

The Supporting Statement for OMB 0596-0110
NATIONAL VISITOR USE MONITORING
2007

A. Justification

- 1. Explain the circumstances that make the collection of information necessary. Identify any legal or administrative requirements that necessitate the collection. Attach a copy of the appropriate section of each statute and regulation mandating or authorizing the collection of information.**

Statutes and Regulations:

- National Forest Management Act (16 USC § 1600-1614)
- Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 (GPRA), (Public Law 103-62)
- Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act (SNPLMA), (Public Law 105-263)
- National Trails System Act (16 USC § 1241-1251)

This request is for extension and revision of Forest Service information collection 0596-0110 - National Visitor Use Monitoring (NVUM) survey. The NVUM sampling protocol and survey instrument specifically estimate the number of visits that occur on lands in the National Forest System (NFS).

Recreation is one of the key outputs identified in the Forest Service's strategic plan and in the **National Forest Management Act**. Credible science-based estimates of recreation visitation on National Forests are critical elements of agency performance reporting and resource planning. The NVUM program develops estimates for each National Forest of the number of National Forest Visits.¹ In addition, estimates are made of the number of visitors who drive roads adjacent to or through National Forests to view forest scenery, but who never actually set foot on agency lands. Such corridors can include non-Forest Service roads, rivers, and users of cruise ships.

The **Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 (GPRA)** requires that Federal agencies establish measurable goals and monitor their success at meeting those goals. Two specific performance elements for the Forest Service are (1) the quantity of recreation visitation to the National Forest System (NFS), including Wilderness Areas managed by the agency, and (2) the level of customer satisfaction with recreation opportunities. The NVUM specifically addresses these needs.

On an annual basis, the Forest Service is required to report to Congress on the agency's effectiveness in utilizing appropriated funds. An important element of that report is the number of visits to National Forests and Grasslands, as well as to Wilderness Areas that the agency manages. The NVUM survey provides the data needed for tracking the agency's progress for a number of elements in the

¹ National Forest Visits, defined as "the entry and exit of one person onto a National Forest for the purpose of recreation."

Forest Service's Performance Accountability Rating Tool (PART) documentation. The elements and programs using information from this collection include:

- Percent of recreation customers satisfied with outdoor recreation services and facilities provided in a sustainable managed setting (Recreation),
- Percent of NFS visitors participating in outdoor based physical activities (Recreation),
- Cost per visitor contact (Recreation),
- Cost per visitor at developed and recreation fee sites (Recreation),
- Customer satisfaction with value for fee paid (Recreation),
- Racial mix of recreation visitors (Civil Rights),
- Percent of recreation visitors satisfied with the perception of safety (Law Enforcement).

Finally, NVUM results and data are an essential information source in addressing forestland management planning, facility master planning, regional- and local-level agency-mandated business planning, national strategic planning, Civil Rights issues regarding service to minorities, and identification of individual forest recreation niches.

This request also includes extension of the NVUM survey protocol to several Department of Interior agencies. First, during CY2007, the National Park Service (NPS), Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), and Bureau of Land Management (BLM) want to apply the NVUM process to their lands in Clarke County, Nevada. The goal is to obtain reliable, defensible, and mutually comparable (both among themselves and with Forest Service lands in that county which were sampled in FY2005) estimates of visitation volume and characteristics, in support of the **Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act (SNPLMA)**.

Second, the BLM wants to continue its testing of NVUM as a means for obtaining agency-wide visitation data. That test will extend to four field offices in both FY2008 and FY2009.

Finally, the Forest Service and National Park Service are cooperating to estimate visitation volume to the Appalachian Trail. As identified in **the National Trails System Act**, the NPS and FS cooperatively manage the Appalachian National Scenic Trail (AT).

The AT has been in existence for over 75 years and has never had a science-based calculation of trail user volume. The Appalachian Trail Conservancy (formerly Conference) determined in the 1970s by non-scientific means that 3-4 million visits occur annually.

Acquisition of protected lands for the AT has cost of over 150 million dollars. Annual operations cost taxpayers \$1.5 million annually. The AT crosses 14 states, 8 National Forests, 6 National Park Service units, 1 National Wildlife Refuge, and about 6 dozen state park and forest units. It is the best-known national trail in the United States, with hundreds of access points.

Visitor counts are necessary for key Government Performance and Results Act

(GPRA) measures. Without an accurate visitor count, the Appalachian Trail Park Office cannot report mandatory performance measures related to improving park safety. The intent is to obtain a statistically valid and cost effective count of annual AT visits. Following the NVUM protocol will meet this objective. A secondary objective is to identify and test the accuracy of proxy and index count estimation procedures from a combination of trail counters, traffic counters, and parking lot counts in estimating annual visits. The project involves a pilot test of the NVUM method on a section of the AT in FY2007, with full implementation beginning in FY2009.

2. Indicate how, by whom, and for what purpose the information is to be used. Except for a new collection, indicate the actual use the agency has made of the information received from the current collection.

- a. What information will be collected - reported or recorded? (If there are pieces of information that are especially burdensome in the collection, a specific explanation should be provided.)**
- b. From whom will the information be collected? If there are different respondent categories (e.g., loan applicant versus a bank versus an appraiser), each should be described along with the type of collection activity that applies.**

Table 1 (response to items a and b)

Information	Collected from
Visit purpose, Home zip code or home country	All respondents
Visit characteristics (duration, # sites visited, activity participation, lodging types used, travel distance, trip purpose, overall satisfaction, group size)	Respondents whose recreation visits ended that day
Personal information (Annual forest visit rate, Race, Age, Gender)	Respondents whose recreation visit ended that day
Calibration information for visitation proxy measures	Recreation visits ending that day at sites collecting proxy measures
Satisfaction / importance of facilities and services, crowding evaluation, disability reporting	1/3 of respondents whose recreation visit ended that day
Economic information (Trip spending, income, Substitute site) and facility usage	1/3 of respondents whose recreation visit ended that day
Region 6 addendum on recreation experiences	1/3 of respondents in Washington and Oregon whose recreation visit ended that day
Region 10 addendum on economic spending	1/3 of respondents in Alaska whose recreation visit ended that day

c. What will this information be used for - provide ALL uses?

Visit purpose, group size, and proxy calibration information are used to estimate the volume of recreation visits annually to each sampling unit (national forest, BLM field office, FWS refuge, or NPS unit), and to determine the expansion weights for each recreation response.

Unit-level visitation estimates assist in land management and strategic planning. For example, NVUM results describe the existing condition and project the desired future conditions in Land and Resource Management Plans and Revisions for the Shawnee National Forest (NF), Beaverhead and Deerlodge NF, and Hoosier NF. 'Visitation estimates' is one of three components used in allocating the National Engineering Road Maintenance

Budget, and one of seven components in allocating the National Recreation Budget. National reports of visitation volume and visit characteristics to Wilderness developed because one sampling stratum targets these lands. Estimates of average visits per day have been used to prorate visitation across large geographic subunits of national forests (examples include both the Spring Mountains National Recreation Area and the Chatooga River basin).

Individual information used to generate summary reports for each sampling unit includes demographics, activity participation, visit duration, annual use rates, satisfaction and importance, facility usage, characteristics of Wilderness users, and perceptions of crowding. These summary reports are published on the NVUM web site² and provide basic information used in unit-level planning documents. Aggregations are used for regional and national reporting, including civil rights, law enforcement, and PART reporting. These are the type of reports expected from the DOI agencies employing the NVUM protocols.

Lodging usage, visit duration, and travel distance define the primary segments for visitor spending and estimate the share of visitation in each segment. Trip spending information assists in estimating average spending per visit within segments; combining numbers of visits in each segment by its average spending yields estimates of the total spending by visitors, which in turn allow estimates of economic impact of recreation.

Overlaying segment shares with participation in wildlife-related activities provides estimates of economic contribution of that program. Much of the work on spending segment and spending profiles goes into the Forest Service's Forest Economic Analysis Support Tool (FEAST), and into economic impact modeling.

Annual visitation rates combined with other individual data estimates recreation demand models. Results of the models assist in estimating net economic values and projecting visitation changes stemming from anticipated population changes. These results are useful in forest planning, recreation facility master planning, and in agency strategic planning and economic analysis. An example of this work is in:

Bowker, J.M., D.B.K. English, J.C. Bergstrom, C.M. Starbuck. Valuing National Forest Recreation Access: Using a Stratified On-Site Sample to Generate Values across Regions and Activities. American Agricultural Economics Association Annual Meeting. **Selected Paper**, Providence, RI, July 24-27, 2005.

Travel distance information identifies the primary geographic market served by the forest. Comparing the activity mix of those visits with the overall recreation participation by the same population, helps define the forest's recreation niche. Linking usage rates for developed sites that have visitation proxy measures with operating cost information for the same sites enables computation of cost and supply curves for economic analysis. This

² www.fs.fed.us/recreation/programs/nvum

information is critical in the Recreation Site Facility Master Planning process and has been used by the Apache-Sitgreaves, Mendocino, Lolo, San Juan, and Willamette National Forests, as well as several others. It also provided critical information used in the Recreation Strategy for the Arapaho-Roosevelt and Pawnee National Grassland plan (2003).

Descriptions of the subset of visits engaged in selected activities, such as off-highway vehicle use or downhill skiing, have enabled development of reports describing that visit subpopulation. Expectations are that similar subsets will be developed for users of particular facilities or resources, including interpretive centers or scenic byways.

Results of maps of respondent ZIP codes and responses to visit purpose questions provide engineering staff with data to evaluate and better understand the variety of uses made of the forest road system.

In the Pacific Northwest Region, also known as Forest Service Region 6 (Washington and Oregon), recreation staff seek additional information about visitors experiences and motivation for recreating on a particular forest or at a specific site. This information has proven to be critically important to FS resource managers in identifying the niche of a particular forest and managing the recreation opportunities on the forest with that niche in mind. Understanding visitors' motivations and experiences can also provide resource managers with stakeholder (interested public) input when making critical decisions related to the Facility Master Planning process. A set of questions addressing recreation experience and motivation will be added to the one-third of the surveys that has neither economic or satisfaction questions.

Forest Service Region 10 (Alaska) intends to add a series of questions on the analogous subset of survey respondents, to (1) better estimate the economic contribution of recreation within the Region and to (2) more specifically address forest plan recreation monitoring requirements in the Chugach and Tongass National Forests. Current sources of this information are limited and do not fully meet the needs described above. However, this information could easily be collected through the existing NVUM program. Although some research has been conducted on the economic contribution of tourism, less has been done to estimate resident spending associated with the two National Forests. The additional questions will also assist the Region 10 Forests in addressing their forest plan monitoring requirements, specifically those that track the effectiveness of forest plan direction in meeting the demand for recreation opportunities on the forests. A systematic and probabilistic approach to this monitoring is desired and NVUM is the only existing program of this type available. Failure to develop this information will handicap recreation and forest planning efforts. In addition, the monitoring is required under the 1982 planning regulations.

The joint NPS/FS Appalachian Trail (AT) Study involves a pilot test of the NVUM method on a section of the AT in FY2007, with full implementation beginning in FY2009. The index estimator would be developed by relating car counts at parking lots to the NVUM-type visitation estimate at each of the

141 sampled site days along the AT pilot study area. (See Part B, item 1, for additional information.)

Information from this collection is shared with Forest Service scientists whose research examine a variety of recreation topics including: minority participation in outdoor recreation, components of visitor satisfaction, recreation and Wilderness demand, spending patterns and economic impacts of recreation on public lands, and Wilderness use and users. Data and results have been shared with students wishing to use them for academic papers. A list of these would include:

- Kristy Mazcko, Ph. D. dissertation, Colorado State University, 2006
- Eric White, Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 2005
- Scott Gruber, Senior Thesis, Princeton University, 2002

NVUM data and results have been used in several recreation resource textbooks, including:

- Wilderness Management. John Hendee and Chad Dawson, SUNY-ESF University, Syracuse NY
- Bowker, J.M., Harvard, J.E. III, J.C. Bergstrom, H.K. Cordell, D.B.K. English, and J.B. Loomis. "The Net Economic Value of Wilderness." In: Cordell, Bergstrom, Bowker, eds. **The Multiple Values of Wilderness**, State College, PA: Venture Publishing, 2005, pp.161-180

d. How will the information be collected (e.g., forms, non-forms, electronically, face-to-face, over the phone, over the Internet)? Does the respondent have multiple options for providing the information? If so, what are they?

Nearly all information will be collected through face-to-face onsite interviews. The only exceptions are for interviews days scheduled at remote cabins where prior reservations are needed, such as in Alaska. There, in order to reduce agency staff and travel costs, interviews are conducted by phone within a week after the scheduled use of the cabin. Fewer than 250 of the total annual interviews for this program are conducted by phone.

e. How frequently will the information be collected?

National Forest sampling occurs on a five-year cycle. That is, surveys occur on about 20 percent of all forests in a given year, and surveys occur on each forest at least once every five years. Sampling occurs on about 0.01 percent of the visits to any forest.

f. Will the information be shared with any other organizations inside or outside USDA or the government?

Yes. Once analysis is complete, case weights that expand the sample to the population of National Forest recreation visits are attached to each individual recreation response. This dataset is available to university researchers, government scientists, or others who request it, so that they can perform their own analyses. Summary reports describing the visit population at forest, regional, and national levels are publicly available over the internet.

Upon completion of sampling year and development of reports, data are migrated into the agency's corporate information system; an application allows agency staff to construct queries of the data and generate tabular reports. Upon completion of analysis and reporting, each DOI agency will receive a copy of the information collected on its lands.

g. If this is an ongoing collection, how have the collection requirements changed over time?

The collection has changed to add surveys for the Department of the Interior, Alaskan cruise ships, and the Appalachian Trail pilot study. Some questions moved to different sections of the survey instrument. In addition, interviewers record responses from those who are completing their visit at the time of the contact, as well as those who will be completing a visit during the sample day.

3. Describe whether, and to what extent, the collection of information involves the use of automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g. permitting electronic submission of responses, and the basis for the decision for adopting this means of collection. Also describe any consideration of using information technology to reduce burden.

Presently, interviewers record responses on optically scannable paper forms. Costs have thus far precluded use of electronic field-data collection techniques. Testing of field-data recorders for interviewers is ongoing through the Forest Service San Dimas (CA) Technology and Development Center. This testing will first examine recorder performance under adverse field conditions, and then will examine reporting and data submission issues. A limited pilot test may occur within the time of this collection period.

4. Describe efforts to identify duplication. Show specifically why any similar information already available cannot be used or modified for use for the purposes described in Item 2 above.

The NVUM program represents the only large-scale effort of the partner agencies for concurrently monitoring visitation volume, and describing salient characteristics of those visits. No other agency-wide process for obtaining statistically valid descriptions of the full set of visitors or estimates of visitation exists. No previous collection instrument has attempted this level of statistical sampling at this scale. NVUM fills a critical void for the Forest Service. Credible estimates of current levels and trends in recreation visitation data at the Forest, Region, and National levels are crucial for planning, policy making, and reporting purposes.

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

The NVUM program does not conduct interviews with small businesses or other small entities. Only information that small businesses, such as outfitters and campground concessionaires, already supply to the Forest Service through other means is part of the visitation estimation process.

6. Describe the consequence to Federal program or policy activities if the collection is not conducted or is conducted less frequently, as well as any technical or legal obstacles to reducing burden.

This NVUM, as designed, meets the Agency's reporting and monitoring needs for a number of GRPA and other Congressional reporting requirements. NVUM collects data that are critical ingredients in planning and business decisions at all levels of the agency including forest-level land management planning, regional and forest-level agency business planning, regional and national master planning for facilities management, and regional and national strategic planning. The agency's commitment to customer service, its accountability, its credibility with partners, and its budget appropriations are all dependent on current and accurate recreation use data. Data on recreation use trends, values, and local economic impacts are all part of Forest plans, national and regional strategic plans, and agency rural development programs. Information on the number of customers is essential to any business plan.

Sample sizes for the NVUM meet targeted goals of statistical accuracy. Reducing sample sizes would prevent the agency from reaching those statistical goals. Spreading data collection across more fiscal years (i.e. reducing the frequency of data collection on any Forest) would prevent accurate reporting by the Forest Service for Congressional and GPRA purposes; reduce ability to track trends in visitation patterns accurately; and negatively affect the timing of data collection for optimal use in forest planning. Inability to implement NVUM would prevent the Forest Service from meeting the specific GPRA reporting requirements that pertain to recreation and Wilderness use, customer satisfaction, and service to minorities.

For DOI agency use of the NVUM protocols, not conducting this collection would leave them with no viable or timely alternative for meeting the requirements of the SNPLMA and GPRA requirements to obtain visitation and tourism estimates they need.

7. Explain any special circumstances that would cause an information collection to be conducted in a manner:

- **Requiring respondents to report information to the agency more often than quarterly;**
- **Requiring respondents to prepare a written response to a collection of information in fewer than 30 days after receipt of it;**
- **Requiring respondents to submit more than an original and two copies of any document;**
- **Requiring respondents to retain records, other than health, medical, government contract, grant-in-aid, or tax records for more than three years;**
- **In connection with a statistical survey, that is not designed to produce valid and reliable results that can be generalized to the universe of study;**
- **Requiring the use of a statistical data classification that has not**

been reviewed and approved by OMB;

- **That includes a pledge of confidentiality that is not supported by authority established in statute or regulation, that is not supported by disclosure and data security policies that are consistent with the pledge, or which unnecessarily impedes sharing of data with other agencies for compatible confidential use; or**
- **Requiring respondents to submit proprietary trade secret, or other confidential information unless the agency can demonstrate that it has instituted procedures to protect the information's confidentiality to the extent permitted by law.**

There are no special circumstances. The collection of information is conducted in a manner consistent with the guidelines in 5 CFR 1320.6.

- 8. If applicable, provide a copy and identify the date and page number of publication in the Federal Register of the agency's notice, required by 5 CFR 1320.8 (d), soliciting comments on the information collection prior to submission to OMB. Summarize public comments received in response to that notice and describe actions taken by the agency in response to these comments. Specifically address comments received on cost and hour burden.**

Publication in the Federal Register of the notice of the agency's intent to revise and extend this collection occurred on 8/11/2006 (71 FR 46184-46185). No comments were received in response to the notice.

Describe efforts to consult with persons outside the agency to obtain their views on the availability of data, frequency of collection, the clarity of instructions and record keeping, disclosure, or reporting format (if any), and on the data elements to be recorded, disclosed, or reported.

Over the last 12-15 months, consultations have occurred by phone, email, and in meetings with the following individuals about sampling procedures, data elements, instructions, and data availability with regard to this collection:

- Dr. Robert Burns, West Virginia University, (304) 293-2941, ext. 2416
- Dr. Alan Graefe, Penn State University, (814) 863-8986
- Dr. Daniel Stynes, Michigan State University (emeritus), (517)353-9881

All three have research emphases and extensive experience in surveying recreation users of public lands. All three use the data from this collection in their research. All three have been consulted multiple times, and each has been solicited for recommendations regarding existing survey questions.

Consultation with representatives of those from whom information is to be obtained or those who must compile records should occur at least once every 3 years even if the collection of information activity is the same as in prior periods. There may be circumstances that may preclude consultation in a specific situation. These circumstances should be explained.

There are no record compilations in connection with this collection. It would be very difficult to *ex ante* identify those individuals who would be surveyed through this collection. Information is obtained from individuals who visit a forest on a randomly selected set of dates, locations, and times. As well, on a particular day and location, a random sample of people who are exiting the forest are encouraged to participate, although participation is voluntary. It is also very difficult to *ex post* identify or contact those individuals who do participate. No names, addresses, or phone numbers are collected from the persons who are interviewed.

Questions in all sections of the survey have been pre-tested in earlier collection approval periods, and are reviewed by field staff for clarity. As part of the NVUM quality control, all involved forests participate in end-of-sample-year closeout interviews. During the closeout interview, forest staff members verify the average length of time it took to complete an on-site interview. As well, staff members who performed field interviews identify any sets of questions that were difficult or overly time consuming for respondents to answer. The ongoing quality review and improvement process incorporates the feedback received at the closeout interviews.

9. Explain any decision to provide any payment or gift to respondents, other than re-enumeration of contractors or grantees.

No payments or gifts are made to any respondents.

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

The names and addresses of respondents are not collected. Personal questions (i.e., questions about income levels and ethnicity) are shared with respondents in writing (laminated card) and individuals respond by saying or pointing to a number associated with the appropriate response. Information that might be used to try to identify particular individuals is limited to reported 10-year age categories, race and/or ethnicity, gender, and reported home ZIPCODE.

Respondents are also presented with another laminated card that contains the following message: *“According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, an agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 0596-0110. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 10 minutes per response.”*

11. Provide additional justification for any questions of a sensitive nature, such as sexual behavior or attitudes, religious beliefs, and other matters that are commonly considered private. This justification should include the reasons why the agency considers the questions necessary, the specific uses to be made of the information, the explanation to be given to persons from whom the information is requested, and any steps to be taken to obtain their consent.

Interviewers do not ask questions of such a private nature. The surveys focus on the purpose of an individual’s visit, their recreation behavior during the visit,

their level of satisfaction about services provided by the agency, and expenditures in the local economy during the visit. Individuals may withhold their age, race, gender, home ZIP code, annual household income or trip-related expenditures on recreation.

12. Provide estimates of the hour burden of the collection of information. Indicate the number of respondents, frequency of response, annual hour burden, and an explanation of how the burden was estimated.

- **Indicate the number of respondents, frequency of response, annual hour burden, and an explanation of how the burden was estimated. If this request for approval covers more than one form, provide separate hour burden estimates for each form.**
 - a) Description of the collection activity**
 - b) Corresponding form number (if applicable)**
 - c) Number of respondents**
 - d) Number of responses annually per respondent,**
 - e) Total annual responses (columns c x d)**
 - f) Estimated hours per response**
 - g) Total annual burden hours (columns e x f)**

Table 2 – Estimates of Hourly Burden

(a) Description of the Collection Activity	(b) Form Number	(c) Number of Respondents	(d) Number of responses annually per Respondent	(e) Total annual responses (c x d)	(f) Estimate of Burden Hours per response	(g) Total Annual Burden Hours (e x f)
FS, Basic Survey, English version	N/A	15200	1	54,900	.1442 ³	7,916.58 or 7,917
FS, Basic Survey, English version, with R6 addendum	N/A	2000	1			
FS, Basic Survey, English version, with R10 addendum	N/A	300	1			
FS, Economics Survey, English version	N/A	17500	1			
FS, Satisfaction Survey, English, version	N/A	17500	1			
FS, Basic Survey, Spanish version	N/A	400	1			
FS, Economics Survey, Spanish version	N/A	400	1			
FS, Satisfaction Survey, Spanish Version	N/A	400	1			
FS, Alaska cruise ship version	N/A	400	1			
FS, Viewing Corridor survey	N/A	800	1			
DOI Southern NV, Basic Survey (CY2007 only)	N/A	4,000 ⁴	1	12,000	0.1458 ⁵	1,750
DOI Southern NV, Economics Survey (CY2007 only)	N/A					
DOI, Southern NV, Satisfaction Survey (CY2007 only)	N/A					
BLM, Basic Survey (FY2008 and 2009 only)	N/A	8,000 ⁶	1			
BLM, Economics Survey (FY 2008 and 2009 only)	N/A					
BLM, Satisfaction Survey (FY2008 and 2009 only)	N/A					
FS / NPS , Appalachian Trail project	N/A	3000	1	3,000	0.083	249
Totals	---	69,900	---	69.900	---	9,916

- Record keeping burden should be addressed separately and should include columns for:

a) Description of record keeping activity: None

b) Number of record keepers: None

c) Annual hours per record keeper: None

d) Total annual record keeping hours (columns b x c): Zero

3 Calculations: 0.125 hrs (FS Basic Survey, English) + (4 x .154 hrs [FS Basic Survey, English with R6, R10, Economics, or Satisfaction addendum]) + .167 (FS Basic Survey, Spanish) + (2 x .217 [FS Basic Survey, Spanish with Economics or Satisfaction addendum]) + 0.050 (FS Alaska Cruise survey) + 0.050 (FS Viewing Corridor Survey) = .1442 hours per response

4 Of the 4,000 respondents, 1/3 will be given basic survey, 1/3 economic survey, and 1/3 satisfaction survey

5 Calculations: 0.125 hrs (BLM Basic Survey) + (5 x .15 [other DOI surveys]) = .875/6 surveys = .1458 hr or 8.75 minutes per response

6 Of the 8,000 respondents, 1/3 will be given basic survey, 1/3 economic survey, and 1/3 satisfaction survey

- **Provide estimates of annualized cost to respondents for the hour burdens for collections of information, identifying and using appropriate wage rate categories.**

Table 3 - Estimates of annualized cost to respondents

(a) Description of the Collection Activity	(b) Estimated Total Annual Burden on Respondents (Hours)	(c) Estimated Average Income per Hour	(d) Estimated Cost to Respondents
FS, Basic Survey, English version	7,917	\$6.67	\$52,806.39
FS, Basic Survey, English version, and R6 addendum			
FS, Basic Survey, English version, and R10 addendum			
FS, Economics Survey, English version			
FS, Satisfaction Survey, English, version			
FS, Basic Survey, Spanish version			
FS, Economics Survey, Spanish version			
FS, Satisfaction Survey, Spanish Version			
FS, Alaska cruise ship version			
FS, Viewing Corridor survey			
DOI Southern NV, Basic Survey (CY2007 only)	1,750	\$6.67	\$11,672.50
DOI Southern NV, Economics Survey (CY2007 only)			
DOI, Southern NV, Satisfaction Survey (CY2007 only)			
BLM, Basic Survey (FY2008 and 2009 only)			
BLM, Economics Survey (FY 2008 and 2009 only)			
BLM, Satisfaction Survey (FY2008 and 2009 only)	249	\$6.67	\$1,660.83
FS / NPS Appalachian Trail Survey			
Totals	9,916	---	\$66,139.72

The annualized costs to respondents can be determined by the opportunity cost of the time they spend completing the survey. The National Compensation Survey (Bulletin 2581, August 2006) from the Bureau of Labor Statistics indicates an average hourly wage of \$18.62 per hour for US workers in June of 2005. We use a rate of \$20 per hour to allow for rising wages during the period covered in this collection. In studies of the net economic value of outdoor recreation, standard practice is to value participant time at one-third of the wage rate. For this collection, burden costs are approximately \$6.67 per hour.

- 13. Provide estimates of the total annual cost burden to respondents or record keepers resulting from the collection of information, (do not include the cost of any hour burden shown in items 12 and 14). The cost estimates should be split into two components: (a) a total capital and start-up cost component annualized over its expected useful life, and (b) a total operation and maintenance and purchase of services component.**

There are no capital operation and maintenance costs.

14. Provide estimates of annualized cost to the Federal government. Provide a description of the method used to estimate cost and any other expense that would not have been incurred without this collection of information.

The response to this question covers the actual costs the agency will incur as a result of implementing the information collection. The estimate should cover the entire life cycle of the collection and include costs, if applicable, for:

Employee labor and materials for developing, printing, storing forms

Employee labor and materials for developing computer systems, screens, or reports to support the collection

Employee travel costs

Cost of contractor services or other reimbursements to individuals or organizations assisting in the collection of information

Employee labor and materials for collecting the information

Employee labor and materials for analyzing, evaluating, summarizing, and/or reporting on the collected information

The NVUM program is part of the Forest Service's inventory and monitoring efforts. The agency allocates about \$2.5 million per year to cover all aspects of the training, supply purchases, on-site data collection, data entry and cleaning, and analysis.

Costs for the DOI agency collection are borne by those agencies. Assuming their costs will be similar to those of the Forest Service, the estimated cost per year would be about \$275,000 for these agencies.

Therefore the total estimated cost for this information collection is \$2,500,000 (Forest Service) + \$275,000 (DOI) = \$2,775,000.

15. Explain the reasons for any program changes or adjustments reported in items 13 or 14 of OMB form 83-I.

There has been a slight increase in the number of respondents per year from about 65,400 to 69,900. The increase reflects collaboration with DOI agencies who wish to use this collection to obtain estimates of recreation visitation, and FS entities who want to increase sampling intensity to better estimate their own visitation patterns and visitor characteristics.

16. For collections of information whose results are planned to be published, outline plans for tabulation and publication.

The primary outputs of results from this collection are in unit-level, regional, and national tabulations of results that are published on-line, on the NVUM website (www.fs.fed.us/recreation/programs/nvum). Results of research publications based on the NVUM data are published in various conference proceedings, and in research journal articles. A partial list of scientific publications, reports, and

presentations includes:

- Bowker, J.M., D. Murphy, H.K. Cordell, D.B.K. English, J.C. Bergstrom, C.M. Starbuck, C.J. Betz, G.T. Green. "Wilderness and Primitive Area Recreation Participation and Consumption: An Examination of Demographic and Spatial Factors." **Journal of Agricultural and Applied Economics** 38 (2006):317-326.
- Bowker, J.M., D.B.K. English, J. Harvard, P. Reed. Toward a value for recreation on Alaskas National Forests. **Selected Presentation**, Southeastern Recreation Research Conference, Charleston, SC, February 8-10, 2004.
- Bowker, J.M., D.B.K. English, S.J. Zarnoch, P.Reed, J.Harvard. Access Value on Alaskas National Forests: Weighting for the Correct Surplus. **Offered Presentation**, Joint Canadian Agricultural Economics Society and Northeastern Agricultural and Resource Economics Association Annual Meeting, Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada, June 20-23, 2004.
- Starbuck, C.M., J.M. Bowker, D.B.K. English, J.C. Bergstrom. "Estimating Travel Cost Demand Models for National Forest Recreation: An Examination of Dependent Variable Dispersion, Grouping, and Functional Form." **Offered Presentation**, Camp Resources Annual Meeting, Wilmington, NC, August 16-18, 2004.
- Starbuck, C.M., J.C. Bergstrom, D.B.K.English, J. M. Bowker. "Valuing National Forest Recreation Access: A Look Across Regions and Activities." **Offered Presentation**, 27th Annual Southeastern Recreation Research Conference. Savannah, Georgia, February 27-March 1, 2005.
- Bowker, J.M., D.B.K. English, J.C. Bergstrom, C.M. Starbuck. Valuing National Forest Recreation Access: Using a Stratified On-Site Sample to Generate Values across Regions and Activities. American Agricultural Economics Association Annual Meeting. **Selected Paper**, Providence, RI, July 24-27, 2005.
- Bowker, J.M., D.B.K. English, J.C. Bergstrom, C.M. Starbuck. "National Forest Recreation Access: Do You Really Get What You Pay For?" **Invited Presentation**, University of Georgia, Warnell School of Forest Resources, September 8, 2005.
- Bowker, J.M., C.M. Starbuck, D.B.K. English, J.C. Bergstrom, J. Harvard. "Estimating the Value of Recreation Access to U.S. National Forest Wilderness." **Poster Presentation**. 8th World Wilderness Congress, Anchorage, AK, October 1-6, 2005.
- Stynes, D.J.,White E.M. and Leefers, L.A. 2003. Spending profiles of National Forest Visitors: Years 2000 and 2001. Report to USDA Forest Service. East Lansing, MI: Department of Park, Recreation and Tourism Resources. Michigan State University. USDA FS and MSU Joint Venture Agreement No. 01-JV-11130149-203. 62 p.
- Stynes, D., E. White, L. Leefers, and J.M. Vasievich. 2003. Applying National Visitor Use Monitoring data to forest planning in the Eastern Region. Poster

presented at the 2003 USDA FS Region 9 planning workshop, Minneapolis, MN

- White, E., D. Stynes, and L. Leefers. 2004. Spending by recreation visitors to USDA National Forests. Presentation at the 2004 joint meeting of the Midwest Forest Economists and Midwest Forest Mensurationists, Grand Rapids, MI.
- Stynes, D.J. and White E. 2004. Spending profiles of National Forest Visitors; 2002 Update. Report to USDA Forest Service. East Lansing, MI: Department of Park, Recreation and Tourism Resources. Michigan State University. USDA FS and MSU Joint Venture Agreement No. 01-JV-11130149-203. 46p.
- Stynes, D.J. and White E. 2005. Effects of Changes in the FY2003 NVUM Instrument and Development of National Forest Visitor Spending Profiles for Lodging-based Segments. Report to USDA Forest Service. East Lansing, MI: Department of Park, Recreation and Tourism Resources. Michigan State University. USDA FS and MSU Joint Venture Agreement No. 01-JV-11130149-203. 35 p.
- Stynes, D.J. and White E. 2005. Spending profiles of National Forest Visitors, four-year report. Report to USDA Forest Service. East Lansing, MI: Department of Park, Recreation and Tourism Resources. Michigan State University. USDA FS and MSU Joint Venture Agreement No. 01-JV-11130149-203. 44 p.
- White, E. 2005. National Visitor Use Monitoring Visitor Spending Profiles. Presentation at USDA FS IMPLAN/FEAST Forest Planning Workshop, Ft. Collins, CO.
- Stynes, D. and E. White. 2006. Reflections on measuring recreation and travel spending. *Journal of Travel Research*. 45(1): 8 - 16.
- English, D.B.K., S. J. Zarnoch, and S.M Kocis. Designing a Sampling System for Concurrently measuring Outdoor Recreation Visitation and Describing Visitor Characteristics. In: *Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Monitoring and Management of Visitor Flows in Recreational and Protected Areas*. Rovaniemi, Finland, June 2004.
- Kocis, S.M., S. J. Zarnoch, and D.B.K. English. Effects of Road Sign Wording on Visitor Survey Non-response Bias. In: *Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Monitoring and Management of Visitor Flows in Recreational and Protected Areas*. Rovaniemi, Finland, June 2004.
- Zarnoch, S.J., D.B.K. English, and S.M. Kocis. A Model for Evaluating Outdoor Recreation Use Estimation. In: *Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Monitoring and Management of Visitor Flows in Recreational and Protected Areas*. Rovaniemi, Finland, June 2004.

17. If seeking approval to not display the expiration date for OMB approval of the information collection, explain the reasons that display would be inappropriate.

The OMB expiration date is displayed on each form.

18. Explain each exception to the certification statement identified in