Supporting Statement for Paperwork Reduction Act Submission
OMB Control Number 1018-0088
2006 National Survey of Fishing, Hunting, and Wildlife-Associated Recreation
April 1, 2005

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.

The Fish and Wildlife Service (Service, we) has overall Federal responsibility for managing the Nation's fish and wildlife resources and for providing technical and financial assistance to the States for carrying out their fish and wildlife programs. Our mission is, working with others, to conserve, protect and enhance fish, wildlife, and plants and their habitats for the continuing benefit of the American people.

To assist in carrying out our responsibilities, we have sponsored national surveys of fishing and hunting at 5-year intervals since 1955 (primarily under authority of the Federal Aid in Sport Fish Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 777-777m), referred to as the Dingell-Johnson or D-J Act; the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 669-699i), referred to as the Pittman-Robertson or P-R Act; and the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 (16 U.S.C. 742d-f)). The D-J Act was expanded in 1984 by Public Law 98-369 (98 Stat. 1015), referred to as the Wallop-Breaux Amendment. The Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs Improvement Act of 2000 (Public Law 106-408) authorizes multistate conservation grant programs, which fund projects such as the National Survey of Fishing, Hunting, and Wildlife-Associated Recreation (FHWAR) that benefit a majority of the States.

Under the P-R and D-J Acts, we provide $500 million in grants annually to States for projects that support sport fish and wildlife management and restoration and improve boating access. Fish and wildlife projects include acquisition and improvement of aquatic resources, fishing access, fish stocking, and the acquisition and improvement of wildlife management areas, facilities, and access. Grants also are provided for aquatic education and hunter education, maintenance of completed projects, and research into problems affecting fish and wildlife resources. Boating projects include acquisition, development, renovation, and improvement of boating access sites.

As with previous surveys, the International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies recommended updating the FHWAR. The Association, which represents the 50 State fish and wildlife agencies, recommended that we conduct a survey in 2006 similar in scope and methodology to the 1991, 1996, and 2001 surveys. Accordingly, the 2006 FHWAR will result in a comprehensive database of fish and wildlife-related recreation activities and expenditures. The survey is the only comprehensive national database of uses and users of fish and wildlife resources. It provides comparable national and State statistics not available from other sources.

The survey information helps the Service effectively administer fish and wildlife restoration grant programs, and helps the States develop project proposals and conservation programs. Data are used to evaluate the status and trends of recreational uses as well as the values and benefits of fish and wildlife resources. The data provide essential information on present recreation demands and serves as a basis for projecting future demands.

It is important that the Service and coastal States are able to differentiate the number of saltwater and freshwater resident anglers within each State. This information is used to equitably allocate funds between freshwater and saltwater projects as required by the Sport Fish Restoration Act. The information is not readily available elsewhere because few States have saltwater licenses or conduct their own surveys. If the FHWAR data were not available, it would impair the States' ability to meet their obligations under the Act.

The FHWAR information is needed to prepare resource management and development plans and environmental documents required for compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Also, the data are used to calculate economic values of fish and wildlife recreation resources. Those values serve as a basis for assessing damages to fish and wildlife resources from adverse occurrences such as oil spills and hazardous waste dumps.

In summary, if the FHWAR were not conducted in 2006, the Service and States will experience difficulty in effectively carrying out their responsibilities to meet statutory, administrative, and other obligations. We will not have uniform national and State level data to use in identifying priorities for fish and wildlife grant programs, to evaluate the effectiveness of those programs, and to identify and plan for special needs and new initiatives. The FHWAR's uniformly collected and comparable data are not available elsewhere at the national and State levels. Without it, the Service and the States will have to acquire the data at greater expense and delay or use outdated and inconsistent data where available.

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.]

The scope and purpose of the 2006 FHWAR are similar to those of previous surveys. The FHWAR will generate information identified as priority data needed by the Service, other Federal agencies, States, nongovernmental organizations, and other major survey users. General categories of information collected include the number of participants in different types of fish and wildlife consumptive and nonconsumptive activities, the extent of their participation (days and trips), and related trip and equipment expenditures. The 2006 FHWAR questions and methodology are similar to those used in the 1991, 1996, and 2001 surveys, so their estimates are comparable.

Fish and wildlife agencies use the information in formulating management and policy decisions. Participation patterns and trend information assist in identifying present and predicting future wildlife-related recreation needs and demands. The information is used for planning the acquisition, development, and enhancement of fish and wildlife resources.

Land managing agencies use data on expenditures, economic evaluation, and participation to assess the value of fish and wildlife-related uses of natural resources in comparison with other

uses such as timber production, hydropower development, grazing, and irrigation. The Service, Bureau of Land Management, Forest Service, Bureau of Reclamation, Corps of Engineers, Economic Research Service, and National Park Service use the data for preparing and evaluating resource development and management plans and for environmental analysis required by NEPA.

The FHWAR collects information in two phases. Information collected by the screening interview phase is used to identify individuals 16 years old and older for detailed interviews during the survey year. Estimates of the number of anglers 6 years old and older in coastal States are used to determine the proper ratio for allocating funds between freshwater and saltwater projects. Information collected by the detail interview phase will be used to estimate wildlife-related recreation participation and expenditures occurring in 2006. The information will be similar to that collected in previous surveys to meet priority needs and maintain consistency and comparability. Specifically, data are used as follows:

Data on how many persons participated in fish and wildlife activities, what types of activities they participated in, how often they participated, and what species and other resources were involved are used in formulating management, enhancement, and rehabilitation plans. The FHWAR provides baseline information for allocating resources and providing recreation access and opportunities, and for evaluating the relative benefits of alternative plans for doing so. States use the information in developing conservation plans for funding under the fish and wildlife restoration grant programs. The Service uses the data to:

- Evaluate proposals and overall program performance.

- Assist Federal, State, and local agencies in developing sound multiple-use plans that contain fish and wildlife conservation, recreation, and enhancement features.

- Formulate and evaluate activities and projects initiated under major policies and acts such as the National Recreational Fisheries Policy, the North American Waterfowl Management Plan, and the Great Lakes Fishery Commission Act.

- Prepare reports the Congress requests to evaluate alternatives for distributing funds and resources under proposed legislation.

- Evaluate the impacts of projects on fish and wildlife and to develop mitigation plans under the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act and NEPA.

- Evaluate regulatory tradeoffs of migratory bird hunting regulations and to assess economic impacts of waterfowl hunting regulations. The evaluations are done in compliance with Executive Order 12866, which requires Federal agencies to evaluate alternative regulatory configurations.

Trip and equipment expenditure estimates are used to evaluate economic impacts of wildlife-related recreation activities on national and State economies. The information is used in economic modeling and cost-benefit analysis. It is used to estimate the economic significance of alternative fish and wildlife resource acquisition, development, and management programs. The data is not available from another source and is of significant value in formulating and evaluating programs and projects and in preparing budget and legislative proposals.

Economic evaluation questions are used to estimate nonmarket values of wildlife-related recreation activities. The Department of the Interior has used the data for the Type A model damage assessment program under the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA). The data also are used to quantify values for wildlife-related recreation activities and to compare those values with other activities using the same resources such as mining, timber harvesting, and grazing.

Participants' demographic characteristics such as age, sex, race, and income provide information to managers and planners on factors influencing participation and demand. Data are used to evaluate programs and to estimate future participation. The number of years and history of participation provide data on influences and changes in fish and wildlife recreation activities. Data are used in planning and providing recreation opportunities.

Information regarding fish and wildlife-associated activities on private and public lands are analyzed to identify the amount of use being met by those types of landownership and trends in that use. This information provides a basis for estimating the needs for public resources and for formulating acquisition and development plans.

Data on types of activities such as flyfishing, ice fishing, catch-and-release fishing, and primitive firearm and bow hunting are used to identify trends in fishing and hunting, impacts on resources, and recreation demand. Data are used in resource planning, management, and educational programs.

License and tag information are used to analyze expenditures for fishing and hunting. Information on licensed and unlicensed sportspersons help fish and wildlife agencies plan ways to serve their entire constituency.

Land leasing and ownership data help identify the extent that privately owned and leased lands meet demands for fish and wildlife resources and the amount of expenditures for those activities. The information is used in economic analysis and resource planning.

Data on the type and size of boats used for fishing and on boat launch facilities that need improvements help identify those needs and develop plans for meeting them.

Data on the type of information most helpful to boaters and anglers and their primary way of acquiring the information will help agencies more effectively provide and coordinate information on boating access and fishing opportunities. Similarly, the extent of people's awareness of the Water Work Wonders' public messages will help the Recreational Boating and Fishing Foundation evaluate the effectiveness of their program which is funded by the Sport Fish Restoration Program.

Information on who most often accompanied anglers fishing from a boat will help identify social dynamics of the activity so agencies can plan more adequately to meet recreationists' needs.

Information on how many anglers fishing from a boat completed boating safety instruction are used by State agencies and the Coast Guard to assess participation in safety training and to plan for future training.

Data on participation by sportspersons in wildlife-watching activities are used to identify recreation use patterns for planning and program development.

Data on Great Lakes fishing are used to identify and analyze the extent and value of these important fishery resources for recreation. The Great Lakes Fishery Commission has used the data to assess the effectiveness of programs for enhancing and protecting the lakes' fishery.

Wildlife watching (nonconsumptive) information is used in developing and evaluating game and nongame policies, programs, and resources. The Service, Bureau of Land Management, Forest Service, Economic Research Service, National Park Service, and the States rely on this information. The FHWAR is the only source of comparable data at both the national and State levels. The 2006 FHWAR will be the sixth one to collect wildlife-watching (nonconsumptive) data and will provide a significant data point for trend analysis. Like the 1991, 1996, and 2001 surveys, the 2006 FHWAR will focus on collecting data on participation where wildlife-watching activities, such as wildlife observation, feeding, and photographing, were the primary reason for participation.

Although the Service is the primary Federal user of FHWAR information, many other Federal agencies rely on it. Land managing and water development agencies use the data on participation rates, species sought, and types of resources used to formulate policies, programs, and plans related to recreational fish and wildlife uses. Federal regulatory, permitting, and environmental agencies rely on the economic data for estimating damages to fish and wildlife resources, and for determining the benefits and costs of projects affecting natural resources. Data are used in evaluating alternative plans and their environmental impacts.

State fish and wildlife agencies also are primary users of FHWAR data. Their planning divisions in conjunction with their fishery and wildlife sections use the data for program planning, development, management, and evaluation. Other State users include park and recreation departments, State planning and budget offices, tourism councils, and forestry divisions. State uses of the data are not significantly different from those of the Federal Government, and are to:

- Analyze the costs and benefits of management proposals for fish and wildlife programs.
- Prepare and support budgets, allocate resources, and establish management priorities based on public use and demand.
- Set fees for hunting and fishing licenses.
- Provide an economic database on which to evaluate economic benefits of fish and wildlife activities and resources.
- Provide data on wildlife-related activities for legislative committees and public meetings.
- Project future demand for fish and wildlife based on trend analysis of participation data, using the information for such purposes as strategic and long-range planning.
- Evaluate the impact of recreational hunting and fishing on State economies.

- Prepare policy studies (e.g., land acquisition policy based on the type and value of wildlife-related recreation).

- Provide a data source used in preparing environmental impact statements.

- Evaluate potential impacts of uses of natural resources on wildlife-associated recreation (e.g., the impact of timber harvesting on wildlife-watching activities).

- Identify species of concern for persons enjoying fish and wildlife resources.

- Assist in developing wildlife-watching programs (e.g., species to focus on in program development and how to allocate funding for specific programs).

- Provide a uniform and reliable database that permits comparability among States.

- Allocate funds equitably between freshwater and saltwater projects in coastal States as required by the Sport Fish Restoration Act.

- Identify various constituent groups served by fish and wildlife programs and resources (e.g., consumptive and nonconsumptive users).

- Provide baseline data otherwise unavailable to the States (e.g., characteristics and activities of wildlife watchers and unlicensed sportspersons).

- Evaluate program needs and management priorities based on participation rates and types of fish and wildlife activities pursued.

- Estimate the amount of State tax revenues that should be dedicated to fish and wildlife programs. Estimated revenues are based on the survey's estimates of wildlife-related recreational expenditures. These revenues are critical for State agencies relying on this source of funding.

- Evaluate effectiveness of fish and wildlife programs based on user days of consumptive and nonconsumptive recreation produced.

- Identify boating access needs to plan and evaluate programs to meet those needs.

- Develop, disseminate, and evaluate programs providing information to recreationists on fishing, hunting, and boating opportunities.

Other non-Federal users of the FHWAR data include conservation organizations, researchers, and trade and manufacturing associations. These users also participated in determining priorities for data collection and streamlining. Their needs for the data largely reflect those of the Federal and State agencies.

The value of the FHWAR database for natural resource economics was confirmed by Drs. Richard C. Bishop and David E. Ervin. They asked 3,000 professionals working in the natural

resource and environmental field to identify their most "used" and "very important" data sources. The FHWAR was identified as one of the most important data sources for their work.

In conclusion, if the 2006 FHWAR were not conducted, the Service, other Federal agencies, States, and other major users would experience difficulty in formulating resource management plans and in meeting program objectives. They would not be able to adequately measure current demand and project future demand for particular fish and wildlife resources on a uniform basis nationally and by state. They would not be able to update trends in the use of fish and wildlife resources. Professionals working in the natural resource and environmental field would not have one of their most important databases for research and analysis.

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.].**

The Census Bureau collects and records verbal responses through telephone or in-person interviews using computer-assisted technology. Respondents are individuals selected from a sample of the general public and cannot respond with computer tapes, disks, or punch cards.

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.**

There is no other comparable source of national and State-by-State reliable data on recreational fish and wildlife uses that we can adapt to carry out our program and management responsibilities. The National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) provides limited coverage of saltwater fishing, but does not cover freshwater fishing, hunting, or nonconsumptive activities. NMFS coverage of the coastal States varies from year to year. In recent years, not all the States on the West and Gulf coasts have been included in the NMFS survey. It is important that the Service and the coastal States are able to differentiate the number of saltwater and freshwater resident anglers within each State. Since the NMFS survey does not provide comparable data to accomplish this, there is no unnecessary duplication of efforts between the two surveys.

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

The proposed information collection does not involve small businesses or small entities.

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.**

The 5-year frequency of data collection is appropriate for current and projected management purposes. FHWAR users have indicated they need the data updated at least every 5 years. If the Service collected the data at greater intervals than every 5 years, the value of the information collected would be reduced. The credibility of the data would diminish rapidly over time and a

greater chance would exist for errors in decisionmaking. The Federal Government must have highly credible data to deal adequately with fish and wildlife management problems. Federal land managing agencies and State fish and wildlife agencies rely on a 5-year updating of the survey data to meet their planning and management needs.

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.**

No special circumstances exist.

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.

We consulted with States and other survey users to determine the specific content of the 2006 FHWAR. From April to September 2004, we received comments and recommendations through meetings and correspondence with Federal agencies, State fish and wildlife agencies, national conservation organizations, researchers, and nongovernmental organizations. Comments and recommendations were compiled, analyzed, and used in planning the survey and revising the 2001 computerized questionnaires. The 2006 FHWAR questions are the result of this consultative process.

Representatives from fish and wildlife agencies participated in regional technical committees that were established to advise the Service on the survey. A listing of those individuals is available on request. The technical committee members will continue to be involved throughout the course of the 2006 FHWAR. The chairmen of the committees are:

Mr. Charles Anderson (Chair, Mid-West Committee)
Minnesota Department of Natural Resources
(651) 296-0794

Mr. Virgil Kopf (Chair, Southeast Committee.)
Virginia Department of Game & Inland Fisheries
(804) 367-0639

Mr. Mark Hoffman (Chair, Northeast Committee)
Maryland Department of Natural Resources
(410) 260-8449

Mr. Dana Dolsen (Chair, Western Committee.)
Utah Division of Wildlife Resources
(801) 538-4790

Consultations also were made with the Census Bureau.

Mr. Ken Kaplan
Special Surveys Branch, Demographic Surveys Division
U.S. Bureau of the Census
(301) 763-3836

Major issues relating to data collection for the FHWAR were resolved generally through consultations. Comments and suggestions from individuals and organizations varied and reflected the interests of those particular users of the survey. As much as possible, constructive comments were incorporated in the final data collection plan and questionnaires.

On November 26, 2004, we published in the Federal Register (69 FR 68966) a notice of our intent to request information collection authority from OMB. In that notice, we solicited public comments for 60 days, ending on January 25, 2005. We received comments from only one individual regarding this notice. The commenter expressed an objection to using taxpayers' money to collect information on hunting (which the commenter opposes) and to the survey being conducted every 5 years. The commenter recommended that groups like the Friends of Animals, Fund for Animals, and Humane Society be involved in collecting information. We note the concerns raised by this individual. However, we believe the FHWAR information collection

provides an important means of measuring the extent of wildlife-related recreation and will be of great benefit to Federal and State agencies responsible for maintaining and enhancing fish and wildlife resources in the United States. The FHWAR collects information on nonconsumptive activities (observing, feeding, and photographing wildlife) as well as on consumptive activities (hunting and fishing). The survey, conducted only every 5 years, is paid for by grants from multistate conservation grant programs authorized by Public Law 106-408 (sections 113 and 122). Money for the programs comes from Federal excise tax and import duties on hunting, shooting, boating, and angling equipment and from a tax on motorboat and small engine fuel—not from general tax revenues. The Census Bureau was selected to collect the information for the survey because of its expertise, excellent response rates, reliable methodology, and 39 years of experience collecting information for the FHWAR.

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

We do not make any payment or gift to respondents.

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

Title 13, U.S. Code, Section 9 guarantees the respondent anonymity. It assures that all information that the Census Bureau collects is used only for statistical purposes. Data for the 2006 FHWAR will not be released with personal identifiers attached. A letter mailed to respondents prior to interviewing and read to respondents in the case of nonreceipt will contain this guarantee of confidentiality and information required by the Privacy Act of 1974. The letter also informs the respondent that the survey is voluntary.

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.

This survey does not ask questions of a sensitive nature. Respondents are asked some demographic questions as well as questions about the type of fish and wildlife-related recreation activities that they engaged in, the amount of time spent doing it, and the expenditures incurred on taking trips and purchasing equipment.

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.**

The projected number of respondents and the estimated burden for the 2006 FHWAR are indicated in the following table.

	ESTIMATED NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLD RESPONSES	AVERAGE TIME PER HOUSEHOLD (MINUTES)	ESTIMATED NUMBER OF PARTICIPANT RESPONSES	AVERAGE RESPONDENT TIME (MINUTES)	TOTAL BURDEN (HOURS)
Screen	76,000*	7			8,867
Screen Reinterview**	3,800	5			317
Hunting & Fishing 1st interview 2d interview 3d interview reinterview			12,000 24,000 36,000 2,000	15 10 15 5	3,000 4,000 9,000 167
Wildlife Watching 1st interview 2d interview 3d interview reinterview			7,200 12,000 18,000 1000	11 11 11 5	1,320 2,200 3,300 83
TOTAL	79,800	6.9	112,200	12.3	32,254

*The estimated number of respondents reached from a sample of households will be 76,000. About one half, 38,000, of those respondents will sample in and receive a detail interview. An additional 50 percent of those households where one person is sampled (19,000) will have a second person screened in for interviews. Therefore, the total number of respondents is estimated to be 95,000 (76,000 + 19,000) in the 2006 FHWAR.

**Of the survey respondents, 5 percent from the CAPI screener workload and 6 percent from the CAPI third interview sportspersons and wildlife-watchers workloads are reinterviewed by another Census interviewer using a subset of the regular questionnaire. These reinterview responses are compared to the responses of the full interview as a quality control measure.

The total number of respondents can be calculated by adding up the household and participant responses and subtracting the reinterviews and the third interviews. There is some wave 1 and wave 2 overlap.

We expect the burden to be about 15 minutes for the sportsmen and 11 minutes for the wildlife-watching participants. We base the estimate for interview length on the 2001 survey and experience with similar surveys. The combined total estimated hours of respondent burden is 32,254.

The estimated total annualized cost to respondents for the hour burdens for collections of information for the 2006 FHWAR Survey is $462,200. This was calculated by multiplying the estimated burden hours (32,254) by $14.33, the average hourly earnings in the U.S. nonagricultural industrial sector (2002 Statistical Abstract of the United States, p.392).

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 are no non-hour costs to respondents.

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 total estimated data collection cost to the Federal Government for the 2006 FHWAR is about $13.2 million of which $11.2 million is for Census Bureau work. The Fish and Wildlife Service and the Census Bureau developed separate cost estimates based on sample sizes and questionnaire length. Each estimate included salaries, benefits, administrative, overhead, design, printing, and mailing costs. The costs by fiscal year are as follows:

	Total	Census Bureau
FY 2004	$ 407,904	$ 27,000
FY 2005	$ 715,380	$ 371,000
FY 2006	$7,469,118	$7,095,000
FY 2007	$3,935,618	$3,514,908
FY 2008	$ 650,835	$ 220,908

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

The estimated burden hours for the 2006 FHWAR are 32,254 hours. The current OMB inventory is zero because the survey is conducted every 5 years and OMB approval was allowed to expire. The 2006 estimate is based on actual experience with the 2001 FHWAR screen and detail response rates applied to an increase in sample size. The estimated burden hours for the 2001 FHWAR were 27,000 hours.

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.

The time schedule for the information collection and publication of reports is:

- Data Collection — April 2006 to March 2007
- Computer Processing — June 2006 to July 2007
- Preliminary Tabulations released to FWS — June 2007
- Release of Public Use CD-ROM by FWS — September 2007
- Release of Publications — August 2007 to April 2008

The 2006 FHWAR will produce an updated National report and 50 State reports of fishing, hunting, and wildlife-associated recreation statistics. Preliminary estimates will be released in preliminary publications. The final tabulations will be similar to those produced in 2001 with some modifications due to streamlining and meeting current data needs of the users. We have attached draft 2006 report tables showing where modifications from the 2001 tables will be made for the 2006 final reports. Also produced will be a trends report showing a comparison of major

findings of the FHWAR from 1991 to 2006. The report will have trends in the number of participants, days of participation, and expenditures for hunting and fishing. This report will be released in early 2008. The reports will be available on the Internet.

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 are not seeking approval to not display the expiration date.

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

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.

Eighty-two million people 16 years old and older participated in fishing, hunting, and wildlife watching in the United States in 2001. Thirty-eight million were sportspersons, of which 34 million fished and 13 million hunted. Sixty-six million were wildlife watchers who fed, observed, and photographed wildlife. The Census Bureau has designed and plans to conduct a survey of a sample of potential sportspersons and wildlife watchers to update the FHWAR in 2006. The survey content and methodology will be similar to that used for the previous three surveys.

The screening sample for the 2006 FHWAR will include approximately 90,000 housing units. It will consist of expired Current Population Survey (CPS) housing units where the eighth month interview fell between June 2002 and September 2005. The CPS samples were selected from 2000 Decennial Census files with coverage in all 50 States and the District of Columbia. A sample also will be drawn from three State databases of licensed anglers and hunters to determine the viability of State databases as a supplemental sample source.

The FHWAR initial interviews will be attempted by telephone by field representatives working out of the Census Bureau's 12 regional areas. Cases not resolved by telephone will be followed up by the same field representatives through personal visits. Census field representatives will ask questions on participation in fishing, hunting, and wildlife-watching activities of the U.S. civilian noninstitutional population age 6 years and older, and military personnel not residing in barracks.

Two independent detail samples will be chosen from the FHWAR screening sample. They will consist of sportspersons and wildlife watchers. The Census Bureau will select the detail samples based on information reported during the screening phase. Every person 16 years of age and

older in the screening sample will be assigned to a sportsperson stratum based on time devoted to hunting or fishing in the past and time expected to be devoted to hunting or fishing in the future. The three sportspersons categories are:

(a) Active - a person who participated in hunting or fishing in 2005 or 2006 OR intends to participate in 2006.

(b) Inactive - a person who did not participate in hunting or fishing in 2005 AND does not intend to participate in 2006.

(c) Nonparticipant - a person who has not participated in hunting or fishing since 2001 AND does not intend to participate in 2006.

The active and inactive groups will be eligible for interviews in the sportsperson detail sample. Every person in the FHWAR screening sample also will be assigned to one of the following two wildlife-watching categories:

(a) Active - a person who participated in a wildlife-watching activity in 2005 or 2006 OR intends to participate in 2006.

(b) Nonparticipant - a person who did not participate in a wildlife-watching activity in 2005 or 2006 AND does not intend to participate in 2006.

Only the active group will be eligible for interviews in the wildlife-watching detail sample. The following table shows the expected 2006 FHWAR response rates for the screening and detail samples:

2006 FHWAR Expected Response Rates

	Screener FH-2 (households)	Sportspersons FH-3 (persons)	Wildlife Watchers FH-4 (persons)
Total Assigned Cases	90,000	36,000	18,000
B&C Noninterviews	14,000	200	100
Total Eligible Cases	76,000	35,800	17,900
Type A Noninterviews			
- Number	15,200	4,296	1,790
- Percent	20%	12%	10%
Interviews			
- Number	60,800	31,504	16,110
- Percent	80%	88%	90%

The active sportsperson stratum comprises those who hunted or fished in 2005 or 2006 and those who did not participate in 2005 or 2006, but plan to in 2006. Sportspersons who had hunted or

fished in 2005, but not in 2006, will be stratified into two substrata based on expenditures on hunting or fishing and the number of days of participation in hunting or fishing. The two substrata are:

(a) Avid - a person who hunted at least 30 days or fished at least 30 days OR spent more than $600 on hunting or on fishing in 2005.

(b) Nonavid - a person who hunted or fished at least one day but not more than 29 days AND did not spend more than $600 on either fishing or hunting in 2005.

All avid sportspersons and sportspersons who have already participated in 2006 will be given a detail sportsperson interview. Nonavid sportspersons and those active sportspersons who did not participate in 2005 will be subsampled to yield the desired number of active sportspersons. The expected sample size for the FHWAR sportsperson detail sample is 36,000 people.

Only the active group will be eligible for interviews in the detail wildlife-watchers sample. The Census Bureau will stratify the wildlife watchers who participated in 2005, but not in 2006 into two categories based on the distance traveled by the individual to participate in the wildlife-watching activity:

(a) Primary Nonresidential - a person who took a trip of 1 mile or more to participate in a wildlife-watching activity.

(b) Primary Residential - a person who participated in a wildlife-watching activity only within 1 mile from home.

The first stratum, primary nonresidential, will be further classified into two substrata based on the expenditures on the wildlife-watching activity and the number of days of participation in the wildlife-watching activity:

(a) Avid - a person who participated at least 30 days OR spent at least $300 on wildlife-watching activities in 2005.

(b) Nonavid - a person who participated between 1 and 29 days AND spent less than $300 on wildlife-watching activities in 2005.

The expected sample size for the wildlife-watching detail sample is 18,000.

The 2001 FHWAR interview response rate for the screening sample of households was 75 percent; 88 percent for the sportspersons detailed sample; and 90 percent for the wildlife-watcher detailed sample.

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.**

Data for the FHWAR sportsperson sample and wildlife-watching sample will be collected in three waves. The first wave will be conducted April-June 2006, the second in September 2006, and the third in January 2007. In the sportsperson sample, all persons who hunted or fished in 2006 2001 by the time of the screening interview will be interviewed in the first wave. The remaining sportsperson sample will be interviewed in the second wave. All sample persons (from both the first and second waves) will be interviewed in the third wave.

The reference period will be the preceding 4 months for waves 1 and 2. In wave 3, the reference period will be either 4 or 8 months depending on when the sample person was first interviewed. After the wave 3 interviews, Census will have collected data on each sample person's activities for the entire year of 2006.

The estimation procedure for the FHWAR screening and detail samples follow the usual statistical principles used for other surveys. The final weight for each case in the screening sample is the product of the inverse of the selection probability, a weight adjustment to account for noninterviews, a first-stage weighting factor to reduce the variance due to the selection of nonself-representing primary sampling units (PSUs), and a second stage weighting factor to bring sample estimates into agreement with independent population controls by age, sex, and race.

The final weight for each case in the FHWAR detail samples is the product of the inverse of the selection probability, a weighting adjustment to account for noninterviews, and a ratio adjustment to bring the estimates of persons age 16 or older from the detail interviews into agreement with the same estimates from the screening sample, which was a much larger sample.

The Census Bureau estimates that the overall degree of accuracy of their collection methods will meet the Fish and Wildlife Service objective that the coefficient of variation on the estimated number of sportsmen age 16 and older within a given State (excluding the District of Columbia and Hawaii) from the FHWAR sample should be approximately 6 percent.

There are no unusual problems requiring specialized sampling.

The data for this survey is collected approximately every 5 years to reduce respondent burden.

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 Census Bureau Field Division staff will perform standard procedures to keep the noninterview rate at a low level. Three attempts, including an in-person interview if appropriate, will be made to get a completed interview.

In addition, the Census Bureau will follow respondents who move. Since respondents are interviewed three times to obtain a full year's data, new respondents cannot be substituted into the sample. Therefore, instead of losing sample persons, Field Division will follow the respondents to their new residences to finish the interview. The exception is if the respondent moves beyond 50 miles of any sample area and cannot be reached by telephone.

The estimation procedure includes a noninterview adjustment to adjust for those cases that the field staff cannot interview.

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.**

After incorporating a few new questions into the instrument, test interviews were administered. These interviews were given to eight individuals. The interviews were timed and the flow of the questions was monitored to make sure that the intended information was obtained. Aided by the fact that the great majority of the instrument's questions have been tested in previous FHWARs, the interview procedures went very well. Feedback from the test subjects included the observations that (1) identification of the recall period should be reinforced and (2) the recall period was repeated too often. One respondent was confused about whether he could be included as a wildlife watcher if he went to watch birds but never saw any. (That definitional confusion is not a problem for hunters or anglers.) Interviewers are trained to answer such respondent questions when they come up. We believe it is important to emphasize the recall period to reduce telescoping.

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.**

You may consult the following Census Bureau individuals for information regarding sample design and data collection:

Sample Design: Thomas Moore 301-763-5997

Data Collection: Kenneth Kaplan 301-763-3836