

**Supporting Statement for OMB 0596-NEW**  
Prince William Sound User Experience Survey  
March 2008

**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.**

In 1989, Prince William Sound, the geographic heart of the Chugach National Forest (CNF), was severely impacted by the *Exxon Valdez* oil spill (EVOS). In the aftermath of the spill, a council of federal and state trustees (EVOS Trustee Council) was awarded criminal and civil restitution funds to help with the recovery (and the evaluation of the recovery) of injured natural resources and human services. A recovery plan for the Sound and its affected resources was jointly drafted and is the guiding document directing research and remediation efforts undertaken by Trustee Council members (for statutory direction, see Appendix I, item 1) The Prince William Sound User Experience Survey aims to advance understanding of the status of recovery for the recreation/tourism human service still defined by EVOS trustees as “recovering” and not yet fully “recovered.” It also aims to identify potential impacts to the recovery of other injured goods and services. A complete list of 30 injured natural resources and human services and their current recovery status, is available through the *Exxon Valdez* oil spill Trustee Council: <http://www.evostc.state.ak.us>.

The CNF, as the major land-managing EVOS Federal Trustee in Prince William Sound is responsible for playing an important role in the recovery process as well as the management of recreation within the region (Appendix I, items 2-4). One important aspect of this recovery is the distribution, behavior, and experience of recreation/tourism users throughout Prince William Sound and its impact on recovering natural resources and human services, including the recreation/tourism human service itself. This area of research has received less attention in the past, yet is of critical importance to CNF managers because of the key role the forest plays in the management of recreation/tourism use (Appendix I, item 5) in Prince William Sound. Managers are concerned that the potential for increased competition between user groups may negatively impact the recreation experience in Prince William Sound, which would further impair the recovery of the recreation/tourism human service. Additionally, displacement arising from intensified use and possible conflict may result in increased use of areas that currently support recovering resources injured following the oil spill.

The results of the proposed information collection will be integrated with the results of three other EVOS-funded studies currently being lead by the CNF that characterize: 1) human use hot spots; 2) subsistence use patterns; and 3) sensitive cultural and biological resources in the Sound. What follows is a short discussion of each of these three sister projects.

### Study 1: Human Use Hot Spots GIS Database and Spatial Analysis

Hot Spots are important areas in PWS where human use is concentrated. In many cases, these locations are physiographic bottlenecks restricting access to desirable upland opportunities for recreation or subsistence activities. They also exist in areas of concentrated seasonal resources such as the mouths of salmon streams, or exceptional wildlife viewing opportunities. It is critical for the sustainable management of tourism, subsistence, and resources in PWS that the location, timing, and nature of these areas be well understood by PWS area managers (including where, when, how much and how often commercial activities occur on forest lands in the Sound). Several existing data sources characterizing human use in PWS are currently available to the CNF but these have not been compiled into a single comprehensive database. Such a database is critical in order to ensure our management actions continue to enhance the experience of all PWS users and provide for the restoration of the vital recreation/tourism and subsistence services while providing for protection and restoration of EVOS injured resources.

### Study 2: Spatial and Temporal Characterization of PWS Subsistence Harvest Activities

The project will create a GIS database characterizing subsistence activities in a spatially and temporally explicit manner. This simulation will be driven by empirical data collected from individual subsistence harvesters in the PWS communities of Chenega Bay, Tatitlek, Cordova, and Whittier. Data will be collected through a partnership with communities of the Sound for a variety of harvest activities including: mountain goat, bottom fish, deer, salmon, marine mammals, shellfish and plants harvested commonly in the PWS region. Results of the simulation will be used to evaluate spatiotemporal overlap with both private and commercial recreation use activities throughout PWS. The results of this assessment will inform recreation management practices on the Chugach National Forest aimed at minimizing user conflict and displacement of subsistence users from traditional harvest areas in PWS.

### Study 3: Sensitive Areas (Biological/Cultural - including results of a 5<sup>th</sup> EVOS funded study of Black Oystercatcher nest site distribution in PWS)

This project will produce GIS layers for wildlife species, fish, and habitats as well as culturally sensitive areas affected by the oil spill (those still described as injured or recovering by EVOS trustee council). Compilation of available data sources will be through collaboration with partner agencies including USFWS, NOAA, Alaska Natural Heritage Program, NFMS, ADF&G, etc. A focus on distribution data for wildlife and fish species affected by EVOS as well as other sensitive wildlife species and habitats (e.g. seabird colonies, estuaries, marine mammal haul-outs, and concentration areas, sea ducks, etc.) will be mapped. Where species and habitat is appropriately EVOS focused this would include data layers from the Biological Hotspots Analysis completed in 2003 by the World Wildlife Fund. We will also compile and verify GIS layers currently housed by the CNF for important cultural heritage sites identified in PWS in the years since the

oil spill. Our aim with this project is to create a comprehensive GIS layer with consistency throughout the PWS and between parent data sources.

Together these projects are foundational studies/analyses for what the Chugach is calling the Prince William Sound Framework. The “Framework” is a multi-year effort in which we aim to engage with PWS communities, stakeholders, and our land management partners in the region to promote resource protection through sustainable tourism management. As a key component of this larger Framework effort, the Prince William Sound User Experience Survey will add critical depth to the few existing Prince William Sound human use studies by describing the exact nature of user experiences in the Sound, as well as how those experiences ultimately effect the distribution of human use. The survey will also aid in evaluating the potential for conflict among user groups and the possibility of displacement resulting from those interactions. Additionally, it will investigate recreation/tourism user perceptions about lingering oil and evaluate how those perceptions may affect experience.

Data from the trip diaries and survey will be used to populate a computer simulation. This simulation will provide a baseline evaluation of existing user conditions in the Sound. An analysis of the survey data will be performed to determine probabilistic rules that will be used to forecast future use. In addition to the proposed survey, kayak and boat surveys will be undertaken to collect in the field as an aid in validating the computer model. The goal of kayak and boat survey component of the Prince William Sound User Experience Study is to evaluate the spatial and temporal distribution of visitors across the Sound to provide a baseline of information regarding distribution throughout the Sound, and to cross-validate results with the first and fourth components (Recreational User Questionnaire and Computer Simulation). U.S. Forest Service personnel and researchers from the University of Arizona will survey the entire shoreline of PWS during three seasons various high, medium, and low areas of use throughout Prince William Sound. Surveys will be completed via powerboat May 1 – June 15 (spring) and Sept 1 – October 31 (fall) and by kayak during June 15-Aug 31(summer) in 2007 and 2008. All surveys will be a combination of water-based and shore/anchor based. The following provides a description of the procedures and data that will be collected.

#### **a. SURVEY TYPES**

Each trip will consist of water and shore/anchor based surveys to maximize the observations of recreational users within Prince William Sound. The data returned by these surveys are entirely observational and do not result in additional burden to recreationists in the region based on contact with the observed groups.

##### **1) Water-based surveys**

In order to determine user distribution across the entire PWS, water-based surveys (i.e. transects) will be conducted continuously while researchers are on the water. Each transect begins when the observer enters the

water and is ready to record observations. Each transect ends when the observer leaves the kayak or stops the boat for longer than 15 minutes or during challenging water conditions when safety is a concern (e.g. during a crossing or high waves). The boat surveys will travel within a range of 10 - 20 knots.

## **2) Shore/anchor-based surveys**

Shore/anchor-based surveys will be conducted at each campsite and lunch destination, for a total of at least three times per day: breakfast, lunch, and dinner. Each shore/anchor-based survey begins when the observer is ready to record observations. **Observations can be made while cooking meals, but NOT while setting up and taking down camp.**

## **b. METHODOLOGY**

There are four components to collection of data for the kayak/boat surveys: 1) the survey datasheet, 2) the survey map, 3) the observation datasheet, and 4) the observation map.

### **1) Survey Datasheet**

**There will be one survey datasheet per trip.** The begin/end times and GPS waypoints will be recorded for each transect. In addition, a waypoint will be taken for the shore-based surveys (Note: The waypoint will be the same for many breakfast and dinner time surveys). The observer will also record the start and end time of each shore-based survey.

#### **a) Data variables to be collected**

The following words in **bold** under each heading are correlated to the variables that need to be recorded on the Survey Datasheet at the beginning and end of each survey (i.e. transect and shore/anchor survey) (see attached Survey Datasheet example).

##### **i. Trip Information**

**Trip:** Name of the entire trip area surveyed (e.g., Blackstone/Cochrane Bays, Port Nellie Juan)

**Trip Initials:** A two-letter combination of the trip name (e.g., Blackstone/Cochrane Bays = "BC," Port Nellie Juan = "NJ").

**Observers:** List all trip participant initials.

\* write weather note on the back of this datasheet (e.g., high/low temps, rain, clouds, and noticeable changes in weather).

##### **ii. Water-based Surveys**

**Transect ID:** A unique Trip Initial/double-digit number combination associated with each transect (e.g., Port Nelly Juan transect number 5 = "NJ05").

**Date:** Day/month/year of transect.

**Begin Time:** Start time of each transect

**Begin Waypoint:** Start GPS waypoint of each transect

**End Time:** End time of each transect

**End Waypoint:** End GPS waypoint of each transect

**Loc:** Notes on the reason for stopping water transect (e.g. get water, high seas, crossing, etc).

iii. Shore-based Surveys

**Shore-based Survey ID:** A unique Trip Initial/letter combination associated with each shore-based survey (e.g., Port Nelly Juan first shoreline survey = NJ\_A).

**Date:** Day/month/year of transect

**Waypoint:** GPS waypoint of campsite or lunch site location.

**Begin Time:** Start time of the shore-based survey\*

**End Time:** End time of the shore-based survey

**Loc:** Notes on the location of the survey. Camp = C, lunch destination= L (e.g., NJ first breakfast survey = C1 am).

**2) Survey Map**

The Survey Map will be of the entire survey area. As a backup to the GPS tracking system, each transect line will be drawn along the shoreline of a map(s) of the entire trip area. Be as specific as possible regarding your travel route during each transect. Once each transect is complete, mark on the survey map(s) the travel route taken during each transect and label it with the transect ID and approximate begin and end locations, (e.g. L1, C1, or End 1; water). See attached survey map example.

**3) Observation Datasheet**

**At least one user Observation Datasheet will be used each day. One datasheet will never have observations from more than one day.** Regardless of survey method, a user observation begins at the first sighting of a water or land-based user and will be recorded on Observation Datasheets.

**a) Data variables to be collected**

The following words in **bold** under each heading are correlated to the variables that need to be recorded on the Observation Datasheet.

**Date:** Date observations will be recorded as Day/Month/Year.

**Day:** Day of the week

**Location:** General location(s) surveyed that day (this is not the same as Trip ID).

**Survey ID:** Letter/number that corresponds to the transect ID or shore-based survey ID (e.g., Blackstone Bay transect 3 = "BB03", Blackstone Bay shore-based survey A = "BB\_A"). Observers may also list the numbers of transects and letters of shore-based surveys and leave out the trip initials.

**Encounter:** Non-repeating number assigned to each water- or land-based user observed. The first encounter of the first day of the trip will be assigned "1" and every additional encounter will be assigned the next chronological number so that all encounters with users are individually numbered from one to the total number of encounters for the ENTIRE TRIP without repeating (e.g. if 7 encounters are made on day 1, day 2 starts with encounter number 8).

Clarifications: If a vessel was anchored at first sighting then begins to move (and vice versa) it is still the same encounter. Write details of change in movement in the notes section. However, if the vessel was seen on water first, then the vessel went ashore or camped nearby this constitutes a change in vessel type (e.g. from CC to OS) and should be marked as a new encounter of the same group. If the primary vessel has other vessels aboard (e.g. a cabin cruiser with 3 kayaks on board) the primary vessel will be recorded as the encounter (CC) and a note made to describe other vessels on board (3 kayaks aboard).

**Group:** Unique letter assigned to each individual or group of users. This letter assignment will be maintained at every repeat encounter of an individual or group of users PER DAY. The first group of the day will be group "A"; the second will be "B" and so forth. For example, the first observation of the day will be encounter 1 group "A"; if the fifth encounter of the day is the same vessel/user as group A, the observation will be recorded as encounter "5" group "A". If the number of groups observed in a day exceeds the letter "Z", continue with "AA", "BB", and so on.

Clarifications: If there are multiple users in close vicinity to one another, the observer will make the distinction as to whether or not the vessels are together in one group or if they are unrelated. If users of different vessel types are determined to be in the same group they will be recorded as additional encounters of the same group (e.g. 1A= 3K, 2A= 2IN); if all users are unrelated, they will be recorded as

separate groups.

**Vessel observ wypt:** GPS waypoint of observer when vessel is first observed.

**Vessel type:** Circle type of vessel. A vessel will be classified as what it looks like, not the actual activity (e.g. A CF that is being used as a research vessel, will be classified as a CF).

<i>K</i> = kayak	<i>TC</i> = tour/cruise
<i>OS</i> = onshore user*	<i>CF</i> = commercial fishing
<i>OST</i> = onshore tent**	<i>FW</i> = fixed wing aircraft
<i>IN</i> = inflatable or skiff	<i>HE</i> = helicopter
<i>CC</i> = cabin cruiser	<i>S</i> = sailboat***
<i>MY</i> = motor yacht	<i>OT</i> = other (barges, oil rigs)

\* If people are seen onshore, record vessel types and numbers associated with the onshore users in the notes section.

\*\* *OST* takes priority in recording over *OS*. If tents and people are seen onshore, circle the vessel type *OST* and record the number of tents and people in the notes section.

\*\*\* A sailboat will always be classified as a sailboat even under motor.

Clarifications: Cabins and floating structures

If no people or tents are observed at cabins and floating structures, including docks and dense groups of buoys (e.g. some type of large net or shrimp, etc. traps), then only mark the structure on the map using *FS* for Floating structure or *CA* for cabin and write details in the notes section. Do NOT record as an encounter. If people are observed, then circle *OS* and write that they were observed at a cabin or floating structure in the notes section.

**Time first observed:** Time of the initial sighting of a user.

**Distance:** Distance from the observer to the user at the onset of the observation. Circle one of the following distance bands (in meters and kilometers):

*100* = less than or equal to 100m

*500* = 101-500m

*1* = 501m-1km

*>1* = over 1km

**Noise H M L:** Write the letter that corresponds to the level of noise disturbance caused by the observed vessel: high (H), medium (M) or low (L). \*KAYAK TEAMS ONLY. Boat teams will NOT record Noise Effect.

*High* = Low effect (e.g. sound is in background; doesn't affect what I am doing)

*Medium* = Medium effect (e.g. somewhat noisy; moderate annoyance)

*Low* = High effect (e.g. loud; attention is drawn to the source with high annoyance)

**Closest distance:** Distance between the user and observer at the point when the two subjects are the nearest to each other.

**Time last observed:** Time the vessel moves out of sight of the observer. \*

\* If a user that has moved out of sight of the observer, moves back into sight of the observer within 15 minutes, a new "time last observed" will be marked when the user is again out of sight. If the user moves out of sight and after more than 15 minutes moves back into sight of the observer, the observation will be marked as an additional encounter of the same group.

**Vessel Moving:** Was the vessel moving? Y = Yes, N = No.

**Campsite # or waypt:** If users are seen at a campsite, record the USFS campsite ID or a take a GPS waypoint if the location is a new campsite in the notes section.

**Obs:** Initials of the person who recorded the observations

**Notes:** Record as much information about each encounter as possible (e.g. vessel name, tour company, vessel description, number of people in party, number of single/double kayaks, number of onshore users, including tents and other vessels onboard the observed vessel). Record this information on the back of the datasheet in a notes section when applicable. Use the unique Encounter-Group ID to specify to which observation the notes refer.

#### **4) Observation Map**

The Observation Maps will be detailed maps of specific areas (e.g. bays, passages) within the entire survey area. There will be several observation maps associated with each trip. The location of the individual or group of users will be marked on the observation map with the corresponding Encounter number from the Observation Datasheet.

The User Experience survey effort and the kayak and boat surveys coupled with computer simulation all have the potential to inform the



Chugach National Forest plan as well as planning efforts by our partners in PWS. The data collected, in concert with other research currently being completed under the suite of Prince William Sound Framework projects, has great potential to bring sound, scientific insights to update land management strategies in the region and answer some specific research questions. Some of these key management questions include:

- How much visitor use is occurring in PWS?
- What is the existing spatial pattern of use (over variable time periods: seasonal, weekly, daily) in PWS?
- When are the peak visitation periods in PWS and where does peak use occur?
- What biophysical features attract recreationists in PWS?
- What are the spatial/temporal relationships between patterns of visitor use and seasonal use of wildlife?
- Are the existing spatial and temporal distributions acceptable for visitor experience ((had little demonstrably negative impact on experience) and resource protection?
- What is the nature of encounters being had by recreationists in PWS in terms of numbers, types, proximity, and resulting effects of those encounters on the quality of recreation experience?

The final report will include an analysis of survey questions, baseline, and projected simulation visitor distribution over space and time as well as a set of management strategies and recommendations will be made for specific PWS management units.

Finally, an understanding of user experience and conflicts between user groups is critical to advance understanding of the status of the recovery of the recreation/tourism human service in Prince William Sound. It is also critical in order to make accurate and useful predictions about the changing dynamics of human use distribution. Such predictive power will allow us to gain an understanding of the spatial and temporal patterns of recreation/tourism human use relative to EVOS-impacted natural resources and human services. The results will inform recovery and restoration activities which have been undertaken by both the EVOS trustees and local resource managers relative to current and projected levels of human use. As one of the three federal EVOS Trustees, the information collection proposed by the CNF is of critical importance to Forest management and to management of the region as a whole. A host of federal, state, and private land and resource managers will benefit from the proposed work.

**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.**

**a. What information will be collected - reported or recorded? (If there are pieces of information that are especially burdensome in the collection, a specific explanation should be provided.)**

Data collection efforts will consist of:

- 1) A mapped description (trip diary) of the trip completed,
- 2) The numbers and types of encounters respondents had with other users during the trip, and
- 3) Respondents' overall conclusions about their PWS experiences and the factors that affected those conclusions; additionally, limited categorical information will be collected about the mode of transportation, preferred recreation activity, and landscape/seascape features sought in Prince William Sound.

**b. From whom will the information be collected? If there are different respondent categories (e.g., loan applicant versus a bank versus an appraiser), each should be described along with the type of collection activity that applies.**

Data will be collected from recreation users to the PWS area departing from the harbors of Whittier, Valdez, and Cordova. Though there are likely differences in behavior typical to certain classes (such as travel mode, trip length, and specific desired type of recreation activity), for the purposes of this study, we are treating all recreation users of PWS as a single study population.

**c. What will this information be used for - provide ALL uses?**

Trip Diary Data

Data from trip diaries will provide information that will allow managers to characterize spatial patterns and intensity of recreation use for the Sound. Such spatially and temporally explicit data will provide managers with the ability to quantify overlap of recreation with EVOS impacted resources and services; thus informing the ongoing remediation efforts. The information collection will provide decision makers with insight on recovery of the injured service of recreation/tourism, as well as information on the implications that changing recreation use patterns have relative to overlap with other injured human services (e.g., subsistence harvest). Diary information will assist in characterizing recreation use overlap with distributions of lingering oil.

Encounter Data

Encounter data collected will help managers understand the number and types of encounters happening between PWS recreationists and other users of the region. An analysis of how the numbers and types of encounters

relates to overall user experience in the Sound will be critical to assessing the status of the recovery of Recreation and Tourism as a service. Furthermore, encounter levels can have profound implications for ultimate dispersal patterns of recreationists. An analysis evaluating the impact of numbers and types of encounters on dispersal patterns will be completed; the EVOS Trustees believe this to be critical in terms of predicting recreation overlap with injured resources and services.

#### Summary Experience Data

The summary experience data of individual recreational visitors to the Sound and the factors most closely associated with that experience will assist managers in evaluating the recovery status of the Recreation and Tourism service. A categorical analysis of transportation methods used by recreationists as well as their preferred recreation activities and the landscape/seascape features sought by users to this region will support this analysis.

- d. How will the information be collected (e.g., forms, non-forms, electronically, face-to-face, over the phone, over the Internet)? Does the respondent have multiple options for providing the information? If so, what are they?**

Prior to embarking on their trips, Prince William Sound recreation users will be contacted in-person by Forest Service and contract personnel at harbors in three PWS communities: Whittier, Cordova, and Valdez. Respondents will complete a paper questionnaire during their trip and return it in via self-addressed and stamped envelope. USFS employees and contractors from the University of Arizona will analyze and summarize the collected information.

- e. How frequently will the information be collected?**

Plans are for daily distribution of surveys (4 days per week) at peak times of departure from the three ports accessing PWS from May through October of 2008. Only one survey will be collected from each respondent.

- f. Will the information be shared with any other organizations inside or outside USDA or the government?**

The resulting raw survey data will be housed temporarily by our partners at the University of Arizona during the analysis phase of the project (fall 2008 – fall 2009). The summarized results of the survey (devoid of individual details) will be reported to the EVOS Trustee Council and will be made available to the public at large upon request.

- g. If this is an ongoing collection, how have the collection requirements changed over time?**

This is a new survey.

### **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.**

No electronic transmission options used, paper forms are necessary to allow respondents to record information during their trip into Prince William Sound.

**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.**

Collection of some PWS human use data occurred during late May-September 2005 by researchers from Oregon State University in cooperation with the CNF<sup>1</sup> (Wolfe, et al, 2006). Survey respondents mapped their routes in the Sound. No collection of experience, encounter, and duration information occurred. During the study, recreationists departing from Valdez and Cordova were under-represented, as were recreationists using the Sound during spring and fall seasons. The data collected by this study as well as their sampling strategy leave significant information gaps relative to management of EVOS injured resources and services. The final report is expected in the near future.

A study completed by USFS Pacific Northwest Research Station ([Colt et al. 2002](#)<sup>2</sup>) evaluated the extent and nature of recreation within South Central Alaska. The results of this study described types of uses throughout this region of the state as well as the general motivations of PWS users but did not explicitly evaluate user experience. It does contain some trend data relative to a few large-scale geographic areas in western PWS, but the conclusions are based on data prior to the opening of the Whittier tunnel in 2000, an event that has dramatically increased numbers of users to the region. Another study completed by Alaska Pacific University and the Wildlife Federation in 2001 ([Brown 2001](#)<sup>3</sup>), initiated in part because of the pending opening of the Whittier Tunnel, characterized the attitudes and beliefs of Sound residents relative to recreation use and development but was not an explicit characterization of user experience or use distribution. A study completed prior to the tunnel by researchers contracted through the Rocky Mountain Research Station ([Twardock and Monz 1998](#)<sup>4</sup>) described kayak use of beaches in several areas of western PWS but focused on a single user group and only addressed portions of the western Sound.

**5. If the collection of information impacts small businesses or other small**

1 Completed under OMB approved information collection 0596-0110

2 <http://www.fs.fed.us/pnw/pubs/gtr551/gtr551a.pdf> - Researchers did not seek OMB approval, as they did not collect information from individuals, but rather relied on existing economic databases. This was confirmed with the lead author on March 7, 2008

3 <http://polar.alaskapacific.edu/gregb/pws/pwssumm.htm> - Federal funding was not used to support this data collection.

4 [http://www.fs.fed.us/rm/pubs/rmrs\\_p015\\_4/rmrs\\_p015\\_4\\_175\\_180.pdf](http://www.fs.fed.us/rm/pubs/rmrs_p015_4/rmrs_p015_4_175_180.pdf) - This study relied only on existing economic information; specifically State managed outfitter and guide databases and empirical field observation of use patterns without information being sought through specific user contact.

**entities<sup>5</sup>, describe any methods used to minimize burden.**

There is no anticipated burden to small business or 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.**

The EVOS Trustees will continue to lack a detailed assessment enabling evaluation of the recovery status of recreation and tourism injured by the spill. Further, the Trustees will be unable to make systematic and robust evaluations about the overlap of increasing recreation use with the numerous sensitive resources still recovering from the spill. The CNF, as both a Trustee Council member and the leading recreation manager for the region, would find itself in the untenable position of not understanding the potential for resource impacts and user conflicts in an area that is experiencing increasing use.

The necessity for record keeping throughout the respondent's trip is certainly a potential obstacle to reducing burden. Unfortunately, the broad expanse and diversity of recreation activities taking place in the Sound, as well as the need for spatially explicit trip and encounter data, preclude a more simplistic experience summary type survey format.

**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**

---

5

**agencies for compatible confidential use; or**

- **Requiring respondents to submit proprietary trade secret, 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.**

There are no special circumstances. The collection of information is conducted in a manner consistent with the guidelines in 5 CFR 1320.6.

- 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 describe actions taken by the agency in response to these comments. Specifically address comments received on cost and hour burden.**

Published in the 11/01/2007 Federal Register as Prince William Sound User Experience Survey. Federal Register: November 1, 2007 (Volume 72, Number 211), Page 61857-61858.

One comment received in response to the Federal Register Notice, from B.Sachau: "attention prince william sound "user" experience - is this tax dollars for the benefit of exxon? what earthly reason is there for this spending of tax dollars - so univ of arizona can make money? why this spending? ...exxon should have had to pay the full amount of civil and criminal damages immediately but they got away with it. his damage was immense and the oil is still below the sea...i believe this is a wasteful survey. what could visitors to the area possibly add to the science of what has happened to this area. did the visitors look under the sea to see the damage. do the visitors know how the area was before the oil came and damaged to the ultimate degree - the comments of visitors is entirely irrelevant. get exxon to pay up."

The Forest Service responded on November 1, 2007:

"...The source of funding for this work is from Exxon criminal monies entrusted to the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Trustee Council (made up of federal and state agencies from the region) following the spill. These funds are made available to state and federal agencies for research and remediation projects focused on the injured natural resources and human services in the affected area. As such, the money funding the proposed study came directly from Exxon as part of the original settlement following the spill...We believe that understanding the visitor experience to Prince William Sound is a critical part of understanding the status of the recovery of the injured service of recreation and tourism itself. Additionally, by understanding the behavior of recreationists to the region we can better understand how their activity may overlap with other resources and services that were injured by the spill. If you are interested please see the Trustee Council's website for further information about those human services and natural resources injured by the spill: <http://www.evostc.state.ak.us>"

The comment and response enclosed as separate attachments.

**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 record keeping, disclosure, or reporting format (if any), and on the data elements to be recorded, disclosed, or reported.**

The lack of pre-existing data adequate for our needs (relative to recreation experience and the implications of those experiences for resulting distribution patterns) was a prerequisite to receiving funding from the EVOS Trustee Council. During that process, various Trustee Council representatives from Alaska Department of Natural Resources, the US Department of Interior, and the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Agency Administration provided concurrence relative to the need for this information.

We collaborated on survey instrument, methodological approach, and project development with Dr. Randy Gimblett from the University of Arizona and Dr. Bob Itami (Geodimensions Pty Ltd. Sorrento, Victoria BC), who are internationally known for their work in the spatial characterization of recreation use patterns and the effect of encounters on those patterns.

As part of the EVOS funding approval process we completed a formal peer review and consultation on overall project development, methodological approach and survey instrument development with Dr. Brian Glaspell. He is a social scientist with the Division of Conservation Planning & Policy U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service Alaska Region (recently relocated to the Kodiak National Wildlife Refuge) who has conducted several years of sociological survey work throughout Alaska.

Dr. Steve Lawson from Virginia Tech, who specializes in normative recreation research and choice modeling, consulted relative to overall project design.

Mr. Van Johnson, who is a statistician with the National Agricultural Statistics Service, also reviewed the methodology relative to scope of inference and provided insights on appropriate summary analysis techniques following data collection.

**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.**

The survey instrument was reviewed for clarity at two different stages by an ad hoc group of seven outdoor recreationists familiar with activities in Prince William Sound. These people included:

- Jack Blackwell, Alaska State Park ranger with many years of experience

participating in and managing recreation in southeast Alaska coastal environments.

- Tony Turrini who is a wildlife and nature enthusiast working for the National Wildlife Federation in the Sound.
- Sue Cogswell is an outdoor enthusiast who works with communities in Prince William Sound through the Prince William Sound Economic Development District.
- Two students (Jessica Fraver and Laura Kennedy) from the University of Arizona and two students (Sadie Youngstrom and Mary Ann Smith) from Alaska Pacific University all of whom are recreationists in PWS.
- Additionally, during the development of the survey Dr. Brian Glaspell, Regional Sociologist for the US Fish and Wildlife Service in Alaska, also provide specific comments on the survey instrument both from the perspective of a sociologist but also based on his experience as a PWS recreationist.

The contact information for these people and their comments are included in Appendix II. Contact information for the recreation and sociological subject matter experts described in #8 above can be found in Question #5 of *18B - Collections of Information Employing Statistical Methods* at the end of this document.



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

There will be no payments made or gifts given to respondents.

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

The data collected will be kept under controlled conditions. No personally identifiable or sensitive information will be collected from respondents. Names and addresses will not be associated with the responses returned for any part of the data summary or analysis. The proponents only intend to collect name and address information as a tool to tally the number of non-respondents.

**11. Provide additional justification for any questions of a sensitive nature, such as sexual behavior or 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 included in the survey.

**12. Provide estimates of the hour burden of the collection of information. Indicate the number of respondents, frequency of response, annual hour burden, and an explanation of how the burden was estimated.**

- **Indicate the number of respondents, frequency of response, annual hour burden, and an explanation of how the burden was estimated. If this request for approval covers more than one form, provide separate hour burden estimates for each form.**

**a) Description of the collection activity**

**b) Corresponding form number (if applicable)**

**c) Number of respondents**

**d) Number of responses annually per respondent,**

**e) Total annual responses (columns c x d)**

**f) Estimated hours per response**

**g) Total annual burden hours (columns e x f)**

**Supporting Statement for OMB 0596-NEW**  
 Prince William Sound User Experience Survey  
 March 2008

(a) Description of the Collection Activity	(b) Form Number	(c) Number of Respondents	(d) Number of responses annually per Respondent	(e) Total annual responses (c x d)	(f) Estimate of Burden Hours per response	(g) Total Annual Burden Hours (e x f)
PWS User Questionnaire	NA	667	1	667	.5 hour	333
Non-response (refusal)	NA	1333	1	1333	.02	27
Totals	---	2000	---	2000	---	360

- **Record keeping burden should be addressed separately and should include columns for:**
  - a) Description of record keeping activity:** None
  - b) Number of record keepers:** None
  - c) Annual hours per record keeper:** None
  - d) Total annual record keeping hours (columns b x c):** Zero
- Provide estimates of annualized cost to respondents for the hour burdens for collections of information, identifying and using appropriate wage rate categories.

(a) Description of the Collection Activity	(b) Estimated Total Annual Burden on Respondents (Hours)	(c)* Estimated Average Income per Hour	(d) Estimated Cost to Respondents
PWS User Experience Survey	360	17.80*	\$6408
Totals	360	---	\$6408

\* Estimated average income per hour calculated using the average income per hour for private industry, \$17.80, taken from the Bureau of Labor News Release on Real Earnings for January 2008. Access news release at <http://www.bls.gov/news.release/pdf/realer.pdf>

**13. Provide estimates of the total annual 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 estimates 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.**

There are no capital operation and maintenance costs.

**14. Provide estimates of annualized cost to the Federal government.**

**Provide a description of the method used to estimate cost and any other expense that would not have been incurred without this collection of information.**

**The response to this question covers the actual costs the agency will incur as a result of implementing the information collection. The estimate should cover the entire life cycle of the collection and include costs, if applicable, for:**

**Employee labor and materials for developing, printing, storing forms**

**Employee labor and materials for developing computer systems, screens, or reports to support the collection**

**Employee travel costs**

**Cost of contractor services or other reimbursements to individuals or organizations assisting in the collection of information**

**Employee labor and materials for collecting the information**

**Employee labor and materials for analyzing, evaluating, summarizing, and/or reporting on the collected information**

**Contractor Costs to Government - University of Arizona  
 (Survey production, contact data, analysis, and reporting)**

ACTION ITEM	PERSONNEL	HOURLY RATE	HOURS	TOTAL COST TO GOVT.	ANNUAL COST TO GOVT.
On-site support and project coordinator	Principal Research Assistant	\$20	40 hours a week for 2 years	\$32,000	\$10,667
Data analysis	Data analyst	\$55	10 weeks over 2 years	\$22,000	\$ 7,333
Technological and database support	Database specialist	\$50	6 weeks over 2 years	\$12,000	\$ 4,000
Travel and Per Diem	3 contractors	N/A	Over 2 years	\$14,000	\$ 4,667
Production costs for surveys	---	---	Over 2 years	\$3,600	\$ 1,200
Equipment, supplies, and miscellaneous expenses	---	----	Over 2 years	\$2,500	\$ 833
<b>TOTAL</b>	---	---	---	86,100	\$28,700

- The Forest Service has contracted with the University of Arizona to complete survey production, conduct data summary, analysis and reporting for a total of \$28,700 per year ( $\$86,100 \div 3 \text{ years} = \$28,700$ ).
- These funds support a principal research associate to serve as an on-site support and project coordinator (at ~ 20\$/hour) for ~ 40 weeks over 2 years for a total cost of ~ \$32,000.
- They also support data analysis by one analyst (~ 55\$/hour) for a total of 10

**Supporting Statement for OMB 0596-NEW**  
 Prince William Sound User Experience Survey  
 March 2008

weeks over 2 years for ~ \$22,000 as well as technological and database support by one specialist (\$50/hour) for a total of 6 weeks over 2 years for a cost of ~ \$12000.

- Travel and per diem costs for these contracted individuals estimated to be ~\$14,000 over 2 years.
- Production costs for surveys is estimated to be about \$3600 and University of Arizona budgeted for an additional ~ \$2500 for equipment, supplies and miscellaneous expenses.

**Forest Service Cost to the Government (excluding contractor costs)**

ACTION ITEM	PERSONNEL	GS LEVEL	HOURLY RATE*	HOURS	TOTAL COST TO GOVT* OVER 3 YRS	ANNUAL COST TO GOVT*
Survey Distribution	3 Seasonal Employees	GS 4/Step 5	\$20.98	2000	\$41,964	\$13,988
Contract Oversight and Supervision of Survey Distribution, Data Analysis, and Reporting	2 Employees	GS 9/Step 5	\$31.80	400	\$12,720	\$ 4,240
Travel	Various	---	---	---	\$ 4,000	\$ 1,333
Supplies and Miscellaneous Expenses	---	---	---	---	\$ 1,500	\$ 500
<b>TOTAL</b>	---	---	---	---	\$ 60,184	\$20,061

\*Salary rates from <http://www.opm.gov/oca/08tables/index.asp> - Salary Tables 2008 RUS. Cost to Government calculated at hourly wage multiplied by 1.3.

- The Forest Service estimates that Government employee salary, travel, supplies and miscellaneous expenses will be \$20,061 per year ( $\$60,184 \div 3 \text{ years} = \$20,061$ ).
- Three, GS-04/Step 05 seasonal employees (Cost to Government =  $\$16.14/\text{hour} \times 1.3 = \$20.98/\text{hour}$ ) will assist with approximately 250 days of survey distribution (2,000 hours) for an annual cost of \$13,988 ( $\$41,964 \div 3 \text{ years}$ ).
- Contract oversight and supervision of survey distribution, data analysis, and reporting will be completed by two GS 09, step 5 permanent employees (Cost to Government =  $\$24.46/\text{hour} \times 1.3 = \$31.80/\text{hour}$ ) for 50 days (400 hours), for a total of \$4240 ( $\$12,720 \div 3 \text{ years}$ ).
- Total employee travel costs associated with training and fieldwork in support of this survey estimated to be \$4,000.
- An additional \$1500 in supplies and miscellaneous expenses has also been budgeted to support the USFS component of this work.

The total annual cost to the Federal Government will be **\$48,761**.

**15. Explain the reasons for any program changes or adjustments reported in items 13 or 14 of OMB form 83-I.**

NA

**16. For collections of information whose results are planned to be published, outline plans for tabulation and publication.**

The results of this study will be published as an EVOS Trustee Council technical report. Portions will also be published in two graduate theses that are part of this project. It is likely that additional portions of the survey results will be published in recreation management and simulation modeling literature, as well as in conference proceedings dealing with recreation management.

**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.**

NA

**18. Explain each exception to the certification statement identified in item 19, "Certification Requirement for Paperwork Reduction Act."**

The agency is able to certify compliance with all provisions under item 19 of OMB Form 83-I.