

NOTICE OF OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET ACTION

Date 05/04/2015

Department of Commerce
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

FOR CERTIFYING OFFICIAL: Jerry Harper
FOR CLEARANCE OFFICER: Jennifer Jessup

In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act, OMB has taken action on your request received 03/02/2015

ACTION REQUESTED: Extension without change of a currently approved collection

TYPE OF REVIEW REQUESTED: Regular

ICR REFERENCE NUMBER: 201502-0648-010

AGENCY ICR TRACKING NUMBER:

TITLE: ALASKA CHINOOK SALMON ECONOMIC DATA REPORT (EDR)

LIST OF INFORMATION COLLECTIONS: See next page

OMB ACTION: Approved without change

OMB CONTROL NUMBER: 0648-0633

The agency is required to display the OMB Control Number and inform respondents of its legal significance in accordance with 5 CFR 1320.5(b).

EXPIRATION DATE: 05/31/2018

DISCONTINUE DATE:

| BURDEN: | RESPONSES | HOURS | COSTS |
|---------------------------------|-----------|--------|---------|
| Previous | 694 | 9,976 | 25,958 |
| New | 283 | 1,168 | 4,631 |
| Difference | | | |
| Change due to New Statute | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Change due to Agency Discretion | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Change due to Agency Adjustment | -411 | -8,808 | -21,327 |
| Change due to PRA Violation | 0 | 0 | 0 |

TERMS OF CLEARANCE:

OMB Authorizing Official: Dominic J. Mancini
Acting Deputy Administrator,
Office Of Information And Regulatory Affairs

List of ICs

| IC Title | Form No. | Form Name | CFR Citation |
|---|----------|-----------------------------------|---------------|
| Annual Chinook Salmon PSC Compensated Transfer Report (CTR) | NA | Compensated Transfer Report (CTR) | |
| Vessel Fuel Survey | NA | Vessel Fuel Survey | |
| Vessel Master Survey | NA | Vessel Master Survey | |
| Verification/Audit of Chinook Salmon EDR Data | | | 50 CFR 679.65 |

PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT SUBMISSION

Please read the instructions before completing this form. For additional forms or assistance in completing this form, contact your agency's Paperwork Clearance Officer. Send two copies of this form, the collection instrument to be reviewed, the supporting statement, and any additional documentation to: Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, Docket Library, Room 10102, 725 17th Street NW, Washington, DC 20503.

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>1. Agency/Subagency originating request</p> | <p>2. OMB control number b. <input type="checkbox"/> None a. _____ - _____</p> |
| <p>3. Type of information collection (<i>check one</i>)</p> <p>a. <input type="checkbox"/> New Collection</p> <p>b. <input type="checkbox"/> Revision of a currently approved collection</p> <p>c. <input type="checkbox"/> Extension of a currently approved collection</p> <p>d. <input type="checkbox"/> Reinstatement, without change, of a previously approved collection for which approval has expired</p> <p>e. <input type="checkbox"/> Reinstatement, with change, of a previously approved collection for which approval has expired</p> <p>f. <input type="checkbox"/> Existing collection in use without an OMB control number</p> <p>For b-f, note Item A2 of Supporting Statement instructions</p> | <p>4. Type of review requested (<i>check one</i>)</p> <p>a. <input type="checkbox"/> Regular submission</p> <p>b. <input type="checkbox"/> Emergency - Approval requested by _____ / _____ / _____</p> <p>c. <input type="checkbox"/> Delegated</p> |
| | <p>5. Small entities Will this information collection have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> |
| | <p>6. Requested expiration date</p> <p>a. <input type="checkbox"/> Three years from approval date b. <input type="checkbox"/> Other Specify: _____ / _____</p> |
| <p>7. Title</p> | |
| <p>8. Agency form number(s) (<i>if applicable</i>)</p> | |
| <p>9. Keywords</p> | |
| <p>10. Abstract</p> | |
| <p>11. Affected public (<i>Mark primary with "P" and all others that apply with "x"</i>)</p> <p>a. <input type="checkbox"/> Individuals or households d. <input type="checkbox"/> Farms</p> <p>b. <input type="checkbox"/> Business or other for-profit e. <input type="checkbox"/> Federal Government</p> <p>c. <input type="checkbox"/> Not-for-profit institutions f. <input type="checkbox"/> State, Local or Tribal Government</p> | <p>12. Obligation to respond (<i>check one</i>)</p> <p>a. <input type="checkbox"/> Voluntary</p> <p>b. <input type="checkbox"/> Required to obtain or retain benefits</p> <p>c. <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory</p> |
| <p>13. Annual recordkeeping and reporting burden</p> <p>a. Number of respondents _____</p> <p>b. Total annual responses _____</p> <p> 1. Percentage of these responses collected electronically _____%</p> <p>c. Total annual hours requested _____</p> <p>d. Current OMB inventory _____</p> <p>e. Difference _____</p> <p>f. Explanation of difference</p> <p> 1. Program change _____</p> <p> 2. Adjustment _____</p> | <p>14. Annual reporting and recordkeeping cost burden (<i>in thousands of dollars</i>)</p> <p>a. Total annualized capital/startup costs _____</p> <p>b. Total annual costs (O&M) _____</p> <p>c. Total annualized cost requested _____</p> <p>d. Current OMB inventory _____</p> <p>e. Difference _____</p> <p>f. Explanation of difference</p> <p> 1. Program change _____</p> <p> 2. Adjustment _____</p> |
| <p>15. Purpose of information collection (<i>Mark primary with "P" and all others that apply with "X"</i>)</p> <p>a. <input type="checkbox"/> Application for benefits e. <input type="checkbox"/> Program planning or management</p> <p>b. <input type="checkbox"/> Program evaluation f. <input type="checkbox"/> Research</p> <p>c. <input type="checkbox"/> General purpose statistics g. <input type="checkbox"/> Regulatory or compliance</p> <p>d. <input type="checkbox"/> Audit</p> | <p>16. Frequency of recordkeeping or reporting (<i>check all that apply</i>)</p> <p>a. <input type="checkbox"/> Recordkeeping b. <input type="checkbox"/> Third party disclosure</p> <p>c. <input type="checkbox"/> Reporting</p> <p> 1. <input type="checkbox"/> On occasion 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Weekly 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Monthly</p> <p> 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Quarterly 5. <input type="checkbox"/> Semi-annually 6. <input type="checkbox"/> Annually</p> <p> 7. <input type="checkbox"/> Biennially 8. <input type="checkbox"/> Other (describe) _____</p> |
| <p>17. Statistical methods</p> <p>Does this information collection employ statistical methods</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> | <p>18. Agency Contact (person who can best answer questions regarding the content of this submission)</p> <p>Name: _____</p> <p>Phone: _____</p> |

19. Certification for Paperwork Reduction Act Submissions

On behalf of this Federal Agency, I certify that the collection of information encompassed by this request complies with 5 CFR 1320.9

NOTE: The text of 5 CFR 1320.9, and the related provisions of 5 CFR 1320.8(b)(3), appear at the end of the instructions. *The certification is to be made with reference to those regulatory provisions as set forth in the instructions.*

The following is a summary of the topics, regarding the proposed collection of information, that the certification covers:

- (a) It is necessary for the proper performance of agency functions;
- (b) It avoids unnecessary duplication;
- (c) It reduces burden on small entities;
- (d) It used plain, coherent, and unambiguous terminology that is understandable to respondents;
- (e) Its implementation will be consistent and compatible with current reporting and recordkeeping practices;
- (f) It indicates the retention period for recordkeeping requirements;
- (g) It informs respondents of the information called for under 5 CFR 1320.8(b)(3):
 - (i) Why the information is being collected;
 - (ii) Use of information;
 - (iii) Burden estimate;
 - (iv) Nature of response (voluntary, required for a benefit, mandatory);
 - (v) Nature and extent of confidentiality; and
 - (vi) Need to display currently valid OMB control number;
- (h) It was developed by an office that has planned and allocated resources for the efficient and effective management and use of the information to be collected (see note in Item 19 of instructions);
- (i) It uses effective and efficient statistical survey methodology; and
- (j) It makes appropriate use of information technology.

If you are unable to certify compliance with any of the provisions, identify the item below and explain the reason in Item 18 of the Supporting Statement.

Signature of Senior Official or designee

Date

Agency Certification (signature of Assistant Administrator, Deputy Assistant Administrator, Line Office Chief Information Officer, head of MB staff for L.O.s, or of the Director of a Program or StaffOffice)

Signature

Date

Signature of NOAA Clearance Officer

Signature

Date

SUPPORTING STATEMENT
ALASKA CHINOOK SALMON ECONOMIC DATA REPORT (EDR)
OMB CONTROL NO. 0648-0633

This request is for extension of an existing information collection.

INTRODUCTION

National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), Alaska Region manages the groundfish fisheries in the Exclusive Economic Zone off Alaska. The North Pacific Fishery Management Council (Council) prepared the Fishery Management Plan for Groundfish of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area (FMP) under the authority of the [Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act](#), 16 U.S.C. 1801 *et seq.* (Magnuson-Stevens Act). The FMP is implemented under regulations at [50 CFR part 679](#).

NMFS manages the Bering Sea pollock fishery under the [American Fisheries Act](#) (AFA) (16 U.S.C. 1851). The AFA “rationalized” the Bering Sea pollock fishery in part by allowing for the formation and management of fishery cooperatives. AFA fishing vessels harvest pollock using pelagic (mid-water) trawl gear, which consists of large nets towed through the water by the vessel. At times, Chinook salmon and pollock occur in the same locations in the Bering Sea. Consequently, Chinook salmon are incidentally caught in the nets as pollock is harvested. This incidental catch is called bycatch and is also called prohibited species catch (PSC). Chinook Salmon are defined as a prohibited species because they are caught by a vessel issued a Federal Fisheries Permit under [§ 679.4\(b\)](#) while fishing for groundfish (pollock) in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area (BSAI) or Gulf of Alaska.

The Chinook Salmon Economic Data Report (Chinook Salmon EDR), also known as Amendment 91 EDR, was implemented in 2010 to evaluate the effectiveness of Chinook salmon bycatch management measures for the Bering Sea pollock fishery. The Chinook EDR Program provides information to the analysts and the Council and is intended to evaluate the effectiveness of the Chinook Salmon Incentive Plan Agreement (IPA) (see OMB Control No. 0648-0401). The Chinook EDR Program is intended to evaluate where, when, and how pollock fishing and salmon bycatch occur and to provide data to study and verify conclusions drawn by industry in the IPA annual reports.

The Amendment 91 EDR program is managed primarily by the Alaska Fisheries Science Center, with support from NMFS Alaska Region, and is administered in collaboration with Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission (Pacific States). The EDR is a mandatory reporting requirement under 50 CFR 679.65 for all entities participating in the AFA BSAI pollock trawl fishery, including vessel masters and businesses that own or lease one or more AFA-permitted vessels active in fishing or processing BSAI pollock, Western Alaska Community Development Quota (CDQ) groups receiving allocations of BSAI pollock, and representatives of Sector entities receiving allocations of Chinook salmon prohibited species catch (PSC) from NMFS. The EDR program is comprised of three separate survey forms:

- ◆ Chinook Salmon PSC Allocation Compensated Transfer Report (CTR) – collects transfer and monetary compensation information for Chinook Salmon PSC allocations;
- ◆ Vessel Fuel Survey – collects fuel consumption and average fuel costs; and
- ◆ Vessel Master Survey – collects vessel master impressions of fishing experiences during the year and of Chinook salmon PSC avoidance efforts.

Distinct conditions that require an entity to submit one or more of the respective forms are discussed in more detail below. In addition to the EDR program, the data collection measures developed by the Council also specified modification of the Daily Fishing Logbook (DFL) (see OMB 0648-0213) for BSAI pollock trawl CVs and CPs (implemented in for the 2012 fishing year) to add a "checkbox" to the tow-level logbook record requiring vessel operators to indicate instances when a vessel fishing pollock in the BSAI changed fishing locations, prior to each tow, for the primary purpose of avoiding Chinook salmon PSC. For AFA catcher/processors, this information is recorded in the Trawl Catcher/processor Electronic Logbook (see OMB 0648-0515) and submitted to NMFS via the eLandings system.. Amendment 91 EDR forms can be accessed online at <http://www.alaskafisheries.noaa.gov/sustainablefisheries/bycatch/salmon/chinook/edr/default.htm>.

NMFS uses data from these collections to compare the annual, seasonal, and, where possible, trip-level and haul-level changes in the behavior of the pollock fleet by sector, cooperative, and vessel. The Bering Sea pollock fishery is managed under the AFA. The four AFA sectors are: Catcher/processor, mothership, inshore processor, and community development quota (CDQ). NMFS allocates annual transferrable or non-transferrable Chinook salmon PSC to members of a qualifying catcher/processor sector, mothership sector, inshore cooperatives, and CDQ groups. Chinook salmon PSC may be transferred between these entities and among members of each entity.

NMFS sends login credentials for use with the online Chinook Salmon EDR submittal site to submitters by certified mail. The combination of the login credentials and the signature certification statement on the online form are equivalent to a signature for confidentiality and accuracy purposes. In addition, all AFA vessel owners and other known entities subject to Chinook Salmon EDR submission requirements are contacted directly by Pacific States with instructions for using the EDR web application to submit the required forms.

A. JUSTIFICATION

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

The Chinook Salmon EDR Program provides additional data to assess the effectiveness of the Chinook salmon bycatch management measures implemented under Amendment 91 to the Fishery Management Plan for Groundfish of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area. The information collected is a combination of quantitative and qualitative data to conduct

descriptive and quantitative analysis and comparisons of the annual and seasonal changes in the pollock fleet under Amendment 91.

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.

a. Annual Chinook Salmon PSC Compensated Transfer Report (CTR)

An owner or leaseholder of an AFA-permitted vessel and the representative of any entity that received an allocation of Chinook Prohibited Species Catch (PSC) from NMFS must complete and submit the Certification Page (Part 1) of a PSC Compensated Transfer Report (CTR) each year, for the previous calendar year.

Any person who transferred Chinook salmon PSC allocation after January 20, and paid or received money for the transfer, must submit a completed CTR (Part 1 and Part 2) for the previous calendar year.

This CTR is intended to provide information to fishery managers to evaluate the effectiveness of Chinook salmon bycatch management measures. The CTR collects information on transfers of Chinook salmon PSC allocation to or from another person during each calendar year for which the transferor or transferee paid or received monetary compensation. Compensated transfers are those transfers that include monetary compensation for a part of or the whole value of the transferred Chinook PSC allocation.

A compensated transfer is a transfer that is paid for with an exchange of dollars (or any currency) for bycatch units from one party to another for a part of or the whole value of the transferred Chinook PSC allocation. The purpose of the CTR is to account for Chinook salmon PSC transfers and the amount of money exchanged for transfers between AFA vessel owners and other entities transferring Chinook salmon PSC. NMFS would examine data reported for each transaction and tabulate the data to compare the amount of Chinook salmon PSC transferred in each transaction, number of transactions by vessel type (sector and AFA cooperative), and time intervals of the transfers in a season or year. Also, this data will allow for tabulation of the average and variation in price paid for transactions by vessel operation type, sector, and AFA cooperative.

Information on the affiliation of transferor and transferee will be used to determine the independence of the parties of any reported compensated transfer. This is required to differentiate market-based transactions and associated prices from transfer payments between affiliated or integrated entities.

The majority of the respondents are vessels engaged in either catching or catching and processing pollock. Some of the catcher vessels and catcher/processors in this fleet are owned by firms that also own inshore processing plants. Owners of inshore processing plants may also

be familiar with specific Chinook salmon PSC transfers, and thus, are potential respondents for the CTR.

The CTR Certification Page or entire CTR must be submitted online on or before 1700 hours A.L.T. on June 1. Submit EDR online at <https://chinookedr.psmfc.org>.

Compensated Transfer Report (CTR)

Part 1. Certification page

Entity information

- Entity type (Check one)
- Name of reporting entity
- AFA permit number or entity NMFS ID

Submittal of CTR

If submitting Certification Page Only

- You are the owner or leaseholder of an AFA permitted vessel or
A representative of an entity
- That received an allocation of Chinook PSC from NMFS and
no financial transactions occurred

If submitting entire CTR form (both Parts 1 and 2)

- You are the owner or leaseholder of an AFA permitted vessel or
A person or representative of an entity

Who **paid or received money for a transfer** of Chinook salmon PSC allocation after January 20

Person completing this report

- Select appropriate description of person completing form
- Name and title or NMFS ID
- Business telephone number, business fax number, and business email address (if available)

Certification

- Signature of owner or leaseholder
- Date signed

Part 2. Chinook Salmon PSC allocation transfer information

Report each transfer of Chinook salmon PSC allocation to or from another person or entity during the calendar year for which you paid or received monetary compensation. Compensated transfers are those transfers that include monetary compensation for a part of or the whole value of the transferred Chinook PSC allocation

NMFS ID -- identify the other person who paid or received money for each transfer

- If other person was a vessel owner/leaseholder, record AFA vessel permit number
- For other persons, record NMFS ID.
- If AFA vessel permit number or NMFS ID is unavailable, record the entity name

Direction of transfer -- indicate if the Chinook salmon were transferred (sold) to another person by you, or transferred (bought) from another person by you.

Date of transfer -- record the date Chinook salmon were transferred to the receiving person. This may not be the date of final settlement on terms of compensation

Transfer type -- Identify the type(s) of association between you and the other entity in the transfer

Entity type -- indicate the entity type of the other party in the Chinook Salmon PSC allocation transfer.

CHINOOK SALMON PSC ALLOCATION TRANSFERRED AND COMPENSATION

Number of Chinook salmon transferred

Payment amount (\$US)

- record the total amount of money in U.S. dollars for each transfer. Report all payment as of the date of submission of this form. This includes all money paid for the transfer regardless of whether other assets, such as pollock quota, are included in the transaction. Do not report any compensation made in any form other than monetary compensation.

Other assets included -- If the transaction included assets other than Chinook salmon and monetary compensation, indicate this using the checkbox. Other assets could include pollock quota, goods, or services of value. Do not check the box if additional assets included only assets of nominal or no value.

Changed number of respondents from 200 to 1; No compensated transfer reports were submitted for 2012 or 2013. Changed method of submittal to online only.

| Compensated Transfer Report, Respondent | |
|---|----------------|
| Estimated number of respondents | 1 |
| Total annual responses | 1 |
| Responses per respondent = 1 | |
| Total burden hours | 40 hr |
| Hours per response = 40 hr | |
| Total personnel cost (\$75/hr x 40) | \$3,000 |
| Total miscellaneous costs (submitted Online) | 0 |

| Compensated Transfer Report, Federal Government | |
|--|--------------|
| Total annual responses | 1 |
| Total burden hours | 10 hr |
| Estimated hours per response = 10 hr | |
| Total personnel cost (\$75/hr x 10) | \$750 |
| Total miscellaneous costs | 0 |

b. Vessel Fuel Survey

An owner or leaseholder of an AFA-permitted vessel must submit a completed Vessel Fuel Survey for each vessel used to harvest pollock in the Bering Sea in a given year.

The Vessel Fuel Survey collects information on the estimated quantity and cost of all fuel consumed by each AFA vessel harvesting or processing pollock during the calendar year. This survey collects data on average fuel use fishing and transiting and annual fuel use and costs. Data are reported on a vessel basis annually. These data, when used with existing data and data concerning Chinook salmon avoidance efforts, allow analysts to examine fuel use and costs associated with choices of fishing grounds and Chinook Salmon PSC avoidance.

These data, combined with other information in the Chinook Salmon EDR Program, provide information on movements of a vessel to avoid Chinook salmon, and in particular, Chinook salmon bycatch. Fuel use and price data are not available for vessels in the pollock fishery in any uniform format. NMFS would apply fuel usage data to assess the extent to which fleet members are willing to incur these expenses to avoid Chinook salmon PSC. These data could provide useful estimates of fuel usage for evaluating Amendment 91 effects.

The Vessel Fuel Survey is available through the Internet on the NMFS Alaska Region website at <http://alaskafisheries.noaa.gov/sustainablefisheries/bycatch/salmon/chinook/edr/default.htm> or by contacting NMFS at 206-526-6301. The vessel owner or leaseholder must electronically submit all completed Vessel Fuel surveys on or before 1700 A.l.t. on June 1.

Vessel Fuel Survey

Part 1: Certification Page

AFA-permitted vessel and owner identification

Vessel Owner/ Leaseholder name and NMFS ID

Vessel name and AFA permit number

Submittal of vessel fuel survey

Select one of the following statements

You were the AFA permit holder or leaseholder for an AFA-permitted vessels **that harvested or processed AFA pollock** during the calendar year.

Complete and submit **entire vessel fuel survey** form for the calendar year.

In addition, submit all the vessel fuel surveys received from and completed by hired masters on that same vessel

You were the AFA owner or leaseholder for an AFA permitted vessel **that did not harvest or process AFA pollock** during the calendar year.

Complete and submit the **Certification Page only**

Person submitting this report

Name and title or NMFS ID

Business telephone number, business fax number, and business email address (if available)

Certification

Signature

Date signed

Part 2. Vessel Fuel Consumption and Cost

For each vessel operated in the AFA pollock fishery during calendar year

AFA Vessel permit number

Average rate of fuel consumption

Report the average rate of fuel consumption under average operating conditions during the calendar year

Report the fuel consumption rate separately for operating while fishing (towing) and not fishing (operating while transiting. traveling between points on fishing grounds, but not towing)

Report fuel consumption rates for the pollock fishery only

For motherships, report the rate of fuel consumption for transiting only

If you do not have equipment on the vessel for actively monitoring the rate of fuel usage, provide the most accurate estimate you can based on the best information you have available

Annual Fuel Loaded

For each vessel, report the total amount of fuel loaded to the vessel, in gallons, during the calendar year

Annual Fuel Cost

For each vessel, report total cost of fuel for this vessel during the calendar year. Include all fuel that was loaded and invoiced, even if not completely used or paid for during the calendar year.

Do not include lubrication and fluids costs other than fuel.

Changed number of respondents from 109 to current 105. Changed method of submittal to online only.

| Vessel Fuel Survey, Respondent | |
|--|-----------------|
| Estimated number of respondents | 105 |
| Total annual responses | 105 |
| Estimated responses per respondent = 1 | |
| Total burden hours | 420 hr |
| Estimated hours per response = 4 hr | |
| Total personnel cost (\$75/hr x 420) | \$31,500 |
| Total miscellaneous costs (Submittal Online) | 0 |

| Vessel Fuel Survey, Federal Government | |
|---|-----------------|
| Total annual responses | 105 |
| Total burden hours | 420 hr |
| Estimated hours per response = 4 hr | |
| Total personnel cost (\$75/hr x 420) | \$31,500 |
| Total miscellaneous costs | 0 |

c. Vessel Master Survey

The Vessel Master Survey is a qualitative assessment survey that poses a series of questions to elicit vessel operator input on factors that influenced the vessel's performance during the year. The questions in this survey are primarily qualitative questions concerning operator on-grounds impressions and choices made during the pollock season, including incentives, fishing location choices, and salmon PSC reduction measures.

For any AFA-permitted vessel used to harvest pollock in the Bering Sea in the previous year:

- ◆ The vessel master must complete the Vessel Master Survey, and the Vessel Master certification following the instructions on the form, Part 1A.
- ◆ An owner or leaseholder must complete the Vessel owner certification following instructions on the form, Part 1B.
- ◆ An owner or leaseholder must submit all Vessel Master Surveys, Parts 1A and 1B, electronically on or before 1700, A.l.t., on June 1 following the instructions on the form.

Many masters may compile notes in-season to be used for response to the specific survey at year-end. The burden associated with tracking activity will vary depending on the circumstances encountered during the year. Fully completing the form at the end of the season is estimated to require approximately 4 hours of in-season time, recording impressions of conditions and decision making.

The respondents would annually complete the Vessel Master Survey at the end of the fishing year.

If a vessel did not participate in the Bering Sea pollock fishery during the reporting year, the vessel owner is required to submit only the Certification Page of a Vessel Master Survey.

The Vessel Master Survey is available through the Internet on the NMFS Alaska Region website at <http://alaskafisheries.noaa.gov/sustainablefisheries/bycatch/salmon/chinook/edr/default.htm> or by contacting NMFS at (206) 526-6414.

Vessel Master Survey

Part 1A: Vessel Owner Certification Page

AFA-permitted vessel and owner identification

Vessel owner or leaseholder name and NMFS ID

Vessel name

AFA permit number

Vessel master name and CFEC gear operator permit number (repeat if more than one master)

Submittal of Vessel Master Survey

Select one of the following statements

You were the AFA owner or leaseholder for an AFA permitted vessel **that harvested or processed AFA pollock** during the calendar year

Complete and submit **ENTIRE Vessel Master Survey** Form (both Part 1 and Part 2)

You were the AFA owner or leaseholder for an AFA permitted vessel **that did not harvest or process AFA pollock** during the calendar year

Complete and submit the **Vessel Owner Certification Page** (Part 1)

Person Submitting this Report

Name and title or NMFS ID

Business Number Telephone, Business FAX Number, and Business E-mail address

Certification

Signature of owner or leaseholder of an AFA-permitted vessel and date signed

Part 2: Pollock Fishing and Salmon Bycatch Avoidance

Hired Master Certification

Vessel master name and CFEC gear operator permit number

Signature of vessel master

Date signed

Provide complete answers. Where applicable, note any differences between the A and B pollock seasons

Attach extra sheets if more space is needed to complete your answers.

If the vessel participated in an Incentive Plan Agreement (IPA), did the IPA affect your fishing strategy?

IF YES, describe and discuss what incentives had the largest impact on your strategy.

Did the amount and/or cost of Chinook Salmon PSC allocation available to the vessel lead you to make changes in pollock fishing operations?

IF YES, describe.

How would you compare the Chinook salmon bycatch and pollock conditions during the A and B seasons this year relative to the last two years?

Describe any unique aspects of the season.

Did Chinook salmon bycatch conditions cause you to delay the start of your pollock fishing or otherwise alter the timing of your pollock fishing for some period during the past A and/or B season?

IF YES, describe the Chinook salmon bycatch condition, when it occurred, and any change in your pollock fishing as a result.

In the past year, did you end a trip and return to port early because of Chinook salmon bycatch conditions?

IF YES, indicate the number of trips that this occurred in each season (use a check to mark the appropriate answer for each season).

Describe how any area closures or restrictions for the purpose of reducing Chinook salmon bycatch affected where and how you fished.

Describe how any regulatory or other area closures or restrictions for a purpose other than reducing Chinook salmon bycatch affected where and how you fished.

Compared to a typical year, did weather or sea ice conditions have more, less, or about the same impact on fishing as in a typical year

IF YES, describe especially if there were particularly uncommon conditions at any point this year. If these conditions had an impact on your ability to avoid Chinook salmon bycatch, describe.

Were there exceptional factors that affected your pollock fishing this year? For example, were there unusual market or stock conditions, unusual pollock fishing conditions, or maintenance problems?

IF YES, describe.

Separate from an Incentive Plan Agreement, were there other incentives for you to reduce Chinook salmon bycatch? **IF YES**, describe.

Did actual or potential bycatch of species other than Chinook salmon cause you to change your harvesting decisions during the pollock season? **IF YES**, describe.

Changed number of respondents from 185 to 133. Change fax cost from \$5 to \$6. Changed postage from .44 to .45. Change Government response from 8 hr to 4 hr.

| Vessel Master Survey, Respondent | |
|---|-----------------|
| Estimated number of respondents | 133 |
| Total annual responses | 133 |
| Estimated responses per respondent = 1 | |
| Total burden hours | 532 hr |
| Estimated hours per response = 4 hr | |
| Total personnel cost (\$75/hr x 532) | \$39,900 |
| Total miscellaneous costs (Submittal Online) | 0 |

| Vessel Master Survey, Federal Government | |
|---|-----------------|
| Total annual responses | 133 |
| Total burden hours | 532 hr |
| Estimated hours per response = 4 hr | |
| Total personnel cost (\$75/hr x 532) | \$39,900 |
| Total miscellaneous costs | 0 |

d. Verification/Audit of Chinook Salmon EDR Data

NMFS and Pacific States have developed measures to verify data submitted in the Chinook Salmon in-season compensated transfer report (CTR), Vessel Master Survey, and the Vessel Fuel Survey. The principal means to verify data and resolve questions is through validation of data submitted in these three surveys against supporting records. The person submitting the EDR must respond within 20 days of NMFS's information request. Responses after 20 days could be considered untimely and could result in a violation and enforcement action.

For CTR verification, a NMFS-approved auditor may review and request copies of additional data provided by the owner or leaseholder, including but not limited to: previously audited or reviewed financial statements, worksheets, tax returns, invoices, receipts, and other original documents substantiating the data. The NMFS-approved auditor will verify records by comparing specific elements of the report with participant accounting records.

To make the verification process as efficient and non-intrusive as possible, NMFS suggests that participants:

- ◆ Keep copies of all certification pages and completed EDRs, with all attachments, submitted to the Pacific States.
- ◆ Keep a file that has all of the supporting information used in the preparation of the EDR.
- ◆ Make sure that the EDR agrees with the company's highest level of financial information. For this purpose, the highest level of financial information is defined in order as:
 - Audited financial statements

- Reviewed financial statements
- Compiled financial statements
- Tax returns.

◆ Record only whole numbers. Round up dollar figures to the next highest dollar.

Changed number of respondents from 200 to 44.

| Chinook Salmon EDR Verification, Respondent | |
|--|-----------------|
| Estimated number of respondents | 44 |
| Total annual responses | 44 |
| Estimated responses per respondent = 1 | |
| Total burden hours | 176 hr |
| Estimated hours per response = 4 hr | |
| Total personnel cost (\$75/hr x 176) | \$13,200 |
| Total miscellaneous costs | \$4,631 |
| Photocopy (\$.05 x 5 pp x 44 = \$11) | |
| Telephone calls (\$5 x 44 = \$220) | |
| Accountant fee to verify EDR (\$100 x 44 = \$4,400) | |

| Chinook Salmon EDR Verification, Federal Government | |
|--|----------|
| Total annual responses | 0 |
| Total burden hours | 0 |
| Total personnel cost | 0 |
| Total miscellaneous costs | 0 |

Information derived from the collected data will be disseminated to the public consistent with applicable requirements for nondisclosure of confidential information or used to support publicly disseminated information. NOAA Fisheries 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. See Question 10 of this Supporting Statement for more information on confidentiality and privacy. The information collection is designed to yield data that meet all applicable information quality guidelines. Prior to dissemination, the information will be subjected to quality control measures and 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.

This collection is 95 percent electronic; except for the verification process, these reports are submitted online.

4. Describe efforts to identify duplication.

None of the information collected as part of this information collection duplicates other collections. This information collection is part of a specialized and technical program that is not like any other.

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

This collection applies only to those entities that participate in the AFA directed pollock trawl fishery in the Bering Sea. The only small entities that are directly regulated by this action are the six CDQ organizations, and the impact is not significant.

6. Describe the consequences to the Federal program or policy activities if the collection is not conducted or is conducted less frequently.

Chinook salmon caught in the pollock fishery are considered PSC under the Magnuson-Stevens Act, the FMP, and NMFS regulations at 50 CFR part 679. National Standard 9 of the Magnuson-Stevens Act requires the Council to select, and NMFS to implement, conservation and management measures that, to the extent practicable, minimize bycatch and bycatch mortality.

The Compensated Transfer Report (CTR) in conjunction with data from IPA reports provides information on the number and characteristics of Chinook salmon PSC transfers. Without this data, NMFS will not be able to tell how vessels differ from each other in terms of efficient use of Chinook salmon PSC or of the costs of avoiding Chinook salmon PSC. Without this data, it will not be possible to determine if the tradable Chinook salmon PSC is working or if it is not working, how to fix it.

Without the Vessel Master Survey, we will not understand the tradeoffs vessel masters made to avoid Chinook salmon. NMFS may not be able to detect if there are some essential pieces of information missing in other survey or report data that are needed to evaluate the effect of the IPAs in Amendment 91

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

No special circumstances exist.

8. 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.

A Federal Register Notice published on September 23, 2014 (79 FR 56775) solicited public comments. No comments were received.

In addition, a questionnaire was distributed by email soliciting comments from 20 randomly selected participants. Five respondents completed and returned the questionnaire. Two addresses were returned as invalid.

A summary of the comments received from the survey follows.

Summary of Survey Comments, OMB 0648-0633 – Expiration Date 03/31/2015

Note: The 2014 Council Summary of the 2012 EDR mentioned in some of the responses below is posted as a supplementary document.

| | |
|--|---------------------------------|
| Vessel Master Survey ◀ View | |
| <p>1. Are the requirements for this survey easy to understand? Comment: Masters frequently lack context to understand why they are being asked these questions. Moreover, in some questions masters lack awareness of owners’ decisions and so report erroneous information (e.g., one question asks if timing of fishing participation is affected by salmon bycatch – a master may be unaware of an owners’ decision to tie up the boat due to salmon bycatch and simply shows up at the dock when the owner tells him to do so). We need to brief masters ahead of time on the purpose and need for the EDR so that answers have value to the economists. Otherwise, masters are confused, annoyed, and write simple non-responsive answers in order to be done with it. Response: According to the 2014 Council Update Report, “A small number of respondents voiced frustration with either having to describe their fishing experience or thought the questions were obvious”. It is likely that others felt the same way. Going forward, we will further evaluate the questions and discuss whether questions can be combined or re-ordered to elicit better responses. As several years of data are gathered and common responses are identified, some multiple choice questions may be created that would make it easier for respondents to complete and analysts to utilize. . . . The Council would be asked for input on any proposed changes that we believe would improve the survey. The survey for the 2013 fishing season is currently available online. Data can be entered beginning in April and must be completed by June 1, 2014. For the second year of the survey, the questions will be identical to those in Year 1. Starting the following year, changes could be made to make the survey easier to complete which would reduce burden and hopefully elicit better information.”</p> | <p>4Y 0N</p> |
| <p>2. We estimate it takes 4 hours for your office personnel to complete this survey. Is this time accurate and reasonable? Comment: If captains have the information readily available the survey can be completed fairly quickly Response: NMFS acknowledges this comment. Comment: This is a reasonable estimate for each vessel master. If a company has more than one vessel or more than one master per vessel, the amount of time should be multiplied by the number of vessel masters. Response: NMFS acknowledges this comment. Comment: The vessel captains fill these out and they estimate about an hour Response: NMFS accepts this comment, but no change to the analysis will be made.</p> | <p>3Y 2N</p> |
| <p>3. We estimate that personnel costs to complete and submit the survey are \$75/hour. Is this cost accurate and reasonable? Comment: Many vessel masters complete the survey using uncompensated time, however they are highly compensated employees and their time should be valued as such. Moreover, company personnel assisting masters should be included in this estimate. Look at the AFA Coop reports or IPA reports for reasonable estimates of office personnel costs. Response: NMFS acknowledges this comment. The “personnel costs” shown in OMB Control No. 0648-0401 analysis for the IPA Annual Report are \$165 per hour; for the AFA Coop Report are \$75 per hour.</p> | <p>2Y 2N No comment</p> |

| | |
|---|----------------------------------|
| Vessel Master Survey ◀ View | |
| <p>Comment: Not applicable Response: No response required.</p> | |
| <p>4. Do you believe that this survey has practical utility? Comment: The survey has utility that is limited by the attention given to the questions by the masters. Many masters pencil-whip the form to be done with it, and those answers are useless. When a master provides detailed observations, those are useful. However, the responses are limited by the questions asked, and many of the questions miss the key drivers – most importantly the opportunity costs of forgone fishing opportunities due to concerns re salmon bycatch. Response: The 2014 Council Update Report asked the question -- Did respondents give useful and forthright answers? And answered the question as follows: “The responses to the survey appear to be useful and to provide insight into pollock fishing and salmon bycatch conditions. 2012 was a very low Chinook bycatch year, so there were not large numbers of vessels approaching their Chinook PSC allocations. We would expect the survey questions about years with higher Chinook PSC to provide more nuances and different explanations among vessels. We cannot tell if respondents are strategically responding to the survey, but there are a wide range of responses that provide useful information beyond any question of whether or not the IPAs and hard cap are changing behavior. It is unclear whether it is in respondent’s interests to voluntarily convey any information that is inconsistent with the Council’s stated objectives for the program.” Comment: Would need to see results Response: NMFS believes the commenter refers to how the data is used.</p> | <p>3N Y</p> |
| <p>5. Can you suggest ways to enhance the quality and clarity of the information to be collected? Comment: Collect salmon data on a seasonal basis. It can be difficult for captains to accurately remember trip by trip information from a year and a half ago. Response: Data required for the Vessel Master Survey is generally qualitative and based on the opinion of an owner or vessel master. NMFS does not require that submitters record and retain additional logs or records to support the qualitative responses. Comment: Economists should ask better questions. Perhaps they should collaborate with anthropologists or sociologists for help, as the information they seek is more complex than their assumptions would have it. Response: NMFS disagrees. Subsequent to the Council's final action on the EDR program in 2009, industry representatives worked with AFSC economists, AKRO, and Council staff members to refine EDR survey forms, clarify instructions, and develop and improve the administrative process for implementing the annual data collection. An initial workshop was held at AFSC on June 21, 2010 to review the original drafts of the three Amendment 91 EDR forms and solicit input on any needed modifications. With minor revisions resulting from the workshop, the draft forms were reviewed by the Council in October 2010 and approved with some additional modifications to the Vessel Fuel Survey and Vessel Master Survey forms recommended by the Advisory Panel. Also see the 2014 Council Update Report.</p> | <p>2Y 0N 2No comment</p> |
| <p>6. Can you suggest ways to minimize the burden of completing this survey? Comment: Make your webpage more user friendly. The links often don’t work and the tokens can be difficult to use. Response: NMFS and Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission work continuously to</p> | <p>2Y 0N 2No comment</p> |

| Vessel Master Survey ◀ View | |
|---|--------------------------|
| <p>provide a user-friendly web site. Not knowing who Vessel Masters are ahead of the EDR collection requires the vessel owner/EDR submitter to provide that information by listing the Vessel Masters; and the system sends out email invitations. The Tokens in the email make sure the correct Vessel Master is completing a survey for the correct vessel as one master can potentially operate more than one A91 vessel a year.</p> <p>Comment: If it's submitted electronically, save the data so we don't have redundant info and we can remember what it's about</p> <p>Response: NMFS has considered this idea, to provide the respondent data given in the previous year with instructions to update the information. Completion of that project in the future is based on software development which depends on available talent and time. Probably within the next five years or so, it may become possible.</p> | |
| <p>7. What else would you care to tell us? Provide any additional comments on any aspect of the Chinook Salmon EDR Program.</p> <p>Comment: I want to commend Brian Garber-Yonts in particular for his outreach efforts to industry to try to get better EDR reports.</p> <p>Response: NMFS certainly agrees with commenter.</p> | <p>Y 3No comment</p> |

| Vessel Fuel Survey ◀ View | |
|--|---------------------------------|
| <p>1. Are the requirements for this survey easy to understand?</p> | 5Y |
| <p>2. We estimate it takes 4 hours for your office personnel to complete this survey. Is this time accurate and reasonable?</p> <p>Comment: To plug in the numbers is easy. But if this information is not already compiled it would take well over 4 hours.</p> <p>Response: NMFS acknowledges this comment.</p> <p>Comment: takes maybe an hour</p> <p>Response: NMFS acknowledges that the recordkeeping habits of each respondent varies.</p> <p>Comment: If you keep good records, this is a quick answer</p> <p>Response: NMFS acknowledges this comment.</p> | <p>0Y 4N</p> |
| <p>3. We estimate that personnel costs to complete and submit the survey are \$75/hour. Is this cost accurate and reasonable?</p> <p>Comment: The data requested is easily gathered by personnel at this level of compensation.</p> <p>Response: NMFS acknowledges this comment.</p> <p>Comment: We don't charge for time</p> <p>Response: No response needed.</p> | <p>3Y 2N</p> |
| <p>4. Do you believe that this survey has practical utility?</p> <p>Comment: If you are trying to put a price tag on salmon avoidance this could give you a general idea but would not result in a highly accurate number. Fuel consumption rates are estimates during fishing and steaming.</p> <p>Response: NMFS acknowledges this comment.</p> <p>Comment: Within its limitations – it gathers useful information about transit expenses but does not answer questions about other factors affecting decisions to move (i.e. product form, fish concentrations, perceived bycatch risks of other areas, etc.)</p> <p>Response: NMFS acknowledges this comment.</p> | <p>2Y 2N No comment</p> |
| <p>5. Can you suggest ways to enhance the quality and clarity of the information to be collected?</p> <p>Comment: Adequate within its limitations</p> <p>Response: No response needed.</p> | <p>2N 3No comment</p> |
| <p>6. Can you suggest ways to minimize the burden of completing this survey?</p> | 0Y |

| | |
|---|-------------------|
| Vessel Fuel Survey ◀ View | |
| Note: Although the commenter indicated he/she had suggestions, no comments were made. | 3N No comment |
| 7. What else would you care to tell us? Provide any additional comments on any aspect of the Chinook Salmon EDR Program. | 0N 4No comment |

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Chinook PSC Allocation In-Season Compensated Transfer Report ◀ View | |
| 1. Are the requirements for this report easy to understand? Note: 3 respondents do not use this report | 2Y |
| 2. We estimate it takes 40 hours for your office personnel to complete this report. Is this time accurate and reasonable? Comment: The Mothership Salmon Savings Incentive Plan (MSSIP) has had no compensated transfers. Thus, our time to complete this report is substantially less. Maybe two hours max to get it all done and make sure I don't mess it up. Response: No response is needed. | 2N |
| 3. We estimate that personnel costs to complete and submit the report are \$75/hour. Is this cost accurate and reasonable? Comment: See personnel costs for IPA Report submissions. Response: See response above | 2N |
| 4. Do you believe that this report has practical utility? Comment: It was explained to me by economists that their hope was to be able to calculate or infer a "spot price" for Chinook salmon PSC. The idea shows a profound lack of understanding of the dynamics of the fishery and an arrogant self-love of their own modeling techniques. My understanding is that some of these economists have woken up to the fact that the fishery is more complicated than their hoped-for spot price modeling, and I believe they are attempting more complex explanations (and of course, models) to reflect this revelation. Response: The 2014 Council Update Report discusses the benefits and challenges of the data collection during 2012 and 2013. | 2N |
| 5. Can you suggest ways to enhance the quality and clarity of the information to be collected? Comment: The economists should take their licks and admit a mistake. Get rid of this form and question. Go back to the drawing board and come up with better questions reflecting the complexity of the fishery dynamics. Abandon the mythical spot price assumption as being not reflective of fishery dynamics. Response: The purpose of 2014 Council Update Report was to update the Council on the status of the Amendment 91 Chinook Salmon EDR program and related data collection measures implemented in relation to Amendment 91 to the BSAI Groundfish FMP. The report includes the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A review of the Council's objectives and process for the development and implementation of this data collection; • Summary of details regarding the administration of the 2012 Chinook EDR data; • A summary of empirical results from the 2012 Amendment 91 data collection; • A report on ongoing collaborative efforts between industry members and NMFS and Council staff to implement the EDR program, minimize EDR submitter burden, and ensure data quality standards and that the Council's stated objectives for the data collection program are met; and • A discussion of the benefits and challenges of the data collection during 2012 and 2013. | 0Y No comment |
| 6. Can you suggest ways to minimize the burden of completing this report? | 0Y |

| | |
|---|-------------|
| Chinook PSC Allocation In-Season Compensated Transfer Report ◀ View | |
| Comment: Eliminate it. Response: No response required. | No comment |
| 7. What else would you care to tell us? Provide any additional comments on any aspect of the Chinook Salmon EDR Program. | 2No comment |

| | |
|--|------------------------|
| Verification/Audit of Chinook Salmon EDR Data | |
| 1. Are the requirements for this verification process easy to understand? Note: Two respondents do not do this process | 3Y |
| 2. We estimate it takes 4 hours for your office personnel to respond to this verification. Is this time accurate and reasonable? Comment: Audit information for the compensated transfer survey is simple. Although proof of fuel survey is time consuming and required extensive explanation Response: No response needed. Comment: 1 hour Response: No response needed. | 3N |
| 3. We estimate that personnel costs to complete and submit the verification are \$75/hour. Is this cost accurate and reasonable? Comment: no charge Response: No response needed. | 0Y 2N |
| 4. We estimate that miscellaneous costs include \$5 to respond by telephone and \$100 or accountant fee to verify the EDR. Do you agree? | 2Y 0N |
| 5. Do you believe that this verification has practical utility? | 0Y 0N No comment |
| 6. Can you suggest ways to enhance the quality and clarity of the information to be verified? | 3No comment |
| 7. Can you suggest ways to minimize the burden of completing this verification? | 3No comment |
| 8. What else would you care to tell us? Provide any additional comments on any aspect of the Chinook Salmon EDR Program. | 3No comment |

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

No payment or gift is provided under this program.

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

The data requested in the Chinook Salmon EDR includes detailed proprietary information provided by firms and individuals, as well as personally identifying information (PII) and business identifying information (BII). These data are considered confidential under section 402(b) of the Magnuson-Stevens Act. It is also confidential under [NOAA Administrative Order 216-100](#), which sets forth procedures to protect confidentiality of fishery statistics. The EDR data are prohibited from release to the public. Access to EDR data is tightly controlled under numerous provisions of statute, regulation, and administrative order.

The Code of Federal Regulations ([50 CFR 600.415](#)) specifies that access to confidential data collected by NMFS is restricted to

- ◆ Federal and Council employees responsible for collection and maintenance of the data, FMP development, monitoring or enforcement, or performing research that requires access to confidential statistics, or on a demonstrable need-to-know basis.
- ◆ NOAA/NMFS contractors or grantees who require access to confidential statistics to perform functions authorized by a Federal contract or grant.
- ◆ State personnel who demonstrate a need for confidential statistics for use in fishery conservation and management, provided that the State has entered an agreement to protect confidential data to a standard comparable to that required by the Magnuson-Stevens Act.

The regulations further provide for granting of access to Council members under conditions that are unlikely to be met in the case of these Chinook Salmon EDR data, and individual submitters may request that their own records be released to themselves or a third party.

In addition, the confidential proprietary data collected in this Chinook Salmon EDR meet the definition of trade secrets as defined in the [Freedom of Information Act](#) (5 U.S.C. 552) and [Trade Secrets Act](#) (18 U.S.C. 1905) (we insert hyperlinks), and as such is exempted from disclosure of raw, un-aggregated data under FOIA. All individuals who are determined to be authorized for access to confidential data are required to sign and submit a nondisclosure agreement, affirming the user's understanding of NMFS' obligations with respect to confidential data and the penalties for unauthorized use and disclosure. [NOAA Administrative Order 216-100](#) is the principal legal guidance for NMFS' employees on specific protocols for handling confidential data, including definitions, policies, operational responsibilities and procedures, penalties, and statutory authorities and requirements.

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.

This information collection does not involve information of a sensitive nature.

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

Estimated total respondents: 133, down from 200. Estimated total responses: 283, down from 694. Estimated total burden: 1,168, down from 9,976 hr. Estimated total personnel costs: \$87,600 down from \$748,200.

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).

Estimated total miscellaneous costs: \$4,631, down from \$25,958.

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

Estimated total responses: 239, down from 494. Estimated total burden: 962, down from 3,916 hr. Estimated total personnel cost: 72,150, down from \$293,700.

15. Explain the reasons for any program changes or adjustments.

Adjustments were made to update the number of respondents, the use of online submission, and cost of personnel wages.

Compensated Transfer Report

- a decrease of 199 respondents and responses, 1 instead of 200
- a decrease of 7,960 hours burden, 40 instead of 8,000
- a decrease of \$597,000 personnel costs, \$3,000 instead of \$600,000
- a decrease of \$1,054 miscellaneous costs, 0 instead of \$1,054

Vessel Fuel Survey

- a decrease of 4 respondents and responses, 105 instead of 109
- a decrease of 16 hours burden, 420 instead of 436
- a decrease of \$1,200 personnel costs, \$31,500 instead of \$32,700
- a decrease of \$378 miscellaneous costs, 0 instead of \$378

Vessel Master Survey

- a decrease of 52 respondents and responses, 133 instead of 185
- a decrease of 208 hours burden, 532 instead of 740
- a decrease of \$15,600 personnel costs, \$39,900 instead of \$55,500
- a decrease of \$526 miscellaneous costs, 0 instead of \$526

Chinook EDR Verification

- a decrease of 156 respondents and responses, 44 instead of 200
- a decrease of 624 hours burden, 176 instead of 800
- a decrease of \$46,800 personnel costs, \$13,200 instead of \$60,000
- a decrease of \$19,369 miscellaneous costs, \$4,631 instead of \$24,000

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

The information collected will not be published.

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 statement.

Not Applicable.

**SUPPORTING STATEMENT
ALASKA CHINOOK SALMON ECONOMIC DATA REPORT (EDR)
OMB CONTROL NO. 0648-0633**

B. COLLECTIONS OF INFORMATION EMPLOYING STATISTICAL METHODS

No changes will be made to methods or participants in this collection at this time. An update report to the Council on this program entitled, "Council Update on the Amendment 91 Chinook Salmon Economic Data Report Program, January 2014" is attached as a supplementary document.

The purpose of the report is to update the Council on the status of the Amendment 91 Chinook Salmon EDR Program and related data collection measures implemented in relation to Amendment 91 to the BSAI Groundfish FMP. The report includes the following:

- ◆ A review of the Council's objectives and process for the development and implementation of this data collection;
- ◆ Summary of details regarding the administration of the 2012 Chinook EDR data;
- ◆ A summary of empirical results from the 2012 Amendment 91 data collection;
- ◆ A report on ongoing collaborative efforts between industry members and NMFS and Council staff to implement the EDR program, minimize EDR submitter burden, and ensure data quality standards and that the Council's stated objectives for the data collection program are met; and
- ◆ A discussion of the benefits and challenges of the data collection during 2012 and 2013.

1. Describe (including a numerical estimate) the potential respondent universe and any sampling or other respondent selection method to be used. Data on the number of entities (e.g., establishments, State and local governmental units, households, or persons) in the universe and the corresponding sample are to be provided in tabular form. The tabulation must also include expected response rates for the collection as a whole. If the collection has been conducted before, provide the actual response rate achieved.

Submission of each of the three forms in the Chinook salmon EDR is required for the entire universe of potential respondents (a census of the entire population for each); thus, NMFS anticipates a response rate of 100 percent. The respondent universe varies for each of the three forms.

NMFS requires only the owners of the AFA-permitted vessels to submit the Vessel Fuel Survey; it is estimated at or below 110, because some persons own multiple vessels.

For the Vessel Master Survey, masters fill out the form and owners send them in to NMFS. NMFS did a count of all of the State of Alaska Commercial Fisheries Entry Commission (CFEC)

permits that were associated with AFA vessels as a rough proxy of how many masters to be involved. It is possible that each vessel master on each vessel that participated in the pollock fishery could be included for a respondent universe of up to 185 individuals. The number of entities that could supply these data may be substantially reduced if the owners of the vessels that are named in an IPA supply these forms for multiple vessels.

For the Compensated Transfer Report (CTR), there could be transactions from the vessel owners, the CDQ groups, and representatives for cooperatives, IPAs, and Chinook receiving entities. The representative for AFA vessel owners that are subject to an agreement for receiving Chinook salmon PSC may also be part of the respondent universe for the CTR, if these representatives are involved in the buying and selling of Chinook salmon PSC. The universe of these owners will be known by November 1 of each year, but is estimated to be 200 individuals.

For each AFA vessel that is not covered in an agreement, but that participated in the pollock fishery, the respondent will be the owner named on a Federal Fisheries Permit. Some of the vessel owners may also provide the name of a representative established by the IPA, AFA cooperative, or CDQ group to submit these forms. Those respondents are either named on a permit application or would be named by November 1 of each year for each vessel.

2. Describe the procedures for the collection, including: the statistical methodology for stratification and sample selection; the estimation procedure; the degree of accuracy needed for the purpose described in the justification; any unusual problems requiring specialized sampling procedures; and any use of periodic (less frequent than annual) data collection cycles to reduce burden.

All information collected in this Chinook salmon EDR is collected through a census of the population of vessels and persons authorized to catch pollock in the Bering Sea. Thus, sample selection methods are not applicable to this action.

NMFS will use census data from these collections to develop a descriptive (qualitative) analysis and quantitative or tabular comparisons to evaluate the effects of Amendment 91. Where data are available, NMFS may also apply descriptive statistics or other statistical analyses to examine whether:

- ◆ Chinook salmon PSC has been reduced,
- ◆ Incentives have changed fishing behavior during high and low Chinook salmon PSC encounter rates, or
- ◆ If pollock fishing location and Chinook salmon PSC locations have changed as a result of Amendment 91.

Regression analysis with a small number of variables or multi-variable statistical analysis may be applied to this data with the intent to assess the variability and explanatory power of two or more variables in a function. This regression analysis will also provide important insight into the

distribution of data and potential accuracy of variables or of variables that require further verification.

Chinook salmon PSC transaction data reported in the CTR may be further examined with regression analysis by applying observed transaction prices and quantities traded by vessel. For example, it may be possible to estimate the frequency with which Chinook salmon transactions occur based upon the type or characteristics of vessels, during periods where members of an IPA approach the performance standard based on their proportion of the 47,591 Chinook salmon PSC in no more than two out of seven consecutive years. To conduct this statistical analysis, the variables used from the CTR and other data sources may include the number of transactions, total value of each transaction, vessel characteristics, and membership in a given AFA sector, AFA cooperative, or IPA. These statistical procedures could provide insight as to whether some vessels are either unable to avoid Chinook salmon PSC, or have a higher valued use of Chinook salmon PSC than other vessels and choose to purchase Chinook salmon PSC.

Fuel use and fuel cost from the Vessel Fuel Survey and vessel movement data from revisions to NMFS logbooks and landing reports may be examined with regression analysis to determine if the increase or decrease in selected travel costs can be estimated from data on bycatch incentives imposed by an AFA sector or cooperative and from other existing information. These estimates may also be compared during intervals of time where various types of incentives and combinations of incentives are imposed, and can be compared with various conditions in the fishery (such as weather and sea conditions) that may impact vessel movements. Examples of some of the independent variables that might be tested in a regression analysis of travel costs include: general type of incentive; where and when the incentive is imposed; fuel costs; and distance traveled in response to an incentive, pollock catch, and Chinook salmon PSC.

3. Describe the methods used to maximize response rates and to deal with non-response. The accuracy and reliability of the information collected must be shown to be adequate for the intended uses. For collections based on sampling, a special justification must be provided if they will not yield "reliable" data that can be generalized to the universe studied.

As discussed in Question 2, this collection will be applied annually to a census of vessel owners who participate in the AFA Bering Sea pollock fishery. NMFS explicitly identified in Amendment 91 the entities required to supply the data. The collection is mandatory, so non-response error is anticipated to be extremely small. The fuel data supplied on the Vessel Fuel Survey will not represent primary data (actual fuel used by date and event). The Vessel Fuel Survey data represents masters' estimates based on the type of actions they took to respond to Amendment 91; some response error may occur.

Sources of error or incomplete information may also be present in the Chinook salmon PSC prices reported for each transfer in the CTR form. For example, if a transfer of Chinook salmon PSC is accompanied by both monetary and a non-monetary compensation, the owner of a vessel may have some control over when prices are reported and whether the reported price can be attributed to Chinook salmon PSC.

Measuring and minimizing non-response bias is an important aspect of assuring accurate data. The degree of accuracy needed for the Chinook salmon EDR is not established by statistical theory or legislative mandates. The Council specifically identifies this collection as improving the amount of data available to analyze the effectiveness of the Amendment 91 for reducing Chinook salmon PSC to the extent practicable and to assess any changes in the yield of pollock. Data collected through these EDR forms will be used for simple deterministic comparisons, statistical inference by vessel type and cooperative, as well as for estimation of econometric models used for policy-making purposes.

While more accurate data is clearly preferred, standards do not exist regarding the accuracy of data required for estimation of statistical models. The statistical analysis applied to this data may range from simple descriptive statistics, to more sophisticated regression and spatial analysis to assess the effectiveness of Amendment 91.

The major tool for minimizing errors, improving accuracy, and resolving any missing data or non-response of Chinook salmon EDR data is through verification procedures developed by NMFS economists and analysts. These measures would help NMFS to verify data submitted in the CTR, the Vessel Master Survey, and the Vessel Fuel Survey. The principal means to verify data and resolve questions would be through validation of data submitted in these three surveys against supporting records. NMFS would contact the Chinook salmon EDR submitter and request oral or written confirmation of data submissions. The person submitting the Chinook salmon EDR would need to respond within 20 days of NMFS's information request. Responses after 20 days could be considered untimely and could result in a violation and enforcement action.

For the CTR, a NMFS-approved auditor would review the CTR data submitted and may request financial documents substantiating the data submitted in the Chinook salmon EDR. An auditor/accounting specialist would be subject to strict confidentiality requirements.

4. Describe any tests of procedures or methods to be undertaken. Tests are encouraged as effective means to refine collections, but if ten or more test respondents are involved OMB must give prior approval.

The Council held two industry meetings in 2009 to review and recommend data to be collected in each of the three new reports/surveys. While the meetings were not a formal pretest of the data reports, several fields in the reports/surveys were significantly revised as a result of the meetings. In addition, some members of the AFA trawl sectors have voluntarily submitted individual comments on previous versions of the forms developed for each report/survey.

In each meeting these draft data forms were reviewed by members of the AFA sector, North Pacific Fishery Management Council staff, Alaska Fisheries Science Center (AFSC) staff, and other NMFS staff. On June 21, 2010, AFSC held an industry workshop in Juneau to review the proposed reports/surveys. That workshop did not include formal pretests of the data forms, but resulted in some additional changes to the data forms.

5. Provide the name and telephone number of individuals consulted on the statistical aspects of the design, and the name of the agency unit, contractor(s), grantee(s), or other person(s) who will actually collect and/or analyze the information for the agency.

Jeff Hartman
Biologist
NMFS Sustainable Fisheries
Juneau, AK
PH: (907) 586-7228
Internet Address: jeff.hartman@noaa.gov

Ron Felthoven
Economist
NMFS WASC Route: F/AKC3
PH: (206) 526-4114
Internet Address: ron.felthoven@noaa.gov

Alan Haynie
Economist
NMFS WASC Route: F/AKC3
PH: (206) 526-4114
Internet Address: alan.haynie@noaa.gov

Brian Garber-Yonts
Economist
NMFS WASC Route: F/AKC3
PH: (206) 526-6301
Internet Address: brian.garber-yonts@noaa.gov

Dave Colpo
Program Manager
Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission
PH: (503) 595-3100
Internet Address: front_office@psmfc.org

Jennifer Mondragon
NMFS Sustainable Fisheries
Juneau, AK
PH: (907) 586-7228

REFERENCES

- Cahalan, J., J. Mondragon, and J. Gasper. 2010. "Catch sampling and estimation in the Federal groundfish fisheries off Alaska," US Dept. Commerce, *NOAA Tech. Memo.* NMFS-AFSC-205, 42 p.
- NMFS. 2009. Regulatory Impact Review, Amendment 91. National Marine Fisheries Service Alaska Regional Office. Juneau, AK. December 2009. <http://www.fakr.noaa.gov/sustainablefisheries/bycatch/salmon/chinook/rir/rir1209.pdf>

Council Update on the Amendment 91 Chinook Salmon Economic Data Report Program

1.1 January 2014, Alaska Fisheries Science Center

1. Introduction

The purpose of this report and presentation is to update the Council on the status of the Amendment 91 Chinook Salmon Economic Data Report (EDR) program and related data collection measures implemented in relation to Amendment 91 to the BSAI Groundfish FMP. The report includes the following:

- A review of the Council's objectives and process for the development and implementation of this data collection;
- Summary of details regarding the administration of the 2012 Chinook EDR data;
- A summary of empirical results from the 2012 Amendment 91 data collection;
- A report on ongoing collaborative efforts between industry members and NMFS and Council staff to implement the EDR program, minimize EDR submitter burden, and ensure data quality standards and that the Council's stated objectives for the data collection program are met; and
- A discussion of the benefits and challenges of the data collection during 2012 and 2013.

The Amendment 91 EDR program is managed primarily by the Alaska Fisheries Science Center (AFSC), with support from NMFS Alaska Region, and is administered in collaboration with Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission (PSMFC). The EDR is a mandatory reporting requirement under 50 CFR 679.65 for all entities participating in the American Fisheries Act (AFA) BSAI pollock trawl fishery, including vessel masters and businesses that own or lease¹ one or more AFA-permitted vessels active in fishing or processing BSAI pollock, CDQ groups receiving allocations of BSAI pollock, and representatives of Sector entities receiving allocations of Chinook salmon prohibited species catch (PSC) from NMFS. The EDR program is comprised of three separate survey forms²:

- Chinook salmon PSC Allocation Compensated Transfer Report (CTR)
- Vessel Fuel Survey
- Vessel Master Survey

Distinct conditions that require an entity to submit one or more of the respective forms are discussed in more detail below. In addition to the EDR program, the data collection measures developed by the Council also specified modification of the Daily Fishing Logbook (DFL) for BSAI pollock trawl CVs and CPs (implemented in for the 2012 fishing year) to add a "checkbox" to the tow-level logbook record,

¹ For the sake of clearer exposition, "vessel owners or leaseholders" as a group are referred to collectively as "vessel owners" hereafter in this report, except where a relevant distinction pertains.

² Amendment 91 EDR forms can be accessed online at <http://www.alaskafisheries.noaa.gov/sustainablefisheries/bycatch/salmon/chinook/edr/default.htm>.

requiring vessel operators to indicate instances when a vessel fishing pollock in the BSAI changed fishing locations, prior to each tow, for the primary purpose of avoiding Chinook salmon PSC. For AFA CPs, this information is recorded in the Trawl CP Electronic Logbook (ELB) and submitted to NMFS via the eLandings system. Vessel movement data collected from CPs for the 2012 fishing year is summarized later in the report, although the number of observations is extremely limited. The DFL for trawl CVs is not submitted to NMFS in a form that permits electronic data capture, so vessel movement data for pollock CVs remains unavailable pending implementation of an Electronic Logbook for trawl CVs or the digitization of logbook data.

In summary, the Vessel Fuel Survey and Vessel Master Survey have been successfully implemented to collect data from all active AFA vessels and have yielded substantial new information that will be useful for analysis of Amendment 91. However, to date, very little information has been collected through the logbook checkboxes or the Compensated Transfer Report (CTR) form. With more standardization and communication with vessel operators, the checkbox can be made more useful. Whether or not the current information collected in the CTR is adequate to meet the Council's intent in the data collection is unclear and is discussed further in Section 5.2.

This report provides evidence of both successes and limitations of these data collections at a very early point in the process of compiling a multi-year stream of data. Any conclusions that may be drawn regarding the importance of addressing limitations of the data collections, and an appropriate timeline for considering modifications, are left to future deliberations. One purpose of this report, however, is to identify potential problems in the design or implementation of the data collections and opportunities for improvements that could make the data collection more efficient in the use of submitters' time and resources and effective in producing information critical to the Council decision-making process.

2. Amendment 91 Economic Data Report (EDR) Background

In developing Amendment 91, the Council determined that fisheries data available through existing sources would be insufficient to adequately monitor implementation of management measures under the amendment. The Council subsequently recommended a data collection program to supplement existing data and support analysis of the effectiveness of Amendment 91 in reducing Chinook salmon PSC and to assess any changes in the yield of pollock. The Council's December 2009 purpose and need statement recommended that this data be used to address four components of Amendment 91:

- Understand the effects and impacts of the Amendment 91 IPAs, the higher and lower PSC hard caps, and the performance standard;
- Evaluate the effectiveness of the IPA incentives in times of high and low levels of salmon PSC, and the effectiveness of the performance standard to reduce salmon PSC;
- Evaluate how Amendment 91 affects where, when, and how pollock fishing and salmon PSC occur; and
- Study and evaluate conclusions drawn by industry in the IPA annual reports.

In its final motion on the Amendment 91 EDR, the Council recommended implementing new data collection measures as summarized below:

1. Transaction data for salmon and pollock, including:
 - a. IPA and AFA Cooperative reports, summarizing the assignment of Chinook PSC and pollock quota to each participating vessel at the start of each fishing season, and all in-season transfers of Chinook and pollock PSC;
 - b. Compensated Transfer Form, to collect the quantity and price of Chinook PSC, and quantity of pollock PSC, in all PSC transfers in which there is a monetary exchange for PSC transferred from one party to another;
2. A logbook checkbox, incorporated into exiting AFA vessel logbooks, to collect data at the tow-level regarding movement of the vessel for the primary purpose of Chinook PSC avoidance;
3. A vessel fuel usage survey, to collect average hourly fuel use rates for fishing and transiting and quantity and cost of annual fuel purchases to be used to estimate costs of moving vessels to avoid salmon PSC; and
4. A vessel master survey, to determine rationale for decision making during the pollock season (fishing location choices and salmon PSC reduction measures).

Subsequent to the Council's final action on the EDR program in 2009, industry representatives worked with AFSC economists, AKRO, and Council staff members to refine EDR survey forms, clarify instructions, and develop and improve the administrative process for implementing the annual data collection. An initial workshop was held at AFSC on June 21, 2010 to review the original drafts of the three Amendment 91 EDR forms and solicit input on any needed modifications. With minor revisions resulting from the workshop, the draft forms were reviewed by the Council in October 2010 and approved with some additional modifications to the Vessel Fuel Survey and Vessel Master Survey forms recommended by the Advisory Panel. At the same time, the Council reviewed the draft Proposed Rule implementing the new data collection measures, including the EDR program, addition of the salmon movement checkbox to the Daily Fishing Logbook (CV's) and Electronic Logbook (CP's), and additional requirements for IPA Annual Report regarding PSC sub-allocations and in-season transfers³.

The final rule to implement the above measures went into effect March 3, 2012⁴. Although the Chinook PSC reduction measures under Amendment 91 itself were implemented for the 2011 pollock fishing season, the new data collection measures required the affected entities to initiate new in-season recordkeeping systems beginning in 2012. As a result, the earliest feasible administration of annual EDR reports was to collect data for the 2012 pollock season, with an initial EDR submission due date of June 1, 2013. Submission requirements for each of the three forms are contingent on the entity's role and activity in the AFA Pollock Fishery as defined under Amendment 91, and include conditions for certification-only submission with exemption from data reporting portions of respective EDR forms.

Requirements are as follows:

³ Available at <http://www.npfmc.org/wp-content/PDFdocuments/bycatch/ChinookBycatchEDR910.pdf>.

⁴ See [77 FR 5389](http://www.federalregister.gov/fr/2012/02/03/fr5389) (February 3, 2012) for details; <http://www.alaskafisheries.noaa.gov/frules/77fr5389.pdf>.

- Compensated Transfer Report
 - Certification: An owner or leaseholder of an AFA-permitted vessel and the representative of any entity that received an allocation of Chinook salmon PSC from NMFS must submit a CTR, Part 1, each calendar year, for the previous calendar year.
 - Fully completed CTR: Any person who transferred Chinook salmon PSC allocation after January 20, and paid or received money for the transfer, must submit a completed CTR (Part 1 and Part 2) for the previous calendar year.
- Vessel Fuel Survey
 - An owner or leaseholder of an AFA-permitted vessel must submit all completed Vessel Fuel Surveys for each vessel used to harvest pollock in the Bering Sea in a given year.
- Vessel Master Survey
 - For any AFA-permitted vessel used to harvest pollock in the Bering Sea in the previous year:
 - The vessel master must complete the Vessel Master Survey and the Vessel Master certification following the instructions on the form, and
 - An owner or leaseholder must submit all Vessel Master Surveys and each Vessel owner certification following the instructions on the form.

Two features of the EDR program posed unique challenges for NMFS' and PSMFC's administration of the annual data collection process compared to the BSAI Crab and Amendment 80 EDRs implemented previously. As specified in the final rule, all Amendment 91 EDR forms must be submitted electronically. In addition, the rule requires that: a) for any AFA-permitted vessel used to harvest BSAI pollock, the vessel master must complete and certify a Vessel Master Survey form; and b) the vessel owner must certify and submit all Vessel Master Surveys. These specifications required the development of new IT infrastructure and other survey administration protocols by AFSC and PSMFC in the course of implementing the program, as well as substantial coordination with EDR submitters and industry representatives prior to and during the data collection in April-June of 2013. Related administrative details are described further below in Section 3.

Initial development of administrative protocols and software to support electronic data submission began in early 2012, and AFSC and PSMFC staff met with industry representatives in June of 2012 to present a prototype web portal and online versions of the three EDR forms, as well as associated procedures for distributing login credentials for secure online access to enable use and submission of the electronic forms. Several issues related to the Vessel Master form were identified at the meeting, most importantly issues concerning ambiguity in determining which individual captains employed by AFA vessel owners would be required to complete survey forms⁵, and the procedures for vessel owners to assign, certify, and submit survey forms completed online by their captain(s). As it would be necessary for vessel owners to make determinations regarding which individual captains would complete the Vessel Master Surveys, it was requested that the prototype web portal be modified to

⁵ There is no regulatory definition of "Vessel Master" as used in the Amendment 91 EDR regulations that is applicable to groundfish trawl vessels, and not all individuals identifiable in in-season catch accounting or other reporting systems are employed as vessel captains.

enable vessel owners (or authorized administrative staff) to generate and assign vessel master user accounts to the appropriate captains. Additional questions addressed the definition of compensated transfers as described in the CTR form, and additional guidance from NMFS was requested to clarify standards for compliance in submission of Vessel Master Survey and CTR forms. To the extent possible, such guidance was provided in the form of additional instructions incorporated into the online EDR forms as well as supplementary guidance distributed to EDR submitters prior to the start of the data collection period in April 2013, as described in the final section of this report.

1.2 3. Overview of 2012 Annual Amendment 91 EDR Implementation and Data Submission

Because of previous experience in implementing the BSAI Crab and Amendment 80 EDR programs, PSMFC was contracted by AFSC to support of the Amendment 91 EDR. All EDR data collection for the 2012 fishing year has been completed. This section provides an overview of information compiled by PSMFC staff during the process of implementing the online EDR survey forms, identification and notification of specific entities of requirements for 2012 EDR submission, and communications and submitter support during the data collection. Details regarding EDR response and compliance rates are also provided.

The contact list for all AFA vessel owners (including both primary and secondary owners), CDQ groups, Inshore Cooperative representatives, and Sector Entity representatives determined to be subject to EDR reporting requirements was constructed in consultation with NMFS AKR staff. On March 26, PSMFC distributed notices by certified mail to the identified contacts, describing the requirements for EDR submission and instructions for accessing the online survey forms using the included secure login credentials⁶.

Table 1 displays the counts, by entity-type and EDR form, of individual entities that received notices, submitted certification-only EDRs, and submitted completed EDR forms. Extensive efforts on the part of EDR submitters and PSMFC staff were expended to work through procedures for online EDR submission, assign Vessel Master forms, and provide the required data elements during the EDR collection period that began April 1 through the submission due date on June 1, and for some weeks thereafter. In all, 147 vessel owner entities were notified by PSMFC to submit one or more portions of the EDR. Of these, six were determined to be no longer active in the pollock fishery or no longer were owners.

Due to complications encountered with the web portal, as well as confusion among many entities regarding EDR submission in general, late EDR submissions past the June 1 due date were accommodated. As of July 1, 2013, one month after the EDR due date, five entities had not completed the EDR requirement, and PSMFC enlisted the assistance of NMFS Office of Law Enforcement in contacting the last two entities, who completed and certified the final EDR forms on August 16, 2013, and January 6, 2014, respectively.

⁶ Copies of all mailings distributed to EDR submitters by AFSC or PSMFC are available on request from the AFSC Economics and Social Science Research Program.

2.0 TABLE 1: NUMBER OF EDR SUBMITTERS AND RATES OF RESPONSE AND ON-TIME CERTIFICATION

| Entity Type | Contacted | Certified | Certified on-time | Completed |
|----------------------------|------------------|-----------|-------------------|-----------|
| Vessel Owner | 141 ¹ | 141 | 108 (77%) | 107 (76%) |
| CDQ Group | 6 | 6 | 4 (67%) | 0 (0%) |
| Cooperative | 7 | 7 | 5 (71%) | 0 (0%) |
| Sector/IPA Representatives | 3 | 3 | 2 (67%) | 0 (0%) |

¹ Of the 141 current AFA vessels for which owners notified, there were total of 115 distinct vessel entities contacted, several of which owned and submitted EDR forms for multiple vessels.

Following consultation with industry representatives in April, 2012, the EDR web portal was improved to enable vessel owners to identify and assign a Vessel Master Survey form to one or more individual captains for each of their vessels that were active in the 2012 pollock fishery; vessel owners could complete the survey form themselves as an owner/operator as well as assign forms to one or more other captains for each vessel. Upon assignment of a Vessel Master Survey and entry of a valid email address for the assigned captain, the web portal generated an email message to the captain with login credentials and instructions for accessing and submitting the online survey form.

Because the online EDR forms were not available for submission of the EDR until April, 2013, industry members were previously advised to distribute PDF or paper copies of the Vessel Master Survey form to captains for the purpose of recording survey responses as close as possible to the end of the 2012 pollock season to ensure the best possible recall of conditions and events. As a result, a number of vessel owners had collected copies of the Vessel Master form completed and certified by their captain(s) on paper. Instructions for proxy certification and submission of transcribed Vessel Master Survey responses by vessel owners were distributed by email through industry representatives and incorporated into the web portal. In all, 144 Vessel Master Survey forms were completed and submitted, of which 99 were completed and submitted online by an assigned captain, and 45 were submitted by vessel owners/representatives as either owner/operators or as transcribed forms submitted on behalf of the captains.

2.1 4. Summary of Data Collected, 2012 Amendment 91 EDR

The following sections summarize and provide preliminary analysis of data collected in the 2012 EDR.

4. 1 Chinook PSC Compensated transfer report (CTR)

For 2012, no compensated transfers were reported by any entity. Further discussion of this result and concerns regarding interpretation and intent of the CTR form that arose during the 2012 EDR are discussed further below.

4.2 Fuel survey

An owner or leaseholder of an AFA-permitted vessel must submit all completed Vessel Fuel Surveys for each vessel used to harvest pollock in the Bering Sea in a given year. Vessel operators are required to report the total annual quantity of fuel loaded onto the vessel, the total cost of that fuel, and the

average annual rates of fuel consumption while fishing and transiting while engaged in the pollock fishery. Data reported for all vessels active in the 2012 BSAI pollock fishery are summarized in Table 2 below⁷.

3.0 TABLE 2: VESSEL FUEL SURVEY RESULTS (PRELIMINARY)

| SECTOR | Annual average fuel consumption rate (gallons per hour), mean (sd) | | Annual fuel purchases & expenditures, mean (sd) | |
|--------|--|------------|---|-------------------------|
| | Fishing | Transiting | Gallons | Cost (\$ US) |
| CP | 251 (91) | 227 (98) | 1,022,189 (421,163) | \$3,615,112 (1,453,522) |
| CV | 154 (453) | 116 (379) | 199,734 (188,221) | \$765,548 (706,411) |
| MS | 179 (263) | 148 (227) | 247,475 (393,468) | \$849,125 (1,184,979) |

4.3 Vessel Master Survey

Captains of vessels used to harvest AFA or CDQ pollock allocations in the Bering Sea are required to complete the Vessel Master Survey, which provides qualitative information regarding their experience operating the vessel in the fishery and efforts to avoid salmon PSC. The survey form includes 11 questions on different topics, and combines 7 categorical response questions (yes/no) with 10 open-ended response questions. Frequencies are reported for each of the categorical questions below, and an overview of common themes in written responses to each of the open-ended questions is provided.

More formal methods of qualitative data analysis are planned, which will permit statistical analysis to associate the qualitative information collected in the survey with vessel PSC rates and levels to attempt to better understand differences among vessels as part of forthcoming Amendment 91 analysis.

The general goal of the Vessel Master Survey as expressed by the Council is “to determine rationale for decision-making during the pollock season (fishing location choices and salmon PSC reduction measures).” Analysts expect to gain on-going insight into a number of aspects of fishing, such as 1) what aspects of the IPAs impact the pollock fishery the most; 2) how year-to-year conditions in markets, stock conditions, and the environment impact salmon PSC outcomes; and 3) whether there were special events for some vessels that led to their high or low PSC outcomes.

That this is a census of all vessel operators is very useful as a means to understand the experiences of all vessels participating in the fishery. Analysts often seek and receive input from individuals but it is not always clear if a skipper’s anecdotal account of conditions is unique or common. The survey ensures that all vessel operators have an equal and systematic opportunity for input into ongoing analyses of Amendment 91.

⁷ Fuel survey data summarized in Table 2 was examined for outliers and a total of seven anomalies were detected. On inspection, four outliers were identifiable as data entry errors where either too many or too few digits were entered and an edited value could be readily imputed. Three anomalies consisted of omitted data; average values for vessels of the same size class were imputed for missing values. These values will be refined after additional analysis.

The fisher responses to both the yes/no and open-ended questions from the vessels master survey are recorded below. Common answers and those that seem informative are summarized, and yes/no questions are recorded by sector.⁸

Q1. If the vessel participated in an Incentive Plan Agreement (IPA), did the IPA affect your fishing strategy? YES NO

| VESSEL_TYPE | Yes | No | % Yes |
|-------------|-----|----|-------|
| CP | 12 | 5 | 71% |
| CV | 74 | 20 | 79% |
| MS | 19 | 2 | 90% |

If YES, please describe and discuss what incentives had the largest impact on your strategy.

Respondents reported a number of impacts that suggest that A91 is effective at changing behavior.

Primary responses include:

- Many vessels report they always pay attention to bycatch rates.
- Operators report avoiding historically high bycatch areas.
- Captains report more communication within the fleet.
- Respondents report faster movement away from bycatch when it occurs.
- Vessels slow down and inspect catch more between hauls.
- Operators report that they avoid salmon “sign” on their fishfinders.
- In response to this question, some skippers reported using salmon excluders.

Several respondents also reported t negative economic impacts on the pollock fishery of the IPAs:

- Many vessels reported more steaming time and fuel usage.
- Respondents noted an inability to fish in some historically high-value roe areas.
- A number of captains reported having to fish on small fish because they cannot afford to have lower catch rates that could increase bycatch.
- Several vessels reported that they had to go to areas where there are no catch or bycatch reports, which increases costs.

Q2. Did the amount and/or cost of Chinook PSC allocation available to the vessel lead you to make changes in pollock fishing operations? YES NO

| VESSEL_TYPE | Yes | No | % Yes |
|-------------|-----|----|-------|
| CP | 13 | 4 | 76% |
| CV | 74 | 20 | 79% |
| MS | 20 | 1 | 95% |

⁸ Note: In the yes/no questions, catcher vessels were considered to be in the Mothership (MS) sector if 50 percent or more of their hauls were delivered to motherships in 2012.

If YES, please describe.

This year there were many overlapping responses between question 1 and 2. Responses:

- Vessels reported avoiding recently and traditionally high-salmon areas.
- Vessels reported that they avoided Chinook to be able to catch all their pollock.
- Several respondents noted that Sea State reports were useful.

Negative economic impacts on the pollock fishery:

- Respondents reported that they had to target salmon with less roe.
- Vessels left areas of high bycatch for less productive areas.
- Vessels travelled farther and caught smaller fish.

Q3. How would you compare the Chinook salmon bycatch and pollock conditions during the A and B seasons this year relative to the last two years? Please describe any unique aspects of the season.

Responses:

- Many respondents reported that there was less A-season area to fish this year because of ice.⁹
- Several captains reported more competition and conflict with other fisheries, leading to more Chinook bycatch.
- Several respondents reported less pollock on the fishing grounds.
- “Less Chinook” – several respondents said this was the case for the last 2 years.
- Several captains reported fishing shallower to avoid salmon.
- “About the same” – also several vessels
- Rolling hotspots caused movement further from shore
- For B season, one vessel mentioned that 2012 was different than in the captain’s decades of experience, with no fishing available east of 170.
- Several vessels reported that they stood down for a period the previous year but learned from that experience and did not have to stop fishing at any point in 2012.

4. Did Chinook salmon bycatch conditions cause you to delay the start of your pollock fishing or otherwise alter the timing of your pollock fishing for some period during the past A and/or B season?

YES NO

⁹ Many respondents mentioned this here and in question 8 that asks about weather and ice conditions.

| VESSEL_TYPE | Yes | No | % Yes |
|-------------|-----|----|-------|
| CP | 0 | 17 | 0% |
| CV | 35 | 59 | 37% |
| MS | 11 | 10 | 52% |

If YES, please describe the Chinook salmon bycatch condition, when it occurred, and any change in your pollock fishing as a result.

Responses:

- “Always waiting on reports to decide where to fish.”
- One operator noted that the SSIP requires test tows in new area, leading to more wear and tear.
- Several captains report that they began the B season earlier and began the A season cautiously.
- “September trip -- searched mid trip and had to go home not full.”
- One vessel operator reported switching from targeting pollock to targeting cod when Chinook bycatch increased, then back when bycatch declined.

Q5. In the past year, did you end a trip and return to port early because of Chinook salmon bycatch conditions? YES NO If YES, please indicate the number of trips that this occurred in each season (use a checkmark to indicate appropriate answer for each season).

| VESSEL_TYPE | Number of respondents reporting 1-3 delays in A-season | Number of respondents reporting 1-3 delays in B-season |
|-------------|--|--|
| CP | 1 | 0 |
| CV | 8 | 11 |
| MS | 0 | 0 |

Q6. Please describe how any area closures or restrictions for the purpose of reducing Chinook salmon bycatch affected where and how you fished.

Responses:

The following responses were offered by many respondents.

- Vessels, unsurprisingly, reported that they avoided closure areas. Some commented that they did this regardless of their tier status and several noted that they avoided a larger area than the actual closure.
- Vessels reported that they traveled more, burning more fuel.

Q7. Please describe how any regulatory or other area closures or restrictions for a purpose other than reducing Chinook salmon bycatch affected where and how you fished.

Responses:

- Chum closures
- Herring closure
- “Closures near Dutch”
- “Some SSL closures are good fishing areas.”
- Pribilof closures
- None
- “Leads to smaller fish and more tow time; more flatfish, squid.”

Q8. Compared to a typical year, did weather or sea ice conditions have more, less, or about the same impact on fishing as in a typical year? Please describe especially if there were particularly uncommon conditions at any point this year. If these conditions had an impact on your ability to avoid Chinook salmon bycatch, please describe.

Responses:

- One of the most common answers was “ the same”
- Ice limited available fishing areas, pushed fishing deeper
- Ice led to more pollock schooling, smaller fish.
- Mostly people reported that ice didn’t impact bycatch, but some said it made it higher
- One CV reported that weather wasn’t great, which slowed down fishing
- One person commented that it could have pushed them right into salmon bycatch, but didn’t.
- Only one comment about summer fishing, that it was normal.

One respondent made comments about 2013 A-Season fishing, indicating that there is the possibility of confusion if the survey is completed after the A season following the reporting period.

Q9. Were there exceptional factors that affected your pollock fishing this year? For example, were there unusual market or stock conditions, unusual pollock fishing conditions, or maintenance problems? Please describe.

Responses:

- “Smaller fish, mostly the same year class”
- Several people said they wished the quota had been lower; one said this was to allow fish to grow.
- “Lots of vessel movement to avoid fish”
- One CV reported that there was poor roe, regardless of fish size.
- “Fishing was good in June”
- “High fuel prices”
- “Chum closure led to switch to other fishery”
- Several operators reported gear conflicts in winter.
- One operator: “No fish on “slime bank”
- One CV operator reported that “pollock was way to the Northwest.” Another commented that there was “no fish on the slime bank.”
- “All examples [in the question] are cyclical – no two years the same”
- Some vessels reported mechanical issues, which will help analysts to understand non-participation in some years may be driven by those problems rather than fishing or bycatch conditions.

Q10. Separate from an Incentive Plan Agreement, were there other incentives for you to reduce Chinook salmon bycatch? YES NO

| VESSEL_TYPE | Yes | No | % Yes |
|-------------|-----|----|-------|
| CP | 9 | 8 | 53% |
| CV | 61 | 33 | 65% |
| MS | 17 | 4 | 81% |

If YES, please describe.

Select responses:

- The skipper bycatch award
- Many operators reported that they were influence by pressure from a variety of groups: owners, CDQ groups, “peers”, other cooperatives, and members of their cooperative.
- Numerous respondents reported that they avoided Chinook because it is “the right thing to do” is a “moral responsibility,” or they gratified for “clean fishing” or “good stewardship.”
- Several operators reported that they were influenced by “politics” and the “public view”.
- “I wasn’t out there to catch salmon”
- “We go above and beyond to not catch salmon, but nothing is for sure.”
- “I care about my reputation. I don’t want to be on the dirty list.”

Q11. Did actual or potential bycatch of species other than Chinook salmon cause you to change your harvesting decisions during the pollock season? YES NO

| VESSEL_TYPE | Yes | No | % Yes |
|-------------|-----|----|-------|
| CP | 10 | 7 | 59% |
| CV | 63 | 31 | 67% |
| MS | 11 | 10 | 52% |

If YES, please describe.

Responses:

- Chum
- Halibut
- Herring
- Red king crab
- Squid
- “Squid and halibut a concern in the corner.”
- Atka mackerel
- “Baby pollock”.

4.4 Salmon movement checkbox

Beginning in early 2012, catcher processors had a checkbox to record salmon bycatch related vessel movement in their electronic logbook forms. However, a very limited number of vessels utilized the vessel movement checkbox in 2012 or 2013 with only a few observations (7) recorded.

5. Discussion of different components to the Amendment 91 EDR

Below a discussion of each component of the Amendment 91 EDR is provided. Please note that the Council would be asked for input on any proposed changes that we believe would improve the survey.¹⁰ The survey for the 2013 fishing season is currently available online. Data can be entered beginning in April and must be completed by June 1, 2014. *For the second year of the survey, the questions will be identical to those in Year 1.* In later years, changes could be made to make the survey easier to complete which would reduce burden and hopefully elicit better information.

5.1 Vessel Master Survey Discussion

Several questions arise in examining the Vessel Master Survey.

- *Did respondents give useful and forthright answers?*

The responses to the survey appear to be useful and to provide insight into pollock fishing and salmon bycatch conditions. 2012 was a very low Chinook bycatch year, so there were not large numbers of vessels approaching their Chinook PSC allocations. We would expect the survey questions about years with higher Chinook PSC to provide more nuances and different explanations among vessels. We cannot tell if respondents are strategically responding to the survey, but there are a wide range of responses that provide useful information beyond any question of whether or not the IPAs and hard cap are changing behavior. It is unclear whether it is in respondent's interests to voluntarily convey any information that is inconsistent with the Council's stated objectives for the program.

- *How do we reduce the burden of the survey?*

The first year completing a survey of this nature is always the most difficult. A small number of respondents voiced frustration with either having to describe their fishing experience or thought the questions were obvious. It is likely that others felt the same way. Going forward, we will further evaluate the questions and discuss whether questions can be combined or re-ordered to elicit better responses. As several years of data are gathered and common responses are identified, some multiple choice questions may be created that would make it easier for respondents to complete and analysts to utilize.

Already, several possibilities arise for means to improve the survey. Questions 1 and 2 were intended to distinguish between the IPA and the hard cap, but the answers imply that this distinction is not very clear and may reflect that vessels are avoiding Chinook to avoid either reaching the hard cap or suffering from running afoul of the IPA. Analyzing a second year of responses should provide more insight into this question. Vessels tended to give overlapping responses to the questions about whether there were special aspects to the pollock and salmon PSC (question 3), weather (question 8), and market and stock (question 9) conditions. It may make sense to refine or condense these in the future.

¹⁰ This communication would occur with Council staff and then through either the data collection committee or review from the entire Council.

- Is the timing of the survey appropriate?

The current June 1 deadline for EDR submission applies to all three of the EDR forms. As with other North Pacific EDR programs, PSMFC begins the process of active administration of the Amendment 91 EDR sixty days prior to the submission deadline. While a limited window for submission of an EDR form is appropriate in some cases to support greater consistency in reporting¹¹, it is not clear that the current window is optimal, or that timing of the submission deadline should be the same for all three of the EDR forms. In particular, the quality of information reported by captains in the Vessel Master Survey may be degraded by a significant lag between the end of the fishing season and completion of the survey form. In 2012, PSMFC and AFSC staff consistently recommended that the PDF version of the Vessel Master form (which has been available for download through NMFS Alaska Region's Chinook PSC EDR page since early 2012) be used by captains to collect and maintain a written record of responses during or shortly after the pollock fishing season. To further encourage this, the EDR web portal was reconfigured for the 2013 EDR to provide vessel owners and captains access to the online 2013 Vessel Master form as early as November 6, including the ability for captains to complete and certify their required survey form(s) at any time prior to the June 1, 2014 submission deadline. Options for changing the timing of the Vessel Master Survey could be developed and implemented for all AFA captains to improve data quality, if warranted and generally supported by EDR submitters, with little to no increase in submitter burden.

5.2 Compensated Transfer Report (CTR) discussion

As noted above, for 2012, no compensated transfers were reported by any entity. On a positive note, the lack of recorded transfers indicates that most individual vessels are staying under their share of PSC bycatch units allocated under the IPAs. However, it is unclear how effective the CTR will be at capturing pricing information for Chinook PSCs, as discussed below.

As reported in the inshore IPA report for the 2012 fishing year, numerous transfers of pollock quota and paired transfers of Chinook PSC and pollock quota occurred during the 2012 fishing year, with a small number of transfers consisting exclusively of Chinook PSC within a cooperative (~50 out of 600 total transfers)¹². At meetings with inshore sector representatives in April 2013, industry representatives expressed concerns about the potential expectation of correspondence between transfers to be reported in the CTR form and those reported in the IPA report. Cooperative members and industry representatives made the case that in-season transfers of pollock and Chinook PSC between coop members as reported in Table 4 of the inshore IPA report are only posted for purpose of the SSIP. Rather than functioning as a continuous spot market for both PSC and pollock quota, under the SSIP, vessels harvesting “transferred” pollock quota are typically paid a harvest fee by the quota holder rather than paying out lease fees and receiving the entire ex-vessel payment from the processor. As such, neither the pollock quota nor the PSC is legally transferred as a financial asset and the original quota holder

¹¹ To constrain the submission of data associated with financial contracts that are typically settled post-season to an appropriately delayed time, for example.

¹² This report is available at http://alaskafisheries.noaa.gov/npfmc/PDFdocuments/catch_shares/CoopRpts2013/CVSalmSavingsIPA-313.pdf.

retains control of both the pollock and PSC until it is caught by the vessel and debited from their balance in the coop. As a result, financial settlements that are made post-season involving pollock quota and PSC transferred and used in-season cannot be disaggregated to identify payment-per-unit of PSC based solely on contract prices and the quantities reported in Table 4 of the IPA report. In addition, as described by industry members, the amount of PSC used on a landing makes no difference in the amount that a vessel gets paid for harvesting a given amount of transferred pollock, and none of the PSC-only transfers identified in the IPA report were compensated.¹³

As initially conceived, the intent of the CTR component of the data collection was to measure the price of salmon PSC units as observed in in-season "spot-market" leases. Theoretically, the price of Chinook PSC in the pollock fishery at any given time is a function of their scarcity, the cost of avoiding PSC, and the expected value of pollock harvest. With information on market prices of both PSC and pollock quota, analysts could estimate the costs of the hard cap and salmon avoidance over time to the fishery during times in which Chinook PSC allocation is a binding constraint. This would provide important information to assess the effectiveness of Chinook PSC reduction measures under Amendment 91.

In the current CTR form, for all in-season¹⁴ compensated transfers, submitters are required to report the amount of PSC transferred, the total payment amount, and check a box to indicate whether any additional (unspecified) assets were transferred. Transferred PSC is most commonly bundled with a proportional quantity of pollock quota, but with no information reported other than the quantity of PSC and the total value of the bundled transfer, the price of Chinook PSC in such observations could not be identified directly or estimated using standard statistical methods. Thus, if a market should emerge in the future, useable data to support estimation of market prices for PSC units will be limited to PSC-only transfers. Without information on the value of pollock quota transferred, it will be difficult to estimate the relationship between observed PSC prices and PSC levels.

If Chinook PSC levels were to come closer to the cap level and Chinook PSC allocated under the IPAs become a constraint on pollock harvest across a larger portion of the fleet, it is possible that a market for PSC will develop and the values of compensated transfers as currently specified would be observed through the CTR. However, due to the limitations discussed above, it is not clear that this would be the case, even during seasons of higher than average PSC encounters.

5.3 Fuel Survey discussion

Until the implementation of Amendment 91 no data had been regularly collected on fuel consumption and expenditures in the Bering Sea pollock fishery. Fuel costs are one of direct expenditures that results from vessels choosing to travel to different areas to fish to avoid Chinook bycatch. These data will be integrated with other data to better understand the constraints and choices faced by different vessels

¹³ In light of the description of the transfers given by industry, AFSC staff advised submitters that it was not necessary that the CTR forms submitted by cooperative member vessel owners correspond to their respective transfers identified in the IPA report. However, if PSC transfers were recorded in any final compensation settlement of quota lease or harvest services contracts, such transactions should be recorded in the CTR.

¹⁴ In the current CTR form, pre-season transfers are not reported.

which may lead to different Chinook PSC outcomes. While much of the data on the value of fishing in different areas at different times is based on differences in catch rates and product values, fuel costs are also a significant element of economic decisions about Chinook avoidance. The information collected reveals that there are considerable differences in fuel efficiency among vessels. As such, different vessels have different costs and therefore, incentives, to avoid Chinook. Fuel cost information is very valuable because it will allow better modeling of trade-offs for specific vessels of moving to avoid Chinook, especially as we begin to observe a greater number of years and the associated variation in fuel use.

5.4 Salmon movement checkbox discussion

As noted above, beginning in early 2012, catcher processors had a checkbox to record salmon PSC related vessel movement in their electronic logbook forms. However, a very limited number of vessels utilized the vessel movement checkbox in 2012 or 2013. In part this may be because Chinook salmon bycatch was very low compared to historical periods. It's also possible that not all vessel personnel are clear of what is intended to be captured by the checkbox. Ed Richardson of the At-Sea Processors Association contacted AFSC to discuss how to productively designate different movements and some standardization was conveyed to the CP fleet. One mothership operator noted that while the MS catcher vessels that deliver to it adjust their behavior significantly because of Chinook, the mothership platforms did not move as a result of Chinook in 2012.

Analysis of the vessel master survey indicates that vessels in all sectors report that they regularly make spatial choices to avoid potentially high Chinook PSC areas. However, the nature of the movement checkbox may be that the definition of a "move" is unclear if all location choices are at least partially based on potential Chinook PSC.

Our expectations regarding the effectiveness of this question were that respondents would tend to check this box if there was any consideration made regarding salmon, in part reflecting their desire to abide by program goals and because PSC avoidance since Amendment 91 truly is an integral part of many decisions when fishing for pollock. As such, it may not be a successful "binary" indicator of Chinook avoidance, as we believe was envisioned by the industry members who devised and suggested this approach. The standard struggle that fishers and other members of industry have expressed about utilizing the checkbox is that Chinook is always a factor in location decisions, so by some rationale the checkbox could always be checked. If it were used in a consistent manner, it could be correlated with vessel responses to PSC rates and to better understand when vessels are observing PSC and reacting to it. The checkbox has been used only a few times and without more standardization it will be difficult to interpret how it is being used even if it is used more. Possible means to improve the checkbox include:

- Clarify instructions to the fleet, either formally or informally to ensure data quality; or
- Include a question on the vessel master survey to allow each captain to explain how each vessel utilized the checkbox.

In 2014, AFSC economists will work with industry to attempt to clarify the checkbox instructions and make reporting more consistent. We will continue to assess the utility of the checkbox going forward.

ANNUAL
**AMENDMENT 91/CHINOOK EDR
AFA POLLOCK FISHERY**
CHINOOK PSC ALLOCATION IN-SEASON
**COMPENSATED TRANSFER
REPORT**
CALENDAR YEAR 2012

EXAMPLE ONLY. SUBMIT EDR ONLINE AT
<https://chinookedr.psmfc.org>



PUBLIC REPORTING BURDEN STATEMENT

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 40 hours per response, including time for reviewing the instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden to Assistant Regional Administrator, Sustainable Fisheries Division, NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service, P.O. Box 21668, Juneau, AK 99802-1668.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Before completing this form, please note the following: 1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person is required to respond to, nor shall any person be subject to a penalty for failure to comply with, a collection of information subject to the requirements of the Paperwork Reduction Act, unless that collection of information displays a currently valid OMB Control Number; 2) This information is mandatory and is required to manage commercial fishing efforts for groundfish under section 402(a) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (Magnuson-Stevens Act) (16 U.S.C. 1801, *et seq.*) as amended in 2006; 3) Responses to this information request are confidential under section 402(b) of the Magnuson-Stevens Act. They are also confidential under NOAA Administrative Order 216-100, which sets forth procedures to protect confidentiality of fishery statistics.

ANNUAL CHINOOK EDR COMPENSATED TRANSFER REPORT

The Chinook Salmon Economic Data Report (EDR) Program provides additional data to assess the effectiveness of the Chinook salmon bycatch management measures implemented under Amendment 91 to the Fishery Management Plan for Groundfish of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area. The information collected is a combination of quantitative and qualitative data to conduct descriptive and quantitative analysis and comparisons of the annual and seasonal changes in the pollock fleet under Amendment 91.

An owner or leaseholder of an American Fisheries Act (AFA) permitted vessel and the representative of any entity that received an allocation of Chinook Prohibited Species Catch (PSC) from NMFS must complete and submit the Certification Page (Part 1) of a PSC Compensated Transfer Report (CTR) each year, for the previous calendar year.

Any person who paid or received money for a transfer of Chinook salmon PSC allocation after January 20 must complete and submit both the Certification Page and Chinook Salmon PSC Allocation Transfer Information (Parts 1 and 2) for the previous calendar year.

This CTR is intended to provide information to fishery managers to evaluate the effectiveness of Chinook salmon bycatch management measures. The CTR collects information on transfers of Chinook salmon PSC allocation to or from another person during each calendar year for which the transferor or transferee paid or received monetary compensation. Compensated transfers are those transfers that include monetary compensation for a part of or the whole value of the transferred Chinook PSC allocation.

Please provide all requested information.

If you have questions regarding this CTR, or need additional information, contact:

Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission
NMFS Economic Data Reports
205 SE Spokane, Suite 100
Portland, OR 97202

FAX: 503-595-3450

EMAIL: CTR@psmfc.org

TELEPHONE toll free 1-877-741-8913

OR

Brian Garber-Yonts
NMFS Alaska Fisheries Science Center

EMAIL: brian.garber-yonts@noaa.gov

TELEPHONE: 206-526-6301

SUBMIT CTR CERTIFICATION PAGE OR ENTIRE CTR ELECTRONICALLY
ON OR BEFORE 1700 HOURS A.L.T. ON JUNE 1 TO:

<https://chinookedr.psmfc.org>

ANNUAL CHINOOK EDR COMPENSATED TRANSFER REPORT

PART 1: Certification Page

Entity Information

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| Check the one appropriate entity type and record the name and AFA Permit Number or NMFS ID for the entity. | | |
| Reporting Entity Type | <input type="checkbox"/> AFA Vessel | <input type="checkbox"/> IPA ¹ |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Inshore Cooperative | <input type="checkbox"/> Sector-level Entity ² |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> CDQ ³ Group | <input type="checkbox"/> Other: describe |
| Name of Reporting Entity | | AFA Permit Number or Entity NMFS ID |

¹IPA = Incentive Plan Agreement

²Sector-level entity = Catcher/processor, mothership, or inshore entity

³CDQ group = Western Alaska Community Development Quota Group

NOTE: Fishery cooperatives are managed in three pollock sectors (catcher/processor, mothership, and inshore). A portion of the Bering Sea pollock fishery is managed by a separate CDQ program.

Submittal of Compensated Transfer Report: Select one of the following statements (check one box below)...

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | You are the owner or leaseholder of an AFA permitted vessel or are a person or representative of an entity that received an allocation of Chinook PSC from NMFS and NO FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS OCCURRED this fishing year. Complete and submit CERTIFICATION PAGE ONLY |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | You are the owner or leaseholder of an AFA permitted vessel or are a person or representative of an entity who paid or received money for a transfer of Chinook salmon PSC allocation after January 20. Complete and submit ENTIRE COMPENSATED TRANSFER FORM (both Part 1 and Part 2) |

Person Completing this Report

| | |
|--|---------------------|
| Check one and provide the name, title or NMFS ID, and contact information for the individual submitting the form. | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Representative for an IPA, Inshore Cooperative, Sector-Level Entity, or CDQ Group <input type="checkbox"/> Vessel Owner/Leaseholder <input type="checkbox"/> Other Designated Representative; Explain | |
| Name | Title or NMFS ID |
| Business Number Telephone | Business FAX Number |
| Business E-mail address (if available) | |

Certification: Read the following statement, and sign and date the box below:

| | |
|---|-------------|
| <i>I certify under penalty of perjury that I have reviewed all the information in this report and that it is true and complete to the best of my knowledge.</i> | |
| Signature of Owner or Leaseholder | Date signed |

ANNUAL CHINOOK EDR COMPENSATED TRANSFER REPORT PART 2. Chinook PSC Allocation Transfer Information

Report each transfer of Chinook salmon Prohibited Species Catch (PSC) allocation to or from another person or entity during the calendar year 20XX for which you paid or received monetary compensation. Compensated transfers are those transfers that include monetary compensation for a part of or the whole value of the transferred Chinook PSC allocation:

NMFS ID: identify the other person who paid or received money for each transfer. If the other person was a vessel owner/leaseholder, record the AFA Vessel Permit Number. For other persons, record the NMFS ID. If an AFA Vessel Permit or NMFS ID of entity is unavailable, record the entity name.

Direction of Transfer: using the checkbox, indicate if the Chinook salmon were transferred (sold) to another person by you, or transferred (bought) from another person by you.

Date of transfer: record the date Chinook salmon were transferred to the receiving person. This may not be the date of final settlement on terms of compensation.

Transfer Type: Identify the type(s) of association between you and the other entity in the transfer. Use the following codes to identify the type(s) of association (check all that apply):

| Association Type | Association between transfer entities description |
|------------------|---|
| 1 | Transfer is between 2 persons which are affiliated as under AFA as defined in 50 CFR part 679.2 |
| 2 | Transfer is between 2 persons in the same pollock cooperative but not affiliated under AFA |
| 3 | Transfer is between 2 persons in the same AFA sector but not affiliated under AFA or in the same pollock cooperative (inshore only) |
| 4 | Transfer is between 2 persons not part of the same AFA sector or pollock cooperative, and not affiliated under AFA |

Entity Type: indicate the entity type of the other party in the Chinook salmon PSC allocation transfer. Check one: Vessel Owner/Leaseholder, IPA, Inshore Cooperative, Sector-level Entity, CDQ Group, or other entity type.

Chinook Salmon PSC Allocation Transferred and Compensation

Number of Chinook salmon transferred: for each transfer, record the number of Chinook salmon transferred.

Payment amount: record the total amount of money in U.S. dollars for each transfer. Report all payment as of the date of submission of this form. This includes all money paid for the transfer regardless of whether other assets, such as pollock quota, are included in the transaction. Do not report any compensation made in any form other than monetary compensation.

Other assets included: If the transaction included assets other than Chinook salmon and monetary compensation, indicate this using the checkbox. Other assets could include pollock quota, goods, or services of value. Do not check the box if additional assets included only assets of nominal or no value.

ANNUAL
**AMENDMENT 91/CHINOOK EDR
AFA POLLOCK FISHERY
VESSEL FUEL SURVEY
CALENDAR YEAR 2012**

EXAMPLE ONLY. SUBMIT EDR ONLINE AT
<https://chinookedr.psmfc.org>



PUBLIC REPORTING BURDEN STATEMENT

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 4 hours per response, including time for reviewing the instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden to Assistant Regional Administrator, Sustainable Fisheries Division, NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service, P.O. Box 21668, Juneau, AK 99802-1668.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Before completing this form, please note the following: 1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person is required to respond to, nor shall any person be subject to a penalty for failure to comply with, a collection of information subject to the requirements of the Paperwork Reduction Act, unless that collection of information displays a currently valid OMB Control Number; 2) This information is mandatory and is required to manage commercial fishing efforts for groundfish under section 402(a) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1801, *et seq.*) (Magnuson-Stevens Act) as amended in 2006; 3) Responses to this information request are confidential under section 402(b) of the Magnuson-Stevens Act. They are also confidential under NOAA Administrative Order 216-100, which sets forth procedures to protect confidentiality of fishery statistics.

ANNUAL CHINOOK EDR AFA POLLOCK VESSEL FUEL SURVEY

The Chinook Salmon Economic Data Report (EDR) Program provides additional data to assess the effectiveness of the Chinook salmon bycatch management measures implemented under Amendment 91 to the Fishery Management Plan for Groundfish of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area. The information collected is a combination of quantitative and qualitative data to conduct descriptive and quantitative analysis and comparisons of the annual and seasonal changes in the pollock fleet under Amendment 91.

An owner or leaseholder of an American Fisheries Act (AFA) permitted vessel used to harvest or process pollock in the Bering Sea must submit the Vessel Fuel Survey each year, for the previous calendar year.

This Fuel Survey is intended to provide information to fishery managers to evaluate the effectiveness of Chinook salmon bycatch management measures. The Fuel Survey collects information on the quantity and cost of all fuel consumed by each AFA vessel harvesting or processing pollock during the calendar year.

If you have questions regarding this survey or need additional information, contact:

Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission

NMFS Economic Data Reports
205 SE Spokane, Suite 100
Portland, OR 97202

FAX: 503-595-3450

EMAIL: CTR@psmfc.org

TELEPHONE toll free 1-877-741-8913

OR

Brian Garber-Yonts
NMFS Alaska Fisheries Science Center

TELEPHONE: 206-526-6301

EMAIL: brian.garber-yonts@noaa.gov

**SUBMIT VESSEL FUEL SURVEY CERTIFICATION PAGE OR
ENTIRE VESSEL FUEL SURVEY ELECTRONICALLY
ON OR BEFORE 1700 HOURS A.L.T. ON JUNE 1 TO:**

<https://chinookedr.psmfc.org>

**ANNUAL CHINOOK EDR AFA POLLOCK VESSEL FUEL SURVEY
PART 1: Certification Page**

AFA-permitted vessel and owner identification

| | |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|
| Vessel Owner /Leaseholder Name | NMFS ID |
| Vessel Name | AFA Permit Number |

Submittal of Vessel Fuel Survey: Select one of the following statements (check one box below).

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | You were the AFA owner or leaseholder for an AFA permitted vessel that harvested or processed AFA pollock during the calendar year 20XX. Complete and submit ENTIRE VESSEL FUEL SURVEY FORM In addition, submit all the Vessel Fuel Surveys received from and completed by Hired Masters on that same vessel. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | You were the AFA owner or leaseholder for an AFA permitted vessel that DID NOT HARVEST OR PROCESS AFA pollock during the calendar year 20XX. Complete and submit the Certification Page ONLY |

Person Submitting this Report

| | |
|--|---------------------|
| Provide the name, title or NMFS ID, and contact information for the individual submitting the form. | |
| Name | Title or NMFS ID |
| Business Number Telephone | Business FAX Number |
| Business E-mail address (if available) | |

Certification: Read the following statement, and sign and date the box below:

| | |
|--|-------------|
| <i>I certify under penalty of perjury that I have reviewed all the information in this report and that it is true and complete to the best of my knowledge.</i> | |
| Signature | Date signed |

ANNUAL CHINOOK EDR AFA POLLOCK VESSEL FUEL SURVEY
PART 2: Vessel Fuel Consumption and Cost

Instructions

For each vessel operated by you in the AFA pollock fishery during calendar year 20XX, report the following information:

1. AFA Vessel Permit Number
2. Average rate of fuel consumption.

Report fuel consumption rates for the pollock fishery only.

For each vessel, report the average rate of fuel consumption under average operating conditions during the calendar year. Report the fuel consumption rate separately for operating while towing and operating while transiting (traveling between points on fishing grounds, but not towing).

For motherships, report the rate of fuel consumption for transiting only. If you do not have equipment on the vessel for actively monitoring the rate of fuel usage, provide the most accurate estimate you can based on the best information you have available.

3. Annual Fuel Loaded and Total Cost.

For each vessel, report the total amount of fuel loaded to the vessel, in gallons, during the calendar year and total cost of fuel for this vessel during the calendar year. Include all fuel that was loaded and invoiced, even if not completely used or paid for during the calendar year.

Do not include lubrication and fluids costs other than fuel.

ANNUAL
**AMENDMENT 91/CHINOOK EDR
AFA POLLOCK FISHERY
VESSEL MASTER SURVEY
CALENDAR YEAR 2012**

EXAMPLE ONLY. SUBMIT EDR ONLINE AT
<https://chinookedr.psmfc.org>



PUBLIC REPORTING BURDEN STATEMENT

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 4 hours per response, including time for reviewing the instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden to Assistant Regional Administrator, Sustainable Fisheries Division, NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service, P.O. Box 21668, Juneau, AK 99802-1668.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Before completing this form, please note the following: 1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person is required to respond to, nor shall any person be subject to a penalty for failure to comply with, a collection of information subject to the requirements of the Paperwork Reduction Act, unless that collection of information displays a currently valid OMB Control Number; 2) This information is mandatory and is required to manage commercial fishing efforts for groundfish under section 402(a) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Management and Conservation Act (Magnuson-Stevens Act) (16 U.S.C. 1801, *et seq.*) as amended in 2006; 3) Responses to this information request are confidential under section 402(b) of the Magnuson-Stevens Act. They are also confidential under NOAA Administrative Order 216-100, which sets forth procedures to protect confidentiality of fishery statistics.

ANNUAL CHINOOK EDR: VESSEL MASTER SURVEY

The Chinook Salmon Economic Data Report (EDR) Program provides additional data to assess the effectiveness of the Chinook salmon bycatch management measures implemented under Amendment 91 to the Fishery Management Plan for Groundfish of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area. The information collected is a combination of quantitative and qualitative data to conduct descriptive and quantitative analysis and comparisons of the annual and seasonal changes in the pollock fleet under Amendment 91.

An owner or leaseholder of an American Fisheries Act (AFA) permitted vessel must submit a Vessel Master Survey completed by each master of each vessel used to harvest pollock in the Bering Sea in the previous year. It is the responsibility of the vessel owner/leaseholder to obtain a completed Vessel Master Surveys and submit all completed surveys to NMFS.

The Vessel Master Survey has two parts. Part 1 is the Vessel Owner Certification Page. Part 2: Pollock Fishing and Salmon Bycatch Avoidance, is to be completed by the vessel master and asks about different aspects of decision-making during the pollock season, including incentives, fishing location choices, and salmon bycatch reduction measures.

If you have questions regarding this survey or need additional information, contact:

Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission

NMFS Economic Data Reports
205 SE Spokane, Suite 100
Portland, OR 97202

FAX: 503-595-3450

EMAIL: CTR@psmfc.org

TELEPHONE toll free 1-877-741-8913

OR

Brian Garber-Yonts
NMFS Alaska Fisheries Science Center

TELEPHONE: 206-526-6301

EMAIL: brian.garber-yonts@noaa.gov

**SUBMIT CERTIFICATION PAGE OR ENTIRE VESSEL MASTER SURVEY ELECTRONICALLY
ON OR BEFORE 1700 HOURS A.L.T. ON JUNE 1 TO:**

<https://chinookedr.psmfc.org>

**ANNUAL CHINOOK EDR: VESSEL MASTER SURVEY
PART 1: Vessel Owner Certification Page**

AFA-permitted vessel and owner identification and name and CFEC gear operator permit number for all vessel masters operating the vessel in the AFA pollock fishery during calendar year 20xx

| | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| Vessel Owner /Leaseholder Name | NMFS_ID |
| Vessel Name | AFA Permit Number |
| Vessel Master Name | CFEC ¹ Gear Operator Permit Number |
| Vessel Master Name | CFEC Gear Operator Permit Number |
| Vessel Master Name | CFEC Gear Operator Permit Number |
| Vessel Master Name | CFEC Gear Operator Permit Number |

¹CFEC = State of Alaska Commercial Fisheries Entry Commission

Submittal of Vessel Master Survey

Select one of the following statements (check one box below)

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | You were the AFA owner or leaseholder for an AFA permitted vessel that harvested or processed AFA pollock during the calendar year 20XX. Complete and submit ENTIRE VESSEL MASTER SURVEY FORM (both Part 1 and Part 2) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | You were the AFA owner or leaseholder for an AFA permitted vessel that DID NOT HARVEST OR PROCESS AFA pollock during the calendar year 20XX. Complete and submit the VESSEL OWNER CERTIFICATION PAGE (Part 1) ONLY |

Person Submitting this Report

| | |
|--|---------------------|
| Provide the name, title or NMFS ID, and contact information for the individual submitting the form. | |
| Name | Title or NMFS ID |
| Business Number Telephone | Business FAX Number |
| Business E-mail address (if available) | |

Certification: Read the following statement, and sign and date the box below:

| | |
|--|-------------|
| <i>I certify under penalty of perjury that I have reviewed all the information in this report and that it is true and complete to the best of my knowledge.</i> | |
| Signature | Date signed |

**ANNUAL CHINOOK EDR: VESSEL MASTER SURVEY
PART 2: Pollock Fishing and Salmon Bycatch Avoidance**

Each Vessel Master on the AFA-permitted vessel must complete the Hired Master information and sign and date the certification. *Duplicate Part 2 if additional entries are needed.*

Hired Master Certification

| | |
|---|----------------------------------|
| Vessel Master Name | CFEC Gear Operator Permit Number |
| I certify under penalty of perjury that I have reviewed all the information in this report and that it is true and complete to the best of my knowledge. | |
| Signature (Vessel Master) | Date signed |

Please consider the following questions carefully and provide the most complete answers you can. Where applicable, please note any differences between the A and B pollock seasons. Please attach extra sheets if more space is needed to complete your answers.

1. If the vessel participated in an Incentive Plan Agreement (IPA), did the IPA affect your fishing strategy?
 YES NO

If YES, please describe and discuss what incentives had the largest impact on your strategy.

2. Did the amount and/or cost of Chinook PSC allocation available to the vessel lead you to make changes in pollock fishing operations?
 YES NO

If YES, please describe.

3. How would you compare the Chinook salmon bycatch and pollock conditions during the A and B seasons this year relative to the last two years? Please describe any unique aspects of the season.
4. Did Chinook salmon bycatch conditions cause you to delay the start of your pollock fishing or otherwise alter the timing of your pollock fishing for some period during the past A and/or B season?
 YES NO

If YES, please describe the Chinook salmon bycatch condition, when it occurred, and any change in your pollock fishing as a result.

5. In the past year, did you end a trip and return to port early because of Chinook salmon bycatch conditions?

YES NO

If YES, please indicate the number of trips that this occurred in each season (use a checkmark ✓ to indicate appropriate answer for each season).

| Number of trips suspended due to bycatch | Season | |
|--|--------|---|
| | A | B |
| 0 | | |
| 1-3 | | |
| 4-10 | | |
| More than 10 | | |

6. Please describe how any area closures or restrictions for the purpose of reducing Chinook salmon bycatch affected where and how you fished.

7. Please describe how any regulatory or other area closures or restrictions for a purpose other than reducing Chinook salmon bycatch affected where and how you fished.

8. Compared to a typical year, did weather or sea ice conditions have more, less, or about the same impact on fishing as in a typical year? Please describe especially if there were particularly uncommon conditions at any point this year. If these conditions had an impact on your ability to avoid Chinook salmon bycatch, please describe.

9. Were there exceptional factors that affected your pollock fishing this year? For example, were there unusual market or stock conditions, unusual pollock fishing conditions, or maintenance problems? Please describe.

10. Separate from an Incentive Plan Agreement, were there other incentives for you to reduce Chinook salmon bycatch?

YES NO

If YES, please describe.

11. Did actual or potential bycatch of species other than Chinook salmon cause you to change your harvesting decisions during the pollock season?

YES NO

If YES, please describe.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration****Proposed Information Collection; Comment Request; Alaska Chinook Salmon Economic Data Report (EDR)**

AGENCY: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Commerce.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, invites the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on proposed and/or continuing information collections, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

DATES: Written comments must be submitted on or before November 24, 2014.

ADDRESSES: Direct all written comments to Jennifer Jessup, Departmental Paperwork Clearance Officer, Department of Commerce, Room 6616, 14th and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230 (or via the Internet at Jjessup@doc.gov).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Requests for additional information or copies of the information collection instrument and instructions should be directed to Patsy A. Bearden, (907) 586-7008, or patsy.bearden@noaa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**I. Abstract**

National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), Alaska Region manages the groundfish fisheries in the Exclusive Economic Zone off Alaska. The North Pacific Fishery Management Council (Council) prepared the Fishery Management Plan for Groundfish of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area (FMP) under the authority of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, 16 U.S.C. 1801 *et seq.* (Magnuson-Stevens Act). The FMP is implemented under regulations at 50 CFR part 679.

NMFS manages the Bering Sea pollock fishery under the American Fisheries Act (AFA) (16 U.S.C. 1851). The AFA "rationalized" the Bering Sea pollock fishery in part by allowing for the formation and management of fishery cooperatives. AFA fishing vessels harvest pollock using pelagic (mid-water) trawl gear, which consists of large nets towed through the water by the vessel. At times, Chinook salmon and pollock occur in the same locations in the Bering Sea. Consequently,

Chinook salmon are incidentally caught in the nets as pollock is harvested. This incidental catch is called bycatch and is also called prohibited species catch (PSC). Chinook Salmon are defined as a prohibited species because they are caught by a vessel issued a Federal Fisheries Permit under § 679.4(b) while fishing for groundfish (pollock) in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area (BSAI) or Gulf of Alaska.

In December 2009, the Council recommended that NMFS implement the Chinook Salmon Economic Data Report (Chinook Salmon EDR) to evaluate the effectiveness of Chinook salmon bycatch management measures for the Bering Sea pollock fishery that were implemented under Amendment 91 to the BSAI FMP (75 FR 53026, August 30, 2010).

The Chinook EDR Program provides information to the analysts and the Council for determining the effectiveness of the Incentive Plan Agreement (IPA). The Chinook EDR Program evaluates the effectiveness of the IPA incentives, the PSC limits, and the performance standard in terms of minimizing salmon bycatch in times of high and low levels of salmon abundance, and evaluates how Amendment 91 affects where, when, and how pollock fishing and salmon bycatch occur. The data collection program also provides data for NMFS and the Council to study and verify conclusions drawn by industry in the IPA annual reports.

II. Method of Collection

Attachment to email, electronically (Internet), fax, or mail.

III. Data

OMB Control Number: 0648-0633.

Form Number(s): None.

Type of Review: Regular submission (extension of a current information collection).

Affected Public: Individuals or households; business or other for-profit organizations.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 200.

Estimated Time Per Response: 40 hours for Compensated Transfer Report; 4 hours each for Vessel Fuel Survey, Vessel Master Survey; and Chinook EDR Verification/Audit.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 9,976.

Estimated Total Annual Cost to Public: \$25,958.

IV. Request for Comments

Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the proposed collection of information

is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden (including hours and cost) of the proposed collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Comments submitted in response to this notice will be summarized and/or included in the request for OMB approval of this information collection; they also will become a matter of public record.

Dated: September 17, 2014.

Gwellnar Banks,

Management Analyst, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 2014-22511 Filed 9-22-14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-22-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration****National Estuarine Research Reserve System**

AGENCY: Estuarine Reserves Division, Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management, National Ocean Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of approval of the Waquoit Bay, Massachusetts National Estuarine Research Reserve Management Plan Revision.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the Estuarine Reserves Division, Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management, National Ocean Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce approves the Waquoit Bay, Massachusetts National Estuarine Research Reserve Management Plan revision. The revised management plan outlines the administrative structure; the research, education, training, and stewardship goals of the reserve; and the plans for future land acquisition and facility development to support reserve operations. The Waquoit Bay Reserve Management Plan revision will replace the plan approved in 2006.

The Waquoit Bay, Massachusetts National Estuarine Research Reserve takes an integrated approach to