NOTICE OF OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET ACTION

Date 03/31/2014

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 11/05/2013

ACTION REQUESTED: New collection (Request for a new OMB Control Number)
TYPE OF REVIEW REQUESTED: Regular
ICR REFERENCE NUMBER: 201309-0648-005
AGENCY ICR TRACKING NUMBER:
TITLE: Survey of Fish Processors and Business Disruptions Caused By Hurricane Sandy
LIST OF INFORMATION COLLECTIONS: See next page

OMB ACTION: Approved with change
OMB CONTROL NUMBER: 0648-0692
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: 03/31/2017 DISCONTINUE DATE:

BURDEN:	RESPONSES	HOURS	COSTS
Previous	0	0	0
New	14	22	0
Difference			
Change due to New Statute	0	0	0
Change due to Agency Discretion	14	22	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
Fish Processors Survey	NA, NA	Question guide for processor interviews, Processor Survey Instrument (now includes note on guidance)	

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 Survey of Fish Processors and Business Disruptions Caused By Hurricane Sandy

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

9. Keywords Fishing, fisheries, fishery

10. Abstract

The Northeast Fisheries Science Center's Social Sciences branch seeks to collect data distribution networks and business practices from fish processors that process groundfish and sea scallop in the Northeast United States. It also seeks to collect data on business disruptions due to Hurricane Sandy from those firms. The data collected will improve research and analysis about the economic impacts of potential fishery management actions, consistent with the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, the Regulatory Flexibility Act, and the National Environmental Policy Act.

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

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

13. Annual recordkeeping and reporting burden
a. Number of respondents 43
b. Total annual responses 14
1. Percentage of these responses collected electronically 0 %
c. Total annual hours requested 22
d. Current OMB inventory 0
e. Difference 22
f. Explanation of difference
1. Program change 22
2. Adjustment 0

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. P Program planning or management
b. ___ Program evaluation f. X 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: Min-Yang Lee
Phone: (508) 495 -2026

19. Certification for Paperwork Reduction Act Submissions

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

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

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

(a) It is necessary for the proper performance of agency functions;

(b) It avoids unnecessary duplication;

(c) It reduces burden on small entities;

(d) It used plain, coherent, and unambiguous terminology that is understandable to respondents;

(e) Its implementation will be consistent and compatible with current reporting and recordkeeping practices;

(f) It indicates the retention period for recordkeeping requirements;

(g) It informs respondents of the information called for under 5 CFR 1320.8(b)(3):

- (i) Why the information is being collected;
- (ii) Use of information;
- (iii) Burden estimate;
- (iv) Nature of response (voluntary, required for a benefit, mandatory);
- (v) Nature and extent of confidentiality; and
- (vi) Need to display currently valid OMB control number;

(h) It was developed by an office that has planned and allocated resources for the efficient and effective management and use of the information to be collected (see note in Item 19 of instructions);

(i) It uses effective and efficient statistical survey methodology; and

(j) It makes appropriate use of information technology.

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

Signature of Senior Official or designee	Date

Agency Certification (signature of Assistant Administrator, Deputy Assistant Administrator, Line Office Chief Information Officer, head of MB staff for L.O.s, or of the Director of a Program or StaffOffice)	
Signature signed by Dr. Ned Cyr	Date 09/15/2013
Signature of NOAA Clearance Officer	
Signature	Date

SUPPORTING STATEMENT
SURVEY OF FISH PROCESSORS AND DISRUPTIONS CAUSED BY HURRICANE SANDY
OMB CONTROL NO. 0648-XXXX

A. JUSTIFICATION

This request is for a new information collection.

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

There are two purposes to this survey. The first purpose is to understand how Hurricane Sandy directly impacted fish processors in the Northeast United States. The second purpose is to increase the agency's knowledge of the supply and distribution networks of fish and fishery products in order to improve fisheries management.

Hurricane Sandy direct impacts

Under the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management (MSA), the Department of Commerce is authorized to provide disaster assistance to the fishing industry, including fish after commercial fisheries failures (Section 312) and catastrophic regional fishery disasters (Section 315). In order to effectively develop and respond to future disasters, it is important to understand the status of existing fish processors and their dependence on the regional fishery for raw materials. Understanding how Hurricane Sandy impacted fish processors in these will provide insight into the true social and economic costs of this disaster. Just as importantly, it will increase the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's (NOAA) National Marine Fisheries Service's (NMFS) knowledge and capacity to respond to future disasters in the Northeast United States.

- Section 315 of the MSA describes regional coastal disaster assistance programs for catastrophic regional fishery disasters, which were declared in New York and New Jersey after Hurricane Sandy. This section authorizes "a regional economic transition program to provide immediate disaster relief assistance to the fishermen, charter fishing operators, United States fish processors, and owners of related fishery infrastructure affected by the disaster."

- Section 312 of the MSA describes commercial fishery failure assistance programs; funds are available for "any activity that the Secretary determines is appropriate to restore the fishery or prevent similar failure in the future and assist a fishing community affected by such failure."

Agency's knowledge of the supply and distribution networks of fish

Both the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the reauthorization of the MSA require considerations of social and economic impacts of fishery management decisions. The MSA also requires a strategic plan for fisheries research, including research on "the social, cultural and economic relationships among fishing vessel owners, crew, United States (U.S.) fish processors, associated shoreside labor, seafood markets and fishing communities." Furthermore, the President's Executive Order 12866 (E.O.) requires considerations of costs and benefits to the nation as well as a determination of a significant regulatory action.

- 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 and the relationship of people with that environment" (Council on Environmental Quality NEPA Implementing Regulations 40 CFR 1508.14).

- Under the MSA there are a variety of requirements for fisheries management related to social, cultural and economic issues for fishermen and their communities (Section 301). For example, National Standard 1 for fishery conservation and management states that "Conservation and management measures shall prevent overfishing while achieving, on a continuing basis, the optimum yield from each fishery for the United States fishing industry." National Standard 5 states that "Conservation and management measures shall, where practicable, consider efficiency in the utilization of fishery resources." National Standard 8 requires management measures to "take into account the importance of fishery resources to fishing communities by utilizing economic and social data."

- In addition to requirements for fisheries management, Section 404 of the MSA requires NMFS to maintain a program of fisheries research that is "designed to acquire knowledge and information, including statistics, on fisheries conservation and management and on the economics and social characteristics of fisheries."

- Under Executive Order 12866, "agencies should consider all costs and benefits of available regulatory alternatives, including the alternative of not regulating....Further, in choosing among alternative regulatory approaches, agencies should select those approaches that maximize net benefits... unless a statute requires another regulatory approach."

Fish processors are part of the fishing industry, and the effects of alternative fisheries policies on

these businesses should be considered. Fisheries management policy often disrupts supply, potentially by opening or closing fishing areas, seasons, or changing Annual Catch Limits. While Hurricane Sandy was a specific shock to the activities of many fishery related businesses in the Mid-Atlantic and New England, understanding how businesses were impacted and adapted can provide insight into the general ability of processors to adapt to supply or demand caused by fishery policy. For example, if supply temporarily expands rapidly due to a regulatory change, this may lead to dramatic price declines if the supply and distribution network is not very flexible. If the quantity of fish supplied temporarily decreases due to a regulatory change, processors with low network capital may close if they because they cannot find alternative products with which to keep operating. Processors with large amount of network capital may be able to remain operational until supply stabilizes.

Knowledge of how fish is transferred from dealer to processor to end consumer will enable NMFS to fully and realistically and thoroughly describe the effects of fisheries management on the commercial fishing industry and regional economies. One way that this is currently done is by constructing regional input-output models using IMPLAN[1]. The results of these models are sensitive to the regional purchase coefficients (RPCs) that describe how goods and services move across different counties and states in the economy. NMFS currently assumes that the generic RPCs are correct; these data collected will allow NMFS to validate this assumption and, if necessary, update the data that is used in these models. This information collection will improve the agency's ability to describe economic and social impacts of alternative fishery regulations as required under MSA, NEPA, and E.O. 12866.

Section 404 of MSA requires a strategic plan for fisheries research. This addresses the research priorities for social and economic research in the Northeast region to:

- Broaden social and cultural investigation beyond fishermen, to include more women and those involved in fishing-related industries (such as processing workers)
- Continue to explore the use of GIS [Geographic Information Systems] to assist in describing and analyzing the social and cultural dimensions of fisheries and fishing communities
- Perform statistical analysis of changes in marine industries in regional economies over time, and investigate the relationships between these changes and resource conditions (NMFS 2007, p124-5).

[1] IMPLAN (IMpact analysis for PLANning) is an economic modeling system that can be used to model the effects that changes in the supply of goods (like fish supplied) will have on output and employment in related industries in the regional economy.

2. <u>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</u>.

This will be a one-time information collection using an in-person, structured interview by NMFS staff or contractor. We will use a multi-mode approach as described by Dillman *et al* (2009). We will make first contact by phone. If the phone number in the processed products report is not correct, we will make a mail contact. For respondents that choose to participate, we will follow-up with email or mail (as preferred by the respondent) that contains the discussion topics in the form of a question list, and appointment logistics. We do not have a "form" for the respondents to fill out. However, we plan to send a list of questions to the respondent (by email or postal mail) in advance of the interview, so that they can prepare for the interview (rather than actually answer questions) and make sure that the correct person is being interviewed. That list is attached.

Purpose

The Social Sciences Branch (SSB) at the Northeast Fisheries Science Center will use this information for two purposes. Firstly, SSB will describe and understand the impacts of natural disasters on fishery related businesses. This will allow NMFS to better understand and respond to future natural disasters. Second, SSB will be able to describe and analyze the fish processing sector. This will contribute to better fishery management by (properly) considering the entire fishing industry, not just the extractive harvest sector. Reports and analyses using these data are expected to be valuable to the New England and Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Councils in their decision making processes. Because this type of information has not been collected or utilized in the fishery management process, it is difficult to predict the exact uses of these analyses and reports.

Types of information collected and rationale

There are four areas of information that will be collected: general information about the fish processing firm, Impacts of Hurricane Sandy and Adaptations to those impacts, Purchases and Sales of Fish, and Contracting &New Markets.

General Information

Q1: In 2013, what limited the size of your business? The profitabilityof your business?

We will ask an open-ended question about current factors that limit operations and profitability of processors. Based on pre-testing, this may be the most important piece of information that the respondents will want to convey to fisheries managers. As an agency, NMFS knows very little about fish processing firms in the Northeast US. This question will also build rapport between the interviewer and respondent.

Expected Uses: These answers are likely to be related to the supply of domestic fish (both levels and volatility). Because Fisheries management Councils make decisions that directly and indirectly affect supply of domestic fish, collecting this data will lead to better understanding of how fisheries regulations are likely to impact fish processors.

Impacts of Hurricane Sandy

Q2: How did Hurricane Sandy affect your business? How did you respond to these impacts?

This open-ended question will help NMFS understand the immediate impacts of Hurricane Sandy on businesses and how businesses coped with the disaster.

Expected Uses: This directly addresses the first goal of the survey, to understand how Hurricane Sandy directly impacted fish processors in the Northeast United States.

Q3: How many production workers per shift were working in Nov, 2012? Dec, 2012? How many hours per day was the plant operational? How many days per week was the plant operating? What percentage of typical operations do these represent?

Expected Uses: This will help NMFS understand the immediate impacts of Hurricane Sandy on employment (Hurricane Sandy made landfall in NY/NJ at the end of October, 2012). It will allow us to understand how operations changed.

Some of this information overlaps slightly with the employment questions administered in the ongoing NMFS processor survey (OMB Control No. 0648-0018). However, this question focuses on the "production" part of facility operations, which probably declined as a result of Hurricane Sandy. The processor survey includes all employees; in addition, it is possible that firms retained employees on payroll instead of letting them go. This change in operational status would not be captured by the processor survey. This directly addresses the first goal of the survey, to understand how Hurricane Sandy directly impacted fish processors in the Northeast United States.

Q4: During the two months following Hurricane Sandy (Nov. & Dec. of 2012), how many of your sales contracts were canceled by your customers? What percentage of your sales volume does this represent? What is typical for this two-month period? When did your customers return and what did your firm do in response?

Q5: During the two months following Hurricane Sandy (Nov. & Dec. of 2012), how many of your purchase contracts were canceled by your suppliers? What percentage of your purchasing volume does this represent? What is typical for this two-month period? When did your suppliers return and what did your firm do in response?

Hurricane Sandy may have affected both demand for finished products and supply of raw materials. Processors frequently engage in agreements with large, sophisticated clients to supply fish at a specific price and time.

Expected Uses: Understanding the extent of changes in sales will provide a direct measure of the effects of Hurricane Sandy on processors. Understanding the extent of any changes in purchases of raw fish will provide a direct measure of the effects of Hurricane Sandy on processors.

In addition, this will allow fisheries managers to understand the flexibility of the supply chain. Fisheries policy often disrupts supply, potentially by opening or closing fishing areas, seasons, or changing Annual Catch Limits. If supply temporarily expands rapidly due to a regulatory change, this may lead to dramatic price declines if the supply and distribution network is not very flexible. If the quantity of fish supplied temporarily decreases due to a regulatory change, processors with low network capital may close if they because they cannot find alternative products with which to keep operating.

Purchases and Sales of Fish

Q6: Approximately how much fish (by weight) did your facility purchase in 2013?

Understanding where fish are sourced from will improve our regional economic models and NMFS ability to analyze the impacts of alternative fisheries management policies on the regional economy as required under MSFCMA.

Expected Uses: SSB anticipates using the answers to question 4 to update and validate the NERIOM that is currently used to describe the effects of fishing regulation on the economy. The answers to question 5 give us information about the input side: for example, the firms in ME might purchase 20% of their groundfish from ME, 10% from the rest of New England, and the rest is imported from Canada.

Q7: To which cities did your facility ship finfish and scallops in 2013? Approximately how much was shipped (by weight) to each city?

The answer to this question will give provide information about demand for finished products. Understanding where fish are sourced from will improve our regional economic models and NMFS ability to analyze the impacts of alternative fisheries management policies on the regional economy and all businesses which are using fish.

While collection of dollar-denominated information (instead of weights) in questions 4 and 5 would be ideal, pretesting revealed that asking about revenues and costs would be likely to reduce participation in this survey. However, NMFS collects data on prices (through the seafood dealer reporting system for primary sales and through the Market News and Processed Products programs for final product sales); therefore converting weights to dollars will be possible.

Expected Uses: SSB anticipates using the answers to question 5 to update and validate the regional Input-Output models that we use to describe the effects of fishing regulation on the economy. The answers to question 5 will help us with the output side: for example, the firms in ME might sell 25% of their processed finfish to Portland, ME; 50% to Boston, MA; and the rest

goes “out” of the Northeast region.

In addition, questions 5 and 6 will allow fisheries managers to take into the current network capital of fish processors. Processors with diverse upstream and downstream networks are less vulnerable to disruptions such as natural disasters, reductions in catch, or spatial closures of fishing grounds..

For example, consider a processor that buys scallops in New Bedford, MA and sells only that product at the Fulton Fish Market in New York. That specialization leave the processor highly exposed to shocks to the New York economy (like Hurricane Sandy) and to the New Bedford scallop industry. That firm might be stuck with rotting or lower quality scallops if there is a demand disruption. That firm may have difficulty purchasing scallops if there are closures of fishing grounds that are used primarily by New Bedford fishermen. In contrast, a diversified firm that sells many products (scallops, groundfish, and Norwegian salmon) to many markets (Boston, NY, DC) may be far less impacted.

Reporting of Survey Results

Analyses and summarization of the Hurricane Sandy data will be used by NMFS, Congressional staff and the public to understand effects of the Hurricane and subsequent commercial fishery disaster on processors and employment. Analyses and summarization of data related to the role of fisheries processors in the regional economy will be used by NMFS, the Northeast Fisheries Management Council, and the Mid-Atlantic Fisheries Management Council, and the public to incorporate processor outcomes in policy and decision making. Qualified researchers with data access and confidentiality agreements will have access to raw data for performing economic research and analyses. It is anticipated that results will also be reported through academic publications, presentations at conferences, and technical guides. All reporting of survey results will conform to data confidentiality requirements.

Information Quality Guidelines

It is anticipated that the information collected will be disseminated to the public or used to support publicly disseminated information. NMFS will retain control over the information and safeguard it from improper access, modification, and destruction, consistent with NOAA standards for confidentiality, privacy, and electronic information. See Question 10 for information on confidentiality. Data will not be released for public use except in aggregate statistical form without identification as to its source. The information collection is designed to yield data that meet all applicable information quality guidelines. Prior to dissemination, the information will be subjected to quality control measures and a pre-dissemination review pursuant to Section 515 of Public Law 106-554.

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

Automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological techniques or other forms of information technology will not be used to collect this data. In-person interviews will be conducted. The information will be transcribed and entered into a database by the interviewer after the interview is complete. While this two-step procedure for collecting and storing information will increase the amount of time required by NMFS to process survey answers, an interview recorded with pen-and-paper has been successful in the past and is anticipated to provide the best data (Dirlam and Georgianna, 1994; Georgianna and Dirlam, 2001; Georgianna and Shrader, 2008)

4. Describe efforts to identify duplication.

NMFS currently conducts a nationwide survey of processors (OMB Control No. 0648-0018). That survey collects annual data on outputs, no information about inputs, and no information about marketing. The processor survey is administered once per year and data is not available until 7 months after the end of the calendar year. There is one question on the Processed Products survey "Number of persons working at this establishment during the payroll period that included the 12th of the month." In this information collection, we will ask about both employment and active operational time. We ask this because processing firms may have reduced employment status of workers, operating hours, or both in reaction to hurricane Sandy.

The Alaska Fisheries Science Center collected information regarding fishing and fish processing in Alaska (OMB Control No. 0648-0614). This proposed information collection does not overlap with this regional survey.

Staff at the Northeast Fisheries Science Center are preparing a one-year assessment of the impacts of Hurricane Sandy on commercial and recreational fishing industries in New York and New Jersey (August, 26, 2013; 78 FR 52761). That data collection will not include processing firms as part of the respondent universe, therefore no duplication is expected.

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

Nearly all potential respondents to the survey are expected to be classified as "Fresh and Frozen Seafood Processing" (NAICS 311712, size standard 500 employees). Based on the NMFS survey of processors, all respondents are expected to be small entities.

To minimize the burden while also maximizing information collected, we have relied on expert academics in the field of fishery management research who have conducted interviews with processors to develop a survey which has the appropriate length. We have also pre-tested the

survey instrument to ensure it is length appropriate. To minimize burden, we will conduct surveys at convenient times and locations for respondents (presumably at the processing plant and during business hours that are preferred). Participation in this information collection is strictly voluntary.

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

Not conducting the collection would reduce the ability of NMFS to fully assess impacts of future fishery management policies and to respond to fishery disasters in the future. In particular, the agency's knowledge of the processing segment of the fishing industry will continue to be poor.

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 published on July 5, 2013 (73 FR 40434-5) solicited public comments. No comments were received.

The survey was pretested on fewer than 10 members of the respondent universe. As part of the pretesting process, respondents helped us remove questions that were likely to be difficult to answer due to unavailable data and to refine questions and instructions that were unclear. These respondents also indicated that the time-burden estimate is reasonable, that the frequency of collection is not overly burdensome, and that data elements required to answer the questions are likely to be easily accessible.

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.

NMFS will retain control over the information and safeguard it from improper access, modification, and destruction, consistent with NOAA standards for confidentiality, privacy, and electronic information and this assurance is included in the form. We have included text in the question guide that assures confidentiality as required by section 402(b) of the Magnuson-Stevens Act and NOAA Administrative Order 216-100, Confidentiality of Fisheries Statistics, and that the information will not be released for public use except in aggregate statistical form, without identification as to its source.

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

None of the questions being asked in the survey include matters that would be considered private.

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

Based on our pre-testing, we estimate that the respondent will need to spend approximately 30 minutes reviewing business records to prepare for the interview. Most of this time would be spent examining employment/payroll records, purchasing records, and shipping records (Questions 3-7).

Also based on our pre-testing, we estimate that the interview portion of the survey will last approximately 1 hour, for a total of 1 hour and 30 minutes per respondent. There are 62 potential respondents and a 70% response rate is expected (43 expected respondents). Therefore, the public burden is 65 hours (annualized to 14 responses and 22 hours per year). Respondents are likely to be "General and operations managers" (median weekly wage of $1,264[2]), "Purchasing agents, except wholesale, retail, and farm products" ($987), or "Sales representatives, wholesale and manufacturing" ($1,064). The hourly labor cost for respondents is therefore likely to range from $24.68-31.60 per hour. The labor cost (of the 65 hours) is estimated at $1,604 -2,054 for the entire information collection.

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).

We estimate zero annual burden cost to the respondent (exclusive of the value of labor cost above). There are no capital or start-up costs. There are no operational costs.

---

2 http://www.bls.gov/cps/cpsaat39.htm

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

The entire information collection project is expected to cost approximately $80,000. Therefore, the annualized cost (over three years) is $26,667 per year. This includes labor and travel costs for contractors totaling $70,000: assistance with survey development ($5,000), conducting and recording interviews ($22,500), labor costs for encoding and storing data ($7,500), performing analysis ($27,500), and project management ($7,500). In addition, one FTE (ZP-3) is expected to spend 10% of his time overseeing this project ($10,000).

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

Not Applicable. This is a new program.

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

Geographical, numerical, and textual survey information will be a product of this study. Survey data will be analyzed using standard economic and geographical data analysis methods. 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 submitted for publication in peer-reviewed journals to encourage additional analysis as well as to disseminate findings. Data will also be released to the public, but only in summary or tabular form. Data used to produce maps will also be aggregated in a way that preserves respondents' anonymity.

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

Not Applicable.

18. Explain each exception to the certification statement.

Not Applicable.

SUPPORTING STATEMENT
SURVEY OF FISH PROCESSORS AND DISRUPTIONS CAUSED BY HURRICANE SANDY
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.

Potential Respondent Universe

The Fishery Product Report data (collected under OMB 0648-0018) will be used to construct the potential respondent universe. The Fishery Report data contains mailing and physical addresses. Respondents consist of all active fish processors and wholesalers which are located in the states of NJ, NY, CT, RI, MA, VT, NH, and ME which reported selling processed groundfish or scallops. As of 2011, there were 62 potential respondents that fit this criteria. The 2012 data are not available yet, but will be available before the survey begins and will be used to construct the potential respondent universe. Therefore, the number of respondents may change slightly when the updated data are available.

	Businesses (small businesses)
Groundfish Processors	43 (43)
Scallop Processors	5 (5)
Both	14 (14)
Total	62 (62)
Expected Response Rate	70% (70%) 43 respondents (43 small)

Sample Selection

A census is planned. Because the information being collected is voluntary, less than a 100% response rates is expected. Little information is known about the fish processing sector in the Northeast United States and this information collection has not been previously performed. Similar work has been conducted by Dirlam and Georgianna (1994) and Georgianna and Dirlam (2001). However, no response rates were computed. Georgianna and Shrader (2008) achieved

60% response rates for in-person interviews of scallop fishing vessels in which the potential respondents are difficult to interview because they are mobile. We expect a slightly higher response rate because fish processing firms have fixed addresses.

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.

We plan to conduct a census of the respondents. Therefore, there will be no stratification or sample selection. After the information collection, we can examine the characteristics of the respondents and non-respondents to detect and correct for any non-response bias during the analysis. For example, the Fishery Product Report data contains addresses, outputs, and employment figures. From this we can verify if our data is representative by both location (state, region) or size (based on inputs or outputs) and re-weight our data when conducting analyses if necessary.

One application of this data collection would be to compute the changes in employment or operational status immediately after Hurricane Sandy. Another application would be to verify and adapt, if necessary, the Regional Purchase Coefficients (RPCs) that are used in the input output modes l that assess impacts of fishery regulations on the regional economy (Steinback and Thunberg, 2006).

Unusual problems requiring specialized sampling procedures are not anticipated. The data collection will occur one time.

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.

We will use a multi-mode approach as described by Dillman *et al* (2009). We will make first contact by phone. If the phone number in the processed products report is not correct, we will make a mail contact. For respondents that choose to participate, we will follow-up with email or mail (as preferred by the respondent) that contains the discussion topics and appointment logistics. The data collection will be conducted by Dr. Dan Georgianna, who has been actively conducting research in this field and is well respected by fish processors in the region (Dirlam and Georgianna, 1994; Georgianna and Dirlam, 2001; Georgianna and Shrader, 2008).

While we would prefer to gather data on the value of fish products instead of the weight of those products, pre-testing and Dr. Georgianna's previous experience collecting similar data indicated that asking for value would be likely to reduce our response rate significantly. Therefore, the survey instrument will collect data on sales and purchases using weight, not value. It will be possible to estimate costs of raw materials using NMFS dealer data for domestically produced fish.

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

The survey has been pre-tested by fewer than ten respondents. The proposed information collection will be conducted in-person by a single individual; one of the major advantages of this approach is that allows us to clarify the questions in a consistent way if there is any confusion.

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.

Min-Yang Lee, Ph.D. (508) 495-2026 and Tammy Murphy, Ph.D. (508) 495-2007 participated in the statistical aspects of the design.

The information will be collected by Dan Georgianna, Ph.D. (508) 910-6378. Dr. Georgianna has conducted extensive research in the field of fisheries economics, specifically focusing on fish processing firms (Dirlam and Georgianna, 1994; Georgianna and Dirlam, 2001; Georgianna and Shrader, 2008).

The information will be analyzed primarily by Georgianna and Lee.

References

Dillman, D.A and J.D.Smyth and L.M. Christian. 2009. Internet, Mail, and Mixed-mode Surveys: The Tailored Design Method. 3Rd Edition. Hoboken, NJ. John Wiley and Sons.

Dirlam, J. and D. Georgianna. 1994. Recent Adjustments in New England Fresh Groundfish Processing. *Marine Resource Economics*. 9: 375-384.

Georgianna, D and J. Dirlam. 2001. The Effect of Reduced Supply on Fish Processing in New England. *IIFET 2000 Proceedings*. Corvallis, OR.

Georgianna, D and D. Shrader. 2008. The Effects of Days at Sea on Employment, Income, and Hours of Work: Some Preliminary Evidence. *Human Ecology Review* 15(2): 185-193.

National Marine Fisheries Service. 2007. NMFS Strategic Plan for Fisheries Research. U.S. Department of Commerce. NOAA Technical Memo NMFS F/SPO-80. Silver Spring, MD. 170p.

Steinback SR, Thunberg EM. 2006. Northeast Regional Fishing Input-Output Model. NOAA Tech Memo NMFS-NE-188; 54 p. Availiable at http://www.nefsc.noaa.gov/publications/tm/tm188

Guide for Interviewers

Overview

Interviewer notes: Prompt or cue the respondent for continuation after each answer for Questions 1 and 2.

Refusal or Non-response, in the form of "I don't know" is possible for some questions (Particularly questions 2,4, and 5). Clarify if "I don't know" is polite "non-response" by asking: "What I would like to know is if you don't know, or if you'd rather not talk about it. If you would rather not talk about it, that's okay."

Introduction:

We are conducting a survey to understand two things:

1. The role of fish processing in the regional economy.
2. The impacts, if any, of Hurricane Sandy on supply of fish, demand for fish.

In addition to understanding the direct impacts of Hurricane Sandy, answers to this survey will help NMFS understand how changes in regulations on fishing vessels impact fish processors and the regional economy of the Northeast United States. Your answers to these questions will be kept confidential as provided for under section 402(b) of the Magnuson-Stevens Act and NOAA Administrative Order 216-100.

[**Pre-Question 1:** We would like to spend a few minutes talking generally about the fish processing business.]

Question 1: In 2013, what limited the size of your business? What limited the profitability of your business?

- <u>Do not</u> prompt with expected answers.
- <u>Do</u> prompt with "anything else?" before moving to Question 2.
- Ask for clarification on regulations ("NMFS" regulations or "other" regulations, such as food

safety).

[**Pre-question 2**: We would like to focus discussion on the effects of Hurricane Sandy for a while. Hurricane Sandy hit New Jersey and New York at the end of October, 2012.]

Question 2: How did Hurricane Sandy affect your business? How did you respond to these impacts?

- Ask the questions <u>without</u> a prompt.
  - The respondent is likely to answer that there was no effect, because they are probably thinking about physical damages.
  - <u>Prompt</u> for business disruptions and physical damages if they are not mentioned. Note if the respondent needed prompting.
- <u>Do</u> prompt with "anything else?" before moving to Question 3.

[**Pre-question 3**: The order of questions 3-5 may be adjusted depending on the answers to question 2.]

Question 3: How many production workers per shift were working in Nov, 2012? Dec, 2012? How many hours per day was the plant operational? How many days per week was the plant operating? What percentage of typical operations do these represent?

- ["Typical operations" refers to a normal November or December.]
- [Ensure that this does not refer to "production workers" only .]
  - Production workers, include line-supervisors, engaged in fabricating, processing,assembling, inspecting, receiving, packing, warehousing, shipping, maintenance, repair, janitorial, product development or product transport.

Question 4: During the two months following Hurricane Sandy (Nov. & Dec. of 2012), how many of your sales contracts were canceled by your customers?

- **Q3F1: What percentage of your sales volume does this represent?**
- **Q4F2: What is typical for this two-month period?**

- **Q4F3: When did your customers return and what did your firm do in response?**

Q4F2 refers to "The number of contracts and percentage of sales volume that are typically cancelled in the November and December period?"

Q5: During the two months following Hurricane Sandy (Nov. & Dec. of 2012), how many of your purchase contracts were canceled by your suppliers?

- **Q5F1: What percentage of your purchasing volume does this represent?**
- **Q5F2: What is typical for this two-month period?**
- **Q5F3: When did your suppliers return and what did your firm do in response?**

Q5F2 refers to "The number of contracts and percentage of purchase volume that are typically cancelled in the November and December period?"

[Pre-question 6: We would like to talk about what types of fish (whole vs. partially processed) that your company purchases and where that fish comes from (Where does the truck go to get fish?). We are interested in groundfish, monkfish, sea scallop, and "other whole" and "processed"]

Question 6: Approximately how many pounds of [product X] did your plant purchase in 2013 from [location Y]?

- **Products:** Whole groundfish, monkfish (whole, tail, liver), sea scallop, other finfish whole, finfish processed.
- **Locations:** Your state, the rest of your region, the "other" regions.
- [Interviewer note: Since product is delivered in slightly different forms, ensure that "whole groundfish" is understood to refer to anything that requires "cutting" (still has the backbone)]
- [Interviewer note: Make sure that percentages are percentage by weight, not by value.]
- [Interviewer note: Have the US map visible to facilitate discussion.]
- [Interviewer note: We have five "regions": New England, Mid Atlantic, "US West Coast & Alaska", Other US, Imported].

Question 7: To which cities did your facility ship products in 2013? Approximately how much was shipped (by weight) to each city?

A note about the question guide. This page will not be sent to respondents.

We do not have a “form” for the respondents to fill out. The information collection will be conducted using an in-person interviewer. However, we plan to send a list of questions to the respondent (by email or postal mail) in advance of the interview so that they can prepare for the interview and make sure that the correct person is being interviewed.

Question #6 contains a space for the respondent to fill in answers. This is not designed to actually collect the information. It is designed to prime the respondent to think about the type of information that we want to to talk about during the interview. The “State” and “Region” column will be customized based on the address of the respondent. If the facility is located in CT, MA, ME, NH, RI, or VT then the region will be “New England.” If the facility is located in NY, NJ, DE, MD, PA, or VA then the region will be “Mid Atlantic.”

We are conducting a survey to answer two questions:

1. **How did Hurricane Sandy impact fish processors?**
2. **How important are fish processing firms to the local economy and food system?**

The results of this survey will be used to help fisheries managers understand how fisheries regulations impact fish processors and help them respond to any fishery disasters in the future. We are grateful for your participation in this survey.

1: In 2013, what limited the size of your business? The profitability of your business?

2: How did Hurricane Sandy affect your business? How did you respond to these impacts?

3: How many production workers per shift were working in Nov, 2012? Dec, 2012? How many hours per day was the plant operational? How many days per week was the plant operating? What percentage of typical operations do these represent?

4: During the two months following Hurricane Sandy (Nov. & Dec. of 2012), how many of your sales contracts were canceled by your customers? What percentage of your sales volume does this represent? What is typical for this two-month period? When did your customers return and what did your firm do in response?

5: During the two months following Hurricane Sandy (Nov. & Dec. of 2012), how many of your purchase contracts were canceled by your suppliers? What percentage of your purchasing volume does this represent? What is typical for this two-month period? When did your suppliers return and what did your firm do in response?

6: Approximately how much fish (by weight) did your facility purchase in 2013?

	State	Region	West Coast	Other US	Import
Whole Groundfish	____	____	____	_____	_____
Scallops	____	____	____	_____	_____
Monkfish	____	____	____	_____	_____
Other Raw or Whole	____	____	____	_____	_____
Fillet/Processed	____	____	____	_____	_____

7: To which cities did your facility ship products in 2013? Approximately how much was shipped (by weight) to each city?

OMB Control number 0648-XXXX

Expiration Date MM/DD/YYYY

This survey is being conducted to understand the role of fish processing in the regional economy and the impacts Hurricane Sandy on fish processors. Answers to this survey will be used to help NOAA Fisheries understand how changes in fisheries regulations impact fish processors and improve NOAAs capacity to respond to fishery disasters. This will allow NOAA to better meet the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act and the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act.

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 90 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 Min-Yang Lee, NOAA Fisheries, 166 Water St, Woods Hole, MA 02543.

Your answers to these questions will be kept confidential as provided for under section 402(b) of the Magnuson-Stevens Act and NOAA Administrative Order 216-100. 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.

Sample No-phone contact Letter

Interviewer Name

Interviewer Contact Info

Dear XXXXX,

I am conducting research with the Northeast Fisheries Science Center's Social Sciences Branch to learn about how Hurricane Sandy impacted fish processors and the importance of fish processing to the local and regional economy. Hurricane Sandy devastated New York and New Jersey at the end of October, 2012. The Fulton Fish Market was closed for two days and many fisheries related businesses have yet to recover.

Without fish processors, fishermen would have fewer buyers for fish. Despite the importance of processors in regional fisheries, fish processors do not often have a place at the table when fisheries policy is decided. The results of this research will be used to help fisheries managers understand how fisheries regulations impact fish processors and help them respond to any fishery disasters in the future.

I have conducted interviews with [NUMBER of INTERVIEWS] so far and I would be grateful for your participation in this research. I have attached a copy of the topics that I hope we could talk about. Unfortunately, I was unable to reach you at the phone number in our records [PHONE NUMBER]. If you would be willing to speak with me and contribute to this research, please call me at [CONTACT NUMBER] or email me at [CONTACT EMAIL].

Regards,

[Interviewer Name]

Introduction

Hello _____, my name is _____. I am collaborating with the Social Sciences Branch at the Northeast Fisheries Science Center on researchabout the importance of fish processing in the [REGION] economy and the effects of Hurricane Sandy of fish processors. Despite their importance, processors do not often have a place at the table when fisheries policy is decided. Hopefully, the results of this research will change that. I would like to come down to [FACILITY NAME] and chat with someone from your company about the fish processing business, how and where fish is bought and sold, and the effects of Hurricane Sandy.

Do you think that you, or someone from your company, could participate in this research?

RESPONSE: Agree to Respond to Survey

Thank you. I appreciate your participation. Could we set up a date and time that is convenient for you?

I would like to send an email or postal mail that contains the topics that we would talk about. Which would you prefer?

Email – Could I have your email address?

Postal – Could I have the postal address?

Thank you for your time. I look forward to seeing you on _____. Have a good day.

RESPONSE: Decline to Respond to Survey

Do you think that I could send you a brief description of the survey and the topics that we would talk about? Maybe you would change your mind?

Accept:

Thank you, I appreciate the opportunity. I can send it be email or postal mail, which would you prefer?

Email – Could I have your email address?

Postal – Could I have the postal address?

Thank you for your time. Have a good day.

Decline again:

I understand. Thank you for your time. We will not contact you again regarding this survey. Have a good day.

RESPONSE: Not the correct person.

Could you connect me to the correct person to talk to? I am researching both fish purchasing and selling, so perhaps the buying manager, selling manager, or even the owner could help me?

[Repeat script when connected to correct person]

Sample Advance Letter

Interviewer Name

Interviewer Contact Info

Dear XXXXX,

Thank you for agreeing to participate in the Northeast Fisheries Science Center's survey survey about how Hurricane Sandy impacted fish processors and the importance of fish processing to the local and regional economy. Hurricane Sandy devastated New York and New Jersey at the end of October, 2012. The Fulton Fish Market was closed for two days and many fisheries related businesses have yet to recover.

Without fish processors, fishermen would have fewer buyers for fish. Despite the importance of processors in regional fisheries, fish processors do not often have a place at the table when fisheries policy is decided. The results of this research will be used to help fisheries managers understand how fisheries regulations impact fish processors and help them respond to any fishery disasters in the future. I am grateful for your participation.

Our meeting is scheduled for MONTH DAY, YEAR for HH:MM to HH:MM. If this time is inconvenient, please contact [contact person] at [Email address] or [phone number] to reschedule. I have attached a copy of the topics that I hope that we can talk about during our meeting.

Regards,

[Interviewer Name]

Sample Decline Letter

Interviewer Name

Interviewer Contact Info

Dear XXXXX,

Thank you for considering participating in the research that I am conducting jointly with the Northeast Fisheries Science Center's Social Sciences Branch on the impacts of Hurricane Sandy on fish processors and the importance of fish processing to the local and regional economy. I have attached a copy of the topics that I am researching.

Without fish processors, fishermen would have fewer buyers for fish. Despite the importance of processors in regional fisheries, fish processors do not often have a place at the table when fisheries policy is decided. The results of this research will be used to help fisheries managers understand how fisheries regulations impact fish processors and help them respond to any fishery disasters in the future. So far, I have conducted [Insert number of interviews here] and your participation would be invaluable.

I will make one follow-up phone call in approximately one month. If you decide to participate, we can arrange a meeting at that time. If your company cannot participate, then I will not contact you again regarding this research.

Regards,

[Interviewer Name]

Conclusion

In sum, after reviewing and considering interested party comments and concerns, the Department has determined, as discussed above, that to the extent that we agree with some of the comments received, the Department will consider addressing the issues raised in those comments in our future administrative proceedings on a case-by-case basis.

Dated: June 28, 2013.

Paul Piquado

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 2013–16171 Filed 7–3–13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

Meeting of the Manufacturing Council

AGENCY: International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of an open meeting.

SUMMARY: The Manufacturing Council will hold a meeting to discuss the work the Council will focus on for the remainder of their term. This will be the first meeting since the Council established subcommittees. The subcommittees—Workforce and Public Perception of Manufacturing; Innovation, Research and Development; Tax Policy and Export Growth; and Manufacturing Energy Policy—will share with the full Council the key issues they will address in their specific subcommittees. The subcommittees will present the scope of their proposed work for the remainder of their term to the full Council for discussion. The Council was re-chartered on April 5, 2012, to advise the Secretary of Commerce on government programs and policies that affect U.S. manufacturing and provide a means of ensuring regular contact between the U.S. Government and the manufacturing sector.

DATES: July 23, 2013, 10:00 a.m.–12:30 p.m. Eastern Daylight Time (EDT).

ADDRESSES: Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW., Room 4830, Washington, DC 20230. Because of building security, all non-government attendees must pre-register. This meeting will be physically accessible to people with disabilities. Seating is limited and will be on a first come, first served basis. Requests for sign language interpretation, other auxiliary aids, or pre-registration, should be submitted no later than July 16, 2013, to Elizabeth Emanuel, the Manufacturing Council, Room 4043, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC, 20230, telephone 202–482–1369, *elizabeth.emanuel@trade.gov.* Last minute requests will be accepted, but may be impossible to fill.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Elizabeth Emanuel, the Manufacturing Council, Room 4043, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC, 20230, telephone: 202–482–1369, email: *elizabeth.emanuel@trade.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: A limited amount of time, from 12:15–12:30, will be made available for pertinent brief oral comments from members of the public attending the meeting. To accommodate as many speakers as possible, the time for public comments will be limited to 3 minutes per person. Individuals wishing to reserve speaking time during the meeting must contact Ms. Emanuel and submit a brief statement of the general nature of the comments, as well as the name and address of the proposed speaker by 5:00 p.m. EDT on Thursday, July 18th. If the number of registrants requesting to make statements is greater than can be reasonably accommodated during the meeting, the International Trade Administration may conduct a lottery to determine the speakers. Speakers are requested to bring at least 20 copies of their oral comments for distribution to the members of the Manufacturing Council and to the public at the meeting. Any member of the public may submit pertinent written comments concerning the Manufacturing Council's affairs at any time before or after the meeting. Comments may be submitted to Elizabeth Emanuel, the Manufacturing Council, Room 4043, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC, 20230, telephone: 202–482–1369, email: *elizabeth.emanuel@trade.gov.* To be considered during the meeting, written comments must be received by 5:00 p.m. EDT on Thursday, July 18, 2013, to ensure transmission to the Manufacturing Council prior to the meeting. Comments received after that date will be distributed to the members but may not be considered at the meeting. Copies of Council meeting minutes will be available within 90 days of the meeting.

Dated: July 1, 2013.

Elizabeth Emanuel,

Executive Secretary, the Manufacturing Council.

[FR Doc. 2013–16174 Filed 7–3–13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DR–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

Proposed Information Collection; Comment Request; Survey of Fish Processors and Disruptions Caused by Hurricane Sandy

AGENCY: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Notice.

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

DATES: Written comments must be submitted on or before September 3, 2013.

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 Min-Yang Lee, (508) 495–2026, or *Min-Yang.Lee@noaa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Abstract

This request is for a new information collection.

The Northeast Fisheries Science Center's Social Sciences Branch seeks to collect data on distribution networks and business practices from fish processors that process groundfish and sea scallops in the Northeast United States. It also seeks to collect data on business disruptions due to Hurricane Sandy for those firms. The data collected will improve research and analysis on the economic impacts of potential fishery management actions, consistent with the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act and the Regulatory Flexibility Act.

II. Method of Collection

This information will be collected by in-person, face-to-face interviews.

III. Data

OMB Control Number: None.
Form Number: None.

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

Affected Public: Business or other for-profit organizations.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 20.

Estimated Time Per Response: 1 hour, 30 minutes.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 30.

Estimated Total Annual Cost to Public: $0 in capital costs and $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 28, 2013.

Gwellnar Banks,

Management Analyst, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 2013–16096 Filed 7–3–13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–22–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

Proposed Information Collection; Comment Request; Gulf of Alaska Trawl Fishery, Rationalization Sociocultural Study

AGENCY: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Notice.

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

DATES: Written comments must be submitted on or before September 3, 2013.

ADDRESSES: Direct all written comments to Jennifer Jessup, Departmental Paperwork Clearance Officer, Department of Commerce, Room 66165, 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 Amber Himes-Cornell (Phone: (206) 526–4221), *amber.himes@noaa.gov*.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Abstract

This request is for a new information collection.

Historically, changes in fisheries management regulations have been shown to result in impacts to individuals within the fishery. An understanding of social impacts in fisheries—achieved through the collection of data on fishing communities, as well as on individuals who fish—is a requirement under several federal laws. Laws such as the National Environmental Policy Act and the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (as amended 2007) describe such requirements. The collection of this data not only helps to inform legal requirements for the existing management actions, but will inform future management actions requiring equivalent information.

Fisheries rationalization programs have an impact on those individuals participating in the affected fishery, as well as their communities and may also have indirect effects on other fishery participants. The North Pacific Fishery Management Council is considering the implementation of a new, yet to be defined, rationalization program for the Gulf of Alaska trawl fishery. This research aims to study the affected individuals both prior to and after the implementation of the rationalization program. The data collected will provide a baseline description of the industry as well as allow for analysis of changes the rationalization program may create for individuals and communities. The measurement of these changes will lead to a greater understanding of the social impacts the management measure may have on the individuals and communities affected by fisheries regulations. To achieve these goals, it is critical to collect the necessary data prior to the implementation of the rationalization program for comparison to data collected after the management program has been implemented. This study will be inclusive of both a Phase 1 pre-implementation data collection effort, as well as a Phase 2, post-implementation data collection effort to achieve the stated objectives.

II. Method of Collection

Literature reviews, secondary sources including Internet sources, United States Census data, key informants, focus groups, paper surveys, electronic surveys, and in-person interviews will be utilized in combination to obtain the greatest breadth of information as possible.

III. Data

OMB Control Number: None.

Form Number: None.

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

Affected Public: Individuals or households; business or other for-profit organizations; not-for-profit institutions.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 500.

Estimated Time per Response: 1 hour and 30 minutes.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 750.

Estimated Total Annual Cost to Public: $0.

IV. Request for Comments

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

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