



NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS

MARCH 2019

MARINE ANGLER EXPENDITURES FOR SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA BASED TRIPS TO NON-US WATERS, 2016

James Hilger¹, Rachel Mahler, Sabrina J. Lovell Ph.D.², and Charles Villafana³

¹NOAA Fisheries Southwest Fisheries Science Center
NMFS Fisheries Resources Division
8901 La Jolla Shores Drive
La Jolla, CA 92037

²Office of Science and Technology
NMFS Division of Economics and Social Science
1315 East West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

³NOAA Fisheries West Coast Region U.S. Department of Commerce
501 West Ocean Boulevard, Suite 4200
Long Beach, CA 90802

NOAA-TM-NMFS-SWFSC-611

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
National Marine Fisheries Service
Southwest Fisheries Science Center

About the NOAA Technical Memorandum series

The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), organized in 1970, has evolved into an agency which establishes national policies and manages and conserves our oceanic, coastal, and atmospheric resources. An organizational element within NOAA, the Office of Fisheries is responsible for fisheries policy and the direction of the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS).

In addition to its formal publications, the NMFS uses the NOAA Technical Memorandum series to issue informal scientific and technical publications when complete formal review and editorial processing are not appropriate or feasible. Documents within this series, however, reflect sound professional work and may be referenced in the formal scientific and technical literature.

SWFSC Technical Memorandums are available online at the following websites:

SWFSC: <https://swfsc.noaa.gov>

NOAA Repository: <https://repository.library.noaa.gov/>

NTIS National Technical Reports Library: <https://ntrl.ntis.gov/NTRL/>

Accessibility information

NOAA Fisheries Southwest Fisheries Science Center (SWFSC) is committed to making our publications and supporting electronic documents accessible to individuals of all abilities. The complexity of some of SWFSC's publications, information, data, and products may make access difficult for some. If you encounter material in this document that you cannot access or use, please contact us so that we may assist you.

Phone: 858-546-7000

Recommended citation

James Hilger, Rachel Mahler, Sabrina J. Lovell, Ph.D., Charles Villafana. 2019. Marine Angler Expenditures for Southern California based Trip to Non-US waters, 2016. U.S. Department of Commerce, NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SWFSC-611

Contents

PREFACE.....	iii
ABSTRACT	1
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. SAMPLING	2
III. METHODOLOGY	3
CALCULATIONS	3
V. RESULTS	4
EXPENDITURES	4
ECONOMIC CONTRIBUTIONS	5
DISCUSSION	5
REFERENCES	7
GLOSSARY	8

PREFACE

Successful implementation of the 2016 Southern California based Trips to Non-US waters Expenditure Survey is the result of the participation and support of many individuals and organizations. We wish to acknowledge invaluable assistance, advice, and support from colleagues at the National Marine Fisheries Service's Southwest Fishery Science Center and Office of Science and Technology, including Rita Curtis, Gerard DiNardo, John Foster, Dale Squires, and Dale Sweetnam for their overall support of the project.

We extend our gratitude to California Department of Fish and Wildlife for providing fisheries data. We thank the Sportfishing Association of California and their vessel members for their support of the project. We would also like to acknowledge all the field interviewers who participated in the survey: Yasmin Lee, Jeanette Miller, Fei Ren, and Jacob Smith. Finally, we thank all of the recreational anglers who contributed their time and information in order to complete this important research effort.

Address all comments or questions to:

James Hilger
Southwest Fisheries Science Center, NMFS
Fisheries Resources Division
8901 La Jolla Shores Drive
La Jolla, CA 92037
James.Hilger@noaa.gov

ABSTRACT

Marine recreational fishing is a popular pastime and economic activity to both local economies and the nation. In California, roughly 632 thousand marine recreational angler trips were taken in US waters in 2016 aboard Commercial Passenger Fishing Vessels (CPFVs); angler expenditures associated with these trips significantly contributes to the economy. In this report, we look beyond angler trips taken in US waters, and focus on angler trips to non-US waters from Southern California aboard Commercial Passenger Fishing Vessels (CPFV). In 2016, over 70 thousand angler trips were reportedly taken from Southern California to non-US waters. We quantify the level of US fishing expenditures for these trips, and estimate that recreational anglers participating in Southern California-based CPFV trips to non-US waters spent an average of \$630.28 per angler day. We report that as angler expenditures filtered through the California economy, they contributed over \$80.3 million in total sales, \$47.6 million in value-added (i.e., contribution to gross domestic product), \$30.1 million in income, and supported over 800 jobs.

I. INTRODUCTION

The Southern California based Commercial Passenger Fishing Vessel (CPFV) fleet provides recreational fishing opportunities in both US and non-US waters. For trips taken in US waters, NOAA Fisheries regularly surveys licensed California anglers to collect data on their expenditures and to estimate their economic contribution to the California economy. However, anglers on CPFV trips that fish solely outside US waters are not required to obtain a California license, and are therefore missed in the regular survey. To correct this data gap, the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) Southwest Fisheries Science Center (SWFSC) conducted the San Diego Charter/Party Fishing Expenditure Survey (hereafter referred to as “SDES”) in 2016. A majority of regularly scheduled trips to non-US waters are based out of four commercial sportfishing landings in San Diego that fish in Mexican waters. Trips to non-US waters occasionally depart from alternative landings in San Diego, Orange, and Los Angeles counties.

The survey was administered concurrently with the 2016 National Marine Recreational Fishing Expenditure Survey (hereafter referred to as “NES”), conducted by the NMFS. Marine recreational fishing was defined as fishing for finfish in the open ocean or any body of water that is saltwater or brackish. The 2016 NES collected information from anglers on marine trip expenditures throughout the United States. The 2016 NES is the third nationwide survey conducted by NMFS to gather marine recreational fishing expenditures across the United States, with the earlier surveys taking place in 2011 and 2006. The NES utilizes the Department of Fish and Wildlife’s fishing license database to randomly select anglers for participation in the survey.

The SDES is the first survey completed by NMFS to gather marine recreational fishing expenditures for trips aboard Southern California-based CPFVs to non-US waters. While the state license frame utilized by the NES includes anglers that participate in non-US waters trips, anglers on these non-US waters trips do not need a state license and therefore may not have a chance to be randomly selected to participate in the nationwide studies. As NES based expenditure estimates are trip based, expenditures associated with non-US trips are removed from expenditure estimates.

As specified in the Magnuson-Stevenson Fishery Conservation and Management Act of 1996 (and reauthorized in 2006), NMFS is required to enumerate the economic contributions of the policies it implements on fishing participants and coastal communities. The survey data on expenditures are then used

to estimate the economic contribution of marine recreational fishing via a regional input-output model. Additional objectives included obtaining a profile of the most recent marine recreational vessel-trip and collecting demographic information from these marine recreational anglers.

In section 1 of this report, we describe the survey methodology and sampling design. In section 2, we discuss the survey questionnaires, survey protocol and survey response rates. In section 3, we discuss the analytical methods used to estimate mean angler expenditures and total angler expenditures. Finally, in section 4, we report the regional input-output model and the calculation of state level economic contributions, and concluding remarks. Appendix A contains a copy of the survey questionnaire.

II. SAMPLING

The target population for the 2016 SDES was marine recreational anglers, 16 years of age and older, who fished from Southern California based CPFVs in non-US waters in 2016. As there was no sample frame of this target population, a pilot study was undertaken to select the preferred sampling method.

The pilot study was fielded on the same fishery as the 2016 SDES from mid-August, 2015 to mid-October, 2015. Sampling was split between four commercial sportfishing landings across two ports. Three candidate methodologies were chosen for field-testing based on the consideration of input received from constituents and the research team. The three methodologies are: (A) in-person intercept and interviewer-assisted surveys (in-person); (B) in-person intercept and survey distribution with post-completion mail-back (handout/mail-back); and (C) in-person intercept with address collection and survey distribution by mail (address collection/mail). Based on analysis of the response rates, completion rates, expected costs, and feedback from the field interview staff, the in-person intercept with interviewer-assisted survey methodology was recommended. This method provided the highest response rate (51.26%), highest completion rate (49.87%), and the lowest expected cost per completed survey (\$20.30/ completed survey).

The SDES was conducted from January 17, 2016, to January 11, 2017, at four landings across two ports in San Diego County. The four sampling sites accounted for 98% of the Southern California based CPFV effort for non-US waters in 2016 and were the same four landings utilized in the pilot study. A multi-stage, stratified cluster sampling design based on fishing effort at San Diego CPFV ports was used. The sample is stratified by both port and month. The port-month stratum sample allocation was in proportion to stratum size. Due to lower historical effort during winter months, the months of January, February, and March for one port were aggregated into one stratum. The primary sampling unit within a given month is a site-day, where site is one of two ports and day is defined a calendar day. Interviewers were assigned to specific site-days and were instructed to interview as many anglers as possible as they returned from a fishing trip. The final sample for non-US waters trips includes 1,759 surveys from 643 vessel-trips aboard 51 vessels across 2 ports.

As noted, the NMFS NES was simultaneously fielded with the SDES. The California component of the NES is designed to estimated expenditures for sportfishers who take part in marine sportfishing trips aboard California CPFVs in US waters, while the SDES's focus is on sportfishers who take part in marine sportfishing trips aboard California CPFVs in non-US waters. It is expected that anglers may participate in both the California CPFV US waters and non-US waters fisheries. If an angler reported that their most recent trip was only in non-US waters, their results were not included in the NES calculations or estimates. The 2016 NES is not designed to produce estimates of expenditures for non-US water trips; the number of respondents indicating such trips was a small proportion of all NES reported trips.¹ Due to the lack of California sportfishing license requirements for California based trips to non-US waters, the different market segments occupied by trips to the two fishing grounds, and an expected higher proportion of

¹ Trips sampled by the NES with both US and non-US fishing components are included in the NES expenditure statistics.

California non-resident anglers that take part in non-US waters trips, these non-US trips are not represented in the license-frame survey.

III. METHODOLOGY

The survey form was filled out by a surveyor while conducting an in-person interview with the respondent. The survey form included four primary sections: record keeping, background, expenditure, and demographic.

The record keeping section included fields for a unique trip ID, the CPFV name, the interview date, and the respondents' zip code of residence.

The background section included fields for the number of nights the angler spent on a boat; the number of nights spent away from the angler's primary residence; the total number of days the angler spent fishing on the trip; the primary purpose of the trip (fishing, business, or personal); the number of people the angler traveled and fished with; the number of days fished in the last twelve months in non-US waters from California, California marine waters from a boat, California marine waters from a pier or jetty; whether the angler has fished in California fresh waters; and the primary and secondary species targeted during the trips.

The expenditure section included fields for the current trip's expenditures broken down into several fishing specific and ancillary categories. Fishing specific expenditure categories included tips to crew and on-vessel fillet charges; galley tab (food and drink purchased on the vessel); off-vessel fish processing; on-vessel gifts or souvenirs; and guide, equipment rental, and permit fees. Ancillary expenditure categories included off-vessel gifts or souvenirs; food and drink from restaurants and bars; grocery and convenience store expenses; lodging; auto-rental; auto-fuel; parking fees; public transportation; and airfare. For ancillary expenditure categories anglers were asked to estimate what percentage of expenditures were made in Southern California. For California non-residents, airfare is assumed to have been spent 50% in California and 50% in the state of residence. All fishing specific expenditures and California resident airfare expenditures were assumed to be made in California. Anglers were asked to report what they personally spent on either themselves or others. They were asked not to include expenses that others paid on their behalf. If they did not have expenditures in a given category, that was recorded as a zero expenditure; if the respondent declined to answer for a specific expense category, that was recorded as missing.

The demographic section included fields for year of birth, gender, and broad income categories. The survey form can be found in the appendix.

CALCULATIONS

Survey data were used to estimate mean trip expenditures for anglers that took Southern California based CPFV trips to non-US waters. Estimates of mean angler trip expenditures were also reported by California resident or non-resident status. All estimates were calculated for an angler trip, defined as one day of fishing for one angler. On the survey, anglers were asked to estimate total expenditures by category for the entire trip away from their permanent residence. Data on the number of nights anglers spent away from their permanent or seasonal residence, the number of nights anglers spent on a boat, and the number of days spent fishing was used to allocate ancillary category expenditures to fishing and normalize expenditures to a per angler trip. For fishing specific expense categories, expenditures were divided by the number of fishing days to result in a per angler day expense. For ancillary expense categories (e.g. food and drink from restaurants and bars; lodging; etc.), the share of days spent on a boat out of the days away from home for each angler was calculated and multiplied by the expense category. This resulted in the ancillary category expense from longer trips apportioned to fishing. The resulting number was then divided by the number of days fishing to

days spent away from home to result in a per angler day expense attributed to fishing for ancillary expenditure categories.

Mean trip expenditures per angler day were calculated using the *svy mean* command in Stata/MP 15.1. Mean trip expenditures were estimated by accounting for both the survey design of the underlying sample and the appropriate sample weights. Weights within a stratum were adjusted during analysis for actual 2016 effort estimates relative to the projected effort based on 2015 effort that was used to draw the sample.

Outliers within each expenditure category were removed from the data set. The decision rule for outliers allowed strata with low variances to remain intact while strata with high variances had outliers removed. Initial weighted mean estimates for all expenditures categories were generated using Stata/MP 15.1 and any estimated with a proportion of standard error (PSE) greater than 20% had the upper 1% of its distribution truncated. After removing outliers using this procedure, visual inspection and comparison of the data across categories and states was done to identify any remaining outliers. In a few cases, professional judgement was used to remove outliers in situations where the PSE was under 20% but outliers still existed at the higher levels of the distribution for that expenditure category. Mean trip expenditures per angler day were recalculated after the removal of identified outliers.

Total angler expenditures were used to estimate the economic contributions to the state of California from CPFV trips to non-US waters. A regional-input output model was created for the state of California, using IMPLAN software.² The model was adapted and based on the typical NMFS recreational fishing regional input-output models created for prior NES surveys.

V. RESULTS

EXPENDITURES

Survey disposition is reported in Table 1. Survey interviewers contacted a total of 3,806 anglers. Of those, 3,163 (83%) had returned from fishing in non-US waters, 419 (11%) had returned from fishing in US waters, and 224 (6%) has returned from fishing in both non-US and US waters. Information on which fishing grounds the vessel-trip utilized were provided by the landing office; in many cases, the survey respondents and the survey interviewer were not aware of the vessel's fishing grounds at the time of the interview. This report limits its analysis on those anglers that had returned from fishing in non-US waters. Survey responses for trips that took place in both non-US and US waters are excluded from the analysis as these trips would fall within the sample from the NES. Of the 3,163 angler contacts for trips to non-US waters, 1,719 (54%) resulted in completed surveys, 89 (3%) resulted in partially completed surveys, 644 (20%) resulted in zip code information only, and 711 (22%) resulted in a refusal. Survey completion rates were lower for respondents returning from trips to both non-US and US waters (51%), and US waters (37%); this is not surprising as the survey interviewer stated the focus of the survey was the collection of information from anglers taking part in non-US waters, and some anglers may have been aware of what fishing grounds they had returned from prior to this information being available to the survey interviewer.

Average daily angler trip expenditures estimates are reported in Table 2. Estimates are reported by category and in total and are provided for both non-residents of California, residents of California, and all anglers. Primary table columns are mean and standard error. Recreational anglers participating in Southern California-based CPFV trips to non-US waters spent an average of \$630.28 per angler day on for-hire trips to non-US waters. Average total angler day expenditures were higher for California non-residents than for residents, with expenditures of \$794.59 and \$591.55 respectively.

² IMPLAN, Version 3, Minnesota IMPLAN Group, Inc., 2018. IMPLAN base data is for year 2016.

The top three expenditure categories for trips taken by all anglers were combined vessel tickets, galley, rentals, and permits with \$439.40 in expenditures – consisting of 70% of total expenditures; combined crew tips and on-vessel fishing processing with \$73.36 in expenditures – consisting of 12% of total expenditures; and off-vessel fish processing with \$33.24 in expenditures – consisting of 5% of total expenditures. With some differences, the relative size of expenditures by category were similar between California non-residents and residents. Exceptions include lodging, restaurant, and airfare expenditures of \$58.60 (7%), \$44.17 (6%), and \$20.02 (3%), respectively.

ECONOMIC CONTRIBUTIONS

Table 3 reports estimated economic contributions from trip expenditures for Southern California-based CPFV sportfishing trips to non-US waters. Economic contributions were estimated using an IMPLAN software³ based regional input-output model for the state of California, which was adapted and based on the typical NMFS recreational fishing regional input-output models created for prior NES surveys.

Total non-US waters angler trip expenditures for Southern California-based CPFV trips were estimated at over \$44.7 million (2016\$) in 2016. The estimate is the product of the \$630.28 per angler day estimate and a California Department of Fish and Wildlife effort estimate of 70,850 CPFV angler days in non-US waters in 2016 based on CPFV log book records.

The economic contribution model estimated that the \$44.7 million in expenditures from CPFV trips in non-US waters contributed approximately 800 full- and part-time jobs; generated \$80.3 million in gross sales by businesses (output); \$47.6 million to the state's gross domestic product (value added); and \$30.1 million in wage, salary, or self-employment income to the California economy (Table 4). While angler expenditures on durable goods, such as fishing tackle, are expected to result from participation in the fishery – expenditures on durable goods and the resulting economic contribution were not studied.

DISCUSSION

We report on an in-person survey of trip expenditures for participants engaged in Southern California-based CPFV trips to non-US waters. The data collection was initiated to fill a data gap that existed due to the presence of an important recreational fishery outside the standard survey sample frame. The economic contribution of the fishery was estimated by expanding angler day expenditure estimates by fishery effort estimates and running them through the regional-input output model.

The 2016 SDES angler expenditure and economic contribution estimates in this report fill a data gap by providing information on the economic importance of Southern California CPFV fishing in non-US waters. We estimate that saltwater anglers spent an average of \$630 per angler day. With over 70 thousand angler days, 2016 Southern California-based CPFV trips to non-US waters reached over \$4.7 million in trip-based expenditures (e.g. vessel tickets, galley, rentals, crew tips and on- and off-vessel fishing processing.) These expenditures generated an estimated \$80.3 million in total sales, \$47.6 million in value-added (i.e., contribution to gross domestic product), \$30.1 million in income, and supported approximately 800 jobs across California.

Promising areas of future research include analyzing the relationship between the expenditures of the Southern California-based CPFV non-US waters fishery with that of the California CPFV US waters fishery as well as a detailed analysis of heterogeneity with respect to trip expenditures in the non-US fishery.

³ IMPLAN, Version 3, Minnesota IMPLAN Group, Inc., 2018. IMPLAN base data is for year 2016.

Table 1. Survey Disposition

Fishing Grounds	Vessel Trips	Angler Contacts	Complete	Partial	Zip Code Only	Refusal
Non-US	673	3163	1719	89	644	711
US	104	419	156	9	127	127
US and Non-US	44	224	115	4	58	47
Total	821	3806	1990	102	829	885

Table 2. Trip Mean California Expenditures per Angler Day on trips to Non-US waters in 2016

Category	CA Non-Resident		CA Resident		All Anglers	
	Mean	Std. Err.	Mean	Std. Err.	Mean	Std. Err.
Airfare	\$20.02	\$2.02	\$1.55	\$0.44	\$5.81	\$0.62
Auto fuel	\$25.88	\$1.54	\$15.57	\$0.53	\$17.43	\$0.56
Auto rental	\$7.71	\$1.55	\$0.35	\$0.20	\$1.97	\$0.39
Crew tips, fish processing on-vessel	\$78.69	\$2.47	\$72.57	\$1.43	\$73.36	\$1.31
Fish processing off-vessel	\$40.83	\$1.30	\$32.03	\$1.85	\$33.24	\$1.30
Groceries	\$4.29	\$0.45	\$5.85	\$0.38	\$5.38	\$0.31
Lodging	\$58.60	\$4.31	\$6.87	\$0.71	\$18.26	\$1.38
Parking	\$5.36	\$0.48	\$7.67	\$0.26	\$6.96	\$0.22
Public transportation	\$1.43	\$0.30	\$0.08	\$0.03	\$0.42	\$0.09
Restaurants	\$44.17	\$2.38	\$14.44	\$0.89	\$20.89	\$0.98
Souvenir, off-vessel	\$10.51	\$1.45	\$2.06	\$0.32	\$3.68	\$0.38
Souvenir, on-vessel	\$4.08	\$0.47	\$3.40	\$0.94	\$3.49	\$0.62
Vessel ticket, galley, rental, permits	\$493.01	\$9.73	\$429.11	\$5.32	\$439.40	\$4.64
Total Expenditure	\$794.59	-	\$591.55	-	\$630.28	-
Obs. (range)	412-417		1,337-1,342		1,729-1,759	
Days Fished	3.7	0.06	3.2	0.04	3.3	0.03

Table 3. Economic Contribution (Million \$)

	Expenditures	Employment	Labor Income	Total Value Added	Output
Total	\$44.7	800	\$30.1	\$47.6	\$80.3

REFERENCES

Cochran, W.G. 1977. *Sampling Techniques*, 3rd ed. Wiley, New York.

Dillman, D.A., J.D. Smyth, and L.M. Christian. 2009. *Internet, Mail, and Mixed-Mode Surveys: The Tailor Design Method*. Wiley, New York.

Gentner, Brad, and Scott Steinback. 2008. [The Economic Contribution of Marine Angler Expenditures in the United States, 2006](#). U.S. Dep. Commerce, NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFSF/ SPO-94, 301 p.

Lovell, Sabrina, Scott Steinback, and James Hilger. 2013. [The Economic Contribution of Marine Angler Expenditures in the United States, 2011](#). U.S. Dep. Commerce, NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-F/SPO-134, 188 p.

StataCorp. Stata/MP 15.1 for Mac (64-bit Intel). Revision 20 Dec 2017. College Station, TX 77845.

GLOSSARY

Angler	A person catching finfish with no intent to sell, including people releasing all or part of the catch. Also known as a recreational fisherman. The method of fishing includes rod and reel, nets, and spears.
CPFV	Stands for Commercial Passenger Fishing Vessel. Often referred to generally as “For-Hire” vessels, where anglers buy tickets or charter the vessel which is operated by a licensed captain and crew.
Effort	The number of marine recreational fishing trips taken by marine recreational fishermen (anglers).
Fishing Mode	The type of recreational fishing a recreational fisherman (angler) engaged in such as fishing from shore, from a private or rental boat, or from a for-hire boat.
Fishing Trip	For this report, a fishing trip refers to any part of a single day of marine recreational fishing.
For-hire Mode	Refers to fishing trips that took place on a party (also referred to as a headboat) or charter boat.
Trip Expenditures	The expenses incurred by recreational fishermen (anglers) related to a specific fishing trip, such as expenditures on transportation costs, food and lodging, boat fuel and oil, ice, and guide fees.

APPENDIX

2016 San Diego Charter/Party Fishing Expenditure Survey

Trip ID: Vessel Name:

YR/MO/DAY ZIP CODE:

1. How many **nights**, if any, were spent on a **boat**?

Number of Nights

2. How many nights did you spend away from home?

Number of Nights

3. How many days on this trip did you go fishing?

Number of Fishing Days

4. What was the primary purpose of this entire trip away from home?

- 1 Fishing
 2 Vacation/Personal
 3 Business

5. **Including yourself**, how many people **traveled together** on this entire trip?

Number of People

6. Of the people who traveled with you, how many people were **fishing**, including yourself?

Number of People

7. In the past 12 months including this trip, how many days have you fished on a charter/Party boat in **non-U.S. waters from California**?

Number of Days

8. In the past 12 months, including this trip, how many days have you fished for finfish (excluding shellfish and squid) in the marine waters of California?

Number of Days

9. How many of those days were from a Pier or Jetty?

Number of Days

10. In the last 12 months, have you fished fresh waters in California? 1 Yes 2 No

11. Species of fish personally targeted on this trip?

Primary Any
 Secondary

Now I would like to ask you about the amount of money that you personally have spent and will spend for your entire trip away from home, not just the time spent fishing. For each category, please estimate your personal expenses.

12. Type of Expense	Personal Expenses in CA	% Spent in So. CA (0-100%)
A. Tips to crew and/or fish filleting fees	\$	100%
B. Galley Tab	\$	100%
C. Fish Processing/Freezing/Shipping fees	\$	100%
D. Gifts or Souvenirs Aboard	\$	100%
E. Vessel Ticket(s) and Surcharge (not including prices above)	\$	100%
F. Gifts or souvenirs off the vessel	\$	%
G. Food/drink from restaurants/ bars	\$	%
H. Expenses from grocery/ convenience stores	\$	100%
I. Lodging (hotel etc.)	\$	%
J. Auto, truck, RV rental	\$	%
K. Auto, truck, RV fuel	\$	%
L. Parking and site access fees	\$	%
M. Public transportation	\$	%

13. How much was spent on Airfare?

\$ Did not fly

14. Year Born:

15. Gender: 1 M 2 F

1 Complete 2 Partial/Incomplete

16. Which category best describes your household's total annual income before taxes in 2015?:

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than \$20,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> \$80,000-\$99,999 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$20,000-\$39,999 | <input type="checkbox"/> \$100,000-\$149,999 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$40,000-\$59,999 | <input type="checkbox"/> \$150,000-\$199,999 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$60,000-\$79,999 | <input type="checkbox"/> \$200,000 or more |