

Id – pilot respondent ID

Set- 1 = 2015 flights, 2 = hypothetical flights post-invasion (with aquatic invasive species hazard present)

Alt: Region as shown in map image and consistent with hydrologic units HUS boundaries.

- 1- Yukon
- 2- North Slope
- 3- Kuskokwim
- 4- Bristol Bay
- 5- Cook Inlet
- 6- Gulf
- 7- Knik
- 8- Kodiak
- 9- No fly alternative

Choice: 0 – pilot did not fly there, 1 – pilot flies there

Elodea: 0- no elodea, an aquatic invasive plant present, 1- elodea present

Sheep: Hunting quality index or also called kill per hunter ratio calculated as the species-specific ratios of the reported number of animals killed to the reported number of hunters within a GMU (Alaska Department of Fish and Game's Game Management Unit) in 2015. It serves as an indirect measure for the abundance of target species (Skalski et al., 2005). If a GMU spanned multiple watershed boundaries we calculated the percent of the GMU area within each of the watersheds and used the percent to allocate the number of hunters and harvest among watersheds. Consequently, if two pilots flew to the same watershed region but their individual destinations fall into different GMUs, hunting quality will vary between the two pilots.

Moose: same as above for moose hunts

Cost The cost to fly to each alternative region was individual-specific for regions the pilot chose to fly to and estimated for other regions not in the pilot's set of destinations. The stated floatplane operating cost, aviation fuel cost, pilot's plane type and cruising speed were used to calculate a per km cost for each respondent multiplied by the weighted average of each respondent's Euclidean distances between home base and destinations within region j. Costs associated with destination regions to which the pilot did not fly, were estimated using the pilot's per km cost multiplied by the Euclidean distance between the pilot's home base and centroid of the destination regions not chosen.

Age: pilot age as reported in survey

Weight: equal to the number of flights taken to the respondent's destinations in each region in 2015 for each of the first nine rows of the panel data and frequency weights for flights the respondents would have taken under post-invasion conditions for the second set of nine alternatives. The weight was further scaled to the population of pilots in each strata as defined by the sample frame and accounted for the observed proportion of pilots reporting that they did not fly floatplanes in 2015.