

MRIP Survey Coverage Project Kickoff Workshop (6/2/2008-6/3/2008)

In attendance:

Connie Ryan, Joe Weinstein, Phil Law, California DFG (conference call)

Han Lin-Lai, Erik Zlokovitz, Dave Van Voorhees, Rob Andrews, Ron Salz, NOAA (S&T)

John Skalski, University of Washington

Linda Barker, Maryland DNR

Doug Mumford, Chris Wilson, North Carolina DNR

Richard Cody, Florida FWC

Virginia Lesser, Oregon State University

- **Overview of MRIP (Rob Andrews):**
 - NRC Review
 - MRIP organizational structure
 - DAWG projects.
 - **Provide source documents for regional programs to project team.**
 - Impact of Magnuson reauthorization on MRIP
 - Angler License Directory (ALDS)

- **Overview of Coverage Issues (Rob Andrews)**
 - Night fishing document drafted by Buskirk et.al. (March 5, 2008) documents magnitude of night fishing activity, regional and temporal differences.
 - A summary slide documented percent of private-access fishing (at 25%). It would be useful to modify this if possible to obtain the percent of sites not surveyed by intercept studies (i.e.: private plus inaccessible public sites). Needs modification of current registry of sites to

- **Discussion of CA Panel Survey (Joe Weinstein et al.)**
 - Conducted April-December, 2005
 - RecFIN Statistical Sub Committee was consulted and basic approach approved.
 - 2 Panels (public-access and private-access skiff owners).
 - Approximately 100 anglers per panel. Randomly selected anglers from the phone survey were asked to participate.
 - Panels recruited through angler license directory. Panel recruitment was ongoing through September of 2005. No participation incentives were offered to participants.
 - Sought to identify differences in behavior and CPUE between panels (geographic distribution, trip types, areas fished, etc.). Also sought to validate information collected through ALDS.
 - Results
 - Data are sparse (approximately 750 trips – 300 private access and 400 public access)

- There were significant differences in CPUE on species-by-species differences, but difficult to assess if these are true differences are the result of random effects
 - No difference in areas fished, but there were differences in trip-types. However, classification of trip types probably needed to be more “robust” as information on primary target depended on angler ability to identify species.
 - No differences in CPUE between panels within trip types.
 - Private-access boats generally larger, have larger crews and longer trips.
 - Potential avidity bias in ALDS (active ALDS respondents reportedly more avid than panelists).
 - **Question: Were the results of the CPUE from public anglers obtained in the intercept surveys compared with the public log panel results to determine if the survey mode (log versus intercept) might have influenced results?**
- Potential issues with self-selection of panel. Anglers on list were not selected from a probability sample and angling may not be representative of boat mode angling in general (agree to provide contact information for ALDS, then agree to participate in panel).
 - **CA has grant to continue/modify study (100K)**
 - Need to complete study and produce report by September 2009.
 - Online logbook/diary being considered for new study.

Some documentation that outlines methods and results of initial CA panel study are needed to compare with notes from workshop and to provide adequate background for development of pilot studies/improvements to CA study.

- **Overview of Night Fishing Documentation and Preliminary Characterization (Chris Wilson)**
 - Night fishing not assessed regularly in master site register (intercept sampling frame)
 - Distribution of night trips reported in CHTS
 - Limited regional data on Night-fishing (CA 24 hr study, FL snook intercept program, MS Shore angler study).
 - Need to standardize definitions of night or “off-survey” trips among regions for analysis
 - **Issue is not really night trips, but trips that are not accessible to intercept interviewers (return to docks or end when samplers not present).** Based on the CHTS, the percent of fishing events that are classified as night fishing varied across months, states and modes. Night fishing events made up 7.4% of all fishing events in 2007, ranging from 0% Oregon to 14.3% (Virgin Islands). This also varied by mode: 14.7% for shore mode and 3.8% for private/rental averaged across states. The

average difference of night and day fishing across the year (Jan-Dec) was not summarized.

- **General Discussion**

- Can estimate catch rates by residency type (in CHTS frame vs. out of CHTS frame)
- Discussion of incidence of cell-phone only (increasing dramatically in recent years). Report from CDC on increasing number of cell phone only households from the BRFSS? Has major impact on RDD surveys. It is illegal contact cell phone users using auto-dialers, making call attempts 2-4 X more expensive than automated survey calls. What is the response rate to this survey by state and combined across all states?
- Historical MRFSS documents provide justification for NOT collecting catch data over phone. **Rob Andrews will track down and provide to team.** Two-month recall period for which the calling period is limited to two weeks. Has this recall period been reviewed since the initiation of this time period which was done in 1978? Is this recall period still working?
- Night fishing could be covered by stratifying intercept sampling by day and night. Would cost more. Sampling at night may be problematic in terms of safety and cost (two samplers needed?). D. Mumford indicated that this was discussed at a previous wave meeting. **E. Zlokovitz was going to follow-up with Patty Zielinski.**
- **CHTS provides potential recruitment tool for identifying panels.** Have been asking respondents if they would be willing to participate in follow-up study. Also have information about their trip types that would allow for identification of likely private-access and public-access anglers. CHTS conducted in all coastal states except Oregon.
- Night Fishing: Options for obtaining information
 - Pairwise comparison of site-days: Currently sampling procedures to select site-day, then also sample at night at the sampled site-day.
 - Stratification and sample at night. Would require new/updated sample frame and could be costly to do in terms of coverage benefits. Some discussion by John Skalski as to what would be an acceptable level of coverage. Can always add strata and bump up sample size but needs to be practical.
 - Panel survey. Again, CHTS and/or APAIS could provide panel participants.
- What is actually being covered in regional surveys (including MRFSS-APAIS)? Definitions of private and public may differ from region to region. Some sites perceived as “private” may be sampled by interviewers. There is no clear definition of private-access and public-access. Depending on definition, some private access site sampling occurs. Sampling protocols do not necessarily exclude private access sites such as private marinas, gated private slips, and restricted access boat launch facilities at Military bases. Some residential private access site anglers are intercepted at public fuel docks.

- For APAIS, can CPUE for anglers residing in coastal and non-coastal counties be compared?
- Would it be more appropriate to look at coverage issue in terms of surveyed vs. unsurveyed as opposed to private vs. public and night vs. day? (2X2 matrix: Private/Day Private/Night Public/Day Public/Night)?
- **Need to produce distributions of private and public trips reported in CHTS by state and mode.** Based on the CHTS, approximately 25% of anglers report that their fishing trip departed from a private access site.
- **Improving CA study: Larger panels, improved methods of recruiting anglers.**
- Some approaches identified by Virginia Lesser

I. Personal Interview (Intercept Study: Observed/reported). Surveyor will determine CPUE based on a probability sample of anglers intercepted at specific locations identified.

- Intercept anglers at fuel docks (RA-would not include trailored boats or shore anglers)
- On-the-water intercept of boats at egress points (RA-would not include shore anglers)

II. Not a Personal Interview (Reported only). Respondent will estimate CPUE. This provides a few options to recruit anglers to participate in an additional study. This may be done by sending a log book to the subsample of participants or by obtaining a one time angler event. The goal is to obtain estimates and compare estimates across the various groups. May require some means of improving response rates.

Investment of effort needed for follow-up with respondents.

- Add-On to CHTS to obtain catch data from most recent trip. Ask a subsample of participants to participate in an additional survey. A sample of both public and private angling trips can be selected as well as a sample of night and day trips. This also may select those that focus on a particular species. From this subsample, the CPUE estimates can be compared.
- Address based for private and public boats. Shore mode won't be estimated from this method? Shore fishing occurs also at private access sites. Two samplers of anglers are selected:
 - Private boat owners are sent an invitation to participate by obtaining name/address from marina or by marina mailing notice of the study to slip owner. A log book or questionnaire will be sent to individual to complete.
 - Public boat owners are recruited by identification of boat identification number and then obtaining name/address from DMV or marine board (this may not be possible in all some states due to confidentiality laws). This group is already surveyed in the intercept surveys. However, this group of public anglers is needed in order to mail them a log book or questionnaire as done with the private boat owners above. Another idea is to recruit these at the public

access points (but only recruit those that have not been surveyed to eliminate any training they receive from the surveyor at the site).

- Addresses of coastal residences are obtained from the US Postal Office. All state residents would be included but a larger proportion of anglers would be selected from coastal counties. Phone numbers could be traced for these residences if a phone survey is preferred. This would provide data for shore and boat estimates for both private and public anglers.

Virginia Lesser had some recommendations for logbook and self-reporting studies, respectively:

1. Consider conducting follow up phone calls to remind respondents to complete logbook.
2. If anglers will estimate CPUE, consider conducting focus groups in pilot study states to train anglers on fish identification.

If catch-card approach used, there also needs to be some advance notice. Some advantages to this approach – May also be some logistics problems in distributing to anglers on public and private access sites. Australian study – Called ahead of dropping off catch cards.