

NOTICE OF OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET ACTION

Date 05/06/2014

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 04/03/2014

ACTION REQUESTED: New collection (Request for a new OMB Control Number)

TYPE OF REVIEW REQUESTED: Regular

ICR REFERENCE NUMBER: 201403-0648-010

AGENCY ICR TRACKING NUMBER:

TITLE: Panel Member Survey to Develop Indicators of Resilient Coastal Tourism

LIST OF INFORMATION COLLECTIONS: See next page

OMB ACTION: Approved without change

OMB CONTROL NUMBER: 0648-0694

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: 05/31/2016

DISCONTINUE DATE:

BURDEN:	RESPONSES	HOURS	COSTS
Previous	0	0	0
New	174	116	0
Difference			
Change due to New Statute	0	0	0
Change due to Agency Discretion	174	116	0
Change due to Agency Adjustment	0	0	0
Change due to PRA Violation	0	0	0

TERMS OF CLEARANCE: To ensure any subsequent surveys have practical utility (5 CFR 1320), this survey has been approved for two years. Within 60 days of completion, NOAA must send its analysis of the survey results to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs and explain how the results will be used by the agency to carry out its functions.

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
Webinars			
Surveys, Rounds 1 and 2	NA	Tourism Indicators Survey, Rounds 1 and 2	

PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT SUBMISSION

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

1. Agency/Subagency originating request	2. OMB control number b. <input type="checkbox"/> None a. _____ - _____
3. Type of information collection (<i>check one</i>) a. <input type="checkbox"/> New Collection b. <input type="checkbox"/> Revision of a currently approved collection c. <input type="checkbox"/> Extension of a currently approved collection d. <input type="checkbox"/> Reinstatement, without change, of a previously approved collection for which approval has expired e. <input type="checkbox"/> Reinstatement, with change, of a previously approved collection for which approval has expired f. <input type="checkbox"/> Existing collection in use without an OMB control number For b-f, note Item A2 of Supporting Statement instructions	4. Type of review requested (<i>check one</i>) a. <input type="checkbox"/> Regular submission b. <input type="checkbox"/> Emergency - Approval requested by _____ / _____ / _____ c. <input type="checkbox"/> Delegated
7. Title	5. Small entities Will this information collection have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
8. Agency form number(s) (<i>if applicable</i>)	6. Requested expiration date a. <input type="checkbox"/> Three years from approval date b. <input type="checkbox"/> Other Specify: _____ / _____
9. Keywords	
10. Abstract	
11. Affected public (<i>Mark primary with "P" and all others that apply with "x"</i>) a. ___ Individuals or households d. ___ Farms b. ___ Business or other for-profit e. ___ Federal Government c. ___ Not-for-profit institutions f. ___ State, Local or Tribal Government	12. Obligation to respond (<i>check one</i>) a. <input type="checkbox"/> Voluntary b. <input type="checkbox"/> Required to obtain or retain benefits c. <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory
13. Annual recordkeeping and reporting burden a. Number of respondents _____ b. Total annual responses _____ 1. Percentage of these responses collected electronically _____ % c. Total annual hours requested _____ d. Current OMB inventory _____ e. Difference _____ f. Explanation of difference 1. Program change _____ 2. Adjustment _____	14. Annual reporting and recordkeeping cost burden (<i>in thousands of dollars</i>) a. Total annualized capital/startup costs _____ b. Total annual costs (O&M) _____ c. Total annualized cost requested _____ d. Current OMB inventory _____ e. Difference _____ f. Explanation of difference 1. Program change _____ 2. Adjustment _____
15. Purpose of information collection (<i>Mark primary with "P" and all others that apply with "X"</i>) a. ___ Application for benefits e. ___ Program planning or management b. ___ Program evaluation f. ___ Research c. ___ General purpose statistics g. ___ Regulatory or compliance d. ___ Audit	16. Frequency of recordkeeping or reporting (<i>check all that apply</i>) a. <input type="checkbox"/> Recordkeeping b. <input type="checkbox"/> Third party disclosure c. <input type="checkbox"/> Reporting 1. <input type="checkbox"/> On occasion 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Weekly 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Monthly 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Quarterly 5. <input type="checkbox"/> Semi-annually 6. <input type="checkbox"/> Annually 7. <input type="checkbox"/> Biennially 8. <input type="checkbox"/> Other (describe) _____
17. Statistical methods Does this information collection employ statistical methods <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	18. Agency Contact (person who can best answer questions regarding the content of this submission) Name: _____ Phone: _____

19. Certification for Paperwork Reduction Act Submissions

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

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

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

- (a) It is necessary for the proper performance of agency functions;
- (b) It avoids unnecessary duplication;
- (c) It reduces burden on small entities;
- (d) It used plain, coherent, and unambiguous terminology that is understandable to respondents;
- (e) Its implementation will be consistent and compatible with current reporting and recordkeeping practices;
- (f) It indicates the retention period for recordkeeping requirements;
- (g) It informs respondents of the information called for under 5 CFR 1320.8(b)(3):
 - (i) Why the information is being collected;
 - (ii) Use of information;
 - (iii) Burden estimate;
 - (iv) Nature of response (voluntary, required for a benefit, mandatory);
 - (v) Nature and extent of confidentiality; and
 - (vi) Need to display currently valid OMB control number;
- (h) It was developed by an office that has planned and allocated resources for the efficient and effective management and use of the information to be collected (see note in Item 19 of instructions);
- (i) It uses effective and efficient statistical survey methodology; and
- (j) It makes appropriate use of information technology.

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

Signature of Senior Official or designee

Date

Agency Certification (signature of Assistant Administrator, Deputy Assistant Administrator, Line Office Chief Information Officer, head of MB staff for L.O.s, or of the Director of a Program or StaffOffice)

Signature

Date

Signature of NOAA Clearance Officer

Signature

Date

SUPPORTING STATEMENT

Panel Member Survey to Develop Indicators of Resilient Coastal Tourism

OMB CONTROL NO. 0648-xxxx

A. JUSTIFICATION

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

Tourism is a key economic driver for coastal states, and coastal tourism faces risks posed by climate change, sea level rise, and coastal storms that have increased in frequency and severity. To date, most research that pertains to tourism in the context of natural or manmade disasters focuses on reactive industry response or recovery efforts rather than the proactive implementation of processes and techniques that generate resiliency. Under this project, The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's Coastal Services Center (NOAA CSC) will explore how to measure the resilience of coastal tourism to natural disasters, economic downturns, and climate change. Understanding the factors that contribute to the resiliency of the tourism sector in the face of disasters will allow NOAA and tourism stakeholders to measure resiliency and, potentially, take proactive measures to improve resiliency in cases where an area has low resiliency.

This project will address two aspects under [NOAA's Next Generation Strategic Plan](#). First, the Plan sets out NOAA's vision for the future as "Resilient Ecosystems, Communities, and Economies." This is described as "Resilient ecosystems, communities, and economies can maintain and improve their health and vitality over time by anticipating, absorbing, and diffusing change." Furthermore, one of NOAA's long term goals in the Plan is "Resilient Coastal Communities and Economies." This survey will measure the resiliency of the tourism sector in two coastal areas and develop indicators that can be used to measure resiliency in these areas.

Furthermore, two Executive Orders (Eos) are relevant for this survey work. [EO 13597](#), signed on January 19, 2012 identifies the tourism sector as an important priority for enhancing economic growth in the United States. [EO 13653](#), signed on November 1, 2013 identifies resiliency to climate impacts as a key objective.

This effort will focus on two coastal areas: 1) the Central North Carolina Coast and 2) the San Francisco Bay Area (inner and outer coast). Focusing on two specific areas will allow NOAA to better understand the details on what makes a tourism sector resilient. NOAA also expects that some of the findings from these two areas will be generalizable to the broader set of coastal tourism sectors across the country.

NOAA will collect data on tourism resiliency by conducting a multi-round, iterative survey process based on the Delphi Method, which is a structured method for eliciting and combining opinions from experts¹. NOAA will apply the Delphi Method to a multi-round survey of two

¹ Linstone and Turoff, Eds. 2002. The Delphi Method: Techniques and Applications. Accessible at: <http://is.njit.edu/pubs/delphibook/>.

panels of individuals with first-hand experience and insight into tourism resiliency and/or the tourism industry in the two geographic areas identified above. Examples of these panel experts include local tourism officials, trade association representatives, university staff who focus on tourism research, and local business owners. These two regions were selected because they offer distinct tourism experiences from one another. The Central North Carolina Coast offers a more rural experience and the San Francisco Bay Area offers a combination of urbanized coastal area combined with natural areas. Additionally, one site is located on the east coast and one is located on the west coast offering the different perspectives from two of the United States coastal areas. NOAA does not expect the results from the two areas to be representative or applicable to other areas. However, using two sites with diverse characteristics allows for development of a broader set of indicators.

The end product for this work will be a set of indicators to measure the resiliency of coastal tourism in the two geographic study sites. The study will also look for themes and shared indicators of resiliency among the two sites that might suggest the types of indicators that may be more broadly applicable to other areas. The expert opinion provided by panel members in both study sites will be critical in developing indicators that are useful and can be practically applied by tourism officials and practitioners measuring tourism resiliency in future efforts.

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

NOAA CSC will use the indicators of tourism resiliency that result from the survey process to establish next steps that can be taken by the Agency as well as tourism officials and businesses to increase resiliency in coastal tourism:

First, the indicators will help NOAA CSC better understand if the types of factors that promote or hinder resiliency vary among differing coastal areas as well as rural versus urban areas and possibly suggest indicators that may apply on a broader geographic scale. By understanding what indicators are appropriate to different coastal geographies, the indicators can then be used to measure the resiliency of coastal tourism in different areas. These resiliency measurements can be conducted by NOAA CSC or eventually developed into measurement tools that can be used by tourism officials and businesses at the local level to help inform them of their current level of resiliency. By understanding a current level of resiliency, NOAA CSC, tourism officials, and businesses can develop action items for increasing that resiliency.

Second, the results will be used by the NOAA Sentinel Site Program. The NOAA Sentinel Site Program engages local, state, and federal managers as part of a cooperative team that works together to ensure the types of science conducted, information gathered, and products developed are immediately used for better management in the coastal area where the site is located. The two geographic areas of focus in this study align with NOAA's San Francisco Bay and Central North Carolina Coast Sentinel Sites.

Finally, the data will be used by the Mississippi/Alabama Sea Grant Consortium as they integrate data from a similar effort they are undertaking in Orange Beach, AL.

Type of Information Being Collected and Rationale

Methods: Delphi Technique

The data will be collected using the Delphi Technique, a form of expert elicitation. In short, the method involves assembling a set of experts in the field under study; the tourism sector in two different regions in this case. Data are collected in two primary rounds, with an “iteration round” following each primary round. The sequence is as follows:

- Round 1 – Experts are sent a questionnaire asking a series of questions related to the topic. A key part of the Round 1 survey is to identify a set of factors that lead to tourism sector resiliency.
- Round 1 iteration – Data collected from the experts are compiled and summarized and the summaries are presented back to the experts for consideration. At this time, the experts can decide to alter their original responses or provide additional explanation of their original responses.
- Round 2 - The final Round 1 data are analyzed (by NOAA CSC and its contractor in this case) and a second questionnaire is constructed based on the responses to Round 1. The Round 1 results will identify the factors that the experts identify as being the most important factors that contribute to resiliency. The Round 2 survey will focus on most important factors identified in Round 1 survey and ask the experts on prospective ways to measure those factors using available data.
- Round 2 iteration – As with Round 1, the data from Round 2 are compiled and summarized and the experts would again have the opportunity to review and alter/further explain their responses.

In addition to these two rounds and their iteration rounds, NOAA CSC will conduct a webinar with panel members before Round 1 (to discuss the nature of the data collection) and a webinar at the end (to allow panel members to provide final feedback in an open forum).

Below we explain some of the information we will collect in each round.

Both Rounds

Knowledge, Experience, and Expertise

Both the Round 1 and Round 2 surveys ask respondents a series of rating-style questions related to their level of knowledge and/or experience of particular tourism and recreation sectors as well as specific topics, such as climate change and natural disasters. This information will be collected to help provide context to the respondents’ input and preferences that are provided in the remainder of the survey. It will help link the level of respondent confidence and subject matter familiarity to the suggestions and preferences stated in the remainder of the survey.

Round 1 Survey

Industry Vulnerability to External Shocks

The first survey asks respondents to rate the vulnerability of the tourism industry to a variety of external shocks such as climate change, natural disasters, and economic downturns. This information will inform the types of vulnerabilities that the panel members from each of the two geographic regions feel are most relevant or likely to occur in their region. This information also helps shape the type of resiliency indicators that might be relevant given the types of external shocks that result from the responses.

Factors that Contribute to Tourism Resiliency

The Round 1 survey asks respondents to rate their level of agreement that certain factors contribute to the resiliency of tourism in their area. Respondents will be asked to rate factors such as (non exhaustive listing): strength of business connections, such as membership in a Convention and Visitors Bureau (CVB) or Chamber of Commerce (COC); social cohesion; diversity of set of tourism options; and access to capital for each of the types of external shocks being evaluated in the survey (e.g., climate change, natural disasters, and economic downturns).

Respondents will then be asked to rate how helpful it would be for tourism industry professionals to be provided with information on the factors that contribute to resiliency that were addressed in previous questions.

Understanding the factors that strongly contribute to tourism resiliency will be critical for developing a set of indicators that will be used to measure tourism resiliency, which is the intended final product of this project. Additionally, understanding what type of resiliency-related information that the tourism industry finds valuable will be important to understand as the information from this project is used to help increase the resiliency of the tourism in coastal areas.

Round 2 Survey

Measuring Factors of Resiliency

The Round 2 survey utilizes the information gathered in the Round 1 survey that informs the types of factors that might contribute to tourism resiliency and asks respondents about ways to effectively measure those factors. For each resiliency factor, the respondents will be asked to rate how useful certain types of measures would be that factor. The respondents will also have the opportunity to provide comments in addition to their ranking for those measures associated with each of the factors.

Understanding the resiliency measures that the panel of tourism officials, stakeholders, and businesses find useful provides valuable insight into the types of measures that will be effective for measuring resiliency at the ground-level. Having effective measures of tourism resiliency will allow users of the information to more accurately determine their level of resiliency and, thereby, better understand the areas of resiliency that warrant improvement.

Likelihood of Using Related Data in their Work

Respondents will also be asked how likely they would be to utilize different types of data pertaining to the resiliency measures in their jobs. This information will help inform the utility of certain types of information being provided to tourism stakeholders concerning resiliency.

Frequency of Use

NOAA CSC anticipates that the resiliency indicators developed through this project will be used on an ongoing basis as they form a core component of resiliency research for coastal tourism. NOAA CSC also expects that the frequency with which the indicators are applied by individuals outside of NOAA CSC will increase over time as the Agency is able to incorporate the indicators into resiliency-based tools and outreach materials that can be used at the local level by tourism officials, stakeholders, and businesses.

Public Dissemination

It is anticipated that the information collected will be disseminated to the public or used to support publicly disseminated information. As explained in the preceding paragraphs, the information gathered has utility. NOAA's Coastal Services Center will retain control over the information and safeguard it from improper access, modification, and destruction, consistent with NOAA standards for confidentiality, privacy, and electronic information. See response to Question 10 of this Supporting Statement for more information on confidentiality and privacy. The information collection is designed to yield data that meet all applicable information quality guidelines. Prior to dissemination, the information will be subjected to quality control measures and a pre-dissemination review pursuant to [Section 515 of Public Law 106-554](#).

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

The survey provided to panel members will be in electronic format and distributed via email communications. The respondents will complete the survey in the electronic format and return the surveys via email. This distribution and submission of electronic surveys will occur for two rounds of survey. Each round of survey will also include an iteration round, where the summarized survey responses from that round are provided to respondents for their review, and the respondents are given the opportunity to adjust or clarify their original responses and submit these adjustments via email.

4. Describe efforts to identify duplication.

After conducting a preliminary literature review on tourism resiliency indicators, we are not aware of any studies that duplicate the work being conducted under this study. We are aware of a related Mississippi Alabama (MS-AL) Sea Grant study being conducted on the Northern Gulf of Mexico NOAA Sentinel Site. The MS-AL Sea Grant project focuses on an areas not being considered under this NOAA CSC project but will use the same method (Delphi Technique) to collect data. The NOAA CSC project team has been in contact with the MS-AL Sea Grant project team and will coordinate efforts and results to ensure the two studies are compatible and build on one another.

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

NOAA CSC anticipates that a portion of the panel member participants undergoing the survey process will represent small entities. To minimize the burden while also maximizing information collected, two approaches have been applied. First, the panel member process has been designed to consider participants' current time commitments and need for flexibility in their participation. Participants will be made aware in advance of when they can expect to receive their surveys and will be given at least a week to complete and submit them. Secondly, the length of each of the surveys is designed to be approximately 30 minutes in length to minimize the level of effort needed for survey completion. In confirming possible panel members for this project, participants were made aware of and agreed to the expected time requirements.

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

Not conducting the collection would inhibit NOAA CSC's and other tourism stakeholders' ability to effectively measure tourism resiliency. These measures of tourism resiliency are essential for understanding current levels of resiliency in coastal tourism in order to identify where the industry can make improvements to increase resiliency.

This is a new information collection that is not recurring. Therefore "conducted less frequently" is NA.

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

The information collection is consistent with OMB Guidelines for Information Collections.

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 17, 2013 (78 FR 242) solicited public comments. NOAA received one comment that indicated the survey was not necessary and that events such as Hurricane Katrina provide examples of how areas rebound. NOAA respectfully disagrees and believes this work is necessary to better understand the underlying factors that lead to resilient tourism sectors.

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.

The Delphi Technique offers some limited confidentiality. To begin, as stated on the survey instrument, NOAA will not reveal any respondent's specific responses to other respondents or to anyone else. NOAA will, however, know which respondent provided which responses. Furthermore, at the beginning and the end of this process, we are holding webinars with the panel members (respondents). At these webinars, it is possible and likely that respondents will be identified as being part of the panel. In recruiting individuals for these panels, however, we have provided this information to each potential panel member. That is, NOAA has been clear on what we can offer (i.e., not revealing the data provided by each respondent to others respondents or anyone else) and what they can expect in terms of confidentiality (i.e., they will be involved in webinars and that NOAA will know what data each one has provided).

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.

None of the questions being asked in the surveys deal with matters that are considered private.

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

Table 1 provides estimates of the total one-time number of respondents, responses, burden hours, and the cost of burden hours. The surveys will involve collecting data from an estimated 29 respondents with each respondent providing four responses. Each panel member will also participate in two webinars. NOAA CSC estimates that the time for responses will include: one hour for the preliminary webinar, one hour for the first round survey, one hour for the second round survey, and one hour for the final webinar, resulting in a total burden hour estimate of 116 hours. The labor cost associated with the estimated burden hours is \$2,400 dollars, based on information from the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) (see note [a] below Table 1, next page).

Table 1: Estimated Number of Respondents, Responses, Burden Hours, and Cost of Burden Hours

Category	Value
Respondents	
Total number of respondents	29 respondents
Surveys	
Responses per respondent	4 responses
Total number of responses	116 responses
Burden hours per response	30 minutes
Total burden hours for surveys	58 hours
Webinars	
Responses per respondent	2 responses
Total number of responses	58 responses
Burden hours per response	1 hour
Total burden hours for webinars	58 hours
Responses	
Total number of responses	174 responses
Total burden hours	116 hours
Cost	
Cost per hour [a]	\$20.69
Total cost of burden hours	\$2,400

[a] Labor costs are derived from BLS <http://www.bls.gov/cew/cewind.htm#year=2012>. The labor cost for respondents was developed using the general labor categories associated with the types of panel members potentially involved in the panel process, including: Local business associations; local tourism businesses (used NAICS code for leisure and travel businesses), state tourism officials; local tourism officials; academic and research organizations (used NAICS for education and healthcare); and federal officials relevant to tourism (used NAICS code for leisure and travel businesses). The hourly rate for each category of panel member was calculated for either North Carolina or California, and a weighted salary average was then calculated for each state's site. The two weighted averages for CA and NC were then averaged to obtain the average hourly cost for panel members.

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

There will be no reporting/recordkeeping costs.

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

NOAA CSC has contracted with consultants to develop and implement this survey. Based on this, costs to NOAA CSC include costs to develop the method, the survey materials, and implement the methods described in this package. Total cost to NOAA CSC for these services is \$88,300.

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

This is a new program.

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

NOAA CSC will develop both reports and tabulations based on the data collected under these surveys. For each survey conducted, NOAA CSC will tabulate the responses from each survey question and provide cross-tabulations of survey questions when warranted. These tabulations will be provided on the NOAA CSC web site.

Figure 1 provides a summary of the time line for completing the two rounds of panel member surveys as well as the preliminary and final webinars. The surveys and webinars will be implemented over an approximate four month timeframe.

Figure 1: Data Collection, Analysis, and Reporting Timeline

Survey/Activity	Month 1	Month 2	Month 3	Month 4
Preliminary Webinar	■			
Round 1 Survey				
Perform Survey	■			
Enter Data		■		
Analyze Data		■		
Prepare Tabulations		■		
Perform Iteration Round		■		
Enter Data		■		
Analyze Data		■		
Prepare Tabulations		■		
Round 2 Survey				
Perform Survey			■	
Enter Data			■	
Analyze Data			■	
Prepare Tabulations			■	
Perform Iteration Round			■	
Enter Data			■	
Analyze Data			■	
Prepare Tabulations and Reports				■
Final Webinar				■

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. The collection instruments will display the expiration date.

18. Explain each exception to the certification statement.

No exceptions are being requested.

SUPPORTING STATEMENT

Panel Member Survey to Develop Indicators of Resilient Coastal Tourism

OMB CONTROL NO. 0648-xxxx

B. COLLECTIONS OF INFORMATION EMPLOYING STATISTICAL METHODS

1. Describe (including a numerical estimate) the potential respondent universe and any sampling or other respondent selection method to be used. Data on the number of entities (e.g. establishments, State and local governmental units, households, or persons) in the universe and the corresponding sample are to be provided in tabular form. The tabulation must also include expected response rates for the collection as a whole. If the collection has been conducted before, provide the actual response rate achieved.

The respondent universe includes 59 individuals from organizations and groups identified as being able to provide expert opinion on tourism issues related to resiliency (See Table 2). From that universe of 59 potential respondents, 33 individuals agreed to participate in the survey process, and these individuals comprise the respondent sample. NOAA expects a total of 29 to complete the survey. Table 2 below shows the breakdown of respondents by geographic area as well as by the type of entity that the respondents represents (e.g., local government, academia).

Table 1: Respondent Universe and Sample by Study Site

Organization or Group Providing Expertise	Potential Universe		Sample		Anticipated Response Rate [a]	Actual Respondents
	Percent	Number	Percent	Number		
Total-Both Sites	100%	59	100%	33	-	29
North Carolina	100%	30	100%	19	89%	17
Academic/Research	20%	6	21%	4	89%	4
Business Owners	17%	5	16%	3	89%	3
Chamber of Commerce/Business	23%	7	21%	4	89%	4
Federal	13%	4	21%	4	89%	4
State	3%	1	5%	1	89%	1
Tourism Bureau	23%	7	16%	3	89%	3
San Francisco	100%	29	100%	14	86%	12
Academic/Research	21%	6	21%	3	86%	3
Business Owners	24%	7	14%	2	86%	2
Chamber of Commerce/Business	21%	6	29%	4	86%	3
Federal	10%	3	21%	3	86%	3
State	7%	2	7%	1	86%	1
Tourism Bureau	17%	5	7%	1	86%	1

[a] Response assumes that two people from each site do not respond. This response rate is based on the fact that panel members in the sample have already agreed to participate in the survey process.

It is anticipated that at least 29 individuals will respond to the survey since individuals comprising the sample have already agreed to participate in the survey process.

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.

Participants will attend a webinar at the start which will provide an overview of the process and the survey. Following the webinar, respondents will be sent an electronic copy of the round 1 survey via email for completion. Upon completion of the round 1 survey, participants will return their responses to NOAA CSC via email. NOAA will summarize these responses and then provide the summaries back to the respondents for review and allow respondent to alter their responses or provide additional information NOAA will then develop a round 2 survey based on the responses to the round 1 survey. NOAA will then administer the round 2 survey in a process similar to the round 1 survey, allowing for respondents to review a summary of the round 2 data. The entire process will end with a webinar that will allow respondents the opportunity to review the final data and provide feedback on the results.

No sampling will be performed in selecting the sample, so NOAA CSC has not developed a statistical methodology for stratification and sample selection. Additionally, no estimation procedure or degree of accuracy is needed, as no sampling procedures are being employed.

This will be a one-time 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.

NOAA CSC expects that a high response rate is achievable; however, it will continue to follow good survey practices, including the following:

- NOAA has recruited participants to the expert panel and provided them with information regarding the usefulness of the data that would be collected. These potential respondents have agreed, in principle, to participate in the expert panel.
- Potential respondents will participate in a pre-survey webinar to answer questions related to the effort.
- Potential respondents will be sent a pre-notification email to inform them of the exact timing of the survey.
- Potential respondents will be sent the electronic version of the survey via email 3-4 days after the pre-notification email.
- NOAA will send 2 reminders to non-responders one and two weeks following the email with the survey link.
- NOAA will provide contact information on the survey email and on the survey itself to its contactors assisting with this work to allow panel members to ask questions and obtain clarifying information in a timely manner.

The survey will be administered to the full sample of tourism-related experts, and, therefore, no statistical methods will be used.

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 tests will be conducted. However, NOAA CSC consulted with ERG on the development of the survey instrument. ERG has significant experience assessing stakeholder needs and perspectives in conjunction with Federal agency research through detailed interviews, focus groups, stakeholder engagement, and surveys that focus on customer satisfaction with services. They calculated average time to respond to the draft survey.

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.

NOAA CSC has contracted with Eastern Research Group, Inc. (ERG) of Lexington, MA to design the survey instrument and implement the survey.

NOAA CSC's lead for this project is Chris Ellis (843-740-1195; Chris.Ellis@noaa.gov).

ERG's project manager and task lead for survey development is Dr. Lou Nadeau (781-674-7316; lou.nadeau@erg.com).

ROUND 1 SURVEY

OMB Control No. 0648-xxxx

Expiration Date: __ / __ / 2017

Project Overview

Thank you for taking the time to participate in this voluntary study! NOAA will be using the information you provide to develop measures of tourism resiliency for {AREA} and to, potentially, inform development of broader national-level measures of tourism resiliency.

As we discussed during our initial conversation with you, this survey will be conducted in two parts with the opportunity for each of you to review and alter what you said after each round. Over the next 2 months, you'll be getting a total of four "survey requests" from us, including this one:

- Round 1 – this survey
- Round 1 review – you will be provided with the opportunity to see what others said in Round 1 (in aggregate) and alter or explain your responses in more detail
- Round 2 – the second round will take the results from round 1 and ask more in-depth questions
- Round 2 review – once again, you will have the opportunity to see what others said in the round and alter or explain in more detail.

Following these two rounds, a webinar will be held to review the results with all of the participants in {AREA} and allow for group discussion on what the results mean and how they can be used.

Your responses to this survey will be kept anonymous and any published results of the survey will be summarized in a manner that does not allow identification of individuals. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 25 minutes per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other suggestions for reducing this burden to Chris Ellis, NOAA Coastal Services Center, 2234 South Hobson Avenue, Charleston, 29405-2413.

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.

[NEXT SCREEN]

ROUND 1 PURPOSE

The purpose of this first round of questions is to determine the types of things that would measure the resiliency of tourism in {AREA}. Once we have compiled this information, the second round of questions will ask more specific questions about the information that you provide in this first round.

For purpose of this project, we'd like you think of tourism sector resiliency as the capacity of the tourism industry, when exposed to external shocks, to adapt to or recover from the shock and to reach and maintain an acceptable level of functioning.

We certainly understand that resiliency may differ by type of business. Therefore, we ask some questions about tourism as a whole in {AREA}, and we also ask about a few key business types:

- Lodging
- Restaurants
- Charter boats
- Marinas
- Golf
- Fishing

We recognize that you may not be knowledgeable about all of these types of businesses and we provide an opportunity for you to tell us which ones you do know something about.

[NAVIGATION INSTRUCTIONS]

Questions: If you have trouble navigating through the survey or understanding the questions, please contact Melanie Sands at 781-674-7321 or melanie.sands@erg.com.

Round I Questions

1. Please rate how knowledgeable you consider yourself to be about each of the following types of tourism and recreation businesses in {AREA}.

Type of Tourism Business	Expert Level of Knowledge 5	More Knowledge than Most 4	Average Level of Knowledge 3	Less Knowledge than Most 2	No Knowledge of this Business Type 1
Lodging					
Restaurants					
Charter boats					
Marinas					
Golf					
Fishing					
Other: {open-ended}					

2. Please rate how knowledgeable you consider yourself to be in each of the following subject categories.

Category	Expert Level of Knowledge 5	More Knowledge than Most 4	Average Level of Knowledge 4	Less Knowledge than Most 2	No Knowledge of this Subject 1
Sea level rise					
Natural disaster preparedness					
Economic shocks (e.g., recessions/downturns) that impact the tourism industry					

3. How often do you typically think about the each of the following topics?

Subject Area	Extremely Often 5	Often 4	Occasionally 3	Rarely 2	Never 1
Sea level rise					
Natural disaster preparedness					
Economic shocks (e.g., recessions/downturns) that impact the tourism industry					

4. On a scale of 1 (not at all) to 5 (extremely), how would you rate the vulnerability of the tourism sector as a whole in {AREA} to the following types of external shocks?

Type of External Shock	Extremely Vulnerable 5	More Vulnerable than Most 4	Average Vulnerability 3	Less Vulnerable than Most 2	Not At All Vulnerable 1
Sea level rise					
A natural disaster such as a hurricane					
Economic recessions or downturns					
Shock #4					

5. On a scale of 1 (not at all) to 5 (extremely), how would you rate the vulnerability of overall tourism industry and the different types of tourism businesses in {AREA} to a natural disaster such as a hurricane?

Category of tourism in {AREA}	Extremely vulnerable 5	Highly Vulnerable 4	Moderately Vulnerable 3	Somewhat Vulnerable 2	Not vulnerable at all 1	Not a Sector I Know Well -
Overall tourism sector						
Lodging						
Restaurants						
Charter boats						
Marinas						
Golf						
Fishing						

6. On a scale of 1 (not at all) to 5 (extremely), how would you rate the vulnerability of overall tourism industry and the different types of tourism businesses in {AREA} to climate change (e.g., rising sea level, global warming)?

Category of tourism in {AREA}	Extremely vulnerable 5	Highly Vulnerable 4	Moderately Vulnerable 3	Somewhat Vulnerable 2	Not vulnerable at all 1	Not a Sector I Know Well -
Overall tourism sector						
Lodging						
Restaurants						
Charter boats						
Marinas						
Golf						
Fishing						

7. On a scale of 1 (not at all) to 5 (extremely), how would you rate the vulnerability of overall tourism industry and the different types of tourism businesses in {AREA} to an economic downturn such as the one experienced in 2008?

Category of tourism in {AREA}	Extremely vulnerable 5	Highly Vulnerable 4	Moderately Vulnerable 3	Somewhat Vulnerable 2	Not vulnerable at all 1	Not a Sector I Know Well -
Overall tourism sector						
Lodging						
Restaurants						
Charter boats						
Marinas						
Golf						
Fishing						

8. To what extent do you agree that the following factors make an important contribution to the resiliency of the tourism industry as a whole in {AREA} to natural disasters?

Factor	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Community engagement (e.g., Membership in a CVB or COC)					
Business located in a strong, cohesive community					
Business/Business owners have a strong connection to the natural resource(s) upon which it relies					
Locally owned and operated businesses					
Economically stable or successful years prior to the disaster					
Strong <i>existing</i> marketing effort by tourism bureau, CVB, or other group to attract tourists to the area					
Access to emergency capital or alternative sources of income					
Business provides unique tourism opportunities					
Diverse set of tourism options in the area					
Previous shocks have prepared the sector					
Disaster communication planning					
Strong disaster/recovery planning by tourism businesses					
Strong disaster/recovery planning by local municipalities					
Critical facilities (e.g., local government buildings, fire department, evacuation shelter)					
Portable technology in place					
Critical infrastructure (e.g., power grid, evacuation routes)					
Transportation (e.g., accessibility and operability following the disaster/shock)					

9. Are there other factors that we missed (i.e. not included in Question 8) that you feel make an important contribution to the resiliency of the tourism industry in {AREA} to natural disasters?

- i. Factor _____ and rate _____
- ii. Factor _____ and rate _____
- iii. Factor _____ and rate _____

10. To what extent do you agree that the following factors make an important contribution to the resiliency of the tourism industry as a whole in {AREA} to climate change?

Factor	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Community engagement (e.g., Membership in a CVB or COC)					
Business located in a strong, cohesive community					
Business/Business owners have a strong connection to the natural resource(s) upon which it relies					
Locally owned and operated					
Economically stable or successful years prior to the disaster					
Strong <i>existing</i> marketing effort by tourism bureau, CVB, or other group to attract tourists to the area					
Access to emergency capital or alternative sources of income					
Business provides unique tourism opportunities					
Diverse set of tourism options in the area					
Previous shocks have prepared the sector					
Disaster communication planning					
Strong disaster/recovery planning by tourism businesses					
Strong disaster/recovery planning by local municipalities					
Critical facilities (e.g., local government buildings, fire department, evacuation shelter)					
Portable technology in place					
Critical infrastructure (e.g., power grid, evacuation routes)					
Transportation (e.g., accessibility and operability following the disaster/shock)					

11. Are there other factors that we missed (i.e. not included in Question 10) that you feel make an important contribution to the resiliency of the tourism industry in {AREA} to climate change?

- i. Factor _____ and rate _____
- ii. Factor _____ and rate _____
- iii. Factor _____ and rate _____

12. To what extent do you agree that the following factors make an important contribution to the resiliency of the tourism industry as a whole in {AREA} to economic downturns?

Factor	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Community engagement (e.g., Membership in a CVB or COC)					
Business located in a strong, cohesive community					
Business/Business owners have a strong connection to the natural resource(s) upon which it relies					
Locally owned and operated					
Economically stable or successful years prior to the disaster					
Strong <i>existing</i> marketing effort by tourism bureau, CVB, or other group to attract tourists to the area					
Access to emergency capital or alternative sources of income					
Business provides unique tourism opportunities					
Diverse set of tourism options in the area					
Previous shocks have prepared the sector					
Disaster communication planning					
Strong disaster/recovery planning by tourism businesses					
Strong disaster/recovery planning by local municipalities					
Critical facilities (e.g., local government buildings, fire department, evacuation shelter)					
Portable technology in place					
Critical infrastructure (e.g., power grid, evacuation routes)					
Transportation (e.g., accessibility and operability following the disaster/shock)					

13. Are there other factors that we missed (i.e. not included in Question 12) that you feel make an important contribution to the resiliency of the tourism industry in {AREA} to economic downturns?

- i. Factor _____ and rate _____
- ii. Factor _____ and rate _____
- iii. Factor _____ and rate _____

14. On a scale of 1 (not at all) to 5 (extremely), how HELPUL would it be for tourism industry professionals such as yourself to have information on the factors we've asked about above?

Factor	Extremely Helpful 5	Very helpful 4	Moderately helpful 3	Somewhat helpful 2	Not at all helpful 1
Community engagement (e.g., Membership in a CVB or COC)					
Business located in a strong, cohesive community					
Business/Business owners have a strong connection to the natural resource(s) upon which it relies					
Locally owned and operated					
Economically stable or successful years prior to the disaster					
Strong <i>existing</i> marketing effort by tourism bureau, CVB, or other group to attract tourists to the area					
Access to emergency capital or alternative sources of income					
Business provides unique tourism opportunities					
Diverse set of tourism options in the area					
Previous shocks have prepared the sector					
Disaster communication planning					
Strong disaster/recovery planning by tourism businesses					
Strong disaster/recovery planning by local municipalities					
Critical facilities (e.g., local government buildings, fire department, evacuation shelter)					
Portable technology in place					
Critical infrastructure (e.g., power grid, evacuation routes)					
Transportation (e.g., accessibility and operability following the disaster/shock)					

15. Please provide any additional comments and/or feedback that you wish to share.

[Open-ended]

ROUND 2 SURVEY

OMB Control #0648-xxxx

Expires: __ / __ / 2014

Overview

The first round of questions and follow-up opportunity to review and alter your responses was targeted at identifying the most relevant areas to pursue related to resiliency of coastal tourism. Based on the results from the first round, NOAA and ERG identified a number of factors to consider pursuing as we move forward. These include:

- {List of factors that rated highly.}

This second round of questions will be taking these factors, which are general by design, and asking about ways to measure them in a meaningful way.

To do this, you will be presented with a set of indicators (ways of measuring the factors) and asked to rate how well you think each indicator would work and how useful it would be for measuring resiliency. You will also be provided with the opportunity to suggest other ways to measure the factors that were rated as the most important.

Your responses to this survey will be kept anonymous and any published results of the survey will be summarized in a manner that does not allow identification of individuals. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 25 minutes per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other suggestions for reducing this burden to Chris Ellis, NOAA Coastal Services Center, 2234 South Hobson Avenue, Charleston, 29405-2413.

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.

- 1. Before we begin, please rate how knowledgeable you consider yourself to be about each of the following types of tourism and recreation businesses in {AREA}. (We realize you were asked this on the last round, but we need this during round 2 to better target questions later on in the survey.)**

Type of Tourism Business	Very Knowledgeable	Moderately Knowledgeable	Somewhat Knowledgeable	No Knowledge of this Industry
Lodging				
Restaurants				
Charter boats				
Marinas				

Golf				
Fishing				

[Note: To make this manageable, we would restrict the number of “business types” to 3-4 key sectors in each region.]

2. The first round results indicated that {FACTOR 1} is relevant for tourism resiliency as a whole in {AREA}. How would you rate the following ways to measure {FACTOR 1}?

Indicator	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	Comments
F1, Indicator 1						
F1, Indicator 2						
F1, Indicator 3						

3. If you had data on each of the following ways to measure {FACTOR 1}, how likely would you be to use this information in your job?

Indicator	Very Likely	Moderately Likely	Somewhat Likely	Not At All Likely	Not Part of my Job	Comments
F1, Indicator 1						
F1, Indicator 2						
F1, Indicator 3						

4. Are there other ways of measuring {FACTOR 1} for tourism as a whole in {AREA} that we missed?

[open-ended]

5. How relevant are the following ways to measure {FACTOR 1} for {BUSINESS TYPE 1} in {AREA}?

[Note: Respondents would only be asked about business types they indicate they are “very” knowledgeable about under Question #1 above.]

Indicator	Very Relevant	Somewhat Relevant	Somewhat Not Relevant	Not At All Relevant	Comments
F1, Indicator 1					
F1, Indicator 2					
F1, Indicator 3					

Outline for Panel Member Webinars

Webinar 1: Introductory Webinar

1. Introduction

- Welcome panel members and introduce NOAA CSC project team

Note: Panel members will not introduce themselves during this webinar in order to maintain participant confidentiality throughout the survey process.

2. Project Overview

- Project background
 - a. What is the impetus for the study?
 - b. Who is responsible for the study?
- Project objectives
 - a. Developing indicators for resilient tourism
- Project approach
 - a. Review of panel member survey process
 - Panel member expectations
 - Timeframe

3. Questions from Panel Members about the Survey Process

Webinar 2: Results and Discussion Webinar

1. Introduction

- The NOAA CSC (including subcontractor ERG) project team will introduce themselves
- The NOAA team will provide details on why the data collection was important

2. Review of Preliminary Survey Results

- NOAA CSC will provide an overview of results from Round 1 and Round 2 Surveys
 - a. Findings of interest

3. Discussion of Survey Findings

- a. This will be an opportunity for panel members to ask the NOAA CSC project team questions or provide additional feedback regarding the survey results that were presented.

will be considered only if space and scheduling constraints permit.

How To Apply:

Applications can be downloaded from the business development mission Web site (<http://export.gov/GCCMission2014>) or can be obtained by contacting the Office of Business Liaison (see below). Completed applications should be submitted to the Office of Business Liaison via email: businessliaison@doc.gov or fax: 202-482-4054.

Contacts:

General Information and Applications:

The Office of Business Liaison, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW., Room 5062, Washington, DC 20230, Tel: 202-482-1360, Fax: 202-482-4054, Email: BusinessLiaison@doc.gov.

Elnora Moye,

Trade Program Assistant.

[FR Doc. 2013-29884 Filed 12-16-13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DR-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

Proposed Information Collection; Comment Request; Panel Member Survey To Develop Indicators of Resilient Coastal Tourism

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

ACTION: Notice.

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

DATES: Written comments must be submitted on or before February 18, 2014.

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 Chris Ellis, (843) 740-1195 or Chris.Ellis@noaa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Abstract

This request is for a new information collection.

The purpose of this survey is to better understand the factors that shape the tourism industry's ability to adapt to or bounce back from external shocks such as natural disasters, climate change, and economic downturns (i.e. resiliency) in order to develop a set of indicators to measure the resiliency of coastal tourism. To help gather this information, NOAA will conduct a multi-round, iterative survey process based on the Delphi Method, which is a structured method for eliciting and combining expert opinion. The method requires indirect interaction among experts through a moderator. Experts make individual judgments, and these judgments are shared anonymously with the whole group. After viewing other experts' judgments, each expert is then given the opportunity to revise his or her own judgments, and the process is repeated. Theoretically, the goal of the Delphi study is to reach a consensus after a few rounds. In reality this rarely happens; thus, at the end of the Delphi rounds, the experts' final judgments are typically combined mathematically.

NOAA will apply the Delphi Method to a multi-round survey of panels of individuals with experience and insight into tourism resiliency and/or the tourism industry in two geographic areas: (1) The Central North Carolina Coast, and (2) The San Francisco Bay Area (inner and outer coast). Data to be collected through the survey include factors that may prevent or facilitate tourism resiliency as well as ranking or rating of those factors; suggested resiliency indicators; relevance and usefulness of resiliency indicators; and levels of respondent certainty with regard to their responses.

II. Method of Collection

The survey will be provided to respondents in electronic format via email and responses will be submitted via email of electronic forms.

III. Data

OMB Control Number: None.

Form Number: None.

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

Affected Public: Non-profit institutions; Federal Government; State, local, or tribal government; Business or other for-profit organizations.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 40.

Estimated Time per Response: Four hours per respondent as follows: Preliminary webinar, 1 hour; first round

survey, 1 hour; second round survey, 1 hour; and final webinar, 1 hour.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 160.

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: December 11, 2013.

Gwellnar Banks,

Management Analyst, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 2013-29905 Filed 12-16-13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-08-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

RIN 0648-BD77

Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Snapper-Grouper Fishery Off the South Atlantic States; Regulatory Amendment 17

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

ACTION: Supplemental notice of intent (NOI) to prepare a draft environmental impact statement (DEIS).

SUMMARY: NMFS, Southeast Region, in collaboration with the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council (Council), is publishing this supplemental NOI to announce that scoping meetings for Regulatory Amendment 17 to the Fishery Management Plan for the Snapper-Grouper Fishery in the South Atlantic Region (Regulatory Amendment 17) will be postponed and