

Appendix D

State/Territory	Does your new system help you understand patterns of noncommercial fishing that are taking place? If so, how?	Does it help you understand the volume of fish being caught (better than before)? If so, how?	Has it improved your ability to educate noncommercial fishers? If so, how? What is different for you now?	Are there any other ways that the noncommercial fishing license/registry information is being used by your agency?	Has it provided any efficiencies for your agency that were not possible prior to having the license/registry in place?	General Recommendations
1. New Hampshire	Somewhat. We only have a single license, so no species-specific data is obtained through the recreational license, but it does allow us to track the changes in the number and timing of saltwater license sales within and between years.	The primary purpose of implementing the federal registry, followed by its replacement with the state saltwater license, was to use the directory of known-saltwater anglers for use in the National Marine Fisheries Service's Recreational Saltwater Fishing Effort Survey. Prior to the license the effort was generated through a highly inefficient random-digit-dial survey. Since that time the survey has piloted mail surveys with more success than the phone survey with the shift to cell phones instead of land-lines. Currently they have selected to move the effort survey to a hybrid mail and phone survey, of which the phone portion will use the directory of saltwater anglers that is created by the saltwater license (or the federal registry for states that do not have a saltwater license). The directory should mean that the rate of contact with an angler compared to the random-digit-dial should be exponentially higher and therefore produce a greater sample size in the final effort estimation. The greater sample size should lead to results that have better precision and can be used with more certainty than the current and past estimates. The effort portion of the survey is what is used to calculate the catch and harvest estimate (numbers and weight) and because of that, our understanding of the volume of fish being caught should be better (more precise) than before.	Minimally. We obtain contact information for saltwater recreational anglers through the licensing system and it can and has been used to send out information (email) to license holders about regulatory changes, most notably those that change mid-season after the production of our printed rule books.	No.	No.	
2. Connecticut	As there is no mandatory catch reporting associated with our saltwater angler licenses, the license system itself provides no direct information on fishing activity or catch, other than geographic distribution of anglers. For effort and harvest data, Connecticut (as does all other Atlantic Coastal states) relies on NOAA Fisheries' Marine Recreational Information Program. Our office supplies MRIP with angler-level monthly uploads of saltwater fishing license information (including phone number(s), email address, mailing address) that forms a basis for their survey sampling frame. Our license system does provide us with some demographic information (gender, age, race, town, etc.) about recreational angling participants.	See response to bullet 1.	By virtue of non-mandatory collection of email addresses, it has enhanced the scope of our listserv in informing the fishing public on regulation changes, public hearings/informational meetings, and others matters of interest.	Analysis of the demographic data has informed efforts to make some legislative changes to the portfolio of licenses offered for sale. For example, to encourage and enhance fishing and hunting participation among young adults, we got legislation passed that established reduced fees for 16-17 year olds. Demographic data was also used to inform an unsuccessful attempt in establishing a nominal fee for presently free 65+ hunting and fishing licenses.	It provides us a means of identifying and geographically/demographically analyzing and characterizing our saltwater angling population that would not otherwise be possible. Having email addresses (see bullet 3) provides an efficient and economical means of contacting at least that portion of our licensed anglers that provide an email address (~30%). Contacting licensed saltwater anglers by mail (n~150,000) would be prohibitively expensive. It also provides contact information (phone number) for our anglers in case we need to contact specific individuals for any reason, and our licensing system has a contact log in which we can maintain a history of interactions (staff person, date, time, type of contact, reason, resolution, etc.) with our license holders.	
3. Rhode Island	It breaks down license sales into resident, non resident, over 65, active military, and temporary (10 day). Other data includes DOB, address, phone number.	Not really that is accomplished via MRIP sampling. Volume of anglers more appropriately.	Yes we provide an annual budget report to a stakeholder group (required by statute) gives opportunity to give program info to rec folks who are generally heads of various fishing organizations in turn they can pass along the info to their members. Also we attend and issue licenses at our annual fishing trade show which allows for ample public discourse.	We use the info to update our annual saltwater verses freshwater participation breakdown for USFWS funding.	It was a new license program so it didn't update an older system. We have it set up with our internet portal contractor such that they do all of the remittance and tech support to vendors and the public, this is better than our current Freshwater/ Hunting license program which is still paper based and billing is handled by RIDEM staff, not as cost effective as our SW license program.	

State/Territory	Does your new system help you understand patterns of noncommercial fishing that are taking place? If so, how?	Does it help you understand the volume of fish being caught (better than before)? If so, how?	Has it improved your ability to educate noncommercial fishers? If so, how? What is different for you now?	Are there any other ways that the noncommercial fishing license/registry information is being used by your agency?	Has it provided any efficiencies for your agency that were not possible prior to having the license/registry in place?	General Recommendations
4. Delaware	Yes, but only in a rather limited regard - resident versus non-resident; trout anglers (stamp); 7-day tourist; boat license. Note that the boat license is an option that covers all folks fishing on a vessel.	It does not. Estimates of recreational fishing effort and landings are coastwide initiatives generated through phone surveys (transitioning to mail-based) and access point angler intercept surveys. NOAA/NMFS administers the program in partnership with the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission and its member states.	Only in the sense that we use a small portion of the funds to produce plastic fishing rulers that are distributed free at license sales agents. We recently received the authority from our legislature to use license information for recruiting and retaining angler and for sustaining and increasing license sales. We have yet to do so, but this will allow us to work cooperatively with the Recreational Boating and Fishing Foundation (RBFF) to retain anglers through the numerous promotions and incentives they offer to anglers. The difference is that it generates a tremendous amount of money that can be used to match (25%) our federal Sport Fish Restoration dollars. Over the years general fund monies and positions were cut and converting our freshwater fishing license to a general fishing license was the only long-term solution to obtaining match. Sport Fish Restoration monies fund a lion's share of our fishery projects (research, boat ramps, fishing piers, aquatic ed, monitoring, etc.).	We use license information in conjunction with our Fisherman Information Network (FIN) number information to establish our saltwater/freshwater splits for federal aid purposes. The 5 question for the FIN inform us on whether they will fish non-tidal waters, tidal waters, federal waters, or fish for blue crab or clams.	I would not say that the licenses provided any efficiencies per se.	
5. Maryland	Maryland has actually had a recreational saltwater license since the late 80s, but it provided certain exemptions that did not comply with NSAR. Created a free registry to capture the fishers exempt from the existing license (fishers on registered boats, in free fishing areas, waterfront property, etc.). The system provides individuals with a unique identifying number that allows the department to see what products an individual purchases from the department (e.g. fishing license, hunting license, camping permit). That allows them to see who renews their licenses and how that might relate to fee increases.	The fisher estimates with the license + registry are better than before when it was based on surveys alone. Maryland has few shoreline access points so intercept survey data is weaker and data from telephone surveys was weaker because it didn't necessarily capture fishers. At least now they have a mechanism for targeting fishers with surveys for data.	Fishers can opt in for email contact from the department. Provides a direct mechanism for communication to fishers and updates on rules.	The online system now provides individuals with a unique identifying number that allows the department to see what products an individual purchases from the department (e.g. fishing license, hunting license, camping permit).	The free registry increased department's costs. And even though it is free, fishers still complain about the inconvenience of having to register in both the boat and saltwater registry. The registry also operates at a loss.	Maryland was not in a position to build a system from scratch, just modified an existing system to comply with NSAR. If they started from scratch, they would not have created license exemptions (especially for those on registered boats) which put them in a place of having to create a shadow registry system to capture the necessary data. If possible, have any fee increase legislation submitted by a fisher group or advisory board, rather than the department. Fee-increase bill successfully adopted that way. Look into possible grant from the Recreational Boating & Fishing Foundation (https://www.takemefishing.org/corporate/) to support your efforts to create a license system. If anglers on charter boats will not need to purchase license, but charter boat captain will have to report catch, start with electronic reporting. Paper reporting requires a lot more staff time. Be prepared for the creation of any system to take years. Modifications to Maryland's existing fee rates take at least a year. Unrelated to the registry/license creation, a fisher stakeholder group initiated a bill that increased the recreational fees and created a task force group that made recommendations to the department about how the increased fee revenue should be spent. Although there were problems with the bill that had to be worked out later, the report that was generated by the task force provided something that the fishers and department could use to pressure legislators not to cut the department's budget to account for the increased fees. Since fee-increase was initiated by the fishers, the legislators would be very unpopular, if they cut the support to those same fee-payers.
6. Puerto Rico	Puerto Rico's recreational saltwater (and freshwater) license system will also include stamps for hunting doves, pigeons and ducks. I say "will" because it is still not implemented. We came within a few days of starting sales last year, but circumstances intervened. We're working with Active Network to redo some parts of the web-based system (which we call "FLIPR", for Fishing Licenses in Puerto Rico), adding a shoreline fishing license at low cost, and a few other tweaks.		One of my goals for the system is to clarify the dividing line between recreational anglers and commercial fishermen. We also expect that it will provide us with an avenue to get the regulations out to a broader audience. Internal surveys have shown us that only around 10% of the non-commercial fishermen have ever seen our regulations.			Some things I've learned in this experience, are that it is critical to have complete buy-in from the top of the agency. And it's not enough to think you have it. And you have to realize they may be under pressures you don't realize. Also, setting up a system like this is very, very, very complicated. There are so many details, and we're short on people that can handle them. Ours may be particularly complicated since we're trying to do it fully bilingual, working with a company that isn't completely comfortable in Spanish. The training of all the sales personnel, law enforcement, finances people in the Department, alerting the Treasury people to what's coming, preparing informational/educational materials, User Acceptance Testing of the main system, the streamlined system for use by our Regional Offices, and the Administrative System, with financial reports and special access by administrators, hiring of a coordinator and getting her trained fully. We'll have 3 phone help lines also: one for general users, one for Regional Office sales people (the Regional offices will sell in cash to people who don't have credit cards or who have special needs, and we've had to upgrade their internet speed and buy new computers also), and one for law enforcement to call to check validity of licenses or with other questions. Each phone line has "wait" text, in Spanish and English that has to be approved.