

NOTICE OF OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET ACTION

Date 05/01/2012

Department of Commerce
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
FOR CERTIFYING OFFICIAL: Simon Szykman
FOR CLEARANCE OFFICER: Diana Hynek

In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act, OMB has taken action on your request received 01/30/2012

ACTION REQUESTED: Revision of a currently approved collection
TYPE OF REVIEW REQUESTED: Regular
ICR REFERENCE NUMBER: 201201-0648-013
AGENCY ICR TRACKING NUMBER:
TITLE: Evaluation of Public Visitors' Experience of Exhibits at Mokupapapa Discovery Center
LIST OF INFORMATION COLLECTIONS: See next page

OMB ACTION: Approved with change
OMB CONTROL NUMBER: 0648-0582

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: 05/31/2015

DISCONTINUE DATE:

BURDEN:	RESPONSES	HOURS	COSTS
Previous	250	31	0
New	250	31	0
Difference			
Change due to New Statute	0	0	0
Change due to Agency Discretion	0	0	0
Change due to Agency Adjustment	0	0	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
Visitor Survey	NA	Mokupapapa Discovery Center - General Public Visitor Interview	

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	2. OMB control number b. <input type="checkbox"/> None a. _____ - _____
3. Type of information collection (<i>check one</i>) a. <input type="checkbox"/> New Collection b. <input type="checkbox"/> Revision of a currently approved collection c. <input type="checkbox"/> Extension of a currently approved collection d. <input type="checkbox"/> Reinstatement, without change, of a previously approved collection for which approval has expired e. <input type="checkbox"/> Reinstatement, with change, of a previously approved collection for which approval has expired f. <input type="checkbox"/> Existing collection in use without an OMB control number For b-f, note Item A2 of Supporting Statement instructions	4. Type of review requested (<i>check one</i>) a. <input type="checkbox"/> Regular submission b. <input type="checkbox"/> Emergency - Approval requested by _____ / _____ / _____ c. <input type="checkbox"/> Delegated
7. Title	5. Small entities Will this information collection have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
8. Agency form number(s) (<i>if applicable</i>)	6. Requested expiration date a. <input type="checkbox"/> Three years from approval date b. <input type="checkbox"/> Other Specify: _____ / _____
9. Keywords	10. Abstract
11. Affected public (<i>Mark primary with "P" and all others that apply with "x"</i>) a. ___ Individuals or households d. ___ Farms b. ___ Business or other for-profit e. ___ Federal Government c. ___ Not-for-profit institutions f. ___ State, Local or Tribal Government	12. Obligation to respond (<i>check one</i>) a. <input type="checkbox"/> Voluntary b. <input type="checkbox"/> Required to obtain or retain benefits c. <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory
13. Annual recordkeeping and reporting burden a. Number of respondents _____ b. Total annual responses _____ 1. Percentage of these responses collected electronically _____ % c. Total annual hours requested _____ d. Current OMB inventory _____ e. Difference _____ f. Explanation of difference 1. Program change _____ 2. Adjustment _____	14. Annual reporting and recordkeeping cost burden (<i>in thousands of dollars</i>) a. Total annualized capital/startup costs _____ b. Total annual costs (O&M) _____ c. Total annualized cost requested _____ d. Current OMB inventory _____ e. Difference _____ f. Explanation of difference 1. Program change _____ 2. Adjustment _____
15. Purpose of information collection (<i>Mark primary with "P" and all others that apply with "X"</i>) a. ___ Application for benefits e. ___ 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 (<i>check all that apply</i>) a. <input type="checkbox"/> Recordkeeping b. <input type="checkbox"/> Third party disclosure c. <input type="checkbox"/> Reporting 1. <input type="checkbox"/> On occasion 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Weekly 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Monthly 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Quarterly 5. <input type="checkbox"/> Semi-annually 6. <input type="checkbox"/> Annually 7. <input type="checkbox"/> Biennially 8. <input type="checkbox"/> Other (describe) _____
17. Statistical methods Does this information collection employ statistical methods <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	18. Agency Contact (person who can best answer questions regarding the content of this submission) Name: _____ Phone: _____

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

Date

Signature of NOAA Clearance Officer

Signature

Date

**SUPPORTING STATEMENT
EVALUATION OF PUBLIC VISITORS' EXPERIENCE OF EXHIBITS AT
MOKUPAPAPA DISCOVERY CENTER
OMB CONTROL NO. 0648-0582**

A. JUSTIFICATION

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

The enabling legislation for the National Marine Sanctuary system, the [National Marine Sanctuaries Act](#) (NMSA), denotes specific educational mandates. Section 309(c)(1) of the NMSA states that one of the purposes of the Office of National Marine Sanctuaries (ONMS) is:

“ . . .to enhance public awareness, understanding, appreciation and wise and sustainable use of the marine environment, and the natural historical, cultural and archeological resources of the national Marine Sanctuary System. Efforts supported, promoted, or coordinated under this subsection must emphasize the conservation goals and sustainable public uses of national marine sanctuaries and the System.”

In 2005, the planning committee of the National Marine Sanctuary Program (NMSP) developed a 10-year strategic plan of operations for the organization. Specific goals and strategies were established to guide the progress of the Education and Outreach program. The Education and Outreach goal is:

“To enhance nation-wide public awareness, understanding and appreciation of marine and Great Lakes ecosystems and maritime heritage resources through outreach, education and interpretation efforts”

The specific performance measure, in place since 2010, for evaluating this goal is:

“By 2010 all education programs implemented in national marine sanctuaries will be assessed for effectiveness against stated program goals and objectives and appropriate National and State education standards.”

The NMSP education team has embarked on an ambitious evaluation project that will allow the NMSP to assess education program outcomes and impacts across all sites and activities and to link outcome measures to program efforts. The purpose of this effort is to evaluate if current and future education efforts are meeting the goals and objectives of the education and outreach programs and the educational mandates of the National Marine Sanctuaries Act. The application of these findings will assist in assessing current installed content and creating new content and information delivery methods.

Program to be evaluated

Mokupāpapa Discovery Center (MDC), an ONMS interpretive facility, located on the island of Hawai`i, is an outreach education center designed to interpret the natural and cultural history of the Papahānaumokuākea Marine National Monument (PMNM). The Center was designed to interpret the natural sciences, culture, and history of the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands (NWHI) and surrounding marine environment. The MDC exhibits were created to inform the public and garner support for protection for the remote area. The abundant natural life of the NWHI comes alive within MDC with replicas of sharks swimming overhead, a 2,500 gallon aquarium, and a mockup submersible.

After eight years of operation, MDC has a consistent annual 60,000 visitors per year. Based on our location, the MDC has achieved a good balance between local residents and visitors to the island. MDC is an integral part of downtown Hilo, with frequent repeat visitors. MDC collaborates with public, private and charter school educators and services approximately 4,200 students annually.

Being a Marine National Monument and UNESCO World Heritage Site* has had a major impact on the outreach activities we are trying to get across to the public. MDC is examining what concepts we are conveying in our exhibits and programmatic materials. As MDC develops new content, we are taking into account not only NOAA's Papahānaumokuākea Marine National Monument (PMNM) messages, but also applicable messages from our co-trustees, the US Fish and Wildlife Service and the State of Hawai`i, as well as the NMSP's and NOAA's goals.

MDC is requesting to evaluate patron acuity to determine successful concept attainment. By conducting thorough evaluations it will aid in vital decisions regarding exhibit renovation, new exhibits, interpretational programs, and educational content. A survey very similar to the one proposed here, and which formed the basis for this survey, was completed in January 2010 (OMB Control No 0648-0582, approved in January 2009) and provided valuable data on visitor demographics, and exhibit effectiveness. We have since modified several of the exhibits in the facility, and added programming better tailored to the audiences described by the original survey. This survey will allow us to determine the effectiveness of these exhibit and program changes/improvements, and will also allow us to determine any changes in our audience. Since conducting the last survey we have gained World Heritage status, and we would also like to determine what change this may have on our audience.

The survey conducted in 2010 was created through a contract with a professional evaluation company (People, Places and Designs Research, <http://ppdresearch.com/>). From this survey we

* World Heritage is the designation for places on Earth that are of outstanding universal value to humanity and as such, have been inscribed on the World Heritage List to be protected for future generations to appreciate and enjoy. Once a country signs the [Convention](#), and has sites inscribed on the World Heritage List, the resulting prestige often helps raise awareness among citizens and governments for heritage preservation. Greater awareness leads to a general rise in the level of the protection and conservation given to heritage properties. A country may also receive financial assistance and expert advice from the World Heritage Committee to support activities for the preservation of its sites (from <http://whc.unesco.org/en/faq/#q2>).

were able to better determine our audience, as well as which exhibits were being used most frequently. *A survey report was created, and we have submitted it with these responses.* In response to the feedback from the first survey we have expanded our live aquaria exhibits, have improved and updated the deep sea research area, increased interactive exhibit content, and also tailored some of our program offerings to the needs of resident visitors, whom we were able to determine from the survey, composed half of our visitors. This request is to run the survey again, probably next year, to see how visitor experience, and composition, is changing over time, and if our new/revised exhibits are effective. We modified the original survey instrument only slightly.

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.

The information from this new survey will be used to align future exhibit and educational programs developed at Mokupāpapa Discovery Center. Additionally, information will be used to improve NMSP's and Papahānaumokuākea Marine National Monument (PMNM) messages to the 60,000 + patrons. The survey will only be conducted once.

- Questions 1, 2 & 14 provide us with demographics.
- Question 3, 3a are a succinct account of the patrons experience at MDC.
- Questions 4 & 5 gauge elementary concepts.
- Question 6 determines if people value the exhibits.
- Question 7 determines which exhibits people would like to see.
- Question 8 identifies comprehension of monument status.
- Question 8a & 8b identifies comprehension of UNESCO World Heritage status and value.
- Question 9 determines archipelago and place comprehension.
- Question 10 identifies exhibit comprehension effectiveness.
- Question 11 gauges patron environmental comprehension.
- Question 12 identifies patron learning style.
- Question 12a identifies patron learning behavior.
- Question 13 identifies patron learning inclination.

NOAA ONMS will retain control over the information and safeguard access, modification, and destruction, consistent with NOAA standards for confidentiality, privacy, and electronic information. See response to Question 10 of this Supporting Statement for more information on confidentiality and privacy. Information collected is designed to yield data that meet all applicable information quality guidelines. Information gathered is not expected to be disseminated to the public. The assessments results may be used in scientific, management, technical or general information publications. Should NOAA Office of National Marine

Sanctuaries 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 MDC patron assessments will consist of intercept interviews and self paced assessments. Interviews will be conducted on paper, using a clipboard, for the reasons below:

- Patron aversion to surveys can be tempered via the humanistic learning theory of instructional design (by calling to their values and judgments interviewers build patron trust)
- Patrons that wish to have their comments recorded who are uncomfortable with a more formal interview assessment process will have the option to do a self-paced assessment.

4. Describe efforts to identify duplication.

This is the second instance that MDC is requesting a patron experience assessment. No other organization has conducted, or plans to conduct, such an assessment for this visitor center.

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

This project will not impact small entities, businesses, organizations, or government bodies. All respondents will be individuals or families.

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

If this evaluation were not conducted, MDC would not be able to assess whether it is fulfilling NOAA's mandate of having an informed society that comprehends the importance of the oceans, coasts, and atmosphere in the global ecosystem to make the best social and economic decisions. In addition, MDC will not be able to modify our exhibits and education programs effectively to fulfill NOAA's, NOS', ONMS' and Papahānaumokuākea Marine National Monument's education and outreach goals.

The feedback we received from the first run of this survey instrument was very useful to us in determining our visitor composition and demographics, as well as which exhibits were the most effective, and what content visitors were most interested in. We have since used the results from this first survey instrument to modify and improve our exhibits, and to better tailor our program offerings to the visitor base we are getting. Finally, the Office of National Marine Sanctuaries is required, as part of our PART Performance Measures to evaluate our formal and informal education and outreach programs, and this is one important component of our evaluations.

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

There are no special circumstances that deviate from OMB guidelines as listed in Attachment 1 of the instructions.

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 November 8, 2011 (76 FR 69241) solicited comments from the public. No comments were received.

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

No payments, gifts or incentives will be offered.

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

All persons interviewed will be anonymous; no information will be collected that would identify the specific individual (e.g., name, address, phone number, social security number, driver's license number); therefore, no assurance of confidentiality will be required or provided. Demographic information will only be used for statistical analysis and aggregate information about the sample (e.g., age, gender, area of residence, visitor group size and composition).

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.

No questions of a sensitive nature are being asked in this survey.

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

Respondent sample: This one-time study will seek one interview each from a sample of 250 visitor groups (pre-existing parties who arrived together, including single adults visiting alone, couples, families, etc.), randomly selected after they have seen exhibits at MDC and are about to exit the building. One adult (age 18+) per visitor group will be approached and invited to give his/her opinion; participation will be voluntary. Prior experience with this type of work suggests that the response rate will be approximately 85-90%. [From the social scientist researcher who developed the original study, we have information on that response rate and the rates of cooperation at similar facilities (aquariums, museums). In general, the cooperation rate averages about 90%; the rate from about 20 recent projects has ranged from 72% to 98%.]

Data sought from:	# of respondents	Responses per respondent	Total # Responses	Response Time	Total Burden	Labor Cost to Public *
Visitors to Mokupapapa Discovery Center	278-294 visitors approached to obtain a sample of 250	1 interview	250	7.5 min avg. per interview	31 hrs.	\$465

Based on the US Census data from 2010 the average *household* income is \$49,445 (\$14.86 per hour for adults in household). The average estimated time per respondent is 7.5 minutes (12.5% of an hour). Therefore, the average labor cost per adult answering the questions would be \$1.86, multiplied by the 250 responders, with a total burden of \$465.

13. Provide an estimate of the total annual recordkeeping/reporting cost burden to the respondents resulting from the collection (excluding the value of the burden hours in Question 12 above).

a. Capital and start-up costs: none.

b. Operations and maintenance costs for the public: none (an interviewer will ask a series of questions, and the interviewer will write visitors' answers on the interview form; no follow-up or mailing or other expense will be required of the visitors).

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

We estimate 120 hours of work for the Mokupāpapa Discovery Center Manager in this capacity as a normal part of his job, and 8 hours of work for three other Mokupāpapa Staff members, also part of their normal job hours. Collection of data will be conducted by a combination of both staff and volunteers, and overseen by the Manager. With the estimate of 68 hours of data collection time (based upon actual data collection time, and intervals between survey participants), we anticipate only 24 hours will be of staff time, with the other 44 hours being conducted by volunteers. Processing of data will be handled by MDC Manager.

Personnel	Time	Additional cost
Manager Time	120 hours @ \$25 per hour	Normal job responsibilities
Staff Time	24 hours @ \$20 per hour	Normal job responsibilities
Volunteer Time	44 hours	No cost

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

There are no changes.

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

The purpose of this evaluation is to measure content achievement and design improvement of education and outreach goals. To facilitate qualified uses (e.g., among other marine sanctuaries), a short summary of the analysis will be made available on the PMNM web site (www.papahanaumokuakea.gov/education/) education homepage explaining how to request a full copy from MDC.

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

We are not requesting an exception to displaying OMB documentation.

18. Explain each exception to the certification statement.

No exceptions.

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.

Conducting an exit survey, as was done in 2010, appears to us to be the most effective means of capturing responses: impressions are captured immediately after the Discovery Center experience, and the level of detail in our questions, as stated in Part A, enabled us to make several improvements after that first survey, as described in the report we have included in this response. Comments we have received through other venues, including our Facebook site, have been extremely general, such as “nice facility”.

	Mokupapapa Discovery Center (MDC)
Annual total visitor attendance (avg.) at Mokupāpapa Discovery Center (MDC)	60,000 persons
Annual attendance by GENERAL PUBLIC visitors at MDC (excludes school groups and professional visitors)	55,000 persons
Estimated number of adult visitors (age 18+) in the MDC general public visitor audience	40,000 adults
Desired sample size of general public adult visitors in the MDC audience	278-294 visitors will be approached to obtain a sample of 250 adults
Respondent selection method	One adult per randomly selected visitor group, when exiting from the exhibit area of MDC
Estimated rate of cooperation of randomly selected adult visitors	85% [x 294 or fewer visitors for a final sample of 250]

Note: Results of the social scientist researcher who conducted the first study, as well as the rates of cooperation at similar facilities (aquariums, museums) averaged 90%; the rate from about 20 projects in the last two years has ranged from 72% to 98%.

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.

Characteristics of patron types at visitor centers and museums may vary considerably (e.g., a local family may be followed by a tourist couple who may be followed by a single adult tourist). In places with relatively low volumes of visitors (such as the Mokupāpapa Discovery Center, compared to high volume places such as the Smithsonian) a representative random sample of visitor groups can be obtained by using a “next available” protocol, as follows:

The interviewer is positioned near the exit from the exhibit space. As any visitor group (usually 1-4 people) nears the exit, the interviewer approaches and makes eye contact with the ‘first adult’ (in practice: the one who is physically closest to the interviewer) and requests their participation in giving feedback about the exhibits. The cooperation rate for this type of intercept interview (using a brief introduction that explains the purpose in one sentence) typically averages about 90%. If the adult visitor agrees, the interview is

completed. Upon completion, the interviewer will tend to step aside to complete their work on the interview form (documenting the date and time of the interview, adding their own initials to it, reviewing the form to check for completeness and readable handwriting, and also to put away that completed interview form and have a new blank one ready); this process usually takes 3-5 minutes. When the interviewer is then prepared with a new blank interview form and related materials (e.g., a photo board about the exhibits, used for some of the interview questions), he/she looks up and selects the “next available” visitor group.

The principle of this and other sampling methods is that the interviewer does not *choose* who to interview by appearance, or by facial expression that might indicate enjoyment or not, or by whether there are or are not children in the group; in essence, the visitor group *selects themselves* (although they don’t know the sampling parameters) by deciding when to exit (e.g., there may be another group being interviewed at the time when this group leaves, in which case they would not be selected). Depending on the visitor flow, the next visitor group might be leaving right then, or the interviewer might have to wait for 5-10 minutes for the next group to leave. This characteristic of ‘low volume’ visitor facilities makes it impractical to use other methods such as selecting every 4th visitor group, or using a random number chart (for example, from 1 to 5) to decide which visitor group to select. While additional methods could be used to provide reliability assessments of the sampling method, the budget is modest in this particular project, and we are choosing to put relatively more effort in the analysis of open-ended questions than in conducting a rigorous reliability study, trusting that a well-conducted random sampling of “next available” visitor groups will result in a sufficiently representative sample.

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.

Based on responses to MDC’s prior survey (completed in January of 2010, and noted in Part A, Question 1), and data from similar surveys conducted at aquariums and other interpretive facilities (noted in Part A, Question 12) there is an expected response rate of 85%-90%. Therefore, non-response should not be an issue in this study. Prior experience has shown that inviting visitors to contribute their opinions and feedback is a positive motivator.

When the renewed survey instrument and procedures are approved, MDC will begin monitoring the patron cooperation rate. If it is below 75%, MDC will modify the logistics of the survey (where the interviewer stands, which sentence of the explanation comes first) to seek improvements in the cooperation rate. Prior survey cooperation rates have yielded significant reliable data and were well above the 75% benchmark.

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 under the Paperwork Reduction Act.

A prior pilot survey of 8 visitors had been conducted, which confirmed essential prerequisites for this survey. Visitors did not need an incentive to participate, comprehended questions, provided succinct responses, and completed the interview process.

The survey instrument was originally designed by a professional evaluation company called People, Places and Designs Research (<http://ppdresearch.com/>; <http://ppdresearch.com/profile/>) managed by Jeff Hayward. PPD Research works with many Science Centers and Museums and is highly respected in this field.

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.

The instructional designer and information scientist who adapted the research design from the original survey, and composed the survey instrument, is:

Kālewa Correa, MLISc, MET candidate,
Manager of Mokuāpāpapa Discovery Center
kalewa.correa@noaa.gov
(808) 933-8181

Kālewa Correa will be NOAA's informational designer and responsible for data compilation and synthesis. Representative data will be used for exhibits, programs, and related ways of educating the public about Papahānaumokuākea Marine National Monument.

Reactions to exhibits

at the Mokuapapa Discovery Center, Hilo HI

Information for visitors

1. The policy reasons for this study

The Office of National Marine Sanctuaries (ONMS), in its latest 10-year strategic plan, seeks to raise awareness, understanding and appreciation of marine ecosystems through interpretation efforts such as these exhibits. The ONMS education team seeks to evaluate this and other program activities to assess education program outcomes and impacts, and to link outcome measures to program efforts. The purpose of this effort is to evaluate if current and future education efforts are meeting the goals and objectives of the education and outreach programs and the educational mandates of the National Marine Sanctuaries Act.

2. The way in which the information will be used to further performance of agency functions.

The information from this survey will be used to align exhibit and educational programs developed in the future at Mokuapapa Discovery Center, to better deliver the ONMS, and Papahānaumokuākea Marine National Monument's messages to the 60,000 people who come to this Discovery Center each year. All of this information will help us determine what messages are and are not being conveyed in our exhibits, and what we need to improve on in both exhibits and educational programs to fulfill agency goals.

3. An estimate of the average time involved:

Visitor participation for this collection of information is estimated to average 7-8 minutes per visitor group. Send comments regarding this estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing the burden to you, to:

Papahānaumokuākea Marine National Monument
Main Office: 6600 Kalanianaʻole Hwy, #300, Honolulu, HI 96825
phone: 808-397-2660 fax: 808-397-2662 email: hawaiireef@noaa.gov
Hilo Office: 308 Kamehameha Ave, #203, Hilo, HI 96720
phone: 808-933-8180 fax: 808-933-8186.

4. Your participation is voluntary.

5. Interviews are anonymous. You do not need to give your name or address.

6. Valid OMB Control Number:

Notwithstanding any other provision of the law, no person is required to respond to, nor shall any person be subject 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.

Hi, we're talking with people to help us MODIFY or ADD TO our exhibits – may I ask you some questions about your visit today? [if they didn't look at exhibits, discontinue] [hand out visitor rights page:] Because this is a federal site, this is a summary of your rights.

1. Have you been here before? no (1st time) yes → How many times? _____

2. Where do you live? _____
[town if Big Isl. / island if other HI / state if mainland US / country if not US]

3. Thinking about your **experience with these exhibits today**, would you say this visit was?
 great good OK fair needs improvement?

3.a What did you like most about Mokupāpapa? [check if parent asks child/ren, who answer]

4. Do you think that the exhibits are **about a specific area or place**, or are they **about Hawai'i and the Pacific IN GENERAL**?
[if specific place:] What place? _____

5. What do you think the **main idea or themes** of the exhibits are? (whatever you think)

 no main idea; there are different exhibits on different topics didn't see enough to figure that out

6. Using a 5-point scale, how **important** do you think these exhibits are, for people like you (yourselves) – '1' would be the lowest: not at all worthwhile, '5' would be the highest: very worthwhile – what number would you say? _____
[if rating # less than 2, ask this] Is there anything important about them?
[otherwise, ask:] What's "important" about them? _____

7. What types of exhibits would you like to see more of in the Center? (check all that apply)
 interactive educational entertaining challenging static web accessible
 textual based video based game based kid oriented responsive collaborative

8. **Did the exhibits adequately inform you that Mokupāpapa was the educational center for Papahānaumokuākea Marine National Monument?**

8.a **Did the exhibits adequately inform you that Papahānaumokuākea Marine National Monument is a UNESCO World Heritage Site?**

8.b **Do you feel that it is important to be a UNESCO World Heritage Site?** yes no
If **YES** why? _____
If **NO** why? _____

9. These exhibits are about the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands and the Papahānaumokuākea Marine National Monument.
Had you heard of that name before: the "Northwestern Hawaiian Islands" or "Papahānaumokuākea Marine National Monument"? yes no

10. Which of these ideas or themes **did the exhibits demonstrate and explain?** – If you could tell me Yes or Not Really for each one:

- Yes Not a. what an atoll is?
 - Yes Not b. there are unique species in the Northwest Hawaiian Islands?
 - Yes Not c. the extent of fragile ecosystems?
 - Yes Not d. that there are more than eight Hawaiian Islands?
 - Yes Not d. that this area is already protected, a safe haven?
 - Yes Not e. that people have a long history in the NWHI?
- [ask:]* **What kind of history would that be?**
- Yes Not NWHI are a sacred place with cultural significance?
 - Yes Not human actions today are affecting the NWHI?

11. Do you think that human actions affecting those islands would be:

- negative? or positive? some negative and some positive?

What kinds of negative impacts are you aware of? (or would you guess?)

What kinds of positive impacts are you aware of? (or would you imagine are possible?)

12. What is your style of learning? (*check all that apply*)

- hands on reading listening by teaching others immersive collaborative visually

12.a How do you learn about things? (*check all that apply*)

- internet searches blogs T.V teachers friends family social media
 games radio websites books movies QR codes magazines

13. If Mokupāpapa had additional educational information, games and media online would you want to use that as a learning resource? yes no

14. How many ____adults and ____children under 18 are in your group?
 Ages of children: _____

PLEASE ANSWER THE 3 QUESTIONS IN THE BOX (helps us know we're talking with a cross-section of people)

Your Age:	Education, so far:	Ethnic/racial heritage (check one or more):
___ 18-29	___ some school	___ American Indian or Alaska Native
___ 30's	___ high school graduate	___ Asian
___ 40's	___ some college	___ Black or African-American
___ 50's	___ college graduate	___ Hispanic/Latino
___ 60's	___ graduate school	___ Native Hawaiian
___ 70+		___ Pacific Islander
		___ Caucasian/White

PLEASE RETURN CLIPBOARD TO THE INTERVIEWER.

Thank you for taking the time to share your opinions!

Person interviewed: man woman

ESL/LEP

Date: _____ Day of week: _____ Time: _____ Interviewer: _____

OMB Control # 0648-0582

Expires: 1-31-2012

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**International Trade Administration**

[A-570-601]

Tapered Roller Bearings and Parts Thereof, Finished or Unfinished, From the People's Republic of China: Extension of Time Limit for the Final Results of the Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

AGENCY: Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

DATES: *Effective Date:* November 8, 2011.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Demetri Kalogeropoulos or Frances Veith, AD/CVD Operations, Office 8, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; *telephone:* (202) 482-2623 or (202) 482-4295, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**Background**

On July 28, 2010, the Department of Commerce ("Department") published the initiation of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on tapered roller bearings and parts thereof, finished or unfinished, ("TRBs") from the People's Republic of China ("PRC"). *See Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews and Requests for Revocation in Part*, 75 FR 44224 (July 28, 2010). On July 13, 2011, the Department published the preliminary results of the review. *See Tapered Roller Bearings and Parts Thereof, Finished or Unfinished, From the People's Republic of China: Preliminary Results of the 2009-2010 Administrative Review of the Antidumping Duty Order and Intent To Rescind Administrative Review, in Part*, 76 FR 41207 (July 13, 2011). The 2009-2010 administrative review covers the period June 1, 2009, through May 31, 2010. The final results are currently due no later than November 10, 2011.

Extension of Time Limit for Final Results of Review

Pursuant to section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("Act"), the Department shall make a final determination in an administrative review of an antidumping duty order within 120 days after the date on which the preliminary results are published. The Act further provides, however, that the Department may extend that 120-day period to 180 days if it determines

it is not practicable to complete the review within the foregoing time.

The Department finds that it is not practicable to complete the final results of the 2009-2010 administrative review of TRBs from the PRC within the 120-day period. We find that we need additional time to fully analyze the complicated issues raised in the case and rebuttal briefs, specifically input consumption allocations and issues relating to a successor-in-interest determination. Therefore, in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act, the Department is extending the time period for completion of the final results of this review by 30 days to December 10, 2011. However, because December 10, 2011, falls on a Saturday, a non-business day, the final results will now be due no later than December 12, 2011, the next business day. *See Notice of Clarification: Application of "Next Business Day" Rule for Administrative Determination Deadlines Pursuant to the Tariff Act of 1930, As Amended*, 70 FR 24533 (May 10, 2005).

This notice is published in accordance with sections 751(a)(3)(A) and 777(i) of the Act.

Dated: November 2, 2011.

Christian Marsh,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations.

[FR Doc. 2011-28915 Filed 11-7-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration****Proposed Information Collection; Comment Request; Papahānaumokuākea Marine National Monument Mokuapapa Discovery Center Exhibit Evaluation**

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 January 9, 2012.

ADDRESSES: Direct all written comments to Diana Hynek, Departmental Paperwork Clearance Officer, Department of Commerce, Room 6616, 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 Andy Collins, at (808)-694-3922 or Andy.Collins@noaa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**I. Abstract**

This request is for a revision and extension of a currently approved information collection. Mokuapapa Discovery Center (Center) is an outreach arm of Papahānaumokuākea Marine National Monument that reaches 60,000 people each year in Hilo, Hawai'i. The Center was created eight years ago to help raise support for the creation of a National Marine Sanctuary in the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands. Since that time, the area has been proclaimed a Marine National Monument and the main messages we are trying to share with the public have changed to better reflect the new monument status, UNESCO World Heritage status and the joint management by the three co-trustees of the Monument. We therefore are seeking to find out if people visiting our Center are receiving the new messages by conducting an optional exit survey which is the proposed revision to the collection.

II. Method of Collection

Surveys will be conducted by in-person interview as people exit the Center. Interviewers will record responses on paper, and later transfer them to an electronic database.

III. Data

OMB Control Number: 0648-0582.

Form Number: None.

Type of Review: Regular submission (revision and extension of a currently approved collection).

Affected Public: Individuals or households.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 250.

Estimated Time per Response: 7 minutes.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 29.

Estimated Total Annual Cost to Public: \$0 in recordkeeping/reporting costs.

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: November 2, 2011.

Gwellnar Banks,

Management Analyst, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 2011-28811 Filed 11-7-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-NK-P

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Application for New Awards; College Assistance Migrant Program

AGENCY: Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Department of Education.

ACTION: Notice.

Overview Information

College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP).

Notice inviting applications for new awards for fiscal year (FY) 2012.

Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) Number: 84.149A.

DATES: *Applications Available:* November 8, 2011.

Deadline for Transmittal of Applications: January 18, 2012.

Deadline for Intergovernmental Review: March 20, 2012.

Full Text of Announcement

I. Funding Opportunity Description

Purpose of Program: The purpose of CAMP is to provide academic and financial support to help migrant and seasonal farmworkers and their children complete their first year of college and continue in postsecondary education.

Priorities: This competition includes two competitive preference priorities and two invitational priorities. In accordance with 34 CFR 75.105(b)(2)(ii), Competitive Preference Priority 1 is from the Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR) (34 CFR 75.225). In accordance with 34 CFR 75.105(b)(2)(iv), Competitive Preference Priority 2 is from section 418A(e) of the Higher Education Act of

1965, as amended by section 408(3) of the Higher Education Opportunity Act (20 U.S.C. 1070d-2(e)). The third priority is an invitational priority for applications that promote science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) education. The fourth priority is an invitational priority for applications that propose to engage faith-based and community organizations in the delivery of services under this program.

Competitive Preference Priorities: For FY 2012 and any subsequent year in which we make awards from the list of unfunded applicants from this competition, these priorities are competitive preference priorities. Under 34 CFR 75.105(c)(2)(i) we award an additional five points to an application that meets Competitive Preference Priority 1 and we award up to 15 additional points to an application, depending on how well the applicant meets Competitive Preference Priority 2. The maximum amount of competitive preference points an application can receive under this competition is 15 points.

These priorities are:

Competitive Preference Priority 1—Novice Applicant (5 Points)

The applicant must be a “novice applicant” as defined in 34 CFR 75.225(a). A novice applicant is defined as one who has: (i) Never received a grant or a subgrant under the CAMP program; (ii) never been a member of a group application, submitted in accordance with 34 CFR 75.127–75.129, that received a grant under the CAMP program; and (iii) not had an active discretionary grant from the Federal government in the five years before the deadline date for applications under the CAMP program (January 18, 2012).

Competitive Preference Priority 2—Prior Experience of Service Delivery (Up to 15 Points)

For applicants with an expiring CAMP project, the Secretary will consider the applicant’s prior experience in implementing its expiring CAMP project, based on information contained in documents previously provided to the Department, such as annual performance reports, project evaluation reports, site visit reports, and the previously approved CAMP application.

Under this competition, we also are particularly interested in applications that address the following priorities.

Invitational Priorities: For FY 2012, and any subsequent year in which we make awards from the list of unfunded applicants from this competition, these

priorities are invitational priorities. Under 34 CFR 75.105(c)(1), we do not give an application that meets these invitational priorities a competitive or absolute preference over other applications.

These priorities are:

Invitational Priority 1—Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics Education

Projects that are designed to address one or more of the following priority areas:

(a) Providing students with increased access to rigorous and engaging coursework in STEM.

(b) Increasing the number and proportion of students prepared for postsecondary or graduate study and careers in STEM, with a specific focus on an increase in the number and proportion of students so prepared who are from groups traditionally underrepresented in STEM careers, including minorities, individuals with disabilities, and women.

Note: Applicants could consider increasing participants’ access to studies in STEM through such activities as counseling and tutoring in ways that motivate participants to pursue postsecondary education in the areas of STEM. Similarly, applicants could consider increasing students’ preparedness for study and careers in STEM through activities such as referrals to STEM-oriented work study, exposure to academic programs and careers in STEM-related fields, and providing support services. These could include services to improve participants’ academic skills and knowledge so that they may pursue studies and careers in STEM-related fields.

Invitational Priority 2—Faith-Based and Community Organizations

Applications that propose to engage faith-based and community organizations in the delivery of services under this program.

Program Authority: 20 U.S.C. 1070d-2.

Applicable Regulations: (a) The Education Department General Education Regulations (EDGAR) in 34 CFR parts 74, 75, 77, 79, 82, 84, 85, 86, 97, and 99. (b) The regulations for this program in 34 CFR part 206. (c) The definitions of a *migratory agricultural worker* in 34 CFR 200.81(d), *migratory child* in 34 CFR 200.81(e), and *migratory fisher* in 34 CFR 200.81(f). (d) The regulations in 20 CFR 669.110 and 669.320.

Note: The regulations in 34 CFR part 86 apply to institutions of higher education (IHEs) only.

II. Award Information

Type of Award: Discretionary grants.