

**1SUPPORTING STATEMENT  
GREATER ATLANTIC REGION SURFLAM/OCEAN QUAHOG ITQ  
ADMINISTRATION  
OMB CONTROL NO. 0648-0240**

**A. JUSTIFICATION**

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

The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's (NOAA) National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) is requesting an extension of OMB Control No. 0648-0240, to continue management of the Atlantic Surfclam and Ocean Quahog Fishery Management Plan (FMP) developed under the authority of the [Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act](#) (16 U.S.C. 1801 *et seq*, Section 303). This extension would enable NMFS to continue to collect information necessary for the management of the individual transferable quota (ITQ) program.

**Individual transferable quota (ITQ)**

Amendment 8 to the Atlantic Surfclam and Ocean Quahog Fishery Management Plan became effective September 30, 1990. The amendment provided for ITQs by species (surfclam or ocean quahog) for individuals who were qualified to receive an ITQ for either or both species. ITQs were issued in September 1990 to individual owners, based on their percentage share of the annual allowed quota for harvest.

Allocations are expressed in terms of bushels, but tracked and transferred in terms of the cages in which harvested product is landed and shipped (a cage contains 32 bushels of product). To facilitate enforcement and tracking, sequentially numbered tags are issued to each owner on an annual basis and all cages of product must be tagged, with tag use reported by both the harvesting vessel and the purchasing dealer. Each allocation holder must renew a surfclam/ocean quahog ITQ permit each year, which specifies the amount of their allocation and the tag numbers they are required to use during the harvest of their allocation. Individual allocations are transferable per regulations found at 50 CFR 648.74(b). Owners may transfer their allocation on a permanent basis or may transfer tags to other vessel owners to use on a temporary (annual) basis. This transferability means that the allocation ownership frequently changes.

The surfclam/ocean quahog ITQ permit must be renewed annually, along with the completion of an ITQ ownership form (see Question 2). This is necessary to ensure that the information NMFS collects about allocation holders stays up-to-date. In addition to a surfclam/ocean quahog ITQ permit application form, allocation holders need to submit a surfclam/ocean quahog ITQ ownership form. Both of these forms are necessary to ensure that permit holders are qualified to hold ITQ and to identify the individual owners of entities that hold ITQ allocation. To renew an ITQ permit the applicant needs to review a pre-filled form, and verify the information is still accurate.

The application to transfer ITQ form is required by NMFS to process and register all ITQ transactions. Information required on the transfer form includes ITQ permit holder name, allocation number (assigned by NMFS for internal tracking), and the numbers of tags associated with the transfer. The form includes questions to collect the price paid and any broker fees, whether the transfer is part of a long-term contract, and any other conditions placed on the transfer. This additional information is required to understand the potential control of ITQ allocation that might be subject to an excessive shares cap. ITQ permit and ownership form requirements at § 648.74(a) were implemented by a final rule published on July 20, 2015 (80 FR 42747), and will become effective on January 1, 2016.

### **Shucking clams at sea**

Because of potential difficulties in disposing of clam shells on shore, Amendment 8 allowed for the Regional Administrator to approve requests to shuck product at sea. However, because of the difficulties involved in converting the volume of shucked clam meats to bushels, the regulations allow shucking at sea only if the vessel carries a NMFS-approved observer. The observer is necessary to certify the amount, in bushels, of unshucked product that the vessel has processed at sea. The regulations authorizing this collection are found at 50 CFR 648.75.

### **Reopened Portion of the Georges Bank (GB) Closed Area**

The GB Closed Area has been closed to the harvest of surfclams and ocean quahogs since 1990 due to red tide blooms that cause paralytic shellfish poisoning (PSP). The closure was implemented based on advice from the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA), after samples tested positive for toxins that cause PSP. Shellfish contaminated with the toxin, if eaten in large enough quantity, can cause illness or death in humans.

Due to inadequate testing or monitoring of this area for the presence of PSP-causing toxins, the closure was made permanent in 1999. NMFS has issued exempted fishing permits (EFPs) since 2008 to surfclam and ocean quahog vessels to conduct research in the closure area. Testing of clams on GB by the FDA in cooperation with NMFS and the fishing industry under the EFPs demonstrate that PSP toxin levels have been well below the regulatory limit established for public health safety. The FDA, the industry, and NMFS also developed a Protocol for Onboard Screening and Dockside Testing in Molluscan Shellfish that is designed to test and verify that clams harvested from the GB continue to be safe. The protocol was formally adopted into the National Shellfish Sanitation Program (NSSP) at the October 2011 Interstate Shellfish Sanitation Conference (ISSC).

In 2013, NMFS reopened a portion of the existing GB Closed Area for the harvest of surfclams and ocean quahogs at the request of the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council and the industry. The reopening is based upon the recent adoption of the protocol and the regulatory authority of the NMFS Greater Atlantic Regional Fisheries Office Regional Administrator to impose harvest restrictions when considering reopening PSP closures. Now that the protocol has been formally adopted, NMFS reopened a portion of the GB Closed Area with the requirement that the protocol be used on all trips into the area. The protocol is necessary to ensure shellfish harvested are safe for human consumption.

**2. Explain how, by whom, how frequently, and for what purpose the information will be used.**

**ITQ permit application form**

In order to receive cage tags, an entity needs to have a valid ITQ permit. This application form collects standard contact information (name, address, telephone number, email, date of birth, or taxpayer identification number for businesses, and fishing vessel) as well as verification that the entity is eligible to own a documented vessel under the terms of 46 U.S.C. 12103(b), General Eligibility Requirements. This section of the United States Code outlines the U.S. citizenship requirements for owning a vessel that has been issued a certificate of documentation by the United States Coast Guard (USCG). Because the ITQ program conveys certain rights over a natural resource of the U.S., it is required that the allocation owner meet the same citizenship requirements as that required to document a fishing vessel. This requirement is authorized at 50 CFR 648.74(b)(1). If the entity is renewing an existing ITQ permit, the form will be auto-populated with the information NMFS has on file. The applicant will then just need to review the information to ensure it is still accurate, sign the form, and submit it to NMFS in order for the permit to be renewed.

**ITQ ownership form**

The information on the ITQ ownership form is used by NMFS to identify individuals who may hold ITQ allocation through multiple businesses or through members of their immediate family. This is necessary in order to determine the current level of potential control any single person or entity can exert on the fishery. Some allocations are held by banks, which have taken possession of the quota share as collateral on a loan. The form includes questions to identify when a bank holds quota share, but does not control how the cage tags are used. In these cases, the detailed ownership information will be collected from the borrower rather than from the bank. Like the ITQ permit application, this form needs to be submitted annually, but after the first year the applicant will only have to identify changes from the information previously submitted. Signatures are required to ensure that the information is complete and accurate. This information is necessary for NMFS to identify and track individuals who hold an exclusive privilege to harvest a natural resource. The information will also be used by the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council for the development and monitoring of an excessive share cap in this fishery. The Magnuson-Stevens Act requires the Council to set an excessive share cap.

**ITQ transfer form**

The information on the ITQ transfer form is used by NMFS to maintain a proper accounting of an individual or corporation's quota share. Specific questions on the form include the type of transfer requested (permanent or temporary), the name and ITQ allocation numbers of the transferor and the transferee, and the cage tags requested to be transferred. These data fields are necessary in order to identify the companies or individuals and ITQ tags involved in the transaction. Both parties involved in the transfer, or their authorized agents, are required to sign the form.

This form includes additional questions to determine how much was paid for the transfer, whether the transfer is part of a long-term contract, and any other conditions that have been placed on the transfer. This information is needed to accurately track how allocation is controlled in these fisheries. This information is necessary for use by the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council for the development and monitoring of an excessive share cap in this fishery.

### **Shucking clams at sea**

The information contained in the application to shuck product at sea is used by the NMFS to evaluate if the process used to shuck at sea allows for the proper accounting of the harvest in terms of unshucked bushels, which is the measure used to monitor the quota. The NMFS-approved observer is necessary to certify the information reported in the vessel's shellfish logbook. Information requested includes the applicant's contact information (name, address, and ITQ allocation number), specifications of the harvesting vessel, and accommodations for the observer. Specifications on the harvesting vessel and the harvesting process are required in order to evaluate if the operations facilitate the proper accounting of harvested unshucked product. As mentioned previously, the quotas are monitored and enforced using unshucked bushels. Thus any authorization to deviate from this method of accounting needs to be thoroughly evaluated. Since a NMFS-approved observer is required to certify the vessel's shellfish logbook, NMFS requires that suitable accommodations for the observer are available on the vessel.

### **Reopened Portion of the GB Closed Area**

The results from the testing protocol will be used regularly by a number of entities including the harvesters, the FDA, laboratories, seafood dealers, the State Shellfish Control Authority (SSCA) in the state of landing, and possibly the general public as well to assist with the coordination, testing, and monitoring of shellfish harvested from the reopened area. Although a number of entities may use the information, they will all essentially be utilizing the data for the same purpose: to determine if shellfish harvested are safe for human consumption. Secondly, data obtained from test results may also be archived and further analyzed to assist in determining if additional areas are suitable for reopening or if there should be additional closures. The following information is required under the protocol (detailed instructions available at [www.greateratlantic.fisheries.noaa.gov/sfd/clams/ApprovedProtocol.pdf](http://www.greateratlantic.fisheries.noaa.gov/sfd/clams/ApprovedProtocol.pdf)) :

- Submission of concurrence from state of landing;
- Maintenance and submission of harvest records;
- Compilation and submission of laboratory test results;
- Creation and maintenance of a written onboard lot segregation plan; and
- Provision of notification prior to unloading.

NMFS retains control over the information and safeguards 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. Although the information collected is not expected to

be disseminated directly to the public, results may be used in scientific, management, technical, or general informational publications. Should NMFS decide to disseminate the information, it will be subject to the quality control measures and 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 ITQ permit application, ITQ ownership form, application to shuck at sea, and ITQ transfer form will all be available online in a fillable and printable version through the NMFS forms portal at <http://www.greateratlantic.fisheries.noaa.gov/aps/forms.html>.

Because the ITQ transfer form is used to transfer a privilege, NOAA General Counsel has previously required a hard copy of the ITQ Transfer form with an original signature. However, General Counsel has recently revised this decision and has now determined that a unique electronic password and pin are also acceptable forms of verification in lieu of original signatures. NMFS is currently working to allow ITQ permit applications, ITQ ownership forms, and ITQ transfer forms to be completed and submitted electronically through our existing Fish-on-Line web application. This web-based application is currently used in the Greater Atlantic Region for similar leasing programs in other fisheries.

The method of transmitting the collection of information requirements in the protocol is not specifically outlined. The protocol was developed primarily by the industry, the FDA, and the SSCA and was approved by the NSSP at the ISSC. NMFS adopted the protocol as it was approved. Therefore, it is not NMFS's position to further dictate the terms and conditions of the protocol including the methods of transmission outside of what is in the currently approved protocol. Therefore, the method of submission will be worked out by the industry, the FDA, and the SSCA. NMFS is only concerned that the protocol is followed; hence the method of submission will be largely up to the industry's discretion. Due to the nature of the requirements in the protocol, it is likely that the majority of the requirements will need to be completed in writing and submitted as such, however it is not required to be hand written and, therefore, could be hand written or could be completed and submitted through a computer. The notification requirement only requires that a notification be made, and, therefore, it is likely electronic means will be used such as cellular phone or via shipboard electronic equipment such as VHF radio, email, or the vessel's vessel monitoring system.

A copy of the protocol was mailed to all Atlantic surfclam and ocean quahog permit holders. A copy of the protocol is also available online at <http://www.greateratlantic.fisheries.noaa.gov/sfd/clams/ApprovedProtocol.pdf>.

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

The information requested is unique to this fishery; thus, there is no duplication of items in this collection with other collections. Because NMFS is the lead agency implementing the

Magnuson-Stevens Act, NMFS is very aware of all information collections required from fishermen.

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

Small businesses are the primary respondents of the data collection. The forms used to gather the required information are designed to be simple and easy to complete, thus saving time for both the respondents and managers of the system. The ability to make timely transfers gives these businesses the flexibility to make rational business decisions. Once the ITQ permit application and the ITQ ownership form have been completed, the allocation holder will only need to verify that the information is still accurate in order to renew their ITQ permit. This will save the applicants time and effort in completing the forms.

The application to shuck product at sea is required only if the entity wishes to shuck product at sea. The authorization to shuck at sea is valid for one year.

Vessels are required to follow the protocol only if they wish to fish in the reopened portion of the GB Closed Area. The protocol was developed by the industry and NMFS did not add any additional reporting requirements that would further increase burden.

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

The ITQ permit application and ownership form must be submitted annually to issue the ITQ permit. For the ITQ transfer form, the frequency of submission is dependent upon how often the allocation holder desires to transfer quota. If these information collections were not conducted, NMFS could not properly monitor and enforce the quota restrictions in the Atlantic surfclam and ocean quahog ITQ program. If the additional ownership data collected through the ITQ ownership form and the ITQ transfer form were not collected the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council would not be able to properly assess the need and impact of a future excessive shares cap that is required by law. If the application and the requirement to carry an observer for operations where product is shucked at sea were removed, then a means to verify the quantity of product harvested by the vessel would not exist. The consequences from the removal of any of these information collections would compromise the ability of NMFS to conserve and manage the resource.

If the collection is not conducted under the protocol, shellfish harvested from the reopened portion of the GB Closed Area would not be adequately monitored and screened for PSP. This could potentially result in toxic shellfish being released to the public for human consumption. This could be harmful to public health as well as it would likely result in long term damage to the industry as the public may purchase and consume less shellfish products if incidences of illness increase as a result of consuming shellfish.

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

This information 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.**

The ITQ management system was developed under the Magnuson-Stevens Act, and was the subject of extensive public hearing and public comment. As the ITQ management system has evolved operationally, comment has been obtained on an ongoing basis through the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council's Industry Advisors and Surfclam/Ocean Quahog Subcommittee.

Prior to this extension, the most recent revision to this collection was associated with a proposed rule in the *Federal Register* on August 7, 2014, and accepted public comments until September 8, 2014. After the comment period closed, the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council requested that we reopen the comment period to allow for additional public comment to be submitted after the proposed action was discussed at a Council meeting. In response, we published an announcement in the *Federal Register* on October 2, 2014, that the comment period was reopened until October 17, 2014. Altogether, we received comments from 23 individuals. Nearly all of the comments received were from the surfclam and ocean quahog industry including dealers, processors, harvesters, and surfclam and ocean quahog consumer product producers and manufacturers. Those comments were addressed in the final rule published on July 20, 2015 (80 FR 42747), and in the associated PRA approval submission.

A notice was published in the *Federal Register* on August 10, 2015 (80 FR 47910), to solicit public comment on the extension of this information collection. Announcements of this public comment period were widely distributed through the Regional Office's constituent email list, an online posting on the regional office's website (<http://www.greateratlantic.fisheries.noaa.gov/regs/2015/August/15clamitqpranotice.pdf>), and at the August (<http://www.mafmc.org/briefing/august-2015>, audio at 00:04:13 of organizational reports webinar recording) and October (<http://www.mafmc.org/briefing/october-2015>, audio at 00:02:10 of organizational reports webinar recording) meetings of the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council. Eight comments were submitted, of which four were identical save for the signatures. All of the comments received were from representatives of the clam industry, and made the same points based on their continued opposition to the changes implemented by the July 20, 2015, final rule. The public comments and our responses are summarized below.

*Comment 1:* Commenters expressed concern that an excessive share cap is not necessary for these fisheries, and, therefore, there is no reason to collect additional information to help determine such caps.

*Response:* Two sections of the Magnuson-Stevens Act address the need to prevent an individual or corporation from acquiring an excessive share of fishing privileges, National Standard 4 and

Section 303A(c)(5)(D). Amendment 8 to the Atlantic Surfclam and Ocean Quahog FMP, which established the ITQ fishery in 1990, cited existing anti-trust laws as being sufficient to meet the requirements of National Standard 4, “that no particular individual, corporation, or other entity acquires an excessive share of such privileges.” Section 303A was added to the Magnuson-Stevens Act by the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Reauthorization Act of 2006. This section contains provisions and requirements for Limited Access Privilege Programs (LAPPS), which include ITQ programs. These added provisions include § 303A(c)(5)(D)(i), which requires LAPPs to ensure limited access privilege holders do not acquire an excessive share of the total limited access privileges in the program, by “establishing a maximum share, expressed as a percentage of the total limited access privileges, that a limited access privilege holder is permitted to hold, acquire, or use.” Because the FMP does not currently include an excessive share cap expressed as a percentage of the total allocated quota, it is out of compliance with this provision of the Magnuson-Stevens Act.

This information collection program is an important part of the Council’s efforts to establish a cap that meets this requirement. See the response to Comment 2 for additional rationale for why this information collection is necessary.

*Comment 2:* Commenters expressed concern that we are generally collecting too much information and that it is not necessary or applicable in helping determine excessive shares. These comments expressed concern that we should not collect this information because it involves business transactions that should be confidential.

*Response:* We understand that this information collection includes more specific detail than is collected in other fisheries in the region. However, prior reports and analyses for these fisheries suggest this information is necessary and appropriate to determine current ownership and control of allocations in these fisheries. In the surfclam and ocean quahog fisheries there is a series of complex corporate and business relationships involving control of quota shares. A 2002 GAO report on this ITQ program suggested that NMFS did not gather sufficient ownership information to appropriately characterize the amount of consolidation in the fishery. In 2011, NMFS and the MAFMC contracted an economic consulting firm to examine and report on potential excessive share caps in this fishery (Mitchell, Peterson and Willig. *Recommendations for Excessive Share Limits in the SCOQ Fisheries*. May 3, 2011), and subsequently convened a panel of independent reviewers to evaluate the report (*Summary of Findings by the Center for Independent Experts Regarding Setting Excessive Share Limits for ITQ Fisheries*; [www.nefsc.noaa.gov/publications/crd/crd1122/](http://www.nefsc.noaa.gov/publications/crd/crd1122/)). In a series of public meetings, a special Council workgroup met and considered the recommendations of these reports, reviewed how ownership information is collected in other fisheries around the country, reviewed the information currently collected in this fishery, and then devised a suite of data elements that would provide the information the Council would need when developing an excessive shares cap. These recommendations were detailed in a white paper that was considered and approved by the Council. Without the additional information this action will collect, the Council may not have the information necessary to make informed decisions on excessive share caps. When the Council ultimately establishes an excessive shares cap, it is possible that not all of these data elements will be necessary to effectively monitor the cap. At that time, this collection will be



reevaluated, and data elements may be added, removed, or modified to address the specific information needed to monitor the cap.

We agree that some business transactions are confidential. Pursuant to section 402(b) of the Magnuson-Stevens Act, information submitted in compliance with the Act is confidential, and would not be distributed or made publicly available. These confidentiality requirements of the Magnuson-Stevens Act apply to information collected as a result of this action. Therefore, the collected information may be used to conduct analysis by NMFS, or Council staff members who are subject to confidentiality agreements. Results of this analysis could only be presented in an aggregate form, which protects any confidential information.

*Comment 4:* The commenters opposed the fact that we did not heed a motion approved at the October 2014 Council meeting to request we remove much of the information to be collected on the ITQ transfer form.

*Response:* In the July 20, 2015, final rule we explained that while the motion was supported by a majority of the Council members present, the vote was not unanimous and there were members who expressed a strong interest in having this information available when they consider an excessive shares cap. Removing these fields from the ITQ transfer form would be contrary to the recommendations in the white paper prepared by the Council's special workgroup and the 2011 report *Economic Guidelines for Excessive Share Limits in the Surfclam and Ocean Quahog Fisheries*. Currently, no information is collected on the financial aspects of allocation transfers in the surfclam and ocean quahog ITQ fishery. Similar programs around the country routinely collect information about the price paid for allocation. This information can provide valuable insight into the market for quota or long-term contracts and agreements that would not otherwise be apparent. These additional details about transfers can illuminate situations where individuals or companies exert effective control over ITQ allocation, even if they do not directly hold the quota share. Under section 402(a) of the Magnuson-Stevens Act, the Secretary of Commerce has the authority to implement an information collection program that she deems necessary for developing, implementing, or revising a fishery management plan, either at the recommendation of a council or under her own volition.

As mentioned above in the response to Comment 2, we anticipate that the specific data elements will be reevaluated and revised when an excessive share cap is implemented. For these reasons, we continue to support the inclusion of all of the proposed elements of this information collection program, at least for the short term. Therefore, this action implements the ITQ transfer form as described in the proposed rule.

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

No payments or gifts are made.

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

The NMFS General Counsel has ruled that allocation information is public information because the ITQ system assigns shares of a public resource to the allocation holders. Industry participants are well aware of this fact, and they are among the primary requesters of this information as they seek to transfer or obtain allocation.

The information submitted under the PSP testing protocol is also public as it is distributed to state and other Federal agencies with the intent of making it publicly available for analysis. It is in fact beneficial to make this information available to the public as it displays that the product being harvested is safe for human consumption and could potentially lead to other areas being reopened for shellfish harvesting.

The respondents are aware that the data collected with the testing protocol is not confidential, and is available to the public. The industry was involved in developing the protocol, and they know that having the information publicly available for use by the FDA is essential to continuing to monitor the area, in order to ensure shellfish harvested are safe for human consumption. It is in fact advantageous for the industry to make this information publicly available so the public is informed that shellfish harvested are safe for consumption, allowing the industry to maintain the Atlantic surfclam and ocean quahog markets.

Otherwise, as stated on the forms, information submitted to NMFS by any person in compliance with this information collection is confidential pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 1881a.

**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.**

Table 1 below summarizes the burden hours estimated for this collection. From 2011 to 2013, the average annual number of ITQ allocation holders that either held ITQ quota share or participated in an ITQ transfer was 189. Each ITQ permit application form is estimated to take 5 minutes to complete. **Therefore, the annual burden for the ITQ permit application is 16 hours.** Each ITQ ownership form is estimated to take 1 hour to complete for new entrants and 5 minutes when pre-filled in for renewing entities. All 189 ITQ permit holders will need to fill out the ownership form the first year this form is used. After the first year, most respondents are expected to renew an existing ITQ permit and will not need to complete the full ownership form. Between 2011 and 2013, an average of 12 new entities obtained an ITQ permit each year. Factoring in the higher initial reporting burden in the first year, with subsequent renewals for most entities and 12 new entrants each year, **the estimated average annual burden over three years for the ITQ ownership form is 81 hours (71 hours for initial form, 10 hours for renewals).** The average annual number of ITQ transfer requests processed by NMFS from 2011

to 2013 was 472. It is estimated that each ITQ transfer form takes approximately 5 minutes to complete, with a **total annual burden of approximately 40 hours**. NMFS did not receive any applications (30 minutes per application) to shuck at sea from 2011 to 2013. The requirements under the protocol are based on the number of vessels that landed surfclams or ocean quahogs and the number of trips taken into the area in 2011, **with a total annual burden of 2,400 hours**. **The total burden for this collection of information is 2,538 hours.**

**Table 1. Cost and Burden Hours**

<b>Information Collection</b>	<b>Number of Respondents</b>	<b>Frequency of Responses</b>	<b>Number of Responses</b>	<b>Average Time per Response</b>	<b>Total Response Time</b>	<b>Cost to Public</b>	<b>Cost to Govt.</b>
ITQ Permit Application <sup>1,2</sup>	189 <sup>2</sup>	1 <sup>2</sup>	189	5 minutes	16 hours	\$93	\$400
ITQ Ownership Form-New Entrant <sup>2</sup>	71 <sup>2</sup>	1 <sup>2</sup>	71	60 minutes	71 hours	\$35	\$1,775
ITQ Ownership Form-Renewal <sup>1,2</sup>	118 <sup>2</sup>	1 <sup>2</sup>	118	5 minutes	10 hours	\$58	\$250
ITQ Transfer Form <sup>1,2,3</sup>	174 <sup>2</sup>	5 <sup>2</sup>	472	5 minutes	40 hours	\$231	\$1,000
Shuck-at-Sea Application <sup>1</sup>	1	1	1	30 minutes	30 minutes (1 hr)	\$109,200	\$25
Protocol - Submission of concurrence from state of landing	11	1	11	60 minutes	11 hours	\$6	\$25
Protocol - Maintain and submit harvest records	47	46 <sup>5</sup>	2,162	30 minutes	1,081 hours	\$1,059	0
Protocol - Compile and submit laboratory test results	47	46 <sup>5</sup>	2,162	30 minutes	1,081 hours	\$1,059	0
Protocol - Create and maintain a written onboard lot segregation plan	47	1	47	60 minutes	47 hours	\$23	\$100
Protocol - Provide notification prior to unloading	47	46 <sup>5</sup>	2,162	5 minutes	180 hours	\$0	\$0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>189</b>		<b>7,395</b>		<b>2,538 hours</b>	<b>\$111,764<sup>4</sup>*</b>	<b>\$3,575</b>
<b>PREVIOUS APPROVAL TOTAL</b>	<b>189</b>		<b>7,395</b>		<b>2,538 hours</b>	<b>\$111,764<sup>4</sup></b>	<b>\$3,575</b>
<b>NET CHANGE</b>	<b>0</b>		<b>0</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

<sup>1</sup>Based on 2011 to 2013 annual averages.

<sup>2</sup>The “Number of Respondents” and “Frequency of Responses” treats each surfclam and ocean quahog ITQ allocation permit as separate and distinct entity. This creates a numerical inconsistency because a single entity can hold both types of ITQ permits.

<sup>3</sup> The total number of entities using the ITQ Transfer Request Forms will always be two, a transferor and a transferee. This causes a numerical inconsistency between the “Number of Respondents” “Frequency of Responses” and “Number of Responses” because entities frequently submit multiple forms as either transferors or transferees.

<sup>4</sup>This cost includes the cost to carry a NMFS-approved observer on board the vessel during trips where product is shucked at sea.

<sup>5</sup>Number of total items based on maximum number of trips per vessel that occurred in the area in 2011.

\*Rounded down to \$111,763 in ROCIS.

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

The annual cost burden of this collection of information is summarized in Table 1.

The cost burden for the ITQ Permit Application, ITQ Ownership Form, ITQ Transfer Form, and the Shuck-at-Sea Application is based on the postage of \$0.49 per first-class stamp. For these 851 responses, the total cost is \$416.99.

The cost to carry an observer as part of the authorization to shuck product at sea is based upon a rate of \$700 per day at sea to carry the observer, for an average of 156 sea days per vessel, or \$109,200.

In regard to the protocol, four of the five elements require document submission, two of which are annual submissions and the other two are required on each trip; the fifth requires no document submission. **Of the 6,544 responses, 4,382 have postage costs in total of \$2,147 (4,382 x \$0.49).** The fifth element, the offload notification requirement, does not impose any additional costs as the notification would be completed through a pre-existing email or cellular phone account and is not required to be submitted in writing.

**This yields an annual cost of approximately \$111,764 for this collection of information.**

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

The annual cost to the Federal government is summarized in Table 1.

The cost to the Federal government to process an ITQ Transfer Form is based on a rate of \$25 per hour and a processing time of 12 transfers per hour. This gives an annual cost of \$1,000. The ITQ permit application is expected to take approximately 5 minutes to process at a rate of \$25 per hour for an annual cost of \$400. The ITQ Ownership form for new entrants is expected to take approximately 20 minutes to process, while processing this form for a renewing applicant is expected to take just 5 minutes. Therefore, at a rate of \$25 per hour, the expected annual cost to the Federal government will be \$2,025. The application to shuck product at sea takes approximately 30 minutes per application to process at a rate of \$25 per hour. This gives an annual cost of \$25. Receiving, reviewing, and filing the written onboard lot segregation plan takes 5 minutes per plan received, for a total of 4 hours of burden to the Federal government, at \$25 an hour for a total of \$100. Receiving and processing the concurrence from the state of landing letter will take 5 minutes, at \$25 hour for a total of \$25. Thus, the total cost to the Federal government for this collection of information is estimated to \$3,575.

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

**Program Changes**

There have been no program changes since the approval of the revision in July 2015.

## **Adjustments**

There have been no adjustments since the approval of the revision in July 2015.

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

The list of quota share holders is posted each year on line. This listing will not contain date of birth or tax identification number, or the information collected through the ITQ Ownership form. The results of this collection will be available to the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council staff for the technical analysis needed to assess the impacts of an excessive shares cap. However, this information will only be available to the public in an aggregated form that preserves confidentiality. A list of permanent and temporary transfers has been posted online in the past for use by the public and may be made available in the future, upon request.

The results collected under the protocol are not planned for publication; however, it is possible that the data may be published in the future in support of scientific research to reopen or close additional areas on GB. Further, NMFS does not own the information collected under the protocol, so we do not have control over how and if information collected under the protocol will 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.**

The expiration date will be displayed for the forms under this collection, with the exception of the protocol. The requirements in the protocol do not include any forms for the information submitted under this requirement. Further, NMFS is also not able to display the expiration number on the protocol itself. The testing protocol was developed by industry and was formally adopted into the NSSP at the ISSC. Therefore, although NMFS requires vessels to follow the terms and conditions of the protocol, the protocol itself and the requirements within it are not maintained by NMFS and it is not NMFS's position to modify the document. Therefore, NMFS will also not be able to display the expiration date on the testing protocol itself. However, an expiration date will be displayed in the bulletin that will be mailed to each permit holder who may be required to report under the terms and conditions of the protocol.

Further, vessels harvesting under the protocol obtain a letter of authorization (LOA) from NMFS. The LOA outlines the harvesting requirements for the reopened area, including the protocol, and by obtaining the LOA, a vessel is acknowledging and agreeing to the terms and conditions of the protocol and the LOA. The LOA is created and issued by NMFS and will therefore include an OMB expiration date. The collection of information requirements for the LOA is part of the 0202 family of forms

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

There are no exceptions.

**B. COLLECTIONS OF INFORMATION EMPLOYING STATISTICAL METHODS**

This collection does not employ statistical methods.