NOTICE OF OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET ACTION

Date 03/01/2017

Department of Commerce
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

FOR CERTIFYING OFFICIAL: Steve Cooper
FOR CLEARANCE OFFICER: Jennifer Jessup

In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act, OMB has taken action on your request received 01/30/2017

ACTION REQUESTED: New collection (Request for a new OMB Control Number)
TYPE OF REVIEW REQUESTED: Regular
ICR REFERENCE NUMBER: 201701-0648-009
AGENCY ICR TRACKING NUMBER:
TITLE: West Coast Fisheries Participation Survey
LIST OF INFORMATION COLLECTIONS: See next page

OMB ACTION: Approved without change
OMB CONTROL NUMBER: 0648-0749
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: 03/31/2020 DISCONTINUE DATE:

BURDEN:	RESPONSES	HOURS	COSTS
Previous	0	0	0
New	3,543	1,181	0
Difference			
Change due to New Statute	0	0	0
Change due to Agency Discretion	3,543	1,181	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
Deputy and Acting Administrator,
Office Of Information And Regulatory Affairs

List of ICs			
IC Title	Form No.	Form Name	CFR Citation
West Coast Fisheries Participation Survey	NA	West Coast Fisheries Participation 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
DOC/NOAA/NMFS/WCR-Northwest Region

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

3. Type of information collection (*check one*)
a. [✔] New Collection
b. [ ] Revision of a currently approved collection
c. [ ] Extension of a currently approved collection
d. [ ] Reinstatement, without change, of a previously approved collection for which approval has expired
e. [ ] Reinstatement, with change, of a previously approved collection for which approval has expired
f. [ ] Existing collection in use without an OMB control number
For b-f, note Item A2 of Supporting Statement instructions

4. Type of review requested (*check one*)
a. [✔] Regular submission
b. [ ] Emergency - Approval requested by ____/____/____
c. [ ] Delegated

5. Small entities
Will this information collection have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities? [ ] Yes [✔] No

6. Requested expiration date
a. [✔] Three years from approval date b. [ ] Other Specify:_____

7. Title West Coast Fisheries Participation Survey

8. Agency form number(s) (*if applicable*) None

9. Keywords Fisheries, Fishing, Fishery

10. Abstract

Northwest Fisheries Science Center (NWFSC) seeks to conduct fisheries participation analyses which involve a survey of United States (U.S.) West Coast commercial fishing participants. A U.S. mail survey will be conducted. The survey will be voluntary, and contacted individuals may decline to participate. Respondents will be asked to answer questions about their motivations for fishing and other factors that affect participation in the suite of West Coast commercial fisheries. Demographic and employment information will be collected so that responses can be organized based on a respondent typology. This survey is essential because data on smaller scale fishing practices, values, participation decisions and beliefs about fishing livelihoods are sparse; yet, they are critical to the development of usable fishery ecosystem models that account for non-pecuniary benefits of fishing, as well as the ways in which fishing practices shape individual and community well-being.

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 3,543
b. Total annual responses 3,543
1. Percentage of these responses collected electronically 0 %
c. Total annual hours requested 1,181
d. Current OMB inventory 0
e. Difference _____
f. Explanation of difference
1. Program change _____
2. Adjustment _____

14. Annual reporting and recordkeeping cost burden (*in thousands of dollars*)
a. Total annualized capital/startup costs 0
b. Total annual costs (O&M) 0
c. Total annualized cost requested 0
d. Current OMB inventory 0
e. Difference _____
f. Explanation of difference
1. Program change _____
2. Adjustment _____

15. Purpose of information collection (*Mark primary with "P" and all others that apply with "X"*)
a. ___ Application for benefits e. ___ Program planning or management
b. ___ Program evaluation f. P 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 only

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: Karma Norman
Phone: (206) 302-2418

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 Emily Menashes, Deputy Director for Alan Risenhoover, Director of Sustainable Fisheries	Date 1/27/2017
Signature of NOAA Clearance Officer	
Signature BRABSON.SARAH.1365710488 Digitally signed by BRABSON.SARAH.1365710488 DN: c=US, o=U.S. Government, ou=DoD, ou=PKI, ou=OTHER, cn=BRABSON.SARAH.1365710488 Date: 2017.03.03 14:18:27 -05'00'	Date

SUPPORTING STATEMENT
WEST COAST FISHERIES PARTICIPATION SURVEY
OMB CONTROL NO. XXX

This request is for clearance related to a one-time administration of social science survey questions concerning participation in West Coast fisheries.

A. JUSTIFICATION

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

The National Marine Fisheries Services' developing interest in ecosystem-based management (EBM) and its implementation has allowed for the development of ecosystem models, including models of California Current Large Marine Ecosystem processes along the U.S. West Coast. In conjunction with these efforts, the California Current Integrated Ecosystem Assessment (CCIEA) process has specified a need for human dimensions data and fisheries models that include behaviors of and social influences on fisheries participants (Levin et al. 2011). These actions, however, will require new data collection and the development of new models.

Previous efforts to use extant data to characterize fishing have been presented to fishery managers at the Pacific Fishery Management Council as part of the California Current Integrated Ecosystem Assessment (Levin et al. 2013) and the annual State of the California Current Report (March 9, 2016), and stakeholders and fishery managers have additionally requested improved data and analyses on fishing behaviors and fishing communities.

While commercial fishery participation is often assumed to be motivated exclusively or primarily by traditional economic factors, the role of non-financial psychological and social factors that directly motivate participation or mediate the responses of fishermen to changes in profitability have largely been ignored in management modeling. There is a substantial social science literature indicating that many fishermen obtain utility from fishing itself – apart from its role in providing income (e.g. Anderson 1980; Smith 1981; Gatewood and McCay 1990; Pollnac and Poggie 2006; Pollnac et al. 2015). Anderson (1980) coined the term "satisfaction bonus" to describe this tendency, and suggested it could affect the adaptive responses of fishermen to falling rents in open access fisheries, leading to greater depletion than might otherwise occur. Fishing may also contribute significantly to a sense of individual identity and social capital, particularly in strongly fishery-dependent communities. Fish kept for personal use or sharing with friends and family is also an important benefit of fishery participation (Poe et al. 2015). Taken together, this collection of factors may influence participation decisions in ways that would not be obvious if only standard market economic motivations are considered.

Given these gaps in information about these factors, and in concert with the evolution of ecosystem-based management (EBM) approaches on the West Coast, NMFS researchers at the Northwest Fisheries Science Center, partnering with the University of Washington and Washington Sea Grant have begun an effort to develop these data collections and modeling developments. The goal of the proposed study is to collect original data regarding the participation of West Coast fishermen in the full suite of commercial fisheries and to develop

scientifically rigorous ecosystem models that explicitly consider social perspectives and behaviors alongside oceanographic and biological considerations.

For this reason, the Northwest Fisheries Science Center seeks to conduct a survey of West Coast commercial fisheries participants. Fishing permit owners will be asked, via a mail survey, a series of general questions regarding their connections to and participation in West Coast fisheries.

Information collected under this clearance will include demographic variables, economic data, fishing use patterns, data on social linkages between resource users and the resource as well as data related to other activities that influence living marine resource use. The overall purpose of collecting these data is to develop stakeholder-based societal inputs relative to fisheries participation, but these survey data will also increase the capacity of NOAA to respond effectively to relevant mandates and executive orders that guide social science activities within the National Marine Fisheries Service (NEPA, MFCMA and its National Standard 8, and Executive Order (EO) 12898).

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 will be collected for this one-time survey, using a mail survey format, and will be disseminated, in an aggregate form (with no personally identifiable information attached), to the public upon request. The information will be used to develop fisheries participation analyses by Northwest Fisheries Science Center (NWFSC) scientists and their survey research partners at Washington Sea Grant and University of Washington. These analyses will also be disseminated to the public in the form *of interpreted products*, including technical memoranda and peer-reviewed publications. Such products will be developed in conjunction with the associated research project. Research partners at the University of Washington will administer the data collection tool over a period of 10-12 weeks, until all applicable respondents have been contacted. This is the only period over which the survey will be conducted. The written form of the survey ensures that the survey is reproducible, and the University of Washington and Northwest Fisheries Science Center's experience in implementing surveys of this nature will help to insure that the quality of the information collected, at the level of raw data, meet NOAA's Information Quality Guidelines.

Specifically, each question in the proposed survey is designed to elicit certain data of direct benefit to the ecological and socioeconomic modeling efforts underway at the Northwest Fisheries Science Center. The questions in the proposed survey all relate to elements we will use in our models as potential predictor variables. These will enable us to examine how different segments of the West Coast fishing population are thinking about their fisheries participation, their fishery and economic alternatives, their linkages to local fishing communities and their levels of satisfaction with fishing as an occupation.

Demographics/Involvement in Commercial Fishing

In the first section of the survey, the first five questions are designed to garner basic demographic information from survey respondents, as well as information about respondents' historical and current involvement in fishing.

Fishing Community Connections

In the second section of survey, questions 5-10 will allow for the development of a respondent-informed definition of fishing community, including respondents' familial and local connections to fishing.

Fishing Job Satisfaction

A set of five subsequent questions are designed to measure respondents' general level of satisfaction with fishing as an occupation, and are aimed at producing an enhanced understanding of some of the challenges related to fishing as a livelihood.

Fisheries Participation

In the fourth section of the survey, questions 16- 21 will allow for improved information on differing levels of participation in the variety of fisheries available to West Coast fishermen. These questions are also designed to gather information that would ameliorate models reflecting how and when fishermen choose to move between different fisheries and why fishermen might access alternative, non-fishing occupations.

Crew Employment/Personal Use and Income from Fishing

The final set of questions are designed to measure fishing crew employed by respondents, identify how much and which kinds of fish are retained for designated "personal use" harvests, and how fisheries incomes and benefits vary and accommodate incomes from other occupations.

As explained in the preceding paragraphs, the information gathered has utility for the National Marine Fisheries Service in its efforts to carry out science in service to management needs. NOAA will retain control over the information and safeguard it from improper access, modification, and destruction, consistent with NOAA standards for confidentiality, privacy, and electronic information. See response to Question 10 of this Supporting Statement for more information on confidentiality and privacy. The information collection is designed to yield data that meet all applicable information quality guidelines. Prior to dissemination, the information will be subjected to quality control measures and a pre-dissemination review pursuant to Section 515 of Public Law 106-554.

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

The information described in the survey will be collected primarily through the use of completed paper surveys sent via U.S. mail, with an option for web-based input available to mail survey recipients. University of Washington staff will contract with Hardwick Research to mail out the survey via U.S. mail, and NWFSC scientists and University of Washington/Washington Sea Grant partners will be responsible for analyzing the data and disseminating the findings generated by the survey, The mail and web-based questionnaire will follow the written survey instrument provided and will adhere to all protocols that have been developed according to the University of Washington's Institutional Review Board's Human Subjects Division (http://www.washington.edu/research/hsd/) as well as the Office of Management and Budget requirements under the Paperwork Reduction Act.

4. Describe efforts to identify duplication.

The social scientists at the NWFSC work closely with regional academics, community-based organizations, industry groups and other parties interested in this type of information. Reviews of existing information are common practice when initiating social science studies. A thorough literature review has been completed and we are confident there is no duplication. An overall strategic research plan will also guide this process and ensure that all data collected is relevant, new and essential for achieving NMFS social science goals. The NMFS point of contact for this research, Karma Norman, also has presented his research to the Ecosystem Subcommittee of the Pacific Fishery Management Council's Science and Statistical Committee (SSC), so he keeps informed of the Council's activities and has verified with the organization that they have not commenced or planned duplicative social research efforts. The partnership with Washington Sea Grant also aids in ensuring that there is adequate communication with other research entities along the Pacific coast such that duplication of research efforts will be avoided.

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

The study is designed to survey individual respondents – at the permit owner level - regarding a range of demographic information, and the respondents are not anticipated to be small businesses. Instead, the survey seeks to collect information from individuals involved in the fishing industry. Only the minimum data necessary for the research are requested and the estimated time for the completion of the survey is 15-20 minutes per individual.

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

Without current information on the human dimensions of fisheries and coastal use practices, NMFS and the Regional Councils will be unable to adequately understand and predict the potential impacts of policy decisions on people, particularly those people who do not regularly

attend public meetings, but are nonetheless affected by the decisions of the Pacific Fishery Management Council (PFMC).

The federal mandates and executive orders described in Section A of this document require the analysis of the impacts that government actions have on the individuals and communities involved in fishing and coastal related activities. Social impacts assessment, analysis of the affected human environment, cumulative impacts as well as the distribution of impacts with a special emphasis on vulnerable or at risk communities are all examples of these requirements. The ability of the NWFSC Social Scientists to adequately respond to this charge rests on access to timely and relevant information about the stakeholders involved. Currently, social scientists are largely dependent on extant data limited to fishing vessels and the fishing trips and landings attributed to these vessels. Existing information does not include research and data on the full set of coastal fisheries stakeholders and their satisfaction with fisheries occupations along with their capacities to access different fisheries as ocean and policy conditions change within target fisheries.

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

The collection will be 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 February 9, 2016 (81 FR 6841) solicited public comments on this survey.

One comment was received in response to this notice. A non-profit organization submitted a letter of support for the survey research and the broader ocean and fisheries modeling and management efforts behind the proposed survey. The letter of support encouraged the research team to carry out the survey work.

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

To encourage participation in the mail survey, a token honorarium of $5 will be given to participants in the initial mailing. Inclusion of an incentive acts as a sign of goodwill on the part of the study sponsors and encourages reciprocity of that goodwill by the respondent. Singer (2002) provides a comprehensive review of the use of incentives in surveys. She notes that giving respondents a small financial incentive (even a token amount) in the first mailing increases response rates in mail-based surveys and is cost-effective. Such prepaid incentives are

more effective than larger promised incentives that are contingent on completion of the questionnaire. In tests conducted by Lesser, et al. (1999), including a $2 incentive in a mailing with four contact points was shown to increase response rates by an additional 19 to 31 percentage points. Thus, even a small upfront incentive typically is more cost effective than additional follow-up steps that are often considered. Moreover, the use of a $5 incentive has an even greater potential to foster survey responses. James and Bolstein (1992) have indicated that $5 incentives at first mailing are associated with response rates at or near 50%.

The proposed survey contractor that would be tasked with mailing out the survey, Hardwick Research, has suggested several additional steps to obtain a minimum 50% response rate. The first involves a multi-part mailing process that would include a postcard announcement notifying participants that a questionnaire will be coming and a thank you gift will be enclosed. This would be followed by the initial mailing of the survey with incentive included and return postage-paid envelope enclosed, a second postcard reminder, and a follow-up postcard reminder to all non-responders.

There are several reasons why we believe inclusion of both a financial incentive and follow-up contacts will be needed to reach desired response rates. A principal reason is because the use of a token incentive in prior NMFS surveys achieved an overall response rate of 57% (e.g. Lew, et al. 2010). Given the similarity of survey protocols and survey materials for this proposed survey, we anticipate a similar response rate for this data collection. Additionally, although every attempt is will be made to ensure the survey is easy to read, understand, and complete, the amount of information it needs to present and the number of questions it needs to ask contribute to a survey requiring more respondent attention than some surveys. For these reasons, we expect both incentives and follow-up contacts will be required to obtain a suitable response rate and to evaluate potential non-response biases.

The steps in the data collection follow a modified Dillman Method protocol (Dillman, et al. 2014), and are as follows. Overall, attempted contacts are made via postcard mailing, since most of the potential respondents within the database of fisheries permit holders do not have email or telephone contact information included.

<u>Mail attempt when phone/email screening not available</u>:

The first mail contact to a potential fisherman recipient will be a prenotice postcard sent out to all addresses in the database of commercial fisheries permit holders. The postcard will notify potential respondents of the survey booklet's imminent arrival, and describe, in brief, the survey instrument's purpose.

<u>Mail attempt with survey booklet:</u>

Next, the full survey packet itself will be sent, including the incentive. The survey packet will include introductory language, a survey booklet, and a postage-paid business reply envelope.

<u>Second mail reminder:</u>

One week after the survey booklet has been sent out, a postcard reminder will be distributed to all survey recipients reminding them that they will have received the survey, expressing gratitude

for any completed surveys, and asking them again for their assistance in filling out the survey - if they have not already done so. Included on this postcard reminder will be an address for a web link version of the survey.

Mail attempt with no prior successful contact:

If the survey is not completed within a period two months, a second post card reminder will be sent by mail to non-responsive survey recipients asking them again for their assistance in filling out the survey, if they have not already done so. Included on this second postcard reminder will again be an address for a web link version of the survey.

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

As stated in the survey materials, the data collected will be kept anonymous and will not be released for public use except in aggregate statistical form without identification of sources. The survey approach renders respondent participation in the survey entirely voluntary.

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 is one area where issues of a potentially sensitive nature will be explored.

1. Employment and economic status: Questions regarding employment and income are often useful in determining potential environmental justice issues, as well as allowing for standard demographic analyses. Questions submitted for approval comply with OMB regulations and follow the US Census approach.

The nature of the survey methodology ensures anonymity with regard to this sensitive area.

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

The total burden hours are projected at 1,181, all of which will be incurred during a single time period. No follow-up surveys are planned. At 20 minutes per respondent, with a total of 3,543 possible respondents, the total cost to the public in terms of burden hours is 1,181 hours. Response time includes not only the time necessary for respondents to answer the questions, but also the time needed to make the initial contact. Participants are not expected to spend time gathering information because the information sought is based on participants' personal experiences, perceptions and knowledge.

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).

The total recordkeeping/reporting cost burden to respondents is $0, as there will be postage-paid envelopes included with the mailed surveys. There are no start-up, capital, or maintenance costs

associated with this collection. No new or specialized equipment is needed to respond to this collection.

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

The annualized cost to the Federal government for this research is estimated to be $0. Funding for this research is provided via a research grant provided to the University of Washington, through which research partners will develop and deploy the survey work via contract.

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

This is a new program.

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

The survey results are not intended for publication for statistical use by others. Data will be analyzed using standard social science quantitative and qualitative data analysis methods. Where possible and relevant, final reports and other relevant portions of the research process will be posted on the appropriate web site. Where relevant, the study in its entirety may be published as an internal report or in part may be submitted for publication in journals to encourage peer review of data collected through this process as well as to disseminate findings.

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.

The expiration date for OMB approval will be displayed on the forms.

18. Explain each exception to the certification statement.

Not Applicable.

SUPPORTING STATEMENT
WEST COAST FISHERIES PARTICIPATION SURVEY
OMB CONTROL NO. XXX

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.

Region	Respondent Universe (Est.)*	Total Desired Responses	Response Rate (Est.) **	Number Contacted
U.S. West Coast Region	3,543	1,771	50%	3,543

*Respondent universe is equal to the total number of fishing permit holders for the U.S. West Coast region, for which there were 3,543 identified in 2016.

**Estimated response rate based upon prior, similar work conducted by Lew, et al. (2010)

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.

Rather than sample potential respondents, this research will be a census, directed at surveying the universe of West Coast fisheries participants, as identified by their fishing permits. In 2016, 3,543 of these fishing permit holders were identified, and the survey will be distributed to each one of them. For this reason, additional methodologies aimed at stratifying and selecting samples from this population are not required. No specialized sampling procedures will be required, and the survey is intended as a one-time data collection effort such that periodic collections will not be necessary.

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.

Given the proposed survey partners and contractors' prior experiences implementing very similar surveys both in the West Coast region and in other regions, we anticipate an estimated response rate of 50%.

Using a survey questionnaire developed in conjunction with the NOAA/Washington Sea Grant/ University of Washington/University of Arizona project team, the proposed survey contractor will carry out distribution of all mail surveys, and provide an SPSS data file including all variable and value labels. The survey will be provided to the proposed mail survey contractor by University of Washington, and will have received, in addition to Office of Management and Budget (OMB) level approvals, approval from the University of Washington's Institutional Review Board (IRB)'s Human Subjects Division (HSD). All of these procedures are designed to ensure commitment to human research ethics and high completion rates. Prior research has shown that response rates are higher when a research project has university sponsorship than when conducted solely commercial organization (even with NOAA sponsorship as well). All involved parties will have signed confidentiality statements about sharing survey data with other people and the entire process will be reviewed and approved by the University of Washington Institutional Review Board (IRB).

The proposed survey contractor, Hardwick Research, has suggested several steps to obtain a 50% response rate. The first involves the use of a $5 incentive to foster survey responses. James and Bolstein (1992) have indicated that $5 incentives at first mailing are associated with response rates at or near 50%. Additionally, the survey contractor would implement a multi-part mailing process that would include a postcard announcement notifying participants that a questionnaire will be coming and a thank you gift will be enclosed. This would be followed by the initial mailing of the survey with incentive included and return postage-paid envelope enclosed, a second postcard reminder, and a follow-up postcard reminder to all non-responders. Prior research suggests that the inclusion of cash incentives not only increases response rates overall, but also induces demographic groups that are frequently underrepresented to respond, thereby reducing nonresponse error (Singer and Ye 2013). Taking steps toward maximizing response rate is the first means by which we intend to prevent nonresponse error.

Additionally, because we are interested in accounting for and correcting any nonresponse error, we will analyze for nonresponse bias in terms of distinctive demographic or geographic profiles of survey respondents as compared to non-respondents. Analyzing for these biases will be aided in part by the research design, insofar as we are surveying the universe of West Coast fisheries permit holders and will have some of these demographic and geographic data available via the permits database. Finally, the data should be weighted to correct for potential nonresponse biases related to the income and age of the respondents, using 2010 U.S. Census figures.

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.

During the development of the survey, the survey instrument was distributed to seven individuals working within West Coast fisheries, in order to determine whether the questions were appropriate and intelligible given their backgrounds as fishermen and fisheries permit holders. This period of survey feedback also allowed for the research partners to test and complete the survey themselves with the aim of accounting for the estimated burden hours that would be attributed to the survey. All test respondents found the survey to require 15-20 minutes for completion, and the final versions of the questions were deemed appropriate and intelligible for the target population of commercial fishermen.

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.

Karma Norman *
Social Scientist
Northwest Fisheries Science Center
2725 Montlake Blvd East
Seattle, WA 98112-2097
Phone: (206) 302-2418
E-mail: karma.norman@noaa.gov

Hardwick Research
8720 SE 45th Street
Mercer Island, WA 98040
Phone: (206) 232-9400
Fax: (206) 232-9402

Melissa Poe
University of Washington
Washington Sea Grant
3716 Brooklyn Avenue NE
Box 355060
Seattle, WA 98105-6716
Phone: (206) 685-8209
Email: mpoe@uw.edu

Dan Holland
Economist
Northwest Fisheries Science Center
2725 Montlake Blvd East
Seattle, WA 98112-2097
Phone: (206) 302-1752
E-mail: Dan.Holland@noaa.gov

*PRA/OMB process point of contact

References

Dillman, D., Jolene D. Smyth, Leah M. Christian. 2014. *Internet, Phone, Mail and Mixed-Mode Surveys: The Tailored Design Method*. John Wiley and Sons: Hoboken, NJ.

James, J.M. and R. Bolstein. 1992. Large Monetary Incentives and Their Effect on Mail Survey Response Rates. *Public Opinion Quarterly* Volume 56:442-453.

Lesser V., Dillman D.A., Lorenz F.O., Carlson J., and Brown T.L. 1999. The influence of financial incentives on mail questionnaire response rates. Paper presented at the meeting of the Rural Sociological Society. Portland, OR.

Levin, P. S., F. B. Schwing. (eds.) 2011. Technical background for an integrated ecosystem assessment of the California Current: Groundfish, salmon, green sturgeon, and ecosystem health. U.S. Dept. of Commerce, NOAA Tech. Memo., NMFS-NWFSC-109, 330 p

Levin, P. S., B. K. Wells, and Sheer M. B.. (eds.). 2013. California current integrated ecosystem assessment: Phase II report. http://www.noaa.gov/iea/CCIEA

Lew, D. K., J. Lee, and D. M. Larson. 2010. Saltwater sportfishing in Alaska: A summary and description of the Alaska saltwater sportfishing economic survey, 2007. U.S. Dep. Commerce, NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-AFSC-214, 229 p.

Singer, E. 2002. “The Use of Incentives to Reduce Nonresponse in Household Surveys.” In Groves, R., Dillman, D., Eltinge, J. and Little, R. (eds) Survey Non Response. New York: Wiley.

Singer E. and C. Ye. 2013. The use and effects of incentives in surveys. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 645(1): 112-141.

1300 19th Street NW
8th Floor
Washington DC 20036

Ocean Conservancy

202.429.5609 Telephone
202.872.0619 Facsimilie
www.oceanconservancy.org

April 11, 2016

Jennifer Jessup, Departmental Paperwork Clearance Officer
Department of Commerce, Room 6616
14th and Constitution Avenue NW
Washington, D.C. 20230

RE: Proposed Information Collection; West Coast Fisheries Participation Survey

Dear Ms. Jessup:

Ocean Conservancy[1] commends the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) for its commitment to on-going collection of social and economic data that can help NMFS and others better understand the complex dynamics of West Coast fishing communities, and we appreciate the opportunity to comment on this proposed information request. In response to the following invited comments:

(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

The scope of proposed information collection can greatly enhance the proper performance of the functions of NMFS and will have practical utility for agency scientists, managers, and fishery stakeholders. Expanding NMFS's understanding of the relationship between social and economic factors and the physical ecosystem will significantly improve responsiveness to requests of stakeholders and managers for this type of information and meets key requirements of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA).[2] In the larger context of data, information, and analysis that NMFS collects and conducts, studies and surveys that focus on the social components of fisheries are relatively sparse. We appreciate this effort and others by the agency to bolster this body of knowledge, and encourage further data collection and studies similar to this request.

If NMFS is to achieve optimum yield and move toward ecosystem-based fishery management (EBFM), a better understanding of the social and economic underpinnings of existing and proposed policies is important. Optimum yield requires the consideration of ecological, social and economic factors.[3] This survey will improve the information mangers have available about the existing relationships between the physical environment and social and economic factors, as well as a better understanding of the potential outcomes of their decisions. Today, many of these decisions are driven by anecdotal information and personal experience, as opposed to factual evidence or analysis provided from the social sciences. While the political underpinnings of Regional Fishery Management Council decision-

[1] Ocean Conservancy is a non-profit organization that educates and empowers citizens to take action on behalf of the ocean. From the Arctic to the Gulf of Mexico to the halls of Congress, Ocean Conservancy brings people together to find solutions for our water planet. Informed by science, our work guides policy and engages people in protecting the ocean and its wildlife for future generations.
[2] *See, e.g.*, 16 U.S.C. §§ 1802(33); 1851(a)(1 & 2); 1852(g)(1)(B); 1853(a & b).
[3] 16 U.S.C. § 1802(33).

making that also contribute to this process are beyond the scope of this letter, stronger social science and greater inclusion of social and economic data and analysis will undoubtedly aid Councils and NMFS when considering management actions, and better support the legally mandated achievement of optimum yield.[4]

Further, as NMFS implements its new EBFM policy,[5] the inclusion of social and economic data becomes even more important; strategies and tools that bring ecosystem information into management often depend on or are strengthened by social and economic data and analysis. For example, the Pacific Fishery Management Council maintains a Fishery Ecosystem Plan that calls for an annual ecosystem report produced by the NMFS California Current Integrated Ecosystem Assessment (IEA) program. The ecosystem report has strong oceanographic and biological sections, but limited information on social and economic analysis.[6]

Increased attention and resources to fill these gaps requires primary data collection such as that found in the proposed survey. As such, we support the efforts of this survey and look forward to its results. Dr. Karma Norman's proposed survey and analysis concentrates on better understanding the choices fisherman with diverse permit or quota portfolios make when faced with changing social and environmental factors. This fundamental knowledge is critical for understanding the effect existing policies have on fisherman and fishing communities, and can better inform future decisions by helping predict the outcomes of potential management actions. This will contribute to not only the existing body of knowledge around the relationship of social factors to environmental, but will also be in direct service to managers.

(b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden (including hours and cost) of the proposed collection of information

We have limited knowledge regarding internal allocations of employee time and budgetary allotments within NMFS and the Science Centers; however, given that this is a crucial element to fishery management, we believe the limited burden imposed on the agency is appropriate. Similarly, the burden this will have on survey participants is limited and appropriate, especially given the great need for such information in the fishery management process.

(c) way to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information collected

The proposed information to be collected is appropriate and greatly needed. The scope appears to have been well thought out and is both simple and concise enough that respondents should not feel overburdened to complete the survey. To enhance quality, utility, and clarity of information collected, we urge NMFS to ensure that data and findings are made available to research partners and the public, and are used to inform Council management decisions in a timely manner.

---

[4] 16 U.S.C. § 1851(a)(1).

[5] National Marine Fisheries Service Policy Directive, Ecosystem-Based Fisheries Management Policy, Discussion Draft (Sept. 9, 2015).

[6] Pacific Fishery Management Council Meeting, September 2015, Scientific and Statistical Committee Supplemental Report, Agenda Item D.1.a., *available at* http://www.pcouncil.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/D1a_SUP_SSC_SEPT2015BB.pdf.

(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.

As noted above, the burden on respondents is minimal and appropriate. A mail survey is an effective means of information collection and can be completed with very limited effort. However, we recommend that NMFS continue to investigate alternative methods (e.g. electronic data collection and submission) that will produce and provide more timely and cost effective data. For example, the survey could include a request for an email address for each permit holder with the goal of switching to an electronic system in future years.

In closing, we appreciate the opportunity to comment on this proposed data collection, and strongly support the work of Dr. Karma Norman and other NMFS scientists to further the collection and analysis of critical social data and information.

Sincerely,

Corey Ridings
Policy Analyst

Ivy Fredrickson
Staff Attorney

POSTCARD #1

Hello!

We are asking your help with an important study being conducted by University of Washington Sea Grant and NOAA Fisheries to understand the importance of West Coast fisheries to individuals and communities. In the next few days you will receive a short survey in the mail.

This research can only be successful with the generous help of people like you. To say thanks, you will receive a small token of appreciation with the survey. I hope you will take 15-20 minutes of your time to help us. Most of all, I hope that you enjoy the questionnaire and the opportunity to voice your opinions about West Coast fisheries.

Any questions, feel free to contact Karma Norman (Northwest Fisheries Science Center) at 206302-2418.

From:
WA Sea Grant
c/o Hardwick Research
8720 SE 45th Street
Mercer Island, WA 98040

Stamp

To:

_____

_____

_____

POSTCARD #2

Hello!

Last week a questionnaire was mailed to you because you were selected to help in a study about the importance of West Coast fisheries to individuals and communities.

If you have already completed and returned the questionnaire, please accept our sincere thanks. If not, please do so right away. For your convenience, there is a web link where you can complete the survey online www.surveymonkey__.com if you prefer. You will need your participant code (under your name) so you can start the survey.

If you did not receive a paper questionnaire or please call us at 1-206-302-2418.

We are especially grateful for your help with this important study.

Hardwick Research on behalf of WA Sea Grant

From:
National Marine Fisheries Service
2725 Montlake Blvd East
Seattle, WA 98112-2097

Stamp

To:

_____

_____

_____

POSTCARD #3

I

Hello Again!

We are reaching out because you have been asked to participate in very important research regarding the importance of West Coast fisheries to individuals and communities.

We want to be sure your experience and feedback are incorporated into this research study. If you have not yet filled out and returned the questionnaire, please do so right away. If you have misplaced your paper copy, we have included a web link where you can complete the survey online www.surveymonkey .com. You will need your participant code (under your name) so you can start the survey.

Questions? Give us a call 1-206-302-2418.

We are especially grateful for your help with this important study.

From:
National Marine Fisheries Service
2725 Montlake Blvd East
Seattle, WA 98112-2097

Stamp

To:

_____

_____

_____

****DRAFT****

WEST COAST FISHERIES PARTICIPANTS SURVEY

This is a voluntary survey.

Purpose of West Coast Fishery Participation Survey: This survey collects information about why you fish and the benefits you get from participating in fisheries, including non-monetary benefits. This will enable fishery managers to better understand how individuals and communities are affected when opportunities and profitability in particular fisheries change.

Researchers: Joshua Abbott (Arizona State Univ), Dan Holland (NOAA), Melissa Poe (UW Washington Sea Grant), Karma Norman (NOAA)
Contact: mpoe@uw.edu or karma.norman@noaa.gov

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 20 minutes per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other suggestions for reducing this burden to Karma Norman, National Marine Fisheries Service, 2725 Montlake Blvd East, Seattle, WA 98112-2097.

The data collected will be kept confidential as required by section 402(b) of the Magnuson-Stevens and NOAA Administrative Order 216-100, Confidentiality of Fisheries Statistics, and will not be released for public use except in aggregate statistical form without identification of sources. 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.

1. What year were you born? _____

2. How many years have you been involved in fishing as a paid crew member, captain and/or vessel owner?

   __ Less than 5
   __ 5-9
   __ 10 – 14
   __ 15– 19
   __ 20 or more

3. How much longer do you expect to continue to fish or operate a vessel commercially?

__ Less than 5
__ 5-9
__ 10 – 14
__ 15– 19
__ 20 or more
__ as long as I can

4. Do you captain your own vessel? __ Always __Mostly __Sometimes __Never

5. What is the zip code where you live more than half the year? _____

6. How many immediate family members also work in the fishing industry? _____

7. How many extended family members also work in the fishing industry? _____

8. Besides your family, what proportion of the people that you interact with regularly (e.g., friends, social acquaintances, colleagues, business associates, etc.) work in the fishing industry? _____All _____ Most ____Some ____Few ____None

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

10. How would you define the fishing community you feel most a part of?

___ as a place (e.g., the town you tie up your vessel, land fish, and or the town where you and your family reside)

___ as a collection of people (e.g., the fishermen who fish in the same area or in your "radio" group, belong to the same industry association as you, or an ethnic group)

___ both place and people

___ I'm not part of a fishing community

11. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements.

Statement	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neutral	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree
Being a fisherman is important to me.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Continuing a family tradition of fishing is important to me.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

My fishing community is important to me.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Continuing a community tradition of fishing is important to me.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Fishing is a respected occupation where I live.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Fishing is more respected where I live now than it was 15 years ago.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

12. Please indicate your level of job satisfaction associated with each of these potential attributes of commercial fishing in terms of your own experience as a fisherman.

Attribute of Fishing	Very dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very satisfied
Adventure of job	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Challenge of job	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Working outdoors	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Camaraderie with crew					
Being on the water	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Competing with others	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Doing something worthwhile	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Producing healthy food	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Pitting skill against nature	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Being my own boss	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Working my own schedule	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Earnings from fishing	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Predictability of earnings	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Job safety	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

13. What do you consider the biggest challenge or impediment to making a living as a fisherman?
    __ Natural variation in the fish available to catch
    __ Variation in prices for fish or costs of inputs such as fuel, supplies or maintenance
    __ Ability to access fisheries or the cost of licenses or quota

__ Regulations (please explain the specific types of regulations)

_____
_____
_____
_____

__ Other Factors (please explain)

_____
_____
_____
_____

14. Has your fishing operation been affected by fishery closures in recent years (yes / no – please circle one)? If yes, please indicate what fishery closures.

_____
_____
_____
_____

15. If you answered yes to the question above, how did you respond to the closure?

__ Fished in another fishery
__ Worked in a job or business other than commercial fishing
__ Did not work in either fishery or non-fishery employment during the closure

16. Do you prefer to participate in multiple fisheries or a single fishery?

__ single fishery
__ 2 fisheries
__ 3 or more fisheries

17. Which fishery is your most important source of fishing income?

__ Dungeness Crab
__ Albacore
__ Market Squid
__ Salmon
__ Pink Shrimp
__ Pacific Whiting
__ Groundfish (fixed gear)
__ Groundfish (trawl)
__ Other (please specify) _____

18. If that fishery were unprofitable or closed, in which other fishery would you choose to participate, or would you pursue non-fishery work?

__ Dungeness Crab
__ Albacore
__ Market Squid
__ Salmon
__ Pink Shrimp
__ Pacific Whiting
__ Groundfish (fixed gear)
__ Groundfish (trawl)
__ Other fishery (please specify fishery) _____
__ Non-fishery work (specify type of work) _____

19. Given the choice between fishing and an alternative job for which you are qualified, would you prefer fishing or the alternative job if the expected pay for both was the same (check one)? __Fishing __Alternative Work

20. If you answered "fishing" in question 22, how much more would the other job have to pay for you to prefer it over fishing?

__ 1-10% more
__ 11-25% more
__ 26-50 % more
__ 51-100 % more
__ Greater than 100% more
__ Would never choose another job

21. Which fishery is most important to you <u>personally</u>, not necessarily financially, but in terms of your identity or enjoyment?
__ Dungeness Crab
__ Albacore
__ Market Squid
__ Salmon
__ Pink Shrimp
__ Pacific Whiting
__ Groundfish (fixed gear)
__ Groundfish (trawl)
__ Other fishery (please specify) _____

22. If applicable, what is the maximum number of crew you employ on your fishing boat, not including the captain? _____

23. Have you ever continued fishing in order to provide employment for crew when you thought the profits earned by the vessel might fail to cover expenses? __YES __NO

24. Do you keep your commercial catch for your own use and/or sharing with family and friends? __YES __NO [If NO, skip to Question 30]

25. Roughly how many pounds of catch do you keep each year for personal use? _____

26. How important are the following reasons for keeping some of your catch?

Reason	Not Important	Somewhat Important	Very Important
Regular household consumption			
Pleasure of eating seafood I caught myself			
It's just what we do around here			
To give to friends or family			
To trade catch for other goods or services			

27. For each species, indicate (with an "X") if you keep catch for any of the following reasons (leave a row blank if you do not keep the catch of that species for personal use):

	Regular household consumption	**Share with friends or family**	**Food for special occasions**	**There is a surplus**	**Other (please specify)**
Dungeness Crab					
Albacore					
Chum Salmon					
Chinook Salmon					
Coho Salmon					
Shrimp					
Market Squid					
Pacific Sardine					
Halibut					
Groundfish					
Other					

28. Over the last 3-4 years: what percentage of your household income came from commercial fishing? _____%

29. Over the last 3-4 years: what percentage of the income you personally contributed to your household was from work other than commercial fishing? _____%

30. If you provided a positive percentage in Q29, what type of non-fishing work did you do in this period?

_____

31. In recent years how often do you personally earn non-fishing income in each quarter?

January-March	__ Always	__Mostly	__Sometimes	__Never
April-June	__ Always	__Mostly	__Sometimes	__Never
July-September	__ Always	__Mostly	__Sometimes	__Never
October-December	__ Always	__Mostly	__Sometimes	__Never

32. What was your average annual household income over the last 3- 4 years?

__ Less than $25,000
__ $25,000 to $74,999
__ $75,000 to $124,999
__ $125,000 to $174,999
__ $175,000 or more

33. How many people are in your household? _____

34. Do you have health insurance and, if so, how is it acquired?
__ No health insurance
__ Purchased independently
__ Provided through your fishery related job
__ Provided through your own employment other than fishing
__ Provided through another household member's employer
__ Provided through Medicare or Medicaid

35. Would you be willing to participate in a more in-depth interview on your participation in fishing? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes please contact:

Karma Norman
Email: Karma.norman@noaa.gov
Phone: (206) 302-2418

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–201–837]

Certain Magnesia Carbon Bricks From Mexico: Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2014–2015

AGENCY: Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the Department) is rescinding its administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain magnesia carbon bricks from Mexico for the period of review September 1, 2014, through August 31, 2015 (POR).

DATES: *Effective Date:* February 9, 2016.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Terre Keaton Stefanova, AD/CVD Operations, Office II, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–1280.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On September 1, 2015, the Department published in the **Federal Register** a notice of opportunity to request administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain magnesia carbon bricks from Mexico for the POR.[1]

On September 30, 2015, in accordance with section 751(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), and 19 CFR 351.213(b), the Department received a timely request from the Magnesia Carbon Bricks Fair Trade Committee (the Committee)[2] to conduct an administrative review of the POR sales of RHI-Refmex S.A. de C.V., Trafinsa S.A. de C.V., Vesuvius Mexico S.A. de C.V., and Ferro Alliages & Mineraux Inc. On November 9, 2015, the Department published in the **Federal Register** a notice of initiation of an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain magnesia carbon bricks from Mexico with respect to these companies.[3] On January 19, 2016, the Committee timely withdrew all its requests for review.

Rescission of Administrative Review

Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.213(d)(1), the Department will rescind an administrative review, in whole or in part, if the parties that requested a review withdraw the request within 90 days of the date of publication of the notice of initiation of the requested review. The Committee withdrew its request for review before the 90-day deadline, and no other party requested an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain magnesia carbon bricks from Mexico for the POR. Therefore, in response to the timely withdrawal of the request for review and pursuant to 19 CFR 351.213(d)(1), the Department is rescinding this review in its entirety.

Assessment

The Department will instruct U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) to assess antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Antidumping duties shall be assessed at rates equal to the cash deposit of estimated antidumping duties required at the time of entry, or withdrawal from warehouse, for consumption, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.212(c)(1)(i). The Department intends to issue appropriate assessment instructions directly to CBP 41 days after the date of publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**.

Notification to Importers

This notice serves as the only reminder to importers of their responsibility, under 19 CFR 351.402(f)(2), to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during this review period. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the Secretary's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

Notification Regarding Administrative Protective Order

This notice serves as the only reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order (APO) of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305(a)(3). Timely written notification of the return or destruction of APO materials, or conversion to judicial protective order, is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and the terms of an APO is a sanctionable violation.

This notice is published in accordance with section 777(i)(1) of the Act, and 19 CFR 351.213(d)(4).

Dated: February 3, 2016.

Christian Marsh,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations.

[FR Doc. 2016–02553 Filed 2–8–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

[1] *See Antidumping or Countervailing Duty Order, Finding, or Suspended Investigation; Opportunity To Request Administrative Review,* 80 FR 52741 (September 1, 2015).

[2] The Committee is an ad hoc association comprised of the following three U.S. producers of magnesia carbon bricks: Resco Products, Inc.; Magnesita Refractories Company; and Harbison Walker International, Inc. *See* September 30, 2015, Letter regarding Certain Magnesia Carbon Bricks From Mexico: Request For Administrative Review.

[3] *See Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews,* 80 FR 69193, 69195 (November 9, 2015).

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

Proposed Information Collection; Comment Request; West Coast Fisheries Participation Survey

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 April 11, 2016.

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 Karma Norman, Northwest Fisheries Science Center, (206) 302–2418 or *Karma.Norman@noaa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Abstract

This request is for a new information collection.

Fishing livelihoods are both centrally dependent on marine ecosystems and part of the set of forces acting on other components of these ecosystems, including the ecosystem's resident fish and marine species. Alongside social factors like economics and management actions, biophysical dynamics within the ecosystems, including fisheries

population fluctuations, shape fishing livelihoods. However, the decisions fishermen make regarding which fisheries to access and when to access them are not fully understood, particularly within the holistic food web frameworks offered up by ecosystem-based approaches to research and management. Moreover, a full understanding and predictive capacity for these movements of fishermen across fisheries in the context of ecological and social variability presents a significant gap in management-oriented knowledge. Managing fisheries in a way that enhances their social and economic value, mitigates risks to ecosystems and livelihoods, and facilitates sustainable adaptation, requires this fundamental knowledge.

For this reason, the Northwest Fisheries Science Center (NWFSC) seeks to conduct fisheries participation analyses which involve a survey of United States (U.S.) West Coast commercial fishing participants. A U.S. mail survey will be conducted. The survey will be voluntary, and contacted individuals may decline to participate. Respondents will be asked to answer questions about their motivations for fishing and other factors that affect participation in the suite of West Coast commercial fisheries. Demographic and employment information will be collected so that responses can be organized based on a respondent typology. This survey is essential because data on smaller scale fishing practices, values, participation decisions and beliefs about fishing livelihoods are sparse; yet, they are critical to the development of usable fishery ecosystem models that account for non-pecuniary benefits of fishing, as well as the ways in which fishing practices shape individual and community well-being.

II. Method of Collection

Respondents will be contacted via mail for administration of the survey.

III. Data

OMB Control Number: 0648-xxxx.

Form Number(s): None.

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

Affected Public: Individuals or households.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 3,000.

Estimated Time per Response: 30 minutes.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 1,500.

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: February 3, 2016.

Sarah Brabson,

NOAA PRA Clearance Officer.

[FR Doc. 2016–02410 Filed 2–8–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–22–P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Air Force

U.S. Air Force Reminder Re: United Launch Alliance (ULA) Consent Order and Recent Change in Department of Defense (DOD) Compliance Officer

AGENCY: Principal DOD Space Advisor Staff, Department of Defense (DOD).

ACTION: Publicize Consent Order, Notify Public of New DOD Compliance Officer and Provide Points of Contact for Information and/or Comment Submittal.

SUMMARY: This is not a notice of solicitation issuance. The Director, Principal DOD Space Advisor Staff, as the Compliance Officer under the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) Decision and Order (hereinafter referred to as the ''Consent Order''), in the Matter of Lockheed Martin Corporation (LMC), the Boeing Company (Boeing), and United Launch Alliance, L.L.C. (ULA) (hereinafter referred to as the ''Respondents''), Docket No. C–4188, dated May 1, 2007, is posting this notice to publicize the Consent Order, notify the Public of a change in DOD Compliance Officer personnel and to provide points of contact for further information or for comment submittal.

The Consent Order: The Consent Order requires that with regard to covered Government programs, (1) ULA afford all space vehicle manufacturers non-discriminatory treatment for launch services that ULA may provide, and that (2) LMC and Boeing, as space vehicle manufacturers, consider all qualified launch service providers on a non-discriminatory basis. Covered programs are Government programs which are delivered in orbit and utilize medium-to-heavy launch services. The Consent Order also requires firewalls to prevent information from a space vehicle provider being shared by ULA with its Boeing or LMC parent company. Similarly, Boeing and LMC must have firewalls to ensure that other launch service information is not shared with ULA. The Consent Order also requires that the Department of Defense appoint a Compliance Officer to oversee compliance with the Consent Order by all three Respondents. The Consent Order remains in full effect through 30 April 2017. The complete text of the ULA Consent Order and supplementary information is located on the following FTC Web site: *http://www.ftc.gov/enforcement/cases-proceedings/0510165/lockheed-martin-corporation-boeing-company-united-launch.*

DOD Compliance Officer: The DOD Compliance Officer is the Director, Principal DOD Space Advisor Staff. The duties of this position are now conducted by Mr. Winston A. Beauchamp.

Points of Contact for Further Information or Inquiries: For further information and inquires, or to request a meeting with the DOD Compliance Officer or her Government Compliance Team, interested parties should contact either Mrs. Sarah Beth Cliatt (Compliance Division Chief), Tel: 719–556–2268; or Colonel Marc Berkstresser (Deputy Compliance Division Chief), Tel: 703–693–3634.

Henry Williams,

Acting Air Force Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 2016–02544 Filed 2–8–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5001–10–P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Office of the Secretary

Publication of Housing Price Inflation Adjustment

AGENCY: Office of the Under Secretary (Personnel and Readiness), DoD.

ACTION: Notice.