

NOTICE OF OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET ACTION

Date 07/10/2015

Department of Commerce
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

FOR CERTIFYING OFFICIAL: Jennifer Jessup

FOR CLEARANCE OFFICER: Jennifer Jessup

In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act, OMB has taken action on your request received 06/08/2015

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

TYPE OF REVIEW REQUESTED: Regular

ICR REFERENCE NUMBER: 201506-0648-004

AGENCY ICR TRACKING NUMBER:

TITLE: NOAA Marine Debris Program Performance Progress Report

LIST OF INFORMATION COLLECTIONS: See next page

OMB ACTION: Approved without change

OMB CONTROL NUMBER: 0648-0718

The agency is required to display the OMB Control Number and inform respondents of its legal significance in accordance with 5 CFR 1320.5(b).

EXPIRATION DATE: 07/31/2018

DISCONTINUE DATE:

BURDEN:	RESPONSES	HOURS	COSTS
Previous	0	0	0
New	140	1,400	0
Difference			
Change due to New Statute	0	0	0
Change due to Agency Discretion	140	1,400	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
Grantee semi-annual reports	NA	Marine Debris Program Performance Progress Report	

PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT SUBMISSION

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

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

19. Certification for Paperwork Reduction Act Submissions

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

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

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

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

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

Signature of Senior Official or designee

Date

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

Signature

signed by Hugh Johnson

Date

Signature of NOAA Clearance Officer

Signature

Date

SUPPORTING STATEMENT
MARINE DEBRIS PROGRAM PERFORMANCE PROGRESS REPORT
OMB CONTROL NO. 0648-xxxx

A. JUSTIFICATION

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

The NOAA Marine Debris Program (MDP) supports national and international efforts to research, prevent, and reduce the impacts of marine debris. The MDP is a centralized office within NOAA that coordinates and supports activities, both within the bureau and with other federal agencies that address marine debris and its impacts. In addition to inter-agency coordination, the MDP uses partnerships with state and local agencies, tribes, non-governmental organizations, academia, and industry to investigate and solve the problems that stem from marine debris through research, prevention, and reduction activities, in order to protect and conserve our nation's marine environment and ensure navigation safety. In large part, these partnerships are formalized through grants, cooperative agreements and contracts.

The [Marine Debris Research, Prevention, and Reduction Act](#) (33 U.S.C. 1951 et seq.) as amended by the [Marine Debris Act Amendments of 2012](#) (P.L. 112-213, Title VI, Sec. 603, 126 Stat. 1576, December 20, 2012) authorizes the MDP to enter into cooperative agreements and contracts and provide financial assistance in the form of grants to carry out the purposes of the Act – namely to identify, determine sources of, assess, reduce, and prevent marine debris and its adverse impacts on the marine environment and navigation safety. To date, both competitive and non-competitive funding opportunities have been implemented by MDP to conduct such program activities. These funding opportunities provide federal funding to non-federal applicants throughout the coastal United States and territories.

The terms and conditions of the financial assistance awarded through the above-mentioned grant programs require regular progress reporting and communication of project accomplishments to MDP. Progress reports contain information related to, among other things, the overall short and long-term goals of the project, project methods and monitoring techniques, actual accomplishments (such as tons of debris removed from an ecosystem, numbers of volunteers participating in a cleanup project, area of habitat restored, etc.), status of approved activities, challenges or potential roadblocks to future progress, and lessons learned.

Since 2006, the NOAA Restoration Center (RC) managed the MDP's grant program, meaning that appropriated funds were passed on to the NOAA RC from NOAA MDP, and NOAA RC staff ran the funding competition and subsequently managed all resulting awards. Reporting requirements for those grant awards were satisfied using the NOAA RC Performance Progress Report (OMB Control for OMB Control No. 0648-0472). Currently, after some program office changes, the NOAA RC no longer manages the NOAA MDP competition, and the NOAA MDP now conducts all grant award management. As such, the NOAA MDP now requests approval for the use of a standardized reporting form that has worked well for marine debris reporting purposes.

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.

As mentioned above, the terms and conditions of the financial assistance awarded by the MDP require regular progress reporting and communication of project accomplishments to MDP. For grants and cooperative agreements, the NOAA Grants Management Division (GMD) requires a semi-annual reporting frequency (twice per year), and that grantees report on both programmatic accomplishments and financial expenditures. While there is some degree of latitude on when in a calendar year reports are to be submitted to the agency, the NOAA MDP typically sets due dates as April 30 and October 31. At the end of an award, a final report comprehensive to the entire project is due to MDP.

This information collection enables MDP to monitor and evaluate the activities supported by federal funds to ensure accountability to the public and to ensure that funds are used consistent with the purpose for which they were appropriated. It also ensures that reported information is standardized in such a way that allows for it to be meaningfully synthesized across a diverse set of projects and project types. MDP uses the information collected in a variety of ways to communicate with federal and non-federal partners and stakeholders on individual project and general program accomplishments. It enables MDP staff, who are subject matter and technical experts on domestic and international marine debris issues to understand how effective projects are at accomplishing their objectives, and to provide technical assistance if needed throughout the life of an award so as to maximize the impact of MDP funds.

NOAA will retain control over the information and safeguard it from improper access, modification, and destruction, consistent with NOAA standards for confidentiality, privacy, and electronic information. See response to Question 10 of this Supporting Statement for more information on confidentiality and privacy. The information collection is designed to yield data that meet all applicable information quality guidelines. Prior to dissemination, the information will be subjected to quality control measures and a pre-dissemination review pursuant to [Section 515 of Public Law 106-554](#).

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

Progress reports are form-fillable PDF files that are populated, saved, and updated using Adobe software and a personal computer. Grantees access the form either by going to the NOAA MDP website (marinedebris.noaa.gov) or it is emailed to them by the project's Federal Program Officer. Grantees must have access to a personal computer and internet connection in order to fill out the form and submit it. At the very least a personal computer and internet connection are required to access the form so that it may be printed out if electing to submit a paper copy. NOAA strongly encourages that these forms are submitted electronically via the NOAA Grants Online system to facilitate the review, revision and approval processes. The forms themselves do not require that the grantee have access to any other additional technology beyond a PC and internet connection, although the quality of the report may be enhanced by such technology. For example, the reporting form does request that geographic coordinates of project locations be

provided. Internet mapping tools are powerful enough to provide a sufficient level of detail in this regard, however more precise measurements may be taken by hand held GPS units used in situ during project activities that would give NOAA a better representation of where a project takes place.

4. Describe efforts to identify duplication

Because this information collection is directly linked to understanding progress of specific marine debris activities funding directly by the NOAA MDP, there is very little likelihood that this information collection would be a duplication of an existing tool. There is a small chance that NOAA's reporting requirements could duplicate reporting requirements that a grantee has to other funding sources for their project, if it is indeed being funded by multiple sources with similar progress reporting conditions. The duplication in such cases would likely be minimal however, or at least the burden would be insignificant since NOAA does not request any information that could not also serve a grantee's reporting requirements to their other sources.

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

The NOAA MDP works with all grantees (regardless of organization type) at the start of a project to identify the most critical elements of the project on which they will be reporting, as such there is agreement at the outset of what the reporting parameters will be. This is to ensure that NOAA better understands the project implementation plan, and that grantees understand, agree to, and have a hand in shaping their reporting responsibilities under the award.

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

If the information collection is not conducted or is conducted less frequently, the ability to account for the expenditure of federal funds for the marine debris project activities supported by the NOAA MDP would be substantially diminished. Project evaluations would be informed only by periodic but infrequent site visits by regional program staff and ad hoc updates otherwise provided to NOAA. Additionally, it will not meet the standards of the NOAA Grants Management Division for semi-annual reporting, and would make it more difficult to determine and correct poor grantee performance, since less frequent collection provides insufficient information to monitor awards to ensure Federal monies are properly used

If the collection is not approved, standardizing what information NOAA MDP can collect on a project would be difficult, time-consuming, and may not be as meaningful especially if it is an incomplete picture of a project's progress.

The agency's ability to maintain the public trust and ensure accountability of public funds would be meaningfully reduced. The information used by NOAA to communicate to agency, executive and congressional leadership about the disposition and efficacy of program funds would be informed by an inferior level of detail and confidence.

Altering collection frequency may also inhibit timely responses to Freedom of Information Act requests that may be submitted.

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 April 2, 2015 (80 FR 17728) solicited public comments. No comments were received.

Prior to publishing the Federal Register Notice NOAA MDP staff asked four existing grantees to comment on the form and provide their opinions on approximate time it might take to fill out, along with any general comments they might have about the form. This process informed our burden estimate provided in the Federal Register Notice, and allowed us the opportunity to enhance the form with practical feedback prior to publication of the Notice. Grantee response was positive, suggesting that such a form provides good guidance, structure, and clarity to the progress reporting process.

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

No such payments or gifts will be provided to respondents, other than acceptable remuneration of contractors or grantees implementing projects supported by NOAA MDP.

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

The information collection does not request confidential information, or personally identifiable information beyond the name and organization details of the project's principal investigator. The information collection may be used by NOAA MDP to publicly communicate about the accomplishments of the project, and this is stated on the information collection form. As such, progress reports may be posted to the NOAA MDP website to accomplish those communication goals. As a matter of internal policy, NOAA MDP does not share publicly anything but final reports and documentation; interim reports are not made publicly available. During the initial scoping with grantees (described in Question 8 above), NOAA MDP asked grantees whether they had any issues with final reports being made public, and all agreed that such a policy was an acceptable practice.

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 such sensitive information is requested or collected.

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

Between new grantees and existing grantees, NOAA MDP estimates that about 70 respondents will each report twice per year. Grantees who were consulted during the initial scoping for the Federal Register Notice indicated that it would take, on average, between 8.7 and 11.3 hours to collect and report on all the information required by this collection. This equates to an overall average of 10 hours per report. Since reporting is required twice per year, we estimate that 20 hours per year is required, per grantee, to satisfy NOAA’s reporting requirements. The grantees that NOAA MDP consulted have experience in submitting a similar reporting form for their grants, as such these estimates are based on actual time requirements.

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).

No additional costs are required to respond to this information collection beyond the time-value of personnel responsible for completing the form. Any cost requirements for a personal computer or internet connection may be supported through the NOAA grant. Reports are submitted through Grants Online, which does not require a paid subscription or any other cost to the grantee.

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

Annualized costs to the government due to the NOAA progress reporting process result from the amount of time it takes for NOAA staff to review and approve a report. Two NOAA MDP staff review each report submitted. It takes anywhere from 15 to 60 minutes to review a report, depending on the amount of detail provided, and the amount of supplementary materials (maps, PSAs, graphs, monitoring reports, etc...) provided. This is an average of 37.5 minutes per reviewer, per report. This leads to a total of 75 minutes of review, per report. Assuming an average FTE annual salary of \$70,000, this equals about 8% of an FTE for all 70 anticipated semi-annual information collections.

Task	Number of NOAA Reviews / Year	Total Time per NOAA Review (mins)	Total NOAA Hours of Review / Year	Total NOAA Cost
NOAA Report Review	140	75	175	\$5,889

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

No program changes or adjustments are being made.

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

NOAA will not use the information collected here to inform any publication. Final reports or other publications submitted as deliverables under the grant may also be published on the NOAA MDP website (marinedebris.noaa.gov). It may also be housed in the NOAA Marine Debris Clearinghouse (<https://clearinghouse.marinedebris.noaa.gov>).

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.

We are not requesting this.

18. Explain each exception to the certification statement.

Not applicable.

B. COLLECTIONS OF INFORMATION EMPLOYING STATISTICAL METHODS

This collection will not employ statistical methods.

C. Take any action to acquire from or to facilitate the acquisition or attempted acquisition from a Denied Person of any item subject to the EAR that has been exported from the United States;

D. Obtain from a Denied Person in the United States any item subject to the EAR with knowledge or reason to know that the item will be, or is intended to be, exported from the United States; or

E. Engage in any transaction to service any item subject to the EAR that has been or will be exported from the United States and which is owned, possessed or controlled by a Denied Person, or service any item, of whatever origin, that is owned, possessed or controlled by a Denied Person if such service involves the use of any item subject to the EAR that has been or will be exported from the United States. For purposes of this paragraph, servicing means installation, maintenance, repair, modification or testing.

Third, that, after notice and opportunity for comment as provided in section 766.23 of the EAR, any other person, firm, corporation, or business organization related to a Denied Person by affiliation, ownership, control, or position of responsibility in the conduct of trade or related services may also be made subject to the provisions of this Order.

In accordance with the provisions of Section 766.24(e) of the EAR, X-TREME Motors LLC and/or XTREME Outdoor Store may, at any time, appeal this Order by filing a full written statement in support of the appeal with the Office of the Administrative Law Judge, U.S. Coast Guard ALJ Docketing Center, 40 South Gay Street, Baltimore, Maryland 21202-4022. In accordance with the provisions of Sections 766.23(c)(2) and 766.24(e)(3) of the EAR, Tyson Preece, Corey Justin Preece and/or Toby Green may, at any time, appeal their inclusion as a related person by filing a full written statement in support of the appeal with the Office of the Administrative Law Judge, U.S. Coast Guard ALJ Docketing Center, 40 South Gay Street, Baltimore, Maryland 21202-4022.

In accordance with the provisions of Section 766.24(d) of the EAR, BIS may seek renewal of this Order by filing a written request not later than 20 days before the expiration date. The Respondents may oppose such a request to renew this Order by filing a written submission with the Assistant Secretary for Export Enforcement, which must be received not later than seven days before the expiration date of the Order.

A copy of this Order shall be served on the Respondents and shall be published in the **Federal Register**.

This Order is effective immediately and shall remain in effect for 180 days.

Dated: March 27, 2015.

David W. Mills,

Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Export Enforcement.

[FR Doc. 2015-07569 Filed 4-1-15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE CODE P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

Proposed Information Collection; Comment Request; NOAA Marine Debris Program Performance Progress Report

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

ACTION: Notice.

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

DATES: Written comments must be submitted on or before June 1, 2015.

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 Tom Barry at (301) 713-4248 x161 or tom.barry@noaa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Abstract

This request is for a new information collection.

The NOAA Marine Debris Program (MDP) supports national and international efforts to research, prevent, and reduce the impacts of marine debris. The MDP is a centralized office within NOAA that coordinates and supports activities, both within the bureau and with other federal agencies, that address marine debris and its impacts. In addition to inter-agency coordination, the MDP uses partnerships with state and local agencies, tribes, non-governmental organizations, academia, and industry to

investigate and solve the problems that stem from marine debris through research, prevention, and reduction activities, in order to protect and conserve our nation's marine environment and ensure navigation safety.

The Marine Debris Research, Prevention, and Reduction Act (33 U.S.C. 1951 *et seq.*) as amended by the Marine Debris Act Amendments of 2012 (Pub. L. 112-213, Title VI, Sec. 603, 126 Stat. 1576, December 20, 2012) outlines three central program components for the MDP to undertake: (1) Mapping, identification, impact assessment, removal, and prevention; (2) reducing and preventing fishing gear loss; and (3) outreach to stakeholders and the general public. To address these components, the Marine Debris Act authorized the MDP to establish several competitive grant programs on marine debris research, prevention and removal that provide federal funding to non-federal applicants throughout the coastal United States and territories.

The terms and conditions of the financial assistance awarded through these grant programs require regular progress reporting and communication of project accomplishments to MDP. Progress reports contain information related to, among other things, the overall short and long-term goals of the project, project methods and monitoring techniques, actual accomplishments (such as tons of debris removed from an ecosystem, numbers of volunteers participating in a cleanup project, etc.), status of approved activities, challenges or potential roadblocks to future progress, and lessons learned. This information collection enables MDP to monitor and evaluate the activities supported by federal funds to ensure accountability to the public and to ensure that funds are used consistent with the purpose for which they were appropriated. It also ensures that reported information is standardized in such a way that allows for it to be meaningfully synthesized across a diverse set of projects and project types. MDP uses the information collected in a variety of ways to communicate with federal and non-federal partners and stakeholders on individual project and general program accomplishments.

The MDP operates within the Office of Response and Restoration as part of NOAA's National Ocean Service.

II. Method of Collection

Respondents to this collection may choose to submit electronically or in paper format.

III. Data

OMB Control Number: 0648–xxxx.

Form Number(s): None.

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

Affected Public: Business or other for-profit organizations, not-for-profit institutions, state, local or tribal government.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 70.

Estimated Time per Response: 10 hours (semi-annually).

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 1,400.

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

IV. Request for Comments

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

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

Dated: March 30, 2015.

Sarah Brabson,

NOAA PRA Clearance Officer.

[FR Doc. 2015–07547 Filed 4–1–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE CODE 3510-JE-P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE**Office of the Secretary****Africa Partnership Forum (APF) Day; Notice of Meeting**

AGENCY: United States Africa Command (USAFRICOM), DoD.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: The Headquarters, United States Africa Command (USAFRTCOM), plans to host an Africa Partnership Forum (APF) Day, June 8–12, 2015. For planning purposes, AFRICOM is gathering information on potential number or “head count” of business or

commercial entities that may be interested in participating in the Africa Partnership Forum Day.

DATES: June 8–12, 2015.

ADDRESSES: Stage Palladium Theater, Plieninger Str. 102 70567 Stuttgart, Germany.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Interested parties may send their intent to participate to the following email addresses: (1) AFRICOM Stuttgart ACJ95 Mailbox, africom.stuttgart.acj95.mbx.ppp-branch@mail.mil; (2) <http://www.ncsi.com/africom/2015/index.php>.

Please include your company name, point of contact information, the number of potential attendees, and indicate whether U.S. or non-U.S. business entity. State in the subject line: “USAFRICOM Africa Partnership Forum (APF): June 8–12, 2015.”

Please respond to this notice no later than close-of-business on April 10, 2015. The three-day, USAFRICOM APF 8–12 will be held in Stuttgart, Germany. Specific details of the event, including a detailed schedule will be published at a later date.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Monday, June 8, from 2 p.m. to 5 p.m., will focus on arrivals, registration, networking, and a ‘No-Host’ social.

Tuesday, June 9, from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. and Wednesday, June 10, from 8 a.m. to 4 p.m., will consist of focused topic plenary presentations and facilitate discussions to obtain greater mutual situational understanding; develop new concepts, approaches, insights, and innovative solutions; and to capture opportunities for shared cooperative engagements.

Thursday, June 11, from 8 a.m. to 2 p.m., will focus on vendors’ expositions showcasing/demonstrating available products and capabilities and networking to foster greater relationships with commercial industry, NGOs, academia, corporate social foundations, international/private and other organizational entities.

Friday, June 12 will focus on departure of attendees and compiling of comments and contributions of participants.

Dated: March 30, 2015.

Aaron Siegel,

Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.

[FR Doc. 2015–07575 Filed 4–1–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE CODE 5001-06-P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE**Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers****Notice of Intent To Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the East Rockaway Inlet to Rockaway Inlet and Jamaica Bay Reformulation Study**

AGENCY: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, DOD.

ACTION: Notice of intent.

SUMMARY: In compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, New York District (Corps) with (New York State Department of Environmental Conservation as local sponsor) is preparing an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) in accordance with Council on Environmental Quality’s NEPA regulations; Corps’ principles and guidelines as defined in Engineering Regulations (ER) 1105–2–100, Planning Guidance Notebook, and ER 200–2–2, Procedures for Implementing NEPA; and other applicable Federal and State environmental laws for the proposed Atlantic Coast of New York, East Rockaway Inlet to Rockaway Inlet and Jamaica Bay Coastal Storm Risk Management Feasibility Study. The study is re-assessing the feasibility of coastal storm risk management alternatives to be implemented within the congressionally authorized project area. This overall study area includes the entire Rockaway peninsula as well as the back-bay communities surrounding Jamaica Bay. During Hurricane Sandy, both Rockaway and Jamaica Bay communities were severely affected with large areas subjected to erosion, storm surge, and wave damage along the Atlantic Ocean shoreline and flooding of communities within and surrounding Jamaica Bay. Along the Rockaways, the Atlantic Ocean surge and waves exceeded the island height, resulting in flow of water across the peninsula, and contributing to the flooding along the shoreline of the interior of Jamaica Bay. Hurricane Sandy illustrated the need to re-evaluate the entire peninsula and back-bay area as a system, when considering risk-management measures. Acknowledging the amount of analyses required to comprehensively reevaluate the study area considering the influence of the Atlantic Ocean shorefront conditions on the back-bay system, a single Hurricane Sandy General Reevaluation Report and EIS (GRR/EIS) will be prepared. The Corps will use a tiered process to