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**Justification for an Information Collection under the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service’s Federal Lands Transportation Generic Clearance (OMB Control No. 0596-0236)**

**John Heinz National Wildlife Refuge at Tinicum**

**Visitor Feedback Survey**

**Introduction: Federal Lands Transportation Generic Clearance Submission, OMB Control Number 0596-0236**

The Federal Lands Transportation Generic Clearance is intended to help Federal Land Management Agencies (FLMAs) measure visitors’ transportation-related experiences in order to improve on any transportation-related issues or problems and to promote planning across land units, regionally and nationally. Each FLMA (U.S. Forest Service (USFS), National Park Service (NPS), U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), Bureau of Land Management (BLM), and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)) has representatives on the planning team formed to establish the generic clearance.

A brief overview of the steps involved in submitting an Information Collection Request (ICR) is provided below. For more detailed information, along with a list of bureau/office contacts, please see the Best Practices and Guidance document developed specifically for this generic clearance[[1]](#footnote-1).

1. If more than one bureau/office (e.g., FWS and BLM) is collaborating on an IC, the partners must select a “lead” bureau/office to spearhead the effort, along with a contact person from the lead bureau/office.
2. The Information Collection Clearance Officer (ICCO) from the lead bureau/office must review the ICR and provide feedback to the lead bureau/office contact.
3. After the ICCO review has been completed (including a review by the DOI Information Collection Clearance Coordinator), the ICCO must forward the ICR to the USDA Forest Service and copy the FLMA Generic Clearance Coordinator (for contact information, see Best Practices and Guidance document).
4. After the Forest Service ICCO review, the USDA Departmental Clearance Officer submits the ICR to the OMB desk officer for the Forest Service via ROCIS.
5. The OMB desk officer reviews the ICR and provides comments. The lead bureau/office revises the ICR as necessary. Upon approval by OMB, a Notice of Action is issued.

**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 the lead bureau/office Information Collection Clearance Officer and copy the FLMA Generic Clearance Coordinator.
2. Lead Bureau/Office: Insert the name of the lead bureau/office conducting the survey.
3. Abstract: Summarize the proposed study with an abstract not to exceed 150 words.
4. Bureau/Office Point of Contact Information: Complete the bureau/office contact information. Forest Service will communicate with OMB initially and then direct them to the point of contact listed here (and to the IC Clearance Officer listed in #6 below) throughout the remainder of the approval process. Forest Service should be included on any correspondence pertaining to this IC.
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. Otherwise note: Same as #4.
6. Lead bureau/office IC Clearance Officer Reviewing the IC: Provide the name and contact information for the ICCO from the lead bureau/office who reviewed the IC.
7. Description of population/potential respondents: Provide a brief description of the population/potential respondents from whom the information will be collected.
8. 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. The request for expedited approval, and submission of a complete and accurate approval package, must be made at least *45* calendar days prior to the first day the PI wishes to begin the IC.
9. Type of IC Instrument: Check the type(s) of information collection instrument(s) that will be used. If other, please explain.
10. Data Collection Instrument: Explain how the data collection instrument (e.g., survey, interview guides, discussion guides, etc.) was developed. With whom did you consult during the development on content? 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.)
11. Which of the five 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** |
| Q1 | #1- Respondent characteristics | GROUP1 |
| Q2 | #1- Respondent characteristics | VHIS7 |
| Q3 | #2 Traveler Information | TINFO1 |
| Q4 | #2 Traveler Information | NEW |
| Etc. |  |  |

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

Note: Web-based surveys are not an acceptable method of sampling a broad population. If a survey is completely web-based, it must be limited to services provided by the web site. However, it is appropriate to use web-based surveys in combination with other methods, such as an in-person intercept.

13. 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.

14. 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).

15. 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 survey (or other data collection mechanism).

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

17. Justification, Purpose and Use**:**  Provide a brief justification for the information collection, its purpose, goals, and utility to managers. Specifically, describe how data will be tabulated and what statistical techniques will be used to generalize the results to the entire user population. 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. Note whether or not the information collection is intended to measure a Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) performance measure.

**Instructions for Checklist**

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

**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 0596-0236).

Justification for Submission under Federal Lands Transportation Generic Clearance (OMB Control Number 0596-0236)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **U.S. Department of Agriculture-Forest Service**  Office of Regulatory and Management Services | Forest Service Tracking Number: (for internal use only) |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | | Date Submitted to Forest Service/USDA: | 02/14/2020 |
| 1. | **IC Title:** | John Heinz National Wildlife Refuge at Tinicum Visitor Feedback Survey | | |
| 2. | **Bureau/Office:** | U.S. Department of the Interior – U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service | | |
| 3. | **Abstract:** (not to exceed 150 words)  The purpose of this survey is to collect information that will help U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service staff better understand visitors’ transportation and visitation related experiences at John Heinz National Wildlife Refuge (‘the Refuge”) and to obtain their evaluation of facilities, assets, and conditions of the Refuge. Respondents will be asked questions about their trip characteristics, their activities, their use of and satisfaction with different facilities and/or features of the Refuge; the extent to which different transportation and/or visitation issues/conditions are problematic; and safety-related issues or concerns. The survey will provide refuge managers, planners, and visitor services professionals with scientifically sound data that can be used to: (1) Prepare conservation planning documents; (2) Understand visitor satisfaction; (3) Improve the design of visitor facilities; (4) Tailor visitor services and facilities to match visitor interests and needs; and (5) Better protect refuge resources by combining this data with biological data. | | | |
|  | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **4.** | **Bureau/Office Point of Contact Information**  **Please note that this form was completed by: Alexandra Bird Becker, University of Pennsylvania (alexbird@sas.upenn.edu)** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **First Name:** | | | Lamar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Last Name:** | | | Gore | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Title:** | | | Refuge Manager, John Heinz NWR at Tinicum | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  |  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Bureau/Office:** | | | **U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service**  John Heinz National Wildlife Refuge at Tinicum | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Street Address:** | | | 8601 Lindbergh Boulevard | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **City:** | | | Philadelphia | | | **State:** | | | | | PA | | **Zip code:** | | | 19153 | |
|  | **Phone:** | | | 215-365-3118; Ext:3201 | | | | **Fax:** | | | | 215.365.2846 | | | | | | |
|  | **Email:** | | | lamar\_gore@fws.gov | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  |  | | |  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **5.** | **Principal Investigator (PI) Information [If different from #4]** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **First Name:** | | | Nina | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Last Name:** | | | Gallagher, Ph.D. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Title:** | | | Director of Research and Evaluation | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  |  | | |  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Bureau/Office:** | | | ImpactED at the University of Pennsylvania | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Address:** | | | 3440 Market Street, Suite 450 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | **City:** | | Philadelphia | | | | | **State:** | | | PA | | | **Zip code:** | | | 19014 |
|  | **Phone:** | | | 215-573-3774 | | | **Fax:** | | | | |  | | | | | | |
|  | **Email:** | | | ninahoe@sas.upenn.edu | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  |  | | |  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **6.** | **Lead agency IC Clearance Officer Reviewing the IC:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **First Name** | | | | Madonna | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Last Name** | | | | Baucum | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Title** | | | | FWS Information Collection Clearance Officer | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Phone** | | | | 703-358-2503 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Email** | | | | madonna\_baucum@fws.gov | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  |  | | | |  | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **7.** | **Description of Population/Potential respondents** | | | | Visitors to John Heinz National Wildlife Refuge | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **8.** | **IC Dates** | | | | (mm/dd/yyyy) | | | | | to | | | (mm/dd/yyyy) | | | | | |
|  | 06/01/2020 | | | | |  | | | 07/31/2021 | | | | | |
| **9.** | **Type of Information Collection Instrument (Check ALL that Apply)** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **X\_\_Intercept** | | | **\_\_Telephone** | | **\_\_Mail** | **X\_Web-based** | | | | | **\_\_Focus Groups** | | | | | **\_\_Comment Cards** | | |
| **\_\_Other** | | | **Explain:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **10. Instrument Development**:  (Who assisted in content development? Statistics? Was the instrument pretested? How were improvements integrated?)  The survey was developed by researchers at the University of Pennsylvania, Nina Gallagher and Alexandra Bird Becker, in consultation with U.S. Fish and Wildlife staff at the John Heinz National Wildlife Refuge. Team members include:   * Lamar Gore, Refuge Manager * Brianna Amingwa, Environmental Education Supervisor * Kelly Kemmerle, Environmental Education Specialist   The team convened numerous meetings to discuss data requirements, develop the method, and to design the survey instrument.  The survey instrument was drafted using the list of pre-approved CVTS questions. Further, the questions in this survey are similar (and in many cases identical) to those used in previous studies that were reviewed and approved by the Office of Management and Budget as part of the Federal Land Management Agencies Compendium of Questions (OMB Control No. 0596-0236).  Pre-testing and consultation were conducted with 6 volunteer participants identified by the research team at UPenn with no specific background or training in survey research methods or analysis (i.e., representatives of the general public, rather than survey experts). In particular, the individuals were asked to complete the  questionnaire, and asked a series of debriefing questions after to elicit their feedback on questionnaire/respondent burden, quality and clarity of the questionnaires and instructions, and ways to minimize respondent burden. Results from the pre-testing were incorporated into the instrument. | | | |
| **11. Which of the five areas from the Compendium of Questions will be addressed in your IC?** (Check all that apply)**.** .  X Topic Area #1: Respondent characteristics  X Topic Area #2: Traveler Information  X Topic Area #3: Trip behaviors  X Topic Area #4: Assessment of Visitor Experiences & Transportation-Related Facilities, Conditions, and Services  Topic Area #5: Economic Impact and Visitor Spending/Costs  **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”.**   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | **Compendium Topic Area** | **Compendium Question Identifier** | **Comment** | |  | | | | | Q1 | Transportation Use and Travel Related Conditions | TRANSUSE4 | No change. | | Q2 | Traveler Information | TINFO36 | Rephrased the question to read, “Had the shuttle service been active today, would you have considered using it?” The Southwest Community Shuttle runs on days when there are special events at John Heinz NWR and another cultural site in the community. The Refuge is interested in better understanding visitors’ perceptions of shuttle utility and accessibility. | | Q3 | Visitation History | VHIS12 | In response categories, rather than asking for specific number of visits in last ten years, provided ranges (to ease respondent burden). Study objectives do not require high level of precision in this response (e.g., 4 v. 5 visits), rather only general patterns are needed (e.g., first visit, ten or more visits, etc.). | | Q4 | Trip Purpose & Activities | TPURP4 | Added two additional response categories: “to appreciate the beauty and peacefulness of nature” and “to connect with others in my community” – both are aligned to urban refuge evaluation indicators. | | Q5 | Trip Purpose & Activities | TACT3 | We added the phrase “or plan to participate,” since respondents may be intercepted at the start of their trip to the site. Eliminated an irrelevant response item (“auto tour route/driving”) | | Q6 | Assessment of Visitor Experience | EVAL 18 | Per compendium, added a list of relevant and site-specific services, facilities, programs, activities | | Q7 | Assessment of Visitor Experience | EVAL 15 | Tailored the response options to align more closely with the needs of the study (specifically, urban refuge evaluation indicators). | | Q8 | Assessment of Visitor Experience | EVAL 15 | Tailored the response options to align more closely with the needs of the study (specifically, urban refuge evaluation indicators). | | Q9 | Assessment of Visitor Experience | NEW | Added the Net Promoter Score question to gauge the extent of visitors’ likelihood to recommend visiting the Refuge to others | | Q10 | Evaluation of Resource Protection | RESPRO2 | Added a time reference (i.e., “after this visit to John Heinz NWR”). Rephrased final part of question as a result of pretesting. As originally written, volunteers reported that the question was difficult to understand. Now reads “how important do you think the Refuge is in providing”. | | Q11 | Evaluation of Resource Protection | RESPRO5 | Added a time reference (i.e., “after this visit to John Heinz NWR”). Replaced irrelevant response items (e.g., light pollution, noise pollution) with relevant items (e.g., habitat loss, harm to wildlife). | | Q12 | Respondent Characteristics | RES5 | No change | | Q13 | Respondent Characteristics | AGE1 | No change | | Q14 | Respondent Characteristics | GEN1 | Eliminated “other” and added two additional response options (i.e., “non-binary/third gender” and “prefer to self-describe” per [inclusivity guidelines](https://www.hrc.org/resources/collecting-transgender-inclusive-gender-data-in-workplace-and-other-surveys). | | Q15 | Respondent Characteristics | ETH/RACE1 | No change | | Q16 | Respondent Characteristics | INC1 | No change | | | | |
| **12. Methodology:**  (Use as much space as needed; if necessary, include additional explanation on separate page). | | | |
| **Respondent Universe** | | The respondent universe includes adult (18 years of age or older) users and visitors of the John Heinz National Wildlife Refuge. | |
| **Sampling Plan/Procedure** | | The survey will be administered by way of two methods: in-person intercept and web-based.  The sampling plan for the **in-person intercept survey** method is as follows:  The sample of visitors selected for the intercept survey will be randomly selected by the survey interns assigned to the area of the Refuge during the data collection period.  Survey interns will be trained to ensure that they are using the same methods and understand the project objectives. In addition, the training will address any questions the survey aides may have. Project leads will be available to answer questions that arise, arrange for unannounced spot checks on the surveying procedure, and in general ensure survey aides are following protocol.  For intercept surveys, a random sample can be obtained by assigning time blocks to the study period, consecutively numbering each block, and then randomly selecting time blocks (Vaske, 2008). The number of blocks selected is determined by the expected variation in visitor numbers and visitor characteristics across the blocks. The sample will be guided by the following principles:   * Gather data for each site at different times throughout the data collection period to increase representation and ensure the sample is not influenced by temporal events such as extreme rain events or temporary road closures. * Sites will be sampled across various days of the week (i.e., each site will contain a mix of weekdays and weekend days). * Within selected time blocks sampling will occur across a range of times of the day (i.e., sites will be sampled in the morning, afternoon, and evening). * The number of days each site is selected for sampling will be determined by expected use levels, variation in use across the season, and significant events at that site (e.g., SW Philadelphia Roots Festival). * When sampling a group, to provide randomization, we will ask the person with the most recent birthday to complete the survey.   The goal is to obtain at least 350 intercept survey responses over the course of the data collection period June 2020 – July 2021. John Heinz National Wildlife Refuge at Tinicum attracts over 250,000 visitors annually (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2018, written comm.). This goal is based on the results of the 2019 National Visitor Survey administered at this Refuge, which had a similar sampling strategy and similar length of time designated for data collection. The target number of contacts per shift will be 25 adult visitors. The sampling schedule will include four randomly selected sampling shifts during each of four 14-day sampling periods, for a total of 16 discrete sampling shifts. Shifts will be four-hour time bands stratified across mornings and afternoons/ evenings. Survey interns will approach every other group that passes by to ensure respondents are randomly selected. The schedule will be customized as needed to accommodate the individual sampling locations and specific spatial and temporal patterns of visitation.  If the respondent is willing, the intercept surveys will be completed on a mobile device, such as an iPad or a large iPhone, which allows the data to be entered into a database as the survey is being completed. Davis, Thompson, and Schweizer (2012) found iPads to be cost effective and enjoyable by visitors to use, with visitors expressing a preference for iPads over paper surveys. However, some visitors might feel more comfortable with a paper survey, so we will also have paper surveys available. Computers will be used to input data from any paper surveys. Recorded with the onsite survey will be date, time, and location the survey was administered.  The sampling plan for the **web-based survey** method is as follows:  Flyers with information and instructions for taking the web-based survey will be distributed to all guests who enter the visitor center at the Refuge. Additionally, flyers will be posted in the parking lot and at each trail head to ensure that even visitors who do not enter the visitor center have an opportunity to take the survey.  The web-based survey will be able to be accessed via a direct URL that can be typed into an internet browser, a QR code that can be scanned with a cell phone, or by sending a text message with the specified trigger word (e.g., @REFUGE) to a designated number (to which the visitor would receive a message in response with a link to take the survey).  Visitors who choose to take the web-based survey would be self-selected and thus, the web-based survey sample would be a convenience sample. These surveys are subject to the same limitations facing other surveys using nonprobability-based samples: the relationship between the sample and the population is unknown so there is no theoretical basis for computing or reporting a margin of sampling error and thus for estimating how representative the sample is of the population as a whole. However, by blending this non-probability sample with the intercept survey sample using a specialized weighting technique, there is potential to overcome some of the limitations of non-probability sampling.  The goal is to obtain at least 250 web-based survey responses over the course of the data collection period June 2020 – July 2021. On average, the Refuge welcomes about 250,000 visitors each calendar year. We assume that at least 50% of visitors come into contact with a survey flyer (approximately 125,000 visitors). If .002% of the visitors who come into contact with a survey flyer complete the web-based survey, we will reach our goal sample for the web-based survey. | |
| **Instrument Administration** | | For the on-site intercept survey, trained interviewers will approach the randomly selected visitor/visitor group and will ask them to participate in the survey using the following script (also see Appendix C for script):  *Good morning [/afternoon]. My name is (first and last name), and I am conducting a study for the John Heinz National Wildlife Refuge to learn about visitors’ experiences. We are asking users to complete a brief survey now, which should take fewer than 10 minutes to complete. Your participation is voluntary, and you can withdraw from the study at any time. Would you be willing to take 10 minutes to complete the survey now?*  IF YES: *“Thank you! May I ask who in your group has most recently celebrated his or her birthday? Can you please complete the survey? I am going to ask you questions and enter your responses on this mobile device, or if you prefer, we also have a paper version of the survey.*  *[IF NECESSARY EXPLAIN: “We ask who has celebrated their birthday most recently because we are trying to randomly select who completes the survey from each group”]*  IF NO: *Thank you. Have a great visit.*  For the web-based survey, visitors will access the survey one of three ways after seeing the survey flyers posted at different locations throughout the Refuge. They will either type the survey URL into an internet browser, scan a QR code with their cell phones, which will trigger their browser to pen and go directly to the survey, or they will send a text message with the specified trigger word (e.g., @REFUGE) to a designated number and receive a message in response with a link to take the survey. | |
| **Expected Response Rate**  **and Confidence Levels** | | Sites like John Heinz NWR with independent travelers visiting for recreation (primarily local travelers), response rates should be close to 90% (Fix, 2008; Fix, Ackerman, & Fay, 2012; Fix, Padilla, & Lingle, 2012; Stegmann, Fix, & Teel, 2008). This response rate is realistic as it is similar to that obtained from the 2019 NVS conducted at John Heinz NWR. Estimates derived from 350 intercept survey completions will have a 95% confidence interval of +/- 4%.  Calculating the expected response rate for the web-based survey is not possible, as the proposed sample for this survey method is non-probability convenience. However, our goal is to use the blended sample method to overcome some of the limitations present when using a non-probability sample, as we plan to do via the web-based survey. | |
| **Strategies for dealing with potential non-response bias** | | While administering the survey onsite, survey interns will track observable information for all those contacted to complete the survey who refused (see Appendix B for log sheet). This information would include group size, whether with an organized tour, presence of children, and if possible, to observe, mode of transportation (e.g., RV, sedan, bicycle) and activity. Weather conditions will also be observed. The results will provide insight as to whether those who did not respond were systematically different than those who did respond. We will provide both weighted and unweighted estimates if the data show there is significant non-response bias in the sample. | |
| **Description of any pre-testing and peer review of the methods and/or instrument (recommended)** | | The survey was developed by researchers at the University of Pennsylvania in consultation with U.S. Fish and Wildlife staff at the John Heinz National Wildlife Refuge. The team convened numerous meetings to discuss data requirements, develop the method, and to design the survey instrument. The PI, Dr. Nina Hoe Gallagher, and her team provided a rigorous review, and there were several rounds of revision based on their input (see Q. 10 above on Instrument Development). In addition, the PI conducted a small pre-test of the survey with 6 people to determine if any questions were unclear or confusing, and to test survey length.  In particular, the individuals were asked to complete the survey questionnaire, and asked a series of debriefing questions after to elicit their feedback on the practical utility of the study, questionnaire/respondent burden, quality and clarity of the questionnaires and instructions, and ways to minimize respondent burden. Participants were also asked to indicate if they had any difficulty or confusion with multi-item response scales, and/or instructions for recording responses (e.g., “Please mark one button (X) for each  item”).  The feedback from the pre-test participants was positive. Participants indicated that the layout of the questionnaires, and question wording were straightforward, which helps to minimize respondent burden. Participants reported no trouble with multi-item response scales or instructions for recording responses.  The time it took each respondent to complete the questionnaire was recorded by the pre-test administrators: 8 to 10 minutes was the typical response time. This finding helps to validate the burden estimates reported in the submission; and suggests that participation in the study does not cause undue/excessive respondent burden. Finally, the completed questionnaires were inspected by the pre-test administrators, after the pre-test was concluded. Inspection of the completed surveys indicated that respondents answered all of the relevant questions and recorded their answers correctly.  Participants in the pre-test offered minor suggestions to improve the wording or format of specific questions in the survey instrument, and revisions to the questionnaires were made accordingly. | |
|  | | | |
| **13.** | **Total Number of Initial Contacts and Expected Number of Respondents** | | For the onsite intercept survey, we plan to intercept 400 visitors total (across 16 sampling shifts). Based on a 90% response rate, we expect that 360 visitors will complete the on-site intercept survey. There is no expected response rate for the web-based survey, but if less than 1% of annual visitors choose to take the survey posted on flyers throughout the Refuge, we will meet our goal of at least 250 web-based survey responses. |
| **14.** | **Estimated Time to Complete Initial Contact and Time to Complete Instrument** | | For the onsite intercept survey, we estimate 1 minute for the initial contact and 1 minutes for the non-response question. We estimate 10 minutes total to complete the onsite intercept survey and 10 minutes total to complete the web-based version of the survey. |
| **15.** | **Total Burden Hours**  **Contacts**  **Respondents**  **-----------------**  **Total** | | **Contacts:** 1 min. (.02 hour) \* 400 = 8 hours  **NON-RESPONSE**   * On-site: 1 min. (.02 hour) \* 40 = .8 hours * Web-based: N/A   **RESPONSE**   * On-site: 10 min (.2 hour) \* 360 = 14.4 hours * Web-based: 10 (.2 hour) \*250 = 50 hours   **Total= 73.2 hours** |
| **16. Reporting Plan:**  A presentation will be made to explain the findings and their implications to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Staff at the John Heinz National Wildlife Refuge. A separate report detailing the results of the survey will be developed and submitted to the same group. | | | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **17. Justification, Purpose, and Use:** | |
| **IC Justification and Purpose** | The survey will provide refuge managers, planners, and visitor services professionals with scientifically sound data that can be used to: (1) Prepare conservation planning documents; (2) Determine if they are meeting GPRA visitor satisfaction goals; (3) Improve the design of visitor facilities; (4) Tailor visitor services and facilities to match visitor interests and needs; and (5) Better protect refuge resources by combining this data with biological data.  Authorizing Statute: US Code: 16 USC 668dd-668ee  Name of Law: National Wildlife Refuge Administration Act  The passage of this Act gave guidance to the Secretary of the Interior for the overall management of the Refuge System. The Act's main components include:   * a strong and singular wildlife conservation Mission for the Refuge System; * a requirement that the Secretary of the Interior maintain the biological integrity, diversity and environmental health of the Refuge System; * a new process for determining compatible uses on refuges; * a recognition that wildlife-dependent recreational uses involving hunting, fishing, wildlife observation and photography, and environmental education and interpretation, when determined to be compatible, are legitimate and appropriate public uses of the Refuge System; * that these compatible wildlife-dependent recreational uses are the priority general public uses of the Refuge System; and * a requirement for preparing a comprehensive conservation plan for each refuge. |
| **IC Goals** | The goal of this IC is to collect information from users/visitors of John Heinz National Wildlife Refuge, and more specifically their use and evaluation of transportation and visitation-related assets and conditions. |
| **Utility to Managers** | Survey data will provide refuge managers, planners, and visitor services professionals with information that can be used to: (1) Prepare conservation planning documents; (2) Determine if they are meeting GPRA visitor satisfaction goals; (3) Improve the design of visitor facilities; (4) Tailor visitor services and facilities to match visitor interests and needs; and (5) Better protect refuge resources by combining this data with biological data. |
| **How will the results of the IC be analyzed and used?** | Web-based survey data will be combined with the onsite intercept data. The source (web-based versus intercept) will be tagged in order to allow for any relevant subgroup analysis.  All data will be entered in to the Qualtrics survey platform and will be downloaded into an Excel spreadsheet and uploaded to SPSS for analysis. Analysis will be conducted using IBM SPSS Statistics version 26. All data will be stored in electronic and hard copy and will adhere to data management procedures required by the Federal Government. After the test for representation and bias have been conducted, analysis will be conducted. We will analyze overall frequencies, which will consist of frequency distributions of responses and means of responses as appropriate. For example, a question asking respondents what activities they participated in will result in categorical data and will be analyzed as the percentage of respondents selecting each activity. A question that asked respondents to rate their satisfaction on a 4-point scale can utilize parametric statistics such as means. Frequencies or means will be reported for all questions in the survey (although content analysis would be conducted on any open-ended questions).  Relationships between variables will be examined as appropriate. For example, we could analyze activity participation, information sources used, or satisfaction with facilities by demographic variables such as age or residence. A variable such as satisfaction with facilities could also be compared across transportation types such as private vehicles versus tour buses. When comparisons among sites are made, the Chi-square, t-test, or Analysis of Variance will be conducted as appropriate. |
| **How will the data be tabulated? 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?** (Use as much space as needed; if necessary include additional explanation on separate page).  Frequencies and crosstabs will be tabulated, as described in the previous question. Statistical tests used to generalize the results to the entire population include ANOVA and t-tests when the variable being compared is interval or ratio data. Confidence intervals will be reported.  Any limitations on use of the data will be noted in the data codebook and in the survey report.  For the on-site intercept survey, if the response rate lower than expected, we will use the non-response analysis to determine if weighting is needed. If that analysis reveals that there are no significant differences between respondents and non-respondents, then weighting will not be necessary. Appropriate confidence intervals will be reported, based on sample size. | |
| **Is this survey intended to measure a Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) performance measure? If so, please include an excerpt from the appropriate document.** (Use as much space as needed; if necessary include additional explanation on separate page).  No, this survey is not intended to measure a GPRA performance measure. | |

**Checklist for Submitting a Request to Use USDA-Forest Service Federal Lands Transportation Generic Clearance**

*X 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).

X 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.

X [IF SURVEY] A qualified statistician has reviewed and approved your request.

X Your bureau/office Information Collection Clearance Officer has reviewed and approved the approval package.

X When you forward the approval package to USDA Forest Service, copy the FLMA Generic Clearance Coordinator

The approval package includes:

X A completed Justification

X A signed Certification Form

X A copy of the survey instrument

X Other supporting materials, such as:

* + 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:

X The respondent universe

X The sampling plan and all sampling procedures, including how respondents will be selected

X How the instrument will be administered

X Expected response rate and confidence levels

X Strategies for dealing with potential non-response bias

X A description of any pre-testing and peer review of the methods and/or the instrument is highly recommended.

X 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.

X The package is properly formatted (Word) and submitted to the Office of Regulatory and Management Services electronically.

**Certification Form for** **Submission Under OMB Control Number 0596-0236**

This form should only be used if you are submitting a collection of information for approval under the USDA-Forest Service Federal Lands Transportation 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.*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Bureau/Office 2. **U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service** | | | | | | | |
| 1. IC Title *(Please be specific)* 2. **John Heinz National Wildlife Refuge at Tinicum Visitor Feedback Survey** | | | | | | | |
| 1. Estimated Number 2. Contacts (intercept) 3. Respondents (intercept)   Contacts (web-based)   1. Respondents (web-based) | | 400  360  125,000  250 | Time per Response (minutes)  Contacts:  Respondents (intercept)  Respondents (web-based)  Time for Non-Response  On-site intercept  Web-based | | | | 1 minute/contact  10 minutes/respondent  10 minutes/respondent  1 minutes  N/A (0 minutes) |
|  | |  | Total Burden Hours  Contacts  Respondents (total)  Non-Respondents (total)  -----------------  Total | | | | 8 hours  64.4 hours  0.8 hours  **73.2 hours** |
| 1. Bureau/Office Contact (who can best answer questions about content of the submission): | | | | | | | |
| 1. Name | Lamar Gore | | | Phone | 215-365-3118; Ext. 3201 | | |
|  | | | | | | | |
| 1. **Certification: The collection of information requested by this submission meets the requirements of OMB control number 0596-0236** | | | | | | | |
| 1. Bureau/Office Qualified Statistician 2. Danielle Ross-Winslow | | | | | | DATE  2/12/20 | |
| 1. Bureau/Office Information Collection Clearance Officer 2. Madonna Baucum | | | | | | DATE  02/14/2020 | |
| 1. Forest Service, Office of Regulatory and Management Services | | | | | | DATE | |

# 

1. <http://volpe-public-lands.s3-website-us-east1.amazonaws.com/flma_lrtp_cvts/documents/Guidance_FLMA_CVTSproject.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)