

Measuring the Impacts of Sea Level Rise on Marine
Recreational Shore Fishing in North Carolina*

John C. Whitehead
Department of Economics
Appalachian State University
Boone, NC

Ben Poulter
Department of Global Change and Natural Systems
Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research
Potsdam, Germany

Christopher F. Dumas
Department of Economics and Finance
University of North Carolina Wilmington
Wilmington, NC

Okmyung Bin
Department of Economics
East Carolina University
Greenville, NC

May 14, 2008

* The authors thank Joel Smith, David Chapman, Michael Hanemann, Sasha Mackler and an anonymous reviewer for guidance and comments on this research. This research was supported by the National Commission on Energy Policy and the University of North Carolina Research Competitiveness Fund.

Measuring the Impacts of Sea-Level Rise on Marine
Recreational Shore Fishing in North Carolina

Abstract. We develop estimates of the economic effects of sea level rise on marine recreational shore fishing in North Carolina. We estimate the relationship between angler behavior and spatial differences in beach width using the Marine Recreational Fishing Statistics Survey and geospatial data. We exploit the empirical relationship between beach width and site choice by simulating the effects of (1) sea level rise on beach width and (2) beach width on angler site choice. We find that the welfare losses are potentially substantial, ranging up to a present value of \$1.26 billion over 75 years.

Key Words: marine recreational fishing, travel cost method, climate change, sea level rise

Introduction

Rapid economic growth in the coastal zone in the last few decades has resulted in larger populations and more valuable coastal property. However, coastal development is exposed to considerable risk as sea level is projected to rise 0.18 to 0.59 meters over the next century (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change 2007) creating potential problems for coastal economies. North Carolina was chosen as the case study due to its economic vulnerability to sea level rise. Coastal North Carolina is located within the relatively low-income eastern region of the state. The coastal tourism market is an important economic sector in this region. Given that the barrier island roads and highways act as barricades in the absence of a beach retreat policy, sea-level rise is expected to result in significant changes in beach width impacting the land that currently hosts beach cottages and beach tourism opportunities.

In this study we estimate the impacts of sea level rise on marine recreational shore fishing in North Carolina. Assessing the benefits of climate change mitigation policy is important because the costs of climate change policy are fairly well known. The costs can be measured with observable parts of the economy (e.g., changes in market prices and quantities). The benefits of climate change policy often only indirectly affect market prices and quantities or occur outside of markets entirely. Often, when the costs of environmental policy are well known and the benefits are less well known, the costs are given more weight and there is a policy bias towards not doing enough to efficiently protect the environment.

The concept of consumer surplus is the basis for the theoretical definition of the economic benefits of climate change mitigation policy. Consumer surplus is the

difference between what the consumer is willing (and able) to pay and the market price or cost of the product. Consumer surplus is also called net willingness to pay since it is willingness to pay net of the costs. In the case of marine recreational fishing, if the angler is willing to pay \$100 for a fishing trip and the out-of-pocket expenditures are \$25 then the consumer surplus is \$75. The consumer surplus is the value of the recreation experience to the recreationist, while the out-of-pocket expenditures represent the initial, direct economic impact of the trip on the local beach economy. Hereafter, we refer to consumer surplus as willingness to pay, or WTP.

Estimation of WTP from demand curves is relatively straightforward if market data exist to estimate the demand curves. Without market data, a number of methodologies have been developed to estimate WTP for environmental, and other, non-market goods. The travel cost method is a revealed preference approach that is most often used to estimate the benefits of outdoor recreation. The travel cost method begins with the insight that the major cost of outdoor recreation is the travel and time costs incurred to get to the recreation site. Since individuals reside at varying distances from the recreation site, the variation in distance and the number of trips taken are used to estimate a demand curve for the recreation site. The demand curve can then be used to derive the WTP associated with using the site. With data on appropriate demand curve shift variables (i.e., independent variables such as beach width), the economic benefits (i.e., changes in WTP) associated with changes in the shift variables (e.g., changes in beach width) can be derived.

Past research on the impact of climate change on outdoor recreational activities in the United States is sparse. Early studies find that precipitation and temperature impacts

beach recreation activities (McConnell, 1977, Silberman and Klock, 1988). More recently, Englin and Moeltner (2004) find that temperature and precipitation affects the number of skiing and snowboarding days in expected ways.

Two studies have related the effects of temperature and precipitation on outdoor recreation activities and used these results to model the impacts on WTP of climate change on the entire United States. This research finds that the impacts of climate change on outdoor recreation will be positive. Mendelsohn and Markowski (1999) consider the effects of changes in temperature and precipitation on boating, camping, fishing, hunting, skiing and wildlife viewing using statewide aggregate demand functions. Considering a range of climate scenarios, the authors find that increased temperature and precipitation increases the aggregate WTP of hunting, freshwater fishing and boating and decreases the aggregate WTP of camping, skiing and wildlife viewing. The net impacts of climate change on aggregate WTP are positive.

Loomis and Crespi (1999) take an approach similar to Mendelsohn and Markowski (1999) but use different sources and disaggregate microdata. They consider the effects of temperature and precipitation on beach recreation, reservoir recreation, stream recreation, downhill and cross-country skiing, waterfowl hunting, bird viewing and forest recreation. Overall, they find that climate change will have positive impacts on the aggregate WTP of outdoor recreation activities. Of interest to this study, they consider the impacts of sea level rise on beach recreation and waterfowl hunting. For beach recreation they use the positive relationship between beach length and the number of beach days per month to assess the loss of beaches. The joint effects of increased temperature, increased precipitation and beach loss leads to a positive economic impact. For waterfowl hunting

they use the relationship between wetland acres and waterfowl hunting participation and find a negative economic impact with sea level rise.

Three studies have focused on more narrow regions and outdoor recreational activities. Pendleton and Mendelsohn (1998) relate the effects of temperature and precipitation to fish catch rates for trout and pan fish in the northeastern United States. Climate change is expected to decrease trout catch rates and increase pan fish catch rates. Using recreation demand models and microdata, the authors find that fish catch rates influence fishing site location choice. Combining the effects of climate change on catch rates the authors find that climate change would, in general, benefit freshwater fishing in the northeastern United States. Ahn et al. (2000) focus on trout fishing in the Southern Appalachian Mountain region of North Carolina. Using similar methods as Pendleton and Mendelsohn (1998) the authors find contrasting results. Climate change would reduce the welfare of trout anglers in this region. The contrast may be due to a lack of substitution possibilities (e.g., pan fish) in the demand model.

Richardson and Loomis (2004) provide an additional contrast by employing a stated preference approach to estimate the impacts of climate change on WTP for recreation at Rocky Mountain National Park. In this context stated preference surveys ask outdoor recreation participants for their willingness to pay for climate change or for their hypothetical changes in visitation behavior with changes in climate. Richardson and Loomis' hypothetical scenario explicitly considers the direct effects of climate, temperature and precipitation, and the indirect effects of temperature and precipitation on other environmental factors such as vegetation composition and wildlife populations. Using visitor data, they find that climate would have positive impacts on visitation at the

Rocky Mountain National Park.

To estimate recreational impacts from sea level rise on beach conditions we follow the methods employed in past revealed preference climate and outdoor recreation research. We estimate the relationship between behavior and spatial differences in beach width. We exploit this relationship by simulating the effects of sea level rise on beach width and beach width on angling behavior. In particular, we use the random utility model version of the revealed preference travel cost method (Haab and McConnell 2002). In this model it is assumed that individuals choose recreation sites based on tradeoffs among trip costs and site characteristics (e.g., beach width, catch rates). Beach width might affect angling decisions in North Carolina due to the complementary between the use of beach buggies (i.e., four wheel drive trucks and sport utility vehicles) and beach site access. Narrow beaches do not support the transportation of gear and anglers to fishing sites. If anglers make fishing site selections based on beach width then the existing relationship between variation in beach width and fishing site selection can be used to simulate the impact of an eroded beach. We calculate current erosion rates for fishing locations and model projected beach widths with geospatial data. Projected increases in beach erosion are estimated for the years 2030 and 2080. Increased erosion is anticipated because of increased storminess and changes in shoreline geometry from sea level rise. These erosion rates are then mapped spatially to describe changes in beach width assuming no beach nourishment, barrier island migration or beach retreat.

In the rest of this paper we describe the methods used to measure the impacts of sea level rise on beach width. We describe the angler data and the empirical model. The empirical results are presented and willingness to pay values are derived. The potential

impacts of sea level rise on angler activity are estimated and policy implications are discussed.

Geospatial Analysis

Thirty-seven fishing locations were identified in this study as important shore fishing locations (Figure 1). The first line of stable natural vegetation on the beach (i.e., vegetation line) for each location was digitized for 1-3 km in either direction of the fishing location (initially identified as a lat/long point) using 2005 USDA National Air Inventory Program photographs. Beach width was calculated by measuring the distance between the vegetation line and a vectorized 1998 shoreline provided by the North Carolina Division of Coastal Management.

To calculate the erosion rate for each beach we used erosion rate transect data provided by the U.S. Geological Survey (Figure 2). These data consist of short-term (1970-1997) and long-term (1849-1997) erosion data measured directly from aerial photograph time sequences. Each transect extends from the ocean toward the estuary and with attributes describing erosion. A series of these transects run north to south and capture any spatial variation in the rates of erosion that exist along the shoreline. Transects (separated by approximately 100 meters) were intersected with the vegetation line for a beach to obtain erosion rates. The erosion attributes for each transect were then partitioned according to each beach providing a range of erosion estimates that were then summarized to mean, minimum, maximum, and standard deviation (Table 1). Projected changes in beach width were then calculated for the years 2030 and 2080 using percent increase factors (personal communication, Orrin Pilkey).

An important assumption is the lack of adaptation in terms of beach nourishment.

Each of the beaches that we consider is bordered inland by highways and roads. We assume that beach erosion proceeds to the highway or road and, at that point, the sandy beach has vanished. This is the most extreme assumption but it allows us to estimate of the maximum loss of recreation values that might be expected from sea level rise. Periodic beach nourishment occurs in North Carolina but these efforts are costly.

Recreational Fishing Data

The National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) collects recreational fishing data annually with the Marine Recreational Fishery Statistics Survey (MRFSS). The MRFSS is focused on estimation of angler's catch (i.e., a creel survey) with information on fishing location, mode, target species, catch and harvest, and fishing days during the past 2-month and 12-month time periods. Periodically, the NMFS collects additional data from anglers with economic add-on surveys. In the southeast region, economic add-ons have taken place in 1997, 1999 and 2000. An expenditure add-on was conducted in 2006.

The MRFSS add-on surveys requests additional information so that the travel cost method can be employed with the intercept creel survey data. Key information collected is on single-day vs. multiple-day trips and if fishing is the primary purpose of the trip. The travel cost method typically employs only single-day fishing trips (i.e., trips in which the respondent did not spend any nights away from the permanent residence) because overnight trips may have multiple purposes (McConnell and Strand, 1999).

The most comprehensive of the MRFSS southeastern add-on surveys was in 1997 when data on expenditures, household income, location-specific trips, mode-specific trips, target species-specific trips and WTP for various management measures were collected with on-site and telephone follow-up surveys. The 1997 data supports analysis

of economic impacts and recreation demand (Haab, Whitehead and McConnell, 2000). In 1999 expenditures data were collected that supports economic impact analysis (Gentner, Price and Steinback, 2001). In 2000 income and other data were collected that supports recreation demand analysis.

We investigated the potential of the 1997 and 2000 MRFSS add-on data to support a shore-based demand model for North Carolina. Unfortunately, too few cases exist for demand analysis. Instead, we adapt the most recently available MRFSS data from 2005 and 2006. Forty-five percent of the North Carolina anglers fish from the shore and almost all of these shore anglers use hook and line gear. We consider only those anglers who fished in ocean waters (excluding the sounds of coastal North Carolina). In an attempt to focus on day trips we exclude about one-half of these anglers who reside outside of North Carolina. In a further attempt to consider only day trip anglers we exclude anglers who live more than 200 miles from any of the fishing sites. In 2005 and 2006, 1905 and 1699 angler trips are available for analysis. Sixty-two percent of the anglers fish from piers or bridges while the rest fish from the shore. The frequency of trips is presented for the 22 pier and bridge fishing sites in Table 2 and the 28 beach fishing sites in Table 3.

To measure site quality in the standard NMFS demand model (Haab, Whitehead and McConnell, 2001), the catch and keep rate is measured with the 5-year historic targeted harvest of big game fish (e.g., tunas), bottom fish (e.g., spot, groupers), flat fish (e.g., flounders), and small game fish (e.g., mackerels). In contrast, we consider all targeted species in the catch rates for the North Carolina shore fishing model, because only twenty-six percent of anglers in our data target specific species (most others target

“anything they can catch”). Of those that target species the most popular are spot, flounder, kingfish, seatrout, bluefish, striped bass, Spanish mackerel, red drum and king mackerel. Three year targeted historic catch and keep rates per hour are calculated using MRFSS data at each of the sites to measure site quality. The average catch rate per hour across all trip choice occasions is 0.75.

Travel distances and time between each survey respondent’s home zip code and the zip code of the population center of each county are calculated using the ZIPFIP correction for “great circle” distances (Hellerstein et al. 1993). Travel time is calculated by dividing distance by 50 miles per hour. The cost per mile used is \$0.37, the national average automobile driving cost for 2003 including only variable costs and no fixed costs as reported by the American Automobile Association (AAA) (AAA Personal communication, 2005). Thirty-three percent of the wage rate is used to value leisure time for each respondent. The round-trip travel cost is $p = (c \times d) + (\theta w \times [d / mph])$ where c is cost per mile, d is round trip distance, θ is a fraction of the wage rate, w , and mph is miles per hour. In the standard NMFS travel cost methodology, a measure of time cost is collected in the add-on survey for anglers who forego wages during the trip. Since income is not available with the creel surveys we use the zip-code level median household income from the 2000 Census, inflated to 2005 dollars, as a proxy for household income in the measurement of the opportunity cost of time. The average travel cost across all trip choice occasions is \$143.

Empirical Model

Suppose an angler considers a number of recreation sites on each choice occasion. The individual utility from the trip is decreasing in trip cost and increasing in trip quality:

$$(1) \quad u_i = v_i(y - p_i, q_i, w_i) + \varepsilon_i$$

where u is the individual utility function, v is the nonstochastic portion of the utility function, y is income, p is the trip cost, q is site quality, w is beach width, ε is the error term, and i is a member of s recreation sites, $j = 1, \dots, i, \dots, J$. The individual chooses the site that gives the highest utility:

$$(2) \quad \pi_i = \Pr(v_i + \varepsilon_i > v_s + \varepsilon_s \quad \forall s \neq i)$$

where π is the probability that site i is chosen. If the error terms are independent and identically distributed extreme value variates then the conditional logit model results:

$$(3) \quad \pi_i = \frac{e^{v_i}}{\sum_{j=1}^J e^{v_j}}$$

The conditional logit model restricts the choices according to the assumption of the independence of irrelevant alternatives (IIA). The IIA restriction forces the relative probabilities of any two choices to be independent of other changes in the choice set. For example, if a quality characteristic at site i causes a 5% decrease in the probability of visiting site i then the probability of visiting each of the other j sites must increase by 5%. This assumption is unrealistic if any of the j sites are better substitutes for site i than the others.

The nested logit model relaxes the IIA assumption. The nested logit site selection model assumes that recreation sites in the same nest are better substitutes than recreation sites in other nests. Choice probabilities for recreation sites within the same nest are still governed by the IIA assumption.

Consider a two-level nested model. The site choice involves a choice among M groups of sites or nests, $m = 1, \dots, M$. Within each nest is a set of J_m sites, $j = 1, \dots, J_m$.

When the nest chosen, n , is an element in M , the site choice, i , is an element in J_n and the error term is distributed as generalized extreme value the site selection probability in a two-level nested logit model is:

$$(4) \quad \pi_{ni} = \frac{e^{v_{ni}/\theta} \left[\sum_{j=1}^{J_n} e^{v_{nj}/\theta} \right]^{\theta-1}}{\sum_{m=1}^M \left[\sum_{j=1}^{J_m} e^{v_{mj}/\theta} \right]^{\theta}}$$

where the numerator of the probability is the product of the utility resulting from the choice of nest n and site i and the summation of the utilities over sites within the chosen nest n . The denominator of the probability is the product of the summation over the utilities of all sites within each nest summed over all nests. The dissimilarity parameter, $0 \leq \theta \leq 1$, measures the degree of similarity of the sites within the nest. As the dissimilarity parameter approaches zero the alternatives within each nest become less similar to each other when compared to sites in other nests. If the dissimilarity parameter is equal to one, the nested logit model collapses to the conditional logit model.

Welfare analysis is conducted with the nested logit model by, first, specifying a functional form for the site utilities. It is typical to specify the utility function as linear:

$$(5) \quad \begin{aligned} v_{ni}(y - p_{ni}, q_{ni}, w_{ni}) &= \alpha(y - p_{ni}) + \beta q_{ni} + \gamma w_{ni} \\ &= \alpha y - \alpha p_{ni} + \beta q_{ni} \\ &= -\alpha p_{ni} + \beta q_{ni} + \gamma w_{ni} \end{aligned}$$

where α is the marginal utility of income. Since αy is a constant it will not affect the probabilities of site choice and can be dropped from the utility function.

The next step is to recognize that the inclusive value is the expected maximum utility from the cost and quality characteristics of the sites. The inclusive value, IV , is measured as the natural log of the summation of the nest-site choice utilities:

$$(6) \quad IV(p, q, w; \alpha, \beta, \gamma) = \ln \left(\sum_{m=1}^M \left[\sum_{j=1}^{J_m} e^{v_{mj}/\theta} \right]^\theta \right)$$

Hanemann (1999) shows that the per choice occasion welfare change from a change in quality characteristics is:

$$(7) \quad WTP = \frac{IV(p, q, w; \alpha, \beta, \gamma) - IV(p, q, w - \Delta w; \alpha, \beta, \gamma)}{\alpha}$$

where willingness to pay, WTP , is the compensating variation measure of welfare. Haab and McConnell (2002) show that the willingness to pay for a quality change (e.g., changes in beach width) can be measured as

$$(8) \quad WTP(\Delta w | ni) = \frac{\gamma \Delta w_{ni}}{\alpha}$$

Willingness to pay for the elimination of a recreation site from the choice set (e.g., beach erosion that eliminates the sandy beach) is

$$(9) \quad WTP(i | n) = \frac{\ln \left[(1 - \Pr(i | n))^\theta \Pr(n) + (1 - \Pr(n)) \right]}{\alpha}$$

where $\Pr(i | n)$ is the unconditional probability of choosing site i given that nest n is chosen and $\Pr(n)$ is the unconditional probability of choosing nest n .

These welfare measures apply for each choice occasion, in other words, trips taken by the individuals in the sample. If the number of trips taken is unaffected by the changes in beach width, then the total willingness to pay is equal to the product of the per trip willingness to pay and the average number of recreation trips, \bar{x} .

If the number of trips taken is affected by the changes in beach width then the appropriate measure of aggregate WTP must be adjusted by the change in trips. There are several methods of linking the trip frequency model with the site selection model (Herriges, Kling and Phaneuf, 1999; Parsons et al., 1999), we choose the original approach that

includes the inclusive parameter as a variable in the trip frequency model (Bockstael, Hanemann and Kling, 1987):

$$(10) \quad x = x[IV(c, q, w; \alpha, \beta, \gamma)]$$

where $x[\cdot]$ is a trip frequency model. These models are typically estimated with count (i.e, integer) data models such as the Poisson or negative binomial models (Haab and McConnell 2002, Parsons 2003).

Trips under various climate change scenarios can be simulated by substitution of alternative beach width into the trip frequency model:

$$(12) \quad x(\Delta) = x[IV(c, q, w - \Delta w; \alpha, \beta, \gamma)]$$

The total willingness to pay of a quality change that might affect the number of trips is aggregated over the number of trips:

$$(13) \quad TWTP(\Delta w) = \sum_{m=1}^M \sum_{j=1}^{J_m} \left([\bar{x}_{mj}(\Delta)] WTP(\Delta w | mj) + [\bar{x}_{mj} - \bar{x}_{mj}(\Delta)] WTP(m | j) \right)$$

The first component of the total willingness to pay, $TWTP$, is the product of the average number of trips taken with the quality change and the value of the quality change. The second component of the willingness to pay is the product of the difference in trips and the willingness to pay for a trip to a particular site.

Empirical Results

We model the angler fishing site choice in two stages (Figure 3). The first stage choice of shore anglers is between piers and bridges and the beach fishing modes. In addition, we assume that anglers choose between a northern trip (i.e., Outer Banks) and a southern North Carolina fishing trip. In the second stage decision, anglers choose fishing sites. The theory behind the NRUM is that anglers consider fishing sites based on the utility (i.e., satisfaction) that each site provides. Anglers will tend to choose fishing sites

that provide the most utility. The NRUM exploits the empirical observation that anglers tend to choose fishing sites with relatively low travel costs and relatively high chances of fishing success. The utility function is a linear function of the travel costs, the square root of the catch rate and beach width. The NRUM is estimated using the full information maximum likelihood PROC MDC in SAS and presented in Table 4. The full information maximum likelihood routine estimates the two stages of choice jointly.

The likelihood that an angler would choose a fishing site is negatively related to the travel cost and positively related to the historic targeted hourly catch and keep rate. Beach width is positively related to site choice. In other words, beach anglers prefer a wider beach. Various other model specifications (e.g., including a squared width term and width +/- one standard deviation) were investigated to test the sensitivity of results to the simple linear specification. The simple linear specification is statistically preferred. The parameter estimate on the mode/region-specific inclusive value is between 0 and 1 and statistically different from zero and one which indicates that the nested model is appropriate.

A limitation of the NRUM model is that it holds the number of fishing trips constant. With the loss of a fishing site anglers are assumed to substitute to other sites or fishing modes. This assumption may be appropriate for many events and policies that have a minor impact on the fishing experience. But for lost beach fishing sites and lost quality it would not be surprising if the aggregate number of fishing trips declines. A practical approach to estimating this effect is with a trip intensity model in which angler trips are regressed on the inclusive value, which is constructed for each angler from the parameters of the NRUM, and other individual angler characteristics. If trips are

positively related to the utility of fishing then a change in fishing conditions which lowers utility will lead to fewer trips taken.

The “demand” model is a negative binomial model estimated with Proc GENMOD in SAS. The dependent variable in the negative binomial trip intensity model is the annual number of fishing days. The negative binomial model accounts for the integer values and the truncation at one of the dependent variable. Note that the annual number of trips variable is not necessarily equivalent to annual single-day trips since the single-day trippers in our site choice data may also take multiple-day fishing trips over the course of a year.

The demand model does a satisfactory job of explaining the variation in fishing days (Table 5). Shore anglers increase trips as the inclusive value increases. More intuitively, trips increase as travel costs decrease since the inclusive value is negatively related to travel costs (catch rates and width do not vary across angler). The dispersion coefficient is statistically different from zero which suggests that the negative binomial is the appropriate model relative to the Poisson.

Willingness to Pay

A large number of WTP estimates can be developed from the model including the loss of access to fishing sites, changes in catch rates and changes in beach width. For example, the change in WTP per trip from a change in the catch rate of one fish per hour at each site is \$12.52. The change in WTP per trip from an increase in beach width of 10 meters is \$2.09. Both results seem to be of an appropriate magnitude which lends validity to the model.

The WTP loss resulting from reduced beach width is estimated by calculating the

change in angler utility using the beach width data. Beaches with negative width, choice numbers “Oregon Inlet South” and “South Topsail Beach Bank” in 2030 and 2080 and “Ocracoke Inlet Beach N. & S.” in 2080, are removed from the choice set. The change in WTP per trip with reduced beach width in 2030 is \$5.82. The change in WTP per trip with reduced beach width in 2080 is \$6.45.

We aggregate WTP values over 3.84 million North Carolina shore mode ocean fishing trips (personal communication, NMFS 2006). The baseline (without climate change) total number of trips in 2030 and 2080 is estimated as simple 50% and 100% increases in trip estimates relative to 2006, respectively. We use this simple approach for several reasons. First, Milon (2000) uses the MRFSS participation data and forecasts fishing participation out to 2025. He finds that participation, measured as the percentage of the population that takes at least one marine recreational fishing trip, will decline slightly. Second, an analysis of the National Survey of Recreation and the Environment saltwater fishing participation data finds that income increases do not significantly affect North Carolina saltwater fishing participation. In light of these results, we assume that the number of trips per angler stays constant while the number of participants increases only with population, with a constant participation rate. Our estimates of future trips are significantly lower than a forecast that uses the trend line from the 1981-2006 aggregate MRFSS data obtained from the NMFS website to forecast trips into the future. Our simple estimate is 9% lower in 2030 and 32% lower in 2080. Therefore, our estimates of the economic effects of climate change on marine recreational fishing may be conservative.

Assuming that the shore fishing participants are constant between 2006 and 2080,

aggregate annual WTP loss due to sea-level rise is \$22 million in 2030 and \$25 million in 2080. Assuming that the number of shore fishing participants increases by 50% between 2006 and 2030, aggregate annual WTP loss is \$34 million in 2030. Assuming that the number of shore fishing participants increases by 100% between 2006 and 2080, aggregate annual WTP loss is \$50 million in 2080.

The present value of the annual welfare costs from 2006-2080 due to reductions in fishing quality are estimated by assuming the impacts of sea level rise are equal to zero in 2006 and increase linearly to 2080. Using a 2% discount rate, the present value of the aggregate WTP loss is \$630 million assuming no change in fishing participants and \$1.1 billion assuming an increase in participants. Using a 7% discount rate, the present value of the WTP loss is \$140 million assuming no change in population and \$224 million assuming increasing population.

The negative binomial regression model is used to simulate the number of fishing days that anglers would experience with the loss of beach width. The predicted number of annual fishing days falls from 37.11 in 2005-06 to 34.40 in 2030, a 7.3% decrease, and to 34.05 in 2080 (another 0.9% decrease). The value of the lost trips is estimated by determining the value of lost beach sites using equation (10). The value of a lost beach fishing trip is \$15.91. Considering the baseline 3.84 million shore fishing trips in 2006, a 7.3% reduction in trips is 280 thousand trips. The annual economic loss associated with the reduction in trips is \$4.46 million in 2030 with no upward trend in fishing trips. The additional annual economic loss associated with the addition 0.9% reduction in trips in 2080 is an additional \$550 thousand with no upward trend in fishing trips. Assuming that the number of shore trips increases by 50% between 2006 and 2030 and by 100%

between 2006 and 2080, aggregate annual WTP loss due to a reduction in trips is \$6.69 million in 2030 and an additional \$82 million in 2080.

The present value of the annual aggregate WTP loss from 2006-2080 due to reductions in trips are estimated by assuming the impacts of sea level rise are equal to zero in 2006 and increase linearly to 2080. Using a 2% discount rate, the present value of the WTP loss is \$127 million assuming no change in fishing participants and \$191 million assuming an increase in fishing participants. Using a 7% discount rate, the present value of the WTP loss is \$28 million assuming no change in fishing participants and \$43 million assuming increasing participation.

Combining the WTP losses due to reductions in fishing quality of existing trips and reductions in fishing trips due to reductions in beach width provides an estimate of the total shore fishing WTP loss associated with sea-level rise. Using a 2% discount rate, the present value of the total WTP loss is \$757 million assuming no change in population and \$1.291 billion assuming an increase in fishing participants. Using a 7% discount rate, the present value of the WTP loss is \$168 million assuming no change in population and \$267 million assuming increasing fishing participants.

Conclusions

In this paper we develop estimates of the economic effects of climate change-induced sea level rise on marine recreational shore fishing in North Carolina. We find that the welfare losses are potentially substantial, ranging up to a present value of \$1.291 billion over 75 years, using conservative estimates of fishing participation growth and a 2% discount rate. Our analysis is limited in a number of ways.

The impacts on shore anglers are partially muted since piers are a good substitute

for fishing from the beach. However, pier fishing in North Carolina is becoming more limited as coastal property values rise. Some of the piers in the 2005 data are no longer available as substitute fishing sites in the 2006. Other piers are in jeopardy. Also, boat anglers might be affected by sea-level rise if marinas must be relocated. Our analysis does not include these impacts.

Second, our analysis focuses on only one aspect of climate change. Changes in temperature and precipitation might also impact shore fishing behavior. Other climate-related changes could be shifts in fish species to less or more desirable fish and changes in fish stocks.

Third, a limitation of the MRFSS data is that it includes information on recreation participants only. Another potential impact of sea-level rise is its negative effect on participation. Marine recreational shore anglers may choose another recreation activity, such as freshwater fishing, if shore based fishing becomes unavailable. To the extent that substitute activities are available and acceptable to shore anglers, we overestimate the impacts of sea-level rise. These extensions are left for future research.

References

- Ahn, Soeun, Joseph E. DeSteiguer, Raymond B. Palmquist and Thomas P. Holmes, "Economic Analysis of the Potential Impact of Climate Change on Recreational Trout Fishing in the Southern Appalachian Mountains: An Application of a Nested Multinomial Logit Mode," *Climatic Change* 45:493-509, 2000.
- Creel, Michael, and John Loomis, "Recreation Value of Water to Wetlands in the San Joaquin Valley: Linked Multinomial Logit and Count Data Trip Frequency Models", *Water Resources Research*, 28(10):2597-2606, 1992.
- Englin, Jeffrey, and Klaus Moeltner, "The Value of Snowfall to Skiers and Boarders," *Environmental and Resource Economics* 29:123-136, 2004.
- Gentner, Brad, Michael Price and Scott Steinback, *Marine Angler Expenditures in the Southeast Region, 1999*, NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-F/SPO-48, August 2001.
- Haab, Timothy C., and Kenneth E. McConnell, *Valuing Environmental and Natural Resources: The Econometrics of Non-market Valuation*, Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar, 2002.
- Haab, Timothy C., John C. Whitehead, and Ted McConnell. *The Economic Value of Marine Recreational Fishing in the Southeast United States: 1997 Southeast Economic Data Analysis. Final Report for NMFS Contract No. 40WCNF802079* (353 kb PDF file), National Marine Fisheries Service, Southeast Regional Office, St. Petersburg, FL. 2000.
- Hellerstein, D., D. Woo, D. McCollum, and D. Donnelly. "ZIPFIP: A Zip and FIPS Database." Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Agriculture, ERS-RTD, 1993.

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. 2007. Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis. Summary for Policymakers: Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. <http://www.ipcc.ch/SPM2feb07.pdf>.

Loomis, John and John Crespi, "Estimated Effects of Climate Change on Selected Outdoor Recreation Activities in the United States," Chapter 11 in *The Impact of Climate Change on the United States Economy*, Cambridge University Press, pp. 289-314, 1999.

McConnell, Kenneth E., "Congestion and Willingness to Pay: A Study of Beach Use," *Land Economics* 53(2):185-195, 1977.

McConnell, Kenneth E., and Ivar E. Strand, "Overnight Trip Choice for Marine Anglers," Report on NMFS contract number 40ANF804203, August 8, 1999.

Mendelsohn, Robert and Marla Markowski, "The Impact of Climate Change on Outdoor Recreation," Chapter 10 in *The Impact of Climate Change on the United States Economy*, Cambridge University Press, pp. 267-288, 1999.

Milon, J. Walter, "Current and Future Participation in Marine Recreational Fishing in the Southeast U.S. Region", NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-F/SPO-44, September 2000.

National Survey on Recreation and the Environment (NSRE): 2000-2002. The Interagency National Survey Consortium, Coordinated by the USDA Forest Service, Recreation, Wilderness, and Demographics Trends Research Group, Athens, GA and the Human Dimensions Research Laboratory, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN.

Parsons, George R., "The Travel Cost Model," in *A Primer on Nonmarket Valuation*, ed.

By Patricia A. Champ, Kevin J. Boyle, and Thomas C. Brown, London: Kluwer, 2003.

Parsons, George R., Paul M. Jakus and Ted Tomasi, "A Comparison of Welfare

Estimates from Four Models for Linking Seasonal Recreational Trips to Multinomial Logit Models of Site Choice," *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, 38, 143-157, 1999.

Pendleton, Linwood H., and Robert Mendelsohn, "Estimating the Economic Impact of

Climate Change on the Freshwater Sportsfisheries of the Northeastern U.S.," *Land Economics* 74(4):483-496, 1998.

Richardson, Robert B., and John B. Loomis, "Adaptive Recreation Planning and Climate

Change: A Contingent Visitation Approach," *Ecological Economics* 50(83-99): 2004.

Silberman, J. and Klock, M., "The Recreation Benefits of Beach Nourishment," *Ocean*

and *Shoreline Management* 11:73-90, 1988.

Figure 1: Location of Fishing Beaches




Figure 2: Illustration of Calculation of Erosion Rates for Fishing Beaches




Figure 3. Nested Fishing Mode / Region / Site Choice Model
(NP = Northern Pier, SP = Southern Pier, NB = Northern Beach, SB = Southern Beach)




Table 1. Beach Widths

Choice	Site Name	County	2005	2030	2080
23	Oregon Inlet South	Dare	27.17	-4.34	-9.59
24	Cape Point	Dare	46.88	15.37	10.12
25	Hatteras Inlet	Dare	39.11	7.60	2.34
		New			
26	Kure Beach	Hanover	211.47	179.95	174.70
27	Holden Beach	Brunswick	225.65	194.14	188.88
		New			
28	Ft Fisher State Beach	Hanover	225.65	194.14	188.88
29	Ocracoke Inlet Beach N. & S.	Hyde	36.51	5.00	-0.25
30	Avalon Pier Kitty Hawk Area	Dare	310.36	278.84	273.59
31	Ft Macon State Park	Carteret	81.31	49.80	44.55
32	Emerald Isle Public Access Area	Carteret	84.87	53.35	48.10
33	Oregon Inlet North Shore	Dare	59.53	28.02	22.77
34	Hatteras Inlet Beach	Hyde	83.26	51.75	46.49
35	Access at New River Inlet Drive	Onslow	94.83	63.32	58.07
36	Beach Access Ramp 20	Dare	82.32	50.80	45.55
37	Beach Access Ramp 23	Dare	49.87	18.36	13.10
38	Beach Access 27	Dare	60.12	28.61	23.36
39	Beach Access 30	Dare	45.02	13.51	8.26
40	Beach Access Ramp 34	Dare	50.37	18.86	13.60
41	Beach Access Ramp 38	Dare	47.73	16.21	10.96
42	New River Inlet, Topsail Island	Onslow	55.03	23.51	18.26
		New			
43	Carolina Beach NW Extension	Hanover	122.39	90.88	85.63
44	Calvin Street Kill Devil Hills	Dare	276.45	244.93	239.68
45	1st Street Kill Devil Hills	Dare	77.36	45.85	40.60
46	Public Access E. Gulfstream S. Nags Head	Dare	37.45	5.94	0.68
47	Public Access E. Bonnett St Nags Head	Dare	144.28	112.77	107.51
48	Public Access E. Forest St Nagshead	Dare	50.97	19.46	14.21
49	Ramp 49 Frisco	Dare	60.87	29.36	24.11
50	South Topsail Beach Bank	Pender	30.41	-1.10	-6.35

Table 2. Pier and Bridge Fishing Site Trip Frequency				
Choice	Site Name	County	Frequency	Percent
1	Seaview Pier	Pender	63	1.75
2	Sunset Beach Fishing Pier	Brunswick	22	0.61
3	Yaupon Beach Fishing Pier	Brunswick	31	0.86
4	Ocean Isle Pier	Brunswick	4	0.11
5	Nags Head Fishing Pier	Dare	216	5.99
6	Avalon Pier Kitty Hawk Area	Dare	285	7.91
7	Bogue Inlet Fishing Pier	Carteret	260	7.21
8	Frisco Pier	Dare	70	1.94
9	Hatteral Fishing Pier	Dare	55	1.53
10	Holden Beach Fishing Pier	Brunswick	23	0.64
11	Jeanette's Ocean Fishing Pier	Dare	7	0.19
12	Outer Banks Pier South Nags Head	Dare	108	3.00
13	Oceanana Fishing Pier	Carteret	31	0.86
14	Sportsmans Pier	Carteret	290	8.05
15	Triple "S" Fishing Pier	Carteret	137	3.8
16	Jolly Rogers Pier	Pender	58	1.61
17	Surf City Ocena Pier	Pender	46	1.28
18	Oregon Inlet Bridge	Dare	22	0.61
19	Kure Beach Pier	New Hanover	100	2.77
20	Long Beach Fishing Pier	Brunswick	3	0.08
21	Avon Fishing Pier	Dare	153	4.25
22	Carolina Beach Pier	New Hanover	97	2.69

Table 3. Beach and Bank Fishing Site Trip Frequency				
Choice	Site Name	County	Frequency	Percent
23	Oregon Inlet South	Dare	49	1.36
24	Cape Point	Dare	328	9.1
25	Hatteras Inlet	Dare	54	1.5
26	Kure Beach	New Hanover	44	1.22
27	Holden Beach	Brunswick	17	0.47
28	Ft Fisher State Beach	New Hanover	7	0.19
29	Ocracoke Inlet Beach N. & S.	Hyde	7	0.19
30	Avalon Pier Kitty Hawk Area	Dare	5	0.14
31	Ft Macon State Park	Carteret	204	5.66
32	Emerald Isle Public Access Area	Carteret	48	1.33
33	Oregon Inlet North Shore	Dare	357	9.91
34	Hatteras Inlet Beach	Hyde	21	0.58
35	Access at New River Inlet Drive	Onslow	5	0.14
36	Beach Access Ramp 20	Dare	41	1.14
37	Beach Access Ramp 23	Dare	21	0.58
38	Beach Access 27	Dare	12	0.33
39	Beach Access 30	Dare	23	0.64
40	Beach Access Ramp 34	Dare	17	0.47
41	Beach Access Ramp 38	Dare	37	1.03
42	New River Inlet, Topsail Island	Onslow	143	3.97
43	Carolina Beach NW Extension	New Hanover	4	0.11
44	Calvin Street Kill Devil Hills	Dare	20	0.55
45	1st Street Kill Devil Hills	Dare	27	0.75
46	Public Access E. Gulfstream S. Nags Head	Dare	5	0.14
47	Public Access E. Bonnett St Nags Head	Dare	10	0.28
48	Public Access E. Forest St Nagshead	Dare	2	0.06
49	Ramp 49 Frisco	Dare	14	0.39
50	South Topsail Beach Bank	Pender	1	0.03

Table 4: Nested Random Utility Model (Dependent Variable = Mode / Region / Site Choice)			
	Mean	Coeff.	t-ratio
Travel Cost	143.87	-0.035	-30.82
Square root of catch rate per hour	0.87	0.43	8.86
Width	54.34	0.0072	25.61
IV		0.42	23.64
McFadden's R^2		0.10	
Trips		3604	
Sites		50	

Table 5. Negative Binomial Participation Model (Dependent Variable = Days Fished)^a		
	Coeff.	t-statistic
Intercept	3.31	156.75
IV	0.36	32.30
Dispersion	1.50	47.38
Cases	3604	

^aMean = 38.15, standard deviation = 61.87.

Table 6. Present Value of Aggregate Willingness to Pay Loss Due to Sea Level Rise (millions of 2005 dollars): 2007-2080

Source	Discount Rate	Participants	
		Constant	Increasing
Quality	2%	630	1100
Quality	7%	140	224
Trips	2%	127	191
Trips	7%	28	43
Quality and Trips	2%	757	1291
Quality and Trips	7%	168	267