



# TurningPoint Results

Round 2 Stakeholder Input  
NAWMP Revision Workshop


Portland, January 10-11, 2011





# I attended a Round 1 workshop


1. Yes
2. No
3. I don't remember





# What is your country of residence?


1. Canada
2. Mexico
3. United States





# What is your primary employment affiliation?


1. Federal agency
2. Non-Government Organization
3. Private business
4. State/Provincial agency
5. University





Which *ONE* best describes the geography for which you have waterfowl **habitat** responsibilities?


1. Atlantic Flyway
2. Mississippi Flyway
3. Central Flyway
4. Pacific Flyway
5. National/multiple Flyways
6. Don't have habitat responsibilities





Which *ONE* best describes the geography for which you have waterfowl **population** responsibilities?


1. Atlantic Flyway
2. Mississippi Flyway
3. Central Flyway
4. Pacific Flyway
5. National/multiple Flyways
6. Don't have population responsibilities





## How long have you been active in waterfowl management?


1. 0-1 year
2. 2-5 years
3. 6-10 years
4. 11-20 years
5. 21-30 years
6. > 30 years





Which one hat do you most frequently wear when it comes to waterfowl management?

1. Agency director/  
executive director
2. Program coordinator or  
administrator
3. Biologist/Scientist
4. Researcher/ academic
5. Regulations committee  
member








## I spend most of my time on...


1. Managing waterfowl populations (sport harvest, subsistence take, take to reduce population size)
2. Managing habitat
3. About equal
4. None of the above





# How important is waterfowl hunting to you?

1. It's my most important recreational activity
2. It's one of my most important recreational activities
3. It's no more important than my other recreational activities
4. It's less important than my other recreational activities
5. It's one of my least important recreational activities
6. I don't hunt waterfowl





# Round 2 Stakeholder Input NAWMP Revision Workshop


## Objectives





It is important that NAWMP has quantitative (numerical) objectives


1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree





It makes sense to have quantifiable objectives for each of the four fundamental objectives.


1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree





The current NAWMP population objectives are adequate to guide waterfowl conservation into the future.


1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree





## What is the most appropriate form of a numeric population objective for NAWMP?


1. Peak pop. sizes that will be achieved periodically when habitat conditions are good
2. Average population sizes over a period of years
3. Minimum population sizes maintained even when habitat conditions are poor
4. NAWMP should not include numeric population objectives





NAWMP should include continental-scale, numeric distribution objectives for breeding, migration and wintering areas.

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree








## What is the most appropriate form of a numeric habitat objective for NAWMP?


1. Habitat conserved specifically for waterfowl conservation
2. Habitat conserved by all conservation efforts, whether or not targeted for waterfowl
3. Status of important landscape features needed to sustain waterfowl pops, incorporating both habitat gains & losses
4. Numeric estimate of waterfowl carrying capacity
5. NAWMP should not include numeric habitat objectives





Numeric habitat objectives should be employed on the following scales:


1. Continental
2. Joint-Venture (JV) or Bird Conservation Region (BCR)
3. Scales smaller than JV's or BCR's
4. All of the above
5. None of the above





## What is the most appropriate form of a numeric waterfowl hunting objective for NAWMP?


1. Number of waterfowl hunters and/or days afield
2. Size of the waterfowl harvest
3. Amount of financial and policy support provided by waterfowl hunters
4. The level of hunter satisfaction as determined by surveys
5. NAWMP should not include numeric waterfowl hunting objectives





NAWMP should set an objective of:


1. Increasing waterfowl hunters and/or hunting activity
2. Maintaining current levels of hunters and/or hunting activity
3. Neither – let hunters and/or hunting activity fluctuate as it may





## What is the most appropriate form of a numeric waterfowl viewing and enjoyment objective for NAWMP?


1. Participation in activities associated with viewing/enjoying waterfowl
2. Financial support from waterfowl viewers
3. Activism in the policy arena by those who view and enjoy – but don't hunt – waterfowl
4. General public's attitude towards waterfowl conservation
5. NAWMP should not include numeric waterfowl viewing and enjoyment objectives





Of the four fundamental objectives, it is most important that we have clear numeric objectives for (4 votes total):


1. Populations
2. Landscape conditions
3. Hunting
4. Viewing
5. None





Which of these most closely reflects your philosophy about objectives?

1. They should be realistic & achievable
2. They should be a “stretch” that will be a challenge to achieve
3. Neither





# Workshop Evaluation








Workshop goal 1 “To summarize Round 1 workshop results and provide an update on the Plan Revision process” was met.


1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree





Workshop goal 2 “To clarify the fundamental objectives and associated measurable attributes” was met.


1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree





Workshop goal 3 “To seek input on the values associated with the fundamental objectives ” was met.


1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree





Workshop goal 4 “To discuss how best to formulate new objectives in the Plan Revision” was met.


1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree





Workshop goal 5 “To initiate discussion of institutions and processes that will facilitate integrated waterfowl management” was met.


1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree





Workshop goal 6 “To provide feedback to the NAWMP Plan Committee as they move forward with the Plan Revision” was met.


1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree





How do you feel about the Revision process as described at this meeting?


1. Excellent
2. Good
3. Okay
4. Not so good
5. Bad





Overall, I thought this workshop was a success

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree







Thank you  
for your participation

