

# Participant Client Web Survey Results Report

Prepared for: Bonneville Power Administration,  
the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Army Corps of Engineers FCRPS Cultural  
Resource Program



Survey Research Lab



This report was prepared for the  
**Bonneville Power Administration, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Army Corps of Engineers FCRPS Cultural Resource Program**  
and presents feedback from the  
**Participant Client Web Survey**  
**Spring 2013**

Submitted  
**June 27, 2013**

By

**Survey Research Lab**

Portland State University  
P.O. Box 751  
Portland, OR 97207-0751

1600 SW 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Suite 400  
Portland, OR 97201  
503-725-9530 (voice)

---

**Tiffany Conklin, MUS**  
Senior Research Assistant  
503-725-5970  
tconklin@pdx.edu

**Amber Johnson, Ph.D.**  
Project Manager  
503-725-9541  
amberj@pdx.edu

**Debi Elliott, Ph.D.**  
Director  
503-725-5198  
elliottd@pdx.edu

# Executive Summary

---

The Portland State University (PSU) Survey Research Lab (SRL) conducted a web survey with representatives at organizations that participate in the Federal Columbia River Power System (FCRPS) Cultural Resource Program. This survey aimed to evaluate the Cultural Resource Program's services, items, products, and activities; specifically, how these products are used by Program Participants, changes in their use, and interest in future use. This survey also assessed the quality, effectiveness, and changes in working relationships between Lead Agency staff and Program Participants.

The **Program Participant Survey** was implemented online from **May 6 to May 24, 2013**. The SRL sent emails to 64 key contacts. A total of **29 web surveys** were completed (a 45.3% response rate). All responses are included in this report.

Most respondents (65.4%) were part of a tribal government or staff and had been affiliated with their organization's Cultural Resource Program for "10 years or more" (62.7%). Respondents held many different types of job positions at their organizations, most commonly being an archaeologist or involved in archeology (31.0%).

The majority of respondents **reported using** site records (96.3%), followed by technical reports (85.2%), GIS data/maps (85.2%), and ethnographic studies (70.4%). Suggestions of ways to improve program products included: providing online access, professional training to parse resource data, annotated hard copies of materials and resources, improving the contracting processes, and more public involvement. The majority of respondents **showed interest** in using GIS data/maps (88.5%), artifact collections and records (84.6%), ethnographic studies (84.6%), site records (84.6%), and technical reports (84.6%) in the future.

When asked to **rate program products in terms of quality on a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being "poor" and 5 being "excellent,"** websites, interpretive short films, and annual reports were **rated the highest overall**, with mean scores of 4.00, 3.87, and 3.87 respectively. Posters, archeological site stabilization, and informational brochures received the **lowest overall ratings** with mean scores of 3.00, 3.10, and 3.13 respectively.

Over half of respondents (64.0%) agreed that **cooperating groups** were an effective means of coordinating program activities, saying that they create a productive work environment and allow participation in the decision-making process.

A majority of respondents (73.1%) indicated that the Lead Agency staff they work with the most **"maintains respectful relationships with program participants,"** and over half of respondents (53.8%) thought that the Lead Agency staff they work with the most have **"well-coordinated work plans."** Conversely, over half of respondents (53.9%) thought that the Lead Agency staff they work with the most **do not "have enough funding to**

**accomplish program work”.**

When asked what they thought the program could do to **improve its relationships with and be more responsive to the needs of Program Participants**, respondents suggested that the program: adhere to Section 106 and other laws, increase funding, balance the priorities of agencies and tribes, and improve communication in general.

### **Recommendations for Future Data Collection**

If this survey is implemented again in the future, consider adding an option for “Tribal Government or Staff” to Question #1.

In general, the survey should remain simple and focus only on essential information. If changes are implemented to the FCRPS Cultural Resource Program, the SRL recommends waiting 6 to 12 months for those changes to occur and have an effect, then reassess the current situation using the existing (or revised) survey instrument. If changes are not made to the FCRPS Cultural Resource Program, the SRL recommends implementing this survey once every 1 to 2 years (or based on need).

---

---