

to the start of a trip, or by submitting a request to participate in the program(s) of interest using their FishOnline account.

**Vessel Owner Single Letter Option:** Vessel owners that own multiple vessels, but would like to receive only a single Greater Atlantic Fisheries Bulletin or small entity compliance guide instead of one for each vessel permit, must submit a written request to NMFS to participate in this program.

### III. Data

**OMB Control Number:** 0648–0202.  
**Form Number(s):** None.

**Type of Review:** Regular (revision of a current information collection).

**Affected Public:** Businesses and other for-profit organizations are primarily affected. Individuals or households, state, local or tribal governments, and the Federal Government are also affected.

**Estimated Number of Respondents:** 129,453.

**Estimated Time per Response:** *Vessel Permits:* Vessel permit application: 40 minutes; vessel permit renewal forms: 20 minutes; initial dealer permit applications: 15 minutes; dealer permit renewal forms: 5 minutes; initial and renewal vessel operator permit applications: 30 minutes; online account creation (FishOnline Account Information Collection): 15 minutes; limited access vessel replacement applications: 1.5 hours; and applications for retention of limited access permit history: 1.5 hours. *VMS Requirements:* Installing a VMS unit: 1 hour; confirming VMS connectivity: 5 minutes; VMS certification form: 5 minutes; VMS installation for Canadian herring transport vessels: 1 hour and 20 minutes; email to declare their entrance and departure from U.S. waters: 15 minutes; automatic polling of vessel position using the VMS unit: 0 minutes; area and DAS declarations: 5 minutes; declaration of days-out of the gillnet fishery for monkfish and NE multispecies vessels: 5 minutes; Good Samaritan DAS credit request: 30 minutes; entangled whale DAS credit request: 30 minutes; DAS credit for a canceled trip due to unforeseen circumstances, but have not yet begun fishing: 5 minutes to request via the VMS unit and 10 minutes to request via the paper form; VMS catch reports: 5 minutes; VMS power down exemption: 30 minutes. *Observer Program Call-in Requirements:* Requests for observer coverage are estimated to require either 2 or 10 minutes per request, depending on the program for which observers are requested. *Exempted Fisheries Programs:* Letter of Authorization (LOA)

to participate in any of the exemption programs: 5 minutes; Charter/Party Exemption Certificate for GOM Closed Areas: 5 minutes; limited access sea scallop vessels state waters DAS exemption program or state waters gear exemption program: 2 minutes; withdraw from either state waters exemption program prior to the end of the 7-day designated exemption period requirement: 2 minutes; request for change in permit category designation: 5 minutes; request for transit to another port by a vessel required to remain within the GOM cod trip limit: 2 minutes; gillnet category designation, including initial requests for gillnet tags: 10 minutes; requests for additional tags: 2 minutes; notification of lost tags and requests for replacement tag numbers: 2 minutes; attachment of gillnet tags: 1 minute; initial lobster area designations: 5 minutes; requests for additional tags: 2 minutes; and notification of lost tags: 3 minutes; requests for state quota transfers in the bluefish, summer flounder and scup fisheries: 1 hour; GOM cod trip limit exemption: 5 minutes; vessel owner single letter option: 5 minutes.

**Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours:** 18,737.

**Estimated Total Annual Cost to Public:** \$2,302,677 in record keeping/reporting costs.

**Respondent's Obligation:** Mandatory.  
**Legal Authority:** Title 50, Chapter VI, Part 648: FISHERIES OF THE NORTHEASTERN UNITED STATES.

### IV. Request for Comments

We are soliciting public comments to permit the Department/Bureau to: (a) Evaluate whether the proposed information collection is necessary for the proper functions of the Department, including whether the information will have practical utility; (b) Evaluate the accuracy of our estimate of the time and cost burden for this proposed collection, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used; (c) Evaluate ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) Minimize the reporting burden on those who are to respond, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Comments that you submit in response to this notice are a matter of public record. We will include or summarize each comment in our request to OMB to approve this ICR. Before including your address, phone number, email address, or other personal identifying information in your comment, you should be aware that your entire comment—including your

personal identifying information—may be made publicly available at any time. While you may ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

**Sheleen Dumas,**

*Department PRA Clearance Officer, Office of the Chief Information Officer, Commerce Department.*

[FR Doc. 2021–14292 Filed 7–2–21; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510–22–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

[RTID 0648–XB202]

### Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council (MAFMC); Public Meeting

**AGENCY:** National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

**ACTION:** Notice; public meeting.

**SUMMARY:** The Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council's Northeast Trawl Advisory Panel (NTAP) Working Group will hold a public webinar meeting.

**DATES:** The meeting will be held on Wednesday, July 21, 2021, from 1 p.m. to 3 p.m. For agenda details, see

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION.

**ADDRESSES:** The meeting will be held via webinar. Details on the proposed agenda, webinar listen-in access, and briefing materials will be posted at [www.mafmc.org](http://www.mafmc.org).

**Council address:** Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council, 800 N State Street, Suite 201, Dover, DE 19901; telephone: (302) 674–2331; [www.mafmc.org](http://www.mafmc.org).

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Christopher M. Moore, Ph.D., Executive Director, Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council, telephone: (302) 526–5255.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** This meeting was rescheduled from June 18, 2021 to July 21, 2021 due to the new Juneteenth federal holiday. The purpose of this rescheduled meeting is for the NTAP Working Group to discuss (1) objectives of the restrictor cable research, (2) scope and timing of the research, and (3) prepare documentation for reporting out to the full panel.

#### Special Accommodations

The meeting is physically accessible to people with disabilities. Requests for sign language interpretation or other

auxiliary aids should be directed to Kathy Collins at the Mid-Atlantic Council Office (302) 526–5253 at least 5 days prior to the meeting date.

**Authority:** 16 U.S.C. *et seq.*

**Dated:** June 29, 2021.

**Diane M. DeJames-Daly,**

*Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service.*

[FR Doc. 2021–14294 Filed 7–2–21; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510–22–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

#### Agency Information Collection Activities; Submission to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for Review and Approval; Comment Request; Economic Analysis of Shoreline Treatment Options for Coastal New Hampshire

The Department of Commerce will submit the following information collection request to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and clearance in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, on or after the date of publication of this notice. We invite the general public and other Federal agencies to comment on proposed, and continuing information collections, which helps us assess the impact of our information collection requirements and minimize the public's reporting burden. Public comments were previously requested via the **Federal Register** on April 26, 2021 (86 FR 22034) during a 60-day comment period. This notice allows for an additional 30 days for public comments.

**Agency:** National Oceanic & Atmospheric Administration, Commerce.

**Title:** Economic Analysis of Shoreline Treatment Options for Coastal New Hampshire.

**OMB Control Number:** 0648–0788.

**Form Number(s):** None.

**Type of Request:** Regular submission [revision of a current information collection].

**Number of Respondents:** 2,701.

**Average Hours per Response:**

Pretest—17 minutes; Full survey—20 minutes; Non-response survey—5 minutes.

**Total Annual Burden Hours:** 824.

**Needs and Uses:** This is a request for a revision to information collection 0648–0788, sponsored by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) National Center for Coastal Ocean Science (NCCOS).

This collection will benefit the NOAA, Office of Coastal Management (OCM), and decision-makers on the state and local level in New Hampshire. NOAA will collect economic data pursuant to the Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA) and Digital Coastal Act.

The New Hampshire Coastal Risk and Hazards Commission (CRHC) was established by the State Legislature through RSA 483–E on July 2, 2013. The purpose of the Commission, as stated in the law, is to “recommend legislation, rules and other actions to prepare for projected sea-level rise and other coastal watershed hazards such as storms, increased river flooding and storm water runoff, and the risks such hazards pose to municipalities and the state assets in New Hampshire.” Further, in carrying out this charge, the Commission is specifically directed to “review National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and other scientific agency projections of coastal storm inundation and flood risk to determine the appropriate information, data, and property risks” to incorporate into its recommendations.

In 2016, the CRHC recommended the development of a “comprehensive, integrated New Hampshire Coastal Shoreline Management Plan (CSMP) that presents general priorities for coastal shoreline management, as well as site-specific and place-based strategies including, where appropriate, protection, adaptation, and abandonment.” Following a New Hampshire Shoreline Management workshop organized by GBNERR in 2014 and consistent with CRHC Recommendation BL6, NHCP has prioritized living shoreline assessment and implementation in its five-year strategy to enhance coastal management (309 Strategy, 2015) and set a longer term goal to develop a Tidal Shoreline Management Plan (TSMP) for New Hampshire.

The National Ocean Service (NOS) proposes to collect economic data to document perceived effects of weather and climate events and adaptation strategies, to assess probable public benefits that would be derived from shoreline treatment options within coastal New Hampshire, and to establish a baseline for future monitoring of NOAA's success in meeting its mandates and obligations.

Respondents will be randomly sampled from households (1) within New Hampshire, (2) within block groups in Maine adjacent to the Piscataqua River, and (3) within block groups in Massachusetts adjacent to the Hampton-Seabrook Estuary. Questions will explore such issues as participation

in recreational activities, familiarity with weather and climate effects and adaptation methods, sense of place, and opinions on shoreline treatment options. No PII will be collected. The final collection will support the development of a CSMP for New Hampshire as well as provide information to help inform local coastal zone management and planning.

Upon analysis of the pre-test data and guidance from experts in survey methodology, the following changes were made to enhance understanding, response rate, and to minimize respondent burden:

- **Question 4:** “suffered damage” has been replaced with “been damaged” to avoid potential bias an increase data quality.

- **Questions 7a/8a:** “coastal flooding” has been replaced with “flooding” to not exclude riverine flooding.

- **Questions 7a/8a, 7b/8b:** “flooding damage” and “shoreline erosion damage” were replaced with “damage from flooding” and “damage from shoreline erosion” to improve understanding.

- **Questions 14h and 14i** were removed based on pre-test results to reduce burden without decreasing data quality.

- **Questions 16–21** originally asked respondents to indicate their preference to six unique policy options, but now respondents are asked to compare three sets of unique policy options. Pre-test results suggested that respondents would prefer to compare policies rather than rate them individually, and comparing three sets of policy options should reduce burden while increasing data quality.

- **Question 22b:** This question is now asked after each policy comparison instead of once to improve data quality.

- **Question 22f:** “a public vote or referendum” was replaced with “being considered by the New Hampshire legislature” to convey the same information, but using region-specific terminology, which should increase data quality.

- **Question 22:** An additional statement was added to capture potentially invalid responses due to “scenario rejection,” which should increase data quality.

- **Question 23:** The question and response option phrasings have been updated to reflect the modified choice experiment.

- **Question 30:** The year has been updated from 2019 to 2020 when asking about the previous year's household income.

- A question has been added to ask how long the respondent has been a