

**The Neighborhood Stabilization Program
Tracking Panel:
OMB Clearance Package Appendix C**

Draft

October 9, 2012

Program Design Staff Interview Protocol		
Survey Section	Item	Data Analysis Elements
Overall NSP2 Strategy (All respondents)	1. Based on the most recent QPR, [lead grantee's] intervention strategy involved the following NSP2 activities and volume of activity (e.g., expected number of units/properties): financing, acquisition and rehabilitation, land banking, demolition, redevelopment. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Is the information about NSP2 activities and units/properties accurate for your organization? b. If this has changed, please describe how and why. 	The questions in this introductory section are designed to provide a broad understanding of the changes in grantees' implementation of their NSP2 grant since the baseline site visit, as well as the reasons for any changes.
	2. In general, are your overall objectives for NSP2 the same now as they were back when we last spoke (summer 2012)? Please explain. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> c. If it has changed, please describe how and why your objectives have changed. 	
Partnership Arrangements (Grantees with partner organizations)	3. In addition to pursuing NSP2 eligible activities, organizations were also responsible for the following tasks: communicating with and managing other organizations, monitoring progress, securing and managing non-federal funds, managing NSP grant and/or other federal funds, DRGR reporting. Has your organization's role or responsibilities changed since our last interview? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. If so, how and why? 	The questions in this section are intended to provide an understanding of the variety of partnership arrangements NSP2 grantees formed to carry out their grant activities, and specifically how the partnership and partners' roles have changed since the baseline site visit. In addition, the questions address whether any challenges were created by partnerships and how these were overcome, and ways in which partnerships facilitated or supported the implementation of NSP2, both generally and in specific areas of program implementation. The last question in the section is intended to get insight from grantees about the relative importance of partnership arrangements in the success or failure of NSP2 implementation, and asks for opinions about how best to structure partnerships in the future.
	4. In thinking about your partnership arrangements, what have been the greatest challenges to implementing your NSP2 strategy within this arrangement? In other words, are there specific aspects of your partnership arrangements that you believe have made it harder to implement NSP2?	
	5. Have you been able to overcome these challenges? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. If so, how and what were the consequences until it was resolved? b. If not, why not and what has been the consequence? 	

Program Design Staff Interview Protocol		
Survey Section	Item	Data Analysis Elements
	<p>6. Conversely, are there specific aspects of your partnership arrangements that you believe has supported or facilitated the overall implementation of NSP2?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. If so, please explain these factors/aspects and how they facilitated implementation. b. If no, has that led you to conclude anything about the value of your partnership arrangement? 	
	<p>7. On the whole, thinking about your partnership arrangements, give me a sense for how well this arrangement facilitates your ability to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. understand what your partners are doing, b. coordinate activities across partners, c. share experiences across partners, e.g., lessons learned, best practices, strategies; d. share data across partners; e. select your NSP2 tracts; f. select properties for intervention; g. build your organization's internal capacity; h. complete your NSP2 activities; i. accomplish your overall objectives. <p>Please explain each – e.g., How has it made it better? How has it made it worse?</p>	
	<p>8. To what extent are partnership structures and types important factors in programs' success?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. What partnership structures and types would you most recommend? 	
Target Area (All respondents)	<p>9. When we last spoke, you were targeting ____ [insert number] tracts with NSP2 funds. Has the number of targeted NSP2 tracts or the areas being targeted changed since then?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. If so, please describe how (and by how many) and why your target areas changed. b. Has your approach for targeting tracts for NSP2 activity changed since we last spoke? If so, how and why? 	<p>These questions are intended to understand changes in the geography grantees are targeting with their NSP2 grant activities, changes in strategy related to tract selection, and the degree to which grantees were able to concentrate their activities within census tracts.</p> <p><i>A priori</i>, we would expect that concentrated activities would have a greater impact on neighborhoods with high rates of foreclosure, and learning about the obstacles grantees faced in concentrating activities will</p>
	<p>10. [If applicable] When we last spoke, you had different strategies for different types of tracts. Has your approach to targeting tracts for specific NSP2 activities changed in any way?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. If so, please describe how and why it changed. 	

Program Design Staff Interview Protocol		
Survey Section	Item	Data Analysis Elements
	<p>11. [If applicable] Also, in our last discussion, we talked about the level of NSP2 concentration and you indicated that _____ [fill in, e.g., you were unable to concentrate some of your activities because you had to find properties that were the “low-hanging fruit” to purchase/demolish in order to meet your spending deadlines]. Did this change at all since we last spoke?</p> <p>a. If yes, how did it change and why (e.g., what happened to allow you to do this, or what happened to prevent you from achieving the desired level of concentration)?</p> <p>b. If you were not able to concentrate activities to the degree desired, how do you think this affected your NSP2 implementation, and in particular, the potential impact on the surrounding community?</p>	shed light on the possible limitations of neighborhood revitalization efforts.
Obstacles, Challenges, and Supports (All respondents)	<p>12. Among your organization’s NSP2 activities, which activity was the most difficult to implement?</p> <p>a. Why?</p> <p>b. Were you able to overcome these barriers, and if so, how?</p>	The questions in this section are designed to help understand the practical obstacles grantees faced in carrying out their originally planned activities. Responses will be compared across market types to determine whether there are correlations between market types and the activities that can successfully be executed in each.
	<p>13. Conversely, among your organization’s NSP2 activities, which activity was the least difficult to implement?</p> <p>a. What made it easier to implement than the other activities?</p>	
	<p>14. Were there any specific features about the program itself – i.e., its rules and regulations – that either facilitated or inhibited your ability to implement the program well or in a timely way?</p> <p>a. If yes, what were they and how did they affect your implementation?</p>	These questions are intended to reveal grantees’ perceptions about aspects of NSP2 program design that either facilitated or hindered their efforts.
	<p>15. On the whole, looking across all aspects of the program – e.g., program rules, your partnerships, the selection of tracts and properties, working with other stakeholders in the community, your relationships with private developers and lenders, politics, executing the NSP activities, and so on – what have been the greatest challenges your organization has encountered in implementing your NSP2 strategy?</p>	These questions ask grantees to make a judgment about the most significant challenges they faced and to describe whether and how they overcame these. Looking across responses, this question will provide an ordinal ranking of the most factors that created the most significant problems for grantees.
	<p>16. Have you been able to overcome these challenges?</p> <p>a. If so, how?</p> <p>b. If not, why not and what have been the consequences?</p>	Likewise, they ask grantees to identify the factors that most facilitated their efforts.

Program Design Staff Interview Protocol		
Survey Section	Item	Data Analysis Elements
	17. Conversely, what factors do you believe have supported or facilitated your organization's NSP2 implementation? For example, have there been specific developments, people, or events that seemed to have pushed the program's implementation forward?	
Concurrent Neighborhood Revitalization Activities/ Funding/TA (All respondents)	18. Based on our previous discussion, you indicated that the following non-NSP2 organizations or initiatives were working on community development efforts in the targeted areas. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Are these efforts still occurring in the target area? b. Are there any additional non-NSP community development efforts occurring in the targeted area? 	This question is designed to help segregate the impacts of NSP2 activities from other concurrent or previous neighborhood stabilization or revitalization. For the follow-up site visit, the questions focus on changes that have happened since the baseline site visit.
	19. According to our last interview, your organization leveraged the following non-federal resources [populate from baseline interview]. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Has that changed since our last interview? b. If it has changed, how and why? How is this changing your NSP2 strategies, plans, and activities? 	These questions are designed to understand the extent to which grantees are actually able to access the leveraged funds they identified in their proposals, and how this has changed since the baseline site visit. This will help us assess the total amount of funding available for NSP2 activities.
	20. Your most recent QPR shows program income of _____ [insert]. Is this correct? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. How much program income in total do you expect? b. Do you have plans for how those funds will be used? If so, what are they? 	This question is also intended to help assess the total amount of funding available for NSP2 activities. Specifically, it gathers information about the NSP2 funding that will be "recycled" and return to grantees in the form of program income, and those funds will be used.
	21. Your organization received the following forms of technical assistance related to NSP2 _____ [populate from baseline interview]. Do you continue to take advantage of this technical assistance? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. If so, please describe how this technical assistance affected your ability to accomplish NSP2 activities. b. If not, please describe why your organization stopped utilizing it. 	These questions are intended to provide an understanding of the changes in the use of technical assistance since the baseline site visit, the reasons for this, and whether grantees believe this TA has been helpful in their efforts to implement NSP2 activities.
	22. Have you used other forms of technical assistance since our last visit? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. If so, please describe this technical assistance. b. Please describe how it has affected your ability to accomplish NSP2 activities. 	
	23. What types of technical assistance do you think are most helpful?	

Program Design Staff Interview Protocol		
Survey Section	Item	Data Analysis Elements
NSP2 Outcomes and Impact (All respondents)	24. I have information from a previous AP, as well as expectations we discussed during our last visit. Let's discuss your organization's progress for each activity.	The questions in this section are intended to understand differences, if any, between original expectations for NSP2 outcomes and expectations based on a year of experience with NSP2. They also ask grantees for the reasons for these differences. In addition, information about outcomes other than specific NSP2 activities is gathered. These may include outcomes such as homeownership counseling, job training, and job creation.
	25. Do you ultimately expect to finance as many units as you originally expected [as reported on the earliest AP]? a. If not, what are the reasons for this? b. [If grantee will exceed expectations]: What factors have/will allow you to exceed expectations?	
	26. Do you ultimately expect to do as many units of acquisition and rehab as you originally expected [as reported on the earliest AP]? a. If not, what are the reasons for this? b. [If grantee will exceed expectations]: What factors have/will allow you to exceed expectations?	
	27. Do you ultimately expect to land bank as many units as you originally expected [as reported on the earliest AP]? a. If not, what are the reasons for this? b. [If grantee will exceed expectations]: What factors have/will allow you to exceed expectations?	
	28. Do you ultimately expect to demolish as many units as you originally expected [as reported on the earliest AP]? a. If not, what are the reasons for this? b. [If grantee will exceed expectations]: What factors have/will allow you to exceed expectations?	
	29. Do you ultimately expect to do as many units of redevelopment as you originally expected [as reported on the earliest AP]? a. If not, what are the reasons for this? b. [If grantee will exceed expectations]: What factors have/will allow you to exceed expectations?	

Program Design Staff Interview Protocol		
Survey Section	Item	Data Analysis Elements
	30. Please describe the outcomes your agency has achieved outside of the five specific NSP2 activities. For example, in our last interview your organization hoped to accomplish: [populate from last interview]. Has your organization been able to accomplish these additional outcomes? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. If not, why not? Do you expect to eventually accomplish these? b. If so, what factors contributed to your success? 	
	31. Thinking more generally, please describe how you think all of the NSP2 activities have impacted the neighborhood(s)?	These questions are intended to gather grantees' observations and opinions about how their NSP2 activities have impacted the neighborhoods where they occur. They are also asked for their opinions about what the most and least effective intervention strategies have been, and in what types of neighborhoods interventions were more and less successful.
	32. Among your organization's intervention strategies, which NSP2-eligible activity do you think contributed the most to these neighborhood impacts and why? The least?	
	33. Within your target area, were there some neighborhoods where the intervention was more successful than others? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. If so, how do these neighborhoods' characteristics differ from other neighborhoods in your target area? 	
Lessons Learned (All respondents)	34. After you were awarded the NSP2 grant, how long was it before you were able to start doing NSP2 activities (e.g., acquiring properties)? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Was this interval too long? b. If so, how could the NSP2 program have been designed differently to shorten this interval? c. In retrospect, was there anything you could have done differently to shorten this interval? 	This question is designed to address one aspect of the NSP2 program design and grantees' ability to respond to their grant award – the length of time between grant award and first expenditures. In baseline site visit interviews, we learned that it took many grantees 4-6 months after grant award to begin spending funds, which might undermine the intent of the program to rapidly address the foreclosure crisis.
	35. What staff skills are most needed to effectively and efficiently accomplish neighborhood revitalization efforts?	This question is designed to gather grantees' opinions and experience about the mix of staff needed to successfully implement NSP2.
	36. What other interventions are needed to support organizations' efforts or achieve the desired neighborhood impacts (e.g., investments in infrastructure, schools, the ability to use powers of eminent domain, etc.)?	These questions elicit grantees' opinions and observations about whether investments in residential properties are sufficient to stabilize a neighborhood, or whether these should be coupled with other types of interventions. It also asks whether the level of funding available for NSP2 was large enough to make a measurable, positive impact on distressed neighborhoods.
	37. What level of financial investment is needed to successfully impact a distressed neighborhood? Did the level of NSP2 funding you received reach this threshold? Or combine with other neighborhood revitalization efforts to reach this level? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. If not, what level of financial investment is likely needed to successfully impact a distressed neighborhood? 	

Program Design Staff Interview Protocol		
Survey Section	Item	Data Analysis Elements
	38. Are there any other "lessons learned" of how to best structure efforts to stabilize or revitalize distressed neighborhoods that you would like to share?	These questions encourage grantees to provide any other observations or lessons they feel they have learned while implementing their NSP2 grant.
	39. Are there things you would have liked to do but couldn't? If so, what were these, and what prevented you from doing these?	
	40. Is there anything you wish you had done differently? If so, what?	

Program Operations Staff Interview Protocol		
Survey Section	Item	Data Analysis Elements
Property Acquisition Process (Grantees doing acquisition and rehab, demolition, redevelopment, and/or land banking)	1. According to our last interview, your organization preferred to pursue properties with the following characteristics: [populate from baseline interview]. a. Has your organization continued to prefer these types of properties? b. If not, how and why did your preference change?	These questions will identify if there were any changes to how grantees acquired properties for rehabilitation, demolition, redevelopment, or land banking since the baseline site visit, as well as the reasons for any changes. Understanding whether grantees were able to acquire the properties they targeted will aid in appropriately specifying property-level models, thus allowing the models to use the assumption that we can control for differences between NSP2 properties and other foreclosures. It will also identify external factors that may have affected grantees' success in achieving intended outcomes.
	2. What have been the greatest challenges in acquiring these properties?	These questions ask grantees to make a judgment about the most significant challenges they faced acquiring properties and to describe whether and how they overcame these. These questions will help identify external factors that may have affected grantees' success in achieving intended outcomes.
	3. Have you been able to overcome these challenges? a. If so, how? b. If not, why not?	
	4. Within your target area, were there neighborhoods where it was easier to acquire properties? a. If yes, was this related to neighborhood characteristics, or available property types, or both? 1. If neighborhood characteristics, how did these neighborhoods' characteristics differ from other neighborhoods? 2. If property types, what types of property (tax lien, short sale, foreclosure, etc.) were easier to acquire?	The last questions in this section will identify if there were neighborhoods where it was easier for grantees to acquire properties and specifically if there were neighborhood characteristics and/or available property types that distinguished these neighborhoods. These questions will inform our understanding of the external factors that may have affected grantees' success in achieving intended outcomes. They will also inform how these factors may affect the degree to which grantees concentrated their NSP2 activity within certain census target tracts, which we expect to influence grantees' neighborhood impacts.
Rehabilitation Process (Grantees doing rehab)	5. What were the primary obstacles that your organization faced in trying to rehabilitate properties?	These questions ask grantees to make a judgment about the most significant challenges they faced rehabilitating properties and to describe whether and
	6. How did your organization respond to these challenges?	

Program Operations Staff Interview Protocol		
Survey Section	Item	Data Analysis Elements
	7. What factors contributed to your organization's success in rehabilitating properties?	how they overcame these. Likewise, they ask grantees to identify the factors that most facilitated their rehabilitation efforts. These questions will help identify external factors that may have affected grantees' success in achieving intended outcomes.
	8. According to our last interview, your organization expected the following individuals to benefit from your rehabilitation activities: [populate from baseline interview].	The final questions in this section are intended to understand differences, if any, between grantees' baseline expectations for NSP2 beneficiaries and the actual NSP2 beneficiaries. They also ask grantees for the reasons for these differences.
	9. To what extent has this expectation been realized? a. If the beneficiaries differ from the baseline expectations, what factors contributed to this outcome? b. If the beneficiaries differ from the baseline expectations, what are the differences?	
Redevelopment Process (Grantees doing redevelopment)	10. What were the primary obstacles that your organization faced in trying to redevelop properties?	These questions ask grantees to make a judgment about the most significant challenges they faced redeveloping properties and to describe whether and how they overcame these. Likewise, they ask grantees to identify the factors that most facilitated their redevelopment efforts. These questions will help identify external factors that may have affected grantees' success in achieving intended outcomes.
	11. How did your organization respond to these challenges?	
	12. What factors contributed to your organization's success in redeveloping properties?	
	13. According to our last interview, your organization expected the following individuals to benefit from your redevelopment activities: [populate from baseline interview]. To what extent has this expectation been realized? a. If the beneficiaries differ from the baseline expectations, what factors contributed to this outcome? b. If the beneficiaries differ from the baseline expectations, what are the differences?	
Demolition Process (Grantees doing demolition)	14. What were the primary obstacles that your organization faced in trying to demolish properties?	These questions ask grantees to make a judgment about the most significant challenges they faced demolishing properties and to describe whether and
	15. How did your organization respond to these challenges?	

Program Operations Staff Interview Protocol		
Survey Section	Item	Data Analysis Elements
	16. What factors contributed to your organization's success in demolishing properties?	how they overcame these. Likewise, they ask grantees to identify the factors that most facilitated their demolition efforts. These questions will help identify external factors that may have affected grantees' success in achieving intended outcomes.
	17. In our last interview your organization described the decision process of what should happen to a property after it is demolished. [Briefly describe the process as you understand it. Get any corrections necessary.] Have you updated or changed the process and criteria to determine what happens with demolished properties? a. If so, please describe how and why the decision process changed?	The questions in this section will identify if there were any changes in how grantees decided what should happen to a property after it was demolished since the baseline site visit, as well as the reasons for any changes. This will inform our understanding of how well grantees were able to implement their baseline demolition strategies.
	18. According to our last interview, your organization expected the following individuals to benefit from your demolition activities: [populate from baseline interview]. To what extent has this expectation been realized? a. If the beneficiaries differ from the baseline expectations, what factors contributed to this outcome? b. If the beneficiaries differ from the baseline expectations, what are the differences?	The final questions in this section are intended to understand differences, if any, between grantees' baseline expectations for NSP2 beneficiaries and the actual NSP2 beneficiaries. They also ask grantees for the reasons for these differences.
Land Banking Process (Grantees doing land banking)	19. What were the primary obstacles that your organization faced in trying to bank properties?	These questions ask grantees to make a judgment about the most significant challenges they faced land banking properties and to describe whether and how they overcame these. Likewise, they ask grantees to identify the factors that most facilitated their land banking efforts. These questions will help identify external factors that may have affected grantees' success in achieving intended outcomes.
	20. How did your organization respond to these challenges?	
	21. What factors contributed to your organization's success in banking properties?	
	22. According to our last interview, your organization expected the following outcomes for your land banked property after the NSP2 program: [populate from baseline interview]. Are these expectations still accurate? a. If not, how and why have your expectations changed?	

Program Operations Staff Interview Protocol		
Survey Section	Item	Data Analysis Elements
Financing Process (Grantees doing financing)	23. According to our last interview, your organization pursued the following financing activities: [populate from baseline interview]. Do you continue to pursue these activities or has your strategy changed? a. If it has changed, please describe how and why your strategy changed.	The first questions in this section will identify if there were any changes to how grantees implemented NSP2 financing activities since the baseline site visit, as well as the reasons for any changes. This will inform our understanding of how well grantees were able to implement their baseline financing strategies.
	24. What were the primary obstacles that your organization faced in trying to provide these financing activities?	These questions ask grantees to make a judgment about the most significant challenges they faced providing financing and to describe whether and how they overcame these. Likewise, they ask grantees to identify the factors that most facilitated their financing efforts. These questions will help identify external factors that may have affected grantees' success in achieving intended outcomes.
	25. How did your organization respond to these challenges?	
	26. What factors contributed to your organization's success in providing these financing activities?	
	27. According to our last interview, your organization expected the following individuals to benefit from your financing activities: [populate from baseline interview]. To what extent has this expectation been realized? a. If the beneficiaries differ from the baseline expectations, what factors contributed to this outcome? b. If the beneficiaries differ from the baseline expectations, how do they differ?	The final questions in this section are intended to understand differences, if any, between grantees' baseline expectations for NSP2 beneficiaries and the actual NSP2 beneficiaries. They also ask grantees for the reasons for these differences.
Obstacles, Challenges, and Supports (All respondents)	28. Among your organization's intervention strategies [insert list of activities], which NSP2-eligible activity was the most difficult to implement and why? The least difficult? Why?	These questions are designed to help understand the more general obstacles grantees faced in carrying out their originally planned activities. Responses will be compared across market types to determine whether there are correlations between market types and the activities that can successfully be executed in each.
	29. In general, what challenges has your organization encountered in implementing your NSP2 strategy?	These questions ask grantees to make a judgment about the most significant challenges they faced in general and to describe whether and how they overcame these. Looking across responses, this question will provide an ordinal ranking of the most factors that created the most significant problems for grantees. Likewise, they ask grantees to identify the factors that in general most facilitated their efforts.
	30. Have you been able to overcome these challenges? a. If so, how? b. If not, why not?	
	31. What factors do you believe have supported or facilitated your organization's NSP2 implementation?	

Program Operations Staff Interview Protocol		
Survey Section	Item	Data Analysis Elements
Lessons Learned (All respondents)	32. After you were awarded the NSP2 grant, how long was it before you were able to start doing NSP2 activities (e.g., acquiring properties)? a. Was this interval too long? b. If so, how could the NSP2 program have been designed differently to shorten this interval? c. In retrospect, was there anything you could have done differently to shorten this interval?	This question is designed to address one aspect of the NSP2 program design and grantees' ability to respond to their grant award – the length of time between grant award and first expenditures. In baseline site visit interviews, we learned that it took many grantees 4-6 months after grant award to begin spending funds, which might undermine the intent of the program to rapidly address the foreclosure crisis.
	33. Are there any other "lessons learned" of how to best structure efforts to stabilize or revitalize distressed neighborhoods that you would like to share?	These questions encourage grantees to provide any other observations or lessons they feel they have learned while implementing their NSP2 grant.
	34. Are there things you would have liked to do but couldn't? If so, what were these, and what prevented you from doing these?	
	35. Is there anything you wish you had done differently? If so, what?	
Wrap-up/Conclusion	This concludes my questions for you. Do you have any questions for me or other input you'd like to provide?	Concluding question that provides grantees an opportunity to raise topics not covered in the interview protocol.

Appendix D

Billing Code: 4210-67

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

[Docket No. FR-5609-N-11]

Notice of Proposed Information Collection for Public Comment: Neighborhood Stabilization Program Tracking Study

AGENCY: Office of the Assistant Secretary for 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: Comment Due Date: [Insert date 60 days after date of Federal Register publication].

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 electronically to judson.l.james@hud.gov or in hard copy to: Judson L. James, Office of Policy Development and Research, Department of Housing and Urban Development, 451 7th Street, SW, Room 8120, Washington, D.C. 20410-6000. Please use "NSP PRA Comment" in the subject line of any email.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Judson L. James at 202-402-5707 (this is not a toll-free number) or judson.l.james@hud.gov, for copies of the proposed forms and other available documents. Please use "NSP PRA Comment" in the subject line of any email.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Department of Housing and Urban Development will submit the proposed extension of 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 whether the information will have practical utility; (2) evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the 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.

This Notice also lists the following information:

Title of Proposal: *Site Visit Protocols for Neighborhood Stabilization Program (NSP2) Evaluation; Second Round*

OMB Control Number:

Description of the Need for the Information and Proposed Use: The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) is conducting an important national study of the Neighborhood Stabilization Program (NSP), with a particular focus on the round of funding from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA), known as “NSP2.” This information collection will constitute the second round of site visits and interviews of NSP2 grantees, as well as collection of grantees’ property-level data on NSP2 activities conducted. The information collected will be used to describe how program implementation occurred in practice, gather views of what program outcomes and impacts have occurred, and explore factors that contributed to program outcomes.

Agency Form Numbers:

Members of the Affected Public: A total of 29 NSP2 grantees (25 local and 4 national) and 50 partner agencies will be part of the study. Staff of these grantees will be asked to participate in interviews with HUD’s contractor and to provide HUD’s contractor with access to their records for tracking program activity. Local interviews will take approximately 2 hours per person and will be administered to approximately 4 staff per NSP2 grantee and 4 additional staff among partner agencies. Interviews with national grantees will be administered to approximately 2 staff per NSP2 grantee.

Property-level data will be compiled either by grantee representatives or by a HUD contractor. Approximately one-half of the 29 grantees (or 14 grantees) and 25 partner organizations will likely chose to report the required data themselves via the study’s preformatted spreadsheet. HUD estimates that each spreadsheet will take one person about 1.5 working days (12 hours) to complete, on average.

For the remaining 15 grantees and 25 partner organizations, the data will be compiled by the research team with the support of local representatives. The majority of this effort will be conducted by the researcher. HUD estimates that it will take approximately two hours per grantee and partner organization to provide access to records during this time (e.g., pulling the appropriate files).

Estimation of the total number of hours needed to prepare the information collection including number of respondents, frequency of response, and hours of response: The following chart details the respondent burden on a quarterly and annual basis:

	Number of entities	Responses per entity	Hours per response	Total hours
Interviews: Local NSP grantees	25	4	2	200
Interviews: Local Partner agencies	50	4	2	400
Interviews: National NSP2 grantees	4	2	2	16
Providing Access to Records	40	1	2	80
Compiling Records	39	1	12	468

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.

Date: August 31, 2012

Erika C. Poethig

Assistant Secretary for

Policy Development and Research