

NOTICE OF OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET ACTION

Date 01/05/2012

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

In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act, OMB has taken action on your request received 08/05/2011

ACTION REQUESTED: New collection (Request for a new OMB Control Number)
TYPE OF REVIEW REQUESTED: Regular
ICR REFERENCE NUMBER: 201106-0648-013
AGENCY ICR TRACKING NUMBER:
TITLE: Defining Target Levels for Ecosystem Targets: A Socio-Ecological Approach
LIST OF INFORMATION COLLECTIONS: See next page

OMB ACTION: Approved with change
OMB CONTROL NUMBER: 0648-0641

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

EXPIRATION DATE: 01/31/2015

DISCONTINUE DATE:

BURDEN:	RESPONSES	HOURS	COSTS
Previous	0	0	0
New	1,000	250	0
Difference			
Change due to New Statute	0	0	0
Change due to Agency Discretion	1,000	250	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
NOAA - Puget Sound Coastal Restoration Survey	NA	NOAA - Puget Sound Coastal Restoration Survey	

PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT SUBMISSION

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

1. Agency/Subagency originating request	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. <input type="checkbox"/> P Individuals or households d. <input type="checkbox"/> Farms b. <input type="checkbox"/> Business or other for-profit e. <input type="checkbox"/> Federal Government c. <input type="checkbox"/> Not-for-profit institutions f. <input type="checkbox"/> 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. <input type="checkbox"/> Application for benefits e. <input type="checkbox"/> Program planning or management b. <input type="checkbox"/> Program evaluation f. <input type="checkbox"/> Research c. <input type="checkbox"/> General purpose statistics g. <input type="checkbox"/> Regulatory or compliance d. <input type="checkbox"/> 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
DEFINING TARGET LEVELS FOR ECOSYSTEM COMPONENTS:
A SOCIO-ECOLOGICAL APPROACH
OMB CONTROL NO. 0648-XXXX**

This request is for clearance related to a one-time administration of social science questions concerning the human dimensions of the Puget Sound ecosystem and its restoration goals.

A. JUSTIFICATION

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

The creation of the [Puget Sound Partnership](#) (PSP) allowed for a group of private and public entities, local citizens, tribes and businesses to begin to collectively work toward restoring the ecological health of the Puget Sound. Restoration of the Puget Sound's ecological health has been identified as a state-level priority within Washington State. With the PSP's inception, the Puget Sound ecosystem has become a national example of ecosystem-based management (EBM) implementation. The Partnership's 2008 "[Action Agenda](#)" identified 80 near-term actions that are required for ecosystem recovery. These actions, however, will require specific performance measures. In concert with the PSP's evolution, NMFS research partners at the Northwest Fisheries Science Center, partnering with the State of Washington, have begun an effort to develop these performance measures. The goal of the proposed study is to develop and implement an approach for identifying scientifically rigorous ecosystem targets that explicitly considers social perspectives.

For this reason, the Northwest Fisheries Science Center seeks to conduct social norm analyses which involve a survey of Puget Sound community stakeholders (residents of one of the twelve counties associated with the Puget Sound). Stakeholders will be asked, via a random digit dial (RDD) telephone survey, a series of general questions regarding their views on the Puget Sound environment and the desirability of a range of potential ecosystem conditions for the Puget Sound.

Information collected under this clearance will include demographic variables, economic data, resource governance and use patterns, data on cultural linkages between resource users and the resource as well as data related to other coastal activities that influence the social sustainability of living marine resource use.

The aforementioned Puget Sound Partnership "Action Agenda" sets out concrete interventions and activities for Puget Sound, including many that are required by state and federal laws like the Endangered Species Act. Although there is language in these statutes that requires consideration of social as well as ecological considerations to guide restoration decision making, state and federal authorities have limited social science data from which to make these decisions. The proposed survey will provide a source of quantitative data regarding Puget Sound residents' views about different restoration options, collected to be statistically viable and predictive. Because the design of the project explicitly links social and ecological information, we can assess the acceptability and support for different types of ecological restoration activities that

ecologists suggest are needed based on their data. Previously, the social perspectives that have been included with ecological data have been anecdotal in nature. This survey will provide quantitative data from a sample of residents of the Puget Sound region, utilizing a survey and methodology constructed to develop a sample that is as representative as possible. Rigorous social data is as necessary for policy making and environmental management as ecological data is. This is where our survey will be particularly valuable. , the results will help to ensure that social perspectives are included and considered in Puget Sound policy processes,

The overall purpose of collecting these data is to develop stakeholder-based societal inputs relative to the restoration of the Puget Sound, but these survey data will also increase the capacity of NOAA to respond effectively to relevant mandates and executive orders that guide social science activities (NEPA, MFCMA, and Executive Order (EO) 12898).

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.

Information will be collected for this one-time survey, using a random digit dial (RDD) telephone survey and will be disseminated, in an aggregate form (with no personally identifiable information attached), to the public upon request. The information will be used to develop normative sociological analyses by Northwest Fisheries Science Center (NWFSC) scientists and their survey research partners, and these analyses will also be disseminated to the public in the form of *interpreted products*, including technical memoranda and peer-reviewed publications. Such products will be developed in conjunction with the associated research project. Research partners at the University of New Hampshire's survey research center, The Carsey Institute (<http://www.carseyinstitute.unh.edu/>), will administer the data collection tool over a period of weeks, until 1000 respondents have been contacted. This is the only period over which the survey will be conducted. The written form of the survey ensures that the survey is reproducible, and the Carsey Institute's experience in implementing surveys of this nature will help to insure that the quality of the information collected, at the level of raw data, meet NOAA's Information Quality Guidelines. For example, the Carsey Institute has produced publications based on similar research for Southeast Alaska (*Enduring Ties to Community and Nature: Charting an Alternative Future for Southeast Alaska* Ulrich, 2011, Issue Brief No. 22), Northern Michigan (*How Yoopers See the Future of their Communities: Why Residents Leave or Stay in Michigan's Upper Peninsula* Ulrich, 2010, Policy Brief No. 17) and rural areas more generally (*Environmental, Economic, and Social Changes in Rural America Visible in Survey Data and Satellite Images* Hartter and Colocousis, 2011, Issue Brief No. 23).

Specifically, each question in the proposed survey is designed to elicit certain data of direct benefit to the ecological restoration goals of the Puget Sound Partnership and to the ecological modeling efforts underway at the Northwest Fisheries Science Center.

In the first few pages of the survey instrument as well as later in the survey (p. 3-6 as well as 7-10 and 13-14), there are a series of questions that relate to respondents' views about 1) the current status of social and ecological conditions in the Puget Sound region and 2) the most

important uses of coastal resources. These questions provide an important framework for understanding how beliefs about current conditions as compared to other factors such as normative orientations influence residents' views about ecological restoration approaches and alternatives, including those approaches that may be designed and implemented by the Puget Sound Partnership.

Another set of questions (p. 6-7) are some of the first normative questions that begin to elicit factors that might predict or influence residents' views about the environment and restoration. These are questions about, for example, the respondent's trust in government as opposed to business and the respondents' access to scientific information.

On pages 10-13 of the survey instrument, there are a series of trade off and restoration activity related questions. These are based on the specific actions identified in the Puget Sound Partnership's "Action Agenda." Through the responses to these questions, our project will determine relative support for these activities as well as predictors of why some segments of the population might be more or less likely to support these different activities.

On page 14, there are questions about support and trust in science and the science of climate change. These are important to include in order to understand how broader discussions of environmental issues such as climate change influence normative orientations and support for restoration activities. Climate change mitigation is one of the top priorities in the "Action Agenda" and it is also important to consider how broader environmental concerns might shape residents' views about "local" environmental concerns such as coastal restoration. In general, questions on pages 14-18 are about trust in specific governmental policies and approaches to restoration. As the implementing agency, the Puget Sound Partnership has not only a series of different restoration alternatives that it can use, but also policy tools and approaches that will frame implementation. The series of questions on pages 14-18 are questions that enable us to determine whether it is not only the particular restoration activity, reduction of lawn-based fertilizer use for example, but also whether support or opposition is based on the way this activity is implemented. For example, implementation could be required by law or supported through financial incentives, both of which constitute definitively distinct and available approaches.

The final questions in the proposed survey, on pages 18-25, all relate to elements we will use in our models as predictor variables. These will enable us to examine how different segments of the population appear to think about coastal environmental concerns, different restoration alternatives, and appropriate governmental approaches for achieving environmental objectives.

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. 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.

The information described in the survey will be entirely collected through the use of random digit dial telephone contacts. Carsey Institute staff will conduct the survey over the telephone, following the written survey instrument and adhering to all protocols that have been developed during the Carsey Institute's nine years of social survey implementation (<http://www.carseyinstitute.unh.edu/CERA/cera-home.html>).

4. Describe efforts to identify duplication.

The social scientists at the NWFSC work closely with regional academics, community based organizations, industry groups and other parties interested in this type of information. Reviews of existing information are common practice when initiating social science studies. A thorough literature review has been completed and we are fairly confident there is no duplication. An overall strategic research plan will also guide this process and ensure that all data collected is relevant, new and essential for achieving NMFS social science goals. The NMFS point of contact for this research, Karma Norman, also serves on the Partnership for Puget Sound (PSP)'s Social Science and Social Strategies Advisory Committee, so he keeps informed of the Partnership's activities and has verified with the organization that they have not commenced or planned duplicative social research efforts.

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

The study is designed to survey individual respondents – at the household level - regarding a range of demographic information, and the respondents are not anticipated to be small businesses. Small business contacts which occur as part of the Random Digit Dial (RDD) process will be excluded from participation. The random samples used in the RDD process will be purchased from Scientific Telephone Surveys (STS), of Fort Hill Ranch, California. STS screens each selected telephone number to eliminate non-working numbers, disconnected numbers, and business numbers to improve the efficiency of the sample, reducing the amount of time interviewers spend calling non-usable numbers. Only the minimum data necessary for the research are requested and the estimated time for the completion of the survey is 15 minutes per individual.

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

Without current information on the human dimensions of fisheries and coastal use practices, NMFS and the Regional Councils will be unable to adequately understand and predict the potential impacts of policy decisions on people, particularly those people who do not regularly attend public meetings, but are nonetheless affected by the decisions.

The federal mandates and executive orders described in Section A of this document require the analysis of the impacts that government actions have on the individuals and communities involved in fishing and coastal related activities. Social impacts assessment, analysis of the affected human environment, cumulative impacts as well as the distribution of impacts with a special emphasis on vulnerable or at risk communities are all examples of these requirements. The ability of the NWFSC Social Scientists to adequately respond to this charge rests on access to timely and relevant information about the stakeholders involved. Currently, social scientists are largely dependent on data limited to fishing vessels, captains, owners and dealers. Although in recent years, partly as the result of increased funding and staffing capacity, more studies have been developed, apart from isolated studies, existing information does not include research on a broader set of stakeholders.

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

The collection will be 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 March 9, 2011 (76 FR 12942) solicited public comments on this survey.

One comment was received in response to this notice. A faculty member in an environmentally-oriented academic department requested copies of the survey instrument, grant proposal and contact information for the relevant government agencies, including the Puget Sound Partnership and the Northwest Fisheries Science Center. Center scientists have been in contact with him in order to provide him with hard copy versions of all requested documents.

Through our work with Puget Sound Partnership and the Principal Investigator's service on the Puget Sound Partnership's Social Science and Social Strategies Committee, the survey and concomitant approach have been discussed and reviewed by interested peers. Moreover, because funds for this research project originate with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the project is subject to the EPA's Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP) standards, which specify that each phase of the project and all included data collection efforts are subject to EPA review.

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

No payments or gifts are planned for respondents.

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

As stated in the survey script, the data collected will be kept confidential as required by section 402(b) of the Magnuson-Stevens and [NOAA Administrative Order 216-100](#), Confidentiality of Fisheries Statistics, and will not be released for public use except in aggregate statistical form without identification of sources.

Further, the nature of a Random Digit Dial (RDD) telephone survey ensures that survey staff is collecting data from survey respondents without reference to the respondents' names, specific locations or other indentifying characteristics. The RDD telephone survey approach renders respondent participation in the survey both anonymous and entirely voluntary.

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.

There are two different areas where issues of a potentially sensitive nature will be explored. These are listed and discussed below:

1. Ethnicity and Race: Questions of ethnicity and race are often useful in determining potential environmental justice issues where certain groups are more negatively impacted by governmental regulations than others. Questions submitted for approval comply with federal standards and follow the US Census approach.
2. Employment and economic status: Similarly, questions regarding employment and income are often useful in determining potential environmental justice issues, as well as allowing for standard demographic analyses. Questions submitted for approval comply with OMB regulations and follow the US Census approach.

The Random Digit Dial (RDD) nature of the survey methodology ensures confidentiality with regard to both of these sensitive areas.

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

The total burden hours are projected at 250, all of which will be incurred during a single time period. No follow-up surveys are anticipated or planned. At 15 minutes per respondent, with a total of 1000 respondents, the total cost to the public in terms of burden hours is 250 hours. Response time includes not only the time necessary for respondents to answer the questions, but also the time needed to make the initial contact. Participants are not expected to spend time gathering information because the information sought is based on participants' personal experiences, perceptions and knowledge.

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).

The total cost burden to respondents is zero dollars. There are no start-up, capital, or maintenance costs associated with this collection. No new or specialized equipment is needed to respond to this collection.

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

The annualized cost to the Federal government for this research is estimated to be \$139,000. This cost is solely due to the cost for contract survey work to be conducted by the University of New Hampshire's Carsey Institute under the direction of Dr. Thomas Safford.

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.

The survey results are not intended for publication for statistical use by others. Data will be analyzed using standard social science quantitative and qualitative data analysis methods. Where possible and relevant, final reports and other relevant portions of the research process will be posted on the appropriate web site. Where relevant, the study in its entirety may be published as an internal report or in part may be submitted for publication in journals to encourage peer review of data collected through this process as well as to disseminate findings.

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.

The expiration date for OMB approval will be displayed on the forms; although since this is a telephone survey, information about the OMB number and expiration date will be provided verbally to survey respondents.

18. Explain each exception to the certification statement.

Not Applicable.

**SUPPORTING STATEMENT
 DEFINING TARGET LEVELS FOR ECOSYSTEM COMPONENTS:
 A SOCIO-ECOLOGICAL APPROACH
 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.

Region	Respondent Universe (Est.)*	Total Desired Responses	Response Rate (Est.) **	Number Contacted
Puget Sound (12 Washington State Counties)	3,701,000	1000	40%	2500

*Respondent universe is equal to the estimated adult population of the Puget Sound Region, using American Community Survey population data (<http://www.census.gov/acs/www/>) for the twelve counties of the region multiplied by the estimated percentage of the population (82.7%) that is 18 years or older.

**Estimated response rate based upon prior, similar work conducted by the Carsey Institute-University of New Hampshire

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.

A sample of households in the Puget Sound region will be selected by a procedure known as random digit dialing. First, with the aid of the computer, an area code is selected at random from within the selected geography (e.g., 206). Next, one of the three-digit telephone exchanges which are currently used in the area code (e.g., 772) is randomly selected. The computer then randomly selects one of the "working blocks"-- the first two of the last four numbers in a telephone number (e.g., 64) -- and attaches it to the randomly selected exchange. Finally, the computer program then generates a two-digit random number between 00 and 99 (e.g., 57) which is attached to the previously selected prefix (772), and the previously selected working block (64) resulting in a complete telephone number -- i.e., 206/772-6457. This procedure is then repeated numerous times by the computer to generate more random numbers, so that we have a

sufficient quantity to conduct the survey. The end result is that each household in the area in which there is a telephone has an equally likely chance of being selected into the sample.

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

Given the Carsey Institute's prior experiences implementing very similar surveys both in the Alaska region and in the Puget Sound region, we anticipate an estimated 40% response rate.

Using the questionnaire developed in conjunction with the NOAA project team, the UNH Survey Center will use the included Computer-Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) script, carry out all interviews, and provide an SPSS data file including all variable and value labels. Probability weights will be calculated to equalize the chances of a respondent being included in the study (by the number of adults in the household and the number of different telephone numbers on which the household can be reached), and make adjustments based on the sex of the respondent, the respondents race, and respondent age to account for known biases in telephone surveys.

All interviews will be conducted by UNH Survey Center interviewers from a centrally supervised location in Huddleston Hall, on the UNH Durham campus. The Survey Center has a 32-station CATI center using WinCati software. This software provides for extreme flexibility in programming complex questionnaires including skip patterns, question and response rotation, and split ballot experimentation as well as excellent scheduling capacities to ensure that selected telephone numbers are called on multiple dates and at multiple times. The Survey Center also uses an 800 number for respondents to contact the Survey Center at convenient times. All of these procedures are designed to ensure high completion rates. Prior research has shown that response rates are higher when a research project has university sponsorship than when conducted solely commercial organization (even with NOAA sponsorship as well).

All Survey Center interviewers have been trained on the use of the Survey Center's CATI system and have extensive experience in telephone surveys. In addition, all interviewers will be additionally trained on the NOAA restoration survey to ensure they fully understand the questionnaire. All interviewers have signed confidentiality statements about sharing survey data with other people and the entire process will be reviewed and approved by the UNH Institutional Review Board (IRB). Telephone interviewers are paid on an hourly basis, NOT on a per-interview basis, as we emphasize quality of data over speed of completing the project.

An average of 8 call attempts will be made to each randomly selected number to ensure high response rates. All initial refusals will be re-contacted by senior interviewers and we anticipate that 20–30% of these conversion attempts will result in completed interviews. The average response rate for similar social-environmental surveys conducted by UNH Survey Center has been 40%. Analysis of U.S. Census data will be used to ensure that survey respondents are representative of the underlying populations in the target counties in Washington. Probability weights will be employed to allow for minor adjustments toward a representative age-sex-race

distribution, and also compensate for household-size bias inherent in the two-step random selection.

Questions about political party affiliation and income will be posed at the close of the survey in order to maximize participation. Such questions are more likely to lend themselves to non-response, which is why the question order has been constructed with those more sensitive questions arriving at the end. In terms of bias by political party affiliation, we can compare survey respondents to actual registered voters by party, including those who identify as independent or “non-affiliated.” These data are available at the county level from the state and can therefore be used for weighting purposes.

Generally speaking, while questions about party may decrease the total number of respondents we can use in our analysis due to question refusals, the University of New Hampshire Survey Center has not found in other surveys that particular political parties are less likely to respond to their surveys in general. In terms of questions about income, which also has higher rate of question refusal as compared to other questions, we will use census data for weighting our respondent results..

Table 1 displays survey information from recent environment-related surveys completed by the Carsey Institute (UNH Survey Center), related to the Communities and the Environment in Rural America project (CERA) including the field period for each region, the number of completed interviews, and the response rate. The survey will use similar questions and be of the same length, making these an accurate benchmark for assessing potential response rates for the survey. Response rates are calculated using the standard developed by the American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR).¹ The predicted AAPOR response rate of 40% was used because of the overlap of telephone exchanges across geographies in each of the regions. The formula to calculate AAPOR response rate is:

$$\frac{I}{((I+P) + (R+NC+O) + e(UH+UO))}$$

I=Complete Interviews, **P**=Partial Interviews, **R**=Refusal and break off, **NC**=Non Contact, **O**=Other, **e**=estimated portion of cases of unknown eligibility that are eligible, **UH**=Unknown household, **UO**=Unknown other.

Table 1
Communities and the Environment in Rural America

State	Year	Survey Period	Response Rate
Louisiana	2010	7/29/2010 – 9/11/2010	38.0 %
Florida	2010	8/3/2010 – 9/30/2010	41.0%
Alaska	2010	6/22/2010 – 8/2/2010	40.1%
Washington	2010	10/13/2010 – 11/15/2010	36.5%

Weighting of the Data

¹ For a discussion of the importance of understanding non-response and calculation of response rates, see Groves, Robert (2006) “Non-response Rates and Non-response Biases in Household Surveys,” *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 70(5):646-675.

To avoid biasing the sample in favor of households which can be reached through more than one telephone number, each case should be weighted inversely to its probability of being included in the sample. In addition, the data should be weighted to correct for sampling biases due to size of household (i.e., number of adults living in the household). Finally, the data should be weighted to correct for potential sampling biases on the sex of the respondent, using 2010 U.S. Census figures.

Sampling Error

This survey, like all surveys, will be subject to sampling error due to the fact that all residents in the area were not interviewed. For those questions asked of one thousand (1000) or so respondents, the error is +/-3.1%. For those questions where fewer than 1000 persons responded, the sampling error can be calculated as follows:

$$\text{Sampling error} = \pm (1.96) \frac{\sqrt{P(1-P)}}{\sqrt{N}}$$

Where **P** is the percentage of responses in the answer category being evaluated and **N** is the total number of persons answering the particular question.

For example, suppose you had the following distribution of answers to the question, "Should the state spend more money to restore Puget Sound even if that means higher taxes?" Assume 1,000 respondents answered the question as follows:

YES	- 47%
NO	- 48%
DON'T KNOW	- 5%

The sampling error for the "YES" percentage of 47% would be

$$\pm(1.96) \frac{\sqrt{(47)(53)}}{\sqrt{1,000}} = \pm 3.1\%;$$

for the "NO" percentage of 48% it would be

$$\pm(1.96) \frac{\sqrt{(48)(52)}}{\sqrt{1,000}} = \pm 3.1\%;$$

and for the "DON'T KNOW" percentage of 5% it would be

$$\pm(1.96) \frac{\sqrt{(5)(95)}}{\sqrt{1,000}} = \pm 1.4\%;$$

In this case we would expect the true population figures to be within the following ranges:

YES 43.9% - 50.1% (i.e., 47% +/-3.1%)
NO 44.9% - 51.1% (i.e., 48% +/-3.1%)
DON'T KNOW 3.6% - 6.4% (i.e., 5% +/-1.4%)

These weighting protocols will be used to ensure that statistical analyses conducted using data from the Determining Target Levels for Ecosystem Components survey will be valid.

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.

Given the Carsey Institute's prior experience with the implementation of similar surveys, no survey testing will be conducted.

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.

Dr. Thomas Safford
Assistant Professor of Sociology
Department of Sociology
417 Horton Social Science Center
The University of New Hampshire
Durham, NH 03824
Phone: (603) 862-1876
Fax: (603) 862-3558
E-mail: tom.safford@unh.edu

University of New Hampshire Survey Center
The Carsey Institute
73 Main Street, Huddleston Hall
The University of New Hampshire
Durham, NH 03824
603-862-2821 (P)
603-862-3878 (fax)
Carsey.Institute@unh.edu

NOAA – PUGET SOUND COASTAL RESTORATION SURVEY

INTRO:

"Hello, my name is _____ and I'm calling from the UNH Survey Center on behalf of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). We are conducting a short, confidential study of communities and the environment in the Puget Sound region. We would like to talk with you for a few minutes, to help us understand what is going on in your community and how it affects you and your family. The OMB approval number for this survey is ___ and the expiration date on this survey is ___."

- 1 CONTINUE WITH INTERVIEW
- 2 APPOINTMENT

- 99 REFUSED

BUSTEL

"Is this a residential phone or one used for a business?"

- 1 – Residential (continue with interview)
- 2 – Business (terminate survey – out of scope)
- 99 - Refused

"In order to determine whom to interview, could you tell me, of the adults aged 18 or older who currently live in your household -- including yourself -- who had the most recent birthday? I don't mean who is the youngest, but rather, who had the most recent birthday?"

- 1 INFORMANT →SKIP TO SEX
- 2 SOMEONE ELSE (SPECIFY): _____ → SKIP TO INT2
- 3 DON'T KNOW (DK) ALL BIRTHDAYS, ONLY SOME → CONTINUE WITH BIR2 BELOW
- 4 DON'T KNOW (DK) ANY BIRTHDAYS OTHER THAN OWN → SKIP TO SEX

- * 99 REFUSED -- ENTER NON-RESPONSE INFORMATION

BIR2

"Of the ones that you do know, who had the most recent birthday?"

- 1 INFORMANT _____ → SKIP TO SEX
- 2 SOMEONE ELSE (SPECIFY): _____ → GO TO INT2
- 3 PERSON NOT AVAILABLE
- 99 REFUSED

INT2

ASK TO SPEAK TO THAT PERSON

"Hello, my name is _____ and I'm calling for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). We are conducting a short, confidential study of communities and the environment in the Puget Sound region. The area where you live is one of several chosen for our study, and we would really appreciate your help and cooperation. You have been identified as the adult in your household who had the most recent birthday. Is this correct?"

	1	YES
	2	APPOINTMENT
*	99	REFUSED

Q:SEX

"Thank you very much for helping us with this important study. We really appreciate your help. Before we begin I want to assure you that all of your answers are strictly confidential. They will be combined with answers from other people from across the region. Your telephone number was randomly selected from all households in this part of Washington. This call may be monitored for quality assurance."

"Participation is voluntary. If you decide to participate, you may decline to answer any question or end the interview at any time."

IF ASKED - "This survey will take about 15 minutes to complete."

RECORD SEX OF RESPONDENT

	1	MALE
	2	FEMALE
	98	DON'T KNOW (DK)
	99	REFUSED

Q:AGE

"To start off, what is your current age?"

(RECORD EXACT NUMBER OF YEARS OLD -- E.G., 45)

	96	NINETY-SIX YEARS OF AGE OR OLDER
	98	DK
	99	REFUSED

Q:COUNTY

"What county do you live in?"

	1	CLALLAM
	2	ISLAND
	3	JEFFERSON
	4	KING
	5	KITSAP
	6	MASON
	7	PIERCE
	8	SAN JUAN

- 9 SKAGIT
- 10 SNOHOMISH
- 11 THURSTON
- 12 WHATCOM

- 97 OTHER -----TERMINATE (Code as out of scope)
- 98 DK -----TERMINATE (Code as out of scope)
- 99 REFUSED -----TERMINATE

SKIP TO LIVED

Q:LIVED

"How many years have you lived in this area?"

IF "ALL MY LIFE" ASK -- "About how many years is that?"

RECORD EXACT NUMBER OF YEARS OF RESIDENCE

- 1 ONE YEAR OR LESS
- 96 96 YEARS OR MORE

- 98 DK
- 99 REFUSED

Q:H2ODIST

"How close to you live to one of Puget Sound's waters, like a river, bay, creak, or stream (READ LIST)

- 1 ONE BLOCK OR LESS
- 2 LESS THAN ONE MILE
- 3 ONE TO FIVE MILES
- 4 FIVE MILES OR MORE

- 98 DK / UNSURE
- 99 REFUSED

Q:LEAV

"Looking ahead, do you expect to continue living in this area for the next 5 years, or move somewhere else?"

- 1 EXPECT TO STAY HERE NEXT 5 YEARS
- 2 EXPECT TO MOVE AWAY WITHIN 5 YEARS

- 98 DK - DO NOT PROBE
- 99 REFUSED

Q:NEWJ2

"Job or employment opportunities"

READ IF NECESSARY: "Does this seem ... very important, somewhat important, or not important among your reasons for staying here or moving away?"

- 1 VERY IMPORTANT REASON FOR ME TO STAY HERE OR MOVE
- 2 SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT REASON FOR ME TO STAY HERE OR MOVE
- 3 NOT IMPORTANT REASON FOR ME TO STAY HERE OR MOVE / DOESN'T APPLY

- 98 DK - DO NOT PROBE
- 99 REFUSED

Q:REC2

"Outdoors or other recreational opportunities."

READ IF NECESSARY: "Does this seem ... very important, somewhat important, or not important among your reasons for staying here or moving away?"

- 1 VERY IMPORTANT REASON FOR ME TO STAY HERE OR MOVE
- 2 SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT REASON FOR ME TO STAY HERE OR MOVE
- 3 NOT IMPORTANT REASON FOR ME TO STAY HERE OR MOVE / DOESN'T APPLY

- 98 DK - DO NOT PROBE
- 99 REFUSED

Q:BEAU2

"Natural beauty of the area."

READ IF NECESSARY: "Does this seem ... very important, somewhat important, or not important among your reasons for staying here or moving away?"

- 1 VERY IMPORTANT REASON FOR ME TO STAY HERE OR MOVE
- 2 SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT REASON FOR ME TO STAY HERE OR MOVE
- 3 NOT IMPORTANT REASON FOR ME TO STAY HERE OR MOVE / DOESN'T APPLY

- 98 DK - DO NOT PROBE
- 99 REFUSED

Q: ED1A

"I'm going to read you a list of different types of economic development. For each, please tell me how important you think this form of development is for your community's future:"

“Tourism and recreation?”

READ IF NECESSARY: "Does this seem ... very important, somewhat important, or not important to increasing economic opportunities in your community?"

- 1 VERY IMPORTANT FOR COMMUNITY'S FUTURE
- 2 SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT FOR COMMUNITY'S FUTURE
- 3 NOT IMPORTANT FOR COMMUNITY'S FUTURE / DOESN'T APPLY

- 98 DK - DO NOT PROBE
- 99 REFUSED

Q: ED1B

“Forest-based industries such as logging, pulp and paper, and lumber production?”

READ IF NECESSARY: "Does this seem ... very important, somewhat important, or not important to increasing economic opportunities in your community?"

- 1 VERY IMPORTANT FOR COMMUNITY'S FUTURE
- 2 SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT FOR COMMUNITY'S FUTURE
- 3 NOT IMPORTANT FOR COMMUNITY'S FUTURE / DOESN'T APPLY

- 98 DK - DO NOT PROBE
- 99 REFUSED

Q: WIND

“Wind-powered electricity generation?”

READ IF NECESSARY: "Does this seem ... very important, somewhat important, or not important to increasing economic opportunities in your community?"

- 1 VERY IMPORTANT FOR COMMUNITY'S FUTURE
- 2 SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT FOR COMMUNITY'S FUTURE
- 3 NOT IMPORTANT FOR COMMUNITY'S FUTURE / DOESN'T APPLY

- 98 DK - DO NOT PROBE
- 99 REFUSED

Q: FISH

“Fishing and fish processing?”

READ IF NECESSARY: "Does this seem ... not important ... somewhat

important ... or very important to increasing economic opportunities
in your community?

"

- 1 VERY IMPORTANT FOR COMMUNITY'S FUTURE
- 2 SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT FOR COMMUNITY'S FUTURE
- 3 NOT IMPORTANT FOR COMMUNITY'S FUTURE / DOESN'T APPLY

- 98 DK - DO NOT PROBE
- 99 REFUSED

Q: AQUA

"Aquaculture or fish farming?"

READ IF NECESSARY: "Does this seem ... very important, somewhat important, or not important to increasing economic opportunities in your community?"

- 1 VERY IMPORTANT FOR COMMUNITY'S FUTURE
- 2 SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT FOR COMMUNITY'S FUTURE
- 3 NOT IMPORTANT FOR COMMUNITY'S FUTURE / DOESN'T APPLY

- 98 DK - DO NOT PROBE
- 99 REFUSED

Q: BUSTRST (Trust in Business)

"Which of the following statements comes closer to your view..."

- 1 "Many businesses can be trusted to take good care of the nation's natural resources, and the government should intervene only in the worst cases."
- 2 "Many businesses will cut corners and damage the environment unless strong government rules and regulations are in place."

- 98 UNSURE / DK - DO NOT PROBE
- 99 REFUSED

Q: EVRKNW (Environmental Knowledge)

"Let's change the subject for a moment... Thinking about environmental problems facing Puget Sound, how well do you feel you understand these issues – would you say very well, fairly well, not very well, or not at all?"

- 1 VERY WELL

- 2 FAIRLY WELL
- 3 NOT VERY WELL
- 4 NOT AT ALL

- 98 DK/UNSURE
- 99 REFUSED

Q:PSPROG (Puget Sound Progress)

“How much progress have we made in dealing with environmental problems in Puget Sound in the past few decades – say since 1970? Would you say we have made a great deal of progress, only some progress, or hardly any progress at all?”

- 1 A GREAT DEAL OF PROGRESS
- 2 SOME PROGRESS
- 3 HARDLY ANY PROGRESS

- 98 DK/UNSURE
- 99 REFUSED

Q:ZONE

"Have conservation or environmental rules that restrict development generally been a good thing for your community, a bad thing, have they had no effect – OR ARE YOU UNSURE?"

- 1 CONSERVATION RULES HAVE BEEN A GOOD THING HERE
- 2 CONSERVATION RULES HAVE BEEN A BADD THING HERE
- 3 CONSERVATION RULES HAVE HAD NO EFFECT HERE

- 4 NO CONSERVATION RULES HERE - VOLUNTEERED

- 98 DK/UNSURE
- 99 REFUSED

Q:CUTTING

"Now I'm going to read a list of environmental issues that might be problems in some places in Washington. With regard to the place where YOU live, for each issue I'd like to know whether you think this has had no effect, had minor effects, or had major effects ON YOUR FAMILY OR COMMUNITY OVER THE PAST 5 YEARS?"

“Overharvesting or heavy cutting of timber?”

READ IF NECESSARY : "Do you think this has had no effect ... had minor effects ... or had major effects
ON YOUR FAMILY OR COMMUNITY OVER THE PAST 5 YEARS?"

- 1 HAD NO EFFECT ON YOUR FAMILY OR COMMUNITY
- 2 HAD MINOR EFFECTS ON YOUR FAMILY OR COMMUNITY
- 3 HAD MAJOR EFFECTS ON YOUR FAMILY OR COMMUNITY

- 98 DK - DO NOT PROBE
- 99 REFUSED

Q:OVERFISH

"Overfishing in the ocean"

READ IF NECESSARY: "Do you think this has had no effect ... had minor effects ... or had major effects
ON YOUR FAMILY OR COMMUNITY OVER THE PAST 5 YEARS?"

- 1 HAD NO EFFECT ON YOUR FAMILY OR COMMUNITY
- 2 HAD MINOR EFFECTS ON YOUR FAMILY OR COMMUNITY
- 3 HAD MAJOR EFFECTS ON YOUR FAMILY OR COMMUNITY

- 98 DK - DO NOT PROBE
- 99 REFUSED

Q:WATER1

"Water quality and pollution issues"

READ IF NECESSARY: "Do you think this has had no effect ... had minor effects ... or had major effects
ON YOUR FAMILY OR COMMUNITY OVER THE PAST 5 YEARS?"

- 1 HAD NO EFFECT ON YOUR FAMILY OR COMMUNITY
- 2 HAD MINOR EFFECTS ON YOUR FAMILY OR COMMUNITY
- 3 HAD MAJOR EFFECTS ON YOUR FAMILY OR COMMUNITY

- 98 DK - DO NOT PROBE
- 99 REFUSED

Q:WATER2

"Water supply problems"

READ IF NECESSARY : "Do you think this has had no effect ... had minor effects ... or had major effects
ON YOUR FAMILY OR COMMUNITY OVER THE PAST 5 YEARS?"

- 1 HAD NO EFFECT ON YOUR FAMILY OR COMMUNITY

- 2 HAD MINOR EFFECTS ON YOUR FAMILY OR COMMUNITY
- 3 HAD MAJOR EFFECTS ON YOUR FAMILY OR COMMUNITY

- 98 DK - DO NOT PROBE
- 99 REFUSED

Q:WARMING

"Global warming or climate change"

READ IF NECESSARY : "Do you think this has had no effect ... had minor effects ... or had major effects
ON YOUR FAMILY OR COMMUNITY OVER THE PAST 5 YEARS?"

- 1 HAD NO EFFECT ON YOUR FAMILY OR COMMUNITY
- 2 HAD MINOR EFFECTS ON YOUR FAMILY OR COMMUNITY
- 3 HAD MAJOR EFFECTS ON YOUR FAMILY OR COMMUNITY

- 98 DK - DO NOT PROBE
- 99 REFUSED

Q:SPRAWL

"Urban sprawl or rapid development of the countryside"

READ IF NECESSARY : "Do you think this has had no effect ... had minor effects ... or had major effects
ON YOUR FAMILY OR COMMUNITY OVER THE PAST 5 YEARS?"

- 1 HAD NO EFFECT ON YOUR FAMILY OR COMMUNITY
- 2 HAD MINOR EFFECTS ON YOUR FAMILY OR COMMUNITY
- 3 HAD MAJOR EFFECTS ON YOUR FAMILY OR COMMUNITY

- 98 DK - DO NOT PROBE
- 99 REFUSED

Q:LOSSCEN

"Loss of scenic natural beauty"

READ IF NECESSARY: "Do you think this has had no effect ... had minor effects ... or had major effects
ON YOUR FAMILY OR COMMUNITY OVER THE PAST 5 YEARS?"

- 1 HAD NO EFFECT ON YOUR FAMILY OR COMMUNITY
- 2 HAD MINOR EFFECTS ON YOUR FAMILY OR COMMUNITY
- 3 HAD MAJOR EFFECTS ON YOUR FAMILY OR COMMUNITY

- 98 DK - DO NOT PROBE
- 99 REFUSED

Q: HABITAT

"Loss of habitat for fish and wildlife"

READ IF NECESSARY : "Do you think this has had no effect ... had minor effects ... or had major effects ON YOUR FAMILY OR COMMUNITY OVER THE PAST 5 YEARS?"

- 1 HAD NO EFFECT ON YOUR FAMILY OR COMMUNITY
- 2 HAD MINOR EFFECTS ON YOUR FAMILY OR COMMUNITY
- 3 HAD MAJOR EFFECTS ON YOUR FAMILY OR COMMUNITY

- 98 DK - DO NOT PROBE
- 99 REFUSED

Q:FUTURE

"Let's change the subject for a moment. For the future of your community, do you think it is more important to use natural resources (forests, water, fish) to create jobs, or to conserve natural resources for future generations – or don't you have an opinion on this?"

- 1 USE NATURAL RESOURCES TO CREATE JOBS
- 2 CONSERVE NATURAL RESOURCES FOR THE FUTURE
- 3 CREATING JOBS AND CONSERVING RESOURCES ARE BOTH EQUALLY IMPORTANT

- 98 DK / UNSURE - DO NOT PROBE
- 99 REFUSED

Q: INDVGOV (Individuals and Government)

"If you had to choose, which is MORE important...?"

- 1 "The ability of individuals to do what they want with the land that they own"
- 2 "The ability of government to regulate residential and commercial development for the common good."

98 DK/UNSURE
99 REFUSED

Q: H2OAVL (Availability of water)

“When your local government is considering different water uses, which do you think is MORE important...”

1 “Ensuring sufficient water for industrial and housing development”
2 “Ensuring sufficient water for fish and wildlife”

98 DK/UNSURE
99 REFUSED

Q: SEPUPG (Septic Unit Upgrades)

“When considering changes to your home or property, would you agree or disagree with following....”

“I would pay to upgrade my septic system if I knew it would improve the water quality of Puget Sound.”

1 AGREE
2 DISAGREE

98 DK/UNSURE
99 REFUSED

Q: FERTUP (Fertilizer use)

“I would stop using fertilizer on my lawn if it would improve the water quality of Puget Sound.”

1 AGREE
2 DISAGREE

98 DK/UNSURE
99 REFUSED

Q: GOVACT (Government actions)

“Please tell me whether you agree or disagree with the following statements...”

“The government should take stronger action to clean up pollution in Puget Sound.”

1 AGREE
2 DISAGREE

98 DK/UNSURE
99 REFUSED

Q: PERACT (Personal actions)

“I feel a personal obligation to do whatever I can to prevent pollution of Puget Sound.”

- 1 AGREE
- 2 DISAGREE

- 98 DK/UNSURE
- 99 REFUSED

Q: BUSACT (Business actions)

“Industry should clean up pollution it has discharged into Puget Sound.”

- 1 AGREE
- 2 DISAGREE

- 98 DK/UNSURE
- 99 REFUSED

Q: ENVECON (Environment and economy)

“With which of the following statements about the environment and the economy do you most agree ... ”

- 1 “Protection of the environment should be given priority, even at the risk of curbing economic growth.”
- 2 “Economic growth should be given priority, even if the environment suffers to some extent.”

- 98 DK / UNSURE
- 99 REFUSED

Q: HCHWLD (Hatchery and wild fish)

“Which of the following do you think is MORE important....”

- 1 “Maintaining hatchery production of salmon to ensure fish availability for recreational and commercial fishermen.”
- 2 “Restricting hatchery production of salmon to protect wild salmon populations, even if it reduces the number of fish available to recreational and commercial fishermen”

- 98 DK/UNSURE

99 REFUSED

Q: BUYCLAM (Buying local seafood)

“When purchasing seafood (fish, crabs, clams, oysters), I usually try to buy those that are locally caught or produced?”

1 YES
2 NO

98 DK/UNSURE
99 REFUSED

Q: FISHIMAPCT (Fishing impacts)

"I'm now going ask you some questions about environmental problems that may impact coastal communities in Washington. For each of the following, do you think that these problems pose a serious threat to you or your community in the FUTURE?"

“Overfishing in the ocean”

IF NECESSARY: "Does this pose a serious threat to you or your community in the FUTURE?"

1 YES
2 NO

98 DK/UNSURE
99 REFUSED

Q:BEACHPOLT (Beach pollution)

“Pollution of beaches or clam beds”

IF NECESSARY: "Does this pose a serious threat to you or your community in the FUTURE?"

1 YES
2 NO

98 DK/UNSURE
99 REFUSED

Q:AQUADEV (Development of aquaculture)

“Development of aquaculture – such as fish or shellfish farms”

IF NECESSARY: "Does this pose a serious threat to you or your community in the FUTURE?"

1 YES
2 NO

98 DK/UNSURE

99 REFUSED

Q:FISHRISK (Health risks from fish)

“Health risks from contaminated seafood, such as that caused by red tides or mercury”

IF NECESSARY: "Does this pose a serious threat to you or your community in the FUTURE?"

1 YES
2 NO

98 DK/UNSURE
99 REFUSED

Q:SEARISE (Sea level rise)

“Rise in sea level due to global warming or climate change”

IF NECESSARY: "Does this pose a serious threat to you or your community in the FUTURE?"

1 YES
2 NO

98 DK/UNSURE
99 REFUSED

Q:DEVIMPACT (Development impacts)

“Commercial and housing development along the coast”

IF NECESSARY: "Does this pose a serious threat to you or your community in the FUTURE?"

1 YES
2 NO

98 DK/UNSURE
99 REFUSED

Q: WARMUND (Understandings of climate change)

“Next, I would like to ask you some questions about the issue of global warming or climate change. How much do you feel you understand about this issue — would you say a great deal, a moderate amount, only a little, or nothing at all?”

1 A great deal
2 A moderate amount
3 Only a little

98 DK/Nothing
99 REFUSED

Q: WARMSCI (Climate change and scientific consensus)

“Which of the following two statements do you think is more accurate?” (read numbers)

- 1 Most scientists agree that climate change is happening now, caused mainly by human activities.
- 2 There is little agreement among scientists whether climate change is happening now, caused mainly by human activities.

- 98 DK/UNSURE
- 99 REFUSED

Q: WARMOP (Climate change beliefs)

“Which of the following three statements do you personally believe?” (read numbers)

- 1 Climate change is happening now, caused mainly by human activities.
- 2 Climate change is happening now, but caused mainly by natural forces.
- 3 Climate change is not happening now.
- 98 DK/UNSURE
- 99 (no response)

Q: WARMTHY (Climate change threats)

“Do you think that global warming or climate change will pose a serious threat to you or your way of life in your lifetime, or not?”

- 1 YES
- 2 NO

- 98 DK/UNSURE
- 99 REFUSED

Q: NEWSTRST (News organization trust)

“I’d like to change the subject again. As a source of information about environmental issues, would you say that you trust, don’t trust or are unsure about each of the following?”

“TV network news”

IF NECESSARY: How much do trust this as source of information about environmental issues?

- 1 TRUST
- 2 DON’T TRUST
- 3 UNSURE

98 DK - DO NOT PROBE
99 REFUSED

Q:SCITRST (Scientific trust)

“How about... scientists?”

IF NECESSARY: How much do trust this as source of information about environmental issues?

1 TRUST
2 DON'T TRUST
3 UNSURE

98 DK - DO NOT PROBE
99 REFUSED

Q:RELTRST (Religious leaders and trust)

“How about... religious leaders?”

IF NECESSARY: How much do trust this as source of information about environmental issues?

1 TRUST
2 DON'T TRUST
3 UNSURE

98 DK - DO NOT PROBE
99 REFUSED

Q:WEBTRST (Trust in the internet)

“How about... websites or blogs that you visit?”

IF NECESSARY: How much do trust this as source of information about environmental issues?

1 TRUST
2 DON'T TRUST
3 UNSURE

98 DK - DO NOT PROBE
99 REFUSED

Q:TRUSTGOV (Trust in the government)

"Thinking now about the role of the government...Generally speaking, how often do you think you can trust the government to do what's right? Can you trust the government almost always, usually,, only some of the time, or rarely or never?"

1 ALMOST ALWAYS
2 USUALLY
3 ONLY SOME OF THE TIME
4 RARELY OR NEVER

98 DK - DO NOT PROBE

99 REFUSED

Q:LOCGOV (Local government effectiveness)

"Do you think that local government has the ability to deal effectively with environmental problems or is local government not able to deal effectively with these environmental problems?"

- 1 NO – LOCAL GOVERNMENT NOT ABLE TO DEAL WITH ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS.
- 2 YES – LOCAL GOVERNMENT ABLE TO DEAL WITH ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS
- 98 DK / UNSURE - DO NOT PROBE
- 99 REFUSED

Q: ENVPROP1 (Environmental proposals)

"Next, I am going to read some specific environmental proposals. For each one, please say whether you generally favor or oppose it. How about [see below]

"Spending government money to restore the natural environment for fish and wildlife"

- 1 FAVOR
- 2 OPPOSE
- 98 DK/UNSURE - DO NOT PROBE
- 99 REFUSED

Q: ENVPROP2 (Environmental proposals)

"More strongly enforcing environmental regulations"

- 1 FAVOR
- 2 OPPOSE
- 98 DK/UNSURE - DO NOT PROBE
- 99 REFUSED

Q:ENVPROP3 (Environmental proposals)

"Setting higher emissions and pollution standards for business and industry"

- 1 FAVOR
- 2 OPPOSE
- 98 DK/UNSURE - DO NOT PROBE
- 99 REFUSED

Q:ENVPROP4 (Environmental proposals)

"Restricting shipping and boating activities in order protect marine mammals such as killer whales and sea

lions”

- 1 FAVOR
- 2 OPPOSE

- 98 DK/UNSURE – DO NOT PROBE
- 99 REFUSED

Q: EVALIND (Evaluation indicators)

“Thinking about ways of evaluating progress in improving environmental conditions in Puget Sound, which of the following two ways do you think is the BEST way to do this?”

- 1 “Progress should be evaluated based mostly on economic indicators that show the costs and benefits of particular activities”
- 2 “Progress should be evaluated based on environmental indicators that assess the health of the Puget Sound environment.”

- 98 DK/UNSURE
- 99 REFUSED

Q:POLLUTE (Pollution issues)

"Do you agree or disagree with the following statements about your community?"

"If this community were faced with a local issue such as the pollution of a river or the possible closure of a school, people here could be counted on to work together to address it."

- 1 DISAGREE
- 2 AGREE

- 98 DK - DO NOT PROBE
- 99 REFUSED

Q:NEIGH (Neighbor relationships)

"People around here are willing to help their neighbors."

IF NECESSARY: "Do you agree or disagree with this statement about your community?"

- 1 DISAGREE
- 2 AGREE

- 98 DK - DO NOT PROBE
- 99 REFUSED

Q:GETA (Community cohesion)

"People in this community generally trust one another and get along."

IF NECESSARY: "Do you agree or disagree with this statement about your community?"

- 1 DISAGREE
- 2 AGREE

- 98 DK - DO NOT PROBE
- 99 REFUSED

Q: BANY (Boards and any civic involvement)

"Now we'd like to ask you about your involvement in community affairs. Do you belong to or serve in any role in any local organization such as a business group; civic, service, or fraternal organization; local government, school, or zoning board; or another type of local organization that has regular meetings?"

- 1 YES
- 2 NO

- 98 DK - DO NOT PROBE
- 99 REFUSED

Q:DRIVE1 (Driving habits)

"On a typical weekday, about how much time would you say you spend traveling by car or truck (for all purposes)?"(READ RESONSES)

- 1 no driving most days
- 2 half an hour or less
- 3 30 min to 1 hr
- 4 one to two hours per day
- 5 two or more hours per day

- 98 DK/UNSURE
- 99 REFUSED

Q:HOUSIZE (Size of house)

"Now I just have a few questions about you and your household for classification purposes. Including yourself, HOW MANY PEOPLE CURRENTLY LIVE in your household?"

- 1 ONE
- 2 TWO
- 3 THREE
- 4 FOUR
- 5 FIVE
- 6 SIX
- 7 SEVEN OR MORE

- 98 DK/UNSURE

99 REFUSED

Q:D11

"Counting yourself as 1, how many adults age 18 or older currently live in your household?"

ENTER NUMBER OF ADULTS

- | | |
|----|---------------|
| 1 | ONE |
| 2 | TWO |
| 3 | THREE |
| 4 | FOUR |
| 5 | FIVE |
| 6 | SIX |
| 7 | SEVEN OR MORE |
| 98 | DK/NOT SURE |
| 99 | REFUSED |

Q:OWNRENT (Owner or renter)

"Do you own or rent the place where you live?"

- | | |
|----|-------------------|
| 1 | RENT |
| 2 | OWN |
| 3 | OTHER |
| 98 | DK - DO NOT PROBE |
| 99 | REFUSED |

IF (ANSWER = 2) SKIPTO HOMETYPE

IF (ANSWER = 3) SKIPTO EMPLOY

IF (ANSWER > 3) SKIPTO EMPLOY

Q:HOMETYPE (Type of home)

“What type of home is this?”

- 1 A mobile home
- 2 A single family home
- 3 A townhouse, duplex, or other multi-family house
- 4 Other

- 98 DK/NOT SURE
- 99 REFUSED

Q:EMPLOY (Employment)

"Which of the following best describes your employment status during the PAST YEAR?"

READ RESPONSES. IF R GIVES 2 RESPONSES, ENTER LOWER NUMBER

- 1 Employed full time
- 2 Employed part-time, or part of the year
- 3 Self-employed
- 4 Retired and not working
- 5 Unemployed and looking for work
- 6 Unemployed and not looking for work
- 7 Homemaker
- 8 Disabled
- 9 Student

- 98 DK - DO NOT PROBE
- 99 REFUSED

Q: NR1 (Natural Resources)

“Do you work in commercial fishing, or a fishery-related industry such as fish processing?”

- 1 YES
- 2 NO

- 98 DK - DO NOT PROBE
- 99 REFUSED

Q: NR1SF (Natural Resources)

“Do you work in sport fishing or some other related field?”

- 1 YES
- 2 NO

- 98 DK - DO NOT PROBE
- 99 REFUSED

Q: NR2 (Natural Resources)

“Do you work in the forest products industry, either as a logger, in a lumber, pulp, or paper mill, or some related field?”

- 1 YES
- 2 NO

- 98 DK - DO NOT PROBE
- 99 REFUSED

Q:RACE

"Would you describe yourself as White non-Hispanic, African American, Hispanic, Asian American, Native American / Alaska Native, or state all that apply?" Respondents shall be offered the option of selecting one or more racial designations.

- 1 WHITE, NON-HISPANIC
- 2 AFRICAN AMERICAN
- 3 HISPANIC
- 4 ASIAN AMERICAN
- 5 NATIVE AMERICAN / ALASKAN NATIVE

- 6 OTHER

- 98 DK (DO NOT PROBE)
- 99 REFUSED

Q:PARTY

"Now. let's talk for a moment about your political views ..."

"Generally speaking, do you usually think of yourself as a Republican, a Democrat, an Independent or what?"

IF REPUBLICAN: "Would you call yourself a strong Republican or a not very strong Republican?"

IF DEMOCRAT "Would you call yourself a strong Democrat or a not very strong Democrat?"

IF INDEPENDENT, NO PREFERENCE, OR OTHER: "Do you think of yourself as closer to the Republican or to the Democratic party?"

- 1 STRONG DEMOCRAT
- 2 NOT VERY STRONG DEMOCRAT
- 3 INDEPENDENT, BUT CLOSER TO DEMOCRATS
- 4 INDEPENDENT--CLOSER TO NEITHER
- 5 INDEPENDENT, BUT CLOSER TO REPUBLICANS
- 6 NOT VERY STRONG REPUBLICAN
- 7 STRONG REPUBLICAN
- 8 OTHER PARTY

- 98 DK
- 99 REFUSED

Q:EDUC (Educational level)

"What is the highest grade in school, or level of education that you've completed and received credit for?" [READ RESPONSES]

- 1 Eighth grade or less,
- 2 Some high school,
- 3 High school graduate, (INCLUDES G.E.D.)
- 4 Technical school,
- 5 Some college,
- 6 College graduate,
- 7 Or postgraduate work?"

- 98 DK (DO NOT PROBE)
- 99 REFUSED

Q:INCOME

"What was your approximate total household income including all wages, public assistance and child support for 2010, before taxes?"

- 1 LESS THAN \$25,000
- 2 \$25,000 to \$50,000
- 3 \$50,000 to \$75,000
- 4 \$75,000 to \$100,000

5 More than \$100,000
98 DK (DO NOT PROBE)
99 NA / REFUSED

Q:INCLOW (Low income)

"OK, would you say that your total household income was more or less than \$20,000?"

1 LESS THAN \$20,000
2 \$20,000 TO \$40,000

98 DK (DO NOT PROBE)
99 REFUSED

SKIPTO OPTIMIST

Q:INCMED

"OK, would you say that your total household income was more or less than \$60,000?"

1 LESS THAN \$60,000
2 \$60,000 TO \$90,000

98 DK (DO NOT PROBE)
99 REFUSED

SKIPTO OPTIMIST

Q:INCHIGH

"OK, would you say that your total household income was more or less than \$160,000?"

1 LESS THAN \$160,000
2 MORE THAN \$160,000

98 DK (DO NOT PROBE)
99 REFUSED

SKIPTO OPTIMIST

Q:OPTIMIST

"Based on what you see of the situation today, do you think that ten years from now, your community will be a better place to live, a worse place, or about the same?"

1 WORSE PLACE
2 ABOUT THE SAME
3 BETTER PLACE

98 DK (DO NOT PROBE)
99 REFUSED

Q:D14

"Not counting business lines, extension phones, or cellular phones -- on how many different telephone NUMBERS can your household be reached?"

1 ONE
2 TWO
3 THREE
4 FOUR
5 FIVE
6 SIX
7 SEVEN OR MORE

8 THIS SURVEY WAS DONE ON A CELL PHONE, ONLY PHONE THEY HAVE

98 DK
99 REFUSED

Q:END

"Thank you for your time and participation. Your input has been very valuable. If you would like to learn about the results from this survey, as they come in over the months and years ahead, please send Dr. Karma Norman a letter or e-mail at the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA)."

IF ASKED FOR ADDRESS

Mail: Dr. Karma Norman
NOAA - Northwest Fisheries Science Center
2725 Montlake Blvd. East
Seattle, WA 98112

E-MAIL

Karma.Norman@noaa.gov

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 15 minutes per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other suggestions for reducing this burden to Karma Norman, National Marine Fisheries Service, Northwest Fisheries Science Center, 2725 Montlake Blvd. East, .

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.

MSFMCA National Standards

SEC. 301. NATIONAL STANDARDS FOR FISHERY 16 U.S.C. 1851

CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT

(a) IN GENERAL.--Any fishery management plan prepared, and any regulation promulgated to implement any such plan, pursuant to this title shall be consistent with the following national standards for fishery conservation and management:

98-623

(1) Conservation and management measures shall prevent overfishing while achieving, on a continuing basis, the optimum yield from each fishery for the United States fishing industry.

(2) Conservation and management measures shall be based upon the best scientific information available.

(3) To the extent practicable, an individual stock of fish shall be managed as a unit throughout its range, and interrelated stocks of fish shall be managed as a unit or in close coordination.

(4) Conservation and management measures shall not discriminate between residents of different States. If it becomes necessary to allocate or assign fishing privileges among various United States fishermen, such allocation shall be (A) fair and equitable to all such fishermen; (B) reasonably calculated to promote conservation; and (C) carried out in such manner that no particular individual, corporation, or other entity acquires an excessive share of such privileges.

104-297

(5) Conservation and management measures shall, where practicable, consider efficiency in the utilization of fishery resources; except that no such measure shall have economic allocation as its sole purpose.

(6) Conservation and management measures shall take into account and allow for variations among, and contingencies in, fisheries, fishery resources, and catches.

(7) Conservation and management measures shall, where practicable, minimize costs and avoid unnecessary duplication.

104-297

(8) Conservation and management measures shall, consistent with the conservation requirements of this Act (including the prevention of overfishing and rebuilding of overfished stocks), take into account the importance of fishery resources to fishing communities in order to (A) provide for the sustained participation of such communities, and (B) to the extent practicable, minimize adverse economic impacts on such communities.

104-297

(9) Conservation and management measures shall, to the extent practicable, (A) minimize bycatch and (B) to the extent bycatch cannot be avoided, minimize the mortality of such bycatch.

104-297

(10) Conservation and management measures shall, to the extent practicable, promote the safety of human life at sea.

Presidential Documents

Title 3—

Executive Order 12898 of February 11, 1994

The President

Federal Actions To Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, it is hereby ordered as follows:

Section 1-1. *Implementation.*

1-101. Agency Responsibilities. To the greatest extent practicable and permitted by law, and consistent with the principles set forth in the report on the National Performance Review, each Federal agency shall make achieving environmental justice part of its mission by identifying and addressing, as appropriate, disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of its programs, policies, and activities on minority populations and low-income populations in the United States and its territories and possessions, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the Commonwealth of the Mariana Islands.

1-102. Creation of an Interagency Working Group on Environmental Justice.

(a) Within 3 months of the date of this order, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency ("Administrator") or the Administrator's designee shall convene an interagency Federal Working Group on Environmental Justice ("Working Group"). The Working Group shall comprise the heads of the following executive agencies and offices, or their designees: (a) Department of Defense; (b) Department of Health and Human Services; (c) Department of Housing and Urban Development; (d) Department of Labor; (e) Department of Agriculture; (f) Department of Transportation; (g) Department of Justice; (h) Department of the Interior; (i) Department of Commerce; (j) Department of Energy; (k) Environmental Protection Agency; (l) Office of Management and Budget; (m) Office of Science and Technology Policy; (n) Office of the Deputy Assistant to the President for Environmental Policy; (o) Office of the Assistant to the President for Domestic Policy; (p) National Economic Council; (q) Council of Economic Advisers; and (r) such other Government officials as the President may designate. The Working Group shall report to the President through the Deputy Assistant to the President for Environmental Policy and the Assistant to the President for Domestic Policy.

(b) The Working Group shall: (1) provide guidance to Federal agencies on criteria for identifying disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on minority populations and low-income populations;

(2) coordinate with, provide guidance to, and serve as a clearinghouse for, each Federal agency as it develops an environmental justice strategy as required by section 1-103 of this order, in order to ensure that the administration, interpretation and enforcement of programs, activities and policies are undertaken in a consistent manner;

(3) assist in coordinating research by, and stimulating cooperation among, the Environmental Protection Agency, the Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and other agencies conducting research or other activities in accordance with section 3-3 of this order;

(4) assist in coordinating data collection, required by this order;

(5) examine existing data and studies on environmental justice;

(6) hold public meetings as required in section 5-502(d) of this order; and

(7) develop interagency model projects on environmental justice that evidence cooperation among Federal agencies.

1-103. *Development of Agency Strategies.* (a) Except as provided in section 6-605 of this order, each Federal agency shall develop an agency-wide environmental justice strategy, as set forth in subsections (b)-(e) of this section that identifies and addresses disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of its programs, policies, and activities on minority populations and low-income populations. The environmental justice strategy shall list programs, policies, planning and public participation processes, enforcement, and/or rulemakings related to human health or the environment that should be revised to, at a minimum: (1) promote enforcement of all health and environmental statutes in areas with minority populations and low-income populations; (2) ensure greater public participation; (3) improve research and data collection relating to the health of and environment of minority populations and low-income populations; and (4) identify differential patterns of consumption of natural resources among minority populations and low-income populations. In addition, the environmental justice strategy shall include, where appropriate, a timetable for undertaking identified revisions and consideration of economic and social implications of the revisions.

(b) Within 4 months of the date of this order, each Federal agency shall identify an internal administrative process for developing its environmental justice strategy, and shall inform the Working Group of the process.

(c) Within 6 months of the date of this order, each Federal agency shall provide the Working Group with an outline of its proposed environmental justice strategy.

(d) Within 10 months of the date of this order, each Federal agency shall provide the Working Group with its proposed environmental justice strategy.

(e) Within 12 months of the date of this order, each Federal agency shall finalize its environmental justice strategy and provide a copy and written description of its strategy to the Working Group. During the 12 month period from the date of this order, each Federal agency, as part of its environmental justice strategy, shall identify several specific projects that can be promptly undertaken to address particular concerns identified during the development of the proposed environmental justice strategy, and a schedule for implementing those projects.

(f) Within 24 months of the date of this order, each Federal agency shall report to the Working Group on its progress in implementing its agency-wide environmental justice strategy.

(g) Federal agencies shall provide additional periodic reports to the Working Group as requested by the Working Group.

1-104. *Reports to the President.* Within 14 months of the date of this order, the Working Group shall submit to the President, through the Office of the Deputy Assistant to the President for Environmental Policy and the Office of the Assistant to the President for Domestic Policy, a report that describes the implementation of this order, and includes the final environmental justice strategies described in section 1-103(e) of this order.

Sec. 2-2. *Federal Agency Responsibilities for Federal Programs.* Each Federal agency shall conduct its programs, policies, and activities that substantially affect human health or the environment, in a manner that ensures that such programs, policies, and activities do not have the effect of excluding persons (including populations) from participation in, denying persons (including populations) the benefits of, or subjecting persons (including populations) to discrimination under, such programs, policies, and activities, because of their race, color, or national origin.

Sec. 3-3. Research, Data Collection, and Analysis.

3-301. Human Health and Environmental Research and Analysis. (a) Environmental human health research, whenever practicable and appropriate, shall include diverse segments of the population in epidemiological and clinical studies, including segments at high risk from environmental hazards, such as minority populations, low-income populations and workers who may be exposed to substantial environmental hazards.

(b) Environmental human health analyses, whenever practicable and appropriate, shall identify multiple and cumulative exposures.

(c) Federal agencies shall provide minority populations and low-income populations the opportunity to comment on the development and design of research strategies undertaken pursuant to this order.

3-302. Human Health and Environmental Data Collection and Analysis. To the extent permitted by existing law, including the Privacy Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. section 552a): (a) each Federal agency, whenever practicable and appropriate, shall collect, maintain, and analyze information assessing and comparing environmental and human health risks borne by populations identified by race, national origin, or income. To the extent practical and appropriate, Federal agencies shall use this information to determine whether their programs, policies, and activities have disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on minority populations and low-income populations;

(b) In connection with the development and implementation of agency strategies in section 1-103 of this order, each Federal agency, whenever practicable and appropriate, shall collect, maintain and analyze information on the race, national origin, income level, and other readily accessible and appropriate information for areas surrounding facilities or sites expected to have a substantial environmental, human health, or economic effect on the surrounding populations, when such facilities or sites become the subject of a substantial Federal environmental administrative or judicial action. Such information shall be made available to the public, unless prohibited by law; and

(c) Each Federal agency, whenever practicable and appropriate, shall collect, maintain, and analyze information on the race, national origin, income level, and other readily accessible and appropriate information for areas surrounding Federal facilities that are: (1) subject to the reporting requirements under the Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act, 42 U.S.C. section 11001-11050 as mandated in Executive Order No. 12856; and (2) expected to have a substantial environmental, human health, or economic effect on surrounding populations. Such information shall be made available to the public, unless prohibited by law.

(d) In carrying out the responsibilities in this section, each Federal agency, whenever practicable and appropriate, shall share information and eliminate unnecessary duplication of efforts through the use of existing data systems and cooperative agreements among Federal agencies and with State, local, and tribal governments.

Sec. 4-4. Subsistence Consumption of Fish and Wildlife.

4-401. Consumption Patterns. In order to assist in identifying the need for ensuring protection of populations with differential patterns of subsistence consumption of fish and wildlife, Federal agencies, whenever practicable and appropriate, shall collect, maintain, and analyze information on the consumption patterns of populations who principally rely on fish and/or wildlife for subsistence. Federal agencies shall communicate to the public the risks of those consumption patterns.

4-402. Guidance. Federal agencies, whenever practicable and appropriate, shall work in a coordinated manner to publish guidance reflecting the latest scientific information available concerning methods for evaluating the human health risks associated with the consumption of pollutant-bearing fish or

wildlife. Agencies shall consider such guidance in developing their policies and rules.

Sec. 5-5. *Public Participation and Access to Information.* (a) The public may submit recommendations to Federal agencies relating to the incorporation of environmental justice principles into Federal agency programs or policies. Each Federal agency shall convey such recommendations to the Working Group.

(b) Each Federal agency may, whenever practicable and appropriate, translate crucial public documents, notices, and hearings relating to human health or the environment for limited English speaking populations.

(c) Each Federal agency shall work to ensure that public documents, notices, and hearings relating to human health or the environment are concise, understandable, and readily accessible to the public.

(d) The Working Group shall hold public meetings, as appropriate, for the purpose of fact-finding, receiving public comments, and conducting inquiries concerning environmental justice. The Working Group shall prepare for public review a summary of the comments and recommendations discussed at the public meetings.

Sec. 6-6. *General Provisions.*

6-601. *Responsibility for Agency Implementation.* The head of each Federal agency shall be responsible for ensuring compliance with this order. Each Federal agency shall conduct internal reviews and take such other steps as may be necessary to monitor compliance with this order.

6-602. *Executive Order No. 12250.* This Executive order is intended to supplement but not supersede Executive Order No. 12250, which requires consistent and effective implementation of various laws prohibiting discriminatory practices in programs receiving Federal financial assistance. Nothing herein shall limit the effect or mandate of Executive Order No. 12250.

6-603. *Executive Order No. 12875.* This Executive order is not intended to limit the effect or mandate of Executive Order No. 12875.

6-604. *Scope.* For purposes of this order, Federal agency means any agency on the Working Group, and such other agencies as may be designated by the President, that conducts any Federal program or activity that substantially affects human health or the environment. Independent agencies are requested to comply with the provisions of this order.

6-605. *Petitions for Exemptions.* The head of a Federal agency may petition the President for an exemption from the requirements of this order on the grounds that all or some of the petitioning agency's programs or activities should not be subject to the requirements of this order.

6-606. *Native American Programs.* Each Federal agency responsibility set forth under this order shall apply equally to Native American programs. In addition, the Department of the Interior, in coordination with the Working Group, and, after consultation with tribal leaders, shall coordinate steps to be taken pursuant to this order that address Federally-recognized Indian Tribes.

6-607. *Costs.* Unless otherwise provided by law, Federal agencies shall assume the financial costs of complying with this order.

6-608. *General.* Federal agencies shall implement this order consistent with, and to the extent permitted by, existing law.

6-609. *Judicial Review.* This order is intended only to improve the internal management of the executive branch and is not intended to, nor does it create any right, benefit, or trust responsibility, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law or equity by a party against the United States, its agencies, its officers, or any person. This order shall not be construed to create any right to judicial review involving the compliance or noncompliance

of the United States, its agencies, its officers, or any other person with this order.

William J. Clinton

THE WHITE HOUSE,
February 11, 1994.

[FR Citation 59 FR 7629]

NEPA Section 102 (c)

Section 4332. Cooperation of agencies; reports; availability of information; recommendations; international and national coordination of efforts [NEPA Section 102]

The Congress authorizes and directs that, to the fullest extent possible: (1) the policies, regulations, and public laws of the United States shall be interpreted and administered in accordance with the policies set forth in this chapter, and (2) all agencies of the Federal Government shall -

(A) Utilize a systematic, interdisciplinary approach, which will insure the integrated use of the natural and social sciences and the environmental design arts in planning and in decision-making, which may have an impact on man's environment;

(B) Identify and develop methods and procedures, in consultation with the Council on Environmental Quality established by subchapter II of this chapter, which will insure that presently unquantified environmental amenities and values may be given appropriate consideration in decision-making along with economic and technical considerations;

(C) Include in every recommendation or report on proposals for legislation and other major Federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment, a detailed statement by the responsible official on -

- (i) The environmental impact of the proposed action,
- (ii) Any adverse environmental effects which cannot be avoided should the proposal be implemented,
- (iii) Alternatives to the proposed action,
- (iv) The relationship between local short-term uses of man's environment and the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity, and
- (v) Any irreversible and irretrievable commitments of resources which would be involved in the proposed action should it be implemented.

Prior to making any detailed statement, the responsible Federal official shall consult with and obtain the comments of any Federal agency, which has jurisdiction by law or special expertise with respect to any environmental impact involved. Copies of such statement and the comments and views of the appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies, which are authorized to develop and enforce environmental standards, shall be made available to the President, the Council on Environmental Quality and to the public as provided by section 552 of Title 5, and shall accompany the proposal through the existing agency review processes;

(D) Any detailed statement required under subparagraph (C) after January 1, 1970, for any major Federal action funded under a program of grants to States shall not be deemed to be legally insufficient solely by reason of having been prepared by a State agency or official, if:

- (i) The State agency or official has statewide jurisdiction and has the responsibility for such action,
- (ii) The responsible Federal official furnishes guidance and participates in such preparation,
- (iii) The responsible Federal official independently evaluates such statement prior to its approval and adoption, and
- (iv) After January 1, 1976, the responsible Federal official provides early notification to, and solicits the views of, any other State or any Federal land management entity of any action or any alternative thereto which may have significant impacts upon such State or affected Federal land management entity and, if there is any disagreement on such impacts, prepares a written assessment of such impacts and views for incorporation into such detailed statement.

The procedures in this subparagraph shall not relieve the Federal official of his responsibilities for the scope, objectivity, and content of the entire statement or of any other responsibility under this chapter; and further, this subparagraph does not affect the legal sufficiency of statements prepared by State agencies with less than statewide jurisdiction.

(E) Study, develop, and describe appropriate alternatives to recommended courses of action in any proposal which involves unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources;

(F) Recognize the worldwide and long-range character of environmental problems and, where consistent with the foreign policy of the United States, lend appropriate support to initiatives, resolutions, and programs designed to maximize international cooperation in anticipating and preventing a decline in the quality of mankind's world environment;

(G) Make available to States, counties, municipalities, institutions, and individuals, advice and information useful in restoring, maintaining, and enhancing the quality of the environment;

(H) Initiate and utilize ecological information in the planning and development of resource-oriented projects; and

(I) Assist the Council on Environmental Quality established by subchapter II of this chapter.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration****Proposed Information Collection; Comment Request; Defining Target Levels for Ecosystem Components: A Socio-Ecological Approach**

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 May 9, 2011.

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 Karma Norman, (206) 302-2418 or Karma.Norman@noaa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**I. Abstract**

This notice is for the request of a new information collection.

The creation of the Puget Sound Partnership (PSP) allowed for a group of private and public entities, local citizens, tribes and businesses to begin to collectively work toward restoring the ecological health of the Puget Sound. With the PSP's inception, the Puget Sound ecosystem has become a national example of ecosystem-based management (EBM) implementation. The Partnership Action Agenda identified 80 near-term actions that are required for ecosystem recovery. These actions, however, will require specific performance measures.

Ecosystems can contain numerous species, and a mean level of species placement within a predator/prey chain or food web can serve as an ecological indicator. Similarly, measures of relative biodiversity may provide indications of ecological health and therefore function as ecological indicators. Such indicators can facilitate Ecosystem-based Management, when

target levels for indicators exist. Because targets are an expression of the desired state of the ecosystem, establishing targets must include both ecological understanding and societal values. This project will develop a unique approach for identifying scientifically rigorous ecosystem targets that explicitly considers social perspectives. For this reason, the Northwest Fisheries Science Center seeks to conduct social norm analyses which involve a survey of Puget Sound community stakeholders. Stakeholders will be asked, via telephone survey, a series of general questions regarding their views on the Puget Sound environment and the desirability of a range of potential ecosystem conditions for the Puget Sound.

A random digit dial phone survey will be conducted. The survey will be voluntary, and contacted individuals may decline to participate. Respondents will be asked to respond to statements regarding their perceptions of the health of the Puget Sound. Demographic and employment information will be collected so that responses can be organized based on a stakeholder typology. This survey is essential because data on social norms, values and beliefs in the Puget Sound region are sparse; yet, they are critical to the development of sound ecosystem health targets.

II. Method of Collection

Respondents will be contacted via telephone for administration of the survey.

III. Data

OMB Control Number: None.

Form Number: None.

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

Affected Public: Individuals or households.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 1,000.

Estimated Time per Response: 15 minutes per response.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 250.

Estimated Total Annual Cost to Public: \$0.

IV. Request for Comments

Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden (including hours and cost) of the proposed collection of information; (c)

ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

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

Dated: March 4, 2011.

Gwellnar Banks,

Management Analyst, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 2011-5358 Filed 3-8-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-22-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration**

RIN 0648-XX222

Gulf Spill Restoration Planning; Meeting Location Correction for Public Scoping Meetings for the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for the Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill; Correction

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), U.S. Department of Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of public scoping meetings; correction.

SUMMARY: In a March 2, 2011, **Federal Register** notice, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) announced the public scoping meeting dates, times, and locations for the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for the Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill. There have been location changes for the meeting in Pensacola, FL, Spanish Fort, AL, Houma, LA, and Morgan City, LA. No other information in the notice published on March 2, 2011 has changed.

DATES: The public scoping meetings in Pensacola, FL and Mobile, AL will begin at 7:30 p.m. (local time) and doors will open at 6:30 p.m. The public meetings in Houma, LA and Morgan City, LA will start at 6:30 p.m. (local time) and open doors at 5:30 p.m.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

NOAA—Brian Hostetter at 888.547.0174 or by e-mail at gulfspillcomments@noaa.gov;