

SUPPORTING STATEMENT - PART A

Silver Jackets Program Nomination and Awards – 0710-0023

Summary of Changes from Previously Approved Collection

- *The overall burden to respondents decreased slightly due to decreases in assumed wages for those responding. The overall burden to the federal government decreased due to efforts to streamline the collection mechanism as well as pro-rating of one-time operations and maintenance costs over time.*
- *The voting phase of the Silver Jackets Program Award process has been removed from this information collection request because it is not an information collection under the PRA. It is maintained as a supplementary document.*

1. Need for the Information Collection

The National Flood Risk Management Program (NFRMP) supports the USACE mission to coordinate flood risk management programs and activities with Federal, State, and local agencies using the following existing authorities: Section 206, 1960 Flood Control Act that provides the Corps authority coordinate flood hazard information and actions, provide engineering advice for flood hazard planning and flood warning studies; Section 22, Water Resources Development Act of 1974 to provide technical assistance to states for development of water resources development plans and studies that support state hazard mitigation plans; and the Flood Control Act of 1955 to coordinate technical assistance for flood preparedness, response & recovery to include non-structural alternatives.

This information collection is needed in order to obtain feedback from our state government partners regarding our shared program, the Silver Jackets Program, which is a component of the National Flood Risk Management Program. Because the program is a shared program, state partners need to have a role in selecting the teams deserving of annual recognition.

2. Use of the Information

Respondents include State government employees who are partners on state Silver Jackets teams. Silver Jackets is an innovative program that provides states with an opportunity to consistently coordinate with multiple state, federal, and sometimes tribal and local agencies to learn from one another and implement flood risk reduction. The USACE provides customer service to the states through these “Silver Jackets” state teams. The responses to this information collection are used to recognize excellent work by teams, thank the team partners for their efforts, and provide incentives for future team participation. These are state-led teams, so it would be inappropriate for USACE to decide the team awardees; instead, the awardees are determined by peer voting.

A Call for Nominations is issued annually to solicit nominations for the Silver Jackets Team of the Year award. The Call is sent out through formal USACE channels, and then shared with appropriate state government partners. State partners from all 50 states, the District of Columbia, and several United States territories, all of which have active or developing Silver Jackets teams, receive this call for nominations.

State government employees are requested to participate in the nomination and voting process. Both nominations and voting are entirely voluntary and are conducted online. Respondents are asked to visit a website (<https://awards.nfrmp.us>) to submit their team nominations, and supply a narrative, not to exceed 350 words, of the qualities and achievements meriting recognition. Respondents use the ENG Form 6128, "Silver Jackets State Team of the Year," to provide the information necessary to nominate a team. Team self-nominations are encouraged. All qualified team nominations are posted for consideration by other team members. Respondents are then invited to visit the same website to review team nominations and cast their vote for the most deserving team from among the nominated teams. Voting is limited to members of developing or active state teams. The team receiving the most votes is awarded "Silver Jackets Team of the Year." Please note that the voting phase of the process has been determined to not require OMB approval because it is not an information collection under the Paperwork Reduction Act. We have included, as a supplementary document, screenshots of the website on which voting takes place.

All nominations and votes are submitted through the NFRMP website. A contractor, Web and Writing Solutions Company, collects and reviews state team nominations and then collects, reviews, and sums votes for each nominated team. After nominations are submitted and reviewed, the supporting information included within the nomination forms is made available on the same website so that all respondents can then choose how to cast their vote for the winning team.

3. Use of Information Technology

All survey responses are collected electronically, via the website annotated in Section 2.

4. Non-duplication

The information obtained through this collection is unique and is not already available for use or adaptation from another cleared source.

5. Burden on Small Businesses

This information collection does not impose a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small businesses or entities.

6. Less Frequent Collection

Awards recipients are recognized on an annual basis for work completed over the previous calendar year. As such, an annual collection of information is necessary. If information were collected less frequently, significant accomplishments of Silver Jackets state teams could not be recognized on an annual basis.

7. Paperwork Reduction Act Guidelines

This collection of information does not require collection to be conducted in a manner inconsistent with the guidelines delineated in 5 CFR 1320.5(d)(2).

8. Consultation and Public Comments

Part A: PUBLIC NOTICE

A 60-Day Federal Register Notice (FRN) for the collection published on Friday, September 22, 2023. The 60-Day FRN citation is 88 FR 65371.

No comments were received during the 60-Day Comment Period.

A 30-Day Federal Register Notice for the collection published on Monday, January 29, 2024. The 30-Day FRN citation is 89 FR 5507.

No additional consultation apart from soliciting public comments through the Federal Register was conducted for this submission.

9. Gifts or Payment

No payments or gifts are being offered to respondents as an incentive to participate in the collection.

10. Confidentiality

A Privacy Act Statement is required for this collection and is provided at the top of the collection instrument.

A System of Record Notice (SORN) is not required for this collection because records are not retrievable by PII.

A Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) is not required for this collection because PII is not being collected electronically.

Records are managed in compliance with Army Regulation (AR) 25-400-2, defined as follows. RN 672-20e: Nominations, requests, certificates, citations, awards and similar information is retained in current file area until no longer needed for business but not longer than 6 years, then destroyed.

11. Sensitive Questions

No questions considered sensitive are being asked in this collection.

12. Respondent Burden and its Labor Costs

Part A: ESTIMATION OF RESPONDENT BURDEN

1) Collection Instruments

Nomination for Silver Jackets Team of the Year

- a) Number of Respondents: 54
- b) Number of Responses Per Respondent: 1
- c) Number of Total Annual Responses: 54
- d) Response Time: 20 minutes
- e) Respondent Burden Hour: 18 hours

2) Total Submission Burden

- a) Total Number of Respondents: 54
- b) Total Number of Annual Responses: 54
- c) Total Respondent Burden Hours: 18 hours

Part B: LABOR COST OF RESPONDENT BURDEN

1) Collection Instruments

Nomination for Silver Jackets Team of the Year

- a) Number of Total Annual Responses: 54
- b) Response Time: 20 minutes
- c) Respondent Hourly Wage: \$35.41
- d) Labor Burden per Response: \$11.80
- e) Total Labor Burden: \$637

2) Overall Labor Burden

- a) Total Number of Annual Responses: 54
- b) Total Labor Burden: \$637

It was assumed that USACE employees participating on state Silver Jackets teams were typically at the GS-11 or GS-12 level. Second, it was assumed that state employees participating on the teams would typically be comparable in level to the USACE employees on the teams, and therefore would have comparable salaries. For cost estimate purposes, the GS-11 step 5 (\$32.21) and GS-12 step 5 (\$38.61) salaries found in OPM tables were averaged, resulting in an hourly salary of \$35.41. This salary was assumed to be a reasonable hourly salary value to assign to the state employees responding to the survey.

13. Respondent Costs Other Than Burden Hour Costs

There are no annualized costs to respondents other than the labor burden costs addressed in Section 12 of this document to complete this collection.

14. Cost to the Federal Government

Part A: LABOR COST TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

1) Collection Instruments

Nomination for Silver Jackets Team of the Year

- a) Number of Total Annual Responses: 54
- b) Processing Time per Response: 0.52 hour

- c) Hourly Wage of Worker(s) Processing Responses: \$90
- d) Cost to Process Each Response: \$46.80
- e) Total Cost to Process Responses: \$2,527.20

- 2) Overall Labor Burden to the Federal Government
 - a) Total Number of Annual Responses: 54
 - b) Total Labor Burden: \$2,527

Part B: OPERATIONAL AND MAINTENANCE COSTS

- 1) Cost Categories
 - a) Equipment: \$0
 - b) Printing: \$0
 - c) Postage: \$0
 - d) Software Purchases: \$0
 - e) Licensing Costs: \$215
 - f) Other: \$1,695
- 2) Total Operational and Maintenance Cost: \$1,910

Part C: TOTAL COST TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

- 1) Total Labor Cost to the Federal Government: \$2,527
- 2) Total Operational and Maintenance Costs: \$1,910
- 3) Total Cost to the Federal Government: \$4,437

15. Reasons for Change in Burden

The burden has decreased since the previous approval primarily due to the removal of burden estimates for the voting phase of the Silver Jackets Award Program. It has been determined that the voting does not constitute an information collection under the PRA.

Additionally, the average respondent wage has been estimated lower. The overall burden to the federal government decreased due to efforts to streamline the collection mechanism as well as pro-rating of one-time operations and maintenance costs over time.

16. Publication of Results

The results of this information collection will not be published.

17. Non-Display of OMB Expiration Date

We are not seeking approval to omit the display of the expiration date of the OMB approval on the collection instrument.

18. Exceptions to "Certification for Paperwork Reduction Submissions"

We are not requesting any exemptions to the provisions stated in 5 CFR 1320.9.