

# **The 2000 Virginia Beach Red, White, and Blue Fishing Tournament: Participants' Characteristics, Attitudes, Expenditures, and Economic Impacts**

Carol E. Thailing  
Robert B. Ditton  
David K. Anderson

Department of Wildlife and Fisheries Sciences  
Texas A&M University  
College Station, TX 77843- 2258

Thomas J. Murray  
James E. Kirkley  
Jon Lucy

Virginia Sea Grant Marine Advisory Program  
Virginia Institute of Marine Science  
College of William & Mary  
Gloucester Point, Virginia 23062

**VIMS, College of William and Mary, Virginia Marine Resource Report No. 2001-9  
VSG-01-88 (VA Sea Grant Pub. #)**

**March 15, 2001**

Prepared for the Department of Convention and Visitor Development, City of Virginia  
Beach through a research contract with the Texas Agricultural Experiment Station, Texas  
A&M University- College Station

## Executive Summary

We mailed questionnaires to all participants in two new offshore fishing tournaments held between June 26<sup>th</sup> and July 3<sup>rd</sup> in Virginia Beach, VA in an effort to learn more about the angler market attracted to the events. Specifically, the purpose of the survey was to provide tournament planners with feedback on participants' demographic characteristics, overall level of fishing participation and involvement, tournament experience preferences, tournament-related expenditures, and satisfaction with the two events. The city of Virginia Beach was also interested in the level of angler expenditures associated with the Red, White, and Blue event and resultant economic impacts. There were 251 anglers registered for the Virginia Beach Red, White, and Blue (RWB) Tournament and 44 anglers registered for the Buff Foundation / Sertoma by the Bay Billfish (BFSBB) Tournament, with complete mailing information for 219 and 44 anglers, respectively. In the former event, 102 usable surveys were returned with 5 reported as non-deliverable for an effective response rate of 50.9%. In the latter event, 20 usable surveys were returned with 4 non-deliverables for an effective response rate of 62.5%. A telephone check of anglers participating in the Red, White, and Blue Tournament indicated there were no differences between respondents and non-respondents in terms of their overall tournament expenditures. Because of the small number of participants in the Buff Foundation / Sertoma by the Bay Billfish Tournament due to bad weather, resultant sample size was too small to test for significant differences between these anglers and Red, White, and Blue tournament anglers. Only results for the Virginia Red, White, and Blue Tournament will be summarized below.

- Red, White, and Blue anglers averaged 45 years of age with 60.8% of the participants coming from the local Virginia Beach area and 19.6% coming from elsewhere in Virginia.
- RWB participants spent an average of 50 days fishing “since the same time last year,” with 75.5% of these tournament anglers reporting that fishing was their most important outdoor recreation activity.
- Marlin and tuna were listed by RWB anglers as their most preferred fish species to catch in saltwater.
- Eighty-four percent (84.2%) of RWB anglers indicated that either they or someone else in their household owned a powerboat. The average powerboat length of RWB anglers was 32.5 feet.
- RWB anglers participated in an average of 3 saltwater tournaments in the past year (including this tournament).
- Overall satisfaction with the 2000 Red, White, and Blue Tournament was generally favorable with 54.1% of RWB anglers reporting they were either very or extremely satisfied with their tournament and 39.8% reporting they were at least moderately satisfied with this first-time tournament.

- Average tournament-related expenditures (excluding registration fees) made by RWB survey respondents were extrapolated to all RWB registrants of the 2000 RWB Tournament (\$450,359). Of this total amount, \$223,759 was spent by local residents of Virginia Beach.
- Non-local Virginia residents spent \$109,113 in Virginia Beach. Out-of-state participants of the 2000 Red, White, and Blue Tournament spent \$96,042 in Virginia Beach.
- 2000 RWB fees were not included in the economic impact assessment because this would have required a detailed understanding of exactly where this money was spent by tournament officials. Thus, estimates of tournament anglers are conservative.
- The greatest expenditures made by RWB participants were in the categories of gas and oil for their boat (26.5%) and the “other” category (miscellaneous retail and service items) (10.1%).
- Total expenditures by local, non-local, and out-of-state residents in Virginia Beach and elsewhere in Virginia participating in the Red, White, and Blue Tournament (\$450,359) resulted in a total economic impact of \$343,000, a total income of \$177,000, and a total of 7 new jobs. This is the case because not all of what is spent locally or in the state of Virginia remains in the respective economies.
- The indirect economic impacts generated by the direct economic impacts of RWB anglers were \$112,000 in total output, \$66,000 in total income, and 1 new job.
- The induced economic impacts generated by the direct economic impacts of RWB anglers totalled \$404,000 in output, \$228,000 in generated income, and 7 new jobs.
- The total economic impacts of RWB Tournament angler expenditures including direct, indirect, and induced impacts resulted in a total output of \$859,000, \$471,000 in total income, and 15 new jobs.

## **Acknowledgements**

This study was funded by the Department of Convention and Visitor Development, City of Virginia Beach and partially supported by the Virginia Sea Grant program and the Texas Agricultural Experiment Station. We appreciate the efforts of Bill Gooch of Virginia Beach for recognizing the need for this study and getting us in contact with city officials.

Several individuals on our staff played important roles in this project. We would like to recognize the special efforts of Ryan Reitz and Sydney Pye who helped conduct the mail survey to tournament participants and completed follow-up phone calls to non-respondents. Their efforts were crucial to completing this research.

We are appreciative of the efforts of David Timms and Denise Cohan who provided us with the names and addresses of tournament participants following registration as well as the tournament logo and artwork that appeared on the cover of the angler survey. We are appreciative of the coordination and responsiveness of Buddy Wheeler of the Virginia Beach Department of Convention and Visitor Development.

And finally, we acknowledge the anglers in the two events studied here who took the time and made the effort to respond to our mail survey and provide important feedback to the planners of future fishing tournament events in Virginia Beach. We are solely responsible for any errors of omission or commission.

**CET**

**RBD**

**DKA**

**TJM**

**JEK**

**JL**

# Table of Contents

Acknowledgements .....	iii
List of Tables .....	v
Introduction .....	1
Methods .....	3
Results .....	6
Conclusions and Discussion .....	14
References .....	18
Appendix A: Tables .....	20
Appendix B: Economic Output Multipliers for Virginia Saltwater Recreational Fishing.....	49
Appendix C: Economic Impact Definitions .....	52
Appendix D: Mail Questionnaire with Cover Letters.....	54
Appendix E: Non-respondent Interview Schedule .....	77
Appendix F: Methodology for Calculation Margins of Error .....	80
Appendix G: Excel Spreadsheet .....	82

## List of Tables

Table 1. Response Rates.....	21
Table 2. Frequency Distribution of Anglers Gender by Tournament.....	21
Table 3. Frequency Distribution of Anglers Age by Tournament.....	21
Table 4. Frequency Distribution of Anglers by Household Income Category by Tournament.....	22
Table 5. Frequency Distribution of Anglers Who Returned the Survey by Residence Location by Tournament.....	22
Table 6. BFSBB Anglers by their Residence Location; Determined by Three-Digit Zip Code Area (n = 20).....	22
Table 7. RWB Anglers by their Residence Location; Determined by Three-Digit Zip Code Area (n = 102 ).....	23
Table 8. Frequency Distribution of Anglers by Number of Days Fished in the Previous Year by Tournament.....	24
Table 9. Frequency Distribution of Anglers by Number of Days Fished in the United States in the Previous Year by Tournament.....	24
Table 10. Frequency Distribution of Anglers by Number of Days Fished Outside of the United States in the Previous Year by Tournament.....	24
Table 11. Frequency Distribution of Anglers Who Participated in Each Type of Fishing During the Previous Year by Tournament.....	25
Table 11a. Number of Days Anglers Spent Participating in Each Type of Fishing During the Previous Year by Tournament.....	25
Table 12. Frequency Distribution of Anglers by Number of Saltwater Tournaments in the Previous Year by Tournament.....	25
Table 13. Frequency Distribution of RWB Anglers by Fish Species Sought Most Often.....	26
Table 14. Frequency Distribution of BFSBB Anglers by Fish Species Sought Most Often.....	26
Table 15. Frequency Distribution of Anglers by Whether They Put Most of Their Effort Into Catching One Species by Tournament.....	27
Table 16. Frequency Distribution of Anglers by Species They Target Most by Tournament.....	27

Table 17. Frequency Distribution of Anglers by the Importance of Fishing to Them Compared to Other Outdoor Recreational Activities by Tournament .....	27
Table 18. Frequency Distribution of Anglers by Their Self-Evaluated Fishing Ability Compared to Other Saltwater Anglers by Tournament.....	27
Table 19. Frequency Distribution of Anglers by Whether They Own a Boat by Tournament .....	28
Table 20. Frequency Distribution of Anglers by the Lengths of Their Longest Powerboat by Tournament .....	28
Table 21. Frequency Distribution of Anglers by Number of Rod and Reel Combinations Owned by Tournament .....	28
Table 22. Frequency Distribution of RWB Anglers by Their Feelings About Recreational Fishing .....	29
Table 23. Frequency Distributions of BFSBB Anglers by Their Feelings About Recreational Fishing .....	30
Table 24. Frequency Distribution of Anglers by Type of Group They Fished With Most Often by Tournament .....	31
Table 25. Frequency Distribution of Anglers by the Number of Friends that Fish by Tournament .....	31
Table 26. Frequency Distribution of Anglers by the Number of Their Co-workers that Fish by Tournament.....	31
Table 27. Frequency Distribution of Anglers by the Number of Vacation Trips that Include Fishing by Tournament .....	31
Table 28. Frequency Distribution of Anglers by Whether They Are Members of a Fishing Club/ Organization by Tournament.....	32
Table 29. Frequency Distribution of Anglers by Their Favorite Fishing Clubs/Organizations by Tournament.....	32
Table 30. Frequency Distribution of Anglers by the Number of Fishing Clubs/Organizations They Belong to by Tournament.....	32
Table 31. Frequency Distribution of Anglers by Whether They Subscribe to Fishing/Boating Magazines by Tournament.....	33

Table 32. Frequency Distribution of Anglers by Number of Fishing/Boating Magazines They Subscribe to by Tournament .....	33
Table 33. Frequency Distribution of Anglers by Their Favorite Fishing/Boating Magazines by Tournament.....	33
Table 34. Frequency Distribution of Anglers by Whether They Have Called or Written an Elected Official or Attended a Public Hearing on a Fisheries Matter by Tournament .....	34
Table 35. Frequency Distribution of Anglers by the Number of Days Fished in Respective Tournament .....	34
Table 36. Frequency Distribution of Anglers by the Number of Nights They Stayed in the Virginia Beach Area by Tournament .....	34
Table 37. Frequency Distribution of Anglers by the Number of Additional Persons They Brought to Respective Tournament.....	34
Table 38. Frequency Distribution of Anglers by the Type of Lodging They Used in the Virginia Beach Area by Tournament .....	35
Table 38a. Frequency Distribution of Anglers by the Other Types of Lodging Used in the Virginia Beach Area by Tournament .....	35
Table 39. Frequency Distributions of Anglers by the Sources of Information From Which They Found Out About the Tournament by Tournament.....	35
Table 39a. Frequency Distribution of Anglers by the Other Sources of Information From Which They Found Out About the Tournament by Tournament.....	36
Table 40. Frequency Distribution of Anglers Who Have Viewed the Tournament Web Page Since Last Year by Tournament .....	36
Table 41. Frequency Distributions of Anglers as to Their Evaluation of Overall Satisfaction with Their Respective Tournament by Tournament .....	36
Table 42. Frequency Distribution of RWB Anglers by Their Experience Preferences (Reasons for Fishing) in Saltwater Tournaments.....	37
Table 43. Frequency Distribution of BFSBB Anglers by Their Experience Preferences (Reasons for Fishing) in Saltwater Tournaments.....	38
Table 44. Frequency Distribution of RWB Anglers' Feelings About Their Fishing Trip and Participation in the Tournament .....	39

Table 45. Frequency Distribution of BFSBB Anglers' Feelings About Their Fishing Trip and Participation in the Tournament .....	40
Table 46. Average Tournament Expenditures of RWB Anglers by Type of Purchase .....	41
Table 47. Average Tournament Expenditures of RWB Anglers by Type of Purchase in Virginia Beach .....	41
Table 48. Average Tournament Expenditures of RWB Anglers by Type of Purchase in Virginia .....	42
Table 49. Total Direct Purchases by RWB Anglers by Type of Purchase.....	42
Table 50. Total Expenditures made by RWB Anglers by Residence Location Using Personal Expenditure Data.....	43
Table 51. Average Tournament Expenditures of BFSBB Anglers by Type of Purchase .....	43
Table 52. Average Tournament Expenditures of BFSBB Anglers by Type of Purchase in Virginia Beach .....	44
Table 53. Average Tournament Expenditures of BFSBB Anglers by Type of Purchase in Virginia .....	44
Table 54. Total Direct Purchases by BFSBB Anglers by Type of Purchase .....	45
Table 55. Total Expenditures (Direct Economic Impact) made by BFSBB Anglers by Residence Location Using Personal Expenditure Data .....	45
Table 56. Total Amount Spent in Virginia Beach by Type of Purchase and Tournament .....	46
Table 57. Purchases Made in Virginia Beach by Non-local RWB Anglers.....	46
Table 58. Purchases Made in Virginia Beach by Out-of-state RWB Anglers .....	47
Table 59. Purchases Made in Virginia Beach by Out-of-state BFSBB Anglers .....	47
Table 60. Direct Economic Impacts of RWB by Participant's Origin and Impact Measure.....	48
Table 61. Indirect Economic Impacts of RWB Anglers by Participant's Origin and Impact Measure.....	48
Table 62. Induced Economic Impacts of RWB Participant's Origin and Impact Measure.....	48
Table 63. Total Economic Impacts of RWB Anglers by Impact Measure .....	48

## Introduction

Fishing competitions have probably been around for as long as there has been recreational fishing. The idea of one person competing with another to see who can catch the biggest fish has given way to organized multi-day events that involve hundreds and thousands of participants seeking to win prizes, trophies, or cash. The three tournaments we studied last year, for example, (Annual Pirate's Cove Billfish Tournament, Annual Alice Kelly Ladies Only Memorial Billfish Tournament, and the Texas International Fishing Tournament) had been operating for 16, 10, and 61 years, and award cash prizes, trophies, and trophies, respectively. From these and numerous other examples, we know tournament events differ in size, categories, and number of participants as well. They also differ in purpose.

Some events offer cash prizes and seek to make a profit, while most are simply social events designed to enhance the fishing experience available in a particular community and just break even. Others are conducted to raise funds and donate their profits to various charitable causes including fishery conservation. Increasingly, fishing tournaments are being seen as tools of local economic development (Gillis and Ditton 1999). In other words, tournaments can be planned, developed, marketed, and conducted to attract particular types of visitors and their respective expenditures for a known period of time to the community. The goal is to not just have a fishing competition but to stimulate the local economy in a predictable way. Those who run existing fishing tournaments are also beginning to view them from a local economic impact standpoint and make event-related decisions accordingly. Fishing tournaments are attractions just like any other type of tourist attraction that bring additional expenditures and economic impacts to businesses in the local community. Whether planned for this express purpose or not, fishing tournaments have the ability to attract new visitors and their money to coastal communities. Whether they do so (and the extent they do so) or simply cater to local residents who are likely to spend their money there anyway remains to be seen.

Previously, we have conducted five offshore fishing tournament studies to provide tournament directors and their staffs with market insight to the anglers that participate in their events as well as the extent of local and state level economic impact attributable to the respective tournament (Ditton and Loomis 1985; Ditton and Arneson 1986; Ditton and Loomis 1988; Gillis and Ditton 1998; Ditton et al. 2000a; Ditton et al. 2000b). In each case, events were considered successful and were long standing. Generally, they were not planned from an economic impact standpoint but tournament directors wanted economic impact information for strategic purposes nonetheless. Typically, they wanted the information so they could demonstrate locally how important tournaments were to the local economy. They often noted that fishing tournaments "didn't get any respect" from the local business community or they used the economic impact results to solicit additional sponsorships or leverage public sector decisions regarding additional facilities or infrastructure needs. In some cases, we were able to document considerable economic impact in the local community (and in some cases at the state level as well) while in others demonstrable economic impacts were lacking altogether. In the latter cases, locals were nonetheless generally satisfied with the tournament event as an opportunity to socialize and have a good time. If this is the purpose of the tournament, then it may not be appropriate to expect an economic development outcome as well. Hopefully, there will always be fishing tournaments where local anglers get together to have fun, socialize, and raise money for good causes.

In the spring of 2000, we were asked to conduct a study of two tournament events being held for the first time in Virginia Beach, Virginia. The first event, the Buff Foundation / Sertoma by the Bay Billfish Tournament, was a women's only event and was held on July 27 with registration the previous day. It was sponsored by a local charitable organization, Sertoma by the Bay, to benefit breast cancer research. In the case of this event, participants were likely drawn from the local area and economic impact concerns were of little importance. This was a good opportunity, however, to better understand the female angler market. On the other hand, the Virginia Beach Red, White, and Blue Tournament was sponsored by the City of Virginia Beach with economic impact implications as a priority. This event was held from June 28- July 3 and was intended to be a new source of new tourist spending for the local area. City officials and the tournament planning staff were interested in knowing the extent to which the planned event was a positive economic stimulus to the local area. It would either be a major economic success or results would be less than expected and useful as a feedback to planning upcoming events. The economic impact at the local level demonstrated by previous fishing tournaments may have occurred without planning but was more likely the result of careful deliberations and informed decisions. Fishing tournaments need to be designed to produce the desired local economic impacts. This study will be the first source of feedback for tournament planners in Virginia Beach. Regardless of the extent of economic impacts associated with the events, results should prove useful for future decision-making.

## Objectives

The objectives of this study are to:

1. Profile the population of anglers who participated in two fishing tournaments held in Virginia Beach, VA: the Buff Foundation / Sertoma By the Bay Billfish (BFSBB) Tournament and the Virginia Beach Red, White, and Blue (RWB) Tournament. These profiles will include anglers' social and demographic characteristics, level of fishing participation and involvement, tournament fishing motivations, attitudes towards catching fish, expenditure levels, and angler satisfaction with the tournaments.
2. Determine the direct and indirect economic impact of the two tournament events on the city of Virginia Beach and the state of Virginia.
3. Discuss the implications of the results and make recommendations to tournament planning officials associated with these two events.

# Methods

## Sampling Design

The names and addresses of all tournament participants were taken from registration forms completed by tournament anglers. Lists of tournament anglers from the Red, White, and Blue (RWB) Tournament as well as the Buff Foundation / Sertoma by the Bay (BFSBB) Tournament were subsequently compiled by officials from each of the two tournaments and provided to the Texas A&M research team after the two tournaments were completed. A total of 44 anglers registered for the Buff Foundation / Sertoma by the Bay Tournament and 251 for the Red, White, and Blue Tournament. However, 32 of the 251 RWB anglers' registration forms were incomplete; this left an actual sample size of 219 Red, White, and Blue Tournament anglers and 44 Buff Foundation / Sertoma by the Bay Tournament anglers.

## Questionnaire Design

The survey instrument consisted of a seven-page questionnaire designed to gather information about tournament anglers' demographics, overall fishing participation and involvement, tournament fishing activity, tournament experience preferences, tournament expenditure levels, and angler satisfaction with their respective event (Appendix D). Most of the questions in the survey had been pre-tested in previous studies of angler populations (Bohnsack and Ditton 1999; Ditton et al. 1998), and specific tournament studies (Ditton and Loomis 1985; Ditton and Arneson 1986; Ditton and Loomis 1988; Ditton et al. 2000a; Ditton et al. 2000b).

## Mailing Procedures

The survey methodology followed the protocols advocated by Salant and Dillman (1994). The data were collected by mail questionnaire using a modified version of the Total Design Method (TDM) first advocated by Dillman (1978), and later revised by Salant and Dillman (1994). Initially, personalized introductory letters including the recipients' names and respective tournament in which they participated were sent to participants informing them of their inclusion in the study and that they would be receiving a questionnaire shortly (Appendix D). Our purpose was to inform them of our study and why it was important to the planning of future tournament events. A second mailing, sent a week later, included another personalized letter accompanied by the survey. Reminder postcards were sent to non-respondents one week after the first survey was sent to encourage response and/or as thanks for their participation. Two weeks after the postcard, another survey with a reminder cover letter was sent to non-respondents urging them to respond and reinforcing their importance to the study.

In addition to personalization of all three letters, other steps were taken to increase response rate. These included using Red, White, and Blue and Buff Foundation / Sertoma by the Bay letterhead and envelopes for the mailings as appropriate and the assurance of confidentiality as per Texas A&M University Human Subjects Committee requirements. Salant and Dillman (1994) reported that mail surveys using their methodologies and procedures should result in a response rate between 50%-60%. However, because we were conducting the survey during the summer months, or a time when response rates would be expected to be lower (Brown 1989), we

probably received a lower response rate than if we had waited until after Labor Day to contact anglers. However, we had concerns for recall bias (the anglers' ability to remember the specific details of their tournament participation including itemized expenditures asked in the questionnaire), if we waited until after Labor Day. These concerns encouraged us to conduct the mail survey as soon as possible following the tournament events in order to minimize this bias.

### **Response Rates and Non-response Bias Checks**

Surveys were mailed to 219 of the estimated 251 registered anglers of the Red, White, and Blue Tournament and the total 44 registered anglers of the Buff Foundation / Sertoma by the Bay Tournament. Of the 219 surveys mailed to the RWB anglers, 2 surveys were removed from the study because they should not have been included in the original sample, 108 were returned (6 of which were unusable), and 5 were reported as non-deliverable by the U.S. Postal Service. This resulted in an effective response rate of 50.9% (Table 1). Of the 44 surveys mailed to the BFSBB women anglers, 1 was removed from the original sample, 25 were returned (5 of which were unusable), and 4 were reported as non-deliverable by the U.S. Postal Service, providing an effective response rate of 62.5%. The two RWB surveys and the one BFSBB survey eliminated from the original samples were because they were completed by minors.

Telephone surveys of non-respondents were conducted to test for differences between those who did and did not respond to the survey. This was done to account for non-response bias in the survey results. Survey respondents may not be representative of the target population if respondents differ somehow from non-respondents (Filion 1980; Fisher 1996). To adjust for this non-response bias, a telephone check of anglers who did not return the survey was conducted using an abbreviated 9-item questionnaire. The non-respondent telephone survey included questions on their overall fishing participation and specifically tournament participation, which included questions about their expenditures and satisfaction with the tournaments (Appendix E). Twenty-two of the 104 tournament anglers who did not respond to the original Red, White, and Blue Tournament questionnaire answered the non-response survey; 17 of the 104 anglers could not be reached; and 8 anglers refused to answer the telephone survey resulting in an effective response rate of 25.3%. Five of the 15 non-respondents from the Buff Foundation / Sertoma by the Bay Tournament questionnaire were interviewed and 2 could not be reached, resulting in an effective response rate of 38.5%. RWB non-respondents were similar to survey respondents on 8 of the 9 questions on the telephone survey and were only significantly different ( $P < 0.05$ ) from respondents on 1 question from the 9-item telephone survey. RWB non-respondents differed significantly from survey respondents only when asked about how fishing compares to their other outdoor recreational activities. RWB non-respondents (31.8%) were more likely ( $P < 0.05$ ) to report that fishing was only one of their outdoor activities compared to the 6.9% of respondents. Conversely, respondents (75.5%) were significantly ( $P < 0.05$ ) more likely than non-respondents (40.9%) to indicate that fishing was their most important outdoor activity. Most importantly, there were no differences in terms of total tournament expenditures between groups. Due to the small sample sizes of respondents and non-respondents for the Buff foundation Tournament, no testing for significant differences was possible.

## **Precision Estimates**

Since only a portion of the population is being sampled and because there are errors in measurement, the results of sample surveys include a certain amount of uncertainty (McNamara 1994). As a result, sample surveys have a margin of error associated with population estimates. The numbers of overall usable returns (122) were used as basis for precision estimates in this report, i.e. the accuracy of the data. The precision of each estimate is determined by the level of acceptable significance for the study (95%) and the number of observations used to make each estimate. Therefore, estimates of proportions and percentages close to .50 or 50% have a margin of error of +/- 3.4%; for estimates around .1 or .9 (10% or 90%) there is a corresponding margin of error of +/- 2.0%. A detailed description of the methodology used for these calculations is provided in Appendix F.

## **Item Non-response and Open-ended Comments**

Results presented in this report are based on the tournament anglers who answered each question. The number of anglers who answered each question is indicated in each table. Open-ended comments volunteered by anglers from both tournaments are presented in Appendices G and H. The only editing of comments included the elimination of names of persons, businesses, etc. Comments are grouped according to anglers' overall satisfaction level with their respective tournaments. The only identifying characteristic of the open-ended comments is the identification number of the respondent which enables us to make links with their other responses.

## **Economic Impacts**

The economic impact analysis includes only those tournament participants with complete name and address information (219 for RWB; 44 for BFSBB), and not the estimated total number of registrants (251 for RWB; 44 for BFSBB). Therefore, estimates of the total impact of the tournaments will more than likely be lower than actual direct economic impacts. Both tournaments have direct and indirect economic impacts to some extent on the local and state economies. In order to determine the direct economic impacts of actual angler expenditures and the resultant indirect impacts on both the local and state economies, we divided tournament participants according to their place of residence: the city of Virginia Beach, elsewhere in Virginia, and out-of-state.

In order to calculate the various direct and indirect economic impacts the two respective tournaments made to both the local economy of Virginia Beach as well as the state of Virginia, participants were separated into three categories based upon their residence: local anglers residing in Virginia Beach, non-local anglers residing in the state of Virginia, and out-of-state anglers. These were the first annual tournaments for both the Red, White, and Blue and the Buff Foundation / Sertoma by the Bay tournaments and therefore we had no prior experience to make any presumptions about where anglers were traveling from or the percentage of local anglers participating in the two tournaments.

# Results

## Demographic Characteristics

Most (99%) of RWB anglers were male with 86.9% between the ages of 28-57 years of age with a mean age of 45 years (Tables 2, 3). The majority (85%) of the participants of the ladies only tournament ranged between the ages of 28-47 years of age with a mean of 37.

The median annual household income of RWB participants was \$120,000-\$139,999 while the median annual household income of the BFSBB participants ranging between \$80,000 and \$119,999 (Table 4).

A large percentage of anglers from both the RWB tournament (61%) and the BFSBB tournament (85%) were from the Virginia Beach area (Tables 6, 7, and 8). Twenty percent (20%) of RWB anglers and 5% of BFSBB anglers were from other areas of Virginia, respectively.

## General Fishing Participation

This section includes information regarding the overall fishing activity of RWB and BFSBB tournament anglers including their previous fishing experience, preferences, boat ownership, and attitudes. The average number of days spent fishing since the same time last year by Red, White, and Blue participants was greater (50 days fished) than the 8.2 days spent fishing by Buff Foundation / Sertoma by the Bay participants (Table 8). Most of these days were spent fishing in the United States; RWB and BFSBB anglers spent an average of 2.3 days and 1.4 days fishing outside the United States in the previous 12 months (Table 10). While anglers in both tournaments spent time in the last 12 months fishing in saltwater from a shore/pier and in freshwater, nearly all reported they had fished in saltwater from a boat (100% RWB; 95% BFSBB) (Table 11). RWB participants fished an average of 3 saltwater tournaments in the past twelve months and Buff Foundation / Sertoma by the Bay participants fished an average of 1 saltwater tournament in the last year (Table 12). Because of the way the survey question was worded, these numbers include the 2000 RWB and BFSBB tournaments.

Anglers were asked to state the three kinds of fish they preferred to catch in saltwater. Anglers from both tournaments listed marlin and tuna as their most preferred saltwater species (Tables 13, 14). Slightly less than one-half (48% RWB and 48% BFSBB) of the anglers from each tournament put most of their effort into fishing for one particular species of fish, while 52% and 52% of the anglers, respectively, did not focus on fishing for one particular species (Table 15). The species listed most often was marlin (51% including both Blue and White Marlin) for RWB anglers and Tuna (43%) for BFSBB anglers (Table 16).

Tournament participants were asked to indicate their agreement or disagreement with 16 statements about recreational fishing as presented in Tables 22 and 23. RWB participants were more likely to place greater emphasis on catching fish than BFSBB participants (Tables 22 and 23). Statements receiving the greatest amount of agreement were "I like to fish where there are several kinds of fish to catch," "I'm just as happy if I release the fish I catch," and "I usually eat the fish I catch." These were agreed with or strongly agreed with by 91%, 82%, and 74% of

RWB anglers and 90%, 79%, and 90% of BFSBB anglers, respectively. RWB anglers either disagreed or strongly disagreed most with the following two statements: “I want to keep all the fish I catch” with 75% and “When I go fishing, I am just as happy if I don’t catch any fish” with 55% respectively (Table 22). The two statements most disagreed or strongly disagreed with by BFSBB anglers were “I want to keep all the fish I catch” (58%) and “If I thought I would go fishing, I wouldn’t go fishing” (55%) (Table 23).

Seventy-six percent of RWB anglers indicated that fishing was their most important outdoor recreation activity compared to other activities (Table 17). In contrast, only 20% of BFSBB anglers indicated fishing was their most important outdoor activity. About 50% of BFSBB anglers indicated that fishing was “only one of many outdoor activities” (Table 17). When asked to rate their fishing ability to that of other saltwater anglers in general, RWB anglers (32%) were much more likely to indicate they were “more skilled” than other saltwater anglers compared to BFSBB anglers (0%). On the contrary, BFSBB anglers (43%) were much more likely than RWB anglers (13%) to indicate they were less skilled compared to other saltwater anglers (Table 18). However, most anglers from both tournaments (55% RWB; 57% BFSBB) indicated they were equally skilled compared to other saltwater anglers.

Since tournament anglers generally participate more frequently in fishing than other saltwater anglers, they probably invest more money in equipment and gear, etc. for fishing than non-tournament anglers as well. Therefore, tournament anglers were asked about their ownership of powerboats and fishing gear. Eighty-four percent (84%) of RWB anglers indicated either they or someone else in their household owned a powerboat (Table 19). This was much greater than the thirty-seven percent (37%) of the BFSBB participants who answered, “yes” to the same question. The average powerboat length for RWB participants was 32.5 feet. BFSBB participants reported an average powerboat length of 31.9 feet (Table 20). However, RWB participants reported more rod and reel combinations (mean=18.9 combinations) than the BFSBB participants (mean=1.6 combinations) (Table 21). The fewer rod and reel combinations held by BFSBB participants (all women) might be a reflection of the higher annual fishing frequency by men (RWB was 99% male) than women and consequently their greater involvement with fishing gear.

## **Social Organization**

In this section we will present results pertaining to the social organization of the tournament participants. This is necessary for understanding the extent to which tournament participants are involved in the fishing community, who they fish with, and the prevalence of fishing within their social circles.

When asked which type of group they fished with most often, the majority of the RWB and BFSBB participants indicated friends (54% RWB; 53% BFSBB) followed by family and friends together (38% RWB; 26% BFSBB) (Table 24). All tournament participants indicated that at least “some” of their friends fish. Fifty-six percent (56%) of RWB participants indicated that some of their friends fish and 44% reported that most of their friends fish (Table 25). Similarly, 55% of BFSBB anglers indicated that some of their friends fish, while 45% reported that most of their friends fish. Additionally, most anglers in each tournament indicated that at least some of

their co-workers fish (76% RWB; 68% BFSBB) (Table 26). As expected, because recreational fishing is usually a central life interest for tournament anglers, over half of the participants in each tournament indicated that at least some of their vacation trips included fishing (53% RWB; 58% BFSBB) (Table 27). More specifically, 37% of RWB anglers and 37% of BFSBB anglers indicated that most of their vacations include fishing.

Although a minority of anglers from each tournament, more anglers from the RWB tournament (39%) reported belonging to a fishing club or organization than the 5% of BFSBB anglers (Table 28). Sixty-one (61%) percent of the RWB anglers who belonged to fishing clubs or organizations belonged to only one group. The most popular groups were CCA (26%), IGFA (13%), and Virginia Beach Billfish Foundation (13%) (Table 29). Only one angler from the BFSBB tournament reported belonging to a fishing club or organization, however she did not list the name of the organization (Table 28). Many more anglers who participated in the RWB tournament reported that they subscribed to a fishing or boating magazine than anglers who participated in the BFSBB tournament (74% RWB; 24% BFSBB) (Table 31). Just over one-half (51%) of RWB anglers indicated they subscribed to “Marlin,” and all of the women anglers participating in the BFSBB indicated they subscribed to Marlin as well (Table 33). Saltwater Sportsman was the second most subscribed to magazine by RWB anglers (12%).

When asked whether tournament participants had taken an active role in calling or writing their legislators or elected officials regarding fisheries matters, a minority of RWB and BFSBB anglers indicated they had done so (Table 34). None of the BFSBB anglers reported they had called their legislators or elected officials about a fisheries-related matter. Almost one-half of the RWB anglers indicated they had previously attended a public hearing on a fisheries matter (45%) (Table 34).

### **Tournament Fishing Participation**

Most (66%) of the RWB participants fished the entire three days of the RWB tournament (Table 35). About 15% and 12% of RWB anglers indicated they fished 1 or 2 days of the three-day tournament, respectively. The BFSBB event featured only one day of fishing and nearly all (95%) of the registered anglers participated (Table 35).

Corresponding to the length of the tournament, RWB anglers spent an average of 3 nights in Virginia Beach (Table 36). However, while the BFSBB tournament lasted only one day, the number of nights spent by BFSBB anglers in Virginia Beach was slightly more than the number of nights spent by RWB anglers. BFSBB anglers spent an average of 4 nights in Virginia Beach and therefore may have been spouses or friends of those participating in the RWB event (Table 36).

There was little difference between the number of non-tournament fishing family members or friends that accompanied anglers to the two tournaments. Just less than one-half (46%) of the RWB anglers brought between one and four additional people to the tournament, while 22% brought more than five additional people. This resulted in an average of 3 additional family or friends (Table 37). About thirty-seven percent (37%) of RWB anglers did not bring any additional family or friends compared to the 56% of the BFSBB participants who indicated they did not bring additional family members or friends. Seventeen percent (17%) of BFSBB anglers

reported bringing one or two additional people while 11% reported bringing three or four additional people. This resulted in an average of 2 additional family members or friends who accompanied participants to the tournament event (Table 37).

Most of the anglers participating in each tournament stayed in private residences while in Virginia Beach (RWB 59%; BFSBB 80%) (Table 38). The next most frequent answer was “other”. All of the anglers in each tournament who answered “other” reported, “they live there” (Table 38a). This is consistent with the finding that a high percentage of anglers in each tournament were from Virginia Beach (Table 5).

When anglers were asked how they learned about the tournament, the most frequent answer was through their network of friends (Table 39). Forty-nine percent (49%) of RWB anglers reported their friends were their major source of information, followed by the Internet (17%), and magazines (13%). Just over one-half (52%) of BFSBB anglers also indicated their friends were their source of information, followed by the Sertoma by the Bay Foundation (19%), and the Internet (11%).

Anglers were presented with a list of 17 reasons why people fish in saltwater and were asked to indicate how important each item was as a reason for fishing in each tournament. Three statements to which the most RWB anglers thought were extremely important were “for the challenge or sport” (42%), “to experience adventure and excitement” (42%), and “to be close to the sea” (37%) (Table 42). The statement reported as least important was “to obtain fish for eating” with 53% of RWB anglers either reporting it as either not important at all or only slightly important. The most important (extremely important) reasons for BFSBB participants fishing the tournament were first “to be close to the sea” (65%) then “to experience adventure and excitement” (55%) (Table 43). Both of these statements had a median of “5” which represents “extremely important.” The women of the BFSBB anglers indicated, “to test my equipment” (70%) as the least important reason for fishing the tournament.

Anglers were asked to indicate their overall level of satisfaction with their respective tournament. Most (54%) of RWB anglers and (80%) BFSBB anglers reported they were either very or extremely satisfied with their tournament (Table 41). About 40% of RWB anglers indicated they were only moderately satisfied with this first-time tournament event.

Eleven follow-up questions were asked of all anglers to probe into the reasons why anglers might have been satisfied or dissatisfied with each of the tournament events. The statements receiving the most agreement (either agree or strongly agree) from RWB anglers were “I thoroughly enjoyed the tournament,” “tournament staff were always helpful,” “I would like to fish other tournaments like this one,” and “the tournament was well worth the money spent to take this trip” (Table 44). Similarly, the statements receiving the most agreement (either agree or strongly agree) from BFSBB anglers were “I thoroughly enjoyed the tournament,” “I would like to fish other tournaments like this one,” and “the tournament was well worth the money spent to take this trip” (Table 45). The statements receiving the most disagreement (either “disagree” or “strongly disagree”) from RWB anglers were “I caught more fish than I expected in this tournament” and “I cannot imagine better fishing.” BFSBB anglers disagreed (either disagree or

strongly disagree) most with the statements “I caught what I consider a ‘trophy’ fish” and “I caught more fish than I expected in this tournament.”

### **Tournament Expenditures**

Study participants were asked to report how much they spent on various items while participating in the 2000 Red, White, and Blue Tournament and the Buff Foundation / Sertoma by the Bay Tournament. Rather than asking participants to report a lump sum expenditure, participants were cued with 14 expenditure categories including transportation, gas and oil for the boat, charter fees, tackle and equipment, restaurant meals, lodging, etc. Anglers were further asked to separate expenditures into those made in Virginia Beach specifically and those made elsewhere in Virginia. The level of tournament-related expenditures according to where they were made in reference to angler residence location was useful in calculating local and state level economic impacts.

### **Fishing Expenditures by Red, White, and Blue Tournament Anglers**

Most participants of the RWB Tournament reported making at least five of the tournament-related expense items listed on the questionnaire in either Virginia Beach, or elsewhere in Virginia (Table 46). The three expenditures made by the largest percentage of RWB anglers were in the categories of groceries, snack foods, drinks (69%); automobile transportation (60%); and gas and oil for their boat (57%). Five of the fourteen expense items per angler in column two of Table 46, plus additional expenses in two “other” categories totaled over \$1,000. These expense categories were charter fees, ice, gas and oil for boat, lodging, and boat repairs / upgrades. With the exception of gas and oil for their boat and ice with 57% and 55% of the RWB anglers making these expenditures, respectively, the other three categories over \$1,000 as well as the “other” category were representative of less than 12% of the RWB anglers. The expenses incurred by the fewest number of RWB anglers were entertainment (8%), other transportation (8%), charter fees (9%), and lodging (9%) (Table 46).

Average angler tournament-related expenditures were extrapolated to all RWB anglers participating in the 2000 event for which we had names and addresses (n = 219). By far, the greatest expenditure made by RWB anglers was for gas and oil for the boat (\$117,684) (Table 49). This overall expenditure was 27% of the total expenditures made by all RWB anglers (\$444,535). The next largest expenditure was for the three “other” categories combined, which included calcuttas, tournament fees, seasick bands and Dramamine, costumes, shirts and hats, and miscellaneous expenses. The remaining expenditure centers were all less than 10% of the total expenditure of RWB anglers. Those expenditures that were 5% or more (but less than 10%) of the total were slip or dockage fees (9%); charter fees (9%); restaurant meals (7%); boat repairs / upgrades (7%); groceries, snack foods, drinks (7%); and lodging (6%) (Table 49).

### **Fishing Expenditures by Buff Foundation / Sertoma by the Bay Tournament Anglers**

Most BFSBB participants reported purchasing only one of the fourteen tournament-related expense items listed on the questionnaire (Table 51). The most frequent expenditures were made in the following categories: groceries, snack foods, drinks (53%); tips (42%); restaurant meals

(37%); automobile transportation (32%); and charter fees (26%). Only four categories had expenditures greater or equal to \$100 by those anglers who made those purchases: gas and oil for boat, charter fees, tips, and bait (Table 51). None of the BFSBB anglers reported spending money on lodging, boat repairs/upgrades, entertainment, or other forms of transportation. Since 85% of the BFSBB anglers were local anglers from Virginia Beach, this would explain the lack of spending in the lodging and other transportation categories.

Average tournament-related expenditures by BFSBB anglers were extrapolated to all BFSBB anglers in the 2000 event (n = 44). Overall expenditures by BFSBB anglers totaled only \$13,941 (Table 54). Differences in overall expenditure levels are due to the different sizes of these two tournament events.

### **Total Expenditures by Where They Were Made and Angler Residence Location**

Total tournament-related expenditures in Virginia Beach by expenditure category by RWB and BFSBB anglers are shown in Table 56. Total tournament-related expenditures, according to where anglers made expenses and where they reside, are shown in Tables 50 and 55 for RWB and BFSBB anglers, respectively. Total tournament-related expenses made by residents of Virginia Beach participating in the RWB Tournament totaled \$223,259 or 50% of total expenditures (Table 50). The BFSBB resulted in very little new money coming into the city of Virginia Beach.

Total tournament-related expenditures made by non-resident Virginia participants of the RWB Tournament totaled \$126,783; the majority of this expenditure was made in Virginia Beach (86%) (Table 50). Because of the small sample size for BFSBB anglers, there were insufficient data to calculate the amount of new money non-resident BFSBB anglers brought to Virginia Beach.

Out-of-state anglers participating in the 2000 RWB Tournament spent \$96,042 in the local Virginia Beach economy and \$3,774 elsewhere in Virginia (Table 50). These expenditures do not include the indirect and induced impacts these expenditures generate because of the numerous times money is spent and re-spent in local and state economies. This information was calculated using an economic multiplier model, which estimated the extent to which these dollars were spent and re-spent locally and statewide.

### **Economic Impacts of the First RWB - The Standard Input-Output Model<sup>1</sup>**

Impact analysis begins with introducing a change in the output of goods and using the multiplier model to analyze the effects on a region's economic base. The standard input-output model estimates the direct, indirect, and induced economic implications of some basic economic activity, in this case, a recreational fishing tournament. The secondary effects (the indirect and induced impacts), along with the basic economic activity estimates, provide an estimate of the "multiplier" effects from the basic activity (direct impact).

---

<sup>1</sup> Given the limited primary survey information related to the BFSBB expenditures, impact assessments were not completed for that event.

The expenditures made by participants in the 2000 RWB tournament initiated changes in the local economy. While typically the infusion of ‘outside’ dollars into an economic region are necessary to initiate economic base expansion, an event such as the RWB may also be considered a change in local expenditure patterns and as such are treated in this impact assessment along with the expenditures of out-of-state and “non-local’ Virginia participant expenditures.

The purchases of goods and services which have arisen as a result of the RWB are the source of direct expenditures for the purchase of products and services from companies both within and outside of the region and expenditures for non-local visitation at the RWB such as lodging, meals, etc.

In the standard input-output model, measures of aggregate economic activity are used as a basis for estimating the total economic impact of the subject activity. For example, measures of direct employment or total sales in an industry are obtained, and these are then used as a basis for evaluating the total impact. In this report, estimates of the primary sales by category were obtained and used as the base measure of the “direct impact” of the tournament.

With this measure of direct purchases made by tournament anglers in the recreational fishing industry, an estimate was made of the indirect impacts using information on the interactions between these industry sectors and other economic sectors that are, to varying extent, dependent upon the recreational fishing industry.

For example, suppliers of materials into the recreational fishing product’s manufacturing, transportation, storage, marketing and distribution are also dependent upon the sales of fishing-related goods and services. These added sales or impacts are referred to as the “indirect impacts.” Such “indirectly” dependent sectors include hundreds of other types of manufacturing and trade, industrial classifications ranging from “Boat Building and Repairing” to “Veneer

It is important to understand that not all tournament-related purchases generate economic impact in the study region. In view of the fact that a sale by a local merchant does not mean all of the impact accrues to that region, a partitioning of the expenditures into direct impacts is needed for realistic assessment. The IMPLAN<sup>2</sup> model does this. IMPLAN assesses the industry sector and computes the producer output from the gross sales amount or how much of the necessary expenditures to produce or provide the good are locally acquired for the sake of multiplier analysis. The purchases of inputs from outside the study area, in a sense, are “leakages” from the local economy. The sale of such goods (for example, fuel for a boat involved in the tournament) while sold in the study area does not entirely impact the study region.

---

<sup>2</sup> Implan Professional Social Accounting & Impact Analysis Software, 1997, and 1995 state data package for Virginia (1998). Minnesota Implan Group, Inc. Stillwater, Minnesota. The model contains 528 industry sectors. The Virginia sector modeling is based upon the primary data collected in completion of the report entitled “Saltwater Angling and Its Economic Importance to Virginia”(J. Kirkley 1997) which estimated economic activity using 1994 data. The measures here have been adjusted to 2000 values using the consumer price index.

## **Direct Economic Impacts of the RWB Tournament**

The direct economic impact begins with the infusion of “outside” dollars (angler expenditures) into the region (Table 60). Again, for purposes of this study, there is one economic region modeled, the state of Virginia. While it is obvious that the initial economic activity occurs in the tournament community in and around Virginia Beach, the existing capability for the model does not include the impact software for individual counties or municipalities. In the future, estimates of local and regional impacts need to be made as well. As outlined above these dollars come from two sources:

- Purchases of tournament-related marine products from companies within these regions, and
- Non-fishing related expenditures of non-local RWB anglers and their parties.

In addition to direct impacts, two other types of impacts were estimated:

- Indirect impacts which measure the change in output production in backward linked industries caused by the changing input needs of directly-affected industries;
- Induced impacts, which measure the change in regional household expenditure patterns caused by changes in household income.

## **Indirect Economic Impacts of the RWB Tournament**

Having calculated the first (“direct”) effects of RWB angler expenditures on various measures (Table 60), the further “ripple” effect of the initial change can be quantified using the input-output model (Table 61).

Based upon information on the interrelationships among the sectors of the regional economy, the values of the inter-industry “multipliers” are generated by the IMPLAN. That is, quantifying from which industries the subject sector buys its production inputs, and to which sectors its final products are sold, enables estimates of the multiplier effects to be made. Understanding both the purchases of inputs and sale of goods and services by the marine products sectors allows the “forward” and “backward” linking of the sector’s economic activity. This permits the tracing of expenditures as they “multiply” throughout directly and indirectly impacted sectors.

## **Induced Economic Impacts of the RWB Tournament**

Ultimately, direct sales activity associated with the RWB Tournament, and the resulting indirect activity, generates increases in the general level of employment and income in the study area. The extra income generated in this way leads to a third “wave” of economic impact through greater household expenditures on goods and services. Much of this additional re-spending will

also occur within the study area, further expanding economic activity. These effects are referred to as the “induced impacts” of the RWB Tournament.

As a result of the added employees’ compensation and personal income directly generated from RWB sales, and similar growth in indirect (supply) industries, overall income levels rise further initiating expenditure and economic activity (Table 62).

For example, following Table 62, the increases in household incomes bring about economic activity in non-fishing sectors such as “Owner-occupied Dwellings,” Eating & Drinking establishments, Banking, Hospitals, Real Estate, etc.

### **Total Economic Impacts of the RWB Tournament**

In reality, most of the input-output model’s 528 sectors are impacted (directly, indirectly, or through induced expenditures) by the fishing industry-related business resulting from the RWB.

Summing up the direct, indirect and induced impacts, an estimate for the total economic impact of the RWB in 2000 is presented in Table 63. The total output generated was \$859,000; the total income generated was \$471,000; and the tournament generated 15 new jobs.

## **Conclusions and Discussion**

In terms of demographic characteristics, general fishing participation, and specific tournament participation, results for RWB and BFSBB participants were similar to those for angler groups surveyed at the 1999 Pirate’s Cove Billfish Tournament and the Alice Kelly Ladies Only Tournament, respectively, in Manteo, North Carolina (Ditton et. al. 2000b). Unfortunately, due to the small sample size of BFSBB anglers, we were unable to test for group differences.

### **2000 RWB Tournament Expenditures in Virginia Beach**

RWB Tournament-related expenditures made by local anglers in Virginia Beach exceeded that of non-locals by over \$100,000; this was mainly a tournament for local anglers. Whether this was the intent of the tournament planners or simply what occurred, our results serve as a useful baseline for future tournament events. Other tournament events where participation and expenditures by local anglers exceeded those of non-local anglers include the 1985 Hall of Fame Fishing Tournament (Ditton and Loomis 1986) and the Greater Jacksonville King Mackerel Fishing Tournament (Milon et al. 1982), for example. It is reasonable to expect new tournaments to be dominated by local anglers since they likely were the driving force for holding the tournament. Without local interest and enthusiasm, these two tournaments in Virginia Beach would probably never have occurred. Also, it should be remembered that results presented in this report for angler expenditures are conservative since 32 of RWB anglers were deleted from the economic analysis because address information was incomplete. However, if we assume this lack

of information was equal among locals and non-local anglers, then the pattern of local expenditures exceeding that of non-locals would remain consistent in findings presented here.

Some additional sources of non-local expenditures by non-anglers attending the event would increase the level of non-local spending or new money to Virginia Beach. The ESPN crew that came to town to televise the Red, White, and Blue Tournament event comprised 10 individuals. If we assumed they stayed in town for 7 full days at \$200/person/ day, this would total an additional \$14,000 and bring the extent of non-local expenditures in Virginia Beach to about \$140,783.

### **Total Economic Impact of the RWB Tournament**

As in previous tournament studies, we have not been asked to look at tournament-related expenditures of angler fees made by the tournament organizing committee. If local economic impact is important, then as many expenditures as possible should be made using local businesses and vendors. If the tournament-related infrastructure is not in place and expenditures have to be made outside the local area, then tournament officials need to do everything possible to remedy this situation. Support capability may need to be developed in the local community.

Finally, although the economic impacts of the RWB identified previously are important to note, they should be considered “short run” impacts only. Given the region’s growing position in offshore fishing, the initial tournament-related sales will continue to generate future “long run” impacts, and economic activity. Other impact measures also apply to such events as fishing tournaments. For example, by virtue of the fact sales activity is created, sales taxes are paid in conjunction with the direct, indirect, and induced expenditures. Accordingly, the RWB further enhances the local and regional communities by generating public revenues in addition to private output and income.

It is perhaps most difficult to quantify the positive amenity values or externalities which arise from the RWB Tournament and its continuing success. In bringing offshore recreational fishing enthusiasts to Virginia Beach, the community both enhances and reinforces its historic identity as a recreational fishing destination. Clearly the RWB Tournament also serves to introduce the region’s diverse attractions to the rest of the nation and the world.

### **The Future of the BFSBB Tournament**

Although angler numbers were well below expectations for the inaugural BFSBB, bad weather played a major role in this outcome. The idea of a one-day charity tournament event for lady anglers is a popular one today. It is also an excellent way to expose women to the benefits of fishing and more specifically, tournament fishing. Women have had traditionally low rates of participation (percent that participate) in recreational fishing due to a number of constraining factors (Fedler et al. 1998). However, this is a major new growth segment in the recreational fishing community. Besides generating financial support for a local charity and helping to socialize women into fishing, there is a chance this event could develop drawing power beyond local anglers. Additionally, because it is only a one-day tournament, this may make it difficult

to attract women anglers from out-of-state. Therefore, tournament officials should concentrate their marketing efforts on non-local areas close to Virginia Beach that would still bring new money to the local economy. It will, however, take time to attract women anglers to a new event. To the extent they do, additional new dollars will be attracted to the community. However, this is probably not a reasonable goal at this point. The BFSBB was designed first and foremost a local social event and secondarily to raise money for a "good cause". And that is probably the way it should remain until BFSBB planners decide it is time to market the event more broadly.

### **The Future of the RWB Tournament**

The question that needs to be asked is what do local officials and planners envision for this event in the future? A current constraint on future growth is the size of the current marina where the 2000 event was held. But there are other considerations besides the total number of boats that can be accommodated at some future date, namely, what is an appropriate number and balance of locals and non-locals in future tournament events? It can be argued that tournaments need to have a certain base of locals involved to ensure community buy-in and to minimize unwanted social impacts. Are tournament planners prepared to develop marketing strategies necessary to attract an increasing number of non-local anglers? Also, what about the effects of other variables involved in tournament planning, namely, the duration of the tournament event (number of days) and the number of non-fishing individuals who accompany the anglers to the tournament?

Accordingly, we have developed an Excel spreadsheet (Appendix I) that RWB tournament officials can use to understand the implications of planning decisions. Specifically, we made use of the data collected from anglers participating in the 2000 RWB event to develop a tool that local tournament officials can use to better understand the economic impact trade-offs of their decisions. Our study identified the extent of direct and indirect economic impacts associated with the 2000 event; only those involved in planning next year's event and those to follow can address the matters of event goals and objectives. These are decisions to be made locally and not by researchers.

This study needs to be replicated hopefully at some later date and done in a way to enable comparisons with the data collection presented here. This is the only way to evaluate whether or not tournament goals and objectives are being met or not over time.

If the RWB Tournament is to be viewed from an economic development perspective, emphasis needs to shift from attracting and planning activities for locals to attracting and planning activities for non-locals. The focus needs to be on providing related events and activities that enhance the fishing experiences of the tournament participants and their friends and families. Eventually, this will make this tournament event competitive for participants. Also, this is what will make anglers choose to participate in this fishing tournament over one that is closer to home but lacks the amenities and activities provided at the the RWB Tournament.

While perhaps not obviously connected to economic impacts at the local level, tournament directors and city officials need to be concerned with angler responses regarding

their reasons for various levels of satisfaction with the two tournaments. Anglers from both tournaments disagreed most with statements that they caught more fish than expected and that they caught what they considered to be a “trophy” fish. Fishing tournaments cannot be conducted independent of the current status of fish stocks in the adjacent U.S. Atlantic Ocean. To the extent there is a general reduction in the size and quality of fish stocks due to over-fishing and water quality, we can expect tournament anglers to be displaced to other fishing locales. The upshot here is that tournament officials have a major stake in fisheries conservation. They need to join with other recreational fishing interests in their efforts to reduce overfishing by commercial fishing interests. Likewise, they need to promote ethical practices and angler behavior at tournament events. If fish stocks continue to decrease, angler satisfaction with the tournament fishing can be expected to decrease as well. When this occurs, anglers will be attracted to tournament events elsewhere, resulting in economic impact losses to the local community. The take home message here is that the current status of fish stocks is connected to fishing quality, which is linked to angler satisfaction, which is linked to their willingness to participate in local fishing tournaments on a regular basis. Fishing quality now and in the future is an important consideration for successful fishing tournaments.

## References

- Bohnsack, B. L. and R. B. Ditton. 1999. Demographics, participation, attitudes, and management preferences of Texas anglers. Human Dimensions of Fisheries Laboratory Report #HD-611. Texas A&M University, College Station.
- Brown, T. L., D. L. Decker, and N. A. Connelly. 1989. Response to mail surveys on resource-based recreation topics: a behavioral model and an empirical analysis. *Leisure Sciences* 11: 99- 110.
- Dillman, D. A. 1978. Mail and telephone surveys: The total design method. John Wiley and Sons, New York.
- Ditton, R. B., and L. A. Arneson. 1986. 1984 Deep Sea Roundup Fishing Tournament: An analysis of participants' characteristics, attitudes and expenditures. TAMU-SG-86-203. Texas A&M University Sea Grant College Program, College Station.
- Ditton, R. B., B. L. Bohnsack, and K. M. Hunt. 1998. Understanding future issues in saltwater fisheries management in Texas. Human Dimensions of Fisheries Research Laboratory Report #HD-610, Texas A&M University, College Station.
- Ditton, R. B. and D. K. Loomis. 1988. 1985 Hall of Fame Fishing Tournament: an analysis of participants' characteristics, attitudes and expenditures. TAMU-SG-88-201. Texas A&M University Sea Grant College Program, College Station.
- Ditton, R. B. and Loomis, D. K. 1985. 1983 Texas International Fishing Tournament: An analysis of participants' characteristics, attitudes and expenditures. TAMU-SG-85-202. Texas A&M University Sea Grant College Program, College Station.
- Ditton, R. B., D. K. Anderson, B. L. Bohnsack, and S.G. Sutton. 2000a. 1999 Texas International Fishing Tournament: Participants' Characteristics, Participation in Fishing, Attitudes, Expenditures, and Economic Impacts. Human Dimensions of Fisheries Research Laboratory Report #HD-614, Texas A&M University, College Station.
- Ditton, R. B., D. K. Anderson, J. F. Thigpen, B. L. Bohnsack, and S. G. Sutton. 2000b. 1999 Pirates Cove Big Game Tournaments: Participants' Characteristics, Participation in Fishing, Attitudes, Expenditures, and Economic Impacts. Human Dimensions of Fisheries Research Laboratory Report #HD-615, Texas A&M University, College Station.
- Fedler, A. J., R. B. Ditton, and M. D. Duda. 1998. Factors influencing recreational fishing and boating participation. Sportfishing and Boating Partnership Council, Alexandria, Virginia.
- Filion, F. 1980. Human surveys in wildlife management techniques manual. Pages 441-454. The Wildlife Society, Washington, D.C.

- Fisher, M. R. 1996. Estimating the effect of nonresponse bias on angler surveys. *Transaction of the American Fisheries Society* 125(1): 118-126.
- Gillis, K. S. and R. B. Ditton. 1998. Tournament and non-tournament recreational billfish anglers to examine the efficacy of hosting competitive billfish angling events in southern Baja, Mexico. *Journal of Festival Management and Event Tourism* 5: 147-158.
- Kirkley, J. 1997. Saltwater angling and its economic importance to Virginia. Virginia Sea Grant Publications VSG-97-04.
- Milon, J. W., M. J. Ellerbrock, G. L. Brinkman, and C. M. Logan. 1982. Economic impact and participant characteristics for the First Annual Greater Jacksonville Natural Light Kingfish Tournament. Technical Paper No. 21. Department of Food and Resource Economics, University of Florida, Gainesville.
- McNamara, J. F. 1994. *Surveys and experiments in education research*. Technomic Publishing Co., Lancaster, PA.
- Salant, P. and D. A. Dillman. 1994. *How to conduct your own survey*. John Wiley and Sons. New York.

## **Appendix A: Tables**

**Table 1. Response Rates**

<b>Event</b>	<b># Mailed</b>	<b>Returned Usable</b>	<b>Returned Non-usable</b>	<b>Screened Out</b>	<b>Not Returned</b>	<b>Non-Deliverable</b>	<b>Effective Response Rate</b>
<b>RWB</b>	219	102	2	6	104	5	50.9
<b>BFSBB</b>	44	20	1	4	14	4	62.5

**Table 2. Frequency Distribution of Anglers Gender by Tournament**

<b>Gender</b>	<b>RWB</b>		<b>BFSBB</b>	
	<b>Absolute Frequency</b>	<b>Adjusted Frequency (%)</b>	<b>Absolute Frequency</b>	<b>Adjusted Frequency (%)</b>
Male	98	99.0	N/A	N/A
Female	1	1.0	N/A	N/A
No response	3		N/A	N/A
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>100.0</b>		

**Table 3. Frequency Distribution of Anglers Age by Tournament**

<b>Age</b>	<b>RWB</b>		<b>BFSBB</b>	
	<b>Absolute Frequency</b>	<b>Adjusted Frequency (%)</b>	<b>Absolute Frequency</b>	<b>Adjusted Frequency (%)</b>
18-27	3	3.0	1	5.0
28-37	26	26.3	9	45.0
38-47	31	31.3	8	40.0
48-57	26	26.3	2	10.0
58-67	10	10.1	0	0.0
68-72	3	3.0	0	0.0
No response	3		0	
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>100.0</b>
Mean	45.0		37.1	
Standard Deviation	10.7		7.6	

**Table 4. Frequency Distribution of Anglers by Household Income Category by Tournament**

Income	RWB		BFSBB	
	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (%)	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (%)
Under \$20,000	0	0.0	0	0.0
\$20,000 – \$39,000	4	4.4	2	11.1
\$40,000 – \$59,000	5	5.5	4	22.2
\$60,000 – \$79,000	3	3.3	2	11.1
\$80,000 – \$99,000	17	18.6	1	5.6
\$100,000 – \$119,000	13	14.3	2	11.1
\$120,000 – \$139,000	11	12.1	3	16.6
\$140,000 – \$159,000	4	4.4	0	0.0
\$160,000 – \$179,000	2	2.2	1	5.6
\$180,000 – \$199,000	2	2.2	1	5.6
\$200,000 – \$219,000	2	2.2	0	0.0
\$220,000 or above	28	30.8	2	11.1
No response	11		2	
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 5. Frequency Distribution of Anglers Who Returned the Survey by Residence Location by Tournament**

Residence Location	RWB		BFSBB	
	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (%)	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (%)
Virginia Beach, VA	62	60.8	17	85.0
Other parts of VA	20	19.6	1	5.0
Non-residents	20	19.6	2	10.0
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 6. BFSBB Anglers by their Residence Location; Determined by Three-Digit Zip Code Area (n = 20)**

Zip					
Zip Code	City	%	Code	City	%
12139	Piseco, NY	5.0	23454	Virginia Beach, VA	20.0
13451	Maplecrest, NY	5.0	23456	Virginia Beach, VA	5.0
23221	Richmond, VA	5.0	23462	Virginia Beach, VA	5.0
23451	Virginia Beach, VA	45.0	23464	Virginia Beach, VA	5.0
23452	Virginia Beach, VA	5.0			
				Total	100.0

**Table 7. RWB Anglers by their Residence Location; Determined by Three-Digit Zip Code Area (n = 102 )**

<b>Zip Code</b>	<b>City</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Zip Code</b>	<b>City</b>	<b>%</b>
680	Puerto Rico	.98	23229	Richmond, VA	.98
12451	Leeds, NY	1.96	23231	Richmond, VA	.98
12454	Maplecrest, NY	.98	23310	Cape Charles, VA	1.96
13454	Salisbury, NY	.98	23320	Chesapeake, VA	.98
13456	Sauquoit, NY	.98	23451	Virginia Beach, VA	35.29
13693	Three Mile Bay, NY	.98	23452	Virginia Beach, VA	2.94
17331	Hanover, PA	.98	23454	Virginia Beach, VA	7.84
18612	Dallas, PA	.98	23455	Virginia Beach, VA	7.84
19607	Sinking Springs, PA	.98	23456	Virginia Beach, VA	5.88
20646	LaPlata, MD	.98	23464	Virginia Beach, VA	.98
20695	White Plains, MD	.98	23508	Norfolk, VA	.98
20815	Chevy Chase, MD	.98	23518	Norfolk, VA	1.96
21623	Church Hill, MD	.98	23601	Newport News, VA	.98
22482	Kilmarnock, VA	.98	23662	Poquoson, VA	1.96
22579	Wicomico Church, VA	1.96	23692	Yorktown, VA	.98
23058	Glen Allen, VA	.98	23696	Seaford, VA	.98
23091	Little Plymouth, VA	.98	27954	Manteo, NC	1.96
23103	Manakin Sabot, VA	.98	29910	Bluffton, SC	.98
23139	Powhatan, VA	.98	33410	West Palm Beach, FL	1.96
			95212	Stockton, CA	.98
				Total	100.0

**Table 8. Frequency Distribution of Anglers by Number of Days Fished in the Previous Year by Tournament**

Number of Days Fished	RWB		BFSBB	
	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (%)	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (%)
0	0	0.0	1	5.6
1-13	14	15.4	14	77.7
14-33	29	31.8	2	11.1
34-63	27	29.7	1	5.6
64-123	13	14.3	0	0.0
124-365	*8	8.8	**0	0.0
No response	5		1	
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>100.0</b>
Mean	50.0		8.2	
Standard Deviation	48.2		8.7	

\*6 Outliers; \*\*1 Outlier

**Table 9. Frequency Distribution of Anglers by Number of Days Fished in the United States in the Previous Year by Tournament**

Number of days Fished	RWB		BFSBB	
	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (%)	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (%)
0	0	0.0	1	5.5
1-13	16	16.2	14	77.8
14-33	33	33.3	3	16.7
34-63	27	27.3	**0	0.0
64-123	13	13.1	0	0.0
124-365*	*10	10.1	0	0.0
No response	0		1	0.0
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>100.0</b>
Mean	49.8		7.4	
Standard Deviation	48.4		7.5	

\*3 outliers; \*\*1 outlier

**Table 10. Frequency Distribution of Anglers by Number of Days Fished Outside of the United States in the Previous Year by Tournament**

Number of days Fished	RWB		BFSBB	
	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (%)	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (%)
0	49	52.7	15	75.0
1-3	21	22.6	2	10.0
4-6	12	12.9	2	10.0
7-10	7	7.5	0	0.0
11 or more	*4	4.3	1	5.0
No response	4		0	
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>20</b>	
Mean	2.3		1.4	
Standard Deviation	3.6		3.4	

\*5 outliers

**Table 11. Frequency Distribution of Anglers Who Participated in Each Type of Fishing During the Previous Year by Tournament**

Type of Fishing	RWB		BFSBB	
	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (%)	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (%)
Freshwater	33	32.4	2	10.5
Saltwater from a boat	102	100.0	18	94.7
Saltwater from a shore/pier	25	24.5	3	15.8

**Table 11a. Number of Days Anglers Spent Participating in Each Type of Fishing During the Previous Year by Tournament**

Type of Fishing	RWB		BFSBB	
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
Freshwater	3.4	5.6	2.8	4.4
Saltwater from a boat	35.7	28.4	4.6	4.6
Saltwater from a shore/pier	3.2	4.5	1.8	2.2

**Table 12. Frequency Distribution of Anglers by Number of Saltwater Tournaments in the Previous Year by Tournament**

Number of Tournaments	RWB		BFSBB	
	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (%)	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (%)
0	12	11.9	4	22.2
1	26	25.7	14	77.8
2	16	15.9	0	0.0
3	18	17.8	**0	0.0
4	9	8.9	**0	0.0
5	6	5.9	0	0.0
6	5	5.0	0	0.0
7 or more	*9	8.9	0	0.0
No response	0		0	
<b>TOTALS</b>	101	100.0	18	100.0
Mean	2.8		0.8	
Standard Deviation	2.4		0.4	

\*1 outlier;\*\*2 outliers

**Table 13. Frequency Distribution of RWB Anglers by Fish Species Sought Most Often**

Species Sought	Preference			Total	
	1 <sup>st</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>	3 <sup>rd</sup>	N	%
White Marlin	10	15	1	26	8.7
Billfish	13	2	4	19	6.3
Marlin	26	8	6	40	13.4
Tuna	21	29	24	74	24.7
Drum/Trout/Seatrout/Spotted Weakfish	1	0	1	2	0.7
Amberjack	0	0	1	1	0.3
Blue Marlin	18	5	3	26	8.7
Sailfish	2	6	9	17	5.7
Wahoo	1	5	11	17	5.7
Tarpon	2	0	0	2	0.7
Striped Bass	6	7	12	25	8.3
Flounder	1	3	6	10	3.3
Yellow fin Tuna	0	0	2	2	0.7
Blue fin tuna	0	1	0	1	0.3
Spotted Trout	1	0	0	1	0.3
Spot	0	2	0	2	0.7
Bonefish	0	3	0	3	1.0
Bottom	0	1	0	1	0.3
Salmon	0	1	0	1	0.3
Mahi Mahi/Dolphin/Dorado	0	11	11	22	7.3
Ling	0	1	0	1	0.3
Sharks	0	0	4	4	1.3
Bluefish	0	0	2	2	0.7
All	0	0	1	1	0.3
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>301</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 14. Frequency Distribution of BFSBB Anglers by Fish Species Sought Most Often**

Species Sought	Preference			Total	
	1 <sup>st</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>	3 <sup>rd</sup>	N	%
Wahoo	0	1	1	2	4.1
Sailfish	3	0	0	3	6.3
Marlin	7	1	1	9	18.8
Redfish	0	0	0	0	0.0
Blue Marlin	1	0	0	1	2.1
Tuna	4	7	4	15	31.2
Dolphin/Dorado/Mahi Mahi	0	0	5	5	10.4
Billfish	1	0	0	1	2.1
White Marlin	0	3	0	3	6.3
Rockfish/Striper	1	3	0	4	8.3
Ling/Cobia	0	0	1	1	2.1
Flounder	0	2	0	2	4.1
Mako Shark	0	0	1	1	2.1
Anything	1	0	0	1	2.1
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 15. Frequency Distribution of Anglers by Whether They Put Most of Their Effort Into Catching One Species by Tournament**

<b>Effort?</b>	<b>RWB</b>		<b>BFSBB</b>	
	<b>Absolute Frequency</b>	<b>Adjusted Frequency (%)</b>	<b>Absolute Frequency</b>	<b>Adjusted Frequency (%)</b>
Yes	48	48.0	9	45.0
No	52	52.0	11	55.0
No response	2		0	
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 16. Frequency Distribution of Anglers by Species They Target Most by Tournament**

<b>Species Targeted</b>	<b>RWB</b>		<b>BFSBB</b>	
	<b>Absolute Frequency</b>	<b>Adjusted Frequency (%)</b>	<b>Absolute Frequency</b>	<b>Adjusted Frequency (%)</b>
White Marlin	7	14.9	0	0.0
Yellow fin tuna	1	2.1	0	0.0
Marlin	14	29.8	2	28.5
Billfish	9	19.1	1	14.3
Blue Marlin	3	6.4	0	0.0
Mako Shark	1	2.1	0	0.0
Flounder	2	4.3	0	0.0
Sailfish	1	2.1	1	14.3
Rockfish	6	12.8	0	0.0
Tuna	2	4.3	3	42.9
All	1	2.1	0	0.0
No response	1		2	
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 17. Frequency Distribution of Anglers by the Importance of Fishing to Them Compared to Other Outdoor Recreational Activities by Tournament**

<b>Importance</b>	<b>RWB</b>		<b>BFSBB</b>	
	<b>Absolute Frequency</b>	<b>Adjusted Frequency (%)</b>	<b>Absolute Frequency</b>	<b>Adjusted Frequency (%)</b>
Most important activity	77	75.5	3	15.8
Second most important activity	15	14.7	4	21.1
Third most important activity	3	2.9	2	10.5
Only one of many activities	7	6.9	10	52.6
No response	0		1	
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 18. Frequency Distribution of Anglers by Their Self-Evaluated Fishing Ability Compared to Other Saltwater Anglers by Tournament**

<b>Ability</b>	<b>RWB</b>		<b>BFSBB</b>	
	<b>Absolute Frequency</b>	<b>Adjusted Frequency (%)</b>	<b>Absolute Frequency</b>	<b>Adjusted Frequency (%)</b>
Less skilled	13	12.8	9	45.0
Equally skilled	56	54.9	11	55.0
More skilled	33	32.3	0	0.0
No response	0		0	
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>102</b>		<b>20</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 19. Frequency Distribution of Anglers by Whether They Own a Boat by Tournament**

<b>Own Boat?</b>	<b>RWB</b>		<b>BFSBB</b>	
	<b>Absolute Frequency</b>	<b>Adjusted Frequency (%)</b>	<b>Absolute Frequency</b>	<b>Adjusted Frequency (%)</b>
Yes	85	84.2	7	36.8
No	16	15.8	12	63.2
No response	1		1	
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 20. Frequency Distribution of Anglers by the Lengths of Their Longest Powerboat by Tournament**

<b>Length (ft)</b>	<b>RWB</b>		<b>BFSBB</b>	
	<b>Absolute Frequency</b>	<b>Adjusted Frequency (%)</b>	<b>Absolute Frequency</b>	<b>Adjusted Frequency (%)</b>
1-12	0	0.0	0	0.0
13-16	2	2.4	1	14.3
17-20	7	8.4	1	14.3
21-24	19	22.9	1	14.3
25-30	21	25.3	2	28.5
31-40	14	16.9	1	14.3
40+	20	24.1	1	14.3
No response	19		13	
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>100.0</b>
Mean	32.5		31.9	
Standard Deviation	13.0		20.6	

**Table 21. Frequency Distribution of Anglers by Number of Rod and Reel Combinations Owned by Tournament**

<b>Number of Combinations</b>	<b>RWB</b>		<b>BFSBB</b>	
	<b>Absolute Frequency</b>	<b>Adjusted Frequency (%)</b>	<b>Absolute Frequency</b>	<b>Adjusted Frequency (%)</b>
0	2	2.0	11	61.1
1-3	5	5.0	4	22.2
4-6	6	6.0	2	11.1
7-9	7	7.0	0	0.0
10-12	21	21.0	1	5.6
13-15	7	7.0	**0	0.0
16-20	16	16.0	0	0.0
21-25	13	13.0	0	0.0
26-30	11	11.0	0	0.0
31+	*12	12.0	0	10.0
No response	1		1	
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>100.0</b>
Mean	18.9		1.6	
Standard Deviation	12.5		2.6	

\*1outlier; \*\*1outlier

**Table 22. Frequency Distribution of RWB Anglers by Their Feelings About Recreational Fishing**

Statement of Feelings	Median	Strongly	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly	
		Disagree	2	3	4	Agree	
		1	2	3	4	5	
		***Values given are percentages***					
The more fish I catch, the happier I am	4.0	3.9	9.8	18.6	43.2	24.5	
A fishing trip can be successful even if no fish are caught	4.0	3.9	14.7	18.6	53.0	9.8	
I usually eat the fish I catch	4.0	1.0	6.9	17.8	33.7	40.6	
A successful fishing trip is one in which many fish are caught	4.0	7.0	17.0	24.0	38.0	14.0	
I would rather catch 1 or 2 big fish than 10 smaller fish	4.0	4.0	5.9	22.8	39.6	27.7	
When I go fishing, I am just as happy if I don't catch any fish	2.0	7.1	47.5	23.2	20.2	2.0	
It doesn't matter to me what type of fish I catch	3.0	7.9	33.7	31.7	23.8	2.9	
The bigger the fish I catch, the better the fishing trip	3.5	2.0	21.6	26.4	33.3	16.7	
I'm just as happy if I don't keep the fish I catch	4.0	2.0	8.9	17.8	47.5	23.8	
I like to fish where there are several kinds of fish to catch	4.0	0.0	1.0	7.9	62.4	28.7	
I want to keep all the fish I catch	2.0	32.0	43.0	17.0	5.0	3.0	
I'm happiest with the fishing trip if I catch a challenging game fish	4.0	0.0	2.0	14.1	48.5	35.4	
I'm just as happy if I release the fish I catch	4.0	0.0	4.0	14.0	36.0	46.0	
If I thought I wouldn't catch any fish, I wouldn't go fishing	3.0	18.8	27.7	16.8	22.8	13.9	
I like to fish where I know I have a chance to catch a "trophy" fish	4.0	0.0	12.9	22.8	42.5	21.8	
When I go fishing, I'm not satisfied unless I catch at least something	3.0	3.0	37.6	19.8	31.7	7.9	

**Table 23. Frequency Distributions of BFSBB Anglers by Their Feelings About Recreational Fishing**

Statement of Feelings	Median	Strongly	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly	
		Disagree	2	3	4	Agree	
		1	2	3	4	5	
		***Values given are percentages***					
The more fish I catch, the happier I am	5.0	0.0	10.0	5.0	25.0	60.0	
A fishing trip can be successful even if no fish are caught	4.0	0.0	15.0	20.0	50.0	15.0	
I usually eat the fish I catch	5.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	30.0	60.0	
A successful fishing trip is one in which many fish are caught	4.0	5.3	5.3	31.6	47.3	10.5	
I would rather catch 1 or 2 big fish than 10 smaller fish	4.0	5.0	5.0	30.0	40.0	20.0	
When I go fishing, I am just as happy if I don't catch any fish	3.0	10.0	20.0	30.0	25.0	15.0	
It doesn't matter to me what type of fish I catch	3.0	0.0	35.0	30.0	25.0	10.0	
The bigger the fish I catch, the better the fishing trip	4.0	0.0	15.0	30.0	40.0	15.0	
I'm just as happy if I don't keep the fish I catch	4.0	5.0	10.0	30.0	30.0	25.0	
I like to fish where there are several kinds of fish to catch	4.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	65.0	25.0	
I want to keep all the fish I catch	2.0	15.8	42.1	36.8	0.0	5.3	
I'm happiest with the fishing trip if I catch a challenging game fish	4.0	0.0	5.0	25.0	45.0	25.0	
I'm just as happy if I release the fish I catch	4.0	5.2	0.0	15.8	31.6	47.4	
If I thought I wouldn't catch any fish, I wouldn't go fishing	2.0	25.0	30.0	20.0	20.0	5.0	
I like to fish where I know I have a chance to catch a "trophy" fish	3.5	10.0	10.0	30.0	25.0	25.0	
When I go fishing, I'm not satisfied unless I catch at least something	3.0	5.0	30.0	35.0	25.0	5.0	

**Table 24. Frequency Distribution of Anglers by Type of Group They Fished With Most Often by Tournament**

<b>Group</b>	<b>RWB</b>		<b>BFSBB</b>	
	<b>Absolute Frequency</b>	<b>Adjusted Frequency (%)</b>	<b>Absolute Frequency</b>	<b>Adjusted Frequency (%)</b>
Alone	3	2.9	0	0.0
Family	4	3.9	2	16.7
Friends	55	53.9	10	55.5
Family & friends together	39	38.3	5	27.8
Club	1	1.0	0	0.0
No response	0		2	
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>102</b>		<b>18</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 25. Frequency Distribution of Anglers by the Number of Friends that Fish by Tournament**

<b>Number of Friends</b>	<b>RWB</b>		<b>BFSBB</b>	
	<b>Absolute Frequency</b>	<b>Adjusted Frequency (%)</b>	<b>Absolute Frequency</b>	<b>Adjusted Frequency (%)</b>
None	0	0.0	0	0.0
Some	57	56.4	11	57.9
Most	44	43.6	8	42.1
No response	1		1	
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 26. Frequency Distribution of Anglers by the Number of Their Co-workers that Fish by Tournament**

<b>Number of Co-workers</b>	<b>RWB</b>		<b>BFSBB</b>	
	<b>Absolute Frequency</b>	<b>Adjusted Frequency (%)</b>	<b>Absolute Frequency</b>	<b>Adjusted Frequency (%)</b>
None	8	8.1	4	22.2
Some	75	75.8	12	67.7
Most	16	16.1	2	11.1
No response	3		2	
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 27. Frequency Distribution of Anglers by the Number of Vacation Trips that Include Fishing by Tournament**

<b>Number of Trips</b>	<b>RWB</b>		<b>BFSBB</b>	
	<b>Absolute Frequency</b>	<b>Adjusted Frequency (%)</b>	<b>Absolute Frequency</b>	<b>Adjusted Frequency (%)</b>
None	10	9.8	1	5.6
Some	54	52.9	11	61.1
Most	38	39.3	6	33.3
No response	0		2	
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 28. Frequency Distribution of Anglers by Whether They Are Members of a Fishing Club/ Organization by Tournament**

Member of Club?	RWB		BFSBB	
	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (%)	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (%)
Yes	39	38.6	1	5.3
No	62	61.4	18	94.7
No response	1		1	
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 29. Frequency Distribution of Anglers by Their Favorite Fishing Clubs/Organizations by Tournament**

Club	RWB		BFSBB	
	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (%)	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (%)
RFA – Recreational Fishing Alliance	2	6.5	*N/A	N/A
CCA	8	25.8	N/A	N/A
IGFA	4	13.0	N/A	N/A
TBF	1	3.2	N/A	N/A
VBAC	1	3.2	N/A	N/A
WBS	1	3.2	N/A	N/A
MSSA	1	3.2	N/A	N/A
Easternshore Marlin Club	1	3.2	N/A	N/A
Virgina Beach Billfish Foundation	4	13.0	N/A	N/A
Peninsula Saltwater (PSWSFA)	3	9.7	N/A	N/A
Virginia Beach Anglers	1	3.2	N/A	N/A
Hatteras Marlin Club	1	3.2	N/A	N/A
Virginia Tagging Program	1	3.2	N/A	N/A
Virginia Coastal FF Association	1	3.2	N/A	N/A
The Billfish Foundation	1	3.2	N/A	N/A
No response	9			
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>100.0</b>		

\*The 1 BFSBB angler who belonged to a club/organization did not specify which one

**Table 30. Frequency Distribution of Anglers by the Number of Fishing Clubs/Organizations They Belong to by Tournament**

Number of Clubs	RWB		BFSBB	
	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (%)	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (%)
1	22	61.1	*N/A	N/A
2	7	19.4	N/A	N/A
3	5	13.9	N/A	N/A
4	2	5.6	N/A	N/A
5+	0	0.0	N/A	N/A
No response	66		N/A	N/A
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>100.0</b>		

\*The 1 BFSBB angler who belonged to a club/organization did not specify how many

**Table 31. Frequency Distribution of Anglers by Whether They Subscribe to Fishing/Boating Magazines by Tournament**

Subscribe?	RWB		BFSBB	
	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (%)	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (%)
Yes	75	73.5	5	25.0
No	27	26.5	15	75.0
No response	0		0	
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 32. Frequency Distribution of Anglers by Number of Fishing/Boating Magazines They Subscribe to by Tournament**

Number of Magazines	RWB		BFSBB	
	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (%)	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (%)
1	10	13.9	2	40.0
2	16	22.2	1	20.0
3	20	27.8	2	40.0
4	12	16.7	0	0.0
5	5	6.9	0	0.0
6+	9	12.5	0	0.0
No response	3		0	
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 33. Frequency Distribution of Anglers by Their Favorite Fishing/Boating Magazines by Tournament**

Magazine	RWB		BFSBB	
	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (%)	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (%)
Saltwater Sportsman	8	12.4	0	0.0
Boat US	2	3.2	0	0.0
Saltwater Fisherman	2	3.2	0	0.0
Fisherman	1	1.5	0	0.0
Marlin	33	50.8	4	100.0
Sounding	1	1.5	0	0.0
Saltwater	4	6.2	0	0.0
The Sportfishing Report	5	7.7	0	0.0
Big Game Fishing Journal	1	1.5	0	0.0
Chesapeake Bay	1	1.5	0	0.0
Yachting, Motorboat & Sailing	1	1.5	0	0.0
The Fisherman	1	1.5	0	0.0
Power and Motor Yacht	1	1.5	0	0.0
Power Boat	1	1.5	0	0.0
International Game Fishing Journal	1	1.5	0	0.0
Boating	1	1.5	0	0.0
Saltwater Fishing	1	1.5	0	0.0
No response	5		1	
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 34. Frequency Distribution of Anglers by Whether They Have Called or Written an Elected Official or Attended a Public Hearing on a Fisheries Matter by Tournament**

Involvement	RWB		BFSBB	
	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (%)	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (%)
Called elected official	30	30.6	0	0.0
Written elected official	29	30.2	2	10.0
Attended Public Hearing	45	45.0	3	15.0

**Table 35. Frequency Distribution of Anglers by the Number of Days Fished in Respective Tournament**

Days Fished	RWB		BFSBB	
	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (%)	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (%)
0	0	0.0	0	0.0
1	15	15.0	18	94.7
2	12	12.0	1	5.3
3	66	66.0	0	0.0
4 or more	7	7.0	0	0.0
No Response	2		1	
TOTALS	100	100.0	19	100.0

**Table 36. Frequency Distribution of Anglers by the Number of Nights They Stayed in the Virginia Beach Area by Tournament**

Number of Nights	RWB		BFSBB	
	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (%)	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (%)
0	14	26.4	1	20.0
1-2	4	7.6	2	40.0
3-4	17	32.1	0	0.0
5-6	12	22.6	0	0.0
7+	6	11.3	2	40.0
No response	46		15	
TOTALS	53	100.0	5	100.0
Mean	3.2		3.8	
Standard Deviation	2.4		3.5	

**Table 37. Frequency Distribution of Anglers by the Number of Additional Persons They Brought to Respective Tournament**

Number of Additional Persons	RWB		BFSBB	
	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (%)	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (%)
0	36	37.1	9	53.0
1-2	24	24.7	3	17.6
3-4	21	21.7	2	11.8
5+	*16	16.5	**3	17.6
No response	4		1	
TOTALS	97	100.0	17	100.0
Mean	2.2		1.4	
Standard Deviation	2.7		1.9	

\*1outlier; \*\*2 outliers

**Table 38. Frequency Distribution of Anglers by the Type of Lodging They Used in the Virginia Beach Area by Tournament**

Type of Lodging	RWB		BFSBB	
	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (%)	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (%)
Hotel/Motel <sup>1</sup>	13	13.1	1	6.7
Private Residence	58	58.6	12	80.0
Boat	8	8.1	0	0.0
Condo/Home Rental	3	3.0	0	0.0
Other <sup>2</sup>	17	17.2	2	13.3
No response	3		5	
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.0</b>

<sup>1</sup>Some respondents answered more than one type of lodging, increasing the total number of item respondents.

<sup>2</sup>See Table 39a for identification and frequencies of other types of lodging used.

**Table 38a. Frequency Distribution of Anglers by the Other Types of Lodging Used in the Virginia Beach Area by Tournament**

Other Type of Lodging	RWB		BFSBB	
	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (%)	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (%)
My home/live there	17	100.0	2	100.0
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>17</b>		<b>2</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 39. Frequency Distributions of Anglers by the Sources of Information From Which They Found Out About the Tournament by Tournament**

Source of Information	RWB		BFSBB	
	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (%)	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (%)
Friends	80	48.8	14	51.9
Radio	2	1.2	1	3.7
Television	3	1.8	0	0.0
Mail advertisement	10	6.1	0	0.0
Magazine	21	12.8	1	3.7
Newspaper	12	7.3	0	0.0
Internet	27	16.5	3	11.1
Other <sup>1</sup>	9	5.5	8	29.6
<b>TOTALS<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>164</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100.0</b>

<sup>1</sup> See Table 39a for identification and frequencies of other sources of information.

<sup>2</sup> Some respondents listed more than one source of information.

**Table 39a. Frequency Distribution of Anglers by the Other Sources of Information From Which They Found Out About the Tournament by Tournament**

Other Source of Information	RWB		BFSBB	
	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (%)	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (%)
Friends/Family	1	11.1	0	0.0
Word of Mouth	2	22.3	0	0.0
Red, White and Blue Promoter	1	11.1	0	0.0
Employer/Work	1	11.1	1	12.5
Club	1	11.1	0	0.0
Phone	1	11.1	0	0.0
Captain	1	11.1	0	0.0
Marina	1	11.1	1	12.5
Sertoma By the Bay	0	0.0	5	62.5
Committee	0	0.0	1	12.5
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 40. Frequency Distribution of Anglers Who Have Viewed the Tournament Web Page Since Last Year by Tournament**

Web Page?	RWB		BFSBB	
	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (%)	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (%)
Yes	47	48.0	14	70.0
No	51	52.0	6	30.0
No response	4		0	
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 41. Frequency Distributions of Anglers as to Their Evaluation of Overall Satisfaction with Their Respective Tournament by Tournament**

Level of Satisfaction	RWB		BFSBB	
	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (%)	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (%)
Not at all satisfied	1	1.0	0	0.0
Slightly satisfied	5	5.1	0	0.0
Moderately satisfied	39	39.8	4	20.0
Very satisfied	41	41.8	7	35.0
Extremely satisfied	12	12.3	9	45.0
No response	4		0	
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>100.0</b>
Median*	4.0		4.0	

\*On a five-point scale ranging from 1 “not at all satisfied” to 5 “extremely sat

**Table 42. Frequency Distribution of RWB Anglers by Their Experience Preferences (Reasons for Fishing) in Saltwater Tournaments**

<b>Importance of Statement as a Reason for Fishing the Red, White, and Blue Tournament</b>	<b>Median</b>	<b>Not at All Important</b>	<b>Slightly Important</b>	<b>Moderately Important</b>	<b>Very Important</b>	<b>Extremely Important</b>
		<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
***Values given are percentages***						
To be outdoors	4.0	3.2	5.3	22.3	50	19.2
For family recreation	3.0	14.3	13.2	37.4	27.5	7.7
To experience new and different things	4.0	7.5	15.1	24.7	39.8	12.9
For relaxation	4.0	4.4	12	21.7	38	23.9
To be close to the sea	4.0	1.1	6.5	16.2	39.8	36.6
To obtain fish for eating	2.0	25.8	26.9	30.1	12.9	4.3
To get away from demands of other people	3.0	15.2	13	29.4	21.7	20.7
For the experience of the catch	4.0	0.0	1.1	16.3	50	32.6
To test my equipment	3.0	23.9	25	28.3	17.4	5.4
To be with friends	4.0	1.1	5.5	13.2	47.3	33.0
To experience unpolluted natural surroundings	4.0	1.1	5.4	25.0	44.6	23.9
To win a tournament trophy/prize money	3.0	11.8	15.1	24.7	24.7	23.7
To develop my skills	4.0	2.2	8.7	25.0	42.4	21.7
To get away from the regular routine	4.0	5.4	3.3	26.1	39.1	26.1
To obtain a trophy fish	4.0	15.1	10.8	23.7	30.1	20.4
For the challenge or sport	4.0	1.1	2.2	10.8	44.1	41.9
To experience adventure and excitement	4.0	1.1	1.1	17.0	39.4	41.5

**Table 43. Frequency Distribution of BFSBB Anglers by Their Experience Preferences (Reasons for Fishing) in Saltwater Tournaments**

<b>Importance of Statement as a Reason for Fishing the Buff Foundation / Sertoma by the Bay Tournament</b>	<b>Median</b>	<b>Not at All Important 1</b>	<b>Slightly Important 2</b>	<b>Moderately Important 3</b>	<b>Very Important 4</b>	<b>Extremely Important 5</b>
***Values given are percentages***						
To be outdoors	4.0	0.0	0.0	15.0	45.0	40.0
For family recreation	4.0	20.1	5.0	20.0	35.0	20.0
To experience new and different things	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	40.0	45.0
For relaxation	4.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	35.0	45.0
To be close to the sea	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	35.0	65.0
To obtain fish for eating	3.0	5.0	30.0	45.0	5.0	15.0
To get away from demands of other people	3.0	10.0	20.0	25.0	15.0	30.0
For the experience of the catch	4.0	0.0	5.0	15.0	35.0	45.0
To test my equipment	1.0	65.0	5.0	15.0	5.0	10.0
To be with friends	4.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	45.0	45.0
To experience unpolluted natural surroundings	4.0	5.3	0.0	5.3	42.1	47.4
To win a tournament trophy/prize money	3.0	30.0	5.0	30.0	20.0	15.0
To develop my skills	4.0	15.0	20.0	10.0	20.0	35.0
To get away from the regular routine	4.0	5.0	5.0	15.0	40.0	35.0
To obtain a trophy fish	3.0	15.0	15.0	25.0	30.0	15.0
For the challenge or sport	4.0	5.0	0.0	15.0	40.0	40.0
To experience adventure and excitement	5.0	5.0	0.0	5.0	35.0	55.0

**Table 44. Frequency Distribution of RWB Anglers' Feelings About Their Fishing Trip and Participation in the Tournament**

Statement of Feelings About Fishing Trip and Participation in the Red, White and Blue Tournament	Median	Strongly	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly
		Disagree 1	2	3	4	Agree 5
***Values given are percentages***						
I thoroughly enjoyed the tournament	4.0	0.0	1.1	10.6	61.7	26.6
I cannot imagine better fishing	2.0	16.8	37.89	31.58	12.63	1.05
Tournament staff were always helpful	4.0	0.0	2.1	20.0	60.0	17.9
The tournament was well worth the money spent to take this trip	4.0	1.1	8.6	30.1	41.9	18.3
I would like to fish other tournaments like this one	4.0	1.1	5.43	26.1	52.2	15.2
The lodging facilities in the local area met my needs	3.0	1.3	1.3	57.5	31.3	8.75
I caught more fish than I expected in this tournament	2.0	19.2	41.5	25.5	13.8	0.0
I encountered more people in the tournament than I expected	3.0	3.2	30.5	35.8	27.4	3.2
I caught what I consider a "trophy" fish	3.0	17.9	29.5	15.8	23.2	13.7
My fishing skills were tested in this tournament	3.0	4.2	24.2	23.2	35.8	12.7
I was disappointed with some aspects of this tournament	3.0	8.6	15.1	28.0	45.2	3.2

**Table 45. Frequency Distribution of BFSBB Anglers' Feelings About Their Fishing Trip and Participation in the Tournament**

Statement of Feelings about Fishing Trip and Participation in the Buff Foundation / Sertoma by the Bay Tournament	Median	Strongly Disagree 1	Disagree 2	Neutral 3	Agree 4	Strongly Agree 5
	***Values given are percentages***					
I thoroughly enjoyed the tournament	5.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	35.0	55.0
I cannot imagine better fishing	3.0	10.0	15.0	45.0	25.0	5.0
Tournament staff were always helpful	4.0	0.0	0.0	30.0	25.0	45.0
The tournament was well worth the money spent to take this trip	4.5	0.0	0.0	20.0	30.0	50.0
I would like to fish other tournaments like this one	5.0	0.0	0.0	15.0	30.0	55.0
The lodging facilities in the local area met my needs	4.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	13.3	46.7
I caught more fish than I expected in this tournament	2.0	30.0	30.0	25.0	10.0	5.0
I encountered more people in the tournament than I expected	3.0	0.0	31.6	26.3	31.6	10.5
I caught what I consider a "trophy" fish	2.0	36.8	26.3	10.5	15.8	10.5
My fishing skills were tested in this tournament	3.0	10.5	15.8	31.6	26.3	15.8
I was disappointed with some aspects of this tournament	3.0	5.3	31.6	15.8	31.6	15.8

**Table 46. Average Tournament Expenditures of RWB Anglers by Type of Purchase**

<b>Type of Purchase</b>	<b>Percent of Anglers Who Purchased Each Item n = 101</b>	<b>Average Total Amount Spent by Anglers Who Purchased the item</b>	<b>Average Total Amount Spent by All Anglers n = 93</b>
Automobile transportation	60.4	\$106.31	\$40.19
Other transportation	7.9	385.00	24.46
Gas and oil for boat	57.4	1,282.56	537.37
Slip or dockage fees	31.7	579.87	174.26
Charter fees	8.9	1,777.78	172.04
Bait	52.5	232.29	78.28
Fishing tackle/equipment	41.6	445.46	116.67
Boat repairs/upgrades	11.9	1,236.45	135.49
Lodging	8.9	1,253.33	121.29
Restaurant meals	46.5	350.87	149.35
Groceries, snack foods, drinks	69.3	262.23	132.96
Ice	54.5	1,409.68	80.43
Tips	33.7	122.21	44.68
Entertainment	7.9	172.50	14.84
Other1	11.9	1,358.33	175.27
Other2	2.2	1,500.00	32.26
Other3	0.0	0.00	0.00

**Table 47. Average Tournament Expenditures of RWB Anglers by Type of Purchase in Virginia Beach**

<b>Type of Purchase</b>	<b>Percent of Anglers Who Purchased Each Item n = 101</b>	<b>Average Amount Spent by Anglers Who Purchased the Item (minus tran1&gt;4000)</b>	<b>Average Amount Spent by All Anglers n = 93</b>
Automobile transportation	49.5	\$65.86	\$35.41
Other transportation	6.9	315.00	23.71
Gas and oil for boat	52.5	907.56	517.21
Slip or dockage fees	29.7	537.37	173.34
Charter fees	8.9	1,777.78	172.04
Bait	47.5	142.29	73.44
Fishing tackle/equipment	36.6	269.46	107.20
Boat repairs/upgrades	10.9	1,136.45	134.42
Lodging	8.9	1,253.33	121.29
Restaurant meals	45.5	300.87	148.82
Groceries, snack foods, drinks	64.4	184.23	128.76
Ice	51.5	66.35	37.10
Tips	33.7	122.21	44.68
Entertainment	7.9	172.50	14.84
Other1	11.9	1,358.33	175.27
Other2	2.0	1,500.00	32.26
Other3	0.0	0.00	0.00

**Table 48. Average Tournament Expenditures of RWB Anglers by Type of Purchase in Virginia**

<b>Type of Purchase</b>	<b>Percent of Anglers Who Purchased Each Item n = 101</b>	<b>Average Amount Spent by Anglers Who Purchased the Item n = 101</b>	<b>Average Amount Spent by All Anglers n = 93</b>
Automobile transportation	10.9	\$40.45	\$4.78
Other transportation	1.0	70.00	0.75
Gas and oil for boat	5.0	375.00	20.16
Slip or dockage fees	2.0	42.50	0.91
Charter fees	0.0	0.00	0.00
Bait	5.0	90.00	4.84
Fishing tackle/equipment	5.0	176.00	9.46
Boat repairs/upgrades	1.0	100.00	1.08
Lodging	0.0	0.00	0.00
Restaurant meals	1.0	50.00	0.54
Groceries, snack foods, drinks	5.0	78.00	4.19
Ice	3.0	1,343.33	43.33
Tips	0.0	0.00	0.00
Entertainment	0.0	0.00	0.00
Other1	0.0	0.00	0.00
Other2	0.0	0.00	0.00
Other3	0.0	0.00	0.00

**Table 49. Total Direct Purchases by RWB Anglers by Type of Purchase**

<b>Type of Purchase</b>	<b>Total Amount Spent</b>	<b>Percent of Total</b>
Automobile transportation	\$8,801.61	1.9
Other transportation	\$5,356.74	1.2
Gas and oil for boat	\$117,684.03	26.5
Slip or dockage fees	\$38,162.94	8.6
Charter fees	\$37,676.76	8.5
Bait	\$17,143.32	3.9
Fishing tackle/equipment	\$25,550.73	5.7
Boat repairs/upgrades	\$29,672.31	6.7
Lodging	\$26,562.51	6.0
Restaurant meals	\$32,707.65	7.4
Groceries, snack foods, drinks	\$29,118.24	6.6
Ice	\$17,614.17	4.0
Tips	\$9,784.92	2.2
Entertainment	\$3,249.96	0.7
Other1	\$38,384.13	8.6
Other2	\$7,064.94	1.5
Other3	\$0.00	0.0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$444,534.96</b>	<b>100.00</b>

The total amount spent above does not add to the total presented in Table 50 due to rounding error.

**Table 50. Total Expenditures made by RWB Anglers by Residence Location Using Personal Expenditure Data**

<b>Residence Location</b>	<b>Dollars Spent in Virginia Beach</b>	<b>Dollars Spent elsewhere in VA</b>	<b>Total</b>
Virginia Beach	\$222,370.00	\$1,388.75	\$223,758.75
Virginia residents (not Virginia Beach)	\$109,113.39	\$17,670.00	\$126,783.39
Non-residents	\$96,042.38	\$3,774.00	\$99,816.38
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$427,525.77</b>	<b>\$22,832.75</b>	<b>\$450,358.52</b>

**Table 51. Average Tournament Expenditures of BFSBB Anglers by Type of Purchase**

<b>Type of Purchase</b>	<b>Percent of Anglers Who Purchased Each Item n = 19</b>	<b>Average Amount Spent by Anglers Who Purchased Item n = 19</b>	<b>Average Amount Spent by All Anglers n = 12</b>
Automobile transportation	31.6	\$19.17	\$9.58
Other transportation	0.0	0.00	0.00
Gas and oil for boat	5.3	300.00	25.00
Slip or dockage fees	0.00	0.00	0.00
Charter fees	26.3	183.00	76.25
Bait	5.3	100.00	8.33
Fishing tackle/equipment	5.3	50.00	4.17
Boat repairs/upgrades	0.0	0.00	0.00
Lodging	0.0	0.00	0.00
Restaurant meals	36.8	74.29	43.33
Groceries, snack foods, drinks	52.6	57.50	47.92
Ice	15.8	10.67	2.67
Tips	42.1	126.25	84.17
Entertainment	0.0	0.00	0.00
Other1	15.8	56.67	14.17
Other2	5.3	15.00	1.25
Other3	0.0	0.00	0.00

**Table 52. Average Tournament Expenditures of BFSBB Anglers by Type of Purchase in Virginia Beach**

<b>Type of Purchase</b>	<b>Percent of Anglers Who Purchased Each Item n = 19</b>	<b>Average Amount Spent by Anglers Who Purchased Item n = 19</b>	<b>Average Amount Spent by All Anglers n = 12</b>
Automobile transportation	31.6	\$19.17	\$9.58
Other transportation	0.0	0.00	0.00
Gas and oil for boat	0.0	0.00	0.00
Slip or dockage fees	0.0	0.00	0.00
Charter fees	26.3	183.00	76.25
Bait	5.3	100.00	8.33
Fishing tackle/equipment	5.3	50.00	4.17
Boat repairs/upgrades	0.0	0.00	0.00
Lodging	0.0	0.00	0.00
Restaurant meals	36.8	74.29	43.33
Groceries, snack foods, drinks	52.6	57.50	47.92
Ice	15.8	10.67	2.67
Tips	42.1	126.25	84.17
Entertainment	0.0	0.00	0.00
Other1	15.8	56.67	14.17
Other2	0.0	0.00	0.00
Other3	0.0	0.00	0.00

**Table 53. Average Tournament Expenditures of BFSBB Anglers by Type of Purchase in Virginia**

<b>Type of Purchase</b>	<b>Percent of Anglers Who Purchased Each Item n = 19</b>	<b>Average Amount Spent by Anglers Who Purchased Item n = 19</b>	<b>Average Amount Spent by All Anglers n = 12</b>
Automobile transportation	0.0	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other transportation	0.0	0.00	0.00
Gas and oil for boat	5.3	300.00	25.00
Slip or dockage fees	0.0	0.00	0.00
Charter fees	0.0	0.00	0.00
Bait	0.0	0.00	0.00
Fishing tackle/equipment	0.0	0.00	0.00
Boat repairs/upgrades	0.0	0.00	0.00
Lodging	0.0	0.00	0.00
Restaurant meals	0.0	0.00	0.00
Groceries, snack foods, drinks	0.0	0.00	0.00
Ice	0.0	0.00	0.00
Tips	0.0	0.00	0.00
Entertainment	0.0	0.00	0.00
Other1	0.0	0.00	0.00
Other2	5.3	15.00	1.25
Other3	0.0	0.00	0.00

**Table 54. Total Direct Purchases by BFSBB Anglers by Type of Purchase**

<b>Type of Purchase</b>	<b>Total Amount Spent</b>	<b>Percent of Total</b>
Automobile transportation	\$421.52	3.0
Other transportation	\$0.00	0.0
Gas and oil for boat	\$1,100.00	7.9
Slip or dockage fees	\$0.00	0.0
Charter fees	\$3,355.00	24.1
Bait	\$366.52	2.6
Fishing tackle/equipment	\$183.48	1.3
Boat repairs/upgrades	\$0.00	0.0
Lodging	\$0.00	0.0
Restaurant meals	\$1,906.52	13.7
Groceries, snack foods, drinks	\$2,108.48	15.1
Ice	\$117.48	0.8
Tips	\$3,703.48	26.6
Entertainment	\$0.00	0.0
Other1	\$623.48	4.5
Other2	\$55.00	0.4
Other3	\$0.00	0.0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$13,940.96</b>	<b>100.0</b>

The total amount spent above does not add to the total presented in Table 55 due to rounding error.

**Table 55. Total Expenditures (Direct Economic Impact) made by BFSBB Anglers by Residence Location Using Personal Expenditure Data**

<b>Residence Location</b>	<b>Dollars Spent in Virginia Beach</b>	<b>Dollars Spent elsewhere in VA</b>	<b>Total</b>
Virginia Beach	\$10,778.00	\$1,020.00	\$11,798.00
Virginia Residents (not Virginia Beach)	*N/A	*N/A	\$0.00
Non-residents	\$317.00	\$15.00	\$332.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$11,095.00</b>	<b>\$1,035.00</b>	<b>\$12,130.00</b>

\*Not enough information existed to calculate because only one non-local Virginia resident returned the survey and she did not answer this question

**Table 56. Total Amount Spent in Virginia Beach by Type of Purchase and Tournament**

<b>Type of Purchase</b>	<b>RWB</b>		<b>BFSBB</b>	
	<b>Total Amount Spent</b>	<b>% of Total</b>	<b>Total Amount Spent</b>	<b>% of Total</b>
Automobile transportation	\$8,801.61	1.9	\$421.52	3.0
Other transportation	\$5,356.74	1.2	\$0.00	0.0
Gas and oil for boat	\$117,684.03	26.5	\$1,100.00	7.9
Slip or dockage fees	\$38,162.94	8.6	\$0.00	0.0
Charter fees	\$37,676.76	8.5	\$3,355.00	24.1
Bait	\$17,143.32	3.9	\$366.52	2.6
Fishing tackle/equipment	\$25,550.73	5.7	\$183.48	1.3
Boat repairs/upgrades	\$29,672.31	6.7	\$0.00	0.0
Lodging	\$26,562.51	6.0	\$0.00	0.0
Restaurant meals	\$32,707.65	7.4	\$1,906.52	13.7
Groceries, snack foods, drinks	\$29,118.24	6.6	\$2,108.48	15.1
Ice	\$17,614.17	4.0	\$117.48	0.8
Tips	\$9,784.92	2.2	\$3,703.48	26.6
Entertainment	\$3,249.96	0.7	\$0.00	0.0
Other1	\$38,384.13	8.6	\$623.48	4.5
Other2	\$7,064.94	1.5	\$55.00	0.4
Other3	\$0.00	0.0	\$0.00	0.0
		100.0		100.0

The total amount spent above does not add to the total presented in Tables 50 and 55 due to rounding error.

**Table 57. Purchases Made in Virginia Beach by Non-local RWB Anglers**

<b>Type of Purchase</b>	<b>Total Amount Spent in Virginia Beach</b>	<b>Percent Spent in Virginia Beach</b>
Automobile transportation	\$2,109.00	1.9
Other transportation	\$0.00	0.0
Gas and oil for boat	\$25,921.89	23.8
Slip or dockage fees	\$3,163.50	2.9
Charter fees	\$8,122.50	7.4
Bait	\$2,878.50	2.6
Fishing tackle/equipment	\$5,229.75	4.8
Boat repairs/upgrades	\$15,105.00	13.8
Lodging	\$5,130.00	4.7
Restaurant meals	\$12,326.25	11.3
Groceries, snack foods, drinks	\$9,675.75	8.9
Ice	\$3,177.75	2.9
Tips	\$2,451.00	2.3
Entertainment	\$1,710.00	1.6
Other1	\$6,412.50	5.9
Other2	\$5,700.00	5.2
Other3	\$0.00	0.0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$109,113.39</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 58. Purchases Made in Virginia Beach by Out-of-state RWB Anglers**

<b>Type of Purchase</b>	<b>Total Amount Spent in Virginia Beach</b>	<b>Percent Spent in Virginia Beach</b>
Automobile transportation	\$3,034.00	3.1
Other transportation	\$986.79	1.0
Gas and oil for boat	\$20,128.00	21.0
Slip or dockage fees	\$4,785.21	5.0
Charter fees	\$18,006.79	18.7
Bait	\$1,899.21	2.0
Fishing tackle/equipment	\$5,032.00	5.2
Boat repairs/upgrades	\$1,235.80	1.3
Lodging	\$20,226.79	21.1
Restaurant meals	\$11,100.00	11.6
Groceries, snack foods, drinks	\$3,465.79	3.6
Ice	\$937.21	1.0
Tips	\$912.79	0.9
Entertainment	\$1,825.21	1.9
Other1	\$2,466.79	2.6
Other2	\$0.00	0.0
Other3	\$0.00	0.0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$96,042.38</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 59. Purchases Made in Virginia Beach by Out-of-state BFSBB Anglers**

<b>Type of Purchase</b>	<b>Total Amount Spent in Virginia Beach</b>	<b>Percent Spent in Virginia Beach</b>
Automobile transportation	\$20.00	6.3
Other transportation	\$0.00	0.0
Gas and oil for boat	\$0.00	0.0
Slip or dockage fees	\$0.00	0.0
Charter fees	\$165.00	52.1
Bait	\$0.00	0.0
Fishing tackle/equipment	\$0.00	0.0
Boat repairs/upgrades	\$0.00	0.0
Lodging	\$0.00	0.0
Restaurant meals	\$20.00	6.3
Groceries, snack foods, drinks	\$50.00	15.8
Ice	\$2.00	0.6
Tips	\$10.00	3.1
Entertainment	\$0.00	0.0
Other1	\$50.00	15.8
Other2	\$0.00	0.0
Other3	\$0.00	0.0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$317.00</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 60. Direct Economic Impacts of RWB by Participant's Origin and Impact Measure**

<b>Impact Measure</b>	<b>Out-of-State</b>	<b>Local</b>	<b>Non-Local</b>	<b>Total</b>
Output	\$92,000	\$150,000	\$101,000	\$343,000
Income	\$52,000	\$73,000	\$52,000	\$177,000
Employment	2.0	3.0	2.0	7.0

**Table 61. Indirect Economic Impacts of RWB Anglers by Participant's Origin and Impact Measure**

<b>Impact Measure</b>	<b>Out-of-State</b>	<b>Local</b>	<b>Non-Local</b>	<b>Total</b>
Output	\$26,000	\$55,000	\$31,000	\$112,000
Income	\$15,000	\$33,000	\$18,000	\$66,000
Employment	0	1.0	0	1.0

**Table 62. Induced Economic Impacts of RWB Participant's Origin and Impact Measure**

<b>Impact Measure</b>	<b>Out-of-State</b>	<b>Local</b>	<b>Non-Local</b>	<b>Total</b>
Output	\$119,000	\$167,000	\$118,000	\$404,000
Income	\$67,000	\$94,000	\$67,000	\$228,000
Employment	2.0	3.0	2.0	7.0

**Table 63. Total Economic Impacts of RWB Anglers by Impact Measure**

<b>Impact Measure</b>	<b>Direct</b>	<b>Indirect</b>	<b>Induced</b>	<b>Total</b>
Output	\$343,000	\$112,000	\$404,000	\$859,000
Income	\$177,000	\$66,000	\$228,000	\$471,000
Employment	7.0	1.0	7.0	15.0

## **Appendix B: Economic Output Multipliers for Virginia Saltwater Recreational Fishing**

<b>Expenditure Category</b>	<b>Direct Impact</b>	<b>Indirect Impact</b>	<b>Induced Impact</b>	<b>Total Impact</b>
<b>Trip Expenses</b>				
Restaurant meals	1.0000	0.3500	1.7378	3.0878
Groceries	0.3221	0.1063	0.3517	0.7802
- Wholesale	0.1009	0.0059	0.0775	0.1844
- Retail	0.2280	0.0527	0.3904	0.6711
Lodging	1.0000	0.0724	1.5940	2.6664
Bait	0.1259	0.0204	0.1889	0.3353
- Wholesale	0.0670	0.0039	0.0515	0.1224
- Retail	0.2440	0.0564	0.4178	0.7182
Ice	0.6960	0.1542	0.7228	1.5730
- Wholesale	0.0517	0.0030	0.0397	0.0944
- Retail	0.2400	0.0554	0.4110	0.7064
Head boat fees	1.0000	0.3771	1.1064	2.4835
Charter boat fees	1.0000	0.4760	0.9742	2.4502
Boat rental fees	1.0000	0.4087	0.7009	2.1096
Equipment rental	1.0000	0.4087	0.7009	2.1096
Public transportation	0.6069	0.2329	0.3621	1.2020
Rental automobile	0.7013	0.1835	0.5404	1.4252
Private automobile	0.4560	0.1169	0.3852	0.9581
Other fees				
<b>Fishing Equipment Purchases</b>				
Fishing rods	0.0161	0.0047	0.0089	0.0298
- Wholesale	0.1308	0.0077	0.1004	0.2389
- Retail	0.3420	0.0747	0.5747	0.9915
Fishing reels	0.0161	0.0047	0.0089	0.0298
- Wholesale	0.1308	0.0077	0.1004	0.2389
- Retail	0.3420	0.0747	0.5747	0.9915
Special fishing clothing	0.4300	0.2118	0.4543	1.0960
- Wholesale	0.0420	0.0025	0.0322	0.0767
- Retail	0.3740	0.0817	0.6285	1.0842
Other fishing tackle	0.0161	0.0047	0.0089	0.0298
- Wholesale	0.1308	0.0077	0.1004	0.2389

<b>Expenditure Category</b>	<b>Direct Impact</b>	<b>Indirect Impact</b>	<b>Induced Impact</b>	<b>Total Impact</b>
-Retail	0.3420	0.0747	0.5747	0.9915
<b>Boat Expenses</b>				
Boat fuel and oil	0.0551	0.0000	0.0011	0.0562
-Wholesale	0.1017	0.0060	0.0781	0.1858
-Retail	0.1450	0.0336	0.1693	0.3479
Docking and launching fees	1.0000	0.6096	1.1058	2.7154
Dry storage fees	1.0000	0.6096	1.1058	2.7154
Haul out/bottom paint	1.0000	0.3328	1.2037	2.5365
Engine repair/maintenance	0.8887	0.3443	0.7293	1.9623
Other hull/electronic repair/	0.9506	0.4361	0.7286	2.1153
New electronic equipment	0.0764	0.0024	0.0289	0.1078
-Wholesale	0.0541	0.0032	0.0415	0.0988
-Retail	0.3000	0.0353	0.7109	1.0462
New accessories and equipm	0.1524	0.0433	0.0649	0.2606
-Wholesale	0.0541	0.0032	0.0415	0.0988
-Retail	0.3000	0.0353	0.7109	1.0462
Trailer maintenance	0.8887	0.3443	0.7293	1.9623
New trailer	0.0097	0.0052	0.0074	0.0223
-Wholesale	0.0234	0.0014	0.0180	0.0428
-Retail	0.3170	0.0734	0.3702	0.7606
Insurance	0.6951	0.3297	0.6974	1.7221
Taxes/registration	0.8755	0.0000	1.1868	2.0624
Boat loan	1.0000	0.3967	0.8187	2.2154
Boat purchases	0.0143	0.0022	0.0091	0.0256
-Wholesale	0.0194	0.0011	0.0149	0.0354
-Retail	0.1250	0.0289	0.1460	0.2999
Average Ratio	0.3964	0.1307	0.4400	0.9671
Multiplier	1.0	.329	1.109	2.438

## **Appendix C: Economic Impact Definitions**

Impact multiplier: a measure of the direct and indirect impacts resulting from purchases of raw materials and labor due to changes in final demand for a sector's products. In general the greater a sector's dependence upon other state industries for raw materials and services, the larger the impact multiplier.

Indirect impacts are created through the sale of materials and services to the industry by other state industries.

Induced impacts arise from the spending by employees in a primary (direct) or support (indirect) industry. The employee spending takes place throughout the state economy through retail purchases, financing, and sales of added goods and services.

Total employment is the sum of direct, indirect and induced employment. It is expressed in "full-time employment" (FTE). An FTE could be made up of, for example, 12 people working one month each.

Total income is the sum of direct income earned by employees in each sector and the income generated in other sectors due to indirect and induced effects.

Total output for a sector is the sum of in-state sales and exports. This is measured in terms of dollar value of each sector's sales to final demand.

Total economic activity for a sector is the sum of total output and the output generated in other sectors of the state economy due to the indirect and induced impacts explained above.

## **Appendix D: Mail Questionnaire with Cover Letters**

**Virginia Beach  
Red, White, and Blue  
Fishing Tournament  
Angler Survey**



*Sponsored by*  
The City of Virginia Beach

*In Cooperation with*  
Department of Wildlife and Fisheries Sciences  
Texas A&M University



**FOR QUESTIONS #1 - #17, PLEASE TELL US ABOUT YOUR GENERAL FISHING ACTIVITY AND EXPERIENCE. (Not just your tournament fishing, but all fishing.)**

1. Since this time last year, how many *days* did you go fishing in the U.S.A.:  
*(If none, please enter 0)*

- \_\_\_\_\_ FRESHWATER
- \_\_\_\_\_ SALTWATER FROM A BOAT
- \_\_\_\_\_ SALTWATER FROM SHORE OR PIERS

\_\_\_\_\_ TOTAL DAYS FISHED SINCE THIS TIME LAST YEAR IN U.S.A. (*Sum of above*)

2. Since this time last year, how many days did you go saltwater fishing outside of the U.S.A.?

\_\_\_\_\_ TOTAL DAYS FISHING SALTWATER OUTSIDE OF THE U.S.A.

3. Since this time last year, in how many saltwater fishing tournaments have you participated?  
*(If none, please enter 0)*

\_\_\_\_\_ TOTAL SALTWATER TOURNAMENTS (*Sum of above*)

4. What fish species do you prefer to catch in *saltwater*?

- \_\_\_\_\_ FIRST CHOICE
- \_\_\_\_\_ SECOND CHOICE
- \_\_\_\_\_ THIRD CHOICE

5. Do you or someone in your household own a powerboat?

- 1 YES If YES, please indicate the length of your longest powerboat: \_\_\_\_\_ feet
- 2 NO



6. Compared to your other outdoor recreation activities (such as golf, tennis, hunting, camping, etc.) would you rate fishing as: *(Please circle only one)*

- 1 YOUR MOST IMPORTANT OUTDOOR ACTIVITY
- 2 YOUR SECOND MOST IMPORTANT OUTDOOR ACTIVITY
- 3 YOUR THIRD MOST IMPORTANT OUTDOOR ACTIVITY
- 4 ONLY ONE OF MANY OUTDOOR ACTIVITIES

7. How do you compare your fishing ability to that of other *saltwater* anglers in general?

- 1 LESS SKILLED
- 2 EQUALLY SKILLED
- 3 MORE SKILLED

8. Do you put most of your effort into fishing for one particular species of fish?

- 1 YES If YES, what species? \_\_\_\_\_
- 2 NO

9. Do you subscribe to fishing or boating magazines?

- 1 YES If YES, how many? \_\_\_\_\_ Which is your favorite? \_\_\_\_\_
- 2 NO

10. *Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about recreational fishing*

	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly Agree</i>
a) The more fish I catch, the happier I am.....	1		3	4	5
A fishing trip can be successful even if no fish are caught.....	1	2	3	4	5
c) I usually eat the fish I catch.....	1		3	4	5
A successful fishing trip is one in which many fish are caught.....	1	2	3	4	5
e) I would rather catch 1 or 2 big fish than 10 smaller fish.....	1	2		4	5
f) When I go fishing, I am just as happy if I don't catch any fish.....		2	3		
g) It doesn't matter to me what type of fish I catch.....	1	2		4	5
h) _____ er the fishing trip.....	1	2		4	5
I'm just as happy if I don't keep the fish I catch.....	1	2	3	4	5
j) I like to fish where there are several kinds of fish to catch.....			3	4	5
k) _____ to keep all the fish I catch.....		2		4	5
l) I'm happiest with the fishing trip if I catch a challenging game fish.....	1	2	3	4	5
m) I'm just as happy if I release the fish I catch.....		2	3		
n) If I thought I wouldn't catch any fish, I wouldn't go fishing.....	1	2		4	5
o) I like to fish where I know I have a chance to catch a "trophy" fish.....	1	2	3	4	5
p) When I go fishing, I'm not satisfied unless I catch at least something....	1	2	3	4	5



11. Are you a member of a fishing club or organization?

- 1 YES If **YES**, how many?\_\_\_\_\_ Which is your favorite?\_\_\_\_\_
- 2 NO

12. Have you ever:

- |   |       |      |
|---|-------|------|
| Called your legislator/elected official on a fisheries matter?  | 1 YES | 2 NO |
| Written your legislator/elected official on a fisheries matter? | 1 YES | 2 NO |
| Attended a public hearing on a fisheries matter?                | 1 YES | 2 NO |

13. How many rod and reel combinations do **YOU** own?

\_\_\_\_\_ NUMBER OF ROD AND REEL COMBINATIONS

14. What type of group do you fish with most often? (*Please circle only one*)

- 1 BY YOURSELF
- 2 FAMILY
- 3 FRIENDS
- 4 FAMILY and FRIENDS TOGETHER
- 5 CLUB

15. How many of your friends fish? \_\_\_\_\_NONE \_\_\_\_\_SOME \_\_\_\_\_MOST

16. About how many of your co-workers fish? \_\_\_\_\_NONE \_\_\_\_\_SOME \_\_\_\_\_MOST

17. How many of your vacation trips include fishing? \_\_\_\_\_NONE \_\_\_\_\_SOME \_\_\_\_\_MOST

**QUESTIONS #18- #29 ASK ABOUT YOUR ACTIVITY, EXPENDITURES, AND OPINIONS OF THE 2000 VIRGINIA BEACH RED, WHITE, AND BLUE TOURNAMENT. PLEASE TRY TO RECALL THE INFORMATION ASKED FOR AS ACCURATELY AS POSSIBLE.**

18. How many days did you fish in this tournament? \_\_\_\_\_ DAYS FISHED IN TOURNAMENT

19. How many **non-tournament fishing** family members or friends came with you to the Tournament?

\_\_\_\_\_ NON-FISHING FAMILY MEMBERS or FRIENDS

20. How many nights did you stay in Virginia Beach?

\_\_\_\_\_ NIGHTS IN VIRGINIA BEACH



21. On your most recent fishing trip to participate in the Virginia Beach Red, White, and Blue Fishing Tournament, how much did **YOU** spend on each of the following items in the city of Virginia Beach?

**Total Amount Spent**

	<b><u>In the city of Virginia Beach</u></b>	<b><u>In other parts of Virginia</u></b>
Automobile transportation (gas, rental car, etc.).....	\$ _____	\$ _____
Other transportation (airplane, boat, etc.).....	\$ _____	\$ _____
Gas and oil for boat.....	\$ _____	\$ _____
Slip or dockage fees.....	\$ _____	\$ _____
Charter fees.....	\$ _____	\$ _____
Bait.....	\$ _____	\$ _____
Ice.....	\$ _____	\$ _____
Fishing tackle/equipment.....	\$ _____	\$ _____
Boat repairs/upgrades.....	\$ _____	\$ _____
Lodging (hotel, condo rental, etc.).....	\$ _____	\$ _____
Restaurant meals.....	\$ _____	\$ _____
Groceries, snack foods, drinks.....	\$ _____	\$ _____
Tips.....	\$ _____	\$ _____
Entertainment (museums, theaters, etc.).....	\$ _____	\$ _____
Anything else for this trip ( <i>please specify below</i> ).....	\$ _____	\$ _____
_____ .....	\$ _____	\$ _____
_____ .....	\$ _____	\$ _____
<b>Total Dollars Spent On This Fishing Trip</b>	\$ _____	\$ _____

22. What type of lodging did you use while in Virginia Beach? (**Please check only one**)

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> HOTEL/MOTEL                | <input type="checkbox"/> CONDOMINIUM/HOME RENTAL |
| <input type="checkbox"/> PRIVATE RESIDENCE          | <input type="checkbox"/> BOAT                    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER Please specify _____ |  |

23. Where did you get most of your information about this tournament? (**Please check all that apply**)

- |                                     |  |   |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> FRIENDS    | <input type="checkbox"/> MAGAZINE                    | <input type="checkbox"/> MAIL ADVERTISEMENT |
| <input type="checkbox"/> RADIO      | <input type="checkbox"/> NEWSPAPER                   | <input type="checkbox"/> INTERNET           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> TELEVISION | <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER Please specify: _____ |   |



24. Have you viewed the Red, White, and Blue Fishing Tournament web page since this time last year?

- 1 YES
- 2 NO

25. What did you *like* about the tournament or how it was run?

26. *Below is a list of reasons why people fish in saltwater fishing tournaments. Please circle the number that indicates how important each item was to you as a reason for fishing in this tournament.*

	Not at all Important	Slightly Important	Moderately Important	Very Important	Extremely Important
a) To be outdoors.....	1	2	3	4	5
b) For family recreation.....	1	2	3	4	5
c) To experience new and different things.....	1	2	3	4	5
d) For relaxation.....	1	2	3	4	5
e) To be close to the sea.....	1	2	3	4	5
f) To obtain fish for eating.....	1	2	3	4	5
g) To get away from the demands of other people.....	1	2	3	4	5
h) For the experience of the catch.....	1	2	3	4	5
i) To test my equipment.....	1	2	3	4	5
j) To be with friends.....	1	2	3	4	5
k) To experience unpolluted natural surroundings.....	1	2	3	4	5
l) To win a tournament trophy/prize money.....	1	2	3	4	5
m) To develop my skills.....	1	2	3	4	5
n) To get away from the regular routine.....	1	2	3	4	5
o) To obtain a "trophy" fish.....	1	2	3	4	5
p) For the challenge or sport.....	1	2	3	4	5
q) To experience adventure and excitement.....	1	2	3	4	5

27. What would you like to see *changed* with this tournament?



28. How well do the following statements describe your feelings about your fishing trip and participation in the Red, White, and Blue Fishing Tournament? Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following:

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
a) I thoroughly enjoyed the tournament.....	1	2	3	4	5
b) I cannot imagine better fishing.....	1	2	3	4	5
c) Tournament staff were always helpful.....	1	2	3	4	5
d) The tournament was well worth the money spent to take this trip.....	1	2	3	4	5
e) I would like to fish other tournaments like this one.....	1	2	3	4	5
f) The lodging facilities in the local area met my needs.....	1	2	3	4	5
g) I caught more fish than I expected in this tournament.....	1	2	3	4	5
h) I encountered more people in the tournament than I expected.....	1	2	3	4	5
i) I caught what I consider a "trophy" fish.....	1	2	3	4	5
j) My fishing skills were tested in this tournament.....	1	2	3	4	5
k) I was disappointed with some aspects of this tournament.....	1	2	3	4	5

	Not at all Satisfied	Slightly Satisfied	Moderately Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Extremely Satisfied
29. Overall, how satisfied were you with this trip?.....	1	2	3	4	5

**THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS WILL HELP US KNOW MORE ABOUT TOURNAMENT ANGLERS. THE INFORMATION YOU PROVIDE WILL REMAIN STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL AND YOU WILL NOT BE IDENTIFIED WITH YOUR ANSWERS.**

30. What is your age? \_\_\_\_\_

31. Are you?  
1 MALE  
2 FEMALE

32. What is the Zip Code of your current home residence? \_\_\_\_\_

33. What is your approximate household income before taxes?

- |                        |                           |
|------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1 UNDER \$20,000       | 7 \$120,000 to \$139,999  |
| 2 \$20,000 to \$39,999 | 8 \$140,000 to \$159,999  |
| 3 \$40,000 to \$59,999 | 9 \$160,000 to \$179,999  |
| 4 \$60,000 to \$79,999 | 10 \$180,000 to \$199,000 |
| 5 \$80,000 to \$99,999 | 11 \$200,000 to \$219,000 |
| 6 \$100,000 to 119,999 | 12 \$220,000 AND ABOVE    |



34. Was the survey completed by the person to whom it was addressed?
- 1 YES
  - 2 NO

*Is there anything else you would like to share with us?*

**Your contribution of time to this study is greatly appreciated. Please return your completed questionnaire in the business reply envelope as soon as possible.**

Texas A&M University  
Department of Wildlife and Fisheries Sciences  
College Station, TX 77843-2258  
8/9/00

Virginia Beach, Virginia  
Red, White & Blue  
Tournament  
www.fishvb.com

August 9, 2000

«FIRST» «LAST»  
«ADDRESS»  
«CITY», «STATE» «ZIP»

Dear «FIRST»:

Your name was selected from the list of participants in the 1<sup>st</sup> Annual Virginia Beach Red, White and Blue Fishing Tournament to be included in the socio-economic study of this tournament. Within the next few days you will receive a questionnaire in the mail regarding your opinions, expenditures and other items associated with this fishing trip.

The study is being conducted for the Red, White and Blue Fishing Tournament by the City of Virginia Beach and a research team at Texas A&M University to help us learn more about participants in our tournament. The information gathered will provide a social and economic information base on tournament participants. We will use the information you provide for planning future tournaments.

We would greatly appreciate your taking the few minutes to complete and return your questionnaire as soon as possible.

Thank you in advance for your help.

Sincerely,

Bill Gooch  
Tournament Director

«IDNUMBER»

Virginia Beach, Virginia  
Red, White & Blue  
Tournament  
www.fishvb.com

August 16, 2000

«FIRST» «LAST»  
«ADDRESS»  
«CITY», «STATE» «ZIP»

Dear «FIRST»:

We are conducting a survey of anglers that fished in the 1<sup>st</sup> Annual Virginia Beach Red, White, and Blue Tournament in cooperation with the City of Virginia Beach and a research team from Texas A&M University. Our tournament is an important and popular recreational activity in Virginia Beach. Therefore, it is important to learn about the impact of the tournament on the local area and get feedback from the participants so we can do an even better job with next year's event.

We have enclosed a questionnaire to help us learn more about **YOUR** fishing opinions, preferences, activities and expenditures regarding the Virginia Beach Red, White, and Blue Fishing Tournament. This information will be very useful to us for planning purposes.

You may be assured of complete confidentiality. The questionnaire has an identification number for mailing purposes only. This is so the research team can check your name off the mailing list when your questionnaire is returned. Your name will never be placed on the questionnaire itself and all names and addresses will be destroyed by the research team as soon as the data collection is complete.

Your prompt response is appreciated and will save us cost of mailing additional surveys. If we do not receive your returned questionnaire within two weeks, we will send you another. After you complete the questionnaire, please return it in the postage-paid business reply envelope provided as soon as possible. For questions or clarifications about the survey, please call Carol Thailing with Texas A&M University at (979)845-4283.

Thank you very much for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Bill Gooch  
Tournament Director

«IDNUMBER»

Virginia Beach, Virginia  
Red, White & Blue  
Tournament  
www.fishvb.com

September 13, 2000

«FIRST» «LAST»  
«ADDRESS»  
«CITY», «STATE» «ZIP»

Dear «FIRST»:

About a month ago, we sent you a survey of anglers who fished the 1<sup>st</sup> Annual Virginia Beach Red, White, and Blue Fishing Tournament. As of today, we have not yet received your completed questionnaire. If you have recently returned your survey, please accept our thanks.

The success and accuracy of our study depends on you and the others who have not yet responded. You and the other tournament anglers who have not responded may have different opinions and may represent a completely different portion of the fishing public than those who have sent in their questionnaires. We need to hear from YOU.

The enclosed survey is designed to tell us about your general fishing activities, your fishing activity and preferences at the tournament, and your expenditures incurred on your trip. The information will be useful in understanding the economic impacts of the Virginia Beach Red, White, and Blue Fishing Tournament. Additionally, the information will allow us to determine the value anglers place on the tournament.

You are one of a small number of anglers selected to participate in this study. It is important that YOU and no one else complete the questionnaire. Your responses are important to us whether you fish at the tournament often, or this was your first time. All responses will be strictly confidential, and you will not be identified with your answers.

After you complete the questionnaire, please return it in the postage-paid, business reply envelope as soon as possible. If you have any questions, please feel free to call Carol Thailing with Texas A&M University at (979) 845-4283. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Bill Gooch  
Tournament Director

# Buff Foundation / Sertoma By the Bay Billfish Tournament Angler Survey



Sponsored by  
The City of Virginia Beach

In Cooperation with  
Department of Wildlife and Fisheries Sciences  
Texas A&M University



**FOR QUESTIONS #1 - #17, PLEASE TELL US ABOUT YOUR GENERAL FISHING ACTIVITY AND EXPERIENCE. (Not just your tournament fishing, but all fishing.)**

1. Since this time last year, how many *days* did you go fishing in the U.S.A.:  
(If none, please enter 0)

- \_\_\_\_\_ FRESHWATER
- \_\_\_\_\_ SALTWATER FROM A BOAT
- \_\_\_\_\_ SALTWATER FROM SHORE OR PIERS

\_\_\_\_\_ TOTAL DAYS FISHED SINCE THIS TIME LAST YEAR IN U.S.A. (*Sum of above*)

2. Since this time last year, how many days did you go saltwater fishing outside of the U.S.A.?

\_\_\_\_\_ TOTAL DAYS FISHING SALTWATER OUTSIDE OF THE U.S.A.

3. Since this time last year, in how many saltwater fishing tournaments have you participated?  
(If none, please enter 0)

\_\_\_\_\_ TOTAL SALTWATER TOURNAMENTS

4. What fish species do you prefer to catch in *saltwater*?

- \_\_\_\_\_ FIRST CHOICE
- \_\_\_\_\_ SECOND CHOICE
- \_\_\_\_\_ THIRD CHOICE

5. Do you or someone in your household own a powerboat?

- 1 YES If YES, please indicate the length of your longest powerboat: \_\_\_\_\_ feet
- 2 NO



6. Compared to your other outdoor recreation activities (such as golf, tennis, hunting, camping, etc.) would you rate fishing as: *(Please circle only one)*

- 1 YOUR MOST IMPORTANT OUTDOOR ACTIVITY
- 2 YOUR SECOND MOST IMPORTANT OUTDOOR ACTIVITY
- 3 YOUR THIRD MOST IMPORTANT OUTDOOR ACTIVITY
- 4 ONLY ONE OF MANY OUTDOOR ACTIVITIES

7. How do you compare your fishing ability to that of other *saltwater* anglers in general?

- 1 LESS SKILLED
- 2 EQUALLY SKILLED
- 3 MORE SKILLED

8. Do you put most of your effort into fishing for one particular species of fish?

- 1 YES (If YES, what species? \_\_\_\_\_)
- 2 NO

9. Do you subscribe to fishing or boating magazines?

- 1 YES (If YES, how many? \_\_\_\_\_ Which is your favorite? \_\_\_\_\_)
- 2 NO

10. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about recreational fishing

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
a) The more fish I catch, the happier I am.....	1	2	3	4	5
b) A fishing trip can be successful even if no fish are caught.....	1	2	3	4	5
c) I usually eat the fish I catch.....	1	2	3	4	5
d) A successful fishing trip is one in which many fish are caught.....	1	2	3	4	5
e) I would rather catch 1 or 2 big fish than 10 smaller fish.....	1	2	3	4	5
f) When I go fishing, I am just as happy if I don't catch any fish.....	1	2	3	4	5
g) It doesn't matter to me what type of fish I catch.....	1	2	3	4	5
h) The bigger the fish I catch, the better the fishing trip.....	1	2	3	4	5
i) I'm just as happy if I don't keep the fish I catch.....	1	2	3	4	5
j) I like to fish where there are several kinds of fish to catch.....	1	2	3	4	5
k) I want to keep all the fish I catch.....	1	2	3	4	5
l) I'm happiest with the fishing trip if I catch a challenging game fish.....	1	2	3	4	5
m) I'm just as happy if I release the fish I catch.....	1	2	3	4	5
n) If I thought I wouldn't catch any fish, I wouldn't go fishing.....	1	2	3	4	5
o) I like to fish where I know I have a chance to catch a "trophy" fish.....	1	2	3	4	5
p) When I go fishing, I'm not satisfied unless I catch at least something....	1	2	3	4	5



11. Are you a member of a fishing club or organization?

- 1 YES (If YES, please identify \_\_\_\_\_)
- 2 NO

If you answered YES, which group is your favorite? \_\_\_\_\_)

12. Have you ever:

- |   |       |      |
|---|-------|------|
| Called your legislator/elected official on a fisheries matter?  | 1 YES | 2 NO |
| Written your legislator/elected official on a fisheries matter? | 1 YES | 2 NO |
| Attended a public hearing on a fisheries matter?                | 1 YES | 2 NO |

13. How many rod and reel combinations do *YOU* own?

\_\_\_\_\_ NUMBER OF ROD AND REEL COMBINATIONS

14. What type of group do you fish with most often? (*Please circle only one*)

- 1 BY YOURSELF
- 2 FAMILY
- 3 FRIENDS
- 4 FAMILY and FRIENDS TOGETHER
- 5 CLUB

15. How many of your friends fish? \_\_\_\_\_NONE \_\_\_\_\_SOME \_\_\_\_\_MOST

16. About how many of your co-workers fish? \_\_\_\_\_NONE \_\_\_\_\_SOME \_\_\_\_\_MOST

17. How many of your vacation trips include fishing? \_\_\_\_\_NONE \_\_\_\_\_SOME \_\_\_\_\_MOST

**QUESTIONS #18- #29 ASK ABOUT YOUR ACTIVITY, EXPENDITURES, AND OPINIONS OF THE 2000 VIRGINIA BEACH RED, WHITE, AND BLUE TOURNAMENT. PLEASE TRY TO RECALL THE INFORMATION ASKED FOR AS ACCURATELY AS POSSIBLE.**

18. How many days did you fish in this tournament? \_\_\_\_\_ DAYS FISHED IN TOURNAMENT

19. How many *non-tournament fishing* family members or friends came with you to the Tournament?

\_\_\_\_\_ NON-FISHING FAMILY MEMBERS or FRIENDS



20. How many nights did you stay in Virginia Beach?

\_\_\_\_\_ NIGHTS IN VIRGINIA BEACH

21. On your most recent fishing trip to participate in the Virginia Beach Red, White, and Blue Fishing Tournament, how much did **YOU** spend on each of the following items in the city of Virginia Beach?

**Total Amount Spent**

	<b><u>In the city of Virginia Beach</u></b>	<b><u>In other parts of Virginia</u></b>
Automobile transportation (gas, rental car, etc.).....	\$ _____	\$ _____
Other transportation (airplane, boat, etc.).....	\$ _____	\$ _____
Gas and oil for boat.....	\$ _____	\$ _____
Slip or dockage fees.....	\$ _____	\$ _____
Charter fees.....	\$ _____	\$ _____
Bait.....	\$ _____	\$ _____
Ice.....	\$ _____	\$ _____
Fishing tackle/equipment.....	\$ _____	\$ _____
Boat repairs/upgrades.....	\$ _____	\$ _____
Lodging (hotel, condo rental, etc.).....	\$ _____	\$ _____
Restaurant meals.....	\$ _____	\$ _____
Groceries, snack foods, drinks.....	\$ _____	\$ _____
Tips.....	\$ _____	\$ _____
Entertainment (museums, theaters, etc.).....	\$ _____	\$ _____
Anything else for this trip ( <i>please specify below</i> ).....	\$ _____	\$ _____
_____ .....	\$ _____	\$ _____
_____ .....	\$ _____	\$ _____
<b>Total Dollars Spent On This Fishing Trip</b>	\$ _____	\$ _____

22. What type of lodging did you use while in Virginia Beach? (**Please check only one**)

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> HOTEL/MOTEL                | <input type="checkbox"/> CONDOMINIUM/HOME RENTAL |
| <input type="checkbox"/> PRIVATE RESIDENCE          | <input type="checkbox"/> BOAT                    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER Please specify _____ |  |



23. Where did you get most of your information about this tournament? (Please check all that apply)

- FRIENDS       MAGAZINE       MAIL ADVERTISEMENT
- RADIO       NEWSPAPER       INTERNET
- TELEVISION       OTHER (Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_)

24. Have you viewed the Red, White, and Blue Fishing Tournament web page since this time last year?

- 1 YES
- 2 NO

25. What did you like about the tournament or how it was run?

26. Below is a list of reasons why people fish in saltwater fishing tournaments. Please circle the number that indicates how important each item was to you as a reason for fishing in this tournament.

	Not at all Important	Slightly Important	Moderately Important	Very Important	Extremely Important
a) To be outdoors.....	1	2	3	4	5
b) For family recreation.....	1	2	3	4	5
c) To experience new and different things.....	1	2	3	4	5
d) For relaxation.....	1	2	3	4	5
e) To be close to the sea.....	1	2	3	4	5
f) To obtain fish for eating.....	1	2	3	4	5
g) To get away from the demands of other people.....	1	2	3	4	5
h) For the experience of the catch.....	1	2	3	4	5
i) To test my equipment.....	1	2	3	4	5
j) To be with friends.....	1	2	3	4	5
k) To experience unpolluted natural surroundings.....	1	2	3	4	5
l) To win a tournament trophy/prize money.....	1	2	3	4	5
m) To develop my skills.....	1	2	3	4	5
n) To get away from the regular routine.....	1	2	3	4	5
o) To obtain a "trophy" fish.....	1	2	3	4	5
p) For the challenge or sport.....	1	2	3	4	5
q) To experience adventure and excitement.....	1	2	3	4	5



27. What would you like to see *changed* with this tournament?

28. *How well do the following statements describe your feelings about your fishing trip and participation in the Red, White, and Blue Fishing Tournament? Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following:*

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
a) I thoroughly enjoyed the tournament.....	1	2	3	4	5
b) I cannot imagine better fishing.....	1	2	3	4	5
c) Tournament staff were always helpful.....	1	2	3	4	5
d) The tournament was well worth the money spent to take this trip.....	1	2	3	4	5
e) I would like to fish other tournaments like this one.....	1	2	3	4	5
f) The lodging facilities in the local area met my needs.....	1	2	3	4	5
g) I caught more fish than I expected in this tournament.....	1	2	3	4	5
h) I encountered more people in the tournament than I expected.....	1	2	3	4	5
i) I caught what I consider a "trophy" fish.....	1	2	3	4	5
j) My fishing skills were tested in this tournament.....	1	2	3	4	5
k) I was disappointed with some aspects of this tournament.....	1	2	3	4	5

	Not at all Satisfied	Slightly Satisfied	Moderately Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Extremely Satisfied
29. Overall, how satisfied were you with this trip?.....	1	2	3	4	5

**THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS WILL HELP US KNOW MORE ABOUT TOURNAMENT ANGLERS. THE INFORMATION YOU PROVIDE WILL REMAIN STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL AND YOU WILL NOT BE IDENTIFIED WITH YOUR ANSWERS.**

30. What is your age? \_\_\_\_\_

31. What is the Zip Code of your current home residence? \_\_\_\_\_



**32.** What is your approximate household income before taxes?

- |   |                      |    |                        |
|---|----------------------|----|------------------------|
| 1 | UNDER \$20,000       | 7  | \$120,000 to \$139,999 |
| 2 | \$20,000 to \$39,999 | 8  | \$140,000 to \$159,999 |
| 3 | \$40,000 to \$59,999 | 9  | \$160,000 to \$179,999 |
| 4 | \$60,000 to \$79,999 | 10 | \$180,000 to \$199,000 |
| 5 | \$80,000 to \$99,999 | 11 | \$200,000 to \$219,000 |
| 6 | \$100,000 to 119,999 | 12 | \$220,000 AND ABOVE    |

**33.** Was the survey completed by the person to whom it was addressed?

- 1 YES
- 2 NO

*Is there anything else you would like to share with us?*

**Your contribution of time to this study is greatly appreciated. Please return your completed questionnaire in the business reply envelope as soon as possible.**

Texas A&M University  
Department of Wildlife and Fisheries Sciences  
College Station, TX 77843-2258

8/9/00

«idnumber»

**Buff Taylor Foundation  
Sertoma By the Bay  
Ladies Only  
Billfish Tournament**

August 9, 2000

«First» «Last»  
«StreetAddress»  
«City», «State» «Zip»

Dear «First»:

Your name was selected from the list of participants in the 1<sup>st</sup> Annual Buff Foundation / Sertoma By the Bay Billfish Tournament to be included in the socio-economic study of this tournament. Within the next few days you will receive a questionnaire in the mail regarding your opinions, expenditures and other items associated with this fishing trip.

The study is being conducted for the Buff Foundation/Sertoma By the Bay Billfish Tournament in cooperation with the City of Virginia Beach and a research team at Texas A&M University to help us learn more about participants in our tournament. The information gathered will provide a social and economic information base on tournament participants. We will use the information you provide for planning future tournaments.

We would greatly appreciate your taking the few minutes to complete and return your questionnaire as soon as possible.

Thank you in advance for your help.

Sincerely,

Bill Gooch  
Tournament Director

<idnumber>

# **Buff Taylor Foundation Sertoma By the Bay Ladies Only Billfish Tournament**

August 9, 2000

<<First>> <<Last>>

<<StreetAddress>>

<<City>>, <<State>> <<Zip>>

Dear <<First>>:

We are conducting a survey of anglers that fished in the 1<sup>st</sup> Annual Buff Foundation Sertoma By the Bay Billfish Tournament in cooperation with the City of Virginia Beach and a research team from Texas A&M University. Our tournament is an important and popular recreational activity in the Sertoma By the Bay area. Therefore, it is important to learn about the impact of the tournament on the local area and get feedback from the participants so we can do an even better job with next year's event.

We have enclosed a questionnaire to help us learn more about **YOUR** fishing opinions, preferences, activities and expenditures regarding the Buff Foundation Sertoma By the Bay Billfish Tournament. This information will be very useful to us for planning purposes.

You may be assured of complete confidentiality. The questionnaire has an identification number for mailing purposes only. This is so the research team can check your name off the mailing list when your questionnaire is returned. Your name will never be placed on the questionnaire itself and all names and addresses will be destroyed by the research team as soon as the data collection is complete.

Your prompt response is appreciated and will save us cost of mailing additional surveys. If we do not receive your returned questionnaire within two weeks, we will send you another. After you complete the questionnaire, please return it in the postage-paid business reply envelope provided as soon as possible. For questions or clarifications about the survey, please call Carol Thailing with Texas A&M University at (979)845-4283.

Thank you very much for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Bill Gooch  
Tournament Director

<idnumber>

# **Buff Taylor Foundation Sertoma By the Bay Ladies Only Billfish Tournament**

September 13, 2000

<First> <Last>  
<StreetAddress>  
<City>, <State> <Zip>

Dear <First>:

About a month ago, we sent you a survey of anglers who fished the 1<sup>st</sup> Annual Buff Foundation / Sertoma By the Bay Billfish Tournament. As of today, we have not yet received your completed questionnaire. If you have recently returned your survey, please accept our thanks.

The success and accuracy of our study depends on you and the others who have not yet responded. You and the other tournament anglers who have not responded may have different opinions and may represent a completely different portion of the fishing public than those who have sent in their questionnaires. We need to hear from YOU.

The enclosed survey is designed to tell us about your general fishing activities, your fishing activity and preferences at the tournament, and your expenditures incurred on your trip. The information will be useful in understanding the economic impacts of the Buff Foundation / Sertoma By the Bay Billfish Tournament. Additionally, the information will allow us to determine the value anglers place on the tournament.

You are one of a small number of anglers selected to participate in this study. It is important that YOU and no one else complete the questionnaire. Your responses are important to us whether you fish tournaments often, or this was your first time. All responses will be strictly confidential, and you will not be identified with your answers.

After you complete the questionnaire, please return it in the postage-paid, business reply envelope as soon as possible. If you have any questions, please feel free to call Carol Thailing with Texas A&M University at (979) 845-4283. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Bill Gooch  
Tournament Director

## **Appendix E: Non-respondent Interview Schedule**

**2000 Red, White, and Blue Billfish Tournament**

Phone: «PHONE»

Hello, may I please speak to: «FIRST» «LAST»

Date/Time to call back: \_\_\_\_\_

My name is Ryan Reitz, and I am calling from Texas A&M University of behalf of the Virginia Beach, Red, White, and Blue Tournaments. Recently, we sent you a survey regarding your participation in the 2000 Red, White, and Blue Tournament, but we never heard back from you. I would like to ask you about 10 quick questions to help complete our study. It will only take a couple of minutes.

1. Compared to your other outdoor recreation activities (such as golf, tennis, hunting, camping), would you rate fishing as:

- 1 Your most important outdoor activity
- 2 Your second most important outdoor activity
- 3 Your third most important outdoor activity
- 4 Only one of my outdoor activities

2. Since this time last year, how many days did you go fishing in?

- Freshwater \_\_\_\_\_
- Saltwater from a boat \_\_\_\_\_
- Saltwater from shore or pier \_\_\_\_\_

3. How many days did you fish in this tournament? \_\_\_\_\_

4. How many nights did you stay in Virginia Beach? \_\_\_\_\_

5. How many non-tournament fishing family members or friends came with you to the tournament? \_\_\_\_\_

6. On your fishing trip to participate in the Red, White, and Blue Tournament, how much did you spend on each of the following items in Virginia Beach and the state of Virginia?

	<b>In the city of Virginia Beach</b>	<b>In other parts of Virginia</b>
Transportation (gas, rental car, other transportation)	_____	_____
Gas and oil for boat/Slip and dockage fees	_____	_____
Charter Fees/Tips	_____	_____
Fishing Tackle and Equipment/Bait	_____	_____
Boat Repairs/Upgrades	_____	_____
Lodging (hotel/condo rental)	_____	_____
Restaurant meals	_____	_____
Groceries, snacks, foods, drinks, ice	_____	_____
Entertainment (museums, theaters, etc.)	_____	_____

7. How did you find out about this tournament? **(Please check all that apply)**

- |                          |                                     |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| _____ Friends            | _____ Magazine                      |
| _____ Radio              | _____ Newspaper                     |
| _____ Television         | _____ Internet                      |
| _____ Mail advertisement | _____ Other (Please specify: _____) |

8. Overall, how satisfied were you with this tournament?

- Not at all      Slightly      Moderately      Very      Extremely

9. What is your age? \_\_\_\_\_

**Don't ask**      Male      Female

Thanks for your time and helping us complete this survey.

**2000 Buff Foundation / Sertoma By the Bay Ladies Only Tournament**

Phone: «PHONE»

Hello, may I please speak to: «FIRST» «LAST»

Date/Time to call back: \_\_\_\_\_

My name is Ryan Reitz, and I am calling from Texas A&M University of behalf of the Virginia Beach, Red, White, and Blue Tournaments. Recently, we sent you a survey regarding your participation in the 2000 Buff Foundation / Sertoma By the Bay Tournament, but we never heard back from you. I would like to ask you about 10 quick questions to help complete our study. It will only take a couple of minutes.

1. Compared to your other outdoor recreation activities (such as golf, tennis, hunting, camping), would you rate fishing as:

- 1 Your most important outdoor activity
- 2 Your second most important outdoor activity
- 3 Your third most important outdoor activity
- 4 Only one of my outdoor activities

2. Since this time last year, how many days did you go fishing in?

- Freshwater \_\_\_\_\_
- Saltwater from a boat \_\_\_\_\_
- Saltwater from shore or pier \_\_\_\_\_

3. How many days did you fish in this tournament? \_\_\_\_\_

4. How many nights did you stay in Virginia Beach? \_\_\_\_\_

5. How many non-tournament fishing family members or friends came with you to the tournament? \_\_\_\_\_

6. On your fishing trip to participate in the Buff Foundation / Sertoma By the Bay Tournament (Ladies Only), how much did you spend on each of the following items in Virginia Beach and the state of Virginia?

	<b>In the city of Virginia Beach</b>	<b>In other parts of Virginia</b>
Transportation (gas, rental car, other transportation)	_____	_____
Gas and oil for boat/Slip and dockage fees	_____	_____
Charter Fees/Tips	_____	_____
Fishing Tackle and Equipment/Bait	_____	_____
Boat Repairs/Upgrades	_____	_____
Lodging (hotel/condo rental)	_____	_____
Restaurant meals	_____	_____
Groceries, snacks, foods, drinks, ice	_____	_____
Entertainment (museums, theaters, etc.)	_____	_____

7. How did you find out about this tournament? **(Please check all that apply)**

- |                          |                                     |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| _____ Friends            | _____ Magazine                      |
| _____ Radio              | _____ Newspaper                     |
| _____ Television         | _____ Internet                      |
| _____ Mail advertisement | _____ Other (Please specify: _____) |

8. Overall, how satisfied were you with this tournament?

- Not at all      Slightly      Moderately      Very      Extremely

9. What is your age? \_\_\_\_\_

**Don't ask**      Female

Thanks for your time and helping us complete this survey.

## **Appendix F: Methodology for Calculation Margins of Error**

## Methodology for Calculating Margins of Error

For this study we used a 95% confidence interval, meaning that we are 95% confident that the true population proportion falls in the interval specified by each estimate and its associated margin of error. The precision around each estimate is determined by this level of significance (95%) and the number of observations used to make each estimate.

$$d = \frac{t\sqrt{pq}}{\sqrt{n}} * \frac{\sqrt{N-n}}{\sqrt{N}}$$

d = margin of error

t = critical value for 95% confidence interval

p = estimated proportion

q = 1-p

n = sample size

N = population

For example, the margin of error for Question #5 (Do you or someone in your household own a powerboat?) is as follows.

$$d = \frac{1.96 \sqrt{.77 (.23)}}{\sqrt{120}} * \frac{\sqrt{295-120}}{\sqrt{295}}$$

$$d = 0.029$$

Thus, we are 95% confident that the true proportion of all anglers who either own or live in a household with someone who owns a powerboat lies between 74.1% and 79.9% (i.e. 77%  $\pm$  2.9%).

Note: This is based upon the 120 participants, both RWB and BFSBB who answered this question (#5). Since not all respondents answered each question, the precision estimates will be different for each question.

## **Appendix G: Excel Spreadsheet**

The planning tool provided in the accompanying diskette can be useful to planners who want to see how certain variables they control may affect the economic impacts associated with future RWB tournaments. This tool allows planners to adjust the number of boats in the tournament, as well as the distribution of where these anglers are from, to estimate total expenditures in Virginia, direct economic impact associated with those expenditures, total economic impact to Virginia and employment associated with these figures.

#### Instructions

- The worksheet must be opened as read-only. Planners can alter those values found in the cells that are shaded blue in the accompanying worksheet (Number of Boats, Location Percentages). Only values in these cells may be changed. The worksheet will calculate the remaining values, with the cells shaded in yellow (Number of Anglers, Total Number of People, Total Expenditures, Direct Economic Impact, Total Economic Impact, Employment) providing the impact estimates.
- For accurate results, data entered into the location percentages must total 100%. There are no checks in the worksheet to mandate this, however. If the percentages entered sum to over 100%, the value will show at the bottom of the location column.
- Based upon results from the 2000 event, this worksheet is designed solely for use with the RWB tournament. Calculations will not be accurate for any other tournament event.
- While offering a certain level of freedom, planners must be realistic. Remember that the number of boats that an area can handle is dependent on the infrastructure in place to accommodate those boats. The same is true for the amount of people coming from outside the area, facilities and services must sufficient to accommodate the influx of people coming from outside the area.

## 2000 Virginia Beach Red, White And Blue Tournament

Number Of Boats	Average Number Of Anglers Per Boat	Number Of Anglers	Location	Average Size Of Group	Total Number Of People	Average Total Expenditure In Virginia	Total Expenditures	Direct Economic Impact	Total Economic Impact	Employment
40	6.275	251	Percentage from Virginia Beach	2.14	307	\$728.86	\$223,760.02	\$150,000.00	\$859,000.00	15
			57.1%							
			Percentage From Virginia	2.95	193	\$656.91	\$126,783.63	\$101,000.00		
			26.0%							
Percentage From Out-Of-State	1.83	78	\$1,279.70	\$99,816.60	\$92,000.00					
16.9%										
TOTAL			100.0%		578		\$450,360.25	\$343,000.00		

Created by David K. Anderson

[Human Dimensions of Recreational Fisheries Research Lab](#)