
It is easy for me to submit related documentation.	63%
It is easy for me to sign an FPA/WTMF.	61%
It is easy for me to obtain the necessary signatures for an FPA/WTMF.	43%
It is easy for me to pay for an FPA.	33%
It is easy for me to find past FPAs/WTMFs I have submitted.	65%

Total respondents = 49

Source: fpOnline Q3 2024 Baseline User Experience & Partner Survey, N=147, Sept 30 - Oct 18, 2024



Large landowner Representatives - Specific (continued)

It is easy for me to manage multiple FPAs/WTMFs at once.	65%
It is easy for me to manage FPAs/WTMFs on behalf of more than one client.	35%
I am aware of when my FPA(s)/WTMF(s) are in the review and approval/concurrence process.	65%
I receive sufficient support from DNR, Forest Practices (FP) program staff when I have questions about my FPA(s)/WTMF(s)	82%
I receive sufficient support from DNR, FP program staff when I need to edit my FPA(s)/WTMF(s) after I've submitted the form(s).	88%
The DNR FP Program staff review and approve/concur my FPA(s)/WTMF(s) within the expected timeframe.	76%
Under the current process, the FPA/WTMF review and approval process aligns with current operating procedures or regulations.	61%
It is easy for me to communicate with DNR's FP Program office and/or field staff about my FPA/WTMF.	84%
My FPA/WTMF gets processed with no delay.	51%
It is easy for me to create or submit an activity map(s) / water type modification form map(s).	55%
Withdrawing or resubmitting an FPA/WTMF for any reason is easy.	73%

Total respondents = 49



Large Landowners Open-Ended Responses

Note: 19 responded

Electronic Submittal/Signatures/Payment

“Would like electronic signatures to be accepted by landowners on FPAs.”

“It is frustrating to have to have a "wet" signature instead of an electronic. Which for me makes submitting the apps cumbersome. The FPARS mapping program is not very intuitive for me. I might be alone in that though. The FP office staff is very helpful.”

“Being able to submit FPA's online instead of mailing or in person would make the process much more efficient. Also, being able to sign electronically would be a huge benefit.”



Large Landowners Open-Ended Responses

Note: 19 responded

Electronic Submittal/Signatures/Payment

“Would like to pay with a credit card.”

“Current process needs to be capable of submitting electronic forms and maps. Electronic notification via submittal and approvals.”

“Online submission and a portal to see the status of my FPA's in one location would help a ton.”



Large Landowners Open-Ended Responses

Note: 19 responded

WTMFs

“With the open approval timeline of WTMF there is a lack clarity of where a WTMF is in the review process are a form is submitted. The timelines set in place for FPA approval make it so there is not the same issue.”

“My 'disagree' comments come from the WTM process. FPAs are held to a very defined review timeline. We usually have issues with WTM applications being reviewed in a timely or expected timeframe. This causes our organization to usually submit WTMs along with associated FPAs to ensure an expected time frame.”

“Adding a 30-day regulatory review requirement to the water typing rule update for WTMF’s submitted by themselves would be beneficial.”

“Need a deadline and tracking number so the DNR can be accountable for completing WTMF's timely.”



Large Landowners Open-Ended Responses

Note: 19 responded

Mapping

“Additionally, the DNR Hydro Lines are exceptionally outdated- roughly 30% of the hydro lines within my unit or 200ft from the unit are non-existent or mapped incorrectly. I understand these are lines will never be perfectly accurate, but there are a lot of databases with updated stream locations that could be utilized to update the DNR Hydro lines.”

“FPAMT can be glitchy and sometimes not allow me to use specific features. WTM approval process is seamless when WTMs get on the clock. If WTM forms are not submitted with an FPA timing can be all over the board and communication about when they get an approval deadline can be sporadic.”

“Instead of filling out applications DNR should consider webgis data sharing solutions. WTMFs should have a 30 day concurrence process to match fpa processing regulatory times.”



Large Landowners Open-Ended Responses

Note: 19 responded

Inconsistency

“TFW partners do not tend to operate in good faith. Often not caring what the rules are and push for things that far surpass the rule/law. Many FP's fall into this trap and help push agendas outside of the scope/intent of the rule/law. SPS region is terrible with doing everything last minute and not following WTM timelines.”

“Certain FP Foresters will not review FPA's or WTMF's in a timely fashion and then deny the process because they say the snow is too deep.”

“Inconsistency across regions especially on what documents or how they are completed makes the process more difficult than it needs to be.”

“There are differences between the regions in regards to timeliness of processing WTMs. With some regions there's no clear timeline for when a WTM will be added to the WTA system while other regions it happens almost immediately. **Taking a Credit card for FPA payments would be helpful, however with how we are currently operating it works too.**”



Large Landowners Open-Ended Responses

Note: 19 responded

Additional

“In many instances, adding self checkout options/ adding on-line capabilities has actually increased the amount of staff time needed due to slowness, unreliability/glitches, and user skill sets. Please don't expect this will reduce or eliminate the need for real, live FP people in the Regions. They are the FP lifeline and we all yearn for a real person to talk to when our "on-line" systems go sideways.”

“I am a professional forester with close to 20 years experience figuring out how to work in the past and current FPA process. It takes time to figure out how to work effectively in the system.”



Large Landowners Open-Ended Responses

Note: 19 responded

Additional

“It is very one-sized and inflexible. It is arcane and frustratingly behind current technology. I am a user and reviewer, and I find it a very limiting process on both sides. It is also trying to enact forest practice rules that are very one-sized and biased toward industrial timber management. In addition to submitting applications for commercial timber management I also submit them for forest health, historical landscape restoration, wildfire risk reduction, habitat improvement, and development projects for a large state agency. I run into incongruency and difficulty completing applications on almost every project. The Class IV-General process administered by counties is also very poorly designed and unaccommodating of novel applications. I'm excited to have a new digital applications system that makes it easier to complete, sign, review, and submit payment; but the application questions and the rules driving them also need to be rethought and I'm not sure that is part of the scope of this project.”



Forestry Consultants - Overall

The current FPA process is easy for me	71%
The current FPA process is efficient	35%
The current FPA process is consistent	47%
The current FPA process is intuitive	29%
The current FPA process works smoothly	53%
The current FPA process helps me do my job effectively	41%
I feel knowledgeable about how the current FPA process works	82%
I know where to go for help when I have questions regarding the current FPA process	88%
The mapping tools that DNR makes available are effective for the current process	53%
The FPA instructions are easy to find.	76%
The FPA instructions are easy to understand.	59%

Total respondents = 17

Source: fpOnline Q3 2024 Baseline User Experience & Partner Survey, N=147, Sept 30 - Oct 18, 2024



Forestry Consultants - Specific

I have familiarized myself with the FPA/WTMF instructions before or while filling out forms I'm submitting.	94%
It is easy for me to fill out an FPA/WTMF form.	82%
It is easy for me to provide all of the information requested on an FPA/WTMF.	71%
It is easy to know which forms are required before I submit my FPA/WTMF.	59%
It is easy for me to submit an FPA/WTMF.	71%
It is easy for me to submit related documentation.	71%
It is easy for me to sign an FPA/WTMF.	41%
It is easy for me to obtain the necessary signatures for an FPA/WTMF.	18%
It is easy for me to pay for an FPA.	41%
It is easy for me to find past FPAs/WTMFs I have submitted.	76%
It is easy for me to manage multiple FPAs/WTMFs at once.	71%

Total respondents = 17

Source: fpOnline Q3 2024 Baseline User Experience & Partner Survey, N=147, Sept 30 - Oct 18, 2024



Forestry Consultants - Specific (continued)

It is easy for me to manage FPAs/WTMFs on behalf of more than one client.	65%
I am aware of when my FPA(s)/WTMF(s) are in the review and approval/concurrence process.	41%
I receive sufficient support from DNR, Forest Practices (FP) program staff when I have questions about my FPA(s)/WTMF(s)	76%
I receive sufficient support from DNR, FP program staff when I need to edit my FPA(s)/WTMF(s) after I've submitted the form(s).	94%
The DNR FP Program staff review and approve/concur my FPA(s)/WTMF(s) within the expected timeframe.	76%
Under the current process, the FPA/WTMF review and approval process aligns with current operating procedures or regulations.	65%
It is easy for me to communicate with DNR's FP Program office and/or field staff about my FPA/WTMF.	71%
My FPA/WTMF gets processed with no delay.	53%
It is easy for me to create or submit an activity map(s) / water type modification form map(s).	71%
Withdrawing or resubmitting an FPA/WTMF for any reason is easy.	41%

Total respondents = 17

Source: fpOnline Q3 2024 Baseline User Experience & Partner Survey, N=147, Sept 30 - Oct 18, 2024



Forestry Consultants - Open-Ended Responses

Note: 5 responded

Water Mods should be done online for consultants like myself who use GIS for most of our projects. My main issues stem from the stream type decision making process and conclusions, let with the actual modification paperwork. All forms should have the option to DocuSign or, at the least, not require a wet signature.

Biggest concerns are regarding the original signatures and the inconsistencies between field foresters and FPA review. Stream typing with some foresters and regions is on the edge and sensitivity to landowners and costs causes frustrations and delays.



Forestry Consultants - Open-Ended Responses

Note: 5 responded

I enjoy the current process. The only thing I'd like to see added is the option to docusign the signature page, and to pay online. It would also be nice if we could email completed applications and send links to have them docusigned by clients.

I use the process infrequently but when I do it works satisfactorily.

DNR unnecessarily uses the entire 30-day approval window in too many cases.



Small Forest Landowners - Overall

The current FPA process is easy for me	60%
The current FPA process is efficient	60%
The current FPA process is consistent	60%
The current FPA process is intuitive	40%
The current FPA process works smoothly	60%
The current FPA process helps me do my job effectively	60%
I feel knowledgeable about how the current FPA process works	80%
I know where to go for help when I have questions regarding the current FPA process	80%
The mapping tools that DNR makes available are effective for the current process	80%
The FPA instructions are easy to find.	80%
The FPA instructions are easy to understand.	80%

Total respondents = 5

Source: fpOnline Q3 2024 Baseline User Experience & Partner Survey, N=147, Sept 30 - Oct 18, 2024



Small Forest Landowners - Specific

I have familiarized myself with the FPA/WTMF instructions before or while filling out forms I'm submitting.	80%
It is easy for me to fill out an FPA/WTMF form.	60%
It is easy for me to provide all of the information requested on an FPA/WTMF.	80%
It is easy to know which forms are required before I submit my FPA/WTMF.	60%
It is easy for me to submit an FPA/WTMF.	60%
It is easy for me to submit related documentation.	80%
It is easy for me to sign an FPA/WTMF.	60%
It is easy for me to obtain the necessary signatures for an FPA/WTMF.	80%
It is easy for me to pay for an FPA.	60%
It is easy for me to find past FPAs/WTMFs I have submitted.	60%
It is easy for me to manage multiple FPAs/WTMFs at once.	80%

Total respondents = 5

Source: fpOnline Q3 2024 Baseline User Experience & Partner Survey, N=147, Sept 30 - Oct 18, 2024



Small Forest Landowners - Specific (continued)

It is easy for me to manage FPAs/WTMFs on behalf of more than one client.	60%
I am aware of when my FPA(s)/WTMF(s) are in the review and approval/concurrence process.	60%
I receive sufficient support from DNR, Forest Practices (FP) program staff when I have questions about my FPA(s)/WTMF(s)	80%
I receive sufficient support from DNR, FP program staff when I need to edit my FPA(s)/WTMF(s) after I've submitted the form(s).	80%
The DNR FP Program staff review and approve/concur my FPA(s)/WTMF(s) within the expected timeframe.	80%
Under the current process, the FPA/WTMF review and approval process aligns with current operating procedures or regulations.	60%
It is easy for me to communicate with DNR's FP Program office and/or field staff about my FPA/WTMF.	80%
My FPA/WTMF gets processed with no delay.	60%
It is easy for me to create or submit an activity map(s) / water type modification form map(s).	60%
Withdrawing or resubmitting an FPA/WTMF for any reason is easy.	40%

Total respondents = 5

Source: fpOnline Q3 2024 Baseline User Experience & Partner Survey, N=147, Sept 30 - Oct 18, 2024



Small Landowners Open-Ended Responses

Note: 2 responded

As time has gone on over doing this for 40 years the process has gotten better. Thank you.

I don't use the system - our consultant does. I filled out the survey because you asked twice and wanted to break a record. I don't think my answers are very helpful.



State Agency Reviewers - Overall

The current FPA process is easy for me	40%
The current FPA process is efficient	20%
The current FPA process is consistent	50%
The current FPA process is intuitive	10%
The current FPA process works smoothly	20%
The current FPA process helps me do my job effectively	30%
I feel knowledgeable about how the current FPA process works	40%
I know where to go for help when I have questions regarding the current FPA process	60%
The mapping tools that DNR makes available are effective for the current process	20%
The FPA instructions are easy to find.	20%

Total respondents = 10

Source: fpOnline Q3 2024 Baseline User Experience & Partner Survey, N=147, Sept 30 - Oct 18, 2024



State Agency Reviewers - Specific

It is easy for me to fill out or update my reviewer profile form.	10%
It is easy for me to know when I have new FPA(s)/WTMF(s) to review.	70%
It is easy for me to review FPA(s)/WTMF(s).	60%
It is easy for me to find the information that I am looking for in an FPA/WTMF.	30%
It is easy for me to provide comments for an FPA/WTMF.	50%
It is easy for me to find past FPA(s)/WTMF(s) if I need to review them for additional information.	30%
It is easy for me to track FPA/WTMF commenting due dates/workflow.	30%
It is easy for me to track my comments in an ICN/NTC.	20%
It is easy for me to add notes of my review or comments/complaints received regarding an FPA/WTMF.	40%

Total respondents = 10

Source: fpOnline Q3 2024 Baseline User Experience & Partner Survey, N=147, Sept 30 - Oct 18, 2024



State Agency Reviewers - Specific (continued)

Statement	all skipped
It easy for me to assign unique identifiers so I can track FPAs/WTMFs/Enforcement documents.	60%
I am confident that I'm being notified of all FPAs/WTMFs/ENF forms relevant to my role for my organization	50%
FPA(s)/WTMF(s) contain the required information for me to complete my review.	30%
FPA(s)/WTMF(s) contain sufficient information for me to complete my review.	90%
I receive sufficient support from DNR FP program office staff when I ask questions or have concerns during FPA/WTMF review.	90%
I receive sufficient support from DNR FP program field staff when I ask questions or have concerns during FPA/WTMF review	40%
In my experience working with FP program staff, the FPA/WTMF review and approval/concurrence rules/standard operating procedures (SOPs) are consistently implemented.	20%
The current system allows my organization to protect confidential information (Threatened and Endangered Species and Archaeological data/location).	

Total respondents = 10

Source: fpOnline Q3 2024 Baseline User Experience & Partner Survey, N=147, Sept 30 - Oct 18, 2024



State Agency Reviewers-Overall

Note: 3 responded

Open-Ended Response:

“If it were perfect, we wouldn't need to field review any. There are big differences in WTMF format depending on who completed the survey. Some are easier to read and understand than others. Also, when photos are submitted, reviewers often only see a scanned printout of the photo. Can we get the photos (and other materials for that matter) submitted digitally so we can see the originals?”

“The Map Application page is not consistent between reviewers; it would be nice to standards in a spatial data format like shapefiles or feature class.”

“Works fine for me as is.”



Tribal Reviewers - Overall

The current FPA process is easy for me	89%
The current FPA process is efficient	56%
The current FPA process is consistent	89%
The current FPA process is intuitive	33%
The current FPA process works smoothly	44%
The current FPA process helps me do my job effectively	78%
I feel knowledgeable about how the current FPA process works	67%
I know where to go for help when I have questions regarding the current FPA process	89%
The mapping tools that DNR makes available are effective for the current process	56%
The FPA instructions are easy to find.	78%
The FPA instructions are easy to understand.	78%

Total respondents = 9

Source: fpOnline Q3 2024 Baseline User Experience & Partner Survey, N=147, Sept 30 - Oct 18, 2024



Tribal Reviewers - Specific

It is easy for me to fill out or update my reviewer profile form.	33%
It is easy for me to know when I have new FPA(s)/WTMF(s) to review.	89%
It is easy for me to review FPA(s)/WTMF(s).	89%
It is easy for me to find the information that I am looking for in an FPA/WTMF.	78%
It is easy for me to provide comments for an FPA/WTMF.	67%
It is easy for me to find past FPA(s)/WTMF(s) if I need to review them for additional information.	67%
It is easy for me to track FPA/WTMF commenting due dates/workflow.	67%
It is easy for me to track my comments in an ICN/NTC.	22%
It is easy for me to add notes of my review or comments/complaints received regarding an FPA/WTMF.	56%

Total respondents = 9

Source: fpOnline Q3 2024 Baseline User Experience & Partner Survey, N=147, Sept 30 - Oct 18, 2024



Tribal Reviewers - Specific (continued)

It easy for me to assign unique identifiers so I can track FPA(s)/WTMFs/Enforcement documents.

all
skipped

I am confident that I'm being notified of all FPA(s)/WTMFs/ENF forms relevant to my role for my organization

33%

FPA(s)/WTMF(s) contain the required information for me to complete my review.

78%

FPA(s)/WTMF(s) contain sufficient information for me to complete my review.

67%

I receive sufficient support from DNR FP program office staff when I ask questions or have concerns during FPA/WTMF review.

89%

I receive sufficient support from DNR FP program field staff when I ask questions or have concerns during FPA/WTMF review

89%

In my experience working with FP program staff, the FPA/WTMF review, and approval/concurrence rules/standard operating procedures (SOPs) are consistently implemented.

44%

The current system allows my organization to protect confidential information (Threatened and Endangered Species and Archaeological data/location).

56%

Total respondents = 9

Source: fpOnline Q3 2024 Baseline User Experience & Partner Survey, N=147, Sept 30 - Oct 18, 2024



City County Reviewers - Overall

Note: Only one respondent

Open-Ended Response:

“The data in the DNR maps changed in the past couple years which removed a lot of stream channels. But the data that Kitsap County has on their GIS database still shows those streams. In some cases we know those streams still exist but our code refers to the DNR database for our stream data. So it is difficult to implement and explain to a landowner why even though the DNR map doesn't show a stream anymore and our code relies on the DNR data, we still need a critical areas report.”



Federal Reviewers - Overall

Note: Only one respondent

Open-Ended Response:

“The current FPA review process varies greatly based on the staff that runs the review. It is rarely certain if all aspects of a review will be addressed or at which stage TFW reviewers will be consulted”*

*In the survey responses, this respondent identified themselves as a federal reviewer. However, during a meeting presentation of these slides, a tribal reviewer identified this as their comment. Halcyon followed up with the person over email to formally confirm that this was actually a tribal reviewer comment, but did not get a response. Therefore it is still ascribed to a federal reviewer, as is the related quantitative data received.