Economic Analysis of the Recreational Fisheries in Sardis & Grenada Lakes

Clifford Hutt, Kevin Hunt, & Steve Grado Human Dimensions & Conservation Law Enforcement Laboratory at MSU

Steve Miranda MS Coop Fisheries Research Unit

Sardis Lake

sas

Grenada Lake



Mississippi

Memphis

Management Issues

Increased use by non-residents and tournaments

Perceived decline in crappie abundance; resident anglers blaming non-residents

Drought and low water levels



Study Objectives

 Socio-economic assessment of the fisheries at Sardis and Grenada Lake

Estimate economic impact of fishery
Angler daily expenditures and activity days

Estimate net economic value
Angler consumer surplus (WTP)

On-site creel survey and follow-up mail survey

Onsite Creel & Mail Surveys

Sardis: Mar 2006 – Feb 2007 (120 d)

Grenada: Mar 2007 – Feb 2008 (129 d)

Estimate total angler activity days

Collect addresses for quarterly mail survey
June, Sept, January, & March

Mail Survey Data

Trip characteristics

 State of origin, distance traveled, trip length, group size, first or repeat trip, trip satisfaction

Trip specific expenditures Transportation, food, lodging, bait, fees, etc.

Long-term equipment expenditures
Boat, motor, rods & reels, electronic, etc.
Only those made in MS in the past 12 months

Demographics

Contingent Valuation

Dichotomous choice WTP question

If the price of goods a services were to increase so this trip cost \$XX more, would you pay the higher price rather than have not gone fishing on this trip?

Bid amounts ranged from \$3 to \$1,200

Economic Impact

Input-output analysis
Impacts of fishing to MS economy
Sales, salaries, wages, and jobs
Inter-industry trade and commerce
Household consumption from employment

Method of modeling
Impact Analysis for Planning (IMPLAN)
Developed by USFS
Activity days and average daily expenditures

Economic Impact

Debate on including resident impacts

 Resident expenditures are endogenous to regional economy, do NOT count (Crompton et al. 2001; Chen et al. 2003)

Others argue resident may spend their money elsewhere if the resource did not exist (Steinback 1999; Loomis 2006)

Economic Impact Adjustment

Asked resident anglers what % of their expenditures would be spent out-of-state if they could go longer fish Sardis/Grenada

 Average response used to estimate potential leakage and adjust resident impacts

Consumer Surplus (WTP)

Probit model estimation in SAS

- BID randomly assigned bid amount
- RESIDENCE MS resident (0) or non-resident (1)
- CLUB member of a fishing club (1)
- WORTH agreed trip was worth what they paid (1)
- TROPHY did they catch a trophy fish (1)
- IMPFISH how important they ranked fishing as an outdoor activity

Recalculated model with significant variables to estimate marginal effects and mean WTP

Angler Contacts & Response Rate

	Survey Pa	rticipants		Response
Lake	Resident	Non-Res	Total	Rate
Sardis	260 (60%)	176 (40%)	436	78%
Grenada	395 (82%)	86 (18%)	481	74%

Respondent Demographics

	Mean			Median	Median
	Age	%Male	%White	Income	Educ.
Sardis					
Res	53	97	94	\$50-59K	H.S.
N-R	54	95	92	\$70-79K	College
Grenada					
Res	52	99	97	\$50-59K	H.S.
N-R	54	98	100	\$70-79K	College

Trip Characteristics

	Distance Travel (mi)	First Trip to Lake (%)	% Crappie Fishing
Sardis			
Res	37	0.6	75
N-R	111	6.0	85
Grenada			
Res	33	2.0	86
N-R	332	34.0	95

Activity Days

	Mean Trip		No. Days
	Length	No. of Trips	Fishing
Sardis			
Res	1.2 d	45,140	54,168
N-R	3.7 d	10,174	37,643
Grenada			
Res	1.2 d	31,074	37,289
N-R	4.1 d	2,133	8,747

Average Daily Expenditures

	Expen	ditures (\$)	Est. Resident
	Trip	Long-term	Leakage (SE)
Sardis			
Res	49.44	112.00	47.5 (3.8)
N-R	45.79	111.35	
Grenada			
Res	60.25	121.69	26.5 (2.8)
N-R	57.59	61.12	

Total Economic Impact (In thousands, 2009 Dollars)

	Impacts				
-	Direct	Indirect	Total	Multiplier	Jobs
Sardis					
Res	9,205	7,976	17,181	1.87	155
N-R	4,618	4,158	8,776	1.90	80
Grenada					
Res	7,130	6,481	13,611	1.91	132
N-R	1,071	970	2,041	1.91	19

Adjusted Total Economic Impact (In thousands, 2009 Dollars)

		Impacts			
-	Direct	Indirect	Total	Multiplier	Jobs
Sardis					
Res	4,372	3,789	8,161	1.87	74
N-R	4,618	4,158	8,776	1.90	80
Grenada					
Res	1,890	1,717	3,607	1.91	35
N-R	1,071	970	2,041	1.91	19

Sardis Probit Model

		Model 1	
Variable	Mean	β	<i>p</i> -value
CONSTANT		0.292	0.173
BID	86.424	-0.004	< 0.001
RESIDENCE	0.442	0.257	0.135
CLUB	0.163	0.173	0.468
WORTH	0.660	0.681	< 0.001
TROPHY	0.046	0.583	0.208
IMPFISH	0.675	0.007	0.971

Sardis Probit Model

	Model 2			
Variable	Mean	β	β(x)	WTP
CONSTANT	1.000	0.411	0.411	104.80
BID	86.424	-0.004	-0.339	
WORTH	0.660	0.654	0.432	110.10

Mean WTP per trip = \$214.90

Grenada Probit Model

		Model 1	
Variable	Mean	β	<i>p</i> -value
CONSTANT		0.480	0.005
BID	124.301	-0.007	< 0.001
RESIDENCE	0.183	0.496	0.034
CLUB	0.132	0.684	0.016
WORTH	0.562	0.415	0.015
TROPHY	0.120	-0.097	0.715
IMPFISH	0.633	0.061	0.724

Grenada Probit Model

	Model 2			
Variable	Mean	β	β(x)	WTP
CONSTANT	1.000	0.509	0.509	82.30
BID	124.301	-0.006	-0.768	
RESIDENCE	0.183	0.468	0.086	13.88
CLUB	0.132	0.661	0.087	14.11
WORTH	0.562	0.410	0.230	37.28

Mean WTP per trip = \$147.57

Consumer Surplus

		Mean	Consumer
	No. of Trips	WTP	Surplus
Sardis			
Res	45,140	214.90	9,700,586
N-R	10,174	214.90	2,186,392
Grenada			
Res	31,074	147.57	4,585,590
N-R	2,133	147.57	314,766

Total Economic Value (In thousands, 2009 Dollars)

	Economic	Consumer	
	Impact	Surplus	Combined
Sardis			
Res	8,161	9,701	17,862
N-R	8,776	2,186	10,962
Grenada			
Res	3,607	4,586	8,193
N-R	2,041	315	2,356

Factors Reducing Economic Value

Low water suppressed angler use in 2006-08

Non-residents spending \$ outside MS

 Local economies underdeveloped (1.9)
Multipliers for recreation \$ usually 1.5 to 2.7





Conclusions

- Fishing on Sardis & Grenada is still a valuable contribution to local economy
- Provide substantial benefit to anglers
- Potential for greater economic impact & net value in the future



