

NOTICE OF OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET ACTION

Date 11/12/2014

Department of Commerce
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

FOR CERTIFYING OFFICIAL: Kirit Amin
FOR CLEARANCE OFFICER: Jennifer Jessup

In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act, OMB has taken action on your request received 10/10/2014

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

TYPE OF REVIEW REQUESTED: Regular

ICR REFERENCE NUMBER: 201408-0648-006

AGENCY ICR TRACKING NUMBER:

TITLE: Alaska Halibut Catch Sharing Plan Survey

LIST OF INFORMATION COLLECTIONS: See next page

OMB ACTION: Approved with change

OMB CONTROL NUMBER: 0648-0705

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: 11/30/2017

DISCONTINUE DATE:

BURDEN:	RESPONSES	HOURS	COSTS
Previous	0	0	0
New	633	186	0
Difference			
Change due to New Statute	0	0	0
Change due to Agency Discretion	633	186	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
Alaska Halibut Catch Sharing Plan Survey	NA	Alaska Halibut Catch Sharing Plan 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	2. OMB control number b. <input type="checkbox"/> None a. _____ - _____
3. Type of information collection (<i>check one</i>) a. <input type="checkbox"/> New Collection b. <input type="checkbox"/> Revision of a currently approved collection c. <input type="checkbox"/> Extension of a currently approved collection d. <input type="checkbox"/> Reinstatement, without change, of a previously approved collection for which approval has expired e. <input type="checkbox"/> Reinstatement, with change, of a previously approved collection for which approval has expired f. <input type="checkbox"/> Existing collection in use without an OMB control number For b-f, note Item A2 of Supporting Statement instructions	4. Type of review requested (<i>check one</i>) a. <input type="checkbox"/> Regular submission b. <input type="checkbox"/> Emergency - Approval requested by _____ / _____ / _____ c. <input type="checkbox"/> Delegated
7. Title	5. Small entities Will this information collection have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
8. Agency form number(s) (<i>if applicable</i>)	6. Requested expiration date a. <input type="checkbox"/> Three years from approval date b. <input type="checkbox"/> Other Specify: _____ / _____
9. Keywords	
10. Abstract	
11. Affected public (<i>Mark primary with "P" and all others that apply with "x"</i>) a. ___ Individuals or households d. ___ Farms b. ___ Business or other for-profit e. ___ Federal Government c. ___ Not-for-profit institutions f. ___ State, Local or Tribal Government	12. Obligation to respond (<i>check one</i>) a. <input type="checkbox"/> Voluntary b. <input type="checkbox"/> Required to obtain or retain benefits c. <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory
13. Annual recordkeeping and reporting burden a. Number of respondents _____ b. Total annual responses _____ 1. Percentage of these responses collected electronically _____ % c. Total annual hours requested _____ d. Current OMB inventory _____ e. Difference _____ f. Explanation of difference 1. Program change _____ 2. Adjustment _____	14. Annual reporting and recordkeeping cost burden (<i>in thousands of dollars</i>) a. Total annualized capital/startup costs _____ b. Total annual costs (O&M) _____ c. Total annualized cost requested _____ d. Current OMB inventory _____ e. Difference _____ f. Explanation of difference 1. Program change _____ 2. Adjustment _____
15. Purpose of information collection (<i>Mark primary with "P" and all others that apply with "X"</i>) a. ___ Application for benefits e. ___ Program planning or management b. ___ Program evaluation f. ___ Research c. ___ General purpose statistics g. ___ Regulatory or compliance d. ___ Audit	16. Frequency of recordkeeping or reporting (<i>check all that apply</i>) a. <input type="checkbox"/> Recordkeeping b. <input type="checkbox"/> Third party disclosure c. <input type="checkbox"/> Reporting 1. <input type="checkbox"/> On occasion 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Weekly 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Monthly 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Quarterly 5. <input type="checkbox"/> Semi-annually 6. <input type="checkbox"/> Annually 7. <input type="checkbox"/> Biennially 8. <input type="checkbox"/> Other (describe) _____
17. Statistical methods Does this information collection employ statistical methods <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	18. Agency Contact (person who can best answer questions regarding the content of this submission) Name: _____ Phone: _____

19. Certification for Paperwork Reduction Act Submissions

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

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

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

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

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

Signature of Senior Official or designee

Date

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

Signature

Date

Signature of NOAA Clearance Officer

Signature

Date

**SUPPORTING STATEMENT
ALASKA HALIBUT CATCH SHARING PLAN SURVEY
OMB CONTROL NO. 0648-XXXX**

A. JUSTIFICATION

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

The National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) is the agency responsible for collecting and analyzing scientific data on the United States' (U.S.) living marine resources, including Pacific halibut (*Hippoglossus stenolepis*). Under the [Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act](#) (see Section 303), [Executive Order 12962](#) (Marine Recreational Fishery Statistics, Section 1(h)), and [Executive Order 12866](#) (Section 1(b)(6)), NMFS is required to provide economic analyses of Federal management actions and policies to improve the Nation's fisheries. This data collection project will meet these statutory and administrative requirements by providing resource managers with the information necessary to understand the likely future impacts of management actions on the Alaska charter boat-based halibut sport fishery.

The halibut sport fishery in Alaska is quite large. During 2012, for instance, over 387,000 halibut were harvested by sport anglers in the state, a large proportion of which were caught by anglers on charter vessels.¹ The Alaska charter boat sector has undergone significant change in recent years due, at least in part, to regulatory changes in the management of the Pacific halibut sport fishery. To control growth of the charter sector in the primary recreational charter boat fishing areas off Alaska, a limited entry program was implemented in 2011 (75 Federal Register 554). In addition, in the past several years, charter vessel operators in Southeast Alaska (International Pacific Halibut Commission [IPHC] Area 2C) have been subject to harvest controls that impose both size and bag limits on the catch of Pacific halibut on guided fishing trips, with these limits being more restrictive than the regulations for non-guided trips (e.g., 78 Federal Register 16425).² Most recently, a Halibut Catch Sharing Plan (CSP) is being implemented during 2014 that formalizes the process (a) of allocating catch between the commercial and charter sector and (b) for evaluating changes to harvest restrictions (78 FR 75843). Importantly, the CSP allows leasing of commercial halibut individual fishing quota (IFQ) by eligible charter businesses. Leased halibut IFQ (called guided angler fish, or GAF) could then be used by charter businesses to relax harvest restrictions for their angler clients, since GAF fish would not be subject to the charter sector-specific size and bag limits that may be imposed—though the non-charter sector size and bag limit restrictions (currently two fish of any size per day) would still apply to charter anglers individually..

¹ From Alaska Department of Fish and Game's Statewide Harvest Survey website:

<http://www.adfg.alaska.gov/sf/sportfishingsurvey/index.cfm?ADFG=region.home>. Accessed July 25, 2014.

² The other main area of Alaska in which saltwater fishing for Pacific halibut occurs is Southcentral Alaska (IPHC Area 3A), an area that includes the Cook Inlet region, Kodiak Island, and the Prince William Sound. Similar harvest restrictions were implemented in this area during 2014 (79 FR 13906).

Under the initial rules for the IFQ leasing program, henceforth the GAF leasing program, several restrictions are placed on the use of GAF, including the following:

1. **Single-season use.** GAF must be used before the end of the season for which it is leased, with automatic returns if the GAF is unused by a certain date (15 days before the end of the commercial fishing season).
2. **No transfers.** GAF can't be transferred between CHP holders during the season.

The restrictions listed above are features that are sometimes relaxed in other IFQ (or, more generally, tradable permit) programs to increase flexibility for participants. Recent research has shown that the restrictions imposed on transfers within IFQ markets can have significant effects on economic efficiency and other goals (e.g., Kroetz et al. 2013). To aid decision makers about the likely impacts of relaxing program features such as those above, as well as other programs that may be considered by the North Pacific Fishery Management Council (Council), the survey will collect data from eligible participants in the IFQ leasing market to determine their attitudes towards, and behavior in, the lease market and attitudes and preferences towards alternative programs.

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

Information from this collection will be used by NMFS economists in the Alaska Fisheries Science Center (AFSC) to address issues discussed in Question 1 above, and others that may arise. Using these data, analyses will be conducted to describe the reception of the CSP in the charter sector, its early effects on the charter sector (e.g., participation in the GAF lease market), and likely changes to charter sector participants resulting from the ability to lease GAF under the current program, and under alternative programs.

The information collection consists of conducting a survey sent to all eligible participants in the GAF leasing market, meaning any individual or business that holds a valid charter halibut permit (CHP) allowing their clients to fish for Pacific halibut. Since the population is small (about 650 in 2011), the survey will be conducted as a voluntary census. For this implementation, we will mail questionnaires to population members, followed by follow-ups to encourage response. Among the follow-up efforts will be a postcard reminder, a full second mailing, and a telephone contact with non-responding charter businesses to encourage response and gather data for assessing non-response behavior. Respondents will also be given the opportunity to provide information via a telephone interview that will be offered to respondents during the telephone prompt. Due to issues of timing sensitivity discussed below, we do not anticipate being able to conduct a formal pretest to test the mail survey instrument.

The charter boat fishing season in Alaska generally runs from mid-May through mid-September. After numerous discussions with charter boat operators, it was determined that the off-season

(January-April) is the best time for collecting the type of information sought in this particular data collection. *Since the survey collects information about the first year of the CSP and plans for participating in the second year (season) of the program, conducting the survey in the winter of 2015 appears to be the best time to conduct the survey. As a consequence, we are targeting March 2015 for implementing the survey.*

The mail survey and the follow-up telephone interview script are described below. The telephone survey is based on the mail survey (and will be conducted with a paper questionnaire in the respondent's possession), and involves asking the same questions. As a result, it will not be discussed separately.

Mail Questionnaire

The questionnaire is divided into six sections. The following is a discussion of how particular questions in the questionnaire will be used.

Section A is short and presents some basic information about the CSP, including the IFQ leasing (GAF) component of the program, while asking for information about general attitudes toward the CSP generally (A1), the GAF leasing program specifically (A2), and the expected effect the GAF leasing program will have on the individual's business (A3). These introductory questions are easy to answer for respondents and serve the dual purpose of enabling them to voice general opinions about the CSP and to get them thinking about specific aspects of the program relevant to the survey.

Section B focuses on gathering information about respondents' behavior in the GAF leasing market during 2014. This includes questions on whether or not the respondent leased GAF during 2014 and, if not, their reasons for not leasing GAF (B1); the amount of GAF leased (B2), whether a broker was used to facilitate the leasing process (B3); the relationship between the respondent and the person/entity from whom GAF was leased (B4); and the level of difficulty of the leasing process to the respondent (B5). Respondents indicating they did not lease GAF during 2014 are directed to B10, which asks all respondents to indicate whether or not they plan to lease GAF in the following year (i.e., in 2015). In addition, respondents are given some information about the program rules regarding mandatory returns of unused GAF (B6). They are then asked whether they returned any GAF (B6) and whether there were any provisions in their lease agreement that allowed them to get a refund (or partial refund) for GAF that was unused and returned (B7). For respondents who leased GAF, question B8 asked respondents to assess how positive or negative the impact of having GAF during 2014 was for their business, while B9 asks them to state their reasons for leasing GAF during 2014. The data collected in this section supplement information on lease transactions from IFQ transfer/lease application forms submitted to NMFS.

Section C is a short section that presents information on two restrictions in the current GAF leasing program that are sometimes relaxed in other tradable permit programs: single-season use and no transfers between CHP holders. In C1, they are asked how helpful, if at all, they believe being able to relax each of those restrictions would be for their business. This is followed by two

questions that ask how their behavior in the GAF leasing market would change if the restrictions were relaxed in terms of how much GAF they would lease (C2 and C3).

Section D extends the line of questioning in Section C by asking respondents several stated preference questions in which they are asked to choose their preferred option between two programs: the current GAF leasing program (and all the associated restrictions and rules) and an alternative program that relaxes one or both of the restrictions discussed in Section C. Each alternative program would have a different associated market price that the respondent would have to pay (payment vehicle). These three choice questions (D1, D3, and D5) provide information on how respondents trade off relaxed restrictions with price variations they would hypothetically see in the market (i.e., the prices presented are hypothetical, but based on amounts determined to be in a range of plausible values in pretesting). In addition to these choice questions, respondents are asked to identify the amount of GAF they would lease under each of the presented options in D2, D4, and D6. D7 identifies how confident individuals are about their answers to the stated preference questions. In combination with the stated preference choice questions (D1, D3, and D5), these questions will be used to estimate the demand for GAF under different GAF leasing programs, and can be used to assess trade-offs charter businesses make with respect to relaxing restrictions and higher costs. Respondents stating they are “not at all confident” in their answers may be excluded from the model estimation since these individuals, for whatever reason, are uncertain that their answers reflect how they feel.

Section E presents information about a proposed program that will be discussed at the Council in the next year or two. This program, the Catch Accountability through Compensated Halibut (CATCH) proposal, creates a recreational quota entity (RQE) that would be eligible for purchasing commercial halibut IFQ that would be added to the charter sector’s allocation that is determined under the CSP. By increasing the overall share of the allocation to the recreational charter sector, the program intends to reduce the risk of the Council imposing overly-restrictive harvest restrictions (e.g., setting maximum size limits on halibut that are very small fish or reducing the number of fish that may be caught to a single fish in combination with a size limit). Thus, it is a common pool approach to increasing the recreational charter sector’s allocation. Question E1 asks about the respondent’s familiarity with the program. In E2, respondents are provided information about several options for financing the program, then are asked how supportive they would be of each of those funding mechanisms. E3 asks respondents if they would be willing to pay a specific amount of money (that depends upon how many client anglers the respondent can take out fishing as per the CHP they hold (again, the presented amounts are hypothetical, but are based upon amounts viewed as plausible by respondents in pretesting activities). The section ends with a question that asks how much the respondent agrees or disagrees to several statements about the CATCH project (E4). These include statements regarding passing on higher fees to customers, supporting the CATCH project no matter how much it costs, how effective the program will be if implemented, and whose responsibility it is to fund the CATCH project.

The final section contains questions aimed at another alternative to the GAF leasing program, a program in which CHP holders were eligible to own GAF (IFQ), putting them on level ground with commercial fishermen. After describing the program, respondents are asked how helpful

they feel such a program would be (F1) and how likely they would be to purchase halibut IFQ (F2). The final survey question (F3) asks how supportive the respondent would be to each of the three types of programs asked about in the survey, programs that relax GAF leasing restrictions, the CATCH project, and the GAF ownership program described in Section F.

Telephone Follow-Up

Following the initial mailing, postcard reminder, and second full mailing, we will contact non-respondents by telephone to encourage them to complete the mail survey and to collect limited information from those who decide not to participate in the survey (and to give them the option of completing the survey over the telephone).³ The information provided by these non-respondents will be compared with that from respondents to address issues concerning non-response bias. Selected questions from the survey regarding their attitudes toward the CSP (Q1, Q2, and Q3) and whether or not they plan to lease GAF in 2015 (Q4) are asked to statistically test whether non-respondents differ from respondents with respect to these characteristics. These questions match questions in the survey (A1, A2, A3, and B10, respectively). Together, information from these questions can be used to evaluate and adjust the results for potential non-response bias in the data.

It is anticipated that the information collected will be disseminated to the public or used to support publicly disseminated information. NMFS will retain control over the information and safeguard it from improper access, modification, and destruction, consistent with NOAA standards for confidentiality, privacy, and electronic information. See response to Question 10 of this Supporting Statement for more information on confidentiality and privacy. The information collection is designed to yield data that meet all applicable information quality guidelines. Prior to dissemination, the information will be subjected to quality control measures and a pre-dissemination review pursuant to [Section 515 of Public Law 106-554](#).

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

Not Applicable.

4. Describe efforts to identify duplication.

The information collected in this survey is not collected by other Federal, state, or local agencies. We have informed the Council, the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, and the Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission (PSMFC) about this project. None of these entities have conducted or are conducting similar economic data collections.

³ In the telephone follow-up, a limited amount of information may also be collected from those agreeing to return the mail survey.

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

All respondents are small businesses. Considerable efforts have been made to minimize the burden of filling out the survey on charter boat businesses. Nine cognitive interview sessions were conducted with CHP holders (charter fishing businesses) to obtain their input on potential questions and ways of improving the questions to make them easier (and faster) for them to answer. Moreover, we have made considerable efforts to stay in contact with the charter boat associations in the state to keep them informed of the status of the survey and the questions that we intend to ask.

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

If the data collection is not conducted, the Council and NMFS will not have information on how the population of CHP holders view the Catch Sharing Plan and alternative policies that affect the Alaska charter fishing businesses or the ability to estimate the effects of recent and proposed changes in fishing regulations.

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

The collection is consistent with OMB guidelines.

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

A Federal Register Notice published on May 8, 2014 (79 FR 26412) solicited comments on the information collection. No comments were received about the proposed data collection.

Several individuals outside NMFS were consulted about the survey, availability of existing data, data to collect, and other aspects of the project. These included staff at the Alaska Department of Fish and Game (Scott Meyer and William Romberg), and the North Pacific Fishery Management Council (Jane DiCosimo and their consultant on halibut management issues, Jonathan King), all individuals with experience in recreational fishing issues in Alaska.

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.

In the cover letter accompanying each mailing, respondents will be told that their responses are voluntary and will be kept strictly confidential. The initial mailing letter and the follow-up mailing cover letter also include the following statement:

“All information you provide in the survey is considered confidential under section 402(b) of the Magnuson-Stevens Act (16 U.S.C. 1801, *et seq.*) and NOAA Administrative Order 216-100. Only aggregated results from the survey will be released publicly. Your personal information will not be disclosed and will only be accessible to authorized personnel responsible for management and research of fisheries under the authority of NOAA.”

Following completion of the data collection, the survey contractor will delete any information identifying individuals (i.e., names and addresses) before any data file is delivered to NMFS or any other participating researchers and agencies. The plan for collecting data and maintaining its confidentiality will adhere to [NOAA Administrative Order 216-100](#) and Section 402(b) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act of 1996, as amended, per the notice above.

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

There are no questions of a sensitive nature asked in the survey.

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

The survey will be sent to all individuals who hold a charter halibut permit (CHP). In general, these are saltwater sport fishing charter businesses. For 2014, this amounts to 602 individuals. The contact information for each business will be obtained from the NMFS CHP database that contains updated address information for each permit holder. We expect a final response rate of approximately 40 percent, leading to 241 responding CHP holders returning completed surveys (or completing the survey via telephone interview). Charter business representatives who have taken the survey during the cognitive interviews have taken, on average, 20 minutes to complete the survey. For the purpose of computing the potential burden hours, however, we use a more conservative estimate of the completion time (30 minutes). In addition, our tests administering the survey via telephone take approximately the same amount of time (30 minutes). As a result, those ultimately completing the survey are expected to contribute up to 120.5 hours to the overall annual hour burden ($241 \times 0.5 \text{ hours} = 120.5 \text{ hours}$).

Based on our experience with other surveys, we expect 210 respondents to have returned a completed survey following the initial mailing, postcard reminder, and second full mailing (~87% of all completed surveys). Given that the ADF&G license database has business names for each CHP holder, we anticipate being able to find telephone contact information via web and

telephone lookup services. Therefore, we expect to be able to contact all of those who have not yet responded to the mail survey (602 - 210 = 392 respondents). These 392 CHP holders will be contacted by telephone and encouraged to complete and return the survey and asked to answer a few questions if they indicate they will not be returning the survey or are unwilling to complete the full survey over the telephone. Thus, the telephone follow-up serves multiple purposes: (a) to increase the number of mail responses, (b) provide an alternative survey mode to complete the survey (telephone survey), and (c) to gather basic information by telephone needed to estimate the impact of non-response. The phone interview is expected to take 10 minutes on average to complete, and assuming 100% of the 392 individuals for which there is a phone number are reached and complete phone interviews, the contribution of the phone interview to the total time burden totals 65.3 (65) hours. Thus, totaling the time contribution of the 241 completed mail or telephone surveys (120.5 (121)hours) with the time from the phone interviews (65.3 hours) yields a total of 185.8 (186) hours per year (Table 1).

The total number of unique respondents to all contacts in the survey implementation will be 241 (full survey respondents) + 392 (phone respondents) – 31 (phone respondents who also complete the full survey) = 602 (the total population size).

Table 1. Annual Burden Hours by Survey Instrument

Survey instrument	Estimated number of respondents	Estimated time per respondent (minutes)	Estimated total annual burden hours (hours)
Mail survey (from initial mailing, postcard reminder, and second full mailing) or full Telephone Interview	241	30	121
Follow-up phone survey	392 ^a	10	65
Totals	602^b (633 with duplication)		186

^a Number of successful phone contacts of CHP holders that have not returned completed surveys following initial mailing, postcard reminder, and second full mailing.

^b Total unique respondents reflect the total CHP holders who complete the mail survey and all who completed the phone interview, including those who completed the survey afterward (accounts for individuals who completed both).

13. Provide an estimate of the total annual cost burden to the respondents or record-keepers resulting from the collection (excluding the value of the burden hours in Question 12 above).

No additional cost burden will be imposed on respondents aside from the burden hours indicated above.

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

Cost to the Federal government of the survey implementation is approximately \$40,000, divided as follows: \$35,000 in contract award money and \$5,000 in staff time and resources.

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

This is a new collection.

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

The response rates, survey data, and analysis of the data will be described in a report. A separate paper describing economic models used to analyze the data and the results from estimating these models will be submitted to a peer-reviewed journal.

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
ALASKA HALIBUT CATCH SHARING PLAN SURVEY
OMB CONTROL NO. 0648-XXXX**

B. COLLECTIONS OF INFORMATION EMPLOYING STATISTICAL METHODS

1. Describe (including a numerical estimate) the potential respondent universe and any sampling or other respondent selection method to be used. Data on the number of entities (e.g., establishments, State and local governmental units, households, or persons) in the universe and the corresponding sample are to be provided in tabular form. The tabulation must also include expected response rates for the collection as a whole. If the collection has been conducted before, provide the actual response rate achieved.

The potential respondent universe is all charter halibut permit (CHP) holders in Alaska during 2014. Each of these CHP holders have a permit to take anglers on charter fishing trips that target Pacific halibut. The permit designates the number of anglers allowed on each fishing trip, and the permit program is administered by NMFS. In 2014, there were 602 CHP holders.

A full census is expected to be conducted of the population, so no sampling or other methods will be employed. For the collection as a whole, an overall response rate of 40% is anticipated. This estimate is based on previous AFSC experience with similar survey protocols used for a nearly identical population (Alaska saltwater sport fishing charter businesses). CHP holders are a subset of this previously-surveyed population. However, the survey administered in that study was much more complex and asked for financial information. This led to a much lower response rate (between 22% and 27%) than expected for this data collection, which asks for primarily opinions and attitudinal information (but also for basic information on participation in the GAF leasing market).

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.

Since the survey will be conducted as a census, no sampling or sample selection methods will be employed.

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.

Numerous steps have been, and will be, taken to maximize response rates and deal with non-response behavior. These efforts are described below.

Maximizing Response Rates

The first step in achieving a high response rate is to develop an appealing questionnaire that is easy for respondents to complete. Significant effort has been spent on developing a good survey instrument. The survey instrument has benefited from input from numerous one-on-one interviews with members of the target population. In early testing, participants helped identify questions and concepts that needed to be clarified or modified to make them easier to fill out for them, as well as provided useful information about ways of making the survey more useful and attractive for them and other CHP holders to want to fill it out. Later interviews were also used to fine-tune survey design issues related to specific wording, flow, and comprehension issues. Additionally, the interviews were used to ensure the survey was a comfortable length and easy to complete. The result is a high-quality and professional-looking survey instrument.

CHP holders have made it clear to us that the optimal time for conducting the survey to minimize burden on them and maximize the accuracy of the information they provide is between March and May, a time period just before the CHP holders, who are also charter businesses, begin in earnest activities necessary to get ready for the fishing season. As a result, conducting the survey in March will maximize potential response by this population.

The implementation techniques that will be employed are consistent with methods that maximize response rates. Implementation of the mail survey will follow a modified Tailored Design Method (Dillman, Smyth, and Christian, 2009), which consists of multiple contacts. The specific set of contacts that will be employed is the following:

1. An **advance letter** notifying respondents a few days prior to the questionnaire arriving. This will be the first contact with the sample.
2. An **initial mailing** sent a few days after the advance letter. Each mailing contains a personalized cover letter, instructions and credentials for accessing the online survey, a printed questionnaire, and a pre-addressed stamped return envelope,
3. A **postcard follow-up reminder** to be mailed 5-7 days following the initial mailing.
4. A **second full mailing** will be mailed approximately 1-2 weeks after the postcard follow-up reminder.
5. The **telephone contact and follow-up interview** will be initiated about 1-2 weeks following the second full mailing. All individuals who have not returned the survey to date will be contacted, provided a valid phone number can be procured via reverse telephone lookup or other means (e.g., internet search). Contacted respondents will

be encouraged to fill out and return the questionnaire, but also given the option to complete the survey over the telephone either on the same phone call or at another scheduled time and date. During this phone contact, all respondents, regardless of their desire to complete the mail survey, take the survey via telephone, or unwillingness to participate, will be asked several questions that will assist in understanding non-response behavior. These phone interviews are expected to last up to 10 minutes for those agreeing to complete and return the mail survey, for those who decline participation, and for those who agree to a follow-up telephone interview at a different time and date. For those agreeing to the telephone interview to be taken immediately, we expect the phone call to last about 30 minutes.

Non-respondents

To better understand why non-respondents did not return the survey and to determine if there are systematic differences between respondents and non-respondents, those contacted in the follow-up phone call and identified as non-respondents will be asked a few questions to gauge their reasons for not responding to the mail survey. These include select questions related to their attitudes toward the CSP and plans for participating in 2015. Information collected from non-respondents will aid in improving the survey implementation and to correct for non-response bias where necessary. Lew et al. (2014) outlines how samples of fishery participants can be weighted to adjust for non-response bias. They illustrate the methods using data from a survey of Alaska saltwater sport fishing charter businesses—one that overlaps significantly with the population of interest in this study—and that uses auxiliary data about the population from available data from the State of Alaska. Given that the same auxiliary data are available for the population of interest in this study, we anticipate applying the sample weighting approaches delineated in Lew et al. (2014) (included as a supplemental document) to adjust responses to the census to better match up with the population in generating population estimates.

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.

Numerous cognitive interviews were conducted during the survey design phase to test survey materials. [Six members of the target population \(owners/operators of saltwater sport fishing charter businesses with CHPs\) provided input during the in-depth interviews.](#) Moreover, the survey design and implementation plan have benefited from review by individuals with expertise in fisheries-related economic survey design and implementation. [The reviewers included staff from the Alaska Department of Fish and Game--Scott Meyer \(fishery biologist\) and William Romberg \(sport fish administrator/supervisor\). A Council staff member \(Jane DiCosimo\) and an advisor to the Council on halibut management \(Jonathan King\) were also consulted, as well as NMFS Regional Office staff involved with halibut management issues \(Rachel Baker, Jason Gasper, and Julie Scheurer\).](#)

Note that since the timing of the survey requires fielding the survey in March 2015, and information being collected is pertinent to ongoing Council discussions and is thus time-

Comment [LS1]: For a survey with considerable management applications, it is important that pre-testing is conducted, even if not “formal”.

What were the affiliations of the people involved with the cognitive interviews and reviewers? (Please include.)

Was there any pre-testing of the survey with fishermen or Council members? There would seem to be sufficient time to do pre-testing and any necessary revisions to the ICR package if the survey must be fielded in March.

sensitive, we do not anticipate being able to conduct a formal pretest implementation.

5. Provide the name and telephone number of individuals consulted on the statistical aspects of the design, and the name of the agency unit, contractor(s), grantee(s), or other person(s) who will actually collect and/or analyze the information for the agency.

The following individuals were consulted on the statistical aspects of the design:

Dr. Dan Lew
Economist
NMFS
Alaska Fisheries Science Center
(530) 752-1746
Dan.lew@noaa.gov

Dr. Doug Larson
Professor
Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics
(530) 752-3586
dmlarson@ucdavis.edu

Drs. Dan Lew and Doug Larson are responsible for analyzing the data.

The survey will be conducted with a survey firm (TBD) with expertise in survey data collection methods and implementation.

References:

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

Kroetz, Kailin, James N. Sanchirico, and Daniel K. Lew. 2013. "Efficiency Costs of Social Objectives in Tradable Permit Programs." Working paper.

Lew, Daniel K., Amber Himes-Cornell, and Jean Lee. 2014. "Weighting and Data Imputation for Missing Data in Fisheries Economic and Social Surveys." Working paper.

Your Opinions About GAF in the Halibut Catch Sharing Plan



Photo credit: R. Yamada



This survey is funded by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, a U.S. government agency charged with management of federal fisheries.

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated at 30 minutes, including time for reviewing instructions, reviewing 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 Dan Lew, NOAA Fisheries, Alaska Fisheries Science Center, Dan.Lew@noaa.gov. Notwithstanding any other provision of the law, no person is required to respond to, nor shall any person be subject 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.

OMB Control No: 0648-XXXX
Expiration Date: mm/dd/yyyy

We are seeking your opinions about the recently implemented Halibut Catch Sharing Plan (<http://alaskafisheries.noaa.gov/frules/78fr75844.pdf>). Please answer all questions as best as you can.

SECTION A: Your Views on the Catch Sharing Plan

A1 A main purpose of the Catch Sharing Plan (CSP) is to establish how much of the total allowable catch of Pacific halibut is allocated between the recreational charter and commercial fisheries. In general, how positively or negatively do you view the CSP as a whole?

- Very positively
- Somewhat positively
- Neither positively nor negatively
- Somewhat negatively
- Very negatively

A2 The CSP allows **charter halibut permit (CHP) holders** to lease **Individual Fishing Quota (IFQ)** from commercial fishermen holding quota shares for Pacific halibut. When leased, the IFQ, which are measured in pounds, are converted to **guided angler fish (GAF)** using an area-specific conversion factor based on the previous year’s average weight of GAF. (CHP holders owning commercial IFQ may convert a portion of their IFQ into GAF as well.) GAF can be used by charter clients to harvest up to two fish of any size per person per day, regardless of charter-specific bag and size limits.

In general, how positively or negatively do you view the GAF component of the Catch Sharing Plan?

- Very positively
- Somewhat positively
- Neither positively nor negatively
- Somewhat negatively
- Very negatively

A3 How positively or negatively do you believe the ability to use GAF will affect your business?

- Very positively
- Somewhat positively
- Neither positively nor negatively
- Somewhat negatively
- Very negatively

Please explain your answer: _____

SECTION B: Your Participation in the GAF Lease Market

B1 Did you lease GAF during 2014?

Yes → **Continue to the next question (B2)**

No → What were your main reasons for not leasing GAF during 2014? *Please check all that apply.*

- Leasing GAF was too expensive
- The leasing process was too difficult
- My business did not need any GAF
- I do not support the GAF leasing program
- I did not want to conduct business with commercial fishing businesses
- The program was too new and there was too much uncertainty
- I did not know about the GAF leasing program
- Other (please specify): _____

 **Skip to question B10**

B2 How many GAF did you lease during 2014?

_____ guided angler fish (GAF) during 2014

B3 Did you use a broker to facilitate the leasing of GAF?

- Yes
- No

B4 From whom did you lease GAF? *Please check all that apply.*

- Someone I did not know personally prior to leasing
- Someone I knew personally who held halibut IFQ (friend or family)
- Myself (you hold both commercial IFQ and a CHP and leased to yourself)

- B5** How difficult was the leasing process in general?
- Not at all difficult
 - Somewhat difficult
 - Difficult
 - Very difficult
 - Extremely difficult
- B6** Returns of unused GAF occur automatically 15 days before the end of the commercial fishing season or voluntarily before then (on or after September 1). During 2014, did you return any unused GAF?
- Yes, I voluntarily returned unused GAF before the end of the season
 - Yes, my unused GAF was returned automatically
 - No
- B7** In your lease agreement, was there a provision that allowed you to get a refund (or partial refund) for GAF that are unused and returned?
- Yes
 - No
- B8** How much of an impact, positive or negative, do you believe having GAF during 2014 had on your business?
- Very positive
 - Somewhat positive
 - Neither positive nor negative
 - Somewhat negative
 - Very negative
- B9** What were the main reasons you decided to lease GAF during 2014?
-
-

- B10** Do you plan to lease GAF during 2015?
- Yes
 - No
 - Don't know

SECTION C: Guided Angler Fish (GAF) Restrictions

Under the current GAF leasing program, there are several restrictions on the use of GAF, including:

1. **Single-season use.** GAF must be used before the end of the season for which it is leased, with automatic returns if the GAF is unused by a certain date (15 days before the end of the commercial fishing season).
2. **No transfers.** GAF can't be transferred between CHP holders during the season.

The restrictions listed above are features that are sometimes relaxed in other IFQ (or tradable permit) programs to increase flexibility for participants.

C1 How helpful, if at all, would relaxing each of the restrictions listed above be to you? *Note that there are no proposals being considered currently for relaxing these restrictions, which may be administratively or politically infeasible under current laws and regulations. Even so, such changes could possibly occur in the future, and your opinion about them is valuable.*

Restriction	Not helpful at all ▼	A little helpful ▼	Somewhat helpful ▼	Very helpful ▼	Extremely helpful ▼
Single-season use.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
No transfers between CHP holders.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

C2 **Relaxing single-season use.** Multi-year leases would specify more than one year the GAF could be used (e.g., a two year lease would allow the GAF to be used in either the year it was leased or the following year). If multi-year leases of GAF were allowed next year, how would your participation in the GAF leasing market change? *Assume all other program features remain the same.*

- I would lease more GAF than I currently planned
- I would lease the same amount of GAF that I currently planned (no change)
- I would lease less GAF than I currently planned
- I don't know

C3 **Allowing transfers between CHP holders.** If you were allowed to transfer a limited amount (up to a specific amount) of GAF to other CHP holders during the season starting next year, how would your participation in the IFQ leasing market change? *Assume all other program features remain the same.*

- I would lease more GAF than I currently planned
- I would lease the same amount of GAF that I currently planned (no change)
- I would lease less GAF than I currently planned
- I don't know

SECTION D: What Programs Do You Prefer?

In this section, you choose which of several different leasing programs you like most and least. The options include the **current leasing program (Option A)**, and several different options (**Options B, C, and D**) that relax one or more of the current GAF restrictions, but would result in a price increase above the GAF price under the current program. The prices listed for each option may be more or less than prices you have seen, but please use the ones presented in making your decision. *Your opinion about these programs is important, even if some of the restrictions they relax may be currently administratively or politically infeasible.*

D1 Consider options A and B below. Which one do you prefer? *Please indicate your response below the table.*

	Option A Current leasing program	Option B
Length of lease period.....	1 season only	1 season only
Ability to transfer to other CHP holders in-season.....	None	Yes
Price per GAF.....	\$75	\$100
	<u>Option A</u>	<u>Option B</u>

Which option do you prefer?

Check one box----->

D2 For each option in D1, how many GAF would you lease if the regulations for only that option were in place **next year**? *Assume the angler bag and size limits remain at current levels.*

	<u>Option A</u>	<u>Option B</u>
Number of GAF I would lease under this option.....	_____	_____

D3 Again, here is the current leasing program and another option that relaxes the restrictions on GAF use, but results in a higher price for GAF. Which option do you prefer? *Please indicate your response below the table.*

	Option A Current leasing program	Option C
Length of lease period.....	1 season only	1 or 2 seasons
Ability to transfer to other CHP holders in-season.....	None	No
Price per GAF.....	\$75	\$200

Option A

Option C

Which option do you prefer?

Check one box----->

D4 How many GAF would you lease under **Option C** if the regulations for that option were in place **next year**? *Assume the angler bag and size limits remain at current levels.*

_____ GAF under Option C

D5 Again, here is the current leasing program and an additional option that relaxes the restrictions on GAF use, but results in a higher price for GAF. Which option do you prefer? *Please indicate your response below the table.*

	Option A Current leasing program	Option D
Length of lease period.....	1 season only	1 or 2 seasons
Ability to transfer to other CHP holders in-season.....	None	Yes
Price per GAF.....	\$75	\$250
	<u>Option A</u>	<u>Option D</u>

Which option do you prefer?

Check one box----->

D6 How many GAF would you lease under **Option D** if the regulations for that option were in place **next year**? *Assume the angler bag and size limits remain at current levels.*

_____ GAF under Option D

D7 These questions were asked to obtain public input for decision makers to consider along with information from scientists and planners. How confident are you that your answers in D1 through D6 accurately reflect how you feel about the different options for GAF use? *Please "X" only one box.*

Not at all confident

Slightly confident

Somewhat confident

Very confident

Extremely confident

SECTION E: The Catch Accountability Through Compensated Halibut (CATCH) Proposal

A recent proposal, called the **Catch Accountability Through Compensated Halibut (CATCH) Project**, proposes the creation of a recreational quota entity (RQE) that would be eligible to purchase commercial halibut IFQ that would be added to the charter sector’s allocation that is determined annually under the CSP. The RQE would purchase IFQ with the goal of eventually accumulating enough to ensure that the charter boat sector would not have overly restrictive size and bag limits imposed upon it, thus benefiting all charter boat businesses who have clients fishing for halibut.

E1 How familiar are you, if at all, with the CATCH Project?

- Not at all familiar
- Somewhat familiar
- Familiar
- Very familiar
- Extremely familiar

E2 How the purchase of IFQ would be funded by the CATCH Project has not yet been determined. One way to fund the CATCH Project would be to assess a mandatory fee on CHPs that would be paid by all CHP holders and be based on the number of angler endorsements (**CHP fee**). Another is to fund it with a tax charged on each halibut harvested by levying a fee per halibut harvested according to charter logbook records (**charter halibut tax**). A third way to fund it is with a **halibut stamp** program that would be similar to the Alaska king salmon stamp program, where all anglers would be required to purchase a halibut stamp to be able to catch and keep halibut.

The CHP fee and charter halibut tax funding mechanisms would cost your business money. The halibut stamp would be paid directly by anglers, which would make it more expensive for anglers to fish for halibut. Any of these funding mechanisms would be expected to minimize overly-restrictive fishing regulations on charter fishing clients.

If the CATCH Project were adopted, how supportive, if at all, would you be of each funding mechanism?

	Not at all supportive	A little supportive	Somewhat supportive	Very supportive	Extremely supportive
	▼	▼	▼	▼	▼
CHP fee.....	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Charter halibut tax.....	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Halibut stamp.....	<input type="checkbox"/>				

E3 Suppose you were asked to vote for or against the CATCH Project, and it would require an **annual CHP fee**. If a majority of CHP holders voted in favor of it, then you and all other CHP holders would be required to pay the fee if adopted by fishery managers. If the majority voted against it, it would not be proposed to fishery managers. Would you vote in favor of the CATCH Project if it required you to pay a **CHP fee of \$X per angler endorsement you have each year**?

- Yes
- No

Please explain your answer: _____

E4 For each statement below, check the one box that best represents your opinion.

	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree
	▼	▼	▼	▼	▼
I expect to pass on any fee to the customer...	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I would support the CATCH Project no matter what the fee was.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
If adopted, I believe the CATCH Project will be effective	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I should <u>not</u> have to fund the CATCH Project at all (it is the angler's responsibility).....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Charter businesses, like mine, should have to fund the CATCH Project (it is the industry's responsibility).....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Funding the CATCH Project is a responsibility that should be shared between charter businesses and anglers.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SECTION F: Owning GAF Instead of Leasing GAF

As an alternative to the GAF leasing program, consider a program in which all CHP holders were allowed to own commercial halibut IFQ (quota share). Under this **GAF ownership** program:

- You could buy, sell, and own commercial halibut IFQ
- Each year, any halibut IFQ you own (in pounds) would be converted to GAF using the area-specific conversion factor based on the previous year’s average weight of GAF
- There would be no initial allocation of IFQ to CHP holders (no IFQ would be allocated to you, so you would have to purchase IFQ to own GAF)

Note: There are no proposals like this program being considered currently, and it may be administratively or politically infeasible under current laws and regulations. Nevertheless, your opinions about the program are important to share with fishery managers.

F1 How helpful, if at all, would this GAF ownership program be to you?

Not helpful at all A little helpful Somewhat helpful Very helpful Extremely helpful

F2 If this GAF ownership program were put into place, how likely are you to purchase halibut IFQ? *Check the box of the best answer.*

Not at all likely A little likely Somewhat likely Very likely Extremely likely

F3 We have asked you about programs to relax the GAF leasing program restrictions, the CATCH Project, and a GAF ownership program. How supportive, if at all, are you of each of these potential program changes?

	Not at all supportive	A little supportive	Somewhat supportive	Very supportive	Extremely supportive
	▼	▼	▼	▼	▼
Relaxing GAF leasing restrictions.....	<input type="checkbox"/>				
CATCH Project proposal.....	<input type="checkbox"/>				
GAF ownership program.....	<input type="checkbox"/>				

YOUR PARTICIPATION IS GREATLY APPRECIATED!

Please feel free to provide us with any additional comments you may have. Thank you!



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE

<DATE>

John Smith
123 Main Street
Anywhere, USA 12345

Dear <Name>

NOAA Fisheries (the National Marine Fisheries Service) is conducting a study to learn more about charter halibut permit (CHP) holders' views of, and experiences with, the Alaska Halibut Catch Sharing Plan (CSP). We are interested in hearing your opinions about the CSP, particularly about the Guided Angler Fish (GAF) leasing program and similar programs. With your help, we can provide better information to fishery managers to improve and enhance fishery management practices.

Your participation in this survey is completely voluntary. You were selected since you hold a CHP. We are contacting all CHP holders, but the population is small, so your help is critical to the survey's success. In the next few days, you will receive a questionnaire in the mail from <Survey Firm>, a survey research firm that is assisting us in conducting the survey.

Even if you are unfamiliar with the specifics of the CSP and the GAF leasing program, your opinion matters. To keep costs low and to make sure we hear from enough CHP holders for the results to be scientifically valid, we need to hear from you.

Thank you in advance for your help.

Sincerely,

Dan Lew
Project Director
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration





UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE

<DATE>

John Smith
123 Main Street
Anywhere, USA 12345

Dear <Name>

Enclosed is the questionnaire I wrote to you about last week.

We need your help to learn about the effects of the Alaska Halibut Catch Sharing Plan in Alaska. With your help, we can provide better information to fishery managers that can help them in making sound policy decisions.

The survey discusses the Guided Angler Fish (GAF) leasing program, as well as other related programs. Even if you have no experience with leasing GAF, your opinion matters. Although your participation is voluntary, you are part of a small population of charter halibut permit (CHP) holders being contacted to participate, so hearing from you is really important.

The survey takes most people about 30 minutes to complete, sometimes more, sometimes less. All information you provide in the survey is considered confidential under section 402(b) of the Magnuson-Stevens Act (16 U.S.C. 1801, *et seq.*) and NOAA Administrative Order 216-100. Only aggregated results from the survey will be released publicly. Your personal information will not be disclosed and will only be accessible to authorized personnel responsible for management and research of fisheries under the authority of NOAA. The identification number on the survey is there so that <Survey Firm>, a survey firm hired to assist us, can check your name off when the questionnaire is returned. If you have any questions, please call them toll-free at 1-800-XXX-XXXX.

We realize your time is valuable and truly appreciate your participation in this survey.

Thank you for your help, and please remember to complete all the questions.

Sincerely,

Dan Lew
Project Director
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration



Last week a questionnaire was mailed to you seeking information about your opinions about the Alaska Halibut Catch Sharing Plan.

If you have already completed and returned the questionnaire, please accept our sincere thanks. If you have not completed and returned it, we ask that you do so today.

It is very important that we hear from you. Since the population of saltwater sport fishing charter businesses is small, your voice matters. Your response will help inform decision makers about this topic. However, a high rate of participation is required to include the results from the questionnaire.

If you need another copy of the questionnaire, please call <Survey Firm>, a survey firm hired to assist us, at **1-800-XXX-XXXX** and a questionnaire will be mailed to you today.

Thank you for your help.

Dan Lew
Project Director
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration



Halibut CSP Survey TELEPHONE FOLLOW-UP

Hello, my name is _____ and I am calling from <Survey contractor> in <location>, on behalf of National Marine Fisheries Service's Alaska Fisheries Science Center. I am trying to reach [name on address].

[IF NOT AVAILABLE] Thank you, I will call back later. When would be a good time to reach [name on address]?

[IF QUALIFIED RESPONDENT IS ON THE PHONE]

QA Recently, we mailed you a questionnaire asking you about your opinions about the recently-implemented Halibut Catch Sharing Plan in Alaska. The survey had a picture of charter boats on the cover and was titled "Your Opinions About GAF in the Halibut Catch Sharing Plan". Do you remember receiving that questionnaire?

1 YES

2 NO [*SKIP TO QA2*]

QA1 As of today, we have not received your completed questionnaire. As a charter halibut permit holder, you are probably aware of the regulatory changes that have occurred in the Alaska saltwater sport fishing charter sector in recent years, including the adoption and implementation of the Halibut Catch Sharing Plan (commonly called the CSP). The purpose of this survey is to gather information from CHP holders like you about their views on the CSP and similar programs. As one of a small population of CHP holders we are contacting, your response is very important, and we would greatly appreciate it if you would participate in the survey. Would it be possible for you to complete the mail survey and return it in the next week?

1 YES [*SKIP TO VERIFY*]

2 NO [*SKIP TO QA3*]

3 SURVEY HAS ALREADY BEEN RETURNED [*THANK YOU, SKIP TO
CONTINUE*]

QA2 We are collecting information Alaska charter halibut permit holders to help the federal government better assess the economic effects of management and regulatory actions (currently in place or potential) on Alaska charter boat fishing businesses. Your input is very important since if too few people respond, the results of the analysis cannot pass scientific standards, and thus will not be used to inform decision makers about CHP holders' views of current and potential management actions. If we sent you a questionnaire in the mail, would it be possible for you to complete it and return it within a week of receiving it?

- 1 YES *[SKIP TO VERIFY]*
- 2 NO TO MAIL SURVEY *[SKIP TO QA3]*
- 3 SURVEY HAS ALREADY BEEN RETURNED *[THANK YOU, SKIP TO CONTINUE]*

QA3 Okay, would you be willing to take the survey over the telephone today?

- 1 YES, telephone survey now – *[SKIP TO TELEPHONE_SURVEY]*
- 2 YES, but not now – *[SKIP TO RESCHED]*
- 3 NO - *[SKIP TO QB]*

RESCHED: (If they indicate they'll take survey by telephone at a later date)

Okay, thanks for agreeing to complete the survey by telephone. We expect it will take about 30 minutes. What date and time would you be available to complete the interview?

Date: _____

Time: _____

Thank you, We will call you back then. If possible, please have the paper questionnaire available when we call, as the interview goes faster if you have the survey handy. *[GO TO QB]*

VERIFY (If new survey needs to be sent)

I would like to verify the address for [name of business] as...

STREET ADDRESS _____
CITY _____ STATE _____ ZIP _____
PHONE _____

Is this correct?

- 1- NO – *[RECORD NEW ADDRESS.]*
- 2- YES

Okay, I will send another questionnaire out today. *[GO TO CONTINUE]*

CONTINUE (If they indicate survey has been or will be returned)

Thanks for your participation. *[GO TO QB]*

QB It is very important for our analysis that we understand how those who haven't returned the survey compare to those who did. This way we will not misinterpret the results. Could I take about 4 minutes to ask you a few questions that will help us with our work? I'd like to remind you that all of your answers are confidential and your name will not be revealed to anyone.

- 1 YES [*SKIP TO Q1*]
- 2 NO [*THANK AND TERMINATE*]

Classification Questions

Q1 A main purpose of the Catch Sharing Plan (CSP) is to establish how much of the total allowable catch of Pacific halibut is allocated between the recreational charter and commercial fisheries. In general, how positively or negatively do you view the CSP as a whole?

- Very positively
- Somewhat positively
- Neither positively nor negatively
- Somewhat negatively
- Very negatively

Q2 The CSP allows **charter halibut permit (CHP) holders** to lease **Individual Fishing Quota (IFQ)** from commercial fishermen holding quota shares for Pacific halibut. When leased, the IFQ, which are measured in pounds, are converted to **guided angler fish (GAF)** using an area-specific conversion factor based on the previous year's average weight of GAF. (CHP holders owning commercial IFQ may convert a portion of their IFQ into GAF as well.) GAF can be used by charter clients to harvest up to two fish of any size per person per day, regardless of charter-specific bag and size limits.

In general, how positively or negatively do you view the GAF component of the Catch Sharing Plan?

- Very positively
- Somewhat positively
- Neither positively nor negatively
- Somewhat negatively
- Very negatively

Q3 How positively or negatively do you believe the ability to use GAF will affect your business?

- Very positively
- Somewhat positively
- Neither positively nor negatively
- Somewhat negatively
- Very negatively

Q4 Do you plan to lease GAF during 2015?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

[IF RETURNING SURVEY] Thank you, this will help with our preliminary analysis. Receiving your completed survey will greatly help improve our understanding of CHP holders' views of halibut management in Alaska. Thanks again, and have a good evening.

[IF NOT RETURNING QUESTIONNAIRE] That's all the questions I have for you. Do you have any comments that you would like to add? Thank you for your time. We really appreciate your participation in this brief survey. Thanks again, and have a good evening.

[END]

TERMINATE

[IF RESCHEDULED FOR TELEPHONE INTERVIEW] Okay, we will call you back at <TIME rescheduled> on <DATE rescheduled> . Thanks again and have a good evening.

[IF NOT] Okay, thank you for your time and have a good evening.

[TO BE COMPLETED BY INTERVIEWER]

Respondent gender: MALE
FEMALE

LANG Language or other barrier:

- 1 YES, POSSIBLE LANGUAGE BARRIER
- 2 YES, DEFINITE LANGUAGE BARRIER
- 3 NO LANGUAGE, BUT OTHER TYPE OF BARRIER [*SPECIFY*]
- 4 NO BARRIERS

OTHER RESPONDENT COMMENTS

QUESTIONS/COMMENTS AND ANSWERS

[If concerned about purpose of the call] This is not a marketing or sales call. We are collecting public input for government, industry, and citizen groups to consider when evaluating ways to manage fish species, like halibut, that are targeted by charter businesses in Alaska. I want to assure you that your answers will be kept confidential and your name will not be revealed to anyone.

[If asking about the study sponsor] This survey is being conducted by the Alaska Fisheries Science Center, a scientific branch of NOAA Fisheries, also known as the National Marine Fisheries Service, a U.S. government agency charged with understanding the effects of federal management actions and policies affecting the nation's saltwater and freshwater fisheries.

[If concerned about confidentiality of information they provide] All information you provide in this phone call and in the survey is considered confidential under federal law, including the Magnuson-Stevens Act or the Trade Secrets Act – the details are described in NOAA Administrative Order 216-100. In short, only aggregated results from the survey will be released publicly. Your personal and business information will not be disclosed and will only be accessible to authorized personnel responsible for management and research of fisheries under the authority of NOAA. All authorized personnel have signed nondisclosure agreements specifying penalties for unauthorized use and disclosure of confidential fisheries data.

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: May 2, 2014.

Gwellnar Banks,

Management Analyst, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 2014-10545 Filed 5-7-14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-22-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

Proposed Information Collection; Comment Request; Alaska Prohibited Species Donation (PSD) Program

AGENCY: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 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 July 7, 2014.

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 Patsy A. Bearden, (907) 586-7008 or Patsy.Bearden@noaa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Abstract

This request is for extension of a currently approved information collection.

A prohibited species donation (PSD) program for salmon and halibut has effectively reduced regulatory discard of

salmon and halibut by allowing fish that would otherwise be discarded to be donated to needy individuals through tax-exempt organizations. Vessels and processing plants participating in the donation program voluntarily retain and process salmon and halibut bycatch. An authorized, tax-exempt distributor, chosen by the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), is responsible for monitoring the retention and processing of fish donated by vessels and processors. The authorized distributor also coordinates the processing, storage, transportation, and distribution of salmon and halibut. The PSD program requires an information collection so that NMFS can monitor the authorized distributors' ability to effectively supervise program participants and ensure that donated fish are properly processed, stored, and distributed.

II. Method of Collection

Respondents have a choice of either electronic or paper forms. Methods of submittal include email of electronic forms and mail of paper forms.

III. Data

OMB Control Number: 0648-0316.

Form Number: None.

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

Affected Public: Not for-profit institutions.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 1.

Estimated Time per Response:

Application to be a NMFS Authorized Distributor, 13 hours.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 13.

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: May 2, 2014.

Gwellnar Banks,

Management Analyst, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 2014-10544 Filed 5-7-14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-22-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

Proposed Information Collection; Comment Request; Alaska Halibut Catch Sharing Plan Survey

AGENCY: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 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 July 7, 2014.

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 Dr. Dan Lew, (530) 752-1746 or Dan.Lew@noaa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Abstract

This request is for a new information collection.

Numerous management measures have recently been proposed or implemented that affect recreational charter boat fishing for Pacific halibut off Alaska, including the adoption of a Halibut Catch Sharing Plan (78 FR 75843, December 12, 2013) in International Pacific Halibut Commission Regulatory Areas 2C and 3A that alters the way Pacific halibut is allocated between the guided sport (i.e., the charter sector) and the commercial halibut fishery. The Catch Sharing Plan (CSP) formalizes the annual process of allocating catch between the

commercial sector and charter sector and for determining harvest restrictions in the charter sector (78 FR 75843, December 12, 2013). In addition, the CSP allows leasing of commercial halibut individual fishing quota (IFQ) by eligible charter businesses holding a charter halibut permit (CHP). The IFQ pounds are leased in terms of number of fish, called guided angler fish (GAF), which are determined based on a conversion rate published by the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). Leased GAF can be used by charter businesses to relax harvest restrictions for their angler clients, since the fish caught under the leased GAF would not be subject to the charter sector-specific size and bag limits that may be imposed—though the non-charter sector size and bag limit restrictions (currently two fish of any size per day) would still apply to charter anglers who are not using GAF.

To help inform potential future policy discussions about the CSP, NMFS Alaska Fisheries Science Center plans to conduct a survey that will collect information on general attitudes toward the CSP and the GAF leasing program from Area 2C and Area 3A charter boat businesses (CHP holders), and ask them to indicate their preferences for hypothetically relaxing specific features of the GAF leasing program that are employed in similar types of programs in both fisheries and non-fisheries contexts. This information could provide valuable information to the North Pacific Fishery Management Council in its evaluation of the current features of the CSP and provide information that may help it evaluate adjustments to the CSP. The survey will also provide a broad gauge of attitudes toward the program and its impacts on the charter sector and anglers.

II. Method of Collection

The method of data collection will be a survey of CHP permit holders implemented through a mail questionnaire.

III. Data

OMB Control Number: 0648-xxxx.
Form Number: None.

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

Affected Public: Individuals or households; business or other for-profit organizations.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 700.

Estimated Time per Response: 30 minutes.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 350.

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: May 2, 2014.

Gwellnar Banks,

Management Analyst, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 2014-10546 Filed 5-7-14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-22-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

RIN 0648-XD285

Endangered and Threatened Species; Take of Anadromous Fish

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

ACTION: Application to modify one scientific research permit.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that NMFS has received one scientific research permit application request relating to Pacific salmon. The proposed research is intended to increase knowledge of species listed under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) and to help guide management and conservation efforts. The application may be viewed online at: https://apps.nmfs.noaa.gov/preview/preview_open_for_comment.cfm.

DATES: Comments or requests for a public hearing on the applications must be received at the appropriate address or fax number (see **ADDRESSES**) no later

than 5 p.m. Pacific standard time on June 9, 2014.

ADDRESSES: Written comments on the application should be sent to the Protected Resources Division, NMFS, 1201 NE Lloyd Blvd., Suite 1100, Portland, OR 97232-1274. Comments may also be sent via fax to 503-230-5441 or by email to nmfs.nwr.apps@noaa.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Rob Clapp, Portland, OR (ph.: 503-231-2314), Fax: 503-230-5441, email: Robert.Clapp@noaa.gov. Permit application instructions are available from the address above, or online at <https://apps.nmfs.noaa.gov>.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Species Covered in This Notice

The following listed species are covered in this notice:

Chinook salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*): endangered Upper Columbia River (UCR) spring-run.

Steelhead (*O. mykiss*): threatened UCR; threatened Snake River (SR); threatened middle Columbia River (MCR).

Authority

Scientific research permits are issued in accordance with section 10(a)(1)(A) of the ESA (16 U.S.C. 1531 *et. seq.*) and regulations governing listed fish and wildlife permits (50 CFR 222-226). NMFS issues permits based on findings that such permits: (1) Are applied for in good faith; (2) if granted and exercised, would not operate to the disadvantage of the listed species that are the subject of the permit; and (3) are consistent with the purposes and policy of section 2 of the ESA. The authority to take listed species is subject to conditions set forth in the permits.

Anyone requesting a hearing on an application listed in this notice should set out the specific reasons why a hearing on that application would be appropriate (see **ADDRESSES**). Such hearings are held at the discretion of the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, NMFS.

Applications Received

Permit 16329-2M

The Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) is seeking to modify a five-year permit that currently allows it to take adult and juvenile fish throughout Oregon. By modifying the permit, they would add adult and juvenile UCR Chinook and steelhead, MCR steelhead, and SR steelhead to the species of fish they may take. The fish would be taken during the course of five possible projects: (1) The