NOTICE OF OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET ACTION

Date 08/11/2016

Department of Commerce
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

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

In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act, OMB has taken action on your request received 03/23/2016

ACTION REQUESTED: Revision of a currently approved collection
TYPE OF REVIEW REQUESTED: Regular
ICR REFERENCE NUMBER: 201603-0648-013
AGENCY ICR TRACKING NUMBER:
TITLE: Evaluations of Coastal Zone Management Act Programs: State Coastal Management Programs and National Estuarine Research Reserves
LIST OF INFORMATION COLLECTIONS: See next page

OMB ACTION: Approved without change
OMB CONTROL NUMBER: 0648-0661
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: 08/31/2019 DISCONTINUE DATE:

BURDEN:	RESPONSES	HOURS	COSTS
Previous	468	943	0
New	432	957	0
Difference			
Change due to New Statute	0	0	0
Change due to Agency Discretion	0	0	0
Change due to Agency Adjustment	-36	14	0
Change due to PRA Violation	0	0	0

TERMS OF CLEARANCE:

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
Coastal Zone and NERR managers information	NA, NA	Information Request for Coastal Management, Comparison information collection requests - shows changes	
Stakeholder surveys	NA, NA, NA , NA	Comparison survey of CMP partners and stakeholds - shows changes, Survey of stakeholders and partners of national estuarine research reserves, Comparison reserve partners and stakeholders - shows changes, Survey of stakeholders and partners of coastal management programs	

PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT SUBMISSION

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

1. Agency/Subagency originating request

NOAA/NOS/OCM

2. OMB control number b. [ ] None

a. 0648 - 0661

3. Type of information collection (*check one*)

a. [ ] New Collection

b. [✔] Revision of a currently approved collection

c. [✔] Extension of a currently approved collection

d. [ ] Reinstatement, without change, of a previously approved collection for which approval has expired

e. [ ] Reinstatement, with change, of a previously approved collection for which approval has expired

f. [ ] Existing collection in use without an OMB control number

For b-f, note Item A2 of Supporting Statement instructions

4. Type of review requested (*check one*)

a. [✔] Regular submission
b. [ ] Emergency - Approval requested by ____/____/____
c. [ ] Delegated

5. Small entities

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

6. Requested expiration date

a. [✔] Three years from approval date b. [ ] Other Specify:____

7. Title Evaluations of Coastal Zone Management Act Programs: State Coastal Management Programs and National Estuarine Research Reserves

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

9. Keywords

10. Abstract

The Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972, as amended (CZMA; 16 U.S.C. 1451 et seq.) requires that state coastal management programs and national estuarine research reserves developed pursuant to the CZMA and approved by the Secretary of Commerce be evaluated periodically. This request is for collection of information to accomplish those evaluations.

11. Affected public (*Mark primary with "P" and all others that apply with "x"*)

a. ___ Individuals or households d. ___ Farms
b. x Business or other for-profit e. ___ Federal Government
c. x Not-for-profit institutions f. x 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	432
b. Total annual responses	432
1. Percentage of these responses collected electronically	100 %
c. Total annual hours requested	957
d. Current OMB inventory	943
e. Difference	14
f. Explanation of difference	
1. Program change	
2. Adjustment	14

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. ___ Program planning or management
b. P Program evaluation f. ___ Research
c. ___ General purpose statistics g. ___ Regulatory or compliance
d. ___ Audit

16. Frequency of recordkeeping or reporting (*check all that apply)*

a. [ ] Recordkeeping b. [ ] Third party disclosure
c. [✔] Reporting
1. [ ] On occasion 2. [ ] Weekly 3. [ ] Monthly
4. [ ] Quarterly 5. [ ] Semi-annually 6. [ ] Annually
7. [ ] Biennially 8. [ ] Other (describe) Every 5-6 years

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: Carrie Hall
Phone: 240-533-0730

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 Cheryl Marlin for Hugh Johnson	Date 03/23/3016
Signature of NOAA Clearance Officer	
Signature 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: 2016.08.22 14:34:25 -04'00'	Date

SUPPORTING STATEMENT
EVALUATIONS OF COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT ACT PROGRAMS: STATE COASTAL MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS AND NATIONAL ESTUARINE RESEARCH RESERVES
OMB CONTROL NO. 0648-0661

A. JUSTIFICATION

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

The Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972, as amended (CZMA; 16 U.S.C. 1451 *et seq.*) requires that state coastal management programs (CMPs) and national estuarine research reserves (NERRs or research reserves) that are developed pursuant to the CZMA and approved by the Secretary of Commerce be evaluated periodically. This request is for a revision/extension of the information collection to accomplish those evaluations.

Section 1458 of the CZMA (previously numbered Section 312, which has historically been the number used to refer to the evaluation process and is done here as well) and implementing regulations at 15 CFR 923, Subpart L, require that state CMPs be evaluated concerning the extent to which the state has:

1) implemented and enforced the program approved by the Secretary;
2) addressed the coastal management needs identified in 16 U.S.C. 1452(2)(A) through (K); and
3) adhered to the terms of any grant, loan, or cooperative agreement funded under the CZMA.

Section 1461(f) of the CZMA and implementing regulations at 15 CFR 921, Subpart E, require that research reserves be evaluated with regard to:

1) their operation and management, including education and interpretive activities;
2) the research being conducted within the research reserve; and
3) adherence to the requirements of section 1458 of the CZMA and procedures set forth in 15 CFR 923.

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.

NOAA's Office for Coastal Management (OCM) conducts periodic evaluations of the 34 CMPs and 28 research reserves and produces written findings for each evaluation. Each CMP and research reserve will be evaluated (and thus need to provide information pursuant to this collection request) approximately once every five (5) to (6) years. Partners and stakeholders of a program being evaluated will be asked to provide information during the same timeframe.

As an outcome of this revision process, specific information needs were identified that OCM must have to evaluate the programs against the requirements of the CZMA. OCM has access to documents, information and data submitted in cooperative agreement applications, semi-annual performance progress reports, and certain documentation required by the CZMA and

implementing regulations. However, additional information from each CMP and research reserve, as well as information from the CMP and research reserve partners and stakeholders with whom each works, is necessary to evaluate against statutory and regulatory requirements. Different information collection subsets are necessary for 1) CMPs, 2) research reserves, 3) partners and stakeholders of CMPs, and 4) partners and stakeholders of research reserves.

A few minor changes to questions #3 and # 7 have been made to the information submittal for CMP and reserve managers. The changes clarify and narrow the scope of the information collected. For the list of stakeholders, the number of names request has been raised from 12-20 to 20-30 to provide for more potential respondents to the survey. Many program managers choose to work with their OCM program specialist to develop the list. In order to obtain a wider sample with the combined list we have requested additional names. For question #7 on the CMP information submittal, one change was made in response to a GAO audit recommendation to make sure that potential stakeholders surveyed could as a group address the suite of issues in the CZMA, including public access. For questions #12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19, 22, 23, 25, 26, 28, and 29 the questions have been clarified to focus on the top 2-4 challenges or impacts for an area. In addition, one question in the CMP information submittal was reordered based on feedback from a program.

For the survey of stakeholders, the scope of questions has been reduced by 4 questions for the reserve survey and 9 questions for the coastal program surveys. In addition, minor modifications have been made to several questions. The surveys have been shortened so that respondents and OCM can focus on the questions that provide the most useful information and this also reduces the time burden for survey respondents. In addition, the questions remaining in the survey are of a more general nature and respondents can answer without providing identifying information if they so choose.

The information requests, included in this submission, for CMPs and for research reserves identify the statutory and/or regulatory citations for evaluation criteria for which OCM requires the information to determine a program's compliance during the evaluation.

<u>The information request for coastal management programs contains eight sections:</u>

- Section I, Questions #1 through #10 and #35 address the administration, operation, and management of the program, as required by 16 USC §1458(a) and 16 USC §1455(d);

- Section II, Questions #11 through #13 elicit information about the protection of natural resources and coastal habitat, as required by 16 USC §1452 (2)(A);

- Section III, Questions #14 through #16 request information explaining how the CMP addresses coastal hazards and the adverse effects of land subsidence and sea level rise, as required by 16 USC §1452(2)(B) and 16 USC §1452 (2)(K);

- Section IV, Questions #17 through #19 seek information about how the program addresses coastal water quality as required by 16 USC §1452(2)(C);

- Section V, Questions #20 through #23 request information about how the program addresses coastal dependent uses, siting of major facilities, and community development; assistance to support planning, conservation, and management for living marine resources, including aquaculture facilities; and redevelopment of deteriorating urban waterfronts and ports, as required by 16 USC §1452 (2)(D), (J), and (F);

- Section VI, Questions #24 through #26 are designed to obtain information about public access, as required by 16 USC §1452 (2)(E);

- Section VII, Questions #27 through #34 seek information about how the program addresses coordination and simplification for expedited governmental decisionmaking, consultation and coordination with federal agencies, and public and local government participation in coastal management decisionmaking, as required by 16 USC §1452 (2)(G), (H), and (I);
- Section VIII, Question #36 is an overarching question about the significant accomplishments and challenges the program had or faced during the evaluation period.

<u>The information request for national estuarine research reserves contains eight sections:</u>

- Section I, Questions #1 through #13 address the administration, operations, management, and facilities of the reserve, as required by 16 USC §1458(a), 16 USC §1461(f)(1), and 15 CFR 921.40(b)(1), (3), and (6);

- Section II, Questions #14 through #17 are designed to obtain information about public access, as required by 16 USC §1458(a) and 15 CFR 921.40(b)(4);

- Section III, Questions #18 through #20 seek information about the reserve's land acquisition activities, as required by 16 USC §1458(a) and 15 CFR 921.40(b)(6);

- Section IV, Questions #21 through #30 request information about the research and monitoring carried out at the reserve, as required by 16 USC §1458(a), 16 USC §1461(f)(1), and 15 CFR 921.40(b)(1) and (2);

- Section V, Questions #31 through #36 elicit information about the educational activities of the reserve, as required by 16 USC §1458(a), 16 USC §1461(f)(1), and 15 CFR 921.40(b)(1) and (3);

- Section VI, Questions #37 through #40 are designed to obtain information about the reserve's Coastal Training Program, as required by 16 USC §1458(a), 16 USC §1461(f)(1), and 15 CFR 921.40(b)(1) and (2);

- Section VII, Questions #41 through #44 address the reserve's responsibilities for stewardship of the reserve resources, including resource protection, manipulation, and restoration, as required by 16 USC §1458(a) and 15 CFR 921.40(b)(1) and (7);

- Section VIII, Question 45 is an overarching question about the significant accomplishments and challenges the reserve had or faced during the evaluation period.

The information request for partners and stakeholders of the CMPs is in the form of a survey and solicits opinions about:
Questions #1, #7, and #12 – general management of the state's coastal zone, recommendations for improvement, and any other thoughts to share;
Questions #2, #3, #5, #6 – accomplishments, strengths, weaknesses, and challenges of the CMP;
Questions #8 and #9 – the effectiveness of, and concerns about, the federal consistency process;
Questions #9 through #11 – the effectiveness of, and concerns about, the state permitting process in the coastal zone.
All of the opinions and information are being requested to validate information provided by the CMP or provide new information or concerns from an outside perspective.

The information request for partners and stakeholders of the national estuarine research reserves is in the form of a survey and solicits opinions about:
Questions #1, #7 and #8 – addressing priorities of the National Estuarine Research Reserve System, recommendations for improvement, and any other thoughts to share;
Questions #2, #3, #5, and #6 – strengths, accomplishments, weaknesses, and challenges of the reserve;

All of the opinions and information are being requested to validate information provided by the CMP or provide new information or concerns from an outside perspective.

Because each CMP and each research reserve has a unique administrative and programmatic framework to accomplish the requirements of the CZMA, there will be no comparisons or aggregation of information between or among any of the CMPs or research reserves. Even the information in the form of opinions requested from partners and stakeholders for a particular program evaluation will not be aggregated because each coordinates or collaborates with the program from a unique perspective.

The information collected will not be disseminated to the general public but will be used to support the evaluation findings, which are available to the public. NOAA's Office for Coastal Management will retain control over the information and safeguard it from improper access, modification, and destruction, consistent with NOAAA standards for confidentiality, privacy, and electronic information. See response to Question10 of this Supporting Statement for more information on confidentiality and privacy. The information collected is designed to yield data that meet all applicable information quality guidelines. If NOAA's OCM should decide to disseminate the information, it will be subject to the quality control measures and pre-dissemination review pursuant to Section 515 of Public Law 106-554.

Under this PRA request, the previously used surveys for the national estuarine research reserve and coastal management program stakeholders have been shortened to focus on the key information needed by the evaluation team and to reduce the burden on stakeholders. In addition, several questions were modified to further clarify the information being solicited.

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.

CMP and research reserve manager respondents will receive information requests via e-mail, and submittals will be made via e-mail. Some of their information request responses will be in the form of existing documents. Other information provided by them may require multi-page responses. E-mail and attachments accommodate these requests more efficiently than a web-based survey tool. Partners and stakeholders of CMPs and of reserves will receive a link to a web-based survey tool (Survey Monkey) and will respond to questions soliciting their opinions through the survey tool. Because these information requests ask for opinions only, these are more easily accommodated by the web-based Survey Monkey.

4. Describe efforts to identify duplication.

NOAA is the only agency charged with administering the CZMA and with evaluating the state coastal management programs and national estuarine research reserves pursuant to the requirements of the CZMA for ongoing approval and operation of the programs. No other similar information collections were found.

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

The CMP and reserve partners and stakeholders are almost entirely representatives of state, local, regional, or inter-state government agencies or entities, and in some cases, universities and non-governmental organizations. In a few instances, a small business or other small entity might have some interaction with a CMP or research reserve. Those businesses or entities (as well as all other partners and stakeholders) will be asked to complete a questionnaire through a web-based survey tool. Completion of the questionnaire should take approximately 15 minutes, and respondents have approximately 15 days until the deadline for completion.

The survey for CMP and reserve partners and stakeholders has been shortened, reducing the amount of time needed to complete the survey. The number of days the survey is open was reduced as respondents typically fill out the survey during the first two days or the last day the survey.

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

NOAA would not be able to determine compliance of a state CMP or research reserve with the requirements of the CZMA and thus could not determine whether program approval and federal financial assistance should be maintained, modified, or withdrawn. If the collection was conducted less frequently, more time could elapse before a serious problem was addressed.

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

Not applicable.

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 December 23, 2015 (80 FR 79864) solicited public comments. No comments were received.

The Office also solicited comments on the time, clarity, and usefulness of the stakeholder and partner survey from several stakeholders and partners who completed an evaluation survey. No responses were received. OCM has given careful consideration to how the survey burden could be reduced and in year 2 asked a subset of questions similar in size to the current proposed surveys. OCM was able to conduct an analysis of data in Survey Monkey from year 2 to estimate survey completion in the 10-14 minute range which has been rounded to 15 minutes for ease of calculation.

OCM also received feedback from five CZMA program managers on the information submittal representing reserves, small and large coastal management program, and an island coastal management program. The average burden of completing the information submittal was found to be 71 hours. This is higher than the original 55- hour estimate given by CZMA managers.

For the most part, program managers felt the instructions were clear but a few needed clarification on a question or two and reached out to NOAA who promptly provided clarification.

Program managers were also asked if the information was useful to them. One manager stated yes, two stated they did not anticipate using the information themselves. One manager noted that maybe some of the information requested could be built into performance reporting, another noted that they had included much of the information in prior progress reports and another noted that much of the information could be found in their recently updated Section 309 Assessment and Strategy. One noted that the information was for NOAA and it was up to NOAA to determine the usefulness.

The OCM has carefully considered the value of information collected, whether it could consistently be found in other NOAA information collectors. The OCM made small changes to several questions to reduce the information collected.

To ease the burden of information collection, coastal programs can continue to reference their 309 Assessment and Strategies if the information is there. It should be noted that 309 Assessment and Strategies are updated on a 5-year schedule and although most programs complete them, they are not required and not all programs do.

Unfortunately, OCM cannot rely on progress reporting to provide the information in the information submittal. CZMA funding has remained level over the past 20 years (a reduction of

over 33% in inflation adjusted dollars) and many programs pursue additional sources of funding to support their programs. These activities are not usually reported on to NOAA although many are key to the successful implementation of CZMA programs. In addition, although progress reports track near term outcomes, they do not include information on the long-term impacts of program activities. The information submittal also asks the program to look back and identify the most important impacts and challenges over the evaluation period which is something that isn't captured in semi-annual progress reporting

For both coastal programs and reserves, the information requested and for coastal programs, the 309 Assessment and Strategy, are the documents given to the full evaluation teams which include non-NOAA members, to provide a concise summary of the implementation of the program over the evaluation period.

The OCM also collects performance measure data for both coastal programs and reserves and indicator information through coastal program 309 Assessment and Strategies. This information is incorporated into the evaluation process.

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

No payments or gifts will be provided to respondents.

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

Responses to coastal management program and reserve information requests will not be disseminated or published by NOAA OCM, but a summary of responses to stakeholder surveys will be compiled for the CMP or reserve and the summary will be available to the public upon request. However, respondent names will not be linked to survey results when surveys are conducted.

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

No sensitive questions are asked.

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

With a total of 62 approved CMPs and research reserves, and in order to evaluate a single program once every five to six years, 12 individual programmatic evaluations will need to be conducted each year. Each year, 12 different CZMA managers will need to respond to the information request, and an average of 35 partners and stakeholders per program will be asked to provide information. Thus, the estimated number of respondents is 432 annually (12 CZMA program managers; 420 partners and stakeholders [35 per CZMA program]).

Based on the feedback of three CMP managers and two reserve managers who recently completed the information submittal, the average estimated time per response is 71 hours per CZMA program manager.

There are two points worth noting about the 71-hour response time for a manager. First, although 12 managers will respond to the information request each year, a single CZMA program manager will only have to respond once every five to six years. On an annualized basis for one manager, this is a burden of approximately 12-14 hours.

Number of Respondents x Hours x Responses/Year	**Annual Burden Hours**
1) 12 respondents x 71 hours x response/year CMP and Reserve managers completion of information submittal	852 hours *(previously 715 hours based on 13 respondents x 55 hours x 1 response/year*
2) 420 respondents x 15 minutes x 1 response/year	105 hours, *(previously 227.5 hours based on 455 respondents x .5 hours x 1 response/year)*
Annual Totals: 432 responses	**957 hours** *(previously 942.5)*

In 2015, OCM sent a shortened version of the approved surveys to stakeholders and participants. The shortened surveys are the same size as the revised surveys being submitted for approval under the Paperwork Reduction Act. Based on an analysis of the time taken by CMP and reserve stakeholders in 2015 to complete the surveys, the estimated time per response for the stakeholder survey is 15 minutes.

Each coastal management program and reserve that is scheduled to be evaluated in that year will include a task in its cooperative agreement award that will allow the program to expend award funds toward the participation in and completion of its programmatic Section 312 evaluation.

Respondents are likely to be program managers, department heads, and content area specialists within their respective organizations – both within the CZMA programs and within the partners' and stakeholders' organizations. Although there are broad salary ranges by state, regionally, and by type of agency and organization, the average salary is equivalent to a Government Service Pay Grade 12, Step 1 basic hourly rate of $33.75.

Number of hours x hourly wage	**Estimated Cost**
852 respondent hours x $33.75 wage	$28,775 *(previously $20,649 based on 715 hours x $28.88)*
105 respondent hours x $33.75	$3,544 *(previously $1819 based on 63 hours x $28.88)*
Annual Total Cost	**$32,319** *(previously $22,468)*

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 is no reporting or recordkeeping cost burden for the respondents.

14. <u>Provide estimates of annualized cost to the Federal government</u>.

This information collection effort is supported through in-house staff time. The OCM will conduct approximately 12 evaluations per year. One evaluator will conduct five evaluations per year, so 2.4 evaluators are needed annually to complete 12 evaluations. The OCM program specialist assigned to work with each CZMA program being evaluated will also participate in the evaluation process, so 12 program specialists will be involved annually.

Currently evaluators are primarily CAPS ZA-3 and ZA-4 salaried employees at various pay intervals. Evaluators are presumed to be salaried at the beginning point of the CAPS ZA-4, Interval 1 scale for the Washington DC region at $90,823 or $44.66 per hour. Based on the average of estimates by program evaluators serving on the CZMA Evaluation Workgroup, an evaluator spends approximately 330 hours on a single evaluation.

Program specialists are primarily CAPS ZA-3 and ZA-4 salaried employees at various pay intervals. OCM program specialists are presumed to be salaried at the beginning point of the CAPS ZA-4, Interval 1 scale $90,823 or 44.66 per hour. Based on the average of estimates by program specialists serving on the CZMA Evaluation Workgroup, a specialist spends approximately 60 hours of involvement for a single evaluation.

Regional representatives from NOAA participate in the evaluation. These are usually managers and primarily Levels ZA-4 and ZA-5. Regional representatives are presumed to be salaried at the beginning point of the CAPS ZA-5, Interval 1 scale at $126,245 or $60.69 per hour. The reginal representative spends approximately 24 hours of involvement for a single evaluation.

Every evaluation now includes a site visit; most site visits are 2.5 days. This change from visits to only 2 sites per year was made at the request of state programs. For each site visit, an evaluator, the program specialist, and regional representative from NOAA participate. It is assumed in about half the evaluations, there will be no need for travel. Assuming an average of $2,000/person for a 2.5 day site visit with two or three people, <u>travel will cost approximately $60,000</u>.

ANNUALIZED COST

Personnel and Travel	**Cost**
1) 12 evaluations x 330 hours x $44.66 wage for evaluator	$176,854 for evaluators *(previously 13 evaluations x 330 hours x $43.27 = $185,628.30)*
2) 12 evaluations x 60 hours x $44.66 wage for site liaison	$32,155 for site liaisons *(previously 13 evaluations x 60 hours x $43.27 = $33,750.60)*
3) 12 evaluations x 24 hours x $60.69 wage for regional representative	$17,478 for regional representatives *(previously not included)*
4) 12 evaluations x 2.5 personnel x $2,000 cost	$60,000 (*previously 2 evaluations x 2.5 personnel x $1000*)
Total Cost:	**$209,009** *(previously $237,324)*

The entire evaluation process will be implemented electronically, with no administrative staff support, printing, or supply costs.

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

The OCM has not conducted more than 12 evaluations per year in the past three years and will continue to conduct 12 or fewer for the next three years. The previous PRA request used an estimate from program managers for completing the information submittal, as it was a new form and no manager had experience in completing the form. Based on feedback from five CZMA managers who have now completed the information submittal, the average was 71 hours to complete the information submittal. The time estimate has been modified to use 71 hours as the estimated time to complete the information submittal.

For the survey of stakeholders, the scope of questions has been reduced by 4 questions for the reserve survey and 9 questions for the coastal program surveys. The surveys have been shortened so that respondents and OCM can focus on the questions that provide the most useful information while reducing the time burden for survey respondents. In addition, the questions remaining in the survey are of a more general nature and respondents can answer without providing identifying information if they so choose.

Due to the reduction in the scope of the survey, the estimated time to complete the survey has been reduced to 15 minutes, from 30 minutes. The estimate is based on a similar shortened survey to solicit feedback from partners and stakeholders used in 2015.

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

The collection results will not be published.

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

Not applicable; not seeking approval.

18. Explain each exception to the certification statement.

There are no exceptions to the certification statement identified in Item 19.

SUPPORTING STATEMENT
EVALUATIONS OF COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT ACT PROGRAMS: STATE COASTAL MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS AND NATIONAL ESTUARINE RESEARCH RESERVES
OMB CONTROL NO. 0648-0661

B. COLLECTIONS OF INFORMATION EMPLOYING STATISTICAL METHODS

This information collection does not employ statistical methods. However, two of the four information requests that are a part of this total information request package are in the form of surveys, so according to the OMB guidance for completion of this section, the following responses pertain to those two surveys only. The responses below do not pertain to the information requests for state coastal management program and reserve managers.

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.

One of the information requests to a manager whose CZMA program is being evaluated is to provide names and contact information for 20-30 stakeholders and partners with whom the program coordinated or collaborated on projects and activities. The manager should include at least one contact from each of 12 categories, if applicable. The OCM program specialist who works with the particular CZMA program will also provide names and contact information based on his/her knowledge of the program's partners and stakeholders during the evaluation period. Each year, the respondent universe for the partner/stakeholder surveys will include 420 partners and stakeholders for 12 CZMA programs evaluated annually (an average of 35 partners and stakeholders per program, assuming some overlap between the program manager's and OCM specialist's submission of names). Because each of the partners and stakeholders chosen to respond to a survey coordinates or collaborates from a unique perspective with the program being evaluated, all will be asked to complete the survey, and OCM will send reminder e-mails to those not responding to achieve as close to a 100 percent response rate as possible. The overall response rate for stakeholders that have participated in a reserve or CMP survey is 53 percent.

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.

No statistical methodology has been applied to stratify either of the two surveys, there will be no sampling, and because the respondents are asked to provide opinions, the degree of accuracy is not relevant. Because each CZMA program will be evaluated approximately every five to six years, each partner/stakeholder survey will occur only once every five to six years for the partners and stakeholders of a single program.

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.

This information collection does not employ statistical methods. The survey has been designed to use the minimum number of questions necessary to solicit the respondent's opinions. Since each of the partners and stakeholders chosen to respond to the survey coordinates or collaborates from a unique perspective with the program being evaluated, there will likely be one or more questions in the survey that do not apply to a particular respondent or which the respondent will not feel qualified to express an opinion. For example, a representative of a non-profit organization may have collaborated with a coastal management program on a particular project but has no involvement in the coastal permitting process. Therefore, the representative need not respond to permit questions.

The initial contact with both the reserve and coastal program partner/stakeholder survey participants will consist of an e-mail inviting participation, explaining the purpose of the survey, and providing a link to the survey instrument and instructions. The survey participants will have an approximately 15-day period during which to complete the web-based survey using survey software. Because of the unique perspective and collaboration of each partner/stakeholder, OCM will send up to two e-mail reminders to those not responding after 1 week and the day before the survey closes to achieve as close to a 100 percent response rate as possible.

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.

No additional tests of procedures or methods will be undertaken. Several questions have been refined and the number stakeholder questions narrowed, based on the experience of the OCM over the past three years.

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.

No statistical methods were used in the design of this information collection. At the time of this PRA submission, the people who will conduct evaluations are Carrie Hall, Ralph Cantral, Susie Holst, and Pam Kylstra who are OCM evaluators. Each evaluator assigned to conduct a particular program evaluation will administer the survey and use the information as one source to inform those particular program evaluation findings.

<u>Agency contact information:</u>
Carrie Hall, Program Analyst
Planning and Performance Management
NOAA Office for Coastal Management
1305 East-West Highway, N/OCM1
Silver Spring, MD 20910

240-533-0730
Carrie.Hall@noaa.gov

Information Request for Coastal Management Programs

FOR THE EVALUATION PERIOD (MONTH/YEAR - MONTH/YEAR):

Administration, Operation, and Management

1. Provide an organization chart for:
    a) the CMP's lead agency, and
    b) the CMP.
2. Provide a staffing list for the CMP, including:
    a) names and titles of each staff member,
    b) full or part-time status of each staff member,
    c) source of position funding for each staff member,
    d) subject/topic area(s) of work and responsibility(ies) of each staff member,
    e) loss or gain of positions during the evaluation period, and
    f) number of vacant positions with length of each vacancy as of the time of the response to this request.
3. Identify any non-CZMA federal or state match program funding (i.e., other federal, state, and private funding) in the amount of $100,000 or more for each year of the evaluation period by source, amount, and how those funds were used. Please note: This does not include CZMA cooperative agreement funds and associated match.
4. Identify the composition of any advisory committee or board, frequency of meetings, and the committee's or board's role.
5. If the CMP has a strategic plan, provide a copy and identify how the CMP developed its goals and priorities, including whether it was a public-driven, internal, or hybrid process.
6. The evaluator will contact stakeholders and partners for input into the Section 312 evaluation. Provide the name, organization, position, and e-mail address, for 20-30 stakeholders and partners with whom the CMP coordinated or collaborated on projects and activities. Include at least one contact from each of the following categories, if applicable: other parts of the coastal management program's lead state agency; other state agencies; federal agencies; gubernatorial offices and staff; legislative representatives and staff; local government elected officials and staff; regional planning organizations; non-governmental organizations (e.g., chambers of commerce, trade associations); non-profit organizations (e.g., environmental groups); local businesses and industry; the permit-regulated community; and academia. Please ensure that at least two of the stakeholders and partners can speak to each of the major six areas of the CZMA: public access, coastal hazards, coastal habitat, community development, coordination and public involvement, and water quality.

First Name	Last Name	Organization	Position	E-mail Address

In a total of two pages or less:

7. Summarize any major changes to program administration, structure, operation, or management that occurred and any associated impacts or accomplishments.
8. Summarize any issues or challenges the CMP faced in regard to program administration, operation, or management, including grants management. Include influences and factors that have hindered program administration, operation, or management.

In a total of two pages or less:

9. Summarize the CMP's partnership or activities with any reserve(s) in the state, including any major initiatives or projects and their impacts.
10. Summarize the nature of major local, regional, statewide, and/or national partnerships and projects and the role that the CMP has played or is playing in them to achieve and/or complement CMP goals.

Protection of Natural Resources/Coastal Habitat

In a total of five pages or less:

11. Summarize how the CMP addressed protection of coastal habitat and any changes to relevant state legislation and/or regulations.
12. Summarize the 2-4 major impacts or accomplishments of the CMP with regard to coastal habitat.
13. Summarize the 2-4 major challenges the CMP faced in addressing coastal habitat.

(*If the information requested is in a Section 309 assessment and strategy document in effect during the evaluation period or is part of any program changes already submitted to OCM, you may refer to those documents instead of including the information in your information submittal.)*

Coastal Hazards and
Adverse Effects of Land Subsidence and Sea Level Rise

In a total of five pages or less:

14. Summarize how the CMP addressed coastal hazards and any changes to relevant state legislation and/or regulations.
15. Summarize the 2-4 major impacts or accomplishments of the CMP with regard to coastal hazards.
16. Summarize the 2-4 major challenges the CMP faced in addressing coastal hazards.

(*If the information requested is in a Section 309 assessment and strategy document in effect during the evaluation period or is part of any program changes already submitted to OCM, you may refer to those documents instead of including the information in your information submittal.)*

Coastal Water Quality

In a total of five pages or less:

17. Summarize how the CMP addressed coastal water quality and any changes to relevant state legislation and/or regulations.
18. Summarize the 2-4 major impacts or accomplishments of the CMP with regard to coastal water quality.
19. Summarize the 2-4 major challenges the CMP faced in addressing coastal water quality.

(*If the information requested is in a Section 309 assessment and strategy document in effect during the evaluation period or is part of any program changes already submitted to OCM, you may refer to those documents instead of including the information in your information submittal.)*

Coastal Dependent Uses, Siting of Major Facilities, and Community Development; Assistance to Support Planning, Conservation, and Management for Living Marine Resources, including Aquaculture Facilities; and
Redevelopment of Deteriorating Urban Waterfronts and Ports

In a total of five pages or less:

20. If the CMP started, continued, or completed any special area management plans (SAMPs) or ocean/Great Lakes plans, please describe the effectiveness to date of the SAMP or ocean/Great Lakes plan in meeting its designed purpose and goals.
21. Summarize how the CMP addressed coastal dependent uses and community development and any changes to relevant state legislation and/or regulations.
22. Summarize the 2-4 major impacts or accomplishments of the CMP with regard to coastal dependent uses and community development.
23. Summarize the 2-4 major challenges the CMP faced in addressing coastal dependent uses and community development.

(*If the information requested is in a Section 309 assessment and strategy document in effect during the evaluation period or is part of any program changes already submitted to OCM, you may refer to those documents instead of including the information in your information submittal.)*

Public Access

In a total of five pages or less:

24. Summarize how the CMP addressed public access and any changes to relevant state legislation and/or regulations.
25. Summarize the 2-4 major impacts or accomplishments of the CMP with regard to public access.
26. Summarize the 2-4 major challenges the CMP faced in addressing public access.

(It is not necessary to include information that is in the Section 309 assessment and strategy documents in effect during the evaluation period or that is part of any program changes already submitted to OCM. The evaluator has access to those documents.)

Coordination and Simplification for Expedited Governmental Decision Making; **Consultation and Coordination with Federal Agencies**; and
Public and Local Government Participation in Coastal Management Decision Making

In a total of five pages or less:

27. Summarize how the CMP addressed government coordination and decision making and any changes to relevant state legislation and/or regulations.
28. Summarize the 2-4 major impacts or accomplishments of the CMP with regard to government coordination and decision making.
29. Summarize the 2-4 major challenges the CMP faced in addressing government coordination and decision making.

(*If the information requested is in a Section 309 assessment and strategy document in effect during the evaluation period or is part of any program changes already submitted to OCM, you may refer to those documents instead of including the information in your information submittal.)*

30. In one page or less, summarize any changes in the roles of state and local governments in managing the coastal zone since the last evaluation that are not addressed in other topic areas.
31. In two pages or less, for the issuance of permits that are part of the state's approved coastal management program, summarize:
    a) how the CMP collaborated and coordinated with other state and federal permitting agencies;
    b) how and whether the process of collaboration and coordination worked well;
    c) any ways to improve collaboration and coordination; and
    d) any improvements to length of time for permit issuance and to permit processing efficiency.
32. Provide the list of the CMP's enforceable policies and enforceable policy information that the CMP provides to federal agencies and others who request it, and describe how interested parties obtain access to the enforceable policies list.

In a total of four pages or less:

33. Summarize any concerns or issues the CMP had in regard to effective implementation of federal consistency.
34. Summarize the process for incorporating public comments into federal consistency and other decision making.

<u>Education and Outreach</u>

35. In two pages or less, summarize any outreach and education efforts to communicate the value of the state and national coastal management program and coastal resources to the public.

<u>Overarching</u>

36. In two pages or less, and from the CMP manager's perspective, identify the two - four most significant impacts or accomplishments and the two - four most significant challenges (<u>excluding</u> program administration, operations, or management challenges discussed in item #9) the CMP had or faced during this evaluation period. If any of these are <u>not</u> already discussed in #13, 14, 16, 17, 19, 20, 23, 24, 26, 27, 29, or 30, please

summarize them. Include influences and factors that have advanced or hindered the achievement of any CMP goals, objectives, or outcomes.

OMB Control # 0648-0661, March 31, 2016.The Office for Coastal Management requires this information in order to adequately evaluate the ongoing approval and financial eligibility of CZMA coastal management programs. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 71 hours per response. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Carrie Hall, NOAA/NOS/OCM/PPC, 1305 East-West Hwy., N/OCM1, Silver Spring, Maryland 20910.This reporting is required under and is authorized under 16 U.S.C. 1458(a). Information submitted will be treated as public records. Notwithstanding any other provision of the law, no person is required to respond to, nor shall any person be subject to a penalty for failure to comply with, a collection of information subject to the requirements of the Paperwork Reduction Act unless that collection displays a currently valid OMB Control Number.

Information Request for National Estuarine Research Reserves

FOR THE EVALUATION PERIOD (MONTH/YEAR - MONTH/YEAR):

Administration, Operations, Management, and Facilities

1. Provide an organization chart for:
    a) the reserve's lead agency, and
    b) the reserve.
2. Provide a staffing list for the reserve, including:
    a) name and title of each staff member,
    b) full or part-time status of each staff member,
    c) source of position funding for each staff member,
    d) subject/topic area(s) of work and responsibility(ies) of each staff member,
    e) loss or gain of positions during the evaluation period, and
    f) number of vacant positions with length of each vacancy at the time of the response to this request.
3. Identify any non-CZMA federal or state match program funding (i.e., other federal, state, and private funding) in the amount of $100,000.00 or more for each year of the evaluation period by source, amount, and how those funds were used. Please note: This does not include CZMA cooperative agreement funds and associated match.
4. Identify the composition of advisory committee(s) or board(s), frequency of meetings, and the committee's or board's role.
5. If the reserve management plan is not up-to-date, please describe a plan and timeline for how this is being or will be addressed.
6. In one page or less, summarize how the reserve funds and maintains facilities and note any major changes to reserve facilities and infrastructure.

7. In one page or less, summarize the results and impacts of any geographic information system (GIS) products developed by the reserve and used by partners and reserve staff.
8. In one page or less, summarize how the reserve's research and monitoring, education, coastal training, and stewardship programs and activities are integrated with one another.
9. The evaluator will contact stakeholders and partners for input into the Section 312 evaluation. Provide the name, organization, position, and e-mail address, for 20-30 stakeholders and partners with whom the reserve coordinated or collaborated on projects and activities. Include at least one contact from each of the following categories, if applicable: other parts of the reserve's lead state agency or organization; other state agencies; federal agencies; gubernatorial offices and staff; legislative representatives and staff; local government elected officials and staff; regional planning organizations; non-governmental organizations (e.g., chambers of commerce, trade associations); non-profit organizations (e.g., environmental groups); land management partners; local businesses and industry; and academia. The stakeholders and partners should also include, if applicable: Coastal Training Program participants, Coastal Training Program partner providers, educators and/or school district staff whose students have participated in reserve education events, stewardship partners, and researchers who have conducted research projects at the reserve.

First Name	Last Name	Organization	Position	E-mail Address

In a total of two pages or less:

10. Summarize any major changes to program administration, structure, operation, or management and any associated impacts or accomplishments.
11. Summarize any issues or challenges the reserve faced in regard to program administration, operation, or management, including grants management. Include influences and factors that have hindered program administration, operation, or management.

In a total of two pages or less:

12. Summarize the reserve's partnership or activities with the state coastal management program, including any major initiatives or projects and their impacts.
13. Summarize the nature of major local, regional, statewide, and/or national partnerships and projects and the role that the reserve has played or is playing in them to achieve and/or complement reserve goals and to ensure protection of reserve resources.

Public Access

In a total of four pages or less:

14. Summarize existing public access and public use, and any changes of uses at the reserve.
15. Summarize the results of any studies related to public access at the reserve and any activities undertaken as a result of the studies.

16. Summarize major public access projects or initiatives developed or implemented and their results or accomplishments, including how a project or initiative responded to emerging national, state, or local issues, and highlight successes in helping to resolve an on-the-ground coastal management issue, if applicable.
17. Summarize the challenges the reserve faced in achieving its public access goals and objectives.

Acquisition

In a total of four pages or less:

18. Summarize the values of any land acquisition projects completed or in process.
19. Summarize major acquisition projects or initiatives developed or implemented and their results or accomplishments, including how a project or initiative responded to emerging national, state, or local issues, and highlight successes in helping to resolve an on-the-ground coastal management issue, if applicable.
20. Summarize the challenges the reserve faced in achieving its acquisition goals and objectives.

Research and Monitoring

In a total of one page or less:

21. Summarize any efforts to fill data gaps identified in the site profile.
22. Summarize how the reserve and others (if known) use the site profile.

In one page or less:

23. Summarize how Graduate Research Fellows were integrated into reserve activities and discuss how their research addressed coastal management issues, as well as the value of their work on a local, regional, and/or national scale, as appropriate.

In a total of two pages or less:

24. Summarize the reserve's ongoing efforts to develop and maintain the System-wide Monitoring Program (SWMP) and to implement any new SWMP protocols (e.g., vegetation monitoring, sentinel sites).
25. Summarize any additional non-SWMP monitoring activities the reserve conducted or in which it participated or collaborated.
26. Summarize how SWMP and other reserve monitoring data is shared with and used by other researchers, partners, and stakeholders.

In a total of two pages or less:

27. Summarize the process for identifying, prioritizing, and monitoring the reserve's research and monitoring needs to address coastal management issues and how, and the extent to which, collaborations occurred between research scientists at the reserve and coastal managers and coastal planners.
28. Summarize activities the research and monitoring programs undertook to promote the reserve as a research platform and the value and impact of reserve research and monitoring to external partners and reserve staff.

In a total of four pages or less:

29. Summarize major research and monitoring projects or initiatives developed or implemented and their results or accomplishments, including how a project or initiative responded to emerging national, state, or local issues, and highlight successes in helping to resolve an on-the-ground coastal management issue, if applicable.
30. Summarize the challenges the reserve faced in achieving its research and monitoring goals and objectives.

Education

In a total of three pages or less:

31. Summarize the process for identifying, prioritizing, and monitoring/evaluating educational activities and audiences.
32. Describe how KEEP (K-12 Estuarine Education Program) is integrated or incorporated into the initiatives and activities of the reserve.
33. Describe how the reserve's classroom curricula aligned with state standards. If not aligned, please summarize why and any plans the reserve may have to do so.
34. Summarize any professional development opportunities for teachers provided by the reserve alone or in collaboration or coordination with reserve partners.

In a total of four pages or less:

35. Summarize major education projects or initiatives developed or implemented and their results or accomplishments, including how a project or initiative responded to emerging national, state, or local issues, and highlight successes in helping to resolve an on-the-ground coastal management issue, if applicable.
36. Summarize the challenges the reserve faced in achieving its education goals and objectives.

Coastal Training Program (CTP)

In a total of one page or less:

37. Summarize any collaboration efforts the reserve's CTP organized or in which it participated at the local, regional, and/or watershed scale.
38. Summarize how CTP projects and training have integrated NOAA's and other external partners' research and stewardship information or programs.

In a total of four pages or less:

39. Summarize the reserve's progress in implementing the CTP strategy, including major CTP projects or initiatives developed or implemented and their results or accomplishments, including how a project or initiative responded to emerging national, state, or local issues, and highlight successes in helping to resolve an on-the-ground coastal management issue, if applicable.
40. Summarize the challenges the reserve faced in achieving its CTP goals and objectives.

Stewardship/Resource Protection, Manipulation, Restoration

In a total of five pages or less:

41. Summarize the process for identifying, prioritizing, and monitoring/evaluating stewardship or resource management activities at the reserve.
42. Summarize existing capacities and abilities, as well as changes, regarding the reserve's land management and/or enforcement responsibilities.
43. Summarize major stewardship/resource protection, manipulation, and restoration projects or initiatives developed or implemented and their results or accomplishments, including how a project or initiative responded to emerging national, state, or local issues, and highlight successes in helping to resolve an on-the-ground coastal management issue, if applicable.
44. Summarize the challenges the reserve faced in achieving its stewardship/resource protection, manipulation, and restoration goals and objectives.

Overarching

45. In two pages or less, and from the reserve manager's perspective, identify the two to four most significant impacts or accomplishments and the two to four most significant challenges (excluding program administration, operations, or management challenges discussed in item #11) the reserve had or faced during this evaluation period. If any of these are not already discussed in #16, 17, 19, 20, 29, 30, 35, 36, 39, 40, 43, or 44, please summarize them. Include influences and factors that have advanced or hindered the achievement of any reserve goals, objectives or outcomes.

OMB Control # 0648-0661, March 31, 2016.The Office for Coastal Management requires this information in order to adequately evaluate the ongoing approval and financial eligibility of CZMA national estuarine research reserves. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 71 hours per response. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Carrie Hall, NOAA/NOS/OCM/PPC, 1305 East-West Hwy., N/OCM1, Silver Spring, Maryland 20910. This reporting is required under and is authorized under 16 U.S.C. 1458(a). Information submitted will be treated as public records. Notwithstanding any other provision of the law, no person is required to respond to, nor shall any person be subject to a penalty for failure to comply with, a collection of information subject to the requirements of the Paperwork Reduction Act unless that collection displays a currently valid OMB Control Number.

2017 PRA Evaluation: Reserves - Survey for Partners and Stakeholders

The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Office for Coastal Management conducts periodic evaluations of national estuarine research reserves as required by the Coastal Zone Management Act. As part of the evaluation of [NAME] Reserve, the Office for Coastal Management would like to obtain your perspective and opinion on the reserve's implementation of its programs and activities.

The evaluation will cover the time period of [MONTH YEAR to MONTH YEAR].

Please note that the word “you” in the following questions refers to an organization or a person, as appropriate. If there are questions that do not apply to you, or questions you do not wish to answer, you may skip them.

Thank you for your participation in this survey.

1. How well do you think the reserve is doing in addressing the following four National Estuarine Research Reserve System priorities?

a. Providing opportunities for research and monitoring.

Excellent	Good	Adequate	Poor	Very Poor	No Opinion
○	○	○	○	○	○

Comments

b. Enhancing public awareness and understanding of estuarine areas through public education and interpretation opportunities.

Excellent	Good	Adequate	Poor	Very Poor	No Opinion
○	○	○	○	○	○

Comments

c. Providing coastal decision makers with knowledge and tools to address critical resource management issues through the Coastal Training Program.

Excellent	Good	Adequate	Poor	Very Poor	No Opinion
○	○	○	○	○	○

Comments

d. Protecting and restoring the reserve's resources.

Excellent	Good	Adequate	Poor	Very Poor	No Opinion
○	○	○	○	○	○

Comments

2. What are the reserve's top one to three accomplishments?

1.

2.

3.

3. What are the top one to three coastal management challenges/issues in the region?

1.

2.

3.

4. What are the reserve's top one to three opportunities to make a bigger impact in the future? (Locally, regionally, state-wide, or nationally)

1.

2.

3.

5. What are the reserve's top one to three strengths in implementing its programs?

1.

2.

3.

6. What are the reserve's top one to three weaknesses in implementing its programs?

1.

2.

3.

7. What are the top one to three opportunities to improve effective implementation of the reserve's programs?

1.

2.

3.

8. Is there anything else you would like to share?

9. Choose the category that best describes who you represent.

- Local Government
- State Government
- Federal Government
- Business or Industry
- Nonprofit or Nongovernmental Organization
- Academia
- Other

Other (please specify)

OMB Control Number 0648-0661. Expires: 3/31/2016. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 15 minutes per completed survey. Send comments regarding this burden estimate, including any suggestions for reducing this burden, to Carrie Hall, NOAA NOS/OCM/PPC, 1305 East-West Hwy., N/OCM1, Silver Spring, Maryland 20910. A summary report of the survey results will be provided to the reserve and will be available to the public upon request. Your survey responses will not be linked to your name. Responses to this survey are voluntary. Notwithstanding any other provision of the law, no person is required to respond to, nor shall any person be subject to a penalty for failure to comply with, a collection of information subject to the requirements of the Paperwork Reduction Act unless that collection displays a currently valid Office of Management and Budget (OMB) control number.

2017 PRA Evaluation: CMPs Issuing Permits - Survey for Partners and Stakeholders

The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Office for Coastal Management conducts periodic evaluations of state coastal management programs as required by the Coastal Zone Management Act. As part of the evaluation of the [NAME OF STATE] Coastal Management Program, the Office for Coastal Management would like to obtain your perspective and opinion on the program's implementation and activities.

The evaluation will cover the time period of [MONTH YEAR to MONTH YEAR].

Please note that the word “you” in the following questions refers to an organization or a person, as appropriate. If there are questions that do not apply to you, or questions you do not wish to answer, you may skip them.

Thank you for your participation in this survey.

1. How would you characterize the coastal management program's management of the state's coastal zone?

Excellent	Good	Adequate	Poor	Very Poor	No Opinion
○	○	○	○	○	○

Comments

2. What are the coastal management program's top one to three accomplishments?

1.

2.

3.

3. What are the top one to three coastal management challenges/issues in the state?

1.

2.

3.

4. What are the coastal management program's top one to three opportunities to make a bigger impact in the future? (Locally, regionally, and/or nationally)

1.

2.

3.

5. What are the coastal management program's top one to three strengths in implementing the state coastal management program?

1.

2.

3.

6. What are the coastal management program's top one to three weaknesses in implementing the state coastal management program?

1.

2.

3.

7. What are the top one to three opportunities to improve effective implementation of the coastal management program?

1.

2.

3.

8. How well does the federal consistency process work?

Excellent	Good	Adequate	Poor	Very Poor	No Opinion
○	○	○	○	○	○

9. Discuss your rating of the federal consistency process in terms of what is working well and what is not working well.

10. How effective is the permit process in balancing development and environmental protection?

Excellent	Good	Adequate	Poor	Very Poor	No Opinion
○	○	○	○	○	○

Comments

11. If you have applied for a permit, how would you rate the permit assistance provided by the program?

Excellent	Good	Adequate	Poor	Very Poor	No Opinion
○	○	○	○	○	○

Comments

12. Is there anything else you would like to share?

13. Choose the category that best describes who you represent.

- ○ Local Government
- ○ State Government
- ○ Federal Government
- ○ Business/Industry
- ○ Nonprofit/Nongovernmental Organization
- ○ Academia
- ○ Other
- ○ Other (please specify)

OMB Control Number 0648-0661. Expires: 3/31/2016. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 15 minutes per completed survey. Send comments regarding this burden estimate, including any suggestions for reducing this burden, to Carrie Hall, NOAA NOS/OCM/PPC, 1305 East-West Hwy., N/OCM1, Silver Spring, Maryland 20910. A summary report of the survey results will be provided to the coastal management program and will be available to the public upon request. Your survey responses will not be linked to your name. Responses to this survey are voluntary. Notwithstanding any other provision of the law, no person is required to respond to, nor shall any person be subject to a penalty for failure to comply with, a collection of information subject to the requirements of the Paperwork Reduction Act unless that collection displays a currently valid Office of Management and Budget (OMB) control number.

harvesting permit application and/or harvesting vessel operators and to importers and re-exporters of Antarctic marine living resources. The collection is necessary in order for the United States to meet its treaty obligations as a contracting party to the Convention.

II. Method of Collection

Paper applications, electronic reports, satellite-linked vessel monitoring devices, radio and telephone calls, gear and vessel markings are required from participants and methods of transmittal include internet, satellite, facsimile and mail transmission of forms, reports and information.

III. Data

OMB Control Number: 0648–0194.

Form Number(s): None.

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

Affected Public: Individuals; business or other for-profit organizations; not-for-profit institutions.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 1 research entity; 2 vessel owners; 50 dealers.

Estimated Time Per Response: One hour to apply for a CEMP research permit; 1 hour to report on research; 28 hours to supply information on potential new or exploratory fishing; 2 hours to apply for a harvesting permit; 2 minutes to transmit information by radio; 4 hours to install a vessel monitoring device (VMS); 2 hours for annual VMS maintenance; 45 minutes to mark a vessel; 40 minutes to mark buoys; 10 hours to mark pot gear; 6 minutes to mark trawl nets; 15 minutes to apply for a dealer permit to import and/or re-export Antarctic marine living resources; 15 minutes to complete and submit a toothfish catch document; 15 minutes to apply for pre-approval of toothfish imports; 15 minutes to complete and submit re-export catch documents; 15 minutes to submit import tickets.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 290 hours.

Estimated Total Annual Cost to Public: $86,800.

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: December 17, 2015.

Sarah Brabson,

NOAA PRA Clearance Officer.

[FR Doc. 2015–32165 Filed 12–22–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–22–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

RIN 0648–XE373

New England Fishery Management Council; Public Meeting

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

ACTION: Notice; public meeting.

SUMMARY: The New England Fishery Management Council (Council) is scheduling a public meeting of its *Whiting* Committee on January 21, 2016 to consider actions affecting New England fisheries in the exclusive economic zone (EEZ). Recommendations from this group will be brought to the full Council for formal consideration and action, if appropriate.

DATES: This meeting will be held on Thursday, January 21, 2016 at 10 a.m.

ADDRESSES:

Meeting address: The meeting will be held at the Hampton Inn, 2100 Post Road, Warwick, RI 02886; telephone: (401) 739–8888; fax: (401) 739–1550.

Council address: New England Fishery Management Council, 50 Water Street, Mill 2, Newburyport, MA 01950.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Thomas A. Nies, Executive Director, New England Fishery Management Council; telephone: (978) 465–0492.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Agenda

The Committee will review Amendment 22 scoping comments and develop recommendations for the range of issues to be addressed by the amendment. The Council will then approve the scope of the amendment at its January Council meeting. The Committee will also review and discuss PDT recommendations for five-year Council research priorities. Other business may be discussed if time permits.

Special Accommodations

This meeting is physically accessible to people with disabilities. Requests for sign language interpretation or other auxiliary aids should be directed to Thomas A. Nies, Executive Director, at (978) 465–0492, at least 5 days prior to the meeting date.

Authority: 16 U.S.C. 1801 *et seq.*

Dated: December 18, 2015.

Tracey L. Thompson,

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

[FR Doc. 2015–32298 Filed 12–22–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–22–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

Proposed Information Collection; Comment Request; Evaluations of Coastal Zone Management Act Programs—State Coastal Management Programs and National Estuarine Research Reserves

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 February 22, 2016.

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 Carrie Hall, (240) 533–0730 or *carrie.hall@noaa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Abstract

This request is for revision and extension of a current information collection.

The Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972, as amended (CZMA; 16 U.S.C. 1451 *et seq.*) requires that state coastal management programs and national estuarine research reserves developed pursuant to the CZMA and approved by the Secretary of Commerce be evaluated periodically. This request is for to collect information to accomplish those evaluations.

Section 1458 of the CZMA and implementing regulations at 15 CFR 923, Subpart L, require that state coastal management programs be evaluated concerning the extent to which the state has implemented and enforced the program approved by the Secretary, addressed the coastal management needs identified in 16 U.S.C. 1452(2)(A) through (K), and adhered to the terms of any grant, loan, or cooperative agreement funded under the CZMA. Section 1461(f) of the CZMA and implementing regulations at 15 CFR 921, Subpart E, require that national estuarine research reserves be evaluated with regard to their operation and management, including education and interpretive activities, the research being conducted within the reserve, and be evaluated in accordance with section 1458 of the CZMA and procedures set forth in 15 CFR 923.

NOAA's Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management (OCRM) conducts periodic evaluations of the 34 coastal management programs and 28 research reserves and produces written findings for each evaluation. OCRM has access to documents submitted in cooperative agreement applications, performance reports, and certain documentation required by the CZMA and implementing regulations. However, additional information from each coastal management program and research reserve, as well as information from the program and reserve partners and stakeholders with whom each works, is necessary to evaluate against statutory and regulatory requirements. Different information collection subsets are necessary for (1) coastal management programs, (2) their partners and stakeholders, (3) research reserves, and (4) their partners and stakeholders.

II. Method of Collection

Coastal program and reserve manager respondents will receive information requests/questionnaires via email, and submittals will be made via email. Partners and stakeholders of coastal management programs and of reserves will receive a link to a web-based survey tool and respond through the survey tool.

As part of this submission, a few questions will be modified to clarify the information that should be provided as part of the information requests/questionnaires sent to the coastal program and reserve managers. The overall number of survey questions for the partners and stakeholders will be reduced.

III. Data

OMB Control Number: 0648–0661.

Form Number: None.

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

Affected Public: State, local, or tribal government; not-for-profit institutions; business or other for-profit organizations.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 468.

Estimated Time Per Response: 55 hours per CZMA program manager's evaluation; 30 minutes per partner/stakeholder's evaluation.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 943 hours.

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

IV. Request for Comments

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

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

Sarah Brabson,

NOAA PRA Clearance Officer.

[FR Doc. 2015–32100 Filed 12–22–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–08–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

RIN 0648–XE372

North Pacific Fishery Management Council; Public Meeting

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

ACTION: Notice of public meeting.

SUMMARY: The North Pacific Fishery Management Council (Council) Crab Plan Team (CPT) will meet in Anchorage, AK.

DATES: The meeting will be held on Tuesday, January 12, 2016 through Friday, January 15, 2016, from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held in the Birch/Willow room at the Hilton Hotel, 500 W 3rd Ave., Anchorage, AK 99501.

Council address: North Pacific Fishery Management Council, 605 W. 4th Ave., Suite 306, Anchorage, AK 99501–2252; telephone: (907) 271–2809.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Diana Stram, Council staff; telephone: (907) 271–2809.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Agenda

Tuesday, January 12, 2016 through Friday, January 15, 2016

The agenda includes developing recommendations on 2016–2017 OFL (over fishing limit) and ABC (acceptable biological catch) catch for NS RKC (Norton Sound Red King Crab), review assessment models for BSAI (Bering Sea and Aleutian Island) crab stocks, develop crab specific ecosystem indices, review a discussion paper on crab bycatch, revise the crab SAFE (Stock Assessment and Fishery Evaluation) guidelines and terms of reference for the CPT. The Agenda is subject to change, and the latest version will be posted at *http://www.npfmc.org/*

Special Accommodations

These meetings are physically accessible to people with disabilities. Requests for sign language interpretation or other auxiliary aids should be directed to Shannon Gleason at (907) 271–2809 at least 7 working days prior to the meeting date.