NOTICE OF OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET ACTION

Date 12/11/2014

Department of Commerce
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

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

In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act, OMB has taken action on your request received 10/01/2014

ACTION REQUESTED: New collection (Request for a new OMB Control Number)
TYPE OF REVIEW REQUESTED: Regular
ICR REFERENCE NUMBER: 201410-0648-001
AGENCY ICR TRACKING NUMBER:
TITLE: Gulf of Alaska Ecosystem Indicator Survey (GEIS)
LIST OF INFORMATION COLLECTIONS: See next page

OMB ACTION: Approved without change
OMB CONTROL NUMBER: 0648-0708
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: 12/31/2017 DISCONTINUE DATE:

BURDEN:	RESPONSES	HOURS	COSTS
Previous	0	0	0
New	70	35	0
Difference			
Change due to New Statute	0	0	0
Change due to Agency Discretion	70	35	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
Gulf of Alaska Survey	NA	Gulf of Alaska Ecosystem Indicators Survey	

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/NMFS

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 Gulf of Alaska Ecosystem Indicator Survey (GEIS)

8. Agency form number(s) (*if applicable*) None

9. Keywords Fishery

10. Abstract

The goal of this project is to select a short (8-10) list of ecosystem indicators for the Gulf of Alaska (GOA) that will form the basis of a GOA Report Card and Ecosystem Assessment to include in the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's (NOAA) Ecosystem Considerations report. This report is produced annually as part of the Stock Assessment and Fishery Evaluation report for the North Pacific Fishery Management Council. The format of the new GOA Report Card and Ecosystem Assessment will be similar to those that have been produced in recent years for the eastern Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands. The primary recipients, considered to be the stakeholders, of the Report Card and Ecosystem Assessment are those involved with the fishery quota-setting process for the North Pacific Fisheries Management Council. This includes the Science and Statistical Committee and the regional Plan Teams, which are composed of mainly federal and state scientists, academics, and other individuals. Additional recipients include the Advisory Panel, Council, and stock assessment scientists. The Report Card and Ecosystem Assessment are also made available to the public.

11. Affected public (*Mark primary with "P" and all others that apply with "x"*)
a. x Individuals or households d. ___ Farms
b. x Business or other for-profit e. ___ Federal Government
c. x Not-for-profit institutions f. x State, Local or Tribal Government

12. Obligation to respond (*check one*)
a. [✔] Voluntary
b. [ ] Required to obtain or retain benefits
c. [ ] Mandatory

13. Annual recordkeeping and reporting burden
a. Number of respondents 70
b. Total annual responses 70
1. Percentage of these responses collected electronically 100 %
c. Total annual hours requested 35
d. Current OMB inventory
e. Difference
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
e. Difference
f. Explanation of difference
1. Program change
2. Adjustment

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

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

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

18. Agency Contact (person who can best answer questions regarding the content of this submission)
Name: Stephani Zador
Phone: (206) 473-2778

19. Certification for Paperwork Reduction Act Submissions

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

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

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

(a) It is necessary for the proper performance of agency functions;

(b) It avoids unnecessary duplication;

(c) It reduces burden on small entities;

(d) It used plain, coherent, and unambiguous terminology that is understandable to respondents;

(e) Its implementation will be consistent and compatible with current reporting and recordkeeping practices;

(f) It indicates the retention period for recordkeeping requirements;

(g) It informs respondents of the information called for under 5 CFR 1320.8(b)(3):

- (i) Why the information is being collected;
- (ii) Use of information;
- (iii) Burden estimate;
- (iv) Nature of response (voluntary, required for a benefit, mandatory);
- (v) Nature and extent of confidentiality; and
- (vi) Need to display currently valid OMB control number;

(h) It was developed by an office that has planned and allocated resources for the efficient and effective management and use of the information to be collected (see note in Item 19 of instructions);

(i) It uses effective and efficient statistical survey methodology; and

(j) It makes appropriate use of information technology.

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

Signature of Senior Official or designee	Date

Agency Certification (signature of Assistant Administrator, Deputy Assistant Administrator, Line Office Chief Information Officer, head of MB staff for L.O.s, or of the Director of a Program or StaffOffice)	
Signature signed by David Detlor for Dr. Ned Cyr	Date 9/30/2014
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: 2014.12.12 13:56:56 -05'00'	Date

SUPPORTING STATEMENT
GULF OF ALASKA ECOSYSTEM INDICATOR SURVEY
OMB CONTROL NO. 0648-XXXX

A. JUSTIFICATION

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

The Alaska Fisheries Science Center (AFSC) is requesting approval for a new collection of information on ecosystem indicators for the Gulf of Alaska (GOA). The goal of this project is to select a short (8-10) list of ecosystem indicators for the GOA that will form the basis of a GOA Report Card and Ecosystem Assessment to include in the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's (NOAA) AFSC's Ecosystem Considerations report (http://access.afsc.noaa.gov/reem/ecoweb/Index.php). This report is produced annually as part of the Stock Assessment and Fishery Evaluation report for the North Pacific Fishery Management Council, established under the authority of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C 1801 et seq). The format of the new GOA Report Card and Ecosystem Assessment will be similar to those that have been produced in recent years for the eastern Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands.

During a workshop in 2010, a group of largely NOAA scientists and some fisheries managers with expertise in the eastern Bering Sea ecosystem selected 10 indicators to best represent trends in productivity in the eastern Bering Sea. In response to a request to increase diversity in the indicator-selection team, a more diverse group including a commercial fisherman and conservation non-governmental organization representative met in a similar workshop format in 2011 to select 8 ecosystem indicators for the Aleutian Islands that best characterized trends in variability throughout the ecosystem. For the GOA, we hope to increase the group size and diversity in GOA expertise of the participants in the indicator selection process by soliciting information individually via an online survey, thus participation will not require travel or funding. The main objective of the survey is to have participants rank the importance of ecosystem indicators among lists of indicators that are presented; the surveys will then be compiled to generate a list of top indicators.

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 survey will be disseminated to scientists, fishers, and managers with expertise in the Gulf of Alaska. The respondents' individual indicator rankings will be compiled and summarized by AFSC scientists. The information will be used to inform the final ecosystem indicators used to create the new Gulf of Alaska Report Card and Ecosystem Assessment. The primary recipients, considered to be the stakeholders, of the Report Card and Ecosystem Assessment are those involved with the fishery quota-setting process for the North Pacific Fisheries Management Council. This includes the Science and Statistical Committee and the regional Plan Teams, which of are composed of mainly federal and state scientists, academics, and other individuals. Additional recipients will include the Advisory Panel, Council, and stock assessment scientists.

The Report Card and Ecosystem Assessment are also made available to the public. We hope that by surveying a greater number of individuals than were involved with indicator selection for the eastern Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands, the survey results will reflect broader expertise and an 'equal voice' from all participants.

It is anticipated that the information collected will be used to support publicly disseminated information. NOAA AFSC Resource Ecology and Ecosystem Modeling Program 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. The information collection is designed to yield data that meet all applicable information quality guidelines. Prior to dissemination, the information will be subject to quality control measures and pre-dissemination review pursuant to Section 515 of Public Law 106-554.

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

Google Forms will be used to create, disseminate, and collect the surveys from participants. Survey Monkey provides a free service for basic surveys. Survey Monkey provides some statistical and summary application of the survey data, but the raw data are also available to be downloaded and analyzed.

4. Describe efforts to identify duplication.

This is a new survey, so it will not duplicate other efforts. To the best of our knowledge, no other agencies are conducting or have conducted a similar survey.

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

We estimate that approximately half the respondents, or 50, will be classified as small businesses. The survey can be completed at any time that is convenient for the participant and should require no more than 30 minutes.

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

If the survey is not conducted, the Gulf of Alaska Report Card and Assessment will not reflectthe formal input of members of the public with Gulf of Alaska ecosystem expertise. The expertise of some non-federal government individuals is extensive, for example through commercial fishing, conservation work, or state government research. The reviewing body from the North Pacific Fisheries Management Council has requested that the input in the indicator selection process represent a broader array of expertise and experience.

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

None.

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 June 2, 2014 (79 FR 31296) solicited public comments. No substantive comments were received.

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

None.

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

The survey will not be confidential. This will be made clear on the online survey form. The respondents will be asked to submit a description of their Gulf of Alaska ecosystem expertise to aid in our summary statistics.

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.

Not Applicable

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

An estimated 70 respondents and responses, with an individual response time of 30 minutes, will result in a total burden of 35 hours.

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

There will be no recordkeeping/reporting burden, as the survey will be administered online.

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

We estimate that creating and distributing the survey and summarizing results will take approximately 3 weeks of a ZP-3 research biologist's time at an estimated cost of $4,819.20 (120 hours * $40.16/hr).

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

This is a new information collection.

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

The survey results will be used to select ecosystem indicators to be incorporated into a Gulf of Alaska Report Card and Ecosystem Assessment. The Report Card and Assessment will be published within a government report called the Ecosystem Considerations report. This report is produced annually as part of the Stock Assessment and Fishery Evaluation report for the North Pacific Fishery Management Council. Later publication may occur in the peer-reviewed literature, in which the process and results of this survey are compared with that from the eastern Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands.

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.

respondents as candidate indicators for the GOA Ecosystem Report Card. Rankings will range from most often selected to least often selected and thus not require more than standard accuracy in reporting. Standard summary statistics will be calculated on the responses. Indicator selection summaries may be stratified by respondent expertise so as to weigh consideration of top indicators more heavily by those with expertise in each indicator category. The preliminary rankings will be reviewed by the Resource Ecology and Ecosystem Modeling program at the AFSC. Formal review of the Report Card and Assessment that is developed from the indicator selection survey will be provided by the North Pacific Fisheries Management Council.

Data collection is planned for only one time in 2014.

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 survey has been designed to be quick and simple in order to maximize response, using methods described in Dillman 2007.In the unlikely event of complete non-response, the Report Card will be developed in house, but will lack broad input from non-federal employees. Any responses will broaden the expertise and strengthen the justification for indicator selection, which was a request of the reviewing body of the North Pacific Fisheries Management Council. The extent and make-up of the survey respondents will be described in the final product and available for review by the North Pacific Fisheries Management Council. Any input from survey results that we receive will be evaluated and incorporated into the final indicator selection process, so an inadequate response rate is not a concern.

Respondents will be notified of the survey with an email letter sent directly to respondents or to Council staff to forward to respondents. We will request that Council staff provide a list of names to whom they forward the letter.

Reminder emails will be sent out 2 weeks after the initial email to those individuals who have not responded.

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.

This is the first time that a survey of the public will have been conducted for this project. In previous in-person efforts to create ecosystem report cards for the eastern Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands, we concluded that more input representing a broader range of ecosystem expertise can influence indicator selection. This conclusion motivated the creation of an online survey to facilitate more peoples' input into indicator selection without requiring travel or extensive time and facilities to host much larger meetings.

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.

Alaska Fisheries Science Center
Resource Ecology and Fisheries Management Division
Resource Ecology and Ecosystem Monitoring Program
Stephani Zador 206-526-4693

Stephani Zador will collect and analyze the survey responses. These data will then be available for further analysis in the development of the Gulf of Alaska ecosystem report card by the Science Center staff.

Respondents will be notified of the survey with an email letter sent directly to respondents or to Council staff to forward to respondents. We will request that Council staff provide a list of names to whom they forward the letter. The draft email letter text is below:

<Sent from NOAA email address>

Dear –

We invite you to participate in an online survey to select ecosystem indicators to be used for fisheries management in the Gulf of Alaska (GOA). The goal of this project is to select a short (8-10) list of ecosystem indicators for the GOA that will form the basis of a GOA Report Card and Ecosystem Assessment to include in NOAA's Ecosystem Considerations report. Providing these Report Cards and Ecosystem Assessments is a part of how ecosystem-based fisheries management is practiced in Alaska.

You've been selected because you have known experience relevant to fisheries management in the GOA ecosystem. We hope that by surveying a greater number of individuals that were involved with previous ecosystem indicator selection for the eastern Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Report Cards, the new survey results will reflect broader expertise and an "equal" voice from all participants.

There are 11 questions in the survey, which we estimate will take approximately 20 minutes to complete. Your responses are voluntary. We will ask you to provide your name and a short description of your GOA expertise at the end to help us analyze the results. Because of this, we cannot accept anonymous responses.

We appreciate your time in completing this survey and helping us to develop an ecosystem Report Card that best represents the state of the Gulf of Alaska ecosystem to inform fisheries management.

If you have any question about the survey please do not hesitate to contact me.

Many thanks,
Stephani Zador

<email signature text with contact details>

Reminder emails will be sent out 2 weeks after the initial email to those individuals who have not responded. Draft email text is below:

<Sent from NOAA email address>

Dear –

Two weeks ago an invitation to participate in an online survey was sent to you. The goal of the survey is solicit your expert opinion on which ecosystem indicators for the Gulf of Alaska should be included in a new ecosystem Report Card to be provided to the North Pacific Fisheries Management Council.

We would appreciate your responses to the survey question within 3 weeks. If you are unable or decline to complete this survey, please let me know.

If you have any question about the survey please do not hesitate to contact me.

Many thanks,
Stephani Zador

<email signature text with contact details>

Gulf of Alaska Ecosystem Indicator Survey

Introduction

1 / 12 8%

Thank you for participating in our survey. Your feedback is important.

The goal of this project is to select a short (8-10) list of ecosystem indicators for the Gulf of Alaska that will form the basis of a Gulf of Alaska (GOA) Report Card and Ecosystem Assessment to include in the NOAA's Ecosystem Considerations report. This report is produced annually as part of the Stock Assessment and Fishery Evaluation report for the North Pacific Fishery Management Council. The format of the new GOA Report Card and Ecosystem Assessment will be similar to those that have been produced in recent years for the eastern Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands.

The primary recipients, considered to be the stakeholders, of the Report Card and Ecosystem Assessment are those involved with the fishery quota-setting process for the North Pacific Fisheries Management Council. This includes the Science and Statistical Committee and the regional Plan Teams. Additional recipients include the Advisory Panel, Council, and stock assessment scientists. The Report Card and Ecosystem Assessment are also made available to the public.

For the purposes of this project, ecosystem indicators are defined as time-series of data that measure some component of the ecosystem. Hundreds of indicators are available for the GOA, which is defined as the Canadian-US boundary at Dixon Entrance to the east and False Pass to the west. During a workshop in 2010, a group of largely scientists and some fisheries managers with expertise in the eastern Bering Sea ecosystem selected 10 indicators to best represent trends in productivity in the eastern Bering Sea. In 2011, a more diverse group including a commercial fisherman and conservation NGO representative met in a similar workshop format to select 8 ecosystem indicators for the Aleutian Islands that best characterized trends in variability throughout the ecosystem. For the GOA, we hope to increase the group size and diversity in GOA expertise of the participants in the indicator selection process by soliciting information individually via an email survey. The main objective of the survey is to have participants rank the importance of indicators; the surveys will then be compiled to generate a list of top indicators. This process will be followed by a smaller in-person meeting to refine this list to form to basis of the new GOA Report Card. We hope that by surveying a greater number of individuals than were involved with indicator selection for the eastern Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands, the survey results will reflect broader expertise and an 'equal voice' from all participants.

The GOA is characterized by topographical complexity, including: islands; deep sea mounts; continental shelf interrupted by large gullies; and varied and massive coastline features such as the Cook Inlet, Prince William Sound, Copper River, and Cross Sound, which bring both freshwater and nutrients into the GOA. The topographical complexity leads to ecological complexity, such that species richness and diversity differ from the western to eastern GOA. Thus, local effects of ecosystem drivers may swamp basin-wide signals. With this in mind, we hope to create a short list of ecosystem indicators that best reflect the complexity of the GOA. Although there are many more people living in both large and small communities throughout the GOA relative to the AI or EBS, we consider the GOA to be data-moderate relative to the AI (data-poor) and EBS (data-rich). That being said, we have developed a non-exhaustive list of about 75 ecosystem indicators from which we hope to form the basis of a new GOA report card and ecosystem assessment.

Next

Powered by **SurveyMonkey**
Check out our sample surveys and create your own now!

Gulf of Alaska Ecosystem Indicator Survey

Instructions

2 / 12 17%

The survey is structured as follows. There are 8 categories of indicator types. Within each indicator category, rank the top 3 indicators that in your opinion are the most informative of the current and likely future state of the GOA ecosystem. If there are fewer than 3 potential indicators in a category, rank only the ones (or none) that you believe fit the above criteria. You may skip indicator categories if you don't feel that you can make a choice. Each indicator category will have a blank option for you to fill in with a suggested indicator. Please specify whether this is one that currently exists or not.

After you have finished making your choices within each category you will be asked to select your top 10 indicators among all of the possible choices regardless of category. The last page of the survey has a space for you to add any comments you wish to pass along and to note your particular area(s) of expertise in the GOA ecosystem. [Note that we are interested in your rankings in any category, even for ones in which you may not consider yourself an 'expert']. This will help us better understand the composition of the survey group for our summary report(s).

Prev Next

Powered by SurveyMonkey
Check out our sample surveys and create your own now!

Gulf of Alaska Ecosystem Indicator Survey

3 / 12 25%

1. Physical indicators: Considered forcing functions, physical indicators should reflect changes in the environment that lead to changes in the biological components of the ecosystem, usually through bottom up processes. For details on most indicators see the Ecosystem Considerations report http://access.afsc.noaa.gov/reem/ecoweb/Index.php

For the 12 indicators for the GOA listed below, select and rank the top 3 in your opinion. You may select only up to three indicators, but can add a description of additional indicators in the box below.

	1	2	3
NINO3.4 - Characterizes the state of the El Nino Southern Oscillation; 1948-present Contact/Source: Nick Bond/UW JISAO	○	○	○
PDO - Pacific Decadal Oscillation; the leading mode of North Pacific sea surface temperature variability ;1948-present Contact/Source: Nick Bond/UW JISAO	○	○	○
NPI - North Pacific Index, area-weighted sea level pressure; 1948-present Contact/Source: Nick Bond/UW JISAO	○	○	○
NPGO - North Pacific Gyre Oscillation, the second leading mode of variability in the North Pacific, related to biological and chemical properties in the GOA and California Current System; 1950-present Contact/Source: Nick Bond/UW JISAO	○	○	○
Eddy kinetic energy - Monthly eddy kinetic energy derived from altimetry; 1992-present Contact/Source: Carol Ladd/PMEL	○	○	○
PAPA trajectory index - This measures ocean surface currents. It is the end point latitude of a simulated drifter track released from Ocean Station PAPA on Dec 1 for 90 days; 1902-present Contact/Source: Buck Stockhausen/NMFS	○	○	○
GOA transport - The proportion of the North Pacific current diverted into the GOA; 2002-present Contact/Source: Howard Freeland/DFO Canada	○	○	○
Water temperature anomalies 25 m deep at the GAK 1 mooring - offshore of Seward;1970-current Contact/Source: UAF	○	○	○
Water temperature anomalies 100 m deep at the GAK 1 mooring - offshore of Seward; 1970-current Contact/Source: UAF	○	○	○
Bottom temperature anomalies in Barnabus gully - offshore Kodiak; 1990-current Contact/Source: Carrie Worton, ADF&G	○	○	○
Bottom temperature anomalies in Kiliuda and Ugak bays - inshore Kodiak; 1990-current Contact/Source: Carrie Worton, ADF&G	○	○	○
Freshwater input to GOA - source to be identified	○	○	○

Other indicator (please specify whether this is an indicator that currently exists or one that you believe should exist)

Prev Next

Gulf of Alaska Ecosystem Indicator Survey

4 / 12 33%

2. Plankton indicators: Phyto and zooplankton serve important roles at the base of the GOA food web. Plankton indicators should inform us about how changes are occuring at the base of the food web. For details on most indicators see the Ecosystem Considerations report http://access.afsc.noaa.gov/reem/ecoweb/Index.php

For the 6 indicators for the GOA listed below, select and rank the top 3 in your opinion. You may select up to three indicators or none if you have no opinion. You may add a description of additional indicators in the box below.

	1	2	3
Large diatom abundance anomaly - Measured on the shelf southeast of Lower Cook Inlet; sampled 5-6x per year by continuous plankton recorder deployed on container ships; 2004-present Contact/Source: Sonia Batten; SAHFOS	○	○	○
Total zooplankton density by summer month in Icy Strait - SE Alaska; density anomaly (numbers/m3); May - Aug; 1997-present Contact/Source: Molly Sturdevant/NMFS	○	○	○
Large calanoid copepod % composition in Icy Strait - SE Alaska; percent numerical composition anomaly, May-Aug; 1997-present Contact/Source: Molly Sturdevant/NMFS	○	○	○
Small calanoid copepod % composition in Icy Strait - SE Alaska; percent numerical composition anomaly, May-Aug; 1997-present Contact/Source: Molly Sturdevant/NMFS	○	○	○
Copepod community size anomaly - Measured on the shelf southeast of Lower Cook Inlet; sampled 5-6x per year Apr - Sept by continuous plankton recorder deployed on container ship; 2004-present Contact/Source: Sonia Batten, SAFOS	○	○	○
Mesozooplankton biomass - Measured on the shelf southeast of Lower Cook Inlet; sampled 5-6x per year Apr - Sept by continuous plankton recorder deployed on container ship; 2004-present Contact/Source: Sonia Batten, SAFOS	○	○	○

Other indicator (please specify whether this is an indicator that currently exists or one that you believe should exist)

Prev Next

Powered by SurveyMonkey
Check out our sample surveys and create your own now!

Gulf of Alaska Ecosystem Indicator Survey

5 / 12 42%

3. Benthic fauna indicators: These indicators should inform us about variations in the size and composition of the group of sea floor-dwelling animals such as crabs, urchins, and sea stars. For details on most indicators see the Ecosystem Considerations report http://access.afsc.noaa.gov/reem/ecoweb/Index.php

For the 3 indicators for the GOA listed below, select up to 3 or none if you have no opinion, and, if you wish, add a description of additional indicators in the box below.

	1	2	3
Aggregate motile epifauna biomass - Total biomass of crabs, echinoderms, sea stars, etc. from NOAA summer bottom trawl surveys; 1984-2003, biennial or triennial. Contact/Source: Kerim Aydin/NMFS	○	○	○
Tanner Crab biomass: Barnabus Gully - Offshore Kodiak; standardized anomalies of ADF&G trawl survey catch; 1988-present Contact/Source: Carrie WortonADF&G	○	○	○
Tanner Crab biomass: Kiliuda and Ugak Bays - Inshore Kodiak; standardized anomalies of ADF&G trawl survey catch; 1988-present Contact/Source: Carrie Worton/ADF&G	○	○	○

Other indicator (please specify whether this is an indicator that currently exists or one that you believe should exist)

Prev Next

Powered by SurveyMonkey
Check out our sample surveys and create your own now!

4. Forage fish indicators: Forage fish include small fish such as sandlance as well as young age classes of larger fish such as pollock. Forage fish play a fundamental role in marine ecosystems by converting energy from lower trophic levels into food for larger fish, marine mammals, and seabirds (Lenfest, http://www.oceanconservationscience.org/foragefish/project/what.html). For details on most indicators see the Ecosystem Considerations report http://access.afsc.noaa.gov/reem/ecoweb/Index.php

For the 12 indicators for GOA listed below, select and rank the top 3 in your opinion. You may select up to three indicators or none if you have no opinion. You may add a description of additional indicators in the box below.

	1	2	3
Eulachon CPUE - From smallmesh trawl surveys; CPUE kg/km; western GOA, nearshore; 1972-present Contact/Source: Dan Urban/NMFS	○	○	○
Juvenile pollock CPUE - From smallmesh trawl surveys; CPUE kg/km; western GOA, nearshore; 1972-present Contact/Source: Dan Urban/NMFS	○	○	○
Herring CPUE - From smallmesh trawl surveys; CPUE kg/km; western GOA, nearshore; 1972-present Contact/Source: Dan Urban/NMFS	○	○	○
Post-fishery mature herring biomass+catch - Sitka Sound; 1980-present Contact/Source: Kyle Hebert, Sherrie Dressel/ADF&G	○	○	○
Herring spawning biomass - Total biomass in SE Alaska; 1980-present Contact/Source: Kyle Hebert, Sherrie Dressel/ADF&G	○	○	○
Age-3 herring abundance - Millions of age-3 herring; Sitka Sound; 1980-present Contact/Source: Kyle Hebert, Sherrie Dressel/ADF&G	○	○	○
Capelin, percent composition in puffin chick diets; collected **at the Barren Islands** - Percent of fish delivered to tufted puffin chicks;1995-present, except 2012 Contact/Source: Heather Renner/USFWS	○	○	○
Capelin, percent composition in puffin chick diets collected **at Middleton Island**- Percent biomass of fish delivered to rhinoceros auklet chicks; 1993-present Contact/Source: Scott Hatch/ISRC	○	○	○
Sandlance, percent composition in puffin chick diets - Percent of fish delivered to tufted puffin chicks; collected **at the Barren Islands**; 1995-present, except 2012 Contact/Source: Heather Renner/USFWS	○	○	○
Sandlance, percent composition in puffin chick diets - Percent biomass of fish delivered to rhinoceros auklet chicks; collected **at Middleton Island**; 1993-present Contact/Source: Scott Hatch/ISRC	○	○	○
Northern lampfish/myctophid ichthyoplankton abundance - Western GOA; late spring larval abundance (log10 of mean abundance (no/m^2 + 1), standarized); bongo tows;1981-present, missing some years. Contact/Source: Miriam Doyle/NMFS	○	○	○
Sandlance ichthyoplankton abundance - Western GOA; late spring larval abundance (log10 of mean abundance (no/m^2 + 1), standarized); bongo tows; 1981-present, missing some years. Contact/Source: Miriam Doyle/NMFS	○	○	○

Other indicator (please specify whether this is an indicator that currently exists or one that you believe should exist)

5. Non-forage fish indicators: These indicators should reflect various aspects of the fish community as it interacts with the ecosystem, but should not duplicate stock trend information that could be found in a stock assessment. For details on most indicators see the Ecosystem Considerations report http://access.afsc.noaa.gov/reem/ecoweb/Index.php

For the 16 indicators for the GOA listed below, select and rank the top 3 in your opinion. You may select up to three indicators or none if you have no opinion. You may add a description of additional indicators in the box below.

	1	2	3
Pacific cod ichthyoplankton abundance - Western GOA; late spring larval abundance (log10 of mean abundance (no/m^2 + 1), standarized); bongo tows; 1981-present, missing some years. Contact/Source: Miriam Doyle/NMFS	○	○	○
Pollock ichthyoplankton abundance - Western GOA; late spring larval abundance (log10 of mean abundance (no/m^2 + 1), standarized); bongo tows; 1981-present, missing some years. Contact/Source: Miriam Doyle/NMFS	○	○	○
Arrowtooth ichthyoplankton abundance - Western GOA; late spring larval abundance (log10 of mean abundance (no/m^2 + 1), standarized); bongo tows; 1981-present, missing some years. Contact/Source: Miriam Doyle/NMFS	○	○	○
Halibut ichthyoplankton abundance - Western GOA; late spring larval abundance (log10 of mean abundance (no/m^2 + 1), standarized); bongo tows; 1981-present, missing some years. Contact/Source: Miriam Doyle/NMFS	○	○	○
Mushy halibut - Presence/absence of mushy halibut reports during sport fishing, mainly Kenai Peninsula area;1980-present Contact/Source: ADF&G	○	○	○
Juvenile pink salmon CPUE - Juvenile peak pink salmon survey CPUE during June or July, Icy Strait, SE Alaska ;1998-present Contact/Source: NOAA/SECM	○	○	○
Marine survival of PWS hatchery pink salmon - survival of hatchery salmon; 1977-present Contact/Source: Botz/ADF&G	○	○	○
Arrowtooth biomass: Barnabus Gully - Offshore Kodiak; standardized anomalies of ADF&G trawl survey catch; 1988-present Contact/Source: Carrie Worton/ADF&G	○	○	○
Pollock biomass: Kiliuda and Ugak Bays - Inshore Kodiak; standardized anomalies of ADF&G trawl survey catch; 1988-present Contact/Source: Carrie Worton/ADF&G	○	○	○
Groundfish trawl community index: Species richness - Calculated from summer NOAA bottom trawl survey data; 1984-present, biennial or triennial. Contact/Source: Franz Mueter/UAF	○	○	○
Groundfish trawl community index: Species diversity - Calculated from summer NOAA bottom trawl survey data; 1984-present, biennial or triennial. Contact/Source: Franz Mueter/UAF	○	○	○
Pelagic forager aggregate biomass - Total biomass of pollock, forage fish, etc. from summer bottom trawl surveys; 1984-present, biennial or triennial. Contact/Source: Kerim Aydin/NMFS	○	○	○
Fish top predator aggregate biomass - Total biomass of Pacific cod, arrowtooth, halibut, etc. from summer bottom trawl surveys; 1984-present, biennial or triennial. Contact/Source: Kerim Aydin/NMFS	○	○	○
Benthic forager aggregate biomass - Total biomass of crabs, echinoderms, sea stars, etc. from summer bottom trawl surveys; 1984-present, biennial or triennial. Contact/Source: Kerim Aydin/NMFS	○	○	○
Total annual groundfish surplus production - annual change in biomass (estimated from stock assessments) plus catch; 1978-2009 Contact/Source: Franz Mueter, UAF	○	○	○
Single species CPUE - Mean survey CPUE of any single groundfish species caught regularly in NOAA summer bottom trawl surveys; 1984-present, biennial or triennial. **Please specify the species in the comment box below.** Contact/Source: Chris Rooper/NMFS	○	○	○

If you selected the 'Single species CPUE' indicator, specify that species here. Also, list any additional indicator not included above (please specify whether this is an indicator that currently exists or one that you believe should exist)

Prev Next

Gulf of Alaska Ecosystem Indicator Survey

8 / 12 67%

6. Marine mammal indicators: Marine mammal indicators have been used in the EBS to represent upper trophic consumers (fur seals) and in the AI to represent a keystone species in the nearshore (otters). For details on most indicators see the Ecosystem Considerations report http://access.afsc.noaa.gov/reem/ecoweb/Index.php

There are 3 indicators for the GOA listed below. You may select and rank up to three or none if you have no opinion, and can add a description of additional indicators in the box below.

	1	2	3
Steller sea lion adult plus juvenile population - non-pup counts; 1990-present, mostly biennial Contact/Source: Lowell Fritz/NMFS	○	○	○
Cook Inlet beluga whale population - Annual; 1994-2011 Contact/Source: NMFS	○	○	○
Sea otter surveys - specific location within the GOA to be determined and dependent on data. Source: USGS	○	○	○

List any additional indicator not included above (please specify whether this is an indicator that currently exists or one that you believe should exist)

Prev Next

Powered by SurveyMonkey
Check out our sample surveys and create your own now!

Gulf of Alaska Ecosystem Indicator Survey

9 / 12 75%

7. Seabird indicators: Seabirds are conspicuous top predators that mainly feed on zooplanton (e.g., storm petrels), fish (e.g., murres and kittiwakes), or discards from fishing vessels (e.g., fulmars). For details on most indicators see the Ecosystem Considerations report http://access.afsc.noaa.gov/reem/ecoweb/Index.php

For the 5 indicators below, select and rank the top 3 in your opinion. You may select up to three indicators or none if you have no opinion. You may add a description of additional indicators in the box below.

	1	2	3
Seabird bycatch estimates - all gear types; 1993-present Contact/Source: Shannon Fitzgerald/NMFS	○	○	○
Black-legged kittiwake reproductive success at the Semedi Islands - Western GOA; surface-forager, piscivorous;1979-present, except 82-88, 92-94,96-97,99-01,03, and 08. Contact/Source: Heather Renner/USFWS	○	○	○
Common murre reproductive success at the Semedi Islands - Western GOA; diving-forager, piscivorous; 1979-present, except 82-88, 92, 94, 96-97, 99-01, 03, and 08. Contact/Source: Heather Renner/USFWS	○	○	○
Fork-tailed storm petrel reproductive success at St Lazaria - Eastern GOA; surface forager; mostly planktivorous, partially piscivorous; 1995-present Contact/Source: Heather Renner/USFWS	○	○	○
Common murre reproductive success at St Lazaria - Eastern GOA; diving forager, piscivorous; 1994-present Contact/Source: Heather Renner/USFWS	○	○	○

List any additional indicator not included above (please specify whether this is an indicator that currently exists or one that you believe should exist)

Prev Next

Powered by SurveyMonkey
Check out our sample surveys and create your own now!

Gulf of Alaska Ecosystem Indicator Survey

10 / 12 83%

8. Human indicators: Humans are considered part of the ecosystem. We are looking for indicators that reflect how humans both impact and are impacted by the ecosystem. For details on most indicators see the Ecosystem Considerations report http://access.afsc.noaa.gov/reem/ecoweb/Index.php

For the 12 indicators below, select and rank the top 3 in your opinion. You may select up to three indicators or none if you have no opinion. You may add a description of additional indicators in the box below.

	1	2	3
Human abundance trends - Population of fishing communities within 25 miles of the coast and/or with historical involvement in GOA subsistence or industrial fisheries; 1920-present, decadally; Contact/Source: Amber Himes-Cornell/NMFS	○	○	○
K-12 school enrollment trends - Numbers of K-12 students in fishing communities within 25 miles of the coast; 1995- present Contact/Source: State of Alaska	○	○	○
Groundfish fishery discards - Either tonnage or percent discarded in managed groundfish fisheries in the GOA; 1994-present Contact/Source: Jean Lee/Pacific States	○	○	○
Groundfish fishery non-target catch - Total catch of scyphozoan jellyfish, HAPC-associated species (seapens sponges, anemones, etc.), invertebrates (bivalves, sea stars, etc.)in groundfish fisheries;2003-present Contact/Source:Jean Lee/Pacific States	○	○	○
Commericial pink salmon harvest - Total commercial catch; 1994-2013 Contact/Source: ADF&G	○	○	○
Commercial sockeye salmon harvest - Total commercial catch; 1994-2013 Contact/Source: ADF&G	○	○	○
Total commercial fisheries removals - Includes groundfish, crab, salmon; to be developed; Contact/Source: To be identified	○	○	○
Numbers of fishing crew licenses - to be determined; Contact/Source: To be identified	○	○	○
Numbers of sport licenses - to be determined; Contact/Source: ADF&G	○	○	○
Percent of trawlable area trawled - not yet calculated; would be similar to that calculated for the AI Report Card; Contact/Source: Steve Barbeaux/NMFS	○	○	○
Overall exploitation rates of groundfish - total catch divided by the estimated combined biomass at the beginning of each year; 1977-2009 (could be updated) Contact/Source: Franz Mueter/UAF	○	○	○
Groundfish fleet composition - Numbers of longline/jig, trawl, and/pot vessels participating in the groundfish fisheries; 1994-present Contact/Source: Jean Lee/Pacific States	○	○	○

List any additional indicator not included above (please specify whether this is an indicator that currently exists or one that you believe should exist)

Prev Next

Powered by SurveyMonkey
Check out our sample surveys and create your own now!

Gulf of Alaska Ecosystem Indicator Survey

11 / 12 92%

9. Select 10 indicators from all of the indicators listed previously in this survey. Your choice should represent what you believe are the 10 indicators that best represents the current state and may portend the future state of the GOA ecosystem regardless of trophic category. The reason for this is because some people may not think that the best 10 indicators to represent the GOA should include one in each trophic category. For example, some may think that 2 groundfish indicators would be better than 1 benthic and 1 groundfish, etc. If you added indicators by text in any of the previous questions, don't worry; they will be evaluated for inclusion in the final list.

- [ ] NINO3.4
- [ ] PDO
- [ ] NPI
- [ ] NPGO
- [ ] Eddy kinetic energy
- [ ] Ocean surface currents: PAPA trajectory index
- [ ] GOA transport
- [ ] Water temperature anomalies at 25 m, GAK 1 (Kenai Peninsula)
- [ ] Water temperature anomalies at 100 m, GAK 1 (Kenai Peninsula)
- [ ] Bottom temperature anomalies in Barnabus gully (Western GOA)
- [ ] Bottom temperature anomalies in Kiliuda and Ugak bays (Western GOA)
- [ ] Freshwater input to GOA
- [ ] Large diatom abundance anomaly (Western GOA)
- [ ] Total zooplankton density by summer month in Icy Strait (Eastern GOA)
- [ ] Large calanoid copepod % composition in Icy Strait (Eastern GOA)
- [ ] Small calanoid copepod % composition in Icy Strait (Eastern GOA)
- [ ] Copepod community size anomaly (Western GOA)
- [ ] Mesozooplankton biomass (Western GOA)
- [ ] Aggregate motile epifauna biomass
- [ ] Tanner Crabs: Barnabus Gully
- [ ] Tanner Crab: Kiliuda and Ugak Bays
- [ ] Eulachon CPUE (Western GOA)
- [ ] Juvenile pollock CPUE (Western GOA)
- [ ] Herring CPUE (Western GOA)
- [ ] Post-fishery mature herring biomass+catch (Eastern GOA)
- [ ] Herring spawning biomass (Eastern GOA)
- [ ] Age-3 herring abundance (Eastern GOA)
- [ ] Capelin in puffin chick diets (Barren Islands)
- [ ] Capelin in puffin chick diets (Middleton Island)
- [ ] Sandlance in puffin chick diets (Barren Islands)
- [ ] Sandlance in puffin chick diets (Middleton Island)
- [ ] Northern lampfish/myctophid ichthyoplankton abundance (Western GOA)
- [ ] Mushy halibut
- [ ] Juvenile pink salmon CPUE (Eastern GOA)
- [ ] Marine survival of PWS hatchery pink salmon
- [ ] Total catch per km towed: Barnabus Gully
- [ ] Total catch per km towed: Kiliuda and Ugak Bays
- [ ] Arrowtooth catch: Barnabus Gully
- [ ] Arrowtooth catch: Kiliuda and Ugak Bays
- [ ] Pollock catch: Barnabus Gully
- [ ] Pollock catch: Kiliuda and Ugak Bays
- [ ] Groundfish trawl community index: Species richness
- [ ] Groundfish trawl community index: Species diversity
- [ ] Pelagic forager aggregate biomass
- [ ] Fish top predator aggregate biomass
- [ ] Benthic forager aggregate biomass
- [ ] Total annual groundfish surplus production
- [ ] single species CPUE
- [ ] Steller sea lion adult plus juvenile population
- [ ] Cook Inlet beluga whale population
- [ ] Sea otter surveys
- [ ] Seabird bycatch estimates: all gear types
- [ ] Black-legged kittiwake reproductive success (Semedi Islands)
- [ ] Common murre reproductive success(Semedi Islands)
- [ ] Fork-tailed storm petrel reproductive success (St Lazaria)
- [ ] Common murre reproductive success(St Lazaria)
- [ ] Human abundance trends
- [ ] K-12 school enrollment trends
- [ ] Groundfish fishery discards
- [ ] Groundfish fishery non-target catch
- [ ] Commercial pink salmon harvest
- [ ] Commercial sockeye salmon harvest
- [ ] Total commercial fisheries removals
- [ ] Numbers of fishing crew licenses
- [ ] Numbers of sport licenses
- [ ] Percent of trawlable area trawled
- [ ] Overall exploitation rates of groundfish
- [ ] Groundfish fleet composition

Gulf of Alaska Ecosystem Indicator Survey

12 / 12 100%

10. Thank you for participating! Please note your particular area(s) of expertise in the GOA ecosystem and any additional comments here.

Prev Done

Powered by SurveyMonkey
Check out our sample surveys and create your own now!

end of the month following the month in which the subaward was made.

VIII. Agency Contacts

The RUS Contact for this grant announcement is Kristi Kubista-Hovis, Senior Policy Advisor, Rural Utilities Service, Electric Programs, United States Department of Agriculture, 1400 Independence Avenue SW., STOP 1560, Room 5165 South Building, Washington, DC 20250–1560. Telephone (202) 720–9545, Fax (202) 690–0717, email *Kristi.Kubista-Hovis@wdc.usda.gov.*

Dated: May 1, 2014.

John C. Padalino,

Administrator, Rural Utilities Service.

[FR Doc. 2014–12690 Filed 5–30–14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

Proposed Information Collection; Comment Request; Gulf of Alaska Ecosystem Indicator Selection

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 August 1, 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 Stephani Zador, (206) 526–4693) or *stephani.zador@noaa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Abstract

This request is for a new information collection.

The goal of this project is to select a short (8–10) list of ecosystem indicators for the Gulf of Alaska that will form the basis of a Gulf of Alaska (GOA) Report Card and Ecosystem Assessment to include in the NOAA's Ecosystem Considerations report. This report is produced annually as part of the Stock Assessment and Fishery Evaluation report for the North Pacific Fishery Management Council. The format of the new GOA Report Card and Ecosystem Assessment will be similar to those that have been produced in recent years for the eastern Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands.

The primary recipients, considered to be the stakeholders, of the Report Card and Ecosystem Assessment are those involved with the fishery quota-setting process for the North Pacific Fisheries Management Council. This includes the Science and Statistical Committee and the regional Plan Teams, which of are composed of mainly federal and state scientists, academics, and other individuals. Additional recipients include the Advisory Panel, Council, and stock assessment scientists. The Report Card and Ecosystem Assessment are also made available to the public.

For the purposes of this project, ecosystem indicators are defined as time-series of data that measure some component of the ecosystem. Hundreds of indicators are available for the GOA, which is defined as the Canadian-US boundary at Dixon Entrance to the east and False Pass to the west. During a workshop in 2010, a group of largely scientists and some fisheries managers with expertise in the eastern Bering Sea ecosystem selected 10 indicators to best represent trends in productivity in the eastern Bering Sea. In 2011, a more diverse group including a commercial fisherman and conservation non-governmental organization representative met in a similar workshop format to select 8 ecosystem indicators for the Aleutian Islands that best characterized trends in variability throughout the ecosystem. For the GOA, we hope to increase the group size and diversity in GOA expertise of the participants in the indicator selection process by soliciting information individually via an online survey. The main objective of the survey is to have participants rank the importance of ecosystem indicators among lists of indicators that are presented; the surveys will then be compiled to generate a list of top indicators. We have developed a non-exhaustive list of about 75 ecosystem indicators that are grouped by categories based on ecosystem components, such as forage fish or seabirds. Participants will be asked to select the top three within each category, then the top ten among all categories. Space is provided for suggestions of additional indicators not included. We will use these rankings to form the basis of a new GOA report card and ecosystem assessment. We hope that by surveying a greater number of individuals than were involved with indicator selection for the eastern Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands, the survey results will reflect broader expertise and an 'equal voice' from all participants.

The GOA is characterized by topographical complexity, including: Islands; deep sea mounts; continental shelf interrupted by large gullies; and varied and massive coastline features such as the Cook Inlet, Prince William Sound, Copper River, and Cross Sound, which bring both freshwater and nutrients into the GOA. The topographical complexity leads to ecological complexity, such that species richness and diversity differ from the western to eastern GOA. Thus, local effects of ecosystem drivers may swamp basin-wide signals. With this in mind, we hope to create a short list of ecosystem indicators that best reflect the complexity of the GOA.

II. Method of Collection

Respondents will be asked to fill out an online survey.

III. Data

OMB Control Number: 0648-xxxx.

Form Number: None.

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

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

Estimated Number of Respondents: 100.

Estimated Time Per Response: 30 minutes.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 50.

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: May 28, 2014.

Gwellnar Banks,

Management Analyst, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 2014–12668 Filed 5–30–14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–22–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Foreign-Trade Zones Board

[B–11–2014]

Foreign-Trade Zone 87—Lake Charles, Louisiana, Authorization of Production Activity, LEEVAC Shipyards, LLC (Shipbuilding), Lake Charles and Jennings, Louisiana

On January 27, 2014, the Lake Charles Harbor and Terminal District, grantee of FTZ 87, submitted a notification of proposed production activity to the Foreign-Trade Zones (FTZ) Board on behalf of LEEVAC Shipyards, LLC, in Lake Charles and Jennings, Louisiana.

The notification was processed in accordance with the regulations of the FTZ Board (15 CFR part 400), including notice in the **Federal Register** inviting public comment (79 FR 8679–8680, February 13, 2014). The FTZ Board has determined that no further review of the activity is warranted at this time. The production activity described in the notification is authorized, subject to the FTZ Act and the FTZ Board's regulations, including Section 400.14, and the following special conditions:

1. Any foreign steel mill product admitted to the subzone, including plate, angles, shapes, channels, rolled steel stock, bars, pipes and tubes, not incorporated into merchandise otherwise classified, and which is used in manufacturing, shall be subject to customs duties in accordance with applicable law, unless the Executive Secretary determines that the same item is not then being produced by a domestic steel mill.

2. LEEVAC Shipyards, LLC, shall meet its obligation under 15 CFR 400.13(b) by annually advising the Board's Executive Secretary as to significant new contracts with appropriate information concerning foreign purchases otherwise dutiable, so that the Board may consider whether any foreign dutiable items are being imported for manufacturing in the subzone primarily because of FTZ procedures and whether the Board should consider requiring customs duties to be paid on such items.

Dated: May 27, 2014.

Andrew McGilvray,

Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2014–12708 Filed 5–30–14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Foreign-Trade Zones Board

[B–4–2014]

Foreign-Trade Zone 221—Mesa, Arizona, Authorization of Production Activity, Apple Inc./GT Advanced Technologies Inc., (Components for Consumer Electronics), Mesa, Arizona

On January 23, 2014, Apple Inc./GT Advanced Technologies Inc. submitted a notification of proposed production activity to the Foreign-Trade Zones (FTZ) Board for its facility within Subzone 221A, in Mesa, Arizona.

The notification was processed in accordance with the regulations of the FTZ Board (15 CFR part 400), including notice in the **Federal Register** inviting public comment (79 FR 4661, 1–29–2014). The FTZ Board has determined that no further review of the activity is warranted at this time. The production activity described in the notification is authorized, subject to the FTZ Act and the Board's regulations, including Section 400.14.

Dated: May 28, 2014.

Andrew McGilvray,

Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2014–12727 Filed 5–30–14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Foreign-Trade Zones Board

[Docket 35–2011]

Proposed Foreign-Trade Zone—Eloy, Arizona; Amendment of Application

A request has been submitted to the Foreign-Trade Zones Board (the Board) by Tucson Regional Economic Opportunities (TREO), grantee of Foreign-Trade Zone 174, located in Tucson, Arizona, at the request of the City of Eloy, to amend the City's pending application requesting authority to establish a new general-purpose zone in Eloy, Arizona.

TREO is requesting authority to include the four sites originally proposed for FTZ designation as part of a new zone in Eloy, Arizona (FTZ Board Docket B–35–2011, 76 FR 30907, 05/27/2011 and 77 FR 62216–62217, 10/12/2012) as additional magnet sites of FTZ 174, adjacent to the Tucson, Arizona, U.S. Customs and Border Protection port of entry.

The proposed sites are as follows: *Site 1* (81 acres)—two parcels located at the intersection of Houser Road and Eleven Mile Corner Road, Eloy; *Site 2* (277 acres)—Sunshine Industrial Park, located at the intersection of Interstate 10 and Sunshine Boulevard, Eloy; *Site 3* (279 acres)—Toltec Business Park, located at the intersection of Houser Road and Toltec Road, Eloy; and, *Site 4* (293 acres)—Red Rock Industrial Park, located along Interstate 10 and the Union Pacific Railroad line opposite Sasco Road, Red Rock. The sites are owned by the City of Eloy (Site 1), Walton International Group (USA), Inc. and Walton Arizona, LLC (Site 2), Walton International Group (USA), Inc. (Site 3) and Walton International Group (USA), Inc. and Walton Arizona, LLC (Site 4). If approved, the sites being proposed would be assigned new site numbers under FTZ 174.

Public comment is invited from interested parties. Submissions shall be addressed to the Board's Executive Secretary at: Foreign-Trade Zones Board, U.S. Department of Commerce, Room 21013, 1401 Constitution Ave. NW., Washington, DC 20230.

The closing period for their receipt is July 2, 2014. Rebuttal comments in response to material submitted during the foregoing period may be submitted during the subsequent 15-day period (to July 17, 2014).

A copy of the application amendment 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: Christopher Kemp at *Christopher.Kemp@trade.gov* or (202) 482–0862.

Dated: May 21, 2014.

Andrew McGilvray,

Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2014–12704 Filed 5–30–14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P