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Overview of nutrient water quality problems

- Nitrogen and phosphorus pollution
- Agriculture, municipal waste, urban runoff

The Iowa Lakes Project

Some Findings
I. Overview of Water Quality Problems
Biological condition of the nation’s rivers and streams, based on the Macroinvertebrate Multi-metric Index (EPA/NRSZ)
A cyanobacteria bloom in a Midwestern lake.
Harmful algal blooms in Lake Erie can prompt beach closures. They also pose a threat to drinking water that is supplied from the lake. The two largest algal blooms ever recorded on Lake Erie occurred in the past five years.

Photo credit: Ohio Sea Grant and Stone Laboratory

Sandusky Bay, Erie County, Ohio
Algae blooms in Lake Erie contaminate water in Ohio and Michigan

“Toledo bearing full brunt of Lake Erie algae”
The Columbus Dispatch August 4, 2014

“Toxin leaves 500,000 in northwest Ohio without drinking water”
REUTERS August 2, 2014
Toxic Algae Blooms Infesting Florida Beaches Are Putting a Damper on 4th of July Celebrations

A dead walking catfish lays on the shore with algae Sewell's Point, Fla. on the St. Lucie River under an Ocean Boulevard bridge on June 27, 2016

The Norfolk Broads
Human impact on the broads

- eutrophication
- erosion

http://www.slideshare.net/ecumene/9-norfolk-broads-tessa-1240600
Depleted oxygen creates zones incapable of supporting most life

Stressed marine and estuarine systems, mass mortality, and dramatic changes in the structure of marine communities (Diaz and Rosenberg, 1995).
The Gulf of Mexico

http://www.umces.edu/people/boesch-gulf-mexico-hypoxia
Image courtesy of Nancy Rabalais (Louisiana Universities Marine Consortium) and can be found on the Southern Regional Water Program web site.
Gulf of Mexico Annual Cruise (Dr. Rabalais at LUMCON)
BOTTOM DISSOLVED OXYGEN (mg/L)

JULY 24-31, 2010

Galveston Bay
Sabine Lake
Lake Calcasieu
Atchafalaya River
Mississippi River

Dissolved Oxygen (mg/L)
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7

Data source: N. Rabalais
Map by: T. Widgeon

CARD
Center for Agricultural and Rural Development

IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY
OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

NOAA Gulf of Mexico Program

O2
Size of bottom-water hypoxia in mid-summer

Data source: Nancy N. Rabalais, LUMCON, and R. Eugene Turner, LSU
Funding sources: NOAA Center for Sponsored Coastal Ocean Research and U.S. EPA Gulf of Mexico Program
The Baltic sea is home to the largest dead zone in the world, while the northern Gulf of Mexico harbors the second-largest dead zone.

Baltic Sea: Historical zone size

Hypoxia and eutrophication globally

From World Resources Institute at http://www.wri.org/map/world-hypoxic-and-eutrophic-coastal-areas
How does this harm ecosystem services?

Micro (species) level
- death,
- reduced reproductive success,
- interruptions of food webs,
- lost habitat,
- increased predation

Macro level (fish stock, catch etc.)
- Mobile species exit zone, move outside,
- “A number of compensatory mechanisms limit the translation of local scale effects of hypoxia to the scale of the whole system” Breitburg, et al. Annual Review of Marine Science, 2009
- Concerns: long run effects, hysteresis effects, different equilibrium ecosystem
- Much remains unknown
Pathways for water quality to affect utility

1. Recreation – swimming, boating, fishing, nature viewing
2. Local Amenity- housing values
3. Drinking water/household use
4. Input into production of private goods - commercial fisheries
5. Existence value - passive use, nonuse
Methods and degree of knowledge

1. Recreation – recreation demand, stated preference, many good local studies, aggregate values not well known (US)

2. Local Amenity- hedonics, stated preference, many good local and improving regional

3. Drinking water/household use – avoidance costs, good for perfect substitutes, little known for continuing health effects,

4. Input into production of private goods - hypoxic conditions, little known for at least some systems, US Gulf and Baltic

5. Existence value - ?,
II. The Iowa Lakes Project

With Joseph Herriges, Yongjie Ji, Hocheol Jeon and many graduate students and post docs

Funding from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and the State of Iowa, Department of Natural Resources
Iowa (~3 million people, 56K sq mi: Denmark 6 million, 16K sq mi)
Iowa Lakes Project

Four years initially, Iowans usage of lakes

- Surveyed 8000 Iowans, random population sample
- Actual trip behavior and future expected trips, years 2001-2006
- Stated Preference scenarios at several target lakes
- Knowledge and perceptions regarding lake quality

Data linked to limnological measurements (Downing) at 130 primary lakes in Iowa (Nitrogen, Phosphorous, Dissolved Oxygen, turbidity, etc)

Two additional years: 2009 and 2014, 6 years of panel information
Iowa State University lake study sites
Baseline survey

- Random sample of Iowa households
- Survey collected
  - trip data for 132 lakes
  - attitudes regarding lake quality
  - Socio-demographic data
- ~62% response rate, first year; lower in later years
### Summary Socioeconomic Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average visits</td>
<td>8.52</td>
<td>9.07</td>
<td>8.30</td>
<td>8.19</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>8.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>$55K</td>
<td>$55K</td>
<td>$58K</td>
<td>$59K</td>
<td>$64K</td>
<td>$72K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>57.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel costs</td>
<td>$209</td>
<td>$167</td>
<td>$236</td>
<td>$224</td>
<td>$239</td>
<td>$187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Real trips</td>
<td>$56</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>$67</td>
<td>$72</td>
<td>$50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample size</td>
<td>3317</td>
<td>4296</td>
<td>3554</td>
<td>3151</td>
<td>5352</td>
<td>3055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete panel</td>
<td>3317</td>
<td>2290</td>
<td>1763</td>
<td>1349</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>605</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Income and Age are elicited with intervals, we take the middle point of each interval as the point value.
- Travel costs are calculated between each household home location and each lake centroid. The travel cost for real trips is corresponding to households’ single day trips to each visited lake, weighted by the number of trips taken in that year.
Percentage of respondents who took at least one trip

- **2001**: Iowa Lakes (60%), Mississippi/Missouri River (25%), Lakes outside of Iowa (20%)
- **2002**: Iowa Lakes (50%), Mississippi/Missouri River (30%), Lakes outside of Iowa (20%)
- **2003**: Iowa Lakes (50%), Mississippi/Missouri River (25%), Lakes outside of Iowa (25%)
Average number of day trips

- **2001**: 8
- **2002**: 8
- **2003**: 8

- **Iowa Lakes**
- **Mississippi/Missouri River**
- **Lakes outside of Iowa**
### National Sanitation Foundation

**Water quality index**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dissolved Oxygen</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fecal Coliform</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOD</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature Change</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total phosphate</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrates</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turbidity</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Solids</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1

- Indicators are first converted to the sub-indices (Q-value) $q_i$, then weighted into water quality index as $WQI = \sum w_i \times q_i$.
- Since we only have 6 out of 9 indicators, the weights are adjusted by $w'_i = w_i \sum w_i$, $i = 1, \ldots, 6$. 

### Water Quality Ladder

- **Best possible water quality**
  - 10: Safe to drink
  - 9: Safe for swimming
  - 8: Game fish like bass can live in it
  - 7: Great for fishing
  - 6: Ok for boating
  - 5: Good for swimming

- **Worst possible water quality**
  - 0: Dangerously polluted
  - 1: Not safe for any human contact
  - 2: Not safe for swimming
  - 3: Not safe for fishing
  - 4: Not safe for boating

---

[Center for Agricultural and Rural Development](https://www.card.iastate.edu)

[Card at Iowa State University](https://www.iastate.edu)
## Water Quality data: National Sanitation Foundation Water quality index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WQI</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average of All Lakes</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Visited Lake</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Visited Lake</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; Visited Lake</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Visited Lake</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Visited Lake</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Visited Lake</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Visited Lake</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Visited Lake</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Visited Lake</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Visited Lake</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rathbun Lake
West Okoboji Lake
Activities engaged in by respondents

- Fishing
- Camping
- Boating
- Nature appreciation/wildlife viewing
- Hunting
- Jet skiing
- Sailing
- Canoeing
- Picnicking
- Swimming and beach use
- Snowmobiling and other winter recreation
- Other
Average allocation of importance points to factors important in Choosing a lake for recreation

- Proximity: 32%
- Water Quality: 22%
- Location of Friends/Relatives: 18%
- Park Facilities: 11%
- Activities at the Lake: 9%
- Activities in the Town: 5%
- Other: 3%
Average allocation of importance points to lake characteristics

- Water clarity: 27%
- Hard, clean, sandy bottom in swimming area: 19%
- Lack of water odor: 14%
- Diversity of wildlife: 12%
- Diversity of fish species/habitat: 10%
- Quantity of fish caught: 9%
- Safety from Bacteria contamination/health advisories: 8%
- Other: 1%
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Factors when choosing a lake for recreation in 2002 vs 2014

Important Factors when choosing a lake for recreation in 2002

- Activities at the lake: 9.3%
- Activities in the town: 11.3%
- Park facilities: 17.4%
- Proximity: 22.0%
- Location of friends/relatives: 32.0%
- Water quality: 2.9%

Important Factors when choosing a lake for recreation

- Activities at the lake: 13.8%
- Activities in the town: 7.9%
- Park facilities: 10.8%
- Proximity: 18.4%
- Location of friends/relatives: 16.8%
- Water quality: 30.2%
- Other: 2.3%
Lake characteristics when choosing a lake for recreation in 2002 vs 2014
Comparison of proportion of trip takers over the years

Proportion of trip takers and average trips

Proportion: 62.5% 61.6% 62.1% 57.4% 59.8%
Average: 8.52 9.07 8.30 8.19 5.70 8.57


Proportion: Teal
Average: Brown
Recreation Demand Modeling

1. Random Utility Maximization (RUM) Model – current “workhorse”

   • Based on McFadden, applied extensively (both recreation and elsewhere)
   • Morey et al, repeated logit model, important insight for extending to recreation data
   • Strengths: deals with discrete nature of choices, relatively easy to estimate even for large choice occasions
   • Weaknesses: each trip is independent, no diminishing marginal utility of trips, arbitrary number of choice occasions

2. Kuhn-Tucker Model

   • Based on Wales and Woodland, derives estimating equation from Kuhn-Tucker conditions for utility maximization
   • Strengths: fully utility theoretic re. both site choice and number of trips
   • Weaknesses: Difficult to estimate for large number of choice occasions, limited functional forms that are estimable
RUM Model specification

\[ U_{ijt} = \begin{cases} 
\beta^z z_i + \epsilon_{iot}, & j = 0 \\
-\beta^p p_{ij} + \beta^q Q_j + \beta^a A_j + \epsilon_{ijt}, & j = 1, \ldots, J 
\end{cases} \]

Where \( j = 0 \), stay home option

- \( z_i \) is a vector of social–demographic data
- \( p_{ij} \) represents the computed travel cost or “price” of the recreation trip calculated as: \( p_{ij} = 2 \times (0.25 \times distance + \frac{1}{3} \times travel \ time \times wage) \)
- \( Q_j \) represents the physical water quality measures for each lake
- \( A_j \) represents non-water quality attributes for each lake
- \( \beta s \) are unknown parameters, the subscript \( i \) indicates that parameter is a random parameter.
Water Quality and welfare aside: Choice of water quality measures

• $Q_j$ is a vector of water quality variables, what are they?
  
  • Physical measurements of biological and chemical components: Nitrogen, Phosphorus, suspended solids, etc
  
  • Water quality indices, water quality ladder
  
  • Descriptions of related attributes: catch rates, clarity (Secchi depth), odor, species richness

• How do we decide? Here, use model fit

  1. Five water quality variables, fit model using 2002 data for each combination of log vs linear inclusion of variable, $N=2^5=32$ combinations

  2. Within-Sample fit = lowest log likelihood value.
RUM Model welfare measures, 2002 data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual WTP</th>
<th>All lakes improved to West Okoboji</th>
<th>Nine focus lakes improved to West Okoboji</th>
<th>Loss of Lake West Okoboji</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average WTP per Iowa household</td>
<td>$229.81</td>
<td>$78.87</td>
<td>$17.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total WTP for all Iowa households</td>
<td>$264,115,000</td>
<td>$90,643,000</td>
<td>$19,791,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- WTP is measured by the compensating variation
- The considered water quality improvement is to improve focus lakes’ water quality to the level of Lake West Okoboji in 2002
- Total WTP for all Iowa Households is calculated as the average WTP times the number of households in 2000 US census, and rounded to the nearest thousand
How stable are parameter and welfare estimates from one year of data? Can we be confident that estimates from a single year of data collection can be applied to other years?

- Estimate models using 2002 data,
- search for best fit,
- examine how well the model predicts other years

How stable are welfare estimates using a different model structure altogether? Kuhn-Tucker model
Within-Sample Fit vs Out-of-Sample Prediction

1. Five water quality variables, fit model using 2002 data for each combination of log vs linear inclusion of variable, $N=2^5=32$ combinations

2. Within-Sample fit = lowest log likelihood value.

3. Out-of-sample fit, compute Root Mean Square Error for trips prediction between 2002 and 2003

$$\text{RMSE} = \sqrt{N^{-1} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{N} (y_i - \hat{y}_i)^2 \right)},$$

where $y_i$ and $\hat{y}_i$ are household $i$'s reported recreation trips and predicted trips in 2003 with parameter estimates from 2002 data, respectively.
Within-Sample Fit vs Out-of-Sample Prediction

RMSE is defined as \(N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{N} (y_i - \hat{y}_i)\). \(y_i\) and \(\hat{y}_i\) are household \(i\)'s reported recreation trips and predicted trips in 2003 with parameter estimates from 2002 data, respectively.
## Most favored RUM specifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spec</th>
<th>Secchi</th>
<th>Chlorophyll</th>
<th>TN</th>
<th>TP</th>
<th>DO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Linear</td>
<td>Log</td>
<td>Log</td>
<td>Linear</td>
<td>Log</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Log</td>
<td>Log</td>
<td>Log</td>
<td>Linear</td>
<td>Log</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Linear</td>
<td>Linear</td>
<td>Log</td>
<td>Log</td>
<td>Linear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Linear</td>
<td>Linear</td>
<td>Log</td>
<td>Linear</td>
<td>Linear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Log</td>
<td>Log</td>
<td>Linear</td>
<td>Log</td>
<td>Linear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Log</td>
<td>Linear</td>
<td>Log</td>
<td>Log</td>
<td>Linear</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Willingness to Pay estimates—from most favored RUM specifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$267</td>
<td>$532</td>
<td>$530</td>
<td>$413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$109</td>
<td>$286</td>
<td>$245</td>
<td>$191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$21</td>
<td>$62</td>
<td>$48</td>
<td>$35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$187</td>
<td>$274</td>
<td>$264</td>
<td>$116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$59</td>
<td>$104</td>
<td>$80</td>
<td>$61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$12</td>
<td>$18</td>
<td>$14</td>
<td>$11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>$230</td>
<td>$206</td>
<td>$370</td>
<td>$382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$79</td>
<td>$193</td>
<td>$164</td>
<td>$156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$17</td>
<td>$42</td>
<td>$33</td>
<td>$31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>$174</td>
<td>$264</td>
<td>$315</td>
<td>$370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>$184</td>
<td>$157</td>
<td>$163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$18</td>
<td>$42</td>
<td>$33</td>
<td>$32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>$239</td>
<td>$416</td>
<td>$260</td>
<td>$242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$59</td>
<td>$92</td>
<td>$74</td>
<td>$88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>$17</td>
<td>$14</td>
<td>$13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average CV</td>
<td>$203</td>
<td>$315</td>
<td>$315</td>
<td>$294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(coefficient of variation)</td>
<td>$79</td>
<td>$165</td>
<td>$143</td>
<td>$113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$17</td>
<td>$35</td>
<td>$28</td>
<td>$21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2002: estimated coefficients with 2002 data, water quality data and household information also from 2002 data.
2003-predicted I: coefficients from 2002 data, water quality data and household information from 2003 survey.
2003: estimated coefficients with 2003 data, water quality data and household information also from 2003 data.
Percentage Difference: 2003 Fitted model and 2002 Prediction

Chart showing the percentage difference for different models and conditions.

Legend:
- Blue: All Lakes Improved
- Orange: Nine Lakes Improved
- Gray: Okoboji Closed
More to come

• Extend to all years, 2002 – 2014

• Consider alternative variable choices,
  • Water quality index
  • Lagged water quality
  • Panel estimates

• How stable are welfare estimates using a different model structure altogether? Kuhn-Tucker model
Thank you!
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This research was supported by the US Environmental Protection Agency, the Iowa Department of Natural Resources, and the Center for Agricultural and Rural Development at Iowa State University.
Kuhn-Tucker Model

\[ U = \sum_{j=1}^{M} \Psi_j \ln(\phi_j x_j + \theta) + \frac{1}{\rho} z^\rho \]

\[ \ln \Psi_j = \delta^T s + \mu \varepsilon_j, \]

\[ \ln \phi_j = \gamma^T q_j \]

\[ s = \text{socioeconomic variables} \]

\[ x_j = \text{visits to site } j = 1, \ldots, J \]

\[ q_j = \text{vector of water quality variables} \]

\[ z = \text{numeraire} \]

\[ \varepsilon = \text{random term} \]

\[ \Psi_j, \delta, \mu, \phi_j, \gamma, \rho = \text{parameters to be estimated} \]
### Willingness to Pay estimates—KT Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual WTP</th>
<th>All lakes improved to West Okoboji</th>
<th>Nine focus lakes improved to West Okoboji</th>
<th>Loss of Lake West Okoboji</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average WTP per Iowa household</td>
<td>$129.39</td>
<td>$17.20</td>
<td>$28.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total WTP for all Iowa households</td>
<td>$148,708,000</td>
<td>$19,762,000</td>
<td>$32,286,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- WTP is measured by the compensating variation

- The considered water quality improvement is to improve focus lakes’ water quality to the level of Lake West Okoboji in 2002

- Total WTP for all Iowa Households is calculated as the average WTP times the number of households in 2000 US census, and rounded to the nearest thousand
Willingness to Pay estimates comparison—average WTP per Iowa household

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All lakes improved to West Okoboji</th>
<th>Nine focus lakes improved to West Okoboji</th>
<th>Loss of Lake West Okoboji</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RUM</td>
<td>KT</td>
<td>RUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; favorable model</td>
<td>$229.81</td>
<td>$129.39</td>
<td>$78.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>$196.82</td>
<td>$126.15</td>
<td>$88.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>$70.26</td>
<td>$128.97</td>
<td>$71.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>$174.32</td>
<td>$129.00</td>
<td>$74.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>$167.28</td>
<td>$193.33</td>
<td>$82.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (32 models)</td>
<td>$202.77</td>
<td>$193.33</td>
<td>$78.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV (coefficient of variation)</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The favorability of each model specification is judged by its log-likelihood values. Best fit for RUM is 24, best fit for KT is 27
What are the Consequences of Consequentiality?
The Impact of Consequential Surveys on Stated Preference Responses

Chih-Chen Liu, Joseph A. Herriges, Catherine L. Kling, and Justin Tobias

Department of Economics
Iowa State University
Motivation

- Carson, Groves, and Machina (2000): If respondents believe the result of the survey might influence an outcome they care about, dominant strategy to answer CV questions truthfully

- Provision and payment consequentiality both important

- Want to value water quality improvements inclusive of all values (not just recreation) and want to consider role of consequentiality
In the following sections we will ask you some questions about potential changes to the water quality of Rathbun Lake located in Appanoose County. First, however, we will give you some information on the current condition of the lake. Please read this information carefully before answering the questions that follow.

**Rathbun Lake’s Current Condition**

The quality of a lake can be described in many ways. One measure of water quality is the clarity of the lake water. Water clarity is usually described in terms of how far down into the water an object remains visible. The clarity of Rathbun Lake is currently between 2 to 4 feet. This means that objects are visible down to about 2 to 4 feet under the surface of the water.

Another measure of water quality is the amount of nutrients and other contaminants contained in the water. Water degradation can result from a number of sources, including urban runoff, fertilizers used in agriculture, motor vehicles, and others. Currently nutrients contribute to the occurrence of algae blooms in the lake, usually 1 to 3 times per year. Under some circumstances these blooms can be a health concern, causing skin rashes and allergic reactions. While Rathbun Lake is currently not regularly monitored, lakes with water quality measurements similar to those of Rathbun Lake had “Swimming is Not Recommended” signs posted by the Iowa Department of Natural Resources for anywhere from 6 to 8 weeks during a typical summer.

The overall quality of the water can affect other conditions of the lake. Poor water quality can result in an undesirable color and odor to the lake water. Currently, the color of Rathbun Lake varies between blue and greenish brown. The water usually has a mild to occasionally strong odor that many describe as “fishy.”

Finally, the quality of the water affects the variety and quantity of fish in the lake. Rathbun Lake is a popular fishing lake for crappie and walleye. Catch rates for crappies are typically very good (about 120,000 annually) while walleye catches are more variable, but Rathbun Lake is the best walleye fishery in southern Iowa (about 2,000 annually). Large mouth bass and bluegill are not important sportfish species at Rathbun Lake.

4. During the course of the next year (2004), how many trips do you expect to take to Rathbun Lake?
   - ____ trips in 2004.

In the next question, we will be asking you how you would vote on a special ballot regarding the water quality of Rathbun Lake. While there is currently no such ballot initiative, we would like you to respond as if you were actually voting on the initiative and as if this were the only alternative available for improving water quality in the lake. (In particular, assume that no state action will be undertaken unless the referendum passes.)

When you think about your answer, it is important to keep in mind that people may indicate that they would be willing to pay more money when payment is hypothetical than when they are immediately expected to pay. It may be easy for people to say that they support a project when they are not sure they will ever have to pay any money based on their response. However, if the proposed payments are real and immediate, people may be more inclined to think about other options and what things they would have to give up to make this payment. So in answering the following questions, please keep in mind both the benefits of the water quality improvement and the impact that passage of such a referendum would have on your finances. In other words, please answer as if this were a real referendum.

Suppose that investments could be made to actually improve the quality of Rathbun Lake. These investments might include dredging, building protection strips along the edge of the lake to reduce runoff from the surrounding watershed or other structural changes to the lake and watershed. These changes would improve the lake over the next 5 years to the conditions described in Figure 2.

5. Would you vote “yes” on a referendum to improve the water quality in Rathbun Lake to the level described here? The proposed project would cost you $CV IID=$ (payable in five $-1$ partial payments over a five year period.)
   - [ ] no  [ ] yes

6. How sure are you of this answer?
   1 (not sure at all)  2    3  4    5 (certain)

---

**Figure 1. Current conditions of Rathbun Lake**

**Figure 2. Conditions of Rathbun Lake following an improvement**
FROM THE DIRECTOR

A Road Map To Lake Improvement

Here’s a fascinating passage in the Iowa Conservation Plan that I think is worth sharing: “The natural lakes of Iowa constitute one of the state’s most wonderful assets. They are of incomparable value for recreational purposes. They offer the finest fishing and the finest refuges for waterfowl. They serve as storage to equalize stream flow. They are enormously interesting from the biological standpoint and they comprise one of the loveliest features in the landscape.”

The report continues: “They (Iowa’s lakes) have been greatly damaged. Uncontrolled erosion of banks and drainage areas has deposited silt on the bottoms of most of the lakes and this has been aggravated by such heedless acts as taking natural rock protection barriers away from the shores. The silt deposits are in no small measure responsible for the unbalanced biologic condition and growth of algae. The intensive occupation of adjoining lands has cut the public off from access to these finest public playgrounds.”

What’s interesting about this assessment is that it was done more than 70 years ago in the Iowa Conservation Plan of 1933. We still face many of the same challenges today in protecting and improving the water quality in our lakes.

This issue of the Iowa Conservationist contains a number of success stories. The common thread linking these success stories has been the interest and initiative local residents have taken to spearhead restoration efforts in their own communities.

One of the best examples we have to illustrate local leadership driving a successful lake restoration effort has been Storm Lake, which recently saw its hard work pay off in the form of an $8 million Vision Iowa grant.

The leaders in Storm Lake have recognized the importance that improving water quality means for the economic well being of their region.

For those not familiar with the efforts in Storm Lake, you are missing a truly remarkable story of a community that has the vision to recognize its strengths and improve on them. Not only are locally led efforts being made to improve the water quality in the lake, but also of developing the additional amenities such as parks and green spaces that will allow their community to flourish.

Iowans must come to accept that water quality is not just an

Director Vork agrees that your input is important in prioritizing restoration projects!
Results: Consequentiality and WTP

• Found that respondents who believed consequential surveys were different than those who did not, consistent with underlying theory

• Benefits function findings:
  
  • \( Wtp \) is increasing in income, education, and female

  • Average willingness to pay for improvements about $160/household