## 2005 Survey of U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Ecological Services Employees in the Southeast Region (GA, AL, AR, FL, KY, LA, MS, TN, NC, SC, PR)

Return Rate: 29.4% for Region 4 (77 out of 262); 29.4% National (414 out of 1410) Note: A certain percentage of responses for most questions were left blank. These figures are not included below causing, in many cases, the percentages listed to equal less than 100%.

1. I feel that I am allowed to do my job as a scientist.

strongly agree	agree	don't know	disagree	strongly disagree
Region 4				
11.7%	48.1%	3.9%	27.3%	9.1%
National				
6.8%	56.8%	3.6%	22.0%	9.9%

2. Within the agency I can openly express my concerns about the biological needs of species and habitats without fear of retaliation.

strongly agree	agree	don't know	disagree	strongly disagree
Region 4				
14.3%	44.2%	5.2%	16.9%	19.5%
National				
12.6%	49.0%	7.5%	18.1%	11.6%

3. Outside the agency I can openly express my concerns about the biological needs of species and habitats without fear of retaliation.

strongly agree	agree	don't know	disagree	strongly disagree
Region 4				
5.2%	46.8%	13.0%	20.8%	14.3%
National				
5.6%	38.4%	13.0%	29.2%	12.8%

4. USFWS fosters a work place ethic consistent with the agency's mission to "conserve, protect and enhance fish and wildlife and their habitats for the continuing benefit of the American people."

strongly agree	agree	don't know	disagree	strongly disagrees
Region 4				
10.4%	46.8%	3.9%	24.7%	14.3%
National				
7.7%	44.9%	6.0%	29.7%	9.9%

5. USFWS Ecological Services is acting effectively to maintain or enhance species and their habitats, so as to avoid possible listings under the Endangered Species Act.

strongly agree	agree	don't know	disagree	strongly disagree
Region 4				
2.6%	19.5%	9.1%	44.2%	24.7%
National				
1.9%	13.3%	9.2%	52.2%	22.9%

6. USFWS Ecological Services is effectively accomplishing efforts toward recovery of Endangered Species Act listed species.

strongly agree	agree	don't know	disagree	strongly disagree
Region 4				
1.3%	27.3%	6.5%	42.9%	22.1%
National				
1.2%	19.1%	10.1%	48.3%	20.5%

7. In my opinion, USFWS Ecological Services is moving in the right direction.

strongly agree	agree	don't know	disagree	strongly disagree
Region 4				
1.3%	32.5%	10.4%	35.1%	20.8%
National				
0.7%	21.0%	12.8%	44.0%	20.3%

8. I trust USFWS decision makers to make decisions that will protect species and habitats.

strongly agree	agree	don't know	disagree	strongly disagree
Region 4				
0%	29.9%	10.4%	29.9%	28.6%
National				
0.5%	20.0%	10.6%	37.7%	29.7%

9. Scientific input from Ecological Services research staff receives appropriate consideration in decisions regarding protection of species and habitats.

strongly agree	agree	don't know	disagree	strongly disagree
Region 4				
7.8%	35.1%	22.1%	19.5%	14.3%
National				
3.1%	23.2%	19.3%	33.8%	18.1%

10. My Regional Directorate will stand up for scientific staff or supervisors who take controversial stands.

strongly agree	agree	don't know	disagree	strongly disagree
Region 4				
5.2%	19.5%	24.7%	19.5%	29.9%
National				
2.2%	17.6%	25.6%	30.0%	23.4%

11. I have been directed by USFWS decision makers to provide incomplete, inaccurate or misleading information to the public, media or elected officials.

frequently	occasionally	seldom	never	not applicable
Region 4				
3.9%	7.8%	3.9%	70.1%	11.7%
National				
1.4%	7.7%	9.4%	68.1%	11.8%

12. In my experience, scientific documents generally reflect technically rigorous evaluations of impacts to listed species and associated habitats.

strongly agree	agree	don't know	disagree	strongly disagree
Region 4 6.5%	50.6%	13.0%	19.5%	9.1%
National				
7.5%	54.3%	13.8%	18.1%	4.3%

13. I have been directed to inappropriately exclude or alter technical information from a USFWS scientific document.

frequently	occasionally	seldom	never	not applicable
Region 4				
3.9%	6.5%	7.8%	70.1%	10.4%
National				
2.2%	8.9%	9.2%	68.8%	10.4%

14. I have been directed, for non-scientific reasons, to refrain from making jeopardy or other findings that are protective of species.

frequently	occasionally	seldom	never	not applicable
Region 4				
6.5%	15.6%	14.3%	42.9%	19.5%
National				
3.6%	14.0%	13.3%	39.4%	29.2%

15. As a norm, USFWS scientific documents and reports rely upon the best available science.

strongly agree	agree	don't know	disagree	strongly disagree
Region 4				
15.6%	59.7%	3.9%	14.3%	5.2%
National				
15.0%	60.1%	9.2%	11.6%	2.9%

16. I know of cases where U.S. Department of Interior political appointees have injected themselves into Ecological Services determinations.

strongly agree	agree	don't know	disagree	strongly disagree
Region 4				
20.8%	31.2%	42.9%	2.6%	1.3%
National				
43.2%	30.0%	22.9%	2.7%	0.5%

17. I know of cases where political appointees from other federal departments or agencies (for example, OMB, CEQ, USDA, DOD) have injected themselves into Ecological Services determinations.

strongly agree	agree	don't know	disagree	strongly disagree
Region 4				
18.2%	16.9%	54.5%	7.8%	1.3%
National				
21.3%	21.0%	51.0%	5.3%	0.7%

18. I know of cases where members of Congress have injected themselves into Ecological Services determinations.

strongly agree	agree	don't know	disagree	strongly disagree
Region 4				
22.1%	28.6%	42.9%	5.2%	0%
National				
26.3%	28.0%	40.3%	3.9%	0.7 %

19. I know of cases where state, tribal or local governments/elected officials have injected themselves into Ecological Services determinations.

strongly agree	agree	don't know	disagree	strongly disagree
Region 4				
20.8%	31.2%	39.0%	7.8%	0%
National				
23.7%	31.9%	37.0%	6.3%	0.5 %

20. I know of cases where commercial interests have inappropriately induced the reversal or withdrawal of USFWS scientific conclusions or decisions through political intervention.

strongly agree	agree	don't know	disagree	strongly disagree
Region 4				
18.2%	31.2%	39.0%	6.5%	2.6%
National				

25.4% 30.9% 36.2% 5.6% 1.0%