

## Supporting Statement A for Paperwork Reduction Act Submissions

### Social Indicators in Coastal Alaska: Arctic Communities

OMB Control Number 1010-NEW

Current Expiration Date: None

**Terms of Clearance:** None

#### General Instructions

A Supporting Statement, including the text of the notice to the public required by 5 CFR 1320.5(a)(i)(iv) and its actual or estimated date of publication in the Federal Register, 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 in Section A below. If an item is not applicable, provide a brief explanation. When statistical data is employed, Section B of the Supporting Statement must be completed. The Office of Management and Budget (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.**

The United States Congress, through the 1953 Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) Lands Act (OCSLA) [Public Law 95-372, Section 20] and its subsequent amendments, requires the Secretary of the Department of the Interior (DOI) to monitor and assess the impacts of resource development activities in Federal waters on human, marine, and coastal environments. The OCSLA amendments authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct studies in areas or regions of sales to ascertain the “environmental impacts on the marine and coastal environments of the outer Continental shelf and the coastal areas which may be affected by oil and gas development” (43 U.S.C. 1346).

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321-4347) requires that all Federal Agencies use a systematic, interdisciplinary approach to ensure the integrated use of the natural and social sciences in any planning and decision making that may have an effect on the human environment. The Council on Environmental Quality’s Regulations for Implementing Procedural Provisions of NEPA (40 CFR 1500-1508) state that the “human environment” is to be “interpreted comprehensively” to include “the natural and physical environment and the relationship of people with that environment” (40 CFR 1508.14). An action’s “aesthetic, historic, cultural, economic, social or health” effects must be assessed, “whether direct, indirect, or cumulative” (40 CFR 1508.8).

Executive Order 12898 of February 11, 1994, on Environmental Justice requires that Federal agencies consider the impacts of any action of disadvantaged, at risk, and minority populations. To evaluate these impacts, information about the vulnerability of certain stakeholders must be better understood. Indicators of vulnerability can include but are not limited to income, race/ethnicity, household structure, education levels, and age. Although some general information related to this issue is available through census and other quantitative data, these sources do not disaggregate those individuals or groups that are subsistence harvesters or those affected by changes through oil and gas exploration and development.

Therefore, other types of data collection tools must be utilized to gather information on Alaska coastal Native communities related to Executive Order 12898.

The Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (BOEM) is the DOI agency that conducts OCS lease sales and monitors and mitigates adverse impacts that might be associated with offshore resource development. The BOEM Environmental Studies Program implements and manages the responsibilities of research. The survey in this collection will facilitate the meeting of DOI/BOEM information needs on the well-being and living conditions in coastal Alaska with specific focus on coastal Alaska communities in the North Slope area. This submission involves a data collection survey, Social Indicators in Coastal Alaska: Arctic Communities (Social Indicators Study).

North Slope communities are subject to potential impacts of offshore energy development. The intent of this study is to monitor and thus potentially mitigate these impacts. Previous studies have established that residents use the surrounding lands and waters to harvest local food resources such as caribou, bowhead whale, and Arctic char. Studies have also established that the overall well-being of residents is closely tied to these harvest activities and products. The Social Indicators Study is intended to measure baseline social indicators of well-being in six North Slope communities. Monitoring changes in these indicators over time will help DOI/BOEM to identify and therefore be able to mitigate impacts of offshore development.

***2. Indicate how, by whom, and for what purpose the information is to be used. Except for a new collection, indicate the actual use the agency has made of the information received from the current collection. Be specific. If this collection is a form or a questionnaire, every question needs to be justified.***

The information to be collected in this survey is intended to inform regulatory agencies, academic researchers, and partner communities about local social systems, well-being, and living conditions of Alaska Native communities in the Arctic region in a way that can shape oil and gas development strategies and serve as an interim baseline for impact monitoring to compare against future conditions.

This survey will be conducted in an interview format (see No. 3). The categories, or domains of questions, are social indicators of well-being, impacts of oil industry activities on subsistence, and population subgroup attributes.

#### *Social Indicators of Well-being (Questions in Sections A-G)*

The research team formed a management board, the North Slope Management Board (NSMB) made up of community and regional representatives to identify the social indicators to be measured. The NSMB built upon the work of the Arctic Council's international Arctic Social Indicators Initiative (Larsen et al., 2010; see references in Supporting Statement B) and DOI/BOEM's recommended set of six social indicator domains: cultural continuity, economic well-being, education, local control, health and safety, and physical environment.

The NSMB then identified social indicators within each domain. The NSMB used as a starting point questions previously used in National Science Foundation research conducted in North Slope communities between 1977 and 2003. In a 2-day meeting held in Barrow in April 2012, the NSMB reviewed the Social Indicators Assessment and the draft questionnaire, making several changes in the questionnaire. While some of the original questions were rephrased during the review process, the research team was careful to retain comparability with the original research questions from the 1977 and 2003 studies.

Three global indicators were selected by the NSMB to represent overall well-being. Variations in overall well-being have been found in previous studies to be significantly related to social indicators drawn from each of the six domains (Kruse et al., 2009; see references in Supporting Statement B).

1. Satisfaction with life in this community
2. Satisfaction with life as a whole
3. Considered moving from community and reasons for staying or moving

#### *Impacts of Oil Industry Activities on Subsistence (Questions in Sections H-I)*

The second major category of questions measure perceived impacts of oil industry activities on subsistence activities. The questions are designed to enable researchers to differentiate between oil industry activities associated with offshore and onshore development. Respondents are asked to both describe the oil industry activity and to identify actions that could mitigate its impact.

#### *Population Subgroup Attributes (Questions in Section J)*

The third and final category of questions is necessary to identify population subgroups that may be disproportionately affected by some impacts of offshore development.

The specific wording of questions is based on previous use of questions under a National Science Foundation Grant (OPP- 0120174) during the period 2001 to 2006 ([www.arcticlivingconditions.org](http://www.arcticlivingconditions.org)). Some questions include local phrases where they have been found to help the respondent understand the question (e.g., “sewed skins, made parkas, kamiks or other traditional clothing”).

The interview makes extensive use of cue cards to reduce response burden and increase the confidentiality of responses in household settings.

The species listed will vary by community. In each community the species listed will be the top 10 species harvested by total edible weight. The resulting variable is an estimate of total harvest as the top 10 species have been empirically shown to account for a mean of 90 percent of the total subsistence harvest in rural Alaska communities.

Employment questions concern the job in which the respondent worked the most hours in the previous 12 months. Many Arctic residents hold more than one job during the year. The job with the most hours was used in the Survey of Living Conditions in the Arctic (Kruse et al., 2009) as an operational definition of the most important job held in the past year.

***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.***

No information pertaining to this information collection will be submitted electronically. Interviews will be done orally, face to face, in a setting that is comfortable for each respondent, such as the home, the workplace, or a community venue (such as the local community center). Interviews will either be conducted during nonwork hours or during work hours with the permission of the employer. This personal method is more expensive and time consuming. However, these drawbacks are outweighed by improvements in response rate, the quality of information obtained, and the rapport established between

the interviewer and the interviewee. Telephone interviews have not proven to be broadly successful in obtaining useful information on the North Slope.

**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.**

BOEM research indicates that Social Indicators surveys are not being performed in the State of Alaska. This survey will not be duplicative of any similar information that could be used or modified for use for the purposes described herein.

There are, however, some other DOI surveys that may ask a few similar questions. For instance, the Social Indicators Survey will obtain data on the top 10 subsistence harvest resources, which could include a bird species depending on the study community. The Fish and Wildlife Service maintains a collection, Alaska Migratory Bird Subsistence Harvest Household Survey (1018-0124), that may contain questions on the same bird species. However, the migratory bird survey does not yield the estimates of subsistence harvests of all resources, which is necessary to assess cumulative impacts. Also, the National Park Service Community Harvest Assessment for Alaska National Parks (1024-0262) collects household income data for Nuiqsut, a community that is also included in the BOEM survey. The BOEM survey contains questions linking income data with subsistence in order to assess impacts and overall well-being.

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

Some individuals connected with small businesses may be interviewed, but the collection of information will not have a direct impact or impose a burden on small businesses.

**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.**

BOEM has minimized the burden on respondents as much as possible. To help respondents, the interviewer will ask all the questions, clarify if needed, and write the answers down. This technique will help the respondent by eliminating any confusion in how to answer and will help the interviewer with consistent written responses. The Social Indicators Study is necessary to meet BOEM's mandate of assessing and mitigating impacts of offshore energy development. It will measure well-being across living condition domains. Completing the first phase of this study in North Slope communities before major offshore activities begin is necessary to the objective of establishing baseline measures. These data are unavailable through other sources.

**7. Explain any special circumstances that would cause an information collection to be conducted in a manner:**

**(a) requiring respondents to report information to the agency more often than quarterly.**

**(b) requiring respondents to prepare a written response to a collection of information in fewer than 30 days after receipt of it.**

**(c) requiring respondents to submit more than an original and two copies of any document.**

**(d) requiring respondents to retain records, other than health, medical, government contract, grant-in-aid, or tax records, for more than 3 years.**

**(e) 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.**

**(f) requiring the use of statistical data classification that has been reviewed and approved by OMB.**

**(g) 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.**

**(h) 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.**

There are no special circumstances that require us to collect the information in a manner inconsistent with OMB guidelines.

**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 3 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.**

As required by 5 CFR 1320.11, BOEM published a 60-day review comment notice in the *Federal Register* on March 14, 2014 (79 FR 14533). We received one response. The Mayor's Office of the North Slope Borough posed several questions and concerns about aspects of the survey. A summary of each and the response are outlined below. The Social Indicators study has been under construction and planned by the Environmental Studies Program of BOEM for more than 5 years and reported in annual Study Development Plans provided to the North Slope Borough (NSB) for review and comment. It is directly linked to Arctic Social Indicator domain identification undertaken by the Arctic Council and is responsive to the Arctic Research Plan, issued by the Executive Office of the President, National Science and Technology Council in February 2013. BOEM believes this pioneering effort is a way to monitor impacts for oil and gas exploration and development in that the study meets the information needs to identify and monitor broad social changes in the Arctic. We appreciate this opportunity to respond to specific questions raised by the Mayor of the North Slope Borough, Alaska.

#### Need for the Survey

##### *1. Is this collection a result of the HIA in the EIS?*

This survey collection is not a result of the Health Impact Assessment (HIA) in an EIS. The collection is linked to the Arctic Social Indicators Project, an outgrowth of the Arctic Human Development Report of 2004 conducted under the auspices of the Arctic Council's Sustainable Development Working Group (Arctic Social Indicators 2010). HIA involves a more specific set of questions about health status in the communities, whereas the Social Indicators study, designed to assess respondents' sense of well-being, explores six domains, one of which is health.

2. *BOEM should use the NSB's Baseline Community Health Analysis Report in the social indicators and acknowledge that the health environment is already impacted by resource development.*

The NSB Baseline Community Health Analysis Report was not completed until June 2012, after the Social Indicators contract was awarded. The designs of both the Baseline Community Health Analysis Report and the Social Indicators survey are complementary because they are derived from the same parent document, the NSB Census of 2010. The Social Indicators survey results will be shared with the NSB. Some of the survey questions will correspond with the NSB Community Health Analysis Report and will support decision making at all levels of government. The 2010 NSB Census includes the same overall health questions that were asked by the Survey of Living Conditions in the Arctic (SLiCA) conducted by Dr. Kruse in collaboration with the NSB in 2003. These same questions were approved by the North Slope Management Board (NSMB) for the BOEM Social Indicators survey. The project report will be the venue to address emerging trends, including if the health environment has been impacted by resource development, not the survey instrument.

### Survey Design

3. *Who are the members of the NSMB, how were they selected, and how was the survey developed?*

The chair and the members of the NSMB are serving on a voluntary basis. Representatives are from the communities of Barrow, Kaktovik, Nuiqsut, Wainwright, Point Lay, and Point Hope. Since the members of the NSMB are volunteers, the BOEM prefers not to disclose their names in this document. As for the survey design, the contractor, Stephen R. Braund & Assoc. (SRBA), held a workshop for the NSMB in Barrow in April 2012 to discuss survey content and design. The Social Indicators survey is based upon a pool of questions derived from previous research conducted in collaboration with the NSB (e.g., SLiCA). The questions correlate directly with domains identified in the Arctic Social Indicators Report, 2010, an outgrowth of the Arctic Human Development Report of 2004 conducted under the auspices of the Arctic Council's Sustainable Working Group and the BOEM Social Indicators contract. Subsequently, SRBA generated a survey instrument for review by OMB to obtain a control number. SRBA consulted again with the NSMB in September 2012 before the survey instrument was provided to BOEM for the OMB submission. This submission was delayed for a year to perform a Privacy Act Impact Assessment, now completed.

4. *Why address only the "head of the household"?*

BOEM is concerned about the burden of effort and therefore limits the survey to heads of households (HH), as the HH is the individual with the knowledge and authority to address all of household-level questions asked. The HH may be an adult male or female of any age over 18. This is the standard best practice among social scientists conducting surveys, including Dr. Gary Kofinas's "The Study of Sharing Networks to Assess the Vulnerabilities of Local Communities to Oil & Gas Development in Arctic Alaska," also funded by BOEM. To select the head of household, the study team will ask the first adult contacted in the household to identify the head of household. If the response is more than one person, then the interviewer will be directed to interview the person with the next birthday as a means of random selection.

5. *It is important to have a variety of people from the North Slope involved in helping to pick the contractor/review the survey questions.*

A variety of individuals from each North Slope coastal community and the Alaska Eskimo Whaling Commission were involved in selecting the survey questions. BOEM selected the contractor through a competitive bidding process based on the merits of the technical proposal and expertise of the contractor.

6. *Survey fatigue: Suggest BOEM coordinate with the other agencies/industry.*

BOEM and its project contractors are highly concerned about survey fatigue and the importance of coordinating with others who conduct research among the Iñupiat of the North Slope. BOEM has coordinated with other entities doing research. However, BOEM has found that even though there are surveys that may ask a similar question, none fully address the sense of well-being as this Social Indicators survey is designed to assess. BOEM and SRBA are leaders in the field of social research and well understand and are sensitive to the problems of public burden and survey fatigue. Once BOEM receives OMB approval, BOEM and SRBA will coordinate with local and regional authorities to schedule the Social Indicators survey implementation.

BOEM is also responding to a comment received on a *Federal Register* notice (78 FR 25473) published

May 1, 2013, requesting public comment on a survey renewal collection (1010-0184) that we have since discontinued. In that notice, we introduced this new survey and received a comment; therefore, we are addressing that comment in this new collection now.

The commenter suggested the use of Dillman's *Tailored Design Method* as being a superior alternative to random sampling. BOEM agrees with the Dillman strategy and has used similar elements in designing our face-to-face surveys. Dillman's strategies target improving response rates for mail, telephone, and internet surveys, which can have response rates lower than 50 percent. In contrast, prior experience in applying the proposed sample design and face-to-face interviews in northern Alaska has shown response rates above 80 percent. Several opportunities of advance survey notice have been achieved through the NSMB participation in the survey design process. Upon OMB approval, the design team will work with the NSMB to extend community involvement to the city councils, tribal governments, and village corporations (See Board description below). In addition, Dillman's approach concerns how the interview process is designed, not how people are sampled from the population to be described. The sampling approach used in our surveys is termed "area probability sampling," developed by the Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, to meet the statistical goals of producing valid estimates and confidence intervals. A probability sample means that each person/household in the population to be sampled has a known probability of being selected. A probability sample is commonly referred to as a "random sample." In accordance with Dillman's approach, BOEM incorporates specific procedures to maintain the validity of the probability sample by making repeated contacts to interview the selected respondent. We also train interviewers to build trust and engagement in the study and engage community leaders and secure their approval. The addition of a remuneration provides additional incentive for participation.

North Slope Management Board: The Research Plan for this survey included an approach to community engagement involving a board made up of community and regional representatives in all phases of the study. The board is called the North Slope Management Board (NSMB). The contractor worked with the NSMB, which includes representatives from the six communities listed in the statement of work as well as a representative from the Alaska Eskimo Whaling Commission. In a 2-day meeting held in Barrow in April 2012, the NSMB reviewed the Social Indicators Assessment, making several changes to the list of social indicators to be addressed in the survey. The survey instrument was developed through collaborative discussions with these key community members on the board. The study team conducted a pre-test with nine North Slope respondents and estimated that the survey would take 1 hour. The pre-test also provided the opportunity to test the flow of questions and detect unforeseen problems.

Prior to implementation of the survey, the study team plans to work through the NSMB to involve community and regional organizations, including village councils, city councils, regional and village corporations, and the North Slope Borough. Public notification of the study will occur prior to surveying and will include public notices that direct residents to the study website. The study team will coordinate with the NSMB and the appropriate local organization in each community to plan fieldwork.

The respondents of this survey will also be read a one-page description of the project that notes the required Paperwork Reduction Act statement. The statement will display the OMB control number, explain that respondents may comment on any aspect of the survey including burden estimates, expiration date, and provide the address to which comments may be directed.

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

Respondents will receive an honorarium for participating in the survey. The primary reason to remunerate study participants is the need to reduce non-response within a small community in a cultural setting where an exchange of reciprocity for time commitment is expected. High rates of non-response would undermine survey efforts and introduce bias into the data. Remuneration is intended as an additional incentive to participate.

Respondents will be remunerated at the rate of \$50 per interview. Our estimate is \$40,050 (801 households @ \$50/interview = \$40,050).

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

This survey is voluntary. The respondent will be asked questions by the interviewer who will also record responses. The survey will be conducted in a face-to-face setting and will be administered under the guidelines of 45 CFR 46 when applicable. The information in this survey is not covered by the Privacy Act of 1974. The introduction that will be covered with each participant stresses that participation is voluntary and anonymity will be maintained because no personally identifying information will be collected and the respondent can choose not to answer a question or may withdraw from the survey before the questionnaire is completed. No personal names, home addresses, birthdates, social security numbers, or any other information that could directly or indirectly identify a respondent will be collected on the survey form. The surveys will not be coded with identifying information. BOEM also does not believe that it will be possible to identify individuals indirectly by using any or all of the information that will be collected from individuals and/or that is entered into the database. No recognizable photographs will be taken of any informant, and no videotaping will be conducted. Minor children and prisoners will not be interviewed. Survey instruments are designed to avoid linking reported data with personally identifiable information. Interviewers are consistently instructed not to write names on survey instruments or other survey material. (A Privacy Impact Assessment was conducted for this collection and determined that a SORN is not required for this collection—PIA attached in ROCIS).

**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.**

The Social Indicators Study will ask four potentially sensitive but routine questions on personal health (D6-D9). Health and Safety is one of the six domains identified as important to overall well-being. These questions are presented to the respondent as a self-administered portion of the interview. The questions cover victimization, problems related to alcohol or drug use in the home, depression, and social supports. Each of these topics has been found in previous research to be important to overall well-being and is therefore necessary for BOEM to monitor (Kruse et al 2009; see References in Supporting Statement B). These particular questions were selected by the North Slope Management Board to cover key dimensions of health and safety, physical and mental health, satisfaction, social support, and family health. These dimensions have been found to be significant predictions of overall well-being.

The Social Indicator survey is designed to be voluntary. Any individual can refuse to answer a question or withdraw from the survey at any point in time. Social researchers contracted by BOEM are sensitive toward coercion and will ensure that it does not happen. The Principal Investigator, Dr. Kruse, has decades of experience conducting social research among the Iñupiaq Eskimo of the North Slope of Alaska. Respondents will be read an informed consent statement that tells them that their involvement is voluntary and that they can decline to answer any question. In each community, entities such as the Indian Reorganization Authorization (IRA) Tribal Council will also be asked for approval to conduct the survey. The consent statement explains to the respondent that there are sensitive questions. To minimize risk of disclosure of responses to other persons, the survey uses cue cards in which the respondent chooses a letter or number associated with their response. To further minimize the risk of disclosure of

responses to sensitive questions, the respondent is given a self-administered section of the questionnaire. The respondent places their completed form in an envelope which they seal. The envelope is only opened during the analysis phase, at which point the self-administered form is destroyed. To minimize the risk of inadvertent disclosure to an analyst of the identity of the respondent, response choices are grouped into categories sufficiently general so as to include multiple respondents, even when responses to several questions are seen by the analyst.

The research team established the North Slope Management Board (NSMB) composed of community representatives. The NSMB is a review board comprised of well-respected Iñupiat representatives from each community who were selected by a prominent, well-respected Iñupiaq leader (see <http://www.arctichost.net/NSSI/>). All of the questions in the survey instrument, including the sensitive ones, were selected and approved by the NSMB. The NSMB considered the risk of including questions that, if the results were published, could stigmatize a community. It was not an easy choice. On balance, the NSMB concluded that such concerns as domestic violence were important enough to include questions in the survey. To minimize the risk of stigmatization, community-specific survey results will first be reviewed by the NSMB to ensure that the results are valid. The NSMB will review publication plans, which will only be implemented with their approval. If the NSMB chooses, results will only be published for all North Slope communities combined, or with villages other than Barrow combined. The unpublished data will contain a community variable that analysts can use to differentiate sources of impacts. The NSMB will be asked to review draft publications so that the risk of inadvertent harm to residents and communities can be minimized.

The Social Indicator survey is intended to help decision makers avoid unintended consequences imposed upon the Iñupiaq people. The Social Indicator survey asks some sensitive questions that respond to concerns that have been expressed in public testimony by Iñupiat residents of the North Slope in the past 40 years regarding potential social effects of offshore oil and gas development. Social surveys and the data they provide play a vital role in monitoring and mitigating impacts from development. BOEM would like to administer the survey, analyze the results, and apply them to planned oil and gas exploration and development in the Beaufort and Chukchi Seas.

Finally, it should be noted that the researchers successfully used all of the above approaches to minimizing risks in the international Survey of Living Conditions in the Arctic (SLiCA), see [www.arcticlivingconditions.org](http://www.arcticlivingconditions.org).

**12. Provide estimates of the hour burden of the collection of information. The statement should:**

***(a) 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.***

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

**c) 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.**

The total burden for this collection is 834 hours. We plan to approach approximately 1,001 individuals during the sampling period and expect to receive about 801 complete questionnaires for this collection. We estimate that the initial contact time will be about 2 minutes per person. We expect that 200 individuals will not participate. For those who agree to participate, 1 hour will be required to complete the survey.

We estimate that the dollar value of the annual burden hours will be \$28,256. The BLS lists the 2012 mean hourly wage for persons in farming, fishing, and forestry occupations in Alaska at \$24.06 ([http://www.bls.gov/oes/current/oes\\_ak.htm#45-0000](http://www.bls.gov/oes/current/oes_ak.htm#45-0000)). We multiplied this by 1.4 to account for benefits in accordance with release USDL 14-0390 March 12, 2014 (\$24.06 x 1.4 = \$34 (rounded)).

<i>Activity</i>	<i>No. of Responses</i>	<i>Completion Time Per Response</i>	<i>Total Annual Burden Hours</i>	<i>Dollar Value of Annual Burden Hours (\$34/hr.)</i>
Initial contact	1,001	2 minutes	33	\$ 1,122
Survey	801	1 hour	801	27,234
Total	1,802		834	28,356

**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).**

**(a) The cost estimate should be split into two components: (1) a total capital and start-up cost component (annualized over its expected useful life) and (2) 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.**

**(b) If cost estimates are expected to vary widely, agencies should present ranges of cost burden 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.**

**(c) 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 non-hour paperwork cost burdens to the respondents for this collection of 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.**

The study was awarded to Stephen R. Braund & Associates by BOEM. The total amount of the project award is \$685,103. The project is divided into two phases. The first phase includes the research design, literature search and review, community engagement and formulation of the NSMB, development of social indicator domains and alternatives, and survey design and approval. The second phase of the project includes continued community engagement and involvement with the NSMB, administering the survey, data analysis, preparation of draft and final deliverables, and dissemination of findings to communities. Both phases of the project are scheduled to be completed in 3 years. Therefore, the annualized cost to the government is estimated at \$228,368.

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

This is a new collection, so we are requesting a program increase of 834 burden hours. There are no non-hour costs.

**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.**

Preliminary results of the Social Indicators Study will be reviewed for validity by the North Slope Management Board (NSMB) described under Item A.8. The NSMB will also review pre-publication drafts in order to identify any statements that inadvertently could cause harm to the North Slope resident population. These procedures were followed in the Survey of Living Conditions in the Arctic (SLiCA) (Kruse et al., 2009) study. Microdata from the SLiCA study will be merged with microdata from this study in order to perform statistical tests on observed differences in results over time (the data from the two studies cannot, however, be linked by individual). The study team will construct comparable analytic variables and will apply tests of significance appropriate to the level of measurement of each variable. Results will be published in a form suitable for lay readership and published in a peer-reviewed journal such as *Social Indicators Research*.

**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 expiration date of the OMB approval will be in the PRA statement read to each respondent.

**18. Explain each exception to the certification statement, “Certification for Paperwork Reduction Act Submissions.”**

There are no exceptions to the certifications statement.