

SUPPORTING STATEMENT FOR PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT SUBMISSION  
FOR THE “ALTERNATIVE FUTURES FOR THE UPPER LAS VEGAS WASH” SURVEY

OMB Control Number 1004-XXXX-new

Prepared by

Richard Krannich, Ph.D.,  
James MacMahon, Ph.D.,  
Thomas Edwards, Ph.D.,  
Richard Toth, Ph.D., and  
Janis Boettinger, PhD.

Utah State University

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 Bureau of Land Management (BLM) strives to include best science in rendering management decisions. The BLM is cooperating with Utah State University to undertake a scientific study focused on a highly sensitive area called the Upper Las Vegas Wash, which is managed by the BLM and located near the city of Las Vegas, Nevada.

Information on existing urban development and its socio-demographic composition adjacent to the Upper Las Vegas Wash is necessary to assess the impacts of future development on the sensitive resources. BLM wants to better understand the interaction of the adjacent human communities with the natural environment in this area. There are important linkages between social conditions in the greater Las Vegas Metropolitan area and ecological conditions of the surrounding landscape. Ecological disturbance stemming from human interaction with the Upper Las Vegas Wash is complex and involves important relationships between proximity and spatial dispersal of local populations around the wash, use patterns, attachments, and demographic characteristics of local residents. The word *attachment* is defined here as a measure of personal connectedness that a local resident feels to the adjacent natural environment, a measure of value that a local resident places on the adjacent natural environment, and a measure of the importance of the adjacent natural environment to the quality of life of a local resident. Thus, a onetime social survey of residents who live adjacent to the Upper Las Vegas Wash is needed as part of this scientific investigation.

**Attachment A** contains the relevant sections of the following:

- National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) regulations, 40 CFR Parts 1502.22, Incomplete or Unavailable Information. Section (a) states that the agency shall obtain incomplete information that is relevant to reasonably foreseeable significant adverse impacts that are essential to a reasoned choice among alternatives.

This study will provide information so that the government can make informed decisions on resource protection, public recreation, and infrastructure development that must be analyzed through the requirements of NEPA.

- National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, Title I, Section 101, 16 U.S.C 470a(a) – National Register of Historic Places Expansion and Maintenance. Section (8) states that significant threats to properties included on the National Register shall be reviewed. The Upper Las Vegas Wash project area includes the 980-acre Tule Springs National Register Site of Historic Places.
- Federal Land Policy and Management Act, 1976, Section 102 (43 U.S.C. 1701) (a). Item (8) states as policy that public lands be managed in a manner that will protect the quality of scientific and archaeological resources. The Upper Las Vegas Wash contains rare fossil formations and sensitive plant species.

Details of this survey are provided immediately below.

**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. [Be specific. If this collection is a form or a questionnaire, every question needs to be justified.]**

The information from the social survey will be used by Utah State University, along with soils, biological, and resource damage information, in an Alternative Futures model that will predict human impacts to sensitive resources within the Upper Las Vegas Wash as adjacent development expands. The Alternative Futures model will assist the BLM with understanding the potential impacts to the landscape resulting from different land use decisions. BLM will use the information to implement effective programs that protect the Upper Las Vegas Wash.

The purpose of the information is to correlate human-caused disturbance within the Upper Las Vegas Wash (e.g., trash, illegal trails) with the characteristics of the local population. The ultimate goal is to better understand these characteristics in order to more effectively develop programs to protect the natural resources, such as public education, public outreach, signage, and law enforcement. A social survey of residents who live adjacent to the Upper Las Vegas Wash is designed to elicit from the respondents their views on activities, uses, attachments, and attitudes about protection of the Upper Las Vegas Wash environment.

The information will be collected through use of a mail survey questionnaire. **Attachment B** contains the 25 questions. Justification for each specific survey question follows, organized by topic and question number.

**Outside Cover:** Contains the title of the survey and the name of the institution conducting the survey.

**Cover Letter:** The information on the cover letter is designed to introduce the respondents with the following information: (1) the institution that is conducting the survey, and the purpose of the study; (2) that the respondent has been randomly selected to participate; (3) the general need for the survey; (4) how important this information will be in future resource management planning and decision-making; and (5) contact information.

**Instruction Page:** The information appearing on this page is designed to provide respondents with a context for understanding the purpose of the survey, the process by which sampled households and individual respondents within households are selected, and the procedures for completing and returning the questionnaire. It also provides a reminder about the anonymity of questionnaire responses, and provides survey participants with contact information for the lead social scientist responsible for conducting the survey.

**Map Attachment:** A map will be attached that shows the location and general features of the Upper Las Vegas Wash in relation to adjacent development.

**Living Near the Las Vegas Wash:** Questions #1-12. These questions are necessary to determine the extent to which respondents are familiar with the Upper Las Vegas Wash analysis area, the extent to which they participate in a variety of recreational activities and other uses of the area, their levels of concern about various activities and uses that may result in ecological damage in the area,

their views about future management of the area, and their possible future use of the area if some portions of the Wash are protected from development.

Question #1 is intended to provide a measure of whether or not any portion of the Wash analysis area is visible to respondents from their homes. Inclusion of this question will allow us to test the hypothesis that visual accessibility is associated with a higher level of awareness and concern about the quality of the Wash environment, and with a greater propensity to exhibit pro-environmental attitudes and behaviors regarding the Wash.

Question #2 through #5 provide indicators of respondents' levels of familiarity with and personal exposure to the Wash area. Question #2 asks about respondent familiarity with the area in a general sense. Question #3 asks whether or not respondents have spent any time engaged in on-the-ground activities within the Wash area during the past 12 months, and serves as a screening question to allow respondents who have not engaged in such activity to skip the next two questions. Question #4 asks those who responded affirmatively to Question #3 to indicate the specific outdoor activities they have pursued in the Wash area during the past 12 months. Question #5 asks respondents to identify which of the activities they have pursued in the Wash area is most important to them, and the frequency with which they have engaged in that activity during the past 12 months. In combination, these questions provide a basis for assessing what specific types of human use occurring within the Wash analysis area are most prevalent among residents living in neighborhoods that adjoin the area. In addition, these questions are necessary in order to test the hypothesis that residents who are more familiar with and more actively engaged in certain uses of the Wash will be more likely to exhibit pro-environmental attitudes and behaviors regarding the area than will be the case among residents who are less familiar with the area.

Questions #6 and #7 are designed to measure respondents' levels of concern about a variety of activities and uses of the Wash environment that may to varying degrees result in environmental damage. Question #6a through #6h focus on respondents' views about the appropriateness of eight different types of use and activity that are known to occur within the Wash; Questions #7a through #7h ask about the extent to which respondents are concerned about potential ecological damage that may be associated with those same activities. Inclusion of both sets of questions addresses the need to increase measurement reliability through the use of multiple questions addressing the same or similar constructs.

Question #8 asks whether the presence of the natural environment in the Upper Las Vegas Wash analysis area influenced respondents' decisions to move into the neighborhood where they currently live. This measure provides an additional means of determining the extent to which respondents place value on the Wash environment, and to test the hypothesis that those who consider that environment important are more likely to exhibit pro-environmental attitudes and behaviors regarding the area.

Questions #9a through #9g are designed to assess the extent to which respondents are likely to engage in surveillance of the Wash area and to report inappropriate activities and uses that might cause damage to the environment when those activities are observed. These questions are necessary in order to test the hypothesis that surveillance and reporting of environmentally depreciative activities will be associated with both residential proximity to the Wash area and with selected socio-demographic characteristics of residents living in neighborhoods adjoining the area.

Question #10 and Questions #11a through #11d are designed to assess respondents' views about future use and management of the Upper Las Vegas Wash analysis area. In combination, these questions provide the basis for assessing the degree to which respondents exhibit more "protectionist" or more "utilitarian" orientations toward the Wash environment. Measurement of this construct is necessary in order to test the hypothesis that pro-environmental, protectionist orientations will be associated with both residential proximity to the Wash area and with selected socio-demographic characteristics of area residents.

Questions #12a through #12h ask respondents to indicate the likelihood that they would engage in a range of outdoor recreation activities within portions of the Upper Las Vegas Wash area, if those areas were protected from future development. Inclusion of these questions will provide the BLM with a better understanding of recreational demands and public uses that would need to be considered in establishing future management plans for portions of the area that may be protected from development.

**Feelings about the Upper Las Vegas Wash:** Questions #13a through #13h are designed to measure respondents' overall levels of attachment to the environment encompassed by the Upper Las Vegas Wash analysis area. The individual items included in this series will be used to construct a composite measure of attachment to the Wash environment that provides for a higher level of measurement reliability than could be attained with any single question focusing on environmental attachment. Measurement of this construct is necessary in order to test the hypothesis that higher levels of attachment to the local environment will be associated with both residential proximity and with selected socio-demographic characteristics of residents. In addition, this measure is needed to test hypotheses that higher levels of environmental attachment will be associated with greater familiarity with and use of the Wash area, stronger pro-environmental orientations and behaviors regarding the Wash environment, and a higher propensity to engage in surveillance of the area and to sanction depreciative uses of the environment.

**Background (Demographic) Information:** Questions #14 through #25 are designed to measure selected social and demographic characteristics of survey respondents. A key premise of this research involves the expectation that the socio-demographic characteristics of people living in neighborhoods adjoining the Wash environments are related to their attitudes and behaviors regarding the Wash, and help to differentiate between those who are more likely to engage in pro-environmental as opposed to environmentally depreciative activities and uses of the area. In addition, aggregated sociodemographic measures will allow us to assess whether neighborhood-level variation in socioeconomic status is associated with measures of ecological disturbance within the Wash analysis area. Such information will provide important guidance regarding the ways in which future development surrounding the Wash area might be planned and managed in ways that could minimize ecological disturbance.

A substantial body of prior research has demonstrated that social and demographic characteristics such as sex (question #14), age (question #15), educational attainment (question #16), racial/ethnic identity (questions #23 and 24), and socioeconomic status as represented by income (question #25) are associated in various ways with environmental attitudes and levels of environmental concern. In addition, we expect residential tenure characteristics (question #17, question #18, question #19, question #20) to be associated with levels of awareness, use of, and attachment to the local environment. Household attributes pertaining to stage in life cycle and the presence of children (question #21) and individual employment status (question #22) are also likely to exhibit associations with environmental awareness, use patterns, and levels of environmental concern.

- 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 [and specifically how this collection meets GPEA requirements].**

The BLM has determined that adopting this means of information collection is not practical and we will not gather the information in an automated way.

- 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.**

This is a onetime survey specific to this study. This effort does not duplicate any other surveys administered by BLM.

- 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.**

We do not collect information on whether the respondents are small businesses or small entities. There is no likely impact on small businesses or other small entities from the collection of this information.

- 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.**

If the Federal Government does not collect these data, Utah State University will not have adequate information to construct the Alternative Futures model and, thus, will not be able to correlate human impacts on the sensitive resources of the Upper Las Vegas Wash. This will reduce the effectiveness of the BLM and other Federal actions to protect sensitive resources within the wash.

- 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 secrets, 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.**

These circumstances are not applicable to our collection of data. Ours is a onetime survey, so frequency of reporting, preparation of documents, retaining of records, and revealing of trade secrets do not apply in any way. While the mail survey implementation methodology does involve a request that respondents complete and return the questionnaire as soon as possible after the time when it is delivered to them, any respondent who wishes to have more time to complete the questionnaire will be provided with the opportunity to do so.

This is a statistical survey designed to produce valid and reliable results that can be generalized, as discussed in Part B, and using data classifications to be reviewed and approved by OMB that will involve only aggregated, grouped comparisons rather than analysis focused on individual respondents. The questionnaire includes a well-supported and appropriate pledge of anonymity for survey participants. There are no special circumstances that require the collection to be conducted in a manner inconsistent with the guidelines. We do not exceed the guidelines in 5 CFR 1320.5.

**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 in response to the PRA statement associated with the collection over the past three years] 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 recordkeeping, disclosure, or reporting format (if any), and on the data elements to be recorded, disclosed, or reported. [Please list the names, titles, addresses, and phone numbers of persons contacted.]**

**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.**

As required in 5 CFR 1320.8(d), the BLM published the 60-day notice in the Federal Register on November 21, 2006 (71 FR 67364) soliciting comments from the public and other interested parties. The comment period closed on January 22, 2007. The BLM did not receive any comments from the public in response to this notice.

**Attachment B** contains the copy of the announcement of the data collection in the Federal Register, Tuesday, November 21, 2006, page 67364. No comments were submitted in response to this listing.

In addition to the Federal Register notice, the sponsoring agency notified the following stakeholders during a public meeting held by the BLM on November 28, 2006:

Name	Affiliation
CAROL SHIMER	Archaeo Nevada Society
HELEN MORTENSON	Archaeo Nevada Society
DON WHITE	Citizens Action Committee for Tule Springs
NANCY GENTIS	Citizens Action Committee for Tule Springs
TOM PERRIGO	City of Las Vegas
RANDY FULTZ	City of Las Vegas
TUESDAY JAMES	City of Las Vegas, Office of Councilman Steve Ross
JAN SCHWEITZER	City of North Las Vegas
DON TURNER	Clark County
ROB MROWKA	Clark County
BRUCE PALMER	ENTRIX
GEOFFREY SCHAFLER	JW Zunino Associates
BILLIE YOUNG	Morse, Morse, & Young
CINDY SKROMAK	Nevada Power Company
LISA CORBETT	Nevada Power Company
ART DAVOREN	Nevada Power Company
BARBARA ADAMS	Nevada State Museum
HARRY MORTENSON	Nevada State Assemblyman
ART DIXON	Clark County Shooting Park Advisory Committee
SUE WAINSCOTT	Public
HERMI HIATT	Red Rock Audubon
TIM SUTKO	Regional Flood Control
JANE FELDMAN	Sierra Club
JULENE HAWORTH	Southern Nevada Homebuilders Association
ED DODRILL	Southern Nevada Regional Trails Partnership
JILL & TONY DESTEFANO	Sun City Aliante
DAVID BROWN	SWCA
ERIC KOSTER	SWCA
MAURICIA BACA	The Nature Conservancy
RON PORTANO	TQR Corporation/ROCUS Commercial
AMY LAVOIE	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
SHANNON RABORN	U.S. Senator Harry Reid
LAURA MEGILL	University of Nevada – Las Vegas (UNLV)
HOKWON CLTO	University of Nevada – Las Vegas (UNLV)
DEBRA JOHNSON	University of Nevada – Las Vegas (UNLV)



STEVE ROWLAND                      University of Nevada – Las Vegas (UNLV)

One comment was received as a result of the above open public meeting:

Don Turner (DTurner@co.clark.nv.us), Project Manager for the Clark County Shooting Park, stated *“If your proposed public survey will include questions regarding the recreational use of firearms, we would appreciate an opportunity for input before being distributed.”*

BLM replied, *“As far as input on the Social Survey, I [Gayle Marrs-Smith] will make sure that all the stakeholders are aware of the Federal Register Notices and public comment periods, the first of which ended January 22, 2007. Your comments are very much appreciated.”*

BLM also informed two homeowners associations near the Upper Las Vegas Wash that a social survey is proposed:

Sun City Alliante Homeowners Association (Sydney Young – [Sydney.Young@delwebb.com](mailto:Sydney.Young@delwebb.com))

Prescott Homeowners Association (Michelle Hopewell – [Michelle.Hopewell@delwebb.com](mailto:Michelle.Hopewell@delwebb.com))

Many homeowners of both associations wanted to be included in the survey. BLM explained that the survey needed to be random and objective, but that it was good for homeowners to be aware of this effort.

**9. Explain any decision to provide any payment or gift to respondents, other than remuneration of contractors or grantees.**

We do not provide payments or gifts to the respondents.

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

Respondents are assured in survey materials that their responses will remain anonymous. This includes an assurance that no personal identifying information will be included in the survey data base, and that analysis will be based solely on grouped data. Respondents are informed of this assurance on the survey instruments and in survey cover letters used during the course of the survey. No information that would allow for identification of individual respondents will be recorded as part of the project data set, and all analysis will be conducted on aggregated data rather than on data provided by any specific individual respondent. Project records that could allow identification of individual sampled households will be kept in locked storage accessible only to the Utah State University lead social scientist responsible for the social survey while data collection is underway. All records that include the names, mailing addresses, or other information that could possibly be used to identify individual survey participants will be destroyed as soon as data collection has been completed.

**11. Provide additional justification for any questions of a sensitive nature, such as sexual behavior and 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.**

There are no questions of a nature that would commonly be considered sensitive. While some socio-demographic questions such as those asking for information about age, educational attainment, and household income may be viewed by some respondents as requesting information that is generally considered private, such questions represent standard measures of socio-demographic characteristics that are hypothesized to exhibit important associations with environmental concern and behavior. The questionnaire administration procedure includes an explanation in the survey cover letter, and also in the second page of survey instructions, that participation in the survey is voluntary, that all of the information provided will remain completely anonymous, and that records containing names and mailing addresses will be destroyed as soon as data collection is complete. In particular, the second page of the survey instruction sheets states explicitly that “participation in this survey is voluntary,” that “responses will be summarized across groups of survey participants, and no individuals’ answers will be reported separately,” and that “we will keep your answers, and your name and address, anonymous to the extent permissible by law.”

**12. Provide estimates of the hour burden of the collection of information. The statement should: Indicate the number of respondents, frequency of response, annual hour burden, and an explanation of how the burden was estimated. Unless directed to do so, agencies should not conduct special surveys to obtain information on which to base hour burden estimates. Consultation with a sample (fewer than 10) of potential respondents is desirable. If the hour burden on respondents is expected to vary widely because of differences in activity, size, or complexity, show the range of estimated hour burden, and explain the reasons for the variance. Generally, estimates should not include burden hours for customary and usual business practices.**

**If this request for approval covers more than one form, provide separate hour burden estimates for each form and aggregate the hour burdens.**

**Provide estimates of annualized cost to respondents for the hour burdens for collections of information, identifying and using appropriate wage rate categories. The cost of contracting out or paying outside parties for information collection activities should not be included here. Instead, this cost should be included in Item 14.**

The estimated average number of potential respondents is 1,000;

The average number of responses is estimated to be between 500 and 600;

The average hour burden per respondent is 30 minutes;

The frequency of response is one per respondent; and

The annual reporting burden is estimated at 300 hours.

We estimate \$4,500 based on a \$15 per-hour valuation of volunteer time for an approximate aggregate cost to respondents. Burden includes the total time, effort, or financial resources expended to generate, maintain, retain, or disclose or provide the information, including: (1) reviewing instructions; (2) developing, acquiring, installing, and utilizing technology and systems for purposes of collecting, validating, verifying, processing, maintaining, disclosing, and providing information; (3) adjusting the existing ways to comply with any previously applicable instructions and requirements; (4) training personnel to respond to a collection of information; (5) searching

data sources; (6) completing and reviewing the collection of information; and (7) transmitting or otherwise disclosing information.

**13. Provide an estimate of the total annual [non-hour] cost burden to respondents or recordkeepers resulting from the collection of information. (Do not include the cost of any hour burden shown in Items 12 and 14).**

**\*The cost estimate 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. The estimates should take into account costs associated with generating, maintaining, and disclosing or providing the information [including filing fees paid]. Include descriptions of methods used to estimate major cost factors including system and technology acquisition, expected useful life of capital equipment, the discount rate(s), and the time period over which costs will be incurred. Capital and start-up costs include, among other items, preparations for collecting information such as purchasing computers and software; monitoring, sampling, drilling and testing equipment; and record storage facilities.**

**\*If cost estimates are expected to vary widely, agencies should present ranges of cost burdens and explain the reasons for the variance. The cost of purchasing or contracting out information collection services should be a part of this cost burden estimate. In developing cost burden estimates, agencies may consult with a sample of respondents (fewer than 10), utilize the 60-day pre-OMB submission public comment process and use existing economic or regulatory impact analysis associated with the rulemaking containing the information collection, as appropriate.**

**\*Generally, estimates should not include purchases of equipment or services, or portions thereof, made: (1) prior to October 1, 1995, (2) to achieve regulatory compliance with requirements not associated with the information collection, (3) for reasons other than to provide information or keep records for the Government, or (4) as part of customary and usual business or private practices.**

This survey is part of a scientific study by Utah State University under a Cooperative Ecosystem Study Unit agreement with the BLM. We have identified no reporting and recordkeeping “non-hour cost” burdens associated with this proposed collection of information. There are no capital and start-up cost, operation, and maintenance. The budget for Utah State for the social survey includes an estimated \$2,500 for questionnaire printing and \$4,000 for postage, along with salary and benefits for the lead social scientist who is co-principal investigator on the project and a graduate research assistant. The BLM does not charge a filing fee for survey responses.

**14. Provide estimates of annualized cost to the Federal Government. Also, provide a description of the method used to estimate cost, which should include quantification of hours, operational expenses (such as equipment, overhead, printing, and support staff), and any other expense that would not have been incurred without this collection of information. Agencies also may aggregate cost estimates from Items 12, 13, and 14 in a single table.**

We estimate \$69,784 for processing and analysis as the cost to the Federal Government for the Upper Las Vegas Wash social survey. This includes 2.5 months of salary coverage and associated benefits for the lead social scientist who is directing the survey activity, 24 months of salary

coverage and associated benefits for a graduate research assistant, \$6,500 as estimated printing and postage costs, and \$1,000 in part-time student wages associated with survey mailing and processing.

**15. Explain the reasons for any program changes or adjustments.**

This is a new collection.

**16. For collections of information whose results will be published, outline plans for tabulation and publication. Address any complex analytical techniques that will be used. Provide the time schedule for the entire project, including beginning and ending dates of the collection of information, completion of report, publication dates, and other actions.**

Responses to survey questions will be coded into digital format and entered for computerized data analysis. Analytic techniques will include common statistical procedures such as bivariate correlation and multivariate linear and logistic regression procedures. Analysis will include examination of relationships that may exist among the sociological variables measured through survey procedures (e.g., associations between individual socio-demographic characteristics and patterns of familiarity with or use of the Las Vegas Wash setting), as well as relationships between sociological variables and measures documenting bio-physical conditions within the study area (e.g., associations between the aggregate socio-demographic characteristics of specific neighborhoods and measures of environmental disturbance in particular areas within the Wash environment).

Selection of a representative sample of residential households in the designated transect areas adjoining the Upper Las Vegas Wash study area will occur during December 2007. Collection of survey data is expected to begin no later than January 2008, with all mail survey data collection activities to be completed by March 31, 2008. Data coding and data entry will be completed by April 30, 2008. Analysis and preparation of project reports to be submitted to the Bureau of Land Management will occur through the remainder of 2008, with the final project report scheduled for completion in December 2008. These dates may require adjustment if final OMB approval of the survey is accomplished later than December 15, 2007. Preparation of scientific papers for conference presentation and for submission to peer-reviewed scientific journals will proceed concurrent with preparation of project reports.

**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.**

We will display the OMB expiration date on the information collection instruments.

**18. Explain each exception to the certification statement identified in Item 19, "Certification for Paperwork Reduction Act Submissions."**

There are no exceptions to the certification statement.

**ATTACHMENT A**

SECTIONS FROM

40 CFR PARTS 1502.22- NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT;

16 U.S.C. 470a(a), NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT, 1966; and

43 U.S.C. 1701(a) – FEDERAL LAND POLICY AND MANAGMEENT ACT, 1976  
RELEVANT TO THE “ALTERNATIVE FUTURES OF THE UPPER LAS VEGAS WASH  
SURVEY”

To be conducted by Utah State University

Sponsored by the U.S. Department of the Interior

**NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT (NEPA), 40 CFR PARTS 1502.22,  
INCOMPLETE OR UNAVAILABLE INFORMATION.**

When an agency is evaluating reasonably foreseeable significant adverse effects on the human environment in an environmental impact statement and there is incomplete or unavailable information, the agency shall always make clear that such information is lacking.

**(a)** If the incomplete information relevant to reasonably foreseeable significant adverse impacts is essential to a reasoned choice among alternatives and the overall costs of obtaining it are not exorbitant, the agency shall include the information in the environmental impact statement.

**NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT, Title I, Section 101, 16 U.S.C. 470a(a)  
NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES, EXPANSION AND MAINTENANCE**

- (a)** **(8)** The Secretary shall, at least once every 4 years, in consultation with the Council and with State Historic Preservation Officers, review significant threats to properties included in, or eligible for inclusion on, the National Register, in order to –
- (A) determine the kinds of properties that may be threatened;
  - (B) ascertain the causes of the threats; and
  - (C) develop and submit to the President and Congress recommendations for appropriate action.

**43 U.S.C. 1701(a) – FEDERAL LAND POLICY AND MANAGMENT ACT, 1976,  
DECLARATION OF POLICY**

**Section 102 (43 U.S.C. 1701) (a)** The Congress declares that it is the policy of the United States that -

(8) the public lands be managed in a manner that will protect the quality of scientific, scenic, historical, ecological, environmental, air, and atmospheric, water resources, and archeological values; that, where appropriate, will preserve and protect certain public lands in their natural condition; that will provide food and habitat for fish and wildlife and domestic animals; and that will provide for outdoor recreation and human occupancy and use;

