

A Report on

Customer Service

for Texas Parks and Wildlife Department

Submitted June 1, 2006



TEXAS
PARKS &
WILDLIFE

CUSTOMER INVENTORY

The Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD) serves a wide array of customers. We consider the citizens of Texas our most important “customer” group – it is our mission to manage and conserve Texas’ resources for the benefit of current and future generations.

Each of the strategies in the General Appropriations Act directs an effort to provide or enhance a facility, program, activity or service that benefits our customers directly and all Texans indirectly:

STRATEGY	DESCRIPTION OF SERVICES	CUSTOMERS SERVED
A.1.1.	Wildlife conservation, habitat management and research	Hunters, anglers, non-consumptive users, WMA visitors
A.1.2.	Technical guidance to private landowners and general public	Hunters, non-Consumptive users, private landowners
A.1.3.	Enhanced hunting and wildlife-related recreational opportunities	Hunters, anglers, non-consumptive users, private landowners
A.2.3.	Coastal fisheries management, research and habitat conservation	Anglers, boaters, non-consumptive users
A.2.4.	Coastal hatcheries operations	Anglers, boaters, non-consumptive users
B.1.1.	State parks, historic sites and state natural areas	State park, historic site, and state natural area visitors, hunters, anglers, boaters, non-consumptive users
B.1.2.	Parks minor repair program	State park, historic site and state natural area visitors, hunters, anglers, boaters, non-consumptive users
B.1.3.	Parks support	State park, historic site and state natural area visitors, hunters, anglers, boaters, non-consumptive users
B.2.1.	Local park grants	Local governments and their park visitors
B.2.2.	Boating access, trails and other grants	Local governments and their park visitors, boaters, anglers, physically challenged and disadvantaged populations
C.1.1.	Wildlife, fisheries and water safety enforcement	Hunters, anglers, boaters, commercial fishermen, private landowners, general public

A Report on Customer Service

STRATEGY	DESCRIPTION OF SERVICES	CUSTOMERS SERVED
C.1.2.	Game warden training academy	Hunters, anglers, boaters, non-consumptive users, commercial fishermen, private landowners
C.1.3.	Law enforcement oversight, management and support	Hunters, anglers, boaters, non-consumptive users, commercial fishermen, private landowners
C.2.1.	Hunter and boater education	Hunters, anglers, boaters, non-consumptive users
C.2.2.	<i>Texas Parks & Wildlife</i> magazine	Hunters, anglers, private landowners, boaters, state park, historic site and state natural area visitors, non-consumptive users, educators
C.2.3.	Communication products and services	Hunters, anglers, private landowners, boaters, state park, historic site and state natural area visitors, non-consumptive users
C.2.4.	Outreach and education	Non-consumptive users, educators, youth, women, physically challenged, with focus on minorities
C.3.1.	Hunting and fishing license issuance	Hunters, anglers, commercial fishermen, license deputies
C.3.2.	Boat registration and titling	Boaters and county tax assessor-collectors
D.1.1.	Capital improvements and major repairs	State park, historic site and state natural area visitors, hunters, anglers, boaters, non-consumptive users
D.1.2.	Land acquisition	State park, historic site and state natural area visitors, hunters, anglers, boaters, non-consumptive users
D.1.3.	Infrastructure program administration	State park, historic site and state natural area visitors, hunters, anglers, boaters, non-consumptive users
D.1.4.	Debt service	State Park, Historic Site and State Natural Area visitors, Hunters, Anglers, Boaters, Non-Consumptive Users

TEXAS PARKS AND WILDLIFE DEPARTMENT'S CUSTOMER SERVICE COMPLAINT-HANDLING PROCESS

As prescribed by Section VI, Texas Parks and Wildlife Department's Personnel Manual and Employee Handbook, formal complaints received in the divisions must be submitted to the Office of Internal Affairs for review, tracking and determination of proper follow-up action. Information on the complaint-handling process, as well as instructions on how to file a complaint can be found at www.tpwd.state.tx.us/complaints/.

Correspondence containing non-formal complaints received at the department through the Executive Office are logged into the Department Mail Tracking System and assigned to the appropriate division director for a timely response that appropriately addresses the concerns raised.

Correspondence containing non-formal complaints received at the department through individual divisions are logged into division tracking systems and assigned to the appropriate division personnel for a timely response that appropriately addresses the concerns raised.

COMPACT WITH TEXANS

A Customer Compact is an agreement made with the customers of an institution to provide services that follow a predetermined set of guiding principles. Simply stated, it defines the standards that customers should expect. The following compact is provided to the many diverse customers of the department.

The Texas Parks and Wildlife Department provides outdoor recreational opportunities, manages state parks, historic sites, state natural areas, wildlife management areas and fish hatcheries, protects fish, wildlife and historical and cultural resources for present and future generations.

Over the years it has inherited the functions of many state entities created to protect Texas' natural and cultural resources. More information about the history of TPWD can be found at www.tpwd.state.tx.us/business/about/history/.

TPWD has 11 internal divisions: Wildlife, Coastal Fisheries, Inland Fisheries, Law Enforcement, State Parks, Infrastructure, Information Technology, Communications, Administrative Resources, Legal and Human Resources. Intergovernmental Affairs and Internal Audit and Investigations are administered through the Executive Office. Texas Parks and Wildlife Department headquarters is located at 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, Texas 78744. State parks, historic sites, state natural areas, wildlife management areas, fish hatcheries and field offices are located across the state.

TPWD is largely user-funded. As a result, the department works diligently to listen to our current customers, anticipate future customers' needs and adjust TPWD programs and services to deliver the greatest benefit to Texans, while protecting natural and cultural resources for future generations.

A Report on Customer Service

Our Customer Service Philosophy is:

We affirm that excellent customer service is essential to our mission of managing and conserving natural and cultural resources and providing hunting, fishing and outdoor recreational opportunities for the use and enjoyment of present and future generations.

Our goal is to provide highly responsive service to our customers. We will achieve exemplary customer service through:

- Listening to our internal and external customers, to better understand them and providing opportunities for our customers to submit comments,
- Courtesy,
- Personal responsibility,
- Professionalism,
- Problem solving,
- Respect,
- Being open, friendly, flexible and caring,
- Being responsive, and
- Working to resolve conflicts with different user groups.

TEXAS PARKS AND WILDLIFE DEPARTMENT'S SERVICE STANDARDS

In serving our customers, TPWD employees will strive to do the following:

1. Answer correspondence (including faxes and e-mails) quickly and clearly.
2. See people as promptly as possible in all our offices.
3. Provide current information about services on the Internet and at field offices across the state. TPWD's home page is at www.tpwd.state.tx.us. Frequently asked questions can be found at www.tpwd.state.tx.us/faq/
4. Answer telephone calls quickly and helpfully. Our toll free number is (800) 792-1112. More information on specific TPWD telephone numbers can be found at www.tpwd.state.tx.us/business/about/
5. Respond to inquiries typically within 10 working days of receipt.
6. Do everything reasonably possible to make services available to everyone, including those with disabilities.
7. Provide information about TPWD sites and programs to Texans statewide.

Concerns about TPWD's customer service should be sent to:

Texas Parks and Wildlife Department
Communications Division
4200 Smith School Road
Austin, Texas 78744

e-mail: customer.feedback@tpwd.state.tx.us

Please include specific information, including the location, date, time and name of TPWD employee(s) if applicable.

The agency's customer service representative is Lydia Saldaña, Director of Communications. She can be reached at (512) 389-4557 or (512) 389-4448 (fax).

WHAT IS A CUSTOMER?

Customers are the most important people in this office.

Customers are not dependent on us ...
... we are dependent on them.

Customers are not an interruption of our work ...
... they are the purpose of it.

Customers are not doing us a favor by our serving them ...
*... they are doing us a favor by giving us the
opportunity to do so.*

A Report on Customer Service

FY 2005 CUSTOMER SATISFACTION SURVEYS

Two survey efforts related to customer satisfaction were implemented by TPWD in FY 2005. A year-long study of Texas state parks visitors involved on-site customer surveys at 29 state parks to assess the overall satisfaction of park users with their visit.

The second survey effort in FY 2005 was an online survey that measured the level of satisfaction with TPWD, covering the seven statutorily required customer service elements, among key TPWD customer groups: state park visitors, hunters, anglers, boaters and wildlife watchers. This survey was implemented in the fall of 2004.

In addition, results from a telephone survey of the general population of Texas, conducted by a third-party research firm, are presented to provide a measure of the general public's satisfaction with TPWD. This survey was conducted in February 2005.

Where applicable, the Standard Customer Service Performance Measures are addressed and performance is estimated for FY 2006 for each survey effort.

STATE PARK ON-SITE MARKETING AND VISITOR SATISFACTION SURVEY

This is an ongoing study of day and overnight state park visitors to gain useful marketing and customer satisfaction information on state park visitors on a year-round basis. Topics covered in the survey include:

- Overall satisfaction with park visit;
- Likelihood to return to the park;
- Visitation and travel patterns;
- Visitor socio-demographics.

Park managers at 29 state parks, natural areas and historic sites that offer overnight camping to park users elected to participate in the visitor survey. Results for the full year, June 1, 2004 – May 31, 2005, are presented in this report. Managers at five day-use historic sites also participated in the survey; however, results from these surveys are not presented because the results are available only on a site-specific basis and no aggregate results are available.

A. Information Gathering Methods

The visitor surveys were conducted at 29 state parks, natural areas and historic sites beginning June 1, 2004 and ending May 31, 2005. The surveys were distributed randomly by park staff on weekdays and weekends to both day and overnight users and distributed for an entire year to capture data for all four seasons. Park staff asked the visitor to return the survey either by mail or at the entrance gate before leaving the park.

TIMEFRAME

The surveys were distributed from June 1, 2004 – May 31, 2005.

METHODOLOGY

Park staff and volunteers began questionnaire distribution in the parks on June 1, 2004. Park staff were provided detailed information on how to randomly distribute surveys to ensure adequate representation of state park visitors. Visitors were approached in the park and asked to complete the questionnaire and return it either at the park office, survey drop box or by mail to Austin headquarters.

The goal for each park was to complete 200 surveys per three-month season, or 800 surveys for the year. Based on an estimated 30% response rate, the goal was for park staff to distribute approximately 60 surveys per week at most parks. Parks with low visitation distributed fewer than 60 surveys per week. Questionnaires were distributed based on the proportion of day to overnight visitors at each park, based on visitation data collected by the State Parks division for FY 2004. Simple random sampling procedures were followed to ensure that customers who received the questionnaire were representative of the entire population of state park visitors.

Supervised Gary Job Corps students performed data entry at Austin headquarters. Consumer Research staff audited and corrected data entry completed by the students.

Due to various reasons (low visitation, staff shortages, park closures, etc.), questionnaire distribution at many parks was below the 60 surveys per week goal and returns were well below the goal of 200 per season. A total of 11,001 completed surveys were returned from the 29 parks for the year.

LIMITATIONS

One limitation of this survey research was the lower than expected distribution of surveys at some sites, leading to a lower number of returned surveys at these sites. However, the impact of this limitation is more relevant to the site-specific data. For the aggregate data reported in this report, the sampling error is very low due to the large number of completed surveys (over 11,000).

A second limitation was that an ideal response rate of 50% or greater could not be achieved at most sites due to budget considerations. Thus, there may be a certain amount of non-response bias in this survey. Non-response bias occurs when those visitors who respond to the survey are systematically different from those visitors who did not respond. To gauge the extent to which the lower response rate leads to non-response bias in results, a non-response test was conducted at three sites. A non-response survey, covering several key variables, was mailed as a follow-up to visitors who did not complete and return the visitor survey they were given. The results of the non-response survey were compared to the onsite visitor survey to determine if there were differences that might indicate a bias. At one of the parks studied, the onsite visitor survey seems to have over-estimated the overall satisfaction level of day users. For day visitors at the other two sites, and for all overnight visitors, there was no significant difference in overall satisfaction between the onsite visitor survey respondents and the non-response survey respondents. This suggests that non-response bias had a limited effect on the results of the satisfaction question.

A third limitation of this survey effort involves the representativeness of the surveyed parks to the entire state park system. While the survey's primary intent was to collect information on a site-specific basis, a secondary goal was to collect information to provide visitor information on a system-wide basis. This is an ongoing survey effort in which data will be collected from park visitors in three distinct survey periods. The results presented in this report cover parks in the second of these survey periods. It is hoped that in the next couple years, enough sites will have participated in the survey to provide an adequate representation of visitors for the entire state park system. To ensure that the data in this report is as representative as possible, survey data was weighted so that the aggregate results presented in this report will reflect the proper balance of visitors based on overnight and day visitation and seasonal visitation for each individual park as well as the overall contribution of each park's visitation to the total visitation at all 29 state parks in the survey. Thus data from parks with high visitation will be weighted more heavily in the aggregate results than will data from low-visitation parks.

NUMBER OF CUSTOMERS SURVEYED

A total of 11,001 surveys were returned from 29 state parks participating in the survey for the year.

SAMPLING ERROR, CONFIDENCE LEVEL AND RESPONSE RATE

The sampling error for 11,001 surveys is less than plus or minus one percentage point at the 95% confidence level. An estimated 47,947 surveys were distributed, resulting in an overall response rate of 23%.

A Report on Customer Service

GROUPS EXCLUDED FROM THE DATA COLLECTION PROCESS

Both day and overnight visitors and visitors in all four seasons of the year were included in the data collection process. The survey fielded this year at 29 state parks. Surveys were not conducted at all state parks during the same year because the time required for consumer research staff to manage all the surveys concurrently made this process infeasible. By the end of the three year data collection process, all state parks and historic sites will have had the opportunity to be included in the survey. Visitors to very small parks with low visitation and parks that are not gated and do not have onsite staff to distribute the surveys may not be included in the survey.

B. Performance Measures

Outcome Measures

PERCENTAGE OF SURVEYED CUSTOMER RESPONDENTS EXPRESSING OVERALL SATISFACTION WITH SERVICES RECEIVED

The visitor survey measured customer satisfaction with their park visit and likelihood to return to the park. The aggregate results for all visitors at the 29 parks are presented, as are comparisons between day and overnight visitors and visitors across the seasons of the year.

Overall, park visitors are quite satisfied with their visit to the park. Sixty-two percent of visitors are very satisfied with their visit and 32% are satisfied. Very few (2%) of visitors are unsatisfied.

There is no significant difference in satisfaction between overnight and day park users. Winter and fall visitors report statistically significantly higher levels of satisfaction than spring and summer visitors; however, satisfaction is high for visitors across all seasons.

Overall Satisfaction with Visit (Overnight vs. Day Visitors and Total)

	Overnight visitors	Day visitors	Total
Very Satisfied	61%	63%	62%
Satisfied	32%	31%	32%
Somewhat Satisfied	5%	4%	5%
Dissatisfied	1%	1%	1%
Very Dissatisfied	1%	1%	1%

Overall Satisfaction with Visit (By Season)

	Winter	Spring	Summer	Fall
Very Satisfied	*65%	60%	61%	*64%
Satisfied	30%	32%	33%	31%
Somewhat Satisfied	4%	6%	4%	4%
Dissatisfied	<1%	1%	1%	1%
Very Dissatisfied	<1%	1%	1%	1%

* Winter and fall visitors are significantly more likely to report being “very satisfied” with their visit at the 95% confidence level.

Likelihood to Return to the Park (Overnight vs. Day Visitors and Total)

	Overnight visitors	Day visitors	Total
Very likely	66%	67%	66%
Likely	21%	20%	20%
Somewhat likely	9%	9%	9%
Unlikely	3%	3%	3%
Very unlikely	1%	2%	2%

Likelihood to Return to Park (By Season)

	Winter	Spring	Summer	Fall
Very likely	62%	*66%	*69%	*66%
Likely	23%	20%	20%	19%
Somewhat likely	9%	9%	7%	11%
Unlikely	4%	4%	3%	2%
Very unlikely	2%	2%	1%	2%

* Spring, summer and fall visitors are significantly more likely to report being “very likely” to return to the park at the 95% confidence level.

PERCENTAGE OF SURVEYED CUSTOMERS IDENTIFYING WAYS TO IMPROVE SERVICE DELIVERY

Twenty-nine percent of respondents identified an area of dissatisfaction or an area in which TPWD could improve the state park that the respondent visited.

Output Measure

NUMBER OF CUSTOMERS SURVEYED (SURVEYS COMPLETED)

Each park was expected to distribute 60 surveys per week for a total of over 3,000 surveys distributed over the course of the year. Not all parks were able to distribute the required number of surveys due to various reasons (low visitation, staff shortages, park closures, etc.). For the 29 sites surveyed, a total of approximately 47,974 surveys were distributed and 11,001 surveys were returned.

The average number of people in each visitor group is 3.35. The survey thus covered 36,850 visitors to state parks, historic sites and natural areas.

NUMBER OF CUSTOMERS SERVED

Preliminary visitation data suggest that for all state parks and historic sites in the TPWD system combined, there were approximately 9,500,000 visits in FY 2005. An estimated 2,486,000 of these visits were overnight visits and 7,080,000 visits were day use. As many state park users visit the parks multiple times in a single year, the total number of state park users is less than the total number of visits.

A Report on Customer Service

Efficiency Measure

SURVEY COSTS

The out-of-pocket costs of this survey effort are for producing and mailing the onsite surveys to each park and historic site (\$1,400) and conducting the non-response survey to visitors at three sites, including mailing the survey and paying the return postage (\$1,500), for a total of \$2,900. The majority of other costs were associated with park staff time including distribution of the survey. Marketing staff also invested a considerable amount of staff time coordinating the survey effort, monitoring the data entry by Gary Job Corps students, and conducting the data analysis and reporting. A rough estimate of staff time contributed by Marketing Services staff is 1,000 hours for a total of \$25,000. The labor provided by Gary Job Corps students was free. A very rough estimate of park staff time to administer the surveys is 100 hours per park per year (at \$10 estimated hourly wage) for a total park staff cost of \$29,000. The total estimated cost for the entire survey effort including staff time is \$56,900, a cost of \$5.17 per customer surveyed.

Explanatory Measures

NUMBER OF CUSTOMERS IDENTIFIED

The total number of customers identified is based on the number of surveys returned (11,001 survey returns).

NUMBER OF CUSTOMER GROUPS SURVEYED

Three customer groups were surveyed:

- State Park Day Visitors
- State Park Overnight Visitors
- Historic Site Day Visitors

C. Analysis of Findings

One of the objectives of the onsite park visitor survey was to provide an assessment of customer satisfaction on a site-specific basis. The survey findings illustrate that TPWD is providing quality service to its state park customers and that they are satisfied with the offerings at state parks.

In FY 2003, TPWD conducted the first wave of onsite customer surveys at 35 state parks and historic sites. Surveys were conducted at 34 sites in FY 2005. Onsite surveys will continue at additional sites in the future to measure customer satisfaction with the parks. The goal of the survey effort is to complete visitor surveys at all state parks and historic sites and to conduct an analysis of results in FY 2007. At that time, TPWD will be able to identify needs and opportunities for change that may be necessary in response to the survey results.

TPWD ONLINE SATISFACTION SURVEY

This is a customer satisfaction survey of key TPWD constituents – state park visitors, hunters, freshwater and saltwater anglers, boaters and jet skiers, and birders and wildlife watchers. The survey was conducted on the TPWD Web site in the fall of 2004 to measure the statutorily required customer service quality elements:

- Overall satisfaction with TPWD;
- Satisfaction with TPWD facilities;
- Satisfaction with TPWD staff;
- Satisfaction with TPWD communications;
- Satisfaction with the TPWD Web site;
- Satisfaction with TPWD complaint-handling processes;
- Satisfaction with TPWD service timeliness;
- Satisfaction with TPWD printed information.

The survey also collected data on the customer's level of participation or avidity in several outdoor activities to define the customer groups.

A. Information Gathering Methods

The survey was conducted on the TPWD Web site from September 1, 2004 – December 9, 2004. The goal was to collect a minimum of 1,000 responses, with at least 100 in each of the key customer groups (state park visitors, hunters, freshwater anglers, saltwater anglers, boaters, wildlife viewers). The survey was posted on the TPWD Web site in the highly visible areas of the home page and the Web pages for park visitors, hunters, anglers, boaters and wildlife viewers. The survey was conducted as a convenience sample in which Web visitors had the option to click on the survey button and complete the survey online. It is recognized that a convenience sample poses a risk of non-response bias; therefore, the results are presented as indicators of the satisfaction of the customer groups measured. A future study with a random sample would be necessary to completely measure the satisfaction levels of TPWD customers. However, the costs of performing such a study would be substantial.

TIMEFRAME

The survey was made available on the TPWD Web site from September 1, 2004 – December 9, 2004.

METHODOLOGY

Visitors to the TPWD Web site could click on the survey button to complete the survey. The survey data was automatically entered electronically into a database, and analysis of the data was completed by Marketing staff.

LIMITATIONS

The primary limitation of this research is that the survey was conducted as a convenience sample in which Web visitors had the option to complete the survey while visiting the TPWD Web site. A convenience sample poses risks as it may not fully represent the population of TPWD customers and there was no way to follow up with respondents to determine whether respondents differed from non-respondents.

Additionally, due to the use of the Web site to conduct the survey, TPWD customers who do not have Internet access could not take part in the survey. Though the use of the Internet is generally high among Americans, and Internet access is widely available through libraries and schools as well as in private homes and offices, it is possible that TPWD customers who do not use the Internet may vary from the Web users who participated in the survey.

A Report on Customer Service

Another limitation of this study is that the survey was conducted during a single period of the year and does not cover the broadest possible range of customers who use the TPWD Web site. The fall season is a peak use period for state park visitors and hunters. Many birders/wildlife watchers and anglers are also active during this season. Boaters are somewhat less likely to use the Web site during the fall; their high use period is from January through July. However, a considerable number of boaters did visit the Web site and complete the survey online during the fall season.

NUMBER OF CUSTOMERS SURVEYED, SAMPLING ERROR, CONFIDENCE LEVEL AND RESPONSE RATE

A total of 1,938 customers completed the online satisfaction survey. Many of these customers fell into more than one customer group based on their participation in more than one outdoor recreation activity once or more per year; thus the groups are not mutually exclusive. The goal for overall sample size as well as sample within each group was exceeded. The final tally of customer group sample sizes is as follows:

Customer Group	Sample Size
Total Sample	1,938
State Park Visitors	1,743
Hunters	1,239
Freshwater Anglers	1,531
Saltwater Anglers	1,017
Boaters/Jet Skiers	1,094
Wildlife Watchers/Birders	1,386

The maximum sampling error for the total sample of 1,938 surveys is less than plus or minus 2.5 percentage points at the 95% confidence level. The sampling error for the individual groups outlined above is less than plus or minus 3.1 percentage points at the 95% confidence level.

The response rate cannot be calculated for this survey due to the methodology.

GROUPS EXCLUDED FROM THE DATA COLLECTION PROCESS

Commercial fishermen were not targeted for this survey due to the expense of contacting them to complete the survey. Some commercial fishermen may be included in the survey if they used the TPWD Web site, but they have not been isolated as a separate group from the total sample of TPWD Web site users.

B. Performance Measures

Outcome Measures

PERCENTAGE OF SURVEYED CUSTOMERS EXPRESSING OVERALL SATISFACTION WITH SERVICES RECEIVED

TPWD receives high satisfaction ratings from its customers in this survey. Eighty-one percent of customers report being either very satisfied or satisfied overall with the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department. Nine percent of customers report being dissatisfied with the agency.

For the overall satisfaction question and nine of the 11 questions used to assess satisfaction levels on the statutorily required customer service elements, at least three-quarters of customers report being very satisfied or satisfied with TPWD's performance. These include the following areas: facilities, staff, communications, Web site and printed information.

Approximately two-thirds of customers are satisfied with the timeliness of TPWD’s response to inquiries, with 12% being dissatisfied.

Complaint handling – measured by satisfaction with TPWD’s responsiveness to customer’s complaints – is the only area in which a minority of customers is satisfied. The largest number of customers (44%) report being “neither satisfied nor dissatisfied” with TPWD’s responsiveness to complaints. Thirteen percent of customers are dissatisfied.

	% Very satisfied/ satisfied	% Very dissatisfied/ dissatisfied
Overall satisfaction	81%	9%
Cleanliness and appearance of sites	86%	5%
Friendliness and courtesy of staff	85%	4%
Usefulness of information on Web site	84%	6%
Usefulness of printed information	83%	4%
Knowledge of staff	83%	4%
Availability of printed information	81%	6%
Ease of understanding information	80%	9%
Ease of finding information on Web site	76%	11%
Hours of operation of business offices	75%	6%
Amount of time it takes for inquiries to be answered	65%	12%
Responsiveness to customer complaints	42%	13%

Below are the detailed results of each satisfaction question for the total sample of respondents. Following that is a breakdown of results by customer group.

DETAILED SURVEY RESULTS FOR TOTAL SAMPLE OF RESPONDENTS

OVERALL: How satisfied are you overall with TPWD?

	Total
Very satisfied	38%
Satisfied	44%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	10%
Dissatisfied	5%
Very dissatisfied	4%

FACILITIES: How satisfied are you with the cleanliness and appearance of TPWD sites?

	Total
Very satisfied	35%
Satisfied	51%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	9%
Dissatisfied	4%
Very dissatisfied	1%

A Report on Customer Service

FACILITIES: How satisfied are you with the hours of operation of TPWD business offices?

	Total
Very satisfied	24%
Satisfied	51%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	20%
Dissatisfied	4%
Very dissatisfied	1%

STAFF: How satisfied are you with the friendliness and courtesy of TPWD staff?

	Total
Very satisfied	43%
Satisfied	42%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	10%
Dissatisfied	2%
Very dissatisfied	2%

STAFF: How satisfied are you with the knowledge of TPWD staff?

	Total
Very satisfied	37%
Satisfied	45%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	13%
Dissatisfied	3%
Very dissatisfied	2%

COMMUNICATIONS:

How satisfied are you overall with the ease of understanding information you have received from TPWD?

	Total
Very satisfied	32%
Satisfied	49%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	11%
Dissatisfied	6%
Very dissatisfied	3%

WEB SITE: How satisfied are you with the ease of finding information on the TPWD Web site? *

	Total
Very satisfied	32%
Satisfied	44%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	13%
Dissatisfied	7%
Very dissatisfied	4%

WEB SITE: How satisfied are you with the usefulness of the information on the TPWD Web site? *

	Total
Very satisfied	36%
Satisfied	48%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	10%
Dissatisfied	4%
Very dissatisfied	2%

* Note: The TPWD Web site was redesigned in September 2005 to improve navigation and usefulness of the Web site to customers. The results of this survey apply to the older version of the Web site.

PRINTED INFORMATION: How satisfied are you with the availability of printed information from TPWD?

	Total
Very satisfied	31%
Satisfied	50%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	14%
Dissatisfied	3%
Very dissatisfied	2%

PRINTED INFORMATION: How satisfied are you with the usefulness of printed information from TPWD?

	Total
Very satisfied	31%
Satisfied	52%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	13%
Dissatisfied	2%
Very dissatisfied	2%

A Report on Customer Service

TIMELINESS:

How satisfied are you with the amount of time it takes for your telephone, letter or e-mail inquiries to be answered?

	Total
Very satisfied	23%
Satisfied	41%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	23%
Dissatisfied	8%
Very dissatisfied	5%

COMPLAINT HANDLING: Do you know how to make a complaint to TPWD?

	Total
Yes	48%
No	52%

COMPLAINT HANDLING: How satisfied are you with TPWD responsiveness to customer complaints?

	Total
Very satisfied	15%
Satisfied	27%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	44%
Dissatisfied	7%
Very dissatisfied	6%

TPWD received similar satisfaction ratings from each of the customer groups surveyed. The following tables show the net “satisfied” and net “dissatisfied” ratings for each of the customer service quality elements by customer group.

Percentage of Each Visitor Group Rating “Very Satisfied” or “Satisfied”

	State Park Visitors	Hunters	Freshwater Anglers	Saltwater Anglers	Boaters	Wildlife Watchers
Overall satisfaction	83%	81%	81%	81%	82%	83%
Cleanliness and appearance of sites	87%	87%	86%	86%	87%	87%
Friendliness and courtesy of staff	86%	85%	85%	86%	85%	87%
Usefulness of information on Web site	84%	84%	85%	86%	85%	85%
Usefulness of printed information	83%	83%	83%	84%	84%	83%
Knowledge of staff	83%	83%	83%	82%	84%	84%
Availability of printed information	81%	81%	81%	82%	83%	82%
Ease of understanding information	81%	79%	80%	81%	80%	82%
Ease of finding information on Web site	77%	76%	77%	78%	77%	78%
Hours of operation of business offices	75%	75%	75%	76%	75%	76%
Amount of time it takes for inquiries to be answered	65%	65%	66%	66%	66%	65%
Responsiveness to customer complaints	43%	44%	43%	43%	43%	43%

Percentage of Each Visitor Group Rating “Very Dissatisfied” or “Dissatisfied”

	State Park Visitors	Hunters	Freshwater Anglers	Saltwater Anglers	Boaters	Wildlife Watchers
Overall satisfaction	8%	9%	9%	9%	8%	8%
Responsiveness to customer complaints	12%	11%	11%	11%	11%	12%
Amount of time it takes for inquiries to be answered	12%	12%	11%	12%	11%	12%
Ease of finding information on Web site	11%	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%
Ease of understanding information	8%	10%	9%	8%	8%	8%
Usefulness of information on Web site	6%	6%	5%	5%	5%	6%
Hours of operation of business offices	6%	5%	6%	5%	6%	5%
Availability of printed information	5%	6%	5%	6%	5%	5%
Cleanliness and appearance of sites	5%	5%	5%	6%	5%	5%
Friendliness and courtesy of staff	4%	5%	5%	5%	5%	4%
Usefulness of printed information	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%
Knowledge of staff	4%	5%	4%	4%	4%	4%

The survey also measured the avidity level of the respondents, based on their participation in the outdoor recreation activities on a yearly basis. The following table shows the percentage of each customer group who are casual participants (participate one to three times per year), active participants (participate four to 10 times per year) and avid participants (participate 11 or more times per year), as well as the total number of survey respondents in each customer group.

The highest proportions of avid participants are among hunters (60%), birders/wildlife watchers (57%), freshwater anglers (52%) and boaters (48%).

Avidity/Frequency of Participation in Activities (By Customer Group)

	State Park Visitors	Hunters	Freshwater Anglers	Saltwater Anglers	Boaters	Wildlife Watchers
Casual (1-3 times per year)	32%	15%	21%	49%	26%	18%
Active (4-10 times per year)	43%	25%	27%	24%	25%	25%
Avid (11+ times per year)	25%	60%	52%	28%	48%	57%
n (number of respondents)	1,743	1,239	1,531	1,017	1,094	1,386

PERCENTAGE OF SURVEYED CUSTOMER RESPONDENTS IDENTIFYING WAYS TO IMPROVE SERVICE DELIVERY
Forty-seven percent of respondents offered comments on the online satisfaction survey. Many of these comments involved ways to improve TPWD programs and services while other comments were statements of appreciation and support for TPWD.

Output Measure

NUMBER OF CUSTOMERS SURVEYED (COMPLETED)

A total of 1,938 customers who visited the TPWD Web site were surveyed.

A Report on Customer Service

NUMBER OF CUSTOMERS SERVED

TPWD serves the entirety of the state of Texas population by managing and conserving the natural and cultural resources of Texas and offering outdoor recreation opportunities to its citizens. A recent estimate for the population of the state of Texas in 2005 is 22.5 million people.

Efficiency Measure

COST PER CUSTOMER SURVEYED (SURVEYS COMPLETED)

There were no out-of-pocket costs for conducting this survey. All costs were for staff time in designing the survey instrument, defining the methodology and analyzing and reporting survey results. Staff time costs are estimated at \$2,500 (100 hours). This results in a per-survey staff cost of \$1.29.

Explanatory Measures

NUMBER OF CUSTOMERS IDENTIFIED

This survey was implemented to a sample of Web users from September 1 – December 9, 2004. A total of 1,938 customers were surveyed.

NUMBER OF CUSTOMER GROUPS SURVEYED

Many TPWD customer groups were surveyed. Web users include persons interested in TPWD services and programs. The following customer groups were targeted for this survey:

- State Park and State Historic Site Visitors
- Hunters
- Freshwater Anglers
- Saltwater Anglers
- Boaters and Jet skiers
- Birders and Wildlife Watchers

Additionally, other customers who use the TPWD Web site include:

- Landowners
- Recreational Bikers and Mountain Bikers
- Rock Climbers
- Horseback Riders
- Outdoor Enthusiasts
- The General Public

C. Analysis of Findings

Overall, TPWD receives high satisfaction ratings across the board from its customers, with very similar levels of satisfaction from respondents in each of the six targeted customer groups.

In the areas of facilities, staff, communications, Web site and printed information, between 75% and 87% of customers rated themselves as “satisfied” or “very satisfied” with TPWD’s performance. Sixty-five percent of customers are satisfied with the timeliness of TPWD’s response to inquiries, with 12% being dissatisfied.

The only area in which a minority of customers is satisfied with TPWD is complaint handling. Forty-two percent of customers rated themselves as satisfied with complaint handling, while 44% are “neither satisfied nor dissatisfied” and 13% are dissatisfied.

A possible improvement to this survey process would be to field the survey on the TPWD Web site during a time of year that reaches an even broader cross-section of TPWD customers. Data collection during the spring or summer would yield a different mix of customer groups to supplement the fall and early winter data collected in FY 2005.

PUBLIC OPINION ON FISH AND WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT ISSUES SURVEY

This survey was conducted by Responsive Management for the Southeastern Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (SEAFWA) to determine the public opinion on fish and wildlife management issues and agency reputation and credibility. The study involved a telephone survey of the general population’s attitudes toward and opinions on fish and wildlife management issues and opinions on the state’s fish and wildlife agency in 16 states. This report focuses on the results of the Texas survey only.

A. Information Gathering Methods

A telephone survey was selected as the preferred method because of the high incidence of telephone ownership within the general population. Trained surveyors at a central polling site at the Responsive Management office telephoned and interviewed Texas residents using computer-assisted interviewer software. These surveyors are experienced in conducting telephone interviews on the subjects of natural resources and wildlife-associated outdoor recreation. Survey center managers randomly monitored telephone workstations to guarantee high levels of quality by interview staff. Each phone number was called five times to ensure the representativeness of the sample, to avoid a bias toward people who are easy to reach by telephone.

The survey instrument was developed cooperatively by Responsive Management and SEAFWA with input from TPWD. Responsive Management performed the data analysis using SPSS and proprietary software they developed.

TIMEFRAME

The survey was conducted in February 2005. Interviews took place on Monday through Friday from 9 a.m. to 9 p.m., Saturday from noon to 6 p.m., and Sunday from 5 p.m. to 9 p.m., local time.

LIMITATIONS

The telephone survey methodology will not cover Texas residents who either do not own a telephone or only own a cell phone, as survey phone calls are made only to land lines. However, the number of residents affected by this is likely small and will have a minimal impact on survey results.

NUMBER OF CUSTOMERS SURVEYED

A total of 404 Texas residents completed the telephone interview during February 2005.

SAMPLING ERROR, CONFIDENCE LEVEL AND RESPONSE RATE

The sampling error is at most plus or minus 4.88 percentage points at the 95% confidence level. The response rate to this survey was not reported by Responsive Management.

GROUPS EXCLUDED FROM THE DATA COLLECTION PROCESS

This survey focused on the general population of Texas, so no sub-groups were either targeted or excluded during the data collection process.

A Report on Customer Service

B. Performance Measures

Outcome Measures

PERCENTAGE OF SURVEYED CUSTOMERS EXPRESSING OVERALL SATISFACTION WITH SERVICES RECEIVED
 The majority (71%) of respondents stated that they were very satisfied (32%) or somewhat satisfied (39%) with the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department as a government agency. Four percent were somewhat or very dissatisfied.

Overall Satisfaction with TPWD as a Government Agency

Very satisfied	32%
Somewhat satisfied	39%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	6%
Somewhat dissatisfied	3%
Very dissatisfied	1%
Don't know	19%

Respondents were asked to rate TPWD's performance in 14 program areas on a scale of 0 to 10, with 0 being poor and 10 being excellent. TPWD performed above the midpoint, on average, on all program areas. The average scores for the program areas are reported in the following table.

Average Performance Level in TPWD Program Areas

Program Area	Average Score
Enforcing fish and game laws	7.61
Protecting residents against diseases from wild animals	7.56
Providing opportunities for recreational fishing	7.48
Protecting residents from harm from wildlife	7.43
Managing fish populations overall	7.04
Providing opportunities for general public to view wildlife	7.00
Providing opportunities for hunting safety education	6.92
Managing wildlife populations	6.90
Providing opportunities for boating safety education	6.88
Protecting threatened and endangered species	6.88
Providing educational programs on state's fish/wildlife	6.83
Conserving fish and wildlife habitat	6.78
Restoring native fish and wildlife species to state	6.76
Providing opportunities for legal hunting	6.76

Thirty-four percent of respondents stated that they have ever contacted TPWD for information or assistance. Among those that had contacted TPWD, the majority had done so by telephone. Ninety-four percent of respondents were satisfied overall with their contact with TPWD.

Ever Contacted TPWD for Information or Assistance

Yes	34%
No	65%
Don't know	1%

How Did They Contact TPWD? (Among those who had contacted TPWD)

Telephone	64%
In person	31%
E-mail or Internet	17%
Mail	7%
Other	1%

Overall Satisfaction with Contact with TPWD (Among those who had contacted TPWD)

Very satisfied	80%
Somewhat satisfied	14%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	1%
Somewhat dissatisfied	1%
Very dissatisfied	4%

PERCENTAGE OF SURVEYED CUSTOMERS IDENTIFYING WAYS TO IMPROVE SERVICE DELIVERY

Five percent of survey respondents offered a comment at the end of the survey; most of these comments related to ways that TPWD could improve customer satisfaction with the agency.

Output Measure

NUMBER OF CUSTOMERS SURVEYED (COMPLETED)

A total of 404 surveys of Texas residents were completed.

NUMBER OF CUSTOMERS SERVED

TPWD serves the entirety of the state of Texas population by managing and conserving the natural and cultural resources of Texas and offering outdoor recreation opportunities to its citizens. A recent estimate for the population of the state of Texas in 2005 is 22.5 million people.

Efficiency Measure

COST PER CUSTOMER SURVEYED (SURVEYS COMPLETED)

There were no costs to TPWD for this survey to be conducted. Responsive Management fielded the survey and analyzed results using funding from SEAFWA.

A Report on Customer Service

Explanatory Measures

NUMBER OF CUSTOMERS IDENTIFIED

In this survey of the general population of Texas, 404 residents were surveyed.

NUMBER OF CUSTOMER GROUPS SURVEYED

This survey covered the general population of Texas. Many members of the public participate in outdoor recreation activities supported by TPWD. The various groups covered by the survey (and the percentage of the total sample of 404 who participated in that activity in the last 12 months) include:

- Birders and Wildlife Watchers (45%)
- State or National Park Visitors (44%)
- Freshwater Anglers (35%)
- Campers (26%)
- Motorboaters (23%)
- Saltwater Anglers (17%)
- Hunters (15%)
- Canoers and Kayakers (9%)
- Jet skiers (7%)
- Trappers (1%)

C. Analysis of Findings

The general population of Texas gave the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department high scores for overall satisfaction, the 14 specific wildlife-agency performance measures and satisfaction with agency contact.

Compared to the fish and wildlife agencies of the other SEAFWA states, TPWD received higher ratings for overall satisfaction. Seventy-one percent of Texas residents reported being satisfied with TPWD, compared to 62% of the total 16 states included in the research.

Ratings on the 14 performance measures and satisfaction with agency contact were generally similar for TPWD and the other wildlife agencies.

TPWD executive management and commission members are reviewing the results of the SEAFWA study to identify ways to improve the programs and services TPWD provides to the public.

FY 2006 ESTIMATED PERFORMANCE

For FY 2006, TPWD will again field the TPWD online satisfaction survey to measure the seven statutorily required customer service quality elements. The same survey instrument and general methodology that was used in FY 2005 will be used in FY 2006; however, data collection is expected to occur during spring or summer to include a broader cross-section of TPWD customers and to complement the fall and early winter data collected during FY 2005.

Output Measure

ESTIMATED NUMBER OF CUSTOMERS SURVEYED (SURVEYS COMPLETED)

The goal will be to collect a minimum of 1,000 responses, with at least 100 in the each of the key customer groups (state park visitors, hunters, freshwater anglers, saltwater anglers, boaters, wildlife viewers).

Efficiency Measure

ESTIMATED SURVEY COSTS

There will be no out-of-pocket costs for conducting this survey. All costs were for staff time in designing the survey instrument, defining the methodology, and analyzing and reporting survey results. Staff time costs are estimated at \$2,000 (80 hours).

Explanatory Measures

ESTIMATED NUMBER OF CUSTOMERS IDENTIFIED

The total number of customers identified is based on the number of surveys completed (minimum of 1,000).

NUMBER OF CUSTOMER GROUPS TO BE SURVEYED

Many TPWD customer groups will be surveyed. Web users include persons interested in TPWD services and programs. The following customer groups will be targeted for this survey:

- State Park and State Historic Site Visitors
- Hunters
- Freshwater Anglers
- Saltwater Anglers
- Boaters and Jet skiers
- Birders and Wildlife Watchers

Additionally, other customers who use the TPWD Web site include:

- Landowners
- Recreational Bikers and Mountain Bikers
- Rock Climbers
- Horseback Riders
- Outdoor Enthusiasts
- The General Public



4200 Smith School Road • Austin, Texas 78744

www.tpwd.state.tx.us

In accordance with Texas State Depository Law, this publication is available at the Texas State Publications Clearinghouse and/or Texas Depository Libraries.