Supporting Statement A

Social Values of Ecosystem Services at Cape Lookout National Seashore

OMB Control Number: 1024-NEW

Terms of Clearance: None.

---

1. Explain the circumstances that make the collection of information necessary. Identify any legal or administrative requirements that necessitate the collection

The mission of the National Park Service's (NPS) is to preserve the nation's natural and cultural heritage (National Park Service Act of 1916; 16USC§1 et seq.). To accomplish that mission NPS managers must manage people who visit parks so that resources are protected. The success of efforts to manage park visitors is partially dependent on park managers' understanding of people's knowledge, perceptions, and values concerning the park and its resources. Social science research in support of park planning and management is discussed in the National Park Service (NPS) Management Policies 2006 (Section 8.11.1, "Social Science Studies"). The NPS pursues a policy that facilitates social science studies in support of the NPS mission to protect resources and enhance the enjoyment of present and future generations (National Park Service Act of 1916, 38 Stat 535, 16 USC 1, et seq.). NPS policy affirms that social science research will be used to provide an understanding of park visitors, the non-visiting public, gateway communities and regions, and human interactions with park resources. As such research is needed to provide a scientific basis for park planning, development, and resource management. This information collection supports the NPS mission by providing an understanding of park visitors, the non-visiting public, gateway communities and regions, and human interactions with park resources (NPS Management Policies 8.11.1). It furthers the research mandate of NPS to incorporate research results into park management decisions (National Parks Omnibus Management Act of 1998; 16USC§§5931-5937).

Cape Lookout National Seashore (CALO) managers are in the process of preparing several resource management plans including: Wildlife Management Plan, Off-Road vehicle Plan, Historic Resource Management Plan, and Shoreline Protection Plan. Park managers have requested this study to help them understand visitors and local residents' perceptions and level of support for management actions balancing the need to protect park resources and provide for public enjoyment.

In response to their need to incorporate social values into their ecosystem services assessments, CALO managers requested a survey to quantify the perceived social values for ecosystems, such as aesthetics, biodiversity, and recreation. These values, often equating to cultural ecosystem services, will be used to distinguish park users and local residents' attitudes and preferences regarding public uses of public lands. This study will collect information that will be used to by managers to understand what people value about the park and where on the landscape those values exist. The results will be combined with existing spatially mapped data that will provide an overall assessment of known park resources, visitor uses, perceptions and values.

2. Indicate how, by whom, and for what purpose the information is to be used. Except for a new collection, indicate the actual use the agency has made of the information received from the current collection. Be specific. If this collection is a form or a questionnaire, every question needs to be justified.

This information will be used by CALO managers and planners to understand the values visitors and local residents place on services at CALO. Park managers are interested in knowing more about visitor knowledge, attitudes and satisfaction concerning natural resources management within the park. CALO managers request a study that would help them to gather information about park users and local residents' perceptions and attitudes towards park management of protected species, climate change, and protection of beaches and shoreline policies and regulations. Information about visitor values have and an expanded role for natural resource giving voice to values and concerns that may not otherwise be expressed in natural resource decision-making processes. Park managers have no other way to gather information about the places visitors' value and most importantly they have no information about why visitors value these places. This information will be used to update the current communication and outreach programs that will include input from the public..

Annotated versions of the surveys are included as supplementary documents in the relevant ICs in ROCIS.

3. Describe whether, and to what extent, the collection of information involves the use of automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses, and the basis for the decision for adopting this means of collection. Also describe any consideration of using information technology to reduce burden and specifically how this collection meets GPEA requirements.

The primary method of collection will be mail-back surveys.

4. Describe efforts to identify duplication. Show specifically why any similar information already available cannot be used or modified for use for the purposes described in Item 2 above.

There are no known duplication of efforts.

5. If the collection of information impacts small businesses or other small entities, describe the methods used to minimize burden.

This collection is not expected to have any impact on small business or small entities. We will only survey members of the general public visiting the park and local residents in the communities surrounding the park.

6. Describe the consequence to Federal program or policy activities if the collection is not conducted or is conducted less frequently, as well as any technical or legal obstacles to reducing burden.

This study will provide information about how the public values the park resources. The survey will also measure the visitors' and residents' level of satisfaction with park managers' decisions and provide opinions about quality of services and facilities at the park. No similar study has ever been conducted at the Cape Lookout National Seashore. Absent this study, the park managers will not have adequate data to evaluate how well park resources are being managed to fulfill the dual mission of protecting resources and providing for public enjoyment. In addition, the surveys will provide feedback from visitors and local residents on management issues and suggestions for improvement.

There are no technical or legal obstacles to reducing burden for this collection.

7. Explain any special circumstances that would cause an information collection to be conducted in a manner:
- **requiring respondents to report information to the agency more often than quarterly;**
- **requiring respondents to prepare a written response to a collection of information in fewer than 30 days after receipt of it;**
- **requiring respondents to submit more than an original and two copies of any document;**
- **requiring respondents to retain records, other than health, medical, government contract, grant-in-aid, or tax records, for more than three years;**
- **in connection with a statistical survey that is not designed to produce valid and reliable results that can be generalized to the universe of study;**
- **requiring the use of a statistical data classification that has not been reviewed and approved by OMB;**
- **that includes a pledge of confidentiality that is not supported by authority established in statute or regulation, that is not supported by disclosure and data security policies that are consistent with the pledge, or which unnecessarily impedes sharing of data with other agencies for compatible confidential use; or**
- **requiring respondents to submit proprietary trade secrets, or other confidential information, unless the agency can demonstrate that it has instituted procedures to protect the information's confidentiality to the extent permitted by law.**

This request contains no special circumstances with the exception of item 2 above. We will ask respondents to return their responses within 30 days after receipt of the survey. This is a voluntary survey and respondents are not obligated to respond.

8. If applicable, provide a copy and identify the date and page number of publication in the Federal Register of the agency's notice, required by 5 CFR 1320.8(d), soliciting comments on the information collection prior to submission to OMB. Summarize public comments received in response to that notice and in response to the PRA statement associated with the collection over the past three years, and describe actions taken by the agency in response to these comments. Specifically address comments received on cost and hour burden.

Describe efforts to consult with persons outside the agency to obtain their views on the availability of data, frequency of collection, the clarity of instructions and recordkeeping, disclosure, or reporting format (if any), and on the data elements to be recorded, disclosed, or reported.

Consultation with representatives of those from whom information is to be obtained or those who must compile records should occur at least once every three years — even if the collection of information activity is the same as in prior periods. There may be circumstances that may preclude consultation in a specific situation. These circumstances should be explained.

The Federal Register notice requesting comments was published on August 2, 2012 (77 FR 46113). The notice announced that we would submit this information request to OMB for approval. In that notice we solicited public comments for 60 days, ending October 1, 2012. We received one comment that did not address any changes to the information collection burden or the content of the survey, therefore we did not make any changes to this collection based on this comment.

In addition to our Federal Register notice, we solicited comments from five professionals with expertise in natural resource management and planning as well as survey design and methodology. We asked them to provide feedback about the validity of each question and the clarity of instruction. We conducted two focus groups to test the overall clarity of the questions and the estimated time to complete a paper version of the questionnaire. For Group #1 we enlisted the help of 7 University of Idaho graduate students to test the visitor questionnaire. For Group #2 we enlisted the help of 8 University of Idaho graduate students to test the resident questionnaire.

Based on the results of the focus groups we determined that the average time to complete the both versions of the survey to be about 20 minutes. This included the time the respondents needed to read the accompanying cover letter, review instructions and complete the survey.

The review panel members were asked to provide comments concerning the structure of the survey and if the estimated time to complete seemed adequate. The panel concurred with our estimated burden to complete the survey to be about 20 minutes or less for both versions of the survey. We received several editorial and grammatical suggestions to provide clarity and to correct punctuation. Those edits were incorporated into the final versions of both surveys. For example, questions concerning social value mapping in both surveys have been revised based on experts' recommendations. The original scale and mapping technique were developed by Brown and Reed (2000). Since then the methods have been widely adapted for use in many other studies. Survey respondents were often asked to identify as low as 3 places per value (Brown et al., 2004, Brown et al. 2008) and as high as 6 or 8 places per value (Brown et al 2007, Alessa et al 2008, Nielsen-Picus 2011). A single place per value approach is not appropriate because respondent often associate a value to more than one place in the geographic area of interest. Asking respondent to select only one location will create more burden because the participants will have to go through an internal ranking to pick out the "best" place which cognitively harder to process. The experts recommended 5 places per value as an appropriate number for the size of the area.

Names and contact Information of individuals requested to review and pilot test the survey.

Greg Brown, Associate Professor of Environmental Planning School of Geography Planning and Environmental Management University of Queensland Brisbane Qld 4072 Australia Phone: (61) 336-56654 greg.brown@uq.edu.au	Don A. Dillman, Regents Professor Department of Sociology Deputy Director The Social and Economic Research Center Washington State University Pullman, WA 99164-4014 Phone: 509-335-1511 dillman@wsu.edu

Kenneth J. Bagstad, Research Economist U.S. Geological Survey Geosciences & Environmental Change Science Center PO Box 25046, MS 980 Denver, CO 80225 Phone:303-236-1330 kjbagstad@usgs.gov Eva Strand, Assistant Professor, NIFTT/FRAMES Outreach Wildland Fire Program University of Idaho 875 Perimeter Drive MS 1133 Moscow ID 83844-1133 Phone: 208-885-5579 evas@uidaho.edu	Steven Hollenhorst, Professor and Dean Huxley College of the Environment Western Washington University Bellingham, WA 98225-9079 Phone: 360-650-3521 steve.hollenhorst@wwu.edu

9. Explain any decision to provide any payment or gift to respondents, other than remuneration of contractors or grantees.

There are no payments or gift giving associated with this collection.

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

We will not provide any assurances of confidentiality. Names and contact information (e.g., street address) will be maintained only for the purpose of follow-up contact with non-respondents. Respondent names or addresses will not appear in any of our reports or findings. All responses will be anonymous and the respondent's names will never be associated with their responses. The database containing all contact information will be completely destroyed at the conclusion of this information collection.

11. Provide additional justification for any questions of a sensitive nature such as: sexual behavior and attitudes, religious beliefs, and other matters that are commonly considered private. This justification should include the reasons why the agency considers the questions necessary, the specific uses to be made of the information, the explanation to be given to persons from whom the information is requested, and any steps to be taken to obtain their consent.

No questions of a sensitive nature are asked.

12. Provide estimates of the hour burden of the collection of information. The statement should:

- **Indicate the number of respondents, frequency of response, annual hour burden, and an explanation of how the burden was estimated. Unless directed to do so, agencies should not conduct special surveys to obtain information on which to base hour burden estimates. Consultation with a sample (fewer than 10) of potential respondents is desirable. If the hour burden on respondents is expected to vary widely because of differences in activity, size, or complexity, show the range of estimated hour burden, and explain the reasons for the variance. Generally, estimates should not include burden hours for customary and usual business practices.**
- **If this request for approval covers more than one form, provide separate hour burden estimates for each form and aggregate the hour burdens.**

* **Provide estimates of annualized cost to respondents for the hour burdens for collections of information, identifying and using appropriate wage rate categories. The cost of contracting out or paying outside parties for information collection activities should not be included here. Instead, this cost should be included under "Annual Cost to Federal Government."**

This collection will involve two surveys.

1) **Visitor Survey:** While on-site at CALO we will randomly select 3,168 visitors to participate in the survey. We assume that 35% (n=1,109) of those contacted will return a completed survey. All visitors approached will be asked to answer the following questions:

   1. Is this your first time visiting Cape Lookout National Seashore?
   2. What is your zip code?
   3. How many people are in your group?

   And those who refuse will be asked to provide a reason for refusal.

   These questions will be used to address any non-response bias. The responses and gender will be recorded in a survey log and compared to results from respondents completing and returning the questionnaire to see if non-response bias is present.

2) **Resident Survey:** 3,600 household addresses will be contacted. Assuming that 10% will be undeliverable (n=400) and a 30% response rate, this implies that we will have 1,080 respondents and 2,520 non-respondents.

   Non-response bias will be examined by selecting a random sample of all non-respondents. We will send a 2 minute survey card to 1,900 of the non-respondents, assuming a 10% response rate we expect to receive 190 responses from this group.

The response rates for both surveys were estimated based on results of similar studies (Browns 2004, 2005 & 2006; Sherrouse et al. 2011; Van Riper et al. 2012)

Table 1: Estimate of annual respondent burden.

	Number of Respondents	Completion Time (mins)	Burdens (hours)
Visitor Survey			
Initial Contact	3,168	2	106
Completing the survey	1,109	20	370
Resident Survey			
Completing the Survey	1,080	20	360
Non-response Survey	190	2	6
TOTAL	5,547		**842**

We estimate the total annual dollar value of this collection to be $ 25,934 (Table 2). We multiplied the estimated burden hours by $30.80 (for individuals or households). This wage figure includes a benefits multiplier and is based on the National Compensation Survey: Occupational Wages in the United States published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics Occupation and Wages, (BLS news release USDL-12-2162 for Employer Costs for Employee Compensation—September 2012 at - http://www.bls.gov/news.release/ecec.nr0.htm), dated December 11, 2012).

Table 2: Estimated Dollar Value of Respondent Annual Burden Hours.

Activity	Annual Number of Responses	Total Annual Burden Hours	Dollar Value of Burden Hours (Including Benefits)	Total Dollar Value of Annual Burden Hours
Visitor Survey				
Initial Contact	3,168	106	$30.80	$14,661
Completing the survey	1,109	370		
Resident Survey				
Completing the Survey	1,080	360	$30.80	11,273
Non-response Survey	190	6		
	4,438	**842**		**0**

13. Provide an estimate of the total annual non-hour cost burden to respondents or recordkeepers resulting from the collection of information. (Do not include the cost of any hour burden already reflected in item 12.)

- **The cost estimate should be split into two components: (a) a total capital and start-up cost component (annualized over its expected useful life) and (b) a total operation and maintenance and purchase of services component. The estimates should take into account costs associated with generating, maintaining, and disclosing or providing the information (including filing fees paid for form processing). Include descriptions of methods used to estimate major cost factors including system and technology acquisition, expected useful life of capital equipment, the discount rate(s), and the time period over which costs will be incurred. Capital and start-up costs include, among other items, preparations for collecting information such as purchasing computers and software; monitoring, sampling, drilling and testing equipment; and record storage facilities.**
- **If cost estimates are expected to vary widely, agencies should present ranges of cost burdens and explain the reasons for the variance. The cost of purchasing or contracting out information collection services should be a part of this cost burden estimate. In developing cost burden estimates, agencies may consult with a sample of respondents (fewer than 10), utilize the 60-day pre-OMB submission public comment process and use existing economic or regulatory impact analysis associated with the rulemaking containing the information collection, as appropriate.**
- **Generally, estimates should not include purchases of equipment or services, or portions thereof, made: (1) prior to October 1, 1995, (2) to achieve regulatory compliance with requirements not associated with the information collection, (3) for reasons other than to provide information or keep records for the government, or (4) as part of customary and usual business or private practices.**

There are no non-hour burden costs resulting from the collection of this information.

14. Provide estimates of annualized cost to the Federal government. Also, provide a description of the

method used to estimate cost, which should include quantification of hours, operational expenses (such as equipment, overhead, printing, and support staff), and any other expense that would not have been incurred without this collection of information.

We estimate that the total cost to the Federal Government for processing and reviewing completed surveys and preparing reports as a result of this collection of information will be $126,778. This cost includes Federal employee salaries and benefits and operational expenses. The table below shows Federal staff and grade levels performing various tasks associated with this information collection. We used the Office of Personnel Management Salary Table 2011 General Schedule (GS) Locality Pay Tables to determine the hourly rate (see: http://www.opm.gov/flsa/oca/12tables/pdf/den_h.pdf). We multiplied the hourly rate by 1.5 to account for benefits (as implied by the BLS news release mentioned above).

Table 3. Annualized Federal Employee Salaries and Benefits.

Position	Grade/ Step	Hourly Rate	Hourly Rate incl. benefits (1.5 x hourly pay rate)	Estimated time (hours) per task	Annual Cost
Project Manager	12/5	$40.10	$60.15	160	$9,624
Project Advisor	12/4	$38.92	$58.38	160	$9,340
Project Advisor	12/2	$36.56	$54.84	160	$8,774
			Total	480	0

Table 4 Estimation of Operational Expenses

Operational Expenses	Costs
Contract Support Survey Design and Development, Survey Administration, Data Collection, Data entry, Data analysis and Reporting	**64,043**
Printing Costs	**$4,200**
Postage	**$7,541**
Travel	**23,256**
Total	**0**

15. Explain the reasons for any program changes or adjustments in hour or cost burden.

This is a new request.

16. For collections of information whose results will be published, outline plans for tabulation and publication. Address any complex analytical techniques that will be used. Provide the time schedule for the entire project, including beginning and ending dates of the collection of information, completion of report, publication dates, and other actions.

Data analysis will include frequency distributions and descriptive statistics, percentages, response averages to report the findings from the survey. Factor analysis will be used to create measurement indexes of attitude/behavior toward climate change issue, level familiarity with the park, level of awareness of park management practices, and level of trust in park management. Multivariate analysis of variance and multiple regressions will be used to compare between residents and non-residents, users and non-users, and among different user groups

In addition, this collection will explore the potential for mapping spatially distribution social values as a method to understand the social values assigned to key ecosystem services managed by the park. We will use SolVES (Social Values for Ecosystem Services) as a tool to map social and ecological values to provide an understanding of the differences (if any) between visitor and local resident perceptions with park management goals and practices. Ultimately, park managers will be able to use this information to understand how the public relates to current ecosystem services and management.

The final deliverables will include a comprehensive report to the park, manuscript to scientific peer review journals and professional meetings. Given the complexity of analyses we estimate it will take approximately 5 months to complete.

Total time anticipated to work on this project is 14 months.

	July 2013	August 2013	September 2013	October 2013	November 2013	December 2013	January 2014	through	June 2014
Resident survey			X	X	X	X			
Visitor survey	X	X	X	X	X	X			
Data analysis							X	X	X
Final report to the park									X
Manuscript preparation & submission to journal							X	X	X

17. If seeking approval to not display the expiration date for OMB approval of the information collection, explain the reasons that display would be inappropriate.

We will display the OMB control number and expiration date on the information collection instruments.

18. Explain each exception to the topics of the certification statement identified in "Certification for Paperwork Reduction Act Submissions."

There are no exceptions to the certification statement.