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Two main IPHC regulatory areas where both guided and unguided Pacific halibut sport fishing occur

**Area 2C** (Southeast Alaska)

**Area 3A** (Southcentral Alaska)

**Important Issues**
- Declining stocks over the last decade
- Until 2014, allocation was determined using a guideline harvest level policy
- Guided (charter) sector has grown substantially (until recent years)
- Halibut IFQ program excludes non-commercial and non-CDQ entities, thereby precluding the flow of IFQ across sectors
- **Catch Sharing Plan (CSP)** implemented in 2014
  - Sets formula for commercial/recreational allocation depending on stock
  - Allows leasing of IFQ from commercial sector to charter sector
Project goals

- Collect baseline economic data from charter businesses

- Generate population-level estimates (total revenues, total costs, employment, etc.)
  - Fishery/state-level (here)
  - Fishing community and regional level (in progress)

- Use sample weighting and data imputation approaches to adjust for missing data

- Identify/assess trends in costs, revenues, employment in 2011-2013 fishing seasons
  - Details in NOAA tech memo (Lew, Sampson, Himes-Cornell, Lee, and Garber-Yonts 2015)
Alaska Saltwater Sport Fishing Charter Business Survey

- 12 page survey that collects data from Alaska charter businesses offering sport fishing trips to angler clients in Alaska.

- Target population: All active charter businesses in Alaska.

- Data collected include: employment, services offered, revenues, costs, types of clients.

- Administered as a population census in 2012-2014 as a repeat mail survey (using a modified Dillman approach including a telephone prompt).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fishing Year</th>
<th>Population Size</th>
<th>Unit Responses</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Missing data

• Missing data comes in two forms
  • **Unit non-response**: sampled individuals or entities (i.e., the targeted respondents contacted to participate) that do not respond to any component of the survey
  • **Item non-response**: refers to cases where individual questions in the survey are left unanswered

• Voluntary social and economic surveys in fisheries contexts often have missing data

• Missing data may introduce biases in survey estimates if unaddressed

• Weighting and data imputation are used to adjust sample data for missing data
Sample weighting

Individual weight for individual $i (w_i)$, $\forall i$ in $n$ (Brick and Kalton):

$$w_i = w_{1i} \times w_{2i} \times w_{3i}$$

where

$w_1 = \text{sample selection weight ("base" weight)}$

*inverse of the probability of being selected for sample (e.g., $N/N^\text{pop}$ for simple random sample)*

$w_2 = \text{non-response adjustment weight}$

*adjusts for difference in those who respond and those who do not*

$w_3 = \text{post-stratification weight}$

*ensures that the sample conforms to a known population characteristic (reduces coverage error)*
Non-response adjustment and post-stratification weights

• Non-response weight ($w_2$)
  • Used logit model to identify differences between respondents and non-respondents based on 17 variables from charter logbook records
  • Weighting classes: divide respondents and non-respondents on small number of characteristics (respondents given weights equal to inverse of frequency within each cell)

• Post-stratification weights ($w_3$)
  • Weights were based on both effort (as measured by total client trips) and IPHC area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>2011 weight ($w_2$)</th>
<th>Percent of responding sample (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No late shoulder or off-season fishing</td>
<td>1.3248</td>
<td>15.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No late shoulder fishing but some off-season fishing</td>
<td>2.2996</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some late shoulder fishing but no off-season fishing</td>
<td>0.9808</td>
<td>74.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both late shoulder and off-season fishing</td>
<td>0.527</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>2012 weight ($w_2$)</th>
<th>Percent of responding sample (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did not fish for salmon</td>
<td>0.6562</td>
<td>14.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fished for salmon</td>
<td>1.0588</td>
<td>85.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>2013 weight ($w_3$)</th>
<th>Percent of responding sample (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No late season fishing</td>
<td>1.8837</td>
<td>10.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late season fishing</td>
<td>0.8983</td>
<td>89.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data imputation: K-nearest neighbor imputation

• Distance function is used to determine the most similar item respondent to each item non-respondent.
  • Charter logbook data provided the auxiliary information
  • Eight variables related to where, how much, and when fishing was done, as well as the types of fishing, such as target species

• Missing values are randomly selected from among the K=3 nearest neighbors
Population totals and variances

- Totals for costs, revenues, and employment are calculated by weighted summation over constituent categories after the missing data have been imputed.

- Variances are calculated using the simulation approach of Shao (2002) that accounts for the variance associated with the data imputation method.
Labor population estimates, 2011-2013

Notes:
- Population of charter businesses fell between 2011-2013 (650 to 572)
- Full and part-time workers aggregated
- Most year-to-year changes occurred in main fishing season (Memorial Day to Labor Day)
Estimated mean costs by type

Figure 34. -- Mean estimated major expenses by type for the population of charter businesses for 2011-2013. Error bars represent two standard errors above and below the means.
Figure 33. -- Mean estimated population-level revenues for the 2011, 2012, and 2013 fishing years. Error bars represent two standard errors around the mean.
Population-level total revenue and cost estimates

Table 38. -- Summary of total (in millions) and mean revenues and expenses for the 2011, 2012, and 2013 fishing years (in 2013 dollars).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>144.90</td>
<td>220,931</td>
<td>124.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4.39)</td>
<td>(6,719)</td>
<td>(4.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Costs (excluding investment payments)</td>
<td>181.65</td>
<td>276,956</td>
<td>109.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7.14)</td>
<td>(10,164)</td>
<td>(1.70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Expenses</td>
<td>33.11</td>
<td>50,489</td>
<td>23.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.28)</td>
<td>(1,941)</td>
<td>(0.58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charter Trip Expenses</td>
<td>42.60</td>
<td>64,952</td>
<td>30.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.77)</td>
<td>(4,233)</td>
<td>(0.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead Expenses</td>
<td>57.47</td>
<td>87,618</td>
<td>32.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.34)</td>
<td>(3,554)</td>
<td>(0.77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Expenditures</td>
<td>48.47</td>
<td>73,897</td>
<td>23.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5.18)</td>
<td>(7,874)</td>
<td>(0.93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Payments</td>
<td>23.64</td>
<td>36,051</td>
<td>30.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.85)</td>
<td>(2,823)</td>
<td>(1.87)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: standard errors are given in parentheses.
Discussion

• Labor
  • Some shifts to more full-time employment for shore and crew workers, decline in number of shore workers
  • Total number of guides were fairly constant across years despite a shrinking fleet

• Revenues and Costs
  • Revenues were higher in 2013 compared to 2011
  • Except for investment expenses, average per business costs were lower in 2013 than in 2011

• Implications
  • Charter sector operated at a loss during 2011, but then became profitable in 2012-2013
Next Steps

• Fishing community-level analysis (in progress)
  • Apply weighting and data imputation to generate fishing community-level estimates
  • Did recreational charter fishing change in the years leading up the CSP in fishing communities?

• Contributions analysis (state and regional levels)
  • Generate estimates of total output, spending, and employment

• Post-CSP survey
  • Will be conducted in 2016 and 2017

• Individual firm-level modeling: profit functions and entry-exit decisions to measure effects of allocation and/or regulations