# NOTICE OF OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET ACTION

Date 04/08/2013

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 02/14/2013

ACTION REQUESTED: New collection (Request for a new OMB Control Number)
TYPE OF REVIEW REQUESTED: Regular
ICR REFERENCE NUMBER: 201301-0648-008
AGENCY ICR TRACKING NUMBER:
TITLE: NERRS Science Collaboration Evaluation Survey
LIST OF INFORMATION COLLECTIONS: See next page

OMB ACTION: Approved without change
OMB CONTROL NUMBER: 0648-0666
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: 04/30/2016 DISCONTINUE DATE:

| BURDEN: | RESPONSES | HOURS | COSTS |
|---|---|---|---|
| Previous | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| New | 140 | 47 | 0 |
| Difference | | | |
| Change due to New Statute | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Change due to Agency Discretion | 140 | 47 | 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 |
| National Estuarine Research Reserve System Science Collaborative Evaluation Survey | NA | NERRS Science System Collaborative Evaluation Survey | |

# PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT SUBMISSION

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

1. Agency/Subagency originating request
NOAA/NOS/ERD

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

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 NERRS Science Collaboration Evaluation Survey

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

9. Keywords

10. Abstract

One of the activities of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's (NOAA's) National Ocean Service's (NOS's) Estuarine Reserves Division (ERD) is investment in research that is focused on transforming and making accessible the best available science and technology for that coastal managers to use to detect, prevent, and reverse the impacts of coastal pollution and habitat degradation. To make sure that the research activities we fund are focused on the research and information needs of the National Estuarine Research Reserve System (NERRS), customer feedback is critical. We receive this input through various means, one being to survey our customers to assess if the research investments we are making are meeting their needs.

In continuing compliance with Executive Order 12862, Setting Customer Service Standards (attached), this survey will be used by the NOAA Estuarine Reserves Division to obtain information from its customers – NERRS managers, scientists, educators, and coastal

11. Affected public (*Mark primary with "P" and all others that apply with "x"*)
a. x Individuals or households d. ___ Farms
b. ___ Business or other for-profit e. ___ Federal Government
c. x Not-for-profit institutions f. P 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 140
b. Total annual responses 140
1. Percentage of these responses collected electronically 99 %
c. Total annual hours requested 47
d. Current OMB inventory 0
e. Difference 47
f. Explanation of difference
1. Program change 47
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. ___ Application for benefits e. ___ Program planning or management
b. P Program evaluation f. ___ Research
c. ___ General purpose statistics g. ___ Regulatory or compliance
d. ___ Audit

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

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: Dwight Trueblood
Phone: 603-862-3580

## 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 Hugh Johnson | Date<br>01/14/2013 |
| Signature of NOAA Clearance Officer | |
| Signature<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: 2013.04.22 14:23:49 -04'00' | Date |

**SUPPORTING STATEMENT**

**NATIONAL ESTUARINE RESEARCH RESERVE SYSTEM SCIENCE COLLABORATIVE EVALUATION SURVEY**

**OMB CONTROL NO. 0648-xxxx**

## A. JUSTIFICATION

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

The original authority for establishing the National Estuarine Research Reserve System (NERRS) program is codified in Section 315 of the Coastal Zone Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1451). NOAA is given authority under this statute to issue funds to the NERRS for planning, conservation, research, monitoring, education, resource protection, restoration, and/or construction projects.

One of the activities of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's (NOAA's) National Ocean Service's (NOS's) Estuarine Reserves Division (ERD) is investment in research that is focused on transforming and making accessible the best available science and technology for coastal managers to use to detect, prevent, and reverse the impacts of coastal pollution and habitat degradation. To make sure that the research activities we fund are focused on the research and information needs of the NERRS, customer feedback is critical. We receive this input through various means, one being to survey our customers to assess if the research investments we are making are meeting their needs.

In continuing compliance with Executive Order 12862, Setting Customer Service Standards (attached), this survey will be used by the NOAA Estuarine Reserves Division to obtain information from its customers – NERRS managers, scientists, educators, and coastal training and stewardship professionals – regarding their research and information needs based on their coastal resource management responsibilities, technology and information management capabilities and critical resource management issues.

The survey we plan to conduct will help ERD to determine how satisfied the NERRS are, and future actions to take with our 5-year investment in the NERRS Science Collaborative and its focus on collaborative research related to land use issues, habitat restoration and change issues, and estuarine contamination issues. The information collected will be used by ERD to guide future research investments in the NERRS.

Although other offices in NOAA and NOS have collected information from segments of the respondents that this survey addresses, these surveys have not specifically addressed ERD support for the NERRS Science Collaborative. Great effort has been made to tailor the questions, herein, to pertain specifically to the types of functions the NERRS Science Collaborative supports, such as collaborative research, graduate training and information transfer activities. No other office within NOAA has collected the same specific information from the same group of respondents.

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.**

Purpose, Delivery, and Frequency

The proposed survey is the first survey designed to assess how satisfied the NERRS are with the program activities being implemented by the NERRS Science Collaborative. No other surveys focused on the overall NERRS Science Collaborative programs have ever been done. It is anticipated that this will be the only such survey to be conducted over the next five years.

ERD is committed to supporting innovative, collaborative research in the NERRS through a transparent and competitive process. Currently ERD is supporting a 5-year cooperative agreement that funds the NERRS Science Collaborative which was established in 2009 following a national competition to establish a national estuarine research and technology program that operates in partnership with the NERRS. The focus of this program is to conduct collaborative research utilizing the capabilities of the NERRS to apply the best available science and transform it into practical tools that coastal managers can use to detect, prevent, and reverse the impacts of coastal pollution and habitat degradation in the face of ongoing climate change. The University of New Hampshire (UNH) was the successful applicant in this competition implementing a program that integrates and applies the principles of collaborative research, transfer, education and adaptive management to achieve the goals of the funding request.

The NERRS Science Collaborative has three program components:

1. A collaborative and multidisciplinary competitive research program that funds projects that target priority coastal management problems in the NERRS. This program empowers Reserves to work with their local communities to address the influences of climate change on problems related to the impacts of land use change, habitat change and restoration, management of stormwater, and nonpoint source pollution.

2. A graduate student education program known as TIDES (Training for the Integrations of Decisions and Ecosystems Science) integrates university-based training on collaborative processes with an applied research experience at Reserve sites to provide students with the skills necessary to better link research to application, decision making and policy.

3. An applied science and information transfer component that engages coastal science translation and training specialists in the NERRS to disseminate project-generated tools and information to coastal professionals outside of any particular project's targeted stakeholder audience.

This survey is part of a larger evaluation process of the NERRS Science Collaborative and will be used to help NOAA assess the NERRS satisfaction with the Science Collaborative programs designed to foster targeted, multidisciplinary, collaborative research to address the impacts of human activities on coasts and estuaries. It is important for NOAA to understand how the

targeted beneficiaries of this program view NOAA's investment in this program in order to better target future research investment in the NERRS.

The survey will cover the following topical areas with each section asking between 3-5 questions of the respondents:

1. The first section of the survey asks general information questions about people's professional background and whether they have received funding from the Science Collaborative in order to help NOAA interpret the results from the survey.
2. The second section of the survey asks questions regarding respondent's satisfaction with the Request for Proposals released by the Science Collaborative.
3. The third section of the survey asks respondents questions about their satisfaction with the focus of the competitive research program.
4. The fourth section asks a series of questions about respondent's satisfaction with the graduate program funded by the collaborative.
5. The fifth section asks respondents questions about their satisfaction with how the Science Collaborative has enabled the NERRS to address important coastal management challenges.
6. The sixth section asks questions about accessible the different Science Collaborative program activities were to the Reserve System.

NOAA's Estuarine Reserves Division 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 #10 of this Supporting Statement for more information on confidentiality and privacy. The information collection is designed to yield data that meet all applicable information quality guidelines. Although the information collected is not expected to be disseminated directly to the public, results may be used in scientific, management, technical or general information publications. Should NOAA's National Ocean Service decide to disseminate the information, it will be subject to the quality control measures and pre-dissemination review pursuant to Section 515 of Public Law 106-554.

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

The survey will be administered via a Web-based survey instrument. We will work with NOAA's Coastal Services Center (CSC) to develop and administer the web-survey. CSC is approved by the National Ocean Service Chief Information Officer to use Survey Monkey to develop and administer the survey. A mail survey would entail added expense and can require more time to complete. Invitations with a link to the survey will be sent to members of the NERRS and related communities. Upon request, respondents will be mailed a paper version of the survey to complete and return in a postage paid envelope. If requested, accommodations will also be made to facilitate completion of the survey via telephone.

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

No other existing similar information collections were found.

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

No small businesses or other small entities are involved. Regardless, the burden is only 20 minutes.

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

Without input from the NERRS coastal resource management community, ERD would risk investing limited research money in projects that have little relevance to the coastal resource management community's needs. Conducting this survey will provide ERD with consistent information from its customer base. Survey results will enable ERD to be more efficient in the development of specific research programs that meet the needs and capabilities of our customers. This is the first collection of survey information focused on the NERRS Science Collaborative and it is not anticipated that additional surveys will need to be done by NOAA for at least five years.

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

The collection will be conducted consistently with OMB guidelines.

**8. Provide information on the PRA Federal Register Notice that solicited public comments on the information collection prior to this submission. Summarize the public comments received in response to that notice and describe the actions taken by the agency in response to those comments. Describe the efforts to consult with persons outside the agency to obtain their views on the availability of data, frequency of collection, the clarity of instructions and recordkeeping, disclosure, or reporting format (if any), and on the data elements to be recorded, disclosed, or reported.**

A Federal Register Notice published on October 29, 2012 (77 FR 65533) solicited public comments. No substantive comments pertinent to the collection were received.

ERD personnel consulted with people trained in survey research and design at NOAA's Coastal Services Center who have created numerous survey instruments in the past. Technical literature consulted in the planning and development of the instrument and survey administration included *Questionnaire Design: Asking questions with a purpose* (Taylor-Powell, 1998) and *How to Conduct our Own Survey* (Salant and Dillman, 1994) as well as numerous other survey instruments and technical references. Salant and Dillman have conducted extensive research on all aspects of survey design and implementation for over a decade and their methods of distribution and follow-up have consistently achieved positive results.

Pilot testing of the instrument was completed in December, 2012. Pilot participants included representative members from across the different NERRS sectors. Pilot testing of the survey included timing of respondents, identification and discussion of unclear instructions and question content, asking respondents about the length of the instrument, and discussing suggestions for improvements. Fewer than 10 external, non-federal employees participated in the pilot testing and subsequent discussions.

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

No plans exist for payment or gifts to survey respondents.

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

Responses will not be reported individually, only in aggregate. On the survey instrument, respondents are assured that their names will not be placed on their completed surveys or subsequent reports. A summary of results will be used by ERD and individuals involved in the review of the NERRS Science Collaborative program activities. A summary of the results will also be made available to the NERRS community and the investigators implementing the NERRS Science Collaborative program at the University of New Hampshire.

**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.**

NA.

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

The maximum estimated annualized burden estimate for the survey is 47 hours although we expect a response rate of around 70% (33 hours). The maximum estimate reflects 140 respondents with an average completion time of 20 minutes, including the time for reviewing instructions and gathering the requested information.

Respondents are likely to be reserve managers, research coordinators, coastal training program professionals, stewardship coordinators and education coordinators from the NERR system equivalent to a Government Service Pay Grade12 Step 1. Using this grade to estimate the hourly rate of the respondent ($28.62), the maximum estimated annualized cost to the respondent for the hour burden of each collection (i.e., 20 minutes) is $9.44 per respondent; the maximum cost for the information collection for a 100 percent response rate (i.e., 140 respondents) is $1,322.

**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).**

Responding to the survey requires no record keeping or reporting expenses.

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

This information collection effort is supported through in-house staff time. The estimated annualized cost for this information collection is $6,309 (i.e., in-house staff time, supplies). Estimates presented below represent the costs per annum for the term of the approval.

| Annualized Cost to Federal Government | Labor | $Cost |
|---|---|---|
| Supplies | | $100. |
| Printing | | $100. |
| Data management and database development | | $100. |
| Project staff (ZA4) | 100 hrs @ $46.73/hr | 4,673. |
| Project supervisor (ZA4) | 20 hrs @ 46.73/hr | $936. |
| Administrative staff support | 20 hrs @ 20.00/hr | $400. |
| TOTAL | | $6,309. |

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

This is the first time this survey will be administered.

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

The results will be summarized in a tabular form for use in the review process but otherwise there are no plans to publish the survey results.

**17. If seeking approval to not display the expiration date for OMB approval of the information collections, explain the reasons why display would be inappropriate.**

NA.

**18. Explain each exception to the certification statement.**

NA.

**SUPPORTING STATEMENT**

**NATIONAL ESTUARINE RESEARCH RESERVE SYSTEM SCIENCE COLLABORATIVE EVALUATION SURVEY**

**OMB CONTROL NO. 0648-xxxx**

## B. COLLECTIONS OF INFORMATION EMPLOYING STATISTICAL METHODS

This study will not employ inferential statistics. We will use nothing beyond basic descriptive statistical measures, such as means, medians and mode scores.

**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 universe of respondents for this information collection comprises the NOAA ERD's core customer base involved in the management of the NERRS, approximately 140 people. Based on frequent interaction with our constituents, we anticipate a 70% survey response rate.

**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.**

No statistical methodology has been applied to stratify the survey. This is because we have a reasonably small population of primary customers which we plan to reach out to with the survey as a census. It is anticipated that this is a one-time survey.

**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 survey has been designed to use the minimum number of questions necessary to solicit the required information.
- The survey will be sent to all mangers, research coordinators, education coordinators, stewardship coordinators and coastal training program coordinators in the NERRS, a total of 140 people.

- We expect a fairly good response rate (70%) to the survey given the intended user's interest in the focus of the survey – the NERRS Science Collaborative.
- Prior to administering the survey, ERD will announce to respondents that a survey will be forthcoming to aid NOAA in evaluating the NERRS Science Collaborative program.
- The initial contact with perspective survey participants will consist of an email cordially inviting participants and describing the purpose of the survey along with a link to the survey instrument and instructions.
- A series of two follow-up reminders will be sent to respondents at two-week intervals, following the delivery of the original survey invitation.
- If a paper copy of the survey is requested, postage-paid return envelopes will be enclosed.
- Respondents will be given multiple ways to contact ERD representatives with questions regarding the survey (phone, email).
- For expediency, electronic mail will be used instead of postal mail to communicate with customers, unless postal carrier services are requested.

**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.**

Pilot testing of the survey questions was completed in December, 2012. Pilot test participants included representative members from across the NERRS community reflecting respondent types (managers, researchers, educators, etc.). The goals of the pilot test gauged readability, ease of completion, clarity of instructions, and estimated completion time. Pilot testing of the survey included timing of respondents, identification and discussion of unclear instructions and question content, asking respondents about the length of the survey instrument, and suggestions for improvements. Five non-federal employees participated in the pilot test and subsequent discussions. Comments from the pilot test were highly beneficial and resulted in design, content and wording changes to clarify responses.

**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.**

No statistical sampling methods will be used in this information collection.

Chris Ellis (843-740-1195, chris.ellis@noaa.gov) from NOAA's Coastal Services Center was consulted in the development of the survey.

NOAA's Estuarine Reserves Division will conduct the survey and collect and analyze all responses. The survey invitation will be sent on behalf of the NOAA Estuarine Reserves Division.

Agency contact information:
Dwight Trueblood
NOAA Estuarine Reserves Division
UNH, Gregg Hall, Suite 130
35 Colovos Road
Durham, NH 03824
603-862-3580
Dwight.Trueblood@noaa.gov

**Survey Announcement (to be sent via email to 140 staff at the NERRS)**

NOAA is evaluating the NERRS Science Collaborative in order to determine how effective it is at fostering targeted, multidisciplinary, collaborative research to address the impacts of human activities on coasts and estuaries. As part of this evaluation NOAA will be conducting a survey to solicit Reserve input on the NERRS Science Collaborative program. The survey information from the NERRS will be only one piece of information used to evaluate the overall effectiveness of the Science Collaborative in helping the NERRS meet their strategic goal of NERRS science improving understanding and informing decisions affecting estuaries and coastal watersheds.

In a 2 weeks you will receive an email invitation to participate in this survey along with a weblink to the survey. We would deeply appreciate you taking the time to participate in the survey which should take approximately 20 minutes to complete.

Best Regards, Dwight Trueblood

**Survey Invitation/Cover Letter (to be sent via email to 140 staff at the NERRS)**

NOAA is evaluating the NERRS Science Collaborative in order to determine how effective it is at fostering targeted, multidisciplinary, collaborative research to address the impacts of human activities on coasts and estuaries. The purpose of this survey is to solicit Reserve input on the NERRS Science Collaborative program. The survey information from the NERRS will be one piece of information used by ERD to evaluate the overall effectiveness of the Science Collaborative in helping the NERRS meet their strategic goal of NERRS science improving understanding and informing decisions affecting estuaries and coastal watersheds.

The survey can be accessed at the following SurveyMonkey.com weblink:

[Insert www.surveymonkey.com survey weblink here]

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.

Survey responses will not be reported individually, only in aggregate. Respondents are assured that their names will not be placed on their completed surveys or subsequent reports. A summary of results will be used by NOAA and individuals involved in the review of the NERRS Science Collaborative program activities. A summary of the results will also be made available to the NERRS community and the investigators implementing the NERRS Science Collaborative program at the University of New Hampshire.

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.

Best Regards, Dwight Trueblood

**Reminder Email 1 (To be sent 2 weeks after original message.)**

Two weeks ago you received an invitation to participate in a survey asking for your perspective and input on the NERRS Science Collaborative. If you have already completed the survey, thanks! If not this is just a friendly reminder to please complete the survey at you earliest convenience.

The survey can be accessed at the following SurveyMonkey.com weblink:

[Insert www.surveymonkey.com survey weblink here]

Best Regards, Dwight Trueblood

**Reminder Email 2 (To be sent 4 weeks after original message.)**

This is a final reminder to please complete the NERRS Science Collaborative survey if you haven't done so already. The survey will be closing on MONTH, DAY YEAR.

The survey can be accessed at the following SurveyMonkey.com weblink:

[Insert www.surveymonkey.com survey weblink here]

Best Regards, Dwight Trueblood

**OMB Control No. 0648-xxxx**
**Expiration Date: xx/xx/xxxx**

**NERRS Science Collaborative Survey for the NERRS**

Survey Introduction

NOAA is evaluating the NERRS Science Collaborative in order to determine how effective it was at fostering targeted, multidisciplinary, collaborative research to address the impacts of human activities on coasts and estuaries. The purpose of this survey is to solicit your input on the NERRS Science Collaborative program. The survey information will be used by ERD in evaluating the overall effectiveness of the program in meeting NERRS goals and priorities.

Please tell us a bit about yourself:

1. What is your affiliation?
    a. National Estuarine Research Reserve staff
    b. Other (please specify)
2. If you work for a Reserve, please identify your sector.
    a. Manager
    b. Research Coordinator
    c. Coastal Training Program Coordinator
    d. Education Coordinator
    e. Stewardship Coordinator
    f. Other (please specify)
3. If you do not work for a Reserve what is your area of work?
    a. Please Specify

The rest of the survey focuses on the three main program components of the NERRS Science Collaborative: 1) competitive grants, 2) transfer, and 3) the TIDES (Training for the Integration of Decisions and Ecosystem Science) Master's program. At the end of the survey you will have an opportunity to suggest alternative approaches to the goal of "fostering targeted, multidisciplinary, collaborative research to address the impacts of human activities on coasts and estuaries."

**Competitive Grants Component**
Each year the Science Collaborative releases a Request for Proposals (RFP) that seeks proposals that integrate intended users into the conduct of applied research projects using collaboration practices to address priority coastal management problems in the Reserves and their surrounding communities. The following 4 questions ask you about your involvement in this program and your level of satisfaction with the focus of the NERRS Science Collaborative RFPs to date.

4. How often have you participated in the development of collaborative research proposals that were submitted for NERRS Science Collaborative funding?
    a. None
    b. 1 time
    c. 2 times
    d. 3 times
    e. 4 or more times
5. How many collaborative research projects that you participated in have been funded by the NERRS Science Collaborative?
    a. None
    b. 1 project
    c. 2 projects
    d. 3 projects
    e. 4 or more projects

6. What is your degree of satisfaction with the focus of the annual Request for Proposal's on the following coastal and estuarine issues in a changing climate?
    a. Land use
       1=Extremely Dissatisfied, 2=Not Satisfied, 3=No Opinion, 4=Satisfied, 5=Extremely Satisfied

    b. Habitat restoration
       1=Extremely Dissatisfied, 2=Not Satisfied, 3=No Opinion, 4=Satisfied, 5=Extremely Satisfied

    c. Estuarine contaminants
       1=Extremely Dissatisfied, 2=Not Satisfied, 3=No Opinion, 4=Satisfied, 5=Extremely Satisfied

    d. Stormwater management and contamination
       1=Extremely Dissatisfied, 2=Not Satisfied, 3=No Opinion, 4=Satisfied, 5=Extremely Satisfied

7. What is your degree of satisfaction with the Science Collaborative Program's competitive funding approach that requires the inclusion of intended users in your research project?

    1=Extremely Dissatisfied, 2=Not Satisfied, 3=No Opinion, 4=Satisfied, 5=Extremely Satisfied

    [Please explain your answer.]

**Transfer Component of the NERRS Science Collaborative**

The goal of this component of the program is to share information, good ideas, and lessons learned from the place-based research funded by the NERRS Science Collaborative with other Reserves in the most effective way possible. Some of the Transfer activities include the Collaborative Learning training (offered by Chris Feurt of the Wells NERR) or the project webinars offered by the program. The next 5 questions ask you about your level of satisfaction with this aspect of the NERRS Science Collaborative.

8. How often have you participated in the development of collaborative information transfer proposals that were submitted for NERRS Science Collaborative funding?
    a. None
    b. 1 time
    c. 2 times
    d. 3 times
    e. 4 or more times
9. How many transfer projects that you participated in have been funded by the NERRS Science Collaborative?
    a. None
    b. 1 project
    c. 2 projects
    d. 3 projects
    e. 4 or more projects
10. Please indicate the ways you have interacted with the Transfer component of the program. Choose all that apply.
    a. I have not interacted with the Transfer program
    b. Collaborative Learning training
    c. Webinars
    d. Project-level transfer project
    e. Other (please list)

11. What is your degree of satisfaction with the support provided by the Science Collaborative for Collaborative Learning Training workshops as a way to develop collaborative capacity in the NERRS?

    1=Extremely Dissatisfied, 2=Not Satisfied, 3=No Opinion, 4=Satisfied, 5=Extremely Satisfied

12. What is your degree of satisfaction with the overall Transfer component of the NERRS Science Collaborative?

    1=Extremely Dissatisfied, 2=Not Satisfied, 3=No Opinion, 4=Satisfied, 5=Extremely Satisfied

    [Please provide reasons for your answer.]

**TIDES Component of the NERRS Science Collaborative**

TIDES (Training for the Integration of Decisions and Ecosystems Science) is a Master's program based at the University of New Hampshire. Its goal is to increase the number of professionals specifically trained to create processes for linking science and decisions. TIDES students serve 6-month internships at Reserves as part of their program requirements working on projects funded by the NERRS Science Collaborative. The next 3 questions ask you about your level of satisfaction with this aspect of the program.

13. Have you had a TIDES student(s) work at your Reserve since the inception of the program in 2009?
    a. Yes – answer all of the following questions in this section
    b. No – Skip Question 14. Go to Question 15.

14. What is your degree of satisfaction with the TIDES program?
    1=Extremely Dissatisfied, 2=Not Satisfied, 3=No Opinion, 4=Satisfied, 5=Extremely Satisfied

[Please indicate how you personally have interacted with the TIDES program.]

15. What is your degree of satisfaction with NOAA supporting graduate training, with focus on training professionals to connect science to decision making?

    1=Extremely Dissatisfied, 2=Not Satisfied, 3=No Opinion, 4=Satisfied, 5=Extremely Satisfied

    [Please elaborate]

**General Questions on the NERRS Science Collaborative**

One of the goals for NOAA in funding the Science Collaborative was to improve the Reserve System's ability to address important coastal management challenges facing both the Reserves and the Nation's coastal areas. The following 8 questions ask you about your level of satisfaction with how NOAA's support for the Science Collaborative has helped Reserves address this challenge.

16. What is your degree of satisfaction with how Science Collaborative funding has improved your Reserve's ability to address the following issues of importance to the NERRS?
    a. Impacts of land use change
       1=Extremely Dissatisfied, 2=Not Satisfied, 3=No Opinion, 4=Satisfied, 5=Extremely Satisfied

    b. Habitat change and restoration
       1=Extremely Dissatisfied, 2=Not Satisfied, 3=No Opinion, 4=Satisfied, 5=Extremely Satisfied

    c. Management of stormwater
       1=Extremely Dissatisfied, 2=Not Satisfied, 3=No Opinion, 4=Satisfied, 5=Extremely Satisfied

    d. Nonpoint source pollution
       1=Extremely Dissatisfied, 2=Not Satisfied, 3=No Opinion, 4=Satisfied, 5=Extremely Satisfied

    e. Climate change
       1=Extremely Dissatisfied, 2=Not Satisfied, 3=No Opinion, 4=Satisfied, 5=Extremely Satisfied

17. What is your degree of satisfaction with how Science Collaborative funding has improved your Reserve's ability to address the following issues of importance to the community your Reserve serves?
    a. Impacts of land use change
       1=Extremely Dissatisfied, 2=Not Satisfied, 3=No Opinion, 4=Satisfied, 5=Extremely Satisfied

    b. Habitat change and restoration
       1=Extremely Dissatisfied, 2=Not Satisfied, 3=No Opinion, 4=Satisfied, 5=Extremely Satisfied

    c. Management of stormwater
       1=Extremely Dissatisfied, 2=Not Satisfied, 3=No Opinion, 4=Satisfied, 5=Extremely Satisfied

    d. Nonpoint source pollution
       1=Extremely Dissatisfied, 2=Not Satisfied, 3=No Opinion, 4=Satisfied, 5=Extremely Satisfied

e. Climate change
   1=Extremely Dissatisfied, 2=Not Satisfied, 3=No Opinion, 4=Satisfied, 5=Extremely Satisfied

18. What is your degree of satisfaction with how Science Collaborative funding has improved the application of Reserve science to address Reserve management needs?

    1=Extremely Dissatisfied, 2=Not Satisfied, 3=No Opinion, 4=Satisfied, 5=Extremely Satisfied

19. What is your degree of satisfaction with how Science Collaborative funding has improved the application of Reserve science to address coastal management needs?

    1=Extremely Dissatisfied, 2=Not Satisfied, 3=No Opinion, 4=Satisfied, 5=Extremely Satisfied

20. What is your degree of satisfaction with how the following Science Collaborative program activities have increased your Reserve's capacity to make your community aware of Reserve-led management practices?
    a. Competitive research funding
       1=Extremely Dissatisfied, 2=Not Satisfied, 3=No Opinion, 4=Satisfied, 5=Extremely Satisfied

    b. Collaborative learning training
       1=Extremely Dissatisfied, 2=Not Satisfied, 3=No Opinion, 4=Satisfied, 5=Extremely Satisfied

    c. Transfer activities for project findings and information
       1=Extremely Dissatisfied, 2=Not Satisfied, 3=No Opinion, 4=Satisfied, 5=Extremely Satisfied

21. What is your degree of satisfaction with the distribution of funding across the following Science Collaborative program activities:
    a. Competitive research program funding
       1=Extremely Dissatisfied, 2=Not Satisfied, 3=No Opinion, 4=Satisfied, 5=Extremely Satisfied

    b. Transfer program activities funding
       1=Extremely Dissatisfied, 2=Not Satisfied, 3=No Opinion, 4=Satisfied, 5=Extremely Satisfied

    c. TIDES program funding
       1=Extremely Dissatisfied, 2=Not Satisfied, 3=No Opinion, 4=Satisfied, 5=Extremely Satisfied

    [Please explain your response]

22. Has NOAA's support for the NERRS Science Collaborative better positioned the NERRS to be more effective leaders in their communities?
    a. Yes
    b. No

    [Please Explain]

23. Do you have other comments or suggestions for how ERD can use a system-wide research program, either similar to the NERRS Science Collaborative or quite different, to further the goal of fostering

targeted, multidisciplinary, collaborative research to address the impacts of human activities on coasts and estuaries?

**Paperwork Reduction Act Statement:**
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 Dwight Trueblood, NOAA National Ocean Service, Estuarine Reserves Division, UNH, Gregg Hall, Suite 130, 35 Colovos Road, Durham, NH 03824.

Responses will not be reported individually, only in aggregate. Your name will not be placed on your completed survey or included in subsequent reports. A summary of results will be used by NOAA and individuals involved in the review of the NERRS Science Collaborative program activities. A summary of the results will also be made available to the NERRS community and the investigators implementing the NERRS Science Collaborative program at the University of New Hampshire.

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.

Operations, Office 2, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–3874.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

## Background

On April 10, 2012, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published in the **Federal Register** a notice of ''Opportunity to Request Administrative Review'' of the antidumping duty order on solid fertilizer grade ammonium nitrate (ammonium nitrate) from the Russian Federation (Russia) for the period of review (POR) of May 2, 2011, through March 31, 2012.[1] The Department received timely-filed requests from JSC Acron (Acron) and MCC EuroChem (EuroChem) (the respondents) in accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(b), for an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on ammonium nitrate from Russia. On May 29, 2012, the Department published a notice of initiation of an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on ammonium nitrate from Russia for Acron and EuroChem.[2] On the same date, we: (1) Issued the antidumping questionnaire to these companies; and (2) requested information from U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) on imports of subject merchandise from these respondents during the POR, in accordance with our practice. In June 2012, we received the requested CBP information, which showed that neither Acron nor EuroChem had entries of subject merchandise during the POR. On June 5, 2012, we placed a memorandum on the administrative record of this case stating that our review of the CBP database showed no POR entries of subject merchandise by the respondents.[3] We released the results of our CBP data query to the respondents and CF Industries, Inc. and El Dorado Chemical Company (collectively, the petitioners). We received no comments on the CBP data.

On June 20, 2012, Acron submitted its response to section A of the Department's antidumping questionnaire, which indicated that Acron had a shipment of subject merchandise to the United States in March 2012; however, the entry documentation submitted with this response showed that the entry associated with this shipment was not made until after the end of the POR. *See* Acron's June 20, 2012, response at Exhibits 1 and 19.

On June 22, 2012, EuroChem submitted a partial response to section A of the Department's antidumping duty questionnaire, which stated that EuroChem also had a shipment of subject merchandise to the United States in March 2012. Unlike Acron, however, EuroChem provided a CBP 7501 form indicating that the entry associated with this shipment occurred on March 26, 2012. *See* EuroChem's June 22, 2012, submission at Exhibit 2. Because this information was not consistent with the underlying CBP data, on June 25, 2012, we queried the CBP database as to the status of the particular entry in question. According to the CBP database, although EuroChem submitted its entry documentation on March 26, 2012, the entry was not accepted by CBP as entered until after the end of the POR.

Because neither respondent had an entry of subject merchandise into the United States during the POR, on June 28, 2012, the Department placed a memorandum on the record notifying interested parties of its intent to rescind this administrative review.[4] We invited parties to comment on our Intent to Rescind Memo. On July 9, 2012, we received comments from the respondents, and on July 16, 2012, we received rebuttal comments from the petitioners.

On August 24, 2012, we placed a memorandum on the record regarding EuroChem's entry date, to which EuroChem responded on September 4, 2012.

### *Rescission of Review*

It is the Department's practice to rescind an administrative review pursuant to 19 CFR 351.213(d)(3) when there are no reviewable entries of subject merchandise during the POR subject to the antidumping duty order and for which liquidation is suspended.[5] At the end of the administrative review, the suspended entries are liquidated at the assessment rate computed for the review period. *See* 19 CFR 351.212(b)(l). Therefore, for an administrative review to be conducted, there must be a reviewable, suspended entry to be liquidated at the newly calculated assessment rate. As discussed in the Issues and Decision Memorandum (Decision Memo) accompanying this notice, we find that neither respondent made entries of subject merchandise during the POR. Therefore, we are rescinding this review of the antidumping duty order on ammonium nitrate from Russia pursuant to 19 CFR 351.213(d)(3).

### *Analysis of Comments Received*

All issues raised in by parties to this administrative review in their comments are addressed in the Decision Memo, which is adopted by this notice. Parties can find a complete discussion of all issues and the corresponding recommendations in this public memorandum, which is on file electronically via IA ACCESS in the Central Records Unit, room 7046, of the main Department of Commerce building.

In addition, a complete version of the Decision Memo can be accessed directly on the Web at *http://ia.ita.doc.gov/frn/.* The paper copy and electronic version of the Decision Memo are identical in content.

This notice is published in accordance with section 751 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and 19 CFR 351.213(d)(4).

Dated: October 22, 2012.

**Paul Piquado,**

*Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 2012–26531 Filed 10–26–12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

[1] *See Ammonium Nitrate from Russia: Correction to Notice of Opportunity to Request Administrative Review,* 77 FR 21527 (Apr. 10, 2012).

[2] *See Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews and Requests for Revocation in Part,* 77 FR 31586, 31570 (May 29, 2012).

[3] *See* the June 5, 2012, memorandum from Elizabeth Eastwood, Senior Analyst, to the file, entitled, ''2011–2012 Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Solid Fertilizer Grade Ammonium Nitrate (Ammonium Nitrate) from the Russian Federation (Russia): Data Query Request.''

[4] *See* the June 28, 2012, memorandum from Holly Phelps, Analyst, to James Maeder, Director, Office 2, entitled, ''Intent to Rescind Administrative Review: 2011–2012 Antidumping Duty Administrative Review of Solid Fertilizer Grade Ammonium Nitrate from the Russian Federation'' (Intent to Rescind Memo).

[5] *See, e.g., Certain Frozen Warmwater Shrimp From Brazil: Notice of Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review,* 77 FR 32498 (June 1, 2012); and *Certain Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bars From Turkey; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review,* 67 FR 21634, 21635 (May 1, 2002), unchanged in *Certain Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bars From Turkey; Final Results and Partial Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review,* 67 FR 66110 (Oct. 30, 2002).

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

### Proposed Information Collection; Comment Request; National Estuarine Research Reserve System Science Collaborative Evaluation

**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 information collection, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

**DATES:** Written comments must be submitted on or before December 31, 2012 December 28, 2012.

**ADDRESSES:** Direct all written comments to Sarah Brabson, 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 Dwight Trueblood, (603) 862–3580 or *Dwight.Trueblood@noaa.gov.*

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

## I. Abstract

The National Estuarine Research Reserve System (NERRS) Science Collaborative was created in 2009 to put Reserve-based science to work for coastal communities coping with the impacts of land use change, pollution, and habitat degradation in the context of a changing climate. The program operates on the belief that for science to be applied to solve coastal management problems, the people who need to use the science must be involved in its generation.

The projects funded by the NERRS Science Collaborative are designed to bring the intended users of the science into the research process so that their perspectives can inform problem definition, research design and implementation, and ultimately, application of the project results. This is what is meant by ''collaboration,'' and it is the program's goal to use this process to ensure that the good science happening in and around the Reserves gets put to good use.

To help evaluate the efficacy of the NERRS Science Collaborative, NOAA is conducting a survey of the NERRS staff located in the 28 Reserves around the country to solicit their perspective about the program and how it has been implemented.

## II. Method of Collection

Respondents will be surveyed electronically and the submission of results will be online. If requested, a paper copy of the survey will be provided to the survey respondents.

## III. Data

*OMB Control Number:* None.

*Form Number:* None.

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

*Affected Public:* Non-profit institutions; State, local, or tribal government.

*Estimated Number of Respondents:* 140.

*Estimated Time per Response:* 20 minutes.

*Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours:* 47.

*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: October 23, 2012.

**Gwellnar Banks,**

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

[FR Doc. 2012–26465 Filed 10–26–12; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510–08–P**

---

# DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

## National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

**[0648–XC242]**

## Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; General Provisions for Domestic Fisheries; Application for Exempted Fishing Permit

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

**ACTION:** Notice; request for comments.

**SUMMARY:** The Assistant Regional Administrator for Sustainable Fisheries, Northeast Region, NMFS, has made a preliminary determination that the subject exempted fishing permit (EFP) application contains all the required information and warrants further consideration. The subject EFP would allow a commercial fishing vessel to conduct fishing operations that are otherwise restricted by the regulations governing the fisheries of the Northeastern United States. Regulations under the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act require publication of this notification to provide interested parties the opportunity to comment on applications for proposed EFPs.

**DATES:** Comments must be received on or before November 13, 2012.

**ADDRESSES:** You may submit written comments by any of the following methods:

- *Email: nero.efp@noaa.gov.* Include in the subject line ''Comments on REDNET EFP.''
- *Mail:* John K. Bullard, Regional Administrator, NMFS, NE Regional Office, 55 Great Republic Drive, Gloucester, MA 01930. Mark the outside of the envelope ''Comments on REDNET EFP.''
- *Fax:* (978) 281–9135.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Brett Alger, Fisheries Management Specialist, 978–675–2153, *Brett.Alger@noaa.gov.*

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The School for Marine Science and Technology, University of Massachusetts, Dartmouth (SMAST), submitted a complete EFP application on September 5, 2012, to conduct a redfish trawl codend selectivity experiment. This is the third of six components for ''REDNET: A Network to Redevelop a Sustainable Redfish (*Sebastes fasciatus*) Trawl Fishery in the Gulf of Maine'', which is funded by the Northeast Fisheries Science Center's (NEFSC) Cooperative Research Program. The overall objective of REDNET is to develop gear type(s), seasons, and/or area combinations to efficiently harvest the redfish resource in the Gulf of Maine (GOM) to maximize the long-term benefits while minimizing negative impacts, thereby providing a means to achieve the annual catch limit (ACL) for a rebuilt, but largely inaccessible, redfish resource. The REDNET project includes the following components: (1) Network development; (2) baseline catch and bycatch evaluation; (3) codend selectivity; (4) conservation