NOTICE OF OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET ACTION

Date 04/07/2017

Department of Commerce
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

FOR CERTIFYING OFFICIAL: Steve Cooper
FOR CLEARANCE OFFICER: Jennifer Jessup

In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act, OMB has taken action on your request received 03/02/2017

ACTION REQUESTED: New collection (Request for a new OMB Control Number)
TYPE OF REVIEW REQUESTED: Regular
ICR REFERENCE NUMBER: 201703-0648-001
AGENCY ICR TRACKING NUMBER:
TITLE: Chesapeake Bay Watershed Environmental Literacy Indicator Tool
LIST OF INFORMATION COLLECTIONS: See next page

OMB ACTION: Approved with change
OMB CONTROL NUMBER: 0648-0753
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: 04/30/2020 DISCONTINUE DATE:

BURDEN:	RESPONSES	HOURS	COSTS
Previous	0	0	0
New	352	528	0
Difference			
Change due to New Statute	0	0	0
Change due to Agency Discretion	352	528	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
Deputy and Acting Administrator,
Office Of Information And Regulatory Affairs

List of ICs			
IC Title	Form No.	Form Name	CFR Citation
Environmental Literacy Indicator Tool	NA	Environmental Literacy Indicator Tool	

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/HC

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 Chesapeake Bay Watershed Environmental Literacy Indicator Tool

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

9. Keywords

10. Abstract

The Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement of 2014 specifies review of progress towards the environmental literacy goal: ‘‘Enable students in the region to graduate with the knowledge and skills needed to act responsibly to protect and restore their local watersheds.’’ The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), on behalf of the Chesapeake Bay Program, will ask the state education agencies for Maryland, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Virginia, West Virginia, and the District of Columbia to survey their public school districts to determine: (1) district capacity to implement a comprehensive and systemic approach to environmental literacy education, (2) student participation in Meaningful Watershed Educational Experiences during the school year, (3) sustainability practices at schools, and (4) district needs for improving environmental literacy education programming. Public school districts are asked to complete the survey on the status of their district on a set of key indicators for the four areas listed above. One individual from each district is asked to complete this survey once every two years.

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

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

13. Annual recordkeeping and reporting burden
a. Number of respondents 503
b. Total annual responses 352
1. Percentage of these responses collected electronically 100 %
c. Total annual hours requested 528
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 0
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. P 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 (*check all that apply*)
a. [ ] Recordkeeping b. [ ] Third party disclosure
c. [✔] Reporting
1. [ ] On occasion 2. [ ] Weekly 3. [ ] Monthly
4. [ ] Quarterly 5. [ ] Semi-annually 6. [ ] Annually
7. [✔] Biennially 8. [ ] Other (describe) ____

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

18. Agency Contact (person who can best answer questions regarding the content of this submission)
Name: Shannon Sprague
Phone: (410) 267-5664

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 Patricia Montanio, Director, Habitat Conservation	Date 2/27/2017
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: 2017.04.07 15:10:02 -04'00'	Date

SUPPORTING STATEMENT
CHESAPEAKE BAY WATERSHED ENVIRONMENTAL LITERACY INDICATOR TOOL
OMB CONTROL NO. 0648-XXXX

A. JUSTIFICATION

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

The Chesapeake Bay Watershed Environmental Literacy Indicator Tool (ELIT) was developed to monitor public school districts' capacity and progress towards meeting the environmental literacy goal of the 2014 Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement (http://www.chesapeakebay.net/documents/ChesapeakeBayWatershedAgreemenetFINAL.pdf): ''Enable every student in the region to graduate with the knowledge and skills to act responsibly to protect and restore their local watershed.'' The signatories of the Agreement included the mayor of the District of Columbia and the governors of the states of Delaware, Maryland, New York, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and West Virginia. The general statutory authority for this program is the National Environmental Policy Act, 42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.

The ELIT will monitor public school districts' progress towards three outcomes of the Agreement:

1) Student Outcome:
   Continually increase students' age-appropriate understanding of the watershed through participation in teacher-supported, meaningful watershed educational experiences (MWEEs) and rigorous, inquiry-based instruction, with a target of at least one meaningful watershed educational experience in elementary, middle, and high school, depending on available resources.
2) Sustainable Schools Outcome:
   Continually increase the number of schools in the region that reduce the impact of their buildings and grounds on their local watershed, environment, and human health through best practices, including student-led protection and restoration projects.
3) Environmental Literacy Planning Outcome:
   Each participating Bay jurisdiction should develop a comprehensive and systemic approach to environmental literacy for all students in the region that includes policies, practices and voluntary metrics that support the environmental literacy Goals and Outcomes of this Agreement.

The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), on behalf of the Chesapeake Bay Program, will ask the state education agencies for Maryland, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Virginia, West Virginia, and the District of Columbia to survey their public school districts to determine progress toward these three outcomes, as well as areas where public school districts may need additional support:

1) student participation in MWEEs during the school year (Outcome 1),
2) sustainability practices at schools (Outcome 2),
3) school district capacity to implement a comprehensive and systemic approach to environmental literacy education (Outcome 3), and
4) school district needs to support improvements in environmental literacy education.

In addition to monitoring progress on the environmental literacy goal of the Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement, the information collected will inform several Chesapeake Bay Program partner agencies' work to support the school districts' environmental literacy education efforts.

Public school district representatives will be asked to complete the ELIT survey on the status of their school district on a set of key indicators for the four areas listed in Question 1 above (see ELIT, Attachment 1). One representative from each school district's administration is asked to complete this survey once every two years. Respondents will submit their information electronically on web-based survey forms.

ELIT data collection will begin on June 1, 2017 and remain open through September 2017. Data will be analyzed and summarized in fall 2017 and presented publicly in winter/spring 2017-18. The same timeline will be followed for the 2019 data collection.

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 results of the biennial ELIT survey will be analyzed and reported to the internal stakeholders of the Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement. Participating states will receive a summarized report of findings for the full watershed, a summary of findings for their state, and comparisons of results between states. These aggregated results will be used by the state agencies to understand progress of their school districts over time, and to inform decision-making about strategies and priorities for future work with school districts.

The biennial reporting will also be used by the Chesapeake Bay Program to understand progress of school districts in the watershed, understand differences between jurisdictions, and guide strategy for providing targeted support in each state.

State agencies and other stakeholders will also have access to the responses of each public school district, which they will use to customize outreach and support to a particular school district, based on their status and needs.

Beyond the internal stakeholders, aggregated results from the ELIT survey will be made available for public use in these formats:

1) Results will be summarized on the Engaged Communities page of the publicly-available ChesapeakeProgress website (http://www.chesapeakeprogress.com/engaged-communities#environmental-literacy), which is designed to help oversight groups track the progress toward the Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement goals.
2) A Summary Report (PDF) will be produced and made available for download on the Chesapeake Bay Program website.
3) Chesapeake Bay Program staff will include a selection of results in presentations delivered at relevant education-focused professional conferences.

It is anticipated that the information collected will be disseminated to the public or used to support publicly disseminated information. NOAA's Chesapeake Bay Office 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 NOAA Information Quality Guidelines for objectivity, utility, and integrity (http://www.cio.noaa.gov/services_programs/IQ_Guidelines_103014.html). Prior to dissemination, the information will be subjected to quality control measures and a pre-dissemination review pursuant to Section 515 of Public Law 106-554.

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

The ELIT data collection will be electronic. School district respondents will receive email prompts to complete the online instrument accessed through Qualtrics, an online survey platform. The Qualtrics ELIT will have built-in "logic" prompts so respondents complete only items relevant to their location and experience. Data will be stored on Qualtrics' server and then downloaded by NOAA. The proposed data collection process minimizes costs, while also being sensitive to issues of respondent burden, accuracy, and efficiency. Due to the nature of their administrative roles within public school districts, it is assumed that all respondents will have access to the Internet at work, where they will also have access to the information needed to complete the survey. In addition, it is likely that respondents would have additional routes to complete the survey, including internet access at home, on a smartphone, or at a public institution such as a local library.

4. Describe efforts to identify duplication.

There are no similar data collections in progress.

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

An iterative review process, which included critical review of survey items by school district representatives, was used to eliminate any non-essential questions from the ELIT and to ensure question parameters were limited to information that is readily known or attainable by prospective respondents. This effort has kept the instrument as streamlined as possible while ensuring that sufficient data is collected to assess progress towards the environmental literacy goal.

To minimize time spent completing the online form, respondents will be provided with a Word copy of the questions so they can research responses before starting the online ELIT.

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

If the data were not collected, the Chesapeake Bay Program would not fulfill its responsibility to monitor progress towards the goals of the 2014 Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement, nor

would it be able to develop support strategies that are most targeted to the needs of the school districts it serves.

The Agreement specifies the review and updating of strategies related to these outcomes every two years. The primary purpose of the data is to inform this revision and decision-making, so the ELIT data collection must coincide with this process and cannot be executed less frequently.

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

The collection will be conducted in a manner consistent with OMB guidelines.

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

A Federal Register Notice published on December 21, 2016 (81 FR 93666) solicited public comments. No comments were received.

The ELIT was developed in consultation with representatives from the state education agencies and other partners who are part of the Chesapeake Bay Program's Environmental Education Workgroup, with support from an external evaluation firm to guide the process and develop the tool. The process included, as noted above, an external review by school district representatives on the feasibility of the data collection method and specific information requested, and subsequent revision of the ELIT survey. In addition, the states' departments of education led a data collection effort and distributed a version of the ELIT questions in their own 2015 survey. Respondents to that survey were asked how difficult it was to provide requested data. In response to the question, "On a scale from 1 to 10, how difficult was it to provide the data for the survey overall? (1=Very difficult, 10=Very easy)," the mean response from 265 respondents was 4.9 (SD=2.3).

In response to the open-ended question, "Do you have any suggestions for improving the design and/or functionality of the survey?", 71 respondents provided suggestions, which were reviewed and addressed. The most common difficulty was that a more appropriate respondent in the district be found; this suggestion was mainly the result of one state that distributed to teachers, when it is most easily completed by a district-level staff person. The proposed ELIT data collection invitation materials and recruitment process offer suggestions as to who would be the right staff person to complete the questions. The other most common suggestion was to shorten the survey and eliminate redundancy, including eliminate questions that are available from public data sources; this suggestion was addressed by excluding questions that can be obtained through public sources (e.g., sustainable schools certification, whether the school district was in the watershed, enrollment data), and limiting additional questions from state agencies to three questions. Other suggestions included having the survey open during the autumn, to allow easier completion, which was accommodated in the ELIT data collection plan.

The proposed ELIT will collect feedback from the respondents about difficulty to complete the survey.

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

Payments or gifts from federal agencies are not provided to respondents. Some state education agencies, which will facilitate the data collection, may opt to use incentives as appropriate to their state and contexts.

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

Assurance of confidentiality is not provided to respondents. No personally identifiable information will be collected from the respondents; thus, the Privacy Act does not apply to this data collection.

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

No questions of a sensitive nature are asked on the ELIT.

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

The ELIT will be distributed to all public school districts in the District of Columbia, Delaware, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and West Virginia for a total of 754 public school districts (see Table 1).

Table 1. Number of Public School Districts by State

State	Number of Public School Districts
DC	1
DE	39
MD	24
PA	500
VA	135
WV	55
Total	**754**

A 70% response is expected for the school districts as a whole. This response rate is estimated based on past data collection efforts from another NOAA education program (B-WET), in which 2016 response rates ranged from 38% to 71%, depending on the familiarity of the respondent with the sender of the survey. In this case, since respondents will receive the request from their state education contacts, along with two reminders to complete the survey, we hope to achieve the high end of that range.

One respondent from each public school district will be asked to submit a completed ELIT form

every other year, thus the annualized number of respondents is 503. With a 70% response rate, the annualized number of responses over three years is therefore 352.

The response time average is expected to be 90 minutes. The annualized response time burden is therefore expected to be 31,680 minutes or 528 hours.

The mean hourly wage for an education administrator is $43.74 per hour according to the U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. National Occupational Employment and Wage Estimates, United States, May 2015. Thus, the annualized labor cost is expected to be $23,095.

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 are no direct costs to respondents. The only costs are the costs of respondents' time required to provide information as explained in Question 12 above. No capital equipment, start-up, or record maintenance requirements are placed on respondents.

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

The estimated cost to the Federal government of implementing the ELIT is based on the government's contracted cost for periodic study and analysis activities and personnel cost of government employees involved in oversight and/or analysis. For the data collection activities for which OMB approval is currently being requested, the overall cost to the government is $23,200 over a three-year period. This includes:

- $12,000 total (annualized to $4,000) for contracted data analysis and results report following each implementation of the ELIT;
- $11, 200 total (annualized to $3,733) for government personnel costs in overseeing survey activity (80 hours in each year the ELIT is implemented).

The total annualized cost is $7,733.

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

This is a new data collection; there are no program changes or adjustments.

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

The data will be summarized using descriptive statistics, such as frequency of response or mean response for each item. For the items regarding environmental literacy planning activities, responses to each item will be given a score based on level of readiness, and a total score across all questions will be calculated and used for reporting an overall readiness score. The results will be presented as an aggregated watershed-wide summary and by state.

These data will be published on the ChesapeakeProgress website (as described in question 2 above), including displays of change in aggregated results over time.

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

The OMB approval expiration date will be displayed at the beginning of the ELIT.

18. <u>Explain each exception to the certification statement</u>.

There will be no exceptions to the certification statement.

SUPPORTING STATEMENT
CHESAPEAKE BAY WATERSHED ENVIRONMENTAL LITERACY INDICATOR TOOL
OMB CONTROL NO. 0648-XXXX

B. COLLECTIONS OF INFORMATION EMPLOYING STATISTICAL METHODS

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

As described in Table 1 in Part A Question 12, there are 754 public school districts included in this data collection. The data collection will be a census, therefore no sampling will occur. The minimum expected response rate is 50%, with a hope of reaching a 70% response rate – see B3 for rationale.

2. Describe the procedures for the collection, including: the statistical methodology for stratification and sample selection; the estimation procedure; the degree of accuracy needed for the purpose described in the justification; any unusual problems requiring specialized sampling procedures; and any use of periodic (less frequent than annual) data collection cycles to reduce burden.

This data collection will occur every two years to track the progress of the Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement environmental literacy goals and to reduce burden on respondents. It will not involve sampling.

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.

Many efforts have been and will be made to minimize the burden on the respondents and maximize the response rates. The ELIT has been reviewed, modified, and streamlined to collect only data essential for tracking progress on the environmental literacy goal, and has eliminated questions where data can be obtained in other ways (e.g., sustainable school certifications).

Although this is a data collection initiated by the Chesapeake Bay Program, the ELIT will be distributed by the state education agencies (SEAs) directly to their school districts (Attachment 2). Chesapeake Bay Program partners have developed mutually-supportive relationships with the

state education agencies and maintain high levels of communication and trust. The SEA representatives have committed to reach out to their states' school districts to encourage high levels of participation in the data collection, including sending out multiple reminders for participation, providing opportunities at statewide meetings that dedicate time to complete the survey, and possibly creating incentive programs. Data collection will be open for an extended period of time – from late spring through early fall – to allow school districts to complete the items at a time that is most conducive to their academic calendars (spring, summer, or fall).

In an effort to maximize the utility of the data to the state partners, up to three customized questions, related to environmental education, may be added at the end of the ELIT at the request of state education agencies. These questions will be limited to three to ensure the additional survey time is minimal. The data collected from state-specific questions will be distributed to the state education agencies and will not be used by the Chesapeake Bay Program.

If less than a 70% response rate is achieved, a non-response analysis will be conducted to ensure that the results are generalizable. Any publicly available data about non-responding school districts will be obtained, such as number of schools, student enrollment data, number of Title 1 schools, and location in or out of the watershed. Non-responding school districts will be compared to responding school districts to determine whether there is a significant difference in which districts chose not to respond.

4. Describe any tests of procedures or methods to be undertaken. Tests are encouraged as effective means to refine collections, but if ten or more test respondents are involved OMB must give prior approval.

No additional tests of the ELIT will be conducted for this data collection.

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.

Federal agency contact for questions about data collection management and use of results:

Shannon Sprague, Manager
Environmental Literacy and Partnerships
NOAA Chesapeake Bay Office
Shannon.sprague@noaa.gov
410-267-5664

Consultant contact for questions about ELIT instrument design and data analysis:

Jessica Sickler, Principal
J. Sickler Consulting, LLC
jessica@jsickler.net
412-552-3027

Attachments

1. Environmental Literacy Indicator Tool (ELIT)
2. Sample email invitation and reminder to school district representatives

Attachment 3: Email Invitation and Reminder

ELIT Survey Invitation Email

Text may be slightly modified by distributing State Education Agencies to personalize messages to respondents.

Dear [NAME],
The Environmental Literacy Indicator Tool (ELIT) is a federally-directed effort to collect information from all public school districts in the Mid-Atlantic region every two years to monitor the status of environmental literacy efforts at a district level. The results from these data help the Chesapeake Bay Program Education Workgroup most effectively support local efforts to implement strategies that support students' environmental literacy.

We request that you – or the appropriate district staff-person – complete the Environmental Literacy Indicator Tool (ELIT) by [DEADLINE] to provide important information about activities related to district-wide environmental literacy curriculum and planning activities in your state. The results from these data help the Chesapeake Bay Program Education Workgroup most effectively support local efforts to implement strategies that support students' environmental literacy.

Follow this link to the ELIT questionnaire:
[Link]
Or copy and paste the URL below into your internet browser:
[URL]

The ELIT takes an average of about 90 minutes to complete, which includes the time to obtain needed information about district-wide activities. To review the questions ahead of time to help you find the information or identify the right staff person to complete the survey, click here: [link to PDF of survey]

Who should complete the ELIT for your district? Only one person per district should complete the ELIT. The best respondent is someone who works at the district-level and has most familiarity with environmental education activities across the district. If your district does not have a position similar to an environmental education coordinator, consider a science curriculum coordinator or similar role. Teachers or individuals familiar with just one school or grade-range would have difficulty completing these questions.

To review the questions ahead of time to help you find the information or identify the right staff person to complete the survey, click here: [link to PDF of survey]

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. If you have any concerns, please contact either of the contacts below:

Name, State Education Agency
[signature block]

Shannon Sprague
NOAA Environmental Literacy Manager
[signature block]

OMB Control Number: 0648-xxxx, Expires: xx/xx/2020

ELIT Survey Reminder Email

Text may be slightly modified by distributing State Education Agencies to personalize messages to respondents.

Dear [NAME],
This is a friendly reminder that we need feedback on the Environmental Literacy Indicator Tool (ELIT) from all public school districts in [STATE NAME]. We have not yet received a response from your district, and want to encourage your district to complete this survey.

The ELIT is a federally-directed effort to collect information from all public school districts in the Mid-Atlantic region every two years to monitor the status of environmental literacy efforts at a district level. The results from these data help the Chesapeake Bay Program Education Workgroup most effectively support local efforts to implement strategies that support students' environmental literacy.

We request that you – or the appropriate district staff-person – complete the ELIT about district-wide environmental literacy curriculum and planning activities by [DEADLINE].

Follow this link to the ELIT questionnaire:
[Link]
Or copy and paste the URL below into your internet browser:
[URL]

The ELIT takes an average of about 90 minutes to complete, which includes the time to obtain needed information about district-wide activities. On the first page of the survey, you can download a complete copy of the questions to aid you in finding the needed information.

Who should complete the ELIT for our district? Only one person per district should complete the ELIT. The best respondent is someone who works at the district-level and has most familiarity with environmental education activities across the district. If your district does not have a position similar to an environmental education coordinator, consider a science curriculum coordinator or similar role. Teachers or individuals familiar with just one school or grade-range would have difficulty completing these questions.

To review the questions ahead of time to help you find the information or identify the right staff person to complete the survey, click here: [link to PDF of survey]

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. If you have any concerns, please contact either of the contacts below:

Name, State Education Agency
[signature block]

Shannon Sprague
NOAA Environmental Literacy Manager
[signature block]

OMB Control Number: 0648-xxxx, Expires: xx/xx/2020

OMB Control Number: 0648-xxxx
Expiration Date: xx/xx/2020

Attachment 2: Environmental Literacy Indicator Tool Survey

This is a voluntary survey.

Paperwork Reduction Act Statement

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 90 minutes per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other suggestions for reducing this burden to Shannon Sprague, NOAA Chesapeake Bay Office, 410 Severn Avenue, Suite 207, Annapolis, MD 21403.

Responses are voluntary, but are not confidential. Information will be treated in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act (5 USC 552).

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

Important Tips before You Begin the ELIT

- We recommend that you preview the Environmental Literacy Indicator Tool (ELIT) before completing it online. Download a Word version of the survey at this link: Environmental Literacy Indicator Tool.
- We recommend you first make note of your responses within this "offline" document, including consulting with colleagues, as needed, to answer the questions accurately.
- Use this online survey to enter and submit your responses. If you've typed answers into Word, you can copy-and-paste into the online survey.
- We recommend that you enter the answers online during one sitting. Due to security settings on some computers, your system may not retain previously entered responses between two different sessions.

Introduction

The purpose of the Chesapeake Bay Program's Environmental Literacy Indicator Tool (ELIT) is to help local and state schools systems collect important information that will help advance the implementation of environmental education efforts in schools in the mid-Atlantic region.

This tool, the data collected, and related efforts supporting environmental education in the region are in direct support of the Environmental Literacy Goal and Outcomes of the new Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement (signed 6/19/14).

> **Environmental Literacy Goal:** Enable every student in the region to graduate with the knowledge and skills to act responsibly to protect and restore their local watershed.
> **Environmental Literacy Planning Outcome:** Each participating Bay jurisdiction should develop a comprehensive and systemic approach to environmental literacy for all students in the region that includes policies, practices and voluntary metrics that support the environmental literacy Goals and Outcomes of this Agreement.
> **Student Outcome:** Continually increase students' age-appropriate understanding of the watershed through participation in teacher-supported, meaningful watershed educational experiences and rigorous, inquiry-based instruction, with a target of at least one meaningful watershed educational experience in elementary, middle and high school depending on available resources.
> **Sustainable Schools Outcome:** Continually increase the number of schools in the region that reduce the impact of their buildings and grounds on their local watershed, environment and human health through best practices, including student-led protection and restoration projects.

The underlying principles of the outcomes and the resulting elements of this tool are founded on research-based best practices in the field of environmental education. The results from these data collection efforts will provide valuable information to states and the Chesapeake Bay Program Education Workgroup about how best to support local efforts to create and implement comprehensive strategies to support student environmental literacy. It will also be used by major funding partners, including the NOAA Bay Watershed Education and Training (B-WET) Program and the Chesapeake Bay Trust, to inform funding priorities and decisions. Therefore, accurate reports of both accomplishments and gaps are important.

Please complete the five sections of the Environmental Literacy Indicator Tool:

Section I: Environmental Literacy Planning
Section II: Student Participation in Meaningful Watershed Educational Experiences (MWEEs)
Section III: Sustainable Schools
Section IV: Environmental Education Improvement Efforts
Section V: Feedback on ELIT

If you have questions about this tool, please contact:
Shannon Sprague, Co-Chair
Chesapeake Bay Program Education Workgroup
NOAA Chesapeake Bay Office
shannon.sprague@noaa.gov
410.267.5664

Please complete this contact information before you begin completing the Environmental Literacy Survey.

**required question*
Please select your state from the drop-down list below:

- Delaware
- District of Columbia
- Maryland
- Pennsylvania
- Virginia
- West Virginia

**required question*
Please select your school district or local education agency (LEA) from the dropdown list.
[pre-populated drop-down list with LEA names]

**required question*
What is your primary job title/responsibility? (please select the title that most closely matches your job)

- District-level superintendent
- District-level assistant superintendent
- District-level director of curriculum/instruction/education
- District-level curriculum supervisor/coordinator
- District-level STEM supervisor/coordinator
- District-level business administrator

- School principal
- School assistant principal
- Classroom teacher
- Other, please describe: _____

Section I: Environmental Literacy Planning

Environmental Literacy Planning Outcome: *Each participating Bay jurisdiction should develop a comprehensive and systemic approach to environmental literacy for all students in the region that includes policies, practices and voluntary metrics that support the environmental literacy Goals and Outcomes of this Agreement.*

State departments of education and local education agencies play an important role in establishing expectations and guidelines, and providing support for the development and implementation of environmental education programs within their schools. To ensure that every student in the region graduates with the knowledge and skills to act responsibly to protect and restore their local watershed as called for in the Chesapeake Watershed Agreement, environmental education should be embedded into the local curriculum and Meaningful Watershed Educational Experiences (MWEE Definition 2014.pdf) should occur at least once during each level of instruction (elementary, middle, and high school).

In the development of plans and the delivery of programs, local education agencies can also benefit from partnerships with environmental education organizations, natural resource agencies, universities, businesses, and other organizations that have a wealth of applicable products and services as well as a cadre of scientific and professional experts that can complement the classroom teacher's strengths and heighten the impact of environmental instruction both in the classroom and in the field.

The following questions are intended to help assess the current capacity of your school division/local education agency (LEA) to implement a comprehensive and systemic approach to environmental education. **Please review the following elements (a-f) and, using the scale below, make a determination about your LEA's capacity to address them.**

a. An established program leader for environmental education (providing effective, sustained and system leadership)

- ❍ Not in Place
- ❍ Fully in Place: Program leader is in place to design, implement, and/or monitor EE program

Comments

b. An integrated program infusing environmental concepts into appropriate curricular areas

- ❍ Not in Place
- ❍ Partially in Place: EE is represented in some LEA curricula (science, social studies, math, reading, etc.) or initiatives (STEM, Service Learning, etc.)
- ❍ Fully in Place: EE is fully embedded in the curriculum across all relevant PK-12 LEA curricula and initiatives

Comments

c. Regular communication among staff responsible for environmental education curriculum and program implementation.

- ❍ Not in Place
- ❍ Partially in Place: Appropriate staff meet periodically and/or share information about environmental education curriculum and programs
- ❍ Fully in Place: Appropriate staff meet regularly to design, implement, and/or monitor environmental education curriculum and programming for students

Comments

d. A support system in place that enables teachers and administrators to engage in high quality professional development in content knowledge, instructional materials, and methodology related to environmental education.

- ❍ Not in Place
- ❍ Partially in Place: PD in environmental education is offered periodically to teachers and/or administrators
- ❍ Fully in Place: PD in environmental education is provided regularly for all relevant teachers and administrators

Comments

e. A plan to ensure opportunities for all students to engage in meaningful watershed educational experiences (MWEEs) at the elementary, middle and high school levels

- ❍ Not in Place
- ❍ Partially in Place: LEA has a plan to provide MWEEs in one or two grade bands (elementary, middle, and high)
- ❍ Fully in Place: LEA has a plan to provide MWEEs at least once in each grade band (elementary, middle, and high)

Comments

f. Established community partnerships for delivery of environmental education, including implementation of MWEEs

- ❍ Not in Place
- ❍ Partially in Place: Partners are offering environmental education programs in schools, but these are not coordinated with the LEA
- ❍ Fully in Place: Partners are working with LEA to coordinate delivery of environmental education programs in support of a LEA environmental education plan or priorities

Comments

Section II: Student Participation in Meaningful Watershed Educational Experiences

Environmental Literacy Student Outcome*: Continually increase students' age-appropriate understanding of the watershed through participation in teacher-supported, meaningful watershed educational experiences and rigorous inquiry-based instruction, with a target of at least one meaningful watershed educational experience in elementary, middle and high school depending on available resources.*

All four of these components are required for the experience to qualify as a Meaningful Watershed Educational Experience (MWEE) (for a more detailed definition, see MWEE Definition 2014.pdf):

> ***Issue Definition:*** *Students identify an environmental question, problem, or issue and explore through background research and investigation.*
> ***Outdoor field experiences:*** *Students participate in one or more outdoor field experience sufficient to collect the data required for answering the research questions and informing student actions.*
> ***Action projects:*** *Students participate in an action project during which students take action to address environmental issues at the personal or societal level.*
> ***Synthesis and conclusions:*** *Students analyze and evaluate the results of their investigation of the issue and synthesize and communicate results and conclusions.*

On the following pages, please describe the participation of your school district's elementary, middle, and high school students in MWEEs in the 2016-2017 school year.

Elementary School

For each grade level, please indicate student participation in MWEE programs during the 2016-2017 school year.

A complete MWEE program includes: 1) Issue Definition, 2) Outdoor Field Experience, 3) Action Project, and 4) Synthesis and Conclusions.

	A system-wide MWEE is in place for students in this grade	Some schools or classes in this grade participate in MWEEs	No evidence that students in this grade participate in a MWEE
Kindergarten	❍	❍	❍
1st grade	❍	❍	❍
2nd grade	❍	❍	❍
3rd grade	❍	❍	❍
4th grade	❍	❍	❍
5th grade	❍	❍	❍

[If selected column 1 for any item above]

Please describe the system-wide MWEE programs that are in place to reach all elementary school students (i.e., grade, description of unit, partnerships, etc.).

[If selected column 2 for any item above]

Please provide examples of MWEE programs in which students participate that are currently not offered to all elementary school students (i.e., grade, description of unit, partnerships, school(s), etc.).

Do you have any other system-wide outdoor education experiences that do NOT meet the full criteria of a MWEE at any elementary grade level(s)?

- O Yes
- O No

[If at yes is selected above.]

In which grade level(s) do you have a system-wide outdoor education experience that does NOT meet the full criteria of a MWEE? (select all that apply)

- ☐ K
- ☐ 1
- ☐ 2
- ☐ 3
- ☐ 4
- ☐ 5

[If yes is selected above.]
Please describe the system-wide outdoor education experiences for the grade(s) selected above. (i.e., location, partnerships, description, etc.)

Middle School
For each grade level, please indicate student participation in MWEEs during the 2016-2017 school year.
A complete MWEE program includes: 1) Issue Definition, 2) Outdoor Field Experience, 3) Action Project, and 4) Synthesis and Conclusions.

	A system-wide MWEE is in place for students in this grade	Some schools or classes in this grade participate in MWEEs	No evidence that students in this grade participate in a MWEE
6th grade	❍	❍	❍
7th grade	❍	❍	❍
8th grade	❍	❍	❍

[If column 1 is selected for any items above.]
Please describe the system-wide MWEE programs that are in place to reach all middle school students (i.e., grade, description of unit, partnerships, etc.).

[If column 2 is selected for any items above.]
Please provide examples of MWEE programs in which students participate that are currently not offered to all middle school students (i.e., grade, description of unit, partnerships, school(s), etc.).

Do you have any other system-wide outdoor education experiences that do NOT meet the full criteria of a MWEE at any middle school grade level? (select all that apply)

- O Yes
- O No

[If at yes is selected above.]

In which grade level(s) do you have a system-wide outdoor education experience that does NOT meet the full criteria of a MWEE? (select all that apply)

- ☐ 6
- ☐ 7
- ☐ 8

[If a yes is selected above.]

Please describe the system-wide outdoor education experiences for the grade(s) selected above. (i.e., location, partnerships, description, etc.)

High School

For each **REQUIRED** high school course (i.e., every student takes the course), please indicate student participation in MWEEs during the 2016-2017 school year.

A complete MWEE program includes: 1) Issue Definition, 2) Outdoor Field Experience, 3) Action Project, and 4) Synthesis and Conclusions.

Just answer for required courses. We'll ask about elective courses next.

	System-wide, a MWEE is included in this course	Some schools or classes include a MWEE in this course	No evidence that students in this course participate in a MWEE
Biology (required course)	❍	❍	❍
Chemistry (required course)	❍	❍	❍
Physics (required course)	❍	❍	❍
Earth Science (required course only)	❍	❍	❍
History and Social studies	❍	❍	❍
English	❍	❍	❍
Mathematics	❍	❍	❍
Other Required Science Course (indicate course) _____	❍	❍	❍
Other Required Course (indicate course) _____	❍	❍	❍

For each high school **ELECTIVE course**, please indicate student participation in MWEEs during the 2016-2017 school year.

	System-wide, a MWEE is included in this elective	Some schools or classes include a MWEE in this elective	No evidence that students in this elective participate in a MWEE
Environmental Science/Ecology	❍	❍	❍
AP Environmental Science	❍	❍	❍
Career and Technical Education	❍	❍	❍
Health and Physical Education	❍	❍	❍
Other Science Electives (indicate course) _____	❍	❍	❍
Other History or Social Studies Electives (indicate course) _____	❍	❍	❍
Other elective (indicate course) _____	❍	❍	❍
Other elective (indicate course) _____	❍	❍	❍

[If column 1 is selected for any items in the above two tables.]

Please describe the system-wide MWEE programs that are in place to reach all high school students (i.e., grade, description of unit, partnerships, etc.).

[If column 2 is selected for any items in the above two tables.]

Please provide examples of MWEE programs in which students participate that are currently not offered to all high school students (i.e., grade, description of unit, partnerships, school(s), etc.).

Do you have any other system-wide outdoor education experiences that do NOT meet the full criteria of a MWEE, at any high school grade level?

- O Yes
- O No

[If yes is selected above.]

In which grade level(s) do you have a system-wide outdoor education experience that does NOT meet the full criteria of a MWEE? (select all that apply)

- ☐ 9
- ☐ 10
- ☐ 11
- ☐ 12

[If yes is selected above.]

Please describe the system-wide outdoor education experiences for the grade(s) selected above. (i.e., location, partnerships, description, etc.)

Section III: Sustainable Schools

Environmental Literacy Sustainable Schools Outcome*: Continually increase the number of schools in the region that reduce the impact of their buildings and grounds on their local watershed, environment and human health through best practices, including student-led protection and restoration projects.*

Sustainable Schools Pillars (as defined by the U.S. Department of Education Green Ribbon Schools):

- Reduce environmental impact and costs,
- Improve the health and wellness of schools, students and staff, and
- Provide effective environment and sustainability literacy, incorporating STEM, civic skills and green career pathways

Separate from this survey, we will receive data about which schools in your LEA are recognized as Sustainable Schools by several certifying organizations that are recognized by the Chesapeake Bay Program Education Workgroup, including:

- U.S. Department of Education Green Ribbon Schools
- Eco Schools (National Wildlife Federation)
- Project Learning Tree Green Schools
- Maryland Green Schools (MAEOE)
- Virginia Naturally Schools
- West Virginia Sustainable Schools

Other than the sustainable schools programs above, what best practices are schools implementing

and/or in what environmental certification programs do schools in your LEA participate (e.g. LEED)?

Please select one answer per question.

	Yes	No	I don't know
Does your LEA have a staff lead or team responsible for coordinating sustainable schools efforts?	❍	❍	❍
Does your LEA have a sustainability plan or formal environmental sustainability objectives?	❍	❍	❍
Are sustainable school efforts, which may be overseen by facilities departments, incorporated in district curriculum?	❍	❍	❍
Do you encourage your schools to seek sustainable school certification? If yes, which certification program(s) do you encourage: _____	❍	❍	❍
Has your school district received district-level sustainable school certification?	❍	❍	❍

Section IV: Continuous Environmental Education Improvement Efforts

What are the strongest elements of your environmental education program for students? What data or subjective assessments support this?

What are the strongest elements of your environmental education program for teachers? What data or subjective assessments support this?

Please share any success stories as exemplars and models of best practice that are not detailed above. (Please provide links to websites, articles, etc. if possible.)

What are the greatest challenges related to establishing/implementing your environmental education program?

What are opportunities to grow your environmental education program?

What are your highest priority needs for improving your environmental education programs? Please rate how much of a need each of the items below is for your LEA.

	1 No need	2	3	4	5	6	7 High Need
Outdoor Classrooms	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Increased Alignment with Curriculum	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Support from Board of Education	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Teacher Professional Development	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Sustainable Schools Technical Assistance	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Curriculum Planning/Integration Support	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Funding	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Community Partnerships	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Other (please describe)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

Section VI: Feedback on ELIT

On a scale from 1 to 10, how difficult was it to provide the data for the ELIT survey overall?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
Very difficult	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	Very easy

Do you have any suggestions for improving the design and/or functionality of the ELIT survey?

THANK YOU for completing this survey! Please click on the SUBMIT button below to complete the survey. After you submit the survey, you will see a summary of your entered responses. Click on the Adobe symbol to download a PDF and save a copy of your data.

Court's final judgment affirming the *2010–2011 AR Final Results* constitutes the Court's final decision which is not in harmony with the *2010–2011 AR Final Results.* This notice is published in fulfillment of the publication requirements of *Timken.* Accordingly, the Department will continue the suspension of liquidation of the subject merchandise pending a final and conclusive court decision.

Amended Final Results of Review

Because there is now a final court decision, the Department is amending the *2010–2011 AR Final Results* with respect Jiheng and Kangtai, as follows:

Exporter	Weighted-average margin percentage
Hebei Jiheng Chemical Co., Ltd.	31.22
Juancheng Kangtai Chemical Co., Ltd.	34.21

In the event the Court's ruling is not appealed or, if appealed, upheld by a final and conclusive court decision, the Department will instruct the U.S. Customs and Border Protection to assess antidumping duties on unliquidated entries of subject merchandise based on the revised rate the Department determined and listed above.

Cash Deposit Requirements

Because there have been subsequent administrative reviews for Jiheng and Kangtai, the case deposit rates will remain the rates established in the *2012–2013 Final Results,* which are 0.00 percent respectively for both Jiheng and Kangtai.[7]

Notification to Interested Parties

This notice is issued and published in accordance with sections 516A(e)(l), 75l(a)(l), and 777(i)(l) of the Act.

Dated: December 15, 2016.

Christian Marsh,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations.

[FR Doc. 2016–30728 Filed 12–20–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

[7] *See Chlorinated Isocyanurates From the People's Republic of China: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2012–2013,* 80 FR 4539 (January 28, 2015) (*2012–2013 Final Results*).

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[C–570–911]

Circular Welded Carbon Quality Steel Pipe From the People's Republic of China: Rescission of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review; 2015

AGENCY: Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce is rescinding the administrative review of the countervailing duty order on circular welded carbon quality steel pipe (CWP) from the People's Republic of China (PRC) for the period January 1, 2015, through December 31, 2015, based on the timely withdrawal of the request for review.

DATES: Effective December 21, 2016.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Rebecca M. Janz, AD/CVD Operations, Office II, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–2972.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On July 5, 2016, the Department published in the **Federal Register** a notice of opportunity to request an administrative review of the countervailing duty order on CWP from the PRC for the period January 1, 2015, through December 31, 2015.[1] The Department received a timely-filed request from Wheatland Tube Company (the petitioner), in accordance with section 751(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), and 19 CFR 351.213(b), for an administrative review of this countervailing duty order.[2] Pursuant to this request and in accordance with 19 CFR 351.221(c)(1)(i), on September 12, 2016, the Department published in the **Federal Register** a notice of initiation with respect to 20 individually-named companies or company groups.[3] On December 12, 2016, the petitioner timely withdrew its request for an administrative review.[4]

[1] *See Antidumping or Countervailing Duty Order, Finding, or Suspended Investigation; Opportunity to Request Administrative Review,* 81 FR 43584 (July 5, 2016).

[2] *See* letter from the petitioner, ''Circular Welded Carbon Quality Steel Pipe From the People's Republic of China: Request for Administrative Review,'' dated July 29, 2016.

[3] *See Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews,* 81 FR 62720 (September 12, 2016).

[4] *See* letter from the petitioner, ''Circular Welded Carbon Quality Steel Pipe From the People's Republic of China: Withdrawal of Request for Administrative Review,'' dated December 12, 2016.

Rescission of Review

Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.213(d)(1), the Department will rescind an administrative review, in whole or in part, if a party that requested a review withdraws the request within 90 days of the date of publication of notice of initiation of the requested review. The petitioner withdrew its request for review by the 90-day deadline. No other parties requested an administrative review of the order. Therefore, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(d)(1), we are rescinding the administrative review of the countervailing duty order on CWP from the PRC covering the period January 1, 2015, through December 31, 2015.

Assessment

The Department will instruct U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) to assess countervailing duties on all appropriate entries. Countervailing duties shall be assessed at rates equal to the cash deposit of estimated countervailing duties required at the time of entry, or withdrawal from warehouse, for consumption, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.212(c)(1)(i). The Department intends to issue appropriate assessment instructions to CBP 15 days after the date of publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**.

This notice is published in accordance with section 751 of the Act and 19 CFR 351.213(d)(4).

Dated: December 15, 2016.

Christian Marsh,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations.

[FR Doc. 2016–30727 Filed 12–20–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

Proposed Information Collection; Comment Request; Chesapeake Bay Watershed Environmental Literacy Indicator Tool

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

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, invites the general public and other Federal agencies to

take this opportunity to comment on proposed and/or continuing information collections, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

DATES: Written comments must be submitted on or before February 21, 2017.

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 Shannon Sprague, NOAA Chesapeake Bay Office, 410 Severn Avenue, Suite 207, Annapolis, MD 21403, 410–267–5664 or *shannon.sprague@noaa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Abstract

This request is for a new information collection.

The Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement of 2014 requires monitoring of progress towards the environmental literacy goal: ''Enable students in the region to graduate with the knowledge and skills needed to act responsibly to protect and restore their local watersheds.'' NOAA, on behalf of the Chesapeake Bay Program, will ask the state education agencies for Maryland, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Virginia, West Virginia, and the District of Columbia to survey their local education agencies (LEAs) to determine: (1) LEA capacity to implement a comprehensive and systemic approach to environmental literacy education, (2) student participation in Meaningful Watershed Educational Experiences during the school year, (3) sustainability practices at schools, and (4) LEA needs for improving environmental literacy education programming. LEAs (generally school districts, in some cases charter school administration) are asked to complete the survey on the status of their LEA on a set of key indicators for the four areas listed above. One individual from each LEA is asked to complete this survey once every two years.

II. Method of Collection

Respondents will submit their information electronically on web-based survey forms.

III. Data

OMB Control Number: 0648-xxxx.

Form Number(s): None.

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

Affected Public: State, Local, or Tribal government (local education agencies); Not-for-profit organizations (charter schools).

Estimated Number of Respondents: The survey will be distributed to approximately 983 local education agencies.

Estimated Time per Response: 1.5 hours.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 1,106 hours.

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

IV. Request for Comments

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

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

Dated: December 16, 2016.

Sarah Brabson,

NOAA PRA Clearance Officer.

[FR Doc. 2016–30757 Filed 12–20–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–12–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

Proposed Information Collection; Comment Request; Conflict of Interest Disclosure for Nonfederal Government Individuals Who Are Candidates To Conduct Peer Reviews

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

ACTION: Notice.

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

DATES: Written comments must be submitted on or before February 21, 2017.

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 Michael Liddel (301) 427–8139 or *Michael.Liddel@noaa.gov*.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Abstract

This request is for extension of a currently approved collection.

The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) issued government-wide guidance to enhance the practice of peer review of government science documents. OMB's Final Information Quality Bulletin for Peer Review (''Peer Review Bulletin'' or PRB) (available at *http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/memoranda/fy2005/m05-03.pdf*) establishes minimum peer review standards for influential scientific information that Federal agencies intend to disseminate.

The Peer Review Bulletin also directs Federal agencies to adopt or adapt the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) policy for evaluating conflicts of interest when selecting peer reviewers who are not Federal government employees (federal employees are subject to Federal ethics requirements). For peer review purposes, the term ''conflicts of interest'' means any financial or other interest which conflicts with the service of the individual because it could: (1) Significantly impair the individual's objectivity; or (2) create an unfair competitive advantage for any person or organization. NOAA has adapted the NAS policy and developed two confidential conflict disclosure forms which the agency will use to examine prospective reviewers' potential financial conflicts and other interests that could impair objectivity or create an unfair advantage. One form is for peer reviewers of studies related to government regulation and the other form is for all other influential scientific information subject to the Peer Review Bulletin. In addition, the latter form has been adapted by NOAA's Office of