NOTICE OF OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET ACTION

Date 07/24/2013

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 06/24/2013

ACTION REQUESTED: New collection (Request for a new OMB Control Number)
TYPE OF REVIEW REQUESTED: Regular
ICR REFERENCE NUMBER: 201305-0648-007
AGENCY ICR TRACKING NUMBER:
TITLE: Survey of Coastal Managers to Assess Needs for Ecological Forecasts
LIST OF INFORMATION COLLECTIONS: See next page

OMB ACTION: Approved with change
OMB CONTROL NUMBER: 0648-0675
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: 07/31/2016 DISCONTINUE DATE:

BURDEN:	RESPONSES	HOURS	COSTS
Previous	0	0	0
New	100	33	0
Difference			
Change due to New Statute	0	0	0
Change due to Agency Discretion	100	33	0
Change due to Agency Adjustment	0	0	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
Survey to assess the need for scenario-based ecosystem models within US coastal waters and the Great Lakes	NA	Survey to assess the need for scenario-based ecosystem models within US coastal waters and the Great Lakes	

PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT SUBMISSION

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

7. Title Survey of Coastal Managers to Assess Needs for Ecological Forecasts

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

9. Keywords Coastal Management, Ecological Forecast

10. Abstract

This request is for a new survey of coastal managers to determine their needs and potential uses for ecological forecasts or scenarios. NOAA has a long-history of conducting operational modeling and forecasting, mostly in the National Weather Service for weather and climate and the National Ocean Service for tides and currents. Expanding this capacity to include forecasting of ecological trends and conditions can be critical to many coastal management applications. This survey will help to assess coastal managers' needs for ecological forecasts and scenarios, and how such forecasts may be used in management contexts.

11. Affected public (*Mark primary with "P" and all others that apply with "x"*)
a. ___ Individuals or households d. ___ Farms
b. ___ Business or other for-profit e. x Federal Government
c. x Not-for-profit institutions f. P 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 100
b. Total annual responses 100
1. Percentage of these responses collected electronically 100 %
c. Total annual hours requested 33
d. Current OMB inventory 0
e. Difference 33
f. Explanation of difference
1. Program change 0
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. P Program planning or management
b. ___ Program evaluation f. x 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: Elizabeth Turner
Phone: 603-862-4680

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 5/10/2013
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: 2013.07.31 12:26:07 -04'00'	Date 5/10/2013

SUPPORTING STATEMENT
Survey of Coastal Managers to Assess Needs for Ecological Forecasts
OMB CONTROL NO. 0648-xxxx

A. JUSTIFICATION

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

This request is for a new survey of coastal and Great Lakes managers, in order to determine their needs and potential uses for ecological forecasts or scenarios. This activity is in line with the Coastal Zone Management Act, 16 U.S.C. § 1456b. Coastal Zone Enhancement Grants (Section 309). NOAA has a long history of conducting operational modeling and forecasting, mostly in the National Weather Service for weather and climate and the National Ocean Service for tides and currents. Expanding this capacity to include forecasting of ecological trends and conditions can be critical to many coastal management applications. This survey will help to assess managers' needs for ecological forecasts and scenarios, and how such forecasts may be used in management contexts.

The proposed survey will be conducted through a cooperative agreement that was awarded competitively in 2011. The project is led by Mr. James Fitzpatrick at HDR|HydroQual in Mahwah, N.J. Other experts are drawn from the University of Maine, the University of Michigan, the University of Delaware, the University of Maryland, and Limno-Tech, Inc. In addition to these scientists and modelers, the project was designed to involve coastal managers by assessing their information needs. This survey is a major part of the project, and will help to guide a subsequent workshop on the topic and a set of recommendations that will be summarized in a white paper at the end of the project.

NOAA and the National Ocean Service (NOS) have polled coastal managers for information needs and tool development, but not specifically for forecasting needs. No other office within NOAA has collected this information in a consolidated and formalized way.

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.

Purpose, Delivery, and Frequency
The survey will assess what types of projections or scenarios would be most useful to managers, and how best to portray model output in a forecast mode. This will be a one-time survey, administered through a Web-based survey engine.

Projected Use of Results
The information collected will be used by the project team to develop a white paper that will recommend approaches and methods for developing forecasts and making them available to a wide audience.

The questionnaire is designed to assess the need for models used in developing scenarios and/or current use of such models, and model requirements. It is divided into two separate pathways: one for agency directors/managers to assess the need for models used in developing scenarios and/or current use of such models, and one for agency staff who may be applying existing models themselves or overseeing outside consultants or vendors who are applying models for the agency.

1. A set of 12 questions asks about the respondent's job responsibilities (state and agency where they work, spatial domain covered, types of management decisions they make, major issues they deal with). Depending on whether respondents identify themselves as directors or modeling staff, they are directed to one of the two pathways:
    a. A set of 19 questions asks directors about the use of models in decision-making (are models used in the management process currently, what types of decisions are influenced, are models proprietary, how best to provide model output, what members of the community are influenced by the decisions based on model output)
    b. A set of 19 questions asks staff modelers more technical details about the models themselves (what are the needs for data input, what were the costs of model development, what are the costs of running the model, what are the uncertainty estimates)
2. Two follow-up questions ask for any additional comments, and whether the respondent would like to participate in a further workshop activity.

The survey responses will be collated and used to develop a subsequent workshop that will include a subset of the managers surveyed (based on their responses to the final question) as well as modelers and representatives from NOAA and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) as workshop leaders/facilitators. The workshop will discuss the topic of scenario forecasts more deeply, and develop a white paper with suggestions on what scenarios are of most interest to the management community and how forecasts might be provided to them.

The project team 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. Although the information collected is not expected to be disseminated directly to the public, results may be used in scientific, management, technical or general information publications. Should NOAA's National Ocean Service 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.

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

The survey will be administered via a Web-based survey instrument. Invitations with a link to the survey will be sent to coastal managers via e-mail. The survey will be fillable and fileable

online. If preferred and requested, respondents will be mailed a paper version of the survey to complete and return in a postage paid envelope. Also if requested, accommodations will be made to facilitate completion of the survey via telephone.

4. Describe efforts to identify duplication.

Program staff made personal contact with EPA Council for Regulatory Environmental Modeling (CREM). We also conducted an Internet search for needs assessment and coastal modeling, both as a wide Internet -search and through the NOAA Coastal Services Center Web site and the Integrated Ocean Observation System (IOOS).

No other existing similar information collections were found. Some assessments existed for either specific issues (storm surge, marsh restoration, coastal erosion) or specific geographic regions (South Florida, Great Lakes, West Coast). None of these explicitly addressed scenario-based forecast needs, but instead were more for general information and mapping needs.

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

None of the survey targets are small businesses. In any case, the collection does not require record keeping or expenditure funds, only information about existing responsibilities and uses of models and scenarios. The individual response time is estimated to be 20 minutes.

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

Conducting this survey will provide the project with crucial information from the targeted community on the potential use of ecological forecasts. Survey results will enable the project to tailor a workshop that will discuss questions in more detail, and develop the major outcome of the project, a white paper detailing recommendations on how to develop and deliver such forecasts. This will help NOAA plan future programs in research and operational delivery of future forecasts. Without this survey, the planned workshop will be less informed by coastal managers' needs, and the resulting report will be less useful to NOAA.

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

NA.

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

A Federal Register Notice published on March 7, 2013 (78 FR 14775) solicited public comments). No substantive comments pertinent to the collection were received.

The project has a group of outside advisors which encompasses state coastal resource managers, managers in the National Estuary Programs, and field personnel of NOAA/NMFS and the Environmental Protection Agency. Seven members of the advisory group provided pilot testing of the survey in January, 2013. This included timing for responses, identification and discussion of unclear instructions and question content, asking respondents about the length of the instrument, and discussing suggestions for improvements. After the pilot test, some questions were re-worded and clarified.

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

No payment or gifts to survey respondents will be provided.

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

As stated on the survey instrument, responses will not be reported individually, only in aggregate. Individual names will not be kept on completed surveys or subsequent reports, but will be retained on a list of those who ask to be kept informed about the project. A summary of results will be used by the project team in the development of their recommendations. A summary of the aggregate results will also be made available to participants at a workshop in FY14.

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.

NA.

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

The estimated annualized burden estimate for the survey is 33.3 (33) hours. This reflects 100 respondents with an average completion time of 20 minutes, including the time for reviewing instructions and gathering the requested information.

Respondents are likely to be coastal managers and state employees with an average pay grade equivalent to a Government Service Pay Grade 12 Step 1. Using this grade to estimate the hourly rate of the respondent ($28.62), the maximum estimated annualized cost to the respondent for the hour burden of each collection (i.e. 20 minutes) is $9.45 per respondent; the maximum cost for the information collection for a 100 percent response rate (i.e., 100 respondents) is $945.

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).

Responding to the survey requires no reporting or record keeping costs.

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

This information collection and analysis effort is supported through a cooperative agreement. The estimated annualized cost for this information collection is $8709 (i.e., in-house staff time, supplies). Estimates presented below represent the costs per annum for the term of the approval.

Annualized Cost to Federal Government	Labor	$Cost
Supplies and printing		$100
Project personnel (through a cooperative agreement)	15.5 days	$8209
NOAA staff (through coop. agreement substantial involvement)	20 hrs @ 20.00/hr	$400
TOTAL		$8709

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

This is a new information collection.

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

The results will be summarized and presented in aggregated form in a workshop venue and in a white paper final project report. Aggregated results may be shown in bar chart, pie chart or tabular format.

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

NA.

18. Explain each exception to the certification statement.

NA.

SUPPORTING STATEMENT
Survey of Coastal Managers to Assess Needs for Ecological Forecasts
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.

E-mail requests for responses to the survey will be sent to approximately 100 coastal managers and agency personnel involved in modeling from around the US. The survey will be sent to both managers and modelers: if a modeler is known at an agency, it will be sent directly; if it is not known if a modeler is on staff at an agency, it will be sent to the manager. If the manager feels that they are not the right person to answer the survey, they are requested to send the survey on to someone on their staff who may be more appropriate. The estimate below of 3 respondents per agency took allowance for managers to forward to a staff member. A survey target of 100 is deemed to be large enough to allow representation from most geographic areas (see below), but not overwhelming in terms of analysis. The potential respondent universe can be calculated as:

> # of coastal and Great Lakes states X number of management agencies per state with responsibilities for coastal planning, water quality or fisheries management X number of personnel at each agency with appropriate expertise in modeling or management.
> This works out to be 33 X 4 X 3 =792.

	# of states	Avg. # agencies/state	Avg. # respondents/agency
Estimated Universe	33	4	3
Survey Requests	29	3.5	1

Respondents were chosen through consultation with project personnel and the project's advisory group. Survey targets were chosen with the following criteria:

1. Geographic balance – approximately equal numbers from all coastal regions of the US. This required some states to be unrepresented. (For instance, there are only 4 states on the Pacific continental US coast, but 8 Great Lakes states. All 4 Pacific states were represented, but only 6 Great Lakes states were targeted.

2. Some level of sophistication with modeling – the survey asks relatively technical questions about modeling, so respondents have to be involved in running models or utilizing model results.

3. Area of responsibility – respondents need to be involved in using models to aid in decision making for coastal management.

4. Respondents are primarily state agency personnel. This survey has not been conducted before, so no reliable estimates of response rate exist.

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.

Information will be collected by a Web-based instrument. In addition to collecting the responses to the survey, this instrument also provides simple analysis of responses to individual questions. This analysis includes:

- Summaries for each question presented as a percent of the sample population who answered the question,
- Where appropriate, summary statistics (percent) for each sub-choice available for a particular question that provides multiple choice options. The percentages are presented based on the number of respondents that choose to answer that particular question.

For those questions which do not involve multiple choice, the project team will review the written text, categorize the results, where appropriate, into similar response classes and summarize the results using simple percentages.

Since this is a relatively simple survey meant to collect information concerning the needs and potential uses for ecological forecasts or scenarios, there is no need to for sample stratification. The sample size is expected to be of a manageable size and all respondents responses will be considered in developing the summary statistics for the survey responses. Similarly, given the generic nature of the survey, there are no concerns at this time with the expected accuracy of the survey. The survey is meant to provide an indication of the potential needs for and interest in the use of ecological forecast models. The information from this survey will be used to inform a national workshop, comprised on coastal managers and modeling experts, about the needs for and the types of ecological forecast and scenario models (ex. eutrophication, fisheries, contaminant fate and transport, etc.) of interest to coastal managers.

This survey will be a one-time survey and, therefore, there is no need for any use of periodic data collection.

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.

- The initial contact with perspective survey participants will consist of an email inviting participants and describing the purpose of the survey along with a link to the survey instrument and instructions. Members of the steering committee with professional relationships with the survey targets will send these e-mails, to maximize the responses from targeted individuals. We expect a relatively high response rate because of this personal outreach with an explanation of the survey goals, as well as the relative brevity of the survey and ease of response via the web.
- A series of follow-up reminders may be sent to respondents, following the delivery of the original survey invitation.
- If a paper copy of the survey is requested, postage-paid return envelopes will be enclosed.
- Respondents will be given contact information for any questions regarding the survey
- For expediency, electronic mail will be used instead of postal mail to communicate with customers, unless a mailed hard copy is requested.
- If fewer than 80% of the targeted managers respond after the series of reminders, we will compare the responders vs. non-responders in terms of their geographic region and the type of agency (Federal, state, NGO) to assess potential biases in survey results.

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.

Pilot testing of the survey instrument was completed in January, 2013. Seven advisory group members participated in the pilot test and subsequent discussions. Pilot testers were state coastal resource managers, managers in the National Estuary Programs, and field personnel of NOAA/NMFS and the Environmental Protection Agency. Responses of the pilot group included timing for responses, identification and discussion of unclear instructions and question content, the length of the instrument, and discussing suggestions for improvements. Comments from the pilot test participants resulted in some content and wording changes to clarify responses.

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.

Principal Investigator under the Cooperative Agreement:
James Fitzpatrick
HDR|HydroQual
1200 MacArthur Blvd.
Mahwah, NJ 07430
Phone: 201-529-5151 x7110
Fax: 201-529-5728
Jim.Fitzpatrick@hdrinc.com

Agency contact information:
Elizabeth Turner
NOS/NCCOS/CSCOR
Gregg Hall Room 146
35 Colovos Road
Durham, NH 03824
603-862-4680
Elizabeth.Turner@noaa.gov

NOAA - Draft Final (4-13-2013)

Questionnaire from: NOAA National Ocean Service, National Centers for Coastal Ocean Science
OMB Control No. 0648-0675 Expiration Date: 07/31/2016
Responding to this questionnaire is entirely voluntary.

This questionnaire is meant to to gather information and assess the need for scenario-based ecosystem models within US coastal waters and the Great Lakes.
The questionnaire is actually divided into two parts - one for agency directors/managers to assess the need for models used in developing scenarios and/or current use of such models and one for agency staff who may be applying existing models in-house or who may be directing or overseeing outside consultants or vendors who are applying models for the agency.
If you are a director/manager we would appreciate it if you could take the time to fill-out this questionnaire. If your agency is currently using models or has used models in the past, we would appreciate it if you would also forward this questionnaire to the appropriate staff member who is or has applied the model(s) and/or who has managed outside consultants or vendors in the application of the model(s) for your agency.

1. Please enter your name and the agency/organization that you work for

Name:

Agency/Organization:

State:

2. Please respond if you are a director/manager or staff member

- ◯ Director/Manager
- ◯ Staff

3. Is your role or the role of your agency to make regulatory/policy decisions or to provide or to make recommendations to other regulatory or policy making groups, i.e., would you consider yourself a regulatory/policy manager or a natural resources manager?

- ◯ Regulatory/Policy Manager
- ◯ Natural Resources Manager

4. What is your spatial domain (i.e., specific estuary(ies), coastal regions or Great Lakes) of decisions?

5. What issues (eutrophication, toxics, fisheries, etc.) are you concerned with? (Please check as many Issues as are appropriate and rank order of importance)

- [ ] Eutrophication
- [ ] Hypoxia/Anoxia
- [ ] HABs
- [ ] Fisheries
- [ ] Toxics
- [ ] Seagrasses
- [ ] Wetlands
- [ ] Benthic Habitat
- [ ] Pathogens/Shellfish
- [ ] Pathogens/Recreational Contact
- [ ] Other

6. What indicators or end-points (HABs, hypoxia, fish body burden, regulatory drivers, etc.) tend to inform or drive your decisions? (Please fill-in as many indicators/end-points that correspond to Question 3 as appropriate)

- [ ] Regulatory drivers (ex. WQ standards, TMDLs, etc.)
- [ ] Summer average chlorophyll-a
- [ ] Annual average chlorophyll-a
- [ ] HAB biomass
- [ ] Hypoxia/anoxia
- [ ] Submerged aquatic vegetation or seagrasses
- [ ] Benthic abundance/diversity
- [ ] Fisheries yield/catch
- [ ] Fish body burden
- [ ] Beach closure days

Others (please specify as many as appropriate)

7. Who is influenced by your decision? (Please check all appropriate boxes)

- [ ] Other Government regulators and planners
- [ ] Municipalities/Counties (NPDES)
- [ ] Municipal Dischargers
- [ ] Industrial Dischargers
- [ ] Landowners
- [ ] Farmers
- [ ] Fishermen

Other(s) (please specify)

8. How are these different people or groups affected by the decisions you make? For example, Does the decision result in the development of a TMDL? Does it influence permit limits for a discharger? (Please check boxes as appropriate)

- [ ] TMDL
- [ ] Permitting or permit limits
- [ ] Fisheries catch limitations
- [ ] Shellfish harvesting
- [ ] Beach closures

Other (please specify)

9. What is the time frame that is assessed under the decision making process, i.e., Is the time frame annual or seasonal as might be used when considering fisheries yield -or- might it be daily as might be used when considering attainment of a dissolved oxygen water quality standard?

- [ ] Annual
- [ ] Seasonal
- [ ] Monthly
- [ ] Weekly
- [ ] Daily

10. What is the spatial scale of your decisions? Is it local, statewide, regional or multi-jurisdictional? (Check all that apply)

- [ ] Regional
- [ ] State-wide
- [ ] Local
- [ ] Multi-jurisdictional

11. Are there other agencies or team members that assist in making the decision?

- ( ) Yes
- ( ) No

If "Yes" would you please specify who

12. What factors/variables (examples: monitoring data, compliance with water quality standards, fisheries yield, demographics, climate change, etc.) do you consider or evaluate when you are making a decision about XYZ? (Please check all that apply)

- [ ] Monitoring data
- [ ] Compliance with WQS
- [ ] Fisheries yield
- [ ] Climate change
- [ ] Demographic trends

Other (please specify)

13. Are models being used to inform or guide the decision? If so, could you please explain how they are being used in the decision process, e.g., TMDL, as part of a weight of evidence approach, etc.

- ( ) Yes
- ( ) No

Please explain

14. What types of models (empirical/statistical, process-based/mechanistic) are being used?

- [ ] Empirical/statistical
- [ ] Process-based/mechanistic
- [ ] Mixed (Empirical/Statistical - Process-based/mechanistic)

15. If you replied "multi-jurisdictional" to Question 8, then are there any constraints or issues (ex. two states sharing a waterbody, but with different water quality standards for the constituent of interest) for use of the model? If so please describe

16. What level of funding was required for model development, including calibration/confirmation vs. other funding required for data collection/ monitoring? (total costs for model development and total costs for data collection/monitoring used in support of the model development)

	don't know	less than $50k	$50k-$100k	$100k - $250k	$250k - $500k	>$500k
Funding for model development ($)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Funding for data collection/monitoring ($)	○	○	○	○	○	○

17. How do these costs, including the costs of scenario evaluation, compare to the expected cost for implementing the scenario(s) being considered (i.e., construction, BMP implementation, remediation, O&M, etc.)?
First, the costs of scenario evaluation.

	Don't know	Less than $100k	$100k - $250k	$250k - $500k	$500k - $1M	$1m - $10M	>$10m
Costs for data collection and model calibration/ validation/scenario evaluation (Total $)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

18. Second, the expected cost for implementing the scenario(s) being considered.

	Don't know	Less than $500k	$500k - $1M	$1M-$10M	$10M-$50M	$50M-$100M	>$100M
One time implementation costs, e.g., construction, remediation, BMP implementation (Total $)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
If appropriate: Annual costs for O&M, compliance monitoring, etc. (assumming 20-year service life) ($/year)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

19. Is the model or are the models still continuing to be run or used?

○ Yes

○ No

If Yes, briefly explain

20. What level of annual funding is required to support the execution of the model for scenarios vs. funding for data collection?

	Don't know	Less than $10k	$10k - $50k	$50k - $100k	$100k - $250k	>$250k
Funding for model execution ($/year)	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Funding for data collection ($/year)	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

21. What type of infrastructure or computer platform (ex. in-house server farm, desktop or laptop PC, external IT-service, etc.) is in place to run the model?

22. Do you have a need for a model(s) used to develop and evaluate scenarios?

◯ Yes ◯ No

23. What are the issues or variables of interest are important to your region or spatial domain that such a model would need to address (hypoxia vs. fisheries vs. toxic contaminants, etc.)? (Please identify issues/variables)

- ☐ Eutrophication
- ☐ Hypoxia/Anoxia
- ☐ HABs
- ☐ Fisheries
- ☐ Toxics
- ☐ Submerged aquatic vegetation or seagrasses
- ☐ Benthic habitat
- ☐ Pathogens/Shellfish
- ☐ Pathogens/Recreational Contact

Others (please specify)

24. Please describe your assessment of how such a model would or would not benefit your scenario-based management goals.

25. Are there funds and/or resources available for process-based/mechanistic modeling versus empirically-based models?

◯ Yes ◯ No

26. Do you have an interest in in-house capabilities versus external providers such as consultants / NOAA / USGS / USEPA / etc.?

- [ ] Interest in In-house capabilities
- [ ] Interest in external providers

27. Was the existing model developed, calibrated/confirmed and/or implemented in-house or by an outside consultant/vendor?

- ( ) In-house
- ( ) Outside consultant/vendor

28. Is the model being run or exercised internally or by a consultant/vendor?

- ( ) Internally
- ( ) Consultant/Vendor

29. What type of infrastructure/budget is available to run or exercise the model?

	Infrastructure	Budget
Infrastructure / Budget ($/yr)		

30. What level of total funding was required for data collection to calibrate/validate the model?

- ( ) Don't know
- ( ) Less than $50k
- ( ) $50k-$100k
- ( ) $100k-$250k
- ( ) $250k-$500k
- ( ) $500k-$1M
- ( ) >$1M

31. Over how many years did this expenditure take place (i.e., how many years of data were collected)?

- ( ) 1 year or less
- ( ) 1-2 years
- ( ) 3-5 years
- ( ) 5-10 years
- ( ) > 10 years

32. Are additional data collection efforts being conducted to support the model?

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No

33. Are these data collection efforts being conducted to support additional model confirmation?

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No

34. Are these additional data collection efforts being used to support a model being used in adaptive managment mode?

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No

35. What is the level of funding being provided to support the addtional data collection?

- ◯ Don't know
- ◯ $10k-50k/yr
- ◯ >$100k/yr
- ◯ Less than $10k/yr
- ◯ $50k-$100k/yr

36. Is the model proprietary?

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No

37. Will the model be used in an adaptive management process?

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No

38. How often and over what time period might you need to use or exercise the model in the adaptive management process?

How often (times/year) _____

Time period (e.g., 1year, 2 years, etc.) _____

39. Was the model developed and used for more than one round of management application (e.g., adaptive management mode)?

- ☐ One round only
- ☐ Adaptive Management

40. Do you think that the model could be easily transferred or applied to another similar waterbody within your region or geographic area?

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No

41. Has the model been applied to another waterbody within your region or geographic area?

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No

42. How successful was the new application?

	Not successful	Limited success	Moderately successful	Very successful
Degree of success	◯	◯	◯	◯

43. What are the expected management actions or controlling factors (load reductions, physical alterations to the system, climate change, etc.) that the current model considers? (Please check all appropriate boxes)

- ☐ Load reductions
- ☐ Fisheries restrictions
- ☐ Physical alterations
- ☐ Climate change

Other (please specify)

44. What are the expected management actions or controlling factors (load reductions, physical alterations to the system, climate change, etc.) that a future model (if needed) will need to consider? (If a future model is not envisioned, please check N/A, otherwise, please check boxes as appropriate)

- ☐ N/A
- ☐ Load reductions
- ☐ Physical alterations
- ☐ Fisheries restrictions
- ☐ Climate change

Other (please specify)

45. What are the key model outputs (variables) that are needed and how do they need to be summarized and presented (graphical, tabular) to your management team?

Key model outputs (variables)

Presentation materials (graphical, tabular, etc.)

46. If presentations are to be made to the public, what are the key model outputs (variables) that are needed and how do they need to be summarized and presented (graphical, tabular) to the public?

Key model outputs (variables)

Presentation materials (graphical, tabular, etc.)

47. What are the relevant spatial (small tributary, estuary, coastal waters)and temporal scales (daily, seasonal, yearly, etc.) of interest?

Spatial scale

Temporal scale

48. What is the uncertainty or error tolerance required of a model (e.g., for DO, is acceptable error 10%, 20% or 50%?) before deciding whether to implement a management action or not?

- ◯ Don't know
- ◯ <10%
- ◯ 10-20%
- ◯ 20-30%
- ◯ 30-40%
- ◯ 40-50%
- ◯ Not important - model being used in a weight of evidence approach

49. What types of tools (post-processing, graphical presentations) are available or being used?

- [ ] Post-processing capabilities self-contained within the model GUI
- [ ] Model prepares NetCDF compatible output files
- [ ] Model prepares Matlab compatible output files
- [ ] Model prepares ArcGIS Explorer (or TatukGIS) compatible files
- [ ] Modeling package contains appropriate post-processing tools
- [ ] Internally developed post-processing tools

Other (please specify)

50. Do you have more or equal confidence in empirical/statistical models vs. process-based/mechanistic models? What about a combination of empirical/statistical and process-based/mechanistic models?

- ( ) Empirical/statistical models
- ( ) process-based/mechanistic models
- ( ) Equal confidence in both empirical/statistical and process-based/mechanistic models
- ( ) A combination of empirical/statistical and process-based/mechanistic models approach

51. Do you see a value in model hindcasting as a means of improving confidence in the model? By this we mean testing the model's ability to simulate previously observed system responses to changing conditions (e.g., nutrient load reductions, extreme storm events, protracted droughts).

( ) Yes ( ) No

52. Are there any other thoughts or comments that you might wish to provide at this time?

53. We very much appreciate your taking the time to participate in this data gathering effort as well as the time that you spent in filling out our questionnaire. This information will be compiled and used to develop a "white paper" on national needs for scenario-based ecosystem models for the nation's coastal waters and the Great Lakes and will also be used to inform a future workship focusing on this issue.

We now have one final question for you ...

Would you like to be kept informed as to the progress of this study? If so, would you be interested in participating in the national workshop if it is convenient to your schedule?

◯ Yes ◯ No

Confidentiality and PRA Statements:

Responses will not be reported individually, only in aggregate. Individual names will not be placed on completed surveys or subsequent reports. A summary of results will be used by the Project Team in the development of their recommendations. A summary of the aggregate results will also be made available to participants at a workshop in FY14.

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

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average twenty (20) minutes per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Please send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other suggestions for reducing this burden to Laurie Golden, NOAA National Ocean Service, National Centers for Coastal Ocean Science (laurie.golden@noaa.gov).

additional company information will be posted.

The U.S. Environmental Solutions Toolkit will refer users in foreign markets to U.S. approaches to solving environmental problems and to U.S. companies that can export related technologies. The Toolkit Web site will note that its contents and links do not constitute an official endorsement or approval by the U.S. Commerce Department or the U.S. Government of any of the companies, Web sites, products, or services listed.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Todd DeLelle, Office of Energy & Environmental Industries (OEEI), International Trade Administration, Room 4053, 1401 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230. (Phone: 202–482–4877; Fax: 202–482–5665; email: *todd.delelle@trade.gov*).

Catherine Vial,

Team Leader, Environmental and Renewable Energy Industries, Office of Energy and Environmental Industries.

[FR Doc. 2013–05262 Filed 3–6–13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DR–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

Proposed Information Collection; Comment Request; Survey of Charter Boat and Headboat Angler Interactions With Sea Turtles

AGENCY: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, invites the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on proposed and/or continuing information collections, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

DATES: Written comments must be submitted on or before May 6, 2013.

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 Sara McNulty, (301) 427–8402 or *sara.mcnulty@noaa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Abstract

This request is for a new collection.

The collection of recreational fishing bycatch data is necessary to fulfill statutory requirements of Section 303 of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1852 *et. seq.*), Section 401 of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Reauthorization Act, and to comply with Executive Order 12962 on Recreational Fisheries. Additionally, the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*) imposed prohibitions against the taking of endangered species as the sea turtle. This collection will seek to better understand the nature and overall level of sea turtle interactions with recreational anglers on charter boat and headboats. The information collected will be used to develop more reliable bycatch estimates.

II. Method of Collection

Respondents will be asked to fill out a paper form and return via mail.

III. Data

OMB Control Number: None.

Form Number: None.

Type of Review: Regular submission (new collection).

Affected Public: Individuals or households.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 1,990.

Estimated Time per Response: 10 minutes.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 332.

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: March 4, 2013.

Gwellnar Banks,

Management Analyst, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 2013–05332 Filed 3–6–13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–22–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

Proposed Information Collection; Comment Request; Survey of Coastal Managers To Assess Needs for Ecological Forecasts

AGENCY: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, invites the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on proposed and/or continuing information collections, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

DATES: Written comments must be submitted on or before May 6, 2013.

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 Elizabeth Turner (603) 862–4680 or *Elizabeth.Turner@noaa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Abstract

This request is for a new survey of coastal managers to determine their needs and potential uses for ecological forecasts or scenarios. Coastal managers would be staff from state agencies who deal with issues such as coastal water quality and habitat management. The survey will be conducted under a cooperative agreement between the NOAA National Centers for Coastal Ocean Science (NCCOS) and HDR, Inc., an environmental consulting firm. NOAA has a long history of conducting operational modeling and forecasting, mostly in the National Weather Service

for weather and climate and the National Ocean Service for tides and currents. Expanding this capacity to include forecasting of ecological trends and conditions can be critical to many coastal management applications. This survey will help to assess coastal managers' needs for ecological forecasts and scenarios, and how such forecasts may be used in management contexts.

II. Method of Collection

Coastal managers will be emailed a link to an internet survey. The survey will be a one-time needs assessment, and will not be repeated on a regular basis.

III. Data

OMB Control Number: None.

Form Number: None.

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

Affected Public: Not-for-profit institutions; state, local, or tribal governments; business or other for-profit organizations.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 100.

Estimated Time Per Response: 20 minutes.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 33.

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: March 4, 2013.

Gwellnar Banks,

Management Analyst, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 2013–05325 Filed 3–6–13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–JS–P

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Federal Perkins Loan, Federal Work-Study, and Federal Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant Programs; 2013–2014 Award Year Deadline Dates

AGENCY: Federal Student Aid, Department of Education.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Secretary announces the 2013–2014 award year deadline dates for the submission of requests and documents from postsecondary institutions for the Federal Perkins Loan, Federal Work-Study (FWS), and Federal Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant (FSEOG) programs (collectively, the ''campus-based programs'').

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Federal Perkins Loan program encourages institutions to make low-interest, long-term loans to needy undergraduate and graduate students to help pay for their education.

The FWS program encourages the part-time employment of needy undergraduate and graduate students to help pay for their education and to involve the students in community service activities.

The FSEOG program encourages institutions to provide grants to exceptionally needy undergraduate students to help pay for their cost of education.

The Federal Perkins Loan, FWS, and FSEOG programs are authorized by parts E and C, and part A, subpart 3, respectively, of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended.

Throughout the year, in its ''Electronic Announcements,'' the Department expects to continue to provide additional information for the individual deadline dates listed in the table under the DEADLINE DATES section of this notice. You will find the information on the Information for Financial Aid Professionals (IFAP) Web site at: *www.ifap.ed.gov.*

Deadline Dates: The following table provides the 2013–2014 award year deadline dates for the submission of applications, reports, waiver requests, and other documents for the campus-based programs. Institutions must meet the established deadline dates to ensure consideration for funding or waiver, as appropriate.

2013–2014 AWARD YEAR DEADLINE DATES

What does an institution submit?	How is it submitted?	What is the deadline for submission?
1. The Campus-Based Reallocation Form designated for the return of 2012–2013 funds and the request for supplemental FWS funds for the 2013–2014 award year.	The Reallocation Form is located in the ''Setup'' section of the electronic FISAP and must be submitted from the eCampus-Based Web site at *www.cbfisap.ed.gov*.	August 16, 2013.
2. The 2012–2013 Fiscal Operations Report and 2014–2015 Application to Participate (FISAP).	The FISAP must be submitted electronically via the Internet from the eCampus-Based Web site at *www.cbfisap.ed.gov*. The FISAP signature page must be mailed to: FISAP Administrator, 3130 Fairview Park Drive, Suite 800, Falls Church, VA 22042–4548.	October 1, 2013.
3. The Work Colleges Program Report of 2012–2013 award year expenditures.	The Work Colleges Program Report is located in the ''Setup'' section of the electronic FISAP and must be submitted from the eCampus-Based Web site at *www.cbfisap.ed.gov*. A printed copy of the signed report with an original signature must be submitted by one of the following methods: Hand deliver to: U.S. Department of Education, Federal Student Aid, Grants & Campus-Based Division, 830 First Street, NE., room 63C5 ATTN: Work Colleges Coordinator, Washington, DC 20002, or	October 1, 2013.