NOTICE OF OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET ACTION

Date 10/25/2012

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 08/16/2012

ACTION REQUESTED: New collection (Request for a new OMB Control Number)
TYPE OF REVIEW REQUESTED: Regular
ICR REFERENCE NUMBER: 201208-0648-001
AGENCY ICR TRACKING NUMBER:
TITLE: Evaluation of Interpretative Signs Located Along the Californnia Coastline Part of the California Signage Plan Initiative
LIST OF INFORMATION COLLECTIONS: See next page

OMB ACTION: Approved with change
OMB CONTROL NUMBER: 0648-0653
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: 10/31/2015 DISCONTINUE DATE:

BURDEN:	RESPONSES	HOURS	COSTS
Previous	0	0	0
New	400	50	0
Difference			
Change due to New Statute	0	0	0
Change due to Agency Discretion	400	50	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
California Signage Plan Survey	NA, NA	NOAA Visitor Questionnaire, NOAA Visitor Questionnaire	

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
NOAA/NOS/ONMS

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

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

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

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

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

7. Title Evaluation of Interpretative Signs Located Along the California Coastline Part of the California Signage Plan Initiative

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

9. Keywords interpretive signs, coastal areas, sanctuaries, marine resources, key messages

10. Abstract

The California Signage Plan is an organized and systematic way to develop and install graphic signs along the California coastline and inland that interpret the natural and cultural resources of a particular location and it's connection to the sanctuaries located within California. To date, a strategic approach to evaluating interpretive signs produced by the Office of National Marine Sanctuaries has not been conducted, therefore we do not know if the messages we are trying to convey to our audiences are effective. We are proposing to conduct an online and onsite survey to approximately 400 visitors to the signs that are currently installed. The questions outlined in the survey examine the public's use of the signs, understanding of the signs' content, understanding and awareness of protected areas/zones and how those messages are portrayed in regulatory signs, demographics of the target audience, interest in alternate sources of interpretive content, perception of the National Marine Sanctuaries identity, and awareness of the national marine sanctuary system.

11. Affected public (*Mark primary with "P" and all others that apply with "x"*)
a. p Individuals or households d. ___ Farms
b. ___ Business or other for-profit e. ___ Federal Government
c. ___ Not-for-profit institutions f. ___ State, Local or Tribal Government

12. Obligation to respond (*check one*)
a. [✔] Voluntary
b. [ ] Required to obtain or retain benefits
c. [ ] Mandatory

13. Annual recordkeeping and reporting burden
a. Number of respondents 400
b. Total annual responses 400
1. Percentage of these responses collected electronically 50 %
c. Total annual hours requested 50
d. Current OMB inventory 0
e. Difference 50
f. Explanation of difference
1. Program change 50
2. Adjustment

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

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

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

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

18. Agency Contact (person who can best answer questions regarding the content of this submission)
Name: Seaberry Nachbar
Phone: 831-647-4204

19. Certification for Paperwork Reduction Act Submissions

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

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

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

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

(b) It avoids unnecessary duplication;

(c) It reduces burden on small entities;

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(j) It makes appropriate use of information technology.

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

Signature of Senior Official or designee	Date

Agency Certification (signature of Assistant Administrator, Deputy Assistant Administrator, Line Office Chief Information Officer, head of MB staff for L.O.s, or of the Director of a Program or StaffOffice)	
Signature signed by Hugh Johnson	Date 08/02/2012
Signature of NOAA Clearance Officer	
Signature signed by Sarah Brabson	Date 08/03/2012

SUPPORTING STATEMENT
EVALUATION OF INTERPRETIVE SIGNS LOCATED ALONG THE CALIFORNIA COASTLINE PART OF THE CALIFORNIA SIGNAGE PLAN INITIATIVE
OMB CONTROL NO. 0648-xxxx

A. JUSTIFICATION

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

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

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

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

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

The specific performance measure for evaluating this goal is:

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

The ONMS education team has embarked on an ambitious evaluation project, of which this activity is only a part, that will allow the ONMS to assess education program outcomes and impacts across all sites and activities and to link outcome measures to program efforts. The purpose of this effort is to evaluate if current and future education efforts are meeting the goals and objectives of the education and outreach programs and the educational mandates of the National Marine Sanctuaries Act. The application of these findings will assist in adjusting program content, format, and activities mix and targeting audiences to improve overall effectiveness of educational efforts and expenditures.

Program to be evaluated

The California Signage Plan, initiated in 2004, uses a systematic approach to interpretive signage among the four California sanctuary sites: Cordell Bank National Marine Sanctuary, Gulf of Farallones National Marine Sanctuary, Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary, and Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary. Representatives from the four sanctuaries meet regularly to establish a list of common themes and messages. Each sign has a common look and feel, yet is adaptable to the needs of the partners. Baseline standards and required visual elements have been

identified when producing joint signs with partners. Funding is requested based on the priorities at each site and among sites. The result is an integrated signage plan along the California coastline.

To date, an organized, strategic approach to evaluating interpretive signs produced by ONMS has not been conducted. There are important questions that need to be asked in order to guide us with future development of signs. We need to evaluate these interpretive signs to determine if we are conveying our key messages to our audiences, so that we may make better decisions about additional interpretive signs, interpretation programs and other educational programs that we deliver.

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

The information from this survey will be used to better understand the perception and knowledge gained from the content and design of installed interpretive signs located along the California coastline and to help ONMS better deliver messages to the thousands of visitors that come to the California coastline each year. At this point, we do not plan to conduct the survey more than once. There will be two collection methods, one onsite at the actual location of the signs, and one online—not available to the public at large—but for the convenience of visitors to the site so they have the option of completing the survey at home.

Onsite:

- Questions 1, 2, 3 & 4 provide basic information about the person and their visit to the coastline;
- Question 5 provides some economic information to give insight into the economic level of the coastline visitor;
- Questions 6 & 15 determines if the visitor has seen more than one sign and if s/he recognizes that the signs are part of a system (in many areas where we have placed signs, there are a number of them that interpret different information and types of information);
- Question 7 determines where the visitor saw the sign(s);
- Questions 8, 13 & 16 provide information as to our logo and identity. Do viewers of the sign(s) look to see who made the sign?
- Question 9 provides visitors' overall opinion of the sign(s);
- Questions 10, 11 & 12 provide information as to the content: is the message that we are trying to convey clearly understood and are viewers learning new information?
- Question 14 identifies if there are better ways to communicate this information to the public;
- Questions 17 & 18 provide information about the sign'(s') content and if they convey priority ocean literacy principles and primary messages about sanctuaries.
- Questions 19, 20 & 21 are all demographic questions that help determine the types of visitors that come to the California coastline.

Web-Based:

- Questions 1, 2, 3, 4, & 5 provide basic information about the person and their visit to the coastline (includes question about how long ago the visit was);
- Question 6 provides some economic information that will give us insight into the economic level of the coastline visitor;

- Questions 7 & 16 determine if the visitor has seen more than one sign and if s/he recognizes that the sign(s) are a part of a system (in many areas where we have placed signs, there are a number of them that interpret different information);
- Question 8 determines where they saw the sign(s);
- Questions 9, 14 & 17 provide information as to our logo and identity. Do viewers of the sign(s) look to see who made the sign?
- Question 10 provides visitors' overall opinion of the sign(s);
- Questions 11, 12 & 13 provide information as to the content: is the message that we are trying to convey clearly understood and are viewers learning new information?
- Question 15 identifies if there are better ways to communicate this information to the public;
- Questions 18 & 19 provide information about the sign(s) content and if they convey priority messages about sanctuaries and ocean literacy principles.
- Questions 20, 21 & 22 are all demographic questions that help determine the types of visitors that come to the California coastline.

All of this information will help us determine what messages are and are not conveyed in our interpretive signs, and what we need to improve to fulfill the ONMS goals. NOAA ONMS 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 Question10 of this Supporting Statement for more information on confidentiality and privacy. The information collected is designed to yield data that meet all applicable information quality guidelines. Although the information collected is not expected to be disseminated directly to the public, results may be used in scientific, management, technical or general informational publications. Should NOAA Office of National Marine Sanctuaries decide to disseminate the information, it will be subject to the quality control measures and pre-dissemination review pursuant to Section 515 of Public Law 106-554.

We will comply with all OMB standards for asking questions about race and ethnicity.

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 collection of information will consist of intercept interviews, conducted in person by volunteers and paid assistants, and an online survey. Both methods will include the use of a standardized questionnaire. We propose using an online survey in addition to an onsite survey to accommodate visitors who may not have time to complete an onsite survey or who may prefer a less invasive surveying method. Visitors at the two sites who are intercepted but do not wish to take the onsite survey will be given a postcard with the survey URL, and asked for their e-mail addresses so that NOAA can send a reminder e-mail with the survey link.

4. Describe efforts to identify duplication.

This is the first effort of its kind to understand the educational value and effectiveness of interpretive signs within the sanctuary system.

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

This project will not have a significant impact on small entities such as small businesses, organizations, or government bodies. All respondents will be individuals.

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

If this evaluation were not conducted, we would not be able to assess if we are fulfilling portions of NOAA's mandate to have an informed society that comprehends the role of the ocean, coasts, and atmosphere in the global ecosystem to make the best social and economic decisions. In addition, we would not be able to modify our interpretive signs to best fulfill NOAA's, ONMS' education and outreach goals. Nor would we contribute to our role in fulfilling the Office of National Marine Sanctuaries (ONMS) goal of evaluating all of its programs.

This evaluation has never been conducted before and there is not a plan to repeat this evaluation.

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

NA.

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 August 4, 2011 (76 FR 47172) solicited comments from the public. No comments were received.

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

Onsite: **as a thank you for participating**, small tokens of appreciation will be offered, such as pens (25¢ ea.), key chains (99¢ ea.), or sunglasses ($1.19 ea.). Approximate total value of giveaways is $511; this is an averaged number since participants will be allowed to choose from items of differing costs.

Online: **as an incentive to improve the response rate**, only respondents who complete the survey can elect to enter a raffle whereby they have the chance to win one of four $50 Amazon gift cards; the drawing will take place at the end of the data collection period. Respondents are informed about the raffle when they are given the postcard with the survey URL.

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

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

Online respondents who wish to be entered in the drawing for a gift card will provide an email address, however no other identifying information will be requested. Assurance of confidentiality is provided in the online survey raffle entry instructions.

11. Provide additional justification for any questions of a sensitive nature, such as sexual behavior and attitudes, religious beliefs, and other matters that are commonly considered private.

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

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

a. Respondent sample: This one-time study will seek one interview each from a sample of 400 on-site visitors randomly selected after they have seen the interpretive signs, approximately 200 of which are expected to agree to onsite interview and and approximately 200 who opt to complete a web-based survey at home after visiting the site and seeing the interpretive signs. Participation will be entirely voluntary. Based on her nearly 30 years of experience administering standardized questionnaires, the evaluator managing this project believes that the overall response rate will range from 66% to 70%. Estimates are based on an overall 66%: 80% for onsite interviews and 50% for online survey completion.

Data sought from:	# of respondents	Responses per respondent	Total # Responses	Response Time	Total Burden	Labor Cost to Public *
Visitors to the California coastline, specifically to pre-determined sites with ONMS interpretive signs.	664 visitors approached to obtain a targeted sample of 400	1 interview/ online completion	400	7 to 8 min avg. per interview/online completion	50 hrs.	$1,288

Based on the U.S. Census data from 2009, the average *household* income is $49,777 ($25.92 per hour for adults in household). The average estimated time per respondent is 7.5 minutes (12.5% of an hour). Therefore, the average labor cost per adult answering the questions would be $3.22, multiplied by the 400 responders, with a total burden of $1,288.

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

a. Capital and start-up costs: none.
b. Operations and maintenance costs for the public: none.

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

We will discuss goals, best practices, and techniques with the contractor (evaluator) who is developing the surveys, and who will prepare us for data collection. We estimate 120 hours of work for the CA Signage Plan coordinator in this capacity as a normal part of her job. Collection of data will be conducted by staff and volunteers at the ONMS sites and overseen by the coordinator. With the estimate of 50 hours of data collection time, we anticipate only 24 hours will be of staff time, with the other 26 hours being conducted by volunteers. Processing of data will be handled by our evaluator. Consultation of results will be with Manager. The evaluator —who is responsible for developing the instrument, training data collectors, processing the data, and analyzing the results —is on contract.

Personnel	Time	Additional cost
Manager Time	120 hours @ $25 per hour	Normal job responsibilities
Staff Time	24 hours @ $20 per hour	Normal job responsibilities
Volunteer Time	26 hours	No cost
Contractor	Approx. 161 hours (various contractor staff)	$25,174

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.

Since the primary purpose of this evaluation is to reflect on the level of knowledge provided by these interpretive signs to the general audience, the distribution of results is intended to be primarily intra-governmental. The public is not likely to receive any additional benefits from this evaluation's information.

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.

NA.

18. Explain each exception to the certification statement.

NA.

SUPPORTING STATEMENT
EVALUATION OF INTERPRETIVE SIGNS LOCATED ALONG THE CALIFORNIA COASTLINE PART OF THE CALIFORNIA SIGNAGE PLAN INITIATIVE
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.

	Two survey sites located along the California coastline
Annual total visitor attendance (avg.) by the General Public at the Monterey Bay Recreational Trail (MB) and the Landing Emporium for the Channel Islands (CI)	500,000
Estimated number of adult visitors (age 18+) in the MB and CI general public visitor audience	350,000
Desired sample size of general public adult visitors in the MB and CI audience	664 adults will be approached to obtain a sample of 400 adults
Respondent selection method	One adult per randomly selected visitor group, when exiting from the exhibit areas of MB and CI
Estimated rate of cooperation of randomly selected adult visitors	66% [x 664] or fewer visitors for a final sample of 400]

Note: In the nearly 30 years experience of the evaluator who will direct this study, the actual rate of onsite cooperation at similar facilities (aquariums, museums) averages about 80%; the rate from about 20 projects in the last two years has ranged from 72% to 98%. We are estimating a lower response rate due to the online option, as online options typically have lower response rates. The online survey is intended to serve as a convenience to potential respondents. Thus, the average response rate, considering the onsite and online response rates, is 66%.

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.

The characteristics of visitor populations at visitor centers and museums vary considerably and randomly (e.g., a local family may be followed by a tourist couple who may be followed by a single adult tourist, and so on). In places with relatively low volumes of visitors (such as the Channel Islands Marine Sanctuary), compared to high volume places such as the Smithsonian, a

representative random sample of visitor groups can be obtained by using a "next available" protocol, as follows:

> The interviewer is positioned near the exit from the exhibit space (e.g., at the Channel Islands Marine sanctuary area where boats pick up and drop off visitors). As any visitor group (usually 1-4 people) begins exiting, the interviewer approaches and makes eye contact with the 'first adult' (in practice: the one who is physically closest to the interviewer) and requests their participation in giving feedback about the exhibits. The cooperation rate for this type of intercept interview (using a brief introduction that explains the purpose in one sentence) typically averages about 80%. If the adult visitor agrees, the interview is completed. Upon completion, the interviewer will tend to step aside to complete their work on the interview form (documenting the date and time of the interview, adding their own initials to it, reviewing the form to check for completeness and readable handwriting, and also to put away the completed interview form and have a new blank one ready); this process usually takes 2-5 minutes. When the interviewer is then prepared with a new blank interview form and related, s/he looks up and selects the "next available" visitor group who are moving to the exit.
>
> For the online survey, visitors at the two sites will be intercepted, given a postcard with the survey URL, and asked for their e-mail addresses so that NOAA can send a reminder e-mail with the survey link. The postcard will be given to visitors who decline completing the survey onsite. If visitors decline to provide an e-mail address, they will still be given a postcard. By soliciting in person, we hope to increase the response rate.
>
> PRA information will be read to onsite respondents, and a handout (attached) with the information will be given to visitors who agree to complete the Web-based survey.

The principle of this and other sampling methods is that the interviewer does not *choose* who to interview by appearance or facial expressions that might indicate enjoyment or not, or by whether there are or are not children in the group; in essence, the visitor group *selects themselves* by deciding when to exit (although they don't know the sampling parameters). There may be another group being interviewed at the time when another group leaves, in which case they would *not* be selected. Depending on the visitor flow, the next visitor group might be leaving right then, or the interviewer might have to wait for 5-10 minutes for the next group to leave. This characteristic of 'low volume' visitor facilities makes it impractical to use other methods such as selecting every 4th visitor group, or using a random number chart (for example, from 1 to 5) to decide which visitor group to select.

In addition, data will be collected on weekdays, weekends and different times of day, to endeavor to yield a representative sample. Data collection will take place over *all open hours of the sites*; no weighting will be necessary as the sample will be representative of all visitors to the site.
If we intercept every 4th person (for example) that means that we will be getting more (or fewer) visitors on weekends (for example),depending on the flow. Our systematic sampling takes into account the flow of visitors; when more visitors come through, we collect data from more people. Ultimately because of our systematic procedure, we will obtain a sample that is representative.

3. <u>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</u>

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.

ONSITE:
Prior experience with intercept interviewing of visitors in museums and interpretive centers leads our evaluator to expect a response rate of 80%-90%. Therefore, non-response is not likely to be a factor during onsite data collection. Typically, experience has shown that inviting visitors to give their opinions is a positive motivator, and that the way in which the invitation is delivered can enhance or detract from visitors' desire to cooperate (e.g., neat appearance of the interviewer, a clear voice, pleasant demeanor, and in a small proportion of interactions: giving assurances that the interview won't take too long, or that it won't be too hard).

When the survey instrument and procedures are approved for implementation, we will begin monitoring the cooperation rate onsite and maintain a log of those who decline to participate, noting their gender and approximate age. We will compare the respondents with non-respondents (those who declined) to determine whether the populations differ according to these two variables. If the response rate is below 80% in the early part of our collection (our estimated response rate for onsite surveys [not including the typically lower response rate of on-line surveys]) we will experiment with fine-tuning of the logistics of the survey (where the interviewer stands, which sentence of the explanation comes first, offering tokens of appreciation/thanks before interviewing vs. after) to seek improvements in the cooperation rate onsite. In the unlikely event that we encounter an ongoing response rate onsite of below 80%, we can increase the number of hours volunteers collect data until the desired sample size is reached, while noting the lower overall response rate.

If respondents decline participation onsite, volunteers will give them a postcard with a URL for responding online. As with the onsite interviewees, gender and (apparent) age will also be noted, using the attached form. The postcard will note an incentive for completing the survey online. The incentive is a $50 Amazon.com gift card; four gift cards will be given away via a random drawing.

We are consciously choosing to not advise visitors when they enter the site that we will be seeking their opinions and feedback, since this tends to cue people in ways that sometimes lead to changing their behavior and use of exhibits (e.g., staying longer, feeling that they will be "tested" later), and we are seeking to generalize to the normally occurring pattern of visitor experience.

ONLINE:
By offering the incentive of winning one of four $50 Amazon.com gift cards, we hope to encourage those visitors who declined to be interviewed onsite to complete the survey online. We are striving for a 52% online response rate (online response rates are higher when there has been a personal invitation to participate). Offering several prizes presents a greater chance of winning and thus more incentive to participate. Participants will not be able to enter the raffle unless they complete the entire survey. Additionally, sending a reminder with a link to the survey to those visitors who provided an email address onsite will also encourage participation.
When respondents decline participation **onsite**, volunteers will give them a postcard with a URL for responding online. The postcard will note an incentive for completing the survey online. The incentive is a $50 Amazon.com gift card; four gift cards will be given away via a random drawing.

We will report non-response rates based on the number of postcards distributed vs. number of surveys completed online. We will note the gender and age of all persons receiving a postcard and will compare gender and age data on the sample that declined with the sample that participated and note differences. In addition, we will include the following questions in the reminder email and request a reply to help identify additional nonresponse biases:

Did you visit that site alone or with others? [Mark one response.]
❑ Alone
❑ With friends/family
❑ Organized group

What effect, if any did the sign or signs have on your visit to this site?
❑ None, the sign(s) neither enhanced nor detracted from my experience at this site.
❑ The sign(s) detracted from my experience at this site.
❑ The sign(s) enhanced my experience at this site.
❑ Other (please describe):_____

NOAA will be responsible for collecting and forwarding the responses to be statistically analyzed.

4. Describe any tests of procedures or methods to be undertaken. Tests are encouraged as effective means to refine collections, but if ten or more test respondents are involved OMB must give prior approval under the Paperwork Reduction Act.

The evaluator will conduct onsite testing of the survey prior to data collection, with fewer than 10 individuals, and will change the instrument as necessary. The new versions will be tested during the staff and volunteer training sessions and any final changes will be made before the paper surveys are printed. A change request will be submitted once the two survey instruments are finalized.

If, after the survey is approved and the formal data collection begins, survey completion rates seem low, strategies for maintaining the scientific quality of the research while increasing cooperation will be considered (e.g., as described in the response to the previous question: location of the interviewer, offer of incentives, etc.).

5. Provide the name and telephone number of individuals consulted on the statistical aspects of the design, and the name of the agency unit, contractor(s), grantee(s), or other person(s) who will actually collect and/or analyze the information for the agency.

The evaluator, who developed the research design and composed the survey instrument, is: **Randi Korn**, Founding Director, Randi Korn & Associates, Inc. (www.randikorn.com); 703-548-4078.

Ms. Korn will supervise the beginning of the implementation of the survey, and oversee Research Associates who will conduct training (in random selection, techniques for conducting intercept interviews and maintaining rapport with visitors), and will coach and support the OMNS staff coordinator, Seaberry Nachbar (regarding the monitoring of the quality of interviewers' work) who will organize and manage the data collection process.

Randi Korn & Associates, Inc. has 23 years of experience in museum evaluation and visitor studies, (with 30 years of work in the field of visitor studies) and the experienced staff (with 2 to 15 years of experience) will analyze and interpret the data.

Seaberry Nachbar will be NOAA's principal representative in interpreting the data and articulating the possible implications for exhibits, programs and related ways of educating the public about the ONMS.

INTERVIEW REFUSAL LOG

#	Data Collector	Date	M/F	Age	Reason for Refusal	Email address

Age Categories

18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+

SURVEY RESPONDENT INSTRUCTIONS

In 2005, the planning committee of the Office of National Marine Sanctuaries (ONMS) developed a 10-year strategic plan of operations for the organization with specific goals and outcomes. The plan lists the Education and Outreach performance measure as:

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

The ONMS will use this signage evaluation to link outcome measures to program efforts. The purpose of this effort is to evaluate if current and future education efforts are meeting the goals and objectives of the education and outreach programs and the educational mandates of the National Marine Sanctuaries Act. The application of these findings will assist in adjusting program content, format, and activities mix and target audiences to improve overall effectiveness of educational efforts and expenditures.

The public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average **7-8 minutes per response**, including the time for reviewing instructions, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Please send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to (Seaberry Nachbar, Office of National Marine Sanctuaries, 99 Pacific Street, Building 455, Monterey, CA 93940).

Your participation is strictly voluntary and anonymous. Notwithstanding any other provision of the law, no person is required to respond to, nor shall any person be subject to a penalty for failure to comply with, a collection of information subject to the requirements of the Paperwork Reduction Act, unless that collection of information displays a currently valid OMB Control Number."

If you are responding online, any ISP or email address information will not be distributed, made public, nor shared with any other persons or entity.

ID#:_____ DATE: ____/_____/_____ DATA COLLECTOR NAME: _____
SITE:_____

NOAA Visitor Questionnaire

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. Your honest feedback is appreciated.

1. **At which site are you completing this questionnaire?**
   - ❑ Point Reyes
   - ❑ Mavericks
   - ❑ Monterey Bay
   - ❑ Island Packers in Ventura Harbor (departure point to Channel Islands)
   - ❑ Santa Cruz Island Scorpion Anchorage

2. **What is your primary reason for visiting this site today?** [Mark one response.]
   - ❑ To walk, hike, picnic
   - ❑ To boat
   - ❑ To fish
   - ❑ To visit this marine area
   - ❑ Other (please describe):_____

3. **Are you visiting this site today alone or with others?** [Mark one response.]
   - ❑ Alone
   - ❑ With friends/family
   - ❑ Organized group

4. **Approximately how much time did you spend at that site?** [Mark one response.]
   - ❑ Less than 4 hours ❑ 4 to 8 hours ❑ 8 to 12 hours
   - ❑ 12 to 24 hours ❑ 24 to 48 hours ❑ More than 48 hours

5. **What were your total trip expenditures?**
   - ❒ $0 to $1,000 ❒ $1,000 to $3,000 ❒ $3,000 to $6,000
   - ❒ $6,000 to $10,000 ❒ More than $10,000

6. **During your visit today, how many signs like this did you look at (see example below)?**

[Mark one response.]
- ❑ 1
- ❑ 2-3
- ❑ 4 or more
- ❑ Not sure/don't recall

7. **For the sign or signs you looked at today, where were they located?** [Mark all that apply.]
   - ❑ On a walking path or recreational trail
   - ❑ On a boat launch, dock, or pier
   - ❑ Near ticketing office, concessions, or restroom
   - ❑ Not sure/don't recall
   - ❑ Other (please describe):_____

8. **Who do you think is responsible for sponsoring the sign or signs?** [Mark all that apply.]
   - ❑ Not sure/don't know
   - ❑ City or local government
   - ❑ State of California
   - ❑ NOAA National Marine Sanctuaries
   - ❑ National Park Service
   - ❑ Other (please describe):_____

9. **Using the following 7-point scales, what is your overall opinion of the sign or signs you looked at today?** [Mark one number on each scale below.]

9a.	Not at all informative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Very informative
9b.	Language was difficult to understand	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Language was easy to understand
9c.	Tone was off-putting, bossy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Tone was friendly, helpful

10. **What do you think the sign or signs were trying to communicate?** [Mark all that apply.]
    - ❑ Not sure/don't recall
    - ❑ General information about the animals that live in the area
    - ❑ That this area is a protected ocean area
    - ❑ Rules and regulations about what you can and cannot do in the area
    - ❑ Other (please describe):_____

11. **What, if anything, did you find out about this site you're visiting, that you didn't know before reading the sign(s)?** [Please describe.]

    _____

12. **What effect, if any did the sign or signs have on your visit to this site?**
    - ❑ None, the sign(s) neither enhanced nor detracted from my experience at this site.
    - ❑ The sign(s) detracted from my experience at this site.
    - ❑ The sign(s) enhanced my experience at this site.
    - ❑ Other (please describe):_____

13. **On the sign or signs you looked at, did you see this symbol?**

    ❑ No ❑ Yes

NATIONAL MARINE SANCTUARIES

14. Would you be interested in having the information on the sign or signs you looked at today available in another medium? [Mark one response.]

- ❑ No, I'm just not that interested in the information in any format.
- ❑ No, I prefer getting the information from a sign.
- ❑ Yes, I'd like to have the information in a brochure.
- ❑ Yes, I'd like to access the information via a website.
- ❑ Yes, I'd like to access the information via a mobile phone application.
- ❑ Yes, I have another suggestion (please describe):_____

15. Thinking about the sign or signs you looked at today, have you seen similar signs anywhere else on the California coast?

- ❑ No [Skip to Question 16]
- ❑ Yes → **15a. Where on the California coast?** [Mark all that apply.]

❑ Not sure/don't recall
❑ Bodega Bay
❑ Point Reyes
❑ Golden Gate National Recreational Area
❑ Mavericks
❑ Monterey/Pacific Grove
❑ Cambria/Moonstone
❑ Santa Barbara
❑ Ventura
❑ Oxnard
❑ Other (please describe): _____

16. Have you heard of the National Marine Sanctuaries?

❑ No ❑ Yes

17. Please indicate whether you think the following statements are "true" or "false." [Circle one response in each row.]

17a.	National Marine Sanctuaries helps to protect marine and Great Lakes ecosystems.	True	False
17b.	Access to National Marine Sanctuaries is generally prohibited.	True	False

18. What is your opinion of the following statement? [Circle one response.]

The health of the ocean and the actions of humans are inter-connected.	I Strongly Disagree	I Disagree	Neither Agree or Disagree	I Agree	I Strongly Agree

Now a few questions about you:

19. Are you? ❒ Male ❒ Female

20. What is your age?

❒ 18 to 24 ❒ 25 to 34 ❒ 35 to 44 ❒ 45 to 54 ❒ 55 to 64 ❒ 65+

21. [US residents only] What is your home zip code? _____

Thank you for completing this questionnaire. Please hand it to the data collector.

ONLINE QUESTIONNAIRE

NOAA Visitor Questionnaire

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. Your honest feedback is appreciated.

1. **At which site were you asked to participate in this study?**
   - ❑ Point Reyes
   - ❑ Mavericks
   - ❑ Monterey Bay
   - ❑ Island Packers in Ventura Harbor (departure point to Channel Islands)
   - ❑ Santa Cruz Island Scorpion Anchorage

2. **How long ago did you visit that site?** [Mark one response.]
   - ❑ Less than 1 week ago
   - ❑ Between 1 and 2 weeks ago
   - ❑ More than 2 weeks ago
   - ❑ Not sure/don't know

3. **What was your primary reason for visiting that site?** [Mark one response.]
   - ❑ To walk, hike, picnic
   - ❑ To boat
   - ❑ To fish
   - ❑ To visit this marine area
   - ❑ Other (please describe):_____

4. **Did you visit that site alone or with others?** [Mark one response.]
   - ❑ Alone
   - ❑ With friends/family
   - ❑ Organized group

5. **Approximately how much time did you spend at that site?** [Mark one response.]
   - ❑ Less than 4 hours
   - ❑ 4 to 8 hours
   - ❑ 8 to 12 hours
   - ❑ 12 to 24 hours
   - ❑ 24 to 48 hours
   - ❑ More than 48 hours

6. **What were your total trip expenditures?**
   - ❒ $0 to $1,000
   - ❒ $1,000 to $3,000
   - ❒ $3,000 to $6,000
   - ❒ $6,000 to $10,000
   - ❒ More than $10,000

7. **During your visit, you were asked to participate in this study after viewing a sign that looks like this (see example below). How many signs like this did you look at?**

[Mark one response.]
- ❑ 1
- ❑ 2-3
- ❑ 4 or more
- ❑ Not sure/don't recall

8. **For the sign or signs you looked at during your visit, where were they located?** [Mark all that apply.]
- ❑ On a walking path or recreational trail
- ❑ On a boat launch, dock, or pier
- ❑ Near ticketing office, concessions, or restroom
- ❑ Not sure/don't recall
- ❑ Other (please describe):_____

9. **Who do you think was responsible for installing the sign or signs?** [Mark all that apply.]
- ❑ Not sure/don't know
- ❑ City or local government
- ❑ State of California
- ❑ NOAA National Marine Sanctuaries
- ❑ National Park Service
- ❑ Other (please describe):_____

10. **Using the following 7-point scales, what was your overall opinion of the sign or signs you looked at during your visit?** [Mark one number on each scale below.]

10a.	Not at all informative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Very informative
10b.	Language was difficult to understand	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Language was easy to understand
10c.	Tone was off-putting, bossy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Tone was friendly, helpful

11. **What do you think the sign or signs were trying to communicate?** [Mark all that apply.]
- ❑ Not sure/don't recall
- ❑ General information about the animals that live in the area
- ❑ That this area is a protected ocean area
- ❑ Rules and regulations about what you can and cannot do in the area
- ❑ Other (please describe):_____

12. **What, if anything, did you find out about the site you visited, that you didn't know before reading the sign(s)?** [Please describe.]

_____

13. **What effect, if any did the sign or signs have on your visit to this site?**
    - ❑ None, the sign(s) neither enhanced nor detracted from my experience at this site.
    - ❑ The sign(s) detracted from my experience at this site.
    - ❑ The sign(s) enhanced my experience at this site.
    - ❑ Other (please describe):_____

14. **On the sign or signs you looked at, did you see this symbol?**

    NATIONAL MARINE SANCTUARIES

    ❑ No ❑ Yes

15. **Would you be interested in having the information on the sign or signs available in another medium?** [Mark one response.]
    - ❑ No, I'm just not that interested in the information in any format.
    - ❑ No, I prefer getting the information from a sign.
    - ❑ Yes, I'd like to have the information in a brochure.
    - ❑ Yes, I'd like to access the information via a website.
    - ❑ Yes, I'd like to access the information via a mobile phone application.
    - ❑ Yes, I have another suggestion (please describe):_____

16. **Thinking about the sign or signs you looked at on your visit, have you seen similar signs anywhere else on the California coast?**
    - ❑ No [Program will skip to Question 17]
    - ❑ Yes → **16a. Where on the California coast?** [Mark all that apply.]
        - ❑ Not sure/don't recall
        - ❑ Bodega Bay
        - ❑ Point Reyes
        - ❑ Golden Gate National Recreational Area
        - ❑ Mavericks
        - ❑ Monterey/Pacific Grove
        - ❑ Cambria/Moonstone
        - ❑ Santa Barbara
        - ❑ Ventura
        - ❑ Oxnard
        - ❑ Other (please describe): _____

17. **Have you heard of the National Marine Sanctuaries?**
    ❑ No ❑ Yes

18. Please indicate whether you think the following statements are "true" or "false."
[Circle one response in each row.]

18a.	National Marine Sanctuaries helps to protect marine and Great Lakes ecosystems.	True	False
18b.	People are not allowed to visit National Marine Sanctuaries.	True	False

19. What is your opinion of the following statement? [Circle one response.]

The health of the ocean and the actions of humans are inter-connected.	I Strongly Disagree	I Disagree	Neither Agree or Disagree	I Agree	I Strongly Agree

Now a few questions about you:

20. Are you? ❒ Male ❒ Female

21. What is your age?
❒ 18 to 24 ❒ 25 to 34 ❒ 35 to 44 ❒ 45 to 54 ❒ 55 to 64 ❒ 65+

22. [US residents only] What is your home zip code? _____

Thank you so much for completing the survey! If you would like to be entered into a drawing to win one of four $50 Amazon gift cards, please enter your email address, and select "Done."

Regardless of whether or not you would like to participate in the raffle, please select "Done" to submit the survey; your responses are important to us.

Email address

Your participation is strictly voluntary and anonymous. Notwithstanding any other provision of the law, no person is required to respond to, nor shall any person be subject to a penalty for failure to comply with, a collection of information subject to the requirements of the Paperwork Reduction Act, unless that collection of information displays a currently valid OMB Control Number.

Any ISP or email address information will not be distributed, made public, nor shared with any other persons or entity.

whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden (including hours and cost) of the proposed collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

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

Dated: July 29, 2011.

Gwellnar Banks,

Management Analyst, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 2011–19757 Filed 8–3–11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–22–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

Proposed Information Collection; Comment Request; Cooperative Game Fish Tagging Report

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 October 3, 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 Eric Orbesen, (305) 361–4253 or *Eric.Orbesen@noaa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Abstract

The Cooperative Game Fish Tagging Program was initiated in 1971 as part of a comprehensive research program resulting from passage of Public Law 86–359, Study of Migratory Game Fish, and other legislative acts under which the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) operates. The Cooperative Tagging Center attempts to determine the migration patterns of, and other biological information for, billfish, tunas, and swordfish. The fish tagging report is provided to the angler with the tags, and he/she fills out the card with the information when a fish is tagged and mails it to NMFS. Information on each species is used by NMFS to determine migratory patterns, distance traveled, stock boundaries, age, and growth. These data are necessary input for developing management criteria by regional fishery management councils, states, and NMFS.

II. Method of Collection

Information is submitted by mail.

III. Data

OMB Control Number: 0648–0247.

Form Number: NOAA form 88–162.

Type of Review: Regular submission (extension of a current information collection).

Affected Public: Individuals or households.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 12,000.

Estimated Time per Response: 2 minutes.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 400 hours.

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: July 29, 2011.

Gwellnar Banks,

Management Analyst, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 2011–19721 Filed 8–3–11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–22–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

Proposed Information Collection; Comment Request; California Signage Plan: Evaluation of Interpretive Signs

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 October 3, 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 Seaberry Nachbar, 831–626–1023, *seaberry.nachbar@noaa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Abstract

This request is for a regular submission (new collection). The California Signage Plan is an organized and systematic way to develop and install graphic signs along the California coastline and inland that interpret the natural and cultural resources of a particular location and its connection to the sanctuaries located within California. To date, a strategic approach to evaluating interpretive signs produced by the Office of National Marine Sanctuaries has not been developed; therefore, NOAA does not know if the messages trying to be conveyed to their audiences are effective. NOAA is proposing to conduct an online and onsite survey of approximately 400 visitors to the locations where signs are currently

installed. The questions outlined in the survey examine the public's use of the signs, understanding of the signs' content, understanding and awareness of protected areas/zones and how those messages are portrayed in regulatory signs, demographics of the target audience, interest in alternate sources of interpretive content, perception of the National Marine Sanctuaries identity, and awareness of the national marine sanctuary system.

II. Method of Collection

Half of the respondents will use paper forms completed onsite. Half of the respondents will be asked to complete the survey online.

III. Data

OMB Control Number: None.

Form Number: None.

Type of Review: Regular submission (new collection).

Affected Public: Individuals or households.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 400.

Estimated Time per Response: 8 minutes.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 53 hours.

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

IV. Request for Comments

Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden (including hours and cost) of the proposed collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

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

Dated: July 29, 2011.

Gwellnar Banks,

Management Analyst, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 2011–19720 Filed 8–3–11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–22–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

RIN 0648–XA614

Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Crab Rationalization Program; Public Meeting

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

ACTION: Notice of peer review meeting.

SUMMARY: NMFS has requested the Center for Independent Experts (CIE) to conduct a peer review of the agency's economic data collection program for the Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands crab fisheries managed under the BSAI Crab Rationalization program. The CIE, operated by Northern Taiga Ventures, Inc., provides independent peer reviews of NMFS's fisheries stock assessments and other science products. The BSAI Crab Economic Data Report (EDR) program administered by NMFS began collecting cost, earnings and employment data in 2005, concurrently with the transition of BSAI crab fisheries to the rationalized management regime. The program was developed under the direction of the North Pacific Fishery Management Council (Council). The CIE review will examine the scientific methods and practices employed by NMFS in the design and administration of the EDR program and dissemination of results, assess whether the data and information produced represent the best available science, and provide recommendations for methodological improvements to achieve best scientific practices in economic data collection and analysis of BSAI crab fisheries. The public is invited to attend and observe the presentations and discussions between the CIE panel and the NMFS scientists and contractors who have administered the data collection.

DATES: The public portion of the meeting will be held August 23–24, 2011, 9 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. Pacific standard time.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held in the Observer Training Room, Building 4 of the National Marine Fisheries Service, Alaska Fisheries Science Center, 7600 Sand Point Way, NE., Seattle, WA 98115.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Brian Garber-Yonts, 206–526–7143 or *brian.garber-yonts@noaa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: For further information about this meeting and the CIE Review of the BSAI crab EDR program, please visit the Alaska Fisheries Science Center Web site at *http://www.afsc.noaa.gov/.* For further information on the Crab Rationalization Program, please visit the NMFS Alaska Region Web site at *http://www.alaskafisheries.noaa.gov.*

Special Accommodations

This meeting is physically accessible to people with disabilities. Requests for special accommodations should be directed to Brian Garber-Yonts (see **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**) at least 5 working days before the workshop date.

Dated: August 1, 2011.

Margo Schulze-Haugen,

Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service.

[FR Doc. 2011–19811 Filed 8–3–11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–22–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

RIN 0648–XW30

Takes of Marine Mammals Incidental to Specified Activities; Pile-Driving and Renovation Operations on the Trinidad Pier by the Cher-Ae Heights Indian Community of the Trinidad Rancheria in Trinidad, CA

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

ACTION: Notice; Issuance of an Incidental Take Authorization (ITA).

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) regulation, notification is hereby given that NMFS has issued an Incidental Harassment Authorization (IHA) to the Cher-Ae Heights Indian Community of the Trinidad Rancheria (Trinidad Rancheria) to take small numbers of marine mammals, by Level B harassment, incidental to pile-driving and renovation operations for the Trinidad Pier Reconstruction Project in Trinidad, California.

DATES: Effective August 1, 2011 through January 31, 2012.

ADDRESSES: A copy of the IHA is available by writing to P. Michael Payne, Chief, Permits, Conservation, and Education Division, Office of Protected Resources, National Marine Fisheries Service, 1315 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, MD 20910 or by telephoning the contacts listed here.