From:	Mansfield, Carol A.
То:	Bruce_Peacock@nps.gov; James_Gramann@partner.nps.gov
cc:	John_Dennis@nps.gov; Sandra_Hamilton@nps.gov; Mike_Murray@nps.gov; Mansfield, Carol A.
Subject:	plans for surveys
Date:	06/12/2008 02:23 PM
Attachments:	Count survey.doc survey expenditure comparison.xls

Hi all,

Regarding the question about what to ask businesses to keep track of --I assume they have to report sales tax revenue so we can ask for that. It would be informative to know the number of employees each season for the last few years, total revenue and profit for the last few years, maybe hours of operation if they have to cut back. But we can't ask them to keep that data. But I would be interested in seeing what the businesses are thinking of collecting.

I attached 2 documents for you to look at if you are interested. The first is a short description of what we could do for our "survey" to count vehicles and passengers (would it be hard to tell how many people are in the vehicle). I am meeting again tomorrow with our sampling statistician and the guy who would run the manage the data collection at RTI to see whether they have some cost numbers.

Depending on cost, the decision is how many subgroups of the sample we want to be able to compare to each other. The more subgroups, the fewer assumptions we will have to make in the analysis about how many vehicles will be affected by the proposed alternatives -- but the more expensive since we need a larger sample size.

The spreadsheet compares the per person per day expenditure estimates (in \$2006) from surveys done by Vogelsong, Neal, and the outer banks tourism bureau. I would like to use the expenditure data collected from these 3 "less than perfect" surveys to provide a range of spending estimates in the economic analysis. If we do a visitor intercept, I would like to keep the survey short and not have to ask about spending. Each survey asked about spending in a different way, but all things considered the numbers look pretty close to me. Whatever data we use, we will use a range of estimates in the analysis. We can also compare these numbers to other surveys, either official national surveys (like the MRFSS or survey of hunting, fishing, etc.) or surveys in the literature to compare with these surveys. What do you think?

Thanks, Carol

-----Original Message-----From: Bruce\_Peacock@nps.gov [mailto:Bruce\_Peacock@nps.gov] Sent: Thursday, June 12, 2008 2:14 PM To: James\_Gramann@partner.nps.gov Cc: Mansfield, Carol A.; John\_Dennis@nps.gov; Sandra\_Hamilton@nps.gov

Subject: Re: Fw: Draft workplan

Sandy - I agree with Jim's comments.

#### Bruce

	+	>
İ		James Gramann
		06/09/2008 06:30
		PM EDT
	+	>
_		
>		
	То:	Sandra Hamilton/DENVER/NPS
1		
	cc:	carolm@rti.org, Bruce Peacock/FTCOLLINS/NPS@NPS,
John_Denni		
. I	Subject:	Re: Fw: Draft workplan
>		1

#### Sandy,

Regarding Mike's suggestion to develop a standardized reporting process to document economic impacts, I'd leave it up to Carol to decide if this would be useful, what could be documented that isn't available from other sources, how the process should be implemented, etc.

Concerning OMB approval, I can't answer that question until I have a better idea of what's being contemplated. Is the documentation a collection of already available economic data, such as sales tax receipts? Or are businesses being asked to report their own gross receipt data? If existing data are being collected and analyzed, OMB approval is probably not required. If new data are being reported/collected by businesses, visitors, residents, etc., and this collection is sponsored by NPS, OMB appoval is probably required.

Given the very serious backlog at OMB right now, I'd strongly recommend avoiding any activity that requires approval by OMB.

Jim Gramann, Ph.D. Visiting Chief Social Scientist National Park Service

1201 Eye Street, NW (2300) Washington, DC 20005 202.513.7189 At Texas A&M University: Dept. of Recreation, Park and Tourism Sciences 2261 TAMU College Station, TX 77843-2261 979.845.4920 -----Sandra Hamilton/DENVER/NPS wrote: -----To: carolm@rti.org, Bruce Peacock/FTCOLLINS/NPS@NPS, James Gramann/Partner/NPS@NPS From: Sandra Hamilton/DENVER/NPS Date: 06/09/2008 09:39AM Subject: Fw: Draft workplan Hi Carol / Bruce / Jim, See Mike's email below. Would this give us any helpful information? Would we have to go through OMB to get approval to do it? Thanks. Sandy Sandy Hamilton National Park Service - Environmental Quality Division Academy Place P.O. Box 25287 Denver CO 80225 PH: (303) 969-2068 FAX: (303) 987-6782 ---- Forwarded by Sandra Hamilton/DENVER/NPS on 06/09/2008 08:24 AM \_\_\_\_ Mike Murray/CAHA/NPS 06/06/2008 03:40 PM EST То Patrick Field CC ccboucher@cox.net, Cyndy Holda , destryjarvis@earthlink.net, leew@darenc.com, Ona Ferguson , Patrick Field , Robert Fisher Robert Fisher , "Sandra\_Hamilton@nps.gov" , warrenj@darenc.com, warrenj@co.dare.nc.us Subject

Looks okay to me, except that I would add something in June under the socioeconomic sub-committee about working with the contractor to develop a standardized reporting process to document economic impacts, positive or negative, of consent decree implementation. It is an opportunity to

Re: Draft workplan

document the actual impacts of more restrictive management, but it needs to be done systematically so that the information is useful for forecasting potential impacts of proposed ORV management alternatives.

(I don't know much about economics, but imagine that it would be better to develop a reporting format soon, so businesses can be tracking the impacts as the summer progresses, rather than wait until the end of the season. I would defer to Carol Mansfield's judgment about how and when this needs to be done. Just want to be sure we ask the question now, in case timing is important.)

Thanks,

Mike Murray Superintendent Cape Hatteras NS/ Wright Brothers NMem/ Ft. Raleigh NHS (w) 252-473-2111, ext. 148 (c) 252-216-5520 fax 252-473-2595

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE

This message is intended exclusively for the individual or entity to which it is addressed. This communication may contain information that is proprietary, privileged or confidential or otherwise legally exempt from disclosure. Patrick Field

Patrick Field 06/06/2008 03:25 PM

То

"\"Mike\_Murray@nps.gov\"" , , Cyndy Holda , , , Ona Ferguson , Patrick Field , Robert Fisher Robert Fisher , "Sandra\_Hamilton@nps.gov" , ,

CC

Subject Draft workplan

ALL

Please find attached a draft work plan for the Committee. Carla gave terrific input on this as did Sandy Hamilton (however, the work product and all its flaws are strictly ours). Please take a look and send us any comments you have by mid-week (Wed). We would like to get this out in draft form to the Committee members by end of next week. We'll also go over this with the Committee during the June meeting.

Thanks.



PAT, ROBERT, ONA(See attached file: CAHARegNegworkplan draft 6.6.08.doc)

### **Counting Vehicles and Passengers**

- **1. Purpose:** To provide an estimate of the number of vehicles (and passengers?) that drive onto the beach at Cape Hatteras by season between August, 2008, and July 2009.
- 2. Need: To support EIS and rulemaking analysis -- provide an estimate of the number of vehicles and passengers that drive on the beach that can be adjusted up or down based on estimated change in use (or range of possible changes) under each alternative.

### 3. Sampling:

- a. Sampling frame: all ocean and sound-side ramps (34?) during one year
- b. Plan should account for time of day/day of week/month/season
  - Travel time between ramps, sample on consecutive days to limit travel to and from CAHA by field staff
- c. Sample to allow comparison of number of vehicles (and passengers?)
  - sound-side and ocean-side during summer, fall, spring/winter (6 sub-samples)

### 4. Limitations:

• Since alternatives do not affect all ramps and all seasons equally, we will have to make assumptions about what fraction of the sample used the affected ramps in the affected season

#### Alternative sampling:

- Time frames:
  - Annual
  - Seasons (3 or 4)
  - Time frames defined by bird/turtle closure seasons
- Locations
  - Sound-side and ocean-side
  - Most popular and other
  - Closed under most stringent alternative and other
  - Affected by any alternative and other
  - more than 2 groups

How divide ramps?	Annual	3 seasons (summer, fall, winter/spring) OR 3 times based on bird/turtle behavior	Number of sub- samples needed	Assumptions needed for analysis since alternatives do not affect all ramps/seasons equally
All ramps	X		1	fraction of vehicles at affected ramps in affected seasons
All ramps		Х	3	Fraction of vehicles at affected ramps
Sound-side/Ocean side	X		2	fraction of vehicles at affected ramps on ocean or sound side in affected seasons
Sound-side/Ocean side		Х	6	Fraction of vehicles at affected ramps on ocean or sound side
Most popular ramps /Other ramps	Х		2	fraction of vehicles at affected ramps at most popular ramps and at other in affected seasons
Ramps that would be closed during under most stringent alternative/other ramps		Х	6	fraction of vehicles at affected ramps during less than full closure for less stringent alternatives

	Outer Banks Visitors Bureau (OVBB) Wave 4- 2006, N & S Hatteras	OVBB - Visitors staying in S. Hatteras, Summer	OVBB - Visitors staying in S. Hatteras, Fall	OVBB - Visitors staying in S. Hatteras, Winter/Spring	Cape Hatteras National Seashore Visitor Use Study (Vogelsong August 2003)	Lower Outer Banks of NC: Survey of Visitors and Non- Resident Property Owners (W. Neal, SDR Consulting)	
Expenditu	res per visitor pe	r day (\$2006)				Vistors	Non-resident property owners
Lodging	\$200	\$205	\$120	\$85	\$170	\$165	\$85
Food	\$74	\$66	\$47	\$48	\$101	\$78	\$79
Fishing Ge	ar					\$15	\$11
Entertainm	\$7	\$5	\$3	\$1	\$26	\$0	\$0
Shopping	\$45	\$38	\$34	\$29	\$52	\$34	\$29
Transporta	\$36	\$35	\$23	\$18	\$31	\$13	\$17
Attractions	\$11	\$9	\$10	\$7	\$4	\$1	\$1
Other	\$11	\$16	\$4	\$9	\$105	\$2	\$3
Total	\$385	\$374	\$242	\$198	\$488	\$307	\$225