

APPENDIX B

TRIBAL FOREST PROTECTION ACT

On-Line Survey Results

Results of a Tribal Survey on TFPA and Related Issues

Conducted for the Intertribal Timber Council by CINTRAFOR

Dr. Indroneil Ganguly, Dr. Ivan Eastin and Tait Bowers

May 25, 2012




Figure 1. Map of Forest Service Regions.

Table 1. Summary of tribal and BIA respondents across the different Forest Service Regions.

		Tribe	BIA	Other
Northern Region	(R1)	8	4	0
Rocky Mountain Region	(R2)	1	1	0
Southwestern Region	(R3)	9	7	1
Intermountain Region	(R4)	0	1	0
Pacific Southwest Region	(R5)	9	0	1
Pacific Northwest Region	(R6)	22	4	2
Southern Region	(R8)	0	1	0
Eastern Region	(R9)	13	4	1
Alaska Region	(R10)	3	0	0
Unknown	(U)	1	5	1
TOTAL		66	26	6

Note: Using other responses we tried to identify the regions of the tribes/BIA who did not indicate their location in the survey. However, we did not try to identify the actual tribal affiliation of the respondents who did not express it in the survey.

Statistical test for comparing mean of responses

The student's t-test (or chi-square test) is used to compare the means (proportion of responses) between two different sample groups. The test wants to see if the mean from each groups' responses are significantly different from each other at the 0.05 level of significance, or the probability of observing data at least as extreme as that observed from the survey. The level of 0.05 is the commonly used reference point for comparing sample means. For the tests comparing the tribe and BIA respondents, there were no questions having statistical significance utilizing a two-tailed t-test at the 0.05 level. For this survey this was mainly due to the small overall sample size and the number of BIA respondents. However, three questions where the t-test/chi-square test results were closest to the 0.05 level of significance have been included in the report.

Table 1.1. Tribal respondents across the different Forest Service Regions.

USFS Region No.	Forest Service Regions	Name of the tribe	No.of Responses
R1	Northern	Nez Perce Tribe	3
		Ft. Belknap Indian Community	1
		Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes	2
		Coeur d'Alene Tribe	2
R2	Rocky Mountain	Southern Ute Indian Tribe Department of Natural Resources Forestry Division	1
R3	Southwestern	San Carlos Apache Tribe	3
		Pueblo of Acoma Department of Natural Resources	1
		Mescalero Apache Tribes Div. of Resource Mgmt & Protection	2
		White Mountain Apache Tribe	2
		Santa Clara Pueblo	2
R4	Intermountain		0
R5	Pacific Southwest	Tule River Indian Reservation, (TIA)	2
		Karuk Tribe	1
		Hoopa Valley Tribe	2
		Confederated Tribes of Round Valley Indian Reservation	3
		Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians	1
R6	Pacific Northwest	Yakama Nation	2
		Spokane Tribe of Indians	3
		Quinault Indian Nation	4
		Quileute Tribe	1
		Kalispell Tribe of Indians	1
		Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians	1
		Coquille Indian Tribe	1
		Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation	2
		Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation	1
		Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation	3
		Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians	1
Unknown Tribe	2		
R8	Southern		0
R9	Eastern	Turtle Mountain Chippewa Indians	1
		St Croix Chippewa of Wisconsin	1
		Sokaogon Chippewa Community	1
		Menominee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin (MITW)	1
		Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe	1
		Lac Courte Oreilles	1
		Grand Portage Band Of Lake Superior Chippewa	2
		Forest County Potawatomi Community	2
		Fond du Lac Band of Lake Superior Chippewa	1
		Bois Forte Band of Minnesota - Lake Superior Chippewa	1
		1854 Treaty Authority (inter-tribal organization governed by Bois Forte Band and Grand Portage Band)	1
		Unknown Tribe	1
		R10	Alaska
Tanana Chiefs Conference	1		
Chugachmiut	1		
R--	Unknown	Unknown	1

Table 1.2. BIA respondents across the different Forest Service Regions.

USFS Region No.	Forest Service Regions	Name of the Agency	Number of Responses
R1	Northern Region	BIA Northern Cheyenne Agency	1
		BIA-National Interagency Fire Center	1
		BIA, Rocky Mountain Regional Office	1
		Crow Agency	1
R2	Rocky Mountain Region	BIA, Southern Ute Agency	1
R3	Southwestern Region	USDOJ BIA Western Regional Office	1
		Bureau of Indian Affairs; Fort Apache Agency	4
		BIA Western Region	1
		Unknown (BIA)	1
R4	Intermountain Region	BIA WRO Uintah & Ouray Agency	1
R5	Pacific Southwest Region		
R6	Pacific Northwest Region	BIA / Colville Agency	3
		Unknown (BIA)	1
R8	Southern Region	Cherokee Agency	1
R9	Eastern Region	Great Lakes Agency	1
		BIA/MRO	1
		BIA Midwest Region	1
		Unknown (BIA)	1
R10	Alaska Region		
	Unknown	Unknown (BIA)	5

Table 1.3. Other (non-tribal/non-BIA) respondents across the different Forest Service Regions.

USFS Region No.	Forest Service Regions	Name of the Agency	Number of Responses
R5	Pacific Southwest Region	Cahuilla Reservation Fire Department	1
R6	Pacific Northwest Region	University of Washington (retired)	1
		Unknown	1
	Unknown	Unknown (Other)	1

Q2. Please indicate how often you contact neighboring Forest Service personnel?




Figure 2. Total number of times survey respondents have contacted someone at either the Forest Service Ranger District or Forest Service Supervisor level.

Table 2. Total number of times survey respondents have contacted someone at the Forest Service *Ranger District*, Tribal vs BIA.

	Contact Neighboring FS Ranger			
	Actively engaged (5+ times/year)	Moderately engaged (3-4 times/year)	Lightly engaged (1-2 times/year)	Not regularly engaged
Tribe	24	7	11	17
BIA	2	3	8	6
Other	2	2	0	2

2 - tailed test

	T-Test	N	Mean	t-value	sig
Contact Forest Service Ranger District	Tribe	59	2.36	-1.84	0.069
	BIA	19	2.95		

Table 2.1. Total number of times survey respondents have contacted someone at the Forest Service Ranger District, tribal respondents vs. BIA respondents, by region

		<i>How often you contact neighboring Forest Service personnel from Forest Service Ranger District</i>									
FS Region	No of surveys		Actively engaged (5+ times/year)		Moderately engaged (3-4 times/yr)		Lightly engaged (1-2 times/yr)		Not regularly engaged		
	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA	
R1	8	4	1	0	2	0	2	1	2	1	
R2	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	
R3	8	7	5	0	0	2	1	3	2	1	
R4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	
R5	9	0	4	0	1	0	1	0	2	0	
R6	22	4	9	0	2	0	4	0	4	3	
R8	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	
R9	13	4	4	1	2	1	1	0	5	1	
R10	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	
U	1	5	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	
Totals	57	27	23	2	7	3	11	8	17	6	
		84		25		10		19		23	

Table 3 Total number of times that survey respondents have contacted someone at the Forest Service *Supervisor* level, Tribal vs. BIA.

	Contact Neighboring FS Supervisor			
	Actively engaged (5+ times/year)	Moderately engaged (3-4 times/year)	Lightly engaged (1-2 times/year)	Not regularly engaged
Tribe	14	11	12	22
BIA	3	2	10	5
Other	1	0	0	3

Table 3.1. Total number of times that survey respondents have contacted the Forest Service *Supervisor*, tribal respondents vs. BIA respondents, by region.

		How often you contact neighboring Forest Service personnel from Forest Service Supervisor Office									
FS Region	No of surveys		Actively engaged (5+ times/year)		Moderately engaged (3-4 times/yr)		Lightly engaged (1-2 times/yr)		Not regularly engaged		
	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA	
R1	8	4	1	0	1	0	2	2	3	1	
R2	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	
R3	9	7	5	0	2	1	0	4	2	1	
R4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	
R5	9	0	3	0	0	0	2	0	3	0	
R6	22	4	3	0	6	0	7	1	5	3	
R8	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	
R9	13	4	2	1	2	0	0	1	6	0	
R10	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	
U	1	5	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	
Totals	66	27	14	3	11	2	12	10	22	5	
	93		17		13		22		27		

Q3. Please rate the responsiveness of the Forest Service to tribal efforts to engage.




Figure 5. Total number of responses regarding survey respondents' perceptions of the responsiveness of either the Forest Service Ranger District or the Forest Service Supervisor Office to their efforts to engage them.

Table 4. Total number of responses regarding survey respondents perceptions of the responsiveness of the Forest Service *Ranger District* to their efforts to engage them, Tribal vs. BIA.

	Responsiveness of Ranger District		
	< 2 weeks	2-4 weeks	> month
Tribe	31	11	8
BIA	5	7	2
Other	4	1	1

Table 5. Total number of responses regarding survey respondents perceptions of the responsiveness of the Forest Service *Supervisor* to their efforts to engage them, Tribal vs. BIA.

	Responsiveness of Supervisor		
	< 2 weeks	2-4 weeks	> month
Tribe	22	15	8
BIA	7	7	2
Other	1	0	1

Table 6. Responsiveness of the Forest Service to tribal efforts to engage Forest Service *Ranger District*, by region

<i>Responsiveness of the Forest Service to Tribal efforts to engage Forest Service Ranger District, by region</i>								
FS Region	No of surveys		Quick Response (< 2 weeks)		Moderate Response (2-4 weeks)		Slow Response (> 1 month)	
	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA
R1	8	4	3	1	1	3	3	1
R2	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0
R3	9	7	6	1	1	0	0	4
R4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
R5	9	0	6	0	0	2	2	0
R6	22	4	10	0	0	5	5	0
R8	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0
R9	13	4	5	1	1	1	1	1
R10	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
U	1	5	1	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	66	27	31	5	5	11	11	7
	93		36		16		18	

Table 7. Responsiveness of the Forest Service to tribal efforts to engage Forest Service *Supervisor Office*, by region

<i>Responsiveness of the Forest Service to Tribal efforts to engage Forest Service Forest Supervisor by region</i>								
FS Region	No of surveys		Quick Response (< 2 weeks)		Moderate Response (2-4 weeks)		Slow Response (> 1 month)	
	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA
R1	8	4	3	2	2	1	1	1
R2	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0
R3	9	7	4	2	2	2	2	3
R4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
R5	9	0	4	0	0	3	3	0
R6	22	4	8	0	0	8	8	1
R8	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0
R9	13	4	2	1	1	1	1	1
R10	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
U	1	5	1	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	66	27	22	7	7	15	15	7

	93	29	22	22
--	----	----	----	----

Q4. Please indicate Tribal concerns regarding conditions on neighboring Forest Service lands




Figure 6. Tribal, BIA and Other Respondent's perceptions of the threat that Forest Service lands pose to reservation trust lands.

Table 8. Responses of Tribal concerns regarding conditions on Forest Service administered lands that *border a Tribe's reservation* pose significant threats of damage from wildfire, insects or disease to reservation trust lands, Tribal vs. BIA.

	Conditions on FS Administered Lands Posing a Threat Bordering Lands		
	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Tribe	11	12	30
BIA	4	0	21
Other	2	0	4

Table 9. Responses of Tribal concerns regarding conditions on Forest Service administered lands that are *not adjacent to, but within the immediate vicinity of a Tribe's reservation* pose significant threats of damage from wildfire, insects or disease to reservation trust lands, Tribal vs. BIA.

	Conditions on FS Administered Lands Posing a Threat Immediate Vicinity		
	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Tribe	10	11	34
BIA	3	2	19
Other	2	1	3

Table 10. Response of Tribal concerns regarding conditions on neighboring Forest Service lands: In their current condition, water, fish and wildlife resources on federal lands are not able to support meaningful exercise of treaty or other reserved rights, Tribal vs. BIA

	Conditions on FS Administered Lands Posing a Threat Exercising Treaty or Reserved Rights		
	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Tribe	15	23	21
BIA	9	10	3
Other	3	2	0

Table 11. Responses of Tribal concerns regarding conditions on Forest Service administered *lands that border a Tribe's reservation* pose significant threats of damage from wildfire, insects or disease to reservation trust lands, Tribal vs. BIA by region.

FS Region	No of surveys		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Not Applicable	
	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA
R1	8	4	0	0	2	0	3	4	3	0
R2	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
R3	9	7	4	1	0	0	5	6	0	0
R4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
R5	9	0	1	0	1	0	6	0	0	0
R6	22	4	5	0	4	0	10	4	2	0
R8	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
R9	13	4	1	2	4	0	5	2	3	0
R10	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0
U	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	0
Totals	66	27	11	4	12	0	30	21	11	0
	93		15		12		51		11	

Table 12. Responses of Tribal concerns regarding conditions on Forest Service administered *lands that are not adjacent to, but within the immediate vicinity of a Tribe's reservation* pose significant threats of damage from wildfire, insects or disease to reservation trust lands, Tribal vs. BIA by region

FS Region	No of surveys		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Not Applicable	
	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA
R1	8	4	1	0	1	1	5	3	1	0
R2	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
R3	9	7	4	1	0	0	5	5	0	1
R4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
R5	9	0	1	0	1	0	5	0	1	0
R6	22	4	4	0	3	0	12	4	1	0
R8	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
R9	13	4	0	1	5	1	6	2	2	0
R10	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0
U	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	0
Totals	66	27	10	3	11	2	34	19	8	1
	93		13		13		53		9	

Table 13. Response of Tribal concerns regarding conditions on neighboring Forest Service lands: In their current condition, *water, fish and wildlife resources* on federal lands are not able to support meaningful exercise of treaty or other reserved rights, Tribal vs. BIA, by region.

FS Region	No of surveys		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Not Applicable	
	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA
R1	8	4	2	1	2	2	3	0	1	0
R2	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
R3	9	7	4	2	2	1	3	2	0	2
R4	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
R5	9	0	1	0	4	0	3	0	0	0
R6	22	4	4	1	6	2	10	1	0	0
R8	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
R9	13	4	4	2	6	2	2	0	1	0
R10	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0
U	1	5	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0
Totals	66	27	15	9	23	10	21	3	4	2
	93		24		33		24		6	

5. Which of the following treaty or reserved rights does the Tribe claim on adjacent federal lands (please check all that apply)?




Figure 7. Number of Tribes who have treaty or reserved rights on adjacent federal lands.

Table 14. Number of Tribes who have treaty or reserved rights on adjacent federal lands, Tribal vs BIA.

Answered "Yes"	<i>No. of Tribes with Claimed or Reserved Rights</i>			
	Hunting and Fishing	Fish and Wildlife Management	Sacred Sites	Water
Tribe	49	30	50	31
BIA	16	13	16	7
Other	4	5	5	3

Table 15. Types of treaty or reserved rights that Tribe's have on adjacent federal lands, Tribal vs. BIA, by region.

		Hunting, fishing, gathering (foods, medicines, personal use)		Fish & wildlife resource co-management responsibility		Sacred sites		Water	
		No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Tribe	Northern Region (R1)	1	7	3	5	1	7	3	5
	Rocky Mountain Region (R2)	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	0
	Southwest Region (R3)	2	7	5	4	0	9	4	5
	Intermountain Region (R4)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Pacific Southwest Region (R5)	3	6	6	3	4	5	5	4
	Pacific Northwest Region (R6)	4	18	10	12	6	16	11	11
	Southern Region (R8)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Eastern Region (R9)	4	9	8	5	2	11	7	6
	Alaska Region (R10)	2	1	3	0	3	0	3	0
	Unknown (U)	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0
BIA	Northern Region (R1)	2	2	3	1	2	2	3	1
	Rocky Mountain Region (R2)	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
	Southwest Region (R3)	3	4	3	4	1	6	4	3
	Intermountain Region (R4)	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0
	Pacific Southwest Region (R5)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Pacific Northwest Region (R6)	0	4	1	3	0	4	2	2
	Southern Region (R8)	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0
	Eastern Region (R9)	3	1	3	1	4	0	4	0
	Alaska Region (R10)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Unknown (U)	3	2	3	2	3	2	5	0

6. Which of the following terms best describe your view on "Adjacency" of federal lands for purposes of the TFPA (please check all that apply)




Figure 8. Respondents views of terms that best describe their views on "Adjacency" of federal lands for the purposes of TFPA.

Table 16. Respondents views of terms that best describe their views on "Adjacency" of federal lands for the purposes of TFPA, Tribal vs. BIA.

Purpose of TFPA Best Describes "Adjacency"	View on "Adjacency" of Federal Lands						
	Share Common Border	Treaty/Tribal Rights Exercised	Watersheds Affecting Tribes Reservation	Specified Distance of Border	Within traditional use areas	All National Forest Lands neighboring	Not sure per TFPA
Tribe	39	30	42	21	38	23	5
BIA	21	14	13	9	13	13	2
Other	7	4	5	3	5	5	0

Pearson's Chi-Sq 2-sided

Terms best describe view of adjacency of federal lands	Chi-Sq	N = Yes	Chi-Sq	sig
Share a common Border	Tribe	39	2.923	0.087
	BIA	21		

Table 17a. Respondents views of terms that best describe their views on “Adjacency” of federal lands for the purposes of TFPA, Tribal vs. BIA, by region.

Tribe	No of surveys	Share a common border		Where treaty or other reserved Tribal rights are exercised		Watersheds affecting a Tribe's reservation or reserved rights		Within a specified distance of the reservation's boundaries	
		No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Northern Region (R1)	8	3	5	4	4	4	4	7	1
Rocky Mountain Region (R2)	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
Southwestern Region (R3)	9	1	8	4	4	2	7	5	3
Intermountain Region (R4)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pacific Southwest Region (R5)	9	7	2	8	1	4	5	6	3
Pacific Northwest Region (R6)	22	6	16	10	12	6	16	13	9
Southern Region (R8)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Eastern Region (R9)	13	8	5	6	7	5	8	9	4
Alaska Region (R10)	3	2	1	3	0	3	0	3	0
Unknown (U)	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	0
BIA Northern Region (R1)	4	0	4	2	2	3	1	3	1
BIA Rocky Mountain Region (R2)	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	0
BIA Southwestern Region (R3)	7	1	6	3	4	3	4	5	2
BIA Intermountain Region (R4)	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0
BIA Pacific Southwest Region (R5)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
BIA Pacific Northwest Region (R6)	4	0	4	1	3	2	2	2	2
BIA Southern Region (R8)	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	1
BIA Eastern Region (R9)	4	3	1	3	1	3	1	4	0
BIA Alaska Region (R10)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
BIA Unknown (U)	5	2	3	3	2	2	3	2	3

Table 17b. Respondents views of terms that best describe their views on “Adjacency” of federal lands for the purposes of TFPA, Tribal vs. BIA, by region.

		No. of surveys	<i>Within traditional use or treaty ceded areas</i>		<i>All lands of National Forest neighboring a reservation</i>		<i>Not sure what "adjacency" is per TFPA</i>	
			No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Tribe	Northern Region (R1)	8	4	4	5	3	8	0
	Rocky Mountain Region (R2)	1	0	1	0	1	1	0
	Southwestern Region (R3)	9	5	3	4	5	8	0
	Intermountain Region (R4)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Pacific Southwest Region (R5)	9	5	4	4	5	9	0
	Pacific Northwest Region (R6)	22	6	16	18	4	21	1
	Southern Region (R8)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Eastern Region (R9)	13	5	8	8	5	11	2
	Alaska Region (R10)	3	2	1	3	0	1	2
	Unknown (U)	1	0	1	1	0	1	0
BIA	Northern Region (R1)	4	3	1	1	3	4	0
	Rocky Mountain Region (R2)	1	0	1	1	0	0	1
	Southwestern Region (R3)	7	3	4	3	4	7	0
	Intermountain Region (R4)	1	1	0	0	1	1	0
	Pacific Southwest Region (R5)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Pacific Northwest Region (R6)	4	1	3	3	1	4	0
	Southern Region (R8)	1	0	1	0	1	1	0
	Eastern Region (R9)	4	4	0	3	1	3	1
	Alaska Region (R10)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Unknown (U)	5	2	3	3	2	5	0

7. Please rate your degree of agreement with the following statements.




Figure 9. Tribal attitudes regarding their experience with TFPA.

Table 18a. Tribal attitudes regarding their experience with TFPA, Tribal vs. BIA

Question #7	<i>Tribe is interested in using the TFPA Authority</i>		
	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Tribe	4	16	42
BIA	2	5	14
Other	1	1	3

Table 18b. Tribal attitudes regarding their experience with TFPA, Tribal vs. BIA

Question #7	<i>Familiar with TFPA authority and procedures</i>		
	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Tribe	20	16	27
BIA	10	7	5
Other	3	1	2

Table 18c. Tribal attitudes regarding their experience with TFPA, Tribal vs. BIA

Question #7	<i>I know how to initiate project proposals for TFPA</i>		
	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Tribe	29	15	19
BIA	15	4	2
Other	3	1	1

Table 18d. Tribal attitudes regarding their experience with TFPA, Tribal vs. BIA

Question #7	<i>I need additional training or technical assistance on the TFPA</i>		
	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Tribe	5	8	50
BIA	1	4	18
Other	0	1	3

Table 18e. Tribal attitudes regarding their experience with TFPA, Tribal vs. BIA

Question #7	<i>Forest Service Staff that Tribe works with are familiar with TFPA Authority</i>		
	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Tribe	19	23	13
BIA	4	9	7
Other	1	2	1

Table 18f. Tribal attitudes regarding their experience with TFPA, Tribal vs. BIA

Question #7	<i>Forest Service been receptive to working with tribe on TFPA</i>		
	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Tribe	16	24	12
BIA	4	10	5
Other	1	2	1

Tables 19 a-f. Respondent attitudes regarding their experience with TFPA, Tribal vs. BIA, by region.

Table 19a: Statement: My Tribe is interested in using the TFPA authority

FS Region	No of surveys		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Not Applicable	
	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA
R1	8	4	1	0	1	0	6	3	0	1
R2	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
R3	9	7	2	0	0	1	7	5	0	1
R4	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
R5	9	0	0	0	2	0	6	0	0	0
R6	22	4	0	0	5	1	15	3	0	0
R8	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
R9	13	4	1	0	6	2	6	0	0	1
R10	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
U	1	5	0	1	1	0	0	2	0	1
Totals	66	27	4	2	16	5	42	14	0	4
	93		6		21		56		4	

Table 19b. **Statement: I am familiar with the TFPA authority and administrative procedures for implementation**

FS Region	No of surveys		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Not Applicable	
	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA
R1	8	4	2	2	3	0	3	1	0	1
R2	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
R3	9	7	4	1	1	2	4	2	0	1
R4	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
R5	9	0	0	0	3	0	5	0	0	0
R6	22	4	6	0	4	2	11	2	0	0
R8	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
R9	13	4	6	3	4	0	3	0	0	0
R10	3	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
U	1	5	0	3	1	1	0	0	0	0
Totals	66	27	20	10	16	7	27	5	0	2
	93		30		23		32		2	

Table 19c. **Statement: I know how to initiate project proposals for the TFPA**

FS Region	No of surveys		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Not Applicable	
	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA
R1	8	4	3	3	1	0	4	0	0	1
R2	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
R3	9	7	5	2	0	1	4	2	0	1
R4	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
R5	9	0	0	0	5	0	3	0	0	0
R6	22	4	11	1	6	2	4	0	0	1
R8	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
R9	13	4	8	3	2	0	3	0	0	0
R10	3	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
U	1	5	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	66	27	29	15	15	4	19	2	0	3
	93		44		19		21		3	

Table 19d. **Statement: I need additional training and/or technical assistance on the TFPA**

FS Region	No of surveys		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Not Applicable	
	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA
R1	8	4	1	0	0	1	7	3	0	0
R2	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
R3	9	7	1	0	1	1	7	4	0	1
R4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
R5	9	0	1	0	1	0	6	0	0	0
R6	22	4	1	0	3	1	17	3	0	0
R8	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
R9	13	4	1	1	2	1	10	1	0	0
R10	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
U	1	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	0
Totals	66	27	5	1	8	4	50	18	0	1
	93		6		12		68		1	

Table 19e. **Statement: The Forest Service line/staff that my Tribe works with are familiar with the TFWA authority**

FS Region	No of surveys		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Not Applicable	
	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA
R1	8	4	3	1	3	0	1	2	1	0
R2	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
R3	9	7	5	0	1	1	2	4	1	1
R4	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
R5	9	0	1	0	3	0	4	0	0	0
R6	22	4	5	2	10	2	6	0	0	0
R8	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
R9	13	4	4	0	5	2	0	0	4	1
R10	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
U	1	5	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	1
Totals	66	27	19	4	23	9	13	7	8	3
	93		23		32		20		11	

Table 19f. **The Forest Service has been very receptive to working with my Tribe in developing TFWA proposals**

FS Region	No of surveys		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Not Applicable	
	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA
R1	8	4	2	1	2	2	2	1	2	0
R2	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
R3	9	7	5	0	0	1	3	4	1	1
R4	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
R5	9	0	1	0	4	0	3	0	0	0
R6	22	4	6	2	11	1	2	0	2	1
R8	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
R9	13	4	2	0	7	2	1	0	2	1
R10	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
U	1	5	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	2
Totals	66	27	16	4	24	10	12	5	10	5
	93		20		34		17		15	

8. Tribal Forest Protection Act (TFPA) training or meetings

Table 20: Responses on attending training or meetings on TFPA.

	Yes	No
Have you ever attended training or meetings on TFPA	21	72

Table 21: Responses on attending training or meetings on TFPA, Tribal vs. BIA.

	Yes	No
Tribe	17	45
BIA	2	23
Other	2	4

Pearson's Chi-Sq 2-sided

Have you ever attended training or meetings on TFPA	Chi-Sq	N = Yes	Chi-Sq	sig
Total		17	3.561	0.047
		2		

Proportion of tribal attendance significantly higher

Table 22. Responses on attending training or meetings on TFPA, Tribal vs. BIA, by region.

Have you ever attended training or meetings on the TFPA

FS Region	Responses		No		Yes	
	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA
R1	8	4	4	3	4	1
R2	1	1	1	1	0	0
R3	9	7	5	6	4	1
R4	0	1	0	1	0	0
R5	9	0	4	0	3	0
R6	22	4	17	4	4	0
R8	0	1	0	1	0	0
R9	13	4	12	3	1	0
R10	3	0	1	0	1	0
U	1	5	1	4	0	0
Totals	66	27	45	23	17	2
	93		68		19	

Q13. Please select the type of work that was done under this contract and/or agreement. (select all that apply)




Figure 10: Types of work done under a TFPA agreement.

Table 23: Types of work done under a TFPA agreement, Tribal vs. BIA.

Question #13	Type of Work Done Under National Forest Project Agreement		
	Tribe	BIA	Other
Answered "Yes"			
Forest Pest/Disease treatment	2	2	0
Hazard Fuel Treatment	10	6	1
Biomass Utilization	5	1	1
Commercial Harvest	4	1	0
Road Rehabilitation	4	0	0
Stream Rehabilitation	0	0	0

14. Experience with the TFPA project. Please rate your degree of agreement with the following statements

Table 24: Respondent's experience with various aspects of TFPA projects.

	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Administrative Procedures worked well	10	11	6
Difference in Policy Interpretation was resolved	10	13	5
Legislative Authority was adequate	9	8	10
Project planning was completed in a timely fashion	10	12	4
Substantive differences in views of adjacency were experienced	5	16	6
Substantive differences in views of "threats to trust resources" for the TFPA were experienced	1	0	0
Substantive differences in views of goods for services were experienced	3	14	5
Negotiations over price and other terms were easily concluded	8	13	3
Format for the agreement/contract was easy to use and understand	5	14	4
Funding was available to complete the project	7	12	6
The project was implemented in a timely fashion without incident	7	11	6
Compliance monitoring was adequate	2	15	5

Table 25a: Respondent's experience with various aspects of TFPA projects, Tribal vs. BIA

Question #14	<i>Experience with TFPA project - Administrative procedures worked well</i>		
	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Tribe	9	8	3
BIA	1	3	2
Other	0	0	1

Table 25b: Respondent's experience with various aspects of TFPA projects, Tribal vs. BIA

Question #14	<i>Experience with TFPA project - Differences in Policy interpretation were easily resolved</i>		
	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Tribe	8	11	2
BIA	2	2	2
Other	0	0	1

Table 25c: Respondent's experience with various aspects of TFPA projects, Tribal vs. BIA

Question #14	<i>Experience with TFPA project - Legislative Authority was adequate for project</i>		
	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Tribe	6	8	7
BIA	3	0	2
Other	0	0	1

Table 25d: Respondent's experience with various aspects of TFPA projects, Tribal vs. BIA

Question #14	<i>Experience with TFPA project -Project Planning was completed in a timely and cost effective manner</i>		
	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Tribe	8	10	2
BIA	2	2	1
Other	0	0	1

Table 25e: Respondent's experience with various aspects of TFPA projects, Tribal vs. BIA

Question #14	<i>Experience with TFPA project - Substantive Differences in views of "adjacency were experienced</i>		
	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Tribe	5	11	5
BIA	0	4	1
Other	0	1	0

Table 25f: Respondent's experience with various aspects of TFPA projects, Tribal vs. BIA

Question #14	<i>Experience with TFPA project - Difference Views of threats to trust resources were experienced</i>		
	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Tribe	0	0	0
BIA	0	0	0
Other	1	0	0

Table 25g: Respondent's experience with various aspects of TFPA projects, Tribal vs. BIA

Question #14	<i>Experience with TFPA project - Differences in views of goods for services were experienced</i>		
	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Tribe	3	10	4
BIA	0	4	1
Other	0	0	0

Table 25h: Respondent's experience with various aspects of TFPA projects, Tribal vs. BIA

Question #14	<i>Experience with TFPA project - Negotiations over determination of price and other terms were easily concluded</i>		
	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Tribe	6	9	3
BIA	1	4	0
Other	1	0	0

Table 25i: Respondent's experience with various aspects of TFPA projects, Tribal vs. BIA

Question #14	<i>Experience with TFPA project -The format for the agreement was easy to use and understand</i>		
	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Tribe	4	10	3
BIA	1	4	0
Other	0	0	1

Table 25j: Respondent's experience with various aspects of TFPA projects, Tribal vs. BIA

Question #14	<i>Experience with TFPA project -Funding was available to complete the project</i>		
	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Tribe	6	8	5
BIA	1	4	0
Other	0	0	1

Table 25k: Respondent's experience with various aspects of TFPA projects, Tribal vs. BIA

Question #14	<i>Experience with TFPA project -The project was implemented in a timely manner without incident</i>		
	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Tribe	5	8	4
BIA	2	3	1
Other	0	0	1

Table 25l. Respondent's experience with various aspects of TFPA projects, Tribal vs. BIA.

Question #14	<i>Experience with TFPA project - Compliance monitoring was adequate</i>		
	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Tribe	2	11	4
BIA	0	4	1
Other	0	0	0

Tables 26 a-l: Respondent's experience with various aspects of TFPA projects, Tribal vs. BIA, by region.

Table 26a: *Administrative procedures worked well*

FS Region	No of surveys		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Not Applicable	
	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA
R1	8	4	1	0	0	1	1	1	2	0
R2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
R3	9	7	2	0	1	1	2	1	1	1
R4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
R5	9	0	2	0	3	0	0	0	1	0
R6	22	4	4	0	2	1	0	0	2	0
R8	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
R9	13	4	0	1	2	0	0	0	2	0
R10	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
U	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Totals	66	27	9	1	8	3	3	2	9	2
	93		10		11		5		11	

Table 26b: *Differences in policy interpretation were easily resolved*

FS Region	No of surveys		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Not Applicable	
	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA
R1	8	4	1	1	0	0	1	1	2	0
R2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
R3	9	7	2	0	3	1	0	1	1	1
R4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
R5	9	0	2	0	3	0	1	0	1	0
R6	22	4	3	0	3	1	0	0	2	0
R8	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
R9	13	4	0	1	2	0	0	0	2	0
R10	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
U	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Totals	66	27	8	2	11	2	2	2	9	2
	93		10		13		4		11	

Table 26c: **Legislative authority was adequate for the needed purpose of the project**

FS Region	No of surveys		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Not Applicable	
	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA
R1	8	4	0	1	0	0	2	1	2	0
R2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
R3	9	7	2	0	0	0	3	1	1	1
R4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
R5	9	0	2	0	3	0	1	0	1	0
R6	22	4	2	1	4	0	0	0	2	0
R8	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
R9	13	4	0	1	1	0	1	0	2	0
R10	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
U	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Totals	66	27	6	3	8	0	7	2	9	2
	93		9		8		9		11	

Table 26d: **Project planning, including NEPA was completed in a timely and cost effective manner**

FS Region	No of surveys		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Not Applicable	
	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA
R1	8	4	0	1	1	1	1	0	2	0
R2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
R3	9	7	3	0	1	0	1	1	1	1
R4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
R5	9	0	3	0	3	0	0	0	1	0
R6	22	4	2	0	3	1	0	0	3	0
R8	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
R9	13	4	0	1	2	0	0	0	2	0
R10	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
U	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Totals	66	27	8	2	10	2	2	1	10	2
	93		10		12		3		12	

Table 26e: **Substantive differences in views of "adjacency" were experienced**

FS Region	No of surveys		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Not Applicable	
	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA
R1	8	4	2	0	0	2	0	0	2	0
R2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
R3	9	7	2	0	2	1	1	0	1	1
R4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
R5	9	0	1	0	4	0	1	0	1	0
R6	22	4	0	0	4	1	2	0	2	0
R8	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
R9	13	4	0	0	1	0	1	1	2	0
R10	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
U	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Totals	66	27	5	0	11	4	5	1	9	2
	93		5		15		6		11	

Table 26f: **Substantive differences in views of "threats to trust resources" for the TFPA were experienced.**

FS Region	No of surveys		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Not Applicable	
	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA
R1	8	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
R2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
R3	9	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
R4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
R5	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
R6	22	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
R8	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
R9	13	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
R10	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
U	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	66	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	93		0		0		0		0	

Table 26g: **Substantive differences in views of "goods for services" were experienced**

FS Region	No of surveys		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Not Applicable	
	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA
R1	8	4	0	0	1	1	1	1	2	0
R2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
R3	9	7	3	0	1	1	1	0	1	1
R4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
R5	9	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	2	0
R6	22	4	0	0	2	1	2	0	4	0
R8	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
R9	13	4	0	0	2	1	0	0	2	0
R10	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
U	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Totals	66	27	3	0	10	4	4	1	12	2
	93		3		14		5		14	

Table 26h: **Negotiations over determination of price or other terms were easily concluded**

FS Region	No of surveys		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Not Applicable	
	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA
R1	8	4	1	1	0	1	1	0	2	0
R2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
R3	9	7	2	0	2	1	1	0	1	1
R4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
R5	9	0	2	0	3	0	0	0	1	0
R6	22	4	1	0	2	1	1	0	4	0
R8	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
R9	13	4	0	0	2	1	0	0	2	0
R10	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
U	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Totals	66	27	6	1	9	4	3	0	11	2
	93		7		13		3		13	

Table 26i: *The format for the agreement/contract was easy to use and understand*

FS Region	No of surveys		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Not Applicable	
	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA
R1	8	4	2	0	0	2	0	0	2	0
R2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
R3	9	7	2	0	2	1	1	0	1	1
R4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
R5	9	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	2	0
R6	22	4	0	0	2	1	2	0	4	0
R8	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
R9	13	4	0	1	2	0	0	0	2	0
R10	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
U	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Totals	66	27	4	1	10	4	3	0	12	2
	93		5		14		3		14	

Table 26j: *Funding was available to complete the project*

FS Region	No of surveys		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Not Applicable	
	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA
R1	8	4	1	0	0	2	1	0	2	0
R2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
R3	9	7	2	0	1	1	2	0	1	1
R4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
R5	9	0	2	0	3	0	1	0	1	0
R6	22	4	0	1	3	0	1	0	4	0
R8	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
R9	13	4	1	0	1	1	0	0	2	0
R10	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
U	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Totals	66	27	6	1	8	4	5	0	11	2
	93		7		12		5		13	

Table 26k: *The project was implemented in a timely manner without incident.*

FS Region	No of surveys		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Not Applicable	
	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA
R1	8	4	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	0
R2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
R3	9	7	1	0	1	1	3	1	1	1
R4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
R5	9	0	2	0	3	0	0	0	1	0
R6	22	4	0	0	2	1	1	0	5	0
R8	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
R9	13	4	0	0	2	1	0	0	2	0
R10	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
U	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Totals	66	27	5	2	8	3	4	1	12	2
	93		7		11		5		14	

Table 26l: *Compliance monitoring was adequate*

FS Region	No of surveys		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Not Applicable	
	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA	Tribal	BIA
R1	8	4	0	0	0	2	2	0	2	0
R2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
R3	9	7	1	0	2	0	2	1	1	1
R4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
R5	9	0	1	0	4	0	0	0	1	0
R6	22	4	0	0	3	1	0	0	5	0
R8	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
R9	13	4	0	0	2	1	0	0	2	0
R10	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
U	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Totals	66	27								
	93		0		0		0		0	

18. Please select the type of work that was done under this contract and/or agreement. (select all that apply)

Table 27: Types of work done under a TFPA agreement.

	Number of Respondents
Forest Pest/Disease treatment	0
Hazard Fuel Treatment	0
Biomass Utilization	0
Commercial Harvest	0
Road Rehabilitation	0
Stream Rehabilitation	0

19. Experience with the TFPA project. Please rate your degree of agreement with the following statements

Table 28: Respondent agreement with various aspects of TFPA agreements.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Administrative Procedures	1	0	4	0	0
Difference in Policy Interpretation was resolved	1	0	4	0	0
Legislative Authority was adequate	1	0	4	0	0
Project planning was completed in a timely fashion	1	0	4	0	0
Substantive differences in views of adjacency were experienced	1	0	4	0	0
Substantive differences in views of goods for services were experienced	0	0	4	0	0
Negotiations over price and other terms were easily concluded	1	0	4	0	0
Format for the agreement/contract was easy to use and understand	0	0	4	0	0
Funding was available to complete the project	0	0	4	1	0
The project was implemented in a timely fashion without incident	1	0	4	0	0
Compliance monitoring was adequate	1	0	4	0	0

Results of a Forest Service Survey on TFPA and Related Issues

Conducted for the Intertribal Timber Council by CINTRAFOR

Dr. Indroneil Ganguly, Dr. Ivan Eastin and Tait Bowers

May 25, 2012




Figure 1: Map of Forest Service Regions.

Table 1: Summary of Forest Service respondents by Regions.

	Responses
Northern Region (R1)	3
Rocky Mountain Region (R2)	5
Southwestern Region (R3)	30
Intermountain Region (R4)	1
Pacific Southwest Region (R5)	5
Pacific Northwest Region (R6)	13
Southern Region (R8)	0
Eastern Region (R9)	21
Alaska Region (R10)	1
Unknown (U)	3
TOTAL	82

Table 1.1. Forest Service respondents across the different Forest Service Regions.

USFS Region No.	Forest Service Regions	Name of the tribe	Number of Responses
R1	Northern Region	Western Montana Acquisition Zone	1
		Northern Region Headquarters	1
		Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forests	1
R2	Rocky Mountain Region	Unknown	1
		San Juan National Forest	1
		GMUG SO	1
		GMUG NF	1
		21305	1
R3	Southwestern Region	Unknown	3
		Tonto NF-SO	1
		Tonto National Forest, Globe Ranger District	1
		Tonto National Forest	5
		Tonto Basin Ranger District, Tonto National Forest	1
		Southwestern Region, Regional Office	3
		Santa Fe National Forest	3
		RO	1
		Prescott National Forest	1
		Lincoln National Forest	2
		Lakeside Ranger District, Apache-Sitgreaves National Forests	1
		Kaibab National Forest	1
		Gila NF	1
		Coronado NF	1
		Coronado National Forest, Safford Ranger District	1
		Coconino NF	1
		Cibola National Forest and Grasslands	1
		Carson NF	1
Apache -Sitgreaves NF, Supervisor's Office	1		
R4	Intermountain Region	Ashley National Forest	1
R5	Pacific Southwest Region	Unknown	1
		San Bernardino National Forest	1
		Regional Office	1
		Klamath National Forest	1
		Sequoia National Forest	1

USFS Region No.	Forest Service Regions	Name of the tribe	Number of Responses
R6	Pacific Northwest Region	RO NR FP	1
		PNW Region, Acquisition Management	1
		Olympic National Forest/Pacific Ranger District	1
		Olympic National Forest, Olympia, WA	1
		Fremont-Winema National Forest	1
		Okanogan-Wenatchee NF	3
		Naches Ranger District, Okanogan Wenatchee National Forest	1
		Colville and Okanogan Wenatchee NF's	1
		Cle Elum Ranger District	1
		NFS	1
		Rogue River-Siskiyou National Forest	1
R8	Southern Region		0
R9	Eastern Region	Unknown (2)	2
		Eastern Region	1
		Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest	1
		Superior National Forest	1
		Ottawa NF/Bessemer-Iron River-Watersmeet Districts	1
		Ottawa National Forest, J.W. Toumey Nursery	1
		Ottawa National Forest	3
		Monongahela National Forest	1
		Marienville Ranger District, Allegheny National Forest	1
		Iron River/Watersmeet RD, Ottawa NF, USDA Forest Service	1
		Hoosier National Forest	1
		Hiawatha National Forest	2
		Eastern Region - SO	1
		Chequamegon-Nicolet NF/Lakewood/Laona RD	1
		Chequamegon-Nicolet, Ottawa, Hiawatha NFs	1
Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest	1		
31204	1		
R10	Alaska Region	Ketchikan Misty Fiords RD	1
U	Unknown	Unknown	1
		forest supervisor's office	1
		215	1

Q2. Please indicate how often you contact neighboring Tribes concerning resource management projects on federal lands.




Figure 2: Total number of times survey respondents have contacted someone at neighboring tribe concerning resource management projects.

Table 2: Total number of times survey respondents have contacted Tribes regarding resource management issues

	How often do you contact neighboring Tribes concerning resource management projects on Federal Lands?				
	Responses	Actively engaged (5+ times/year)	Moderately engaged (3-4 times/year)	Lightly engaged (1-2 times/year)	Not regularly engaged
Northern Region (R1)	3	3	0	0	0
Rocky Mountain Region (R2)	5	1	2	0	1
Southwestern Region (R3)	30	13	4	3	7
Intermountain Region (R4)	1	0	0	0	1
Pacific Southwest Region (R5)	5	3	1	1	0
Pacific Northwest Region (R6)	13	4	3	2	2
Southern Region (R8)	0	0	0	0	0
Eastern Region (R9)	21	5	4	3	6
Alaska Region (R10)	1	0	0	0	0
Unknown	3	1	0	0	1

Q3. Please rate the responsiveness of neighboring Tribes to your effort to engage.




Figure 3: Total number of responses regarding survey respondents' perceptions of the responsiveness of either neighboring tribes to their efforts to engage them.

Table 3: Total number of responses regarding survey respondents' perceptions of the responsiveness of Tribes to their efforts to engage them, by region.

	Responsiveness of neighboring Tribes to your efforts to engage			
	Responses	Quick response (< 2 weeks)	Moderate response (2-4 weeks)	Slow response (>1 month)
Northern Region (R1)	3	2	1	0
Rocky Mountain Region (R2)	5	0	1	3
Southwestern Region (R3)	30	3	8	11
Intermountain Region (R4)	1	0	0	1
Pacific Southwest Region (R5)	5	0	4	1
Pacific Northwest Region (R6)	13	3	2	4
Southern Region (R8)	0	0	0	0
Eastern Region (R9)	21	0	11	3
Alaska Region (R10)	1	0	0	0
Unknown	3	0	0	1

Q4. Please indicate general concerns expressed by Tribal neighbors regarding conditions on Forest Service lands.




Figure 4: Respondent's perceptions of the conditions of Tribal lands bordering FS Administered lands




Figure 5: Respondent’s perception of the conditions on lands in the immediate vicinity of a Tribe’s reservation.




Figure 6: Respondent’s perception on current conditions on federal lands in regards to treaty and reserved rights.

Table 4: Responses of conditions on Forest Service administered lands that border a Tribe's reservation pose significant threats of damage from wildfire, insects or disease to reservation trust lands, by FS region.

	Responses	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Northern Region (R1)	3	0	2	1
Rocky Mountain Region (R2)	5	1	0	0
Southwestern Region (R3)	30	7	4	8
Intermountain Region (R4)	1	1	0	0
Pacific Southwest Region (R5)	5	1	2	2
Pacific Northwest Region (R6)	13	2	2	7
Southern Region (R8)	0	0	0	0
Eastern Region (R9)	21	8	5	2
Alaska Region (R10)	1	0	0	0
Unknown	3	0	0	0

Table 5: Responses of conditions on Forest Service administered lands that are not adjacent to, but within the immediate vicinity of a Tribe's reservation pose significant threats of damage from wildfire, insects or disease to reservation trust lands, by FS region.

	Responses	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Northern Region (R1)	3	0	1	2
Rocky Mountain Region (R2)	5	1	0	0
Southwestern Region (R3)	30	9	4	8
Intermountain Region (R4)	1	0	1	0
Pacific Southwest Region (R5)	5	1	0	4
Pacific Northwest Region (R6)	13	4	1	6
Southern Region (R8)	0	0	0	0
Eastern Region (R9)	21	7	5	3
Alaska Region (R10)	1	0	0	0
Unknown	3	0	0	0

Table 6: Response to current conditions regarding Forest Service lands: In their current condition, water, fish and wildlife resources on federal lands are not able to support meaningful exercise of treaty or other reserved rights, by FS region

	Responses	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Northern Region (R1)	3	1	1	0
Rocky Mountain Region (R2)	5	1	0	0
Southwestern Region (R3)	30	10	7	3
Intermountain Region (R4)	1	0	1	0
Pacific Southwest Region (R5)	5	2	2	1
Pacific Northwest Region (R6)	13	7	2	2
Southern Region (R8)	0	0	0	0
Eastern Region (R9)	21	8	4	2
Alaska Region (R10)	1	0	0	0
Unknown	3	0	0	0

Q5. On the FS lands that you administer, is there a Tribe which/who has claimed any of the following treaty rights or reserved rights (please check all that apply)?




Figure 7: Number of Tribes who have treaty or reserved rights on Forest Service Lands.

Table 7: Number of Tribes who have treaty or reserved rights on adjacent federal lands, by FS region.

		Hunting, fishing, gathering	Fish & wildlife resource co-management	Sacred Sites	Water
	Responses	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Northern Region (R1)	3	2	1	1	1
Rocky Mountain Region (R2)	5	5	0	1	0
Southwestern Region (R3)	30	13	1	14	5
Intermountain Region (R4)	1	0	0	0	0
Pacific Southwest Region (R5)	5	3	1	4	2
Pacific Northwest Region (R6)	13	11	1	1	1
Southern Region (R8)	0	0	0	0	0
Eastern Region (R9)	21	12	4	7	1
Alaska Region (R10)	1	0	0	0	0
Unknown	3	1	0	1	0

Q6. Have you ever attended training or meetings on the Tribal Forest Protection Act (TFPA)?

Table 8: Attendance at training or meeting on the TFPA, by FS region.

	Have you ever attended training or meetings on the TFPA		
		No	Yes
	Responses	Count	Count
Northern Region (R1)	3	0	3
Rocky Mountain Region (R2)	5	5	0
Southwestern Region (R3)	30	20	10
Intermountain Region (R4)	1	1	0
Pacific Southwest Region (R5)	5	4	1
Pacific Northwest Region (R6)	13	12	1
Southern Region (R8)	0	0	0
Eastern Region (R9)	21	17	4
Alaska Region (R10)	1	1	0
Unknown	3	3	0

Q7. Please rate your degree of agreement with the following statements.




Figure 8: Agreement with interest in using the TFPA.




Figure 9: Agreement with familiarity with the TFPA authority and procedures.




Figure 10: Agreement with need for additional training or assistance.




Figure 11: Agreement that the Forest Service has contacted tribes regarding potential TFPA projects.




Figure 12: Agreement that the tribes the respondent works with are familiar with the TFPA.




Figure 13: Agreement that the tribes the respondent works with are receptive to working with the Forest Service in developing TFPA proposals.

Table 9: Statement that respondent agency is interested in using the TFPA, by region.

	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Disagree
Northern Region (R1)	0	1	2	0
Rocky Mountain Region (R2)	1	3	1	1
Southwestern Region (R3)	0	7	17	0
Intermountain Region (R4)	0	1	0	0
Pacific Southwest Region (R5)	0	1	3	0
Pacific Northwest Region (R6)	1	1	10	1
Southern Region (R8)	0	0	0	0
Eastern Region (R9)	1	5	10	1
Alaska Region (R10)	0	0	0	0
Unknown	0	1	1	0

Table 10: Statement that respondent is familiar with TFPA administrative procedures and implementation.

	Responses	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Northern Region (R1)	3	0	1	2
Rocky Mountain Region (R2)	5	2	1	2
Southwestern Region (R3)	30	10	4	11
Intermountain Region (R4)	1	1	0	0
Pacific Southwest Region (R5)	5	1	0	2
Pacific Northwest Region (R6)	13	4	0	8
Southern Region (R8)	0	0	0	0
Eastern Region (R9)	21	7	7	4
Alaska Region (R10)	1	0	0	0
Unknown	3	1	1	0

Table 11: Statement that the respondent needs additional training or assistance with the TFPA.

	Responses	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Northern Region (R1)	3	0	1	2
Rocky Mountain Region (R2)	5	1	0	4
Southwestern Region (R3)	30	5	5	15
Intermountain Region (R4)	1	0	0	1
Pacific Southwest Region (R5)	5	1	1	2
Pacific Northwest Region (R6)	13	1	2	9
Southern Region (R8)	0	0	0	0
Eastern Region (R9)	21	0	5	13
Alaska Region (R10)	1	0	0	0
Unknown	3	1	0	2

Table 12: Statement that the respondent has contacted the tribes they work with about potential TFPA projects.

	Responses	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Northern Region (R1)	3	0	3	0
Rocky Mountain Region (R2)	5	2	0	0
Southwestern Region (R3)	30	9	7	8
Intermountain Region (R4)	1	1	0	0
Pacific Southwest Region (R5)	5	1	0	2
Pacific Northwest Region (R6)	13	2	3	5
Southern Region (R8)	0	0	0	0
Eastern Region (R9)	21	6	3	7
Alaska Region (R10)	1	0	0	0
Unknown	3	0	0	1

Table 13: Statement that the respondent's tribes they work with are familiar with the TFPA authority

	Responses	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Northern Region (R1)	3	0	1	2
Rocky Mountain Region (R2)	5	0	3	0
Southwestern Region (R3)	30	5	11	7
Intermountain Region (R4)	1	1	0	0
Pacific Southwest Region (R5)	5	0	2	2
Pacific Northwest Region (R6)	13	0	5	6
Southern Region (R8)	0	0	0	0
Eastern Region (R9)	21	0	11	5
Alaska Region (R10)	1	0	0	0
Unknown	3	0	0	1

Table 14: Statement that the tribes the respondent works with are receptive to working on developing TFPA proposals.

	Responses	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Northern Region (R1)	3	0	1	2
Rocky Mountain Region (R2)	5	1	1	0
Southwestern Region (R3)	30	5	10	6
Intermountain Region (R4)	1	1	0	0
Pacific Southwest Region (R5)	5	0	2	2
Pacific Northwest Region (R6)	13	0	6	3
Southern Region (R8)	0	0	0	0
Eastern Region (R9)	21	0	10	5
Alaska Region (R10)	1	0	0	0
Unknown	3	0	0	0

Q9. Which of the following terms best describe your view of what constitutes "adjacency" to federal lands as stated in TFPA (please check all that apply)




Figure 14: Respondents views of terms that best describe their views on “Adjacency” of federal lands for the purposes of TFPA.

Table 15. Respondents views of terms that best describe their views on “Adjacency” of federal lands for the purposes of TFPA, by region.

	Responses	Share a common border	Where treaty or other reserved Tribal rights are exercised	Watersheds affecting a Tribe's reservation or reserved rights	Within a specified distance of the reservations borders	Within traditional use or treaty ceded areas	All lands of National Forest neighboring a reservation	Not Sure
		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Northern Region (R1)	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Rocky Mountain Region (R2)	5	2	1	2	0	1	1	2
Southwestern Region (R3)	30	15	10	14	6	11	10	4
Intermountain Region (R4)	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pacific Southwest Region (R5)	5	3	0	1	0	1	3	2
Pacific Northwest Region (R6)	13	7	1	3	0	1	0	0
Southern Region (R8)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Eastern Region (R9)	21	12	11	9	7	11	5	5
Alaska Region (R10)	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unknown	3	2	2	2	0	1	2	1

Q13. Please select the type of work that was done under this contract and/or agreement (select all that apply)




Figure 15: Type of work that was done under resource management contract and/or agreement

Table 16: Types of work done under a TFPA agreement, by region: number of respondents who said “Yes” to the following work

	Responses	Forest pest/disease treatment	Hazard fuel treatment	Biomass utilization	Commercial harvest	Road rehabilitation	Stream rehabilitation
Northern Region (R1)	3	0	2	1	1	0	0
Rocky Mountain Region (R2)	5	0	0	0	0	0	0
Southwestern Region (R3)	30	4	6	2	5	0	0
Intermountain Region (R4)	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pacific Southwest Region (R5)	5	1	3	1	0	0	0
Pacific Northwest Region (R6)	13	2	2	1	2	2	1
Southern Region (R8)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Eastern Region (R9)	21	0	1	0	0	0	0
Alaska Region (R10)	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unknown	3	0	0	0	0	0	0

14. Experience with the TFPA project- please rate your degree of agreement with the following statements

Table 17: Respondents experience with various aspects of TFPA projects.

	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Administrative procedures worked well	3	7	7
Differences in policy interpretation were easily resolved	1	8	6
Legislative authority was adequate for the needed purpose of the project	2	5	9
Project planning, including NEPA was completed in a timely and cost effective manner	0	6	8
Substantive differences in views of "adjacency" were experienced	6	6	2
Substantive differences in views of "goods for services" were experienced	8	4	1
Negotiations over determination of price or other terms were easily concluded	3	7	4
The format for the agreement/contract was easy to use and understand	0	9	5
Funding was available to complete the project	3	5	5
The project was implemented in a timely manner without incident	3	5	4
Compliance monitoring was adequate	1	8	4

Table 18: Respondents experience with various aspects of TFPA projects, by region

Table 18a: <i>Q14.1</i>		Administrative procedures worked well		
	Responses	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Northern Region (R1)	3	0	1	0
Rocky Mountain Region (R2)	5	0	0	0
Southwestern Region (R3)	30	3	2	3
Intermountain Region (R4)	1	0	0	0
Pacific Southwest Region (R5)	5	0	0	3
Pacific Northwest Region (R6)	13	0	3	1
Southern Region (R8)	0	0	0	0
Eastern Region (R9)	21	0	1	0
Alaska Region (R10)	1	0	0	0
Unknown	3	0	0	0

Table 18b: <i>Q14.2</i>		Differences in policy interpretation were easily resolved		
	Responses	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Northern Region (R1)	0	1	1	0
Rocky Mountain Region (R2)	0	0	0	0
Southwestern Region (R3)	0	4	3	0
Intermountain Region (R4)	0	0	0	0
Pacific Southwest Region (R5)	0	0	2	0
Pacific Northwest Region (R6)	1	2	0	1
Southern Region (R8)	0	0	0	0
Eastern Region (R9)	0	1	0	0
Alaska Region (R10)	0	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0	0	0

Table 18c: Q14.3	Responses	Legislative authority was adequate for the needed purpose of the project		
		Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Northern Region (R1)	3	1	0	0
Rocky Mountain Region (R2)	5	0	0	0
Southwestern Region (R3)	30	0	2	5
Intermountain Region (R4)	1	0	0	0
Pacific Southwest Region (R5)	5	0	0	3
Pacific Northwest Region (R6)	13	1	2	1
Southern Region (R8)	0	0	0	0
Eastern Region (R9)	21	0	1	0
Alaska Region (R10)	1	0	0	0
Unknown	3	0	0	0

Table 18d: Q14.4	Responses	Project planning, including NEPA was completed in a timely and cost effective manner		
		Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Northern Region (R1)	3	0	0	0
Rocky Mountain Region (R2)	5	0	0	0
Southwestern Region (R3)	30	0	2	5
Intermountain Region (R4)	1	0	0	0
Pacific Southwest Region (R5)	5	0	1	2
Pacific Northwest Region (R6)	13	0	2	1
Southern Region (R8)	0	0	0	0
Eastern Region (R9)	21	0	1	0
Alaska Region (R10)	1	0	0	0
Unknown	3	0	0	0

Table 18e: <i>Q14.5</i>	Substantive differences in views of "adjacency" were experienced			
	Responses	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Northern Region (R1)	3	0	0	0
Rocky Mountain Region (R2)	5	0	0	0
Southwestern Region (R3)	30	4	2	1
Intermountain Region (R4)	1	0	0	0
Pacific Southwest Region (R5)	5	0	1	1
Pacific Northwest Region (R6)	13	2	2	0
Southern Region (R8)	0	0	0	0
Eastern Region (R9)	21	0	1	0
Alaska Region (R10)	1	0	0	0
Unknown	3	0	0	0

Table 18f: <i>Q14.6</i>	Substantive differences in views of "goods for services" were experienced			
	Responses	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Northern Region (R1)	3	1	0	0
Rocky Mountain Region (R2)	5	0	0	0
Southwestern Region (R3)	30	5	1	0
Intermountain Region (R4)	1	0	0	0
Pacific Southwest Region (R5)	5	1	0	1
Pacific Northwest Region (R6)	13	1	2	0
Southern Region (R8)	0	0	0	0
Eastern Region (R9)	21	0	1	0
Alaska Region (R10)	1	0	0	0
Unknown	3	0	0	0

Table 18g: <i>Q14.7</i>	Negotiations over determination of price or other terms were easily concluded			
	Responses	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Northern Region (R1)	3	0	0	1
Rocky Mountain Region (R2)	5	0	0	0
Southwestern Region (R3)	30	3	3	1
Intermountain Region (R4)	1	0	0	0
Pacific Southwest Region (R5)	5	0	1	1
Pacific Northwest Region (R6)	13	0	2	1
Southern Region (R8)	0	0	0	0
Eastern Region (R9)	21	0	1	0
Alaska Region (R10)	1	0	0	0
Unknown	3	0	0	0

Table 18h: <i>Q14.8</i>	The format for the agreement/contract was easy to use and understand			
	Responses	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Northern Region (R1)	3	0	1	0
Rocky Mountain Region (R2)	5	0	0	0
Southwestern Region (R3)	30	0	4	3
Intermountain Region (R4)	1	0	0	0
Pacific Southwest Region (R5)	5	0	1	1
Pacific Northwest Region (R6)	13	0	2	1
Southern Region (R8)	0	0	0	0
Eastern Region (R9)	21	0	1	0
Alaska Region (R10)	1	0	0	0
Unknown	3	0	0	0

Table 18i: <i>Q14.9</i>	Funding was available to complete the project			
	Responses	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Northern Region (R1)	3	0	1	0
Rocky Mountain Region (R2)	5	0	0	0
Southwestern Region (R3)	30	2	1	3
Intermountain Region (R4)	1	0	0	0
Pacific Southwest Region (R5)	5	1	0	1
Pacific Northwest Region (R6)	13	0	2	1
Southern Region (R8)	0	0	0	0
Eastern Region (R9)	21	0	1	0
Alaska Region (R10)	1	0	0	0
Unknown	3	0	0	0

Table 18j: <i>Q14.10</i>	The project was implemented in a timely manner without incident			
	Responses	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Northern Region (R1)	3	1	0	0
Rocky Mountain Region (R2)	5	0	0	0
Southwestern Region (R3)	30	1	2	2
Intermountain Region (R4)	1	0	0	0
Pacific Southwest Region (R5)	5	1	0	1
Pacific Northwest Region (R6)	13	0	2	1
Southern Region (R8)	0	0	0	0
Eastern Region (R9)	21	0	1	0
Alaska Region (R10)	1	0	0	0
Unknown	3	0	0	0

Table 18k: <i>Q14.11</i>	Compliance monitoring was adequate			
	Responses	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Northern Region (R1)	3	0	1	0
Rocky Mountain Region (R2)	5	0	0	0
Southwestern Region (R3)	30	0	4	2
Intermountain Region (R4)	1	0	0	0
Pacific Southwest Region (R5)	5	0	1	1
Pacific Northwest Region (R6)	13	1	1	1
Southern Region (R8)	0	0	0	0
Eastern Region (R9)	21	0	1	0
Alaska Region (R10)	1	0	0	0
Unknown	3	0	0	0

Q18. Please select the type of work that was done under this contract and/or agreement (select all that apply)

Table 19: Types of work done under a TFPA agreement, by region: number of respondents who said “Yes” to the following work

	Responses	Forest pest/disease treatment	Hazard fuel treatment	Biomass utilization	Commercial harvest	Road rehabilitation	Stream rehabilitation
		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Northern Region (R1)	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rocky Mountain Region (R2)	5	0	0	0	0	0	0
Southwestern Region (R3)	30	1	0	0	0	0	0
Intermountain Region (R4)	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pacific Southwest Region (R5)	5	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pacific Northwest Region (R6)	13	0	0	0	0	0	0
Southern Region (R8)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Eastern Region (R9)	21	0	0	0	0	0	0
Alaska Region (R10)	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unknown	3	0	0	0	0	0	0

Q19. Experience with the TFPA project. Please rate your degree of agreement with the following statements

Table 20: Respondent agreement with various aspects of TFPA agreements.

Experience with TFPA project	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Administrative procedures worked well	0	1	3
Differences in policy interpretation were easily resolved	0	3	1
Legislative authority was adequate for the needed purpose of the project	0	1	3
Project planning, including NEPA was completed in a timely and cost effective manner	0	1	3
Substantive differences in views of "goods for services" were experienced	0	3	1
Negotiations over determination of price or other terms were easily concluded	0	3	1
The format for the agreement/contract was easy to use and understand	0	1	4
Funding was available to complete the project	0	1	4
The project was implemented in a timely manner without incident	0	2	3
Compliance monitoring was adequate	0	2	3

Table 21: Respondent agreement with various aspects of TFPA agreements, by region (only the regions with valid responses is included)

<i>Q19.1</i>	Administrative procedures worked well			
	Responses	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Northern Region (R1)	3	0	0	0
Rocky Mountain Region (R2)	5	0	0	0
Southwestern Region (R3)	30	0	1	1
Intermountain Region (R4)	1	0	0	0
Pacific Southwest Region (R5)	5	0	0	1
Pacific Northwest Region (R6)	13	0	0	0
Southern Region (R8)	0	0	0	0
Eastern Region (R9)	21	0	0	1
Alaska Region (R10)	1	0	0	0
Unknown	3	0	0	0

<i>Q19.2</i>	Differences in policy interpretation were easily resolved			
	Responses	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Northern Region (R1)	3	0	0	0
Rocky Mountain Region (R2)	5	0	0	0
Southwestern Region (R3)	30	0	2	0
Intermountain Region (R4)	1	0	0	0
Pacific Southwest Region (R5)	5	0	0	1
Pacific Northwest Region (R6)	13	0	0	0
Southern Region (R8)	0	0	0	0
Eastern Region (R9)	21	0	1	0
Alaska Region (R10)	1	0	0	0
Unknown	3	0	0	0

Q19.3	Legislative authority was adequate for the needed purpose of the project			
	Responses	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Northern Region (R1)	3	0	0	0
Rocky Mountain Region (R2)	5	0	0	0
Southwestern Region (R3)	30	0	1	1
Intermountain Region (R4)	1	0	0	0
Pacific Southwest Region (R5)	5	0	0	1
Pacific Northwest Region (R6)	13	0	0	0
Southern Region (R8)	0	0	0	0
Eastern Region (R9)	21	0	0	1
Alaska Region (R10)	1	0	0	0
Unknown	3	0	0	0

Q19.4	Project planning, including NEPA was completed in a timely and cost effective manner			
	Responses	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Northern Region (R1)	3	0	0	0
Rocky Mountain Region (R2)	5	0	0	0
Southwestern Region (R3)	30	0	1	1
Intermountain Region (R4)	1	0	0	0
Pacific Southwest Region (R5)	5	0	0	1
Pacific Northwest Region (R6)	13	0	0	0
Southern Region (R8)	0	0	0	0
Eastern Region (R9)	21	0	0	1
Alaska Region (R10)	1	0	0	0
Unknown	3	0	0	0

Q19.5	Substantive differences in views of "goods for services" were experienced			
	Responses	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Northern Region (R1)	3	0	0	0
Rocky Mountain Region (R2)	5	0	0	0
Southwestern Region (R3)	30	0	2	0
Intermountain Region (R4)	1	0	0	0
Pacific Southwest Region (R5)	5	0	0	1
Pacific Northwest Region (R6)	13	0	0	0
Southern Region (R8)	0	0	0	0
Eastern Region (R9)	21	0	1	0
Alaska Region (R10)	1	0	0	0
Unknown	3	0	0	0

Q19.6	Negotiations over determination of price or other terms were easily concluded			
	Responses	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Northern Region (R1)	3	0	0	0
Rocky Mountain Region (R2)	5	0	0	0
Southwestern Region (R3)	30	0	2	0
Intermountain Region (R4)	1	0	0	0
Pacific Southwest Region (R5)	5	0	0	1
Pacific Northwest Region (R6)	13	0	0	0
Southern Region (R8)	0	0	0	0
Eastern Region (R9)	21	0	1	0
Alaska Region (R10)	1	0	0	0
Unknown	3	0	0	0

<i>Q19.7</i>	The format for the agreement/contract was easy to use and understand			
	Responses	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Northern Region (R1)	3	0	0	0
Rocky Mountain Region (R2)	5	0	0	0
Southwestern Region (R3)	30	0	1	1
Intermountain Region (R4)	1	0	0	0
Pacific Southwest Region (R5)	5	0	0	1
Pacific Northwest Region (R6)	13	0	0	0
Southern Region (R8)	0	0	0	0
Eastern Region (R9)	21	0	0	1
Alaska Region (R10)	1	0	0	0
Unknown	3	0	0	1

<i>Q19.8</i>	Funding was available to complete the project			
	Responses	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Northern Region (R1)	3	0	0	0
Rocky Mountain Region (R2)	5	0	0	0
Southwestern Region (R3)	30	0	1	1
Intermountain Region (R4)	1	0	0	0
Pacific Southwest Region (R5)	5	0	0	1
Pacific Northwest Region (R6)	13	0	0	0
Southern Region (R8)	0	0	0	0
Eastern Region (R9)	21	0	0	1
Alaska Region (R10)	1	0	0	0
Unknown	3	0	0	1

Q19.9	The project was implemented in a timely manner without incident			
	Responses	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Northern Region (R1)	3	0	0	0
Rocky Mountain Region (R2)	5	0	0	0
Southwestern Region (R3)	30	0	1	1
Intermountain Region (R4)	1	0	0	0
Pacific Southwest Region (R5)	5	0	0	1
Pacific Northwest Region (R6)	13	0	0	0
Southern Region (R8)	0	0	0	0
Eastern Region (R9)	21	0	1	0
Alaska Region (R10)	1	0	0	0
Unknown	3	0	0	1

Q19.10		Compliance monitoring was adequate		
	Responses	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Northern Region (R1)	3	0	0	0
Rocky Mountain Region (R2)	5	0	0	0
Southwestern Region (R3)	30	0	2	0
Intermountain Region (R4)	1	0	0	0
Pacific Southwest Region (R5)	5	0	0	1
Pacific Northwest Region (R6)	13	0	0	0
Southern Region (R8)	0	0	0	0
Eastern Region (R9)	21	0	0	1
Alaska Region (R10)	1	0	0	0