

Supporting Statement A

National Gap Analysis Program Evaluation

OMB Control Number: 1028-NEW

Terms of Clearance: None

General Instructions

A completed Supporting Statement A must accompany each request for approval of a collection of information. The Supporting Statement must be prepared in the format described below, and must contain the information specified below. If an item is not applicable, provide a brief explanation. When the question “Does this ICR contain surveys, censuses, or employ statistical methods?” is checked "Yes," then a Supporting Statement B must be completed. OMB reserves the right to require the submission of additional information with respect to any request for approval.

Specific 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 Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) require federal agencies to document their performance in annual performance plans and performance reports. This Act authorizes the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) to collect information to evaluate the customer satisfaction and performance of the National Gap Analysis Program (GAP). This information collection supports USGS’ programmatic requirements as a provider of land classification and natural resource data. This information collection will contribute to the requirement that programs demonstrate progress toward their stated goals. Specifically, this effort will provide information required by the following authorities:

- Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) (1993) (P.L. 103-62)
- Organic Act of October 2, 1888 (25 Stat. 505, 526)

The Gap Analysis Program has been operational for over 15 years, providing spatial data that can be used as a framework to make assessment about how well biodiversity is protected, and what aspects of biodiversity need greater protection. Among the stated program goals are the responsibility of providing “information to the public and those entities charged with land use research, policy, planning, and management.” To date, there has not been a comprehensive assessment of how well the program is meeting its ultimate goal, better informing the management of biodiversity. The information we collect will be used to provide the data to assess the Program’s performance, update the strategic plan, and help the staff determine how to maximize the effectiveness of their products.

2. Indicate how, by whom, and for what purpose the information is to be used. Be specific. If this collection is a form or a questionnaire, every question needs to be justified.

The purpose of this information collection is to provide data that will be included in a program evaluation of GAP. This part of the program evaluation will involve a survey of individuals who have used GAP data. The program evaluation of GAP includes the domains of need for the program, implementation and delivery, and impact. Conversations with key informants among the GAP staff and cooperators indicated three particular areas of concern. These areas are the characteristics of the data, technology access issues, and education and outreach about the data offered by GAP.

Typically, need assessments are conducted prior to implementation of a program. However, need assessments can be conducted throughout the life of a program to characterize changes over time. In this case, the focus is on technological and educational needs of a population of GAP data users. Questions on the topics of characteristics of users, technological requirements of users, data needs of users, and education/outreach needs of users will be included in the user needs assessment.

We will use a survey to will gather feedback from current and previous users of GAP data regarding the following issues:

- GAP data quality;
- Technological issues that may impede use of GAP data;
- Satisfaction with performance of GAP in achieving the goal of preserving biodiversity; and
- The effectiveness of current outreach and education strategies for GAP products and data.

The impacts assessed in this evaluation will be proximal (showing an immediate impact on the user) and distal (users' estimation of overall effects). User satisfaction will be used to determine the impact of the program. Questions regarding benefits, value, perception and overall impact are included on the survey to evaluate program impact. The overall goal of the survey is for GAP to have the most up-to-date feedback that will be used to inform any necessary changes needed to better serve the users of GAP data.

An annotated copy of the survey (in ROCIS) provides specific justification for the questions included on the survey.

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.

Data collection for this information collection will be 100% electronic. The surveys will be administered through a secure USGS website. We believe that using electronic means to collection this information will be appropriate for this sample. The sample will consist of professional users of geospatial data who are highly reliant on computer and web technology as a part of their daily work. The method used for identifying the sample (See Part B) suggests that they all have access to email and web technology.

All respondents will receive all correspondences by email. Each message will include a unique link to the survey. Key Survey™ software will be used to administer, collect and analyze the information collected during 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.

GAP is unique in the information it provides. No such survey of GAP data users has been conducted in the past. No similar information exists.

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

We have made efforts to keep the amount of information requested to a minimum for all of the respondents. This collection is not expected to have a significant impact on small business or small entities. We have attempted to minimize the burden to all respondents by developing an online survey.

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.

Failure to collect this information would make it difficult for GAP to understand the needs of its users, the users' perspectives on GAP data, and how well GAP is meeting its program objectives. Without this information, GAP would have to make any decisions regarding future actions with no knowledge of how any changes would affect users of GAP data. GAP's success at meeting its primary goal is dependent upon the continued use of GAP data.

There are no technical or legal obstacles to reducing burden for this collection.

7. Explain any special circumstances that would cause an information collection to be conducted in a manner: (i) requiring respondents to report more often than quarterly, (ii) requiring respondents prepare written responses in fewer than 30 days after receipt, (iii) requiring respondents to submit more than an original and two copies of any document, (iv) retain records for more than 3 years; (v) in connection with a statistical survey, that is not designed to produce valid and reliable results that can be generalized to the universe of Assessment; (vi) the use of a statistical data classification that has not been reviewed and approved by OMB; (vii) that includes a pledge of confidentiality not supported by authority established in statute or regulation; requiring respondents to submit proprietary trade secrets or other confidential information.

The only special circumstances stated in Item 7 that are relevant to this information collection are in regards to sub-items (ii) and (v). In regard to (ii), because we will be following standard survey protocol for web-based surveys, we will be asking respondents to send back their responses in fewer than two weeks after receipt of the survey. Two reminder messages will be sent to those who have not completed the survey at 7 and 10 days after the data collection process begins.

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.

On February 24, 2009, we published a Federal Register notice (74 FR 8269) announcing that we would submit this information request to OMB for approval. In that notice we solicited public comments for 60 days, ending April 27, 2009. We did not receive any comments in response to that notice.

In addition to the Federal Register notice, we solicited comments from several individuals with expertise in geospatial data in general and data produced by GAP specifically. The purpose of the feedback was to obtain critical reviews of the survey from individuals who have similar backgrounds to those in the sample and who would know what language and terminology would be most appropriate to use in designing questions for a survey of GAP users. We asked for feedback on the clarity of instruction and the comprehension of questions. Most of the comments provided helped us make editorial and grammatical corrections. Nearly all the recommendations were incorporated. The recommendations that were not incorporated would have added questions that either were outside the scope of the intent of the data collection or were closely related to questions already on the survey. There were no recommendations to reduce the amount or type of data collected; recommendations were made to change the wording of several questions to make the questions more specific to GAP.

Table 1. Names and contact information of individuals consulted with outside the agency.

<u>Non-Federal Employees</u>	<u>Federal Employees</u>
<p>Jocelyn Aycrigg, Conservation Biologist and Northwest GAP Coordinator Department of Fish and Wildlife Resources and GAP, University of Idaho 530 S. Asbury St., Suite 1 208-885-3901 aycrigg@uidaho.edu</p>	<p>Kevin Gergely, Operations Manager National GAP Operations Office 530 S. Asbury St., Suite 1 Moscow, ID 83843 208-885-3565 gergely@usgs.gov</p>
<p>Alexa McKerrow, Adjunct Assistant Professor and Regional Landcover Mapping Coordinator-GAP Department of Biology, North Carolina State University David Clark Labs 218, Box 7617 NCSU Campus Raleigh, NC 27695 919-513-2853 alexa_mckerrow@ncsu.edu</p>	<p>Julie Prior-Magee, SWReGAP Regional Coordinator P.S. Box 30003 - MSC 4901 Las Cruces, NM 88003 575-646-1084 jpmagee@usgs.gov</p>
<p>Jill Maxwell, Outreach/Web Development Coordinator Department of Fish and Wildlife Resources and GAP, University of Idaho 530 S. Asbury St., Suite 1 208-885-3550 jmaxwell@uidaho.edu</p>	<p>Robert Waltermire, IT Specialist Fort Collins Science Center 2150 Centre Ave., Building C Fort Collins, CO 80526 970-226-9344 waltermireb@usgs.gov</p>

Steve Williams, Research Assistant and Regional Vertebrate Modeling Coordinator-GAP Department of Biology, North Carolina State University David Clark Labs 220, Box 7617 NCSU Campus Raleigh, NC 27695 919-513-7413 steve_williams@ncsu.edu	
--	--

Additionally, we pilot tested the survey instrument with employees at the USGS Fort Collins Science Center to estimate the time to complete the survey. It took reviewers between 20 and 30 minutes to complete the survey depending on which paths they completed. There are four paths in this adaptive survey. Each path is specific to one of the four types of data that GAP produces: land cover, predicted species distributions, stewardship, and analysis data. The longest path (predicted species distributions) took the pilot testers about 30 minutes, the next longest paths (land cover and stewardship) took about 28 minutes, and the shortest path (analysis) took around 20 minutes. Based on this review, we recalculated and increased the overall burden to 28 minutes per response (from the 22 minutes suggested in the 60-day notice). The difference in the estimated completion time from the 60-day notice is due to the refinement of the survey instrument and verification of the time with pilot testers. This estimated completion times of 30 (predicted species distribution), 28 (land cover and stewardship), and 20 (analysis) minutes are used in Table 2 to respond to question 12 below.

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

There are no payments or gift giving associated with this collection.

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

All connections between respondent e-mail addresses and returned surveys will be eliminated upon receipt. No list of respondent e-mail addresses will be retained after data collection is completed. There is one question at the end of the survey that states “If you would like to receive notifications of new release of GAP data, products, and other information, please type your email address here:” After the data collection period is closed, any responses to this question will be sent directly to GAP.

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.

This collection does not ask for information of a sensitive nature.

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.**

Burden estimate is based upon the time to read instructions and to complete an online survey. All respondents will receive instructions and answer a short series of questions we estimate that it will take an average of 28 minutes to complete the survey.

A total of 813 nonfederal individuals will be contacted. Assuming a 70% response rate, we anticipate 569 nonfederal respondents. For the non-response bias check, we expect a 10% response rate from the remaining population which adds approximately 25 respondents to the burden calculation. Total burden estimate for this collection is 273 hours (see table 2 below).

The estimated dollar value of the burden hours for this collection takes into account the nature of our respondents. We estimate the total dollar value of this collection to be \$11,841 (Table 2). We arrived at this figure by multiplying the estimated burden hours by the Employer Costs for Employee Compensation (for private industry and State/Local/ Government employees). This wage figure included benefits and is based on the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) news release USDL-10-1687 for Employer Costs for Employee Compensation—September 2010 at http://www.bls.gov/news.release/archives/ecec_12082010.pdf, dated December 8, 2010.

Table 2. Estimated Dollar Value of Annual Burden Hours.

Survey Respondents (sector)	Annual Number of Respondents	Estimated Completion Time per Respondent (minutes)	Total Annual Burden Hours	Dollar Value of Burden Hour Including Benefits	Total Dollar Value of Annual Burden Hours
Survey					
Private	205	28	96	\$49.14	\$4,717
State and Local Governments	364	28	170	\$40.10	\$6,817
SUBTOTAL	569		266		\$11,534
Non-response Check Survey					
Private	10	15	3	\$49.14	\$147
State and Local Governments	15	15	4	\$40.10	\$160
SUBTOTAL	25		7		\$307
TOTAL	594		273		\$11,841

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 already reflected in item 12.)

- * 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 for form processing). 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.

We have identified no total annual (non-hour) cost burden to respondents that would result from the collection of this information.

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.

There will be 3 federal employees working on this study. The total estimated cost to the Federal Government for writing and revising the survey, and collecting, processing and analyzing the information received as a result of this collection is \$31,516 (Table 3). This includes Federal employee salaries and benefits. The table below shows Federal staff and grade levels performing various tasks associated with this information collection. We used the Office of Personnel Management Salary Table 2010-DEN (http://www.opm.gov/oca/10tables/html/den_h.asp) to determine the hourly rate. We multiplied the hourly rate by 1.5 to account for benefits (as implied by the previously referenced BLS news release)

Table 3. Federal Employee Salaries and Benefits.

Position	Grade/ Step	Hourly Rate	Hourly Rate incl. benefits (1.5 x hourly pay rate)	Estimated time per task	Annual Cost
Project Leader, Social Scientist	11/4	\$32.47	\$48.70	600 hrs	\$29,220

Supervisory Social Scientist	14/3	\$53.04	\$79.56	20 hrs	\$1,591
Computer Specialist	13/5	\$47.69	\$71.54	10 hrs	\$715
Total					\$31,516

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

This is a new request.

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.

The data collected during this study will be coded directly into a computerized database. Most of the statistics will be analysis through the use of SPSS® 15. Data analysis will include two phases. The first will consist of frequency distributions of responses to each question. The second will include cross tabulations, nonparametric statistics, and analysis of variance to summarize the survey results.

The USGS Publication Series (Open File Reports) will be used to produce two publications. The first publication will include the frequency distributions of responses to each question; this will be a report to respondents. The second publication will be a study completion report that will include a full description of the survey development process, the data collection methods, and results from the data analyses. A time schedule for the project is presented in Table 4 below.

Table 4. Project Time Schedule.

Task	Completion Date
Survey Information Collection	2 months from OMB clearance
Data Analysis	4 months from OMB clearance
Report Preparation	5 months from OMB clearance
Final Report	10 months from OMB clearance

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 OMB’s expiration date on the information collection instruments.

18. Explain each exception to the certification statement "Certification for Paperwork Reduction Act Submissions".

There are no exceptions to the certification statement.