

# NOTICE OF OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET ACTION

Date 01/03/2013

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 10/19/2012

ACTION REQUESTED: New collection (Request for a new OMB Control Number)

TYPE OF REVIEW REQUESTED: Regular

ICR REFERENCE NUMBER: 201209-0648-006

AGENCY ICR TRACKING NUMBER:

TITLE: Understanding Recreational Angler Attitudes and Preferences for Saltwater Fishing

LIST OF INFORMATION COLLECTIONS: See next page

OMB ACTION: Approved with change

OMB CONTROL NUMBER: 0648-0656

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: 01/31/2016

DISCONTINUE DATE:

BURDEN:	RESPONSES	HOURS	COSTS
Previous	0	0	0
New	6,541	2,180	0
Difference			
Change due to New Statute	0	0	0
Change due to Agency Discretion	6,541	2,180	0
Change due to Agency Adjustment	0	0	0
Change due to PRA Violation	0	0	0

TERMS OF CLEARANCE:

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

List of ICs

IC Title	Form No.	Form Name	CFR Citation
Recreational Angler Survey	NA, NA	Saltwater Recreational Survey: Attitudes and Preferences, Saltwater Recreatinal Survey: Attitudes and Preferences	

# 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	2. OMB control number <span style="float: right;">b. <input type="checkbox"/> None</span> a. _____ - _____
3. Type of information collection ( <i>check one</i> ) a. <input type="checkbox"/> New Collection b. <input type="checkbox"/> Revision of a currently approved collection c. <input type="checkbox"/> Extension of a currently approved collection d. <input type="checkbox"/> Reinstatement, without change, of a previously approved collection for which approval has expired e. <input type="checkbox"/> Reinstatement, with change, of a previously approved collection for which approval has expired f. <input type="checkbox"/> Existing collection in use without an OMB control number For b-f, note Item A2 of Supporting Statement instructions	4. Type of review requested ( <i>check one</i> ) a. <input type="checkbox"/> Regular submission b. <input type="checkbox"/> Emergency - Approval requested by _____ / _____ / _____ c. <input type="checkbox"/> Delegated
7. Title	5. Small entities Will this information collection have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
8. Agency form number(s) ( <i>if applicable</i> )	6. Requested expiration date a. <input type="checkbox"/> Three years from approval date b. <input type="checkbox"/> Other Specify: _____ / _____
9. Keywords	
10. Abstract	
11. Affected public ( <i>Mark primary with "P" and all others that apply with "x"</i> ) a. ___ 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 ( <i>check one</i> ) a. <input type="checkbox"/> Voluntary b. <input type="checkbox"/> Required to obtain or retain benefits c. <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory
13. Annual recordkeeping and reporting burden a. Number of respondents _____ b. Total annual responses _____ 1. Percentage of these responses collected electronically _____ % c. Total annual hours requested _____ d. Current OMB inventory _____ e. Difference _____ f. Explanation of difference 1. Program change _____ 2. Adjustment _____	14. Annual reporting and recordkeeping cost burden ( <i>in thousands of dollars</i> ) a. Total annualized capital/startup costs _____ b. Total annual costs (O&M) _____ c. Total annualized cost requested _____ d. Current OMB inventory _____ e. Difference _____ f. Explanation of difference 1. Program change _____ 2. Adjustment _____
15. Purpose of information collection ( <i>Mark primary with "P" and all others that apply with "X"</i> ) a. ___ Application for benefits e. ___ Program planning or management b. ___ Program evaluation f. ___ Research c. ___ General purpose statistics g. ___ Regulatory or compliance d. ___ Audit	16. Frequency of recordkeeping or reporting ( <i>check all that apply</i> ) a. <input type="checkbox"/> Recordkeeping b. <input type="checkbox"/> Third party disclosure c. <input type="checkbox"/> Reporting 1. <input type="checkbox"/> On occasion 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Weekly 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Monthly 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Quarterly 5. <input type="checkbox"/> Semi-annually 6. <input type="checkbox"/> Annually 7. <input type="checkbox"/> Biennially 8. <input type="checkbox"/> Other (describe) _____
17. Statistical methods Does this information collection employ statistical methods <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	18. Agency Contact (person who can best answer questions regarding the content of this submission)  Name: _____ Phone: _____

## 19. Certification for Paperwork Reduction Act Submissions

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

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

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

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

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

Signature of Senior Official or designee

Date

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

Signature

Date

Signature of NOAA Clearance Officer

Signature

Date

**SUPPORTING STATEMENT  
UNDERSTANDING RECREATIONAL ANGLER ATTITUDES AND PREFERENCES  
FOR SALTWATER FISHING  
OMB CONTROL NO. 0648-XXXX**

**A. JUSTIFICATION**

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

The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's (NOAA) National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) manages recreational fisheries, under the authority of the [Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act](#) of 1976 as amended through 2006 (MSA). National Standard 2 under the MSA Sec 301.98-623 requires the use of the best scientific information available. Sec. 303.109-479 specifies that a fishery impact statement for a plan or amendment must assess, specify and analyze the likely effects, including the social, conservation and economic impacts of conservation and management measures for participants in the fishery and fishing communities.

To date, relatively little information has been collected in a systematic manner concerning stakeholder perceptions and preferences for recreational fisheries management. An understanding and knowledge of stakeholder preferences for broad-level management objectives, as well as opinions regarding the current management system and status of marine resources would assist the agency in making decisions that maximize the total societal benefits from marine resources. Furthermore, a systematic understanding of stakeholder preferences for broad-level management objectives would assist NMFS in understanding the likely social impacts of conservation or management measures on recreational fisheries participants.

The objective of the survey will be to understand the range of attitudes, preferences, and concerns that recreational anglers hold towards saltwater fishing. Furthermore, the survey elicits the types of goals and objectives that should be pursued (e.g., in developing guidelines), and overall attitudes and concerns regarding recreational fisheries management. The questionnaire is well timed to establish a baseline for outreach and planning. NMFS and the Regional Fishery Management Councils will be hosting the third Managing our Nation's Fisheries in May 2013. One of the thematic focus areas is the assessment and integration of socioeconomic tradeoffs. The survey results will inform NMFS, the Fishery Management Councils and other stakeholders on anglers' preferences for recreational fisheries management.

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

The information will provide fisheries managers with quantitative information on stakeholder preferences for recreational fisheries management, so that when goals and objectives of fisheries management are being reviewed or developed, managers will understand the priorities and preferences of a diverse group of fisheries stakeholders. Council staff and staff from NOAA

Fisheries may refer to the information periodically as management guidelines are revised, and future decisions concerning fisheries management may refer to the information to anticipate what stakeholder responses might be to particular management decisions.<sup>1</sup>

The survey form is organized to ease the collection of the data by clearly identifying the types of data being collected, through the use of clearly defined sections. The survey will collect information on 1) recreational fishing participation, 2) fishing motivations, 3) preferences for management strategies, 4) preferences for management objectives, 5) preferences for managing the marine environment, and 6) demographic information. These are data that are unavailable from other sources. The sections are further described below.

#### Section 1 – Recreational Fishing Participation

This section seeks to describe the actual level of involvement an individual has in recreational fishing. Questions are asked to determine fishing avidity, location of fishing activity, frequent targets on fishing trips. Also, a question is asked to determine the primary sources of information that a recreational fishermen uses. The results of these questions will primarily be used for outreach and education purposes.

#### Section 2 – Fishing Motivations

This section seeks to understand why anglers fish and what their expectations are from a fishing trip. These results can assist managers in managing angler expectations and understanding where to target efforts designed to improve angler satisfaction.

#### Section 3 – Preferences for Management Strategies

This section seeks to understand which types of strategies anglers prefer in managing fisheries. These results can assist managers when one or more types of strategies can achieve the same outcome, allowing managers to choose strategies that are most preferable to anglers and may minimize angler's negative reactions to management and regulations.

#### Section 4 – Preferences for Management Objectives

This section seeks to understand the types of larger objectives anglers are most interested in management pursuing. These results will be useful for outreach and educational purposes.

#### Section 5 – Managing the Marine Environment

This section contains questions about the marine environment but not specifically about saltwater fishing in the marine environment. Responses to these questions, along with the demographic questions in section 6, will be useful in understanding and interpreting responses to questions in other sections of the survey.

#### Section 6 – About you and your Household – demographic information

This section elicits information on the respondent, their age, level of education, employment level, household income, sex, race and ethnicity. This standard demographic information will allow us to better understand the unique characteristics of the recreational fishermen.

Information collected in this section is comparable to United States (U.S.) Census information. The U.S. Census does not collect or provide the information at a level to be able to identify a

---

<sup>1</sup> The NMFS National Policy Advisor for Recreational Fisheries would like to repeat this survey every five years. We expect that attitudes and preferences should remain relatively constant in this time period. Plans for repeating the survey are all dependent on funding.

specific population of fishermen, or fishermen as a separate industry. Information about fishermen in the U.S. Census is aggregated with other industries such as forestry and agriculture. Collection of the data in this section serves to describe this specific population of fishermen and will allow for comparisons to the general U.S. public.

It is anticipated that the information collected will be disseminated to the public or used to support publicly disseminated information. NMFS 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. Prior to dissemination, the information will be subjected to quality control measures and a pre-dissemination review pursuant to [Section 515 of Public Law 106-554](#).

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

The data will be collected via a voluntary mail survey, and thus the use of automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological techniques is minimal with the exception of a mail merge to create personalized cover letters and mailing labels. The cover letter will involve the merging of the sampling database with prepared cover letters to create a personalized introduction to the survey.

**4. Describe efforts to identify duplication.**

Canvassing NOAA Fisheries economists and social scientists determined that no similar survey efforts have been or will be undertaken by NOAA Fisheries. One exception was for the Pacific Islands. The Pacific Islands Science Center and the Pacific Islands Regional Office have recently conducted similar surveys that ask respondents about their preferences for saltwater fishing, and a survey is planned for the fall of 2012 that will also focus on angler attitudes regarding saltwater fishing and fisheries management. Because the sampling frame for Pacific Islands anglers will be taxed as a result of these survey efforts, we are delaying the implementation of our survey in the Pacific Islands and will review the results of ongoing and planned surveys to determine whether our survey would yield new information. If our survey is deemed necessary for the Pacific Islands it will be implemented via a nonsubstantive change request at a later date, to be determined.

As stated in Question 2, some of the information to be collected is comparable to United States (U.S.) Census information. However, the U.S. Census does not collect or provide the information at a level to be able to identify a specific population of fishermen, or fishermen as a separate industry. Information about fishermen in the U.S. Census is aggregated with other industries such as forestry and agriculture. Collection of the data in this section serves to describe this specific population of fishermen and will allow for comparisons to the general U.S. public.

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

Not applicable.

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

As stated above, NOAA Fisheries lacks data collected in a systematic manner that describes stakeholder's attitudes toward and preferences for recreational fisheries management. It is vital to collect survey data to facilitate stakeholder understanding of the process, and to allow stakeholders to express preferences and concerns about the overall management approach. Without this type of information, fisheries managers will lack information on what types of goals and objectives stakeholders consider important in recreational fisheries management, thus making it more difficult to maximize societal benefits from management decisions. In addition, lacking the type of information that will be collected in this research will reduce the efficiency of planning and outreach activities.

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

The collection will be conducted in a manner consistent with OMB Guidelines.

**8. Provide a copy of 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 record keeping, disclosure, or reporting format (if any), and on the data elements to be recorded, disclosed, or reported.**

A Federal Register Notice published on June 21, 2012 (77 FR 37387) solicited public comment.

Three comments were received in response to the Federal Register Notice. The commenters wanted more information about the survey, and were provided a copy of the survey instrument. One of these followed up with specific comments on the survey instrument. A written response was provided to address each of his comments in the survey, and he was provided with a revised survey version. Comments and responses are included as a supplementary document, Appendix 1.

Several briefings have been made with industry stakeholders (e.g. recreational fishing group representatives) to discuss the objectives of the survey and the need to conduct a survey at this time. In addition, a briefing was provided to the Recreational Subcommittee of the Marine Fisheries Advisory Committee to discuss the need for, timing of, and general objectives of the survey.

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

No payments or gifts are made.

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

As stated on the survey, the data collected will be 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.

**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.**

There are no questions of a sensitive nature.

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

The proposed collection will require approximately 2,180 burden hours (6,541 estimated respondents, and responses, at 20 minutes per response).

**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).**

There are no start-up, capital, or maintenance costs associated with this collection. No new or specialized equipment is needed to respond to this collection. The forms are provided with postage-paid envelopes.

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

The estimated Cost to Government is \$2,420 for printing and mailing the survey. All analysis and reporting will be done as part of regular duties: 160 hours total X \$65.38 = \$10,461 + 160 hours total X \$46.63 = \$7,462.

Total cost to Government for analysis and reporting is \$17,923.

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

This is a new submission.

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

All results will be entered in a database using standard quality assurance/quality control procedures in survey research. Economists from NOAA Fisheries will analyze the data using standard software (e.g. SAS) and standard statistical procedures that are appropriate for survey data. Results from this collection may be used in scientific, management, technical or general informational publications, and would follow prescribed statistical tabulations and summary table formats. Data will be available to the general public on request in summary form only.

**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  
UNDERSTANDING RECREATIONAL ANGLER ATTITUDES AND PREFERENCES  
FOR SALTWATER FISHING  
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.**

The potential respondent universe consists of saltwater recreational anglers in the contiguous U.S. and in Alaska. The sampling frame will be the National Registry of Saltwater Anglers which contains contact information for anglers who purchased a saltwater fishing license during the last year. Note that some states collect their own license information but provide that information to the National Registry. For states that are exempted from the National Registry (CA, WA, OR) we will obtain license data that includes angler contact information from either the Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission or the state agency that collects the data, as they are required to provide NMFS with the data necessary to conduct surveys (i.e. contact information) if they are exempt from the National Registry.

Respondents will be stratified by region of fishing license.

NOAA Fisheries will use a stratified random sample (proportionally sampled from each region) to select the sampling population from the frame. The sampling frame has been cleaned to remove duplicates. Table 1 describes data on each stakeholder entity.

NOAA Fisheries attains response rates between 40 and 65% for surveys related to recreational fishing preferences. For surveys on costs and/or expenditures, response rates may be lower. For this survey we expect a slightly higher response rate of 75% for several reasons. First, there are no cost earnings questions, which may be perceived as sensitive and may dissuade potential respondents from returning their survey. The survey does not contain a choice experiment or conjoint question, which tend to be cognitively taxing for survey respondents and may decrease response rates. This survey is strictly about attitudes and opinions and does not require anglers to make trade-offs, as in a conjoint survey, or recall or calculate expenditures. Thus the cognitive burden on anglers will be relatively minimal. In addition, there is a section on angler satisfaction with recreational fisheries management which we anticipate will encourage anglers to return their completed survey. This expectation is based on focus group feedback in which anglers stated that they would like their evaluations of management to be known to managers. Finally, outreach efforts that focus on the upcoming survey have been relatively extensive via the NMFS Regional Recreational Fisheries Coordinators and the National Policy Advisor for Recreational Fisheries.

**TABLE I**

<b>Column A. Respondent Entity</b>	<b>Column B. Number of Entries in Sampling Frame</b>	<b>Column C. Observations required to estimate true population value<sup>1</sup> using proportional sampling rate<sup>2</sup> (see Equation 1)</b>	<b>Column D. Sample size required under assumption of 75% response rate (Column C / 75%)</b>	<b>Column E. Sample size with 15% Buffer (Column D * 115%)</b>
Gulf of Mexico (TX, LA, MS, AL, West Coast FL)	1,272,925	812	1,083	1,245
Northeast (CT, RI, MA, ME, NH)	502,172	320	427	491
Mid-Atlantic (VA, DE, MD, NJ, NY)	931,802	595	793	912
Southeast (NC, SC, GA, East Coast FL)	913,769	583	777	894
Alaska	435,700	278	371	426
West Coast (CA, WA, OR)	2,629,712	1,678	2,237	2,573
Total	6,686,082	4,266	5,688	6,541

<sup>1</sup> n = 278 is the minimum number of observations required for true population estimate

<sup>2</sup> proportional sampling rate = 0.0638%.

**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.**

A stratified random sample of the frame will be used to draw the sample population. The allocation method for each of the  $l$  strata (Respondent Entity) will be a proportional allocation ( $n_1/N_1 = n_2/N_2 \dots n_l/N_l$ ). This allocation method is appropriate when unequal variances for each stratum are assumed, which NOAA Fisheries assumes to be true for stakeholder entities in the frame (Rice 1995).

Note that each region is represented within each  $l$  strata. Section 1 of the instrument will be tailored to reflect the appropriate species for that particular region. The survey instrument provided is an example of a West Coast survey. Other than the different species or complexes contained in Section 1, the instrument will look the same for all regions (with exceptions for specific references to ‘Southeast’, ‘Northeast’, ‘Mid-Atlantic’, ‘Alaska’, ‘West Coast’ or ‘Gulf of Mexico’ in explanatory text or questions).

Following Equation 1 (Yamane 1967) approximately 278 observations are required to represent the true value for a population of > 100,000, assuming a +/- 6% precision rate,

$$\text{Equation 1. } n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)^2}$$

$$\text{Equation 1, Example. } 278 = \frac{435,700}{1 + 435,700(0.06)^2}$$

where  $n$  is the sample size,  $N$  is the population size, and  $e$  is the level of precision required. The equation assumes a confidence interval of 95% and maximum variability in the sample (.50). An observation unit is an individual respondent.

To ensure proportional allocation among the strata and to ensure that the minimum number of observations is met for each strata (278 observations) requires a sampling rate of 0.0638% ( $278/435,700 = 0.0638\%$ ). Applying this rate to each stratum results in a combined sample of 4,266 observations (Table 1).

As explained in Question 1, we assume a 75% response rate for this survey, and funds will be available to provide a 15% sampling buffer, resulting in a combined sample of 6,541 (Table 1).

As described in Dillman (2000):

- Each respondent will receive a pre-notice letter informing the potential respondent of the survey effort, purpose, and forthcoming survey instrument.
- Approximately 9 days after the pre-notice, a survey instrument and cover letter will be mailed to all sampling units.
- A reminder postcard will be sent to all respondents 2 weeks after the survey mailing, and
- A second survey mailing will be sent to all respondents who have not completed and returned their survey within 2 weeks of the reminder postcard.

This is a one-time data collection.

**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 mail survey implementation will follow state-of-the-art protocols described in ‘The Tailored Design Method’ (Dillman 2000). Protocols include 4 mailings with approximately 2 weeks between mailings: (1) a pre-notice letter informing the respondent that they have been selected to receive a survey within the next two weeks; (2) a cover letter describing the importance of filling out the survey completely and the survey questionnaire; (3) a post-card follow up thanking respondents who returned their survey and reminding respondents to complete their survey and return it if they have not already done so; (4) a final mailing including a cover letter and survey

instrument. The tailored design method is designed to maximize response rates, and components of the design have been scientifically tested and determined to increase response rates for mail surveys (Dillman 2000). In addition, the survey will be designed to be easy to understand and will minimize the response burden by providing categorical answer choices for the majority of the questions.

A small random sample of non-respondents will be contacted by telephone to determine the extent, if any, of non-response bias. All non-respondents will be asked demographic information and 5 randomly selected questions from Section 3 of the survey.

**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.**

Prior to the survey implementation, NOAA Fisheries conducted a focus group with 9 anglers in the southeastern U.S. Their feedback was used to revise language and questions in the instrument and to ensure that material is understood and interpreted by the respondent as intended.

**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.**

Sampling Design, Data Analysis and Report Writing:

Kristy Wallmo, NOAA Fisheries

301-427-8190

Ayeisha Brinson, NOAA Fisheries

301-427-8198

## **References**

Dillman, D. 2000. Mail and Internet Surveys. The Tailored Design Method. John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, New York.

Rice, J. 1995. Mathematical Statistics and Data Analysis, Second Edition. Wadsworth Publishing Company, Belmont, California.

Yamane, Taro. 1967. Statistics, An Introductory Analysis, 2nd Ed., New York: Harper and Row.

## **Appendix I. Comments from the Federal Register Notice and Agency Responses**

### **Comment 1**

On Fri, Jun 22, 2012 at 2:37 PM, Jack Kelleher <[jfkshadow@comcast.net](mailto:jfkshadow@comcast.net)> wrote:  
**This request is for a new collection of information.**

The objective of the survey will be to understand the range of attitudes, preferences, and concerns that recreational anglers hold towards saltwater fishing. Rather a broad statement, isn't it. Is there further information about what they would like commented on?

Thanks,

John Kelleher

**Kristy Wallmo**

Jun 22

to Jack

Jack,

We are currently developing the survey instrument. The focus will be on the kinds of things recreational anglers expect out of their fishing trips, their satisfaction with current management, and opinions on regionally-specific issues related to saltwater recreational fishing and management.

When we have a survey instrument developed I would be happy to send it to you.

Thanks for your interest - Kristy Wallmo

**Note: A survey instrument was sent to Jack in August.**

## Comment 2

On Tue, Jul 3, 2012 at 11:29 AM, Chad Hanson <[chanson@pewtrusts.org](mailto:chanson@pewtrusts.org)> wrote:  
Ms. Wallmo,

I have seen the agency's notice and solicitation for comments on the proposed information collection on "understanding recreational angler attitudes and preferences for saltwater fishing." The notice only provide general information as to what is to be collected. I am wondering if you can share the specific information that is to be collected (i.e., provide a copy of the survey questions to be asked) so I can have a better understanding of what data this survey will be gathering.

thanks  
Chad

### Chad W. Hanson

Science and Policy Analyst

Gulf of Mexico Fish Conservation Campaign

The Pew Charitable Trusts, Pew Environment Group

o: 850.745.8086 | **NEW c: 850-491-4754** | e: [chanson@pewtrusts.org](mailto:chanson@pewtrusts.org)

[www.PewEnvironment.org/GulfFish](http://www.PewEnvironment.org/GulfFish) | [www.pewenvironment.org](http://www.pewenvironment.org)

**From:** Kristy Wallmo [mailto:[kristy.wallmo@noaa.gov](mailto:kristy.wallmo@noaa.gov)]

**Sent:** Tuesday, July 03, 2012 2:00 PM

**To:** Chad Hanson

**Subject:** Re: Proposed Information Collection: Angler Attitudes

Chad,

Thanks for your message - I have attached the survey instrument. Please note that at this stage the instrument is a draft and we will be taking this to a focus group and also asking for feedback from regional economists and NMFS's recreational fisheries coordinators. Also, note that this version is specific to the West Coast (CA, WA, OR), but there will be a version that is specific to each coastal region of the U.S. Please feel free to email if you have additional questions. Thanks, Kristy

**Kristy Wallmo**

Jul 5

to Chad

Thanks Chad. I've tried to address your questions below:

On Tue, Jul 3, 2012 at 3:30 PM, Chad Hanson <[chanson@pewtrusts.org](mailto:chanson@pewtrusts.org)> wrote:

Thanks for the draft survey and bit of background. A couple of more questions if you don't mind:

1. Does this notice for comments cover all the regional surveys under development, or would another notice have to go out for public comment on the process for the other regions one at a time?

(Krsisty) This notice covers all regional surveys - they will likely not change too much with the exception of the species and geographic fishing areas - there may be additional questions for regional instruments, pending comments.

2. When and how could I get the final version of the survey for the SE/Gulf region?

(Krsisty) I would be happy to send you this when it is developed - it may be the end of August.

3. What is the specific intent for these surveys? For instance, will these results be presented at Council meetings, made available to state agencies? Or is this for internal planning /evaluation purposes?

(Krsisty) The findings will be publicly available - results will be presented at meetings and conferences, and can certainly be sent to state agencies/commissions, etc... If a Council requests that we make a presentation on the results we would be more than happy to oblige, as long as travel budgets allow.

4. Also, is it possible to provide input as to what type of information / questions asked for the SE/Gulf survey?

For instance, I am interested in

a. if anglers might prefer having a set recreational season where many or most species would be open at the same time rather than having some species opened and closed at separate times where there might be inducing bycatch issues.

(Kristy) I actually like "a" a lot, and will likely try to incorporate this into a question for the Southeast survey instrument.

b. anglers catch and release practices/behavior/attitudes which may include a number of questions but I think would be very informative to managers.

(Kristy) "b" would not be possible on this survey - I agree it would be informative but the survey is almost at it's capacity for questions as it stands. We have conducted a survey in the Northeast that included a suite of questions on catch and release behavior -- I published a paper from that data in NAJFM and can send you a copy.

Thanks for your interest,

Kristy

**Comment 3**

**From:** Todd Phillips <[tphillips@oceanconservancy.org](mailto:tphillips@oceanconservancy.org)>

**Date:** August 17, 2012 11:28:38 AM EDT

**To:** "Jessup, Jennifer" <[JJessup@doc.gov](mailto:JJessup@doc.gov)>

**Subject: Comment Letter: Proposed Information Collection: Understanding Recreational Angler Attitudes and Preferences for Saltwater Fishing [FR Doc No: 2012-15127]**

**RE: Proposed Information Collection: Understanding Recreational Angler Attitudes and Preferences for Saltwater Fishing [FR Doc No: 2012-15127]**

Dear Ms. Jessup:

Ocean Conservancy<sup>1</sup> appreciates this opportunity to provide comments on the **Proposed Information Collection: Understanding Recreational Angler Attitudes and Preferences for Saltwater Fishing** survey to be performed by National Marine Fisheries Service Office of Science and Technology (NMFS OST).<sup>2</sup> We are encouraged to see that NMFS OST is pursuing stakeholder involvement in their decision making processes. This, we believe, is integral to the success of the recreational data collection and management programs administered by NMFS. The addition of these data will likely help managers shape regulatory actions in the future.

In the Federal Register notice, comments were invited on four topics: (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.

**Summary Recommendations:**

- (a) This information is essential to the proper performance of agency functions and integral to increased understanding of angler attitudes and preferences.
- (b) We choose not to comment on this point as we lack the necessary information regarding internal time management and budgetary allocations within the OST.
- (c) We suggest several additions to the survey questions in order to clarify and/or obtain more detailed data from participants.
- (d) The dual mode information collection methodology is very functional and efficient.

**Detailed Recommendations:**

***Item (a)***

Understanding of angler attitudes and preferences is integral to US fishery management. In the current fishery management system, stakeholders are invited to participate in all publicly held fishery management meetings. The decisions managers make affect the public. They, the managers, require stakeholder involvement in the process to make informed decisions that provide the best benefit to the nation. Unfortunately, members of the public are not always able to attend these meetings due to such things as travel costs, work schedule, etc. These stakeholders deserve a voice and this survey allows their thoughts and opinions to be relayed to the

appropriate decision makers. We would argue more of these types of qualitative data gathering surveys, not fewer, are needed to give the public more input into the system.

***Item (b)***

No comment due to our lack of knowledge regarding internal allocations of employee time and budgetary allotments with the NMFS OST.

***Item (c)***

The scope of the information to be collected has been well thought out and is both simple and concise enough that respondents should not feel overburdened to complete the survey. However, there are several instances where additional choices should have been provided for participants. The specific questions that we would draw your attention to are listed below, with our comments and recommendations following.

*Question 9: During the past year, which of the following meetings have you attended?*

While this question provides four (4) descriptive answers and an 'Other' category, it does not provide a 'None' category. It could be assumed that in the 'Other' category, one could answer with a "no meetings attended;" however, this is not explicitly stated. We suggest a 'None' selection be provided.

*Question 11: Most of my fishing trips are taken from...*

Kayaks are increasingly popular methods of fishing platforms. While the selection of 'Private Boat' could also imply kayak, it is not explicitly stated. Further, to developed better sampling data and understanding of the fishery at-large, the selection of 'Kayak' should be provided or, at minimum, included with or described as a private boat.

*Question 15: Please read each item in the table...*

The layout of this question is confusing. The data is necessary; however, a suggested means to make the layout easier to read would be to added vertical column dividers. This would allow participants to understand each column is a separate section and uses a different scale.

*Question 18: In your opinion, how much of a threat, if any...*

A suggested addition to the listed factors is “Commercial Fishing.” While Ocean Conservancy does not have a position on this one way or another, a common topic at regional fishery management council meeting’s public testimony session is recreational anglers voicing their opinion on commercial fishing and its effects on marine fisheries. Thus it seems useful to include this option given the purpose of the survey.

*Section 5: About you and your household*

Two additional questions are suggested for this section:

- 1) If the angler has their own boat
- 2) If their boat is moored at a private dock or marina

The limitations of saltwater recreational surveys, like the Marine Fisheries Information Program, to sample private docks and marinas are well known. We suggest these two questions as a means to increase data collection from these modes

*Additional Comments*

This portion provides nearly a page for participants to submit any additional comments they may have. Some participants may be more vocal than others and a suggested improvement would be to allow anglers to attach additional pages for those participants who do not use the internet based survey.

*Item (d)*

The dual mode method of mail and the internet as a means of distribution and data transmission is appropriate. The provided information did not detail the level of contact between NMFS OST and selected participants and whether the participants would be given the choice of electronic or paper submission. Electronic submission, via the internet, is a cost effective and efficient means to obtain the information requested in the questionnaire. We suggest NMFS OST offer both methods and allow the participant to choose which one they believe works best for them.

We thank NMFS and the Department of Commerce for allowing Ocean Conservancy to comment on this forthcoming survey. Angler attitudes and preference data is intrinsic to better management of the resource and will allow managers to make better decisions regarding our nations fishery resources.

Sincerely,

Todd Phillips  
Fishery Monitoring Specialist  
Ocean Conservancy  
106 E 6th Street, Suite 400  
Austin, TX 78701

to tphillips, JJessup, Sarah, Ayeisha, bcc: me

Hello Todd,

Thank you for your comments on the NMFS survey "Understanding Recreational Angler Attitudes and Preferences for Saltwater Fishing" [FR Doc No: 2012-15127]. Based on comments we have received thus far we have already made revisions to the survey instrument you reviewed. I am attaching a revised survey instrument that I believe addresses some of your comments - particularly the comment you had on Q. 15. Please see below for responses to your specific comments. Thanks for your careful review of the survey and your suggestions. Please feel free to email myself or Ayeisha Brinson (the other NMFS economist working on the survey development and implementation) if you have further questions or comments.

Q9: adding a "None" response category. We assume the respondent will not check any of the boxes if the intent is none of the above. However, we will work on arranging the responses so that we can add a "None" category - we are slightly constrained by the page layout but will try to work that in.

Q11: adding a "Kayak" response category. We would like to maintain consistency with the MRIP survey, which does not include an option for "kayak"

Q15: Please see the revised instrument - we had other comments that were similar to yours and thus revised the question and the format.

Q18: adding "commercial fishing" as a response category. There is a response category for overfishing, which includes commercial fishing. This question was taken from a larger survey and we would like to maintain consistency in the format/response categories as much as possible for comparative purposes.

Section 5: Adding two additional questions about boat ownership/mooring. We can work on trying to incorporate these two questions - again we have space constraints and need to maintain a survey booklet that is no more than 12 pages total but we will try and fit these two questions onto the page.

For the space constraint reason listed above we cannot add extra blank pages for anglers to comment. In addition, in our experience survey respondents rarely write more than one page of comments - most do not write more than a paragraph.

We are looking into implementing this survey as a dual mode survey - currently the survey is intended as a mail survey but we are examining our budget constraints to determine whether a dual mode is possible.

Again, thank you for your comments. - Kristy Wallmo and Ayeisha Brinson

# Saltwater Recreational Fishing Attitudes and Preferences Survey



**Your Response Is Important!**

Sponsored by  
NOAA Fisheries Service

The National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) is conducting a survey about **saltwater** recreational fishing and recreational fisheries management.

NMFS is the federal agency responsible for the stewardship of marine fishery resources and their habitat, works together with state agencies to manage fish stocks so that anglers have quality opportunities to participate in recreational fishing. NMFS is conducting this survey to improve our understanding of anglers' expectations and how they may be changing with fishing conditions. Responses to this survey will provide a basis for more informed decision- making for fisheries managers and to determine recreational anglers' preferred management approaches.

Your responses are strictly confidential and will not be associated with your personal identity.

The questions in this survey are about **YOU** and **YOUR** saltwater recreational fishing activities and preferences. Except when asked, please do not include any information from other household members or other saltwater fishing party members.

**Marine or saltwater** refers to open ocean or any portion of a bay, sound, or river that is saltwater or brackish water.

**Please print clearly.**

Write numbers as two digits: 2 trips =

Fill in boxes with a  or

## Section 1. Recreational Fishing Participation

In this section, we ask about your recreational fishing experience.

1. How many years have you been saltwater recreational fishing?

Number of years

2. During the past **12 months**, how many days have you spent **saltwater** recreational fishing?

Number of days, count partial days as full

I am unsure

3. During the past 12 months, has most of your fishing been from? (*Check one.*)

Three miles or less from shore

More than three miles from shore

I am unsure

4. During the past 12 months, which area did you most frequently fish from? (*Check one.*)

Washington

Oregon

Northern California

Southern California

Other \_\_\_\_\_

5. What species do you frequently target when you fish off the coast of California, Oregon or Washington? (*Check all that apply.*)

Rockfish, greenling, sculpin, other bottomfish

Halibut, other flatfish

Bonito, barracuda, seabass

Sturgeon, striped bass

Surfperches

Salmon

Crabs, clams, lobster, other shellfish

Tuna, yellowtail

Herring, smelt, grunion, sardine, mackerel, anchovy, baitfishes

Other \_\_\_\_\_

None, I don't typically target any particular species

	Shore (Beach, pier or bridge)	For-hire (Charter, party, or head boats)	Private boat
6. During the past 12 months..... Most of my fishing trips were taken from... <i>(check only one)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I took at least one fishing trip from... <i>(check all that apply)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

7. Thinking ahead to the next 12 months, is it likely that the number of fishing trips you take will decrease?

- No**, the number of trips I intend to take will stay the same or increase. *Go to question 8.*
- Yes**, the number of trips I intend to take will decrease. *Go to question 7b.*

7b. In the next 12 months, the number of fishing trips you take will decrease for the following reasons...  
*(For each reason check one box.)*

	Very likely	Somewhat likely	Somewhat unlikely	Not likely at all	I am unsure
a. Availability of leisure time	<input type="checkbox"/>				
b. Personal finances	<input type="checkbox"/>				
c. Fishing trip costs	<input type="checkbox"/>				
d. Change of residence	<input type="checkbox"/>				
e. Recreational fishing regulations	<input type="checkbox"/>				
f. Conditions of the fishery (e.g. change in the abundance of fish)	<input type="checkbox"/>				

8. Where do you get information about fishing and other marine related activities and issues?  
*(Check all that apply.)*

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Friends or Family             | <input type="checkbox"/> Television             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Radio                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Newspapers/magazines   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Social media                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Fishing websites/blogs |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Organization newsletter/email | <input type="checkbox"/> Federal/state websites |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Please name) _____     |   |

The table below lists different characteristics of fishing trips. Please read each characteristic and state how important each one is to you. (For each characteristic check one box.)

9. On most of your fishing trips, how important is it to...	Extremely important	Somewhat important	Neutral	Somewhat unimportant	Not important at all
a. Catch fish	<input type="checkbox"/>				
b. Catch as many fish as I can for consumption	<input type="checkbox"/>				
c. Catch-and-release as many fish as possible	<input type="checkbox"/>				
d. Catch a trophy-sized fish	<input type="checkbox"/>				
e. Target a particular species	<input type="checkbox"/>				
f. Catch the bag limit of a species I am targeting	<input type="checkbox"/>				
g. Know that I will encounter abundant fish	<input type="checkbox"/>				
h. Fish in an area that is not heavily congested	<input type="checkbox"/>				
i. Be close to amenities such as parking, restrooms, cleaning stations, boat launches, etc...	<input type="checkbox"/>				
j. See information concerning fishing regulations clearly posted	<input type="checkbox"/>				
k. Have access to staff (park staff, marina operators, etc...) to answer questions or provide information.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
l. Have easy access to weather and tide information	<input type="checkbox"/>				
m. Fish in a scenic area	<input type="checkbox"/>				
n. Fish with family or friends	<input type="checkbox"/>				
o. Teach others about fishing	<input type="checkbox"/>				

## Section 2. Your Preferences for Management Strategies

There are a variety of strategies that recreational fisheries managers can use in managing a fishery. Some strategies regulate the amount of effort (for example, shorter or longer fishing seasons), others regulate catch (for example, bag limits or size limits), and others focus on setting aside areas of the ocean (for example, marine reserves) that provide spawning habitat or shelter for fish.

In this section, we ask for your opinions about the types of strategies that you prefer for managers to use in recreational fisheries management.

10. Please state your preference for using each strategy listed below (For each strategy check one box).

	Strongly prefer	Somewhat prefer	Slightly prefer	Do not prefer at all	I am unsure
a. Establish minimum size limits of the fish you can keep	<input type="checkbox"/>				
b. Establish maximum size limits of the fish you can keep	<input type="checkbox"/>				
c. Limit the total number of fish you can keep	<input type="checkbox"/>				
d. Manage some species as catch-and-release only	<input type="checkbox"/>				
e. Establish longer seasons with more restrictive bag limits	<input type="checkbox"/>				
f. Establish shorter seasons with less restrictive bag limits	<input type="checkbox"/>				
g. Establish shorter seasons with a larger variety of species you can legally catch	<input type="checkbox"/>				
h. Increase the recreational harvest limit by decreasing the commercial harvest limit	<input type="checkbox"/>				
i. Divide the recreational harvest limit among different modes (e.g. private anglers and for-hire/charter boat anglers)	<input type="checkbox"/>				
j. Restrict certain types of fishing gear	<input type="checkbox"/>				
k. Require the use of release techniques that reduce fish mortality	<input type="checkbox"/>				
l. Provide artificial fish habitat (e.g. artificial reef) in some areas of the ocean	<input type="checkbox"/>				
m. Protect and restore fish habitat that has been degraded	<input type="checkbox"/>				
n. Designate some areas of the ocean as marine reserves with catch-and-release fishing only	<input type="checkbox"/>				
o. Close some areas of the ocean for certain seasons	<input type="checkbox"/>				

### Section 3. Your Preferences for Management Objectives

There are a number of different management objectives that can be pursued by recreational fisheries management. Some objectives may conflict with each other, and some may be more important to you than others.

In this section, we ask for your opinions about the types of objectives that *you* think are important and should be pursued by recreational fisheries management.

11. Please state how important you believe each objective is for recreational fisheries management (*For each objective check one box*).

	Extremely important	Somewhat important	Neutral	Somewhat unimportant	Not important at all	I am unsure
a. Ensure that large quantities of fish are available to catch	<input type="checkbox"/>					
b. Ensure that many different fish species are available to catch	<input type="checkbox"/>					
c. Ensure that adequate numbers of trophy-sized fish are available to catch	<input type="checkbox"/>					
d. Reduce the mortality associated with releasing fish that are not legal to keep	<input type="checkbox"/>					
e. Ensure that future generations will have high quality fishing opportunities	<input type="checkbox"/>					
f. Allocate some quota from commercial fisheries to recreational fisheries	<input type="checkbox"/>					
g. Recover fish stocks that have been depleted	<input type="checkbox"/>					
h. Protect marine biodiversity	<input type="checkbox"/>					
i. Protect threatened or endangered marine species	<input type="checkbox"/>					
j. Achieve consistency between state and federal fishing regulations	<input type="checkbox"/>					
k. Simplify recreational fishing regulations	<input type="checkbox"/>					
l. Monitor and enforce recreational fishing regulations	<input type="checkbox"/>					
m. Ensure that the opinions of all recreational fisheries stakeholders are considered in policy-making	<input type="checkbox"/>					
n. Ensure opportunities to fish in high quality fishing areas	<input type="checkbox"/>					
o. Ensure that fishing sites are not heavily congested	<input type="checkbox"/>					

## Section 4. Your Satisfaction with Recreational Fisheries Management

In this section, we ask about your satisfaction level with recreational fisheries management.

12. How satisfied are you that recreational fisheries management is adequately addressing each item below  
(For each item, check one box).

	Extremely satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Neutral	Somewhat dissatisfied	Not satisfied at all	I am unsure
a. Managing fish stocks to provide high quality fishing opportunities	<input type="checkbox"/>					
b. Restoring fish stocks that have been depleted	<input type="checkbox"/>					
c. Adjust regulations in a timely manner to address changing conditions of the fishery	<input type="checkbox"/>					
d. Using management strategies that minimize costs to anglers	<input type="checkbox"/>					
e. Ensure that the annual harvest limit provides enough fish for recreational fisheries	<input type="checkbox"/>					
f. Ensuring that state and federal regulations are consistent	<input type="checkbox"/>					
g. Monitoring and enforcing recreational fishing regulations	<input type="checkbox"/>					
h. Using high quality data and assessments in policy-making	<input type="checkbox"/>					
i. Incorporating stakeholder interests in policy-making	<input type="checkbox"/>					
j. Protecting fish or shellfish species that are declining	<input type="checkbox"/>					
k. Protecting marine habitats	<input type="checkbox"/>					
l. Addressing conflicts between anglers and marine mammals	<input type="checkbox"/>					

## Section 5. Managing the Marine Environment

In this section, we ask about broader issues concerning management of the marine environment.

13. In your opinion, how much of a threat, if any, does each of the following factors pose to the marine environment? (For each factor, check one box.)

	Severe threat	Moderate threat	Not a very severe threat	Not a threat at all	I am unsure
a. Industrial pollution	<input type="checkbox"/>				
b. Oil and gas extraction	<input type="checkbox"/>				
c. Climate change	<input type="checkbox"/>				
d. Ocean acidification	<input type="checkbox"/>				
e. Shipping	<input type="checkbox"/>				
f. Overfishing in commercial fisheries	<input type="checkbox"/>				
g. Overfishing in recreational fisheries	<input type="checkbox"/>				
h. Non-native species	<input type="checkbox"/>				
i. Aquaculture	<input type="checkbox"/>				
j. Alternative energy (e.g. wave or wind) development	<input type="checkbox"/>				
k. Coastal development	<input type="checkbox"/>				
l. Algal blooms	<input type="checkbox"/>				
m. Marine habitat loss or degradation	<input type="checkbox"/>				
n. Dams/barriers	<input type="checkbox"/>				

**Section 6. About You and Your Household**

The following questions will help us know more about recreational saltwater anglers. The information you provide will remain STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL and will not be associated with your personal identity.

14. In the past 12 months, how many hours per week did you typically work for pay?

15. Which of the following categories best describes your household's total annual income before taxes in 2010? *(Please check only one category.)*

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than \$20,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> \$80,000-\$99,999   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$20,000-\$39,999  | <input type="checkbox"/> \$100,000-\$149,999 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$40,000-\$59,999  | <input type="checkbox"/> \$150,000-\$199,999 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$60,000-\$79,999  | <input type="checkbox"/> \$200,000 or more   |

16. Do you or anyone in your household make a living part-time or full-time from work directly associated with marine resources or the marine environment? *(Please check one.)*

- Yes       No       I am unsure



If yes, how concerned are you that fisheries management decisions will impact your livelihood? *(Please check one.)*

- Very concerned  
 Somewhat concerned  
 Slightly concerned  
 Not concerned at all

17. Are you male or female?

- Male       Female

18. In what year were you born?

(Year)

19. What is your ethnicity? *(Please check one.)*

- Hispanic or Latino
- Not Hispanic or Latino

20. What is your race? *(Please check all that apply.)*

- American Indian or Alaska Native
- Asian
- Black or African American
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
- White

21. What is the highest level of education you have completed? *(Please mark only **one** category.)*

- 12<sup>th</sup> Grade or less
- High school graduate or GED
- Associate or technical school degree or college coursework
- Bachelor's degree (ex: BA or BS)
- Advanced, professional, or doctoral degree or coursework

## Thank You For Completing This Survey!

We appreciate your participation in this survey. If you would like further information on prior surveys or economic information related to marine recreational angling, please visit our website at <http://www.st.nmfs.noaa.gov/st5/RecFishEcon.html>.

Please write any additional comments you have in the space below:

Please check this box if you would like a copy of the survey results.

OMB Control No. XXXX-XXXX. Expiration Date: XX/XX/20XX

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average XX 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 Kristy Wallmo, 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.

<NMFS Letterhead> (Prenotice)

Respondent Name

Respondent Address

Date

In a few days you will be receiving a questionnaire from the National Marine Fisheries Service. This is a voluntary questionnaire asking a sample of stakeholders about their opinions, attitudes, and concerns toward recreational fishing and recreational fisheries management.

We have found that many people like to know ahead of time that they will be receiving a questionnaire, so we are sending this notice to you in advance. Understanding your opinions and concerns will help fisheries managers in their decision-making, and we look forward to receiving your completed questionnaire.

Sincerely,

Kristy Wallmo, Ph.D.  
Office of Science and Technology  
National Marine Fisheries Service  
301-427-8190

<NMFS letterhead> (1<sup>st</sup> mailing cover letter)

Respondent Name

Respondent Address

Date

You may recall from an earlier letter that you will be receiving a voluntary questionnaire about recreational fisheries management. That questionnaire accompanies this letter, and is part of an effort by the National Marine Fisheries Service to understand opinions and concerns about current and future fisheries management.

Your opinions are important. You have been selected to participate because of your participation in recreational fishing. Questionnaires such as this are one of the best ways for managers to understand the variety of viewpoints people have about recreational fisheries management.

Please take a few minutes to share your opinions by completing the questionnaire. It should take about 20 minutes, and all responses are completely confidential.

Please do not hesitate to call or email if you have any questions concerning this effort. We appreciate your time and look forward to your completed questionnaire. A report containing the survey results will be available at:

[www.st.nmfs.noaa.gov/st5/index.html](http://www.st.nmfs.noaa.gov/st5/index.html)

Sincerely,

Kristy Wallmo, Ph.D.  
Office of Science and Technology  
National Marine Fisheries Service  
301-427-8190

(Postcard)

Respondent Name

Respondent Address

Date

You were recently sent a questionnaire concerning recreational fisheries management. If you have returned the questionnaire, *thank you*. If you have not yet completed the questionnaire, please take a few minutes to do so now. Your input is important in helping fisheries management meet your needs.

Sincerely,

Kristy Wallmo, Ph.D.  
Office of Science and Technology  
National Marine Fisheries Service  
301-427-8190

<NMFS letterhead> (2<sup>nd</sup> mailing cover letter)

Respondent Name

Respondent Address

Date

We recently sent you a questionnaire about recreational fisheries management. Although we have received completed questionnaires from many of the fisheries stakeholders that were selected to participate, to date we have not heard from you. Your opinions and concerns are very important, as they will help fisheries managers understand the needs and concerns of a variety of stakeholder interests.

Please do not hesitate to call or email if you have any questions concerning this effort. We appreciate your time and look forward to your completed questionnaire. A report containing the survey results will be available at:

[www.st.nmfs.noaa.gov/st5/index.html](http://www.st.nmfs.noaa.gov/st5/index.html)

Sincerely,

Kristy Wallmo, Ph.D.  
Office of Science and Technology  
National Marine Fisheries Service  
301-427-8190

benefit the United States poultry industry. COLOM-PEQ shall accept proposals for the funding of projects approved by resolution of the Board of Directors of USAPEEC.

2. Fifty percent (50%) shall be distributed to fund direct market development or market competitiveness improvement projects to benefit the Sector Representative Association ("sector gremial representativo") for poultry in the Republic of Colombia in accordance with Article 2.6 of the Colombian Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development Decree No. 0728 of April 13, 2012.

*O. Arbitration of Disputes.* Any dispute, controversy or claim arising out of or relating to the TRQ System or the breach thereof, including inter alia, a Member's qualification for distribution, interpretation of documents, or of the distribution itself, shall be settled by arbitration administered by the American Arbitration Association in accordance with its Commercial Arbitration Rules, and judgment on the award rendered by the arbitrator may be entered in any court having jurisdiction thereof.

*P. Confidential Information.* The Administrator shall maintain as confidential all export documentation or other business sensitive information submitted in connection with application for COLOM-PEQ membership, bidding in the open tender process, or requests for distribution of proceeds, where such documents or information has been marked "Confidential" by the person making the submission. The Administrator shall disclose such information only to another neutral third party or authorized government official of authorized government official of the United States or of the Republic of Colombia and only as necessary to ensure the effective operation of the TRQ System or where required by law (including appropriate disclosure in connection with the arbitration of a dispute).

*Q. Annual Reports.* COLOM-PEQ shall publish an annual report including a statement of its operating expenses and data on the distribution of proceeds, as reflected in the audited financial statement of the COLOMPEQ TRQ System.

Dated: June 15, 2012.

**Joseph E. Flynn,**

*Director, Office of Competition and Economic Analysis.*

[FR Doc. 2012-15120 Filed 6-20-12; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE P**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

#### Proposed Information Collection; Comment Request; Understanding Recreational Angler Attitudes and Preferences for Saltwater Fishing

**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 August 20, 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](mailto:Jjessup@doc.gov)).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Requests for additional information or copies of the information collection instrument and instructions should be directed to Kristy Wallmo, 301-427-8190 or [kristy.wallmo@noaa.gov](mailto:kristy.wallmo@noaa.gov).

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### I. Abstract

This request is for a new collection of information.

The objective of the survey will be to understand the range of attitudes, preferences, and concerns that recreational anglers hold towards saltwater fishing.

The National Marine Fisheries Service, Office of Science and Technology will conduct this survey to improve our understanding of anglers' expectations and how they may change with fish stock recovery. As more stocks recover, the survey is well-timed to inform fisheries management on anglers' satisfaction with current management and the types of goals and objectives that should be pursued (e.g., in developing guidelines). Results of the survey will be used to inform fisheries management and planning and establish a baseline for outreach and education.

##### II. Method of Collection

The survey will be conducted using two modes: mail and Internet.

## III. Data

*OMB Control Number:* None.

*Form Number:* None.

*Type of Review:* Regular submission (request for a new information collection).

*Affected Public:* Individual recreational fishing permit holders.

*Estimated Number of Respondents:* 6,000.

*Estimated Time per Response:* 20 minutes.

*Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours:* 2,000.

*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: June 15, 2012,

**Gwellnar Banks,**

*Management Analyst, Office of the Chief Information Officer.*

[FR Doc. 2012-15127 Filed 6-20-12; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-22-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

RIN 0648-BC27

#### New England Fishery Management Council; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS); Request for Comments

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