

**SUPPORTING STATEMENT**  
**FOR RECORDKEEPING AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS**  
**25 CFR PARTS 519, 522, 556, AND 558**

**A. JUSTIFICATION**

- 1. Explain the circumstances that make the collection of information necessary. Identify any legal or administrative requirements that necessitate the collection. Attach a copy of the appropriate section of each statute and regulation mandating or authorizing the collection of information.**

The Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (IGRA or the Act), Public Law 100–497, 25 U.S.C. 2701, *et seq.*, was signed into law on October 17, 1988. The Act established the National Indian Gaming Commission (NIGC or Commission) and set out a comprehensive framework for the regulation of gaming on Indian lands. The Act sets standards for the regulation of Indian gaming, including requirements for the approval or disapproval by the NIGC Chair of tribal gaming ordinances and resolutions. Specifically, 25 U.S.C. 2705(a)(3) requires the Chair to review and approve all class II and class III tribal gaming ordinances and resolutions before tribes can game on their Indian lands. Section 2710 sets forth the specific requirements for the tribal gaming ordinances, including the requirement that there be adequate systems in place: to cause background investigations to be conducted on individuals in key employee and primary management official (PMO) positions (§ 2710(b)(2)(F)(i)); and to provide two prompt notifications to the Commission, including one containing the results of the background investigations before the issuance of any gaming licenses, and the other one of the issuance of such gaming licenses to key employees and PMOs (§ 2710(b)(2)(F)(ii)). In addition, § 2710(d)(2)(D)(ii) requires tribes who have, in their sole discretion, revoked any prior class III ordinance or resolution to submit a notice of such revocation to the NIGC Chair. The Act also authorizes the Commission to “promulgate such regulations and guidelines as it deems appropriate to

implement” IGRA. 25 U.S.C. 2706(b)(10). Parts 519, 522, 556, and 558 of title 25, Code of Federal Regulations, implement these statutory requirements.

**25 CFR §§ 519.1, 519.2, and 522.2(g)**

As part of any official determination, order, or notice of violation, the NIGC Chair is required to serve such process on tribes, tribal operators, and/or management contractors. For this reason, §§ 519.1 and 522.2(g) require a tribe to designate an agent for service of process by written notification to the Commission. Section 519.2 likewise requires a management contractor or a tribal operator to designate an agent for service of process.

**25 CFR §§ 522.2(a), 522.3(a), 522.10, and 522.11**

Before a tribe can game on its Indian lands, the Act requires the NIGC Chair to review and approve all class II and class III tribal gaming ordinances and resolutions, and amendments thereof. Accordingly, § 522.2(a) requires a tribe to submit a copy of an ordinance or resolution certified as authentic by an authorized tribal official, and that meets the approval requirements in 25 CFR §§ 522.4(b) or 522.6. In addition, §§ 522.10 and 522.11 require tribes to submit, respectively, an ordinance for the licensing of individually owned gaming operations other than those operating on September 1, 1986, and for the licensing of individually owned gaming operations operating on September 1, 1986. Section 522.3(a) requires a tribe to submit an amendment to an ordinance or resolution within 15 days after adoption of such amendment.

**25 CFR §§ 522.2(b)-(h) and 522.3(b)**

The Act requires the collection of certain information to make the NIGC Chair’s approval of tribal gaming ordinances and resolutions possible. In addition to a copy of an authentic gaming ordinance or resolution and the designation of an agent for service of process as set forth above, § 522.2(b)-(h) requires tribes to submit to the Commission: (i) a description of procedures

that the tribe will employ in conducting background investigations on key employees and PMOs, and to ensure that key employees and PMOs are notified of their rights under the Privacy Act; (ii) a description of procedures that the tribe will use to issue licenses to key employees and PMOs; (iii) copies of all tribal gaming regulations; (iv) a copy of any applicable tribal-state compact or procedures as prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior; (v) a description of procedures for resolving disputes between the gaming public and the tribe or the management contractor; and (vi) the identification of the law enforcement agent that will take fingerprints and a description of the procedures for conducting criminal history checks, including a check of criminal history records information maintained by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. In addition, § 522.3(b) requires a tribe to submit any amendment to these submissions within 15 days after adoption of such amendment.

#### **25 CFR § 522.12**

Section 522.12(a) implements 25 U.S.C. 2710(d)(2)(D). The regulation requires a tribe to submit to the Commission a copy of an authentic ordinance revocation or resolution.

#### **25 CFR §§ 556.2 - 556.4**

The Act requires tribes to conduct background investigations on key employees and PMOs involved in class II and class III gaming. To that end, § 556.4 requires tribes to mandate the submission of the following information from applicants: (i) name(s), Social Security number(s), date and place of birth, citizenship, gender, and languages; (ii) present and past business and employment positions, ownership interests, business and residential addresses, and driver's license number(s); (iii) the names and addresses of personal references; (iv) current business and personal telephone numbers; (v) a description of any existing and previous business relationships with Indian tribes, including ownership interests; (vi) a description of any existing

and previous business relationships with the gaming industry generally, including ownership interests; (vii) the name and address of any licensing/regulatory agency with which the person has filed an application for a license or permit related to gaming, even if the license or permit was not granted; (viii) for each ongoing felony prosecution or conviction, the charge, the name and address of the court, and the date and disposition, if any; (ix) for each misdemeanor conviction or ongoing prosecution within the past 10 years, the name and address of the court and the date and disposition; (x) for each criminal charge in the past 10 years that is not otherwise listed, the criminal charge, the name and address of the court, and the date and disposition; (xi) the name and address of any licensing/regulatory agency with which the person has filed an application for an occupational license or permit, even if the license or permit was not granted; (xii) a photograph; and (xiii) fingerprints.

To ensure that applicants are forthcoming with all of their information, §§ 556.2 and 556.3 requires tribes to place a specific Privacy Act notice on their key employee and PMO applications, and to warn applicants regarding the penalty for false statements by also placing a specific false statement notice on their key employee and PMO applications.

#### **25 CFR §§ 556.6(a) and 558.3(e)**

When a tribe employs individuals in key employee and/or PMO positions, §§ 556.6(a) and 558.3(e) require tribes to keep/maintain the individuals' complete application files, investigative reports, and eligibility determinations during their employment and for at least three years after termination of their employment.

#### **25 CFR § 556.6(b)(1),(b)(2)**

Before issuing a license to a PMO or to a key employee, § 556.6(b)(1) requires tribes to create and maintain an investigative report on each background investigation that includes: (i)

the steps taken in conducting a background investigation; (ii) the results obtained; (iii) the conclusions reached; and (iv) the basis for those conclusions. In addition, § 556.6(b)(2) requires tribes to submit, no later than 60 days after an applicant begins work, a notice of results of the applicant's background investigation that includes: (i) the applicant's name, date of birth, and Social Security number; (ii) the date on which the applicant began or will begin work as a key employee or PMO; (iii) a summary of the information presented in the investigative report, including license(s) that have been previously denied, gaming licenses that have been revoked, every known criminal charge brought against the applicant within the past 10 years, and every felony conviction or ongoing prosecution; and (iv) a copy of the eligibility determination.

**25 CFR §§ 558.3(b),(d) and 558.4(e)**

The Act requires tribes to maintain an adequate system in place to provide prompt notifications to the Commission regarding the issuance of tribal licenses to key employees and PMOs. To that end, § 558.3(b) requires a tribe to notify the Commission of the issuance of PMO and key employee licenses within 30 days after such issuance. In addition, § 558.3(d) requires a tribe to notify the Commission if the tribe does not issue a license to an applicant, and requires it to forward copies of its eligibility determination and notice of results to the Commission for inclusion in the Indian Gaming Individuals Record System.

Because it is important for the Commission to know at all times which individuals are licensed in PMO and key employee positions, § 558.4(e) requires a tribe, after a revocation hearing, to notify the Commission of its decision to revoke or reinstate a gaming license within 45 days of receiving notification from the Commission that a specific individual in a PMO or key employee position is not eligible for continued employment.

- 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.**

#### **25 CFR Part 519**

This information collection is needed so that the NIGC Chair knows the correct party on whom to properly serve any official determination, order, or notice of violation. If the collection of information were not conducted as described, the NIGC would lack confidence that official determinations, orders, or notices of violation have been legally and effectively served on the parties authorized to make decisions and take action for the tribes, management contractors, and tribal operators.

#### **25 CFR §§ 522.2, 522.3, and 522.10 - 522.12**

The submission of ordinances, resolutions, or amendments thereof, that meet the approval requirements in 25 CFR §§ 522.4(b) or 522.6 allows the NIGC Chair to decide whether said ordinances meet IGRA's statutory requirements, and helps the Chair ascertain whether an adequate tribal regulatory system exists within the tribal gaming operation. The Chair also reviews the information collected to ensure that the ordinance or resolution was enacted in accordance with all applicable tribal laws. In addition, the information collected in connection with an ordinance or resolution submission is used by the Chair in determining whether to approve or disapprove tribal ordinances and resolutions, as required by IGRA.

This information is also used by the Chair to determine whether a particular tribe has revoked class III gaming for their gaming operation(s), and thus to stay apprised of which Indian gaming operations offer or do not offer class III gaming.

## 25 CFR Parts 556 and 558

The information collected pursuant to these parts is used by the Commission, in accordance with its statutory duties, to ensure that the background investigations conducted on individuals employed in PMO and key employee positions are stringent and thorough, and that the tribes have sufficient background information to make determinations regarding whether an individual is eligible to be licensed as a PMO or key employee. The Commission also uses this information to review tribal decisions to license PMOs and key employees to ensure that no criminal element enters the tribal gaming system.

- 3. Describe whether, and to what extent, the collection of information involves the use of automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses, and the basis for the decision for adopting this means of collection. Also describe any consideration of using information technology to reduce burden.**

While tribes must submit copies of ordinances, resolutions, or amendments thereof in paper form, the Commission's regulations allow them to maintain and/or submit other types of information to the Commission by compatible automated, electronic, and/or mechanical means, including e-mail.

- 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.**

The Act requires a certain minimum degree of regulation and adequate systems in place in each tribe's gaming ordinance, but these tribes have their own sovereign authority to adopt more stringent requirements on any subject, making each tribe's ordinance unique. Likewise, background investigations and licensing information and determinations are unique to each applicant. Thus, no similar information pertaining to gaming on Indian lands is collected by the Commission or by any other federal agencies.

**5. If the collection of information impacts small businesses or other small entities (Item 5 of OMB Form 83-I), describe any methods used to minimize burden.**

Not applicable. Nonetheless, the Commission's regulations require operations to submit the minimum amount of information that the Commission requires to fulfill its statutory responsibilities. The burden is directly proportional to the economic activity conducted.

**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.**

One of the purposes of IGRA is to establish federal standards for the operation of gaming by Indian tribes as a means of promoting tribal economic development, self-sufficiency, and strong tribal governments. The Act specifically sets forth the minimum standards that must be contained in tribal ordinances or resolutions, and specifically requires the NIGC Chair to approve class II and III gaming ordinances. In addition, IGRA requires tribes to notify the Commission when they revoke class III gaming ordinances. Thus, the failure of the Commission to collect this information is not an option. The frequency of the submissions is largely dependent on the tribes, i.e., they only need to make the submissions when they adopt new ordinances or resolutions, or amend existing ordinances.

Another purpose of IGRA is to provide a statutory basis for the regulation of Indian gaming to adequately shield it from organized crime and other corrupting influences, to ensure that the Indian tribe is the primary beneficiary of the gaming operation revenue, and to assure that gaming is conducted fairly and honestly by both the operator and players. To that end, the Act also requires that tribes have adequate systems in place that ensure that background investigations are conducted on individuals in PMO and key employee positions, and that tribal licenses are not issued to such individuals "whose prior activities, criminal record, if any, or reputation, habits and associations pose a threat to the public interest or to the effective

regulation of gaming, or create or enhance the dangers of unsuitable, unfair, or illegal practices and methods and activities in the conduct of gaming.” The Act also requires tribes to promptly notify the Commission when they issue a license to an individual in a PMO or key employee position. Again, the failure of the Commission to collect this information is not an option, and would render the Commission unable to carry out its statutory obligations under IGRA to help tribes protect the integrity of Indian gaming. The frequency of the need to submit relevant background and licensing information is inextricably linked to the hiring of individuals in PMO or key employee positions.

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

- **requiring respondents to report information to the agency more often than quarterly;**
- **requiring respondents to prepare a written response to a collection of information in fewer than 30 days after receipt of it;**
- **requiring respondents to submit more than an original and two copies of any document;**
- **requiring respondents to retain records, other than health, medical, government contract, grant-in-aid, or tax records, for more than three years;**
- **in connection with a statistical survey, that is not designed to produce valid and reliable results that can be generalized to the universe of study;**
- **requiring the use of a statistical data classification that has not been reviewed and approved by OMB;**
- **that includes a pledge of confidentiality that is not supported by authority established in statute or regulation, that is not supported by disclosure and data security policies that are consistent with the pledge, or which unnecessarily impedes sharing of data with other agencies for compatible confidential use; or**
- **requiring respondents to submit proprietary trade secrets, or other confidential information unless the agency can demonstrate that it has instituted procedures to protect the information's confidentiality to the extent permitted by law.**

Tribes must promptly submit the information in these collections to the Commission whenever it becomes available. As mentioned above, the frequency of the submissions is largely dependent on the tribes, i.e., tribes only need to make the submissions when they adopt new ordinances or resolutions, amend existing ordinances, and revoke class III ordinances. While

rare, it is theoretically possible that a tribe may amend an ordinance two or more separate times during a particular quarter, and thus would have to make multiple submissions during one quarter. However, under such circumstances, IGRA requires the tribe to submit the amendments for approval by the NIGC Chair.

The frequency of the background investigation and licensing information submissions is again largely dependent on the tribes, i.e., tribes must submit relevant background investigation and licensing information whenever they make new hires in PMO and key employee positions, or when they revoke such types of licenses. Because gaming operations are businesses, the hiring of individuals in PMO and key employee positions are done on an as needed basis, and can often occur multiple times during a given quarter, thus requiring tribes to submit such information to the Commission more often than quarterly. This ensures that the Commission is up-to-date on all background investigations and eligibility determinations taking place in Indian gaming. Such continuous reporting is necessary to avoid criminal influence in, and to ensure the integrity of, Indian gaming.

- 8. If applicable, provide a copy and identify the date and page number of publication in the Federal Register of the agency's notice, required by 5 CFR 1320.8(d), soliciting comments on the information collection prior to submission to OMB. Summarize public comments received in response to that notice and describe actions taken by the agency in response to these comments. Specifically address comments received on cost and hour burden.  
Describe efforts to consult with persons outside the agency to obtain their views on the availability of data, frequency of collection, the clarity of instructions and recordkeeping, disclosure, or reporting format (if any), and on the data elements to be recorded, disclosed, or reported.  
Consultation with representatives of those from whom information is to be obtained or those who must compile records should occur at least once every 3 years - even if the collection of information activity is the same as in prior periods. There may be circumstances that may preclude consultation in a specific situation. These circumstances should be explained.**

On June 6, 2016, a notice containing the information collection renewals was published in the Federal Register allowing the public an opportunity to comment on the requirements. 81 FR 36322 (June 6, 2016). The public comment period closed on August 5, 2016. No public comments were received.

In addition, the NIGC consulted with 16 tribal gaming regulatory commissions and/or tribal gaming operators, and laid out the recordkeeping and submission requirements contained in its regulations, but did not provide its own estimates to the tribes. The Commission asked the tribal gaming commissions and/or tribal gaming operators to provide annual hourly estimates required to perform the tasks, as well as any cost estimates. The average burden hours per response and average annual costs in this information collection were provided by these 16 tribes. The Commission has adjusted its previous estimates accordingly.

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

Not applicable. The NIGC does not provide any payment or gift to respondents.

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

The Act requires the Commission to keep confidential any and all trade secrets, and privileged or confidential, commercial or financial information received pursuant to IGRA, or information related to ongoing law enforcement investigations. Section 2716 of title 25, United States Code, removes from the Commission any discretion it otherwise would have to disclose information that falls within FOIA exemptions 4 and 7, and requires the Commission to disclose such information only to other law enforcement agencies for law enforcement purposes.

In addition, the Commission must ensure the integrity of Indian gaming and that it is kept free from criminal influence. To that end, the Commission must require the maintenance and

reporting of certain personal information in the form of background investigations. Pursuant to the Privacy Act, the Commission has established a system of records for maintaining and protecting such confidential information. In addition, the Privacy Act prevents the Commission from revealing any personal information received in connection with a background investigation or license eligibility determination.

**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.**

Not applicable. No sensitive questions are asked.

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

- **Indicate the number of respondents, frequency of response, annual hour burden, and an explanation of how the burden was estimated. Unless directed to do so, agencies should not conduct special surveys to obtain information on which to base hour burden estimates. Consultation with a sample (fewer than 10) of potential respondents is desirable. If the hour burden on respondents is expected to vary widely because of differences in activity, size, or complexity, show the range of estimated hour burden, and explain the reasons for the variance. Generally, estimates should not include burden hours for customary and usual business practices.**
- **If this request for approval covers more than one form, provide separate hour burden estimates for each form and aggregate the hour burdens in Item 13 of OMB Form 83-I.**
- **Provide estimates of annualized cost to respondents for the hour burdens for collections of information, identifying and using appropriate wage rate categories. The cost of contracting out or paying outside parties for information collection activities should not be included here. Instead, this cost should be included in Item 13.**

As mentioned in Item 8 above, the NIGC consulted with 16 tribal regulatory gaming commissions and/or tribal gaming operators to gather the burden estimates for these information collections. The sizes of tribal gaming operations in the United States vary from small, truck stop-sized facilities to one of the largest gaming operations in the world. The sizes of the gaming

operations consulted included six Tier A gaming operations (annual gross gaming revenues of more than \$1 million but not more than \$5 million), three Tier B gaming operations (annual gross gaming revenues of more than \$5 million but not more than \$15 million), and seven Tier C gaming operations (annual gross gaming revenues of more than \$15 million). Depending on market forces, a gaming operation can fall into one tier during one year, and into another tier the following year.

Because the estimates sometimes varied dramatically for an information collection even amongst gaming operations in the same tiers (e.g., one Tier C operation reported 7,280 burden hours for a specific collection while another Tier C operation reported 1 burden hour for the same collection), the Commission averaged the estimates received only after dropping the highest and lowest estimates for each information collection. Another example of the dramatic variances in reported estimates include one Tier A operation reporting 1,600 burden hours to create and maintain/keep investigative reports, while another Tier A operation reported 10 burden hours for the same information collection.

Some of these information collections are mandatory and some are voluntary, and thus the difference in the number of annual respondents. There are 241 federally recognized tribes that operate 493 Indian gaming operations. The table below shows the Commission's estimated hourly burdens and the hourly cost burdens for respondents. The average hours per response and average hourly rates were provided by the tribal gaming commissions and/or tribal gaming operators.

**ESTIMATED ANNUAL BURDEN HOUR TOTALS**

<b>CFR CITE/ COLLECTION</b>	<b>NUMBER OF ANNUAL RESPONDENTS</b>	<b>FREQUENCY OF RESPONSES PER YEAR</b>	<b>TOTAL ANNUAL RESPONSES</b>	<b>AVERAGE HOURS PER RESPONSE</b>	<b>TOTAL ANNUAL HOURS</b>
519.1, 522.2(g); 519.2	30	Varies	30	1	30
522.2(a); 522.3(a); 522.10; 522.11	30	Varies	57	134	7,638
522.2(b)- (h), 522.3(b)	30	1	30	175	5,250
522.12	1	1	1	2.5	2.5
556.2, 556.3	241	1	241	15	3,615
556.4	213	Varies	72,387	3	217,161
556.6(a); 558.3(e)	240	1	240	1,483	355,920
556.6(b)(1)	240	Varies	43,055	5.3	228,191
556.6(b)(2)	240	Varies	43,055	5	215,275
558.3(b),(d)	240	Varies	43,055	2	86,110
558.4(e)	92	Varies	358	6	2,148
<b>TOTAL</b>	1597	Varies	202,509		1,121,340

**13. Provide an estimate for the total annual cost burden to respondents or recordkeepers resulting from the collection of information. (Do not include the cost of any hour burden shown in Items 12 and 14).**

- **The cost estimate should be split into two components: (a) a total capital and start-up cost component (annualized over its expected useful life) and (b) a total operation and maintenance and purchase of services component. The estimates should take into account costs associated with generating, maintaining, and disclosing or providing the information. Include descriptions of methods used to estimate major cost factors including system and technology acquisition, expected useful life of capital equipment, the discount rate(s), and the time period over which costs will be incurred. Capital and start-up costs include, among other items, preparations for collecting information such as purchasing computers and software; monitoring, sampling, drilling and testing equipment; and record storage facilities.**
- **If cost estimates are expected to vary widely, agencies should present ranges of cost burdens and explain the reasons for the variance. The cost of purchasing or contracting out information collections services should be a part of this cost burden estimate. In developing cost burden estimates, agencies may consult with a sample of**

respondents (fewer than 10), utilize the 60-day pre-OMB submission public comment process and use existing economic or regulatory impact analysis associated with the rulemaking containing the information collection, as appropriate.

- Generally, estimates should not include purchases of equipment or services, or portions thereof, made: (1) prior to October 1, 1995, (2) to achieve regulatory compliance with requirements not associated with the information collection, (3) for reasons other than to provide information or keep records for the government, or (4) as part of customary and usual business or private practices.

Although part of the dollar cost for this information collection is the estimated total amount that the tribes will pay to outside counsel to review certain documents (e.g., ordinances) before they are submitted to the NIGC, the remaining total costs provided by the tribes were unspecified.

**ESTIMATED ANNUAL COST TOTALS**

<b>CFR CITE/ COLLECTION</b>	<b>NUMBER OF ANNUAL RESPONDENTS</b>	<b>FREQUENCY OF RESPONSE PER YEAR</b>	<b>TOTAL ANNUAL RESPONSES</b>	<b>AVERAGE ANNUAL COSTS (if any)</b>	<b>TOTAL COSTS</b>
519.1, 522.2(g); 519.2	30	Varies	30	\$0	\$0
522.2(a); 522.3(a); 522.10; 522.11	30	Varies	57	\$8,723	\$497,211
522.2(b)-(h), 522.3(b)	30	1	30	\$196	\$5,880
522.12	1	1	1	\$0	\$0
556.2, 556.3	241	1	241	\$100	\$24,100
556.4	213	Varies	72,387	\$50	\$10,650
556.6(a); 558.3(e)	240	1	240	\$4,667	\$1,120,080
556.6(b)(1)	240	Varies	43,055	\$4,667	\$1,120,080
556.6(b)(2)	240	Varies	43,055	\$397	\$95,280
558.3(b),(d)	240	Varies	43,055	\$794	\$190,560
558.4(e)	92	Varies	358	\$69	\$6,348
<b>TOTAL</b>	1597	Varies	202,509		\$3,070,189

**14. Provide estimates of annualized costs 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. Agencies may also aggregate cost estimates from Items 12, 13, and 14 in a single table.**

The Commission determined its cost and burden hour estimates, inclusive of operational expenses, based on the workflows of the agency, and the functions specific to the receipt, recordation, and analysis of the submissions. As a general matter, the cost rate was based upon the hourly rate of personnel assigned to task. Support services are included in cost estimates.

**ESTIMATED ANNUAL AGENCY BURDEN**

<b>CFR CITE/ COLLECTION</b>	<b>NUMBER OF ANNUAL RESPONDENTS</b>	<b>FREQUENCY OF RESPONSE PER YEAR</b>	<b>TOTAL ANNUAL RESPONSES</b>	<b>REVIEW HOURS PER RESPONSE</b>	<b>TOTAL HOURS</b>	<b>HOURLY RATE</b>	<b>TOTAL AGENCY COST</b>
519.1, 522.2(g); 519.2	30	Varies	30	0.1	3	\$63	\$189
522.2(a); 522.3(a); 522.10; 522.11	30	Varies	57	2.1	120	\$63	\$7,560
522.2(b)- (h), 522.3(b)	30	1	30	1.3	39	\$63	\$2,457
522.12	1	1	1	0.25	0.25	\$63	\$16
556.2, 556.3	241	1	241	0.3	72	\$63	\$4,536
556.4	213	Varies	72,387	0.02	1,448	\$23	\$33,304
556.6(a); 558.3(e)	240	1	240	6.0	1,440	\$45	\$64,800
556.6(b)(1)	240	Varies	240	1.7	408	\$45	\$18,360
556.6(b)(2)	240	Varies	40,055	0.2	8,011	\$45	\$360,495
558.3(b), (d)	240	Varies	40,055	0.2	8,011	\$45	\$360,495
558.4(e)	92	Varies	358	0.2	72	\$45	\$3,240
<b>TOTAL</b>	1597	Varies	153,694				\$855,452

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

It should be noted at the outset that each tribe is unique and tribal business practices vary. The amount of time and resources a gaming tribe will expend in fulfilling regulatory requirements will naturally depend upon the size and complexity of its gaming operations and will often fluctuate in response to tribal investment in technology and technical expertise. In short, PRA burden hours often vary greatly among tribes and across time.

As mentioned in item number 8, the Commission surveyed 16 tribes and/or tribal regulatory authorities. Based on tribal feedback, the Commission has made the following adjustments to its estimated burdens:

- the current estimate of the total number of annual respondents has been slightly increased from 1580 to 1597. This is based on the average number of annual submission to the Commission for the past three years. This increase is due, primarily, to the increase - from 76 to 92 - of tribal reporting of license revocation notifications per § 558.4(e). It was also caused by, secondarily, the fact that there has been a slight increase in the overall number of gaming tribes.
- the estimated annual burden hour total has been slightly adjusted downward from 1,392,450 to 1,121,340. There are two main factors that account for this decrease. First, the average number of applications that were processed for background checks under § 556.4 decreased from 89,864 to 72,387. This resulted in a cumulative reduction of approximately 29,965 hours. Second, and more significantly, the average number of hours that tribes reportedly spent creating and maintaining investigative application reports per § 556.6(b)(1) decreased from 15 to 5.3. This decrease, multiplied over 40,055

applications that were reviewed, on average per year, resulted in a reduction 283,504 hours (from 511,695 to 228,191).

- the estimated annual cost total was decreased from \$3,334,176 to \$3,070,189. This decrease was mainly attributable to a \$636 decrease in the average costs of § 556.6(a) / 558.3(e) and a \$727 decrease in the average cost of § 556.6(b)(1).

**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.**

These are ongoing information collections with no ending date and no plans for publication.

**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.**

Not applicable.

**18. Explain each exception to the certification statement identified in Item 19, “Certification for Paperwork Reduction Act Submissions,” of OMB Form 83-I.**

Not applicable. The NIGC certifies compliance with 5 CFR § 1320.9.

**B. COLLECTIONS OF INFORMATION EMPLOYING STATISTICAL METHODS**

This section is not applicable. Statistical methods are not employed.