

**APPENDIX B: Qualitative Interviews Exploring Visitor  
Experiences in Glacier Bay National Park and Preserve**

**Douglas Deur  
Scott Smiley  
Mark E. Vande Kamp**

## **Table of Contents**

<b>1. INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1. Research Objectives .....	1
1.2. The Structure of this Report.....	1
<b>2. METHODS .....</b>	<b>1</b>
2.1. Contacting Cruise Ship Visitors .....	2
2.2. Contacting Single-day, Motorized Boat Visitors.....	2
2.3. Contacting Multi-day, Motorized Boat Visitors .....	2
2.4. Contacting Multi-day, Non-motorized Boat Visitors .....	3
2.5. Interviews .....	3
<b>3. ATTRIBUTES OF GLACIER BAY VALUED BY VISITORS .....</b>	<b>5</b>
3.1. An Uneven Geographic Distribution of Valued Attributes.....	5
3.2. Specific Valued Attributes .....	5
3.2.1. Experiences with Nature .....	5
3.2.2. Soundscapes.....	7
3.2.3. Absence of Humans .....	8
3.2.5. Scale/Vastness .....	10
3.3. Unanticipated Omissions and Inclusions.....	10
<b>4. EFFECTS OF CRUISE SHIPS ON VALUED ATTRIBUTES.....</b>	<b>11</b>
4.1. An Uneven Geographic Distribution of Cruise Ship Effects.....	11
4.2. Cruise Ship Effects on Specific Valued Attributes .....	11
4.2.1. Glaciers .....	11
4.2.2. Wildlife .....	12
4.2.3. Soundscapes.....	14
4.2.4. Absence of Humans .....	15
4.2.5. Scale/Vastness .....	17
4.3. Sources of Effects.....	18
4.3.1. Visual Presence.....	18
4.3.2. Sound.....	18
4.3.3. Wakes .....	19
4.4. Cruise Ships Having No Effect .....	20

<b>5. OTHER EFFECTS OF CRUISE SHIPS.....</b>	<b>20</b>
5.1. Ships Provide Access .....	20
5.2. Effects on Local Communities.....	21
5.3. Effects on Trip Planning and Itineraries.....	22
5.4. Ships as Corporate Symbols .....	22
5.5. Ships as an Object of Interest.....	22
<b>6. COMMENTS SUMMARIZING VISITORS’ PERSPECTIVES ON CRUISE SHIP MANAGEMENT AND POLICY .....</b>	<b>23</b>
6.1. Comments Regarding the Number of Cruise Ships.....	23
6.2. Comments Regarding NPS Management of Cruise Ships and Other Vessels.....	24
<b>7. EFFECTS OF OTHER MODES OF TRANSPORT .....</b>	<b>25</b>
7.1. Comments Regarding Other Vessels .....	25
7.2. Comments Regarding Aircraft.....	27
<b>8. PERCEPTIONS OF “WILDERNESS” .....</b>	<b>27</b>
8.1. Are “Wilderness” Experiences Nonsensical to Some Glacier Bay Visitors? .....	27
8.2. Comments Regarding “Wilderness” and Valued Attributes of the Glacier Bay Experience .....	28
<b>9. CONCLUSION .....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>REFERENCES .....</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW SCHEDULE GUIDING QUALITATIVE INTERVIEWS.....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>APPENDIX B: INCIDENTAL INFORMATION OF POTENTIAL INTEREST TO GLBA MANAGERS.....</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>APPENDIX C: ADDITIONAL INFORMATION RELEVANT TO RESEARCHERS DEVELOPING SURVEY INSTRUMENTS.....</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>APPENDIX C: ADDITIONAL INFORMATION RELEVANT TO RESEARCHERS DEVELOPING SURVEY INSTRUMENTS.....</b>	<b>36</b>

## **1. Introduction**

### **1.1. Research Objectives**

This qualitative study is intended to inform and improve the design of a 2008 research effort that will use quantitative questionnaires. By collecting information about visitors' experiences in Glacier Bay, and the effects of cruise ships on those experiences, this study will help researchers write questions that are more relevant to visitors and more sensitive to the effects of cruise ships (negative or positive) on those experiences. The value of qualitative work is that it allows the flexibility for interviewees to raise issues and concerns that might not have been anticipated by the interviewer. The bulk of this report is therefore description of and quotations from the respondent interviews along with analysis of the various dimensions of visitor experience brought up by respondents during the interviews.

The specific objectives of the qualitative research were as follows:

- Explore and define the range of dimensions or attributes that comprise a high quality experience for the various types of visitors to Glacier Bay.
- Determine how, if at all, encounters with cruise ships affect those dimensions or attributes.
- Determine whether experiences are consistent enough, across user types, to be evaluated by the same set of survey questions.

### **1.2. The Structure of this Report**

This report includes first a statement of methodology and then a description and analysis of the interviewees' experiences, as expressed in the interviews. Much of the analysis is organized around dimensions of the visitor experience described by interviewees. More specifically, chapter three describes these valued attributes, which range from glaciers and wildlife to solitude and tranquility. Chapter four builds on chapter three by describing the effects of cruise ships on the valued attributes, as evident from visitors' comments.

Later chapters of this report describe a range of issues and comments that are important to the researchers designing the 2008 research, and to managers of GLBA. However, the majority of the relevant information is concentrated in chapters three and four.

## **2. Methods**

For purposes of research methodology and analysis, Glacier Bay visitors were conceptualized as four separate target populations: 1) Cruise ship visitors (hereafter "CS"), 2) Single-day, motorized boat visitors (hereafter "SDM"), 3) Multi-day, motorized boat visitors (hereafter "MDM"), and 4) Multi-day, non-motorized visitors (hereafter "MDN"). For each target population, the respondent universe consisted of adult visitors to Glacier Bay (age 18 or older) contacted between June 1, 2007 and August 15, 2007.

Interview procedures were developed in consultation with quantitative researchers at the Pacific Northwest Cooperative Ecosystem Studies Unit. Park managers reviewed the instruments and methods. All interviews were conducted by Dr. Douglas Deur, a researcher with expertise in qualitative research in National Park settings. In addition to conducting the interviews as described below, Dr. Deur had the opportunity to observe Glacier Bay visitors while on-board the Glacier Bay Lodge tour boat (hereafter referred to as day boat), while on-board a cruise ship, while at the Visitor Information Station (VIS) and Glacier Bay Lodge, and in other settings. He was also able to speak informally with a number of park staff, tour boat charter operators, and others in the course of his research. Together, these experiences contributed significantly to an appreciation of the context and logistics of Glacier Bay visitation that informs the report that follows.

During the study period the surveyor contacted visitors at appropriate meeting locations to arrange interviews. Specific contact procedures related to each target population are described below:

### **2.1. Contacting Cruise Ship Visitors**

Passengers were contacted individually by the interviewer as they left the cruise ship. All cruise ships that visit Glacier Bay stop in Juneau either before or after their visit to the park. The arrival and length of stay times for each day and vessel are public information and allowed our interviewer to be at the Juneau dock to contact visitors arriving on vessels that had already visited the park. During summer of 2007, all such ships spent at least 6 hours in Juneau.

### **2.2. Contacting Single-day, Motorized Boat Visitors**

Passengers were contacted individually by the interviewer. Approximately one-third of these visitors take the day boat trip offered by Glacier Bay Lodge and Tours that leaves out of Bartlett Cove. The interviewer boarded this boat in the morning and contact single-day, day boat passengers after the tour boat had left the tidewater glacier. Also, approximately two-thirds of single-day, motorized boat visitors enter Glacier Bay on private tour boats. Many of these tours leave from the Juneau dock. Visitors of this type were contacted individually upon their return to Juneau – these individuals were contacted and interviewed at the Cruise West guest lobby, where passengers returning from Cruise West tours gather upon the completion of their trip. The use of the Cruise West guest lobby may skew the sample slightly toward passengers who are less mobile or active, as these were the passengers who were available and had no other obligations or activities at the time when the interviewer was present.

### **2.3. Contacting Multi-day, Motorized Boat Visitors**

Some of the multi-day, motorized boat visitors enter the park on private vessel permits. Captains entering for the first time each season are required to stop at the Visitor Information Station (VIS) at Bartlett Cove to take a brief orientation. The interviewer and/or VIS staff contacted visitors individually at this time (see Appendix A for script). Visitors were asked to grant interviews that would be conducted later. Upon agreement, the visitor and interviewer set a time for a telephone interview with the visitor after the

completion of their trip. The visitor's name and phone number were collected to allow the interviewer to phone the visitor as agreed.

Captains that are entering for second or later trips are not required to stop at the VIS nor are boats required to stop at the VIS as they leave the park. All boats are required to radio the rangers at the VIS when they enter the bay and the captain's name and contact information is recorded in a database. A small number of interviews were conducted with captains from private vessels that entered on second or later trips. The contact information for these captains was provided from the park database, with the verbal consent of the captains. The interviewer contacted these captains and interviewed them by phone at a mutually agreed upon time.

Multi-day motorized boat visitors that enter the park on charter boats or on non-park tour boats that depart from the dock in Juneau or Gustavus are also common visitors to the park. These visitors proved difficult to contact during the early-summer season; names and phone numbers of people were gathered in the course of this research that will facilitate contacting visitors of this group in the 2008 study phase.

#### **2.4. Contacting Multi-day, Non-motorized Boat Visitors**

These visitors are primarily backcountry visitors (virtually all kayakers) who camp at Bartlett Cove and/or take the park day boat to and from drop-off points further up-bay. These visitors were contacted either before or after their kayak trips. For most, a mutually convenient telephone interview time was agreed upon, after their return from Glacier Bay. Four of these interviewees were interviewed at the VIS after their trip was complete. Two of the MDN interviewees – both regular kayakers in the park - were called on the basis of personal recommendations from other kayakers; both consented to phone interviews.

#### **2.5. Interviews**

The interviewer conducted a total of sixty-three interviews: 18 with CS visitors, 20 with SDM visitors, 13 with MDM visitors, and 12 with MDN visitors. Because the goal of this survey was to describe the range of visitor experiences for each target population rather than to create quantitative estimates of the prevalence of those experiences, sampling continued longer (up to the maximum of 20 respondents) for those target populations where visitors experiences were found to be most complex and/or heterogeneous. For all target populations, the number of interviews was sufficient to describe the breadth of visitor experiences.

The length of interviews varied considerably, ranging from seven minutes to roughly an hour and a half. The length of interviews was shaped in large part by the interviewees' available time and level of interest in the topic. During the time periods when the researcher was contacting visitors for immediate interviews, response bias was minimized by focusing each request for an interview on a visitor who had not observed the prior interview process.

In addition to the 63 formal interviews, 22 individuals provided some type of informal information. These persons included charter boat operators, and potential interviewees that did not have the time for, or interest in, participating in a full interview. While not interviewees, many of these individuals still provided valuable contextual information; for this reason, these individuals are sometimes alluded to as “informal” contacts, but are not quoted or mentioned by name in the report that follows.

In the case of face-to-face contacts, the initial contact with visitors to explain the study and determine if visitors were interested in participating took approximately 1 minute when visitors refused quickly and approximately three minutes when they read the consent form. Because the survey was being conducted through a cooperative agreement with the University of Washington, Office of Management and Budgeting (OMB) compliance information was also made available as part of the university-required consent form. The form included investigators’ contact information, a research statement, the research purpose and benefits, the research procedures, the associated risks, stress and discomforts, a confidentiality statement, voluntary participation request, and OMB compliance information (see Appendix C). The respondent was provided with the opportunity to ask questions and was then asked to sign the form as a prelude to the interview. In addition, the surveyor verbally reiterated the voluntary and confidential nature of the interview process, and explained that interviewees could refuse to answer questions or could stop the interview at any time. Phone interviews involved similar procedures, except that the content of the informed consent form and OMB documentation was summarized verbally; those agreeing to phone interviews did so verbally.

Interviews with small groups of consenting visitors were conducted as described in the interview guide (see Appendix D). During each interview, the interviewer made particular efforts to elicit the interviewees’ thoughts, opinions, values, and observations on the topic while maintaining a tone of value neutrality. As part of the introduction to each interview, each interviewee was given a very brief (less than 10 second) overview of the park’s efforts to assess the outcomes, if any, of different levels of motorized traffic in the park. Interviews followed the attached interview guide thematically. However, the interviewer attempted to maintain a conversational tone and to be responsive to interviewees’ interests and priorities. Thus, the specific content of the interviews, as well as the ordering of questions, varied between interviews. This variation in questioning reflected variation in the context of the interview, the interviewee’s experiences in the park, and the like. This type of variation is widely accepted as a valid and often necessary component of qualitative interviewing, which facilitates both the establishment of rapport with interviewees while also providing a flow of inquiry that is customized to fit the circumstances of any single interviewee. Interviews continued until the interviewees had touched on each of the principal themes mentioned in the interview guide to their satisfaction and/or had run out of time for their interview.

The interviewer took field-notes during each interview; the interviewer often clarified and augmented these notes as necessary after the interview was complete. Also, during face-to-face interviews, with the consent of the interviewee, audio recordings were made

of all or part of the interview. The interviewer reviewed the field-notes and interview recordings for recurring themes. Using these materials, as well as his own general impressions formed during formal and informal exchanges with park visitors, the interviewer produced an outline of interviewees' comments regarding the dimensions or valued attributes of the Glacier Bay experience. This outline, along with field-notes and audio recordings, was provided to Dr. Scott Smiley. Smiley, a specialist in visitor experiences of parks and other landscapes, used the interviewer's outline for organizing the field findings into this report.

### **3. Attributes of Glacier Bay Valued by Visitors**

Consistent with the objectives of the study, this chapter (the first to discuss survey results) describes the dimensions or attributes that comprised a high quality experience for visitors to Glacier Bay. Before discussing the specific valued attributes revealed by visitors' comments, we present an important observation concerning the geographic focus of visitors' attention.

#### **3.1. An Uneven Geographic Distribution of Valued Attributes**

A pattern that emerged from the interviews, observations, and informal conversations is that motorized visitors to Glacier Bay experience the park as a scenic pathway punctuated by nodes of special interest. These nodes are made up largely of tidewater glaciers and wildlife sightings (the former being geographically fixed, the latter being more geographically variable). Interviewees' descriptions of valued attributes (discussed below) tend to focus on the nodes of interest. Similarly, Chapter 4 describes how the effects of cruise ships and other vessels are also focused on tidewater glaciers and wildlife. The focus of visitors' attention on glaciers and wildlife has important implications for the study and management of cruise ship effects on experience. In particular, visitors' experience of "Glacier Bay" is focused on a much smaller area than one might assume when looking at a map.

#### **3.2. Specific Valued Attributes**

##### **3.2.1. Experiences with Nature**

The nodes of special interest were those at which visitors could experience the natural wonders of Glacier Bay. As mentioned above, those nodes largely consisted of tidewater glaciers and wildlife sightings.

##### **Glaciers**

The glaciers came up in almost every exchange with visitors. However, interviewees tended to be very brief in their discussion of them. In fact, most seemed to get what they had to say "off their chest" before the interviewer could even complete the informed consent process and get the audio recorder running. By the time formal interviewing was in progress, it sometimes seemed that their comments on the general nature of Glacier Bay were clarification of what they had originally said about the glaciers, and to a lesser extent the wildlife and the wild, rugged landscape. Thus, many of the comments regarding Glacier Bay in general could be said to apply directly to the glaciers.

Interviewees also made specific comments regarding glaciers. Those who intentionally sought out Glacier Bay as a destination (i.e., those other than the cruise ship passengers who went there as an unintended consequence of their cruise itinerary) identified the glaciers as the principal reason for their visit. Some said that they had chosen to come to the park to see the glaciers before the ice retreats farther upslope due to global warming or other factors, and one cruise ship passenger had a different take on that theme, intimating that she had wanted to see the glaciers before government regulators shut down public access to protect the glaciers.

As far as the values expressed, interviewees tended to proclaim that "the glaciers were [awesome and/or ominous and/or amazing and/or incredible]." Almost everyone was wowed by them and several people noted that the glaciers exceeded their expectations in their grandeur and aesthetic interest. Many commented —seldom in more than a short sentence—on the amazing/unearthly sounds that the ice makes as it moves or calves. Many commented, with similar brevity, on the visual scale of the ice when the ship pulled close to it. A number also commented very briefly on the look of the ice, especially its deep blue color as a surprising but appealing aspect of their visit. Some mentioned what we might call the 'purity' of the solid pieces of ice. The combination of the sound of the ice and the sight of the ice (scale, blue color) seemed to be important and positive components of their experience. A few mentioned the novelty of seeing wildlife (usually harbor seals) floating on freshly calved ice. A small number mentioned the bracing blast of cold air descending off the glacier as an interesting and presumably appealing aspect of their visit. Four or five marveled at the antiquity of the ice, that the sections calving before them fell as snow hundreds or thousands of years ago. One or two of these people also commented on the purity of the water/air in these old glacial fragments, i.e., that they predated industrialization and presumably were pure as a result.

## Wildlife

Apart from the ubiquitous mention of glaciers, "wildlife" was the most commonly mentioned attribute of Glacier Bay experiences (by 39 interviewees across all groups): "the wildlife, up close and personal" (#44mdn). "We saw the mother bear and two cubs ... That sort of changed our whole perspective. A wonderful introduction to Glacier Bay" (#8sdm). "We saw a bear and two cubs on the shore" (#23mdn). "We saw some whales, we saw some seals, and some bald eagles" (#18cs). "Ah, the wildlife [was] definitely [the high point]. We went to a rookery yesterday, and that was beautiful. Puffins and sea lions. It was a once-in-a-lifetime trip for me" (#4sdm).

Some were disappointed that they did not see more wildlife. "We were hoping to see moose and porcupines" (#6sdm). "That was the only wildlife that I'm aware of seeing, what I think was an eagle sitting on top... We didn't see any other wildlife... that was a disappointment" (#9cs). "We were surprised we didn't see as many animals... but we saw enough of each one... a lot of people may not have seen as much as we did. We really thought that there would be a lot of animals.... I have to wonder if so many people, if it scares them away" (#13cs). "[We] didn't get to see any moose or any walrus... [but we] did get to see 150 otters altogether [and] whales" (#4sdm). And signs of wildlife

were valued as well: “There were bear tracks every place we saw” (#21mdn). Wildlife was mentioned so frequently that it, along with viewing glaciers, might be considered essential attributes of a Glacier Bay experience. However, the interviews do not reveal the reasons for the wide discrepancy gap between CS passengers who reported seeing a lot of wildlife and those who complained of seeing little. Some possibilities are differences in attention, use of binoculars (mentioned by one respondent) or telephoto lenses, or interpretation. The interviewer noted, in his experience riding a cruise ship and the day boat, that the angle of view from the cruise ship allowed a much more commanding view of the area than did the day boat and thus, allowed more sightings. However, the speed and direction of the cruise ship precluded the intimate sightings of animals that were experienced on the day boat.

### **Intimacy**

A number of interviewees indicated that they appreciated the sense of “intimacy” or being “up close” to the place or to the wildlife in particular (one to three in each population). This attribute of the Glacier Bay experience arises through interactions with attributes such as glaciers and wildlife. The sense of intimacy may act in balance against some of the other values, such as remoteness and solitude that seem to embody a sense of distance. While experiences of being “up close” can produce a sense of intimacy, they can also impress upon visitors how large the glaciers, mountains, and wildlife are.

Although they rarely used the term “intimate”, it was common for SDM respondents to mention that they were having a much closer and more personal experience than the passengers on large ships. One interviewee summed it up:

I wanted to do it in a small ship. They can get closer and into places, and far less impersonal than on most big ships that I have no desire to travel on.... We all had an interest in the wildlife or we wouldn't be doing this cruise, and to do it in the small ship where you can get into the nooks and crannies without disturbing nature (#4sdm)

One MDM visitor made a similar observation that small boats are able to experience the place more intimately, and that wildlife “swim right up to the boat” (#49mdm). Contrary to the expectations of visitors on smaller vessels, CS visitors also described experiencing a sense of intimacy: “Yeah, I like the restricted access. I think that makes it more personal and intimate” (#10cs). Another found the contact with nature “totally personal” (#11cs). These responses suggest that survey questions focused on intimacy and closeness to glaciers and wildlife may be appropriate for all visitor groups in the 2008 research. However, wording the questions to avoid the term “intimacy” may be necessary, as the term is likely to be confusing and/or misunderstood by many visitors.

### **3.2.2. Soundscapes**

A soundscape refers to the total acoustic environment in an area and can include anthropogenic and natural sounds. Comments related to the natural soundscape were not common. However, a few interviewees described their experiences using terms such as peace, quiet, and silence. For example, one MDN visitor described Adams Inlet: “it was

just really quiet back in there...you're just hearing the bird life out there" (#37mdn). Similarly, respondent #55 (mdm) was amazed by hearing the eagles and the glacier calving into the water when there were no engines running. And another MDM visitor considers this a key aspect of the experience:

that's the way you should experience Glacier Bay—you pull into a quiet place like Blue Mouse Cove and you turn off all of the engines and generators and lights and just experience the place as it is, without all of the noise and distractions... that's what people really need to see at Glacier Bay (#48mdm).

The importance of natural soundscapes may be more evident in complaints about noise. Although only a few interviewees talked about Glacier Bay in terms of tranquility, peace, or quiet, the objections to noise from ships (see Section 4.2.3 below) indicate that natural soundscapes may be a significant attribute of experiences in Glacier Bay.

In order to explore visitor experiences of natural soundscapes it may be necessary to use a variety of terms—tranquility, peace, quiet, silence—or specific questions about the sounds visitors hear. The sound of glaciers calving and wildlife calls, as well as motors or loudspeakers define the soundscape and may determine whether the visitor experiences tranquility. “Silence” may be a problematic term in a questionnaire if used alone, as it implies the absence of any sound, whereas visitors clearly value the natural sounds of Glacier Bay.

### **3.2.3. Absence of Humans**

The absence of humans or human artifacts in Glacier Bay is closely associated with a number of valued attributes including solitude, a pristine environment, and remoteness. Interviewees made a variety of comments concerning those more specific attributes (see below). In addition, a few interviewees remarked directly about the absence of humans or of any evidence of human activity. One MDN visitor said that in many places they “didn't see anybody... that was heaven” (#44mdn). And an MDM visitor said this was a highlight: “there's just not that many people there” (58mdm). Another MDN visitor was:

surprised just how raw the park felt... there's no logging roads, there's [no] mining roads, there's no towers on the ridges... and even in the channels, there's no navigation markers or buoys or anything... there's no stamp of man back there... there's no blown up debris like you find on other beaches” (#37mdn)

The absence of human artifacts and infrastructure is a hallmark of the conventional definition of wilderness, and is also likely to be an important determinant of the subjective sense of “wilderness” mentioned by some interviewees. Due to its relationship with so many different valued attributes of the Glacier Bay experience, the absence of humans and human artifacts might receive considerable attention in the 2008 survey.

#### **Solitude**

“Solitude” or the sense of being alone is an experience associated with the absence of other humans. Solitude was mentioned frequently by CS individuals and MDN

individuals, but only by three MDM visitors and one SDM visitor. Cruise ship passengers expressed the experience of solitude despite the presence of many fellow passengers: “Oh, yeah, you felt like you were alone in there, because people were being very quiet and stuff, very solemn... it feels like you’re alone in there even though you’re surrounded by hundreds of people” (#11cs). “I felt like we had the place to ourselves; well, with a thousand other people, lined up on the deck, on every deck. And the boat would turn, so everyone got a view of the glacier” (#14cs).

The sense of solitude appears to arise because “we” are alone or because there are few, if any, “other” people about. Looking out from the ship or the boat, visitors see nature, wildlife, scenery, etc., but not other people. Kayakers expressed this primarily in terms of not seeing motorized boats. “We never did see the cruise ships...not even off in the distance.<sup>1</sup> I was kind of surprised.... I would like to have not had any power boats in there, that would have been my preference...Mostly for the solitude of it” (#37mdn). “I mostly prefer to see nobody or other kayakers” (#46mdn). One MDM visitor expressed solitude as something of value as an ideal rather than as the reality experienced: “It would be nice to go up there and never see any body” (#54mdm). And another described solitude arising from seeing few people rather than none: “It’s hard to believe it’s a national park, there were so few people there...that was really nice. The solitude I guess” (#55mdm).

### **Pristine Environment**

The idea that Glacier Bay is “pristine,” meaning clean or unspoiled, was mentioned by several interviewees across the population groups (one to three in each group). “It’s pristine. You can feel like the first person who’s ever been there; that’s why I come here” (#46mdn). “It’s a special place: nice, cold, pristine” (#36sdm). The one CS visitor who used the word pristine did so in the context of the need to maintain this quality: “They should really limit the environmental impact of these ships... maybe they need to place restrictions. Sure, the price of a cruise will go up if the demand for trips is higher, but that’s fine, let it go up. That will help to reduce the number of people that go there, and keep it pristine” (#50cs). This comment makes links between pristine quality, environmental impact, management restrictions, and numbers or crowding (all of which are issues being weighed by managers of GLBA).

The term “pristine” is closely tied to “wilderness” or “nature,” depending on how the speaker uses the term. It implies an area not degraded by human environmental impacts, and is thus related to concerns over the environmental impacts of cruise ships, especially pollution. The term “pristine” implies an environment that appears to be untouched by humans. However, it is not clear if the interviewees who expressed appreciation for this characteristic of Glacier Bay would endorse the sort of “zero-tolerance” policies regarding noise, litter, air pollution, or crowding of vessels that might be implied by a strict interpretation of their comments.

---

<sup>1</sup> Note that the collective sense of “we” may include other kayakers.

## Remoteness

Only a few respondents mentioned remoteness. The term was used in reference to Glacier Bay as distant from civilization and difficult to access. Three interviewees (two MDN visitors and one MDM visitor) described Glacier Bay as “remote” or out of the way. One kayaker said he “loved it, absolutely spectacular, the scale of it, the remote feeling of it...” (#37mdn). Another mentioned this quality in the context of preservation:

There’s just such potential to ruin a place, and what makes this great is that it’s out of the way and hard to get to. I think that we need to treat it like a sacred place. You can’t have it so that just anyone gets to go there just anytime they feel like it...if there’s constant pressure when does it end. When does it end? (#62mdn)

The attribute of remoteness may also be implicit in other valued attributes: the pristine environment, solitude, wilderness, or the absence of humans. However, the scarcity of explicit comments suggests that remoteness is not a particularly salient factor in visitor experience of Glacier Bay.

### **3.2.5. Scale/Vastness**

A sense of the vast expanse of Glacier Bay and its surrounding landscape was also evident in the comments of some visitors. In particular, scale may have been a factor in the sense of solitude. A sense of solitude was sometimes evoked when a visitor was faced with the vast landscape that made them feel “small”. This sense of scale was also mentioned by some respondents in relation to seeing a cruise ship in the distance, an experience that provided a sense of the potentially overwhelming scale of Glacier Bay.

## **3.3. Unanticipated Omissions and Inclusions**

The problem analysis that formed part of the background for this study (Vande Kamp and Nelson 2006) included a review of literature that sought to describe recreational experiences of wilderness. A number of the attributes described in the literature did not appear in the interviews. Some of these attributes were oneness with nature, opportunity for primitive recreation, sense of humility, and timelessness. Accordingly, questions focused on those attributes are poor candidates for use in the 2008 research.

Photographic opportunities and photography were mentioned a number of times as valued attributes of the Glacier Bay experience. Photography was a particularly common topic among CS visitors (seven of them), several of whom (#12, #15/16, #31/32) said that photographing wildlife was a highlight of the visit. “I’ve got terrific photos of eagles coming right straight at me” (#12cs). One kayaker also discussed photography, objecting to the intrusion of jet streams from aircraft into photographs (#24mdn). Photography was not singled out for discussion in section 3.2 above because it is primarily a medium by which visitors’ experience the other attributes, rather than an attribute in its own right. For visitors concerned with photography, much of the glacial landscape is viewed through a camera’s lens. Potential visual impacts, such as the presence of cruise ships or other vessels, may be of particular importance to these people, due to their effects on photographic opportunities.

## **4. Effects of Cruise Ships on Valued Attributes**

In the course of describing valued attributes of the Glacier Bay experience, and in response to direct questions about cruise ships, interviewees described a wide range of ways in which cruise ships affected their experiences. There are a number of ways in which these effects could be classified and presented. In this section, we discuss the effects of cruise ships on the various valued attributes that were described above in Chapter 3.

It is important to note that cruise ships can be seen as having a variety of effects, ranging from those that are, a) harmful, destructive, or that detract from the experience, b) potentially harmful or detracting, c) neutral, d) positive, or e) mixed in impact. These categories are not necessarily mutually exclusive. A respondent who felt that cruise ships detract from their experience at the glacier, for example, might also report that seeing the cruise ship from a distance helped them appreciate the scale of the glacier.

### **4.1. An Uneven Geographic Distribution of Cruise Ship Effects**

Recall that motorized visitors to Glacier Bay tended to experience the park as a scenic pathway punctuated by nodes of special interest. Most interviewees did not seem to mind encountering other vessels along pathways but found that encounters at nodes detracted from experiences. Issues related to solitude, or the lack thereof, focused on these nodes or attractions. In fact, the likelihood of visitors on motorized vessels, particularly cruise ships, noticing other boats/ships at any point other than the glaciers or interpreter-announced wildlife sightings appears to be low. On cruise ships there are an abundance of windowless rooms, public areas with narrow views of specific angles, etc. Casual conversations confirmed that for many, boat sightings were an issue only at the attractions—glaciers and wildlife sightings—usually not elsewhere. Interviewees rarely discussed what they saw “in transit,” or on the pathways, focusing instead on attraction nodes in their comments. Margerie Glacier was the most-often mentioned node, while other tidewater glaciers that are visually striking and accessible by boat would be included in this general category of glaciers as nodes, including Johns Hopkins, Lamplugh, etc.

### **4.2. Cruise Ship Effects on Specific Valued Attributes**

#### **4.2.1. Glaciers**

Few interviewees had concerns that cruise ships or other vessels might have direct and immediate effects on the tidewater glaciers. However, one CS visitor wondered whether boats could cause calving: “The glacier calved, and we felt sad. I think the boat motor running is making them do that... He sits there and goes around, and round, and round [expressing concern over impact], but it’s beautiful” (#14cs). Another CS visitor questioned specifically if the sound of cruise ships might affect the movement of glaciers:

Does the noise of the ship have some effect on the environment, the wildlife, the movement of the glacier, things like that?... If there is any damage to environment, then no additional ships should not be allowed. I really think the

environment is more important than the pleasure of a cruise if people can spoil it by their presence, even if it's totally unintentional. (#9cs)

In a similar manner one CS visitor suggested that the amount of glacial ice would be decreased by cruise ship traffic.

Right now there's a lot of ice in there, but with a constant flow of ships the ice would probably be pushed to the side. It would take away some of the natural beauty of it, I think. (#20cs)

It was more common for interviewees to express concerns that cruise ships produce pollution that might threaten the pristine ice or, at least, degrade visitors' ability to view the glacier. One CS visitor (#13) expressed such concerns, and they are clearly evident in the comments of a MDN visitor:

When you go see a glacier now, if there's no wind that day, all that exhaust stays right in front of you, so you're looking through smog.... how do we know that that alone doesn't have enough impact on the glaciers to cause some of the recessions?... And these are diesel fuel engines, so you know they're leaving tracks everywhere they go." (This respondent was concerned about the possibility of an oil spill like the Valdez as well.) (#24mdn)

Several respondents (2 CS visitors and 5 SDM visitors) thought that cruise ships were generally harmful or destructive to a wide range of features in Glacier Bay. These people believed that cruise ships have a negative impact on the Bay (including its wildlife, glaciers, or general environment) and that they should therefore be curtailed to minimized impacts. One person said the ships should be eliminated from the Bay on these grounds:

They ought to be sunk, visiting a place like Glacier Bay.... I don't think the things ought to be there, and I think the passengers ought to be there mainly because they are environmentalists, ecologists, that kind of people. (#36sdm)

#### **4.2.2. Wildlife**

When interviewees expressed concerns about the effects of cruise ships on wildlife it was sometimes unclear whether they had in mind an intrinsic value of the wildlife, or an instrumental value concerning their own ability to view and experience it. The distinction may prove important, depending on biological research measuring cruise ship effects on wildlife. For example, it is conceivable that cruise ships might serve to concentrate wildlife in small areas where they are easily viewed, but that such concentration may have negative effects on the health of the animals. It is difficult to predict whether visitors would evaluate such a situation as positive or negative. The comment below is an example of an ambiguous response:

It makes sense that you could allow a certain amount of shipping in without disturbing the wildlife too much, before it became an environmental impact. And

if more people could get to see it, that's great. At the same time, don't ruin the beauty of it. (#15cs)

Other comments clearly illustrated the instrumental value of wildlife. For example, comments concerning the possibility that cruise ships would scare away wildlife were quite common, and viewing wildlife was a highly valued attribute of the Glacier Bay experience. Anything that would interfere with this experience was commonly seen negatively. For example a SDM visitor said, "I'd rather not see them when I'm there... I don't want to see the big ships. And we don't want them to scare away the wildlife" (#6sdm). Similar statements were also made by CS visitors in regard to other ships and vessels, "We really thought that there would be a lot of animals.... I have to wonder if so many people, if it scares them away" (#13cs).

Crowding by boats at sites where wildlife gather was also described as an impediment to viewing wildlife. Although interviewees were not consistent in describing how the number of vessels at those sites affected opportunities for viewing, the number of vessels at sites where wildlife gather came up repeatedly in informal interviews.

Comments that may have been motivated, at least in part, by intrinsic values placed on wildlife were focused on a wide range of ways in which cruise ships might affect wildlife. One of the most common concerns focused on the sounds made by ships. For example a MDM visitor felt that noise "might disturb the birds and the wildlife" (#48mdm). Other visitors said, "I would also be concerned about the impacts that the frequency waves might have on the wildlife" (#52mdm), and, "That big ship with the loud speakers yesterday... you could just about hear every word of the presentation.... I'm sure the animals would have been disturbed by it too" (#4sdm), and finally,

I think that would freak out all the mammals in the water up there, too [to have more cruise ships]. I'm sure even our little boat, I'm sure the noise of the engine: they're probably used to it, but you start having more and more big cruise ships in, I think that would really encroach on their habitat (#35sdm).

Visitors also expressed concerns about other ways in which ships might affect wildlife. Several respondents mentioned the possibility of an oil spill:

We've been fortunate that we haven't had a Valdez situation here, but you don't think that those big old boys have a lot of fuel, and oils and things on board? ... But there is a disaster pending every year as far as I'm concerned... what's the cleanup period gonna be like. It would be a nightmare for wildlife. (#24mdn)

Similarly, a few interviewees expressed concern about the impact of sewage disposal by cruise ships, but lacked information on the subject. Finally, one kayaker said that wakes from cruise ships were disruptive,

...especially for those wolves and bears that feed in the intertidal zone; all the little crabs and barnacles get kind of torn up from the wake.... I'm not a biologist, I'm just assuming that the wake is disruptive, but I think that it is something that needs to be looked at. (#63mdn)

### Intimacy

It is implicit in their comments suggesting that cruise ships might scare away wildlife that some visitors felt the ships could limit opportunities to build a sense of intimacy or personal experience with those animals. The impacts of cruise ships on the sense of intimacy with the glaciers was not evident in as direct a manner, but is implied in comments about crowding or "lining up" at glaciers that are reported in Section 4.2.4 below. For example, "[If we had seen other cruise ships] they might have been in the way" (#11cs).

### 4.2.3. Soundscapes

Sounds from loudspeakers and motors were a concern to a number of interviewees. It was a common complaint (for smaller boats as well as cruise ships) that public address systems were so loud that any other boats in the area were forced to hear the commentary for as much as an hour as the ship or boat passes by. This was considered a substantial intrusion into the experience of Glacier Bay.

But the worst thing, when I'm on Sturgess Island just recently on the east arm, and there I am thinking I'm by myself, I'm walking the beach and there's some great oyster catchers... and then all of a sudden you've got this cruise ship going by with this speaker system that I can hear from two and a half miles out! Well your passengers aren't two and a half miles out! So why do we have to hear it? ... You can't quite make out the words but you can definitely hear the system going. And it's not just a short term, it can be like 45 minutes as they cruise through. (#24mdn)

A big ship came in. And it sounded like it was a presentation happening.... And you could just about hear every word of the presentation. And to me, and to all of us, that was just sound pollution that we didn't need. I'm sure the animals would have been disturbed by it too. And it was sort of in an amphitheater of ice and mountains. It just was dreadful. It didn't appreciate that, and others on board didn't either. But then I understand they have to get the message across on that thing... It was just after we'd left the glacier... I'd rather listen to the water. (#4sdm)

In addition, some visitors complained about motor noise, but many of those complaints focused on smaller boats: "One of the smaller boats had their generator on at the glacier...that was kind of annoying" (#55mdm). "[There was a] problem with little boats that have a lot of noise and that are so slow that you have to listen to it forever. It can take an hour of noise before it passes; hear it 30 minutes before it arrives and 30 minutes after it passes" (#38mdn). For this interviewee noise was the biggest issue in the park, especially from charter boats with diesel engines.

#### **4.2.4. Absence of Humans**

A range of attributes arise from an absence of other humans. In this section we discuss three such attributes: solitude, the experience of a pristine environment, and the sense of remoteness from civilization. Because of their common origin, many of these attributes are closely related, and visitor comments often touched on more than one attribute at a time.

##### **Solitude**

Solitude is commonly defined as the feeling of being alone. The number of mentions of solitude indicates that it is a significant factor in the experience of Glacier Bay. Interviewees made a wide variety of comments concerning the effect of ships on solitude. In one of the most explicit comments, a SDM visitor described the interruption of solitude by the arrival of ships at the glacier:

It was great with solitude at the glacier, then those two big guys came in there and the solitude was just ruined. We had to hurry out of there to make way and there was a lineup... It was just awful (#39sdm) (it is unclear whether the interviewee is referring to large or small cruise ships).

Comments regarding solitude by numerous interviewees in the cruise ship and kayaking populations demonstrate that flexibility is needed in the interpretation of the term itself. Some find solitude in a solo kayak with no other human being within sight or earshot, while others find it standing on the deck of a large ship with hundreds of people at their backs. And there may therefore be variations in what visitors consider to be interruptions to their sense of solitude. What sounds, for example, interrupt the sense of solitude? Does it matter where the sound is coming from? Does sound coming from a visitor's own vessel tend to be less of a detractor? And what visual factors interrupt solitude? Further, as suggested in the above quote from interview #39, being forced to hurry may also disturb solitude. A SDM visitor described crowding at the Margerie Glacier, feeling that finding one ship at a time at the glacier was acceptable, but "that traffic jam... was really unacceptable" and destroyed the sense of solitude (#39sdm).

Visitors' experiences at some of the main attraction sites in Glacier Bay colored their comments. Some described numerous ships and boats "lined up" at glaciers or wildlife sites. One respondent noted that "wherever we went there was another boat [at anchorages and at all the glaciers]." This interviewee complained of a major glut of boats at Marjorie Glacier: sailboats, cruise ships, tour boats (#55mdm). Others, however, specifically said that they did not feel crowded. "It's pretty impressive to go that long without feeling crowded [not seeing other ships]" (#15cs). "I'm really glad that we didn't see anyone else at the glacier, any other boats, so that we could have it to ourselves" (#16cs).<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> In this case the respondent is voicing solitude in a very specific context: solitude *with* a glacier, or in relationship to it. Such an experience is very closely associated with the sense of intimacy discussed earlier.

Most interviewees who commented about crowding, however, were concerned that it could become a problem if the number of boats, ships, and people increased in the Bay, particularly at the glaciers. “I didn’t feel crowded [by other ships] but I wouldn’t want to see any more than we did... if they started backing up in there, it would be pretty awful” (#50cs). “Yeah, I think if there were a lot of ships, one right after the other, it tends to make you think like you’re little cattle... If you had *so* many liners in there it would probably change the bay a little bit” (#20cs). Several indicated that the problem of crowding could be avoided by managing the vessels to keep them from clumping in one location. “As long as they’re spaced I think that would be wonderful, but you don’t want a whole group at one time in there” (#18cs).

### Pristine Environment

The sense that Glacier Bay is a pristine environment, one that can be seen as if you were the first to view it, is a valued attribute of the Glacier Bay experience. A number of interviewees expressed concern that large numbers of ships and people would inundate the area, reducing the pristine quality. “You can’t turn it into something like Yosemite, which has far too many” (#6sdm). “People come to Alaska to look at the wilderness and appreciate it. If you start inundating us with all these huge floating cities, it will change the whole landscape” (#35sdm). “I would be concerned if the floodgates opened like some of the other parks that are out there [referring to people rather than cruise ships specifically]” (#5sdm).

A few CS visitors expressed specific concern about more ships visually detracting from the place. “I think it [seeing other cruise ships] would take away. I’m glad have it spread out a little bit... If there was one behind us, which I’m sure there was, we never saw it” (#13cs). “If it was overrun with vessels in there, it would obviously detract from the experience” (the interviewee did not distinguish large from small vessels) (#12cs).

Some visitors expressed concern about the effects of cruise ships on air quality: “I wonder about the environmental impact... after the cruise ships would go by the air was brown” (#43mdn). “The constant black smoke that comes out of those ships is totally gross” (#62mdn). “When you go see a glacier now, if there’s no wind that day, all that exhaust stays right in front of you, so you’re looking through smog” (#24mdn). Such smog or haze is visual evidence of human activity and is inconsistent with a pristine environment.

### Remoteness

Very few, if any, interviewees made direct comments concerning the effects of cruise ships on the sense of remoteness. However, a variety of comments bear indirectly on that attribute of the Glacier Bay experience. For example, a group of three SDM visitors (interviewed together) went on at length about the need to mitigate impacts, including effects of the wake, so that reduced speed should be required: “It doesn’t have to be bigger and bigger, faster and faster... this is not the place for that” (#25/26/27sdm). Their comments suggest that the large, fast cruise ships are not consistent with the perspective that Glacier Bay is a remote place, “...what makes this [place] great is that it’s out of the

way and hard to get to... You can't have it so that just anyone gets to go there just anytime they feel like it" (#62mdn).

Similar comments focused on the ability of cruise ships to provide a sense of remoteness to their passengers. One CS visitor argued that the cruise ship experience "leads you down the garden path" by keeping people traveling along engineered pathways that are intentionally created for commercial purposes (#50cs). And a kayaker went on a length:

I have a problem nowadays with some of these cruise ships where they literally have video cameras mounted on the decking, and they take them to the lounge downstairs, and they drive up to the glacier, and people stay inside and watch their TV monitors! ... You're not even getting to smell the air... So I got a problem with that, and the flotillas. Anything that holds 3000 people with 1200 workers on it and doesn't even rock... I don't like that because they cover so much area in such a short amount of time and take that money. (#24mdn)

#### **4.2.5. Scale/Vastness**

Visitors made comments concerning two very different effects of cruise ships on the sense of vast scale in Glacier Bay. Some visitors liked seeing a cruise ship because it helped to highlight just how big everything is: "it just looked tiny compared to everything else; it was actually kind of neat to get pictures of the ship, so that you can show the size of everything" (#16cs). "They [ships] give you a sense of the scale of the glacier...to see how massive it really is" (#53mdm). "There's nothing else around for reference! Didn't really affect my experience..." (#34sdm).

In contrast, a few comments suggested that cruise ships were inappropriately large. For example, one SDM visitor felt they should be eliminated on these grounds:<sup>3</sup>

I think there ought to be a law. They should not allow these big, huge floating cities to unload all their passengers into a town whose own population, summertime population, is only like 800. I mean, I think that's like overkill; it's ridiculous. No way, I hate it. People come to Alaska to look at the wilderness and appreciate it. If you start inundating us with all these huge floating cities, it will change the whole landscape. (#35sdm)

Several MDN visitors made similar comments, "they're almost scary—they're huge and look totally out of place. They're monsters... especially when you're next to them at water level in a kayak or on shore" (#43mdn).

Some comments suggested that the scale of Glacier Bay limited or eliminated the effect of cruise ships on their experience, particularly when cruise ships were seen only from a

---

<sup>3</sup> A kayaker, on the other hand, used the metaphor as a way to limit her objections: She said to herself "there goes a city" when seeing cruise ships; this kind of travel is not what she wants to do, but it is not a problem (#38mdn).

distance and not encountered at close range. “We saw the cruise ships, but you couldn’t really hear anything... they were a long ways away” (#21mdn). “When you see them in the distance it’s no big deal” (#45mdn). “Cruise ships were not really a problem since the place is so vast” (#49mdn). These comments suggest that strategies maximizing the distance between cruise ships and other vessels could minimize their effect on visitor experiences.

### **4.3. Sources of Effects**

Section 4.2 above discussed the effects of cruise ships on valued attributes of the Glacier Bay experience. In this section, we briefly discuss the different ways in which those effects occurred. Before describing the specific aspects of cruise ships that visitors noted, however, it is important to note that any particular encounter with another vessel might involve some or all of the different aspects. For example, a MDN visitor described an encounter with a cruise ship at Lamplugh Glacier that involved its visual presence (smoke), sound, and even smell:

It was so loud... there we are, as close as we got to a glacier and there’s this cruise ship with this constant noise, a loud buzzing sound all the time, and it smelled...we could smell their food and their perfume, and it was kind of nauseating. It kind of ruined the experience for us. Here we are in a wilderness area 50 feet from a glacier and we have to deal with that...the constant black smoke that comes out of those ships is totally gross. (#62mdn)

#### **4.3.1. Visual Presence**

A variety of comments suggested that seeing cruise ships had effects on a variety of experiences. As discussed above, these effects could be positive or negative. For example, on the positive side, some visitors reported that cruise ships provided a sense of scale that emphasized the vast space of the Glacier Bay environment, “It was actually kind of neat to get pictures of the ship, so that you can show the size of everything” (#16cs). “They [ships] give you a sense of the scale of the glacier...to see how massive it really is” (#53mdn).

In contrast, several MDN visitors felt that cruise ships detracted from the visual experience: “They’re almost scary—they’re huge and look totally out of place. They’re monsters... especially when you’re next to them at water level in a kayak or on shore” (#43mdn). “They’re *so* big; they really block your view. If you were in the wrong position, you’d miss things, even a whole glacier” (#62mdn). MDN visitors may have felt this more than other visitors due to the great difference in vessel sizes.

#### **4.3.2. Sound**

The sounds from loudspeakers and motors were a concern to a number of interviewees. It was a common complaint (for smaller boats as well as cruise ships) that public address systems were so loud that any other boats in the area were forced to hear the commentary for as much as an hour as the ship or boat passes by. This was considered a substantial

intrusion into the experience of Glacier Bay, affecting (or potentially affecting) a number of valued attributes. Sounds from ships obviously detract from the natural soundscape, but visitor comments also suggested concerns with sound impacts on other aspects of the natural environment and on visitors' ability to experience those resources. Comments sometimes described specific incidents:

A big ship came in. And it sounded like it was a presentation happening.... And you could just about hear every word of the presentation. And to me, and to all of us, that was just sound pollution that we didn't need. I'm sure the animals would have been disturbed by it too. And it was sort of in an amphitheater of ice and mountains. It just was dreadful. It didn't appreciate that, and others on board didn't either. But then I understand they have to get the message across on that thing... It was just after we'd left the glacier... I'd rather listen to the water. (#4sdm)

Other comments expressed uncertainty mixed with concern. One MDM visitor felt that noise, including underwater noise, "might disturb the birds and the wildlife; if that was going on it would really need to stop or be fixed somehow... I don't know for sure but you have to wonder... you have to wonder" (#48mdm). A CS visitor expressed similar concern:

Does the noise of the ship have some effect on the environment, the wildlife, the movement of the glacier, things like that?... If there is any damage to environment, then no, additional ships should not be allowed. I really think the environment is more important than the pleasure of a cruise if people can spoil it by their presence, even if it's totally unintentional." (#9cs)<sup>4</sup>

### **4.3.3. Wakes**

A number of respondents in the MDM visitor and MDN visitor groups brought up the issue of wake disturbances from both cruise ships and smaller vessels. Comments about wakes were mixed; some thought it was a serious problem while others found it easily manageable. "We had some pretty good swells from them while we were on anchor" otherwise no problems" (#61mdm). "Everyone is pretty respectful and follows the rules, including trying to minimize wakes" (#56mdm). "I know they were really gentle with the ships when they pulled in, not to create any big wakes or anything" (#33cs). One kayaker (#62mdn) said that the cruise ships run a big wake up onto the shore; they had a few close calls on the shoreline. They found it necessary to paddle out into the water and wait out the wake. But another (#38mdn) said she simply gets prepared for the wake from ships, so it is not a problem.

Respondents who visited the Bay in smaller boats (MDM and MDN) more often described wake disturbances from ships as an issue that detracted from the experience. "Being a smaller boat, sometimes the wake from the cruise ships would really impact

---

<sup>4</sup> This interviewee considered herself "not qualified to assess" impacts as they are biological in nature and outside of her expertise.

you...” (#55mdm). “When they’re leaving and heading out, they put out a fair wake...my only suggestion would be a 10 knot maximum speed for those ships...to cut the wake” (#59mdm). However, most who mentioned wake disturbances said that this problem is manageable. “They waked pretty badly, but it wasn’t a huge deal” (#47mdm). One kayaker felt that the problem was worse with tour and charter boats.

#### **4.4. Cruise Ships Having No Effect**

A few visitors reported that cruise ships had no effect on their trip experience. Most simply said that the cruise ships were not a problem or did not bother them personally. “I ignored it. It was kind of like a mosquito, you know; you just kind of bat it away. They had to stay in back of us, so they didn’t interrupt our experience of the landscape and seeing all the animals. It was wonderful!” (#35sdm). “We see a few...we are really there for a different reason than other people so we don’t really notice them” (#60mdm). “We’re kind of neutral about it. Everybody can’t do what we did.... Some people on our boat, though, didn’t like it” (#1sdm).

It didn’t matter to me at all. People would go out on the side and take pictures of them... I didn’t mind them being there... I never saw the people... They didn’t bother us; they didn’t go to the same places. Oh, when we was looking at the glacier, there was one in there all the same time we were. We got in closer and went around them... They didn’t get to see what we saw. (#3sdm)

Other visitors concluded that cruise ships had no effect on their experience in Glacier Bay because they successfully avoided cruise ships. These people avoided cruise ships based on the expectation that seeing cruise ships would have a negative effect on their experience in Glacier Bay, although no one knows if that indeed would have been the case. In sum, visitors reported that cruise ships had no effect on their experience for two very different reasons: 1) they encountered the ships and didn’t find them bothersome, or 2) they successfully avoided the ships and did consider them a problem.

## **5. Other Effects of Cruise Ships**

### **5.1. Ships Provide Access**

The most common reason for positive comments regarding cruise ships was that they provide access for people to see Glacier Bay. “That’s the only way you’re going to get people to support parks is to allow them to experience them on their own terms” (#21mdn).

A great way to get a zillion people in and out of the park without having an impact and then they go home and maybe they donate to a group that will help protect wilderness like this.... For some of them it’s as close as they’ll ever get to nature and if that’s all they can experience then great—I’m glad that they have had the opportunity to see it all. (#38mdn)

Many of these comments reflect a rather complex set of tradeoffs between specific impacts to Glacier Bay, personal preferences for desired experiences, beliefs that exposure to Glacier Bay will increase public support for all national parks, and pragmatic assessments of alternative policies. “I was happy that human beings got to see it; it might make some people more aware” (#2sdm). “You can’t lock them out, but you can minimize the impacts” (#22mdn). And several interviewees considered the impact relative to smaller vessels:

They are a real negative, but it is better than having all of those people in small boats.... I’d far rather not see any cruise ships, but the alternative is far worse in terms of wildlife, and expense and fuel spills. (#58mdm).

I think it’s a shame there are so many big ones, but then if we didn’t have the big ones we’d need a lot more smaller ones. It’s six of one, half a dozen of the other, isn’t it? And it’s probably better to have the big ones because they don’t get into these nooks and crannies. (#4sdm)

It may be important for the design of the future research (and is certainly important to its interpretation) to avoid looking at a single aspect of visitors’ views of cruise ships in isolation. If one considered only the stated opinion “I don’t like cruise ships” without considering the other half “but it’s great that they give so many people an opportunity to see this,” then the full meaning of the comment will be misinterpreted.

## **5.2. Effects on Local Communities**

A number of respondents were concerned about the social impacts of cruise ships in Glacier Bay, particularly on Native communities and local port communities. One SDM visitor was concerned about economic and social impacts of cruise ships at port communities. He said that most of the proceeds don’t go to communities; in his view, the cruise ship industry has huge influence politically and can force themselves into places like Glacier Bay with negative impacts on both resources and visitors’ experience (#28sdm). A cruise ships passenger who had experience living in tourist towns said that the impacts of cruise ships on port communities was a concern. The town can be swamped by the numbers of tourists and the economic outcome for these towns is mixed (i.e., they derive income, but also some money goes to outside shops, housing costs go up, etc.) (#51cs). An SDM visitor (#2) was also concerned for people living in the area, mentioning fishermen and Sitka, while another felt for local Native Americans: “I can see that that would be a big issue if I were a Native here... to have everything kind of shut off from me, not be able to go to your homeland” (#1sdm). And a kayaker was surprised and concerned that local residents have no preferential access and so they have to wait on lists to get into the park, or simply don’t go (#62mdn). A kayaker voiced similar concerns: locals should be able to “come in and bring their family and friends in the summertime, and they find out that there’s a waiting list, and they can’t even get up-bay any more. And this is their neighborhood” (#24mdn)

### **5.3. Effects on Trip Planning and Itineraries**

Among MDN and MDM visitors, a common response to the issue of cruise ships detracting is the strategy of avoidance. A number of respondents in both of these groups mentioned taking steps to avoid cruise ships, often by spending more time in the East arm of the bay where cruise ships are absent. “We chose that east arm just because we knew there would be far less boat traffic back there.” (This visitor researched ahead on the Internet) (#37K). “I kind of figured out their track and we were pretty much able to stay away from them” (#61mdm). One MDM respondent explained that cruise ships had no impact on them other than visual, as they saw them only from a distance because “we were keeping our distance on purpose when we saw them” (#48mdm). This avoidance will have an impact on survey results, affecting measures such as how many cruise ships were seen or way cruise ships affected visitors’ experiences. One potential implication of this finding is that managers should maintain opportunities for visitors to avoid cruise ships if they wish to do so. The finding also suggests that the future survey should address whether visitors make choices and plans based on other vessels at the onset of trips, in addition to measuring the experiences of visitors during their trips. The questionnaire might ask MDN and MDM respondents “did you plan your trip so as to intentionally avoid (other) motorized vessels?” And secondary effects of cruise ship avoidance, including potential crowding due to displacement, and limited effects of cruise ships based on lack of encounters, should be taken into account in the 2008 survey.

### **5.4. Ships as Corporate Symbols**

A few interviewees (SDM, MDN, and CS) considered cruise ships offensive for symbolic or ideological reasons, including corporate power, commercialism and consumption of nature, impacts outside the park, and impersonalization. One SDM visitor pointed to the political power of money: “I know the big cruise ships are gonna win out. They’ve got money, they’ve got lobbyists, so they’ll win, that’s reality” (#35sdm).

The commercialism of cruise ships came up repeatedly in informal interviews. This attitude of cruise ships as offensive may often be formed apart from or prior to the actual experience of cruise ships during a visit to Glacier Bay. It may therefore be pertinent to ask those holding this attitude whether the actual experience of the visit to the Bay and what they saw there had any impact on this attitude (or whether the what they saw in the Bay made them feel more strongly or less strongly about this).

### **5.5. Ships as an Object of Interest**

Finally, a number of interviewees considered their encounters with cruise ships to be positive (4 CS respondents, 4 MDN respondents, 3 MDM respondents, 0 SDM respondents). One cruise ship passenger (#33) enjoyed them as a marvel of engineering, and several appreciated them as an object of interest in the landscape. One CS visitor liked seeing another ship because it helped you to see just how big everything is: “it just looked tiny compared to everything else; it was actually kind of neat to get pictures of the ship, so that you can show the size of everything” (#16cs). This reflects back on the quality of vastness discussed earlier. Another respondent pointed to the novelty of seeing them: “everybody enjoyed just watching that other ship go by, something that you don’t see every day” (#17cs).

## **6. Comments Summarizing Visitors' Perspectives on Cruise Ship Management and Policy**

### **6.1. Comments Regarding the Number of Cruise Ships**

Comments from interviewees regarding quotas for the number of cruise ships in Glacier Bay covered the full range of possible options. A few visitors simply felt that more ships should be allowed in the Bay. “The people who don’t want to see the cruise ships there are the same people who move into a new area and then start fighting to keep other people from moving there because they think it might spoil the place... I can’t stand that” (#53mdm). “It really wouldn’t bother me if they put another cruise ship in there a day...in fact, I’d like to see more small boats out there” (#57mdm). And another respondent pointed out that having a number of ships and other vessels in the area provides safety, “peace of mind” in case a smaller boater gets in trouble.

A number of interviewees (mostly MDM visitors) were neutral or mixed on the idea of more ships. “[The number of ships] really doesn’t effect what I do when I’m up there...we just go there for the fishing and I doubt that the boat traffic will affect the fish” (#60mdm). “From a kayaker’s perspective, the fewer ships the better. Yet, I also think it’s great that all those people can have the chance to see it—especially those people who aren’t really outdoorsy or don’t give a shit about the environment” (#62mdn). “I would say it was neutral. It was nice that there weren’t a lot of ships” (#19cs). “My personal opinion is that the level it is at now, it doesn’t negatively affect our operation or our clients’ experience in the bay.” This interviewee indicated that, an increase of two or three cruise ships would probably not be a problem; it would take a lot more (“like 10”) to be a problem and detract from visitors’ experiences. (#56mdm)

Similarly, several other visitors felt it might be all right to allow more ships, as long as they were managed properly:

There’s got to be a real balance between the protection of the wildlife and the number of people who are allowed to see it... You could actually divide ... Bartlett Cove ... in half, ... two ships could get up to maybe that point, but when you get further north, it start closing in, the islands start becoming more [and there is less room]. (#7sdm)

I don’t know, because I think that people need to have access to Glacier Bay and the impacts of all those people in small boats would be huge, but personally I’d really rather see no cruise ships in there. Right now they could really support a larger number of small boats than they have, but there are a lot of trade-offs, with water quality impacts, a greater chance for oil spills, the wakes and that kind of thing. (#58mdm)

As a resident of Alaska, I have such a mixed feeling [about the possibility of more ships].” He says that having them makes money for Alaskans, but also he enjoys nature, “pristine views.” He ends up being neutral on the issue because of the trade-offs. (#54mdm)

Several interviewees said that more ships are not needed, or that the current number is about right. “It sounds like the demand is being met. There’s probably not a need for seven cruise ships lines to all come in with the same size boats” (#7sdm). “It’s my perspective that we have kind of reached capacity. I think that the level they have right now is about right” (#47mdm). “From my perspective, they’ve got it at the perfect point” (#49mdm). “If they want to reduce the number of ships, then that would be fine, but they really shouldn’t let any more in there” (#50cs).

While most interviewees who voiced concerns about environmental impacts of cruise ships stopped at that point, a few specified that the number of ships should be reduced if they were found to have negative environmental impacts. “They should really limit the environmental impact of these ships... maybe they need to place restrictions. Sure, the price of a cruise will go up if the demand for trips is higher, but that’s fine, let it go up. That will help to reduce the number of people that go there, and keep it pristine” (#51cs).

In a similar manner, several interviewees felt that more ships should not be allowed at all, and possibly the number should be reduced. “Reduce or minimize the amount of usage [of both cruise ships and smaller motorized boats]” (#23mdn).

I should say that I wouldn’t want to see any more up there...because it felt like a wild experience, and to have more ships, more of any of the smaller boats, it would have become like a theme park, I suppose, and I wouldn’t want to see that happen. (#52mdm)

Finally, a few respondents presented the most extreme position, stating that they wished the cruise ships were absent entirely: “I’d rather not see them when I’m there... I don’t want to see the big ships. And we don’t want them to scare away the wildlife” (#6sdm).

## **6.2. Comments Regarding NPS Management of Cruise Ships and Other Vessels**

In the course of the interviews, respondents made a number of comments, both favorable and unfavorable, regarding vessel management policies in Glacier Bay. Many were pleased to see the restrictions in place. “I was glad to see it so protected, [glad] the restrictions were strict [that they can’t discharge treated water], no business, no ship business, no cups once you enter the Bay, and I thought that was great” (#2sdm). “I think we were actually glad to see some of those restrictions on the paper or plastic cups while we were in the park” (#5sdm). “It would be terrible to see paper cups floating, or plastic bags” (#7sdm). “I like the restricted access. I think that makes it more personal and intimate” (#10cs). “That’s why I came [knowing the number of vessels are restricted]. I thought ‘someday they’re not going to let anybody see anything up here’” (#14cs).

Others were less positive about restrictions in the Bay. “I’m sure one way or another the government’s going to regulate it” (#41/42sdm). One MDM visitor argued that access to Glacier Bay as public land is the right of every American taxpayer and therefore should not be regulated: “you have people who really want nothing in there. Me, I figure it’s

federal money being spent and every one of us has got the right to go there if we want to” (#57mdm).

Another MDM visitor (#53) spoke at some length about management issues. He argued that Glacier Bay is “managed in a really anal way... they assume we’re all absolutely idiots.” For example, the respondent explains, you have to stay a mile off shore in the park, but as soon as you leave the park you can’t help but get within 10 feet of the whales sometimes and the whales don’t seem to mind. If this is not an issue, the policy should be changed. If this is actually an issue, then they need to educate the public as to the basis for this. If they can show the basis of their decisions then he would be happy to comply, but hates being given orders without explanations. He also mentions proximity to seals as an issue. “Kind of a cop first, and an ambassador maybe...you’ve got to kind of work at it... This is not Nazi Germany!” He adds that “repeating the boater education class is a problem too... two hours with same movie every year is tedious and unnecessary” (#53mdm).

## **7. Effects of Other Modes of Transport**

### **7.1. Comments Regarding Other Vessels**

In addition to discussion of cruise ships, interviewees made a number of comments about smaller ships, motorized boats, and aircraft. Many of the comments are about issues that were also discussed in terms of cruise ships: noise, wake, and crowding. While this topic may appear to be irrelevant in regard to the question of the effects of cruise ships on visitor experiences, the fact that many respondents considered this to be part of the topic under discussion demonstrates otherwise. For many of the aspects of cruise ships that impact visitor experiences, smaller ships and boats are not entirely separable, neither in the minds of respondents nor at a practical level. Crowding, for example, is not simply a matter of number of cruise ships but must take into account the total number of vessels at any particular location at one time. Furthermore, these comments suggest that some of the remarks directed at cruise ships may have as much or more to do with other ships and boats than with cruise ships themselves.

Several respondents admired or envied the charter and tour boats, their maneuverability and ability to access attractions. One kayaker complained of seeing a charter boat in Adams Inlet where he believed they were prohibited. Another advocated restricted access by boats in terms of both time and location: “It’s at the edge of this huge, huge tract of wilderness, and we don’t need to have access to every last part of it, and we don’t have to have access 24 hours a day” (#63mdn). And another would prefer to encounter no motorized boats at all: “I wouldn’t mind if it was all nonmotorized. I wouldn’t mind sailcraft, nonmotorized.” (#23mdn). Another respondent (#24mdn) also said that sailboats are the least offensive.

Numerous comments were made about noise from motorboats—all from kayakers. “We could hear small boats through the day... I don’t want to say non-stop, but it was all the time... we almost never had a time that was completely quiet.... It was clearly negative... [although] when we were on the interior of the islands it wasn’t too bad”

(#63mdn). “We saw one motor trawler. When it’s dead quiet out, ... you notice it” (#22mdn). “[The] problem with little boats that have a lot of noise and that are so slow that you have to listen to it forever. It can take an hour of noise before it passes; hear it 30 minutes before it arrives and 30 minutes after it passes” (#38mdn).

Wake was another issue raised regarding motor boats, although not as frequently as noise. One MDM visitor described problems with tour boats:

At Marjorie Glacier, tour boats got so close to the glacier that it seemed dangerous, then one of these tour boats when leaving went by them so fast—without slowing down—that it created a wake that knocked things off their shelves...that was kind of rude. But otherwise it was beautiful.... it was amazing. (#49mdm)

Another MDM visitor gave a similar description (possibly the same incident):

With some of the smaller boats, like the ones touring the glaciers...at least one time, [the impact] was very significant... This one small boat went by really fast and it had a huge wake... the wake was big enough that it knocked everything off of our shelves.... [Wake is a major issue] and it is mostly the small boats. (#52mdm)

Most comments made about wake disturbances, however, applied to cruise ships rather than smaller boats.

Crowding is another issue that arose in regard to smaller ships and boats. Quite a few MDN visitors and MDM visitors made comments in this regard. “We had to wait a long time for the main channel crossing- maybe an hour - for all the boats to go by” (#44mdn). “Wherever we went there was another boat.” (The respondent specifies at anchorages, and at all the glaciers, a “major glut” of boats at Marjorie Glacier: sailboats, cruise ships, tour boats) (#55mdm). Crowding is an issue that is not readily separable by type of vessel; it is the number of vessels at any time that seems to create the issue.

Contrary to complaints about crowding from MDN visitors and MDM visitors, a number of respondents (CS, SDM, and MDM) said they saw few or no other vessels. “I don’t have any idea how many small, private boats, charter boats, actually go in there. We didn’t see very many” (#7sdm). “We didn’t see many boats, hardly any, so there was plenty of room and you could see everything you wanted to see... there was nothing between us and the glacier and animals and stuff to get in the way and that was great, really great” (#15cs). “We were all alone at the glacier” (#17cs). A fisherman notes: “there are whole days when I don’t see another boat, except the cruise ships... I don’t have many encounters with other boats.... There really isn’t a crowding problem in there” (#57mdm).

## **7.2. Comments Regarding Aircraft**

In addition to comments about other vessels, there were a few remarks from kayakers about the impact of aircraft flying overhead. Both the sound and the jet trails were considered intrusive. “You’re watching whales, it’s peaceful out, you got the Swanson’s Thrush singing in the background, and you’ve got a plane flying overhead or some boat going by; you’ve got motorized sounds that you try to avoid when you’re up there” (#24mdn). “Especially over there at McBride, low-flying aircraft over our heads” (#21mdn). “Every three minutes a jet flies over the east arm during the day, every three minutes. You can have six trails going across the east arm. How do you disguise that in your photograph?” (#24mdn). “I think they should have a moratorium on no flights over National Parks, especially in more of a wilderness type area” (#22mdn).

## **8. Perceptions of “Wilderness”**

“Wilderness” was a term used by many respondents, and is closely related to many of the attributes of the Glacier Bay experience that were valued by all visitors. In fact, those valued attributes could be considered aspects of wilderness. As Nash (1982) points out, wilderness as a concept is much less straightforward than it may seem:

“Wilderness” has a deceptive concreteness at first glance.... There is no specific material object that is wilderness. The term designates a quality (as the “ness” suggests) that produces a certain mood or feeling within a given individual and, as a consequence, may be assigned by that person to a specific place. Because of this subjectivity, a universally acceptable definition of wilderness is elusive. One man’s wilderness may be another’s roadside picnic ground.

Because of the flexibility and inclusiveness of the concept of wilderness, an interviewee who emphasizes solitude, for example, is expressing a wilderness value even if the latter term is not used explicitly.

### **8.1. Are “Wilderness” Experiences Nonsensical to Some Glacier Bay Visitors?**

One of the concerns that motivated this qualitative study was that the experiences of different visitors to Glacier Bay would be so dissimilar that questions relevant to one group would be nonsensical to another. In particular, there was concern that questions asking visitors about various aspects of a “wilderness” experience would be difficult for CS visitors to answer. In an effort to assess whether those concerns were warranted, one or more questions about wilderness were included in interviews with CS visitors.

Among the CS visitor population, mentions of glaciers, wildlife, solitude, and photography were common. Only one interviewee in this group used the term “wilderness” without prompting, so this may indicate that this population is less likely to think in those terms. “Nature,” “wildlife,” and “environment” are similar terms that could resonate with those who do not use the term “wilderness.” The low rate of unprompted use of the term does not necessarily support the conclusion that it has no meaning for this group -- almost all who were asked if they considered this a wilderness experience

answered “yes.” CS visitors made no mention of remoteness, tranquility, or absence of humans. The latter is perhaps not surprising given their situation on a large ship with many fellow passengers. However, CS interviewees did mention solitude with fair frequency. As discussed above, this may be due to the tendency to find solitude based on the scene visitors look out upon, without regard to how large a group “we” comprises. Other comments by CS respondents seemed to contrast wilderness with the packaged, repeatable quality of commercial entertainment: “One of the things I thought was so cool about it was that what we witnessed is never going to be seen again; not the same way, not the same sequence, not the same sounds” (#10cs). “This was so natural; nobody was paid to put on a show” (#11cs).

In general, CS visitors seemed to have little problem answering a question about their “wilderness” experience. Even the one CS visitor (#19) who reported not having a “wilderness experience” appeared to understand the question: “I didn’t feel like that, being on a ship.”

Wilderness appeared to be an even more significant concept for the experience of other Glacier Bay visitors. Interviewees from each of the three remaining populations mentioned wilderness, including a full two-thirds of the MDN visitor group (of course, all MDN visitors took wilderness trips). In an interesting contrast, the interviews show that SDM passengers saw themselves as more wilderness-oriented, more environmentally aware, less consumerist, and more interested in nature and Glacier Bay than cruise ship passengers. (The MDN visitor group seems to think of itself in terms of these qualities as well, but with less effort put into distinguishing themselves from the cruise ship passengers.) The majority of comments from some SDM interviewees (even in response to questions about the ships themselves) criticized cruise ship passengers as disinterested, ecologically ignorant, more interested in shopping than nature, or having an inferior experience of Glacier Bay. The possibility that SDM visitors will base their reactions to cruise ships on beliefs regarding cruise ship passengers may be an important factor for interpreting their responses in the 2008 survey. Researchers should consider whether to include questions regarding beliefs about cruise ship passengers in the survey instruments.

## **8.2. Comments Regarding “Wilderness” and Valued Attributes of the Glacier Bay Experience**

A number of interviewees suggested that Glacier Bay was a special environment in terms of wilderness.

I’ve been in wilderness areas before but this is the first time I’ve actually felt like it was in wilderness... Eastern wildernesses [do] *not* feel like wilderness... In the Adirondacks you’ll come across a dozen other people during the trip, but [here] we didn’t see anybody (#23mdn).

Another visitor noted that it is one of the few wildernesses anywhere that “is truly wild with no people and no sign of people” (#46mdn). The one MDM visitor who mentioned wilderness did so in conjunction with other values: “quiet, wilderness feel, peace, getting

back to nature, getting to see what's there and hopefully will stay there...looking for animals, hoping to see animals that are indigenous to the area" (#49mdn).

One MDN visitor noted contrast between cruise ships and the emptiness of the Glacier Bay shoreline. "I've hiked most of the national parks in the US and this one is kind of unique in the entire country...[with] wilderness everywhere, but so many tourists all in one place" (#45mdn).

Very few, if any, interviewees commented on the Glacier Bay experience using the more subtle concepts found in the literature on wilderness experiences (e.g., oneness with nature, sense of humility, and timelessness). Two of the MDN interviewees (who were visiting together) did mention wilderness in terms of renewing the spirit or the soul, "We needed to patch up some holes in our soul. It worked" (#21mdn). You come back to wilderness and it just repairs your spirit" (#22mdn).

Some respondents were concerned that the possibility of crowding would threaten the wilderness quality in particular areas of Glacier Bay:

Would not like to see more than one boat/ship at a time at the glacier or at wildlife, could scare wildlife but it's not a lot less fun to sit there with other boats, all looking at the same thing... it should be a wilderness experience...wilderness without other motorized vehicles is an important experience for kids especially; they will remember it. (#29sdm)

Stating a more extreme position, one kayaker felt that cruise ships ruin the wilderness experience:

You are out in this wilderness and you worked hard to get there, and then you don't expect to have ... [a cruise ship sitting in front of glacier] it was so loud...there we are, as close as we got to a glacier and there's this cruise ship with this constant noise, a loud buzzing sound all the time, and it smelled... we could smell their food and their perfume, and it was kind of nauseating. It kind of ruined the experience for us. Here we are in a wilderness area fifty feet from a glacier and we have to deal with that. (#62mdn)

## **9. Conclusion**

Comments collected in this qualitative study revealed a variety of attributes valued by visitors to Glacier Bay. These valued dimensions of the experience were largely determined by opportunities to view glaciers and wildlife, and by encountering an environment in which humans and human artifacts were absent or extremely rare. In general, the valued attributes of the Glacier Bay experience were similar across the different user groups – similar enough that potential survey questions about the range of valued attributes would likely make sense to all the groups.

Comments suggested that encounters with cruise ships had the potential to affect all the valued attributes of the Glacier Bay experience. Although some effects were rarely mentioned, interviewees described effects that spanned the range of valued attributes. Sound was one of the more commonly mentioned ways in which cruise ships might affect experiences, but the sight of the ships, and their wakes also had some effects. Comments also showed that cruise ships sometimes served as symbols, and that those associations played a role in their effects on visitors. Similarly, attitudes and beliefs regarding ships and their passengers also played a role in determining the effects of ships on visitor experiences.

Several additional insights of potential importance for the design of the 2008 survey can be taken from the results of this qualitative survey. First, most motorized visitors to Glacier Bay experience the park as a scenic pathway punctuated by nodes of special interest. These nodes are made up largely of tidewater glaciers and wildlife sightings (the former being geographically fixed, the latter being more geographically variable). Interviewees' descriptions of valued attributes focused on the nodes of interest. Similarly, the effects of cruise ships and other vessels are also focused on tidewater glaciers and wildlife.

Second, the comments of many visitors showed a sophisticated awareness of the various tradeoffs relevant to cruise ship management. Some of the factors included in those comments included specific impacts to Glacier Bay, personal preferences for desired experiences, beliefs that exposure to Glacier Bay will increase public support for all national parks, and pragmatic assessments of alternative policies.

Third, the language used by visitors to describe many valued attributes of the Glacier Bay experience varied across interviewees. For example, different visitors used the terms "tranquility," "peace," or "quiet" to convey roughly the same idea. Terminology is a key aspect of how experience is conceptualized, and concepts that are attached to multiple terms may not be evoked consistently by any one of those terms. At the same time, introducing a variety of terms may bring to mind concepts that would otherwise be salient, or even introduce visitors to new concepts. Thus, there may be some risk, when designing a questionnaire, of either using limited terminology that does not resonate with some visitors or of "putting words in their mouths" by introducing terminology that visitors may not often use themselves.

It may therefore be important to use more than one term in questions regarding valued attributes in order to make the broadest connection with respondents. For example, a respondent who does not attach meaning to the term "tranquility" may react to "peace and quiet" instead. Use of alternate terminology may help to eliminate any bias caused when particular terms fail to resonate with certain individuals. Terms may also be used differently by different visitors. Both a kayaker who has been thinking about wilderness experiences for years and a cruise ship passenger who has never seriously considered the notion may answer "yes" to a question asking whether this was a wilderness experience. Designing questionnaire items that use varying terminology (and in the case of

wilderness, items that include a range of values related to a wilderness experience) will minimize any distorting effects of language on the ways experiences are expressed.

## **References**

Nash, Roderick. *Wilderness and the American Mind*, third edition (New Haven and London: Yale University Press 1982). 1.

Vande Kamp, M. E. and P. Nelson. (2007). *Research assessing current and potential impacts of cruise ships on visitor experiences in Glacier Bay National Park and Preserve: A problem analysis*. Technical report. Protected Area Social Research Unit, College of Forest Resources, University of Washington.

## **Appendix A: Interview Schedule Guiding Qualitative Interviews**

*Introduction and request to participate.*

Hello, my name is *Insert first and last name*. I work for the Protected Area Social Research Unit at the University of Washington. Along with Glacier Bay National Park and Preserve, we are doing a survey of visitors to Glacier Bay. Here is some information about the survey for you to review [hand person copy of Consent Form — give them time to review].

There are a few key points that I'd like to reiterate while you're looking it over:

- The purpose of this consent form is to assure you that the interview process is completely voluntary and confidential.
- You have the option of stopping the interview at any time
- You don't have to answer any question you don't want to.

As you can see, park management is interested in learning about visitors and their trips to Glacier Bay to help them provide the best quality of visitor experiences in the bay. This survey involves an interview concerning your experience on your trip to Glacier Bay that you just completed. The interview takes about fifteen minutes.

Do you have any questions about the study? *If yes, answer questions. If no, continue.*

Would you be willing to participate in the survey?

NO → Thank you for your time. Have a nice day.

YES → Thank you. Would you please sign the consent form in duplicate? I will be leaving one copy with you.

- ***Sign your line in advance and point out the line where they'll sign.***

The consent form asks if I can tape-record this interview so that I can represent your thoughts most accurately for this study. Please indicate if that is OK.

- Please keep in mind that the cassettes will be destroyed as soon as the project is completed and that all information in this interview is confidential.

Thank you for participating. I am going to start the interview by asking you some relatively simple questions.

Please feel free to stop me at any time for clarification.

1. What is your home zip code (or city and country if not US resident)?
2. Was this your first trip to Glacier Bay National Park?

*If not...How many other trips have you made?*

*Interviews Regarding Visitor Experiences in Glacier Bay*

What kind(s) of trip(s) did you take before? [*Lodge visit, cruise, backcountry*]

3. How long did you spend in Glacier Bay National Park on this trip?

The rest of the interview involves questions that are more open-ended. Feel free to talk through your answers in some detail.

[The topics addressed by the questions listed below will be addressed in the rest of the interview but may not be ordered or worded in the specific manner described here.]

- Describe the experience you had in Glacier Bay National Park?
  - What was the best? The worst?
  - What aspects of this experience were most important? Least important?
- Describe the experience you were expecting (hoping) to have in Glacier Bay?
- How important was a wilderness experience to your trip?
- What kinds of boats/ships did you see in Glacier Bay?
- Overall did the presence of other boats/ships affect the quality of your experience in Glacier Bay?
- How did the presence of boats/ships affect the quality of your experience?
- How did your experience with different kinds of boats compare to each other?
- How did your experience with boats/ships compare with your experience of aircraft in Glacier Bay?
- What aspects of [*insert type of vehicle*] affected your experience? [*Ask for each type of boat or aircraft that interviewee saw*]
- Where were you when [*insert type of vehicle*] affected your experience? [*Ask for each type of boat or aircraft that interviewee saw*]
- Were there other detractions to your trip?
  - What were they?
  - What aspects of your trip experience did they affect?

**[Say this without referring to your notes]** We have come to the end of our interview. I would really like to thank you again for taking the time out of your day to talk with me. Please be assured that everything we've discussed in this interview will be held totally confidential and your input will be a great help to park managers.

- If you have any questions for me in the future, or any concerns regarding our study, contact information is included on your copy of the consent form.
- Thanks very much! *Offer to shake their hand.*

## Appendix B: Incidental Information of Potential Interest to GLBA Managers

There were a number of comments about Park interpreters. “We had forest rangers twice in, and they are so intense, that that’s nice because if they’ve got somebody who’s not involved, not disposed to think it’s a problem, they will when it’s finished” (#36sdm). And a couple (#39/40sdm) found the cultural interpretation especially interesting but redundant at all of the different venues and, by default, simplistic; they would have enjoyed hearing about ‘intellectual property’ in traditional culture, not just hearing stories, but learning about traditional ownerships and telling rights. And a couple from a cruise ship had lengthier comments:

“Actually we were a little disappointed.... I understood from somebody who had been on a cruise that the park rangers come in and they’re going to explain about everything that you’re seeing... It was actually my mother, and she said ‘look for the park rangers on a cruise ship, they’ll just give a wonderful talk’ and we could never find where the rangers were. In the beginning they came on and they showed some animals, and that was nice, but I thought that was going to be in addition to other things.” (#19cs);

“And there was the slide show, and that was basically it. Then just announcing that we’re at Marjorie Glacier” (#20cs). “We just weren’t sure well where do you go to find them” (#19cs). “There was no history behind it.” “My personal opinion was that they were more interested in hawking their books and other paraphernalia than explaining what was going on” (#20cs). “We kept looking for areas where they might be speaking but we could never find areas; I’d see them eating, having lunch” (#19cs). “They could have, on the open P.A., said something, but there was nothing” (#20cs).

Regarding opportunities for multi-day motorized trips into Glacier Bay, one kayaker noted:

I was disappointed when I found out that Glacier Bay Lodge doesn’t even have a three-day charter out of the lodge any more. The *Spirit of Adventure* used to go out for three days... To me, if you really want to show people an intimate experience, it takes the smaller boats. (#24mdn)

Environmental awareness, particularly in terms of global warming, was discussed by several respondents. “We saw that program on global warming, and it was such an impact on us that when we saw all this, it made you really stop and think, just the beauty of everything, to really be ashamed (#13cs). “To see it [Glacier Bay] made you really appreciate how the earth needs to be, or how it was” (#2sdm).

“I come back later [after being here in 1992], and I’m expecting disaster after global warming, and I think ‘oh my God, I’m gonna go up there and I’d better try to see glaciers while they’re still there. They’re not gonna be there much longer;

*Interviews Regarding Visitor Experiences in Glacier Bay*

they make it sound like they're disappearing quickly.' And there might be some recession in the glaciers but there's some that are still advancing, so that kind of goes against the global norm (#24mdn).

## **Appendix C: Additional Information Relevant to Researchers Developing Survey Instruments**

One area of imprecision in this study arose from the way respondents answered some of the questions. Interviewees sometimes failed to answer the thrust of the question and instead commented on whatever related topic they felt strongly about. The most common example of this was the respondents in the SDM visitor group who, when asked about cruise ships, would comment on how glad they were that they were on a smaller ship where they had better experiences than the large cruise-ship passengers. This issue would presumably play a smaller role in a mail survey where response options are constrained.

An issue that may be of greater concern is the tendency of some respondents to mix up or combine categories that were treated as distinct for this study. Interviewees at times conflated cruise ships with other ships and boats or failed to distinguish between the number of vessels and the number of people. When addressing impacts, some focused on the ships themselves while others focused on impacts from numbers of people or from the sum total of vessels or people without distinction. This tendency to blur lines should be carefully considered in the design of the 2008 questionnaire.

The level of knowledge about Glacier Bay varied widely between groups, and within groups. The kayakers in the MDN group, for example, exhibited extensive geographical knowledge of Glacier Bay and its place names, while some cruise ship passengers fumbled for the name of Margerie Glacier or seemed unaware that there is more than one glacier in the Park. This is another factor that must be considered for the 2008 survey questionnaire study.

Interviewees were often embarrassed about taking strong positions. This created another area of imprecision in this study, and could similarly affect the 2008 research. Extreme opinions expressed before the recorder was turned on would be moderating when recorded, or positions would later be laughed away as facetious. Such interviewees appeared uncomfortable when these strong opinions were reflected back or restated. The design and/or interpretation of the 2008 survey should take into account the tendency of some respondents to moderate their opinions in this way.

The results of this study also suggest that the MDM (multi-day motorized) category was sufficiently diverse that it might be useful to distinguish between some of the sub-groups within this category. The MDM category currently includes visitors focused on fishing-recreation use of the Bay, aesthetic-recreational use (wilderness, wildlife, glaciers, scenery), and small commercial tour operators. A distinction was not made between these three categories for the purposes of this qualitative study, but such a distinction might be considered for the 2008 study.

This study also suggested it may be important to examine the ways in which “experiential gatekeepers,” such as charter boat captains, kayak tour guides, and the like, affect the experiences of their clients or other visitors they advise. Many visitors were unaware of the effort put into avoiding encounters with (other) motorized vehicles. Accordingly, data

gathered from visitors to describe their experiences may provide a relatively superficial or uninformed view with regard to control and mediation of the experience.

Comments regarding visitor experiences were consistent enough across the visitor groups to suggest that most would understand questions regarding experiences with nature and wilderness. For example, the responses from CS interviewees indicate that (contrary to the assumptions expressed by many SDM visitors) a good portion of cruise ship passengers are aware and concerned about potential impacts by cruise ships, just as they are aware of solitude, wilderness, and environment. At the same time, there is great variation in the way visitors, particularly CS passengers, spend their time during their visit, even during the relatively short time when the ships stop to view glaciers. Many stand on the decks and marvel, some hover near the NPS interpreters seeking guidance on how to comprehend, some sit at window-side chairs—of these, some watch attentively while others read books or doze—and a good many shop, typically in rooms without windows, and their experiences, at least for that portion of their trip, is not noticeably different than that of a shopper in any similar store, in any other part of America. One can hear passengers of one kind mocking the recreational choices of the others. This diversity in the level of engagement with the place is probably unique to the CS group. The MDN population might be considered to be at the other end of the scale, with maximum and consistent engagement.

It is a repeated pattern in the interviews that respondents had more objections to vessels the next larger size than their own. SDM visitors, particularly, took pains to differentiate themselves from the CS visitors, whose experiences on large ships they portrayed as inferior to their own on smaller ships. But it was much more common among CS visitors to demonstrate awareness of the impact of their own ships than among SDM visitors or MDN visitors. In general, however, the kayakers tended to find motorized boats intrusive, the motorized boats found small and large ships intrusive, and those on small ships found the large ships intrusive. It is not clear how this observation might alter the design of the 2008 questionnaire, but it may be relevant to the interpretation of the results.

The MDN visitor population and the CS visitor population (those in the smallest and largest vessels, respectively) were surprisingly close in their attitudes toward cruise ships. Two CS visitors and no MDN visitor called cruise ships harmful or destructive, and five of each population considered them potentially so. The attitudes of “detracting” and “neutral” is where the two groups diverged: six kayakers said that cruise ships were detracting, while no cruise ship passengers did so. And while four CS visitors said that cruise ships were neutral, only one MDN visitor did so. Two CS visitors and one MDN visitor considered the impact mixed, and four of each population said that cruise ships were positive. The similarity in the answers of these two groups is surprising, as they seem to be the most different in how they experience Glacier Bay: the MDN visitor from a small, unmotorized kayak and the CS visitor from a large ship with all the conveniences and hundreds of fellow passengers. Several factors could explain the similarity of the two groups, especially why the MDN visitor population was the least negative of all populations toward cruise ships. First, avoidance of cruise ships by kayakers should mean

fewer opportunities for negative encounters with cruise ships. Second, kayakers may experience more negative impact from smaller motorized boats that share the same spaces with them than from the cruise ships in the distance. Third, several pointed out that there is less impact with hundreds of people on one ship than there would be putting those people on many smaller boats. “From a kayaker’s perspective, the fewer ships the better” (#62mdn).