NOTICE OF OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET ACTION

Date 06/29/2015

Department of Commerce
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

FOR CERTIFYING OFFICIAL: Jennifer Jessup
FOR CLEARANCE OFFICER: Jennifer Jessup

In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act, OMB has taken action on your request received 05/29/2015

ACTION REQUESTED: Extension without change of a currently approved collection
TYPE OF REVIEW REQUESTED: Regular
ICR REFERENCE NUMBER: 201505-0648-013
AGENCY ICR TRACKING NUMBER:
TITLE: Evaluation of Public Visitors' Experience of Exhibits at Mokupapapa Discovery Center
LIST OF INFORMATION COLLECTIONS: See next page

OMB ACTION: Approved without change
OMB CONTROL NUMBER: 0648-0582
The agency is required to display the OMB Control Number and inform respondents of its legal significance in accordance with 5 CFR 1320.5(b).

EXPIRATION DATE: 06/30/2018 DISCONTINUE DATE:

BURDEN:	RESPONSES	HOURS	COSTS
Previous	250	31	0
New	250	31	0
Difference			
Change due to New Statute	0	0	0
Change due to Agency Discretion	0	0	0
Change due to Agency Adjustment	0	0	0
Change due to PRA Violation	0	0	0

TERMS OF CLEARANCE:

OMB Authorizing Official: Dominic J. Mancini
Acting Deputy Administrator,
Office Of Information And Regulatory Affairs

List of ICs			
IC Title	Form No.	Form Name	CFR Citation
Visitor Survey	NA	Mokupapapa Discovery Center - General Public Visitor Interview	

PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT SUBMISSION

Please read the instructions before completing this form. For additional forms or assistance in completing this form, contact your agency's Paperwork Clearance Officer. Send two copies of this form, the collection instrument to be reviewed, the supporting statement, and any additional documentation to: Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, Docket Library, Room 10102, 725 17th Street NW, Washington, DC 20503.

1. Agency/Subagency originating request
NOAA/NOS/ONMS

2. OMB control number b. [ ] None
a. 0648 - 0582

3. Type of information collection (*check one*)
a. [ ] New Collection
b. [ ] Revision of a currently approved collection
c. [✔] Extension of a currently approved collection
d. [ ] Reinstatement, without change, of a previously approved collection for which approval has expired
e. [ ] Reinstatement, with change, of a previously approved collection for which approval has expired
f. [ ] Existing collection in use without an OMB control number
For b-f, note Item A2 of Supporting Statement instructions

4. Type of review requested (*check one*)
a. [✔] Regular submission
b. [ ] Emergency - Approval requested by ____/____/____
c. [ ] Delegated

5. Small entities
Will this information collection have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities? [ ] Yes [✔] No

6. Requested expiration date
a. [✔] Three years from approval date b. [ ] Other Specify:____/____

7. Title NWHI Mokupapapa Discovery Center Exhibit Evaluation

8. Agency form number(s) (*if applicable*) NA

9. Keywords Evaluation of Public Visitors' Experience at Mokupapapa Discovery Center

10. Abstract

This request is for a revision and extension of a currently approved information collection. Mokupapapa Discovery Center (Center) is an outreach arm of Papahanaumokuakea Marine National Monument that reaches 60,000 people each year in Hilo, Hawai`i. The Center was created eleven years ago to help raise support for the creation of a National Marine Sanctuary in the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands. Since that time, the area has been proclaimed a Marine National Monument and the main messages we are trying to share with the public have changed to better reflect the new monument status, UNESCO World Heritage status and the joint management by the three co-trustees of the Monument. We therefore are seeking to find out if people visiting our Center are receiving our new messages by conducting an optional exit survey.
MDC is requesting to conduct a second survey to evaluate patron acuity to determine successful concept attainment. By conducting thorough evaluations it will aid in vital decisions regarding exhibit renovation, new exhibits, interpretation programs, and educational

11. Affected public (*Mark primary with "P" and all others that apply with "x"*)
a. P Individuals or households d. ___ Farms
b. ___ Business or other for-profit e. ___ Federal Government
c. ___ Not-for-profit institutions f. ___ State, Local or Tribal Government

12. Obligation to respond (*check one*)
a. [✔] Voluntary
b. [ ] Required to obtain or retain benefits
c. [ ] Mandatory

13. Annual recordkeeping and reporting burden
a. Number of respondents 250
b. Total annual responses 250
1. Percentage of these responses collected electronically 0 %
c. Total annual hours requested 31
d. Current OMB inventory 31
e. Difference 0
f. Explanation of difference
1. Program change
2. Adjustment

14. Annual reporting and recordkeeping cost burden (*in thousands of dollars*)
a. Total annualized capital/startup costs 0
b. Total annual costs (O&M) 0
c. Total annualized cost requested 0
d. Current OMB inventory 0
e. Difference 0
f. Explanation of difference
1. Program change
2. Adjustment

15. Purpose of information collection (*Mark primary with "P" and all others that apply with "X"*)
a. ___ Application for benefits e. P Program planning or management
b. x Program evaluation f. ___ Research
c. ___ General purpose statistics g. ___ Regulatory or compliance
d. ___ Audit

16. Frequency of recordkeeping or reporting (*check all that apply*)
a. [ ] Recordkeeping b. [ ] Third party disclosure
c. [ ] Reporting
1. [ ] On occasion 2. [ ] Weekly 3. [ ] Monthly
4. [ ] Quarterly 5. [ ] Semi-annually 6. [ ] Annually
7. [ ] Biennially 8. [✔] Other (describe) One time

17. Statistical methods
Does this information collection employ statistical methods
[✔] Yes [ ] No

18. Agency Contact (person who can best answer questions regarding the content of this submission)
Name: Andrew Collins
Phone: 808-725-5802

19. Certification for Paperwork Reduction Act Submissions

On behalf of this Federal Agency, I certify that the collection of information encompassed by this request complies with 5 CFR 1320.9

NOTE: The text of 5 CFR 1320.9, and the related provisions of 5 CFR 1320.8(b)(3), appear at the end of the instructions. *The certification is to be made with reference to those regulatory provisions as set forth in the instructions.*

The following is a summary of the topics, regarding the proposed collection of information, that the certification covers:

(a) It is necessary for the proper performance of agency functions;

(b) It avoids unnecessary duplication;

(c) It reduces burden on small entities;

(d) It used plain, coherent, and unambiguous terminology that is understandable to respondents;

(e) Its implementation will be consistent and compatible with current reporting and recordkeeping practices;

(f) It indicates the retention period for recordkeeping requirements;

(g) It informs respondents of the information called for under 5 CFR 1320.8(b)(3):

- (i) Why the information is being collected;
- (ii) Use of information;
- (iii) Burden estimate;
- (iv) Nature of response (voluntary, required for a benefit, mandatory);
- (v) Nature and extent of confidentiality; and
- (vi) Need to display currently valid OMB control number;

(h) It was developed by an office that has planned and allocated resources for the efficient and effective management and use of the information to be collected (see note in Item 19 of instructions);

(i) It uses effective and efficient statistical survey methodology; and

(j) It makes appropriate use of information technology.

If you are unable to certify compliance with any of the provisions, identify the item below and explain the reason in Item 18 of the Supporting Statement.

Signature of Senior Official or designee	Date

Agency Certification (signature of Assistant Administrator, Deputy Assistant Administrator, Line Office Chief Information Officer, head of MB staff for L.O.s, or of the Director of a Program or StaffOffice)	
Signature signed by Cheryl Marlin for Hugh Johnson	Date 5/27/2015
Signature of NOAA Clearance Officer	
Signature BRABSON.SARAH.1365710488 Digitally signed by BRABSON.SARAH.1365710488 DN: c=US, o=U.S. Government, ou=DoD, ou=PKI, ou=OTHER, cn=BRABSON.SARAH.1365710488 Date: 2015.06.30 15:49:41 -04'00'	Date

SUPPORTING STATEMENT
EVALUATION OF PUBLIC VISITORS' EXPERIENCE OF EXHIBITS AT MOKUPAPAPA DISCOVERY CENTER
OMB CONTROL NO. 0648-0582

A. JUSTIFICATION

1. Explain the circumstances that make the collection of information necessary.

This request is for extension of a currently approved information collection.

The enabling legislation for the National Marine Sanctuary system, the National Marine Sanctuaries Act (NMSA), denotes specific educational mandates. Section 309(c)(1) of the NMSA states that one of the purposes of the Office of National Marine Sanctuaries (ONMS) is:

> " . . .to enhance public awareness, understanding, appreciation and wise and sustainable use of the marine environment, and the natural historical, cultural and archeological resources of the national Marine Sanctuary System. Efforts supported, promoted, or coordinated under this subsection must emphasize the conservation goals and sustainable public uses of national marine sanctuaries and the System."

In 2005, the planning committee of the National Marine Sanctuary Program (NMSP) developed a 10-year strategic plan of operations for the organization. Specific goals and strategies were established to guide the progress of the Education and Outreach program. The Education and Outreach goal is: "To enhance nation-wide public awareness, understanding and appreciation of marine and Great Lakes ecosystems and maritime heritage resources through outreach, education and interpretation efforts".

The specific performance measure, in place since 2010, for evaluating this goal is:

> "… all education programs implemented in national marine sanctuaries will be assessed for effectiveness against stated program goals and objectives and appropriate National and State education standards."

The NMSP education team has embarked on an ambitious evaluation project that will allow the NMSP to assess education program outcomes and impacts across all sites and activities and to link outcome measures to program efforts. The purpose of this effort is to evaluate if current and future education efforts are meeting the goals and objectives of the education and outreach programs and the educational mandates of the National Marine Sanctuaries Act. The continued application of these findings will assist in assessing current installed content and creating new content and information delivery methods.

Program to be evaluated

Mokupāpapa Discovery Center (MDC), an ONMS interpretive facility, located on the island of Hawai`i, is an outreach education center designed to interpret the natural and cultural history of

the Papahānaumokuākea Marine National Monument (PMNM). The Center was designed to interpret the natural sciences, culture, and history of the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands (NWHI) and surrounding marine environment. The MDC exhibits were created to inform the public and garner support for protection for the remote area. The abundant natural life of the NWHI comes alive within MDC with replicas of sharks swimming overhead, a 3,500 gallon aquarium, and a mockup submersible.

After eleven years of operation, MDC has a consistent annual 60,000 visitors per year. Based on our location, the MDC has achieved a good balance between local residents and visitors to the island. MDC is an integral part of downtown Hilo, with frequent repeat visitors. MDC collaborates with public, private and charter school educators and services approximately 4,200 students annually.

Being a Marine National Monument and UNESCO World Heritage Site* has had a major impact on the outreach activities we are trying to get across to the public. MDC is examining what concepts we are conveying in our exhibits and programmatic materials. As MDC develops new content, we are taking into account not only NOAA's Papahānaumokuākea Marine National Monument (PMNM) messages, but also applicable messages from our co-trustees, the US Fish and Wildlife Service and the State of Hawai`i, as well as the NMSP's and NOAA's goals.

MDC is requesting to evaluate patron acuity to determine successful concept attainment. By conducting thorough evaluations it will aid in vital decisions regarding exhibit renovation, new exhibits, interpretational programs, and educational content. A survey very similar to the one proposed here, and which formed the basis for this survey, was completed in January 2010 (OMB Control No 0648-0582, approved in January 2009) and provided valuable data on visitor demographics, and exhibit effectiveness. We had intended with the last (2012) extension request, to conduct the survey again in 2013 but due to relocation of the facility in 2013-2014, and re-opening in March of 2014, we were unable to do this. Our new facility is four blocks down the street from our previous location but nearly all the exhibits and layout are the same. We have modified several of the exhibits in the facility, and added programming better tailored to the audiences described by the original survey. This survey will allow us to determine the effectiveness of these exhibits and program changes/improvements, and will also allow us to determine any changes in our audience. Since conducting the last survey we have gained World Heritage status, and we would also like to determine what change this may have on our audience.

The survey conducted in 2010 was created through a contract with a professional evaluation company (People, Places and Designs Research, http://ppdresearch.com/). From this survey we

* World Heritage is the designation for places on Earth that are of outstanding universal value to humanity and as such, have been inscribed on the World Heritage List to be protected for future generations to appreciate and enjoy. Once a country signs the Convention, and has sites inscribed on the World Heritage List, the resulting prestige often helps raise awareness among citizens and governments for heritage preservation. Greater awareness leads to a general rise in the level of the protection and conservation given to heritage properties. A country may also receive financial assistance and expert advice from the World Heritage Committee to support activities for the preservation of its sites (from http://whc.unesco.org/en/faq/#q2).

were able to better determine our audience, as well as which exhibits were being used most frequently. *A survey report was created, and we have submitted it with these responses*. In response to the feedback from the first survey we have expanded our live aquaria exhibits, have increased interactive exhibit content, and also tailored some of our program offerings to the needs of resident visitors, whom we were able to determine from the survey, composed half of our visitors. This request is to run the survey again, probably next year, to see how visitor experience, and composition, is changing over time, and if our new/revised exhibits, as well as our new, larger location, are effective. Note: changes to exhibits did not cause changes to the questions.

2. Explain how, by whom, how frequently, and for what purpose the information will be used. If the information collected will be disseminated to the public or used to support information that will be disseminated to the public, then explain how the collection complies with all applicable Information Quality Guidelines.

The information from this new survey will be used to align future exhibit and educational programs developed at Mokupāpapa Discovery Center. Additionally, information will be used to improve NMSP's and Papahānaumokuākea Marine National Monument (PMNM) messages to the 60,000 + patrons. The survey will be conducted every five years.

- Questions 1, 2 & 14 provide us with demographics.
- Question 3, 3a are a succinct account of the patrons experience at MDC.
- Questions 4 & 5 gauge elementary concepts.
- Question 6 determines if people value the exhibits.
- Question 7 determines which exhibits people would like to see.
- Question 8 identifies comprehension of monument status.
- Question 8a & 8b identifies comprehension of UNESCO World Heritage status and value.
- Question 9 determines archipelago and place comprehension.
- Question 10 identifies exhibit comprehension effectiveness.
- Question 11 gauges patron environmental comprehension.
- Question 12 identifies patron learning style.
- Question 12a identifies patron learning behavior.
- Question 13 identifies patron learning inclination.

NOAA ONMS will retain control over the information and safeguard access, modification, and destruction, consistent with NOAA standards for confidentiality, privacy, and electronic information. See response to Question10 of this Supporting Statement for more information on confidentiality and privacy. Information collected is designed to yield data that meet all applicable information quality guidelines. Information gathered is not expected to be disseminated to the public. The assessments results may be used in scientific, management, technical or general information publications. Should NOAA Office of National Marine Sanctuaries decide to disseminate the information, it will be subject to the quality control measures and pre-dissemination review pursuant to Section 515 of Public Law 106-554.

3. Describe whether, and to what extent, the collection of information involves the use of automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological techniques or other forms of information technology.

The MDC patron assessments will consist of intercept interviews and self paced assessments. Interviews will be conducted on paper, using a clipboard, for the reasons below:

- Patron aversion to surveys can be tempered via the humanistic learning theory of instructional design (by calling to their values and judgments, interviewers build patron trust)

- Patrons who wish to have their comments recorded who are uncomfortable with a more formal interview assessment process will have the option to do a self-paced assessment.

4. Describe efforts to identify duplication.

This is the second instance that MDC is requesting a patron experience assessment. No other organization has conducted, or plans to conduct, such an assessment for this visitor center.

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

This project will not impact small entities, businesses, organizations, or government bodies. All respondents will be individuals or families.

6. Describe the consequences to the Federal program or policy activities if the collection is not conducted or is conducted less frequently.

If this evaluation were not conducted, MDC would not be able to assess whether it is fulfilling NOAA's mandate of having an informed society that comprehends the importance of the oceans, coasts, and atmosphere in the global ecosystem to make the best social and economic decisions. In addition, MDC will not be able to modify our exhibits and education programs effectively to fulfill NOAA's, NOS', ONMS' and Papahānaumokuākea Marine National Monument's education and outreach goals.

The feedback we received from the first run of this survey instrument was very useful to us in determining our visitor composition and demographics, as well as which exhibits were the most effective, and what content visitors were most interested in. We have since used the results from this first survey instrument to modify and improve our exhibits, and to better tailor our program offerings to the visitor base we are getting. Finally, the Office of National Marine Sanctuaries is required to evaluate our formal and informal education and outreach programs, and this is one important component of our evaluations.

7. Explain any special circumstances that require the collection to be conducted in a manner inconsistent with OMB guidelines.

There are no special circumstances that deviate from OMB guidelines as listed in Attachment 1 of the instructions.

8. Provide information on the PRA Federal Register Notice that solicited public comments on the information collection prior to this submission. Summarize the public comments received in response to that notice and describe the actions taken by the agency in response to those comments. Describe the 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.

A Federal Register Notice published on March 31, 2015 (80 FR 07290) solicited comments from the public. No comments were received. Comments were also solicited from non-NOAA stakeholders. Three comments were received.

1. I read the 2010 *Visitor Perceptions of Mokupapapa Discovery Center* report and reviewed the survey on which it is based. I find the results useful for assessing the facility and broader education facility planning for the monument. The survey is relatively short and collection of survey results does not appear to be overly burdensome to the public or the staff. It appears that the survey can easily be completed in less than 10 minutes.

   Kem Lowry
   Citizen Representative,
   Northwestern Hawaiian Islands Coral Reef Ecosystem Reserve (NWHICRER) Advisory Council

2. I have reviewed the Mokupapapa Visitor Survey, the Supporting Statement and the Visitors' Perceptions report and feel that the results from the 2010 survey have been very useful for education planning for Papahānaumokuākea.

   In addition, the report generated from the first survey was very comprehensive and informative, and the Supporting Statement clearly demonstrates that the estimate of burden upon survey participants of 7.5 minutes per survey is correct. I fully support the administration of a second exit survey.

   Gail Grabowsky
   NWHI Coral Reef Ecosystem Reserve Advisory Council Member
   Education Representative

3. Thank you for sharing the Mokupapapa survey with me. It is impressively comprehensive. I support the use of this survey and the information is valuable. I also feel that the estimate of burden on the public of 7.5 minutes per survey is accurate.

   Laura Thompson
   Conservation Member
   Northwestern Hawaiian Islands Ecosystem Reserve Council.

9. Explain any decisions to provide payments or gifts to respondents, other than remuneration of contractors or grantees.

No payments, gifts or incentives will be offered.

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

All persons interviewed will be anonymous; no information will be collected that would identify the specific individual (e.g., name, address, phone number, social security number, driver's license number); therefore, no assurance of confidentiality will be required or provided. Demographic information will be used only for statistical analysis and aggregate information about the sample (e.g., age, gender, area of residence, visitor group size and composition).

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.

No questions of a sensitive nature are being asked in this survey.

12. Provide an estimate in hours of the burden of the collection of information.

Respondent sample: This study will seek one interview each from a sample of 250 visitor groups (pre-existing parties who arrived together, including single adults visiting alone, couples, families, etc.), randomly selected after they have seen exhibits at MDC and are about to exit the building. One adult (age 18+) per visitor group will be approached and invited to give his/her opinion; participation will be voluntary. Prior experience with this type of work, and the first implementation of this survey, shows that the response rate is approximately 85-90%. [From the social scientist researcher who developed the original study, we have information on that response rate and the rates of cooperation at similar facilities (aquariums, museums). In general, the cooperation rate averages about 90%; the rate from about 20 recent projects has ranged from 72% to 98%.]

Data sought from:	# of respondents	Responses per respondent	Total # Responses	Response Time	Total Burden	Labor Cost to Public *
Visitors to Mokupapapa Discovery Center	278-294 visitors approached to obtain a sample of 250	1 interview	250	7.5 min avg. per interview	31 hrs.	$508

Based on the US Census data from 2014, the average *household* income is $53,891 ($16.20 per hour for adults in household). The average estimated time per respondent is 7.5 minutes (12.5% of an hour). Therefore, the average labor cost per adult answering the questions would be $2.03, multiplied by the 250 responders, with a total burden of $508.

13. Provide an estimate of the total annual recordkeeping/reporting cost burden to the respondents resulting from the collection (excluding the value of the burden hours in Question 12 above).

a. Capital and start-up costs: none.

b. Operations and maintenance costs for the public: none (an interviewer will ask a series of questions, and the interviewer will write visitors' answers on the interview form; no follow-up or mailing or other expense will be required of the visitors).

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

We estimate 120 hours of work for the Mokupāpapa Discovery Center Manager in this capacity as a normal part of his job, and 8 hours of work for three other Mokupāpapa Staff members, also part of their normal job hours. Collection of data will be conducted by a combination of both staff and volunteers, and overseen by the Manager. With the estimate of 68 hours of data collection time (based upon actual data collection time, and intervals between survey participants), we anticipate only 24 hours will be of staff time, with the other 44 hours being conducted by volunteers. Processing of data will be handled by MDC Manager.

Personnel	Time	Additional cost
Manager Time	120 hours @ $25 per hour = $3,000	Normal job responsibilities
Staff Time	24 hours @ $20 per hour = $480	Normal job responsibilities
Volunteer Time	44 hours	No cost

Total cost of manager and staff time: $3,480.

15. Explain the reasons for any program changes or adjustments.

There are no changes.

16. For collections whose results will be published, outline the plans for tabulation and publication.

The purpose of this evaluation is to measure content achievement and design improvement of education and outreach goals. To facilitate qualified uses (e.g., among other marine sanctuaries), a short summary of the analysis will be made available on the PMNM web site (www.papahanaumokuakea.gov/education/) education homepage explaining how to request a full copy from MDC.

17. <u>If seeking approval to not display the expiration date for OMB approval of the information collection, explain the reasons why display would be inappropriate</u>.

We are not requesting an exception to displaying OMB documentation.

18. <u>Explain each exception to the certification statement</u>.

No exceptions.

B. COLLECTIONS OF INFORMATION EMPLOYING STATISTICAL METHODS

1. <u>Describe (including a numerical estimate) the potential respondent universe and any sampling or other respondent selection method to be used. Data on the number of entities (e.g. establishments, State and local governmental units, households, or persons) in the universe and the corresponding sample are to be provided in tabular form. The tabulation must also include expected response rates for the collection as a whole. If the collection has been conducted before, provide the actual response rate achieved</u>.

Conducting an exit survey, as was done in 2010, appears to us to be the most effective means of capturing responses: impressions are captured immediately after the Discovery Center experience, and the level of detail in our questions, as stated in Part A, enabled us to make several improvements after that first survey, as described in the report we have included in this response. Comments we have received through other venues, including our Facebook site, have been extremely general, such as “nice facility”.

	Mokupapapa Discovery Center (MDC)
Annual total visitor attendance (avg.) at Mokupāpapa Discovery Center (MDC)	60,000 persons
Annual attendance by GENERAL PUBLIC visitors at MDC (excludes school groups and professional visitors)	55,000 persons
Estimated number of adult visitors (age 18+) in the MDC general public visitor audience	40,000 adults
Desired sample size of general public adult visitors in the MDC audience	278-294 visitors will be approached to obtain a sample of 250 adults
Respondent selection method	One adult per randomly selected visitor group, when exiting from the exhibit area of MDC

Estimated rate of cooperation of randomly selected adult visitors	85% [**x** 294 or fewer visitors for a final sample of 250]

Note: Results of the social scientist researcher who conducted the first study, as well as the rates of cooperation at similar facilities (aquariums, museums) averaged 90%; the rate from about 20 projects in the last two years has ranged from 72% to 98%.

2. Describe the procedures for the collection, including: the statistical methodology for stratification and sample selection; the estimation procedure; the degree of accuracy needed for the purpose described in the justification; any unusual problems requiring specialized sampling procedures; and any use of periodic (less frequent than annual) data collection cycles to reduce burden.

Characteristics of patron types at visitor centers and museums may vary considerably (e.g., a local family may be followed by a tourist couple who may be followed by a single adult tourist). In places with relatively low volumes of visitors (such as the Mokupāpapa Discovery Center, compared to high volume places such as the Smithsonian) a representative random sample of visitor groups can be obtained by using a "next available" protocol, as follows:

> The interviewer is positioned near the exit from the exhibit space. As any visitor group (usually 1-4 people) nears the exit, the interviewer approaches and makes eye contact with the 'first adult' (in practice: the one who is physically closest to the interviewer) and requests their participation in giving feedback about the exhibits. The cooperation rate for this type of intercept interview (using a brief introduction that explains the purpose in one sentence) typically averages about 90%. If the adult visitor agrees, the interview is completed. Upon completion, the interviewer will tend to step aside to complete their work on the interview form (documenting the date and time of the interview, adding their own initials to it, reviewing the form to check for completeness and readable handwriting, and also to put away that completed interview form and have a new blank one ready); this process usually takes 3-5 minutes. When the interviewer is then prepared with a new blank interview form and related materials (e.g., a photo board about the exhibits, used for some of the interview questions), he/she looks up and selects the "next available" visitor group.

The principle of this and other sampling methods is that the interviewer does not *choose* who to interview by appearance, or by facial expression that might indicate enjoyment or not, or by whether there are or are not children in the group; in essence, the visitor group *selects themselves* (although they don't know the sampling parameters) by deciding when to exit (e.g., there may be another group being interviewed at the time when this group leaves, in which case they would not be selected). Depending on the visitor flow, the next visitor group might be leaving right then, or the interviewer might have to wait for 5-10 minutes for the next group to leave. This characteristic of 'low volume' visitor facilities makes it impractical to use other methods such as selecting every 4th visitor group, or using a random number chart (for example, from 1 to 5) to decide which visitor group to select. While additional methods could be used to provide reliability assessments of the sampling method, the budget is modest in this particular project,

and we are choosing to put relatively more effort in the analysis of open-ended questions than in conducting a rigorous reliability study, trusting that a well-conducted random sampling of "next available" visitor groups will result in a sufficiently representative sample. We will make an effort to balance the sampling between weekday and weekend surveys to ensure capture of both local and visitor traffic.

3. Describe the methods used to maximize response rates and to deal with nonresponse. The accuracy and reliability of the information collected must be shown to be adequate for the intended uses. For collections based on sampling, a special justification must be provided if they will not yield "reliable" data that can be generalized to the universe studied.

Based on responses to MDC's prior survey (completed in January of 2010, and noted in Part A, Question 1), and data from similar surveys conducted at aquariums and other interpretive facilities (noted in Part A, Question 12) there is an expected response rate of 85%-90%. Therefore, non-response should not be an issue in this study. Prior experience has shown that inviting visitors to contribute their opinions and feedback is a positive motivator.

When the renewed survey instrument and procedures are approved, MDC will begin monitoring the patron cooperation rate. If it is below 75%, MDC will modify the logistics of the survey (where the interviewer stands, which sentence of the explanation comes first) to seek improvements in the cooperation rate. Prior survey cooperation rates have yielded significant reliable data and were well above the 75% benchmark.

4. Describe any tests of procedures or methods to be undertaken. Tests are encouraged as effective means to refine collections, but if ten or more test respondents are involved OMB must give prior approval under the Paperwork Reduction Act.

A prior pilot survey of 8 visitors had been conducted, which confirmed essential prerequisites for this survey. Visitors did not need an incentive to participate, comprehended questions, provided succinct responses, and completed the interview process.

The survey instrument was originally designed by a professional evaluation company called People, Places and Designs Research (http://ppdresearch.com/; http://ppdresearch.com/profile/) managed by Jeff Hayward. PPD Research works with many Science Centers and Museums and is highly respected in this field.

5. Provide the name and telephone number of individuals consulted on the statistical aspects of the design, and the name of the agency unit, contractor(s), grantee(s), or other person(s) who will actually collect and/or analyze the information for the agency.

The instructional designer and information scientist who adapted the research design from the original survey, and composed the survey instrument, is **Kālewa Correa**, MLISc, MEd, Manager of Mokupāpapa Discovery Center, kalewa.correa@noaa.gov, (808) 933-8181.

Kālewa Correa will be NOAA's informational designer and responsible for data compilation and synthesis. Representative data will be used for exhibits, programs, and related ways of educating the public about Papahānaumokuākea Marine National Monument.

RR	R
RR	R
	R

Hi, we're talking with people to help us MODIFY or ADD TO our exhibits – may I ask you some questions about your visit today? [if they didn't look at exhibits, discontinue]

[hand out visitor rights page:] Because this is a federal site, this is a summary of your rights.

1. Have you been here before? ❑ no (1st time) ❑ yes ➔ How many times? _____

2. Where do you live? _____
   [town if Big Isl. / island if other HI / state if mainland US / country if not US]

3. Thinking about your **experience with these exhibits today**, would you say this visit was?

   ❑ great ❑ good ❑ OK ❑ fair ❑ needs improvement?

3.a What did you like most about Mokupāpapa? [*check* ❑ *if parent asks child/ren, who answer*]

   _____

4. Do you think that the exhibits are ❑ **about a specific area or place**, or are they ❑ **about Hawai'i and the Pacific IN GENERAL**?
   [*if specific place:*] What place? _____

5. What do you think the **main idea or themes** of the exhibits are? *(whatever you think)*

   _____

   ❑ no main idea; there are different exhibits on different topics ❑ didn't see enough to figure that out

6. Using a 5-point scale, how **important** do you think these exhibits are, for people like you (yourselves) – '1' would be the lowest: not at all worthwhile, '5' would be the highest: very worthwhile – what number would you say? _____

   [*if rating # less than 2, ask this*] Is there anything important about them?

   [*otherwise, ask:*] What's "important" about them? _____

   _____

7. What types of exhibits would you like to see more of in the Center? *(check all that apply)*
   ❑ interactive ❑ educational ❑ entertaining ❑ challenging ❑ static ❑ web accessible

   ❑ textual based ❑ video based ❑ game based ❑ kid oriented ❑ responsive ❑ collaborative

8. **Did the exhibits adequately inform you that Mokupāpapa was the educational center for Papahānaumokuākea Marine National Monument?**

8.a **Did the exhibits adequately inform you that Papahānaumokuākea Marine National Monument is a UNESCO World Heritage Site?**

8.b **Do you feel that it is important to be a UNESCO World Heritage Site?** ❑ yes ❑ no

   If **YES** why?_____

   If **NO** why?_____

9. These exhibits are about the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands and the Papahānaumokuākea Marine National Monument.

   Had you heard of that name before: the "Northwestern Hawaiian Islands" or "Papahānaumokuākea Marine National Monument"? ❑ yes ❑ no

OMB Control # __0648-0582_

Expires: ___5/31/2015_

10. Which of these ideas or themes **did the exhibits demonstrate and explain**? – If you could tell me Yes or Not Really for each one:

Yes Not a. what an atoll is?

Yes Not b. there are unique species in the Northwest Hawaiian Islands?

Yes Not c. the extent of fragile ecosystems?

Yes Not d. that there are more than eight Hawaiian Islands?

Yes Not d. that this area is already protected, a safe haven?

Yes Not e. that people have a long history in the NWHI?

[ask:] **What kind of history would that be?**

Yes Not NWHI are a sacred place with cultural significance?

Yes Not human actions today are affecting the NWHI?

11. Do you think that human actions affecting those islands would be:

❑ negative? or ❑ positive? ❑ some negative and some positive?

What kinds of negative impacts are you aware of? (or would you guess?)

_____

What kinds of positive impacts are you aware of? (or would you imagine are possible?)

_____

12. What is your style of learning? *(check all that apply)*

❑ hands on ❑ reading ❑ listening ❑ by teaching others ❑ immersive ❑ collaborative ❑ visually

12.a How do you learn about things? *(check all that apply)*

❑ internet searches ❑ blogs ❑ T.V ❑ teachers ❑ friends ❑ family ❑ social media

❑ games ❑ radio ❑ websites ❑ books ❑ movies ❑ QR codes ❑ magazines

13. If Mokupāpapa had additional educational information, games and media online would you want to use that as a learning resource? ❑ yes ❑ no

14. How many ____adults and ____children under 18 are in your group?
Ages of children: _____

PLEASE ANSWER THE 3 QUESTIONS IN THE BOX (helps us know we're talking with a cross-section of people)

Your Age:	**Education, so far**:	**Ethnic/racial heritage (check one or more)**:
___ 18-29	___ some school	___ American Indian or Alaska Native
___ 30's	___ high school graduate	___ Asian
___ 40's	___ some college	___ Black or African-American
___ 50's	___ college graduate	___ Hispanic/Latino
___ 60's	___ graduate school	___ Native Hawaiian
___ 70+		___ Pacific Islander
		___ Caucasian/White
		_____

PLEASE RETURN CLIPBOARD TO THE INTERVIEWER.
Thank you for taking the time to share your opinions!

Person interviewed: man woman ❑ ESL/LEP

Date: _____ Day of week:_____ Time:_____ Interviewer: _____

OMB Control # __0648-0582_

Expires: ___5/31/2015_

Visitors' Perceptions of Mokupapapa Discovery Center

Research report prepared by:
People, Places & Design Research

Visitors' Perceptions of the Mokupapapa Discovery Center

Executive Summary 1

A. Profile of the Audience 4

B. Visitors' Use of the Exhibits 7
1. How much did visitors see?
2. Did visitors speak with staff?

C. Reactions to the Exhibits 13
1. Ratings of the experience
2. What people liked most
3. Repeatability of the experience

D. Perception of Interpretive Messages 18
1. Perceptions of the main idea
2. Did people understand that it's about a specific place?
3. What did visitors find out about the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands?
4. Perceptions of various interpretive themes
5. Understanding human impacts on the islands
6. Do visitors have additional questions?

prepared by

People, Places & Design Research

Jeff Hayward & Jolene Hart

Northampton, Massachusetts

January, 2010

Executive Summary

This research was conducted to assess audience perceptions of the key educational messages at the Mokupapapa Discovery Center, and to inform a process of revising the exhibits and/or developing new exhibits and interpretive programs. Since the designation of the Papahanaumokuakea Marine National Monument, there is a new story to tell and a renewed emphasis on conservation messages (awareness of how human actions threaten protected places like this). This study was designed to evaluate how well the current exhibits address this new focus and what are the implications for possible changes or enhancements to the exhibits.

Method

Face-to-face interviews were conducted with a random sample of 209 visitor groups at the end of their visits. Discovery Center staff and volunteers were trained to conduct the structured interviews, and the interviews took place over several seasons (April through November, 2009).

Results

Audience profile: About half of the visitors are Hawaii residents (primarily repeat visitors) and half are tourists (primarily first-time visitors). More than a third of the visitors groups (38%) include children. The audience is quite diverse in terms of age, education level and ethnicity.

Use of exhibits: The two most viewed exhibits are the aquarium (97%) and the map (83%). Most visitors also stop to look at the marine debris display (69%), the submarine room (64%) and the island/volcano simulation kiosk (61%). Some of the exhibits seem to appeal to a variety of types of visitors (aquarium, trash display, computer simulation kiosk), while the submarine control room is used more by families with children, and the map is used more by tourists, and adults without children. About half of the visitors (53%) encountered and talked with staff during the visit.

Affective reactions/satisfaction: The findings indicate that visitors enjoy the experience and see it as a worthwhile educational activity. About half of the visitors rated their experience at the Discovery Center as 'good,' while 39% said it was 'great.' The aquarium with live fish is clearly a highlight of the visit.

Awareness of the marine National Monument: Most visitors (59%) thought the center was explaining Hawaii or the Pacific in general. About 30% of visitors got the idea that it was about a specific area – the Hawaiian Archipelago or Northwestern Hawaiian Islands.

Conservation messages: The idea that human activity is negatively affecting the islands was a strong message (selected from a list of themes by 92% of visitors). Based on open-ended answers about negative effects it is obvious that the marine debris exhibit had a big impact on visitors. However, most people did not come away with specific ideas about what they could do personally to benefit the NWHI. Beyond "recycling" and "not littering," visitors' open-ended comments about conservation activities were pretty vague. Also, most people didn't really understand more complicated concepts such as "what is a fragile ecosystem?"

Implications

Appealing to diverse audiences: The current mix of types of exhibits (live animals, computer interactives, film, pictures, and text panels) seems to work well for a variety of different audiences. There is something for everyone, and people are using these exhibits. It would seem to be especially important to encourage the local family audience with repeatable experiences (e.g., interactives where the outcome could be different on future visits), because they come here voluntarily (not just because they are delivered to Front Street by a cruise ship).

Room for improvement: Visitors' ratings of the experience were mostly in the moderate range, which indicates that there is room for improvement. Although the Discovery Center is, and will continue to be, a modest experience in terms of size, it could be more engaging and inspiring.

Awareness of NWHI: Clearly something needs to be done to enhance the public's awareness of the Papahanaumokuakea Marine National Monument (or at least the idea/location of the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands). It may be a challenge to figure out how to increase people's awareness of a place that has a name that is difficult to pronounce and is hundreds of miles away from Hilo. It may require a combination of tactics such as revising the large wall map, adding a main message panel, and changing labels at various exhibits (especially the aquarium). Graphic labels would be especially helpful, so that the labels are interesting and understandable to a wide range of ages, languages, and education levels. It might be interesting and inspiring for visitors to hear the story of why President Bush created this Monument – the largest fully protected marine area in the world.

Interpretation about human impacts: Clearly the marine debris exhibit is effective, but visitors' perceptions of other conservation issues were vague ("what is a fragile ecosystem?" "what can you do to help?"), suggesting that some interpretive messages were not so compelling. Perhaps some "action suggestions" could be added to the marine debris exhibit, and also at other exhibits. "Action items" might include a list of several things that people or industry can do to reduce the threats to protected areas, or an interactive to identify what is a threat and what isn't. Another option would be to add a visitor comment/opinion station, asking people what they can do to protect the National Monument. This could be useful not only for people to make a commitment and feel as though they can do something, but also because visitors can read other people's comments and ideas (hopefully more than recycling and picking up trash).

Ultimately improvement in the effectiveness of interpretive messages needs some creative thinking about exhibit experiences, and perhaps testing of preliminary ideas with visitors.

A. Profile of the Audience

This first section of the report summarizes the demographic characteristics of the audience, as an important context for interpreting subsequent analyses and findings about visitor perceptions. It also presents a profile and comparison of two audience segments: Hawaii residents and tourists. The key points are:

- The Discovery Center audience consists of equal proportions of Hawaii residents and tourists from out-of-state. Similarly, about half are visiting for the first-time and half are repeat visitors.
- Most visitor groups (62%) consist of adults without children. However, one can't ignore the sizeable family audience (38%), especially families with preschool-aged children (23%).
- The Discovery Center serves a more diverse audience than is seen in many museums. There are visitors of all ages, all education levels, and various ethnic identities.
- There are some significant differences between the residents and the tourists: Hawaii residents are slightly younger, less educated, more ethnically diverse, and more likely to bring children to the Center.

A. Profile of the Audience

OVERVIEW: About half of the Discovery Center visitors are Hawaii residents. The proportions of first-time and repeat visitors are about equal. Most of the visitor groups consist of adults only, although 38% of groups include children under age 18. Among adults, all age groups and educational levels are represented.

SEGMENTATION: Comparisons between Hawaii residents and tourists from out-of-state will be highlighted throughout this report. Interpretation of results is aided by recognizing that there are demographic differences between these audience segments. Residents are more likely to bring children to the Center (50% vs. 27%), they are less educated (46% vs. 74% college graduates), and they are more ethnically diverse (46% vs. 84% White).

	Overall Sample (n=209)	Hawaii Residents (n=102)	Tourists (n=105)
Residence:			
Hawaii	49%		
other U.S.	41%		
other countries	10%		
Familiarity with Center:		**	
first-time visitors	53%	24%	91%
occasional repeat visitors [1]	22%	31%	8%
frequent repeat visitors	25%	44%	1%
Group composition:		**	
adults-only	62%	50%	73%
family with children	38%	50%	27%
Ages of children:			
any preschoolers (0-5)	23%	31%	14%
school-aged children only (6-17)	14%	18%	11%
Group Size:		**	
one	22%	27%	17%
two	41%	29%	53%
three	21%	28%	14%
four or more	16%	17%	15%

(**) Asterisks indicate statistically significant differences ($p<.05$) between sets of figures. For example on this page, there is a substantial difference in the proportion of first-time and repeat visitors when comparing the two segments of residents vs. out-of-state visitors. The figures should be read as percents of the column heading, e.g., 91% of tourists are visiting the Center for the first-time.

[1] Occasional repeat visitors are those who have been to the Center up to six times (most visited once or twice before). Frequent repeat visitors have visited ten or more times (some have been 50-100 times).

	Overall Sample (n=209)	Hawaii Residents (n=102)	Tourists (n=105)
Gender:			
man	46%	44%	48%
woman	54%	56%	52%
Age:		++	
18-29	24%	29%	18%
30's	27%	30%	24%
40's	18%	15%	22%
50's	16%	14%	18%
60+	15%	12%	18%
Education:		**	
high school	13%	16%	10%
some college	27%	38%	16%
college graduate	33%	27%	40%
graduate school	27%	19%	34%
Ethnic identity:		**	
Native Hawaiian / Pacific Islander	15%	25%	5%
American Indian / Alaska Native	3%	5%	1%
Asian	13%	23%	5%
White	65%	46%	84%
Hispanic/Latino	3%	2%	4%
African American/black	0	0	0
other / mixed	1%	1%	1%

(++) Plus signs are used in this report to indicate patterns of differences which are not quite statistically significant (milder differences, which may have occurred by chance), but which suggest a trend and may have some intuitive value in some circumstances.

B. Visitors' Use of the Exhibits

This section gives an overview of the proportion of visitors who looked at selected exhibits or talked with staff. There are also analyses of exhibit use by various audience segments (for example, residents vs. tourists and families vs. adult-only groups). Highlights of these findings are:

- The aquarium was the most highly used exhibit – 97% of visitors stopped to look at it. The large map on the wall was also highly used (83% of visitors). Three other exhibits (debris, submarine room, computer kiosk) were viewed by at least 60% of visitors.
- About half of the visitors said they had encountered and talked with a staff member. People who stopped at the map were more likely to talk with staff than those who didn't stop here.
- There were some differences in use by various audience segments. For example, families with children were more likely than adults to use the submarine room, and less likely to stop at the map.

B.1. How much did visitors see?

OVERVIEW: Nearly all visitors stop to look at the aquarium with live fish. The vast majority (83%) look at the large map, and most (61%-69%) see the trash exhibits, the submarine room, and the computer kiosk. The map is used more by tourists, men, and adult-only groups. The submarine room is used more by families (79%) compared to adult-only groups (54%).

Which of these exhibits did you stop at?

	Overall	Residents		Tourists
the aquarium	97%	98%		95%
large map on the wall showing chain of islands	83%	75%	**	90%
pile of trash, or large mural of trash	69%	72%		67%
submarine control room, with robotic arms	64%	78%	**	50%
computer simulation of geology and volcanoes	61%	69%	**	55%

AQUARIUM

TRASH

Ka Piha Kai

NOAA
NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Ho'ona'auao
Gain wisdom

Who was more likely to stop at the MAP?

**	93%	of men
	76%	of women (68% of women with kids vs. 84% of women without kids)
**	88%	of adult-only groups
	76%	of family groups with children (only 67% of *local* families stop here)
**	88%	of people who talked with staff
	76%	of people who didn't talk with staff

Who was more likely to stop at the SUBMARINE ROOM?

**	79%	of families with children
	54%	of adult-only groups

Who was more likely to stop at the COMPUTER SIMULATION?

++	72%	of young adults (age 18-29)
	60%	of families with children
	64%	of middle-aged adults (age 30-49)
	51%	of older adults (age 50+)

B.2. Did visitors speak with staff?

OVERVIEW: About half of the visitors said they had talked with a staff member during the visit, and this proportion was about the same among residents and tourists. People who stopped to look at the map were most likely to speak with staff (or, among the people who talked with staff, more of them were shown or used the map).

Did any staff or volunteer talk with you about the exhibits?

	Overall	Residents	Tourists
yes	53%	49%	56%
no	47%	51%	44%

Who was most likely to talk with staff?

**	57%	of those who stopped at the map
	35%	of those who didn't stop here
++	56%	of men
	42%	of women

C. Reactions to the Exhibits

This section presents information about visitors' opinions of the experience – ratings, what's worthwhile about the visit, what they enjoyed, and what they would want to see again if they return to the Center. The key findings are:

- Visitors' ratings of their experience today indicate a satisfying experience for most, and a superlative for some (more people said it was 'good' than said it was 'great').
- Visitors gave higher ratings on the question of "how worthwhile are these exhibits?" Residents consider them to be more worthwhile than tourists (repeat visitors may be more loyal).
- The most appealing exhibit is the aquarium with live fish – 43% like it best, and it was mentioned most often as the exhibit people would like to see again on a return visit.

C.1. Ratings of the experience

OVERVIEW: About half of the visitors rated their experience at the Discovery Center as "good," 39% said it was "great," and 13% said it was just "okay." Families were somewhat more likely than adults without children to give a rating of "great" (48% vs. 34%). When asked to give a separate rating of how *worthwhile* these exhibits are, the ratings tended to be higher, especially among residents (59% 'high' ratings). This finding suggests a sense of loyalty among residents – they believe the Center is worthwhile and important even if it isn't a "wow" experience for them. People believe the exhibits are worthwhile primarily for the educational value, although most of their explanations seemed general and vague.

Rate your experience today:

	Overall	Residents		Tourists	Families		Adults
great	39%	41%		37%	48%	++	34%
good	48%	43%		53%	44%		50%
okay / fair	13%	16%		10%	7%		16%
How worthwhile are these exhibits (on a scale of 1 to 10)? [2]							
High (9-10)	52%	59%	**	45%	60%		48%
Medium (7-8)	39%	28%		49%	33%		42%
Low (1-6)	10%	13%		7%	7%		10%

What's worthwhile about them?

46%	educational, informative, interesting (general answers)
15%	seeing the fish, the film, the photos, the beauty
14%	ocean conservation awareness, learning about ecosystem issues
10%	I learned something new (especially about island formation)
8%	good for children
6%	hands-on activities
6%	general positive: well done, clear interpretation, accessible, awesome
6%	it's free
2%	negative comment (needs more hands-on, no time to read)
4%	other
3%	blank, no answer

[2] Interpreting visitors' ratings on 10-point scales is based on years of experience with museum visitors, using follow-up questions to ask what their ratings mean, or why they gave a particular number. Consistently over time and a variety of settings, we have found that '9' or '10' means an excellent experience which is completely positive, a '7' or '8' means a moderately positive rating which can be accompanied by some misgivings or not-so-enthusiastic support, and a '6' or lower number indicates a disappointing experience or one with substantial misgivings. The highest ratings we've seen (national award winning, and very popular among visitors) have been in the range of 75%-80% high ratings (9+10).

Sample of answers: ***What's worthwhile?***
Educational, seeing the actual fish and beauty of wildlife in film
Educational
Teaching people about NWHI and species found there
Awareness of what's happening in our oceans and islands
Explanations are quite good, and the layout
Lots of information
Learning about the environment and fish
Trash exhibits are good for awareness, albatross exhibit
I didn't know what an atoll was
I like the fish, informative
We really love it here and we are regulars, the place is wonderful for kids
Overview and understanding of reefs and fish and what we saw in the water
Satellite map shows entire chain, very hands-on facility
It's enough to bring my family back again
Kids get to see the aquarium, it's free
Education
The pictures and information
Facts, understanding, some of the pictures show things that you wouldn't see in person
Hands-on display
Inspires people to take care of the Hawaiian reefs and resources
It is worthwhile if you are devoted and want to read the information
I liked learning about the geology of the atolls and the Hawaiian Islands

C.2. What people liked most

OVERVIEW: The aquarium with live fish is clearly the highlight of the visit. Other exhibits (film, submarine, marine debris, map, kiosk) were also mentioned to a lesser extent.

What did you like the most here?

43%	aquarium, live fish
14%	film, video
12%	submarine, Pisces, robotic arm
11%	marine debris
11%	map of Hawaiian archipelago
10%	kiosk about island formation, volcanoes
9%	information (especially about conservation issues)
4%	everything
3%	Hawaiian chanting, music
2%	artistic mural
2%	program room displays
2%	photos, pictures
2%	animal models, shark, ray, albatross
9%	other (globe, peepholes, displays, geology, interactive, atoll, etc)

Sample of answers:
Aquarium, trash picture, how islands were formed
Aquarium, robotic arm
Aquarium
The examples and debris found
The displays
They were all great
Interpretation
Aquarium
Satellite map
Touch screens, video
Free admission
I like that it's not too big, great for children, will come back again
The aquarium and the control room is fun
The aquarium and wall map
I like the fish tank
Aquarium, theater, the overhead sounds, replicas of shark
Trash displays to show people what we are doing to ocean
Room with the movie in it, the photos
Film about coral reefs
Hot spot kiosk
The detailed information
It teaches the kids why to recycle

C.3. Repeatability of the experience

OVERVIEW: About three-quarters of the visitors indicated that they would like to see some of the exhibits again (higher among residents, lower among tourists). Again, the aquarium stands out as the exhibit people most want to see if they return.

If you came back again, is there an exhibit that you would like to see again or spend more time at?

	Overall	Residents		Tourists	Families	Adults
yes	73%	83%	**	64%	80%	71%
no	27%	17%		36%	20%	29%

(if yes) ***Which one?***

30%	aquarium
10%	submarine, robotic arm
10%	film, video
9%	all of them
5%	map on wall
4%	program room
4%	marine debris
3%	kiosk about how islands formed
2%	suggestions (more hands-on, touch tank, more info about . . .)
1%	mural, photos, models
5%	other

D. Perceptions of Interpretive Messages

This section contains information about visitors' perceptions of the main educational messages presented in the Discovery Center. Did visitors understand that these exhibits are about a specific place, the Marine National Monument? Did visitors get any conservation messages or ideas about how they can help with preservation efforts? Highlights of the results are:

- Few visitors understood that this Center is about a specific place – only 3% mentioned the Monument *top-of-mind*, and 11% named the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands. However, when presented with a statement, 'this area is already protected,' many visitors (63%) thought or guessed the exhibits did show that idea.
- Visitors clearly got some conservation messages – such ideas were most frequently mentioned as the main theme of the exhibits (45% of open-ended responses). Also, when given a list of seven themes and asked which ones the exhibits explained, visitors most often selected the two conservation-related themes: 'human actions are affecting the NWHI' and 'fragile ecosystems.' Most of visitors' comments about negative human impacts referred to trash and pollution, suggesting that the marine debris display had a big effect on visitors.
- The vast majority of visitors (80%) believe that 'there is something you or I can do to benefit the NWHI.' Some people (44%) said that they would likely behave differently as a result of seeing these exhibits (e.g., recycle more, pick up trash at the beach).

D.1. Perceptions of the main idea

OVERVIEW: Conservation awareness was the top theme cited by visitors (45% "got" that message). The next most cited theme was education about marine life. Only a small proportion of visitors (8%) mentioned the NWHI or Monument.

What's the main idea or theme of the exhibits here?

45%	increase awareness about conservation issues (coral, trash)
30%	educate about oceans, marine life
14%	Hawaiian islands, how they formed, natural history
11%	education
6%	Northwestern Hawaiian Islands
2%	National Monument, refuge
1%	other
1%	don't know

Sample of answers:
Natural history of Hawaiian Islands
Trash in ocean, wildlife in Hawaii, very broad
Knowledge about NWHI
Preserving our marine life, also the coral
How islands were formed and the garbage
Fish
Education
Show people fish and be aware of the environment
Coral and sea health
The aquatic life
Hidden Hawaiian Islands
Educate the public
Teach tourists about natural beauty of Hawaii
How island chain was formed
Ocean education
The islands
Wildlife refuge in NWHI
Promote health of archipelago
Education about preservation
Ecological protection
Oceanography
Education on the ocean, Hawaiian Islands and animals

D.2. Did people understand that it's about a specific place?

OVERVIEW: Most visitors (59%) thought the exhibits were about Hawaii or the Pacific, in general. Some said it was about the Hawaiian Archipelago or Hawaii. Only 11% identified the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands as the subject of these exhibits, and 3% referred to the marine sanctuary.

Did you think the exhibits here were about a specific area or place or were they about Hawaii and the Pacific in general?

	Overall	Residents	Tourists	Saw Map		Didn't See
specific place	41%	39%	42%	45%	**	22%
Hawaii and Pacific in general	59%	61%	58%	55%		78%

(if specific) ***What place?***

13%	Hawaiian Archipelago, islands
11%	Northwestern Hawaiian Islands
9%	Hawaii
3%	national monument, marine sanctuary
2%	atolls
2%	other
1%	don't know

D.3. What did visitors find out about the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands?

OVERVIEW: Most visitors (60%) claimed that they knew of the NWHI before coming to the Center. Awareness is higher among residents and repeat visitors compared to tourists and first-time visitors. Most visitors (61%) said they had learned something interesting or surprising about NWHI from these exhibits. Visitors mentioned surprise/interest in the marine debris, how the islands were formed, and how large an area it is, among other things.

These exhibits are intended to be about the Northwest Hawaiian Islands – a chain of small islands. Had you heard of that name before?

	Overall	Residents		Tourists	Repeat		1st-time
yes, heard of it	60%	77%	**	43%	74%	**	49%
no, haven't heard	40%	23%		57%	26%		51%

Did you find out anything interesting or surprising about the NWHI from these exhibits?

	Overall	Residents		Tourists	Talked w/ Staff		Didn't Talk
yes	61%	53%	**	69%	66%	++	52%
no	39%	47%		31%	34%		48%

What?

13%	marine debris, how animals are affected
12%	how islands formed, what's an atoll, erosion
9%	how expansive an area, how far north it extends
8%	existence and location of these islands
7%	abundant wildlife, different fish, facts about animals
7%	how many islands there are
3%	unique ecosystems, each island is unique
3%	history, WWII, Midway
2%	human history, cultural aspects
2%	protected area
3%	other

Sample of answers (find out anything interesting or surprising about NWHI?)

The trash in the ocean was interesting, albatross stomach contents
I didn't realize the expanse and how far it went
Battle of Midway
Names of fish and what is native to Hawaii
I didn't know what an atoll was
Marine debris
That the atolls are there and eroding away and getting smaller
There are more islands than I thought
Baby bird that died and turtle that got caught in the net
Age of the islands
Isolation of the islands
I didn't know there was a unicorn fish
The formation and geology of the Hawaiian islands (hot spot)
I didn't realize there were so many coral reefs
They are protected
More detail on the NWHI
There's concern about the health of the coral reef ecosystem in that region
Just how each one is its own little universe
That they stretched all the way to Russia
Pile of trash, amazingly shocking
How large of an area it actually is
Didn't realize they go so far north
I didn't know there were that many islands
The bird guano history in the islands
The Laysan eggs, I had no idea that they harvested them
That these islands existed
The satellite view of where they are
The geological formation
The names of them
The movies of the NWHI, Midway is part of island chain
The problem with trash in the ocean and on the islands, in the bird's stomach
The volcano right off the coast is just underground
I didn't realize how many fish there were
How sacred and untouched they are
There is a lot of litter
Diverse ecosystem
That they support 54% of the apex predators

D.4. Perceptions of various interpretive themes

OVERVIEW: Visitors' perceptions of interpretive themes were also assessed using a list of topics (a different approach from open-ended recall[3]). Nearly everyone thought the exhibits showed 'how human actions are affecting the islands.' Other frequently recognized themes were 'fragile ecosystems' and 'unique species.' The least noticed topic was 'people have a long history in NWHI.' Hawaii residents showed higher awareness of the theme 'a sacred place with cultural significance' compared to tourists. The idea that 'this area is protected' ranked fifth out of the seven topics, indicating that this message is less salient (the marine debris display has a great impact on visitors' perceptions, and it's probably hard to conceive how this area could be protected and covered with trash at the same time). Some audience segments were more likely than others to understand about the safe haven: repeat visitors (70%), men who looked at the map (80%), and people with graduate school education (75%).

Which of these ideas or themes did the exhibits show and explain?

	Overall	Residents		Tourists
Human actions today are affecting the NWHI	92%	94%		90%
About fragile ecosystems	83%	83%		82%
Whether there are unique species in the NWHI	77%	75%		78%
How an Hawaiian atoll is formed	68%	66%		69%
That this area is already protected, a safe haven	63%	64%		62%
It's a sacred place with cultural significance	62%	70%	**	53%
That people have a long history in the NWHI	55%	58%		51%

Who thought exhibits showed SAFE HAVEN?

**	70%	of repeat visitors
	56%	of first-time visitors
**	80%	of men who saw the map
	58%	of women who saw the map
	34%	of people who didn't look at the map
**	75%	of graduate school educated
	56%	of college graduates
	66%	of people with some college
	46%	of high school educated

[3] Lists of suggested answers help visitors to recognize ideas that they may not have been able to articulate or think of in a 'top-of-mind' way. Such recognition is a legitimate measure of their thoughts and perceptions, but it does also lead to some guessing and possibly over-representation of the effectiveness of the interpretive experience.

OVERVIEW: If they recognized the theme 'fragile ecosystems,' visitors were asked to define it. About one-quarter expressed a clear understanding that a fragile ecosystem is more vulnerable to change or human activity than other ecosystems in general. Some people mentioned negative impacts such as trash or loss of species. Some people said coral were fragile ("because they break easily if you step on them").

What does fragile ecosystem mean, in terms of an island? (if yes to 'fragile'; n=172)

24%	sensitive, vulnerable to human impacts
22%	affected by trash, pollution
18%	needs to be protected, threatened by human activity
14%	coral reefs
11%	potential loss of species: coral, birds, fish
8%	balanced system, interconnected, food chain
4%	eroding, breaking up
2%	impacted by invasive species
5%	other
4%	blank

Sample of answers

Bird populations
The food chain
The Monument, having to be a monument
Humans are impacting
The animal are affected by pollution and trash that hurts them
Beaches could be deteriorating, land is developed by humans
The coral reefs and their interconnectedness to everything
They're threatened
The ocean and pollution
Our impact on that ecosystem
There are many things that can jeopardize the health
Pollution affecting the reef
The balance is finely tuned, so if you take a predator away it will affect another animal
Marine pollution tangling up the animals
Easily ruined
Any change, even the slightest, can have effects
Resources are limited & loss of them shows up faster
That is threatened by humans and climate change
Coral is sensitive
Friendly ecosystem, where all species survive, on the brink of endangered
The coral reef and its balance
Erosion of an island, impacts of others close to it
If one thing goes it's going to affect something else
Conserve, Hawaii is a unique place, species found only here
Breaks easy, corals
Vulnerable to humans, trash and natural erosion
If not looked out for it could be damaged and disappear

OVERVIEW: People who identified the theme of 'human history' were asked to explain what they had seen about this topic. About one-third gave general answers about Hawaiians living there a long time ago, one-third cited some specific information (e.g., WWII, Kumulipo, guano mining, Polynesian influences), and one-third couldn't think of anything.

What kind of history would that be? (if yes to 'people have a long history'; n=114)

28%	people lived there long ago, early Hawaiian culture
14%	WWII, Midway
11%	spiritual, sacred, place of worship, Kumulipo
9%	fishing, guano mining, egg & feather collecting
8%	Polynesians
8%	travel, navigation, ship wrecks
7%	other
30%	blank

Sample of answers

Midway was used before the war
People lived there
Hawaiian people
Battle of Midway, harvesting eggs, shipping ports
Picture of artifacts, early Polynesians
Religious, spiritual, traditional navigation
Worshipped there
WWII, roots go way back - Hawaiian history
Research there
Chanting
Ancient Hawaiian
Military bases
Ship wrecks and guano mining
Polynesian history
The natives, how they would navigate
Voyages, Hawaiians in area
Cultural-some areas of special significance
Hawaiian culture and artifacts
Midway atoll, Kalakaua's exploration for the Hawaiian kingdom
The World War II history
The war and bird feathers for hunting
Early settlers lived in the NWHI a long time ago
Polynesian influence
Because of the Kumulipo
Kapunas used to take care, fishing the reefs
Symbiotic relationship with nature
People lived on the islands a long time ago

D.5. Understanding human impacts on the islands

OVERVIEW: Most visitors (67%) agreed with the idea that human activities may have both positive and negative effects on the islands, while 30% thought human impacts would be entirely negative. Residents and tourists had similar perceptions. The marine debris display obviously had a big impact on visitors because "trash" and "pollution" dominated people's examples of negative influences. In terms of positive impacts, visitors cited educational efforts (at the Discovery Center), that people are trying to preserve nature, and the volunteer clean-up efforts, among other things.

Do you think that human actions affecting those islands would be:

	Overall	Residents	Tourists
almost all negative	30%	38%	31%
almost all positive	3%	2%	5%
some negative, some positive	67%	70%	64%

What kinds of negative impacts are you aware of?

56%	marine debris, trash
32%	pollution
15%	overfishing, hunting
8%	damaging coral
7%	cruise ships, boats, tourism
4%	land development, habitat destruction
4%	invasive species
3%	global warming
3%	overpopulation
2%	military actions, bombs, airfields
2%	lack of respect for animals
8%	other
2%	blank

Sample of answers
Trash problem in ocean
Marine debris
What people are doing to the ocean
Trash, non-biodegradable plastics
Litter
Pollution, destruction of native plants, overpopulation
Environmental degradation
Fishing, harvesting, tourism
Waste, destruction of coral reefs
Sewage problem
Destroying habitats and species

What kinds of positive impacts are you aware or?

28%	education, awareness, this center
25%	trying to protect, conservation
22%	clean-up efforts, pick up trash
11%	research
9%	National Preserves, sanctuaries
7%	turtle recovery program, restoring native habitat
6%	rules and regulations about fishing, etc.
3%	coral etiquette
3%	recycle, don't litter, no plastic
7%	other
9%	blank

Sample of answers

Scientific exploration is showing us the need for conservation
Clean-up efforts in NWHI, reducing trash
People trying to protect it
You can educate people on cruises about protecting the area
Education centers like this
Turtle recovery projects, clean-ups, nature reserves
That people are aware of the environmental degradation
Conservation
Clean-ups
Protecting the animals and trying to keep it clean
Just leave it alone
The research going on and learning about the marine and bird life
Making it a National Monument, stopping fishing
Cleaning up, rebuilding, rules and regulations
Educating the public
Preservation

Understanding human impacts (continued)

OVERVIEW: Eight out of ten visitors thought that something could be done to benefit the NWHI, but only four of ten thought they would be likely to change their own behavior. The primary suggested activity was education (the role of the Center), followed by basic actions such as recycling or picking up trash.

Is there anything that you or I could do for the benefit of the NWHI?

	Overall	Residents	Tourists
yes	80%	82%	78%
no	20%	18%	22%

Are you likely to do anything differently after seeing the exhibits here?

yes	44%	49%	39%
not really	56%	51%	61%

What?

Could do	Likely to do	
30%	11%	educate, raise awareness
12%	9%	recycle
12%	5%	pick up trash, volunteer, join clean-ups
9%	4%	no littering, don't throw trash at beach
6%	4%	respect nature, protect, preserve (general answers)
6%	0	support educational centers and research
3%	3%	avoid plastics
3%	2%	other specific 'green' actions (organic, lower consumption, etc.)
3%	0	leave it alone
2%	<1%	responsible fishing, enforce regulations
<1%	4%	don't step on the reef
<1%	2%	move here, visit NWHI, explore reefs
3%	2%	other

Sample of answers
Cut down on waste, less consumption
Reduce our trash, recycle more
Clean-up effort
More education
Volunteer
More money to National Parks
Educate others
Promote need to clean it up
Leave it alone, end tourism
By cleaning up and not throwing trash
More publicity, more trash cans
Protecting nature
Exhibits to increase awareness
Recycle
Support conservation
Continue to teach the youth
Awareness
Dispose of trash responsibly
Tell people not to stand on reef
Teach our children not to litter
Continue recycling
Respect the environment

D.6. Do visitors have additional questions?

OVERVIEW: About one-quarter of the visitors had additional comments or questions at the end of the interview. Some wondered about the Discovery Center (who runs it?), some had specific informational questions about the content, and some gave suggestions for exhibits (e.g., touch tanks).

Do you have any questions about any of this?

Questions about interpretive content/exhibits (themes: human inhabitants, animals, island formation, trash, etc.)
What kind of human history in the monument?
Are all of the islands inhabited? Can you visit?
Are there people who live up there now?
Where is the Polynesian influence?
Turtle populations, ...everywhere, are they going up?
When do the banded coral shrimp in aquarium come out?
Movie room, wingspan of all
Where is the information on the turtles?
How do islands sink, geologically?
How long until new island is on the surface?
Where is the garbage patch? Show tectonic plates on map
Where is the island with all the trash?
Are they protected?
Yes, what is guano?
More explanation of wall map in relation to large wall mural
Is this protected area larger than the great barrier reef?

Questions about the Center /NOAA
Who funds center? How long has it been here?
How old is discovery center?
What exactly is the center about?
Who is paying for this?
Who runs this place?
Who runs this?
Who's funding this? Can you dive?
How are you funded?
How long has NOAA fisheries been in service?
How long has Mokupapapa been open?

<u>Suggestions about the exhibits (themes: more hands-on for children, more live animals, etc.)</u>
No, but need more fun stuff for children
More hands on stuff for kids, touch screens and tanks
More hands on stuff for kids like the sub
More for kids, everything seemed to be above their heads

When will you have more tanks?
More real ocean life, more live things
Touch tank

Share beach clean-up information
Maybe more on cultural significance
More about Hawaiian people and their history
More about the formation of the coral reefs
Robotic arms not always working?
More information on the island formation

More about the fish and coral
Maybe some films of what it's like on the islands
More plastic fish displays like at Lyman and identification

Put a sign on the back door

21013, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230–0002, and in the ''Reading Room'' section of the FTZ Board's Web site, which is accessible via *www.trade.gov/ftz.*

For further information, contact Pierre Duy at *Pierre.Duy@trade.gov* (202) 482–1378.

Dated: March 24, 2015.

Andrew McGilvray,

Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2015–07381 Filed 3–30–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

Proposed Information Collection; Comment Request; Papahanaumokuakea Marine National Monument Mokupapapa Discovery Center Exhibit Evaluation

AGENCY: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, invites the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on proposed and/or continuing information collections, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

DATES: Written comments must be submitted on or before June 1, 2015.

ADDRESSES: Direct all written comments to Jennifer Jessup, Departmental Paperwork Clearance Officer, Department of Commerce, Room 6616, 14th and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230 (or via the Internet at *JJessup@doc.gov).*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Requests for additional information or copies of the information collection instrument and instructions should be directed to Andy Collins, at (808) 694–3922 or *Andy.Collins@noaa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Abstract

This request is for extension of a currently approved information collection. Mokupapapa Discovery Center (Center) is an outreach arm of Papahanaumokuakea Marine National Monument that reaches 60,000 people each year in Hilo, Hawai'i. The Center was created eight years ago to help raise support for the creation of a National Marine Sanctuary in the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands. Since that time, the area has been proclaimed a Marine National Monument and the main messages we are trying to share with the public have changed to better reflect the new monument status, UNESCO World Heritage status and the joint management by the three co-trustees of the Monument. We therefore are seeking to find out if people visiting our Center are receiving our new messages by conducting an optional exit survey.

II. Method of Collection

Surveys will be conducted by in-person interview as people exit the Center. Interviewers will record responses on paper, and later transfer them to an electronic database.

III. Data

OMB Control Number: 0648–0582.

Form Number: None.

Type of Review: Regular submission (extension of a currently approved collection).

Affected Public: Individuals or households.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 250.

Estimated Time Per Response: 7 minutes.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 29.

Estimated Total Annual Cost to Public: $0 in recordkeeping/reporting costs.

IV. Request for Comments

Comments are invited on: (a) whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden (including hours and cost) of the proposed collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Comments submitted in response to this notice will be summarized and/or included in the request for OMB approval of this information collection; they also will become a matter of public record.

Dated: March 26, 2015.

Sarah Brabson,

NOAA PRA Clearance Officer.

[FR Doc. 2015–07290 Filed 3–30–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–NK–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–580–867]

Large Power Transformers From the Republic of Korea: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2012–2013

AGENCY: Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

SUMMARY: On September 24, 2014, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the preliminary results of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on large power transformers from the Republic of Korea.[1] The review covers five producers/exporters of the subject merchandise, Hyosung Corporation (Hyosung), Hyundai Heavy Industries Co., Ltd. (Hyundai), ILJIN, ILJIN Electric Co., Ltd. (ILJIN Electric), and LSIS Co., Ltd. (LSIS). ILJIN, ILJIN Electric, and LSIS, were not selected for individual examination. The period of review (POR) is February 16, 2012, through July 31, 2013. As a result of our analysis of the comments and information received, these final results differ from the *Preliminary Results.* For the final weighted-average dumping margins, *see* the ''Final Results of Review'' section below.

DATES: Effective March 31, 2015.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Brian Davis (Hyosung) or David Cordell (Hyundai), AD/CVD Operations, Office VI, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–7924 or (202) 482–0408, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On September 24, 2014, the Department published the *Preliminary Results.* In accordance with 19 CFR 351.309(c)(1)(ii), we invited parties to comment on our *Preliminary Results.*[2] On October 15, 2014, the Department issued a post-preliminary supplemental questionnaire, to which Hyundai

---

[1] *See Large Power Transformers From the Republic of Korea: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2012–2013,* 79 FR 57046 (September 24, 2014) (*Preliminary Results*).

[2] The Department issued the briefing schedule in a Memorandum to the File, dated November 3, 2014. This briefing schedule was later extended at the request of interested parties to December 19, 2014 for briefs and January 9, 2015 for rebuttal briefs on all issues, except one.