NOTICE OF OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET ACTION

Date 12/06/2011

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 09/27/2011

ACTION REQUESTED: New collection (Request for a new OMB Control Number)
TYPE OF REVIEW REQUESTED: Regular
ICR REFERENCE NUMBER: 201109-0648-002
AGENCY ICR TRACKING NUMBER:
TITLE: Elwha River Dam Removal and Floodplain Restoration Ecosystem Service Valuation Pilot
LIST OF INFORMATION COLLECTIONS: See next page

OMB ACTION: Approved with change
OMB CONTROL NUMBER: 0648-0638
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: 12/31/2014 DISCONTINUE DATE:

BURDEN:	RESPONSES	HOURS	COSTS
Previous	0	0	0
New	164	304	0
Difference			
Change due to New Statute	0	0	0
Change due to Agency Discretion	164	304	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
Focus groups and stakeholder meetings	NA	General Focus Group Process, to be adapted for Interviews	
Individual interviews	NA	General Focus Group Process, to be adapted for Interviews	

PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT SUBMISSION

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

7. Title
Elwha River Dam Removal and Floodplain Restoration Ecosystem Service Valuation Pilot

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

9. Keywords

10. Abstract

The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) is requesting approval for a new information collection in order to conduct focus groups and one-on-one interviews to develop and test the Elwha River Dam Removal and Floodplain Restoration Ecosystem Service Valuation Survey it is developing.
NOAA has received funding from the Estuary Restoration Act of 2000 (Title I, P.L. 106-457) to expand research on ecosystem services valuation. Part of NOAA's role under this Act is to develop metrics to determine the economic value and impact of restoration. The proposed Elwha River Dam Removal and Floodplain Restoration Ecosystem Service Valuation Pilot Project (the "Pilot Project") will be NOAA's first effort to develop these metrics.

11. Affected public (*Mark primary with "P" and all others that apply with "x"*)
a. P 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 (*check one*)
a. [✔] Voluntary
b. [ ] Required to obtain or retain benefits
c. [ ] Mandatory

13. Annual recordkeeping and reporting burden
a. Number of respondents 164
b. Total annual responses 164
1. Percentage of these responses collected electronically 0 %
c. Total annual hours requested 304
d. Current OMB inventory 0
e. Difference 0
f. Explanation of difference
1. Program change
2. Adjustment

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

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

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

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

18. Agency Contact (person who can best answer questions regarding the content of this submission)
Name: Peter Edwards
Phone: 301-427-8608

19. Certification for Paperwork Reduction Act Submissions

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

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

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

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

(b) It avoids unnecessary duplication;

(c) It reduces burden on small entities;

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(j) It makes appropriate use of information technology.

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

Signature of Senior Official or designee	Date

Agency Certification (signature of Assistant Administrator, Deputy Assistant Administrator, Line Office Chief Information Officer, head of MB staff for L.O.s, or of the Director of a Program or StaffOffice)	
Signature signed by Hugh Johnson	Date 08/30/2011
Signature of NOAA Clearance Officer	
Signature signed by Sarah Brabson	Date 08/30/2011

SUPPORTING STATEMENT

ELWHA RIVER DAM REMOVAL AND FLOODPLAIN RESTORATION ECOSYSTEM SERVICE VALUATION PILOT PROJECT

OMB CONTROL NO. 0648-xxxx

A. JUSTIFICATION

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

The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) is requesting approval for a new information collection in order to conduct focus groups, stakeholder meetings and one-on-one interviews to develop and test the Elwha River Dam Removal and Floodplain Restoration Ecosystem Service Valuation Survey it is developing.

NOAA has received funding from the Estuary Restoration Act of 2000 (Title I, P.L. 106-457) to expand research on ecosystem services valuation. Part of NOAA's role under this Act is to develop metrics to determine the economic value and impact of restoration. The proposed Elwha River Dam Removal and Floodplain Restoration Ecosystem Service Valuation Pilot Project (the "Pilot Project") will be NOAA's first effort to develop these metrics.

The Elwha River Ecosystem and Fisheries Restoration Act of 1992 (i.e., the "Elwha Act", P.L. 102-495) authorized the Secretary of the Interior to acquire and remove two hydroelectric dams on the Elwha River (the Elwha and Glines Canyon dams) and implement restoration actions to restore the Elwha River and its native, anadromous fisheries. The proposed Pilot Project will not be used to make agency decisions on dam removal or restoration efforts on the Elwha River. This Pilot Project is designed to capitalize on the planned dam removal and restoration efforts to allow NOAA to better understand the public's understanding about ecosystem service measures (metrics) and value of these types of restoration activities and changes in ecosystem services associated with the river habitat restoration.

The Elwha River dam removal and restoration project presents a unique opportunity for NOAA to test ecosystem service metrics in order to determine the economic value of restoration activities. Because of the extensive planning and review process for the dam removal, significant baseline ecological data are available to allow a comparison of ecological values before and after the floodplain restoration and dam removal and to investigate potential tradeoffs between ecological and human use values. The ability to link results of the Pilot Project to precise measures of ecosystem changes could be applied to future restoration sites, enabling NOAA to evaluate a broader range of ecosystem services provided by future restoration actions.

The planned removal of these dams, scheduled to begin in September 2011, will be the largest dam removal project in U.S. history. Dam removal, along with restoration actions planned for the floodplain and drained reservoir basins, will impact people in the surrounding region in numerous ways. Impacted groups include recreators who engage in river activities such as fishing and rafting, reservoir users, and members of Native American tribes for whom the river

has cultural, environmental, and economic significance. These impacted groups are likely to have associated some value with the natural resources associated with the Elwha River. Because part of their value has to do with their use of the resource, we call it a *use* value. The dam-removal and restoration actions could also provide value to people throughout the Pacific Northwest and the United States, regardless of whether they visit the Elwha River or the Olympic Peninsula. This type of value is often called a *nonuse* value. Nonuse values associated with the dam removal and habitat restoration activities may be significant because these activities will restore the river to more natural conditions, and will also restore threatened and endangered populations of salmon and other fish species. The proposed Pilot Project is designed to measure the total value (i.e., combined use and nonuse values) of alternative restoration activities. This Pilot Project will also address an important gap in research on indirect and nonuse values provided by habitat restoration and protection.

NOAA plans to develop and implement a total value, nonmarket valuation survey of portions of the U.S. public and members of the Lower Elwha Klallam Tribe. To ensure the survey questions and restoration scenarios presented in this survey are accurate, easily understood, and not burdensome, it is important to test the survey with small focus groups and in one-on-one interviews.

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 applicable NOAA Information Quality Guidelines.

This information collection will form the basis for designing an effective total valuation survey. At the regional level, we anticipate a diversity of views about the dam removal and habitat restoration. We plan to investigate the heterogeneity of views and values through the qualitative investigation using a series of focus groups, stakeholder meetings, and one-on-one interviews.

NOAA has contracted with Stratus Consulting in Boulder, Colorado, to inform the total value survey by conducting up to 12 focus groups, 2 stakeholder meetings, and up to 24 one-on-one interviews. NOAA team members and the research team (hereinafter the Team) anticipate conducting several focus groups drawing on residents of counties located near the Elwha River in the State of Washington and, more broadly, of the population of the State of Washington. Because the Olympic National Park also includes some areas of Oregon and Idaho, we may redistribute the total number of sessions and interviews over a wider area. Information on which to base this decision will be gathered by examining visitor information collected by the National Park Service (NPS) at this park, to determine how many people from outside the Western Washington region might visit. We will also speak with some key stakeholders (e.g., NPS staff) to determine the potential need to conduct focus groups in Oregon, Eastern Washington, and Idaho.

In each of the 12 focus groups, about 10 participants will provide written responses to questions presented in a series of handouts. The use of handouts helps gather individual views on specific issues before a group discussion on a topic. The focus group moderators, Mr. David Chapman and Dr. Richard Bishop, will lead a discussion based on the handouts and ask participants to describe their responses and to provide additional clarification of key issues. During the focus

group process, the Team will (1) discover issues of potential importance that may have been overlooked in background research, (2) learn how facts and concepts can be most clearly presented, (3) explore the alternative approaches to incorporating uncertainty about specific information into the analysis, and (4) explore potential valuation approaches and payment vehicles to determine whether people understand and correctly interpret draft valuation questions. Between each round of focus groups, we will refine the survey to improve respondents' understanding and interpretation to ensure valid survey responses.

In each of the 12 focus groups, about 10 participants will provide oral and written feedback based on descriptive materials (e.g., pictures and written descriptions of the salmon and sea run trout of the Elwha River) presented to them in a series of handouts. The use of handouts helps gather individual views on specific issues before a group discussion on a topic. The focus group moderators will lead a discussion based on the orally presented materials and handouts and ask participants to describe their responses and to provide additional clarification of key issues. During the focus group process, the Team will:

- Assess participant's knowledge of anadromous fish, dams and dam removal impacts, ecosystem restoration, and related topics.
- Discover issues of potential importance that may have been overlooked in background research,
- Learn how facts and concepts can be most clearly presented, both through language and graphics,
- Explore the alternative approaches to incorporating uncertainty about specific information into the analysis, and
- Explore potential valuation approaches and payment vehicles to determine whether people understand and correctly interpret draft valuation questions.

Between each focus group, we will refine the draft survey materials to improve respondents' understanding and interpretation to ensure valid survey responses. The focus group format and questions will evolve between focus groups since each one builds upon information learned in the previous one. For the first focus groups, we anticipate having an initial set of open-ended questions about the topics listed below. These questions will help the Team understand what existing knowledge people have of the dam removal and restoration activities and what information we need to provide. In general focus group discussion topics will include:

- Perception of natural resource or environmental problems.
- Knowledge of issues related to anadromous fish, dam impacts, and dam removal issues in the region.
- Knowledge of the Elwha River and its water and fishery resources.
- Knowledge and perceptions of the various proposed Elwha River restoration activities.

- Relative preference for alternative proposed restoration actions.

Some of the specific types of questions that may be used to assess participant's background knowledge of the dam removal include:

- Please write down anything that you have heard or read about the removal of the Elwha and Glines Canyon dams.

- Please write down anything you have heard or read about proposed restoration activities around the Elwha River.

Once we collect information on participants' baseline knowledge in the initial focus groups, we can begin to craft descriptive language about the dam removal and restoration activities to present to participants in the next focus groups. At this stage we will begin to explore how participants react to the specific words we use in the focus group handouts and the overall presentation of information. We would make sure that all participants interpret descriptive materials and questions in the same way when we discuss the details of the restoration options. There are a lot of technical terms that we will likely have to simplify for participants. For example, we have found in the past that people may have a difficult time defining a floodplain. We may have to use words other than floodplain to convey the same concept or meaning. Examples of questions the moderators might ask in an open-ended format are below.

- In your own words, how would you define the word floodplain?

- When you hear the word floodplain, what do you think of?

- (After some discussion) Can you describe what I am talking about in your own words?

During this stage, we will also explore the best way to present information, particularly the science, to participants. Some people prefer to see information summarized in tables; others prefer a graph. We will experiment with different types of presentations to see which one fits best for this particular topic.

A further refinement to the survey language involves clearly incorporating scientific uncertainty into the descriptions of ecological endpoints. For example, scientists expect salmon to return to the Elwha River after the dams are removed, but there is uncertainty regarding both how soon this will occur and how big the population will be. This information must be communicated in the policy scenarios in order to ensure the survey is scientifically valid. We anticipate exploring the most effective way to communicate the concepts of ranges, probabilities, and averages by presenting the same information using different language, and asking follow-up questions to determine how well participants understood the information. Examples of questions the moderators might ask are below:

- In your own words, how soon do scientists expect salmon to return to the Elwha River?

- How many salmon do scientists expect will return to the Elwha River?

- Is this a sure thing, or might the results be different than the prediction from scientists?

Finally, the survey will ask respondents to choose between alternative potential restoration scenarios that cost different amounts of money. We will use the focus groups to determine the most appropriate way to present the cost the restoration activities. We will present these choices using different payment methods, such as higher taxes or higher electricity prices, to determine the most appropriate method for this project. The moderators would then follow up with questions such as:

- Is there anything that concerns you regarding how these activities would be paid for?
- Would you be more or less willing to pay for these activities if it were paid for in a different way?

As with the earliest, more general questions, these will be refined as the focus groups progress, based on previous participants' responses during this phase of the research.

The qualitative research phase also involves 24 one-on-one interviews (also called cognitive interviews), which generally occur after the focus groups. The purpose of these interviews is to further refine and improve the survey instrument outside the group setting and to determine whether participants fully understand the information presented to them and whether they interpret the valuation questions in a way that is consistent with the research objectives .

The focus groups and interviews will be conducted in hotel settings using paper handouts, with respondents participating in the discussion in a conference room at the facility. Stakeholder meetings will either occur in a similar hotel setting or at a Tribal meeting location, depending on the stakeholder group involved, and also include the use of paper handouts.

How information disseminated to the public complies with NOAA Information Quality Guidelines

Utility

The overall study goals will be refined through the qualitative research phase of this project and through meetings with key stakeholder groups, including federal and state resource managers and the Team. These initial meetings will allow us to identify key information needs. At critical points throughout the study, we plan to update the key stakeholders on the status of the study. This will ensure that all information developed from this project will be transparent to all members of the public. Any information that is ultimately disseminated to the public will provide detailed analysis on the value associated with improving ecosystem services, which is a key issue associated with many environmental policy decisions.

Objectivity

The survey instrument will contain scientific facts/information and potential scenarios that will be presented to respondents. The information will allow them to make tradeoffs and state preferences for different ecosystem services and ecological outputs (eg changes in fish biomass). These ecological outputs as presented will need to be vetted by subject matter experts such as fish biologists for their validity. The goal is to present balanced and factual information to the respondent.We will also conduct internal peer reviews on all work products. External reviewers

will also have an opportunity to comment on factual details presented in the survey and work products throughout the qualitative research process. Peer review will ensure that the information collected is accurate, reliable, and unbiased and that the information reported to the public is accurate, clear, complete, and unbiased.

Integrity

During all focus group sessions, stakeholder meetings and interviews, participants will be reminded that their participation is voluntary, that their responses will be protected, and that any material identifying them will not be provided to anyone.

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. 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.

We do not plan to use any automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological techniques or other forms of information technology.

4. Describe efforts to identify duplication.

Based on conversations with a variety of stakeholders (academic, governmental, and Tribal representatives) involved in the dam removal and restoration effort, we have found no existing data collection activities that have specifically addressed the information needs of this study.

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

Focus groups, stakeholder meetings, and one-on-one interviews will target individuals rather than small businesses or small entities.

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

Without this collection, NOAA will be unable to develop the tools necessary to conduct this study.

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

This collection 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 requesting comments regarding this request was published on March 16, 2011(76 FR 14374). No comments were received.

Consultants outside the agency

NOAA and Stratus Consulting have compiled a team of experts to carry out this study. Key team members include Mr. David Chapman, Dr. Michael Welsh, Dr. Eric English, Dr. Megan Lawson, Ms. Colleen Donovan, and Drs. Richard Bishop, James Boyd, John Duffield, John Loomis, Roger Tourangeau, and Barbara Kanninen. We have also contracted with Drs. V. Kerry Smith, Richard Carson, and W. Michael Hanemann to participate in advisory roles. These experts have extensive experience in all disciplines necessary to complete an effective study, including the fields of nonmarket valuation, econometrics, and survey research and design. They have frequently applied their expertise in the context of environmental issues, including the protection of threatened and endangered (T&E) species, the implementation of ecological restoration projects, water quality issues, water allocation issues, impacts to recreation, and impacts to tribal resources. Members of this Team have worked extensively for federal, state, and local governments; American Indian tribes in the Pacific Northwest and throughout the United States; nonprofit groups; and research foundations.

A key qualification of our proposed team is the substantial experience of team members specifically addressing dam removal, dam modification projects, and management of river flows to protect T&E species. Prior experience specifically related to dam modification projects includes:

- Dr. Bishop conducted a study that valued improvements to environmental, cultural, and recreational resources of the Grand Canyon resulting from modifications to the operation of Glen Canyon Dam (Bishop et al., 1987; Welsh et al., 1997). The study involved two nonuse surveys, one conducted throughout the United States and one conducted specifically with ratepayers whose electricity costs would increase due to changes in dam operations. The valuation scenarios included protection of tribal, cultural, and spiritual resources. Secretary of the Interior Bruce Babbitt and Commissioner of Reclamation Eluid Martinez (Martinez and Babbitt, 1996) cited the nonuse valuation study in justifying their decision to modify Glen Canyon Dam operations in order to achieve environmental and other goals.

- Dr. Hanemann studied the restoration of water flows below the Friant Dam on the San Joaquin River in California and the resulting restoration of salmon populations (Hanemann, 2005; Cody et al., 2007). In a lawsuit between a coalition of conservation and fishing groups and the Bureau of Reclamation, the nonuse value of the restored river was considered alongside the value of irrigation water and other economic values to reach a settlement in which water flows were restored to a 60-mile portion of the river that was previously dry.

- Dr. Loomis conducted a study that valued the increase in salmon populations from the removal the Elwha River dams (Loomis, 1996b). To our knowledge this is the only nationwide study of the nonuse value of environmental impacts from dam removal. One conclusion of this study involved the extent of the relevant market, specifically, that a nationwide population held nonuse values for dam removal and restored salmon runs (Loomis, 1996a).

- Dr. Smith is currently engaged in a similar nonmarket valuation effort investigating the value of dam removal on the Klamath River in Oregon. Dr. Smith will provide important insights from the findings in that study which may be applicable to the Pilot Project.

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

Based on Stratus Consulting's extensive experience in working with local marketing firms to conduct focus groups, incentives will be provided by the local marketing research groups to participants, to increase participation rates. The specific incentive amounts ($50-$75) are determined by each of the market areas where the focus groups are conducted (that is, a larger amount might be expected in a larger city). The purpose of the incentive is to encourage attendance and to thank people for their time.

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

No assurance of confidentiality based on statute or regulation will be provided to the respondents. Respondents will be told that their identity will be protected. The anonymity of the focus group members and one-on-one interview participants will be protected by using an independent contractor to collect the information, by enacting procedures to prevent unauthorized access to respondent data, and by preventing the public disclosure of the responses of individual participants. In each focus group or one-on-one interview, we will ask only for the respondent to record his or her first name. The focus group will be taped to help prepare a summary of the group discussion. However, these recordings do not have any personal identifying information beyond respondents' first names.

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.

We will not ask questions of a sensitive nature.

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

Estimated number of participants for the:

- Focus groups[1].....140
- One-on-one interviews.....24

Total respondents and responses: 164.

Estimated time per response for the:

- Focus groups .....2 hours
- One-on-one interviews.....1 hour

Estimated total annual burden hours for the:

- Focus groups .....280 hours
- One-on-one interviews.....24 hours

Total: 304 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 will be no recordkeeping/reporting costs to the respondents.

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

The cost to the federal government for this pilot project will be $320,000.

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

This is a new information collection request.

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

Stratus Consulting will provide NOAA with a report of the focus group discussions. No statistical analyses will be conducted, and there are no plans to publish the data for statistical use.

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.

---

[1]. The estimate of participants, time per response, and burden hours for focus groups includes 12 focus groups and 2 stakeholder meetings.

NA.

18. Explain each exception to the certification statement.

NA.

SUPPORTING STATEMENT

ELWHA RIVER DAM REMOVAL AND FLOODPLAIN RESTORATION ECOSYSTEM SERVICE VALUATION PILOT PROJECT

OMB CONTROL NO. 0648-xxxx

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.

To inform the total value survey, NOAA plans to conduct up to 12 focus groups, 2 stakeholder meetings, and up to 24 one-on-one interviews, for a total of up to 164 respondents. The Team anticipates conducting several focus groups drawing on residents of counties located near the Elwha River in the State of Washington and, more broadly, of the population of the State of Washington. Due to the National Park status where the restoration efforts will occur, we will investigate the need to include a wider potential extent of the market area (Oregon and Idaho).

Because the survey is intended for the general population of adults, the only screening criteria for both the focus groups and one-on-one interviews will be to exclude individuals younger than 20 years of age. Otherwise, individuals will be recruited to ensure that a broad mix of sociodemographic characteristics (e.g., sex, age, education) is represented.

Stratus Consulting will work with local market research companies in each of the focus group locations to recruit potential participants and provide the facilities for hosting the focus group discussions. Using convenience sampling, the market research companies will recruit potential participants who meet the eligibility criteria from their databases.

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.

For this information collection, no specific statistical sampling will be conducted. Informal data collection will be through focus group discussions and cognitive interviews. The focus group moderators, will lead a discussion based on the handouts, asking participants to describe their responses and providing additional clarification of key issues. Overall, the focus groups will help the Team determine the following:

- Participants' experience with, familiarity with, and understanding of the Elwha River dam removal and restoration activities
- Participants' prior knowledge, perceptions, and attitudes regarding measures to protect threatened or endangered fish species
- Participants' reactions to the stated choice questions
- Plausibility and clarity of the potential choice scenario
- Appropriateness of the attribute categories and attribute levels used to describe the choice options
- Reactions to the size and method of payment for the restoration activities (planned and hypothetical)

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.

For the focus groups and cognitive interviews, each market research company will recruit 12 individuals to ensure that 10 individuals participate in each of the discussion groups. We anticipate up to 120 adults participating in these focus group discussions. An additional 20 adults will participate in the targeted stakeholder meetings.

Based on Stratus Consulting's extensive experience in working with local marketing firms to conduct focus groups, incentives will be provided by the local marketing research groups to participants, to increase participation rates. The specific incentive amounts ($50-$75) are determined by each of the market areas where the focus groups are conducted (that is, a larger amount might be expected in a larger city). The purpose of the incentive is to encourage attendance and to thank people for their time.

The market research firms will recruit individuals with a broad mix of demographic characteristics for the focus groups and cognitive interviews. Because of the small sample size (up to 10 people per focus group), the people recruited will not be representative of the larger population. At this stage of the project, however, having a representative sample is not critical.

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 Team has extensive experience with conducting focus groups and one-on-one interviews. As explained in Part A, Question 2 (page 3), they will use the broad questions and discussion as tests in the initial proposed focus groups and one-on-one interviews to refine the questions used in subsequent focus groups and one-on one interviews.

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.

For this pilot, no statistical design is anticipated. The results of the focus groups will be reviewed and summarized by Stratus Consulting and team experts, including Mr. David Chapman, Dr. Michael Welsh, Dr. Eric English, Dr. Megan Lawson, Ms. Colleen Donovan, and Drs. Richard Bishop, James Boyd, John Duffield, John Loomis, Roger Tourangeau, and Barbara Kanninen.

General Focus Group Process, to be adapted for Interviews

In each of the 12 focus groups, about 10 participants will provide oral and written feedback based on descriptive materials (e.g., pictures and written descriptions of the salmon and sea run trout of the Elwha River) presented to them in a series of handouts. The use of handouts helps gather individual views on specific issues before a group discussion on a topic. The focus group moderators will lead a discussion based on the orally presented materials and handouts and ask participants to describe their responses and to provide additional clarification of key issues. During the focus group process, the Team will:

- Assess participant's knowledge of anadromous fish, dams and dam removal impacts, ecosystem restoration, and related topics.
- Discover issues of potential importance that may have been overlooked in background research,
- Learn how facts and concepts can be most clearly presented, both through language and graphics,
- Explore the alternative approaches to incorporating uncertainty about specific information into the analysis, and
- Explore potential valuation approaches and payment vehicles to determine whether people understand and correctly interpret draft valuation questions.

Between each focus group, we will refine the draft survey materials to improve respondents' understanding and interpretation to ensure valid survey responses. The focus group format and questions will evolve between focus groups since each one builds upon information learned in the previous one. For the first focus groups, we anticipate having an initial set of open-ended questions about the topics listed below. These questions will help the Team understand what existing knowledge people have of the dam removal and restoration activities and what information we need to provide. In general focus group discussion topics will include:

- Perception of natural resource or environmental problems.
- Knowledge of issues related to anadromous fish, dam impacts, and dam removal issues in the region.
- Knowledge of the Elwha River and its water and fishery resources.
- Knowledge and perceptions of the various proposed Elwha River restoration activities.
- Relative preference for alternative proposed restoration actions.

Some of the specific types of questions that may be used to assess participant's background knowledge of the dam removal include:

- Please write down anything that you have heard or read about the removal of the Elwha and Glines Canyon dams.
- Please write down anything you have heard or read about proposed restoration activities around the Elwha River.

Once we collect information on participants' baseline knowledge in the initial focus groups, we can begin to craft descriptive language about the dam removal and restoration activities to present to participants in the next focus groups. At this stage we will begin to explore how participants react to the specific words we use in the focus group handouts and the overall presentation of information. We would make sure that all participants interpret descriptive materials and questions in the same way when we discuss the details of the restoration options. There are a lot of technical terms that we will likely have to simplify for participants. For example, we have found in the past that people may have a difficult time defining a floodplain. We may have to use words other than floodplain to convey the same concept or meaning. Examples of questions the moderators might ask in an open-ended format are below.

- In your own words, how would you define the word floodplain?
- When you hear the word floodplain, what do you think of?
- (After some discussion) Can you describe what I am talking about in your own words?

During this stage, we will also explore the best way to present information, particularly the science, to participants. Some people prefer to see information summarized in tables; others prefer a graph. We will experiment with different types of presentations to see which one fits best for this particular topic.

A further refinement to the survey language involves clearly incorporating scientific uncertainty into the descriptions of ecological endpoints. For example, scientists expect salmon to return to the Elwha River after the dams are removed, but there is uncertainty regarding both how soon this will occur and how big the population will be. This information must be communicated in the policy scenarios in order to ensure the survey is scientifically valid. We anticipate exploring the most effective way to communicate the concepts of ranges, probabilities, and averages by presenting the same information using different language, and asking follow-up questions to determine how well participants understood the information. Examples of questions the moderators might ask are below:

- In your own words, how soon do scientists expect salmon to return to the Elwha River?
- How many salmon do scientists expect will return to the Elwha River?

- Is this a sure thing, or might the results be different than the prediction from scientists?

Finally, the survey will ask respondents to choose between alternative potential restoration scenarios that cost different amounts of money. We will use the focus groups to determine the most appropriate way to present the cost the restoration activities. We will present these choices using different payment methods, such as higher taxes or higher electricity prices, to determine the most appropriate method for this project. The moderators would then follow up with questions such as:

- Is there anything that concerns you regarding how these activities would be paid for?
- Would you be more or less willing to pay for these activities if it were paid for in a different way?

As with the earliest, more general questions, these will be refined as the focus groups progress, based on previous participants' responses during this phase of the research.

Paperwork Reduction Act Statement

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average two hours per focus group and one hour per interview, 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 Peter Edwards, NOAA NMFS, 301-427-8608.

The identity of individuals will be protected, and individual responses will not be disclosed to the public. 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.

Desk Officer either by fax (202–395–7245) or e-mail (*bharrisk@omb.eop.gov*).

Dated: March 11, 2011.

Glenna Mickelson,

Management Analyst, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 2011–6116 Filed 3–15–11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–07–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

The Department of Commerce will submit to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for clearance the following proposal for collection of information under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. chapter 35).

Agency: U.S. Census Bureau.

Title: Partnership Program Focus Groups and Interviews.

Form Number(s): None.

OMB Control Number: None.

Type of Request: New collection.

Burden Hours: 150.

Number of Respondents: 120.

Average Hours per Response: 48 minnutes.

Needs and Uses: For the 2010 Census, among the many other outreach efforts, the Census Bureau conducted the Partnership Program, involving commercial entities of national scope; State, local and Tribal governments; and regional and local corporations and organizations. The purpose of the Partnership Program was to target historically "hard-to-count" (HTC) areas in hopes of increasing census form mail-back rates. Over 800 National Partners participated in the 2010 Census Partnership Program. The program will continue to be an integral part of future inter-census year promotional activities. The proposed data collection for Partnership Program Research will assist the Census Bureau by (1) identifying the enhancers, incentives, and barriers to maintaining partner relationships over time; (2) investigating the rationales behind organizations refusing to participate in the Partnership Program; and (3) identifying the specific improvements to the Partnership Program that will lead to more engagement by Partnership organizations.

The Census Bureau needs to collect and analyze qualitative data to address the following research questions:

(a) How can the Partnership program be improved and the partnerships be maintained in the future during the intercensal years as well as for the 2020 Census?

(b) What metrics can be used to monitor and assess the impact of the Partnership Program in the intercensal years and for the 2020 Census?

Essentially, the research for which data collection approval is being sought seeks to inform the future direction, composition, and maintenance of this outreach program for the next eight or nine years, in preparation for the 2020 Census.

The Census Bureau proposes to collect qualitative data via six focus groups and 30 individual interviews among national Partnership Program participant organizations. The Census Bureau intends to ask program participants about ways the program can be improved, and ways in which their own participation can be enhanced in future years. The resulting qualitative data will be used by Census Bureau management staff to create recommendations for program redesign in order to improve the program in the years leading to the next Census.

Affected Public: Business or other for-profit; not-for-profit institutions; State, local or Tribal governments.

Frequency: One time.

Respondent's Obligation: Voluntary.

Legal Authority: Title 13 U.S.C., Sections 141 and 193.

OMB Desk Officer: Brian Harris-Kojetin, (202) 395–7314.

Copies of the above information collection proposal can be obtained by calling or writing Diana Hynek, Departmental Paperwork Clearance Officer, (202) 482–0266, Department of Commerce, Room 6616, 14th and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230 (or via the Internet at *dhynek@doc.gov*).

Written comments and recommendations for the proposed information collection should be sent within 30 days of publication of this notice to Brian Harris-Kojetin, OMB Desk Officer either by fax (202–395–7245) or e-mail (*bharrisk@omb.eop.gov*).

Dated: March 11, 2011.

Glenna Mickelson,

Management Analyst, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 2011–6119 Filed 3–15–11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–07–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Proposed Information Collection for Focus Groups and One-on-One Interviews

AGENCY: Office of Response and Restoration, Assessment and Restoration Division and the Office of Habitat Conservation, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Notice and request for comments on Proposed Information Collection for Focus Groups and One-on-one Interviews for the Elwha River Dam Removal and Floodplain Restoration Ecosystem Service Valuation Pilot Project located on the north central part of the Olympic Peninsula of Washington State.

SUMMARY: As required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, we will ask the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to approve the Information Collection (IC) to conduct focus groups and one-on-one interviews, described below. We invite the general public and Federal agencies to comment on this proposed IC.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For further information, please contact Dr. Anthony Dvarskas by telephone at 732–872–3090, or by e-mail at *Anthony.Dvarskas@noaa.gov.* You may also contact Dr. Peter Edwards by telephone at 301–713–2325 ext. 210 or by e-mail at *Peter.Edwards@noaa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Abstract

NOAA is requesting approval for a new IC to conduct focus groups and one-on-one interviews to develop and test the Elwha River Dam Removal and Floodplain Restoration Ecosystem Service Valuation Survey.

The planned removal of two hydroelectric dams on the Elwha River would be one of the largest dam-removal projects in U.S. history. This project, along with restoration actions planned for the floodplain and drained reservoir basins, would have numerous impacts to people of the surrounding region. Impacted groups include recreators who engage in river activities such as fishing and rafting, reservoir users, and members of American Indian Tribes for whom the river has cultural, environmental, and economic significance. The dam removal and restoration actions could also have value to people throughout the Pacific Northwest and the United States, regardless of whether they visit the Elwha River or Olympic Peninsula. Such nonuse value may be significant because the dam removal and habitat restoration will restore the river to more natural conditions and will restore threatened and endangered populations of salmon and other fish species. This project will also address an important gap in research on indirect and nonuse values provided by habitat restoration and protection.

A study of the value of ecological restoration is of particular interest in this location because significant baseline ecological data are available to allow a comparison of ecological values with some of the more obvious use losses associated with the reservoir.

The ability to link results of the study to precise measures of ecosystem changes will be useful in applying the study to future restoration sites, enabling NOAA to evaluate a broader range of ecosystem services provided by future restoration actions.

A nonmarket valuation survey of the U.S. public and members of the Lower Elwha Klallam Tribe will be developed and implemented. To ensure the survey questions and policy scenarios presented in this survey are accurate, easily understood, and the least burdensome, it is important to test the survey with small focus groups and in one-on-one interviews.

II. Method of Collection

Information will be collected through 12 focus groups, 2 stakeholder meetings and 24 one-on-one interviews.

III. Data

Title: Elwha River Dam Removal and Floodplain Restoration Ecosystem Service Valuation Pilot Project.

OMB Control Number: 0648–xxxx.

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

Affected Entities: Individuals or households.

Frequency of Response: One time.

Respondent's Obligation: Voluntary.

Annual Reporting and Record-keeping Burden:

Estimated Number of Respondents Annually: 156 (120 for focus groups, 12 for stakeholder meetings, and 24 for one-on-one interviews).

Estimated Burden per Response: 2 hours for focus groups and stakeholder meetings, and 1 hour for one-on-one interviews.

Total Annual Reporting: 300.

Estimated Total Annual Cost to Public: $0.

IV. Request for Comments

We invite comments concerning this IC on: (1) Whether the collection of information is necessary, including whether the information will have practical utility; (2) the accuracy of our estimate of the burden for this collection of information; (3) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (4) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents.

Comments that you submit in response to this notice are a matter of public record. We will include or summarize each comment in our request to OMB to approve this IC. Before including your address, phone number, e-mail address, or other personal identifying information in your comment, you should be aware that your entire comment, including your personal identifying information, may be made publicly available at any time. Although you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Dated: March 3, 2011.

David G. Westerholm,

Director, Office of Response and Restoration, National Ocean Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

[FR Doc. 2011–6062 Filed 3–15–11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–JE–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Bureau of the Census

Census Scientific Advisory Committee

AGENCY: Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of public meeting.

SUMMARY: The Bureau of the Census (U.S. Census Bureau) is giving notice of a meeting of the Census Scientific Advisory Committee (C–SAC). The Committee will address policy, research, and technical issues relating to a full range of Census Bureau programs and activities, including communications, decennial, demographic, economic, field operations, geographic, information technology, and statistics. Last minute changes to the agenda are possible, which could prevent giving advance public notice of schedule adjustments.

DATES: April 7 and 8, 2011. On April 7, the meeting will begin at approximately 9 a.m. and adjourn at approximately 5 p.m. On April 8, the meeting will begin at approximately 8:30 a.m. and adjourn at 12 p.m.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held at the U.S. Census Bureau Conference Center, 4600 Silver Hill Road, Suitland, Maryland 20746.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jeri Green, Committee Liaison Officer, U.S. Department of Commerce, U.S. Census Bureau, Room 8H182, 4600 Silver Hill Road, Washington, DC 20233, telephone 301–763–6590. For TTY callers, please use the Federal Relay Service 1–800–877–8339.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Members of the C–SAC are appointed by the Director, U.S. Census Bureau. The Committee provides scientific and technical expertise, as appropriate, to address U.S. Census Bureau program needs and objectives. The Committee has been established in accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Title 5, United States Code, Appendix 2, Section 10).

The meeting is open to the public, and a brief period is set aside for public comments and questions. Persons with extensive questions or statements must submit them in writing at least three days before the meeting to the Committee Liaison Officer named above. If you plan to attend the meeting, please register by Monday, April 4, 2011. You may access the online registration form with the following link: *http://www.regonline.com/csacapr2011.* Seating is available to the public on a first-come, first-served basis.

This meeting is physically accessible to people with disabilities. Requests for sign language interpretation or other auxiliary aids should also be directed to the Committee Liaison Officer as soon as known, and preferably two weeks prior to the meeting.

Dated: March 10, 2011.

Robert M. Groves,

Director, Bureau of the Census.

[FR Doc. 2011–6140 Filed 3–15–11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–07–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

United States Integrated Ocean Observing System Advisory Committee

AGENCY: National Ocean Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Department of Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of Establishment of and Membership Solicitation for the United States Integrated Ocean Observing System Advisory Committee.

SUMMARY: The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) has established and is soliciting applications for membership on the United States Integrated Ocean Observing System Advisory Committee (the Committee), a Federal advisory committee. The Integrated Coastal and Ocean Observation System (ICOOS) Act of 2009 establishes a national integrated System of ocean, coastal, and Great Lakes observing systems, comprised of