NOTICE OF OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET ACTION

Date 02/12/2013

Department of Commerce
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

FOR CERTIFYING OFFICIAL: Simon Szykman
FOR CLEARANCE OFFICER: Jennifer Jessup

In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act, OMB has taken action on your request received 12/27/2012

ACTION REQUESTED: New collection (Request for a new OMB Control Number)
TYPE OF REVIEW REQUESTED: Regular
ICR REFERENCE NUMBER: 201211-0648-007
AGENCY ICR TRACKING NUMBER:
TITLE: Economic Value of Puerto Rico's Coral Reef Ecosystems for Recreation/Tourism
LIST OF INFORMATION COLLECTIONS: See next page

OMB ACTION: Approved with change
OMB CONTROL NUMBER: 0648-0660
The agency is required to display the OMB Control Number and inform respondents of its legal significance in accordance with 5 CFR 1320.5(b).

EXPIRATION DATE: 02/29/2016 DISCONTINUE DATE:

BURDEN:	RESPONSES	HOURS	COSTS
Previous	0	0	0
New	32	64	0
Difference			
Change due to New Statute	0	0	0
Change due to Agency Discretion	32	64	0
Change due to Agency Adjustment	0	0	0
Change due to PRA Violation	0	0	0

TERMS OF CLEARANCE: If NOAA submits a pre-test or full survey for approval under PRA based on the results of this focus group, the results of the focus group must be submitted as supplementary materials.

OMB Authorizing Official: Dominic J. Mancini
Acting Deputy Administrator,
Office Of Information And Regulatory Affairs

List of ICs			
IC Title	Form No.	Form Name	CFR Citation
Resident and Tourist Focus Groups	NA	Introductory Questions for Focus Groups	

PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT SUBMISSION

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

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

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

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: 12 / 2013

7. Title Economic Value of Puerto Rico's Coral Reef Ecosystems for Recreation/Tourism

8. Agency form number(s) (*if applicable*) Not Applicable

9. Keywords coral reefs, Puerto Rico, recreation, tourism, focus groups

10. Abstract

The required information will be gathered from focus groups ,to help in designing the full surveys of visitors and residents of Puerto Rico. The four focus groups - two visitor and two resident focus groups - will be used to address the attributes of coral reef ecosystems that people may consider important, and the levels of the attributes to be valued. Attributes would include natural attributes such as water clarity/visibility, coral cover and diversity, and fish abundance and diversity. In addition, issues such as crowded conditions or number of other users that users (e.g. SCUBA divers, snorkelers, recreational fishers, and wildlife viewers) see while doing their activities on the reefs will be evaluated. This set of focus groups will be conducted one time only.

11. Affected public (*Mark primary with "P" and all others that apply with "x"*)
a. x 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 32
b. Total annual responses 32
1. Percentage of these responses collected electronically 0 %
c. Total annual hours requested 64
d. Current OMB inventory 0
e. Difference 64
f. Explanation of difference
1. Program change
2. Adjustment

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

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

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

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

18. Agency Contact (person who can best answer questions regarding the content of this submission)
Name: Dr. Vernon R. (Bob) Leeworthy
Phone: (301) 713-7261

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 11/8/2012
Signature of NOAA Clearance Officer	
Signature signed by Sarah Brabson BRABSON.SARAH.1365710488 Digitally signed by BRABSON.SARAH.1365710488 DN: c=US, o=U.S. Government, ou=DoD, ou=PKI, ou=OTHER, cn=BRABSON.SARAH.1365710488 Date: 2013.02.26 17:56:39 -05'00'	Date

SUPPORTING STATEMENT
Economic Value of Puerto Rico's Coral Reef Ecosystems for Recreation/Tourism
OMB CONTROL NO. 0648-xxxx

A. JUSTIFICATION

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

The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) is requesting approval for a new information collection in order to conduct focus groups to help in designing full surveys of visitors and residents of Puerto Rico, on ecosystem services valuation.

NOAA's National Ocean Service, Office of National Marine Sanctuaries and the United States (U.S). Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) have entered into an Interagency Agreement (IA) to estimate the market and nonmarket economic value of Puerto Rico's coral reef ecosystem for recreation-tourism uses (submitted as a supplementary document). The goal of this collaboration is to complete an economic valuation (market and nonmarket) survey for four ecosystem services (tourism and recreation, fishing, shoreline protection, and natural products) to support development of a decision-support tool for the Guanica Bay Watershed Restoration Management Plan that can provide evaluations of different restoration strategies on the coral reef ecosystem services connected to the Guanica Bay Watershed. This data collection effort is focused on the recreation-tourism ecosystem service of the coral reef ecosystems of all of Puerto Rico with a special attention to the coral reef ecosystems connected to the Guanica Bay Watershed.

NOAA is authorized to undertake this effort under the Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA), 16 USC 1456c, while EPA is authorized under the Clean Water Act Sec. 104 (b) (2).

NOAA plans to develop and implement surveys of both the resident population of Puerto Rico and the visitor population that use the coral reef ecosystems for recreation-tourism. The surveys will be designed to provide the necessary information to estimate the market and nonmarket economic use values of Puerto Rico's coral reef ecosystems and how those values change with changes in the physical/natural attributes of the coral reef ecosystems.

The estimated market and non-market economic values and the relationships on how these values change with changes in coral reef ecosystem attributes (e.g. coral cover, coral diversity, fish abundance, fish diversity, and water clarity/visibility) and user characteristics (e.g. residents of Puerto Rico versus visitors to Puerto Rico, household income, educational attainment, age, sex, and race/ethnicity) will, when combined with the physical/natural science in the decision support tool for the Guanica Bay Watershed Restoration Management Plan, support the assessment of the net benefits (benefits minus costs) of various restoration activities and regulations by the various agencies responsible for implementing the plan.

The economic value estimates or the benefits associated with changes in coral reef ecosystem attributes can also be utilized in assessing broader regulations affecting these attributes. Regulations such as water quality discharges and regulations establishing no-take marine

reserves are good examples. The benefit estimates can also be used in post implementation monitoring plans to assess the actual benefits that occur post implementation of restorations or regulations. In addition, the estimates can be used in evaluating public and private investments in coral reef ecosystem protection and restoration across all of Puerto Rico.

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.

This information collection will use focus groups to help design the full surveys of residents and visitors of Puerto Rico to address the attributes of coral reef ecosystems that people may consider important, and the levels of the attributes to be valued. Attributes would include natural attributes such as water clarity/visibility, coral cover and diversity, and fish abundance and diversity. In addition, issues such as crowded conditions or number of other users that users (e.g. SCUBA divers, snorkelers, recreational fishers, and wildlife viewers) see while doing their activities on the reefs will be evaluated. NOAA has done a world-wide literature review of coral reef valuation and the attributes of coral reefs that recreational-tourism users value and how those values change with changes in the levels of attributes. This information will serve as a starting point in focus groups to identify what attributes and the levels of attributes that would be important for Puerto Rico.

Four focus groups of eight persons per group will be used: two focus groups for residents of Puerto Rico and two groups for visitors to Puerto Rico. A local marketing firm in Puerto Rico will be used to conduct the focus groups. This firm will be hired under sub-contract to the University of Puerto Rico – Mayaguez. NOAA is currently in the process of negotiating a cooperative agreement with the University of Puerto Rico – Mayaguez to implement the full surveys of visitors and residents and oversee the focus groups. The principal investigator from the University of Puerto Rico – Mayaguez will be Professor Manuel Valdez-Pizzini. Dr. Vernon R. (Bob) Leeworthy, ONMS Chief Economist, will take part in developing handout materials. All materials will be provided in English and Spanish. For the focus groups, the group discussion leader will be conversant in both English and Spanish.

In each of the four focus groups, about eight participants will provide oral and written feedback based on descriptive materials (e.g. pictures, videos and written descriptions of coral reef attributes of Puerto Rico's reefs). Open discussions will be conducted on what attributes of the coral reef ecosystems of Puerto Rico that people care about to support their recreation-tourist activities. Then discussions will be directed at the levels of each attribute that might change how they value coral reef ecosystems for their recreation-tourism activities. So during the focus group process, the study team will:

- Assess what attributes of Puerto Rico's coral reef ecosystems people care about to support their recreation-tourism activities.

- Assess the levels of each attribute that might affect people's value of coral reef ecosystems to support their recreation-tourist activities.

- Learn how attributes and levels attributes of coral reef ecosystems are best presented in surveys (illustrations, pictures, videos and bulleted facts).

Four focus groups, two visitor and two resident focus groups, will be used to address the attributes of coral reef ecosystems that people may consider important, and the levels of the attributes to be valued. The first focus groups for residents and visitors will be used to identify the important attributes and their levels. The second focus groups will be used to learn how best to present the materials describing attributes and their levels to be used in the full surveys. Attributes would include natural attributes such as water clarity/visibility, coral cover and diversity, and fish abundance and diversity. In addition, issues such as crowded conditions or number of other users that users (e.g. SCUBA divers, snorkelers, recreational fishers, and wildlife viewers) see while doing their activities on the reefs will be evaluated.

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

Utility
This information collection does not result directly into a product for public dissemination. The focus group work proposed here is to help design full surveys of residents and visitors to Puerto Rico who use coral reef ecosystems in Puerto Rico for recreation-tourism by gaining an understanding of the attributes of coral reef ecosystems of Puerto Rico are to resident and visitors that use the coral reefs for recreation-tourism and the levels of the attributes that affect users valuations. The full surveys will be designed to estimate the market and nonmarket economic use values for Puerto Rico's coral reef ecosystems for recreation-tourism uses and how those values change with changes in the attributes of the coral reef ecosystems (e.g. water clarity/visibility, coral cover and diversity, and fish abundance and diversity). The survey results and analysis will be used in a decision-support tool that will assess restoration strategies for the Guanica Bay Watershed Restoration Management Plan. The results for coral reef ecosystems will also support management of the coral reef ecosystems of Puerto Rico.

Objectivity
The full surveys will use a stated choice conjoint method incorporating different combinations of coral reef attributes and levels of the attributes where people will make choices on their preferred bundle of reef attributes for a certain specified cost (a simulated market). This method is now considered state-of-the-art in the science of natural resource economic valuation. The goal will be to provide specific description of the goods or services provided by coral reefs that people are being asked to value or the changes in the goods or services via changes in the attributes of the coral reef ecosystems. Peer review will ensure that the information collected is accurate, reliable, and unbiased and that the information reported to the public is accurate, clear, complete and unbiased.

Integrity
During the focus group sessions and in the full surveys, participants will be reminded that their participation is voluntary, that their responses will be protected, and that any material identifying them will not be provided to anyone.

NOAA will retain control over the information and safeguard it from improper access,

modification, and destruction, consistent with NOAA standards for confidentiality, privacy, and electronic information. See response to Question 10 of this Supporting Statement for more information on confidentiality and privacy. The information collection is designed to yield data that meet all applicable information quality guidelines. Prior to dissemination, the information will be subjected to quality control measures and a pre-dissemination review pursuant to Section 515 of Public Law 106-554.

3. Describe whether, and to what extent, the collection of information involves the use of automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological techniques or other forms of information technology.

For presenting the different levels of coral reef ecosystem attributes, we will explore the use of videos. EPA, NOAA and other university entities have conducted underwater surveys of Puerto Rico's coral reef ecosystems and produced underwater videos. NOAA is trying to obtain these underwater videos to assess how they might be used in the survey in presenting different attributes and their levels to recreation-tourist users.

4. Describe efforts to identify duplication.

We have conducted a world-wide review of the literature (submitted as a supplementary document) on coral reef valuation for recreation-tourist uses. One study was found for Puerto Rico that was limited to the coral reefs off the Northeast coast of Puerto Rico. The study was focused on total economic value but did not address how values might change with changes in coral reef attributes, which is critical to the current effort.

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

The focus groups will target individuals rather than small businesses or small entities.

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

Without this collection, NOAA will not be able to meet its obligation under the Interagency Agreement with EPA. Also, as discussed under item 1 above, NOAA, EPA, Puerto Rico Department of Natural Resources and other agencies that will invest in the Guanica Bay Watershed Restoration Management Plan or make investments in coral reef ecosystems protection and restoration will not be able to estimate the benefits of their investments or regulations to assess benefits relative to the costs.

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

This collection is consistent with OMB guidelines.

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

A Federal Register Notice published on August 14, 2012 (77 FR 48504) solicited public comments. One set of comments were received from the Utility Water Act Group (UWAG) represented by the firm Hutton & Williams LLP. Comments were dated October 15, 2012 (Attachment A).

UWAG realizes that all their comments are on areas that are normally covered in the Supporting Statement, but felt it important to point out the issues they would like to make sure are addressed in the Supporting Statement.

We will list each issue UWAG would like to see addressed and reference the section of this supporting statement that addresses the issue.

1. **The notice does not reveal how the information will serve any statutory purpose or have "practical utility".**

NOAA Response: See Part A Justification, Question 1 for background and statutory authorities to conduct the work. See Part A, Question 2, Utility for and explanation of how we are complying with NOAA Guidelines under the Information Quality Act in addressing the practical utility of the information to be collected.

2. **The determination of purpose has to be *before* public comment and before OMB review.**

NOAA Response: See Part A Justification, Questions 1 and 2 for how this was addressed.

3. **Assigning zero value to the public's time is unrealistic.**

NOAA Response: There is no record keeping or reporting requirement of the focus group work proposed in this application for collection of information. The focus groups do use people's time and we do plan to compensate people for their time. See answer to Part A, Question 9 for rate of compensation and answer to Part A Question 12 for the burden hours per respondent.

Efforts to consult with persons outside the agency

The planned focus group work is targeted at determining the attributes of coral reef ecosystems those recreation-tourist users of Puerto Rico care about and the levels of those attributes that might change their economic use values for Puerto Rico's coral reefs. NOAA has a multiple-organization partnership called the Marine Ecosystem Service Partnership (MESP). MESP is an on-line annotated bibliography of all studies done world-wide on natural resource valuation in marine (coastal and ocean) resources http://www.marineecosystemservices.org. In

addition, MESP has joined The Ecosystem Commons http://ecosystemcommons.org to engage in a "community of practice". A "community of practice" is a group of technical experts that will provide free consultation on how to do economic valuation of ecosystem services.

We also conducted a review of the literature using the MESP site to see what other economic valuation experts world-wide had done with respect to coral reef attribute valuation for recreation-tourism uses. Only four studies world-wide were uncovered that addressed the value of attributes of coral reef ecosystems for recreation-tourism and how economic value changes with changes in the levels of those attributes. None of the studies addressed the coral reef ecosystems of Puerto Rico.

A query to Ecosystem Commons was made along with the World Resources Institute (WRI), which is a key partner in MESP on relevant work on attributes and their levels for coral ref ecosystems. No additional experts were discovered.

We will construct a peer review panel consisting of authors of past work on the economic value for recreation-tourism of coral reef attributes. Jeffrey Wielgus, author of work in the Red Sea which was published in Marine Resource Economics Journal (Wielgus et al, 2003) and now with WRI will be a key peer reviewer. We will also seek peer review by George Parsons at the

University of Delaware who is co-author on an economic valuation in Bonaire (Parsons and Thur, 2008).

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

Based on past experience and advice from Professor Manuel Valdez-Pizzini at the University of Puerto Rico – Mayaguez we will work with a local marketing firm to implement the focus groups. We are expecting to provide between $50 and $75 per participant per session (the standard range for focus groups, based on location). The purposes of the incentive are to encourage attendance and thank people for their time.

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

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

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

We will not ask questions of a sensitive nature.

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

Estimated number of participants: 32.

Estimated time per response: 2 hours.

Estimated total burden hours: 64 hours.

.13. Provide an estimate of the total annual cost burden to the respondents or record-keepers resulting from the collection (excluding the value of the burden hours in Question 12 above).

There will be no record keeping/reporting costs to the respondents.

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

Total Costs to the Federal Government for the Focus Group Work (One Year)

1. Contract for Local Marketing Firm	**$26,600 - $27,400**
a. Incentives for focus group members @ $50 to $75 per respondent for 2-hr session.	$1,600 - $2,400
b. Marketing Firm costs: staff, rooms, audio recordings, reports and overhead	$25,000
2. NOAA staff time ZP - 04 Economist 80 hours @ $80 per hr.	**$6,400**
3. NOAA travel to Puerto Rico	**$2,500**
Total Costs	**$35,000 - $36,300**

Focus group work is a one-time effort done in less than one year's time.

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

This is a new information collection request.

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

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

17. If seeking approval to not display the expiration date for OMB approval of the information collection, explain the reasons why display would be inappropriate.

NA.

18. Explain each exception to the certification statement.

NA.

SUPPORTING STATEMENT
Economic Value of Puerto Rico's Coral Reef Ecosystems for Recreation/Tourism
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.

Four focus groups will be conducted, each focus groups consisting of eight people who has participated in recreational activities on coral reefs in Puerto Rico. Two focus groups will be residents of Puerto Rico and two groups will be visitors to Puerto Rico. The local marketing firm will choose people so that at least two persons in each focus group has done either snorkeling, SCUBA diving, or fishing. We don't expect residents will do much glass-bottom boat riding. The visitor focus will include at least one glass-bottom boat rider.

The only screening criteria besides recreational use of Puerto Rico's coral reefs is age. Focus group members will need to be at least 18 year old. Focus group members will be recruited to ensure a broad mix of sociodemographics (e.g., sex, age, education).

The University of Puerto Rico – Mayaguez will work with the local marketing firm to recruit potential participants at each location and provide facilities for focus group discussions. Using convenience sampling, the local marketing firm will select people for the focus groups from locations where coral reef users live or where users who visit coral reefs are known to access the reefs.

2. Describe the procedures for the collection, including: the statistical methodology for stratification and sample selection; the estimation procedure; the degree of accuracy needed for the purpose described in the justification; any unusual problems requiring specialized sampling procedures; and any use of periodic (less frequent than annual) data collection cycles to reduce burden.

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

- What attributes are important to recreational users of coral reefs in Puerto Rico.
- Are there differences in what attributes might be important to residents versus visitors to Puerto Rico?
- What levels of each attribute of importance might change recreational users values for the coral reefs.

- What kinds of materials (illustrations, photos, videos) might be needed for each attribute to communicate the different levels of attributes of the coral reefs).

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

For the four focus groups, eight persons will be recruited for each group, for a total of 32 persons.

Based on past experience, incentives will be provided by the local marketing firm to focus group recruits to increase participation rates. The specific amounts ($50 to $75) will be determined by area and type of user (resident or visitor). The purpose of the incentive is to encourage attendance and to thank people for their time.

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

The research team has experience is conducting focus groups to design surveys. As explained in Part A, Question 2, they will use the broad questions (also see Introductory Questions for the Focus Groups) to help focus discussions on particular attributes of coral reefs that have been discovered in other studies around the world as a starting point of discussions. The discussions will be used to revise the list of attributes and refine the levels of attributes in further discussions with the focus groups.

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

For the focus groups, no statistical design is anticipated. The results of the focus groups will be reviewed and summarized by the University of Puerto Rico-Mayaguez, the local marketing firm, and Dr. Vernon R. (Bob) Leeworthy the overall project leader.

Focus Group Introductory Questions

Tonight we have invited you here to talk about your recreational activities on the coral reefs of Puerto Rico and the attributes of the coral reefs that are important to you when doing your activities on the coral reefs.

We have a couple of questions we would like to ask you before we begin our discussion.

{hand out questions and give 10 minutes to complete}

1. What recreational activities do you do on Puerto Rico's coral reefs?

(Please check all that apply)

__ snorkeling __ SCUBA Diving __ fishing _glass-bottom boat rides

__ Other (Specify) _____

_____

2. What attributes of coral reefs in Puerto Rico are important to you when doing your recreational activities? (For each attribute, please check each activity for which the attribute is important to you)

Snorkeling	SCUBA Diving	Fishing	Glass-bottom Boat Rides	
____	____	____	____	Coral cover – percent of sea floor covered by coral
____	____	____	___	Coral and fish diversity – number of different kinds of coral and fish
____	____	____	____	Fish abundance – amount of fish on the reefs
____	____	____	____	Water clarity/visibility – the distance you can see clearly
____	____	____	____	Opportunity to view Major Predators/Large Fauna (sharks, rays, sea turtles, manatees)
____	____	____	____	Water Quality – pollutants in water that might cause ear infections

Snorkeling	SCUBA Diving	Fishing	Glass-bottom Boat Rides	
____	____	____	____	Coast development – percentage of coastal development on coastline near where coral reefs are located
____	____	____	___	Marine Protected Areas – where you can to snorkeling, SCUBA diving and glass-bottom boat rides, but cannot fish or take things
____	____	____	____	Waters ports Zoning – exclusion of personal watercraft (jet skis and wave runners) from coral reef areas
____	____	____	____	Number of other users on the coral reefs
____	____	____	____	Opportunity to view Major Predators/Large Fauna (sharks, rays, sea turtles, manatees)
____	____	____	____	Water Quality – pollutants in water that might cause ear infections

ATTACHMENT C: Review of Literature on Coral Reef Attributes for Recreation-tourism

Beharry-Borg, Nesha and R. Scarpa, "*Valuing quality changes in Caribbean coastal waters for heterogeneous beach visitors*." Ecological Economics 69 (2010): 1124-1139.

This study examines the impact of the quality of coastal waters upon the tourism sector in Tobago. The purpose of this study is to fill a gap in the literature on valuation estimates specific to Tobago. The study utilizes two choice experiments designed to estimate willingness to pay (WTP) for an improvement in coastal water quality for snorkellors and nonsnorkellers. Study results indicate WTP estimates vary significantly between these two groups. It also demonstrates the value of using estimation methods designed to account for individual-specific difference in WTP estimates. Of all the studies found in the literature review this one included the most comprehensive suite of indicators as noted below.

Coral cover levels were noted as up to 15% coral cover and up to 45% coral cover. Fish abundance levels were 0-10 and 0-60. Water clarity levels were noted as visibility up to 5 m and visibility up to 10 m. Number of other users included recreational and fishing boats near coastline (up to 2, up to 7) and number of snorkelers allowed per group (up to 5, up to 15). Presence of marine protected area included two permutations: MPA where you can tour, swim, snorkel, dive and fish and MPA where you can do all such activities except fish. Coastline development was indicated by levels of up to 75% development allowed and up to 25% development allowed. Levels for risk of contracting an ear infection from swimming in polluted water were noted as increased chance or reduced chance. Plastic debris, as measured by the number of plastics per 30 m of coastline, was indicated by levels of less than 5 pieces or up to 15 pieces. Finally, a contribution fee to beach authority notes pricing levels of $10, $20 and $25. In all cases, with the exception of the fee category, a third possibility for an attribute level was the total absence of a relevant policy.

Ditton, Robert B. and D. Clark, "*Characteristics, Attitudes, Catch and Release Behavior, and Expenditures of Billfish Tournament Anglers in Puerto Rico*." Department of Wildlife and Fisheries Sciences, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX. July 1, 1994.

This research paper was initiated by The Billfish Foundation. It was designed for three reasons: 1) educate people regarding the social and economic significance of billfish angling, 2) support billfish conservation and management efforts and 3) provide information useful to the billfish conservation community to positively influence policy decisions made by ICCAT. A mailed survey questionnaire was used to collect information from resident and non-resident anglers who participated in tournaments held in Puerto Rico between August, 1991 and October, 1992.

No discrete levels of indicators were noted in this study.

Hargreaves-Allen, Venetia, S. Mourato and E. Milner-Gulland, *"A Global Evaluation of Coral Reef Management Performance: Are MPAs Producing Conservation and Socio-Economic Improvements?"* Environmental Management 47 (2011) 684-700.

This paper provides an analysis using several metrics to answer the question as to whether marine protected areas provide conservation and socio-economic improvements. Performance measures utilized to test the hypothesis include (but were not limited to) fulfillment of design and management criteria, achievement of aims, cessation of banned or destructive activities and

changes in threats. Analytical results were mixed with most MPAs failing to produce improvement in coral cover and conflict reduction. Yet a majority did produce a slowing of coral loss, reduction in destructive uses and an increase in tourism and local employment.

The only indicators listed associated with coral reef condition are 'coral mining/destructive fishing never occurs', 'better coral cover than national average' and 'maintained or improved coral cover'. No discrete levels for these indicators are provided.

Edwards, Peter, *"Sustainable financing for ocean and coastal management in Jamaica: The potential for revenues from tourist user fees."* Prepared for the Latin American and Caribbean Environmental Economics Program. Project No. WP04. June, 2008.

This study explores the feasibility of implementing a sustainable funding mechanism for ocean and coastal management in Jamaica. The study models contingent behavior for tourists who receive two slightly different scenarios and provides hypotheses about how consumer demand may differ across individuals. Study results indicate that an environmental surcharge of US$2 per person could generate $3.4M per year for management with 0.2% rate of decline in tourist visitation.

No levels relevant to coral reef condition were noted in this study.

Parsons, George R. and Steven Thur, "*Valuing Changes in the Quality of Coral Reef Ecosystems: A Stated Preference Study of SCUBA Diving in the Bonaire National Marine Park."* Environmental Resource Economics 40 (2008): 593-608.

This study estimates the economic value of changes in the quality of a coral reef ecosystem to SCUBA divers in the Caribbean who purchased a tag to obtain diving access to Bonaire National Marine Park in 2001. A stated preference mail survey was used to infer the value of three different levels of quality defined by the metrics of visibility, species diversity and percent coral cover.

Coral cover levels are noted at 5%, 20%, 30% and 35%. Coral and fish diversity combination levels are 50 fish/10 corals, 125 fish/25 corals, 225 fish/40 corals and 300 fish/45 corals. Water visibility levels are noted at 20 feet, 50 feet, 75 feet and 100 feet.

Rudd, Murray A., "*Live long and prosper: collective action, social capital and social vision*." Ecological Economics 34 (234): 131-144.

"This paper demonstrates the utility of social capital theory by articulating linkages between human decision making at individual and collective levels and social vision, an important research focus within the emerging ecological economics research tradition."

No levels relevant to coral reef condition were noted in this study.

Schuhmann, Peter W., Juan Seijo and James Casey, "*Economics Considerations for Marine EBM in the Caribbean*" taken from "Towards Marine Ecoystems based Management in the Wider Caribbean." Center for Maritime Research. MARE Publication Series No. 6. Amsterdam University Press. 2011.

This paper contributes to the ongoing dialogue regarding how an ecosystem approach to fisheries (EAF) may inform ecosystem-based management (EBM) practices and ultimately contribute to successful implementation of EAF in the Caribbean Region. EAF is seen as desirable as it promotes a more holistic approach to resource allocation and management as opposed to the single-species approach to fisheries management.

No levels relevant to coral reef condition were noted in this study.

Spash, Clive L., "*Multiple Value Expression in Contingent Valuation: Economics and Ethics.*" Environmental Science and Technology 34 (2000): 1433-1438.

This paper explores the influence of ethics and economics in human value formation. It specifically presents evidence "confirming the influence of ethical beliefs about rights for endangered species in determining willingness to pay (WTP) responses to a CVM survey."

No levels relevant to coral reef condition were noted in this study.

Spash, Clive L., "*Ecosystems, contingent valuation and ethics: the case of wetland recreation*." Ecological Economics 34 (2000): 195-215.

"This paper addresses a current issue in environmental valuation, namely, the extent to which environmental preferences depart from the usual economics paradigm to incorporate some lexicographic elements. After a theoretical discussion the paper reviews attempts to explore this question empirically by supplementing contingent valuation analyses with an exploration of the motives behind willingness-to-pay responses, including zero bids and refusals to answer."

No levels relevant to coral reef condition were noted in this study.

Uyarra, Maria C., Isabelle Cote, Jennifer Gill, Rob Tinch, David Viner and Andrew Watkinson, "*Island-specific preferences of tourists for environmental features: implications of climate chance for tourism-dependent states.*" Environmental Conservation 32 (1): 11-19.

This paper examines the impact that climate change induced alteration in key environmental components of tourism destinations may have on the tourism economies of Bonaire and Barbados. Temperature, water clarity and health risk were determined to be environmental features most influential upon holiday destination selection. A strong correlation was found between the quality of environmental attributes and a willingness of tourists to return. For example, "more than 80% of tourists in Bonaire and Barbados were noted to be unwilling to return for the same holiday price in the event, respectively, or coral bleaching as a result of elevated sea surface temperatures and reduced beach area as a result of sea level rise."

This study provided a number of environmental attributes to assess what may influence tourism behavior. Environmental attributes included coral diversity, coral cover, coral health, fish diversity, fish abundance,

presence of sea turtles, bird diversity, landscape attractiveness, water clarity, air temperature, few tropical diseases, no malaria, no vaccination requirements, beach size, sand quality and number of tourists. No discrete values for these attributes were provided. Importance of attributes was computed using a Likert scoring system.

Van Beukering, Pieter J.H., Samia Sarkis, Emily McKenzie, Sebastiaan Hess, Luke Brander, Mark Roelfsema, Loes Looijenstijn-van der Putten and Tadzio Bervoets, "*Total Economic Value of Bermuda's Coral Reefs, Valuation of Ecosystem Services*"
Institute for Environmental Studies, Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam, The Netherlands.

"This environmental economic study seeks to address the lack of environmental consideration in current policy and decision-making for the marine environment, by providing a means of recognizing the value of the range of ecosystem services provided by Bermuda's coral reefs. Bermuda is one of the most densely populated countries in the world, with an economy supported by international business and tourism; increasing coastal development places intense pressure on the island's natural resources, namely on the marine environment and more specifically on the northernmost coral reef system in the world. The policy issues affecting Bermuda's coral reefs involve the lack of formal procedure when "planning" or "developing" in the marine environment, and the absence of a mechanism for integrating environmental values into those decisions."

No levels relevant to coral reef condition were noted in this study.

Waterman, Troy, "*Assessing Public Attitudes and Behavior Toward Tourism Development in Barbados: Socio-Economic and Environmental Implications*." Systems Consulting Ltd. Presented at Annual Review Seminar, Central Bank of Barbados. July 27-30, 2009.

"This research discusses the negative social, environmental and economic impacts of tourism development in Barbados; describes the perceptions of residents and tourists to such; and measures their preferences for environmental management changes using the island's lone marine reserve, the Folkestone Marine Reserve, as a case study. The research outcomes demonstrated that environmental management within the context of tourism development in Barbados requires the balancing of public needs with the environmental and economic consequences of development."

Attributes listed in this study are *not specific* to coral reef quality. Selected attributes and levels include sewage treatment, facilities and information, watersports zoning, and a payment vehicle for both residents and visitors. Sewage treatment levels include no change in policy, most sewage treated to moderate quality and most sewage treated to high quality. Facility levels include no policy change and signposts showing zones and user information with or without additional public showers/toilets. Zoning possibilities included no policy change, an expansion of watersports zone and complete exclusion of watercrafts from recreational zone. Resident payment levels included $9, $15, $20, $37, $48 and $70. Non-resident (visitor) payment levels were $15, $25, $43, $60, $74 and $100.

Wielgus, Jeffrey, Nanette Chadwick-Furman, Naomi Zeitouni and Mordechai Shechter, *"Effects of Coral Reef Attribute Damage on Recreational Welfare."* Marine Resource Economics 18 (2003): 225-237.

"This paper presents the results of an economic valuation of coral reef degradation at Eilat, Israeli Red Sea. The marginal prices of coral and fish diversity and water visibility are estimated to be US$2.60 and US$1.20 per dive, respectively. From the standpoint of recreational diving welfare, the annual social costs of activities contributing to coral reef degradation are approximately US$2.86 million."

Coral cover and fish abundance attribute levels are indicated by a combined index which is based on the number of different taxonomic categories for coral and fish plus abundance per square meter. A low level is 7 taxonomic categories plus 1.75 abundance per square meter. Medium is 20 taxonomic categories plus 5.75 abundance per square meter. High is 21 taxonomic categories plus 11.25 abundance per square meter.

Coral Reef Ecosystem Attributes for Recreation-tourism Ecosystem Service

Attributes/Levels	Reference
1. Coral Cover	
low, medium, high (videos of sites with different levels) See index below under coral and fish diversity.	Wielgus (2003)
Can view up to 15% coral cover while snorkeling, can view up to 45% coral cover while snorkeling	Beharry-Borg/Scarpa (2010)
5%, 20%, 30%, 35%	Parsons & Thur (2008)
2. Coral and fish diversity	
low, medium and high (videos of sites with different levels) Calculated Index as number of different taxomic categories for coral and fish plus abundance per square meter (m^2). Low = 7 taxonomic categories plus 1.75 abundance/m^2 or 8.85 Medium = 20 taxonomic categories plus 5.75 abundance/m^2 or 25.75 High = 21 taxonomic categories plus 11.25 abundance/m^2 or 32.25	Wielgus (2003)
50 fish 10 corals, 125 fish 25 corals, 225 fish 40 corals, 300 fish, 45 corals	Parsons & Thur (2008)
3. Fish Abundance	
low, medium, high (see combined index above)	Wielgus (2003)
0-10, 0-60	Beharry-Borg/Scarpa (2010)
4. Water Clarity/Visibility	
Meters of maximum visibility 3, 10 and 30 (videos of reference SCUBA diver at different distances)	Wielgus (2003)
Visibility up to 5 m, visibility up to 10m	Beharry-Borg/Scarpa (2010)
20 feet, 50 feet, 75 feet, 100 feet	Parsons & Thur (2008)
5. Opportunity to View Major Predators/Large Fauna	
Presence/absense	

6. Number of Other Users	
Number of recreational and fishing boats near coastline - up to 2, up to 7	Beharry-Borg/Scarpa (2010)
Number of snorkelers allowed per group - up to 5, up to 15	Beharry-Borg/Scarpa (2010)
7. Marine protected area - (presence of a marine protected area)	
MPA where you can tour, swim, snorkel, dive AND fish, MPA where you can all EXCEPT fish	Beharry-Borg/Scarpa (2010)
8. Coastline development - percentage of coastal development on the coastline	
Up to 75% development allowed, up to 25% development allowed	Beharry-Borg/Scarpa (2010)
9. Average bathing water quality - Risk of contracting an ear infection from swimming in polluted water	
Increased chance, reduced chance	Beharry-Borg/Scarpa (2010)
10. Plastic debris - number of plastics per 30m of coastline	
Less than 5 pieces, up to 15 pieces	Beharry-Borg/Scarpa (2010)
11. Sewage Treatment	
Most sewage treated to moderate quality, most sewage treated to high quality	Waterman (2009)
12. Facilities/Information	
Signposts showing zones and user info, signposts showing zones and user info + more public showers/toilet	Waterman (2009)
13. Watersports zoning	
Expansion of watersports zone, total exclusion of watercraft from recreational zone	Waterman (2009)
14. Fee - Contribution fee to beach authority	
$10, $20, $25	Beharry-Borg/Scarpa (2010)
Called a 'conservation levy': For residents: $9, $15, $20, $37, $48, $70 For visitors: $15, $25, $43, $60, $74, $100	Waterman (2009)

United States Environmental Protection Agency
Washington, DC 20460

Interagency Agreement/ Amendment

Part 1 - General Information

1. EPA IA Identification Number DW-13-92357901 - 0	2. Funding Location by Region EPA HQ
3. Other Agency IA ID Number (if known) MOA-2012-027/8530	4. Awarding Office IASSC East
5. Type of Action New	6. IA Specialist: NancyT Brown 202-564-3264 brown.nancyt@epa.gov

7. Name and Address of EPA Organization US Environmental Protection Agency IASSC East 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW Mail code 3903R Washington, DC 20460	8. Name and Address of Other Agency Department of Commerce-NOAA Office of National Marine Sanctuaries 1315 East West Highway Silver Spring, MD 20910
9. DUNS: 029128894 10. BETC: DISB	11. DUNS: 784769085 12. BETC: COLL

13. Project Title and Description
Market and Non-market valuation of Puerto Rico's coral reef ecosystem services

The goal of this collaboration is to complete an economic valuation (market and non market) survey for four ecosystem services (tourism and recreation, fishing, shoreline protection, and natural products) for Puerto Rico. There are five phases that must be completed to achieve this goal: 1) understanding the Puerto Rico context for decisions; 2) designing the survey sampling frame; 3) designing the survey instruments; 4) implementing the surveys; and 5) assessing and publishing the survey results.

14. EPA Project Officer (Name, Address, Telephone Number) William Fisher 1 Sabine Island Drive Gulf Breeze, FL 32561-5299 850-934-9394 E-Mail: Fisher.William@epamail.epa.gov FAX: 850-934-9201	15. Other Agency Project Officer (Name, Address, Telephone) Dr. Vernon R. (Bob) Leeworthy 1315 East West Highway Silver Spring, MD 20910 301-713-0404 E-Mail: bob.leeworthy@noaa.gov FAX: 301-713-7235
16. Project Period: ~~05/01/2012~~ when signed to 12/31/2015	17. Budget Period: ~~05/01/2012~~ when signed to 12/31/2015

18. Scope of Work (See Attachment) CZMA, 16 USC 1456c
See Attached SOW. Program Authority: ~~NMSA, 16 USC 1431 et seq~~

19. Employer/Tax ID No. 520852695	20. CAGE No: 347A4	21. ALC: 68-01-0727

22. Statutory Authority for Transfer of Funds and Interagency Agreement Clean Water Act: Sec. 104(b)(2)	23. Other Agency Type Federal Agency

24. Revise Reimbursable Funds and Direct Fund Cites (only complete if applicable)

	Previous Funding	This Action	Amended Total
Revise Reimbursable (in-house)			0
Direct Fund Cite (contractor)			0
Total			0

Funds	Previous Amount	Amount This Action	Total Amount
25. EPA Amount		$195,000	$195,000
26. EPA In-Kind Amount		$129,363	$129,363
27. Other Agency Amount			$0
28. Other Agency In-Kind Amount		$53,715	$53,715
29. Total Project Cost		$378,078	$378,078

30. Fiscal Information

Treas. Symbol	DCN	FY	Appropriation	Budget Org	PRC	Object Class	Site/Project	Cost Org	Ob/De-Ob Amt
682/30107	1226XQ0197	1213	C	26XQ000	301FK8XPW	2571			195,000
									195,000

Part II - Approved Budget

EPA IAG Identification Number
DW-13-92357901 - 0

31. Budget Categories	Itemization of All Previous Actions	Itemization of This Action	In-Kind Itemization of This Action	Itemization of Total Project Cost to Date
(a) Personnel			$142,815	$142,815
(b) Fringe Benefits			$27,313	$27,313
(c) Travel		$5,000	$3,000	$8,000
(d) Equipment				$0
(e) Supplies				$0
(f) Procurement / Assistance		$188,000	$1,950	$189,950
(g) Construction				$0
(h) Other		$2,000	$8,000	$10,000
(i) Total Direct Charges	$0	$195,000	$183,078	$378,078
(j) Indirect Costs:	$0			$0
Indirect Amount: Rate: % Base: $ (k) Charges: Pass-Out: Not charged by Other Agency Estimate by other Agency Amount: $				
(l) Total (EPA Share 85.79 %) (Other Agency Share 14.21 %)	$0	$195,000	$183,078	$378,078

32. How was the IDC Base calculated?

33. Is equipment authorized to be furnished by EPA or leased, purchased, or rented with EPA funds? [X] Yes [ ] No
(Identify all equipment costing $1,000 or more)

34. Are any of these funds being used on extramural agreements? [X] Yes [ ] No

Type of Extramural Agreement: Cooperative Agreement [ ] Contract

Contractor/Recipient Name (if known)	Total Extramural Amount Under This Project	Percent Funded by EPA (if known)
TBD	189950 Total: $ 189,950.00	100

Part III - Funding Methods and Billing Instructions

35. (Note: EPA Agency Location Code (ALC) - 68010727)

[X] Disbursement Agreement — Request for repayment of actual costs must be itemized on SF 1080 and submitted to the Financial Management Office, Cincinnati, OH 45268-7002.

[X] Repayment — Monthly [ ] Quarterly [ ] Upon Completion of Work

[ ] Advance — Only available for use by Federal agencies on working capital funds and approximate quarterly cash flow is the basis of payment method. Unexpended funds at completion of work to be returned to EPA. Quarterly cost reports will be forwarded to the Financial Management Center, EPA, Cincinnati, OH 45268-7007.

[ ] Allocation Transfer-Out — Used to transfer obligational authority or transfer of function between federal agencies. Must receive prior approval by the Office of Comptroller, Budget Division, Budget Formulation and Control Branch, EPA Hdqtrs. Forward approval letters to the Financial Reports and Analysis Branch, Financial Management Division, PM-226F, EPA, Washington, DC 20460.

[ ] Reimbursement Agreement [ ] Repayment [ ] Advance
Allocation Transfer-In

Other Agency's Billing Address (Include ALC or Station Symbol Number)	Other Agency's Billing Instructions and Frequency

Part IV - Acceptance Conditions	EPA Identification Number DW-13-92357901 - 0

37. Terms and Conditions, when included, are located at the end of the 1610-1, or as an attachment.

Part V - Offer and Acceptance

Note: A) For Fund-out actions the agreement/amendment must be signed by the other agency official in duplicate and one original returned to the Grants and IA Management Division for Headquarters agreements or to the appropriate EPA Regional IA administration office within 3 calendar weeks after receipt or within any extension of time that may be granted by EPA. The agreement/amendment must be forwarded to the address cited in item 23 after acceptance signature

Failure to return the properly executed document within the prescribed time may result in the withdrawal of offer by EPA. Any change to the agreement/amendment by the other agency after the document is signed by the EPA Award Official, which the Award Official determines to materially alter the agreement/amendment, shall void the agreement/amendment

B) For Funds-In actions the other agency will initiate the action and forward two original agreements/amendments to the appropriate EPA program office for signature. The agreements/amendments will then be forwarded to the appropriate EPA IA administration office for signature on behalf of the EPA. EPA will return one original copy after acceptance returned to the other agency after acceptance.

EPA IA Administration Office (for administrative assistance)	EPA Program Office (for technical assistance)
38. Organization/Address U.S. Environmental Protection Agency IASSC East 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW Mail code 3903R Washington, DC 20460	39. Organization/Address US Environmental Protection Agency ORD - Office of Research and Development 1 Sabine Island Drive Gulf Breeze, FL 32561-5299

Award Official on Behalf of the Environment Protection Agency	
40. Digital signature applied by EPA Award Official | FOR Frank N. Roth - Chief Fellowship IA & SEE Branch Michelle Messick - AO delegate	Date 06/26/2012

Authorizing Official on Behalf of the Other Agency		
41. Signature	Typed Name and Title Daniel J. Basta, Director, Office of National Marine Sanctuaries	Date 9/14/12

IA Terms and Conditions

1. In accordance with Public Law 102-389, EPA's policy requires, to the fullest extent possible, that at least 8% of its overall Federal funding for prime and subcontracts awarded in support of authorized programs be awarded to business concerns or other organizations owned or controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals, including historically Black colleges and universities and women. Also, in accordance with CERCLA, as amended (P.L. 99-499), Section 105, any Federal agency awarding contracts, grants or cooperative agreements utilizing Superfund monies shall consider the availability of minority contractors for participation in contracts. This includes, but is not limited to: contracts, subcontracts, and any sub-agreements. The IA recipient will also strive to meet EPA's SBA negotiated goals for awarding contracts to small and disadvantaged businesses. The IA recipient will accomplish these objectives through adherence to the small and minority owned business requirements set forth in the Small Business Act, 15 U.S.C. 631 et seq and the annual Small Business goals negotiated with the IA recipient and the Small Business Administration. All reporting on MBE/WBE and small business accomplishments will be done through the existing federal contracting reporting mechanism, currently the "Federal Procurement Data System, Next Generation," which is available at: https://www.fpds.gov/fpdsng_cms/.

2. Should disagreements arise on the interpretation of the provisions of this agreement or amendments and/or revisions thereto, that cannot be resolved at the operating level, the area(s) of disagreement shall be stated in writing by each party and presented to the other party for consideration. If agreement or interpretation is not reached within 30 days, the parties shall forward the written presentation of the disagreement to respective higher officials for appropriate resolution.

If a dispute related to funding remains unresolved for more than 30 calendar days after the parties have engaged in an escalation of the dispute, disputes will be resolved in accordance with instructions provided in the Treasury Financial Manual (TFM) Volume I, Part 2, Chapter 4700, Appendix 10, available at http://www.fms.treas.gov/tfm/index.html.

3. Cost Collection Upon Cancellation
If the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) cancels the order, the Department of Commerce is authorized to collect costs incurred prior to cancellation of the order plus termination costs, up to the total payment amount provided for under the agreement.

4. When requesting payments, a breakdown of the cost associated with the billing request must be provided to the EPA Project Officer. This information should allow the Project Officer to determine that costs billed to EPA are necessary and reasonable. If this information is not provided, the EPA Project Officer will notify FMD to suspend or charge back the payment of the invoice.

5. EPA expressly reserves the right to terminate the IA for failure to make sufficient progress so as to reasonably ensure completion of the project within the project period, including any extensions. EPA will measure sufficient progress by examining the performance required under the Statement of Work, the time remaining for performance, and/or the availability of funds necessary to complete performance. In exercising this right to terminate, EPA will follow the procedures for terminating the IA in Term and Conditions.

6. This interagency agreement (IA) obligates and transfers or advances EPA funds appropriated under the Department of Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act (FY12 Appropriations Act). As a result, this IA is subject to the provisions of Division Sections 433 and 434 of the Appropriations Act, regarding federal felony convictions and unpaid federal tax liabilities. Specifically, Section 433 provides:

> None of the funds made available by this Act [FY12 Appropriations Act] may be used to enter into a contract, memorandum of understanding, or cooperative agreement with, make a grant to, or provide a loan or loan guarantee to, any corporation that was convicted (or had an officer or agent of such corporation acting on behalf of the corporation convicted) of a felony criminal violation under any Federal law within the preceding 24 months, where the awarding agency is aware of the conviction, unless the agency has considered suspension or debarment of the corporation, or such officer or agent, and made a determination that this further action is not necessary to protect the interests of the Government.

Section 434 of Division E of the Appropriations Act further provides:

> None of the funds made available by this Act [FY12 Appropriations Act] may be used to enter into a contract, memorandum of understanding, or cooperative agreement with, make a grant to, or provide a loan or loan guarantee to, any corporation with respect to which any unpaid Federal tax liability that has been assessed, for which all judicial and administrative remedies have been exhausted or have lapsed, and that is not being paid in a timely manner pursuant to an agreement with the authority responsible for collecting the tax liability, where the awarding agency is aware of the unpaid tax liability, unless the agency has considered suspension or debarment of the corporation and made a determination that this further action is not necessary to protect the interests of the Government.

Accordingly, by accepting the award of this IA, the *Department of Commerce* agrees that it will comply with and implement the prohibitions of Sections 433 and 434 for any contract, assistance agreement, loan, loan guarantee or other instrument that uses funds provided under this IA.

Non-compliance with the provisions of Sections 433 and 434 may implicate the Antideficiency Act. *The Department of Commerce* will notify the EPA Award Official within 30 days of an award where the *Department of Commerce* considered suspension and debarment in accordance with Sections 433 and 434.

7. AMENDMENTS:

A. This Agreement may be amended at any time by mutual written consent of the Partners.
B. This agreement will be reviewed periodically, but not less than annually. It may be subject to reconsideration at such times as may be required and as agreed to by the Partners entering into this Agreement.

8. TERM OF AGREEMENT

A. This Agreement becomes effective when all Partners sign it.
B. This agreement will remain in effect until December 31, 2015, or until terminated by mutual written agreement of the Partners. Any Partner may terminate its participation in the agreement by giving the other Partner 30 days advance written notice.

9. BILLING:

Fiscal and Accounting Data:

NOAA DUNS: 78-4769085
NOAA EIN: 52-0821608
NOAA Appropriation Code (for collection): 13x1450
EPA DUNS: 029128894
EPA EIN: 520852695
EPA Appropriation Code (for payment): 26XQ000

Scope of Work
"Market and Non-market valuation of Puerto Rico's coral reef ecosystem services"

Interagency Agreement Between the
Environmental Protection Agency
Office of Research and Development
National Health and Environmental Effects Laboratory
Gulf Ecology Division
And
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
National Ocean Service
Office of National Marine Sanctuaries

I. BACKGROUND

A.) EPA/ORD:
The Office of Research and Development (ORD) is the scientific research arm of EPA. ORD's mission is to perform research and development to identify, understand, and solve current and future environmental problems, provide responsive technical support to EPA's mission, integrate the work of ORD's scientific partners, and provide leadership in addressing emerging environmental issues and in advancing the science and technology of risk assessment and risk management.

The Gulf Ecology Division (OED) is one of four ecological divisions within the National Health and Environmental Effects Research Laboratory (NHEERL) of ORD. GED's mission includes developing the scientific basis for assessing the condition of estuarine and coastal ecosystems, their response to natural and anthropogenic stresses, and the development of methods to quantify ecosystem services provided by fishing, tourism, shoreline protection and natural products discovery.

B.) NOAA/ONMS:
The Office of National Marine Sanctuaries (ONMS) manages 13 sanctuaries and one marine national monument encompassing more than 150,000 square miles of U.S. Ocean and Great Lakes waters. Important habitats like breeding and feeding grounds of whales, sea lions, sharks, and sea turtles; coral reefs; kelp forests; and historic shipwrecks are represented within the National Marine Sanctuary System.

National marine sanctuaries are centers for strong local economies and have economic value reaching far beyond the water. ONMS conducts socioeconomics research and monitoring, including nonmarket and market economic values of ecosystem services provided by natural and cultural resources as well as what economists call passive economic use value or what many have referred to as nonuse value.

C.) Puerto Rico:

An insular U.S. Commonwealth, Puerto Rico represents a spatially-limited geographic system that is opportune for examining economic, social and ecological sustainability. Communities across Puerto Rico vary in population, economic base, ecological resources and culture, and the decisions made by one community can affect several others. As an island, Puerto Rico is highly dependent on coastal resources, including fisheries, tourism, shoreline protection from biogenic habitat, and has built a leading industry on development of pharmaceutical products from natural marine resources. Different watersheds in Puerto Rico face a variety of tradeoffs between land and coastal services.

The multi-Agency U.S. Coral Reef Task Force (USCRTF) initiated a program to address sediment and nutrient pollution of coral reefs in the Guanica Bay watershed in southwest Puerto Rico. Agencies involved in the partnership include NOAA, EPA, US Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource Conservation Service (USDA-NRCS) and Forest Service (USDA-FS), US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), US Geological Survey (USGS), and Puerto Rico Department of the Environment and Natural Resources (DRNA). NOAA funded the Center for Watershed Protection (CWP) to develop a Guanica Bay Watershed Management Plan, which was published in 2008 (CWP 2008). The plan recommended several potential management actions focused on a variety of issues that could reduce pollutant loads and adverse effects on coral reefs. In 2010, EPA and the Caribbean Coral Reef Institute (CCRI) held a Decision Workshop with resource managers, scientists and citizens to examine the objectives and activities proposed in the Management Plan and to conceptually organize the issues in a decision framework useful for identifying trade-offs and information gaps. A key aspect of the workshop was framing the management recommendations into a conceptual framework, the Driving forces-Pressure-State-Impact-Response (DPSIR) framework, an exercise that elicited valuable information on benefits, costs, values and unintended consequences of the proposed actions.

Effective protection of coral reefs begins with the recognition and appreciation of ecosystem services they provide. Land-use and water management decisions must be made with full understanding of potential economic and social losses to downstream resources.

II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The goal of this collaboration is to complete an economic valuation (market and nonmarket) survey for four ecosystem services (tourism and recreation, fishing, shoreline protection, and natural products) for Puerto Rico. There are five phases that must be completed to achieve this goal: 1) understanding the Puerto Rico context for decisions; 2) designing the survey sampling frame; 3) designing the survey instruments; 4) implementing the surveys; and 5) assessing and publishing the survey results.

1. <u>Understanding the Puerto Rico context for decisions.</u>

Successful completion of this project requires:

a. A sound understanding of coral reef ecosystems, threats to those systems, perceptions of their value and how they might be affected by different decision and management options. EPA will convene scientist and stakeholder panels to address these questions.

b. An understanding of the Puerto Rico human population. NOAA will collect information from the US Census and other sources to characterize the Puerto Rican population.

2. Designing the survey sampling frame.

In a statistically valid survey, the sample is objectively chosen so that the results can be reliably projected from the sample to the population. NOAA will design a statistically representative sample frame. We will be analyzing our data in five (5) regions (NE, SE SW, NW, and the islands of Vieques and Culebra).

3. Designing the survey instruments.

Surveys represent one of the most common types of quantitative, social science research. In survey research, the researcher selects a sample of respondents from a population and administers a standardized questionnaire to them. The questionnaire, or survey, can be a written document that is completed by the person being surveyed, an online questionnaire, a face-to-face interview, or a telephone interview. Using surveys, it is possible to collect data from large or small populations (sometimes referred to as the universe of a study).

NOAA will apply a modified form of the method used in the Florida Keys (Leeworthy 1996; Leeworthy and Wiley 1997) and in Hawaii (Bishop et al. 2011). This approach uses the stated-preference (SP) and stated-choice hybrid survey methods of estimating the values of attributes (ecosystem services) combined with surveys of residents and visitors to assess the value that stakeholders assign to coral reef attributes.

The project will use information collected in phase 1a; to generate meaningful survey questionnaires. The project will use a combination of paper survey questionnaires (for residents) and web-based surveys (for visitors and optional for residents). NOAA will lead the effort to develop the initial survey questions.

NOAA and EPA will hold focus groups and one-on-one interviews to pretest the survey instrument. The survey instrument will be designed so that all respondents will be able to fully complete the survey questionnaire within about 30 minutes.

NOAA and EPA will subject the survey instrument and related materials (e.g., underlying economic theory, experimental design) to an external peer review.

NOAA will submit the survey questionnaire and all required paperwork to OMB for approval prior to conducting the survey.

4. Implementing the surveys.

NOAA will be responsible for implementing the surveys.

We will use a combination of paper survey questionnaires (for residents) and web-based surveys (for visitors and optional for residents). We will target visitors at airports, deploying the short

on-site form (Leeworthy 1996). This form gathers demographic and use information from visitors departing the islands.

We will use this information to recruit visitors into Internet Panels for follow-up survey modules addressing market and non-market economic valuation. This method allows us to assess and weight non-response bias in the Internet Panels.

We will use a two-pronged approach to target Puerto Rico residents. We will first recruit residents into the sample via in-home survey and then ask them if they would fill out the longer survey questionnaire and mail it back. This approach will allow us to get probabilistic samples that can be extrapolated from sample to population. The forms will be in Spanish and in paper format.

5. Assessing and publishing the survey results.

Multiple human activities impinge on Puerto Rico's coral reefs. In order to gain insights into the public's values for coral reef protection and restoration, this study will focus on impacts from land-based sources of pollution. Of particular interest will be the management activities proposed in the Guanica Bay Watershed Management Plan, and the potential value to be derived from those.

We will be analyzing our data in five (5) regions (NE, SE, SW, NW, and the islands of Vieques and Culebra).

III. RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE PARTIES:

In section II above, some of the responsibilities of the parties were discussed. Here all the responsibilities of the parties are detailed. The responsibilities of EPA/ORD and NOAA/NOS/ONMS, the PARTNERS, described below are contingent upon the U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB) approval of all project survey sample designs and questionnaires under the Paperwork Reduction Act and the availability of appropriated funds to the agencies.

A. EPA/ORD agrees to:

1. Provide to NOAA/NOS/ONMS $195,000 to fund contracts, cooperative agreements, and any travel necessary to design and implement the surveys of recreation-tourist users of Puerto Rico's coral reef ecosystems and the economic analysis and reporting of the information collected.
2. Provide the services of Pat Bradley for overall project management and coordination.
3. Provide EPA economists to assist in survey designs and economic analyses and internal project peer review.
4. Provide a series of workshops in Puerto Rico to help determine what attributes of Puerto Rico's coral reef ecosystems people care about and thus have economic value.

5. Provide a team of physical/natural scientists to estimate how coral reef ecosystems will change with changes in management strategies.

B. NOAA/NOS/ONMS agrees to:

1. Provide the services of ONMS Chief Economist, Dr. Vernon R. (Bob) Leeworthy to serve as project co-manager, lead the design and implementation of surveys, and the analysis and reports of the survey data.
2. Lead the design of all survey sample designs and questionnaires meeting PARTNER objectives and provide to all PARTNERS for review and approval. In addition, to be responsible for all activities related to getting OMB approval of all survey sample designs and questionnaires.
3. Fully participate in planning and conducting research in analyzing results, and in disseminating research results and publishing findings.
4. Coordinate all project activities related to the economic components of the project and all the deliverables described in Section IV.
5. Enter and manage all contracts and cooperative agreements necessary to design and implement surveys of Puerto Rico's coral reef system recreation-tourist users.

IV. DELIVERABLES:

The following work products shall be delivered by NOAA/NOS/ONMS to EPA/ORD consistent with the terms of this agreement and the Budget and Timeline herein incorporated and made part of the agreement as Attachment A. All budget items are "best estimates" since the work will be done through contracts, sub-contracts and or cooperative agreements.

A. OMB approved questionnaires and sample designs for surveys of residents of Puerto Rico and visitors to Puerto Rico that used the coral reef ecosystems in Puelto Rico.
B. All data and documentation from the resident and visitor surveys in formats useable by EPA/ORD.
C. Quarterly status reports summarizing progress on the project and preliminary data analyses as they become available.
D. Final reports and analyses of the data collected, to include the following:

1. Estimates of total resident and visitor use (person-trips and person-days) by user group (resident and visitor), by season (summer and winter), and by five geographic regions (NE, SE SW, NW, and the islands of Vieques and Culebra).
2. Profiles of residents and visitors including information on age, race/ethnicity, sex, education level, household income, activity participation, and spending in the local and regional Puerto Rican economies.
3. Estimates of economic impact (sales/output, income and employment) of visitor and resident spending associated with use of coral reef ecosystems.
4. Estimates of non-market economic use values associated with coral reef ecosystem uses and how those values change with changes in coral reef ecosystem attributes.

V. OWNERSHIP OF DATA AND DELIVERABLES:

The Partners to this Agreement shall be joint owners of, and shall have complete and equal access to all project data and deliverables, except as limited by applicable law with respect to confidential survey data. (Names and addresses of survey participants will be removed from all databases before distribution).

POINTS OF CONTACT:

A. NOAA/NOS/ONMS

Dr. Vernon R. (Bob) Leeworthy
Chief Economist
NOAA/NOS/ONMS – N/NMSI
1305 East West Highway, SSMC4, 11th floor
Silver Spring, MD 20910
Telephone: (301) 713-7261
Fax: (301) 713-0404
E-mail: Bob.Leeworthy@noaa.gov

B. EPA/ORD

Patricia Bradley
US EPA/ORD/NHEERL/AED/MAB
c/o Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary
33 East Quay Road
Key West, FL 33040
Telephone: 305-809-4690
Fax: 305-293-5011
E-mail: bradley.patricia@epa.gov

The Parties agree that if there is a change regarding the information in this section, the Party making the change will notify the other Party in writing of such change. An amendment is not required to make the change.

References

Bishop RS, Chapman OJ, Kanninen BJ, Krosnick JA, Leeworthy B, Neade NF. 2011. *Total Economic Value for protecting and restoring Hawaiian Coral Reef Ecosystems Final Report.* Silver Spring, MD: NOAA Office of National Marine Sanctuaries, Office of response and Restoration, and Coral Reef Conservation Program. NOAA Technical Memorandum CRCP 16, 405 pp.

Center for Watershed Protection (CWP). 2008. *Gucmica Bay Watershed Management Plan.* Prepared for the NOAA Coral Reef Program. Center for Watershed Protection. Ellicott City, MD.

Leeworthy VR. 1996. *Linking the Economy and Environment of the Florida Keys/Florida Bay Technical Appendix Sampling Methodologies and Estimation Methods Applied to The Florida Keys/Key West Visitors Surveys.* National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Silver Spring MD.

Leeworthy VR and Wiley PC. 1997. *Linking the Economy and Environment of the Florida Keys/Florida Bay.*

Technical Appendix: Sampling Methodologies and Estimation Methods Applied to the Survey of Monroe County Residents. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Silver Spring MD.

ATTACHMENT A

ESTIMATED BUDGET

Item	Amount
Contracts/Cooperative Agreements for Surveys	$188,000
Travel (two trips to Puerto Rico)	$5,000
Data for IMPLAN 1-0 Model	$2,000
Total	$195,000

Total Funding for EPA-NOAA Puerto Rico Study on Recreation-tourism Use of Coral Reef Ecosytem

Budget Categories	EPA Funds[1]	EPA In-kind[2]	NOAA In-kind[3]	Total Project[4]
(a.) Personnel	$0	$94,690	$48,125	$142,815
(b.) Fringe Benefits	$0	$23,673	$3,640	$27,313
(c.) Travel	$5,000	$3,000	$0	$8,000
(d.) Equitpment	$0		$0	$0
(e.) Supplies	$0		$0	$0
(f.) Procurement/Assistance	$188,000		$1,950	$189,950
(g.) Construction	$0		$0	$0
(h.) Other	$2,000		$0	$2,000
(i.) Total Direct Charges	**$195,000**	**$129,363**	**$53,715**	**$378,078**
(j.) Indirect Costs	$0		$0	$0
(k.) Total	**$195,000**	**$129,363**	**$53,715**	**$378,078**
Percentage of Total	51.58	34.22	14.21	100.00

1. EPA funds must all be obligated or spent in FY 2013.
2. EPA in-kind spread over FY 2012 ($12,936.30), FY 2013 ($38,808.90), FY 2014 ($38,808.90) FY 2015 ($38,808.90).
3. NOAA in-kind spread over FY 2012 ($5,371.50), FY 2013 ($16,114.50), FY 2014 ($16,114.50) FY 2015 ($16,114.50).
4. Total Project Costs spread over FY 2012 ($18,307.80), FY 2013 ($249,923.40), FY 2014 ($54,923.40) FY 2015 ($54,923.40).

HUNTON & WILLIAMS

HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP
RIVERFRONT PLAZA, EAST TOWER
951 EAST BYRD STREET
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA 23219-4074

TEL 804 • 788 • 8200
FAX 804 • 788 • 8218

JAMES N. CHRISTMAN
DIRECT DIAL: 804 • 788 • 8368
EMAIL: jchristman@hunton.com

FILE NO: 29142.060007

October 15, 2012

VIA E-MAIL

Ms. Jennifer Jessup
Departmental Paperwork Clearance Officer
Department of Commerce
Room 6616
14th and Constitution Avenue NW
Washington, DC 20230

Economic Value of Puerto Rico's Coral Reef Ecosystems

Dear Ms. Jessup:

Enclosed are the comments of the Utility Water Act Group on the Proposed Information Collection Request; Economic Value of Puerto Rico's Coral Reef Ecosystem for Recreation - Tourism, noticed at 77 Fed. Reg. 48,504 (August 14, 2012). We appreciate the opportunity to comment and hope these comments prove helpful.

Yours very truly,

James N. Christman

James N. Christman

Enclosure

COMMENTS OF
THE UTILITY WATER ACT GROUP
ON PROPOSED INFORMATION COLLECTION REQUEST;
ECONOMIC VALUE OF PUERTO RICO'S CORAL REEF
ECOSYSTEMS FOR RECREATION - TOURISM

77 Fed. Reg. 48,504 (August 14, 2012)

October 15, 2012

The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), in partnership with the Environmental Protection Agency, proposes to conduct focus groups to help design surveys of visitors to and residents of Puerto Rico. The focus groups will be used "to address the attributes of coral reef ecosystems that people may consider important, and the levels of the attributes such as water clarity/visibility, coral cover and diversity, and fish abundance and diversity." 77 Fed. Reg. 48,504 col. 2. The purpose is to "estimate the market and non-market economic values of Puerto Rico's coral reef ecosystems." The Federal Register notice provides the following information:

> **III. Data**
> *OMB Control Number:* 0648–XXXX.
> *Form Number:* None.
> *Type of Review:* Regular submission (new information collection).
> *Affected Public:* Individuals or households.
> *Estimated Number of Respondents:* 32.
> *Estimated Time per Response:* 2 hours per focus group member.
> *Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours:* 64.
> *Estimated Total Annual Cost to Public:* $0 in recordkeeping/reporting costs

The Utility Water Act Group (UWAG)[1] offers the following comments on the proposed focus groups.

UWAG understands that there is yet no supporting statement and that all that is available for the public to look at is the Federal Register notice. Evidently the focus group interviews will

[1] UWAG is a voluntary, *ad hoc*, non-profit, unincorporated group of 182 individual energy companies and three national trade associations of energy companies: the Edison Electric Institute (EEI), the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, and the American Public Power Association. The individual energy companies operate power plants and other facilities that generate, transmit, and distribute electricity to residential, commercial, industrial, and institutional customers. EEI is the association of U.S. shareholder-owned energy companies, international affiliates, and industry associates. The National Rural Electric Cooperative Association is the association of nonprofit energy cooperatives supplying central station service through generation, transmission, and distribution of electricity to rural areas of the United States. The American Public Power Association is the national trade association that represents publicly-owned (units of state and local government) energy utilities in 49 states representing 16 percent of the market. UWAG's purpose is to participate on behalf of its members in EPA's rulemakings under the CWA and in litigation arising from those rulemakings.

help NOAA prepare a supporting statement, which the Office of Management and Budget will review for 60 days. Hence the purpose of taking public comments on the August 14 Federal Register notice is to help NOAA prepare the submission to OMB.

1. The notice does not reveal how the information will serve any statutory purpose or have "practical utility"

In UWAG's view the proposed focus group effort does not comply with the Paperwork Reduction Act, 44 U.S.C. §§ 3501-20. In particular, § 3506(c) requires an agency to establish a process to review each collection of information including an evaluation of the "need" for the information. 44 U.S.C. § 3506(c)(1)(A)(i).[2]

Even more pointedly, the agency must solicit comment to evaluate whether the information is "necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility." 44 U.S.C. § 3506(c)(2)(A)(i). Then OMB is to review the proposed collection and maximize the "practical utility of and public benefit from" the information. 44 U.S.C. § 3506(c)(4).

The August 14 Federal Register says nothing about how the focus groups, the survey, or the resulting estimate of market and non-market economic values will serve any statutory duty imposed on NOAA or EPA. Hence the public is unable to comment on the single most important issue, which is how the information collection will help fulfill some statutory purpose. How the focus groups and survey will have "practical utility" is unknown.

2. The determination of purpose has to be *before* public comment and before OMB review

It may be that NOAA is trying to get an early start on public input. But the determination of the statutory purpose to be served by the information has to come first. If there is no statutory

[2] Also, each information collection must inform the recipient of the "reasons the information is being collected." 44 U.S.C. § 3506(c)(1)(B)(iii)(I).

purpose to be served, then collecting the information is *ultra vires*, and the Paperwork Reduction Act will again be violated because its purposes include minimizing the cost to the federal government, maximizing the utility of information collected, and improving the use of federal information to strengthen decisionmaking. 44 U.S.C. § 3501(4), (5), (6).

3. Assigning zero value to the public's time is unrealistic

The August 14 Federal Register notice assigns $0 to recordkeeping and reporting by the public. It appears that the federal government, then, values the public's time participating in the focus groups as zero.

This is unrealistic and inconsistent with the principles of economics. Time has value, and there is no justification for assuming that, because the focus groups are made up of volunteers, their participation has no economic value.

Other ICRs of similar kind appear to have recognized that volunteer respondents' time has value. Recently OMB approved a renewal of an ICR from EPA for conducting focus groups. Focus Groups as Used by EPA for Economics Projects (Renewal), OMB Control No. 2090-0028 (Completion Date June 20, 2012). The supporting statement included estimated costs for respondents, based apparently on an hourly rate of $10.14 (though the footnote mentions $30.45 per hour):

> 6(b) Estimating Respondent Costs
>
> Estimates of respondent burden were derived from projected focus group usage over the next three years. Each program office was asked for the number and size of the focus groups that they anticipate conducting for economics projects over the next three years. The total estimated hourly burden imposed by this collection of information over the next three years for focus groups is approximately 4,078 hours or approximately 1,359 hours annually. The total burden per year is valued at approximately $41,356. There are no capital costs or operating and maintenance costs associated with this collection.

TABLE 1a. – Average Annual Respondent Burden and Costs

Center	Subject	Approximate Number of Studies	Average Number of Focus Groups per Study	Average Number of Participants per Group	Average Hours of Duration for Each Group (includes screening)	Total Estimated "Respondent" Hours Over next 3 years	Total Estimated Burden per Year ($)
Office of Policy	Various (e.g., water valuation, children's health valuation, health risk valuation, stream scouring, altruism, energy efficiency)	8	11.25	9.5	2.0	1,710	$17,356
Office of Research and Development	Various (e.g., water quality valuation, ecosystem services valuation, sustainable communities)	13	9.5	8	1.9	1877	$19,052
Office of Air	Various (e.g., urban visibility, fuel economy, perceptions of new technology)	3	8	9.3	2.2	491	$4984
	TOTAL					4,078	$41,356

There are no capital costs or operating and maintenance costs associated with this collection of information.

Hourly rate ($30.45) from "Total Employer costs per hour worked for employee compensation and costs as a percent of total compensation: Civilian workers, by major occupational and industry group, December 2011. U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

See ICR no. 2205.03, http://www.reginfo.gov/public/do/DownloadDocument?documentID=314071&version=2.

Therefore, for the reasons stated above, UWAG recommends that NOAA abandon the focus group effort or at least explain what statutory purpose it is designed to serve.

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: August 8, 2012.

Gwellnar Banks,

Management Analyst, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 2012–19834 Filed 8–13–12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

Proposed Information Collection; Comment Request; Economic Value of Puerto Rico's Coral Reef Ecosystems for Recreation-Tourism

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 15, 2012.

ADDRESSES: Direct all written comments to Jennifer Jessup, Departmental Paperwork Clearance Officer, Department of Commerce, Room 6616, 14th and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230 (or via the Internet at *JJessup@doc.gov*).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Requests for additional information or copies of the information collection instrument and instructions should be directed to Dr. Vernon R. (Bob) Leeworthy, (301) 713–7261 or *Bob.Leeworthy@noaa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Abstract

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

NOAA and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) have entered a partnership to estimate the market and non-market economic values of Puerto Rico's coral reef ecosystems. Estimates will be made for all ecosystem services for the Guanica Bay Watershed and for recreation-tourism for all of Puerto Rico's coral reef ecosystems.

The required information is to conduct focus groups to help in designing the full surveys of visitors and residents of Puerto Rico. The four focus groups; two visitor and two resident focus groups, will be used to address the attributes of coral reef ecosystems that people may consider important, and the levels of the attributes to be valued. Attributes would include natural attributes such as water clarity/visibility, coral cover and diversity, and fish abundance and diversity. In addition, issues such as crowded conditions that users (e.g. SCUBA divers, snorkelers, recreational fishers, and wildlife viewers) see while doing their activities on the reefs will be evaluated. This set of focus groups will be conducted one-time only.

II. Method of Collection

Four focus groups will be conducted, two for visitors and two for residents of Puerto Rico. Each focus group will consist of eight people. Focus groups will be conducted at a suitable facility where they will engage in open discussions about reef attributes. Some paper forms, photos and illustrations describing reef attributes will be presented. Focus group sessions will last about two hours per session and will be recorded for the research team (video and audio).

III. Data

OMB Control Number: 0648–XXXX.

Form Number: None.

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

Affected Public: Individuals or households.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 32.

Estimated Time per Response: 2 hours per focus group member.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 64.

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: August 8, 2012.

Gwellnar Banks,

Management Analyst, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 2012–19848 Filed 8–13–12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–NK–P

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

[Docket No. CPSC–2012–0024]

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request—Coal and Woodburning Appliances

AGENCY: Consumer Product Safety Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In the **Federal Register** of May 3, 2012 (74 FR 26253), the Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC or Commission) published a notice in accordance with provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35), to announce the CPSC's intention to seek extension of approval of a collection of information for regulations on coal and woodburning appliances. No comments were received in response to that notice. Therefore, by publication of this notice, the Commission announces that it has submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) a request for extension of approval of this collection of information, without change.

ADDRESSES: To ensure that comments on the information collection are received, the OMB recommends that written comments be faxed to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, OMB, Attn: CPSC Desk Officer, Fax: 202–395–6974, or emailed to *oira_submission@omb.eop.gov.* All comments should be identified by Docket No. CPSC–2010–0024. In