# NOTICE OF OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET ACTION

Date 03/07/2013

Department of Commerce
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

FOR CERTIFYING OFFICIAL: Simon Szykman
FOR CLEARANCE OFFICER: Jennifer Jessup

In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act, OMB has taken action on your request received 01/22/2013

ACTION REQUESTED: New collection (Request for a new OMB Control Number)
TYPE OF REVIEW REQUESTED: Regular
ICR REFERENCE NUMBER: 201212-0648-008
AGENCY ICR TRACKING NUMBER:
TITLE: Social Capital Survey of Northeast Groundfish (SCSN) Fishery Sector Participants
LIST OF INFORMATION COLLECTIONS: See next page

OMB ACTION: Approved with change
OMB CONTROL NUMBER: 0648-0662
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: 03/31/2016 DISCONTINUE DATE:

| BURDEN: | RESPONSES | HOURS | COSTS |
|---|---|---|---|
| Previous | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| New | 151 | 50 | 0 |
| Difference | | | |
| Change due to New Statute | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Change due to Agency Discretion | 151 | 50 | 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 |
| Social capital survey | NA | Social capital survey of Northeast Groundfish Sector Participants | |

# 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 Social Capital Survey of Northeast Groundfish (SCSN) Fishery Sector Participants

8. Agency form number(s) (*if applicable*) N/A

9. Keywords Fisheries, Fishery

10. Abstract

Catch share systems are being encouraged and considered in a variety of United States (U.S.) fisheries. Scientists, policy makers, and stakeholders (including fishermen and non-governmental environmental organizations) have different views about potential social and economic impacts and outcomes of these output-oriented systems. Thus establishing baselines for trend analysis and identifying and evaluating impacts over time is essential to assess and improve such systems and determine whether intended outcomes are realized. The largest-ever catch share program (in terms of number of permits) was implemented in the groundfish fishery in the Northeast region May 1, 2010. This system includes decentralizing the management of groundfish quota to groups of fishermen called sectors. This management system is distinctly different from past approaches in a variety of ways. In particular, it relies heavily on the ability of groups, rather than individual permit holders, to work together (and in collaboration with councils and other fisheries managers) to manage the resource.

11. Affected public (*Mark primary with "P" and all others that apply with "x"*)
a. x Individuals or households d. x Farms
b. P Business or other for-profit e. x Federal Government
c. x Not-for-profit institutions f. x 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 151
b. Total annual responses 151
1. Percentage of these responses collected electronically 0 %
c. Total annual hours requested 50
d. Current OMB inventory 0
e. Difference 50
f. Explanation of difference
1. Program change
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
2. Adjustment

15. Purpose of information collection (*Mark primary with "P" and all others that apply with "X"*)
a. x Application for benefits e. x Program planning or management
b. P Program evaluation f. P Research
c. x General purpose statistics g. x Regulatory or compliance
d. x 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) once every 3-4 years

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: Patricia Pinto da Silva
Phone: (508) 495-2370

## 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<br>signed by Dr. Ned Cyr | Date<br>12/05/2012 |
| Signature of NOAA Clearance Officer | |
| Signature<br>signed by Sarah Brabson<br>BRABSON.SARAH.1365710488<br>Digitally signed by BRABSON.SARAH.1365710488<br>DN: c=US, o=U.S. Government, ou=DoD, ou=PKI, ou=OTHER, cn=BRABSON.SARAH.1365710488<br>Date: 2013.03.18 10:56:09 -04'00' | Date |

**SUPPORTING STATEMENT**
**SOCIAL CAPTIAL SURVEY OF NORTHEAST GROUNDFISH FISHERY SECTOR PARTICIPANTS**
**OMB CONTROL NO. 0648-XXXX**

## INTRODUCTION

This request is for a new information collection.

## A. JUSTIFICATION

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

Catch share systems are being encouraged and considered in a variety of United States (U.S.) fisheries. Scientists, policy makers, and stakeholders (including fishermen and non-governmental environmental organizations) have different views about potential social and economic impacts and outcomes of these output- oriented systems. Thus, establishing baselines for trend analysis and identifying and evaluating impacts over time is essential to assess and improve such systems and determine whether intended outcomes are realized. The largest-ever catch share program (in terms of number of permits) was implemented in the groundfish fishery in the Northeast Region on May 1, 2010. This system includes decentralizing the management of groundfish quota to groups of fishermen called sectors. This management system is distinctly different from past approaches in a variety of ways. In particular, it relies heavily on the ability of groups, rather than individual permit holders, to work together (and in collaboration with councils and other fisheries managers) to manage the resource.

The success of the Groundfish Sector program is likely to rest in part on the strength of the relationships between permit holders, including their degree of trust and collaboration. We also hypothesize that successful sectors will build norms and networks that enable collective action over time. The value of these relationships is commonly referred to in social and economic literature as social capital.

A Gulf of Maine Research Institute (GMRI) survey of groundfish permit holders in New England in 2009/2010 captured baseline information related to social capital between permit holders and sectors in this fishery. This survey submitted here will implement a subset of questions included in the the GMRI survey focusing on only those groundfish permit holders that are sector members in order to measure how the level of collaboration and cooperation has changed since the implementation of the Sector Catch Share program.

Historically, changes in fisheries management regulations have been shown to impact individuals within the fishery. In promulgating and issuing regulations, NMFS) must determine the relative impacts of different management measures (re. Colburn et al. 2006). Catch shares are currently being highly encouraged as a core strategy to improve the status of fish stocks and habitat, and also the social and economic status of communities and individual fishermen. Several new catch share programs have just been implemented or are about to be implemented in the NMFS Northeast Region.

An understanding of social and economic impacts in fisheries – achieved through the collection of data on fishing communities, and on individuals who fish – is a requirement under multiple federal laws, including the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) as amended (42 U.S.C. 4371 et seq.), the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act of 1976 as amended through 2006 (MSA), Executive Order 12898 of February 11, 1994 on Environmental Justice (E.O. 12898) and the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 as amended by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996, and subsequently (RFA). The collection of these data, therefore, not only complies with legal requirements for existing management actions, but will inform future management actions requiring equivalent information.

**National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA)**

NEPA requires federal agencies to consider the interactions of natural and human environments, and the impacts on both systems of any changes due to governmental activities or policies. This consideration is to be done through the use of '…a systematic, interdisciplinary approach that will insure the integrated use of the natural and social sciences…in planning and decision-making which may have an impact on man's environment;' (NEPA Section 102 (2) (A)). Under NEPA, an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) or Environmental Assessment (EA) is required to assess the impacts on the human environment of any federal activity. NEPA specifies that "the term 'human environment' shall be interpreted comprehensively to include the natural and physical environment and the relationship of people with that environment" (Council on Environmental Quality NEPA Implementing Regulations 40 CFR 1508.14).

**Executive Order 12898 of 1994 (EO)**

E.O. 12898 requires federal agencies to consider the impacts of any action on disadvantaged, at risk and minority populations. To evaluate these impacts, information about the vulnerability of certain stakeholders must be better understood. Indicators of vulnerability can include but are not limited to income, race/ethnicity, household structure, education levels and age. Although some general information related to this issue is available through census and other quantitative data, these sources do not disaggregate those individuals or groups that are affected by changes in marine resource management or the quality of the resource itself. Therefore, other types of data collection tools must be utilized to gather information related to this executive order.

**Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 (RFA)**

The RFA requires federal agencies to prepare an initial and final regulatory flexibility analysis which '…shall describe the impact of the proposed rule on small entities…'. The initial regulatory flexibility analysis'…shall also contain a description of any significant alternatives to the proposed rule which accomplish the stated objectives of applicable statutes and which minimize any significant economic impact of the proposed rule on small entities. [Section 603 (b)(5)(c)]. In addition, each final regulatory flexibility analysis shall contain '…a description of the steps the agency has taken to minimize the significant economic impact on small entities….' [Section 604 (a)(5)]. Fishing vessels in the Northeast are predominantly categorized as small entities. Individual crewmembers are also considered to be small businesses in their status as sole proprietors.

**Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA)**

Under the MSA there are a variety of requirements related to social, cultural and economic issues for fishermen and their communities. National Standard 8 (section 301(8)), for instance, requires

that: "Conservation and management measures shall, consistent with the conservation requirements of this Act (including the prevention of overfishing and rebuilding of overfished stocks), take into account the importance of fishery resources to fishing communities in order to (A) provide for the sustained participation of such communities, and (B) to the extent practicable, minimize adverse economic impacts on such communities. Section 303(b)(6) on limited entry requires examination of "(A) present participation in the fishery, (B) historical fishing practices in, and dependence on, the fishery, (C) the economics of the fishery, (D) the capability of fishing vessels used in the fishery to engage in other fisheries, (E) the cultural and social framework relevant to the fishery and any affected fishing communities, and (F) any other relevant considerations." Section 303(a)(9) on preparation of Fishery Impact Statements notes they "shall assess, specify, and describe the likely effects, if any, of the conservation and management measures on: (A) participants in the fisheries and fishing communities affected by the plan or amendment; and (B) participants in the fisheries conducted in adjacent areas under the authority of another Council, after consultation with such Council and representatives of those participants."

## CONTEXT FOR PROPOSED RESEARCH

Amendment 16 to the Northeast Multispecies Fishery Management Plan dramatically changed the structure and dynamics of the New England groundfish (GF) industry. Catch quotas comprising over 95% of total commercial groundfish quotas were granted to seventeen groups of fishermen that formed self-selecting harvest cooperatives referred to as “sectors”. Sectors are managed by a designated ‘sector manager’ a non-permit-holder who acts as a boundary agent between sectors and the federal governments’ fisheries management institution (National Marine Fisheries Service). Sector managers also coordinate the development of sector operations plans, and manage quota trades among other critical duties.

Each year each sector is granted a share, denominated in pounds, of the total annual catch limit (ACL) of up to sixteen different groundfish stocks, These species and stock specific catch limits are referred to as annual catch entitlement (ACE) [1]. Sectors must constrain their catches (including discards) of all regulated groundfish species to their ACE allocations, but they are exempted from effort controls and trip limits that had been the primary means of constraining catch. Sectors have substantial flexibility in how they manage their allocations to meet their own goals including but not limited to financial viability. However, in the 2010-2011 fishing year, most sectors chose to divide their ACE into individual allocations based on the catch history each permit brought to the sector which, in sum, determines the allocation to the sector. Sector members could then fish their allocations or trade them with other sector members (Holland and Wiersma 2010). Trades of ACE between sectors are also allowed but must be approved by sector managers and regulators.

These new arrangements represent a significant departure from past management systems. The prior system did not require collaboration amongst fishermen or joint accountability nor did it

[1] The New England Fisheries Management Council (NEFMC) voted via Amendment 16 to allocate the 16 stock ground fish fishery using a formula based on the total catch history between the years of 1996-2006. Using these baseline years, each fishing permit was assigned a Potential Sector Contribution (PSC), which is a percent share of the total fishing history between these baseline years. As long as the fishing permit is enrolled in a sector, this PSC may be converted to sector ACE, which is then re-distributed back to the sector member as a quasi-catch entitlement.

strictly limit total catch of any particular species, relying instead on indirect measures designed to achieve target fishing mortalities. All sector members now must abide by a legally binding operations plan, and sector members are jointly and severally liable for maintaining catches below their allocations and abiding by other fishing regulations such as area closures and reporting requirements. Although sector contracts all specify penalties for members that break sector rules, sectors have limited ability to monitor and enforce compliance by their members and thus are somewhat reliant on moral suasion and reciprocal trust amongst members. Economic performance of sectors and their members may also be improved by cooperation and information sharing within and amongst sectors. Sharing information about where fish are and trading ACE, internally amongst sector members and between sectors, can boost efficiency by increasing catch per unit effort and reallocating ACE to the most efficient vessels. Sharing information about how to avoid catching certain species with low total quotas may be particularly important to minimize the degree to which quotas of these species constrain catch of others for which ACE allocations are not limiting.

New England lobstermen are well known for their long-standing co-management institutions (Acheson, 2003). Conversely, the ability of groundfishermen, known for their fierce independence, to create similar co-management structures to manage the groundfish fishery was questionable (Wilson et al, 2007). Improved collaboration and coordination among fishermen in the region was occurring prior to the implementation of sectors (Pinto da Silva & Kitts, 2006). However, the challenges involved in organizing and building the necessary institutions to support the sector program were generally new and represented a tremendous learning curve for participants. An added challenge to permit holders was the need to create these organizations and institutions in less than a year due to the start of the new regulations and the new fishing year. If they wanted to participate in a sector they had to mobilize quickly.

When sectors formed, the common denominator for each group of permit holders was unclear. What, if anything, were they bonded by? Was it their geographic location? Gear type? Sense of shared goal or purpose? Would existing bonds be an essential foundation for these new business relationships? Most sectors formed without a history of prior collaboration.

Given the critical role of collaborative behavior in the creation and operation of sectors, we hypothesize that the economic success of sectors and long term sustainability of group membership is likely to be determined in part by the strength of the relationships between permit holders within sectors, among sectors, and among sectors and government agencies and non-governmental organizations. This includes the depth and breadth of relationships and the degree of trust, collaboration and information sharing. The value of these relationships, networks and public participation is commonly referred to in social and economic literature as social capital (Putnam 2000).

In the recent literature, two primary forms of social capital have come to be called “bonding” and “bridging” social capital (Gittell and Vidal, 1998). Bonding social capital denotes “strong” ties between people in similar situations, such as immediate family, close friends and neighbors. Putnam (2000) defines “bonding” social capital as exclusive, or inward-looking, which has a tendency to reinforce exclusive identities and homogenous groups. Bonding social capital constitutes a kind of “sociological superglue” (Putnam 2000). It facilitates cooperation based on relationships within a homogeneous group (Woolcock and Sweetser 2002).

Bridging social capital, in contrast, encompasses more distant "weak" ties of like persons, such as loose friendships and workmates (Granovetter 1973). Bridging social capital refers to connections to people who are not like you in some demographic sense (Woolcock and Sweetser 2002). It tends to bring together people across diverse social divisions (Field 2003). Putnam (2000) defines "bridging" social capital as inclusive. Bridging social capital may be more outward-looking . If "bonding" social capital is super-glue that holds same communities together, "bridging" social capital may be thought of as a type of "sociological lubricant" (Putnam 2000) that brings different communities together. Bridging social capital enhances access to and exchange of information, enforcement of contracts, and focusing on a shared vision and collective goals (Nahapiet and Goshal 1998) and can provide a critical mechanism for the diffusion of knowledge and innovation (Grafton et al. 2004).

Another dimension of social capital is one that extends past the relationships and trust of people in like situations or roles to include relationships with individual and institutions outside one's peer group, often in positions of influence or power. These relationships, referred to as "linking social capital" may be thought of as vertical ties. Woolcock (2001) defines linking social capital as reaching out to unlike people in dissimilar situations, such as those who are entirely outside of the community, thus enabling members to leverage a far wider range of resources than are available in the community. Linking social capital also includes vertical connections to formal institutions According to Woolcock and Sweetser, (2002), "linking social capital pertains to connections with people in power, whether they are in politically or financially influential positions."

In the context of sectors, bonding social capital might take the form of permit holders who are also brothers or cousins or neighbors of the same ethnic background forming a sector. Bridging social capital could be a sector formed with a broad range of vessel sizes and geographic range but committed to the same purpose. Linking would be the strength of the relationship between sector groups and regulatory bodies (See Figure 1).

Increasingly, it is has been argued that the level of social capital endowed to different communities matters in the management of collective resources as they provide structure and foster trust and norms of reciprocity for cooperation and coordinated actions (Uphoff 2000; Pretty 2003). The existence of community social capital, which is often defined as trust, norms and networks facilitating cooperation and collective action (Putnam 1993), plays a vital role in determining success or failure of collective action. Knack and Keefer (1993) find that trust and civic cooperation are associated with stronger economic performance at a societal level. As Grafton (2005) explains, greater social capital can improve fishery management and governance leading to better compliance and lower management costs, higher economic returns and improved sustainability. Social capital is particularly relevant in co-management systems which rely on co-operative behavior among fishers, and between fishers and regulators and government agencies (Jentoft et al. 1998). Social capital enhances ability to resolve conflicts, information sharing and devolution of responsibilities from regulators to fishermen leading to improved resource management (Adams et al. 2003, Pretty 2003).

Prior to the implementation of the new sector system the Gulf of Maine Research Institute conducted a telephone survey of northeast commercial multispecies GF permit holders to derive baseline measures of social capital. All members of each groundfish sector were contacted as

well as a sample of permit holders that did not join a sector and remained in a common pool fishery.

**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.**

Information sought will be of practical use, as NMFS social scientists will utilize the information for descriptive and analytical purposes. In addition, knowledge gained via the results of this survey could help to refine the current sector program or better design future such programs in the region or beyond. Findings will be made available to the New England and Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Councils and the public.

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 topical transitions between areas of inquiry. The survey starts by collecting basic information related to the relationship between the permit holder and the fishing community that they most closely identify with. It then moves towards exploring the relationship between the permit holder and fishing organizations. Finally the relationships among permit holders are explored as well as specific questions related to how they manage their businesses and their participation in the fisheries management process.

This information is related to specifics of how the fishing industry operates and can then be utilized to better understand impacts on individuals if regulatory actions change how, when or where fishing may occur.

NOAA's National Marine Fisheries Service 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. The information collection is designed in accordance with NOAA 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 initial survey was conducted by phone by the Gulf of Maine Research Institute. This method proved to have a good response rate (62% for sector member respondents) and to maintain consistency and comparability of the results, we also intend to implement this survey by telephone.

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

NOAA Fisheries social scientists and contractors work closely with regional academics, community-based organizations, industry groups and other parties interested in this type of information. We are aware of the current research activities of key government and academic research institutions that gather fisheries information in the Northeast, including the New

England Fishery Management Council, the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council, the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, the University of Rhode Island, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) Sea Grant Program, the University of New Hampshire, the University of Maine, the Gulf of Maine Research Institute, the University of Massachusetts, the Rutgers University, and the Virginia Institute of Marine Science. Additionally, we are building on a baseline data collection effort by the Gulf of Maine Research Institute in order to measure changes in this fishery.

Further, we have conducted a thorough literature review of related studies in the Northeast and elsewhere to assure there is no duplication with current activities.

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

This request includes the collection of data on individuals and those who may be linked to or represent small businesses. Prior to contacting these respondents, researchers will gather any publicly available answers to the questions. Only those questions that cannot be reliably answered through this manner, and may change with perspective of the respondent, will be asked. In addition, participation in data collection will be voluntary.

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

Not collecting this information will mean the loss of vital information needed to evaluate the impacts of introducing catch share programs in the Northeast. In the absence of current information, NOAA Fisheries and Regional Councils will be unable to adequately understand and predict the potential impacts of policy decisions on permit holders. They will also not have the information they need to best design future such initiatives or to adapt the current program to maximize results. Loss of a reapplication of this baseline survey will make it impossible to fully evaluate the impacts as required under NEPA and the MSA (see response to Question 1).

Therefore not collecting this information may lead to incomplete representation of the science and information. This could impact the decision making process and negatively impact the individuals and communities subject to the decisions.

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

Not Applicable.

**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 was published on September 17, 2012 (77 FR 57074), soliciting public comment on this information collection. No comments were received.

The survey designed and implemented by the Gulf of Maine Research Institute benefited from the input of an economist (Dr. Josh Weirsma) who is also a sector manager who works closely with groundfish sector participants and is also aware of the academic research underlying the concept of social capital. This survey was also tested prior to implementation by Market Decisions.

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

No payments or gifts will be provided to respondents.

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

As stated on the form, information collected is confidential under Section 402(b) of the Magnuson-Stevens Act and under NOAA Administrative Order (AO) 216-100, Confidentiality of Fisheries Statistics, which sets forth procedures to protect confidentiality of fishery statistics.

**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 will be asked.

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

The study involves telephone surveys with approximately 244 individuals and an estimated approximate response rate of 62%. The time to complete the survey per respondent is estimated at 20 minutes, for a total survey burden of 50 hours.

In addition to this implementation in Spring 2013, we would like to implement this survey again prior to 2018.

| Description | Targeted No. of Respondents | No. of Responses based on a 62% response rate | Time to complete the survey | Estimated Burden Hours | Labor Cost in $25 in Public per Burden Hour |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total burden** | 244 | 151 | 20 minutes | 50 | $1,250 |

**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).**

No additional cost to the public other than labor cost is expected.

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

Total estimated annual cost to the federal government is $48,300. The survey will be conducted by the contractor. Survey design, data collection and processing, and report development will be conducted by NOAA federal employees. Staff time would be 200 hours at $60 per hour or $12,000 total.

**FY2012 Budget**

| **Description** | |
|---|---|
| Survey Company | $35,000 |
| Printing | $100 |
| Supplies | $1,200 |
| Staff 200 hrs @ $60 per hour | $12,000 |
| **Total** | **$48,300** |

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

This is a new collection.

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

Survey numerical and textual information will be a product of this study. Textual information will be numerically coded and analyzed. Survey data will be analyzed using standard social science quantitative data analysis methods. Where possible and relevant, final reports and other relevant portions of the research process will be posted on http:/www.nefsc.noaa.gov. Where relevant, studies in their entirety will be published as internal reports and in part will be submitted for publication in peer-reviewed journals to encourage additional analysis and review of data collected through this process, as well as to disseminate findings.

**Timeline**

| | Month | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** | **11** | **12** |
| **ACTIVITY** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Implement Survey** | **X** | **X** | **X** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Data Analyses** | | | | | **X** | **X** | **X** | **X** | | | | |
| **Report Preparation** | | | | | | | | | **X** | **X** | **X** | |
| **Final Report** | | | | | | | | | | | | **X** |

**17. <u>If seeking approval to not display the expiration date for OMB approval of the information collection, explain the reasons why display would be inappropriate</u>.**

Not Applicable.

**18. <u>Explain each exception to the certification statement</u>.**

Not Applicable.

**SUPPORTING STATEMENT**
**SOCIAL CAPTIAL SURVEY OF NORTHEAST GROUNDFISH FISHERY SECTOR PARTICIPANTS**
**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 respondent universe for this study consists of all groundfish permit holders in the Northeast Region that are members of a groundfish sector. Published data for delimiting the number of participating vessels are available via the NMFS Northeast Regional Office (NERO) database. The total number of permit holders participating in the sector program is 244.

Given that the phone survey will try to capture all participants, no other sampling method will be used. Based on the response rate of the initial survey implemented by the Gulf of Maine Research Institute, we expect to have a similar response rate of approximately 62% of groundfish permit holders who are also sector members.

**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 census of all permit holders participating in the sector program will be attempted and this represents the sampling strategy for the survey. The initial survey achieved a 62% percent response rate.

Data collection will occur via phone surveys. The projected study year is 2013.

**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.**

Various steps have been and will continue to be taken to maximize response rates. The first step to increase response rates will be to use a pre-existing refined survey tool that has already been tested and revised. . A maximum of 15 attempts (minimum 9) will be made by phone to reach the Groundfish permit holder. Where numerous attempts are unsuccessful, a paper copy of the

survey will be sent to the permit holder's address, with an envelope with prepaid postage. No further attempt to contact the respondent will be made.

Prior to survey implementation, we will reach out to key industry representatives to inform them about the purpose of the survey as well as the timing. This will include contacting by email/phone all the sector managers that work for and coordinate the activity of each of the sectors members that will be called to complete the survey.
Prior to the implementation of the survey, interviewers will explain that the survey is anonymous, participation is voluntary and that the interview can be stopped at any point. It will also be explained that participants can skip questions they do not want to answer. In the previous study there was no pattern to the very few questions that were refused or skipped. In general all questions were completed by those taking the survey. Additionally, as the survey is done as a phone interview, the respondent will have the opportunity to ask for clarification.

Additionally, we have information about the characteristics of all potential respondents including vessel size, sector membership, homeport that we can use to categorize non-respondents in order to evaluate for the need to adjust to non-response bias.

**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.**

Market Decisions piloted this survey in 2010 prior to full implementation when it was conducted by the Gulf of Maine Research Institute. Refinements/adjustments were made to reflect feedback from the pilot test. Additionally, survey results from the initial round conducted indicated that some questions were not valuable/useful and were therefore removed. A review of the study description, the study methodology, and the survey instrument has been undertaken. NMFS personnel in various regions have reviewed the survey tool and provided comments on both the survey tool and the study.

In order to mirror the 2010 study, we will attempt a census of all permit holders that are sector members. The survey will be implemented by telephone. When a working telephone number is called, the interview will be conducted with the individual that holds the groundfish fishery permit. After several phone attempts, a paper survey will be mailed to the permit holder's address. A total of 542 permit holders were interviewed in the 2010 survey. This total included 244 permit holders who had signed up for sectors, 56 active vessel owners who were not planning to participate in the sector program, and 242 permit holders who were not active in the groundfish fishery in 2009. The overall response rate for sector member respondents was 62% (total response rate for all respondents was slightly higher at 64%).

This round will target only those permit holders that have signed up for a sector. We expect to get approximately the same number of respondents (244).

**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.**

The internal NMFS team is made up of Dr. Daniel Holland, Economist, 206-302-1752 and Dr. Patricia Pinto da Silva, Social Scientist NEFSC (508) 495-1252. Dr. Holland and Dr. Pinto da Silva will be responsible for analyzing the data that results from the implementation of this survey. They will also be responsible for writing any resulting reports or publications and disseminating results. Note that Dr. Holland was employed by the Gulf of Maine Research Institute when this survey was designed and initially implemented.

Josh Weirsma also participated in the design of this survey. His contact information is: 603.682.6115, josh.wiersma@gmail.com.

Market Decisions, a survey and research company based out of Portland Maine implemented the first iteration of this study. They can be contacted by phone on: 207-767-6440 or 800-293-1538. Their website is: www.marketdecisions.com.

**REFERENCES**


Acheson JM (2003) Capturing the Commons (Univ Press of New England, Hanover, NH).

Adams WM, Brockington D, Dyson J, Vira B. Managing tragedies: understanding conflict over common-pool resources. Science 2003;302:1915–6.

Field, J. 2003. Social Capital. London: Routledge.

Gittell, R., and A. Vidal. 1998. Community Organizing: Building Social Capital as a Development Strategy. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.Granovetter MS 1973. The strength of weak ties. American Journal of Sociology 78:1360–80.

Grafton, R. Quentin. "Social capital and fisheries governance." Ocean & Coastal Management. Vol 48 (2005).

Grafton RQ, Knowles S, Owen PD. Total factor productivity, per capita income and social divergence. The Economic Record 2004;80(250):302–13.

Grootaert, Christina, Deepa Narayan, Veronica Nyhan Jones and Michael Woolcock. Measuring Social Capital: An Integrated Questionnaire. The World Bank. Washington D.C. 2004.

Jentoft S, McCay BJ, Wilson DC. Social theory and fisheries co-management. Marine Policy 1998;22(4–5):423–36.

Kitts, A, E Bing-Sawyer, J Walden, C Demarest, M McPherson, P Christman, S Steinback, J Olson, P Clay. 2010 Final Report on the Performance of the Northeast Multispecies (Groundfish) Fishery (May 2010 – April 2011*)*. US Dept Commer, Northeast Fish Sci Cent Ref Doc. 11-19; 97 p; 2011. Available from: National Marine Fisheries Service, 166 Water Street, Woods Hole, MA 02543-1026, or on the internet at <http://www.nefsc.noaa.gov/publications/crd/crd1119/

Knack, Stephen and Philip Keefer 1997.. "Does social capital have an economic payoff? A cross-country investigation." Quarterly Journal of Economics. Vol 112 (Nov. 1997) No. 4.

Nahapiet, J., & Ghoshal, S. 1998. Social capital, intellectual capital, and the organizational advantage. Academy of Management Review, 23: 242-266.Paldam M. Social capital: one or many? Definition and measurement. Journal of Economic Surveys 2000;14:629–53.

NEFSC. 2010. 'Lessons Learned' Sector Workshop. October 25-26 2011. Portland ME. Sector Manager Summaries. http://www.nefmc.org/nemulti/index.html).

Pinto da Silva, P. & A. Kitts. 2006. Collaborative fisheries management in the Northeast US: Emerging initiatives and future directions. Marine Policy (30) pp.832-841.

Pretty J. Social capital and the collective management of resources. Science 2003;302:1912–4.

Putnam, R., 1993. Making democracy work: civic traditions in modern Italy. Princeton University Press, Princeton N.J.

Putnam, R. 2000. Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community.New York: Simon and Schuster.

Uphoff, N. 2000. Understanding Social Capital: Learning from the Analysis and Experience of Participation. In: Social Capital: A Multifaceted Perspectives, G. Parthadas and S. Serageldin, eds. Washington D. C.: World Bank.

Wilson, J., L.Yan, C. Wilson. 2007. The precursors of governance in the Maine Lobster Fishery. PNAS vol. 104. p.15212-15217 _

Woolcock M. 2001. The place of social capital in understanding social and economic outcomes. In: HRDCOECD,editor. The contribution of human and social capital to sustained economic growth and wellbeing. Ottawa: HRDC; 2001. p. 65–88.

Woolcock, M. and A. T. Sweetser. 2002. Bright Ideas: Social Capital—The Bonds That Connect. ADB Review 34 (2).

# Social Capital Survey of Northeast Groundfish Sector Participants

**LEAD STATEMENT**

We are conducting a survey of groundfish permit holders in the Northeast on behalf of the NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service. The goal of this survey is to understand the communities and social relationships within the groundfish industry as they are currently and how they affect the outcomes in the fishery and the success or failure of the fishery management system.

Could you answer a few questions for me?

YOUR PARTICIPATION IS IMPORTANT. This is not a sales or promotional survey. We are conducting this survey on behalf of the NMFS Northeast Fisheries Science Center to help evaluate how changes in management of the groundfish fishery may affect the fishery and the individuals and communities involved in it. Your input is a critical part of this process.

The survey should only take about 18 minutes of your time, but the answers you give will provide us with critical information that will help us to understand the importance of social relationships and communities in making the groundfish fishery work effectively for those involved in it.

I want to assure you that your responses will be kept confidential, as authorized by Section 402(b) of the Magnuson-Stevens Act and under NOAA Administrative Order (AO) 216-100, Confidentiality of Fisheries Statistics. Your name will not be released and only aggregated results of the survey will be made public. For more information about the survey call Patricia Pinto da Silva at the Northeast Fisheries Science Center at 508 495 2370.

The information collection is designed in accordance with NOAA Information Quality Guidelines. Prior to dissemination, the information will be subjected to quality control measures and a pre-dissemination review pursuant to MSA 402(b).

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.

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 20 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 Patricia Pinto da Silva, NOAA Northeast Fisheries Science Center, patricia.pinto.da.silva@noaa.gov.

**General Information**

1. How long have you been involved in fishing?

2. How did you get started and what positions have you worked on boats?

3. What year did you first captain?

4. What year did you first buy a vessel?

5. Do you captain your vessel(s) now?

6. How many immediate family members also work in the New England groundfish industry, either on your vessel or on another vessel? _____

7. How many extended family members also work in the New England groundfish industry on your vessel or on an another vessel? _____

8. What languages are spoken in your home? Italian, Portuguese, English, Spanish, other

9. Besides your family, how many close friends are also commercial groundfish fishermen?

_____#

10. How many generations of commercial fishermen does your family represent? _____

11. Do you consider yourself part of a fishing community?

Yes___ (go to 16) No___

12. How would you define the fishing community you feel most a part of? (check all that apply)

___ the town you tie up your vessel in

___ the geographic region where you mostly land fish

___ the town you and your family reside in

___ the harbor town closest to where you and your family reside (not necessarily where you tie up your vessel)

_____the fishermen who fish in the same area you fish

____ fishermen who belong to the same industry association as you

_Other_____

13. How important is this fishing community to you?

Very important [ ] 1 Important [ ] 2 somewhat important [ ] 3 Not important [ ] 4

14. What town do you live in? _____

**Now, we'd like to ask some questions about how you interact with other fishermen.**

15. Generally speaking, how many of the groundfish fishermen you know in the fishing community you described earlier do you trust (for example to maintain a confidence or keep a bargain or return a favor)?

Most [ ] 1 Many [ ] 2 Few [ ] 3 None [ ] 4

16. How many of the groundfish fishermen you know outside that community do you trust?

Most [ ] 1 Many [ ] 2 Few [ ] 3 None [ ] 4

17. Would you say that the fishermen you know and trust *the most* are the ones that fish in the same fishing community as you (as you defined the community earlier)? Yes/No

18. Do you agree that fishermen in the community you described earlier would generally trust one another in matters of lending and borrowing?

Strongly agree [ ] 1 Agree [ ] 2 Disagree [ ] 3 Strongly disagree [ ] 4 Don't Know [ ]

19. Have you ever gone into business with another fisherman? Yes / No

19b. How would you rate that experience?

very positive [ ] mostly positive [ ] not positive [ ]

20. Do you agree or disagree that most fishermen would look out for the welfare of those whom they consider to be of similar ethnic or cultural backgrounds ahead of those who are not?

Strongly agree [ ] 1 Agree [ ] 2 Disagree [ ] 3 Strongly disagree [ ] 4 Don't Know [ ]

21. Overall, how important to you and your family are social or religious organizations such as a church, social clubs or sports teams you play on?

Very important [ ] 1 Important [ ] 2 somewhat important [ ] 3 Not important [ ] 4 Don't Know [

22. What commercial fishing organizations do you belong to?

Check list (open ended question)

a_____

b_____

c_____

d_____

e_____

23. Which one of these organizations is most important to you? _____

**Answer the following three questions relative to the fishing organization that is most important to you.**

24. Which of the following activities describe your participation in the fishing organizations you belong to (check all that apply)?

____Pay membership duties

____attend meetings

____serve on committees

____hold or held a leadership position

**Now, I'd like to ask a few questions about your level of public participation relative to fisheries management.**

25. How often in the past year have you attended a fisheries management council meeting or other public meeting about fisheries management?

Frequently [ ] 1 A couple of times [ ] 2 Once [ ] 3 Never [ ] 4

26. How often in the past year have you joined together with others in your community to participate in a public meeting, rally or protest to publicly address other issues relevant to fisheries management or to your community's well being?

Frequently [ ] 1 A couple of times [ ] 2 Once [ ] 3 Never [ ] 4

27. Have you ever participated in a cooperative research project as a primary partner where you helped to develop the initial research question, and were paid charter vessel rates?

Yes __ No___

28. Have you ever participated in a cooperative research project in a more minor way, like returning a fish tag, attending a meeting, providing log book data, etc. (this is a project where you did not help to develop the initial research question, and you did not receive much, if any, compensation).

Yes __ No___

**Now we'd like to ask about how you get and use information in your fishing business.**

29. Do you have a network of friends that are other captains or owners on whom you rely to share useful information about fishing?

Yes [ ]1 No [ ] 2 Don't Know [ ] 3

30. How big is the network?

31. How often do you share useful information about fishing with this network of friends (other captains and owners)?

Not Often____ Sometimes____ A lot_____

32. In general, how important is information you get from other fishermen to your fishing success?

Very important [ ] 1 Important [ ] 2 somewhat important [ ] 3 Not important [ ] 4 Don't Know [ ]

33. Suppose you needed to ask another fisherman in your community (as you defined it earlier) for help with a business related matter. How comfortable would you feel about doing this?

Very uncomfortable____ A little uncomfortable____ Somewhat Comfortable____

Very Comfortable____

34. In general, how often do use the internet for purposes relevant to your fishing business?

Never____ Not Often____ Sometimes____ A lot_____

**Next, we'd like to ask general questions about your fishing business and about fisheries management. If you are involved in more than one fishery, when answering these question answer relevant to the groundfish fishery only.**

35. Are you enrolled in a groundfish sector for the 2012-2013 fishing season?

Yes [ ] 1 (go to 47) No [ ] 2 (go to 48)

36. If no, why not: checklist and open ended responses

___Not invited to join a sector

___Not aware of the option to join a sector in time

___Prefer working alone

___I don't trust others actions – (joint liability of sector members)

___I think I can make more money in common pool – (better business decision)

37. Why did you join a sector (check all that apply)

___I will be more profitable in a sector

___I feel like sectors have less risky regulations than the common pool

___I want to be able to have greater control over my fishing

___I liked the idea of working with other fishermen

___I think sectors will yield more consistent management rules

___Most other fishermen that I know have enrolled and I didn't want to be left out

___Other_____

38. What is the name of the sector you are enrolled in? _____

39. How involved were you in the formation of your sector

Very involved____ Somewhat involved____ Not Involved____

40. How well do you feel you understand your sector's operations plan?

Very well____ Somewhat____ Not well____

41. What percentage of your sector's members do you know very well?

_____%

42. What percentage of your sector's members do you not know at all?

_____%

43. Do your family members interact socially with family members of other members of your sector (for example your kids go to school together or you families attend the same church)? ___Yes ___No

**Groups and Networks**

44. Including yourself, how many family members are also permit owners in your sector (immediate and extended family)? _____

45. Besides your family, how many close friends are also permit holders in your sector? ____#

46. What percentage of your sector's members are part of your fishing community that you defined earlier ? _____percentage

47. In general, do you agree or disagree that members of your sector come from diverse backgrounds (prompt: are different economically, ethnically, and speak different languages)?

Strongly agree [ ] 1 Agree [ ] 2 Disagree [ ] 3 Strongly disagree [ ] 4 Don't Know [ ]

48. Is there a member(s) of your sector who you feel is a well recognized fishing leader in the fishing community (as you define it earlier) or in the region?

Yes [ ] 1 No [ ] 2 I don't Know [ ] 3

49. Do you think that your sector members work well together?

Yes [ ] 1 No [ ] 2 I don't Know [ ] 3

50. Do you expect that most of your sector's members will stay in the sector for several more years?

Yes [ ] 1 No [ ] 2 I don't Know [ ] 3

## Trust

51. Suppose your sector manager informed the group that the sector's ACE (quota) was running low for a particular stock, and that the group should avoid the stock until more ACE (quota) was purchased. Do you trust that most or all of the members of your sector would make an effort to stay off the stock?

Do Trust [ ] 1 Do Not Trust [ ] 2 I don't Know [ ] 3

52. If you sector plans to allocate ACE (quota) to individuals in the sector or set catch limits for individuals, do you trust that the other members of your sector will make their best effort to avoid intentionally or carelessly exceeding their ACE or catch limits?

Do Trust [ ] 1 Do Not Trust [ ] 2 I don't Know [ ] 3

53. How concerned are you that not all members of your sector will abide by all the sector specific rules outlined in your contracts?

Not concerned [ ] 1 Somewhat concerned [ ] 2 Very concerned [ ] 3

54. Do you trust that the board of governors or directors for your sector will make decisions that are in the best interest of the whole sector?

Do Trust [ ] 1 Do Not Trust [ ] 2 I don't Know [ ] 3

55. Do you trust the sector will have a fair system set up to deal with violations of sector rules?

Do Trust [ ] 1 Do Not Trust [ ] 2 I don't Know [ ] 3

56. How much do you expect to depend on personal communication with other members of your sector for information about sector meetings, fish and quota prices, other announcements from you sector manager, or for other important sector business?

Very Often [ ] 1 Often [ ] 2 Sometimes [ ] 3 Not at all [ ] 4

57. Do you agree or disagree that your sector has an important role in preserving the fishing community you are a member of?

Strongly agree [ ] 1 Agree [ ] 2 Disagree [ ] 3 Strongly disagree [ ] 4 Don't Know [ ]

**58. Would you say that if you were to run out of your individual allocation for one of your fish stocks most other members of you sector would be willing to sell you some of their quota at a fair price or trade you for quota of another stock if they had some available? Would you do the same for them?**

**59. Would you say that if another member of your sector ran out of his individual allocation for one of his fish stocks and you had quota for that stock you would generally be willing to sell some of your quota to him at a fair price or trade for quota of another species?**

and reduce the costs associated with weather related congestion and associated delays. Additionally, the project will shed light upon the interrelationship between meteorological phenomena, road conditions, and their combined impact on travel.

**II. Method of Collection**

PEGUS Research, a professional firm, will gather responses via random digit dialing, with survey participants providing responses via landline or cell phone communication.

**III. Data**

*OMB Control Number:* 0648–0624.

*Form Number:* None.

*Type of Review:* Regular submission (reinstatement of a previously approved collection).

*Affected Public:* Individuals or households.

*Estimated Number of Respondents:* 1,200.

*Estimated Time per Response:* 10 minutes.

*Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours:* 200.

*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 27, 2012.

**Gwellnar Banks,**

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

[FR Doc. 2012–16189 Filed 7–2–12; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510–22–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

### Proposed Information Collection; Comment Request; Modification to Gulf of Maine/Georges Bank Herring Letter of Authorization

**AGENCY:** National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA).

**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 September 4, 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 and instructions should be directed to Allison Murphy, 978–281–9122 or *Allison.murphy@noaa.gov.*

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**I. Abstract**

This request is for extension of a current information collection.

Under the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, the Secretary of Commerce has the responsibility for the conservation and management of marine fishery resources. We, NOAA's National Marine Fisheries Service, and the Regional Fishery Management Councils are delegated the majority of this responsibility. The New England Fishery Management Council (Council) develops management plans for fishery resources in New England.

In 2009, we implemented modifications to the requirements for midwater trawl vessels issued an All Areas Limited Access Herring Permit and/or an Areas 2 and 3 Limited Access Herring Permit that fish in Northeast (NE) multispecies Closed Area I (CA I). Affected vessels intending to fish in CA I at any point during a trip are required to declare their intention when scheduling a NMFS-approved at-sea observer. To ensure 100–percent observer coverage, midwater trawl vessels are not permitted to fish in CA I without an observer.

Midwater trawl vessels in the directed herring fishery that have been assigned a NMFS-approved at-sea observer and that are fishing in CA I, are prohibited, unless specific conditions are met (see below), from releasing fish from the codend of the net, transferring fish to another vessel that is not carrying a NMFS-approved observer, or discarding fish at sea, unless the fish have first been brought aboard the vessel and made available for sampling and inspection by the observer.

We recognize that there are certain conditions under which fish must be released from the codend without being sampled. Therefore, fish that have not been pumped aboard the vessel may be released if the vessel operator finds that: Pumping the catch could compromise the safety of the vessel; mechanical failure precludes bringing some or all of a catch aboard the vessel; or spiny dogfish have clogged the pump and consequently prevent pumping of the rest of the catch. If a net is released for any of these three reasons, the vessel operator must complete and sign a CA I Midwater Trawl Released Codend Affidavit detailing where, when, and why the net was released as well as a good-faith estimate of both the total weight of fish caught on that tow and the weight of fish released (if the tow had been partially pumped). The completed affidavit form must be submitted to us within 48 hr of the completion of the trip.

Following the release of a net for one of the three exemptions specified above, the vessel is required to exit CA I. The vessel may continue to fish, but may not fish in CA I for the remainder of the trip.

**II. Method of Collection**

Respondents must submit paper forms via postal service.

**III. Data**

*OMB Control Number:* 0648–0602.

*Form Number:* None.

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

*Affected Public:* Business or other for-profit organizations.

*Estimated Number of Respondents:* 46.

*Estimated Time per Response:* 5 minutes.

*Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours:* 12.

*Estimated Total Annual Cost to Public:* $75.

## 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 27, 2012.

**Gwellnar Banks,**

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

[FR Doc. 2012–16168 Filed 7–2–12; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510–22–P**

---

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

**RIN 0648–XB041**

### Small Takes of Marine Mammals Incidental to Specified Activities; Pile Driving in Port Townsend Bay, WA

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

**ACTION:** Notice; proposed incidental harassment authorization; request for comments.

**SUMMARY:** NMFS has received a complete and adequate application from the Washington State Department of Transportation/Ferries Division (WSF) for an Incidental Harassment Authorization (IHA) to take marine mammals, by harassment, incidental to pile driving during replacement of the Port Townsend Ferry Terminal Transfer Span. Pursuant to the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA), NMFS proposes to issue an IHA to incidentally harass, by Level B harassment only, 11 species of marine mammals during the specified activity within a specific geographic area and requests comments on its proposal.

**DATES:** Comments and information must be received no later than August 2, 2012.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments on the application and this proposal should be addressed to Michael Payne, Chief, Permits and Conservation Division, Office of Protected Resources, National Marine Fisheries Service, 1315 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, MD 20910–3225. The mailbox address for providing email comments is *ITP.Hopper@noaa.gov.* NMFS is not responsible for email comments sent to addresses other than the one provided here. Comments sent via email, including all attachments, must not exceed a 10-megabyte file size.

*Instructions:* All comments received are a part of the public record and will generally be posted to *http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/permits/incidental.htm* without change. All Personal Identifying Information (for example, name, address, etc.) voluntarily submitted by the commenter may be publicly accessible. Do not submit Confidential Business Information or otherwise sensitive or protected information.

An electronic copy of the application containing a list of the references used in this document may be obtained by writing to the address specified above, telephoning the contact listed below (see **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**), or visiting the internet at: *http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/permits/incidental.htm.* Documents cited in this notice may also be viewed, by appointment, during regular business hours, at the aforementioned address.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Brian D. Hopper, Office of Protected Resources, NMFS, (301) 427–8401.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

### Background

Sections 101(a)(5)(A) and (D) of the MMPA (16 U.S.C. 1361 *et seq.*) direct the Secretary of Commerce to allow, upon request, the incidental, but not intentional, taking of small numbers of marine mammals by U.S. citizens who engage in a specified activity (other than commercial fishing) within a specific geographical region if certain findings are made and either regulations are issued or, if the taking is limited to harassment, a notice of a proposed authorization is provided to the public for review.

Authorization for incidental takings shall be granted if NMFS finds that the taking will have a negligible impact on the species or stock(s), will not have an unmitigable adverse impact on the availability of the species or stock(s) for subsistence uses (where relevant), and if the permissible methods of taking and requirements pertaining to the mitigation, monitoring and reporting of such takings are set forth. NMFS has defined ''negligible impact'' in 50 CFR 216.103 as '' * * * an impact resulting from the specified activity that cannot be reasonably expected to, and is not reasonably likely to, adversely affect the species or stock through effects on annual rates of recruitment or survival.''

Section 101(a)(5)(D) of the MMPA established an expedited process by which citizens of the United States can apply for an authorization to incidentally take small numbers of marine mammals by harassment. Section 101(a)(5)(D) further established a 45-day time limit for NMFS' review of an application, followed by a 30-day public notice and comment period on any proposed authorizations for the incidental harassment of marine mammals. Within 45 days of the close of the comment period, NMFS must either issue or deny the authorization.

Except with respect to certain activities not pertinent here, the MMPA defines ''harassment'' as: any act of pursuit, torment, or annoyance which (i) has the potential to injure a marine mammal or marine mammal stock in the wild [Level A harassment]; or (ii) has the potential to disturb a marine mammal or marine mammal stock in the wild by causing disruption of behavioral patterns, including, but not limited to, migration, breathing, nursing, breeding, feeding, or sheltering [Level B harassment].

### Summary of Request

In August 2011, NMFS received an application from WSF, requesting an IHA for the take, by Level B harassment, of small numbers of harbor porpoises (*Phocoena phocoena*), Dall's porpoises (*Phocoenoides dalli*), Pacific white-sided dolphins (*Lagenorhynchus obliquidens*), killer whales (*Orcinus orca*), gray whales (*Eschrichtius robustus*), humpback whales (*Megaptera novaeangliae*), minke whales (*Balaenoptera acutorostrata*), Pacific harbor seals (*Phoca vitulina richardii*), California sea lions (*Zalophus californianus*), northern elephant seals (*Mirounga angustirostris*) and Steller sea lions (*Eumatopius jubatus*) incidental to pile driving activities conducted during the replacement of a transfer span at the Port Townsend ferry terminal, which is located inside Port Townsend Bay in northern Puget Sound (see Figure 1–9 in the WSF IHA application). Upon receipt of additional information and a revised application (submitted October 2011), NMFS determined the application