Olympic National Park
"Friends" Workshop
August 7, 2001

Executive Summary:

As a follow up to earlier, informal discussions, Olympic National Park scheduled a special workshop in August, 2001 to more fully explore the idea of organizing and establishing a local citizens' group that could improve public participation in, and appreciation of, Olympic National Park. ONP contracted with Port Angeles-based Den-Ree Productions, to help facilitate this workshop and organize the suggestions from the public.

Participation:

Nearly 50 people took park in the two hour workshop that was held in the Port Angeles Library meeting room. During the meeting, the audience was divided into three different groups, to openly make suggestions in response to a number of key questions, and then evaluate those ideas among their peers. This resulted in dozens of responses, and hundreds of individual evaluations of the key suggestions (see Complete Summary for a detailed account of the voting process and results).

Findings:

The Need for a "Friends" group:

The audience's primary responses centered around their belief that a citizens' organization would be a good way to establish a better community awareness of ONP, or relationships with the surrounding communities. Some participants felt the group could help the park develop policies; others said it would be a good way to protect park resources.

The Benefits of a "Friends" group to individuals:

The participants offered a wide range of responses to this question, many touching upon how the organization might help the public "have a voice" on park issues. But other also believed the group could give people an opportunity to "give something back" to ONP, provide service (volunteering) to the park and help the park meet its' needs.

The Benefits for the Park "as a whole":

Many of the respondents mentioned that a "Friends" group would be an excellent way to build relationships between the park and the surrounding communities, or as a tool to "resolve conflicts". Some felt it would also provide a forum for "exchanging ideas", or working out "acceptable solutions to mutual problems".

The Drawbacks/Challenges to having such a group:

All three workgroups saw potential problems, primarily focusing on potential conflicts between various interests or viewpoints. They felt one of the biggest challenges would be "adopting a

common agenda". Some expressed fears about not "being heard" by park leadership.

How the Membership might be organized:

There were no clear-cut suggestions, but a variety of responses, such as organizing the "Friends" around people of "similar interests", building around user groups with ONP liaison members, or a representation of all "focus groups". There seemed to be limited interest in having membership based upon geography.

Primary things a Citizens' Group could be involved in:

Suggestions included a framework for volunteers, especially to help with educational outreach, assisting with public relations and helping with funding. Some believed the "Friends" could assist with political activities such as "lobbying Congress".

Specific ways a Citizens' Group could interface with ONP staff:

By far the most popular suggestion, which emerged from all three groups, was to have regular meetings between the "Friends" and ONP staff. Some said the citizens' group members could "roll up their sleeves" and help staff with work parties. Others made the lighthearted suggestion of "parties", reflecting a desire to get together with park staff on an informal basis.

Bringing greater Public Involvement through a "Friends" organization:

A majority of the suggestions favored the use of traditional media outlets, such as newspaper articles, or a general organization of "public relations activities". Others suggested a Speaker's Bureau, educational events, or a festival to improve public awareness and appreciation of ONP.

Organization of a Citizens' Group:

A majority of the respondents felt that a "Friends" group should be very structured, i.e. with a formal Board of Directors and otficers. A smaller number felt it should be organized.gradually, beginning with "open meetings" to help develop the structure in the early stages.

Conclusions:

The August workshop has shown there is definite community interest in the forrnation of a citizens' group to become more intimately involved with Olympic National Park and its' staff. While there are concerns about how such a group could function amid perceived conflicts over various viewpoints or issues, overall the audience seemed to believe there was value in such an organization. Those benefits ranged from improving relationships with communities surrounding the park, to organizing volunteers and helping to protect park resources. Finally, most of those attending the workshop felt a citizens' group should be a more formal organization, offering a way for more regular interaction between ONP staff and the public.

Olympic National Park – "Friends" Complete Results

Just under 50 people participated in the workshop, which was held August 7, 2001 in the meeting room at the Port Angeles library. The audience represented a wide sector of park users, with some coming as far away as Kitsap County to take part in the meeting.

The public was given a briefing on the reasons and background for the meeting by ONP Superintendent David Morris. He explained the general concept of "friends" groups at other National Park units around the U.S. and how earlier, informal discussions had led to this gathering.

After an explanation of the process to be used in the workshop, the audience was asked to form into three separate work groups, to take part in the "action board" exercise. For the next 90 minutes, the groups were asked a series of key questions, designed to stimulate their thoughts on the formation of a "friends" group or some other similar organization, and what rore such a group might play in the future of Olympic National Park. Participants were able to write their responses on cards, which were then posted on each action board. As the board was filled with cards, members of each work group were then invited to come forward and "rank" all the response cards (both their own cards and those submitted by the others in the group). Using stars, the participants ranked the suggestions and ideas, based upon what they believed to be the most important or critical. Each group member was allowed three "votes" under each question subheading based upon these point values:

Gold = 5 pts.
Silver = 3 pts.
Blue/Red = 1 pt.

After the "voting" was completed, the facilitator then went through a brief verbal recap of the top selections before moving on to the next set of questions.

The details of responses for each of the three work groups follow:

Group #1 - Dennis Bragg, facilitator

1.) What do you see as the need for a "Friends" group?

This work group clearly indicated that a -'Friends" group could make it "easier" for the Park to obtain "input prior to establishing park policies" (26 pts), while others felt the organization would be a good way to establish community awareness of the park, and help to maintain the park's integrity. The card suggesting there was "no need" for such a group gathered the least support (3 pts).

- Maintain park's integrity (16 pts.)
- Notification to public (6 pts.)
- Expand community awareness of park (18 pts.)
- Give positive outlook on a major federal responsibility (S pts.)
- Volunteer work (14 pts.)
- People (1 pt)
- Park for everyone (9 pts.)
- Understanding how the park works so we can tell others (5 pts.)
- Help solve park issues (7 pts.)
- Fresh perspective for park (11 pts.)
- Maintenance (5 pts.)
- No need (3 pts.)
- User input prior to establishing park policies (26 pts.)
- ONP defense against park-bashers (13 pts.)
Other ideas:
- Organize Program

2.) What are the benefits to having such a group for you as an individual?

Group #1 clearly felt that a "Friends" organization was an excellent way to "give back something of value" for the park (31 pts). As with question #1, this work group also felt it was a good way to "participate in park policy" (20 pts). They also felt it was a good way to work with others who share their interest in the park (19 pts) and felt it was a way to "interact in a more intimate way" with the park environment (19 pts).

- Park should respect decisions of local people (5 pts.)
- Access to decision-makers (18 pts.)
- Participate in policy (20 pts.)
- Interact in more intimate way with park environment (19 pts.)
- Chance to "give back" something of value (31 pts.)
- Better communication between park/public (1 pt.)
- I'd feel better about the park admin. if I knew more about it (4 pts.)
- Work with others who share interest in park (19 pts.)
- Like-minded people meeting - achieving same goals (9 pts.)
Other ideas:
- Express views for park

- Have a local voice
- Exercise
- Communication

2b.) What about the benefits for the park and community as a whole?

Group #1 indicated that a "Friends" organization would be an excellent way to create a feeling of commonality between ONP and the communities that adjoin the park (28 pts). This was further emphasized by their perception that the organization could help resolve conflicts (20 pts) and improve participation for park users (20 pts).

- Communication (10 pts.)
- Helps eliminate "we-they" conflicts (12 pts.)
- More participation, better access for park users (20 pts.)
- Better opportunity to meet people's expectations (1 pt.)
- More feeling of two-way communication (18 pts.)
- Badly needed local input (11 pts.)
- Could show the common interests between park and public (5 pts.)
- Individual citizen input re mission - management expansion, etc. (9 pts.)
- Better avenue for conflict resolution (20 pts.)
- Feeling of community/park commonality (28 pts.)
Other ideas:
- Continued quality attractions

2c.) What might be the drawbacks/challenges to having such a group?

Group #1 did see some potential problems with the operation of a "Friends" organization, not the least of which was incorporating different viewpoints. "Disagreement between groups" was listed as the second biggest challenge (21 pts). But the biggest concern was the possibility of "frustration" at not being heard by the park bureaucracy (28 pts).

- Keeping an open mind, i.e. not swinging to a "radical" agenda (11 pts.)
- Keeping interest of participants, disagreements on issues (13 pts.)
- Minority representation making major decisions (5 pts.)
- Frustration at not being head by bureaucracy (28 pts.)
- Resolving conflicting uses (21 pts.)
- Achieving consensus (10 pts.)
- Could be seen as part of an "in-group" - still not part of the "public"
- Group might get hijacked by a vocal few (9 pts.)
- Disagreement between groups (21 pts.)
Other ideas:
- Creating yet another vehicle for dissension
- Possible duplication of efforts
- Divergent ideas

3.) How should the membership be organized? (i.e. geography, interests)

Group #1 didn't give any single, clear-cut answer to this question, splitting between the concepts of having representation based upon interest groups with (park) liaison members

(27 pts), or by having broader interest groups or basing membership on "different areas of the park" (22 pts). One suggestion that "anyone interested in the park should be a member" seemed to get support (7 pts), but idea of straight geographic representation did not (3 pts)

- Inclusive (15 pts.)
- Interest groups (2 pts.)
- Anyone interested in park should be member - not by groups (17 pts.)
- Interest groups with liaison people (27 pts.)
- By "broad" interests (23 pts.)
- Geography (3 pts.)
- How organized? By socio-economic diversities (6 pts.)
- Homogenized cross-sections for diff. areas of the park-? (22 pts.)

4.) Name 3 primary things or activities such a group should be involved in.

To this question, Group #1 once again pointed to an interest in developing policy and helping with public relations and community outreach (22 pts)..Other suggestions focused on volunteer work, education and helping with funding issues. But by far the single most popular suggestion included not only education/outreach, but also helping protect the park resources and minimizing visitor impacts (34 pts).

- Comprehensive policies, community outreach, education (1 pt.)
- Policy development program, evaluation, public relations (22 pts.)
- Policy, volunteer work, education (9 pts.)
- Regulations, expansion, funding source (10 pts.)
- Education, policy development, outreach (16 pts.)
- Protection of resources, minimizing impact, education/outreach (34 pts.)
- Achieve consensus on issues, input to management plans, education (3 pts.)
- Input on park policy, advocating for the park, volunteer work (18 pts.)
- Consult ONP officials about needs, volunteering, outreach to other organizations (3 pts.)
- OMSBUNDSMAN * like communications, fun kids stuff, newsletter?
- voice for animals (7 pts.)

5.) Name a specific way such a Friends group could interface with ONP staff.

Group #1 seemed to express an intense interest in interfacing with ONP staff (even in the lighthearted, but heartfelt suggestion of "parties"). Quarterly meetings with department heads received strong support (34 pts). But the group also expressed an interest to "roll up their sleeves" with work parties (35 pts).

- Quarterly meetings with department heads, diff. department each meeting (34 pts.)
- Same staff member(s) could be assigned to specific interest group (27 pts.)
- Regular monthly meetings for exchange of information (5 pts.)
- Have outings - hikes, etc. with staff (1 pt.)
- Monthly or quarterly meetings (6 pts.)
- Parties!! (22 pts.)
- Work parties (35 pts.)
- Policy meetings newsletter (1 pt)

Other ideas:
- Team-building meetings
- Quarterly meetings
- Physically work together

6.) How could the Friends group bring greater public involvement and appreciation of ONP, esp. among residents of the Olympic Peninsula?

The concept of having the "Friends" organization help promote and explain the park (as with the "outreach" suggestion above), really appealed to the participants in Group #1. The idea of using tools like a Speaker's Bureau, newsletter or specific website was clearly the favorite suggestion (36 pts).

- Develop and promote local activities (6 pts.)
- Publish newsletter and have speakers to meet with civic and community groups (13 pts.)
- Generate a community participation project (3 pts,)
- Have special programs and outings focusing on different aspects of the park (15 pts.)
- Forums on issues (11 pts.)
- Frequent meetings in peninsula cities (15 pts.)
- Accessibility - i.e. announce meetings (dates), Published – Report of meetings, Interaction - social gatherings (14 pts.)
- Adopt a ....? Program - encourage more school field trips (1 1 pts.)
- Speakers bureau, news column, website (36 pts.)
- More recreation develop areas (5 pts.)
Other ideas:
- Education - newsletter, school volunteers
- Fun programs

7.) How should a group be organized? (such as Board of Directors, committee, etc.)

While some members of Group #1 favored a more casual approach to the actual organizational structure of a "Friends" panel, the suggestion of using a formal structure, i.e. President, Vice President, with "open membership" was preferred by a wide margin (44 pts).

- Be comfortable with an evolving structure - don't force it (8 pts.)
- Board of Directors composed of interest - group leaders (1-2 per group) (5 pts.)
- Expand from "chairman' to multiple officers to board of directors as membership expands (3 pts.)
- A broad organization with few permanent committees (mosfly ad HOC) avoid rigid hierarchy (14 pts.)
- Small board elected by members - (open membership) committees as needed (16 pts.)
- Open membership, elected officers (3 pts.)
- Board of Directors and committee (7 pts.)
- Charismatic leader with lots of happy followers (25 pts.)
- Elected - board of directors - Pres., V.P., Treasurer, Secretary - Ad Hoc Committees, Open membership (44 pts.)

Group #2 -Boyd Millet, facilitator

Group #2 was the largest workgroup, due to the layout of the meeting room. As such the point values are somewhat higher than the other two groups. The responses to the questions remained similar.

1.) What do you see as the need for a "Friends" Group?

As with Group #1, the second group felt that a "Friends" panel could help ONP with community and political relationships (although this workgroup didn't focus as heavily on the "policy" question). Most of all, this group felt the "Friends" could help improve the relationships between ONP and the surrounding communities (38 pts).

- To improve relationship with, and support of, local community (38 pts.)
- Support park on controversial issues (20 pts.)
- Political support to achieve better appropriations from Congress (28 pts.)
- Community / Park cooperation (17 pts.)
- Appreciation of our backyard (7 pts.)
- To communicate issues of importance MI park (7 pts.)
- Volunteers (7 pts.)
- Support park mission (7 pts.)
- Improved park image (6 pts.)
Other ideas;
- To save money by not having so many other opinions
- To get information out

2a). What are the benefits to having such a group for you as an individual?

Group #2 suggested the "Friends" would be a way for the general public to have a "voice on the issues" (36 pts), although they also felt it could provide a framework for park supports to help the park meet its' "needs" (28 pts).

- Voice on issues (36 pts.)
- Join with other park supporters to help park meet its' needs (28 pts.)
- Cooperation (22 pts.)
- Forum for involvement (10 pts.)
- Way to communicate ideas related to park (19 pts.)
- Gives local support to my strong belief in the importance of ONP to
the citizens of the United States (4 pts.)
- Sharing interests/concerns w/"neighbors" (5 pts.)
Other ideas: Free camping

2b.) what about the benefits for the park and community as a whole?

Group #2 continued to express a belief that the "Friends" organization would be a useful tool in improving communication between the park and the surrounding communities (47 pts), mirroring the responses in Group #1.

- Improved communication between park and community (47 pts.)
- Educational outreach (24 pts.)
- Greater assistance in meeting park and community needs (20 pts.)
- Support for park svc. mission (11 pts.)
- Distribution of knowledge about park to local people (10 pts.)
- Improve cooperation of both - sharing work resources (8 pts.)
- Help your neighbor (6 pts.)
- Bring (together) all interest groups (S pts.)
- Take care and/or oversee our tax dollar (and be prideful!) (1 pt.)
Other ideas:
- Indicate to tourists that park is available to all

2c.) what might be the drawbacks/challenges to having such a group?

Like Group #1, the second workgroup was also worried that issues and "personal agendas" would threaten the "Friends" success (23 pts), or that issues could become "inflamed" (23 pts). It should be noted that one suggestion (that "park administration might not be receptive to ideas" from the "Friends") didn't appear to be a widespread concern, receiving just a single point.

- Personal agenda (23 pts.)
- Possibility of negative responses (18 pts.)
- Issues become "inflamed" (23 pts.)
- Not enough people (1 pt.)
- Issues (6 pts.)
- Feeling that it isn't able to have meaningful role (9 pts.)
- Lack of balance (11 pts.)
- Maintaining citizen enthusiasm and interest (7 pts.)
- Unlikely to have true cross-section of community e.g. where are the 20-30 yr. olds? (8 pts.)
- Focus (9 pts.)
- Stagnation - not moving ahead (8 pts.)
- Park administration might not be receptive to ideas (1 pt)
Other ideas:
- Direction and consistency
- Not having young people "under 50" involved

3.) How should the membership be organized? (i.e. geography, interests)

Group #2 also felt that membership in the "Friends" should be organized in interest groups under a "board of directors" (56 pts), although the idea of geographic representation got more support here than in Group #1 (24 pts).

- Interests groups under board of directors (56 pts.)
- According to geographical relationship to park (24 pts.)
- Open to all groups of interest (15 pts.)
- Continuous cross sections, not interest groups (11 pts.)
- Use established format, i.e. bylaws - officers (3 pts.)
- Board of Directors reflecting mission statements, membership open (12 pts.)

Other ideas:
- Interests

4.) Name 3 primary things or activities such a group should be involved in.

Group #2 didn't mention the "policy development" issue (as had Group #1), but did suggest the "Friends" could help "lobby Congress or develop political support for ONP (39 pts). They felt equally strong about the suggestion that the "Friends" could help with use and care of park facilities (39 pts). (It should be noted that there were surprisingly few suggestions to this question given the size of the group, but this is likely due to some consolidation of the suggestions by the facilitator).

- Use/care of facilities (39 pts.)
- Lobby congress/Political support (39 pts.)
- Education (18 pts.)
- Mission of park (15 pts.)
- Volunteer (11 pts.)

5.) Name a specific way such a Friends group could interface with ONP staff.

Group #2 also expressed an interest in regular meetings with different ONP staff (38 pts) or having a "variation of park personnel" with the "Friends" (22 pts): In fact, all of the responses to this question fit within the general suggestion of meetings between ONP personnel and the "Friends".

- Have variation of park personnel meet with group (22 pts.)
- Schedule regular (quarterly?) meetings with park's superintendent
or designated member of staff (38 pts.)
- Food and beverage gathering... neutral grd. (9 pts.)
- Write a mission statement which reinforces support of the park and staff (9 pts.)
- Friends Committees meet with sr. staff members in area of interest (9 pts.)
- Periodic meetings through the year (9 pts,)
- Through the board of dir, (6 pts.)
- Have a representative of park attend meetings (8 pts.)
- "Friends' board of directors meet with park superintendent's staff on monthly basis (4 pts.)
Other ideas:
- Through informational meetings having park personnel as speakers

6.) How could the Friends group bring greater public involvement and appreciation of ONP, esp. among residents of the Olympic Peninsula?

This group felt it could depend upon "traditional media" to do more to educate the public about ONP and its' issues through newspaper features (31 pts). Others suggested educational events at various locations and even a "festival" might be the way to improve public involvement and appreciation of the park.

- Feature on paper (Peninsula Daily News, Forks Forum, Gazette) on a weekly article on activity in park (31 pts.)

- Sponsor educational events in various locations near the park (21 pts.)
- Informational meetings to get public informed (15 pts.)
- Festival - food, music, educational displays (23 pts.)
- Start with schools K-12, early interesUrespect (13 pts.)
- Education (7 pts.)
- Meet with all interest and groups (5 pts.)
- Communication with community (1 pt.)

Other ideas:
- Letters to the paper (with e-mail address to respond to?)
- ?
- By example

7.) How should such a group be organized? (such as Board of Directors, committee, etc.)

As with the first group, Group #2 favored a more formal organization to the "Friends", utilizing a board of directors with committees (49 pts).

- Board of directors with committees represented (49 pts.)
- Board of directors with chairperson of Board of Dir. Committees with chairperson for each committee (26 pts.)
- Members choose officers and Board of Dir. (13 pts.)
- Board of Directors elected from membership-small fee for joining (5 pts.)
- Committee (5 pts.)
- Peacefully - active members, dues - board of directors, 4-6 voted by members (16 pts.)

Group #3 - Jim Heintz, facilitator

This third group was utilized to not only provide an opportunity for everyone at the meeting to participate, but also as a "control group", by which to measure the responses from the first two groups (thereby insuring that the suggestions weren't "weighted" too heavily by any specific perspective). The size of this group was a few less than Group #2, but larger than Group #1.

1.) What do you see as the need for a "Friends' group?

While Group #3 didn't specifically mention policy development in response to this question (as did the first group), they did take a similar direction with their top response, "involve local community in park issues" (46 pts). Building an interface between the park and public was also mentioned as the second most popular suggestion card (31 pts). The group also felt the "Friends" might help protect park resources (22 pts).

- Involve local community in park issues (46 pts.)
- Interface b/t park and public (31 pts.)
- Public education (18 pts.)
- Local people that know the daily effects of things that happen in the area (4 pts.)
- Protect (22 pts.)
- Communication with ONP hdgs. (19 pts.)
- Volunteers to do whatever (3 pts.)
- Public relations (5 pts.)
Other ideas:
- Support
- Group cohesion

2a.) What are the benefits to having such a group for you as an individual?

As with the first two groups, Group #3 saw the "Friends" group as an opportunity to provide service to ONP (31 pts), although mentioning it, as an "individual benefit" was unique to this workgroup. Group #3 believed the "Friends" would especially be beneficial to "meet people with similar concerns" (41 pts).

- Meet with people with similar concerns (41 pts.)
- A service opportunity (31 pts.)
- A better park (15 pts.)
- Local voice (12 pts.)
- Want to support the park (protection) (9 pts.)

- Public information (2 pts.)
- Learning about park (5 pts.)
- Knowledgeable people who can advise for interest/help/direction (3 pts.)
- More public input (1 pt.)

2b.) What about the benefits for the park and community as a whole?

This workgroup also saw strong park and community benefits from a "Friends" organization, believing it would be a good way to improve communication between the park and the community (44 pts) and as a forum for exchanging ideas on issues (42 pts). Further, Group #3 felt a "Friends" organization would be a tool for "working for acceptable solutions to mutual problems" (28 pts).

- Communication between park and community (44 pts.)
- Forum for exchange of ideas on issues (42 pts.)
- Working for acceptable solutions to mutual problems (28 pts.)
- Local input to park (10 pts.)
- Preserve the resource (7 pts.)
- Organized leadership (6 pts.)
- Helpful assistance at a minimal cost (3 pts.)
Other ideas:
- An info boot/comm., a helpful partner/park
- Knowing what we, as individuals, want
- Better understanding
- Economic stability for both

2c.) What might be the drawbacks/challenges to having such a group?

As with the first two groups, people who gathered in Group #3 were worried about how such a diverse collection of people could work around conflicting viewpoints or ideas. The top suggestions, "adopting a common agenda", including "all views", and working with "too many diverse ideas", received nearly equal support during the voting.

- Challenge - adopting a common agenda (29 pts.)
- Keeping group inclusive/open to all views (28 pts.)
- Too many diverse ideas (21 pts.)
- Finding a consensus on difficult issues (13 pts.)
- Decision making (6 pts.)
- Individualwillingness to commit for an extended time period (6 pts.)
- Getting mainstreamed into certain sensitive issues (4 pts.)
- Keeping group focused (1 pt)

Other ideas:
- Ideas not useful or practical
- Factions

2.) How should the membership be organized? (i.e. geography, interests)

Group #3 responded in a similar fashion to this question, with the most support for the concept of organizing the "Friends" based around "similar interests" (46 pts) or a representation of all "focus groups" (21 pts). Geography was the third most popular suggestion (14 pts).

- Similar interests (46 pts.)
- Focus groups all represented (21 pts.)
- Geography (14 pts.)

- By function (11 pts.)
- Interest and willingness to participate (4 pts.)
- Education and skill (1 pt.)

4.) Name 3 primary things or activities such a group should be involved in.

The third workgroup expressed a keen interest in the idea of the "Friends" being a framework to bring together volunteers. The suggestion of "education volunteering" gathered one of the highest vote totals of the entire workshop (55 pts). The group also felt the "Friends" could be a good forum for park issues and building community relationships.

- Education volunteering (55 pts.)
- Forum for park issues, support for park admin. Community resource - educ./writing/research (18 pts.)
- Park advocacy (11 pts.)
- Forums (9pts.)
- Service and safety (8 pts.)
- Interpretive program, issues discussion (7 pts.)
- Public relations (7 pts.)
- Local advisory board to park admin. (6 pts.)
- Support, public education, open to any concern or need and service to be done (3 pts.)
- Protection and documentation (1 pt.)
Other ideas:
- Community input to park
- Access issues for all (handicap, elderly)
- Cleanup, education, collecting public input

5.) Name a specific way such a Friends group could interface with ONP staff.

As with the other workgroups, Group #3 believed there were definite benefits to having the "Friends" hold regular meetings with ONP staff. They were a little more direct in their top suggestion, saying the staff should meet with the "focus group when asked" (44 pts). There was also another light-hearted response, saying the "Friends" and staff should have "parties' (23 pts). While on the surface that might be considered to be frivolous, it does reflect a genuine desire to get to know ONP staff in a more informal setting.

- Staff meets with focus group when asked (44 pts.)
- Parties (23 pts.)
- Regularly scheduled time with superintendent/assistant super. (22 pts.)
- Meetings (21 pts.)
- Support staff (9 pts.)
Other ideas:
- Thru clear mission statement, goals
- Bigsister/brother/mentorconcept

6.) How could the Friends group bring greater public involvement and appreciation of ONP, esp. among residents of the Olympic Peninsula?

Group #3 followed a similar pattern with the other work groups; suggesting the "Friends"

could help facilitate greater public involvement by using traditional tools such as a "newspaper column" (42 pts) or other "public relations activities" (40 pts).

- Newspaper column (42 pts.)
- Public relations activities (40 pts.)
- Organizing activities in park (19 pts.)
- Feature articles and photos (8 pts.)
- Advertise prolects that we are involved with (8 pts.)
- Keep public current on subjects and issues (5 pts.)
- Rallies at local events (4 pts.)
Other ideas:
- Knowing the people involved, better relations
- Letters in paper

7.) How should such a group be organized? (such as Board of directors, committee, etc.)

Group #3 reflected the opinions of the other two workgroups, that the "Friends" organization should be more structured, using a "board with committees" (37 pts). However, the did have two other unique suggestions; that the "Friends" use "task teams" to work on specific issues and projects (32 pts), or start functioning with "open meetings to generate enough interest" and then move to a formal board organization at a later date (26 pts).

- Board with committees (37 pts.)
- Task teams (32 pts.)
- Start with open meetings to generate enough interest - move to bd. later (26 pts.)
- Interest committees (12 pts.)
- Committee with rotating teams (6 pts.)
- Board of directors with various committee chairmen (as needed) (6 pts.)
Other ideas:
- Officers, board, committees

Olympic National Park - "Friends" Results

Gold = 5 pts.
Silver = 3 pts.
Blue/Red = 1 pt.

Group #1 - Jim Heintz

1.) What do you see as the need for a "Friends" group?
- Maintain park's integrity (16 pts.)
- Notification to public (6 pts.)
- Expand community awareness of park (18 pts.)
- Give positive outlook on a major federal responsibility (5 pts.)
- Volunteer work (14 pts.)
- People (1 pt)
- Park for everyone (9 pts.)
- Understanding how the park works so we can tell others (5 pts.)
- Help solve park issues (7 pts.)
- Fresh perspective for park (11 pts.)
- Maintenance (5 pts.)
- No need (3 pts.)
- User input prior to establishing park policies (26 pts.)
- ONP defense against park-bashers (13 pts.)
Other ideas:
- Organize Program

2.) What are the benefits to having such a group for you as an individual?
- Park should respect decisions of local people (5 pts.)
- Access to decision-makers (18 pts.)
- Participate in policy (20 pts.)
- Interact in more intimate way with park environment (19 pts.)
- Chance to "give back" something of value (31 pts.)
- Better communication between parUpublic (1 pt.)
- I'd feel better about the park admin. if I knew more about it (4 pts.)
- Work with others who share interest in park (19 pts.)
- Like-minded people meeting - achieving same goals (g pts.)
Other ideas:
- Express views for park
- Have a local voice
- Exercise
- Communication

2b.) What about the benefits for the park and community as a whole?
- Communication (10 pts.)
- Helps eliminate "we-they" conflicts (12 pts.)
- More participation, better access for park users (20 pts.)
- Better opportunity to meet people's expectations (1 pt.)
- More feeling of two-way communication (18 pts.)
- Badly needed local input (11 pts.)

- Could show the common interests between park and public (8 pts.)
- Individual citizen input re mission - management expansion, etc. (9 pts.)
- Better avenue for conflict resolution (20 pts.)
- Feeling of community/park commonality (28 pts.)
Other ideas:
- Continued quality attractions