

**Evaluation of the  
Demonstration  
Planning Grant  
Program**

**Task Order  
C-CHI-01031/  
GS-10F-0086K**

**OMB Paperwork  
Reduction Act  
Submission for  
Survey of Section 202  
Sponsors**

**Part A: Justification**

June 14, 2010

*Prepared for*

Ashaki Robinson Johns, M.S.W.  
Office of Policy Development and  
Research  
US Department of Housing and  
Urban Development  
451 7th St. SW, Suite 8120  
Washington, DC 20410

*Prepared by*

Gretchen Locke  
Melissa Vandawalker  
Abt Associates Inc.  
55 Wheeler Street  
Cambridge, MA 02138

# Table of Contents

---

<b>Part A: Justification</b> .....	<b>1</b>
A1 Circumstances That Make the Collection of Information Necessary .....	1
A2 How and by Whom the Data Will Be Used .....	3
A2.1 Project Overview .....	3
A2.2 Purpose of the Data Collection .....	4
A2.3 Who Will Use the Information .....	5
A2.4 Instrument Item-by-Item Justification .....	6
A3 Use of Improved Technologies.....	12
A4 Efforts to Avoid Duplication .....	13
A5 Involvement of Small Entities .....	14
A6 Consequences of Less Frequent Data Collection .....	14
A7 Special Circumstances .....	14
A8 Consultations Outside the Agency.....	14
A9 Payments to Respondents .....	15
A10 Arrangements and Assurances Regarding Confidentiality.....	15
A11 Sensitive Questions.....	15
A12 Estimate of Annualized Burden Hours .....	15
A13 Estimated Record Keeping and Reporting Cost Burden on Respondents .....	15
A14 Estimated Cost to the Federal Government .....	16
A15 Reasons for Changes in Burden.....	16
A16 Tabulation Plan, Statistical Analysis, and Study Schedule .....	16
A17 Expiration Date Display Exemption .....	17
A18 Exceptions to Certification .....	17
<b>Appendix: Federal Register Notice</b> .....	<b>A-1</b>

## Part A: Justification

### A1 Circumstances That Make the Collection of Information Necessary

This request is for the clearance of a telephone survey instrument for the evaluation of the Housing and Urban Development's Section 202 Demonstration Planning Grant program.

The Section 202 Supportive Housing for the Elderly program, established under the Housing Act of 1959, provides capital advances and operating funding in the form of Project Rental Assistance Contracts (PRACs) to nonprofit "sponsors" to develop and operate housing for very low-income seniors. Section 202 awards can also be used to fund full-time service coordinators who assist residents with their daily living needs and connect them to supportive services in the community.

The Section 202 program is funded by competitive grants (capital advances) administered by HUD's Office of Housing's Multifamily HUBs and Program Centers, or "field offices." Section 202 capital advance awardees include a wide range of types of organizations, from large national organizations with extensive Section 202 development experience, such as National Church Residences, Catholic Charities, and Volunteers of America, to local community and faith-based organizations that may not have in-house development expertise.

Before construction can start, sponsors need to complete several activities during the predevelopment period, including design, permitting, zoning, and environmental site assessments. HUD guidelines stipulate that these predevelopment activities should be completed within 18 months, but the field office can extend up to 24 months. If additional time is needed beyond 24 months, the sponsor may request a waiver. Waivers for additional Section 202 funding can also be granted for exceptional circumstances that are beyond the control of the sponsor. Both waivers for additional time and waivers for additional funding must be submitted to and approved by the field office and HUD Headquarters.

HUD's goal is for Section 202 properties to reach initial closing within 18 months of fund reservation. However, a 2003 General Accounting Office (GAO) report<sup>1</sup> found that approximately 70 percent of Section 202 properties funded between 1998 and 2000 did not meet HUD's target for gaining approval to start construction within 18 months of fund reservation. The GAO report also stated that properties that did not meet the timeline took an average of 29 months, contributing to unexpended fund balances. Sponsors and field office respondents attributed the delays to a number of factors, including a lack of predevelopment funding.

---

<sup>1</sup> Government Accountability Office (2003). Elderly Housing: Project Funding and Other Factors Delay Assistance to Needy Households. Washington, DC.

The Demonstration Planning Grant Program (DPG) was implemented in fiscal year 2004 in response to concerns identified in the GAO report. Eligible activities include consulting services, architectural and engineering services, environmental site assessments, legal fees, organizational costs, building permits, and relocation expenses. Congress appropriated funds for the DPG in FY2004; and from FY2004 through FY2008, more than 350 Section 202 sponsors applied for grants. Sponsors can request DPG funding of up to \$400,000 per property. The funding is based on predevelopment cost estimates developed by the sponsor and submitted with the DPG application.

With five rounds of DPG awards completed, it is a good time to assess the experience and outcomes of the program both for grant recipients and for Section 202 sponsors that did not apply for or receive DPG grants. It is important for HUD to understand whether the DPG program is meeting its stated goal of reducing the predevelopment time period for Section 202 properties. The study will help HUD understand which sponsor and property characteristics and other factors are associated with faster development of affordable elderly housing. Information collected from this study will also help HUD better understand the DPG application and administrative processes and how they affect the development of Section 202 properties. Between FY2004 and FY2008, approximately two-thirds of Section 202 properties were awarded Demonstration Planning Grants. The study will help HUD understand why the program is not being fully utilized and whether aspects of the program deter participation.

The research activities for this project include both quantitative and qualitative analysis of information on the Section 202 capital advance and DPG programs. The study will draw on the following sources of information:

- Administrative data extracted from HUD systems, including:
  - The Development Application Process (DAP) system that tracks properties receiving funding provided by the Office of Housing;
  - The Integrated Real Estate Management System (iREMS) that provides additional property-level data elements;
  - HUD Headquarters' DPG Selection Spreadsheets that identify properties awarded DPG funding; and
  - Amendment waiver information available in Federal Register notices and quarterly reports provided by HUD staff.
- Semi-structured surveys with HUD field office staff in offices that administer the Section 202 capital advance and DPG programs; and
- Semi-structured surveys with Section 202 project sponsors, including representatives of sponsors that have received DPG grants (referred to here as

“recipients”) and those that have not applied for or received DPG grants (referred to here as “non-recipients”).

This OMB submission addresses the semi-structured surveys with Section 202 sponsors. OMB approval for the field office surveys is not necessary because the surveys will be conducted with HUD staff.

This data collection activity is authorized under [12.U.S.C. 170 1z-1], which reads as follows:

TITLE 12 – BANKS AND BANKING

CHAPTER 13 – NATIONAL HOUSING

Sec. 1701z-1. Research and demonstrations; authorization of appropriations; continuing availability of funds.

The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development is authorized and directed to undertake such programs of research, studies, testing and demonstration relating to the mission and programs of the Department as he determines to be necessary and appropriate.

## **A2 How and by Whom the Data Will Be Used**

### **A2.1 Project Overview**

The study will gather information on the characteristics of Section 202 sponsors and the properties they develop, including why sponsors do or do not apply for the competitive program, the effectiveness of the DPG application and administrative processes, and whether the DPG program reduces delays in the development of affordable housing for very low-income elderly residents. The survey will be administered to a purposive sample of sponsors who have developed properties under the Section 202 Supportive Housing for the Elderly program. Surveys will be conducted with both DPG recipients and non-recipients. Non-recipients are sponsors who have never applied for or received a DPG.

The survey will be conducted via telephone by trained interviewers. Contingent upon OMB approval, the survey data collection will be conducted over a 10-week period, beginning in November 2010.

The goal of the study is to address the following main research questions:

- What are the property and sponsor characteristics of DPG recipients and non-recipients?

- Has the DPG helped Section 202 sponsors get to initial closing within the HUD established timeline requirement of 18 months of fund reservation?
- Has the DPG reduced delays in property completion?
- Has the DPG reduced the need for amendment fund waivers?
- What are HUD field offices' and sponsors' experiences with the DPG?
- What leads Section 202 sponsors to apply for the DPG or not?
- How has the DPG affected the Section 202 development process?
- What other factors influence the Section 202 development process?

## **A2.2 Purpose of the Data Collection**

This research is intended to help HUD better understand sponsor perspectives on the effectiveness of the DPG program in providing predevelopment funding to help Section 202 properties reach initial closing within 18 months from fund reservation. The study will also provide HUD information on sponsor perspectives of the marketing of the DPG program by HUD field office staff, the DPG application process, and the overall administration of the grant program. The data collection will help HUD understand whether these activities could be improved to increase sponsor participation in the DPG program and to decrease the amount of time needed for Section 202 properties to reach initial closing.

Initial preliminary analysis was conducted on the administrative data during the research design period. The purpose of the analysis was to provide a broad overview of the Section 202 properties that have received the DPG to date and the larger universe of properties funded by the Section 202 capital advance program over the years. While the study sample of DPG recipients and non-recipients is drawn from Section 202 properties awarded between FY2004 and FY2008, the administrative data analysis includes properties funded between FY1998 and FY2008 in order to look at patterns in processing time from before and after the introduction of the DPG program.

Over the FY1998-FY2008 administrative data analysis period, a total of 1,497 properties were funded by the Section 202 program. On average, about 136 properties were funded per year over this period, although the number of properties funded has trended downward in recent years. Over the study period of FY2004-FY2008, a total of 50 HUD field offices administered Section 202 awards, and 47 had at least one property with a DPG award. The field offices with the largest volume of DPG awards also processed the largest volume of Section 202 properties during that period.

The preliminary analysis included an analysis of processing time (the period between fund reservation and initial closing), comparing DPG recipients and non-recipients. Processing

times varied considerably across Census regions and field offices. Time from Section 202 funding award to initial closing was declining before the DPG program was implemented and has continued to decline since the DPG launch. However, the duration of the predevelopment period is still longer than HUD's recommended time period for many Section 202 properties, with typically only a quarter of the reaching initial closing in 18 months.

Initial descriptive statistics on processing time showed no appreciable difference between the DPG recipients and non-recipients in average processing time during each fiscal year. In fact, for FY2006 and FY2007 awards, fewer DPG recipients reached initial closing in 18 months than non-recipients. This implies that other factors beyond availability of predevelopment funding influence the duration of the predevelopment period. Reconnaissance discussions with sponsor and field office staff confirmed that a number of other factors may intervene, including the need for additional funding to supplement the capital advance and time for local and HUD approval processes.

In addition to processing time, no appreciable difference was found in the receipt of amendment waivers between DPG recipients and non-recipients. Non-completions, or properties that receive a Section 202 award but are terminated before being completed, were also reviewed as part of the preliminary analysis. Between FY1998 and FY2008, there were only 71 non-completions, and none was a DPG recipient.

The preliminary data analysis was conducted on initial data extracts obtained in January 2010 for use in the study's research design. Updated data extracts will be obtained at the start of the data collection period to update and extend the preliminary descriptive analysis. Additional analysis using multiple regressions will also be conducted separately during the data analysis phase of the study. The sponsor DPG recipient and non-recipient surveys will add to the administrative analysis by providing additional detailed Section 202 sponsor and property information as well as sponsor perspectives on the DPG program.

Both DPG recipients and non-recipients will be asked about sponsor and property characteristics that are not available through other data sources. The surveys will capture information on sponsor knowledge of the DPG program and reasons why sponsors did or did not apply for the grant. DPG recipients will also be asked about their experience with the DPG application process, how the program is administered by the HUD field offices, and how the DPG affects sponsor and property outcomes.

### **A2.3 Who Will Use the Information**

The survey findings will be used to assess the effectiveness of the Demonstration Planning Grant program in helping Section 202 sponsors reduce delays in the development of affordable elderly housing. HUD's Office of Policy Development and Research (PD&R) will use the survey results to better understand the types of organizations and properties that

benefit from the DPG program and what factors increase program participation and effectiveness.

The sponsor surveys will also help inform PD&R about a possible change in the DPG award process from a competitive grant process to one in which the level of predevelopment funding is determined by a funding formula. Survey responses will provide information on which sponsor and property characteristics and other factors are associated with quicker predevelopment periods and whether the inclusion of a DPG award mitigated any development delays associated with those characteristics.

HUD’s Office of Housing, which administers the Section 202 and Demonstration Planning Grant programs, will use the survey results to gain a better understanding of how the DPG grant program is marketed and administered by HUD field office staff and whether changes to the application and administrative processes should be considered. The survey results will also help the Office of Housing understand what factors, other than access to predevelopment funding, contribute to the untimely processing of Section 202 grants prior to initial closing. The survey will include questions similar to those asked of sponsors in the 2003 GAO study about other factors that contribute to development delays. Including these questions will allow researchers to compare the results from before and after the implementation of the DPG program to see if other factors affecting processing time have changed.

**A2.4 Instrument Item-by-Item Justification**

Exhibits 1 and 2 describe the content and reason for inclusion of each question in the survey instrument. The DPG Recipient and Non-Recipient Surveys are submitted under separate covers with this OMB submission.

<b>Exhibit 1: Item-by-Item Justification of Survey – DPG Recipients</b>	
<b>Question(s)</b>	<b>Content and Reason for Inclusion</b>
<b>Section I: Knowledge of the DPG Program</b>	<p>The first section asks about key information on the sponsor organization’s affordable housing development experience including experience with the Section 202 and DPG programs. The survey will confirm the accuracy of HUD’s administrative data on the number of Section 202 and DPG grants applied for and obtained by the sponsor organization.</p> <p>In addition to asking about the Section 202 and DPG experience of the sponsor organization, this section also asks about the respondent’s personal experience with the grant programs and asks the respondent to rate his or her overall knowledge of the DPG program. We will use results from these initial questions to determine if there are any differences in DPG application rates or processing time based on the previous Section 202 or DPG experience of the sponsor.</p>

---

**Exhibit 1: Item-by-Item Justification of Survey – DPG Recipients**

---

<b>Question(s)</b>	<b>Content and Reason for Inclusion</b>
<b>Section II: Property and Sponsor Characteristics of Recipients</b>	<p>Sponsor and property characteristics that will be collected in this section include data on the internal development capacity vs. the use of development consultants or other outside contractors, the percent of development cost funded by the Section 202 capital advance, other sources of funding used for the development of the property, and access to predevelopment funding.</p> <p>The survey results will provide insight on property and sponsor characteristics that cannot be determined by administrative data. We will present survey respondents' views on whether a DPG award affects a sponsor's ability to procure consultants or other outside contractors for the Section 202 development process. We will present what other sources of funding sponsors receive for the targeted property and whether the sources can be used to pay predevelopment costs. From this data, we will analyze differences in uses of contractors or consultants and access to predevelopment funding between DPG recipients and non-recipients. We will also present what percent of the total development cost is funded by the Section 202 capital advance by region, property size, and predevelopment time.</p>
<b>Section III: Marketing of the DPG Program</b>	<p>This section asks about the respondent organization's interaction with the HUD field office about the DPG program both prior to and during the DPG application process. Respondents are asked how and when HUD field office staff provided information about the DPG to them, and are asked to rate HUD field office staff member's knowledge of the program.</p> <p>The survey data will help us determine how often and at what point during the Section 202 award process HUD field office representatives provide information to sponsors about the DPG and whether the methods or timing affects whether sponsors apply for the grant. The responses to these questions will help HUD understand how sponsors are learning about the DPG program, whether field office staff members are knowledgeable about the grant program, and whether there are differences in marketing and program knowledge among field offices.</p>

---

**Exhibit 1: Item-by-Item Justification of Survey – DPG Recipients**

---

<b>Question(s)</b>	<b>Content and Reason for Inclusion</b>
<b>Section IV: DPG Application Process</b>	<p data-bbox="507 398 1390 562">This section asks the respondent about the DPG application process and why the respondent’s organization decided to apply for the DPG. Respondents are also asked if their organization had any other Section 202 properties which were eligible for a DPG but for which sponsors did not apply, and the reasons the sponsor organizations did not apply.</p> <p data-bbox="507 600 1390 689">The survey responses will help us analyze differences in the reasons sponsors apply for the DPG and determine whether there are differences by location, field office, sponsor type, and sponsor experience.</p> <p data-bbox="507 728 1390 1086">Responses to this section will also inform HUD about the effort needed to complete the DPG application. This section addresses the cost (in hours and dollars) to the sponsor of applying for the DPG, how difficult sponsors found the application process to be, and how sponsors estimated the predevelopment costs required for the application. The purpose of this analysis is to determine if there are any aspects of the application process that deter participation in the grant program or add to processing time from fund reservation to initial closing. From the survey responses, we will summarize findings on the extent of sponsor resources needed to fulfill the DPG application requirements and provide averages and ranges of the reported cost in dollars and staff hours.</p> <p data-bbox="507 1124 1390 1245">Finally, this section will ask about issues sponsors report about the application process, with particular attention to those that may cause delays in processing time. This section will also provide information on suggestions that sponsors may have about the DPG application process.</p>

---

---

**Exhibit 1: Item-by-Item Justification of Survey – DPG Recipients**

---

Question(s)	Content and Reason for Inclusion
<b>Section V: DPG Administration</b>	<p data-bbox="507 405 1390 663">This section asks questions related to DPG administration including DPG activities that take place after the sponsor receives the DPG grant award. The survey asks DPG recipients about their experience with HUD on several key DPG activities including receiving access to HUD’s Line of Credit Control System (LOCCS), receiving approval for payment voucher requests, and moving DPG funds between budget line items. Respondents are asked how long each step took, whether there were any issues throughout the processes, and how HUD resolved the issues.</p> <p data-bbox="507 696 1390 1055">This section will provide valuable information to the HUD Office of Housing regarding efficiencies of the administration and management of the DPG program. We will pay particular attention to whether there are any aspects of the administration of the program that may add to processing time between fund reservation and initial closing. From the survey results from this section, we will analyze whether different steps in the administrative process are completed within reasonable amounts of time, including the time from grant execution to fund obligation, processing sponsors’ access to LOCCS in order to drawdown funds, field office LOCCS authorization, and processing of DPG payment vouchers. We will compare these processes by field offices to determine any differences in administration.</p> <p data-bbox="507 1088 1390 1346">We will also determine findings on the incidence of sponsors moving DPG funds between line items after grant award. We will include in our analysis the proportion of sponsors who say they requested to move funds, the frequency with which the requests are granted, and whether moving funds had any effect on processing time. We will also summarize the results of the sponsor surveys that provide information on the amounts of DPG funds that are moved, reflecting how accurate sponsors were in their estimates of predevelopment funding.</p>
<b>Section VI: DPG Outcomes</b>	<p data-bbox="507 1357 1390 1491">This section addresses whether the DPG helps sponsors decrease the time period between fund reservation for a property and its initial closing and whether the DPG had any effect on the organization’s ability to access other development funds outside of the Section 202 program.</p> <p data-bbox="507 1525 1390 1715">The survey responses from this section will add to the administrative data analyses on the effect of the DPG program. HUD’s administrative data provides information on the funding categories in which sponsors planned to spend their DPG, based on approved estimates from the DPG applications. We will supplement the administrative data on actual DPG fund uses with results from the sponsor recipient surveys.</p> <p data-bbox="507 1749 1390 1912">Responses from this section will also add to the analysis of administrative data on processing time. We will analyze what effect the DPG had on processing time based on opinions of sponsors that received DPGs. We will also present the opinions of DPG recipients on whether the receipt of DPG had any effect on the sponsor’s ability to access other sources of funding.</p>

---

**Exhibit 1: Item-by-Item Justification of Survey – DPG Recipients**

---

<b>Question(s)</b>	<b>Content and Reason for Inclusion</b>
<b>Section VII: Factors Affecting Time from Fund Reservation to Initial Closing</b>	<p data-bbox="507 398 1374 689">This section asks what factors, other than access to predevelopment funding, contribute to the time it takes to process Section 202 grants from fund reservation to initial closing. DPG recipients are asked about the impact of certain state and local factors such as zoning, permitting, site contamination, and litigation on processing time. Respondents are asked about both the impact of each factor on time between fund reservation and initial closing for the target property, and whether receipt of a DPG had a positive, negative, or no effect on the effect of each factor on the predevelopment process.</p> <p data-bbox="507 725 1374 987">From the survey responses, we will present views of sponsor recipients on the effect of state and local factors on processing time. We will summarize the percentage of sponsors who stated that each factor had either no impact, minor impact, moderate impact, or significant impact on the organization's ability to reach initial closing within 18 months. Responses to these questions will be compared to a similar question posed in the survey of sponsors for the 2003 GAO study to compare differences in the effects of certain factors from before and after the DPG program was introduced.</p> <p data-bbox="507 1023 1374 1223">Respondents will also be asked in this section for any suggestions for HUD to aid the timely processing of Section 202 properties or about the Section 202 and DPG programs in general. We will present suggestions that sponsors may have on what actions HUD could take to aid the timely processing of Section 202 properties other than the Demonstration Planning Grant.</p>

---

**Exhibit 2: Item-by-Item Justification of Survey – DPG Non-Recipients**

---

Question(s)	Content and Reason for Inclusion
<b>Section I: Experience with the Section 202 and DPG Programs</b>	<p>The first section asks about key information on the sponsor organization's experience developing affordable housing including specific experience with the Section 202 program. The survey will confirm the accuracy of HUD's administrative data on the number of Section 202 grants applied for and obtained by the sponsor organization.</p> <p>We will use results from these initial questions to determine if there are any differences in processing time based on the previous housing development experience of the sponsor.</p>
<b>Section II: Property and Sponsor Characteristics of Recipients</b>	<p>Sponsor and property characteristics that will be collected in this section include data on the internal development capacity vs. the use of development consultants or other outside contractors, the percent of development cost funded by the Section 202 capital advance, other sources of funding used for the development of the property, and access to predevelopment funding.</p> <p>The survey results will provide insight on property and sponsor characteristics that cannot be determined by administrative data. We will analyze what other sources of funding sponsors receive for the targeted property and whether the sources can be used to pay predevelopment costs. From this data, we will present differences in uses of contractors or consultants and access to predevelopment funding between DPG recipients and non-recipients.</p>
<b>Section III: DPG Knowledge and Application Process</b>	<p>This section asks about the respondent organization's knowledge of the DPG program at the time the sponsor received the Section 202 award for the target property. Respondents are asked whether, how and when HUD field office staff provided information about the DPG to them. Respondents are also asked about why their organization did not apply for the DPG and if they would consider applying to the program for future Section 202 properties.</p> <p>The responses to these questions will help HUD understand how sponsors are learning about the DPG program, whether there are differences in marketing among field offices, and why some sponsors do not apply for the grant. Responses to these questions will help us determine if there are differences in the marketing of the DPG program between DPG recipients and non-recipients.</p> <p>The survey responses in this section will also help us analyze differences in the reasons sponsors did not apply for the DPG and determine whether there are differences in location, field office, sponsor type, and sponsor experience. We will analyze reasons why sponsors did not apply for the DPG for the sponsor's target property, including other access to predevelopment funding or lack of knowledge of the DPG program, and under what circumstances the sponsor would apply for future properties.</p>

---

**Exhibit 2: Item-by-Item Justification of Survey – DPG Non-Recipients**

---

Question(s)	Content and Reason for Inclusion
<b>Section IV: Factors Affecting Time from Fund Reservation to Initial Closing</b>	<p data-bbox="507 398 1394 622">This section asks what factors, other than access to predevelopment funding, contribute to the time it takes to process Section 202 grants from fund reservation to initial closing. Non-recipients are asked about the impact of certain state and local factors such as zoning, permitting, site contamination, and litigation on processing time. Respondents are asked about the impact of each factor on time between fund reservation and initial closing for the target property.</p> <p data-bbox="507 663 1394 913">From the survey responses, we will present views of non-recipients on the effect of state and local factors on processing time. We will summarize the percentage of sponsors who stated that each factor had either no impact, minor impact, moderate impact, or significant impact on the organization's ability to reach initial closing within 18 months. Responses to these questions will be compared to a similar question posed in the survey of sponsors for the 2003 GAO study to compare differences in the effects of certain factors from before and after the DPG program was introduced.</p> <p data-bbox="507 954 1394 1111">Respondents will also be asked in this section for any suggestions for HUD to aid the timely processing of Section 202 properties or about the Section 202 program in general. We will present suggestions that sponsors may have on what actions HUD could take to aid the timely processing of Section 202 properties other than the Demonstration Planning Grant.</p>

---

### **A3 Use of Improved Technologies**

The survey will be administered via telephone by trained interviewers. HUD's contractor for this study, Abt Associates, will use the online Checkbox Survey Software program to administer and compile results for the semi-structured sponsor surveys. Checkbox Survey Software is a flexible and easy to use online survey software tool for creating surveys and questionnaires. The surveys will be created, managed, and analyzed on a web browser.

The survey instruments will be created with Checkbox's Survey Editor. With the Survey Editor, survey questions can be customized using several different types of programmed survey questions including single answer, multiple choice, open text, rating scales, and matrix questions. Checkbox Survey Software's logic-based functionality allows surveys to be personalized based on respondents' responses. The software program also allows interviewers to upload files to the surveys so that reference material for the specific respondents will be available during survey administration.

Checkbox's management interface, Survey Manager, will be used to organize and manage all the survey responses. Surveys can be viewed by sponsor or field office name, interviewer, creation date, and completion status.

Checkbox allows data entry to be accomplished as the sponsor surveys are conducted. The responses to questions will be collected within Checkbox's response database and will be extracted at the end of the data collection period.

#### **A4 Efforts to Avoid Duplication**

In designing the DPG recipient and non-recipient surveys, available administrative data on Section 202 properties and DPG recipients was reviewed to ensure that the survey gathers only information not available from other sources.

HUD tracks data on the Section 202 and DPG programs through several different databases and spreadsheets:

- **Development Application Processing (DAP) System.** The DAP system tracks properties applying for funding provided by the Office of Housing's programs. It contains property-level information such as property size, funding amount, fiscal funding year (FY), construction cost, and application and processing dates.
- **Integrated Real Estate Management System (iREMS).** Additional property-level data elements are included in iREMS. These include property and program characteristics such as building type, occupancy date, location, HUD field office, and sponsor/owner information.
- **HUD Headquarters' DPG Selection Spreadsheets.** Properties awarded DPG funding are identified in spreadsheets obtained from HUD Headquarters staff. The spreadsheets contain property-level information such as property ID number, DPG funding amount, funding FY, and sponsor/owner information.
- **Waivers information.** Amendment waivers information for the Section 202 properties is available in Federal Register notices and quarterly reports provided by HUD staff. The following information has been identified for each waiver granted: the property ID number, type of amendment waiver (funding or processing time), date of waiver granted, and reason for the waiver.

While HUD maintains databases and spreadsheets of basic information about grants made under the Section 202 and DPG programs, the data does not include detailed property and sponsor information such as other sources of development funding, use of consultants or other outside contractors, and the housing development experience of the sponsor organization. The available data does not include information on why sponsors do or do not apply for the DPG or how the DPG program is marketed and administered by HUD field offices. The surveys will also address sponsor opinions on whether receipt of a DPG decreased the development delays in the delivery of Section 202 housing.

Since there is no comparably detailed information on the program characteristics, processes, and outcomes of HUD's Section 202 DPG program, the sponsor DPG recipient and non-recipient surveys will help fill this gap. The surveys will provide information on the experiences and opinions of sponsors that may help identify program inefficiencies and guide policy decisions.

## **A5 Involvement of Small Entities**

No small businesses or other small entities are involved as respondents in the proposed data collection effort. Respondents to this data collection are nonprofit sponsors of Section 202-funded properties. Efforts have been made to minimize response burden on respondents through careful design of the data collection strategy and efficient construction of the data collection instrument. All data collection is voluntary.

## **A6 Consequences of Less Frequent Data Collection**

Not applicable. This is a one-time data collection effort.

## **A7 Special Circumstances**

The proposed data collection activities are consistent with the guidelines set forth in 5 CFR 1320.6 (Controlling Paperwork Burden on the Public—General Information Collection Guidelines). There are no special circumstances that require deviation from these guidelines.

## **A8 Consultations Outside the Agency**

In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, HUD published on May 6, 2010 a notice in the Federal Register announcing the agency's intention to request an OMB review of data collection activities for the Evaluation of the Section 202 Demonstration Planning Grant program. The notice provided a 60-day period for public comments. The Federal Register Notice is included as an appendix.

HUD's contractor, Abt Associates, developed this data collection instrument in consultation with staff from HUD. Representatives of HUD's Office of Policy Development and Research reviewed the instrument. In addition, five sponsor representatives who are not part of the sponsor sample will review the survey instruments to ensure the correct terminology is used and to test the flow of the survey including skip patterns. The sponsor representatives include three DPG recipients and two non-recipients. Pre-testing of the survey instrument will be completed in June 2010.

## A9 Payments to Respondents

There will be no payments to respondents. Respondents will be informed that their responses are important to helping HUD learn more about the Section 202 and DPG programs.

## A10 Arrangements and Assurances Regarding Confidentiality

None of the questions asked in the survey is considered sensitive. Therefore, for this study, there is no need to arrange for confidentiality.

## A11 Sensitive Questions

The survey does not contain any questions that are considered sensitive.

## A12 Estimate of Annualized Burden Hours

Exhibit 3 provides information on the survey to be used in the study and the estimated time to complete the data collection. Total burden for data collection for the study is estimated at 101 hours.

For the DPG recipient survey, the researchers will administer a one-time telephone survey to 70 sponsor staff. These interviews are expected to last 45 minutes. An additional 20 minutes will be needed to compile material needed to complete the survey, for a total burden hour estimate of 76 hours. For the non-recipient survey, the researchers will administer a one-time telephone survey to 30 sponsor staff. The burden estimates for the non-recipient interviews are 30 minutes for the telephone survey administration and 20 minutes to compile material needed to complete the survey, for a total burden hour estimate of 25 hours.

---

**Exhibit 3: Estimate of Burden Hours**

---

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Number of Respondents</b>	<b>Number responses per respondent</b>	<b>Average burden/response (in hours)</b>	<b>Total burden hours</b>
DPG Recipients	70	1	1.08	76
Non-Recipients	30	1	0.83	25
Total	100	100		101

---

## A13 Estimated Record Keeping and Reporting Cost Burden on Respondents

There is no cost to respondents, other than the time required to respond to the survey.

## **A14 Estimated Cost to the Federal Government**

The total contracted cost to the federal government for the Telephone Survey of Section 202 Sponsors is \$50,775. This includes \$44,530 in labor (indirect costs and fee are included in labor rates) and \$6,245 in direct costs.

## **A15 Reasons for Changes in Burden**

This submission to OMB is a new request for approval; there is no change in burden.

## **A16 Tabulation Plan, Statistical Analysis, and Study Schedule**

Data collection is scheduled to begin in November 2010 assuming 16-week OMB review period. The sponsor survey data collection period will run eight weeks, through December 31, 2010. The survey will be conducted by Abt Associates' research staff who will administer the survey and compile a database of survey responses for analysis purposes. Each survey record will be assigned a unique identifier.

Data analysis of the sponsor survey responses will begin following completion of the data collection period in January 2011. A draft report of the findings will be completed on March 11, 2011 with a final report submitted on April 22, 2011. The data documentation will be submitted the following week on April 29, 2011.

The primary objective of this analysis will be to analyze the effectiveness of the Demonstration Planning Grant program and whether the program helped reduce development delays in the Section 202 Supportive Housing for the Elderly program. Analysis will compare the outcomes and sponsor and property characteristics of DPG recipients and non-recipients, as well as the opinions of sponsors on the DPG application and administrative processes.

The analysis of survey results will include:

- Additional Section 202 sponsor and property characteristics that are not available from HUD administrative data sources.
- Findings on the degree of awareness and knowledge that sponsors have about the DPG program.
- Whether there are any aspects of the DPG application process that deter participation in the grant program or add to processing time from fund reservation to initial closing.
- Whether there are any aspects of the administration of the program that may add to processing time between fund reservation and initial closing.

- Comparison of outcomes for properties for which the sponsors received a DPG to those for properties that did not receive a DPG, including amendment waiver requests, the sponsor's ability to access other sources of funding, what other sources of funding sponsors receive, and the ability to obtain outside development consultants or contractors.
- Opinions of sponsors that received DPGs on the effect the DPG had on predevelopment processing time and the effect the DPG had on other factors that affect processing time.
- What issues, other than access to predevelopment funding, affect sponsors' ability to reach initial closing within the recommended 18 month timeframe.
- Suggestions that sponsors may have on what actions HUD could take to aid the timely processing of Section 202 properties other than the Demonstration Planning Grant.

## **A17 Expiration Date Display Exemption**

All data collection instruments will prominently display the expiration date for OMB approval.

## **A18 Exceptions to Certification**

This submission describing data collection requests no exceptions to the Certificate for Paperwork Reduction Act (5 CFR 1320.9).

# Appendix: Federal Register Notice

control number 2528–0256. Approximately 1,430 DHAP participants responded to the baseline survey. Respondents were contacted in January-February 2010 to update their contact information under the same OMB control number.

A 12-month follow-up survey of respondents to the baseline survey is planned for fall 2010 and is the subject of this notice. The survey will collect data on participants' housing employment, income, and savings/debt outcomes approximately 12 to 15 months after they transitioned off DHAP assistance. The survey also will ask about participants' experiences with the alternative strategies employed by participating public housing authorities (PHAs) for providing case management to help households with the recovery process. The information collected through these surveys will be supplemented by administrative data on participant characteristics and program services (including rental assistance and case management) collected during program operation. The participant survey will take approximately 40 minutes per respondent to complete.

*Members of affected public:* The data collection effort for the DHAP IRT Study initially involved a baseline survey conducted under OMB control number 2528–0256. Approximately 1,430 DHAP participants responded to the baseline survey. Respondents were contacted in January-February 2010 to update their contact information under the same OMB control number.

*Estimation of the total number of hours needed to prepare the information collection, including the number of respondents, frequency of response, and hours of response:* The researchers will survey 1,430 participants in all; the surveys are expected to last 40 minutes. This constitutes a total burden hour estimate of 958 burden hours.

*Status of the proposed information collection:* Pending OMB approval.

**Authority:** Section 3506 of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, 44 U.S.C. Chapter 35, as amended.

Dated: April 20, 2010.

**Raphael W. Bostic,**

*Assistant Secretary for Policy Development and Research, R.*

[FR Doc. 2010–10687 Filed 5–5–10; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4210–67–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

[Docket No. FR–5382–N–09]

### Notice of Proposed Information Collection for Public Comment: 202 Demonstration Planning Grant Evaluation

**AGENCY:** Office of Policy Development and Research, HUD.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The proposed information collection requirement described below will be submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act. The Department is soliciting public comments on the subject proposal.

**DATES:** *Comments Due Date:* July 6, 2010.

**ADDRESSES:** Interested persons are invited to submit comments regarding this proposal. Comments should refer to the proposal by name and/or OMB Control Number and should be sent to: Ashaki Robinson Johns, Office of Policy Development and Research, Department of Housing and Urban Development, 451 7th Street, SW., Suite 8120, Washington, DC 20410.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ashaki Robinson Johns (202) 402–7545, (this is not a toll free number) for copies of the proposed forms and other available documents.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Department will submit the proposed information collection to OMB for review, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35, as amended). This notice is soliciting comments from members of the public and affected agencies concerning the proposed collection of information to: (1) Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including if the information will have practical utility; (2) Evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of proposed collection of information; (3) Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (4) Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond; including through the use of appropriate automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses.

*Title of Proposal:* Research Plan for an Evaluation of the Section 202 Demonstration Planning Grant Program.

*Description of the need for information and proposed use:* The Department is conducting, through a contract to Abt Associates Inc. and its subcontractor, VIVA Consulting LLC, a study of the Section 202 Supportive Housing for the Elderly Demonstration Planning Grant Program. The Section 202 Supportive Housing for the Elderly program provides capital advances and operating funds to nonprofit organizations (“sponsors”) to develop affordable elderly housing. HUD's goal for Section 202 properties is for sponsors to reach initial closing within 18 months of fund reservation. However, a 2003 study of the Section 202 program by the Governmental Accountability Office (GAO) found that approximately 70 percent of Section 202 properties funded between 1998 and 2009 did not meet this goal and that properties that did not meet the 18-month timeline took an average of 29 months to reach initial closing. The predevelopment delays were attributed to a number of factors, including the lack of predevelopment funding.

The Section 202 Demonstration Planning Grant Program (DPG) was created in 2004 to provide predevelopment funding to Section 202 sponsors to reduce development delays and increase the number of affordable rental units made available each year for low-income elderly households. This evaluation will assess the awareness and effectiveness of the program through telephone surveys with project sponsors. The key research question is whether the DPG helps sponsors get from Section 202 award to initial closing on the project within 18 months, HUD's target duration for the predevelopment period.

To collect the information necessary for this study, the Department will conduct a telephone survey of staff members from a sample of sponsor organizations. The surveys will be conducted with both staff from sponsor organizations that have received Demonstration Planning Grants (“DPG recipients”) and staff from sponsor organizations that have received Section 202 funding between fiscal years 2004 and 2008 but have not received a Demonstration Planning Grant (“non-recipients”). Surveys will be conducted with 70 DPG recipients and 30 non-recipients. The samples will be selected purposively to provide geographic diversity by Census region and a range of durations of predevelopment periods.

DPG recipients will be asked about their knowledge of and experience with the DPG program and how the DPG and other factors influenced their ability to reach initial closing within 18 months.

Non-recipients will be asked about their familiarity with the DPG program, the reasons they did not apply for the program, and the factors that contributed to their ability to reach initial closing within 18 months.

*Members of Affected Public:* The telephone sponsor survey will affect approximately 100 recipients of a

Section 202 Supportive Housing for the Elderly grant.

*Estimation of the total number of hours needed to prepare the information collection including number of respondents, frequency of response, and hours of response:* For the DPG recipient survey, the researchers will administer a one-time telephone survey to 70

sponsor staff. These interviews are expected to last 60 minutes for a total burden hour estimate of 70 hours. For the non-recipient survey, the researchers will administer a one-time telephone survey to 30 sponsor staff. The non-recipient interviews are expected to last 30 minutes for a total burden hour estimate of 15 hours.

Respondents	Number of respondents	Number responses per respondent	Average burden/response (in hours)	Total burden hours
DPG Recipients .....	70	1	1.0	70
Non-recipients .....	30	1	0.5	15
Total .....	100	100	.....	85

*Status of the proposed information collection:* Pending OMB approval.

**Authority:** Section 3506 of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, 44 U.S.C. Chapter 35, as amended.

Dated: April 28, 2010.

**Raphael W. Bostic,**

*Assistant Secretary for Policy Development and Research.*

[FR Doc. 2010-10689 Filed 5-5-10; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4210-67-P**

**ADDRESSES:** Send your comments on the IC to Hope Grey, Information Collection Clearance Officer, Fish and Wildlife Service, MS 222-ARLSQ, 4401 North Fairfax Drive, Arlington, VA 22203 (mail); or *hope\_grey@fws.gov* (e-mail).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** To request additional information about this IC, contact Hope Grey by mail or e-mail (see ADDRESSES) or by telephone at (703) 358-2482.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**I. Abstract**

The National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. 668dd-668ee), as amended by the National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act of 1997, and the Refuge Recreation Act of 1962 (16 U.S.C. 460k-460k-4) govern the administration and uses of national wildlife refuges and wetland management districts. We are authorized to permit public uses on lands of the National Wildlife Refuge System, including hunting, fishing, wildlife observation, wildlife photography, and environmental education and interpretation, and other visitor uses when we find that the activities are compatible and appropriate with the purpose or purposes for which the refuges were established.

We collect information on hunters and anglers and other visitors in order to protect refuge resources and administer and evaluate the success of visitor programs. Because of high demand and limited resources, we often provide visitor opportunities by permit, based on dates, locations, or type of public use. We may not allow all opportunities on all refuges and harvest information differs on each refuge. Therefore, we are proposing two forms to collect this information. Not all

refuges will use each form and some refuges may collect the information in a nonform format. We propose to collect:

- Information on the visitor (name, address, and contact information).
- Whether or not hunters/anglers were successful (number and type of harvest/caught).

- Purpose of visit (hunting, fishing, wildlife observation, wildlife photography, auto touring, birding, hiking, boating/canoeing, visitor center, special event, environmental education class, volunteering, other recreation).
- Date of visit.

This information will be a vital tool in meeting refuge objectives and maintaining quality visitor experiences. The above information will help us:

- Administer and monitor visitor programs and facilities on refuges.
- Distribute visitor permits to ensure safety of visitors.
- Ensure a quality visitor experience.
- Minimize resource disturbance, manage healthy game populations, and ensure the protection of fish and wildlife species.
- Assist in Statewide wildlife management and enforcement and develop reliable estimates of the number of all game fish and wildlife.
- Determine facility and program needs and budgets.

**II. Data**

*OMB Control Number:* 1018-XXXX.  
*Title:* Refuge Daily Visitor Use Report and Check-In Permit.

*Service Form Number(s):* 3-2405 and 3-2406.

*Type of Request:* Request for a new OMB control number.

*Affected Public:* Visitors to national wildlife refuges.

*Respondent's Obligation:* Required to obtain or retain a benefit.

*Frequency of Collection:* On occasion.

**DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**

**Fish and Wildlife Service**

[FWS-R4-R-2010-N091] [40137-1263-0000-0X]

**Proposed Information Collection; OMB Control Number 1018-NEW; Refuge Daily Visitor Use Report and Check-In Permit**

**AGENCY:** Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

**ACTION:** Notice; request for comments.

**SUMMARY:** We (Fish and Wildlife Service) will ask the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to approve the information collection (IC) described below. As required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 and as part of our continuing efforts to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, we invite the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on this IC. We may not conduct or sponsor and a person is not required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number.

**DATES:** To ensure that we are able to consider your comments on this IC, we must receive them by July 6, 2010.