

Introduction to Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Online Course

Whether you are new to the field of conservation or have dedicated your entire career to this cause ... whether you are an employee of a state or Federal agency, or work in the private sector ... your mastery of wildlife conservation should include a thorough understanding of America's Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Program.

It's the most successful conservation program in history. It's pumped more than \$14 billion into fish and wildlife management, restoration of species, research and monitoring, education, and public access.

It's the envy of the world and it exists because some far-sighted leaders 75 years ago joined with conservationists and private industry to create the means by which hunters and anglers pay to sustain wildlife populations and their sports.

This introduction to America's wildlife and sport fish restoration programs will give you an overview of how this unique partnership among states, industry, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has worked successfully since 1937.

Whether you are a field-based fish and wildlife employee who carries out the work on the ground ... a project manager who conceives programs and seeks the funds to support them ... or an administrative specialist who reviews the progress and oversees the expenses ... a thorough understanding of these grant programs is essential.

And that's what this online course will provide – a brief overview of the history, intent, and actual operation of two programs commonly known as the “Pittman-Robertson” and “Dingell-Johnson” wildlife and sport fish restoration programs.

At the end of each topic, you will have an opportunity to review what you've learned at a glance. Let's get started by reviewing the key points in this introduction.

- WSFR is the most successful conservation program in the history of the United States.
- Hunters and anglers pay to sustain wildlife populations and their sports.
- Unique partnership among states, industry, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has worked successfully since 1937.

There was a reason for the passage of this historic conservation legislation. The landscape of North America had been unalterably changed by European settlement. Destruction of habitat and unregulated hunting had led to the decline of game animals.

By the late 1800s, concerned hunters, anglers, and conservation pioneers like Theodore Roosevelt recognized the need for regulations that would halt or diminish this unchecked decline. Many state fish and wildlife agencies were established during this era.

America's first conservation efforts emphasized harvest restrictions and law enforcement. As the science of wildlife biology emerged, better management practices were introduced. But despite these advances, wildlife continued its decline. Record population lows were reached in the "Dust Bowl" era of the 1930s. Money from the sale of state hunting and fishing licenses just wasn't meeting the need for a national wildlife conservation effort.

In that era, sportsmen and conservation leaders also were influential in business and industry, politics, and science. They quickly realized that only a stable source of funds could sustain a national wildlife conservation program.

Predecessors of many of today's national non-profit conservation groups – the National Wildlife Federation, the National Audubon Society, the Izaak Walton League, and the Wildlife Management Institute – added their support to securing stable funding for wildlife conservation.

- Destruction of habitat and unregulated hunting had led to the decline of game animals.
- In spite of conservation advances in the form of wildlife laws and the emerging science of wildlife biology, wildlife populations continued to decline.
- Revenue from the sale of state hunting and fishing licenses was insufficient to meet the need for a national wildlife conservation effort.
- Sportsmen, conservationists, industry leaders and politicians, joined forces to secure stable funding for wildlife conservation.

The idea of an excise tax on sporting arms and ammunition emerged. The Sporting Arms and Manufacturing Institute added its support, recognizing that sport hunting couldn't continue without huntable populations of game species.

Carl Shoemaker, former Oregon Fish and Game Commission Director, conceived legislation to create a ten percent manufacturer's excise tax on sporting arms and ammunition "for allocation to the states based on an equitable formula."

Senator Key Pittman of Nevada and Representative Willis Robertson of Virginia sponsored the bill in the U.S. Congress ... but not before Robertson added 29 important words to the bill. Now known as the "diversion clause," Robertson's language required the states to agree that their hunting license revenue could not be diverted to other, alternative uses.

That specified, the "Pittman-Robertson" legislation passed both houses of Congress with little opposition.

What emerged in this wildlife restoration act was a classic "user pay/user benefit" concept overseen by an unprecedented partnership among business and the state and Federal levels of government.

An excise tax on guns and ammunition, reflected in the retail purchase price paid by the consumer, is remitted by the manufacturers for wildlife conservation programs distributed and monitored by the Federal Government and managed by the states. Users pay more for their sporting gear ... but benefit from the increased hunting opportunities created by the funds raised by these excise taxes.

A formula ensures equity in the distribution of money to the states and territories. It's based on 50 percent of the square mileage of a state's land and inland waters, in proportion to other states, and 50 percent on the number of licenses sold yearly in that state, also in proportion to the licenses sales of other states.

No state receives more than five percent, nor less than one percent, of the total funds. The territories receive smaller amounts.

Click your mouse on the map to reveal the formula.

Wild birds and mammals are eligible for wildlife restoration funding and are the focus of these dollars for restoration and conservation. Other activities – law enforcement, public relations, revenue-producing activities – don't qualify for funding.

In 1970, the Pittman-Robertson Act was amended to add receipts from handgun sales to the excise tax roll. In 1972, it was amended again to add most archery equipment and components. With these new expansions, hunter education, firearm safety, bow hunter education safety, and shooting ranges all became eligible for funding for the first time.

- Legislation was conceived to create a ten percent manufacturer's excise tax on sporting arms and ammunition.
- A classic "user pay/user benefit" concept was developed.
- An excise tax on guns and ammunition, reflected in the retail purchase price paid by the consumer, is remitted by manufacturers for wildlife conservation programs.
- A formula based 50 percent of the square mileage of a state's land and inland waters in proportion to other states and 50 percent on the number of licenses sold yearly in that state ensures equity in the distribution of funds.
- Law enforcement, public relations, and revenue-producing activities don't qualify for funding.
- The Pittman-Robertson Act was amended to add receipts from handgun and archery equipment sales to the excise tax.
- With new revenue sources, hunter education, firearm safety, bow hunter education safety, and shooting ranges all became eligible for funding.

This chart shows the proportion of sporting equipment covered by the wildlife restoration excise tax.

Manufacturer's Excise Taxes
collected annually for wildlife restoration

- 36% Firearms**
- 31% Pistols**
- 22% Ammo**
- 11% Archery**

While the average customer in a sporting goods store may not realize it, the purchase of any of these items channels vital money into conservation programs in the user's own backyard. It's a quiet, yet effective, national conservation success story that's worked well for 75 years.

Taxes are collected by the U.S. Treasury Department's Internal Revenue Service and Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau and by the Homeland Security Department's U.S. Customs and Border Protection. Funds are deposited into the Wildlife Restoration Trust Fund Account and then apportioned to the states. Once state projects are reviewed and approved by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, funds are obligated for wildlife restoration and basic and enhanced hunter education programs.

- 11% tax firearms and ammunition
- 10% tax pistols, handguns, and revolvers
- 11% tax bows, quivers, broadheads, points, and 45 cents per shaft
- Interest from the Trust Fund

Arrow points downward to
Wildlife Restoration Trust Fund

Arrow points downward to areas benefitting from taxes:

Multi-state conservation \$3 million

Wildlife Restoration Administration costs for USFWS fixed at approximately 2% and adjusted annually according to the Consumer Price Index

Migratory birds (interest & reverted funds)

States – Wildlife restoration 77.8%

Basic hunter education

Enhanced hunter education \$8 million

- Funds are deposited into the Wildlife Restoration Trust Fund Account and then apportioned to the states.
- State grant project applications are reviewed and approved by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

The success of the Pittman-Robertson wildlife restoration program through the 1930s and 1940s encouraged companion legislation for sport fish.

Modeled after the Wildlife Restoration Act, the Sport Fish Restoration Act was passed in 1950. It provided grant funds to the states, District of Columbia, and territories from a similar excise tax on fishing tackle. The legislation was sponsored by Senator Edwin Johnson of Colorado and Representative John Dingell, Sr. of Michigan.

The distribution formula for sport fish funds differs slightly from the wildlife restoration grant program. It places more emphasis on the number of fishing licenses sold. The formula is based 40 percent on a state's size in square miles, including land and both inland and coastal waters, in proportion to other states, and 60 percent on annual license sales, also in proportion to license sales in other states.

The same five percent cap and one percent minimum on funds going to any state also apply, and the territories receive smaller amounts.

- Modeled after the Wildlife Restoration Act, the Sport Fish Restoration Act was passed in 1950.
- The Sport fish restoration legislation was sponsored by Senator Edwin Johnson of Colorado and Representative John Dingell, Sr. of Michigan.
- The distribution formula for sport fish funds is based 40 percent on a state's size in square miles, including land and both inland and coastal waters, in proportion to other states, and 60 percent on annual license sales, also in proportion to license sales in other states.

In 1984, the Sport Fish Restoration Act expanded. The so-called "Wallop-Breaux" amendment included additional fishing equipment in the calculation, an import duty on recreational boats, and a portion of marine fuel tax revenue. This amendment included funding for aquatic education programs as an eligible activity.

Funds in the sport fish restoration program can be used only for sport fish species and their habitats. Each state must spend 15 percent of its annual apportionment on boating access and no more than 15 percent on aquatic education.

This chart shows the proportion of fish equipment, fuels, import duties, and related gear covered by the sport fish restoration excise tax.

Sport Fish Restoration Excise Taxes

Motorboat fuel 54%
Small engine fuel 15%
Fishing equipment 12%
Interest 9%
Import duties 6%
Rods/poles 3%
Tackle boxes, electric motors 1%

Once excise taxes are collected, they're deposited into the Sport Fish and Boating Trust Fund. Then, they're apportioned to these subprograms. The trust fund supports a wide range of activities, from wetlands conservation to wastewater control from recreational boats. Take a moment to familiarize yourself with these many programs in this slide.

Excise taxes, fishing equipment, trolling motors
Import duties, pleasure boats, and yachts
Fuel tax, highway trust fund
motorboat/small engine fuel
Interest from trust fund

Arrow pointing downward to Sport Fish Restoration & Boating Trust Fund

Click or tap SF and Boating Partnership Counsel to see definitions of acronyms.

Arrow pointing downward

Sport fish and boating partnership counsel \$400,000
Multi-state conservation \$3 million
Fisheries commissions \$800,000
Sport Fish Restoration Administration costs for USFWS fixed at approximately 2% and adjusted annually according to the Consumer Price Index
Clean Vessel Act Program 2%
Big Program 2%
National Outreach & Communication 2%
Recreational Boating Safety Program 18.5%
Coastal Wetlands 18.5%
States Sport Fish Restoration/Boat Access 57%

- The "Wallop-Breaux" provided new revenue from additional fishing equipment, an import duty on recreational boats, and a portion of the marine fuel tax.
- The Wallop-Breaux amendment allowed aquatic education programs as eligible activities for funding.

- Each state must spend a minimum of 15 percent of its annual apportionment on boating access and no more than 15 percent on aquatic education.

Perhaps the most brilliant aspect of the legislation that authorized both Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs was Willis Robertson's assent legislation. It's a condition on the states for their participation in the programs. It requires each state to pass legislation restricting control and use of revenue from the sale of state hunting and fishing licenses solely for administration of the state fish and wildlife agency. That use is limited to functions required to manage the agency and the fish and wildlife resources for which the agency has authority under state law.

It's a protection that's guaranteed the integrity of the Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Program for many years.

Assent legislation requires each state to pass legislation restricting control and use of revenue from the sale of state hunting and fishing licenses solely for the administration of the state fish and wildlife agency.

State fish and wildlife agencies apply for apportioned funds through a grants process. States must provide at least 25 percent of the grant project's cost, often using hunting or fishing license revenue as the match. Payment is made on a cost-reimbursement basis after work is completed.

This is a genuine partnership. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service manages the grants. Resource management decisions are conducted at the state level.

The states determine what kinds of projects meet their own conservation needs. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service does not develop or prioritize state projects. It must ensure that projects are eligible for funding, are cost-effective, and apply sound fish and wildlife scientific and management principles.

Once grants are awarded, the funds must be obligated to projects by the states within two years, or the funds will revert back to the trust fund or the Federal Migratory Bird Program.

Use of these Federal grant funds requires compliance with a number of Federal acts, regulations, and Executive Orders. The acts that require submission of compliance review documents with grant applications include the National Environmental Policy Act (also known as "NEPA"), Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, and the National Historic Preservation Act.

The success of these wildlife and sport fish restoration programs prompted an initiative to provide stable funding for species with the greatest conservation need, with priority to those that are not hunted or fished.

The effort focused on a possible excise tax on gear used in non-consumptive sports and outdoor recreation, such as binoculars and field guides. But the effort failed to establish a permanent excise tax similar to those used to benefit game animals and fish.

Congress did authorize the Wildlife Conservation and Restoration Program in 2000 to create a new program to benefit game and non-game species. Such a program relies on a Congressionally-approved annual appropriation from the General Treasury. While the program still exists, no funding has been made since 2001.

That same year, the State Wildlife Grant Program began under an annual appropriation bill to provide funds for species of greatest conservation need with an emphasis on non-game fish and wildlife and their habitat. The funds came from the Land and Water Conservation Fund through revenue generated from Outer Continental Shelf oil and gas royalties. Today, the program continues with funds from the General Treasury.

To participate in the State Wildlife Grant Program, states and territories were required to develop a comprehensive wildlife conservation plan by 2005. Funds have been appropriated yearly since then via annual appropriations bills. A 35 percent non-Federal match is required from states for implementation projects and a 25 percent match for planning projects. The territories receive a 100 percent match.

- States must provide at least 25 percent of the grant project's cost.
- Payments to states are made on a cost-reimbursement basis after work is completed.
- The states determine what kinds of projects meet their own conservation needs. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service does not develop or prioritize projects.
- The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service must ensure that projects are eligible for funding, are cost-effective, and apply sound fish and wildlife scientific and management principles.
- Funds must be obligated to projects within two years, or the funds will revert back to the trust fund or the Federal Migratory Bird Program.
- The State Wildlife Grant Program began under an annual appropriation bill to provide funds for fish and wildlife species with the greatest conservation need and their habitat.
- A 35 percent non-Federal match is required from states for implementation projects and a 25 percent match for planning projects.

The achievements of the Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration grant programs are many. In addition to the \$14 billion that has been matched with state funds for management, restoration, research and monitoring, education, and access, there are a number of other superlatives to mention:

- Nearly 10 million students have been trained in hunter education;
- Over seven million hours have been contributed by volunteers to hunter education and safety training;
- Four hundred fifty-five million acres are maintained for wildlife restoration and wildlife recreation nationwide;
- Three and a half-million students have been trained in aquatic education;
- Habitat improvements have been made on two million surface acres of reservoirs and lakes;

- Thousands of pump-out stations, boat access sites, and tie-up facilities have been built;
- And three hundred thousand acres have been purchased for species of greatest conservation need, many of them non-game animals.

Take a look at just some of the benefits that an enlightened conservation program – this unprecedented partnership of government, industry, and sportsmen and women – have brought us.

\$14 billion dollars has been matched with state funds for management, restoration, research and monitoring, education, and recreational opportunity.

These accomplishments have been achieved through accountability. We must remember that the financial resources we hold in trust are to be used for the benefit of wildlife and fish ... for the use of hunters, anglers, boaters, and others with a stake in natural resource conservation ... and for the purposes that a wise and very far-sighted group of leaders originally intended back in the 1930s.

State and Federal partners must ensure sound administration and oversight of funds and activities.

It's all our responsibility to carry the legacy of this historic program into the future.

We hold both natural and financial resources in trust for America's hunters and shooters, anglers and boaters ... all of whom have given generously to finance the recovery of wildlife species for future generations.

It's a cycle of success that's been achieved through integrity, hard work, and far-sighted and enlightened management.

What starts as a contribution when you purchase a rifle, fishing rod, or gallon of fuel magnifies its impact when combined with the contributions of millions of other sportsmen and women.

- The wildlife and sport fish restoration funds are held in trust to be used for the benefit of wildlife and fish and for the use of hunters, anglers, boaters, and others with a stake in natural resource conservation.
- State and Federal partners must ensure sound administration and oversight of funds and activities.

Programs developed by the states provide recreation, access, and enjoyment for all. As each new generation of young people is introduced to the outdoors, the cycle repeats itself.

You are working in a program that has turned decline and near-extinction for many wildlife and fish species into a future of survival and abundance. You are doing a job that provides enjoyment, education, and economic prosperity to millions of Americans.

In the following classroom portions of this training course, you'll learn a lot more about administration of the Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Program, in great detail. You'll practice various aspects of the Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Program grant writing and review process.

It's been my pleasure to introduce you to this overview, and to encourage you to expand and refine your knowledge and skills in helping to manage one of America's greatest conservation success stories.

It's a cycle of success that's been achieved through integrity, hard work, and far-sighted management that provides enjoyment, education, and economic prosperity to millions of Americans.

Now you have the opportunity to test what you have learned. Click the next button to take a short test. To receive a certificate, you must score 70%.

Optional Sidebars Text

Theodore Roosevelt

Theodore Roosevelt (1858-1919), served as the twenty-sixth President of the United States from 1901 to 1909. Historians often cite conservation of natural resources as Roosevelt's most enduring contribution to the country. As President, Roosevelt was faced with critical conservation issues and made decisive moves to promote conservation, thus becoming the President most clearly associated with preservation of public land.

During his tenure in the White House, he designated 150 National Forests, 5 National Parks, 18 National Monuments, 4 National Game Preserves, 21 Reclamation Projects and the first 51 Federal Bird Reservations (these preserves provided a base for today's extensive national wildlife refuge system). Altogether, in the seven-and-one-half years he was in office, he provided federal protection for almost 230 million acres, a land area equivalent to that of all the East coast states from Maine to Florida.

Roosevelt was an avid big game hunter and life-long bird watcher. Roosevelt relished the fact that he could match naturalist John Burroughs's prowess at identifying birds.

In his own words, Theodore Roosevelt strongly believed in conserving our national lands.

"I recognize the right and duty of this generation to develop and use the nature resources of our land; but I do not recognize the right to waste them, or to rob, by wasteful use, the generations that come after us."

"...The conservation of natural resources is the fundamental problem. Unless we solve that problem it will avail us little to solve all others."

Dust Bowl

West Virginia documentarian Pare Lorentz's "The Plow That Broke the Plains" remains the classic depiction of America's "Dust Bowl" of the 1930s.

Lorentz, working for the New Deal's Resettlement Administration, wrote and directed this 25-minute film documentary chronicling the misuse of land in the Nation's Midwest. Coupled with drought, such neglect led to erosion, crop failure, and social disruption from the Dakotas through Texas.

It produced similar devastation for wildlife, creating fertile soil for the "Pittman-Robertson" program in 1937, which sought to restore habitat for species then in severe decline.

When you watch this brief video clip that Lorentz recorded with his camera, you are witnessing the re-birth of conservation in the heartland of America and the genesis of sustained Federal/state involvement in wildlife -- and later fisheries -- restoration.

The Dust Bowl had devastating effects on wildlife.

Carl Shoemaker

The birth of the "Pittman-Robertson" program was attended by many conservation luminaries. But only Carl Shoemaker can rightly be called the "father" of America's Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration effort.

It was Shoemaker who wrote the original Congressional bill, solicited sponsors, and oversaw its passage in the remarkably short time of 3 months.

Not a bad legacy for the Oregon conservationist and publisher of the *Roseburg Evening News*, whose legacy endures 75 years later.

Shoemaker was appointed head of the Oregon Fish and Game Commission in 1915. When the state's game and fish divisions later were separated, he became director of its Fish Commission. In those roles, Shoemaker shuttled back-and-forth to Washington, D.C. on various legislative assignments. He quickly learned his way around the Nation's Capital.

Named secretary of the new National Wildlife Federation in 1936, Shoemaker revived the idea of a Federal aid excise tax for wildlife. The Federation's first major political undertaking became Shoemaker's crusade.

Shoemaker drafted the basic authorizing legislation and took it through 13 refinements. His key provision – a formula that blended a state's population and land area into an equitable apportionment arrangement among the 48 states – never changed.

"I decided that the number of paid license holders would be justifiable as one of the factors of the formula. This would protect the Western States with their smaller populations while using the

area of each State as the other factor would equalize the advantage that the Eastern States had because of their much larger number of paid license holders,” he wrote.

Shoemaker steered the new tax proposal through the maze of government, corporate, and non-profit interests. He recognized the value of compromise; his plan for a 10 percent set-aside for costs of administering the new program was opposed by sporting arms executives. Shoemaker compromised to 8 percent, and the limit remained in effect until the Federal Aid Improvement Act of 2000 which limited administrative costs to approximately 2%.

Shoemaker recruited his home-state senator, Charles L. McNary, as the first sponsor of the Federal aid bill, later adding Nevada Senator Key Pittman and several other senators to the list, along with Virginia Representative A. Willis Robertson.

Shoemaker’s design began to take shape. It remains much the same 75 years later.

29 Words Story

It pays to be a man of few words ... and a veteran of state fish and wildlife conservation.

The 29 words that Representative Absalom Willis Robertson attached to embryonic legislation designed to provide a stable funding base for wildlife have proved to be some of the most important words in American conservation.

Seventy-five years after they were written, they still resonate, and they permit the Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration program to continue doing the job it was designed to do.

Robertson (father of televangelist and future presidential candidate Pat Robertson) was a conservative Democratic representative – and later senator – from Virginia. Previously he had served as chairman of the Virginia Game and Inland Fisheries Commission – a position that gave him keen insight into the budgetary antics of state legislatures.

When National Wildlife Federation secretary Carl Shoemaker was soliciting Congressional sponsors in 1937 for the Nation’s first Federal aid funding program for wildlife, he naturally turned to Robertson, chairman of the House Select Committee on Conservation of Wildlife Resources. Over lunch in the Capitol Hill dining room, Shoemaker presented Robertson the latest of his 13 drafts of the original Federal aid legislation.

Out came Robertson’s editing pencil. A 29-word edit by Robertson that Shoemaker characterized as “the most important addition that had been made by anyone” specified that state hunting license fees couldn’t be diverted for other uses, offsetting the largesse soon to come with the arrival of the first wave of Federal excise tax receipts on arms and sporting equipment.

Robertson was wise to the ways of provincial state legislatures, which occasionally were not above taking hunting and fishing license receipts and spending them on other state programs. His edit effectively closed that loophole.

“What he had inserted made the bill foolproof,” Shoemaker later wrote. “States could not tamper with or divert their own game protection funds and receive the Federal aid provided in the bill.”

Robertson’s 29 words stabilized the stage for millions of dollars for wildlife conservation for the past 75 years, and they continue to protect Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration programs to this day.

29 Words Text

“and which shall include a prohibition against the diversion of license fees paid by hunters for any other purpose than the administration of said State fish and game department ...”

National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)

National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) - Signed by former President Nixon, and established a process by which federal agencies must evaluate the environmental effects of their actions. Specifically, all Federal agencies are to prepare detailed statements assessing the environmental impact of and alternatives to major Federal actions significantly affecting the environment. There are three levels of analysis, each more complex than the previous: categorical exclusion determination; preparation of an environmental assessment/finding of no significant impact (EA/FONSI); and preparation of an environmental impact statement (EIS). In general, the level of analysis correlates to the complexity and/or level of controversy of the project.

Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act

Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act - The Endangered Species Act was signed into law by former President Nixon. Section 7(a)(1) of this Act, requires ALL Federal agencies to use their legal authorities to do good things for listed species (those either threatened with becoming endangered or those in danger of extinction in the foreseeable future). Section 7(a)(2) requires Federal agencies to ensure any actions that they authorize, fund, or carry out do not jeopardize listed species or adversely modify designated critical habitat.

The National Historic Preservation Act

The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 - is legislation intended to preserve historical and archaeological sites in the United States of America. The act created the National Register of

Historic Places, the list of National Historic Landmarks, and the State Historic Preservation Offices. It is the most far-reaching preservation legislation ever enacted in the United States. Among other things, the act requires Federal agencies to evaluate the impact of all federally funded or permitted projects on historic properties (buildings, archaeological sites, etc.) through a process known as Section 106 Review.

The National Survey of Fishing, Hunting, and Wildlife-Associated Recreation has been conducted since 1955 and is one of the oldest and most comprehensive continuing recreation surveys. The Survey collects information on the number of anglers, hunters, and wildlife watchers and provides information on how often they participate and how much they spend on their activities in the United States. According to the 2006 National Survey, a total of 33.9 million U.S. residents 16 years old and older participated in fishing and hunting. During that year, 30.0 million people fished and 12.5 million hunted—8.5 million both fished and hunted.

Sportspersons (anglers and hunters) spent a total of \$76.7 billion in 2006—\$42.0 billion on fishing, \$22.9 billion on hunting, and \$11.7 billion on items used for both hunting and fishing. Trip-related expenditures, including food, lodging and transportation, were \$24.6 billion—32 percent of all fishing and hunting expenditures. Total equipment expenditures amounted to \$41.0 billion, 53 percent of the total. Other expenditures—magazines, membership dues, contributions, land leasing and ownership, and licenses, stamps, tags, and permits—accounted for \$11.1 billion, or 15 percent of all sportspersons' expenditures.

Sportspersons

Total participants* 33.9 million
Anglers 30.0 million
Hunters 12.5 million
* 8.5 million both fished and hunted.

Total expenditures \$76.7 billion
Fishing 42.0 billion
Hunting 22.9 billion
Unspecified 11.7 billion