

June 25, 2010

Supporting Statement for Paperwork Reduction Act Submissions

OMB Control Number: 1660 – NEW

Title: FEMA Preparedness Grants: Port Security Grant Program (PSGP)

Form Number(s): FEMA Form# 089-5

General Instructions

A Supporting Statement, including the text of the notice to the public required by 5 CFR 1320.5(a)(i)(iv) and its actual or estimated date of publication in the Federal Register, must accompany each request for approval of a collection of information. The Supporting Statement must be prepared in the format described below, and must contain the information specified in Section A below. If an item is not applicable, provide a brief explanation. When Item 17 or the OMB Form 83-I is checked “Yes”, Section B of the Supporting Statement must be completed. OMB reserves the right to require the submission of additional information with respect to any request for approval.

Specific Instructions

A. Justification

1. Explain the circumstances that make the collection of information necessary. Identify any legal or administrative requirements that necessitate the collection. Attach a copy of the appropriate section of each statute and regulation mandating or authorizing the collection of information. Provide a detailed description of the nature and source of the information to be collected.

The **Port Security Grant Program (PSGP)** is a DHS grant program that focuses on infrastructure protection activities. The PSGP is one tool in the comprehensive set of measures authorized by Congress and implemented by the Administration to strengthen the Nation’s critical infrastructure against risks associated with potential terrorist attacks. The vast bulk of U.S. critical infrastructure is owned and/or operated by State, local and private sector partners. PSGP funds support increased port-wide risk management; enhanced domain awareness; training and exercises; and further capabilities to prevent, detect, respond to, and recover from attacks involving improvised explosive devices (IEDs) and other non-conventional weapons.

Section 102 of the Maritime Transportation Security Act of 2002, as amended (46 U.S.C. §70107), established the PSGP to provide for the establishment of a grant program for making a fair and equitable allocation of funds to implement Area Maritime Transportation Security

Plans and facility security plans among port authorities, facility operators, and State and local government agencies required to provide port security services.

Before awarding a grant under the program, the Secretary shall provide for review and comment by the appropriate Federal Maritime Security Coordinators and the Maritime Administrator. In administering the grant program, the Secretary shall take into account national economic and strategic defense concerns based upon the most current risk assessments available.” In addition, any information collected by FEMA for this program is in accordance with *46 U.S.C. §70107(g), as amended by section 112(c) of the Security and Accountability For Every (SAFE) Port Act of 2006 (P.L. 109-347)*, which states: “Any entity subject to an Area Maritime Transportation Security Plan may submit an application for a grant under this section, at such time, in such form, and containing such information and assurances as the Secretary may require.”

2. Indicate how, by whom, and for what purpose the information is to be used. Except for a new collection, indicate the actual use the agency has made of the information received from the current collection. Provide a detailed description of: how the information will be shared, if applicable, and for what programmatic purpose.

FEMA Form 089-5, PSGP Investment Justification – Submitted with the application, this document provides narrative detail on proposed investments. The Investment Justification must demonstrate how proposed projects address gaps and deficiencies in current programs and capabilities and the ability to provide enhancements consistent with the purpose of the program and guidance provided by FEMA. The data from the Investment Justification (IJ) is collected to assist decision-making at all levels, although, it is primarily used by individual application reviewers. The PSGP uses a multi-phase review process. Application data, including the IJ, is evaluated to determine which applications are the highest-scoring and address the program priorities. Review begins at the local level and the highest scoring applications advance to the national review phase. The National Review Panel (NRP) is comprised of officials from FEMA and United States Coast Guard (USCG). Representatives of other Federal stakeholder agencies such as the Transportation Security Administration (TSA), Customs and Border Patrol (CBP), U.S. Maritime Administration (MARAD) are also included. These reviewers then determine whether proposed activities identified in the application and IJ help achieve core missions of the grant program and formulate recommendations for funding to DHS leadership. **Note: (FEMA Form 089-21, Ferry Investment Justification)**, this data collection tool was published in the 60-day Federal Register Notice (FRN) on November 17, 2009 however, was later determined by the program office that this tool is no longer needed for this program and have since been removed.

Concept of Operations (CONOPS) – The CONOPS is a brief document designed to assist the Area Maritime Security Committee (AMSC) in providing a high level plan on how funding is going to be utilized. The CONOPS outlines the port area’s plan for developing their Port Wide Risk Management/Mitigation and Port Wide Trade Resumption/Resiliency Plans. The CONOPS includes who will be part of the process, how the interface between the Fiduciary Agent (FA) and the Area Maritime Security Committee (AMSC) will be conducted, and the key personnel that will be involved in the planning process. The CONOPS is reviewed and approved by the Executive Steering Committee (ESC). The ESC includes many of the same

members in the National Review Panel, including FEMA, TSA, USCG, and MARAD. The ESC reviews the CONOPS to ensure that a clearly defined and coordinated approach to funding expenditures will be used by the grant recipient prior to releasing funds for the development of the Port-Wide Risk Management/Mitigation Plan. Upon approval of the CONOPS, FEMA provides a partial release of funds to allow for development of the Port-Wide Risk Management Plan. The CONOPS is not a formal template, but rather a suggested format, and does not have required format. FEMA provides guidance to the applicant on the content and sample templates, which are being migrated to the Homeland Security Information Network (HSIN), a DHS-owned resource. The web address for this portal is <https://portal.hsin.gov>.

Port-Wide Risk Management/Mitigation Plan (PWRMP) – The PWRMP is developed through the active engagement of all port partners and Area Maritime Security Committee (AMSC), along with key Federal, state, local, and non-governmental entities. The PWRMP lays out the strategy and a series of concrete actions which must be undertaken to address the prevention of, protection against, response to, and recovery from major security incidents (to include all-hazard compatibility) within the port area to minimize the impact upon lives, property, and the economy (local, regional, national). All Group I and II Port Areas (excluding new Group II Port Areas that choose to opt out of the Fiduciary Agency process) are required to submit a PWRMP. The Plan must be approved by the Executive Steering Committee (ESC) prior to submitting Investment Justifications for potential grant funding. The PWRMP is used as a priority listing of investment types to be funded through the Fiduciary Agent process. Investment Justifications submitted subsequent to approval of the PWRMP are approved based on the effectiveness of the project, its’ relevance to the identified priorities within the PWRMP, as well as allowable expenditures based on PSGP guidance for the fiscal year in which the funds were awarded. The PWRMP is considered at minimum Sensitive Security Information (SSI) and is shared by FEMA only with the USCG and other Federal Agencies as needed. The grantee is responsible for the security of their documentation. The PWRMP is not a formal template, but rather a suggested format, and does not have a required format. FEMA provides guidance to the applicant on the content and sample templates, which are being migrated to the Homeland Security Information Network (HSIN), a DHS-owned resource. The web address for this is <https://portal.hsin.gov>.

PSGP - Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) or Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) - An MOU or MOA is a cooperative agreement for projects that provide layered security. Layered security projects are those projects that impact/affect agencies and entities other than the applicant, and the applicant has agreed to utilize the project to continue to support other agencies or entities (i.e. Improvised Explosive Device (IED) Response vessel purchased by Fire Department XYZ, Fire Department XYZ has an MOU with ABC Police Department to respond to IED incidents). A number of grantees encounter challenges in obtaining an MOU or MOA due to state and local legislative requirements. In lieu of an MOU/MOA, PSGP also will accept a letter from the Captain of the Port stating that the agency/entity is noted within the Area Maritime Security Plan as a layered security provider. An MOU/MOA may not be required for Group 1 and 2 port areas participating in the Fiduciary Agent process, in which the grantee and all sub-recipients are included in the Area Maritime Security Plan and Port-wide Risk Management Plan. An MOU or MOA is used by FEMA as assurance that an agreement exists between port partners for layered security projects funded by FEMA. This helps to

ensure minimal redundancies where no redundancies are needed, and to minimize duplicative project funding requests in areas where funded capabilities already exist. The MOU/MOA is not a formal template, but rather a suggested format, and does not have a required format. FEMA provides a Sample MOU/MOA Template for usage. The MOU/MOA is listed in the PSGP program guidance, which is accessible at:
http://www.fema.gov/pdf/government/grant/psgp/fy09_psgp_guidance.pdf (page 33).

The Homeland Security Information Network (HSIN) is utilized by Federal, State, local, and private partners as a data bank resource for sharing and storing sensitive information. HSIN is a web-based encrypted network providing for delivery of real-time interactive information exchange among FEMA and its Partners. The program office creates folders in secured compartments accessible only to authorized users of each folder. The program office grants access to United States Coast Guard (USCG), Executive Steering Committee (ESC) members, PSGP staff, and grantees. The CONOPS, PWRMP, IJ's, reference documents, and review forms are all (in MS Word or other electronic format) uploaded and stored within the HSIN. This provides a single source access point for PSGP partners. The Homeland Security Information Network web address is <https://portal.hsin.gov>.

FEMA Form 024-0-1, Environmental and Historic Preservation (EHP) Environmental Screening Form (ESF) - The Environmental and Historic Preservation Environmental Screening Form is a paper form used by FEMA's Grant Programs Directorate (GPD) and is utilized when following the requirements for grant packages that utilize this instrument. This form should be attached to all project information sent to GPD for an Environmental and Historic Preservation (EHP) regulatory compliance review. This collection activity is currently in the OMB process for approval under ICR Reference No. 201003-1660-007.

Semiannual Progress Report, (formerly known as the Categorical Assistance Progress Report (CAPR)) – The Semiannual Progress Report provides programmatic information on the use of grant funding. The Report should also address performance measures and the activities identified in the Investment Justifications as necessary. In addition, the information provided in the reports will be used by the grantor agency to monitor grantee cash flow to ensure proper use of Federal funds. The reports are due within 30 days after the end of the reporting period (July 30 for the Reporting period of January 1 through June 30; and January 30 for the reporting period of July 1 through December 31). The Semiannual Progress Report is part of the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ), Office for Justice Program (OJP) Grant Management System (GMS). OJP has received clearance from OMB for this collection activity under OJP OMB Number 1121-0243 which expires on August 31, 2012.

Homeland Security Exercise and Evaluation Program (HSEEP) After-Action Report (AAR) and Improvement Plan (IP) – The information contained within this report identifies areas where expectations for preparedness to respond to an emergency situation are met as well as areas where improvement is required. This information is used by the Secretary of Homeland Security and shared with heads of other Federal Departments including FEMA's National Preparedness Directorate to allow for planning methods to increase levels of preparedness, establishing mechanisms for improved delivery of Federal preparedness assistance to State and local governments, and outlining actions to strengthen preparedness capabilities of Federal, State and local entities.

This initiative is managed by FEMA's National Preparedness Directorate (NPD). Grant recipients must report on scheduled exercises and ensure that an HSEEP After-Action Report (AAR) and Improvement Plan (IP) are prepared for each exercise conducted with FEMA support. This information must be submitted to the FEMA within 60 days following completion of an exercise. There are two separate templates that support this data collection effort: (1) **Discussion-Based Exercise template**; 2) **Operations-Based Exercise template**. This collection activity is currently in the OMB process for approval under ICR Reference No. 201006-1660-001.

3. Describe whether, and to what extent, the collection of information involves the use of automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses, and the basis for the decision for adopting this means of collection. Also describe any consideration of using information technology to reduce burden.

The submission of information for the FY 2009 PSGP involves the use of electronic means. Grant applicants must submit their proposals through www.grants.gov and upload the PSGP Investment Justification and all other required documents as attachments (in MS Word or other electronic format) to their PSGP application. Eligible applicants must apply for funding through this portal accessible on the internet.

4. Describe efforts to identify duplication. Show specifically why any similar information already available cannot be used or modified for use for the purposes described in Item 2 above.

This information is not collected in any form, and therefore is not duplicated elsewhere.

5. If the collection of information impacts small businesses or other small entities (Item 5 of OMB Form 83-I), describe any methods used to minimize.

This information collection does not have an impact on small businesses or other small entities.

6. Describe the consequence to Federal/FEMA program or policy activities if the collection of information is not conducted, or is conducted less frequently as well as any technical or legal obstacles to reducing burden.

These data collection elements are required in order to exercise comprehensive financial management and ensure the efficient and effective use of Federal funds. If FEMA was not able to receive information collected from grant recipients, the agency could not fulfill its requirement to ensure funding is provided in a fair and equitable manner to eligible entities as described in the law, to ensure that the funding is being used only for the allowable costs within the grant regulations, and to fulfill our federal monitoring requirements. Failure to collect this data could result in unfair and uninformed granting of funds, grantees utilizing funds for unallowable costs, and the inability to carry out the program as is statutorily outlined.

7. Explain any special circumstances that would cause an information collection to be conducted in a manner:

(a) Requiring respondents to report information to the agency more often than quarterly.

No collection elements are required more often than quarterly. Most collection elements are only required once per year per grant application.

(b) Requiring respondents to prepare a written response to a collection of information in fewer than 30 days after receipt of it.

There are no requirements for respondents to prepare a written response to this collection of information in fewer than 30 days after receipt of it.

(c) Requiring respondents to submit more than an original and two copies of any document.

There are no requirements for a respondent to submit more than an original and two copies of any document.

(d) Requiring respondents to retain records, other than health, medical, government contract, grant-in-aid, or tax records for more than three years.

Records must be retained for three years. If any litigation, claim, negotiation, audit or other action involving the records has been started before the expiration of the three-year period, the records must be retained until completion of the action and resolution of all issues which arise from it, or until the end of the regular three-year period, which ever is later.

(e) In connection with a statistical survey, that is not designed to produce valid and reliable results that can be generalized to the universe of study.

There is no statistical survey involved with this data collection.

(f) Requiring the use of a statistical data classification that has not been reviewed and approved by OMB.

There is no use for statistical data classification in this data collection.

(g) That includes a pledge of confidentiality that is not supported by authority established in statute or regulation, that is not supported by disclosure and data security policies that are consistent with the pledge, or which unnecessarily impedes sharing of data with other agencies for compatible confidential use.

There is no pledge of confidentiality that is not supported by authority established in statute or regulation for this data collection.

(h) Requiring respondents to submit proprietary trade secret, or other confidential information unless the agency can demonstrate that it has instituted procedures to protect the information's confidentiality to the extent permitted by law.

There are no requirements for respondents to submit proprietary trade secret, or other confidential information for this data collection.

8. Federal Register Notice:

a. Provide a copy and identify the date and page number of publication in the Federal Register of the agency's notice soliciting comments on the information collection prior to submission to OMB. Summarize public comments received in response to that notice and describe actions taken by the agency in response to these comments. Specifically address comments received on cost and hour burden.

A 60-day Federal Register Notice inviting public comments was published on November 17, 2009, Vol. 74, Number 220, pp. 59234. No comments were received. See attached copy of the published notice included in this package.

A 30-day Federal Register Notice inviting public comments was published on March 29, 2010, Vol. 75, Number 59, pp. 15444. No comments were received. See attached copy of the published notice included in this package.

b. Describe 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.

FEMA mainly meets with the American Association of Port Authorities (AAPA) national association that represents this entity, as well as individual grantees, through regular program-specific conferences and workshops. Additionally, teleconferences and e-mail communications are also used. These consultations focus on the nature of information needed by FEMA to manage the grant programs.

c. Describe consultations with representatives of those from whom information is to be obtained or those who must compile records. Consultation should occur at least once every three years, even if the collection of information activities is the same as in prior periods. There may be circumstances that may preclude consultation in a specific situation. These circumstances should be explained.

FEMA consults on a regular basis with Federal, State, local, tribal stakeholders on a variety of issues. In particular, on matters related to this information collection submission. These consultations involve discussions regarding the nature of information needed by FEMA to manage the grant programs. Partners offer comments and suggestions about their reporting practices. The most common area of concern is performance reporting, as most States are very familiar and comfortable with the grant administrative and financial reporting data elements that FEMA uses.

9. Explain any decision to provide any payment or gift to respondents, other than remuneration of contractors or grantees.

FEMA does not provide payments or gifts to respondents in exchange for a benefit sought.

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

The DHS Privacy Office approved the Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) for this information collection on July 14, 2009.

11. Provide additional justification for any question of a sensitive nature (such as sexual behavior and attitudes, religious beliefs and other matters that are commonly considered private). This justification should include the reasons why the agency considers the questions necessary, the specific uses to be made of the information, the explanation to be given to persons from whom the information is requested, and any steps to be taken to obtain their consent.

There are no questions of sensitive nature.

12. Provide estimates of the hour burden of the collection of information. The statement should:

a. Indicate the number of respondents, frequency of response, annual hour burden, and an explanation of how the burden was estimated for each collection instrument (separately list each instrument and describe information as requested). Unless directed to do so, agencies should not conduct special surveys to obtain information on which to base hour burden estimates. Consultation with a sample (fewer than 10) of potential respondents is desired. If the hour burden on respondents is expected to vary widely because of differences in activity, size, or complexity, show the range of estimated hour burden, and explain the reasons for the variance. Generally, estimates should not include burden hours for customary and usual business practices.

The PSGP is an existing grant program that uses the forms outlined in this collection. The vast bulk of U.S. critical infrastructure is owned and/or operated by State, local and private sector partners. PSGP funds support increased port-wide risk management; enhanced domain awareness; training and exercises; and further capabilities to prevent, detect, respond to and recover from attacks at our nation's ports involving improvised explosive devices (IEDs) and other non-conventional weapons. The burden hour estimates shown on the following pages are based upon internal and external subject matter expertise. The burden to collect the necessary information has estimated to be 21,822 total annual burden hours.

b. If this request for approval covers more than one form, provide separate hour burden estimates for each form and aggregate the hour burdens in Item 13 of OMB Form 83-I.

c. Provide an estimate of annualized cost to respondents for the hour burdens for collections of information, identifying and using appropriate wage rate categories. The cost to the respondents of contracting out or paying outside parties for information collection activities should not be included here. Instead this cost should be included in Item 13.

State Table

Table A.12: Estimated Annualized Burden Hours and Costs

Type of Respondent	Form Name / Form Number	No. of Respondents	No. of Responses per Respondent	Total No. of Responses	Avg. Burden per Response (in hours)	Total Annual Burden (in hours)	Avg. Hourly Wage Rate*	Total Annual Respondent Cost
State, Local or Tribal Government	PSGP Investment Justification / FEMA Form 089-5	56	4	224	16 hrs.	3584	\$33.60	\$120,422.40
State, Local or Tribal Government	Concept of Operations (CONOPS)	20	1	20	4 hrs.	80	\$33.60	\$2,688.00
State, Local or Tribal Government	Port-Wide Risk Management/Mitigation Plan (PWRMP)	20	1	20	80 hrs.	1600	\$33.60	\$53,760.00
State, Local or Tribal Government	PSGP - Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) or Memorandum of Agreement (MOA)	4	1	4	2 hrs.	8	\$33.60	\$268.00
Total		100				5,272		\$177,138.40

* Note: The "Avg. Hourly Wage Rate" for each respondent includes a 1.4 multiplier to reflect a fully-loaded wage rate.

According to the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics Web site (www.bls.gov) the wage rate category for State Water Transportation Support Representatives is estimated to be \$24.00 per hour (\$33.60 with the 1.4 multiplier) for completing and submitting the FEMA grant information to FEMA for review and approval. Therefore, the estimated total burden hour cost to State Water Transportation Support Representatives is estimated to be \$172,837.60 annually.

Local Table

Table A.12: Estimated Annualized Burden Hours and Costs

Type of Respondent	Form Name / Form Number	No. of Respondents	No. of Responses per Respondent	Total No. of Responses	Avg. Burden per Response (in hours)	Total Annual Burden (in hours)	Avg. Hourly Wage Rate*	Total Annual Respondent Cost
State, Local or Tribal Government	PSGP Investment Justification / FEMA Form 089-5	128	3	384	16 hrs.	6144	\$40.64	\$249,692.16
State, Local or Tribal Government	Concept of Operations (CONOPS)	22	1	22	4 hrs.	88	\$40.64	\$3,576.32
State, Local or Tribal Government	Port-Wide Risk Management/Mitigation Plan (PWRMP)	22	1	22	80 hrs.	1760	\$40.64	\$71,526.40
State, Local or Tribal Government	PSGP - Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) or Memorandum of Agreement (MOA)	17	1	17	2 hrs.	34	\$40.64	\$1,381.76
Total		189				8026		\$326,176.64

* Note: The “Avg. Hourly Wage Rate” for each respondent includes a 1.4 multiplier to reflect a fully-loaded wage rate.

According to the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics Web site (www.bls.gov) the wage rate category for Local Water Transportation Support Representatives is estimated to be \$29.03 per hour (\$40.64 with the 1.4 multiplier) for completing and submitting the FEMA grant information to FEMA for review and approval. Therefore, the estimated total burden hour cost to Local Water Transportation Support Representatives is estimated to be \$326,176.64 annually.

Business or other for-profit Table

Table A.12: Estimated Annualized Burden Hours and Costs

Type of Respondent	Form Name / Form Number	No. of Respondents	No. of Responses per Respondent	Total No. of Responses	Avg. Burden per Response (in hours)	Total Annual Burden (in hours)	Avg. Hourly Wage Rate*	Total Annual Respondent Cost
Business or other for-profit	PSGP Investment Justification / FEMA Form 089-5	159	3	477	16 hrs.	7632	\$44.31	\$338,173.92
Business or other for-profit	Concept of Operations (CONOPS)	12	1	12	4 hrs.	48	\$44.31	\$2,126.88
Business or other	Port-Wide Risk Management/Mitigation	12	1	12	80 hrs.	960	\$44.31	\$42,537.60

for-profit	Plan (PWRMP)							
Business or other for-profit	PSGP - Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) or Memorandum of Agreement (MOA)	6	1	6	2 hrs.	12	\$44.31	\$531.72
Total		189				8652		\$383,370.12
Grand Total		478				21,950		\$886,685.16

* **Note:** The “Avg. Hourly Wage Rate” for each respondent includes a 1.4 multiplier to reflect a fully-loaded wage rate.

According to the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics Web site (www.bls.gov) the wage rate category for Water Transportation Support Representatives is estimated to be \$31.65 per hour (*\$44.31 with the 1.4 multiplier*) for completing and submitting the FEMA grant information to FEMA for review and approval. Therefore, the estimated total burden hour cost to Water Transportation Support Representatives is estimated to be \$383,370.12 annually.

Note: The estimated grand total burden hour cost for all three tables annually is \$886,685.16.

The Standard Forms listed in the table below are used in FEMA administration of grant programs collections of information. These burden estimates are captured under the OMB government-wide collections of information for Standard Forms (SF). Other data collection activities approved by OMB are also identified in the table below.

Port Security Grant Program (PSGP) (97.056)

Standard Forms

Type of Respondent	Form Name / Form Number	No. of Respondents	No. of Responses per Respondent	Total Annual Burden (in hours)	Avg. Burden per Response (in hours)	Annual No. of Responses	Avg. Hourly Wage Rate	Total Annual Respondent Cost
State, Local or Tribal Government	Application for Federal Assistance / SF 424	478	1	478	0.75	359	\$33.60	\$12,062.40
State, Local or Tribal Government	Budget Information - Non-Construction Programs / SF 424A	478	1	478	3	1,434	\$33.60	\$48,182.40

State, Local or Tribal Government	Assurances - Non-Construction Programs / SF 424B	478	1	478	0.25	120	\$33.60	\$4,032.00
State, Local or Tribal Government	Budget Information - Construction Programs / SF 424C	478	1	478	3	1,434	\$33.60	\$48,182.40
State, Local or Tribal Government	Assurances - Construction Programs / SF 424D	478	1	478	0.25	120	\$33.60	\$4,032.00
State, Local or Tribal Government	Disclosure of Lobbying Activities / SF LLL	478	1	478	0.167	80	\$33.60	\$2,688.00
State, Local or Tribal Government	Direct Deposit Sign-Up Form / SF 1199A	478	1	478	0.167	80	\$33.60	\$2,688.00
State, Local or Tribal Government	Federal Financial Report / SF 425	478	4	1912	1.5	2,868	\$33.60	\$96,364.80
State, Local or Tribal Government	Financial Status Report / Standard Form 269	478	4	1912	0.5	956	\$33.60	\$32,121.60
Total				7,170		7,451		\$250,353.60
Other Departments/ Agencies Data Collection Activities								
State, Local or Tribal Government	EHP - Environmental Screening Form / FEMA Form	478	1	478				

	024-0-1, FEMA OMB Number 1660-XXXX							
State, Local or Tribal Government	Semiannual Progress Report, formerly known as the Categorical Assistance Progress Report (CAPR) / OJP OMB control number 1121-0243	478	1	478				
State, Local or Tribal Government	Homeland Security Exercise & Evaluation Program (HSEEP) After Action Report (AAR) and Improvement Plan (IP) / No Form; FEMA OMB Number 1660-XXXX	478	1	478				
Total				1,434				

13. Provide an estimate of the total annual cost burden to respondents or recordkeepers resulting from the collection of information. The cost of purchasing or contracting out information collection services should be a part of this cost burden estimate. (Do not include the cost of any hour burden shown in Items 12 and 14.)

The cost estimates should be split into two components:

a. Operation and Maintenance and purchase of services component. These estimates should take into account cost associated with generating, maintaining, and disclosing or providing information. Include descriptions of methods used to estimate major cost factors including system and technology acquisition, expected useful life of capital equipment, the discount rate(s), and the time period over which costs will be incurred.

b. Capital and Start-up-Cost should include, among other items, preparations for collecting information such as purchasing computers and software, monitoring sampling, drilling and testing equipment, and record storage facilities.

There are no record keeping, capital, start-up or maintenance costs associated with this information collection.

14. Provide estimates of annualized cost to the federal government. Also, provide a description of the method used to estimate cost, which should include quantification of hours, operational expenses (such as equipment, overhead, printing and support staff),

and any other expense that would have been incurred without this collection of information. You may also aggregate cost estimates for Items 12, 13, and 14 in a single table.

The total cost to FEMA is \$1,106,664.80. Approximately 10 staff members with an estimated grade level of GS-13 review and analyze the information collected by this program.

Annual Cost to the Federal Government

Item	Cost (\$)
Contract Costs There is one contract that supports this effort: The Grant Operations Support Contract. This contract supports the development of the programs & provide guidance/assistance to grantees, collect & review information, and the cost for this contract is: Grant Operations Support: \$376,478.00	\$376,478.00
Staff Salaries [10 GS-13, step 1 employees spending approximately 60% of time annually for this administrative and financial data collection] 10x \$86,927.00 = \$869,270.00 x 1.4 = \$1,216,978.00 x .60 = \$730,186.80	\$730,186.80
Facilities [cost for renting, overhead, etc. for data collection activity]	
Computer Hardware and Software [cost of equipment annual lifecycle]	
Equipment Maintenance [cost of annual maintenance/service agreements for equipment]	
Travel	
Printing [number of data collection instruments annually]	
Postage [annual number of data collection instruments x postage]	
Other	
Total	\$1,106,664.80

* Note: The "Avg. Hourly Wage Rate" for each respondent includes a 1.4 multiplier to reflect a fully-loaded wage rate.

15. Explain the reasons for any program changes or adjustments reported in Items 13 or 14 of the OMB Form 83-I in a narrative form. Present the itemized changes in hour burden and cost burden according to program changes or adjustments in Table 5. Denote a program increase as a positive number, and a program decrease as a negative number.

A **Program increase** is an additional burden resulting from a Federal government regulatory action or directive. (e.g., an increase in sample size or coverage, amount of information, reporting frequency, or expanded use of an existing form). This also includes previously in-use and unapproved information collections discovered during the ICB process, or during the fiscal year, which will be in use during the next fiscal year.

A "**Program decrease**", is a reduction in burden because of: (1) the discontinuation of an information collection; or (2) a change in an existing information collection by a Federal agency (e.g., the use of sampling (or smaller samples), a decrease in the amount of information requested (fewer questions), or a decrease in reporting frequency).

"**Adjustment**" denotes a change in burden hours due to factors over which the government has no control, such as population growth, or in factors which do not affect what information the government collects or changes in the methods used to estimate burden or correction of errors in burden estimates.

Itemized Changes in Annual Burden Hours
--

Data collection Activity/Instrument	Program Change (hours currently on OMB Inventory)	Program Change (New)	Difference	Adjustment (hours currently on OMB Inventory)	Adjustment (New)	Difference
PSGP Investment Justification/ FEMA Form 089-5	0	17,360	+17,360			
Concept of Operations (CONOPS)	0	216	+216			
Port-Wide Risk Management/Mitigation Plan (PWRMP)	0	4,320	+4,320			
PSGP - Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) or Memorandum of Agreement (MOA)	0	54	+54			
Total(s)	0	21,950	+21,950			

Explain: This is a new collection that was not previously on the OMB inventory. Therefore, the burden hours are positive program changes.

Itemized Changes in Annual Cost Burden						
Data collection Activity/Instrument	Program Change (cost currently on OMB Inventory)	Program Change (New)	Difference	Adjustment (cost currently on OMB Inventory)	Adjustment (New)	Difference
PSGP Investment Justification/ FEMA Form 089-5	0	\$708,288.48	+\$708,288.48			
Concept of Operations (CONOPS)	0	\$8,391.20	+ \$8,391.20			
Port-Wide Risk Management/Mitigation Plan (PWRMP)	0	\$167,824.00	+\$167,824.00			
PSGP - Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) or Memorandum of Agreement (MOA)	0	\$2,181.48	+ \$2,181.48			
Total(s)	0	\$886,685.16	+\$886,685.16			

Explain: This collection has not previously been approved for use by OMB and there was no previous Annual Cost Burden.

16. For collections of information whose results will be published, outline plans for tabulation and publication. Address any complex analytical techniques that will be used. Provide the time schedule for the entire project, including beginning and ending dates of the collection of information, completion of report, publication dates, and other actions.

FEMA does not intend to employ the use of statistics or the publication thereof for this information collection.

17. If seeking approval not to display the expiration date for OMB approval of the information collection, explain reasons that display would be inappropriate.

FEMA will display the expiration date for OMB approval of this information collection.

**18. Explain each exception to the certification statement identified in Item 19
“Certification for Paperwork Reduction Act Submissions,” of OMB Form 83-I.**

FEMA does not request an exception to the certification of this information collection.

B. Collections of Information Employing Statistical Methods.

There is no statistical methodology involved in this collection.