

**1 Supporting Statement A for  
Paperwork Reduction Act Submission**

**Migratory Bird Harvest Surveys  
3-2056J, 3-2056K, 3-2056L, 3-2056M, 3-2056N, 3-165, 3-165A, 3-165B, 3-165C,  
3-165D, 3-165E  
50 CFR 20.20**

**OMB Control Number 1018-0023**

**Terms of Clearance. None.**

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

**Migratory Bird Harvest Information Program**: Under 50 CFR 20.20, migratory bird hunters must register for the Migratory Bird Harvest Information Program (HIP) in each State in which he or she hunts each year. State natural resource agencies are required to send names and addresses of all migratory bird hunters to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (we, Service). We send surveys to selected hunters to estimate the magnitude and composition of migratory bird species harvest.

**Migratory Bird Hunter Survey and Parts Collection Survey**: Under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 U.S.C. 703-711), the Department of the Interior is designated as a key agency responsible for the wise management of migratory bird populations frequenting the United States and for the setting of hunting regulations that allow appropriate harvests of magnitudes that will allow for the populations' well-being. These responsibilities dictate the gathering of accurate data on various characteristics of migratory bird harvests of a temporal and geographic nature. The Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 (16 U.S.C. 742a-742j) authorizes collection of such information as is necessary to determine the status of wildlife resources, which is necessary to develop appropriate hunting regulations. Information required for effectively governing harvests of migratory birds includes not only knowledge of the harvest's magnitude but also information of the species, age, and sex composition within that harvest, including the geographic and chronologic distribution of these components as they relate to various hunting regulations.

**Sandhill Crane Harvest Survey**: The cooperative management guidelines for mid-continent sandhill cranes (included are three currently recognized subspecies: lesser, *Grus canadensis canadensis*; Canadian, *G. c. rowani*; and greater, *G. c. tabida*) are aimed at providing optimum diverse recreational opportunity consistent with the welfare of the species and within the provisions of international treaties and socio-economic constraints. Beginning in 1960 and continuing to date, hunting seasons have been allowed for sandhill cranes in Alaska and all or part of eight Midwestern States (Colorado, Montana, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Texas, and Wyoming) during specified time periods. In addition, a sandhill crane hunting season has been allowed in Kansas since 1993. Prior to the initiation of the sandhill crane harvest questionnaire in 1975, little information was available on the number of individuals who annually hunt sandhill cranes or the number of cranes harvested. This lack of information was a major void in management of the species. Annual crane hunter activity and harvest information were readily available for Canada through uniform nationwide surveys conducted by the Canadian Federal Government. Lack of comparable information from the United States precluded ascertaining the total annual hunter harvest from this migratory bird resource shared by the two countries.

**2. Indicate how, by whom, and for what purpose the information is to be used.**

Data are collected via various survey forms that are specific to the type of information being collected (e.g., mail survey form for Migratory Bird Hunter Survey, envelope for Parts Collection Survey). Data are collected by State natural resource agencies (Migratory Bird Harvest Information Program) and the Service (Migratory Bird Hunter Survey, Parts Collection Survey, and Sandhill Crane Harvest Survey). All data are collected each year, because there is a reasonable expectation of significant changes in key statistics between collections. This is because: (1) hunters change addresses over time; and (2) hunter success is dependent upon bird populations and migration chronology, which can vary from year to year depending on weather and habitat conditions. Information collected is used by both Federal and State authorities to monitor the effects of various hunting regulations on the harvest of individual migratory bird species. The information has been particularly useful in evaluating the effects of changes in daily bag limits, hunting season length, and hunting season dates on harvest. Information obtained also gives the Service a great deal of insight into the status of the many species involved. If this information were not collected, the Service's ability to promulgate regulations allowing controlled hunting of migratory birds would be greatly weakened. Agencies participating in determining appropriate hunting regulations, and making use of survey results, include the Department of the Interior, the Canadian Wildlife Service, State conservation agencies, and various private conservation organizations. Additionally, researchers often use these data to investigate biological phenomena such as range expansion, migration chronology, and species presence/absence.

Annual reports are made available on the Division of Migratory Bird Management's (DMBM) website <http://www.fws.gov/migratorybirds/NewReportsPublications/HIP/hip.htm>. Promulgation of annual hunting regulations by the Service relies on a well-defined process of monitoring data collection and scientific assessment. At key points during that process, Flyway technical committees, Flyway Councils (State agencies), consultants, and the public (and in some instances international regulatory agencies) review and provide valuable input on data collection and technical assessments. All assessments pertaining to the setting of annual harvest regulations are deemed "highly influential"; however, they are exempted from strict application of IQA peer-review guidelines due to the compressed time schedule associated with the regulatory process. Therefore, peer-review plans for technical assessments which influence annual hunting regulations decisions are not posted on the DMBM webpage. The DMBM has a long-history of subjecting applicable portions of such technical assessments to formal peer-review through submission to scientific journals, or other means, in addition to the review received as part of the annual regulatory process. Information from each survey contributes towards a national program to monitor the harvest of all migratory game bird species in the U.S.

The **Migratory Bird Harvest Information Program (MBHIP)** was developed by the State natural resource agencies and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to allow each State to provide annual lists of all migratory bird hunters licensed by the State. Each migratory bird hunter is required to register in each State in which he/she hunts by providing his/her name, address, and date of birth, and other ancillary information (described below). We request the date of birth in order to identify duplicate records and assess the quality of the data provided. The State includes the date the hunter registered with the record. We are preparing to accept email addresses in the HIP registration from States that already collect them, to assist us in implementing electronic surveys.

This ancillary information that allows the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to stratify the sample, investigate sources of bias, calculate bias correction factors, and identify duplicate records. Each State collects the information in a way that is most appropriate for that State, but all States ask some variation of the following questions that are appropriate in that State:

- 1) Will you hunt migratory birds this year?
- 2) How many ducks did you bag last year?
- 3) How many geese did you bag last year?
- 4) How many doves did you bag last year?
- 5) How many woodcock did you bag last year?
- 6) Did you hunt coots or snipe last year?
- 7) Did you hunt rails or gallinules last year?
- 8) Will you hunt sandhill cranes this year?
- 9) Will you hunt band-tailed pigeons this year?
- 10) Will you hunt brant this year?
- 11) Did you hunt sea ducks last year?

Because the distributions of these birds vary across the country and hunters vary in terms of what species they choose to hunt, the answers to these questions allow us to increase the efficiency of sampling by allowing us to concentrate sampling effort on the most appropriate hunters in each State.

The **Migratory Bird Hunter Survey (MBHS)** is based on the sample frame provided by the Migratory Bird Harvest Information Program. Randomly selected migratory bird hunters are sent one of the following forms and asked to report their harvest of those species: a waterfowl questionnaire (form 3-2056J), a dove and band-tailed pigeon questionnaire (form 3-2056K), a woodcock questionnaire (form 3-2056L), or a snipe, rail, gallinule, and coot questionnaire (form 3-2056M). The resulting estimates of harvest per hunter are combined with the complete list of migratory bird hunters, which serves as the expansion factor to provide estimates of the total harvest of those species or species groups.

On survey forms form 3-2056J - M, we ask hunters to identify the following information:

- Whether or not they hunted (waterfowl [form 3-2056J]; doves and/or band-tailed pigeons [form 3-2056K]; woodcock [form 3-2056L]; or snipe, rails, gallinules and/or coots [form 3-2056M]) this season. We need this information to estimate the number of active hunters of that species or species group. If they did hunt those species, we ask for:
  - o Month and day of hunt, because this provides information on the temporal distribution of the harvest that enables us to evaluate the effects of hunting season dates on harvest;
  - o County and State of hunt, because this enables us to estimate the geographic distribution of the harvest;
  - o Number of birds bagged, because this provides us with information on daily hunting success that enables us to evaluate the impacts of daily bag limits on harvest; and
  - o Season totals (days hunted, birds bagged, and birds knocked down but not retrieved), because this allows people who do not record their daily hunts to still provide us with data that enable us to estimate total days of hunting, total harvest, and mortality due to crippling loss.

The **Parts Collection Surveys (PCS)** are used to estimate the species, sex, and age composition of the harvest, and the geographic and temporal distribution of the harvest. Randomly selected successful hunters who responded to the Migratory Bird Hunter Survey the previous year are asked to complete and return a postcard (form 3-165A [waterfowl], form 3-165C [woodcock, band-tailed pigeon, rail, gallinule], or 3-165D [mourning dove]) if they are willing to participate in the Parts Collection Surveys. Those who answer "Yes" are also asked to report approximately how many birds they harvest in an average season. We need this information to determine how many of forms 3-165, 3-165B, or 3-165E to send each participant

at the beginning of the hunting season.

Respondents to forms 3-165A, 3-165C, and 3-165D are provided postage-paid envelopes before the hunting season and asked to send in a wing or the tail feathers from each duck or goose (form 3-165) they harvest, a wing from each woodcock, band-tailed pigeon, rail, or gallinule (form 3-165B) they harvest, or a wing from each dove (form 3-165D) they harvest. Dove managers are interested in estimates of local recruitment, so dove wings are requested from only the first 2 hunts during the first week of the dove season, to limit the sample to local birds. The wings and tail feathers are used to identify the species, age, and sex of the harvested sample.

Respondents are also asked to report on the envelope:

- Hunter name, to allow identification of the hunter if the barcode sticker is damaged or destroyed;
- Location (State, county and nearest town) the bird was harvested, because this enables us to estimate the geographic distribution of the harvest of each species (nearest town enables us to identify county if county was unknown);
- Month and day the bird was harvested, because this provides information on the temporal distribution of the harvest of each species that enables us to evaluate the effects of hunting season dates on species-specific harvest;
- Time of day the bird was harvested (form 3-165 only), because some States restrict shooting hours and this information enables us to evaluate the effects of those restrictions on harvest; and
- The band number of any leg-banded bird, because this enables us to estimate band reporting rates (form 3-165 only, because only waterfowl are banded in significant numbers).

The **Sandhill Crane Harvest Survey** is used to annually estimate the magnitude, geographical distribution, and temporal distribution of the sandhill crane harvest in Alaska, Colorado, Kansas, Montana, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Texas, and Wyoming. It has also been possible for us to estimate the portion of the sandhill crane's total population that is taken during harvest. This information has been particularly useful in determining the effects on harvests of daily bag limits and changes in hunting dates and the areas (counties) of States open to hunting. Based on information from the U.S. and Canadian surveys, hunting regulations can be adjusted as needed to optimize harvest at levels that provide a maximum of hunting recreation while keeping populations at desired levels.

On survey form 3-2056N, we ask hunters to identify the following information:

- Whether or not they hunted sandhill cranes this season. We need this information to estimate the number of active crane hunters.
- If they did hunt cranes, we ask for:
  - o Month and day of hunt, because this provides information on the temporal distribution of the harvest that enables us to evaluate the effects of hunting season dates on harvest;
  - o County and State of hunt, because this enables us to estimate the geographic distribution of the harvest;
  - o Number of birds bagged, because this provides us with information on daily hunting success that enables us to evaluate the impacts of daily bag limits on harvest; and
  - o Season totals (days hunted, birds bagged, and birds knocked down but not retrieved), because this allows people who do not record their daily hunts to still

provide us with data that enable us to estimate total days of hunting, total harvest, and mortality due to crippling loss.

- 3. Describe whether, and to what extent, the collection of information involves the use of automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology; e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses, and the basis for the decision for adopting this means of collection. Also describe any consideration of using information technology to reduce burden [and specifically how this collection meets GPEA requirements].**

Of the total number of burden hours, most (126,910 hours) are responses to the Migratory Bird Harvest Information Program. These data are collected by the State wildlife agencies, who in turn forward the responses (hunters' names and addresses) to the Service for use in national harvest surveys. On average, we receive the name and addresses of about 3,800,000 migratory bird hunters. Approximately 3,600,000 were collected electronically by the States, either online (through electronic licensing systems) or by telephone. The remaining records were collected using paper forms. The proportion of electronic responses increases each year as more States implement electronic data collection methods. About 224,800 responses are from randomly selected migratory bird hunters who are asked to voluntarily participate in a season-long survey (84,200 responses) or to send in migratory bird wing/feather parts in envelopes provided by the Service (140,600 responses). We have to print paper survey forms for our initial contact with hunters, to ensure a representative sample because not all hunters have electronic mail addresses.

For this Information Collection Request renewal, we are requesting permission to collect email addresses from hunters. We would collect email addresses from States that already collect email addresses from hunters, thus not adding any additional burden on the 49 State natural resource agencies. This request by the USFWS has been endorsed by the Migratory Shore and Upland Game Bird Working Group of the Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (AFWA) at their 2013 meeting. The addition of email addresses will allow us to phase in electronic survey methods, beginning with sending 2 of the 3 reminders electronically instead of as paper copies through the mail.

We have a contract with the USFWS's Information Resources and Technology Management (IRTM) to develop an online survey response platform to allow hunters to respond to our season-long survey over the internet. Pending availability of IRTM programmers, we will test modules of the application starting in the 2015-2016 hunting season, and have full implementation by the 2017-18 hunting season.

Finally, we have implemented 2 electronic methods for hunters to communicate with us: an email address ([MigratoryBirdHarvestSurveys@fws.gov](mailto:MigratoryBirdHarvestSurveys@fws.gov)) and a website that allows hunters to request more survey forms or request more survey forms or wing envelopes (<https://migbirdapps.fws.gov/hipweb/>).

The envelopes (forms 3-165, 3-165B, 3-165E) for the migratory bird wing/feather parts are large and would not print out on most standard printers. Furthermore, we could not guarantee envelopes printed on personal printers would comply with U.S. Postal Service regulations, thus we do not anticipate putting those envelopes online. The burden currently placed on cooperators and the cost to the Federal government is thought to be at a minimum level consistent with the information required.

We do not print out paper copies of our reports for distribution. Annual reports are made

available on the Division of Migratory Bird Management's (DMBM) website <http://www.fws.gov/migratorybirds/NewReportsPublications/HIP/hip.htm>.

#### **4. Describe efforts to identify duplication.**

Many State wildlife agencies collect some information on migratory bird harvest within their State, and a number of State hunter surveys have been examined. State information is generally collected secondarily in harvest surveys of game other than migratory birds and is not adequate for Federal regulatory responsibilities primarily because: (1) surveys to estimate harvest of migratory birds and hunter activity are not conducted in every State, and (2) survey methodologies vary among those States who do conduct harvest surveys. Information from State surveys is often insufficiently detailed or imprecise, or has weaknesses in sampling design that can result in bias (e.g., failing to contact nonrespondents; having no verification of species identification). Furthermore, many State survey results are not available in time to be useful for promulgating regulations. Some States eliminated migratory birds from their harvest surveys when we began conducting the Migratory Bird Hunter Survey; thus, duplication of effort between State and Federal surveys has been reduced since implementation of the Migratory Bird Harvest Information Program. Within the USFWS, we do not select a hunter for more than one survey each year. We have implemented computer algorithms to identify exact duplicate Migratory Bird Harvest Information Program registrations across all data files. We eliminate these duplicate records prior to drawing our sample, thus improving the efficiency of our survey while avoiding asking a single hunter to fill out more than 1 survey. We are also investigating the cost-effectiveness of implementing address hygiene software to identify probable duplicates across all data files, to further decrease the probability that a hunter will be selected for more than one survey each year.

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

This collection does not impact small entities. This information is only collected from individual migratory bird hunters and State agencies.

#### **6. Describe the consequence to Federal program or policy activities if the collection were not conducted or is conducted less frequently, as well as any technical or legal obstacles to reducing burden.**

If this information were not collected, our ability to promulgate regulations allowing controlled hunting of migratory game birds would be greatly weakened. We would not be able to estimate how many migratory birds were being taken by hunters annually, or assess our ability to manage populations through harvest regulation. The continued health of migratory bird populations demands that harvests be commensurate with population size and status. If these surveys were not conducted, the lack of accurate assessment of migratory bird harvests would dictate restrictive hunting regulations, which could result in lost hunting recreation. Loss of hunting opportunity due to lack of monitoring would not be acceptable to the hunting public, state natural resource agencies (many of whom rely on revenue from hunting licenses for funding and Service harvest surveys to set State-level hunting regulations), and some Non-Governmental Organizations (e.g., Ducks Unlimited). Allowing hunting opportunity without monitoring would not be acceptable to conservationists, much of the hunting public, nonhunting public, and some NGOs (e.g., Humane Society).

Surveys need to be conducted annually because the number of birds harvested can change substantially between years. Harvests fluctuate with the size of the hunted and hunter

population, as well as climatic conditions such as drought, flood, and extreme warm or cold temperatures, and annual fluctuations in species distribution. Annual harvest estimates are required to allow us to adequately measure these changes in harvest. Furthermore, States and some NGOs are interested in creating increased hunting opportunity for hunters and are experimenting with hunting regulations (e.g., different license types, special seasons, season length, bag limit, opening and closing dates, zoning). The utility of these approaches needs to be monitored annually to determine efficacy.

- 7. Explain any special circumstances that would cause an information collection to be conducted in a manner:**
- \* requiring respondents to report information to the agency more often than quarterly;**
  - \* requiring respondents to prepare a written response to a collection of information in fewer than 30 days after receipt of it;**
  - \* requiring respondents to submit more than an original and two copies of any document;**
  - \* requiring respondents to retain records, other than health, medical, government contract, grant-in-aid, or tax records, for more than three years;**
  - \* in connection with a statistical survey, that is not designed to produce valid and reliable results that can be generalized to the universe of study;**
  - \* requiring the use of a statistical data classification that has not been reviewed and approved by OMB;**
  - \* that includes a pledge of confidentiality that is not supported by authority established in statute or regulation, that is not supported by disclosure and data security policies that are consistent with the pledge, or which unnecessarily impedes sharing of data with other agencies for compatible confidential use; or**
  - \* requiring respondents to submit proprietary trade secrets, or other confidential information unless the agency can demonstrate that it has instituted procedures to protect the information's confidentiality to the extent permitted by law.**

There are no special circumstances that require the collection to be conducted in a manner inconsistent with OMB guidelines.

- 8. If applicable, provide the date and page number of publication in the Federal Register of the agency's notice, required by 5 CFR 1320.8(d), soliciting comments on the information collection prior to submission to OMB. Summarize public comments received in response to that notice (or in response to a PRA statement) and describe actions taken by the agency in response to these comments.**

**Describe 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.**

On November 8, 2013, we published in the Federal Register (78 FR 67183) a notice soliciting public comment on this information collection for 60 days, ending January 7, 2014. We received one comment. The commenter stated that (1) hunting of birds has no place in a modern society, (2) the harvest surveys are a service to gun enthusiasts, and (3) the surveys are a waste of Federal tax dollars and should either be dropped or performed every 5 years.

*Service Response:* Our long-term objectives continue to include providing opportunities to harvest portions of certain migratory game bird populations and to limit harvests to levels

compatible with each population's ability to maintain healthy, viable numbers. Harvest surveys are an important component used in determining migratory bird distribution, abundance, economic value, breeding habits, and times and lines of flight of migratory birds. Information from harvest surveys are integral in establishing hunting seasons that are compatible with the current status of migratory bird populations and long-term population goals. As such, we continue to seek new ways to improve our surveys. The commenter did not address the collection requirements, and we did not make any changes to the surveys.

In addition to the Federal Register notice, we contacted the following individuals who participate in our surveys and asked them four questions about this information collection. Six hunters were selected if they called, wrote, or emailed us in mid-October (to request more survey materials, ask a question, or provide a comment), and provided an email address or phone number for contact. We also queried three professional biologists who had been randomly selected to participate in the surveys, to ensure that that the migratory bird management community was included in this scoping process.

Brad Bales 503-544-7980	John Hanks 318-376-9181	Brent West 301-491-2750
Bill Lesch beartooth56@yahoo.com	Ryan Kabelowsky 920-901-6961	Will Greer 864-431-4487
Donny Browning 846-607-7412	Joel Saiki 507-381-9876	Stephen Soukup 620-241-7069

**Is the collection of the information necessary? Does the information have practical utility?** All hunters said the information was necessary for sound waterfowl management.

**How accurate is our estimate of how long it takes you to fill out the survey?** Four respondents said it is accurate, and five said it is probably too high.

*Service response:* Individuals take different amounts of time to fill out forms, and we think it is appropriate to err on the high side for purposes of this OMB approval.

**Can you suggest any ways to enhance quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected?** Suggestions were: try to get large vendors like WalMart & BassPro to accurately register hunters for the HIP program, and do not ask for time of harvest on the wing envelopes if it is not used in analyses.

*Service response:* We are working with the 49 State natural resource agencies to help them identify and address problems with HIP compliance at the local level. Time of harvest has been used periodically by the Service and States to help assess the impacts of various hunting regulations, most recently in an evaluation of the Central Flyway “Hunters’ Choice” experiment 2006-2008.

**Can you suggest any ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on hunters chosen for the survey?** Suggestions were: make sure hunters get additional envelopes in a timely fashion, give new hunters as many envelopes as they request when they enter the survey (was capped at 30/hunter), investigate using Tyvek wing envelopes to minimize blood seepage, allow hunters to send in an entire day’s harvest in a single envelope, and do not ask for time of harvest if it is not used in analyses.

*Service response:* In response to comments from hunters in the survey, we now fill envelope requests daily, and we have changed our mailing protocol to send new hunters as many envelopes as they request. We have investigated other materials for wing



mailing envelopes, including Tyvek, but have not made changes because these materials speed up decomposition of wings, which results in more lost data. They also would increase the annual cost of survey materials by an estimated \$30,000/year (these envelopes cost \$340/1,000, while paper envelopes cost \$180/1,000). We request hunters to send one wing in each envelope, because putting more than one wing in an envelope increases the chance of decomposition and also creates bulkier packages of inconsistent size that are problematic for the U.S. Postal Service to process. We continue to work with the U.S. Postal Service to ensure that wing packages meet current standards for health and safety and do not cause undue work for postal handlers. Time of harvest has been used periodically by the Service and States to help assess the impacts of various hunting regulations, most recently in an evaluation of the Central Flyway "Hunters' Choice" experiment 2006-2008. We have not formally used time of harvest in at least 10 years. Historically, these data were used to determine if it was appropriate to allow States to extend their shooting hours to allow hunting before and after sunrise. Currently, a State that wishes to extend shooting hours performs field studies to assess the impact. This is generally believed to provide more reliable data, but is also more labor intensive for the States. We are not likely to use time of harvest data in the near future. However, some States have requested that we collect the information. They most likely use these data to help refine their hunting regulations. We will work with the States to determine if we need to continue to collect the data.

The surveys were initially designed in consultation with experts in statistics, survey design and implementation, and natural resource management, including Dr. Donald A. Dillman, WA State University; Stephen L. Sheriff, MO Department of Conservation; Dr. Vernon L. Wright, LA State University; Dr. Kenneth H. Pollock, NC State University; and Dr. Paul H. Geissler, US Geological Survey (retired). We continue to review surveys to maintain and improve statistical methodology. Currently, we contract with Dr. David L. Otis (sitohome@gmail.com), USGS (retired) to undertake a review of the efficacy of stratification, nonresponse bias, and missing or incomplete sample frame. This review is being conducted with the support and funding of the AFWA Migratory Shore and Upland Game Bird Working Group.

Meetings and workshops are held several times annually between Service and State personnel responsible for management of migratory birds, at which time problems and needs related to harvest surveys are discussed and acted upon. The Service has representatives to each of the four flyways (groups of States) to coordinate migratory bird management with State biologists.

We are working with all 49 State natural resource agencies to review the Harvest Information Program (HIP) registration program, including data collection and transfer, through the Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (AFWA). This review was initiated by AFWA in March 2013. The State agencies and the Service agree that we need to conduct a national survey of migratory bird hunters to monitor harvest consistently across the United States. Through this review, we will suggest modifications to the program to make it more effective and efficient. One of the topics we are discussing is collection and transfer of HIP registrations. A copy of the most recent report is attached as a supplementary document.

**9. Explain any decision to provide any payment or gift to respondents, other than remuneration of contractors or grantees.**

No payments or gifts are provided to respondents. As incentive, we provide participants in the Parts Collection Survey with a report at the end of the hunting season. This report lists the species, age, and sex of each wing that hunter submitted during the past hunting season.

**10. Describe any assurance of confidentiality provided to respondents and the basis for**

**the assurance in statute, regulation, or agency policy.**

Each hunter contacted receives an assurance that the survey is conducted in accordance with the Privacy Act of 1974 (5 USC 552a). Hunters are not asked to write their names on the questionnaires, and are assured that their names or identifications will not be associated with their questionnaires. A system of records, titled Migratory Bird Population and Harvest Surveys – Interior, FWS-26, was published in 46 FR 18378. This is being updated in collaboration with our Privacy Act Officer..

We contract out the printing of some of the survey materials. Contracting is completed through the Government Printing Office (GPO), and all contractors must meet Privacy Act guidelines. Our GPO officer is Bob Stanley ([rstanley@gpo.gov](mailto:rstanley@gpo.gov), 303-236-5292 #3).

**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.

**12. Provide estimates of the hour burden of the collection of information.**

We estimate that we will receive 227,586 responses totaling 144,021 annual burden hours for this information collection. The total dollar value of the annual burden hours is approximately \$5,785,770 (rounded). We used the Bureau of Labor Statistics news release USDL 14-0390, March 12, 2014, Employer Costs for Employee Compensation—December 2013, to estimate average hourly wages and calculate benefits.

- Individuals - We used the wage and salary costs for all workers from Table 1 (\$21.77) and multiplied by 1.4 to calculate benefits, resulting in an hourly rate of \$30.48.
- State Government - We used the wage and salary costs for all workers from Table 3 (\$27.65) and multiplied by 1.5 to calculate benefits, resulting in an hourly rate of \$41.48.

COLLECTION TYPE/FORM NUMBER	NO. OF RESPONDENTS	NO. OF ANNUAL RESPONSES	AVG. BURDEN PER RESPONSE	TOTAL ANNUAL BURDEN HOURS	COST PER HOUR (INCLUDING BENEFITS)	TOTAL ANNUAL DOLLAR VALUE OF BURDEN HOURS
<b>Migratory Bird Harvest Information Program</b>	49	686	185 hours	126,910	\$41.48	\$5,264,226.80
<b>Migratory Bird Hunter Survey</b>						
Form 3-2056J	37,100	37,100	5 minutes	3,092	\$30.48	\$94,244.16
Form 3-2056K	23,100	23,100	4 minutes	1,540	\$30.48	\$46,939.20
Form 3-2056L	11,700	11,700	4 minutes	780	\$30.48	\$23,774.40
Form 3-2056M	12,300	12,300	3 minutes	615	\$30.48	\$18,745.20
Subtotal	84,200	84,200		6,027	\$30.48	\$183,702.96
<b>Parts Collection Survey</b>						

Form 3-165	6,500	117,000	5 minutes	9,750	\$30.48	\$282,457.50
Form 3-165A	6,000	6,000	1 minute	100	\$30.48	\$3,048.00
Form 3-165B	3,000	4,500	5 minutes	375	\$30.48	\$11,430.00
Form 3-165C	400	400	1 minute	7	\$30.48	\$213.36
Form 3-165D	2,600	2,600	1 minute	43	\$30.48	\$1,310.64
Form 3-165E	2,600	3,900	5 minutes	325	\$30.48	\$9,906.00
Subtotal	21,100	134,400		10,600	\$30.48	\$323,088.00
<b>Sandhill Crane Harvest Survey</b>						
Form 3-2056N	8,300	8,300	3.5 minutes	484	\$30.48	\$14,752.32
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>113,649</b>	<b>227,586</b>		<b>144,021</b>		<b>\$5,785,770.08</b>

**13. Provide an estimate of the total annual [nonhour] cost burden to respondents or recordkeepers resulting from the collection of information.**

The survey is accompanied by a postage paid return envelope. There is no nonhour dollar cost burden to respondents. There is no fee for completing the survey or any other costs associated with responding to this survey.

**14. Provide estimates of annualized costs to the Federal Government.**

The total estimated cost for this Information Collection Request to the Federal Government is \$1,905,700/year (see Attachment A). This is based on operating costs (printing and mailing survey forms, packing and mailing wing envelopes, processing incoming data, producing reports, coordinating with state agency partners, and implementing modernizations). Staff grades range from GS-05 step 9 survey clerks (\$43,597/year) to GS-14 step 3 Branch Chief (\$113,346/year). We used Office of Personnel Management Salary Table 2014-DCB ([https://www.opm.gov/policy-data-oversight/pay-leave/salaries-wages/salary-tables/pdf/2014/DCB\\_h.pdf](https://www.opm.gov/policy-data-oversight/pay-leave/salaries-wages/salary-tables/pdf/2014/DCB_h.pdf)) to determine the hourly wages and multiplied the hourly wage by 1.5 to account for benefits in accordance with BLS news release USDL 14-0390. Most work is done from the Patuxent Wildlife Research Center in Laurel, MD so the DC area salary table was used.

**15. Explain the reasons for any program changes or adjustments in hour or cost burden.**

There are no program changes or adjustments.

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

Plans are to continue the Migratory Bird Harvest Surveys annually as long as migratory bird hunting seasons are opened in the U.S.

**Schedule for Migratory Bird Harvest Information Program:** The schedule for the Migratory Bird Harvest Information Program varies among States and is dependent upon the license structure used in that State. States have differing hunting license structures, including license that are valid from 1 January-31 December, 1 September-31 August, 1 April – 31 March, and 365-days from date of purchase. These data are generally sent from August-February, but some States send data year-round. Migratory bird hunter names and addresses are received from the States, either in the form of electronic databases or on paper forms from which the data are

compiled in a database.

### **Schedule for the Migratory Bird Hunter Survey**

- Sep-Feb Sampled migratory bird hunters are sent questionnaires asking them to keep track of their hunting trips throughout the hunting season and return the form when they have completed their hunting season.
- Dec-Apr Following a staggered schedule based on the closing date of the hunting season in each State, sampled hunters who have not returned questionnaires are sent reminder letters and replacement questionnaire forms. Responses are accepted until the end of April.
- Apr-May Response data are edited, compiled in a database, and analyzed.
- Jun-Jul The report on non-waterfowl species must be prepared and distributed by early June, in time for the public meeting on hunting regulations for those species and publication in the Federal Register and various status reports. The report on waterfowl must be prepared and distributed by early July, in time for the public meeting on waterfowl hunting regulations and publication in the Federal Register. The complete harvest report is distributed both internally and externally and made available on our website:  
<http://www.fws.gov/migratorybirds/NewReportsPublications/HIP/hip.htm>

### **Schedule for the Parts Collection Survey**

- Jun Postcards soliciting participation in the survey are mailed to the public from the Service in Laurel, Maryland. Respondents return the postcard to the Service in Laurel, Maryland. Names and addresses of respondents are compiled in a database.
- Jul-Aug Employees prepare the parts envelopes for mailing.
- Aug-Oct Because they must be in the possession of survey participants at the start of the hunting season, parts envelopes are sent to participants about 2 weeks before the hunting season begins in each State. Hunting seasons open as early as September 1 in many States, and as late as early November.
- Sep-Mar Hunters mail parts to collection points in each Flyway throughout the hunting season, which continues to mid-March in some States.
- Nov-May Federal and State biologists assemble at one of six collection points to identify the species, age, and sex of each part between late November and mid-March. Late arriving parts are sent to Laurel in early April and identified there. Parts are accepted until May.
- Feb-May Completed data slips (form #s) are shipped to Laurel, where the data are compiled in a database. Data are analyzed in combination with information derived from the Migratory Bird Hunter Survey to generate species-specific estimates of harvest.

Jun-Jul The report on non-waterfowl species must be prepared and distributed by early June, in time for the public meeting on hunting regulations for those species and publication in the Federal Register and various status reports. The report on waterfowl must be prepared and distributed by early July, in time for the public meeting on waterfowl hunting regulations and publication in the Federal Register.

The complete harvest report is distributed both internally and externally and made available on our website at

<http://www.fws.gov/migratorybirds/NewReportsPublications/HIP/hip.htm>

**Schedule for Sandhill Crane Harvest Survey:** In all States but Alaska, participating States issue permits to sandhill crane hunters in mid-July. Electronic or paper copies of issued permits (showing names and addresses of permittees) are sent to the Division of Migratory Bird Management, Laurel, Maryland, following the end of the crane hunting season in each State. Upon receipt of name and address cards, computer records of each name/address are produced, hunters are selected, and surveys are mailed. These questionnaires are mailed to permittees approximately 2 weeks after the close of the respective hunting seasons. A follow-up questionnaire is mailed to nonrespondents approximately 1 month later. In recent years, the latest crane season has closed in early February. Thus distribution of follow-up forms is completed in early April and the analysis of data commences about early May. The sample frame for the estimating sandhill crane harvest from Alaska is provided from the Migratory Bird Harvest Information Program. Survey procedures are the same as for the other States, except that the survey can be sent out before the close of the sandhill crane hunting season because of earlier receipt of sample frame information. An annual report is available by August on our website:

<http://www.fws.gov/migratorybirds/NewReportsPublications/HIP/hip.htm>

**17. If seeking approval to not display the expiration date for OMB approval of the information collection, explain the reasons that display would be inappropriate.**

We will display the OMB approval expiration date on the survey forms.

**18. Explain each exception to the certification statement.**

There are no exceptions to the certification statement.