

**Justification for Use of Non-Timber Forest Products Information Collection, OMB Control Number 0596-0243 – Request to Submit Project for Expedited Review**

---

**Overview:** The Non-Timber Forest Products Generic Clearance provides for collection of information from individuals and groups who forage for non-timber forest products (NTFPs) and from natural resource professionals who manage land where NTFP foraging takes place, using a broad range of social science methods (e.g., surveys, interviews, and focus groups). Please consult the briefing paper for an overview on this process and the compendium of questions for specific questions you may use in the proposed collection for expedited review. Reach out to [Kenli Kim](#) with questions.

**Instructions for Completing the Justification Form:**

1. Information Collection (IC) Title/Date Submitted to the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) Forest Service, Office of Regulatory and Management Services: Insert title for the proposed IC (e.g., survey, focus group, comment card, etc.). Insert date that the expedited approval package will be submitted to Forest Service. Reminder: Please submit the package through [Kenli Kim](#), the National Program Leader for Social Science Research.
2. Deputy Area and Organization: E.g., R&D/NRS
3. Abstract: Summarize the proposed study with an abstract. Please keep to 150 words.
4. Station Point of Contact Information: This is the individual with whom ORMS and the WO R&D POC will be in contact with this project. In many cases, this person will likely be the PI, but in some cases, it could be different.
5. Principal Investigator (PI) Conducting the IC: Complete information about the PI who will be conducting the IC, if different than Point of Contact listed in #4.
6. Lead WO R&D POC Reviewing the IC (This is filled in already.)
7. IC Dates: List the time period in which the IC will be conducted, including specific starting and ending dates. The starting date should be at least 45 days after the submission date.
8. Type of IC Instrument: Check the type(s) of information collection instrument(s) that will be used. If other, please explain.
9. Data Collection Instrument: Explain how the data collection method and instrument (e.g., survey, interview guides, discussion guides, etc.) were developed. With whom did you consult during the development? Who were the social science and/or statistical experts who reviewed the instruments? How did you address any concerns raised or improvements suggested? Did you pretest the data collection instrument? If yes, how did you address any concerns raised or improvements suggested? (Note: A description of any pre-testing and peer review of the methods and/or instrument is highly recommended.)
10. Which of the topic areas from the Compendium of Questions will be addressed in your IC? Check all that apply. For each question in your survey (or discussion guide or comment card), please indicate the Compendium Topic Area and the unique question identifier from the Compendium. For any questions that are not taken from the Compendium, please indicate “NEW” in the table.

Sample table:

Survey Question Number	Compendium Topic Area	Compendium Question Identifier
1	Foraging Experience	Q1
2	Foraged Species	Q9
Etc.		

11. Methodology: Explain how the IC will be conducted. Provide a description of the methodology including: (a) The population of interest (b) How will the users/visitors be sampled? (if fewer than all users/visitors will be surveyed); (c) What percentage of users/visitors asked to participate will respond, and (d) What actions are

planned to increase the response rate? If statistics are generated, this description must be specific and include each of the following:

- The respondent universe;
- The sampling plan and all sampling procedures;
- How the instrument will be administered;
- Expected response rate and confidence levels; and
- Strategies for dealing with potential non-response bias.

12. Total Number of Initial Contacts and Expected Number of Respondents: Provide an estimated total number of initial contacts and the total number of expected respondents.

13. Estimated Time to Complete Initial Contact and Time to Complete Survey Instrument: Estimate the time to complete the initial contact and the time to complete the information collection (e.g., survey, comment card, focus group, etc.) in minutes.

14. Total Burden Hours: Provide the total number of burden hours. The total burden hours should account for the amount of time required to instruct the respondents and the amount of time required for the respondent to complete the data collection.

15. Reporting Plan: Provide a brief description of the reporting plan for the data being collected.

16. Justification, Purpose, and Use: Provide a brief justification for the information collection, its purpose, goals, and use, including utility to managers. Describe what statistical techniques will be used to generalize the results to the entire user population, if appropriate. Describe how data from the survey will be used. Describe how you will acknowledge any limitations related to the data, particularly in cases where we obtain a lower than anticipated response rate.

**Instructions for Certification Form:**

Complete the Form and include the names of those who certify that the Justification Form meets the requirements of the generic clearance (OMB control number 0596-0243).

**Instructions for Checklist**

Review the checklist to ensure you have met the requirements for submission and that your approval package includes the required items.

**Justification for Submission under Non-Timber Forest Products Generic Clearance  
(OMB Control Number 0596-0243)**

**U.S. Department of Agriculture-Forest Service**

Forest Service Tracking Number for internal use:

**Date Submitted to WO R&D:** July 16, 2018

**Date Submitted to ORMS:** July 17, 2018

**1. IC Title:**

Urban Foraging in a Community of Place--Atlanta's Browns Mill community

**2. Deputy Area and Organization:**

R&D/Southern Research Station (SRS)

**3. Abstract:**

This information collection gathers data on the social acceptability of urban foraging in Atlanta's Browns Mill community. There is a growing literature on urban foraging in the United States that concentrates on the Northeast, Pacific Northwest, and Pacific southwest regions of the country. No studies have undertaken this investigation in the South, despite the fact that the South has a climate conducive to both the growing and harvesting of wild foods. African Americans have a long and complicated history in natural areas in the South, including those in urban settings; yet, there exists no data on urban foraging in the South or anywhere else in the country for this population segment. The City of Atlanta is establishing a Food Forest in the mostly low-wealth, predominantly African American Browns Mill community in southeast Atlanta. This effort is being undertaken to help address the relative dearth of fresh produce sources in this part of the city (i.e., "food deserts"). The success of this effort for the Browns Mill community will hinge on residents' views and ultimate engagement with the resource. This study aims to capture that information.

**4. R&D Project Point of Contact:**

Cassandra Johnson Gaither, Research Social Scientist, Southern Research Station  
706-559-4270 (p), 706-559-4266 (f), [cjohnson09@fs.fed.us](mailto:cjohnson09@fs.fed.us)  
320 Green Street, Athens, GA 30602

**5. Principal Investigator Information (If different from #4):**

Same as #4

**6. WO R&D Point of Contact:**

Kenli Kim, NPL for Social Science Research, WO R&D  
202-841-8819, [kkim@fs.fed.us](mailto:kkim@fs.fed.us)

**7. IC Dates:**

Start of this info collection is TBD, upon approval until appropriate sample size reached, but no later than 10/31/2020

**8. Type of Information Collection Instrument (please check all that apply):**

- Intercept
- Telephone Survey
- Mail Survey
- Drop-off/Pick-up Survey
- Interviews
- Focus Groups
- Comment Card
- Other, please explain:

**9. Instrument and Method Development:**

The survey was developed in consultation with Dr. Marla Emery with the USDA Forest Service, Northern Research Station. Dr. Emery advised as to the content of the questionnaire, that is, which items to include from the approved generic information collection for non-timber forest products (0596-0243). Dr. Emery also suggested questions from prior work she has done on urban foraging in other parts of the country. Suggestions for survey item placement and flow were also given by Dr. Emery. Dr. Johnson and Dr. Emery iterated back and forth on survey design until agreement was reached. Dr. Stanley Zarnoch with the USDA Forest Service Southern Research Station was consulted regarding appropriate methodology for implementing the survey. Dr. Zarnoch was asked about the appropriateness of proportionate, census-guided sampling. Dr. Zarnoch concurred that this sampling protocol would yield a sample appropriate for making inferences about the larger Browns Mill community. The instrument will be pre-tested with a small sample prior to deployment of the collection.

**10. Which of the following question areas from the Compendium of Questions will be addressed in your IC?**

(Mark X for all that apply.)

Questions for Foragers:

- Foraging Experience
- Foraged Species
  - Optional Follow-up Questions Related to Each Foraged Species
  - Optional Follow-up Questions Related to Consumption of Foraged Species
- Foraging Locations
- Motivations for Foraging
  - Knowledge of Foraging Regulations/Encounters with Land Owners or Land Managers
  - Demographic Information

Questions for Land Managers:

- Encounters with Foragers
- Additional Questions for Land Managers

Questions & Scales Related to Environmental Concern, Self & Nature, Sense of Place, Etc

- Ecocentric/Anthropocentric Attitudes
- Self and Nature
- The NEP
- Psychological Distance/Construal Theory
- Limits to Action
- Trust
- Place Attachment
- Place Dependence
- Place Identity

**In addition, for each question in your survey instrument (or discussion guide, comment card, etc), please indicate the Compendium Topic Area and the unique question identifier from the Compendium. If the question is not taken from the Compendium, indicate "NEW".**

Survey Question Number	Compendium Topic Area	Compendium Question
------------------------	-----------------------	---------------------

		Identifier
1	NEW	
2	NEW	
3	NEW	
4	NEW	
5	NEW	
6	NEW	
7	NEW	
8	NEW	
9	NEW	
10	MODIFIED	Q15
11	NEW	
12	Foraging Experience	Q2
13	Foraging Experience	Q3
14	Foraging Experience	Q4
15	Foraging Experience	Q5
16	Foraged Species	Q10
17	Foraged Species	Q17
18	Foraged Species	Q18
19	Foraged Species	Q19
20	Foraging Locations	Q23
21	NEW	
22	Motivations for Foraging	Q34
23	Motivations for Foraging	Q35
24	Demographic Information	Q52
25	Demographic Information	Q51
26	Demographic Information	Q53
27	Demographic Information	Q54
28	Demographic Information	Q55
29	Demographic Information	Q57

**11. Methodology:**

**Population (i.e., Respondent Universe):**

Data will be collected from residents in the City of Atlanta’s Neighborhood Planning Unit Z, specifically from those in six census tracts--67, 68.02, 70.01, 70.02, 71, and 73 which are within a 1-mile radius of the Browns Mill Food Forest at 2217 Browns Mill Rd. NPU Z is one of the most socially and economically challenged sections of the city. According to the City of Atlanta 2010 Census Summary Report, in Neighborhood Planning Unit Z, 93% of residents are African American, and 43% of the households are headed by a female, no husband present (<http://www.atlantaga.gov/Home/ShowDocument?id=3893>; [https://cgis.gatech.edu/NQOLH/About\\_NPUs/Z/](https://cgis.gatech.edu/NQOLH/About_NPUs/Z/)). Also, there has been significant out-migration of residents over the past thirty years. The population density is just 2.8 persons per acre for NPU Z, compared to 5 persons per acre for the city; also, at the time the report was written, the unemployment rate was 22%, nearly double the rate for the city as a whole (12.4%); median household income was just \$26,354, compared to \$46,146 city wide, and more than one-third of the population was below the poverty line. The 2010 U.S. census indicates that there were 21,274 people living in the six tracts. The total land area is 8.97 sq. miles. There were 7,686 occupied housing units in census tracts comprising NPU Z.

**Sampling Plan and Procedure:**

The proportionate census-guided (PCG) systematic random sampling method will be used to gather data from residents living within a 1-mile radius of the food forest. PCG systematic random sampling makes use of U.S. Census Bureau census tracts and blocks to develop a stratified sampling framework for neighborhoods based on the number of households comprising each census block. We desire a sample size of 400 respondents. Sample size for each of the tracts is calculated by determining the proportion of land area for a census tract that falls

within a 1-mile radius of the food forest. Proportions were determined in ArcMap (column 3). This ratio is then multiplied by the total number of occupied housing units for the census tract to derive estimates of the number of occupied housing units in our area of interest (column 5). These estimates are calculated assuming that houses are distributed randomly in each of the census tracts. The estimated number of housing units for each census tract is then divided by the total estimate of occupied houses to derive a proportion for each census tract. That proportion is multiplied by 400 to derive the number of samples per census tract.

Census tract	Study Area Sq. Miles	Prop. of census track in study area	Number of Occupied Houses	Est. Occupied Houses (rounded)	Prop. Total Est. Houses* in census tract— (sample size/CT)	Sample size per Tract
13121006700	1.32	0.08	1540	126	0.06 (24)	24
13121006802	0.28	0.14	504	73	0.04 (16)	16
13121007001	1.76	0.61	1352	831	0.36 (144)	144
13121007002	1.69	0.78	988	769	0.33 (132)	132
13121007100	0.96	0.16	791	125	0.05 (20)	20
13121007300	2.97	0.15	2511	374	0.16 (64)	64
Total	8.97		7,686	2,298	400 (*rounded up)	400

**Instrument Administration:**

Surveyors will canvas blocks included in each portion of the census tracts within the 1-mile radius and collect the targeted number of surveys for each census tract. Surveyors will begin survey administration by randomly selecting a street contained in any one of the six census tracts that also falls within the one-mile buffer. Households on that street will be selected based on randomized intervals between 1 and 10 (or maximum number of houses on one side of a street). For instance, ten slips of paper, each containing one of the numbers 1 to 10 will be placed in a container. The surveyor will select one slip of paper and approach the third, sixth, or tenth home, for example, on one side of a street to begin surveying. Surveys will start on one side of a street and continue on the other, with one house skipped between administrations. All streets in the study area will be covered in the same manner until the target number of surveys for that census tract has been reached.

**Expected Response Rate and Confidence Levels:**

The response rate is expected to be 85 percent or greater for a sample size of 400. The response rate is based on recent surveys and published research in a predominantly African American community in Atlanta, GA. That effort examined resident support for the Atlanta Beltline, an urban greenway in the city. Using proportionate census-guided techniques, the response rate for that survey was 84 percent [(Palardy et al., 2017. Residents and urban greenways: modeling support for the Atlanta Beltline. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 160(250-259); Weber et al. 2017. The impact of urban greenways on residential concerns: findings from the Atlanta Beltline trail. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 167(147-156).]

The desired confidence interval is relative to the mean of a variable of interest. The data collection instrument consists of 29 questions containing dichotomous choice (yes, no) and ordered response options. We are mostly interested in responses to questions with multiple response options, for instance, “I see other people in my neighborhood gathering or picking wild foods—with response options: often, sometimes, or rarely. No prior research exists on which to base the estimate of the proportion of the sample that sees others foraging in the neighborhood. Typically, if no such estimates exist, then one-half (p=0.50) of the sample is assumed to engage in the activity. However, in the case of the Browns Mill community, anecdotal evidence suggests that a smaller proportion of the population actually forages. For this reason, we assume that the proportion of Browns Mill foragers = 0.10. The confidence level is set at 95 percent, which means that if the survey were repeated multiple times, results would show that in 95 percent of samples taken, 10 percent of the population would indicate that they saw their neighbors foraging. The following equation shows how estimated proportions, confidence intervals, and the critical value (1.96) for a 95 percent confidence level:

$n = .10(1-.10)(1.96/.03)^2$   
 $n = 384.16$ , rounded to 400.

**Strategies for dealing with potential non-response bias:**

We expect an 85 percent response rate. To help achieve this aim, we intend to train two residents of the Browns Mill community to help administer the survey. We believe this response rate can be achieved because of the direct method of door-to-door data collection and the familiarity of the surveyors with the neighborhood. Face-to-face interviewing offers numerous advantages in terms of increased response rates and minimization of non-response bias. The presence of the interviewer helps to increase response rates. The interviewer can quickly clarify questions the respondent might have about any of the survey questions, and the respondent is more likely to complete a survey administered by a human being. Importantly, face-to-face data collection is also better suited for reaching lower income and education and minority populations (Dillman, 1978, p.40).

**12. Number of Contacts:**

Total Number: 470 (will assume an 85% response rate)  
Expected Number of Respondents: 400  
Expected Number of Non-respondents: 70

**13. Estimated Burden:**

Estimated time for respondents to complete survey: 10 minutes  
Estimated time for non-respondents to refuse: 2 minutes

**14. Total Burden Hours:**

Total: 69 hours  
Respondents: 67 hours  
Non-respondents 2 hours

**15. Reporting Plan:**

Findings will be reported in the form of peer-reviewed journal articles and presentations at scientific conferences. In addition to publication in peer-reviewed outlets, results will be posted on the Research Work Unit's (SRS-4952) website and featured in Southern Research Station newsletters and online publications. No personally identifiable information will be included in the reporting of research results.

**16. Information Collection Justification, Purpose, and Use:**

**Justification and Purpose:**

The information collection supports USDA Strategic Goal 7 (Provide all Americans access to a safe, nutritious and secure food supply). Specific objectives for this goal are to: 1) provide access to safe and nutritious food for low-income people while supporting a pathway to self-sufficiency and 2) to support and encourage healthy dietary choices through data-driven, flexible and customer-focused approaches. The proposed IC strongly supports these directives by providing information on how community members use a Food Forest. Of course this information will be specific to this community, but there may be lessons learned that offer valuable information for other similar efforts.

**Goals:**

To provide data on community receptivity to the concept and practice of urban foraging. For the Browns Mill Food Forest or any public agency-sponsored initiative to be successful, it should have the support and participation community residents. The IC will help to gauge this interest.

**Use of results (or example, relevance to managers):**

This information can be used by project managers with the City of Atlanta Office of Resiliency (under which the Browns Mill Food Forest falls) to gauge community receptivity to the concept and practice of urban foraging before the Browns Mill Food Forest is officially launched (official launch date yet to be decided). Urban foraging is thought to convey human health and well-being to participants. A number of community input events have been hosted by the City of Atlanta, but no systematic surveying of the broader community has been conducted. While research suggests that the availability of nearby fresh food stores has no or only weak associations with fresh food consumption by both children and adults (Boone-Heinonen et al., 2011; An et al., 2012; Lee, 2012), findings from the urban agriculture literature indicates positive human health impacts from community gardening activities (Soga et al., 2017; Carney et al., 2012). However, we are not aware of any research that has examined the longer term contribution of urban foraging to well-being for residents in a predominantly African American community. The Forest Service Region 8 is also a sponsor of the food forest. Study results can be delivered to the Cooperative Forestry division to aid in formulating strategies for involvement in future urban agriculture initiatives. Findings will also be used in one or more manuscripts submitted for submission to peer reviewed outlets, for executive summary to natural resource management professionals, for summary in unit reports and summaries, and for presentation at professional conferences. Summaries will also be supplied to community based groups such as the various NPUs in Atlanta and to interested City of Atlanta officials.

**17. How will the data be tabulated and analyzed? What statistical techniques will be used to generalize the results to the entire customer population? How will limitations on use of data be handled? If the survey results in a lower than anticipated response rate, how will you address this when reporting the results?**

Survey responses will be entered manually onto paper copies of the survey and then entered into Microsoft Excel spreadsheets. Data transfer will be verified for accuracy by Dr. Cassandra Johnson Gaither. The primary aim of data analysis and reporting will be to establish baseline information on community receptivity to urban foraging. Analysis of responses will include summary and descriptive statistics, as well as means difference tests, and analysis of variance, given there is sufficient variation for the latter. For instance, we wish to estimate the percent of Browns Mill residents who collect/gather; the types of food they forage; their history of doing so; and constraints to foraging, among other questions. To generalize survey results to the larger Browns Mill community, we will use standard statistical techniques for various tests of significance (i.e., F test, T test). Results should be generalized only to the Browns Mill community and not to other neighborhoods or the larger city. If the survey results in a lower than anticipated response rate, we will use census-based, population weights to adjust mean values to reflect the actual proportion of the population by block or block group within each census tract.



**Certification Form for Submission Under OMB Control Number 0596-0243**

This form should only be used if you are submitting a collection of information for approval under the USDA-Forest Service Non-Timber Forest Products Generic Clearance.

*If the collection does not satisfy the requirements of the Generic Clearance, you should follow the regular PRA clearance procedures described in 5 CFR 1320.*

Lead PI (Include Deputy Area and Station/Region/Office): Dr. Cassandra Johnson Gaither, Research & Development, Southern Research Station, Athens, GA	
IC Title: Urban Foraging in a Community of Place--Atlanta's Browns Mill community	
(a) Estimated Number of total Contacts: 470 (b) Respondents: 400 (10 minutes to complete survey) (c) Non-respondents: 70 (2 minutes to refuse to complete survey)	
Total Burden Hours: 69 hours Respondents - 66.67 Non-respondents - 2.33	
Project Contact: Cassandra Johnson Gaither, (706) 559-4270, <a href="mailto:cjohnson09@fs.fed.us">cjohnson09@fs.fed.us</a> R&D WO Contact: Kenli Kim, (202) 841-8819, <a href="mailto:kkim@fs.fed.us">kkim@fs.fed.us</a>	
<b>Certification: The collection of information requested by this submission meets the requirements of OMB control number 0596-0243</b>	
Lead PI Cassandra Johnson Gaither	DATE July 16 2018
WO R&D POC Kenli Kim	DATE July 17 2018
Office of Regulatory and Management Services	DATE

## Checklist for Submitting a Request to Use USDA-Forest Service Non-Timber Forest Products Approval

All questions in the survey instrument are within the scope of one of the USDA-Forest Service Generic Clearance topic areas (see Compendium of Questions).

- The approval package is being submitted to the Forest Service Office of Regulatory and Management Services at least 45 days prior to the first day the PI wishes to administer the IC to the public.
- The WO R&D POC has reviewed the package, and then will submit the package to ORMS.
- Please ensure that the package is properly formatted and submitted to the Office of Regulatory and Management Services electronically.

The approval package includes:

- Completed Justification
- Certification Form (typed electronic signature OK)
- Copy of the data collection instrument
- Other supporting materials, as appropriate:
  - Cover letters to accompany mail-back questionnaires
  - Introductory scripts for initial contact of respondents
  - Necessary Paperwork Reduction Act compliance language
  - Follow-up letters/reminders sent to respondents

The survey methodology presented in the Justification includes a specific description of:

- The respondent universe
- The sampling plan and all sampling procedures, including how respondents will be selected
- How the instrument will be administered
- Expected response rate and confidence levels
- Strategies for dealing with potential non-response bias
- A description of any pre-testing and peer review of the methods and/or the instrument is highly recommended.
- The burden hours reported in the Justification include the number of burden hours associated with the initial contact of all individuals in the sample (i.e., including refusals), if applicable, and the number of burden hours associated with individuals expected to complete the survey instrument.