

SUPPORTING STATEMENT
ALASKA SALTWATER SPORT FISHING ECONOMIC SURVEY
OMB CONTROL NO. 0648-XXXX

A. JUSTIFICATION

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

This request is for a new information collection.

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

The halibut sport fishery in Alaska is quite large. During 2009, for instance, over 440,000 halibut were harvested by sport anglers in the state.¹ In recent years, several regulatory changes have occurred and more have been proposed that could significantly impact the sport fishery. In February 2011, a program was implemented to limit entry into the saltwater charter boat recreational fishery in Alaska (75 FR 554). This policy sets a limit on the number of charter vessels that may participate in the guided sport halibut fishery in United States (U.S.) waters off Alaska. The limited entry program is separate from other policies intended to regulate harvest of halibut by the guided fishing sector, such as the guideline harvest limit (GHL) policy established in 2003 that sets an acceptable limit on the amount of halibut that can be harvested by the recreational charter fishery during a year and establishes a process for the North Pacific Fishery Management Council (Council) to initiate harvest restrictions in the event that the limit is met or exceeded. At present, numerous harvest restrictions have been adopted by the Council to address exceedances of the GHL that have occurred in recent years. These restrictions have primarily been aimed at fishing in the charter boat industry, such as restrictions on client or crew fishing behavior (e.g., bag and size limits). This year, maximum size limits for halibut caught on charter boat fishing trips were adopted. Moreover, NMFS and the Council are currently assessing a plan to implement a catch sharing plan to allocate halibut between the recreational and commercial sectors that would replace the GHL system (76 FR 14300). To assess the impacts of pending and potential regulatory changes on sport angler behavior, it is necessary to have estimates of the baseline demand for halibut fishing trips and an understanding of the factors that affect it.

¹ From Alaska Department of Fish and Game's Statewide Harvest Survey website: <http://www.adfg.alaska.gov/sf/sportfishingsurvey/index.cfm?ADFG=region.home>. Accessed June 28, 2011.

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

Information from this collection will be used by NMFS economists in the Alaska Fisheries Science Center (AFSC) and Alaska Regional Office, and by staff at the NPFMC, to address issues discussed in Question 1, and others that may arise. Using these data, econometric and statistical models will be estimated to describe the demand for, and value of, halibut and other saltwater fishing trips by sport anglers in Alaska, and assess the effects of regulatory changes in support of efforts to develop, implement, and monitor fishery management plans.

The information collection consists of conducting a mail survey using a sample of individuals who hold a sport fishing license in Alaska. For this implementation, we will mail questionnaires to members of the sample, followed by follow-ups to encourage response. Among the follow-up efforts will be a postcard reminder, a telephone contact with non-responding license holders for whom we have telephone numbers to encourage response and gather data for assessing non-response behavior, and a full second mailing. Since an earlier survey with similar survey instruments and implementation protocols was successfully completed (“Alaska Saltwater Sport Fishing Economic Survey” conducted under OMB Control No. 0648-0535 and described in Lew, Lee, and Larson [2010]) in 2007, we do not anticipate needing to conduct a formal pretest to test the mail survey instrument.²

There are three survey instruments, one for non-residents, one for Southeast Alaska residents, and another for all other Alaska residents. Since the majority of non-Southeast Alaska residents live in South Central Alaska, we refer to the non-Southeast Alaska resident survey version as the South Central (SC) Alaska resident version. Every respondent will receive a map insert showing two regions in Alaska where the vast majority of Alaska saltwater sport fishing occurs. The survey versions and the follow-up telephone interview script are described below.

All three mail questionnaires collect information about respondents’ behavior and preferences for saltwater fishing in Alaska, which include fishing for halibut³. The questionnaire is divided into five sections. The following is a discussion of how particular questions in the questionnaire will be used.

Mail Questionnaires for Non-Residents and Residents

The non-resident (NR) mail survey will be sent to sport anglers who do not live in Alaska, while the resident versions of the survey will be sent to anglers who are residents of Southeast Alaska (SE) and other areas of Alaska (SC).⁴ A separate survey instrument is needed for non-residents due to key differences in recreational travel behavior and constraints faced by non-resident

² In addition, the timing of collecting data from Alaska saltwater anglers is critical and the window for the collection is small given recall issues and when the sampling frame is complete and available. Conducting a full formal pretest would push the full implementation back a season and issues currently in front of the Council and NMFS require understanding the information this data collection intends to provide.

³ Saltwater sport anglers who catch halibut sometimes catch or target other species on the same trip, such as salmon, lingcod, and rockfish. Since these species potentially act as substitute target fish species for halibut, it is important to collect information about the demand for these species as well.

⁴ As discussed in Part B, Alaska residents are divided into two groups, Southeast Alaska residents and all other (non-Southeast) Alaska residents.

anglers compared to resident anglers, as well as possible differences in preferences for saltwater fishing. This requires asking several questions in the NR version that are different from the resident (SE and SC) versions. However, all survey versions are similar in structure and most questions are identical. The following will discuss the features common to the surveys and point out the differences where appropriate.

Section A

In all versions, Section A collects general participation information about the respondent's sport fishing activities in Alaska. Both provide instructions and definitions for freshwater and saltwater fishing to be used in the survey. The SE and SC versions include instructions to exclude subsistence fishing activities, which apply only to residents, in the survey. Questions in this section are used to determine basic experience and participation in fishing activities in Alaska. Question A1 asks whether the individual has fished in Alaska before 2011 (under the maintained assumption that the survey is implemented in 2012). This will be used to determine whether respondents have previous experience fishing in Alaska. Basic information about overall fishing effort, both in freshwater and saltwater, for the previous season is collected in A2 in the SE and SC versions and A3 in the NR version. Responses to this question will be used to determine participation rates for freshwater and saltwater fishing and as covariates in statistical models. In addition, a question is asked to determine in what areas of Alaska the individual fished (A3 in the resident versions, A4 in the NR version). This question is principally used to familiarize individuals with the regions in Alaska that will be used throughout the survey. The final question in the section (A4 in the resident versions, A5 in the NR version) is used to identify individuals who have fished in saltwater in Alaska during the previous season. Individuals who have not fished in saltwater for halibut and other saltwater species are directed to skip to Section D. The remaining respondents will fill out Sections B and C, which request information about their saltwater fishing activities in the recent past. Question A2 in the NR version asks respondents how many different visits were taken to Alaska during 2011. This information provides the context for fishing trip behavior by non-resident anglers provided in later sections.

Section B

Only individuals who have saltwater-fished during the past season for halibut and other saltwater species will fill out Sections B and C. For non-residents who must travel to Alaska to fish, and who generally visit the state for a long vacation and participate in more than fishing activities, Section B gathers basic information about their most recent visit to Alaska that included saltwater sport fishing. For these respondents, information in Section B provides the building blocks for calculating travel costs that are the basis for the recreation demand modeling of these types of anglers. In the SE and SC survey versions, Section B collects detailed information about the respondent's saltwater fishing activities during the past season. Responses from this section form the basic data needed to estimate the seasonal demand models for fishing trips to sites in Alaska and assess changes to demand resulting from potential regulatory changes.

Non-resident version:

Non-residents must travel to Alaska before they can fish in Alaska. While visiting Alaska, they may take more than one fishing trip. If they are visiting the state for non-fishing reasons, not all

of the travel costs they accrue are appropriate for inclusion in the fishing trip cost used in the recreation demand modeling. As a result, this version asks respondents for details of their most recent visit to Alaska during 2011 that can be used to calculate the appropriate portion of their costs associated with saltwater fishing activities on that visit.

- B1 provides information on how important saltwater sport fishing is to the most recent visit to Alaska. In combination with B2, which asks whether the visit to Alaska would have been taken if saltwater fishing was not part of the visit, B1 is used to evaluate how essential saltwater fishing was for the visit to Alaska. If saltwater fishing is not an important reason for visiting Alaska, the costs of traveling to Alaska would not influence the respondent's fishing activities decisions.
- B3 and B4 provide information on when and how long the respondent's most recent visit to Alaska was, while B5 collects information on the total number of days the respondent spent saltwater fishing in Alaska on this visit. This information provides basic information about the time period and length of the overall trip, which can be used to characterize the fishing done on the Alaska visit.
- B6 collects information on the number of people that traveled with the respondent to Alaska.
- B7 and B8 collect information about transportation used by the respondent to travel to Alaska. There are two primary ways of entering Alaska—by air and water. In B7, for respondents who took an airplane into the state, the arrival city is asked for, which is necessary to calculate in-state travel costs. B8 is specific to individuals who traveled to Alaska on a cruise ship.
- B9 asks if the respondent stayed at a fishing lodge, which provide (usually) all-inclusive experiences. If they say yes, they are asked how much time it took them to travel to the fishing lodge from their point of entry into the state, which is critical information for calculating fishing-related transportation costs for these individuals.
- B10 collects detailed information on the expenses accrued on fishing and non-fishing activities, as well as on transportation, for this visit to Alaska. This information can be used in economic impact models to evaluate the impact of angler expenditures on the regional economy.
- B11 identifies the number of persons for which the expenses reported in B10 apply.

SE and SC versions:

The SE and SC versions ask nearly identical questions in Section B that only differ in terms of the fishing locations asked about. Lew, Lee, and Larson (2010) found that very little saltwater sport fishing occurs outside of a resident's home region. That is, Southeast Alaska resident anglers generally do not fish in South Central Alaska, and non-Southeast Alaska resident anglers do not generally fish in Southeast Alaska. Thus, the fishing locations listed in the SE version are only those in Southeast Alaska, while the SC version only lists fishing locations in South Central Alaska.

- B1 collects information about the number of within-Alaska fishing trips taken to each of several different fishing sites and the number of days spent fishing by mode.
- B2 asks for the total number of fish that were caught at each site during the past season, and B3 collects information about the frequency with which respondents released fish they caught.
- B4 collects information about the type of transportation the respondent used on fishing trips

and will be used to help determine the respondent's travel costs to fishing sites.

- B5 is used to determine access to private boat fishing. Responses will be used to assess differential private boat fishing opportunities for residents in different regions in Alaska.

Section C

In all versions, Section C collects basic behavioral information necessary to model recent saltwater fishing behavior.

Non-resident version:

As noted above, calculating travel costs associated with fishing for non-resident anglers is a challenge that requires getting details about their Alaska visit (Section B), as well as information about the fishing activities engaged in and travel taken within the state to fishing locations. To further refine cost calculations, C1 in the NR version asks a question to help identify the type of fishing trip the respondent took, C6 asks for the location in Alaska the non-resident respondent considered their starting point for saltwater fishing while in Alaska, and C7 collects information on the time spent traveling from this starting point to the location where fishing occurred. Other questions in the section collect information about the fishing that was done including the locations in Alaska and number of days spent saltwater fishing (C2), the number of days fished by mode (C3), the number of fish by species that were targeted, caught, and kept (C4) on this fishing trip, and the amount of actual time spent fishing (with a fishing pole in the water) (C5).

Resident version:

For resident anglers, Section C elicits information about the most recent Alaska saltwater fishing, including the expenditures the respondent made related to the trip. This trip-specific approach is necessary to gather detailed trip information that respondents generally cannot reliably recall for an entire season, especially avid anglers who fish frequently. Asking for detailed expenditure information for the whole season, for instance, is cognitively too difficult. Information about the most recent trip will allow separate estimation of a recreation demand model that focuses on the most recent trip in addition to a seasonal demand model using information from Section B. In addition, detailed trip expenditure information can be used to evaluate the economic impact of recreational fishing activity within regional economic impact models.

Both the SE and SC versions ask respondents to describe their most recent saltwater fishing trip in Alaska. This includes questions to elicit information about where fishing occurred, how many days of fishing occurred, and what fishing modes were employed (C1); when the trip occurred and its length (C2 and C3), how many people went on the trip (C4), what types of transportation were used (C5), the total fish targeted, caught, and kept by species (C6), how much time was spent actively fishing (with a fishing pole in the water) (C7), and whether the trip was principally to saltwater fish (C8). C9 and C10 collect information on trip expenses and the number of people the expenses were spent on.

Section D

Section D collects stated preference response information needed to understand respondents' preferences for saltwater fishing trips in Alaska. The section begins with a set of questions to get

the respondent thinking about the types of Alaska fishing trips they prefer and the factors affecting these trips. These questions introduce the respondent to factors that are used to describe different types of fishing trips in subsequent stated preference questions. Differences in this section between the SE, SC, and NR versions are minor, with the major difference being an additional question in the SE and SC versions that ask about the respondent's preference for private versus charter boat saltwater fishing (D2 in those versions). In the NR version, D2 asks whether the respondent has a preference for fishing in a particular region of Alaska, a question not asked in the resident angler versions.

Following these introductory questions are directions for the stated preference questions and a budget reminder. Responses to the stated preference questions will be used to identify respondent preferences for characteristics of fishing trips that affect saltwater fishing trip experiences. This information will be used to understand how changes to fishing trip characteristics will affect participation in saltwater fishing. The stated preference questions (D4, D5, D6, and D7) are in a choice experiment, or stated choice, framework (Hanley, Wright, and Adamowicz, 1998; Alpizar, Carlsson, and Martinsson, 2001; Hanley, Mourato, and Wright, 2001).⁵

In each stated preference question, respondents are confronted with three choices. The first two choices, Choice A and Choice B, are fishing trips that differ in how much they cost, where they are taken (NR version only), whether fishing is by private boat or by charter boat, how long the trips are, and regulations applicable on the trips, among other attributes. The third choice, Choice C, is an opt-out alternative that can be chosen by the individual if other activities are preferred to Choices A and B. Responses to these questions will be analyzed within a random utility-based discrete choice econometric model.

The last question in the section (D8) identifies how confident respondents are about their answers to the stated preference questions. Respondents stating they are "not at all confident" in their answers may be excluded from the estimation since these individuals, for whatever reason, are uncertain that their answers reflect how they feel.

Section E: About You and Your Household

The final section is identical across versions and consists of questions about the respondent and the respondent's household to be used as explanatory variables in the stated preference and demand models, for comparing respondents to non-respondents (non-response bias), and for informing resource managers of the characteristics of the population.

Socioeconomic and demographic information collected includes gender, age, household size, number of workers in the household, education, ethnicity, race, employment status, hours worked per week, wage, and income. Respondents are also asked to indicate the number of years they have been fishing. This provides a measure of fishing experience that can be incorporated into the recreation demand models. Additionally, respondents are asked to provide more detailed information about their work time constraints, specifically whether they would

⁵ The first application of the choice experiment method in non-market valuation was a study by Adamowicz, Louviere, and Williams (1994) of recreational opportunities in Canada. The approach has since been used in a number of studies to estimate use values and participation for activities like hunting (Adamowicz, et al., 1997; Bullock, Elston, and Chalmers, 1998) and climbing (Hanley, Wright, and Koop, 2002).

prefer to work fewer, the same, or more hours than they currently are. This information is needed to better understand their time constraints and opportunities for participating in sport fishing and other leisure activities and will be incorporated into the recreation demand model.

Telephone Follow-Up

Following the initial mailing and postcard reminder, we will contact non-respondents by telephone to encourage them to complete the mail survey and to collect limited information from those who decide not to participate in the mail survey at all.⁶ The information provided by these non-respondents can be compared with that from respondents to address issues concerning non-response bias. Selected socioeconomic and demographic questions, along with a few key behavioral questions, are asked to statistically test whether non-respondents differ from respondents with respect to these characteristics. The behavioral questions include versions of questions from Section A of the mail questionnaire to identify basic fishing behavior and an additional question to identify respondents who have fished for halibut during the year of interest. This information can be used to evaluate and adjust the results for potential non-response bias among sample members.

It is anticipated that the information collected will be disseminated to the public or used to support publicly disseminated information. As explained above, 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 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 survey data collection does not utilize any specialized information technology.

4. Describe efforts to identify duplication.

The information collected in this survey is not collected by other Federal, state, or local agencies. To date, the NMFS Marine Recreational Fishery Statistics Survey (now called the Marine Recreational Information Program, or MRIP) and its add-ons have not been conducted in Alaska. We have informed the Council, the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, and the Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission about this project. None of these entities have conducted or are conducting similar economic data collections. Although there is no economic content, the Alaska Department of Fish and Game regularly conducts a survey that collects effort and catch data of Alaska sport fisheries, including saltwater recreational fisheries.

⁶ In the telephone follow-up, a limited amount of information may also be collected from those agreeing to return the mail survey.

Studies conducted in 1997 and 2003 provide an incomplete picture of the demand for halibut sport fishing trips. The 1997 study concentrated on trips taken to the Kenai Peninsula in South Central Alaska, which accounts for about half of the fishery's harvest (Lee, et al., 1999). Since halibut fishing opportunities in other areas of Alaska are different from those offered in this area, it is difficult to rely on these results to make inferences about halibut fishing behavior elsewhere in Alaska. A 2003 NMFS study collected information about halibut sport fishing from all Alaska sport anglers. This study was the first effort to characterize the demand for the entire Alaskan sport halibut fishery, and consequently, it was recognized that a follow-up survey would be necessary to update the estimates. Moreover, the study did not collect detailed information about actual fishing behavior, focusing instead on understanding angler preferences for trip attributes that affect the demand for halibut fishing. As a result, demand models based on observed fishing behavior in Alaska could not be estimated from that data.

The proposed data collection described herein is an update of a NMFS survey conducted in 2007 that collected information on angler behavior during the 2006 season (Lew, Lee, and Larson, 2010). That data collection updated the 2003 NMFS survey and addressed changes in the variables that affect the economic value of marine recreational fishing trips (particularly halibut fishing trips), utilized improved methodologies, and improved welfare estimates of trip value. The current updated survey will assist NMFS in understanding trends in preferences and behavior that cannot be discerned with a single, cross-sectional study, as well as provide information on preferences for recent and proposed fishing regulations that were not on the table when the 2007 survey was conducted.

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 or other small entities.

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

If the data collection is not conducted, the Council and NMFS will not have information on angler preferences and values associated with recent and proposed changes in fishing regulations. In addition, no information will be available about changes to fishing values under current conditions and regulations, which the 2007 survey data alone cannot inform. As a result, it will not be possible to monitor the impact of existing or proposed regulatory programs on demand for Alaska halibut sport fishing.

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

The collection is consistent with OMB guidelines.

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

A Federal Register Notice published on June 3, 2011 (76 FR 32142) solicited comments on the information collection.

Several comments were received by e-mail. One expressed some general opinions about government spending on economic surveys during these trying economic times. No action was taken in response to this comment. A few comments were received requesting more information about the purpose and type of data collected, as well as copies of the survey instruments. Answers to these questions and pdf files of the survey instruments were provided in e-mail responses. The remaining comments were from charter boat operators from the Alaska sport charter boat fishery who expressed a variety concerns about the current policies and the state of the charter boat industry, while also requesting materials. Requested materials were provided by e-mail.

Several individuals outside NMFS were consulted about elements of the survey, availability of existing data, data to collect, and other aspects of the project. These included staff at the Alaska Department of Fish and Game with experience conducting recreational angler surveys in Alaska.

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 \$1 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 are 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.

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 a \$1 incentive was provided in the 2007 survey, which achieved an overall response rate of 57% (Lew, et al. 2010). Given the similarity of survey protocols and survey materials, we anticipate a similar response rate for this data collection. Second, the 2003 NMFS survey achieved an overall response rate of 49.6% without an incentive, which is lower than what was achieved in the 2007 survey that included a \$1 token incentive. Third, although every attempt is being 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 16 page 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.

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

In the cover letter accompanying each mailing, respondents will be told that their responses are voluntary and will be kept strictly confidential under the authority of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act of 1996 and in accordance with [NOAA Administrative Order 216-100](#). The initial mailing letter and the follow-up mailing cover letter will also include the following statement:

“Your name and address will be kept separate from your responses, and only responses will be delivered to researchers for analysis.”

Following completion of the data collection, the survey firm (ICF Macro) will delete any information identifying individuals (i.e., name and addresses) before any data file is delivered to NMFS or any other participating researchers and agencies.

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

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

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

The survey will be sent to a random sample of approximately 4,600 Alaska sport fishing license holders drawn from the Alaska Department of Fish and Game Fish License Data file, which contains the names and addresses of all individuals who have purchased a license to sport fish in Alaska. Based on previous experience, up to 10% of addresses in these samples can be expected to be bad or unusable, which means the number of license holders receiving the survey will be approximately 4,140. We expect a final response rate of 55 percent (of the valid sample), leading to 2,277 responding license holders returning completed surveys. For the purpose of computing burden hours, 2,004 completed from the initial mailing and postcard reminder⁷ and 273 completed following contact via phone and the second full mailing. The cover letter will solicit the participation of the individual license holder to complete the survey. While our experience has been that respondents typically complete the survey in 25 minutes, we assume 30 minutes to conservatively compute the potential burden hours. As a result, those ultimately completing the mail survey are expected to contribute up to 1,139 hours to the overall hour burden.

⁷ The number of returns here are based on the 2007 survey's response rates for the corresponding stage of approximately 38% of the total completes from the first mailing and 50% of total completes being returned following the postcard reminder.

We expect 2,004 respondents to have returned a completed survey following the initial mailing and postcard reminder. Of the *remaining* valid sample (those who had not returned a completed survey) (4,140 – 2,004 = 2,136), we expect approximately 28% or 598 license holders to have telephone numbers available, based on the 2007 survey’s telephone matching rate. These 598 license holders that have not responded after the initial mailing and postcard reminder will be contacted by telephone and encouraged to complete and return the survey or asked to answer a few questions if they indicate they will not be returning the survey. Thus, the telephone follow-up serves the dual purpose of increasing the number of mail responses and gathering information by telephone needed to estimate the impact of non-response. The phone interview is expected to take 6 minutes on average to complete, and assuming 25% of the 598 individuals for which there is a phone number are reached and complete interviews, the contribution of the phone interview to the total time burden totals approximately 15 hours.⁸ Following the phone interviews, the second full mailing will be sent out to all individuals who have not returned a completed survey to date. As noted above, we expect a total of 273 individuals to have returned completed surveys following the phone interviews and second full mailing. Thus, totaling the time contribution of the 2,277 completed mail surveys (1,139 hours) with the time from the phone interviews (15 hours) yields a total of 1,154 hours.

The total number of unique respondents to all contacts in the survey implementation will be 2,277 (mail survey respondents) + 150 (phone respondents) – 30 (phone respondents who also returned the mail survey based on ~20% rate from 2007 survey) = 2,397. This number consists of respondents who return the questionnaire (2,277 respondents) and respondents who do not return the questionnaire but do provide some survey information during the telephone contact (120 respondents).

Survey instrument	Estimated number of respondents	Estimated time per respondent (minutes)	Estimated total annual burden hours (hours)
Mail survey (from initial mailing, postcard reminder)	2,004	30	1,002
Follow-up phone survey	150 ^a	6	15
Mail survey (second full mailing)	273	30	137
Totals	2,397^b		1,154

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

^b Total unique respondents reflect the total license holders who complete the mail survey or phone interview only (accounts for individuals who completed both).

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

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

⁸ The actual success rate for completing the telephone interview in the 2007 survey was ~25%.

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

Annual cost to the Federal government is approximately \$70,000 divided as follows: \$55,000 in contract award money and \$15,000 in staff time and resources. Contractor services include conducting the cognitive interviews (completed) and final survey implementation, entering and cleaning the data, and preparing a report that documents the survey procedures and response rates.

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

This is a new collection.

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

A report describing the sampling methods, experimental design, response rates, and descriptive statistics of data collected will be prepared similar to Lew, et al. (2010). A separate paper describing economic models used to analyze the data and the results from estimating these models will be submitted to a peer-reviewed journal (e.g., see Lew and Seung [2010]). Statistical data summaries in tabular form will be made available at the Alaska Fisheries Science Center web site.

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.

Not Applicable.