

NOTICE OF OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET ACTION

Date 01/27/2010

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 12/07/2009

ACTION REQUESTED: New collection (Request for a new OMB Control Number)  
TYPE OF REVIEW REQUESTED: Regular  
ICR REFERENCE NUMBER: 200911-0648-006  
AGENCY ICR TRACKING NUMBER:  
TITLE: CZMA External Review  
LIST OF INFORMATION COLLECTIONS: See next page

OMB ACTION: Approved without change  
OMB CONTROL NUMBER: 0648-0604  
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: 01/31/2013 DISCONTINUE DATE:

BURDEN:	RESPONSES	HOURS	COSTS
Previous	0	0	0
New	78	156	0
Difference			
Change due to New Statute	0	0	0
Change due to Agency Discretion	78	156	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
CZMA External Review Interview Questions			

# 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 <span style="float: right;">b. <input type="checkbox"/> None</span> 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  
COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT ACT EXTERNAL EVALUATION  
OMB CONTROL NUMBER 0648-xxxx**

**A. JUSTIFICATION**

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

This request is for a new information collection.

As part of its continuing efforts to monitor and improve performance of programs authorized by the [Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972](#), as amended, NOAA has contracted for an independent external review of CZMA programs. This review was commissioned to provide a time-series comparison of how NOAA has addressed recommendations from previous program reviews and in preparation for a re-assessment of CZMA Programs through the Office of Management and Budget's Program Assessment and Rating Tool (PART). OMB assessed the CZMA Programs in 2003. The PART requires that each program have an independent external review conducted at least every five years to monitor and assess the program's performance. In conducting this review, the contractor needs to interview with representatives from state, local and non-governmental organizations that work for or with state Coastal Zone Management Programs or National Estuarine Research Reserves (NERRS).

**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.**

Based on the discussion in Section I above and the data available, the contractor, SRA, is proposing an evaluation that focuses on collecting and assessing complementary information to: 1) determine how CZ programs are perceived by parties external to their programs; and 2) solicit information about models and approaches that are "working well" with the intent of sharing these success stories broadly. Considering previous foci on assessments of state CZ managers, this evaluation aims at a truly external audience – those with which these programs interact at a state and regional level.

**A. Overall Methodology**

This approach relies on telephone interviews that assess how parties outside the State Coastal Zone Management Programs/NERRS view the impact and value of those programs. Further, it attempts to assess what factor(s) (e.g., approaches, foci, programs) are associated with perceived effectiveness. Because programs are diverse in their approaches, structures and activities, we hope this evaluation will provide meaningful information in the context of potential reauthorization and improve the federal-state partnership. It is also the intent to share "what works" information among the programs to improve best practices and foster information sharing on effective and innovative approaches.

The data for this evaluation will be provided mainly through telephone interviews with a variety of external parties at the local level associated with either the state coastal zone management program or a NERRS (avg. 4 per program) associated with a given program or reserve.

### ***Interviews with Local Collaborators for State Coastal Zone Management Programs***

Since resources are limited and all the State Coastal Zone Management Programs and NERRS cannot be studied in detail, we recommend stratifying the sample of state programs by structure type (e.g., networked vs. policy-focused) in order to ask whether or not a particular type of structure is correlated with perceived effectiveness. It is anticipated that we will choose 6 programs of the “network” type and 6 of the “policy type”. For each state program we intend to interview key people in important interest groups (e.g., state government, local government, non-profit sector) for an average of 4 interviews per program.

Total Interviews Anticipated = ~48

We will work with NOAA CZ experts to determine useful criteria for stratifying the State Coastal Zone Management Programs, but will include factors such as:

- *Independence*: Program primarily imbedded in a single agency vs. stand alone.
- *Funding*: A few sources of funding vs. many sources of funding.
- *Governance*: Board vs. agency lead.

### ***Interviews with Local Collaborators for National Estuarine Research Reserve Programs***

NERRS programs are dissimilar from State Coastal Zone programs in that their program structure type is not so clearly divided into categories. For that reason, and the fact that the overall number is smaller, we will choose 6 NERRS with an eye toward size and geographic distribution, ensuring both small and large reserves as well as one reserve on the East Coast, West Coast, Gulf Coast, and Great Lakes.

Total Interviews Anticipated = ~18

### ***Interviews with National Level Collaborators***

In addition to interviewing people with continuous, direct experience with a particular State Coastal Zone Management Program or NERRS, we are interested in collecting information from programs that interact on a national level with these programs (e.g., other federal agencies, state associations, local government associations, coastal experts/academicians). The purpose of these interviews is to assess perceived effectiveness of the State Coastal Zone Management Programs/NERRS in the aggregate including:

1. factors that contribute to effectiveness;
2. important roles that programs play; and
3. changes in perceived effectiveness/role over time.

Through our background materials review, convening process and interviews with State CZ and NERRS personnel, we will identify 12 national level collaborators for further discussions. Through our background material review, discussion with collaborators regarding their partners we will identify individuals who:

- have previous significant experience working with CZ programs;
- are leaders in current government organizations and nonprofits with coastal zone management focus;
- are leaders in current government organizations and nonprofits likely to interact with CZ programs; and
- are academics who focus on coastal zone issues.

Suggestions for this group of interviews includes:

- Coastal States Organization
- National League of Cities
- National Governor’s Association
- Association of State Floodplain Managers
- EPA’s Office of Water (National Estuary Program/Wetlands Office)
- USACE Programs (Beach Nourishment, 404 Program, Floodrisk Management)
- Restore America’s Estuaries
- Christophe Toulou (academic)
- Timothy Beatley (academic)

Total Interviews Anticipated = ~12

## **B. Interview Questions**

### ***Introduction & Background***

Past assessments of NOAA's Coastal Zone and NERRS programs found that both exhibited deficiencies mainly in the areas of strategic planning, program results and accountability. In many cases, these deficiencies also were tied to lack of performance measurement. These evaluative efforts (e.g., 1997 GAO Audit, Hershman, et.al. 1998) also reported that lack of program measures/indicators hampered their efforts to assess the impact (and therefore effectiveness) of coastal zone state programs.

We are conducting an evaluation that focuses on collecting and assessing complementary information to: 1) determine how CZ and NERRS programs are perceived by parties external to their programs; and 2) solicit information about models and approaches that are “working well” with the intent of sharing these success stories broadly. Considering previous foci on assessments of CZ and NERRS managers, this evaluation aims at a truly external audience – those with which these programs interact at a state and regional level. We've contacted you to assist us in this effort.

There will be some common questions for the State Coastal Zone Management Programs and the National Estuarine Research Reserves, but others tailored toward their unique programmatic goals and organic legislative intent.

### *Major Study Questions*

Below is an initial list of the major study questions. These are not the specific questions we will use as interview questions; rather, the information we are trying to gather.

#### Part One: Questions Common to Each Group

- What are the strongest drivers/influences for decisions made related to coastal resources in the states?
  - Who are the most influential parties?
  - To what degree has change been influenced by CZ/NERRS programs?
- What role do State Coastal Zone/NERRS management programs play in assisting in coastal decisions at the state/regional level (e.g., decision-maker, data provider, data translator, expert)?
- Do you view your State Coastal Zone/NERRS program as effective? If so, why?
  - What are the factors you believe make the State Coastal Zone Management/NERRS program effective? (e.g., organizational, institutional, financial, data provider, coordinator/facilitator)?
- What do State Coastal Zone/NERRS programs do that is unique? What is their niche?
- If State Coastal Zone Management Programs did not exist, what would be the impact in the coastal zone?
  - What influence do they actually have on final decisions?
- What is the most helpful role that State Coastal Zone Management programs/NERRS provide to state/regional decision-makers?
- How has the role of State Coastal Zone/NERRS programs changed over time?
- How has the influence of State Coastal Zone/NERRS programs changed over time?

#### *Future Looking Questions*

- What are the most exciting types of work being conducted at the CZ and NERRS programs? Why are these projects/approaches particularly helpful?
- How do/should CZ programs and NERRS identify and weigh future challenges? How do they prepare to address them?
- How much connectivity between CZ programs and NERRS exist at a state/regional level? How has this been helpful or harmful?
- How are/should CZ programs and NERRS position themselves to understand and effect time sensitive resource decisions?

#### Part Two: Assessment of the Influence of State Coastal Zone Management Programs

In addition to the above questions, the following questions will be the basis of interviews with external stakeholders that interact with State Coastal Zone Management Programs.

- How important a role does the State Coastal Zone Management Program play in protecting or enhancing natural resources in the coastal zone and adjacent waters? (using 1-5 Likert scale)
  - Are there activities, programs, efforts are particularly effective?

- How important a role does the State Coastal Zone Management Program play in enhancing public awareness of estuarine areas/issues/topics? (1-5 Likert scale)
  - Are there activities, programs, efforts that are particularly effective?
- How important a role does the State Coastal Zone Management Program play in reducing harmful coastal development? (1-5 Likert scale).
  - Are there activities, programs, efforts that are particularly effective?
- How important a role does the State Coastal Zone Management Program play in supporting compatible economic development? (1-5 Likert scale)
  - Are there activities, programs, efforts that are particularly effective?
- How important a role does the State Coastal Zone Management Program play in increasing public access for recreation? (1-5 Likert scale)
  - Are there activities, programs, efforts that are particularly effective?
- How important a role does the State Coastal Zone Management Program play in assisting in the coordination of decision-making at a local, state, federal level?
  - Are there activities, programs, efforts that are particularly effective?
- Is there a difference in decisions in the coastal zone between states that have approved State Coastal Zone Management Programs as those that do not? If so, how do they differ?

Part Three: Assessment of the Influence of National Estuarine Research Reserve Programs

In addition to Part One, the following questions will be the basis of interviews with external stakeholders that interact with National Estuarine Research Reserve Programs.

- How important a role does the NERRS play in enhancing public awareness of estuarine areas? (1-5 Likert Scale)
  - Are there activities, programs, efforts that are particularly effective?
- How important a role does the NERR play in identifying and establishing priorities among coastal management issues? (1-5 Likert Scale)
  - Are there activities, programs, efforts that are particularly effective?
- Are there gaps in understanding, information, etc. that could/should be provided by the NERR that would be particularly useful to you?

The contractor will use the information collected through the interviews to analyze, report and make recommendations on the effectiveness of the CZMA programs and to assess status of the deficiencies identified in the 2003 PART from OMB. NOAA will, in turn, use the contractor's evaluation report and recommendations to report on the CZMA's performance/effectiveness, particularly as evidence for an OMB PART assessment. NOAA will also use this information for continuous improvement of the program.

NOAA will retain control over the information collected and safeguard it from improper access, modification, and destruction, consistent with NOAA standards for confidentiality, privacy, and electronic information. The evaluation report delivered to NOAA, which will result in part from these interviews, will be available to the public. See response to Question 10 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 informational publications. Should NOAA's

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.**

All interviews will be conducted via telephone.

**4. Describe efforts to identify duplication.**

NOAA is the only agency charged with administering the CZMA. The type of information collected under this request is similar in nature to the Government Accountability Office's report (GAO-08-1045); however, the GAO focused on the coastal zone management programs, not the research reserves. This evaluation has a much broader scope than that of the GAO study and will include interviews not limited to coastal zone management program managers.

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

This collection does not involve small businesses and is not likely to involve other small entities. Most partners of the CZMA programs consist of state, local, regional or inter-state government agencies or entities, or in some cases, non-governmental organizations, which in most cases would not qualify as small entities.

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

The agency would not be able to report periodically on its performance or effectiveness implementing the CZMA if program partners and customers could not be interviewed or surveyed periodically.

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

Not applicable.

**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 9 June 2009 (74 FR 27279) solicited public comment on this collection request. None was received.

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

Not applicable.

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

As stated on the interview forms, the contents of the final report from the external evaluation are considered a matter of public record. Interview notes would be considered pre-decisional and/or private under the [Freedom of Information Act](#).

**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 sensitive questions are asked.

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

The total one-time burden is estimated as 156 hours. The number of interviews to be conducted will not exceed 78. Each interview is expected to last less than 2 hours.

**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).**

There is no cost burden to the respondents because the contractor will conduct interviews with respondents by telephone as part of the contract.

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

The cost in staff time for NOAA to coordinate, review and disseminate the report is estimated as 10 hours at \$56/hour, for a total annual cost of approximately \$560. The cost of the contract to conduct interviews and complete analysis and report is \$92,000.

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

Not applicable. This is a new collection.

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

NOAA may summarize information contained within the information collection in order to provide internal assessments of program performance or resource allocation, progress reports, or accomplishments, or information required by the Congress or agencies of the federal government outside of NOAA for oversight.

**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.**

Not applicable.

**18. Explain each exception to the certification statement.**

Not applicable.

**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.**

The total respondent universe is 125 potential interviews. Of this universe, we anticipate the total number of interviews to be 78. The target for responses for local collaborators for the state Coastal Zone Management Programs is 48 interviewees, stratified by type of structure of those programs (networked v. policy focused) – 6 per each type/4 interviews per program. The target for responses for the local collaborators for the NERRS program is 18 (no specific stratification but sample will be chosen to ensure geographic and size distribution) – 6 NERRS programs/3 interviews each. The target responses is 12 interviews for national level collaborators (know both the CZ and NERRS programs) and will: have previous significant experience working with CZ programs; are leaders in current government organizations and non profits with coastal zone management focus; are leaders in current government organizations and nonprofits likely to interact with CZ programs; and are academics who focus on coastal zone issues – 1 interview per person.

In order to choose the specific sample (interviewees) from the universe of potential interviews, SRA will conduct the following steps:

- Consult with NOAA planning group to categorize CZ and NERRS programs by stratification criteria and develop a list of national collaborators;
- Develop a universe of potential interviews (8-10) through talking with each program regarding their collaborators, partners, actual and potential customers of their information, including contact information (telephone and e-mail);
- SRA will send an introductory e-mail describing the study, requesting an interview and estimating the estimated time commitment, SRA will schedule an interview with the first responders on that list until 6 interviews are reached. If one of the interviewees is unavailable or unresponsive, SRA will move to the next interviewee on the list.

### Tabular Form of Interview Protocol

State Coastal Zone Programs (48)		National Estuarine Research Reserves (18)
<b>Policy Focused (24)</b>	<b>Network Focused (24)</b>	6 local government
6 local government	6 local government	6 non-profit
6 state government	6 state government	6 business
6 non-profit	6 non-profit	
6 business	6 business	
<b>National Collaborators (12)</b>		
6 federal government		
6 academics/researchers		

Response rate is anticipated to be at least 80 percent, based on rates for recent similar surveys (see Question 3).

**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.**

We do not intend to conduct any statistical analysis of the responses received. Rather, we anticipate a descriptive evaluation.

**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.**

Our pool of possible interviewees is greater than the number of interviews planned in the scope of work. In the event that a respondent is unreachable or does not respond, we will move on to another possible interviewee in that group. We will send the background and questions in advance and then schedule a phone interview. In the event that a respondent is unavailable for a phone interview, but wishes to participate, we can arrange for email submission. Furthermore, we have staff on both the east and west coasts, so are easily available for 12 hours on any given business day.

We anticipate, at a minimum, an 80% response rate for our interview requests, based on past experience of the contractor with similar process designs. Examples: 1) in the development of a 2003 Report to Congress, we interviewed a series of personnel from the areas of public health, microbiology, wastewater management, and/or water quality. Employing methods similar to those recommended here, we interviewed 76 of 88 candidates (86%); 2) in a 2001 effort to support the Delaware River Basin Commission to develop a model for the fate and transport of PCBs in the Delaware Estuary, SRA staff interviewed 71 of 80 candidates (89%). We have

found in past experiences that the personnel are committed enough to the program or issue, that they are eager to talk, provided they have the time.

**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.**

The survey questions were developed based on reviews of previous data collection efforts (both internal and external), focused towards the overall mission of the CZMA program as well as a series of discussions with both CZ and NERRS program managers. Prior to implementing our survey in the interviews, we will beta test the survey form through two test interviews with people familiar with the subject matter, but who are not part of the sample.

**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.**

In order to ensure a robust methodological design, we recommend the use of a small (2-4 person) informal review panel of evaluation/program experts to assist in two phases of this evaluation: 1) methodological review; and 2) interpretation of findings. Suggestions include:

- 1) Yvonne Watson (EPA's Evaluation Support Division) – Phone: 202-566-2239; Email: watson.yvonne@epa.gov
- 2) Bill Michaud (SRA International) – Phone: 860-738-7501; Email: bill\_michaud@sra.com.
- 3) Steve Yaffee or Julia Wondolleck (Ecosystem Management Initiative)

Data collection and analysis will be performed by:

1. Linda Manning (The Council Oak) – Phone: 703.942.8512; Email: lmanning@thecounciloak.com.
2. Greg Frey (SRA) – Phone: 503.236.7100; Email: greg\_frey@sra.com.

## **CZMA External Review Interview Questions**

The final list of questions sent to the interviewees will state, at the top, that participation is voluntary and that the information provided will assist with the continuing efforts to monitor and improve performance of programs authorized by the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972.

There will be some common questions for the State Coastal Zone Management Programs and the National Estuarine Research Reserves, but others tailored toward their unique programmatic goals and organic legislative intent.

### ***Major Study Questions***

Below is an initial list of the major study questions. These are not the specific questions we will use as interview questions; rather, the information we are trying to gather.

#### **Part One: Questions Common to Each Group**

- What are the strongest drivers/influences for decisions made related to coastal resources in the states?
  - Who are the most influential parties?
  - To what degree has change been influenced by CZ/NERRS programs?
- What role do State Coastal Zone/NERRS management programs play in assisting in coastal decisions at the state/regional level (e.g., decision-maker, data provider, data translator, expert)?
- Do you view your State Coastal Zone/NERRS program as effective? If so, why?
  - What are the factors you believe make the State Coastal Zone Management/NERRS program effective? (e.g., organizational, institutional, financial, data provider, coordinator/facilitator)?
- What do State Coastal Zone/NERRS programs do that is unique? What is their niche?
- If State Coastal Zone Management Programs did not exist, what would be the impact in the coastal zone?
  - What influence do they actually have on final decisions?
- What is the most helpful role that State Coastal Zone Management programs/NERRS provide to state/regional decision-makers?
- How has the role of State Coastal Zone/NERRS programs changed over time?
- How has the influence of State Coastal Zone/NERRS programs changed over time?

#### ***Future Looking Questions***

- What are the most exciting types of work being conducted at the CZ and NERRS programs? Why are these projects/approaches particularly helpful?
- How do/should CZ programs and NERRS identify and weigh future challenges? How do they prepare to address them?

- How much connectivity between CZ programs and NERRS exist at a state/regional level? How has this been helpful or harmful?
- How are/should CZ programs and NERRS position themselves to understand and effect time sensitive resource decisions?

### Part Two: Assessment of the Influence of State Coastal Zone Management Programs

In addition to the above questions, the following questions will be the basis of interviews with external stakeholders that interact with State Coastal Zone Management Programs.

- How important a role does the State Coastal Zone Management Program play in protecting or enhancing natural resources in the coastal zone and adjacent waters? (1-5 Likert scale)
  - Are there activities, programs, efforts are particularly effective?
- How important a role does the State Coastal Zone Management Program play in enhancing public awareness of estuarine areas/issues/topics? (1-5 Likert scale)
  - Are there activities, programs, efforts are particularly effective?
- How important a role does the State Coastal Zone Management Program play in reducing harmful coastal development? (1-5 Likert scale).
  - Are there activities, programs, efforts are particularly effective?
- How important a role does the State Coastal Zone Management Program play in supporting compatible economic development? (1-5 Likert scale)
  - Are there activities, programs, efforts are particularly effective?
- How important a role does the State Coastal Zone Management Program play in increasing public access for recreation? (1-5 Likert scale)
  - Are there activities, programs, efforts that are particularly effective?
- How important a role does the State Coastal Zone Management Program play in assisting in the coordination of decision-making at a local, state, federal level?
  - Are there activities, programs, efforts that are particularly effective?
- Is there a difference in decisions in the coastal zone between states that have approved State Coastal Zone Management Programs as those that do not? If so, how do they differ?

### Part Three: Assessment of the Influence of National Estuarine Research Reserve Programs

In addition to Part One, the following questions will be the basis of interviews with external stakeholders that interact with National Estuarine Research Reserve Programs.

- How important a role does the NERRS play in enhancing public awareness of estuarine areas? (1-5 Likert Scale)
  - Are there activities, programs, efforts are particularly effective?
- How important a role does the NERR play in identifying and establishing priorities among coastal management issues? (1-5 Likert Scale)
  - Are there activities, programs, efforts are particularly effective?
- Are there gaps in understanding, information, etc. that could/should be provided by the NERR that would be particularly useful to you?

*This statement will be on the information sent to the interviewees:*

**Paperwork Reduction Act Statement:** The contents of the final report from the external evaluation based on these interviews are considered a matter of public record. Interview notes would be considered pre-decisional and/or private under the HUFreedom of Information ActUH.

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 2 hours)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 Patmarie Nedelka, NOAA National Ocean Service, OCRM/NPED,1305 East-West Highway, Room 10650,Silver Spring, MD 20910.

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.

between 8 a.m. and 8 p.m., Eastern Standard Time, Monday through Friday.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The leaders of the Forest Service see benefit in merging the Northeastern Area with the Eastern Region under the leadership of one Regional Forester. The merger of the two units will improve forest management and enhance technology transfer through unified leadership. This decision by the ELT will:

- Integrate existing programs—management, discovery and applications—to address ecosystem to landscape-level questions from a suite of contemporary conservation issues.

- Augment the transfer of science developed by the Northern Research Station.

- Deliver to the constituents of the Northeast and Midwest a broader suite of programs.

- Enhance capabilities that allow national level concerns to be addressed, including climate change; using wood for energy; land restoration; destructive invasive species; and urban natural resources stewardship.

- Improve the agency structure in the twenty-state region and overall operating efficiencies.

- Move to a unified *Eastern Region*, led by a Regional Forester.

Both units currently have strong programs. Combining the strengths of current resources will provide a powerful way to serve the people in the region and contribute to national priorities.

Both units will continue to build on their collective strengths and will strive to develop a model approach for effective forest management and science-based technology transfer. This is important as the Agency continues to seek ways to maximize the effectiveness of Forest Service programs. The potential to help address national stewardship issues will be profound. Specifically, actions that we envision include:

- Landscape-level stewardship within a wide range of land ownerships.

- More cohesive and integrated projects and programs that build on current capacity. The Climate Change Program is a prominent example. Work in the control and management of destructive invasive species is another example. Urban natural resources stewardship offers still another great opportunity.

- A suite of business operation practices that more effectively serve all the twenty states through one organizational mission.

- A single executive team organized and located in a way that best facilitates

an integrated *Landscape Science* vision and works in harmony with the Combined Eastern Leadership Team (CELT).

- The Agency leadership will avoid any activity that creates inefficiencies and runs contrary to the mission of the Forest Service. Accordingly, we will strive to minimize the movement of current employees and move towards a unified Eastern Region as quickly as practicable. We will proceed at a pace that affords the best possible program to be implemented and addresses the needs of the people we serve.

- Begin the formal process of combining two organizational units.

Dated: June 2, 2009.

**Hank Kashdan,**

*Associate Chief, U.S. Forest Service.*

[FR Doc. E9-13380 Filed 6-8-09; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3410-11-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

#### Proposed Information Collection; Comment Request; Coastal Zone Management Act External Review

**AGENCY:** National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

**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 August 10, 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](mailto:dHynek@doc.gov)).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Requests for additional information should be directed to Patmarie Nedelka, (301) 713-3155 ext. 127 or [Patmarie.Nedelka@noaa.gov](mailto:Patmarie.Nedelka@noaa.gov).

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### I. Abstract

As part of its continuing efforts to monitor and improve performance of programs authorized by the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972, as

amended (CZMA) NOAA has contracted for an independent external review of CZMA programs. As part of this review, the contractor will conduct telephone interviews with representatives from Federal, State, local and non-governmental organizations that work for or with State Coastal Zone Management Programs or National Estuarine Research Reserves.

##### II. Method of Collection

Respondents will be contacted by telephone.

##### III. Data

*OMB Control Number:* None.

*Form Number:* None.

*Type of Review:* Regular submission.

*Affected Public:* State, Local, or Tribal Government; not-for-profit institutions.

*Estimated Number of Respondents:* 100.

*Estimated Time per Response:* Telephone interviews, 2 hours.

*Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours:* 160.

*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: June 4, 2009.

**Gwellnar Banks,**

*Management Analyst, Office of the Chief Information Officer.*

[FR Doc. E9-13485 Filed 6-8-09; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-08-P**