SCOMM

#22:7

LAW OFFICES
BIRCH, HORTON, BITTNER AND MONROE
4400 JENIFER ST., N. W. - SUITE 300
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20015
(202) 244-4250
TELEX 9-89-2591

733 W. FOURTH AVE., SUITE 206
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 279-9403
TELEX 25-356

1200 AIRPORT HEIGHTS DRIVE
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99504
(907) 279-9501

751 OLD RICHARDSON HWY., SUITE 340
FAIRBANKS, ALASKA 99707
(907) 452-1886

130 SEWARD STREET, SUITE 314
JUNEAU, ALASKA 99801
(907) 586-2890

MEMORANDUM

To: Senator Mike Colletta

Date: June 28, 1978

Revised Harris Survey

This evening we received the attached revised Harris poll analysis. We believe that it is so flawed with errors, both analytical and mathematical, that Harris will again have to revise it. We will be in contact with his organization shortly and will, of course, provide you with any changes made subsequent to the survey version below.

We have also completed a memorandum that points out the gross errors of commission and omission in this "amended" Harris poll. That memorandum is attached.

Joseph M. Chomski

LAW OFFICES
BIRCH, HORTON, BITTNER AND MONROE
4400 JENIFER ST., N. W. - SUITE 300
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20015
(202) 244-4250
TELEX 9-89-2591

733 W. FOURTH AVE., SUITE 206
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 279-9403
TELEX 25-356

1200 AIRPORT HEIGHTS DRIVE
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99504
(907) 279-9501

751 OLD RICHARDSON HWY., SUITE 340
FAIRBANKS, ALASKA 99707
(907) 452-1888

130 SEWARD STREET, SUITE 314
JUNEAU, ALASKA 99801
(907) 586-2890

MEMORANDUM

To:

Date: June 28, 1978

Changes in Analysis
"A Study of National Opinions of Alaska Park Lands"
Louis Harris & Associates, Inc.

The Steering Council for Alaska Lands commissioned Louis Harris and Associates, Inc. to conduct a national survey to determine the American public's opinion on the Alaska parklands legislation. On June 20, the Steering Council sponsored a press conference at which Mr. Richard Dresner, Vice President of the Louis Harris organization, explained the "final" results of the poll and distributed 300 copies of the survey and analysis.

Sometime the next day, Louis Harris informed the Alaskan press that the results of the poll announced the day before would be revised and described certain changes in his analysis. At no time did Harris inform his client, the Steering Council, of the proposed changes.

The following analysis quotes the changes and shows how each change misrepresents the data collected by the Harris organization. The only conclusion is that the original analysis was fairly accurate and that the changes are generally unwarranted. Some of the changes are absolutely unsupported by the data.

The first revision occurs on page 1 of the Introduction. After the first sentence, the remainder of the analysis is deleted and the following is inserted:

> "But a majority (67%) of the public is generally unaware of the legislation currently pending in Congress. Among the 32% who had heard, there was overwhelming support for it, (67% favor, 16% oppose). In addition, after being read the following statement, 'In Washington, the Congress is now writing legislation which would create national parks and refuges on Federal lands in Alaska totaling over 100 million acres. Do you think that this is a good idea?' The remainder of our sample thought that such legislation would be a good idea by 57% to 16%. Overall, then, it is clear that the American public supports the general type of legislation currently before Congress. When asked why they favor such legislation, (57%) volunteered that the preservation of Alaska ecology is top priority."

The revised analysis concluding that the American public overwhelmingly supports the Alaska National Interest Lands legislation misrepresents the data. Of those questioned, 67% had not even heard of the legislation. When they were given the description quoted above, 51% thought it was a "good idea", but a sizeable minority (32%) were not certain and 16.9% were opposed. Moreover, the 33% of the population who had "heard" of Alaska Lands legislation were not queried as to whether they knew of the particulars of any of the bills. From such figures, it is unfair to conclude that there is "overwhelming support" for any bill.

The last sentence in the introductory analysis is totally dishonest. Nowhere in the poll are the respondents given the opportunity to set priorities. Nowhere in a question or response were the words "top priority" ever used. Secondly, the last sentence stating that a majority (57%) volunteered that preservation of Alaska ecology is of top priority, misrepresents the data. The ecological reasons given to favor such legislation show that 45% of the whole sample rather than 57% favor the general concept for ecological reasons. This question included respondents favoring either the bill or the concept, which was roughly 1/2 of those polled. Not all the responses explaining why they favored the concept were ecological. By no stretch of the imagination can one conclude that more than 1/2 of the respondents believed that the ecological reasons are of top priority. Thirdly, no question in the poll gave a summary of the legislation pending before Congress. The only description of Alaska land legislation is contained in the question quoted above. The statement that the public supports such legislation extracts conclusions which are not in the poll.

The revised analysis has been slanted in favor of the Administration position by asking questions about the concept of creating parks and wildlife refuges and then transferring the data to H.R. 39. Note that the revised analysis refers to "the general type of legislation pending before Congress" (page 1), "the type of legislation" before Congress" (page 2), and "the bill passed by the House" (page 3). This is a dishonest use of data which is derived from one question in the poll. That question (question #2) refers only to legislation "Congress is now writing".

On pages 2, 7, and 8, Harris deletes the following phrase dealing with cost-effectiveness:

> "and the pipeline route is the only cost-effective way of getting the oil and gas to the market",

on the grounds that the question of cost-effectiveness was never part of the poll.

This is untrue. Question 10 of the poll reads as follows:

> "If oil or gas is discovered in an area which is adjacent to a national park or wildlife refuge, and a pipeline across the national park or refuge is the only cost-effective way of delivering the oil or gas to market, which statement most accurately reflects your views of pipeline construction?"

The above sentence was deleted from three pages and should have been kept, because it was one of the qualifications to the responses.

On page 3 Harris adds another sentence at the end of the last paragraph which reads as follows:

> "Despite the majority who favor the bill passed by the House, the public would like to see a broadening of legislation, in particular allowing access to the park areas."

No question in the poll ever refers to "the bill passed by the House". This first clause of this sentence is an outright falsehood. It also ignores the responses regarding access for oil and gas, mining, as well as several other values referred to in the poll, all of which run counter to the policies embodied in H.R. 39.

The most blatant error in the revised analysis occurs on page 11. Under the category 3.7 Parklands Services, Harris rewrites the analysis to read as follows:

> "The Federal government is planning to spend little or no funds to provide for new trails, way stations, rough vehicle roads, and other such services in the new parks or wilderness areas created by this legislation classifying Alaska lands. (89% say that no access shall be provided and 42% say that very little access shall be provided.) On the other hand, a sizeable minority (44%) say that all these methods should be provided."

The Harris revisions grossly distort the data collected. First, Harris clouds the distinction between access to parks and services in parks. His data shows that only 8% of the respondents want no parkland services. Only on wilderness lands are there no park services, so this response could be read as a rejection of wilderness. The data shows that 86% of the public wants at least some parkland services. 89% is probably a mathematical or typographical misprint, and 8% is the number intended (see computer printout data to question #15).

With regard to access to parks, the data is clear. Even in the revised survey, Harris concedes that "By an impressive ratio, 78% to 16%, the American public feels that the new national parks in Alaska ought to be accessible to the American public." (page 10) In fact, 67% want motorized access to parks. Only 6.9% want no access to parks.

CONCLUSION

In our opinion, the Harris amendments to the first "final analysis" are not supported by the data and are extremely misleading.

Constance E. Brooks

Constance E. Brooks

Joseph M. Chomski

Study #: T9886

A STUDY OF NATIONAL OPINIONS

OF

ALASKA PARKLANDS

June 1978

Conducted for

ALASKA PARKLANDS

BY

National Center for Telephone Research
A division of Louis Harris & Associates

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CROSS-REFERENCES..... i

1. INTRODUCTION..... 1

2. SUMMARY..... 2

3. WILDERNESS..... 4

3.1 Minerals..... 5
3.2 Oil and Gas Production..... 7
3.3 Pipeline Access..... 7
3.4 Cooperative Management..... 8
3.5 Development..... 9
3.6 Parklands Access..... 10
3.7 Parklands Services..... 11
3.8 Parklands Access and Cost..... 12

4. MAGNITUDE..... 13

5. ALASKA POPULATION..... 14

6. IMPACT OF MANKIND..... 15

7. ALASKA EXPERIENCE..... 16

8. TECHNICAL NOTE..... 18

8.1 Sample Design..... 20

APPENDIX..... 23

Questionnaire

1. INTRODUCTION

The concept of Alaska national-interest lands legislation is a popular one in the United States. But a majority (67%) of the public is unaware of the legislation currently pending in Congress. Among the 32% who had heard of such legislation however, there was overwhelming support for it (67% favor 15% oppose). In addition, after being read the following statement, "In Washington, the Congress is now writing legislation which would create national parks and refuges on federal lands in Alaska totaling over 100 million acres...do you think this is a good idea or not?" The remainder of our sample thought that such legislation would be a good idea by 57%-17%. Overall then, it is clear that the American public supports the general type of legislation currently before Congress. When asked why they favor such legislation, 57% volunteered that preservation of the ecology of Alaskan lands is top priority.

2. SUMMARY

The American public would like to have legislation regarding new national parklands and wildlife refuges in Alaska, and by 56% to 16% they feel the type of legislation now before congress is a good idea.

Wilderness: Only those parklands which reflect the highest scenic and wildlife values should also be classified as wilderness; the remainder should be subject to existing laws governing parks, refuges and forests.

Minerals: A survey of mineral deposit potential on national-interest lands should be made before the land is classified in such a way that would prohibit mining.

Oil and Gas Production: Such resources should be developed as long as the production does not interfere with the main purposes of a park or refuge.

Utility Access: Pipeline access can be permitted across national parks or refuges in Alaska, as long as environmental safeguards are followed, and the purpose of a park or refuge is not violated by the presence of a pipeline.

Cooperative Management: The federal government should manage these lands cooperatively with the State of Alaska.

Development: Land can be developed while natural, scenic, wildlife and environmental values are also protected.

Parklands Access: The legislation should provide for a means of access, and the most convenient means for the American people is the automobile. The National Park Service should provide trails, way stations, rough vehicle roads and other facilities in some of the new national parks created in Alaska.

Legislation with these features is what the American public would select as appropriate for d(2) legislation in the Congress. Despite the majority who favor the bill passed by the House, the public would like to see a broadening of the legislation, particularly to allow more access for visitors to the parks area.

3. WILDERNESS

The American is inclined to classify federal land in Alaska as wilderness only if the land reflects the highest scenic and wildlife values. "Wilderness" was explained as follows:

> "In addition to the creation of the parks and refuges, Congress is seeking to classify some Alaska parks, refuges, and existing national forest lands as "wilderness," which under federal law means that no roads, physical structures like cabins or recreational buildings or development of any type can ever be placed on the land."

Given three views on wilderness classifications, the survey found the following consensus, and variation:

> Fifteen percent opted for the statement that "All or most of the parks, refuges, and national forest lands should also be classified as wilderness." This is essentially the position reflected in the bill which passed in the United States House of Representatives in May, 1978.
>
> Fifty-nine percent opted for the statement that "Only those portions of the national parks and refuges which reflect the highest scenic and wildlife values should be also classified as wilderness, with the remainder subject to the existing laws governing national parks, refuges and forests." This is essentially the position reflected by the State of Alaska and the Steering Council for Alaska Lands.
>
> Seventeen percent opted for the statement that "Existing laws provide enough protection to parks, refuges and national forests, so the more restrictive wilderness classification is not needed." This is a position taken by some development interests.

A majority favors the middle statement in all regions of the nation, save New England, where a plurality (45%) select it, and where 27% select the first statement, which is often characterized as the "instant wilderness" provision. It does appear that as density of population increases, the inclination to apply instant wilderness to Alaska parks and refuges also increases. The American population must draw upon its own experience of space in order to reflect a value which would classify land use elsewhere, and in the urban Northeast, this experience derives from a density of population thousands of times greater than that which exists in Alaska.

3.1 Minerals

There is no hard evidence about mineral potential under these national-interest lands in Alaska. Therefore, the legislation must settle on a procedure for discovering such potential, and decide whether such knowledge should then be used for determining the land use for a mineralized area.

On this count, 71% of the American public think that "Congress should make a survey of mineral deposits such as copper, uranium or coal, before it decides to classify federal land in Alaska so as to prohibit mining." About 20% of the public oppose that view, while 9% are unsure.

A large majority of the public in each of the eight major regions of the country support this view:

	For the survey of minerals before classification of land	Against the survey of minerals before classification of land
	%	%
Nation	72	20
New England	65	26
Middle Atlantic	72	22
South Atlantic	77	14
Southwest	63	25
East-Midwest	69	19
West-Midwest	73	16
Mountain	73	21
Pacific	75	19

Note: Percentages do not add to 100 since 9% were unsure or undecided.

Under the wilderness provisions of the Alaska Lands Conservation Act which passed in the United States House of Representatives in May, 1978, minerals access is prohibited. The majority of the acreage classified in that legislation is designated as wilderness.

3.2 Oil and Gas Production

If oil or natural gas is discovered on a national park or wildlife refuge in Alaska, the resource should be developed, but only if it does not interfere with the main purpose of the park or refuge, according to a plurality (43%) of the American public. This sentiment runs to 47% in the Southwest, West-Midwest and Pacific states.

Significant minorities prefer in this case that "oil and gas should not be produced unless a national emergency arises" (30%); or the opposite feeling that "oil or gas should be produced immediately but with environment safeguards" (25%).

If the oil and gas production could be accomplished without interfering with the purposes of the park or refuge, two-thirds of the American public would prefer the development to come about.

3.3 Pipeline Access

By relatively the same ratio, the American public would permit pipeline utility access across a national park or refuge, under the same conditions. Forty-seven percent of the public agree that the pipeline should be built across the park, as long as it does not interfere with the purposes for which the park or refuge was created. In addition, 27% believe that the pipeline should be built, even if it

does interfere with the purposes of the park and refuge, but only if environment safeguards are provided. Finally, 23% think that the pipeline should not be built unless there is a national emergency.

Almost three-fourths of the American public would permit pipeline access across a national park or refuge in Alaska, as long as environmental safeguards were followed, the purposes of the park were not violated. The American public looks at the oil and gass production issue and the pipeline access issue in almost the same way.

3.4 Cooperative Management

A significant majority (59%) of the American public would like to have the State of Alaska and the federal government manage lands cooperatively, if these large tracts of state and federal lands lay next to each other. This is an approach proposed by the State of Alaska and the Steering Council for Alaska Lands, but largely rejected by the United States House of Representatives. There, the law created a management system similar to that which is approved by 34% of the American public, where each government essentially manages its lands in Alaska separately.

Endorsement of the cooperative management concept exceeds 60% of those surveyed in the Middle Atlantic states and in the Mountain and Pacific states (where many states have experience with large tracts of federally-owned land with their borders). The least amount of support for cooperative management can be found in the American Southwest, where a majority (55%) still support it.

3.5 Development

The values behind the legislation which passed in the United States House of Representatives are summed up by the brief statement,

> "There is very little undeveloped land remaining in America, and we should save all we can from further development,"

and one can find this sentiment expressed one way or the other in just about all the Congressional Record statements in support of the Alaska Lands Conservation Act, which passed in the House in May. In this national survey, however, only 32% opt for the above statement. A plurality (41%) of the American public believe, instead, that,

> "Americans have learned that land can be developed while natural, scenic, wildlife and environmental values are also protected."

While another 22% say :

> "There is plenty of undeveloped land in America and further development will help the economy."

In the debate over environmental and economic values in the national-interest lands in Alaska, the American public comes down solidly in the middle. The public believes that land can be rationally developed, and resources taken, without extreme, adverse environmental impact.

3.6 Parklands Access

By an impressive ratio, 78% to 16%, the American public feels that the new national parks in Alaska ought to be accessible to the American public. This feeling is universal in all regions of the country.

Asked how such access could be brought about, the public came forth with 29 various responses, a majority of which related to the automobile, roads, highways, trains, and buses -- surface access. Only 5% mentioned small aircraft, and 2% boats -- the only transportation modes which could possibly penetrate the new parklands created in Alaska.

Supporters of the U. S. House version of the Alaska Lands Conservation Act often cited the case that these federal lands were meant for the enjoyment of all the American people -- not just those living in Alaska. It appears that the American people agree. They believe

parks are for people. Only 5% of the American public suggested a restricted means of access to these new American parklands in Alaska, while 13% felt that a form of public transportation ought to be available.

3.7 Parklands Services

The federal government is planning to spend little or no funds to provide for trails, way stations, rough vehicle roads, and other such services in the new parks or wilderness areas created by this legislation classifying Alaska lands. A bare majority of the public agree that little or no access should be provided to these lands. (89% say that no access should be provided and 42% say that very little should be provided). On the other hand a sizeable minority (44%) said that all these methods of access should be provided for. A similar finding in an Alaskas survey[1] was reported in February, 1978, where the question read:

> "Do you believe roads, railroads or some other form of surface transportation should be built to these parks to provide easy access to large numbers of people?"
>
> 31% yes, to all parks.
> 48% yes, to some parks.
> 21% no,
> 1% it depends upon the park.

[1]"Alaskans Talk About National Interest (d-2) Lands," Rowan Group Report for the Steering Council for Alaska Lands, February, 1978, 467 personal in-home interviews statewide.

Americans and Alaskans are in agreement as to the access of people to the new national parklands created by this legislation.

3.8 Parklands Access and Cost

The American public reported that its total budget for a two-week, family vacation in a national park in the U.S.A. would average out to slightly over $500 per family. Thirty-four percent of the American families would fall below the $500 budget estimate, and 38% come in above it, with 28% unsure about an estimated budget for such a vacation.

The Alaska Visitor Census and Expenditure Survey, previously cited, indicates that the average visit was slightly over 2 weeks, the average pleasure-visitor expenditure was $443, and the most popular mode of transportation once in the State was the automobile for the 1976-77 year.

Since the average visitor expenditures in-state are already close to the average estimate of a whole two-week budget for a family vacation, and since the cost of getting to Alaska from one of the continental states is always significant but not accounted for here, it does appear that only the upper-income families in the U.S.A. could afford to visit Alaska national parklands. Further, if the National Park Service does not provide access into the national parks in Alaska, and visitors must use small planes or boats to gain the experience of being in these parks, the cost is probably prohibitive for all but a handful of Americans.

4. MAGNITUDE

Asked to estimate the magnitude of 100,000,000 acres against a list of states of increasingly larger sizes, the public makes a fairly close estimate in 47% of the cases, and in the remaining cases either estimates on the low side, or cannot say at all. Twenty percent of the sample estimates the acreage as about the size of Rhode Island, Delaware, Massachusetts or Connecticut, whereas in actuality all four of these states could fit comfortably into 100 million acres several times over. The low estimates appear to come from the smaller states, and the correct, larger estimates from the larger states, more than the average.

5. ALASKA POPULATION

The American public places the probable Alaska population at around one million, although half of the sample had no idea and refused to make an estimate. Some 10% felt that Alaska's population was over three million persons, and 16% estimated, accurately, that the population in the 49th State was less than half a million. Actual population is about 430,000 people.

6. IMPACT OF MANKIND

The American public believes that people have had a far greater effect on Alaska and its land mass than in fact they have had. Only 5% of the public estimate correctly the percentage of land in Alaska which is "occupied by, affected by, or inhabited by people, or any development which people create..." Examples given were "a city, a road, a pipeline, an airport," the works of man, and his impact. The actual impact is at 1% or less of Alaska's land mass, but a majority of the American public places man's impact on the land at anywhere from 10% of the land to over 50% of the land. These estimates indicate that the American public thinks that the impact of mankind in Alaska is not that far behind the impact found in their home states, a false proposition.

7. ALASKA EXPERIENCE

In 15% of the American households in the sample, someone living there had visited Alaska at some time in their lives. While 13% of low- and middle-income families had a household member who visited Alaska, 18% of the upper-income families, earning $20,000 or more per year, did so. Regionally, the lowest visitation rate occurs in New England (10%), and the highest in the Pacific (23%) and Mountain (27%) states.

Among those who have never visited Alaska, 32% hoped to do so within the next five years. This includes 43% of the upper-income American households, and from 39% to 45% of Americans living in the Southwest, Mountain or Pacific states of the union.

Taken together, households where a family member has visited Alaska and households where a family member has hoped to visit Alaska in the next five years, comprise 42% of all American households contacted in the national survey.

The most common reason offered by those who have visited or who hope to visit Alaska in the next 5 years is recreation; in fact, 56% offer recreation, a vacation, tourism, camping, fishing, backpacking, and so on, as the reason for the potential, intended

visit. Actual visitor census information[1] indicates that 60% of the 1976-77 visitors to Alaska traveled there for recreation or pleasure. The hard visitor statistics on Alaska corroborate the intentions found in this national survey.

In addition, the survey finds that 8% of those intending to visit Alaska will do so as a function of their work, and 9% will visit as a result of military service.

---

1 Alaska Visitor Industry, a summary prepared by the Department of Commerce and Economic Development, State of Alaska, March, 1978.

8. TECHNICAL NOTE

This study involved 1219 interviews conducted with a random sample of adult residents of the United States. All of our respondents were at least 18 years of age; those under 18 years old were excluded from the sample.

All the interviews for this study were conducted between May 20th and May 24th, 1978. Our interviewers work between 4 P.M. and 11 P.M. on weekdays. All interviews were completed by telephone from centralized phone banks in New York City.

All the interviewers used in this project have had extensive previous experience and were provided with continuous supervision throughout the interview process. The two most important elements of this supervisory process are: (1) an edit of each survey instrument as soon as the interview is complete, which permits us to uncover obvious problems quickly and to recontact respondents for missing information where necessary and (2) an audit using silent monitoring equipment to evaluate the quality of each interviewer while actually on the telephone. The process we use for selecting our respondents is a form of random-digit dialing. Our interviewers are given the first five digits of a series

of randomly selected residential telephone numbers that have been previously stratified by geographic location. They then add to these two randomly generated digits to complete a new seven-digit number. The purpose of this process is to guarantee the inclusion of individuals in our sample who have unlisted telephones and the more transient elements in the population whose telephones are not yet listed. While about 95% of all American households have phones, in some subgroups (blacks, for example) the percentage of families with unlisted and non-listed numbers approaches 40%. Thus, a random-digit procedure is essential to obtain a sample with the correct demographic balance.

In order to complete this study we reached individuals at 2054 telephone numbers. Three-hundred and eighty-four of these calls were made to people under 18 years of age or to businesses, institutions, pay phones, etc., and were excluded from the sample. Of the remaining 1670, 366 refused to be interviewed and 139 more terminated during the interview.

In order to reduce the number of individuals who refused to participate,our interviewers asked those who initially refused to cooperate to set up an appointment to call them back at a more appropriate time. During

this study, 59 appointments were set up in this way.

	Number	% of Eligible Respondents Contacted
		%
Completed interviews	1219	64
Refusals	366	29
Terminated during interview	85	6
Total of eligible contacts	1670	
Ineligible respondents	384	
Total calls completed	2054	

In addition to these 2054 numbers, many others were dialed which rang but were never answered. These are primarily numbers which are not in service or belong to businesses, but to reduce the chances that a respondent was simply not home, each of these numbers was dialed at different times during the survey period.

8.1 Sample Design

Surveys at Louis Harris and Associates and National Center for Telephone Research are based on national samples of the civilian population of the United States. Those in prisons, hospitals, or religious and educational institutions are not represented in the sample.

The samples are based on census information on the population of each state in the country. These population figures are updated by intercensal estimates produced annually by the Bureau of the Census, and sample locations are selected biennially to reflect changes in the country's demographic profile.

National samples are stratified in two dimensions -- geographic region and metropolitan (and non-metropolitan) residence. Stratification ensures that the samples will reflect, within 1%, the actual proportions of those living in the country in different regions and metropolitan (and non-metropolitan) areas. Within each stratum the selection of the ultimate sampling unit (minor civil divisions: cities, towns, and townships) is achieved through multi-stage cluster sampling. First states, then counties, and then minor civil divisions are selected with probability proportional to census estimates of their respective household populations.

Within ultimate clusters, respondents are selected by a newly developed application of random-digit dialing (RDD). First, telephone numbers are systematically selected from directories covering the designated ultimate clusters. Before dialing, the final two digits of a published listing are randomly varied in order to decrease sampling bias by bringing the population of unlisted numbers within the sample frame. Since only 20% of

potential subscribers' lines are working and assigned, this method maintains sample efficiency by confining selection to working blocks of phone numbers.

Given the final size of our sample, the overall error due to sampling is as follows:

For percentages of about 50	+/-3.6%
For percentages of 30 to 70	+/-3.3%
For percentages of 20 or 80	+/-2.9%
For percentages of 10 or 90	+/-2.2%
For percentages of 5 or 95	+/-1.6%

These percentages represent two standard errors. Therefore, for most of the data in this study, the chances are 95% to 100% that the true values lie within a range equal to the reported percentages plus or minus the sampling error.

APPENDIX

NATIONAL CENTER FOR TELEPHONE RESEARCH
250 West 57th Street
New York, N.Y. 10019

May 1978

Date_____

Study no. T9886

Telephone No._____ Interviewer_____

Hello, my name is_____ and I'm with National Center for Telephone Research. We're conducting a study of public opinions and I'd like to talk to any adult 18 years old or older.

1. FROM OBSERVATION: Sex

Male	(6(___	-1
Female	___	-2

2. In Washington, the Congress is now writing legislation which would create national parks and refuges on federal lands in Alaska totaling over 100 million acres. Have you heard of this legislation or not?

Yes	(7(___	-1	(ASK 3)
No	___	-2	(SKIP TO 4)
Not sure	___	-3	(SKIP TO 4)

3. (IF "YES" IN 2, ASK) Do you favor or oppose it?

Favor	(8(___	-1	(SKIP TO 5)
Oppose	___	-2	(SKIP TO 6)
Not sure	___	-3	(SKIP TO 7)

4. (IF "NO" OR "NOT SURE" IN 2, ASK) From what I have just described to you, do you think it is a good idea or not?

Good idea	(9(___	-1	(SKIP TO 5)
Not good idea	___	-2	(SKIP TO 6)
Not sure	___	-3	(SKIP TO 7)

5. (IF "FAVOR" IN 3 OR "GOOD IDEA" IN 4, ASK) Why?

_____(10(-
_____(11(-
_____(12(-

6. (IF "OPPOSE" IN 3 OR "NOT GOOD IDEA" IN 4, ASK) Why?

_____(13(-
_____(14(-
_____(15(-

7. (ASK ALL) In addition to the creation of the parks and refuges, Congress is seeking to classify some Alaska parks, refuges, and existing national forest lands as "wilderness", which under federal law means that no roads, physical structures like cabins or recreational buildings, or development of any type can ever be placed on the land. Which statement most accurately reflects your views about these "wilderness" proposals?

a. All or most of the parks, refuges, and national forest lands should also be classified as "wilderness" (16(___-1

b. Only those portions of the national parks and refuges which reflect the highest scenic and wildlife values should be classified as "wilderness", with the remainder subject to the existing laws governing national parks, refuges and forests. ___-2

c. Existing laws provide enough protection to parks, refuges and national forests, so the more restrictive "wilderness" classification is not needed. ___-3

Don't know enough, not sure ___-4

8. Do you think the Congress should make a survey of mineral deposits such as copper, uranium or coal, before it decides to classify federal land in Alaska so as to prohibit mining?

Yes (17(___-1
No ___-2
Not sure ___-3

9. If oil or natural gas is discovered on a national park or wildlife refuge in Alaska, which statement most accurately reflects your feelings about production?

a. The oil or gas should not be produced unless a national emergency arises, (18(___-1

b. The oil or gas should be produced, but only if the development does not interfere with the main purpose for which the park or refuge was created. ___-2

c. The oil or gas should be produced immediately, but with environmental safeguards, even though the development may interfere with the purpose of the park or refuge to some degree. ___-3

Not sure ___-4

10. If oil or gas is discovered in an area which is adjacent to a national park or wildlife refuge, and a pipeline across the national park or refuge is the only cost-effective way of delivering the oil or gas to market, which statement most accurately reflects your views of pipeline construction?

a. The pipeline should not be built unless a national emergency arises. (19(___-1

b. The pipeline should be built across the park or refuge, but only if it does not interfere with the purposes for which the park or refuge was created. ___-2

c. The pipeline should be built across the park or refuge with environmental safeguards even though it may interfere with the purpose of the park or refuge to some degree. ___-3

Not sure ___-4

11. If one large tract of wild, undeveloped land owned by the federal government lies next to a similar wild and undeveloped tract of land owned by the State of Alaska, do you think that the federal and state governments should manage the lands cooperatively, or should each government manage its lands in Alaska separately?

Cooperatively (20___-1
Separately ___-2
Not sure ___-3

12. At this time, which of the following statements most accurately reflects your views?

a. There is very little undeveloped land remaining in America, and we should save all we can from further development. (21(___-1

b. Americans have learned that land can be developed while natural, scenic, wildlife and environmental values are also protected ___-2

c. There is plenty of undeveloped land in America and further development will help the economy. ___-3

Other_____ ___-4

Not sure ___-5

13. Do you think that any new national parks created by Congress ought to be easily accessible to the American public?

Yes (22(___-1 (ASK 14)
No ___-2 (SKIP TO 15)
Not sure ___-3 (SKIP TO 15)

14. (IF "YES" IN 13, ASK) By what means?

_____(23(
(24(
_____(25(

15. (ASK ALL) Should the National Park Service provide trails, way stations, rough vehicle roads and such to the new national parks created in Alaska, or should very little of this access be provided for, or should none be provided for?

Provide all	(26(	-1
Very little		-2
None		-3
Not sure		-4

16. Has anyone in your household ever visited Alaska?

Yes	(27(	-1 (SKIP TO 18)
No		-2 (ASK 17)
Not sure		-3 (ASK 17)

17. (IF "NO" OR "NOT SURE" IN 16, ASK) Does anyone in your household hope to visit Alaska in the next five years?

Yes	(28(	-1 (ASK 18)
No		-2 (SKIP TO 19)
Not sure		-3 (SKIP TO 19)

18. (IF "VISITED" IN 16 OR "HOPE TO VISIT" IN 17, ASK) For what purpose?

_____(29(-
(30(-
_____(31(-

19. (ASK ALL) If you and your family were to spend a 2-week vacation in a national park in this country, what would you estimate as a reasonable, total budget for you to do that...something you could afford to do, or have done?

_____(32 -1
Not sure -y

20. How many people live in Alaska today? (DO NOT READ)

Over 3 million	(33(	-1
Between 1 and 3 million		-2
Less than 1 million		-3
Less than half a million		-4
Not sure		-5

21. What percentage of all the land in Alaska would you estimate is occupied by, affected by, or inhabited by people, or any development which people create, like a city, a road, a pipeline or an airport? (DO NOT READ)

Less than 1%	(34(	-1
From 1 to 4%		-2
From 5 to 8%		-3
From 9 to 15%		-4
From 16 to 25%		-5
From 26 to 50%		-6
Over 50%		-7
Not sure		-8

22. The new parks and refuges proposed for Alaska by Congress total around one hundred million acres. How big is one hundred million acres, as you imagine it? (READ CHOICES)

About the size of Rhode Island or Delaware	(35(	-1
About the size of Massachusetts or Connecticut		-2
About the size of Colorado or Indiana		-3
About the size of Montana or California		-4
About the size of Texas, or larger		-5
Not sure		-6

23. Into what age group do you fall?

18-20	(36(	-1
21-24		-2
25-29		-3
30-34		-4
35-39		-5
40-49		-6
50-64		-7
65 & over		-8
Refused		-9

24. Could you estimate for me the total annual income of your household?

$5,000 and under	(37(	-1
$5,001-10,000		-2
$10,001-15,000		-3
$15,001-20,000		-4
$20,001-25,000		-5
$25,001 and over		-6
Refused		-7

25. FROM OBSERVATION: Region

Far West	(38(	-1
Southwest		-2
Deep South		-3
Mid-Atlantic		-4
Midwest		-5
Northeast		-6

26. State subsamples

Connecticut	(39(	-1	Ohio		-5
Idaho		-2	Oregon		-6
Louisiana		-3	Washington		-7
New Hampshire		-4	West Virginia		-8