

The Supporting Statement for OMB 0596-0110

NATIONAL VISITOR USE MONITORING

2010

Note: This request is for the revision and extension the National Visitor Use Monitoring (NVUM) survey and the continued use of NVUM by Department of Interior agencies.

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)

The USDA Forest Service requests the continuation and revision of the of the National Visitor Use Monitoring (NVUM) survey. The NVUM sampling protocol and survey instrument are designed to estimate the number of individuals who visit lands in the National Forest System (NFS). Additionally, the Forest Service requests the continuation of the collection and use of NVUM by Department of Interior agencies. In the previous submission, a Joint NPS/FS Appalachian Trail Study was piloted. The test is complete, and final results have been developed. No further application is being considered at this time.

Forest Service

Recreation is a key output 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 provided by this collection are critical elements of Agency performance reporting, budgeting, and resource planning. The NVUM data is used to track the Agency's progress for the Forest Service's Performance Accountability Rating Tool (PART) documentation. The **Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 (GPRA)** requires that Federal Agencies establish measurable goals and monitor their success at meeting those goals. Also, the information collected is used when the Forest Service reports to Congress regarding the Agency's effectiveness in utilizing appropriated funds.

The collection addresses two specific performance elements for the Forest Service: (1) the quantity of recreation visitation to the National Forest System, including Wilderness Areas managed by the agency, and (2) the level of customer satisfaction with recreation opportunities. Also NVUM results and data are a source of data and information in addressing forest land 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 a forest's recreation niche.

Department of Interior Agencies

The Department of Interior agencies desire to utilize NVUM. First, during FY2011, 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 at the same time that the Forest Service collected recreation visitation data on its lands in that area. The goal is to obtain reliable, defensible, and mutually comparable estimates of visitation volume and characteristics, in support of the **Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act (SNPLMA)**. Second, the BLM has finished its testing and is expected to begin using NVUM in FY 2011 as a means for obtaining agency-wide visitation data.

- 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 country	• All respondents
• Visit characteristics (duration, # sites visited, activity participation, lodging types used, travel distance, trip purpose, overall satisfaction, and 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	• 1/3 of respondents in Alaska

spending	whose recreation visit ended that day
----------	---------------------------------------

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

Visitation Purpose Estimates

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.

National Visitation Estimates

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).

Summary Reports

Summary reports for each sampling unit are generated from individual information, including demographics, activity participation, visit duration, annual use rates, satisfaction and importance, facility usage, characteristics of Wilderness users, and perceptions of crowding. These reports are published on the NVUM web site (www.fs.fed.us/recreation/programs/nvum), and provide basic information used in unit-level planning documents. Aggregations of these are used for regional and national reporting, including civil rights, law enforcement, and PART reporting. These sorts of reports are expected from the DOI agencies employing the NVUM protocols.

Economic Spending, Resource Usage, and Local Contribution

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 impacts (jobs and GDP supported) of recreation. A key metric for the Secretary of Agriculture is how Department programs contribute to the welfare of rural communities.

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.

The Alaskan Region, also known as 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 (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. It would be easy to collect this information through the existing NVUM program. While research on the economic contribution of tourism has been conducted, less has been done to estimate resident spending associated with the two National Forests. The additional questions will also assist the Forests in addressing forest plan monitoring requirements, specifically those that track the effectiveness of forest plan direction in meeting the demand for recreation opportunities on the forests. The desire is for a systematic and probabilistic approach to this monitoring 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.

Visitor Demand Models

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.

Visitors Travel Data

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 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.

Forest Road Systems

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.

Visitor Experience Information

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.

Primary and Secondary Data for Forest Service and Academic Research

Information from this collection is used by the Forest Service scientists whose research examines 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.

In the past, students have used data and results in academic papers, these 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

Several recreation resource textbooks have used NVUM data and results, 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?

Majority of the information collected will be face-to-face onsite interviews. The only exceptions are interviews scheduled at remote cabins where prior reservations from the public are needed, such as in Alaska. To reduce agency staff and travel costs, interviews will be conducted by phone within a week after the scheduled use of the cabin. Fewer than 250 of the total

annual interviews for this program will be 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?

Once the data collection 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. Also, 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 requirements have changed very little over time. Some questions have moved to different sections of the survey instrument. Responses describing the recreation visit are now obtained from those who will be completing their visit during the sample day, not just those who are completing their visit at the time of initial contact. No changes to the currently approved survey instrument are presented in this approval extension.

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.

For the present, interviewing is performed recording responses on optically scannable paper forms. Costs have thus far precluded use of electronic field data collection techniques. The project for testing the electronic data recorders was not selected for funding. The project proposal is being updated and will be resubmitted during this collection approval period.

Testing of field data recorders for interviewers is ongoing through the Forest Service San Dimas (CA) Technology and Development Center. This testing will 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, pending approval of funding for the test.

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.

The notice of the Agency's intent to extend this collection was published in the Federal Register on 4/10/2009 (74 FR 16349-16350). Only one comment was received in response to this publication of notice, either by FAX, telephone, e-mail, letter, or personal communication. The comment did not provide substantive commentary on this collection only their personal frustration with the US Federal government.

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

Dr. Troy Hall, University of Idaho, 208 - 885 - 9455

All four have research emphases and extensive experience in surveying recreation users of public lands. All four use the data from this collection in their research. All four 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 that are done in connection with this collection. It would be impossible 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, the set of people who are exiting the forest who are encouraged to participate is also a random sample. Participation is voluntary. It is also very difficult to ex post identify or contact those individuals who decline to participate or follow-up with those 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, end-of-sample-year close-out interviews with all involved forests are conducted. Within that close-out interview, forest staff members are asked to verify that the average length of time it took to complete an on-site interview. As well, staff members who performed field interviews are asked to identify any sets of questions that were difficult or overly time consuming for respondents to answer. Results from the close-out interviews are built into the ongoing quality review and improvement process.

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

Responses are voluntary and 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

(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		15200	1	15,200	0.122	1,854
FS, Basic Survey, English version, with R6 addendum		2000	1	2,000	0.154	308
FS, Basic Survey, English version, with R10 addendum		300	1	300	0.154	46
FS, Economics Survey, English version		17500	1	17,500	0.154	2,695
FS, Satisfaction Survey, English, version		17500	1	17,500	0.154	2,695
FS, Basic Survey, Spanish version		400	1	400	0.167	67
FS, Economics Survey, Spanish version		400	1	400	0.217	87
FS, Satisfaction Survey, Spanish Version		400	1	400	0.217	87
FS, Alaska cruise ship version		400	1	400	0.050	20
FS, Viewing Corridor survey		800	1	800	0.050	40
DOI Southern NV, Basic Survey (FY2012 only)		667*	1	667	0.154	103
DOI Southern NV, Economics Survey (FY2012 only)		667*	1	667	0.154	103
DOI, Southern NV, Satisfaction Survey (FY2012 only)		666*	1	666	0.154	103
BLM, Basic Survey (FY2011 and 2012 only)		2000	1	2,000	0.122	244
BLM, Economics Survey (FY 2011 and 2012 only)		2000	1	2,000	0.154	308

(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)
BLM, Satisfaction Survey (FY2011 and 2012 only)		2000	1	2,000	0.154	308
Totals	---	62,900	---	62,900	---	9,068

* Because the three DOI surveys will only been done in 2012, annual responses are 666 (1/3 of 2,000).

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

Table 3

(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	1,854	\$6.67	\$12,366
FS, Basic Survey, English version, and R6 addendum	308	\$6.67	\$2,054
FS, Basic Survey, English version, and R10 addendum	46	\$6.67	\$307
FS, Economics Survey, English version	2,695	\$6.67	\$17,975
FS, Satisfaction Survey, English, version	2,695	\$6.67	\$17,975
FS, Basic Survey, Spanish version	67	\$6.67	\$447
FS, Economics Survey, Spanish version	87	\$6.67	\$580
FS, Satisfaction Survey, Spanish Version	87	\$6.67	\$580
FS, Alaska cruise ship version	20	\$6.67	\$133
FS, Viewing Corridor survey	40	\$6.67	\$267
DOI Southern NV, Basic Survey (CY2007 only)	103	\$6.67	\$687.00
DOI Southern NV, Economics Survey (CY2007 only)	103	\$6.67	\$687.00
DOI, Southern NV, Satisfaction Survey (CY2007 only)	103	\$6.67	\$687.00
BLM, Basic Survey (FY2008 and	244	\$6.67	\$1,627

(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
2009 only)			
BLM, Economics Survey (FY 2008 and 2009 only)	308	\$6.67	\$2,054
BLM, Satisfaction Survey (FY2008 and 2009 only)	308	\$6.67	\$2,054
Totals	9,068		\$64,480

*The annualized costs to respondents can be determined by the opportunity cost of the time they spend completing the survey. The National Compensation Survey 2009 (<http://www.bls.gov/news.release/ecec.t05.htm>) from the Bureau of Labor Statistics indicates an average hourly wage of \$19.45 per hour for US workers. 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 funded as a part of the Forest Service's inventory and monitoring efforts. The amount allocated in the agency's budget amounts to 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.

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 decrease in the number of respondents per year from about 69,900 to 62,900. The reduction reflects better coordination with DOI agencies who wish to use this collection to obtain estimates of recreation visitation.

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 which 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. Please see partial list of publications under supplementary documents.

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 Forest Service seeks permission to not to display the expiration date on the surveys. The rationale is the survey is on a 5-year rotating cycle. Printing surveys with expiration dates leads to confusion by the public filling out potentially expired OMB forms during OMB approval periods. Additionally, the disposal of outdate forms and the inability to bulk order for the 5 year cycle leads to waist of federal funds and not maximizing tax payer dollars.

18. Explain each exception to the certification statement identified in item 19, "Certification Requirement for Paperwork Reduction Act."

There are no exceptions to the certification statement identified on Form FS-1300-25, Part V "Certification Requirement for Paperwork Reduction Act."