

2011 National Survey
of Fishing, Hunting,
and Wildlife-Associated Recreation




Utah



2011 National Survey of Fishing, Hunting, and Wildlife-Associated Recreation



Utah



U.S. Department of the Interior
Sally Jewell,
Secretary

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Dan Ashe,
Director



U.S. Department of Commerce
Cameron F. Kerry,
Acting Secretary

Economics and Statistics Administration
Mark Doms,
Under Secretary for Economic Affairs

U.S. CENSUS BUREAU
Thomas L. Mesenbourg,
Acting Director



**Economics and Statistics
Administration**
Mark Doms,
Under Secretary for
Economic Affairs



U.S. CENSUS BUREAU
Thomas L. Mesenbourg,
Acting Director



U.S. Department of the Interior
Sally Jewell,
Secretary



U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Dan Ashe,
Director



Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration
Hannibal Bolton,
Assistant Director

The U.S. Department of the Interior protects and manages the Nation's natural resources and cultural heritage; provides scientific and other information about those resources; and honors its trust responsibilities or special commitments to American Indians, Alaska Natives, and affiliated Island Communities. The mission of the Department's U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is working with others to conserve, protect, and enhance fish, wildlife, and their habitats for the continuing benefit of the American people. The Service is responsible for national programs of vital importance to our natural resources, including administration of the Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs. These two programs provide financial assistance to the States for projects to enhance and protect fish and wildlife resources and to assure their availability to the public for recreational purposes. Multistate grants from these programs fund the National Survey of Fishing, Hunting, and Wildlife-Associated Recreation.

Suggested Citation

U.S. Department of the Interior, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and U.S. Department of Commerce, U.S. Census Bureau. 2011 National Survey of Fishing, Hunting, and Wildlife-Associated Recreation.

Contents

List of Tables.	iv
Foreword.	vi
Survey Background and Method	vii

Highlights

Introduction.	2
Summary.	4
Wildlife-Related Recreation	5
Sportspersons	6
Anglers	7
Hunters	9
Wildlife Watchers	11
2001–2011 Comparison	13

Tables

Guide to Statistical Tables.	16
Fishing and Hunting Tables	17
Wildlife-Watching Tables	33

Appendixes

A. Definitions	44
B. 2010 Participation of 6- to 15-Year-Olds: Data From Screening Interviews	48
C. Significant Methodological Changes From Previous Surveys and Regional Trends	54
D. Sample Design and Statistical Accuracy	64

List of Tables

Fishing and Hunting

1. Fishing and Hunting in Utah by Resident and Nonresident Sportspersons: 2011	17
2. Anglers and Hunters, Days of Participation, and Trips in Utah by Type of Fishing and Hunting: 2011	17
3. Anglers and Hunters, Trips, and Days of Participation: 2011	18
4. Utah Resident Anglers and Hunters by Place Fished or Hunted: 2011	18
5. Utah Resident Anglers and Hunters, Days of Participation, and Trips in the United States by Type of Fishing and Hunting: 2011	18
6. Freshwater Anglers, Trips, Days of Fishing, and Type of Water Fished: 2011	19
7. Freshwater Anglers and Days of Fishing in Utah by Type of Fish: 2011	19
8. Great Lakes Anglers, Trips, and Days of Fishing in Utah: 2011	20
9. Great Lakes Anglers and Days of Fishing in Utah by Type of Fish: 2011	20
10. Saltwater Anglers, Trips, and Days of Fishing in Utah: 2011	21
11. Saltwater Anglers and Days of Fishing in Utah by Type of Fish: 2011	21
12. Hunters, Trips, and Days of Hunting in Utah by Type of Hunting: 2011	22
13. Hunters and Days of Hunting in Utah by Type of Game: 2011	22
14. Hunters and Days of Hunting in Utah by Type of Land: 2011	23
15. Selected Characteristics of Utah Resident Anglers and Hunters: 2011	24
16. Summary of Expenditures in Utah by State Residents and Nonresidents Combined for Fishing and Hunting: 2011	25
17. Summary of Fishing Trip and Equipment Expenditures in Utah by State Residents and Nonresidents Combined by Type of Fishing: 2011	26
18. Summary of Hunting Trip and Equipment Expenditures in Utah by State Residents and Nonresidents Combined by Type of Hunting: 2011	27
19. Expenditures in Utah by State Residents and Nonresidents Combined for Fishing: 2011	28
20. Expenditures in Utah by State Residents and Nonresidents Combined for Hunting: 2011	29
21. Trip and Equipment Expenditures in Utah for Fishing and Hunting by Utah Residents and Nonresidents: 2011	30
22. Summary of Utah Residents' Fishing and Hunting Expenditures Both Inside and Outside Utah: 2011	31
23. In-State and Out-of-State Expenditures by Utah Residents for Fishing and Hunting: 2011	32

Wildlife Watching

24. Wildlife Watching in Utah by State Residents and Nonresidents Combined: 2011	33
25. Participants, Trips, and Days of Participation in Away-From-Home Wildlife Watching in Utah: 2011	33
26. Away-From-Home Wildlife-Watching Participants by Wildlife Observed, Photographed, or Fed in Utah: 2011	34
27. Participation in Wildlife-Watching Activities Around the Home in Utah: 2011	34
28. Utah Residents Participating in Wildlife Watching in the United States: 2011	35
29. Wild Bird Observers and Days of Observation in Utah by State Residents and Nonresidents: 2011	35

30. Selected Characteristics of Utah Residents Participating in Wildlife Watching: 2011	36
31. Expenditures in Utah by State Residents and Nonresidents Combined for Wildlife Watching: 2011	37
32. Trip and Equipment Expenditures in Utah for Wildlife Watching by Utah Residents and Nonresidents: 2011	38
33. Wildlife-Watching Expenditures Both Inside and Outside Utah by Utah Residents: 2011	39
34. In-State and Out-of-State Expenditures by Utah Residents for Wildlife Watching: 2011	40
35. Participation of Utah Resident Wildlife-Watching Participants in Fishing and Hunting: 2011	40
36. Participation of Utah Resident Sportspersons in Wildlife-Watching Activities: 2011	41

Foreword

When I was growing up, it was taken as a matter of faith that kids belonged outside. I grew up with 4 brothers, and during those long, hot Atlanta summers, it was common for our mom to holler, “You boys get outside, and don’t come back ‘til it’s dark.” It never occurred to me or my brothers to do anything else in our spare time but explore the world around us. The truth is, we had little else to do. But those experiences – waking up on frosty mornings and starting the campfire, scanning trees for a shot at a scampering gray squirrel in the dawn light, scouring creek beds for crawdads and other fishing bait, or simply of the fun we had tramping through the forest – shaped who I am, and drew me to a career in conservation.


That’s why I’m excited by this 2011 National Survey of Fishing, Hunting, and Wildlife-Associated Recreation. This report, the 12th in a series that began in 1955, documents a significant resurgence in the number of people embracing America’s Great Outdoors. Hunting participation has increased by 9 percent, while angling participation grew by 11 percent. Nearly 38 percent of Americans participated in wildlife-related recreation, an increase of 2.6 million participants from the 2006 Survey.

In addition, wildlife-related recreation is a major driver of the nation’s economy. The 2011 Survey estimates that Americans spent \$145 billion on related gear, trips, licenses, land acquisition or leases, and other purchases, representing about one percent of the nation’s gross domestic product. This spending creates thousands of jobs, supports countless local communities and provides vital funding for conservation.

This year marks the 75th anniversary of the Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Program, a cornerstone of wildlife conservation in the United States. Through excise taxes on firearms, ammunition, archery and angling equipment, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has distributed over \$14 billion for State and territorial wildlife conservation programs.

This report would not have been possible without the combined efforts of state wildlife agencies – which provided financial support through the Multi-State Conservation Grant Programs – the Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies and a number of major national conservation organizations. We also owe our gratitude to the thousands of survey respondents from households across America. Because of you, this Survey is the nation’s definitive wildlife-related recreation database and information source concerning participation and purchases associated with hunting, fishing and other forms of wildlife-associated recreation nationwide.

The Fish and Wildlife Service is dedicated to connecting people and families with nature. We are proud to celebrate the good news in this report, and we look forward to continuing progress as we work with the States, and all our partners and the public to help keep recreational fishing, hunting, and wildlife watching growing and going strong.



Dan Ashe
Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Survey Background and Method

The National Survey of Fishing, Hunting, and Wildlife-Associated Recreation (Survey) has been conducted since 1955 and is one of the oldest and most comprehensive continuing recreation surveys. The Survey collects information on the number of anglers, hunters, and wildlife watchers, how often they participate, and how much they spend on their activities in the United States.

Preparations for the 2011 Survey began in 2008 when the Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (AFWA) asked the Fish and Wildlife Service to coordinate the twelfth National Survey of wildlife-related recreation. Funding came from the Multistate Conservation Grant Programs, authorized by Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Acts, as amended.

Four regional technical committees were set up under the auspices of AFWA to ensure that State fish and wildlife agencies had an opportunity to participate in all phases of survey planning and design. The committees were made up of agency representatives.

We consulted with State and Federal agencies and nongovernmental organizations such as the American Sportfishing Association and National Shooting Sports Foundation to determine survey content. Other sportspersons' organizations and conservation

groups, industry representatives, and researchers also provided valuable advice.

Data collection for the Survey was carried out in two phases by the U.S. Census Bureau. The first phase was the screen which began in April 2011. During the screening phase, the Census Bureau interviewed a sample of 48,600 households nationwide, to determine who in the household had fished, hunted, or wildlife watched in 2010, and who had engaged or planned to engage in those activities in 2011. In most cases, one adult household member provided information for all members. The screen primarily covered 2010 activities while the next, more in-depth phase covered 2011 activities. For more information on the 2010 data, refer to Appendix B.

The second phase of data collection consisted of three detailed interview waves. The first wave began in April 2011 concurrent with the screen, the second in September 2011, and the last in January 2012. Interviews were conducted with samples of likely anglers, hunters, and wildlife watchers who were identified in the initial screening phase. Interviews were conducted primarily by telephone, with in-person interviews for respondents who could not be reached by phone. Respondents in the second survey phase were limited to those who were

at least 16 years old. Each respondent provided information pertaining only to his or her activities and expenditures. Sample sizes were designed to provide statistically reliable results at the state level. Altogether, interviews were completed for 11,330 anglers and hunters and 9,329 wildlife watchers. More detailed information on sampling procedures and response rates is found in Appendix D.

Comparability With Previous Surveys

The 2011 Survey's questions and methodology were similar to those used in the 2006, 2001, 1996, and 1991 Surveys. Therefore, the estimates are comparable.

The methodology for these Surveys differs significantly from the 1955 to 1985 Surveys, so these estimates are not directly comparable to those of earlier surveys. Changes in methodology included reducing the recall period over which respondents had to report their activities and expenditures. Previous Surveys used a 12-month recall period which resulted in greater reporting bias. Research found that the amount of activity and expenditures reported in 12-month recall surveys was overestimated in comparison with that reported using shorter recall periods.

The background is a monochromatic green illustration depicting various outdoor recreation activities. In the upper left, a person sits on a log drinking from a can, with a small dog beside them. To the right, a person stands holding a rifle, with a dog standing nearby. In the center-left, a person is shown in a dynamic pose, possibly archery or a dance. In the lower left, two people are in a canoe on a body of water. In the center, two people are using binoculars. In the lower right, a person is standing in water, possibly fishing. The scene is filled with stylized trees, mountains, and butterflies, creating a sense of a vibrant outdoor environment.

Highlights

Introduction

The National Survey of Fishing, Hunting, and Wildlife-Associated Recreation reports results from interviews with U.S. residents about their fishing, hunting, and wildlife watching. This report focuses on 2011 participation and expenditures of persons 16 years of age and older.

The Survey is a snapshot of one year. The information it collected tells us how many people participated and how much they spent on their activities in the State in 2011. It does not tell us how many anglers, hunters, and wildlife watchers there were because many do not participate every year. For example, based on information collected in the Survey's household screen phase, we can estimate that about 51 percent more anglers and 44 percent more hunters participated nationally in at least 1 of the 5 years prior to the screen survey year 2010.

In addition to 2011 estimates, we also provide trend information in the Highlights section and Appendix C of the report. The 2011 numbers reported can be compared with those in the 1991, 1996, 2001, and 2006 Survey reports because they used similar methodologies. The 2011 estimates should not be directly compared with results from Surveys conducted prior to 1991 because of changes in methodology to improve accuracy.

The report also provides information on participation in wildlife recreation in 2010, particularly of persons 6 to 15 years of age. The 2010 information is provided in Appendix B. Information about the Survey's scope and coverage is in Appendix D. The remainder of this section defines important terms used in the Survey.

This report does not provide information about the State's wildlife resources. That, and additional information on wildlife-related recreation, may be obtained from State fish and wildlife agencies. The Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies can provide the addresses and telephone numbers of those agencies. The Association's website is www.fishwildlife.org.

Additionally, this report does not provide information about the State's number of licensed anglers and hunters. Historical license data can be found at wsfrprograms.fws.gov.

Wildlife-Related Recreation

Wildlife-related recreation is fishing, hunting, and wildlife-watching activities. These categories are not mutually exclusive because many individuals participated in more than one activity. Wildlife-related recreation is reported in two major categories: (1) fishing and hunting, and (2) wildlife watching, which includes observing, photographing, and feeding fish or wildlife.

Fishing and Hunting

This Survey reports information about residents of the United States who fished or hunted in 2011, regardless of whether they were licensed. The fishing and hunting sections report information for three groups: (1) sportspersons, (2) anglers, and (3) hunters.


Sportspersons

Sportspersons are those who fished or hunted. Individuals who fished or hunted commercially in 2011 are reported as sportspersons *only* if they also fished or hunted for recreation. The sportspersons group is composed of the three subgroups shown in the diagram below: (1) those that fished and hunted, (2) those that only fished, and (3) those that only hunted.

The total number of sportspersons is equal to the sum of people who only fished, only hunted, and both fished and hunted. It is not the sum of all anglers and all hunters because those people who both fished and hunted are included in both the angler and hunter population and would be incorrectly counted twice.

Anglers

Anglers are sportspersons who only fished plus those who fished and hunted. Anglers include not only licensed hook and line anglers, but also those who have no license and those who use special methods such as fishing with spears. Three types of fishing are reported: (1) freshwater, excluding the Great Lakes, (2) Great Lakes, and (3) saltwater. Since many anglers participated in more than one type of fishing, the total number of anglers is less than the sum of the three types of fishing.



Hunters

Hunters are sportspersons who only hunted plus those who hunted and fished. Hunters include not only licensed hunters using rifles and shotguns, but also those who have no license and those who engage in hunting with archery equipment, muzzleloaders, other primitive firearms, or pistols or handguns.

Four types of hunting are reported: (1) big game, (2) small game, (3) migratory bird, and (4) other animals. Since many hunters participated in more than one type of hunting, the sum of hunters for big game, small game, migratory bird, and other animals exceeds the total number of hunters.

Wildlife Watchers

Since 1980, the National Survey has included information on wildlife-watching activities in addition to fishing and hunting. However, unlike the 1980 and 1985 Surveys, the National Surveys since 1991 have

collected data only for those activities where the *primary* purpose was wildlife watching (observing, photographing, or feeding wildlife).

The 2011 Survey uses a strict definition of wildlife watching. Participants must either take a “special interest” in wildlife around their homes or take a trip for the “primary purpose” of wildlife watching. Secondary wildlife watching, such as incidentally observing wildlife while pleasure driving, is not included.

Two types of wildlife-watching activity are reported: (1) away-from-home (formerly nonresidential) activities and (2) around-the-home (formerly residential) activities. Because some people participated in more than one type of wildlife watching, the sum of participants in each type will be greater than the total number of wildlife watchers. Only those engaged in activities whose *primary* purpose was wildlife watching are included in the Survey. The two types of wildlife-watching activity are defined below.

Away-From-Home

This group includes persons who took trips or outings of at least 1 mile from home for the primary purpose of observing, feeding, or photographing fish and wildlife. Trips to fish or hunt or scout and trips to zoos, circuses, aquariums, and museums are not considered wildlife-watching activities.

Around-The-Home

This group includes those who participated within 1 mile of home and involves one or more of the following: (1) closely observing or trying to identify birds or other wildlife; (2) photographing wildlife; (3) feeding birds or other wildlife; (4) maintaining natural areas of at least 1/4 acre where benefit to wildlife is the primary concern; (5) maintaining plantings (shrubs, agricultural crops, etc.) where benefit to wildlife is the primary concern; or (6) visiting parks and natural areas within 1 mile of home for the primary purpose of observing, feeding, or photographing wildlife.

2011 Utah Summary

Activities in Utah by Residents and Nonresidents

Fishing

Anglers	414,000
Days of fishing	5,979,000
Average days per angler	14
Total expenditures	\$451,259,000
Trip-related	\$226,251,000
Equipment and other	\$225,008,000
Average per angler	\$1,089
Average trip expenditure per day	\$38

Hunting

Hunters	193,000
Days of hunting	2,720,000
Average days per hunter	14
Total expenditures	\$499,141,000
Trip-related	\$186,765,000
Equipment and other	\$312,376,000
Average per hunter	\$2,334
Average trip expenditure per day	\$69

Wildlife Watching

Total wildlife-watching participants . .	717,000
Away-from-home participants	402,000
Around-the-home participants	430,000
Days of participation away from home . .	5,169,000
Average days of participation away from home	13
Total expenditures	\$585,406,000
Trip-related	\$295,723,000
Equipment and other	\$289,683,000
Average per participant	\$801
Average trip expenditure per day	\$57

Activities by Utah Residents Both Inside and Outside Utah

Fishing

Anglers	351,000
Days of fishing	5,609,000
Average days per angler	16
Total expenditures	\$381,829,000
Trip-related	\$169,983,000
Equipment and other	\$211,846,000
Average per angler	\$1,087
Average trip expenditure per day	\$30

Hunting

Hunters	161,000
Days of hunting	2,618,000
Average days per hunter	16
Total expenditures	\$363,040,000
Trip-related	\$130,136,000
Equipment and other	\$232,904,000
Average per hunter	\$2,253
Average trip expenditure per day	\$50

Wildlife Watching

Total wildlife-watching participants . .	558,000
Away-from-home participants	263,000
Around-the-home participants	430,000
Days of participation away from home . .	3,127,000
Average days of participation away from home	12
Total expenditures	\$380,067,000
Trip-related	\$129,357,000
Equipment and other	\$250,710,000
Average per participant	\$681
Average trip expenditure per day	\$41

Wildlife-Related Recreation

Participation in Utah

The 2011 Survey found that 1.0 million Utah residents and nonresidents 16 years old and older fished, hunted, or wildlife watched in Utah. Of the total number of participants, 414 thousand fished, 193 thousand hunted, and 717 thousand participated in wildlife-watching activities, which includes observing, feeding, and photographing wildlife. The sum of anglers, hunters, and wildlife watchers exceeds the total number of participants in wildlife-related recreation because many of the individuals engaged in more than one wildlife-related activity.

Participation in 2011 by 6- to 15-Year-Old Utah Residents

The focus of the National Survey is on the activity of participants 16 years old and older. However, the activity of 6- to 15-year-olds can be calculated using the screening data covering the year 2010. It is assumed for estimation purposes that the proportion of 6- to 15-year-old participants to participants 16 years old


and older remained the same in 2010 and 2011. Based on this assumption, in addition to the 351 thousand resident anglers 16 years old or older in Utah, there were 133 thousand resident anglers 6 to 15 years old. Also, there were 161 thousand Utahns 16 years old and older and 24 thousand Utahns 6 to 15 years old who hunted. Finally, there were 558 thousand Utahns 16 years old and older and 158 thousand Utahns 6 to 15 years old who wildlife watched. Information on 2010 data for 6- to 15-year-olds is provided in Appendix B..

Expenditures in Utah

In 2011, state residents and nonresidents spent \$1.7 billion on wildlife recreation in Utah. Of that total, trip-related expenditures were \$709 million and equipment expenditures totaled \$880 million. The remaining \$161 million was spent on licenses, contributions, land ownership and leasing, and other items.


Percent of Total Participants by Activity

(Total: 1.0 million participants)



Percent of Total Residential Participants 6 to 15 Years Old by Activity: 2010

(Total: 266 thousand participants)



Participants in Wildlife-Related Recreation in Utah: 2011

(U.S. residents 16 years old and older)

Total **1.0 million**

Sportspersons

Total **493 thousand**

Anglers 414 thousand

Hunters 193 thousand

Wildlife Watchers

Total **717 thousand**

Away from home 402 thousand


Around the home 430 thousand

Note: Detail does not add to total because of multiple responses.

Source: Tables 1 and 24.

Wildlife-Related Recreation Expenditures in Utah

(Total: \$1.7 billion)



Sportspersons

In 2011, 493 thousand state resident and nonresident sportspersons 16 years old and older fished or hunted in Utah. This group was comprised of 414 thousand anglers (84 percent of all sportspersons)

and 193 thousand hunters (39 percent of all sportspersons). Among the 493 thousand sportspersons who fished or hunted in the state, 300 thousand (61 percent) fished but did not hunt in Utah.

Another 79 thousand (16 percent) hunted but did not fish there. The remaining 114 thousand (23 percent) fished and hunted in Utah in 2011.

Sportspersons' Participation in Utah	
(State residents and nonresidents 16 years old and older)	
Sportspersons (fished or hunted)	493 thousand
Anglers	414 thousand
Fished only	300 thousand
Fished and hunted	114 thousand
Hunters	193 thousand
Hunted only	79 thousand
Hunted and fished	114 thousand
Note: Detail does not add to total because of multiple responses.	
Source: Table 1.	

Anglers

Participants and Days of Fishing

In 2011, 414 thousand state residents and nonresidents 16 years old and older fished in Utah. Of this total, 343 thousand anglers (83 percent) were state residents and 70 thousand anglers (17 percent) were nonresidents. Anglers fished a total of 6.0 million days in Utah—an average of 14 days per

angler. State residents fished 5.4 million days—90 percent of all fishing days in Utah. Nonresidents fished 606 thousand days in Utah—10 percent of all fishing days in the state.

A large majority of Utah residents who fished anywhere in the United States did so in their resident state. There were 351 thousand Utah residents 16 years

old and older who fished in the United States in 2011 for a total of 5.6 million days. An estimated 98 percent of all Utah residents who fished did so in their home state. Of all fishing days by Utah residents, 96 percent or 5.4 million were in their home state. For further details about fishing in Utah, see Table 3.

Anglers in Utah

(State residents and nonresidents 16 years old and older)

Anglers	414 thousand
Residents	343 thousand
Nonresidents.	70 thousand
 Days of fishing	 6.0 million
Residents	5.4 million
Nonresidents.	606 thousand

Source: Table 3.

In State/Out of State

(State residents 16 years old and older)

Utah anglers.	351 thousand
In Utah	343 thousand
In other states	42 thousand
 Days of fishing	 5.6 million
In Utah	5.4 million
In other states	239 thousand

Note: Detail does not add to total because of multiple responses.

Source: Table 3.

Fishing Expenditures in Utah

All fishing-related expenditures in Utah totaled \$451 million in 2011. Trip-related expenditures, including food and lodging, transportation, and other expenses totaled \$226 million—50 percent of all fishing expenditures. Expenditures for food and lodging were \$94 million and transportation expenditures were \$78 million. Other trip expenses, such as equipment rental, bait, and cooking fuel, totaled \$55 million. Each angler spent an average of \$547 on trip-related costs during 2011.

Anglers spent \$212 million on equipment in Utah in 2011, 47 percent of all fishing expenditures. Fishing equipment (rods, reels, lines, etc.) spending totaled \$52 million—25 percent of the equipment total. Auxiliary equipment expenditures (tents, special fishing clothing, etc.) and special equipment expenditures (boats, vans, etc.) amounted to \$159 million—75 percent of the equipment total. Expenditures classified as special and auxiliary equipment are on items that were purchased for fishing but could be used in activities other than fishing.

The purchase of other items, such as magazines, membership dues, licenses, permits, stamps, and land leasing and ownership, amounted to \$13 million—3 percent of all fishing expenditures. For more details about fishing expenditures in Utah, see Tables 19 and 21 through 23.

Fishing Expenditures in Utah


(State residents and nonresidents 16 years old and older)

Total	\$451 million
Trip-related	\$226 million
Equipment	\$212 million
Fishing	\$52 million
Auxiliary and special	\$159 million
Other	\$13 million

Source: Table 19.


Fishing Expenditures in Utah

(Total: \$451 million)



Percent of Anglers by Residence

(Total: 414 thousand participants)



Hunters

Participants and Days of Hunting

In 2011, there were 193 thousand residents and nonresidents 16 years old and older who hunted in Utah. Resident hunters numbered 158 thousand, accounting for 82 percent of the hunters in Utah. There were 35 thousand nonresidents who hunted in Utah—18 percent of the State’s hunters. Residents and nonresidents hunted 2.7 million

days in 2011, an average of 14 days per hunter. Residents hunted 2.5 million days in Utah or 91 percent of all hunting days, while nonresidents spent 238 thousand days in Utah or 9 percent of all hunting days.

There were 161 thousand Utah residents 16 years old and older who hunted in the United States in 2011 for

a total of 2.6 million days. An estimated 98 percent of all Utah residents who hunted did so in their home state. Of all hunting days by Utah residents, 95 percent or 2.5 million were spent pursuing game in their home state. For further information on hunting activities by Utah residents, see Table 3.

Hunters in Utah

(State residents and nonresidents 16 years old and older)

Hunters.	193 thousand
Residents	158 thousand
Nonresidents.	35 thousand
Days of hunting	2.7 million
Residents	2.5 million
Nonresidents.	238 thousand

Source: Table 3.

In State/Out of State

(State residents 16 years old and older)

Utah hunters	161 thousand
In Utah	158 thousand
In other states
Days of hunting	2.6 million
In Utah	2.5 million
In other states

... Sample size too small (less than 10) to report data reliably.

Source: Table 3.

Hunting Expenditures in Utah

All hunting-related expenditures in Utah totaled \$499 million in 2011. Trip-related expenses, such as food and lodging, transportation, and other trip expenses, totaled \$187 million—37 percent of total expenditures. Expenditures for food and lodging were \$51 million and transportation expenditures were \$102 million. Other trip expenses, such as equipment rental, totaled \$34 million for the year. The average trip-related expenditure per hunter was \$968.

Hunters spent \$262 million on equipment—52 percent of all hunting expenditures. Hunting equipment (guns, ammunition, etc.) totaled \$148 million and made up 57 percent of all equipment costs. Hunters spent \$114 million on auxiliary equipment (tents, special hunting clothes, etc.) and special equipment (boats, vans, etc.), accounting for 43 percent of total equipment expenditures for hunting. Expenditures classified as special and auxiliary equipment are on items that were purchased for hunting but could be used in activities other than hunting.

The purchase of other items, such as magazines, membership dues, licenses, permits, and land leasing, and ownership, cost hunters \$50 million—10 percent of all hunting expenditures. For more details on hunting expenditures in Utah, see Tables 20 through 23.

Hunting Expenditures in Utah


(State residents and nonresidents 16 years old and older)

Total	\$499 million
Trip-related	\$187 million
Equipment	\$262 million
Hunting	\$148 million
Auxiliary and special	\$114 million
Other	\$50 million

Source: Table 20.


Hunting Expenditures in Utah

(Total: \$499 million)




Percent of Hunters by Residence


(Total: 193 thousand participants)




Comparative Hunting Expenditures by Type of Hunting



Trip expenditures per hunter:



Trip expenditures per day:



... Sample size too small (less than 10) to report data reliably.

Wildlife Watchers

Participants and Days of Activity

In 2011, 717 thousand U.S. residents 16 years old and older fed, observed, or photographed wildlife in Utah. Most of them, 60 percent (430 thousand), enjoyed their activities close to home and are called “around-the-home” participants. Those persons who enjoyed wildlife at least one mile from

home are called “away-from-home” participants. People participating in away-from-home activities in Utah in 2011 numbered 402 thousand—56 percent of all wildlife watchers in Utah. Of the 402 thousand, 224 thousand were state residents and 178 thousand were nonresidents.

Utahns 16 years old and older who enjoyed away-from-home wildlife watching within their state totaled 224 thousand. Of this group, 206 thousand participants observed wildlife and 127 thousand photographed wildlife. Since some individuals engaged in more than one of the away-from-home activities during the year, the sum of wildlife observers, feeders, and photographers exceeds the total number away-from-home participants.

Utahns spent 2.6 million days engaged in away-from-home wildlife-watching activities in their state. They spent 1.8 million days observing and 746 thousand days photographing wildlife. For further details about away-from-home activities, see Table 25.

Utah residents also took an active interest in wildlife around their homes. In 2011, 430 thousand state residents enjoyed observing, feeding, and photographing wildlife within one mile of their homes. Among this around-the-home group, 336 thousand fed, 206 thousand observed, and 197 thousand photographed wildlife around their homes. Another 48 thousand participants visited parks or natural areas within a mile of home because of the wildlife. Summing the number of participants in these activities results in an estimate that exceeds the total number of around-the-home participants because many people participated in more than one type of around-the-home activity. In addition, 31 percent of Utahn around-the-home wildlife watchers also enjoyed wildlife away from home. For further details about Utah residents participating in around-the-home wildlife-watching activities, see Table 27.

Wildlife-Watching Participants in Utah

(State residents and nonresidents 16 years old and older)

Total	717 thousand
Around the home	430 thousand
Away from home	402 thousand

Note: Detail does not add to total because of multiple responses.

Source: Table 24.

Away-From-Home Wildlife-Watching Participation in Utah

(State residents and nonresidents 16 years old and older)

Participants, total	402 thousand
Observe wildlife	378 thousand
Photograph wildlife	273 thousand
Feed wildlife	44 thousand
Days, total	5.2 million
Observe wildlife	3.6 million
Photograph wildlife	2.0 million
Feed wildlife	1.3 million

Note: Detail does not add to total because of multiple responses.

Source: Table 25.

Around-The-Home Wildlife-Watching Participation in Utah

(State residents 16 years old and older)

Total	430 thousand
Feed wildlife	336 thousand
Observe wildlife	206 thousand
Photograph wildlife	197 thousand
Maintain natural areas
Maintain plantings
Visit parks and natural areas	48 thousand

... Sample size too small (less than 10) to report data reliably.

Note: Detail does not add to total because of multiple responses.

Source: Table 27.

Wild Bird Observers

Bird watching attracted many wild-life enthusiasts in Utah. In 2011, 410 thousand people observed birds around the home and on trips in the state. Just under half, 49 percent (199 thousand), observed wild birds around the home while 65 percent (266 thousand) took trips away from home to watch birds.

Wildlife-Watching Expenditures in Utah

Wildlife watchers spent \$585 million on wildlife-watching activities in Utah in 2011. Trip-related expenditures, including food and lodging (\$126 million), transportation (\$93 million), and other trip expenses (\$77 million), such as equipment rental, amounted to \$296 million. This summation comprised 51 percent of all wildlife-watching expenditures by participants. The average of the trip-related expenditures for away-from-home participants was \$727 per person in 2011.

Wildlife-watching participants spent nearly \$238 million on equipment—41 percent of all their expenditures. Specifically, wildlife-watching equipment (binoculars, special clothing, etc.) expenditures totaled \$93 million, 39 percent of the equipment total. Auxiliary equipment expenditures (tents, backpacking equipment, etc.) and special equipment expenditures (campers, trucks, etc.) amounted to \$145 million—61 percent of all equipment costs. Expenditures classified as special and auxiliary equipment are on items that were purchased for wildlife-watching recreation but could be used in activities other than wildlife watching.

Other items purchased by wildlife-watching participants, such as magazines, membership dues and contributions, land leasing and ownership, and plantings, totaled \$52 million—9 percent of all wildlife-watching expenditures. For more details about wildlife-watching expenditures in Utah, see Table 31.

Wild Bird Observers in Utah

(State residents and nonresidents 16 years old and older)

Participants, total	410 thousand
Around the home	199 thousand
Away from home	266 thousand
Days, total	23.6 million
Around the home	20.6 million
Away from home	3.0 million

Note: Detail does not add to total because of multiple responses.

Source: Table 29.


Wildlife-Watching Expenditures in Utah

(State residents and nonresidents 16 years old and older)


Total	\$585 million
Trip-related	\$296 million
Equipment	\$238 million
Wildlife watching	\$93 million
Auxiliary and special	\$145 million
Other	\$52 million

Source: Table 31.

Wildlife-Watching Expenditures in Utah
(Total: \$585 million)



Away-From-Home Activity by Around-The-Home Participants
(Total: 430 thousand participants)



2001–2011 Comparison

Comparing the estimates from the 2001, 2006, and 2011 Surveys gives a perspective on the state of wildlife-related recreation in the early twenty-first century in Utah. Only the most general recreation comparisons are presented here.

The best way to compare estimates from surveys is not to compare the estimates themselves but to compare the confidence intervals around the esti-

mates. A 90-percent confidence interval around the estimate gives the range of estimates that 90 percent of all possible representative samples would supply. If the 90-percent confidence intervals of the two surveys' estimates overlap, it is not possible to say the two estimates are statistically different.

The state resident estimates cover the participation and expenditure activity of Utah residents anywhere in the

United States. The in-state estimates cover the participation, day, and expenditure activity if U.S. residents in Utah.

The expenditure estimates were made comparable by adjusting the estimates for inflation—all estimates are in 2011 dollars.

Utah 2001 and 2011 Comparison

(Numbers in thousands. Expenditures in 2011 dollars)

	2001	2011	Percent change
Fishing			
Anglers in state	517	414	NS-20
Days in state	5,238	5,979	NS14
In-state expenditures by U.S. anglers	\$498,672	\$451,259	NS-10
State resident anglers	424	351	-17
Total expenditures by state residents	\$508,351	\$381,829	NS-25
Hunting			
Hunters in state	198	193	NS-3
Days in state	2,455	2,720	NS11
In-state expenditures by U.S. hunters	\$371,013	\$499,141	NS35
State resident hunters	178	161	NS-10
Total expenditures by state residents	\$391,846	\$363,040	NS-7
Away-From-Home Wildlife Watching			
Participants in state	530	402	NS-24
Days in state	4,414	5,169	NS17
State resident participants	323	263	NS-19
Around-The-Home Wildlife Watching			
Total participants	515	430	NS-17
Observers	372	206	-45
Feeders	368	336	NS-9
Wildlife-Watching Expenditures			
In-state expenditures by U.S. wildlife watchers . . .	\$705,825	\$585,406	NS-17
Total expenditures by state residents	\$582,584	\$380,067	NS-35

NS Not different from zero at the 10 percent level of significance

Utah 2006 and 2011 Comparison


(Numbers in thousands. Expenditures in 2011 dollars)

	2006	2011	Percent change
Fishing			
Anglers in state	375	414	NS10
Days in state	3,822	5,979	NS56
In-state expenditures by U.S. anglers	\$414,047	\$451,259	NS9
State resident anglers	313	351	NS12
Total expenditures by state residents	\$456,334	\$381,829	NS-16
Hunting			
Hunters in state	166	193	NS16
Days in state	1,715	2,720	NS59
In-state expenditures by U.S. hunters	\$305,477	\$499,141	NS63
State resident hunters	154	161	NS5
Total expenditures by state residents	\$371,137	\$363,040	NS-2
Away-From-Home Wildlife Watching			
Participants in state	518	402	NS-22
Days in state	3,927	5,169	NS32
State resident participants	255	263	NS3
Around-The-Home Wildlife Watching			
Total participants	491	430	NS-12
Observers	335	206	-39
Feeders	365	336	NS-8
Wildlife-Watching Expenditures			
In-state expenditures by U.S. wildlife watchers	\$629,788	\$585,406	NS-7
Total expenditures by state residents	\$214,215	\$380,067	NS77

NS Not different from zero at the 10 percent level of significance


Number of People Who Hunted and Fished in Utah: 2001–2011

(In thousands)




Number of People Who Wildlife Watched in Utah: 2001–2011

(In thousands)



Total Expenditures by Participants in Utah

(In millions of 2011 dollars)





Tables

Guide to Statistical Tables

Purpose and Coverage of Tables

The statistical tables of this report were designed to meet a wide range of needs for those interested in wildlife-related recreation. Special terms used in these tables are defined in Appendix A.

The tables are based on responses to the 2011 Survey, which was designed to collect data about participation in wildlife-related recreation. To have taken part in the Survey, a respondent must have been a U.S. resident (a resident of one of the 50 states or the District of Columbia). No one residing outside the United States (including U.S. citizens) was eligible for interviewing. Therefore, reported state and national totals do not include participation by those who were not U.S. residents or who were U.S. citizens residing outside the United States.

Comparability With Previous Surveys

The numbers reported can be compared with those in the 1991, 1996, 2001, and 2006 Survey Reports. The methodology used in 2011 was similar to that used in those Surveys. These results should not be directly compared to results from Surveys earlier than 1991 since there were major changes in methodology. These changes were made to improve accuracy in the information provided.

Coverage of an Individual Table

Since the Survey covers many activities in various places by participants of different ages, all table titles, headnotes, stubs, and footnotes are designed to identify and articulate each item being reported in the table. For example, the title of Table 2 shows that data about anglers and hunters, their days of participation, and their number of trips are reported by type of activity. By contrast, the title of Table 7 indicates that it contains data on freshwater anglers and the days they fished for different species.

Percentages Reported in the Tables

Percentages are reported in the tables for the convenience of the user. When exclusive groups are being reported, the base of a percentage is apparent from its context because the percents add to 100 percent (plus or minus a rounding error). For example, Table 2 reports the number of trips taken by big game hunters, those taken by small game hunters, those taken by migratory bird hunters, and those taken by hunters pursuing other animals. These comprise 100 percent because they are exclusive categories.

Percents should not add to 100 when nonexclusive groups are being reported. Using Table 2 as an example again, note that adding the percentages associated with the total number of big game hunters, total small game hunters, total migratory bird hunters, and total hunters of other animals will not yield total hunters because respondents could hunt for more than one type of game.

When the base of the percentage is not apparent in context, it is identified in a footnote. For example, Table 15 reports two percentages with different bases: one base being the number of total participants at the head of the column and the other base being the total population who are described by the row category. Footnotes are used to clarify the bases of the reported percentages.

Footnotes to the Tables

Footnotes are used to clarify the information or items that are being reported in a table. Symbols in the body of a table indicate important footnotes. The following symbols are used in the tables to refer to the same footnote each time they appear:

- * Estimate based on a sample size of 10–29.
- ... Sample size too small to report data reliably.

Z Less than 0.5 percent.

X Not applicable.

NA Not available.

Estimates based upon fewer than ten responses are regarded as being based on a sample size that is too small for reliable reporting. An estimate based upon at least 10 but fewer than 30 responses is treated as an estimate based on a small sample size. Other footnotes appear, as necessary, to qualify or clarify the estimates reported in the tables. In addition, these two important footnotes appear frequently:

- Detail does not add to total because of multiple responses.
- Detail does not add to total because of multiple responses and nonresponse.

“Multiple responses” is a term used to reflect the fact that individuals or their characteristics fall into more than one category. Using Table 5 as an example, those who fished in saltwater and freshwater appear in both of these totals. Yet each angler is represented only once in the “Total, all fishing” row. Similarly, in Table 12, those who hunt for big game and small game are counted only once as a hunter in the “Total, all hunting” row. Therefore, totals will be smaller than the sum of subcategories when multiple responses exist.

“Nonresponse” exists because the Survey questions were answered voluntarily, and some respondents did not or could not answer all the questions.

Table 1. Fishing and Hunting in Utah by Resident and Nonresident Sportspersons: 2011

(Population 16 years old and older. Numbers in thousands)

Sportspersons	Total, state residents and nonresidents		State residents		Nonresidents	
	Number	Percent of sportspersons	Number	Percent of resident sportspersons	Number	Percent of nonresident sportspersons
Total sportspersons (fished or hunted)	493	100	395	100	98	100
Total anglers	414	84	343	87	*70	*72
Fished only	300	61	237	60	*62	*64
Fished and hunted	114	23	106	27
Total hunters	193	39	158	40	*35	*36
Hunted only	*79	*16	*51	*13
Hunted and fished	114	23	106	27

* Estimate based on a sample size of 10–29. ... Sample size too small (less than 10) to report data reliably.

Note: Detail does not add to total because of multiple responses.

Table 2. Anglers and Hunters, Days of Participation, and Trips in Utah by Type of Fishing and Hunting: 2011

(Population 16 years old and older. Numbers in thousands)

Type of fishing and hunting	Participants		Days of participation		Trips	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
FISHING						
Total, all fishing	414	100	5,979	100	4,306	100
Total, all freshwater	414	100	5,979	100	4,306	100
Freshwater, except Great Lakes	414	100	5,979	100	4,306	100
Great Lakes	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)
Saltwater	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)
HUNTING						
Total, all hunting	193	100	2,720	100	2,002	100
Big game	149	77	1,962	72	856	43
Small game	*63	*33	*452	*17	*422	*21
Migratory birds	*30	*16	*597	*22	*567	*28
Other animals

* Estimate based on a sample size of 10–29. ... Sample size too small (less than 10) to report data reliably. (X) Not applicable.

Note: Detail does not add to total because of multiple responses.

Table 3. Anglers and Hunters, Trips, and Days of Participation: 2011

(Population 16 years old and older. Numbers in thousands)

Anglers and hunters, trips and days of participation	Activity in Utah						Activity by Utah residents in United States					
	Total, state residents and nonresidents		State residents		Nonresidents		Total, in state of residence and in other states		In state of residence		In other states	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
FISHING												
Total anglers	414	100	343	83	*70	*17	351	100	343	98	*42	*12
Total trips	4,306	100	3,925	91	*381	*9	4,104	100	3,925	96	*179	*4
Total days of fishing	5,979	100	5,373	90	*606	*10	5,609	100	5,373	96	*239	*4
Average days of fishing	14	(X)	16	(X)	*9	(X)	16	(X)	16	(X)	*6	(X)
HUNTING												
Total hunters	193	100	158	82	*35	*18	161	100	158	98
Total trips	2,002	100	1,919	96	*83	*4	2,098	100	1,919	91
Total days of hunting	2,720	100	2,482	91	*238	*9	2,618	100	2,482	95
Average days of hunting	14	(X)	16	(X)	*7	(X)	16	(X)	16	(X)	...	(X)

* Estimate based on a sample size of 10–29.

... Sample size too small (less than 10) to report data reliably

(X) Not applicable.

Note: Detail does not add to total because of multiple responses.

Table 4. Utah Resident Anglers and Hunters by Place Fished or Hunted: 2011

(Population 16 years old and older. Numbers in thousands)

Place fished or hunted	Anglers		Hunters	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total, all places	351	100	161	100
In-state only	309	88	147	91
In-state and other states	*34	*10
In other states only

* Estimate based on a sample size of 10–29.

... Sample size too small (less than 10) to report data reliably.

Note: Detail does not add to total because of multiple responses and nonresponse.

Table 5. Utah Resident Anglers and Hunters, Days of Participation, and Trips in the United States by Type of Fishing and Hunting: 2011

(Population 16 years old and older. Numbers in thousands)

Type of fishing and hunting	Participants		Days of participation		Trips	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
FISHING						
Total, all fishing	351	100	5,609	100	4,104	100
Total, all freshwater	349	99	5,584	100	4,099	100
Freshwater, except Great Lakes	349	99	5,584	100	4,099	100
Great Lakes
Saltwater
HUNTING						
Total, all hunting	161	100	2,618	100	2,098	100
Big game	130	81	1,813	69	854	41
Small game	*57	*35	*507	*19	*479	*23
Migratory birds	*30	*19	*609	*23	*579	*28
Other animals

* Estimate based on a sample size of 10–29.

... Sample size too small (less than 10) to report data reliably.

Note: Detail does not add to total because of multiple responses.

Table 6. Freshwater Anglers, Trips, Days of Fishing, and Type of Water Fished: 2011

(Population 16 years old and older. Numbers in thousands)

Anglers, trips, and days of fishing	Activity in Utah					
	Total, state residents and nonresidents		State residents		Nonresidents	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total anglers	414	100	343	83	*70	*17
Total trips	4,306	100	3,925	91	*381	*9
Total days of fishing	5,979	100	5,373	90	*606	*10
Average days of fishing	14	(X)	16	(X)	*9	(X)
ANGLERS						
Total, all types of water.	414	100	343	83	*70	*17
Ponds, lakes, or reservoirs	376	100	318	85	*58	*15
Rivers or streams	144	100	116	81
DAYS						
Total, all types of water.	5,979	100	5,373	90	*606	*10
Ponds, lakes, or reservoirs	4,235	100	3,790	89	*445	*11
Rivers or streams	1,882	100	1,719	91

... Sample size too small (less than 10) to report data reliably.

... Sample size too small (less than 10) to report data reliably.

(X) Not applicable.

Note: Detail does not add to total because of multiple responses.

Table 7. Freshwater Anglers and Days of Fishing in Utah by Type of Fish: 2011

(Population 16 years old and older. Numbers in thousands)

Anglers and days of fishing	Activity in Utah						
	Total, state residents and nonresidents			State residents		Nonresidents	
	Number	Percent of total types	Percent of anglers/days	Number	Percent of anglers/days	Number	Percent of anglers/days
ANGLERS							
Total, all types of fish	414	100	100	343	83	*70	*17
Crappie
Panfish
White bass, striped bass, striped bass hybrids
Black bass	*28	*7	*100
Catfish, bullheads
Walleye, sauger
Northern pike, pickerel, muskie, muskie hybrids
Steelhead
Trout	370	89	100	309	84	*60	*16
Salmon
Anything ¹	*45	*11	*100	*31	*71
Other freshwater fish
DAYS							
Total, all types of fish	5,979	100	100	5,373	90	*606	*10
Crappie
Panfish
White bass, striped bass, striped bass hybrids
Black bass	*179	*3	*100
Catfish, bullheads
Walleye, sauger
Northern pike, pickerel, muskie, muskie hybrids
Steelhead
Trout	4,697	79	100	4,293	91	*404	*9
Salmon
Anything ¹	*613	*10	*100	*459	*75
Other freshwater fish

* Estimate based on a sample size of 10–29.

... Sample size too small (less than 10) to report data reliably.

¹ Respondent fished for no specific species and identified “Anything” from a list of categories of fish.

Note: Detail does not add to total because of multiple responses.

Table 8. Great Lakes Anglers, Trips, and Days of Fishing in Utah: 2011

This table does not apply to this state.

Table 9. Great Lakes Anglers and Days of Fishing in Utah by Type of Fish: 2011

This table does not apply to this state.

Table 10. Saltwater Anglers, Trips, and Days of Fishing in Utah: 2011

This table does not apply to this state.

Table 11. Saltwater Anglers and Days of Fishing in Utah by Type of Fish: 2011

This table does not apply to this state.

Table 12. Hunters, Trips, and Days of Hunting in Utah by Type of Hunting: 2011

(Population 16 years old and older. Numbers in thousands)

Hunters, trips, and days of hunting	Activity in Utah					
	Total, state residents and nonresidents		State residents		Nonresidents	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
HUNTERS						
Total, all hunting	193	100	158	82	*35	*18
Big game	149	100	124	83
Small game	*63	*100	*56	*88
Migratory birds	*30	*100	*30	*100
Other animals
TRIPS						
Total, all hunting	2,002	100	1,919	96	*83	*4
Big game	856	100	808	94
Small game	*422	*100	*394	*93
Migratory birds	*567	*100	*567	*100
Other animals
DAYS						
Total, all hunting	2,720	100	2,482	91	*238	*9
Big game	1,962	100	1,749	89
Small game	*452	*100	*423	*93
Migratory birds	*597	*100	*597	*100
Other animals

* Estimate based on a sample size of 10–29. ... Sample size too small (less than 10) to report data reliably.

Note: Detail does not add to total because of multiple responses.

Table 13. Hunters and Days of Hunting in Utah by Type of Game: 2011

(Population 16 years old and older. Numbers in thousands)

Type of game	Hunters, state residents and nonresidents		Days of hunting	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total, all types of game	193	100	2,720	100
Big game, total	149	77	1,962	72
Deer	122	63	920	34
Elk	*111	*58	*1,003	*37
Bear
Wild turkey
Other big game
Small game, total	*63	*33	*452	*17
Rabbit, hare
Quail
Grouse/prairie chicken
Squirrel
Pheasant	*47	*24	*296	*11
Other small game
Migratory birds, total	*30	*16	*597	*22
Waterfowl
Geese
Ducks
Doves
Other migratory birds
Other animals, total¹

* Estimate based on a sample size of 10–29. ... Sample size too small (less than 10) to report data reliably.

¹ Includes groundhog, raccoon, fox, coyote, crow, prairie dog, etc.

Note: Detail does not add to total because of multiple responses.

Table 14. Hunters and Days of Hunting in Utah by Type of Land: 2011

(Population 16 years old and older. Numbers in thousands)

Hunters and days of hunting	Total, state residents and nonresidents		State residents		Nonresidents	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
HUNTERS						
Total, all types of land	193	100	158	100	*35	*100
Public land, total	160	83	132	84
Public land only	106	55	*90	*57
Public and private land	*54	*28	*42	*27
Private land, total	*82	*43	*62	*40
Private land only	*27	*14	*20	*13
Private and public land	*54	*28	*42	*27
DAYS						
Total, all types of land	2,720	100	2,482	100	*238	*100
Public land ¹	2,460	90	2,241	90
Private land ²	*759	*28	*676	*27

* Estimate based on a sample size of 10–29. ... Sample size too small (less than 10) to report data reliably.

¹ Days of hunting on public land includes both days spent solely on public land and those spent on public and private land.² Days of hunting on private land includes both days spent solely on private land and those spent on private and public land.

Note: Detail does not add to total because of multiple responses and nonresponse.

Table 15. Selected Characteristics of Utah Resident Anglers and Hunters: 2011

(Population 16 years old and older. Numbers in thousands)

Characteristic	Population		Sportspersons (fished or hunted)			Anglers			Hunters		
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent who participated	Percent of sports- persons	Number	Percent who participated	Percent of anglers	Number	Percent who participated	Percent of hunters
Total persons	2,036	100	406	20	100	351	17	100	161	8	100
Population Density of Residence											
Urban	1,585	78	283	18	70	257	16	73	*77	*5	*48
Rural	451	22	123	27	30	94	21	27	*84	*19	*52
Population Size of Residence											
Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA)	1,886	93	364	19	90	320	17	91	134	7	83
1,000,000 or more
250,000 to 999,999	1,544	76	274	18	67	264	17	75	*85	*6	*53
50,000 to 249,999	342	17	*90	*26	*22	*56	*17	*16	*48	*14	*30
Outside MSA	150	7	*42	*28	*10	*31	*21	*9	*28	*18	*17
Sex											
Male	1,011	50	300	30	74	245	24	70	140	14	87
Female	1,024	50	106	10	26	106	10	30
Age											
16 to 17 years	65	3
18 to 24 years	243	12
25 to 34 years	483	24	*66	*14	*16	*65	*13	*19
35 to 44 years	351	17	*96	*27	*24	*85	*24	*24	*57	*16	*35
45 to 54 years	376	18	*108	*29	*27	*91	*24	*26
55 to 64 years	256	13	*46	*18	*11	*38	*15	*11
65 years and older	262	13	*48	*18	*12	*41	*16	*12
65 to 74 years	168	8	*40	*24	*10
75 and older	93	5
Ethnicity											
Hispanic	152	7
Non-Hispanic	1,884	93	403	21	99	351	19	100	158	8	98
Race											
White	1,917	94	379	20	93	324	17	92	155	8	96
African American	*33	*2
All others	85	4
Annual Household Income											
Less than \$20,000	113	6
\$20,000 to \$29,999	194	10	*40	*20	*10	*40	*20	*11
\$30,000 to \$39,999	226	11	*43	*19	*10
\$40,000 to \$49,999	245	12	*41	*17	*10	*40	*16	*11
\$50,000 to \$74,999	362	18	*64	*18	*16	*61	*17	*17
\$75,000 to \$99,999	233	11	*65	*28	*16	*61	*26	*17
\$100,000 to \$149,999	223	11
\$150,000 or more	87	4
Not reported	352	17	*86	*24	*21	*82	*23	*23
Education											
11 years or less	177	9	*38	*22	*9
12 years	662	33	105	16	26	86	13	24	*48	*7	*30
1 to 3 years of college	528	26	129	24	32	119	23	34	*37	*7	*23
4 years or more of college	669	33	134	20	33	126	19	36	*56	*8	*35

* Estimate based on a sample size of 10–29. ... Sample size too small (less than 10) to report data reliably.

Note: Detail does not add to total because of multiple responses. Percent who participated columns show the percent of each row's population who participated in the activity named by the column (the percent of those living in urban areas who fished, etc.). Remaining percent columns show the percent of each column's participants who are described by the row heading (the percent of anglers who lived in urban areas, etc.).

Table 16. Summary of Expenditures in Utah by State Residents and Nonresidents Combined for Fishing and Hunting: 2011

(Population 16 years old and older)

Expenditure item	Amount (thousands of dollars)	Spenders (thousands)	Average per spender (dollars) ¹	Average per sportsperson (dollars) ¹
FISHING AND HUNTING				
Total	1,163,865	621	1,874	2,101
Food and lodging	144,336	430	335	293
Transportation	179,471	434	414	364
Other trip costs ²	89,210	350	255	181
Equipment (fishing, hunting)	236,170	381	620	315
Auxiliary equipment ³	65,562	194	337	127
Special equipment ⁴	*339,954	*44	*7,794	*690
Magazines, books, and DVDs	*3,281	*102	*32	*6
Membership dues and contributions	*46,369	*93	*500	*4
Other ⁵	59,512	393	151	121
FISHING				
Total	451,259	424	1,065	1,089
Food and lodging	93,714	362	259	227
Transportation	77,555	379	205	188
Other trip costs ²	54,983	314	175	133
Fishing equipment	52,178	265	197	125
Auxiliary equipment ³	*10,909	*54	*204	*26
Special equipment ⁴
Magazines, books, and DVDs
Membership dues and contributions
Other ⁵	11,699	254	46	28
HUNTING				
Total	499,141	255	1,958	2,334
Food and lodging	50,622	160	317	262
Transportation	101,917	155	659	528
Other trip costs ²	*34,226	*83	*413	*177
Hunting equipment	148,128	183	807	528
Auxiliary equipment ³	*46,555	*99	*469	*232
Special equipment ⁴
Magazines, books, and DVDs
Membership dues and contributions
Other ⁵	47,813	169	282	248
UNSPECIFIED⁶				
Total	*127,397	*73	*1,747	*258

* Estimate based on a sample size of 10–29. ... Sample size too small (less than 10) to report data reliably.

¹ Average expenditures are annual estimates.

² Includes boating costs, equipment rental, guide fees, access fees, heating and cooking fuel, and ice and bait (for fishing only).

³ Includes sleeping bags, packs, duffel bags, tents, binoculars and field glasses, special fishing and hunting clothing, foul weather gear, boots and waders, maintenance and repair of equipment, processing and taxidermy costs, and electronic equipment such as a GPS device.

⁴ Includes big-ticket items bought primarily for hunting and fishing including boats, campers, cabins, trail bikes, dune buggies, 4 x 4 vehicles, ATVs, 4-wheelers, snowmobiles, pickups, vans, travel and tent trailers, motor homes, house trailers, recreational vehicles (RVs) and other special equipment.

⁵ Includes land leasing and ownership, licenses, stamps, tags, permits, and plantings (for hunting only).

⁶ Respondent could not specify whether expenditure was primarily for either fishing or hunting.

Note: Detail does not add to total because of multiple responses and nonresponse.

Table 17. Summary of Fishing Trip and Equipment Expenditures in Utah by State Residents and Nonresidents Combined by Type of Fishing: 2011

(Population 16 years old and older)

Expenditure item	Amount (thousands of dollars)	Spenders (thousands)	Average per spender (dollars) ¹	Average per angler (dollars) ¹
ALL FISHING				
Total	437,836	408	1,073	1,058
Food and lodging	93,714	362	259	227
Transportation	77,555	379	205	188
Other trip costs	54,983	314	175	133
Equipment	211,585	278	761	510
ALL FRESHWATER				
Total	431,329	408	1,058	1,042
Food and lodging	93,714	362	259	227
Transportation	77,112	379	204	186
Other trip costs	54,983	314	175	133
Equipment	205,521	278	739	496
FRESHWATER, EXCEPT GREAT LAKES				
Total	431,329	408	1,058	1,042
Food and lodging	93,714	362	259	227
Transportation	77,112	379	204	186
Other trip costs	54,983	314	175	133
Equipment	205,521	278	739	496
GREAT LAKES				
Total
Food and lodging
Transportation
Other trip costs
Equipment
SALTWATER				
Total
Food and lodging
Transportation
Other trip costs
Equipment

... Sample size too small (less than 10) to report data reliably.

¹ Average expenditures are annual estimates.

Note: Detail does not add to total because of multiple responses and nonresponse. See Table 19 for detailed listing of expenditure items.

Table 18. Summary of Hunting Trip and Equipment Expenditures in Utah by State Residents and Nonresidents Combined by Type of Hunting: 2011

(Population 16 years old and older)

Expenditure item	Amount (thousands of dollars)	Spenders (thousands)	Average per spender (dollars) ¹	Average per type of hunter (dollars) ¹
ALL HUNTING				
Total	448,737	244	1,840	2,077
Food and lodging	50,622	160	317	262
Transportation	101,917	155	659	528
Other trip costs	*34,226	*83	*413	*177
Equipment	261,972	188	1,395	1,109
BIG GAME				
Total	338,848	198	1,710	1,535
Food and lodging	41,945	129	325	217
Transportation	77,728	120	647	403
Other trip costs	*21,011	*69	*306	*109
Equipment	198,164	155	1,276	805
SMALL GAME				
Total	*33,908	*64	*528	*381
Food and lodging	*3,864	*51	*75	*44
Transportation	*10,052	*54	*186	*114
Other trip costs
Equipment	*10,987	*22	*490	...
MIGRATORY BIRDS				
Total	*26,098	*28	*928	*524
Food and lodging
Transportation
Other trip costs
Equipment
OTHER ANIMALS				
Total
Food and lodging
Transportation
Other trip costs
Equipment

* Estimate based on a sample size of 10–29. ... Sample size too small (less than 10) to report data reliably.

¹ Average expenditures are annual estimates.

Note: Detail does not add to total because of multiple responses and nonresponse. See Table 20 for detailed listing of expenditure items.

Table 19. Expenditures in Utah by State Residents and Nonresidents Combined for Fishing: 2011

(Population 16 years old and older)

Expenditure item	Expenditures		Spenders		
	Amount (thousands of dollars)	Average per angler (dollars) ¹	Number (thousands)	Percent of anglers	Average per spender (dollars) ¹
Total, all items	451,259	1,089	424	102	1,065
TRIP-RELATED EXPENDITURES					
Total trip-related	226,251	547	400	97	566
Food and lodging, total	93,714	227	362	88	259
Food	76,472	185	362	88	211
Lodging	17,242	42	104	25	165
Transportation	77,555	188	379	92	205
Other trip costs, total	54,983	133	314	76	175
Privilege and other fees ²	15,760	38	103	25	153
Boating costs ³	*19,352	*47	*71	*17	*271
Bait	8,083	20	246	59	33
Ice	8,597	21	168	41	51
Heating and cooking fuel	*3,192	*8	*83	*20	*39
EQUIPMENT AND OTHER EXPENDITURES PRIMARILY FOR FISHING					
Fishing equipment, total	52,178	125	265	64	197
Reels, rods, and rod-making components	18,749	45	145	35	129
Lines, hooks, sinkers, etc.	8,680	21	209	51	42
Artificial lures and flies	11,426	27	207	50	55
Creels, stringers, fish bags, landing nets, and gaff hooks	*649	*2	*56	*13	*12
Minnow seines, traps, and bait containers
Other fishing equipment ⁴	*12,619	*30	*100	*24	*127
Auxiliary equipment ⁵	*10,909	*26	*54	*13	*204
Special equipment ⁶
Other fishing costs ⁷	13,423	32	268	65	50

* Estimate based on a sample size of 10–29. ... Sample size too small (less than 10) to report data reliably.

¹ Average expenditures are annual estimates.² Includes boat or equipment rental and fees for guides, pack trip (party and charter boats, etc.), public land use, and private land use.³ Includes boat launching, mooring, storage, maintenance, insurance, pumpout fees, and fuel.⁴ Includes electronic fishing devices (depth finders, fish finders, etc.), tackle boxes, ice fishing equipment, and other fishing equipment.⁵ Includes sleeping bags, packs, duffel bags, tents, binoculars and field glasses, special fishing clothing, foul weather gear, boots and waders, maintenance and repair of equipment, processing and taxidermy costs, and electronic equipment such as a GPS device.⁶ Includes big-ticket items bought primarily for fishing including boats, campers, cabins, trail bikes, dune buggies, 4 x 4 vehicles, ATVs, 4-wheelers, snowmobiles, pickups, vans, travel and tent trailers, motor homes, house trailers, recreational vehicles (RVs) and other special equipment.⁷ Includes magazines, books, and DVDs, membership dues and contributions, land leasing and ownership, and licenses, stamps, tags, and permits.

Note: Detail does not add to total because of multiple responses and nonresponse. Percent of anglers may be greater than 100 because spenders who did not fish in this state are included.

Table 20. Expenditures in Utah by State Residents and Nonresidents Combined for Hunting: 2011

(Population 16 years old and older)

Expenditure item	Expenditures		Spenders		
	Amount (thousands of dollars)	Average per hunter (dollars) ¹	Number (thousands)	Percent of hunters	Average per spender (dollars) ¹
Total, all items	499,141	2,334	255	132	1,958
TRIP-RELATED EXPENDITURES					
Total trip-related	186,765	968	182	95	1,024
Food and lodging, total	50,622	262	160	83	317
Food	41,112	213	160	83	257
Lodging
Transportation	101,917	528	155	80	659
Other trip costs, total	*34,226	*177	*83	*43	*413
Privilege and other fees ²	*30,235	*157	*56	*29	*542
Boating costs ³
Heating and cooking fuel	*2,706	*14	*51	*26	*54
EQUIPMENT AND OTHER EXPENDITURES PRIMARILY FOR HUNTING					
Hunting equipment, total	148,128	528	183	95	807
Firearms	*34,955	*155	*40	*21	*872
Ammunition	21,422	111	89	46	240
Other hunting equipment ⁴	91,752	262	148	77	619
Auxiliary equipment ⁵	*46,555	*232	*99	*51	*469
Special equipment ⁶
Other hunting costs ⁷	50,403	256	180	93	280

* Estimate based on a sample size of 10–29. ... Sample size too small (less than 10) to report data reliably.

¹ Average expenditures are annual estimates.² Includes guide fees, pack trip and package fees, public and private land use access fees, and rental of equipment such as boats and hunting or camping equipment.³ Boating costs include launching, mooring, storage, maintenance, insurance, pumpout fees, and fuel.⁴ Includes telescopic sights, decoys and game calls, handloading equipment and components, hunting dogs and associated costs, hunting knives, bows, arrows, archery equipment, and other hunting equipment.⁵ Includes sleeping bags, packs, duffel bags, tents, binoculars and field glasses, special hunting clothing, foul weather gear, boots and waders, maintenance and repair of equipment, processing and taxidermy costs, and electronic equipment such as a GPS device.⁶ Includes big-ticket items bought primarily for hunting including boats, campers, cabins, trail bikes, dune buggies, 4 x 4 vehicles, ATVs, 4-wheelers, snowmobiles, pickups, vans, travel and tent trailers, motor homes, house trailers, recreational vehicles (RVs) and other special equipment.⁷ Includes magazines, books, and DVDs, membership dues and contributions, land leasing and ownership, and licenses, stamps, tags, and permits.

Note: Detail does not add to total because of multiple responses and nonresponse. Percent of hunters may be greater than 100 because spenders who did not hunt in this state are included.

Table 21. Trip and Equipment Expenditures in Utah for Fishing and Hunting by Utah Residents and Nonresidents: 2011

(Population 16 years old and older)

Expenditure item	Amount (thousands of dollars)	Spenders (thousands)	Average per spender (dollars) ¹	Average per sportsperson (dollars) ¹
STATE RESIDENTS AND NONRESIDENTS				
Trip and equipment expenditures for fishing and hunting, total	1,054,703	547	1,928	5,468
Trip and equipment expenditures for fishing, total	437,954	409	1,070	1,058
Food and lodging	93,714	362	259	227
Transportation	77,555	379	205	188
Boating costs ²	*19,352	*71	*271	*47
Other trip costs ³	35,632	306	116	86
Equipment	211,703	280	757	510
Trip and equipment expenditures for hunting, total	490,836	254	1,931	2,077
Food and lodging	50,622	160	317	262
Transportation	101,917	155	659	528
Boating costs ²
Other trip costs ³	*32,941	*83	*398	*171
Equipment	304,071	198	1,535	1,109
Unspecified equipment⁴	*125,912	*58	*2,166	*653
STATE RESIDENTS				
Trip and equipment expenditures for fishing and hunting, total	817,523	390	2,096	5,187
Trip and equipment expenditures for fishing, total	372,882	337	1,106	1,085
Food and lodging	76,937	298	258	224
Transportation	58,956	310	190	172
Boating costs ²	*15,127	*58	*262	*44
Other trip costs ³	20,684	258	80	60
Equipment	201,178	250	804	585
Trip and equipment expenditures for hunting, total	318,963	161	1,983	1,981
Food and lodging	34,023	131	260	216
Transportation	72,504	126	577	460
Boating costs ²
Other trip costs ³	*13,702	*65	*210	*87
Equipment	197,449	126	1,569	1,210
Unspecified equipment⁴	*125,678	*57	*2,205	*797
NONRESIDENTS				
Trip and equipment expenditures for fishing and hunting, total	237,179	157	1,513	*6,725
Trip and equipment expenditures for fishing, total	*65,072	*72	*902	*922
Food and lodging	*16,777	*65	*260	*239
Transportation	*18,598	*68	*273	*265
Boating costs ²
Other trip costs ³	*14,948	*49	*307	*213
Equipment	*10,524	*29	*359	*144
Trip and equipment expenditures for hunting, total	*171,873	*93	*1,842	...
Food and lodging
Transportation
Boating costs ²
Other trip costs ³
Equipment	*106,622	*72	*1,475	...
Unspecified equipment⁴

* Estimate based on a sample size of 10–29. ... Sample size too small (less than 10) to report data reliably.

¹ Average expenditures are annual estimates.

² Includes boat launching, mooring, storage, maintenance, insurance, pumpout fees, and fuel.

³ Includes equipment rental, guide and access fees, ice and bait for fishing, and heating and cooking oil.

⁴ Respondent could not specify whether item was for hunting or fishing.

Note: Detail does not add to total because of multiple responses and nonresponse.

Table 22. Summary of Utah Residents' Fishing and Hunting Expenditures Both Inside and Outside Utah: 2011

(Population 16 years old and older)

Expenditure item	Amount (thousands of dollars)	Spenders (thousands)	Average per spender (dollars) ¹	Average per sportsperson (dollars) ¹
FISHING AND HUNTING				
Total	924,127	401	2,302	2,275
Food and lodging	114,841	354	325	283
Transportation	130,038	351	370	320
Other trip costs ²	55,241	286	193	136
Equipment (fishing, hunting)	131,792	294	448	324
Auxiliary equipment ³	59,110	170	347	146
Special equipment ⁴	*384,957	*45	*8,585	*948
Magazines, books, and DVDs	*2,850	*92	*31	*7
Membership dues and contributions	*1,652	*28	*59	*4
Other ⁵	43,647	327	134	107
FISHING				
Total	381,829	342	1,116	1,087
Food and lodging	77,758	301	259	221
Transportation	53,549	311	172	152
Other trip costs ²	38,676	259	150	110
Fishing equipment	46,099	240	192	131
Auxiliary equipment ³	*10,244	*51	*202	*29
Special equipment ⁴
Magazines, books, and DVDs
Membership dues and contributions
Other ⁵	5,635	205	27	16
HUNTING				
Total	363,040	161	2,253	2,253
Food and lodging	37,083	134	276	230
Transportation	76,489	129	592	475
Other trip costs ²	*16,564	*66	*249	*103
Hunting equipment	84,090	125	673	522
Auxiliary equipment ³	*42,033	*79	*530	*261
Special equipment ⁴
Magazines, books, and DVDs
Membership dues and contributions
Other ⁵	38,012	146	261	236
UNSPECIFIED⁶				
Total	*172,184	*73	*2,368	*424

* Estimate based on a sample size of 10–29. ... Sample size too small (less than 10) to report data reliably.

¹ Average expenditures are annual estimates.

² Includes boating costs, equipment rental, guide fees, access fees, heating and cooking fuel, and ice and bait (for fishing only).

³ Includes sleeping bags, packs, duffel bags, tents, binoculars and field glasses, special fishing and hunting clothing, foul weather gear, boots and waders, maintenance and repair of equipment, processing and taxidermy costs, and electronic equipment such as a GPS device.

⁴ Includes big-ticket items bought primarily for hunting and fishing including boats, campers, cabins, trail bikes, dune buggies, 4 x 4 vehicles, ATVs, 4-wheelers, snowmobiles, pickups, vans, travel and tent trailers, motor homes, house trailers, recreational vehicles (RVs) and other special equipment.

⁵ Includes land leasing and ownership, licenses, stamps, tags, and permits, and plantings (for hunting only).

⁶ Respondent could not specify whether expenditure was primarily for fishing or hunting.

Note: Detail does not add to total because of multiple responses and nonresponse. See Tables 19–20 for a detailed listing of expenditure items.

Table 23. In-State and Out-of-State Expenditures by Utah Residents for Fishing and Hunting: 2011

(State population 16 years old and older)

Expenditure item	Amount (thousands of dollars)	Spenders (thousands)	Average per spender (dollars) ¹	Average per sportsperson (dollars) ¹
IN UTAH				
Expenditures for fishing and hunting, total	860,362	398	2,162	1,747
Trip-related expenditures	293,217	381	770	595
Equipment (fishing and hunting)	127,017	288	441	258
Auxiliary equipment ²	57,469	166	347	117
Special equipment ³	*339,820	*42	*8,123	*690
Other ⁴	42,839	344	124	87
Expenditures for fishing, total	379,225	342	1,108	917
Trip-related expenditures	171,703	330	521	415
Fishing equipment	42,453	237	179	103
Auxiliary equipment ²	*10,244	*51	*202	*25
Special equipment ³
Other ⁴	6,462	203	32	16
Expenditures for hunting, total	347,016	158	2,202	1,799
Trip-related expenditures	121,514	153	792	630
Hunting equipment	82,961	121	684	430
Auxiliary equipment ²	*40,391	*75	*541	*209
Special equipment ³
Other ⁴	34,861	145	240	181
Unspecified expenditures for fishing and hunting, total⁵	*127,047	*70	*1,823	*258
OUT OF STATE				
Expenditures for fishing and hunting, total	*86,373	*326	*265	*175
Trip-related expenditures	*29,511	*41	*715	*60
Equipment (fishing and hunting)
Auxiliary equipment ²
Special equipment ³
Other ⁴	*5,309	*134	*39	*11
Expenditures for fishing, total	*18,197	*263	*69	*44
Trip-related expenditures	*13,873	*31	*445	*34
Fishing equipment
Auxiliary equipment ²
Special equipment ³
Other ⁴
Expenditures for hunting, total
Trip-related expenditures
Hunting equipment
Auxiliary equipment ²
Special equipment ³
Other ⁴
Unspecified expenditures for fishing and hunting, total⁵

* Estimate based on a sample size of 10–29. ... Sample size too small (less than 10) to report data reliably.

¹ Average expenditures are annual estimates.² Auxiliary equipment includes sleeping bags, packs, duffel bags, tents, binoculars and field glasses, special fishing and hunting clothing, foul weather gear, boots and waders, maintenance and repair of equipment, processing and taxidermy costs, and electronic equipment such as a GPS device.³ Special equipment includes boats, campers, cabins, trail bikes, dune buggies, 4 x 4 vehicles, ATVs, 4-wheelers, snowmobiles, pickups, vans, travel and tent trailers, motor homes, house trailers, recreational vehicles (RVs) and other special equipment.⁴ Other equipment includes expenditures for magazines, books, DVDs, membership dues and contributions, land leasing and ownership, licenses, stamps, tags, and permits, and plantings.⁵ Respondent could not specify whether expenditure was primarily for either fishing or hunting.

Note: Detail does not add to total because of multiple responses and nonresponse.

Table 24. Wildlife Watching in Utah by State Residents and Nonresidents Combined: 2011

(Population 16 years old and older. Numbers in thousands)

Participants	Number	Percent
Total participants	717	100
Away from home	402	56
Observe wildlife	378	53
Photograph wildlife	273	38
Feed wildlife	*44	*6
Around the home	430	60
Observe wildlife	206	29
Photograph wildlife	197	27
Feed wildlife	336	47
Visit parks or natural areas ¹	*48	*7
Maintain plantings or natural areas

* Estimate based on a sample size of 10–29. ... Sample size too small (less than 10) to report data reliably.

¹ Includes visits only to parks or natural areas within one mile of home.

Note: Detail does not add to total because of multiple responses.

Table 25. Participants, Trips, and Days of Participation in Away-From-Home Wildlife Watching in Utah: 2011

(Population 16 years old and older. Numbers in thousands)

Participants, trips, and days of participation	Activity in Utah					
	Total, state residents and nonresidents		State residents		Nonresidents	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
PARTICIPANTS						
Total participants	402	100	224	100	178	100
Observe wildlife	378	94	206	92	172	96
Photograph wildlife	273	68	*127	*57	146	82
Feed wildlife	*44	*11
TRIPS						
Total Trips	4,126	100	2,221	100	1,905	100
Average days per trip	1	(X)	1	(X)	1	(X)
DAYS						
Total days	5,169	100	2,642	100	2,527	100
Observing wildlife	3,644	70	*1,794	*68	1,850	73
Photographing wildlife	2,049	40	*746	*28	*1,303	*52
Feeding wildlife	*1,288	*25
Average days per participant	13	(X)	12	(X)	14	(X)
Observing wildlife	10	(X)	*9	(X)	11	(X)
Photographing wildlife	7	(X)	*6	(X)	*9	(X)
Feeding wildlife	*29	(X)	...	(X)	...	(X)

* Estimate based on a sample size of 10–29. ... Sample size too small (less than 10) to report data reliably. (X) Not applicable.

Note: Detail does not add to total because of multiple responses and nonresponse.

Table 26. Away-From-Home Wildlife-Watching Participants by Wildlife Observed, Photographed, or Fed in Utah: 2011

(Population 16 years old and older. Numbers in thousands)

Wildlife observed, photographed, or fed	Total, state residents and nonresidents		State residents		Nonresidents	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total all wildlife	402	100	224	56	178	44
Total birds	315	100	163	52	151	48
Songbirds (cardinals, robins, warblers, etc.)	177	100	*61	*35	*116	*65
Birds of prey (hawks, owls, eagles, etc.)	209	100	*97	*46	*112	*54
Waterfowl (ducks, geese, swans, etc.)	152	100	*85	*56	*67	*44
Other water birds (shorebirds, herons, cranes, etc.)	*87	*100	*55	*63
Other birds (pheasants, turkeys, road runners, etc.)	*97	*100	*48	*49
Total land mammals	292	100	*149	*51	144	49
Large land mammals (bears, bison, elk, etc.)	261	100	*140	*54	*121	*46
Small land mammals (prairie dogs, squirrels, etc.)	173	100	*61	*35	*112	*65
Fish (salmon, sharks, etc.)	*68	*100
Marine mammals (whales, dolphins, etc.)
Other wildlife (butterflies, turtles, etc.)	*100	*100	*60	*60

* Estimate based on a sample size of 10–29. ... Sample size too small (less than 10) to report data reliably.

Note: Detail does not add to total because of multiple responses.

Table 27. Participation in Wildlife-Watching Activities Around the Home in Utah: 2011

(State population 16 years old and older. Numbers in thousands)

Around the home	Participants	
	Number	Percent
Total around-the-home participants	430	100
Observe wildlife	206	48
Visit parks and natural areas ¹	*48	*11
Photograph wildlife	197	46
Feed wildlife	336	78
Maintain natural areas
Maintain plantings
Participants Observing Wildlife		
Total, all wildlife	206	100
Birds	199	97
Land mammals	*134	*65
Large mammals	*111	*54
Small mammals	*94	*46
Amphibians or reptiles
Insects or spiders	*59	*29
Fish and other wildlife
Total, 1 day or more	206	100
1 to 10 days
11 to 50 days	*45	*22
51 to 200 days	*79	*39
201 days or more	*42	*20
Participants Visiting Parks or Natural Areas¹		
Total, 1 day or more	*48	*100
1 to 5 days
6 to 10 days
11 days or more
Participants Photographing Wildlife		
Total, 1 day or more	197	100
1 to 3 days	*127	*65
4 to 10 days
11 or more days	*36	*18
Participants Feeding Wildlife		
Total, all wildlife	336	100
Wild birds	332	99
Other wildlife

* Estimate based on a sample size of 10–29. ... Sample size too small (less than 10) to report data reliably.

¹ Includes visits only to parks or natural areas within one mile of home.

Note: Detail does not add to total because of multiple responses and nonresponse.

Table 28. Utah Residents Participating in Wildlife Watching in the United States: 2011

(State population 16 years old and older. Numbers in thousands)

Participants	Number	Percent of participants	Percent of population
Total participants	558	100	27
Away from home	263	47	13
Around the home	430	77	21
Observe wildlife	206	37	10
Photograph wildlife	197	35	10
Feed wild birds or other wildlife	336	60	16
Maintain plantings or natural areas
Visit parks or natural areas ¹	*48	*9	*2

* Estimate based on a sample size of 10–29. ... Sample size too small (less than 10) to report data reliably.

¹ Includes visits only to parks or natural areas within one mile of home.

Note: Detail does not add to total because of multiple responses. The column showing percent of participants is based on total participants. The column showing percent of population is based on the state population 16 years old and older, including those who did not participate in wildlife watching.

Table 29. Wild Bird Observers and Days of Observation in Utah by State Residents and Nonresidents: 2011

(Population 16 years old and older. Numbers in thousands)

Observers and days of observation	Total, state residents and nonresidents		State residents		Nonresidents	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
OBSERVERS						
Total bird observers	410	100	258	100	151	100
Around-the-home observers	199	49	199	77	(X)	(X)
Away-from-home observers	266	65	*115	*44	151	100
DAYS						
Total days observing birds	23,551	100	21,825	100	1,727	100
Around the home	20,583	87	20,583	94	(X)	(X)
Away from home	2,969	13	*1,242	*6	1,727	100

* Estimate based on a sample size of 10–29. (X) Not applicable.

Note: Detail does not add to total because of multiple responses.

Table 30. Selected Characteristics of Utah Residents Participating in Wildlife Watching: 2011

(State population 16 years old and older. Numbers in thousands)

Characteristic	Population		Participants								
			Total			Away from home			Around the home		
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent who participated	Percent	Number	Percent who participated	Percent	Number	Percent who participated	Percent
Total persons	2,036	100	558	27	100	263	13	100	430	21	100
Population Density of Residence											
Urban	1,585	78	377	24	68	*151	*10	*57	347	22	81
Rural	451	22	*181	*40	*32	*112	*25	*43	*84	*19	*19
Population Size of Residence											
Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA)	1,886	93	490	26	88	195	10	74	425	23	99
1,000,000 or more
250,000 to 999,999	1,544	76	377	24	68	155	10	59	329	21	76
50,000 to 249,999	342	17	*113	*33	*20	*96	*28	*22
Outside MSA	150	7
Sex											
Male	1,011	50	199	20	36	*123	*12	*47	151	15	35
Female	1,024	50	359	35	64	*140	*14	*53	279	27	65
Age											
16 to 17 years	65	3
18 to 24 years	243	12
25 to 34 years	483	24	*61	*13	*11
35 to 44 years	351	17	*173	*49	*31	*91	*26	*34	*109	*31	*25
45 to 54 years	376	18	*92	*25	*17	*77	*20	*18
55 to 64 years	256	13	*136	*53	*24	*66	*26	*25	*109	*43	*25
65 years and older	262	13	*94	*36	*17	*90	*34	*21
65 to 74 years	168	8
75 and older	93	5
Ethnicity											
Hispanic	152	7
Non-Hispanic	1,884	93	538	29	96	252	13	96	421	22	98
Race											
White	1,917	94	533	28	95	242	13	92	424	22	98
African American	*33	*2
All others	85	4
Annual Household Income											
Less than \$20,000	113	6
\$20,000 to \$29,999	194	10	*47	*24	*8
\$30,000 to \$39,999	226	11
\$40,000 to \$49,999	245	12
\$50,000 to \$74,999	362	18	*133	*37	*24	*84	*23	*19
\$75,000 to \$99,999	233	11	*69	*30	*12	*62	*27	*14
\$100,000 to \$149,999	223	11
\$150,000 or more	87	4
Not reported	352	17	*112	*32	*20	*85	*24	*20
Education											
11 years or less	177	9
12 years	662	33	*136	*21	*24	*103	*16	*24
1 to 3 years of college	528	26	*115	*22	*21	*63	*12	*24	*92	*17	*21
4 years or more of college	669	33	291	43	52	*136	*20	*52	219	33	51

* Estimate based on a sample size of 10–29. ... Sample size too small (less than 10) to report data reliably.

Note: Detail does not add to total because of multiple responses and nonresponse. Percent who participated columns show the percent of each row's population who participated in the activity named by the column (the percent of those living in urban areas who participated, etc.). Percent columns show the percent of each column's participants who are described by the row heading (the percent of those who participated who live in urban areas, etc.).

Table 31. Expenditures in Utah by State Residents and Nonresidents Combined for Wildlife Watching: 2011

(Population 16 years old and older)

Expenditure item	Expenditures (thousands of dollars)	Average per participant (dollars) ¹	Spenders		
			Number (thousands)	Percent of wildlife-watching participants ²	Average per spender (dollars) ¹
Total, all items	585,406	801	692	97	846
TRIP EXPENDITURES					
Total, trip-related	295,723	727	405	101	729
Food and lodging	125,937	313	374	93	337
Food	86,572	215	374	93	231
Lodging	*39,365	*98	*137	*34	*287
Transportation	92,783	222	383	95	243
Other trip costs ³	*77,003	*192	*125	*31	*615
EQUIPMENT AND OTHER EXPENDITURES					
Total	289,683	394	441	62	657
Wildlife-watching equipment, total.	92,629	124	391	54	237
Binoculars, spotting scopes
Film and photo processing	*9,204	...	*66	*9	*140
Cameras, special lenses, video cameras, and other photographic equipment, including memory cards	*34,537	*48	*93	*13	*373
Day packs, carrying cases, and special clothing	*9,350	*13	*51	*7	*183
Bird food	11,281	15	208	29	54
Food for other wildlife
Nest boxes, bird houses, bird feeders, and bird baths	*899	*1	*83	*12	*11
Other equipment (including field guides)	*2,900	...	*47	*7	*61
Auxiliary equipment ⁴	*10,627	...	*51	*7	*207
Special equipment ⁵
Magazines, books, and DVDs	*1,682	*2	*53	*7	*32
Membership dues and contributions	*32,197	...	*49	*7	*653
Land leasing and ownership
Plantings

* Estimate based on a sample size of 10–29. ... Sample size too small (less than 10) to report data reliably.

¹ Average expenditures are annual estimates.

² Percent of wildlife-watching participants column for trip-related expenditures is based on away-from-home participation. For equipment and other expenditures, the percent of wildlife-watching participants column is based on total wildlife-watching participants.

³ Includes equipment rental and fees for guides, pack trips, public land use and private land use, boat fuel, other boating costs, and heating and cooking fuel.

⁴ Includes tents, tarps, frame packs and other backpacking equipment, other camping equipment, and other auxiliary equipment.

⁵ Includes boats, campers, cabins, trail bikes, dune buggies, 4 x 4 vehicles, ATVs, 4-wheelers, snowmobiles, pickups, vans, travel and tent trailers, motor homes, house trailers, recreational vehicles (RVs) and other special equipment.

Note: Detail does not add to total because of multiple responses and nonresponse.

Table 32. Trip and Equipment Expenditures in Utah for Wildlife Watching by Utah Residents and Nonresidents: 2011

(Population 16 years old and older)

Expenditure item	Amount (thousands of dollars)	Spenders (thousands)	Average per spender (dollars) ¹	Average per participant (dollars) ¹
STATE RESIDENTS AND NONRESIDENTS				
Total	533,735	663	805	734
Food and lodging	125,937	374	337	313
Transportation	92,783	383	243	222
Other trip costs ²	*77,003	*125	*615	*192
Equipment ³	238,012	403	591	326
STATE RESIDENTS				
Total	271,541	445	610	498
Food and lodging	31,683	205	154	142
Transportation	43,236	217	199	177
Other trip costs ²
Equipment ³	194,336	332	585	361
NONRESIDENTS				
Total	262,195	218	1,203	1,447
Food and lodging	94,254	169	559	528
Transportation	49,547	166	299	278
Other trip costs ²	*74,717	*85	*878	*419
Equipment ³	*43,677	*71	*616	...

* Estimate based on a sample size of 10–29. ... Sample size too small (less than 10) to report data reliably.

¹ Average expenditures are annual estimates.

² Includes equipment rental and fees for guides, pack trips, public land use, private land use, boat fuel, other boating costs, and heating and cooking fuel.

³ Includes wildlife-watching auxiliary and special equipment.

Note: Detail does not add to total because of multiple responses and nonresponse. See Table 33 for detailed listed of expenditure items.

Table 33. Wildlife-Watching Expenditures Both Inside and Outside Utah by Utah Residents: 2011

(State population 16 years old and older)

Expenditure item	Expenditures (thousands of dollars)	Average per participant (dollars) ¹	Spenders		
			Number (thousands)	Percent of wildlife-watching participants ²	Average per spender (dollars) ¹
Total, all items	380,067	681	471	84	807
TRIP EXPENDITURES					
Total, trip-related	129,357	492	252	96	513
Food and lodging	65,009	247	235	90	276
Food	48,308	184	235	90	205
Lodging
Transportation	57,409	218	236	90	243
Other trip costs ³	*6,939	*26	*87	*33	*80
EQUIPMENT AND OTHER EXPENDITURES					
Total	250,710	449	356	64	705
Wildlife-watching equipment, total.	85,127	153	327	59	260
Binoculars, spotting scopes
Film and photo processing
Cameras, special lenses, video cameras, and other photographic equipment, including memory cards	*32,448	*58	*90	*16	*360
Day packs, carrying cases, and special clothing	*9,901	*18	*47	*9	*209
Bird food	11,429	20	207	37	55
Food for other wildlife
Nest boxes, bird houses, bird feeders, and bird baths	*2,682	*5	*86	*15	*31
Other equipment
Auxiliary equipment ⁴	*11,112	*20	*52	*9	*213
Special equipment ⁵
Magazines, books, and DVDs	*1,425	*3	*45	*8	*31
Membership dues and contributions	*30,471	*55	*53	*10	*571
Land leasing and ownership
Plantings

* Estimate based on a sample size of 10–29. ... Sample size too small (less than 10) to report data reliably.

¹ Average expenditures are annual estimates.

² Percent of wildlife-watching participants column for trip-related expenditures is based on away-from-home participation. For equipment and other expenditures, the percent of wildlife-watching participants column is based on total wildlife-watching participants.

³ Includes equipment rental and fees for guides, pack trips, public land use and private land use, boat fuel, other boating costs, and heating and cooking fuel.

⁴ Includes tents, tarps, frame packs and other backpacking equipment, other camping equipment, and other auxiliary equipment.

⁵ Includes boats, campers, cabins, trail bikes, dune buggies, 4 x 4 vehicles, ATVs, 4-wheelers, snowmobiles, pickups, vans, travel and tent trailers, motor homes, house trailers, recreational vehicles (RVs) and other special equipment.

Note: Detail does not add to total because of multiple responses and nonresponse.

Table 34. In-State and Out-of-State Expenditures by Utah Residents for Wildlife Watching: 2011

(State population 16 years old and older)

Expenditure Item	Amount (thousands of dollars)	Spenders (thousands)	Average per spender (dollars) ¹	Average per participant (dollars) ¹
IN UTAH				
Expenditures for wildlife watching, total²	319,663	460	695	594
Trip-related expenditures ³	77,205	227	340	345
Wildlife-watching equipment ⁴	79,434	327	243	148
Auxiliary equipment ⁵
Special equipment ⁶
Other ⁷	*48,122	*91	*531	*89
OUT OF STATE				
Expenditures for wildlife watching, total²	*60,310	*93	*650	*683
Trip-related expenditures ³	*52,152	*73	*712	*675
Wildlife-watching equipment ⁴
Auxiliary equipment ⁵
Special equipment ⁶
Other ⁷

* Estimate based on a sample size of 10–29. ... Sample size too small (less than 10) to report data reliably.

¹ Average expenditures are annual estimates.² Information on trip-related expenditures was collected for away-from-home participants only. Equipment and other expenditures are based on information collected from both away-from-home and around-the-home participants.³ Includes equipment rental and fees for guides, pack trips, public land use and private land use, boat fuel, other boating costs, and heating and cooking fuel.⁴ Includes binoculars, spotting scopes, cameras, special lenses, videocameras, other photography equipment, memory cards, film and photo processing, commercially prepared and packaged wild bird food, other bulk food used to feed wild birds, food used to feed other wildlife, nest boxes, bird houses, feeders, baths, and other wildlife-watching equipment.⁵ Includes tents, tarps, frame packs and other backpacking equipment, other camping equipment, and other auxiliary equipment.⁶ Includes boats, campers, cabins, trail bikes, dune buggies, 4 x 4 vehicles, ATVs, 4-wheelers, snowmobiles, pickups, vans, travel and tent trailers, motor homes, house trailers, recreational vehicles (RVs) and other special equipment.⁷ Includes magazines, books, DVDs, membership dues and contributions, and land leasing and ownership.

Note: Detail does not add to total because of multiple responses and nonresponse.

Table 35. Participation of Utah Resident Wildlife-Watching Participants in Fishing and Hunting: 2011

(State population 16 years old and older. Numbers in thousands)

Participants	Total wildlife watchers		Wildlife-watching activity			
			Away from home		Around the home	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total participants	558	100	263	100	430	100
Wildlife-watching participants who:						
Did not fish or hunt	378	68	145	55	309	72
Fished or hunted	180	32	118	45	121	28
Fished	160	29	98	37	113	26
Hunted	88	16	*62	*24	*49	*11

* Estimate based on a sample size of 10–29.

Note: Detail does not add to total because of multiple responses and nonresponse.

Table 36. Participation of Utah Resident Sportspersons in Wildlife-Watching Activities: 2011

(State population 16 years old and older. Numbers in thousands)

Sportspersons	Sportspersons		Anglers		Hunters	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total sportspersons	406	100	351	100	161	100
Sportspersons who:						
Did not engage in wildlife-watching activities	226	56	191	54	*74	*46
Engaged in wildlife-watching activities	180	44	160	46	88	54
Away from home	118	29	98	28	*62	*39
Around the home	121	30	113	32	*49	*30

* Estimate based on a sample size of 10–29.

Note: Detail does not add to total because of multiple responses and nonresponse.

State reports for previous Surveys included tables that had estimates for all fifty states. In order to expedite release of the 2011 Utah State report, state estimates have been deleted. To find state estimates other than Utah, go to <http://wsfrprograms.fws.gov/Subpages/NationalSurvey/reports2011.html>. State reports are being released alphabetically, beginning in early 2013.

The background is a monochromatic green illustration depicting various outdoor recreation activities. In the top left, a person sits on a log, drinking from a can while a small dog sits beside them. To the right, a person stands holding a rifle, with a dog standing nearby. In the center-left, a person is shown from the side, holding a bow and arrow. In the bottom left, two people are in a canoe on a body of water, one using a paddle. In the center, a person stands with binoculars to their eyes, and a child stands in front of them, also with binoculars. To the right, a person stands in a body of water, holding a fishing rod. The background features rolling hills, mountains, various types of trees (coniferous and deciduous), and several butterflies. The overall style is a flat, illustrative design.

Appendix A

Appendix A.

Definitions

Annual household income—Total 2011 income of household members before taxes and other deductions.

Around-the-home wildlife

watching—Activity within 1 mile of home with one of six primary purposes: (1) taking special interest in or trying to identify birds or other wildlife; (2) photographing wildlife; (3) feeding birds or other wildlife; (4) maintaining natural areas of at least one-quarter acre for the benefit of wildlife; (5) maintaining plantings (such as shrubs and agricultural crops) for the benefit of wildlife; and (6) visiting parks and natural areas to observe, photograph, or feed wildlife.

Auxiliary equipment—Equipment owned primarily for wildlife-associated recreation. For the sportspersons section, these include sleeping bags, packs, duffel bags, tents, binoculars and field glasses, special fishing and hunting clothing, foul weather gear, boots and waders, maintenance and repair of equipment, and processing and taxidermy costs. For the wildlife-watching section, these include tents, tarps, frame packs, backpacking and other camping equipment, and blinds. For both sportspersons and wildlife watchers, it also includes electronic auxiliary equipment such as Global Positioning Systems.

Away-from-home wildlife watching

Trips or outings at least 1 mile from home for the primary purpose of observing, photographing, or feeding wildlife. Trips to zoos, circuses, aquariums, and museums are not included.

Big game—Bear, deer, elk, moose, wild turkey, and similar large animals that are hunted.

Census Divisions

East North Central

Illinois
Indiana
Michigan
Ohio
Wisconsin

East South Central

Alabama
Kentucky
Mississippi
Tennessee

Middle Atlantic

New Jersey
New York
Pennsylvania

Mountain

Arizona
Colorado
Idaho
Montana
Nevada
New Mexico
Utah
Wyoming

New England

Connecticut
Maine
Massachusetts
New Hampshire
Rhode Island
Vermont

Pacific

Alaska
California
Hawaii
Oregon
Washington

South Atlantic

Delaware
District of Columbia
Florida

Georgia
Maryland
North Carolina
South Carolina
Virginia
West Virginia

West North Central

Kansas
Iowa
Minnesota
Missouri
Nebraska
North Dakota
South Dakota

West South Central

Arkansas
Louisiana
Oklahoma
Texas

Day—Any part of a day spent participating in a given activity. For example, if someone hunted two hours one day and three hours another day, it would be reported as two days of hunting. If someone hunted two hours in the morning and three hours in the afternoon of the same day, it would be considered one day of hunting.

Education—The highest completed grade of school or year of college.

Expenditures—Money spent in 2011 for wildlife-related recreation trips in the United States, wildlife-related recreational equipment purchased in the United States, and other items. The “other items” were books, magazines, and DVDs; membership dues and contributions, land leasing or owning; hunting and fishing licenses; and plantings, all for the purpose of wildlife-related recreation. Expenditures included both money spent by participants for themselves and the value of gifts they received.

Fishing—The sport of catching or attempting to catch fish with a hook and line, bow and arrow, or spear; it also includes catching or gathering shellfish (clams, crabs, etc.); and the noncommercial seining or netting of fish, unless the fish are for use as bait. For example, seining for smelt is fishing, but seining for bait minnows is not included as fishing.

Fishing equipment—Items owned primarily for fishing:

Rods, reels, poles, and rodmaking components

Lines and leaders

Artificial lures, flies, baits, and dressing for flies or lines

Hooks, sinkers, swivels, and other items attached to a line, except lures and baits

Tackle boxes

Creels, stringers, fish bags, landing nets, and gaff hooks

Minnow traps, seines, and bait containers

Depth finders, fish finders, and other electronic fishing devices

Ice fishing equipment

Other fishing equipment

Freshwater—Reservoirs, lakes, ponds, and the nontidal portions of rivers and streams.

Great Lakes fishing—Fishing in Lakes Superior, Michigan, Huron, St. Clair, Erie, and Ontario, their connecting waters such as the St. Mary's River system, Detroit River, St. Clair River, and the Niagara River, and the St. Lawrence River south of the bridge at Cornwall, New York. Great Lakes fishing includes fishing in tributaries of the Great Lakes for smelt, steelhead, and salmon.

Home—The starting point of a wildlife-related recreational trip. It may be a permanent residence or a temporary or seasonal residence such as a cabin.

Hunting—The sport of shooting or attempting to shoot wildlife with firearms or archery equipment.

Hunting equipment—Items owned primarily for hunting:

Rifles, shotguns, muzzleloaders, and handguns

Archery equipment

Telescopic sights

Decoys and game calls

Ammunition

Hand loading equipment

Hunting dogs and associated costs

Other hunting equipment

Land leasing and owning—Leasing or owning land either singly or in cooperation with others for the primary purpose of fishing, hunting, or wildlife watching on it.

Maintain natural areas—To set aside 1/4 acre or more of natural environment, such as wood lots or open fields, for the primary purpose of benefiting wildlife.

Maintain plantings—To introduce or encourage the growth of food and cover plants for the primary purpose of benefiting wildlife.

Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA)—A Metropolitan Statistical Area is a grouping of one or more counties or equivalent entities that contain at least one urbanized area of 50,000 or more inhabitants. The "Outside MSA" classification include census-defined Micropolitan Statistical Areas (or Micro areas). A Micro area is defined as a grouping of one or more counties or equivalent entities that contain at least one urban cluster of at least 10,000 but less than 50,000 inhabitants. Refer to www.census.gov/population/metro/about/, for a more detailed definition of the Metropolitan Statistical Area.

Migratory birds—Birds that regularly migrate from one region or climate to another such as ducks, geese, and doves and other birds that may be hunted.

Multiple responses—The term used to reflect the fact that individuals or their characteristics fall into more than one reporting category. An example of a big game hunter who hunted for deer and elk demonstrates the effect of multiple responses. In this case, adding the number of deer hunters (one) and elk hunters (one) would overstate the number of big game hunters (one) because deer and elk hunters are not

mutually exclusive categories. In contrast, for example, total participants is the sum of male and female participants, because "male" and "female" are mutually exclusive categories.

Nonresidents—Individuals who do not live in the State being reported. For example, a person living in Texas who watches whales in California is a nonresidential wildlife-watcher in California.

Nonresponse—A term used to reflect the fact that some Survey respondents provide incomplete sets of information. For example, a Survey respondent may have been unable to identify the primary type of hunting for which a gun was bought. Total hunting expenditure estimates will include the gun purchase, but it will not appear as spending for big game or any other type of hunting. Nonresponses result in reported totals that are greater than the sum of their parts.

Observe—To take special interest in or try to identify birds, fish or other wildlife.

Other animals—Coyotes, crows, foxes, groundhogs, prairie dogs, raccoons, alligators, and similar animals that can be legally hunted and are not classified as big game, small game, or migratory birds. They may be classified as unprotected or predatory animals by the State in which they are hunted. Feral pigs are classified as "other animals" in all States except Hawaii, where they are considered big game.

Participants—Individuals who engage in fishing, hunting, or a wildlife-watching activity. Unless otherwise stated, a person has to have hunted, fished, or wildlife watched in 2011 to be considered a participant.

Plantings—See "Maintain plantings."

Primary purpose—The principal motivation for an activity, trip, or expenditure.

Private land—Land owned by a business, nongovernmental organization, private individual, or a group of individuals such as an association or club.

Public land—Land that is owned by local governments (such as county parks and municipal watersheds),

State governments (such as State parks and wildlife management areas), or the federal government (such as National Forests, Recreational Areas, and Wildlife Refuges).

Residents—Individuals who lived in the State being reported. For example, a person who lives in California and watches whales in California is a residential wildlife watcher in California.

Rural—All territory, population, and housing units located outside of urbanized areas and urban clusters, as determined by the U.S. Census Bureau.

Saltwater—Oceans, tidal bays and sounds, and the tidal portions of rivers and streams.

Screening interviews—The first Survey contact with a sample household. Screening interviews are conducted with a household representative to identify respondents who are eligible for in-depth interviews. Screening interviews gather data such as age and sex about individuals in the households. Further information on screening interviews is available on page vii in the “Survey Background and Method” section of this report.

Small game—Grouse, pheasants, quail, rabbits, squirrels, and similar small animals for which States have small game seasons and bag limits.

Special equipment—Big-ticket equipment items that are owned primarily for wildlife-related recreation:

Bass boats

Other types of motor boats

Canoes and other types of nonmotor boats

Boat motors, boat trailer/hitches, and other boat accessories

Pickups, campers, vans, travel or tent trailers, motor homes, house trailers, recreational vehicles (RVs)

Cabins

Off-the-road vehicles such as trail bikes, all terrain vehicles (ATVs), dune buggies, four-wheelers, 4x4 vehicles, and snowmobiles

Other special equipment

Spenders—Individuals who spent money on fishing, hunting, or wildlife-watching activities or equipment and also participated in those activities.

Sportspersons—Individuals who engaged in fishing, hunting, or both.

Trip—An outing involving fishing, hunting, or wildlife watching. A trip may begin from an individual’s principal residence or from another place, such as a vacation home or the home of a relative. A trip may last an hour, a day, or many days.

Type of fishing—There are three types of fishing: (1) freshwater except Great Lakes, (2) Great Lakes, and (3) saltwater.

Type of hunting—There are four types of hunting: (1) big game, (2) small game, (3) migratory bird, and (4) other animal.

Unspecified expenditure—An item that was purchased for use in both fishing and hunting, rather than primarily one or the other. Auxiliary equipment, special equipment, magazines and books, and membership dues and contributions are the items for which a purchase could be categorized as “unspecified.”

Urban—All territory, population, and housing units located within boundaries that encompass densely settled territory, consisting of core census block groups or blocks that have a population density of at least 1,000 people per square mile and surrounding census blocks that have an overall density of at least 500 people per square mile. Under certain conditions, less densely settled territory may be included, as determined by the Census Bureau.

Visit parks or natural areas—A visit to places accessible to the public and that are owned or leased by a governmental entity, nongovernmental organization, business, or a private individual or group such as an association or club.

Wildlife—Animals such as birds, fish, insects, mammals, amphibians, and reptiles that are living in natural or wild environments. Wildlife does not include animals living in aquariums, zoos, and other artificial surroundings or domestic animals such as farm animals or pets.

Wildlife observed, photographed, or fed—Examples of species that wildlife watchers observe, photograph, and/or feed are (1) *Wild birds*—songbirds such as cardinals, robins, warblers, jays, buntings, and sparrows; birds of prey such as hawks, owls, eagles, and falcons; waterfowl such as ducks, geese, and swans; other water birds such as shorebirds, herons, pelicans, and cranes; and other birds such as pheasants, turkeys, road runners, and woodpeckers; (2) *Land mammals*—large land mammals such as bears, bison, deer, moose, and elk; small land mammals such as squirrels, foxes, prairie dogs, and rabbits; (3) *Fish* such as salmon, sharks, and groupers; (4) *Marine mammals* such as whales, dolphins, and manatees; and (5) *Other wildlife* such as butterflies, turtles, spiders, and snakes.

Wildlife-related recreation—Recreational fishing, hunting, and wildlife watching.

Wildlife watching—There are six types of wildlife watching: (1) closely observing, (2) photographing, (3) feeding, (4) visiting parks or natural areas, (5) maintaining plantings, and (6) maintaining natural areas. These activities must be the primary purpose of the trip or the around-the-home undertaking.

Wildlife-watching equipment—Items owned primarily for observing, photographing, or feeding wildlife:

Binoculars and spotting scopes

Cameras, video cameras, special lenses, and other photographic equipment

Film and developing

Commercially prepared and packaged wild bird food

Other bulk food used to feed wild birds

Food for other wildlife

Nest boxes, bird houses, feeders, and baths

Day packs, carrying cases, and special clothing

Other items such as field guides and maps



Appendix B

Appendix B.

2010 Participation of 6- to 15-Year-Olds: Data From Screening Interviews

The 2011 National Survey of Fishing, Hunting, and Wildlife-Associated Recreation was carried out in two phases. The first (or screening) phase began in April 2011. The main purpose of this phase was to collect information about all persons 16 years old and older in order to develop a sample of potential sportspersons and wildlife watchers for the second (or detailed) phase. However, information was also collected on the number of persons 6 to 15 years old who participated in wildlife-related recreation activities in 2010.

It is important to emphasize that the information reported from the 2011 screen relates to activity only up to and including 2010. Also, these data are reported by one household respondent

speaking for all household members rather than the actual participants. In addition, these data are based on long-term recall (at least a 12-month recall), which has been found in Survey research (see *Investigation of Possible Recall/Reference Period Bias in National Surveys of Fishing, Hunting and Wildlife-Associated Recreation, December 1989, Westat, Inc.*) to add bias to the resulting estimates. In many cases, longer recall periods result in overestimating participation and expenditures for wildlife-related recreation.

Tables B-1 through B-4 report data on 6- to 15-year-old participants in 2010. Detailed expenditures and recreational activity data were not gathered for the 6- to 15-year-old participants.

Because of differences in methodologies of the screening and the detailed phases of the 2011 Survey, the estimates of the two phases are not comparable. Only participants 16 years old and older were eligible for the detailed phase. The screening phase covered activity for 2010 or earlier; the detailed phase has estimates for only 2011. The detailed phase was a series of interviews of the actual participants conducted at 4- and 8-month intervals. The screening phase was a single interview of one household respondent who reported household events with one year or more recall. The shorter recall period of the detailed phase enabled better data accuracy.

Table B-1. Utah Residents 6 to 15 Years Old Participating in Fishing and Hunting Both Inside and Outside Utah: 2010

(Population 6 to 15 years old. Numbers in thousands)

Sportspersons	Sportspersons 6 to 15 years old		
	Number	Percent of sportspersons	Percent of population
Total sportspersons	179	100	38
Total anglers	179	100	38
Fished only	149	83	31
Fished and hunted	*30	*17	*6
Total hunters	*30	*17	*6
Hunted only
Hunted and fished	*30	*17	*6

* Estimate based on a sample size of 10–29. ... Sample size too small (less than 10) to report data reliably.

Note: Detail does not add to total because of multiple responses. Column showing percent of sportspersons is based on the “Total sportspersons” row. Column showing percent of population is based on the state population 6 to 15 years old, including those who did not fish or hunt. Data reported on this table are from screening interviews in which one adult household member responded for household members 6 to 15 years old. The screening interview required the respondent to recall 12 months worth of activity. Includes state residents who fished or hunted only in other countries.

Table B-2. Selected Characteristics of Utah Resident Anglers and Hunters 6 to 15 Years Old: 2010

(Population 6 to 15 years old. Numbers in thousands)

Characteristic	Population		Sportspersons (fished or hunted)			Anglers			Hunters		
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent who participated	Percent	Number	Percent who participated	Percent	Number	Percent who participated	Percent
Total persons	476	100	179	38	100	179	38	100	*30	*6	*100
Population Density of Residence											
Urban	364	76	149	41	83	149	41	83
Rural	112	24	30	27	17	30	27	17
Population Size of Residence											
Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA)	438	92	162	37	91	162	37	91
1,000,000 or more
250,000 to 999,999	283	60	91	32	51	91	32	51
50,000 to 249,999	154	32	*72	*46	*40	*72	*46	*40
Outside MSA	38	8	*16	*43	*9	*16	*43	*9
Age											
6 to 8 years	133	28	*30	*22	*17	*30	*22	*17
9 to 11 years	166	35	*78	*47	*44	*78	*47	*44
12 to 15 years	178	37	71	40	40	71	40	40
Sex											
Male	277	58	133	48	75	133	48	75	*29	*11	*97
Female	199	42	45	23	25	45	23	25
Ethnicity											
Hispanic	*66	*14
Non-Hispanic	411	86	168	41	94	168	41	94	*30	*7	*100
Race											
White	445	93	165	37	92	165	37	92	*26	*6	*85
African American
All others	*22	*5
Annual Household Income											
Less than \$20,000
\$20,000 to \$29,999	*38	*8
\$30,000 to \$39,999	*87	*18
\$40,000 to \$49,999	*19	*4
\$50,000 to \$74,999	115	24	*37	*32	*21	*37	*32	*21
\$75,000 to \$99,999	101	21	69	69	39	69	69	39
\$100,000 or more	84	18	*36	*43	*20	*36	*43	*20
Not reported	*24	*5

* Estimate based on a sample size of 10–29. ... Sample size too small (less than 10) to report data reliably.

Note: Percent who participated columns show the percent of each row's population who participated in the activity named by the column (the percent of those living in urban areas who wildlife watched, etc.). Remaining percent columns show the percent of each column's participants who are described by the row heading (the percent of wildlife watchers who lived in urban areas, etc.). Data reported on this table are from screening interviews in which one adult household member responded for household members 6 to 15 years old. The screening interview required the respondent to recall 12 months worth of activity. Includes state residents who wildlife watched only in other countries.

Table B-3. Utah Residents 6 to 15 Years Old Participating in Wildlife Watching Both Inside and Outside Utah: 2010

(Population 6 to 15 years old. Numbers in thousands)

Participants	Number	Percent of participants	Percent of population
Total participants	167	100	35
Away from home	*60	*36	*13
Around the home	145	87	30
Observe wildlife	95	57	20
Photograph wildlife
Feed wild birds or other wildlife	*26	*16	*6
Maintain plantings or natural areas

* Estimate based on a sample size of 10–29. ... Sample size too small (less than 10) to report data reliably.

Note: Detail does not add to total because of multiple responses. The column showing percent of participation is based on total participants. The column showing percent of population is based on the state population 6 to 15 years old, including those who did not participate in wildlife watching. Data reported on this table are from screening interviews in which one adult household member responded for all household members 6 to 15 years old. The screening interview required the respondent to recall 12 months worth of activity. Includes persons who wildlife watched only in other countries.

Table B-4. Selected Characteristics of Utah Resident Wildlife Watchers 6 to 15 Years Old: 2010

(Population 6 to 15 years old. Numbers in thousands)

Characteristic	Population		Total wildlife watchers			Away from Home			Around the home		
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent who participated	Percent	Number	Percent who participated	Percent	Number	Percent who participated	Percent
Total persons	476	100	167	35	100	*60	*13	*100	145	30	100
Population Density of Residence											
Urban	364	76	148	41	89	*49	*14	*81	132	36	91
Rural	112	24	*19	*17	*11	*12	*11	*9
Population Size of Residence											
Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA)	438	92	156	36	94	*53	*12	*88	139	32	96
1,000,000 or more
250,000 to 999,999	283	60	63	22	38	*23	*8	*38	*47	*17	*32
50,000 to 249,999	154	32	*94	*61	*56	*31	*20	*50	*92	*60	*64
Outside MSA	38	8
Age											
6 to 8 years	133	28	*42	*31	*25	*36	*27	*25
9 to 11 years	166	35	*66	*40	*39	*60	*36	*41
12 to 15 years	178	37	*59	*33	*36	*21	*12	*34	*49	*28	*34
Sex											
Male	277	58	90	33	54	*38	*14	*63	*79	*29	*55
Female	199	42	*76	*38	*46	*22	*11	*37	*65	*33	*45
Ethnicity											
Hispanic	*66	*14
Non-Hispanic	411	86	164	40	98	*60	*15	*100	142	35	98
Race											
White	445	93	164	37	99	*60	*14	*100	142	32	98
African American
All others	*22	*5
Annual Household Income											
Less than \$20,000
\$20,000 to \$29,999	*38	*8
\$30,000 to \$39,999	*87	*18	*65	*75	*39	*65	*75	*45
\$40,000 to \$49,999	*19	*4
\$50,000 to \$74,999	115	24	*27	*23	*16	*19	*16	*13
\$75,000 to \$99,999	101	21	*54	*54	*32	*35	*34	*57	*47	*47	*32
\$100,000 or more	84	18
Not reported	*24	*5

* Estimate based on a sample size of 10–29. ... Sample size too small (less than 10) to report data reliably.

Note: Percent who participated columns show the percent of each row's population who participated in the activity named by the column (the percent of those living in urban areas who fished, etc.). Remaining percent columns show the percent of each column's participants who are described by the row heading (the percent of anglers who lived in urban areas, etc.). Data reported on this table are from screening interviews in which one adult household member responded for household members 6 to 15 years old. The screening interview required the respondent to recall 12 months worth of activity. Includes state residents who fished or hunted only in other countries.

The background is a monochromatic green illustration depicting various outdoor recreation activities. In the upper left, a person sits on a log drinking from a can, with a small dog beside them. To the right, a person stands holding a rifle, with a large dog on a leash nearby. In the center-left, a person is shown archery. In the lower left, two people are in a canoe on a body of water with lily pads. In the center, a person and a child are using binoculars. In the lower right, a person is fishing. The landscape includes rolling hills, various types of trees, and several butterflies. A dark horizontal band across the middle contains the title.

Appendix C

Appendix C.

Significant Methodological Changes From Previous Surveys and Regional Trends

This appendix provides a description of data collection changes and national and regional trend information based on the 1991, 1996, 2001, 2006, and 2011 Surveys. Since these five surveys used similar methodologies, their published information is directly comparable.

Significant Methodological Differences

The most significant design differences in the five Surveys are as follows:

1. The 1991 Survey data was collected by interviewers filling out paper questionnaires. The data entries were keyed in a separate operation after the interview. The 1996, 2001, 2006, and 2011 Survey data were collected by the use of computer-assisted interviews. The questionnaires were programmed into computers, and the interviewer keyed in the responses at the time of the interview.
2. The 1991 Survey screening phase was conducted in January and February of 1991, when a household member of the sample households was interviewed on behalf of the entire household. The screening interviews for the 1996, 2001, and 2006 Surveys were conducted April through June of their survey years in conjunction with the first wave of the detailed interviews. The 2011 Survey also conducted screening interviews and the first detailed interviews April through June of 2011, but furthermore had an additional screening and detailed effort from February 2012 to the end of May 2012. The April–June 2011 screening effort had a high noncontact rate because of poor results using sample telephone numbers obtained from a private firm. Census went back to

the noncontacted component of the original sample in February–May 2012 and interviewed a subsample, requiring annual recall for those respondents. The Wave 3 screen sample was 12,484 of the total 48,600 household screen sample. A modification of the 2011 sampling scheme was to oversample counties that had relatively high proportions of hunting license purchases.

The screening interviews for all five Surveys consisted primarily of demographic questions and wildlife-related recreation questions concerning activity in the previous year (1990, 1995, etc.) and intentions for recreating in the survey year.

In the 1991 Survey, an attempt was made to contact every sample person in all three detailed interview waves. In 1996, 2001, 2006, and 2011 respondents who were interviewed in the first detailed interview wave were not contacted again until the third wave (unless they were part of the other subsample, i.e., a respondent in both the sportsperson and wildlife watching subsamples could be in the first and third wave of sportsperson interviewing and the second and third wave of wildlife watching interviewing). Also, all interviews in the second wave were conducted only by telephone. In-person interviews were only conducted in the first and third waves. The 2011 wave 3 screen phase was composed of both telephone and in-person interviews.

Section I. Important Instrument Changes in the 1996 Survey

1. The 1991 Survey collected information on all wildlife-related recreation purchases made by participants without reference to where the purchase was made. The

1996 Survey asked in which state the purchase was made.

2. In 1991, respondents were asked what kind of fishing they did, i.e., Great Lakes, other freshwater, or saltwater, and then were asked in what states they fished. In 1996, respondents were asked in which states they fished and then were asked what kind of fishing they did. This method had the advantage of not asking about, for example, saltwater fishing when they only fished in a noncoastal state.
3. In 1991, respondents were asked how many days they “actually” hunted or fished for a particular type of game or fish and then how many days they “chiefly” hunted or fished for the same type of game or fish rather than another type of game or fish. To get total days of hunting or fishing for a particular type of game or fish, the “actually” day response was used, while to get the sum of all days of hunting or fishing, the “chiefly” days were summed. In 1996, respondents were asked their total days of hunting or fishing in the country and each state, then how many days they hunted or fished for a particular type of game or fish.
4. Trip-related and equipment expenditure categories were not the same for all Surveys. “Guide fee” and “Pack trip or package fee” were two separate trip-related expenditure items in 1991, while they were combined into one category in the 1996 Survey. “Boating costs” was added to the 1996 hunting and wildlife-watching trip-related expenditure sections. “Heating and cooking fuel” was added to all of the trip-related expenditure sections. “Spearfishing equipment”

was moved from a separate category to the “other” list. “Rods” and “Reels” were two separate categories in 1991 but were combined in 1996. “Lines, hooks, sinkers, etc.” was one category in 1991 but split into “Lines” and “Hooks, sinkers, etc.” in 1996. “Food used to feed other wildlife” was added to the wildlife-watching equipment section, “Boats” and “Cabins” were added to the wildlife-watching special equipment section, and “Land leasing and ownership” was added to the wildlife-watching expenditures section.

5. Questions asking sportspersons if they participated as much as they wanted were added in 1996. If the sportspersons said no, they were asked why not.
6. The 1991 Survey included questions about participation in organized fishing competitions; anglers using bows and arrows, nets or seines, or spearfishing; hunters using pistols or handguns and target shooting in preparation for hunting. These questions were not asked in 1996.
7. The 1996 Survey included questions about catch and release fishing and persons with disabilities participating in wildlife-related recreation. These questions were not part of the 1991 Survey.
8. The 1991 Survey included questions about average distance traveled to recreation sites. These questions were not included in the 1996 Survey.
9. The 1996 Survey included questions about the last trip the respondent took. Included were questions about the type of trip, where the activity took place, and the distance and direction to the site visited. These questions were not asked in 1991.
10. The 1991 Survey collected data on hunting, fishing, and wildlife watching by U.S. residents in Canada. The 1996 Survey collected data on fishing and wildlife-watching by U.S. residents in Canada.

Section II. Important Instrument Changes in the 2001 Survey

1. The 1991 and 1996 single race category “Asian or Pacific Islander” was changed to two categories “Asian” and “Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander.” In 1991 and 1996, the respondent was required to pick only one category, while in 2001 the respondent could pick any combination of categories. The next question stipulated that the respondent could only be identified with one category and then asked what that category was.
2. The 1991 and 1996 land leasing and ownership sections asked the respondent to combine the two types of land use into one and give total acreage and expenditures. In 2001, the two types of land use were explored separately.
3. The 1991 and 1996 wildlife-watching sections included questions on birdwatching for around-the-home participants only. The 2001 Survey added a question on birdwatching for away-from-home participants. Also, questions on the use of birding life lists and how many species the respondent can identify were added.
4. “Recreational vehicles” was added to the sportspersons and wildlife-watchers special equipment section. “House trailer” was added to the sportspersons special equipment section.
5. Total personal income was asked in the detailed phase of the 1996 Survey. This was changed to total household income in the 2001 Survey.
6. A question was added to the trip-related expenditures section to ascertain how much of the total was spent in the respondent’s state of residence when the respondent participated in hunting, fishing, or wildlife watching out-of-state.
7. Boating questions were added to the fishing section. The respondent was asked about the extent of boat usage for the three types of fishing.
8. The 1996 Survey included questions about the months around-the-

home wildlife watchers fed birds. These questions were not repeated in the 2001 Survey.

9. The contingent valuation sections of the three types of wildlife-related recreation were altered, using an open-ended question format instead of 1996’s dichotomous choice format.

Section III. Important Instrument Changes in the 2006 Survey

1. A series of boating questions was added. The new questions dealt with anglers using motorboats and/or nonmotorboats, length of boat used most often, distance to boat launch used most often, needed improvements to facilities at the launch, whether or not the respondent completed a boating safety course, who the boater fished with most often, and the source and type of information the boater used for his or her fishing.
2. Questions regarding catch and release fishing were added. They were whether or not the respondent caught and released fish and, if so, the percent of fish released.
3. The proportion of hunting done with a rifle or shotgun, as contrasted with muzzleloader or archery equipment, was asked.
4. In the contingent valuation section, where the value of wildlife-related recreation was determined, two quality-variable questions were added: the average length of certain fish caught and whether a deer, elk, or moose was killed. Plus the economic evaluation bid questions were rephrased, from “What is the most your [species] hunting in [State name] could have cost you per trip last year before you would NOT have gone [species] hunting at all in 2001, not even one trip, because it would have been too expensive?”, for the hunters, for example, to “What is the cost that would have prevented you from taking even one such trip in 2006? In other words, if the trip cost was below this amount, you would have gone [species] hunting in [State name], but if the trip cost was above this amount, you would not have gone.”

5. Questions concerning hunting, fishing, or wildlife watching in other countries were taken out of the Survey.
6. Questions about the reasons for not going hunting or fishing, or not going as much as expected, were deleted.
7. Disability of participants questions were taken out.
8. Determination of the types of sites for wildlife watching was discontinued.
9. The birding questions regarding the use of birding life lists and the ability to identify birds based on their sight or sounds were deleted.
10. Public transportation costs were divided into two sections, “public transportation by airplane” and “other public transportation, including trains, buses, and car rentals, etc.”.

Section IV. Important Instrument Changes in the 2011 Survey

1. The series of boating questions added in 2006 was deleted.
2. Questions about target shooting and the usage of a shooting range in preparation for hunting were added. The types of weapon used at the shooting range were quantified.
3. Questions about plantings expenditures for the purpose of hunting were added.
4. “Feral pig” was recategorized from big game to other animals for all states except Hawaii.
5. “Ptarmigan” was included as its own small game category, instead of lumped in “other.”
6. In previous Surveys, “Moose” was included as its own category only for Alaska. For 2011, “Moose” was included as its own big game category, instead of lumped in “other,” for all fifty states.
7. In previous Surveys, “Wolf” was included as its own category only for Alaska. For 2011, “Wolf” was included as its own other animal category, instead of lumped in “other,” for all fifty states.

8. The household income categories were modified. The top categories were changed from “\$100,000 or more” to “\$100,000 to \$149,999” and “\$150,000 or more.”
9. The “Steelhead” category was deleted from the saltwater fish species section, with the idea that it would be included in “other.”
10. The 2006 around-the-home wildlife-watching category that quantified visitors of “public parks or areas” was rewritten to wildlife watching at “parks or natural areas.” This change was to make clear that respondents should include recreating at quasi-governmental and private areas.
11. The 2006 wildlife watching equipment category “Film and developing” was rewritten to “Film and photo processing.”

Regional Trends

This trends section covers the period from 1991 to 2011. The 1991, 1996, 2001, 2006, and 2011 Surveys used similar methodologies, making all published information for the five Surveys directly comparable.

Table C-1a. Comparison of Wildlife-Related Recreation in the United States: 1991–1996

(U.S. population 16 years old and older. Numbers in thousands. All expenditures in 2011 dollars. 1996 expenditures categories made comparable to 1991)

Participants, days, and expenditures	1991 (number)	1996 (number)	1991–1996 percent change
Hunting			
Hunters, total.	14,063	13,975	NS–1
Hunting days, total.	235,806	256,676	NS9
Hunting expenditures, total.	\$20,399,152	\$29,259,999	43
Fishing			
Anglers, total.	35,578	35,246	NS–1
Fishing days, total.	511,329	625,893	22
Fishing expenditures, total.	\$39,669,337	\$54,224,581	37
Wildlife Watching			
Wildlife watchers, total.	76,111	62,868	–17
Around the home.	73,904	60,751	–18
Away from home.	29,999	23,652	–21
Wildlife-watching days, away from home.	342,406	313,790	NS–8
Wildlife-watching expenditures, total.	\$30,574,499	\$36,924,875	21

NS Not different from zero at the 5 percent level of significance.

Table C-1b. Comparison of Wildlife-Related Recreation in the United States: 1996–2001

(U.S. population 16 years old and older. Numbers in thousands. All expenditures in 2011 dollars. 1996 and 2001 expenditures categories made comparable to 1991)

Participants, days, and expenditures	1996 (number)	2001 (number)	1996–2001 percent change
Hunting			
Hunters, total.	13,975	13,034	–7
Hunting days, total.	256,676	228,368	–11
Hunting expenditures, total.	\$29,259,999	\$25,993,960	NS–11
Fishing			
Anglers, total.	35,246	34,071	–3
Fishing days, total.	625,893	557,394	–11
Fishing expenditures, total.	\$54,224,581	\$45,076,739	–17
Wildlife Watching			
Wildlife watchers, total.	62,868	66,105	5
Around the home.	60,751	62,928	4
Away from home.	23,652	21,823	–8
Wildlife-watching days, away from home.	313,790	372,006	19
Wildlife-watching expenditures, total.	\$36,924,875	\$42,904,872	16

NS Not different from zero at the 5 percent level of significance.

Table C-1c. Comparison of Wildlife-Related Recreation in the United States: 2001–2006

(U.S. population 16 years old and older. Numbers in thousands. All expenditures in 2011 dollars. 2001 and 2006 expenditures categories made comparable to 1991)

Participants, days, and expenditures	2001 (number)	2006 (number)	2001–2006 percent change
Hunting			
Hunters, total.	13,034	12,510	NS ₋₄
Hunting days, total.	228,368	219,925	NS ₋₄
Hunting expenditures, total.	\$25,993,960	\$25,265,523	NS ₋₃
Fishing			
Anglers, total.	34,071	29,952	-12
Fishing days, total.	557,394	516,781	-7
Fishing expenditures, total.	\$45,076,739	\$46,909,364	NS ₄
Wildlife Watching			
Wildlife watchers, total.	66,105	71,132	8
Around the home.	62,928	67,756	8
Away from home.	21,823	22,977	NS ₅
Wildlife-watching days, away from home.	372,006	352,070	NS ₋₅
Wildlife-watching expenditures, total.	\$42,904,872	\$40,023,078	NS ₋₇

NS Not different from zero at the 5 percent level of significance.

Table C-1d. Comparison of Wildlife-Related Recreation in the United States: 2006–2011

(U.S. population 16 years old and older. Numbers in thousands. All expenditures in 2011 dollars. 2006 and 2011 expenditures categories made comparable to 1991)

Participants, days, and expenditures	2006 (number)	2011 (number)	2006–2011 percent change
Hunting			
Hunters, total.	12,510	13,674	9
Hunting days, total.	219,925	281,884	28
Hunting expenditures, total.	\$25,265,523	\$32,579,640	29
Fishing			
Anglers, total.	29,952	33,112	11
Fishing days, total.	516,781	553,841	NS ₇
Fishing expenditures, total.	\$46,909,364	\$41,624,599	NS ₋₁₁
Wildlife Watching			
Wildlife watchers, total.	71,132	71,776	NS ₁
Around the home.	67,756	68,598	NS ₁
Away from home.	22,977	22,496	NS ₋₂
Wildlife-watching days, away from home.	352,070	335,625	NS ₋₅
Wildlife-watching expenditures, total.	\$40,023,078	\$43,636,608	NS ₉

NS Not different from zero at the 5 percent level of significance.

Table C-1e. Comparison of Wildlife-Related Recreation in the United States: 1991–2011

(U.S. population 16 years old and older. Numbers in thousands. All expenditures in 2011 dollars. 2011 expenditures categories made comparable to 1991)

Participants, days, and expenditures	1991 (number)	2011 (number)	1991–2011 percent change
Hunting			
Hunters, total	14,063	13,674	^{NS} –3
Hunting days, total	235,806	281,884	20
Hunting expenditures, total	\$20,399,152	\$32,579,640	60
Fishing			
Anglers, total	35,578	33,112	–7
Fishing days, total	511,329	553,841	8
Fishing expenditures, total	\$39,669,337	\$41,624,599	^{NS} 5
Wildlife Watching			
Wildlife watchers, total	76,111	71,776	–6
Around the home	73,904	68,598	–7
Away from home	29,999	22,496	–25
Wildlife-watching days, away from home	342,406	335,625	^{NS} –2
Wildlife-watching expenditures, total	\$30,574,499	\$43,636,608	43

^{NS} Not different from zero at the 5 percent level of significance.

Table C-2. Anglers and Hunters by Census Division: 1991, 1996, 2001, 2006, and 2011

(U.S. population 16 years old and older. Numbers in thousands)

Area and sportsperson	1991		1996		2001		2006		2011	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
UNITED STATES										
Total population	189,964	100	201,472	100	212,298	100	229,245	100	239,313	100
Sportspersons	39,979	21	39,694	20	37,805	18	33,916	15	37,397	16
Anglers	35,578	19	35,246	17	34,067	16	29,952	13	33,112	14
Hunters	14,063	7	13,975	7	13,034	6	12,510	5	13,674	6
New England										
Total population	10,180	100	10,306	100	10,575	100	11,233	100	11,593	100
Sportspersons	1,658	16	1,673	16	1,504	14	1,353	12	1,441	12
Anglers	1,545	15	1,520	15	1,402	13	1,246	11	1,355	12
Hunters	444	4	465	5	386	4	374	3	420	4
Middle Atlantic										
Total population	29,216	100	29,371	100	29,806	100	31,518	100	32,392	100
Sportspersons	4,508	15	4,192	14	3,810	13	3,214	10	3,966	12
Anglers	3,871	13	3,627	12	3,250	11	2,550	8	3,496	11
Hunters	1,746	6	1,453	5	1,633	5	1,520	5	1,558	5
East North Central										
Total population	32,188	100	33,121	100	34,082	100	35,609	100	36,199	100
Sportspersons	7,202	22	6,912	21	6,400	19	5,975	17	6,766	19
Anglers	6,264	19	6,006	18	5,655	17	5,190	15	5,861	16
Hunters	2,789	9	2,712	8	2,421	7	2,376	7	2,688	7
West North Central										
Total population	13,504	100	13,875	100	14,430	100	15,458	100	15,860	100
Sportspersons	4,143	31	3,977	29	4,239	29	3,836	25	3,980	25
Anglers	3,647	27	3,416	25	3,836	27	3,284	21	3,591	23
Hunters	1,709	13	1,917	14	1,710	12	1,779	12	1,661	10
South Atlantic										
Total population	33,682	100	36,776	100	39,286	100	43,965	100	46,417	100
Sportspersons	6,996	21	7,282	20	6,957	18	6,633	15	6,749	15
Anglers	6,441	19	6,636	18	6,451	16	6,116	14	6,163	13
Hunters	2,083	6	2,050	6	1,875	5	1,884	4	1,870	4
East South Central										
Total population	11,667	100	12,459	100	12,976	100	13,722	100	14,206	100
Sportspersons	2,984	26	2,907	23	2,865	22	2,689	20	3,010	21
Anglers	2,635	23	2,514	20	2,543	20	2,436	18	2,444	17
Hunters	1,279	11	1,301	10	1,164	9	1,101	8	1,531	11
West South Central										
Total population	19,926	100	21,811	100	23,337	100	25,407	100	27,195	100
Sportspersons	5,125	26	5,093	23	4,924	21	4,499	18	4,855	18
Anglers	4,592	23	4,616	21	4,375	19	3,952	16	4,298	16
Hunters	1,843	9	1,812	8	1,988	9	1,810	7	1,909	7
Mountain										
Total population	10,092	100	11,966	100	13,308	100	15,651	100	17,013	100
Sportspersons	2,488	25	2,761	23	2,757	21	2,372	15	2,976	17
Anglers	2,079	21	2,411	20	2,443	18	2,084	13	2,586	15
Hunters	1,069	11	1,061	9	1,020	8	868	6	1,043	6
Pacific										
Total population	29,508	100	31,787	100	34,498	100	36,681	100	38,438	100
Sportspersons	4,875	17	4,897	15	4,349	13	3,345	9	3,654	10
Anglers	4,505	15	4,501	14	4,111	12	3,094	8	3,319	9
Hunters	1,101	4	1,203	4	837	2	798	2	996	3

Table C-3. Wildlife-Watching Participants by Census Division: 1991, 1996, 2001, 2006, and 2011

(U.S. population 16 years old and older. Numbers in thousands)

Area and wildlife watcher	1991		1996		2001		2006		2011	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
UNITED STATES										
Total population	189,964	100	201,472	100	212,298	100	229,245	100	239,313	100
Total wildlife watchers	76,111	40	62,868	31	66,105	31	71,132	31	71,776	30
Away from home	29,999	16	23,652	12	21,823	10	22,977	10	22,496	9
Around the home	73,904	39	60,751	30	62,928	30	67,756	30	68,598	29
New England										
Total population	10,180	100	10,306	100	10,575	100	11,233	100	11,593	100
Total wildlife watchers	4,598	45	3,710	36	3,875	37	4,489	40	3,954	34
Away from home	1,856	18	1,443	14	1,155	11	1,340	12	1,187	10
Around the home	4,544	45	3,586	35	3,765	36	4,310	38	3,858	33
Middle Atlantic										
Total population	29,216	100	29,371	100	29,806	100	31,518	100	32,392	100
Total wildlife watchers	10,556	36	8,185	28	8,740	29	8,723	28	9,118	28
Away from home	4,166	14	2,960	10	2,849	10	2,729	9	2,561	8
Around the home	10,282	35	8,023	27	8,452	28	8,451	27	8,744	27
East North Central										
Total population	32,188	100	33,121	100	34,082	100	35,609	100	36,199	100
Total wildlife watchers	14,511	45	11,731	35	11,631	34	12,215	34	12,840	35
Away from home	5,572	17	4,501	14	3,571	10	3,792	11	3,168	9
Around the home	14,175	44	11,297	34	11,196	33	11,845	33	12,492	35
West North Central										
Total population	13,504	100	13,875	100	14,430	100	15,458	100	15,860	100
Total wildlife watchers	6,924	51	5,089	37	6,206	43	6,741	44	5,479	35
Away from home	2,654	20	1,927	14	2,059	14	2,163	14	1,783	11
Around the home	6,722	50	4,900	35	5,938	41	6,447	42	5,201	33
South Atlantic										
Total population	33,682	100	36,776	100	39,286	100	43,965	100	46,417	100
Total wildlife watchers	13,047	39	11,252	31	11,395	29	12,862	29	13,315	29
Away from home	4,450	13	3,992	11	3,469	9	3,208	7	4,393	9
Around the home	12,813	38	10,964	30	10,911	28	12,432	28	12,767	28
East South Central										
Total population	11,667	100	12,459	100	12,976	100	13,722	100	14,206	100
Total wildlife watchers	4,864	42	3,904	31	4,514	35	4,931	36	4,663	33
Away from home	1,592	14	1,118	9	1,086	8	1,758	13	1,456	10
Around the home	4,765	41	3,795	30	4,390	34	4,683	34	4,394	31
West South Central										
Total population	19,926	100	21,811	100	23,337	100	25,407	100	27,195	100
Total wildlife watchers	7,035	35	5,933	27	5,747	25	6,764	27	7,164	26
Away from home	2,459	12	2,096	10	1,822	8	2,127	8	1,728	6
Around the home	6,817	34	5,773	26	5,490	24	6,319	25	7,087	26
Mountain										
Total population	10,092	100	11,966	100	13,308	100	15,651	100	17,013	100
Total wildlife watchers	4,437	44	4,099	34	4,619	35	4,968	32	5,189	30
Away from home	2,215	22	1,967	16	2,019	15	2,004	13	2,230	13
Around the home	4,145	41	3,855	32	4,282	32	4,605	29	4,716	28
Pacific										
Total population	29,508	100	31,787	100	34,498	100	36,681	100	38,438	100
Total wildlife watchers	10,139	34	8,966	28	9,377	27	9,439	26	10,054	26
Away from home	5,035	17	3,648	11	3,793	11	3,856	11	3,990	10
Around the home	9,641	33	8,558	27	8,504	25	8,664	24	9,337	24



Appendix D

Appendix D.

Sample Design and Statistical Accuracy

This appendix is presented in two parts. The first part is the U.S. Census Bureau Source and Accuracy Statement. This statement describes the sampling design for the 2011 Survey and highlights the steps taken to produce estimates from the completed questionnaires. The statement explains the use of standard errors and confidence intervals. It also provides comprehensive information about errors characteristic of surveys and formulas and parameters to calculate an approximate standard error or confidence interval for each number published in this report. The second part, Tables D-1 and D-2, reports estimates and approximate standard errors for selected measures of participation and expenditures for wildlife-related recreation.

Source and Accuracy Statement for the Utah State Report of the 2011 National Survey of Fishing, Hunting, and Wildlife-Associated Recreation

SOURCE OF DATA

The estimates in this report are based on data collected in the 2011 *National Survey of Fishing, Hunting, and Wildlife-Associated Recreation* (FHWAR) conducted by the Census Bureau and sponsored by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

The eligible universe for the FHWAR is the civilian noninstitutionalized and nonbarrack military population living in the United States. The institutionalized population, which is excluded from the population universe, is composed primarily of the population in correctional institutions and nursing homes (98 percent of the 4 million institutionalized people in Census 2010).

The 2011 FHWAR was designed to provide state-level estimates of the number of participants in recreational

hunting and fishing and in wildlife watching activities (e.g., wildlife observation). Information was collected on the number of participants, where and how often they participated, the type of wildlife encountered, and the amounts of money spent on wildlife-related recreation.

The survey was conducted in two stages: an initial screening of households to identify likely sportspersons and wildlife-watching participants and a series of follow-up interviews of selected persons to collect detailed data about their wildlife-related recreation during 2011.

SAMPLE DESIGN

The 2011 FHWAR sample was selected from the Census Bureau's master address file (MAF).

The FHWAR is a multistage probability sample, with coverage in all 50 states and the District of Columbia.¹ In the first stage of the sampling process, primary sampling units (PSUs) are selected for sample. The PSUs are defined to correspond to the Office of Management and Budget definitions of Core Based Statistical Area definitions and to improve efficiency in field operations. The United States is divided into 2,025 PSUs. These PSUs are grouped into 824 strata. Within each stratum, a single PSU is chosen for the sample, with its probability of selection proportional to its population as of the 2000 decennial census. This PSU represents the entire stratum from which it was selected. In the case of strata consisting of only one PSU, the PSU is chosen with certainty.

¹ The sample size in the District of Columbia (D.C.) is not of sufficient size to produce reliable estimates for only D.C. The sample responses from D.C. are included in the U.S. totals for complete coverage of the U.S. (excluding Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands).

Within the selected PSUs, the FHWAR sample was selected from the MAF.

FHWAR Screening Sample

The total screening sample in Utah consisted of **546** households. Interviewing for the screen was conducted during April, May, and June 2011. Due to a high noncontact rate, an additional personal visit screening interview, for a subsample of noncontact cases, occurred again in February, March, April, or May 2012. Of all housing units in sample, about **497** were determined to be eligible for interview. Interviewers obtained interviews at **394** of these units for a Utah response rate of **79** percent.² Utah's weighted response rate was **82** percent. The interviewers asked screening questions for all household members 6 years old and older. Noninterviews occur when the occupants are not found at home after repeated calls or are unavailable for some other reason.

Data for the FHWAR sportspersons sample and wildlife-watchers sample were collected in three waves.³ The first wave started in April 2011, the second in September 2011, and the third in January 2012. In the sportspersons sample, all persons who hunted or fished in 2011 by the time of the screening interview were interviewed in the first wave. The remaining sportspersons in sample were interviewed in the second wave. The reference period was the preceding 4 months for waves 1 and 2. In wave 3, the reference period was either 4, 8, or 12 months depending on when the sample person was first interviewed.

² Response rates are calculated by using APPOR's RR2 formula.

³ The sample cases selected due to high noncontact rates were only interviewed once. They received a screener and if they had some form of participation a detailed questionnaire. These participants did not get three waves of interviewing. The reference period for these sampled cases was between 13 and 16 months.

Detailed Samples

Two independent detailed samples were chosen from the FHWAR screening sample. One consisted of sportspersons (people who hunt or fish) and the other of wildlife watchers (people who observe, photograph, or feed wildlife).

A. Sportspersons

The Census Bureau selected the detailed samples based on information reported during the screening phase. Based on information collected from the household respondent, every person 16 years old and older in the FHWAR screening sample was assigned to a sportspersons stratum. The criteria for the strata included time devoted to hunting or fishing in previous years, participation in hunting or fishing in 2011 by the time of the screening interview, and intentions to participate in hunting and fishing activities during the remainder of 2011.⁴ The four sportspersons categories were:

1. *Active*—a person who had already participated in hunting or fishing in 2011 at the time of the screener interview.
2. *Likely*—a person who had not participated in 2011 at the time of the screener, but had participated in 2010 OR was likely to participate in 2011.
3. *Inactive*—a person who had not participated in 2010 or 2011 AND was somewhat unlikely to participate in 2011.
4. *Nonparticipant*—a person who had not participated in 2010 or 2011 AND was very unlikely to participate in 2011.

Due to the high noncontact rates in wave 1, all persons in the active, likely, and inactive groups were selected with certainty.

Active sportspersons were given the detailed interview twice—at the time of the screening interview (in April, May, or June 2011) and again in January or February 2012.⁵ Likely sportspersons and inactive sportspersons were also interviewed

⁴ The sample cases selected due to high noncontact rates were not assigned a sportsperson stratum.

⁵ The sample cases selected due to high noncontact rates were given the detailed sportsperson interview once.

twice—first in September or October 2011, then in January or February 2012. Persons in the nonparticipant group were not eligible for a detailed interview. About **282** persons were designated for interviews in Utah. The detailed sportspersons sample sizes varied by state to get reliable state-level estimates. During each interview period, about **32** percent of the designated persons were not found at home or were unavailable for some other reason. Overall, about **193** detailed sportspersons interviews were completed at a response rate of **68** percent.

B. Wildlife Watchers

The wildlife-watching detailed sample was also selected based on information reported during the screening phase. Based on information collected from the household respondent, every person 16 years old and older was assigned to a stratum. The criteria for the strata included time devoted to wildlife watching activities in previous years, participation in wildlife watching activities in 2011 by the time of the screening interview, and intentions to participate in wildlife watching activities during the remainder of 2011.⁶ The five wildlife-watching categories were:

1. *Active*—a person who had already participated in 2011 at the time of the screening interview.
2. *Avid*—a person who had not yet participated in 2011, but in 2010 had taken trips to participate in wildlife-watching activities for 21 or more days or had spent \$300 or more.
3. *Average*—a person who had not yet participated in 2011, but in 2010 had taken trips to wildlife watch for less than 21 days and had spent less than \$300 OR had not participated in wildlife-watching activities but was very likely to in the remainder of 2011.
4. *Infrequent*—a person who had not participated in 2010 or 2011, but was somewhat

⁶ The sample cases selected due to high noncontact rates were not assigned a wildlife watcher stratum. Wildlife-watching participants in these cases were then subsampled into the detailed questionnaire.

likely or somewhat unlikely to participate in the remainder of 2011.

5. *Nonparticipant*—a person who had not participated in 2010 or 2011 AND was very unlikely to participate during the remainder of 2011.

Persons were selected for the detailed sample based on these groupings, but persons in the nonparticipant group were not eligible for a detailed interview.

A subsample of each of the other groups was selected to receive a detailed interview with the chance of selection diminishing as the likelihood of participation diminished. Wildlife-watching participants were given the detailed interview twice.⁷ Some received their first detailed interview at the same time as the screening interview (in April, May, or June 2011). The rest received their first detailed interview in September or October 2011. All wildlife-watching participants received their second interview in January or February 2012. Some respondents were given the screener and detailed interview in February, March, April, or May 2012. About **178** persons were designated for interviews in Utah. The detailed wildlife-watching sample sizes varied by state to get reliable state-level estimates. During each interview period, about **37** percent of the designated persons were not found at home or were unavailable for some other reason. Overall, about **112** detailed wildlife watcher interviews were completed at a response rate of **63** percent.

ESTIMATION PROCEDURE

Several stages of adjustments were used to derive the final 2011 FHWAR person weights. A brief description of the major components of the weights is given below. All statistics for the population 6 to 15 years of age were derived from the screening interview. Statistics for the population 16 years old and older come from both the screening and detailed interviews. Estimates that come from the screening sample are presented in Appendix B.

⁷ The sample cases selected due to high noncontact rates were given the detailed wildlife-watching interview once.

A. Screening Sample

Every interviewed person in the screening sample received a screening weight that was the product of the following factors:

1. *Base Weight.* The base weight is the inverse of the household's probability of selection.
2. *Household Noninterview Adjustment.* The noninterview adjustment inflates the weight assigned to interviewed households to account for households eligible for interview but for which no interview was obtained.
3. *First-Stage Adjustment.* The 824 areas designated for our samples were selected from 2,025 such areas of the United States. Some sample areas represent only themselves and are referred to as self-representing. The remaining areas represent other areas similar in selected characteristics and are thus designated non-self-representing. The first-stage factor reduces the component of variation arising from sampling the non-self-representing areas.
4. *Second-Stage Adjustment.* This adjustment brings the estimates of the total population into agreement with census-based estimates of the civilian noninstitutionalized and nonbarrack military populations for each state.

B. Sportspersons Sample

Every interviewed person in the sportspersons detailed sample received a weight that was the product of the following factors:

1. *Screening Weight.* This is the person's final weight from the screening sample.
2. *Sportspersons Stratum Adjustment.* This factor inflates the weights of persons selected for the detailed sample to account for the subsampling done within each sportsperson stratum.
3. *Sportspersons Noninterview Adjustment.* This factor adjusts

the weights of the interviewed sportspersons to account for sportspersons selected for the detailed sample for whom no interview was obtained. A person was considered a noninterview if he or she was not interviewed in the third wave of interviewing.

4. *Sportspersons Ratio Adjustment Factor.* This is a ratio adjustment of the detailed sample to the screening sample within the sportspersons sampling strata. This adjustment brings the population estimates of persons aged 16 years old and older from the detailed sample into agreement with the same estimates from the screening sample, which was a much larger sample.

C. Wildlife-Watchers Sample

Every interviewed person in the wildlife-watchers detailed sample received a weight that was the product of the following factors:

1. *Screening Weight.* This is the person's final weight from the screening sample.
2. *Wildlife-Watchers Stratum Adjustment.* This factor inflates the weights of persons selected for the detailed sample to account for the subsampling done within each wildlife watcher stratum.
3. *Wildlife-Watchers Noninterview Adjustment.* This factor adjusts the weights of the interviewed wildlife-watching participants to account for wildlife watchers selected for the detailed sample for whom no interview was obtained. A person was considered a noninterview if he or she was not interviewed in the third wave of interviewing.
4. *Wildlife-Watchers Ratio Adjustment Factor.* This is a ratio adjustment of the detailed sample to the screening sample within the wildlife-watchers sampling strata. This adjustment brings the population estimates of persons aged 16 years old and older from the detailed sample into agreement

with the same estimates from the screening sample, which was a much larger sample.

ACCURACY OF THE ESTIMATES

A sample survey estimate has two types of error: sampling and nonsampling. The accuracy of an estimate depends on both types of error. The nature of the sampling error is known given the survey design; the full extent of the nonsampling error is unknown.

NONSAMPLING ERROR

For a given estimator, the difference between the estimate that would result if the sample were to include the entire population and the true population value being estimated is known as nonsampling error. There are several sources of nonsampling error that may occur during the development or execution of the survey. It can occur because of circumstances created by the interviewer, the respondent, the survey instrument, or the way the data are collected and processed. For example, errors could occur because:

- The interviewer records the wrong answer, the respondent provides incorrect information, the respondent estimates the requested information, or an unclear survey question is misunderstood by the respondent (measurement error).
- Some individuals who should have been included in the survey frame were missed (coverage error).
- Responses are not collected from all those in the sample or the respondent is unwilling to provide information (nonresponse error).
- Values are estimated imprecisely for missing data (imputation error).
- Forms may be lost; data may be incorrectly keyed, coded, or recoded, etc. (processing error).

The Census Bureau employs quality control procedures throughout the production process, including the overall design of surveys, the wording of questions, the review of the work of interviewers and coders, and the statistical review of reports to minimize these errors. Two types of nonsampling

error that can be examined to a limited extent are nonresponse and undercoverage.

Nonresponse. The effect of nonresponse cannot be measured directly, but one indication of its potential effect is the nonresponse rate. For the FHWAR screener interview in Utah, the household-level nonresponse rate was **21** percent. The person-level nonresponse rate for the detailed sportsperson interview in Utah was an additional **32** percent and for the wildlife watchers it was **37** percent. Since the screener nonresponse rate is a household-level rate and the detailed interview nonresponse rate is a person-level rate, we cannot combine these rates to derive an overall nonresponse rate. Since the screener nonresponse rate is a household-level rate and the detailed interview nonresponse rate is a person-level rate, we cannot combine these rates to derive an overall nonresponse rate. Since it is unlikely the nonresponding households to the FHWAR have the same number of persons as the households successfully interviewed, combining these rates would result in an overestimate of the “true” person-level overall nonresponse rate for the detailed interviews.

Coverage. Overall screener undercoverage is estimated to be about 13 percent. Ratio estimation to independent population controls, as described previously, partially corrects for the bias due to survey undercoverage. However, biases exist in the estimates to the extent that missed persons in missed households or missed persons in interviewed households have different characteristics from those of interviewed persons in the same age group.

Comparability of Data. Data obtained from the 2011 FHWAR and other sources are not entirely comparable. This results from differences in interviewer training and experience and in differing survey processes. This is an example of nonsampling variability not reflected in the standard errors. Therefore, caution should be used when comparing results from different sources. (See Appendix C.)

A Nonsampling Error Warning. Since the full extent of the nonsampling error is unknown, one should be particularly careful when interpreting results based on small differences between estimates. The Census Bureau recommends that

data users incorporate information about nonsampling errors into their analyses, as nonsampling error could impact the conclusions drawn from the results. Caution should also be used when interpreting results based on a relatively small number of cases. Summary measures (such as medians and percentage distributions) probably do not reveal useful information when computed on a subpopulation smaller than 90,000 for screener data, 100,000 for the detailed sportsperson data, and 235,000 for the wildlife-watchers data.

SAMPLING ERROR

Since the FHWAR estimates come from a sample, they may differ from figures from an enumeration of the entire population using the same questionnaires, instructions, and enumerators. For a given estimator, the difference between an estimate based on a sample and the estimate that would result if the sample were to include the entire population is known as sampling error. Standard errors, as calculated by methods described in “Standard Errors and Their Use,” are primarily measures of the magnitude of sampling error. However, they may include some nonsampling error.

Standard Errors and Their Use. The sample estimate and its standard error enable one to construct a confidence interval. A confidence interval is a range that has a known probability of including the average result of all possible samples. For example, if all possible samples were surveyed under essentially the same general conditions and using the same sample design, and if an estimate and its standard error were calculated from each sample, then approximately 95 percent of the intervals from 1.96 standard errors below the estimate to 1.96 standard errors above the estimate would include the average result of all possible samples. A particular confidence interval may or may not contain the average estimate derived from all possible samples. However, one can say with specified confidence that the interval includes the average estimate calculated from all possible samples. Standard errors may also be used to perform hypothesis testing, a procedure for distinguishing between population parameters using sample estimates. The most common type of hypothesis is that the population parameters are different. An example would be comparing the proportion of

anglers to the proportion of hunters. Tests may be performed at various levels of significance. A significance level is the probability of concluding that the characteristics are different when, in fact, they are the same. For example, to conclude that two characteristics are different at the 0.05 level of significance, the absolute value of the estimated difference between characteristics must be greater than or equal to 1.96 times the standard error of the difference. This report uses 95-percent confidence intervals and 0.05 level of significance to determine statistical validity. Consult standard statistical textbooks for alternative criteria.

Estimating Standard Errors. The Census Bureau uses replication methods to estimate the standard errors of FHWAR estimates. These methods primarily measure the magnitude of sampling error. However, they do measure some effects of nonsampling error as well. They do not measure systematic biases in the data associated with nonsampling error. Bias is the average over all possible samples of the differences between the sample estimates and the true value.

Generalized Variance Parameters. While it is possible to compute and present an estimate of the standard error based on the survey data for each estimate in a report, there are a number of reasons why this is not done. A presentation of the individual standard errors would be of limited use, since one could not possibly predict all of the combinations of results that may be of interest to data users. Additionally, data users have access to FHWAR microdata files, and it is impossible to compute in advance the standard error for every estimate one might obtain from those data sets. Moreover, variance estimates are based on sample data and have variances of their own. Therefore, some methods of stabilizing these estimates of variance, for example, by generalizing or averaging over time, may be used to improve their reliability. Experience has shown that certain groups of estimates have similar relationships between their variances and expected values. Modeling or generalizing may provide more stable variance estimates by taking advantage of these similarities. The generalized variance function is a simple model that expresses the variance as a function of the expected value of the survey estimate. The parameters of the

generalized variance function are estimated using direct replicate variances. These generalized variance parameters provide a relatively easy method to obtain approximate standard errors for numerous characteristics. Table D-2 provide the generalized variance parameters for FHWAR data. Methods for using the parameters to calculate standard errors of various estimates are given in the next sections.

Standard Errors of Estimated Numbers. The approximate standard error, s_x , of an estimated number shown in this report can be obtained using the following formulas. Formula (1) is used to calculate the standard errors of levels of sportspersons, anglers, and wildlife watchers.

$$s_x = \sqrt{ax^2 + bx} \quad (1)$$

Here, x is the size of the estimate and a and b are the parameters in the tables associated with the particular characteristic.

Formula (2) is used for standard errors of aggregates, i.e., trips, days, and expenditures.

$$s_x = \sqrt{ax^2 + bx + \frac{cx^2}{y}} \quad (2)$$

Here, x is again the size of the estimate; y is the base of the estimate; and a , b , and c are the parameters in the tables associated with the particular characteristic.

Illustration of the Computation of the Standard Error of an Estimated Number

Suppose there were an estimated 37,397,000 persons age 16 years old and older who either fished or hunted in the United States in 2011. Using formula (1) with the parameters $a = -0.000070$ and $b = 16,823$ from table D-2, the approximate standard error of the estimated number of 37,397,000 sportspersons age 16 years old and older is

$$s_x = \sqrt{-0.000070 * 37,397,000^2 + 16,823 * 37,397,000} = 728,857$$

The 95-percent confidence interval for the estimated number of sportspersons 16 years old and older is from 35,968,000 to 38,826,000, i.e., $37,397,000 \pm 1.96 \times 728,857$. Therefore, a conclusion that the average estimate derived from all possible samples lies within a range computed in this way would be correct for roughly 95 percent of all possible samples.

Suppose there were an estimated 13,674,000 hunters age 16 years old and older who engaged in 281,884,000 days of participation in 2011. Using formula (2) with the parameters $a = -0.000284$, $b = -127,863$, and $c = 46,699$ from table D-2, the approximate standard error on 281,884,000 estimated days on an estimated base of 13,674,000 hunters is

$$s_x = \sqrt{-0.000284 * 281,884,000^2 - 127,863 * 281,884,000 + \frac{46,699 * 281,884,000^2}{13,674,000}} = 14,586,000$$

The 95-percent confidence interval on the estimate of 281,884,000 days is from 253,295,000 to 310,473,000, i.e., $281,884,000 \pm 1.96 \times 14,586,000$. Again, a conclusion that the average estimate derived from all possible samples lies within a range computed in this way would be correct for roughly 95 percent of all possible samples.

Standard Errors of Estimated Percentages. The reliability of an estimated percentage, computed using sample data for both numerator and denominator, depends on the size of the percentage and its base. Estimated percentages are relatively more reliable than the corresponding estimates of the numerators of the percentages, particularly if the percentages are 50 percent or more. When the numerator and the denominator of the percentage are in different categories, use the parameter in the tables indicated by the numerator.

The approximate standard error, $s_{x,p}$, can be obtained by use of the formula

$$s_{x,p} = \sqrt{\frac{bp(100 - p)}{x}} \quad (3)$$

Here, x is the total number of sportspersons, hunters, etc., which is the base of the percentage; p is the percentage; and b is the parameter in the tables associated with the characteristic in the numerator of the percentage.

Illustration of the Computation of the Standard Error of an Estimated Percentage

Suppose there were an estimated 13,674,000 hunters age 16 years old and older of whom 18.9 percent hunted migratory birds. From table D-2, the appropriate b parameter is 15,798. Using formula (3), the approximate standard error on the estimate of 18.9 percent is

$$s_{x,p} = \sqrt{\frac{15,798 * 18.9 * (100 - 18.9)}{13,674,000}} = 1.33$$

Consequently, the 95-percent confidence interval for the estimate percentage of migratory bird hunters 16 years old and older is from 16.3 percent to 21.5 percent, i.e., $18.9 \pm 1.96 \times 1.33$.

Standard Error of a Difference. The standard error of the difference between two sample estimates is approximately equal to

$$s_{x-y} = \sqrt{s_x^2 + s_y^2} \quad (4)$$

where s_x and s_y are the standard errors of the estimates x and y . The estimates can be numbers, percentages, ratios, etc. This will represent the actual standard error quite accurately for the difference between estimates of the same characteristic in two different areas, or for the difference between separate and uncorrelated characteristics in the same area. However, if there is a high positive (negative) correlation between the two characteristics, the formula will overestimate (underestimate) the true standard error.

Illustration of the Computation of the Standard Error of a Difference

Suppose there were an estimated 13,608,000 females in the age range of 18-24 of whom 726,000 or 5.3 percent were sportspersons. Similarly, suppose there were an estimated 12,909,000 males in the same age range of whom 2,160,000 or 16.7 percent were sportspersons. The apparent difference between the percentage of female and male sportspersons is 11.4 percent. Using formula (3) and the appropriate b parameter from table D-2, the approximate standard errors of 5.3 percent and 16.7 percent are 0.79 and 1.35, respectively. Using formula (4), the approximate standard error of the estimated difference of 11.4 percent is

$$s_{x-y} = \sqrt{0.79^2 + 1.35^2} = 1.56$$

The 95-percent confidence interval on the difference between 18- to 24-year-old female and male sportspersons is from 8.3 to 14.5, i.e., $11.4 \pm 1.96 \times 1.56$. Since the interval does not contain zero, we can conclude with 95 percent confidence that the percentage of 18- to 24-year-old female sportspersons is less than the percentage of 18- to 24-year-old male sportspersons.

Standard Errors of Estimated Averages. Certain mean values for sportspersons, anglers, etc., shown in the report were calculated as the ratio of two numbers. For example, average days per angler is calculated as:

$$\frac{x}{y} = \frac{\text{total days}}{\text{total anglers}}$$

Standard errors for these averages may be approximated by the use of formula (5) below.

$$s_{x/y} = \frac{x}{y} \sqrt{\left[\frac{s_x}{x}\right]^2 + \left[\frac{s_y}{y}\right]^2 - 2r \frac{s_x s_y}{xy}} \quad (5)$$

In formula (5), r represents the correlation coefficient between the numerator and the denominator of the estimate. In the above formula, use 0.7 as an estimate of r .

Illustration of the Computation of the Standard Error of an Estimated Average

Suppose that the estimated number of the average days per angler age 16 years old and older for all fishing was 16.7 days. Using formulas (1) and (2) above, we compute the standard error on total days, 553,841,000, and total anglers, 33,112,000, to be 20,329,124 and 693,033, respectively. The approximate standard error on the estimated average of 16.7 days is

$$s_{x/y} = \frac{553,841,000}{33,112,000} \sqrt{\left[\frac{20,329,124}{553,841,000}\right]^2 + \left[\frac{693,033}{33,112,000}\right]^2 - 2 * 0.7 \frac{20,329,124 * 693,033}{553,841,000 * 33,112,000}} = 0.45$$

Therefore, the 95-percent confidence interval on the estimated average of 16.7 days is from 15.8 to 17.6, i.e., $16.7 \pm 1.96 \times 0.45$.

Table D-1. Approximate Standard Errors for Utah State Resident Anglers, Hunters, and Away-from-Home Wildlife Watchers

(Numbers in thousands)

Resident anglers, hunters, and away-from-home wildlife watchers	Estimate	Standard error
Resident Anglers		
Participation	351	34
Spenders ¹	342	34
Days of fishing	5,609	991
Expenditures in dollars	381,829	105,114
Resident Hunters		
Participation	161	25
Spenders ¹	161	25
Days of hunting	2,618	609
Expenditures in dollars	363,040	110,650
Resident Away-from-Home Wildlife Watchers		
Participation	263	35
Spenders ¹	252	34
Days away-from-home wildlife watching	3,127	579
Trip-related expenditures in dollars	129,357	44,742

¹ The spenders estimate for resident anglers and resident hunters is all participants who bought equipment and trip-related items. The spenders estimate for away-from-home wildlife watchers is all participants who bought trip-related items.

Table D-2. Parameters a, b, and c for Calculating Approximate Standard Errors for U.S. and Utah Screener, Detailed Sportsperson, and Wildlife-Watching Samples for Levels, Expenditures, and Days or Trips

Sample	Parameters					
	United States			Utah		
	a	b	c	a	b	c
Screener Sample						
Sportspersons, anglers, hunters, and wildlife-watching participants 6 years old and older	-0.000043	12,272	(X)	-0.001050	2,638	(X)
Sportspersons, anglers, hunters, and wildlife-watching participants 6 to 15 years old	-0.000387	15,783	(X)	-0.008515	4,056	(X)
Detailed Sportsperson Sample						
Sportspersons and anglers 16 years old and older	-0.000070	16,823	(X)	-0.001969	4,009	(X)
Hunters 16 years old and older	-0.000066	15,798	(X)	-0.002043	4,159	(X)
Expenditures for sportspersons and anglers 16 years old and older	0.001159	-575,615	45,670	0.063366	-20,537	4,266
Expenditures for hunters 16 years old and older	0.001923	-978,460	44,416	0.066238	-2,994	4,293
Days or trips for sportspersons and anglers 16 years old and older	0.000068	-160,414	51,951	0.009602	-5,402	7,922
Days or trips for hunters 16 years old and older	-0.000284	-127,863	46,699	0.007556	-7,585	7,951
Wildlife-Watching Sample						
Levels of wildlife-watching—away-from-home participants	-0.000134	32,078	(X)	-0.002560	5,211	(X)
Levels of wildlife-watching—wildlife-watching participants ¹	-0.000119	28,477	(X)	-0.002329	4,741	(X)
Expenditures for wildlife-watching	0.001308	-1,548,024	112,362	0.085970	-75,950	8,631
Days or trips for wildlife-watching	0.002307	826,023	54,100	-0.041299	-141,530	33,231

(X) Not applicable

¹ Use these parameters for total wildlife-watching participants and around-the-home participants.



U.S. Department of the Interior
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service

<http://wsfrprograms.fws.gov>

June 2013