

**Fox, Lori**

---

**From:** Mansfield, Carol A. [carolm@rti.org]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 08, 2008 12:20 PM  
**To:** Sandra\_Hamilton@nps.gov  
**Cc:** Poulos, Christine; Otto, Dana; Clayton, Laurel; Fox, Lori; Mansfield, Carol A.; Bruce\_Peacock@nps.gov  
**Subject:** RE: reg-neg meeting follow-up

HI Sandy,

It sounds like Day 2 was more productive, that's a lot of information to digest. I am surprised that they agreed on unanimity, but maybe that is a good sign.

It would probably help me if we could have a call sometime on Thursday or Friday if there is a time that works for all of us. I am free Thursday any time before 2:30 and Friday any time before 3:00.

To answer your question about the baseline and the total value of ORV use -- The economic analysis looks at the change in benefits and costs or the incremental benefits and costs for an alternative relative to the defined baseline (which should be the no action alternative, or conditions as they currently are). We don't calculate the net benefits of the no action alternative because there won't be any incremental changes relative to the no action alternative -- if that makes sense.

We will project visitation under the no action alternative, but not total costs or benefits. For each alternative we calculate the incremental change in visitation and essentially multiply the change in visitation by per visitor WTP (consumer surplus) for each activity under the new conditions in the park and by per visitor spending for the business gains/losses. For each alternative we need to know how it will change visitation and the "value" of the visit (conditions in the park) relative to baseline and then we calculate the benefits of costs of the change. Does that make sense?

And not that it matters, but we did call Bob Eakes' expert (Rob Southwick) and he didn't really have any information or data that would help too much. However, he might be useful in designing a new survey and anyway we will certainly call him (I told Bob all of this at the meeting).

In terms of additional data collection, more information from visitors is what we think we need and obviously the committee thinks we need.

The information that would be most useful is how people would change their behavior in response to specific alternatives, since neither the Vogelsong survey or the Neil survey asked questions about the specific alternatives that will be in the EIS.

In terms of timing, if the NEPA analysis needs to be finished by the end of the year, then we would only have time to interview people in the summer and maybe the early fall (although that would be a very tight schedule to get the analysis done). Depending on when the actual rulemaking would take place, we would continue to collect data in the winter and spring for use in the rulemaking analysis.

\$30,000 for a visitor survey is not nothing, but pretty close to it. It is possible that we could design a survey for \$30,000 (maybe less, but we could not design a conjoint WTP survey like we did for Yellowstone).

But then the data collection would have to be free and the analysis would need to be paid for with additional money. If data collection needs to be free or close to it, then the only alternative I see is asking the rental companies and hotels to send the survey by email to their customers. That means we will only be sampling from a subgroup of visitors, but an important and large subgroup. We could collect data on how they would change visitation in response to specific management plans and collect data to conduct a travel cost/recreation demand study to estimate the value of a visit for different activities.

If we want to actually intercept visitors, I would suggest the approach we used in Yellowstone. Intercept and get some basic information and their address and then mail a survey. An intercept survey would need a rigorous sampling plan that accounts for the fact that there aren't well defined entrance points, field workers, copying/mailling, data

entry, etc. More like \$200,000 or more.

And of course, there is the timing issue. Despite what Bob Eakes thinks, we cannot do a survey in a week.

We will work on a few suggestions.

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: Sandra\_Hamilton@nps.gov [mailto:Sandra\_Hamilton@nps.gov]  
Sent: Tuesday, January 08, 2008 1:21 PM  
To: Mansfield, Carol A.  
Cc: Mansfield, Carol A.; Poulos, Christine; Otto, Dana; Clayton, Laurel; Fox, Lori  
Subject: Re: reg-neg meeting follow-up

Hi Carol,

After much discussion, the committee defined consensus as unanimity (everyone). I think they are coming to understand that NEPA evaluates alternatives, but they may be still confused about the other analyses, which I can understand since the economic analyses compare alternatives while the FWS biological opinion and the CZMA determination only analyze the preferred alternative. An example might help, and it's likely that whatever you pick would engender disagreement (it's the nature of the group). I may be confused myself. Will not the baseline description give the total value of ORV use as it would exist if the current use was continued for the life of the plan, so that the effects on that value from the other alts can be compared? They weren't happy about the need to get to an agreement by next winter, the ORV groups were (mostly) unhappy about the alts workbook or about not having longer to get their comments in. Mike shifted our next internal NPS meeting a week later so we could allow until Feb 15 for workbook comments to come in. My feeling is that they're willing to get to work and try to meet the schedule.

Jim Lyons is a member of the committee representing the Cape Hatteras Recreational Alliance which is a non-ORV based recreation interest group with, I think, some common interests with the environmental organizations. His alternate, Burnie Gould, is on the economics subcommittee (see next paragraph).

The committee did form an economics subcommittee with, according to my notes, Bill Foster (commercial fishermen), Patty Doerr (American Sport Fishing Assn -- industry group), Carolyn McCormick (OBX Visitor's Bureau -- the business arm of the OBX Tourism Board), Judy Swartwood (Cape Hatteras Business Allies), Scott Leggat (OBX Chamber of Commerce VP, associated with Outer Beaches Realty), Pat Weston (Alternate for Rodanthe-Waves-Salvo Civis Assoc. & Greater Kinnakeet Shores Homeowners Inc), Jeff Wells (Hatteras Landing Homeowners' Assoc. Inc.) Jason Rylander/Andrew Hawley (Defenders of Wildlife, Jason is the member, Andrew the alternate, one of them will be on the subcte.), David Scott Escham (Hyde County government - owner Pony Island Motel on Ocracoke), Burnie Gould, (alternate Cape Hatteras Recreational



Alliance), and me (because NPS will probably be involved in supplying some funding for a visitor intercept study). Carolyn offered to put up \$30,000 from the Visitors' Bureau funds and Mike Murray said he had some money he could add if needed for gathering such data.

According to my notes there was not a charge for the subcommittee developed / agreed on, but the discussion included the following comments from committee members (no attempt was made for group to agree/disagree on these):

- interaction with NPS and contractor/subcontractor
- questions, suggestions for data, would be NPS decision was was collected
- input into design of study is more important than who does the study --any study needs a peerreview when it comes in --study design should be reviewed by outside experts before study is conducted
- NC Mrine fisheries Commission data base is available and should be used
- 30 people can't create a survey
- subcommittee shouldn't be involved in creation of this tool, needs to be arms's length
- need raw data to be saved
- need complete disclosure of where data came from if other studies are used
- professionals need to make the decisions on the right questions to ask
- professional help offered by the committee hasn't been used (this was Bob Eakes referring to someone he thought should have been contacted) --subcte. should look at how study is being designed and how data is analyzed --didn't like questions on the old survey and need to have input on the kinds of questions asked (i.e. not "would you come back?", but "how many times now do you come and how many times would you come back in the future if xxx mgmt implemented?") --work product should be NPS product therefore they have to decie on methodology, study should be "fully informed" not "fully directed" (Pat Field)

Above list may not be complete, but is what I jotted down.

Plan is that all meetings there would be subcommittee reports, maybe 4-5 subcommittees, not necessarily at same time.

FYI also several members requested that the Neal study also be peer reviewed so I'm looking into that.

Sara Winslow who's an alternate and works for the NC Marine Fisheries Commission may be able to direct you to a contact person who can give you information on the Commission's data base and provide access to it.  
sara.winslow@ncmail.net (252) 264-3911.

If it would be helpful for us to have a re-grouping call later this week, let me know. Lori and I'll be out next week doing the public alts meetings, but might manage one if before mid-afternoon if that's better than this week.

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

"Mansfield, Carol

A."

<carolm@rti.org>

To

<Sandra\_Hamilton@nps.gov>, "Fox,

01/08/2008 11:01

Lori" <lfox@louisberger.com>,

AM EST

"Otto, Dana"

<dotto@louisberger.com>

cc

"Mansfield, Carol A."

<carolm@rti.org>, "Clayton, Laurel"  
<lclayton@rti.org>, "Poulos,

Christine" <cpoulos@rti.org>

Subject

reg-neg meeting follow-up

Hi Lori and Sandy,

I am interested to hear how the meeting went on Friday. How did they end up defining consensus? More importantly, what are the next steps for us?

I have been thinking about my presentation and what I could have done to have made it better. I'm wondering if an example would have helped -- for example, what if one of the alternatives was to eliminate night driving and take them through what that would mean. But I was afraid they would just start fighting over the example. I am also wondering how much they understand about the EIS and alternatives. Did the NEPA vs. reg-neg discussion go well? They all seem to have an undefined sense that the economic analysis will give them the total value of ORV use or the total value of a ban. I don't think they they fully understand that the economic analysis will be a comparison of the economic impacts of the different alternatives, at least some of which will probably not involve big changes.

On our end, and not in any particular order, here are the things I think we need to work on:

1. draft survey for businesses
2. following up with the Dare county tourism board (I looked at their website and research reports on Friday) and the marine fisheries who have data we can use
3. following up with Butch Street at NPS about the park visitation figures
4. researching substitute areas (a colleague who has fished at CAHA said you can drive your ORV on the beach all up and down the NC coast, he also said that on Emerald Isle, NC, driving on the beach appears to be crushing the little sand fleas/crabs that a particular kind of fish likes to eat and in areas with lots of driving there are very few fish and that the piers are trying to extend the area where people can't drive on the beach on either side of the pier -- all of this is second hand, but interesting).
5. talking to the different board members to find out what information they have

In terms of additional data collection, where do we stand? Should we prepare some suggestions?

Finally, did they establish a subcommittee to "help" with the analysis?  
I got a phone message from someone named Jim Lyons (I think he is a member of the  
"public") asking me to call him about the economic analysis.

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

(See attached file: OMBSurvey Guidance 0106.pdf)