

From: [Fox, Lori](mailto:Lori.Fox@nps.gov)
To: Doug.Wetmore@nps.gov
Cc: Mike.Murray@nps.gov
Subject: FW: full OMB review process details
Date: 02/23/2012 10:46 AM
Attachments: [SupportingStatement PartA example.doc](#)
[60-day example.doc](#)
[Supporting Statement PartB example.doc](#)
[60-day FINAL.pdf](#)

Doug,

I think this is what you are looking for.

Thanks,
Lori

Lori Fox
Senior Planner/Deputy Director Denver Operations

Direct: 303.985.6602
Mobile: 301.461.8772
Fax: 303.984.4942

535 16th Street | Suite 600 | Denver, CO 80202

This message, including any attachments hereto, may contain privileged and/or confidential information and is intended solely for the attention and use of the intended addressee(s). If you are not the intended addressee, you may neither use, copy, nor deliver to anyone this message or any of its attachments. In such case, you should immediately destroy this message and its attachments and kindly notify the sender by reply mail. Unless made by a person with actual authority conferred by The Louis Berger Group, Inc., (LBG) the information and statements herein do not constitute a binding commitment or warranty by LBG. LBG assumes no responsibility for any misperceptions, errors or misunderstandings. You are urged to verify any information that is confusing and report any errors/concerns to us in writing.

-----Original Message-----

From: Mansfield, Carol A. [mailto:carolm@rti.org]
Sent: Tuesday, April 08, 2008 2:37 PM
To: Sandra_Hamilton@nps.gov; Fox, Lori; Mike_Murray@nps.gov
Cc: Mansfield, Carol A.; Bruce_Peacock@nps.gov; Heather_Best@nps.gov
Subject: FW: full OMB review process details

Hi Sandy (and everyone else),

I talked to Megan McBride in the Social Science office for NPS about an expedited OMB review for the survey of businesses. She said that if the project was not controversial we might have been able to expedite, but given everything else going on with Cape Hatteras and surveys, she said we have to go through the whole process. She describes the process below and suggested that we might want to get the first 60 day federal register notice ready and started through the NPS/DOI approval chain.

She said that because of the all NPS/DOI approvals needed, it can take up to 10 months to get through the process. she said we may be lots of public comments as well.

So on my end, I don't think there is anything I can do to get the process expedited. I told her about the reg-neg committee and thought that maybe if all the stakeholders agreed then we could go with expedited, but she said no.

Let me know what next. I assume we will go ahead and get the 60 day FR notice ready. I'm not sure what to do about budgeting for responding to public comments.

As an aside, she said that there is a survey planned for Assateague over-sand vehicle users (which generated a lot of public comments). The attached pdf called "60 day final.pdf" describes the study. We will follow-up with the park and the people doing the study to see what they are doing.

Thanks,
Carol

Carol Mansfield, Ph.D.
Senior Economist
Center for Regulatory Economics and Policy Research Research Triangle Institute 3040 Cornwallis Rd.
PO Box 12194
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709

(o) 919-541-8053
(fax) 919-541-6683
(email) carolm@rti.org

-----Original Message-----

From: Megan_McBride@contractor.nps.gov
[mailto:Megan_McBride@contractor.nps.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, April 08, 2008 3:53 PM
To: Mansfield, Carol A.
Subject: full OMB review process details

Hi Carol,

I will do my best to outline the full review process. However, I'm certain we'll have more conversations along the way to sort out details. In any event, the process begins with the 60-day Federal Register Notice. This is a notice that is published to the Federal Register to inform the public of the intent to collect information; thus, it includes a brief description of the need for the study, contact information for comments to be sent, and some information about the nature of the information collection (see the first attachment below for an example). As I mentioned on the phone, the surnaming process to get this noticed published takes a while, so we should start as soon as possible. Though it doesn't have to be published, a draft questionnaire (or interview guide) must be available at the time of publication and supplied to those who request it. In addition, once the 60-day notice is published, you must notify interested stakeholders that public comments are being solicited. You can use the attached 60-day notice as a template and just update the appropriate fields. Much of the notice is boiler-plate. In an attempt to make it as easy as possible, I've highlighted (in yellow) the fields that require your attention. Focus on those and you can leave the rest of the document as it is.

Once the 60-day notice has been published, and you're waiting for public comments to come in, it is good to get started on the Supporting Statement and the 30-day notice, as well as finalizing the survey instrument (and supplementary documents). What will need to be submitted in this second step are the following:

1. Supporting Statement, including both Part A & B (see the Supporting Statement example documents below). I have also included a blank Supporting Statement that you can fill in when you get to that point; it is attached below.
2. Draft 30-day Federal Register Notice (I have not included an example of this because we're a long way off from that point. Remind me to send you an example 30-day notice when we get closer to that point and I will)
3. Survey Instrument with supplementary documents
4. All public comments, including the following: the name of the commenter, the date the comment was filed and received, how the comment was received (i.e. via phone, email, postal mail, etc), and the affiliation of the commenter (i.e. NPS employee, university faculty, etc).

Once the 60-day period is over, the above documents are submitted to the NPS Information Collection Officer, so that the 30-day Notice can go through the surnaming process. The submission itself (i.e. the Supporting Statement and questionnaire) is reviewed by the Social Science Program and an individual at the Department of the Interior. Once that occurs and 30-day notice is published, everything is put into the electronic system (by me), including uploading the supporting statement, survey instrument, public comments, etc., and then it is submitted electronically to OMB for their review.

Hope this helps. I have also attached the 60-day notice for Assateague Island. Let me know if you have questions.

Megan McBride

 Senior Research Associate
 Social Science Program
 National Park Service

address: NPS Social Science Program
 c/o NPS Air Resources Division
 PO Box 25287
 Denver, CO 80225
 phone: 202-513-7192 (Washington DC)
 303-969-2814 (Denver)
 e-mail: Megan_McBride@contractor.nps.gov

(See attached file: SupportingStatement_PartA_example.doc)(See attached file: 60-day_example.doc)(See attached file: Supporting_Statement_PartB_example.doc)(See attached file: 60-day_FINAL.pdf)

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

**60-Day Notice of Intention to Request Clearance of Collection of Information;
Opportunity for Public Comment**

AGENCY: Department of the Interior, National Park Service

ACTION: Notice and request for comments.

SUMMARY: Under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 and 5 CFR part 1320, Reporting and Record Keeping Requirements, the National Park Service (NPS) invites public comments on a proposed new collection of information (1024-xxxx).

DATES: Public comments will be accepted on or before [insert 60 days from date of publication in the Federal Register].

ADDRESSES: *Send Comments To:* Angela Walters, Appalachian National Scenic Trail, National Park Service, P.O. Box 50, Harpers Ferry, WV 25425; Phone: (304) 535-6278; Fax (304) 535-6270, e-mail: angela_walters@nps.gov Also, you may send comments to Leonard Stowe, NPS Information Collection Clearance Officer, 1849 C St., NW. (2605), Washington, DC

20240, or by e-mail at Leonard_stowe@nps.gov. All responses to this notice will be summarized and included in the request for the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) approval. All comments will become a matter of public record.

To Request a Draft of Proposed Collection of Information Contact: Angela Walters,

Appalachian National Scenic Trail, National Park Service, P.O. Box 50, Harpers Ferry, WV 25425; Phone: (304) 535-6278; Fax (304) 535-6270, e-mail: angela_walters@nps.gov

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. James Gramann, National Park Service Social Science Program, 1201 “Eye” St., Washington, D.C. 20005; or via phone 202-513-7189; or via e-mail James_Gramann@partner.nps.gov. You are entitled to a copy of the entire ICR package free of charge.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title: Appalachian Trail Management Partner Survey

Bureau Form Number: None

OMB Number: To be requested

Expiration Date: To be requested.

Type of Request: New Collection.

Description of Need: The National Park Service Act of 1916, 38 Stat 535, 16 USC 1, et seq., requires that the NPS preserve national parks for the use and enjoyment of present and future generations. The Appalachian National Scenic Trail is an unusual unit of the national park system, managed through a decentralized volunteer-based cooperative management system involving eight national forests, six other national park units, agencies in fourteen states, the Appalachian Trail Conservancy and citizen volunteers in 30 affiliated trail club organizations.

The Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) of 1993 (P.L. 103-62) requires that the NPS develop goals and measure performance related to these goals. The Appalachian Trail Management Partner Survey (ATMPS) measures performance toward those goals through a partner satisfaction survey. The project is an element of the NPS Strategic Plan and the Department of the Interior (DOI) Strategic Plan.

The purpose of the ATMPS is to track the satisfaction of federal, state, and not-for-profit partner organizations and agencies receiving support from the Appalachian Trail Park Office (ATPO) to protect trail resources and provide for the public enjoyment and visitor experience of the Appalachian National Scenic Trail. The ATPO provides support to state and federal agencies, and not-for-profit organizations to assist them in fulfilling shared and delegated management activities in the management of the Appalachian National Scenic Trail. Achievement of on-the-ground results depends on the actions of these partner agencies and organizations. Progress towards management goals is measured by a satisfaction survey where key partners evaluate quality of support provided by ATPO. This effort is required by GPRA and other NPS and DOI strategic planning efforts. Data from the proposed survey is needed to assess performance regarding NPS GPRA goal Iib0. NPS performance on all goals measured in this study will contribute to DOI Department-wide performance reports.

Under provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 and 5 CFR Part 1320, Reporting and Record Keeping Requirements, the NPS invites comments on the need for gathering the information in the proposed survey (OMB # 1024-0216). Comments are invited on: 1) the practical utility of the information being gathered; 2) the accuracy of the burden hour estimate;

3) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and 4) ways to minimize the burden to respondents, including use of automated information collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Automated data collection: This information will be collected via mail-back surveys; no automated data collection will take place.

Description of respondents: Partners in the Appalachian Trail Cooperative Management System

Estimated average number of respondents: 200 (150 respondents and 50 non-respondents)

Estimated average number of responses: 200 (150 respondents and 50 non-respondents)

Estimated average burden hours per response: 1 minute for non-respondents and 3 minutes for respondents.

Frequency of Response: 1 time per respondent.

Estimated annual reporting burden: 23 hours.

Leonard E. Stowe
NPS, Information Collection Clearance Officer

Date

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The 15-member Council advises the Secretary of the Interior, through the BLM, on a variety of planning and management issues associated with public land management in southwestern Idaho.

RAC Officers for the 2008 Fiscal Year will be elected. The Council will be briefed by a representative of Idaho's U.S. Senator Mike Crapo's office regarding the Fee Repeal and Expanded Access Act of 2007 that he is a co-sponsor of with Montana's U.S. Senator Mike Baucus. The bill would repeal the 2004 passed Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act. There will be a discussion about the West-Wide Energy Corridor Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement and proposed routes going through the District's public lands. Hot Topics will be discussed by the District Manager and Field Office managers will provide highlights on activities in their offices.

Agenda items and location may change due to changing circumstances. All meetings are open to the public. The public may present written comments to the Council. Each formal Council meeting will also have time allocated for hearing public comments. Depending on the number of persons wishing to comment and time available, the time for individual oral comments may be limited. Individuals who plan to attend and need special assistance, such as sign language interpretation, or other reasonable accommodations, should contact the BLM Coordinator as provided above.

Dated: February 8, 2008.

David Wolf,

Associate, District Manager.

[FR Doc. E8-3072 Filed 2-19-08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-GG-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

60-Day Notice of Intention To Request Clearance of Collection of Information; Opportunity for Public Comment

AGENCY: Department of the Interior, National Park Service.

ACTION: Notice and request for comments.

SUMMARY: Under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 and 5 CFR Part 1320, Reporting and Record Keeping Requirements, the National Park Service (NPS) invites public comments on a proposed new collection of information (1024-xxxx).

DATES: Public comments will be accepted on the proposed Information

Collection Request (ICR) on or before April 21, 2008.

ADDRESSES: *Send Comments To:* Eppley Institute for Parks & Public Lands, Indiana University Research Park, RE: Assateague Island National Seashore (ASIS), 501 N. Morton Street, Suite 100, Bloomington, Indiana 474074; or via phone at 812/855-3095; or via fax 812/856-5600; or via e-mail at eppley@indiana.edu. Also, you may send comments to Leonard E. Stowe, NPS Information Collection Clearance Officer, 1849 C St., NW., (2605), Washington, DC 20240, or by e-mail at leonard.stowe@nps.gov. All responses of this notice will be summarized and included in the request for the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) approval. All comments will become a matter of public record.

To Request a Draft of Proposed Collection of Information Contact: Eppley Institute for Parks & Public Lands Indiana University Research Park, RE: ASIS, 501 N. Morton Street, Suite 100, Bloomington, Indiana 47404; or via phone at 812/855-3095; or via fax at 812/855-5600; or via e-mail at eppley@indiana.edu.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. James Gramann, NPS Social Science Program, 1201 "Eye" Street, Washington, DC 20005; or via phone at 202/513-7189; or via e-mail at James_Gramann@partner.nps.gov. You are entitled to a copy of the entire ICR package free of charge once the package is submitted to OMB for review. You can access this ICR at <http://www.reginfo.gov/public/>.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title: Assessing Visitor Attitudes, Experiences and Expectations associated with the Management and Use of Over-sand Vehicles at Assateague Island National Seashore.

Bureau Form Number: None.

OMB Number: To be requested.

Expiration Date: To be requested.

Type of Request: New collection.

Description of Need: The proposed study would provide information for use in identifying and evaluating alternatives for future management of Over-Sand Vehicle (OSV) use at Assateague Island National Seashore (ASIS), Maryland. The purpose of this research is to provide park managers with information about the types and characteristics of visitors to the OSV zone and adjacent backcountry areas, attributes of the OSV zone important to the quality of visitor experience, and visitor attitudes regarding OSV management and resource protection practices.

The use of Over-Sand Vehicles (OSVs) for access and recreation is a traditional activity that was occurring on ASIS prior to the establishment of ASIS in 1965. Management of OSV use was formalized with the adoption of special regulations (36 CFR 7.65) in 1974, which established a maximum limit of 145 vehicles using the Maryland District OSV zone at any time, vehicle and equipment requirements, an OSV permit system, and general requirements for legal OSV operation. OSV use was re-evaluated during development of the Seashore's 1982 General Management Plan (GMP). The GMP designated a "Traditional Recreation Subzone" in the Maryland District approximately 12-miles long to be managed for multiple uses including over-sand travel by properly equipped and permitted OSVs. The Traditional Recreation Subzone also includes a small area for overnight accommodation of self-contained OSVs, and tow hike-in, beach front, primitive backcountry campgrounds.

In 2008, the NPS will begin a revision of the GMP for ASIS. GMPs are broad umbrella documents that set the long-term goals for an individual park unit based upon the area's enabling legislation and other relevant laws and executive orders. The GMP (1) clearly defines the desired natural and cultural resource conditions to be achieved and maintained over time; (2) clearly defines the necessary conditions for visitors to understand, enjoy, and appreciate the park's significant resources; (3) identifies the kinds and levels of management activities, visitor use, and development that are appropriate for maintaining the desired conditions; and (4) identifies indicators and standards for maintaining the desired conditions.

The proposed study will develop information about contemporary OSV use and the nature and expectations of visitors to the Traditional Recreation Subzone. The results are expected to assist in the upcoming GMP revision process by providing currently unavailable information for decision-making related to the future management of OSV use at the National Seashore. The study has two primary objectives: (1) Develop baseline data on users of the Traditional Recreation Subzone including types, frequency and patterns of use, and socio-economic and demographic characteristics; and (2) identify potential indicators and standards of quality for maintaining the desired visitor experience in the Traditional Recreation Subzone.

To accomplish these objectives, the proposed study includes two components. The first focuses on OSV permit holders utilizing the ASIS

Traditional Recreation Subzone. The second component targets other, non-OSV users of the Traditional Recreation Subzone.

1. Survey OSV Permit Holders Utilizing the Traditional Recreation Subzone

The purpose of the proposed research is to provide park managers with information about National Seashore OSV users, attributes and quality of the current OSV experience, and user attitudes regarding OSV management. A randomly selected group of current (2008) OSV permit holders will be provided survey questionnaires either in-person or through the mail. The survey will include questions intended to develop information describing OSV user demographics, the frequency, patterns and type of OSV use, standards of quality and factors influencing visitor experience (both positive and negative), and user attitudes regarding the impacts of current and potential future OSV management and resource protection practices. This research is proposed for the summer and fall of 2008.

2. Survey Non-OSV Users of the Traditional Recreation Subzone

The second component of the proposed research is intended to provide park managers with information about other, non-OSV users of the National Seashore's Traditional Recreation Subzone. Non-OSV users of the Subzone include day use hikers, overnight campers using the hike-in primitive backcountry campgrounds, and boat-in visitors. A randomly selected group of visitors issued backcountry camping permits between September 1, 2007 and August 30, 2008, will be provided survey questionnaires through the mail. The survey will include questions similar to the types described above for Component 1, except that the intent will be to develop information from the perspective of non-OSV users of the Traditional Recreation Subzone. This research is proposed for the summer and fall of 2008. The obligation to respond is voluntary.

Automated data collection: This information will be collected via questionnaires, distributed either on-site or through the mail. No automated data collection will take place.

Description of respondents:
Component 1—on-site or mail-back surveys: ASIS OSV special use permit holders for calendar year 2008.
Component 2—mail-back surveys: ASIS visitors issued backcountry camping permits between September 1, 2007 and August 31, 2008.

Estimated average number of respondents: Component 1: 300 respondents; Component 2: 200 respondents.

Estimated average burden hours per response: Component 1: 15 minutes; Component 2: 15 minutes.

Frequency of Response: 1 time per respondent.

Estimated annual reporting burden: 125 hours.

Comments are invited on: (1) The practical utility of the information being gathered; (2) the accuracy of the burden hour estimate; (3) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (4) ways to minimize the burden to respondents, including use of automated information collection techniques or other forms of information technology. Before including your address, phone number, e-mail address, or other personal identifying information in your comment, you should be aware that your entire comment—including your personal identifying information—may be publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public view, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Dated: February 11, 2008.

Leonard E. Stowe,
NPS, Information Collection Clearance Officer.

[FR Doc. 08-740 Filed 2-19-08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4312-60-M

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

Availability of Draft Environmental Impact Statement and General Management Plan for Minuteman Missile National Historic Site, South Dakota

SUMMARY: Pursuant to Section 102(2)(C) of the National Environment Policy Act of 1969, 42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(c), the National Park Service (NPS) announces the availability of a draft Environmental Impact Statement and General Management Plan (EIS/GMP) for Minuteman Missile National Historic Site, South Dakota.

DATES: The draft EIS/GMP will remain available for public review for 60 days following the publishing of the notice of its availability in the **Federal Register** by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Public meetings will be held during the 60-day review period. You may submit your comments by any one of several methods. You may comment

via the Internet through the NPS Planning, Environment, and Public Comment Web site (<http://parkplanning.nps.gov>); simply click on the link to Minuteman Missile National Historic Site. You may mail comments to Superintendent Mark Herberger, Minuteman Missile National Historic Site, 21280 South Dakota Highway 240, Philip, South Dakota 57567. You may contact the Superintendent by telephone at 605-433-5552 or by fax at 605-433-5558. Finally, you may hand-deliver comments to the Minuteman Missile National Historic Site headquarters at the address above.

ADDRESSES: Copies of the draft EIS/GMP are available from Superintendent Mark Herberger, Minuteman Missile National Historic Site, 21280 South Dakota Highway 240, Philip, South Dakota 57567.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This GMP will guide the management of the Minuteman Missile National Historic Site for the next 25 years. The draft GMP considers four draft conceptual alternatives—a no-action and three-action alternatives, including the NPS preferred alternative. The draft document will also include the NPS's preferred location for the visitor/administrative facility.

The NPS preferred alternative would be to present the Delta facilities as symbols that commemorate the Cold War. In this alternative, Delta One would be restored to its active duty alert condition with many original furnishings and items still in place. Guided ranger shuttle tours would be required to access this facility. The Delta Nine facility would remain as it is today. This would be a self-guided experience with parking and interpretive information located nearby.

The draft EIS assesses impacts to cultural resources (archaeological resources, historic buildings and structures, cultural landscapes, ethnographic resources, and museum collections); natural resources (air quality, vegetation, and wildlife); visitor use and experience; socioeconomic environment; and park administration and operations.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Contact Superintendent, Minuteman Missile National Historic Site, at the address or telephone number above. Before including your address, telephone number, electronic mail address, or other personal identifying information in your comments, you should be aware that your entire comment (including your personal identifying information) may be made publicly available at any time. While

Supporting Statement for a New Collection RE: Winter Visitor Experiences in Yellowstone National Park

OMB Control Number 1024-New

B. Collections of Information Employing Statistical Methods

The agency should be prepared to justify its decision not to use statistical methods in any case where such methods might reduce burden or improve accuracy of results.

1. Describe (including a numerical estimate) the potential respondent universe and any sampling or other respondent selection method to be used. Data on the number of entities (e.g., establishments, State and local government units, households, or persons) in the universe covered by the collection and in the corresponding sample are to be provided in tabular form for the universe as a whole and for each of the strata in the proposed sample. Indicate expected response rates for the collection as a whole. If the collection had been conducted previously, include the actual response rate achieved during the last collection.

The potential respondent universe for the qualitative soundscape interviews, the soundscape survey, and the human-bison interaction survey is all visitors, 18 years of age or older, stopping at Snow Lodge and Old Faithful from 1/02/08 to 3/31/08. For the guide interview, the potential respondent universe is all snowmobile and snowcoach guides providing tours to Yellowstone National Park between 1/02/08 to 3/31/08.

Sampling plan/procedures:

To address the soundscape and visitor-bison interaction research, interviews and surveys will be conducted of visitors to Old Faithful during January-early March, 2008. Sample times will include one 8-10 day period with a random start during January, and three four-day periods randomly selected during February and early March. Sample periods will be selected to ensure a balance of weekend and weekday periods and a distribution across the winter season. Some constraints will be imposed on the sampling window to accommodate interviewer schedules and available accommodations in the Old Faithful area.

Qualitative Soundscape Interview

For the qualitative soundscape interviews, we will seek a purposive sample of 45 completed interviews representing a range of respondent ages and primary recreational activities. Based on previous experience with this type of research and the nature of the questions being asked, we believe a sample of approximately 45 will be large enough to provide significant insight into the questions being asked. Interviewers will introduce themselves as researchers from the University of Montana working in cooperation with YNP. They will alert the individual that participation is voluntary and that anonymity will be protected. The interview should take approximately 30 minutes to complete.

Interviews will be conducted at and around the Snow Lodge and Old Faithful area and will employ an open-ended, in-depth process assisted by the use of an interview guide. These interviews will be audio-recorded and transcribed verbatim. Text from the interviews will be imported into a computerized analysis program (NVivo) and analyzed to find themes of

perception and differences among respondents. Upon completion of the semi-structured interview, the respondent will be asked to complete a short questionnaire on socio-demographic information to assist in characterizing the sample and documenting its variability.

Quantitative Soundscape Survey and Human-Bison Interaction Survey

The soundscape survey will obtain 400 completed questionnaires, which will require an average of 30 completions on 15 days of sampling. We will plan for 19 days of sampling with the assumption that weather conditions or other unforeseen events could reduce the effective number of days in the field. Both surveys will be conducted on the same days using two different interviewers in different locations within the park.

On selected sampling days, visitors will be contacted at the Old Faithful Area. Data collectors will approach visitors while they in the lobby at the Snow Lodge, inside the visitor center at Old Faithful, or are waiting for the geyser to erupt and ask them to fill out the questionnaire on-site. The survey is relatively short, so filling out the survey outside is reasonable and can be done in comfort. This same sort of approach was used in the 1999 winter visitor studies (e.g., Davenport et al., 1999) done in Yellowstone National Park and visitors were willing to participate. The 1999 studies had high response rates; visitors were willing to participate and did not find the research design uncomfortable. Additionally, visitors will have the choice to fill out the survey outside at a table or to move inside to the visitor center if they find that more comfortable. Visitor contacts will occur based upon a pre-designed systematic schedule, starting with the first available group during the sample time. The sampled person will be an adult (18 years of age and older), and will be chosen using the next birthday method. Based on previous studies and visitor use data, every 5th group will be eligible and we will use the “next birthday” method to determine individual eligibility within a group. Once a surveyor has finished with one group, he/she will move on to the next eligible group that arrives at the survey site. If a group refuses to be interviewed, the surveyor will then contact the next eligible group, adhering to the sampling schedule of intercepting every 5th group. Given the use patterns at Old Faithful, we anticipate that most data will be collected between 10:00 AM and 3:00 PM. All visitors over 18 years or older will be eligible to participate. Data collectors will introduce themselves as students from the University of Montana working in cooperation with YNP. They will alert the visitors that participation is voluntary and that visitor anonymity will be protected. The soundscape questionnaire should take approximately 15 minutes to complete and the human-bison interaction survey should take approximately 20 minutes.

Qualitative Guide Interview

On selected sampling days, guides will be contacted outside near the Old Faithful Geyser. Data collectors will approach the guides after they let their parties off to visit Old Faithful. Guides generally have a 1-2 hour break during this time. Approximately 30 guides (evenly split between snowcoach and snowmobile) and purposively distributed to represent a range of companies will be interviewed during January and February of 2008. These interviews will be recorded and transcribed verbatim. Text from the interviews will be imported into a computerized analysis program (NVivo) and analyzed to find themes of perception and differences among respondents. Data collectors will introduce themselves as researchers

from the University of Montana working in cooperation with YNP. They will alert the guide that participation is voluntary and that guide anonymity will be protected. The interview should take approximately 20 minutes to complete.

2. Describe the procedures for the collection of information including:
 - * Statistical methodology for stratification and sample selection,
 - * Estimation procedure,
 - * Degree of accuracy needed for the purpose described in the justification,
 - * Unusual problems requiring specialized sampling procedures, and
 - * Any use of periodic (less frequent than annual) data collection cycles to reduce burden.

Qualitative Soundscape and Guide Interviews

We will contact a purposive sample of 50 people for the soundscape interview and expect 45 individuals to participate, for a response rate of 90 percent. Approximately 37 guides will be contacted, and it's expected that 30 will agree to be interviewed, yielding a response rate of 80 percent. Because the soundscape and guide interviews are qualitative in nature and will be administered to relatively small samples, there is no statistical basis for generalizing the findings to all visitors. Therefore, response rates and confidence levels/intervals do not present the same concerns as they do in quantitative studies based on probability samples that employ inferential statistical analysis.

Quantitative Soundscape and Human-Bison Interaction Surveys

For both the soundscape and human-bison interaction surveys, we will contact 440 individuals stratified by weekend and weekday periods and expect 400, or 90 percent, to agree to respond. With these anticipated sample sizes, we will be 90 percent confident that the true proportion in the population is +/- 5 percentage points of the sample statistic. A confidence interval of five percentage points is a standard level of precision for social science surveys of this type.

3. Describe methods to maximize response rates and to deal with issues of non-response. The accuracy and reliability of information collected must be shown to be adequate for intended uses. For collections based on sampling, a special justification must be provided for any collection that will not yield "reliable" data that can be generalized to the universe studied.

Data will be collected on-site using standardized survey instruments and interview guides. The presence of interviewers should lower the incidence of item non-response in the surveys. We have provided both indoor and outdoor stations for completing the survey instruments to maximize respondent comfort and thus response rates in the winter. Additionally, the 1999 winter visitor study (Davenport et al., 1999) also employed this general approach to outdoor winter visitor research and was successful.

We will compare observational data (e.g., date, time, group size, weather, group type) for all non-response groups. Comparisons will be made and reported among those who participate and decline to participate in the survey. Results will be reported, and the implications of non-response bias (if any) for interpreting the results will be discussed in the report.

4. Describe any tests of procedures or methods to be undertaken. Testing is encouraged as an effective means of

refining collections of information to minimize burden and improve utility. Tests must be approved if they call for answers to identical questions from 10 or more respondents. A proposed test or set of tests may be submitted for approval separately or in combination with the main collection of information.

The more psychologically complex “values-based” questions in the surveys come from scales used in previous studies. The page long multi-item scale exploring visitor perceptions of the purpose and value of Yellowstone National Park (Question #6, Appendix B, Question #18, Appendix C) was used in the 1998 study of Yellowstone National Park visitors (Freimund and Borrie 2001; Borrie et al. 2002; Davenport et al. 2002). The only change is the addition of 3 new items exploring the value of the park in terms of protecting soundscapes/natural sounds to complement the focus of the soundscape study. The items measuring symbolic beliefs about bison (Question #16, Appendix C) were drawn primarily from prior studies exploring beliefs, attitudes, and values toward wildlife (Bright and Manfredo, 1996; Teel et al. 2005). However they were adapted to the current research context (e.g., identifying bison as the species and Yellowstone National Park as the location). Additionally, two items specific to Yellowstone National Park and bison were generated for this study (one dealing with the priority of visitor access versus bison protection and the second with bison and snowmobiles). These items were added because they emerged as central issues in interviews with Yellowstone visitors in 1999 (Davenport et al. 2002). The semantic differential questions focusing on visitor affective appraisals of bison (Questions #12, #13, #15 in Appendix C) and the winter setting at Yellowstone (Question #13 in Appendix B, Question #17 in Appendix C) came from literature on affective appraisals in general (Russell and Snodgrass, 1987) and from prior studies exploring visitor perception of animals in zoo settings (Finlay et al., 1988; Reade and Waran, 1996). Normative appraisals (visitors’ prescriptive judgments about the acceptability of situations encountered) (Questions #13 and #17) are one of the most commonly studied types of visitor perceptions in national parks and other wildland settings over the last three decades (see, for example, Vaske et al. 1986). Additionally, questions on importance-performance and visitor satisfaction (Questions #7-#13 in Appendix B and Question #12 in Appendix C) follow standard formats used in satisfaction research and importance-performance analyses (see for example Borrie and Birzell, 2001; Tomas et al. 2003).

When developing the current survey, we engaged in participant observation of Yellowstone National Park visitors during a weekend in February 2005 (snowmobile access) and a weekend in March 2005 (snowcoach access). During this time we observed how winter visitors experienced, reacted to, and discussed sound and bison-related experiences; informally asked visitors questions about these experiences (less than 10 visitors per question); tested wording of possible questions on visitors (less than 10 per question), and explored the feasibility of different sampling strategies. In addition, one of the principal investigators, Wayne Freimund, co-designed the 1998 and 1999 YNP winter visitor surveys which involved both on-site interviews (93 interviews) and a questionnaire (1,064 survey respondents). His experiences with this winter visitor survey informed our design of the current research. The experiences during this prior study were particularly important in determining the burden estimate for the winter season. Finally, survey and interview questions were reviewed by YNP staff and researchers at the University of Montana. This was especially important for Question #15 in Appendix B (visitor support for management actions) and Question #8-#11 of Appendix C (visitor perception of bison reactions) to ensure

the surveys met the information needs of YNP.

Bibliography of Prior Studies from Which Survey Questions Were Drawn

- Bright, A. D., & Manfredi, M. J. (1996). A conceptual model of attitudes toward natural resource issues: A case study of wolf reintroduction. *Human Dimensions of Wildlife*, 1(1), 1-21.
- Borrie, W. T., & Birzell, R. M. (2001). Approaches to measuring the Quality of Recreation Experience. In W. A. Freimund & D. N. Cole (Eds.), *Visitor Use Density and Wilderness Experience. Proceedings RMRS-P-20*. (pp. 29-38). Ogden, UT: US Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station.
- Borrie, W. T., Freimund, W. A., & Davenport, M. A. (2002). Winter visitors to Yellowstone National Park: Their value orientations and support for management actions. *Human Ecology Review*, 9(2), 41-48.
- Davenport, M. A., Borrie, W. T., Freimund, W. A., & Manning, R. E. (2002). Assessing the relationship between desired experiences and support for management actions at Yellowstone National Park using multiple methods. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*, 51-64.
- Finlay, T., James, L. R., & Maple, T. L. (1988). People's perceptions of animals: The influence of the zoo environment. *Environment and Behavior*, 20(4), 508-528.
- Freimund, W. A., & Borrie, W. T. (2001). *Winter visitation to Yellowstone National Park: A review of six years of research*. Missoula, MT: University of Montana.
- Patterson, M. E., Guynn, D. E., & Guynn, D. C. (2000). Human dimensions and conflict resolution. In S. Demaris & P. R. Krausman (Eds.), *Ecology and Management of Large Animals in North America* (pp. 214-232). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Raede, L. S., & Waran, N. K. (1996). The modern zoo: How do people perceive zoo animals? *Applied Animal Behaviour Science*, 47, 109-118.
- Russell, J. A., & Snodgrass, J. (1987). Emotion and the environment. In D. Stokols & I. Altman (Eds.), *Handbook of Environmental Psychology* (pp. 245-280). New York, NY: John Wiley and Sons.
- Teel, T. L., Dayer, A. A., Manfredi, M. J., & Bright, A. D. (2005). *Regional results from the research project entitled "Wildlife Values in the West" (Project Report No. 58) Project Report for the Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies*. Fort Collins, CO: Colorado State University, Human Dimensions in Natural Resources Unit.
- Tomas, S. R., Crompton, J. L., & Scott, D. (2003). Assessing service quality and benefits sought among zoological park visitors. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*, 21(2), 105-124.
- Vaske, J. J., Shelby, B., Graefe, A. R., & Heberlein, T. A. (1986). Backcountry encounter norms: Theory, method, and empirical evidence. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 18, 137-153.

5. Provide the name and telephone number of individuals consulted on statistical aspects of the design and the name of the agency unit, contractor(s), grantee(s), or other person(s) who will actually collect and/or analyze the information for the agency.

Wayne A. Freimund of the Department of Society and Conservation, University of Montana, was consulted on statistical aspects of the design and will assist in statistical analysis of the information for the agency. He also assisted with the design of the survey implementation schedule and associate sample size. His number is (406) 243-5184.

Michael Patterson of the Department of Society and Conservation, University of Montana, was consulted on statistical aspects of the design and will assist in statistical analysis of the information for the agency. He also assisted with the design of the survey implementation schedule and associated sample size and distribution plan. His number is (406) 243-6614.

Shelley Saxen of the Department of Society and Conservation, University of Montana, helped design of the surveys, interview guides, and will assistant in analysis of both components. Her number is (406) 243-6610.

Douglas Dalenberg of the Department of Economics, University of Montana was consulted on aspects of the statistical design. His number is: (406) 243-4406.

Steve McCool of the Department of Society and Conservation, University of Montana was consulted on aspects of the statistical design. His number is (406) 243-5406.

Supporting Statement for a New Collection RE: Winter Visitor Experiences in Yellowstone National Park

OMB Control Number 1024-New

A. Justification

1. Explain the circumstances that make the collection of information necessary. Identify any legal or administrative requirements that necessitate the collection. Attach a copy of the appropriate section of each statute and regulation mandating or authorizing the collection of information.

From the Organic Act of 1916 to enabling legislation for specific parks, the National Park Service (NPS) has received a viable Congressional mandate for collecting information to assist in the management of national parks, monuments, and historic sites. Specifically, 16 U.S.C. 1 through 4 (NPS Organic Act of 1916) provides the authority for the Director of the NPS to manage the parks. Part 245 of the Department of the Interior Manual delegates to the Director of the NPS the Secretary of the Interior's authority to supervise, manage, and operate the National Park System. The National Parks Omnibus Management Act of 1998 (Public Law 105-391, Section 202; 16 U.S.C. 5932) requires that units of the NPS be enhanced by the availability and utilization of a broad program of the highest quality science and information. The NPS *Management Policies 2006*, Section 8.11.1, further states that the NPS will facilitate social science studies that support the NPS mission by providing an understanding of park visitors and human interactions with park resources.

This study will provide the NPS and park managers with critical information on winter visitor experiences of Yellowstone National Park (YNP). The purpose of this research is to assist Park managers in identifying efficient, salient and effective dimensions of the visitor experience for applications in monitoring efforts. Those monitoring efforts can then be tailored to the evaluation of NPS policy and management actions. Recent changes to Yellowstone National Park's winter use policy have driven a need for social science research on winter visitor experiences in the park. The proposed study will provide key information for implementation of a decision on winter use planning in Yellowstone National Park.

Winter use activities in the park are guided by monitoring, mitigation and adaptive management. As such, "Scientific studies and monitoring of winter visitor use and park resources (including air quality, natural soundscapes, wildlife, employee health and safety, water quality, and visitor experience) will continue. Selected areas of the parks, including sections of roads, may be closed to visitor use if studies indicate that human presence or activities have unacceptable effects on wildlife or other park resources that could not otherwise be mitigated." (NPS Winter Use EIS, 2007 P. 32) Additionally, the two most recent studies of behavioral responses of wildlife to oversnow vehicles (White et al. 2006, White et al. 2005) suggest that regulations restricting use level and travel routes are effective and that conflicts regarding motorized use and wildlife is "largely a social issue" (White et al., 2005 P. 1). However, no winter-specific social science

Comment [m1]: You will need to update this section with your own justification. However, if you want to use any of the statutes or regulations that are cited here, you needn't include them as an attachment because I already have copies of them. However, please include (as an attachment) any other statutes or regulations you cite.

research has been conducted since the managed winter program went into effect in 2002; this was identified as a weakness during scoping and in cooperating agency discussions. This proposed research will provide needed information by evaluating three components: (1) The role of the natural soundscape in visitor experiences, (2) visitor perceptions of human-wildlife interactions, and (3) snowcoach and snowmobile guides' perceptions of the effectiveness of the guide-only policy.

Specifically, four information collections are proposed:

- A qualitative interview of visitors (n=45) about the winter experience in Yellowstone, including the soundscape experience (Appendix A)
- A quantitative survey of visitors (n=400) about the winter experience in Yellowstone, including the soundscape experience (Appendix B).
- A quantitative survey of visitors (n=400) about human-bison interactions in the park (Appendix C)
- A qualitative interview (n=30) with snowcoach and snowmobile guides in the park to elicit their impressions about the impacts of guided tours on visitors' experiences.

Relevant documents are contained in the attachments to this statement. **Attachment A** provides a copy of The Organic Act of 1916. **Attachment B** contains the National Parks Omnibus Management Act of 1998. **Attachment C** contains section 8.11.1, "Social Science Studies," of the NPS Management Policies. **Attachment D** contains a copy of the NPS Winter use EIS.

2. Indicate how, by whom, and for what purpose the information is to be used. Except for a new collection, indicate the actual use the agency has made of the information received from the current collection. [Be specific. If this collection is a form or a questionnaire, every question needs to be justified.]

Comment [m2]: This section requires you to justify every question in the survey instrument.

This research has been requested by Yellowstone National Park itself and has three components: 1) the role of the natural soundscape in visitor experiences, 2) visitor perceptions of human-wildlife interactions, and 3) snowcoach and snowmobile guides' perceptions of the effectiveness of the guide-only policy. Both on-site interviews and surveys will be used to collect data. This information will assist park staff in understanding how changes to park winter use policies are affecting park visitors' experiences.

Justifications for the interview and survey questions follow, organized by topic and question number.

SOUNDSCAPE INTERVIEW (Appendix A)

This qualitative research will be the first of its kind. No previous qualitative research has been done on the role of natural sounds in visitor experiences in National Parks. Its purpose is to map out the range of experiences on the ground to gain a sense of the diversity of experiences that exist and the ways in which visitors understand natural

sounds in their park experience. This qualitative study is unique. Interviews provide the opportunity for more in-depth and valid measurement because: (1) data collection is not limited and restricted by prior assumptions about what issues/questions are relevant as is the case a mail survey, (2) the researcher can clarify questions to ensure interviewees understand what is being asked and probe answers to ensure she understands the interviewee means by a response, and (3) the research can more meaningfully explore complex issues (issues for which responses such as yes/no, strongly agree/strongly disagree do not adequately represent the nature of responses subjects wish to express) and multifaceted issues (issues for which the standard multi-item scales used in advanced survey designs cannot adequately capture respondents views). The focus of this study, perspectives on natural sounds, its role in visitor experiences, and willingness to support or oppose different management strategies, reflects the type of complex and multifaceted issues that are more readily explored in an interview, rather than a survey, approach.

Visitor Characteristics (Questions #1 through #3): These questions are necessary for contextualizing the rest of the interview. They establish basic visitor characteristics helpful in directing the interview and later analysis.

Undirected Broad Experience Questions (Questions #4 through #7): These questions are necessary to give the visitors an opportunity to express what elements of their experience are particularly important to them.

More Directive Sound Questions (Questions #8 through #12): These questions are necessary to determine how visitors understand and evaluate their experiences of park sounds. They also provide information on how visitors perceive the importance of park soundscapes to their experience.

Natural Sounds (Questions #13 through #20): These questions are necessary to understand how visitors characterize the natural sounds of the park in winter. They allow the respondent to describe specific natural sounds in the park and provide an opportunity for visitors to explain meanings and significance associated with such sounds. They are necessary for understanding the unique sounds of Yellowstone National Park in the winter, for understanding how visitors perceive impacts to the natural soundscape, and for evaluating visitor perceptions of the appropriate role the National Park Service may or may not have in protecting the natural soundscape.

Mechanical and Human Sounds (Non-natural Sounds) (Questions #21 through #27): These questions are necessary for determining visitor perceptions of non-natural sounds in the park, including understanding how visitors characterize the existence of motorized sounds in the park. These questions will allow park managers to gain a better sense of how visitors perceive NPS policies that affect both motorized sounds and the natural soundscape.

Background Information Survey (Questions #1 through #11): Information from

these questions will be used to contextualize the interview data and to characterize the interview sample.

SOUNDSCAPE SURVEY (Appendix B)

This quantitative survey was not informed by previous qualitative research. It is based on a scale previously used in Yellowstone National Park and published in peer-reviewed journals. We have added soundscape variables to the scale and will analyze the extent to which visitor perceptions of park purpose and sounds demonstrate patterns of support or opposition for management actions that affect both park soundscapes and visitor access.

Visitor Characteristics (Questions #1-5): These questions are necessary to evaluate basic visitor trip characteristics that will be used to characterize/describe the visitor sample. The activity questions are particularly important for analyses to determine if soundscape experiences/evaluations (Questions #7-10), evaluation of the park in general (Questions #11-12), and support for management actions (Question #13) differ by user group.

Perceived value of Yellowstone National Park (Question #6): This question provides information on visitor perceptions of the purpose and value of Yellowstone National Park. These types of enduring values (as opposed to trip-specific goals) were found to be related to visitors' views about management policies in an earlier winter use study at YNP (Freimund and Borrie, 2001; Borrie et al., 2002; Davenport et al. 2002) and are included in the present study due to their potential to help analyze/explain patterns of responses related to visitor evaluations of the soundscape experience (Questions #7- #11), evaluation of the park in general (Questions #12- #13, and support for management actions (Question #14). Question #6 is identical to that used in the earlier YNP winter use studies by Freimund, Borrie, and Davenport (Freimund and Borrie 2001; Borrie et al. 2002), except the current survey adds 3 new items exploring the value of the park's soundscape.

Natural Sounds and Visitor Experiences (Questions #7-#13): These questions are the heart of the soundscape survey. They assess visitors' perceptions of the importance of natural sounds to the overall value of the park (Question #7) and to their experience at the park on the day they were contacted (Question #8). Question #9 is needed in order to understand how individuals' experiences with natural sounds affected their experience. Question #10 asks respondents about their ability to find the experience they were looking for at Yellowstone National Park during their visit. Question #11 and Questions #12 are necessary for assessing visitor satisfaction with their experience of natural sounds in the park. Finally, because this survey focuses on visitors' evaluation of their experiences, it is important to give them an opportunity to evaluate the overall winter setting rather than focus solely soundscape issues. Question #13 accomplishes this. It complements an identical question in the perception of Human-Bison Interaction survey (described below), providing a larger response base for the park regarding visitors' overall evaluations of the park. It will also provide an opportunity to assess how perceptions of the soundscape are related to

overall evaluation of the YNP winter setting. It adopts the same semantic differential response format used in several questions included in the Human-Bison Interaction survey described below. All questions in this section follow wording and response formats commonly used in visitor surveys.

Management Actions related to Soundscape Management and Visitor

Management (Question #14): A second central aspect of the study is visitors' support/opposition to various management actions that affect both the natural soundscape conditions of the park and visitor access to the park. This is important to aid decision making and also in light of findings from the prior winter-use survey that indicated visitors may value a certain aspect of the park while not being supportive of management actions to protect that value (Davenport et al., 2002) The management actions evaluated reflect existing policies (items 1-4), even more restrictive policies that were contemplated in earlier planning efforts (items 5-6), and a policy that focuses on automobile rather than oversnow vehicle access (item 7). The first four items will provide information of visitors' perception of current management actions, while information on alternative actions will help put these responses in context.

Background Information (Questions #15-#20): These provide important information for describing the sample of visitors, comparing the sample to the population of visitors, and analyzing the survey as a whole. They provide important information that may be related to patterns in responses to the dependent variables.

HUMAN-BISON INTERACTION SURVEY (Appendix C)

Trip Characteristics (Questions #1-#5): These questions are necessary to evaluate basic visitor trip characteristics that will be used to characterize/describe the visitor sample. The activity questions are particularly important to determine if perceptions about human-bison interactions and the park setting differ by user group.

About Bison Encounters (Questions #6-#13): Questions #6 and #7 are necessary to assess the frequency of bison encounters experienced by visitors and provide a greater context for understanding visitor appraisals. Specifically, this information will provide information about the types/nature of encounters/interactions that are the basis for the responses to subsequent visitor perception/appraisal questions. This information will help assess the extent to which the nature of interactions influence visitor appraisals/perceptions regarding bison and the NPS's stewardship of bison.

The instructions preceding Question #8 (which will be explained to visitors by a researcher during the interview phase) focus visitors on a specific bison interaction that will serve as the basis for responding to questions #8 through #13. Responding to a specific encounter helps make the responses more meaningful. Questions #8-#11 collect information about the specific encounter being described. These questions will help stimulate the visitors' recall about the specific encounter. Just as importantly, Questions 8-11 will provide information that can be used to help analyze the extent to which the nature of interactions influence visitor perceptions regarding

bison and the NPS's stewardship of bison. These questions were developed based on participation observation of visitors-bison encounters during two trips to YNP in the winter of 2006 and were reviewed by YNP staff.

The need to include questions #12 and #13 stems from prior research findings. First, recent studies of the responses of wildlife to snowmobiles and snowcoaches in YNP concluded that the continuing conflict over motorized recreation is largely a social rather than biological issue, because there is no evidence from the last 35 years suggesting an adverse effect on population dynamics (White et al. 2005; 2006). Thus, monitoring visitor perceptions of these issues is important, especially since changes in management policies are thought to have changed the nature of the visitor population. Further, prior research on YNP winter visitors (Freimund and Borrie, 2001; Davenport et al. 2002) suggested that visitors' experience-based appraisals were one of the major factors influencing views about human-bison interactions and related management policies. These conclusions were based on interview data. Questions #12 and #13 were developed partly on the basis of these interviews and partly on the basis of prior research on these types of visitor perceptions. Question #12 explores visitors' affective appraisals (judgments or evaluations attributed to objects; see Russell and Snodgrass, 1987) and was adapted from similar measures used to study visitor perceptions of animals in zoos (see Finlay et al., 1988; Reade and Waran, 1996). Question #13 explores visitors' normative appraisals (visitors' prescriptive judgments about the acceptability of situations encountered). Both types of appraisals (affective and normative) have a long history of application in applied research seeking to understand visitors' views and perceptions. Additionally, these two types of visitor appraisals seem to capture the relevant experience-based factors that interviews by Davenport et al. (2002) found influenced the views of YNP winter-use visitors regarding bison management policies.

Overall Visitor Experience of Bison (Questions #14-#15): The previous question focuses on visitors' perceptions related to a specific interaction. It is also important to assess visitors' overall perceptions of bison and the bison-viewing experience. Question #14 follows a widely used satisfaction approach based on importance-performance analysis and is adapted from prior visitor studies (see Borrie and Birzell, 2001; Tomas et al. 2003). Question #15 uses the same semantic differential response format used in Question #12 to assess affective appraisals of bison overall in YNP and is adapted from questions used by Finlay et al. 1988 and Reade and Waran, 1996).

Beliefs about Bison (Question #16): This question is necessary to understand the beliefs visitors have about the value and role of bison in relation to YNP. This question includes important information on visitors' symbolic beliefs related to bison, including bison's importance in park planning and management, and their existence and heritage values. The importance of including this question stems from prior research. Prior studies of YNP winter-use visitors indicated that, in addition to experience based appraisals, these types of enduring values influenced views about

management policies (Freimund and Borrie, 2001; Davenport et al. 2002). Additionally, wildlife studies suggest that symbolic beliefs about wildlife often influence views about wildlife management (see for example, Bright and Manfredo, 1996; Patterson et al. 2000). The specific items included in Question 16 were adapted specifically to bison and YNP from existing scales used with studies of other species in other places (see Bright and Manfredo, 1996; Teel et al. 2005).

Beliefs About the Winter Setting of the Park (Question #17): Because this survey focuses on visitors' evaluation of their experiences, it is important to give them an opportunity to evaluate the overall winter setting, rather than focus solely on the bison interactions. This question compliments an identical question in the soundscape survey providing a larger response base for the park. It will also provide an opportunity to assess how perceptions of the bison interactions related to overall evaluation of the YNP winter setting. It adopts the same semantic differential response format used in questions #12, #13, and #15 and assesses aesthetic, affective and normative appraisals.

Role of Yellowstone National Park (Question #18): Question #18 provides information on visitors' perceptions of the purpose and value of Yellowstone National Park. These types of enduring values were found to be related to visitors' views about management policies in an earlier winter use study at YNP (Freimund and Borrie, 2001; Borrie et al., 2002; Davenport et al. 2002) and are included in this study due to their potential to help analyze/explain patterns of responses related to visitor evaluations of bison and the park overall (Questions #12, #13, #15, #17). Question #18 is identical to that used in the earlier YNP winter-use studies by Freimund, Borrie, and Davenport (Freimund and Borrie 2001; Borrie et al. 2002), except the current question adds 3 new items exploring the value of the park's soundscape. These items will make this question parallel to the values question used in the soundscape survey described above.

Demographic Information (Questions #19-#24): These provide important information for describing the sample of visitors, comparing the sample to the population of visitors, and analyzing the survey as a whole. They provide important information that may be related patterns in responses to the dependent variables.

GUIDE INTERVIEW (Appendix D)

Characteristics (Questions #1, #2): provide essential information about the respondent, which is necessary for contextualizing the data collected from the entire interview.

Perceptions of Visitor Experience Related to Clean and Quiet Technology (Questions #3, #4): Question #3 is necessary for assessing guides' perceptions of the general visitor experience provided in the park and its relationship to recent policy changes requiring clean and quiet technology on snowmobiles.

Perceptions Related to Guiding Requirement (Questions #5-#9): Questions #5 and #6 are necessary for understanding guides' perceptions of the effect of guiding requirements for snowmobile access to the park on visitor experiences, perceptions and wildlife. Questions #7 and #8 are necessary for understanding guides' perceptions of the effect of group-size limits on snowmobiles accessing the park on visitor experiences, perceptions and wildlife. Question #9 provides guides the opportunity to comment on how well they believe existing policies are functioning.

3. Describe whether, and to what extent, the collection of information involves the use of automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses, and the basis for the decision for adopting this means of collection. Also describe any consideration of using information technology to reduce burden.

This information will be collected via on-site surveys and interviews. No automated data collection will take place.

4. Describe efforts to identify duplication. Show specifically why any similar information already available cannot be used or modified for use for the purposes described in Item 2 above.

The questions in the interview and survey instruments address specific knowledge gaps related to winter visitor experiences at Yellowstone National Park. These knowledge gaps were identified by NPS personnel and scholars. A thorough review of previous research revealed that these type of data do not currently exist. The current study does not overlap with the 2002-2003 visitor-use study by MACTECH Engineering and Consulting, Inc. which dealt more with economic expenditures and modeled changes in visitor-use patterns associated with various management alternatives (MACTECH 2005). Recent research by Duffield and Neher (2006) focused on economic impacts associated with visitation to Yellowstone National Park. The proposed research does build and extend on the earlier Yellowstone National Park winter-use research of William Borrie and Wayne Freimund (Freimund and Borrie, 2001; Borrie et al. 2002; Davenport et al. 2002) that focused on visitor perceptions. However, the management policies for winter use have changed significantly since the 1998/1999 studies, and the visitor population is thought to have changed as a result.

5. If the collection of information impacts small businesses or other small entities, describe any methods used to minimize burden.

The data collection will not impact small businesses or other small entities.

6. Describe the consequence to Federal program or policy activities if the collection is not conducted or is conducted less frequently, as well as any technical or legal obstacles to reducing burden.

Should these data not be collected, management policy evaluations would be made without empirical evidence about actual visitor experiences in the park. This could result in receiving public input that is not representative of the visiting public or

designing management policies that incite controversy rather than identify constructive and appropriate management solutions.

The sampling schedule and target sample size efficiently collects the data needed for providing the range and complexity of experiences from the interviews and for providing a robust estimation of survey data. Further restriction of the sample size and schedule would risk compromising the significance and reliability of the resulting information.

7. Explain any special circumstances that would cause an information collection to be conducted in a manner:
- * requiring respondents to report information to the agency more often than quarterly;
 - * requiring respondents to prepare a written response to a collection of information in fewer than 30 days after receipt of it;
 - * requiring respondents to submit more than an original and two copies of any document;
 - * requiring respondents to retain records, other than health, medical, government contract, grant-in-aid, or tax records, for more than three years;
 - * in connection with a statistical survey, that is not designed to produce valid and reliable results that can be generalized to the universe of study;
 - * requiring the use of a statistical data classification that has not been reviewed and approved by OMB;
 - * that includes a pledge of confidentiality that is not supported by authority established in statute or regulation, that is not supported by disclosure and data security policies that are consistent with the pledge, or which unnecessarily impedes sharing of data with other agencies for compatible confidential use; or
 - * requiring respondents to submit proprietary trade secrets, or other confidential information unless the agency can demonstrate that it has instituted procedures to protect the information's confidentiality to the extent permitted by law.

These circumstances are not applicable to our collection of data. Ours consists of one-time, on-site surveys and interviews so frequency of reporting, preparation or submission of documents, retaining of records, and revealing of trade secrets do not apply in any way. This research includes an exploratory interview designed to inform park management on the experience of natural sounds and statistical surveys that are designed to produce valid and reliable results that can be generalized. These instruments only use data classifications to be reviewed and approved by OMB. The introductory statements read by researchers at the beginning of the interview and surveys offers a pledge of anonymity.

8. If applicable, provide a copy and identify the date and page number of publication in the Federal Register of the agency's notice, required by 5 CFR 1320.8(d), soliciting comments on the information collection prior to submission to OMB. Summarize public comments received in response to that notice [and in response to the PRA statement associated with the collection over the past three years] and describe actions taken by the agency in response to these comments. Specifically address comments received on cost and hour burden.

Describe efforts to consult with persons outside the agency to obtain their views on the availability of data, frequency of collection, the clarity of instructions and recordkeeping, disclosure, or reporting format (if any), and on the data elements to be recorded, disclosed, or reported.

Consultation with representatives of those from whom information is to be obtained or those who must

compile records should occur at least once every 3 years — even if the collection of information activity is the same as in prior periods. There may be circumstances that may preclude consultation in a specific situation. These circumstances should be explained.

We reviewed prior research related to winter use at Yellowstone National Park to examine existing data and determine potential questions for the survey. The current study does not overlap with the 2002-2003 visitor use study by MACTECH Engineering and Consulting, Inc. which dealt more with economic expenditures and modeled changes in visitor use patterns associated with various management alternatives (MACTECH 2005). We also consulted the work of John Duffield and colleagues to ensure that the survey did not overlap with their research which focuses on economic impacts associated with visitation to Yellowstone National Park (see, for example, Duffield and Neher, 2006). The proposed research does build and extend on the earlier Yellowstone National Park winter-use research of William Borrie and Wayne Freimund (a principal investigator on this project). We have adopted a number of the questions directly from their earlier studies of YNP winter-use visitors. Because the visitor population is thought to have changed as a result of changes in management policy since Borrie and Freimund conducted their research in 1998/1999, Yellowstone National Park needs a new study to monitor visitor perceptions and experiences. Additionally, the current study explores research needs identified by the earlier winter-use studies (especially in relation to visitor perceptions related to bison) and expands into exploring the soundscape dimension of visitor experiences (which was not addressed in prior studies). As described in the justifications of individual questions, we also reviewed similar studies and adopted questions they employed in similar situations whenever possible. Finally, in February and March 2005, the investigators of the current study engaged in participant observation as snowmobilers and on snowcoach trips in order to help design the current survey. We also informally interviewed visitors (less than 10) and tested wording (fewer than 10 respondents per question) for interpretability. Based on this review of the literature and the observations during 2005, we designed the interviews and surveys described above. These surveys were subsequently reviewed by staff at Yellowstone National Park and NPS Social Science Program and wording changes were incorporated.

Attachment E contains a copy of the 60-day Federal Register Notice, published on April 24, 2007.

One public comment was received in response to the 60-day notice. The comment, from Kim Raap of the Wyoming State Snowmobile Association (WSSA), raised concerns related to four aspects of the research design: (1) the possible disruption of visitor experiences through asking them to respond to an on-site survey, (2) the adequacy of the sample size, (3) the appropriateness/practical utility of gathering information on visitors' perceptions about their experiences and park management, and (4) the appropriateness of gathering information on guides' perspectives about the snowcoach/snowmobile guide-only policy. We respond to each of these concerns below.

(1) Possible disruption of visitor experiences through asking them to respond to an on-site survey. The methods used in this study are well-established in the research community. A study designed to gather information about visitor experiences and perceptions of on-the-ground management typically uses one of two strategies: asking for responses on site or collecting names and addresses and subsequently mailing surveys to these visitors. Both approaches have been widely used in visitor surveys of this type, and both have advantages and disadvantages. While collecting only names and addresses requires less time during the experience, thus having lower potential to disrupt the experience, it necessarily results in visitors responding to the survey at a time distant from the actual experience (often 1-3 weeks later). An advantage of collecting the information on-site is that visitors' memories about the actual experience are fresher and more accurate. Research has shown that memory decay associated with delays in response required by a mailed survey can affect the results of these types of study. Because the goals of this study include assessing visitors' perceptions of the sounds they experienced in YNP during their visit or their perceptions of the human-bison interactions they witnessed, we believe it is most appropriate to gather responses on-site. We have tried to limit the impact on the experience by using two separate questionnaires (one focused on sound and the other on bison) and asking each respondent to only fill out one of them. An additional advantage to gathering responses on-site is that potential respondents have the opportunity to ask for clarification about questions if they are confused. Since visitor perceptions of national park soundscapes are a relatively new research focus, and questions on this issue are still being evaluated, we believe on-site data collection is desirable due to the opportunity given to respondents to ask for clarification of questions.

Further, participation in the survey is voluntary. The voluntary nature of participation will be explained to the potential respondents and those visitors who feel that participating would be too disruptive to their experience can decline. Interviews and surveys will not be conducted while the Old Faithful Geyser is erupting so as not to disturb the visitor experience of this unique park feature. Finally, we collected on-site surveys lasting up to 30 minutes with YNP visitors in the winter of 1999 and found visitors were willing and eager to devote this amount of time to responding to questions about their experiences and perceptions of park management.

(2) Adequacy of the sample size. A second concern expressed by WSSA was the adequacy of the sample size. In response to this concern, we have raised the number of questionnaire surveys to be distributed in the soundscape component to equal the number in the human-bison interaction survey. However, WSSA also expressed concerns about the size of the human-bison interaction sample. A major concern was that the proposed sample size (400) represented a relatively small percentage of the total population of winter-use visitors. However, adequacy of sample sizes is not evaluated on the basis of the percent of the total population included in the sample, but on other factors, such as representativeness of the sample (most strongly influenced by how the sample is selected), degree of variability within the population, and requirements of the specific type of data analysis used. As discussed more fully

in the supporting statement, these sample sizes are large enough to address the research needs and will allow for a small standard error of +/- 5%.

A further concern expressed by WSSA was that the sample would under-represent snowmobile users and day users. The concern about day users and snowmobile users stems in part from the concern that day visitors will not be willing to participate due to limited time. As noted above, we did not experience this problem in the 1999 winter-use study. Additionally, the survey collects information on mode of transportation (snowmobile versus snowcoach), length of stay and other visitor characteristics. This will allow us to analyze and compare responses in relation to these characteristics. The information gathered in the survey will also allow us to characterize the composition of the sample and discuss any deviations or limitations of the sample relative to what is known about the population of winter visitors. Further, this park location was chosen as a data-collection site specifically because it is a popular destination for all user groups in Yellowstone National Park.

(3) Appropriateness/practical utility of gathering information on visitor perceptions about their experiences and park management. Here WSSA expresses concern about collecting information about visitor perceptions related to both soundscape and human-bison interactions because perceptions are subjective opinions that may be biased or based on inaccurate assumptions, and because visitors lack sufficient expertise to make realistic judgments. This comment misconstrues the purpose for collecting information on visitors' perceptions. For example, the goal of studying perceptions of human-bison interactions is not to determine physiologically, biologically, or ecologically if recreationists are having an impact on bison. YNP has collected this type of information using qualified wildlife scientists over a period of several years (White et al. 2005; 2006). Rather, the goal of the proposed study is to assess visitors' perceptions about the appropriateness and acceptability of YNP's stewardship of bison, management of human-wildlife interactions witnessed during their experiences, and management of YNP soundscapes. Thus, this information will have important practical utility for park managers because it can help managers understand visitors' experiences and values, how these are related to support or opposition for management policies, what visitors think about NPS stewardship, and how to design interpretation and education efforts. Further, information on visitors' perceptions complements, rather than replaces, other sources of information, such as biological information from studies by wildlife scientists and existing monitoring data of actual sound levels by experts in acoustic monitoring technology (which YNP has also collected over several years). YNP has a strong commitment to understanding visitor experiences and perceptions, in addition to understanding the biological and ecological issues underlying park management.

(4) Appropriateness of gathering information on guides' perspectives about the snowcoach/snowmobile guide-only policy. The major concern expressed by WSSA here is that responses would be biased because guides have financial ties to the guide-only policy. As WSSA points out, perceptions of policies are subjective and influenced by values, relationship to the issue, and similar factors. However, the

guides do represent a constituency with whom YNP interacts, who are impacted by management policies, and who have a wealth of experience and information about winter use. Information about guides' perceptions is therefore another important source of input for understanding winter use. In presenting the results from this portion of the study, we will identify the population represented (guides), so there is no possibility of confusing responses from this sample with those from the sample of actual visitors. To clarify our method, we intend to interview both snowcoach and snowmobile guides. We also will work to identify individuals who guided in the park before the guide-only policy was implemented. While each interview will be valuable, it is these long-term guides who will be able to provide perspective in changes over time.

- 9.** Explain any decision to provide any payment or gift to respondents, other than remuneration of contractors or grantees.

No payments or gifts will be provided to respondents.

- 10.** Describe any assurance of confidentiality provided to respondents and the basis for the assurance in statute, regulation, or agency policy.

No assurance of confidentiality will be provided to respondents, since the Department of the Interior does not have the statutory authority to protect confidentiality or to exempt the survey from a request under the Freedom of Information Act. Instead, those who inquire about this issue will be told that reports prepared from this study will summarize findings across the sample so that responses will not be associated with any specific, identifiable individuals. Names and addresses will not be collected in association with this research. Thus, anonymity will be ensured, but confidentiality will not be pledged.

- 11.** Provide additional justification for any questions of a sensitive nature, such as sexual behavior and attitudes, religious beliefs, and other matters that are commonly considered private. This justification should include the reasons why the agency considers the questions necessary, the specific uses to be made of the information, the explanation to be given to persons from whom the information is requested, and any steps to be taken to obtain their consent.

No questions of a sensitive nature will be asked. In addition, respondents are advised that their answers are voluntary.

- 12.** Provide estimates of the hour burden of the collection of information. The statement should:
- * Indicate the number of respondents, frequency of response, annual hour burden, and an explanation of how the burden was estimated. Unless directed to do so, agencies should not conduct special surveys to obtain information on which to base hour burden estimates. Consultation with a sample (fewer than 10) of potential respondents is desirable. If the hour burden on respondents is expected to vary widely because of differences in activity, size, or complexity, show the range of estimated hour burden, and explain the reasons for the variance. Generally, estimates should not include burden hours for customary and usual business practices.
 - * If this request for approval covers more than one form, provide separate hour burden estimates for

each form and aggregate the hour burdens.

- * Provide estimates of annualized cost to respondents for the hour burdens for collections of information, identifying and using appropriate wage rate categories. The cost of contracting out or paying outside parties for information collection activities should not be included here. Instead, this cost should be included in Item 14.

Instrument	# of Respondents	Frequency of Response	Completion Time	Burden Hours
Soundscape Interview	45	1	30 minutes	23
Soundscape Survey	400	1	15 minutes	100
Bison Survey	400	1	20 minutes	133
Guide Interview	30	1	20 minutes	10
Non-respondents (refusals)	92	1	1 minute	2
TOTAL				268 hours

As shown in the table, in addition to the burden for the respondents, there is minimal burden associated with contacting non-respondents. In the case of this study, there is an estimated 90% response rate for the soundscape survey, soundscape interview, and bison survey, and an 80% response rate for the guide interview. There will be a total of 92 individuals who are initially contacted but do not respond. These contacts will last one minute. Thus, there will be an additional burden of 2 hours for non-respondents. The total burden associated with this study is 268 hours. Using the Bureau of Labor Statistics national wage information, the most recent published report (June 2006) lists an average hourly wage of \$19.29 (<http://www.bls.gov/ncs/ocs/compub.htm#National>). Thus, the estimated annualized cost to respondents for the hour burden is \$5,169.72.

13. Provide an estimate of the total annual [non-hour] cost burden to respondents or record keepers resulting from the collection of information. (Do not include the cost of any hour burden shown in Items 12 and 14).

- * The cost estimate should be split into two components: (a) a total capital and start-up cost component (annualized over its expected useful life) and (b) a total operation and maintenance and purchase of services component. The estimates should take into account costs associated with generating, maintaining, and disclosing or providing the information [including filing fees paid]. Include descriptions of methods used to estimate major cost factors including system and technology acquisition, expected useful life of capital equipment, the discount rate(s), and the time period over which costs will be incurred. Capital and start-up costs include, among other items, preparations for collecting information such as purchasing computers and software; monitoring, sampling, drilling and testing equipment; and record storage facilities.
- * If cost estimates are expected to vary widely, agencies should present ranges of cost burdens and explain the reasons for the variance. The cost of purchasing or contracting out information collection services should be a part of this cost burden estimate. In developing cost burden estimates, agencies may consult with a sample of respondents (fewer than 10), utilize the 60-day pre-OMB submission public comment process and use existing economic or regulatory impact analysis associated with the rulemaking containing the information collection, as appropriate.
- * Generally, estimates should not include purchases of equipment or services, or portions thereof, made: (1) prior to October 1, 1995, (2) to achieve regulatory compliance with requirements not associated with the information collection, (3) for reasons other than to provide information or keep records for the government, or (4) as part of customary and usual business or private practices.

The cost burden on respondents and record-keepers, other than hour burden, is zero.

- 14.** Provide estimates of annualized cost to the Federal government. Also, provide a description of the method used to estimate cost, which should include quantification of hours, operational expenses (such as equipment, overhead, printing, and support staff), and any other expense that would not have been incurred without this collection of information. Agencies also may aggregate cost estimates from Items 12, 13, and 14 in a single table.

The NPS estimates that the agency contribution to the study will total \$66,076, making the annual cost to the Federal government \$22,025. The costs include researcher salaries and benefits, contract services, graduate tuition waivers, supplies and printing, communications, travel, and CESU indirect costs.

BudgetSalary

PI (12 days at 300)	\$3,600
Research Assistant (13 months @\$1400)	\$18,200
Research Assistant (5 months @ \$1400)	\$7,000

Benefits

PI (22.75%)	\$819
Research Assistant (1.0%)	\$182
Research Assistant (1.0%)	\$70

Subtotal salary and benefits \$29,871

Contract Services (transcription) \$2,000

Graduate tuition Waivers
3 semesters @ \$5305.00 \$15,915

Supplies/printing \$1,000

Communications

phone/fax \$150

Travel

Research Assistants
4 round trips from Missoula to West (@300/each) \$1,200
26 nights in a motel @ 75 \$1,950
60 days of per diem (@28.00/day) \$1,680

Principal Investigators

2 round trips from Missoula to West (@300/each) \$600
10 nights in a motel (@ 75/night) \$750
8 days of per diem (@28.00/day) \$224

Snowcoach transport

Four trips @ \$120.00/ trip by two assistants \$960
One trip @\$120.00/ trip by two faculty \$240

Total direct costs \$54,490

Indirect costs CESU (17.5% TDC) \$9,536

Total \$66,076

15. Explain the reasons for any program changes or adjustments.

This is a new one-time collection. No adjustments are involved.

16. For collections of information whose results will be published, outline plans for tabulation and

publication. Address any complex analytical techniques that will be used. Provide the time schedule for the entire project, including beginning and ending dates of the collection of information, completion of report, publication dates, and other actions.

For the two quantitative surveys (soundscape and human-bison interaction) analysis will employ standard social statistics for these types of data. Overall frequency distributions will be computed for each variable and perception measures will be analyzed for differences between categories of respondents based on the types of primary recreation activities in the park (i.e., cross-country skiing, snowmobiling, snowshoeing, and snowcoach touring) and key demographic characteristics, such as age.

For the two qualitative interviews (soundscape and guide interview), sessions will be audio-recorded (with permission of the user) and transcribed verbatim. Text from the interviews will be imported into a computerized analysis program (NVivo) and analyzed to find themes of perception and differences among respondents.

Onsite participant observation to aide in the design of this study was conducted in February and March 2005. Design of the survey and interview instruments began in May 2006, aided by input from Yellowstone National Park staff. In the fall of 2006 and the spring of 2007, the instruments were reviewed by Yellowstone National Park staff and faculty at the University of Montana and pre-tested for readability and burden estimates. In the fall of 2006 and the spring of 2007, the survey instrument was refined based on comments from the pre-tests and initial comments from the NPS Social Science Program. The target date to begin survey and interview implementation is January 2, 2008, if approved by then. Assuming that approval is granted, the on-site data collection will be completed by March 31, 2008. Data analysis and preparation of the draft report will continue until June 30, 2008. Following feedback on the draft from the sponsoring agencies, the final report will be submitted by July 31, 2008.

The time schedule for the larger project, including the survey component covered here, is summarized below.

Task	2008		
	Win (Jan- Mar)	Spr (Apr- May)	Sum (Jun- July)
1. Qualitative Interviews & On-site Surveys	X		
2. Interview Transcription	X		
3. Interview & Survey Analysis	X	X	X
6. Final Report			X

17. If seeking approval to not display the expiration date for OMB approval of the information collection,

explain the reasons that display would be inappropriate.

We are not seeking such approval.

18. Explain each exception to the certification statement.

There are no exceptions to the certification statement.

References

- White, P. J., Davis, T., & Borkowski, J. (2005). *Wildlife responses to motorized winter recreation in Yellowstone*. Gardiner, MT: National Park Service, Yellowstone National Park. <http://www.nps.gov/yell/parkmgmt/winterusetechnicaldocuments.htm>
- White, P. J., Davis, T., Borkowski, J., Garrott, R. A., Reinhart, D. P., & McClure, D. C. (2006). *Behavioral responses of wildlife to snowmobiles and coaches in Yellowstone*. Gardner, MT: Yellowstone National Park. <http://www.nps.gov/yell/parkmgmt/winterusetechnicaldocuments.htm>
- Flyvbjerg, B. (2001). *Making Social Science Matter: Why Social Inquiry Fails and How it Can Succeed Again*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Rosenbloom, D. H. (1997). *Public Administration and Law*. New York: M. Dekker.
- Hummel, R. P. (1991). Stories managers tell: Why they are as valid as science. *Public Administration Review*, 51(1), 31-41.