

Applications, Benefits and Constituent Views on Marine Recreational Fishing Licenses: A Survey of U.S. Coastal States

**Prepared for the Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership
Russell S. Nelson, Nelson Resources Consulting, Inc.
April 4, 2006**

Executive Summary

Thirteen of twenty-three United States coastal states require a license for recreational fishing in marine habitats. Costs for resident anglers range from \$4.00 to \$38.50 for an annual license. All state resource management agencies surveyed dedicate license revenues to resource conservation programs and believed that such dedicated use was necessary for constituent support of licensing. States report that marine licenses generate revenues dedicated to resource management programs, have increased stakeholder influence over management decisions, and that a loss of license revenues would severely diminish the states' ability to conserve marine resources. All states believed that the current federal system of gathering recreational catch and effort data was inadequate. Strongest support for a federal licensing program was reported for a license that was only required in states without a saltwater recreational fishing license.

Recreational sportfishing groups for the most part agree with the observations of their state agencies. There was strong support for existing state license programs and the dedicated use of such revenues for resource conservation. Improved federal catch and effort data collection was a priority. As with state fishery managers, strongest support for a federal licensing program was reported for a license that was only required in states without a saltwater recreational fishing license.

1.0 Introduction

Purpose of this paper is to provide an overview of the conservation and management effects that have accrued to U.S. states in association with the implementation of saltwater recreational fishing licenses. ¹ Utilizing survey instruments, we have collected data from state agencies and marine recreational angling organizations to attempt to:

- a) Provide an overview of existing licensing programs,
- b) Summarize the data collected by such programs,
- c) How revenues collected from license sales are used,
- d) The impact of licensing on angler participation in management decisions,
- e) The impact of licensing on resource management efforts, and
- f) Constituent angler views on licensing programs.

We have also expanded the proposed scope of work to collect the views of state resource management agencies and constituent anglers on the value of present and potential future

¹ We have focused license requirements on the taking of finfish.

federal efforts to collect marine recreational catch and catch-per-unit effort statistics along with views on various options for establishing any federally based licensing/registration system to identify the universe of saltwater anglers in the U.S.

2.0 Methods

A census of all U.S. coastal states was conducted to identify the states that currently license marine anglers and to provide a general overview of the extent and costs to anglers of these licensing programs. A survey instrument (Table 2) was developed with 21 questions designed for use in accessing information on marine recreational fishing license programs from states that currently have such licensing programs. Surveys were distributed to agency or division of marine fishery directors in those states. Follow-up telephone calls were initiated to secure completion of the survey instrument.

Similarly, a separate survey instrument (see Table 6) was distributed to national and state organizations representing both anglers and charter (for hire) boat operators to solicit their views on the value of state and possible future federal licensing efforts. The organizations represented private anglers and those representing charter, or for-hire sector operators. Specifically, the private angler groups included the national and state (Alabama, Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, Maryland and Virginia) offices of the Coastal Conservation Association, the United Anglers of Southern California, the International Gamefish Association and The Billfish Foundation. Charter sector organizations included the National Association of Charterboat Operators, Orange Beach (Alabama) Fishing Association, Panama city (FL) Boatmen's Association, and the Alaskan Ninilchik, Homer and Seward Charter Associations.

3.0 Results

3.1 General marine fishing license requirements

Thirteen of twenty-three U.S. coastal states require some form of license for recreational fishing in the estuarine and/or marine waters within and adjacent to each state (Table 1). North Carolina has enacted legislation that will require such a license in 2007. Of these states eleven have separate saltwater and freshwater licenses and three (Alaska, California and Georgia) sell a single license for use in either fresh or salt waters of the state. License fees (Table 1) for residents vary from a \$4.00 (Mississippi) to \$38.50 (California). Non-resident fees range from \$14 (Maryland) to \$140 (Alaska).

States that do not require licenses fall into regional clusters. Hawaii has no such requirement. All four continental west coast states require licenses, as do the Gulf and Atlantic states from Texas through Virginia. There is no marine fishing license requirement in the coastal states from Delaware north through Maine.

3.2 State marine resource agency survey

Nine resource agencies² (Alabama, Alaska, California, Florida, Georgia, Maryland, South Carolina, Virginia, Washington) of the thirteen states with current marine fishing license requirements were able to provide timely responses to the survey instrument. Responses were organized by marine fisheries or licensing division level managers. Summaries of responses by survey question are presented here and are tabulated in Table 3.

When did your state begin to license saltwater anglers?

Washington (prior to 1950) and Alaska (at statehood in 1960) have longstanding marine recreational fishing license requirements. Other states initiated licensing between 1989 and 1998. North Carolina's license will go into effect in 2007.

What are the categories and costs of saltwater licenses today?

The states generally require a license for general finfish harvest, but also utilize a variety of approaches for special licenses, stamps, permits or endorsements for special recreational fishing opportunities. Some states offer short term (one, three, seven day) angling licenses and combination hunting, freshwater and saltwater fishing licenses.

Some states require special endorsements to fish for certain target species. Alaska issues a tag necessary for the retention of king salmon and Florida and Alabama have similar tags for retention of tarpon. Florida issues special license endorsements for the taking of spiny lobster and snook, and can thus identify a sub-sample of license holders that takes these species. Most states include exceptions to the license requirements for the young (usually under 16), the elderly (generally 65 or 70 and older), and active military personnel. Only Washington reported a special low cost (\$5.48) license for those under 16 and over 70 that includes these groups in the database of anglers.

Can the database of licensed saltwater anglers be accessed for survey purposes?

If so, is the database comprised of all licensed anglers or it a sub-sample of all licensed anglers?

Alaska and Georgia maintain a single database of all salt and fresh water anglers that can be accessed for survey purposes. California maintains a single data base with a 5% sub-sample of all licensed fresh and saltwater anglers. Florida, Georgia, South Carolina and Washington have records of all licensed salt water anglers. Alabama, Maryland and Virginia do not maintain accessible databases of licensed anglers, but Virginia is in the process of converting to web-based license sales that will provide them with a total record of license holders in the future. Overall 78% of the responding states have, or will soon have, the ability to sample license holders and 67% of these states have a database of all license holders.

² Alabama Department of Conservation & Natural Resources; Alaska Department of Fish & Game
California Department of Fish & Game; Florida Fish & Wildlife Conservation
Commission; Georgia Department of Natural Resources, division of Marine Resources; Maryland Department of Natural Resources;
South Carolina Dept. of Natural Resources; Virginia Marines Resources Commission; Washington Dept. of Fish and Wildlife

What revenues were generated by all saltwater licenses in the last two fiscal years?

Due to the joint fresh and saltwater license, Alaska, California and Georgia could not deconstruct revenues to represent the contribution of saltwater anglers. Florida collected the highest level of revenues with \$19.1 million in 2004 and attributed the drop to \$17.8 million in 2005 to the heavy hurricane season. Other responding states reported between \$1.0 and \$2.0 million in saltwater license revenues. A listing of recent revenues is contained in Table 3.

Are the revenues generated by saltwater license fees dedicated solely to support resource management efforts by your agency?

All states reported that revenues collected from license sales were dedicated to supporting resource management programs. Sixty-seven percent of the responding states dedicate marine license revenues to the support of marine research, enforcement, and enhancement programs. The other states: California, Georgia and Washington, pooled saltwater revenues with freshwater revenues to support agency programs.

Do statutes mandate any distribution of the revenues to certain tasks, *i.e.* enforcement, research, landings data collection, education, *etc*? If so, what is the formula for such distributions?

Fifty-six percent of the states had license revenue distributions mandated by law or rule. Four states had no statutory requirement mandating the distribution of license funds. Funding distributions mandated by law for Alaska, Florida, Maryland, South Carolina and Virginia are described in Table 4.

Do recreational anglers have a participatory or advisory role in the decision making process that directs the use of license revenues? If so, how is this role implanted?

Formal processes for constituent input into the spending of license funds (note Table 4) were reported by 78% of the states. Alabama and Washington have no formal programs for constituent input. California, Florida and Alaska received such input through active constituent groups. Florida, Georgia South Carolina and Virginia have formal advisory bodies set either by statute or by rule of the resource agency. Maryland uses public hearings to receive such input.

Has the existence of a saltwater angling license improved your agencies ability to manage marine resources and support angling opportunities?

Every state (100%) responded in the affirmative.

Has the existence of a saltwater angling license improved your agencies ability to collect catch and effort data from saltwater recreational anglers?

Most (67%) states believed that the saltwater fishing license had increased their ability to collect catch and effort data. California and Georgia attributed their universal saltwater/freshwater license and funding shortfalls to problems in collecting catch and effort data for exclusively saltwater anglers. Maryland responded that their licensing system had failed to meet their expectations for improved data collection.

Does your state attempt to set quantitative conservation goals for fish stocks important to recreational anglers? If so could you provide three examples of the status of stocks (including unknown if that is the case) before and after the saltwater license was established?

At least some marine species are managed with quantitative goals in 56% of the responding states. The establishment of marine licensing programs has enhanced some states' ability to adapt such management procedures. South Carolina and Virginia do not set fishery-specific quantitative management goals at this time, but rely on the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission and the South Atlantic and Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council for such information. Alabama and Maryland do set such goals, but were unable to provide specific examples. Alaska, Florida and Georgia provided examples of how specific fisheries responded to management goals both before and after license requirements were set (Table 5).

Since the inception of the saltwater fishing license the influence of recreational anglers on resource management issues has: a) *remained the same* b) *increased* c) *diminished*.

Most (78%) responding states believed that angler influence on management policy had increased since the inception of the saltwater license. Virginia felt that the influence of anglers on management issues had not changed since the inception of their saltwater license. California did not respond to this question.

Saltwater anglers in our state - a) *oppose* b) *are neutral concerning* c) *support* - the saltwater recreational fishing license.

Eight states (89%) responded that their anglers supported the existing license program. South Carolina officials felt their saltwater anglers' attitudes were neutral in regards to license requirements.

If our state were to rescind the recreational saltwater fishing license, conservation efforts directed to marine resources would: a) *remain the same* b) *diminish* c) *increase*.

All states responded that a loss of their licensing program would diminish the management agencies' conservation efforts directed at marine resources.

The saltwater fishing license has been directly responsible for improvements in our agency's ability to monitor, manage and conserve saltwater fish and /or shellfish.

a. True b. False

All states believed that the saltwater fishing license was directly related to improved abilities to manage marine resources.

Our agency believes that the National Marine Recreational Fisheries Statistics Survey (MRFSS): a) *is adequate in its current format* b) *needs improvement in precision and accuracy* c) *should be replaced by a different data collection process*.

No state believed that the MRFSS was adequate in its current form. Fifty-six percent (Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Maryland, Virginia) believed the current survey needed

improvement in precision and accuracy. The remaining 44% (Alaska, California, South Carolina and Washington) responded that the current system needs to be replaced by a different data collection process.³

If a federal saltwater fishing license were implemented for the primary purpose of improving collection of recreational catch and effort data, it should (more than 1 answer may apply):

- a. be required in addition to our states license*
- b. only be required for anglers fishing in saltwater adjacent to states that do not have a saltwater license*
- c. only be required for species managed by the Federal Fisheries Management Councils*
- d. be distributed by state agencies*
- e. be distributed by the National Marine Fisheries Service*
- f. dedicate all revenues generated to programs involving data collection, research, enforcement, and conservation education directly related to saltwater fishing.*

The states provided 17 responses to this question. There was a strong consensus that any such licensing effort on the part of the federal government should dedicate revenues to resource management needs. The frequency distribution of each answer is as follows:

- a. be required in addition to our states license* **5%**
- b. only be required for anglers fishing in saltwater adjacent to states that do not have a saltwater license* **21%**
- c. only be required for species managed by the Federal Fisheries Management Councils* **0%**
- d. be distributed by state agencies* **21%**
- e. be distributed by the National Marine Fisheries Service* **10%**
- f. dedicate all revenues generated to programs involving data collection, research, enforcement, and conservation education directly related to saltwater fishing.* **47%**

Saltwater anglers in our state tend to support licensing:

- a. as long as revenues go directly to resource enhancement efforts*
- b. under any circumstances*
- c. under no conditions.*

All states responded that their saltwater anglers supported licensing as long as revenues go directly to resource enhancement efforts.

Would your agency support use of federal recreational saltwater license revenues to reduce capacity in some commercial fisheries and make available a larger share of the annual catch to recreational anglers?

- a. no*
- b. under some circumstances*
- c. yes*

³ It should be noted that these responses were received prior to the release of the National Research Councils report on the MRFSS on March 29, 2006.

d. we can not respond at this time

Most states ((44% of responses) were not prepared to give an answer to this question. Of the responding states, 67% (Alaska, California, Maryland) supported the concept, at least under some circumstances, and 33% (Alabama and Washington) responded in the negative.

3.2.1 Summary

All responding states generally believe that saltwater license programs have helped them to better manage marine resources, that their ability to provide adequate management would diminish in the absence of a state license, and that the existence of these programs has increased the influence of saltwater anglers on management policy decisions. Most states maintain a database capable of sampling saltwater licensed anglers, but for all states licensing exceptions and in some states the undifferentiated mixing of fresh and saltwater anglers would create difficulties in an attempt to sample the actual universe of anglers fishing in saltwater.

Dedication of the use of revenues collected by licenses to resource management programs (research, data collection, habitat improvement, stock enhancement, enforcement, education) is the standard adopted by most states and resource managers believe that support for licensing programs is contingent on such dedicated funding use. All states believe that the NOAA Fisheries Marine Recreational Fisheries Statistics Survey (MRFSS) is inadequate in its current form and needs to be replaced or undergo major structural revisions. Acceptance of a federal license for the purpose of creating a known universe of saltwater anglers would appear to be most acceptable if that license was only required for saltwater anglers in states that do not have a saltwater licensing program and, most clearly, if revenues generated by such a license went to support resource management goals.

3.3 Sportfishing sector constituent study

Twelve state and four national organizations representing either private recreational anglers or charter (for hire) vessel operators in the participating states were surveyed regarding their attitudes towards existing state and potential federal licensing of recreational saltwater anglers. Responses to the survey instrument are summarized here and are presented in Table 6.

Does your organization support your state's current recreational saltwater fishing license?

All organizations responded in the affirmative.

Does your organization believe that revenues collected from any saltwater sportfishing license should be dedicated to conservation uses?

All organizations responded in the affirmative.

Does your organization believe that fishery managers need more accurate recreational saltwater catch and effort statistics?

All organizations responded in the affirmative.

In general does your organization believe that sampling a known population of licensed anglers can produce improved fishery statistics?

All organizations responded in the affirmative.

Would your organization support a federal recreational saltwater fishing license if it were required in addition to a state license?

Three groups (20%) representing private anglers responded in the affirmative. Four groups (27%) representing charter boat organizations responded in the negative. Most responses from both sectors (53%) presented no opinion. General support for a federal license that is an additional requirement to existing state licenses seems weak.

Would your organization support a federal recreational saltwater fishing license (in addition to a state license) only for highly migratory species (i.e. sharks, tunas, billfish)?

A strong majority (75%) responded in the affirmative, 19% answered no and a single respondent group had no opinion (6%).

Would your organization support a federal recreational saltwater fishing license if it were only required in states without a saltwater fishing license?

Licensing option received the highest support from the recreational fishing sector. Such a federal licensing approach was favored by 88% of the groups and 12% (2) had no opinion.

Theoretically could your organization support a surcharge in the form of a special stamp or endorsement on any state or federal recreational saltwater fishing license if the funds generated were used specifically to increase the recreational allocation of an important target fish species?

A majority of the organizations (81%) would support this approach to resource re-allocation if cost considerations were satisfactory. Thirteen percent offered no opinion and 6% opposed the idea.

Does your organization (group, sector) believe that the existence of the current state recreational saltwater fishing license has improved conservation of important fish resources?

Eighty-one percent believed that existing licensing programs had improved fish conservation efforts. Thirteen percent did not believe this to be the case and 6% offered no opinion.

Does your organization believe that the existence of the current state recreational saltwater fishing license has increased the influence of anglers on policy decisions made by the state's marine resource agency?

Most organizations (81%) experienced greater influence over management decisions as a consequence of licensing, 19% did not believe this to be the case.

3.3.1 Summary

The majority of responding sportfishing organizations supported existing licensing programs and believed that resource conservation and the influence of the recreational community on management decisions benefited from the existence of a license and the revenues it produced. The organizations unanimously supported the need for more accurate recreational catch and effort data. Of the federal licensing scenarios presented, the strongest support was for a license required by anglers in states without an existing saltwater fishing license. Finally, very significant, but not unanimous, support appears to exist for potential license surcharges that might be used to fund re-allocation of fish resources to the recreational sector.

Table 1. Status of saltwater recreational fishing license in U.S. coastal states.

State	Requires license for saltwater?	Resident Annual cost (\$)	Non-resident Annual cost (\$)	Notes
Alabama	Yes	16	31- 90	1
Alaska	Yes	24	145	2
California	Yes	38.85	94	2
Connecticut	No			2
Delaware	No			
Florida	Yes	13.50	31.50	2
Georgia	Yes	9	24	3
Hawaii	No			
Louisiana	Yes	15	90	
Massachusetts	No			
Maine	No			
Maryland	Yes	9	14	4
Mississippi	Yes	4	30	
New Hampshire	No			
New Jersey	No			
New York	No			
North Carolina	No			5
Oregon	Yes	24.75	61.50	2
Rhode Island	No			
South Carolina	Yes	10	35	
Texas	Yes	33	60	2
Virginia	Yes	12.50	12.50	6
Washington	Yes	19.71	39.42	2, 3, 7

1. Non-resident license fees vary by applicant's state of residency
2. Additional fees required for some species, fisheries
3. One license for fresh and salt water
4. Required only for Chesapeake Bay
5. Saltwater license to take effect in 2007
6. Also has \$38 boat license option
7. Not required for smelt

Table 2. Saltwater License Survey Questions Submitted to State Resource Agencies.

1. When did your state begin to license saltwater anglers?
2. Can the database of licensed saltwater anglers be accessed for survey purposes?
 - 2.1 If yes - Is the database comprised of all licensed anglers or it a sub-sample of all licensed anglers?
3. What revenues were generated by all saltwater licenses in the last two fiscal years?
4. Are the revenues generated by saltwater license fees dedicated solely to support resource management efforts by your agency?
5. Do statutes mandate any distribution of the revenues to certain tasks, *i.e.* enforcement, research, landings data collection, education, *etc*?
 - 5.1 If yes - What is the formula for such distributions?
6. Do recreational anglers have a participatory or advisory role in the decision making process that directs the use of license revenues?
 - 6.1 If yes - How is this role implanted?
7. Has the existence of a saltwater angling license improved your agencies ability to manage marine resources and support angling opportunities?
8. Has the existence of a saltwater angling license improved your agencies ability to collect catch and effort data from saltwater recreational anglers?
9. Does your state attempt to set quantitative conservation goals for fish stocks important to recreational anglers?
 - 9.1 If yes - Could you provide three examples of the status of stocks (including unknown if that is the case) before and after the saltwater license was established?
- 10) Since the inception of the saltwater fishing license the influence of recreational anglers on resource management issues has:
 - a) remained the same
 - b) increased
 - c) diminished.
- 11) Saltwater anglers in our state - a) oppose b) are neutral c) support - the saltwater recreational fishing license.
- 12) If our state were to rescind the recreational saltwater fishing license, conservation efforts directed to marine resources would: a) remain the same b) diminish c) increase.
- 13) The saltwater fishing license has been directly responsible for improvements in our agency's ability to monitor, manage and conserve saltwater fish and /or shellfish.
 - a. True
 - b. False
- 14) Our agency believes that the National Marine Recreational Fisheries Statistics Survey (MRFSS): a) is adequate in its current format b) needs improvement in precision and accuracy c) should be replaced by a different data collection process.
- 15) If a federal saltwater fishing license were implemented for the primary purpose of improving collection of recreational catch and effort data, it should (more than 1 answer may apply):
 - a. be required in addition to our states license
 - b. only be required for anglers fishing in saltwater adjacent to states that do not have a saltwater license
 - c. only be required for species managed by the Federal Fisheries Management Councils
 - d. be distributed by state agencies
 - e. be distributed by the National Marine Fisheries Service
 - f. dedicate all revenues generated to programs involving data collection, research, enforcement, and conservation education directly related to saltwater fishing.
- 16) Saltwater anglers in our state tend to support licensing:
 - a. as long as revenues go directly to resource enhancement efforts
 - b. under any circumstances
 - c. under no conditions.
- 17) Would your agency support use of federal recreational saltwater license revenues to reduce capacity in some commercial fisheries and make available a larger share of the annual catch to recreational anglers?
 - a. no
 - b. under some circumstances
 - c. yes
 - d. we can not respond at this time

Table 3. State Agency Saltwater Fishing License Survey Results

State	Questions referenced by number – see Table 1.			Millions \$				
	1	2	2.1	3	4	5	5.1	
AL	1992	No	n/a	1.3, 1.3	Yes	No	n/a	
AK	1960	Yes	All	n/a	Yes	Yes	Table y	
CA	n/r	Yes	5% *	n/a	No	No	n/a	
FL	1989	Yes	All	19.1, 17.8	Yes	Yes	Table y	
GA	1998	Yes	All	n/a	No	No	n/a	
MD	1990	No	n/a	n/r	Yes	Yes	Table y	
SC	1992	Yes	All	1.4, 1.3	Yes	Yes	Table y	
VA	1993	No	**	1.7, 1.3	Yes	Yes	Table y	
WA	<1950	Yes	All	1.6, 0.9	No	No	n/a	
Questions:	6	6.1	7	8	9	9.1	10	
AL	No	n/a	Yes	Yes	Yes	n/r	B	
AK	Yes	A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Table x.	B	
CA	Yes	A	Yes	No	n/r	n/r	n/r	
FL	Yes	A,C	Yes	Yes	Yes	Table x.	B	
GA	Yes	C	Yes	No***	Yes	Table x.	B	
MD	Yes	D	Yes	No	Yes	n/r	B	
SC	Yes	B	Yes	Yes	No	n/a	B	
VA	Yes	B	Yes	Yes	No	n/a	A	
WA	No	n/a	Yes	Yes	Yes	n/r	B	
Questions:	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	
AL	C	B	A	B	A,D,E,F	A	A	
AK	C	B	A	C	B,D,F	A	C	
CA	C	B	A	C	B,D,F	A	C	
FL	C	B	A	B	F	A	D	
GA	C	B	A	B	F	A	D	
MD	C	B	A	B	B,D,F	A	B	
SC	B	B	A	C	E,F	A	D	
VA	C	B	A	B	F	A	D	
WA	C	B	A	C	B	A	A	

n/a = not applicable; n/r = no response

* California can sample 5% of all license holders, freshwater and marine

**VA is developing an internet based license sales system that will put all anglers in future data base

*** difficult to sample marine anglers from total license data base

Table 4. Statutory or other mandates for distribution of saltwater license revenues

State	Mandate
Alaska	100% of revenues (fresh and saltwater) must be used for resource management (Constitution and statute)
Florida	(Saltwater license - Statute) Not more than 7.5% for licensing and information and education; Not less than 30% for law enforcement; Not less than 32.5% for marine research and management; Not less than 30% for fishery enhancement, e.g., fishery statistics, artificial reefs, and hatcheries
Maryland	(Saltwater - Statute) Enforcement 10%; Education 10%; Research 30%; Data Collection 20%; Habitat and reef restoration 30%
Virginia	(Saltwater – Advisory Board Guidelines) Not more than: 20% for Education; 5% for Enforcement; 25% for Facilities/Access; 20% for Habitat Improvement; 30% for Research and Data Collection; 5% for Stock Enhancement

Table 5. Examples of saltwater recreational fishing license impacts on management of key finfish stocks.

State	Species	Status before License	Action	Status after License
Alaska	Sharks	Unknown	Management plan	Sustainable
	Lingcod	Overfished	Management plan	Sustainable
	King salmon	Unknown	Management plan	Sustainable
Florida	Red drum	Overfished	Management plan	Sustainable
	Snook	Overfished	Management plan	Sustainable
	Spotted Seatrout	Overfishing	Management plan	Sustainable
Georgia	Red drum	Overfished	Management plan	Sustainable

**Spotted
Seatrout
Tripletail** **Overfishing
Unknown,
unregulated** **Management plan
Minimum size,
possession limits** **Sustainable
Unknown**

Quantitative goals differ by state.

Table 6. Sportfishing constituency survey results by question

State	Sector	Questions										
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
AL a.	P	YES	YES	YES	YES	No Op	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
AL b.	C	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
AK c.	C	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	YES	No op	NO	NO	NO
AK d.	C	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	No op	NO	NO	NO	NO
AK e.	C	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
FL f.	C	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	Y,dep	YES	YES	YES
FL g.	P	YES	YES	YES	YES	No op	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
CA h.	P	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO
GA i.	P	YES	YES	YES	YES	No op	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
SC j.	P	YES	YES	YES	YES	No op	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
MD k.	P	YES	YES	YES	YES	No op	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
VA l.	P	YES	YES	YES	YES	No op	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
National Organizations												
IGFA m.	P	YES	YES	YES	YES	No op	No op	YES	Y,dep	YES	YES	YES
TBF n.	P	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
CCA o.	P	YES	YES	YES	YES	No op	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
NACO p.	C	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	No op	No op	No op	No op	YES

a. Coastal Conservation Association-AL; b. Orange Beach Fishing Association; c. Niniichik Charter Assoc.; d. Homer Charter Assoc.; e. Seward Charter Fleet; f. Panama City Boatmen's Assoc.; g. Coastal Conservation Association(CCA) –FL; h. United Anglers of Southern California; i. CCA-GA; j. CCA-SC; k. CCA –MD; l. CCA-VA; m. International Gamefish Association; n. The Billfish Foundation; o. CCA- National Office; p. National Association of Charter Boat Operators.

Note: P = private angling sector, C=charter (for hire) sector; No Op = no opinion, Y,dep = yes, depending on cost

Sportfishing Sector Survey Questions

1. Does your organization (group, sector) support your state's current recreational saltwater fishing license?
2. Does your organization (group, sector) believe that revenues collected from any saltwater sportfishing license should be dedicated to conservation uses?
3. Does your organization (group, sector) believe that fishery managers need more accurate recreational saltwater catch and effort statistics?
4. In general does your organization (group, sector) believe that sampling a known population of licensed anglers can produce improved fishery statistics?
5. Would your organization (group, sector) support a federal recreational saltwater fishing license if it were required in addition to a state license?
6. Would your organization (group, sector) support a federal recreational saltwater fishing license (in addition to a state license) if it were only required for highly migratory species (i.e. sharks, tunas, billfish)?
7. Would your organization (group, sector) support a federal recreational saltwater fishing license if it were only required in states without a saltwater fishing license?

8. Theoretically could your organization (group, sector) support a surcharge in the form of a special stamp or endorsement on any state or federal recreational saltwater fishing license if the funds generated were **used** specifically to increase the recreational allocation of an important target fish species?

9. Does your organization (group, sector) believe that the existence of the current state recreational saltwater fishing license has improved conservation of important fish resources?

10. Does your organization (group, sector) believe that the existence of the current state recreational saltwater fishing license has increased the influence of anglers on policy decisions made by the state's marine resource agency?