The Supporting Statement for OMB 0596-NEW

Public Attitudes, Beliefs, and Values About National Forest Systems Land Management

February 2007

Addendum (3/27/2007): Based on OMB review and changes to the survey instruments, only one survey instrument will be used instead of two as originally proposed. Other than this change, the survey methodology will remain the same. Modifications made to item A-12 reflect this change, as well as a reduction in burden hours due to modifications of the survey instrument per OMB instructions.

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.

The purpose of this survey is to provide national forest land managers and planners with scientifically credible information from a broad and diverse representation of the public, as well as from specific stakeholder groups. Information collected will focus on the attitudes, beliefs and values that people have for public land and public land use, and how public land management affects those values. Such information is critical for planning and implementing public policy related to national forests in the Southwestern Region (Region 3) of the Forest Service.

Legal authority for information collection in support of the forest plan revision process in Region 3 comes from several sources:

- The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4321-4347)
- National Forest Management Act (NFMA) of 1976, as amended (NFMA) (16 U.S.C. 1600)
- The 2005 NFMA Planning Rule (36 CFR, Part 219) – This Rule is directly relevant to the proposed survey. The entire Federal Register notice of the new rule is relevant. The "Overview of the Final 2004 Rule"[1] clearly implies the importance of the information to be collected under this proposal.

While social science and economic analyses are not explicitly mentioned in very many places, their use and relevance is implied in many places in natural resource management related legislation. Social science and economics can provide information about public values and expectations that need to be incorporated into the planning and decision making process. Further, social science and economics can provide qualitative and quantitative metrics with which management alternatives and agency performance can be evaluated.

[1] Federal Register, Vol. 70, No. 3, pages 1024-1030, January 5, 2005

The National Environmental Protection Act of 1969[2] and the National Forest Management Act of 1976[3] provide the background and context in which the 2005 NFMA Planning Rule was developed and written. The Acts talk about natural resource management in general and management of the national forests in particular. The Acts emphasize multiple uses; balancing the supply and demand for natural resources and resource outputs; enhancing the quality of renewable resources; and preserving important historic, cultural, and natural aspects of our national heritage. They emphasize utilizing a systematic, interdisciplinary approach that will ensure the integrated use of the natural and social sciences and the environmental design arts in planning and in decision-making. The Acts also talk about and provide for public participation in the decision making process.

Public participation is achieved by providing opportunities for the public to make known their expectations and objectives for public land management, and their preferences regarding the means of accomplishing those objectives. The spirit of the Acts is for broad and diverse segments of the public to participate in the natural resource decision-making process.

Broad and diverse representation of public opinion can achieved by providing credible information on the ways that people actually use public land, how they want to use public lands, and what they expect from management of public lands. Accurate representation of the public can provide input that is focused on issues and questions about which managers need to make decisions.

The intended effects of the 2005 NFMA Planning Rule,

> "are to streamline and improve the planning process by making plans more adaptable to changes in social, economic, and environmental conditions; to strengthen the role of science in planning; to strengthen collaborative relationships with the public and other government entities; and to reaffirm the principles of sustainable management consistent with the Multiple-Use Sustained-Yield Act and other authorities."

The intent of the Planning Rule is to involve the public at all stages in the planning process. To do that, the Forest Service must contact broad groups of people and collect specific and scientifically credible information regarding their values, attitudes, objectives, and preferences related to national forests/grasslands and national forest/grassland management. This proposed survey will provide rigorous and scientifically credible data on public values and expectations regarding national forests/grasslands and national forest/grassland management and planning.

The knowledge gained from analyzing such data will provide planners and managers with broad-based input on the public's objectives for national forest/grassland use and management. The results of this study will show the public's desire for outputs of national forests/grasslands. It will illuminate

[2] As amended
[3] Ibid

individuals' preferences about tradeoffs that are necessary between scarce resources and achievement of management objectives.

Such information, and its incorporation into the plan revision process, will provide the base from which increased collaboration with the public, as envisioned by the Planning Rule, can take place and build over time. Data collected with these survey instruments will also provide a baseline from which to monitor and evaluate changes in social and economic conditions over time. Recognizing and evaluating such changes is an essential component of adapting management plans to changing conditions.

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.)**

      Information will be collected on attitudes, beliefs, and values that people have for public land and public land use; how those attitudes, beliefs, and values are affected by public land management; and acceptable tradeoffs in developing alternative management plans. This information is critical to planning and implementing public policy related to national forests in the Southwestern Region.

   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.**

      Information will be collected from: (1) a stratified random sample of the public within the administrative boundaries of the Forest Service Southwestern Region (Arizona, New Mexico, and a few counties in Texas and Oklahoma); (2) a stratified random sample of the general population around two selected national forests in Arizona and two selected national forests in New Mexico. The sampling plan is described under Section B, Question 1.

      Information collected will be summarized, analyzed, and reported to Forest Service managers and planners. Results will be presented in a form in which they can be applied by land managers and planners to inform the planning and decision making process, in particular to the Southwestern Region forest plan revision process. Analyses will be done cooperatively by the project team, comprised of research scientists at the Rocky Mountain Research Station and faculty members and graduate students at the University of New Mexico, Department of Economics.

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

The information will inform managers and planners regarding public values, objectives, and expectations regarding management of the national forests and grasslands in the Southwestern Region. Beyond the forest plan revision process, the information will be used in project planning and evaluation. Further, results of this information collection will be used by other national forests and grasslands to inform the planning process in other regions.

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?

This information collection contains a split-sample treatment utilizing two versions of the survey. The first[4] is a region-wide survey to be administered to the public in Forest Service Region 3. Region 3 is comprised of New Mexico, Arizona, and a few counties in Texas and Oklahoma. The anticipated usable sample size for this survey is 16,150. This survey will be split by response mode. One group will receive a traditional mail survey utilizing a mail-back response and the other group will be offered the option of responding electronically using a web-based survey. If the web-based survey group does not exercise that option, they can respond via a mail-back survey.

The second survey[5] will be administered to the general population in areas specifically adjacent to four national forests (two in New Mexico, two in Arizona). The anticipated sample size for this test survey is 513 usable observations on each of the four forests. Each forest will have both a mail-back response version and a web-based electronic response option version.[6] If they do not exercise that option, they can respond via a mail-back survey.

The table below summarizes the anticipated responses from each survey and response mode:

Item	Type of Survey / Response Mode	Anticipated Number of Responses	Total Number of Responses Anticipated
Region-wide Survey (distributed to random sample of entire Region 3 general population)	Initial mail contact. Mail-back response.	8,075	16,150
	Initial mail contact. Option for web-based electronic response; otherwise mail-back response.	8,075	
Test Survey (distributed to random samples of the general populations adjacent to each of 4 national forests)	Initial mail contact. Mail-back response.	2,026	4,052
	Initial mail contact. Option for web-based electronic response; otherwise mail-	2,026	

[4] Region-wide Survey or R3_Regionwide_0506.doc (e-filename)
[5] Test Survey or R3_Test_0506.doc (e-filename)
[6] 4 forests X 2 response modes X 513 responses; 4052 responses

	back response.		

This methodology will allow us to make comparisons between the “mail-only” and “mail plus online” response options for surveys. This methodology will help determine the validity of using online surveys for USDA Forest Service planning, and evaluate the use of online response option surveys for future Forest Service applications.

The proposed survey versions are identical, except for one aspect. The Test Survey:

- Deletes the entire (seventh) Section entitled “Addressing Threats to Southwestern Region Forests and Grasslands,” and
- Adds a new Q1, which contains the full set of Values statements from the *Value, Objectives, Beliefs, and Attitudes* (VOBA) module of the *National Survey of Recreation and the Environment*, to the Test Survey’s (second) section entitled *Management of National Forests and Grasslands*.

The National Survey of Recreation and the Environment (NSRE) is related to the information collected here, but is not sufficient to meet the needs of the Region 3 National Forests. The NSRE is a telephone-based national survey designed to collect general information about recreation behaviors and demographics. As a nationwide, random sample survey, a greater number of responses are collected from more highly populated areas than from less highly populated areas in Arizona and New Mexico.

As with other nationwide surveys using random sampling, the sample sizes are too small to allow statistically valid analysis and interpretation at the state level, let alone the sub-state levels at which national forest planners need information. Those applications (for which this proposed information collection was designed) require specific and detailed information about how individuals and groups in the public think about actual and potential uses of National Forests and Grasslands at sub-state levels corresponding to areas adjacent to specific National Forests and Grasslands.

The split sample treatment involving the “Region-wide” and “Test” surveys will allow analysts to test the relative explanatory power of people’s values versus that of the choices contained in the region-wide version, as they relate to preferences for national forest and grassland management. These results will be important for guiding future information collections as far as what type of information provides managers and planners with the most relevant and useful information.

Though sampling is discussed in Part B Question 1, some information about sampling is helpful here for understanding who receives these different surveys and treatments. The region-wide survey will be administered to a stratified random sample of the public in the whole of Region 3. The test survey will be administered to stratified random samples of the general public in (4) areas specifically adjacent to four national forests. The relevant populations for the test survey are (geographic) subsets of the population for the region-wide survey. Filters will be used to ensure no duplication between samples—no one will receive more than one survey. Within both the region-wide survey and the test survey, random samples will be drawn large enough for both the mail-back response treatment and the web-based electronic response option treatment. Those large samples (for both the region-wide and test surveys) will then be randomly split between the two response modes (mail-back and mail plus electronic response option). In that way, we will maximize the likelihood that the samples for the two response mode treatments are identical and ensure that no one receives more than one survey.

e. How frequently will the information be collected?

This is a one-time information collection.

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

Information collected with this survey will be analyzed and published in internal agency reports; *Agency Publication Series*; and in peer-reviewed scientific and management journals. Standard Forest Service procedures for review and approval of analyses and reports will be followed. Timeframes for publication are planned over a 1 – 4 year time span from the date of data collection. Copies of all survey project reports will be archived at the Rocky Mountain Research Station. Additionally, information pertaining to specific national forest/grassland plan revisions will be maintained in the project administrative record files associated with that national forest/grassland plan. The raw data will be maintained with all identifying information removed to ensure anonymity of respondents. Those raw data will be in the public domain and available under the Freedom of Information Act.

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

Not applicable, this is a new collection.

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.

Many in the field of public data collection are looking at web-based survey methodologies as the “wave of the future.” Such methodologies appear to have substantial benefits as far as information collection costs and the speed and accuracy with which data can be entered into a database ready for analysis. One drawback to web-based surveys is the issue that not all segments of the population have access to, or are comfortable with, the computer technology necessary to respond to web-based surveys. That leads to potentially non-representative samples; a serious problem when the need is for information from a representative sample of the public. This survey effort will design identical survey instruments. One will be used as a traditional mail back survey. The other will be put onto a website. The sample contacted for the web-based survey will be encouraged to respond online to the web-based survey. Those choosing not to respond online will be asked to respond to the survey as a mail back survey. This procedure will allow us to test the willingness of the public to respond to a web-based survey and allow us to compare data collected in the web-based survey to data collected using a traditional mail back survey. It will also allow us to make cost comparisons between the two methodologies.

These findings will have implications for future surveys proposed by the Forest Service. Results and findings from these surveys will be reported to, and broadly distributed among, National Forest System planning staffs. Further, they will be incorporated into Forest Service training modules related to social analysis and decision-making.

A 50 percent response rate is expected for this survey.

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.

Searches of literature and consultations with peers were conducted. The results indicate, to the best of our knowledge, that no surveys are in existence that collect similar information at the scale needed by the Southwestern Region national forests. Additionally, no such surveys have been conducted in recent years.

5. If the collection of information impacts small businesses or other small entities (Item 5 of OMB Form 83-I), describe any methods used to minimize burden.

This information collection will not affect small businesses or other small entities. The sample frame consists of individuals. Further, the voluntary nature of response to the survey will be made clear to everyone contacted.

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.

Consequences of not having these data for managerial planning are extensive. Substantial funds are commonly spent on public land management with only one source of information about the users—the assumptions of the project planners. Sometimes those assumptions are data based. In many instances, however, up-to-date data regarding forest visitors, potential visitors, and residents of communities near national forests/grasslands are not available for units of the National Forest System.

This data collection effort is designed to supply the desired information for forest planning, management, and budgeting decisions. Forest Plans can be revised, and projects and programs can be planned and designed, using rigorous and reliable information from the publics they are seeking to serve. Often, feedback to managers comes from a vocal few who represent their own interests, or the interests of a specific user group, to the exclusion of the interests of other, potentially conflicting uses.

Data collected with this survey will be from a representative sample of the public at several levels, i.e., Southwestern Region wide, state wide, and from sub-state areas adjacent to each national forest and grassland in the Southwestern Region.

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.

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.

Notice was published in the Federal Register on July 24, 2006 (vol. 71, no. 141, p. 41758) soliciting comments on the information collection. One comment was received in response to this notice. A copy of the notice and the comment are included in this package.

The comment received did not address cost or hour burden; it raised a concern that particular groups within the general population were being excluded from consideration. No specific action was taken in response to the comment. The comment underscores the need for management agencies to seek information from all groups within the general population and not exclude any group. Our only response is to use a statistically representative and valid sample of the public in the Southwestern Region. That was the plan even before the comment was received, as is described under Section B, Question 1.

Preliminary planning for the project that includes the current survey included presentations and discussions at various professional conferences and symposia, including the 2005 International Symposium on Society and Resource Management, among others. The primary focus at these professional meetings was the framework providing the conceptual foundation for this collaboration between social scientists and natural resource managers. Open discussions among all participants occurred in which no documents or set questions were presented. In the course of those discussions, methodological issues related to the need for and the best ways to collect the types of information proposed here were raised and discussed among professional peers. In addition, the Forest Service social scientists and managers involved in this effort made contacts with several contractors and university cooperators with extensive experience and expertise in survey development, testing, implementation, evaluation, analysis, and reporting.

- Dr. Robert Berrens, University of New Mexico, rberrens@unm.edu
- Dr. Jennifer Thacher, University of New Mexico, jthacher@unm.edu
- Dr. Mark Brunson, Utah State University, mark.brunson@usu.edu
- Dr. Dale Blahna, Utah State University, blahna@cc.usu.edu
- Dr Gene Theodori, Texas A&M University, g-theodori@tamu.edu
- Ms. SuzAnne Miller, Dunrovin Research, dunrovin@bigsky.net

All the above-mentioned scientists provided input and feedback on various methodological issues. Dr. Berrens and Dr. Thacher, in particular, are serving as cooperators on the complete process of sample and survey design, implementation, analysis, and reporting. Dr. Deborah Shields, USDA Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station, provided input on questionnaire design, including a select set of questions on values, objectives, beliefs and attitudes, which comprises a module of the National Survey on Recreation and the Environment (NSRE). Dr. Richard Periman, USDA Forest Service, Southwestern Region, provided reviews on all phases of the survey design and sampling plan.

Further, statistical consulting and review related to design, sampling, and analysis is/has been available as needed from the Rocky Mountain Research Station, Statistical Support Group, as well as elsewhere in the Forest Service organization.

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 such circumstances.

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

Respondents to the survey proposed here will not receive any gratuity for completing a questionnaire.

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

The information provided by respondents is reported only in tabulated form, as is the standard procedure for surveys of this type. Names and addresses are kept temporarily for the purpose of follow-up contact to improve response rates; upon completion of data collection, names and addresses will be deleted from all files.

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.

No sensitive questions are asked. The only potentially sensitive questions are in the demographics section. These include income, age, and other commonly asked demographic questions. Responses to these questions will be used only in categorizing people for the purpose of understanding and interpreting responses to other questions.

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 and aggregate the hour burdens in Item 13 of OMB Form 83-I.**

  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)

Updated (3/27/2007): Based on OMB review and changes to the survey instruments, only one survey instrument will be used instead of two as originally proposed. Other than this change, the survey methodology will remain the same. Modifications made to item A-12 reflect this change, as well as a reduction in burden hours due to modifications of the survey instrument per OMB instructions. Based on changes made under OMB instruction, the estimated time for completion of the survey is 20 minutes.

Burden hours were estimated based on previous experience with survey instruments of the type and scope used here, and from feedback from reviewers who filled out the questionnaire as part of their review—Forest Service and University of New Mexico employees.

Although the complete survey estimates 20,202 total responses, in order to achieve this response rate, it is speculated that contact attempts will have to be made to more than 40,000 names.

The sampling plan for the region-wide effort calls for 8,075 completed questionnaires in the mail-back group and 8,075 completed questionnaires in the web-based electronic option group. The test-sampling plan, as alluded to in item A-2, calls for 4,052 completed questionnaires for the test described in item 2, (2,026 in the mail back group and 2,026 in the web-based electronic option group). The estimated time required to complete the questionnaire is 20 minutes per response. We plan to conduct brief telephone contacts with approximately 200 non-respondents as part of testing for non-response bias. Burden hours for those non-respondents' surveys will be less than 20 minutes, but we have included them in the region-wide and test survey groups. Hence, we estimate 6,734 burden hours to complete the questionnaire (20,202 total responses at 20 minutes each).

Table 12-1 (updated 3/27/2007)

(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)
Region-wide survey	NA	16,150	1	20,202	0.333	6,734
Test survey		4,052				
Totals	---	20,202	---	20,202	---	6,734

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

Table 12-2

(a) Description of record keeping activity	(b) Number of Record keepers	(c) Annual hours per record keeper	(d) Total annual record keeping hours (b x c)
No record keeping required			
Totals	zero	---	zero

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

Updated 3/27/2007:

Participation in the survey is voluntary. Responses will require no data collection, record keeping, or calculation of complex numbers by respondents. Respondents will participate only during their leisure time; therefore, there is no real economic cost to them for participating. The only cost is that of a short amount (estimated to average 20 minutes) of individual respondents' time. Because questionnaires will be filled out during respondents' non-work time, we estimate the opportunity cost of time to be $5 per respondent (20 minutes at $15 per hour). On average, we believe our estimate of $15 per hour is generous. Aggregated over 20,202 respondents, total opportunity cost of time is estimated to be $101,010.

Table 12-3 (Updated 3/27/2007)

(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**
Region-wide survey	5,383	$15	$ 80,745
Test survey	1,351	$15	$ 20,265
Totals	6,734	---	$101,010

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.

No record keeping is required. Capital, start-up, operation, and maintenance costs are zero.

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

There are no additional fixed costs related to this request. The social scientists and managers involved are currently Forest Service employees. Efforts under this program are consistent with their ongoing assignments. The estimated total cost of those efforts is $122,872 for one year:

- 50 percent time for 1 GS-14 scientist,
- 25 percent time for 1 GS-13 scientist,
- 5 percent time for each of 13 GS-12 (average) forest level planners,
- 5 percent time for each of two GS-12 regional level planning staff.

Estimated travel costs associated with this project are $5,000.

Additional variable costs for this program are the costs of data collection, estimated to be $15 per respondent (which extrapolates to $303,030 in total). That cost will come from the operating budgets of the Forest Service units involved. Funds for this effort are included among those already allocated for Forest Plan Revision in the Southwestern Region.

Total estimated annual cost to the Federal government is $430,902.

15. Explain the reasons for any program changes or adjustments reported in Items 13 or 14 of the OMB Form 83-1.

This is a new collection. No program changes or adjustments are required.

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

Information collected with this survey will be analyzed and published in internal agency reports, Agency Publication Series and in peer-reviewed scientific and management journals. Standard Forest Service procedures for review and approval of analyses and reports will be followed. Timeframes for publication are planned over a 1 – 4 year time span from the date of data collection. Copies of all survey project reports will be archived at the Rocky Mountain Research Station. Additionally, information pertaining to specific national forest/grassland plan revisions will be maintained in the project administrative record files associated with that national forest/grassland plan.

Standard methods of analysis will be used as are common in the social science and economic literature. Such statistical methods as frequencies cross tabulation and contingency tables, regression, factor analysis, cluster analysis, and discriminate analysis will be used as appropriate to individual data items and groups of items.

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 expiration date will be displayed.

18. Explain each exception to the certification statement identified on Form 83-I "Certification Requirement for Paperwork Reduction Act."

No exceptions to the certification statement are expected for surveys administered under this Request for Approval.