

# Supporting Statement for Paperwork Reduction Act Submission

## OMB Control Number 1018-0015

### Migratory Bird Harvest Surveys

Form numbers 3-165, 3-165A, 3-165B, 3-165C, 3-2056J, 3-2056K, 3-2056L, and 3-2056M  
July 2004

#### General Instructions

A Supporting Statement, including the text of the notice to the public required by 5 CFR 1320.5(a)(i)(iv) and its actual or estimated date of publication in the Federal Register, must accompany each request for approval of a collection of information. The Supporting Statement must be prepared in the format described below, and must contain the information specified in Section A below. If an item is not applicable, provide a brief explanation. When Item 17 of the OMB Form 83-I is checked "Yes", Section B of the Supporting Statement must be completed. OMB reserves the right to require the submission of additional information with respect to any request for approval.

#### Specific Instructions

##### A. Justification

1. Explain the circumstances that make the collection of information necessary. Identify any legal or administrative requirements that necessitate the collection. Attach a copy of the appropriate section of each statute and regulation mandating or authorizing the collection of information.

Under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 U.S.C. 703-711), the Secretary of the Interior has responsibility for setting appropriate regulations for the hunting of migratory birds, with due regard for maintaining such populations at healthy levels. The Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 (16 U.S.C. 742a-742j) more specifically authorizes collection of such information as is necessary to determine appropriate hunting regulations. Information required for effectively governing harvests of migratory birds includes not only knowledge of the harvest's magnitude but also information of the species, age, and sex composition within that harvest, including the geographic and chronologic distribution of these components as they relate to various hunting regulations. This information collection approval request combines two surveys (the Migratory Bird Hunter Survey and the Parts Collection Survey) and their associated forms because the surveys are interrelated and/or dependent upon each other.

2. Indicate how, by whom, and for what purpose the information is to be used. Except for a new collection, indicate the actual use the agency has made of the information received from

the current collection. [Be specific. If this collection is a form or a questionnaire, every question needs to be justified.]

Information collected is used by both Federal and State authorities to monitor the effects of various hunting regulations on the harvest of individual migratory bird species. The information has been particularly useful in evaluating the effects of changes in daily bag limits, hunting season length, and hunting season dates on harvest. Information obtained also gives the Service a great deal of insight into the status of the many species involved. If this information were not collected, the Service's ability to promulgate regulations allowing controlled hunting of migratory birds would be greatly weakened. The information is also used by private conservation and hunting organizations that are concerned with the welfare of our migratory bird resource.

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

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

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

**The Parts Collection Survey** estimates the species, sex, and age composition of the harvest, and the geographic and temporal distribution of the harvest. Randomly selected successful hunters who responded to the Migratory Bird Hunter Survey the previous year are asked to complete and return a postcard (form 3-165A or form 3-165C) if they are willing to participate in the Parts

Collection Survey. Those who answer “Yes” are then asked to report about how many birds they harvest in an average season. We need this information to determine how many of form 3-165 or form 3-165B to send each participant at the beginning of the hunting season.

Respondents to forms 3-165A and 3-165C are provided postage-paid envelopes before the hunting season and asked to send in a wing or the tail feathers from each duck, goose, or coot (form 3-165) they harvest, or a wing from each woodcock, band-tailed pigeon, snipe, rail, or gallinule (form 3-165B) they harvest. The wings and tail feathers are used to identify the species, age, and sex of the harvested sample. Respondents are also asked to report on the envelope:

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

The combined results of these surveys enable the Service to evaluate the effects of season length, season dates, and bag limits on the harvest of each species, and thus help determine appropriate hunting regulations.

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

Of the total number of annual responses, most (3,600,000) are collected by the State wildlife agencies, which forward the responses (hunters' names and addresses) to the Service for use in national harvest surveys. Of those responses, about 3,000,000 were collected electronically by the States in 2003, either online (through electronic licensing systems) or by telephone. The proportion of electronic responses increases each year as more States implement electronic data collection methods. The remaining responses are from randomly selected migratory bird hunters who are asked to voluntarily participate in a season-long survey or to send in migratory bird body parts in envelopes provided by the Service. If we put the season-long survey forms on line, we might receive responses from people who were not randomly selected for the survey. This would

invalidate (i.e., bias) our survey results and complicate our efforts to obtain reliable harvest information to use in setting migratory bird hunting regulations. The envelopes for the migratory bird body parts are quite large and would not print out on a standard computer, thus we do not anticipate putting those envelopes online.

4. Describe efforts to identify duplication. Show specifically why any similar information already available cannot be used or modified for use for the purposes described in Item 2 above.

Many State wildlife agencies collect some information on migratory bird harvest within their State, and a number of State hunter surveys have been examined. State information is generally collected secondarily in harvest surveys of non-migratory game and is not adequate for Federal regulatory responsibilities because: (1) it is often insufficiently detailed or imprecise, or has inherent weaknesses in sampling design resulting in serious biases; (2) comparable information is not available from all States because survey methodologies vary among States; (3) many State survey results are not available in time to be useful for promulgating regulations; and (4) some States do not conduct hunting surveys or maintain lists of hunter names and addresses. Some States eliminated migratory birds from their harvest surveys when we began conducting the Migratory Bird Hunter Survey; thus, duplication of effort between State and Federal surveys has been reduced since implementation of the Migratory Bird Harvest Information Program.

5. If the collection of information impacts small businesses or other small entities (Item 5 of OMB Form 83-1), describe any methods used to minimize burden.

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

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

If this information was not collected, the Service's ability to promulgate regulations allowing controlled hunting of migratory game birds would be greatly weakened. The health and well being of migratory bird populations demand that harvests be commensurate with population size. If these surveys were not conducted, the lack of accurate assessment of migratory bird harvests would logically dictate restrictive hunting regulations, with a loss in hunting recreation due to only vague knowledge of the effects of hunting on migratory game bird populations and fear of possible over-harvest.

If the surveys were conducted less frequently than yearly intervals, it would be impossible to

adequately monitor the status of migratory birds, whose populations can change substantially between years as a result of droughts, floods, freezes, or other conditions. Estimates are required for annually promulgating hunting regulations. Information that is not required annually is requested less frequently.

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

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

8. If applicable, provide a copy and identify the date and page number of publication in the Federal Register of the agency's notice, required by 5 CFR 1320.8(d), soliciting comments on the information collection prior to submission to OMB. Summarize public comments received in response to that notice [and in response to the PRA statement associated with the collection over the past three years] and describe actions taken by the agency in response to these comments. Specifically address comments received on cost and hour burden.

Describe efforts to consult with persons outside the agency to obtain their views on the availability of data, frequency of collection, the clarity of instructions and recordkeeping, disclosure, or reporting format (if any), and on the data elements to be recorded, disclosed, or reported. [Please list the names, titles, addresses, and phone numbers of persons contacted.]

Consultation with representatives of those from whom information is to be obtained or those

who must compile records should occur at least once every 3 years — even if the collection of information activity is the same as in prior periods. There may be circumstances that may preclude consultation in a specific situation. These circumstances should be explained.

On March 29, 2004, we published in the **Federal Register** (69 FR 16283) a notice soliciting public comment on this information collection for 60 days, ending May 28, 2004. By that date, we did not receive any comments in response to the notice.

State and private survey specialists and biometricians have reviewed the procedures for the Migratory Bird Hunter Survey, including:

Donald A. Dillman, WA State University	509/335-1511
Stephen L. Sheriff, MO Department of Conservation	314/882-9880
Vernon L. Wright, LA State University	504/388-8303
Kenneth H. Pollock, NC State University	919/737-2535

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

Atlantic Flyway:	Jerome R. Serie	301/497-5851
Mississippi Flyway:	Kenneth E. Gamble	573/234-1473
Central Flyway:	David E. Sharp	303/275-2386
Pacific Flyway:	Robert E. Trost	503/231-6162

Immediately prior to the annual setting of migratory bird hunting regulations, public hearings are held at which individuals may comment on the regulations-setting procedures, including the conduct of harvest surveys. The Service has provided information to the public at the Outdoor Writers Association of America and Association for Conservation Information Meetings. Voluntary written comments and suggestions received from survey participants are noted and considered.

In addition, we solicited comments from the survey participants listed below. Each of them stated that the instructions they received with the survey were straightforward and easy to understand, and each agreed that our estimates of time burden were accurate. One of them suggested that we should make more information about the survey, including survey results from previous years, available to the public on our website.

Mr. Kim Baldi  
311 Old McCloud Road, Unit B  
Mt. Shasta, CA 96067  
tel: (530) 926-2627

Mr. Brandon J. Adams  
377 Clover Avenue  
Comer, GA 30629  
tel: (706) 783-4160

Mr. Steve Richardson  
5641 Dog Kennel Road  
Rhodedale, MD 21659  
tel: (410) 883-2328

Mr. Bill Simpson  
Route 7 Box 211  
Jasper, TX 75951  
tel: (409) 384-1447

Mr. R. Jeffery Harris  
1015 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE  
Aberdeen, SD 57401  
tel: (605) 225-7988

Mr. Mark Boyce  
2 Laurel View Road  
Templeton, MA 01468  
tel: (978) 939-5886

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

No payments or gifts are provided to respondents.

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

Each hunter contacted receives an assurance that the survey is conducted in accordance with the Privacy Act of 1974. Hunters are not asked to write their names on the questionnaires, and are assured that their names or identifications will not be associated with their questionnaires.

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. This justification should include the reasons why the agency considers the questions

necessary, the specific uses to be made of the information, the explanation to be given to persons from whom the information is requested, and any steps to be taken to obtain their consent.

There are no questions of a sensitive nature.

12. Provide estimates of the hour burden of the collection of information. The statement should:

- \* Indicate the number of respondents, frequency of response, annual hour burden, and an explanation of how the burden was estimated. Unless directed to do so, agencies should not conduct special surveys to obtain information on which to base hour burden estimates. Consultation with a sample (fewer than 10) of potential respondents is desirable. If the hour burden on respondents is expected to vary widely because of differences in activity, size, or complexity, show the range of estimated hour burden, and explain the reasons for the variance. Generally, estimates should not include burden hours for customary and usual business practices.
- \* If this request for approval covers more than one form, provide separate hour burden estimates for each form and aggregate the hour burdens in Item 13 of OMB Form 83-I.
- \* Provide estimates of annualized cost to respondents for the hour burdens for collections of information, identifying and using appropriate wage rate categories. The cost of contracting out or paying outside parties for information collection activities should not be included here. Instead, this cost should be included in Item 14.

**Migratory Bird Harvest Information Program:** Although State licensing authorities are collecting the name and address information needed to provide a sample frame of all licensed migratory bird hunters, that information collection is required by Federal regulation. Therefore, the reporting burden associated with that information collection is reported here. The Service estimates that the 49 States will collect the required information from approximately 3,600,000 individuals annually. States are using a variety of methods to collect the required information, and the amount of time required for an individual respondent to provide the information varies from less than 1 minute to up to 4 minutes, depending upon the method employed by the State. We estimate that the overall average time per response is 2 minutes. Thus, the total annual burden estimate for the Migratory Bird Harvest Information Program is 120,000 hours.

**Migratory Bird Hunter Survey:** The frequency of response for each form involved is once annually. Although many respondents report that they did not hunt for the species for which they are being surveyed, they still need about 2 minutes to read the instructions prior to responding. Therefore, each of the following form-specific burden estimates includes 2 minutes per respondent for reviewing instructions on the form.

About 35,000 hunters respond to form 3-2056J; the number of hunting trips reported ranges from zero to as many as 100, with an average of 3 trips reported per respondent. Recording and summarizing the trips requires an average of 1 minute per trip (2,917 total burden hours).

About 25,000 hunters respond to form 3-2056K, with the number of trips reported ranging from zero to about 30. The number of trips reported averages 2, and the time required to report and summarize the trips averages 1 minute per trip (1,667 total burden hours).

About 10,000 respondents are expected annually for form 3-2056L, with response burden averaging 1 minute per trip and respondents averaging 2 trips (667 total burden hours).

About 10,000 respondents are also expected for form 3-2056M, with response burden again averaging 1 minute per trip and respondents expected to average 1 trip (500 total burden hours).

The total annual burden estimate for all 4 forms used for the Migratory Bird Hunter Survey is 5,751 hours.

**Parts Collection Survey:** Approximately 6,000 hunters will respond to the postcard request to provide waterfowl parts. Response frequency is once annually, and it will require about 30 seconds to complete the form (50 total burden hours).

About 6,500 respondents provide waterfowl parts in form 3-165. Response frequency for form 3-165 varies from once to up to 200 times annually dependent on the amount and success of hunting by individuals, averaging about 18 times per individual. The estimated time required to complete form 3-165 is 5 minutes, and about 117,000 completed forms are received annually (9,750 total burden hours).

About 400 hunters will respond to the postcard request to provide wings from woodcock, snipe, rails, gallinules, and band-tailed pigeons. Response frequency is once annually, and it will require about 30 seconds to complete the form (4 total burden hours).

About 3,000 respondents will provide wings using form 3-165B, averaging 1.5 responses per individual annually. The estimated time to complete form 3-165B is 5 minutes (375 total burden hours).

Thus, the total annual burden estimate for the Parts Collection Survey is 10,179 hours.

**Summary:** The total annual burden estimate for the Migratory Bird Harvest Information Program and all surveys and forms included in this request is 135,930 hours. Assuming an hourly cost of \$8.00, this will convert to \$1,087,440 total dollar value of the annual burden hours.

Collection type/form number	No. of respondents	No. of responses	Avg. burden per response	Total annual burden hours
<b>Migratory Bird Harvest Information Program</b>	3,600,000	1	2 minutes	120,000
<b>Migratory Bird Hunter Survey</b>				
Form 3-2056J	35,000	1	5 minutes	2,917
Form 3-2056K	25,000	1	4 minutes	1,667
Form 3-2056L	10,000	1	4 minutes	667
Form 3-2056M	10,000	1	3 minutes	500
Total	80,000	1	4.31 minutes	5,751
<b>Parts Collection Survey</b>				
Form 3-165	6,500	18	5 minutes	9,750
Form 3-165A	6,000	1	0.5 minute	50
Form 3-165B	3,000	1.5	5 minutes	375
Form 3-165C	400	1	0.5 minute	4
Total	9,500	13.46	4.78 minutes	10,179
All types/forms combined	3,600,000	1.06	2.14 minutes	135,930

13. Provide an estimate of the total annual [non-hour] cost burden to respondents or recordkeepers resulting from the collection of information. (Do not include the cost of any hour burden shown in Items 12 and 14).

- \* The cost estimate should be split into two components: (a) a total capital and start-up cost component (annualized over its expected useful life) and (b) a total operation and maintenance and purchase of services component. The estimates should take into account costs associated with generating, maintaining, and disclosing or providing the information [including filing fees paid]. Include descriptions of methods used to estimate major cost factors including system and technology acquisition, expected useful life of capital equipment, the discount rate(s), and the time period over which costs will be incurred. Capital and start-up costs include, among other items, preparations for collecting information such as purchasing computers and software; monitoring, sampling,

- drilling and testing equipment; and record storage facilities.
- \* If cost estimates are expected to vary widely, agencies should present ranges of cost burdens and explain the reasons for the variance. The cost of purchasing or contracting out information collection services should be a part of this cost burden estimate. In developing cost burden estimates, agencies may consult with a sample of respondents (fewer than 10), utilize the 60-day pre-OMB submission public comment process and use existing economic or regulatory impact analysis associated with the rulemaking containing the information collection, as appropriate.
- \* Generally, estimates should not include purchases of equipment or services, or portions thereof, made: (1) prior to October 1, 1995, (2) to achieve regulatory compliance with requirements not associated with the information collection, (3) for reasons other than to provide information or keep records for the government, or (4) as part of customary and usual business or private practices.

There is no non-hour dollar cost burden to respondents; there is no fee for providing this information or any other costs associated with responding to this collection. The forms are even accompanied by a postage-paid return envelope.

14. Provide estimates of annualized cost to the Federal government. Also, provide a description of the method used to estimate cost, which should include quantification of hours, operational expenses (such as equipment, overhead, printing, and support staff), and any other expense that would not have been incurred without this collection of information. Agencies also may aggregate cost estimates from Items 12, 13, and 14 in a single table.

The estimated annual cost of these surveys to the Federal Government is \$1,772,000, as detailed below. Estimates are based on records of actual expenditures incurred in conducting these surveys last year.

Activity	Hours required	Total cost of activity
Printing survey forms (contracted)	0	\$208,000
Mail preparation and handling	2,400	\$45,000
Postage costs	0	\$475,000
Data entry (some contracted)	10,000	\$522,000
Computer (hardware) costs and programming (includes cost of maintenance contracts for capital equipment, including a hand print scanning system, a high volume printer, and automated mailing equipment)	3,000	\$120,000
Data analysis and report preparation	6,000	\$302,000

Total

21,400

\$1,772,000

---

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

There are currently 138,917 burden hours in the OMB inventory for Migratory Bird Harvest Surveys (OMB No. 1018-0015). The decrease of 2,987 hours is the result of phasing out the Waterfowl Hunter Survey (forms 3-1823A and 3-2056G), which was discontinued after the 2001 hunting season and permanently replaced by the Migratory Bird Hunter Survey (form 3-2056J).

16. For collections of information whose results will be published, outline plans for tabulation and publication. Address any complex analytical techniques that will be used. Provide the time schedule for the entire project, including beginning and ending dates of the collection of information, completion of report, publication dates, and other actions.

Plans are to continue the Migratory Bird Harvest Surveys on an ongoing annual basis.

Schedule for the Migratory Bird Hunter Survey

- Aug-Feb Migratory bird hunter names and addresses are received from the States, either in the form of electronic databases or on paper forms from which the data are compiled in a database.
- Sep-Feb Sample migratory bird hunters are sent questionnaires asking them to keep track of their hunting trips throughout the hunting season and return the form when they have completed their hunting season.
- Dec-Apr Following a staggered schedule based on the close of the hunting season in each State, sample hunters who have not returned questionnaires are sent reminder letters and replacement questionnaire forms.
- Apr-May Response data are edited, compiled in a database, and analyzed.
- June The report must be prepared and distributed by early June, in time for the public hearing on hunting regulations for migratory game birds other than waterfowl.

Schedule for the Parts Collection Survey

- June Postcards soliciting participation in the survey are mailed to the Service in Laurel, Maryland, where respondents names and addresses are compiled in a database.
- Jul-Aug Employees prepare the parts envelopes for mailing.

- Aug-Oct Because they must be in the possession of survey participants at the start of the hunting season, parts envelopes are sent to participants about 2 weeks before the hunting season begins in each State. Hunting seasons open as early as September 1 in many States, and as late as early November.
- Sep-Mar Hunters mail parts to collection points in each Flyway throughout the hunting season, which continues to mid-March in some States.
- Jan-Feb Federal and State biologists assemble at each collection point to identify the species, age, and sex of each part. Late arriving parts are sent to Laurel in early April and identified there.
- Feb-May Data slips are shipped to Laurel, where the data are compiled in a database and analyzed in combination with information derived from the Waterfowl Hunter Survey and the Migratory Bird Hunter Survey.
- Jun-Jul The report on nonwaterfowl species must be prepared and distributed by early June, in time for the public hearing on hunting regulations for those species. The report on waterfowl must be prepared and distributed by early July, in time for the public hearing on waterfowl hunting regulations.

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

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

18. Explain each exception to the certification statement identified in Item 19, "Certification for Paperwork Reduction Act Submissions," of OMB Form 83-I.

There are no exceptions to the certification statement.

## **B. Collections of Information Employing Statistical Methods**

The agency should be prepared to justify its decision not to use statistical methods in any case where such methods might reduce burden or improve accuracy of results. When Item 17 on the OMB Form 83-I is checked "Yes", the following documentation should be included in the Supporting Statement to the extent that it applies to the methods proposed:

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 government units, households, or persons) in the universe covered by the collection and in the corresponding sample are to be provided in tabular form for the universe as a whole and for each of the strata in the proposed sample. Indicate expected response rates for the collection as a whole. If the collection had been conducted previously, include the actual response rate achieved during the last collection.

**Migratory Bird Hunter Survey:** The potential respondent universe is all licensed migratory bird hunters in the United States, about 3,600,000 individuals. The universe is stratified by: (1) State, and (2) hunters' hunting experience and success the previous season. A systematic sample is selected within each stratum from the names and addresses in the order in which they are received. Stratum-specific universe and sampling data for forms 3-2056J, 3-2056K, 3-2056L and 3-2056M are given in Tables 1-4. Response rates for all four form types are about 60%.

**Parts Collection Survey:** About 94,000 duck wings and 23,000 goose tails are collected and examined by biologists out of a universe of 13,500,000 ducks and 3,800,000 geese harvested. These parts are obtained from about 6,500 successful waterfowl hunters who return form 3-165 out of a universe of 1,135,000 active waterfowl hunters. State figures are given in Table 5. The sample of hunters who are sent form 3-165B consists of about 2,000 successful hunters from a sample universe of about 220,000 active woodcock, snipe, rail, gallinule, and band-tailed pigeon hunters. About 11,000 wings are collected and examined out of a universe of about 500,000 birds harvested.

2. Describe the procedures for the collection of information including:
  - \* Statistical methodology for stratification and sample selection,
  - \* Estimation procedure,
  - \* Degree of accuracy needed for the purpose described in the justification,
  - \* Unusual problems requiring specialized sampling procedures, and
  - \* Any use of periodic (less frequent than annual) data collection cycles to reduce burden.

**Parts Collection Survey Procedures:** Samples of successful hunters from the previous year's Migratory Bird Hunter Survey are asked to complete and return a postcard (forms 3-165A and C), volunteering to contribute wings and tails during the following hunting season. The samples are randomly selected in proportion to the estimated harvest in each State. Those that volunteer are sent a cover letter with instructions and a supply of pre-addressed, postage-paid return envelopes (forms 3-165 and 3-165B) for mailing in the wings and tails. Inner envelopes to protect other mail from stains and seepage are enclosed with the instructions and return envelopes. These packages are sent to survey volunteers before the hunting season opens in their state. Throughout the hunting season, survey participants mail in parts to four collection points (one in each flyway), where they are stored until they are examined. At the end of the hunting season, biologists examine each part to determine species, age, and sex composition of the sample; hunters can not reliably determine this information. After those data have been compiled, respondents are sent a personalized thank you letter detailing the species, age, and sex of each bird from which they

contributed a wing or a tail.

**Migratory Bird Hunter Survey Procedures:** Survey procedures are based on Dillman's Total Design Method (Dillman, 1978, Mail and Telephone Surveys, the Total Design Method, Wiley). This method has been shown to substantially reduce non-response in many situations.

- a. Each State requires all migratory bird hunters to identify themselves as such, and to provide their name, address, and date of birth, as a condition for obtaining authorization to hunt migratory game birds in the State. Most of the name, address, and date of birth information collection is done by the State's hunting license vendors (agents) or by a State contractor.
- b. State license agents or contractors ask each migratory game bird hunter to answer the following questions:

1) Do you plan to hunt migratory birds during [season]? [This screening question is needed only if a State asks all hunters to provide the above information. Only migratory bird hunters would be asked the following questions.]

2) How many of these birds did you bag last season in [State]?

	None	1-10	11+
Ducks	—	—	—
Geese	—	—	—
	None	1-30	31+
Doves	—	—	—
Woodcock	—	—	—

- 3) Did you hunt coots or snipe last season? Yes\_\_ No\_\_
- 4) Did you hunt rails or gallinules last season? Yes\_\_ No\_\_
- 5) Do you plan to hunt band-tailed pigeons this season? Yes\_\_ No\_\_
- c. States are responsible for development of adequate control procedures to ensure that agents (1) account for all validated licenses; (2) promptly provide the State with names, addresses, and other information; (3) have a low proportion of incomplete or illegible information; and (4) return information from all migratory game bird hunters.
- d. States provide the Service with migratory game bird hunters' names, addresses, birth dates, and their answers to the above questions in an acceptable form (electronic data, or machine-scannable paper form) within 30 days of issuance. The information is needed in time for the Service to contact survey participants and ask them to keep records of their migratory game bird hunting throughout the hunting season.

- e. To protect hunters' privacy, it is the policy of the Service to use the names and addresses only for conducting hunter surveys and for no other purpose. All records of hunters' names and addresses are deleted after each year's surveys and no permanent record of names and addresses is maintained by the Service.
- f. States provide the Service with a report by April 15 each year of the total numbers of migratory bird hunters, by prior year success and species hunted strata. If that report is not complete, States provide the Service with a corrected report by April 15 the following year.
- g. The Service selects samples for surveys of waterfowl hunters, dove and band-tailed pigeon hunters, woodcock hunters, and snipe, rail, gallinule, and coot hunters. Higher sampling rates are needed for successful hunters and for those who hunt less-frequently hunted species. Hunters are not asked to participate in more than one survey per State per year to minimize the burden on individual respondents.
- h. Theoretically, there could be up to  $(3)(3)(3)(3)(2)(2)(2) = 648$  strata in each State, defined by (maximum response to duck success) X (maximum response to goose success) X (maximum response to dove success) X (maximum response to woodcock success) X (whether or not coots or snipe were hunted) X (whether or not rails or gallinules were hunted) X (whether or not band-tailed pigeon hunting is planned). However, individual States do not allow hunting of all the species listed; therefore most States have fewer strata.
- i. Samples are selected as the names are received in order that migratory bird hunters can be contacted and asked to keep records as soon as possible after hunting starts. A systematic sample is selected within each stratum, repeating every  $n_h^{\text{th}}$  hunter in stratum  $h$ , with (potentially) different sampling rates for each stratum. Sampling without replacement is used, with high priority strata being sampled before lower priority strata. Stratum priority is determined by: (1) biological need, and (2) desired precision levels for the estimates.
- j. Double sampling estimates (Hansen and Hurwitz, 1958, JASA) are used to account for non-response (see Groves, 1989, *Survey Errors and Survey Costs*, Wiley, pages 165-169; and Hansen, Hurwitz and Madow, 1953 *Sample Survey Methods and Theory*, Wiley, vol. 1, pages 468-475). Two response strata are defined by the respondents and non-respondents to the first wave of reminder letters. A second wave of reminders is sent to a sample of the non-respondents to the first wave.

For each species (e.g., mourning dove) or species group (e.g., geese), the number of active hunters, number of hunting days, and number of birds harvested are estimated from the questionnaires using a ratio estimate with the response per hunter and the number of migratory bird hunters reported, by stratum, by the States. Species-, age-, and sex-specific harvests will be estimated using ratios estimated from the Parts Collection Survey.

pigeons, and white-winged doves,  $\pm 10\%$ ; sea ducks,  $\pm 25\%$ ; snipe, rails, gallinules, and coots,  $\pm 50\%$ . These target precision levels were deemed appropriate by the Federal and State biologists who are charged with managing those migratory bird species.

Surveys must be conducted annually because migratory bird harvests can change substantially between years depending on the size of the fall flight and hunting pressure. Estimates are required for annually promulgating hunting regulations.

3. Describe methods to maximize response rates and to deal with issues of non-response. The accuracy and reliability of information collected must be shown to be adequate for intended uses. For collections based on sampling, a special justification must be provided for any collection that will not yield "reliable" data that can be generalized to the universe studied.

The forms have been designed to be as attractive and as easy to use as possible. The cover letters attempt to motivate the respondent and stress the importance of participation. For the Migratory Bird Hunter Survey, there are two waves of reminders. The first wave includes a postcard and a letter sent by first class mail. The second wave of reminders is sent to a sample of the non-respondents, also by first class mail. As described in item B. 2. j. above, double sampling estimates are used to detect and, if necessary, account for non-response. The Parts Collection Survey maximizes response rates by using forms 3-165A and 3-165C to solicit volunteer participants from a randomly selected sample of successful hunters.

We have conducted a study of the effects of non-response on Migratory Bird Hunter Survey results, and we are currently analyzing the results of that study. We expect to submit a report on the study to OMB in 2005.

A study conducted by a Louisiana State University Master's student (Oetgen 2002) tested for differences among first-, second- and third-year Parts Collection Survey participants in the species, age and sex composition of their harvests. Oetgen hypothesized that hunters who are willing to participate for more than one year are more successful than the average hunter, therefore less successful hunters drop out after one year. Thus, the survey may be generating biased species composition and/or age and sex ratio estimates because of the potential for overrepresentation of more successful hunters in the sample due to non-response by less successful hunters. Although he found statistically significant differences in the proportion of immature ducks in the harvest and the proportion of male ducks in the harvest among the 3 hunter categories, he concluded that these differences were extremely small and were not biologically significant.

To further examine potential non-response bias in the Parts Collection Survey, we will compare mean seasonal duck and goose harvests (obtained from the previous year's Migratory Bird Hunter Survey) of hunters who volunteer to participate in the Parts Collection Survey with mean seasonal harvests of hunters who fail to respond or decline the invitation. We will also compare mean seasonal harvests (again, from the previous year) of hunters who volunteer for and do participate in the Parts Collection Survey with mean harvests of hunters who volunteer but fail to participate

(another set of non-respondents). We will conduct these analyses in the fall of 2005 after solicitation for participation in the Parts Collection Survey is complete, and submit a report on our findings to OMB.

4. Describe any tests of procedures or methods to be undertaken. Testing is encouraged as an effective means of refining collections of information to minimize burden and improve utility. Tests must be approved if they call for answers to identical questions from 10 or more respondents. A proposed test or set of tests may be submitted for approval separately or in combination with the main collection of information.

No additional testing of procedures is planned.

5. Provide the name and telephone number of individuals consulted on 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.

The individual directly responsible for information collection and analysis is: Dr. Paul I. Padding, Chief, Section of Harvest Surveys, Division of Migratory Bird Management, Laurel, MD 20708-4028 (301/497-5980).

The following statisticians have reviewed the statistical design and analysis of these surveys:

Ms. Christine M. Bunck, Program Coordinator, Biomonitoring Environmental Status and Trends, 1849 C Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20240 (202/482-3972)

Mr. Grey W. Pendleton, Statistician (Biology), Biometrical Group, Patuxent Environmental Science Center, Laurel, MD (301/497-5632)

Dr. Robert E. Trost, Migratory Bird Management Office, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 911 N.E. 11th Avenue, Portland, OR 97232-4181 (503/231-6162)

Dr. Paul H. Geissler, Biologist, National Ecological Surveys Team, Patuxent Environmental Science Center, Laurel, MD 20708 (301/497-5780)

**Table 1. Potential respondent universe and number of hunters sampled, by stratum, for Form 3-2056J. Each hunter is assigned to both a "ducks bagged" and a "geese bagged" stratum.**

State	Hunters in universe						Hunters in sample					
	Ducks bagged			Geese bagged			Ducks bagged			Geese bagged		
	None	1-10	>10	None	1-10	>10	None	1-10	>10	None	1-10	>10
AL	99,106	6,165	3,315	106,056	1,920	610	379	410	368	882	183	92
AK	4,896	2,214	1,976	7,401	1,385	300	597	412	470	1,110	287	82
AZ	1,819	777	497	2,682	367	44	82	87	96	183	72	10
AR	114,029	26,698	29,549	145,702	14,528	10,046	557	687	1,101	1,375	494	476
CA	49,734	9,314	11,895	59,268	9,259	2,416	222	444	690	645	507	204
CO	31,802	6,709	2,948	32,569	6,977	1,913	356	375	402	430	400	303
CT	4,342	1,789	612	4,807	1,509	427	125	275	147	187	244	116
DE	4,081	1,662	1,080	4,312	1,959	552	153	312	343	201	389	218
FL	70,391	5,800	4,207	80,398	0	0	350	583	862	1,795	0	0
GA	87,316	5,600	2,812	91,232	3,007	1,489	363	348	335	635	210	201
ID	36,266	5,910	4,842	41,169	4,760	1,089	307	358	364	569	301	159
IL	39,836	11,262	6,196	47,001	9,129	1,164	318	288	305	535	288	88
IN	25,112	6,851	2,982	26,555	6,883	1,507	172	319	346	324	346	167
IA	15,296	11,676	8,456	21,682	10,539	3,207	125	324	477	318	338	270
KS	41,238	8,445	9,261	45,615	8,430	4,899	292	265	551	489	329	290
KY	14,857	1,890	1,598	16,405	1,525	415	319	239	400	524	304	130
LA	86,882	23,499	28,320	120,645	12,463	5,593	379	989	1,299	1,615	643	409
ME	24,126	1,561	547	25,381	753	100	287	158	138	408	145	30
MD	30,254	8,418	6,152	27,329	11,974	5,521	642	801	731	551	987	636
MA	4,375	1,753	522	5,003	1,360	287	221	287	136	331	253	60
MI	116,081	24,581	11,678	124,558	22,143	5,639	551	780	721	1,009	702	341
MN	91,567	58,904	35,351	117,674	55,051	13,097	304	1,014	832	734	1,036	380
MS	46,723	6,665	5,329	55,622	2,223	872	279	367	409	717	168	170
MO	54,552	8,663	7,910	61,176	6,469	3,480	223	333	517	491	293	289
MT	29,383	5,162	3,854	31,815	4,953	1,631	299	392	444	432	471	232
NE	25,167	8,755	6,786	26,808	8,717	5,183	262	515	618	394	513	488
NV	7,224	1,692	828	8,721	854	169	139	239	227	310	245	50
NH	2,312	1,150	299	2,838	820	103	73	202	115	167	178	45
NJ	6,662	2,960	1,313	7,863	2,239	833	262	302	235	421	245	133
NM	18,186	1,172	618	19,019	805	152	375	245	150	484	217	69
NY	20,469	8,742	4,265	23,261	7,720	2,495	501	733	701	897	657	381
NC	158,922	27,208	8,550	170,063	20,741	3,876	456	922	644	782	863	377
ND	24,289	14,272	15,973	33,898	16,219	4,417	276	806	974	778	936	342
OH	75,228	16,424	7,133	77,987	16,120	4,678	348	552	460	531	546	281
OK	28,556	3,674	4,944	32,034	3,332	1,808	104	91	173	213	100	55
OR	35,275	8,254	9,462	42,758	6,893	3,340	971	448	806	1,398	462	365
PA	91,121	12,887	4,717	91,281	12,114	5,330	314	583	407	454	475	375
RI	493	233	136	585	197	80	38	60	46	41	67	36
SC	46,194	5,715	3,973	53,614	1,972	296	169	403	417	708	221	60
SD	25,594	8,051	9,035	25,946	11,183	5,551	208	347	621	281	467	428
TN	123,473	8,342	6,411	129,241	6,030	2,955	131	289	339	301	292	166
TX	627,072	28,641	23,435	653,802	17,039	8,307	607	769	850	1,197	657	372
UT	15,393	6,326	4,239	22,164	3,311	483	83	382	532	541	376	80
VT	4,405	973	650	5,043	793	192	56	185	174	151	182	82
VA	30,801	5,871	2,855	32,249	5,878	1,400	766	538	496	911	633	256
WA	26,769	8,069	10,330	35,469	6,998	2,701	157	387	605	525	393	231
WV	2,970	409	141	3,017	402	101	88	67	34	91	77	21
WI	112,225	40,882	18,416	139,907	30,119	1,497	369	1,164	920	1,119	1,217	117
WY	7,372	1,896	1,142	8,149	1,640	421	107	190	205	184	231	87
<b>Totals</b>	<b>2,640,236</b>	<b>474,566</b>	<b>337,540</b>	<b>2,947,774</b>	<b>381,902</b>	<b>122,666</b>	<b>14,760</b>	<b>21,266</b>	<b>23,233</b>	<b>29,369</b>	<b>19,640</b>	<b>10,250</b>

Table 2. Potential respondent universe and number of hunters sampled, by stratum, for Form 3-2056K.

State	Hunters in universe						Hunters in sample				
	Doves bagged			Hunt pigeons		Doves bagged			Hunt pigeons		
	None	1-30	>30	No	Yes	None	1-30	>30	No	Yes	
AL	76,160	23,542	8,884			397	715	453			
AZ	14,582	16,540	6,455	25,156	12,421	114	294	291	461	238	
AR	130,558	25,427	14,291			471	854	716			
CA	34,553	29,025	7,365	58,181	12,762	372	520	365	669	588	
CO	29,545	10,317	1,597	37,138	4,321	413	614	285	661	651	
DE	4,391	1,983	449			64	182	76			
FL	60,335	14,939	5,124			480	839	446			
GA	65,612	23,382	6,734			290	422	243			
ID	40,707	5,587	724			356	516	131			
IL	39,909	14,183	3,202			170	419	146			
IN	22,751	9,663	2,531			128	448	460			
KS	25,818	21,709	11,617			132	632	516			
KY	10,179	5,523	2,643			77	468	431			
LA	100,670	30,257	7,774			306	999	503			
MD	35,478	7,546	1,602			193	411	296			
MS	42,574	15,065	1,078			217	436	88			
MO	57,734	9,428	3,963			230	414	232			
MT	37,123	1,070	208			306	175	80			
NE	24,359	12,108	4,241			210	719	378			
NV	6,831	2,686	227			105	234	90			
NM	14,813	3,805	1,558	19,858	118	121	319	270	667	43	
NC	129,123	55,102	10,455			242	520	193			
ND	48,780	5,112	662			407	459	192			
OH	73,857	20,240	4,888			292	403	324			
OK	21,188	10,760	5,206			105	79	56			
OR	47,288	4,846	1,057	37,818	15,173	1,187	900	249	749	1,567	
PA	75,200	28,648	4,877			127	666	164			
RJ	739	110	13			23	15	0			
SC	33,266	16,862	5,752			109	658	273			
SD	32,894	7,433	2,353			213	386	206			
TN	111,132	18,768	8,326			107	365	259			
TX	496,957	119,594	60,597			487	1,179	1,197			
UT	19,381	8,105	472	25,168	790	177	558	88	893	128	
VA	21,453	15,220	2,854			136	685	248			
WA	40,859	3,601	708			320	654	124			
WV	2,242	1,122	156			40	205	44			
WY	8,635	1,472	303			47	153	88			
<b>Totals</b>	<b>2,039,056</b>	<b>598,600</b>	<b>201,144</b>	<b>203,319</b>	<b>45,585</b>	<b>9,134</b>	<b>18,515</b>	<b>10,195</b>	<b>3,900</b>	<b>3,215</b>	

**Table 3. Potential respondent universe and numbers of hunters sampled, by woodcock hunting success stratum, for Form 3-2056L.**

State	Hunters in universe			Hunters in sample		
	None	1-30	>30	None	1-30	>30
AL	107,811	628	147	470	134	32
AR	166,896	2,652	728	440	147	38
CT	6,015	693	35	120	185	9
DE	6,664	102	57	161	51	29
FL	53,136	27,262	0	272	1,488	0
GA	92,590	3,138	0	188	127	0
IL	56,901	378	15	245	121	5
IN	34,326	598	21	148	189	7
IA	34,547	881	0	216	279	0
KS	58,792	99	53	235	4	0
KY	18,095	214	36	157	61	10
LA	133,749	4,680	272	279	498	27
ME	24,758	1,447	29	164	289	5
MD	44,118	696	10	273	0	0
MA	5,972	670	8	211	214	3
MI	128,851	22,750	739	601	1,117	35
MN	174,462	10,305	1,055	348	516	52
MS	57,843	698	176	230	347	88
MO	69,711	1,018	396	292	179	76
NE	40,502	163	43	160	65	20
NH	3,275	473	13	29	108	3
NJ	10,458	465	12	206	154	4
NY	31,826	1,625	25	254	310	5
NC	176,245	15,710	2,725	177	313	55
OH	94,694	4,020	71	171	222	34
OK	36,810	307	57	59	41	10
PA	102,186	5,859	680	326	330	34
RI	819	43	0	27	13	0
SC	55,345	522	15	241	116	4
TN	135,555	711	1,960	125	35	67
TX	674,354	4,794	0	273	194	0
VT	5,400	622	6	143	138	2
VA	38,896	576	55	192	188	19
WV	3,371	119	30	67	33	8
WI	161,621	9,735	167	399	484	9
<b>Totals</b>	<b>2,846,594</b>	<b>124,653</b>	<b>9,636</b>	<b>7,899</b>	<b>8,690</b>	<b>690</b>

Table 4. Potential respondent universe and number of hunters sampled, by stratum, for Form 3-2056M. Each hunter is assigned to both a "hunt coots/snipe" and a "hunt rails/gallinules" stratum.

State	Hunters in universe				Hunters in sample			
	Hunt coots/snipe		Hunt rails/gallinules		Hunt coots/snipe		Hunt rails/gallinules	
	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
AL	107,313	1,273	107,712	874	221	229	247	203
AK	8,672	2,214	9,086	0	23	321	344	0
AZ	38,741	295	37,238	341	101	108	93	118
AR	164,981	5,315	165,882	4,414	218	80	178	120
CA	66,390	4,563	69,214	1,729	147	203	229	121
CO	33,175	8,284	35,514	5,945	127	253	178	204
CT	8,691	52	8,695	48	117	18	116	17
DE	8,696	125	8,724	99	130	80	148	82
FL	75,961	4,437	77,288	3,110	403	369	392	400
GA	92,814	3,114	95,728	0	188	157	343	0
ID	46,599	419	47,018	0	182	77	259	0
IL	56,874	820	57,120	174	125	145	207	83
IN	34,396	549	34,773	172	147	153	241	59
IA	34,599	829	34,943	485	148	124	178	94
KS	58,599	345	58,727	217	228	81	238	51
KY	18,189	176	18,300	45	143	76	198	21
LA	107,077	31,824	108,922	29,779	188	606	193	601
ME	28,234	0	28,234	0	104	0	88	18
MD	42,985	1,839	43,221	1,803	181	379	199	381
MA	6,525	125	6,579	71	133	88	182	39
MI	139,979	12,381	139,979	12,381	272	234	272	234
MN	181,815	4,007	183,481	2,381	389	287	480	198
MS	57,403	1,314	57,719	998	233	365	313	285
MO	89,591	1,534	70,182	943	283	151	308	128
MT	38,061	338	38,399	0	151	89	220	0
NE	40,483	225	40,586	122	185	117	232	70
NV	9,803	141	9,706	38	102	72	149	25
NH	3,665	98	3,761	0	71	42	113	0
NJ	10,758	177	10,851	284	183	60	93	130
NM	19,907	89	19,949	27	133	30	150	13
NY	32,871	605	33,088	388	159	114	183	90
NC	194,387	263	194,589	91	196	20	204	12
ND	53,858	878	54,534	0	159	175	334	0
OH	92,403	8,382	92,898	5,867	199	234	219	214
OK	38,783	391	38,967	207	190	20	84	128
OR	48,403	4,588	52,991	0	198	456	854	0
PA	108,107	818	108,451	274	274	118	259	131
RI	739	123	739	123	17	39	17	39
SC	55,540	342	55,493	389	343	88	201	228
SD	42,270	410	42,860	0	144	84	228	0
TN	135,854	2,572	135,952	2,274	72	90	75	87
TX	873,140	8,008	874,331	4,617	581	505	630	438
UT	24,591	1,387	25,958	0	96	54	150	0
VT	5,967	81	6,028	0	148	20	168	0
VA	35,850	3,877	35,381	4,148	111	565	79	587
WA	44,417	751	45,186	0	177	150	327	0
WV	3,487	33	3,504	18	79	18	92	5
WI	160,837	10,886	181,812	9,711	179	383	200	382
WY	10,291	119	10,306	104	250	41	242	49
<b>Totals</b>	<b>3,381,533</b>	<b>128,752</b>	<b>3,392,159</b>	<b>94,667</b>	<b>8,782</b>	<b>8,122</b>	<b>10,699</b>	<b>8,005</b>

**Table 5. Potential sample universe and sample for Parts Collection Survey - waterfowl.**

<b>State</b>	<b>Ducks harvested</b>	<b>Duck wings collected</b>	<b>Geese harvested</b>	<b>Goose tails collected</b>
<b>AL</b>	152,200	615	17,400	35
<b>AK</b>	71,200	843	6,900	78
<b>AZ</b>	40,700	955	2,300	46
<b>AR</b>	1,129,800	4,319	162,900	298
<b>CA</b>	1,013,100	8,496	118,300	627
<b>CO</b>	138,000	1,079	120,400	624
<b>CT</b>	28200	399	21,200	515
<b>DE</b>	64,900	695	25,400	290
<b>FL</b>	112,100	1,571	3,800	0
<b>GA</b>	127,200	771	25,300	127
<b>ID</b>	262,900	1,931	84,200	560
<b>IL</b>	471,000	2,502	139,000	765
<b>IN</b>	125,100	731	72,100	279
<b>IA</b>	248,900	1,141	71,000	316
<b>KS</b>	233,600	2,304	159,700	771
<b>KY</b>	207,500	473	43,200	46
<b>LA</b>	1,344,300	6,341	171,700	150
<b>ME</b>	78,300	823	10,100	131
<b>MD</b>	197,400	1,576	138,400	931
<b>MA</b>	24,900	614	14,500	503
<b>MI</b>	367,100	1,723	191,700	800
<b>MN</b>	884,500	2,124	286,800	533
<b>MS</b>	241,400	1,882	17,300	203
<b>MO</b>	472,600	2,403	74,600	692
<b>MT</b>	133,600	2,658	66,700	1,031
<b>NE</b>	231,200	2,099	114,800	937
<b>NV</b>	50,200	1,048	8,600	82
<b>NH</b>	18,700	587	5,400	247
<b>NJ</b>	66,900	1,122	40,300	679
<b>NM</b>	61,000	1,419	10,000	202
<b>NY</b>	211,500	2,932	111,100	1,350
<b>NC</b>	200,300	2,064	49,100	245
<b>ND</b>	496,800	3,348	149,800	1,377
<b>OH</b>	161,800	680	88,200	347
<b>OK</b>	224,900	2,185	41,900	298
<b>OR</b>	276,200	3,884	59,900	934
<b>PA</b>	124,300	1,342	194,000	1,334
<b>RI</b>	11,200	260	6,200	189
<b>SC</b>	183,300	1,450	14,800	72
<b>SD</b>	254,400	1,903	185,800	925
<b>TN</b>	275,400	880	41,700	34
<b>TX</b>	815,800	4,704	299,400	498
<b>UT</b>	325,600	3,951	29,600	310
<b>VT</b>	16,300	545	7,200	240
<b>VA</b>	153,000	1,872	72,000	916
<b>WA</b>	350,800	4,684	73,500	830
<b>WV</b>	4800	226	4,200	162
<b>WI</b>	677,400	1,153	151,200	371
<b>WY</b>	39,600	803	24,600	227
<b>Totals</b>	<b>13,401,900</b>	<b>94,110</b>	<b>3,828,200</b>	<b>23,157</b>