SUPPORTING STATEMENT
NOAA RESTORATION CENTER PERFORMANCE PROGRESS REPORT AND
ADMINISTRATIVE PROGRESS REPORT
OMB CONTROL NO. 0648-0472

A.   JUSTIFICATION

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

This request is for revision and extension of a currently approved information collection.

This information collection assists the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) in the administration and evaluation of coastal and marine habitat restoration projects. It helps inform policy and practitioner decisions on restoration cost-effectiveness and relative 'success' through evaluation of short and long-term outcomes, building evidence of the program's effectiveness as a tool for fisheries management.

NOAA notifies the public periodically through www.grants.gov regarding financial and technical assistance available for coastal and marine habitat restoration projects. Examples of previously funded restoration actions that improve habitat for recreational, commercial, managed, and protected fish species include:
- Projects that seek to restore coastal and marine habitat to recover threatened or endangered species or benefit species of concern;
- Projects that remove in-stream migration barriers or create/restore habitats limiting productivity for diadromous fish;
- Projects that restore the broad ecological benefits and ecosystem services shellfish provide;
- Projects that address land-based sources of pollution, recovery from disturbance or disease, or that promote recruitment and/or recovery of coral reefs;
- Projects that reconnect coastal wetlands or stabilize shorelines through restoration;
- Projects that provide protection for communities and infrastructure through habitat restoration to improve coastal resiliency to storms and flooding;
- Projects that improve the potential for coastal habitat to respond to climate change through restoration or protection of transition zones that provide room for habitat migration with sea level rise;
- Projects that support conservation corps type activities to provide employment, education and training through restoration of coastal and marine habitat; and
- Restoration of Great Lakes habitats including addressing beneficial use impairments to loss of fish and wildlife habitat and/or degradation of benthos.

Federal Funding Opportunities (FFO) posted on grants.gov describe eligible habitat restoration activities and applicant groups, specific program priorities and the standard, NOAA-wide evaluation criteria against which applications are reviewed. They also describe the necessity for pre-and post-restoration monitoring to detect short- and long-term ecological and socioeconomic outcomes. To evaluate a basic level of ecological success, NOAA expects a minimum level of short-term evaluation parameters to include one or more of the following: acres restored; stream miles opened for fish passage; or another, similar measure that describes the significance of the

proposed actions. NOAA further encourages outcome-based long-term performance measures, including improved fish habitat quality; increased abundance of target species; impact on status of listed species and species of concern; changes in recreational angling; and similar parameters. NOAA restoration specialists work with successful applicants to incorporate long-term monitoring parameters into select projects to facilitate outcome level analysis of specific project types (fish passage, hydrological reconnection, coral reef and shellfish habitat).

Awards are made as grants or cooperative agreements under the authority of the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, 16 U.S.C. 661, as amended by the Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1970, the Magnuson-Stevens Reauthorization Act of 2006 (Title 1, Sec. 117), the Estuaries and Clean Waters Act of 2000 (Title I, Public Law 106-457), amendments to the Water Resources Development Act of 2007, and other authorities. Applications for federal financial assistance are submitted via the grants.gov website using the required OMB-approved federal application forms. Funding recommendations are typically determined through a competitive process involving technical merit review and ranking of the applications.

Successful applicants are required in accordance with 2 C.F.R. 200.328, to submit periodic performance reports and a final report for each award. This requirement applies to recipients of NOAA restoration awards. This information collection stipulates what is to be provided in these reports and program staff will assist recipients in fulfilling their responsibilities in meeting interim and final progress report requirements. Recipients may also use this information collection to gather project results on sub-awards from sub-recipients.

Over 2,100 restoration projects have received NOAA Community-based Restoration Program funds through awards or sub-awards since 1996. It is critical to accurately track the status and success of funded projects to provide accountability for the expenditure of these federal restoration funds.

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

The NOAA Restoration Center (RC) staff use the information collection to populate a project tracking database (The Restoration and Conservation Database, or RCDB). This database was first established in 2001 and updated in 2013 to increase its functionality and utility for the RC. Results of staff queries to the database are currently used by NOAA management to respond to Department of Commerce, Congressional and constituent inquiries, and provide an accurate accounting of NOAA's performance measure reporting under the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) 'acres restored' measure. The database tracks sources and amounts of funding, volunteer numbers and hours contributed toward projects; provides a subset of project data to the public through the Restoration Atlas on the internet; and promotes planning through a web-based Geographic Information System (GIS) mapping function. Project data is shared with the public once RCDB information has been verified by technical staff.

We have not changed the collection tool since the last submission. We still use two targeted forms. The Performance Progress Report form, the original collection tool, focuses on tracking

project-level implementation, milestones, performance measures, monitoring, and project expenditures. The Administrative Progress Report form applies only to recipients implementing multiple projects. Recipients use the form to document information on the administration of the award, the number of projects supported by the award, and overall award expenditures. Recipients continue to be required to provide information in a two-part process consisting of a progress report narrative and form-fillable fields for specific project or award data. The narrative and data fields are included in a single form. Both the Performance Progress Report form for projects and the Administrative Progress Report form for awards with multiple projects follow this format.

The guidance for use of these forms encourages recipients to complete multiple Performance Progress Report forms when an award has multiple, geographically separate project sites or several distinct projects at one site. In the past, some recipients had done this and found it to streamline reporting for each project site and take less time than compiling all of the information into one form. The Federal Program Officer will help recipients determine the most efficient way to use the form for their award to minimize burden.

When multiple Performance Progress Report forms are used, the recipient also completes the Administrative Progress Report form. This form provides the recipient a place to document its management under a single RC financial award. Recipients or sub-recipients complete an individual Performance Progress Report form for each project listed in the project table of the Administrative Progress Report form. The Administrative Progress Report form is used to track the overall budget for the NOAA award, whereas the budget section of the Performance Progress Report form is used to track the approved and actual expenditures at the project level.

Administrative Progress Report Form includes:

Award Information
The following data elements are part of the collection tool and are identical to the past reporting period with one minor change to a title of a section to more accurately describe the section. These elements are critical to award and project tracking. The data elements are the following:

(1) Name of federal agency and organization to which report is submitted.
(2) Award number as assigned by NOAA's Grants Online electronic awards management system or by the NOAA recipient for subrecipients.
(3) Federal Program Officer - Name
(4) Recipient Organization (Name and complete address including ZIP code).
(5) Award Start Date (MM/DD/YY)
(6) Award End Date (MM/DD/YY)
(7) Report Start Date (MM/DD/YY)
(8) Report End Date (MM/DD/YY)
(9) Award Name
(10) Main Project Contact – Name
(11) Main Project Contact – Title and Organization
(12) Main Project Contract – Email
(13) Main Project Contact – Phone Number
(14) Final Report (check the box 'yes' or 'no').
(15) Report Frequency

(16) Other Attachments: Recipients list other documents they upload into NOAA Grants Online as part of the report including things such as project report forms, articles/news clippings, project photographs, etc.

(17) Authorized Representative – Name and Title

(18) Authorized Representative – Email

(19) Authorized Representative – Phone Number

(20) Performance Narrative

For the **Initial Administrative Progress Report,** provide a background description of the administration and management of the award. Then, similar to the Interim Administrative Progress Reports, the narrative should highlight: competitions to select PI's, subrecipients, or projects; subrecipent/sub-award management; notable milestones or activities performed by the recipient; and any award changes or other activities not described in a performance progress report narrative.

For **Interim Administrative Progress Reports**, describe the administration and management of the award. The narrative should highlight: competitions to select PI's, subrecipients, or projects; subrecipent/sub-award management; notable milestones or activities performed by the recipient; and any award changes or other activities not described in a performance progress report narrative. The performance narrative section should be cumulative throughout the award period.

For **Final Administrative Progress Reports**, comprehensively discuss in detail the following award components not discussed in performance progress reports over the award period.

a) Description of completed tasks related to the administration of the award, such as subrecipient/sub-award management;

b) Summary of results and outcomes of the comprehensive award, such as collective benefits of multiple projects, if applicable;

c) Description of the partnerships developed to leverage resources;

d) Deviations from proposed award activities and expenditures, including detailed explanations of budget changes;

e) Lessons learned that would make future projects more efficient and effective; and

f) Future plans and next steps related to the award focus area (e.g. outreach activities and products, and/or implementing management plan activities).

A. Sub-award or Project List

This section is meant to help RC staff and recipients track the multiple projects they are managing under an award on one page. In this section, recipients capture the name of the subrecipient (column 1); the title of the project being implemented (column 2); indicate the status of the project (column 3) as 'not started', 'planning', 'implementation', 'monitoring', 'closed', or 'terminated;' the National Environmental Policy Act (column 4) status as 'not started', 'in-progress', or 'completed;' the NOAA funding amount (column 5); the project end date (column 6); and any modifications to the sub-award (column7).

B. NOAA Award Funding and C. Non-federal Recipient Share (Match Funds)

In this section, recipients use SF-424A object classes (column 1) to record their annual (up to three years) approved NOAA or Non-federal Recipient Share funding (columns 2-4), the total NOAA or Non-federal Recipient Share approved funding (column 5), and the total NOAA or Non-federal Recipient Share expended through the end of the reporting period

(column 6). Column 7 in the NOAA funding table is for notes. In the Non-federal Recipient Share table, column 7 is for the source of the Non-federal Recipient Share funds. The Budget Deviation Description (Column 8) will be used to capture changes to the approved budget. If projects are 4 or 5 years in length, recipients will be provided duplicate Section B and C pages to provide the funding and recipient share information for these additional years.

Performance Progress Report Form includes:

Project Information

The Project Information data elements in this section are identical to the past reporting period, with one addition of options in the Project Activities progress drop down. The data elements are the following:

(1) Name of federal agency and organization to which report is submitted.
(2) Award or Sub-Award Number as assigned by NOAA's Grants Online electronic grants management system or by the NOAA recipient for subrecipients.
(3) Federal Program Officer - Name
(4) Project Name
(5) Recipient Organization (Name and complete address including ZIP code)
(6) Final Report (check the box 'yes' or 'no')
(7) Award Start Date (MM/DD/YY) and End Date (MM/DD/YY)
(8) Report Start Date (MM/DD/YY) and End Date (MM/DD/YY)
(9) Report Frequency: (check the box 'annual', 'semi-annual', 'other', or 'quarterly')
(10) Main Project Contact – Name
(11) Main Project Contact – Title and Organization (12) Main Project Contract – Email
(13) Main Project Contact – Phone Number
(14) Project City
(15) Project State
(16) Number of Project Sites – Drop down menu 1-6, and see Project Narrative
(17) Project Site Coordinates (longitude and latitude in decimal degrees) –
(18) Project Landowner Permission Received (check 'yes' or 'no')
(19) Monitoring Contact – Name
(20) Monitoring Contact – Title and Organization
(21) Monitoring Contact – Email
(22) Monitoring Contact – Phone Number
(23) Monitoring Level – Tier I, Tier II, or None (determined during award negotiation)
(24) List of Target Species - A list of the target species that will directly benefit from the restoration project.
(25) List of Project Partners - The names and organization affiliation of any partners contributing to or otherwise involved in the project.
(26) Problem the Project Addresses – A description of the historic and current status of the project area and target species. The description also includes how the project activities will enhance the habitat and NOAA trust species populations at the project site.
(27) Other Attachments: Recipients list other documents they plan to upload into NOAA Grants Online as part of the report including: data sharing plans; monitoring plans; monitoring reports; articles/news clippings; before, during, and after high resolution project photographs; and project maps or geographic/spatial data files.

(28) Authorized Representative – Name and Title
(29) Authorized Representative – Email
(30) Authorized Representative – Phone Number
(31) Performance Narrative

For **Initial Performance Progress Reports**, describe the goals and objectives of the project. Then, similar to the Interim Performance Progress Reports, all narratives should provide a detailed description of project activities (e.g. construction and monitoring) which may include: progress achieved towards milestones, an updated timeline of remaining tasks, changes to proposed project activities and budget (e.g. construction design plans or alternate project activities), a description of roadblocks to future progress, and lessons learned.

For **Interim Performance Progress Reports**, all narratives should provide a detailed description of project activities (e.g. construction and monitoring) to date, not just the reporting period. A description may include: progress achieved towards milestones, an updated timeline of remaining tasks, changes to proposed project activities and budget (e.g. construction design plans or alternate project activities), a description of roadblocks to future progress, and lessons learned.

For **Final Performance Progress Reports**, discuss in detail the following project components including the goals and objectives of the project, and a description of project activities implemented to complete the project over the award period. Highlight any project partners' role in project implementation.

a) State if the project was implemented and monitored as proposed. Describe activities completed during implementation and monitoring;
b) Describe materials and methods used to complete project implementation and outreach tasks;
c) For projects with a monitoring plan, describe the methods used in data collection and data analysis, assumptions for data analysis, and key findings;
d) Describe results and outcomes;
e) Describe in detail deviations from proposed implementation methods, achievements of performance metrics, and/or object class expenditures. Include why the deviations were made and how they impacted the outcomes of the proposed project;
f) Describe lessons learned (e.g., new techniques, innovative partnerships, and community engagement); and
g) Describe future plans, such as restoration and monitoring next steps, and/or plans for sharing/publishing results or description of other outreach activities and products.

A. **Project Activities**
In this section, recipients work with NOAA Federal Program Officers and technical monitors to describe (column 1) distinct activities outlined in the final proposal narrative agreed to by the recipient and NOAA. Columns 2 indicates whether the activity is 'completed,' 'in-progress,' 'not started', or 'terminated' during the reporting period and column 3 provides a brief description of the recipient's progress toward completing the activity. The option to indicate terminated was added based on a comment from a

recipient as a way to note if a task is no longer being completed with an explanation of why.

B. Performance Measures
In this section, recipients work with NOAA Federal Program Officers and technical monitors to describe (column 1) specific performance goals and objectives for the project as specified in the approved work plan relative to the type of habitat to be restored, identify the unit of measure (column 2), identify a baseline for that measure (column 3), enter the year the recipient expects to accomplish the target measure specified in the work plan (column 4), the overall amount to be achieved (column 5), the actual, cumulative amount achieved by the end of the reporting period (column 6) and a brief explanation (column 7) that describes monitoring or verification activities related to the specific measure and whether the target was met, and if not, why it was not.

C. NOAA Award Funding and D. Non-federal Recipient Share are the same as the previously described Sections B. and C. of the Administrative Progress Report form.

E. **Project Leverage** and **F. Monitoring Funds**. The information collected in these tables allows the RC to understand the full cost of implementing and monitoring restoration projects. Recipients will describe the supported tasks (column 1), record funds as federal or non-federal (column 2), record the name of the organization providing the funds for the task (column 3), and record the total cost of the task described (column 4).

It is anticipated that the information collected will be disseminated to the public or used to write/create publicly disseminated information. NOAA will retain control over the information and safeguard it from improper access, modification, and destruction, consistent with NOAA standards for confidentiality, privacy, and electronic information. The information collection is designed to yield data that meet all applicable information quality guidelines. The information is subjected to quality control measures prior to project records being approved for the production mode of the database, and specific products produced from the data undergo a pre-dissemination review pursuant to [Section 515 of Public Law 106-554](#).

3. Describe whether, and to what extent, the collection of information involves the use of automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological techniques or other forms of information technology.

The progress reports are form-fillable PDF files that are populated, saved, and updated using Adobe software and a personal computer. Recipients can access the report form at the bottom of https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/national/habitat-conservation/resources-noaa-restoration-center-applicants and it is also provided to recipients by their Federal Program Officer; recipients can save the information in the first progress report and use the same file to produce and print subsequent reports, eliminating duplication, and simplifying the effort needed to produce a comprehensive final report. Electronic submission of the information collected is required. Reports are then viewable by select technical monitors in field locations for review and verification before being accepted by Federal Program Officers. Most recipients have the technology available to collect project location information and verify it using a hand-held Geographic Positioning System unit (GPS). This is not required however, as the RCDB has a web-based GIS mapping function that can identify specific project sites for recipients that don't have access to GPS. The RCDB has the capability to look up and map geographic coordinates, and confirmation of geographic coordinates is part of the quality assurance/quality control plan associated with the RCDB. No other type of information technology is necessary to collect the majority of information that will be requested.

4. Describe efforts to identify duplication.

Based on discussions with staff from other federal programs that undertake similar types of granting activities related to habitat and fisheries and that collect project-specific data, no evidence of duplication of information collection could be found. NOAA and The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Habitat programs have worked to better align their respective databases (NOAA's RCDB and FWS HaBITS) to standardize data fields and definitions to enable meaningful comparison of habitat data. Recipients that receive project funding from more than one agency indicated that this information collection did not duplicate information collected by other agencies, as funds tend to go toward different project components; in fact, recipients found that NOAA's information collection was often useful in helping them report on project status to their other funding sources. The information provided to NOAA by recipients is unique to each project and progress report, and is typically used by recipients to report on project status to interested parties outside NOAA.

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

Only successful applicants are required to submit interim and final progress reports. Specific instructions are provided to guide the preparation of interim and final reports to prevent submission of unnecessary information and to minimize the burden on recipients. The information to be collected is basic in its nature and should not create a hardship or burden for small entities that receive RC project funds. We revised the Performance Progress Report instructions and Administrative Progress Report instructions into a format that is 508 compliant to decrease the burden of using these forms for people with disabilities.

6. Describe the consequences to the Federal program or policy activities if the collection is not conducted or is conducted less frequently.
If the information collection is discontinued, NOAA's ability to consistently and precisely account for the expenditure of federal funds for voluntary restoration activities, and provide

accurate data to support GPRA 'acres restored' and other performance measures, will be compromised. Conducting this information collection less frequently will not meet the standards of the Department of Commerce Grants Manual for interim reporting, and would make it more difficult to determine and correct poor recipient performance, since less frequent collection provides insufficient information to monitor awards to ensure federal funds are properly used. If this collection is not conducted or conducted less frequently, it will compromise the agency's ability to use and build evidence of effectiveness for its restoration grant programs. There will also be no means to respond to Congressional inquiries in a rapid, accurate, efficient and cost-effective manner.

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

Not Applicable.

8. <u>Provide information on the PRA Federal Register Notice that solicited public comments on the information collection prior to this submission. Summarize the public comments received in response to that notice and describe the actions taken by the agency in response to those comments. Describe the efforts to consult with persons outside the agency to obtain their views on the availability of data, frequency of collection, the clarity of instructions and recordkeeping, disclosure, or reporting format (if any), and on the data elements to be recorded, disclosed, or reported</u>.

A Federal Register Notice published on May 17, 2018 (83 FR 22962) solicited public comments on the RC information collection and forms designed to collect the information. We received 9 comments in response to the Federal Register Notice, and 3 comments were submitted directly to NOAA Federal Program Officers (see below).

Consultations with interested and affected persons are an integral part of this information collection, and are accomplished by discussions with recipients. The NOAA Federal Program Officers discuss the reporting form with all new recipients. It is through these discussions that the NOAA Federal Program Officers are made aware of data elements that might be useful for recipients or subrecipients, and about and need for clarifications to ensure the RC is collecting the information desired. Consultations will continue with current and future recipients as necessary to ensure they understand the information collection requirements and to solicit suggestions for improvements.

In May and June 2018, in coordination with the Federal Register Notice publication, the NOAA Federal Program Officers requested comments via email from a diverse cross-section of present and past recipients. Recipients were requested to review the forms to collect the information, and the estimated burden hours for the new forms. The comments were informative and positive. All comments received were considered.

The final Performance Progress Report form and Administrative Progress Report forms and guidance documents incorporate a few comments for improvement. The comments strengthened the consistency of the forms between each other. The RC received comments on the Performance

Progress Report requesting additional drops down options to provide more accurate choices for project activity progress, and changes to the funding tables to allow for data to be entered for more than 3 years of project funding. For projects that are funded for more than 3 years, additional functioning pages will be available for funding information for both report forms.

The RC Received one comment for improving the Administrative Progress Report form by clarifying a title to match the form instructions more closely, and made this change to the form.

A comment that was not incorporated requested a different method for collecting information in real time, rather than in the static reports. These comments will be discussed for future, long term data collection consideration for the office.

Over time, comments received from recipients through consultations or email requests have supported the continued collection of this information and the electronic format in which it is collected. The frequency of reporting and data elements was deemed appropriate and data was readily available. Recipients recognized that this collection not only provides NOAA with data critical for the purposes discussed above, but that it will, over time, reveal status and trends within categories of projects to help recipients strengthen the technical aspects of similar project types proposed for funding consideration and improve NOAA decision making.

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

No payments or gifts will be provided to respondents of this information collection other than remuneration of contractors or recipients implementing projects supported through the NOAA Restoration Center.

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

The information collection does not request any proprietary or confidential information. No confidentiality is provided.

This information is covered by the Privacy Act System of Records Notices DEPT-2, Accounts Receivable and GSA/GOVT-9, System for Award Management.

11. Provide additional justification for any questions of a sensitive nature, such as sexual behavior and attitudes, religious beliefs, and other matters that are commonly considered private.

No information of a sensitive nature is collected.

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

We received a dozen responses to the Federal Register notice from project recipients. Respondents are limited to those organizations that have received funding through select NOAA programs and were asked to respond to the burden for completing the collection tools. This includes the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, and gathering and

maintaining project information (photos, press releases, partner contributions, volunteer hours, tracking of multiple project sites, etc.) as well as completing (filling out) the information collection.

In response to the Federal Register notice, some recipients said they think that both the Administrative and Performance Progress Reports take less time to complete than we estimated, and some think the reports take more time to complete, especially the initial report for an award. We took these comments into account when calculating burden hours and allocated more burden for the initial report compared to the interim reports. Recipients did not view the completion of the Progress Reports as a significant burden, and some commented that the reports are less time consuming than report formats our office has used in the past. Many comments praised the use of a template and guidance for organizing goals and progress on grant activities.

We used the same number of recipients to estimate burden as our previous analysis; however, based on comments from award recipients we analyzed the burden hours more comprehensively, so the hours of burden are slightly different than in 2015. Our specific analysis follows.

Per year: In one year, 130 respondents will submit 310 responses to this collection. The estimated burden hours and costs during one year for this renewed information collection will be:
- 1678 hours for the 260 Performance Progress Report forms (this includes 30 initial reports at 9.5 hours, 200 semi annual reports at 5.5 hours, and 30 final reports at 9.75 hours. Both the initial and final reports are a higher burden than the semi annual reports).
- 168 hours for the 50 Administrative Progress Report forms (5 initial at 6 hours; 40 semi-annual reports at 2.75 hours and 5 final reports at 5.5 hours)
- **1846 total hours for the 310 unique submissions of these forms.**

These 1846 total hours have an estimated cost of $73,800. (see Table 1 below which breaks down these estimated costs). Costs are based on an average of $40 per hour for professional labor. However, it should be noted that the labor cost for the interim and final reports are eligible costs under grants or contracts, and are therefore not costs incurred by the public for this information collection. This amounts to less than 1% of programmatic funds that are used for record keeping and reporting purposes that are part of routine project management for award recipients.

*Table 1: Illustrates the annual burden costs for initial, semi-annual and annual report types for Performance Progress Report (PPR) and Administrative Progress Report (APR) collection forms when they are collected additional to the Performance Progress Report. *Note that the response total in the table equals 260 responses, 210 that are PRA forms only, and 50 that are two report forms (the PRA and APR) in one response*

Report Type and Form Combinations	Responses	PPR Burden Hours	APR Burden Hours	Total Burden Hours	$/hr	Annual Burden Cost
Initial PPR	25	9.5	0	9.5	40	**$9,500**
Initial PPR + APR	5	9.5	6	15.5	40	**$3,100**

Semi-annual PPR	160	5.5	0	5.5	40	**$35,200**
Semi-annual PPR + APR	40	5.5	2.75	8.25	40	**$13,200**
Final PPR	25	9.75	0	9.75	40	**$9,750**
Final PPR + APR	5	9.75	5.5	15.25	40	**$3,050**
						$73,800

The burden cost estimate for the performance and administrative report templates is higher than the previous Paperwork Reduction Act approval ($63,831 in 2015) because we increased the cost of the burden per hour from $35 to $40 an hour, based on a 1.9% inflation, rounding down. Our process to consider the hours of burden for the initial report differently than the regular semi-annual reports marginally increased the total annual burden hours estimate for the performance report (by 15 hours) and marginally increased the annual burden hours estimated for the initial administrative report (by 17 hours).

Per Project: At a given point in time, the RC manages approximately 130 awards with 36-month award periods. The RC initiates a maximum of 30 new awards and sub-awards a year and the remaining awards are in the interim or final reporting periods. For each 36-month award, the RC typically requires one initial report, four interim reports and one final report. Awards and sub-awards requiring only the Performance Progress Report will expend 41.25 hours on this information collection throughout the length of the award, whereas awards required to complete both the Performance Progress Report and the Administrative Progress Report will expend 63.75 hours on the collection throughout the length of the award.

13. Provide an estimate of the total annual cost burden to the respondents or record-keepers resulting from the collection (excluding the value of the burden hours in Question 12 above).

No capital or start-up costs are expected to result from this collection by the respondents. Any need for the purchase of a computer, software, or supplies required for project implementation, or for monitoring and data entry, are included as part of the grant request. Operations and maintenance costs are limited to writing reports and maintaining financial records; these too are included as part of the grant request. There are no costs for submission of reports, as they are submitted through grants.gov.

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

It is anticipated that twenty restoration specialists (full-time employees, or FTE) will devote no more than 5% of their time annually to input the information collected into a database, one GIS specialist FTE will devote no more than 10% of their time annually to update quality controlled data and maintain GIS maps and webpage links, and supervise and task a contractor, and that one contractor will provide 10% of their time to maintain the database, work on change requests and subsequent enhancements and version releases. Assumptions are as follows:

20 restoration FTEs X ($100,000 annual average salary) X (5% of their time) = $100,000
1 GIS FTE X ($100,000 annual average salary) X (10% of his or her time) = $10,000
1 IT contractor X ($100,000 annual average salary) X (10% of his or her time) = $10,000

The annualized cost to the Federal government to conduct this information collection is estimated to be $120,000. No equipment, overhead, printing or other costs should be involved with the processing of this information collection. RCDB was upgraded and a new version was released in August 2012. Cognos, the reporting function for the RCDB was updated for increased functionality in April 2018. This enhancement enables more powerful queries and faster responses to answer specific questions, and subsequent releases will incorporate key monitoring and evaluation data to allow evidence-based evaluation of program effectiveness.

15. Explain the reasons for any program changes or adjustments reported in Items 13 or 14 of the OMB 83-1.

There are no program changes.

There are minor adjustments: 1846 hours total burden increased from 1825 previously.

Burden hours are slightly different due to considering the initial report for each award as a larger burden. The total burden for the performance progress report will be 9.5 for the initial report, 5.5 for the semi-annual report (less than previously estimated), and 9.75 for the final reports. The total burden for the administrative progress report will be 6 for the initial report, 2.75 for the semi-annual report (less than previously estimated), and 5.5 for the final reports.

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

The results of this collection will not be published. A subset of the information is however made available to the public on the Restoration Center's Restoration Atlas at https://restoration.atlas.noaa.gov/src/html/index.html, where the public can view projects by location or habitat type, see the project location on a map, and review an abstract of the project including funding information, project partners, and a contact for more information.

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

18. Explain each exception to the certification.

Not Applicable.

B. COLLECTIONS OF INFORMATION EMPLOYING STATISTICAL METHODS
This collection does not employ statistical methods.