

SUPPORTING STATEMENT ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A: Relevant Statutes and Regulations

I. NPS Management Policies 2006

1.6 Cooperative Conservation Beyond Park Boundaries

Cooperative conservation beyond park boundaries is necessary as the National Park Service strives to fulfill its mandate to preserve the natural and cultural resources of parks unimpaired for future generations. Ecological processes cross park boundaries, and park boundaries may not incorporate all of the natural resources, cultural sites, and scenic vistas that relate to park resources or the quality of the visitor experience. Therefore, activities proposed for adjacent lands may significantly affect park programs, resources, and values. Conversely, NPS activities may have impacts outside park boundaries. Recognizing that parks are integral parts of larger regional environments, and to support its primary concern of protecting park resources and values, the Service will work cooperatively with others to:

- anticipate, avoid, and resolve potential conflicts;
- protect park resources and values;
- provide for visitor enjoyment; and
- address mutual interests in the quality of life of community residents, including matters such as compatible economic development and resource and environmental protection.

Such local and regional cooperation may involve other federal agencies; tribal, state, and local governments; neighboring landowners; nongovernmental and private sector organizations; and all other concerned parties. The Service will do these things because cooperative conservation activities are a vital element in establishing relationships that will benefit the parks and in fostering decisions that are sustainable.

The Service will use all available tools to protect park resources and values from unacceptable impacts. The Service will also seek to advance opportunities for conservation partnerships. Superintendents will monitor land use proposals, changes to adjacent lands, and external activities for their potential impacts on park resources and values. It is appropriate for superintendents to engage constructively with the broader community in the same way that any good neighbor would. Superintendents will encourage compatible adjacent land uses and seek to avoid and mitigate potential adverse impacts on park resources and values by actively participating in the planning and regulatory processes of other federal agencies and tribal, state, and local governments having jurisdiction over property affecting, or affected by, the park. If a decision is made or is imminent that will result in unacceptable impacts on park resources, superintendents must take appropriate action, to the extent possible within the Service's authorities and available resources, to manage or constrain the use to minimize impacts. When engaged in these activities, superintendents should fully apply the principles of civic engagement to promote better understanding and communication by (1) documenting the park's concerns and sharing them with all who are interested, and (2) listening to the concerns of those who are affected by the park's actions.

The Service will also cooperate with federal, state, local, and tribal governments, as well as individuals and organizations, to advance the goal of creating seamless networks of parks. These partnership activities are intended to establish corridors that link together, both physically and with a common sense of purpose, open spaces such as those found in parks, other protected areas, and compatibly managed private lands. The Service's goals in participating in a park network will be to increase protection and enhancement of biodiversity and to create a greater array of educational and appropriate recreational opportunities. When participating in a park network, the Service will not relinquish any of its authority to manage areas under its jurisdiction, nor will it expect other partners to relinquish theirs.

(See Civic Engagement 1.7; Cooperative Planning 2.3.1.8; Cooperative Conservation 3.4; Chapter 4, Natural Resource Management. Also see Director's Order #17: National Park Service Tourism; Director's Order #75A: Civic Engagement and Public Involvement)

1.7 Civic Engagement

The Service will embrace civic engagement as a fundamental discipline and practice. The Service's commitment to civic engagement is founded on the central principle that preservation of the nation's heritage resources relies on continued collaborative relationships between the Service and American society. Civic engagement will be viewed as a commitment to building and sustaining relationships with neighbors and other communities of interest—both near and far. This will require that the Service communicate by both talking and listening. Through its practice of civic engagement, the Service will actively encourage a two-way, continuous, and dynamic conversation with the public.

Civic engagement will take place on many levels to strengthen understanding of the full meaning and contemporary relevance of park resources and values. The goal of civic engagement will be to reinforce the Service's and the public's commitment to the preservation and stewardship of cultural and natural heritage resources.

The Service will welcome people to enjoy their parks in appropriate, sustainable ways. This practice will promote civic responsibility by building long-term, collaborative relationships with a broad range of communities, which in turn will foster a widespread investment in stewardship of the nation's resources. Park and program managers will seek opportunities to work in partnership with all interested parties to jointly sponsor, develop, and promote public involvement activities and thereby improve mutual understanding, decisions, and work products. Through these efforts the Service will also learn from the communities it serves, including gateway communities.

A better understanding of the changing demographics of our nation is critical to the future of the National Park Service. The Park Service must actively seek to understand the values and connections our changing population has or does not have for natural and cultural heritage if it is to remain responsive and relevant to public needs and desires. This includes understanding why people do or do not visit—or care—about national parks. It is vital that the Service help those who do not visit to understand and support their national park system.

(See Relationship with American Indian Tribes 1.11. Also see Director's Order #75A: CivicEngagement and Public Involvement)

II. NPS Director's Order 75A: Civic Engagement and Public Involvement

VI. POLICIES AND STANDARDS

A. Policies

The Service recognizes that the present and future welfare of the national park system depends in large measure on the public's support of the way the Service manages the parks. The public will have a greater appreciation of, and support for, our management if they recognize that we seek, and are receptive to, their contributions to and involvement in the important decisions that are made. Toward that end, the following policies are adopted:

- 1) We will plan in advance and be clear at what stages, and how, we will invite the public to participate in our decision-making processes. It is important to make a clear and early decision about the extent of the public's involvement in each project or decision-making process. The extent of the public's role can vary from issue to issue, and at different stages in the process. This policy for advance public involvement planning will be applied to diverse areas of decision-making, such as the development of superintendents' compendia; general management and site planning processes; major exhibits; major resource management decisions; educational and interpretive programming; new site designations; fee changes; policy development; strategic planning; and a broad range of other products, services, issues, and activities.
- 2) We will plan early for appropriate opportunities for public involvement in our decision-making process when the decisions will lead to actions or policies that may significantly affect or interest them (see VII. Roles and Responsibilities). We will also work to provide sustained opportunities for the public to enter the conversation about relevant issues (both historical and contemporary) at our parks and program offices.
- 3) We acknowledge that public involvement is particularly critical where parks and neighboring communities interact or where there are communities of interest that are engaged with parks. Members of these communities have a vested interest in what we do and it is often best to face common issues and resolve them with a coordinated approach. We will work with communities of interest, neighboring landowners, land managers, and jurisdictions to address issues and seek mutually beneficial solutions to these issues.
- 4) The NPS purpose in seeking public involvement will be more than simply meeting the minimum requirements of law; we will aspire to deliver excellent resource stewardship, be a good neighbor and host, hear what the public has to say, and foster two-way communication to achieve those goals. Public involvement is a sustained partnership with communities that requires the NPS to involve communities in NPS decision-making and is enhanced when the NPS is involved in dialogues regarding community issues and planning.

5) Managers are encouraged to be resourceful and employ a wide variety of methods and techniques to obtain the opinions of individuals and groups. However, we will be mindful of the requirements of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA), which affects how we obtain advice from certain types of groups. Some examples of public involvement activities not implicating FACA are included in Appendix C. Additional information on FACA can be found in the NPS Guide to the Federal Advisory Committee Act (www.nps.gov/policy/DOrders/facaguide.html). We will also be mindful about the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) that makes it necessary to have surveys of more than nine non-federal people cleared through the Office of Management and Budget. Additionally, the Privacy Act limits how we develop, share and use contact lists.

6) We expect public involvement to improve, inform, and influence our decision-making. The public, however, cannot ultimately make many of the decisions that are the legal responsibility of the NPS and the Department of the Interior regarding the resources and values of the national parks and programs. We must make sure to define and communicate what decision-making responsibilities are delegated to us by Congress through enabling legislation, or by the Executive Branch through proclamations. Nevertheless, managers should approach all decision-making with a bias in favor of significant and meaningful public involvement.

7) We will respectfully engage the public in thoughtful participation, build understanding, find creative ways to address problems, accommodate diverse values and dissenting opinions, and encourage continuing collaboration in our decision-making processes.

8) On potentially controversial issues, we will be particularly mindful to plan and design public involvement opportunities at the earliest opportunity, and to use specialized techniques when dealing with controversial issues in order to minimize potential for conflict and achieve a solution smoothly. As issues arise, managers should already be familiar with a range of alternative dispute resolution techniques and resources, including the use of facilitators or mediators, to help resolve controversial issues. If a controversy pertains to a rule-making activity (i.e., adopting a regulation), "negotiated rulemaking" should be considered, utilizing a negotiated rulemaking committee. Special procedures apply to the establishment of such a committee. Those who consider establishing one should contact the Office of Policy and Regulations or their servicing Solicitor's office.

9) To make the most of limited staffing and funding, we will:

- Keep active contact lists of interested, affected parties and groups-making sure to include those who may not agree with us, as well as our supporters.
- Seek to leverage our resources by scheduling public involvement opportunities to coincide with other scheduled activities (meetings, special events, etc.) taking place within the Service as well as external to the Service.
- Maximize sharing of knowledge and tools through NPS program websites and communication tools to provide access to ideas, information, and examples to facilitate civic engagement efforts.

A web site will be developed to share information and expertise. We will call upon individuals with expertise about how to create and manage opportunities for public involvement activities.

· Work in partnership with state, local, and tribal governments, community groups, associations, park "friends" groups, and others to develop strategies to jointly sponsor, develop, and promote public involvement activities.

10) We will develop capacity in public involvement strategies and will encourage Service employees to become knowledgeable about civic engagement and public involvement techniques and principles. Interdisciplinary training materials and opportunities will be developed to help park managers and others who are responsible for public involvement activities understand and apply "best practices." For example, superintendents should consider incorporating the knowledge, skills, and expertise of civic engagement and public involvement practitioners into their staffing requirements.

11) While this DO is oriented toward the "external" public, it is equally important that the underlying principles be applied to employees (i.e., park staff, regional and all Washington program office staffs, and Center staffs). This will lead to better, more rational and defensible decisions that will be supported and more effectively implemented by staff for the benefit of the public.

12) We will design public involvement processes that are as open and inclusive as possible so that diverse publics, including those who typically do not participate, have opportunities to share their views, values, and concerns.

13) We will maximize the use of computer and Internet technologies to expand public access to information and opportunities to participate. We recognize that many people do not have access to these technologies, and we will provide effective alternative access opportunities for them.

B. Standards

In pursuing the policies stated above, public involvement strategies and activities will be deemed to be successful if they meet the following standards*:

1) Match the tools to the job. We respect and respond to a community's or public's unique interests, capacities and civic culture. At the beginning of a public involvement and outreach process, we test and refine engagement strategies to respond to the public's diversity of experiences and perspectives. We explain the public involvement process and help the public define how they would like to participate. We clarify visions, goals and values early, and explain how they will influence decision-making.

2) Ensure that all voices are heard, but none dominate. We actively and meaningfully seek to listen to the voices of all interests. We solicit and hear the diversity of experiences and perspectives. We actively engage those members of the public who may not have been previously or traditionally involved, and keep updated contact lists (especially phone and email) of interested parties.

3) Maintain ongoing relationships. In the parks and programs, our day-to-day, ongoing relationships provide the foundation for effective public involvement among park superintendents, managers, and staff with their neighbors, fellow agencies, tribes and indigenous communities, local and state governments, and others. We will work with national, state, and local partners, and with park "friends" groups to sustain public engagement in parks, programs, and decision-making. We do not rely merely upon written correspondence or other notification methods to get people involved, but make the necessary phone calls and try to meet in person. Whenever key matters are under consideration, to the greatest extent possible, we call major partners and follow up with written communication.

Beyond striving for quality and personal commitment to these critically important relationships, we also find ways to document and share them with succeeding superintendents and managers throughout the NPS, as appropriate, for the good of the Service.

4) Build trust and understanding first, then ownership. We include the public, project sponsors and policy makers in a collaborative exploration of the conditions and trends, precedents and possibilities, and key factors that will shape the future. That common knowledge base fosters working relationships, helps build support, and sets the stage for implementation.

5) Follow a "no surprises" ethic. As a public involvement process moves toward conclusion, we seek to ensure that no one is surprised by new information or controversy. We keep the channels of communication open among all participants.

III. National Environmental Policy Act

Sec. 102 [42 USC § 4332].

The Congress authorizes and directs that, to the fullest extent possible: (1) the policies, regulations, and public laws of the United States shall be interpreted and administered in accordance with the policies set forth in this Act, and (2) all agencies of the Federal Government shall --

(A) utilize a systematic, interdisciplinary approach which will insure the integrated use of the natural and social sciences and the environmental design arts in planning and in decision-making which may have an impact on man's environment;

(B) identify and develop methods and procedures, in consultation with the Council on Environmental Quality established by title II of this Act, which will insure that presently unquantified environmental amenities and values may be given appropriate consideration in decision-making along with economic and technical considerations;

(C) include in every recommendation or report on proposals for legislation and other major Federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment, a detailed statement by the responsible official on --

(i) the environmental impact of the proposed action,

(ii) any adverse environmental effects which cannot be avoided should the proposal be implemented,

(iii) alternatives to the proposed action,

(iv) the relationship between local short-term uses of man's environment and the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity, and

(v) any irreversible and irretrievable commitments of resources which would be involved in the proposed action should it be implemented.

Prior to making any detailed statement, the responsible Federal official shall consult with and obtain the comments of any Federal agency which has jurisdiction by law or special expertise with respect to any environmental impact involved. Copies of such statement and the comments and views of the appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies, which are authorized to develop and enforce environmental standards, shall be made available to the President, the Council on Environmental Quality and to the public as provided by section 552 of title 5, United States Code, and shall accompany the proposal through the existing agency review processes;

(D) Any detailed statement required under subparagraph (C) after January 1, 1970, for any major Federal action funded under a program of grants to States shall not be deemed to be legally insufficient solely by reason of having been prepared by a State agency or official, if:

(i) the State agency or official has statewide jurisdiction and has the responsibility for such action,

(ii) the responsible Federal official furnishes guidance and participates in such preparation,

(iii) the responsible Federal official independently evaluates such statement prior to its approval and adoption, and

(iv) after January 1, 1976, the responsible Federal official provides early notification to, and solicits the views of, any other State or any Federal land management entity of any action or any alternative thereto which may have significant impacts upon such State or affected Federal land management entity and, if there is any disagreement on such impacts, prepares a written assessment of such impacts and views for incorporation into such detailed statement.

The procedures in this subparagraph shall not relieve the Federal official of his responsibilities for the scope, objectivity, and content of the entire statement or of any other responsibility under this Act; and further, this subparagraph does not affect the legal sufficiency of statements prepared by State agencies with less than statewide jurisdiction.

(E) study, develop, and describe appropriate alternatives to recommended courses of action in any proposal which involves unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources;

(F) recognize the worldwide and long-range character of environmental problems and, where consistent with the foreign policy of the United States, lend appropriate support to initiatives, resolutions, and programs designed to maximize international cooperation in anticipating and preventing a decline in the quality of mankind's world environment;

(G) make available to States, counties, municipalities, institutions, and individuals, advice and information useful in restoring, maintaining, and enhancing the quality of the environment;

(H) initiate and utilize ecological information in the planning and development of resource-oriented projects; and

(I) assist the Council on Environmental Quality established by title II of this Act.

IV. NPS Director's Order 12 Handbook for Environmental Impact Analysis

1.2 Intent of NEPA and NPS Mission

D. A procedural act

NEPA's policies encourage agencies to incorporate environmental information and public involvement in making decisions. The detailed and scientifically valid study of impacts and alternatives, and appropriate input from the public, must be available before a federal agency makes any commitment of resources. It is up to the decision-maker how he or she will use this information. If the only way to meet an essential agency goal requires implementing an alternative with the potential for severe adverse environmental impacts, this is ultimately allowed for under NEPA. NEPA is therefore a "procedural," or process-oriented, law, rather than a "substantive," or substance-oriented, one. Other laws, including the Organic Act, are substantive and often prevent an agency from taking action or pieces of an action that have "too great" an impact on a particular resource. The process of environmental analysis under NEPA provides the information that the NPS needs to make substantive decisions for the long-term conservation of resources.

1.4 NEPA Fundamentals

C. Part of a public process

CEQ requires agencies to make "diligent" efforts to involve the interested and affected public in the NEPA process (1506.6), regardless of the level of impact and/or documentation. The extent of the public involvement will change depending on the degree of impact and interest in the proposal. Agencies must also

“encourage and facilitate public involvement in decisions which affect the quality of the human environment” (1500.2 (d)). If the public finds that an agency did not follow the procedural requirements of NEPA, or that the agency’s analysis of a proposal in a NEPA document was lacking or inadequate, relief is often sought through legal action. The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) reviews and rates the adequacy of all EISs, and CEQ oversees the rules and policies governing the NEPA process and resolves certain types of disputes.

4.8 Public Involvement Requirements

This section describes the minimum NPS public involvement requirements for an EIS. However, you are encouraged to be “diligent” and creative in your efforts to involve the public in your NEPA procedures and resource planning. Ways of involving the public include issuing quarterly newsletters to update the public on

Be diligent and creative in your efforts to involve the public in your NEPA procedures and resource planning.

anticipated park actions and opportunities for involvement, using the Internet to facilitate the review of documents or have a dialogue with a commenter, and setting aside handouts or information for park visitors to keep them informed of planning efforts or chances to comment. Park staff often use park friends’ groups to keep the public involved in decision-making that may have environmental consequences.

A. Notice of intent

CEQ (1508.22) specifies that a notice of intent (NOI) to prepare an EIS must be placed in the *Federal Register*. The notice must:

- (a) describe the proposed action and alternatives, if any, developed to date.
- (b) describe the intended scoping process and tell when and where any scoping meetings might be held.
- (c) give the name and address of an NPS contact.
- (d) state whether the proposed EIS is delegated or non-delegated (see 516 DM, 6.3(b), and ESM95–2), unless you submit a memo to OEPC giving NPS’s position at the same time the NOI is issued.

Scoping that has been conducted on an EA which then leads to an EIS does not usually substitute for the official required scoping of the EIS. However, if you stated in the public notice for scoping on the EA that an EIS might be prepared, and the NOI for the EIS indicates that comments on the scope of the alternative and impacts will continue to be considered, scoping for the EA may substitute for additional scoping of the EIS (Q13).

The NOI must include a statement advising the public that individual names and addresses may be included as part of the public record.

B. Scoping

Scoping is an early and open process to determine the scope of environmental issues and alternatives to be addressed in an EIS. You should conduct both internal scoping (see section 2.6) with appropriate NPS staff (including the IDT) and external scoping with the interested and affected public.

Scoping is done to:

- (a) determine important issues.
- (b) eliminate issues that are not important or relevant.
- (c) divide up assignments.
- (d) identify relationships to other planning efforts or documents.
- (e) define a time schedule of document preparation and decision-making.
- (f) “size the analysis box,” which includes defining purpose and need, agency objectives and constraints, and the range of alternatives.

1. External scoping—The public plays an integral role in scoping, and external, or public, scoping is required for any EIS. Scoping is a process, not an event or a single meeting. Parks and other issuing offices are encouraged to use public scoping sessions as well as other means to gather early input on EISs. Examples are direct mailings to park visitors, interested organizations, or park neighbors. These letters should include a project description, a map (if relevant), a description of alternatives and issues to date, a request for any additional issues or alternatives, and the commentor’s rationale for suggesting they be analyzed. Newsletters, ads in local or national media, open houses, or literature available for park visitors are also means of gathering early public input.

2. Scoping with agencies—Scoping with interested federal, state, and local agencies and Indian tribes should be part of the internal scoping process (see section 2.6 and section 2.13 on cooperating agencies).

(a) Historic preservation officers—You should invite the early participation of the state or tribal historic preservation officer by letter when historic properties are associated with any NPS alternative under consideration in an EA or an EIS.

(b) Other agencies—Any interested agency, or any agency with jurisdiction by law or expertise, must be contacted to obtain early input and should be solicited to be cooperating agencies. This could include federal, state, local or tribal agencies or units of government. If the agency has jurisdiction by law, it must be contacted in writing. If not, it can be involved less formally.

(c) Indian tribes—Early in the scoping of an EIS, the involved decision-maker and members of the IDT should identify potential

American Indian issues and the likelihood of tribal/state agency formal interests in NPS proposed actions. Any affected tribes must be invited to scoping meetings and provided with review copies of documents.

ATTACHMENT B: 60-Day Federal Register Notice

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 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-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:* Kirsten M. Leong, NPS SCEP Student, Department of Natural Resources, Cornell University, 306 Fernow Hall, Ithaca, NY 14853; Phone: 607-255-4136; e-mail: kml47@cornell.edu

To Request a Draft of Proposed Collection of Information Contact: Kirsten M. Leong, NPS SCEP Student, Department of Natural Resources, Cornell University, 306 Fernow Hall, Ithaca, NY 14853; Phone: 607-255-4136; e-mail: kml47@cornell.edu

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Margaret Wild, Biological Resource Management Division, 1201 Oakridge Dr., Suite 200, Fort Collins, CO 80525; Phone: 970-225-3593; e-mail: Margaret_Wild@nps.gov

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title: Identifying Capacity for Local Community Participation in Wildlife Management

Planning: White-tailed Deer in Northeastern NPS units.

Bureau Form Number: None

OMB Number: To be requested.

Expiration Date: To be requested.

Type of Request: New collection.

Description of Need: NPS and DOI policies have begun to place more emphasis on civic engagement and public participation in park management (NPS Director's Order 75A), as well as communication and collaboration with local communities (NPS Director's Order 52A).

Discussions with NPS natural resource managers indicate a need for tools to better understand local community residents and ways to engage them in management and planning, especially in situations where local communities may be impacted by NPS management decisions.

Biological studies have been conducted on white-tailed deer (*Odocoileus virginianus*) in park units of the northeastern U.S. for over two decades to determine deer population density, movement, and impact on park resources. Because deer biology has been relatively well-studied in parks, management issues related to deer were chosen as a model system to study the ways in which input from local stakeholders can affect wildlife management planning. Five sites were chosen to represent various stages of deer-issue maturity and amount of outreach efforts related to these issues: the Potomac Gorge area of Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park; Fire Island National Seashore; Morristown National Historical Park; Prince William Forest Park, and; Valley Forge National Historical Park. Fire Island National Seashore is the only park

identified with a long history of deer issues and experience with deer outreach activities. Valley Forge National Historical Park and Morristown National Historical Park represent parks with a long history of deer issues and limited deer outreach activities. Prince William Forest Park and Chesapeake and Ohio National Historical Park (Potomac Gorge area) represent parks with relatively young deer issues and relatively few outreach activities related to deer. No parks with young deer issues and many deer outreach activities were identified.

This study will focus on residents of communities near these parks, using a mail-back survey to describe and understand their opinions and experiences related to the role of parks in deer and other wildlife management, their understanding of deer issues and ways to address them in parks, and the influence of public input in wildlife management in parks. Follow-up telephone interviews with non-respondents (up to 100 per park) will be conducted to assess non-response bias. This information will assist park staff in improving communication with the public in the event that these parks consider managing impacts related to deer in the future. However, any formal management that is considered will be subject to public input requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA, 42 U.S.C. § 4231 *et seq.*). Therefore, research associated with this study should not be considered equivalent to public scoping related to a NEPA process. In addition, insights from this study will enhance NPS ability to respond to other natural resource management issues that involve local communities.

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 primarily collected via mail-back questionnaire. Telephone interviews will be conducted with a small number of non-respondents to the mail survey. No automated data collection will take place.

Description of respondents: Residents of communities near: the Potomac Gorge area of Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park; Fire Island National Seashore; Morristown National Historical Park; Prince William National Historical Park, and; Valley Forge National Historical Park.

Estimated average number of respondents: 2,500 (2,000 respondents for mail survey; 500 respondents for telephone interviews)

Estimated average number of responses: 2,500 (2,000 respondents for mail survey; 500 respondents for telephone interviews)

Estimated average burden hours per response: 1/3 hour for mail survey respondents; 1/12 hour for follow-up telephone interview respondents

Frequency of Response: 1 time per respondent

Estimated annual reporting burden: 709 hours

ATTACHMENT C: 30-Day Federal Register Notice

[Federal Register: January 19, 2007 (Volume 72, Number 12)]
[Notices]
[Page 2551-2553]
From the Federal Register Online via GPO Access [wais.access.gpo.gov]
[DOCID:fr19ja07-83]

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

30-Day Notice of Submission of Study Package to Office of
Management and Budget; Opportunity for Public Comment

AGENCY: National Park Service, Department of the Interior.

ACTION: Notice and request for comments.

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

The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has up to 60 days to approve or disapprove the NPS request for the collection of information, but may respond after 30 days. Therefore, to ensure maximum consideration, OMB should receive public comments within 30 days of the date on which this notice is published in the Federal Register.

This study will provide the NPS and park managers with critical public input regarding deer issues in and around northeastern NPS units. The study will use a mail survey of hometown in communities near parks to assess: (1) The degree to which experience, individual capacity, and perceptions of institutional capacity affect residents' intention to participate in deer management planning, (2) the degree of cognitive co-orientation between park managers and stakeholders about deer and deer management, and (3) social and demographic attributes of residents with different degrees of intention to participate and/or co-orientation to managers.

DATES: Public comments will be accepted on or before February 20, 2007.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments directly to the Desk Officer for the Department of the Interior, (OMB 1024-xxxx) Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, OMB by fax at 202-395-6566 or by electronic mail at OIRA_DOCKET@omb.eop.gov. Please also send a copy of your comments to Leonard E. Stowe, National Park Service, 1849 C Street, NW., (2605), Washington, DC 20240, or by e-mail to Leonard.Stowe@nps.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. Margaret Wild. Voice: 970-225-3593, Fax: 970-225-3585, E-mail: Margaret.Wild@nps.gov.

You are entitled to a copy of the entire ICR package free-of-charge. The NPS published a Federal Register notice to solicit comments on this proposed information collection on September 18, 2006, Volume 71, Number 180, pages 54686-54687.

Input was sought out from a number of stakeholders and others interested in the research project, including interviewees identified in previous preliminary qualitative inquiry with residents of communities near three of the five parks to be surveyed (see OMB Approval 104-0224, NPS 05-047). Comments from two individuals were received as a result of this request for input.

One unsolicited request for a draft survey was received from D.J. Schubert, Wildlife Biologist at the Animal Welfare Institutes. Mr. Schubert submitted a number of comments in response to the draft survey. He believed that to adequately assess public opinion, the survey should be broadened to include park users and to a representative sample of the public nationwide. He also believed that those who receive the survey may understand it to be an indication that it is the first step towards management action, and that the introductory remarks were inadequate. He also believed the survey should include more knowledge questions to assess the reasons behind people's beliefs about both the NPS and deer and questions that assess people's experience using non-lethal deer management alternatives. In addition, he thought the format of Question 8 could be confusing; believed that Question 10 should be worked more neutrally and should be presented as two questions for clarity; and believed that Question 11 asked people to make value judgments that may be based on different criteria for different people. He was concerned that some of the data collected in the survey may be difficult to interpret and may provide misleading results unless additional data is collected and the survey is amended. He also stressed that resolving deer-related concerns in national parks is dictated by law, regulation, and policy and that management cannot deviate from such standards, regardless of public opinion.

Comments regarding sampling frame were received from Gerard Stoddard, President of the Fire Island Association. He observed that there are many long-term renters who would not be reached by a survey focusing on homeowners. He also noted that Fire Island communities are IN, not near the park. We recognize that there are many stakeholders who are interested in the management of Fire Island National Seashore, from homeowners to long-term renters, short-term renters, campers, boaters, and other day users. We chose to focus on homeowners for this survey because preliminary qualitative inquiry indicated that they were somewhat different from renters (see OMB Approval 1024-0224, NPS 05-047). Long-term renters were included in preliminary qualitative inquiry and their perspectives helped shape the questions included on the survey instrument. Language describing the study area of interest and a map showing park boundaries were added to the questionnaire to clarify the relationship between Fire Island communities and Fire Island National Seashore boundaries.

Another comment regarding sampling frame was received from Ronald Martin, President of the Fire Island Pines Property Owners Association. He pointed out that the opinions and experiences regarding deer may be different for communities on Fire Island and those on Long Island. He believed that results should be geographically segmented. In response to this comment, geographic information about responses will be collected so that analysis can be accordingly segregated.

This survey is not meant to be a metric of general public opinion, nor is it designed to be a tool for making decisions about different action alternatives. The survey is intended to assess only local community beliefs

about and level of interest in deer and deer issues in and around these parks and is not equivalent to public scoping as required by the National Environmental Policy (NEPA, 42 U.S.C. 4231 et seq.). If any of the parks decide to consider formal management action related to deer, a full public scoping process would be undertaken. In response to the above comments, a section to this effect is included in the cover letters that are received with the survey. At this time, only Valley Forge NHP is undertaking a Deer Management Environmental Impact Statement, and they have begun a separate public scoping process.

In designing the survey, we worked closely with professionals who specialize in survey design and considered tradeoffs between likelihood of response and survey length, clarity of questions, and depth of understanding. We are not attempting to intuit the full suite of people's reasons for holding the beliefs that they do. We recognize that people's history of experience, knowledge, and values (among others) will play a large role in the way they respond to question items. To fully assess all the reasons behind each response is beyond the scope of any survey. Instead, our goal is to identify the climate for communication with the park; i.e., what are the main concerns of local community members and how are these similar or different from the park. Future dialogue with park staff would be needed to determine the full suite of reasons behind these concerns. Questions 8, 10 and 11 are similar in format to questions that have been used in previous surveys conducted by Cornell University's Human Dimensions Research Unit and did not appear to pose problems of clarity. In response to specific comments above, we reworded question 10 to be more natural.

Each of the study sites for this survey is a park where formal deer management is not currently in place. Formative research with NPS managers identified local community members as playing a crucial role in the development of issues (like those related to deer) from vague concerns to topics meriting management action (Leong and Decker 2005). This survey is designed to help managers identify salient problem elements and communication needs, should they decide to move forward with deer management. By identifying these needs a priority, this survey will help managers improve the quality of future public participation and civic engagement processes that are mandated by Federal policies as a vital part of the decision-making process (National Park Service 2000, 2001b, a, 2003). These policies also recognize that local communities may have different concerns than the general public and that it is important to consider these concerns in addition to national concerns.

The survey cannot be used to make recommendations about management actions because (1) the management problem has not yet been defined (except in the case of Valley Forge NHP), and (2) no questions were asked about potential actions. No other unsolicited comments were received for this one-time information collection as a result of the Federal Register notice.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title: Identifying Capacity for Local Community Participation in Wildlife Management Planning: White-tailed Deer in Northeastern NPS Units.

OMB Number: To be requested.

Expiration Date: To be requested.

Type of Request: New collection.

Description of need: NPS and DOI policies have begun to emphasize on civic engagement and public participation in park management (NPS Director's Order 75A), as well as communication and collaboration with local communities (NPS Director's Order 52A). Discussions with NPS natural resource managers indicate a need for tools to better understand local community residents and ways to engage them in management and planning, especially in situations where communities may be impacted by NPS Management decisions. This study will

provide insight on local stakeholder opinions and experiences related to the role of parks in deer and other wildlife management, their understanding of deer issues and ways to address them in parks, and the influence of public input in wildlife management in parks. This information will assist park staff in improving communication with the public in the event that these parks consider managing impacts related to deer in the future. Insights from this study also should enhance NPS ability to respond to other natural resource management issues that involve local communities.

The goal of this study is to identify criteria for public involvement strategies that successfully engage the public in management planning, particularly with respect to deer management. Collection of these data will assist NPS managers in fulfilling recent policy directives for public participation by indicating how to adapt participatory processes to best meet the specific management and stakeholder contexts. Should these data not be collected, future participatory processes will be undertaken without the benefit of research showing the relevance to public-participation processes to audiences. This could result in receiving public input that is not representative of the public at large or designing participatory processes that are more likely to incite controversy than identify constructive solutions. Specific requirements regarding the information that must be submitted by offerors in response to a prospectus issued by NPS are contained in sections 403(4), (5), (7), and (8) of the Act.

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 the 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 made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Bureau Form Number: None.

Frequency of Collection: On occasion.

Description of respondents: Residents of communities near: The Potomac Gorge area of Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park; Fire Island National Seashore; Morristown National Historical Park; Prince William Forest Park; and Valley Forge National Historical Park.

Automated data collection: This information will be collected via mail-back questionnaire. Telephone interviews will be conducted with a small number of non-respondents to the mail survey. No automated data collection will take place.

Estimated average number of respondents: 2500 (2000 respondents for mail survey; 500 respondents for telephone interviews).

Estimated average number of responses: 2500 (2000 responses for mail survey; 500 responses for telephone interviews).

Estimated average burden hours per response: $\frac{1}{3}$ hour for mail survey respondents, $\frac{1}{12}$ for follow-up telephone interview respondents.

Frequency of Response: 1 time per respondent.

Estimated annual reporting burden: 709 hours.

Total Non-hour Cost Burden: 0.

Dated: January 10, 2007.

Leonard Stowe, NPS Information Collection Clearance Officer.

[FR Doc. 07-205 Filed 1-18-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4312-52-M