

Appendix B. Open-ended Responses by Mode on Q4

This appendix includes the open-ended answers to Question 4 for the phone (B.1), web (B.2), and mail (B.3) respondents. Numbers in parentheses indicate repeated identical responses.

B.1 - Responses from the phone survey

q.4 In your opinion, what is the ONE most important thing the National Park Service can do to encourage you to visit units of the National Park System?

A little more advertisement.
A little more advertising; they are very negligent on advertising.
A lot of it is our history; that is why I go. Just keep them clean.
A really good, inviting website.
Access.
Accessibility (4)
Accessibility, accommodation.
Accessibility, price.
Accessibility; parking and rental of scooters for disabled.
Accessibility; being able to get in and experience it and not go through all the red tape.
Accommodate our RV easily and readily.
Accommodations, safety, emergency facilities and esthetics are important.
Accommodations. (2)
Add something educational for children, on their level.
Additional funding.
Advertise a little. (2)
Advertise and just keep working it.
Advertise more.(9)
Advertise more; have flyers and pictures, or more of them.
Advertise more of what they have to offer.
Advertise more so we will know where to go.
Advertise more than what they have been.
Advertise more. They should tell people what they could expect in a national park, and they should be truthful about it.
Advertise the importance of taking children and family for vacations.
Advertise the interesting things that they have available.
Advertise them. (3)
Advertise, probably.
Advertise; sometimes I don't even know if things are National Parks or not. I stumble upon things and oh, wow!
Advertise. (23)
Advertise: flyers, TV
Advertisement. (5)
Advertisement; what's available?
Advertisements; let's see advertisements for the park.

Advertising (6)
Advertising how to enjoy the park more.
Advertising more. (2)
Advertising, marketing and more activities.
Advertising, more info, clean.
Affordability, clean facilities, convenience.
Air control.
All are interesting and I don't know what else they could do.
Allow hunting.
Allow more access to horses.
Allow off road vehicles.
Already encouraged in going.
Announce it over the TV so that people can learn about it.
At my age, I don't know.
At my age, I'm not going anymore. I'm 90.
Availability to all people.
Awareness.
Basically stay out of being commercialized.
Be able to keep it up and going. Money for the public to use it.
Be available at the right hours: as early as 5am and as late as midnight.
Be aware of the environment.
Be close to where I live.
Be closer.
Be free.
Be helpful.
Be open.
Be reasonable and clean.
Be safe.
Be there having them and increasing the number of parks and their lands. Having passes helps for some people.
Beauty of the area and safety of trails.
Beauty they're preserving, keep it.
Because of our location we just don't visit them that much.
Being aware of location.
Better access. (2)
Better bathrooms.
Better camping facilities on site. Especially at Yellowstone where if you get caught up there you are hard pressed to find a site for camping.
Better map system. I was lost a lot, especially with construction.
Better publicity.
Better rates to people who visit a lot.
Bring gas prices down.
Bring one closer.
Camping facilities. (2)
Camping, hunting.
Campsites with full hookups.
Can't think of anything right now.

Cheaper gas; having access to them on vacation.
Child care.
Choice of activities.
Clean and adequate facilities.
Clean and things of interest for the family.
Clean it up.
Clean parks.
Clean toilets.
Clean up congestion around park.
Clean water.
Clean, wonderful experience.
Cleaner bathrooms.
Cleaning them up.
Cleanliness of the park system itself.
Cleanliness. (7)
Closer travel because of gas prices.
Concerts and activities.
Concerts going; frog fest.
Conservation.
Continue to advertise.
Continue to encourage people to go green, stop people from taking thing in the park and fine people for littering.
Continue to maintain them.
Continue to make them free.
Continue to operate the parks that they do.
Continue to provide habitat for wildlife.
Continue with information items and plaques, stuff like that.
Convenience.
Could be more accessible, more information on national parks.
Could more identifiable as national parks.
Crowd control, parking problems and make it affordable.
Cure his back so he can travel.
Definitely be safe with guards on duty because those two girls were burned to death.
Doing a good job already; keep it clean.
Do more advertisements and have busses.
Do more advertising; offer vacation packages.
Do not increase roads in isolated and protected areas.
Do not know.
Do package deals.
Do something about fuel prices.
Doing ok right now, except gas prices.
Don't go any more because of age.
Don't change.
Don't charge any money.
Don't charge us for going in it should be free.
Don't have a clue.
Don't have time or money to visit the parks.

Don't have time.
Don't have to do anything.
Don't have to encourage me because we always go.
Don't know; commercials.
Don't know, just keep them primitive as they are.
Don't know; I don't travel.
Don't know. (51)
Don't know. When I had children, but now I don't know.
Don't need to be encouraged, make the advertisements better.
Don't really have an answer to that.
Drive threw a park every day.
Drop the fees lower.
Easily accessible. (2)
Education about the outdoors.
Education for kids. Wildlife.
Education.
Educational.
Entrance ranger friendly and welcoming.
Entry fees are too expensive.
Expanded winter access.
Family friendly. (2)
Few more campgrounds.
Fewer regulations.
Figure out a way to ease traffic in the parks.
Find a way to keep automobile traffic down.
Find traveling companions.
Fine with the way they are running it.
Fishing and the pines.
Flowers.
For us they don't have to encourage us.
Free clean and educational.
Gas prices and not much can be done about that.
Gas prices; traveling.
Gas prices.
General documentation.
General upkeep and safety upkeep.
Get gas prices to go down.
Get information out about what is available at each of the parks.
Get me a job with more time off.
Get me a new back and new set of legs.
Get more money. The government keeps cutting their budget. The Blue Ridge is getting sloppy. They need more money to fix them up.
Get rid of some of the geese and clean it up.
Get rid of the hoorahrah about putting god on things. Just go ahead and do it. This country is 97 percent Christian and we don't need to kiss the butts of any Muslims that come here.
Get the government to increase our wages.
Get the government to lower gas prices. (2)

Get the rangers under control.
Getting to them. Where I live there is not a lot of them.
Give a free day pass.
Give away free water; water from water fountain has a mineral taste.
Give me more free time.
Give me more money.
Give me more money. Bring the gas rates down.
Give me the money to go there. (2)
Give you ride, transportation.
Golden passport available to me; hope it will be for others.
Good people doing tours.
Good restrooms, and clean.
Good roads.
Government spends more money on them.
Handicap accessibility.
Handle the crowd. I've been to Yellowstone, and when I lived in Wyoming, you intentionally didn't go during the tourist season.
Have a golden age pass.
Have a lot of bathrooms.
Have a national park closer to my home.
Have a place for the children to play; be child friendly.
Have a reasonable cost to go.
Have affordable lodging.
Have clean bathrooms.
Have free addition.
Have full electric hook up sites for campers.
Have handicap facilities.
Have it clean and tidy and well informed people to ask questions to.
Have it easy accessible for elderly.
Have more activities going on in the parks.
Have more monuments to see.
Have nice nature trails.
Have one closer to me, I guess.
Have patrol out monitoring the park.
Have people put their dogs on leashes.
Have scooter rentals.
Have the entrance fees by donation.
Have them available.
Have things for the kids to do.
Having everything natural, nothing phony.
Having good direction and guides.
Having more time open for some of them places.
Having to walk. Trails are difficult, so trails need to be easier, or some way of riding for older people.
He goes anyways.
Help us lower the price of gas.
Hiking trails.

History and conservation.
History of it.
How clean the parks are.
I am 77 years old and don't travel that much.
I can't say because I work all the time. They need to lower the cost of entering.
I can't tell you because I never visited the parks.
I can't think of any.
I can't think of anything. (7)
I consider them awfully crowded already, and they need to bring the price of gas down so that we can go.
I don't believe there is anything they can do to convince me, I would like to visit but I am unable to.
I don't have a recommendation, except to suggest they allow people to carry concealed arms.
I don't have anything against the park people. They do a good job.
I don't have anything that they could encourage; it's just a matter of priorities.
I don't know, they've all been very nice.
I don't know, make it easier to get in.
I don't know that answer.
I don't know. I think if I had been more aware of the facilities or what was available I would have used them.
I don't know. (58)
I don't think anything they are doing is right or wrong. We just haven't done it.
I don't have any complaints.
I don't intend to visit any.
I don't know how to answer that.
I don't know, I already am encouraged to visit as many as I can.
I don't know, my neighbor goes to Mexico, some resort facility, and I've told her that she should visit the parks and told her how beautiful they are.
I don't know of any specific thing, I suppose maintain good conditions in the park, limit motorized traffic.
I don't know, online information?
I don't know that there is anything that they can do. My parents took us to national parks and now my family does it.
I don't know that they can do anything.
I don't know that they can encourage me anyway. 'Cause we do go. Just not on a regular basis.
I don't know, I think a lot of people go there, and if they drop the price of gas that might happen.
I don't know, I've never thought about it
I don't know, right now our income is off.
I don't know. The reason I'm not going is cost, at the moment.
I don't know. If they keep the grounds clean and well preserved; that's important.
I don't really have an opinion about that. It's pretty good as it is.
I don't really know. I've been to several national parks in my lifetime I enjoy beauty of them and that's why we go.
I don't really know. (2)
I don't think they can do anything, I think it's up to family planning.
I guess accessibility.

I guess get rid of some of their crazy ideas about what is good for the environment and get back to gold old fashioned camping or what not. They want to be politically correct.
I guess offer, or advertise what they offer, or what you can do at the park, like all the amenities they offer.
I guess probably affordability. I like to go when it's not real crowded, too.
I guess still putting out good PR. A lot of people don't know about them.
I guess the good management of the park system.
I guess the location and the accessibility are the two main problems, and travel sometimes gets expensive now.
I guess, maybe more advertising, as to what is actually available, what parks actually provide.
I heard rumors that like they're going limit the number of cars in the grand canyon, I wouldn't go if that were the case. I can't handle and don't like large cars.
I have grandchildren, so anything that can be done to preserve history and encourage young children would be helpful.
I have no idea other than advertising
I have no idea, they seem fine to me.
I have no idea. I have never thought about it.
I have no idea. I mean I don't think that a park can do anything to make people go.
I have no idea. (8)
I have three cats and don't want to leave them.
I have to be near to one to go.
I have to little kids, can't find babysitter.
I just don't go these places.
I just say preserve them, you know, keep them nice.
I kind of go to see those things anyway, I'm not sure.
I like it the way it is.
I like the Eagle Pass that you can buy for the entire year that lets you go to any national park service for a certain amount.
I like the hiking trails and I like the nice lodges in those. They should keep the parks up.
I love it, that's one of my favorite things about the united states is the national parks. They don't have to do anything.
I need more information and more easily available.
I never really thought about it.
I really don't have an opinion.
I really don't know they're all beautiful. Keep out riffraff and keep the parks clean.
I really don't know. (5)
I think gives them a good look of the U.S. but I think we need to get better safety in the parks. I'm glad of this survey. I think that this is good.
I think it would be nice if they had tour buses, with the price of gas anymore.
I think they all have something of interest, so I can't use that. Perhaps be safe for any age of person.
I think they are doing a fine job.
I think they are great just as they are.
I think they are wonderful just the way they are.
I think they do a fantastic job.
I think they do the right thing now.
I think they should be more advertisements.

I think write ups in newspapers.
I think they should advertise more.
I want my golden age membership.
I want them to continue to be supported. I know that sometimes their funds are cut and they can't. The parks are pretty and useful. I think they are national treasures and they should be taken care of.
I want them to do more stuff. Build more historical stuff so people can go see it.
I will say cleanliness.
I would have to have the leisure time, ability, and the fuel to go.
I would say public awareness.
I would say that it gets people out of the cities to see what the country looks like. It's a good place for the children to be out to and see what we have.
I would say to limit the number of people to enter the park at any given time. Limit the number of vehicles in particular at Yosemite.
I would say, probably limit the amount of traffic.
I'd say keep them clean, safe, and the price down.
I'm a widow and live alone and I don't drive anymore.
I'm impressed with the park system as is.
I'm in awe of these parks so I can't really think of anything. I am just in awe. Fine as they are. Lower gas prices and we can go. We'll go to all the parks then.
I'm not sure.
I'm too old.
I've never considered it.
If I could retire sooner I could have the time to go and gas prices determine a lot.
If I decide to go, I go.
If I had kids I would take them all the time, but I don't.
If they are clean.
If they keep it up; trash and all.
If we are close we will go.
I'll tell you, I'm in huge favor of them and I end up in the forest and grass lands. You'd probably have to make my wife get after me more.
I'm 90 years old and not into doing those kind of things.
I'm a geologist and I like birds, trees and babbling brooks and I'm retired.
I'm in my 70s and not likely to go to a national park.
I'm not sure there is anything that they can do.
Improve accessibility in programming for people with disabilities.
Improve availability of lodgings [sic].
Improve security and the bathroom facilities; stuff like that.
In the area I live in, it's probably advertising.
Increase advertising.
Increase the youth groups such as the boy scouts or girl scouts.
Increase their accessibility.
Information they give you.
Information to get there.
Introduces the children to the outdoors.
It just depends on when I have time; there is nothing they can do to persuade me to go more.
It makes the lands that are available to the public: Yellowstone and Grand Tetons are great

places to visit.
It's a matter of transportation, making roads clear and marked.
It's hard to answer for me because I don't need encouragement, always go to parks. They don't have to encourage me, I love them.
It's just when we plan to travel.
It's keeping the environmental prospects of the park high.
Just advertise.
Just being there, because the ones I live closest to, I visit the most.
Just being there.
Just have them very taken care of and open until at least 7pm at night.
Just have them well run.
Just, there isn't anything near my home. I have to travel a long way to see anything.
Just keep it natural.
Just keep up the good work that they are doing.
Just keeping the parks up.
Just keeping them clean.
Just make them clean.
Just to enjoy the scenery.
Just tourism parts, the sightseeing, keep them available.
Keep access affordable.
Keep affordable, keep family friendly, keep it clean.
Keep costs down.
Keep doing what they are doing. Change the rule about the dogs being on the trail. Make it so they can be with a leash.
Keep entry fees to a minimum and provide suitable access.
Keep fees where they are.
Keep it a wilderness. Limit bicycle use.
Keep it as pristine as possible.
Keep it clean and keep cost down.
Keep it clean and natural; maintenance.
Keep it clean and nice.
Keep it clean, good traffic accommodation, keep it safe.
Keep it clean. Have water for campers.
Keep it clean pristine and don't overpopulate it with people.
Keep it clean. (4)
Keep it free or very low priced.
Keep it maintained.
Keep it natural. (2)
Keep it nice and clean and keep the restrooms tidy.
Keep it open for camping.
Keep it safe and clean.
Keep it the way God made it.
Keep it up, keep it clean.
Keep man from destroying land.
Keep national.
Keep out the business.
Keep parks in good condition.

Keep prices low for admissions.
Keep prices low.
Keep property clean and safe.
Keep property in good order.
Keep the crowding to a minimum.
Keep the environment good.
Keep the fees low.
Keep the good work up.
Keep the greedy bastards from developing it.
Keep the maintenance up have restrooms nearby.
Keep the out of state prices down. Here in Missouri, I can't think of anything.
Keep the park clean.
Keep the parking fees lower, especially for younger people.
Keep the parks up. Clean, good roads, etc.
Keep the price down. Keep them accessible.
Keep the price inexpensive.
Keep the price low.
Keep the senior cards and the campgrounds.
Keep the visitor centers up to date.
Keep them affordable in terms of any costs for entry and in costs that have to do with tours. Keep the shops, restaurants, and concession stands affordable as well.
Keep them as clean and well run as they are.
Keep them as natural as possible.
Keep them as neat as they are, keep them available.
Keep them available.
Keep them clean and beautiful. Control the crowds.
Keep them clean and clean drinking water.
Keep them clean and have them properly monitored. There should be personnel available.
Keep them clean and maintained.
Keep them clean and un-commercialized.
Keep them clean make them affordable.
Keep them clean or over commercialize them.
Keep them clean, safe and inexpensive.
Keep them clean, well managed and orderly.
Keep them clean. (14)
Keep them free and open to the public.
Keep them free of charge.
Keep them free.
Keep them from getting too commercialized.
Keep them going and keep the funding going.
Keep them in good repair; fix the roads, clean the toilets, good maintenance.
Keep them kept up and things like that; clean and maintained.
Keep them maintained.
Keep them natural. (2)
Keep them nice the way they are
Keep them open and serving the purpose they are there for. Also, kept up.
Keep them open. (3)

Keep them safe. (2)
Keep them up, spend money on them.
Keep up the roads, equipment and buildings.
Keep your pricing where it is.
Keeping it clean, preserve it and no development.
Keeping it more environmental.
Keeping people from building housing around the parks.
Keeping the beauty, maintenance.
Keeping them open.
Keeping them up.
Keeping up the facilities, having the funding to keep up and improve the facilities.
Kept safe and policed more.
Kept safe.
Kept them up.
Kindness of the caretakers.
Knowing more specifics and having more knowledge of the park system.
Leave it as untouched.
Less crowded. (2)
Let me lose 20 years.
Let the people come there more often and longer.
Life circumstance, just not traveling at present.
Limit the number of visitors per year.
Live close to the Liberty Bell. I always take visitors to historic places.
Lobby for cheaper gas, that's the only reason I don't get around so much.
Lower entrance prices, and some items sold there. Give discounts by 20-30 percent.
Lower gas prices. (16)
Lower prices to get into them.
Lower prices. (3)
Lower the fee to get into park.
Lower the fees. (2)
Lower the price of fishing licenses.
Lower the price to the park.
Lower the prices and advertise more.
Maintain its beauty.
Maintain the natural area for which future generations can visit.
Maintain the natural beauty.
Maintain the parks. (2)
Maintain the pristine quality of the park systems.
Maintain the quality of the parks.
Maintaining it.
Maintenance and grooming.
Maintenance and upkeep.
Maintenance of the park.
Maintenance.
Make affordable.
Make camping more accessible.
Make gas cheaper.

Make it a pleasant, friendly place, without rowdy drunken people. Drinking should be controlled better.
Make it accessible.
Make it convenient, make it comfortable. Water, sewer and make it cheap.
Make it easier to camp, have more campsites.
Make it easier to get accommodations.
Make it easier to travel without personal vehicles.
Make it easy for people who do not walk long distances, needs to be more level.
Make it feasible for middle class people to afford it.
Make it free because I think my taxes pay enough for that.
Make it handicapped accessible.
Make it more accessible for more areas.
Make it more accessible for wheelchairs to get around.
Make it more accessible.
Make it more affordable. (3)
Make it more user friendly.
Make it possible for me to go on vacation. I have no problem with going I just can't do it.
Make it readily available to all people.
Make more of them.
Make more people aware of what is offered.
Make more wheel chair accessible.
Make online information more accessible.
Make parking available.
Make people aware of them, advertise.
Make people more aware of where they are.
Make sure it's clean and safe.
Make sure the weather is good.
Make sure they are clean and easy to get to.
Make the admission fees lower.
Make the cost cheaper.
Make the entry fee more affordable.
Make the information about the parks easy to access on the web.
Make the parks very accessible for all people especially for handicapped people. Make it a reasonable price.
Make them affordable.
Make them as cheap as possible.
Make them cost effective.
Make them free of charge. (2)
Make them free so people could go more often.
Make them more accessible.
Make them more available, like lodging.
Make them more have more displays and stuff like that.
Make them more interesting.
Make them stay clean and affordable.
Make us informed more about where they are and about them.
Make you feel safer.
Managing people.

Manger visitor.
Marketing and promotion.
Maybe advertise a little bit better.
Maybe if I were to come I would like protection. That the park would be safe for elderly people with disabilities.
Maybe more advertising and education literature for promotion.
More access.
More accessible for handicapped or disabled people.
More advertisement. (3)
More advertising. (10)
More advertising and descriptions of what they have.
More advertising and promotions or direct marketing.
More advertising on commercial TV.
More advertising; brochures.
More advertising: more brochures.
More awareness.
More bathrooms which are open.
More camp sites.
More camping space for RVs.
More cleanliness. More advertising.
More facilities to spend the night.
More family and better lit.
More historic units to visit.
More information.
More informative; guided tours.
More knowledge about national parks.
More literature.
More money to get there. Whenever I can get there, I will be there, but the programs are important to me.
More programs on P.B.S. We see the programs then we want to go see the parks.
More public marketing.
More publicity about them; cost, facilities.
More security.
More security. More sports included.
More staff.
More vacation time. (2)
Move some closer.
Moving them closer so I don't have to drive so far.
My biggest problem is being able to get there. Advertising and accurate literature on what's out there for me.
My family camps a lot, I'm just not physically able to do it.
National public service ads.
Need more money to hire more park rangers.
Need to not change anything.
Need to bring gas prices down so people can go on vacation.
Need to have the time to go there.
Never considered it.

Nice as they were 30 years ago; over populated.
No (26)
No. They are all outstanding.
None around me; no money to travel.
None.
Not able to get out.
Not anything.
Not applicable to us.
Not enough advertising.
Not much.
Not really anything they can do.
Not sure don't have any around here.
Not sure. (5)
Not that I can think of.
Not too crowded.
Not too much of anything.
Nothing at my age.
Nothing can be done to encourage me; depends on schedule and happenstance.
Nothing for me.
Nothing for me, I don't travel anymore.
Nothing I can think of.
Nothing, I will never go.
Nothing, I'm not an outdoor person.
Nothing, I'm too old.
Nothing really, if I go I'll go.
Nothing really.
Nothing right now, too many things going on.
Nothing right now.
Nothing, they are run great.
Nothing they can do.
Nothing, they do a great job.
Nothing to say there.
Nothing, I just don't have the money to go.
Nothing, pay you.
Nothing. (63)
Offer travel or gas vouchers because I don't live near one so if they did this it would give me the incentive to go. Also affordable lodging.
Oh I don't know, I'm not much one to travel, that's the thing.
Open access to go hiking, etc.
Open and free to public.
Open them up more, make them more accessible
Other interests.
Our time is the hindrance.
Outlaw ATVs and snowmobiles.
Over improvements.
Overall, more advertising.
Parking. Good parking. And keep the fees reasonable.

Parks I go to, they do a good job. Don't know what they could do.
Parks to be closer by.
Pay me to go.
Pay my gas.
Pay my gasoline expenses.
Pay my plane fare.
Personal security and cleanness.
Places of observation; more to relax.
Preservation, authenticity.
Preservation. (2)
Preserve habitat.
Preserve them better.
Preserve them in their original state. Provide enough money for them to do that and expand them.
Preserve things the way they are.
Preserve wilderness.
Preserving America the way it is.
Pretty much satisfied right now; I take my family to see many things.
Price of gas coming down.
Price.
Prices down.
Probably advertise more; radio, TV. Do a better job to advertise in schools.
Probably advertisement campaigns and internet campaigns telling me which one they are.
Probably free entry.
Probably having the rangers and park staff to collect so you can continue to go.
Probably just have it cheap.
Probably keep prices down for tourism.
Probably make the accessibility easy.
Probably more advertising.
Probably nothing to encourage me, I go if I want to and not if I don't want to.
Probably nothing.
Probably PR events and stuff so I know what's going on.
Probably publicize more what is available for me, why I should go there, what I should see.
Probably television advertising.
Programs for children.
Promote.
Promotion, advertisements.
Promotions.
Protect additional land.
Protect and preserve.
Protect the wilderness, nature.
Protect the wildlife.
Provide a better way of reservations in the parks.
Provide clean facilities.
Provide information about the parks.
Provide security.
Public awareness about nature.

Publicize.
Put ads on TV. Make people aware of it. Not enough awareness.
Put commercials about them on TV.
Put electricity in their RV spaces.
Put in a train system here in California in Yosemite.
Put it indoors, do not like outdoors.
Put more recreation parks and activities closer.
Put snowmobiles in Yellowstone.
Put them closer to where I live.
Quit commercializing them.
Quota on visitors daily.
Really don't know. (2)
Really nothing, just health.
Reasonable fees.
Reasonable rates for camping.
Reduce gas prices. (2)
Reduce the cost of fuel so I can get there.
Reduce the price for senior citizens.
Reduce traffic, cut the fees.
Remain as it is. Remain attacked with minimize of commercialization.
Remain forestry.
Remind of their locations.
Remind us of the treasure our parks are.
Remove the motorcycles and any of the noise making machines.
Restroom need to be open to public.
Retain the remote areas and remain as natural as possible.
Right at this time, I'm not financially able.
Right now I just don't have time.
Right now I'm 75 and with gas prices they way they are, I don't go too far.
RV campsites cleanliness. No interruption to wildlife.
Safety and facilities.
Safety and security.
Safety in terms of natural environment and safety in general.
Safety issues, making it safe.
Safety. (6)
Safety; pristine of parks.
Security and safety.
See more brochures.
Send me some coupons.
Send me information or e-mail about these historic parks.
Send me money. (2)
Send out mailers; tell me about them.
Senior pass.
Some sort of advertisement, in newspaper, TV, etc., telling things about it.
Somehow put on little programs for the children.
Something for children; more kid friendly.
Something historical. Short of advertising.

Stock more trout.
Stop charging me to visit; lower the prices.
Stop outrageous fees to enter.
Straighten out the tax regulations.
Summer vacation.
Survival to make it in this world.
Take better care of the wild life. Let it take care of itself; quit trying to manage it yourself.
Take better care of them and fund them.
Take care of things.
Take good care of resources and park.
Take good care of them.
Tell me where they are and what I would do there.
That they keep the sites from the government.
That's a good question. Plant more trees maybe.
The beauty of every national park is unique.
The biggest problem there is finding a campsite when you are there.
The cleanliness of the parks.
The forest.
The government could give me more vacation.
The major parks are too crowded.
The only national park I've visited so far is Sequoia; at that particular location it would be better if they had showers at the camp site.
The scenic beauty.
The thing of it is we're not close to any national parks. Make them free; it's an expense for us to get there.
There is nothing they can do. It's not because there is anything they can do, I just don't go.
There isn't anything they could do, because I live too far away from the parks.
There isn't anything they could do. I suppose, maybe if I received more information in the mail about a unit of the national park system that I don't know about.
There really isn't anything.
There someplace close to me.
They are doing a good job. I can't complain.
They are doing all the right stuff now.
They are doing fine.
They are doing what they need to do.
They are so strapped for funding that they cannot afford to advertise or maintain the parks as they should. Also the price of gas makes it very hard to go anywhere.
They can offer cheaper prices. They are very expensive.
They can provide low cost and clean places to stay.
They couldn't do anything, I don't like outdoors.
They do a wonderful job.
They need to manage human population, specifically the numbers and their movement.
They really can't do anything. Advertising my help.
They really can't do anything. It's really up to the economy on whether or not I can go.
They should do more encouraging things.
They should keep up the safety of the parks.
They should kill fewer trees. I go to the parks for the fresh air and trees.

Think TV advertising.
To be around when the time comes that I'm traveling.
To encourage us to go, keep them up maintain them.
To have a celebrity.
To keep it clean and policing it.
To keep them natural.
To maintain them and keep creeks clean, last one had lots of pollution.
To make parks accessible to people as much as possible: open beaches, open hours, low fees and no restrictions.
Too crowded.
Too many people visit them, or the parks should limit the number of people entering the park system.
Traffic and transportation could get better.
Traffic.
Trail system.
Transportation.
Trees and everything; they can improve those things.
Trying to preserve the historical center, keep it the way it was.
TV ads and advertising more.
TV advertisements.
Upkeep.
Very handicap accessible.
Visited parks before and enjoyed them.
We don't do very much traveling.
We don't have any parks close to us, but we believe they are managed well.
We have a lot of state parks here in town. Make a national park in town.
We like to see wildlife and nature.
We live in Ohio, so we don't have any National parks available close by, as far as I know.
We really go or don't go according to our situation financially. We do have a handicapped child and I don't like when we go to national parks that are not handicapped accessible.
Well drill for oil in Ottawa and I'd be happy to go to some of these places. Gas is too expensive.
Well, give more information about it, and the directions. Advertise more.
Well, I don't know if this falls into this kind of a category, but last year when they dedicated the thing for the WWI veterans, we were looking at the internet, and I was very unhappy about the disrepair of the monument for the WWI veterans.
Well, I don't know. I think they do fine.
Well, I visited Sequoia National Park and they added a trolley system it was more convenient for the elderly. Please add hand rails going down the stairs.
Well, price needs to be kept down.
Well, we mostly camp and ride horses. They should encourage those activities in national parks.
Well, I can't really answer that, I don't do a lot of travelling.
Well, I don't know whether they could do anything, but I feel as an American I would like to see more national parks.
Well, I don't know of anything.
Well, I enjoyed them while I was there, but I don't intend to go back.

Well, probably a safety concern, particularly where children are concerned.
Wheelchair accessibility.
When I go into a national park, I expect cleanliness.
Wildlife conservation.
With me, fix up with handicap accessibility.
Work on affordability for low income families.
Wouldn't go.
You need to talk to someone that is younger than I am.

B.2 - Responses from the web survey

q.4 In your opinion, what is the ONE most important thing the National Park Service can do to encourage you to visit units of the National Park System?

An animal-safe place with no worries of an attack of a deer.
A book or brochure showing the parks and sites in your area or state or across the country. I know there are a lot in the country but where they are or what they have is unknown to me.
A clean one.
Access.
Access to information, brochures, etc. about that particular park, such as Yellowstone provides.
Accessibility. (2)
Activities, hours of admission, cost if any.
Advertise. (37)
Advertise a little more. I don't ever hear anything about them in mainstream media. I'm sure there is ample info available if somebody went looking for it, but there needs to be more ads in mainstream media.
Advertise activities available in each park.
Advertise and low cost lodging. People can't afford to travel now.
Advertise and point out its best features.
Advertise events.
Advertise family activities or things to see.
Advertise important facts/points of interest.
Advertise: include historic elements surrounding particular site.
Advertise locations.
Advertise more. (9)
Advertise more about them. There are commercials on TV about different states to visit and what you can do there. Do commercials about the parks and what all is available there.
Advertise more about what the national parks have to offer.
Advertise more and let us know how to get to the park and how to access the facilities. Let us know the procedure of how to visit a national park.
Advertise more in detail on TV about all the different locations there are to see other than the normal ones.
Advertise more, maybe through schools.
Advertise more. A lot of people aren't aware of a lot of things available. Children in school should be told about them and bring information home to their parents and then they could plan a trip.
Advertise more, to be in front of the public.
Advertise more. Show that it is fun and exciting.
Advertise on TV. (2)
Advertise on TV. People need to know where they are and what they are like.
Advertise other activities around it.
Advertise sites and promote activities for the different seasons.
Advertise so you know where they are.
Advertise some of their activities.

Advertise the beauty of the park!
Advertise the best features in national media. Also make RV camping more available.
Advertise the great things one can see and do at national parks.
Advertise the things you can do there.
Advertise their affiliation.
Advertise them more. (2)
Advertise well. I didn't even know that the National Park System existed.
Advertise what different parks have to offer.
Advertise what is available in the area.
Advertise what parks are in my state and the costs to visit them.
Advertise with a coupon if there is a fee.
Advertise with reminders of the different systems, parks, monuments, etc. and the features they offer.
Advertise with some tips on how to incorporate units of the National Park System for an inexpensive vacation.
Advertise the beauty and activities.
Advertise. I don't know if I live near one.
Advertisement. (4)
Advertising. (3)
Advertising. I don't really even know what National Parks are nearby other than Hot Springs National Park
Advertising of the parks online, newspapers, magazines, and television.
Advertising on the TV and magazines. (2)
Advertizing. What is out there? What is there to do?
Affordable.
Allow CCH permit holders to visit the parks legally.
Allow dogs.
Allow dogs (on leashes). (2)
Allow dogs on the trails and in lakes.
And to say I was the park to see many.
Anyone that close to me. I'm not sure I did visit in any my life time. Too long to remember.
Anything the National Park Service can do to correct that problem.
Are more aware of the locations.
As I am 89 I will probably not be in position to visit many parks in my future.
Ask me if I've exercised my right to enjoy something in the National Park System.
Assure the public will have an opportunity to learn something educational, or gain some physical bonuses.
At this time in our lives it's not the National Park System that prevents us from visiting; we have too many obligations at home that prevent us from being gone overnight. Along with the gas prices.
Attractions.
Activities in the parks. People do not hear much about them.
Be clean and have things of interest to see.
Be free.
Be safe.

Be welcoming and accessible.
Beauty. (2)
Being clean.
Better security.
Better advertisement.
Better crime control.
Better health and fewer allergies.
Better parking.
Brochure.
Buy a TV channel.
By having a modest, or no charge, so all citizens may have the opportunity to visit the national park system.
By keeping it clean and nice.
By mailing or posting information about the parks in billboards, newsletters, newspaper, doctors' offices and public places.
Camping. (4)
Camping opportunities.
Camping, which I do not do. See different sites. Have never been to a real big park.
Can't think of anything. (2)
Can't think of anything, doing a good job.
Can't think of anything. Maybe I'll visit with my grandchildren.
Cedar point.
Change their method of reservations.
Cheap.
Cheaper annual pass.
Cheaper rates.
Clean.
Clean and available camping and picnicking areas, hiking trails.
Clean and free. No admission.
Clean and orderly parks, which is actually everyone's job.
Clean and safe.
Clean and safe areas.
Clean and safe environment.
Clean, high visibility of rangers.
Clean it up.
Clean park, restrooms, etc.
Cleanliness. (3)
Clean place to camp.
Close to one for over 20 years.
Companies.
Continue to be affordable.
Continue doing what they all ready do, make the places welcoming and clean.

Continue to have knowledgeable and interesting guides.
Continue to honor the "senior" pass.
Continue to provide quality lodging at affordable prices.
Continue with knowledgeable personnel.
Contribution to 'green' environments.
Control of wildfires.
Coupons or specials for cheap or free camping.
Courteous people working there and neat surroundings.
Create an interest.
Cultural events.
Designate a national park or something in southeastern lower Michigan. All the parks are out of driving distance for me.
Discount prices for families, including hotel stay.
Do as much as possible to keep people safe from other people.
Do more to promote the history and natural beauty of our national parks.
Do not advertise. I find that the parks are overcrowded by people that really do not care about the fact that the parks are ours and should be cared for as if they could disappear tomorrow.
Do not post signs falsely claiming that the Grand Canyon was formed 6,000 years ago by Biblical means.
Don't charge.
Don't enjoy parks.
Don't have any money to visit.
Don't have rangers or police watching over my shoulder the whole time.
Don't know. (9)
Don't know, but the one I went to was about history of our country. I like them.
Don't know of any close to where I live.
Don't know. Proximity would help.
Don't need encouragement.
Draw attention to the attractions.
Due to age and infirmity I do not plan to a national park in the foreseeable future.
Ease of access.
Easier to get to.
Easy access to the park with a short line to enter at the gates.
Easy access.
Easy accessibility and money for upkeep.
Easy transportation to and from them.
Encourage me by promoting the history and beauty of our great nation.
Encourage oil companies to lower the price of gas!
Encourage visitor friendly services nearby for vacationing families of various economic groups.
Excellent web pages full of information for all types of travelers.
Excitement.
Fairly safe.

Family friendly.
Family vacation.
Features of the different parks.
Feed wildlife.
Fine view.
Fires.
For all visit who come to the park, to see kids smile to be the park.
For me, nothing. I do not travel and I do not have any ideas that would encourage other people.
For monuments, etc. I don't know.
For outdoor parks, put more toilet facilities.
For people to relax in nature and see how the earth really is.
For us it would be: is the park old age friendly?
Free.
Free access.
Free admission. (2)
Free entry and parking.
Free gas.
Free jeep ride.
Free parking.
Free visits and tour information along the way.
Fresh air.
Friendly environment with room and specialized areas for different activities.
From what I have seen, I really don't think any changes or additions to need to be done. I really enjoyed myself.
Full page, monthly calendar of community events in local neighborhood newspaper.
Fun.
Gaining information on nature and how to maintain it.
Gas.
Get more information to the public on what's available.
Get the government to get the gas prices down to what they were 15 or 20 years ago, and in doing that, all the other prices will come down and make it more affordable to visit more places.
Get the word out more about what each location has to offer.
Get the word out there to families looking for something to do.
Get the word out through TV ads or mailings about the availability of the national parks.
Give discounted admission for off season visitors.
Give free drinks.
Give me time off from my small business.
Give my husband a day off work to go.
Give specials to groups of family or just groups so that they can tell other people about their experiences at the parks.
Good restroom facilities.
Good security.

Good, working bathrooms.
Have a good deal on the fees.
Have a good reservation system.
Have a TV visit.
Have accommodations and areas with no cars.
Have adequate security.
Have affordable hotel rooms and delicious food.
Have an extensive bike trail or walking paths.
Have bathrooms available; not port-a-potties.
Have bus and tour guides within the parks to help save gasoline and help people see the most important sites.
Have camping available. (2)
Have camping close by and things planned in the park.
Have Christian dedications.
Have easy access for disabled seniors.
Have easy access.
Have enjoyable walking areas.
Have events at the site.
Have exciting things for kids.
Have full knowledge of the parks they monitor.
Have good security.
Have good security for visitors.
Have guided tours.
Have historic figures on display and the history of the park itself. Make it interesting for adults as well as children.
Have improved access and facilities at Mt. Rainier National Park. Last I heard roads were closed, facilities were being renovated and what was open was unclear.
Have more advertisement or have the parks on the Travel TV station.
Have more binoculars.
Have more family events.
Have more information about them available to the general public.
Have more of them.
Have more security.
Have one closer to where I live, because I don't travel.
Have one online internet site with detailed information on all sites.
Have planned or regular activities to participate in.
Have some evening operating hours.
Have tent sites or cabin space available at a reasonable price.
Have the web site listing rise to the top of Google and other search engines when someone queries "tourism (state)" or "things to do in (state)" etc.
Have things of interest to me and make sure that the park is well maintained.
Have wildlife shows such as the ones you see in amusement parks and zoos.
Having a feeling of being safe.

Having more summer activities.
Having picnic areas by the water.
Help gas prices go down.
Help kids learn and feel that they are a part.
Historical facts.
Historical value.
History. (3)
History of place.
Hold festivals.
Honor our heritage. Don't cave in and remove all reminders of how we got here. Our flag, the Constitution, the Ten Commandments.
I am not sure. (2)
I am getting too old for visiting national parks.
I am not as familiar with the subject to make a comment. A free trip to the park is the only thing I can come up with.
I am not physically able at this time.
I can't afford to go.
I can't think of anything. (3)
I can't visit as I am incapacitated and can't walk now.
I do plan on visiting several national parks in the next few years. My son at this time is too young to appreciate the trip.
I don't know. (11)
I don't know and really don't care.
I don't care for parks any more.
I don't go.
I don't have to be encouraged in the least.
I don't know of anything that would encourage me. I would love to visit some, but the price of gasoline and the food we buy takes up a majority of my income, so travel is not much of an option for me at this time.
I don't know of anything they can do right now, people cannot afford to travel to the many parks that are any distance from where they live now. I think keeping them clean and inviting would be the only thing.
I don't know! I'm retired and have no money to do anything! And gas is out of sight!
I don't know, I'm not really an outdoor person.
I don't know. It is a cost issue. Maybe keep prices, fees, etc. very low or free.
I don't know. It would not be theirs to encourage me to visit. It is just not something I would plan at my age.
I don't think they could change my mind about visiting because I am 80 years old and have no intention of visiting a park.
I don't travel.
I don't travel anymore.
I don't know anything. I don't want to go to a national park.
I go to the park because I like the outdoors. It just peaceful and just enjoying the outdoors.
I guess bathrooms.

I have never given it much thought.
I have no idea what this national park system is or where these parks are at.
I have no idea where to find one that is toddler friendly.
I just don't have the time to visit the national parks. I believe they need to make it more interesting and advertise what is so great about the nation parks; let people know their history.
I like hotels.
I like the fact that once you pay your annual entrance fee to a national park, you can use it in other national parks. This should be advertised; however, with the recent gasoline prices, road trips are not that affordable for many people.
I like to fish and camp.
I like to go there and look around; real nice place to go; things to see that I never saw before.
I live in Virginia so we have quite the national park areas, with all the battlegrounds and Appomattox Courthouse, where the Confederacy was surrendered by General Robert E. Lee. The parks are quite abundant in Virginia. My property, where I built my house, was where the Feds made a retreat to Cloyd's Mountain, Virginia, then on to Mountain Lake, Virginia, where Dirty Dancing was filmed, the Feds made the retreat across that mountain range called Mini Ball Hill. The Feds dumped their wagons of ammo and powder to make the harsh retreat to Cloyd's Mountain. Virginia is full of history. Jamestown. I live in Blacksburg VA, when Blacksburg was called Drapers Meadow, where the Drapers Meadow Massacre took place, as the Pawnee came from the Ohio Valley and massacred the Draper Meadow settlement. This is where the story of Mary Draper Ingalls, who walked from the Ohio Valley back to the settlement in which her husband Tom Ingalls was still alive, took place. There is so much history and many places to see in Virginia and a lot of it is right at my back door.
I love anything about the U.S. Civil War and have, on many occasions, realized that the facts presented are either wrong or distorted. Any place that goes beyond what is typically done is what I prefer.
I love national parks. I used to work at some.
I love our national parks and monuments. I would like to see more ads, informational features and shows on all of our parks.
I may not visit in the near future because of finances and time. I definitely plan on visiting more parks and monuments when I can.
I really don't know.
I really don't know. Maybe more things to do for kids that are not boring!
I think making all of the parks accessible by train would make for a perfect vacation option.
I think that more primitive campsites could be made available.
I think the most important thing is to advertise and offer discounts.
I think the system doesn't have to do anything. The system and its beauty and reverence speak for themselves.
I think they do a good job and explain the national park system so far as what I had been to. Maybe offer other parks DVDs of other regions.
I think they need to bring some of the lesser known parks into the forefront.
I think things are fine the way they are.
I visit them for the beauty of them.
I went to Grand Canyon once and thought it was rather nice. Would go again if I have the chance.
I would like to visit the park just to see the park.
I would love a brochure of the National Park Service.
I would love to if I had the time.

I would love to visit a nation park already. It is just that I am in school and don't have the time or money right now.
I would say to make it safer to visit.
If I were traveling in the U.S. and decided to make the parks part of a visit, the decision to travel would be based on gas prices and lodging prices.
I'm a widow and have no one to travel with so I don't think there is anything the National Park System can do to encourage me.
I'm not familiar with what they do now.
I'm not sure.
I'm not sure they can do anything; it's a matter of being alone and not having a partner to go to a park with.
I'm not sure. We just want to see some of the parks in our life time.
Increase advertising with the focus being on the "greening" of society.
Increase my knowledge of national parks close to my home. Usually only hear about the famous parks that are farther away from my home.
Increase travel and lodging options close by.
Inexpensive accommodations.
Inform me of items and activities that are appropriate for children under 5. We have avoided some of the places we have visited prior to having a child because they just did not seem appropriate now. I have not done the research to know what places would be good to visit with my 4 year old.
Information about.
Information on their parks.
Information on what is available and if there is a charge.
Informative.
Interest in visiting parks. Lived to.
Is it free? It should be.
It is beautiful and magnificent.
It is more than 15 years since I visited a National Park. Simply lost.
It just needs to be some place I'm interested in going to and I will.
It needs to be more cost effective. With gas at its current level, people cannot afford to travel.
It's been so long since I have been to one I couldn't say.
It's more what my travels take me.
It's nice.
It's not I do not want to visit a national park. The reason I am not going to a park is because we have planned our vacation to Disney World in Florida. We are planning to go to Alaska next summer. Now we do not have a national park around I live.
It's really not a matter of convincing me to visit; it's more about time and money. Having more information on the parks would be helpful.
Just keep it the way mother nature had it.
Just keep the parks clean and nice for all to enjoy.
Just keep them clean.
Just keep them open and affordable to the public.
Just raising awareness.
Just what they are already doing.

Keep admission free.
Keep admission low.
Keep all costs down on all things. With gas prices people who want to vacation will not have money to enter or spend money at the parks.
Keep areas as pristine as possible and provide for accessibility via transit where feasible as they are doing in some parks. The National Park Service does a great job!
Keep camping areas clean and user fees low.
Keep cars and development out.
Keep clean and safe.
Keep clean, keep out riff raff.
Keep costs at minimum.
Keep costs down. (7)
Keep development from progressing in or near the systems.
Keep doing what they are doing. (2)
Keep entrance fee down.
Keep entrance fees low and affordable!
Keep entry fees low.
Keep everything clean.
Keep everything clean, especially the bathrooms.
Keep fees as low as possible and keep the resources safe.
Keep fees low as possible.
Keep grounds clean and kept up to date.
Keep historical sites authentic.
Keep it an economical activity accessible to all.
Keep it as natural as possible.
Keep it cheap!
Keep it clean. (20)
Keep it clean and natural, if possible.
Keep it clean, i.e. trash & debris. Allow aluminum cans of beer.
Keep it clean and friendly.
Keep it clean and safe. (6)
Keep it clean, family atmosphere.
Keep it cost effective.
Keep it free for all to attend.
Keep it patrolled.
Keep it prices fair.
Keep it well maintained.
Keep land natural and educate public.
Keep me aware of what is available. What are the national parks and what do they offer for visitors?
Keep park facilities, trails, brochures, etc. informative, fun, and in good condition.
Keep park visits a quality experience.
Keep rates low on camping fees.

Keep restrooms clean.
Keep the access fees at a reasonable cost.
Keep the area up.
Keep the cost down when visiting.
Keep the entrance fees at a reasonable price. Also keep them clean and well kept.
Keep the entrance fees down so that the average family can afford to take the whole crew.
Keep the facilities clean.
Keep the national park available to the public. There is nothing greater than to be able to get out in nature in all the wonderful parks. Don't close any park in the future, we need them all, they all have their own beauty.
Keep the park more natural! Not to add too many gift shops and things. Just a few but do not take away the naturalness of it!
Keep the parks as natural and undisturbed as possible. For example, don't allow the use of recreational vehicles.
Keep the parks clean and as Mother Nature made them.
Keep the parks clean and beautiful.
Keep the parks clean and interesting to visit.
Keep the parks clean and safe.
Keep the parks clean! When visiting national parks the one thing I see is the trash cans are always full and there's trash all over the grounds at the park.
Keep the parks pristine.
Keep the parks pristine and do not allow them to become overcrowded "tourist traps".
Keep the parks safe. (2)
Keep the price right.
Keep the trees and other growing things alive!
Keep them clean and affordable.
Keep them clean and no ATV traffic.
Keep them clean and promote them through schools so kids ask to go!
Keep them clean and well maintained.
Keep them easily accessible.
Keep them free of litter and graffiti.
Keep them free to visit.
Keep them in good condition.
Keep them in pristine condition.
Keep them interesting and beautiful.
Keep them natural.
Keep them safe and clean and taken care of.
Keep them well maintained.
Keep them in top shape and manage them with our own people and not foreign people.
Keep things clean and quiet.
Keep up cleanliness in the parks.
Keep up improvements.
Keeping it clean. (4)

Keeping it clean and family friendly.
Keeping it family friendly.
Learn about history.
Learning.
Lessen the entry fees into parks.
Lesson in why it is relevant today such as.
Let me know what is available in terms of places of interest or attractions I might want to visit. Also to advertise any special events or programs that may be up-coming.
Let me know where locations are!
Let people know about them and some of their features.
Let people know what is available.
Let us enjoy the god made part, not manmade.
Limit access by automobiles, so they aren't congested.
Limit cars.
Limit the amount of traffic that can be in the park at one time.
Locate one closer to my home area.
Location.
Lodging.
Love nature. I try to get out as much as I can. I love fishing.
Low entry cost.
Lower fees.
Lower gas prices. (2)
Lower gas prices. I know you can't.
Lower prices.
Lower prices for admission. (2)
Lower the admission price.
Lower the entrance fees.
Maintain a clean environment free from the outside influences of the "modern world" so that the site is both authentic and immaculate.
Maintain a natural environment.
Maintain a safe and clean environment.
Maintain basic facilities and ensure personal security from non-nice people.
Maintain facilities.
Maintain low or no cost.
Maintain park quality.
Maintain the beauty of our national parks.
Maintain the integrity of the park and minimize congestion. Parks do not need to be promoted or they will be overrun.
Maintain the sense of peace and quiet.
Maintain them.
Maintain good access roads.
Maintenance of facilities.

Make sure the park is clean and a security guard is there to patrol the park.
Make cites more convenient.
Make discount gas available.
Make free maps available.
Make it easier to bring small children by having lots of bathrooms and stroller accessible trails.
Make it a free entrance.
Make it affordable. (3)
Make it affordable. I have heard about the season pass for all parks, I will check into it.
Make it cost effective to stay there.
Make it easier for me to get there, for example, to work with a tour company, since I prefer not to drive if I can help it.
Make it easier to make camping reservations. The current system makes it difficult to make reservations in specific areas, so much so that I have had to stop vacationing in national park areas.
Make it easy for me to get around in the park.
Make it easy to visit. (2)
Make it economically possible.
Make it family friendly with lots of information on the internet about things families can do there, places to stay, changing stations, etc.
Make it free.
Make it free to the public. If the Government can afford to waste as much money on things like war, they can afford to take care of our parks.
Make it interesting. Most people today want stuff that will pique their interests.
Make it inviting so people will want to visit the National Park System.
Make it less expensive for senior visitors.
Make it more appealing.
Make it more convenient for families with small children.
Make it seem nice and clean, and that it is something the whole family will love to see.
Make it very affordable and easily accessed.
Make me 30 years younger. I am 78. Mother is 96. I'm her sole caretaker. Can't travel anymore.
Make me aware of what places are national parks and what I may enjoy at these places.
Make me more aware of national park sites, lodging and nearby hotel accommodations.
Make me more aware of the different locations and attractions offered. Nothing comes to mind when I think of reasons to visit a national park. I don't like camping.
Make people aware that these are travel destinations.
Make sure hunters aren't anywhere where innocent people can get hurt.
Make sure it's safe.
Make sure it's safe from vandals, animals, etc.
Make sure that they are safe.
Make sure the parks are keep clean. Drug free.
Make sure they are safe and clean.
Make sure they are manned and are enforcing cleanliness and no disturbance of normal wildlife.
Make the locations interesting to visit.
Make the parks free for everybody.

Make the place fun and having a clean and safe park.
Make the price of entry cheaper.
Make them as accessible for families as possible. Make it a great learning and entertainment experience.
Make them closer.
Make them easily accessible.
Make them friendly and affordable for families.
Make them handicap accessible.
Make them more accessible.
Make them more interesting and appealing.
Make them safe for children.
Make them safe for families.
Making it easier for handicapped persons to get around.
Market it as a way to see the United States, a cheap and a once-in-a-lifetime experience to see the states.
Market the natural beauty.
Market the points of interest to the public.
Market them better.
Maybe have one closer to where I live in Minneapolis, Minnesota. I'm not a big traveler. Maybe more ads on TV highlighting ones that are not too far away would spark my interest.
Maybe if gas prices were lower and the cost of everything else quit rising as well. The only thing that is not changing is my paycheck.
Maybe more advertisements about how it's healthy to be outdoors. Maybe more park rangers with more knowledge about the area we are visiting; cleaner and safer facilities. Also, education about areas, history in schools. Make it more personal, not just reading it in the computer, more like from books with beautiful scenic pictures that makes one want to look for oneself.
Maybe much shorter flights.
For me, it is that the parks should have safety.
Media campaign.
Middle eastern cultures do or don't believe in this type of conservation or education or whatever.
Minimize park fees.
More advertising.
More advertising on the availability of services to those traveling in the area. Such as hotels and restaurants.
More advertizing of the various parks in the country.
More awareness.
More benches, restrooms, food stand and to sell things but not expensive.
More buses to tour.
More charter busses.
More facilities.
More handicapped access.
More highway signs on how to get there.
More information in local area.

More information on the current national parks.
More places to stay.
More publicity would be nice, so I know what services such as hotels, etc. are nearby.
More rangers and security people.
More reasonable admission.
More visibility in travel guides.
Most are not close enough.
Move them closer to me.
Move them closer. Seriously, I never had any problem with National Park System units and love visiting them, so it is issue of my time not National Park Systems.
National parks and I don't think there is.
Natural beauty.
Nature.
New attractions.
No admission fees.
No charge.
No fee.
No idea. (2)
No loud boom box loud noises.
No trash around.
No wilderness passes.
None. (3)
Not a thing. (3)
Not charge an entrance fee.
Not charge for entering park or charging for parking.
Not charge so much to go visit them.
Not make you pay to get in to see it.
Not really sure right now.
Not sure. (11)
Not sure exactly what a national park is, but I suppose put info out so one can learn more about it. With the Bush administration fouling up the economy with this war and his interests in big oil, many of us won't be able afford to travel much anyway.
Not sure if there is anything, gas prices too high to travel.
Not sure of anything at the moment because I never went to a national park.
Not sure, don't travel.
Nothing. (25)
Nothing at this moment.
Nothing at this time. Money is tight.
Nothing comes to mind. (2)
Nothing except, right now, lower the gas prices.
Nothing, I am impressed by how the system operates.
Nothing. I'm not the outdoors type.

Nothing, it has to do with the gas prices. All trips have been cancelled until gas prices go down.
Nothing, just not in my plans.
Nothing much really. My lifestyle doesn't permit me to visit these types of places.
Nothing NPS can do. I don't have time to do such a visit.
Nothing really. I enjoy national parks, but my health and limited travel capabilities, keep me from going to these places.
Nothing, due to my health I cannot travel.
Nothing, I just don't have the motivation at age 69 to visit much of anything.
Nothing, I just haven't had the to do so.
Nothing, I would visit them if I had time.
Nothing, I'm just too poor to visit any and my health is bad.
Nothing, it is all about going on vacation and having money.
Nothing, my kids are too young yet to travel.
Nothing, we finally have the resources to visit.
Nothing, I already live in the country and have no desire to go to these places. They are already overcrowded.
Nothing. All the ones I saw were on the West Coast as we were driving through the United States. The Redwood Forest was beautiful.
Nothing. I just need more time to do these things.
Nothing. Just no time or money to get to one.
Nothing. Having a hard time visiting due to the economy and gas prices.
Nothing. I don't go on vacation.
Nothing. I had to go back to work and I do not have any time to vacation anywhere.
Nothing. I know how great the parks are. It's a matter of finding the time.
Nothing. It is just not one of my interests.
Nothing, I'll probably go when my wife and I have kids.
NPS is doing fine.
Offer a free trip.
Offer a learning experience.
Offer discount family packages.
Offer discounts for multiple visits.
Offer low cost access.
Offer more facilities for non-campers. Not everyone who appreciates nature is physically able to rough it.
Offer package deals with hotels, meals, etc.
Offer passes good for multiple visits rather than just single use entrance fees.
Offer some kind of special promotion for kids.
Offer travel vouchers.
Offering you information on how the park came into place.
Offers a variety of things to do.
Open space.
Open the park to the public for free.
Operate an efficient, clean and respectful facility.

Paid the money to get there.
Park safety.
Parking. (2)
Parking and transportation such as a shuttle, bus, etc., to the Monument.
Pay for my vacations.
Perhaps do more advertising to show that there are national parks near you that you may not even be aware of. Most people think only of places like Yellowstone, the Grand Canyon, etc.
Personally it's not encouragement that is needed. I'm just not able to take time away for a vacation because I don't have the money for gas and hotel fees, nor the time to take a vacation.
Place collateral information at visitor centers, on websites, etc. I don't make vacation plans around a visit to a National Park System unit, but I do research places that I will be visiting and would be more likely to visit if information was placed in these areas.
Please clean and update the restrooms.
Plenty of things to do and discover.
Preserve its natural look.
Preserve its wilderness.
Preserve the natural beauty within the park boundaries.
Preserve the parks for the future generations to enjoy.
Pretty and clean.
Price. (2)
Probably nothing. I just do not take many vacations for financial reasons.
Professional and highly trained staff, guides, rangers.
Promote a specific event.
Promote the parks locally. Most people don't take advantage of what is in their own back yard. They take it for granted!
Promote their areas more to the local people as well as with tourism and history cable channels.
Promote them so people know where they are, what they offer, etc.
Properly maintain the facility.
Protect our national treasures such as the forests, mountains and wildlife.
Protect the environment within the parks: air, water, flora, and fauna.
Protect the natural wild environment of our parks from development and pollution.
Provide affordable rental units.
Provide an environment with a lot of history and educational value in a beautiful natural environment that is safe and affordable for a family of five.
Provide easy access.
Provide good information on a well run website.
Provide good restroom facilities.
Provide information about the unit.
Provide information on conservation.
Provide information on the many, lesser known parts of the system in geographical areas.
Provide me with one more weekend.
Provide more entertainment.
Provide more PSAs.

Provide places to camp.
Provide transportation, I don't have a car.
Provide well-maintained tent and camping areas.
Providing more learning options about the state that the park is located in and nature.
Public information on national parks.
Public service announcements would be useful.
Publicity; let the public know there are still parks available for use.
Publicize historic sites. We are most interested in history and sites related to historic events.
Put in doggie parks with access to water areas for the pets to play in safely.
Put more cost-effective packages together, especially considering gas prices today in getting to these places.
Put more fish in the lakes in the national parks.
Put out better maps of the park.
Really can't afford to go visit anything.
Reasonable prices.
Reasonably priced lodging.
Reduce the cost.
Reduce the entrance fees.
Relaxation and feeling good looking at the natural beauty of creation.
Remind us of the beauty of these parks. Advertise.
Restroom convenience for the old and the young.
Right now the price of gas is the most prohibitive reason for not visiting them.
Right now with gas being so high, short of giving discount gas cards.
Run more TV advertising.
Safe.
Safety. (11)
Safety and basic visitor facilities.
Safety and camping.
Safety for the visitors.
Safety in the national parks.
Scenery. (2)
Scenery and educational.
Scenic views.
Security for nature and animals, as well as humans. But natural.
Security. (4)
Security and attractions.
Security; to be able to use a cell phone in case of need to dial 911.
See animals.
Send me an invitation.
Send me information.
Send out newsletters or TV advertising.
Send out pamphlets with pictures and directions.

Service will make us realize how fortunate we all are to live in a free and great America.
Set up a system of transportation so more people can get there individually rather than go by car or by more expensive, professional tour companies.
Show me and the rest of the world that.
Showcase the variety that is available at our national parks. Show that you can do almost anything you want since there are so many options available.
Send me some brochures.
So people may be in closer proximity.
Some advertising.
Some parks are too overcrowded and need more control in some way.
Special activities and/or advertising.
Sponsor a family day with special event and/or activities.
Stay the same as they are now.
Stop being in the business of worrying about how many visits you get. If you get zero visits, that's A-OK: the Park Service is "still" vital and lands preserved are absolutely critical. Heritage is not a matter for marketing.
Stress the importance of being a national asset that may not last much longer and stress the "green" living of national park system.
Sustain wildlife and stop litter in the areas.
Take of our national parks.
Television, such as ads or exposure on PBS shows or National Geographic type shows to highlight these treasures.
Tell more about.
The Texas Parks and Recreation Dept publishes a nice calendar of events for birders, bug, reptile, and native plant clubs, and the new craze is for "adventure-volunteer" vacations. I think also many unemployed families might consider caretaking at national parks as a fulfilling job.
That they are kept clean and pristine.
That those visiting the parks can have easy and safe access while protecting the area they are visiting.
The biggest issue now is the price of gas to get to the parks.
The cleanliness, people not littering their trash all over.
The conservation of it.
The cost of getting to parks.
The experience and memories created to last a lifetime.
The getting away from it all.
The history. (2)
The history, the main features and size.
The most important thing encourage.
The most important thing would be to keep it as affordable as possible. Our family income has been greatly reduced with the closing of my husband's workplace.
The National Park Service just needs to more funding from the government so they can maintain the services already provided. I love going and spending days in the natural environment.
The national parks are a treasure; we enjoy all of our visits to them. The Senior Golden Pass that I paid \$10 for is worth its weight in gold. I don't feel anything needs to be done.
The national parks I have visited were extremely well kept and well run. I am traveling out of the

country and will not do too much in the continental U.S. this year.
The parks are free.
The price of gas.
The scenery.
The trees and flowers.
There is nothing that needs to be done; I just have to make time to visit one, one day.
Their features more so that people.
There is nothing special that the park service can do. I just don't visit the national parks as much because of the gas prices.
There is nothing that the park service should do since any national park I have visited was well done.
There is nothing the NPS can do to encourage me to visit. I do not travel nor am I interested in visiting.
There is nothing the NPS needs to do. I just do not have the time to go to any of the parks that would interest me.
There is nothing they can do at this time. I just don't have the money to travel to a national park.
There is nothing they can do. The reason we are not planning on going any time soon is strictly financial.
The wildlife.
They are doing as well as could be expected.
They are doing something about logging, oil drilling, and all the other things the good old U.S. government is allowing to go on in these so called "protected lands". All so the money is given to whom? And then we are told to do all this for the land and the wildlife as well as for the environment, by the government, by the way. This is, to me, sacred land, just like a grave site. Once it is set aside, to be left alone, do so. Get it?
They are too far away, gas prices too high at this time. So, nothing.
They are treasures to me.
They are well taken care of.
They can discuss how they are there to take care of a part of nature.
They could put pressure on the leaders to get out of bed with the oil companies so a person or families can afford to visit a park.
They do a great job now.
They don't have to encourage me. I have been to quite a few and I cannot describe how great they are and how wonderful they make me feel. I actually feel they need more attention and money for upkeep and programs. The federal government is not doing their part in the support the parks need.
They have lots of things to do: camping, horseback riding, camping.
They need to advertise the parks.
They need to have better roads to access to get to the main buildings at some of the parks. Lower the cost of admission.
They need to have more attractions and provide more safety measures.
They should increase their wheelchair accessibility.
They should maintain the park and site, not necessarily encourage visitors.
Thin out the crowds, limit access.
Things that we can enjoy out at the park, The National Park Service and the National Parks are very important to everybody who like to be outdoors and enjoy being at any park.
Tighten or increase rules and/or fines for littering and vandalism.

Time allowed.
To encourage tourism.
To have useful information on site and personnel there to answer questions, give directions and not lurk glare at you as if you are going to destroy, touch or take something.
To keep motorized vehicles out and off the trails. I'm talking about ATVs and snowmobiles in particular.
To keep them clean and easy to stay at.
To know the place.
To make it safe.
To make sure to post directions throughout the national park and to post important historical facts in plain view, and to have a good trail walkway throughout the national park. Picnic tables would be an excellent idea, too.
To please remind visitors about keeping our parks clean.
To see nature up close.
To view historical landmark.
To enable disabled people to be able to visit the park with little or no help.
Toilet.
Tourist site.
Trail maps.
True, wholesome, family type advertising.
Try to insure safety.
Try to keep congestion down so that visitors can see all that the parks have to offer.
Try to make it more affordable.
Try to make people realize how important our national park service is and the historical influence.
TV ads.
Unique things to see in the park.
Unless the price of gas comes down, no one will be able to travel to any of the national parks unless they live close by.
Upkeep. (2)
US history.
Visiting a unit of the National Park System.
Waive any admissions.
We do not have a national park near us. We do visit a few state parks periodically.
We do not have many national parks in Michigan, so create more of them.
Well kept and safe parks.
Well maintained.
Well maintained with crowd control.
When I go camping, I like to experience the excitement of being away from the conveniences of modern day life. A lot of national park campgrounds are often times over crowded. Camping at a national park feels like spending a night in a [expletive removed] motel. The National Park Service should emphasize secluded campgrounds for small parties of people.
When I was younger I visited and camped in the parks. The parks are a good thing. Just keep them open so the younger people can enjoy them.
Where they are at. How to plan and visit, and need to know.

Why do we need to encourage?
Wildlife.
Wildlife conservation.
With the price of gasoline, it would have to be close.
Work to retain their natural or historical purity.
Yes, but it has been so long ago that time, at this moment, is critical.
You can have quality family bonding time cheap. Camping, hiking, etc.

B.3 - Responses from the mail survey

q.4 In your opinion, what is the ONE most important thing the National Park Service can do to encourage you to visit units of the National Park System?

A form of transportation within the park.
A free trip!
Accessibility to remote areas by vehicle.
Accessibility. (4)
Activities for families.
Activities for first time visitors.
Activities for kids to do.
Adequate enforcement of park facilities and/or rules.
Ads explaining the highlights.
Advertise. Show what makes each park unique.
Advertise with mailings, TV and/or radio in targeted areas of people near national parks.
Advertise and publicize sites.
Advertise in magazines.
Advertise locally in each state.
Advertise more and visit schools.
Advertise occasionally.
Advertise on TV and/or the internet pictures of what to do when you get there, the current costs to get into the park and cost of activities. Also provide names of nearby motels and restaurants. People know then where they want to visit and ballpark costs.
Advertise the parks on TV.
Advertise them.
Advertise to remind people what, where, and why to go.
Advertise. (15)
Advertise. I'm sure there are many I don't even know exist.
Advertise and lower gas prices!
Advertise and/or make me aware.
Advertise and offer special promotions.
Advertisement. (2)
Advertising family outdoor activities.
Advertising through direct mail or national commercials to remind people what the national parks are and how much history they have.
Advertising. (3)
Affordability to get there.
Affordability.
Affordable.
Airfare reductions.
Alleviate crowds.
Allow C.W.P. holder to carry.
Allow dogs and vote democratic!
Allow dogs.
Allow hunting in all parks.
Allow me to bring my dog. I can't leave her in a car in the heat of summer and I have no one to watch

her.
Amenities.
At my age of 59 I'm content to travel to the beach or other centers.
Availability.
Available, easy to park at.
Avoid congestion.
Awareness brochures or advertisement to indicate locations and activities.
Awareness of the parks, ads.
Awareness through promotion as a destination.
Be convenient to a vacation spot.
Be friendlier.
Be on internet and let people know what you have to offer and why we need to stay in USA.
Be user friendly.
Be within a one day driving distance.
Beautiful places, good service.
Beauty.
Better facilities.
Better roads and sights to see wildlife.
Better security.
Better traffic flow, less car congestion, more convenient parking, and shuttle buses.
Booklet or website with info and advertise it.
Brochures.
Build golf courses in national parks.
By keeping them clean.
Camping facilities.
Camping sites available, access.
Camping.
Cannot think of anything specific.
Change their rigid management style.
Cheaper gasoline!
Clean and let natural. Don't damage the forest.
Clean and reasonable cost.
Clean and well kept.
Clean bathrooms with a diaper changing table.
Clean bathrooms.
Clean environment.
Clean facilities.
Clean parks.
Clean restrooms and good campsites.
Clean restrooms and no admission fee.
Clean restrooms. (4)
Clean well and keep a safe place for family.
Clean. (3)
Cleanliness. (7)
Cleanliness. Keep costs low.
Clear communication about park activities and topics of interest via website.
Close more roads to cars and open more trails.

Commercials, TV series, teach them in library system, tell people where they are!
Communicate to me what's available at parks.
Complete value-wise with state.
Conserve and preserve, manage visitation.
Continue development of info on websites.
Continue to express the importance and value of visiting elements of the national park service.
Continue to maintain the parks.
Continue to protect against wildfire.
Continued, good internet information.
Control rowdiness.
Convenience. (2)
Convenient "fly in" trips to major parks.
Cost of visit.
Courtesy to visitors.
Create a website that is nationally advertised.
Create more parks closer to where I live.
Curiosity.
Cut the price of fuel.
Demonstrate awareness that these are irreplaceable resources that must be invested in to ensure future existence!
Discounts. We have lack of money.
Distance limits our frequency of visits.
Distance to travel.
Do a better job of maintenance.
Do not wish to answer.
Documentaries.
Don't deforest them.
Don't know. Most we have visited are nice.
Don't know.
Easy access and parking.
Easy access by car within the park, not like Denali.
Easy access to information about the park location, medical, self help, etc.
Easy access.
Easy availability of nearby overnight facilities.
Education.
Educational experience.
Educational opportunities.
Educational programs: park officers, tour guides, etc.
Eliminate fees and establish control access. Discontinue snowmobiles and watercrafts.
Eliminate fees. Use my tax dollars wisely!
Emphasize nature. Reduce human impact and/or crowding.
Ensure maintenance of all facilities and clean restrooms!
Ensure my safety.
Ensure that parks are safe.
Events and lodging.
Facilities.
Family oriented.

Fishing.
Fix up.
For me this is just the cost of traveling.
Fort Stevenson State Park needs more water.
Free access.
Free entry.
Free recreation for teens.
Freedom to come and go as we choose.
Friendly and informative visitor centers.
Fund outdoor programs to educate our children to safely explore their outdoors.
Gas is too high.
Geographically close.
Get gas prices down!
Getting too old to travel.
Good place for family visits.
Good road system.
Grew up in the park service, and now works on Arrowhead Hotshots in King's Canyon. The park service rules!
Handicap access.
Hands-on experiences.
Have a method to avoid overcrowding.
Have brochures on main attractions of the park.
Have clean bathrooms.
Have drinking water and toilets, also benches to eat at and others to sit on or just rest or enjoy a view. It would be nice to have food service with dumpsters animals could not access.
Have good camping sites.
Have historic markers and exhibits to read to understand the history and importance of the park.
Have hotels.
Have more outhouses and/or showers for public use.
Have more security for our safety.
Have musical and art festivals at a park site.
Have no idea.
Have the cost at more reasonable rate. All taxpayers have already paid for this system.
Having a nice restaurant.
Having restrooms available year round.
History. (3)
Host a no-fee day.
I am a senior citizen and appreciate the free admission. Please don't change.
I am on sick leave.
I do not have an opinion.
I don't know.
I don't need encouragement. I have visited 13 units of the National Park System and will most likely visit more.
I just like to be there. The encouragement is already there.
I live too far from those I would like to visit.
I lost my husband 10 years ago. He visited many national parks and even volunteered two summers.
I need to find time.

I'm in a health condition that I can't visit parks.
If I had the money, I would love my kids to see it.
If I live close to one.
Improve camping facilities to full hook-ups.
Improve disability access and costs.
Improve maintenance of existing facilities.
Improve the physical condition.
Improved maintenance of roads and facilities.
Increase awareness.
Increase relevant, current information available online via the internet.
Increase services.
Info on parks in my area and beyond, amenities for families with kids available.
Inform the public more about their services, opportunities, and locations.
Information, on the internet preferably, about each park: fees, hours, facilities.
Information.
It has nothing to do with them, and everything to do with fuel prices.
It is fine the way it is!
It will be impossible for me.
It's a distance issue for me.
It's free.
Keep access limited, thus assuring a wilderness experience.
Keep admission costs as low as possible.
Keep admission price reasonable.
Keep advertising the beauty of the parks.
Keep clean and safe.
Keep clean. (2)
Keep commercialization away and out of parks.
Keep cost low. (2)
Keep costs such as entry fees low.
Keep costs down.
Keep costs reasonable.
Keep crime such as larceny low.
Keep crowds down.
Keep doing what you're doing!
Keep entrance costs, if there are any, reasonable and keep the roadways clear.
Keep entrance fees at reasonable rates.
Keep entrance fees down.
Keep entrance fees low.
Keep entrance fees low or minimal.
Keep entrance fees reasonable.
Keep entrance prices low.
Keep entry fee family friendly.
Keep entry fees reasonable.
Keep facilities, etc. clean.
Keep fees affordable for families and seniors.
Keep fees down.
Keep fees low.

Keep fees reasonable.
Keep it affordable.
Keep it clean. (3)
Keep it free!
Keep it in its most natural setting possible.
Keep it like it was years ago.
Keep it maintained.
Keep it natural looking, as little man made things as possible.
Keep it safe.
Keep it simple to go, with no added charges.
Keep natural and pristine.
Keep park clean, well-maintained.
Keep park system secure.
Keep parks clean and natural.
Keep parks clean, attractive, and accessible.
Keep pollution under control. Keep facilities up such lodging, restaurants, restrooms. At price of gas they will need lodging, not as opt to drive campers.
Keep preserving the land as they already do.
Keep prices low.
Keep prices reasonable.
Keep reassuring the welcome is the main message.
Keep restrooms clean.
Keep safe from bears.
Keep the Cape Cod National Seashore clean.
Keep the cost affordable. Keep the environment natural.
Keep the cost low enough for everyone to enjoy and preserve the natural beauty.
Keep the cost reasonable to enter.
Keep the cost reasonable.
Keep the park as much as possible in natural state.
Keep the park as natural as possible.
Keep the park clean and safe.
Keep the parks clean and family friendly.
Keep the parks clean and safe.
Keep the parks clean. (2)
Keep the parks free of commercial activities.
Keep them beautiful and clean.
Keep them clean and stocked.
Keep them clean and the roads clear!
Keep them clean. (3)
Keep them free of mining, roads, and commercial interests.
Keep them natural.
Keep them open 24/7.
Keep them open and clean.
Keep them open!
Keep them open. Protect them and keep them safe.
Keep them pristine.
Keep them safe and clean.

Keep them safe to visit.
Keep traffic to a minimum.
Keep up maintenance on walkways and pavilions.
Keep up the good work.
Keeping cost low.
Keeping entrance fees reasonable.
Keeping grounds clean.
Keeping it as natural as possible, but safe and clean.
Keeping parks clean and safe.
Keeping roads, trails, facilities, etc. in good repair.
Keeping the parks open.
Keeping the roads clear of debris and rocks.
Kid friendly.
Lack of congestion.
Leave any road made for public use, like logging roads. Don't disable them.
Less commercialization.
Let history speak for itself. Civil War battlefields don't need to be politically correct.
Let me know about family vacation planning packages.
Let me ride my 4-wheeler (Ineligible).
Limit closures of select areas due to budget.
Limit commercialism and good signage.
Limit development.
Limit the number of people attending.
Limit the number of visitors allowed into the park at a time.
Limiting private vehicles during crowded seasons.
Litter free.
Location. (2)
Lodges.
Lodging for handicapped individuals.
Lots of fish.
Low admission fees.
Low cost.
Low price.
Lower cost.
Lower entrance fee.
Lower entrance price.
Lower the entrance fee.
Lower visitor fees.
Mail me information such as directions, price or a map.
Maintain a level of awareness through the media, advertise.
Maintain and manage our national park system as one of our public's treasured resources, and advocate effectively for sufficient funding to do so.
Maintain and protect resources.
Maintain and sustain them.
Maintain easy access to wild, natural scenes and biota.
Maintain facilities.
Maintain lower fees.

Maintain open space and public access.
Maintain original intent and integrity of the park.
Maintain parks.
Maintain scenic overlook with open and natural views.
Maintain services.
Maintain the current roads. Maybe widen extra lane in some areas to allow smooth flow of traffic and viewing.
Maintain the infrastructure.
Maintain the natural beauty.
Maintain the park, keeping admission low.
Maintain the park's appearance.
Maintain the present level of service, very good.
Maintain the pristine nature of the park.
Maintain the walk-in campsites and hiking trails. Don't let them be used for logging, oil, etc.
Maintain trails.
Maintenance of beauty and purpose.
Maintenance of the facilities.
Maintenance of trails and rest areas.
Major facilities in the park.
Make it a natural experience with less crowdedness.
Make it accessible to all individuals, including disabled. Some of my friends cannot walk long distances and have scooters.
Make it easy to do things.
Make it easy to get around. Good crowd management.
Make it exciting and interesting to visitors.
Make it free. (2)
Make me 15 years younger and fit as a fiddle.
Make me aware of the facility and its features.
Make more user friendly with restaurants, gift shops, etc.
Make parks closer to Illinois.
Make the park interesting for blind people.
Make them accessible to everyone at a fairly minimal cost.
Make them free. I can go to a city park at no cost but not always to a national park.
Make them more inviting for young children age 2-5 years.
Making personal safety safer.
Many of the parks I would like to visit are far from my home. The cost to travel to these parks probably prohibits me from visiting them. Not sure there is anything the park service can do to change that.
Minimal cost.
Money, don't like to travel.
Money. (2)
More access for the disability. I am a 25 year paraplegic.
More access to restrooms, water, trails, etc.
More activities that are children based.
More advertisement, educate people where parks are located.
More advertisement. (2)
More advertising. (4)
More affordable entry.

More bathrooms.
More children oriented.
More facilities and campsites.
More fishing and hunting.
More hiking, camping, and dog friendly beaches, lakes, etc.
More information on closest national park.
More information on where units are.
More online information and easier to find information.
More parking.
More privacy.
More rangers for visitor guides.
More rest areas and places to eat.
More security and safety measures.
More swimming and boating availability.
More units, closer proximity. With urban sprawl a threat, small units, from 100 acres and up, would accomplish much.
Most senior citizens need assistance with cost and/or personal facilities.
Multi-use trails for non-motorized modes, e.g. bike, hike, horseback.
N/A.
National Park Directory; a web based manual.
Native, educational, outdoor experience.
Nature speaks for itself, so nothing really.
Nature.
Nearby hotels.
Needs to have restroom facilities.
Nice hiking trails.
No fee or minimal entry fee.
No fees for access.
No idea.
No opinion.
None. (2)
Not be so busy that you need reservations.
Not disturb the grounds, except for trails, maintenance, fire hazards.
Not having to pay.
Not interested.
Not limit vehicle access; on road, not off road.
Not sure. (4)
Nothing really, it's a matter of time at this time of my life.
Nothing they can really do. I am HCP and don't travel well.
Nothing, I can't go due to high gas prices.
Nothing, I go because I want to.
Nothing, time and cost of gas and lodging prohibit, since our income is rather tight.
Nothing, we are unable to travel due to ill health and do not know of any nearby sites.
Nothing. (8)
Nothing. Depends on if I get the time.
Nothing. I already want to go.
Nothing. I don't have time or money.

Nothing. I have no plans to travel.
Nothing. I just don't have the time.
Nothing. I just need to get there.
NPS doesn't need to do anything extra.
Obtain more funding to keep parks open.
Offer affordable lodging or camping.
Offer affordable lodging or packages.
Offer discounts. (2)
Offer free transport within park.
Offer information and history about the area I am visiting. Clean restrooms.
Open some areas for OHV use.
Organized and informative.
Park and RV, clean.
Parking facilities, upkeep, and clean restrooms.
Parking. (2)
Pay for my trip.
Permit removal, using strict guidelines, of burned, charred, or bug-infested trees by logging companies. Many of these trees have usable lumber and to not be salvaged permits the US National Park Service to permit waste of a national resource.
Personal safety at the park or site.
Picnic areas available and small restaurants.
Plant lists on the internet.
Plentiful parking and easy access.
Posting special events online or around the national park.
Preservation of actual park and/or monument.
Preservation, clean and natural beauty.
Preserve and maintain facilities and park to the highest level of quality.
Preserve natural beauty and habitats.
Preserve places that allow people to imagine a world untouched by man.
Preserve the wilderness feel in the larger parks.
Preserve them.
Preserving nature.
Prevent overuse and promote its reason for visiting the park.
Price and facilities.
Price lower.
Price.
Privacy and clean cabins.
Probably nothing. I will go when I am ready.
Promote as destinations.
Promote low human footprint environments, e.g. no restricted auto traffic.
Promote non-motorized use and entry.
Promote public awareness of park benefits.
Promote the national parks online.
Promote them more.
Promote through advertising.
Proper maintenance.
Proper upkeep.

Protect the environment from greed.
Provide adequate campsites for RVs.
Provide bus, or other, trips to parks.
Provide concise guides to parks online.
Provide data on crowds and access.
Provide decent parking.
Provide easier access.
Provide financial incentives and/or packages for travel.
Provide fishing information.
Provide free public concerts, outdoor activities such as bicycling, food festivals, free parking, etc.
Provide historic and cultural sites.
Provide hookups for RV camping like electricity and water. Provide space for large RVs.
Provide inexpensive camp sites.
Provide information about the park.
Provide on-site instructors and/or interpreters to better involve visiting public.
Provide tours.
Provide transportation and/or tour mobiles for sightseeing.
Provide visitor centers for information on things to see and do while there.
Provide wild habitat resources.
Proximity to our home, facilities such as food and rest areas, affordability.
Publicity about area parks.
Purity of air and scenery.
Quad riding and camping.
Quiet environment.
Ranger programs.
Rangers more people-friendly.
Rangers!
Reasonable fees.
Reasonable rates.
Recreation opportunities in undeveloped outdoor setting.
Recreation.
Reduce entry fees.
Reduce or limit crowds.
Remain inexpensive.
Remain open.
Remind me that they exist.
Remove admission charges for US citizens.
Rest areas or clean bathrooms.
Rest facilities, directions.
Restrooms.
Retired. Don't travel to national parks.
Road and access maintenance, rest areas.
RV facilities.
RV hookup.
Safe for families.
Safe personal safety.
Safe, clean environment.

Safe, clean, courtesy.
Safety for everyone.
Safety. (7)
Scenery distance.
Scenery, clean, camping, relaxing.
Security presence; patrol parks.
Seeing nature and learning more about history.
Send more public picturesque visitor information.
Send out information on special dates and things to do at the parks.
Send out new information on where and what to do.
Send us information; promotions.
Set up affordable tours.
Sightseeing.
Signs to locate and use.
Some educational material.
Special activities.
Stay over facility.
Stop "calling" buffalo. Ban Bush, Cheney et al. from using the parks!
Strong advertisements.
Teach people to appreciate nature.
Television and print advertising.
The beauty of Yosemite.
The loveliness of the park and relaxation.
The peaceful nature.
The protected natural environment.
There is a need for more lodges for people to stay.
There is nothing. The issue is gas prices and time.
They disabled access.
They do a wonderful job. I need more free time.
They presently meet our needs.
To be clean.
To enjoy nature, untouched, in its natural state!
To ensure a safe environment.
Traffic control and clean facilities.
Traffic control.
Traffic handling.
Trails for families with kids.
TV commercials.
Unique.
Unspoiled nature and preserved history.
Update and keep clean the picnic areas.
Vacation packages with tours included.
Visibility. Knowledge of existence.
We are homebodies these days.
We do not live in an area that is close to a national park.
We need no encouragement, we love the national parks.
Web sites to describe the abundant sites.

Well maintained. Pleasant personnel.
Well marked trails.
Well taken care of.
When funds are available, spend on increasing camp sites with electricity and water.
When people visit, encourage them to tell others, to come back, to visit again, and to visit another park. Give information on others.
Wildlife, cleanliness.
Wildlife.
Within few hours driving distance.
Yellowstone. Fix the highways. They need wider shoulders.

Appendix C. Open-ended Responses by Mode on Q9

This appendix includes the open-ended answers to Question 9 for the phone (C.1), web (C.2), and mail (C.3) respondents. Numbers in parentheses indicate repeated identical responses.

C.1 - Responses from the phone survey

q9. Please provide any information that helps explain your answer to the previous question.

\$10 is a little high for some people.
\$10 is a little too high.
\$10 is a lot on top of the fee for if you have a carload of adults.
\$10 is a reasonable price to pay for everyone to be able to enjoy the park.
\$10 is fairly reasonable for a one day visit and if it would reduce pollution from medium to low it would reduce the stress on other visitors and the environment.
\$10 is too much.
\$10 seems like a lot extra to pay when you have to pay to get into the park.
\$15 extra a person is a little bit to ask to drive though a national park.
\$15 is enough to convince someone to pass the park.
\$15 is too high for her income and would limit her to going to the parks. \$5 would be good.
\$15 is too high. (2)
\$15 is too high. In my experience there has been no problem of air pollution. Our air pollution problem is too bad to use the parks as a means of limiting it.
\$15 is too high. It needs to be doable for most Americans.
\$15 might be a lot to middle income families.
\$15 per visitor is just too much. I would choose someplace else to go.
\$15 would not be too much, I agree.
\$2 is a reasonable amount.
\$2 is cheap and that's an awful lot of information and a very inexpensive way to eliminate a horrible problem.
\$2 is hardly anything, if you're going to go from medium to low for a cost of \$2 is an incidental amount.
\$2 is not much and any person under 17 is free, so it would only be \$4 more all together and it helps the environment.
\$2 is not that much, especially if it reduces air pollution.
\$2 is really nothing. It would also help the environment.
\$2 isn't a whole lot.
\$2 per person is a low enough fee that I would be willing to pay.
\$25 for one day is too much.
\$25 is an excessive amount. Vehicles will have to eventually transfer over to fuel cells to be affordable, and of course, they do not produce any pollution.
\$25 is just way too much money.

\$25 is not that bad because you're doing outdoor activities and this helps you out.
\$25 is too high. If four adults go it will cost \$100 for them to get in.
\$25 per person is too much and a couple would be \$50 and my husband and I would have to think of visiting the park.
\$25 seems like a lot to me but I agree to the premise behind the charge.
\$30 is way too much extra to pay for two adults.
\$5 is affordable.
\$5 is kind of steep.
\$5 is not that bad.
\$5 isn't enough to keep someone away.
\$5 to \$10, I could see, but \$25, that's just a lot of money.
\$5 would be better.
A \$10 jump is a lot of money.
A few dollars is not a big deal for the extra protection.
A little enough to pay; if you can't pay that you shouldn't go.
A lot of money.
A lot of people don't have a lot of money. I don't think it is a good idea.
Admission should be free.
Air pollution is a major problem.
Air pollution is nothing but a political scandal.
Air pollution needs to be reduced and is worth \$2.
Air pollution should be reduced by providing the electric cars and solar cars.
Air quality would be important because my wife and I both have allergies and asthma.
All for reducing air pollution.
Anything for my, or the animals', health needs should be done.
Anything that can help stop pollution in the park. A lot of people that go to the parks have asthma and other breathing problems, and this can cause them problems since it is something they cannot see.
Anything that decreases gas prices is a benefit.
Anything that helps with the environment, I'm for.
Anything that improves the environment is worth \$2.
Anything that is good for the environment and my body is favorable.
Anything that will benefit the people for fresher air has got to be a plus.
Anything that would help the pollution would be a plus.
Anything they do to better the environment will cost money.
Anything to help reduce air pollution anywhere is good.
Anywhere you can cut back on pollution it is better whether it is air pollution, garbage, etc.
Are woefully underfunded.
As a nurse, I used to take care of adults and children with lung ills, so this would be a good cause.
As long as I don't have a big family with me, I could afford it. \$20 would be for a good cause, I could afford that.
As long as it is for air pollution.
As long as the fee is doable.

As long as the fee is not too high to where people could not pay it, then they may be able to do this.
Aside from pollution benefits, reduction dependents on foreign oil would be dependent on my participation on this issue. Also would be willing to pay only once.
Assuming that I have the same income I have now it wouldn't have a problem.
Asthma is bad the older you get, the conditions get worse. Anything that helps the people breath is a good idea. It is well worth it to spend that money if it truly would help the air. You want to be able to breathe outdoors.
Availability of funds. I think \$10 is too much.
Based on our income, we are unemployed: too high.
Basically, if it's going to decrease air pollution in the parks, I'm all for it. (2)
Basically, there is no motor transportation, even electric, that does not have some kind of air pollution. If you want to, reduce the number of vehicles going through the park.
Be a waste of money.
Because \$15 per person is too high to control air pollution when you talk about just the park vehicles in general. There are other vehicles traveling in the park that still rely upon gasoline or diesel. Therefore, you are not really limiting anything and you are really making a huge profit.
Because a lot of people are suffering allergies, including me, every year.
Because air pollution needs to be under control. The cars without exhaust would greatly reduce this problem and I support such an idea.
Because, as with most government programs, once it's written into law people will go overboard. It will get quoted by every environmental waco [sic]. I could not in good conscious allow that. Perhaps on a case by case basis, like in Yashimatta, with limited vehicles, but on a national basis, no.
Because I appreciate the electric vehicle, but I think all vehicles in the park should be regulated. Like large diesel motor homes. I think they just have the wrong idea.
Because I do not know the base cost.
Because I don't feel like the \$15 would actually go to air pollution.
Because I don't have any money left after paying bills.
Because I don't want pollution of any kind. So I would be willing to contribute towards lowering it.
Because I have asthma and I would be willing to pay \$15 extra in order to breathe.
Because I have bad respiratory problems. We just need to do something all over the place. I live in Iowa and air pollution here is sometimes too high to go outside and that's crazy!
Because I have had no problems with pollution and it is too expensive.
Because I have health problems. And I'm all for cleaning the air.
Because I have heard that the air pollution in parks is really bad.
Because I have no clue how they are going to do this. It sounds like a bunch smoke and mirrors. In light what is the percentage of park vehicles. Other vehicles; what are you going to do about the particulars in this situation. You actually just spin your wheels. Can the pollution be monitored?
Because I haven't noticed any air quality problems.
Because I know people who have problems and it would be very beneficial to them.
Because I really believe that pollution is not in the car. I believe that people are carrying the pollution. People are caring sin.
Because I think it's bogus. I'm not convinced about a whole lot of the environmentalists' concerns.
Because I think that \$10 is not bad.
Because I think that \$15 per adult is not that much higher, and I think that it goes towards bettering

the park.
Because I think that's what we have to do.
Because I would not be able to afford it, want it to be kept natural and not modern.
Because I wouldn't want to have any trouble breathing while I was in the park.
Because I'm an environmentalist, and I believe that as citizens we need to do what we need to do.
Because I'm environmentally concerned.
Because I'm on a fixed income. I've paid all my taxes and I feel no extra fee is necessary.
Because if I thought that I would be able to breathe better while I was there, I would be able to enjoy myself better, even if it was only one day.
Because I'm on a fixed income, a senior citizen, blind, and I don't have enough to go around.
Because it affects the animals and the plants.
Because it helps not only the people, but the plant life and the animal life.
Because it is healthier for the people and the animals in the area.
Because it seems to be enough.
Because it will eliminate all the pollution if you use those cars that you were talking about a moment ago. I care about my grand children and the babies in my family. They visit the park and I'm not sure which one.
Because it won't make a difference.
Because it would not only help health issues to visitors, but also keep park in a natural state.
Because it's important, we have enough problems with things that cause illnesses. If we can prevent it, it's a good thing.
Because it's like you say, there is too much air pollution in the air and essentially that's a nominal fee.
Because my husband just passed away; it is too high and too high for a family to afford. The United States does not take care of their own, they send all our money overseas they and don't take care of us. If it is a national park it should be paid for by taxes so why should we pay to go in; we should get something for our tax money.
Because my son has mild asthma and I wouldn't want that to ruin our trip.
Because my wife has a breathing problem, and we live near the Smoky Mountains and it is very polluted.
Because our country does not spend enough time, money, or effort to protect our environment.
Because parks might have their own pollution, the whole world has pollution, but if the funds would help the rangers buy new or better equipment, then maybe the extra funds would be ok.
Because people that I know around here don't go to the park, they go to places that are more polluted than the national park. You can go to rivers and streams that are more polluted than that.
Because the amount of private vehicles is what brings air pollution to the park as opposed to park vehicles.
Because the government should be taking care of this instead of putting money into a war that doesn't exist.
Because the government should enforce the laws they already have, not make people pay more.
Because the vehicles that go into a park are usually for emergencies. If you allow private vehicles that use gas, essentially you have to limit their activity. Then I wouldn't have to pay extra and we'd probably have fewer emergencies in the parks. And low pollution anyway. Reverse it; make the private sector be responsible.
Because there are four adults.

Because there are not enough vehicles in national parks to even worry about it.
Because there are too many local things that I will give to.
Because there's getting to be so few places besides national parks where you can breathe easy. I have asthma and I support that.
Because they all support the use of electric power. The government should set an example by using electric vehicles.
Because they don't pay me anything.
Because this is a nationwide problem and I deal with it every day, the rest of the vehicles provide enough pollution that for me, it wouldn't make any difference, just the park vehicles.
Because unless we do something now it's going to keep getting worse.
Because we all live in cities and we're all exposed to air pollution and I don't think the problem is that bad in parks. I also think \$10 is way too much.
Because we have to take care of our environment for future projects.
Because we only have one planet, people should not be getting sick from just walking around.
Because we've been too lax with trying to control air pollution for too long and it's time pay up. We really do have to start taking care of our environment, not like George Bush has.
Because you take \$25 per person. A lot of people can't afford that, they are going to limit poor people from going and it is the poor people who take their kids out to see beauty.
Because you're going to go see something really nice, and it's the responsible thing to do.
Because your breathing is very important. I don't have lung problems, but my mother did, and a lot of people do. I would say it's getting to be really polluted.
Been to dozen of parks; never experienced any breathing problems, so I don't consider it a real issue.
Being in the military for many years, eating grubs and rations, everyone wants their modern appliances and old fashion campsites are gone. So to pay a bit extra would be okay. Trying to get back to the past would be great.
Believe people who visit should pay for it.
Believes the volcano and geysers are creating the pollution not the automobiles killing off wildlife.
Better part of the world.
Breathing problems.
Buys big vehicle, causes pollution and throws trash and nobody cares anymore about the earth.
By improving the park vehicles it will improve the park, but I do not want them cut back so they can't operate.
Change too much already at national parks.
Charge is too high.
Cleaner air is better.
College student.
Common sense to preserve the park and the people in it.
Compared to cost, \$2 is not that much more, usually not as many adults going; it's reasonable.
Concern that it might keep me out.
Concerned about the air quality because that's what I like about the parks.
Could spend it in city instead of parks.
Couldn't afford it.
Create more jobs.
Definitely, I'm for it.

Depending on where this national park is located, and if the pollution is as bad as they say; and who is going to judge that?
Depends on how much the entry fee is to begin with. (2)
Depends on what park.
Disagree that the national park has medium air pollution.
Doesn't seem to be that much to help someone with a breathing problem.
Doing so would help the entire environment: plant life, animals, streams, rivers, lakes, and people.
Electric trams work especially well in other parks.
End up doing it to busses end up doing it to private vehicles and don't want to see that.
Even for my husband and I it would be an extra \$30 and when we go on vacation we spend wisely and that would still be a lot.
Even on a retired persons income we can afford that for clean air.
Every person would pay \$15, it could be enjoyed by all without the pollution.
Everybody should have to do it.
Everyone should provide a little for upkeep.
Everything costs too much now. Makes it only affordable for the rich.
Everything is going up and this is too much.
Extra \$2 is so small. It's not like it's \$10 or \$15 and we are talking about clean air.
Families are expensive, too much money to spend for a vacation.
Families cannot afford that.
Federal government needs to take care of that. We pay enough taxes as it is. Maybe if pollution is bad enough.
Feels that people need to maintain, but feels should be free.
First of all I'm on a fixed income I'm retired. The tourist season is competitive. We would have to book reservations more than or equal to a year in advance. In other words, it's about competitiveness in the tour season.
Fixed income, but agrees.
For better air quality.
For cleaner air and animals.
For health reasons.
For me, I have no problem with breathing, but my son has bad problems so I would pay it, thinking of people like him.
For our family, that would be two adults, so that would be \$30. We could afford that and if you're coming for other states, it is negligible and will help other people.
For retired people that would be too much on top of entry fee. I'm retired and it will be too much.
For the simple reason that the in national parks you know the animals do inhabit the area, and I would be willing to spend the extra money to preserve the animals.
From medium to low, \$5 is a no. It is too high not that big an issue.
Gas price too high. (2)
Give them a mask to wear.
Go ahead and charge \$25, but then have a parking complex like in Washington D.C. and take the bus. If you're paying, then you better get what you're paying for.
Going from medium to low is not a major change, and for one day it would not be worth it.

Going to pass to next question.
Good idea as long as it would reduce the pollution.
Good idea for the vehicles to be healthful.
Good Idea. (3)
Government should pay for it themselves, not the visitors who are already taxed for the up keep.
Has coped, so agrees.
Have a great deal of respect for the great outdoors.
Have a hard enough time breathing in the city.
Has asthma and believes in reducing pollution.
Have to consider the animals, whether you hurt them.
Have to do something to clean the air for everyone; excellent idea.
He would just pay for it. It is worth it.
He would.
Help reduce the breathing problems.
Husband has heart condition, he is an outdoorsman. We have to be concerned about the air quality. He cannot go out when the air quality is bad. It is a family concern. We have grandchildren, so we are also concerned about them.
I absolutely would be willing to pay \$5 to better any need for a national park. I'm a strong believer in conservation and for the future as well.
I agree in the pollution vehicles in the park. Maybe there could be a company that could rent these types of cars to the tourists. Also keep them clean. Also I feel the government should help out with taxes or something.
I agree it will be fine too.
I am a nurse.
I am against pollution, I've lived CA and in big cities for much of my life, I'm not only interested in my life at 84 1/2 I am interested in the future of the new generations.
I am all for whatever we can do.
I am an active adult and I also have asthma.
I am asthmatic.
I am concerned about heath so it would be good to reduce pollution.
I am concerned about the elderly, how they could afford that and also concerned about the pollution.
I am guessing that people who run our national parks know what they are doing so I'm in favor of it. I would follow anything they say or do.
I am in favor for making the air better. (2)
I am into animals and farming and believe in conservation and we do have the money at this time.
I am lower-income, and would find it difficult to pay that much.
I am not sold that there's that much air pollution.
I am obviously concerned with the visitors to the park but I am concerned about the effect on flora, fauna and views of parks.
I am on a fixed income and so could not afford it.
I am on a limited budget and that is getting expensive, but I don't live near national parks so it would still be a destination. The extra \$10 would make me hesitate but I would still do it.
I am on disability and can't afford it.

I am retired on a fixed income.
I am totally for anything to prevent air pollution. I have children that have asthma.
I am very aware of pollution; she lives in New York, so I am aware.
I am very interested in fighting air pollution.
I am very into other sources of energy.
I am willing to pay a onetime visit.
I believe in reducing pollution, although I believe that cost should be borne by everyone, not just those in the parks.
I believe in the environment and support it.
I believe people should limit vehicles coming into park, but do allow people to give donations instead of a set fee.
I believe that everything that I've been reading or hearing about lately is that we are going to run out of fossil fuels. In the future we should exclude the fossil fuels and we should do it now.
I believe that if the park vehicles are run on solar energy the other visiting cars should be parked at the gate.
I believe that we should be doing that in the entire United States.
I believe we should do everything we can to reduce pollution in parks and everywhere.
I can afford it, and I think Yosemite gets awfully polluted, and at \$10 a person it is rather a bargain and for me it would work fine.
I can afford it.(3)
I can't afford it. (7)
I can't imagine air pollution being that bad in those areas. I wonder what the pollution is like; is it as bad as the city areas? I question this. I would like to see a comparison of what it is.
I cannot afford it! I don't even know what the fee is now. If the entry fee is already \$20 then I can't afford it.
I cannot afford to pay the entry fee and this fee too.
I could afford it, and I would be willing to pay it. If I could not afford it, I would walk into a park.
I couldn't afford this fee. But I do think something should be done.
I couldn't afford it. I heard a scope the other day and fuel prices will be \$10 a gallon and I've got a family of five.
I do have asthma. I would like to think I'm breathing pure air.
I do not feel I will be affected by the medium air pollution.
I do not have the money to do that.
I don't agree with the data collected. I think it is asked for other purposes.
I don't believe all this about air pollution, I have allergies, and I don't believe all the crap about air pollution.
I don't believe changing just the park vehicles will do anything to help.
I don't believe in invisible air pollution.
I don't believe that electricity will cost more than gas.
I don't believe the park vehicles emit that much pollution.
I don't believe the situation warrants it. I think the \$10 charge is excessive.
I don't believe there is a problem.
I don't feel that the air pollution in the parks is so bad as to warrant this.

I don't have a problem. I know that others do. If my friends can afford to pay it so can I.
I don't have one. (2)
I don't know because I haven't visited.
I don't know if he can afford that.
I don't know if just converting the park vehicles would work, but I would be for it.
I don't know that it is that serious a problem and that just making the park vehicles low emissions will make a difference.
I don't know what the regular fee is, so I don't know if I could afford it or not.
I don't plan on going to any national parks, never been west of the Mississippi.
I don't plan on going to the parks. (3)
I don't see any scientific assumption that the changing vehicle will change the problem.
I don't think \$5 is too much. (2)
I don't think anyone should have to pay extra or a set fee. A good idea is to take donations as to what people want to pay.
I don't think changing the vehicles will help.
I don't think I should have to pay an extra when you cannot control the air outside.
I don't think it is a bad idea.
I don't think it is necessary.
I don't think it would be worth the cost.
I don't think it's that bad and it would drive a lot of people away.
I don't think it's that bad.
I don't think people should have to pay extra.
I don't think that converting the park vehicles will make a dent in the pollution.
I don't think that is much to pay for something good like that.
I don't think that is too much to ask.
I don't think that would be fair to people who already pay state taxes and shouldn't have to pay an extra fee.
I don't think they should not allow people to smoke in the parks.
I don't think we should pay to retrofit park fees.
I don't want to pay a fee.
I don't want to answer.
I don't agree with it.
I don't believe air pollution is that high.
I don't believe in this invisible air pollution. (2)
I don't have an extra \$25.
I don't have health issues but I think it's important.
I don't have the money to donate.
I don't know how much pollution the park vehicles input and so I'm not sure how to answer this question.
I don't know if I would or could pay an extra \$25, maybe \$10 or \$15, but \$25 seems a bit steep.
I don't know what to say.
I don't know. I just figure that you need to help the air quality.

I don't mind to pay a little fee if it helps make the park better.
I don't really agree with that approach. I think that park vehicles should be made cleaner. The solution would be to limit ALL vehicles, not just park vehicles. The money to update the vehicle fleet should be provided by the Federal Government, not fees at the gates.
I don't see it as that big enough a problem. (3)
I don't see, unless you take the air pollution from the whole world, how is it you can take air pollution out of national parks; it still wouldn't make a difference.
I don't think that \$2 is a lot to ask per individual.
I don't think that just the cars that are inside the park cause enough pollution to make any difference. Even if the Park Service vehicles get change to electric and solar, most of the pollution comes from elsewhere.
I don't think there should be very many park vehicles.
I don't think we should pay more for visiting a national park.
I don't understand the question.
I doubt that the number of vehicles used by the park would affect the air quality that much and the vehicles used by visitors effect the air quality more.
I feel \$2 is a reasonable price.
I feel anyone should be able to spend that much if they can go on a vacation like this. I'm for it but I personally would not be able to afford it on my income. Or ask for donations.
I feel extra \$100 for my family feels like way too much to spend on getting into a park, especially with gas prices being what they are right now.
I feel, if pollution is a problem, that the government should have a solution for the entire country. They need to come up with a solution and pay the amount so the people can travel through our country.
I feel like if you can afford to go to the park. With two individuals \$4 is not much to pay for a family of four.
I feel right now that air pollution is a big problem worldwide with the green house effect and the ozone.
I feel that each individual, if they have a breathing problem, should decide whether or not to go there that day. You can't make everyone pay for the problems of a few.
I feel that I don't visit parks that many times. If it helps someone breathe better I would be glad to help.
I figure if people can afford to go to a park they can afford to pay \$2 extra.
I figure no one should pay that because it should already be included; we pay enough taxes as it is.
I get to leave the park. The animals cant. If it affects me, it will affect them.
I grew up in LA and I can't imagine parked vehicles putting out that much pollution.
I guess I don't feel that the parks are a concentrated area of pollution. We need to worry more about the cities. Also we should not tack extra fees to the entry to the parks since they are a natural resource and should be free.
I guess if I were to go into a park, we shouldn't be charged that much.
I guess if it would reduce the amount of pollutants I would be in favor of that.
I guess I'm against the idea completely.
I guess I'm starting to be very concerned about the environment. And Yellowstone in the wintertime is having problems with air quality, so we should be concerned about that.
I guess to help the animals really, more than the people. And maybe people with breathing problems

would be able to visit.
I had respiratory problems; it concerns me.
I have a child and I would want to for the extra protection.
I have a child with asthma, so I am interested in having the air pollution reduced.
I have a daughter and husband who have asthma, so I would be willing to pay that price.
I have a family member that has asthma.
I have a lung disease.
I have a mild case of asthma that I received from a parent that smoked, so I don't want other people to have problems with breathing.
I have a premature son who does have breathing problems. Anything to cut down risks in that area, I am for.
I have all kinds of allergies, so I wear a mask.
I have allergies.
I have an active child and it's important that he can breathe.
I have asthma and have had a heart attack so I believe it is a great idea.
I have asthma so I would pay.
I have asthma, it would directly affect me.
I have asthma. \$15 is a perfect amount to pay.
I have asthma. (4)
I have asthma. I feel strongly about air pollution.
I have been to the Blue Ridge where the pollution is bad and I do have problems breathing.
I have breathing troubles and it would benefit me to pay that amount. I'd get my money's worth right away.
I have children who have allergies.
I have family and young children with asthma and it seems to be a small fee.
I have no answer.
I have not been to national park in years; I don't know what it costs to get in these days.
I have people in my family that have breathing troubles and I think we should do all we can to reduce air pollution.
I have sinus problems and I'd rather have no pollution.
I have some strong opinions on vehicles, not a fan of solar, but do need changes in their fleet. I would rather see natural gas.
I haven't been to a national park for a long time.
I just agree with preserving for future generations. We need to prepare now.
I just don't expect to be going. (2)
I just don't think that's a reasonable price for that.
I just don't think \$10 is too much to spend for that.
I just enjoy the national parks and I'd like to see them clean.
I just feel like I'm getting older, and the healthier the environment the better.
I just think air pollution clean-up is necessary.
I just think air pollution is a very serious problem and these things would help.
I just think air pollution is important to take care of.

I just think it is too much. (2)
I just think it would be worth the effort to clean it up.
I just think our whole family has pretty good lung health and \$2.00 is not an excessive price.
I just think that \$30 a couple would probably be too high.
I just think that amount is pretty high. That would make a \$30 increase in itself.
I just think that amount is way too high. There is air pollution everywhere.
I just think that clean air is a value.
I just think that if it hurts the people it's got to be affecting plants and animals as well, and I believe that \$10 per adult is sufficient.
I just think that it is worth \$10 to breathe cleaner air.
I just think that it is worth it to the people to have health concerns addressed and be in a safe place.
I just think there is just too much issue on it and from what I've seen it is not bad at all. Maybe in the big cities it's bad.
I just think there is too much pollution and I'm in favor of this.
I just want to be able breath clean air. When I'm outside I like to smell the fresh air.
I just want to have cleaner air, because that's why I'd go.
I just want to improve the environment.
I just wouldn't go to the park if the prices raised that high.
I just wouldn't pay it.
I know how important it is for people to breathe clean air; I'm in favor.
I like the idea of keeping some areas pristine.
I like the idea of non-polluting cars in the park.
I like to see the parks as natural and clean as possible.
I live in central California Valley where pollution is high. I would love to be where air is pure and think it to be a real treat to visit where pollution is under control.
I live in Fresno and we have very bad air. It is more the busses full of international people than the forest rangers.
I live in Northern Virginia and the federal government does not do anything for roads. I get stuck in traffic for 2.5-3 hours at a time. In addition, the government should not be looking at problems that more than likely don't exist. The reason why they have to beg for money is because the government won't fund it.
I live with my daughter, and have no money of my own.
I mean if it really impacts the air quality. You said that medium would affect some people. I would be willing to pay that to help those people.
I mean our natural resources, these are the only things left of the natural vegetation and animals. Paying an extra fee is simply a consequence of what we've already done.
I myself have asthma and it is better for the environment.
I only go to two or three parks and I don't see a problem, but as you said it is invisible, so I agree.
I personally would pay \$15, my husband would not. I can have bronchitis at times, and I need clean air, and so do my kids.
I prefer low pollution.
I probably would not visit if that \$25 extra fee were applied above and beyond the regular fee.
I probably wouldn't spend that much time in there to make it worth the money.

I race cars so I know a little bit about vehicles. There are many ways to reduce pollution that are low cost. Compressed natural gas is one way to go, for \$15 per person you could convert the galaxy to natural gas.
I really don't care.
I see a different type of pollution, oil spills, and antifreeze leaks.
I smoke and have Samantha and it doesn't seem to bother me.
I suffer from asthma myself.
I think \$10 is a little steep, after you pay for parking and everything.
I think \$10 is excessive.
I think \$10 is too high and people with low income could not afford to go.
I Think \$10 is too high.
I think \$10 wouldn't be bad.
I think \$15 is a little high for most people, especially to a senior citizen.
I think \$15 is too high and would make people not want to go.
I think \$2 is reasonable.
I think \$2 is worth it to clean up the air.
I think \$25 is too high.
I think \$25 per person is too high and the fee goes to the national park.
I think \$5 is a reasonable fee to reduce air quality. (2)
I think \$5 per adult.
I think a bigger part of pollution would be taken care of by restricting private vehicles than to worry about park vehicles.
I think a \$10 fee per person is too high.
I think air pollution is a major health concern.
I think air pollution is a real problem and by raising the fees and charging fees it would clean up pollution and help keep visitors low.
I think air pollution is important to address, and I don't think \$5 is too much to ask.
I think all the park should be non pollution.
I think all the parks should be free. If they want to do pollution control it should be wider than just parks. The parks should be set up on donation and funded by another not for profit organization.
I think anybody would want to help reduce air pollution.
I think anything that can be done to improve the environment should be done.
I think charging a little bit is great idea; it's fine. I don't know of a problem that warrants a cost of \$5; I personally don't have problem with that.
I think everybody should pay, not just the visitors. They are our parks and we should pay to keep them up for everyone.
I think for health reasons it would be a good idea.
I think that that's pretty expensive, and people who visit parks frequently would be hit hardest. I don't think it should be a blanket fee.
I think is not too much and it will help fix the problem.
I think it is a bunch of malarkey.
I think it is a good idea but keep it minimal, say \$3-5.
I think it is a good idea not only for the park but also the outlying area.

I think it is a good idea to reduce pollution. It seems to be a general problem in a lot of different areas.
I think it is a little bit too high and people should cut back and people should do their part.
I think it is a waste of time. What good would it do to non-pollute the park vehicles when there are so many other cars, etc., going through there that run on gasoline. Keep running them the way they are.
I think it is a worthwhile objective that should be supported and advertized to make the public aware of it.
I think it is fair because you are not charging children.
I think it is important to reduce pollution for humans and animals. Also plant life, etc.
I think it is important we think about fixing our environment.
I think it is important. (2)
I think it is reasonable amount.
I think it is too high, I think \$10 would be good.
I think it is too high.
I think it is too much for each person.
I think it is well worth it to raise the quality of pollution and charge an additional fee for cars that are high polluters.
I think it is worth it in the long run. (2)
I think it s a good idea to do and I'd be willing to pay for it.
I think it s a good place to start to clean up air.
I think it seems that it is a cost that's important.
I think it should be done because I have health problems to that effect.
I think it should be free.
I think it should come from tax dollars.
I think it will be well worth it \$5 per visitor.
I think it will prohibit some people from visiting the park who can't afford to visit.
I think it would affect all areas of the environment and I am for it.
I think it would be nice if there were buses that run through the park so you don't have to take your car through.
I think it would be responsible of me to do that; I think we should do that.
I think it would be worth it. (2)
I think it would be worth the money to help the pollution problem.
I think it would limit people on fixed incomes to be able to go.
I think it's a great idea.
I think it's a little bit too expensive.
I think it's a worthwhile program and worth lowering the pollution.
I think it's important to control pollutants in the air especially in our national parks where people want to visit.
I think it's important to keep the air good in the parks and I can afford it so I would be willing to pay that.
I think it's outrageous.
I think it's a ridiculous idea.
I think it's a crock of [explicit], I just believe that at any opportunity, our wonderful government will raise the prices on anything, and this is what they have come up with on the national parks. If they do

this then there will be many children who don't get to go to national parks because their parents can't afford it!
I think it's a good idea and if it's the only to get paid, I would.
I think it's important to reduce the air pollution in the national parks. Save on natural resources. I think \$2 a person is reasonable that's not taking a lot.
I think it's ridiculous that we get charged for this program. That should be normal and incurred expense.
I think it's too complicated to know without knowing all the details.
I think it's too much money.
I think I've talked enough.
I think most people could afford that.
I think our national parks are very important and the extra fee will help everyone to enjoy them. I have the senior pass so I would be willing to pay more.
I think parks need to be kept clean.
I think people are going overboard about pollution. I am for electric cars.
I think people should pay an extra \$10 for a one time deal.
I think pollution should be reduced.
I think preservation for the future, and if we don't they might not be around for future generations.
I think reducing pollution is important.
I think reducing the air pollution would help everyone health-wise.
I think that \$10 is too high.
I think that \$15 is too high.
I think that \$15 would be a little bit too much for a senior on a fixed income.
I think that \$2 is a nominal fee to improve air quality.
I think that \$25 per adult is too high. I am in favor of a fee but that is too high.
I think that \$25 per adult would be prohibitive. I would be unwilling to pay this much per adult as an extra fee for anything.
I think that \$25 per person is a bit much when you are already paying an entrance fee.
I think that amount is ridiculous.
I think that amount is too high. (7)
I think that any vehicles that are traveling through national parks or wildlife preserves should be non-polluting, either electric-solar or hydrogen. The more vehicles across the nation like this, the better off we are.
I think that for that program, it seems like a worthy cause. The fee is very reasonable, I also think that knowing what the fee is for makes it easier to pay.
I think that is a fair price.
I think that is a little high.
I think that is quite a lot of money. You have a lot of visitors and I think that's too much.
I think that is reasonable and important for the environment.
I think that is too expensive for the times we live in and other expenses.
I think that is very fair and it is important to keep them clean.
I think that it needs to be done all over instead of just one spot.
I think that it's good for the people with breathing disorders.

I think that the car manufacturers should contribute to the cause because they make the vehicles that pollute so much.
I think that the national park program is funded by US government and vehicles should be bought by US government. The US government paid for gasoline powered vehicles when alternative vehicles were available since 1950s. So it should be the responsibility of US government to buy these vehicles not the public.
I think that the state of the environment is in trouble and it is about time we do some fast cleaning up in a big way.
I think that the whole nation should go to vehicles that are non-emission type. In addition \$10 is nominal for this type of experiment.
I think that there would be other ways to ease the amount. I believe that there would be some kind of a grant available to help fund or even entirely fund the program. With the price of gas and other issues about the U.S. there has to be another way to fund the project.
I think that would be a good thing for me to do to reduce air pollution.
I think that's a fair amount and if I were going to go I would pay \$2.
I think that's a lot from medium to low, from high to low maybe but not medium to low.
I think that's a reasonable price to keep the parks clean.
I think that's a very important issue. I think that any pollution that's outside, especially in the national parks, should be as low as possible. And I feel that \$5 is a fair cost for that.
I think that's an exuberant fee to tack on to anything.
I think that's just an incredibly high price.
I think the ability to breath better is really important; everyone should be able to visit these parks, no matter their physical abilities.
I think the admission fee is enough. Adding fees to this is too expensive for me and others.
I think the environment and anything that can be done to turn the clock back should be done.
I think the fees should cover all expenses.
I think the government should pay for it.
I think the government should pay to take care of this, I don't think the public should.
I think the national park should be free to all citizens.
I think the national parks are run by the government, and the government should pay the additional funds.
I think the national parks provide a lot of entertainment and I think it is too high.
I think the number of the vehicles which are owned by the park will have a negligible effect on pollution.
I think the parks are in danger and they are being overrun by people and we need to do something.
I think the parks should be free of pollution.
I think the parks shouldn't even have fees for entry. We are taxed enough that we shouldn't have to pay. What are taxes for?
I think the price is a little too high considering the price of going to a national park.
I think the survey questions are bias in leading the people questioned in assuming all pollutions come from parks.
I think there is a problem and now that you brought it up I think that that is a wonderful Idea. My husband and I are thinking of buying something that is not necessarily internal combustion.
I think there should be a fee but \$25 is too high. (2)

I think there should be no park fee to begin with and then to pay an extra fee is ridiculous.
I think they should start preserving the air in the parks and this is a good way to do it and \$5 is not that much.
I think they're always going to have sore heads. I think this should take care of that; get those people out of the park.
I think to \$5 is a large jump for adults considering large families visit the park.
I think that you said that the low level is probably good for the animals and that the air would be good for human use also. As long as the wildlife would not be affected, I agree. However, the first time is fine, but if I were a frequent visitor I might have more of a problem with \$35 total or even \$40 because you know you got grandma in the back of the vehicle. So I might be less inclined to pay that.
I think we need all the people who know about this situation.
I think we need to work on pollution in other areas first, before the parks.
I think we should face up to facing pollution.
I think with families it would be a financial burden. Maybe \$15 per family.
I think without paying the fee people won't be able to enjoy the park and won't go.
I think would be good for the parks and good for everything to reduce the pollution. That's a minimal cost to help.
I think you won't get any families to go.
I think that it would likely be more than just me, so we're talking about \$75 to \$100 extra and while I'm against pollution, I don't think that an extra \$100 is payable.
I understand that pollution is being brought to the parks.
I understand that we get an awful lot of pollution from China, but there are a lot places where local air quality has a profound effect on local air quality.
I understand the air pollution in the parks and would like to see it reduced.
I used to work for a company that produced electric cars. It made a difference.
I visit the Adirondack National Park and the pollution from Detroit comes in to the park. It pollutes the trees and the water and it is official; some days there is a haze.
I want one of those vehicles myself.
I want to do my part to help reduce air pollution.
I was recently at Yosemite and there was a lot of pollution until they put in natural gas or electric and it really helped, so I am definitely supportive.
I was thinking more about \$5.
I will never visit a national park. (2)
I worry about what air pollution is doing to the animals and plants. It also hurts people with asthma and they should be able to go and enjoy it.
I would be. I can afford it. It's worth it.
I would be pretty high for people with families.
I would be willing to pay \$10. (2)
I would be willing to pay \$5. (2)
I would be willing to pay less. \$25 is too much.
I would be willing to pay the extra fee only in extreme cases, for example, if it was the only way I could view a national park.
I would certainly provide even more.
I would definitely pay any extra fees to maintain air quality.

I would do that if it was something I wanted to do, but it could be a hardship on older or limited income persons and families.
I would guess that with my income there would be no problem with paying this to decrease air pollution.
I would just say, if people are going to national parks, they're something nice to see. If the air is going bad, then people should pay an amount that they could find in change.
I would like to have clean air with no health problems and would not mind the fee.
I would like to help them so things get better.
I would not be motivated to go to the parks. For the reasons of fuel costs and etc., I would not go and thus not contribute to the problems.
I would not pay an extra \$25 that could go toward something else my family wants to do instead of breathing fresher air that is fresh already.
I would not pay that much for this program.
I would only be there for one day and air pollution wouldn't affect me as much as you guys want to affect my pocket. If I were staying longer, then ok.
I would pay \$5 or \$10. \$15 would be too high.
I would pay it just because it needs to be done. I would hope that once these vehicles are converted, that the fee would no longer be needed.
I would pay less.
I would pay money to reduce pollution in the park just as a global thing.
I would probably just go somewhere else for vacation.
I would rather see the whole country run off alcohol like Brazil and get rid of foreign oil all together.
I would say no just because \$10 is rough and because it would be \$10 per day. I go to national parks for more than one day at a time; it would add up.
I would say yes if it said to provide solar power and electric vehicles.
I would say that I need more information, and what is the entry fee now? If the fee is \$10 and you're asking me for \$15 more, then it is kind of steep for me.
I would think that if they could do it without my \$25 then do it.
I would think the park vehicles should be left alone and the staffs' cars should be fixed.
I would want to do it to help people.
I would want to see the place cleaned up.
I wouldn't have a problem with it because if it's cleaning up the air, \$2 per person is not a lot, plus it keeps people from bringing their trash.
I wouldn't like it, I'd probably grumble, but I'd pay it. I'm on a social security fixed income.
I'd be willing to pay the \$2 more. I believe the air quality in the park should be the best as we can make it.
I'd pay to help for additional help in the parks, but not for vehicle that run on batteries.
I'd rather go somewhere that will be healthy. I'd rather pay an extra fee to clean things up; otherwise I don't want to go.
If \$5 would help someone with a breathing problem it would be worth it.
If it is bad enough to damage humans, what is it doing to the plants and animals?
If cost were half that, then I will consider it.
If I had the money I would pay it but we are both on disability and can't even work.
If I had the money I would support it. I can't even put gas in my car.

If I want an improved service, I would pay for it.
If I wanted to go to that park I'd be willing to pay \$5.
If I was planning to go then yeah, \$10 sounds reasonable.
If I was there I wouldn't want to deal with pollution.
If I was visiting a park, I don't believe medium air pollution would be a HUGE factor but it would be one, and I don't think that \$10 is a huge fee to pay to help.
If I'm visiting a national park it is important to see it and pay whatever it takes to keep it safe.
If it affects people it will affect the environment.
If it helps air pollution it is probably ok. Keep parks affordable.
If it helps everyone's breathing it's worth it.
If it helps people and only costs a few dollars, let's do it.
If it helps your health and lowers the pollution, it would be worth it.
If it is a national treasure, I don't believe that just the people visiting the national parks should be responsible. As a tax payer, I pay for many things I don't feel responsible for, but I would pay an extra fee for national parks. However, the government needs to find extra funding for our national treasures.
If it is a one-time fee, I would be willing to pay per car.
If it is a small park, that does not require payment anyway, I would pay.
If it is for the duration of your visit and not daily.
If it is good and for health.
If it park vehicles can run as hybrids or electric and it doesn't pollute the air that's fine. I like that.
If it really makes a difference for people and animals, it would be reasonable if it is a park you really want to go to.
If it really would do that, with all the parameters that you put in there, then yes, but then I would be paying for myself, not even a small family. A large family would have problems with it, though.
If it was beneficial to everyone why would I not want to participate?
If it went for the program and was utilized correctly.
If it will help with diesel emissions I would pay it.
If it will reduce it I'm willing. (2)
If it would help the national parks, that's really a nominal fee and as long as it creates a more stable environment, I'm all for it.
If it would help with the pollution, it would help with everybody.
If it's going to be funded, then it might as well be funded by those who are there, rather than taxes or something.
If it's going to clean up the air, its fine with me.
If it's going to lower pollution, then I would willingly donate to help it. (2)
If it's going to be a safer environment, then definitely.
If it's just one day that I'm visiting out of the whole summer, then I can afford \$10.
If people have these problems they need to bring their own equipment for protection. I personally can't afford the extra \$5.
If something has to be done, then it has to be done, that's the only way the world can go on.
If the money does go to that intended purpose.
If the state matches in North Carolina, we pay state taxes.

If they limit the number of cars then they won't have to worry about visitors. The good Lord put the earth here and it regulates the pollution itself.
If this is going to lower pollution it should help everyone including animals. Personally I go because of the cleaner air.
If we can reduce pollution and in a somewhat affordable way, then do it.
If we don't do something about it, you degrade the quality for wildlife, and the cost of \$2 is low.
If we're only talking about the park vehicles, then I don't see the point; there is only small percent of park vehicles.
If you can afford it, it would be ok with the price of gasoline.
If you limit the vehicles, that automatically eliminates the pollution. Just limit the traffic.
If you're out there to hike or ride a bike you want able to breathe, and enjoy yourself.
Ill health. Good air is important.
I'm a hunter and an environmentalist. Anything that's good for the earth is good for me. And \$2 is pocket change; it wouldn't be a problem at all.
I'm a smoker and the whole air pollution concept is lost on me.
I'm all for helping the economy go green I guess you'd say, and that would help the animals and plants as well, not just the human factor.
I'm in college I live on my own and I really don't have \$10.
I'm going green myself.
I'm in California, so I know how important it is to keep air pollution low. \$5 is not too much money.
I'm kind of a health nut myself. I just think everyone should take their health seriously, and air pollution seriously as well.
I'm not a big proponent of the climate change movement; I don't buy into this air pollution thing.
I'm not a frequent user of parks, and yet they are of great value to me, so I think they should be kept pristine.
I'm on a fixed income and can't afford to.
I'm on a fixed income but I would be glad to give it.
I'm on disability. You couldn't afford it.
In a park the purpose is to get fresh air.
In favor of the fees: whatever the charge, we are willing to give.
In general, the national parks undercharge visitors; I can purchase an annual pass for \$55. I would be happy to pay more to preserve air quality.
In the interest of everyone's health.
In the interest of lowering air pollution.
In the national parks you are going to see nature, I'm going to relax and I think it should be included in the other fees and expenses.
In theory this is a good idea but unless you limit the other vehicles it isn't really going to make a difference. Do it the right way not half way.
It depends on how much the entry fee is. (4)
It doesn't seem that that is an expense that should be paid for by the visitors. It seems that it should be paid for by the government.
It doesn't matter; we don't pay to go in there anyway.
It is a good idea to change vehicles to reduce the pollution.
It is a good start but it is not going to touch it.

It is a small price.
It is important to breathe well, as I have asthma.
It is important to preserve the environment.
It is important. (4)
It is more important to control pollution; that is not the solution.
It is too much. (2)
It is very important to decrease pollutants in the air and I would be willing to pay for it.
It is very important to reduce to air pollution but some people might not be able to afford it.
It is very logical; it needs to be done.
It is worth \$2 to have good air quality.
It is worth it for the public's health.
It isn't the people who are working in the park; it is the volume of the people who come through the park that is causing the problem.
It makes sense to lower pollution, no matter what it costs.
It might make parks less accessible to me if the price was raised.
It only makes sense to support such a program.
It really would depend on one's salary.
It seems like that's an exorbitant fee, especially where I have an annual pass.
It seems like a reasonable amount. (3)
It seems like the fee of the park already is \$10-\$12 a person and \$15 extra seems steep.
It should be government funded; air pollution is not only a human health issue, but also a flora and fauna issue.
It should be the responsibility of the people who use the park to pay the fee.
It sounds cheap to you but I don't know how much it is to get into the park.
It sounds good to bring it down from medium to low. My wife has asthma and other problems.
It was too high, the \$25 fee.
It was too long; there should be more parks.
It will be better for your health so \$2 isn't too much.
It would be a hidden cost, who would know that is just what it costs?
It would be a whole lot better for the environment, period.
It would be good. People should pay so they won't have to breath invisible air pollution.
It would be nice to get it from medium to none.
It would be unaffordable.
It would be worth it. (3)
It would bring to my attention the importance of reducing air pollution. In relation to the overall expense, it would not be a problem.
It would cost too much for me.
It would depend on the amount of times and the regular entry fee.
It would depend on the national park, and if I decide to go I will pay whatever it is.
It would depend on where the park is and how much air pollution is.
It would encourage reduction of air pollution; I'm concerned with if it would truly help or not.
It would have to be based on what the initial charge of the park is.

It would help the air quality a lot.
It would help the animals as well. I'm for it.
It would make it a better experience and you would only have to pay for so long and then the program would be installed.
It would not be a fair value for only visiting it one time. Park ranger trucks being ecologically friendly would cure the pollution in the park.
It's 5 bucks; won't kill me.
It's a cheap way to help.
It's a good idea and \$2 is not much to ask.
It's a little too expensive per adult.
It's a lot of money; four people equals \$20, but it something that needs to be done.
It's a nominal fee to protect the environment.
It's a waste to the tax payers' money.
It's an issue seen through my lifetime that the parks are seeing the results of pollution. Keep the parks natural.
It's going to have to be done.
It's good for everybody.
It's good to invest in projects which encourage the use of alternative energy by vehicles in the park. The question about cars in the park was a good one and I believe they should be. Some people still drive SUVs and they are fascist pigs.
It's good to support programs that improve health.
It's important that we limit the amount of pollution in ANY aspect, and if we limit the amount we produce, it helps U.S. in the long run.
It's important to keep the environment clean. If people want to maintain the grounds for future generations, we have to consider that it will cost something.
It's just something I support.
It's necessary.
It's ok.
It's our future.
It's such a nominal fee.
It's too high a price to pay. (2)
It's too high. We have a lifetime senior pass.
It's worth it for the extra protection.
It's worth it if it saves lives.
It's worth it, whatever we can do.
It's worthwhile to support national parks.
It's already too much to enter the parks.
It's just for the park itself; there are still the interstates and other vehicles in the park.
It's just the price of it. I wouldn't budget that high a price.
It's something positive, it's not the "be all or end all", but it's a step in the right direction.
It's stupid, we still have our cars that come in.
It's too high. If it were advertised a different way, for instance, per car not per person, then perhaps. It should be consistent.

It's worth getting the air cleaned up in the parks.
It's worth it, that's a fine dollar amount.
I've got issues with pollution and toxicity. I've had issues with my health concerning air pollution. I don't think people of lower socio-economic status should be barred from visiting and in addition people that are disabled and can prove they are shouldn't have to pay the additional fee to get into these parks.
I've had a great concern about the air quality in the parks. Anything that could be done to help this would be well worth the cost.
Just agree; that's all.
Just be able to breathe better.
Just because I'm for lowering pollution and \$5 wouldn't deter me from going. \$5 is not that big of a deal.
Just because it is the right thing to do.
Just because the low cost, \$2 is worth that decrease.
Just for the parks.
Just logical, I want to have clean air in the park.
Just that it makes it more accessible to more people and enjoyable for me.
Just that they're national parks, so we should try to take care of it.
Just to have clean air.
Just would not go. The government gets enough tax to maintain that. The parks should be governed by a private sector.
Keep it as natural as possible at all times for future generations; hope we don't have to live underground because of pollution.
Know about air pollution and I usually arrive on public transportation and backpack.
Mainly, no member of my family suffers from any breathing problems; I'm not interested in paying anything extra for going to a park.
Make a little bit of money I think that the people who work at the national parks. It would be a good thing for the national parks to set examples for better air and cleaning for the environment.
Make the experience better.
Make the visit more pleasant. You don't want smelly air like the city behind a truck, you want to enjoy the beautiful outdoors.
Many people would not be able to.
Medium air pollution is not that bad and \$15 is a big amount with the prices of the park and gas prices to get there. I would love to have low air pollution but not at the price they want.
Most of our pollution is caused from industry.
Much for pollution because of asthma problems.
My concern is people who suffer from the pollution. It is worth it for the extra protection.
My daughter and I have asthma, so it would be kind of hard for us to visit a park.
My family had lung problems, so I know how hard it was when theirs wasn't so good.
My grandson and I have asthma, so it is a real concern.
My husband has asthma and allergies.
My husband has lung problems, so I understand. With the new program more people could visit these places.
My husband has severe allergies, so that makes it personal.

My problem with that is: I don't think they have enough information to know what they are talking about; too much supposition.
My son has asthma.
National parks which are in proximity to major urban and/or pollution areas are not on my list of national parks to visit. Therefore, I would not feel obligated to subsidize a problem that is not mine.
National places should be kept natural for as long as we can keep it.
No answer. (3)
No, because I don't go anywhere.
No comment.(9)
No extra money.
No, it's too much.
No money.
No reason for the park to have to do that.
No. As long as these are the only vehicles contributing air pollution.
None. (6)
Not \$25.
Not affordable.
Not aware of park entry fees. May be too much.
Not convinced there is pollution in the national parks.
Not enough information about price to get in gate.
Not going to ever visit.
Not if it is for just national parks; it needs to be for the whole country.
Not much money for one day.
Not only would pollution hurt the visitors, but it also hurts the environment. The fee would help the maintenance of the park, and help to beautify the surroundings of the environment within the parks.
Not that important.
Not that much for the extra protection.
Not the answer.
Not too much to pay. It would be worth it.
Not worth it.
Nothing else to say.
Oh, I'm for solar energy and other types of alternative energy sources and I believe they have to be funded.
Ok, I will look at the cost the people pay to get into Disney World; the price has gone up and no one complains. Also, if we can spend 42,000,000 to send out a letter that we will be getting a rebate, if we can do this, we can pay for clean air in our parks.
On limited income.
Once started it won't stop.
Our parks are very important.
Over all conspiracy.
Overall, if it is going to help and keep it at a low level, it is worth it.
Parks can't control air pollution.
Pay enough already to get in.

Pay enough for that stuff already.
Pay for the safety of her grandchildren.
Pay something not that high.
People need fresh air and shouldn't put their health at risk. My family members have asthma. I had a good experience with a vehicle running on electric power.
People should understand it is for everyone, but there is one person that ruins it for everyone.
People would use buses with a pick-up at that site, and take them through the sight, limiting air pollution.
Personal vehicles wouldn't make a difference; there is more pollution from personal vehicles causing the problem.
Please guarantee to work.
Pollution is a problem all over.
Pollution is becoming a big problem.
Preserving the air quality is a key resource.
Price of gas and state of economy all make it tough to pay more money.
Pro environment.
Probably pay half that.
Providing a friendly vehicle.
Quit spending money.
Reasonable amount.
Reduces the air quality for health purposes.
Reducing pollution would help the quality of a visit.
Respondent wasn't aware of the original cost to get into a park.
Right now I can't afford it.
Said that there aren't enough park vehicles to make a difference because all the visitors that come in are driving the cars that are causing the pollution. Make them park their cars outside of the park.
See the number of vehicles with less pollution.
Seems too expensive.
She believes that the government should be paying for the upgrade.
She can afford the \$5 cost to stop pollution.
She could afford it.
Should not be pollution from the gas.
Shouldn't have to pay for that.
Since I don't go to parks too often, \$10 would be that much to pay.
Skip. (2)
So far I have never had any problems.
Solar power vehicles do not have the power to do what you want them to do; I suggest leaving them to gas or propane.
Son has asthma and agrees to pay.
Sounds reasonable.
Strongly in favor of ending air pollution from vehicles.
That asking for quite a bit.

That I have asthma, so that would be the main reason. Foliage dies from too much pollution.
That is a little bit too much money. (2)
That is a little high; I could see an extra \$5 or \$8.
That is a little high. (2)
That is a reasonable extra fee.
That is not reasonable.
That is too expensive. (10)
That is too high for a person entering the park for one day. If it was a season pass that might not be too bad.
That is too high to pay people and I don't go to things that are expensive. Maybe they should add it to the taxes because it's everybody's' air.
That seems a little high. The price of gas right now is high.
That sounds reasonable to me.
That the federal government should pay; we should not have to pay for it, it's the federal government's fault. They should have taken care of air pollution a long time ago.
That there is already air pollution in the air.
That will be too much; we go as a group, and that is too much. If you were to charge a dollar a vehicle that would be more affordable.
That would be a small fee to pay to be free from the extra pollution.
That would be an extra \$50 to visit and on my income that would be hard.
That would be good because there are lots of lung conditions.
That would be nice but there are other things that are more effective.
That would probably keep me from going to the park, and with the way the economy is right now, instead of going to national park I would probably go someplace else.
That's a lot of money; \$10 per person is too much.
That's too much to pay for one day in a park and you're already paying an entrance fee.
The answer is that I think the cars can run on propane and that the air is really not bad.
The cost of gas is so high, how you can pay an extra \$25 to go someplace.
The cost; you are taking people that really want to see the parks and preventing the people who make less from visiting those parks.
The entry fee is already too high. The problem is that there would be an even higher fee. Therefore, it would be excruciating for us to travel from our area to a national park and then pay a higher fee.
The entry fee is high, the question needs more detail.
The extra cost will stop him from going to the park.
The extra cost would not allow us to visit.
The fee helps clean the air, which would make it more enjoyable, so I could hike without worrying.
The fee is too much; modify the transportation and limit the vehicles
The fee you pay to get into the parks should cover all of that, not some additional fee for air pollution.
The fees are being raised to the point that people won't be able to afford to go. You're keeping people out of the parks.
The gas prices are just too high to raise the fee; I think the park attendance would just go down.
The government should fund it. (2)
The largest reason is that government programs have to purchase those kinds of vehicles in order for

consumers to be able to buy them.
The last time we went to a park it was a state park, and the fee was \$25.00 We found that prohibitive and we found that we would have to leave because the price, in our opinion, was outrageous.
That's a lot of assumption about pollution. I believe the national park should be paid for by tax dollars instead of admission fees.
The money and finances.
The national parks have to be a leader in the effort to reduce pollution.
The national parks are increasing fees for many things and that's just one more fee. Even though I agree with the concept I would pay it. Overall I don't think it promotes the idea of the national parks.
The national parks are ours and they are too expensive now.
The parks were there way before we were.
The price of gas economy is poor; not in this day.
The real source of the problem needs to be defined.
The reason I say it's okay to pay is because if it's needed then it's okay. I don't think it's necessary because it's not a town or like that.
The reason is: I have seen the effect of electric vehicles; they have helped. It takes the emission out of some vehicles. By increasing the cost, there will be less traffic and therefore, less pollution.
The reason that I would agree to do that is because as an adult, I take my grandchildren, and they all are under 18. We are going to the Grand Canyon in July; I would not have to pay extra for the kids.
With the rising cost of everything else, from travel to gasoline and all costs associated with it, this would be an extra burden.
The use of park vehicles is so small that there wouldn't be a significant value to reducing air pollution in general. It's a bigger problem than what is being indicated here.
The whole question is a question.
There are people who would not go to the parks if it was increased to even \$13.
There are too many people having too much hardship right now to be able to afford that.
There is enough government waste that they should be able to take care of it.
There is funding that comes from the government. And I pay enough in taxes.
There is probably more pollution where I live at now than in one of the parks and the gas price is high.
There's way too many "supposes" in that thing.
These are places we do not visit often, so we need to take care of them. These places are fragile. We need to maintain and improve these areas and their conditions. To many people, we need to maintain our national treasurers.
They are already doing that at Zion; you have to use their transportation you can only go so far in your own vehicle. There is no fee.
They are going to convert a few park vehicles and allow 10,000 public vehicles to come through. I don't believe it would affect the air pollution in the park.
They are going to get that same pollution outside the park. This program is not going to change pollution in the national parks.
They should charge it.
They should go ahead and do it.
They're not near any cities that have the high air pollution. If I were planning my vacation and figuring the cost, I wouldn't pay any extra because I hadn't funded the extra expense.
Things like a reasonable amount of money to reduce the air pollution in the park would be great.

This is probably a health issue and if you want to solve this issue everyone should contribute.
This would help reduce the air pollution.
To contribute, to keep it safe.
To help contribute to decrease pollution.
To help control air pollution is important.
To keep clean air; as an adult I would be willing to pay more money.
To me it would be worthwhile for health reasons; you would be jeopardizing your health and to me, it would be worthwhile.
To protect environment and health.
To reduce the air pollution.
Too expensive already; don't want to pay anymore.
Too high for most people.
Too high. (8)
Too old to pay.
Tour busses instead of private vehicles; Mount Rushmore needs shuttle buses. It would help out to reduce the pollution plus provide information you could learn from guides rather than driving yourself. Very informative with guides.
Understanding that there are certain things that go into making smog and pollution, \$5.00 is a minimal charge. In other words, the family will enjoy it more.
The United States is trying to clean up all the air. China and other countries don't care and we all live in the same atmosphere. How are we going to do it all?
Until all visitor vehicles are being run like the park service vehicles, I don't feel we should be paying for just the park vehicles to be modified. Everyone should have vehicles that don't cause pollution. Until the general public has pollution free vehicles, we should not change those in the parks.
Visits to a major national park would include grandchildren or those under the age of 17 as well as other adults. For me and my wife, if we take just our grandchildren, there is no impact for us and that is a reasonable cost to reduce invisible air pollution and for us to feel a bit more comfortable. The only cost is for the two and not grandchildren.
Visits to national parks should be escapes from the pollution that bombards from everywhere else. We should keep national parks in a pristine condition.
Wants to know if that's a daily fee or a one-time fee.
We all need clean air. Anything will help to reduce air pollution, I guess.
We all should be accountable for pollution, not just the people that go there. It should be like a tax thing; we all contribute to air pollution.
We already spend a lot of time outdoors and these problems don't affect us.
We are on a budget and even if I had asthma, we just watch our pennies.
We go as a family; it would cost us \$50.00 and we would avoid the park.
We both have breathing problems and it should be nice to breathe clean air.
We can afford that and it is important to keep the pollution down.
We can't afford that on a fixed income.
We can't afford that.
We couldn't afford it on our income.
We definitely to do something about air pollution. We need to do something about our need for fuel, and we need to do something about this whole fuel thing.

We have federal emissions: as it is all the cars have pollution controls. We already provide that with the cars we currently have. If we start one program then they will bring in another program and another program and so on.
We live with pollution every day; I am going to a park for one day, that's a lot of money to pay for that.
We need to do everything we can to save the parks and keep the air clean as possible.
We need to get rid of the air pollution.
We need to keep our air clean.
We need to keep pollution down in our parks and everywhere.
We only have one planet right? Might as well save it.
We pay enough taxes that they should be able to fund the pollution without extra fees.
We pay enough taxes. Adding electric vehicles won't help a bit and electric won't climb the mountain.
We pay taxes that should go to those services. Money should be taken from the taxes we pay to reduce that. Taxes should cover my government services.
We should keep the parks clean and pristine.
We shouldn't destroy what is ours.
We visit the national park about a dozen times a year; it would be too much.
We would not be able to pay that; we would not be able to go.
We're taxed enough; if they want to go to electric that's fine, but I don't want to be the one to pay for the conversion.
Well \$2 is not very much to pay for reducing air pollution. I think air pollution is everywhere and it affects everyone. Also, people who are going to a national park are on vacation and are expecting to pay money and I don't think they would think \$2 is very much.
Well, air pollution is serious and I would like to help reduce it more than buying a t-shirt.
Well, basically, because the rangers and the personnel that they have in the park are over worked and underpaid, in order to have all the services, keeping the air pollution level is almost impossible. Maybe if they had some more funding they could keep the air the way it should be.
Well, because I have grandchildren that have breathing problems.
Well, because I know that we need to reduce air pollution in the parks. Who should do this besides the people who use the park?
Well, because that's going to take a burden off of others.
Well, because we need clean air to survive and have nice health; the pollution is so bad now.
Well, first of all, we don't visit any national parks; for me to be there would be a once in a lifetime thing. I'm actually all for being environmentally conscious.
Well, \$5 isn't very much money; that would be fine.
Well, I believe in reducing air pollution, especially in a park where it is a major problem.
Well, I can appreciate the fact that there is a need to cut down on pollution. \$10.00 is too much, regardless of income.
Well, I guess it's just, you don't expect to pay that kind of a fee for a national park when there is a large family trying to view it or visit it.
Well, I happen to know the air pollution in national parks. I live near Rocky. The air pollution there is from agriculture, not cars, so paying an extra fee won't help that.
Well, I have breathing problems to begin with so the clean air would be a value to me.
Well, I have sinus problems, so I'm interested in anything that improves the quality of air.

Well, I just think it would be worthwhile.
Well, I just think that is a cost that I could take care of, and I'm not interested in going somewhere where the pollution is high.
Well, I think if they are going to clean up the park, I'm willing to pay for it.
Well, I think it's worth that for the city people to see what our parks are like and so forth. So I think that it is a good value for them.
Well, I think that it's too high when you think about the amount of people that frequent the park.
Well, I think that something should be done, and you can't restrict the vehicles of the people going to the parks but you can restrict the pollution caused by the ranger vehicles that are there.
Well, I think that's self explanatory, I would be willing to pay that much to reduce the air pollution in the parks. People who visit the national parks should not be penalized because they are for everybody.
Well, I think the parks need to be available to the people and the prices should not be gouged out of the people for the cost of the program. There's enough money within the government to pay for this program. This is just another ploy for tax increases.
Well, I think we all have a responsibility and I wish that there was a way for everyone in the in the nation to pay for this. We caused it, now we have to pay for it.
Well, I think what you're talking about sounds good but you're starting in the wrong place. We need to start in the bigger cities. It sounds to me like somebody is trying to take control of these parks and regulate the number of people that comes to them.
Well, I would say that I feel that is important to keep the air as clean as possible for everyone.
Well, I'm hoping that if they're not smoke free now they soon should be. I'm all for keeping the pollution down.
Well, if it's only \$15 and it will help the environment it's worth it.
Well, I'm an adamant outdoor activist and I have had some of those breathing problems and thus I can afford to be a little selfish here.
Well, I'm considered to be what some people would call low income and it would just prevent me from going.
Well, I'm only going to spend one day there; it would not be worth it to pay an extra \$20.
Well, it's a problem with the air pollution already.
Well, it's not a high fee, and it's worth it; we should have electric cars all over, not just in the national parks.
Well, it's something that has to be done. I guess someone has to pay for it since and we're spending so much money on the war we have to get the money from somewhere.
Well, low pollution is better than medium pollution. I would be willing to pay even more if we could get it to no pollution.
Well, pollution is bad anyway for the trees and the animals, right? Just bad.
Well, pollution will destroy the natural things in the park, and as hard as it would be for me to do, I would pay the extra.
Well, I would rather the government pays for it instead of the people, but I guess I will have to do it.
Well, right now, I'm not a traveler anyway, but I understand getting the air clean. If I was going to travel and there was a chance of keeping the air clean, I'm all for it.
Well, that is an amount that I can afford.
Well, there's generally just my husband and I and we have six grandkids. We usually have two with us. Also \$5 is nominal.

Well, because, paying taxes, the parks are supposed to be paid for by taxes. The poor people go to the parks, not the rich ones and they can't afford to go now; the parks should be free for all.
Well, briefly try too. I just think it's worth it to improve the environment. I'm all for that for the animals and plants, too.
Well, I believe anything they can do to help with air pollution they should do, and if I can afford it then I should help with it.
Well, I don't know; the air here is not polluted, so I don't have any idea.
Well, I guess I feel that I can afford that based on my expenses on other outings and such. I feel that it is more important than things like a first-class ticket or staying at a finer hotel.
Well, I have a heart problem so it would impact me and my breathing. We, my spouse and I, are both in our 70s, so air pollution is a concern for both of us.
Well, I think we need to make the parks accessible to everybody, and if we can change the busses and trucks that go in and out regularly to electric that would help. There many people with breathing trouble and this would help to let them go to the parks.
Well, if it helps to preserve the park and helps keep people healthy, you would have to pay it, right? Otherwise you'd have to limit the number of people that go into the parks, right? I'd pay that much for this.
Well, I'm retired, I'm on a fixed income now and any extra expense is something I have to look at.
Well, I'm thinking that it is a little high. If I go to the parks, I would be with my husband, and that's 50\$ right there, that would keep us from going to the parks.
Well, it does not look like the government will pay it. It is not going to happen, and we need to protect our parks. They are a national treasure.
Well, if it'll lower the air pollution and it's healthier and safer for the kids.
Well, on a vacation budget \$10 is pretty discretionary and worth the privilege of being there.
Well, to preserve the park.
Well, you get a lot of moderate families and for a family of four that would be a lot of money.
Were getting carried away with our polluting worries.
We're on a fixed income, we have some grandkids, and if the prices go up, we have to miss out on stuff.
What little that would do is not as positive as you're making us assume that it is. The little bit that that would affect is not as good as what the price is worth. I think it's like throwing a lawn chair off the Titanic. What about all the heavy equipment they use in the parks? Are they going to change it to electric and solar or whatever?
When we were in the park my wife had trouble breathing because the air is thinner and with air pollution cured, it would be easier to breathe.
When you are on a fixed income it is very difficult.
When you consider the price of fuel, that we are on a limited income and that we have to pay \$400 to fill a propane tank and then add \$4 a gallon of gas, only the rich can afford it. I will just camp somewhere else where it doesn't cost.
When you figure most families that go to parks are not the type that go on cruises or take long trips out of the country I think that \$15 is too steep. \$5 would be more reasonable.
When you get behind a diesel vehicle it makes me sick; I can't take it.
When you go to a park you expect clean air.
Why don't they use more horses in national parks?
Why should I pay?

Willing to invest in the program to convert park vehicles to nonpolluting and everywhere else.
Willing to pay to lower pollution.
With asthma I can understand that it is hard to enjoy anything if you are having trouble breathing.
With gas prices being as they are, what is to say that the additional fee won't go up? Electric and solar will be a good idea.
With his family.
With my family, \$2 isn't at all too much.
With my income, it's just too much. I could afford it, but it would NOT be a good investment, so no, I would not.
Worth it for my health.
Worth paying for.
Worth preserving our parks.
Worthwhile and beneficial.
Would be healthier for everyone to reduce the invisible air pollution.
Would depend on which park and how much it costs initially.
Would like pollution to be less.
Would like to know a lot more.
Would like to not have pollution around.
Would like to see better air.
Would pay \$5 per person. Gas is too high, economics affordable can more often so people can enjoy more often if it's affordable to enjoy.
Would they have testing on the pollution and if it is high would they raise the prices again? The sick people are crying too much. I don't even know of any polluted places near these parks and as far as the admission goes, they're just forcing us to pay more.
Yeah, if they get rid of those oil wells; I don't know if it's really cars. Two bucks isn't too much for anyone, though.
Yes, because it makes it much better for your health.
Yes, I could afford that.
Yes, if it goes to the program.
Yes only if when the vehicles change, the charge would go away.
You shouldn't mind paying the extra money.
You want to go out and enjoy the national parks. If air quality is bad what's the point?
You would lose so many people coming there because that is too high.
Your park people only have a small percentage of pollution causes.
You're throwing a dime at dollar problems.

C.2 - Responses from the web survey

q9. Please provide any information that helps explain your answer to the previous question.

\$10 a person is really a high fee to pay when the other costs have all gone up also.
\$10 I would consider, \$25 is just too high. Cut back a couple of hummers from the Army and use that money to fund electric cars for the rangers.
\$10 is a bit much for my budget, especially when you consider that once the vehicles are paid for, that money is doing what? Considering all vehicles are paid for, now every \$10 admission is just growing, growing in the 'pot'. If \$10 was temporary, until the vehicles are paid for, then the cost is dropped to \$5 additional admission on top of the original cost), then \$10 would be okay.
\$10 is a little too much.
\$10 is a lot.
\$10 is acceptable to improve air quality.
\$10 is cheap to insure a longer life! Anywhere!
\$10 is not a high price to pay for keeping our air good.
\$10 is too much money per person. (3)
\$10 is too much to charge. I'd be willing to pay \$5.
\$10 is too much to have to pay on top of the entry fee that is already being charged.
\$10 is too much.
\$10 is too steep a fee. I like the idea of reducing air pollution in national parks but not at that price.
\$10 is very little for my budget.
\$10 is way too much money! More like \$2! There are billions of adults who visit these parks each year.
\$10 is worth enjoying outdoor activities while protecting your health.
\$10 per adult visitor is too high. I would be willing to pay \$5.
\$10 per person is not that bad, considering the benefits. Group or family rates would be a great idea.
\$10 seems like a lot. I want to know what the \$10 is on top of. Is it on top of \$20 making is \$30 or is it on top of \$50 making it \$60. If I take a family of four, that's an extra \$40 out of my pocket. If you charge that extra amount, pollution will go down anyway because I think it will divert some people from coming. I would be willing to pay \$5.
\$10 seems to be a reasonable fee per person to ensure healthier air quality in national parks. Anything more than that I would consider excessive.
\$15 an adult, I feel, is too much of an extra charge.
\$15 is a bit high. \$10 is a little more reasonable.
\$15 is a minimum price to pay in order to breathe in clear air.
\$15 is a small fee to pay for clean air.
\$15 is a tolerable fee.
\$15 is far too high. I doubt very many people would go to the park if they are charged such a price. I know I wouldn't.
\$15 is not a high price to pay if the air would be cleaner and healthier.
\$15 is too much although the benefit is good.
\$15 per adult is pretty expensive on top of normal park fees.
\$15 per person seems a little high. Can't the government pay?
\$15 seems a little high, I was thinking of a price increase to be at \$5. \$15 is too much. But what is the normal current price?

\$15 seems steep. When I was reading the information, I was thinking more around \$5 to \$10.
\$15 total, yes, not \$15 per day.
\$15 for the park service to switch over and maintain vehicles to keep a pristine environment is not too much to ask.
\$2 extra is well worth it for cleaner air.
\$2, I think, would be a reasonable price; however, how long would that last before the price was raised? The thing that concerns me is, like all taxes, they always go up but never come down.
\$2 is a nominal cost.
\$2 is a small price to pay cleaner air. Per visit, not per day.
\$2 is not a very big amount to pay for such a valuable improvement which could benefit many people, the national park system and the nation as a whole, plus I like the idea of using the alternative energy.
\$2 is not that much to pay for better air to breath.
\$2 isn't so much.
\$2 isn't even the cost of a gallon of gas.
\$25, for me, is affordable, based on the results.
\$25 is a lot of money to require upon admission.
\$25 is considerable addition to a fee for going to a park that sounds congested and overcrowded. Obviously, air pollution is the result of too many people and too many vehicles. If I want to go somewhere I can quietly appreciate nature it would not be in that environment.
\$25 is cost prohibitive and national parks are usually free or low cost vacations.
\$25 is pretty stiff for a one-day visit, on top of existing park fees. I would support a fee of \$10 per day up to a \$25 maximum for a visit of three days or more. I also would support a fee of about \$15 to drive your own auto into and around in the park, but the fee would be \$0, or minimal, say \$2, for those who would park at a peripheral lot, or one central lot, and use park buses for their visit. That would improve the park atmosphere and probably the air quality.
\$25 is too high per person. (3)
\$25 is too high. People like me have kids to raise and everything is too high these days.
\$25 is too steep.
\$25 on top of the existing park entry fee would likely price the visit out of my means.
\$25 per adult is much too high for our family to afford. We'd have to really think about visiting a park at this cost.
\$25 seems a little steep.
\$25 seems a little steep. Maybe per couple.
\$25 seems like a lot of money to spend to reduce the invisible air pollution I breathe for only one day, particularly if I don't typically experience problems at a medium pollution level.
\$30 is too much to add on after the cost of gas to get there, food and lodging. I was thinking may be \$20 at the most for two adults.
\$5 bucks is a reasonable fee.
\$5 in my opinion is not too large a sum but I also doubt changing just park vehicles will make that much difference
\$5 is a small amount of money to pay to help keep my health from getting better.
\$5 is a small amount to pay for reducing pollution.
\$5 is a small price to pay for cleaner air.
\$5 is a very minimum expense for lower air pollution.
\$5 is not too much to ask for clean fresh breathable air.

\$5 is pretty minor.
\$5 per adult in one car equals an additional \$25. That's too high.
\$5 per person is too high.
\$5 seems a small amount to pay for clean air while visiting an outdoor wonder, like our national parks.
As a family of five , if we can afford to drive to national parks from Minnesota, we could not afford to pay an extra \$45 over and above typical entry costs, whatever they are. The idea is great to improve air quality, although, as in everything else, instead of the general public footing the bill for everything, the program itself should find financial means to take on this change-over. If it's that important to the national park system, I'm sure they can come up with a plan which would help accomplish this. The public would benefit during a brief visit but those who you might consider for contributions would be our great "tax and fee them and back the oil companies" government or park employees and residents in the area or state that the park is located in. They're who the pollution levels would have long term effects on. Government must have a program to help subsidize this which they'll pass on to the citizens of the great USA.
A fee of that amount for a one day outing is prohibitive. I value my health, but at that cost, I would find another venue to visit.
A park like this should be free. By being free it gives me and others a place to visit and enjoy without extra cost over what it already cost to take a trip.
A system that will reduce it. I will help you by paying \$10 for your efforts.
A trail naturally is needed and we should not disturb the environment from what it had developed over the decades.
Air pollution happens mainly due to outside pollutants. Allergies are a common thing if you got them.
Air pollution is a large regional problem; bigger than the park.
Air pollution is a serious problem.
Air pollution levels in the medium to high range also impact wildlife and plants, which the NPS is required to prevent. I want my parks to be as natural and healthy as possible including a full complement of wildlife and native plants. I'd also like to protect my health. I'd also support greatly limiting public auto use and access as well.
All these facilities have to be funded by the government by taxation to promote and preserve the national treasures.
Although I agree in concept to the program of adapting all the park vehicles, I believe \$10 per adult is high. Perhaps \$10 per family is more reasonable.
Although I think it is a worthy endeavor to lower air pollution, I usually travel alone and between airfare, hotel accommodations and meals I find it necessary to cut back on the costs for activities as much as possible to make the trip affordable for me.
Although we might not normally visit one of the "outdoor parks," we would even consider a moderate surcharge of \$1 at other parks, Steamtown at Scranton, or St. Augustine for example, to help offset or subsidize the outdoor park program.
An additional \$2 per adult or \$4 total would not be noticed at all.
An additional fee is just another tax. The federal government spends, or really wastes, enough of our money now.
An effort to reduce pollution at the medium level can decrease health issues during my visit and I would pay and feel.
An extra \$10 fee is miniscule considering the cost of gas or diesel to get there. I think \$20 would be more appropriate. Watching sports cost more and is less educational, per se.
An extra \$15 would bring the price to enter the park to be too high for me to afford. I do not live close to any national parks and would have to spend a lot of money to travel there and would not be able to pay

the extra money.
An extra \$25 is a lot of money.
An extra \$5 is too high.
And I would paid extra \$5 toward the.
Any prudent and reasonable person would.
Any reduction to pollution is valuable.
Any type of environmental safe feature is welcome in my book; I would just like the facts on how the money is used.
Anything that I can do to help save the planet and not put my health at risk is worth the extra fee. I'm not just thinking of myself. The animals need to breathe healthier air too. I don't need any extra toxins going into my body causing all types of illnesses.
Anything that would make the air better.
Anything to help minimize pollution.
Anything to help my health.
Anything to help our planet.
Anything to help preserve the air quality is worth paying for.
Anything to help reduce air pollution, I would do, no matter how much, even though I don't make that much money.
Anything to help reduce our carbon footprint would help.
Anything to keep the parks as natural as they were before man is okay with me.
Anything we can do to make the air better for people and animals, we need to be willing to do.
As a family of five, it is expensive enough.
As a rare user of the National Park system, I would pay extra if it would only help preserve what I remember when I visited them as a child 40 years ago.
As a reformed non-smoker, I would be willing to spend a little extra for an enjoyable experience.
As I obviously don't visit NPS locations often, yet, it would be worth the extra money.
As I see it, the number of park vehicles would be minor compared to the number of visitor vehicles so the benefit of such an expensive program would be minimal. A car with four adults visiting the park would pay \$40 extra. That's way out of proportion for the benefit.
As long as the first fee is not too high, then \$2 is not a lot.
At that price I would only be able.
At the end of the trip an extra \$5-\$100 won't make a difference. So if money is not the issue, better safe than sorry.
At this time, an extra charge like this would force me to drastically reduce my visits to national parks.
Avoiding pollution for such a minimum cost is welcome.
Be a hardship. Perhaps a fixed amount.
Because I think it's a good idea.
Because if it is at medium when I go then it will limit my time to spend outdoors, and what are parks for? If you have to stay inside for your health, you may as well reschedule when you go on vacation.
Because if we don't do it, where will the pollution stop.
Because of the benefit on the pollution will be low.
Being on a fixed income and with the price of gasoline getting so high, we will be lucky if we can even afford to get to the park.
Being on a limited budget, every dollar counts.

Better air, more enjoyment, for longer!
Big manufactures.
Bush, plus war, plus big oil, plus a failed economy, equals no extra money.
Buy a yearly pass.
Can't afford amount.
Can't afford extras right now due to extreme gas prices.
Can't afford it. (2)
Can't afford that; most people couldn't.
Can't explain. Don't know.
Can't remember when I was in a national park.
Can't afford it on top of rising gas prices and an extra \$25 for each adult. But then again, some people may not mind paying if it'll help make the trip more enjoyable in the future. I personally find it outrageous.
Cars and trucks would still be allowed to drive in the parks in large numbers, thus not really reducing pollution of the air.
Children.
Clean air, fun, healthy parks.
Clean air is essential to plants, animals, and humans everywhere. I want my grandchildren and their grandchildren and future generations to be able to enjoy National Parks in the future.
Clean air is important.
Clear. This also helps the animals.
Considering that there could be two adults and two children over the age of 17 that comes to \$100 per car. Way out of line on price.
Considering the possible high traffic, \$25 seems really high. Better to lower the price and take more time to pay the cost. \$5-\$10 extra seems more reasonable, considering the other costs.
Contribution to the problem.
Cost is already high.
Cost too high.
Cost. (2)
Couldn't afford it. (3)
Depending how many adults. And only because the Grand Canyon is a pretty place to visit.
Do not go to parks.
Does everything have to cost money nowadays to go to?
Don't have any.
Don't need to charge extra.
Don't think it necessary.
Don't want to pay more.
Don't you think as taxpaying Americans we pay enough? Jesus Christ, give me a damn break. Now we have to pay for air?
Doubt I will visit and do not want to pay \$10 more.
Electric vehicles are a good remedy.
Enjoyed them greatly. Sorry I couldn't be of help.
Enough now.
Enough with the taxes, tolls, surcharges, "extra" fees, etc.

Entrance fees are already close to \$100 for family of four. Too much for us.
Even \$6.
Even though our air quality is very important, the cost to visit one would be prohibitive. The average family couldn't.
Even with a park fee, our national parks are our greatest vacation bargain.
Everything should be done to lower pollution. This should also include trash and other pollution.
Face it. It is hard to enjoy anything with all the added cost. No not another one. When will it stop?
Family income exceeds \$200,000. So we can afford it.
Fewer cars, less people.
Financial.
Fixed income, already pinched by high gas prices and insurance increases.
For a family of four whose children are 18 and 19 years old, that is \$60 in addition to the regular fee. That is a lot. Would this fee be for each day? If so, that is way too much. Some parks are free. People may stop going to the national parks. Besides, this is probably the only time I visited the park, why should I pay for all the people who visited and polluted in the past.
For a good quality of air that will not impede my enjoyment of a national park, I would be willing to pay for admission at that "reasonable" rate.
For a onetime fee of \$10 per adult, that seems reasonable. I am assuming that I know about it ahead of time. If I got to the park, and was not aware of the fee, I would likely be unhappy, but pay it. Knowing about it now, if I were to go to a park this summer and have a fee, up to \$10 would seem reasonable per adult.
For clean air.
For everyone to breathe fresher air.
For my income the fee is a bit steep for a one day visit, say for four adults.
For the sake of peoples health and our children especially, I feel deeply that an extra \$2 would not be a big burden.
Gas is too expensive to pay to get to the park, and then have to pay somewhat double to get in.
Good amount.
Good idea if it's proven to work and not just another rip off.
Got to save the earth and keep pollution down.
Government spending should pay for this through taxes and less of our tax money should be used for government officials to get raises and waste on vacations.
Having the pollution level reduced to low would make it a more enjoyable day and easier to breathe.
Health is priceless.
Help have better park.
Hopefully air pollution would be helped and costs could become less.
How are you going to do that?
How can you change the outside air in the park, from the air outside of the park? It's all open. It would be the same air. Unless the park is inside. Then you could filter the air. So just say you want to raise the fee to get into the park.
I absolutely could not afford this much. \$5 would be better.
I already have lung problems so I would support anything that would lessen pollution.
I am 79 years old and live on a fixed income. \$10 does not seem like a large sum but when you are on a fixed income like mine, you have to watch what you spend on what. It is difficult to justify that expense, especially if you are not certain that it will be used to clean up the air.

I am a senior citizen and am on a fixed income. With the price of gas, it is costing too much already to just "get" to a park, much less pay an extra fee.
I am a senior citizen on a limited income. The price of gas and everything else going up, I just can't afford to pay anything more.
I am a senior on a fixed income, I love to visit the parks but if it costs too much I can't afford it.
I am a widow on a very fixed income.
I am always doing things that are earth friendly such as recycling and buying non-aerosol items.
I am an environmentalist and if necessary I will pay modest fees to protect our Parks and animals and people.
I am assuming that the additional charge per person will not exceed the actual cost, that fee times the number of visitors over a period of time, of replacing gas powered vehicles and other park fossil fuel emissions. In those circumstances, especially since pollution is cumulative, such a fee would make it possible for everyone to engage in the outdoor pursuits that the national parks offer so spectacularly. To go to Yellowstone, Yosemite or to the Smokey Mountains and not be able to hike because of air pollution would be tragic and a travesty, and a failure in the stewardship that is the responsibility of the National Park Service.
I am cheap; no extra fees please.
I am concerned enough about my health to pay that money.
I am getting older and I would like to have better air in my lungs.
I am in favor of reducing pollution if at all possible and would pay to lower whatever I could.
I am in the low income.
I am interested in lowering emissions. I am retired and on fixed income. I live in Las Vegas, Nevada and go to Lake Mead a lot. I have a golden age pass.
I am not a rich or poor man but I think if I planned on going to a national park I could afford that.
I am not going to visit any park anytime soon, but if I were, on my limited income it would be hard for me to pay any extra.
I am on a fix income and now that gas is high I doubt I'll be traveling to some park and pay \$5.00 to pay for better air that may or may not apply to me.
I am on an income that would make that not affordable to us.
I am retired and cannot afford to pay extra.
I am retired and have a limited income so I could not afford another \$10 to visit.
I am retired and have bought a lifetime pass.
I am very fragile.
I am well aware of what pollution can do to our health.
I am willing to do whatever I can afford to help the environment.
I am willing to pay a little extra but I believe my tax dollars should cover this.
I appreciate not charging for children under 17. \$2 doesn't seem that outrageous, however, still consider the high cost it is now.
I believe \$10 per adult is a little high. \$10 per car would be a better solution. Make it too high and you will turn off visitors and the income will go down. Having less pollution and using our natural energy to run the vehicles is the only way we can go from now on.
I believe \$25 is too much money as a supplement to a one day visit.
I believe a lot of the problems people claim exist may not.
I believe it is important to lower emissions from park vehicles.
I believe that \$25 would be stretching.

I believe that a fee of \$25 is very reasonable if it helps lower the pollution.
I believe that adding a fee will accomplish two things. One, it will provide additional funds for park managers to clean up the natural environment; and, two, it may keep the numbers in the parks down, thus helping to preserve the environment in the park.
I believe that for the unknown future it would be a wonderful investment.
I believe that most citizens or visitors have a notion that these types of parks are free of charge or have a low cost admission fee. Adding a \$5 charge would seem high to most people and discourage them from entering or visiting. A lower cost of maybe \$3 per person would seem more reasonable and maybe just adding that price into the admission fee as one set flat admission fee would appear to the general public to be less strenuous on the pocket book and possibly not even questioned.
I believe that much of the pollution in parks is the result of industry, not vehicles in the park. I would prefer if the industries that cause the pollution bear the costs of cleaning it up.
I believe that this will make a big difference in cutting down the amount of pollution.
I believe the park would be more enjoyable and healthy for all of the people that visit the parks.
I can afford \$5.
I can afford the extra \$10 "clean and green" fee.
I can easily afford \$2.
I can no longer travel as I once did.
I can see \$5 a car but I cannot see paying \$5 a head.
I can't afford it and love visiting the park. Maybe the government should spend money on this rather than handing out incentive rebates.
I can't afford much, but I can afford \$2.
I cannot afford any leisure activities.
I cannot afford that much extra to visit a park.
I can't afford it. (2)
I can't afford to go to national parks or even to the movies here in town, so I can't say that even if I was to go a park I'd be able to pay more just to go.
I can't go to the parks now.
I can't walk and I have to take my vehicle. I am on a fixed income.
I could afford \$10 easier.
I could afford it, and I feel the goal is worthwhile.
I could afford that and I think it would be worth it.
I could not afford to pay that much in addition to the fee to enter the park.
I couldn't afford that fee and would not go at all rather than overextend my budget.
I dislike extra user fees added on for most reasons any way and I think \$15 is way too much.
I do have breathing problems.
I do not believe that it's that hazardous.
I do not believe that spending the extra money will make any difference. Further, with the way the government is run and misuses money, why would a taxpayer need to give more to their mismanagement.
I do not consider the park vehicles to have a negative impact on park air pollution. It is the visitors' vehicles which have the most negative impact. Regarding day visitors, I would like to park service to consider distance parking areas and use electric shuttles as the main source of transportation and touring within the largest/most popular parks' boundaries.
I do not have any breathing problems; however, I have friends that do.

I do not know the rate per adult to get into the park before the fee. If it was \$10 per adult to get in and \$10 for the environmental fee, I would probably be OK with it. If it is \$40 per adult to enter plus the \$10, then I would not want to pay \$10 per person, maybe \$5. It all comes down to the total for me. I would probably not turn around and go home, but I wouldn't be as happy paying a total of \$50 per person as I would be paying \$20 per person. That being said, I would probably also justify the expenses as being OK because it takes a lot of money to maintain a national park.
I do not plan on going to a national park.
I do not travel anymore.
I don't believe that converting just the parks' vehicles will reduce air pollution. If other vehicles were limited, then I would be willing to pay the extra fee.
I don't go to parks.
I don't know, I might pay the \$10.
I don't know what you mean.
I don't know. (2)
I don't much think that paying for invisible anything is good business.
I don't think \$5 is very much compared to what other things cost though I do think \$2 or \$3 is more reasonable and would be more likely to be accepted by all.
I don't think cleaning the air in a small portion of this planet is going to have much effect on air quality. A worldwide end to burning gasoline seems to be a better solution to the problem, as long as the breeze continues to blow.
I don't travel.
I don't believe there is that kind of pollution to justify the extra fee. I have more pollution in my neighborhood on a daily basis than any national park could possibly have due to busses and park trucks. I don't mind replacing old equipment with newer less polluting equipment due to attrition, but see no reason to just replace perfectly good equipment to be more trendy and politically correct.
I don't believe we have that big of a problem.
I don't feel there is enough air pollution in a national park to physically affect me. While I applaud efforts to reduce it regardless, if I wanted to visit a park I don't feel I would be willing to pay \$10, especially if it were on top of other fees.
I don't go to any.
I don't have a problem with my health but if I did I would be willing to pay to breathe better. If I'm on vacation my expense account should be able to cover that amount. Also it helps the parks out that don't ever get enough contributions.
I don't have the money.
I don't know the total number of adult visitors annually and can't determine if \$10 is reasonable. It doesn't seem so at first glance.
I don't know what you could do with money to improve pollution problems.
I don't like air pollution. It isn't healthy for us. If we can cut all of it or some of it, I say go ahead.
I don't plan to visit any park, at this time, unless I am traveling with a tour group. Gasoline is too expensive to pleasure ride. The tour group would include the extra cost in the price of trip, if that is necessary.
I don't think staying in a park for one day would cause me health problems.
I don't think that an extra \$2 is out of line to make it better for our physical health.
I don't think there is a problem, but if it were a problem, I would pay the extra to reduce the problem.
I don't think we should have to pay for the use of any park.
I don't visit these parks enough.

I feel \$25 is too high a fee. I would be willing to pay \$10 per adult.
I feel it would be a more enjoyable.
I feel it's important to keep the parks as pristine and natural as possible and the air quality is certainly an integral part of this plan.
I feel like if there is an air pollution problem it a concern for all of us. If it is hurting us then we should look at the effects that this is having on the habitats of the animals of the area. They are just as important as the human population of the world and they cannot help themselves and it is up to the people to protect the wildlife.
I feel that \$10 in addition to the adult entrance fee is too expensive.
I feel that it is not just important to reduce air pollution in the cities, but throughout the world. It creates positive externalities for everyone. Also having cleaner air, especially for people who have respiratory problems, would make it more probable that everyone would visit these places, and also enjoy some physical outdoor activities. For all of these benefits, I would be more than willing to pay an extra \$5 per adult, especially if I knew that everyone else was also putting up their part.
I feel that paying an extra \$5 would benefit me and my family. Since we do not visit these types of parks often, any extra costs that would go towards making the experience healthier and safer for all of us is worth the price
I feel that we as a people have the responsibility to do our part in preserving the earth for generations to come.
I find it incredible that today's Park Service requires such a large number of vehicles and I would limit the number and use of park vehicles. Instead of trucks, give them golf carts, or better yet bicycles or boots.
I find the parks awesome. I don't go that often and consider the open space that is maintained for our pleasure part of our responsibility.
I, from living in the Appalachian Mountains, feel there is not the air pollution people may expect. We have so much virgin timber along with all the vast mountain ranges. The big coal companies in West Virginia have raped the mountains with strip mining, causing sulfur to run into the creeks and streams, along with underground mining methane, and such contributed to the mining of coal. The Smokey Mountains have succumbed to total commercialism that down below yes air pollution may be abundant. You'll never in your life see a more spectacular view of the Blue Ridge and the Smokey's when the sun comes up and that beautiful clean white cloud just hanging over at the break of day ,it's something to behold and know you live right in the midst of it all.
I greatly appreciate this idea! I'm for anything that promotes the use of alternative energy. This action is long overdue! If people cannot afford to contribute that's fine with me, it'll mean less people at these precious natural sites. We must be serious about making these changes immediately and everyone will take this much more seriously when they fully realize it will cost them in one way or another. I certainly prefer a financial loss than one which concerns my health or the health of this awesome planet! These places are far too valuable to be cheap to visit and maintain. Let those who don't see the value in a financial sacrifice find something else to do.
I guess \$2 for a onetime fee isn't too bad.
I guess if I was only planning to go once, then I could. But I wouldn't visit anymore than that one time.
I have a breathing problem.
I have a chronic lung problem.
I have a daughter with lung problems so I perfectly understand why the parks would be considering this program.
I have a hard time paying the fees as it is. I want the services but I personally cannot afford an extra \$15.
I have asthma and emphysema, but I have never been bothered by air pollution in national parks.

I have asthma and this would help me enjoy the out of doors more.
I have asthma. (2)
I have bad allergies plus asthma. My problems are controlled with my prescribed medications. I am all for keeping our environment clean. I do not mind paying this fee no matter how many times I visit a park.
I have breathing problems and would automatically not put myself in the position of knowingly breathing polluted air.
I have coped. (2)
I have emphysema and asthma so I know for me it would be worth the extra money.
I have enough money and I already pay extra for lots of things to reduce my carbon footprint in many ways.
I have health problems.
I have lung problems. (2)
I have mild breathing problems and would be willing to pay more.
I have never yet seen a government organization come up with an estimate of success on a program, which was remotely attainable. I am not paying an additional \$10 in hopes that they would be correct.
I have no problem paying a little more if I will help the environment.
I have problems with my breathing.
I have terrible sinuses and being outside depends on the quality of air.
I have three children and would feel better if I was helping improve the air they breathe.
I have three children. If my husband and I each had to pay an additional \$15 to enter the park, we would pay \$30 extra plus the cost for five people to enter.
I just don't visit parks any more.
I just feel \$25 is too much.
I just feel national parks should be either free or just a nominal entrance fee.
I live in New York city, and that's a lesson in pollution.
I live on a fixed income, I am 74, I enjoy the Great Smokeys I live in, too. Each year I go there; please don't make it any harder with the way gas is now.
I might be willing to pay an additional fee but I feel that an extra \$15 is excessive per adult since the cost to enter most national parks is costly per person.
I minor fee is worth healthy air which could prevent lung problems in the future.
I not a woods kind of person.
I pay enough taxes to cover it, I think.
I pay taxes, this should be enough.
I pay the government to have and maintain national parks already. I feel no obligation to pay again to use them. As far as air pollution is concerned, I would need to see the data, credentials of the people who provided the data and their political preferences before I would be willing to pay a cent.
I really don't think it should cost an adult \$15 per visit and I don't think it would cost that much to take care of that matter.
I saw a show on this subject not too long ago. \$15 is fair. What you also did not say was that these busses will be less stressful to the animals as well. Less noise. That is a big factor in getting the snowmobiles and ATVs and anything like that out of the parks. Anything that changes the lives of the animals for the worse is a no go in any stretch of the imagination. This land is theirs first and foremost and above all else as God wanted it, and set aside by law. We respect it and the animals or stay out and or are punished to the hilt. Clear on that?

I share the concerns of all types of pollution.
I support alternative fuel sources for vehicles.
I support clean air and water. I already give to charities that support a cleaner environment. I would gladly pay a small extra amount.
I support reasonable efforts to reduce pollution. Perhaps vehicles could be replaced selectively and through attrition in order to achieve results while avoiding the \$15 fee.
I think \$10 per adult seems high to me. I could see \$10 per vehicle or something or \$5 per adult. You must consider that people are already probably paying for travel expenses to the park, plus the park entrance fee. I would start it low and at an affordable price, and then work your way up. \$10 per adult just seems like it would tick people off when they get to the gate ready to pay their entrance fee and then an extra \$20 is tacked on. I am all for environmentalism, but I think this is something that might have to go in stages. It may limit lower income families from using national parks which would be unfortunate.
I think \$10 would be great to help this medium to high air.
I think \$10 would be more realistic.
I think \$15 is a reasonable price and I like doing my part to help the environment
I think \$15 plus the regular admission price is too high and it would limit the people who would be able to enjoy the park to the ones who could afford it, thereby blocking access to the lower income class so they won't be able to enjoy the parks that are a national resource and should be available to all.
I think \$2 is a fair charge in helping the environment.
I think \$2 is a reasonable amount to pay to improve the pollution in the park.
I think \$25 is too expensive.
I think \$30 is too much for our low income family and the high cost of gas to get there.
I think \$5 is enough.
I think \$5 per car would be a fairer price to pay, although I would still be willing to pay \$5 per adult if needs be.
I think \$5 is reasonable and it worth the effort to reduce pollution.
I think \$15 is too high; \$7 to \$10 would be adequate.
I think a \$10 fee is a bit on the high side.
I think a fee of \$15 would be more near the fair price acceptable to the general public. \$25 would see a big drop in visitors and so would not generate the money that would otherwise be expected.
I think an extra \$5 is enough. Especially for families.
I think better management of the existing programs and more scrutiny of the resources available including funds is the key to improving the issues discussed in this survey.
I think I would pay it but if it was a little less it would be better.
I think if all of the money would really go to this it would be a great idea, but it always seems our funds never go solely to what it is intended for.
I think if paying would help in keeping up the park.
I think it is a good idea to reduce pollution.
I think it is a rip off. Just another way to make more money. How the hell can they lower the pollution level by charging more money? Just another rip off.
I think it is important for the NPS to set an example of protecting our environment.
I think it is very important to limit air pollution in these places. I would be willing to pay an increased fee to ensure the air pollution is less!
I think it would be good for the environment.

I think it's a good thing, so I'd pay.
I think it's only fair that we help clean up what we caused in the parks.
I think it's worth paying \$10 to make a visit enjoyable for everyone.
I think national parks should be affordable to all visitors, and this fee would limit the number of people who can visit and learn from the parks.
I think preserving our natural resources is very important and that we have a responsibility as individuals to support and promote any programs that improve our environment. Especially if we're only talking an extra \$10; we're a family of four with two kids under 17.
I think that \$10 is too much for people that are on limited income. This would prevent them from going to the parks.
I think that \$25 is too much, maybe \$10 a couple would work.
I think that a person who uses a facility should pay for the improvements.
I think that inflation is inevitable but to hike up a fee or to add-on an additional \$10 is ridiculous.
I think that is a reasonable amount.
I think that it is possible for me to pay the \$10 fee because more than likely it would be a onetime fee.
I think that should be funded by the government. We pay plenty in taxes and they waste money every day on things far less important.
I think that's good idea if paying that \$2 makes a difference.
I think the amount is a bit much. I would be willing to pay \$15.
I think the cost would be well worth the benefit it provides.
I think the extra cost would be a onetime thing for me and the cost could help future generations.
I think there is no price for healthy air. So \$5 is very good.
I think we all should be considering limiting air pollution. If an individual had a vehicle that prevented air pollution, like a hybrid, then they should be exempt from the new fee.
I think we all should help pay for air pollution in the parks and I think automobiles should be banned except park vehicles.
I think we should all help keep our natural resources available and an extra \$5 is worth it.
I think we, the public pay enough now and our government should pay more since we pay such high taxes in the first place.
I visit Yellowstone on a yearly basis and I have no concerns about pollution at all.
I visited many parks when I was younger. I am now 86 so I do not visit them anymore.
I want to avoid any health issues for me and my family or anyone else who visits the park.
I want to help in any way I can to clean up the air.
I was not aware of the problem but strongly agree to protect what we have.
I will not be visiting a park soon, but if I would be a person who visited these parks I would be willing to pay an extra \$10. If this would help lower the air pollution and make mine and other peoples visits more enjoyable and pleasant.
I will not go.
I worked in Yellowstone for six summers, so I am aware of the problem. Compared to the costs of other forms of recreation, the national parks are a bargain, and \$2 extra is more than reasonable.
I would be classified as a less active adult, so my amount of outdoor activities would not be affected whether medium or low.
I would be polluting so if everyone paid that visited it would be fair.
I would be willing if absolutely proven to fix air quality. However, I do not agree that all autos are the problem here. A lot of this is overrated and causing premium money to be thrown at something that

does not provide a solution.
I would be willing to pay \$10.
I would be willing to pay \$3.
I would be willing to pay \$5 per adult but since we haven't visited a national park for years I don't know what they charge to enter and our funds are limited.
I would be willing to pay \$5 per adult or \$10 a carful. \$10 per adult seems very high.
I would be willing to pay \$5 to \$10 per visit if I'm bringing in a vehicle. Remember the Grand Canyon average visitor only spends a few hours in the park. If I use a paid tour bus will it still be \$15 per person?
I would be willing to pay a small fee to improve the air condition.
I would be willing to pay an extra fee if the money would go towards the prevention of pollution but I think that \$25 is very high.
I would be willing to pay more so that air pollution would be reduced.
I would be willing to pay the extra \$2 to enter the park if I knew that it was assisting in the protection of the air pollution of the national park.
I would be willing to pay the extra fee because I would want to clean up the air with the new program. \$15 more for one day is not a lot of money to save the earth and make breathing easier.
I would be willing to pay the extra fee if it is used for this new program to help reduce pollution.
I would be willing to pay the fee but someone who has a large family and is still raising their children may not be able to handle the increase.
I would be willing to pay the price of a large drink to reduce the pollution, and that's about what you are suggesting.
I would be willing to provide \$5 per adult.
I would be willing to provide more money to help improve air quality. I would also be willing to use electric transportation if it would reduce air pollution while in the parks.
I would because it would help everyone.
I would consider \$15 for a park that I'm visiting for more than one day. What would be the cost of the lifetime park pass if \$15 per day were added?
I would go somewhere else where it isn't an issue. Period.
I would honestly pay any reasonable fee to get in a national park. Who knows how long I'll be here or how long the park will be there. We need to get out there and see what we can and do what we can before everything natural is gone.
I would if it helps me and children and I breathe easier. I'm very sensitive to things in the air. If I spend a whole day at a park it would be worth the money.
I would like to see the parks up to date.
I would not be able to afford an extra \$15 and it may deter me from going but, an extra \$5-6 I would still go.
I would not be able to afford that at this time.
I would not be able to afford the extra charges.
I would not be interested.
I would only pay \$10 if the air quality is better than low or medium.
I would participate, but for my family of two that would be \$20. The gas alone getting there is a stretch to go on a vacation.
I would pay \$10 extra because if I lived close to one of these parks I would go a lot and don't want to pay \$25 extra every time I go.
I would pay \$2.
I would pay it if that is exactly what it would be used for, not to pad somebody's pockets.

I would pay the \$10 if it helps to keep air clean.
I would want to be able to be active and out of doors and would want my children to be able to enjoy the park. Otherwise why go?
I wouldn't want to visit a park that had bad air or stink.
I wouldn't be a regular visitor, so \$10 wouldn't be too much.
I wouldn't be willing to pay any amount. I won't be going to a park; gas is too high to travel to a national park.
I wouldn't go to any park that has any visible air pollution. It would damage me and my family's lungs, and I'm not going to be paying an extra fee for that to happen.
I wouldn't mind paying extra for clean air. Maybe, it will help and bring other people to the parks that have breathing problems who try to avoid areas because of the air quality.
I'm a poor college kid. I think it's great if the pollution is going to be lower, but personally I'd be irritated if I had to pay that kind of money. I'd probably do it but I'd be irritated.
I'm all for cleaning up the air.
I'm cheap; I would go somewhere else
If and when I did visit any park, I would have smaller family members with me that have breathing problems as do I. I wouldn't want to risk my family's health just to visit any park.
If everybody put that extra \$15 in, it will definitely help our environment.
If I am visiting a park and need to pay an additional fee it would be worth the benefit for me to pay it for the health benefits.
If I can afford the entrance fee, which where I've been has been quite reasonable, I can afford \$2 more.
If I had to pay an additional \$50 to \$100 for us to go to a park, we probably would not go.
If I pay \$25 more, I would be paying \$50 more. I don't think so, not with the gas prices doing up and up.
If I visited a national park I would surely like to contribute even \$10.
If I went to the park I would expect to be active in the outdoors so I would want the invisible air pollution level to be at least low.
If I would be travelling alone, the \$25 would be acceptable, but if I am travelling with several other adult family members, we might consider this additional cost too high; when on a vacation there are other costs to be considered.
If it doesn't affect me then I won't pay.
If it helps the air I wouldn't mind paying depending what it cost to enter. If I visit several, it costs me too much.
If it helps to keep the air clean then it is worth it.
If it helps, then I am for it. But not if it is just another way to line the pockets of the bureaucrats.
If it is mandated, yes is my answer. If it is optional, no.
If it is needed to ensure low air pollution then we should be willing to make that sacrifice.
If it makes the air better to breathe and help make the environment healthier, I would pay extra.
If it would help the park's air I would consider it a necessary fee.
If it's an extra \$10 plus the regular fee, then no.
If paying extra means helping the park, it is worth it.
If reducing the pollution will make my visit more pleasurable then I would gladly pay the extra money.
If that is for a day pass then I do not agree but for an annual or season pass then it might be acceptable.
If that's what it takes, then the answer is yes. I really could not afford the price but would make a choice to pay it anyway. My concern is that like so many things this would contribute to making the parks places where only those who are well to do could afford and that would be a real tragedy. There is too

much of that already in this country.
If the air is better in the park.
If the air pollution is medium and is being caused by park vehicles and busses, not by private vehicles, I question the validity of that statistic.
If the extra \$5 will allow my family and me to visit the national park and breathe good clean air, it would be worth it.
If the extra money will help the air pollution then I would not mind paying because my children have asthma.
If the federal government would force the EPA to do its job enforcing the existing pollution regulations, additional controls in the park would not be necessary. That said, since pollution affects animals and plants more than humans, I would be willing to spend the extra \$2 if I had some real assurance that the money would be used as the question states and not to line some politicians pocket.
If the government does not support these programs it is up to us to do so, for ourselves, our children, and our future children.
If the improvements only apply to service vehicles at the park, that is not a solution. Tourist vehicular traffic will pollute none the less.
If the money is used for its intended purpose like the program you spoke of it would be a good investment for humans and animals.
If the park or facility is desirable to visit, measures should be taken to keep it as natural as possible. it costs that much to see a movie that lasts only a couple of hours, why wouldn't anyone pay \$10 for something as important and interesting as nature, history and beauty? After all, if it would help in the preservation of these special places for future generations, it would certainly be worth it.
If the present rate is reasonable and the new charge is still affordable then there is no problem with the charge.
If there are no other fees associated with entering the park a \$10 fee would be alright. My initial reaction was that a \$10 fee is excessive for a one day visit. If I was planning on being at the park to walk one specific trail that would take say, two to three hours I think a \$10 fee to do so is a bit excessive. A fee increase of that much may cause some families to not take trips out to the parks, which could reduce vehicle traffic but the people who want to use the parks may make exceptions for the fee.
If this program would take the place of individuals driving through the parks and lower the pollution; then yes I think it would be worth the extra.
If we are preserving the land for the wildlife, we also need to take care of the air that they breathe.
If we can afford to make the trip there, we should be able to pay the extra fee.
If you can afford to travel that far.
If you have a large family this increase could be very expensive. I think families would rather gather in their back yards at a lesser expense.
If you were to do this all retired people should be exempt from the charges along with the very small children.
I'm asthmatic and if it will help me and others, why not?
I'm just cheap. Don't want to pay for a nature hike.
I'm not certain the Zion model would need to cost so much.
I'm poor.
I'm willing to contribute to anything that will benefit me, as well as my family members, for healthier environment, and a more tolerable atmosphere.
I'm willing to pay, but too much money.
In order to make things better at each park.

In theory this is a good program, but I am on a very tight budget and can't afford to be politically correct.
It already costs enough.
It already is costing too much to visit these parks, as they are located very far from my home state.
It costs too much money to do anything these days to keep raising prices is ridiculous. What exactly are my taxes paying for that prices keep going up?
It costs too much to visit a park now.
It is already around \$20 at most so to add that \$25 per adult it would be roughly \$70.
It is better for everybody.
It is common sense.
It is costly already to travel into these national parks.
It is going to a good cause so that is a fair fee.
It is hard to pay extra money for something I cannot see and I think \$5 is significant.
It is helpful for the environment and \$10 isn't that much money.
It is just a waste of money. I don't believe it will be used for that purpose. It's like taxes when the job isn't done more money will be asked for.
It is not likely to affect most people at that level.
It is the responsibility of State and Federal governments to take care of the national parks.
It is too high a price for us no matter how much I like the idea.
It is too much money for someone like me.
It is too much to pay. What if you camped for a week? Too much.
It is up to the users and enthusiasts of national parks to help fund their maintenance and improvement.
It is worth \$10 to reduce air pollution.
It is worth it for the welfare of others.
It is worth it if it makes visiting the parks more enjoyable. I would agree that it would definitely limit some citizens from visiting these parks.
It just makes the trip more expensive!
It makes it safe and comfortable for all.
It seems like everything is going sky high at this time. I would definitely not pay an extra fee. I just could not afford it. I would find some other type of pleasure that did not cost as much.
It should be done anyway. I'm retired and \$50 per day would keep us away. This kind of thing should be done outside the parks as well. It must be done!
It should not take \$15 per person I think that's a little high. But the companies that are emitting the pollution should be required to clean up their own pollution.
It will help other people.
It would be good for health reasons.
It would be too expensive!
It would be worth it to me to pay the extra \$2 because who wants to pay less and then be too sick to enjoy your visit?
It would be worth paying a little more just so all could enjoy the parks not just the healthy.
It would be worth the extra \$5 to ensure the safety of everyone.
It would cause my family to pay an additional \$45, therefore making it too expensive to visit.
It would cost too much just for a family of four which seems to be the average family these days. It makes me not want to visit any national park anything.
It would depend on what the initial cost was to get into the park. I would be interested in comfort and

health of my family, but at the same time I could only give what I have.
It would keep more areas in their natural form and that would be good all around for humans and animals as well.
It would not make a difference. The reason the ozone has a ten mile gap that would take 20 years to regenerate is because of chemical trails; a chemicals produced to manipulate the weather. This is why gas is up to almost \$4 a gallon. Stop the chemical trails and the ozone would have time to repair itself. There is your problem. They are experimenting and using us as test samples to see how well we do on food shortage.
It would take all of us to help make this happen.
It's a budget-buster for me.
It's a small fee for a good cost.
It's always worth the extra to have lower air pollution.
It's free air already. Why should I have to pay?
It's good for the park to be as pollution free as nature intended it to be.
It's good to have low pollution to help people that are already sick so I would be willing to pay a little more to help people stay healthy.
It's not too much to pay and it will be going to a good cause, plus be healthful.
It's obvious. Cleaner air. Do I need to explain that?
It's a reasonable price.
It's too expensive. I've visited the park once with my entire family and have had no adverse effects. There were six adults in our party and I wouldn't be willing to pay that much for something I don't see as an issue.
It's too hard as it is to find a place that you have to pay to have a vacation without extra cost thrown in.
It's worth \$5 to decrease the pollution.
Just about all national parks are in the woods anyway so the air there is already good and clear. Why spend money to clean good air.
Just another form of taxation. There is no reason that the federal budget cannot allocate monies for our federal park systems. They in fact do. The extra dollars would be spent who knows where and why.
Just feel like that is too much. When I visit Death Valley National Park I already pay around \$20 just to get in.
Just have the next button, not the previous one. It's very confusing.
Law breakers pay.
Let's face it; parks should be left alone or visited like museum.
Like I said, parks should be free.
Make it affordable for people to support these programs which we are already paying taxes for.
May help to keep pollutants at a low level as much as possible.
Maybe \$20.
Maybe \$7 an adult.
Me only, it would cost an extra \$50 and as much as I think pollution should be reduced this is a lot of money.
More money would be worth less pollution.
Most of the places I have been to, once you get on the grounds you park your car and you walk. You pay at information centers for admission which helps pay for the upkeep. And sometimes it can be pretty pricey.
Most people don't go but once a year.

My best friend has allergy problems.
My brother has asthma.
My budget could not handle that expense.
My children and I suffer from asthma, so if the air was cleaner it would probably be more comfortable for us.
My dad had lung cancer and had his lung removed, it is very hard for him to go out some days. I would be grateful to have some program like you're talking about and I would gladly pay the price.
My fiancé and I are getting married in June and we are planning to visit at least one national park. We really wouldn't be able to afford another \$50 on top of everything else.
My health is important to me, therefore the additional fee is no problem.
My husband and I are senior citizens and it would be hard for us to pay the additional fee.
My husband and I travel together, So that means \$10 a day extra cost which isn't too bad. But we generally spend more than one day in a national park when visiting. \$70 extra for a week's visit, plus the high cost of gas, would probably keep us from visiting the national park.
My husband suffers from chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. So yes I would pay the extra \$5.
My main concern is keeping the access costs reasonable.
My nine year old son has asthma and of course I would pay more money if it changes the air from medium to low. Anything to help my baby.
My relatives have asthma.
My small fee of \$5 extra would help the air quality! Awesome!
My son already has asthma and the health of my family is my very first priority.
My visit is short enough that I don't feel the cost is worth the benefit. I also don't feel that the park vehicles are the biggest problem in the area.
My wife has asthma.
National parks should be free.
National parks should be lowest fare possible so all people could enjoy them.
National parks should be paid for and kept up by the government. It keeps citizens healthy and happy, which leads to a better community and country overall. Citizens should never have to pay to enter them. Teddy Roosevelt had a lot of great ideas!
No car, no money.
No comment. (3)
No money.
No, because I never visit the parks.
No. (4)
None. (10)
Not a chance.
Not affordable on my income.
Not much of a drop from medium to low to constitute a vast tax.
Not only for the benefit of people, but for the benefit of naturally occurring species in the parks, we need to be better conservationists of air.
Not right to be charging retired people for using a park when they have paid the bills all their lives.
Not sure program will work.
Objective and program to solve it are questionable.
Oil burning.

On my current income level I will be unable to afford it.
On social security not going to visit.
One cannot put a price to health. Raising the fee by \$5 may be a bit more than one can afford; however, visiting a national park is a once in a lifetime opportunity and is not visited frequently. So, using that additional money to make it healthier for people to breathe is a good thing.
One fee is enough.
Only if the gas prices go down and I could afford to pay it, it would be worth the extra cost if it actually was a better environment.
Our environment is most important.
Our family cannot afford this fee at this time. We often take country road drives or walks on the family farm when we want to enjoy the out of doors. I have always had to economize when it comes to entertainment.
Our health and the health of the wild animals are very important.
Our parks are our nation's natural treasures. If people can pay the big bucks to go to places like Disney Land, \$15 extra bucks a head doesn't seem like much.
Overall support of the national parks should be a federal appropriation. Adding such fees for the consumer is counterproductive. The pollution level will be reduced as the revenue from visitors will be equally reduced.
Park department vehicles are a minor.
Park employees drive electric or carpool while at work.
Park fees are already too high.
Park fees are too high as it is. The money probably goes in the general fund as is sent overseas or some other trash and not kept in the park system. I do not know that for a fact but it is what I believe happens.
Park in the past two years. I drive through Ocala National Forest but you didn't want that information. I have been in Yellowstone, Olympic and the Great Smokey Mountains in past years.
Parks are great and if one can go then it would be well worth it to save for the visit to the park. Yes \$15 is a lot. It would be very disappointing to find this cost out the last minute when one arrives. However, I do believe \$10 would not be too much for anyone to feel bad about.
Parks are intended to be a clean; air and the grounds.
Parks should be free or cost a small charge. The air pollution can't be any worst than any major city in the U.S., even on the worst day in one of the parks.
Parks should be kept looking and smelling beautiful.
Parks should be places where we can enjoy the beauty of nature without causing damage to the environment.
Parks should not be a burden to people. It is a place for people to go and not pay for every little thing.
Pay to fix the problem.
Paying additional \$10 pretty stiff for me.
Paying an extra \$10 would prevent the possible risk of a health situation, which would eventually cost much more for corrective measures. Also the possibility of a long term or permanent chronic illness.
Paying to enter a national park should be enough, not adding another fee.
People can't afford that high of price.
People over 65 years should get in free.
People who use the national parks are either helping or hurting the land. Those that love the outdoors and the national parks, in order to preserve them, must help to keep them the way they are today.
Per vehicle rather than per person.

Personally, I feel that all vehicles that produce any type of pollution, noise or any other type, should not be allowed in these places. It is not natural in a wilderness setting anyway. Not only does it affect the human species but more so the animal, bird, and plant life in these areas. Water skiing pollutes the waterways; the fuel alone destroys natural habitats. I don't feel that private vehicles should be allowed, period. If you want to see the wildlife then do it the right way by hiking, walking and other natural means. And I don't feel that people should be allowed to take any food with them either. This can cause all types of problems, littering for one thing not to forget that they feed these animals foods that they would not eat in the wild, this alone can cause bad animal behavior, and it's not natural. If these people can't enjoy wildlife the way it should be done, then they have no business going to these places of beauty. They have to learn to respect nature.
Pollution is low.
Post ahead time when fees will be affected and what the air pollution is at that time.
Prices for national parks are already high, especially if you want a guide of any kind, without the additional fee. It would be better if it was \$5 per family instead of per adult.
Probably not cost effective.
Program for park.
Quite frankly, we can't afford it. Maybe \$20 extra doesn't sound a lot to some, but it would be to us, living from paycheck to paycheck. When I think of parks, I think a free way to spend a day, or more.
Recreational vehicles give off too much pollution.
Reduce to low for my visit.
Reducing pollution in any way is important.
Required to maintain integrity of park. Cost born by user.
Retired single lady on fixed income; entry fee to park sometimes hardship, so only \$10 would be easier.
Save the planet for my grandkids.
School is too high. Right now I don't work.
Senior citizens on a fixed income could not afford the added cost. The parks should be for all citizens.
Should be done per vehicle, if it is a tour bus, it should be a larger fee, accordingly.
Should be paid by the government.
Since I don't visit the national parks very often, I don't mind paying a fee to help them cover expenses necessary to preserve the natural setting as much as possible.
Since I know that air pollution is becoming a problem in some of the major parks I think it is important to do what we can to reduce that pollution. I also think that it would help maintain the notion that our national parks are open and accessible to all people.
Since these are owned and operated by the federal government, let them correct the problems.
Situation, or families with several.
Small price to pay for visiting the area and helping to make changes to keep our environment healthy.
So \$5 plus other expenses would.
Some fee possibly, but \$15 is too high.
Somehow autos must be greatly reduced.
Someone has to pay for the program.
Something has to be done and because politicians won't take a cut in pay to help out the country, citizens will have to step up.
Sounds reasonable.
Sufficiently affordable.
Sure, if it helps the environment.

Taking a trip with my family is a luxury as it is. My income level does not allow for any extra charges. Between paying for all the extras for the children's schooling and their extra activities that are needed to get my children into decent colleges, it makes it difficult to stretch my budget. I would love to be able to support these projects, but the economy as it is does not allow for it.
Taxes are already levied to support such.
That does not seem like such a high cost to do so much good.
That increase would be ok if a family can afford it but with the cost of everything these days, especially the cost of fuel to get there, this extra cost would limit a family's money to enjoy the vacation.
That is a lot of money per person to be added to any fees charged to enter the park. Would be \$20 more for any elderly people.
That is a lot of money.
That is a very small fee for cleaner air in what should be a natural setting.
That is at least one time or more of entry fees. I would be willing to pay a lesser fee, but \$25 is too high.
That is entirely too much. I remember going through the Blue Ridge Mountains when I was a child and it did not cost anything. But if you wanted to camp there or some of the other activities then you paid for those.
That is ridiculous.
That is the amount I thought I would be able to pay extra.
That is too expensive. (2)
That is too much for one day of visiting the park.
That is too much money when your family consists of two adults and three children.
That much more would keep me away.
That seems an extreme increase with all the increases in cost of living, gasoline etc. I would think you would get more people to attend with perhaps an additional \$5.
That seems like a lot of money for one person to pay in exchange for not much; changing from medium to low.
That would be very sad.
That would only cost my family \$10. I can certainly afford that. The number of park visits I make is never more than one per year. I believe \$10 is a fair amount.
That's too high. You're looking at paying almost the amount of going to an amusement park to just "see" nature.
That's too much to pay to get in a park.
That's a small price to pay for the benefit.
That's not much to preserve these parks. They are national treasures!
The \$5 amount seems reasonable for what it would accomplish.
The amount is low enough that the benefit is greater than the few extra dollars it would cost.
The attraction of national parks is the idea that it's public land, it's inexpensive, and it's available to everyone. It's been paid for through taxes. Everything has surcharges on it these days, and it's ridiculous. If it's a cost of doing business I'd rather have it built into the park entrance fee than a line item surcharge. Though I'd rather have neither.
The bad air would also affect the animals. This would help the park and its visitors.
The big cities are where the pollution problems stem from. Start there!
The cost is already high enough.
The cost is not really that much more.
The cost of fuel has skyrocketed which will definitely effect the amount of travelers this summer. The

extra fees that you suggest will certainly be a significant deterrent.
The cost of health care far outweighs the cost of paying an extra \$10.
The cost of travel, gas prices, airfare and entrance to the park would make it prohibitive. \$10 more? That seems like a lot to me.
The cost would be well worth the improved air quality for wildlife, plants and humans.
The economy is too bad at this time. I'm barely making it pay check to pay check. The cheapest vacations are visiting and staying at national parks. If you add \$5 that only adds to the cost.
The entry fees are already high enough.
The extra fee of \$5 is not too much to pay for cleaner air. People suffering from asthma and allergies would have the ability to enjoy the parks without getting sick.
The extra fee seems too high for a visitor that is already paying a high fee to enter the park.
The extra monies would hurt my pockets.
The federal government spends enough wasted money to take care of the parks.
The fee is per person, which could add up for a van or other large vehicle of family members. With the economy in such bad shape right now, "added fees" could prevent it from being affordable. A small fee per vehicle of people would seem more reasonable.
The fee is small enough to not hurt. And if it helps it is well worth it.
The fee is too high; there are plenty of cars that would pass through and there would be more than enough cars where the parks would make quite a bit of money.
The fee is too much. I'd support corporate sponsorship of the reduced emissions program before I'd be willing to pay an additional \$25 fee myself.
They fee to the tune that visitors would refrain from coming to the parks.
The fee would be too high for a family.
The health of my family and I is the most important to me.
The health of my family is more valuable to me than saving money.
The idea of visiting a national park is to experience nature in a purer form, which should include reasonably unpolluted air. I would be willing to pay for that.
The intent goes hand in hand with the fact that it is a park and should be as natural as possible.
The last national park I visited was ten years ago on July 4 th . It was a disaster, way too many cars. The park was Glacier National Park.
The national park service has an operating budget. Replace older vehicles with the new ones using the budget for vehicles purchases as is.
The national parks belong to everyone in the U.S. of all income levels. The park system is being forced to raise fees due to Bush's anti-environmental policies. If we weren't in a war, there would be money to fund anti-pollution measures like electric and solar powered vehicles in national parks.
The park I visit does not have a notable problem with air pollution; however, some of the parks in the western U.S. seem to have major issues.
The Park Service can budget and provide resources through Congress to fund the changes. Much of our tax money is wasted on pork barrel projects. Congress has a responsibility to keep our national parks maintained which should include maintaining air quality. We as tax payers have paid for the land and maintenance of those parks for decades. We do not need and additional tax or fees to pay for keeping our parks clean. Adding an additional charge to enter our parks is unacceptable at any price.
The park should have special programs to fund the cost without raising admission fees.
The parks and forests are the lungs of the world.
The parks are beautiful and should stay that way.
The parks are the responsibility of anyone who visits them.

The parks aren't parks if the air is dirty. Pollution will ruin them.
The parks must be protected.
The parks should be free and paid for by the government. Besides that, more and more people are on fixed or low income and the rich should not be the only ones to enjoy the parks.
The parks were set aside because of various natural features and inhabitants, and anything that will prevent everyone from enjoying the parks should be lessened if at all possible.
The people that use these parks should be willing to help pay for keep them.
The pollution also affects animals and the eco system.
The preservation of these parks is important to me so my kids can take their children some day.
The price for visiting parks has gone along with everything and this much addition would be a lot to enjoy the fresh air.
The price is too high.
The public should not be charged to visit a national park.
The public shouldn't be the ones to pay for this.
The question is unreasonable. Hard to believe that the number of official vehicles in a given venue could make that drastic a difference in pollution level.
The usual park entrance fee is already \$10. That would make it \$20 a person. That's pretty steep. I'd possibly consider an extra \$5.
The way prices are going up on gas and everything I think \$10 per person is a lot.
The worse the environment is, the worse we are in the long run.
There is no reason to believe that any amount of money provided by visitors would necessarily be used for the sole purpose of reducing this invisible pollution. Considering the many hundreds of billions of dollars already collected for many purposes in this country, some other program could be reduced to provide funding for this project.
There is too much "hype" about the environment. I believe it is just another money making scheme. Let's get the price of gasoline down!
There shouldn't be any fees for entering a national park, let alone any extra fees.
There shouldn't be any pollution in national parks.
There's nothing wrong with findings ways to control pollutants in our air. If it means paying a little extra; so be it.
These are national parks and this program shouldn't be funded by only the people that visit them.
These are national parks, for people of this nation to see freely, the government is getting enough from our taxes to pay for their maintenance. A forest is able to convert a lot of this so called pollution into clean air. I do not feel that the public should be charged for someone who wants to benefit or use this as an excuse to sell automotive vehicles at an outrageous price, when money that is being sent on outrageous wars and this same money that's being wasted could be spent on the maintenance of our national parks and many other things for the people.
These are natural parks. They belong to nature; we should not be charged a price for visiting nature.
These large national parks are thousands of miles away from home. Between travel, lodging, meals and entry fees, it is expensive enough!
These national parks should be open to the public. Tax dollars are used to maintain them. Extra fees would just deter visitors.
These parks need to be kept as natural as possible for people to enjoy but also as safe as possible. These types of areas are fast disappearing in this country soon there will be no nature left.
They can go on bikes, walk, horseback, hike, or go on electric cars.
They should leave their cars and trucks outside of parks. Should have buses take every one around. No

more camping and no more trash. Just look and have fun.
Think the national park fees as a whole are extremely inexpensive.
Thinking of the high number of cars that enter the parks, \$15 is kind of expensive.
This extra fee must be clearly advertised, so anyone planning to visit a park is not surprised by this added fee.
This is a hypothetical situation, since I don't believe you can reduce pollution so much, by upgrading the equipment. But if it possible it worse \$10 surcharge.
This is entirely too much, my family couldn't afford to visit the parks ever.
This money will probably make little or no difference.
This pollution is already there.
This would be of a great benefit to all.
This would not only help us now, but tomorrow.
Though it is an extra fee, I think we still need to figure out ways to help out.
To break even, charge all of the illegals triple.
Too dangerous.
To help the environment and the polluted air to become better and breathable yes, I would pay \$15. It might be a high price but when it comes to my health, who puts a price on good breathing and health while I am enjoying the park.
Too much money because living is too high.
Too much money people will not go.
To get the best fun day from the park we the people should pay as much as we can to make any park safe as we the people can then some.
Too expensive. (4)
Too expensive. \$5 is more reasonable.
Too expensive for me.
Too expensive to begin with.
Too high. (2)
Too many fees.
Too much. (8)
Too much extra money.
Too much money just for outdoors fun that should be free.
Too much per person. Fine for a carload. I'm not rich.
Travel will be somewhat less because of gasoline prices and the state of the economy as well as my income.
Traveling is so expensive in the first place, that another expense might keep me from visiting. Also, my tax dollars pay for the upkeep of these parks, and I don't understand why it can't cover the additional costs for this program also.
Trip if there were less pollution.
Two of my children and I have asthma. Anything we can do to help make the pollution better is ok in our family.
User fees help to improve park facilities and quality of visitor expectations.
Users of park services should not be required to pay for clean air which should be paid for by all citizens.
Usually entry fees run about \$20 per car or \$10 per adult, at least in my experience. Hiking it up to \$25 per person would make me think twice about coming there, and maybe I'd go to some other park that is

less expensive.
Usually the admission price is high enough for a national park visit that it prohibits the very thought of a possible visit.
Vacations are expensive no matter where you go or what you do. Another \$5 isn't going to make a difference for us. What's most important is that the air quality is as healthy as possible. Otherwise, we would vacation in New York City or Los Angeles, or maybe even China.
Waste of money to finance a wasted effort.
Way too much!
We all need cleaner air. Should also be no smoking!
We all need to help protect these areas.
We all should reduce air pollution at any cost. If this is one step closer to reducing oil consumption.
We already pay a fee per car where we live of \$3 per car; to go swimming is \$20.
We already pay for the parks.
We are on a fixed income and with gas prices it would be too expensive to go.
We are on a very limited income; we just couldn't afford the extra cost.
We as tax payers do this already.
We cannot afford gas as it is.
We don't have these breathing problems, but to help others that do it is a small price to pay to keep the park as natural as possible.
We don't need any pollution of any kind in our parks.
We have family members with asthma so therefore reducing air pollution should be affordable and good for the environment as well.
We have visited half a dozen national parks in the past few years and have never noticed any sign of air pollution. We are very sensitive to this, as one of our children has asthma. We would be willing to pay an extra fee to help convert park vehicles to alternative power, but \$15 extra seems too high. I think \$5 extra would be a more reasonable amount for most people.
We live well below the poverty level, but would be willing to pay the extra to improve the environment. If it affects people that much, it must also affect the wildlife somehow.
We need to save our air.
We need to take care of our parks, our health and our environment and if we want to visit them we must accept the charges.
We need to take care of the parks. I might go less if it costs more.
We pay enough in federal taxes that we shouldn't have to pay more to the federal government.
We pay enough in taxes. National Parks should remain free for all to visit.
We would have four adults visiting, which would mean an extra \$40. Money is a major consideration for our family when deciding to go somewhere. Plus if you went more than one day, would you have to pay the additional \$40 again?
Well, I am all for reducing pollution; yes I would be glad to pay an extra \$10 for this cause.
Well, living in the city it is already high so what difference does medium make?
Well, it is just a once in a year activity, so an extra \$15 does not seem that bad. Knowing that it will be used to protect the air and not just a frivolous fee makes it worth it.
Whatever it takes to make things right.
What's fair for the Smokey's where you will be driving more may not be fair for the parks where you will do less driving.
When I attend a park I am generally with adults and as many as I can get to go with me. The thought of a

\$50 or more extra fee is not something I like. I'm an adult with no children so the fact that children are excluded does nothing for me.
When I go to Washington DC everything is free. Because it is paid for by federal tax. Our federal taxes should allocate a small amount to cover costs such as these. It is a national park it is a national concern.
When we go on family vacations, we have to save money for up to a year or more. By adding an additional \$10 cost, it would cause even more expense to my family. And considering that all four members of my family are over 17, this would mean that our family would be required to pay an additional \$40 in order to enjoy a national park.
When we spend money for entertainment, it is expected to be non-essential money for living. If an additional \$5 would help improve the atmosphere of our entertainment, that is not much to spend.
While it is a good cause, I do not think people should have to pay for it. That price is also very high, maybe like \$5.
While we have asthmatics in our family and for that reason would want the level to drop to low, we are on a tight budget and could not afford such high "extra" cost.
Why pay \$25 per person? Why not \$15.
Why? They already charge enough to get into the parks they should take the \$2 out of that money to pay for these things.
With adult children to enter the park.
With all the other costs that have gone up and are going up, gas, tolls, food, taxes, \$10 is too steep an increase. It is doubtful we would be able to afford the trip in the first place. A \$2 to \$3 surcharge is a good starting point to begin setting aside money to slowly phase in conversion. There is no need to do it all at once. Even just 1 to 3 altered vehicles per park would help tremendously. All a \$10 increase will do is keep people away, and that surely will cut pollution. Perhaps that is the intent of the proposal, to stop so many visitors from going in the first place. These additional fees almost never really get used for the intended purpose is another reason I have a problem with them.
With all the pollution everywhere else what difference would one day make?
With asthma I could spend more than that for doctor's visit afterwards.
With gas prices so high we can't afford additional fees.
With my low income status, and it being a one day visit, \$5 would seem reasonable. After all tax dollars are supposed to be used for this type of program.
With the current price of gasoline, and it is still rising, I can't afford to pay a \$25 fee. I will not be able to take any extended trips by auto, much less be able to pay an extra fee for access to a national park.
With the economy I don't want to pay one cent more for anything. Gas is \$4 a gallon I can't afford to go to work any longer.
With the high cost of gasoline, that is too much to charge and for the visitor to add to the cost of a vacation.
With the price of gas and diesel so high burdening anyone with an extra fee will deter them from going to our national parks.
With the prices of gas currently it will cost a small fortune just to drive to the parks never mind paying a higher fee.
With today's gas prices, what's \$2 more?
Would decrease air pollution.
Would be better for people in my opinion.
Would improve enjoyment of visit.
Would not be worth it because it would cost that much for gas one way. \$8 per car would be more reasonable.
Wouldn't be able to afford that we are retired and live on a tight budget.

Yes, but how would they be able to do that?
Yes, I would be willing to pay extra.
Yes, \$2 is affordable for a good cause.
Yes, breathing healthy air is important to our health. If \$2 would help promote healthier air I would not mind paying.
Yes, that is no doubt about it and it helps the mother earth.
You are obviously "Global Warming" supporter fanatics who believe we can control the environment and think we have caused "your" invented crisis. Gore is in left field and so are you. Quit thinking we are all "stupid". You are not going to improve natural environments. Have you ever heard of survival of the fittest? The only animals becoming extinct in our environs are because of "man" and we don't need to introduce other animals to an area that were not naturally there.
You don't eat drink or drive in the museum.
You want people to visit the parks and you are already charging a high price to enter the park it may not be a problem for some people to afford it but it may be a hardship for some people that they won't come at all because they can't afford it.
You would be adding \$30 for us to visit as a couple. This would discourage my visiting the park.

C.3 - Responses from the mail survey

q9. Please provide any information that helps explain your answer to the previous question.

\$10 is a reasonable amount. Much more and my answer would change.
\$10 is more than I am willing to pay, but \$3 would be better. \$10 would double the cost in some cases.
\$10 is nothing if it helps clean up the environment.
\$10 per adult is too much. \$10 per vehicle might be more appropriate, or \$5 per adult, however, because national parks benefit all of us in one way or another. Funding should be part of the national budget.
\$10 per adult seemed reasonable.
\$10 per person is too high with the economy. A fee of \$5 per person would make \$10 for a couple and that is reasonable.
\$10 would be more reasonable. Typically I'm only at a park for a few hours and that seems to be a bit high.
\$10 would be too much per visit.
\$15 feels like a lot! Especially if you're already paying for parking, travel, etc. It feels like this is something the government should subsidize.
\$15 is a small cost to reduce air pollution for all that visit national parks.
\$15 is just too much money. I couldn't afford.
\$15 is too high and I am not interested in parks.
\$15 isn't that much money to have visibly cleaner air.
\$15 per adult seems a little high. \$5 should be adequate.
\$15 per visit is ok but should not be limited. \$15 per visit could be the suggested price but higher contributions also accepted.
\$2 is a fair cost.
\$2 is very little to pay for decreasing pollution.
\$2 more is worth having a healthier environment.
\$2 seems like a small price to pay to increase the amount of exposure everyone could have outdoors.
\$25 fee is too high.
\$25 is a small price to pay for better and healthier environment.
\$25 is too high.
\$25 per adult is cost prohibitive.
\$25 per person is too high. \$10 per person is more reasonable.
\$25 seems extremely high, especially since no fees have ever been charged. Start low and with time increase it; it won't feel like such a shock that way!
\$25-\$30 seems a reasonable charge for cleaner air.
\$5 is too high.
\$5 isn't that much to pay for a cleaner park.
\$5 per vehicle would be a more reasonable amount.
\$5 per visit, not per day and not all parks, only those affected.
Four adults per car would be \$40 in addition to the other fees already imposed. Too expensive.
A \$5 fee per vehicle would be ok, but \$5 per adult means an extra fee of \$25 for one vehicle.
A \$5 surcharge is more than sufficient!
A charge for each person is too much. A charge of \$10 per car might work.
A little steep in price with all the hard times going on. Air pollution is very important but people are having hard times and need a place to go to get away from it all.

A minimal fee seems reasonable for the recreational use and experience of a national park, especially for health and environmental benefits.
A smaller amount people won't complain about.
A visit to a park should be a healthful experience.
Absolutely no additional fee for this program. We are already paying our taxes to provide the vehicles. We will continue paying our taxes! We have too much increased expense in gas prices to get to these parks. A higher fee is a bad plea. Please find another way. Also, air pollution floats in from surrounding areas!
According to my income, I can only pay \$5 extra to reduce invisible air pollution for each time visiting a national park.
Added cost.
Added expense, visiting a national park to me would be a turn off. The park I go to has no pollution. It's very nice as is.
Again, like we say, we are up there on age.
Air pollution affects all living organisms!
Air pollution is everywhere, not just in national parks. I would rather stop air pollution everywhere.
Air quality is important and adds to the experience of being outdoors.
Air quality is very important. I'd be willing to pay a reasonable fee to keep clean the air or improve air quality.
Al Gore is a fake and liar. Nature and natural occurrences contribute more pollution than all of mankind. USA pollution is significantly lower than the rest of the world.
All parks I have visited have no indication of any pollution.
All people should be able to enjoy the wonders our nation has to offer and they would be paying the fee also.
Allergies to airborne allergens.
Although I believe \$15 is costly, my visits to national parks are limited. Therefore I would accept the fee. The animals cannot leave.
Amount is too high. \$10-\$15 is more acceptable.
An extra \$25 per day seems like a lot. In addition to other fees, this might be prohibitive. Consider what it will cost just to get there at \$4 per gallon for gas.
An extra \$5 is a small amount of money to improve the air quality in these park areas.
Any reduction in pollution levels would be worth the additional fee. This would be especially true in the summer when levels generally peak.
Any reduction would be great.
Any test program should be funded by tax dollars, not by admissions. Some people cannot visit parks now due to the cost of admissions. Everything that could be done to reduce the cost to visit should be tested. I would like to see all parks free to entry.
Anything extra is helpful to protect our natural resources. \$15 is a reasonable amount for most Americans and visitors.
Anything that improves air quality is a good thing.
Anything we can do to decrease air pollution should be done or at least tried!
Anything we can do to improve the environment is worth paying extra. Everyone should be able to be outside at all times.
As a taxpayer I am already paying for these parks. I object to paying for what I am covering.
As long as the money is used for the program.
Assume husband and wife, \$50 per couple is too much. \$30 per couple is ok, just a gut feeling.
Assuming fee is charged only long enough to cover conversion costs, and then stopped.
At 76 years old I'm not a good candidate to answer the question. National parks were free when I was

young. Today, perhaps a small fee.
Because the government never uses those funds for what they were intended for. I worked at Glendo National Park for 5 years. Those funds were used elsewhere.
Because there is so few of them, you need to come up with a solution for the belching buses and cars. Buses ran the whole time I visited the Grand Canyon. They didn't turn them off even when they were empty. They are the problem, not park vehicles.
Better air quality benefits all of mankind and we should be willing to pay for it.
Budget \$25 would be needed to buy lunch. For \$25 additional per visitor we could be near buying a year's pass, for residents, to an animal amusement park like Busch Gardens.
But reluctantly, find source of pollution, eliminate it, and charge less.
Can't afford to do so. (2)
Can't answer #8 because I don't know the fee to enter a park now. If the \$5 pushes the cost up too high then we could not visit.
Clean air is very important.
Clean air is worth \$5.
Cleaner air can make the visit experience better.
Concerned about increasing pollution.
Congress should fund this instead of other BS pet projects.
Cost is minimal for just one visit. May lead to perfecting alternative ways of transportation.
Cost is too high.
Cost to convert and maintain would cost more than projected and can't possibly reduce air pollution in the national parks.
Could only afford \$5 per person.
Definitely do not like diesel engine fumes.
Depending on what cost is to enter park many people enjoy parks but if cost is outrageous the amount of people visiting will be less.
Do anything to help maintain the natural habitat.
Do not plan to visit any parks.
Do not think it would change the air pollution that much.
Do not want to burden taxpayers with this cost.
Don't believe this would make a significant difference!
Due to limited income, camping is our main source of vacationing.
Due to my very bad health, I am unable to even leave my home.
Everyone should be able to enjoy the parks.
Extra fee seems too high.
Fee is too high.
Fees are high enough, especially in this economy. Not sold on "green."
First, I don't feel there is an air pollution problem in the parks. Second, I am tired of the government hammering this few who already use the park system.
For 10 adults, our children and their spouses, \$150 is too much.
For my family group, that increase would put a visit to the park out of our financial range.
For one visit maybe but not for every time I go.
Fuel efficient, alternative electric, hybrid, hydrogen vehicles should offset pollution over time; rent electric cars in parks.
Gas is at \$4 per gallon and you want more? Already pay enough taxes.
Gas, food, and cost of living are increasing too quickly so income cannot keep up. Visiting parks shouldn't be for only affluent!

General tax dollars should be used elsewhere. User fee for clean up would be a good idea.
Given the cost of gas prices, I would probably choose not to go.
Global warming.
Harvard president Derek Bok once noted, "if you think education is expensive, try ignorance." Same can be applied to this issue.
Have the auto makers make cars that pollute less. Have them donate some of these cars to our parks for publicity purposes.
Have to fund cleaning pollution.
Health reasons; need clean air.
Help to eliminate global warming.
Higher fees may limit visitors. Pollution clears over time.
How are you going to stop something you can't see when most pollution migrates from cities?
How can you enjoy the park if you can't breathe or get sick from breathing?
How does one put a price on clean air? I would wholeheartedly pay for the improvement of the park system and environmental issues.
How many vehicles? Conversion or purchase cost, maintenance cost, insurance cost; are there discounts on the overhead side?
I agree we need low pollution but our government spends so much money overseas, why can't they fund these national parks for US citizens?
I agree with the extra fee, but \$15 per person is a little high, especially for large families.
I already pay enough money in my taxes!
I am a senior citizen and have a free pass.
I am already "lower" middle class. It would make me think twice about where I went.
I am always willing to pay more for a clean park that is well kept-up.
I am assuming the fee would be per visit and not per day for longer visits.
I am asthmatic.
I am by no means wealthy but \$5 is a cheap price for clean air.
I am handicapped. The park I visit I can ride my 4-wheeler.
I am on a fixed income and we are "in a recession."
I am on a fixed income.
I am on a tight budget.
I am very concerned about air pollution.
I am very concerned about conservation and health for present and future generations nationwide. Preservation of our treasure of national parks should be an example of natural resource stewardship to all Americans and should be promoted in various national media.
I am willing to pay extra fees to augment what my vehicle may contribute but not if the federal government cuts USFS budget based on increase in public revenue.
I believe \$25 per family would be fair.
I believe everyone should contribute money towards the issue of pollution which needs to be addressed and resolved as soon as possible!
I believe in good air, but you can't stop someone from entering after driving for hundreds of miles.
I believe pollution is in the atmosphere that originates from anywhere, so trying to reduce pollution in national parks seems like a waste. Concentrate on the litter and conservation.
I believe that a \$25 fee would deter me from visiting. I would be willing to pay an additional \$10 per adult.
I believe that the source of the pollution should be paid and adhere to pollution regulations.
I believe the funds should originate from another source.

I believe there should be collection boxes or volunteer fees.
I believe this price is high enough to deter me from visiting, considering the price of gas, food, and lodging. Perhaps per vehicle would be a better consideration.
I believe we should try to lower pollution everywhere, not just the park system.
I can afford it.
I can afford the extra cost, and would appreciate limited air pollution.
I can only consider \$5 extra per adult, but in reality most people go to parks because they don't have the money for amusement parks.
I can't afford it.
I can't see how the air quality can be changed without putting the park under a bubble!
I consider it a small price to pay to help reduce air pollution. I want to visit the same park with healthy grandkids.
I do believe with gas prices and economy that families are looking for things that can be done at a lower cost.
I do not agree that pollution is a problem. This is silly "green" stuff!
I do not believe that pollution is that bad, nor do I believe in global warming!
I do not believe there is a problem in the wide open national park. Global warming is bunk.
I do not feel that any fee should be collected. Foreign visitors can pay, but not US citizens.
I do not have the money.
I do not view our national parks as polluted.
I do think your questions are very leading and I can tell you're biased. I don't think that anyone would want more smog or to put people at a health risk. This is so leading it is ridiculous!
I don't believe air pollution is a serious problem.
I don't believe that the program would make that much of an impact if all other vehicles are still driving through the park. I also don't think restricting visitors from driving is a good idea.
I don't believe the air pollution is just sitting still in the park. It's all over.
I don't believe the air pollution is that bad.
I don't know anything about all of this.
I don't know the regular fee and don't know how much more I might be willing to pay.
I don't see pollution as a problem. All you will do is spend lots of money to not solve a problem that really does not exist.
I don't think \$25 is too much to pay for cleaner air, now and for the future.
I don't think families could afford such a fee. It's up to a "park program" to reduce air pollution.
I don't think I should be paying to go to a national park my tax dollars pay for. These national parks have natural resources that need to be managed and these resources should provide the additional funding needed.
I don't think that a few days of air pollution is going to kill me or any other visitor.
I don't think you could reduce the air pollution enough to make the cost worthwhile.
I don't trust that the government will allow the extra fees to pay for the pollution prevention. They didn't let BLM.
I feel it is a bit steep in addition to the entry fees we have to pay.
I feel that an extra \$100 a day would deny to many people the enjoyment of visiting national parks.
I feel that reducing any kind of pollution is well worth an extra \$2!
I have a child with asthma. Poor air quality could restrict her ability to breathe.
I have a daughter with asthma.
I have a family of seven. That is \$60 extra.
I have a large family. It would cost me \$10 multiplied by seven plus the regular amount the park

charges.
I have a problem visualizing reduction of pollution in an open area. I sense a waste of money.
I have an allergy to hydrocarbons.
I have asthma, and I am far from alone in that.
I have asthma, so anything reducing air pollution is of value to me.
I have asthma, so I try to avoid driving, and driving in places with high levels of pollution, because it's hard to breathe.
I have asthma. Air pollution is a major concern for me.
I have asthma. My motives are clear.
I have children.
I have mild asthma.
I have never experience air pollution in national parks. This "survey" is a scam.
I have never notices any air pollution whatsoever in our national parks.
I have not seen a problem where I have been.
I just think something should be done.
I like nature and most animals.
I listen to news. If pollution is high I'd stay home.
I live in Los Angeles. Last weekend I was in Muir Woods. The air alone was worth gold. If air could be like that in all national parks I would pay \$20.
I love plants, trees, rivers, lakes, and animals. God gave us a beautiful world and if we mess it up with pollution, shame on us!
I make enough to afford \$10 for pollution control.
I may be broke but I find my child's health worth unlimited money and would pay extra for this.
I really don't visit the park.
I simply think it is the right thing to do for environment and people.
I suffer from asthma.
I teach Earth Science and am very concerned with protecting our ecosystem.
I think \$10 is a fair price to pay for damage we have done to the environment.
I think \$10 is a little high. I think a fee of \$5 would be more reasonable.
I think \$10 is too high. I would probably choose a smaller amount. However, if facilities are available it would be more reasonable.
I think \$10 per adult is way too high. I would consider \$5 per adult.
I think \$10-\$15 is more reasonable.
I think \$15 per adult extra is too expensive!
I think \$15 per adult is too much, maybe \$5 each.
I think \$5 added to an entrance fee is a large increase.
I think \$5 is a better fee to charge, but reduction of pollution is important.
I think a fee is fine to charge but if you make it too much, people won't be able to afford to visit.
I think it is a bit high.
I think it is a small price to pay to preserve our parks for the generations to come.
I think it is unrealistic to ask 'add-on' fees of more than, say, \$1 to 'regular' admissions, no matter how worthy the cause. If you must, raise the regular admission by \$10, and apologetically explain why it was necessary in park literature and signage.
I think more than this program is needed because most of the pollution comes from visitors. However, his is a useful start.
I think our pollution problems need to be addressed in the cities where the pollution is generated, not in national parks. Charging more for park buses would be ok.

I think that \$15 is about the right amount to have clean air for everyone.
I think that a program should be started to lower air pollution everywhere.
I think that an extra \$50 per adult couple would be prohibitive for many people.
I think that most people, including myself, go to state parks for a low cost outing or vacation with family.
I think that would discourage a lot of people. I would have to really think about spending that much for a day trip into a park. \$50 for two adults is a lot.
I think that's within the reasonable range.
I think the air in North Dakota is OK anyway, but I like clean air.
I think the issue of "air pollution" is a non-realistic and political one, advocated by environmentalists who have a self interest in promoting a worse cause.
I think the park vehicles are a small part of the pollution.
I think this extra fee should be per family instead of per each adult.
I think this is a high price. \$5 per adult would be acceptable.
I think we all need to do our part to preserve these national treasures. My only concern would be low income families, might be better to offer flat rate of \$10 per family if more than two people.
I think we need to do everything we can to restore our environment and if \$5 is all it takes per person, that's not asking much.
I value the national park system and am myself a national park fund raiser. I believe in public investment in this, along with other sources of support.
I was not aware of air pollution in national parks. Raising public awareness would and should increase willingness to support project.
I wish to continue controlled burns in park areas to enhance wildlife.
I won't be going! This is about responsibility!
I would be lucky to afford the trip to the park, never mind having to pay extra charges.
I would be willing to pay \$10 to help reduce air pollution as long as some of the fee is used to upgrade facilities and fund better pay for park employees.
I would be willing to pay \$5-\$8 more, but not \$15 more. Also we do not have asthma in my family.
I would be willing to pay an extra fee to help restore our national parks to their original beauty.
I would be willing to pay more.
I would be willing to pay the fee above as long as it covered the entire duration of my visit.
I would favor a graduated fee that increases as atmospheric conditions increase that are conducive to elevated levels of pollution. This might limit gasoline-powered vehicular traffic.
I would have more concern for my health than for expenses for the park.
I would like to see our parks to be safer if possible.
I would pay \$10 and under.
I would pay half of that. Hitting the \$20 seems cost prohibitive. While I truly care about supporting environmental programs, the \$25 part would drive some to not come to the parks at all.
I would pay more money if it would help reduce air pollution! If it would help keep our parks clean I wouldn't think twice!
I would pay the additional per car, but per adult seems excessive.
I would pay the extra \$15, but I feel that \$15 per person is unreasonable, especially since it is slightly reducing the amount of invisible air pollution. I feel that this is unnecessary for me and my family because no one has breathing issues related to health.
I would pay the extra fee to encourage and support the people who are dedicating their time and energy to find ways to reduce pollution.
I would pay up to \$6 more.
I would pay, but not be happy with it. I do strongly agree that the parks need saving.

I would probably be willing to pay \$5 per adult for a one day visit but I would be less likely to camp or do multi-day visits.
I would think that \$2 to \$3 would be allowable in my budget. When paying for a family and adult children the \$5 can add up.
I'd rather pay \$10 extra for clean air than breathe polluted air.
I'm a retired person on a fixed income with the price of everything rising.
I'm at an age at which pollution won't be a great problem for me but I consider the younger people that this problem is a concern.
I'm not trying to pay more. I have six adults.
I'm on a fixed income. I could not afford more than a \$5 increase. I would have to stop going which, I enjoy.
I'm retired. With gas prices increasing people will think twice about trips. That would make people think even more.
I'm under the hopeful expectation that this fee would not be permanent. Also, \$5 is a bit high.
If conversion of park vehicles can provide this benefit the cost is worthwhile, although it seems that the impact of visitor vehicles would overwhelm any benefit.
If gas keeps going up there will be fewer visitors next year. Fewer visitors mean less pollution.
If I actually had the money.
If I were a Latino/Hispanic on welfare and assistance I could afford the price. Senior citizen on a very limited income, although I have just got my Golden Pass for seniors (this is great).
If it can help our parks to be healthy for people and safe, everyone should agree to pay extra.
If it truly will help the environment I am all for it.
If it was higher than \$25 it would probably make it difficult for many people to pay.
If only \$2 per adult can reduce air pollution, that is extremely cheaper than the health care costs that are on the rise! More people would benefit from healthy air.
If parks are located anywhere near a population center your idea will not work.
If people are so sensitive to "invisible" air pollution they should wear a mask. Visible pollution such as smoke and dust from unpaved roads is the problem that should be addressed.
If people can afford a car and fuel to drive to a national park then they can afford the extra fee.
If pollution gets in the way of not being able to perform activities, why not pay to reduce it since it can also cause health issues.
If public transportation is provided for free inside the park.
If the \$2 were used completely to reduce invisible air pollution.
If the pollution went from high to low it would not only benefit me but also all the wildlife.
If we don't pay extra to reduce pollution now we will pay later with costs in health care.
If we had the money I would. Anything to help our national parks is important, especially air pollution. We personally could not and would just not pay an extra \$25. Maybe \$15 extra we could do, but the economy is so bad we're counting every last dime, especially with a 2 year old and 5 month old.
If we went it would be both my wife and I and \$20 to take the kids to a state park is too expensive for our budget. We'd go to friends' and family's property instead.
If you can't go to a US National Park and breathe clean air, why go or even have parks?
If you play you have to pay.
Impossible when so many different activities going on such as BBQs, etc.
In my opinion, with the number of vehicles operated by the park, nobody could ever see a difference.
In some places air pollution is a real problem.
Increasing fees will keep people away. We can't afford to keep paying the increases.
It appears obvious that these places should have low air pollution; I consider it a prerequisite to have that.

It appears to me that you are promoting an agenda rather than conducting a survey!
It depends on how much the regular entrance fee is. My max per person is \$25 per day.
It does seem a little high, especially if a large group would be going together, but on the other hand if it's for the good of all of us it's only \$2. I think it would be better just to add an extra dollar or so to the regular admission fees.
It increases accessibility and reduces number of other folks, so my experience will be enhanced.
It is already expensive to have. If a family went it would cost \$50 for two adults. It would be prohibitive!
It is imperative that we cut down on pollution in order for this planet to survive.
It is not expensive to pay \$10 to support the national park for becoming environmentally friendly.
It is preferred to make outdoor activities available and safe by spending \$10.
It is time to develop and use other ways to move vehicles to lessen our dependence on oil.
It is too much money. Some people do not have \$25 per adult. Reducing use of fossil fuels should have been incorporated by Bush those past seven years he was in office.
It is very important to promote green living.
It is well worth it for humans, pets, and wild animals. Also I believe for plants and trees as well, and no tobacco pollution.
It just seems that everything has to cost money. Nature should be somewhat free.
It should be paid by everyone, not just the visitors. It's my park too, whether or not I choose to visit, I would be willing to have tax dollars pay.
It will only make park vehicles non-polluting but not limit private vehicles or other activities. I think most of the pollution is coming from private vehicles. To pay an extra \$20 for my family is a bit high unless all vehicles were non-polluting vehicles!
It would limit the number of parks we would visit.
It would not only make the air better for us but for the animals also.
It's a fair amount to pay to improve air quality.
It's good for the overall health of this planet and its inhabitants to reduce all air pollution!
It's hard to answer since I don't know the average admission cost. I would rather pay my admission as income tax.
It's not fair.
It's not just air pollution, but carbon emissions that concern me. If funds help reduce carbon, all the better.
It's worth it. I can walk or hike further.
Keep it low.
Let it be, no fees used for made up "invisible" air pollution, more crap.
Life is important!
Limit gas, auto and fires. Electric busses.
Limit private auto traffic during peak season. Have the national parks system provide transportation by tram or bus.
Limit the number of vehicles in the park at one time.
Live on a fixed income but if I could I would pay the extra \$5.
Look for ways to fund the cost inside the current system.
Low air pollution helps more than just the visitors. It helps the staff and wildlife to include plants.
Low pollution is much better for all living creatures and it's very important to make sure we all do our part to help.
Lowering air pollution not only benefits the visitors to the park but wildlife and plant life as well. I believe it would impact positively all over the planet.

Mankind causes pollution and needs to be responsible to help stop it by extra fees.
Many people have breathing problems.
Maybe \$15 for car load.
Maybe the extra charge should be on the code red days or high peak season days. I think it could also be an increase in car load versus per person.
Millions of people visit the national parks every year. \$10 is unreasonable. Traffic in the national parks affects more than just air quality.
Money should not be used as it is to promote overbuilt infrastructure and catering to people in their vehicles. This would provide available funds and reduce air pollution at the same time.
More needs to be done outside the park areas to prevent such pollution. \$15 is too much for a fee.
Most national parks are in the country and air pollution is not that big of a problem, only to extreme environmentalists.
Most people spend a lot of money getting to the parks already. Also consider that the cost of feeding a family on a day out is already very high.
Most pollution from other sources far away from park. Don't believe money is answer.
Most pollution sources occur outside the park, especially Sequoia. How does a user fee affect pollution? I don't believe that you can produce the medium to low effect.
Most visitors only view the parks from their cars, so bus transportation or train would allow information along with the tour of the park.
My children all have lung problems. It would be nice to have the cleaner air for them.
My family is not afflicted with any breathing difficulties such as asthma, painful breathing, shortness of breath, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, etc.
My finances would permit me to do so. However a lower fee, like \$15 per family, would be more realistic.
My husband and I are seniors and our rare trips to national parks are with a senior bus group. Even if our bus group enters free I would agree to \$2 per person for admission.
My husband, now deceased, had chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. He would have appreciated better air quality.
My income is low. I barely make trips or am able to pay park fees as it is. If I made a lot of money my answer would still be the same because I don't think a whole segment of society should be shut out of the parks because they can't afford it.
My interest in going to a national park is not high enough to pay the extra fee.
My son has major respiratory issues. By providing an environment he can go to at an affordable price we can relax and not fear exposing him to a health risk.
N/A. (2)
National parks are already paid for with tax dollars.
National parks belong to the people. Any restriction to access whether it is physical or monetary is ill-advised.
National parks going green, how can that be a bad thing for the environment?
National parks need to be enjoyed by everyone and every generation. If we do not pay for it now we are just passing the burden to our children and I do not want to do that.
National parks should be a place where people of all ages can visit safely without threats to their health. These visits to parks should promote health.
National parks should be safe for everyone to actively participate in activities, from a health perspective.
National parks should not cost that much to visit and most people would not pay that much.
Need clean air.
Need to keep our parks clean and the cost is high.

Need to know what the program might be.
No ban on private vehicles!
No family should be hindered from visiting national parks because of high fees. Let Washington fund them.
Normally these fees go to other funds, not the actual fund.
Not adding any other pollution device than what it already is, will not be harmful to health.
Obviously, the parks should be free of harmful human impact.
Of course. I think it's fair enough because you do not have to pay for children. That is not bad for the outcome you would get, as long as you knew about the fee prior to the visit and could pay for it.
Only on dedicated park roads and parking areas, not on state or local roads used to transit the park. All monies collected must be dedicated to non-fossil-fuel vehicles.
Our health is not good so we have no interest in parks we can't go to.
Our national parks are treasures. We must each give more of our resources to maintain them. Our parks offer a great recreational experience for Americans and an enticement to foreign visitors. We must show that we value parks with support.
Our parks are not for just ourselves, but future generations of people, animals, fauna, and flora.
Our parks need to be funded by everyone who calls themselves a citizen, like all taxes we need to properly fund our parks; electric vehicles are a wonderful idea?
Our taxes should be covering the cost of these parks. If these types of vehicles include an extra cost then experiment at a private entity.
Our taxes should maintain our national parks. There should be no charge to enter or camp.
Our taxes that we pay should be enough to cover the program. \$25 per adult would likely cut the number of visitors in half so the park would not gain any additional funding by raising the fee.
Park is supposed to be "not so expensive." Families can't afford to go.
Park service vehicles would save money by not requiring gasoline purchases. Savings in this area could fund the cost of the conversion.
Park vehicles cannot be causing that much pollution. Give me a break.
Parking outside park and have tour and drop of at trail so not many cars have to be in park at once.
Parks and their natural state need to be protected. A small fee is worth keeping the parks healthy and natural.
Parks charge too much now. A tremendous amount of maintenance, etc. could be done by volunteers and/or community work time.
People should be able to visit at anytime and not worry about if it will affect their health, they may not have an extra day to visit.
People should be willing to pay a few dollars if it means improving their health or the health of those around them.
People should never have to limit outdoor activities due to pollution. If \$2 per person is all it takes to help that it's worth it.
People with breathing problems would appreciate it.
Personally I like to breathe fresh air. I don't want to enjoy something and have to pay for it later, health wise.
Please assume you understand my answer.
Pollution can cause long term health problems.
Pollution is a major problem causing tons to suffering.
Pollution is also bad for trees, wildlife.
Pollution is not a local problem, it's a global problem. Limiting emissions in a small area would not change pollution.
Pretty big increase, but I guess we need to do all we can to save our parks.

Probably would pay it particularly if I hadn't been to that park before, but an additional \$10 added to the entrance fee for a single day is steep.
Public transportation using "green" vehicles would be great! There are too many diesel tour busses on park roads.
Really? You think this is the parks' biggest problem? Get serious! How much air pollution was caused by the West Yellowstone fire a couple decades back? If air pollution is a problem in our parks, how big a crisis are our cities in? Pay for this out of existing funds!
Reducing air pollution is a necessity everywhere, but of the national parks I have visited I did not notice excessive pollution.
Reducing air pollution is more important than money.
Respiratory ailments.
Retired, age 79, have transplanted kidney as of October 1, 2007, and potential for very expensive anti-rejection message for social security income.
Reversing the damages we have created must be paid for by the same people who created the pollution.
See #4. A surcharge is a tax. Find another way to fund our fabulous parks.
Seems like the more you pay extra for something, it never does what it is supposed to do.
Several friends have breathing problems and cannot do some things with me.
Should be free to senior citizens and veterans.
Since the extra fee only applies to adults I would be willing to pay it.
Small fee to maintain "natural" area.
Small price to pay for the good it would do!
Small price to pay, relatively infrequent visits.
So much money is wasted that we would only be willing to pay \$1. In regard to animals in parks, wolves, etc. are introduced and then in a few years there are too many or cattle ranchers complain, and then it is costly and cruel to kill them. It is a no win situation.
Some entrance fees are already high. Maybe \$5 would be more realistic and possible to add to admission. It's not right to limit visitors who are also taxpayers because of affordability.
Son is a quad.
Such as Zion has done, parking your car and using your feet or park transportation will decrease pollution from the public's vehicles. Also post signs re: pollution levels.
Any private vehicles allowed in would be by special permit with extra fee. Everyone else gets shuttled in by electric buses from a lot outside the park.
Taxes.
Technology does not yet provide vehicles which will contribute to a solution to this problem. This is a "feel good" program with limited impact other than increased cost.
That fee seems very high. People with asthma and other health concerns can experience the park for limited times. Too high fee will impact total attendance. I'd look for other vacation options. We are a family of five.
That is too much. (2)
That it too much, couldn't afford it.
That would be \$50 plus the regular fee. That is way out of our budget. I think protecting the air is part of what they should do, like protecting water, trees, wildlife, etc.
That would cost too much for us, but we do wish all vehicles would be earth friendly; however, we can't afford to buy someone else one!
That would increase the entry fee by \$50 per family minimum. That is too much with the ratio of park vehicles to private vehicles. This would seem to be a losing battle.
The \$2 fee is affordable to most any visitor, and environmentally helpful. The principle of shifting

responsibility for park maintenance and management to the public is not one I would agree with. I think it is the responsibility of the park system's bureaucracy to promote and advocate for a quality system on behalf of the American public.
The air quality affects much more than just my experience.
The amount of \$2 is not a large number and would not change my mind whether or not to go to a park or monument.
The cost is too high. Parks should be funded through taxation. Take money from the war!
The cost may reduce the number of days spent in the park, but the quality of air would be worth the extra cost.
The cost of travel is expensive, and then to pay a higher fee to get into park is crazy.
The cost of travel, road, and lodging is expensive. Park upkeep is one thing but I personally feel 20 extra dollars for my wife and me is too much.
The cost per person is low and benefit is high.
The cost to get to a park especially if it's a long distance away gets very pricey, transportation to get there, staying overnight some place not too far away, eating out 3 times a day, and can get cost prohibitive. Also, in order for our young adult children to go, we would pay their fee because they're in grad school and couldn't afford to go otherwise.
The cost would stop me to go.
The dangers and prevalence of air pollution in most areas is nonexistent or vastly overblown.
The economy is bad enough. Extra fees would cause us not to afford to visit places.
The extra fee is miniscule compared to the potential benefits. I would pay up to \$30-40 to improve air quality.
The extra fee seems too high for an initial cost. I would suggest starting lower but increase yearly.
The government should pay. We should get something free for the high taxes we pay.
The major source of invisible air pollution will be caused by the visitors! The park employees and their vehicles are going to cause a minute amount of the pollution that is there. Why would the public want to spend money on a fix that could be used in a better way? Do you have that many vehicles to cause that much pollution?
The money should be provided by a tax on roadway vehicle fuel.
The national parks already overcharge for service provided.
The national parks belong to all American taxpayers. Paid access should not be required. Access should be controlled as Denali in Alaska. All lodges, gas stations, restaurants, and stores within parks should be closed and eliminated. The National Park Service, Forest Service, and Bureau of Land Management should be combined into one entity thereby eliminating duplicate bureaucratic and office personnel facilities expense. Money saved could be put back into national parks. If contacted, many retired senior RVers might donate time to help in national parks.
The national parks I have visited have some of the very cleanest air. There are too many other factors involved to say that electric or solar vehicles will make that much of a difference if only used by park employees.
The national parks should be free to all visitors. The funds should come from congress.
The next generation to live a long time.
The parks are clean and it costs to keep it so.
The people can't afford much now.
The pollution hurts the wildlife.
The price of gas alone is too high for people to travel. If the price of admission is too high, no one will go anywhere.
The program would be valueless because of the number of visitor vehicles, regardless of "assumptions."

The reason we haven't visited for so long is because we can't afford to.
The survey is confusing. What is the source of the pollution? If cars in the park, then restrict the cars and provide alternative transport, preferably non-polluting! If source is pollution blown in from L.A., no park program can help it.
The US government has more than enough "programs" whose only purpose seems to be to take money from its citizens to waste or benefit non-citizens. Any one or more of these could be eliminated and the funds redirected to your proposed program.
The way that jobs are it will hurt a lot of people.
There is so much air pollution now one more day won't matter.
There is still pollution in the air. Any amount of pollution is harmful. I don't believe I should have to pay to breathe cleaner air.
There should not be a set fee. It should be done by donation.
There shouldn't be an extra fee. If the park wants to control the pollution, find other ways.
There's air pollution all over.
These are tax supported. We need to support our country, not give away so much money.
These parks are for the future. We should all help pay for damage that we all have caused! People pay this and more to get into amusement parks all over. At least these parks are nature not cement.
Things are already too expensive.
This is a national problem and therefore should be funded not on a user base but on a national base.
This is a push poll.
This should be a no-brainer answer of yes. Not only does it positively impact humans but the existing habitat.
Times are hard and with the worst economy we have now \$25 means a lot to middle class like us.
To a point if I bring my kids with me they should not count even if they are 18 or older unless they have kids of their own, then I would.
To live we need clean air.
Too costly. (2)
Too expensive for a one-day visit.
Too expensive.
Too high cost. (3)
Too high for a one-day visit (\$10 per adult).
Too high, \$10-15 is okay.
Too many taxes spent incorrectly!
Too much money, a car load of people would be \$50 plus gas, etc.
Too much money. I am on fixed income.
Too much. (2)
Travel costs are high enough.
Two of my children have asthma.
Typical government reaction would be \$2 change now, \$20 in the future, and \$50 down the road.
Until smoking cigarettes is banned, I would not allow paying extra.
Until these new vehicles are tested well you don't know how they will hold up in an emergency.
Very low income. There is no way I could afford to even enter the park.
Very reasonable amount.
Visiting a park should not cost \$15 let alone go up \$15.
Way too high for one person, one visit would pay \$10.
We are currently in an economically and financial crisis with high fuel, food, and other costs. Not much money to spare! Do auto companies ever donate hybrid vehicles to national parks?

We are not the only breathing beings there; the animals, insects, etc.
We are on a fixed income and it would be very hard to pay that.
We can't enjoy the parks if we're not willing to take care of them.
We cannot afford that. We would have to stay home.
We do need to start controlling pollution to some degree.
We don't visit often so we could afford a high fee once in a while.
We have a Golden Eagle pass so we can afford this.
We have five daughters and a draw for national parks is their low cost.
We have limited income.
We must always be ready and willing to assist in any way we can for the reduction of air pollution.
We must be willing to pay for quality anything! "Free" or "cheap" is never good.
We must start taking more steps to reduce air pollution when we can!
We need to assume responsibility for the pollution we have caused.
We need to be more Earth friendly in all areas of our lives, no matter where we are or live; recycle, use our energy sources we have like water to produce plants instead of coal and watch so not to waste like so many do.
We need to protect the environment.
We pay a nut.
We pay enough to our government. If they need more money, downsize.
We reside by a state park and enjoy daily walking. We would pay \$50 a year to use park.
We should do whatever is necessary to reduce emissions, esp. in recreational and national areas.
We use the Golden pass which is great for seniors on fixed incomes.
We would visit more often if this program would put in places for our youngest children who both have asthma.
What about the Smokeys and the pollution in the eastern area? No fees charged. Absurd since most people visit an amusement park or town while visiting the Smokeys. Gas prices will cause a greater use of this park due to demographics.
What is the evidence that invisible pollution is a legitimate health problem for a one-day visitor, compared to other factors affecting that person's state of health, e.g. family history or life style?
Whatever is causing the pollution should be disallowed.
When I visit, it is usually only for a few hours on a drive through and the fees already seem high enough. Would add up with additional people along really quickly. It just sounds too expensive to me to make visiting worth it.
When people visit a national park they expect clean, fresh air.
While I'd be willing to pay \$15 per adult visitor uptown for said program, the obvious solution is to impeach Bush, Cheney et al, bring back the troops, reduce military expenditures, and divert saved funds at high transport and housing infrastructure.
Will not be visiting unless something is done about air pollution!
With gas prices and other cost, so expensive.
With new car smog reports, smog should be less. Gas is too high. Long distance travel to parks is a no win?
With the cost of fuel it would be an added expense which would probably deter our visit. Maybe there should be no smoking in the park.
With the economy and the price of gasoline I feel an additional fee of \$10, even though just for adults, will affect attendance, especially for families.
With the increased cost for many households it would make it impossible for those less fortunate to enjoy the beauty.
With the price of gas we will all be lucky to visit a park. I think \$5 per adult would be more affordable.

With the rising cost of everything I can't afford whatever price you charge. You need to talk to Bush about his war and the money that is being blown over there.
With the tax money I pay I should not be charged more to see nature in its natural state.
Without limiting the emissions from visiting vehicles the air pollution could not be reduced that much. Rangers on horseback might be better or already reduced emission cars.
Would eliminate lower income people from being able to visit.
Would have a difficult time believing an extra \$10 was necessary for what I can't see, would be more accepting of \$10 per adult and a fee for point of view.
Would not go if air warnings were high.
Would not mind paying the extra fee as long as it will go towards reducing air pollution.
Would pay for sure, maybe a tax deduction would work.
Would pay less than \$5, possibly \$2 max.
Yes, my husband has asthma.
You already keep us locals out by your \$20 fee!
You are wasting tax payer money. Warn people and let them make a choice about pollution.
You ask us to base an answer on assumption, yet do we know this change in vehicles will reduce pollution to a lower level?
You can't put a cost on health.
You cannot control air pollution in one area along.
You didn't list cost for an adult to get in for a day or if you need a window sticker for national parks, like state parks. Would there be daily, few days, or weekly fee available? Tour available? Bus shuttle throughout the day for people to sightsee on their own?
You don't say how you will accomplish this.
You have to make it more affordable for everyone, especially families with children.
You would have to stop all air pollution, not just in the parks.

Appendix D. Open-ended Responses by Mode on Q26

This appendix includes the open-ended answers to Question 26 for the phone (D.1) and web (D.2) respondents. The question was not asked on the mail questionnaire.

D.1 - Responses from the phone survey

q26. *That concludes the survey. Thank you very much for participating!* Thinking about this topic, do you have any comments you would like to share?

\$25 is just too much to ask for.
A lot of the questions I didn't know like one national park may be big enough for snowmobiling some parks are small and only for viewing the parks vary a lot.
A lot we should do, could do, but the 'vehicle' that drives all is money, but this is a treasure we all need to care for.
Absolute love the national parks. Everything needs to be done to preserve them.
Again the upkeep of the World War I monument. It really upset me, I called my congressman. It is overgrown, it's moldy looking and green.
Air pollution is a problem we need to address.
Air pollution is foremost in people's minds, and something needs to be done. However I'm not sure charging extra fees will help at all.
All the cars should be made electric.
All the parks are beautiful.
A lot of places they have for monuments they need more for people for handicap places more wheelchair accessible rent scooters for people with disabilities so we could go on the nature trails the mobility part holds some people.
Alternative fuel sources, it's going to be good for the country in the long run. I'm shocked we haven't gone that direction sooner or faster.
Anything that can be done to improve the environment should be done.
Approves of retrograding the park vehicles to solar and electric power.
As long as the snowmobiles and jet skis are not used destructively, I think they should be allowed. I think the charge ought to be a per-vehicle one, and around 10\$ each one, per person gets too expensive too fast.
Can see where they need to do something.
Cannot think of any right now.
Can't think of any. (2)
Charging for non gasoline vehicles will discourage riders, if they have to pay they won't use the park buses. I think the park vehicles should take care of their own vehicles, the ones who are the ones who pollute are the ones who should be charged. I don't think people have the right to drive in our national parks if they are polluting. Maybe that should not include the handicapped.
Clean air is important and we should pay the price to keep it that way.
Clean air is just one of the ways to keep this world healthy. We need to do a lot of other things also. We need water, and soil, etc. We are farmers and we do things by certain guidelines. What I'm getting at is that there is too much chemical use in this country and that this is just one issue of many that needs to be dealt with in our country and throughout the world.

Concerned about the selling off of the national park more than the pollution they are selling parts of national parks to private industries that then become rich.
Do not have any.
Do something about snowmobiles and limit cars and pollutions.
Don't get my number out to anyone.
Explanation is to long should be shorter should not try to be so political correct.
Financing is main concern as to if we can go or not with all the rising costs of everything especially gas!
For lowering the pollution in parks thinks changing park vehicles and private vehicles would help.
Getting real tired of the go green philosophy.
Go cowboys.
Go for it. I am sorry for all the cutbacks for the national parks, they are important. I am afraid with all the expenses people will not be able to go.
Going to all electric is going to extreme she would not pay any extra for that.
Good luck and I hope this works well for them.
Grand canyon park is a fantastic park they should advertise more.
Great afternoon!
Great supporter of national parks am concerned about pollution and traffic been to great number of parks through the years they deserve more financial support.
Greenhouse warming causes many problems.
Hard to believe that a national park would have worse air quality than the city I live in!
Have a scooter rental for the elderly or handicapped.
Have to have the national parks.
Have you taken into consideration if you visit more than one park, cutting the price? I feel families with children should not be priced out.
Hope it gets done before we die!
Hope it helps the park. (2)
Hope the environment stays clean.
Hope the programs work.
Hope they are successful on cleaning the air.
Hope they do pass it to keep litter and pollution under control.
Hopes that the program described happens, she would not be adverse to private vehicle not being allowed in national parks.
How come no surveys about state parks? I'm in New Jersey, but we have great state parks, so we need surveys also. Not so much Western US. Great survey! Made me think.
I think the parks are nice and we need a certain amount of money for improvements.
I have been in a lot of national parks, and have never had problem with air pollution in any of them.
I am a clean air freak and I recycle a lot.
I am an avid visitor to national parks, I am single mom and want to give my children an appreciation for them, visitation should be restricted or repeat visitors should have to pay more, need more restrictions on how many times people should be allowed to visit.
I am glad you are doing a study like this. I think it is a good way to approach the issues.
I am very for the National Parks. I wish the wild life parks well.
i am willing to pay more for clean and natural parks as native as possible.
I appreciate the National Park System.

I appreciate you doing this. I am glad to help out to have clean air.
I assume the purpose of this survey is to figure out how to manage the national parks is that correct? I believe the number of cars should be limited.
I have been to Yellowstone several times but can't go this year because of gas prices.
I believe god created this planet and I think he has provided means to take care of the environment.
I believe if the government wants the people to come up with the solution that they need to so it won't be a problem.
I believe in the protection of our environment and to keep pollution down in our national parks.
I believe in what they are doing is great. I appreciate doing surveys like this one.
I believe that global warming is coming. It's not as big a problem as the media is making it out to be.
I believe that the national parks are an important part of this country, and I believe the government should fund them to the extent that they can.
I believe that there are enough trees in the parks to absorb most of the pollution. I have done other surveys in person.
I believe the national park system is very important to future generations.
I believe they're a nation treasure and they need to continue, I remember going to those national parks when I was younger and I would like them continue for future generations.
I certainly have enjoyed the National Parks that I have visited. I have the special card that lets seniors in for nothing.
I do belong to some organizations that do care about the National parks and things like that. But I also belong to the American Federation of gem and Mineralogical Societies, and we are being kept from going rock hunting in Federal lands because of the Environmental groups.
I do consider myself to be very concerned about the environment and I am embarrassed that I have never visited a national park.
I do enjoy the National Park and shouldn't destroy them.
I do hope that the park will get rid of gas car.
I do hope that they can figure out a way to control pollution because it can be pretty bad.
I do hope that they do some kind of program though because it's needed.
I do surveys for a living. The reading in the middle was too long.
I do think that anything they can do for the national parks is good because I would like for people to be out there if they can.
I don't think the government should control our national parks.
I don't use the real crowded parks/or don't go during peak season so I have not had an issue with air pollution.
I feel concerned about studies that try to measure people's willingness to pay for environmentalist.
I feel that the questions about race and income are prejudicial and should be eliminated.
I feel that there should be no fees for the National Park system at all, They were established by the Federal Government for ALL the people to enjoy. As such there should be no user fees associated with them. Any costs accruing from the Park system should be borne by all the taxpayers.
I have a daughter that is looking to go into the environmental protection agency for a career and agree with this survey!
I have been really happy for the campgrounds that you do not have to pay electric or provide firewood like a town near Chicakio, Minnesota.
I have been really satisfied with all parks I have visited.
I honestly don't think it's a problem. There may need to be restrictions. However, there are enough problems with pollutions from other cities. And I don't believe that people cause global warming.

I hope that they we do something to preserve or national parks they're really important.
I hope the air pollution thing goes through.
I hope the Park Service does everything they can to protect the natural environment of the Parks.
I hope they go to the solar power vehicles.
I hope we do clean up the air in the parks and the project is well worth doing. We need to clean up the air in the whole planet.
I hope you are able to move on with your project.
I hope you do find a solution to this problem.
I just hope our tax money deeps the parks open and we continue have public access.
I just hope this can be accomplished.
I just hope this helps clean up our parks.
I just hope you guys do this.
I just hope the parks expand forever and ever, because people need them as a place to get away from the bump and grind.
I just like to make sure the retired peoples costs are kept low.
I just love the national park service, they do a lovely job.
I just think it is up to the individual to donate whatever they want for anything other than the fee to get in.
I just think that they need to come up with some kind of badge or GPS tracking system before they go hiking, you shouldn't be allowed to go hiking in some parts of the park without some way of tracking them.
I just want to say I was concerned that this survey might be a scam. I am glad I did it.
I just wish the congress would see to it that every one helps up the national parks, especially by the government.
I just wondered if you were in a university town because we are here and surveys are kind of abundant here.
I know it's important to get the air clean and keep thing alive.
I know it is an issue and it does need to be addressed.
I like national parks.
I like the idea of changing the vehicles to electric for maintenance and tours.
I like the parks and like to go.
I like to keep the environment healthy.
I like you because you are a real cool person.
I live in a pollution area so this survey won't help us much.
I live in Tennessee, and the Mountains are beautiful here.
I live near Assateague National Seashore, it is an amazing wonderful place, I take advantage whenever I can.
I lived in Death Valley for about 10 years, then I lived at Mount McKinley, My father was a ranger. While I lived in Death Valley, I worked summers at restaurants in other parks. It was too hot. I was a Fred Harvey Girl while I was still a young girl.
I lived in Los Angeles for many years, breathed that air, and I don't think air pollution is as harmful to us that would warrant a program such as this.
I love the national park service and strongly advocate them. They have such a variety of programs.
I love the national parks and haven't run into any pollution. I do think the government should not charge us any more fees for anything.

I love the National Parks wish the government could get the gas prices down.
I love the national parks and hope that this survey helps a lot.
I love to see more native places kept cleaner need for growth in the wilderness area.
I really feel that anytime that someone has a chance to donate or contribute to this cause it's always worth their while.
I really think the National Parks would be better served by allowing hunting. Introduce a lottery for hunting elk and moose and buffalo. I see a lot of the parks are overgrazed and that's not management. Also the National Parks should be managed by professional foresters to limit and control the burning and deforestation of the Parks.
I strongly support are parks and tax payers money and I do use the parks.
I support most measures to help pollution.
I sure enjoyed this survey and you were very clear with it. You did a great job. Yes! The Parks are wonderful.
I think I got a survey for the public park, I'm very comfortable with the topic and I think it is a good topic to discuss.
I think all across the US, national parks and everywhere the government needs to help more, with all pollution needs.
I think everything you mentioned is important.
I think I enjoy the national parks and hope it is protected for years to come.
I think if you guys are going to try to institute this type of program, it's a fantastic idea.
I think it is a great idea. (3)
I think it is very important about pollution, gas prices are so high and other expenses so keep it in sync with that. Parks need the funding and we do need to keep them up.
I think it would be a wonderful thing, and is much needed. I have toured all the national parks and have really enjoyed them.
I think it would be necessary to curb people cooking outdoors it causes fires. I liked the survey.
I think it's a good cause to reduce pollution in the national parks.
I think it's a pretty good survey.
I think it's a very good program and it needs to be implemented.
I think it's a very important concern, so hopefully, other people will think about the subject, at least, after being asked about it.
I think it's good that they're looking into your parks and want everything clean and natural.
I think it's important to keep up the national parks whatever we have to do and I think \$2 is very reasonable.
I think our country is overly concerned, too publicized about air pollution and global warming etc.
I think people will die more from starvation than pollution. I wish our politicians would make some good decisions instead of dickering so much whenever someone comes up with a new idea.
I think private car should not be allowed. They should have buses to take you where you need to go. That way not so many cars are causing bad air. And they wouldn't need all this money from people.
I think somebody has an agenda and that's the reason for the survey and I don't agree with the premise.
I think that \$15 fee is ridiculous.
I think that the environmental wacos guys have gone overboard.
I think that's a great idea to convert the park vehicles to electric and solar. Anything we can do to help the environment.
I think the government needs to take responsibility for the parks, not the people.

I think the idea of keeping the air clean is very important in both national parks and in the cities.
I think the more we can do to keep our national parks safe should be done.
I think the national park does a great service with what limited funds it have should not be privatized should remain governmentally run.
I think the national park system is doing a great job for what they have to do with. I would like to see them be better funded.
I think the national parks are one of our greatest treasures and should be kept in best possible shape for future generations.
I think the National Parks are very nice and I've enjoyed visiting them very much. I will continue to visit them as much as I can.
I think the need to offer stiffer penalties for litter, if your caught littering you should not be allowed visit a national park for year, and a minimum of a \$500 fine or 50 hours of service to that park.
I think the park service especially civil war sites do wonderful jobs, I've noticed the civil war battlefields have been getting restored to historical accuracy and they are doing a fine job.
I think the parks should be accessible for low income family.
I think the speed limit in Yellowstone should be lowered and really bad food. I'd rather eat HoHo's.
I think there should be a great effort by government and extend car mileage be on mileage we have now and stop global warming.
I think they should continue to use snowmobiles in the Parks, They've gone to four-cycle engines. They want to lock it all down so that no one can do anything. The people with health problems should stay in the house. Our cities are cleaner than ever, yet the environmentalists still want to lock everything down. We all need to be more environmentally aware but without locking things down. People who can't walk are losing the things they can see because of the environmentalists.
I think they've done a wonderful job with the national parks and stuff.
I think this issue is a very important issue.
I think this program is wasting resources.
I think this survey is bias.
I think we need to get off fossil fuel, I think we need to go to nuclear for power, I also we need to switch all vehicles in the US electric power.
I think we should take better care of our parks, because once they are gone they are gone. We need to leave something for our children/grandchildren.
I think what you are doing is good, but hard to answer because I don't go anywhere.
I understand it's important, but I think there has to be general basic national support form general revenues. I have never experienced this pollution problem.
I very much am in favor of this idea.
I was always impressed about how I was treated by rangers, nice atmosphere in stores.
I was grieved when I heard that they had put mountain lions back into the wild and that they had attacked people, I think that they need to protect people that visit the park.
I was impressed with how kind, calm, and collected the interviewer sounded. I normally don't answer telephone surveys but how you came across, I said, "I'll take some time out of my day to answer his questions."
I was the grand canyon last year and I think national park rangers need to handle the parking better and provide more space, and increase the number of women's restrooms at the lodges.
I was very disappointed when I visited Yellowstone Park. There were no animals and it was not clean.
I wasn't aware of the pollution.
I wish I could live closer to one.

I wish I was better off so I could visit Yellowstone park.
I wish more of this information could get out to people.
I wonder where that birthday question came from.
I would like people to get off their dead ass and start moving around and do something. I'm 89 years old and I do more than those dead beats!
I would like to do surveys to help.
I would like to find out the results of this survey.
I would like to see my grandkids be able to see and enjoy the national parks pollution free.
I would like to thank for giving me the opportunity to participate.
I would love at some point to see Grand Canyon.
I would love if this were actually implemented.
I would not mind paying higher taxes for general purposes of our parks.
I would really agree that they have to do something about the air pollution to keep it clean for people and animals.
I would think really that they were clean and attractive and if they wanted to go and liked the looks they would probably love to regardless of the air.
I would want to make sure the pollution idea is legitimate. There is just too much asking for more, the government asks too much as it is and they need to keep these parks affordable for the people.
If I thought that it would help the air then my price would be higher.
If pollution were that high I would figure the park is not that much of natural surroundings. I have asthma and the parks may not be an option.
If surveys were run like this one I would be more willing to do them. Consequently they are always boring and too long which makes me reject them.
If the national park service has the information available about this survey I would be interested to find out the outcome of this survey.
If the national parks are funded by the government and peoples taxes, do not try to make money off of God's property. If you can't afford it, don't do it. It is not in the spirit of how the national parks were founded.
If the [illegible] is about changing the cars that work inside the parks, I don't see how that will help. The other vehicles that come through the Parks have more effect then the Park Service cars.
If there is a problem with pollution they need to make people aware of the problem.
If they are going to charge and extra fee to change the park vehicles to electric power, they should just roll it into the entrance fee.
If they could cut back pollution in any way that would be good.
If this wasn't a student survey, I probably wouldn't have taken it.
If you are concerned about pollution you need to get right on it. Volcanoes cause a lot of pollution. I'm not so sure about this pollution in parks.
If you keep raising the prices, how can the old people afford to go to the parks? We are on a fixed income and even though prices for everything go up, our income doesn't. How are we supposed to even see Old Faithful?
I'm a truck driver.
I'm all for protection of the natural environment and I think the government should acquire more of the prime natural land and keep it up.
I'm curious to know which national parks have a problem before we try to fix a problem. I've been to many parks, Grand Canyon and Yellowstone National Park and many others, and have never seen a problem.

I'm glad for this survey. I think pollution is a real problem.
I'm glad to know that people are thinking about this topic.
I'm glad to see this survey. I just hope that people get so overwhelmed; I need to quit adding and micromanaging things.
I'm just not an outdoor person.
I'm not happy with the way the parks are being run. They leave dead trees instead of cutting them down and using them for other things.
I'm really encouraged that I'm not so dissatisfied when I speak to people that have a social continuous.
I think there is too much emphasis put on this green effect is making us in serious trouble. They need to do more drilling for oil so we don't depend so much on overseas oil. Our air is very clean compared to other countries such as Japan and China.
I'm very much conscious about pollution and growth. I am very concerned about the animal displacement because of growth from within the country.
Important for them to think about reducing air pollution.
In addition to an additional fund, I suggest donation receptacles.
Interesting survey.
It brings up a good point.
It is an important issue that needs to be addressed.
It is wonderful to have these parks and be in a country where the people have concern about the parks.
It occurs to me that there is nothing particularly special about those vehicles that are used in national parks. I don't see a reason to single out park vehicles. However, I believe that the government should be involved to promote all vehicles to be electric. Ironically enough, I believe that electric vehicles are the wave. I don't believe that there is enough power generated from electric vehicles to propel larger vehicles into hard-to-reach areas.
It seems like a good idea and I hope you're successful in convincing people to go for it.
It was a nice survey and you were very good at it.
It was interesting.
It was very difficult to answer the one question about cost since I don't know how much it is to get into some of the parks. Other than that I think this is a good topic to be discussed.
It would be better if the survey was online.
It's a good idea to try and change things. However, taxes are really high and poorer people will not be able to make trips to these places.
It's a good system. They should keep improving it. Keep it up, maintain, and try to keep improving it.
It's interesting. I would be interested to know how the rates are going to change in the park service.
It's interesting. Parks are very important. Parks, global warming and pollution are in the forefront of the public's mind, and something needs to be done about it. Government needs to step up and do something instead of putting the entire burden on the people.
It's like on your pollution. I've backpacked the Smokey Mountains several times and acid rains are killing the vegetation. You can see that personally if you go backpacking. You learn that by experiencing the trails and spelunking. I'd like to see more hunting and fishing programs for children because there are more and more children raised in one parent families.
It's really import to protect our environment.
It's really important to reduce amount of pollution and this plan would make a big difference. Also, sports vehicles and animals should not have to live with that.
It's very important to maintain the parks and the cleanliness of the parks.

Just interesting that the University of Wyoming is doing this survey.
Just that we to get more cognitive to protect our environment it's past time.
Just that we're blessed to have so many national parks.
Just the fact about oil, antifreeze, etc., should be more of a concern.
Just want pure air.
Just what I shared before.
Keep doing it. Clean up the atmosphere.
Keep helping the environment.
Keep the snowmobiles out of the national parks and ATVs out of the national parks. Be careful about the bicycles.
Leave people alone and stop spending money.
Let's clean up the world.
Like I said, we've never been west of the Mississippi. We're old, and do not plan on going to any National Parks.
Like, the parks where we go, the air is clear and I don't want anyone messing with them.
Like, to see our government get more serious.
Limit cars on roads by limiting gas per car, limiting supply and demand.
Looking to spend too much money unnecessarily.
Lower the park prices so more people can go to the parks.
Make the parks more kid friendly. They need more educational [information] on their level.
Make the survey simpler.
More federal funds given to national parks to keep service done, more for rangers, maintenance programs, and the fees could be lowered so more people could enjoy them for free.
Most people would be happy to contribute if they saw more participation from the business community and more neighborhood projects to help people fix their communities. Start small and branch out.
National parks are the best thing ever and everyone should be able to appreciate the parks.
[The] National Park [Service] does not do a good job with the national forest; redwood lumber should not be shipped to Japan nor should the redwoods be used at all, even by Americans.
National Parks are important and should be protected.
Need to do something to restrict the gas guzzlers.
No, an important issue should be addressed.
No answer. (3)
No, but thank you for your courtesy.
No, except I have enjoyed the way you did the survey.
No, except we like our Great Smoky Mountains here. That's it.
No, I don't. (3)
No, I don't think we should give the UN any power over the national parks.
No, I have none.
No, I love to go to more national parks and I am pleased with them, but show me something about the pollution. My opinion is that the parks should have good air.
No not at this time. (2)
No thanks. (2)
No, we don't travel in the United States. Mostly Europe.

No, but I just hope that you can hold on to your parks and not have any encroachment on them.
No, I think that my, and others, willingness to contribute is good, but it takes good management and imagination.
No, I think that the national parks need to keep on going for the generations to come.
No, just getting back to fees, parks should be as inexpensive as possible. There should be a basic free part.
No. I think again this is a waste of time to try to non-pollute the national parks.
No. I just don't ever travel. Never have.
No. I just like to travel a lot and take grandchildren. I would like to take them to the national parks.
No. This is a very interesting survey.
No. It's hard for me to believe that but I do think it is so and that the ones who run these parks know about it.
None at this time.
None, I think that we should do more to protect national parks and we are behind other countries.
None, I just think parks and wildlife are very important.
Nope. I just hope you get it all electric or solar.
Nope. We are conservationists and we are aware of keeping things like they are.
Nope. I just think it's a wise idea to savor anything in nature. There are many houses and buildings that destroy the optic value of the scenery, and Gaylord Nelson helped Wisconsin with some of these issues.
Not at this town.
Not really.
Not right now, I don't.
Not today, but if you call me back any other day I would be glad to help you out.
Now I want to visit some national parks.
Only that I really enjoy the national parks and wish they would showcase them more.
Only that I think that if you do spend money on air pollution, it should be spent on a priority basis, not spread out; some places need it more than others.
Only that, like I said, I'm a big believer in land being set aside for enjoyment. And I utterly support it 100% with my tax dollars.
Only what I already said.
Ought to advertise more about National parks and Historic channels. More advertising, please.
Our National Parks should be kept clean, safe, and free!
Make park vehicles environmentally friendly, but have personal access to the parks. Other people [should] have respect for the environment and ourselves not be penalized by all the environmental issues.
Phone problems. Phone cutting out.
Preserving the quality of the National Parks is a key value to the United States.
Prices too high for fees for air pollution.
Is air pollution something that is really being considered?
Quit wasting the money of Americans.
Really appreciate we have the parks and historical sites and am willing to help, but \$15 is a little much.
Reducing air pollution, I'm all for.
Sounds like a good program.

Tell whoever put this survey together to quit drinking. Make it more simplistic.
Thanks for researching it and protecting our parks.
That survey shouldn't be that long.
That Yellowstone would let more people in the park. They limit the amount of people they let in.
The companies that get the restaurants and stores in the Grand Canyon have more vehicles than the park rangers have. If they do this to the park vehicles they should also make the vendors do it.
The concern of refueling the vehicles in the park by doing this 100% is, will they be able to get there in an efficient amount of time. For example electric and solar [cars] require reserves and if it's not sunny they won't have renewable power.
The electric cars should be around the world, not just in national parks.
The environment is very important. The NPS and the government should get on it, and everyone needs to help.
The fee at the park: maybe you could tack on a service charge at the gate, hand out information and set up donation spots. This would let everybody participate, and those with more money could give more without requiring those with less money give too much.
The government needs to get off their duff and do more for the National Parks. They need to keep up with keeping them clean and nice looking.
The government should be spending more money at home and in parks instead of in Iraq.
The LBJ park in Stonewall, Texas, is great. Johnson City Historic Site is great.
The media is doing a good job of letting people know about pollution at the Great Smoky Mountains.
The national parks in North Carolina are limiting access to beaches, and they said that they wouldn't do that. I would like to see unlimited access for foot traffic and vehicle traffic for the Cape Patters National Sea Shore in North Carolina. They broke their promise to not restrict access.
The National Parks need more care and people working there.
The only reason I did this survey is that I graduated from the University of Wyoming.
The only reason why I answered your survey was because it was about national parks and the only thing that bothered me about my visit to a national [park] was that there were fires. My son told me that they were control burning the area and then everything was alright.
The park service is a good company and I think there is no problem.
The parks are beautiful!
The parks should be free to go to.
The plan sounds like a good one and I support solar and electric [vehicles] but the prices are high, no one could afford them.
The price isn't right, not everyone can afford it.
The rule of the state parks is that you can't have more than 30 kids. Scout groups are usually more than that.
They need to make the parks more affordable for U.S. citizens. Raise them for the tourists from overseas, but not for us.
They should do solar and electric power for park vehicles as well as limit the daily activity of cars during the busiest days and minimize the amount of people, because it should be controlled.
They should limit the cars that they let in.
Think about restricting other vehicles and bussing people into the parks.
I think it is a good project and should continue to the state park level.
I think the mail survey is nice.
This is a very good idea to do this.

This is not going to solve the problem!
This is very worthy survey. Children need to see our world, so anything that can be done to bring children into national parks would be wonderful.
This survey has more the environmental concerns; it was put out by tree huggers.
To cut down on pollution they could use horses and mules for some transportation through there. Use wagons to haul people.
To get the gas price down to go to the beautiful parks.
Took 14 minutes.
Took five marketing surveys for this university.
Try to get to national parks. Did more when the kids were young.
Only one, and that deals with the reason I promote allowing concealed weapons. I cannot understand the logic of allowing people to wander in wilderness areas, where they could be in danger of wildlife or humans, without the ability to protect themselves. Open carry of weapons would also be ok, as long as they are allowed the tools to protect themselves.
I know you're out there to earn your living. And I pray at least once or twice that god will bless people with a divine intervention.
Very concerned about the funding being misused.
Waiting for the government to do something about gas hogs.
We are big supporters of national parks and wilderness and we strongly believe that restricting road access is very important, including private cars.
We are part of this earth and if we don't fix it then we are doomed.
We are planning on going to the Grand Canyon next year and we are excited about the glass floored walk-way.
We have enjoyed a number of the parks over the years. We want children in future years to enjoy them, and want logging to stop completely in all national parks.
We have enjoyed all of the parks we have visited; Glacier Park, Yellowstone, and Great Smoky.
We have visited several parks and monuments and they were great experiences. Keep up the good work.
We need facilities that are handicap friendly, including fishing.
We need: protected areas for the wildlife, the natural beauty, no snow mobiles and no four wheelers. Everything should be saved for future generations: no loggers, no garbage and all national parks need to be preserved.
We need to keep our national parks the way they are, make them cleaner. Get rid of the fossil fuel stuff.
We should allow the seniors to enter places that they cannot afford.
We went to a few national parks, but none like Yosemite. Keep them as pristine as possible so our children can enjoy them also when they're older.
Well done.
Well, I think the parks are being kept pretty good to begin with if they didn't go overboard and kept them to their natural condition.
Well, I think really something has to be done not only to control the pollution in the parks, but if there was some way to not deny access to them. During the busiest months the trash cans overflow; could they get some more garbage cans? Also maybe somehow get the visitors to put their garbage in the cans.
Well I think, with the national parks, the reason why I haven't gone is because I have a handicapped child and I would like to see more handicapped accessible trails in the parks. That would make things

more desirable of the parks.
Well I'm just hoping for a definite change in our government, for actual representation for the average person, not just the rich people.
Well it sounds like you've got a good project here. Thanks for calling and good luck.
Well it was nice speaking with you, and I'm glad we are trying to keep our national parks up to date.
Well, only that I think efforts to insure that there is clean air, or the cleanest air possible, is an important issue, and the NPS should do as much as possible to insure that that is the case. If that means limiting vehicles and jet skies in the national [parks] then they should do that.
Well, we need to protect the environment, but not do it radically. You have to look at what's in the best interest of the people who live in the area as well. I'm not for putting in roads and trails to every little waterfall. I think we need to protect the environment, but I don't think we need to be so radical about it. I don't believe everything they tell us about global warming.
Went to Yellowstone and thought it was beautiful.
When people want to have a real survey, loading it with questions to sway the survey puts a bad taste in people's mouths. The questions are stupid, put questions on that really will help.
Why didn't you go with natural gas instead of electric?
Wish I had more time to visit national parks.
Wish our government would spend money more wisely. Wish people in US would be citizens and eliminate immigration.
Wish the government would allow more funding for the parks.
Yes, I don't like to do surveys. I am on the Do Not Call list.
Yes, I think that America is losing so much energy and pure air through all this building. I believe they are burning down forest land that they should keep.
Yes, strongly reduce costs in parks.
Yes, I'm very strongly in favor of the parks, and endorse them wholeheartedly, but I'm concerned about lack of funding that impacts service in the national parks.
You guys are doing a good job doing the survey.
You would like to pay the five dollars for a one-time fee whether one day or several days. At Ocala National Forest, Florida, the rangers were going around and doing a similar survey to people in the park. They were very happy with the number of people that participated.
You're working with a bunch of politically correct wackos and there is no politically correct agenda. Other than that there are a bunch of smoking mirrors. Tell the head hog at the trough to call me and I'll tell him.

D.2 - Responses from the web survey

[Web version: Thank you for participating in this survey! If you have questions or comments, please call toll-free (1-866-966-2715) or write to: University of Wyoming, Dept. 3925, 1000 E. University Avenue, Laramie, WY 82071. Thinking about this topic, do you have any comments you would like to share?]

25 years. I think it will be either be bought out by land developers or destroyed by pollution from cars and people.
A lot longer than 10 minutes.
Air pollution is a problem only in some busy locations in some parks, maybe somewhat more if you include urban park service sites. I think park vehicles are rarely the main problem, more often the vehicles of visitors or blown-in pollution are a bigger problem than the park's own vehicles. I could support a modest fee to convert park service vehicles, but I would also want a fee aimed at discouraging visitors from driving their own vehicles around in the park, while providing an alternate means to move from site to site in the park, including lesser used sites, which might require a reservation and extra fee. I want clean air in national parks, but not at any cost. Programs should aim at the biggest problems, not marginal ones. You also mentioned snowmobiles and jet skis; these are usually gross polluters, and also unreasonably noisy for a park, and should be banned except perhaps for a narrow range of specific winter access uses. There are plenty of places outside national parks for pure recreational use.
All of us have to do more for it.
All the adults in the house have the same birthday, believe it or not!
Americans are wasting too much time with surveys and questionnaires as well as wasting too much money. If we spent the same time working we would not have time to read and answer questions that really have no correct answer.
Any large scale projects involving the amount of money this would take should be worked into the overall operating budget of the parks department and be paid for by all taxpayers.
Being in my 70s, I don't visit parks.
Besides adding fees, does the forest service have authority to limit vehicles or numbers of people visiting a site? Or perhaps they should vary the times people can visit: non-family visits during school and family visits during school breaks.
It seems like the park is getting smaller each year. It seems like it is becoming over run by people using.
Check out the systems they have in Yosemite. They have a "green" bus system that runs the valley.
Considering that these are national parks, why not have the government fund the vehicles, instead of passing it on to the visitors?
Curious!
I don't travel too much. So it doesn't really apply to me.
Everyone is concerned about cars, trucks, and greenhouse gases and air pollution, but no one has said anything about pollution caused by the space missions every month.
Fresh air is always better to keep you healthy.
Glad to help.
Glad to know that the parks, etc., are of concern outside of the current government. Hope things can be done to preserve the system and to make it available to many visitors.
Go Green!
Good air is good for everyone.

Good survey. [3]
Good topic.
The Grand Canyon has so much more smog than years ago. It really spoils the scenery.
Great, keep them coming. This was a very interesting one.
Great survey, I enjoyed it very much. Thank you very much.
Happy Earth Day. May god bless you and your families.
I have not visited a national park in many years. I prefer more excitement, such as Las Vegas type entertainment.
I have visited the Grand Canyon, Yosemite, Alcatraz, Smokey Mountains, and a few years ago, Mt. St. Helens and Mt. Rainier. I'm not sure if these are all National Parks, but I enjoyed them all.
Have you thought of a rail system through the park, or a bus system that would pay for itself? Starting from one point and having several destinations, it could limit the number of vehicles and increase people, revenue, etc.
Hey! Short, sweet and to the point; that was nice!
High prices are hard to pay, so in my case I would not visit often.
Hope.
Hope my answers can be of some help, and I enjoyed taking it for you.
I am not sure how many surveys I have taken the past 12 months. I will be 76 tomorrow.
I am not sure how much it would help to eliminate pollution in just the park areas. We really need to focus on the country as a whole, but at least it's a start.
I am not sure of the purpose of this survey.
I am park ranger for the state of Idaho.
I am the only adult in this household and I am 79 years old.
I could go on and on about this topic, but there isn't enough time or space to write it all.
I do not know how many surveys I have done online.
I don't think near as many people from the U.S. will be doing much traveling this summer to anywhere.
I don't think that the proposed situation of having green vehicles for the employees that work in the park will matter if other private vehicles are allowed into the park. The way to reduce pollution would be to follow the example of Zion National Park and only allow restricted transportation in sections of the park.
I enjoy being able to use the parks and it's my responsibility as a U.S. citizen to leave only my footprint behind when visiting. Most of the air pollution comes from cities or factories located near the parks.
I enjoy nature and all it has to offer. Let's keep it that way for generations to come. I was only three years old when my parents took me to Yellowstone, so I don't remember much, but maybe someday I will visit there or another park.
I enjoyed this survey and the national park that I visited was Hot Springs National Park in Hot Springs, Arkansas.
I go to Bandelier National Monument at least three to five times a year. Love it!
I did some telephone surveys but I can't remember how many.
I have allergies and I am affected by the atmosphere and trees and grass, but around the time of May and June only. I take my medicine and I am fine. But I loved the national park I visited five years ago.
I have thoroughly enjoyed the national parks in my lifetime and I have a passport that lets me get in for free for the rest of my life. I do wish that visitors would be more considerate of others in the parks.
I incorrectly entered the amount I was willing to pay to stop pollution. Rather than \$10, I would be willing to pay \$25 per person.

I just wish more could be done to resolve the upkeep of our Nation's only WWI memorial here in K.C.
I know it is difficult, but I really feel that the anti-pollution measures should be supported by the park system which is funded by our tax dollars, not by individuals. That way everyone has access to the parks, regardless of their income level. They belong to every American.
I know park rangers. High up in the ranks you could say. What people do to our parks is a shame. Not just the drilling and logging, but when people go walking or camping and all that. They have no respect for anything. I think that as a punishment to people and as a respectful gesture to the land and animals, every five years no one should be allowed into the parks for five years. Give the parks a rest from all this messing up we do. It wouldn't kill us or hurt the park service or rangers. Rotate the closed parks. Punish intruders to the max. No "ifs", "ands", or "I'm sorrys". Do you think you hit on a sore spot?
I like the park in Wyoming very well. It's too bad they are killing it.
I like to do surveys because I am not too good at computers. It helps me to be a better speller, typist and thinker and most of all, to understand the computer more.
I live in a town that is choked with cars already so maybe I wouldn't notice, but if the invisible pollution in a park is high, why would one go at all? Kind of misses the point of being outdoors.
I love national parks but increasing the charge per person by \$15 adds up quickly when you have a large family that goes to parks together. You're looking at a \$100 increase for our family, which could change our minds about visiting.
I love the national parks but because I have a fixed income I would not be able to afford a high price to visit. I think pollution should be a priority in our parks.
I LOVE our national parks!
I love the national parks. I would truly like to visit them all, but because of the cost of traveling, I doubt very seriously that I will be able to.
I love the outdoors and visiting parks, but it seems that the cost keeps going up and I get so [expletive removed] mad that it costs money to stop and go to the outhouse in a state or federal park. Now with the cost of gas I don't know how much I will get to go.
I love to go fishing.
I love to go to the Smokey Mountains.
I loved to go to national parks and many others while my husband was still alive eight years ago; we went to many. I am so sad that they are getting like that. I hope I get to go again with someone that enjoys it, and I will pay the extra fee.
I really enjoy going to national parks, especially Yellowstone.
I sometimes think that national parks should take reservations in advance and limit the amount of people, or impact, for certain days and seasons.
I stated that I have taken 12 surveys in the last year. That is approximately 12 surveys by Knowledge Networks, and no others.
I think a major effort should be made to greatly reduce visitor automobile and O.R.V. use in our national parks. This should be even more effective than just limiting staff use of gasoline engines.
I think everyone should help the environment to the best of their ability.
I think our national parks are our greatest TREASURE and should be treated as such.
I think parks are great places for people to visit and see, in person, nature.
I think the federal government should provide more adequate funding for maintaining the national parks and restrictions should be put on access to preserve natural features.
I think the national parks are clean and well maintained. I have heard stories about campers being robbed and vehicles being broken into. I am concerned about the safety of the parks.
I think the park rangers are a very important part of our national parks as they are interesting and

knowledgeable.
I think the use of polluting vehicles in the parks should be limited.
I wasn't aware that this was an issue. It seems odd that with all that wide open space there would be significant amounts of air pollution produced by the park vehicles. It would seem that the problem with air pollution in national parks must come from sources not within the parks themselves.
I would like to go and stay overnight in a national park but they are very far from my home town. But I definitely will visit soon.
I would rather limit private vehicles than raise rates; after all, it is supposed to be an outdoor experience. Wouldn't it make more sense to have more federal funding set aside for this than for war?
I'd like to see more people going to parks on vacation and staying in the USA, keeping the money here. I love Laramie, Wyoming. I have been there and would like to return. I have friends headed out there this summer.
If more funding is needed to improve air quality or other social and health issues, that's fine.
Impeach Bush!
In camping facilities there is a need to patrol all areas and have a system for telephone relay towers so that one can use a cell phone to call 911.
It is good to "think green" in national parks. It is also good to get to enjoy these parks for free. Everyone should get the privilege to enjoy them and not be left out because of a fee to enter.
It is really nice to get a survey that is about something besides shopping. I'm not a great fan of shopping.
It would be helpful, in answering the questions about the price increase of getting into the parks, if there was a price range listed on the current admission cost of park admittance.
It would be nice to see this program everywhere.
It's just so expensive to travel anywhere due to the cost of gas, and it is very discouraging to try to go to some place natural if we are going jack the cost up to keep folks out.
Just please STOP the tolls, indirect and hidden taxes, surcharges, etc. ONE tax system is enough!
Keep taking care of the parks. We went to Yellowstone this year and it was beautiful! And very well kept!
More emphasis on getting people to clean up after themselves and others, with severe penalties if they don't, should be imposed the help keep parks clean.
More surveys. Jesus loves you.
Mother nature has a way of solving most of her problems. Slow down the traffic in the affected areas. Let mother nature catch up. The answers to a lot of our manmade problems are all around us. We are in too big of a hurry to destroy it.
My contact with National Park Service employees and volunteers has always been very positive.
My dad is Mexican but I don't consider myself to be Hispanic.
My first thought on seeing I was to assume, make an ass of you and me, so.
My husband and I had planned to travel out West but his health did not permit it. We always travel to Michigan to visit our families there. It sure would have been wonderful. Instead we bought a video of the National Parks.
My surveys are mainly Knowledge Works. As for the parks and recreation areas, I based my thoughts on what is here in Virginia's Appalachian Mountains and North Carolina and Tennessee, where the Smokey Mountain ranges are. I have been to 48 states and Canada, and have seen some beautiful parks. I lived in Hawaii for 7 years; there your pollution is due to the four trade winds. On the 4th of July and New Year's Day the smoke from all the fireworks hangs on the islands for days. Along with congested air pollution, my allergies were always on a high when I lived on Oahu. Then I moved to the North Shore and being close to the water seemed to calm my allergies somewhat.

My wife was concerned about charging too much for each person to help the national parks. If a family of 5 or 6 people goes it would cost an extra 50 to 60 dollars more. A lot of families couldn't afford that.
National parks are a precious heritage. I wish our government would do more to protect them. I wish the government would allot more money to their maintenance and upkeep, and hire more rangers to keep them safe.
National parks are wonderful places to see and visit. Let's not destroy this by letting environmentalists tax and control these parks.
Nevada Barr's mysteries are excellent publicity for the national parks!
Nice.
No, not really. But all the parks that we went through are very beautiful and clean. I wouldn't mind paying extra to go through them. I believe we purchased a pass to go through the parks which was very easy instead of trying to get money out.
Nope, other than, "Thank you Park Service for the job you are doing."
The national parks need more rangers.
One other thing that I failed to mention is that the park rangers should be a lot friendlier, because on our last visit to a state or national park they were a little cold, inattentive and not people friendly.
One question said "basic trails," etc., at parks; I have seen some TV shows that show expensive things done in some parks in the middle of nowhere that are ridiculous. We need to make "basic" the primary word.
Our "protected" parks. I don't see a.
Parks are great and wonderful for different reasons. The pollution is very bad not only in parks but all over. We all need to work at helping to get the air we breathe better. Thank you for caring.
Parks are one of the last vacation sites still affordable to visit.
Parks should be visited only by appointment, with a capacity of only so many people (your choice) at certain times.
Animals which are not native to any area or park, that have nowhere else to survive, need someplace to exist. Forests and natural resources are becoming scarcer and we should help to preserve what we still have before we have none left to enjoy. Snowmobiles, etc., should have a designated area away from national parks, etc., to be used because of the associated pollution, etc. Also, there is plenty of lodging and shopping; we don't need so much of it in our forests and parks.
Recession.
Send me more; I'm always eager to do surveys.
So, anything I can do?
Take the previous button off these surveys. It is a pain in the ass. I keep hitting it and going back get rid of it!
Thank you. [4]
Thank you for allowing me to be one of your surveyed persons! I enjoy it very much!
Thank you for asking me to work on this survey.
Thank you for letting me be a part of kn
Thank you for this important survey. I hope it stimulates governments and also private industries to achieve the goal of low, unseen pollution.
Thanks for the survey. It was interesting. I was unaware of air pollution problems in the parks.
Thanks for the war and poor economy, Bush!
The environment is very important to me.
The intent of the National Park System was for the government to assume the stewardship of some of

<p>America's stunning wilderness, to preserve and maintain it and protect it on behalf of the public. The primary directive is to protect and preserve these living examples of American landscape. To fail to conscientiously limit air pollution, as well as noise pollution and habitat destruction or degradation, is a woeful and serious violation of that trust. Tax dollars, and not only user fees should be used preserve them. They represent the legacy of all Americans, even those who do not choose or are unable to enjoy them, as well as of those yet unborn. They are a national trust, to be supported by the whole nation. High user fees make experiencing them out of reach for many hard working people. Visiting the parks should be possible for ALL Americans. Admission should be much less expensive than a visit to Disneyland!</p>
<p>The last question, about the most recent birthday, was a bit confusing. My birthday is in less than two weeks and I didn't know how to answer it. The way I understood it, you were referring to birthdays that have already occurred, so I answered no. I just wanted to let you know that the wording is a little confusing.</p>
<p>The people's access to national parks is one of the most precious rights we have. The parks belong to the American people and should never be deemed so precious that the people are excluded.</p>
<p>The problem with most surveys is that there is no evidence that any responses have an impact in any way.</p>
<p>Referring to the question on how much would be a maximum on spending to improve the quality of the air: it seems to me that \$5 would be a reasonable amount. Any more would be unreasonable.</p>
<p>Members of the United States Congress should be ashamed of themselves if they are not willing to provide funding to maintain our national parks. They are not just parks, they are national treasures! They should treat them as such!</p>
<p>There is NOTHING more important to me and my family than protecting our environment and animal welfare. We're willing to do whatever it takes to make that our main priority. The first step would be to IMPEACH DICKtator [sic] Cheney and the Bush puppet IMMEDIATELY! Then let's FINALLY get the GREEN party in charge or someone like Dennis Kucinich, Ralph Nader or Al Gore.</p>
<p>There would be many more visitors to the parks if our government would take action on the out-of-control oil companies and cap the price of gasoline.</p>
<p>I think the national parks are a wonderful experience and hope they maintain the balance of nature.</p>
<p>Thinking about this problem is sad to me. The federal government's policies for the park system should be a matter of much more public concern, but with all of the other pressing problems it always seems to be of less importance. I feel the majority of the population has no idea of just what the park system faces. If they were made aware with an advertising campaign there might be more public pressure on politicians to correct or, at the least, to address this issue.</p>
<p>"This survey is done by the TV/net." Is that internet? OTHERWISE I have completed a lot of surveys.</p>
<p>This was an interesting survey. [2]</p>
<p>Too many surveys of unrelated subjects are showing up under the ploy of one survey, like this one.</p>
<p>Tourist. I'm afraid the mighty dollar will.</p>
<p>Unfortunately, if the pollution was that bad we wouldn't go to that park, especially if we had to pay extra to breathe. I would, however, be willing to help alleviate the park pollution by paying a higher users fee.</p>
<p>Us having a Great Smokey National Park in. [sic]</p>
<p>Very interesting questions and topic.</p>
<p>Vote Democrat and the national parks will have a better chance.</p>
<p>We are as green as anyone can be, and I think the idea to reduce air pollution in the national parks is an excellent one. But, financially speaking, at some point, those who have ideas and interests that may involve them in this issue may have to understand that the economy, at least where we are</p>

located, is suffering extremely. To even bring up another fee or tax will, at the very least, send the population, here anyway, into a mental if not a financial depression, which we are in the pre-stages of, in my belief.
We, at home, practice very green ideals and while traveling we are always as careful as we can be. We have limited income and with all the government crap that goes on, the government should tighten its grip on consuming, practice more green and stop expecting the average American to bail everyone out. Start being responsible and start acting green with the money you have.
We consider ourselves very fortunate to live near two national parks: The great Smokey Mountains and Cumberland.
We enjoy going to national parks and monuments and have been to a majority of them across the country. They are great national treasures and need to be protected. The men and women who work there, for the most part, do a wonderful job and should be commended.
We live in the Midwest and air pollution here is not much of a problem. However, we visited Los Angeles a few years ago and could see that it is a MAJOR problem out there. What does trouble me, though, is that the automobile seems to get most of the blame when there are THOUSANDS of airliners in the sky at any point in time. These airliners discharge TONS of pollutants into the atmosphere, but little is said about it.
We love our national parks and clean air!
We want to preserve animals and their natural habitats.
What does my income, my race or the fact that I am Latino have to do with questions about pollution?
What's left of the wild to get rich off?
While I understand and appreciate the importance of a cleaner environment, the cost continues to increase. In our city, we are required to pay an additional \$2.50 per month Environmental Fee which is attached to our water bill; during the winter months we pay an additional 5 to 6 cents per gallon of gasoline, which is cleaner. It goes on and on. I would like to see these programs funded with the tax dollars we are presently paying.
Why does everything eventually get around to pollution? How many vehicles are we talking about here? Will they all be converted to the same medium? Will the surcharge end when they are all converted, or is this a never-ending tax?
Why do you not pay a little something to compensate the people who take the surveys for the time it takes to do them?
Win out if people don't stand up for.
Yes. Consider my age of 78, as stated earlier. When younger, I visited many national and state parks in Texas, California and South Dakota. I can't do that anymore. Ergo, my answers are based on THAT.