NOTICE OF OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET ACTION

Date 06/30/2014

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 05/14/2014

ACTION REQUESTED: New collection (Request for a new OMB Control Number)
TYPE OF REVIEW REQUESTED: Regular
ICR REFERENCE NUMBER: 201405-0648-001
AGENCY ICR TRACKING NUMBER:
TITLE: A Formative Evaluation of NOAA's Sentinel Site Program
LIST OF INFORMATION COLLECTIONS: See next page

OMB ACTION: Approved with change
OMB CONTROL NUMBER: 0648-0698
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: 06/30/2017 DISCONTINUE DATE:

BURDEN:	RESPONSES	HOURS	COSTS
Previous	0	0	0
New	125	42	0
Difference			
Change due to New Statute	0	0	0
Change due to Agency Discretion	125	42	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
Sentinal Site Survey	NA	Sentinal Site Suruvey	

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 A Formative Evaluation of NOAA's Sentinel Site Program

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

9. Keywords

10. Abstract

The NOAA Sentinel Site Program (SSP) is a collaborative effort that leverages existing resources and efforts to promote resilient coastal communities and ecosystems in the face of change. The primary purpose of the recently established NOAA Sentinel Site Program is to directly engage local, state, and federal managers as part of a cooperative team. By doing so, managers can ensure the types of science conducted, information gathered, and products developed are immediately usable and relevant for better management. With this point in mind, it is critical to determine a baseline of who is actually using the products and services developed by the Sentinel Site Cooperatives (SSC), and to what degree is capacity being built among and between coastal professionals and organizations through communications generated through the SSC. This will ensure that meaningful program-level evaluation can take place throughout the life of the NOAA SSP. The proposed baseline survey will serve as a critical means to document current attitudes, awareness, understanding, and communication patterns so that NOAA can establish a point from which to evaluate effectiveness and measure success over time.

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. ___ 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 250
b. Total annual responses 125
1. Percentage of these responses collected electronically 100 %
c. Total annual hours requested 42
d. Current OMB inventory 0
e. Difference 42
f. Explanation of difference
1. Program change
2. Adjustment

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

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

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

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

18. Agency Contact (person who can best answer questions regarding the content of this submission)
Name: Chris Ellis, Ph.D.
Phone: 843-740-1195

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 Cheryl Marlin for Hugh Johnson	Date 4/30/14
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: 2014.07.01 15:34:00 -04'00'	Date

SUPPORTING STATEMENT
A Formative Evaluation of NOAA's Sentinel Site Program
OMB CONTROL NO. 0648-xxxx

A. JUSTIFICATION

This request is for a new information collection.

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

The NOAA Sentinel Site Program (SSP) is a collaborative effort that leverages existing resources and efforts to promote resilient coastal communities and ecosystems in the face of change. NOAA's 2011 Corporate Portfolio Analysis (CPA) identified 24 key issues that pose the greatest risk to NOAA's core business and abilities. To address perceived shortfalls in NOAA's capacity to support community resilience to sea level rise and coastal inundation, the National Ocean Service (NOS) was asked to "document a strategy for sentinel sites, including the specific locations over time." The Sentinel Site program became active in 2011 with the selection of five initial Cooperatives. These locations were selected based on many factors: the potential for measuring ecological impact of sea level change; socioeconomic factors, such as large population centers; the potential to expand the use of existing NOAA tools, services, and other assets in a given region; and the potential to apply science-based solutions to solve specific regional coastal problems. These are not the only coastal areas in the U.S. that may meet the criteria. Other regions may be added within the next few years. Statutory authorization for programs such as SSP is the Coastal Zone Management Act, 16 U.S.C. 1451 *et seq.*

The primary purpose of the NOAASSP is to directly engage local, state, and federal managers as part of a cooperative team. By doing so, managers can ensure the types of science conducted, information gathered, and products developed are immediately usable and relevant for better management. With this point in mind, it is critical to determine a baseline of who is actually using and sharing information about the products and services developed by the Sentinel Site Cooperatives (SSC), and to what degree is capacity being built among and between coastal professionals and organizations through communications generated through the SSC. This will ensure that meaningful program-level evaluation can take place throughout the life of the NOAA SSP. The proposed survey will serve as a critical means to document current attitudes, awareness, understanding, and communication patterns so that NOAA can establish a point from which to further evaluate effectiveness and measure success over time.

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

The information collected by the survey will be used to achieve a picture of the patterns and relative effectiveness of current sea-level rise science and information communications across the five Sentinel Site Cooperative geographies. Communications among target organizations are a critical short-term indicator of success for this program. These geographies include the Hawaiian Islands, San Francisco Bay, the northern Gulf of Mexico, the central North Carolina

coast and the Chesapeake Bay. This information will help o establish establish a baseline from which NOAA and place-based Cooperative partners can begin developing informed strategies to enhance communications and collaboration.

The survey will be conducted by a NOAA/National Ocean Service (NOS) social scientist via a web-based survey. A survey link will be emailed to known SSP stakeholders and collaborators. An identical, follow-up survey will be conducted within 2 years of the initial survey to measure temporal changes in awareness, attitudes, understanding, and communications.

Survey questions will help NOAA gather critical information, such as: 1) how familiar respondents are with the SSP, 2) what methods are effective/ineffective for engagement, and 3) a comparison of the value of their "sentinel site" network of communication as compared to their personal, "local" network of communication (i.e., their communication network sans SSP engagement).

Questions focus on the various types of perceived value of communication via the SSP. Respondents are asked to rate their use of different resources and information sources, as well as methods they rely on to receive information from and about the SSP and its activities. The survey also includes a section for an open-ended response at the end of the survey to provide participants with an opportunity to submit suggested improvements.

Further detail is as follows (page numbers correspond to page numbers on the accompanying survey document):

- Page 1 – Introductory and OMB/PRA information
- Page 2 – Background information to understand degree of interest in sea-level rise science and primary basis for interest. The SSP is most interested in working professionals in this area. If respondents indicate it as a part of their job then they will be directed automatically to Page 3.
- Pages 3-4 – These questions will afford insight into what types of professionals have primarily come in contact with Sentinel Site activities, and the types of professionals they engage with most, which will afford the SSP an idea of where they may benefit through engagement in the future.
- Page 5 – This question asks about respondents' sea-level rise information networks at the local/community level. This will give the SSP insight into further refining their niche to maximize product and service utility in the future.
- Pages 6-11 – The question on Page 6 asks about the respondent's primary geography of interest. If a Sentinel Site Cooperative is located in their geography of interest they will be presented with a small number of geographic-specific questions (distributed across pp. 7-11).
- Pages 12-14 – These questions are similar to those on Page 5, but focus on respondents' engagement with the SSP, versus their sea-level rise information networks at the local/community level.

The NOAA SSP team will protect the survey responses during analysis, and will only report anonymously, and in aggregate form. The NOAA SSP team will retain control over the information collected, and safeguard it from improper access, modification, and destruction consistent with NOAA standards for confidentiality, privacy, and electronic information. The information collected is designed to yield data that meet all applicable information quality guidelines. Prior to dissemination, the information will be subject to 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.

This new information collection will be electronic. Surveys will be conducted via the online survey tool ***SurveyMonkey.***

4. Describe efforts to identify duplication.

This is the first stakeholder survey conducted by the NOAA Sentinel Site Program; therefore, there is no duplication.

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

The information collection involves representatives from government agencies, academic institutions, private industry and NGOs only. Additionally, only the minimum data necessary to evaluate SSP communications are requested from participants.

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

If the Program does not collect this information to establish baseline knowledge, there is no way to implement performance metrics to evaluate the success and/or make necessary adjustments to its communications.

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

Not Applicable.

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

A Federal Register Notice published on February 13, 2014 (79 FR 8680) solicited public comments. No public comments were received.

Informal, one-on-one, discussions with a limited number of individual stakeholders (fewer than 10) helped inform the survey development.

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.

As stated on the survey instrument, no personal or personally identifiable information will be reported. All survey responses will be submitted electronically. NOAA staff will protect the survey responses during analysis and provide a summary to the Sentinel Site Program staff. Only the survey summary report will be released. Contact information received from respondents are only for the purposes of 1) understanding the types of individuals that are most valued by the sea-level rise scientific community to guide SSP efforts and 2) to derive a meaningful sample for the follow-up survey evaluation to happen within two years of the initial survey.

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

No questions of a sensitive nature will be included in the survey.

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

The survey will take approximately twenty minutes to complete. The survey instrument will be emailed to 500 individuals (250* in the first year survey, and 250 in the follow-up survey within two years)**, with a combined estimated response rate of 50% (125 and 125). Thus the estimated maximum burden is 42 hours each year.

*Participants in the five workshops held to date.
**** There may be duplication of respondents in the second survey. Professionals working in the sea-level rise scientific community are a very targeted, and relatively small community. It is likely that several initial survey respondents will still be communicating about, and engaged in, Sentinel Site Program-related activities two years from now (2016).

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

There is no annual recordkeeping/reporting cost.

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

We anticipate 120 hours of staff time (60 per survey year) to collect, review, analyze, and assemble the data. Estimated total cost is $5,200 for a single staff member at 120 hours.

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

This is a new request seeking OMB approval.

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

The only information made public is a summary report of the survey results and a brief description of the survey methods. No other information is published.

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

Not Applicable.

18. Explain each exception to the certification statement.

Not Applicable.

SUPPORTING STATEMENT
A Formative Evaluation of NOAA's Sentinel Site Program
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 universe of respondents for this information collection is those who have participated in Sentinel Site Cooperative-sponsored outreach, and research and monitoring workshops. Because only a small number of workshops have taken place (five, to date), all participants will receive an invitation to complete the proposed survey. There are approximately 250 unduplicated participants that have participated in research and monitoring workshops. Workshop objectives for these workshops include:

- Summarize past and current research and monitoring efforts on effects of sea-level rise in Sentinel Site Cooperative geographies;
- Determine and prioritize gaps in research and monitoring that are needed to help stakeholders understand the ongoing and future potential impacts of sea-level rise;
- Provide a forum to forge or enhance partnerships.

These objectives were accomplished through presentations and facilitated discussions. Invitees included scientists and coastal managers involved in generating or applying research and monitoring data related to sea-level rise and inundation in target geographies. Administration plans for the survey will follow steps outlined by Salant and Dillman (1994), including follow-up reminder communications to increase the response rate. Based on related past efforts and lessons learned, a response rate of 50% is expected for this survey.

Population	**% of respondents**	**# of respondents**
State Government	20	50
Non-profit/NGO	20	50
Private Sector	10	25
Academia	50	125

This survey will be distributed via email, and will inquire on degree of interaction and perceived utility of the Sentinel Site Program. The estimated time necessary for each respondent to complete the questionnaire is 20 minutes, based on trials with a small fewer than ten) pilot sample. Total estimated public burden associated with this information collection is 83 hours (250 respondents X 20 minutes). The computer program will keep track of the total number of successful responses.

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.

This will be a census of those who have participated in past Sentinel Site Cooperative-sponsored outreach, and research & monitoring workshops. All participants will receive an invitation to complete the proposed survey. There are approximately 250 unduplicated participants that have participated in research and monitoring workshops.

The survey will be created using SurveyMonkey and administered via an emailed link, which will direct past Sentinel Site Cooperative workshop participants to the SurveyMonkey website.

Completed surveys received via Survey Monkey will be downloaded to a password protected work space at the Coastal Services Center, accessible only by staff particular to this project.

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 intent of this information collection is to assess Sentinel Site Cooperative partner feedback on the utility of the Program in order to inform improvements. In order to improve response rates for this information collection, the survey has been made as brief as possible. Nonresponse testing will be a challenge in that no identifying information will be collected, other than place of work, that will allow for follow-up activities, but comparisons between respondents and nonrespondents can be made to see if there are any clear differences associated with professional affiliation and duties (such differences are not expected, however). The intended approach will aid in working toward a representative sample of the respondent universe, since all past workshop participants will be solicited, and the information gained will be extremely valuable in making programmatic improvements.

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.

Draft versions of this survey were circulated for review and comment to nine past workshop participants. Reviewers were asked to offer feedback on the length, appropriateness and clarity of questions, content, or other aspects to improve the questionnaire. Comments from reviewers were helpful and resulted in design, and content changes to clarify questions and simplify instructions.

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

The implementation of the information collection and data analysis will be completed by Dr. Chris Ellis at the NOAA Coastal Services Center, available by telephone at (843) 740-1195 or by email at Chris.Ellis@noaa.gov.

Introduction

OMB Approval No. xxxx/xxxx / Expires: xx/xx/xxxx

Paperwork Reduction Act Statement
Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 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. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other suggestions for reducing this burden to Chris Ellis, NOAA National Ocean Service, at Chris.Ellis@noaa.gov, or contact him at 843-740-1195.

Respondents are not identified on their questionnaires, and any reports will present data in aggregate form only. 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.

This survey is being conducted on behalf of the NOAA Sentinel Site Program (SSP), which aims to nurture communication and information exchange in sea-level rise science, research and related information. The survey will help the SSP understand how a diverse network of researchers, community members, and natural resource professionals that place great interest in this topic communicate with each other across geography, across agencies, and across professions. This information will identify factors that both hinder and facilitate communication. The end result of this effort is to improve communication in areas that need it. This will, in turn, increase access and awareness of sea-level rise information. The survey should take less than 20 minutes to complete, but you may take as much time as needed. **Your participation is voluntary, and you may discontinue the survey at any time.** Your contact information and all other responses that you provide will not be shared with others. If you have questions or concerns about the research, please contact Chris Ellis, Social Scientist at the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Charleston SC; chris.ellis@noaa.gov and 843-740-1195.

Background Information

What is your general level of interest in sea-level rise science and information?

None	Low	Moderate	Fairly High	Very High
◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

What is the primary basis for your interest in sea-level rise science and information? (check the single best choice)

◯ My job

◯ Personal interest (non-work related)

If you checked "personal interest," please explain

Your Work

Which of the following characterizes your primary job duties? (check all that apply)

- [ ] Conservation
- [ ] Education and outreach
- [ ] Emergency management
- [ ] Floodplain management
- [ ] Human dimensions (sociology, anthropology, economics, or related field)
- [ ] Geospatial technology (GIS, remote sensing, or related field)
- [ ] Natural resources site management
- [ ] Permitting and regulatory enforcement
- [ ] Planning
- [ ] Policy
- [ ] Program administration/management
- [ ] Research/academia
- [ ] Other (please specify below)

What organization do you work for?

Please indicate which of the following best represents your current professional affiliation (check the single best choice)

- ( ) Local government
- ( ) State/territorial government
- ( ) Tribal government
- ( ) Federal government
- ( ) Regional governance organization
- ( ) NGO/nonprofit/volunteer group
- ( ) Private sector
- ( ) Academia
- ( ) Other (please specify)

How many years have you been employed by this organization?

Total years:

Your Local Sea-Level Rise Science and Information Network

Please identify up to five organizations that provided the most credible, relevant and timely sea level based science information for your needs in the past twelve months.

Organization 1

Organization 2

Organization 3

Organization 4

Organization 5

Please evaluate each statement according to your experience with sea-level rise science and information exchange in your "local network." A "local network" includes professionals and knowledgeable community members in in your geography where you live and work, and may consult on issues relating to sea-level rise and the environment.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I get important professional needs met because I am part of a local network.	○	○	○	○
Local network members and I have similar goals.	○	○	○	○
When I need sea-level related information, I get it from members of my local network.	○	○	○	○
I can trust people in a local network.	○	○	○	○
I am acquainted with most local network members.	○	○	○	○
Most local network members know me.	○	○	○	○
I put a lot of time and effort into being part of a local network.	○	○	○	○
Contributing to a local network is important to me.	○	○	○	○
I have influence over what my local network does.	○	○	○	○
Local network members collaborate on solving problems.	○	○	○	○
I feel responsible to actively participate in a local network.	○	○	○	○
I would prefer to be more involved in my local network than I currently am.	○	○	○	○

Your Geography

In which geography are you primarily interested, with regard to sea-level rise? If you have an interest in more than one geography, please check your primary region and then list others in the space below.

- ◯ National
- ◯ Alaska
- ◯ Pacific Islands (HI, AS, GU, CNMI)
- ◯ West Coast (WA, OR, CA)
- ◯ Gulf of Mexico (TX, LA, MS, AL, FL)
- ◯ Great Lakes (MN, WI, IL, IN, MI, OH, PA, NY)
- ◯ Northeast (CT, RI, MA, NH, ME)
- ◯ Mid-Atlantic(VA, MD, DE, NJ, NY)
- ◯ Southeast & Caribbean (NC, SC, GA, FL, PR, USVI)

Other (please specify)

Hawaiian Islands Networks

Please identify your familiarity, and degree of engagement with the following networks.

	Not Aware	Aware but not engaged	Aware and moderately engaged	Aware and highly engaged
NOAA Pacific Regional Team	◯	◯	◯	◯
NOAA National Marine Sanctuary Advisory Council	◯	◯	◯	◯
Pacific Climate Information System (PaCIS)	◯	◯	◯	◯
Pacific Island Climate Change Cooperative (PICCC)	◯	◯	◯	◯
Hawaii's Ocean Resource Management Plan Working and Policy groups (ORMP)	◯	◯	◯	◯
Pacific Risk Management ‘Ohana (PRiMO)	◯	◯	◯	◯
Pacific Islands regional Climate Assessment Team (PIRCA)	◯	◯	◯	◯

Have you had any degree of engagement with the Hawaiian Islands Sentinel Site Cooperative?

◯ Yes

◯ No

San Francisco Bay Networks

Please identify your familiarity, and degree of engagement with the following networks.

	Not Aware	Aware but not engaged	Aware and moderately engaged	Aware and highly engaged
NOAA Western Regional Team	◯	◯	◯	◯
NOAA National Marine Sanctuary Advisory Council	◯	◯	◯	◯
West Coast Governors Alliance on Ocean health	◯	◯	◯	◯
Bay Area Ecosystems Climate Change Consortium	◯	◯	◯	◯
Our Coast Our Future	◯	◯	◯	◯
Bay Conservation and Development Commission	◯	◯	◯	◯
California Landscape Conservation Cooperative	◯	◯	◯	◯

Have you had any degree of engagement with the San Francisco Bay Sentinel Site Cooperative?

◯ Yes

◯ No

Northern Gulf of Mexico Networks

Please identify your familiarity, and degree of engagement with the following networks.

	Not Aware	Aware but not engaged	Aware and moderately engaged	Aware and highly engaged
NOAA Gulf of Mexico Regional Team	◯	◯	◯	◯
Gulf Coast Vulnerability Assessment	◯	◯	◯	◯
Gulf of Mexico Alliance	◯	◯	◯	◯
Gulf of Mexico Climate Community of Practice	◯	◯	◯	◯
Landscape Conservation Cooperatives based in the Gulf of Mexico	◯	◯	◯	◯

Have you had any degree of engagement with the Northern Gulf of Mexico Sentinel Site Cooperative?

◯ Yes

◯ No

Chesapeake Bay Networks

Please identify your familiarity, and degree of engagement with the following networks.

	Not Aware	Aware but not engaged	Aware and moderately engaged	Aware and highly engaged
NOAA North Atlantic Regional Team	◯	◯	◯	◯
Mid Atlantic Regional Council on the Ocean (MARCO)	◯	◯	◯	◯
North Atlantic Landscape Conservation Cooperative	◯	◯	◯	◯
Friends of Blackwater National Wildlife Refuge	◯	◯	◯	◯
Friends of Eastern Neck National Wildlife Refuge	◯	◯	◯	◯
Friends of Jug Bay	◯	◯	◯	◯
National Aquarium in Baltimore	◯	◯	◯	◯
Blackwater Science Committee	◯	◯	◯	◯
Poplar Island Habitat sub-group	◯	◯	◯	◯
The Legacy Institute for the Environment (LIFE)	◯	◯	◯	◯
Alice Ferguson Foundation	◯	◯	◯	◯
Urban Waters Initiative - Baltimore/Patapsco and the Anacostia rivers, specifically	◯	◯	◯	◯

Have you had any degree of engagement with the Chesapeake Bay Sentinel Site Cooperative?

◯ Yes

◯ No

North Carolina Networks

Please identify your familiarity, and degree of engagement with the following networks.

	Not Aware	Aware but not engaged	Aware and moderately engaged	Aware and highly engaged
NOAA Southeast and Caribbean Regional Team	◯	◯	◯	◯
NOAA in the Carolinas	◯	◯	◯	◯
South Atlantic Landscape Conservation Cooperative	◯	◯	◯	◯
Governors South Atlantic Alliance	◯	◯	◯	◯
Southeast and Caribbean Climate Community of Practice	◯	◯	◯	◯

Have you had any degree of engagement with the North Carolina Sentinel Site Cooperative?

◯ Yes

◯ No

Sentinel Site Program Network

Have you had any degree of engagement with the NOAA Sentinel Site Program?

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No

Sentinel Site Program Network

Please evaluate each statement according to your experience with the "Sentinel Site Program." This network refers professionals that you may consult on issues relating to similar issues as a result of engagement with the NOAA Sentinel Site Program.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I get important professional needs met because I am connected to the Sentinel Site Program.	◯	◯	◯	◯
Sentinel Site Program members and I have similar goals.	◯	◯	◯	◯
When I need sea-level information, I get it from Sentinel Site Program colleagues.	◯	◯	◯	◯
I can trust people affiliated with the Sentinel Site Program.	◯	◯	◯	◯
I am acquainted with most Sentinel Site Program collaborators.	◯	◯	◯	◯
Most Sentinel Site Program collaborators know me.	◯	◯	◯	◯
I put a lot of time and effort into being part of the Sentinel Site Program.	◯	◯	◯	◯
Contributing to the Sentinel Site Program is important to me.	◯	◯	◯	◯
I have influence over what the Sentinel Site Program does.	◯	◯	◯	◯
Information on sea-level rise is more easily accessed because I'm involved with sentinel sites.	◯	◯	◯	◯
Sentinel Site Program professionals collaborate on solving problems.	◯	◯	◯	◯
I feel responsible to actively participate in the Sentinel Site Program.	◯	◯	◯	◯
I would prefer to be more involved with the Sentinel Site Program than I currently am.	◯	◯	◯	◯
I would prefer for the Sentinel Site Program to expand the network to	◯	◯	◯	◯

address other climate issues
beyond sea level rise.

Final Thoughts

Do you have any comments you would like to share that were not adequately reflected in this survey? If so, we welcome your thoughts below.

sleeves; anchors; steel wire; copper fittings/fasteners; nickel fittings; aluminum rods/profiles/fittings/ladders/hangers/forgings; lead pipes/fittings; zinc and tin tubes/pipes/fittings; base metal fittings; flexible tubing; boilers; steam and gas turbines and related parts; marine/diesel engines and related parts; hydrojet engines; turbine jets; fuel/cooling/ballast/macerator/hydraulic/bilge/sump/hydraulic/jet pumps and related parts; air/liquid compressors; turbochargers; winches; refrigeration/cooling equipment; heat exchangers; liquid purifiers; air/fuel filters; sprayers; derricks; deck machinery; evaporative air coolers; trash compactors; pressure/scupper/check/relief/gate/valves; roller bearings; transmissions and parts thereof (*e.g.,* z-drives, shafts, gearboxes, clutches); pulleys; flywheels; acoustic baffles; propellers and blades; electric ballasts/motors/generators; generator sets; generator parts; transformers and related parts; starters; heaters and related parts; radio/TV/radar equipment; antennas; tuners; parts of signaling devices; electrical components and panels; switches/switching equipment; connectors; wiring harnesses; lamps; signal generators; displays; cables; mirrors; sonar apparatus; optical instruments; depth sounding equipment; micrometers and calipers; thermostats; chronometers; regulators; controllers; and, search lights (duty rate ranges from free to 6.7%; 17¢ each +2.5%, 1¢/jewel). The production activity under FTZ procedures would be subject to the ''standard shipyard restriction'' applicable to foreign origin steel mill products (*e.g.,* angles, pipe, plate), which requires that LEEVAC must pay all applicable duties on such items.

Public comment is invited from interested parties. Submissions shall be addressed to the FTZ Board's Executive Secretary at the address below. The closing period for their receipt is March 25, 2014.

A copy of the notification will be available for public inspection at the Office of the Executive Secretary, Foreign-Trade Zones Board, Room 21013, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230–0002, and in the ''Reading Room'' section of the FTZ Board's Web site, which is accessible via *www.trade.gov/ftz.*

For further information, contact Pierre Duy at *Pierre.Duy@trade.gov* or (202) 482–1378.

Dated: February 6, 2014.

Andrew McGilvray,

Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2014–03212 Filed 2–12–14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

Proposed Information Collection; Comment Request; A Social Network Analysis of NOAA's Sentinel Site Program

AGENCY: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 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 April 14, 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 collection.

The NOAA Sentinel Site Program (SSP) brings to life NOAA's science, service, and stewardship continuum by leveraging existing resources and integrating multiple parallel efforts to promote resilient coastal communities and ecosystems in the face of change. A primary purpose of the NOAA Sentinel Site Program is to directly engage local, state, and federal managers as part of a Sentinel Site Cooperative (SSC) team. By doing so, managers can help ensure the types of science conducted, information gathered, and products developed are immediately used for better management. With this point in mind, who is actually using the products and services developed by these Cooperatives, and to what degree is capacity being built among and between coastal professionals and organizations through communications generated through the SSCs.

The purpose of this survey is to better understand the frequency and patterns of communication as a result of the efforts of the SSP. To help gather this information, NOAA will survey individuals known to have experience and insight with the SSP and inquire on the communications and collaborations that have resulted. This is intended to serve as a means of formative evaluation for this effort. A formative evaluation is used to assess programs or projects early in their development or implementation to provide information about how best to revise and modify for improvement. This type of evaluation often is helpful for new programs, such as the SSC, but can also be used to monitor the progress of ongoing programs.

II. Method of Collection

The survey will be provided to respondents in electronic format provided via email. Methods of submittal will also be via email of electronic forms.

III. Data

OMB Control Number: None.

Form Number: None.

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

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

Estimated Number of Respondents: 250.

Estimated Time per Response: 20 minutes.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 83.

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: February 10, 2014.

Gwellnar Banks,

Management Analyst, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 2014–03138 Filed 2–12–14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–08–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

RIN 0648–XD128

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council; Public Meetings

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

ACTION: Meetings of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council (SAFMC).

SUMMARY: In addition to a meeting of the Law Enforcement Advisory Panel (AP), the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council (Council) will hold a joint meeting of the Law Enforcement Committee and Law Enforcement AP as well as a joint committee meeting of the Habitat & Environmental Protection Committee and Ecosystem-Based Management Committee. The Council will also hold meetings of the: Southeast Data, Assessment and Review Committee (partially Closed Session); Protected Resources Committee; Snapper Grouper Committee; King & Spanish Mackerel Committee; Executive Finance Committee; Dolphin Wahoo Committee; Data Collection Committee; and a meeting of the Full Council. The Council will take action as necessary. The Council will also hold an informal public question and answer session regarding agenda items and a formal public comment session.

DATES: The Council meeting will be held from 8:30 a.m. on Monday, March 3, 2014 until 1 p.m. on Friday, March 7, 2014.

ADDRESSES:

Meeting Address: The meeting will be held at the Hilton Savannah DeSoto, 15 East Liberty Street, Savannah, GA 31401; telephone: (877) 280–0751 or (912) 232–9000; fax: (912) 232–6018.

Council Address: South Atlantic Fishery Management Council, 4055 Faber Place Drive, Suite 201, N. Charleston, SC 29405.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kim Iverson, Public Information Officer, SAFMC; telephone: (843) 571–4366 or toll free: (866) SAFMC–10; fax: (843) 769–4520; email: *kim.iverson@safmc.net.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The items of discussion in the individual meeting agendas are as follows:

Law Enforcement Advisory Panel Agenda, Monday, March 3, 2014, 8:30 a.m. Until 12 Noon

1. Receive an update on the North Carolina Joint Enforcement Agreement.
2. Review the status of the Oculina Experimental Closed Area Evaluation Team.
3. Receive an update on recently completed and developing amendments.
4. Review Snapper Grouper Amendment 33/Dolphin Wahoo Amendment 7 (fillet issue) and develop recommendations.

Joint Law Enforcement Committee and Law Enforcement Advisory Panel Agenda, Monday, March 3, 2014, 1:30 p.m. Until 3 p.m.

Discuss the recommendations from the Law Enforcement AP.

Joint Habitat & Environmental Protection and Ecosystem-Based Management Committee Agenda, Monday, March 3, 2014, 3 p.m. Until 5:30 p.m.

1. Review the status of Coral Amendment 8, pertaining to Coral Habitat Areas of Particular Concern (HAPCs) and transit through the Oculina Bank HAPC.
2. Review the status of the Coral Reef Conservation Program's Fiscal Year (FY) 2014–16 Cooperative Agreement.
3. Receive the Spatial Representation of the Oculina Bank HAPC Options as requested by the deepwater shrimp industry.
4. Recommend approval of SAFMC policy statements and receive an update on ecosystem activities.

Southeast Data, Assessment and Review (SEDAR) Committee Agenda, Tuesday, March 4, 2014, 8:30 a.m. Until 9:30 a.m. (Note: A Portion of This Meeting Will Be Closed)

1. Receive a SEDAR activities update as well as a SEDAR Steering Committee Report.
2. Receive a report on the South Atlantic Fishery Dependent Workshop as well as the status of the Wreckfish Assessment peer review.
3. Develop recommendations for approvals of SEDAR 41 participants (South Atlantic Red Snapper and Gray Triggerfish) and SEDAR South Atlantic Shrimp Data participants. Appoint a Wreckfish chairperson and reviewers. (Closed Session)

Protected Resources Committee Agenda, Tuesday, March 4, 2014, 9:30 a.m. Until 10:30 a.m.

1. Receive an update on ongoing consultations from the Southeast Regional Office (SERO) Protected Resources Division (PRD).
2. Receive a report on: The Endangered Species Act (ESA) American Eel status review; the Atlantic Sturgeon stock assessment; the proposed critical habitat for Loggerhead Sea Turtles; and the status of the proposed listing for Red Knots.
3. Develop committee recommendations as appropriate.

Snapper Grouper Committee Agenda, Tuesday, March 4, 2014, 10:30 a.m. Until 5:30 p.m. and Wednesday, March 5, 2014, 8:30 a.m. Until 5 p.m.

1. Receive and discuss the status of commercial and recreational catches versus quotas for species under Annual Catch Limits (ACLs).
2. Receive an update on the status of Snapper Grouper amendments under formal Secretarial review.
3. Review the status of the Oculina Experimental Closed Area Evaluation Team.
4. Receive an overview of scoping comments for Regulatory Amendment 16, pertaining to the removal of the Black Sea Bass pot closure. Modify the document, choose preferred alternatives and provide guidance to staff.
5. Review Snapper Grouper Amendment 22, relating to tags that track recreational harvest of species; receive a NOAA General Counsel (GC) report on Limited Access Privilege Program (LAPP) Determination; discuss the amendment and develop guidance to staff.
6. Review Snapper Grouper Amendment 29, regarding Only Reliable Catch Stocks (ORCS) and management measures for Gray Triggerfish; receive an overview of public hearing comments as well as the amendment document; modify the document and develop recommendations for the management measures.
7. Review the options paper for Snapper Grouper Amendment 32, relating to Blueline Tilefish; modify the document; and provide guidance to staff.
8. Review the following amendments and provide guidance to staff: Snapper Grouper Amendment 20 (Snowy Grouper and Mutton Snapper); and Snapper Grouper Amendment 33/