

**SUPPORTING STATEMENT
TAG RECAPTURE CARD
OMB CONTROL NO.: 0648-0259**

A. JUSTIFICATION

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

The Cooperative Game Fish Tagging Program (CGFTP) was initiated in 1971 as part of a comprehensive research program resulting from passage of the Migratory Game Fish Study Act of 1959 (P.L. 86-359) and other legislative acts under which the National Marine Fisheries Service operates, including **U.S.C. 16, Section 760e**. The CGFTP is now known as the Cooperative Tagging Center (CTC). The CTC attempts to determine the migratory patterns and other biological information of billfish, tunas, red drum, tarpon, amberjack, cobia, king mackerel and numerous other species by having fishermen tag and release their catch, so that fish can be subsequently recaptured.

Tagging and releasing fish is a voluntary activity. However, for the program to provide useful scientific data, certain information is required. Information on the actual tagging is needed and the “Tag Issue Report” is the form used by the fishermen to report a tagged fish. That form is approved under Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Control No.: 0648-0247.

The “Tag Recapture Card”, OMB Control No.: 0648-0259, is used by fishermen to provide information on the capture of fish that have been tagged. Forms are distributed to various fishing boat captains. If a tagged fish is caught, the Tag Recapture Card is completed and mailed to the Southeast Fisheries Science Center. The data on the fish is recorded and matched with the data that was reported on the Issue Report. In some instances, the angler may not have a card or simply prefers to phone in a tag recapture rather than fill out and mail the card to the CTC. The estimated burden includes all (both mail and phone) recapture reports.

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 on each species is used by National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) to determine migratory patterns, distance traveled, stock boundaries, and age and growth data. These data are necessary inputs for developing management criteria by regional fishery management councils, states and NMFS. The Tag Recapture Cards are necessary to facilitate the volunteer fishermen in recording when and where the fish was tagged, the species, its estimated length and weight, tag number, and information about the person who tagged the fish. Failure to obtain this data would make management decisions much more difficult and would be contrary to the NMFS policy objectives. Without receiving recapture information, the release information is of little value.

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.

No other satisfactory method of obtaining movement and other tag related information on fishes has been identified given the fact cards are often completed on small vessels.

4. Describe efforts to identify duplication.

No duplication was evident during consultations with other conservation agencies.

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

The collection does not involve small businesses.

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

The usefulness of this program would be compromised if the collection of these data did not take place on a continual basis. It would be impossible to track trends in fish movement, stock definitions, and growth rates. In addition, operating the program on a less than annual frequency would have an adverse effect on the voluntary participation rate.

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

No special circumstances are required.

8. Provide a copy of 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 soliciting comments was published on June 6, 2007. No comments were received.

The NMFS has sole Federal authority to obtain these data. However, consultations take place on a continuous basis with fishery commissions and other agencies in the eastern United States, Puerto Rico, U.S. Virgin Islands and other participating nations throughout the Atlantic Ocean. In practice, individual states have deferred to the NMFS effort because of its expertise, its broader geographical range of coverage, and the long established cooperation of fishermen and their organizations.

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

As an incentive for participating in the CTC tagging program, we provide fishermen who recapture a tagged fish CTC baseball caps. Tag history is made available to fishermen involved with each tag.

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

All data are confidential in accordance with National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Administrative Order (NAO) 216-100, Protection of Confidential Fisheries Statistics.

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

No sensitive questions are asked.

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

We estimate that approximately two minutes are required to complete the Recapture Card (by either mail or phone). Thus, the total burden on the public is estimated to be 8 hours.

Estimated responses per year	240
<u>Mean time/response</u>	<u>x 2 minutes</u>
Total Hours	8
Hourly rate	\$10.00
<u>Total hours</u>	<u>x 8</u>
Total labor cost	\$80.00

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 #12 above).

There is no start-up or other cost to the public.

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

240 responses x \$10.00 per hour* x 1.55 (overhead, printing, mailing) = \$3,720.00
15 cards printed/year x \$3.15 per card = \$47.25
240 hats x \$5.85/hat = \$1,404
Total cost = \$5,171.25

* Undergraduate student contractor rates for data entry

15. Explain the reasons for any program changes or adjustments reported in Items 13 or 14 of the OMB 83-I.

There are no changes.

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

A summary of tagging effort is produced annually. Data are used in scientific studies, journal articles, and stock assessments conducted by NMFS.

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 identified in Item 19 of the OMB 83-I.

Not applicable.

B. COLLECTIONS OF INFORMATION EMPLOYING STATISTICAL METHODS

Statistical methods are not used.