2.1.1. How to allocate limited resources with increasing demand? (6 votes)

2.1.2. Effectiveness of bear information orientation at Katmai and whether it's achieving its desired outcomes. (1 vote)

2.1.3. Visitor capacity studies to maintain targeted recreation experience objectives. (3 votes)

2.1.4. Assess NPS relationships with significant stakeholder groups (snowmobilers in Denali, air taxis in Talkeetna, private landowners in WRST) to assess level of trust in planning and management decisions. (6 votes)

2.1.5. How to manage access to allow flexibility with minimal environmental impacts? (3 votes)

2.1.6. Visitor studies to identify distinct and unique settings, conditions, characteristics, and attributes (e.g., in light of trend toward industrial recreation). (5 votes)

2.1.7. How local residents perceive visitors and vice-versa. (1 vote)

2.1.8. Evaluate interest and willingness to pay for improving access to remote areas for users, visitors, etc. (Valley of Ten Thousand Smokes, horse trails/ATV access at Wrangell-St. Elias). (4 votes)

2.1.9. Assessment of how park-specific managing partners' and service delivery partners' actions affect visitor experience and residents' quality of life. (3 votes)

2.1.10. How can park management affect gateway communities' social and economic fabric to have a positive impact? (3 votes)

2.1.11. Evaluate attitudes of commercial service providers towards NPS management (as Katmai NP currently does). (1 vote)

2.2.1. How can social and other sciences be better used in decision-making? [1 vote]

2.2.2. What are the most appropriate methods to engage local communities in discussions on their utilization of NPS resources (historic sites, wildlife, etc.)? [1 vote]

2.2.3. What are attitudes and perceptions of the NPS by native groups that have interests in and around national parks in Alaska, e.g., subsistence, traditional land uses? If these are not as hoped for, how can they be improved? [1 vote]

2.2.4. How can social science research be tailored to meet the needs of ANILCA? [3 votes]

2.2.5. What is the relationship between recreational uses and subsistence uses? [3 votes]

2.2.6. How to integrate co-management concepts/practices into overall management of Alaska parks as it relates particularly to Alaska natives? [4 votes]

2.2.7. Assessment of recreation outcomes resident and visitors expect and realize both onsite and off site from a particular site/park. [4 votes]

2.2.8. In relation to intangible values, how do wilderness/backcountry visitor experiences and opportunities for those experiences vary across the state (solitude, natural quiet, challenge, etc.)? [2 votes]

2.2.9. How to address conflicts over uses occurring within or adjacent to NPS units (recreational and non-recreational uses)? [2 votes]

2.2.10. How to facilitate a safer visit to NPS units by the aging and diversifying visitor population? [1 vote]

2.2.11. How are cultural resource management practices in national parks inclusive of Alaska natives? [1 vote]

2.2.12. How can values of solitude/unconfined recreation and freedom to explore be achieved with minimum regulation? [2 votes]

2.2.13. How to determine displacement of human users from/in parks and around parks and why? [0 votes]

2.2.14. What is the economic value (measured as willingness to pay) of alternative uses of park resources, defined broadly to include all non-consumptive uses, e.g., value as watershed, airshed, etc.? [2 votes]

2.2.15. How will research (metadata, data sets) be made available to researchers, students, and managers statewide? [0 votes]

2.2.16. How do ANILCA-permitted uses of parklands affect wilderness/backcountry values and experiences? [1 vote]

2.2.17. What processes may need to be modified within NPS regarding impacts of climate change on natural resources and communities nearby (access to Portage Glacier, community relocation)? [2 votes]

2.2.18. Are NPS employees and contractors provided adequate training on Alaska-specific issues? [1 vote]

2.2.19. (Combined with #18.)

2.2.20. What are local and regional perspectives on agency management and decisions? [0 votes]

2.2.21. Study how parks act as economic draw from outside the state, particularly international visitors (characteristics of parks). [2 votes]

2.2.22. How can park management (programs and facilities) positively affect health issues, e.g. obesity? [0 votes]

2.2.23. What are key setting variables that affect wildlife viewing experiences (Denali Road vs. Lake Clark Backcountry)? [1 vote]

2.2.24. How can NPS facilitate more interagency coordination of social science research? [5 votes]

2.2.25. How viable is tourism as a sustainable economic engine for small communities? [1 vote]

2.2.26. Research on pre-ANILCA methods of access and activities? (SEC 1110a, e.g.) [4 votes]

2.2.27. Research to update subsistence information for communities in and around parks (e.g., social networks). [0 votes]

2.2.28. What are the best methods to integrate public management with private service delivery, both in parks and surrounding areas, to maintain human environmental quality? [2 votes]

2.2.29. Assess visitor and resident travel patterns and behavior. [1 vote]

2.2.30. Study alternative methods for partitioning/allocating scarce resources, e.g. campsites. [1 vote]

2.2.24. How can NPS facilitate more interagency coordination of social science research?

Partners/players include:
     i. NPS
    ii. BIA
   iii. FWS
   iv. BLM
    v. USGS
   vi. University of Alaska
  vii. Aldo Leopold Wilderness Research Institute
 viii. Wildland Resource Center
   ix. State of Alaska
        1. Fish and Game
        2. Department of Natural Resources
        3. Community and Regional Development
    x. Native Corporations
   xi. Municipalities
Models:
   xii. ARLIS
  xiii. APLIC
A Memorandum of Understanding (MOA) needed for Federal partners

2.2.2.	DENA, GLBA
2.2.7.	KEFJ
2.2.10.	DENA, KEFJ
2.2.6.	ANIK
2.2.13.	WRST, DENA
2.2.5.	WRST, KATM, LACL, all units in the area with exception of KEFJ
2.2.23.	KATM
2.2.30.	DENA
2.2.28.	DENA
2.2.21.	DENA, WRST, KEFJ, GLBA
2.2.14.	DENA, WRST, JEFJ, GLBA (T. River)
2.2.26.	All but WRST