

**Please provide the specific research questions to be answered with these surveys.**

These surveys will be used to achieve two main goals. These are:

1) to assess the effectiveness of various outreach tools that were implemented as part of the NMFS “Protect Dolphins” campaign, which educates the public that feeding and harassment of wild dolphins is illegal and harmful; and

(2) to determine if there are more applicable and appropriate outreach tools to convey the “Protect Dolphins” campaign message to the intended audience.

NMFS initiated its national “Protect Dolphins” campaign in 1997, with efforts focused on the Panama City area because it is a hot-spot for illegal feeding and harassment of wild dolphins. Since then, numerous other outreach techniques have been used to complement the Protect Dolphins message and to reach target audiences, such as NMFS marine mammal viewing guidelines, town hall meetings, billboards, etc. NMFS believes assessing the effectiveness of current outreach tools is crucial to determine if the conservation messages are being conveyed and received by the intended audiences for two main reasons: (1) illegal feeding and harassment of wild dolphins continues to increase in Panama City and throughout the southeast region; and (2) educational messages have been implemented for well over a decade, and to date, there has not been an attempt to see if the messages have been received by the target audience. This survey is focused on the Panama City Beach, FL area because it has been a hotspot for illegal feeding and harassment of wild dolphins for almost two decades.

Some of the specific questions these surveys are designed to answer to help achieve the stated goal are as follows:

What general categories of existing outreach tools appear to have been effective in educating visitors, residents, and employees of recreation-based businesses in Panama City, FL of the legality and harm caused by feeding and harassing wild dolphins? Which existing categories of outreach tools have been ineffective at reaching the intended audiences with the intended outreach messages?

What currently underutilized outreach tools are potentially an effective means of educating visitors, residents, and employees of recreation-based businesses in Panama City, FL of the legality and harm caused by feeding and harassing wild dolphins?

Do demographic characteristics, such as household income and education level influence the effectiveness of various outreach tools?

Do the knowledge and attitudes of issues related to dolphin feeding and harassment differ according to the type of recreation-based business? Are certain types of recreation-based businesses more prone or more willing to provide education on these issues to their customers than other types of recreation-based businesses?

**Given the small number of expected responses and the number of questions and options, with what power can these research questions be answered?**

For many of the questions, responses will primarily be reported as means (for quantitative answers) or frequencies (for categorical answers).

A few of the survey questions did contain a large list of outreach tools that were provided to aid recall. When evaluating the effectiveness of one tool over another, we will find natural aggregation of categories to condense the number of categories to 11 (including “other” and “cannot recall”). So as an example, consider the survey question which asks the respondent to check the box next to various categories of outreach tools. If one or more of the posted sign subcategories (located at docks, fishing piers, visitor centers, or other) is marked, any of those subcategories will be treated as a posted sign category. We will then evaluate the percentage of respondents who learned particular messages through a particular tool according to the higher level of aggregation.

**For the tourism survey, what do we know about the target demographics? Has the survey been reviewed for clarity and design with this population in mind?**

Some basic demographic information on Panama City, FL residents are available through:

<http://www.fedstats.gov/qf/states/12/1254700.html>

Information concerning Panama City, FL residents are as follows:

The population in 2006 was 36,807; in 2000, it was 36,417.

The number of residents who are both age 25 years or older and are high school graduates is 19,522 (based on 2000 data).

18.9% of those age 25 years or older have a college degree (based on 2000 data).

In 1999, the median household income was \$31,562 (\$40,975 in current dollars)

The racial composition of Panama City residents in 2000 was 73.6% White, 21.5% Black, 0.6% American Indian and Alaska Native, 1.6% Asian, Native Hawaiian or some other Pacific Islander, and 2.7% some other race or two or more races. 2.9% are Hispanic or Latino origin.

Demographic profiles of tourists to the Panama City beaches are not readily available. However, we did receive some basic information on visitor patterns in 2008 from the Panama City Beach Convention and Visitors Bureau. Some of this information is as follows:

The average length of stay is 5.8 days.

The average age of the head of household is 43.1.

The average number of people in travel party is 2.7.

The median annual household income is \$73,613.

8.7% of visitors are Florida residents.

42.8% reside in the Southeast, 27.2% in the Midwest, 7.1% in the Southwest, and 5.2% in the Northeast.

8.9% are either from other parts of the US, Canada or Europe.

The survey has been designed to be easily understood at a junior high reading level. To further aid in ease of reading and responding to questions, we incorporated suggested changes to simplify the language and visual presentation of the survey. The suggested changes were provided through several rounds of review by those who were mindful that the population of respondents were likely to have at least an 8<sup>th</sup> grade education. Because demographic information for this population is limited, we included questions on this survey to gain greater insight on characteristics of Panama City beach visitors in order to help us achieve the goal of ensuring our outreach messages are reaching target audiences.

**Is there any more recent basis for the 75% estimated response rate for individuals? How long was the survey in the 1983 study? What other similarities and differences should we be aware of?**

The reference listed in #1 of Part B of the supporting statement Kalton (1983) is actually a book on survey design. He states that in-person surveys have typical response rates of about 70-75%. In addition, a committee formed to evaluate the pros and cons of face-to-face interview versus phone interviews for the American National Election Studies, indicated that in-person surveys tend to have a response rate that is about 15% higher than telephone surveys (NESACSM, 1999).

While examples of surveys similar to ours were not readily available, a few of the following examples of recent intercept surveys demonstrate that the estimated response rate for this study is in line with other intercept studies:

A study commissioned by the Oregon Department of Transportation and carried out as intercept surveys to collect truck data using a roadside intercept survey method at an interstate highway weigh station, a Port of Portland marine terminal, and a private freight warehouse/distribution center, all in the Portland, OR metro area in 2003. The response rate for those who were asked to participate was 95% at the highway weigh station, 93% at the Port of Portland and 100% at the Distribution Center. This survey, designed to be two minutes in length, was much shorter than ours.

McCluskey, et al (2005) carried out a study in 2003 using an intercept survey approach at conventional supermarkets and natural foods markets in order to determine what attributes consumers consider when making beef purchases, with a special focus on attributes that may lead to the purchase of grass-fed beef. The response rate for this was approximately 50%.

Shivlani, et al (2008) completed a recent study to determine knowledge, attitudes and perceptions of Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary management strategies among stakeholders. The stakeholder groups, mode, and response rates were commercial fishermen (86.2%) through intercept surveys, diver operators (77.5%) through either phone or intercept surveys, and members of a specific environmental group (11.6%) through mail survey.

Miller, et al (1997) conducted a street-intercept survey to assess the feasibility of street-intercept surveys versus random digit-dial telephone surveys in terms of its use in reaching population segments in urban areas that were considered difficult to reach, for example urban areas with high rates of crime. The street-intercept survey was carried in 1992, and again in 1993. It asked for demographic information and health related questions. In 1992, the survey consisted of 64 items and took about 10 to 15 minutes to complete. The 1993 version consisted of 91 items and took about 15 to 20 minutes to complete. The authors only provided the response rate for the 1993 survey, which was 80.2%.

**How will the individual survey be conducted? How will the intercept locations be selected? Given that the general purpose is awareness of dolphins, why wouldn't intercepts near dolphin-related activities bias the results?**

The survey is aimed toward tourists and local residents and will be administered in person. The data collector will notify the  $n^{\text{th}}$  passerby that he has been randomly selected to respond to a survey evaluating the effectiveness of existing education and outreach efforts. The data collector will also stress that because the respondent was randomly selected, it is important that this person participate and answer honestly so that the responses provided by him and other respondents are informative and useful.

The general purpose of the survey is not intended to raise awareness about dolphins in Panama City, FL (see answer to question 1). Rather, the purpose is to evaluate the effectiveness of NMFS' outreach techniques and determine if there are more appropriate outreach tools to convey NMFS' Protect Dolphin conservation messages. Panama City has been a national hot-spot for illegal feeding and harassing of wild dolphins for almost two decades, and a well-known tourist destination where many people participate in water-based activities or tours that may promote or conduct potentially illegal activities. These activities mainly take place from commercial dolphin viewing tours, ecotours, charter tours, and either rental platforms for recreational use by tourists or privately owned vessels/platforms by residents. Therefore, NMFS routinely places outreach materials at locations such as boat ramps; marinas where dolphin viewing and tours dock their vessels; beach-side hotels; etc. While it is true that intercepts near marine-related

activities would likely yield results that differ from those located 50 miles from shore, we chose to target the survey to those respondents who are likely to participate in these water-related activities in order to ensure the survey results yield the intended results of evaluating NMFS' educational materials that are targeted to these audiences and in these locations.

**What is the appropriate N? Will the hours for intercepts be fixed or will there be a quota of intercepts?**

We are using a sample size for which we have the resources, given that our goal is to gain information of the effectiveness of various outreach tools. A sample size of 400 would achieve a 95% level of confidence and 5% margin of error. With our proposed sample size of 900 for the visitor survey, we would improve on these margins of error.

We anticipate using a quota of intercepts, of roughly 100 approaches per day across several intercept locations.

**What is the basis for the estimated 75% response rate for businesses?**

See the earlier justification for the 75% response rate anticipated for the visitor survey.

**How will the businesses be contacted? How many times?**

Survey administrators will visit all businesses that are identified as providing water-based recreation activities, during non-peak seasons and times. If the business owner or manager cannot complete the survey at the time s/he is contacted, but is willing to do so, the survey administrator will return at a mutually agreed-upon time. If the business owner or manager is not available, the survey administrator will return repeatedly until contact with the appropriate party is made.

**Please describe specifically who is eligible for the token gift and what they must do to obtain it. Please explain how this shouldn't be construed as a reward for responding.**

When we wrote the supporting statement, we were still exploring the option of providing the token gift. We have since decided not to provide a token gift, because we did not have enough NOAA logo items on hand, and funding was not available to replenish the supply for this purpose. More plentiful NOAA logo items contained references to protecting wild dolphins, which would not be appropriate given the potential to bias the results of this survey. We do not anticipate the response rate to be significantly affected.

**References**

Jessup, E, KL Casavant, and CT Lawson (2004). Truck Trip Data Collection Methods. Final Report written for the Oregon Department of Transportation and the Federal

Highway Administration. Report available at  
[http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP\\_RES/docs/Reports/TruckTripData.pdf](http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP_RES/docs/Reports/TruckTripData.pdf)

Kalton, Graham (1983) Introduction to Survey Sampling. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc

McCluskey, JJ, TI Wahl, Q Li, and PR Wandschneider (2005). U.S. Gras-Fed Beef: Marketing Health Benefits, Journal of Food Distribution Research. November Vol. 36, No. 3, pp. 1-8.

Miller, Kevin, LB Wilder, FA Stillman and DM Becker (1997). The Feasibility of a Street-Intercept Survey Method in an African-American Community. American Journal of Public Health. April , Vol. 87, No. 4. pp. 655

NESACSM (1999) The State of Scientific Knowledge on the Advantages and Disadvantages of Telephone vs. Face-to-face Interviewing. American National Election Studies Technical Report Series, No. nes010173

Shivlani, M, Leeworthy VR, Murray, TJ, Suman, DO, and F Tonioli (2008). Knowledge, Attitudes and Perceptions of Management Strategies and Regulations of the Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary by Commercial Fishers, Dive Operators, and Environmental Group Members: A Baseline Characterization and 10-year Comparison. Marine Sanctuaries Conservation Series ONMS-08-06. U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Office of National Marine Sanctuaries, Silver Spring, MD. 170 pp.

Please also note that we will be amending the PRA supporting statement to fix a discrepancy we just discovered regarding the number of completed responses.