

NOTICE OF OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET ACTION

Date 01/07/2009

Department of Commerce
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
FOR CERTIFYING OFFICIAL: Suzanne Hilding
FOR CLEARANCE OFFICER: Diana Hynek

In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act, OMB has taken action on your request received 09/11/2008

ACTION REQUESTED: New collection (Request for a new OMB Control Number)
TYPE OF REVIEW REQUESTED: Regular
ICR REFERENCE NUMBER: 200808-0648-011
AGENCY ICR TRACKING NUMBER:
TITLE: Evaluation of Public Visitors' Experience of Exhibits at Mokupapapa Discovery Center
LIST OF INFORMATION COLLECTIONS: See next page

OMB ACTION: Approved with change
OMB CONTROL NUMBER: 0648-0582
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: 01/31/2012 DISCONTINUE DATE:

BURDEN:	RESPONSES	HOURS	COSTS
Previous	0	0	0
New	250	31	0
Difference			
Change due to New Statute	0	0	0
Change due to Agency Discretion	250	31	0
Change due to Agency Adjustment	0	0	0
Change Due to Potential Violation of the PRA	0	0	0

TERMS OF CLEARANCE: This survey is approved with the deletion of the self-described option for the Race & Ethnicity question on the interview form.

OMB Authorizing Official: Kevin F. Neyland
Deputy Administrator,
Office Of Information And Regulatory Affairs

List of ICs

IC Title	Form No.	Form Name	CFR Citation
Visitor Survey	NA	Mokupapapa Visitor Interview form	

PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT SUBMISSION

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

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

19. Certification for Paperwork Reduction Act Submissions

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

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

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

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

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

Signature of Senior Official or designee

Date

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

Signature

Date

Signature of NOAA Clearance Officer

Signature

Date

**SUPPORTING STATEMENT
EVALUATION OF PUBLIC VISITORS' EXPERIENCE OF EXHIBITS AT
MOKUPAPAPA DISCOVERY CENTER
OMB CONTROL NO. 0648-xxxx**

A. JUSTIFICATION

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

The enabling legislation for the National Marine Sanctuary system, the [National Marine Sanctuaries Act](#) (NMSA), denotes specific educational mandates. Section 309(c)(1) of the NMSA states that one of the purposes of the Office of National Marine Sanctuaries (ONMS) is:

“ . . .to enhance public awareness, understanding, appreciation and wise and sustainable use of the marine environment, and the natural historical, cultural and archeological resources of the national Marine Sanctuary System. Efforts supported, promoted, or coordinated under this subsection must emphasize the conservation goals and sustainable public uses of national marine sanctuaries and the System.” .

In 2005, the planning committee of the National Marine Sanctuary Program (NMSP) developed a 10-year strategic plan of operations for the organization. Specific goals and strategies were established to guide the progress of the Education and Outreach program. The Education and Outreach goal is:

“To enhance nation-wide public awareness, understanding and appreciation of marine and Great lakes ecosystems and maritime heritage resources through outreach, education and interpretation efforts”

The specific performance measure for evaluating this goal is:

“By 2010 all education programs implemented in national marine sanctuaries will be assessed for effectiveness against stated program goals and objectives and appropriate National and State education standards.”

The NMSP education team has embarked on an ambitious evaluation project that will allow the NMSP to assess education program outcomes and impacts across all sites and activities and to link outcome measures to program efforts. The purpose of this effort is to evaluate if current and future education efforts are meeting the goals and objectives of the education and outreach programs and the educational mandates of the National Marine Sanctuaries Act. The application of these findings will assist in adjusting program content, format, activities mix and target audiences to improve overall effectiveness of educational efforts and expenditures.

Program to be evaluated

Mokupapapa: Discovery Center for Hawaii's Remote Coral Reefs (Center), located on the island of Hawaii, is an educational center designed to interpret the natural and cultural history of the Papahānaumokuākea Marine National Monument (MNM), and is part of the ONMS. The Center was constructed to interpret the natural science, culture, and history of the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands (NWHI) and surrounding marine environment. Most importantly, the exhibits were created to gain awareness of, as well as support for, additional protection for the remote area. The abundant natural life of the NWHI comes alive within the Center with models of sharks swimming overhead, a 2,500 gallon aquarium and a simulated submersible.

After five years of operation, we now have a solid base of 60,000 visitors per year. Thanks to our location, we have a good balance between local residents and visitors to the island. We are an integral part of downtown Hilo, and many visitors come on a regular basis. Every day we see numerous children pulling their parents by the hand into "The Fish Place". Teachers are aware of our facilities and bring approximately 3,500 students through our doors annually. Best of all, our visitors like what they see: we are continually hearing enthusiastic comments from people about our facilities.

The recent change from being a coral reef ecosystem reserve to a Marine National Monument with two co-trustees has had a major impact on the messages we are trying to get across. We are now taking a fresh look at what messages we are conveying in our exhibits and programs. As we develop new messages, we are taking into account not only NOAA's Papahānaumokuākea Marine National Monument (PMNM) messages, but also applicable messages from our co-trustees, the US Fish and Wildlife Service and the State of Hawaii, as well as the NMSP's and NOAA's goals.

One of our main outreach efforts is through the Center. We need to evaluate the Discovery Center to find out if it is indeed conveying our key messages to our audiences, so that we may make better decisions about exhibit renovations, new exhibits, interpretation programs and other educational programs that we deliver.

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

The information from this new survey will be used to align exhibit and educational programs developed in the future at Mokupapapa Discovery Center, to better deliver the NMSP's, and Papahānaumokuākea MNM's messages to the 60,000 people who come to the Center each year. At this point we do not plan to conduct the survey more than once.

- Questions 1, 2 & 14 provide us with understand basic information about the person.
- Question 3 is an introductory non-threatening question seeking the interviewee's basic impression of the Center.
- Questions 4 & 5 determines what people believe the exhibits are about (including possible top-of-mind perception of messages).
- Question 6 determines if people value the exhibits.
- Question 7 determines which exhibits people want to see again.
- Question 8 determines which exhibits people looked at.
- Question 9 determines what people may have learned.
- Question 10 determines which (if any) of our main messages are coming across in our exhibits.
- Question 11 helps us understand if visitors understand people's impact on PMNM.
- Question 12 informs us if people understand and intend to participate in helping the PMNM.
- Question 13 allows people to ask us questions.

All of this information will help us determine what messages are and are not being conveyed in our exhibits, and what we need to improve on in both exhibits and educational programs to fulfill the ONMS and PMNM goals.

As explained in the preceding paragraphs, the information gathered has utility. NOAA ONMS 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. Although the information collected is not expected to be disseminated directly to the public, results may be used in scientific, management, technical or general informational publications. Should NOAA Office of National Marine Sanctuaries decide to disseminate the information, it will be subject to the quality control measures and pre-dissemination review pursuant to Section 515 of Public Law 106-554.

We will comply with all OMB standards for asking questions about race and ethnicity.

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 collection of information from visitors to the exhibits at the Mokupapapa Discovery Center will consist of intercept interviews, conducted in person by volunteers and paid assistants. The interviews will be conducted on paper, using a clipboard, for three reasons:

- The public's general wariness of "surveys" is best transcended by a personable approach (the more that the interview feels like a conversation, and appears to be a person-to-person interaction, the higher the rate of cooperation).

- People are more likely to finish an interview due to the social characteristics of the interpersonal situation, compared to the impersonal experience of filling out a survey electronically; they feel less like “a number” and more like “a person whose opinions are being listened to” when being interviewed by another person.
- The process of an interviewer using a laptop or other electronic device to input the data during an interview tends to be distracting and less efficient (it is easier to train inexperienced people to conduct interviews than it is to train them to conduct interviews and use a data entry program).

4. Describe efforts to identify duplication.

This is the first effort of its kind to understand the educational value of visitors’ experience of exhibits at a National Marine Sanctuary visitor center (confirmed in a December 2007 meeting of representatives from all 13 Sanctuaries).

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

This project will not have a significant impact on small entities such as small businesses, organizations, or government bodies. All respondents will be individuals or families.

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

If this evaluation were not conducted, we would not be able to assess if the Discovery Center is indeed fulfilling applicable portions of NOAA’s mandate to have an informed society that comprehends the role of the ocean, coasts, and atmosphere in the global ecosystem to make the best social and economic decisions. In addition, we would not be able to modify our exhibits and education programs to best fulfill NOAA’s, NOS’, ONMS’ and Papahānaumokuākea Marine National Monument’s education and outreach goals. Nor would we contribute to our role in fulfilling the Office of National Marine Sanctuaries (ONMS) goal of evaluating all of its programs by 2010.

This evaluation has never been conducted before and is not currently planned to be repeated.

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

There are no special circumstances that deviate from OMB guidelines as listed in Attachment 1 of the instructions.

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 March 18, 2008 (73 FR 14441) solicited comments from the public. No comments were received.

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

No payments, gifts or incentives will be offered.

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

All persons interviewed will be anonymous; no information will be collected that would identify the specific individual (e.g., name, address, phone number, social security number, driver's license number); therefore, no assurance of confidentiality will be required or provided.

Demographic information will only be used for statistical analysis and aggregate information about the sample (e.g., age, gender, area of residence, visitor group size and composition).

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 being asked in this survey.

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

a. Respondent sample: This one-time study will seek one interview each from a sample of 250 visitor groups (pre-existing parties who arrived together, including single adults visiting alone, couples, families, etc.), randomly selected after they have seen exhibits at the Mokupapapa Discovery Center and are about to exit the building. One adult (age 18+) per visitor group will be approached and invited to give his/her opinion; participation will be voluntary. Extensive prior experience with this type of work suggests that the response rate will be approximately 85-90%. [From the social scientist researcher who will direct this study, we have information about actual rates of cooperation at similar facilities (aquariums, museums). In general, the cooperation rate averages about 90%; the rate from about 20 projects in the last two years has ranged from 72% to 98%.]

Data sought from:	# of respondents	Responses per respondent	Total # Responses	Response Time	Total Burden	Labor Cost to Public *
Visitors to Mokupapapa Discovery Center	278-294 visitors approached to obtain a sample of 250	1 interview	250	7.5 min avg. per interview	31 hrs.	\$418

Based on the US Census data from 2004, the average *household* income is \$44,334 (\$13.36 per hour for adults in household). The average estimated time per respondent is 7.5 minutes (12.5% of an hour). Therefore, the average labor cost per adult answering the questions would be \$1.67, multiplied by the 250 responders, with a total burden of \$418.

13. Provide an estimate of the total annual recordkeeping/reporting cost burden to the respondents resulting from the collection (excluding the value of the burden hours in #12 above).

a. Capital and start-up costs: none.

b. Operations and maintenance costs for the public: none (an interviewer will ask a series of questions, and the interviewer will write visitors' answers on the interview form; no follow-up or mailing or other expense will be required of the visitors).

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

We will discuss goals, best practices, and techniques with the contractor (evaluator) who is developing the interview, and who will help us prepare for data collection. We estimate 120 hours of work for the Mokupapapa Discovery Manager (Manager) in this capacity as a normal part of her job, and 8 hours of work for three other Mokupapapa Staff members, also part of their normal job hours. Collection of data will be conducted by a combination of both staff and volunteers, and overseen by the Manager. With the estimate of 68 hours of data collection time, we anticipate only 24 hours will be of staff time, with the other 44 hours being conducted by volunteers. Processing of data will be handled by our evaluator. Consultation of results will be with Manager. Our evaluator who is responsible for developing the instrument, training data collectors, processing the data, and analyzing the results is on contract.

Personnel	Time	Additional cost
Manager Time	120 hours @ \$25 per hour	Normal job responsibilities
Staff Time	24 hours @ \$20 per hour	Normal job responsibilities
Volunteer Time	44 hours	No cost
Contractor	XXX	\$20,000

15. Explain the reasons for any program changes or adjustments reported in Items 13 or 14 of the OMB 83-I.

This is a new program.

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

Since the primary purposes of this evaluation are to reflect on the achievement, or lack thereof, of education and outreach goals of several partner organizations as represented in the exhibits at this Discovery Center, the distribution of results is intended to be primarily intra-governmental. The public is not likely to receive any additional benefits from this evaluation's information. However, to facilitate possible professional uses (e.g., among other marine sanctuaries), a short summary of the results will be made available on the NWHI web site home page, citing the evaluation and explaining how to request a full copy from the Mokupapapa Discovery Center.

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 an exception to displaying OMB documentation.

18. Explain each exception to the certification statement identified in Item 19 of the OMB 83-I.

No exceptions.

B. COLLECTIONS OF INFORMATION EMPLOYING STATISTICAL METHODS

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

	Mokupapapa Discovery Center (MDC)
Annual total visitor attendance (avg.) at Mokupapapa Discovery Center (MDC)	60,000 persons
Annual attendance by GENERAL PUBLIC visitors at MDC (excludes school groups and professional visitors)	55,000 persons
Estimated number of adult visitors (age 18+) in the MDC general public visitor audience	40,000 adults
Desired sample size of general public adult visitors in the MDC audience	278-294 visitors will be approached to obtain a sample of 250 adults
Respondent selection method	One adult per randomly selected visitor group, when exiting from the exhibit area of MDC
Estimated rate of cooperation of randomly selected adult visitors	85% [x 294 or fewer visitors for a final sample of 250]

Note: In the experience of the social scientist researcher who will direct this study, the actual rate of cooperation at similar facilities (aquariums, museums) averages about 90%; the rate from about 20 projects in the last two years has ranged from 72% to 98%.

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.

The characteristics of visitor populations at visitor centers and museums vary considerably and randomly (e.g., a local family may be followed by a tourist couple who may be followed by a single adult tourist, and so on). In places with relatively low volumes of visitors (such as the Mokupapapa Discovery Center, compared to high volume places such as the Smithsonian) a

representative random sample of visitor groups can be obtained by using a “next available” protocol, as follows:

The interviewer is positioned near the exit from the exhibit space (the ‘space’ is essentially a storefront, with exhibits and an auditorium located behind the exhibit space in the rear of the building). As any visitor group (usually 1-4 people) nears the exit, the interviewer approaches and makes eye contact with the ‘first adult’ (in practice: the one who is physically closest to the interviewer) and requests their participation in giving feedback about the exhibits. The cooperation rate for this type of intercept interview (using a brief introduction that explains the purpose in one sentence) typically averages about 90%. If the adult visitor agrees, the interview is completed. Upon completion, the interviewer will tend to step aside to complete their work on the interview form (documenting the date and time of the interview, adding their own initials to it, reviewing the form to check for completeness and readable handwriting, and also to put away that completed interview form and have a new blank one ready); this process usually takes 2-5 minutes. When the interviewer is then prepared with a new blank interview form and related materials (e.g., a photo board about the exhibits, used for some of the interview questions), s/he looks up and selects the “next available” visitor group who are moving to the exit.

The principle of this and other sampling methods is that the interviewer does not *choose* who to interview by appearance, or by facial expression that might indicate enjoyment or not, or by whether there are or are not children in the group; in essence, the visitor group *selects themselves* (although they don’t know the sampling parameters) by deciding when to exit (e.g., there may be another group being interviewed at the time when this group leaves, in which case they would not be selected). Depending on the visitor flow, the next visitor group might be leaving right then, or the interviewer might have to wait for 5-10 minutes for the next group to leave. This characteristic of ‘low volume’ visitor facilities makes it impractical to use other methods such as selecting every 4th visitor group, or using a random number chart (for example, from 1 to 5) to decide which visitor group to select. Ultimately, however, it is not the efficiency of interviewer time that is critical, it is the representativeness of the sample that matters. While additional methods could be used to provide reliability assessments of the sampling method,¹ the budget is modest in this particular project, and we are choosing to put relatively more effort in the analysis of open-ended questions than in conducting a rigorous reliability study, trusting that a well-conducted random sampling of “next available” visitor groups will result in a sufficiently representative sample.

¹ Periodically over the course of conducting hundreds of studies like this (intercept interviews with visitors at museums, aquariums, visitor centers, historic sites) this social scientist research contractor has used reliability studies to check on the characteristics of the sampling. The most common way of assessing reliability has been to use a different method such as ‘entrance interviews’ or admissions information collected by a cashier (i.e., a process which has 100% or near-100% cooperation) to obtain a few pieces of information from a different sample of visitors, or perhaps from all visitors (depending on the volume of attendance). Such information would typically include group composition [adults-only vs. families-with-children], place of residence [local vs. out-of-area, or specific states], and prior experience [first-time-visitor vs. repeat-visitor]). However, in almost all such examples, the ‘next available’ method of sampling visitor groups in exit interviews has produced a sample that varies by only a few percentage points from the reliability study, a degree of accuracy which would be sufficient for this research (the notable variations have occurred where a museum has multiple exits, or a large lobby where it is difficult to identify exiting vs. entering visitors, etc.).

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.

Prior experience with intercept interviewing of visitors in museums and interpretive centers leads our social science researcher to expect a response rate of 85%-90%. Therefore, non-response is not likely to be a big factor in this study. Typically, experience has shown that inviting visitors to give their opinions is a positive motivator, and that the way in which that invitation is delivered can enhance or detract from visitors' desire to cooperate (e.g., neat appearance of the interviewer, a clear voice, pleasant demeanor, and in a small proportion of interactions: giving assurances that the interview won't take too long, or that it won't be too hard).

When the survey instrument and procedures are approved for implementation, we will begin monitoring the cooperation rate. If it is below 75% we will experiment with fine-tuning of the logistics of the survey (where the interviewer stands, which sentence of the explanation comes first) to seek improvements in the cooperation rate. In the very unlikely event that we encounter an ongoing response rate below 75%, we will consider developing a 'mail-back' questionnaire that could be handed to non-respondents, or a web-link survey, to be completed at their convenience later (however, immediate cooperation for an on-site intercept interview is about twice as likely as cooperation for follow-up questionnaires, so we would not use mail-back or web-link as a primary method).

Due to routinely successful cooperation rates, we are consciously choosing to not give visitors advance notification (when they enter the Center) that we will be seeking their opinions and feedback, since this tends to cue people in ways that sometimes leads to changing their behavior and use of exhibits (e.g., staying longer, feeling that they will be "tested" later), and we are seeking to generalize to the normally occurring pattern of visitor experience. Of course, some visitors will see that other visitors are being interviewed at the exit, but without knowing why those people are being interviewed, this circumstance is unlikely to affect visitor behavior.

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 under the Paperwork Reduction Act.

A pilot survey of 8 visitors has been conducted, which has intuitively confirmed the essential prerequisites for this survey, namely that visitors did not need an incentive to participate, appeared to understand the questions, were able to give reasonable answers to those questions, and each completed the interview (did not discontinue part way through). If, after the survey is approved and the formal data collection begins, circumstances seem to change, ideas about experiments and strategies for maintaining the scientific quality of the research will be considered (e.g., as described in answer to the previous question: location of the interviewer, the use of optional mail-back questionnaires).

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

The social scientist researcher who developed the research design, and composed the survey instrument, is:

Jeff Hayward, Ph.D., Director of People, Places & Design Research (www.ppdresearch.com); 413-586-9003.

He will also supervise the beginning of the implementation of the survey, including training (about random selection, techniques for conducting intercept interviews and maintaining rapport with visitors) for interviewers, and will coach and support the MDC staff coordinator Yumi Yasutake (regarding the monitoring of the quality of interviewers' work) who will organize and manage the data collection process.

Dr. Hayward (with 30 years of work in the field of visitor studies) and his experienced staff (with 8 to 15 years of experience in this specialty) will analyze and interpret the data.

Linda Schubert, Manager of Mokupapapa Discovery Center, will be NOAA's principal representative in interpreting the data and articulating the possible implications for exhibits, programs, and related ways of educating the public about the NWHI National Monument.

Reactions to exhibits

at the Mokupapapa Discovery Center, Hilo HI

Information for visitors

1. The policy reasons for this study

The National Marine Sanctuary Program (NMSP), in its latest 10-year strategic plan, seeks to raise awareness, understanding and appreciation of marine ecosystems through interpretation efforts such as these exhibits. The NMSP education team seeks to evaluate this and other program activities to assess education program outcomes and impacts, and to link outcome measures to program efforts. The purpose of this effort is to evaluate if current and future education efforts are meeting the goals and objectives of the education and outreach programs and the educational mandates of the National Marine Sanctuaries Act.

2. The way in which the information will be used to further performance of agency functions.

The information from this survey will be used to align exhibit and educational programs developed in the future at Mokupapapa Discovery Center, to better deliver the NMSP's, and Papahānaumokuākea Marine National Monument's messages to the 60,000 people who come to this Discovery Center each year. All of this information will help us determine what messages are and are not being conveyed in our exhibits, and what we need to improve on in both exhibits and educational programs to fulfill agency goals.

3. An estimate of the average time involved:

Visitor participation for this collection of information is estimated to average 7-8 minutes per visitor group. Send comments regarding this estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing the burden to you, to:

Northwestern Hawaiian Islands Coral Reef Ecosystem Reserve
Main Office: 6600 Kalanianaʻōle Hwy, #300, Honolulu, HI 96825
phone: 808-397-2660 fax: 808-397-2662 email: hawaiiireef@noaa.gov
Hilo Office: 308 Kamehameha Ave, #203, Hilo, HI 96720
phone: 808-933-8180 fax: 808-933-8186.

4. Your participation is voluntary.

5. Interviews are anonymous. You do not need to give your name or address.

6. Valid OMB Control Number:

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.

Hi, we're talking with people to help us consider whether to CHANGE or ADD TO these exhibits – may I ask you some questions about your visit today? [if they didn't look at exhibits, discontinue]

1. Have you been here before? no (1st time) yes → How many times? _____

2. Where do you live? _____
[town if Big Isl. / island if other HI / state if mainland US / country if not US]

3. Thinking about your **experience here today**, would you say this was
 great good OK fair or disappointing?

b. What did YOU PERSONALLY like the most here? [check if parent asks child/ren, who answer]

4. Did you think the exhibits here were **about any place specifically**, or were they **about Hawaii and the Pacific IN GENERAL**?
[if specific place:] What place? _____

5. In your opinion, what's the **main idea or theme** of the exhibits here? (whatever you think)

no main idea; there are different exhibits on different topics didn't see enough to figure that out

6. Using a 10-point scale, how **worthwhile** do you think these exhibits are, for people like yourself (yourselves) – '1' would be the lowest: not at all worthwhile, '10' would be the highest: very worthwhile – what number would you say? _____

[if rating # less than 5, ask this] Is there anything worthwhile about them?

[otherwise, ask:] What's "worthwhile" about them? _____

7. If you were to come back again, is there an exhibit that you would like to spend more time at, or not really? yes no

[if yes] Which one? _____

8. **Which of these exhibits did you see ...(or have you seen)** [circle Yes or No; incl. prior visits]
[use photo board]

- a) Yes No large map on the wall, showing a chain of islands
- b) Yes No the submarine control room, with robotic arms
- c) Yes No the diving bell that you can walk into
- d) Yes No the pile of trash, or the large photo mural of trash
- e) Yes No the aquarium
- f) Yes No the computer simulation of geology and volcanoes

[if NWHI already mentioned by visitor, skip to 9.b]

[if NWHI not already mentioned, ask 9.a and 9.b:]

9.a These exhibits are intended to be about the Northwest Hawaiian Islands – a chain of small islands. Had you heard of that name before: the "Northwest Hawaiian Islands"? yes no

9.b Did you find out anything new (specific, interesting, surprising) about the NWHI from these exhibits? yes no [if yes:] What? _____

10. Here are some ideas. Which of these ideas or themes **did you see** in the exhibits? – just tell me Yes or No for each one:

10. Which of these ideas or themes **did you see** in the exhibits? – just tell me Yes or No for each one:

Yes No a. multiple types of land forms including atolls?

Yes No b. the number of islands?

Yes No c. complex ecosystems?

Yes No d. fragile ecosystems?

[ask:] What does that mean, “fragile ecosystem,” in terms of an island?

Did you see anything in the exhibits about the next idea [say the letter]....or not?

Yes No e. these islands are already or might become a marine protected area, a safe haven?

Yes No f. unique species?

Yes No g. that people have a long history in the NWHI?

[ask:] What kind of history would that be? Do you imagine people lived there, or not?

yes no other comment: _____

Yes No h. it’s a sacred place with cultural significance?

Yes No i. human actions today are affecting the NWHI?

11. Do you think that human actions affecting those islands would be:

almost all negative? or almost all positive? or some negative and some positive?

What kinds of negative impacts are you aware of? (or would you guess?)

What kinds of positive impacts are you aware of? (or would you imagine are possible?)

12. Is there anything that you or I could do for the benefit of the Northwest Hawaiian Islands, or not really? no

yes → What? _____

[if yes:] Are you likely to do anything differently, or not really?

no yes → What? _____

I’d like to finish by asking:

13. Do YOU have any questions about any of this? something that I or the exhibits could try to answer?

14. How many ____ adults and ____ children under 18 are in your group?

Ages of children: _____

PLEASE ANSWER THE 3 QUESTIONS IN THE BOX (helps us know we’re talking with a cross-section of people)

Your Age:	Education, so far:	Ethnic/racial heritage (check one or more):
___ 18-29	___ some school	___ American Indian or Alaska Native
___ 30’s	___ high school graduate	___ Asian
___ 40’s	___ some college	___ Black or African-American
___ 50’s	___ college graduate	___ Hispanic/Latino
___ 60’s	___ graduate school	___ Native Hawaiian, other Pacific Islander
___ 70+		___ White
		___ OR your own description: _____

PLEASE RETURN CLIPBOARD TO THE INTERVIEWER.

Thank you for taking the time to share your opinions!

Person interviewed: man woman

ESL/LEP

Date: _____

Day of week: _____

Time: _____

Interviewer: _____

Dated: March 12, 2008.

David M. Spooner,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E8-5414 Filed 3-17-08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

Proposed Information Collection; Comment Request; NWHI Mokupapapa Discovery Center Exhibit Evaluation

AGENCY: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Department of 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 May 19, 2008.

ADDRESSES: Direct all written comments to Diana Hynek, Departmental Paperwork Clearance Officer, Department of Commerce, Room 6625, 14th and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230 (or via the Internet at dHynek@doc.gov).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Requests for additional information or copies of the information collection instrument and instructions should be directed to Linda Schubert, 808.933.8184 or linda.schubert@noaa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Abstract

Mokupapapa Discovery Center (Center) is an outreach arm of Papahānaumokuākea Marine National Monument that reaches 60,000 people each year in Hilo, Hawaii. The Center was created four years ago to help raise support for the creation of a National Marine Sanctuary in the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands. Since that time, the area has been proclaimed a Marine National Monument and the main messages we are trying to share with the public have changed to better reflect the new monument status and the joint management by the three co-trustees of the Monument. We therefore are seeking to find out if people visiting our Center are getting our new messages by conducting an optional exit survey.

II. Method of Collection

Surveys will be conducted by in-person interview as people exit the Center. Interviewers will record responses on paper, and later transfer them to an electronic database.

III. Data

OMB Control Number: None.

Form Number: None.

Type of Review: Regular submission.

Affected Public: Individuals or households.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 250.

Estimated Time Per Response: 7 minutes.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 29.

Estimated Total Annual Cost to Public: \$0.

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 12, 2008.

Gwellnar Banks,

Management Analyst, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. E8-5323 Filed 3-17-08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-NK-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

RIN 0648-XF70

Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; General Provisions for Domestic Fisheries; Application for Exempted Fishing Permits

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

ACTION: Notice; request for comments.

SUMMARY: The Assistant Regional Administrator for Sustainable Fisheries, Northeast Region, NMFS (Assistant Regional Administrator) has made a preliminary determination that the subject Exempted Fishing Permit (EFP) application from the University of New England (UNE) and the University of New Hampshire (UNH) that would allow Northeast multispecies vessels to possess spiny dogfish for a spiny dogfish life history study contains all the required information and warrants further consideration. The Assistant Regional Administrator has also made a preliminary determination that the activities authorized under the EFP would be consistent with the goals and objectives of the Spiny Dogfish Fishery Management Plan (FMP). However, further review and consultation may be necessary before a final determination is made.

DATES: Comments on this document must be received on or before April 2, 2008.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be submitted by e-mail to dogfish.efp@noaa.gov. Include in the subject line of the e-mail comment the following document identifier: "Comments on UNE dogfish possession EFP proposal." Written comments should be sent to Patricia A. Kurkul, Regional Administrator, NMFS, Northeast Regional Office, 1 Blackburn Drive, Gloucester, MA 01930. Mark the outside of the envelope, "Comments on UNE dogfish possession EFP proposal." Comments may also be sent via facsimile (fax) to (978) 281-9135.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ryan Silva, Cooperative Research Program Specialist, phone: 978-281-9326, fax: 978-281-9135.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The FMP implemented a semi-annual quota. When a semi-annual quota is projected to be harvested, NMFS closes the fishery until the next semi-annual quota opens. During a dogfish closure, no vessel may fish for or possess dogfish. A dogfish closure is currently in effect through April 30, 2008.

As part of a continuing research project, UNE, in collaboration with the UNH, is investigating Gulf of Maine dogfish age and growth, and size at sexual maturity characteristics. The applicant states that current dogfish life history data need updating, particularly in light of recent stock declines and potential regional variability in life history traits. The project investigators are attempting to develop a more accurate aging tool, which would