

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

**Colorado Division of Wildlife  
And the Recreational Boating & Fishing Foundation**

**Executive Summary:**

The Recreational Boating and Fishing Foundation (RBFF) partnered with the Colorado Division of Wildlife (DOW) 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 and online advertising. On April 7, 2008, 49,989 lapsed anglers were sent a postcard with a message to encourage them to once again become active anglers. On May 9, a second postcard was sent to those anglers who had not yet purchased a license.

The size of the final reconciled mailing list was 34,371 after accounting for undeliverable addresses and anglers who bought a license prior to receiving the mailing. Of these 34,371 lapsed anglers, 4,133 purchased a fishing license during the evaluation period for an overall response rate of 12%. These 4,133 anglers purchased 6,121 licenses and permits. Details include:

- Higher ranked priority tiers responded better than lower ranked ones:
  - Tier 1 (bought a license three years straight before lapsing) = 13.5%
  - Tier 2 (bought a license two years straight before lapsing) = 9.7%
  - Tier 3 (bought a license in '04 and '06 before lapsing) = 8.6%
  
- The top five Tapestry™ segments with the highest response rates were:
  - Tapestry 41 – Crossroads (below average income, small towns) = 13.6%
  - Tapestry 28 – Aspiring Young Families (mid income, metro cities) = 13.1%
  - Tapestry 24 – Main Street, USA (mid income, urban outskirts) = 13.0%
  - Tapestry 31 – Rural Resort Dwellers (mid income, rural) = 12.8%
  - Tapestry 36 – Old and Newcomers (below avg. income, metro cities) = 12.8%

The program respondents generated \$111,045 in gross program revenue during the evaluation period. The DOW and RBFF invested \$58,295 in the program, resulting in net program revenue of \$52,750 and an ROI of 90.5%. Additionally, an estimated \$30,954 may be generated from the Sport Fish Restoration Program as a result of this program.

The 2008 Lapsed Angler Direct Mail Marketing Program in Colorado was a successful 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**

**Colorado Division of Wildlife  
And the Recreational Boating & Fishing Foundation**

**Purpose and Introduction:**

In 2008, the Recreational Boating and Fishing Foundation (RBFF) partnered with the Colorado Division of Wildlife (DOW) 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 Colorado.

**Program Summary:**

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

- Target Audience: Approximately 50,000 lapsed anglers
- Implementation:
  - First Mailing:  
Drop Date: April 7

- Mail Piece: Postcard
- Postal Class: First Class
- Second Mailing:
  - Drop Date: May 9
  - Mail Piece: Postcard
  - Postal Class: First Class
- 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 5/5 – 5/25
  - Online Advertising Dates: 4/7 – 6/1
- DOW did not purchase any additional advertising

### **Lapsed Anglers in Colorado:**

For the period covered by this analysis, Colorado’s license year coincided with the calendar year. Records of resident fishing licenses sold for license years 2004 through 2007 were analyzed to identify anglers who purchased any form of fishing privilege (e.g., annual, short-term or combination licenses) in 2006 and earlier years, 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.

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. Nineteen percent of all Colorado resident anglers who purchased a license from 2004 to 2006 lapsed in 2007. Of those lapsed anglers, 21.4% were classified in the top priority tier and approximately one-half were in the lowest priority tier (Table 2).

**Table 1. Definition of Tiers.**

Lapse Tier	Years in which a license was purchased ( x = license purchased):			
	2004	2005	2006	2007
1	X	X	X	
2		X	X	
3	X		X	
4			X	

**Table 2. Anglers in Colorado, 2004-2007.**

	<b>N</b>	<b>% of Records</b>
<b>Non-Lapsed:</b>	704,026	81%
<b>Lapsed:</b>	161,783	19%
<b>Total Records:</b>	<b>865,809</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>All Lapsed Anglers:</b>		
<b>Tier</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Percent</b>
1	34,562	21.4%
2	27,725	17.1%
3	17,829	11.0%
4	81,667	50.5%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>161,783</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Prioritization and Recommendations:**

Mailing list recommendations were developed for Colorado based on previous RBF 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 from Tier 1. The full text of this analysis, “Analysis of the Colorado 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 Colorado that were observed within Tier 1 as lapsing

at a greater rate compared to the average Colorado lapsed angler. These 13 segments, of 66 possible segments, represent 8,374 anglers, or 24% of all Tier 1 lapsed anglers.

Based on the program budget and cost estimates, the program in Colorado could include approximately 50,000 lapsed anglers in the first mailing. Because the budget allowed for a larger mailing than the initial recommendation, the DOW expanded the list to include all of Tiers 1 and 2, supplemented by additional records randomly drawn from Tier 3. In addition to providing a larger pool of names for the program, this non-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 Colorado.

### **Target Audience and Mailing List Development:**

Colorado's target audience was approximately 50,000 lapsed anglers. This was made up of all the lapsed anglers in Tier 1 and Tier 2 with a random draw of lapsed anglers in Tier 3 to make up the difference.

In developing the mailing list, the records were based on household addresses, combining multiple lapsed anglers into one record if they have the same address. This was done in Colorado to eliminate the likelihood of multiple mailings to a single household. In the case of multiple lapsed anglers in a single household, the name that was retained was the first one that appeared in the database from that household.

Records in excess of 50,000 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 Colorado included 60,882 records. Altogether, these addresses represented 63,270 lapsed anglers.

The DOW also requested a control group equal to 10% of the records in each Tier. For Tiers 1 and 2, these were pulled from the household list of lapsed anglers by taking a random draw from each tier prior to creating the mailing list. In the case of Tier 3, the control group consisted of all records remaining after taking a random draw for the mailing list. The analysis and response rate comparisons between the treatment group (lapsed anglers that received mailings) and the control group are the responsibility of the DOW and are not part of this evaluation.

## Direct Mail Implementation:

The Colorado direct mail program included two postcard mailings. Prior to the first mailing, the Colorado list was processed through a National Change-of-Address (NCOA) service to remove bad and unknown addresses. A total of 49,989 addresses 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 7
- Number mailed to: 49,989 (plus 11 seed names)
- Postal Class: First Class

### Second Mailing:

- Drop date: May 9
- Number mailed to: 38,454 (plus 11 seed names)
- Postal Class: First Class

## Evaluation Methods:

The overall evaluation period under consideration is April 8 through June 9. The period for the first mailing begins the day that the target audience was expected to receive the first mailing (April 8) and ends before the target audience received the second mailing (May 9). The period for the second mailing begins the day that the target audience was expected to receive the second mailing (May 10) and ends 30 days later (June 9).<sup>1</sup>

The two key performance measures included in this evaluation are:

### 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. Colorado also requested that the response be calculated by age and gender.
- **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.

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.

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, 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.

Colorado provided a partial list of individuals whose postcards were returned, plus a count of additional undeliverable postcards whose addressees is not known. As a result, the final reconciled mailing list includes 37,226 names of known lapsed anglers who had not purchased a current-year license as of the date of the first mailing and whose first and second mailings were not returned as undeliverable. However, accounting for the number of additional returned mail pieces that were not identified by individual, the size of the final reconciled mailing list is 34,371 for the purpose of calculating the overall response rate (Table 3).

**Table 3. Additional Mailing List Scrubs.**

Mailing List Statistics	#	%
<b>1st List - As Mailed</b>	49,989	
<b>Bought Before 1st Mailing</b>	2,894	5.8%
<b>Returned as Undeliverable</b>	12,724	25.5%
<b>Final Reconciled Mailing List</b>	34,371	

\* 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 34,371 lapsed anglers who were exposed to one or two of the direct mailers, 4,133 or 12% purchased a fishing license during the evaluation period. The response to the first mail piece was 4.7%; the second mailing resulted in an additional 7.4% response (Table 4). Anecdotal evidence suggests that the response to the first mailing may have been depressed by a later than normal snow melt, which could explain the significantly larger response to the second mailing.

**Table 4. Overall response rate to the program.**

<b>Overall Response To Colorado's Direct Mail Effort</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>Response Rate</b>
<b>Final Reconciled Mailing List</b>	34,371	
<b>Response After 1st Mailing</b>	1,606	4.7%
<b>Marginal Response From 2nd Mailing</b>	2,527	7.4%
<b>Cumulative Response After 2nd Mailing</b>	4,133	12.0%

*The response rate calculated above is based on a count of postcards returned as undeliverable that were not matched to any particular individual or group. Therefore, it cannot be compared to any response rates by subgroups shown below which were calculated based on a list of individuals who were specifically identified as "undeliverable."*

The 4,133 lapsed anglers who responded to the direct mailing purchased 6,121 licenses and permits (Table 5). Of these, 59.5% were Resident Annual Fishing licenses and 6.8% were combination hunting and fishing licenses. Extra Rod Stamps made up 27% of the purchases by respondents. Altogether, these license sales generated \$111,045 in sales revenue after agent fees were accounted for (Table 13).

Table 5. License Sales

<b>Licenses and Permits Purchased in Response to Colorado's Direct Mail Effort</b>			
License Code	Description	#	%
11	Resident Annual Combination	418	6.8%
12	Resident Annual Fishing	3,641	59.5%
14	Non-Resident Annual Fishing	4	0.1%
15	Five-Day Fishing	1	0.0%
18	Extra Rod Stamp	1,626	26.6%
30	Resident Senior Annual Fishing	1	0.0%
40	One-Day Fishing	355	5.8%
45	Fishing Addition Day	60	1.0%
902	Lifetime Resident Fishing	14	0.2%
903	Lifetime VA Res Combo	1	0.0%
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>6,121</b>	<b>100%</b>

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 (13.4%) was 40% greater than Tier 2 (9.6%), and 58% greater than the rate at which lapsed anglers in Tier 3 responded (8.5%).

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, level of urbanization in their place residence, age and gender.

The lifestyle segmentation is based on the tendency for people with similar tastes, lifestyles, and behaviors to cluster into similar 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 Appendix A.

NOTE: the response rates calculated for these tables are affected by the lack of a complete detailed list of undeliverable postcards. The result is that the reported response rates are a conservative estimate of the true response rate. The extent to which the true response rate exceeds these estimates is unknown and likely varies for each detailed sub-group.

**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	18,932	1,018	5.4%	1,510	8.0%	2,528	13.4%
Tier 2	15,636	551	3.5%	951	6.1%	1,502	9.6%
Tier 3	2,658	85	3.2%	141	5.3%	226	8.5%

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

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
41	Crossroads	Small Towns	699	42	6.0%	51	7.3%	93	13.3%
28	Aspiring Young Families	Metro Cities	1,353	67	5.0%	109	8.1%	176	13.0%
24	Main Street, USA	Urban Outskirts	1,512	80	5.3%	113	7.5%	193	12.8%
31	Rural Resort Dwellers	Rural	1,596	83	5.2%	119	7.5%	202	12.7%
36	Old and Newcomers	Metro Cities	765	42	5.5%	53	6.9%	95	12.4%
26	Midland Crowd	Rural	1,464	60	4.1%	112	7.7%	172	11.7%
19	Milk and Cookies	Metro Cities	1,419	51	3.6%	114	8.0%	165	11.6%

\* 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 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 (11.4%). Each of the segments in Table 7 includes at least 1.5% of total lapsed anglers in Colorado in 2007. Several Tapestry segments that are not included in the table had higher 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 Colorado is “Crossroads” with a 13.3% response rate. The seven segments in Table 7 represent approximately one-fourth of all lapsed anglers in Colorado’s reconciled mailing list, making them a significant target group for future marketing efforts. Four of the seven segments 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 12.4% response rate – higher than the 11.4% average Tapestry response rate.

Table 8 summarizes all 66 Tapestry segments by their quartile performance. The top one-fourth of Tapestry segments had a collective response rate of 14.2%. While this is higher than the “significant” Tapestry segments listed in Table 7, it should be noted that this top quartile, while accounting for one-fourth of all Tapestry segments, represents only 8.2 percent 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 “Southern Satellites” and “City Commons” as examples, with only five and six lapsed anglers in the mailings respectively, it is possible that the high response rates are 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 12.2% response rate, better than the 11.4% response rate of the average Tapestry segment. In all, twelve of the seventeen segments had a higher response rate than 11.4%. 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 actually live in urban centers. However, this group is relatively small at 831, or only 2.2% of Colorado’s lapsed anglers. This compares to 6,773 or 18.2% of lapsed anglers in the rural and small town groups which are the next two most responsive groups. Both of these segments had response rates above the Tapestry average.

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

Tapestry™ Response 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	3,048	8.2%	190	6.2%	242	7.9%	432	14.2%
2nd Quartile	14,743	39.6%	667	4.5%	1,101	7.5%	1,768	12.0%
3rd Quartile	15,240	40.9%	636	4.2%	1,020	6.7%	1,656	10.9%
4th Quartile	4,195	11.3%	161	3.8%	239	5.7%	400	9.5%

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

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
42	Southern Satellites	Rural	5	1	20.0%	0	0.0%	1	20.0%
56	Rural Bypasses	Rural	95	8	8.4%	5	5.3%	13	13.7%
25	Salt of the Earth	Rural	161	5	3.1%	17	10.6%	22	13.7%
46	Rooted Rural	Rural	348	19	5.5%	28	8.0%	47	13.5%
41	Crossroads	Small Towns	699	42	6.0%	51	7.3%	93	13.3%
53	Home Town	Suburban	250	9	3.6%	24	9.6%	33	13.2%
28	Aspiring Young Families	Metro Cities	1,353	67	5.0%	109	8.1%	176	13.0%
31	Rural Resort Dwellers	Rural	1,596	83	5.2%	119	7.5%	202	12.7%
37	Prairie Living	Rural	376	18	4.8%	28	7.4%	46	12.2%
50	Heartland Communities	Small Towns	382	19	5.0%	27	7.1%	46	12.0%
57	Simple Living	Urban Outskirts	347	18	5.2%	23	6.6%	41	11.8%
26	Midland Crowd	Rural	1,464	60	4.1%	112	7.7%	172	11.7%
17	Green Acres	Rural	1,505	54	3.6%	114	7.6%	168	11.2%
32	Rustbelt Traditions	Urban Outskirts	468	24	5.1%	28	6.0%	52	11.1%
49	Senior Sun Seekers	Small Towns	142	6	4.2%	8	5.6%	14	9.9%
15	Silver and Gold	Suburban	89	2	2.2%	4	4.5%	6	6.7%
43	The Elders	Suburban	17	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	<b>SUBTOTAL</b>		<b>9,297</b>	<b>435</b>	<b>4.7%</b>	<b>697</b>	<b>7.5%</b>	<b>1,132</b>	<b>12.2%</b>

**Table 10. Response Rate by Level of Urbanization.**

Response by Urbanization Group Segments							
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	831	40	4.8%	65	7.8%	105	12.6%
Metro Cities	7,780	358	4.6%	531	6.8%	889	11.4%
Urban Outskirts	6,895	323	4.7%	477	6.9%	800	11.6%
Suburban	14,878	613	4.1%	1,015	6.8%	1,628	10.9%
Small Town	1,223	67	5.5%	86	7.0%	153	12.5%
Rural	5,550	248	4.5%	423	7.6%	671	12.1%

Tables 11 and 12 examine specific demographic aspects of lapsed anglers – age and gender. With the exception of lapsed anglers age 55 to 64 there is little difference in response rates. Lapsed anglers age 55 to 64 may have the time and resources to better respond to marketing campaigns. (The high response rate for anglers under 18 can be largely ignored because there are so few lapsed anglers that fall into that age category due to the fact that a license is not required until the age of 16.)

**Table 11. Response Rate by Age of Lapsed Angler\*.**

Response by Age Group							
Age 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
Under 18	15	-	0.0%	3	20.0%	3	20.0%
18 - 24	4,031	175	4.3%	277	6.9%	452	11.2%
25 - 34	7,871	349	4.4%	549	7.0%	898	11.4%
35 - 44	9,274	370	4.0%	679	7.3%	1,049	11.3%
45 - 54	10,122	435	4.3%	701	6.9%	1,136	11.2%
55 - 64	5,913	325	5.5%	393	6.6%	718	12.1%

\*A license is not required until the age of 16.

Men outnumbered women by a margin of nearly three to one and had a response rate 21% higher than that of women (Table 12). Colorado may want to directly target lapsed angler women with more specific marketing messages next time to improve their response rate.

**Table 12. Response Rate by Gender of Lapsed Angler.**

Response by Gender							
Gender	# in Reconciled Mail List	Response After 1st Mailing		Marginal Response From 2nd Mailing		Cumulative Response After 2nd Mailing	
		#	Response Rate	#	Response Rate	#	Response Rate
Female	9,471	344	3.6%	593	6.3%	937	9.9%
Male	27,737	1,308	4.7%	2,007	7.2%	3,315	12.0%
Did Not Specify	18	2	11.1%	2	11.1%	4	22.2%

## 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 Colorado, the licenses that were sold during the direct mail program generated total license sales of \$120,325.93 (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 \$9,281.20. The remaining \$111,044.73 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 \$44,639.47 in direct expenditures by the DOW for printing and postage. The DOW program did not include any additional costs for advertising or incentives to encourage people to purchase a license. The RBFF spent a total of \$13,655.44 for radio and online advertising in selected Colorado media markets. In total, the DOW and RBFF invested \$58,294.91 in the program. Subtracting this total investment from the state’s gross program revenue yields net program revenue (i.e., net profit) of \$52,749.82. Comparing this net revenue to the total investment produces a positive ROI of 90.5%. In other words, for every dollar invested in the program the state

of Colorado received ninety-and-a-half cents of net revenue (profit) above and beyond the cost of the program.

**Table 13. ROI**

<b>Revenue and Return on Investment Generated from Response to Colorado's Direct Mail Marketing Program</b>		
License Sales Revenue		
1st Mailing	\$	48,189.02
2nd Mailing	\$	72,136.90
<b>Total License Sales</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>120,325.93</b>
Agent Fees *		
1st Mailing	\$	3,699.08
2nd Mailing	\$	5,582.13
<b>Total Agent Fees</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>9,281.20</b>
<b>Gross Program Revenue</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>111,044.73</b>
Program Costs		
Direct Mail Costs	\$	44,639.47
Advertisement by State Agency	\$	-
Incentives	\$	-
Other RBFF Marketing Costs	\$	13,655.44
<b>Total Program Costs</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>58,294.91</b>
<b>Net Program Revenue</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>52,749.82</b>
<b>ROI</b>		<b>90.5%</b>
Estimated Additional Revenue		
Sport Fish Restoration Fund	\$	30,954.39

\* Agent Fees are estimated.

In addition to the revenue generated directly by the license sales, the state of Colorado 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 Colorado received approximately \$7.49 for each licensed

angler. Based on that figure, the lapsed anglers who bought licenses during the program are responsible for \$30,954 of federal funds provided to the DOW to support fisheries management and improve boating access. Adding these funds to the net program revenue would bring the ROI for the program up to 144%.

### **3. Notes and Considerations:**

Anecdotal evidence suggests that the response to the first mailing may have been depressed by a later than normal snow melt, which could explain the significantly larger response to the second mailing.

### **Conclusion and Recommendations:**

The 2008 Lapsed Angler Direct Mail Marketing Program in Colorado was a successful first-year effort to encourage lapsed anglers to again buy a license. Unexpectedly, the program received a higher response to the second mailing of postcards than the first one. Anecdotal evidence suggests this may have been the result of a later than normal snow melt that may have delayed license purchases. The results of future programs may help to confirm this. Other key findings from the first year's results include:

- 4,133 lapsed anglers returned to fishing in 2008.
- These renewed anglers generated \$52,749.82 of revenue to the state of Colorado over and above the costs of program for an ROI of 90.5%.
- An estimated additional \$30,954 may be generated from the Sport Fish Restoration Program by these renewals.
- The program generated a 12% 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 seven key Tapestry lifestyle segments. Four of those seven 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.

*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 Colorado 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	#	Response	#	Response
0	none		67	5	7.5%	5	7.5%	10	14.9%
1	Top Runq	Metro Cities	193	10	5.2%	9	4.7%	19	9.8%
2	Suburban Splendor	Suburban	1,781	75	4.2%	109	6.1%	184	10.3%
3	Connoisseurs	Metro Cities	396	14	3.5%	24	6.1%	38	9.6%
4	Boomburbs	Urban Outskirts	2,637	94	3.6%	184	7.0%	278	10.5%
5	Wealthy Seaboard Suburbs	Metro Cities	111	2	1.8%	8	7.2%	10	9.0%
6	Sophisticated Squires	Suburban	2,319	99	4.3%	153	6.6%	252	10.9%
7	Exurbanites	Suburban	2,019	85	4.2%	136	6.7%	221	10.9%
8	Laptops and Lattes	Urban Centers	123	4	3.3%	5	4.1%	9	7.3%
9	Urban Chic	Metro Cities	447	15	3.4%	17	3.8%	32	7.2%
10	Pleasant-ville	Metro Cities	212	11	5.2%	13	6.1%	24	11.3%
11	Pacific Heights	Urban Centers	-	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
12	Up and Coming Families	Suburban	3,681	138	3.7%	275	7.5%	413	11.2%
13	In Style	Suburban	1,524	69	4.5%	96	6.3%	165	10.8%
14	Prosperous Empty Nesters	Suburban	688	25	3.6%	44	6.4%	69	10.0%
15	Silver and Gold	Suburban	89	2	2.2%	4	4.5%	6	6.7%
16	Enterprising Professionals	Metro Cities	1,034	51	4.9%	66	6.4%	117	11.3%
17	Green Acres	Rural	1,505	54	3.6%	114	7.6%	168	11.2%
18	Cozy and Comfortable	Suburban	1,170	44	3.8%	82	7.0%	126	10.8%
19	Milk and Cookies	Metro Cities	1,419	51	3.6%	114	8.0%	165	11.6%
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%
22	Metropolitans	Metro Cities	824	42	5.1%	46	5.6%	88	10.7%
23	Trendsetters	Urban Centers	105	4	3.8%	7	6.7%	11	10.5%
24	Main Street, USA	Urban Outskirts	1,512	80	5.3%	113	7.5%	193	12.8%
25	Salt of the Earth	Rural	161	5	3.1%	17	10.6%	22	13.7%
26	Midland Crowd	Rural	1,464	60	4.1%	112	7.7%	172	11.7%
27	Metro Renters	Urban Centers	272	9	3.3%	20	7.4%	29	10.7%
28	Aspiring Young Families	Metro Cities	1,353	67	5.0%	109	8.1%	176	13.0%
29	Rustbelt Retirees	Suburban	315	19	6.0%	27	8.6%	46	14.6%
30	Retirement Communities	Metro Cities	237	10	4.2%	16	6.8%	26	11.0%
31	Rural Resort Dwellers	Rural	1,596	83	5.2%	119	7.5%	202	12.7%
32	Rustbelt Traditions	Urban Outskirts	468	24	5.1%	28	6.0%	52	11.1%
33	Midlife Junction	Suburban	968	44	4.5%	63	6.5%	107	11.1%
34	Family Foundations	Metro Cities	36	1	2.8%	3	8.3%	4	11.1%
35	International Marketplace	Urban Centers	81	5	6.2%	10	12.3%	15	18.5%
36	Old and Newcomers	Metro Cities	765	42	5.5%	53	6.9%	95	12.4%
37	Prairie Living	Rural	376	18	4.8%	28	7.4%	46	12.2%
38	Industrious Urban Fringe	Urban Outskirts	1,128	53	4.7%	73	6.5%	126	11.2%
39	Young and Restless	Metro Cities	330	18	5.5%	26	7.9%	44	13.3%
40	Military Proximity	Suburban	57	4	7.0%	2	3.5%	6	10.5%
41	Crossroads	Small Towns	699	42	6.0%	51	7.3%	93	13.3%
42	Southern Satellites	Rural	5	1	20.0%	0	0.0%	1	20.0%
43	The Elders	Suburban	17	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
44	Urban Melting Pot	Urban Centers	-	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
45	City Strivers	Urban Centers	14	0	0.0%	2	14.3%	2	14.3%
46	Rooted Rural	Rural	348	19	5.5%	28	8.0%	47	13.5%
47	Las Casas	Urban Centers	20	0	0.0%	2	10.0%	2	10.0%
48	Great Expectations	Urban Outskirts	437	34	7.8%	31	7.1%	65	14.9%
49	Senior Sun Seekers	Small Towns	142	6	4.2%	8	5.6%	14	9.9%
50	Heartland Communities	Small Towns	382	19	5.0%	27	7.1%	46	12.0%
51	Metro City Edge	Urban Outskirts	5	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
52	Inner City Tenants	Metro Cities	290	17	5.9%	21	7.2%	38	13.1%
53	Home Town	Suburban	250	9	3.6%	24	9.6%	33	13.2%
54	Urban Rows	Urban Centers	-	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
55	College Towns	Urban Outskirts	280	16	5.7%	21	7.5%	37	13.2%
56	Rural Bypasses	Rural	95	8	8.4%	5	5.3%	13	13.7%
57	Simple Living	Urban Outskirts	347	18	5.2%	23	6.6%	41	11.8%
58	NeWest Residents	Urban Centers	167	13	7.8%	13	7.8%	26	15.6%
59	Southwestern Families	Urban Outskirts	76	4	5.3%	4	5.3%	8	10.5%
60	City Dimensions	Metro Cities	71	4	5.6%	2	2.8%	6	8.5%
61	High Rise Renters	Urban Centers	-	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
62	Modest Income Homes	Urban Outskirts	5	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
63	Dorms to Diplomas	Metro Cities	62	3	4.8%	4	6.5%	7	11.3%
64	City Commons	Urban Centers	6	2	33.3%	0	0.0%	2	33.3%
65	Social Security Set	Urban Centers	43	3	7.0%	6	14.0%	9	20.9%
66	Unclassified		2	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
<b>TAPESTRY TOTAL</b>			<b>37,226</b>	<b>1,654</b>	<b>4.4%</b>	<b>2,602</b>	<b>7.0%</b>	<b>4,256</b>	<b>11.4%</b>

**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
12	Up and Coming Families	Suburban	3,650	138	3.8%	274	7.5%	412	11.3%
4	Boomburbs	Urban Outskirts	2,627	94	3.6%	184	7.0%	278	10.6%
6	Sophisticated Squires	Suburban	2,300	99	4.3%	153	6.7%	252	11.0%
7	Exurbanites	Suburban	2,014	85	4.2%	136	6.8%	221	11.0%
2	Suburban Splendor	Suburban	1,777	75	4.2%	109	6.1%	184	10.4%
31	Rural Resort Dwellers	Rural	1,576	83	5.3%	119	7.6%	202	12.8%
13	In Style	Suburban	1,515	69	4.6%	96	6.3%	165	10.9%
17	Green Acres	Rural	1,494	54	3.6%	114	7.6%	168	11.2%
24	Main Street, USA	Urban Outskirts	1,483	80	5.4%	113	7.6%	193	13.0%
26	Midland Crowd	Rural	1,443	60	4.2%	111	7.7%	171	11.9%
19	Milk and Cookies	Metro Cities	1,402	50	3.6%	114	8.1%	164	11.7%
28	Aspiring Young Families	Metro Cities	1,332	66	5.0%	109	8.2%	175	13.1%
18	Cozy and Comfortable	Suburban	1,155	44	3.8%	82	7.1%	126	10.9%
38	Industrious Urban Fringe	Urban Outskirts	1,086	53	4.9%	73	6.7%	126	11.6%
16	Enterprising Professionals	Metro Cities	1,023	51	5.0%	66	6.5%	117	11.4%
33	Midlife Junction	Suburban	946	44	4.7%	63	6.7%	107	11.3%
22	Metropolitans	Metro Cities	812	42	5.2%	46	5.7%	88	10.8%
36	Old and Newcomers	Metro Cities	742	42	5.7%	53	7.1%	95	12.8%
14	Prosperous Empty Nesters	Suburban	682	25	3.7%	43	6.3%	68	10.0%
41	Crossroads	Small Towns	682	42	6.2%	51	7.5%	93	13.6%
32	Rustbelt Traditions	Urban Outskirts	455	24	5.3%	28	6.2%	52	11.4%
9	Urban Chic	Metro Cities	446	15	3.4%	17	3.8%	32	7.2%
48	Great Expectations	Urban Outskirts	423	33	7.8%	31	7.3%	64	15.1%
3	Connoisseurs	Metro Cities	393	14	3.6%	24	6.1%	38	9.7%
50	Heartland Communities	Small Towns	375	19	5.1%	27	7.2%	46	12.3%
37	Prairie Living	Rural	372	18	4.8%	28	7.5%	46	12.4%
46	Rooted Rural	Rural	338	19	5.6%	27	8.0%	46	13.6%
57	Simple Living	Urban Outskirts	338	18	5.3%	23	6.8%	41	12.1%
39	Young and Restless	Metro Cities	320	18	5.6%	26	8.1%	44	13.8%
29	Rustbelt Retirees	Suburban	311	19	6.1%	27	8.7%	46	14.8%
52	Inner City Tenants	Metro Cities	281	17	6.0%	21	7.5%	38	13.5%
55	College Towns	Urban Outskirts	273	16	5.9%	21	7.7%	37	13.6%
27	Metro Renters	Urban Centers	271	9	3.3%	20	7.4%	29	10.7%
53	Home Town	Suburban	241	9	3.7%	24	10.0%	33	13.7%
30	Retirement Communities	Metro Cities	232	10	4.3%	15	6.5%	25	10.8%
10	Pleasant-ville	Metro Cities	210	11	5.2%	13	6.2%	24	11.4%
1	Top Rung	Metro Cities	192	10	5.2%	9	4.7%	19	9.9%
58	NeWest Residents	Urban Centers	164	13	7.9%	13	7.9%	26	15.9%
25	Salt of the Earth	Rural	159	5	3.1%	17	10.7%	22	13.8%
49	Senior Sun Seekers	Small Towns	140	6	4.3%	8	5.7%	14	10.0%
8	Laptops and Lattes	Urban Centers	123	4	3.3%	5	4.1%	9	7.3%
5	Wealthy Seaboard Suburbs	Metro Cities	109	2	1.8%	8	7.3%	10	9.2%
23	Trendsetters	Urban Centers	104	4	3.8%	7	6.7%	11	10.6%
56	Rural Bypasses	Rural	93	8	8.6%	5	5.4%	13	14.0%
15	Silver and Gold	Suburban	88	2	2.3%	4	4.5%	6	6.8%
35	International Marketplace	Urban Centers	80	5	6.3%	10	12.5%	15	18.8%
59	Southwestern Families	Urban Outskirts	72	4	5.6%	4	5.6%	8	11.1%
0	none		67	5	7.5%	5	7.5%	10	14.9%
60	City Dimensions	Metro Cities	64	4	6.3%	2	3.1%	6	9.4%
63	Dorms to Diplomas	Metro Cities	61	3	4.9%	4	6.6%	7	11.5%
40	Military Proximity	Suburban	57	4	7.0%	2	3.5%	6	10.5%
65	Social Security Set	Urban Centers	42	3	7.1%	6	14.3%	9	21.4%
34	Family Foundations	Metro Cities	35	1	2.9%	3	8.6%	4	11.4%
43	The Elders	Suburban	17	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	-	0.0%
47	Las Casas	Urban Centers	16	-	0.0%	2	12.5%	2	12.5%
45	City Strivers	Urban Centers	14	-	0.0%	2	14.3%	2	14.3%
64	City Commons	Urban Centers	6	2	33.3%	-	0.0%	2	33.3%
51	Metro City Edge	Urban Outskirts	5	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	-	0.0%
62	Modest Income Homes	Urban Outskirts	5	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	-	0.0%
42	Southern Satellites	Rural	4	1	25.0%	-	0.0%	1	25.0%
66	Unclassified		1	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	-	0.0%
	<b>TAPESTRY TOTAL</b>		<b>36,738</b>	<b>1,651</b>	<b>4.5%</b>	<b>2,597</b>	<b>7.1%</b>	<b>4,248</b>	<b>11.6%</b>

**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
64	City Commons	Urban Centers	6	2	33.3%	-	0.0%	2	33.3%
42	Southern Satellites	Rural	4	1	25.0%	-	0.0%	1	25.0%
65	Social Security Set	Urban Centers	42	3	7.1%	6	14.3%	9	21.4%
35	International Marketplace	Urban Centers	80	5	6.3%	10	12.5%	15	18.8%
58	NeWest Residents	Urban Centers	164	13	7.9%	13	7.9%	26	15.9%
48	Great Expectations	Urban Outskirts	423	33	7.8%	31	7.3%	64	15.1%
0	none		67	5	7.5%	5	7.5%	10	14.9%
29	Rustbelt Retirees	Suburban	311	19	6.1%	27	8.7%	46	14.8%
45	City Strivers	Urban Centers	14	-	0.0%	2	14.3%	2	14.3%
56	Rural Bypasses	Rural	93	8	8.6%	5	5.4%	13	14.0%
25	Salt of the Earth	Rural	159	5	3.1%	17	10.7%	22	13.8%
39	Young and Restless	Metro Cities	320	18	5.6%	26	8.1%	44	13.8%
53	Home Town	Suburban	241	9	3.7%	24	10.0%	33	13.7%
41	Crossroads	Small Towns	682	42	6.2%	51	7.5%	93	13.6%
46	Rooted Rural	Rural	338	19	5.6%	27	8.0%	46	13.6%
55	College Towns	Urban Outskirts	273	16	5.9%	21	7.7%	37	13.6%
52	Inner City Tenants	Metro Cities	281	17	6.0%	21	7.5%	38	13.5%
28	Aspiring Young Families	Metro Cities	1,332	66	5.0%	109	8.2%	175	13.1%
24	Main Street, USA	Urban Outskirts	1,483	80	5.4%	113	7.6%	193	13.0%
31	Rural Resort Dwellers	Rural	1,576	83	5.3%	119	7.6%	202	12.8%
36	Old and Newcomers	Metro Cities	742	42	5.7%	53	7.1%	95	12.8%
47	Las Casas	Urban Centers	16	-	0.0%	2	12.5%	2	12.5%
37	Prairie Living	Rural	372	18	4.8%	28	7.5%	46	12.4%
50	Heartland Communities	Small Towns	375	19	5.1%	27	7.2%	46	12.3%
57	Simple Living	Urban Outskirts	338	18	5.3%	23	6.8%	41	12.1%
26	Midland Crowd	Rural	1,443	60	4.2%	111	7.7%	171	11.9%
19	Milk and Cookies	Metro Cities	1,402	50	3.6%	114	8.1%	164	11.7%
38	Industrious Urban Fringe	Urban Outskirts	1,086	53	4.9%	73	6.7%	126	11.6%
63	Dorms to Diplomas	Metro Cities	61	3	4.9%	4	6.6%	7	11.5%
16	Enterprising Professionals	Metro Cities	1,023	51	5.0%	66	6.5%	117	11.4%
32	Rustbelt Traditions	Urban Outskirts	455	24	5.3%	28	6.2%	52	11.4%
10	Pleasant-ville	Metro Cities	210	11	5.2%	13	6.2%	24	11.4%
34	Family Foundations	Metro Cities	35	1	2.9%	3	8.6%	4	11.4%
33	Midlife Junction	Suburban	946	44	4.7%	63	6.7%	107	11.3%
12	Up and Coming Families	Suburban	3,650	138	3.8%	274	7.5%	412	11.3%
17	Green Acres	Rural	1,494	54	3.6%	114	7.6%	168	11.2%
59	Southwestern Families	Urban Outskirts	72	4	5.6%	4	5.6%	8	11.1%
7	Exurbanites	Suburban	2,014	85	4.2%	136	6.8%	221	11.0%
6	Sophisticated Squires	Suburban	2,300	99	4.3%	153	6.7%	252	11.0%
18	Cozy and Comfortable	Suburban	1,155	44	3.8%	82	7.1%	126	10.9%
13	In Style	Suburban	1,515	69	4.6%	96	6.3%	165	10.9%
22	Metropolitans	Metro Cities	812	42	5.2%	46	5.7%	88	10.8%
30	Retirement Communities	Metro Cities	232	10	4.3%	15	6.5%	25	10.8%
27	Metro Renters	Urban Centers	271	9	3.3%	20	7.4%	29	10.7%
4	Boomburbs	Urban Outskirts	2,627	94	3.6%	184	7.0%	278	10.6%
23	Trendsetters	Urban Centers	104	4	3.8%	7	6.7%	11	10.6%
40	Military Proximity	Suburban	57	4	7.0%	2	3.5%	6	10.5%
2	Suburban Splendor	Suburban	1,777	75	4.2%	109	6.1%	184	10.4%
49	Senior Sun Seekers	Small Towns	140	6	4.3%	8	5.7%	14	10.0%
14	Prosperous Empty Nesters	Suburban	682	25	3.7%	43	6.3%	68	10.0%
1	Top Rung	Metro Cities	192	10	5.2%	9	4.7%	19	9.9%
3	Connoisseurs	Metro Cities	393	14	3.6%	24	6.1%	38	9.7%
60	City Dimensions	Metro Cities	64	4	6.3%	2	3.1%	6	9.4%
5	Wealthy Seaboard Suburbs	Metro Cities	109	2	1.8%	8	7.3%	10	9.2%
8	Laptops and Lattes	Urban Centers	123	4	3.3%	5	4.1%	9	7.3%
9	Urban Chic	Metro Cities	446	15	3.4%	17	3.8%	32	7.2%
15	Silver and Gold	Suburban	88	2	2.3%	4	4.5%	6	6.8%
43	The Elders	Suburban	17	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	-	0.0%
51	Metro City Edge	Urban Outskirts	5	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	-	0.0%
62	Modest Income Homes	Urban Outskirts	5	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	-	0.0%
66	Unclassified		1	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	-	0.0%
	<b>TAPESTRY TOTAL</b>		<b>36,738</b>	<b>1,651</b>	<b>4.5%</b>	<b>2,597</b>	<b>7.1%</b>	<b>4,248</b>	<b>11.6%</b>

**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
42	Southern Satellites	Rural	4	1	25.0%	-	0.0%	1	25.0%
56	Rural Bypasses	Rural	93	8	8.6%	5	5.4%	13	14.0%
25	Salt of the Earth	Rural	159	5	3.1%	17	10.7%	22	13.8%
53	Home Town	Suburban	241	9	3.7%	24	10.0%	33	13.7%
41	Crossroads	Small Towns	682	42	6.2%	51	7.5%	93	13.6%
46	Rooted Rural	Rural	338	19	5.6%	27	8.0%	46	13.6%
28	Aspiring Young Families	Metro Cities	1,332	66	5.0%	109	8.2%	175	13.1%
31	Rural Resort Dwellers	Rural	1,576	83	5.3%	119	7.6%	202	12.8%
37	Prairie Living	Rural	372	18	4.8%	28	7.5%	46	12.4%
50	Heartland Communities	Small Towns	375	19	5.1%	27	7.2%	46	12.3%
57	Simple Living	Urban Outskirts	338	18	5.3%	23	6.8%	41	12.1%
26	Midland Crowd	Rural	1,443	60	4.2%	111	7.7%	171	11.9%
32	Rustbelt Traditions	Urban Outskirts	455	24	5.3%	28	6.2%	52	11.4%
17	Green Acres	Rural	1,494	54	3.6%	114	7.6%	168	11.2%
49	Senior Sun Seekers	Small Towns	140	6	4.3%	8	5.7%	14	10.0%
15	Silver and Gold	Suburban	88	2	2.3%	4	4.5%	6	6.8%
43	The Elders	Suburban	17	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	-	0.0%
<i>Sub-total:</i>			9,147	434	4.7%	695	7.6%	1,129	12.3%
64	City Commons	Urban Centers	6	2	33.3%	-	0.0%	2	33.3%
65	Social Security Set	Urban Centers	42	3	7.1%	6	14.3%	9	21.4%
35	International Marketplace	Urban Centers	80	5	6.3%	10	12.5%	15	18.8%
58	NeWest Residents	Urban Centers	164	13	7.9%	13	7.9%	26	15.9%
48	Great Expectations	Urban Outskirts	423	33	7.8%	31	7.3%	64	15.1%
0	none		67	5	7.5%	5	7.5%	10	14.9%
29	Rustbelt Retirees	Suburban	311	19	6.1%	27	8.7%	46	14.8%
45	City Strivers	Urban Centers	14	-	0.0%	2	14.3%	2	14.3%
39	Young and Restless	Metro Cities	320	18	5.6%	26	8.1%	44	13.8%
55	College Towns	Urban Outskirts	273	16	5.9%	21	7.7%	37	13.6%
52	Inner City Tenants	Metro Cities	281	17	6.0%	21	7.5%	38	13.5%
24	Main Street. USA	Urban Outskirts	1,483	80	5.4%	113	7.6%	193	13.0%
36	Old and Newcomers	Metro Cities	742	42	5.7%	53	7.1%	95	12.8%
47	Las Casas	Urban Centers	16	-	0.0%	2	12.5%	2	12.5%
19	Milk and Cookies	Metro Cities	1,402	50	3.6%	114	8.1%	164	11.7%
38	Industrious Urban Fringe	Urban Outskirts	1,086	53	4.9%	73	6.7%	126	11.6%
63	Dorms to Diplomas	Metro Cities	61	3	4.9%	4	6.6%	7	11.5%
16	Enterprising Professionals	Metro Cities	1,023	51	5.0%	66	6.5%	117	11.4%
10	Pleasant-ville	Metro Cities	210	11	5.2%	13	6.2%	24	11.4%
34	Family Foundations	Metro Cities	35	1	2.9%	3	8.6%	4	11.4%
33	Midlife Junction	Suburban	946	44	4.7%	63	6.7%	107	11.3%
12	Up and Coming Families	Suburban	3,650	138	3.8%	274	7.5%	412	11.3%
59	Southwestern Families	Urban Outskirts	72	4	5.6%	4	5.6%	8	11.1%
7	Exurbanites	Suburban	2,014	85	4.2%	136	6.8%	221	11.0%
6	Sophisticated Squires	Suburban	2,300	99	4.3%	153	6.7%	252	11.0%
18	Cozy and Comfortable	Suburban	1,155	44	3.8%	82	7.1%	126	10.9%
13	In Style	Suburban	1,515	69	4.6%	96	6.3%	165	10.9%
22	Metropolitans	Metro Cities	812	42	5.2%	46	5.7%	88	10.8%
30	Retirement Communities	Metro Cities	232	10	4.3%	15	6.5%	25	10.8%
27	Metro Renters	Urban Centers	271	9	3.3%	20	7.4%	29	10.7%
4	Boomburbs	Urban Outskirts	2,627	94	3.6%	184	7.0%	278	10.6%
23	Trendsetters	Urban Centers	104	4	3.8%	7	6.7%	11	10.6%
40	Military Proximity	Suburban	57	4	7.0%	2	3.5%	6	10.5%
2	Suburban Splendor	Suburban	1,777	75	4.2%	109	6.1%	184	10.4%
14	Prosperous Empty Nesters	Suburban	682	25	3.7%	43	6.3%	68	10.0%
1	Top Rung	Metro Cities	192	10	5.2%	9	4.7%	19	9.9%
3	Connoisseurs	Metro Cities	393	14	3.6%	24	6.1%	38	9.7%
60	City Dimensions	Metro Cities	64	4	6.3%	2	3.1%	6	9.4%
5	Wealthy Seaboard Suburbs	Metro Cities	109	2	1.8%	8	7.3%	10	9.2%
8	Laptops and Lattes	Urban Centers	123	4	3.3%	5	4.1%	9	7.3%
9	Urban Chic	Metro Cities	446	15	3.4%	17	3.8%	32	7.2%
51	Metro City Edge	Urban Outskirts	5	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	-	0.0%
62	Modest Income Homes	Urban Outskirts	5	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	-	0.0%
66	Unclassified		1	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	-	0.0%
<i>Sub-total:</i>			27,929	1219	4.4%	1,905	6.8%	3,124	11.2%

**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
39	Young and Restless	Metro Cities	320	18	5.6%	26	8.1%	44	13.8%
52	Inner City Tenants	Metro Cities	281	17	6.0%	21	7.5%	38	13.5%
28	Aspiring Young Families	Metro Cities	1,332	66	5.0%	109	8.2%	175	13.1%
36	Old and Newcomers	Metro Cities	742	42	5.7%	53	7.1%	95	12.8%
19	Milk and Cookies	Metro Cities	1,402	50	3.6%	114	8.1%	164	11.7%
63	Dorms to Diplomas	Metro Cities	61	3	4.9%	4	6.6%	7	11.5%
16	Enterprising Professionals	Metro Cities	1,023	51	5.0%	66	6.5%	117	11.4%
10	Pleasant-ville	Metro Cities	210	11	5.2%	13	6.2%	24	11.4%
34	Family Foundations	Metro Cities	35	1	2.9%	3	8.6%	4	11.4%
22	Metropolitans	Metro Cities	812	42	5.2%	46	5.7%	88	10.8%
30	Retirement Communities	Metro Cities	232	10	4.3%	15	6.5%	25	10.8%
1	Top Runq	Metro Cities	192	10	5.2%	9	4.7%	19	9.9%
3	Connoisseurs	Metro Cities	393	14	3.6%	24	6.1%	38	9.7%
60	City Dimensions	Metro Cities	64	4	6.3%	2	3.1%	6	9.4%
5	Wealthy Seaboard Suburbs	Metro Cities	109	2	1.8%	8	7.3%	10	9.2%
9	Urban Chic	Metro Cities	446	15	3.4%	17	3.8%	32	7.2%
	<i>Metro Cities</i>		<b>7,654</b>	<b>356</b>	<b>4.7%</b>	<b>530</b>	<b>6.9%</b>	<b>886</b>	<b>11.6%</b>
42	Southern Satellites	Rural	4	1	25.0%	-	0.0%	1	25.0%
56	Rural Bypasses	Rural	93	8	8.6%	5	5.4%	13	14.0%
25	Salt of the Earth	Rural	159	5	3.1%	17	10.7%	22	13.8%
46	Rooted Rural	Rural	338	19	5.6%	27	8.0%	46	13.6%
31	Rural Resort Dwellers	Rural	1,576	83	5.3%	119	7.6%	202	12.8%
37	Prairie Living	Rural	372	18	4.8%	28	7.5%	46	12.4%
26	Midland Crowd	Rural	1,443	60	4.2%	111	7.7%	171	11.9%
17	Green Acres	Rural	1,494	54	3.6%	114	7.6%	168	11.2%
	<i>Rural</i>		<b>5,479</b>	<b>248</b>	<b>4.5%</b>	<b>421</b>	<b>7.7%</b>	<b>669</b>	<b>12.2%</b>
41	Crossroads	Small Towns	682	42	6.2%	51	7.5%	93	13.6%
50	Heartland Communities	Small Towns	375	19	5.1%	27	7.2%	46	12.3%
49	Senior Sun Seekers	Small Towns	140	6	4.3%	8	5.7%	14	10.0%
	<i>Small Towns</i>		<b>1,197</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>5.6%</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>7.2%</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>12.8%</b>
29	Rustbelt Retirees	Suburban	311	19	6.1%	27	8.7%	46	14.8%
53	Home Town	Suburban	241	9	3.7%	24	10.0%	33	13.7%
33	Midlife Junction	Suburban	946	44	4.7%	63	6.7%	107	11.3%
12	Up and Coming Families	Suburban	3,650	138	3.8%	274	7.5%	412	11.3%
7	Exurbanites	Suburban	2,014	85	4.2%	136	6.8%	221	11.0%
6	Sophisticated Squires	Suburban	2,300	99	4.3%	153	6.7%	252	11.0%
18	Cozy and Comfortable	Suburban	1,155	44	3.8%	82	7.1%	126	10.9%
13	In Style	Suburban	1,515	69	4.6%	96	6.3%	165	10.9%
40	Military Proximity	Suburban	57	4	7.0%	2	3.5%	6	10.5%
2	Suburban Splendor	Suburban	1,777	75	4.2%	109	6.1%	184	10.4%
14	Prosperous Empty Nesters	Suburban	682	25	3.7%	43	6.3%	68	10.0%
15	Silver and Gold	Suburban	88	2	2.3%	4	4.5%	6	6.8%
43	The Elders	Suburban	17	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	-	0.0%
	<i>Suburban</i>		<b>14,753</b>	<b>613</b>	<b>4.2%</b>	<b>1,013</b>	<b>6.9%</b>	<b>1,626</b>	<b>11.0%</b>
	<b>TAPESTRY TOTAL</b>		<b>36,738</b>	<b>1,651</b>	<b>4.5%</b>	<b>2,597</b>	<b>7.1%</b>	<b>4,248</b>	<b>11.6%</b>

**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
64	City Commons	Urban Centers	6	2	33.3%	-	0.0%	2	33.3%
65	Social Security Set	Urban Centers	42	3	7.1%	6	14.3%	9	21.4%
35	International Marketplace	Urban Centers	80	5	6.3%	10	12.5%	15	18.8%
58	NeWest Residents	Urban Centers	164	13	7.9%	13	7.9%	26	15.9%
45	City Strivers	Urban Centers	14	-	0.0%	2	14.3%	2	14.3%
47	Las Casas	Urban Centers	16	-	0.0%	2	12.5%	2	12.5%
27	Metro Renters	Urban Centers	271	9	3.3%	20	7.4%	29	10.7%
23	Trendsetters	Urban Centers	104	4	3.8%	7	6.7%	11	10.6%
8	Laptops and Lattes	Urban Centers	123	4	3.3%	5	4.1%	9	7.3%
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%
44	Urban Melting Pot	Urban Centers	-	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	-	0.0%
54	Urban Rows	Urban Centers	-	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	-	0.0%
61	High Rise Renters	Urban Centers	-	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	-	0.0%
	<i>Urban Centers</i>		820	40	4.9%	65	7.9%	105	12.8%
48	Great Expectations	Urban Outskirts	423	33	7.8%	31	7.3%	64	15.1%
55	College Towns	Urban Outskirts	273	16	5.9%	21	7.7%	37	13.6%
24	Main Street, USA	Urban Outskirts	1,483	80	5.4%	113	7.6%	193	13.0%
57	Simple Living	Urban Outskirts	338	18	5.3%	23	6.8%	41	12.1%
38	Industrious Urban Fringe	Urban Outskirts	1,086	53	4.9%	73	6.7%	126	11.6%
32	Rustbelt Traditions	Urban Outskirts	455	24	5.3%	28	6.2%	52	11.4%
59	Southwestern Families	Urban Outskirts	72	4	5.6%	4	5.6%	8	11.1%
4	Boomburbs	Urban Outskirts	2,627	94	3.6%	184	7.0%	278	10.6%
51	Metro City Edge	Urban Outskirts	5	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	-	0.0%
62	Modest Income Homes	Urban Outskirts	5	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	-	0.0%
	<i>Urban Outskirts</i>		6,767	322	4.8%	477	7.0%	799	11.8%
0	none		67	5	7.5%	5	7.5%	10	14.9%
66	Unclassified		1	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	-	0.0%
	<i>Small Town - Rural</i>		6,676	315	4.7%	507	7.6%	822	12.3%
	<i>Urban - Suburban</i>		29,994	1,331	4.4%	2,085	7.0%	3,416	11.4%
	<b>TAPESTRY TOTAL</b>		<b>36,738</b>	<b>1,651</b>	<b>4.5%</b>	<b>2,597</b>	<b>7.1%</b>	<b>4,248</b>	<b>11.6%</b>

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

**Prepared by Southwick Associates for the State of Colorado and the Recreational Boating  
and Fishing Foundation**

March 11, 2008

Years Analyzed: License years 2004-2007, with any angler not buying a license for 2007 being defined as lapsed.

Number of Licenses Sold by Year: On the last page of this report, the annual number of customers (not licenses sold) for each type of license is listed. Do the results look accurate? If not, this could indicate a data problem that must be addressed to ensure a quality mailing effort.

Definitions of Tiers - Tiers will be used to help prioritize which lapsed anglers are included in your mailing, based on the degree to which they have lapsed:

Lapse Tier	Years in which a license was purchased:			
	2004	2005	2006	2007
1	x	x	x	
2		x	x	
3	x		x	
4			x	

Recommendations – Based on the analysis of your database (a copy of the analysis is attached in EXCEL), 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 8,374 anglers, or 24% of all Tier 1 lapsed anglers. These segments are listed here and are ranked based on which ones have a greater percentage of lapsed anglers in Tier 1 compared to all lapsed anglers combined:

Tapestry Code	Tapestry Name	Urban/Rural	#
49	Senior Sun Seekers	Small Towns	160
25	Salt of the Earth	Rural	199
56	Rural Bypasses	Rural	96
26	Midland Crowd	Rural	1645
15	Silver and Gold	Suburban	98
53	Home Town	Suburban	239
31	Rural Resort Dwellers	Rural	1929
37	Prairie Living	Rural	657

50	Heartland Communities	Small Towns	388
46	Rooted Rural	Rural	416
17	Green Acres	Rural	1440
32	Rustbelt Traditions	Urban Outskirts	419
41	Crossroads	Small Towns	688

These segments are mostly rural and small town, and from below-average income segments for the most part. However, roughly 80% of Colorado’s lapsed anglers come from more urbanized areas, especially suburban neighborhoods. We recommend adding some lapsed anglers from additional suburban and metro segments to more accurately reflect this. We also recommend adding some from higher-income segments to help determine which type of person responds best in order to improve future marketing efforts. Colorado could consider adding Tier 1 lapsed anglers from these segments, especially from the Up and Coming Families segment which makes up 9% of all Colorado lapsed anglers and has a greater rate of lapsing compared to the average angler (see the table in cells H84 – M153 on the ‘Tapestry Segments’ page of the accompanying EXCEL file):

Tapestry Code	Tapestry Name	Urban/Rural	#
12	Up and Coming Families	Suburban	3163
4	Boomburbs	Urban Outskirts	1962
33	Midlife Junction	Suburban	958
18	Cozy and Comfortable	Suburban	972
24	Main Street, USA	Urban Outskirts	1296
19	Milk and Cookies	Metro Cities	1219
7	Exurbanites	Suburban	1671
28	Aspiring Young Families	Metro Cities	1289
13	In Style	Suburban	1450
6	Sophisticated Squires	Suburban	1809

Adding these 10 tapestries to the 13 above would bring the total number of anglers in the mailing list to 24,163 or 70% 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.

Including all Tier 1 anglers will increase to 34,562 the number mailed to. However, anglers from the lower-ranked segments may not respond as well and could reduce the overall response rate.

In addition, recognizing that anglers from lower tiers may be intermittent anglers who would otherwise fish if given a slight push, Colorado could test this by including some of these anglers in your mailing. We recommend maybe 500 anglers in your mailing are from Tier 2 segments. We recommend drawing any lower tier anglers from the same segments listed above. In addition, Colorado may want to include the following segments in any Tier 2 mailing:

- Suburban Splendor (code 2), suburban and above average income
- Enterprising professionals (code 16), metro cities and above average income.

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.

License Code	License Name	2004		2005		2006		2007	
		#	% Customers	#	% Customers	#	% Customers	#	% Customers
9	SR LIFETIME LOW-INCOME FISHING	963	0.2%	904	0.2%	550	0.1%	467	0.1%
11	RES COMBO ANNUAL	77,448	17.9%	78,879	17.8%	75,351	17.1%	75,923	16.8%
12	RES FISHING ANNUAL	295,841	68.4%	303,359	68.4%	301,568	68.3%	311,709	68.8%
40	FISHING-ONE DAY	58,283	13.5%	60,151	13.6%	63,978	14.5%	64,982	14.3%
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>432,535</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>443,293</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>441,447</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>453,081</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

## Appendix C: State Radio and Online Advertising Details

### Colorado Radio Advertising List

Station	Market	Format
KVLE-AM	VAIL/ASPEN/EAGLE	TALK
KVLE-FM	GUNNISON/CRESTED BUTTE/LAKE CITY	N/T
KKKK-AM	COLORADO SPRINGS/PUEBLO	TALK
KSKE-AM	BUENA VISTA/SALIDA	TALK
KRCN-AM	DENVER/BOULDER/LONGMONT	TALK

### Colorado Online Advertising List

Market	URL
Denver	<a href="http://www.9news.com">http://www.9news.com</a>
Denver	<a href="http://TheDenverChannel.com">TheDenverChannel.com</a>
Ft. Collins	<a href="http://www.coloradoan.com">http://www.coloradoan.com</a>