

**From:** [James Gramann](#)  
**To:** [Sandra Hamilton](#)  
**Cc:** [d-breeding@tamu.edu](mailto:d-breeding@tamu.edu)  
**Subject:** Re: Fw: cape hatteras reports  
**Date:** 06/17/2010 02:20 PM

---

Susan,

Sorry for the delay in responding. My mother died week before last, and I'm just now catching up on things that arrived in my in-box while I've been away.

In survey sampling there is always a trade-off between cost and coverage, so this is not an unusual situation at all. Whether or not you decide to continue with the current plan depends on how much additional money you have and whether you think excluding visitors who are on the beach before 10 and after 6 will cause you to miss a strategically important segment of CAHA users. Also, you have to decide (following from Carol's argument) if it's important to include visitors who are not affected by the alternatives, as well as visitors who are.

As I read Carol's argument, she wants to spend her limited resources on sampling in areas and times where people say the alternatives would make a difference to their plans (I assume this is either a positive or negative difference). She seems to be arguing that at some lightly used areas, and during some lightly used times, most people's plans would not change, no matter which alternative were in place. You have to decide if it's important from a planning, legal, and political standpoint to represent these people in the final sample.

Politically, a change in the sampling plan midway through the study could appear to some as an intentional manipulation of the outcome. Recall that the original Vogel song sample was criticized by some ORV users because it appeared to them (correctly or not) that ORV users were being intentionally excluded and that ORV use itself was significantly under-estimated. Do you think you would be able to defend a change in sampling from these types of charges?

That's my two cents worth.

--

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: James Gramann/Partner/NPS@NPS  
From: Sandra Hamilton/DENVER/NPS  
Date: 06/07/2010 03:25PM  
cc: Doug Wetmore/DENVER/NPS@NPS  
Subject: Fw: cape hatteras reports

Hi Jim,

see the 2nd and 3rd paragraphs below where Carol suggests changing the sampling design 3/4 of the way through the visitor intercept study...will this adversely affect the usefulness of the study? It raises questions in my mind, but I need a professional opinion. What do you think? Thanks.

Sandy

Sandy Hamilton  
Environmental Protection Specialist  
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 06/07/2010 02:22 PM -----

**Doug  
Wetmore/DENVER/NPS**

ToSandra Hamilton/DENVER/NPS@NPS  
cc  
SubjectFw: cape hatteras reports

06/07/2010 02:04 PM

email and attachments are here:

N:\EQD\Cape Hatteras\RTI Surveys

Doug Wetmore  
Environmental Protection Specialist  
National Park Service - Environmental Quality Division  
P.O. Box 25287  
Denver, CO 80225-0287  
Office: (303) 987-6955  
Cell: (303) 968-5214

----- Forwarded by Doug Wetmore/DENVER/NPS on 06/07/2010 02:05 PM -----

**"Mansfield, Carol  
A."  
<carolm@rti.org>**

To<Sandra\_Hamilton@nps.gov>,  
<Doug\_Wetmore@nps.gov>  
cc"Loomis, Ross" <rloomis@rti.org>,  
"Mansfield, Carol A." <carolm@rti.org>,  
"Evans, Brian" <evans@rti.org>

06/07/2010 01:44  
PM

Subjectcape hatteras reports

Hi Sandy and Doug,

Attached is the draft report on the business survey. Please let me know if you have any comments. We pretty much just report the results without comments on the responses

(for example, whether they seem realistic). Let me know what you think and if we need to revise.

I also attached several documents related to the intercept survey. The spreadsheet "CAHA trip results" provides the outcome for each day of interviewing through March 29. We made 6 3-day trips between Aug. 7, 2009, and March 29, 2010. Following our original plan, we selected random days throughout the year (weighted by the data we had from the rental housing agencies on occupancy), and we two random 4-hour time periods each day starting at 6am and ending at 10pm. Finally, we randomly selected beach segments along the full 68 miles of beach, weighted by the results from the counting trips for likely crowding. The result was that we ended up surveying at some uncrowded times (early morning and late evening) and in some unpopular locations.

While the original approach provides the ability to generalize the results to a larger visitor population (visitors who are on any part of the beach between 6am and 10pm), it looks like it is just too expensive to continue. Our plan going forward is to narrow the sampling frame to times/locations where we expect to find significant numbers of visitors who will be affected by the alternatives. We are looking at the budget, but as a start we have discussed limiting the survey to 10am to 6pm. The visitors who are most likely to be affected (and therefore change their plans) are the ones who are stretches of beach that would be affected by the alternatives. The beach that will be most impacted by the alternatives seems like the areas open to ORV's now and during the rest of the summer.

I am assuming that the areas closed to ORV's right now would be closed under any of the action alternatives – please correct me if I am wrong. Since the majority of overnight visitors rent homes, the village beaches also seem like a good candidate for interviews (including the Ocracoke lifeguard beach). The other lifeguard beaches are also very popular, but during the summer they would still be closed to vehicles under all action alternatives – is that right?

The data we have so far suggests that when we interview people on stretches of beach that are not affected by an alternative, the alternative doesn't affect their plans. When we interview people on stretches of beach that are affected by an alternative, the alternative does affect their plans. I attached the raw frequency data from our trips through December (so, not including the trip in March) and the survey instrument.

We asked out of town respondents about one of two plans – Version A (that was modeled on Alt. D) and Version B (modeled on Alt. F). We only interviewed 6 locals so far. Looking at out of towners, out of the 54 people who were asked about Alt. D, 67% said that even if Alt. D had been in place they would still have made their current trip.

70% said they would make the same number of trips under Alt. D. Most of the people we interviewed were on parts of the beach that would not have been affected by Alt. D

(41 out of 54). 80% of the people on unaffected beaches said they would make the same trip. The 69% of the 13 people interviewed on the affected segments of beach would have canceled their trip if Alt. D were in place.

For the version modeled after Alt. F, 87% said that they would have still made their current trip if Alt. F had been in place.

Ross is working on an email about the total number of vehicles on the beach.

Thanks,  
Carol

Carol Mansfield, Ph.D. | Senior Economist | RTI International  
Social and Statistical Sciences Division | Hobbs Building, 3040 Cornwallis Road | Durham, NC 27709  
P 919-541-8053 | F 919-541-6683 | [carolm@rti.org](mailto:carolm@rti.org)

[attachment "Draft Business Survey Final Report 6-7-10.pdf" deleted by Doug Wetmore/DENVER/NPS] [attachment "CAHA\_trip\_results.xls" deleted by Doug Wetmore/DENVER/NPS] [attachment "HatterasSurveySpecs\_V04\_7 for NPS.doc" deleted by Doug Wetmore/DENVER/NPS] [attachment "HatterasFreqsNew freqs 12\_09 for NPS.docx" deleted by Doug Wetmore/DENVER/NPS]