

**SUPPORTING STATEMENT
IMPLANTATION AND RECOVERY OF ARCHIVAL TAGS
OMB CONTROL NO.: 0648-0338**

A. JUSTIFICATION

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

The purpose of the collection of this information is to assist in compliance with the **Atlantic Tunas Convention Act** of 1975 (ATCA, 16 U.S.C. 971), the **Magnuson-Stevens Fisheries Conservation and Management Act** (Magnuson-Stevens Act, 16 U.S.C. 1812), and Federal regulations at **50 CFR 635**. ATCA authorizes the promulgation of regulations to implement recommendations adopted by the International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT) and collect information to support these recommendations. Atlantic highly migratory species (HMS) such as tuna, shark, swordfish, and billfish are also managed under the authority of the Magnuson-Stevens Act, which gives NOAA Fisheries the authority to conduct and promote fisheries research, and requires that the United States cooperate with those international organizations involved in the conservation of HMS.

As a member of ICCAT, the United States takes part in the collection of HMS biological statistics for research purposes. The collection of information through the U.S. HMS archival tagging program provides essential stock assessment information for international and domestic fishery management. The tagging program has provided and continues to provide vital information regarding the movement and life history of bluefin tuna and billfish.

Archival tags are miniature data loggers that record the movements, geolocation, and behavior of individually tagged highly migratory species. The tags are returned to the agency by fishermen after a tagged fish is captured in a commercial or recreational fishery. Data from recovered tags is used to ascertain HMS life history information such as migratory patterns and spawning site fidelity. This information is vital for international and U.S. management of HMS fisheries. For example, data from this tagging program was recently presented at an ICCAT intersessional meeting reviewing bluefin tuna stock composition. Bluefin management has been based on a two stock hypothesis (with spawning occurring in two discrete locations in the Mediterranean and Gulf of Mexico); however, additional information collected through tags may help provide a better understanding of the migratory nature and potential spawning areas for bluefin tuna. Data from the archival tagging program will continue to be an integral part of this debate.

This Paperwork Reduction Act package renewal covers two reporting requirements associated with the archival tag program. Current National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service (NOAA Fisheries) regulations (50 CFR §635.33) allow fishermen to retain any HMS with an archival tag implanted or attached without regard to season or size limits, under the condition that the fisherman report the landing to NOAA Fisheries along with certain information about the catch, and make the fish available to NOAA Fisheries for recovery of the tag.

NOAA Fisheries regulations also require that researchers using archival tags for HMS notify NOAA Fisheries in writing before and after project completion, including information such as the type and number of tags used, the species and approximate size of the tagged fish, and the location and method of capture of the tagged fish.

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.

As described above, there are two sets of reporting requirements. The information provided by HMS fishermen will include the archival tag, location of capture, and captured fish. This information will be used to analyze facets of the life history of tagged fish.

The information provided by researchers will include notification of project initiation, and a summary of project results. This information is needed to assist the agency in assessing the effectiveness of archival tag research and the impact of regulatory allowances for tag recovery, and to ensure that archival tag research does not lead to undue mortality, in addition to the information generated by the tagging program itself, as discussed above.

It is anticipated that the information collected will be disseminated to the public or used to support publicly disseminated information. As explained in the preceding paragraphs, the information gathered has utility. NOAA Fisheries will retain control over the information and safeguard it from improper access, modification, and destruction, consistent with NOAA standards for confidentiality, privacy, and electronic information. See response # 10 of this Supporting Statement for more information on confidentiality and privacy. The information collection is designed to yield data that meet all applicable information quality guidelines. 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.

Archival tags have been specifically designed for use on fish, sea turtles, and marine mammals. The archival tag stores environmental and behavioral data. Software provides graphical representation of all the data. Tags currently on the market weigh 25g in air, have up to one megabyte of memory, can retain data for 20 years, and have a lifetime of four to five years.

Archival tag information can be reported at the toll-free number (800) 437-3936, or by contacting: National Marine Fisheries Service, Highly Migratory Species, 1315 East West Highway, Silver Spring, MD 20910.

4. Describe efforts to identify duplication.

Reports submitted to NOAA Fisheries from researchers planning an archival tagging program for HMS will provide for coordination of tagging programs in order to ensure that duplication of tagging programs will not take place. Given the expense of this research, relatively few parties will be involved and a high level of coordination with the researchers will be maintained, which will provide an avenue to avoid any duplication of reporting requirements within NOAA. Other reporting within NOAA that could be required of researchers includes grant reports (if a NOAA grant is issued) or interim and final exempted fishing permit reports. If these other reports contain the necessary information and are available in the timeframe required under 50 CFR §635.33, they may be submitted to satisfy the reporting requirements approved under this collection.

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

There will be no significant impact on small businesses or entities.

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

The tagging program could not be conducted without the reporting requirements, since collecting tag returns is an integral part of a tagging program. If the tagging program were not conducted, domestic and international management of HMS would be compromised, and could be rendered ineffective because of the lack of necessary life history information.

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

The collection is consistent with the guidelines.

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

A Federal Register notice published on October 31, 2007 solicited public comment on this renewal. No comments were received.

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

A \$1,000 reward is offered for the recovery of an archival tag. Given the high cost of each tag and tag deployment, a reward to encourage recovery of the tags is warranted. Rewards in

conventional tagging programs are common and have been found to enhance recovery numbers. The high value of an individual giant tuna on the export market (thousands of dollars) also calls for a reward as an incentive for reporting and providing the fish for sampling. Finally, tags may be recovered by fishermen outside the waters of the United States in the eastern Atlantic or the Mediterranean Sea, and a reward increases the likelihood that they will report.

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

Information submitted will be treated as confidential under the provisions of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Management and Conservation Act and NOAA Administrative Order 216-100.

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.

Approximately 25 tags are recovered and reported on per year. The estimated time for reporting on the fish is 30 minutes, which includes the time for making a toll-free call, making arrangements for the fish to be examined by a fishery biologist or to remove the tag, and processing fish samples as instructed. The burden for tag recovery is therefore:

$$25 \text{ respondents} \times 1 \text{ response} \times 30 \text{ minutes} = 12.5 \text{ (13) hours}$$

The total number of persons implanting archival tags is estimated at 5 researchers, each providing a written notification and a written report.

$$5 \text{ respondents} \times 1 \text{ notification} \times 30 \text{ minutes/notification} = 2.5 \text{ (3) hours}$$
$$5 \text{ respondents} \times 1 \text{ report} \times 1 \text{ hr/report} = 5 \text{ hours}$$

Collection totals are 30 respondents, 35 responses, and 21 hours.

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 are no costs for those recovering tags, since the phone call is toll-free and a reward is given. Other than paper and postage costs, which are estimated to be \$20-\$50 per year (\$4-\$10 per respondent or \$2-\$5 per response), no incremental costs to researchers are anticipated for implantation reports.

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

The cost of the Archival Tagging Program is approximately \$1 million in research grants over a 3-year period. About 75 tags (25 per year) will be returned over the 3 years, with a reward of \$1,000 a tag, for a cost of \$75,000. The total Federal cost for 3 years is therefore approximately \$1,075,000, or \$358,333 a year.

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

The changes in total annual burden hours are adjustments reflecting a re-estimation of the numbers of respondents and responses. Based on activities over the past three years, an additional 6 respondents are expected to report landing information: 6 x 30 minutes = 3 hours. With all hours subtotals being rounded up, total additional hours are actually 4.

The increase of \$50 (not shown on the 83i) is an artifact: when the ICR was migrated to ROCIS, the cost was rounded to zero.

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

Results will not be published. The data obtained may be used in reports and articles, which may be published.

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.

No exceptions are requested.

B. COLLECTIONS OF INFORMATION EMPLOYING STATISTICAL METHODS

This collection will not employ statistical methods.