

NOTICE OF OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET ACTION

Diana Hynek 09/18/2003
Departmental Paperwork Clearance Officer
Office of the Chief Information Officer
14th and Constitution Ave. NW.
Room 6625
Washington, DC 20230

In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act, OMB has taken the following action on your request for approval of a new information collection received on 08/18/2003.

TITLE: Southwest Center Fresh-water Salmon and Stellhead Angler Survey

AGENCY FORM NUMBER(S): None

ACTION : APPROVED WITHOUT CHANGE

OMB NO.: 0648-0484

EXPIRATION DATE: 12/31/2004

BURDEN:	RESPONSES	HOURS	COSTS(\$,000)
Previous	0	0	0
New	7,565	430	0
Difference	7,565	430	0
Program Change		430	0
Adjustment		0	0

TERMS OF CLEARANCE: None

OMB Authorizing Official Title

Donald R. Arbuckle Deputy Administrator, Office of
Information and Regulatory Affairs

PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT SUBMISSION

Please read the instructions before completing this form. For additional forms or assistance in completing this form, contact your agency's Paperwork Clearance Officer. Send two copies of this form, the collection instrument to be reviewed, the supporting statement, and any additional documentation to: Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, Docket Library, Room 10102, 725 17th Street NW, Washington, DC 20503.

1. Agency/Subagency originating request	2. OMB control number b. <input type="checkbox"/> None a. _____ - _____
3. Type of information collection (<i>check one</i>) a. <input type="checkbox"/> New Collection b. <input type="checkbox"/> Revision of a currently approved collection c. <input type="checkbox"/> Extension of a currently approved collection d. <input type="checkbox"/> Reinstatement, without change, of a previously approved collection for which approval has expired e. <input type="checkbox"/> Reinstatement, with change, of a previously approved collection for which approval has expired f. <input type="checkbox"/> Existing collection in use without an OMB control number For b-f, note Item A2 of Supporting Statement instructions	4. Type of review requested (<i>check one</i>) a. <input type="checkbox"/> Regular submission b. <input type="checkbox"/> Emergency - Approval requested by _____ / _____ / _____ c. <input type="checkbox"/> Delegated
7. Title	5. Small entities Will this information collection have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
8. Agency form number(s) (<i>if applicable</i>)	6. Requested expiration date a. <input type="checkbox"/> Three years from approval date b. <input type="checkbox"/> Other Specify: _____ / _____
9. Keywords	10. Abstract
11. Affected public (<i>Mark primary with "P" and all others that apply with "x"</i>) a. ___ Individuals or households d. ___ Farms b. ___ Business or other for-profit e. ___ Federal Government c. ___ Not-for-profit institutions f. ___ State, Local or Tribal Government	12. Obligation to respond (<i>check one</i>) a. <input type="checkbox"/> Voluntary b. <input type="checkbox"/> Required to obtain or retain benefits c. <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory
13. Annual recordkeeping and reporting burden a. Number of respondents _____ b. Total annual responses _____ 1. Percentage of these responses collected electronically _____ % c. Total annual hours requested _____ d. Current OMB inventory _____ e. Difference _____ f. Explanation of difference 1. Program change _____ 2. Adjustment _____	14. Annual reporting and recordkeeping cost burden (<i>in thousands of dollars</i>) a. Total annualized capital/startup costs _____ b. Total annual costs (O&M) _____ c. Total annualized cost requested _____ d. Current OMB inventory _____ e. Difference _____ f. Explanation of difference 1. Program change _____ 2. Adjustment _____
15. Purpose of information collection (<i>Mark primary with "P" and all others that apply with "X"</i>) a. ___ Application for benefits e. ___ Program planning or management b. ___ Program evaluation f. ___ Research c. ___ General purpose statistics g. ___ Regulatory or compliance d. ___ Audit	16. Frequency of recordkeeping or reporting (<i>check all that apply</i>) a. <input type="checkbox"/> Recordkeeping b. <input type="checkbox"/> Third party disclosure c. <input type="checkbox"/> Reporting 1. <input type="checkbox"/> On occasion 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Weekly 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Monthly 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Quarterly 5. <input type="checkbox"/> Semi-annually 6. <input type="checkbox"/> Annually 7. <input type="checkbox"/> Biennially 8. <input type="checkbox"/> Other (describe) _____
17. Statistical methods Does this information collection employ statistical methods <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	18. Agency Contact (person who can best answer questions regarding the content of this submission) Name: _____ Phone: _____

19. Certification for Paperwork Reduction Act Submissions

On behalf of this Federal Agency, I certify that the collection of information encompassed by this request complies with 5 CFR 1320.9

NOTE: The text of 5 CFR 1320.9, and the related provisions of 5 CFR 1320.8(b)(3), appear at the end of the instructions. *The certification is to be made with reference to those regulatory provisions as set forth in the instructions.*

The following is a summary of the topics, regarding the proposed collection of information, that the certification covers:

- (a) It is necessary for the proper performance of agency functions;
- (b) It avoids unnecessary duplication;
- (c) It reduces burden on small entities;
- (d) It used plain, coherent, and unambiguous terminology that is understandable to respondents;
- (e) Its implementation will be consistent and compatible with current reporting and recordkeeping practices;
- (f) It indicates the retention period for recordkeeping requirements;
- (g) It informs respondents of the information called for under 5 CFR 1320.8(b)(3):
 - (i) Why the information is being collected;
 - (ii) Use of information;
 - (iii) Burden estimate;
 - (iv) Nature of response (voluntary, required for a benefit, mandatory);
 - (v) Nature and extent of confidentiality; and
 - (vi) Need to display currently valid OMB control number;
- (h) It was developed by an office that has planned and allocated resources for the efficient and effective management and use of the information to be collected (see note in Item 19 of instructions);
- (i) It uses effective and efficient statistical survey methodology; and
- (j) It makes appropriate use of information technology.

If you are unable to certify compliance with any of the provisions, identify the item below and explain the reason in Item 18 of the Supporting Statement.

Signature of Senior Official or designee

Date

Agency Certification (signature of Assistant Administrator, Deputy Assistant Administrator, Line Office Chief Information Officer, head of MB staff for L.O.s, or of the Director of a Program or StaffOffice)

Signature

Date

Signature of NOAA Clearance Officer

Signature

Date

**SUPPORTING STATEMENT
FRESHWATER SALMON AND STEELHEAD ANGLER SURVEY**

A. JUSTIFICATION

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

Freshwater fishing for salmonids in California occurs largely on rivers and tributaries in central and northern parts of the state. The freshwater fishery is exclusively a sport fishery, with angler participation occurring from a variety of modes - including riverbanks, private boats, and rented boats with hired guides. Salmonid harvests have historically included chinook salmon (*oncorhynchus tshawytscha*), coho salmon (*onchorhynchus kisutch*) and steelhead trout (*oncorhynchus mykiss*).

In recent years, a number of wild salmon and steelhead stocks in California have been listed as threatened or endangered under the Endangered Species Act (ESA).¹ While most of the salmon and steelhead harvested in California are derived from hatchery stocks (which are not listed), stringent state and federal regulations have been imposed on recreational as well as commercial fisheries to protect listed wild stocks that co-occur on the fishery grounds with hatchery fish. For instance, recreational coho harvest has been prohibited statewide since 1996. A variety of restrictions (e.g., area and season closures, bag limit reductions) have been imposed on the chinook fishery to avoid bycatch of wild chinook stocks. To protect wild steelhead stocks, retention of wild steelhead is severely restricted on the Smith River (the state's major steelhead river) and disallowed on all other rivers.²

In addition to implementing fishery restrictions, NOAA Fisheries and the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) also formed a Joint Hatchery Review Committee to evaluate the effects of hatchery practices on survival and abundance of wild salmon and steelhead. While recognizing the need to review existing hatchery practices, the Committee also concluded that it was "cognizant of the biological and societal benefits that California's hatchery system provides. These benefits have to be considered when any changes are proposed to the hatchery system" (CDFG/NMFS Joint Hatchery Review Committee, 2001, p. v). The survey proposed here is intended to assist the Joint Hatchery Review Committee by providing a basis for estimating one component of the "societal benefits" provided by hatcheries - the economic value and local economic impacts generated by the recreational fishery. The data will also be used to predict the extent to which changes in hatchery practices are likely to cause reductions in salmon and

¹ A description of listed stocks can be found at <http://www.nwr.noaa.gov/1salmon/salmesa/pubs/1pgr.pdf>.

² All steelhead reared in California hatcheries have their adipose fin clipped prior to release from the hatchery. This fin clip allows anglers to distinguish between wild and hatchery steelhead.

steelhead fishing effort, the economic effects of effort reductions, and the potential for displacement of effort to alternative fishing activities and target species. To the extent that changes in fishery regulations under the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act are also deemed necessary to support changes in hatchery practices, the information from this survey will also be useful to NOAA Fisheries and the Pacific Fishery Management Council for evaluating the effects of regulatory alternatives.

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

The information will be gathered via two separate one-time telephone surveys - one covering steelhead anglers, the other covering salmon anglers. The data will be used by NOAA Fisheries to estimate (a) aggregate freshwater salmon and steelhead fishing effort and expenditures by river and county, and (b) a random utility model that predicts the effects of changes in river-specific hatchery practices on angler behavior and the economic value of the fishery. Such evaluation will inform future discussions and decisions regarding potential effects of changes in hatchery practices on fishing effort and economic value. No specific timetable has been established for these discussions.

A draft questionnaire is provided in Attachment A. The specific questions included in the questionnaire will be used for the following purposes:

- A1 and A2 will be used to estimate the percentage of steelhead report card holders who fished for steelhead in the previous 12 months. This information will be used to estimate the population of active steelhead anglers (see Section B, equation [1]).
- B1 and B3 will be used to estimate the percentage of freshwater anglers who purchased a steelhead report card in the previous 12 months. This information will be used to estimate the population of freshwater anglers (see Section B, equation [6]). B1 will also be used with B2 to estimate the percentage of freshwater anglers who targeted salmon in the previous 12 months. This information will be used (in combination with the aggregate number of freshwater anglers estimated from B1 and B3) to estimate the population of active freshwater salmon anglers (see Section B, equation [7]).
- C1 will be used in combination with the angler population estimates derived from A1-A2 and B1-B3 to estimate the aggregate annual number of freshwater salmon/steelhead fishing trips made by the angling population.
- C2 will be used to estimate the seasonal distribution of fishing trips. This information is needed to evaluate the potential effects of seasonal fishery closures that may occur as a result of changes in hatchery practices.

- C3 will be used to determine which trip costs to attribute to fishing. If the main purpose of the trip is fishing, both travel and on-site costs will be attributed to fishing. If the main purpose is vacation, business or some other activity, only the on-site costs will be attributed to fishing.
- C4 will be used to convert fishing effort from angler trips to person days (i.e., total number of days spent away from home, including days when the angler did not fish).
- C4 will also be used in combination with C9, C10 and C12 to estimate non-fishing costs (food, lodging, travel) on a per person day basis. Cost per person day will be multiplied by the number of person days to estimate aggregate non-fishing costs.
- C5 will be used to convert fishing effort from angler trips to angler days.
- C5 will also be used in combination with C11 and C13 to estimate fishing costs (gear/tackle/bait, boat fuel, river guide fees) on a per angler day basis. Cost per angler day will be multiplied by the number of angler days to estimate aggregate fishing costs.
- C6 will be used to link fishing effort and expenditures to mode of fishing. Trip expenditures and angler behavior are expected to vary by mode.
- C7 will be used to link fishing effort and expenditures to the river where the fishing occurred. This information is needed to evaluate river-specific changes in hatchery practices. C7 will also be used to determine the location of effort relative to the hatchery. This information is important, as changes in hatchery practices may affect fishing opportunities in areas at and below the hatchery but are unlikely to affect opportunities above the hatchery.
- C8 will be used to link fishing effort and expenditures to the county where the fishing occurred. This information is needed to estimate county-level economic impacts.
- C14 and C15 will be used to estimate foregone income as a component of trip costs.
- D1-D9 are intended to identify fishing opportunities that the respondent pursues in addition to freshwater salmon/steelhead fishing. Information on these other opportunities - in terms of type of fishing (freshwater/saltwater), location, target species, etc. - will be used in the random utility model to evaluate the extent to which anglers are likely to mitigate loss of freshwater salmon/steelhead fishing opportunities associated with changes in hatchery practices by increasing participation in other fisheries.
- E1 and E2 will be used to estimate annual expenditures on fishing gear and equipment attributable to freshwater salmon/steelhead fishing.
- E3, E4 and E5 will be used to estimate annual boat-related expenditures attributable to freshwater salmon/steelhead fishing.
- F1 will be used - in combination with information on the river (C7) and county (C8) associated with each fishing trip - to estimate the distance between the angler's residence and potential fishing locations available to the angler. A standardized cost per mile (from the American Automobile Association) will be used to convert distance to travel cost.
- F2-F9 are demographic characteristics that will be used in the random utility model (along with fishing and travel costs) to explain participation patterns in terms of numbers and types of fishing trips made during the year.

It is anticipated that the information collected will be disseminated to the public or used to support publicly disseminated information. As explained in the preceding paragraphs, the information gathered has utility. NOAA Fisheries will retain control over the information and safeguard it from improper access, modification, and destruction, consistent with NOAA standards for confidentiality, privacy, and electronic information. See response #10 of this Supporting Statement for more information on confidentiality and privacy. The information collection is designed to yield data that meet all applicable information quality guidelines. Prior to dissemination, the information will be subjected to quality control measures and a pre-dissemination review pursuant to Section 515 of Public Law 106-554.

3. Describe whether, and to what extent, the collection of information involves the use of automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological techniques or other forms of information technology.

Data will be gathered by telephone interviewers, who will use computer-assisted telephone interview (CATI) technology to directly enter information provided by respondents into an electronic database. The CATI system will (a) ensure that questions are asked in a consistent manner, (b) facilitate use of skip patterns in the questionnaire, (c) allow real-time validation of angler responses in terms of range and consistency checks, and (d) ensure timely availability of the data for analysis.

4. Describe efforts to identify duplication.

A limited number of economic studies of California's freshwater salmon/steelhead fishery have been conducted. However, none of these studies provide the information needed to address issues associated with hatchery policy and fishery management on an individual river basis. For instance, Fletcher and King (undated) conducted a survey of freshwater anglers in 1988; their survey focused on attitudinal and demographic characteristics of the angling population and provided little economic information. Loomis and Cooper (1990) and Loomis and Ise (1992) estimated recreational demand models for freshwater salmon fishing. However, those two studies are limited in their geographic coverage (Feather and Sacramento Rivers), are based on now-outdated information (surveys conducted in the early 1980s) and involved very simple models (due to the limited economic data available to the analysts). Douglas and Taylor (1998) estimated a recreational demand model for the Trinity River. However, their analysis pertained to all recreational activity (not just fishing) on a single river (the Trinity); their data collection methods and the representativeness of their sample are not well documented, and their results are based on an unconventional method of demand analysis. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) conducts a nationwide recreational fishing and hunting survey every five years and produces summary reports that describe aggregate activity and expenditures on saltwater fishing, freshwater fishing and hunting in each state. While useful as a source of information on state-level outdoor recreational activity, the USFWS survey was not designed to provide information regarding freshwater fishing patterns and expenditures on a river-specific basis.

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

This collection involves individual anglers, not small businesses or 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 collection is not conducted, NOAA Fisheries will have no basis upon which to evaluate the economic effects of changes in hatchery practices on the freshwater salmon and steelhead fisheries or to anticipate the effects of effort displacement from these fisheries on other recreational fisheries.

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

The survey is consistent with OMB guidelines.

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

A copy of the PRA Federal Register notice (Vol. 68, No. 65, April 4, 2003)) is attached. No public comments were received.

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

No payments or gifts will be offered to respondents.

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

Respondents will be assured at the beginning of the telephone interview that the information they provide will be confidential. Should they require additional assurance, the interviewer will be prepared to describe the statutory basis for confidentiality in terms of NOAA Administrative Order 216-100 and Section 402(b) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act. See response #18 for further elaboration on this point.

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 will be asked.

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

252 hours	2 minutes each for 7,565 respondents to respond to the screening questions
178 hours	15 minutes each for 710 salmon/steelhead anglers identified via the screening questions to complete the economic survey
430 hours	Total

(See Tables 4 and 10 of Section B for a more detailed breakdown of the number of respondents.)

13. Provide an estimate of the total annual cost burden to the respondents or record-keepers resulting from the collection.

No additional cost burden will be imposed on respondents other than the burden hours indicated above.

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

Cost of the survey is approximately \$150K. This includes services of a contractor to pretest the salmon and steelhead questionnaires, train interviewers, administer the surveys, provide a documented electronic database of survey responses, and prepare a final report that describes survey procedures, response rates and summary statistics for each variable asked in the survey. Other costs include time spent by NOAA Fisheries staff to respond to Paperwork Reduction Act requirements, administer the data collection contract, and analyze the survey data.

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

This is a new collection and therefore a program change.

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

A report will be prepared that documents the sampling procedures and response rates, provides statistical summaries (i.e., means, variances, frequency distributions) of data collected in the survey and describes economic impacts of freshwater salmon and steelhead fishing on a county- and river-specific basis. A separate paper will be submitted to a peer-reviewed journal that describes results of the random utility model that will be used to analyze angler behavior.

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 survey will be conducted via telephone interviews rather than forms or written questionnaires. In order to hold the respondent's interest and reduce the likelihood of hang-ups, it will be important that the interviewer keep his/her introduction succinct and to-the-point. Thus while the OMB control number will be provided in the introduction, approval not to include the expiration date in the introduction is requested. Should respondents request further information regarding the authority for conducting the interview, interviewers will be prepared to provide them with the expiration date.

18. Explain each exception to the certification statement identified in Item 19 of the OMB 83-I.

As indicated in response #17, the survey will be conducted via telephone interviews rather than forms or written questionnaires. In order to hold the respondent's interest and reduce the likelihood of hang-ups, it will be important that the interviewer keep his/her introduction succinct and to-the-point. Thus while an assurance of confidentiality will be provided in the introduction, approval not to elaborate on the nature and extent of confidentiality in the introduction is requested. Should respondents request such elaboration, interviewers will be prepared to respond with the following:

“The information being collected in this survey is protected as confidential under section 402(b) of the Magnuson Act (16 U.S.C. 1801 *et seq.*) and NOAA Administrative Order 216-100 (Protection of Confidential Fishery Statistics). Data provided by individuals will not be released, and only group averages or totals will be provided in reports describing survey results.”

B. COLLECTION OF INFORMATION EMPLOYING STATISTICAL METHODS

1. Describe (including a numerical estimate) the potential respondent universe and any sampling or other respondent selection method to be used. Data on the number of entities (e.g., establishments, State and local governmental units, households, or persons) in the universe and the corresponding sample are to be provided in tabular form. The tabulation must also include expected response rates for the collection as a whole. If the collection has been conducted before, provide the actual response rate achieved.

The potential respondent universe is the population of recreational anglers who participate in the freshwater salmon and steelhead fisheries in California. Information regarding the size of this population is limited to the following:

- According to a survey conducted by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), about 73,000 freshwater anglers went steelhead fishing and 226,000 went salmon fishing in California in 1996 (USFWS, 1998, Table 6, p. 20).
- The California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) requires all anglers 16 years and older (including those who fish for salmon and/or steelhead) to purchase a fishing license. In addition to having a general license, anglers who fish for steelhead are also required to purchase a steelhead report card. Steelhead report card purchases declined from 77,539 in 1993 to a low of 39,460 in 1998, then increased to 46,828 by 2001 (Table 1).³

The number of steelhead report card holders estimated by CDFG for 1996 (58,417 - see Table 1) is lower than the number of steelhead anglers estimated by the USFWS for the same year (73,000 according to USFWS, 1998, Table 6, p. 20). The CDFG estimate, which is based on records of report card purchases, is likely a more accurate estimate than the USFWS estimate, which is extrapolated from a small sample. Using the only recent available estimate of the number of freshwater salmon anglers (the USFWS' 1996 estimate of 226,000) and the number of steelhead report cards purchased in 2001 (46,828 - see Table 1) as an estimate of the number of steelhead anglers, the number of freshwater salmon/steelhead anglers in California is approximately 226,000-272,828. The lower end of the range is based on the assumption that all of the 46,828 steelhead report card holders also fished for salmon, and the upper end on the assumption that anglers engage in either salmon or steelhead fishing but not both.

Two different one-time surveys utilizing different respondent selection methods will be needed to sample steelhead and salmon anglers. For the steelhead survey, a random sample of steelhead report holders will be contacted and asked several screening questions to determine whether they had gone steelhead fishing in California in the past 12 months; those who had will be asked to complete the angler questionnaire. For the salmon survey, a random sample of individuals who identify "fishing" as one of their "interests" will be purchased from a consulting firm that sells special purpose random digit samples. These individuals will be asked several screening questions to determine whether they had gone freshwater salmon fishing in California in the past 12 months; those who had will be asked to complete the angler questionnaire. For each survey, the number of anglers in the population, the number of individuals who will be asked to respond to the screening questions and the angler questionnaire, and expected response rates to the screening questions and angler questionnaire are as follows:

³ CDFG also requires license holders who fish for salmon in ocean waters north of Point Delgada or on the Klamath River system to purchase a salmon punch card. However, salmon punch card holders are not a good indicator of the number of freshwater salmon anglers, as there is no way to distinguish between punch card holders who fish in the ocean versus the Klamath River system and only a portion of freshwater salmon fishing in California occurs on the Klamath.

	Steelhead Survey	Salmon Survey	Total
# anglers in the population	46,828	226,000	272,828*
# telephone contacts	465	7,100	7,565
# telephone contacts who respond to screening questions regarding steelhead/salmon fishing activity in the past 12 months	409	6,248	6,657
Response rate to screening questions	88%	88%	88%
# eligible anglers identified via screening questions	368	379	747
# eligible anglers who complete angler questionnaire	350	360	710
Response rate to angler questionnaire	95%	95%	95%

* Should be interpreted as a maximum, as it does not account for the possibility that some anglers may engage in both salmon and steelhead fishing.

According to results from the Marine Recreational Fishery Statistics Survey (MRFSS), a survey of marine anglers conducted annually by NOAA Fisheries, about 88% of randomly contacted households are willing to answer screening questions regarding whether or not they had recently gone recreational saltwater fishing. On occasions when add-on economic questions have been added to the MRFSS telephone survey, about 95% of saltwater anglers identified via the screening questions have completed the economic questionnaire (pers. comm. Dave Van Voorhees, NOAA Fisheries, Silver Spring, MD). Although the salmon/steelhead survey and the MRFSS are targeted at different segments of the angling population (freshwater versus saltwater), the surveys are similar in their use of random digit dialing procedures and screening questions and in the types of economic survey questions asked. Thus the 88% and 95% response rates from the MRFSS were deemed to be reasonable proxies for what can be expected in the salmon/steelhead survey.

2. Describe the procedures for the collection, including: the statistical methodology for stratification and sample selection; the estimation procedure; the degree of accuracy needed for the purpose described in the justification; any unusual problems requiring specialized sampling procedures; and any use of periodic (less frequent than annual) data collection cycles to reduce burden.

The sampling protocol is designed to ensure that major salmon/steelhead rivers and major counties of residence for salmon/steelhead anglers are adequately represented in the sample of angler days obtained from the survey, once the survey data are poststratified. A river or county of residence will be considered “adequately represented” if poststratification of the survey data

yields a sample of at least 20 angler days for each major river and county of residence.⁴ The reasons for focusing on rivers and counties are as follows:

- The survey data will be used to estimate aggregate salmon and steelhead fishing effort and expenditures on a river-specific basis.
- The survey data will be used to estimate a random utility model that analyzes how anglers allocate their fishing effort among rivers and how their participation might be affected by river-specific changes in hatchery practices.
- The survey data will be used to estimate the economic impact of the fishery on local (i.e., county) economies. It will therefore be important to distinguish angler expenditures by county of residence.

Because of differences in available information regarding steelhead and salmon fishery participation, this data collection will require that different respondent selection methods be used for steelhead and salmon anglers in order to achieve the above objectives.

a. Proposal for Steelhead Economic Survey

Derivation of Population Estimates

The steelhead economic survey will be based on a random sample drawn from an electronic database maintained by CDFG which includes names, addresses and phone numbers of all steelhead report card holders. Due to weather, personal circumstances and other factors, not all individuals who purchase a report card actually go steelhead fishing. The aggregate number of active steelhead anglers (NSRC_ACT) will be estimated as follows:

$$\text{NSRC_ACT} = \text{NSRC} * \text{PCTFISHSTL} \quad [1]$$

where NSRC = number of steelhead report card holders (a known quantity to be obtained from CDFG), and
PCTFISHSTL = percent of report card holders who fished for steelhead in the past year (to be derived from the random sample of report card holders).

⁴ The assumption that 20 constitutes a reasonable minimum sample size is based on a recommendation from Pollock *et al.* (1994, p. 39), “This procedure [poststratification] works reasonably well provided the N_h ’s are known or at least closely approximated and the sample sizes are reasonably large in each stratum ($n_h > 20$).”

The number of steelhead angler days fished by active report card holders (NSTLDDAYS) will be estimated as:

$$\text{NSTLDDAYS} = \text{NSRC_ACT} * \text{AVGSTLDDAYS} \quad [2]$$

where NSRC_ACT is the number of active report card holders (from equation [1]), and AVGSTLDDAYS is the average number of steelhead angler days fished (to be derived from the random sample of active report card holders).

Sample Size Criteria

Sample size requirements for the steelhead survey were estimated on the basis of three criteria:

Criterion (1) - All steelhead report card holders contacted will be asked a screening question to determine whether they had actually gone steelhead fishing in the past year. A minimum requisite number of report card holders will need to answer this question to ensure that the proportion of report card holders who actually fished for steelhead (PCTFISHSTL, equation [1]) can be estimated with reasonable accuracy. Based on a preliminary estimate of PCTFISHSTL of 90% (pers. comm. Terry Jackson, CDFG Anadromous Fish Branch), the number of steelhead report card holders who must respond to the screening question to ensure that the sample yields an estimate for PCTFISHSTL of $.90 \pm .03$ with 95% probability is:

$$n_{(1)} = t^2 * \text{PCTFISHSTL} * (1 - \text{PCTFISHSTL}) / d^2 = (1.96^2 * 0.9 * 0.1) / (0.03^2) = 384 \quad [3]$$

where t (normal deviate corresponding to 95% confidence probability) = 1.96, and d (acceptable limit of absolute error in PROPFISHSTL) = 0.03

Criterion (2) - The number of steelhead survey respondents needs to be sufficiently large to ensure that the mean number of steelhead angler days per angler (AVGSTLDDAYS, see Equation [2]) can be estimated with reasonable accuracy. Based on assumptions that AVGSTLDDAYS = 3.5 and the standard error of AVGSTLDDAYS, = 4.75 (both statistics derived from 1999 steelhead report card data), the number of economic survey respondents needed to ensure that the sample yields an estimate of AVGSTLDDAYS of 3.5 ± 0.5 with 95% probability is:

$$n_{(2)} = t^2 * S^2 / d^2 = (1.96^2 * 4.75^2) / (0.5^2) = 347 \quad [4]$$

where t (normal deviate corresponding to 95% confidence probability) = 1.96, S (standard deviation of AVGSTLDDAYS) = 4.75, and d (acceptable limit of absolute error in AVGSTLDDAYS) = 0.5

Criterion (3) - In addition to meeting criterion (2), the number of steelhead survey respondents also needs to be sufficiently large to ensure that poststratification of the sample data yields at least 20 angler days for each major steelhead river (as described in Table 2) and each major county of residence for steelhead anglers. A sample size of $n_{(3)} = 350$ survey respondents - combined with an assumption of 3.5 steelhead angler days per angler (the latter estimated based on data provided by 1999 steelhead report card holders) - is expected to be adequate to address criterion (3). Specifically, Table 3a describes the relative distribution of steelhead fishing days among steelhead rivers and counties of residence, as estimated from 1999 steelhead report card data.⁵ Table 3b predicts how the $1,225=350*3.5$ steelhead angler days expected to be reported by survey respondents would be distributed among counties and rivers, once the survey is completed and the data are poststratified. Specifically, the number of angler days associated with each combination of county i and river j was estimated as follows:

$$n_{ij} = 1,225 * a_{ij} \quad [5]$$

where a_{ij} = the relative distribution of steelhead angler days among counties of residence i and rivers j (from Table 3a).

As indicated by the boldfaced row and column totals in Table 3b, Pollock's recommended sample size of $n>20$ is achieved for all major rivers and counties of residence for steelhead anglers.

Summary of Sample Size Requirements for Steelhead Survey

Table 4 summarizes the target sample sizes needed to ensure that the steelhead survey addresses criteria (1)-(3). Specifically, of the 465 report card holders who will be contacted, 409 are expected to be willing to respond to the screening question. This 409 exceeds the sample size of 384 needed to meet criterion (1). The projected respondents for the steelhead survey (350) was derived by taking into account the fact that not all report card holders actually go steelhead fishing and not all active steelhead anglers will be willing to complete the economic survey. The

⁵ For purposes of Tables 3a and 3b, steelhead rivers were grouped by location (north coast, north central coast, Central Valley, south central coast) and counties of residence were grouped into six residence strata (north, Sierra, north central, south central, south and out-of-state). The "north" residence stratum includes Del Norte, Humboldt, Modoc, Siskiyou and Trinity counties. The "Sierra" stratum includes Alpine, Amador, Butte, Calaveras, Colusa, El Dorado, Fresno, Glenn, Lassen, Madera, Mariposa, Merced, Mono, Nevada, Placer, Plumas, Sacramento, San Joaquin, Shasta, Sierra, Solano, Stanislaus, Sutter, Tehama, Tuolumne, Yolo and Yuba counties. The "north central" stratum includes Lake, Marin, Mendocino, Napa and Sonoma counties. The "south central" stratum includes Alameda, Contra Costa, Monterey, San Benito, San Luis Obispo, San Mateo, Santa Clara and Santa Cruz counties. The "south" stratum includes Imperial, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, San Diego, Santa Barbara and Ventura counties.

350 respondents slightly exceeds the 347 respondents needed to address criterion (2) and is equal to the number of respondents needed to address criterion (3).

b. Proposal for Salmon Economic Survey

Determining Geographic Scope of Survey

Unlike the steelhead survey, which is based on a known population of steelhead report card holders which is updated annually, there is no similar database of salmon anglers.⁶ In order to develop a sampling frame for the salmon survey, access to a random sample of names/addresses/telephone numbers of individuals who identify “fishing” as one of their “interests” will be purchased from Scientific Telephone Samples (STS), a company that sells special purpose random digit samples. In order to ensure that telephone interviews of the STS sample are done cost-effectively, the interviews will be limited to residents of 23 California counties where salmon anglers are most likely to reside. The 23 counties were identified as follows:

Based on zipcode of residence data provided by salmon anglers intercepted in CDFG’s Central Valley creel survey, the relative distribution of salmon angler days by county of residence can be estimated for Central Valley rivers. However, because data on county of residence are not available for salmon anglers who fish on rivers other than the Central Valley, information on county of residence provided by *steelhead* report card holders who fish on non-Central Valley rivers was used as a proxy for *salmon* anglers who fish on those same rivers. In order to evaluate the usefulness of this proxy, the distribution of salmon angler days by county of residence on the American and Feather Rivers (from the 1999 Central Valley creel survey) was compared to the distribution of steelhead angler days (from the 1999 steelhead report card data) on the same rivers - the American and Feather both being active salmon and steelhead fishing areas. The objective was not to compare the distributions in a statistical manner but to determine whether the steelhead data provided a reasonable basis for identifying counties that account for the majority of salmon fishing.

⁶ The CDFG conducts an annual creel survey (see Murphy *et al.* 1999) that provides estimates of harvest and effort for nine target species (chinook salmon, steelhead, rainbow trout, striped bass, sturgeon, American shad, catfish, sunfish, black bass) on Central Valley rivers. The CDFG also conducts an annual creel survey on the Klamath River to monitor freshwater harvest and escapement of fall-run chinook (Borok, undated). The Central Valley and Klamath River creel surveys provide information on catch and catch-per-angler-hour but not anglers, angler trips or angler days, nor is information collected on the identity (names/addresses/telephone numbers) of intercepted anglers. For other California rivers, salmon catch and effort data are collected, at best, on a sporadic basis.

Specifically, for each of the two rivers, all counties that accounted for at least 3% of steelhead *or* salmon effort in 1999 (hereafter denoted “major” counties of residence) were identified and evaluated as follows (Table 5):

American River: The steelhead data correctly identify Sacramento, Placer and El Dorado counties as major counties of residence for salmon anglers on the American River; these three counties account for 79% of steelhead and 77% of salmon effort on the American. The steelhead data incorrectly exclude San Joaquin and Yolo and incorrectly include Santa Clara as major counties for salmon anglers. Together San Joaquin and Yolo account for 6.8% of total salmon effort on the American River.

Feather River: The steelhead data correctly identify Butte, Sutter, Sacramento, Placer and Nevada counties as major counties for salmon anglers on the Feather River; these five counties account for 77% of steelhead and 64% of salmon effort on the Feather. The one major county of residence for Feather River salmon anglers that was not also identified as a major county in the steelhead survey was Yuba county, which accounted for only 2% of steelhead effort but 14% of salmon effort.

Based on the results of Table 5, which suggest that the steelhead data provide a useful though not completely accurate basis for identifying major counties of residence for salmon anglers, the following procedure was used to identify counties of residence for inclusion in the telephone survey: Salmon fishing effort on each major Central Valley river (Sacramento, American, Feather, Yuba) was distributed by county of residence (based on data provided by salmon anglers participating in the 2000 Central Valley creel census). A similar distribution of effort by county (using 1999 steelhead report card data as a proxy for the distribution of salmon fishing effort) was generated for each of the major coastal rivers on which chinook fishing occurs (Klamath, Trinity, Mad, Eel). Any county that accounted for at least 3% of fishing effort on *any one* of these eight rivers was designated for inclusion in the telephone survey. The reason for identifying major counties separately for each river is to reduce the likelihood of overlooking a major county (as occurred in Table 5 for San Joaquin, Yolo and Yuba counties) by essentially providing eight different opportunities (i.e., eight rivers) for a county to be considered for inclusion in the survey. Table 6 describes the 23 counties in central/northern California that qualify on this basis for inclusion in the telephone survey. As indicated by the subtotal percentages, these counties are expected to account for 85%-100% of total salmon effort on each river. Nine of the counties (Santa Clara, Contra Costa, San Mateo, Sonoma, Santa Cruz, Humboldt, Mendocino, Siskiyou, Trinity) qualify for inclusion strictly on the basis of fishing activity on coastal rivers rather than the Central Valley.

Derivation of Population Estimates

Individuals in the 23-county STS sample will be screened to determine whether they had gone freshwater fishing in the past year (with those who had fished in the past year hereafter referred to as “active freshwater anglers”). Additional questions will be asked of these active anglers to determine whether they had (i) purchased a steelhead report card and (ii) fished for salmon in the

previous twelve months. The aggregate number of salmon anglers and angler days will be estimated as follows:

The aggregate number of active freshwater anglers residing in the 23 counties ($NFRSH_{23CTY}$) will be estimated as:

$$NFRSH_{23CTY} = NSRC_{23CTY} / PCTSRC_{23CTY} \quad [6]$$

where $NSRC_{23CTY}$ is the number of steelhead report card holders residing in the 23-county area (a known quantity from the CDFG steelhead report card database), and $PCTSRC_{23CTY}$ is the proportion of active freshwater anglers residing in the 23-county area who purchased a steelhead report card in the past year (as estimated from responses provided by active freshwater anglers in the STS sample).

The aggregate number of active freshwater anglers residing in the 23-county area who fish for salmon ($NSAL_{23CTY}$) will then be estimated as:

$$NSAL_{23CTY} = NFRSH_{23CTY} * PCTSAL_{23CTY} \quad [7]$$

where $NFRSH_{23CTY}$ is the aggregate number of freshwater anglers previously estimated in equation [6], and $PCTSAL_{23CTY}$ is the percentage of active freshwater anglers whose activities in the past year included salmon fishing (as estimated from responses provided by active freshwater anglers in the STS sample).

The aggregate number of salmon angler days fished by residents of the 23 counties ($NSALDAYS_{23CTY}$) will then be estimated as:

$$NSALDAYS_{23CTY} = NSAL_{23CTY} * AVGSALDAYS_{23CTY} \quad [8]$$

where $NSAL_{23CTY}$ is the aggregate number of active salmon anglers residing in the 23-county area (from equation [7]), and $AVGSALDAYS_{23CTY}$ is the average number of salmon days fished per active salmon angler (as estimated from responses provided by active salmon anglers identified in the STS sample).

Sample Size Criteria

Four criteria were considered in evaluating sample size requirements for the salmon survey:

Criterion (A) - All STS contacts will be asked a screening question to determine whether they had actually gone freshwater fishing in California in the past year, with those identified as active freshwater anglers asked if they had purchased a steelhead report card. A minimum number of active freshwater anglers will need to answer the latter question to ensure that the proportion of

active freshwater anglers who purchased a steelhead report card ($PCTSRC_{23CTY}$, see equation [6]) can be estimated with reasonable accuracy. Based on a preliminary estimate of $PCTSRC_{23CTNY}$ of 11% (see Table 7), the number of active freshwater anglers who must respond to the screening question to ensure that the sample yields an estimate for $PCTSRC_{23CTY}$ of $.11 \pm .011$ with 95% probability is:

$$n_{(A)} = t^2 * PCTSRC_{23CTY} * (1 - PCTSRC_{23CTY}) / d^2$$

$$= (1.96^2 * 0.11 * 0.89) / (0.011^2) = 3,761 \quad [9]$$

where t (normal deviate corresponding to 95% confidence probability) = 1.96, and d (acceptable limit of absolute error in $PCTSRC_{23CTY}$) = 0.011.

Criterion (B) - In order to estimate the aggregate number of freshwater salmon anglers in the 23 counties, a minimum number of active freshwater anglers will need to provide information regarding their salmon fishery participation in order to ensure that the proportion of anglers who had gone freshwater salmon fishing in the past year ($PCTSAL_{23CTY}$, see equation [7]) can be estimated with reasonable accuracy. Based on a preliminary estimate of $PCTSAL_{23CTNY}$ of 35% (see Table 7), the number of active freshwater anglers who must respond to the screening question to ensure that the sample yields an estimate for $PCTSAL_{23CTY}$ of $.35 \pm .035$ with 95% probability is:

$$n_{(B)} = t^2 * PCTSAL_{23CTY} * (1 - PCTSAL_{23CTY}) / d^2$$

$$= (1.96^2 * 0.35 * 0.65) / (0.035^2) = 713 \quad [10]$$

where t (normal deviate corresponding to 95% confidence probability) = 1.96, $PCTSAL_{23CTY}$ (estimated proportion of SRC holders that participated in the steelhead fishery) = 0.35, and d (acceptable limit of absolute error in $PCTSAL_{23CTY}$) = 0.035

Criterion (C) - In order to estimate aggregate salmon fishing effort, a minimum number of freshwater salmon anglers will need to provide information on the extent of their participation in order to ensure that the mean number of salmon angler days per angler ($AVGSALDAYS_{23CTY}$, see equation [8]) can be estimated with reasonable accuracy. The only prior source of information on this statistic is the USFWS survey (USFWS 1998, Table 6, p. 20), which indicates that 226,000 anglers spent 1,968,000 days freshwater salmon fishing in 1996 ($1,968,000 / 226,000 = 8.7$ salmon days per angler). However, because information on the standard error of this statistic is not available, it is not possible to estimate an optimal sample size for $AVGSALDAYS_{23CTY}$.

Criterion (D) - The number of freshwater salmon anglers who respond to the survey also needs to be sufficiently large to ensure that poststratification of the sample data yields at least 20 angler days for each major salmon river and each major county of residence for salmon anglers. A

sample size of 360 survey respondents - combined with an assumption of 8.7 salmon angler days per angler (the latter based on the USFWS survey results cited under Criterion (C)) - is expected to be adequate to address criterion (D).

In order to predict how the $360 * 8.7 = 3,132$ angler days are likely to be distributed among rivers and counties, once the survey is done and the data are poststratified, it was necessary to first convert the individual river-specific distributions of fishing effort across counties (Table 6) into a single distribution that describes the proportion of statewide fishing effort associated with each river/county combination. Specifically, the proportion of salmon effort associated with river i and county of residence j (p_{ij}) was estimated as:

$$p_{ij} = (x_j^i / \sum_{j=1, \dots, 23} x_j^i) * z_i \quad [11]$$

where x_j^i = proportion of salmon fishing effort on river i originating from county j (from Table 6), and
 z_i = estimated proportion of statewide freshwater chinook salmon harvest occurring on river i (Table 8).

Because the x_j^i 's in Table 6 represent the distribution of salmon angler days across all counties (not just the counties that will be covered in the salmon survey), the x_j^i 's were normalized to 100% in equation [11] by dividing by $\sum_{j=1, \dots, 23} x_j^i$, where $j=1, \dots, 23$ represent the 23 counties that will be included in the salmon survey. The z_i 's are intended to calibrate the normalized x_j^i 's to reflect the relative distribution of harvest among the eight rivers and ensure that $\sum_{j=1, \dots, 23} \sum_{i=1, \dots, 8} p_{ij} = 1$. The harvest distribution is being used here as a proxy for the distribution of effort, as effort estimates are not available for all rivers.

The p_{ij} 's estimated in equation [11] are reported in Table 9a and the associated distribution of the expected sample of 3,132 angler days among rivers and counties (calculated as $3,132 * p_{ij}$) is reported in Table 9b. As indicated by the boldfaced row and column totals in Table 9b, Pollock's recommended sample size of $n > 20$ is achieved for all rivers and all but three counties. Projected sample sizes for two of these counties ($n=18$ for Placer and $n=19$ for Trinity) are very close to 20. The sample size for Mendocino ($n=8$) is nowhere near 20; however, the sample size for this county cannot be brought even close to 20 without increasing the overall sample size to a high and unacceptably costly level.

Summary of Sample Size Requirements for Salmon Survey

Table 10 describes the number of salmon survey respondents expected to result from an initial STS sample size of 7,100. The number of freshwater anglers expected to be identified in the STS sample (3,786) exceeds the number needed to estimate the proportion of freshwater anglers who have a steelhead report card (3,761, according to criterion (A)) and the number needed to estimate the proportion of freshwater anglers who go salmon fishing (713, according to criterion (B)). Moreover, the 360 salmon anglers who are expected to complete the survey exceeds the 350 respondents needed to satisfy criterion (D). As indicated above, lack of prior information on

the standard error of $AVGSALDAYS_{23CTY}$ makes it impossible to determine whether criterion (C) is satisfied.

3. Describe the methods used to maximize response rates and to deal with nonresponse. The accuracy and reliability of the information collected must be shown to be adequate for the intended uses. For collections based on sampling, a special justification must be provided if they will not yield “reliable” data that can be generalized to the universe studied.

To maximize the likelihood of making a household contact, telephone calls will be varied across weekdays and weekends and daylight and evening hours. If the person answering the telephone indicates that a household member does fish but is not available to take the call, the interviewer will attempt to determine times and dates when the angler is most likely to be available and will call back then. Interviewers will receive extensive training to facilitate smooth and cordial interactions with respondents and enhance the quality of the data collected. Interviewers will be familiarized with the purpose of the survey, the survey instrument, interview procedures and strategies for engaging and holding the respondent’s attention. They will be instructed regarding the statutory/policy basis for data confidentiality, should questions regarding confidentiality arise, and will also be given the OMB expiration date, should questions regarding OMB authorization arise. Interviewers will be lead through the survey question-by-question, and the purpose of each question will be explained to them. They will be trained on use of the computer-assisted telephone interview (CATI) technology. They will listen to staged interviews and will engage in practice interviews (using the CATI system) under the guidance of an experienced trainer, with the trainer exposing them to the various types of skip patterns that they will encounter while conducting actual interviews. The CATI system will ensure that interviewers ask questions in an accurate and consistent manner and allow real-time validation of angler responses in terms of range and consistency checks. Once the survey is underway, all interviews will be conducted in a centralized facility under the guidance of supervisors with survey expertise. Supervisors will monitor interviewers in terms of their success rate in completing interviews. They will randomly listen in on interviews to ensure that interviewers are following proper procedure and to correct problems as needed.

4. Describe any tests of procedures or methods to be undertaken. Tests are encouraged as effective means to refine collections, but if ten or more test respondents are involved OMB must give prior approval.

The questionnaires will be pretested on nine anglers who will be identified using the same telephone contact procedures that will be used in the actual salmon and steelhead surveys. Results of the pretest interviews will be used to identify ways to enhance the clarity and flow of the questions, hold the respondent’s interest and correct any problems with the CATI system.

5. Provide the name and telephone number of individuals consulted on the statistical aspects of the design, and the name of the agency unit, contractor(s), grantee(s), or other person(s) who will actually collect and/or analyze the information for the agency.

Statistical aspects of the survey design were developed by:

Cynthia Thomson

NOAA Fisheries

Southwest Fisheries Science Center

110 Shaffer Road

Santa Cruz, CA 95060

831-420-3911

Data collection will be conducted under contract.

REFERENCES

- California Department of Fish and Game/National Marine Fisheries Service Southwest Region. Joint Hatchery Review Committee. 2001. *Final Report on Anadromous Salmonid Fish Hatcheries in California*.
- Douglas, Aaron J. and Jonathan G. Taylor. 1998. Riverine based eco-tourism: Trinity River non-market benefits estimates. *International Journal of Sustainable Development and World Ecology*. 5: 136-148.
- Borok, Sarah. Undated. Untitled draft report on the 2000 Klamath River creel survey. California Department of Fish and Game, Arcata, California.
- Fletcher, James E. and Michael King. Undated. *Attitudes and Preferences of Inland Anglers in the State of California - Final Report*. Conducted February 21-March 21, 1988 by The Survey Research Center, University Foundation, California State University, Chico for Department of Fish and Game, Sacramento, California.
- Loomis, John and Joseph Cooper. 1990. Economic benefits of instream flow to fisheries: a case study of California's Feather River. *Rivers*. 1(1): 23-30.
- Loomis, John and Sabrina Ise. 1992. Net economic value of recreational fishing on the Sacramento River in 1980. In: *Integrated Modelling of Drought and Global Warming: Impacts on Selected California Resources*. National Institute for Global Environmental Change, University of California, Davis.
- Murphy, Kyle, *et al.* 1999. *Central Valley Salmon and Steelhead Harvest Monitoring Project - 1998 Angler Survey*. California Department of Fish and Game.
- Pollock, Kenneth H., Cynthia M. Jones and Tommy L. Brown. 1994. *Angler Survey Methods and Their Applications in Fisheries Management*. American Fisheries Society: Bethesda, MD.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1998. *1996 National Survey of Fishing, Hunting, and Wildlife-Associated Recreation - California*. FHW/96-CA.

Table 1. Annual number of steelhead report cards sold in California, 1993-2001.¹

Year	Number of Report Cards
-----	-----
1993	77,539
1994	77,178
1995	63,714
1996	58,417
1997	51,871
1998	39,460
1999	42,915
2000	43,980
2001	46,828

¹ Source: California Department of Fish and Game.

Table 2. Relative distribution of steelhead angler trips in 1999, by river.¹

River	Trip Distribution
-----	-----
Central Valley:	
American	.104
Feather	.073
Sacramento	.039
Yuba	.020
Other ²	.005
Subtotal	.241
Klamath/Trinity:	
Klamath	.122
Trinity	.116
Subtotal	.238
Coastal Rivers:	
Smith	.180
Mad	.092
Russian	.066
Eel	.030
San Lorenzo	.028
Gualala	.018
Other	.107
Subtotal	.521
Total	1.000

¹ Source: 1999 CDFG steelhead report card data.

² Mokelumne, Stanislaus and San Joaquin Rivers.

Table 3a. Relative distribution of steelhead angler days in 1999, by river and county of residence.¹

River	County of Residence											Total	
	Del Norte	Humboldt	Siskiyou	Trinity	Other	North	Butte	Nevada	Sacramento	Shasta	Tehama	Other	Sierra
<i>North Coast:</i>													
Smith	.058	.004	.026	.002	.000	.090	.003	.003	.003	.009	.001	.020	.038
Klamath	.001	.022	.021	.000	.000	.044	.002	.001	.003	.001	.004	.011	.023
Trinity	.000	.024	.001	.020	.000	.045	.003	.000	.003	.009	.006	.010	.031
Mad	.000	.060	.000	.000	.000	.060	.001	.005	.001	.005	.002	.009	.023
Other	.000	.000	.000	.000	.009	.009	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.008	.008
Subtotal	.059	.110	.048	.023	.009	.249	.010	.009	.010	.024	.012	.057	.123
<i>North Central Coast:</i>													
Eel	.000	.010	.000	.001	.000	.011	.000	.000	.001	.000	.000	.001	.003
Gualala	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.001	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.001
Russian	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.001	.000	.001	.000	.000	.002
Other	.000	.000	.000	.000	.010	.010	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.003	.003
Subtotal	.000	.010	.000	.001	.010	.020	.001	.001	.001	.001	.000	.005	.009
<i>Central Valley:</i>													
Sacramento	.000	.001	.000	.000	.000	.001	.004	.000	.005	.011	.003	.007	.030
Feather	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.032	.005	.010	.000	.000	.017	.064
Yuba	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.003	.004	.000	.000	.010	.017
American	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.001	.001	.059	.000	.000	.024	.086
Other	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.006	.006
Subtotal	.000	.001	.000	.000	.000	.002	.037	.009	.078	.011	.004	.064	.203
<i>South Central Coast:</i>													
San Lorenzo	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.001	.000	.000	.001
Other	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Subtotal	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.001	.000	.000	.001
TOTAL	.059	.120	.048	.024	.019	.271	.048	.019	.090	.037	.016	.126	.336

Table 3a (cont.)

River	County of Residence											TOTAL
	Sonoma	Other	Total No. Central	Alameda	ContraCosta	StaClara	StaCruz	Other	Total So. Central	Total South	Total Out-of-State	
<i>North Coast:</i>												
Smith	.014	.005	.019	.008	.003	.003	.003	.007	.024	.007	.003	.181
Klamath	.004	.002	.006	.005	.005	.021	.000	.008	.039	.008	.003	.122
Trinity	.002	.005	.007	.004	.008	.004	.006	.003	.026	.007	.002	.117
Mad	.001	.002	.003	.000	.001	.001	.000	.003	.005	.001	.000	.091
Other	.000	.001	.001	.000	.000	.000	.000	.001	.001	.000	.003	.022
Subtotal	.021	.015	.036	.018	.017	.030	.009	.021	.094	.023	.011	.534
<i>North Central Coast:</i>												
Eel	.004	.005	.009	.000	.001	.000	.004	.001	.006	.001	.000	.030
Gualala	.009	.005	.014	.001	.001	.000	.000	.001	.003	.000	.000	.018
Russian	.005	.007	.057	.000	.002	.000	.001	.004	.008	.000	.000	.067
Other	.000	.030	.030	.000	.000	.000	.000	.010	.010	.000	.000	.053
Subtotal	.064	.046	.110	.001	.004	.001	.006	.016	.028	.001	.000	.168
<i>Central Valley:</i>												
Sacramento	.000	.002	.002	.001	.001	.000	.000	.001	.003	.001	.000	.037
Feather	.001	.001	.001	.001	.002	.001	.001	.002	.007	.001	.000	.073
Yuba	.000	.000	.000	.001	.001	.000	.000	.000	.003	.000	.000	.020
American	.003	.001	.003	.001	.003	.003	.001	.001	.010	.002	.001	.102
Other	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.002	.002	.000	.000	.008
Subtotal	.003	.003	.006	.005	.007	.005	.002	.007	.025	.003	.002	.241
<i>South Central Coast:</i>												
San Lorenzo	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.006	.020	.000	.027	.000	.000	.028
Other	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.028	.028	.000	.000	.028
Subtotal	.000	.000	.000	.000	.001	.006	.020	.028	.054	.000	.000	.056
TOTAL	.088	.065	.152	.024	.028	.042	.036	.071	.201	.027	.013	1.000

¹ Source: 1999 CDFG steelhead report card data.

Table 3b. Number of steelhead angler days projected to be sampled in steelhead survey, poststratified by river and county of residence (total sample size for each river and county denoted in boldface).¹

River	County of Residence										Total Sierra		
	DelNorte	Humboldt	Siskiyou	Trinity	Other	North	Butte	Nevada	Sacramento	Shasta		Tehama	Other
<i>North Coast:</i>													
Smith	71	5	31	3	0	110	4	3	3	11	1	24	47
Klamath	1	27	26	0	0	53	3	1	4	2	5	14	28
Trinity	0	30	1	25	0	55	4	0	4	11	7	12	37
Mad	0	74	0	0	0	74	1	7	1	6	2	11	28
Other	0	0	0	0	12	12	0	0	0	0	0	10	9
Subtotal	72	135	59	28	12	305	12	11	12	30	15	70	150
<i>North Central Coast:</i>													
Eel	0	12	0	1	0	13	0	0	1	0	0	1	4
Gualala	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Russian	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	2
Other	0	0	0	0	12	12	0	0	0	0	0	4	4
Subtotal	0	12	0	1	12	25	1	1	2	1	0	6	11
<i>Central Valley:</i>													
Sacramento	0	1	0	0	0	1	5	0	6	13	4	9	37
Feather	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	6	12	1	0	20	78
Yuba	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	0	0	12	21
American	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	73	0	0	29	105
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	7
Subtotal	0	1	0	0	0	2	45	11	96	14	4	78	249
<i>South Central Coast:</i>													
San Lorenzo	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2
TOTAL	72	147	59	29	24	331	58	23	110	46	20	155	411

Table 3b (cont.).

River	County of Residence										TOTAL	
	Sonoma	Other	Total No. Central	Alameda	ContraCosta	StaClara	StaCruz	Other	Total So. Central	Total South		Total Out-of-State
<i>North Coast:</i>												
Smith	17	7	24	10	4	4	3	8	30	8	3	222
Klamath	4	3	7	6	6	26	0	9	48	10	3	150
Trinity	2	6	8	5	10	5	8	4	32	8	3	144
Mad	2	2	4	1	1	1	0	3	6	1	0	112
Other	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	4	27
Subtotal	25	18	44	22	20	37	11	26	115	28	13	655
<i>North Central Coast:</i>												
Eel	5	6	11	1	1	0	5	2	8	1	0	37
Gualala	12	6	17	1	2	0	1	1	4	0	0	22
Russian	62	8	70	0	2	1	2	5	10	0	0	82
Other	0	37	37	0	0	0	0	13	13	0	0	65
Subtotal	78	57	135	2	5	1	7	20	34	2	0	206
<i>Central Valley:</i>												
Sacramento	0	2	2	1	1	1	0	2	4	1	0	46
Feather	1	1	2	2	2	1	1	2	9	1	1	90
Yuba	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	4	0	0	25
American	3	1	4	2	3	4	1	2	12	2	1	125
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	10
Subtotal	4	4	8	6	8	7	2	8	31	4	2	295
<i>South Central Coast:</i>												
San Lorenzo	0	0	0	0	0	7	25	0	33	0	0	34
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	34	0	0	34
Subtotal	0	0	0	0	0	7	25	34	67	0	0	68
TOTAL	108	79	187	30	34	51	44	87	246	34	16	1,225

¹ Calculated by multiplying the corresponding proportion contained in Table 3a by the total number of angler days expected to be reported by survey respondents (1,225). Columns and rows may not add up exactly, due to rounding error.

Table 4. Derivation of number of completed steelhead surveys and number of steelhead angler days expected to be reported in the survey sample.

Sample size requirements:

(1) # steelhead report card holders contacted	465
(2) # steelhead report card holders willing to respond to screening question ¹	409
(3) # individuals identified in (2) who actually participated in steelhead fishery ²	368
(4) # individuals identified in (3) who complete the economic questionnaire ³	350

Expected survey results:

(5) Average # steelhead angler days/angler ⁴	3.5
(6) Total number of steelhead angler days sampled ⁵	1,225

¹ 409 = 465 * 88%, based on results from the Marine Recreational Fishery Statistics Survey (MRFSS), a survey of marine anglers conducted annually by NOAA Fisheries. Results from the MRFSS, which uses a random digit dialing procedure similar to the one being proposed here for the steelhead survey, indicate that 88% of randomly contacted households are willing to answer screening questions regarding whether or not they had recently gone recreational saltwater fishing (pers. comm. Dave Van Voorhees, NOAA Fisheries, Silver Spring, MD).

² 368 = 409 * 90%, based on pers. comm. with Terry Jackson (CDFG Anadromous Fisheries Branch, Sacramento, California) indicating that about 90% of steelhead report card holders actually go steelhead fishing during the year.

³ 350 = 368 * 95%, based on MRFSS results indicating that 95% of saltwater anglers contacted via telephone are willing to complete an economic survey of their fishing activities (pers. comm. Dave Van Voorhees, NOAA Fisheries, Silver Spring, MD).

⁴ Derived from 1999 steelhead report card data.

⁵ 1,225 = 350 * 3.5.

Table 5. Relative distribution of salmon and steelhead angler effort on the American and Feather Rivers by county of residence (numbers $\geq .030$ denoted in boldface).

American River		
County	'99 Steelhead Report Card	'99 Central Valley Creel Survey
Sacramento	.589	.644
Placer	.101	.072
El Dorado	.096	.050
San Joaquin	.004	.038
Yolo	.020	.030
Santa Clara	.034	.012
Other CA	.147	.154
Total CA	1.000	1.000

Feather River		
County	'99 Steelhead Report Card	'99 Central Valley Creel Survey
Butte	.438	.177
Sutter	.085	.232
Yuba	.016	.141
Sacramento	.131	.116
Placer	.053	.080
Nevada	.063	.031
Other CA	.214	.223
Total CA	1.000	1.000

Table 6. Population in households in each county in 2000 and relative distribution of river-specific fishing effort among counties (numbers ≥ .030 denoted in boldface).¹

County	Population in Households	Based on '00 CV Chinook Creel Survey Data					Based on '99 Steelhead Report Card Data				
		Sacramento	American	Feather	Yuba	Klamath	Trinity	Mad	Eel		
Santa Clara	1,652,871	.011	.019	.021	.000	.179	.035	.011	.009		
Alameda	1,416,006	.010	.016	.037	.000	.042	.037	.005	.009		
Sacramento	1,198,004	.214	.600	.119	.333	.027	.027	.011	.035		
Contra Costa	937,479	.022	.017	.016	.000	.041	.070	.006	.018		
San Mateo	696,711	.006	.006	.006	.000	.000	.017	.003	.039		
San Joaquin	544,827	.030	.037	.027	.000	.016	.004	.000	.000		
Sonoma	447,512	.007	.019	.015	.000	.030	.015	.015	.123		
Placer	245,511	.040	.079	.060	.333	.019	.014	.005	.004		
Santa Cruz	246,574	.002	.003	.008	.000	.000	.054	.000	.110		
Butte	197,327	.136	.004	.202	.000	.020	.026	.011	.004		
Shasta	159,897	.140	.000	.007	.000	.012	.078	.050	.000		
Yolo	161,145	.046	.041	.026	.000	.027	.026	.005	.000		
El Dorado	155,247	.023	.040	.014	.000	.000	.014	.005	.000		
Humboldt	122,445	.000	.001	.001	.000	.181	.211	.658	.382		
Nevada	91,167	.008	.005	.040	.167	.009	.000	.060	.004		
Mendocino	84,124	.001	.000	.003	.000	.001	.005	.013	.132		
Sutter	77,547	.026	.000	.140	.167	.000	.000	.021	.004		
Tehama	58,885	.059	.000	.007	.000	.032	.051	.019	.009		
Yuba	55,034	.038	.000	.105	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		
Siskiyou	43,611	.003	.000	.001	.000	.179	.006	.003	.000		
Glenn	26,065	.036	.000	.008	.000	.000	.001	.000	.000		
Colusa	18,357	.043	.000	.004	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		
Trinity	12,780	.003	.000	.000	.000	.000	.175	.000	.035		
Subtotal	8,649,126	.951	.914	.910	1.000	.848	.895	.961	.943		
All Else	24,402,768	.049	.086	.090	.000	.152	.105	.039	.057		
Grand Total	33,051,894	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000		

Table 6 (cont.)

¹ County population in households obtained from 2000 Census. Distribution of fishing effort across counties of residence for the Sacramento, American, Feather and Yuba Rivers obtained from 2000 CDFG Central Valley creel survey respondents for whom salmon was the target species. Distribution of fishing effort across counties for the Klamath, Trinity, Mad and Eel rivers were obtained from 1999 CDFG steelhead report card data, used here as a proxy for the distribution of salmon fishing effort.

Table 7. Derivation of the proportion of 2001 California sportfishing license holders residing in 23 central/northern California counties who (a) purchased a steelhead report card and/or (b) targeted salmon.

(1) Total # annual resident California sportfishing licenses sold in 2001 ¹	1,228,636
(2) Total # 2-day California sportfishing licenses sold in 2001 ¹	459,713
(3) Sum	1,688,349
(4) Estimated # 2001 license holders who are freshwater anglers ²	1,381,499
(5) Estimated # 2001 freshwater license holders residing in 23-county area ³	358,994
(6) Total # steelhead report card holders in 2001 ⁴	46,828
(7) Total # 2001 steelhead report card holders residing in 23-county area ⁵	38,999
(8) Steelhead report card holders as proportion of all license holders in 23-county area ⁶	.11
(9) Salmon anglers as proportion of all license holders in 23-county area ⁷	.35

¹ Source of items (1) and (2): California Department of Fish and Game. Because two-day licenses are issued to non-resident as well as resident anglers, item (3) overestimates the total number of resident license holders.

² $1,381,499 = 1,688,349 * 2053/2509$, based on results of a USFWS survey indicating that 2,053,000 of the 2,509,000 resident anglers in California in 1996 went freshwater fishing (USFWS 1998 Tables 3 and 5).

³ As indicated in Table 6, the population of the 23-county area is 8,649,126, which is 26% of the California population (33,051,894). Thus $358,994 = 1,381,499 * 26\%$, based on the assumption that the proportion of licensed freshwater anglers residing in the 23-county area is the same as the proportion of the statewide population residing in those counties.

⁴ Source: California Department of Fish and Game.

⁵ $38,999 = 46,828 * 82\%$, based on 1999 steelhead report card data indicating that 82% of the 46,828 steelhead report card holders in 1999 lived in the 23-county area.

⁶ $.11 = 38,999/358,994$.

⁷ $.35 = .11 * 226/73$, where the 226 and 73 respectively represent the number (in thousands) of freshwater salmon and steelhead anglers in California, as estimated in the 1996 USFWS survey (USFWS 1998, Table 6).

Table 8. Estimates of annual freshwater chinook harvest in California, by river.¹

River	# Chinook	% of Total Harvest

Central Valley:		
Sacramento	45,554	49.4%
American	19,756	21.4%
Feather	18,163	19.7%
Yuba	694	0.8%
Other Rivers:		
Klamath	4,942	5.4%
Trinity	1,914	2.1%
Mad	597	0.6%
Eel	597	0.6%
TOTAL	92,217	100.0%

¹ Chinook harvest estimates were obtained from Murphy *et al.* (1999) for Central Valley rivers, from pers. comm. with Michael Mohr (NOAA Fisheries, Santa Cruz Laboratory) for the Klamath and Trinity Rivers, and from Sparkman (2000) for the Mad River. The Mad River estimate - which is based on chinook harvest data obtained as part of a steelhead creel survey conducted during November 1999-March 2000 - likely underestimates actual annual chinook harvest, as chinook fishing is also known to occur during the late summer/early fall months. Chinook harvest on the Eel River is unknown but assumed to be similar to the Mad River harvest. This assumption is based on similarly low levels of chinook hatchery production on the two rivers.

Table 9a. Estimated relative distribution of statewide salmon fishing effort among counties of residence and rivers.

County	River							Total	
	Sacramento	American	Feather	Yuba	Klamath	Trinity	Mad		Eel
Santa Clara	.006	.005	.005	.000	.012	.001	.000	.000	.028
Alameda	.005	.004	.008	.000	.003	.001	.000	.000	.021
Sacramento	.114	.145	.027	.003	.002	.001	.000	.000	.291
Contra Costa	.012	.004	.004	.000	.003	.002	.000	.000	.024
San Mateo	.003	.002	.001	.000	.001	.000	.000	.000	.008
San Joaquin	.016	.009	.006	.000	.001	.000	.000	.000	.032
Sonoma	.004	.005	.003	.000	.002	.000	.000	.001	.015
Santa Cruz	.022	.019	.014	.003	.001	.000	.000	.000	.058
Placer	.001	.001	.002	.000	.000	.001	.000	.001	.006
Butte	.072	.001	.046	.000	.001	.001	.000	.000	.121
Yolo	.075	.000	.002	.000	.001	.002	.000	.000	.079
Shasta	.024	.010	.006	.000	.002	.001	.000	.000	.043
El Dorado	.012	.010	.003	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.025
Humboldt	.000	.000	.000	.000	.012	.005	.005	.003	.025
Nevada	.004	.001	.009	.001	.001	.000	.000	.000	.017
Mendocino	.001	.000	.001	.000	.000	.000	.000	.001	.003
Sutter	.014	.000	.032	.001	.000	.000	.000	.000	.047
Yuba	.006	.000	.024	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.030
Tehama	.057	.000	.002	.000	.002	.001	.000	.000	.062
Siskiyou	.003	.000	.000	.000	.012	.000	.001	.000	.015
Glenn	.019	.000	.002	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.021
Colusa	.023	.000	.001	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.024
Trinity		.001	.000	.000	.000	.000	.004	.000	.000
									.006
TOTAL	.494	.214	.197	.008	.054	.021	.006	.006	1.000

Table 9b. Number of salmon angler days projected to be sampled in salmon survey, poststratified by river and county of residence (total sample size for each river and county denoted in boldface).¹

County	River								Total
	Sacramento	American	Feather	Yuba	Klamath	Trinity	Mad	Eel	
Santa Clara	18	14	15	0	36	3	0	0	86
Alameda	16	12	26	0	8	3	0	0	66
Sacramento	357	453	85	8	5	2	0	1	912
Contra Costa	38	13	11	0	8	5	0	0	74
San Mateo	10	5	4	0	3	0	0	1	24
San Joaquin	50	28	19	0	3	0	0	0	100
Sonoma	12	14	11	0	6	1	0	3	47
Santa Cruz	68	59	43	8	4	1	0	0	183
Placer	3	2	6	0	0	4	0	2	18
Butte	227	3	144	0	4	2	0	0	380
Yolo	234	0	5	0	2	6	1	0	248
Shasta	76	31	18	0	5	2	0	0	133
El Dorado	38	30	10	0	0	1	0	0	80
Humboldt	1	1	1	0	37	16	15	8	78
Nevada	14	4	28	4	2	0	1	0	53
Mendocino	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	8
Sutter	44	0	100	4	0	0	0	0	149
Yuba	18	0	75	0	0	0	0	0	93
Tehama	178	0	5	0	6	4	0	0	195
Siskiyou	9	0	0	0	36	0	0	0	46
Glenn	60	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	66
Colusa	72	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	75
Trinity		5	0	0	0	0	13	0	1
									19
Subtotal	401	4	220	8	45	18	3	4	703
TOTAL	1,547	671	617	24	168	65	20	20	3,132

¹ Calculated by multiplying the corresponding proportion contained in Table 9a by the total number of angler days expected to be reported by survey respondents (3,132). Rows and columns may not add up exactly, due to rounding error.

Table 10. Derivation of number of completed salmon surveys and number of salmon angler days expected to be reported in the survey sample.

Sample size requirements:

(1) # valid names/addresses/telephone numbers obtained from STS ¹	7,100
(2) # individuals identified in (1) who are willing to respond to screening questionnaire ²	6,248
(3) # individuals identified in (2) who indicate that their interest in fishing includes freshwater fishing ³	5,186
(4) # individuals identified in (3) who had gone freshwater fishing in the past year ⁴	3,786
(5) # individuals identified in (4) whose freshwater fishing activities in the past year included salmon fishing ⁵	379
(6) # individuals identified in (5) who complete the salmon survey ⁶	360

Expected survey results:

(7) Average # salmon angler days/angler ⁷	8.7
(8) Total number of salmon angler days sampled ⁸	3,132

¹ Individuals identified by STS who reside in one of the 23 California counties targeted in the salmon economic survey and who identify “fishing” as one of their “interests”.

² 6,248=7,100*88%, based on results from the Marine Recreational Fishery Statistics Survey (MRFSS), a survey of marine anglers conducted annually by NOAA Fisheries. Results from the MRFSS, which uses a random digit dialing procedure that is similar to the one being proposed here for the salmon survey, indicate that 88% of randomly contacted households are willing to answer screening questions regarding whether or not they had recently gone recreational saltwater fishing (pers. comm. Dave Van Voorhees, NOAA Fisheries, Silver Spring, MD).

³ 5,186=6,248*83%, based on results from USFWS (1998, Table 2, p. 17) indicating that 83% of California residents individuals 16 years and older who fished in California in 1996 went freshwater fishing.

⁴ 3,786=5,186*73%, based on results of Fletcher and King (undated, Table 6, p. 16) indicating that 73% of individuals who had gone freshwater fishing in California in the past three years had their most recent fishing experience in the past year. The assumption here is that individuals in the STS sample who identified “fishing” as one of their “interests” had actually fished some time in the past three years.

⁵ 379=3,786*10%, based on results from USFWS (1998, Table 6, p. 20) indicating that 10% of individuals 16 years and older who went freshwater fishing in California in 1996 went salmon fishing.

⁶ $360=379*95\%$, based on MRFSS results indicating that 95% of saltwater anglers contacted via telephone were willing to complete an economic survey of their fishing activities (pers. comm. Dave Van Voorhees, NOAA Fisheries, Silver Spring, MD).

⁷ Based on assumption that freshwater salmon anglers make went salmon fishing an average of 8.7 days per year, as indicated by the USFWS (1998, Table 6, p. 20).

⁸ $3,132 = 360*8.7$.

ATTACHMENT A

STEELHEAD {SALMON} SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

Note: The same questionnaire will be used for the salmon and steelhead surveys, with the following minor variations: Steelhead survey respondents will be asked screening questions A1-A2; salmon survey respondents will be asked screening questions B1-B3. The remainder of the questionnaire (Questions C1-C15, D1-D9, E1-E5 and F1-F9) will be the same for all survey respondents, except that the word “steelhead” will be used in the steelhead survey and the word “salmon” will be used in the salmon survey wherever the phrase “steelhead {salmon}” appears in the questionnaire.

Screening Questions - Steelhead Version

Hello. This is {name of interviewer} calling from {company conducting the survey}. I’m conducting a survey of steelhead report card holders. The survey is authorized under OMB Control Number _____ and is sponsored by NOAA Fisheries. NOAA Fisheries is interested in determining whether changes in hatchery operations might benefit steelhead stocks listed under the Endangered Species Act. They are also interested in determining how such changes might affect the steelhead fishery. The purpose of this survey is to obtain socioeconomic information on the fishery, including characteristics of fishermen and how much they spend on fishing. The survey is voluntary and all information that you provide will be kept strictly confidential. If you’re an active steelhead angler, the survey will take about 15 minutes of your time.

A1. I understand that you purchased a steelhead report card some time in the past 12 months. Is this correct?

- 01 Yes
- 02 No [Thank respondent and terminate interview.]
- 98 Don’t know [Thank respondent and terminate interview.]
- 99 Refused [Thank respondent and terminate interview.]

A2. Did you actually go steelhead fishing in California in the past 12 months?

- 01 Yes [Skip to C1.]
- 02 No [Thank respondent and terminate interview.]
- 98 Don’t know [Thank respondent and terminate interview.]
- 99 Refused [Thank respondent and terminate interview.]

Screening Questions - Salmon Version

Hello. This is {name of interviewer} calling from {company conducting the survey}. I’m conducting a survey of freshwater salmon anglers. The survey is authorized under OMB Control Number _____ and is sponsored by NOAA Fisheries. NOAA Fisheries is interested in determining whether changes in hatchery operations might benefit salmon stocks listed under the Endangered Species Act. They are also interested in determining how such changes might affect

the salmon fishery. The purpose of this survey is to obtain socioeconomic information on the fishery, including characteristics of fishermen and how much they spend on fishing. The survey is voluntary and all information that you provide will be kept strictly confidential. If you're an active steelhead angler, the survey will take about 15 minutes of your time.

B1. Did you go freshwater fishing in California in the past 12 months?

- 01 Yes
- 02 No [Thank respondent and terminate interview.]
- 98 Don't know [Thank respondent and terminate interview.]
- 99 Refused [Thank respondent and terminate interview.]

B2. Did you target salmon on any of these trips?

- 01 Yes
- 02 No
- 98 Don't know [Thank respondent and terminate interview.]
- 99 Refused [Thank respondent and terminate interview.]

B3. Did you purchase a steelhead report card in California in the past 12 months?

- 01 Yes
- 02 No
- 98 Don't know
- 99 Refused

Details of Freshwater Steelhead {Salmon} Trips in California

C1. How many freshwater steelhead {salmon} fishing trips did you make in California in the past 12 months?

- __ __ trips
- 998 Don't know
- 999 Refused

I'd like to ask you some details of your steelhead {salmon} trips. Beginning with your most recent trip:

C2. In what month did you make the trip?

- 01 Jan 07 Jul 98 Don't know
- 02 Feb 08 Aug 99 Refused
- 03 Mar 09 Sep
- 04 Apr 10 Oct
- 05 May 11 Nov
- 06 Jun 12 Dec

C3. What was the main purpose of the trip?

- 01 Fishing

- 02 Vacation
- 03 Business
- 04 Other - Specify: _____
- 98 Don't know
- 99 Refused

C4. How many days did you spend away from home on the trip?

- ___ days [If C4 response=1, skip to C6. If C4 response >1, continue to C5.]
- 998 Don't know [Skip to C6.]
- 999 Refused [Skip to C6.]

C5. On how many of these days did you actually go steelhead {salmon} fishing on the trip?

- ___ days [Must be <=C4 response]
- 998 Don't know
- 999 Refused

C6. How did you do most of your steelhead {salmon} fishing on this trip? From a

- 01 Riverbank
- 02 Private boat/skiff/zodiac/canoe
- 03 Rented boat with hired guide
- 98 Don't know
- 99 Refused

C7. On which river did you do most of your steelhead {salmon} fishing on this trip?

- 01 Smith ⇒ Above, at or below Rowdy Creek Hatchery?
02a Above; 02b At or below; 02c Don't know; 02d Refused
- 02 Klamath ⇒ Above, at or below Iron Gate Hatchery?
02a Above; 02b At or below; 02c; Don't know; 02d Refused
- 03 Trinity ⇒ Above, at or below Trinity River Hatchery?
03a Above; 03b At or below; 03c Don't know; 03d Refused
- 04 Mad ⇒ Above, at or below Mad River Hatchery?
04a Above; 04b At or below; 04c Don't know; 04d Refused
- 05 Eel/VanDuzen ⇒ Above, at or below Van Duzen Hatchery?
05a Above; 05b At or below; 05c Don't know; 05d Refused
- 06 Gualala ⇒ Above, at or below Ten Mile Hatchery?
06a Above; 06b At or below; 06c Don't know; 06d Refused
- 07 Russian ⇒ Above, at or below Warm Springs Hatchery?
07a Above; 07b At or below; 07c Don't know; 07d Refused
- 08 San Lorenzo ⇒ Above, at or below Kingfish Flat Hatchery?
08a Above; 08b At or below; 08c Don't know; 08d Refused
- 09 Sacramento ⇒ Above, at or below Coleman National Fish Hatchery?
09a Above; 09b At or below; 09c Don't know; 09d Refused
- 10 Feather ⇒ Above, at or below Feather River Hatchery?
10a Above; 10b At or below; 10c Don't know; 10d Refused

- 11 Yuba
- 12 American ⇒ Above, at or below Nimbus Hatchery?
12a Above; 12b At or below; 12c Don't know; 12d Refused
- 13 Other - Specify: _____
- 98 Don't know
- 99 Refused

C8. In what county did you do most of your steelhead {salmon} fishing on this trip?

___ [Enter county FIPS code.]

- 998 Don't know
- 999 Refused

C9. Did you make this trip alone or with other people?

- 01 Alone [Skip to C12.]
- 02 With others
- 98 Don't know [Skip to C14.]
- 99 Refused [Skip to C14.]

C10. How many people went with you on this trip?

___ people

- 998 Don't know [Skip to C14.]
- 999 Refused [Skip to C14.]

C11. How many people who were with you actually fished on this trip?

___ people [Must be <= C10 response]

- 998 Don't know [Skip to C14.]
- 999 Refused [Skip to C14.]

C12. If C9 response = "Alone": About how much money did you spend on this trip for:

If C9 response = "With others": About how much money did you and your companions spend on this trip for:

Food? \$_____

Lodging? \$_____

Gasoline? \$_____

Other travel costs? Specify type of cost: _____ Specify amount spent: \$_____

[For each expenditure category, enter 0 if nothing spent, 99998 if don't know, 99999 if refused.]

C13. If C9 response = "Alone" or C11 response = 0: About how much money did you spend on this trip for:

If C11 response > 0: About how much money did you and your fishing companions spend on this trip for:

Gear, tackle and bait? \$ _____
Boat fuel? \$ _____ [Ask only if C6 response="Priv boat/skiff/zodiac/canoe".]
River guide fees? \$ _____ [Ask only if C6 response="Rented boat with hired guide".]
Other? Specify type of expense: _____ \$ _____

[For each expenditure category, enter 0 if nothing spent, 99998 if don't know, 99999 if refused.]

C14. Did you give up any income in order to make this trip?

01 Yes
02 No [Skip to D1.]
98 Don't know [Skip to D1.]
99 Refused [Skip to D1.]

C15. How much income did you give up?

\$ _____
99998 Don't know
99999 Refused

[Go back to C2 and repeat until all freshwater steelhead {salmon} trips are exhausted.]

Details of Other Freshwater and Saltwater Fishing Trips Inside and Outside of California

D1. Besides the steelhead {salmon} trips that we just discussed, did you made any other freshwater or saltwater fishing trips in the past 12 months, either inside or outside of California?

01 Yes
02 No [Skip to E1.]
98 Don't know [Skip to E1.]
99 Refused [Skip to E1.]

D2. How many of these other fishing trips did you make in the past 12 months?

____ trips
998 Don't know
999 Refused

I'd like to ask you some details of these trips. Beginning with your most recent trip:

D3. Was this a freshwater or saltwater fishing trip?

- 01 Freshwater
- 02 Saltwater
- 98 Don't know
- 99 Refused

D4. In what state did you do most of your fishing on this trip?

__ __ [Enter state FIPS code.]

- 998 Don't know
- 999 Refused

D5. In what county did you do most of your fishing on this trip?

__ __ [Enter county FIPS code.]

- 998 Don't know
- 999 Refused

[If D3 response="Freshwater", ask D6-D8. If D3 response = "Saltwater", skip to D9.]

D6. Did you do most of your fishing on this trip in a river, lake or reservoir?

- 01 River
- 02 Lake or reservoir [Skip to D8.]
- 98 Don't know [Skip to D8.]
- 99 Refused [Skip to D8.]

D7. On what river did you do most of your fishing?

- 01 Smith
- 02 Klamath
- 03 Trinity.
- 04 Mad
- 05 Eel/VanDuzen
- 06 Gualala
- 07 Russian
- 08 San Lorenzo
- 09 Sacramento
- 10 Feather
- 11 Yuba
- 12 American
- 13 Other - Specify: _____
- 98 Don't know
- 99 Refused

D8. What type of fish were you targeting on this trip?

- 01 Steelhead [This response valid only if steelhead trip was made outside California, as steelhead trips in California are already covered under Section C.]
- 02 Salmon [This response valid only if salmon trip occurred in saltwater or was made outside California, as freshwater salmon trips in California are already covered under Section C.]
- 03 Striped bass
- 04 Sturgeon
- 05 American shad
- 06 Catfish
- 07 Bass
- 08 Other Particular Species - Specify: _____
- 09 Anything - whatever I could catch
- 98 Don't know
- 99 Refused

[Go back to D3 until all trips exhausted. Then skip to E1.]

D9. What type of fish were you targeting on this trip?

- 01 Salmon
- 02 Bottomfish (rockfish, lingcod)
- 03 Halibut
- 04 Bonito/barracuda/bass
- 05 Tuna
- 06 Jacks
- 07 Sturgeon
- 08 Striped bass
- 09 Other Particular Species - Specify: _____
- 10 Anything - whatever I could catch
- 98 Don't know
- 99 Refused

[Go back to D3 until all trips exhausted.]

Annual Expenditures on Gear/Equipment/Boat

Now I'm going to ask you some questions about what you spend per year for gear, equipment and boats.

E1. How much did you spend in the past 12 months for fishing gear and equipment (e.g., rods, reels, hooks, lines, GPS, etc.)?

- \$_____ [Enter 0 if nothing spent.]
- 99998 Don't know
- 99999 Refused

E2. Thinking of all the days that you used your gear and equipment over the past 12 months, what percentage of the time were they used for freshwater steelhead {salmon} fishing in California?

___%
998 Don't know

999 Refused

E3. Do you own a boat/skiff/zodiac/canoe that is used for freshwater steelhead {salmon} fishing in California?

01 Yes

02 No [Skip to F1.]

98 Don't Know [Skip to F1.]

99 Refused [Skip to F1.]

E4. Thinking of all the days that the boat was used over the past 12 months, what percent of that time was the boat/skiff/zodiac/canoe used for freshwater steelhead {salmon} fishing in California?

___%
998 Don't know

999 Refused

E5. How much did you spend on the boat/skiff/zodiac/canoe in the past 12 months for:

Replacement of equipment &

electronics attached to the boat? \$_____

Maintenance and repair? \$_____

Storage/slip fees? \$_____

License fees? \$_____

Insurance? \$_____

Other - Specify: _____ \$_____

[For each expenditure category, enter 0 if nothing spent, 99998 if don't know, 99999 if refused.]

Angler Demographics

Now I'd like to end by asking you some demographic questions.

F1. What is your zipcode of residence?

99998 Don't know

99999 Refused

F2. How many years have you spent freshwater fishing for steelhead {salmon}?

____ years
998 Don't know

999 Refused

F3. How would you rank your freshwater steelhead {salmon} fishing ability on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is a novice and 5 is an expert?

- 01 Novice
- 02 Novice/Intermediate
- 03 Intermediate
- 04 Intermediate/Expert
- 05 Expert
- 98 Don't know
- 99 Refused

F4. Record gender: Voice recognition only ... do not ask.

- 01 Male
- 02 Female
- 98 Don't know

F5. In what year were you born?

- 9998 Don't know
- 9999 Refused

F6. What is your ethnic background (multiple answers allowed)? Do you consider yourself

- 01 Non-Hispanic White
- 02 Hispanic White
- 03 Black
- 04 Asian
- 05 Native American
- 06 Other - Specify: _____
- 98 Don't know
- 99 Refused

F7. What is the highest level of education that you've attained?

- 01 < 12 years
- 02 High school graduate or GED
- 03 Some college or technical/trade school
- 04 Two-year college degree
- 05 Four-year college degree
- 06 Postgraduate degree
- 98 Don't know
- 99 Refused

F8. Which of the following best describes your employment status? Would you say ...

- 01 Employed full time, including self employment
- 02 Employed part time, including self employment
- 03 Retired
- 04 Full time homemaker
- 05 Student
- 06 Other - Specify:
- 98 Don't know
- 99 Refused

F9. What is your annual household income before taxes? Would you say ...

- 01 Less than \$15,000
- 02 \$15,001-\$25,000
- 03 \$25,001-\$35,000
- 04 \$35,001-\$45,000
- 05 \$45,001-\$60,000
- 06 \$60,001-\$75,000
- 07 \$75,001-\$100,000
- 08 \$100,001-\$125,000
- 09 \$125,001-\$150,000
- 10 \$150,001-\$175,000
- 11 Greater than \$175,000
- 98 Don't know
- 99 Refused

Thank you for participating in this survey.

ited into a special fund known as the cooperative endangered species conservation fund, to be administered by the Secretary, an amount equal to five percent of the combined amounts covered each fiscal year into the Federal aid to wildlife restoration fund under section 3 of the Act of September 2, 1937, and paid, transferred, or otherwise credited each fiscal year to the Sport Fishing Restoration Account established under 1016 of the Act of July 18, 1984.

(2) Amounts deposited into the special fund are authorized to be appropriated annually and allocated in accordance with subsection (d) of this section.

(16 U.S.C. 1535)

INTERAGENCY COOPERATION

SEC. 7. (a) FEDERAL AGENCY ACTIONS AND CONSULTATIONS.—

(1) The Secretary shall review other programs administered by him and utilize such programs in furtherance of the purposes of this Act. All other Federal agencies shall, in consultation with and with the assistance of the Secretary, utilize their authorities in furtherance of the purposes of this Act by carrying out programs for the conservation of endangered species and threatened species listed pursuant to section 4 of this Act.

(2) Each Federal agency shall, in consultation with and with the assistance of the Secretary, insure that any action authorized, funded, or carried out by such agency (hereinafter in this section referred to as an "agency action") is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any endangered species or threatened species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of habitat of such species which is determined by the Secretary, after consultation as appropriate with affected States, to be critical, unless such agency has been granted an exemption for such action by the Committee pursuant to subsection (h) of this section. In fulfilling the requirements of this paragraph each agency shall use the best scientific and commercial data available.

(3) Subject to such guidelines as the Secretary may establish, a Federal agency shall consult with the Secretary on any prospective agency action at the request of, and in cooperation with, the prospective permit or license applicant if the applicant has reason to believe that an endangered species or a threatened species may be present in the area affected by his project and that implementation of such action will likely affect such species.

(4) Each Federal agency shall confer with the Secretary on any agency action which is likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any species proposed to be listed under section 4 or result in the destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat proposed to be designated for such species. This paragraph does not require a limitation on the commitment of resources as described in subsection (d).

(b) OPINION OF SECRETARY.—(1)(A) Consultation under subsection (a)(2) with respect to any agency action shall be concluded within the 90-day period beginning on the date on which initiated or, subject to subparagraph (B), within such other period of time as is mutually agreeable to the Secretary and the Federal agency.

(B) In the case of an agency action involving a permit or license applicant, the Secretary and the Federal agency may not mutually agree to conclude consultation within a period exceeding 90 days unless the Secretary, before the close of the 90th day referred to in subparagraph (A)—

(i) if the consultation period proposed to be agreed to will end before the 150th day after the date on which consultation was initiated, submits to the applicant a written statement setting forth—

(I) the reasons why a longer period is required;

(II) the information that is required to complete the consultation; and

(III) the estimated date on which consultation will be completed; or

(ii) if the consultation period proposed to be agreed to will end 150 or more days after the date on which consultation was initiated, obtains the consent of the applicant to such period.

The Secretary and the Federal agency may mutually agree to extend a consultation period established under the preceding sentence if the Secretary, before the close of such period, obtains the consent of the applicant to the extension.

(2) Consultation under subsection (a)(3) shall be concluded within such period as is agreeable to the Secretary, the Federal agency, and the applicant concerned.

(3)(A) Promptly after conclusion of consultation under paragraph (2) or (3) of subsection (a), the Secretary shall provide to the Federal agency and the applicant, if any, a written statement setting forth the Secretary's opinion, and a summary of the information on which the opinion is based, detailing how the agency action affects the species or its critical habitat. If jeopardy or adverse modification is found, the Secretary shall suggest those reasonable and prudent alternatives which he believes would not violate subsection (a)(2) and can be taken by the Federal agency or applicant in implementing the agency action.

(B) Consultation under subsection (a)(3), and an opinion based by the Secretary incident to such consultation, regarding an agency action shall be treated respectively as a consultation under subsection (a)(2), and as an opinion issued after consultation under such subsection, regarding that action if the Secretary reviews the action before it is commenced by the Federal agency and finds, and notifies such agency, that no significant changes have been made with respect to the action and that no significant change has occurred regarding the information used during the initial consultation.

(4) If after consultation under subsection (a)(2) of this section, the Secretary concludes that—

(A) the agency action will not violate such subsection, or offers reasonable and prudent alternatives which the Secretary believes would not violate such subsection;

(B) the taking of an endangered species or a threatened species incidental to the agency action will not violate such subsection; and

(C) if an endangered species or threatened species of a marine mammal is involved, the taking is authorized pursuant to section 101(a)(5) of the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972. the Secretary shall provide the Federal agency and the applicant concerned, if any, with a written statement that—

(i) specifies the impact of such incidental taking on the species,

(ii) specifies those reasonable and prudent measures that the Secretary considers necessary or appropriate to minimize such impact,

(iii) in the case of marine mammals, specifies those measures that are necessary to comply with section 101(a)(5) of the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 with regard to such taking, and

(iv) sets forth the terms and conditions (including, but not limited to, reporting requirements) that must be complied with by the Federal agency or applicant (if any), or both, to implement the measures specified under clauses (ii) and (iii).

(c) BIOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT.—(1) To facilitate compliance with the requirements of subsection (a)(2) each Federal agency shall, with respect to any agency action of such agency for which no contract for construction has been entered into and for which no construction has begun on the date of enactment of the Endangered Species Act Amendments of 1978, request of the Secretary information whether any species which is listed or proposed to be listed may be present in the area of such proposed action. If the Secretary advises, based on the best scientific and commercial data available, that such species may be present, such agency shall conduct a biological assessment for the purpose of identifying any endangered species or threatened species which is likely to be affected by such action. Such assessment shall be completed within 180 days after the date on which initiated (or within such other period as in mutually agreed to by the Secretary and such agency, except that if a permit or license applicant is involved, the 180-day period may not be extended unless such agency provides the applicant, before the close of such period, with a written statement setting forth the estimated length of the proposed extension and the reasons therefor) and, before any contract for construction is entered into and before construction is begun with respect to such action. Such assessment may be undertaken as part of a Federal agency's compliance with the requirements of section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332).

(2) Any person who may wish to apply for an exemption under subsection (g) of this section for that action may conduct a biological assessment to identify any endangered species or threatened species which is likely to be affected by such action. Any such biological assessment must, however, be conducted in cooperation with the Secretary and under the supervision of the appropriate Federal agency.

(d) LIMITATION ON COMMITMENT OF RESOURCES.—After initiation of consultation required under subsection (a)(2), the Federal agency and the permit or license applicant shall not make any irreversible or irretrievable commitment of resources with respect to the agency action which has the effect of foreclosing the formula-

tion or implementation of any reasonable and prudent alternative measures which would not violate subsection (a)(2).

(e)(1) ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMITTEE.—There is established a committee to be known as the Endangered Species Committee (hereinafter in this section referred to as the “Committee”).

(2) The Committee shall review any application submitted to it pursuant to this section and determine in accordance with subsection (h) of this section whether or not to grant an exemption from the requirements of subsection (a)(2) of this action for the action set forth in such application.

(3) The Committee shall be composed of seven members as follows:

- (A) The Secretary of Agriculture.
- (B) The Secretary of the Army.
- (C) The Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors.
- (D) The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency. Agency.¹
- (E) The Secretary of the Interior.
- (F) The Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

(G) The President, after consideration of any recommendations received pursuant to subsection (g)(2)(B) shall appoint one individual from each affected State, as determined by the Secretary, to be a member of the Committee for the consideration of the application for exemption for an agency action with respect to which such recommendations are made, not later than 30 days after an application is submitted pursuant to this section.

(4)(A) Members of the Committee shall receive no additional pay on account of their service on the Committee.

(B) While away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of services for the Committee, members of the Committee shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in the same manner as persons employed intermittently in the Government service are allowed expenses under section 5703 of title 5 of the United States Code²

(5)(A) Five members of the Committee or their representatives shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of any function of the Committee, except that, in no case shall any representative be considered in determining the existence of a quorum for the transaction of any function of the Committee if that function involves a vote by the Committee on any matter before the Committee.

(B) The Secretary of the Interior shall be the Chairman of the Committee.

(C) The Committee shall meet at the call of the Chairman or five of its members.

(D) All meetings and records of the Committee shall be open to the public.

(6) Upon request of the Committee, the head of any Federal agency is authorized to detail, on a nonreimbursable basis, any of

¹So in law. At the end of section 7(e)(3)(D) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, the second “Agency.” should had been stricken.

²So in law. At the end of section 7(e)(4)(B) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, the period at end of the paragraph was omitted.

the personnel of such agency to the Committee to assist it in carrying out its duties under this section.

(7)(A) The Committee may for the purpose of carrying out its duties under this section hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, and receive such evidence, as the Committee deems advisable.

(B) When so authorized by the Committee, any member or agent of the Committee may take any action which the Committee is authorized to take by this paragraph.

(C) Subject to the Privacy Act, the Committee may secure directly from any Federal agency information necessary to enable it to carry out its duties under this section. Upon request of the Chairman of the Committee, the head of such Federal agency shall furnish such information to the Committee.

(D) The Committee may use the United States mails in the same manner and upon the same conditions as a Federal agency.

(E) The Administrator of General Services shall provide to the Committee on a reimbursable basis such administrative support services as the Committee may request.

(8) In carrying out its duties under this section, the Committee may promulgate and amend such rules, regulations, and procedures, and issue and amend such orders as it deems necessary.

(9) For the purpose of obtaining information necessary for the consideration of an application for an exemption under this section the Committee may issue subpoenas for the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of relevant papers, books, and documents.

(10) In no case shall any representative, including a representative of a member designated pursuant to paragraph (3)(G) of this subsection, be eligible to cast a vote on behalf of any member.

(f) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of the Endangered Species Act Amendments of 1978, the Secretary shall promulgate regulations which set forth the form and manner in which applications for exemption shall be submitted to the Secretary and the information to be contained in such applications. Such regulations shall require that information submitted in an application by the head of any Federal agency with respect to any agency action include but not be limited to—

(1) a description of the consultation process carried out pursuant to subsection (a)(2) of this section between the head of the Federal agency and the Secretary; and

(2) a statement describing why such action cannot be altered or modified to conform with the requirements of subsection (a)(2) of this section.

(g) APPLICATION FOR EXEMPTION AND REPORT TO THE COMMITTEE.—(1) A Federal agency, the Governor of the State in which an agency action will occur, if any, or a permit or license applicant may apply to the Secretary for an exemption for an agency action of such agency if, after consultation under subsection (a)(2), the Secretary's opinion under subsection (b) indicates that the agency action would violate subsection (a)(2). An application for an exemption shall be considered initially by the Secretary in the manner provided for in this subsection, and shall be considered by the Committee for a final determination under subsection (h) after a report

is made pursuant to paragraph (5). The applicant for an exemption shall be referred to as the "exemption applicant" in this section.

(2)(A) An exemption applicant shall submit a written application to the Secretary, in a form prescribed under subsection (f), not later than 90 days after the completion of the consultation process; except that, in the case of any agency action involving a permit or license applicant, such application shall be submitted not later than 90 days after the date on which the Federal agency concerned takes final agency action with respect to the issuance of the permit or license. For purposes of the preceding sentence, the term "final agency action" means (i) a disposition by an agency with respect to the issuance of a permit or license that is subject to administrative review, whether or not such disposition is subject to judicial review; or (ii) if administrative review is sought with respect to such disposition, the decision resulting after such review. Such application shall set forth the reasons why the exemption applicant considers that the agency action meets the requirements for an exemption under this subsection.

(B) Upon receipt of an application for exemption for an agency action under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall promptly (i) notify the Governor of each affected State, if any, as determined by the Secretary, and request the Governors so notified to recommend individuals to be appointed to the Endangered Species Committee for consideration of such application; and (ii) publish notice of receipt of the application in the Federal Register, including a summary of the information contained in the application and a description of the agency action with respect to which the application for exemption has been filed.

(3) The Secretary shall within 20 days after the receipt of an application for exemption, or within such other period of time as is mutually agreeable to the exemption applicant and the Secretary—

(A) determine that the Federal agency concerned and the exemption applicant have—

(i) carried out the consultation responsibilities described in subsection (a) in good faith and made a reasonable and responsible effort to develop and fairly consider modifications or reasonable and prudent alternatives to the proposed agency action which would not violate subsection (a)(2);

(ii) conducted any biological assessment required by subsection (c); and

(iii) to the extent determinable within the time provided herein, refrained from making any irreversible or irretrievable commitment of resources prohibited by subsection (d); or

(B) deny the application for exemption because the Federal agency concerned or the exemption applicant have not met the requirements set forth in subparagraph (A)(i), (ii), and (iii).

The denial of an application under subparagraph (B) shall be considered final agency action for purposes of chapter 7 of title 5, United States Code.

(4) If the Secretary determines that the Federal agency concerned and the exemption applicant have met the requirements set

forth in paragraph (3)(A) (i), (ii) and (iii) he shall, in consultation with the Members of the Committee, hold a hearing on the application for exemption in accordance with sections 554, 555, and 556 (other than subsection (b) (1) and (2) thereof) of title 5, United States Code, and prepare the report to be submitted pursuant to paragraph (5).

(5) Within 140 days after making the determinations under paragraph (3) or within such other period of time as in mutually agreeable to the exemption applicant and the Secretary, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee a report discussing—

(A) the availability and reasonable and prudent alternatives to the agency action, and the nature and extent of the benefits of the agency action and of alternative courses of action consistent with conserving the species of the critical habitat;

(B) a summary of the evidence concerning whether or not the agency action is in the public interest and is of national or regional significance;

(C) appropriate reasonable mitigation and enhancement measures which should be considered by the Committee; and

(D) whether the Federal agency concerned and the exemption applicant refrained from making any irreversible or irretrievable commitment of resources prohibited by subsection (d).

(6) To the extent practicable within the time required for action under subsection (g) of this section, and except to the extent inconsistent with the requirements of this section, the consideration of any application for an exemption under this section and the conduct of any hearing under this subsection shall be in accordance with sections 554, 555, and 556 (other than subsection (b)(3) of section 556) of title 5, United States Code.

(7) Upon request of the Secretary, the head of any Federal agency is authorized to detail, on a nonreimbursable basis, any of the personnel of such agency to the Secretary to assist him in carrying out his duties under this section.

(8) All meetings and records resulting from activities pursuant to this subsection shall be open to the public.

(h) EXEMPTION.—(1) The Committee shall make a final determination whether or not to grant an exemption within 30 days after receiving the report of the Secretary pursuant to subsection (g)(5). The Committee shall grant an exemption from the requirements of subsection (a)(2) for an agency action if, by a vote of not less than five of its members voting in person—

(A) it determines on the record, based on the report of the Secretary, the record of the hearing held under subsection (g)(4), and on such other testimony or evidence as it may receive, that—

(i) there are no reasonable and prudent alternatives to the agency action;

(ii) the benefits of such action clearly outweigh the benefits of alternative courses of action consistent with conserving the species or its critical habitat, and such action is in the public interest;

(iii) the action is of regional or national significance; and

(iv) neither the Federal agency concerned nor the exemption applicant made any irreversible or irretrievable commitment of resources prohibited by subsection (d); and (B) it establishes such reasonable mitigation and enhancement measures, including, but not limited to, live propagation, transplantation, and habitat acquisition and improvement, as are necessary and appropriate to minimize the adverse effects of the agency action upon the endangered species, threatened species, or critical habitat concerned.

Any final determination by Committee under this subsection shall be considered final agency action for purposes of chapter 7 of title 5 of the United States Code.

(2)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), an exemption for an agency action granted under paragraph (1) shall constitute a permanent exemption with respect to all endangered or threatened species for the purposes of completing such agency action—

(i) regardless whether the species was identified in the biological assessment; and

(ii) only if a biological assessment has been conducted under subsection (c) with respect to such agency action.

(B) An exemption shall be permanent under subparagraph (A) unless—

(i) the Secretary finds, based on the best scientific and commercial data available, that such exemption would result in the extinction of a species that was not the subject of consultation under subsection (a)(2) or was not identified in any biological assessment conducted under subsection (c), and

(ii) the Committee determines within 60 days after the date of the Secretary's finding that the exemption should not be permanent.

If the Secretary makes a finding described in clause (i), the Committee shall meet with respect to the matter within 30 days after the date of the finding.

(i) REVIEW BY SECRETARY OF STATE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Committee shall be prohibited from considering for exemption any application made to it, if the Secretary of State, after a review of the proposed agency action and its potential implications, and after hearing, certifies, in writing, to the Committee within 60 days of any application made under this section that the granting of any such exemption and the carrying out of such action would be in violation of an international treaty obligation or other international obligation of the United States. The Secretary of State shall, at the time of such certification, publish a copy thereof in the Federal Register.

(j) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Committee shall grant an exemption for any agency action if the Secretary of Defense finds that such exemption is necessary for reasons of national security.

(k) SPECIAL PROVISIONS.—An exemption decision by the Committee under this section shall not be a major Federal action for purposes of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.): *Provided*, That an environmental impact statement which discusses the impacts upon endangered species or threatened species or their critical habitats shall have been pre-

viously prepared with respect to any agency action exempted by such order.

(l) COMMITTEE ORDERS.—(1) If the Committee determines under subsection (h) that an exemption should be granted with respect to any agency action, the Committee shall issue an order granting the exemption and specifying the mitigation and enhancement measures established pursuant to subsection (h) which shall be carried out and paid for by the exemption applicant in implementing the agency action. All necessary mitigation and enhancement measures shall be authorized prior to the implementing of the agency action and funded concurrently with all other project features.

(2) The applicant receiving such exemption shall include the costs of such mitigation and enhancement measures within the overall costs of continuing the proposed action. Notwithstanding the preceding sentence the costs of such measures shall not be treated as project costs for the purpose of computing benefit-cost or other ratios for the proposed action. Any applicant may request the Secretary to carry out such mitigation and enhancement measures. The costs incurred by the Secretary in carrying out any such measures shall be paid by the applicant receiving the exemption. No later than one year after the granting of an exemption, the exemption applicant shall submit to the Council on Environmental Quality a report describing its compliance with the mitigation and enhancement measures prescribed by this section. Such report shall be submitted annually until all such mitigation and enhancement measures have been completed. Notice of the public availability of such reports shall be published in the Federal Register by the Council on Environmental Quality.

(m) NOTICE.—The 60-day notice requirement of section 11(g) of this Act shall not apply with respect to review of any final determination of the Committee under subsection (h) of this section granting an exemption from the requirements of subsection (a)(2) of this section.

(n) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Any person, as defined by section 3(13) of this Act, may obtain judicial review, under chapter 7 of title 5 of the United States Code, of any decision of the Endangered Species Committee under subsection (h) in the United States Court of Appeals for (1) any circuit wherein the agency action concerned will be, or is being, carried out, or (2) in any case in which the agency action will be, or is being, carried out outside of any circuit, the District of Columbia, by filing in such court within 90 days after the date of issuance of the decision, a written petition for review. A copy of such petition shall be transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Committee and the Committee shall file in the court the record in the proceeding, as provided in section 2112, of title 28, United States Code. Attorneys designated by the Endangered Species Committee may appear for, and represent the Committee in any action for review under this subsection.

(o) EXEMPTION AS PROVIDING EXCEPTION ON TAKING OF ENDANGERED SPECIES.—Notwithstanding sections 4(d) and 9(a)(1)(B) and (C) of this Act, sections 101 and 102 of the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972, or any regulation promulgated to implement any such section—

(1) any action for which an exemption is granted under subsection (h) of this section shall not be considered to be a taking of any endangered species or threatened species with respect to any activity which is necessary to carry out such action; and

(2) any taking that is in compliance with the terms and conditions specified in a written statement provided under subsection (b)(4)(iv) of this section shall not be considered to be a prohibited taking of the species concerned.

(p) EXEMPTIONS IN PRESIDENTIALLY DECLARED DISASTER AREAS.—In any area which has been declared by the President to be a major disaster area under the Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, the President is authorized to make the determinations required by subsections (g) and (h) of this section for any project for the repair or replacement of a public facility substantially as it existed prior to the disaster under section 405 or 406 of the Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, and which the President determines (1) is necessary to prevent the recurrence of such a natural disaster and to reduce the potential loss of human life, and (2) to involve an emergency situation which does not allow the ordinary procedures of this section to be followed. Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the Committee shall accept the determinations of the President under this subsection.

(16 U.S.C. 1536)

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

SEC. 8. (a) FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE.—As a demonstration of the commitment of the United States to the worldwide protection of endangered species and threatened species, the President may, subject to the provisions of section 1415 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1953 (31 U.S.C. 724), use foreign currencies accruing to the United States Government under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 or any other law to provide to any foreign country (with its consent) assistance in the development and management of programs in that country which the Secretary determines to be necessary or useful for the conservation of any endangered species or threatened species listed by the Secretary pursuant to section 4 of this Act. The President shall provide assistance (which includes, but is not limited to, the acquisition, by lease or otherwise, of lands, waters, or interests therein) to foreign countries under this section under such terms and conditions as he deems appropriate. Whenever foreign currencies are available for the provision of assistance under this section, such currencies shall be used in preference to funds appropriated under the authority of section 15 of this Act.

(b) ENCOURAGEMENT OF FOREIGN PROGRAMS.—In order to carry out further the provisions of this Act, the Secretary, through the Secretary of State shall encourage—

(1) foreign countries to provide for the conservation of fish or wildlife and plants including endangered species and threatened species listed pursuant to section 4 of this Act;

Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act

Public Law 94-265

As amended through October 11, 1996

SEC. 303. CONTENTS OF FISHERY MANAGEMENT PLANS 16 U.S.C. 1853

95-354, 99-659, 101-627, 104-297

(a) REQUIRED PROVISIONS.--Any fishery management plan which is prepared by any Council, or by the Secretary, with respect to any fishery, shall--

(1) contain the conservation and management measures, applicable to foreign fishing and fishing by vessels of the United States, which are--

(A) necessary and appropriate for the conservation and management of the fishery to prevent overfishing and rebuild overfished stocks, and to protect, restore, and promote the long-term health and stability of the fishery;

(B) described in this subsection or subsection (b), or both; and

(C) consistent with the national standards, the other provisions of this Act, regulations implementing recommendations by international organizations in which the United States participates (including but not limited to closed areas, quotas, and size limits), and any other applicable law;

(2) contain a description of the fishery, including, but not limited to, the number of vessels involved, the type and quantity of fishing gear used, the species of fish involved and their location, the cost likely to be incurred in management, actual and potential revenues from the fishery, any recreational interest in the fishery, and the nature and extent of foreign fishing and Indian treaty fishing rights, if any;

(3) assess and specify the present and probable future condition of, and the maximum sustainable yield and optimum yield from, the fishery, and include a summary of the information utilized in making such specification;

(4) assess and specify--

(A) the capacity and the extent to which fishing vessels of the United States, on an annual basis, will harvest the optimum yield specified under paragraph (3),

(B) the portion of such optimum yield which, on an annual basis, will not be harvested by fishing vessels of the United States and can be made available for foreign fishing, and

(C) the capacity and extent to which United States fish processors, on an annual basis, will process that portion of such optimum yield that will be harvested by fishing vessels of the United States;

(5) specify the pertinent data which shall be submitted to the Secretary with respect to commercial, recreational, and charter fishing in the fishery, including, but not limited to, information regarding the type and quantity of fishing gear used, catch by species in numbers of fish or weight thereof, areas in which fishing was engaged in, time of fishing, number of hauls, and the estimated processing capacity of, and the actual processing capacity utilized by, United States fish processors;

(6) consider and provide for temporary adjustments, after consultation with the Coast Guard and persons utilizing the fishery, regarding access to the fishery for vessels otherwise prevented from harvesting because of weather or other ocean conditions affecting the safe conduct of the fishery; except that the adjustment shall not adversely affect conservation efforts in other fisheries or discriminate among participants in the affected fishery;

(7) describe and identify essential fish habitat for the fishery based on the guidelines established by the Secretary under section 305(b)(1)(A), minimize to the extent practicable adverse effects on such habitat caused by fishing, and identify other actions to encourage the conservation and enhancement of such habitat;

(8) in the case of a fishery management plan that, after January 1, 1991, is submitted to the Secretary for review under section 304(a) (including any plan for which an amendment is submitted to the Secretary for such review) or is prepared by the Secretary, assess and specify the nature and extent of scientific data which is needed for effective implementation of the plan;

(9) include a fishery impact statement for the plan or amendment (in the case of a plan or amendment thereto submitted to or prepared by the Secretary after October 1, 1990) which shall assess, specify, and describe the likely effects, if any, of the conservation and management measures on--

(A) participants in the fisheries and fishing communities affected by the plan or amendment; and

(B) participants in the fisheries conducted in adjacent areas under the authority of another Council, after consultation with such Council and representatives of those participants;

(10) specify objective and measurable criteria for identifying when the fishery to which the plan applies is overfished (with an analysis of how the criteria were determined and the relationship of the criteria to the reproductive potential of stocks of fish in that fishery) and, in the case of a fishery which the Council or the Secretary has determined is approaching an overfished condition or is overfished, contain conservation and management measures to prevent overfishing or end overfishing and rebuild the fishery;

(11) establish a standardized reporting methodology to assess the amount and type of bycatch occurring in the fishery, and include conservation and management measures that, to the extent practicable and in the following priority--

(A) minimize bycatch; and

(B) minimize the mortality of bycatch which cannot be avoided;

(12) assess the type and amount of fish caught and released alive during recreational fishing under catch and release fishery management programs and the mortality of such fish, and include conservation and management measures that, to the extent practicable, minimize mortality and ensure the extended survival of such fish;

(13) include a description of the commercial, recreational, and charter fishing sectors which participate in the fishery and, to the extent practicable, quantify trends in landings of the managed fishery resource by the commercial, recreational, and charter fishing sectors; and

(14) to the extent that rebuilding plans or other conservation and management measures which reduce the overall harvest in a fishery are necessary, allocate any harvest restrictions or recovery benefits fairly and equitably among the commercial, recreational, and charter fishing sectors in the fishery.

97-453, 99-659, 101-627, 102-251, 104-297

(b) DISCRETIONARY PROVISIONS.--Any fishery management plan which is prepared by any Council, or by the Secretary, with respect to any fishery, may--

(1) require a permit to be obtained from, and fees to be paid to, the Secretary, with respect to--

(A) any fishing vessel of the United States fishing, or wishing to fish, in the exclusive economic zone [or special areas,]* or for anadromous species or Continental Shelf fishery resources beyond such zone [or areas]*;

(B) the operator of any such vessel; or

(C) any United States fish processor who first receives fish that are subject to the plan;

(2) designate zones where, and periods when, fishing shall be limited, or shall not be permitted, or shall be permitted only by specified types of fishing vessels or with specified types and quantities of fishing gear;

(3) establish specified limitations which are necessary and appropriate for the conservation and management of the fishery on the--

(A) catch of fish (based on area, species, size, number, weight, sex, bycatch, total biomass, or other factors);

(B) sale of fish caught during commercial, recreational, or charter fishing, consistent with any applicable Federal and State safety and quality requirements; and

(C) transshipment or transportation of fish or fish products under permits issued pursuant to section 204;

(4) prohibit, limit, condition, or require the use of specified types and quantities of fishing gear, fishing vessels, or equipment for such vessels, including devices which may be required to facilitate enforcement of the provisions of this Act;

(5) incorporate (consistent with the national standards, the other provisions of this Act, and any other applicable law) the relevant fishery conservation and management measures of the coastal States nearest to the fishery;

(6) establish a limited access system for the fishery in order to achieve optimum yield if, in developing such system, the Council and the Secretary take into account--

- (A) present participation in the fishery,
- (B) historical fishing practices in, and dependence on, the fishery,
- (C) the economics of the fishery,
- (D) the capability of fishing vessels used in the fishery to engage in other fisheries,
- (E) the cultural and social framework relevant to the fishery and any affected fishing communities, and
- (F) any other relevant considerations;

(7) require fish processors who first receive fish that are subject to the plan to submit data (other than economic data) which are necessary for the conservation and management of the fishery;

(8) require that one or more observers be carried on board a vessel of the United States engaged in fishing for species that are subject to the plan, for the purpose of collecting data necessary for the conservation and management of the fishery; except that such a vessel shall not be required to carry an observer on board if the facilities of the vessel for the quartering of an observer, or for carrying out observer functions, are so inadequate or unsafe that the health or safety of the observer or the safe operation of the vessel would be jeopardized;

(9) assess and specify the effect which the conservation and management measures of the plan will have on the stocks of naturally spawning anadromous fish in the region;

(10) include, consistent with the other provisions of this Act, conservation and management measures that provide harvest incentives for participants within each gear group to employ fishing practices that result in lower levels of bycatch or in lower levels of the mortality of bycatch;

(11) reserve a portion of the allowable biological catch of the fishery for use in scientific research; and

(12) prescribe such other measures, requirements, or conditions and restrictions as are determined to be necessary and appropriate for the conservation and management of the fishery.

97-453, 104-297

(c) PROPOSED REGULATIONS.--Proposed regulations which the Council deems necessary or appropriate for the purposes of--

(1) implementing a fishery management plan or plan amendment shall be submitted to the Secretary simultaneously with the plan or amendment under section 304; and

(2) making modifications to regulations implementing a fishery management plan or plan amendment may be submitted to the Secretary at any time after the plan or amendment is approved under section 304.

be assessed at the cash deposit rate, and cash deposits must continue to be collected, at the rate previously ordered. As such, the countervailing duty cash deposit rate applicable to a company can no longer change, except pursuant to a request for a review of that company. *See Federal-Mogul Corporation and The Torrington Company v. United States*, 822 F.Supp. 782 (CIT 1993) and *Floral Trade Council v. United States*, 822 F.Supp. 766 (CIT 1993) (interpreting 19 CFR 353.22(e), the antidumping regulation on automatic assessment, which is identical to 19 CFR 351.212(c)(ii)(2)). Therefore, the cash deposit rates for all companies except those covered by this review will be unchanged by the results of this review.

We will instruct Customs to continue to collect cash deposits for non-reviewed companies at the most recent company-specific or country-wide rate applicable to the company. Accordingly, the cash deposit rates that will be applied to non-reviewed companies covered by this order will be the rate for that company established in the most recently completed administrative proceeding conducted under the URAA. If such a review has not been conducted, the rate established in the most recently completed administrative proceeding pursuant to the statutory provisions that were in effect prior to the URAA amendments is applicable. These rates shall apply to all non-reviewed companies until a review of a company assigned these rates is requested. In addition, for the period January 1, 2001, through December 31, 2001, the assessment rates applicable to all non-reviewed companies covered by this order are the cash deposit rates in effect at the time of entry.

Upon completion of this administrative review, the Department will determine, and Customs shall assess, countervailing duties on all appropriate entries. In accordance with 19 CFR 351.212(b)(2), we have calculated a company-specific assessment rate for merchandise subject to this review. The Department will issue appropriate assessment instructions directly to Customs within 15 days of publication of the final results of review. If these preliminary results are adopted in the final results of review, we will direct Customs to assess the resulting assessment rates against the entered customs values for the subject merchandise on each of the company's entries during the review period.

Public Comment

In accordance with 19 CFR 351.310, we will hold a public hearing, if requested, to afford interested parties an opportunity to comment on these preliminary results. Any such hearing is tentatively scheduled to be held 37 days from the date of publication of these preliminary results, at the U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230. Individuals who wish to request a hearing must submit a written request within 30 days of the publication of this notice in the **Federal Register** to the Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Room 1870, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20230. Parties should confirm by telephone the time, date, and place of the hearing 48 hours before the scheduled time.

Requests for a public hearing should contain: (1) The party's name, address, and telephone number; (2) the number of participants; and, (3) to the extent practicable, an identification of the arguments to be raised at the hearing. Parties may file case briefs pursuant to 19 CFR 351.309(c)(ii). Six copies of the business proprietary version and six copies of the non-proprietary version of the case briefs must be submitted to the Assistant Secretary no later than 30 days from the date of publication of the preliminary determination. As part of the case brief, parties are encouraged to provide a summary of the arguments not to exceed five pages and a table of statutes, regulations, and cases cited. Parties may also submit rebuttal briefs pursuant to 19 CFR 351.309(d). Six copies of the business proprietary version and six copies of the non-proprietary version of the rebuttal briefs must be submitted to the Assistant Secretary no later than 5 days from the date of filing of the case briefs. An interested party may make an affirmative presentation only on arguments included in that party's case or rebuttal briefs. Further written arguments should be submitted in accordance with 19 CFR 351.309 and will be considered if received within the time limits specified above.

This administrative review is issued and published in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1) and 19 U.S.C. 1677f(i)(1)).

Dated: March 31, 2003.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 03-8235 Filed 4-3-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

[I.D. 033103A]

Proposed Information Collection; Comment Request; Southwest Center Freshwater Salmon and Steelhead Angler Survey.

AGENCY: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA).
ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, invites the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on proposed and/or continuing information collections, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104-13 (44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A)).

DATES: Written comments must be submitted on or before June 3, 2003.

ADDRESSES: Direct all written comments to Diana Hynek, Departmental Paperwork Clearance Officer, Department of Commerce, Room 6625, 14th and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230 (or via the Internet at dHynek@doc.gov).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Requests for additional information or copies of the information collection instrument and instructions should be directed to Cindy Thomson, National Marine Fisheries Service, Southwest Fisheries Science Center, 110 Shaffer Road, Santa Cruz, CA 95060, phone 831-420-3911, Cindy.Thomson@noaa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Abstract

Data on fishery participation, expenditures and demographics will be collected from freshwater salmon and steelhead anglers in California. The data will be used to evaluate the economic effects of potential changes in fishery regulations, hatchery practices, and other actions that may be considered to protect chinook, coho, and steelhead stocks listed as threatened or endangered under the Endangered Species Act.

II. Method of Collection

Telephone interviewers will contact a random sample of steelhead report card holders to ask if they had gone steelhead fishing in California in the previous season. Those who were active in the previous season will be asked additional

questions regarding their fishing experiences, expenditures, and demographics. Because names and telephone numbers of salmon anglers are not available, a different method of identifying potential salmon respondents will be used. Specifically, names/telephone numbers of individuals who live in central and northern California and identify fishing as one of their interests will be purchased from a company that specializes in special purpose random digit samples. Telephone interviewers will contact individuals in the special purpose sample to ask if they had gone freshwater salmon fishing in California in the previous season. Those who were active in the previous season will be asked additional questions regarding their fishing experiences, expenditures, and demographics.

III. Data

OMB Number: None.

Form Number: None.

Type of Review: Regular submission.

Affected Public: Individuals or households.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 7,565.

Estimated Time Per Response: Two minutes each for the 7,565 respondents to the screening questions; 15 minutes each for the 710 anglers identified in the screening questions as having fished for salmon or steelhead in the previous season.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 430 hours.

Estimated Total Annual Cost to Public: \$0.

IV. Request for Comments

Comments are invited on: (a) whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden (including hours and cost) of the proposed collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Comments submitted in response to this notice will be summarized and/or included in the request for OMB approval of this information collection; they also will become a matter of public record.

Dated: March 28, 2003.

Gwellnar Banks,

Management Analyst, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 03-8271 Filed 4-3-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-22-S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

[I.D. 033103B]

Proposed Information Collection; Comment Request; Northwest Region Logbook Family of Forms.

AGENCY: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA).
ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, invites the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on proposed and/or continuing information collections, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104-13 (44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A)).

DATES: Written comments must be submitted on or before June 3, 2003.

ADDRESSES: Direct all written comments to Diana Hynek, Departmental Paperwork Clearance Officer, Department of Commerce, Room 6625, 14th and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230 (or via the Internet at dHynek@doc.gov).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Requests for additional information or copies of the information collection instrument and instructions should be directed to Becky Renko, 206-526-6140, or at Becky.Renko@noaa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Abstract

This collection contains certain reporting and recordkeeping requirements for vessels in the Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery in the Exclusive Economic Zone for the northwest. These requirements affect fish processing vessels over 125 feet in length and catcher vessels that deliver their catch to motherships. NOAA also proposes to merge the requirement currently cleared under OMB Control Number 0648-0419 into this clearance. This requirement is for a report of intent to off-load non-whiting groundfish in excess of trip limits for purposes of donating that groundfish to a hunger-relief agency.

The information collected is needed to monitor catch, effort, and production for fishery management purposes.

II. Method of Collection

Forms are used for most requirements. These may be submitted by computer or by facsimile machine. Off-load notifications are made by telephone.

III. Data

OMB Number: 0648-0271.

Form Number: None.

Type of Review: Regular submission.

Affected Public: Business or other for-profit organizations.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 70.

Estimated Time Per Response: 13 minutes per day for a Daily Fishing and Cumulative Production Log (DFCPL) from a catcher vessel; 26 minutes per day for a DFCPL from a catcher-processor; 13 minutes per day for a Daily Report of Fish Received and Cumulative Production Log from a mothership; 4.3 minutes per day for a Weekly/Daily Production Report; 20 minutes for a Product Transfer/Offloading Logbook; 1.25 minutes for a Start or Stop Notification Report; and 5 minutes for an off-load notification.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 1,382.

Estimated Total Annual Cost to Public: \$8,890.

IV. Request for Comments

Comments are invited on: (a) whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden (including hours and cost) of the proposed collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Comments submitted in response to this notice will be summarized and/or included in the request for OMB approval of this information collection; they also will become a matter of public record.

Dated: March 28, 2003.

Gwellnar Banks,

Management Analyst, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 03-8272 Filed 4-3-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-22-S