



PACIFIC STATES MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION
205 SE Spokane Street, SUITE 100, Portland, OREGON 97202
PHONE (503) 595-3100 FAX (503) 595-3232

**Sample Recruitment for a Push-to-Web Alaska Saltwater Sport Fishing Survey
RFP Q&A
2/14/2025**

Question 1: Please confirm that the Terms and General Provisions, as identified on the Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission's procurement page, can be negotiated.

Some of the Terms and Conditions may be negotiable, however, the funding being used to for this project comes from the Federal government, which has it's own non-negotiable terms and conditions that will be passed down as part of the subcontract for this work.

Question 2: Please confirm that the Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission is anticipating a Fixed Firm Price award.

The award may be either a firm fixed price or a cost reimbursement up to a maximum of available funding for this work.

Question 3: Please confirm that proposal submissions can be submitted as one volume.

Yes, proposals may be submitted in one volume.

Question 4: Please confirm that a separate price file is not required as part of the proposal submission.

The proposal doesn't need to include a separate price file. The may be included in the main proposal document.

Question 5: Please confirm that the Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission is amenable to an equal monthly installment payment structure.

Yes, PSMFC would be amenable to a monthly installment payment structure as long as monthly bills are provided that include a detailed description of the services being provided for the month.

Question 6: We are considering submitting two proposals. Our intention is to provide one proposal that directly corresponds to the RFP requirements and another that proposes an alternative design. Could you please advise if submitting two proposals is permissible?

Yes, submitting two alternate proposals is allowed.

Question 7: The RFP notes a general timeline for the survey task of October 2025 – June 2026. Within that general timeframe, does PSMFC have a specific requirement for final data delivery?

We anticipate that final data delivery occurs no later than the end of June 2026 and no later than four weeks after the completion of the telephone contact, as per the RFP (page 7).

Question 8: The RFP mentions a pre-incentive of \$1-\$2. For prior rounds of the study, were there also incentive provided to those who completed the survey? If so, what was that incentive amount?

In past iterations of the survey, a \$1 pre-incentive was approved by OMB and provided to respondents in the initial mailing letter.

Question 9: Could you please confirm the desired initial sample size for budgeting purposes? The RFP mentions both 6,000/7,000 and 6,250/7,250. Additionally, should the effective sample size calculations account for a 10% mortality rate before applying the response rate, or should it be calculated differently?

Yes, we are interested in understanding the budgets for overall sample size targets of both 6,000 and 7,000 for the full administration, with an additional 250 for the small formal pretest in both cases (for a total of 6,250 and 7,250). So long as it is clear which is being used in the response rate calculation, either the effective sample size (after accounting for invalid names and/or addresses) or the original sample size can be used.

Question 10: For the five angler groups, could you provide insights into the size distribution of each group? Understanding whether sampling will be proportional to group size will assist us in ensuring we propose methods that target accurate subgroup analyses.

Each year, there are approximately 250,000 charter anglers in the charter logbook database. A large majority of charter anglers are non-residents (angler group 1). A much smaller proportion of charter anglers are Alaska residents (angler group 2). The other angler group populations (3-5) are more difficult to provide insights about their size given AFSC will be identifying them with ADF&G's help to cross reference the ADF&G license database with the charter logbook database. However, to give you a sense of scale, in 2024 there were about 150,000 resident and 352,000 non-resident fishing licenses sold. We anticipate most of the resident licenses were used for non-charter fishing (angler groups 3 and 4). Based on estimates from previous surveys, we would expect less than half of the non-resident fishing license holders to be non-charter anglers (angler group 5). The most data-intensive model-based analysis is expected to be done on angler groups 1 and 2, but data from the other groups will also need to be large to facilitate model-based analysis and statistical power of comparisons across groups. In any event, suggestions on sample sizes for each group are welcome.

Question 11: To conduct a meaningful non-response bias check, it would be helpful to know which comparison variables are available in the master angler lists. Could you specify what information (e.g., gender, age) is accessible and whether it will be provided for this purpose?

The expected variables in the angler lists include first name, last name, street address, city, state, zip code, phone number, email address, Alaska resident (yes/no), year (of license), and possibly license type. Age and gender are not expected to be available variables.

Question 12: Could you please clarify if fully burdened labor rates and other direct cost and expense information details will suffice for purposes of the cost proposal breakdown requirements, if bidders do not customarily disclose salary and other sensitive information in proposals?

Fully loaded rates are acceptable in the cost breakdown.

Question 13: What response rate should be assumed for bidding purposes?

We anticipate bids to propose steps to be taken in the survey administration that maximize response based on survey best practices and experience. We didn't set a required or anticipated minimum response rate to the survey due to it being a new approach for the survey. Past primarily mail-based iterations of the survey achieved response rates in the 48-57% range as outlined in the RFP. We don't have specific guidance on what response rate at each stage of the administration should be assumed but encourage the bidders to be clear about the response rate assumptions being made and provide justification for those assumptions to the best of their abilities.

Question 14: Which incentive is more likely to be used? \$1 or \$2?

In the past a \$1 incentive has been approved for use by OMB. Thus, \$1 is the amount that stands the highest chance of being approved if any pre-incentive is approved at all. If an argument can be made for why a \$2 amount would enhance response rates and be cost efficient, then AFSC is open to proposing that amount to OMB.