

Contents

Executive Summary	v	Congress Specifically for the NPS.....	19
Contents	xxix	1.7.2 Other Laws	20
Tables	xxxiii	1.7.3 NPS Regulations	21
Figures	xxxv	1.7.4 NPS Management Policies	21
Chapter 1		1.7.5 NPS Director's Orders, Handbooks, and Other Guidance Documents	22
Purpose and Need for Action	1	1.7.6 Judicial Decisions.....	24
1.1 Introduction	3	1.8 Initial Scoping Process and Public Participation	25
1.1.1 The Emerging Need to Define the Role, If Any, of the National Park Service When Research Involving Study of NPS Specimens Discovers Commercially Valuable Results	3	1.9 Issues and Impact Topics from Scoping ...	26
1.2 Background	4	1.9.1 Issues Analyzed as Impact Topics in Chapter 4.....	26
1.2.1 Changing Technologies and Their Role in the Programmatic Benefits-Sharing Proposal	4	1.9.2 Issues Not Evaluated Further in this FEIS	27
1.2.2 The National Park System's Natural Resources Invite Scientific Studies	6	Notes	31
1.2.3 Current Research in U.S. National Parks	8	Chapter 2	
1.2.4 Commercial Applications of NPS-related Research	10	Alternatives	35
1.3 Purpose and Need for a Proposal to Implement Benefits-Sharing	12	2.1 Introduction	37
1.3.1 Existing Conditions: Clarity of Rights and Responsibilities Regarding Research Results	13	2.2 NPS Policies and Procedures That Would Remain Unchanged Under Every Alternative	38
1.3.2 Existing Conditions: Science for Park Management	14	2.2.1 Prohibition of Commercial Use of Natural Products.....	38
1.4 Objectives of the Proposal and Its Alternatives	15	2.2.2 NPS Research Permit Procedures.....	39
1.4.1 Desired Future Condition: Clarity of Rights and Responsibilities Regarding Research Results	15	2.2.3 Intellectual Property Unaffected.....	39
1.4.2 Desired Future Condition: Science for Park Management.....	15	2.3 Alternative A: No Benefits-Sharing/No Action	39
1.4.3 Desired Future Condition: Research Permit Issuance Is Not Influenced By Potential Benefits-Sharing	16	2.3.1 Alternative A and the Yellowstone– Diversa CRADA	40
1.5 Benefits-Sharing by National Parks and Other Organizations	18	2.4 Alternative B: Implement Benefits-Sharing	40
1.6 Commercial Use of Research Results Discovered by Federal or Academic Scientists	18	2.4.1 Necessity for a Benefits-Sharing Agreement.....	41
1.7 Legal Framework	18	2.4.2 Procedure.....	42
1.7.1 NPS Mandates: Laws Enacted by		2.4.3 Disposition of Benefits.....	44
		2.4.4 Variations in Confidentiality: Alternatives B1, B2 and B3	44
		2.4.5 Assurances.....	46
		2.4.6 Mitigation	47
		2.4.7 Alternative B and the Yellowstone– Diversa CRADA	50
		2.5 Alternative C: Prohibit Specimen Collection for Any Commercially Related Research Purposes	50
		2.5.1 Alternative C and the Yellowstone– Diversa CRADA	52

2.6 Issues Addressed in the Alternatives	52
2.6.1 NPS Role Regarding Research Results Used for Commercial Purposes.....	53
2.6.2 Science for Park Management.....	55
2.7 Alternatives Considered But Not Analyzed Further	56
2.7.1 Prohibit Collection of Research Specimens from NPS Units.....	56
2.7.2 Prohibit Collection of Research Specimens from NPS Units by Non-Academic Researchers	56
2.7.3 Exempt Academic Researchers from Benefits-Sharing Agreements	57
2.7.4 Prohibit Any Commercial Use of Research Results Involving Study of Specimens Collected from NPS Units	57
2.8 Determination of the Environmentally Preferred Alternative.....	58
2.9 Summary of Alternatives and Effects	61
Notes.....	67

Chapter 3 Affected Environment

3.1 Introduction	73
3.2 NPS Natural Resource Management	73
3.2.1 Natural Resource Management and Science.....	74
3.2.2 Quantitative Measurements Used for Comparison of the Alternatives.....	78
3.3 NPS Visitor Experience and Enjoyment ...	79
3.3.1 Visitors and Natural Resources.....	79
3.3.2 NPS Interpretive Services.....	80
3.3.3 Interpretation for Natural Resource Management	81
3.3.4 Science in Interpretation.....	81
3.4 Social Resources: The Research Community.....	82
3.4.1 Researchers with NPS Research Permits.....	82
3.4.2 Third-Party Researchers	83
3.4.3 Research That Could Result in Commercial Application	84
3.5 Social Resources: NPS Administrative Operations.....	90
3.5.1 Administration of NPS Agreements ...	90
3.5.2 Administration of NPS Scientific Research and Collecting Permits.....	91
3.5.3 Park Units Most Likely to be Affected by Alternative B (Implement Benefits- Sharing)	91
3.5.4 Existing Administrative Resources	92

Notes.....	93
------------	----

Chapter 4 Environmental Consequences.....

4.1 Introduction	99
4.2 Methodologies for Evaluating Impacts .	100
4.2.1 Natural Resource Management	101
4.2.2 Visitor Experience and Enjoyment....	103
4.2.3 Social Resources: The Research Community	104
4.2.4 Social Resources: NPS Administrative Operations	105
4.2.5 Impairment	106
4.2.6 Cumulative Impacts.....	106
4.3 Alternative A: No Benefits-Sharing/No Action	107
4.3.1 Impacts to Natural Resource Management	107
4.3.1.6 Cumulative impact scenario.....	109
4.3.2 Impacts to Visitor Experience and Enjoyment.....	111
4.3.2.6 Cumulative impact scenario.....	112
4.3.3 Impacts to Social Resources: The Research Community	113
4.3.3.6 Cumulative impact scenario.....	114
4.3.4 Impacts to Social Resources: NPS Administrative Operations	115
4.3.4.6 Cumulative impact scenario.....	116
4.3.5 Irreversible and Irrecoverable Commitments of Resources.....	117
4.3.6 Relationship Between Short-Term Uses of the Environment and Maintenance and Enhancement of Long-Term Productivity....	117
4.3.7 Adverse Effects that Cannot be Avoided	117
4.4 Alternative B: Implement Benefits- Sharing	117
4.4.1 Possible "Benefits" in Benefits-Sharing Agreements	117
4.4.2 Impacts to Natural Resource Management	121
4.4.3 Impacts to Visitor Experience and Enjoyment.....	131
4.4.4 Impacts to Social Resources: The Research Community	134
4.4.4.6 Mitigation measures.....	136
4.4.5 Impacts to Social Resources: NPS Administrative Operations	137
4.4.5.5 Mitigation measures.....	142
4.4.6 Irreversible and Irrecoverable Commitments of Resources.....	146
4.4.7 Relationship Between Short-Term Uses of the Environment and Maintenance and	

Enhancement of Long-Term Productivity....	146
4.4.8 Adverse Effects that Cannot Be Avoided	146

**4.5 Alternative C: Prohibit Research Specimen
Collection for Any Commercially Related
Research Purposes..... 146**

4.5.1 Analysis Common to All Impact Topics	147
4.5.2 Natural Resource Management	148
4.5.3 Visitor Experience and Enjoyment....	151
4.5.4 Social Resources: The Research Community.....	152
4.5.5 Social Resources: NPS Administrative Operations	155
4.5.6 Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitments of Resources.....	157
4.5.7 Relationship Between Short-Term Uses of the Environment and Maintenance and Enhancement of Long-Term Productivity....	157
4.5.8 Adverse Effects that Cannot Be Avoided	157

Notes.....	158
------------	-----

**Chapter 5
Consultation and Coordination 161**

5.1 Introduction	163
5.1.1 History of Public Involvement	163
5.2 Responses to Comments on the Draft Benefits-Sharing EIS.....	166
5.2.1 Introduction	166
5.2.2 Overview of the comment analysis process.....	167
5.2.3 Correspondence content and response	168

Index to Comments and Responses	170
---------------------------------------	-----

5.3 Comment Summaries and Responses 175

5.3.1 Comments Regarding Legal or Procedural Matters—National Park Service Laws, Regulations, and Policies.....	175
5.3.2 Comments Regarding Legal or Procedural Matters—The Wilderness Act...	182
5.3.3 Comments Regarding Legal or Procedural Matters—The National Parks Omnibus Management Act (NPOMA).....	184
5.3.4 Comments Regarding Legal or Procedural Matters—The Federal Technology Transfer Act (FTTA)	186
5.3.5 Comments Regarding Legal or Procedural Matters—The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)	189
5.3.6 Comments Regarding Legal or Procedural Matters—Issues from the Edmonds v Babbitt Court Decisions	190

5.3.7 Correspondents Discuss “Commercial Bioprospecting”	192
5.3.8 Correspondents Support Protecting Park Resources	195
5.3.9 Correspondents Suggest NPS Units Should Be “The Commons”	198
5.3.10 Correspondents Discuss Benefits- Sharing Details	204
5.3.11 Correspondents Discuss the EIS Impact Analysis	220
5.3.12 Miscellaneous Topics	231
5.3.13 New Alternative Suggestion	232
5.3.14 EPA Comments	233
5.3.15 Government-to-Government Comments	234

Notes.....	240
------------	-----

Representative Comments	245
-------------------------------	-----

List of Preparers	336
-------------------------	-----

**Chapter 6
Glossary 339**

**Chapter 7
Bibliography 345**

**Appendix A
Example Cooperative Research and
Development Agreement (CRADA) ... 357**

Article 1. Legal Authority	361
Article 2. Definitions.....	361
Article 3. Statement of Work	366
Article 4. Reports	366
Article 5. Collaborator’s Benefits-Sharing Obligation	368
Article 6. Recognition of Contribution from [Name of Collaborating Unit of the National Park System]	369
Article 7. Patent Rights.....	369
Article 8. Copyrights	371
Article 9. Copyright Royalties	372
Article 10. Data and Publication	372
Article 11. Rights in Generated Information	374
Article 12. Termination.....	374
Article 13. Disputes.....	375
Article 14. Liability	376

Article 15. Miscellaneous Terms and Conditions	378	D.3 Analysis Methodology	442
Article 16. Duration of Agreement and Effective Date.....	380	D.4 How Scoping Comments Were Addressed.....	443
Signature Page.....	382	D.5 Initial Scoping Process and Public Involvement	444
Statement of Work	383	Notes.....	446
CRADA Appendix A	384	Appendix E	
CRADA Appendix B.....	385	Research Trends Analysis	447
Appendix B		Appendix F	
Example Material Transfer Agreement (MTA)	387	An Informal Public–Private Partnership in Service to Yellowstone Natural Resources.....	453
Appendix C		Appendix G	
Estimating Potential Monetary Benefits Under Alternative B (Implement Benefits-Sharing)	397	Background for Benefits-Sharing and Technology Transfer.....	457
C.1 Introduction.....	399	G.1 Benefits-Sharing by the U.S. Government.....	459
C.2 Monetary Benefits Types: Up-Front and Performance-Based.....	399	G.2 Benefits-Sharing Around the World	462
C.3 Monetary Benefits Timing	400	G.3 Commercial Use of Research Results Discovered by Federal or Academic Scientists.....	464
C.4 License Income Reported by Federal and Academic Research Institutions	403	Notes.....	469
C.5 Research Result Income Received by Commercial Firms.....	405	Appendix H	
C.6 CRADA Income Received by Federal Agencies	405	Supplemental Information About NPS Research Permitting.....	473
C.7 Potential Number of Agreements that Could Be Active Annually in the NPS	406	Appendix I	
C.8 Modeling Potential Monetary Benefits.....	410	Key Judicial Decisions.....	491
C.9 Summary of Potential Monetary Benefits.....	419	I.1 Introduction	493
C.10 Data and Calculations	423	I.2 What Happened in Court?	493
C.11 Comparing Estimated Monetary Benefits to Impact Thresholds	432	I.3 What Was the Effect of the Court Case?	494
Notes.....	435	<i>Edmonds Institute, et al. v. Babbitt, et al.,</i> 42 F. Supp. 2d 1 (D.D.C. 1999)	495
Appendix D		<i>Edmonds Institute, et al. v. Babbitt, et al.,</i> 93 F. Supp. 2d 63 (D.D.C. 2000)	539
Public Involvement—Scoping	439	Index	563
D.1 Introduction.....	441		
D.2 Scoping Methodology	441		

List of Tables

Table ES-1. Summary of Effects	xxv
Table ES-1. Summary of Effects, continued	xxvi
Table ES-1. Summary of Effects, continued	xxvii
Table ES-1. Summary of Effects, continued	xxviii
Table 1.2.2. National Park System acreage in each ecoregion division	8
Table 2.6. Issues Addressed in the Alternatives	52
Table 2.9-1. Comparison of Alternatives	61
Table 2.9-2. Summary of Effects	62
Table 2.9-2. Summary of Effects, continued	63
Table 2.9-2. Summary of Effects, continued	64
Table 2.9-2. Summary of Effects, continued	65
Table 3.4.3.2. Bioprospectors in NPS units, 2001	86
Table 4.2. Types and duration of impacts.....	100
Table 4.2.1. Intensity of quantitative impacts to natural resource management.....	102
Table 4.4.1. Potential benefit types and timing generated by a single CRADA	118
Table 4.4.1.2-1. Estimated range of potential monetary benefits used to analyze the impacts of a proposed NPS benefits-sharing program on individual parks other than Yellowstone	120, 421, 429
Table 4.4.1.2-2. Range of potential monetary benefits used to analyze the impacts of a proposed NPS benefits-sharing program on individual parks other than Yellowstone	121, 420
Table 4.4.2.3. All potential monetary benefits compared to the \$78 million NPS Natural Resource Challenge, FY2007.....	126
Table 4.4.2.4. Potential monetary benefits equivalent to a percentage of Yellowstone natural resource management funding level, FY2002.....	128
Table 4.4.2.5. Beneficial impacts to natural resource management at 43 representative parks.....	130
Table 4.4.5.1. Potential servicewide benefits-sharing administrative burden	138
Table 4.4.5.2. Potential Yellowstone benefits-sharing administrative burden.....	139
Table 4.4.5.3. Potential individual park benefits-sharing administrative burden (one benefits-sharing agreement)	140
Table 4.5.1. Potential consequences of Alternative C	147
Table 5.2.2. Summary of correspondence received.....	167
Table C.3.1. Average duration of CRADAs and AUTM licenses	401
Table C.4.1-1. Proportion of AUTM licenses that yielded income	404
Table C.4.1-2. Proportion of AUTM licenses that yielded royalties	404
Table C.7.1-1. NPS-related patents granted annually	407
Table C.7.1-2 NPS-related new patent applications filed annually.....	407
Table C.7.3. Number of agreements that could generate benefits	409
Table C.8.1.5. Analysis of potential annual benefits per average benefits-sharing agreement based on data reported by AUTM (Model One)	412

Table C.8.2.5. Analysis of potential annual benefits per benefits-sharing agreement based on data reported by federal laboratories and AUTM (Model Two)	414
Table C.8.3.1. Estimated market values in industrial sectors that engage in natural products research activities	415
Table C.8.3.2. Federal and academic license income greater than \$1 million	416
Table C.8.4.2. Estimated potential average annual monetary benefits of Model Two applied to a single agreement	418
Table C.8.5. Patents and assignees known to be related to study of NPS specimens, 1978–2007	419
Table C.9. Average monetary benefits per benefits-sharing agreement	419
Table C.10.1. Ratio of patent application filings to invention disclosures as reported by AUTM 1997–2006	423
Table C.10.2-1. Data reported by AUTM and used for development of Model One and Tables 10.2-2 and 10.2-3	424
Table C.10.2-2. Calculations for Model One (estimated immediate monetary benefits)	424
Table C.10.2-3. Calculations for Model One (estimated deferred monetary benefits).....	425
Table C.10.3-1. Data reported by the Department of Commerce and used for development of Model Two and Tables 10.3-2 and 10.3-3.....	426
Table C.10.3-2. Calculations for Model Two (estimated immediate monetary benefits)	427
Table C.10.3-3. Calculations for Model Two (estimated deferred monetary benefits)	428
Table C.10.4.1-1. Estimated annual average monetary benefits per agreement	430
Table C.10.4.1-2. Calculating estimated potential monetary benefits	431
Table C.11-1. Comparison of potential SERVICEWIDE monetary benefits to FY2007 Natural Resource Challenge funding	432
Table C.11-2. Comparison of potential YELLOWSTONE NATIONAL PARK monetary benefits to Yellowstone’s identified natural resource management funding level.....	432
Table C.11-3. Comparison of potential INDIVIDUAL PARK monetary benefits to each park’s natural resource management funding level	433
Table C.11-3. Comparison of potential INDIVIDUAL PARK monetary benefits to each park’s natural resource management funding level, continued	434
Table C.11-4. Number of study parks at each impact threshold (<i>n</i> = 43).....	434
Table E-1. Number of Scientific Research and Collecting Permits issued by Yellowstone, 1992–2001	450
Table E-2. Chi-square calculation, the number of Scientific Research and Collecting Permits issued by Yellowstone, 1992–2001, and 1992–1997 compared to 1998–2001	450
Table E-3. Number of research reports (IAR) submitted to Yellowstone, 1992–2001	450
Table E-4. Chi-square calculation, the number of research reports (IAR) submitted to Yellowstone, 1992–2001, and 1992–1997 compared to 1998–2001	451
Table E-5. Number of research reports (IAR) submitted to 38 parks, 1992–2001	451
Table E-6. Chi-square calculation, the number of research reports (IAR) submitted to 38 parks, 1992–2001, and 1992–1997 compared to 1998–2001	451
Table E-7. Number of research reports (IAR) submitted servicewide, 1992–2001	452
Table E-8. Chi-square calculation, the number of research reports (IAR) submitted servicewide, 1992–2001, and 1992–1997 compared to 1998–2001	452

List of Figures

Figure 1.2.2-1. National park units are spread across the United States.	7
Figure 1.2.2-2. National park units are located within every terrestrial ecoregion of the U.S.	7
Figure 1.2.3. An average of 235 parks received research reports (IARs) each year during 2001–2004.	9
Figure 1.2.4.1. Between 1978 and 2007, The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office granted at least 55 patents based upon research results related to the study of biological material originating in U.S. national parks.	11
Figure 3.2.2.1. The NPS Business Plan Initiative identified funding levels for natural resource management operations.	78
Figure 3.3.2. Millions of park visitors experienced NPS interpretive services in 2004.	80
Figure 3.4.3.2. Less than 1% of all independent researchers performing research in NPS units were declared bioprospectors in 2001.	87
Figure 3.5.4. The number of available administrative FTEs per park varies considerably.	93
Figure 4.3.1.6. In addition to a general increase in funding for research, the balance of federal funding has shifted over the last three decades in favor of the life sciences.	110
Figure 4.4.2.3-1. An NPS benefits-sharing program could generate monetary benefits that would increase over time because CRADAs would obligate researchers to make performance-based payments and such obligation would survive termination of the CRADA.	125
Figure 4.4.2.3-2. Monetary benefits could have a negligible and, in some instances, minor beneficial impacts on servicewide natural resource management.	126
Figure 4.4.2.4. The monetary benefits derived from benefits-sharing program could have a negligible short-term beneficial impact on Yellowstone natural resource management and a long-term negligible-to-major beneficial impact.	129
Figure 4.4.5.5. Research permit review procedures, Yellowstone National Park.	144
Figure C.3. A benefits-sharing agreement could generate monetary benefits during either the immediate benefits period, the deferred benefits period, both periods, or neither period.	400
Figure C.3.2. Each agreement’s obligation to provide immediate benefits would expire, but its obligation to provide performance-based payments through the 20-year FEIS analysis period would continue.	402
Figure C.8.4.1. Model One estimates that every benefits-sharing agreement could generate some income.	417
Figure C.8.4.2. Annual licensing income at academic institutions ranged from \$0 for more than half of all licenses to more than \$1 million for 0.6% of licenses in 1999–2002.	417
Figure G.3.1-1. The number of active CRADAs managed by the Department of the Interior is increasing.	465
Figure G.3.1-2. Several thousand CRADAs were active annually from 1999 through 2003.	465
Figure G.3.1-3. During the five-year period FY1999–FY2003, federal researchers reported discovering approximately 3,900 inventions (commercial applications for research results) annually.	466
Figure G.3.2-1. On average, more than 22,000 technology transfer licenses were active annually from FY1999–FY2002.	468
Figure G.3.2-2. During 1999–2002, academic researchers disclosed an average of more than 13,000 inventions (commercial applications for research results) annually.	468

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK