

RC 22



Economic Importance of Alaska's Wildlife in 2011

Ernie Niemi
Natural Resource Economics

Indicators of Economic Importance



1. Expenditures and Economic Activity Related to Hunting and Viewing
2. Economic Value of Wildlife Goods and Services
3. Wildlife's Contribution to Quality of Life & Influence on Household Location


Research Design



- Surveys
- Literature Review
- Key Informant Interviews
- Consultation with Experts


General Population Survey

- Participation in Hunting and Viewing
- Quality of Life
- Decision to Live in Alaska
- Willingness to Pay for Conservation



Hunting & Viewing Surveys

- Trip-Related Expenditures
- Net Economic Benefit of Trip



Participation


	Hunting	Viewing
Resident Households	96,000 (37%) ~ 11 trips/yr. avg.	199,000 (77%) ~ 30 trips/yr. avg.
Visitor Households	15,000 (2%) ~ 1 trip/yr. avg.	669,000 (86%) ~ 1.4 trips/yr. avg.

Economic Activity

Wildlife-Related Spending Supports:

- Output of Businesses, etc.
- Jobs
- Labor Income
- Governmental Revenue

7



Economic Activity Supported by Spending on Hunting and Viewing

	Hunting & Viewing	% of State Total
In-State Spending	\$3.4 bil.	--
Output	\$4.1 bil.	8%
Jobs	27,220	6%
Labor Income	\$1.4 bil.	4%
Govt. Revenue	\$343 mil.	--

10

Comparison with Fishing

	Sportfishing (2007) (a)	Commercial Fishing (2007) (b)	Hunting & Viewing (2011)
In-State Spending	\$1.4 bil.	\$3.6 bil.	\$3.4 bil.
Output	\$1.6 bil.	\$5.8 bil.	\$4.1 bil.
Jobs	15,879	78,519	27,220
Labor Income	\$0.54 bil.	\$1.75 bil.	\$1.4 bil.

(a) Southwick Associates. 2008. Economic Impacts and Contributions of Sportfishing in Alaska, 2007 (ADF&G Division of Sportfish)
 (b) Northern Economics. 2009. The Seafood Industry in Alaska's Economy (sponsored by Marine Conservation Alliance, At-Sea Processors Association, Pacific Seafood Processors Association)

11

Value & Net Economic Benefit of Wildlife-Related Trips

Total Value =
 What a Household Paid for a Trip (Price)
 + Additional Amount It Was Willing to Pay

Net Economic Benefit =
 The Additional Amount, above the Price,
 the Household Was Willing to Pay

12

Additional Amount Households Would Have Been Willing to Pay

	Hunting	Viewing
Residents	34%	25%
Visitors	7%	14%


13

Net Economic Benefit from Wildlife-Related Trips

	Residents		Visitors	
	Hunting	Viewing	Hunting	Viewing
Total (millions)	\$461	\$1,605	\$12	\$833
Avg./Household	\$4,828	\$8,050	\$765	\$1,244
Avg. per Trip	\$438	\$268	\$765	\$858

14

Satisfaction with Hunting or Wildlife Viewing Trip



15

Contributors to Satisfaction

Contributors to satisfaction :

- Being outside and seeing wildlife
- Scenery
- Remoteness of the site
- Seeing but not necessarily harvesting animals at the site
- Quality of game animals present at the site


Contributors to dissatisfaction:

- Hunters -- Regulations (with almost equal percentages seeing the regulations as too liberal or as too restrictive)
- Wildlife viewers -- the number of other people present at the viewing site and the cost and ease of access to the site

16

Wildlife's Contribution to Alaskans' Quality of Life


65% of Alaskans: "Extremely" Or "Very" Important



17

Wildlife's Influence on Alaskans' Decision to Live in Alaska

50% of Alaskans: "Extremely" Or "Very" Important



18

