NOTICE OF OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET ACTION

Department of Commerce

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

FOR CERTIFYING OFFICIAL: Suzanne Hilding

FOR CLEARANCE OFFICER: Diana Hynek

In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act, OMB has taken action on your request received

05/26/2009

ACTION REQUESTED: Extension without change of a currently approved collection

TYPE OF REVIEW REQUESTED: Regular

ICR REFERENCE NUMBER: 200905-0648-002

AGENCY ICR TRACKING NUMBER:

TITLE: NOAA Coastal Services Center Coastal Resource Management Customer Survey

LIST OF INFORMATION COLLECTIONS: See next page

OMB ACTION: Approved without change

OMB CONTROL NUMBER: 0648-0308

The agency is required to display the OMB Control Number and inform respondents of its legal significance in accordance with 5 CFR 1320.5(b).

EXPIRATION DATE: 09/30/2011 DISCONTINUE DATE:

BURDEN:	RESPONSES	HOURS	COSTS
Previous	500	250	0
New	500	125	0
Difference			
Change due to New Statute	0	0	0

NOTICE OF OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET ACTION

Change due to Agency Adjustment	0	-125	0
Change Due to Potential Violation of the PRA	0	0	0

TERMS OF CLEARANCE:

OMB Authorizing Official: Kevin F. Neyland

Deputy Administrator,

Office Of Information And Regulatory Affairs

List of ICs			
IC Title	Form No.	Form Name	CFR Citation
2009 NOAA Coastal Services Center Coastal Resource Management Customer Survey	NA	2009 CRM Customer Survey	

PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT SUBMISSION

Please read the instructions before completing this form. For additional forms or assistance in completing this form, contact your agency's Paperwork Clearance Officer. Send two copies of this form, the collection instrument to be reviewed, the supporting statement, and any additional documentation to: Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, Docket Library, Room 10102, 725 17th Street NW, Washington, DC 20503.

1. Agency/Subagency originating request
DOC/NOAA/NOS/CSC

2. OMB control number b. [ ] None
a. 0648 - 0308

3. Type of information collection (*check one*)
a. [ ] New Collection
b. [ ] Revision of a currently approved collection
c. [✔] Extension of a currently approved collection
d. [ ] Reinstatement, without change, of a previously approved collection for which approval has expired
e. [ ] Reinstatement, with change, of a previously approved collection for which approval has expired
f. [ ] Existing collection in use without an OMB control number
For b-f, note Item A2 of Supporting Statement instructions

4. Type of review requested (*check one*)
a. [✔] Regular submission
b. [ ] Emergency - Approval requested by ____/____/____
c. [ ] Delegated

5. Small entities
Will this information collection have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities? [ ] Yes [✔] No

6. Requested expiration date
a. [✔] Three years from approval date b. [ ] Other Specify:____/____

7. Title 2009 NOAA Coastal Services Center Coastal Resource Management Customer Survey

8. Agency form number(s) (*if applicable*) NA

9. Keywords

10. Abstract

In continuing compliance with Executive Order 12862, Setting Customer Service Standards, this survey will be used by the NOAA Coastal Services Center to obtain information from our customers – state and territorial coastal resource managers – about their natural resource management issues, their information, training, and technical assistance needs, and their technical capabilities in order to make quality improvements the Center's products and services.

11. Affected public (*Mark primary with "P" and all others that apply with "x"*)
a. ___ Individuals or households d. ___ Farms
b. X Business or other for-profit e. X Federal Government
c. X Not-for-profit institutions f. P State, Local or Tribal Government

12. Obligation to respond (*check one*)
a. [✔] Voluntary
b. [ ] Required to obtain or retain benefits
c. [ ] Mandatory

13. Annual recordkeeping and reporting burden
a. Number of respondents 500
b. Total annual responses 500
1. Percentage of these responses collected electronically 100 %
c. Total annual hours requested 125
d. Current OMB inventory 250
e. Difference -125
f. Explanation of difference
1. Program change
2. Adjustment -125

14. Annual reporting and recordkeeping cost burden (*in thousands of dollars*)
a. Total annualized capital/startup costs 0
b. Total annual costs (O&M) 0
c. Total annualized cost requested 0
d. Current OMB inventory 0
e. Difference
f. Explanation of difference
1. Program change
2. Adjustment

15. Purpose of information collection (*Mark primary with "P" and all others that apply with "X"*)
a. ___ Application for benefits e. P Program planning or management
b. ___ Program evaluation f. ___ Research
c. ___ General purpose statistics g. ___ Regulatory or compliance
d. ___ Audit

16. Frequency of recordkeeping or reporting (*check all that apply*)
a. [ ] Recordkeeping b. [ ] Third party disclosure
c. [✔] Reporting
1. [ ] On occasion 2. [ ] Weekly 3. [ ] Monthly
4. [ ] Quarterly 5. [ ] Semi-annually 6. [ ] Annually
7. [ ] Biennially 8. [✔] Other (describe) Triennially

17. Statistical methods
Does this information collection employ statistical methods
[✔] Yes [ ] No

18. Agency Contact (person who can best answer questions regarding the content of this submission)
Name: Chris Ellis
Phone: 843-740-1195

19. Certification for Paperwork Reduction Act Submissions

On behalf of this Federal Agency, I certify that the collection of information encompassed by this request complies with 5 CFR 1320.9

NOTE: The text of 5 CFR 1320.9, and the related provisions of 5 CFR 1320.8(b)(3), appear at the end of the instructions. *The certification is to be made with reference to those regulatory provisions as set forth in the instructions.*

The following is a summary of the topics, regarding the proposed collection of information, that the certification covers:

(a) It is necessary for the proper performance of agency functions;

(b) It avoids unnecessary duplication;

(c) It reduces burden on small entities;

(d) It used plain, coherent, and unambiguous terminology that is understandable to respondents;

(e) Its implementation will be consistent and compatible with current reporting and recordkeeping practices;

(f) It indicates the retention period for recordkeeping requirements;

(g) It informs respondents of the information called for under 5 CFR 1320.8(b)(3):

- (i) Why the information is being collected;
- (ii) Use of information;
- (iii) Burden estimate;
- (iv) Nature of response (voluntary, required for a benefit, mandatory);
- (v) Nature and extent of confidentiality; and
- (vi) Need to display currently valid OMB control number;

(h) It was developed by an office that has planned and allocated resources for the efficient and effective management and use of the information to be collected (see note in Item 19 of instructions);

(i) It uses effective and efficient statistical survey methodology; and

(j) It makes appropriate use of information technology.

If you are unable to certify compliance with any of the provisions, identify the item below and explain the reason in Item 18 of the Supporting Statement.

Signature of Senior Official or designee	Date

Agency Certification (signature of Assistant Administrator, Deputy Assistant Administrator, Line Office Chief Information Officer, head of MB staff for L.O.s, or of the Director of a Program or StaffOffice)	
Signature signed by Hugh Johnson	Date 05/07/2009
Signature of NOAA Clearance Officer	
Signature signed by Sarah Brabson	Date 05/07/2009

SUPPORTING STATEMENT
2009 NOAA COASTAL SERVICES CENTER COASTAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT CUSTOMER SURVEYOMB CONTROL NO. 0648-0308

A. JUSTIFICATION

1. Explain the circumstances that make the collection of information necessary.

One of the fundamentals of the NOAA Coastal Services Center (Center) is the commitment to serve the technology and informational needs of our customers, the coastal resource management community. To obtain this service goal, customer feedback is a critical need. We receive such input through various means. The most important is the Coastal Resource Management (CRM) Customer Survey (CRM Survey).

In continuing compliance with Executive Order 12862, Setting Customer Service Standards, this survey will be used by the NOAA Coastal Services Center to obtain information from its customers—state and territorial coastal and marine resource managers—regarding their information needs based on their coastal resource management responsibilities, technology and information management capabilities, and critical resource management issues.

The CRM Survey will allow the Center to determine specific services its customers want, understand the customers' level of technical expertise, and document priority issues most relevant to their missions. The information will be used by the Center to guide strategic planning, professional development, and informed delivery of future products and services for the Nation's coastal resource management community.

Other offices within NOAA and the National Ocean Service (NOS) have collected information from segments of the respondent universe that this survey addresses. However, great effort has been made to tailor the questions herein to pertain specifically to the types of functions the Center supports, such as geographic information systems (GIS), remote sensing, and social science. No other office within NOAA has collected the same information from the same universe of respondents.

This request is for a renewal of this information collection.

2. Explain how, by whom, how frequently, and for what purpose the information will be used. If the information collected will be disseminated to the public or used to support information that will be disseminated to the public, then explain how the collection complies with all applicable Information Quality Guidelines.

Purpose, Delivery, and Frequency
The 2009 survey represents the Center's fifth triennial effort to assess customer management issues, technical capabilities, and technical assistance needs at the national level. Previous CRM surveys were administered in 1996, 1999, 2002, and 2006. The 1996 CRM Survey targeted the

information management sector of the coastal resource management community, the primary customer base of the Center's formerly named Coastal Information Services Branch. The 1999 CRM Survey targeted the information management and program or site management sections of the coastal resource management community. The 2002 CRM Survey targeted coastal resource management staff responsible for a broader array of coastal resource management topic: respondents included lead staff responsible for program management, education and outreach, research, natural resource management, planning, permitting and regulatory enforcement, and information technology (GIS or remote sensing). The 2006 CRM Survey began seeking information related to previous collections in order to effectively monitor trends of priority coastal management issues, applications of technology, and key product and service needs that the Center is uniquely equipped to address. The 2009 version seeks to accomplish comparable objectives to the 2006 survey's in a much more concise and user-friendly format.

Use of Past Results

In the planning and development stages for the 2009 CRM Survey, a cross-Center survey working group was established with representatives from each of the Center's four divisions. The Center survey team and Center management staff critically reviewed the questions and results of previous CRM Surveys in terms of their past, present, and future usefulness to individual Center program areas and their application to the Center as a whole. The team's approach was that if they could not justify the usefulness of a question to their specific program or to the Center, it should be omitted from the survey. Specific questions or content areas from the previous 2006 CRM Survey that were identified as obsolete or of reduced utility were omitted from use in the current 2009 version. Key results from the previous CRM surveys have been cited repeatedly during presentations about the Center and have influenced the development of new program initiatives. The following paragraphs describe instances of which results have been used and how they have been applied.

The 1996 CRM Survey was designed primarily to collect information about the computer systems and software that the coastal resource management community uses. The Center has used this information to determine which software programs and formats should be incorporated into the production of products and for designing technical training. The information collected about GIS has been critically important to the Center, as it has been used to seek and acquire support from partners for several locally-based GIS support projects, such as the Protected Areas GIS.

The first section of the 1996 CRM Survey asked about "Coastal Information Management, Problems, and Opportunities." This question contained questions about the respondent agency's coastal responsibilities, the types of problems for which it managed data, and about management obstacles limiting their efforts. In reviewing the results for this section, it was apparent that further information about the agency's management responsibilities would help the Center better plan and develop products and services. This led to the changed design of the 1999 CRM Survey—one part focusing on management issues and the second part focusing on technology and information management.

The section on "Communication Pathways and Data/Information Exchange" asked about the customer's use of metadata and their methods of transmitting and sharing data. This information was used also to direct product development. Using the results, the Center was able to determine what formats and amounts/volumes of data could effectively be transmitted via the Center's Web

site. The section also asked whether Center customers had coastal data or information that could be added to the Center's Coastal Information Directory, an electronic database for accessing coastal data and information.

The "Current and Planned Activities and Products" section asked customers to rate their level of interest in various planned activities. This information had influence on the development of training programs, a competitive funding program for innovative coastal resource management solutions, and ways the Center can better meet the needs of customers.

The 1999 CRM Survey focused on re-evaluating the level of use and need for technology-based decision support in terms of GIS and remote sensing, gaining a better understanding of Center coastal resource manager customers' natural resource management roles, responsibilities, and issues, and gauging interest and need for technical training, including:

- technology tools (e.g., ArcView, remote sensing)
- process skills (e.g., facilitation training, needs assessment, conflict management), and
- content-specific areas (e.g., integrated coastal resource management, Coastal Zone Management Act, smart growth).

Both the information management and natural resource management portions of the 1999 CRM Survey asked in-depth questions about five broad categories of coastal issues: habitat, coastal development, hazards, water quality, and resource management. The information management portion asked about the offices' collection, derivation, use, and management of spatial data pertinent to these issues. Most respondents indicated that they use spatial data that has been collected, derived, or managed by others. Seventy-two percent of the respondents indicated that they use spatial data to manage habitat issues. Approximately half of the respondents use spatial data to manage the other coastal issues (e.g., coastal development, hazards, water quality, natural resource management).

The remainder of the information management portion of the 1999 survey assessed the level of use, kinds of software, numbers of staff and level of expertise related to the use of spatial data and geographic information technologies, development of Federal Geographic Data Committee (FGDC) metadata, and training needs to Center customers. The Center invests a great deal in the development of specialized decision support tools using GIS. Understanding the software most commonly used enables the Center to develop products most useful to the majority of its customers. The overall level of GIS expertise within an office, including the number of people who use it or have been trained to use it, suggests the level of investment that an office has put into spatial data access. The combined results of these questions have helped the Center identify where gaps exist and where to focus its resources. For example, respondents reported that when GIS and remote sensing capabilities are not available in-house, they turn to partnerships with federal, state, or local agencies or academia to obtain these technical services. This information is useful in guiding efficient planning for Center programs, for building partnerships with customers and other federal agencies, and for development of grant funding opportunities for the coastal resource management community. Information pertaining to software use and Internet access has been critical for the development of Web-based tools and practical applications, extensions, and data for Center customers.

The natural resource management portion of the 1999 survey asked about the offices' roles (i.e., lead, coordinating, or independent) in addressing coastal natural resources management issues, technical resources most useful in addressing offices' coastal resource management responsibilities, education and outreach efforts, and training needs. In general, most offices reported playing a coordinating role when managing coastal issues. With this role, many offices emphasized the need for accurate coastal data to properly address issues. Respondents also reported a high interest and need for technical training, both in technology tools and in process skills and specific coastal issue content. A majority of respondents also reported having developed education programs and volunteer programs. At least two thirds of respondents or more reported interest in training for public involvement, outreach planning, communication planning, and conflict management training. Since the 1999 survey, the Center has developed training programs to meet the needs of Center customers offered both at the Center and in coordination with Center customer offices "in the field" in different parts of the country.

The 2002 survey also asked respondents about collaboration with other allied organizations and to indicate practice, preference, and needs for information sharing and training delivery. Respondents indicated that partnership building and outreach and education were a high priority for their offices and that communication with colleagues and attending professional meetings, conferences, workshops, and trainings are the most frequent ways to share new ideas and information. There is considerable interest in training on specific coastal zone management issues and process skills offered both remotely and at the Center, with identified training needs in the areas of needs assessment, resource valuation, and heritage resource management. These results suggested that the Center should continue to dedicate resources toward development and improvement of these products and services.

The 2006 survey was the first survey administered via Email. Similarly, it was conducted to determine opinions on and interaction with the Center among coastal resource stakeholders. This survey was a precursor to tracking specific trends in specific priority topic areas and preferred data content, as compared to access, sharing, and decision support tool development. The results of the 2006 survey were highly utilized throughout numerous NOAA NOA offices for strategic planning purposes, including the Office of Coastal Resource Management (OCRM) and the National Centers for Coastal and Ocean Science (NCCOS).

Projected Use of New Results

Understanding natural resource management issues, technical capabilities, and use of geospatial data and geographic information technologies, and social science needs are important to the Center. The Center is committed to helping the coastal resource community apply GIS and remote sensing technology to support coastal decision-making. The Center is also committed to providing high quality information, technical assistance, and training services. To meet these challenges, the Center needs feedback about the issues facing the coastal resource management community, how Center customers use and manage spatial data, what issues are being addressed, and what priorities exist. The 2009 survey is substantially shorter than the 2006 iteration in an effort to maximize response and refine Center inquiry to items most essential to effective future service delivery. The sections of the new survey are described below.

Section 1 asks respondents to indicate their previous contact with the Center. This will help the Center gauge the means by which respondents have interacted with Center products and services

(e.g., attending Center workshops, using Center data products) and a means by which to compare responses across the survey.

Section 2 begins by asking respondents to report the priority level of a number of coastal management issues. The information resulting from this list of topic areas will aid the Center in developing products and services most useful to Center customers relative to each listed topic. The results will also indicate what issues different offices are tasked with, and help the Center prioritize future spatial data provision.

The section continues with questions from previous Center surveys in assessing the awareness, use, usefulness, and preferences of various technology, technology tools (e.g., GIS, remote sensing, visualization) and related services. This information will be used to continue to provide products and services (e.g., information resources, demonstration projects, training) that match needs and capabilities of the Center's customers. Trends of patterns and use can be depicted over the course of the five CRM Surveys. This information will aid the Center in evaluating its ability to meet the needs of the coastal resource management community as the use of GIS, remote sensing, and other technology gains ever-increasing presence in the natural resource management arena and as this dynamic segment of the computer and technology industry evolves.

Section 3 focuses on tools and information resources, including new and emerging technologies, such as social networking, Web services, and Data warehouses and portals. This continues information tracking since 2002 about respondent's familiarity with applied social science methods and management processes. Additionally, it will allow for tracking new technology trends as they gain increasing use and prominence in the management community. Identification of trends and patterns of use of these methods and processes can aid the Center in evaluating its ability to meet the needs of the coastal resource management community as these methods and processes become more widely practiced.

Section 4 asks respondents to offer information related to their office, their position, the region of the country they serve, and their years of experience as coastal resource management professionals. These questions will aid the Center in improving products and services that are well-suited to the coastal resource management communities in terms of delivering information content at appropriate technical levels for a particular segment (e.g., education and outreach program leaders). These questions will also enable the Center to create products and services more appropriately suited to the needs and expertise of the Center's customer base. This also provides a means by which to group and compare responses (e.g., based on position type, years in the field). This section also provides an opportunity for respondents to offer additional comments related to the survey itself, its administration process, its burden, or any other topic. This can provide valuable feedback for future information collections. The Center has used this information in the past to direct changes in the survey and other products and services.

Our intended sample for the 2009 survey has been refined to include all of the Center's core audiences (e.g., Sea Grant College Programs, National Estuarine Research Reserves (NERRs), National Estuary Programs (NEPs), State, regional, and local coastal managers) and fewer peripheral audiences and partner groups (e.g., National Park Service, US Fish & Wildlife Service, US Army Corps of Engineers). This reflects the Center's efforts to distill efforts to its most critical customers. This will enable the Center to more effectively target products and

services to core audiences of the coastal management community, which will result in greater service to these audiences, and cost savings over time.

As explained in the preceding paragraphs, the information to be gathered has utility. NOAA's National Ocean Service will retain control over the information and safeguard it from improper access, modification, and destruction, consistent with NOAA standards for confidentiality, privacy, and electronic information. See response to Question10 of this Supporting Statement for more information on confidentiality and privacy. The information collection is designed to yield data that meet all applicable information quality guidelines. Although the information collected is not expected to be disseminated directly to the public, results may be used in scientific, management, technical or general information publications. Should NOAA's National

Ocean Service decide to disseminate the information, it will be subject to the quality control measures and pre-dissemination review pursuant to Section 515 of Public Law 106-554.

3. Describe whether, and to what extent, the collection of information involves the use of automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological techniques or other forms of information technology.

The survey will be administered via a web survey instrument. Mail surveys will no longer be used as they are an added expense and can require more time to complete. Invitations with a link to the survey will be sent to members of the coastal resources, and related, communities. Upon request, respondents will be mailed a paper version of the survey to complete and return in a postage paid envelope. If requested, accommodations will also be made to facilitate completion of the survey via telephone.

4. Describe efforts to identify duplication.

No other existing similar information collections were found. Other GIS-related survey reports were identified, but none had coastal resource management-specific content. None addressed the same assemblage of topics.

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

The completion of the proposed collection will not have a significant economic impact on the respondents.

6. Describe the consequences to the Federal program or policy activities if the collection is not conducted or is conducted less frequently.

The Center's first operating principle is to be "customer driven." Without regular input from the coastal resource management community, the Center would risk investing in projects and services that have little relevance to the coastal resource management community's needs or that are delivered in formats not usable by the customer. Conducting this survey will provide the Center with consistent information from its customer base, recognizing and tracking differences in technical capability and management responsibility by agency type and by region. Survey results enable the Center to be more efficient in the development of specific products and services that meet the needs and capabilities of our customers. Given the rapid evolution of technology, the collection could not be conducted any less frequently.

7. Explain any special circumstances that require the collection to be conducted in a manner inconsistent with OMB guidelines.

The collection will be conducted consistently with OMB guidelines.

8. Provide information on the PRA Federal Register Notice that solicited public comments on the information collection prior to this submission. Summarize the public comments received in response to that notice and describe the actions taken by the agency in response to those comments. Describe the 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.

A Federal Register Notice published on January 30, 2009 (73 FR 19 5640) solicited public comments. No substantive comments pertinent to the collection were received.

Center personnel trained in survey research and design, along with MRAG Americas, Inc. created the survey instrument. Technical literature consulted in the planning and development of the instrument and survey administration included *How to Conduct our Own Survey* (Salant and Dillman, 1994) as well as numerous other survey instruments and technical references. Salant and Dillman have conducted extensive research on all aspects of survey design and implementation for over a decade and their methods of distribution and follow-up have consistently achieved positive results.

Pilot testing of the instrument was completed in April 2009. Pilot participants included representative members from across the coastal resource management community. Pilot testing included timing of respondents, identification and discussion of unclear instructions and question content, asking respondents about the length of the instrument, and discussing suggestions for improvements. Fewer than 10 external, non-federal employees participated in the testing and subsequent discussions.

9. Explain any decisions to provide payments or gifts to respondents, other than remuneration of contractors or grantees.

No plans exist for payments or gifts to survey respondents.

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

Each survey response will contain a survey identification number for tracking and response calculations. Responses will not be reported individually, only in aggregate. Respondents are assured that their names will not be placed on their completed surveys or subsequent reports. A summary of results will be posted on the Center's websites, similar to those of past surveys (available at: http://www.csc.noaa.gov/survey/).

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.

The instrument contains no questions of a sensitive nature.

12. Provide an estimate in hours of the burden of the collection of information.

The estimated one-time burden estimate for the survey is 125 hours. This reflects 500 respondents with an average completion time of 15 minutes, including the time for reviewing instructions and gathering the requested information.

Respondents are likely to be program managers, department heads, and content area specialists within their respective organizations, equivalent to a Government Service Pay Grade 12 Step 1. Using this grade to estimate the hourly rate of the respondent ($28.62), the maximum estimated annualized cost to the respondent for the hour burden of each collection (i.e., 0.25 hours) is $7.16 per respondent; the maximum cost for the information collection for a 100 percent response rate (i.e., 500 respondents) is $3,578.

13. Provide an estimate of the total annual cost burden to the respondents or record-keepers resulting from the collection (excluding the value of the burden hours in Question 12 above).

Responding to the survey requires no cost or record keeping.

14. Provide estimates of annualized cost to the Federal government.

This information collection effort is supported through external contract services for data collection and analysis and in-house staff time. The estimated annualized cost for this information collection is $21,948 (i.e., contract services, in-house staff time, supplies). Estimates presented below represent the costs per annum for the term of the approval.

Annualized Cost to Federal Government	Labor	$Cost
Supplies		$100
Printing		$100
Data management and database development		$16,166
Project staff (ZP4)	100 hrs @ $38.46/hr	3,846
Project supervisor (ZA4)	20 hrs @ 46.73/hr	$936
Administrative staff support	20 hrs @ 20.00/hr	$400
Cover design, layout & editing	10 hrs @ 40.00/hr	$400
TOTAL		$21,948

15. Explain the reasons for any program changes or adjustments.

The previously approved request had a maximum one time burden of 250 hours, based on a 30-minute response time. This request adjusts the maximum burden to 125 hours, based on a 15-minute response time, for the same maximum number of respondents.

16. For collections whose results will be published, outline the plans for tabulation and publication.

A summary of results will be posted on the Center's websites similar to past surveys (available at: http://www.csc.noaa.gov/survey/).

17. <u>If seeking approval to not display the expiration date for OMB approval of the information collection, explain the reasons why display would be inappropriate</u>.

The expiration date and OMB control number will be displayed on the survey instrument.

18. <u>Explain each exception to the certification statement identified in Item 19 of the OMB 83-I</u>.

There are no exceptions to the certification statement identified in Item 19.

B. COLLECTIONS OF INFORMATION EMPLOYING STATISTICAL METHODS

1. Describe (including a numerical estimate) the potential respondent universe and any sampling or other respondent selection method to be used. Data on the number of entities (e.g. establishments, State and local governmental units, households, or persons) in the universe and the corresponding sample are to be provided in tabular form. The tabulation must also include expected response rates for the collection as a whole. If the collection has been conducted before, provide the actual response rate achieved.

	Businesses	**Not-for-profit**	**State, Local or Tribal Government**	**Federal Government**	**TOTAL**
	25	75	350	50	500
Examples	Technological consultants Geospatial technology providers Chamber of Commerce Member	The Nature Conservancy Land Trust Alliance NatureServe EBM Tools Network	State Coastal Zone Management Agencies County and municipal planners	Other Ocean Service offices	

The universe of respondents for this information collection comprises the NOAA Coastal Services Center's core customer base involved in coastal natural resource and hazard management. The 2006 CRM survey was sent to all Center customer audiences at the state government level with an identified role in the management of coastal resources. Additionally, the Center attempted to broaden its respondent universe with the inclusion of federal offices within the US Department of the Interior, USDA Forest Service, and the US Army Corps of Engineers. For the 2009 survey, the additional federal offices will be removed from the respondent universe, scaling the survey back to only those audiences identified as core customers to the Center. The total number of responses targeted will be 500.

The response rates for the 1996, 1999, 2002, and 2006 CRM Surveys were 54, 70, 74, and 65 percent, respectively. Administration plans for the 2009 CRM Survey will follow steps outlined by Salant and Dillman (1994), including follow-up reminder communications to increase the response rate. Based on past efforts and lessons learned, a response rate of greater than 70 percent is expected for the 2009 survey. Two factors that potentially led to a decreased response rate for the 2006 survey have been remedied. First, the survey was emailed by the hired subcontractor mail server, which subsequently led to all emails coming from an unknown address. The survey will, this year, be administered via a NOAA email account, which will

increase recognition and will lessen the likelihood of the survey to be discarded, or perceived as spam. Secondly, the 2006 survey attempted to reach out to a substantially broader audience base, with which the Center has little interaction. While the effort was in good faith to identify areas of potential collaboration and means to prevent redundancies in effort, it was the new "survey audiences" that substantially drove down the response rate. For this survey, we are retuning to the core Center audiences. We anticipate that these two actions, as well as the shorter survey, will increase the response rate substantially.

2. Describe the procedures for the collection, including: the statistical methodology for stratification and sample selection; the estimation procedure; the degree of accuracy needed for the purpose described in the justification; any unusual problems requiring specialized sampling procedures; and any use of periodic (less frequent than annual) data collection cycles to reduce burden.

No statistical methodology has been applied to stratify the sample. The 2009 CRM Survey will be sent to all existing Center Customer offices responsible for coastal resource management. The CRM Survey is conducted on a triennial basis. Given the rapid progression and changes in resource management-related technology tools, less frequent collection would not have adequate utility for Center planning and product and service development.

3. Describe the methods used to maximize response rates and to deal with nonresponse. The accuracy and reliability of the information collected must be shown to be adequate for the intended uses. For collections based on sampling, a special justification must be provided if they will not yield "reliable" data that can be generalized to the universe studied.

Actions to maximize response rate:

- The survey has been reduced and simplified from its predecessor in order to reduce time to complete and improve response rate.
- Prior to fielding of the survey, both Center publications will run an announcement, announcing the survey—this is expected to have a positive effect on survey awareness and response.
- The initial (preliminary notification) contact will contain a personalized emailed cover letter from the Center, cordially inviting participation and describing the purpose of the survey along with the survey instrument and instructions.

- A series of two follow-up reminders will be sent to respondents at two-week intervals, following the delivery of the survey instrument.
- All letters, messages, and reminders will be personally addressed (i.e., with salutation).
- If a paper copy is requested, postage-paid return envelopes will be enclosed.
- Respondents will be given multiple ways to contact Center representatives with questions regarding the survey (phone, fax, email).
- For expediency, electronic mail will be used instead of postal mail to communicate with customers, unless postal or private carrier services are requested.

Action to address nonresponse:

If response rates are below 80 percent, nonrespondents will be contacted to test for nonresponse bias: fielded questions will include demographic elements, including years of experience in coastal resource management, geographic area of professional activity, profession type, and degree of familiarity and previous interaction with the Center.

4. Describe any tests of procedures or methods to be undertaken. Tests are encouraged as effective means to refine collections, but if ten or more test respondents are involved OMB must give prior approval.

Pilot testing of the survey instrument was completed in April, 2009. Pilot test participants included representative members from across the coastal management community—reflecting respondent types. The goals of the pilot test were to gauge readability, ease of completion, clarity of instructions, and estimated completion time. Pilot testing included timing of respondents, identification and discussion of unclear instructions and question content, asking respondents about the length of the survey instrument, and discussing suggestions for improvements. Fewer than 10 non-federal employees participated in the pilot test and subsequent discussions. Comments from the pilot test were highly beneficial and resulted in design, content, and wording changes to clarify responses.

5. Provide the name and telephone number of individuals consulted on the statistical aspects of the design, and the name of the agency unit, contractor(s), grantee(s), or other person(s) who will actually collect and/or analyze the information for the agency.

MRAG Americas will conduct the survey and collect and analyze all responses. However, the survey invitation will be sent on behalf of the NOAA Coastal Services Center.

MRAG Americas, Inc.,
65 Eastern Avenue, Unit B2C
Essex, MA 01928
Ph. 978-768-3880
Contact: Jill Swasey, jill.swasey@mragamericas.com

Dear Colleague,

This letter is to inform you of the 2009 NOAA Coastal Services Center Custom Service and invite your participation. The mission of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Coastal Services Center is to support the environmental, social, and economic well being of the coast by linking people, information, and technology. To better serve the nation's coastal resource managers, we must learn about their issues, information needs, and technological capabilities. At the NOAA Coastal Services Center, we gather this information in a variety of ways, one of the most important being the triennial Coastal Resource Management Customer Survey.

The Coastal Resource Management Customer Survey is sent to offices of state coastal management programs and state departments of natural resources (or equivalent agencies) responsible for coastal resource management, National Estuarine Research Reserves, Sea Grant College Programs, National Estuary Programs, allied programs and non-profit and non-governmental organizations. You may be one of several people in your organization that receives the survey. Each survey has an identification number for the sole purpose of tracking which surveys have been returned. No names of individuals will be placed on any documents or used in any reports generated from this project.

The public burden for this collection of information (i.e., time required to complete this survey) is estimated to average 15 minutes, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection information. If you have questions or comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, please contact our survey coordinator Chris Ellis: by mail, at NOAA Coastal Services Center, 2234 South Hobson Avenue, Charleston, SC 29405; by telephone, at (843) 740-1195; or via email, at Chris.Ellis@noaa.gov. We hope you will be able to offer us a moment of your time to complete the survey.

The survey will be administered online, though printed copies for mail submission will be available on request. You will be receiving the survey link within the next month. **We kindly ask that you respond by DATE.**

Thank you in advance for your participation. Your input is extremely valuable and will help us do a better job of planning for and serving your needs. You will be notified when the final survey report is posted on the Web.

Sincerely,

NAME OF CENTER LEADERSHIP
TITLE
NOAA Coastal Services Center

NOAA Coastal Services Center
LINKING PEOPLE, INFORMATION, AND TECHNOLOGY

2009 Coastal Resource Management Customer Survey

INSTRUCTIONS
This voluntary survey is designed to gather information for the NOAA Coastal Services Center (Center) to effectively respond to the needs of the coastal management community and track the trends in issues and needs of this community. This survey should take you approximately 15 minutes to complete. You time and input is greatly appreciated. Please answer the questions to the best of your knowledge, and within the context of your organization and job duties. Please read and follow the instructions provided for each question. Commonly used abbreviations are listed below.

Abbreviations
NA = Not Applicable
Med = Medium

SECTION I. FAMILIARITY WITH NOAA COASTAL SERVICES CENTER
1. Please indicate your level of familiarity with the NOAA Coastal Services Center. Check all that apply.

- ❒ This is my first interaction with the Center
- ❒ I am generally familiar with the Center
- ❒ I have attended a Center workshop
- ❒ I have attended a Center conference (i.e. Coastal Zone, GeoTools)
- ❒ I have participated in training or technical assistance provided by the Center
- ❒ I utilize tools and/or data from the Center
- ❒ Other _____

SECTION II. MANAGEMENT PRIORITIES & SPATIAL DATA USE
2. Indicate which of the following topics represent priority issues and data needs for you.

❒ I do not use spatial data or I am not familiar with the data used by my office. (Please answer only question 2a).

	2a. How much of a priority is each of the topics listed below to you?				2b. Do you use spatial data to address the topics listed?		
	Low	Med	High	NA	Yes	No, but we need this	No, not needed
Coastal Land Use Planning							
Climate change impacts	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Demographics	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Dredging	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Economics	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Infrastructure/utilities development	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Land use planning/growth management	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Permits and enforcement	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒

Port, harbor or marina development	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Public access	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Recreation and tourism	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Transportation planning	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Waterfront and brownfield redevelopment	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Wetland Loss	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Ocean and Great Lakes Planning							
Climate change impacts	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Demographics	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Economics	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Energy development (including alt. energy)	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Marine jurisdictional boundaries	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Marine transportation planning	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Near shore and off shore habitat mapping	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Protected area management	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Shoreline change management	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Submerged lands management	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Water/lake level decrease	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Coastal Conservation Planning							
Climate change impacts	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Cultural and heritage resource management	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Demographics	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Economics	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Erosion and beach nourishment	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Fisheries management	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Habitat restoration and monitoring	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Invasive species management	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Nonpoint source pollution	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Protected species management	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Water quality monitoring	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Coastal Hazards							
Beach safety related to rip currents	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Climate change impacts	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Coral reef management	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Demographics	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Economics	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Erosion	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒

Flooding/inundation/storm surge	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Harmful algal blooms	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Hurricanes	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Impacts to Barrier Islands	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Landslides	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Oil/pollutant spill response	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Pollutant transport and dispersion	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Public health concerns	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Sea level rise	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Search and rescue	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Subsidence	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Tsunami	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒

2c. Please indicate other issues of particular concern to you that were not mentioned above.

2d. Please indicate other data needs, not mentioned above.

2e. Please indicate which of the following demographic and economic information needs are most critical in your job/for your office? *Please select up to three items.*

- ❒ Population counts
- ❒ Population attributes (age, race, educational attainment, other)
- ❒ Housing counts
- ❒ Economic output (gross state product)
- ❒ Employment by type of employer
- ❒ Earnings by type of employer
- ❒ Time-series data (for any of the above)
- ❒ Non-market values
- ❒ Don't know
- ❒ Other(s) _____

3. Indicate your primary need(s) for effective coastal management. *Please select up to three.*

- ❒ Organizational policy/process supporting use of tools and data
- ❒ Equipment/facilities/technology for tool and data use
- ❒ Relevant/necessary data
- ❒ Required knowledge or skills for tool and data use
- ❒ Appropriate and effective tools
- ❒ Applicability/interest in technology tools
- ❒ Coordination with other local entities to accomplish management
- ❒ Education and communication with the public regarding management activities and objectives
- ❒ Lack of coordination with other local entities to accomplish management
- ❒ Time
- ❒ Staff
- ❒ Other resources (i.e. funding)
- ❒ We have no needs
- ❒ Don't know
- ❒ Other_____

4. With respect to Hazards Management: Indicate if each of the information needs is a priority for management in your job.

	Not at all	Somewhat Important	Very Important	Don't Know
Risk and Vulnerability Assessment	❒	❒	❒	❒
Risk Communication	❒	❒	❒	❒
Risk Behavior	❒	❒	❒	❒
Hazards Mitigation	❒	❒	❒	❒
Forecasts and Warnings	❒	❒	❒	❒
Response Immediately after a Hazard Disaster	❒	❒	❒	❒
Long Term Recovery	❒	❒	❒	❒

5. Please indicate your primary need(s) with respect to improving hazards management. *Select up to three*.

- ❒ Access to and usability of information
- ❒ Increase communities' ability to be resilient
- ❒ Enhance communication about hazard preparedness
- ❒ Lack of planning capacity and resources at local level
- ❒ Coastal monitoring programs
- ❒ I do not need to know about these for my job

6a. There are various frameworks and approaches to coastal and ocean management, such as Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICZM), Ecosystem-Based Management (EBM), Adaptive Management, and others. Are there specific approaches that your office has adopted for use, or find more useful than others? If YES, please describe in the space below.

❒Yes ❒No ❒Don't Know

Please explain_____

6b. Do you agree with the premise of including humans as part of the management framework?

❒Yes ❒No ❒ Don't Know

Please explain_____

6c. Please indicate which of the following you would classify as constraints to an interdisciplinary approach to coastal and marine management. *Please select your top three constraints*.

	Primary constraint	Secondary constraint	Tertiary constraint
Financial and technical capital	❒	❒	❒
Political support for integrated management	❒	❒	❒
Jurisdictional boundaries	❒	❒	❒
Clear management objectives	❒	❒	❒
Collaboration/cooperation between agencies	❒	❒	❒
Other_____	❒	❒	❒

6d. In which of the following areas do you feel improvements are needed for an effective interdisciplinary approach to coastal and marine management? *Please select up to three.*

- ❒ Engaging community and stakeholder groups in decision making
- ❒ Developing methods for establishing multiple use marine zones
- ❒ Developing methods for implementing ecosystem approaches to fisheries management
- ❒ Advancing coastal land use practices by accounting for land-sea interactions in land use decisions
- ❒ Managing marine protected areas
- ❒ Socio-economic impact studies
- ❒ Demographic studies
- ❒ Conserving marine biodiversity
- ❒ Including humans, society, and government in the equation

SECTION III: TOOLS AND INFORMATION RESOURCES

7. Please indicate what new, emerging sources and formats of web technology you are using to obtain information. Check all that apply.

- ❒ I do know how my office obtains information
- ❒ Social Networking/Collaborative (Facebook, Twitter, Wikipedia)
- ❒ Warehouse or Portal (The National Map, Digital Coast, Geospatial One Stop)
- ❒ Web Services (RSS, Google Maps/Earth, map service, streaming)
- ❒ Professional Networks (LinkedIn)
- ❒ Static Sites (FTP, agency home page)
- ❒ Other _____

8a. Have you ever participated in web-based training (other than mandatory topics such as safety or information technology security)?

❒Yes ❒No

8b. Indicate your level of interest in web-based training.

❒None ❒Low ❒Medium ❒High

9. Please indicate your use of the following technologies to support coastal resource management and the importance of that technology in decision making.

	9a. Frequency of Use					9b. Importance for Decision Making			
	Daily	Weekly	Monthly	Never	Don't Know	Low	Med	High	NA
Online Mapping (browsing / viewing data)	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Online Databases (data portals, data clearinghouses)	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Decision Support Tools (manipulating/analyzing data)	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
GIS layers, applications, tools, extension, etc.	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Remote Sensing Data and Derivatives (imagery, elevation, land cover, bathymetry, mapping)	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Near Real Time Data (<24 hrs old, e.g. buoys, tide gauges, etc.)	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Model or Model Outputs (habitat modeling, SLOSH, HURREVAC)	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒

Visualization (GIS-, 3D-, and photo-based)	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Other _____	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒

10. Do you utilize visualization software tools for decision making?

Yes	No, and don't need to	No, but would be useful
❒	❒	❒

Please specify any software tools that you are currently using or would like to use: _____

11. Please rate which of the following types of technical assistance you find useful.

	Usefulness				
	Low	Med	High	None	NA
Data access	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Providing training on existing software	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Providing on-site technical assistance in use of software	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Writing statements of work for data purchases/data development	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Applying data for decision-making	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Data quality assurance	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Facilitation	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Survey Design	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Stakeholder Engagement	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Economic Analysis	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Logic Models	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Evaluation	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Using GIS for Coastal Managers	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Other _____	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒

Please use this space to describe any relevant details to the above technical assistance areas. _____

12. Please indicate your use of the following program management and social science tools and their usefulness.

12a. Are you aware of this type of tool and its application? 12b. Please identify if you use the indicated tool and how useful the tool is.

	Awareness		Use			Usefulness			
	Yes	No	Used	Not used	Don't know	Low	Med	High	NA
Processes									
Needs Assessments	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Strategic Planning	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Policy / legislative analysis	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Evaluation of products or projects	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Evaluation of entire programs	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Project management	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Social Assessments	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Stakeholder engagement processes	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Economic									
Demographic analysis	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Cost-benefit analysis	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Non-market valuation	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Tools and Methods									
Performance measures or indicators	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Logic models	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Meeting facilitation	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Social Network Analysis (network mapping)	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Stakeholder analysis	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Content analysis	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Observation	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Interviews	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Focus Groups	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Surveys	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Other_____	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒

13. Does your office collaborate with other groups to enhance its work (i.e. through data sharing, communication, etc)?

❒Yes ❒No (If no, skip to Question 15.)

14a. Please identify the level of engagement your office has with the following audiences.

	Frequent	Occasional	None	Don't Know
Coastal Management	❒	❒	❒	❒

Fisheries Management	❒	❒	❒	❒
Emergency Management	❒	❒	❒	❒
Water Quality & Quantity	❒	❒	❒	❒
Transportation	❒	❒	❒	❒
Weather & Climate	❒	❒	❒	❒
Private Sector	❒	❒	❒	❒
Scientific	❒	❒	❒	❒
Education	❒	❒	❒	❒
Recreation & Tourism	❒	❒	❒	❒
Energy	❒	❒	❒	❒
Public	❒	❒	❒	❒
Other_____	❒	❒	❒	❒

14b. Which of the above audiences to you have difficulties engaging, and why?

❒ This is not an issue for me.

15. Please indicate which of the following areas would enhance partnership and coordination in your office.

	Yes	No	Don't Know
Meeting facilitation	❒	❒	❒
Workshops	❒	❒	❒
Demonstration of successful partnerships	❒	❒	❒
Lessons learned from previous partnerships (things to do, things not to do)	❒	❒	❒
Identify potential partners with common issues	❒	❒	❒
Assist with agreements for cost/data sharing among potential partners	❒	❒	❒

Other(s)_____

SECTION IV: DEMOGRAPHICS/OFFICE INFORMATION

16. Please indicate which of the following best represents your current professional position. Check only one.

- ❒ Education and outreach
- ❒ Emergency management
- ❒ Information technology (GIS, remote sensing or related field)
- ❒ Natural resources management
- ❒ Permitting and regulatory enforcement

- ❒ Planning
- ❒ Program or site administration/management
- ❒ Academic
- ❒ Floodplain management
- ❒ Conservation
- ❒ Government (local, state, regional, federal)
- ❒ Other _____

17. Indicate the number of years you've been involved with coastal resource management.

	< 5	5-10	11-15	16-20	> 20
a. How many years have you been in the coastal resource management field?	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
b. How many years have you been at your current position?	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒

18. Which of the following regions do you represent (check all that apply)?

- ❒ Northeast (ME, NH, RI, MA, CT)
- ❒ Mid-Atlantic (DE, MD, NJ, NY PA, VA)
- ❒ Southeast (NC, SC, GA, FL)
- ❒ Caribbean (PR, USVI)
- ❒ Gulf of Mexico (TX, LA, MI, AL, FL)
- ❒ Great Lakes (NY, IL, IN, MI, MN, NY, OH, PA, WI)
- ❒ West Coast (CA, OR, WA)
- ❒ Alaska
- ❒ Pacific Islands (HI, GUAM, AM SAMOA, CNMI)
- ❒ National (all regions)

19a. Are you aware that the NOAA Coastal Services Center has Regional Offices?

❒Yes ❒No

19b. Do you interact with the Center office in your region?

❒Yes ❒No ❒Not sure if there is one

If YES, to what degree?

- ❒ I know who they are
- ❒ I have had limited communication
- ❒ I have worked on a group with them
- ❒ I have closely partnered with them on 1 or more projects

20, Additional comments—
Please use the space below to offer any additional comments.

Paperwork Reduction Act Statement
Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 15 minutes per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other suggestions for reducing this burden to Chris Ellis, NOAA National Ocean Service, at Chris.Ellis@noaa.gov, or contact him at 843-740-1195.

Respondents are not identified on their questionnaires, and any reports will present data in aggregate form only. Notwithstanding any other provisions of the law, no person is required to respond to, nor shall any person be subjected to a penalty for failure to comply with, a collection of information subject to the requirements of the Paperwork Reduction Act, unless that collection of information displays a currently valid OMB Control Number.

Federal Register
Vol. 58, No. 176
Tuesday, September 14, 1993

Presidential Documents

Title 3—

The President

Executive Order 12862 of September 11, 1993

Setting Customer Service Standards

Putting people first means ensuring that the Federal Government provides the highest quality service possible to the American people. Public officials must embark upon a revolution within the Federal Government to change the way it does business. This will require continual reform of the executive branch's management practices and operations to provide service to the public that matches or exceeds the best service available in the private sector.

NOW, THEREFORE, to establish and implement customer service standards to guide the operations of the executive branch, and by the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States, it is hereby ordered:

Section 1. *Customer Service Standards.* In order to carry out the principles of the National Performance Review, the Federal Government must be customer-driven. The standard of quality for services provided to the public shall be: Customer service equal to the best in business. For the purposes of this order, "customer" shall mean an individual or entity who is directly served by a department or agency. "Best in business" shall mean the highest quality of service delivered to customers by private organizations providing a comparable or analogous service.

All executive departments and agencies (hereinafter referred to collectively as "agency" or "agencies") that provide significant services directly to the public shall provide those services in a manner that seeks to meet the customer service standard established herein and shall take the following actions:

(a) identify the customers who are, or should be, served by the agency;

(b) survey customers to determine the kind and quality of services they want and their level of satisfaction with existing services;

(c) post service standards and measure results against them;

(d) benchmark customer service performance against the best in business;

(e) survey front-line employees on barriers to, and ideas for, matching the best in business;

(f) provide customers with choices in both the sources of service and the means of delivery;

(g) make information, services, and complaint systems easily accessible; and

(h) provide means to address customer complaints.

Sec. 2. *Report on Customer Service Surveys.* By March 8, 1994, each agency subject to this order shall report on its customer surveys to the President. As information about customer satisfaction becomes available, each agency shall use that information in judging the performance of agency management and in making resource allocations.

Sec. 3. *Customer Service Plans.* By September 8, 1994, each agency subject to this order shall publish a customer service plan that can be readily understood by its customers. The plan shall include customer service standards and describe future plans for customer surveys. It also shall identify the private and public sector standards that the agency used to benchmark

its performance against the best in business. In connection with the plan, each agency is encouraged to provide training resources for programs needed by employees who directly serve customers and by managers making use of customer survey information to promote the principles and objectives contained herein.

Sec. 4. *Independent Agencies.* Independent agencies are requested to adhere to this order.

Sec. 5. *Judicial Review.* This order is for the internal management of the executive branch and does not create any right or benefit, substantive or procedural, enforceable by a party against the United States, its agencies or instrumentalities, its officers or employees, or any other person.

William J. Clinton

THE WHITE HOUSE,
September 11, 1993.

[FR Citation 58 FR 48257]

telephone: (202) 482–6412 and (202) 482–0650, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The notice announcing the antidumping duty order on chlorinated isocyanurates from the PRC was published on June 24, 2005. *See Notice of Antidumping Duty Order: Chlorinated Isocyanurates From the People's Republic of China,* 70 FR 36561 (June 24, 2005). On December 22, 2008, we received a timely request for a new shipper review from Juancheng Kangtai Chemical Co., Ltd. (''Kangtai'') in accordance with 19 CFR 351.214(c) and 351.214(d)(2). Kangtai has certified that it produced all of the chlorinated isocyanurates it exported which is the basis for its request for a new shipper review.

Pursuant to the requirements set forth in 19 CFR 351.214(b)(2)(i), in its request for a new shipper review, Kangtai, as an exporter and producer, certified that (1) it did not export chlorinated isocyanurates to the United States during the period of investigation (''POI''); (2) since the initiation of the investigation, Kangtai has never been affiliated with any company that exported subject merchandise to the United States during the POI; and (3) its export activities were not controlled by the central government of the PRC.

In accordance with 19 CFR 351.214(b)(2)(iv), Kangtai submitted documentation establishing the following: (1) The date on which it first shipped chlorinated isocyanurates for export to the United States and the date on which the chlorinated isocyanurates were first entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption; (2) the volume of its first shipment; and (3) the date of its first sale to an unaffiliated customer in the United States.

Initiation of New Shipper Review

Pursuant to section 751(a)(2)(B) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the ''Act'') and 19 CFR 351.214(d)(1), we find that the request submitted by Kangtai meets the threshold requirements for initiation of a new shipper review for shipments of chlorinated isocyanurates from the PRC produced and exported by Kangtai. *See* Memorandum to the File through Wendy Frankel, Office Director, New Shipper Initiation Checklist, dated January 21, 2009. The POR is June 1, 2008, through November 30, 2008. *See* 19 CFR 351.214(g)(1)(i)(B). The Department will conduct this review according to the deadlines set forth in section 751(a)(2)(B)(iv) of the Act.

It is the Department's usual practice, in cases involving non-market economies, to require that a company seeking to establish eligibility for an antidumping duty rate separate from the country-wide rate provide evidence of *de jure* and *de facto* absence of government control over the company's export activities. Accordingly, we will issue questionnaires to Kangtai, which will include separate rate sections. The review will proceed if the response provides sufficient indication that Kangtai is not subject to either *de jure* or *de facto* government control with respect to its export of chlorinated isocyanurates.

On August 17, 2006, the Pension Protection Act of 2006, Public Law 109–280, (''H.R. 4''), was signed into law. Section 1632 of H.R. 4 temporarily suspends the authority of the Department to instruct U.S. Customs and Border Protection to collect a bond or other security in lieu of a cash deposit in new shipper reviews during the period April 1, 2006, through June 30, 2009. Therefore, the posting of a bond or other security under section 751(a)(2)(B)(iii) of the Act in lieu of a cash deposit is not available in this case. Importers of chlorinated isocyanurates exported and produced by Kangtai must continue to post a cash deposit of estimated antidumping duties on each entry of subject merchandise at the PRC-wide rate of 285.63 percent.

Interested parties requiring access to proprietary information in this new shipper review should submit applications for disclosure under administrative protective order in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305 and 351.306.

This initiation and notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(2)(B) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.214 and 351.221(c)(1)(i).

Dated: January 21, 2009.

Ronald K. Lorentzen,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E9–2077 Filed 1–29–09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

Proposed Information Collection; Comment Request; 2009 Coastal Resource Management Customer Survey

AGENCY: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, invites the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on proposed and/or continuing information collections, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

DATES: Written comments must be submitted on or before March 31, 2009.

ADDRESSES: Direct all written comments to Diana Hynek, Departmental Paperwork Clearance Officer, Department of Commerce, Room 7845, 14th and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230 (or via the Internet at *dHynek@doc.gov*).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Requests for additional information or copies of the information collection instrument and instructions should be directed to Chris Ellis at NOAA Coastal Services Center, (843) 740–1195 or *Chris.Ellis@noaa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Abstract

In continuing compliance with Executive Order 12862, Setting Customer Service Standards, this survey will be used by the NOAA Coastal Services Center to obtain information from customers—state and territorial coastal resource managers—about their natural resource management issues, their needs for information, training, and technical assistance, and their technical capabilities in order to make quality improvements to the Center's products and services.

II. Method of Collection

Respondents have a choice of either electronic or paper forms. Methods of submittal include electronic forms, and mail and facsimile transmission of paper forms.

III. Data

OMB Control Number: 0648–0308.

Form Number: None.

Type of Review: Regular submission.

Affected Public: Non-profit institutions; State, local, or tribal government; business or other for-profit organizations.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 500.

Estimated Time per Response: 20 minutes.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 167.

Estimated Total Annual Cost to Public: $0.

IV. Request for Comments

Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden (including hours and cost) of the proposed collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Comments submitted in response to this notice will be summarized and/or included in the request for OMB approval of this information collection; they also will become a matter of public record.

Dated: January 26, 2009.

Gwellnar Banks,

Management Analyst, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. E9–1946 Filed 1–29–09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–08–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

Initiation of Review of Management Plan/Regulations of the Fagatele Bay National Marine Sanctuary; Intent To Prepare Draft Environmental Impact Statement and Management Plan; Scoping Meetings

AGENCY: Office of National Marine Sanctuaries (ONMS), National Ocean Service (NOS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Department of Commerce (DOC).

ACTION: Initiation of Review of Management Plan/Regulations; Intent To Prepare Environmental Impact Statement; Scoping Meetings.

SUMMARY: Fagatele Bay National Marine Sanctuary (FBNMS or Sanctuary) was designated in April of 1986 in response to a proposal from the American Samoa Government to the (then) National Marine Sanctuary Program. FBNMS protects 163 acres (0.25 square miles) of vibrant tropical coral reef ecosystem off the southwest coast of Tutuila Island, American Samoa. The present management plan was written as part of the sanctuary designation process and published in the Final Environmental Impact Statement in 1984. In accordance with Section 304(e) of the National Marine Sanctuaries Act, as amended, (NMSA) (16 U.S.C. 1431 *et seq.*), the Office of National Marine Sanctuaries (ONMS) of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) is initiating a review of the FBNMS management plan, to evaluate substantive progress toward implementing the goals for the Sanctuary, to initiate discussions on possible site expansion, and to make revisions to the plan and regulations as necessary to fulfill the purposes and policies of the NMSA. NOAA will conduct public scoping meetings to gather information and other comments from individuals, organizations, and government agencies on the scope, types and significance of issues related to the Sanctuary's management plan and regulations, and possible site expansion (including expansion to include the Rose Atoll Marine National Monument designated on January 6, 2009). The scoping meetings are scheduled as detailed below.

DATES: Written comments should be received on or before March 26, 2009.

Scoping meetings will be held on:

(1) February 10th, 4–6:30 p.m., Convention Center, Utulei, Tutuila, American Samoa.

(2) February 11th, 4–6:30 p.m., Fagaitua High School Gym, Fagaitua, Tutuila, American Samoa.

(3) February 12th, 4–6:30 p.m., American Samoa Community College, Mapusaga, Tutuila, American Samoa.

ADDRESSES: Written comments may be sent to the Fagatele Bay National Marine Sanctuary (Management Plan Review), P.O. Box 4318, Pago Pago, American Samoa 96799; or faxed to (808) 397–2662. Electronic comments may be sent to *fagatelebay@noaa.gov.*

Comments will be available for public review at the following street address: Fagatele Bay National Marine Sanctuary, 1 Convention Center Circle, Pago Pago, American Samoa 96799. All comments received are a part of the public record. All Personal Identifying Information (for example, name, address, etc.) voluntarily submitted by the commenter may be publicly accessible. Do not submit confidential business information or otherwise sensitive or protected information. NOAA will accept anonymous comments. Attachments to electronic comments will be accepted in Microsoft Word, Excel, or Adobe PDF file formats only.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kevin Grant, 808.397.2660 Ext. 238, *fagatelebay@noaa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The proposed revised management plan will likely involve changes to existing policies of the Sanctuary in order to address contemporary issues and challenges, and to better protect and manage the Sanctuary's resources and qualities. The review process is composed of four major stages: (1) Information collection and characterization; (2) preparation and release of a draft management plan/environmental impact statement, and any proposed amendments to the regulations; (3) public review and comment; and (4) preparation and release of a final management plan/environmental impact statement, and any final amendments to the regulations. In the event that the potential impacts of new actions described in the management plan do not warrant the need for an environmental impact statement, NOAA will publish the appropriate environmental analysis and notify the public. Depending upon the complexity and level of any site expansion, NOAA anticipates completion of the revised management plan and concomitant documents will require approximately thirty-six to forty-eight months.

Preliminary Priority Topics

NOAA, in consultation with the American Samoa Department of Commerce, has prepared a list of preliminary priority topics. This list represents our best professional judgment of the most important issues NOAA should consider in preparation of a new FBNMS management plan. We are interested in the public's comments on these topics, as well as any other topics of interest to the public or other agencies. It is important to note that this list does not preclude or in any way limit the consideration of additional topics raised through public comment, government-to-government consultations, and discussions with partner agencies.

Improved Partnerships—Recent initiatives regarding marine managed areas provide the Sanctuary with new opportunities to strengthen partnerships, particularly with Territorial and Federal agencies, the American Samoa Community College, and other entities. The Sanctuary will work in active partnership to provide a more transparent, cooperative, and coordinated management structure of marine resources within Territorial and federal jurisdictions.

Characterization and Monitoring—There is a need to develop an understanding of baseline conditions of marine resources within the sanctuary, ecosystem functions, and status and trends of biological and socioeconomic