

NOTICE OF OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET ACTION

Date 02/18/2011

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 10/07/2010

ACTION REQUESTED: New collection (Request for a new OMB Control Number)
TYPE OF REVIEW REQUESTED: Regular
ICR REFERENCE NUMBER: 201010-0648-001
AGENCY ICR TRACKING NUMBER:
TITLE: Drivers' Awareness of and Response to Significant Weather Events and the Correlation of Weather to Road Impacts
LIST OF INFORMATION COLLECTIONS: See next page

OMB ACTION: Approved with change
OMB CONTROL NUMBER: 0648-0624
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: 02/29/2012 DISCONTINUE DATE:

BURDEN:	RESPONSES	HOURS	COSTS
Previous	0	0	0
New	1,200	120	0
Difference			
Change due to New Statute	0	0	0
Change due to Agency Discretion	1,200	120	0
Change due to Agency Adjustment	0	0	0
Change Due to Potential Violation of the PRA	0	0	0

TERMS OF CLEARANCE: In accordance with 5 CFR 1320, the information collection is approved for one year. OMB concurs with NOAA that the survey's anticipated low response rate and the lack of information about non respondents will not allow the agency to make any claims that the responses will be generalizable. As a result, there will be limitations of any results or conclusions drawn from the data generated by this survey. Upon completion of the survey, the agency must provide to OMB a detailed report of the data analysis associated with this ICR including an analysis of the non-response bias associated with the survey results.

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
Drivers' survey	NA	Drivers' awareness of and response to significant weather events	

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

Drivers' Awareness of and Response to Significant Weather Events and the Correlation of Weather to Road Impacts

OMB CONTROL NO. 0648-xxxx

A. JUSTIFICATION

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

Over the past several decades, Utah has experienced rapid population growth, including nearly a 24% increase between 2000 and 2008 alone. This has resulted in increased demand on Utah's existing interstate and arterial infrastructure. Recurring traffic congestion (i.e., AM/PM peak commute times) and non-recurring congestion (e.g., weather-related) result in an average annual cost of \$250 million dollars in Utah alone (source: Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT)). Recent studies (UDOT 2007 Congestion Report) have confirmed that inclement weather plays a significant role in non-recurring congestion and associated negative impacts with respect to delays, mobility, productivity, and safety.

In accordance with [Executive Order 12862](#), the [National Performance Review](#), and good management practices, NOAA offices seek to be able to continue to gather customer feedback on services and/or products, which can be used in planning for service and/or product modification and prioritization. Information will be gathered from adults who have recently driven during storms in South Davis, Salt Lake or Summit Counties, on how they access and respond to weather reports about driving conditions.

This request is for a new information collection.

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

Through the administration of a targeted survey, important details will be gathered regarding: (a) the information that drivers possessed prior to and during a storm, including knowledge of observed and forecast weather conditions; (b) sources of weather and road information; (c) any modification of travel and/or commute plans, based on event information; (d) anticipation and perception of storm impacts and severity; and (e) perception and behavioral response to messages conveyed by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's (NOAA's) National Weather Service (NWS) and UDOT, along with their satisfaction with information provided. Analyses of the information gathered will focus on driver knowledge, perceptions, and decision-making.

The information gathered from this project will be used by NWS, UDOT, and NorthWest Weathernet (NWN) to plan for improved services during winter storm events.

Ultimately, the results of this survey will provide insight on how the Weather Enterprise may more effectively communicate hazard information to the public, in a manner which leads to

improved response (*i.e.*, change travel times, modes, *etc.*). With a sufficient level of behavior change, it should be possible to improve safety and reduce the costs associated with weather-related congestion and associated delays. Additionally, the project will shed light upon the interrelationship between meteorological phenomena, road conditions, and their combined impact on travel.

Specific planned uses of the information, and how the questions in the survey will map to them, are:

UDOT/NWN

More effective messaging in 511 Travel Info program (Questions 9, 9a, 10g, 10g1, 11, 13, 14, 15, and 16)

More effective text wording and graphical displays in CommuterLink program (Questions 9, 9a, 10i, 10i1, 10i1a, 11, 13, 14, 15, and 16)

Precise, effective messaging on Variable Message Signs (Questions, 9, 9a, 11, 13, 14, 15, and 16)

Potential new service delivery options (Question 16)

Ideas for mitigating traffic congestion (Questions 1, 2, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, and 16)

Opportunities for enhanced collaboration with NWS, specifically with respect to anticipated road conditions (The data analysis, and actions based on the survey results as a whole, will increase collaboration).

NWS

More effective messaging for impact-based statements and precautionary and/or preparedness actions wording in watches, warnings, and advisories (Questions 9, 9a, 10e, 10e1, 10i, 10i2, 11, 13, 14, 15, and 16)

Potential new service delivery options, such as social media (Questions 10h and 16)

Improved collaboration with UDOT/NWN and media interests (The data analysis, and actions based on the survey results as a whole, will increase collaboration).

As explained in the preceding paragraphs, the information gathered has utility. NOAA will retain control over the information and safeguard it from improper access, modification, and destruction, consistent with NOAA standards for confidentiality, privacy, and electronic information. See response to 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. To ensure consistency with NOAA Information Quality Guidelines, the information collected will be coded and analyzed by Pegus Research and representatives of the University of Utah, ensuring rigorous quantitative and qualitative research methods are met. Knowledge gained from this effort will be used to complement performance verification metrics, currently used by the NWS, including Probability of Detection (POD), False Alarm Rate (FAR), and Lead Time (LT), in relation to weather events. Prior to dissemination, the information will be subjected to quality control measures and a 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.

Random digit dialing (home phones and cell phones) by live interviewers, who control the dialing, will be utilized to conduct a survey in the days following winter storm events.

Due to the flow, and desired content, of the interview, electronic submission of the information was not considered, so no form is involved. The information collected, in aggregated form, will be available over the Internet.

4. Describe efforts to identify duplication.

A review of various scientific journals and conference proceedings, and discussion with federal colleagues at a variety of conferences, does not indicate any duplication of effort. Also, we checked with Paul Pisano, Team Leader, Road Weather Management, in the Federal Highway Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) about possible similar DOT surveys. Mr. Pisano stated in an e-mail message that “to the best of my knowledge there have been no surveys conducted of this nature. The only recent survey we conducted pertains to information to and from a vehicle, but this is much different than the work you're pursuing.”

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

This information collection applies only to individuals.

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

If the data collection is not conducted, a valuable opportunity to more effectively communicate hazardous weather information to NOAA's customers and partners, and the general public, will be compromised. We will select different kinds of storms (morning, evening, etc.) having different potential impacts on the commute. If the survey is conducted less frequently, the opportunity to improve the service delivery of NOAA products will be compromised.

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

All information collection will be conducted in a manner that is consistent with OMB guidelines.

8. Provide information on the PRA Federal Register Notice that solicited public comments on the information collection prior to this submission. Summarize the public comments received in response to that notice and describe the actions taken by the agency in response to those comments. Describe the efforts to consult with persons outside the agency to obtain their views on the availability of data, frequency of collection, the clarity of instructions and recordkeeping, disclosure, or reporting format (if any), and on the data elements to be recorded, disclosed, or reported.

A Federal Register Notice published on July 22, 2010 (75 FR 42681) solicited public comment. No comments were received.

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

No payments or gifts will be given.

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

The following statement, approved by the University of Utah's Institutional Review Board, will be read to each potential survey respondent.

I would like to ask you 10 to 15 questions which will take less than 10 minutes. Your participation is voluntary, and you are free to skip any questions you choose not to answer. There are no immediate benefits to you for participating, but your answers will help us improve weather reporting in the state.

Your answers are completely anonymous. We are not recording your name or telephone number; we use only code numbers in our data file. This interview might be audio-recorded for quality control and to check your answers to open-ended questions. The tapes will be destroyed once we are certain we have accurately typed up your responses.

You can call the researcher, Carol Werner at 801 581 8938 or you can contact the Institutional Review Board if you have questions regarding your rights as a research participant. Also, contact the Review Board if you have questions, complaints or concerns which you do not feel you can discuss with the interviewer. The University of Utah's Institutional Review Board may be reached by phone at (801) 581-3655 or by e-mail at irb@hsc.utah.edu.

Are you willing to participate in this survey? We would appreciate your help.

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 will be asked.

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

The number of respondents will be 1,200. Each respondent will be asked to provide just one response during the survey period, so 1,200 responses are expected. The average response time is expected to be 6 minutes, based on tests by the survey planners and colleagues. Total estimated hours would be 120. The annualized labor cost for each respondent, based on an average hourly wage of \$20 per hour, is \$2, totaling \$2,400.

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).

Respondents will incur no costs beyond the time spent on the survey.

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

This effort will require 200 NWS employee hours. The NWS will incur no additional costs, as resources allocated for this project are consistent with duties outlined in staff performance plans. The majority of the employee hours will be devoted to the collection and analysis of meteorological data sets, and the correlation of this data to road impacts and information gleaned from the survey.

A breakdown of the costs associated with the work provided by PEGUS Research is below.

<i>Description</i>	<i>Costs</i>	
Programming	\$	645.75
Programming	\$	369.00
Data Download	\$	276.75
Data Collection	\$	6,862.20
Training	\$	315.00
Monitoring	\$	460.80
Supervision	\$	1,478.40
Collection	\$	4,608.00
Operations	\$	3,620.45
Sample	\$	3,240.00
Telephone expenses	\$	0.20
Project management	\$	380.25
Project Total	\$	11,128.40
Cost per complete	\$	9.27

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

This is a new program.

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

Information will be collected during the winter of 2010–2011. Analysis of data collected will occur in 2011.

Following the analysis, results of this survey may be presented at workshops and conferences, and submitted to various scientific journals for publication. Presentations and publications may be posted on NOAA/National Weather Service Web pages.

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

(If your collection does not employ statistical methods, just say that and delete the following five questions from the format.)

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.

Random digit dialing (home phones and cell phones) will be utilized to gather 1,200 responses from licensed drivers, 400 following each of three winter storm events. The survey domain is South Davis County, Salt Lake County, and Summit County, in Utah.

Pegus, the survey firm, was asked to draw a simple random sample from all exchanges in the target area, and to conduct the interview in English. Pegus will provide 75% RDD sample (nonautomated dialing system) and 25% cell phone sample (purchased cell phone numbers, participants drawn randomly from the list of numbers).

There are several criteria for inclusion which will affect the population to which the data can be generalized. The respondent (1) must be 18 years of age, (2) must not be driving at the time of the interview (targeted for callback), (3) must have a current driver's license for driving in Utah,

(4) reside in one of the target counties (south Davis, Salt Lake, or Summit), and (5) travel regularly in the Salt Lake Valley (the area of interest to UDOT and NOAA). To increase validity of responses, respondents who cannot remember if they did or did not travel in the Valley on the day of the storm will be excluded.

The expected response rate, defined as the percentage of calls answered by qualified participants which result in completion of the survey, will be between 20% and 25%. This is consistent with RDD surveys of a similar length, conducted within the target area by PEGUS Research, during the past few years. A large enough sample to result in 400 responses per storm will be purchased, taking into account an expected 25 numbers dialed to result in each live contact, and at least four live contacts made to result in one completed survey.

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.

More than 90% of Utah residents speak English. It is understood that there will be an underestimation of responses from Spanish speaking drivers (drivers' license exams are offered only in English and Spanish). Using larger samples and fewer storms for greater precision with our estimates was considered, but it was decided that a sample size of 400 for each survey would be adequate for both point estimates and hypothesis testing (range within +/-5%), and that obtaining information about 3 different storm events will offset the reduced precision.

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.

It is understood that the quality of the sample is greatly influenced by the response rate. The selected survey firm provides professional training, with an emphasis on interpersonal communication, one factor in promoting a higher response rate. The interviewers will be asked to call at different times during a 3-day period following the storm, so as to increase chances of reaching the targeted respondents. There will be 5 call-backs, prior to excluding a telephone number. One difficulty of this process is the short period of time in which to reach eligible respondents. It was decided to contact people within 3 days, and no longer, to increase the accuracy of their recollections, even though this limit has the potential to reduce the number of surveys completed.

The relatively low response rate and lack of information about nonrespondents will not allow us to make any claims that the responses will be representative of adult drivers in the three counties targeted. We will compare the demographic information in the responses to known county demographics; however, that will address only one aspect of nonresponse bias. However, we believe that the information gathered will still be of use in our planning.

In any presentations or publications, we will stress that we cannot claim that the sample of those who completed the survey is representative of the target population.

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 was designed in a collaborative effort between NWS, UDOT, NWN, and the University of Utah's Department of Psychology. The final survey was developed using a series of revisions based on interviews with colleagues. PEGUS Research, the survey firm, conducts in-house tests of the computerized version, so it is not anticipated that these participants will be contacted prior to the actual administration of the survey.

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 individuals listed below are the consultants for the statistical aspects of the design. As indicated, Dawn Straatsma, PEGUS Research, will coordinate data collection, and Carol Werner, University of Utah, will lead the analysis. The descriptive responses (weighted to represent the population) will be provided by PEGUS Research. The actual analyses will be supervised by Carol Werner, who will be examining relationships among variables, rather than a simple item by item description.

Dawn Straatsma – Data Collection
PEGUS Research
801-990-6131
dawn@pegus.com

Carol Werner – Data Analysis
Department of Psychology
University of Utah
801.581.8938
carol.werner@psych.utah.edu

Drivers' Awareness of and Response to Significant Weather Events
and the Correlation of Weather to Road Impacts

I'm calling on behalf of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's National Weather Service, the University of Utah, and the Utah Department of Transportation. I'd like to ask you a few questions about your driving, but first I need to make sure you are somewhere safe to talk on the telephone. Are you driving right now?

If "No," continue below (A).

If "Yes": Sorry, I cannot interview you while you are driving. We'll call you at another time.

Thank you. Good Bye.

A. The purpose of this interview is to learn how people respond to weather reports about driving conditions. We are doing this study to improve how weather reports are given to the public.

Before we begin, I need to make sure you are eligible to participate.

Are you 18 or over ? No Yes

Do you have a driver's license for driving in Utah? No Yes

Do you live in one of these areas: South Davis, Salt Lake or Summit County? No Yes

Do you travel regularly in the Salt Lake Valley? No Yes

If "No" to any of these, end the interview "I'm sorry, you are not eligible, thank you for your time".

If yes to all four: "You are eligible to participate. Let me briefly explain our survey."

I would like to ask you 10 to 15 questions which will take less than 10 minutes. Your participation is voluntary, and you are free to skip any questions you choose not to answer. There are no immediate benefits to you for participating, but your answers will help us improve weather reporting in the state.

Personal information will not be saved or shared. We are not recording your name or telephone number; we use only code numbers in our data file. This interview might be audio-recorded for quality control and to check your answers to open-ended questions. The tapes will be destroyed once we are certain we have accurately typed up your responses.

You can call the researcher, Carol Werner at 801 581 8938 or you can contact the Institutional Review Board if you have questions regarding your rights as a research participant. Also, contact the Review Board if you have questions, complaints or concerns which you do not feel you can discuss with the interviewer. The University of Utah's Institutional Review Board may be reached by phone at (801) 581-3655 or by e-mail at irb@hsc.utah.edu.

Are you willing to participate in this survey? We would appreciate your help.

1. In the past few years have you used the bus or TRAX to travel in Salt Lake County?

No Yes Don't remember

2. In the past few years, have you carpooled to travel in Salt Lake County?

No Yes Don't remember

Now I'd like to ask you some questions about your travel yesterday:

3. Did you travel yesterday in Salt Lake County?

No Yes Don't remember

If "NO" go to 4, 5 and 6

If "YES" go to 7, 8 and 9

If "DON'T REMEMBER" Probe: Take a moment to think about whether you went out yesterday.

If respondent still does not remember, end interview.

4. Did you NOT travel in Salt Lake because of the storm and driving conditions? No Yes

5. Did you NOT travel because your work or school was closed yesterday? No Yes

6. Did you NOT travel for other reasons (If yes, specify) _____

GO TO 9a

7. Which mode did you use MOST for traveling yesterday? Did you drive, carpool, or use transit?

Drove carpoled used transit

8. What were your reasons for traveling yesterday?

8a. Did you commute to or from work or school? No Yes

8b. Did you travel to or from a recreation spot? No Yes

8c. Did you travel to or from health care or other appointments No Yes

8d. Did you travel for other reasons, such as errands, to see friends or entertainment? No Yes

9. Before you traveled, were you aware that a winter storm was coming?

No Yes Don't know/don't remember

If "No" or "Don't know/Don't remember," go to 11

If "YES" go to 10

9a. Before you decided NOT to travel yesterday, were you aware that a winter storm was coming?

No Yes Don't know/Don't remember

If "NO" or "Don't know/Don't remember" go to 17

If "YES" go to 10

10. We'd like to know how people learned about the storm. I'm going to read you a list of sources that provide weather information. Please tell me which sources provided you with information before or during the storm yesterday:

10a. Could you see it was snowing before you began your trip?

No Yes Don't know/don't remember

10b. Did you learn the storm was coming from one of the local TV weather reporters – not a national broadcast, but a local TV weather report ?

No Yes Don't know/don't remember

10c. Did you learn the storm was coming from a nationwide news or weather broadcast?

No Yes Don't know/don't remember

10d. Did you learn the storm was coming from a local radio station?

No Yes Don't know/don't remember

10e. Did you learn the storm was coming from NOAA Weather Radio All Hazards (also called NWR)?

No Yes Don't know/Don't remember

If Yes, continue here 10e1.

If "no" or "Don't know/Don't remember" go to 10f.

10e1. How satisfied were you with the NOAA Weather Radio All Hazards service information?

satisfied

dissatisfied

A mix of satisfied and dissatisfied

10f. Did you learn the storm was coming from a friend, family member or neighbor?

No Yes Don't know/Don't remember

10g. Did you learn the storm was coming by dialing UDOT's 511 service?

No Yes Don't know/Don't remember

If Yes, continue here 10g1.

If "No" or "Don't know/Don't remember", go to next question 10h

10g1. How satisfied were you with the UDOT 511 service information?

satisfied

dissatisfied

A mix of satisfied and dissatisfied

10h. Did you learn the storm was coming from a message to your mobile device?

No Yes Don't know/don't remember

For any answer, continue with 10i.

10i. Did you learn the storm was coming by going online?

No Yes Don't know/Don't remember

If "No," or "Don't know/Don't remember," go to 11

If Yes, continue here 10i1.

10i1. Did you login to the UDOT CommuterLink website?

No Yes Don't know/Don't remember

If "No," or "Don't know/Don't remember" go to 10i2

If Yes continue here 10i1a:

10i1a. How satisfied were you with the UDOT CommuterLink information?

satisfied

dissatisfied

A mix of satisfied and dissatisfied

10i2. Did you login to the National Weather Service website?

No Yes Don't know/don't remember

If "No" or "Don't know/Don't remember," go to 11

If Yes, continue here 10i2a:

10i2a. How satisfied were you with the National Weather Service website?
 satisfied
 dissatisfied
 A mix of satisfied and dissatisfied

The next questions ask your views about the storm.

11. I understood the possible impacts of the winter storm based on the information that I had
 Completely agree
 Somewhat agree
 Neutral
 Somewhat Disagree
 Completely Disagree

12. Which of the following best represents your feelings about the storm's severity?
 The storm was less severe than I expected
 The storm was as severe as I expected
 The storm was more severe than I expected

13. Across all your sources of information, how satisfied were you with the information that you received about the winter storm and driving conditions?
 Very satisfied
 Somewhat satisfied
 Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
 Somewhat dissatisfied
 Very dissatisfied

FOR PEOPLE WHO TRAVELED (said "Yes" to #3, regardless of their answers to the "Knowledge" questions):

14. In which -- if any -- of the following ways did you change your travel because of the storm?

14a. Did you change your route? No Yes

14b. Did you change your travel schedule -- did you leave earlier or later than usual? No Yes

14c. Did you use transit such as TRAX, Front Runner train or a bus instead of driving? No Yes

15. Did any of the following influence you to change your travel?

15a. Was your decision influenced by the actual weather at the time?

15b. Was your decision influenced by the weather forecast?

15c. Was your decision influenced by known road closures?

15d. Was your decision influenced by known road conditions?

16. Is there anything else that would have led you to change your travel to avoid driving during the storm? (open ended)

17. WE HAVE A FEW QUICK QUESTIONS ABOUT YOUR BACKGROUND. THESE WILL ALLOW US TO COMPARE OUR SAMPLE TO THE GENERAL POPULATION ALONG THE WASATCH FRONT:

- A. In what city do you live? _____
- B. What is your zip code? _____

[Interviewer: Do not read the names – mark the response. If the city is not on the list, type the name in the space above.]

Bacchus ____	Grantsville ____	Mills Junction ____	Tooele ____
Bingham ____	Herriman ____	Murray ____	West Jordan ____
Bluffdale ____	Holladay ____	North Salt Lake ____	West Valley City ____
Bountiful ____	Hunter ____	Park City ____	Woods Cross ____
Butlerville ____	Kearns ____	Riverton ____	
Centerville ____	Kimball Junction ____	Salt Lake City ____	
Cottonwood Heights ____	LakePoint ____	Sandy ____	
Crescent ____	Lark ____	Snyderville ____	
Draper ____	Magna ____	South Jordan ____	
Farmington ____	Midvale ____	South Salt Lake ____	

- C. WHAT IS YOUR AGE? _____
- D. ARE YOU MALE OR FEMALE? M F
- E. WHAT IS YOUR ETHNIC GROUP OR RACE?
 WHITE HISPANIC AFRICAN AMERICAN ASIAN TONGAN/SAMOAN/PACIFIC ISLANDS
 NATIVE AMERICAN OTHER:
- F. ARE YOU EMPLOYED OUTSIDE THE HOME?
 CURRENTLY EMPLOYED FULL OR PART-TIME RETIRED NOT EMPLOYED OUTSIDE HOME
- G. HOW MANY YEARS OF SCHOOL HAVE YOU COMPLETED? _____
- H. ARE YOU CURRENTLY A FULL OR PART-TIME STUDENT? NO YES
- I. FOR HOW MANY YEARS HAVE YOU DRIVEN IN SNOWY CONDITIONS? _____
- J. WHAT IS YOUR HOUSEHOLD INCOME PER YEAR? _____

CLOSING: Thank you so much for your help. We really appreciate it.

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 6 minutes per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other suggestions for reducing this burden to Carol Werner, University of Utah Department of Psychology, via carol.werner@psych.utah.edu.

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.

Executive Order 12862: Setting Customer Service StdsArchive

Title:Executive Order 12862: Setting Customer Service Stds.

Author: The White House

Date: 11 Sept 1993

Content-Type: text

Content-Length: 4113

Apparently-To: edowd@ace.esusda.gov

Status: RO

Subject: Executive Order of Sept 11, 1993 Setting Customer Service Stds.

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

September 11, 1993

EXECUTIVE ORDER

SETTING CUSTOMER SERVICE STANDARDS

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

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

Section 1. Customer Service Standards.

In order to carry out the principles of the National Performance Review, the Federal Government must be customer-driven. The standard of quality for services provided to the public shall be: Customer service equal to the best in business.

For the purposes of this order, "customer" shall mean an individual or entity who is directly served by a department or agency. "Best in business" shall mean the highest quality of service delivered to customers by private organizations providing a comparable or analogous service.

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

- identify the customers who are, or should be, served by the agency;
- survey customers to determine the kind and quality of services they want and their level of satisfaction with existing services;
- post service standards and measure results against them;
- benchmark customer service performance against the best in business;
- survey front-line employees on barriers to, and ideas for, matching the best in business;
- provide customers with choices in both the sources of service and the means of delivery;

make information, services, and complaint systems easily accessible; and provide means to address customer complaints.

Sec. 2. Report on Customer Service Surveys.

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

Sec. 3. Customer Service Plans.

By September 8, 1994, each agency subject to this order shall publish a customer service plan that can be readily understood by its customers. The plan shall include customer service standards and describe future plans for customer surveys. It also shall identify the private and public sector standards that the agency used to benchmark its performance against the best in business. In connection with the plan, each agency is encouraged to provide training resources for programs needed by employees who directly serve customers and by managers making use of customer survey information to promote the principles and objectives contained herein.

Sec. 4. Independent Agencies.

Independent agencies are requested to adhere to this order.

Sec. 5. Judicial Review.

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

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Sep

The National Partnership for Reinventing Government (formerly The National Performance Review)

The National Performance Review began on March 3, 1993 when President Clinton announced a six-month review of the federal government and asked Vice President Gore to lead the effort. Unlike past efforts that relied on outsiders, the Vice President gathered experienced federal workers and organized them into teams to examine federal agencies and issues that cut across agencies, such as personnel, procurement or budget policies. The goal: identify problems and offer solutions and ideas for savings. In addition, the President asked each cabinet secretary to organize a 'Reinvention Team' to work from within each agency and to create 'Reinvention Laboratories' where experiments in new ways of doing business could begin immediately.

The Vice President and the National Performance Review teams sought input from people all across America. Vice President Gore spoke with workers at every major agency and at federal centers around the country. He visited programs that work and companies that have implemented new practices, dramatically changing their operations and decreasing costs while increasing profits in the process. The Vice President and the National Performance Review teams learned from the state and local leaders who have put many of these ideas into practice and they listened to the very best experts in the country -- from business, government, and the academic academy -- at special conferences in Philadelphia and Nashville. And, they listened to the American people whose letters and phone calls were invaluable.

The National Performance Review focused on how government should work, not on what it should do. The National Performance Review teams examined every cabinet department and 10 agencies. A 'bottom-up' review of the Department of Defense and the work of the Health Care and Welfare Reform Task Forces at the Department of Health and Human Services both covered areas that the National Health Review did not.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

[Return to Introduction](#)

For general comments, please contact:

National Performance Review at

netresults@npr.gsa.gov

For technical concerns, please contact:

tech-info@www.npr.gov

bathymetric data that are publicly available. The information about the data will be used to construct a Topographic and Bathymetric Data Inventory, an index of the best-available elevation data sets by region. Twenty-one pieces of information about each dataset will be collected to give an accurate picture of data quality and give users of the Topographic and Bathymetric Data Inventory access to each dataset. The end goal of this collection is to provide a comprehensive, publicly available, topographic and bathymetric data, Web resource.

II. Method of Collection

Initial contact with local agencies will be made by telephone to ensure adequate routing of the survey instrument. Information may be submitted via an online survey or by fax/mail or by telephone.

III. Data

OMB Control Number: None.

Form Number: None.

Type of Review: Regular submission (request for a new information collection).

Affected Public: Federal government, State, local, or Tribal government.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 700.

Estimated Time per Response: Initial telephone screening 5 minutes, survey, 10 minutes.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 117.

Estimated Total Annual Recordkeeping/Reporting 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: July 16, 2010.

Gwellnar Banks,

Management Analyst, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 2010-17842 Filed 7-21-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-JE-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

Proposed Information Collection; Comment Request; Drivers' Awareness of and Response to Significant Weather Events and the Correlation of Weather to Road Impacts

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 September 20, 2010.

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 Kevin Barjenbruch, (801) 524-5113 or kevin.barjenbruch@noaa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Abstract

This request is for a regular submission (new collection of information).

This project is a joint effort of the University of Utah (U of U), NOAA's National Weather Service (NWS), the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT), and NorthWest WeatherNet (NWN) to investigate and understand the relationship between meteorological phenomena and road conditions, as well as public understanding and response to available forecast information. The events which impact the Salt Lake City

metro area during the winter of 2010-2011 will be examined.

Through the administration of a targeted survey, important details will be gathered regarding: (a) The information that drivers possessed prior to and during a storm, including knowledge of observed and forecast weather conditions; (b) sources of weather and road information; (c) any modification of travel and/or commute plans, based on event information; (d) anticipation and perception of storm impacts and severity; and (e) perception and behavioral response to messages conveyed by the NWS and UDOT, along with their satisfaction of information provided. Analyses of the information gathered will focus on driver knowledge, perceptions, and decisionmaking.

Ultimately, the results of this survey will provide insight on how the Weather Enterprise may more effectively communicate hazard information to the public in a manner which leads to improved response (*i.e.*, change travel times, modes, *etc.*). With a sufficient level of behavior change, it should be possible to improve safety and reduce the costs associated with weather-related congestion and associated delays. Additionally, the project will shed light upon the interrelationship between meteorological phenomena, road conditions, and their combined impact on travel.

II. Method of Collection

PEGUS Research, a professional firm, will gather responses via random digit dialing, with survey participants providing responses via landline or cell phone communication.

III. Data

OMB Control Number: None.

Form Number: None.

Type of Review: Regular submission (new collection of information).

Affected Public: Individuals or households.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 1,200.

Estimated Time per Response: 10 minutes.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 200.

Estimated Total Annual Cost to Public: None.

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: July 16, 2010.

Gwellnar Banks,

Management Analyst, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 2010-17846 Filed 7-21-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-KE-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[C-570-963]

Certain Potassium Phosphate Salts From the People's Republic of China: Amended Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination and Countervailing Duty Order

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

SUMMARY: Based on affirmative final determinations by the Department of Commerce (the Department) and the U.S. International Trade Commission (ITC), the Department is issuing a countervailing duty order on certain potassium phosphate salts (phosphate salts) from the People's Republic of China (PRC).

DATES: *Effective Date:* July 22, 2010.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Andrew Huston, AD/CVD Operations, Office 6, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-4261.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

In accordance with section 705(d) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), on June 1, 2010, the Department published its final determination in the countervailing duty investigation of phosphate salts from the PRC. *See Certain Potassium Phosphate Salts From the People's Republic of China: Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty*

Determination and Termination of Critical Circumstances Inquiry, 75 FR 30375 (June 1, 2010).

On July 15, 2010, the ITC notified the Department of its final determination, pursuant to section 705(b)(1)(A)(i) of the Act, that an industry in the United States is materially injured by reason of subsidized imports of subject merchandise from the PRC. *See Certain Potassium Phosphate Salts From the People's Republic of China*, USITC Publication 4171, Investigation Nos. 701-TA-473 and 731-TA-1173 (Final) (July 2010). Pursuant to section 706(a) of the Act, the Department is publishing a countervailing duty order on the subject merchandise.

Scope of the Order

The phosphate salts covered by this order include anhydrous Dipotassium Phosphate (DKP) and Tetrapotassium Pyrophosphate (TKPP), whether anhydrous or in solution (collectively "phosphate salts").

TKPP, also known as normal potassium pyrophosphate, Diphosphoric acid or Tetrapotassium salt, is a potassium salt with the formula $K_4P_2O_7$. The CAS registry number for TKPP is 7320-34-5. TKPP is typically 18.7% phosphorus and 47.3% potassium. It is generally greater than or equal to 43.0% P_2O_5 content. TKPP is classified under heading 2835.39.1000, Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS).

DKP, also known as Dipotassium salt, Dipotassium hydrogen orthophosphate or Potassium phosphate, dibasic, has a chemical formula of K_2HPO_4 . The CAS registry number for DKP is 7758-11-4. DKP is typically 17.8% phosphorus, 44.8% potassium and 40% P_2O_5 content. DKP is classified under heading 2835.24.0000, HTSUS.

The products covered by this order include the foregoing phosphate salts in all grades, whether food grade or technical grade. The product covered by this order includes anhydrous DKP without regard to the physical form, whether crushed, granule, powder or fines. Also covered are all forms of TKPP, whether crushed, granule, powder, fines or solution.

For purposes of the order, the narrative description is dispositive, not the tariff heading, American Chemical Society, CAS registry number or CAS name, or the specific percentage chemical composition identified above.

Amendment to the Final Determination

Pursuant to the ITC's final determination, the scope of this investigation, and of this order, has changed. As noted above, the ITC

reached a negative determination regarding Monopotassium Phosphate (MKP), a type of salt that was included within the scope of the investigation by the Department and in our final determination. As a result of this negative determination by the ITC, no order can be issued on imports of MKP from the PRC. Therefore, the scope language cited above has been amended from the Department's final determination to remove references to MKP. The rates established by the Department in the final determination were based on adverse facts available findings, none of which were specific to MKP. Thus, there have been no revisions to our final determination rates, or to any other aspect of our final determination, outside of the revised scope definition.

Countervailing Duty Order

On July 15, 2010, the ITC notified the Department of its final determination, pursuant to section 705(b)(1)(A)(i) of the Act, that an industry in the United States is materially injured as a result of subsidized imports of phosphate salts from the PRC. In its determination, the ITC found three domestic like products (DKP, TKPP, and MKP) covering the scope of subject merchandise subject to the investigation. The ITC made affirmative determinations with respect to DKP and TKPP, and a negative determination with respect to MKP. Since the ITC made different affirmative injury determinations for domestic like products, the Department must instruct U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) to assess countervailing duties on entries of DKP and TKPP separately from MKP.

MKP

Because the ITC made a negative determination of material injury with respect to MKP, the Department will direct CBP to terminate the suspension of liquidation for entries of MKP from the PRC entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, and to release any bond or other security, and refund any cash deposit, posted to secure the payment of estimated countervailing duties with respect to these entries.

DKP and TKPP

Because the ITC determined that imports of DKP and TKPP from the PRC are materially injuring a U.S. industry, all unliquidated entries of such potassium phosphate salts from the PRC, entered or withdrawn from warehouse, are subject to the assessment of countervailing duties.

In accordance with section 706(a) of the Act, the Department will direct CBP