

**Evaluation Results:
2008 Lapsed Angler Direct Mail Marketing Program**

**The Alabama Department of Conservation and Natural Resources
And the Recreational Boating & Fishing Foundation**

Executive Summary:

The Recreational Boating and Fishing Foundation (RBFF) partnered with the Alabama Department of Conservation and Natural Resources (ADCNR) as part of a national effort with thirty state fish and wildlife agencies to implement a new direct mail marketing program targeting resident lapsed anglers to increase fishing license sales.

The program included two separate direct mailings with coinciding local radio and online advertising. On April 9, 2008, 73,934 lapsed anglers were sent a postcard with a message to encourage them to once again become active anglers. On May 19, a second postcard was sent to those anglers who had not yet purchased a license.

The size of the final reconciled mailing list was 68,659 after accounting for undeliverable addresses and anglers who bought a license prior to receiving the mailing. Of the 68,659 lapsed anglers, 6,878 purchased a fishing license during the evaluation period for an overall response rate of 10%. These 6,878 anglers purchased 7,365 licenses and permits. Details include:

- Higher priority tiers had higher response rates:
 - Tier 1 (bought a license two years straight before lapsing) = 16.5%
 - Tier 2 (bought a license in 2006 only) = 8.7%
 - Tier 3 (bought a license in 2005 only) = 5.6%

- The top five Tapestry™ segments with the highest response rates were:
 - Tapestry 12 – Rural Resort Dwellers (upper income, rural) = 12.5%
 - Tapestry 17 – Green Acres (above average income, rural) = 11.4%
 - Tapestry 42 – Southern Satellites (below average income, rural) = 11.0%
 - Tapestry 41 – Crossroads (below average income, small towns) = 11.0%
 - Tapestry 26 – Midland Crowd (mid income, rural) = 10.7%

The program generated \$104,135 in gross program revenue. ADCNR and RBFF invested \$108,440 in the program, resulting in a net program loss of \$4,305 and an ROI of -4%. However, an additional estimated \$51,516 may be generated from the Sport Fish Restoration Program as a result of this program.

The 2008 Lapsed Angler Direct Mail Marketing Program in Alabama was an informative first-year effort to encourage lapsed anglers to again buy a license. The results will be used to improve next year's marketing efforts with a goal of increasing the overall return on investment and maximizing license sales.

**Evaluation Results:
2008 Lapsed Angler Direct Mail Marketing Program**

**The Alabama Department of Conservation and Natural Resources
And the Recreational Boating & Fishing Foundation**

Purpose and Introduction:

In 2008, the Recreational Boating and Fishing Foundation (RBFF) partnered with the Alabama Department of Conservation and Natural Resources (ADCNR) as part of a national effort with thirty state fish and wildlife agencies to implement a new direct mail marketing program to increase fishing license sales. Designed to identify and target resident lapsed anglers, the program is directed at increasing participation in fishing and generating awareness of the connection between fishing license sales and conservation efforts.

For each participating state, the RBFF Direct Mail Marketing Program begins with an analysis of the state's resident fishing license sales. Each state provides up to five years of their most recent unit-level sales data. The raw data is then processed to create a multi-year sales record for each individual angler. Each record is then appended with additional socioeconomic-based information that provides additional insight into the anglers' characteristics and lifestyle as they relate to recreational fishing. The combined purchase history and lifestyle information becomes the basis for identifying and prioritizing lapsed anglers.

Working together, staff from RBFF and the state fish and wildlife agencies develop an integrated marketing program designed to target lapsed anglers with a message that will encourage them to once again become active anglers. By design, the program includes two separate direct mailings with coinciding local radio and online advertising. The states have flexibility in customizing the types of mailing, message and graphics. In addition, the states may choose to place additional local advertising, as well as offer incentives to lapsed anglers who purchase a license during the campaign period.

At the end of the direct mail campaign, the states provide their most recent sales data for an evaluation of the program's effectiveness. This report presents an evaluation of the program's results in Alabama.

Program Summary:

The following provides a summary of the main components of Alabama's program:

- Target Audience: Approximately 75,000 lapsed anglers
- Implementation:
 - First Mailing:
 - Drop Date: April 9
 - Mail Piece: Postcard or personalized letter
 - Postal Class: Standard rate
 - Second Mailing:
 - Drop Date: May 19
 - Mail Piece: Postcard
 - Postal Class: Standard rate
- Incentive: No incentive was offered
- RBFF supported the direct mail effort with the purchase of radio and online advertising (additional details are available in Appendix C):
 - Radio Advertising Dates: 4/7 – 4/27 and 5/26 - 6/15
 - Online Advertising Dates: 4/7 – 5/4 and 5/26 - 6/22
- ADCNR did not purchase any additional advertising

Lapsed Anglers in Alabama:

For the period covered by this analysis, Alabama's license year began on August 1 of the previous calendar year and ended July 31 of the corresponding calendar year.¹ Records of resident fishing licenses sold for license years 2005 through 2007 were analyzed to identify anglers who purchased any form of fishing privilege (e.g., annual, short-term or combination licenses) in 2006 or 2005, but did not purchase any form of fishing privilege in 2007. These anglers are referred to as "lapsed anglers". To help prioritize lapsed anglers for the direct mail marketing program, their previous license purchases were examined. For the purpose of analyzing the response to Alabama's direct mailing, it should be noted that license year 2008 began on September 1, 2007 and ended August 31, 2008.

¹ The period of time covered by an annual Alabama fishing license changed during the study period. From 1987 to August 1, 2007, Alabama annual fishing license have been good for 365 days (366 during leap year). The licenses sold August 1, 2007, to August 31, 2008, were valid until September 1, 2008. Discussion of licenses sold for the 2005 license year would be licenses sold from August 1, 2004, until July 31, 2005. The 2006 license year consists of fishing licenses sold from August 1, 2005, through July 31, 2006. The 2007 license year consists of fishing licenses sold from August 1, 2006, through July 31, 2007. 2008 licenses were sold from August 1, 2007, through the study period and were valid through August 31, 2008. Many 2007 licenses expired during the 2008 license year resulting in a 2008 license that was good for less than a whole year. For example, a person who bought a fishing license on April 22, 2007, had a license that was valid through April 21, 2008. If they wanted to purchase a 2008 license on April 30, 2008, it would be valid for 123 days, from April 30 through August 31.

A key finding of RBFF’s experiences in working with state agencies to implement integrated marketing programs is that lapsed anglers who have a more frequent purchase history (i.e. are recently lapsed) and a longer purchase history (i.e. have purchased numerous fishing licenses in the past) have the greatest response to marketing (when compared to those lapsed anglers who have a distant purchase history and a shorter purchase history).

Based on their purchase history, the lapsed anglers are classified into priority “tiers.” A “tier” reports how frequently an angler bought a license prior to lapsing. Table 1 defines each tier. Nearly half of all Alabama resident anglers who purchased a license from 2005 to 2007 purchased in either of the first two years but lapsed in 2007. Of those lapsed anglers, 12.5% were classified in the top priority tier and 37.8% were in the lowest priority tier (Table 2).

Table 1. Definition of Tiers.

Lapse Tier	Years in which a license was purchased:		
	2005	2006	2007
1	x	x	
2		x	
3	x		

“x” denotes year in which a license was purchased.

Table 2. Anglers in Alabama, 2005-2007.

	N	% of Records
Lapsed	159,089	44.3%
Non-lapsed	200,217	55.7%
Total Records:	359,306	100.0%
Lapsed Anglers:		
Tier 1	19,849	12.5%
Tier 2	79,152	49.8%
Tier 3	60,088	37.8%
Total	159,089	100.0%

Prioritization and Recommendations:

Mailing list recommendations were developed for Alabama based on previous RBFF work in other states that showed anglers from the highest ranked tiers and selected Tapestry™ lifestyle segments generate the best response to this form of marketing campaign. People’s preferences are likely to vary based on income, age, urban/rural lifestyle, where they are in life (single, family, empty-nest, retired, etc.) and more. This type of information is not available from the typical statistics provided by a state’s

electronic license data base. To gain a better understanding of who is more likely to buy or not buy a license, Tapestry lifestyle data are used.

ESRI of Arlington, Va. provides the Tapestry data service. Tapestry is built from Census Bureau data and other sources. From the ESRI website: “The Community Tapestry segmentation system provides an accurate, detailed description of America’s neighborhoods. U.S. residential areas are divided into 65 segments based on demographic variables such as age, income, home value, occupation, household type, education and other consumer behavior characteristics.” Using the ESRI service, the records in the fishing license database were appended with Tapestry data. The appended data allow us to learn more about the lifestyles of people who purchase fishing licenses and gain a better understanding of who does and does not buy fishing licenses. The results allow state agencies and private businesses to become more focused and cost-effective in their marketing, recruitment and communication efforts.

A detailed analysis of the lapsed anglers suggested that the mailing list be drawn primarily from Tier 1. The full text of this analysis, “Analysis of the Alabama Fishing License Data Base and Recommendations Regarding Mail List Contents,” can be found in Appendix B. Of the 17 segments defined nationally by Tapestry to have fishing as part of their lifestyle, there were 13 segments in Alabama that were observed within Tier 1 as lapsing at a greater rate compared to the average Alabama lapsed angler. These 13 segments, of 66 possible segments, represented 12,229 anglers, or 61.6% of all Tier 1 lapsed anglers.

Based on the program budget and cost estimates, the program in Alabama could include approximately 75,000 lapsed anglers in the first mailing. Because the budget allowed for a larger mailing than the initial recommendation, the ADCNR expanded the list to include all of Tiers 1 and 2 as well as Tier 3 lapsed anglers in Life Mode groups L5, L11, and L12. In addition to providing a larger pool of names for the program, this less-targeted approach has the added benefit of providing results across a broader range of tiers and Tapestry segments, thus helping identify any specific segments of lapsed anglers more likely to respond to marketing campaigns. This information will be useful in the development of future targeted campaigns tailored specifically to lapsed anglers in Alabama.

Target Audience and Mailing List Development:

Alabama’s target audience was approximately 75,000 lapsed anglers. These were to be drawn from a pool of lapsed anglers which included all of Tiers 1 and 2 as well as Tier 3 lapsed anglers in Life Mode groups L5, L11, and L12.

Records in excess of 75,000 were provided to replace addresses removed after processing the list through the National Change of Address (NCOA) database. As a rule of thumb, enough extra addresses were provided to allow for a 10 to 15 percent loss through NCOA.

The first mailing list delivered to Alabama included 92,849 records.

Since Alabama had success with a letter in the past, ADCNR decided to target 45% of its lapsed anglers with a letter, 45% with a postcard, and withheld roughly 10% records in the treatment group as a control group. The analysis and response rate comparisons between the treatment group (lapsed anglers that received mailings) and the control group are the responsibility of the ADCNR and are not part of this evaluation.

Direct Mail Implementation:

Due to the success in the past using a letter, Alabama's direct mail program included two mailings with half final target audience receiving a letter in the first round and the other half receiving a postcard. Both groups were sent a postcard in the second round. Prior to the first mailing, the Alabama list was processed through a National Change-of-Address (NCOA) service to remove bad and unknown addresses. A total of 73,934 lapsed anglers were drawn for the first mailing. Following the first mailing and prior to the second mailing, the list was updated to remove names of people who had purchased a license and names of people whose first mailing was returned as undeliverable.

First Mailing:

- Drop date: April 9
- Number mailed to: 73,934 plus 72 seed names (the same 12 seeds for each of the 6 mail pieces)
- Postal Class: Standard rate

Second Mailing:

- Drop date: May 19
- Number mailed to: 66,338 plus 72 seed names (the same 12 seeds for each of the 6 mail pieces)
- Postal Class: Standard rate

Evaluation Methods:

The overall evaluation period under consideration is April 12 through June 21. The period for the first mailing begins the day that the target audience was expected to receive the first mailing (April 12) and ends before the target audience received the second mailing (May 21). The period for the second mailing begins the day that the target audience was expected to receive the second mailing (May 22) and ends 30 days later (June 21).²

The two key performance measures included in this evaluation are:

² For First Class mail, the evaluation period is considered to begin one day after the drop date. For Standard mail the evaluation period begins three days after the drop date.

1) *Response Rate*

- **Definition:** The total number of unique individuals who respond to the offer divided by the total number of unique individuals to which the offer was made. Response rate will be calculated for the program overall as well as by priority tier, Tapestry, and urbanization.
- **Data Source:** The fishing license database – resident fishing license sales.
- **Supporting Information:**
 - Final mailing lists with customer IDs utilized by the states for their first and second mailings.
 - Undeliverable addresses with customer IDs for both the first and second mailings.

2) *Return on Investment (ROI)*

- **Definition:** The revenue generated by the direct mail marketing program (revenue from license sales to the respondents of the direct mail program) minus the expenses associated with the direct mail marketing program (including the cost of the direct mail and radio and online advertisements) divided by these same expenses. Fixed costs are not included.
- **Data Source:** The fishing license database and project expenses:
 - Direct Mail Marketing Program Expenses from the state agency.
 - Radio and Online Advertising Costs from RBFF.
- **Supporting Information:**
 - Current Price Lists for all Fishing License Categories

Several adjustments in the original mailing list need to be taken into account to accurately calculate response. First, anglers who purchased a license prior to the date they received the first mailing were removed. In addition, anglers whose first or second mailing was returned as undeliverable were also removed from the calculation (where these could be identified individually, they were physically removed from the list. If only a summary count of undeliverable postcards was available they were accounted for mathematically in the calculation of the overall response rate.) The result is referred to as the “final reconciled mailing list” upon which all response rate calculations are based.

The US Postal Service does not provide return mail service for undeliverable mail sent by standard rate. As a result, the final reconciled mailing list likely includes an unknown number of lapsed anglers who did not receive either of the two mailings. Since these undeliverable addresses must be included in the evaluation, the calculated response rates are slightly lower than they otherwise would be if undeliverable addresses were known. Accounting for the number anglers on the mailing list who bought a license prior to the start of the direct mail program and those known to have undeliverable addresses, the size of the final reconciled mailing list is 68,659 for the purpose of calculating the overall response rate (Table 3).

Table 3. Additional Mailing List Scrubs.

Mailing List Statistics	#	%
1st List - As Mailed	73,934	
Lifetime Disabled	1,282	
Bought Before 1st Mailing	3,924	5.3%
Returned as Undeliverable	78	0.1%
Final Reconciled Mailing List *	68,659	

* Subtracting *Bought Before 1st Mailing* and *Returned as Undeliverable* from *1st List - As Mailed* may not necessarily result in the number in the *Final Reconciled Mailing List* since they are not mutual exclusive.

RESULTS

1. Response Rates:

Overall, of the 68,659 lapsed anglers who were exposed to one or two of the direct mailers, 6,878 or 10% purchased a fishing license during the evaluation period. The response to the first mail piece was 5.8%; the second mailing resulted in an additional 4.2% response (Table 4).

Table 4. Overall response rate to the program.

Overall Response To Alabama's Direct Mail Effort	#	Response Rate
Final Reconciled Mailing List	68,659	
Response After 1st Mailing	3,972	5.8%
Marginal Response From 2nd Mailing	2,906	4.2%
Cumulative Response After 2nd Mailing	6,878	10.0%

The 6,878 lapsed anglers who responded to the direct mailing purchased 7,365 licenses and permits (Table 5). Of these, 83.4% were annual Resident Freshwater Fishing licenses. Altogether, these license sales generated \$104,135.00 in sales revenue after agent fees were accounted for (Table 13, page 16).

Table 5. License Sales

Licenses and Permits Purchased in Response to Alabama's Direct Mail Effort			
License Code	Description	#	%
100-6100	Wildlife Heritage	5	0.1%
200-1000	Res Freshwater Fishing	6,142	83.4%
200-1100	Disabled Military Veterans Appreciation Fishing	3	0.0%
200-2500	NR Freshwater Trip 7-days	1	0.0%
250-1100	Res Spear Fishing	4	0.1%
300-1000	Res Saltwater Fishing	860	11.7%
300-1500	Res Saltwater Trip 7-days	295	4.0%
350-1000	Res Recreational Net	22	0.3%
350-1500	Res Recreational Shrimp Boat	5	0.1%
770-7230	Lifetime Freshwater Fishing (12-49)	13	0.2%
770-7240	Lifetime Freshwater Fishing (50+)	8	0.1%
770-7330	Lifetime Saltwater Fishing (12-49)	1	0.0%
770-7430	Lifetime Hunting / Freshwater Fishing (12-49)	3	0.0%
770-7440	Lifetime Hunting / Freshwater Fishing (50+)	1	0.0%
770-7730	Lifetime Hunting/Fresh/Saltwater Fishing (12-49)	1	0.0%
770-7800	Lifetime License Replacement	1	0.0%
TOTAL		7,365	100%

The results in Table 6 confirm that lapsed anglers in higher priority tiers are more responsive to marketing efforts. The rate at which lapsed anglers in Tier 1 responded to the program (16.5%) was almost twice as high as the response rate of Tier 2 and roughly three times the response rate of Tier 3.

While overall license sales were responsive to the campaign, there may be subsets of lapsed anglers who responded more positively than others. This analysis can be used to better understand who responded to the test campaign and where to focus future marketing efforts. The detailed segments of lapsed anglers that are examined here include their lifestyle and level of urbanization in their place of residence.

The lifestyle segmentation is based on the tendency for people with similar tastes, lifestyles, and behaviors to cluster into like neighborhoods and exhibit a comparable response to specific marketing messages. The key is to identify which segments characterize lapsed anglers and which of those are most likely to respond to targeted recruitment efforts. We utilize Community Tapestry, by ESRI, which combines lifestyle demography with spatial geography to classify lapsed anglers based on their street address. Tables 7, 8, 9 and 10 examine these segments to help understand the type of

lapsed angler who responded better or worse to the campaign. Additional detailed breakdowns are available in the Appendix A.

Table 7 lists those Tapestry segments that represent a substantial number of lapsed anglers and whose members responded better than the average across all Tapestry segments (10%). Each of the segments in Table 7 includes at least 1.5% of total lapsed anglers in Alabama’s final reconciled mailing list. Several Tapestry segments that are not included in the table had higher than average response rates, but the very small numbers of lapsed anglers in those segments renders them inconsequential for future marketing efforts. The complete list of Tapestry segments and their response rates is included in Appendix A.

The top performing segment in Alabama is “Rural Resort Dwellers” with a 12.5% response rate. The eight segments in Table 7 represent 52% of Alabama’s reconciled mailing list, making them a significant target group for future marketing efforts. Six of the eight include fishing as a part of their lifestyle – those segments are denoted by the green shaded Tapestry code number in the first column of the table. Overall, this group of Tapestry segments had a 10.9% response rate – higher than the 10% average Tapestry response rate.

Table 6. Response Rate, by Priority Tier.

Response by Tier	# in Reconciled Mail List	Response After 1st Mailing		Marginal Response From 2nd Mailing		Cumulative Response After 2nd Mailing	
		#	Response Rate	#	Response Rate	#	Response Rate
Tier 1	12,115	1,173	9.7%	825	6.8%	1,998	16.5%
Tier 2	55,921	2,776	5.0%	2,065	3.7%	4,841	8.7%
Tier 3	701	23	3.3%	16	2.3%	39	5.6%

Table 7. Significant* Tapestry Segments with Above-Average Response Rates.

Tapestry Code	Tapestry Name	Urban/Rural	# in Reconciled Mail List	Response After 1st Mailing		Marginal Response From 2nd Mailing		Cumulative Response After 2nd Mailing	
				#	Response Rate	#	Response Rate	#	Response Rate
31	Rural Resort Dwellers	Rural	1,076	72	6.7%	63	5.9%	135	12.5%
17	Green Acres	Rural	2,701	185	6.8%	122	4.5%	307	11.4%
42	Southern Satellites	Rural	16,893	1,082	6.4%	781	4.6%	1,863	11.0%
41	Crossroads	Small Towns	1,146	81	7.1%	45	3.9%	126	11.0%
26	Midland Crowd	Rural	9,134	547	6.0%	429	4.7%	976	10.7%
14	Prosperous Empty Nesters	Suburban	1,138	60	5.3%	61	5.4%	121	10.6%
29	Rustbelt Retirees	Suburban	1,480	81	5.5%	69	4.7%	150	10.1%
25	Salt of the Earth	Rural	2,137	120	5.6%	96	4.5%	216	10.1%

* Accounting for at least 1.5% of mail list.

The highlighted boxes indicate Tapestry segments identified nationally by ESRI with fishing as a common characteristic of their lifestyle.

Table 8 summarizes all 66 Tapestry segments by their quartile performance. The top one-fourth of Tapestry segments had a collective response rate of 11%, roughly the same as for the “significant” Tapestry segments listed in Table 7. This top quartile, by definition accounting for only one-fourth of all Tapestry segments, represents over one half of all lapsed anglers in the program. As stated earlier, some of the top performing segments found in the first quartile contain very small numbers of anglers and likely would not be worth targeting – unless all are combined into a single target group. Before any such effort is made, please note that some of these segments had too few lapsed anglers to draw any reliable conclusions. Using “The Elders” as an example, with only 30 lapsed anglers in the mailing, it is possible that the high response rate of 20% is just a coincidence and may not be experienced again.

Seventeen of the 66 Tapestry segments include fishing as part of their members’ lifestyles. These seventeen segments are examined as a group in Table 9. Overall, these Tapestry segments exhibited a 10.5% response rate, slightly better than the 10% response rate of the average Tapestry segment. In all, seven of the seventeen segments had a higher response rate than 10%. Not surprisingly, for lifestyles that include fishing, the majority of these Tapestry segments are found in rural or small town areas. This aspect is examined in greater detail next.

As shown in Table 10, when examined by the rural/urban character of their communities, the highest responding group live in rural areas. This group also accounts for nearly 60% of the lapsed anglers targeted in this campaign. The next highest responding groups were from suburban and small town areas which together accounted for 23% of the target audience. However, only rural segments had an above average response rate at 10.7%.

Table 8. Response Rate of Tapestry Segments, by Quartile.

Quartile by Response Rate	# in Reconciled Mail List	% of Mail List	Response After 1st Mailing		Marginal Response From 2nd Mailing		Cumulative Response After 2nd Mailing	
			#	Response Rate	#	Response Rate	#	Response Rate
1st Quartile	36,213	52.7%	2,261	6.2%	1,706	4.7%	3,967	11.0%
2nd Quartile	17,997	26.2%	1,021	5.7%	723	4.0%	1,744	9.7%
3rd Quartile	11,543	16.8%	571	4.9%	406	3.5%	977	8.5%
4th Quartile	2,984	4.3%	119	4.0%	71	2.4%	190	6.4%

Table 9. Response Rate of Tapestry Segments that Include Fishing as Part of their Lifestyle.

Tapestry Code	Tapestry Name	Urban/Rural	# in Reconciled Mail List	Response After 1st Mailing		Marginal Response From 2nd Mailing		Cumulative Response After 2nd Mailing	
				#	Response Rate	#	Response Rate	#	Response Rate
43	The Elders	Suburban	30	2	6.7%	4	13.3%	6	20.0%
31	Rural Resort Dwellers	Rural	1,076	72	6.7%	63	5.9%	135	12.5%
17	Green Acres	Rural	2,701	185	6.8%	122	4.5%	307	11.4%
42	Southern Satellites	Rural	16,893	1082	6.4%	781	4.6%	1863	11.0%
41	Crossroads	Small Towns	1,146	81	7.1%	45	3.9%	126	11.0%
26	Midland Crowd	Rural	9,134	547	6.0%	429	4.7%	976	10.7%
25	Salt of the Earth	Rural	2,137	120	5.6%	96	4.5%	216	10.1%
46	Rooted Rural	Rural	3,226	184	5.7%	136	4.2%	320	9.9%
57	Simple Living	Urban Outskirts	1,060	62	5.8%	43	4.1%	105	9.9%
32	Rustbelt Traditions	Urban Outskirts	1,390	74	5.3%	62	4.5%	136	9.8%
53	Home Town	Suburban	1,426	92	6.5%	47	3.3%	139	9.7%
56	Rural Bypasses	Rural	5,288	306	5.8%	201	3.8%	507	9.6%
28	Aspiring Young Families	Metro Cities	735	38	5.2%	30	4.1%	68	9.3%
50	Heartland Communities	Small Towns	2,976	143	4.8%	113	3.8%	256	8.6%
49	Senior Sun Seekers	Small Towns	105	7	6.7%	1	1.0%	8	7.6%
15	Silver and Gold	Suburban	115	3	2.6%	5	4.3%	8	7.0%
37	Prairie Living	Rural	7	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	SUBTOTAL		49,445	2,998	6.1%	2,178	4.4%	5,176	10.5%

Table 10. Response by Level of Urbanization

Urbanization Group	# in Reconciled Mail List	Response After 1st Mailing		Marginal Response From 2nd Mailing		Cumulative Response After 2nd Mailing	
		#	Response Rate	#	Response Rate	#	Response Rate
Urban Centers	446	23	5.2%	13	2.9%	36	8.1%
Metro Cities	5,114	257	5.0%	191	3.7%	448	8.8%
Urban Outskirts	6,603	326	4.9%	235	3.6%	561	8.5%
Suburban	11,748	634	5.4%	470	4.0%	1,104	9.4%
Small Town	4,227	231	5.5%	159	3.8%	390	9.2%
Rural	40,462	2,496	6.2%	1,828	4.5%	4,324	10.7%

Roughly half the lapsed anglers in this program were sent a letter in the first mailing while the other half received a postcard with both groups receiving a postcard in the second mailing. These anglers were further broken down into three LifeMode groups, L5 (“Senior Styles”), L11 (“Factories and Farms”), and L12 (“American Quilt”) with all other LifeMode groups receiving the same treatment as L12. Table 11 shows the response to the program by LifeMode group and the type of mail piece used. Overall, LifeMode 12 responded best to the program (10.7%) followed closely by LifeMode 11 (10.6%). LifeMode 5 and all those not in one of these three groups had response rates below the overall response rate to the program. In general, and for each of the three targeted LifeModes, those sent a letter in the first mailing responded better than did those who received the postcard.

Table 12 shows the response rates to the two mailing types of the ten significant Tapestry segments with the highest overall response to the program (Table A6 in the Appendix shows response by mail type for all Tapestry segments). Together these ten accounted for 58% of the overall mailing list and had a response rate of 10.8%. Overall, these Tapestry segments responded better to the letter than to the postcard. However, two segments “Rural Resort Dwellers” and “Rustbelt Retirees” responded better to the postcard.

All four of the Tapestry segments that ESRI classifies as LifeMode 12 are among the top 10 responding Tapestry segments along with “Green Acres” which was among the “Other LifeMode Groups” which received the same treatment as L12. This included the highest responding Tapestry segment overall, “Rural Resort Dwellers.” The highest responding LifeMode 11 segment is “Southern Satellites”, in third place at 11%. The highest responding LifeMode 5 segment is “Prosperous Empty Nesters”, in sixth at 10.6%.

Table 11. Response by LifeMode Group and Mailing Type.

Response by LifeMode Group and Mail Type	Letter/Postcard			Postcard/Postcard			Overall		
	# Mailed	# Responded	Response Rate	# Mailed	# Responded	Response Rate	# Mailed	# Responded	Response Rate
L5 - Senior Styles	3,595	349	9.7%	3,522	320	9.1%	7,117	669	9.4%
L11 - Factories & Farms	13,043	1,413	10.8%	12,708	1,312	10.3%	25,751	2,725	10.6%
L12 - American Quilt	7,474	818	10.9%	7,108	739	10.4%	14,582	1,557	10.7%
Other LifeMode Groups *	10,732	958	8.9%	10,555	969	9.2%	21,287	1,927	9.1%
TOTAL	34,844	3,538	10.2%	33,893	3,340	9.9%	68,737	6,878	10.0%

* "Other LifeMode Groups" received the same mailings as L12.

Table 12. Response Rate of Top 10 Overall Responding Tapestries by Mail Type**

Tapestry Code	Tapestry Name	LifeMode	Letter/Postcard			Postcard/Postcard			Overall		
			# Mailed	# Responded	Response Rate	# Mailed	# Responded	Response Rate	# Mailed	# Responded	Response Rate
31	Rural Resort Dwellers	L12	540	61	11.3%	536	74	13.8%	1,076	135	12.5%
17	Green Acres	L2	1,416	161	11.4%	1,285	146	11.4%	2,701	307	11.4%
42	Southern Satellites	L11	8,584	975	11.4%	8,309	888	10.7%	16,893	1,863	11.0%
41	Crossroads	L12	632	72	11.4%	514	54	10.5%	1,146	126	11.0%
26	Midland Crowd	L12	4,648	503	10.8%	4,486	473	10.5%	9,134	976	10.7%
14	Prosperous Empty Nesters	L5	563	63	11.2%	575	58	10.1%	1,138	121	10.6%
29	Rustbelt Retirees	L5	768	76	9.9%	712	74	10.4%	1,480	150	10.1%
25	Salt of the Earth	L11	1,103	112	10.2%	1,034	104	10.1%	2,137	216	10.1%
46	Rooted Rural	L12	1,654	182	11.0%	1,572	138	8.8%	3,226	320	9.9%
57	Simple Living	L5	513	58	11.3%	547	47	8.6%	1,060	105	9.9%
Subtotal			20,421	2,263	11.1%	19,570	2,056	10.5%	39,991	4,319	10.8%

* Tapestry segments accounting for least 1.5% of total mailing list.

2. Return on Investment:

For a given use of money in an enterprise, the return on investment (ROI) is a measure of how much net profit (or net revenue in the case of government and non-profit agencies) is realized from that investment. One way to calculate the ROI is to compare the net revenue (profit) to the cost of the investment required to generate the revenue ((total revenue – total cost) / total cost). If an investment breaks even (total revenue is equal to the total cost and there is no profit) then the ROI is zero. If a project generates \$0.50 of net revenue (profit) for every one dollar of investment then the resulting ROI is 50%. If total costs exceed total revenue then the result is a net loss and the ROI is expressed as a negative percentage (e.g., \$0.25 loss for each dollar of investment results in a ROI of -25%).

In Alabama, the licenses that were sold during the direct mail program generated total license sales of \$111,500.00 (Table 13). A portion of each license sale is retained by the sales agent and is not realized as revenue by state government. The agent fees associated with license buyers targeted by the direct mail program are estimated to be \$7,365.00. The remaining \$104,135.00 represents the gross program revenue received by the state from the sales of licenses to people who were targeted by the direct mail program.

The costs to implement the program include \$64,350.49 in direct expenditures by the ADCNR for printing and postage. The ADCNR program did not include any additional costs for advertising or incentives to encourage people to purchase a license. The RBFF spent a total of \$44,089.50 for radio and online advertising in selected Alabama media markets. In total, the ADCNR and RBFF invested \$108,439.99 in the program. Subtracting this total investment from the state's gross program revenue yields net program revenue (i.e., net profit) of -\$4,304.99, a net loss. Comparing this net revenue to the total investment produces a negative ROI of -4%. In other words, for every dollar gained by the state of Alabama through license sales as a result of this program, there was \$1.04 invested in mailing and marketing.

In addition to the revenue generated directly by the license sales, the state of Alabama receives funds from the Sport Fish Restoration Program (SFR) administered by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. These funds are allocated to the states according to a formula based in part on the number of resident licensed anglers. While the exact amount varies from year to year depending on available funds and the number of anglers nationwide, it is estimated that the state of Alabama received approximately \$7.49 for each licensed angler. Based on that figure, the lapsed anglers who bought licenses during the program are responsible for \$51,516 of federal funds provided to the ADCNR to support fisheries management and improve boating access. Adding these funds to the net revenue in Table 13 would result in a ROI of 44%.

Table 13. ROI

Revenue and Return on Investment Generated from Response to Alabama's Direct Mail Marketing Program		
License Sales Revenue		
1st Mailing	\$	65,617.00
2nd Mailing	\$	45,883.00
Total License Sales	\$	111,500.00
Agent Fees		
1st Mailing	\$	4,271.00
2nd Mailing	\$	3,094.00
Total Agent Fees	\$	7,365.00
Gross Program Revenue	\$	<u>104,135.00</u>
Program Costs		
Direct Mail Costs	\$	64,350.49
Advertisement by State Agency	\$	-
Incentives	\$	-
RBFF Radio and Online Advertising	\$	44,089.50
Total Program Costs	\$	<u>108,439.99</u>
Net Program Revenue	\$	(4,304.99)
ROI		-4.0%
Estimated Additional Revenue		
Sport Fish Restoration Fund	\$	51,516.22

3. Notes and Considerations:

A couple of factors may have dampened the response to this program. First, the change in the license year in 2008 may have caused some anglers to wait to renew rather than purchase a license in April or May of 2008 that would expire on August 31, 2008. Second, Alabama raised its license prices in 2008. Third, record high gasoline prices may have also resulted in less participation in recreational fishing in 2008.

Conclusion and Recommendations:

The 2008 Lapsed Angler Direct Mail Marketing Program in Alabama was a successful first-year effort to encourage lapsed anglers to again buy a license. Key findings from the first year's results include:

- 6,878 lapsed anglers returned to fishing in 2008.
- These renewed anglers generated a loss of \$4,305 to the State of Alabama below the costs of the program for an ROI of -4%.
- An estimated additional \$51,516 may be generated from the Sport Fish Restoration Program by these renewals assuming a per license disbursement of \$7.49.
- The program generated a 10% response rate among lapsed anglers who were contacted by direct mail.
- The highest response to the program came from Tier 1 lapsed anglers. Future direct mail efforts should continue to focus on higher ranked tiers if maximum response rates are the goal.
- The highest response to the program came from anglers in eight key Tapestry lifestyle segments. Six of those eight segments include fishing as part of their lifestyle. Future efforts similar to this one should continue to focus on those Tapestry segments that responded best, while perhaps exploring other means to reach those segments with lower response rates.
- Future direct mail efforts should be better timed with the beginning of the license year and may wish to consider the use of an incentive.

The views and conclusions contained in this document are those of the authors and should not be interpreted as representing the opinions or policies of the U.S. Government. Mention of trade names or commercial products does not constitute their endorsement by the U.S. Government.

Appendices

Appendix A: Detailed Tables

Table A1. Response by Tapestry Segment

Table A2. Response by Size (N) of Tapestry Segment

Table A3. Tapestry Segment by Cumulative Response Rate

Table A4. Response by Tapestry Segment Identified with Fishing as Part of Lifestyle

Table A5. Response by Tapestry Segment - Sorted by Urban-Rural Segments

Appendix B: Analysis of the Alabama Fishing License Data Base and Recommendations Regarding Mail List Contents

Appendix C: State Radio and Online Advertising Details

Appendix A: Detailed Tables

Table A1. Response by Tapestry Segment

Tapestry Code	Tapestry Name	Urban/Rural	# in Reconciled Mail List	Response After 1st Mailing		Marginal Response From 2nd Mailing		Cumulative Response After 2nd Mailing	
				#	Response Rate	#	Response Rate	#	Response Rate
0	none		127	5	3.9%	9	7.1%	14	11.0%
1	Top Rung	Metro Cities	53	2	3.8%	2	3.8%	4	7.5%
2	Suburban Splendor	Suburban	421	22	5.2%	14	3.3%	36	8.6%
3	Connoisseurs	Metro Cities	133	6	4.5%	6	4.5%	12	9.0%
4	Boomburbs	Urban Outskirts	674	32	4.7%	30	4.5%	62	9.2%
5	Wealthy Seaboard Suburbs	Metro Cities	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
6	Sophisticated Squires	Suburban	626	40	6.4%	33	5.3%	73	11.7%
7	Exurbanites	Suburban	941	43	4.6%	36	3.8%	79	8.4%
8	Laptops and Lattes	Urban Centers	28	1	3.6%	1	3.6%	2	7.1%
9	Urban Chic	Metro Cities	40	3	7.5%	0	0.0%	3	7.5%
10	Pleasant-ville	Metro Cities	2	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
11	Pacific Heights	Urban Centers	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
12	Up and Coming Families	Suburban	1970	106	5.4%	70	3.6%	176	8.9%
13	In Style	Suburban	951	50	5.3%	36	3.8%	86	9.0%
14	Prosperous Empty Nesters	Suburban	1138	60	5.3%	61	5.4%	121	10.6%
15	Silver and Gold	Suburban	115	3	2.6%	5	4.3%	8	7.0%
16	Enterprising Professionals	Metro Cities	316	15	4.7%	12	3.8%	27	8.5%
17	Green Acres	Rural	2701	185	6.8%	122	4.5%	307	11.4%
18	Cozy and Comfortable	Suburban	856	54	6.3%	36	4.2%	90	10.5%
19	Milk and Cookies	Metro Cities	906	47	5.2%	45	5.0%	92	10.2%
20	City Lights	Urban Centers	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
21	Urban Villages	Urban Centers	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
22	Metropolitans	Metro Cities	500	29	5.8%	19	3.8%	48	9.6%
23	Trendsetters	Urban Centers	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
24	Main Street, USA	Urban Outskirts	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
25	Salt of the Earth	Rural	2137	120	5.6%	96	4.5%	216	10.1%
26	Midland Crowd	Rural	9134	547	6.0%	429	4.7%	976	10.7%
27	Metro Renters	Urban Centers	65	2	3.1%	7	10.8%	9	13.8%
28	Aspiring Young Families	Metro Cities	735	38	5.2%	30	4.1%	68	9.3%
29	Rustbelt Retirees	Suburban	1480	81	5.5%	69	4.7%	150	10.1%
30	Retirement Communities	Metro Cities	149	8	5.4%	3	2.0%	11	7.4%
31	Rural Resort Dwellers	Rural	1076	72	6.7%	63	5.9%	135	12.5%
32	Rustbelt Traditions	Urban Outskirts	1390	74	5.3%	62	4.5%	136	9.8%
33	Midlife Junction	Suburban	1630	79	4.8%	59	3.6%	138	8.5%
34	Family Foundations	Metro Cities	1002	50	5.0%	40	4.0%	90	9.0%
35	International Marketplace	Urban Centers	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
36	Old and Newcomers	Metro Cities	423	26	6.1%	14	3.3%	40	9.5%
37	Prairie Living	Rural	7	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
38	Industrious Urban Fringe	Urban Outskirts	35	3	8.6%	2	5.7%	5	14.3%
39	Young and Restless	Metro Cities	319	10	3.1%	7	2.2%	17	5.3%
40	Military Proximity	Suburban	164	2	1.2%	0	0.0%	2	1.2%
41	Crossroads	Small Towns	1146	81	7.1%	45	3.9%	126	11.0%
42	Southern Satellites	Rural	16893	1082	6.4%	781	4.6%	1863	11.0%
43	The Elders	Suburban	30	2	6.7%	4	13.3%	6	20.0%
44	Urban Melting Pot	Urban Centers	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
45	City Strivers	Urban Centers	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
46	Rooted Rural	Rural	3226	184	5.7%	136	4.2%	320	9.9%
47	Las Casas	Urban Centers	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
48	Great Expectations	Urban Outskirts	768	34	4.4%	25	3.3%	59	7.7%
49	Senior Sun Seekers	Small Towns	105	7	6.7%	1	1.0%	8	7.6%
50	Heartland Communities	Small Towns	2976	143	4.8%	113	3.8%	256	8.6%
51	Metro City Edge	Urban Outskirts	885	40	4.5%	29	3.3%	69	7.8%
52	Inner City Tenants	Metro Cities	279	13	4.7%	5	1.8%	18	6.5%
53	Home Town	Suburban	1426	92	6.5%	47	3.3%	139	9.7%
54	Urban Rows	Urban Centers	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
55	College Towns	Urban Outskirts	406	19	4.7%	10	2.5%	29	7.1%
56	Rural Bypasses	Rural	5288	306	5.8%	201	3.8%	507	9.6%
57	Simple Living	Urban Outskirts	1060	62	5.8%	43	4.1%	105	9.9%
58	NeWest Residents	Urban Centers	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
59	Southwestern Families	Urban Outskirts	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
60	City Dimensions	Metro Cities	44	2	4.5%	2	4.5%	4	9.1%
61	High Rise Renters	Urban Centers	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
62	Modest Income Homes	Urban Outskirts	1383	62	4.5%	34	2.5%	96	6.9%
63	Dorms to Diplomas	Metro Cities	212	8	3.8%	6	2.8%	14	6.6%
64	City Commons	Urban Centers	287	19	6.6%	2	0.7%	21	7.3%
65	Social Security Set	Urban Centers	64	1	1.6%	3	4.7%	4	6.3%
66	Unclassified		10	0	0.0%	1	10.0%	1	10.0%
TAPESTRY TOTAL			68,737	3,972	5.8%	2,906	4.2%	6,878	10.0%

Table A2. Response by Size (N) of Tapestry Segment

Tapestry Code	Tapestry Name	Urban/Rural	# in Reconciled Mail List	Response After 1st Mailing		Marginal Response From 2nd Mailing		Cumulative Response After 2nd Mailing	
				#	Response Rate	#	Response Rate	#	Response Rate
42	Southern Satellites	Rural	16893	1082	6.4%	781	4.6%	1863	11.0%
26	Midland Crowd	Rural	9134	547	6.0%	429	4.7%	976	10.7%
56	Rural Bypasses	Rural	5288	306	5.8%	201	3.8%	507	9.6%
46	Rooted Rural	Rural	3226	184	5.7%	136	4.2%	320	9.9%
50	Heartland Communities	Small Towns	2976	143	4.8%	113	3.8%	256	8.6%
17	Green Acres	Rural	2701	185	6.8%	122	4.5%	307	11.4%
25	Salt of the Earth	Rural	2137	120	5.6%	96	4.5%	216	10.1%
12	Up and Coming Families	Suburban	1970	106	5.4%	70	3.6%	176	8.9%
33	Midlife Junction	Suburban	1630	79	4.8%	59	3.6%	138	8.5%
29	Rustbelt Retirees	Suburban	1480	81	5.5%	69	4.7%	150	10.1%
53	Home Town	Suburban	1426	92	6.5%	47	3.3%	139	9.7%
32	Rustbelt Traditions	Urban Outskirts	1390	74	5.3%	62	4.5%	136	9.8%
62	Modest Income Homes	Urban Outskirts	1383	62	4.5%	34	2.5%	96	6.9%
41	Crossroads	Small Towns	1146	81	7.1%	45	3.9%	126	11.0%
14	Prosperous Empty Nesters	Suburban	1138	60	5.3%	61	5.4%	121	10.6%
31	Rural Resort Dwellers	Rural	1076	72	6.7%	63	5.9%	135	12.5%
57	Simple Living	Urban Outskirts	1060	62	5.8%	43	4.1%	105	9.9%
34	Family Foundations	Metro Cities	1002	50	5.0%	40	4.0%	90	9.0%
13	In Style	Suburban	951	50	5.3%	36	3.8%	86	9.0%
7	Exurbanites	Suburban	941	43	4.6%	36	3.8%	79	8.4%
19	Milk and Cookies	Metro Cities	906	47	5.2%	45	5.0%	92	10.2%
51	Metro City Edge	Urban Outskirts	885	40	4.5%	29	3.3%	69	7.8%
18	Cozy and Comfortable	Suburban	856	54	6.3%	36	4.2%	90	10.5%
48	Great Expectations	Urban Outskirts	768	34	4.4%	25	3.3%	59	7.7%
28	Aspiring Young Families	Metro Cities	735	38	5.2%	30	4.1%	68	9.3%
4	Boomburbs	Urban Outskirts	674	32	4.7%	30	4.5%	62	9.2%
6	Sophisticated Squires	Suburban	626	40	6.4%	33	5.3%	73	11.7%
22	Metropolitans	Metro Cities	500	29	5.8%	19	3.8%	48	9.6%
36	Old and Newcomers	Metro Cities	423	26	6.1%	14	3.3%	40	9.5%
2	Suburban Splendor	Suburban	421	22	5.2%	14	3.3%	36	8.6%
55	College Towns	Urban Outskirts	406	19	4.7%	10	2.5%	29	7.1%
39	Young and Restless	Metro Cities	319	10	3.1%	7	2.2%	17	5.3%
16	Enterprising Professionals	Metro Cities	316	15	4.7%	12	3.8%	27	8.5%
64	City Commons	Urban Centers	287	19	6.6%	2	0.7%	21	7.3%
52	Inner City Tenants	Metro Cities	279	13	4.7%	5	1.8%	18	6.5%
63	Dorms to Diplomas	Metro Cities	212	8	3.8%	6	2.8%	14	6.6%
40	Military Proximity	Suburban	164	2	1.2%	0	0.0%	2	1.2%
30	Retirement Communities	Metro Cities	149	8	5.4%	3	2.0%	11	7.4%
3	Connoisseurs	Metro Cities	133	6	4.5%	6	4.5%	12	9.0%
0	none		127	5	3.9%	9	7.1%	14	11.0%
15	Silver and Gold	Suburban	115	3	2.6%	5	4.3%	8	7.0%
49	Senior Sun Seekers	Small Towns	105	7	6.7%	1	1.0%	8	7.6%
27	Metro Renters	Urban Centers	65	2	3.1%	7	10.8%	9	13.8%
65	Social Security Set	Urban Centers	64	1	1.6%	3	4.7%	4	6.3%
1	Top Rung	Metro Cities	53	2	3.8%	2	3.8%	4	7.5%
60	City Dimensions	Metro Cities	44	2	4.5%	2	4.5%	4	9.1%
9	Urban Chic	Metro Cities	40	3	7.5%	0	0.0%	3	7.5%
38	Industrious Urban Fringe	Urban Outskirts	35	3	8.6%	2	5.7%	5	14.3%
43	The Elders	Suburban	30	2	6.7%	4	13.3%	6	20.0%
8	Laptops and Lattes	Urban Centers	28	1	3.6%	1	3.6%	2	7.1%
66	Unclassified		10	0	0.0%	1	10.0%	1	10.0%
37	Prairie Living	Rural	7	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
10	Pleasant-ville	Metro Cities	2	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
5	Wealthy Seaboard Suburbs	Metro Cities	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
24	Main Street, USA	Urban Outskirts	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
35	International Marketplace	Urban Centers	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
45	City Strivers	Urban Centers	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
59	Southwestern Families	Urban Outskirts	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
11	Pacific Heights	Urban Centers	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
20	City Lights	Urban Centers	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
21	Urban Villages	Urban Centers	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
23	Trendsetters	Urban Centers	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
44	Urban Melting Pot	Urban Centers	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
47	Las Casas	Urban Centers	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
54	Urban Rows	Urban Centers	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
58	NeWest Residents	Urban Centers	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
61	High Rise Renters	Urban Centers	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
TAPESTRY TOTAL			68,737	3,972	5.8%	2,906	4.2%	6,878	10.0%

Table A3. Tapestry Segment by Cumulative Response Rate

Tapestry Code	Tapestry Name	Urban/Rural	# in Reconciled Mail List	Response After 1st Mailing		Marginal Response From 2nd Mailing		Cumulative Response After 2nd Mailing	
				#	Response Rate	#	Response Rate	#	Response Rate
43	The Elders	Suburban	30	2	6.7%	4	13.3%	6	20.0%
38	Industrious Urban Fringe	Urban Outskirts	35	3	8.6%	2	5.7%	5	14.3%
27	Metro Renters	Urban Centers	65	2	3.1%	7	10.8%	9	13.8%
31	Rural Resort Dwellers	Rural	1076	72	6.7%	63	5.9%	135	12.5%
6	Sophisticated Squires	Suburban	626	40	6.4%	33	5.3%	73	11.7%
17	Green Acres	Rural	2701	185	6.8%	122	4.5%	307	11.4%
42	Southern Satellites	Rural	16893	1082	6.4%	781	4.6%	1863	11.0%
0	none		127	5	3.9%	9	7.1%	14	11.0%
41	Crossroads	Small Towns	1146	81	7.1%	45	3.9%	126	11.0%
26	Midland Crowd	Rural	9134	547	6.0%	429	4.7%	976	10.7%
14	Prosperous Empty Nesters	Suburban	1138	60	5.3%	61	5.4%	121	10.6%
18	Cozy and Comfortable	Suburban	856	54	6.3%	36	4.2%	90	10.5%
19	Milk and Cookies	Metro Cities	906	47	5.2%	45	5.0%	92	10.2%
29	Rustbelt Retirees	Suburban	1480	81	5.5%	69	4.7%	150	10.1%
25	Salt of the Earth	Rural	2137	120	5.6%	96	4.5%	216	10.1%
66	Unclassified		10	0	0.0%	1	10.0%	1	10.0%
46	Rooted Rural	Rural	3226	184	5.7%	136	4.2%	320	9.9%
57	Simple Living	Urban Outskirts	1060	62	5.8%	43	4.1%	105	9.9%
32	Rustbelt Traditions	Urban Outskirts	1390	74	5.3%	62	4.5%	136	9.8%
53	Home Town	Suburban	1426	92	6.5%	47	3.3%	139	9.7%
22	Metropolitans	Metro Cities	500	29	5.8%	19	3.8%	48	9.6%
56	Rural Bypasses	Rural	5288	306	5.8%	201	3.8%	507	9.6%
36	Old and Newcomers	Metro Cities	423	26	6.1%	14	3.3%	40	9.5%
28	Aspiring Young Families	Metro Cities	735	38	5.2%	30	4.1%	68	9.3%
4	Boomburbs	Urban Outskirts	674	32	4.7%	30	4.5%	62	9.2%
60	City Dimensions	Metro Cities	44	2	4.5%	2	4.5%	4	9.1%
13	In Style	Suburban	951	50	5.3%	36	3.8%	86	9.0%
3	Connoisseurs	Metro Cities	133	6	4.5%	6	4.5%	12	9.0%
34	Family Foundations	Metro Cities	1002	50	5.0%	40	4.0%	90	9.0%
12	Up and Coming Families	Suburban	1970	106	5.4%	70	3.6%	176	8.9%
50	Heartland Communities	Small Towns	2976	143	4.8%	113	3.8%	256	8.6%
2	Suburban Splendor	Suburban	421	22	5.2%	14	3.3%	36	8.6%
16	Enterprising Professionals	Metro Cities	316	15	4.7%	12	3.8%	27	8.5%
33	Midlife Junction	Suburban	1630	79	4.8%	59	3.6%	138	8.5%
7	Exurbanites	Suburban	941	43	4.6%	36	3.8%	79	8.4%
51	Metro City Edge	Urban Outskirts	885	40	4.5%	29	3.3%	69	7.8%
48	Great Expectations	Urban Outskirts	768	34	4.4%	25	3.3%	59	7.7%
49	Senior Sun Seekers	Small Towns	105	7	6.7%	1	1.0%	8	7.6%
1	Top Rung	Metro Cities	53	2	3.8%	2	3.8%	4	7.5%
9	Urban Chic	Metro Cities	40	3	7.5%	0	0.0%	3	7.5%
30	Retirement Communities	Metro Cities	149	8	5.4%	3	2.0%	11	7.4%
64	City Commons	Urban Centers	287	19	6.6%	2	0.7%	21	7.3%
55	College Towns	Urban Outskirts	406	19	4.7%	10	2.5%	29	7.1%
8	Laptops and Lattes	Urban Centers	28	1	3.6%	1	3.6%	2	7.1%
15	Silver and Gold	Suburban	115	3	2.6%	5	4.3%	8	7.0%
62	Modest Income Homes	Urban Outskirts	1383	62	4.5%	34	2.5%	96	6.9%
63	Dorms to Diplomas	Metro Cities	212	8	3.8%	6	2.8%	14	6.6%
52	Inner City Tenants	Metro Cities	279	13	4.7%	5	1.8%	18	6.5%
65	Social Security Set	Urban Centers	64	1	1.6%	3	4.7%	4	6.3%
39	Young and Restless	Metro Cities	319	10	3.1%	7	2.2%	17	5.3%
40	Military Proximity	Suburban	164	2	1.2%	0	0.0%	2	1.2%
37	Prairie Living	Rural	7	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
10	Pleasant-ville	Metro Cities	2	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
5	Wealthy Seaboard Suburbs	Metro Cities	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
24	Main Street, USA	Urban Outskirts	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
35	International Marketplace	Urban Centers	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
45	City Strivers	Urban Centers	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
59	Southwestern Families	Urban Outskirts	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
11	Pacific Heights	Urban Centers	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
20	City Lights	Urban Centers	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
21	Urban Villages	Urban Centers	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
23	Trendsetters	Urban Centers	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
44	Urban Melting Pot	Urban Centers	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
47	Las Casas	Urban Centers	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
54	Urban Rows	Urban Centers	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
58	NeWest Residents	Urban Centers	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
61	High Rise Renters	Urban Centers	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
TAPESTRY TOTAL			68,737	3,972	5.8%	2,906	4.2%	6,878	10.0%

Table A4. Response by Tapestry™ Segment Identified with Fishing as Part of Lifestyle

Tapestry Code	Tapestry Name	Urban/Rural	# in Reconciled Mail List	Response After 1st Mailing		Marginal Response From 2nd Mailing		Cumulative Response After 2nd Mailing	
				#	Response Rate	#	Response Rate	#	Response Rate
43	The Elders	Suburban	30	2	6.7%	4	13.3%	6	20.0%
31	Rural Resort Dwellers	Rural	1,076	72	6.7%	63	5.9%	135	12.5%
17	Green Acres	Rural	2,701	185	6.8%	122	4.5%	307	11.4%
42	Southern Satellites	Rural	16,893	1082	6.4%	781	4.6%	1863	11.0%
41	Crossroads	Small Towns	1,146	81	7.1%	45	3.9%	126	11.0%
26	Midland Crowd	Rural	9,134	547	6.0%	429	4.7%	976	10.7%
25	Salt of the Earth	Rural	2,137	120	5.6%	96	4.5%	216	10.1%
46	Rooted Rural	Rural	3,226	184	5.7%	136	4.2%	320	9.9%
57	Simple Living	Urban Outskirts	1,060	62	5.8%	43	4.1%	105	9.9%
32	Rustbelt Traditions	Urban Outskirts	1,390	74	5.3%	62	4.5%	136	9.8%
53	Home Town	Suburban	1,426	92	6.5%	47	3.3%	139	9.7%
56	Rural Bypasses	Rural	5,288	306	5.8%	201	3.8%	507	9.6%
28	Aspiring Young Families	Metro Cities	735	38	5.2%	30	4.1%	68	9.3%
50	Heartland Communities	Small Towns	2,976	143	4.8%	113	3.8%	256	8.6%
49	Senior Sun Seekers	Small Towns	105	7	6.7%	1	1.0%	8	7.6%
15	Silver and Gold	Suburban	115	3	2.6%	5	4.3%	8	7.0%
37	Prairie Living	Rural	7	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	<i>Subtotal</i>		<i>49,445</i>	<i>2,998</i>	<i>6.1%</i>	<i>2,178</i>	<i>4.4%</i>	<i>5,176</i>	<i>10.5%</i>
12	Up and Coming Families	Suburban	1,970	106	5.4%	70	3.6%	176	8.9%
33	Midlife Junction	Suburban	1,630	79	4.8%	59	3.6%	138	8.5%
29	Rustbelt Retirees	Suburban	1,480	81	5.5%	69	4.7%	150	10.1%
62	Modest Income Homes	Urban Outskirts	1,383	62	4.5%	34	2.5%	96	6.9%
14	Prosperous Empty Nesters	Suburban	1,138	60	5.3%	61	5.4%	121	10.6%
34	Family Foundations	Metro Cities	1,002	50	5.0%	40	4.0%	90	9.0%
13	In Style	Suburban	951	50	5.3%	36	3.8%	86	9.0%
7	Exurbanites	Suburban	941	43	4.6%	36	3.8%	79	8.4%
19	Milk and Cookies	Metro Cities	906	47	5.2%	45	5.0%	92	10.2%
51	Metro City Edge	Urban Outskirts	885	40	4.5%	29	3.3%	69	7.8%
18	Cozy and Comfortable	Suburban	856	54	6.3%	36	4.2%	90	10.5%
48	Great Expectations	Urban Outskirts	768	34	4.4%	25	3.3%	59	7.7%
4	Boomburbs	Urban Outskirts	674	32	4.7%	30	4.5%	62	9.2%
6	Sophisticated Squires	Suburban	626	40	6.4%	33	5.3%	73	11.7%
22	Metropolitans	Metro Cities	500	29	5.8%	19	3.8%	48	9.6%
36	Old and Newcomers	Metro Cities	423	26	6.1%	14	3.3%	40	9.5%
2	Suburban Splendor	Suburban	421	22	5.2%	14	3.3%	36	8.6%
55	College Towns	Urban Outskirts	406	19	4.7%	10	2.5%	29	7.1%
39	Young and Restless	Metro Cities	319	10	3.1%	7	2.2%	17	5.3%
16	Enterprising Professionals	Metro Cities	316	15	4.7%	12	3.8%	27	8.5%
64	City Commons	Urban Centers	287	19	6.6%	2	0.7%	21	7.3%
52	Inner City Tenants	Metro Cities	279	13	4.7%	5	1.8%	18	6.5%
63	Dorms to Diplomas	Metro Cities	212	8	3.8%	6	2.8%	14	6.6%
40	Military Proximity	Suburban	164	2	1.2%	0	0.0%	2	1.2%
30	Retirement Communities	Metro Cities	149	8	5.4%	3	2.0%	11	7.4%
3	Connoisseurs	Metro Cities	133	6	4.5%	6	4.5%	12	9.0%
0	none		127	5	3.9%	9	7.1%	14	11.0%
27	Metro Renters	Urban Centers	65	2	3.1%	7	10.8%	9	13.8%
65	Social Security Set	Urban Centers	64	1	1.6%	3	4.7%	4	6.3%
1	Top Rung	Metro Cities	53	2	3.8%	2	3.8%	4	7.5%
60	City Dimensions	Metro Cities	44	2	4.5%	2	4.5%	4	9.1%
9	Urban Chic	Metro Cities	40	3	7.5%	0	0.0%	3	7.5%
38	Industrious Urban Fringe	Urban Outskirts	35	3	8.6%	2	5.7%	5	14.3%
8	Laptops and Lattes	Urban Centers	28	1	3.6%	1	3.6%	2	7.1%
66	Unclassified		10	0	0.0%	1	10.0%	1	10.0%
10	Pleasant-ville	Metro Cities	2	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
5	Wealthy Seaboard Suburbs	Metro Cities	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
24	Main Street, USA	Urban Outskirts	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
35	International Marketplace	Urban Centers	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
45	City Strivers	Urban Centers	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
59	Southwestern Families	Urban Outskirts	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
11	Pacific Heights	Urban Centers	-	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
20	City Lights	Urban Centers	-	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
21	Urban Villages	Urban Centers	-	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
23	Trendsetters	Urban Centers	-	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
44	Urban Melting Pot	Urban Centers	-	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
47	Las Casas	Urban Centers	-	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
54	Urban Rows	Urban Centers	-	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
58	NeWest Residents	Urban Centers	-	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
61	High Rise Renters	Urban Centers	-	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	<i>Subtotal</i>		<i>19,292</i>	<i>974</i>	<i>5.0%</i>	<i>728</i>	<i>3.8%</i>	<i>1,702</i>	<i>8.8%</i>
	TAPESTRY TOTAL		68,737	3,972	5.8%	2,906	4.2%	6,878	10.0%

Table A5. Response by Tapestry Segment - Sorted by Urban-Rural Segments

Tapestry Code	Tapestry Name	Urban/Rural	# in Reconciled Mail List	Response After 1st Mailing		Marginal Response From 2nd Mailing		Cumulative Response After 2nd Mailing	
				#	Response Rate	#	Response Rate	#	Response Rate
1	Top Runq	Metro Cities	53	2	3.8%	2	3.8%	4	7.5%
3	Connoisseurs	Metro Cities	133	6	4.5%	6	4.5%	12	9.0%
5	Wealthy Seaboard Suburbs	Metro Cities	1	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	-	0.0%
9	Urban Chic	Metro Cities	40	3	7.5%	-	0.0%	3	7.5%
10	Pleasant-ville	Metro Cities	2	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	-	0.0%
16	Enterprising Professionals	Metro Cities	316	15	4.7%	12	3.8%	27	8.5%
19	Milk and Cookies	Metro Cities	906	47	5.2%	45	5.0%	92	10.2%
22	Metropolitans	Metro Cities	500	29	5.8%	19	3.8%	48	9.6%
28	Aspiring Young Families	Metro Cities	735	38	5.2%	30	4.1%	68	9.3%
30	Retirement Communities	Metro Cities	149	8	5.4%	3	2.0%	11	7.4%
34	Family Foundations	Metro Cities	1,002	50	5.0%	40	4.0%	90	9.0%
36	Old and Newcomers	Metro Cities	423	26	6.1%	14	3.3%	40	9.5%
39	Young and Restless	Metro Cities	319	10	3.1%	7	2.2%	17	5.3%
52	Inner City Tenants	Metro Cities	279	13	4.7%	5	1.8%	18	6.5%
60	City Dimensions	Metro Cities	44	2	4.5%	2	4.5%	4	9.1%
63	Dorms to Diplomas	Metro Cities	212	8	3.8%	6	2.8%	14	6.6%
<i>Metro Cities</i>			<i>5,114</i>	<i>257</i>	<i>5.0%</i>	<i>191</i>	<i>3.7%</i>	<i>448</i>	<i>8.8%</i>
17	Green Acres	Rural	2,701	185	6.8%	122	4.5%	307	11.4%
25	Salt of the Earth	Rural	2,137	120	5.6%	96	4.5%	216	10.1%
26	Midland Crowd	Rural	9,134	547	6.0%	429	4.7%	976	10.7%
31	Rural Resort Dwellers	Rural	1,076	72	6.7%	63	5.9%	135	12.5%
37	Prairie Living	Rural	7	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	-	0.0%
42	Southern Satellites	Rural	16,893	1,082	6.4%	781	4.6%	1,863	11.0%
46	Rooted Rural	Rural	3,226	184	5.7%	136	4.2%	320	9.9%
56	Rural Bypasses	Rural	5,288	306	5.8%	201	3.8%	507	9.6%
<i>Rural</i>			<i>40,462</i>	<i>2,496</i>	<i>6.2%</i>	<i>1,828</i>	<i>4.5%</i>	<i>4,324</i>	<i>10.7%</i>
41	Crossroads	Small Towns	1,146	81	7.1%	45	3.9%	126	11.0%
49	Senior Sun Seekers	Small Towns	105	7	6.7%	1	1.0%	8	7.6%
50	Heartland Communities	Small Towns	2,976	143	4.8%	113	3.8%	256	8.6%
<i>Small Town</i>			<i>4,227</i>	<i>231</i>	<i>5.5%</i>	<i>159</i>	<i>3.8%</i>	<i>390</i>	<i>9.2%</i>
2	Suburban Splendor	Suburban	421	22	5.2%	14	3.3%	36	8.6%
6	Sophisticated Squires	Suburban	626	40	6.4%	33	5.3%	73	11.7%
7	Exurbanites	Suburban	941	43	4.6%	36	3.8%	79	8.4%
12	Up and Coming Families	Suburban	1,970	106	5.4%	70	3.6%	176	8.9%
13	In Style	Suburban	951	50	5.3%	36	3.8%	86	9.0%
14	Prosperous Empty Nesters	Suburban	1,138	60	5.3%	61	5.4%	121	10.6%
15	Silver and Gold	Suburban	115	3	2.6%	5	4.3%	8	7.0%
18	Cozy and Comfortable	Suburban	856	54	6.3%	36	4.2%	90	10.5%
29	Rustbelt Retirees	Suburban	1,480	81	5.5%	69	4.7%	150	10.1%
33	Midlife Junction	Suburban	1,630	79	4.8%	59	3.6%	138	8.5%
40	Military Proximity	Suburban	164	2	1.2%	-	0.0%	2	1.2%
43	The Elders	Suburban	30	2	6.7%	4	13.3%	6	20.0%
53	Home Town	Suburban	1,426	92	6.5%	47	3.3%	139	9.7%
<i>Suburban</i>			<i>11,748</i>	<i>634</i>	<i>5.4%</i>	<i>470</i>	<i>4.0%</i>	<i>1,104</i>	<i>9.4%</i>
8	Laptops and Lattes	Urban Centers	28	1	3.6%	1	3.6%	2	7.1%
11	Pacific Heights	Urban Centers	-	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	-	0.0%
20	City Lights	Urban Centers	-	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	-	0.0%
21	Urban Villages	Urban Centers	-	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	-	0.0%
23	Trendsetters	Urban Centers	-	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	-	0.0%
27	Metro Renters	Urban Centers	65	2	3.1%	7	10.8%	9	13.8%
35	International Marketplace	Urban Centers	1	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	-	0.0%
44	Urban Melting Pot	Urban Centers	-	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	-	0.0%
45	City Strivers	Urban Centers	1	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	-	0.0%
47	Las Casas	Urban Centers	-	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	-	0.0%
54	Urban Rows	Urban Centers	-	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	-	0.0%
58	NeWest Residents	Urban Centers	-	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	-	0.0%
61	High Rise Renters	Urban Centers	-	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	-	0.0%
64	City Commons	Urban Centers	287	19	6.6%	2	0.7%	21	7.3%
65	Social Security Set	Urban Centers	64	1	1.6%	3	4.7%	4	6.3%
<i>Urban Centers</i>			<i>446</i>	<i>23</i>	<i>5.2%</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>2.9%</i>	<i>36</i>	<i>8.1%</i>

Table A5 (Continued). Response by Tapestry Segment - Sorted by Urban-Rural Segments

Tapestry Code	Tapestry Name	Urban/Rural	# in Reconciled Mail List	Response After 1st Mailing		Marginal Response From 2nd Mailing		Cumulative Response After 2nd Mailing	
				#	Response Rate	#	Response Rate	#	Response Rate
4	Boomburbs	Urban Outskirts	674	32	4.7%	30	4.5%	62	9.2%
24	Main Street, USA	Urban Outskirts	1	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	-	0.0%
32	Rustbelt Traditions	Urban Outskirts	1,390	74	5.3%	62	4.5%	136	9.8%
38	Industrious Urban Fringe	Urban Outskirts	35	3	8.6%	2	5.7%	5	14.3%
48	Great Expectations	Urban Outskirts	768	34	4.4%	25	3.3%	59	7.7%
51	Metro City Edge	Urban Outskirts	885	40	4.5%	29	3.3%	69	7.8%
55	College Towns	Urban Outskirts	406	19	4.7%	10	2.5%	29	7.1%
57	Simple Living	Urban Outskirts	1,060	62	5.8%	43	4.1%	105	9.9%
59	Southwestern Families	Urban Outskirts	1	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	-	0.0%
62	Modest Income Homes	Urban Outskirts	1,383	62	4.5%	34	2.5%	96	6.9%
	<i>Urban Outskirts</i>		6,603	326	4.9%	235	3.6%	561	8.5%
0	none		127	5	3.9%	9	7.1%	14	11.0%
66	Unclassified		10	-	0.0%	1	10.0%	1	10.0%
	<i>Small Town - Rural</i>		44,689	2,727	6.1%	1,987	4.4%	4,714	10.5%
	<i>Urban - Suburban</i>		23,911	1,240	5.2%	909	3.8%	2,149	9.0%
	TAPESTRY TOTAL		68,737	3,972	5.8%	2,906	4.2%	6,878	10.0%

Table A6. Tapestry Segment Response by Mail Type

Tapestry Code	Tapestry Name	LifeMode	Letter/Postcard			Postcard/Postcard			Overall		
			# Mailed	# Responded	Response Rate	# Mailed	# Responded	Response Rate	# Mailed	# Responded	Response Rate
43	The Elders	L5	13	4	30.8%	17	2	11.8%	30	6	20.0%
38	Industrious Urban Fringe	L8	17	1	5.9%	18	4	22.2%	35	5	14.3%
27	Metro Renters	L4	32	4	12.5%	33	5	15.2%	65	9	13.8%
31	Rural Resort Dwellers	L12	540	61	11.3%	536	74	13.8%	1,076	135	12.5%
6	Sophisticated Squires	L1	333	40	12.0%	293	33	11.3%	626	73	11.7%
17	Green Acres	L2	1,416	161	11.4%	1,285	146	11.4%	2,701	307	11.4%
42	Southern Satellites	L11	8,584	975	11.4%	8,309	888	10.7%	16,893	1,863	11.0%
0	none		60	7	11.7%	67	7	10.4%	127	14	11.0%
41	Crossroads	L12	632	72	11.4%	514	54	10.5%	1,146	126	11.0%
26	Midland Crowd	L12	4,648	503	10.8%	4,486	473	10.5%	9,134	976	10.7%
14	Prosperous Empty Nesters	L5	563	63	11.2%	575	58	10.1%	1,138	121	10.6%
18	Cozy and Comfortable	L2	448	45	10.0%	408	45	11.0%	856	90	10.5%
19	Milk and Cookies	L9	441	42	9.5%	465	50	10.8%	906	92	10.2%
29	Rustbelt Retirees	L5	768	76	9.9%	712	74	10.4%	1,480	150	10.1%
25	Salt of the Earth	L11	1,103	112	10.2%	1,034	104	10.1%	2,137	216	10.1%
66	Unclassified		4	1	25.0%	6	-	0.0%	10	1	10.0%
46	Rooted Rural	L12	1,654	182	11.0%	1,572	138	8.8%	3,226	320	9.9%
57	Simple Living	L5	513	58	11.3%	547	47	8.6%	1,060	105	9.9%
32	Rustbelt Traditions	L10	667	56	8.4%	723	80	11.1%	1,390	136	9.8%
53	Home Town	L11	693	65	9.4%	733	74	10.1%	1,426	139	9.7%
22	Metropolitans	L3	248	23	9.3%	252	25	9.9%	500	48	9.6%
56	Rural Bypasses	L11	2,658	261	9.8%	2,630	246	9.4%	5,288	507	9.6%
36	Old and Newcomers	L4	211	23	10.9%	212	17	8.0%	423	40	9.5%
28	Aspiring Young Families	L7	347	29	8.4%	388	39	10.1%	735	68	9.3%
4	Boomburbs	L1	327	33	10.1%	347	29	8.4%	674	62	9.2%
60	City Dimensions	L8	19	2	10.5%	25	2	8.0%	44	4	9.1%
13	In Style	L2	460	45	9.8%	491	41	8.4%	951	86	9.0%
3	Connoisseurs	L1	58	3	5.2%	75	9	12.0%	133	12	9.0%
34	Family Foundations	L10	518	44	8.5%	484	46	9.5%	1,002	90	9.0%
12	Up and Coming Families	L9	975	84	8.6%	995	92	9.2%	1,970	176	8.9%
50	Heartland Communities	L5	1,512	131	8.7%	1,464	125	8.5%	2,976	256	8.6%
2	Suburban Splendor	L1	204	16	7.8%	217	20	9.2%	421	36	8.6%
16	Enterprising Professionals	L2	174	21	12.1%	142	6	4.2%	316	27	8.5%
33	Midlife Junction	L10	838	73	8.7%	792	65	8.2%	1,630	138	8.5%
7	Exurbanites	L1	486	39	8.0%	455	40	8.8%	941	79	8.4%
51	Metro City Edge	L3	422	32	7.6%	463	37	8.0%	885	69	7.8%
48	Great Expectations	L7	409	31	7.6%	359	28	7.8%	768	59	7.7%
49	Senior Sun Seekers	L5	60	5	8.3%	45	3	6.7%	105	8	7.6%
1	Top Runq	L1	31	4	12.9%	22	-	0.0%	53	4	7.5%
9	Urban Chic	L2	22	-	0.0%	18	3	16.7%	40	3	7.5%
30	Retirement Communities	L5	72	4	5.6%	77	7	9.1%	149	11	7.4%
64	City Commons	L9	157	9	5.7%	130	12	9.2%	287	21	7.3%
55	College Towns	L6	202	14	6.9%	204	15	7.4%	406	29	7.1%
8	Laptops and Lattes	L4	17	2	11.8%	11	-	0.0%	28	2	7.1%
15	Silver and Gold	L5	61	6	9.8%	54	2	3.7%	115	8	7.0%
62	Modest Income Homes	L3	695	49	7.1%	688	47	6.8%	1,383	96	6.9%
63	Dorms to Diplomas	L6	99	7	7.1%	113	7	6.2%	212	14	6.6%
52	Inner City Tenants	L8	151	12	7.9%	128	6	4.7%	279	18	6.5%
65	Social Security Set	L5	33	2	6.1%	31	2	6.5%	64	4	6.3%
39	Young and Restless	L4	146	5	3.4%	173	12	6.9%	319	17	5.3%
40	Military Proximity	L6	93	1	1.1%	71	1	1.4%	164	2	1.2%
37	Prairie Living	L11	5	-	0.0%	2	-	0.0%	7	-	0.0%
10	Pleasant-ville	L2	1	-	0.0%	1	-	0.0%	2	-	0.0%
24	Main Street, USA	L10	1	-	0.0%	-	-	0.0%	1	-	0.0%
35	International Marketplace	L8	1	-	0.0%	-	-	0.0%	1	-	0.0%
45	City Strivers	L3	1	-	0.0%	-	-	0.0%	1	-	0.0%
59	Southwestern Families	L9	1	-	0.0%	-	-	0.0%	1	-	0.0%
5	Wealthy Seaboard Suburbs	L1	-	-	0.0%	1	-	0.0%	1	-	0.0%
11	Pacific Heights	L2	-	-	0.0%	-	-	0.0%	-	-	0.0%
20	City Lights	L3	-	-	0.0%	-	-	0.0%	-	-	0.0%
21	Urban Villages	L9	-	-	0.0%	-	-	0.0%	-	-	0.0%
23	Trendsetters	L4	-	-	0.0%	-	-	0.0%	-	-	0.0%
44	Urban Melting Pot	L8	-	-	0.0%	-	-	0.0%	-	-	0.0%
47	Las Casas	L8	-	-	0.0%	-	-	0.0%	-	-	0.0%
54	Urban Rows	L3	-	-	0.0%	-	-	0.0%	-	-	0.0%
58	NeWest Residents	L8	-	-	0.0%	-	-	0.0%	-	-	0.0%
61	High Rise Renters	L8	-	-	0.0%	-	-	0.0%	-	-	0.0%
TAPESTRY TOTAL			34,844	3,538	10.2%	33,893	3,340	9.9%	68,737	6,878	10.0%

Appendix B: Analysis of the Alabama Fishing License Data Base and Recommendations Regarding Mail List Contents

Prepared for the State of Alabama and the Recreational Boating and Fishing Foundation

February 22, 2008

Years Analyzed: License years 2005-2007, with any angler not buying a license since January 1st, 2007 defined as lapsed

Number of Licenses Sold by Year:

License Code	License Name	2005		2006		2007	
		#	% Customers	#	% Customers	#	% Customers
100-5000	Res Sportsmans	1,122	0.8%	1,443	0.9%	2,110	1.1%
100-6000	Res Hunting and Fishing Combo	19,400	14.2%	21,967	13.4%	25,679	13.5%
200-1000	Res Freshwater Fishing	94,105	68.8%	110,801	67.4%	125,032	65.6%
200-1500	Res Freshwater Trip Fishing 7-days	213	0.2%	276	0.2%	342	0.2%
250-1000	Res Combination Salt/Fresh Fishing	11,571	8.5%	15,716	9.6%	20,013	10.5%
250-1100	Res Spear Fishing	51	0.0%	56	0.0%	57	0.0%
250-1200	Res Fishing (Disabled)	877	0.6%	1,695	1.0%	2,331	1.2%
300-1000	Res Saltwater Fishing	5,829	4.3%	7,594	4.6%	8,661	4.5%
300-1100	Res Fishing Saltwater Pier	150	0.1%	130	0.1%	172	0.1%
300-1500	Res Saltwater Trip 7-days	2,106	1.5%	2,866	1.7%	3,529	1.9%
350-1000	Res Recreational Net	184	0.1%	189	0.1%	189	0.1%
350-1500	Res Recreational Shrimp Boat	325	0.2%	316	0.2%	354	0.2%
700-7200	Lifetime Freshwater Fishing	510	0.4%	755	0.5%	1,082	0.6%
700-7300	Lifetime Saltwater Fishing	11	0.0%	28	0.0%	37	0.0%
700-7400	Lifetime Hunting / Freshwater Fishing	202	0.1%	314	0.2%	616	0.3%
700-7500	Lifetime Salt / Freshwater Fishing	10	0.0%	27	0.0%	48	0.0%
700-7600	Lifetime Hunting / Saltwater Fishing	3	0.0%	10	0.0%	9	0.0%
700-7700	Lifetime Hunting/Fresh/Saltwater Fishing	38	0.0%	45	0.0%	104	0.1%
700-7800	Lifetime License Replacement	53	0.0%	72	0.0%	92	0.0%
700-7900	Lifetime License Replacement/No charge	10	0.1%	107	0.1%	172	0.1%
TOTAL		136,870	100.0%	164,407	100.0%	190,629	100.0%

Definitions of Tiers - Tiers will be used to help prioritize who to include in your mailing:

Tier 1 = bought a fishing license in 2005 & 2006, but not in 2007

Tier 2 = bought a fishing license in 2006, but not in 2005 or 2007

Tier 3 = bought a fishing license in 2005, but not in 2006 or 2007

Recommendations – Based on the analysis of your database (a copy is attached in an EXCEL spreadsheet), the following is a recommendation about who to target with your mailing. The final approach should be developed in consultation with the RBFF:

Based on previous RBFF work in other states that showed anglers from the highest ranked tiers responded better to campaigns, we recommend pulling most of the mail list from Tier 1. However, there are segments within this Tier that we think will respond better. Of the 17 segments defined by Tapestry with fishing as part of their lifestyle, 13 of them appear within Tier 1 as having a greater rate of lapsing compared to the average lapsed angler. These 13 segments, of 66 possible segments, represent 12,229 anglers, or 61.6% of all Tier 1 lapsed anglers. It is possible these anglers have lapsed from the state database involuntarily, meaning they either moved or encountered life issues that prevent fishing. However, many may have done something different with their free time in the past two years and could be re-engaged. Only test mailings will tell us for sure. These segments are listed here and are ranked based on which ones have a greater percentage of lapsed anglers in Tier 1 compared to Tier 2:

Tapestry Code:	Tapestry Name:	Urban/Rural
43	The Elders	Suburban
37	Prairie Living	Rural
49	Senior Sun Seekers	Small Towns
15	Silver and Gold	Suburban
17	Green Acres	Rural
50	Heartland Communities	Small Towns
31	Rural Resort Dwellers	Rural
26	Midland Crowd	Rural
46	Rooted Rural	Rural
32	Rustbelt Traditions	Urban Outskirts
42	Southern Satellites	Rural
41	Crossroads	Small Town
25	Salt of the Earth	Rural

These segments are mostly rural with a couple of urban/suburban segments and a few above-average income segments. You may want to consider mixing in a more individuals (at least a thousand each) from urban and suburban segments to test for which type of person responds best in Alabama. The results will help improve your state's future marketing efforts. Consider pulling names from the Exurbanites, Milk and Cookies and Up and Coming Families to help round out the testing aspects of this project.

In addition, recognizing that anglers from lower tiers may be intermittent anglers who would otherwise fish if given a slight push, it is advisable to include some of these anglers in your mailing. We recommend no more than 10-20% of your mail list comes from these anglers. We recommend including Tier 2 anglers from the following segments: Aspiring Young Families, Hometown and Rural Bypasses.

Please let us know your final desired mix in your mail list, and the number you intend to mail to in your first mailing, and we will pull the list.

Just a cautionary note: The final evaluation results for Alabama will be "dirty" and difficult to interpret as many records of people who bought at independent retailers are not included in the state license database. If someone bought a license at Kmart in '06 and at their favorite mom & pop in '07, we're going to count that person as lapsed. Then when they buy again at Wal-Mart in '08, they'll be a "success" in our records. We need to be careful in the mailer's wording and that

agency staff understand what the limitations are. We will likely see higher than average response rates compared to other states as a result of this data problem.

Appendix C: State Radio and Online Advertising Details

Alabama Radio Advertising List

Station	Market	Format
WGSV	GUNTERSVILLE	N/T
WBHP	HUNTSVILLE	N/T
WVNA	MUSCLE SHOALS	TALK
WRMG	RED BAY	CTY
WPRN FM	BUTLER	CTY
WNSI FM	ATMORE	TALK
WEBJ	BREWTON	OLDIES
WABF	FAIRHOPE	NEWS
WHEP	FOLEY	TALK
WBMH FM	GROVE HILL	CTY
WHOD FM	JACKSON	AC
WRJX	JACKSON	NOST
WABB	MOBILE	N/T
WPMI	MOBILE	TALK
WNSI	ROBERTSDALE	TALK
WJDB FM	THOMASVILLE	CTY
WTBF FM	BRUNDIDGE	OLDIES
WACQ	CARRVILLE	OLDIES
WGYV	GREENVILLE	TALK
WKXK FM	GREENVILLE	URBAN AC
WKXN FM	GREENVILLE	URBAN CONT.
WHLW FM	LUVERNE	REL
WNZZ	MONTGOMERY	NEWS
WALX FM	SELMA	HOT AC
WMRK	SELMA	OLDIES
WTLS	TALLASSEE	NOST
WTBF	TROY	TALK
WQSI FM	UNION SPRINGS	CTY
WZBQ FM	CARROLLTON	TOP 40
WACT	TUSCALOOSA	REL
WTBC	TUSCALOOSA	N/T

Alabama Radio Advertising List cont.

Station	Market	Format
WKNG	TALLAPOOSA	CTY
WHMA	ANNISTON	TALK
WDXB FM	BIRMINGHAM	CTY
WERC	BIRMINGHAM	N/T
WEIS	CENTRE	CTY
WKLF	CLANTON	REL
WFMH	CULLMAN	GOSPEL
WKUL FM	CULLMAN	CTY
WLDX	FAYETTE	CTY
WAAX	GADSDEN	N/T
WGMZ FM	GADSDEN	CLROCK
WZLM FM	GOODWATER	HOT AC
WERH	HAMILTON	VARIETY
WENN FM	HOOVER	REL
WIXI	JASPER	CTY
WURL	MOODY	REL
WCRL	ONEONTA	OLDIES
WKLD FM	ONEONTA	CTY
WFHK	PELL CITY PELL CITY	CTY
WJBY	RAINBOW CITY	REL
WYEA	SYLACAUGA	REL
WQEN FM	TRUSSVILLE	HOT AC
WKXM	WINFIELD	CTY
WKXM FM	WINFIELD	OLDIES
WYMR	BRIDGEPORT	NOST.
WWIC	SCOTTSBORO	FARM
WAUD	AUBURN	SPORTS
WULA	EUFAULA	OLDIES
WRJM FM	GENEVA	N/T
WHOS	DECATUR	TALK
WZOB	FORT PAYNE	CTY

Alabama Online Advertising List

Market	URL
Birmingham Huntsville Mobile	al.com
Dothan	DothanEagle.com
Mobile	wkrg.com
Opelika	OANow.com
Montgomery-Selma	www.monntgomeryadvertiser.com