# SURVEY OF FORESTRY ISSUES IN LANE AND LINN COUNTIES

\*\*\*Frequency Distributions\*\*\*

Unpublished report

MAY 1994

Investigators:

Brent S. Steel Political Science

Washington State University

Peter List Philosophy

Oregon State University

Bruce Shindler Forest Resources

Oregon State University

Courtland Smith Anthropology

Oregon State University

For additional copies of these results contact Brent Steel, WSU Vancouver, 1812 E. Mcloughlin, Vancouver, Washington 98663 (206-737-2025) or Bruce Shindler, Forest Resources, Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oregon 97331 (503-737-3299). Funding for this project was provided by the Sustainable Forestry Program at Oregon State University.

### STUDENT RESEARCH ASSISTANTS

MICHELLE BOUYEAR ANDREW BYNUM DICKIE DUFF LORI DUKE TONI GRAVELLE PATRICK HELEM MICHAEL HONL JOHNELLE HORMANN MARTINA MASO TOMI METCALF MONT PACHL JOANNE POWELL VERONICA RUPE PETER SIMI GERALD SMITH ROSEMARY LYNN TOLLE

Washington State University Vancouver

### INTRODUCTION

This report summarizes the responses to the Survey of Forestry Issues in Lane and Linn Counties which was conducted during April and May, 1994. Random samples of Lane and Linn County residents were provided by a national survey research company. Both mail and telephone survey techniques were utilized in the project. Survey design and implementation followed Don Dillman's Mail and Telephone Surveys: The Total Design Method (New York: John Wiley and Sons). Missing values have been omitted and some categories for questions have been collapsed for presentation purposes. All data have been rounded to full percentages, therefore total percentages may equal 99% to 101%.

The maximum standard error for the samples is within plus or minus 4.0% (at the 95% confidence level). In lay terms this means that we can have a high degree of confidence that the sample results presented in the following sections closely approximate the views of the population. The response rates for the samples are as follows:

	LANE COUNTY	LINN COUNTY
Number of prospective respondents contacted:	800	625
Number of surveys completed:	511	420
Response rate:	64%	67%

Results are presented separately for each county. An additional category of information is presented (i.e., "AMA Area") for those eastern Lane and Linn County respondents who live in communities (e.g., Sweet Home, Blue River, McKenzie Bridge, etc.) or rural locations near the proposed Adaptive Management Area east of Blue River in the Willamette National Forest.

In this first section of the survey we asked some general questions about people and the environment.

 $\mathbf{Q-1}$  Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement for each of the following statements.

	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
a.Plants and animals exist	(%)	(%)	(%)
primarily for human use.	• •		• •
Lane	49	11	40
Linn	48	13	39
AMA Area	46	14	40
b. Humankind was created to		•	
rule over the rest of nature.	50		20
Lane	50	11	39
Linn	46 46	11 13	43 41
AMA Area	46	13	41
c. Humans have an ethical obligation to protect plant and animal species	3 <b>.</b>	•	
Lane	10	9	81
Linn	10	13	77
AMA Area	12	13	75
<pre>d.The earth should have   far fewer people on it.</pre>			
Lane	27	28	44
Linn	23	30	47
AMA Area	27	28	45
e.Wildlife, plants & humans have equal rights to live and develop on the earth.			
Lane	29	12	59
Linn	21	19	60
AMA Area	22	20	58
f.Technology will find a way to solve the problem of shortages of natural resources.			
Lane	52	22	26
Linn	34	29	37
AMA Area	38	26	36
<pre>g.People would be better off if   they lived without so much   technology.</pre>	,		
Lane	34	23	43
Linn	37	26	37
AMA Area	37	27	36

	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
.Technical and scientific experts are usually biased.			
Lane	20	22	58
Linn	17	41	42
AMA Area	17	37	46

### SECTION 2

In this second section we asked some general questions concerning FEDERAL FOREST LANDS. These lands were defined as those owned by the public and managed by the federal government for multiple uses.

Q-2 Please indicate your level of disagreement or agreement with the following statements concerning federal forest land.

h. Technical and scientific

	Disagree-	Neutral-	Agree
a. The economic vitality of local communities should be given the	(%)	(%)	(%)
highest priority when making federal forest decisions.			
Lane	40	12	48
Linn	28	17	- 55
AMA Area	25	18	57
<pre>b.Clear-cutting should be banned   on federal forest land.</pre>			
Lane	34	12	54
Linn	47	13	40
AMA Area	49	12	39
c.Some existing wilderness areas should be opened to logging.			
Lane	44	16	40
Linn	34	15	51
AMA Area	34	14	52
d.Greater protection should be given to fish such as salmon on federal lands.			
Lane	13	<b>18</b> .	49
Linn ·	19	24	57
AMA Area	19	25	56
<pre>e.Greater efforts should be made   to protect the remaining "Old   Growth" forests.</pre>			
Lane	33	16	51
Linn	47	19	34
AMA Area	45	21	34

		Disagree-	Neutral	Agree
	red species laws should aside to preserve timber	(%)	( % )	(%)
<b>J</b> ·	Lane	47	14	39
•	Linn	40	14	46
	AMA Area	39	14	47
g.Federal emphasi: products	forest management should ze timber and lumber s.			
-	Lane	37	26	37
	Linn	31	26	43
	AMA Area	29	29	42
	protection should be wildlife habitats on lands.			
	Lane	29	24	47
•	Linn	38	20	42
	AMA Area	36	22	42
their fa	l of timber workers and amilies is more important eservation of old growth			
	Lane	42	18	40
	Linn	30	21	49
	AMA Area	28	23	49
focus or not on :	forest management should nother the forest as a whole and its individual parts (such as rees, and wood products).	5		
	Lane	8	10	82
	Linn	9	12	79
	AMA Area	9	13	78

Q-3 Many federal forest management issues involve difficult trade-offs between natural environmental conditions (wildlife, old growth forests) and economic considerations (employment, tax revenues). Where would you locate yourself on the following scale concerning these issues?

The highest priority should be given to maintaining natural environmental conditions even if there are negative economic consequences.

Both environmental and economic factors should be given equal priority in forest management policy. The highest priority should be given to economic considerations even if there are negative environmental consequences.

Lane	33%	40%	27%
Linn	27%	40%	33%
AMA Area	23%	46%	29%

### SECTION 3

In this section respondents were asked about their views on public involvement in natural resource and forestry issues.

Q-4 How much attention do you pay to natural resource and forestry issues?

	Not Much	Moderate Amount	A Great Deal
Lane	7%	41%	52%
Linn	11%	43%	46%
AMA Area	11%	44%	55%

Q-5 Recently there has been considerable debate over efforts to increase CITIZEN PARTICIPATION in government policy making. Where would you locate yourself on the following scale regarding these efforts?

Citizen participation is of no value and adds needlessly to the cost of government.		Neutral	Citizen participation is of great value even if it adds to the cost of of government.	
Lane	11%	22%	67%	
Linn	9%	32%	59%	
AMA Area	10%	32%	58%	

Q-6 What are the MOST IMPORTANT SOURCES of information you use concerning natural resource issues? (Percentage indicating important.)

	Lane (%)	Linn (%)	AMA Area (%)
1. Local newspaper.	84	84	84
2. Local radio station.	54	48	51
3. Television news programs.	73	77	82
<ol><li>Resource agency (USFS, BLM) programs/meetings.</li></ol>	21	12	13
5. Literature from interest groups.	36	29	26
6. Business representatives.	7	8	9
7. Magazines and books.	55	51	50
8. College/university educators.	11 .	12	14
9. Friends and relatives.	40	39	42

Q-7 In your opinion, a realistic role for the <u>public</u> in forest management should be:

1	None, let resource professionals	Lane (%) 8	Linn (%) 3	AMA Area (%)
1.	(USFS, BLM) decide.	0	3	9
2.	Provide suggestions and let the resource professionals decide.	21	20	21
3.	Serve on advisory boards that review and comment on decisions.	35	39	33
4.	Act as a full and equal partner in making management decisions.	23	31	25
5.	The public should decide management issues and resource professionals should carry them out.	10	5	10
6.	Other.	. 3	2	2

Q-8a. What has been your level of past contact with federal forest managers (Forest Service, BLM, National Park Service)?

1.	I have had no contact with federal forest managers (go to Q-9).	Lane (%) 47	Linn (%) 48	AMA Area (%) 48
2.	Seen them or talked to them at a federal forest area.	30	27	28
3.	Read resource agency information or newsletters.	30	27	28
4.	Personally phoned or written them to discuss an idea or problem.	9	4	4
5.	Made a personal visit to discuss an idea or problem.	9	4	3
6.	Attended a public meeting conducted by agency personnel.	15	9	9
7.	Provided comments on a national forest plan.	8	3	5
8.	Served on a forestry panel or task force.	0	0	0
9.	Worked as a volunteer.	6	1	1

b. In your experiences above, were your contacts generally:

		Lane	Linn	· AMA Area	
		(%)	(%)	(୫)	
1.	Pleasant, enjoyable	33	29	28	
2.	Okay, no complaints	29	31	32	
3.	Not satisfying, some problems	8	10	12	
4.	Frustrating, difficult	9	5	4	
5.	No basis for judgement	17	22	21	
6.	Other	3	3	3	

Q-9 In complex societies such as the United States, interest groups emerge to represent different interests in society. What is your view of the role these groups play in politics?

Interest groups are necessary to make government aware of people's needs.		Uncertain	Interest groups prevent government from being aware of people's needs.
Lane	46%	28%	26%
Linn	43%	29%	28%
AMA Area	40%	28%	32%

Q-10 Competition, whether in work, business, or natural resource issues:

Leads to better performance and a desire for excellence.		Uncertain	Is often wasteful and destructive.	
Lane	58%	20%	22%	
Linn	53%	22%	25%	
AMA Area	53%	23%	24%	

### SECTION 4

Recently President Clinton created a task force to produce a plan that would break the gridlock over federal forest management in the Northwest. The following questions are concerned with the resulting Forest Ecosystem Management Assessment Team (FEMAT) report released in July.

Q-11 How well informed would you say you are concerning the Clinton Administration's new forest ecosystem management plan (also known as Option 9)?

	Not informed	Moderately Informed	Very informed
Lane	46%	42%	12%
Linn	55%	33%	12%
AMA Area	53%	36%	11%

Q-12 The Clinton Administration's plan for Northwest forests stresses a "long-term" perspective for management of federal forest lands. What time frame do you think is appropriate for "long-term" forest planning? (Please circle one.)

		Lane	Linn	AMA Area
		(%)	(%)	(%)
a.	10-20 years	13	11	15
b.	21-50 years	14	18	17
c.	51-100 years	25	28	27
d.	101-300 years	22	14	15
e.	301-500 years	5	4	2
f.	501-1000 years	6	4	2
g.	More than 1000	7	5	5
h.	Uncertain	7	16	16

Q-13 Part of this plan calls for ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT on federal forest lands. Adaptive management is based on a continuing process of planning, monitoring and evaluation, and then adjusting actions to meet forest objectives. The plan includes provisions for ten adaptive management areas throughout the Northwest. These areas would be used to develop and test new ideas concerning long-term forest management, economic stability, and public participation in decision-making. The major objectives are to improve scientific understanding of forest ecosystems and encourage cooperation between state and federal agencies and local communities. We'd like your opinions on this approach.

	Scrongry		Scrongry
·	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
a.Reliable knowledge about forest	(%)	(%)	(%)
ecosystems is lacking.			
Lane	31	21	48
Linn	25	31	44
AMA Area	27	32	41
b.Following nature's way is preferable			
to human intervention in ecosystems.			•
Lane	27	24	49
Linn	23	28	49
AMA Area	23	27	50
c.Testing and evaluating how forest ecosystems respond to human use is appropriate on selected forest lands.			
Lane	17	21	62
Linn	11	36	53
AMA Area	12	30	58
d.In general, adaptive management			
areas seem like a responsible approac	h.	•	
Lane	.7	29	64
Linn	7	40	53
AMA Area	9	38	53

	Strongly		Strongly
a one fodomal format management	Disagree		<del>-</del>
e.Our federal forest management systems need major changes, not just minor adjustments.	(%)	(₹)	(%)
Lane	16	19	65
Linn	17	22	61
AMA Area	19	23	58
f.On forestry issues, public preferences should ultimately prevail even when they conflict with the judgment of resource professionals.			
Lane	42	18	40
Linn	33	13	54
AMA Area	34	16	50
g.Agencies like the Forest Service and BLM are open to public input and use it to shape forest management decision	ns.		
Lane	37 ·	31	32
Linn	32	39	29
AMA Area	30	38	32
h.The best forest plan is one that is a compromise between all interested parties.			
Lane	35	13	52
Linn	28	18	54
AMA Area	25	18	57
i.Science, not politics, should decide environmental issues.			
Lane	14	14	72
Linn	11	22	67
AMA Area	10	19	71
<pre>j.Private forest lands should not   be part of long-term federal planning</pre>			
Lane	35	20	45
Linn	28	16	56
AMA Area	29	16	55
k.I would likely support a community made forest decision, even if it goes against my personal preferences.	,		
Lane	35	26	39
Linn	26	35	39
AMA Area	26	33	41

	Strongly Disagree-	Neutral	Strongly
1.I feel like I don't have much to	(%)	(%)	(%)
contribute to forest planning efforts	• •	( - /	<b>\</b> - <b>/</b>
Lane	37	28	35
Linn	26	34	40
AMA Area	26	33	41
m.Government officials usually create plans without input from local communities surrounding national fores	sts.		
Lane	17	25	58
Linn	8	20	72
AMA Area	9	19	72
SECTION	<b>5</b>		·

In this section respondents were asked some questions about their use of forests.

Q-15a. How often do you visit forests during your leisure time?

1.	Never (go to Q-16).	Lane (%) 1	Linn (%) 4	AMA Area (%) 3
2.	Rarely, no more than once or twice a year.	14	18	16
3.	Occasionally, several times a year.	40	50	51
4.	Somewhat frequently, at least once a month on average.	29	19	23
5.	Very frequently, at least once a week on average.	16	8	6

b. When you visit forests, which kind of place do you usually visit?

		Lane	Linn	AMA Area
		(%)	(%)	(%)
1.	A wooded area near my home	45	37	39
	(public or private land).			
	A city or county park.	. 18	19	22
	A state park.	36	44	43
4.	A federal forest such as those managed by the	65	63	67
	Forest Service.			
5.	Don't know who manages the area.	6	. 8	10
6.	Don't visit forests.	2	2	2

c. How often do you visit the Willamette National Forest in western Oregon?

٠	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		Linn (%)	AMA Area
1.	Never (go to Q-16)	7	4	3
2.	Rarely, no more than once or twice a year.	26	31	32
3.	Occasionally, several times a year.	41	48	48
4.	Somewhat frequently, at least once a month on average	20	13	14
5.	Very frequently, at least once a week on average.	5	4	3

d. How often do you participate in the following outdoor activities in the Willamette National Forest? Please circle your response using the following scale.

\*\*Average participation for both samples\*\*

	NEVER	ONCE A YEAR OR LESS	SEVERAL TIMES A YEAR	MONTHLY &_MORE
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
Day hiking	24	35	35	6
Overnight backpacking	61	31	7	0
River rafting or kayaking	72	21	4	3
Fishing	40	14	31	14
Hunting	62	14	20	4
Camping	27	- 30	39	. 4
Downhill skiing	69	15	14	1
Cross country skiing	83	11.	5	0
Snowmobiling	92	4	2	2
Bicycling	72	17	8	3
Power boating	73	10	14	, <b>3</b>
Motor cycling/ATVs	82	7	7	4
View/photograph wild life	29	28	32	11
Horseback riding	85	5	7	3
Logging	92	3	3	2
Wood cutting	69	18	10	3
Berry/mushroom picking	58	24	15	3

#### SECTION 6

In this section, respondents were asked their opinions about the public and private organizations that are involved in federal forest issues.

Q-16 In recent years, many organizations and institutions have influenced federal forest decisions and policy. We would like to know how much confidence you have in those below that are directly or indirectly involved in managing federal lands. On the left side of the page, circle the number that indicates your confidence in their ability to contribute to good forest management decisions. On the right side, circle the number that indicates the amount of influence these organizations should have in federal forest management. ["Uncertain" responses are ommitted.]

How Much Confidence do You Have in the Following:

How Much Influence Should Each of the Following Have:

None to Limited (%)	Moderate to Great deal (%)		None to Limited (%)	Moderate to Great deal (%)
	1.	Bureau of Land Management		
34	44	Lane	21	64
24	45	Linn	12	65
26	45	AMA Area	15	65
	2.	U.S. Forest Service		
26	56	Lane	13	72
20	58	Linn	8	75
21	49	AMA Area	10	72
	3.	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Servi	ce	
23	53	Lane	16	67
27	48	Linn	11	63
28	48	AMA Area	14	62
	4.	U.S. Congress		
78	6	Lane	63	18
77	7	Linn	61	19
81	6	AMA Area	61	19
	5.	Timber Industry		
41	34	Lane	38	40
34	46	Linn	30	51
35	42	AMA Area	30	51
	6.	Tourism Industry		
45	23	Lane	51	29
42	21	Linn	47	26
43	19	AMA Area	47	21

# How Much Influence Should Each of the Following Have:

None to Limited	Moderate Great dea (%)			None to Limited (%)	Moderate to Great deal (%)
(%)	(8)	7. F	Environmental Groups	(3)	(**)
57	30	,, .	Lane	55	33
68	19		Linn	62	24
73	14		AMA Area	64	20
					•
		8.	'Wise Use" Organizations		
37	22		Lane	38	<b>31</b> ·
35	24		Linn	38	26
36	21		AMA Area	39	24
		9. N	Native Americans		
34	36		Lane	31	44
27	40		Linn	30	44
29	38		AMA Area	34	34
		10.	Forest dependent communities		
36	37		Lane	31	48
32	42		Linn	25	50
30	40		AMA Area	25	49
,		11.	Lane/Linn County Residents		
23	43		Lane	19	53
20	53		Linn	18	<b>.</b> 58
18	57		AMA Area	18	46
		12.	Oregon Public Opinion		
35	27		Lane	28	39
31	32		Linn	27	44
31	34		AMA Area	28	40
		13.	National Public Opinion		
60	10		Lane	60	15
63	12		Linn	61	16
67	9		AMA Area	63	12
•		14.	University Research Scientist	ts	
27	41		Lane	24	47
28	41		Linn	26	51
30	40		AMA Area	26	51
		15.	Federal Courts		
62	<b>15</b> .		Lane	53	18
66	11		Linn	60	18
67	8		AMA Area	57	16
		16.	Clinton Administration		
58	21		Lane	49	26
66	16		Linn	60	22
65	13		AMA Area	60	29

### SECTION 7

In order to check the representativeness of the survey results, respondents were asked some questions about their background and political orientations.

Q-17	Average age:	Lane	53 years, s.d.= 15.6
		Linn	54 years, s.d.= 16.7
		AMA Area	55 years, s.d.= 16.2

Q-18	SEX:	Female	Male
L	ane	55%	45%
L	inn	52%	48%
A	MA Area	51%	49%

# Q-20 Average years of residency in county:

Lane	29	years
Linn	33	years
AMA Area	35	years

# Q-22 Subjective political ideology of respondents:

	Liberal	Moderate	Conservative
Lane	23%	41%	36%
Linn	18%	53%	29%
AMA Area	18%	53%	29%

# Q-24 Immediate family economically dependent on the timber industry:

Lane	16%
Linn	23%
AMA Area	24%

### Q-25 Average family income bracket:

Lane	\$20,000	to	\$24,999
Linn	\$20,000	to	\$24,999
AMA Area	\$20,000	to	\$24,999