

2013 Supporting Statement - Part A OMB 0596-0201
Role of Communities in Stewardship Contracting Projects

Terms of Clearance

The January 12, 2010 Notice of Action contained no terms of clearance.

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.**

Section 323 of Public Law 108-7 (16 U.S.C. 2104 Note) requires the Forest Service (FS) and Bureau of Land Management (BLM) to report to Congress annually on the role of local communities in the development of agreement or contract plans through stewardship contracting. To meet that requirement, the FS annually conducts a survey to gather the necessary information which is used by both the FS and BLM as they each develop their annual report to Congress.

- 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.**

The FS is contracting with the Pinchot Institute for Conservation (Pinchot Institute) to fulfill the requirements of the Congressional direction for both the FS and the BLM. The FS administers the contract. The BLM provides funding to the FS for its share of the contract work via a formal agreement. Additionally, the BLM provides the FS with a list of BLM's active stewardship contracting projects, which is subsequently provided to the Pinchot Institute.

Information is collected annually through a phone survey conducted by the Pinchot Institute for Conservation (Pinchot Institute) and its sub-contractors. All respondents interviewed as part of the phone survey have been involved in a stewardship-contracting project as either a FS or BLM project manager, as an external participant in the project planning, or as a contractor involved in project implementation. The survey consists of 16 questions, four of the questions have a part (a) and (b). The survey is administered to a stratified random sample on an annual basis. During the interview process information is collected and entered into a uniform report format and sent to Michigan State University (MSU) for analysis. Following receipt of the data, MSU researchers code questions and responses for entry into SPSS (originally, Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) and NVivo (a qualitative data analysis computer software package) software programs used for qualitative and quantitative analyses. (For example, the "open-ended" response questions are analyzed qualitatively.) MSU formats the data to protect the anonymity of projects and project participants prior to

2013 Supporting Statement - Part A OMB 0596-0201
Role of Communities in Stewardship Contracting Projects

distributing to the Pinchot Institute. The summarized results from these analyses are then delivered to the Pinchot Institute, which includes them in the final reports it prepares for each agency. The agencies are not given any of the individual survey responses; only summarized results. Both the FS and the BLM use the final report information to report to Congress specifically on the role of local communities in the development of stewardship contract/agreement plans, as required by Section 323 of Public Law 108-7 (16 U.S.C. 2104 Note). The FS also makes its final report, as prepared and provided by the Pinchot Institute, available to the public on the internet at http://www.fs.fed.us/restoration/Stewardship_Contracting/results/index.shtml.

The FS and BLM may use the data provided by the Pinchot Institute, as shown in the final reports to each agency, in other reports related to stewardship contracting (such as the FS's 2004 Stewardship Contracting Assessment Review available at http://www.fs.fed.us/restoration/Stewardship_Contracting/results/index.shtml).

Congress does make the summarized analysis data, as shown in the final report supplied by the Pinchot Institute to each agency and in each agency's report to Congress, available for use by organizations both inside and outside the government.

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.)

The survey collects information on the role of local communities in the development of agreement or contract plans through stewardship contracting.

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.

All respondents have been involved in a stewardship-contracting project - either as a FS or as BLM project manager, as an external participant in the project planning, or as a contractor involved in project implementation.

Table 1: Response to items a and b

Information Collected	Description	Information Provided to:	Prepared by
Phone survey of 16 questions regarding the role of local communities in the development of agreement or contract plans through stewardship contracting	FS project manager involved in a stewardship contracting project	Michigan State University (analysis) and Pinchot Institute for Conservation (receive results of the analysis)	Michigan State University (analysis) Pinchot Institute for Conservation (report to each agency)
	BLM project manager involved in a stewardship contracting project		
	Contractor involved in stewardship contracting project implementation		

2013 Supporting Statement - Part A OMB 0596-0201
Role of Communities in Stewardship Contracting Projects

	External participant involved in a stewardship contracting project		
--	--	--	--

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

The information is used for the annual report to Congress that is required from both agencies. The responses, through their inclusion in the FS and BLM reports to Congress, are available for use by organizations both inside and outside the government. The FS and BLM may use the data provided by the Pinchot Institute, as shown in the final reports to each agency, in other reports related to stewardship contracting (such as the FS's 2004 Stewardship Contracting Assessment Review available at http://www.fs.fed.us/restoration/Stewardship_Contracting/results/index.shtml). Congress does make the summarized analysis data, as shown in the final report supplied by the Pinchot Institute to each agency and in each agency's report to Congress, available for use by organizations both inside and outside the government.

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?

Information is collected through a phone survey conducted by the Pinchot Institute and its sub-contractors. The survey instrument is sent out ahead of time (approximately 30-days or less prior to the actual phone call), via email, to the interviewee, strictly as a courtesy. There is no expectation or requirement that the interviewee review the survey prior to the phone interview. The interviewee may choose to use the survey instrument during the actual phone interview, to follow along with the interviewer, but even that is not necessary. As information is collected during the phone interview process, it is entered into a uniform report format and subsequently forwarded to MSU for analysis.

e. How frequently will the information be collected?

Information is collected once annually through a phone survey conducted by the Pinchot Institute for Conservation and its sub-contractors.

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

Survey information is sent to MSU for analysis. MSU researchers code questions and responses for entry into SPSS and NVivo software programs, used for qualitative and quantitative analyses. The summarized results from these analyses are delivered to the Pinchot Institute for inclusion into its final reports to the managing agencies. The individual survey responses are not

2013 Supporting Statement - Part A OMB 0596-0201

Role of Communities in Stewardship Contracting Projects

shared with the agencies; only the summarized results are shared. The FS posts the report it receives from the Pinchot Institute agency on its internet webpage for viewing by the public. The FS and BLM develop reports for Congress, as required under Section 323 of Public Law 108-7, which includes the summarized analysis data provided by the Pinchot Institute in their final report to each agency. Congress makes the agency reports available for use by organizations both inside and outside the government.

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

The number of stewardship contracting projects changes each year and the potential respondent universe varies slightly. As discussed below under item 12, the actual number of stewardship contracting projects has generally been increasing each year (except for the BLM, which decreased from 113 in 2008 to 69 in 2009 and dropped to 63 in 2010, and then increased to 100 in 2011).

Revisions to the original survey were made and approved, as part of the previous renewal process, to reflect minor word changes for clarity, minor format changes for clarity and or analysis purposes, and to add response categories based on feedback from interviewers and/or the scientist who designed the statistical aspects of the survey. These prior changes were designed to make it easier for both the interviewer and interviewee.

The Burden and Non-Discrimination Statement has been updated as a part of this renewal process; no further revisions are proposed.

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.

The survey is designed for and is conducted by phone so it does not involve the use of automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques. However, the survey form is sent, via email, to the interviewee, strictly as a courtesy.

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.

Currently, the FS and BLM have no other approved surveys that address the role of local communities in stewardship contracting. The stewardship contracting project managers frequently work with external groups that are interested in stewardship contracting. As far as these program managers are aware, there are no similar information collections currently conducted by other government sources or other outside sources.

2013 Supporting Statement - Part A OMB 0596-0201
Role of Communities in Stewardship Contracting Projects

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

There may be some small businesses within the survey pool. However, the phone survey was purposefully limited to 30 - 45 minutes in order to decrease the effect on all respondents, including small businesses and other contractors. The survey instrument is designed to take a maximum of 30 minutes, but the burden estimate shown in A-12 allows for a maximum of 45 minutes, to account for the time it may take to read the survey ahead of the interview, and/or in the event that the interviewee wants to provide further comments or discuss in depth any of their responses with the interviewer during the phone interview. Additionally, the survey is voluntary, which accommodates those who do not have time to respond. Prior to beginning the survey, the interviewer reads the burden statement to the interviewee, lets them know the survey is strictly voluntary, provides the estimated amount of time the interview will take, and asks them if they have the time available to be interviewed.

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.

Without the information from this annual collection of data, the FS and BLM will not be able to provide their annual reports to Congress, as required by law, on the role of local communities in the development of agreement and contract plans.

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;**

The survey is designed for and is conducted by telephone and does not require respondents to prepare a written response. As a courtesy, the survey form is sent, via email, to the interviewee, but they are not required or expected to review the survey instrument prior to the phone interview. The phone interview may take place in fewer than 30 days after receiving the survey instrument.
- **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;**

2013 Supporting Statement - Part A OMB 0596-0201

Role of Communities in Stewardship Contracting Projects

- **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**

There is no assurance of confidentiality. However, the names of people interviewed are not associated with the interviewer's notes from the phone survey, and are not retained after all the phone surveys have been conducted for the year, ensuring some measure of privacy.

Per personal conversation with Dr. Maureen McDonough, Michigan State University and Pinchot partner/subcontractor, the issue of contacting the same person twice has not come up. As a safeguard to ensure the same respondent is not contacted more than once, when the sample is generated, the Pinchot ensures that people are only listed once and the regional partners/subcontractors are the Pinchot's second line of control. The Pinchot knows who is listed as the agency contact for each project so they can sample with replacement if the same person comes up more than once. The only possibility would be if a partner from a Non-Governmental Organization (NGO) at the national level was engaged in more than one project, they might have a chance of getting in the sample more than once as their names come from the agency person. However, it is very rare that national NGO folks are engaged. Additionally, she provided that to her knowledge and regarding the possibility of someone working on two or more stewardship projects in different parts of the country (such as perhaps someone from a national organization) is ever contacted more than once to do the phone interview for the programmatic monitoring efforts; it does not happen. Dr. McDonough reiterated the majority of the interviewees are local and state with very few regional and almost no national [level].

Dr. McDonough also stated 12 of the 16 questions in the survey are about the project and not about the individual at all.

Another level of confidentiality/privacy is that Michigan State University researchers do not see the names of the interviewees, just the agency, region, project and role (i.e. agency person, external participant, or contractor on the project).

- **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 other special circumstances. The collection of information is conducted in a manner consistent with the guidelines in 5 CFR 1320.6.

2013 Supporting Statement - Part A OMB 0596-0201
Role of Communities in Stewardship Contracting Projects

- 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.**

A 60-day notice was published in the Federal Register on June 27, 2012, Vol. 77, No. 124, p. 38267; requesting comments. Two comments were received.

Comment received from:

Jean Public

Email: usacitizen1@live.com

Date: June 27, 2012

Submitted two comments, both on June 27, 2012, which are summarized below:

- The commenter stated the collection needs to be submitted to and filed on the internet for viewing by and as a source of information for the entire nation. The commenter also questioned why the Pinchot was involved. The commenter stated the Forest Supervisor should be responsible for what they allow [on their unit].

Response:

- The information collection is posted on the internet at www.regulations.gov and is available for viewing and comment by all citizens/interested persons. The public may inspect all comments received at the Office of the Director, Forest Management Staff, Third Floor NW., Yates Federal Building, 201 14th Street SW., Washington, DC during normal business hours.
- The Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management are required to report to Congress annually on the role of local communities in the development of agreement or contract plans through stewardship contracting, per Section 323 of Public Law 108-7 (16 (U.S.C. 2104 Note). To meet the requirement, the Forest Service conducts surveys under an OMB approved information collection, to gather the necessary information for use by both the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management. The Pinchot Institute for Conservation carries out the survey and reporting process, under a contract with the Forest Service. The contract was solicited following all federal contracting procedures and the Pinchot Institute for Conservation was the awardee.
- In addition, Forest Service stewardship contracting projects require approval by the Regional Forester prior to their implementation. The Forest Service has posted extensive information regarding stewardship contracting, including the FS report prepared by the Pinchot Institute, on the internet at http://www.fs.fed.us/restoration/Stewardship_Contracting/index.shtml.

2013 Supporting Statement - Part A OMB 0596-0201 Role of Communities in Stewardship Contracting Projects

The Pinchot Institute has posted both the FS and BLM reports on their website at: http://www.pinchot.org/gp/Stewardship_Contracting.

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.

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.

Persons Consulted

The following people were contacted to ascertain if the requested information collection and burden estimate are reasonable.

1. Mr. Brian Kittler
Pinchot Institute for Conservation
3146 NE 63rd Ave.
Portland, OR 97213
Office: (503) 836-7880

Comment:

- Mr. Kittler stated that the survey was designed to take 0.5 hours to administer, and that based on their experience over the last several years, the 0.5 hours seems to be the average time it takes for the interviews.

Response:

- The estimate of annual burden respondent remains at 0.75 hours, even though the survey is designed to be completed in 0.5 hours, to account for the time it may take to read the survey ahead of the interview, and/or in the event that the interviewee wishes to further discuss one or more of their responses to the interviewer.

2. Mr. John Burk, Regional Biologist,
National Wild Turkey Federation
Work Phone: 573-676-5994
Email: jburk@nwtf.net

Comment:

Mr. Burk commented:

- The survey has practical or scientific utility;
- It would be kind of a challenge for him to find a single block of time where he could spend 30-45 minutes, all at once, for a telephone interview.

2013 Supporting Statement - Part A OMB 0596-0201

Role of Communities in Stewardship Contracting Projects

- It might be easier if the survey were online so that an individual could fill it out at their own pace and over several periods.

Response:

- The survey was designed for and is conducted by telephone and does not require respondents to prepare a written response. However, the survey form is sent, via email, to the interviewee, so that they may have the option to review the questions prior to the telephone survey/interview which may occur in fewer than 30 days after receipt of it. This does allow respondents the ability to review the survey form at their own pace prior to the telephone call.

3. Ms. Gina Knudson, Executive Director, Salmon Valley Stewardship
513 Main Street
Salmon, Idaho 83467
208-756-1686
salmonvalley@centurytel.net
www.salmonvalley.org

Comment:

Ms. Knudson stated:

- The survey has practical or scientific utility;
- The survey time allowed (30-45 minutes) is reasonable. She found that the survey actually took quite a bit less time than the maximum (45 minutes) allowed;
- No suggestions regarding enhancing the quality, utility, and/or clarity of the survey – she felt the survey is very good as written; and
- Having the survey sent out ahead of time allowed her to review it prior to the telephone call was very helpful and helped reduce the total time needed.

Response:

- A response to Ms. Knudson's comments above is not necessary.

4. Dr. Melanie McDermott, Associate Director, Climate and Society Initiative
Department of Human Ecology,
School of Environmental and Behavioral Sciences
55 Dudley Road
Cook College, Rutgers University
New Brunswick, NJ 08901-8520
Phone: 732/354-3940
Email: mmcdermott@aesop.rutgers.edu

Comment:

Dr. McDermott stated:

- The survey absolutely has practical or scientific utility – the depth it has now is good (it is down to project level) and has provided a great deal of learning potential;

2013 Supporting Statement - Part A OMB 0596-0201

Role of Communities in Stewardship Contracting Projects

- She has not had to complete the survey, but remarked that the time needed could depend upon how much information someone wanted to share based on their interest level and/or experience;
- She did not have any specific suggestions as to how the FS may enhance the quality, utility, and or clarity of the actual survey instrument. She did add, however, that the entire multiparty monitoring process could additionally benefit by a [lengthy] field visit or preferably an in-depth case study analysis of a stewardship project or projects.
- She stated she “endorsed the present approach” and that the present approach is the “right happy medium” between a cut and dried web-based survey of multiple choice or fill-in-the-blank questions, to reduce the amount of time spent, versus adding in a field visit or an in-depth case study analysis [to enhance the entire multiparty monitoring efforts].

Response:

- The current multiparty monitoring process is under a FS contract with the Pinchot Institute. The Pinchot Institute utilizes a series of regional teams, to help determine regional trends among projects and foster Congress’ multiparty mandate of monitoring/evaluation. These teams include diverse interests from the pre-defined regions. The teams normally spend approximately one-half day visiting a selected project including on-site discussions with federal personnel and project partners, collaborators, and/or contractors. Discussions are of a conversational nature, but the teams also address the following:
 1. What are the predominant problems in engaging communities in FS stewardship contracts? BLM stewardship contracts? What are suggestions for improving the current situation for both agencies?
 2. What successes have emerged within this region for engaging communities in FS stewardship contracting? BLM stewardship contracting? What fostered these successes for both agencies?
 3. What are the major perceived benefits of FS and BLM stewardship contracts to communities within this region?

5. Dr. Maureen McDonough, Partner/Subcontractor with the Pinchot Institute and Professor/Statistician, Michigan State University
Department of Forestry
126 Natural Resources Building
East Lansing, MI 48824-1222
mcdono10@msu.edu

Comment:

- Dr. McDonough was contacted regarding the potential for the same interviewee being contacted more than once and whether there were any non-respondents. Dr. McDonough stated the issue of contacting the same person twice has not come up. The Pinchot subcontractors knows who is listed as the agency contact for each project so they can sample with replacement if the same person comes up more than once.
- Dr. McDonough is unaware of anyone who has refused to participate once

2013 Supporting Statement - Part A OMB 0596-0201
Role of Communities in Stewardship Contracting Projects

contacted.

- Regarding any potential for non-respondents; if there were any non-respondents, it would have been VERY low, or otherwise she would have heard about it from the Pinchot partners/subcontractors.

Response:

- Dr. McDonough's comments have been incorporated into the supporting statement, as appropriate.

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

There are no payments or gifts to respondents, other than remuneration of contractors or grantees.

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

There are no assurances of confidentiality. However, the names of people interviewed are not associated with the interviewer's notes from the phone survey, and the names of those interviewed are not retained, ensuring some measure of privacy.

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.

There are no questions in the survey of a sensitive nature.

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. Record keeping burden should be addressed separately.**
- **Provide estimates of annualized cost to respondents for the hour burdens for collections of information, identifying and using appropriate wage rate categories.**

There is no record keeping requirement placed upon the respondents in relation to this information collection.

Table 2: Comparison of past collection activities during fiscal years 2009-

2013 Supporting Statement - Part A OMB 0596-0201
Role of Communities in Stewardship Contracting Projects

2011

This table shows the total number of stewardship projects available for sampling, the number of stewardship projects actually sampled, the maximum number of potential interviewees and the actual number of interviewees.

Fiscal Year	Total Number of Stewardship Projects Available for Sampling			Number of Stewardship Projects Actually Sampled			Maximum Number of Potential Interviewees to be Surveyed ¹			Actual Number of Interviewees Surveyed ²		
	FS	BLM	Total	FS	BLM	Total	FS	BLM	Total	FS	BLM	Total
2009	349	69	418	88	31	119	264	93	357	226	76	302
2010	319	63	382	83	17	100	229	46	275	206	40	246
2011	399	100	499	100	25	125	300	75	375	251	63	314

¹ Maximum number of potential interviewees to be surveyed totals three per each stewardship project actually sampled.

² In some instances, less than three interviews were undertaken due to difficulties in identifying or contacting participants (as reported in Supporting Statement Part B Item 1).

Since the number of stewardship contracting projects changes each year the potential respondent universe varies slightly, however the manner of selecting respondents to be surveyed does not. The FS and BLM originally estimated that over the first three years there would be no more than 550 stewardship-contracting projects in a given year. However, the actual number of stewardship contracting projects has generally been increasing each year (except for the BLM, which decreased from 113 in 2008 to 69 in 2009 and dropped to 63 in 2010, and then increased to 100 in 2011). Thus, the estimate has been revised for this submission renewal to no more than 675 stewardship contracting projects in a given year. (See Table 2 - Comparison of past collection activities during fiscal years 2009-2011, as shown above, and supporting statement section B.1. Table - Summary of FS Stewardship Project and Interview Response Data, which includes a footnote (2) regarding BLM's number of projects.)

As a result, with the estimated increase in the number of stewardship contracting projects, the estimated number of potential respondents has been increased to 507 respondents. Referencing supporting statement Table B.1 - Summary of FS Stewardship project and Interview Response Data, the potential number of FS interviewees for 2015 is 417. Per Table B.1, footnote 2, the potential number of BLM projects to be sampled, during FY 2015 are 120. This results in a potential of 90 interviewees for the BLM ((120 X .25) X 3 potential interviewees), during 2015, based on an estimated 25% sampling rate (the sampling rate (percentage) used during FY 2010 and FY 2011 sampling years). Thus, a total of 507 potential respondents could be interviewed, during 2015, if every single person were contacted and subsequently interviewed. The prior submission's reported estimate was 401 respondents.

The estimated per response remains at 0.75 hours. The estimated annual number of responses per respondent is one. Therefore, the estimated total annual burden is 380 hours.

2013 Supporting Statement - Part A OMB 0596-0201

Role of Communities in Stewardship Contracting Projects

See separate spreadsheet under supplementary documents for breakdown of the burden hours and respondents cost.

To determine the estimated income per hour, the Bureau of Labor Statistics, "Table 1 Summary: mean hourly earnings and weekly hours for selected worker and establishment characteristics" were reviewed (<http://www.bls.gov/ncs/ncswage2010.htm#Overview>). The specific data table is located at <http://www.bls.gov/ncs/ocs/sp/nctb1475.pdf>. Average mean hourly civilian earnings are \$21.29; private industry workers are \$20.47, and state and local government workers are \$26.08. Averaging the three totals \$22.61 (rounded to \$23).

In addition, per personal conversation with Dr. Maureen McDonough, Michigan State University, who designed the statistical aspects of the survey, she is unaware of anyone who has refused to participate once contacted. Regarding any potential for non-respondents, she added, if there were any non-respondents, it was VERY low, as she did not hear about it from the Pinchot partners/subcontractors.

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/start-up or 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**

2013 Supporting Statement - Part A OMB 0596-0201
Role of Communities in Stewardship Contracting Projects

- Employee labor and materials for analyzing, evaluating, summarizing, and/or reporting on the collected information

A contract was awarded to Pinchot Institute for collecting information on the role of local communities in the development of stewardship contracting plans, analyzing the data, and writing the final reports for both the BLM and the Forest Service. The cost per year (based on total fiscal year contract costs) is currently \$247,602 (FY 2012) which is an increase from prior years simply because the cost of the contract has increased (\$235,800 - FY 2011; \$223,880 - FY 2010 and FY 2009; \$215,610 - FY 2008; and \$205,156 - FY 2007).

15. Explain the reasons for any program changes or adjustments reported in items 13 or 14 of OMB form 83-I.

Due to an increase in the number of stewardship contracting projects in a given year, the estimated number of respondents has increased from 401 to 507 in this renewal submission. Thus the estimated total annual burden hours increased from 301 to 380. This resulted in an overall increase of 79 burden hours.

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

The results of the collection of information are included in each agency's annual Report to Congress on stewardship contracting. Ideally, information collection from participants not employed by the federal government begins in early July. The information collection and analysis is conducted by the Pinchot Institute between July and September. The Pinchot Institute provides a report to the FS and BLM by January 15th of the following year, and these agencies provide their report to Congress by spring. After inclusion in the Report to Congress, the analysis of the data may be used in other reports created both internally and externally by the FS and BLM. For example, the FS's 2004 Stewardship Contracting Assessment Review which is available to the public at http://www.fs.fed.us/restoration/Stewardship_Contracting/results/index.shtml.

Congress does make the summarized analysis data, as shown in the final report supplied by the Pinchot Institute to each agency and in each agency's report to Congress, available for use by organizations both inside and outside the government.

No complex analytical techniques are used.

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 FS and BLM are not seeking this approval. The FS and BLM display the OMB approval expiration date on all information collection instruments.

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 in Item 19.

2013 Supporting Statement - Part A OMB 0596-0201
Role of Communities in Stewardship Contracting Projects