



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

OFFICE OF
PREVENTION, PESTICIDES, AND
TOXIC SUBSTANCES

MEMORANDUM

DATE: August 31, 2009

SUBJECT: Request for OMB Approval of Customer Satisfaction Survey of National Conference, ICR 1711.12, OMB 2090-0019

FROM: Stephanie Plummer
Environmental Stewardship Branch
Biopesticides and Pollution Prevention Division
Office of Pesticide Programs

THROUGH: Patricia Bonner (1807T), Customer Service Director
Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation

Spencer Clark (2822T)
Information Collections Division
Office of Environmental Information

TO: Heidi King, Desk Officer for EPA
Office of Management and Budget

Background:

The Environmental Stewardship Branch (ESB) manages the Pesticide Environmental Stewardship Program (PESP), a voluntary partnership program that partners with the pesticide user community to promote reduced risk pest management practices. PESP has about 150 diverse members nationwide, including schools, farms, commercial pest management professionals, golf courses, non-profits, and more. As such, ESB will be holding a PESP annual meeting this November 17-18, in Arlington, VA to bring its members together. The annual meeting will serve as an opportunity to share some important changes being made to PESP and also as a professional networking forum for members.

PESP plans to follow up the annual meeting with a customer satisfaction survey, which will be distributed to meeting participants via SurveyMonkey. Potential respondents include all attendees except for EPA staff, contractor staff, and media.

This survey consists of 27 questions pertaining to what conference participants thought of the conference (i.e. how satisfied they were with their experience). Question #27 is open-ended and asks participants for any additional comments on the conference. Questions #28-30 are not

related to the conference; they ask participants whether they read the PESP newsletter (called the PESPwire) and how much value they find it to have.

The information collected in this survey will be aggregated to give ESB a sense of how successful the conference was, and serve as the basis for improvements made to future ESB/PESP conferences. Question #22, regarding the PESP newsletter, will enable PESP to improve the quality of its newsletter and make it more useful to our target audience, PESP members.

Estimated total respondent burden: 2 hours

- Assumes:
 1. 22 multiple choice questions, each taking 3 seconds to complete
 2. 3 required open ended questions, each taking 1 minute to complete
 3. non-required open ended questions not included in burden estimate
 4. Total = ~4 minutes per respondent to complete evaluation form
- 100 potential respondents, 30% response rate = 30 completed evaluation forms

Estimated total Agency burden: 6 hours

Internally, staff and managers will spend approximately 4 hours to review and discuss the results and plan/implement changes in response.

Draft Evaluation Form Questions:

1. How would you rate your level of satisfaction with the overall content of the conference?
 - a. Very dissatisfied
 - b. Dissatisfied
 - c. Satisfied
 - d. Very satisfied

2. Please rate your level of satisfaction with the following aspects of the conference (Very dissatisfied, dissatisfied, satisfied, very satisfied):
 - a. Logistics – directions, check-in, etc.
 - b. Location/Venue
 - c. Peer-to-Peer Networking
 - d. Direct Communication with EPA
 - e. Food & Beverage
 - f. Hotel
 - g. Audiovisuals/Handouts

3. In your opinion, the overall length of the conference was:
 - a. Too short
 - b. Too long
 - c. Just right

4. In your opinion, the lengths of the plenary sessions were:
 - a. Too short
 - b. Too long
 - c. Just right

5. In your opinion, the lengths of the breakout sessions were:
 - a. Too short
 - b. Too long
 - c. Just right

6. How satisfied were you with the following sessions, in terms of their ability to help you do your work (Very dissatisfied, dissatisfied, satisfied, very satisfied)?
 - a. Overview of the new PESP
 - b. A particular plenary session (name which one)
 - c. A particular breakout session (name which one)
 - d. Facilitated Feedback Session: Listening to Our Members
 - e. Networking opportunities during breaks
 - f. Other

7. What information or opportunity was least useful to your work?
 - a. Overview of the new PESP
 - b. A particular plenary session (name which one)
 - c. A particular breakout session (name which one)
 - d. Facilitated Feedback Session: Listening to Our Members
 - e. Networking opportunities during breaks
 - f. Other

8. How satisfied were you with the content of the session “The New PESP Overview?”
 - a. Very dissatisfied
 - b. Dissatisfied
 - c. Satisfied
 - d. Very satisfied
 - e. N/A

9. How satisfied were you with the speaker for the session “The New PESP Overview?”
 - a. Very dissatisfied
 - b. Dissatisfied
 - c. Satisfied
 - d. Very satisfied
 - e. N/A

10. How satisfied were you with the content of “PESP Member Success Story and Discussion?”
 - a. Very dissatisfied
 - b. Dissatisfied
 - c. Satisfied
 - d. Very satisfied
 - e. N/A

11. How satisfied were you with the speaker for the “PESP Member Success Story and Discussion?”
 - a. Very dissatisfied
 - b. Dissatisfied
 - c. Satisfied
 - d. Very satisfied
 - e. N/A

12. How satisfied were you with the content of the plenary session “Leveraging the Power of Public-Private Partnerships?”
 - a. Very dissatisfied
 - b. Dissatisfied
 - c. Satisfied
 - d. Very satisfied
 - e. N/A

13. How satisfied were you with the speaker for the plenary session “Leveraging the Power of Public-Private Partnerships?”
 - a. Very dissatisfied
 - b. Dissatisfied
 - c. Satisfied
 - d. Very satisfied
 - e. N/A

14. How satisfied were you with the content of the panel session “Sustainable Agriculture: Growers Protecting Their Most Valuable Resource – the Earth?”
 - a. Very dissatisfied
 - b. Dissatisfied
 - c. Satisfied
 - d. Very satisfied
 - e. N/A

15. How satisfied were you with the panelists for the panel session “Sustainable Agriculture: Growers Protecting Their Most Valuable Resource – the Earth?”
 - a. Very dissatisfied
 - b. Dissatisfied
 - c. Satisfied
 - d. Very satisfied
 - e. N/A

16. How satisfied were you with the content of the panel session “Community IPM: An Integrative Approach to Reducing Risk Where We Live, Work, and Play?”
 - a. Very dissatisfied
 - b. Dissatisfied
 - c. Satisfied
 - d. Very satisfied
 - e. N/A

17. How satisfied were you with the panelists for the panel session “Community IPM: An Integrative Approach to Reducing Risk Where We Live, Work, and Play?”
 - a. Very dissatisfied
 - b. Dissatisfied
 - c. Satisfied
 - d. Very satisfied
 - e. N/A

18. How satisfied were you with the content of the panel session “Restoring the Chesapeake Bay: Opportunities for Collaboration?”
 - a. Very dissatisfied
 - b. Dissatisfied
 - c. Satisfied
 - d. Very satisfied

- e. N/A
19. How satisfied were you with the panelists for the panel session “Restoring the Chesapeake Bay: Opportunities for Collaboration?”
- a. Very dissatisfied
 - b. Dissatisfied
 - c. Satisfied
 - d. Very satisfied
 - e. N/A
20. How satisfied were you with the content of the “PESP Strategy Workshop?”
- a. Very dissatisfied
 - b. Dissatisfied
 - c. Satisfied
 - d. Very dissatisfied
 - e. N/A
21. How satisfied were you with the facilitation of the “PESP Strategy Workshop?”
- a. Very dissatisfied
 - b. Dissatisfied
 - c. Satisfied
 - d. Very satisfied
 - e. N/A
22. How satisfied were you with the content of the session “Listening to Our Members?”
- a. Very dissatisfied
 - b. Dissatisfied
 - c. Satisfied
 - d. Very satisfied
 - e. N/A
23. How satisfied were you with the facilitation of the session “Listening to Our Members?”
- a. Very dissatisfied
 - b. Dissatisfied
 - c. Satisfied
 - d. Very satisfied
 - e. N/A
24. How satisfied were you with the session “Other Opportunities for PESP Members?”
- a. Very dissatisfied
 - b. Dissatisfied
 - c. Satisfied
 - d. Very satisfied
 - e. N/A

25. Would you attend the 2010 ESB Annual Conference?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No

26. What kind of topics would you like to see covered in the future?

27. Please include any additional comments regarding the conference:

28. Do you currently receive the PESPwire via e-mail?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No

29. How satisfied are you with the content of PESPwire?
 - a. Very dissatisfied
 - b. Dissatisfied
 - c. Satisfied
 - d. Very satisfied
 - e. N/A

30. Are there any types of information you would like to see included in the PESPwire that are not currently included?

Burden Statement: Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average four (4) minutes per response, including the time for reviewing instructions and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments on the Agency's need for this information, the accuracy of the provided burden estimates, and any suggestions for reducing the burden, including the use of automated collection techniques to the Director, OEI Collection Strategies Division, United States Environmental Protection Agency (Mail Code 2822T), 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, Washington, DC 20460; and to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, 725 17th Street NW, Washington, DC 20503, Attention: Desk Officer for EPA. Include the EPA ICR number (1711.12) and the OMB control number (2090-0019) in any correspondence.