

Summary Information for Ranking National Coastal Wetlands Grant Program Proposals

Supporting Statement and Justification

for a

Paperwork Reduction Act Submission

In support of the attached OMB 83- I:

Justification:

1. *Why is this information collection necessary?* Grants authorized under the Coastal Wetlands Planning, Protection and Restoration (CWPPR) Act (16 U.S.C. 3951, draft regulations currently proposed as 50 CFR 84) require the submission of proposals by potential grantees. Grantees include many types of information in their proposals in any format they choose. The proposed information collection form allows the grant applicant to summarize and organize the information contained in their grant proposal in a manner where those individuals ranking these proposals can compare and contrast them on equal terms. It saves the ranking panels time by organizing grant proposal information in a manner that allows for a fair ranking of proposals.
2. *How, by whom, and for what purpose is this form used?* Coastal State grant applicants use this form to organize proposal information in a concise ordered way. Applicants can also use this form to highlight habitat and species that would benefit, and to what degree, from the proposed project. The proposal ranking panel members use this form to compare and contrast grant proposal information on an equal footing grant-by-grant.
3. *To what extent is this information collection automated?* Currently none. The Service is moving toward electronic collection of most grant information collections. At present only the SF-424, Grant Agreement, Amendment to Grant Agreement, and some financial information is automated. Over the next several years the Service plans to automate most grant information collections, including proposals, the exceptions to this will involve photographs and large maps. We expect ot be fully automated electronically in the early summer of 2003.
4. *Is this effort duplicated elsewhere?* No.
5. *Does this information collection impact small businesses or other small entities?* No.
6. *What are the consequences if this information collection is not conducted? Are there any technical or legal obstacles to reducing the burden?* If this information is not collected it would be extremely time consuming to rank grant proposals. There is the possibility that technical details in a grant would be missed if not summarized for a fair and equal comparison by the proposal writer. There are no legal barriers to automation.

7. *Are there any circumstances that would require respondents:*
- to report information more frequently than quarterly?* No.
 - to respond sooner than 30 days after receipt of the form?* No.
 - to submit more than an original and two copies of the form?* No.
 - to retain grants-in-aid records for more than three years?* No.
 - ...in a statistical survey...* This is not a statistical survey.
 - ...use of a statistical data classification...* This is not a statistical survey.
 - ...includes a pledge of confidentiality...* No.
 - ...requires submission of trade secrets or confidential information...* No.

8. *What efforts were made to gather public input on this information collection?* The Service published a Notice and Request for Comments in the Federal Register for 60 days (FR Vol. 65, NO. 180, 55994, Friday, September 15, 2000). The Service involved all Regional Offices and, through them, our State agency clientele in the original design on the form. There were no comments resulting from the Federal register Notice.

9. *Are payments or gifts offered to respondents?* No payments or gifts are offered.

10. *Is any pledge of confidentiality made to respondents?* No pledge or promise of confidentiality of any kind is made to respondents.

11. *Are any questions of a sensitive nature asked of respondents?* No questions of a sensitive nature are asked of any respondent.

12. *What is the hour burden on respondents?* There are 34 eligible Coastal States that can participate in this grant program under the CWPPR Act . Each one may submit one proposal a year. We estimate that the form would take an applicant ½ hour to complete.

Form	Number of Respondents	Annual Response	Completion Time for Each Form	Annual Burden	Hourly Cost for Respondent	Financial Burden on Respondents
Summary Form	34	34	½ Hour	17 Hours	\$25.00	\$12.50 ea. or \$425. Total

13. *Is there any cost burden to respondents other than the hourly burden addressed in item #12?*
There is no additional cost to respondents.

14. *What are the costs to the Federal Agency involved in this information collection?*

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Printing of Forms	Mailing	Management of Information Collection	Data Entry	File Maintenance
Non-Electronic Collection Cost	\$10. Annual	\$100. Annual	\$100. Annual	\$10. Annual	\$10. Annual
Electronic Collection Cost (after 2002)	0	0	Negligible	0	Negligible
Management of Information at \$35. Per hour.			1 hours each per 34 responses = \$1190.00 annually		

15. *Explain any program changes or adjustments mentioned in item #13 or #14 of the 83-I.*
New collection.

16. No publication of this data is planned, the form is simply a tool used to help rank proposals.

17. The Service is not seeking a waiver from the requirement to display the expiration date of the OMB approval of the information collection.

18. There are no exceptions to any of the items listed on #19 of the 83-I.

B. No statistical methods are used.