



2009 OSMB Customer Service Survey

Survey Overview and Methodology

The Oregon State Marine Board conducted a customer service survey in June of 2009 as directed by the Oregon Dept. of Administrative Services. The survey results are used as a performance measure for the 2009-11 biennium.

The Oregon State Marine Board is Oregon’s recreational boating agency, dedicated to safety, education and access in an enhanced environment. To adequately perform this mission, Marine Board staff is in close and constant contact with Oregon’s recreational boaters. We maintain these close customer relationships through law enforcement, outreach and education, facilities development, regulatory activities and registration and titling services. We provide numerous publications, signage, web services and personal assistance in a focused effort to help people enjoy Oregon’s waterways safely and legally.

Our primary customer is Oregon’s recreational boater, but we also serve a number of other constituencies. These include the following:

1. Law Enforcement – County sheriff departments and Oregon State Police, who we contract with provide on-the-water enforcement.
2. Facility Providers – Parks districts, municipalities and others who provide, maintain or manage the access points and related facilities used by recreational boaters.
3. Registration Agents – Commercial businesses who partner with the Marine Board to serve recreational boaters with local registration and titling services.
4. Guides, Packers and Charter Boat operators – Professional fishing, hunting and outdoor adventure guides, and Charter Boat businesses, who are required to be licensed by the Oregon State Marine Board.
5. Boater Education Instructors – Volunteers who are trained and certified by the Marine Board to teach boating safety education in Oregon.

Each of these groups was surveyed separately to identify programmatic variations, but all surveys were compatible to enable a general report for an agency-wide customer service rating. The response rate on the survey follows:

Group	Total	Mailed	Received	Return Rate	Margin of Error
Boater Education Instructors	82	82	42	51.2%	10.6%
Facility Providers	87	87	55	63.2%	8.1%
Registration Agents	96	96	44	45.8%	10.9%
Law Enforcement Providers	35	35	16	45.7%	18%
Guides/Outfitters/Charter Boats	1,163	578	253	43.8%	5.4%
Recreational Boaters	180,000	787	239	30.4%	6.4%

Surveys were mailed beginning mid-May and accepted until July 1. Surveys included a self-addressed, postage-paid envelope. Of the 1665 surveys mailed, only 23 were returned as non-deliverable. The highest rate of return was 63% for Facility Providers. The lowest was Recreational Boaters at 30.4%.

A full summary of this survey will be posted online for the public to review.

Agency-Wide Customer Service Rating

This survey was previously conducted in June/July of 2006. Like the 2006 survey, “good & excellent” ratings are high and numerous positive comments were received. A number of suggestions to improve service were also included and will be reviewed by staff. Negative comments were far less frequent but equally instructive.

Questions for each different constituency group were consistent so they could be compared. Survey respondents were asked to rate each question from 1-4 (1=excellent, 2=good, 3=fair, 4=poor).

Question 1 – Timeliness: Timeliness of service provided by OSMB

Question 2 – Accuracy: Ability to provide services correctly the first time

Question 3 – Helpfulness: Helpfulness of OSMB employees

Question 4 – Knowledge: Knowledge and expertise of OSMB employees

Question 5 – Information: Availability of information from OSMB

2009 Overall Agency Average Response						
2009 Rating	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Average
	Percentage of each response					
1	63.2%	64.6%	66.0%	63.2%	61.2%	63.8%
2	33.0%	31.5%	31.0%	32.3%	33.4%	32.0%
3	2.8%	3.0%	2.2%	3.6%	4.3%	3.2%
4	0.9%	0.9%	0.8%	1.0%	1.1%	1.0%
Good or Excellent in 2009	96.3%	96.1%	97.0%	95.5%	94.6%	95.8%
Good or Excellent in 2006	94.4%	93.0%	98.7%	96.2%	91.4%	94.75%

Overall, the Marine Board was ranked “good” or “excellent” by 95.8% of all survey recipients, which is a 1% increase over 2006 but also within the statistical range of error. Specifically, 96.3% of recipients ranked the Marine Board good to excellent for timeliness of service; 96.1% for serving customers correctly the first time; 97% for the helpfulness of staff; 95.5% for knowledge and expertise; and 94.6% for availability of information.

Segment Breakdowns

By viewing each constituency group separately, we can see areas where additional attention may be required. Questions were tailored to each individual section: For example, question one for boating instructors was still related to timeliness of service, but as provided by the Education Information Program.

Facility Providers

	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	
Rating	Frequency					Average
1	80.4%	76.4%	88.9%	83.6%	77.8%	81.4%
2	19.6%	23.6%	11.1%	16.4%	22.2%	18.6%
3	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
4	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Good & Excellent	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
2006 comparison	98.2%	98.2%	100.0%	100.0%	98.1%	98.92%

Registration Agents

	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	
Rating	Frequency					Average
1	67.4%	81.4%	79.5%	75.0%	72.7%	75.2%
2	32.6%	18.6%	20.5%	25.0%	22.7%	23.9%
3	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.3%	0.5%
4	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.3%	0.5%
Good & Excellent	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	95.5%	99.1%
2006 comparison	94.9%	98.7%	94.9%	98.7%	93.7%	96.19%

Guides & Outfitters

	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	
Rating	Frequency					Average
1	59.6%	61.0%	61.8%	61.5%	52.5%	59.3%
2	36.0%	33.5%	33.7%	31.4%	41.2%	35.2%
3	3.6%	4.0%	3.3%	5.4%	4.6%	4.2%
4	0.8%	1.6%	1.2%	1.7%	1.7%	1.4%
Good & Excellent	95.6%	94.4%	95.5%	92.9%	93.7%	94.4%
2006 comparison	94.1%	93.3%	92.6%	89.2%	88.1%	91.46%

Law Enforcement Providers

	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	
Rating	Frequency					Average
1	50.0%	43.8%	68.8%	50.0%	50.0%	51.9%
2	37.5%	56.3%	31.3%	50.0%	43.8%	44.2%
3	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.3%	2.9%
4	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%
Good & Excellent	87.5%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	93.8%	96.2%
2006 comparison	82.4%	88.2%	100.0%	100.0%	94.1%	92.94%

Surveys sent to recreational boaters allowed responses for the three primary contact points: license agents; online registration (RegLine); and OSMB staff. These responses are as follows:

Recreational Boaters - Agents						
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	
Rating	Frequency					Total
1	44.7%	52.6%	50.7%	43.2%	43.2%	46.9%
2	47.4%	39.5%	41.3%	48.6%	43.2%	44.0%
3	6.6%	6.6%	5.3%	6.8%	12.2%	7.5%
4	1.3%	1.3%	2.7%	1.4%	1.4%	1.6%
Good & Excellent	92.1%	92.1%	92.0%	91.9%	86.5%	90.9%
2006 Comparison	92.0%	88.8%	88.1%	79.3%	78.8%	85.37%

Recreational Boaters - RegLine						
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	
Rating	Frequency					Total
1	68.2%	67.7%	65.1%	64.1%	72.7%	67.5%
2	31.8%	30.8%	34.9%	34.4%	27.3%	31.8%
3	0.0%	1.5%	0.0%	1.6%	0.0%	0.6%
4	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Good & Excellent	100.0%	98.5%	100.0%	98.4%	100.0%	99.4%
2006 Comparison	97.0%	91.2%	100.0%	100.0%	97.1%	97.04%

Recreational Boaters - OSMB						
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	
Rating	Frequency					Total
1	60.8%	62.7%	58.1%	60.7%	63.3%	61.1%
2	34.2%	33.1%	39.5%	35.7%	30.6%	34.6%
3	2.5%	3.4%	2.3%	3.6%	5.1%	3.4%
4	2.5%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%	0.9%
Good & Excellent	95.0%	95.8%	97.7%	96.4%	93.9%	95.7%
2006 Comparison	93.2%	93.7%	94.4%	96.5%	94.1%	94.37%

Comments

Respondents submitted 242 specific written comments, including suggestions, praise, criticism and general responses. Of the 242 responses, 198 were positive in nature, 46 were neutral, negative or mixed. Following are samples of comments of particular interest.

- Guides:** For guides and outfitters, 98 of the 253 questionnaires had written comments specifically praising the program and/or staff. Many of the comments are notable with such statements as, “You guys are awesome,” and “In 35 years never a problem. Too bad DMV is not run this way.” There are 25 detailed responses regarding specific issues, some of which are suggestions and some of which are critical of current operation. Several noted discrepancies between Coast Guard and Marine Board carriage requirements and other regulations, concerns about training levels for guides, local representation on rulemaking issues, or specific concerns about paperwork or fees or providing licenses to convicted felons.

- ❑ **Facilities:** With 55 of 80 responses returned, the Facilities Section received the highest marks from facility providers. In all, they received 41 written comments, and all but one were highly appreciative of their service. The common thread is praise for staff assistance, funding support and general service. “OSMB is a great agency to work with. Always responsive & very helpful. Should be used as a model for other state departments.” Another respondent stated, “I cannot think of another agency that we deal with that responds & performs like OSMB.” The only critical comment stated that finding info on the web page can be difficult.
- ❑ **Boating Education Instructors:** With 42 of 82 instructors replying, boating education instructors were also generally positive about the Marine Board’s education program. Of the 33 written comments from boating education instructors, 26 were very positive of the program manager and the services delivered. Six respondents recommend a programmatic change – removing the online option for boating safety exams - and one respondent offered several miscellaneous comments or suggestions. However, even the questionnaires noting program criticisms still gave predominantly “excellent” marks. Several representative comments include; “I have always experienced prompt, professional service from OSMB personnel;” “The staff treats me like I am their boss. I could not be happier.” On the critical side: “Online exams should not be given! Some people have taken them so others could get their boating card!!”
- ❑ **Law Enforcement:** Sixteen of the 35 mailed surveys were filled out and returned by law enforcement program managers, including county sheriffs and Oregon State Police. Of the 16, 11 had written comments. Of these 11, eight were positive and three were critical. Even on two of the surveys with critical comments, the surveys noted all “excellent” marks. Positive comments praised working relationships and staff support. Negative comments noted economic issues. Comments included: “In my experience (25+ years in Oregon), OSMB sets the standard for how a state agency should be run!.” Another stated, “OSMB has improved in being open to suggestion from all LE agencies.” It continued to note specific improvements and recent program changes.
- ❑ **Registration Agents:** Ninety-six survey were mailed out and 44 returned. Of the 44, there were 26 written responses. Of these 26, 16 were positive and 10 were either critical or a mix of positive and negative, generally with specific suggestions for improvement. A typical response: “You guys rock! I enjoy and am proud to work with and represent the Marine Board. I can always count on you.” The new “temporary registration” booklet garnered three negative comments as hard or time-consuming to use.
- ❑ **Recreational Boaters:** Though 787 surveys were mailed, and 239 returned, only five had written comments. Due to the number of questions, there is not room on the front of the document for written comment. This will be changed in future years. One comment request controls on fishing guides, another felt it was unfair to charge a title fee after the boat is paid off.

Copies of the survey and comments have been given to program managers. The entire report has been posted on line.

Program Specific Results

Rec Boaters - Local Agent						
Average Score	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	
Grade	1.64	1.57	1.60	1.66	1.72	
	B+	B+	B+	B+	B+	
Rating Frequency	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Total
1	34	40	38	32	32	176
2	36	30	31	36	32	165
3	5	5	4	5	9	28
4	1	1	2	1	1	6
Good & Excellent	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.86	0.91
Rating by %	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Total
1	44.7%	52.6%	50.7%	43.2%	43.2%	46.9%
2	47.4%	39.5%	41.3%	48.6%	43.2%	44.0%
3	6.6%	6.6%	5.3%	6.8%	12.2%	7.5%
4	1.3%	1.3%	2.7%	1.4%	1.4%	1.6%
Good & Excellent	92.1%	92.1%	92.0%	91.9%	86.5%	90.9%

Rec Boaters - Regline						
Average Score	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	
Grade	1.32	1.34	1.35	1.38	1.27	
	A-	A-	A-	A-	A-	
Rating Frequency	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Total
1	45	44	41	41	48	219
2	21	20	22	22	18	103
3	0	1	0	1	0	2
4	0	0	0	0	0	0
Good & Excellent	100.0%	98.5%	100.0%	98.4%	100.0%	99.4%
Rating by %	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Total
1	68.2%	67.7%	65.1%	64.1%	72.7%	67.5%
2	31.8%	30.8%	34.9%	34.4%	27.3%	31.8%
3	0.0%	1.5%	0.0%	1.6%	0.0%	0.6%
4	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Good & Excellent	100.0%	98.5%	100.0%	98.4%	100.0%	99.4%

Rec Boaters - OSMB Office & Mail						
Average Score	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	
Grade	1.47	1.42	1.44	1.43	1.44	
	A-	A-	A-	A-	A-	
Rating Frequency	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Total
1	73	74	50	51	62	310
2	41	39	34	30	30	174
3	3	4	2	3	5	17
4	3	1	0	0	1	5
Good & Excellent	95.0%	95.8%	97.7%	96.4%	93.9%	95.7%
Rating by %	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Total
1	60.8%	62.7%	58.1%	60.7%	63.3%	61.1%
2	34.2%	33.1%	39.5%	35.7%	30.6%	34.6%
3	2.5%	3.4%	2.3%	3.6%	5.1%	3.4%
4	2.5%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%	0.9%
Good & Excellent	95.0%	95.8%	97.7%	96.4%	93.9%	95.7%

Rec Boaters - Combined Total						
Mailed	787	Received	239	Return %	30.4%	
Rating Frequency	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Total
1	152	158	129	124	142	705
2	98	89	87	88	80	442
3	8	10	6	9	14	47
4	4	2	2	1	2	11
Good & Excellent	95.4%	95.4%	96.4%	95.5%	93.3%	95.2%
Rating by %	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Total
1	58.02%	61.00%	57.59%	55.86%	59.66%	58.51%
2	37.40%	34.36%	38.84%	39.64%	33.61%	36.68%
3	3.05%	3.86%	2.68%	4.05%	5.88%	3.90%
4	1.53%	0.77%	0.89%	0.45%	0.84%	0.91%
Good & Excellent	95.42%	95.37%	96.43%	95.50%	93.28%	95.19%

Boating Instructors						
Average Score	1.05	Q2	1.17	Q4	1.27	
Grade	A	A	A	A-	A	
Mailed	82	Received	42	Return %	51.2%	
Rating Frequency	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Total
1	40	35	38	32	38	183
2	2	7	4	8	4	25
3	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	0	0	0	1	0	1
Good & Excellent	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	97.6%	100.0%	99.5%
Rating by %	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Average
1	95.2%	83.3%	90.5%	78.0%	90.5%	87.5%
2	4.8%	16.7%	9.5%	19.5%	9.5%	12.0%
3	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
4	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.4%	0.0%	0.5%
Good & Excellent	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	97.6%	100.0%	99.5%

Customer Service Survey - Law Enforcement								
Average Score	1.625	Q2	1.5625	Q4	1.5	Q6	2	
Grade	B+	B+	A-	A-	B+	B	B+	
Mailed	35	Received	16	Return %	45.7%			
Rating Frequency	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Total
1	8	7	11	8	8	5	7	54
2	6	9	5	8	7	5	6	46
3	2	0	0	0	1	3	3	3
4	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Good & Excellent	87.5%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	93.8%	71.4%	81.3%	96.2%
Rating by %	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Average
1	50.0%	43.8%	68.8%	50.0%	50.0%	35.7%	43.8%	51.9%
2	37.5%	56.3%	31.3%	50.0%	43.8%	35.7%	37.5%	44.2%
3	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.3%	21.4%	18.8%	2.9%
4	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.1%	0.0%	1.0%
Good & Excellent	87.5%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	93.8%	71.4%	81.3%	96.2%

Customer Service Survey - Facility Providers						
Average Score	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	
	1.20	1.24	1.11	1.16	1.22	
Grade	A	A	A	A	A	
Mailed	87	Received	55	Return %	63.2%	
Rating Frequency	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Total
1	45	42	48	46	42	223
2	11	13	6	9	12	51
3	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	0	0	0	0	0	0
Good & Excellent	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Rating by %	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Average
1	80.4%	76.4%	88.9%	83.6%	77.8%	81.4%
2	19.6%	23.6%	11.1%	16.4%	22.2%	18.6%
3	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
4	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Good & Excellent	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Customer Service Survey - Registration Agents						
Average Score	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	
	1.33	1.19	1.20	1.25	1.34	
Grade	A-	A	A-	A	A-	
Mailed	96	Received	44	Return %	45.8%	
Rating Frequency	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Total
1	29	35	35	33	32	164
2	14	8	9	11	10	52
3	0	0	0	0	1	1
4	0	0	0	0	1	1
Good & Excellent	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	95.5%	99.1%
Rating by %	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Average
1	67.4%	81.4%	79.5%	75.0%	72.7%	75.2%
2	32.6%	18.6%	20.5%	25.0%	22.7%	23.9%
3	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.3%	0.5%
4	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.3%	0.5%
Good & Excellent	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	95.5%	99.1%

Customer Service Survey - Guides & Outfitters						
Average Score	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	
	1.46	1.46	1.44	1.47	1.55	
Grade	A-	A-	A-	A-	B+	
Mailed	578	Received	253	Return %	43.8%	
Rating Frequency	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Total
1	149	153	152	147	125	726
2	90	84	83	75	98	430
3	9	10	8	13	11	51
4	2	4	3	4	4	17
Good & Excellent	95.6%	94.4%	95.5%	92.9%	93.7%	94.4%
Rating by %	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Average
1	59.6%	61.0%	61.8%	61.5%	52.5%	59.3%
2	36.0%	33.5%	33.7%	31.4%	41.2%	35.2%
3	3.6%	4.0%	3.3%	5.4%	4.6%	4.2%
4	0.8%	1.6%	1.2%	1.7%	1.7%	1.4%
Good & Excellent	95.6%	94.4%	95.5%	92.9%	93.7%	94.4%

Agency Total Response						
Average Score	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	
	1.41	1.40	1.38	1.42	1.45	1.41
Grade	A-	A-	A-	A-	A-	A-
Total Mailed	1665	Received	649	Return %	39.0%	
Rating Frequency	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Total
1	423	430	413	390	387	2006
2	221	210	194	199	211	1005
3	19	20	14	22	27	102
4	6	6	5	6	7	31
Good & Excellent	644	640	607	589	598	3011
Rating by %	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Average
1	63.2%	64.6%	66.0%	63.2%	61.2%	63.8%
2	33.0%	31.5%	31.0%	32.3%	33.4%	32.0%
3	2.8%	3.0%	2.2%	3.6%	4.3%	3.2%
4	0.9%	0.9%	0.8%	1.0%	1.1%	1.0%
Good & Excellent	96.3%	96.1%	97.0%	95.5%	94.6%	95.8%