



## PACIFIC STATES MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION

205 SE Spokane Street, SUITE 100, Portland, OREGON 97202  
PHONE (503) 595-3100 FAX (503) 595-3232

### Pretesting and Implementing Alaska Saltwater Sport Fishing Surveys RFP Questions and Answers

09/23/15

1. *Q: Page 4 of the RFP states AFSC will conduct the cognitive interviews, while page 2 states personnel will be required to assist in conducting these interviews. Please confirm whether or not the contractor would provide personnel to perform the cognitive interviews, and if so how many would be required?*

A: The AFSC project manager will conduct the cognitive interviews, but will need personnel to act as host (check in and dismiss people, handle incentives, provide refreshments/snacks, etc.), handle logistics (reserving and setting up room, print and prepare materials as needed, recordings), and other minor tasks. In the past, one person was able to handle these tasks. The interviewing during the cognitive interviews would be the responsibility of AFSC.

2. *Q: Many of the questions that follow would be answered by seeing the previous survey on which this will be based. Is it possible to get a copy of this to help inform the proposal response?*

A: Yes, the most recent surveys will be posted on PSMFC's website at <http://www.psmfc.org/pretesting-and-implementing-alaska-saltwater-sport-fishing-surveys?pid=131>.

3. *Q: You mention coding in the RFP. How many open-ended questions are there and what has the response rate and nature been for these historically? All open-ends are not created equal. Some induce short responses of only a few words while other may inspire full paragraphs.*

A: There are few open-ended questions. Most fall in the "other" category for respondents who want to add a response that was not listed. There is a general open-ended question at the end for which we have received a sentence to a paragraph in response in the past.

4. *Q: You mention phone follow up with non-responders, but not in terms of actually completing the survey with respondents during this contact. Would this be possible, or are there visual components to the survey that require the respondent see this stimuli in order to respond?*

A: Please see the survey instruments from the 2012 survey. In particular, note that we ask several stated preference choice experiment questions that ask respondents to trade off alternatives that differ in a set of attributes. These questions are difficult to

administer over the phone without visual aids. We expect proposals to include implementing the survey as a primarily mail survey. Telephone only surveys are unlikely to be feasible given the set of questions posed in the surveys.

5. *Q: The RFP mentions final deliverable being due 8 weeks after the final mailing, but also mentions initiating the phone contact "several weeks after the second mailing." These two seem to be in conflict with one another from a timing perspective.*

A: Thank you--the RFP contained a timeline for deliverables that was not appropriate for the ordering of survey contacts. We anticipate that a mutually agreed upon delivery date will be established with the contractor that will be no more than six (6) weeks after the close of the survey implementation activities. The exact date survey implementation activities will end will depend upon a lot of factors and will itself be mutually agreed upon by AFSC and the contractor. In the proposal, the contractor should indicate the likely amount of time beyond the survey implementation close that will be needed to deliver the final deliverables to enable sufficient time for data quality checks and assessments to be performed.

6. *Q: The RFP mentions NOAA letterhead "that will be designed by the contractor." Are graphic design services expected for this? Or, will the letterhead be shipped to the contractor as usually occurs in such situations, and the body of the letter is what the contractor needs to compose?*

A: AFSC will provide a MS Word template of the NOAA letterhead that the contractor will need to mail merge and then print as specified in the RFP. In addition, the wording of the form letters will generally be developed and finalized by AFSC with input from the contractor. The contractor will need to design the envelopes (return envelopes, outgoing envelopes), but it is expected that a NOAA logo will be made available by AFSC for that purpose.

7. *Q: What, if any, expectations are there for color in the questionnaire itself?*

A: Please see the survey instruments from the 2012 survey. A minimal amount of color (if any) will be required for printing of the survey booklets. In addition, as discussed in the RFP, there will be a two-sided insert to the survey that will be in color. Color will also be needed in the correspondence letters and postcard for the signatures and NOAA logos.

8. *Q: We assume equal distribution of the 150 versions of the survey – 50 within each of the geographic segments? If the 4,500 total mailing scenario is deployed, this would amount to 30 of each geo/version combination? Please confirm.*

A: We would expect an equal number of survey versions being distributed amongst and within the different survey populations (non-residents, Southeast Alaska residents, and other Alaska residents). So the 30 per survey population and version seems reasonable.

9. Q: *To my understanding the Dillman Method was developed in the mid 70's with the \$1 incentive. Do you feel this amount still has the same impact today? Do you think the devaluing of that dollar might have anything to do with the apparent 16% decrease in response rate between 2007 and 2012?*

A: Inclusion of an incentive acts as a sign of goodwill on the part of the study sponsors and encourages reciprocity of that goodwill by the respondent. Singer (2002) provides a comprehensive review of the use of incentives in surveys. She notes that giving respondents a small financial incentive (even a token amount) in the first mailing increases response rates in mail-based surveys and are cost-effective. Such prepaid incentives are more effective than larger promised incentives that are contingent on completion of the questionnaire. In tests conducted by Lesser et al. (1999), including a \$2 incentive in a mailing with four contact points was shown to increase response rates by an additional 19 to 31 percentage points. In other recent work, we have tested different incentive amounts, but do not find compelling evidence that increasing the incentive amount much (beyond \$5) results in a statistically significant increase in response rate relative to using \$1. We are open to alternative pre-incentive amounts to be given to all respondents with the initial survey mailing.

Lesser, V., Dillman, D.A., Lorenz, F.O., Carlson, J., and Brown, T.L. (1999). "The influence of financial incentives on mail questionnaire response rates." Paper presented at the meeting of the Rural Sociological Society, Portland, OR.

Singer, E. (2000). "The use of incentives to reduce nonresponse in household surveys." In *Survey Nonresponse*, ed. R. Groves, D. Dillman, J. Eltinge, R. Little. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 163-178.