that it has been very useful. The tagging program has benefited horseshoe crab management and has had impacts on management of associated shorebird species whose population levels are of concern. The commenter had concerns on the effort of tag recoveries, and suggested that we provide higher incentives to commercial fishermen to report crab tags, increase efforts on spawning beaches to recover tags, record time searching for tags to determine catch-per-unit-effort, that online reporting can be done in a batch system, and that we increase efforts to collect tag data from commercial fishermen. While we recognize that all of these suggestions would make a stronger program with more significant scientific data, some come with substantial cost. At this time we do not have any additional funds to provide increased incentives to fishermen, increase tag recovery efforts on beaches (done by our cooperators at this time), or increase efforts to solicit tag data from commercial fishermen. Through our cooperators in the future, we can attempt to get an estimate of catch-per-unit-effort and we will discuss this issue with the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission to determine if those data would be useful. We will also explore providing a batch-type data entry program on our Web site to report recaptured tags. We will explore collecting catch-per-unit-effort and online batch reporting in the future.

Commenter 5 was supportive of the information collection, and commented that the scientific data provided by the program has been very useful for horseshoe crab management. Information was collected efficiently and the burden estimates were accurate.

Commenter 6 opposed the use of horseshoe crabs by biomedical companies and proposed a ban on the use of horseshoe crabs for any purpose.

Commenter 7 said that the tagging program is not necessary and the data generated by the program is not useful. The commenter also opposed the commercial harvest of horseshoe crabs and the use of horseshoe crabs by biomedical companies. The commenter proposed a ban on the use of horseshoe crabs for any purpose.

Commenter 8 discussed the scientific merit of the tagging program and said that it has been very useful for horseshoe crab management purposes. The commenter suggested that the Fish and Wildlife Service increase efforts in resighting tagged crabs outside the Delaware Bay area. While we recognize that increasing effort for resighting tagged crabs would increase the quality of the scientific data, there is substantial cost associated with increasing that effort. At this time, we do not have any additional funds to increase tag recovery efforts on beaches (done by our cooperators at this time). We will encourage our cooperators to increase efforts in tag recovery outside the Delaware Bay area. The commenter also suggested we develop an application for smart phones in addition to the online reporting system that we currently offer. We will explore the development of an app for smart phones to provide another method for tag reporting.

Commenter 9 discussed the scientific merit of the tagging program and said that it has been very useful to horseshoe crab and shorebird management (whose population levels are of concern). The commenter suggested that we increase efforts on spawning beaches of Maryland and Virginia to recover tags, record time searching for tags to determine catch-per-unit-effort, and use formal models to determine survival of bled crabs from the Lysate industry. As with previous comments, we will encourage our cooperators to increase tag recovery efforts on the Maryland and Virginia beaches; however, without increased funding, we will not be able to increase tag recovery efforts without the assistance of cooperators. Some formal studies are being done by our cooperators using the Service tagging program to evaluate impacts of both tagging and of the Lysate bleeding programs. We will continue to support the tagging programs that are evaluating crab survival. The commenter also suggested that we should facilitate batch reporting of crabs on the phone and to encourage tag reporting by commercial fishermen. At this time we do not have any additional funds to provide increased incentives to fishermen, increase tag recovery efforts on beaches (done by our cooperators at this time), or increase efforts to solicit tag data from commercial fishermen. We will work with our cooperators to attempt to get better distribution of tag recovery efforts.

Commenter 10 provided comments similar in nature to Commenters 4 and 9.

We did not make any changes to our information collection requirements based on the above comments.

We again invite comments concerning this information collection on:

- Whether or not the collection of information is necessary, including whether or not the information will have practical utility;
- The accuracy of our estimate of the burden for this collection of information;
- Ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and
- Ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents.

Comments that you submit in response to this notice are a matter of public record. 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 can ask OMB in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that it will be done.

Dated: March 6, 2012.

Tina A. Campbell,

Chief, Division of Policy and Directives Management, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

[FR Doc. 2012–5879 Filed 3–9–12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–55–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service

[FWS–R9–MB–2012–N0059; FF09M21200–123–FXMB1231099BPP0L2]

Information Collection Request Sent to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for Approval; Approval Procedures for Nontoxic Shot and Shot Coatings

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice; request for comments.

SUMMARY: We (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service) have sent an Information Collection Request (ICR) to OMB for review and approval. We summarize the ICR below and describe the nature of the collection and the estimated burden and cost. This information collection is scheduled to expire on April 30, 2012. We may not conduct or sponsor and a person is not required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. However, under OMB regulations, we may continue to conduct or sponsor this information collection while it is pending at OMB.

DATES: You must submit comments on or before April 11, 2012.

ADDRESSES: Send your comments and suggestions on this information collection to the Desk Officer for the Department of the Interior at OMB–OIRA at (202) 395–5806 (fax) or *OIRA_DOCKET@OMB.eop.gov* (email).

Please provide a copy of your comments to the Service Information Collection Clearance Officer, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, MS 2042–PDM, 4401 North Fairfax Drive, Arlington, VA 22203 (mail), or *INFOCOL@fws.gov* (email). Please include ''1018–0067'' in the subject line of your comments.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: To request additional information about this ICR, contact Hope Grey at *INFOCOL@fws.gov* (email) or 703–358–2482 (telephone). You may review the ICR online at *http://www.reginfo.gov.* Follow the instructions to review Department of the Interior collections under review by OMB.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

OMB Control Number: 1018–0067.

Title: Approval Procedures for Nontoxic Shot and Shot Coatings, 50 CFR 20.134.

Service Form Number(s): None.

Type of Request: Extension of currently approved collection.

Description of Respondents: Businesses that produce and/or market approved nontoxic shot types or nontoxic shot coatings.

Respondent's Obligation: Required to obtain or retain a benefit.

Frequency of Collection: On occasion.

Estimated Number of Annual Responses: 1.

Completion Time per Response: 3,200 hours.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 3,200 hours.

Estimated Annual Nonhour Cost Burden: $25,000.

Abstract: The Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) (16 U.S.C. 703 *et seq.*) prohibits the unauthorized take of migratory birds and authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to regulate take of migratory birds in the United States. Under this authority, we control the hunting of migratory game birds through regulations in 50 CFR part 20. On January 1, 1991, we banned lead shot for hunting waterfowl and coots in the United States.

The regulations at 50 CFR 20.134 outline the application and approval process for new types of nontoxic shot. When considering approval of a candidate material as nontoxic, we must ensure that it is not hazardous in the environment and that secondary exposure (ingestion of spent shot or its components) is not a hazard to migratory birds. To make that decision, we require each applicant to provide information about the solubility and toxicity of the candidate material. Additionally, for law enforcement purposes, a noninvasive field detection device must be available to distinguish candidate shot from lead shot. This information constitutes the bulk of an application for approval of nontoxic shot. The Director uses the data in the application to decide whether or not to approve a material as nontoxic.

Comments: On September 26, 2011, we published in the **Federal Register** (76 FR 59421) a notice of our intent to request that OMB renew approval for this information collection. In that notice, we solicited comments for 60 days, ending on November 25, 2011. We received one comment. The commenter opposed expending funds to support the approval of nontoxic shot, and stated that a survey is not needed. This information collection is not a survey. It consists of risk assessments, toxicity tests, and background information that an applicant must submit in order for us to determine whether or not a proposed shot is nontoxic. We did not make any changes to our information collection requirements.

We again invite comments concerning this information collection on:

- Whether or not the collection of information is necessary, including whether or not the information will have practical utility;
- The accuracy of our estimate of the burden for this collection of information;
- Ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and
- Ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents.

Comments that you submit in response to this notice are a matter of public record. 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 can ask OMB in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that it will be done.

Dated: March 6, 2012.

Tina A. Campbell,

Chief, Division of Policy and Directives Management, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

[FR Doc. 2012–5878 Filed 3–9–12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–55–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service

[FWS–R7–R–2012–N046; FXRS126307000004A–FF07R08000]

Information Collection Request Sent to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for Approval; Alaska Guide Service Evaluation

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice; request for comments.

SUMMARY: We (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service) have sent an Information Collection Request (ICR) to OMB for review and approval. We summarize the ICR below and describe the nature of the collection and the estimated burden and cost. This information collection is scheduled to expire on March 31, 2012. We may not conduct or sponsor and a person is not required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. However, under OMB regulations, we may continue to conduct or sponsor this information collection while it is pending at OMB.

DATES: You must submit comments on or before April 11, 2012.

ADDRESSES: Send your comments and suggestions on this information collection to the Desk Officer for the Department of the Interior at OMB–OIRA at (202) 395–5806 (fax) or *OIRA_DOCKET@OMB.eop.gov* (email). Please provide a copy of your comments to the Service Information Collection Clearance Officer, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, MS 2042–PDM, 4401 North Fairfax Drive, Arlington, VA 22203 (mail), or *INFOCOL@fws.gov* (email). Please include ''1018–0141'' in the subject line of your comments.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: To request additional information about this ICR, contact Hope Grey at *INFOCOL@fws.gov* (email) or 703–358–2482 (telephone). You may review the ICR online at *http://www.reginfo.gov.* Follow the instructions to review Department of the Interior collections under review by OMB.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

OMB Control Number: 1018–0141.

Title: Alaska Guide Service Evaluation.

Service Form Number(s): 3–2349.

Type of Request: Extension of a currently approved collection.

Description of Respondents: Clients of permitted commercial guide service providers.

Respondent's Obligation: Voluntary.