Supporting Statement A

Community Harvest Assessments for Alaskan National Parks and Preserves

OMB Control Number 1024- NEW

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.

---

1. **Explain the circumstances that make the collection of information necessary. Identify any legal or administrative requirements that necessitate the collection.**

From the Organic Act of 1916 to enabling legislation for specific parks, the National Park Service (NPS) has a Congressional mandate for collecting information to assist in the management of national parks, monuments, and historic sites. Specifically, 16 U.S.C. 1 through 4 (NPS Organic Act of 1916) requires that the NPS preserve national parks for the use and enjoyment of present and future generations. Part 245 of the Department of the Interior Manual delegates to the Director of the NPS the Secretary of the Interior's authority to supervise, manage, and operate the National Park System. The National Parks Omnibus Management Act of 1998 (Public Law 105-391, §202; 16 U.S.C. 5932) requires that units of the NPS be enhanced by the availability and utilization of a broad program of the highest quality science and information. The NPS *Management Policies 2006*, Section 8.11.1, further states that the NPS will facilitate social science studies that support the NPS mission by providing an understanding of park visitors and human interactions with park resources. NPS policy mandates that social science research will be used to provide an understanding of park visitors, the non-visiting public, gateway communities and regions, and human interactions with park resources.

Most national parks, preserves and monuments in Alaska created or expanded by the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA) provide the opportunity for qualified rural residents to harvest fish, wildlife, and other subsistence resources. Section 812 of ANILCA states:

> *"The Secretary [of the Interior], in cooperation with the State and other appropriate Federal agencies, shall undertake research on fish and wildlife and subsistence uses on the public lands."*

To develop resource management strategies for the Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and Preserve (WRST) and Gates of the Arctic National Park and Preserve (GAAR), NPS managers need information on subsistence harvest patterns, and the impact of rural economy on community subsistence activities.

Many Alaskans live off the land, relying on fish, wildlife and other wild resources. Subsistence fishing and hunting provide a large share of the food consumed in rural Alaska. The state's rural residents harvest about 22,000 tons of wild foods each year — an average of 375 pounds per person. Fish makes up about

60 percent of this harvest. Nowhere else in the United States is there such a heavy reliance upon wild foods.

Alaska Natives have used these resources for food, shelter, clothing, transportation, handicrafts and trade for thousands of years. Other residents living in rural Alaska depend on local harvests as reliable and economic food sources. For many, subsistence is more than just about economics. It is about who they are; it is a way of life.

This collection will survey residents of several communities on the topic of subsistence harvesting. The surveyed communities are designated as resident zone communities (or NPS-qualified subsistence users) because they customarily and traditionally engage in subsistence uses within a national park or monument. The most recent comprehensive subsistence harvest survey was conducted in the mid-1980s. This collection aims to fill this identified information gap needed to enable the sound management of each park unit.

Authorities:

- The National Parks Omnibus Management Act of 1998 (Public Law 105-391, §202; 16 U.S.C. 5932)
- NPS Organic Act of 1916 (16 U.S.C. 1 through 4)
- Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA) of 1980
- 36 Code of Federal Regulations (Parks, Forests, and Public Property) §13.430 Determination of Resident Zones

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.

Under the provisions of ANILCA, subsistence harvests by local rural residents are considered to be the priority consumptive use of park resources. This information collection will support the NPS management priorities at GAAR and WRST that address consumptive use of park resources by NPS-qualified subsistence users. The information will be used by the NPS, the Federal Subsistence Board, the State of Alaska, and local/regional advisory councils in making recommendations and making decisions regarding the management of fish, wildlife, and plants in the region (e.g., seasons, harvest limits, and which communities have customarily and traditionally used various resources).

A facilitator will use the proposed questionnaires to gather information from residents of 16 communities with subsistence eligibility in GAAR and WRST. The facilitator will ask questions about harvests, uses, and sharing of subsistence resources. Search and harvest areas will also be mapped during the interviews. Household demographics and the involvement of individual household members in subsistence activities will also be collected.

The survey will document subsistence activities over the past year (January through December) for each sampled household. The head of household will be asked to respond for each household.

The categories of questions in the survey are as follows:

> Individual characteristics: Gender, ethnicity, age, where the family lived when the respondent was born, length of time in the community, and educational level will be used to understand the

variability in subsistence harvest patterns between households.

Individual participation: These questions will provide information needed to learn more about the members of the household who are engaged in subsistence activities and especially whether younger members participate in subsistence activities.

The remaining questions in the survey will be asked at a household level rather than an individual level.

Household uses of park resources: The questions in this category will provide information about:

- changing patterns of resource use,
- whether the household was able get enough resources,
- whether subsistence needs are being met, and
- if not, what was the impact on the household

Because of differences in the resources harvested and the importance of subsistence in household economies, not all respondents will answer all questions.

There will be a series of screening questions to determine whether a household has used or tried to harvest a given category of resources during the sampling period. If the household used or tried to harvest resources in that category, questions will be asked about specific resources.

The questions on page 13 will only be used in communities with access to marine mammals (e.g., Yakutat and Nuiqsut).

Assessments: The questions in this category will provide an overall assessment of subsistence resources, access, and food security. The questions about resources will be used to determine concerns about resource health (e.g., bird flu or Ichthyophonus - a disease affecting salmon), ability to meet subsistence resource needs, and household food security. The questions about access, portable motors, home heating, and handicrafts respond to specific management concerns about transportation methods, the use of natural materials (in handicraft production), and the harvest of firewood (e.g. harvest levels and context for use).

Household economic characteristics: These questions ask about the structure of the household economy, including income from both paid employment and other sources. Because many Alaska Native households are characterized by mixed subsistence-market economies, differences in the proportion of reliance on one type of economy vs. another are critical for understanding subsistence harvest of park resources.

Comments: This will allow the respondents an opportunity to make open-ended comments.

At the end of the study, reports will be provided to the park managers, state and other federal agencies involved in management of subsistence resources, citizen advisory groups, and the surveyed communities. The reports will describe levels and patterns of subsistence uses in these parks by the communities. The project will also provide information that will be used to update the Alaska Department of Fish and Game's Community Subsistence Information System.

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 harvest assessment will be conducted using in-person facilitation to collect this information. A volunteer or NPS staff will work directly with the respondent as they provide responses needed to complete the questionnaire. The facilitator will be available to answer any questions that the respondent will have throughout the process.

At the end of the study, all survey data will be entered into a database and used to interpret the results. Written reports will be developed that will include all survey results. The reports will be made available through an on-line database and ADF&G's Community Subsistence Information System, (www.adfg.alaska.gov/sb/CSIS).

When feasible, we will map the harvest and search areas using a tablet computer. The information will be entered into a geospatial-database allowing us to select specific geographic locations. This will also allow us to skip the step of digitizing paper maps. Due to the size and weight of the equipment, this may not always be feasible to use this option in the field, however, we will plan to use computerized mapping when practicable.

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.

There is no duplication of this effort in the 16 communities surveyed. The proposed collection is needed because no up-to-date information exists for these communities. There are no resources available to provide GARR and WRST with reliable information about subsistence harvests practices by local rural residents.

Although harvest data are available through harvest reports that are required for some hunts and fisheries; these reports provide a historical context and partial information. As a consequence, they do not meet the needs of park managers. In some areas the return rate for harvest reports is low, resulting in poor quality data. This proposed survey will provide additional information that is needed about:

- all important subsistence resources,
- the use of resources by people other than the harvesters, and
- household subsistence economies

Listed below are the most readily available comprehensive harvest surveys of these communities:

Haynes, Terry L., Martha Case, James A. Fall, Libby Halpin, and Michelle Robert. 1984. The use of Copper River salmon and other wild resources by Upper Tanana communities, 1983-1984. ADF&G Division of Subsistence, Technical Paper No. 115.

Marcotte, James R. 1992. Wild fish and game harvest and use by residents of five Upper Tanana communities, Alaska, 1987-88. ADF&G Division of Subsistence, Technical Paper No. 168.

Mills, David D., and Anne S. Firman. 1986. Fish and wildlife use in Yakutat, Alaska: contemporary patterns and changes. ADF&G Division of Subsistence, Technical Paper No. 131.

Stratton, Lee, and Susan Georgette. 1984. Use of fish and game by communities in the Copper River Basin, Alaska: a report on a 1983 household survey. ADF&G Division of Subsistence, Technical Paper No. 107.

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

This information collection will not impact small businesses or other small entities.

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.

Section 812 of ANILCA states, "*The Secretary [of the Interior], in cooperation with the State and other appropriate Federal agencies, shall undertake research on fish and wildlife and subsistence uses on the public lands.*" Under the provisions of ANILCA, this survey responds directly to congressional direction to collect information on subsistence uses (ANILCA 812).

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.**

No special circumstances exist.

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.

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 August 5, 2011, we published a 60-day Federal Register notice (76 FR 47609) stating that we intended to request OMB approval of our information collection associated with Community Harvest Assessments for Alaskan National Parks and Preserves. In this notice, we solicited public comment for 60 days ending October 4, 2011.

We received one comment expressing concern that residents of other states, such as New Jersey, did not have access to these resources. Under the provisions of ANILCA, only rural Alaska residents are qualified to engage in subsistence in Alaskan National Parks, Preserves and Monuments, and this survey responds directly to congressional direction to collect information on subsistence uses (ANILCA 812). The commenter also states that it is not necessary to conduct these surveys on an annual basis. We agree and are not proposing to do so. It has been 10+ years since these communities were last surveyed, and we feel that conducting surveys at an interval of 5 to 10 years between surveys of individual communities will provide adequate information for management while not unnecessarily burdening the public.

The methods and questions to be used in the study are well-established and tested. As the lead organization on this project, Alaska Department of Fish and Game Subsistence Division has more than 25 years' experience with similar studies. The proposed survey is based on the standard instrument used in other locations (Chistochina, Slana, Mentasta, and Copper Center) by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game. Modifications were based on discussions between NPS and ADF&G subsistence staff. Discussions with park management were also used to inform the design and format the survey. The studies listed below provided a source for pre-tested questions and also helped to provide an estimate of the time needed to complete this survey

Fall, James A., Davin L. Holen, Brian Davis, Theodore Krieg, and David Koster. 2006. Subsistence harvests and uses of wild resources in Iliamna, Newhalen, Nondalton, Pedro Bay, and Port Alsworth, Alaska, 2004. ADF&G Division of Subsistence, Technical Paper No. 302.

Holen, Davin L., William E. Simeone, and Liz Williams. 2006. Wild resource harvests and uses by residents of Lake Minchumina and Nikolai Alaska, 2001-2002. ADF&G Division of Subsistence, Technical Paper No. 296.

Magdanz, James S., Charles J. Utermohle, and Robert J. Wolfe. 2002. The production and distribution of wild food in Wales and Deering, Alaska. ADF&G Division of Subsistence, Technical Paper No. 259.

Magdanz, James S., Robert J. Walker, and Ronald R. Paciorek. 2004. The subsistence harvests of wild foods by residents of Shungnak, Alaska, 2002. ADF&G Division of Subsistence, Technical Paper No. 279.

Simeone, William E. 2002. Wild resource harvests and uses by residents of Cantwell, Alaska, 2000. ADF&G Division of Subsistence, Technical Paper No. 272.

Williams, Liz, Chelsie Venechuk, Davin L. Holen and William E. Simeone. 2004. Lake Minchumina, Telida, Nikolai, and Cantwell subsistence community use profiles and traditional fisheries use. ADF&G Division of Subsistence, Technical Paper No. 295.

The individuals listed below in tables 1 and 2 provided editorial suggestions and feedback concerning the clarity of the procedure and approximate length of time it would take to complete process, based on their previous experiences with surveys similar to this. We incorporated their suggested edits to improve the grammatical clarity of the final instrument. The respondents also said that the instrument was straightforward and that the instructions were very helpful. The respondents concurred with our estimated burden time for the application to be about 1 hour. We believe that this estimate reflects the time it takes each respondent to provide the additional information needed to complete the interview.

Table 1. National Park Staff Consulted During Survey Instrument Design.

Name	**Location/Agency Unit**	**Phone Number**
Eric Veach, Chief of Resource Management,	NPS—Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and Preserve	(907) 822-7212
Donald Callaway, Senior Cultural Anthropologist	NPS—Alaska Regional Office (retired)	n.a.
Rachel Mason, Cultural Anthropologist	NPS—Alaska Regional Office	(907) 644-3472
Lois Dalle-Molle, Research Coordinator	North and West Alaska Cooperative Ecosystem Studies Unit	(907) 455-0635

Table 2. List of Reviewers contacted outside of the agency to provide feedback

James Fall	Research Director, Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Subsistence Division
Dave Koster	Research Analyst IV, Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Subsistence Division

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

No payments or gifts will be provided to respondents.

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

Individual responses will be kept anonymous. For reports and databases, the data will be summarized at a community level. Households will be assigned an arbitrary number that will serve as the household ID number. The identification number will be on the survey, and surveyors will be instructed not to place names or other personally identifiable information on the survey. Once the data collection is complete, any link between the household name and the household ID number will be destroyed.

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.

No questions of a sensitive nature will be asked.

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 under "Annual Cost to Federal Government."**

This surveying effort will be conducted over a three year period. For each sampling if the community has less than 100 people 100% of the households in the community will be included in the sample. In the communities with more than 100 household we will randomly select a representative number of households to be sampled. The numbers below reflect the total effort during the 3-year period of approval. Respondents in 16 communities will be surveyed. Based on the 2010 Census, there are 1,334 households in the survey area. Our goal is to interview 336 households each year and we expect that 90% (n=302) will complete the survey.

Table 3: Respondent universe and expected number of responses per year

	Respondent Universe (2010 Census)	Target Contact Goal Per year	Expected Number of Responses Per Year
GAAR Communities	443	143	129
WRST Communities	891	193	173
TOTAL	0	0	302

We estimate the total annual hour burden for this collection will be 358 hours. Our estimate is based upon our experience with similar collections and the research efforts described in item 8 above. For this collection we have considered the time to make the initial contact to set up the interviews and to conduct short non-response survey for 336 individuals (approximately 10 minutes per contact) totaling 56 hours.

We expect that 90% (n=302) of the households contacted will agree to participate in the interviewing session. Each session will take about 60 minutes to complete, totaling 302 annual burden hours.

We estimate the total annual dollar value of this collection to be $10,070 (Table 4). We multiplied the estimated burden hours by $28.13 (for individuals or households). This wage figure includes a benefits multiplier and is based on the National Compensation Survey: Occupational Wages in the United States published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics Occupation and Wages, (BLS news release USDL-11-1305 for Employer Costs for Employee Compensation—June 2011 at - http://www.bls.gov/news.release/pdf/ecec.pdf), dated September 8, 2011).

Table 4. Total Estimated Hour Burden and Annual Dollar Value of this Collection

Activity	Individuals and Households				
	Annual Number of Responses	**Estimated Completion Time per Response**	**Burden Annual Hours**	**Dollar Value of Burden Hour Including Benefits**	**Total Dollar Value of Annual Burden Hours***
Initial Contact and non-response bias check					
GAAR Residents	143	10 minutes	24	$28.13	$675
WRST Residents	193	10 minutes	32	$28.13	$900
Completing Interview					
GAAR Residents	129	60 minutes	129	$28.13	$3,629
WRST Residents	173	60 minutes	173	$28.13	$4,866
TOTAL	638		358		$10,070

13. **Provide an estimate of the total annual [non-hour] 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).**
    * **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.**

There are no non-hour costs to respondents.

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.**

The total estimated data collection cost to the Federal Government for this proposed collection is $355,880 annually. This includes Federal employee salaries and benefits ($46,980). Table 5 below shows Federal staff and grade levels performing various tasks associated with this information collection. We used the Office of Personnel Management Salary Table 2011-AK[1] to determine the hourly rates for federal employees. We multiplied the hourly rate by 1.5 to account for benefits (as implied by the previously referenced BLS news release).

This estimate also includes the operational expenses associated with this collection ($308,900). These costs are largely for the Contractor/cooperator ($300,900) -- travel, staffing and associated operating costs (supplies, field data collection, statistical analysis and reporting) (table 5 below). NPS travel costs of $8,000 are based on actual costs for visiting the more remote communities to be surveyed.

Table 5. Federal Employee Salaries and Benefits

[1] http://www.opm.gov/flsa/oca/11tables/pdf/ak_h.pdf.

Position (Locality: Alaska)	**GS Level**	**Hourly Rate**	**Hourly Rate incl. benefits** *(1.5 x hourly pay rate)*	**Estimated time (hours)**	**Annual Cost**
Cultural Anthropologist (Wrangell-St. Elias NPP)	12/5	$38.12	$57.18	320 hours	$18,298
GIS Specialist (Wrangell-St. Elias NPP)	11/5	$31.80	$47.70	160 hours	$7,632
Subsistence Program Manager (Gates of the Arctic NPP)	9/1	$23.19	$34.79	320 hours	$11,131
GIS Specialist (Gates of the Arctic NPP)	11/5	$31.80	$47.70	160 hours	$7,632
Cultural Anthropologist (Alaska Regional Office)	12/5	$38.12	$57.18	40 hours	$2,287
				Subtotal	0

Operational Expenses

NPS staff travel to remote communities	$8,000
Contractor/cooperator costs for staffing, cooperator travel, supplies, field data collection, statistical analysis and reporting	$300,900
Subtotal	$308,900
TOTAL	$355,880

15. Explain the reasons for any program changes or adjustments in hour or cost burden.

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.

Surveys will be conducted each winter and spring beginning in 2012 and ending in 2014. The time schedule for each round of surveys will be essentially the same:

- The surveys will be conducted in January through April, which are generally less busy times of years for subsistence users and thus months when respondents are more likely have time to participate.
- The 2012 surveys will be conducted in March and April (only).
- Data entry and preliminary data analysis will take place during the summer and fall.
- Meetings will be held in the fall or winter to discuss the preliminary survey results with the subject communities.
- Data analysis and report preparation will continue until November of following year.
- Following feedback on the draft from the sponsoring agencies, the final report will be submitted and the data entered into the Community Subsistence Information System.

A single report for each park will combine the data and responses for the communities surveyed in the same year. A review meeting will be held in each community to discuss the results. The primary purpose of the meetings will be to clarify any information or identify any missing data before the final report is published. Finally, completed reports will be disseminated to park staff, community libraries, tribal council offices, and other agencies and advisory bodies involved in subsistence management in the region. The reports will also be posted on the web sites of the agencies participating in the process.

Data Processing and Analysis of Survey Results

The cooperator will code harvest survey responses, prepare data for analysis, and provide the NPS with integrated SPSS files for this research. They will conduct preliminary analysis of SPSS data, including comparisons of demography, income and harvest levels over time (e.g., with previous harvest surveys) and complete cross-sectional analysis on the influence of household composition, income, employment, ethnicity and so forth on harvest and distributional patterns.

The initial analyses will consist of univariate, bivariate, and multivariate analyses designed to provide descriptive explanations of the data (e.g., frequencies distributions, means, crosstabulations, and Fourier plots). Frequency distributions will be used for the responses to each question and each index created from combined questions. These will be reported as percentages in each of the strata. Cross tabulations will be used to investigate differences between different households and communities. Cross tabulations will also be used to investigate differences between some of the independent and dependent variables. Multivariate analyses will be conducted to assess correlations between specific variables and created indices, and to ascertain whether individual variables might be combined to form a scale based on responses. These types of analyses will also be used to determine amounts of variance in dependent variables as explained by independent variables, to form statistical models for explanation.

Cluster analysis, similarity structure analysis or other multidimensional scaling techniques will be used to find similarities across the data sets. One goal of these analyses is to describe the timing, location, and levels of harvesting activities, as well as the characteristics of the sample across communities (e.g., age, sex, ethnicity, household composition, etc.). In addition, regression models may be used to check for outliers, influential data points, and nonlinearity.

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 expiration date for OMB approval on the information collection instrument associated with this collection.

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

There are no exceptions to the certification statement.