NOTICE OF OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET ACTION

Date 10/16/2012

Department of Commerce
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
FOR CERTIFYING OFFICIAL: Simon Szykman
FOR CLEARANCE OFFICER: Diana Hynek

In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act, OMB has taken action on your request received 10/16/2012

ACTION REQUESTED: New collection (Request for a new OMB Control Number)
TYPE OF REVIEW REQUESTED: Regular
ICR REFERENCE NUMBER: 201210-0648-008
AGENCY ICR TRACKING NUMBER:
TITLE: Marine Recreational Information Program
LIST OF INFORMATION COLLECTIONS: See next page

OMB ACTION: Approved with change
OMB CONTROL NUMBER: 0648-0652
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: 10/31/2015 DISCONTINUE DATE:

BURDEN:	RESPONSES	HOURS	COSTS
Previous	0	0	0
New	53,400	8,900	0
Difference			
Change due to New Statute	0	0	0
Change due to Agency Discretion	53,400	8,900	0
Change due to Agency Adjustment	0	0	0
Change Due to Potential Violation of the PRA	0	0	0

TERMS OF CLEARANCE:

OMB Authorizing Official: Kevin F. Neyland
Deputy Administrator,
Office Of Information And Regulatory Affairs

List of ICs			
IC Title	Form No.	Form Name	CFR Citation
Resident Angler Survey	NA, NA	MRIP Recreational Fishing Survey, Weather and Outdoor Activity Survey	
Nonresident Angler Survey	NA	MRIP Recreational Fishing Survey	
Non-response survey	NA, NA, NA	MRIP Recreational Fishing Survey, MRIP Recreational Filshing Survey, Weather and Outdoor Activity Survey	

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.

1. Agency/Subagency originating request
DOC/NOAA/NMFS

2. OMB control number b. [✔] None
a. 0648 -

3. Type of information collection (*check one*)
a. [✔] New Collection
b. [ ] Revision of a currently approved collection
c. [ ] Extension of a currently approved collection
d. [ ] Reinstatement, without change, of a previously approved collection for which approval has expired
e. [ ] Reinstatement, with change, of a previously approved collection for which approval has expired
f. [ ] Existing collection in use without an OMB control number
For b-f, note Item A2 of Supporting Statement instructions

4. Type of review requested (*check one*)
a. [✔] Regular submission
b. [ ] Emergency - Approval requested by ____/____/____
c. [ ] Delegated

5. Small entities
Will this information collection have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities? [ ] Yes [✔] No

6. Requested expiration date
a. [✔] Three years from approval date b. [ ] Other Specify:____/____

7. Title Marine Recreational Information Program

8. Agency form number(s) (*if applicable*)

9. Keywords Fishing

10. Abstract

Recent amendments to the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act require that the Marine Recreational Fisheries Statistics Survey (MRFSS) be upgraded and that future fishing surveys target anglers licensed or registered at the State or Federal level. Several pilot studies to test new survey methods have been completed. This new information collection will implement new methodologies for collecting recreational fishing effort data.

11. Affected public (*Mark primary with "P" and all others that apply with "x"*)
a. P Individuals or households d. ___ Farms
b. ___ Business or other for-profit e. ___ Federal Government
c. ___ Not-for-profit institutions f. ___ State, Local or Tribal Government

12. Obligation to respond (*check one*)
a. [✔] Voluntary
b. [ ] Required to obtain or retain benefits
c. [ ] Mandatory

13. Annual recordkeeping and reporting burden
a. Number of respondents 53,099
b. Total annual responses 53,099
1. Percentage of these responses collected electronically 0 %
c. Total annual hours requested 8,850
d. Current OMB inventory 0
e. Difference 8,850
f. Explanation of difference
1. Program change 8,850
2. Adjustment

14. Annual reporting and recordkeeping cost burden (*in thousands of dollars*)
a. Total annualized capital/startup costs 0
b. Total annual costs (O&M) 0
c. Total annualized cost requested 0
d. Current OMB inventory 0
e. Difference 0
f. Explanation of difference
1. Program change 0
2. Adjustment 0

15. Purpose of information collection (*Mark primary with "P" and all others that apply with "X"*)
a. ___ Application for benefits e. ___ Program planning or management
b. ___ Program evaluation f. X Research
c. P General purpose statistics g. ___ Regulatory or compliance
d. ___ Audit

16. Frequency of recordkeeping or reporting (*check all that apply*)
a. [ ] Recordkeeping b. [ ] Third party disclosure
c. [✔] Reporting
1. [✔] On occasion 2. [ ] Weekly 3. [ ] Monthly
4. [ ] Quarterly 5. [ ] Semi-annually 6. [ ] Annually
7. [ ] Biennially 8. [ ] Other (describe) ____

17. Statistical methods
Does this information collection employ statistical methods
[✔] Yes [ ] No

18. Agency Contact (person who can best answer questions regarding the content of this submission)
Name: Rob Andrews
Phone: (301) 427-8105

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 signed by Dr. Ned Cyr	Date 10/05/2012
Signature of NOAA Clearance Officer	
Signature signed by Sarah Brabson	Date 10/5/2012

SUPPORTING STATEMENT
MARINE RECREATIONAL INFORMATION PROGRAM
OMB CONTROL NO. xxxx-xxxx

A. JUSTIFICATION

This request is for a new information collection.

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

Collection of recreational fisheries catch and effort data is necessary to fulfill statutory requirements of Section 303 of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1852 et. seq.) and to comply with Executive Order 12962 on Recreational Fisheries. Section 303 (a) of the Magnuson-Stevens Act specifies data and analyses to be included in Fishery Management Plans (FMPs), as well as pertinent data that shall be submitted to the Secretary of Commerce under the plan.

Traditionally, recreational fishing effort data (number of fishing trips) have been collected through the Coastal Household Telephone Survey (CHTS), a list-assisted, random digit dial telephone survey of coastal county households (OMB Control No. 0648-0052). In recent years, the efficiency and effectiveness of RDD surveys in general, and the CHTS specifically, have been questioned due to declining rates of coverage and response. To address concerns about the CHTS, the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) commissioned a review of the survey by the National Research Council (NRC) of the National Academies of Science. The NRC Review concluded that existing recreational fishing surveys suffer from inefficiency, potential bias due to under-coverage, and potential bias due to nonresponse (NRC, 2006).

Specific recommendations and conclusions from the NRC Review include the following:

- "Future telephone surveys should be based on a universal sampling frame";
- "Offsite sampling methods that rely on telephone interviews are complicated by the increasing use of cell phones";
- "The existing random digit dial (RDD) survey suffers in efficiency";
- "The existing random digit dial (RDD) survey may allow bias in estimation from its restriction to coastal counties only";
- "Dual-frame procedures should be used whenever possible to reduce sample bias".

NMFS has addressed these concerns by implementing the Marine Recreational Information Program (MRIP) and developing and testing alternative survey designs. Over the past several years, under OMB Control No. 0648-0052, NMFS has sequentially tested several alternatives to the CHTS with a goal of replacing the CHTS with a more accurate and efficient survey of recreational fishing activity. The various designs that have been studied through MRIP pilot studies are described below. More detailed descriptions of the data collection designs and comparisons of estimates and metrics of survey quality, such as response rates and coverage rates, are documented elsewhere (Brick et al., 2012).

Angler License Directory Telephone Survey
As noted by the NRC, a more efficient approach for surveying anglers is to sample directly from a "universal sampling frame" of licensed saltwater anglers. Working collaboratively with the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commissions, the Gulf Coast states, and the North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries, MRIP has designed and tested Angler License Directory Telephone Surveys (ALDS), which sample from state databases of licensed anglers. The ALDS was implemented as a pilot project in Florida, Alabama, Mississippi and Louisiana in 2007 and expanded to North Carolina in 2008. Currently, the survey is being administered in LA and NC.

As predicted, the ALDS is more efficient than the CHTS at identifying anglers – in a recent reference wave, 46% of ALDS respondents reported fishing, while only 6.5% of CHTS respondents reported fishing during the same wave. However, state license databases are not comprehensive - exemptions to state licensing requirements and unlicensed fishing activity, as well as incomplete and inaccurate contact information for individuals included on the sample frames, result in gaps in the coverage of the survey. Subsequent studies (Brick et al., 2012) have suggested that undercoverage due to unlicensed fishing activity may be as high as 70% in some states for certain types of fishing activity, and that as many as 20% of frame entries may be unreachable due to "bad" (missing, nonworking, wrong number) telephone numbers. In addition, response rates for the ALDS are only marginally higher than CHTS response rates. Consequently, MRIP has explored alternative data collection designs that provide greater coverage and are less susceptible to survey error.

Dual-Frame Telephone Survey
As noted above, the CHTS and the ALDS, considered individually, do not provide complete coverage of the angler population; the CHTS excludes residents of non-coastal counties and households without landline telephone service, and the ALDS excludes unlicensed anglers. To compensate for potential sources of coverage error in the CHTS and ALDS, MRIP developed an estimation design that integrates CHTS and ALDS sampling in a dual-frame design (Lai and Andrews, 2008). The union of the CHTS and ALDS sample frames defines three domains; 1) anglers who can only be sampled from the CHTS frame (unlicensed anglers who reside in coastal counties and have a landline telephone); 2) anglers who can only be sampled from the ALDS frame (licensed anglers who reside outside of the coverage area of the CHTS or reside within the coverage area of the CHTS but don't have a landline telephone); and, 3) anglers who can be sampled from both the CHTS and ALDS frames (licensed anglers who reside in coastal counties and have a landline telephone). A fourth domain includes anglers who cannot be sampled by either the CHTS or ALDS (unlicensed anglers without landline telephones within the CHTS coverage area and unlicensed anglers residing outside the coverage area of the CHTS).

The dual-frame telephone survey design has greater coverage than either the CHTS or the ALDS independently. However, exclusions from the union of the CHTS and ALDS sample frames create a potentially significant coverage gap – for example, an estimated 38% of fishing trips in NC are taken by anglers who are not included on either the CHTS or ALDS frames (Andrews et al., 2010). In addition, partitioning anglers into the appropriate domains, and subsequently adjusting sample weights, is based upon survey respondents' willingness and ability to classify themselves as licensed or unlicensed anglers. This is an unreliable approach for defining dual-frame domains (Andrews et al. 2010) and subsequently calculating unbiased survey weights.

Finally, the dual-frame telephone survey approach is susceptible to nonresponse error due to the low response rates of the component surveys.

Dual-Frame Mail Survey

An alternative to the dual-frame telephone survey is to identify and contact anglers through a dual-frame mail survey design. MRIP initially tested the feasibility of a dual-frame mail survey design in NC in 2009, and conducted a follow-up study aimed at enhancing response rates and response times in NC and LA in 2010.

The specific details of the dual-frame mail survey design are described elsewhere (Andrews et al. 2010). Briefly, anglers are sampled from both state databases of licensed saltwater anglers and residential address frames maintained and made commercially available by the United States Postal Service. To address concerns about coverage, all addresses within the study states are included in the ABS sample frame (i.e. the sample was not limited to coastal counties). Domains defined by the union of the component sample frames are determined by matching the address-based sample (ABS) to the license databases by address and/or telephone number (for the cases in which a telephone number can be located through a commercial service for the ABS sample).

Sampling from the license frame is conducted in a single phase; sampled anglers are mailed a brief questionnaire that asks respondents to report the number of days fished from the shore and from a boat during a two-month reference wave. The ABS sampling is conducted in two phases; residential addresses are sampled and mailed a screening questionnaire to identify individuals who fished during the previous twelve months, and anglers identified in the screening phase are sent a second-phase questionnaire that is identical to the license sample questionnaire.

Results of the pilot studies were encouraging; sampling from the ABS frame provides nearly complete coverage of the population (Iannacchione, 2011), and response rates to the mail surveys were considerably higher than either the ALDS or CHTS (Andrews et al., 2010, Brick et al., 2012), minimizing the potential for nonresponse error. In addition, matching the ABS sample to license frames a priori by address and/or telephone number provides a more accurate means for defining domain membership that is not susceptible to recall error or inaccurate reporting. Frame matching also provides supplemental information for assessing nonresponse error for the ABS sample, and subsequently defining nonresponse weighting adjustment cells.

The dual-frame mail survey design provides many benefits over telephone survey approaches and addresses many of the concerns identified by the NRC. However, frame matching is not 100% accurate, resulting in misclassification of domain membership for some sample units; generally frame units that could have been sampled from both frames are excluded from the overlapping domain due to a failure to match. Subsequently, dual-frame weights are not down-weighted appropriately, resulting in an overestimation of fishing effort (Brick et al., 2012). In addition, there are concerns that a mail survey design cannot satisfy customer needs for timely estimates, although comparisons between early mail survey returns and later survey returns show little difference in terms of fishing activity, suggesting that preliminary effort estimates could be produced within the timeframe required by customers.

Dual-Frame, Mixed-Mode Survey

To further address concerns about timeliness, as well as explore differences between mail and telephone data collection modes, MRIP implemented a dual-frame, mixed-mode survey. The sampling design for the survey, which was implemented in January 2012 and will continue through December 2012, is nearly identical to the dual-frame mail survey – anglers are sampled from angler license frames and households are sampled from residential address frames. As with the dual-frame mail survey, the ABS sample is mailed a screening questionnaire to identify anglers. The methodology differs from the dual-frame mail survey in that anglers identified through household screening, as well as anglers sampled from the state license databases, are randomly allocated into telephone and mail treatment groups – anglers in the telephone treatment group are contacted and asked to provide information about recent recreational fishing trips through a telephone interview, and anglers in the mail treatment group are mailed a questionnaire that asks about recent recreational fishing activity.

Preliminary results demonstrate that after three weeks of data collection, response rates for the mail survey treatment equal or exceed response rates for the telephone treatment, which is fielded and completed during the first ten days following the end of the reference wave. In addition, preliminary estimates based upon early mail survey returns (mail surveys returned within three weeks after the conclusion of the reference wave) are not significantly different from final estimates, which include an additional nine weeks of data collection. This suggests that early mail survey returns can be used to produce preliminary effort estimates in a timeframe that is consistent with the current estimation schedule for the CHTS – estimates are available 45 days after the conclusion of each wave. The study will continue through 2012 and compare telephone and mail survey modes in terms of response rates, nonresponse error, data quality (e.g. item nonresponse, illogical responses, etc.) and timeliness.

Single Phase, Screening Dual-Frame Design with Screening Prior to Data Collection

MRIP Fishing Effort Survey

The dual-frame survey designs developed and tested by MRIP address the NRC's concerns about the CHTS. While a comprehensive, universal frame of anglers is not available, sampling from state databases of licensed saltwater anglers increases the efficiency of data collection. Supplementing license frame sampling with state-wide, address-based sampling compensates for coverage gaps in state license databases and subsequently provides nearly complete coverage of the population, including both residents of noncoastal counties and households without landline telephone service. In addition, response rates for the mail surveys are consistently higher than the CHTS, minimizing the potential for nonresponse error.

This request is to test an alternative design for collecting recreational fishing effort data that maintains design aspects from previous MRIP pilot studies, while eliminating bias resulting from errors in frame matching. The MRIP Fishing Effort Survey (MFES) includes three components; 1) a resident angler survey, which estimates fishing effort by residents of coastal states, 2) a nonresident angler survey, which estimates fishing effort by anglers who fish in a coastal state but reside in a different state, and 3) a nonresponse follow-up study to assess nonresponse error in the resident and nonresident angler surveys.

The Resident Angler Survey is a single-phase mail survey that utilizes a screening dual-frame design with screening occurring prior to data collection (Lohr, 2009). Specifically, an ABS sample within a coastal state is matched to that state's angler license database to identify addresses with (matched) and without (unmatched) licensed anglers. In this application, the license information is used to stratify the ABS sample into strata than can be sampled at different rates. For example, the matched stratum, which is expected to be more productive in terms of identifying anglers, can be sampled at a higher rate than the unmatched strata. This type of stratification is expected to improve the efficiency of data collection and maintain the coverage of the ABS frame, two concerns identified by the NRC Review. Because the matching is only used to determine the sampling rate, matching errors will only impact the efficiency of data collection; they will not result in biased estimates.

The Nonresident Angler Survey is a single-phase mail survey that samples directly from frames derived from state databases of licensed saltwater anglers. An address-based sampling approach would be especially inefficient for sampling nonresident anglers due to the low proportion of nonresident anglers among the general population.

The Nonresponse Follow-Up Study will be a more intensive effort to solicit a response from sample units that failed to respond to the Resident Angler Survey and the Nonresident Angler Survey. The study will utilize the same questionnaire as the initial surveys with a modified delivery mechanism.

The MFES will be tested in four states, Massachusetts, New York, North Carolina and Florida for eight, two-month reference waves, beginning with the September/October w*ave (wave 5) of 2012 and continuing through the November/December wave (wave 6) of 2013. These states provide representative geographic coverage of the Atlantic and Gulf coast states, as well as substantial variations in fishing activity, saltwater fishing licensure, demographic composition and population density*. Similarly, the requested data collection period will cover seasonal differences in fishing activity and fishing regulations. The data collection design will be evaluated in terms of response rates, item nonresponse, coverage and efficiency. These measures will be compared to results from the ongoing CHTS, as well as results from previous pilot studies. In addition, state-level estimates of fishing incidence (percent of respondents that report fishing), participants (number of people participating in saltwater fishing) and total fishing effort (number of angler trips) will be compared to estimates generated from the CHTS. Differences (or similarities) in estimates will be explored in terms of the above measures of survey quality.

This information collection will fulfill statutory requirements of Section 401 of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Reauthorization Act. Section 401 (g) requires that the Secretary of Commerce, "establish a program to improve the quality and accuracy of information generated by the Marine Recreational Fishery Statistics Survey". MSA further specifies that future surveys should, "target anglers registered or licensed at the State or Federal level to collect participation and effort data", and that the program, "to the maximum extent feasible implement the recommendations of the National Research Council [(NRC)]".

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.

Recreational fishing catch and effort data are used on an ongoing basis by NMFS, regional fishery management councils, interstate marine fisheries commissions and state natural resource agencies in developing, implementing and monitoring fishery management programs, per statutory requirements of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act. Catch and effort statistics are fundamental for assessing the influence of fishing on any fish stock. Accurate estimates of the quantities taken, fishing effort, and both the seasonal and geographic distributions of the catch and effort are required for the development of regional management policies and plans.

Information collected through the MFES will be used to assess the effectiveness of the data collection design for collecting recreational fishing effort data and subsequently estimating recreational fishing participation and effort. The design will be assessed in terms of response rates, nonresponse error, coverage, unit nonresponse and efficiency. Survey measures will be compared to results from previous pilot studies, as well as the ongoing Coastal Household Telephone Survey. Results of the study will be used to inform decisions about the data collection design of future surveys of recreational fishing effort and participation.

We plan to evaluate two versions of the Resident Angler Survey questionnaire. The first version (Version 1) will be clearly identified as a recreational saltwater fishing survey. The second version (Version 2) will include 3 household-level questions about activities other than recreational saltwater fishing, such as visiting coastal areas and how the household accesses information about the weather. The intent of this evaluation is to maximize responses by both anglers and non-anglers and subsequently minimize the potential for nonresponse error. The questionnaires will be compared in terms of response rates and nonresponse error.

The Nonresident Angler Survey questionnaire will be identical to the Version 1 questionnaire of the Resident Angler Survey.

The questionnaire for the Nonresponse Follow-up Study will be the same as the original survey questionnaire.

Specific data elements that will be collected in the questionnaire include:

a) A screener question about recreational fishing activity during the previous 12 months is asked to identify eligible fishing households,
b) Total number of household residents,
c) Type of household telephone service is used to assess gains in coverage over the CHTS,
d) The type of household unit (rented or owned) is used for nonresponse weighting adjustment and/or post-stratification,
e) Demographic information of household residents, including gender, age and ethnicity is used for nonresponse weighting adjustment and/or post-stratification of estimates,
f) Questions about fishing activity in the past 12 months, 8 months and 4 months are used to screen for recent fishing activity and assist with recall,

g) The number of recreational fishing trips taken on privately owned boats, and number of shore fishing trips taken during the reference wave will be used to estimate fishing effort.
h) Questions about weather and visitation to coastal areas are included to engage non-anglers and potentially reduce nonresponse bias (Version 2 only).

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 response to 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. Although the information collected is not expected to be disseminated directly to the public, survey results will be used in scientific, technical and general information publications. Should NOAA Fisheries decide to disseminate the information, it will be subject to the quality control measures and pre-dissemination review pursuant to Section 515 of Public Law 106-554.

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

The surveys will be conducted by mail interviews. Survey responses for mail surveys will be automatically captured through optical character recognition (OCR), which will greatly increase the accuracy and efficiency of data collection.

4. Describe efforts to identify duplication.

NMFS collaborates with state natural resource agencies and regional interstate fisheries commissions on the Atlantic and Gulf coasts to ensure that recreational fisheries data collections are not duplicative. Every five years, the Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) of the U.S. Department of the Interior conducts the National Survey of Fishing, Hunting and Wildlife-Associated Recreation (OMB Control No. 1018-0088). This survey collects minimal information about annual recreational saltwater fishing activity within the context of additional recreation activities. That survey does not provide the spatial or temporal resolution needed by managers of fishery resources to monitor and manage recreational fisheries landings.

The MRIP Fishing Effort Survey will overlap with the Coastal Household Telephone Survey (OMB Control No. 0648-0052), which is a random-digit-dial survey that collects similar information. Ultimately, the MFES will replace the CHTS. The surveys will overlap for a period of one year to compare estimates.

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

No small businesses will be impacted by this revision.

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

If the survey is not conducted, NMFS will continue to rely upon the Coastal Household Telephone Survey to estimate recreational fishing effort (CHTS). The CHTS has been criticized for its lack of efficiency and susceptibility to bias resulting from nonresponse and undercoverage. If the survey were conducted less frequently, NMFS and state natural resource agencies would experience difficulty in effectively carrying out their responsibilities to meet statutory, administrative, and other obligations to end overfishing of marine fishery resources. An ongoing survey of recreational anglers is required to monitor changing conditions in the fishery and support modifications in fishery regulations both within fishing seasons and among fishing years. In addition, a continuous time series of data is scientifically essential to assess the impact of recreational fishing on fish stocks.

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

The collection is consistent with OMB guidelines.

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 on what was intended to be a revision of OMB Control No. 0648-0052, with these surveys added, published on March 9, 2012 (77 FR 14348) solicited public comment on this revision. No comments were received.

MRIP is a collaborative effort among government agencies, independent scientists, recreational fishing groups and conservation organizations to ensure scientifically rigorous collection of appropriate information that meets manager and stakeholder needs. Subsequently, NMFS staff maintain regular communication with customers, through workshops, workgroup meetings and one-on-one consultations, to ensure that needs for recreational fishing statistics are being met. For example, MRIP hosted a workshop in March 2011 with data customers (including recreational fishing groups) to discuss data collection alternatives and tradeoffs among alternatives for increasing the timeliness of recreational fishing catch and effort estimates. Outcomes of the workshop are summarized in a final workshop report (https://www.st.nmfs.noaa.gov/mdms/doc/32Recreational_Data_Timeliness_FINAL_Report.pdf).

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

The benefits of prepaid cash incentives on improving survey response rates are well documented.

Dillman (2009) describes a small, prepaid cash incentive as a "token of appreciation" that encourages response and brings attention to the survey request. In addition to improving response rates, incentives may reduce nonresponse bias by encouraging participation from individuals with little or no interest in the survey topic (Groves et al., 2006).

Church (1993) presents a meta-analysis of 38 experimental studies testing the impact of cash incentives on mail survey response rates. The incentives, which ranged from $0.01 to $5.00 increased response rates over control groups by an average of 19.1%.

More recently, Trussell and Lavrakas (2004) reported that providing an incentive of at least $1.00 increased response rates and cooperation rates to the second phase of a two-phase, mixed-mode (RDD/mail diary) survey, and that incremental increases in incentive amounts up to $10.00 increased response rates in a linear fashion. These conclusions were consistent even for individuals who initially refused to participate in the second phase of the study.

Similarly, Brick et al. (2011) concluded that a prepaid cash incentive of $15.00 significantly increased response rates to the second phase of a national, two-phase mail survey, and that response rates for a $5.00 incentive treatment, while not significantly different from either a control group or the $15.00 experimental treatment, were in the expected direction. In addition, the effect of the incentives was most pronounced for the initial mailing, which could result in decreased costs for follow-up mailings.

This data collection will include an experiment to test the impact of small, prepaid cash incentives on survey response. During the first two waves of data collection, sampled addresses within each state will be randomly allocated to incentive treatment groups of $1, $2, and $5, as well as a non-incentive control group. Incentives will be included only in initial survey mailings. Response rates and fishing incidence (percent of respondents reporting fishing) will be compared among treatment groups. Tables 1 and 2 provide the sample sizes for each treatment group, as well as the expected detectable differences in response rates and fishing incidence rates, respectively, between experimental treatments and the control group. Following the incentive experiment, the optimum incentive amount will be included in initial survey mailings for the subsequent six waves.

Table 1. Expected detectable differences in response rates for incentive experiment

Incentive Treatment	Sample Size	Expected Response Rate	Expected Detectable Difference in Response Rates **
$0 (Control)	8,972	35%	
$1	8,972		2.08%
$2	8,972		2.08%
$5	8,972		2.10%

***** Sample sizes have been adjusted to account for an estimated 10% ineligibility rate
** The detectable difference is the difference between the control group and the experimental treatment group.

Table 2. Expected detectable differences in fishing incidence for incentive experiment

Incentive Treatment	Expected Responses	Expected Fishing Incidence	Expected Detectable Difference in Reported Fishing Incidence**
$0 (Control)	3,140	22%	
$1	4,037		2.99%
$2	4,037		2.99%
$5	4,486		2.85%

** The detectable difference is the difference between the control group and the experimental treatment group.

We also propose to include a $5.00 cash incentive in survey mailings for the nonresponse follow-up study, as described in Section B.3.

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

As stated on the instruments, responses are kept confidential as required by section 402(b) of the Magnuson-Stevens and NOAA Administrative Order 216-100, Confidentiality of Fisheries Statistics, and will not be released for public use except in aggregate statistical form without identification as to its source. Section 402(b) stipulates that data required to be submitted under an FMP shall be confidential and shall not be released except to Federal employees and Council staff responsible for FMP monitoring and development or when required under court order. Data such as personal addresses and phone numbers will remain confidential.

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

No sensitive questions are asked.

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

The estimated response burden per survey activity and the total response burden are shown in Table 2. The expected numbers of respondents and responses are based on the results of previous MRIP pilot studies. The hourly rate of $22.77 is based on the average for all civilian workers from the January 2011 National Compensation Survey (http://www.bls.gov/ncs/ocs/sp/nctb1477.pdf). There are no other costs to respondents. There are also no recordkeeping requirements associated with MRIP Fishing Effort Survey. A total of 8,900 burden hours are anticipated, resulting in a labor cost to respondents of approximately $202,653.

Table 2. Estimated response burden for the MRIP Fishing Effort Survey

Activity	Sample Size	Expected Response Rate	Estimated Number of Respondents	Estimated Number of Responses	Minutes per Response	Total Time (Hours)
Study Total	121,266		53,400	53,400		8,900
Resident Angler Survey	112,026[1]	48.3%	48,696	48,696	10	8,116
Nonresident Angler Survey	6,840[2]	60%	4,104	4,104	10	684
Nonresponse Study	2,400	25%	600	600	10	100

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).

These data collections will incur no cost burden on respondents beyond the costs of response time.

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

Annual cost to the Federal government is approximately $2,200,000: $2,000,000 in data collection costs and $200,000 in professional staff, overhead and computing costs.

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

This is a new program

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

Each year, NMFS administers recreational fishing surveys for six discrete, two-month reference waves, beginning with wave 1 (January/February) and continuing through wave 6 (November/December). The MRIP Fishing Effort Survey will be administered for eight successive waves, beginning with wave 5 (November/December), 2012 and continuing through wave 6, 2013.

All data collected and analyzed will be included in table format available on the Web page of

[1] Approximately 10% of addresses will be returned as invalid reducing the final sample size to 100,823.
[2] All individuals sampled from state license databases are assumed to be eligible.

the Fisheries Statistics Division, Office of Science and Technology, National Marine Fisheries Service. The Web site address is http://www.st.nmfs.gov/st1/recreational. Findings from the study will be presented at appropriate profession meetings (e.g. American Fisheries Society, Joint Statistical Meetings) and will be submitted for publication in appropriate statistical or fisheries peer-reviewed journals.

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
MARINE RECREATIONAL INFORMATION PROGRAM
PART B
OMB CONTROL NO. 0648-XXXX

B. COLLECTIONS OF INFORMATION EMPLOYING STATISTICAL METHODS

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.

1.1. MRIP Fishing Effort Survey

The MRIP Fishing Effort Survey (MFES) is bi-monthly (wave), cross-sectional mail survey designed to estimate the total number of individuals who participate in marine recreational fishing and the total number of private boat and shore-based recreational fishing trips taken by anglers in the study states. The survey consists of two independent components; 1) the Resident Angler Survey (RAS), which estimates saltwater fishing effort by residents of coastal states, and 2) the Nonresident Angler Survey (NAS), which estimates saltwater fishing effort by residents of non-coastal states. The RAS is an address-based sample (ABS) that covers all residential addresses within the study states. The NAS is a list-based sample that covers individuals who are licensed to participate in saltwater fishing in the study states but reside in a different state.

1.2. Resident Angler Survey

The sample frame for the RAS is a list of all residential addresses that are serviced by the United States Postal Service (USPS) within the study states. Sampling is stratified by state and geographic proximity to the coast. Specifically, counties with any border that is within 25 miles of the coast are in the coastal stratum, and all other counties are in the non-coastal stratum[1]. This stratification serves two purposes. First, residents of coastal counties are more likely to participate in recreational saltwater fishing than residents of non-coastal counties – historical estimates from the Marine Recreational Fisheries Statistics Survey (MRFSS) demonstrate that 65-90% of recreational saltwater fishing trips in the study states are taken by residents of coastal counties within those states. Stratification provides an opportunity to sample at different rates among strata and subsequently increase the efficiency of data collection. Secondly, the coastal resident stratum is consistent with the coverage of the Coastal Household Telephone Survey, which will allow for direct comparisons between the two surveys.

Each wave, a representative sample of addresses is selected within each stratum in a single stage.

[1] Florida is not stratified due to the relatively high rate of fishing across the state.

The sample size is sufficient to permit sub-sampling, as described below. Addresses are selected from a comprehensive list of residential addresses maintained by a vendor licensed to distribute the USPS Computerized Delivery Sequence File. Following selection, sampled addresses in each state and stratum are matched, by address and telephone number, to databases of anglers licensed to participate in saltwater fishing in the respective state. Databases of licensed anglers are provided to NMFS by state natural resource agencies approximately one month prior to the beginning of data collection for each wave. Prior to matching, addresses within the license databases are formatted to conform to USPS postal addressing standards, and duplicate angler records, as well as records for individuals less than18 years of age are identified and removed.

Matching addresses to license databases screens the ABS sample to identify households with (matched) and without (unmatched) licensed anglers, effectively stratifying the sample into matched and unmatched strata (Lohr, 2009). Stratification provides an opportunity to optimize sampling among strata - previous studies (Andrews et al., 2010, Brick et al., 2012a) have demonstrated that residents of households that match to license databases respond to fishing surveys at a higher rate and are more likely to have fished during the reference wave than residents of unmatched households. The survey instrument collects information about the recent saltwater fishing activity for all residents of each sampled address (i.e. each address is a cluster of individuals who reside at the address).

Table 1 provides the sample universe, initial ABS sample sizes, final target sample sizes and estimated number of completed household interviews for each stratum within a given reference wave. Initially, sample will be distributed among strata such that the expected yield of completed household interviews is uniform among states. However, allocations will be reassessed following each wave. The final target allocation is achieved by retaining all matched addresses in the sample and sub-sampling unmatched addresses. Target sample sizes are expected to result in a completed number of household surveys that are optimally allocated among strata and achieve a coefficient of variation of 15% on estimates of total fishing effort[2] for each state and wave. Sampling requirements are based upon results from previous MRIP pilot studies.

[2] Total fishing effort includes fishing by both resident (RAS) and nonresident anglers (NAS).

Table 1. Estimated size of the sample universe, initial and final sample sizes, expected response rates and estimated number of completed household interviews per wave for the resident angler survey.

State	Geographic Stratum	License Stratum	Estimated Number of Households[3]	Initial ABS Sample Size[4]	Estimated Final ABS Sample Size[5][6]	Expected Response Rates[7]	Estimated Completed Household Surveys
FL	Coastal	Matched	737,818	1,325	1,325	57%	759
FL	Coastal	Unmatched	6,754,869	12,131	2,930	43%	1,270
MA	Coastal	Matched	53,612	1,290	1,290	57%	665
MA	Coastal	Unmatched	1,856,226	44,664	2,262	43%	882
MA	Noncoastal	Matched	43,023	198	198	53%	94
MA	Noncoastal	Unmatched	585,613	2,695	1,055	41%	388
NC	Coastal	Matched	199,839	1,290	1,290	57%	665
NC	Coastal	Unmatched	557,660	3,600	2,262	43%	882
NC	Noncoastal	Matched	222,650	198	198	53%	94
NC	Noncoastal	Unmatched	2,812,924	2,502	1,055	41%	388
NY	Coastal	Matched	75,957	1,290	1,290	57%	665
NY	Coastal	Unmatched	4,434,800	75,318	2,262	43%	882
NY	Noncoastal	Matched	35,537	198	198	53%	94
NY	Noncoastal	Unmatched	2,650,522	14,768	1,055	41%	388
Total			21,021,050	161,467	18,671	48%	8,116

1.3. Nonresident Angler Survey

Non-resident anglers are sampled from lists of individuals who are licensed to participate in saltwater fishing in each study state. The sample frame for each state consists of anglers who were licensed to fish in the state (license state) during the wave but reside in another state. Databases of licensed anglers are provided to NMFS by state natural resource agencies approximately one month prior to the beginning of data collection for each wave. Prior to sampling, addresses within the license databases are formatted to conform to USPS postal addressing standards, and duplicate angler records, as well as records for individuals less than18 years of age are identified and removed.

---

[3] Estimated number of households in the matched stratum is based upon the number of unique addresses in state databases of licensed saltwater anglers as of 8/29/2012. Estimated number of households in the unmatched stratum is the difference between the estimated number of total occupied housing units (Census 2010) and the number of unique addresses in the state license databases.

[4] Estimated amount of ABS sample required to achieve final sampling targets for the matched strata.

[5] Final ABS sample sizes after subsampling from the unmatched strata. All matched addresses are retained in final sample.

[6] Approximately 10% of addresses will be returned by USPS as undeliverable, reducing the total sample for each wave to 16,804.

[7] Response rates estimated from previous MRIP pilot studies.

Each wave, a simple random sample of licensed anglers is selected from each state's license frame. The survey instrument collects information about recent saltwater fishing activity for the sampled angler, as well as any other individuals who reside at the same address as the sampled angler; each sampled angler represents a cluster of anglers who reside at the same address. Table 2 provides the sample universe, sample size, expected response rates and estimated number of completed surveys for each state within a given reference wave.

Table 2. Estimated size of the sample universe, initial and final sample sizes, expected response rates and estimated number of completed interviews per wave for the nonresident angler survey.

State	Estimated Number of Nonresident Anglers[8]	Sample Size	Expected Response Rate[9]	Estimated Completed Surveys
FL	443,711	285	60%	171
MA	73,195	285	60%	171
NC	159,743	285	60%	171
NY	14,555	285	60%	171
Total	691,204	1,140	60%	684

A resident of a study state who is also licensed to fish in one of the other study states could be sampled for both the RAS and the NAS. However, given the sampling rates, it is extremely unlikely (less than 1/10 of 1%) that the same individual would be sampled from both frames. Each wave, sample from each frame will be cross-checked against the other sample to identify any duplicates. If this situation were to occur, the NAS sample will be withheld and treated as a special case of nonresponse.

1.4. Experimental Tests

Previous MRIP pilot studies (Andrews et al. 2010, Brick et al. 2012a) demonstrated that addresses that match to angler license databases respond to fishing surveys at a higher rate and are more likely to have participated in saltwater fishing than unmatched addresses. These studies accounted for this differential nonresponse through nonresponse weighting adjustment.

This study will include an experiment to test two versions of the RAS questionnaire. The two versions will be evaluated in terms of overall response rates and the degree of differential nonresponse and reported fishing activity between anglers (matched addresses) and nonanglers (unmatched addresses). One version of the questionnaire (Version 1) utilizes a "screen out" approach that quickly identifies anglers (and non-anglers) and encourages participation by minimizing the number of questions, particularly for non-anglers. The second version (Version 2) utilizes an "engaging" approach that encourages response by broadening the scope of the questions to include both fishing and non-fishing questions.

[8] Based upon participation estimates from the Marine Recreational Fisheries Statistics Survey
[9] Estimated from previous MRIP pilot studies.

During the first two waves of data collection, sampled addresses within each stratum will be randomly allocated into treatments defined by the questionnaire. Tables 3 and 4 provide the sample sizes for each treatment group, as well as the expected detectable differences in response rates and fishing incidence rates, respectively, between experimental treatments. The version that minimizes differential nonresponse between matched and unmatched addresses will be utilized for the subsequent six waves.

Table 3. Expected detectable differences in response rates for questionnaire experiment

RAS Questionnaire	Sample Size[10]	Expected Response Rate	Expected Detectable Difference in Response Rates[11]
Version 1 (Screen Out)	16,804	48%	
Version 2 (Engaging)	16,804		1.55%

Table 4. Expected detectable differences in fishing incidence for questionnaire experiment

RAS Questionnaire	Expected Responses	Expected Fishing Incidence	Expected Detectable Difference in Fishing Incidence[11]
Version 1 (Screen Out)	8,066	22%	
Version 2 (Engaging)	8,066		1.86%

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.

2.1. Data Collection Procedures

The RAS and NAS are both single-phase, self-administered mail surveys, and data collection procedures for the two survey components are identical. These data collection procedures have been extensively tested through previous MRIP pilot studies (Andrews et al. 2010, Brick et al. 2012a). The surveys are administered for eight independent, two-month reference waves. The data collection period for each wave begins one week prior to the end of the wave with an initial survey mailing. The timing of the initial mailing is such that materials are received prior to the

[10] Sample sizes have been adjusted to account for an estimated 10% ineligibility rate.
[11] The detectable difference is the difference between experimental treatments.

end of the reference wave. The initial mailing is delivered by regular first class mail and includes a cover letter stating the purpose of the survey, a survey questionnaire, a post-paid return envelope and a prepaid cash incentive (as described in section A.9).

One week following the initial mailing, a follow-up thank you/reminder contact is initiated. For sample units with an attached landline telephone number (sample units for which a landline telephone number can be found through a lookup service), an automated voice message is delivered to remind sample units to complete and return the questionnaire. Previous studies have demonstrated that varying the delivery mechanism, for example, switching from regular first class mail to telephone or special mail, may improve response rates in mail surveys (Brick et al., 2012b). For sample with no associated landline telephone number, a thank you/reminder postcard is sent via regular fist class mail. We expect to identify landline telephone numbers for approximately 50% of sampled addresses.

Three weeks after the initial survey mailing, a follow-up mailing is delivered to all sample units that have not responded to the survey. The follow-up mailing is delivered via first class mail and includes a nonresponse conversion letter, a second questionnaire and a post-paid return envelope.

2.2. Estimation Procedures

Final sample weights for both the RAS and the NAS are calculated in stages. In the first stage, base sample weights within each stratum are calculated as the inverse of the selection probability ($\omega_i = \pi_i^{-1}$, where π_i is the probability of selecting unit i for the sample). In the RAS, base weights for addresses that cannot be matched to an angler license database (sample units in the unmatched strata), are adjusted to account for subsampling by multiplying the base weight by the inverse of the subsampling rate.

In the second stage, base weights (or adjusted base weights in unmatched RAS strata) are adjusted to account for nonresponse. Specifically, the weights of nonresponding units are increased by the inverse of the weighted response rate within nonresponse adjustment cells

$$\omega_{ci}^{*} = \omega_{ci}\widehat{\emptyset}_c^{-1}$$

where

$$\widehat{\emptyset}_c = \sum^{r} \omega_{ci} / (\sum^{r} \omega_{ci} + \sum^{m} \omega_{ci})$$

and $\sum^{r} \omega_{ci}$ and $\sum^{m} \omega_{ci}$ are the sums of base weights in cell *c* for respondents and nonrespondents, respectively. Weights for all individuals who reside at a sampled address are equal to the final sample weight for the address.

In the RAS, nonresponse adjustment cells will be defined by state or residence, coastal/non-coastal county, matched/unmatched designation, and whether or not the address was successfully matched to a landline telephone number. In the NAS, adjustment cells will be at the stratum level (license state). Other potential criteria for defining nonresponse adjustment cells will be

examined after each wave of data collection and may include demographic information and type of recreational fishing license.

Estimates of total fishing effort, as well as associated estimates of variance, are calculated in SAS Version 9.3 using the surveymeans procedure. For a given coastal state and wave, total effort is the sum of resident angler effort (from RAS) and nonresident angler effort (from NAS), both of which are calculated as weighted sums

$$\hat{Y} = \sum_{h=1}^{H} \sum_{i=1}^{n_h} \sum_{j=1}^{m_{hi}} \omega_{hij}^{*} y_{hij}$$

where ω_{hij}^{*} and y_{hij} are the final weight and reported number of recreational fishing trips, respectfully, for unit *j* at address *i* of stratum *h*.

Variance of the total effort estimate is estimated using the Taylor series method

$$\hat{V}(\hat{Y}) = \sum_{h=1}^{H} \hat{V}_h(\hat{Y})$$

where

$$\hat{V}_h(\hat{Y}) = \frac{n_h(1 - f_h)}{n_h - 1} \sum_{i=1}^{n_h} (y_{hi\cdot} - \bar{y}_{h\cdot\cdot})^2$$

$$y_{hi\cdot} = \sum_{j=1}^{m_{hi}} w_{hij}^{*}\, y_{hij}$$

$$\bar{y}_{h\cdot\cdot} = \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n_h} y_{hi\cdot} \right) / n_h$$

For estimating total fishing effort, we expect stratification to be more effective than simple random sampling due to the oversampling of coastal and licensed households. Gains in efficiency will be offset somewhat by weighting effects, which will increase the variance of total effort estimates. Given these two factors, we expect a design effect of approximately 1.1.

3. Describe the methods used to maximize response rates and to deal with nonresponse. 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.

The expected response rates for the RAS and NAS are 48% and 60%, respectively. Previous MRIP pilot studies utilized similar data collection procedures and achieved similar response rates.

The expected response rates will be achieved by using standard mail survey protocols (Dillman et al, 2008). An initial mailing will include an introductory letter stating the purpose of the survey, the survey questionnaire, a business reply envelope, and a prepaid cash incentive. Incentive levels of $0, $1, $2 and $5 will be evaluated. Either a thank-you/reminder postcard or automated voice message will be administered to all sample units one week following the initial mailing. A final mailing, including a second questionnaire, a nonresponse conversion letter, and a business reply envelope will be sent to all nonrespondents three weeks after the initial mailing.

We will minimize nonresponse bias by using a questionnaire that maximizes responses by the entire sample population, including both anglers and non-anglers. Experimental testing of different versions of the survey questionnaire is described in Question 1, Section 1.4.

We will assess nonresponse bias in three ways. First, we will compare early and late responders with respect to reported fishing activity. This analysis will identify differences in respondents based upon the level of effort required to solicit a response. Previous studies (Brick et al., 2012) demonstrated that early and late responders are similar in terms of reported recreational fishing activity.

The second approach will utilize information from sample frame to define weighting classes for postsurvey weighting adjustments. Weighting classes will be defined such that response rates and fishing activity are similar within classes. Nonresponse bias will be measured by comparing unadjusted estimates to estimates that have been adjusted to account for differential nonresponse among weighting classes. Previous studies identified differential nonresponse and reported fishing activity between households with and without licensed anglers and demonstrated that nonresponse weighting adjustment decreased estimates of fishing effort by 25% over unadjusted estimates (Andrews et al., 2010).

Finally, we will conduct a nonresponse follow-up study that includes a more intensive effort to contact nonrespondents. In each of the six waves, 400 nonrespondents will be sampled for the follow-up study. Data collection for the study will be initiated six weeks after the final contact for the RAS and the NAS with the delivery of an advanced letter via regular first-class mail. Five days later, a survey packet, including a cover letter, questionnaire (the same questionnaire used in the RAS and NAS), post-paid return envelope and a $5.00 cash incentive will be delivered via FedEx (USPS Priority Mail will be used where FedEX is unavailable). A thank you/reminder postcard will be delivered eight days after the FedEx.

We expect a response rate of 25% for the follow-up study. Respondents to the follow-up study will be compared to RAS and NAS respondents in terms of reported fishing activity and demographic characteristics.

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.

No additional testing is planned.

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.

Statistical support was provided by the following:
Dr. J. Michael Brick, Westat, 301-294-2004
Dr. Nancy A. Mathiowetz, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, 414-229-2216

Rob Andrews, Fisheries Biologist, NOAA Fisheries Service, Office of Science and Technology, 301-427-8105 is the point-of-contact for the Agency.

References

Andrews, W.R., J.M. Brick, N.M. Mathiowetz, and L. Stokes (2010). Pilot Test of a Dual Frame Two-Phase Mail Survey of Anglers in North Carolina. Retrieved from http://www.countmyfish.noaa.gov/projects/downloads/Final_Report%20NC%202009%20Dual%20Frame%20Two%20Phase%20Experiment.pdf.

Brick. J.M., W.R. Andrews, and N.M. Mathiowetz (2012a). A Comparison of Recreational Fishing Effort Survey Designs. Retrieved from https://www.st.nmfs.noaa.gov/mdms/doc/08A_Comparison_of_Fishing_Effort_Surveys_Report_FINAL.pdf.

Brick, J.M., W.R. Andrews, P.D. Brick, H. King, and N.M. Mathiowetz (2012b). Methods for Improving Response Rates in Two-Phase Mail Surveys. Survey Practice 5(4).

Dillman, D.A., J.D. Smyth, and L.M. Christian (2009). *Internet, Mail, and Mixed-Mode Surveys: The Tailored Design Method*. New York: Wiley and Sons.
Lohr, S. (2009). Multiple Frame Surveys. Chapter 4 in Pfeffermann, D. (Ed.) *Handbook of Statistics: Sample Surveys Design, Methods and Applications* (vol. 29A). Elsevier, Amsterdam.

References

Andrews, W.R., J.M. Brick, N.M. Mathiowetz, and L. Stokes (2010). Pilot Test of a Dual Frame Two-Phase Mail Survey of Anglers in North Carolina. Retrieved from http://www.countmyfish.noaa.gov/projects/downloads/Final_Report%20NC%202009%20Dual%20Frame%20Two%20Phase%20Experiment.pdf.

Brick, J.M., D. Williams, and J.M. Montaquila (2011). Address-Based Sampling for Subpopulation Surveys. Public Opinion Quarterly 75: 409-428.

Brick. J.M., W.R. Andrews, and N.M. Mathiowetz (2012). A Comparison of Recreational Fishing Effort Survey Designs. Retrieved from https://www.st.nmfs.noaa.gov/mdms/doc/08A_Comparison_of_Fishing_Effort_Surveys_Report_FINAL.pdf.

Church, A.H. (1993). Estimating the Effect of Incentives on Mail Survey Response Rates: A Meta-Analysis. Public Opinion Quarterly 57:62–79.

Dillman, D.A., J.D. Smyth, and L.M. Christian (2009). *Internet, Mail, and Mixed-Mode Surveys: The Tailored Design Method*. New York: Wiley and Sons.

Groves, R., M. Couper, S. Presser, E. Singer, R. Tourangeau, G. Acosta, and Nelson, L. (2006). Experiments in Producing Nonresponse Bias. Public Opinion Quarterly 70: 720–736.

Iannacchione, V. (2011). The changing role of address-based sampling in survey research, Public Opinion Quarterly. 75: 556-575.

Lai, H-L, and R. Andrews (2008). Development of a Dual-Frame Methodology for Estimating Marine Recreational Fishing Effort. Retrieved from http://www.ices.dk/products/CMdocs/CM-2008/K/K0608.pdf.

Lohr, S. (2009). Multiple Frame Surveys. Chapter 4 in Pfeffermann, D. (Ed.) *Handbook of Statistics: Sample Surveys Design, Methods and Applications* (vol. 29A). Elsevier, Amsterdam**.**

National Research Council (2006). *Review of Recreational Fisheries Survey Methods*. Washington, D.C.: National Academies Press.

Trussell, N. and P.J. Lavrakas (2004). The influence of incremental increases in token cash incentives on mail survey response: Is there an optimal amount? Public Opinion Quarterly 68: 349-367.

June 6, 2012

[State] Resident
(Add 1)
(Add 2)
(City), (State) (Zip)

Dear [State] Resident:

I am writing to ask you for your help in a study being conducted for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. This study is part of an effort to learn about recreational saltwater fishing activities in [State]. This survey provides vital information that is used to enhance recreational fishing opportunities for [State] residents.

For the results to be scientific, we need all anglers who receive this short questionnaire to complete the questionnaire and send it back, even if you **have not** fished. Your name was randomly selected from a list of all anglers licensed for saltwater fishing in [State], and we cannot replace you with someone else. We have enclosed a small token of appreciation as a way of saying thanks for your help.

This is a voluntary survey. Responses are kept confidential as required by section 402(b) of the Magnuson- Stevens Act and NOAA Administrative Order 216-100, Confidentiality of Fisheries Statistics, and will not be released for public use except in aggregate statistical form without identification as to its source.

If you have any questions or comments about this study, we would be happy to talk with you. Please contact XXXXXXXXX at XXX-XXX-XXXX, or you can write to us at the address at the bottom of this letter.

Thank you very much for your help with this important study. Please return your completed questionnaire in the postage paid envelope provided.

Yours sincerely,

Dave Van Voorhees
Chief, Fisheries Statistics Division
NOAA Fisheries, Office of Science and Technology

For North Carolina

Hello, I'm calling for the [Survey Name]. A few days ago we sent you a survey from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. If you have already returned your completed survey, thank you very much. If you haven't, we ask that you complete the survey as soon as possible and return it in the postage-paid envelope we provided. This is a voluntary survey, and responses are kept confidential as required by section 402(b) of the Magnuson- Stevens Act and NOAA Administrative Order 216-100, Confidentiality of Fisheries Statistics, and will not be released for public use except in aggregate statistical form without identification as to its source.

If you have questions about the survey, please call us toll-free at 1-888-xxx-xxxx. Thank you again for your help. (This message will repeat.)

[State] Resident
(Add 1)
(Add 2)
(City), (State) (Zip)

Dear [State] Resident:

A few weeks ago we sent a recreational saltwater fishing questionnaire to your household. If you have already returned the questionnaire, we thank you. If you have not returned it, we ask you to please complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it as soon as possible. For the results of this study to be scientific, we need all anglers who receive this short questionnaire to complete the questionnaire and send it back, even if you **do not** fish.

We are very grateful for your help. This survey is an important part of a research study of recreational saltwater fishing conducted by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). NOAA oversees many of the natural resources in coastal states and needs high quality information to improve recreational fishing opportunities for [State] residents.

Your name was randomly selected from a list of all anglers licensed for saltwater fishing in [State]. This is a voluntary survey. Responses are kept confidential as required by section 402(b) of the Magnuson-Stevens Act and NOAA Administrative Order 216-100, Confidentiality of Fisheries Statistics, and will not be released for public use except in aggregate statistical form without identification as to its source.

If you have any questions about this study, we are happy to talk with you: please contact XXXXXXX at 1-XXX-XXX-XXXX. Thank you again for your generous help with this important study.

Yours sincerely,

Dave Van Voorhees
Chief, Fisheries Statistics Division
NOAA Fisheries, Office of Science and Technology

June 6, 2012

Last week we sent you a Saltwater Fishing Survey on behalf of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. If you have already completed and returned the survey, please accept our sincere thanks. If not, I encourage you to do so today.

This study is being conducted to learn more about the impact of recreational fishing on natural resources in [State]. Please know that your answers are completely confidential and will be used only for this study in accordance with the Magnuson-Stevens Act and NOAA Administrative Order 216-100.

If you did not receive the survey or need another copy, please call XXXXXXXX toll-free at 1-XXX-XXX-XXXX.

Sincerely,

Dave Van Voorhees
Chief, Fisheries Statistics Division
NOAA Fisheries, Office of Science and Technology

Saltwater Fishing Survey
1009 Slater Rd
Suite 110
Durham, NC 27703

Proper Name
Add1
Add2
City, St Zip

MRIP Recreational Fishing Survey

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 10 minutes per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other suggestions for reducing this burden to Rob Andrews, NOAA Fisheries Service, 1315 East-West Hwy., Silver Spring, MD 20910.

This is a voluntary survey, and responses are kept confidential as required by section 402(b) of the Magnuson- Stevens Act and NOAA Administrative Order 216-100, Confidentiality of Fisheries Statistics, and will not be released for public use except in aggregate statistical form without identification as to its source. Notwithstanding any other provisions of the law, no person is required to respond to, nor shall any person be subjected 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.

Commonly Asked Questions

Nobody in my household participates in any of these activities. Should I still respond to the survey?
Yes. It is important that everyone who receives this short questionnaire complete it and return it. For this survey to be scientific, we need basic information about all households selected for the survey – regardless of whether they participate in the activities mentioned in the survey or not.

Who is sponsoring the survey?
This study is being sponsored by the United States Department of Commerce.

How will the information I provide be used?
The Department of Commerce will use the information to help states and federal agencies make decisions about how to manage resources.

How much time will this survey take?
On average, it should take less than ten minutes to complete, including reviewing instructions and answering the questions.

How did you get my address?
Your address was randomly selected from all addresses in your state using scientific sampling. You and your household represent many other households in your part of the State.

Your answers are voluntary.
Please return the completed questionnaire in the prepaid envelope. If you are missing the prepaid envelope please return your completed questionnaire to:

MRIP Recreational Fishing Survey

- Please use a black or blue pen to complete this form.
- Mark ☒ to indicate your answer.
- If you want to change your answer, darken the box and mark the correct answer.

Please complete this survey even if no one in your household fishes.

1. Which category best describes this house, apartment, or mobile home?

- ☐ Owned by you or someone in this household with a mortgage or loan
- ☐ Owned by you or someone in this household free and clear (without a mortgage)
- ☐ Rented
- ☐ Occupied without payment or rent

2. Which category best describes the telephone service for you and members of your household?

- ☐ Regular or Landline phone only
- ☐ Cellular phone only
- ☐ Both Landline and Cellular phone
- ☐ No working phone service

3. How many people, including all adults and children, live in this household?

☐☐

4. Saltwater fishing is fishing in oceans, sounds, or bays, or in brackish portions of rivers. This does not include fishing in freshwater, or for shellfish, such as crabbing. **During the *past 12 months* did anyone who lives here go recreational saltwater fishing?**

- ☐ No → Thank you. Please return this in the envelope provided.
- ☐ Yes → Please continue and complete the questions on the next page for ***EACH PERSON*** in your household who fished during the past 12 months.

	Person 1	Person 2	Person 3	
1. What is this person's gender?	☐ Male ☐ Female	☐ Male ☐ Female	☐ Male ☐ Female	
2. How old is this person? *If less than 1 year old, mark 0 years*	☐☐ Years	☐☐ Years	☐☐ Years	
3. Is this person of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin?	☐ Yes, of Hispanic origin ☐ No, not of Hispanic origin	☐ Yes, of Hispanic origin ☐ No, not of Hispanic origin	☐ Yes, of Hispanic origin ☐ No, not of Hispanic origin	
4. What is this person's race? *Mark one or more boxes*	☐ American Indian or Alaska Native ☐ Asian ☐ Black or African American ☐ Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander ☐ White	☐ American Indian or Alaska Native ☐ Asian ☐ Black or African American ☐ Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander ☐ White	☐ American Indian or Alaska Native ☐ Asian ☐ Black or African American ☐ Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander ☐ White	
5. When was this person's **most recent** recreational saltwater fishing trip? Was it **Saltwater fishing:** fishing in oceans, sounds, or bays, or in brackish portions of rivers. This does not include fishing in freshwater, or for shellfish, such as crabbing.	☐ Within the past 4 months ***Go to Question 6*** ☐ 4 to 8 months ago ☐ 8 to 12 months ago ☐ More than 12 months ago ☐ Never ***Go to Person 2***	☐ Within the past 4 months ***Go to Question 6*** ☐ 4 to 8 months ago ☐ 8 to 12 months ago ☐ More than 12 months ago ☐ Never ***Go to Person 3***	☐ Within the past 4 months ***Go to Question 6*** ☐ 4 to 8 months ago ☐ 8 to 12 months ago ☐ More than 12 months ago ☐ Never ***Go to Person x***	
6. Between **September 1 and October 31, 2012,** on how many days did this person go recreational saltwater fishing in North Carolina from the shore? **Shore** includes docks, bridges, causeways, beaches, banks or any other shore-based structure or area.	Enter '0' if this person did not fish. ☐☐ Days fished from shore	Enter '0' if this person did not fish. ☐☐ Days fished from shore	Enter '0' if this person did not fish. ☐☐ Days fished from shore	**Please use this calendar to assist you in answering Questions 6 and 7.**
7. Not including trips taken on charter boats, between **September 1 and October 31, 2012,** on how many days did this person go recreational saltwater fishing from a private or rental boat that returned to shore in North Carolina? **Charter boats** are rental or commercial boats that include a captain or crew who help locate and catch fish	Enter '0' if this person did not fish. ☐☐ Days fished from a private boat	Enter '0' if this person did not fish. ☐☐ Days fished from a private boat	Enter '0' if this person did not fish. ☐☐ Days fished from a private boat	

<<DATE>>

<<STATE>> Resident
<<Add 1>>
<<Add 2>>
<<City>>, <<State>> <<Zip>>

Dear <<STATE>> Resident:

I am writing to ask for your help with a survey being conducted for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). The survey collects information about severe weather events and participation in outdoor activities. The findings from the study will be used to improve access to information about the environment and ensure the quality of marine and coastal resources.

For the results to be meaningful, we need ***all*** households who receive this short survey to complete the questionnaire and send it back in the postage-paid envelope that is provided.

Your address was randomly selected from a list of all addresses in <<STATE>>. This is a voluntary survey. Responses are kept confidential as required by section 402(b) of the Magnuson- Stevens Act and NOAA Administrative Order 216-100, Confidentiality of Fisheries Statistics, and will not be released for public use except in aggregate statistical form without identification as to its source.

If you have any questions about this study, we are happy to talk to you: please contact XXXXXXXX at 1-XXX-XXX-XXXX.

Thank you again for your help with this important study.

Yours sincerely,

Dave Van Voorhees
Chief, Fisheries Statistics Division
NOAA Fisheries, Office of Science and Technology

<<DATE>>

<<STATE>> Resident
<<Add 1>>
<<Add 2>>
<<CITY>>, <<State>> <<Zip>>

Dear <<STATE>> Resident,

A few weeks ago we sent a questionnaire to your household in an effort to collect information about severe weather events and participation in outdoor activities. If you have already returned the questionnaire, we thank you. If you have not returned it, we ask you to please complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it as soon as possible. For the results of this study to be scientific, we need all households who receive this short questionnaire to complete the questionnaire and send it back.

We are very grateful for your help. Your completed questionnaire will contribute to our understanding of the state's access to information about the environment and ensure the quality of marine and coastal resources.

Your address was randomly selected from a list of all addresses in <<STATE>>. This is a voluntary survey. Responses are kept confidential as required by section 402(b) of the Magnuson- Stevens Act and NOAA Administrative Order 216-100, Confidentiality of Fisheries Statistics, and will not be released for public use except in aggregate statistical form without identification as to its source.

If you have any questions or comments about this study, we would be happy to talk with you. Please contact XXXXXXXX at 1-XXX-XXX-XXXX.

Thank you again for your help with this important study.

Yours sincerely,

Dave Van Voorhees
Chief, Fisheries Statistics Division
NOAA Fisheries, Office of Science and Technology

June 6, 2012

Last week we sent you a survey on behalf of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. If you have already completed and returned the survey, please accept our sincere thanks. If not, I encourage you to do so today.

Information collected in this study will help us to better understand how people use recreation resources in <<STATE>>. Please know that your answers are completely confidential and will be used only for this study in accordance with the Magnuson-Stevens Act and NOAA Administrative Order 216-100.

If you did not receive the survey or need another copy, please call XXXXXXXX toll-free at 1-XXX-XXX-XXXX.

Sincerely,

Dave Van Voorhees
Chief, Fisheries Statistics Division
NOAA Fisheries, Office of Science and Technology

Weather and Outdoor Activities Survey
7431 College Parkway, Ste A
Fort Myers, FL 33907

<<STATE>> Resident
Add1
Add2
City, St Zip

OMB No: 0648-xxxx Approval Expires xx/xx/xxxx

Weather and Outdoor Activity Survey

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 10 minutes per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other suggestions for reducing this burden to Rob Andrews, NOAA Fisheries Service, 1315 East-West Hwy., Silver Spring, MD 20910.

This is a voluntary survey, and responses are kept confidential as required by section 402(b) of the Magnuson- Stevens Act and NOAA Administrative Order 216-100, Confidentiality of Fisheries Statistics, and will not be released for public use except in aggregate statistical form without identification as to its source. Notwithstanding any other provisions of the law, no person is required to respond to, nor shall any person be subjected 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.

Commonly Asked Questions

Nobody in my household participates in any of these activities. Should I still respond to the survey?
Yes. It is important that everyone who receives this short questionnaire complete it and return it. For this survey to be scientific, we need basic information about all households selected for the survey – regardless of whether they participate in the activities mentioned in the survey or not.

Who is sponsoring the survey?
This study is being sponsored by the United States Department of Commerce.

How will the information I provide be used?
The Department of Commerce will use the information to help states and federal agencies make decisions about how to manage resources.

How much time will this survey take?
On average, it should take less than ten minutes to complete, including reviewing instructions and answering the questions.

How did you get my address?
Your address was randomly selected from all addresses in your state using scientific sampling. You and your household represent many other households in your part of the State.

Your answers are voluntary.
Please return the completed questionnaire in the prepaid envelope. If you are missing the prepaid envelope please return your completed questionnaire to:

Weather and Outdoor Activity Survey

- Please use a black or blue pen to complete this form.
- Mark ☒ to indicate your answer.
- If you want to change your answer, darken the box and mark the correct answer.

1. How do members of this household obtain information about the weather, including current weather conditions, forecasts and warnings?
   - ☐ Television
   - ☐ Radio
   - ☐ Newspaper
   - ☐ Internet
   - ☐ Other

2. During the past 12 months has anyone in this household had to evacuate or seek shelter due to a severe weather event such as a tornado, hurricane, or thunderstorm?
   - ☐ Yes
   - ☐ No

3. During the past 12 months, has anyone in this household visited a public beach, national seashore, coastal state park, or other coastal nature reserve or protected area?
   - ☐ Yes
   - ☐ No

4. Which category best describes the telephone service for you and members of your household:
   - ☐ Regular or Landline phone only
   - ☐ Cellular phone only
   - ☐ Both Landline and Cellular phone
   - ☐ No working phone service

5. Which of the following best describes this house, apartment, or mobile home?
   - ☐ Owned by you or someone in this household with a mortgage or loan
   - ☐ Owned by you or someone in this household free and clear (without a mortgage)
   - ☐ Rented
   - ☐ Occupied without payment or rent

6. How many people, including all adults and children, live in this household?

   ☐☐

NOAA works with local communities to manage, conserve and protect marine resources. As part of its mission, NOAA tries to understand who **does** and who **does not** participate in recreational saltwater fishing. Please complete the questions on the next pages for each member of your household including kids. It is important that you complete this survey even if no one in your household fishes.

	Person 1	Person 2	Person 3
1. What is this person's gender?	☐ Male ☐ Female	☐ Male ☐ Female	☐ Male ☐ Female
2. How old is this person? *If less than 1 year old, mark 0 years*	☐☐ Years	☐☐ Years	☐☐ Years
3. Is this person of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin?	☐ Yes, of Hispanic origin ☐ No, not of Hispanic origin	☐ Yes, of Hispanic origin ☐ No, not of Hispanic origin	☐ Yes, of Hispanic origin ☐ No, not of Hispanic origin
4. What is this person's race? *Mark one or more boxes*	☐ American Indian or Alaska Native ☐ Asian ☐ Black or African American ☐ Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander ☐ White	☐ American Indian or Alaska Native ☐ Asian ☐ Black or African American ☐ Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander ☐ White	☐ American Indian or Alaska Native ☐ Asian ☐ Black or African American ☐ Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander ☐ White
5. When was this person's **most recent** recreational saltwater fishing trip? Was it **Saltwater fishing:** fishing in oceans, sounds, or bays, or in brackish portions of rivers. This does not include fishing in freshwater, or for shellfish, such as crabbing.	☐ Within the past 4 months ***Go to Question 6*** ☐ 4 to 8 months ago ☐ 8 to 12 months ago ☐ More than 12 months ago ☐ Never ***Go to Person 2***	☐ Within the past 4 months ***Go to Question 6*** ☐ 4 to 8 months ago ☐ 8 to 12 months ago ☐ More than 12 months ago ☐ Never ***Go to Person 3***	☐ Within the past 4 months ***Go to Question 6*** ☐ 4 to 8 months ago ☐ 8 to 12 months ago ☐ More than 12 months ago ☐ Never ***Go to Person x***
6. Between **September 1 and October 31, 2012,** on how many days did this person go recreational saltwater fishing in North Carolina from the shore? **Shore** includes docks, bridges, causeways, beaches, banks or any other shore-based structure or area.	Enter '0' if this person did not fish. ☐☐ Days fished from shore	Enter '0' if this person did not fish. ☐☐ Days fished from shore	Enter '0' if this person did not fish. ☐☐ Days fished from shore
7. Not including trips taken on charter boats, between **September 1 and October 31, 2012,** on how many days did this person go recreational saltwater fishing from a private or rental boat that returned to shore in North Carolina? **Charter boats** are rental or commercial boats that include a captain or crew who help locate and catch fish	Enter '0' if this person did not fish ☐☐ Days fished from a private boat	Enter '0' if this person did not fish. ☐☐ Days fished from a private boat	Enter '0' if this person did not fish. ☐☐ Days fished from a private boat

Please use this calendar to assist you in answering Questions 6 and 7.

June 6, 2012

[State] Resident
(Add 1)
(Add 2)
(City), (State) (Zip)

Dear [State] Resident:

I am writing to ask you for your help in a study being conducted for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. This study is part of an effort to learn about recreational saltwater fishing activities in [State]. This survey provides vital information that is used to enhance recreational fishing opportunities for [State] residents.

For the results to be scientific, we need all anglers who receive this short questionnaire to complete the questionnaire and send it back, even if you **have not** fished. Your name was randomly selected from a list of all anglers licensed for saltwater fishing in [State], and we cannot replace you with someone else. We have enclosed a small token of appreciation as a way of saying thanks for your help.

This is a voluntary survey. Responses are kept confidential as required by section 402(b) of the Magnuson- Stevens Act and NOAA Administrative Order 216-100, Confidentiality of Fisheries Statistics, and will not be released for public use except in aggregate statistical form without identification as to its source.

If you have any questions or comments about this study, we would be happy to talk with you. Please contact XXXXXXXXX at XXX-XXX-XXXX, or you can write to us at the address at the bottom of this letter.

Thank you very much for your help with this important study. Please return your completed questionnaire in the postage paid envelope provided.

Yours sincerely,

Dave Van Voorhees
Chief, Fisheries Statistics Division
NOAA Fisheries, Office of Science and Technology

[State] Resident
(Add 1)
(Add 2)
(City), (State) (Zip)

Dear [State] Resident:

A few weeks ago we sent a recreational saltwater fishing questionnaire to your household. If you have already returned the questionnaire, we thank you. If you have not returned it, we ask you to please complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it as soon as possible. For the results of this study to be scientific, we need all anglers who receive this short questionnaire to complete the questionnaire and send it back, even if you **do not** fish.

We are very grateful for your help. This survey is an important part of a research study of recreational saltwater fishing conducted by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). NOAA oversees many of the natural resources in coastal states and needs high quality information to improve recreational fishing opportunities for [State] residents.

Your name was randomly selected from a list of all anglers licensed for saltwater fishing in [State]. This is a voluntary survey. Responses are kept confidential as required by section 402(b) of the Magnuson-Stevens Act and NOAA Administrative Order 216-100, Confidentiality of Fisheries Statistics, and will not be released for public use except in aggregate statistical form without identification as to its source.

If you have any questions about this study, we are happy to talk with you: please contact XXXXXXX at 1-XXX-XXX-XXXX. Thank you again for your generous help with this important study.

Yours sincerely,

Dave Van Voorhees
Chief, Fisheries Statistics Division
NOAA Fisheries, Office of Science and Technology

June 6, 2012

Last week we sent you a Saltwater Fishing Survey on behalf of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. If you have already completed and returned the survey, please accept our sincere thanks. If not, I encourage you to do so today.

This study is being conducted to learn more about the impact of recreational fishing on natural resources in [State]. Please know that your answers are completely confidential and will be used only for this study in accordance with the Magnuson-Stevens Act and NOAA Administrative Order 216-100.

If you did not receive the survey or need another copy, please call XXXXXXXX toll-free at 1-XXX-XXX-XXXX.

Sincerely,

Dave Van Voorhees
Chief, Fisheries Statistics Division
NOAA Fisheries, Office of Science and Technology

Saltwater Fishing Survey
1009 Slater Rd
Suite 110
Durham, NC 27703

Proper Name
Add1
Add2
City, St Zip

MRIP Recreational Fishing Survey

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 10 minutes per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other suggestions for reducing this burden to Rob Andrews, NOAA Fisheries Service, 1315 East-West Hwy., Silver Spring, MD 20910.

This is a voluntary survey, and responses are kept confidential as required by section 402(b) of the Magnuson- Stevens Act and NOAA Administrative Order 216-100, Confidentiality of Fisheries Statistics, and will not be released for public use except in aggregate statistical form without identification as to its source. Notwithstanding any other provisions of the law, no person is required to respond to, nor shall any person be subjected 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.

Commonly Asked Questions

Nobody in my household participates in any of these activities. Should I still respond to the survey?
Yes. It is important that everyone who receives this short questionnaire complete it and return it. For this survey to be scientific, we need basic information about all households selected for the survey – regardless of whether they participate in the activities mentioned in the survey or not.

Who is sponsoring the survey?
This study is being sponsored by the United States Department of Commerce.

How will the information I provide be used?
The Department of Commerce will use the information to help states and federal agencies make decisions about how to manage resources.

How much time will this survey take?
On average, it should take less than ten minutes to complete, including reviewing instructions and answering the questions.

How did you get my name?
You were randomly selected from all individuals licensed to participate in saltwater fishing in your state. You and represent many other anglers in your part of the State.

Your answers are voluntary.
Please return the completed questionnaire in the prepaid envelope. If you are missing the prepaid envelope please return your completed questionnaire to:

MRIP Recreational Fishing Survey

- Please use a black or blue pen to complete this form.
- Mark ☒ to indicate your answer.
- If you want to change your answer, darken the box and mark the correct answer.

Please complete this survey even if no one in your household fishes.

1. Which category best describes this house, apartment, or mobile home?

- ☐ Owned by you or someone in this household with a mortgage or loan
- ☐ Owned by you or someone in this household free and clear (without a mortgage)
- ☐ Rented
- ☐ Occupied without payment or rent

2. Which category best describes the telephone service for you and members of your household?

- ☐ Regular or Landline phone only
- ☐ Cellular phone only
- ☐ Both Landline and Cellular phone
- ☐ No working phone service

3. How many people, including all adults and children, live in this household?

☐☐

4. Saltwater fishing is fishing in oceans, sounds, or bays, or in brackish portions of rivers. This does not include fishing in freshwater, or for shellfish, such as crabbing. **During the *past 12 months* did anyone who lives here go recreational saltwater fishing?**

- ☐ No → Thank you. Please return this in the envelope provided.
- ☐ Yes → Please continue and complete the questions on the next page for ***EACH PERSON*** in your household who fished during the past 12 months.

	Person 1	Person 2	Person 3	
1. What is this person's gender?	☐ Male ☐ Female	☐ Male ☐ Female	☐ Male ☐ Female	
2. How old is this person? *If less than 1 year old, mark 0 years*	☐☐ Years	☐☐ Years	☐☐ Years	
3. Is this person of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin?	☐ Yes, of Hispanic origin ☐ No, not of Hispanic origin	☐ Yes, of Hispanic origin ☐ No, not of Hispanic origin	☐ Yes, of Hispanic origin ☐ No, not of Hispanic origin	
4. What is this person's race? *Mark one or more boxes*	☐ American Indian or Alaska Native ☐ Asian ☐ Black or African American ☐ Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander ☐ White	☐ American Indian or Alaska Native ☐ Asian ☐ Black or African American ☐ Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander ☐ White	☐ American Indian or Alaska Native ☐ Asian ☐ Black or African American ☐ Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander ☐ White	
5. When was this person's **most recent** recreational saltwater fishing trip? Was it **Saltwater fishing:** fishing in oceans, sounds, or bays, or in brackish portions of rivers. This does not include fishing in freshwater, or for shellfish, such as crabbing.	☐ Within the past 4 months ***Go to Question 6*** ☐ 4 to 8 months ago ☐ 8 to 12 months ago ☐ More than 12 months ago ☐ Never ***Go to Person 2***	☐ Within the past 4 months ***Go to Question 6*** ☐ 4 to 8 months ago ☐ 8 to 12 months ago ☐ More than 12 months ago ☐ Never ***Go to Person 3***	☐ Within the past 4 months ***Go to Question 6*** ☐ 4 to 8 months ago ☐ 8 to 12 months ago ☐ More than 12 months ago ☐ Never ***Go to Person x***	
6. Between **September 1 and October 31, 2012,** on how many days did this person go recreational saltwater fishing in North Carolina from the shore? **Shore** includes docks, bridges, causeways, beaches, banks or any other shore-based structure or area.	Enter '0' if this person did not fish. ☐☐ Days fished from shore	Enter '0' if this person did not fish. ☐☐ Days fished from shore	Enter '0' if this person did not fish. ☐☐ Days fished from shore	**Please use this calendar to assist you in answering Questions 6 and 7.**
7. Not including trips taken on charter boats, between **September 1 and October 31, 2012,** on how many days did this person go recreational saltwater fishing from a private or rental boat that returned to shore in North Carolina? **Charter boats** are rental or commercial boats that include a captain or crew who help locate and catch fish	Enter '0' if this person did not fish. ☐☐ Days fished from a private boat	Enter '0' if this person did not fish. ☐☐ Days fished from a private boat	Enter '0' if this person did not fish. ☐☐ Days fished from a private boat	

<<DATE>>

<<STATE>> Resident
<<Add 1>>
<<Add 2>>
<<City>>, <<State>> <<Zip>>

Dear <<STATE>> Resident:

I am pleased to inform you that the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration has selected you to participate in a survey of recreational saltwater fishing. This study is part of an effort to learn about recreational saltwater fishing activities in [State]. This survey provides vital information that is used to enhance recreational fishing opportunities for [State] residents.

You were chosen at random as part of this scientific study, and we cannot replace you with someone else. Your answers will make sure that people like you are counted. This is a voluntary survey. Responses are kept confidential as required by section 402(b) of the Magnuson- Stevens Act and NOAA Administrative Order 216-100, Confidentiality of Fisheries Statistics, and will not be released for public use except in aggregate statistical form without identification as to its source.

You should receive the survey in the mail within the next week.

- It usually takes 10 minutes or less to fill out the survey.
- We will include a small token of our appreciation for your participation in this study with the survey.

If you have any questions or comments about this study, we would be happy to talk with you. Please contact XXXXXXXXX at XXX-XXX-XXXX, or you can write to us at the address at the bottom of this letter.

Thank you again for your help with this important study.

Yours sincerely,

Dave Van Voorhees
Chief, Fisheries Statistics Division
NOAA Fisheries, Office of Science and Technology

June 6, 2012

[State] Resident
(Add 1)
(Add 2)
(City), (State) (Zip)

Dear [State] Resident:

I am writing to ask you for your help in a study being conducted for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. This study is part of an effort to learn about recreational saltwater fishing activities in [State]. This survey provides vital information that is used to enhance recreational fishing opportunities for [State] residents.

For the results to be scientific, we need all households who receive this short questionnaire to complete the questionnaire and send it back, even if you **do not** fish. Your address was randomly selected from a list of all home addresses in [State], and we cannot replace you with someone else. We have enclosed a small token of appreciation as a way of saying thanks for your help.

This is a voluntary survey. Responses are kept confidential as required by section 402(b) of the Magnuson- Stevens Act and NOAA Administrative Order 216-100, Confidentiality of Fisheries Statistics, and will not be released for public use except in aggregate statistical form without identification as to its source.

If you have any questions or comments about this study, we would be happy to talk with you. Please contact XXXXXXXXX at XXX-XXX-XXXX, or you can write to us at the address at the bottom of this letter.

Thank you very much for your help with this important study. Please return your completed questionnaire in the postage paid envelope provided.

Yours sincerely,

Dave Van Voorhees
Chief, Fisheries Statistics Division
NOAA Fisheries, Office of Science and Technology

June 6, 2012

We recently sent you a Saltwater Fishing Survey on behalf of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. If you have already completed and returned the survey, please accept our sincere thanks. If not, I encourage you to do so today.

This study is being conducted to learn more about the impact of recreational fishing on natural resources in [State]. Please know that your answers are completely confidential and will be used only for this study in accordance with the Magnuson-Stevens Act and NOAA Administrative Order 216-100.

If you did not receive the survey or need another copy, please call XXXXXXXX toll-free at 1-XXX-XXX-XXXX.

Sincerely,

Dave Van Voorhees
Chief, Fisheries Statistics Division
NOAA Fisheries, Office of Science and Technology

Saltwater Fishing Survey
1009 Slater Rd
Suite 110
Durham, NC 27703

Proper Name
Add1
Add2
City, St Zip

The required information enables NOAA to track, evaluate and report on coastal and marine habitat restoration and demonstrate accountability for federal funds. This information is used to populate a database of NOAA-funded habitat restoration, debris prevention and removal, and barrier removal projects. The database, with its robust querying capabilities, is instrumental to provide accurate and timely responses to NOAA, Department of Commerce, Congressional and Constituent inquiries. It also facilitates reporting by NOAA on the Government Performance and Results Act ''acres restored'' performance measure. Grant recipients are required by the NOAA Grants Management Division to submit periodic performance reports and a final report for each award; this collection stipulates the information to be provided in these reports.

II. Method of Collection

Respondents have a choice of either electronic fillable forms or paper forms. Methods of submittal include email of electronic forms, or mailing of paper forms.

III. Data

OMB Control Number: 0648–0472.

Form Number: None.

Type of Review: Regular submission (extension of a currently approved collection).

Affected Public: Not-for-profit institutions; state, local, or tribal government; business or other for-profit organizations.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 250.

Estimated Time per Response: Semi-annual reports, 7 hours, 45 minutes; final reports, 12 hours, 30 minutes.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 4,145.

Estimated Total Annual Cost to Public: $0 in recordkeeping/reporting costs.

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: March 6, 2012.

Gwellnar Banks,

Management Analyst, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 2012–5774 Filed 3–8–12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–22–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

Proposed Information Collection; Comment Request; Marine Recreational Information Program

AGENCY: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), 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 May 8, 2012.

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(s) and instructions should be directed to Rob Andrews, (301) 482–1805 or *Rob.Andrews@noaa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Abstract

This request is for revision of a current information collection.

Marine recreational anglers are surveyed to collect catch and effort data, fish biology data, and angler socioeconomic characteristics. These data are required to carry out provisions of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.), as amended, regarding conservation and management of fishery resources.

Marine recreational fishing catch and effort data are collected through a combination of mail surveys, telephone surveys and on-site intercept surveys with recreational anglers. Amendments to the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA) require the development of an improved data collection program for recreational fisheries. To meet these requirements, NOAA Fisheries has designed and tested new approaches for sampling and surveying recreational anglers. Revision: A mail survey that samples from a residential address frame will be implemented to collect data on the number of marine recreational anglers and the number of recreational fishing trips. This survey will replace the Coastal Household Telephone Survey, which has traditionally been used to collect recreational fishing effort data. In addition, the sampling and estimation procedures for the access-point angler intercept survey have been revised to ensure better coverage and representation of recreational fishing activity.

This revision also eliminates several data collections that were implemented to test revised sampling procedures. The following data collections will be eliminated: Longitudinal Sampling for Coastal Household Telephone Survey, a Directory Frame Telephone Survey of Licensed Marine Recreational Anglers, the Angler Diary Recruitment Screening Questionnaire, and Biological Data Collection.

II. Method of Collection

Information will be collected through mail surveys and on-site intercept interviews.

III. Data

OMB Control Number: 0648–0052.

Form Number: None.

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

Affected Public: Individuals or households.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 611,282.

Estimated Time per Response: 10 minutes for mail surveys of anglers, and 5 minutes for intercepted anglers.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 66,239 (12,745 new).

Estimated Total Annual Cost to Public: $0.

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: March 5, 2012.

Gwellnar Banks,

Management Analyst, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 2012–5698 Filed 3–8–12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–22–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

RIN 0648–XB068

Availability of Report: California Eelgrass Mitigation Policy

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of availability; request for comments.

SUMMARY: NMFS is providing this notice in order to allow other agencies and the public an opportunity to review and provide comments on the proposed adoption of the California Eelgrass Mitigation Policy (CEMP) by NMFS Southwest Region (SWR) Habitat Conservation Division (HCD). The intent of the CEMP is to help ensure consistent and effective mitigation of unavoidable impacts to eelgrass habitat throughout the SWR. The CEMP is a unified policy document for SWR–HCD, based on the highly successful implementation of the Southern California Eelgrass Mitigation Policy, which has improved mitigation effectiveness since its initial adoption in 1991. This policy is needed to ensure effective, statewide eelgrass mitigation and will help ensure that unavoidable impacts to eelgrass habitat are fully and appropriately mitigated. It is anticipated that the adoption and implementation of this policy will provide for enhanced success of eelgrass mitigation in California. Given the success of the Southern California Eelgrass Mitigation Policy, the California Eelgrass Mitigation Policy reflects an expansion of the application of this policy with minor modifications to ensure a high standard of statewide eelgrass management and protection. The CEMP will supersede the Southern California Eelgrass Mitigation Policy for all areas of California upon its adoption.

DATES: Public comments must be received on or before 5 p.m., Pacific standard time May 8, 2012. All comments received before the due date will be considered before finalizing the CEMP.

ADDRESSES: Comments on the CEMP may be submitted by mail to the National Marine Fisheries Service, 777 Sonoma Avenue, Suite 325, Santa Rosa, CA 95409, Attn: California Eelgrass Mitigation Policy Comments. Comments may also be sent via facsimile to (707) 578–3435. Comments may also be submitted electronically via email to *SWR.CEMP@noaa.gov.* All comments received will become part of the public record and will be available for review upon request.

The reports are available at *http://swr.nmfs.noaa.gov/hcd/or* by calling the contact person listed below or by sending a request to *Korie.Schaeffer@noaa.gov.* Please include appropriate contact information when requesting the documents.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Korie Schaeffer, at 707–575–6087.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Eelgrass species are seagrasses that occur in the temperate unconsolidated substrate of shallow coastal environments, enclosed bays, and estuaries. Seagrass habitat has been lost from temperate estuaries worldwide (Duarte 2002, Lotze *et al.* 2006, Orth *et al.* 2006). While both natural and human-induced mechanisms have contributed to these losses, impacts from human population expansion and associated pollution and upland development is the primary cause (Short and Wyllie-Echeverria 1996). Throughout California, human activities including, but not limited to, urban development, recreational boating, and commercial shipping continue to degrade, disturb, and/or destroy important eelgrass habitat. For example, dredging and filling; shading and alteration of circulation patterns; and watershed inputs of sediment, nutrients, and unnaturally concentrated or directed freshwater flows can directly and indirectly destroy eelgrass habitats. The importance of eelgrass both ecologically and economically, coupled with ongoing human pressure and potentially increasing degradation and loss from climate change, highlights the need to protect, maintain, and where feasible, enhance eelgrass habitat.

Vegetated shallows that support eelgrass are considered a special aquatic site under the 404(b)(1) guidelines of the Clean Water Act (40 CFR 230.43). Pursuant to the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA), eelgrass is designated as Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) for various federally-managed fish species within the Pacific Coast Groundfish and Pacific Coast Salmon Fisheries Management Plans (FMP) (PFMC 2008). Eelgrass is also considered a habitat area of particular concern (HAPC) for various species within the Pacific Coast Groundfish FMP. An HAPC is a subset of EFH; these areas are rare, particularly susceptible to human-induced degradation, especially ecologically important, and/or located in an environmentally stressed area.

The mission of NMFS SWR–HCD is to conserve, protect, and manage living marine resources and the habitats that sustain them. Eelgrass is a habitat of particular concern relative to accomplishing this mission. Pursuant to the EFH provisions of the MSA, the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (FWCA), and obligations under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) as a responsible agency, NMFS Southwest Region annually reviews and provides recommendations on numerous actions that may affect eelgrass resources throughout California, the only state within NMFS SWR that supports eelgrass resources. Section 305(b)(1)(D) of the MSA requires NMFS to coordinate with, and provide information to, other Federal agencies regarding the conservation and enhancement of EFH. Section 305(b)(2) requires all Federal agencies to consult with the NMFS on all actions or proposed actions authorized, funded, or undertaken by the agency that may adversely affect EFH. Under section 305(b)(4) of the MSA, NMFS is required to provide EFH Conservation Recommendations to Federal and state agencies for actions that would adversely affect EFH (50 CFR 600.925). NMFS makes its recommendations with the goal of avoiding, minimizing, or otherwise compensating for adverse effects to EFH. When impacts to NMFS trust resources are unavoidable, NMFS may recommend compensatory mitigation to offset those impacts. In order to fulfill its consultative role, NMFS may also recommend, *inter alia,* the development of mitigation plans, habitat distribution maps, surveys and survey reports, progress milestones, monitoring programs, and reports