## Managing Recreational Fisheries

 in Maryland: Two Survey-Based Approaches Examining Harvest Rates and Participation

MIAMI

Rebecca Wagner
Mentor: Dr. Scott Knoche
PEARL Internship Program 2017

## Part One:

Brook Trout Creel Survey

## Introduction

- Brook trout are a popular target for recreational fishing
- Regarded by conservationists as an indicator species
- Concern: population extirpated throughout most of Maryland
- Survey will help provide MD DNR with current population and fishing effort



## Research Objective

Objective: Implement a creel survey to estimate brook trout fishing effort, catch, and harvest in a key watershed in Maryland

## Methods

- Who?
- Survey personnel: MD DNR
- Target: recreational anglers
- What?
- Access point survey

- Where?
- Upper Gunpowder River
- When?
- Implemented on randomly selected days and times



## Survey Methods and Focus

- General Information
- Time
- Method
- Species targetted
- Fish Catch
- Species caught
- Number caught
- Number harvested
- Angler Information
- State
- County



## Results: Estimated Effort



## Results: Estimated Catch



## Results: Estimated Harvest

- No anglers reported harvesting fish
- First glance: overharvest does not appear to be a concern
- However, fish mortality from live bait may be a potential problem



## Part Two:

Factors Influencing Angler Participation

## Introduction

- 227,000 anglers hold licenses, and anglers spend 2.5 million days fishing in Maryland each year
- Maryland recreational fishing provides valuable revenue for the state
- Survey will help managers improve fishery quality by understanding preferences
- Better management has the potential
 to increase recruitment and retention


## Research Objective

## Objectives:

Quantify factors affecting angler participation in terms of license purchases and trips taken

Examine how these factors differ between demographic groups of interest

## Survey Methods and Focus

## Methods

- Survey sent to 4,300 anglers with current fishing licenses (25.1\% response rate)
- Conducted online and with mail (up to four contacts)
- My Focus
- Examine factors influencing participation
- How participation is affected by individual characteristics



## Statistical Analysis

- Methods
- Assign numerical values to priority responses
- Determine means for each factor
- Determine most important factors among respondents
- Use two sample t-tests to compare importance between groups
- Millennials vs other generations
- Anglers who fished vs anglers who did not fish in 2015


## Results: All Respondents

|  |  | Strongly <br> Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly <br> Agree | Average |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | I was able to catch <br> more fish | $4 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $31 \%$ | $36 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $\mathbf{3 . 5 7}$ |
| access to fishing <br> sites was better | $3 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $32 \%$ | $37 \%$ | $18 \%$ | 3.56 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| I knew when and <br> I WOULD GO <br> where to fish | $5 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $38 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $\mathbf{3 . 5 1}$ |  |
| environmental <br> OFTEN IN <br> MARYLAND <br> NON-TIDAL <br> WATERWAYS <br> IF...... | quality was higher | $4 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $41 \%$ | $32 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $\mathbf{3 . 4 3}$ |
| regulations were <br> less restrictive | $9 \%$ | $21 \%$ | $45 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $\mathbf{2 . 9 3}$ |  |
| fishing areas were <br> less crowded | $5 \%$ | $12 \%$ | $37 \%$ | $32 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $\mathbf{3 . 4 0}$ |  |
| fishing was less <br> expensive | $9 \%$ | $19 \%$ | $44 \%$ | $19 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $\mathbf{3 . 0 2}$ |  |
| I had somebody to <br> go with | $9 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $38 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $\mathbf{3 . 0 8}$ |  |
| I was able to catch <br> larger fish | $5 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $35 \%$ | $33 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $\mathbf{3 . 4 7}$ |  |
| I had more leisure <br> time | $5 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $29 \%$ | $33 \%$ | $\mathbf{3 . 7 9}$ |  |

## Results: Millennials

- Very different priorities from other generations
- Observed that millennials placed a higher importance on the following factors:
- The ability to catch more fish ( $p<0.01$ )
- Crowding of fishing areas ( $p<0.01$ )
- The expense of fishing ( $p<0.01$ )
- The ability to catch larger fish ( $p<0.01$ )
- Having more leisure time ( $p<0.01$ )


## Results: Non-Fishing License Holders

- Similar priorities as respondents who did fish
- Observed that non-fishing anglers placed a lower importance on the following factors...
- Catching more fish ( $p<0.01$ )
- Catching larger fish ( $\mathrm{p}<0.01$ )
- 2nd most important factor: accessibility to
 fishing sites


## Recommendations to Management

- Results may indicate a need to increase the number of fishing options close to cities
- Less time needed to take trips
- Work to appeal to millennial anglers
- Increase stocking
- Work to appeal to anglers who did not fish
- Increase accessibility
- More paths, ramps
- Evaluate the most important factors to maintain and increase license purchases and
 trips


## Thank you!

