Abstract

Determine the willingness to pay (WTP) for recreational activities in NW MN.

• Differences between NW MN residents, U.S. visitors from outside of the NW MN region, and Canadian visitors.

Determine recommendations for marketing strategies and further leveraging of resources in NW MN.

Recruiting Use Survey

• Information collected from NW MN resident and non-resident visitors

• WTP for recreational activities

• Types of recreational activities

• Travel time (length of trip, lodging preferences)

• Meals/restaurants usage while in area

• Demographics

• Survey length depended upon responses to certain questions

Recruiting Use Respondents

266 total respondents

• 80-NW MN Residents

• 73-Penn County

• 2-Roseau County

• 1-Pennington County

• 4-Marshall County

• 139-U.S. Non-residents (outside of NW Minnesota)

• 56-Canadian Residents

Discussion

• Non-resident American and Canadian visitors are not significantly different from one another.

• However, NW MN residents are statistically significant from all non-residents.

• Residents who were younger, single, female, have higher income, higher education, and more outdoor recreation opportunities.

• Participation in recreational activities in the region, and travel long to their destination (both day and overnight trips) demonstrated a higher WTP.

• Non-residents who were older, more visited during cooler weather, less education, have higher income, stay at campgrounds/RV parks (and similar facilities), and smaller households demonstrated a higher WTP.

Implications

• For strategic planning and policy purposes, residents and non-residents of NW MN should be treated differently.

• Aggressively market recreational activities with higher interest in residents and non-residents.

• Include cross promotion w/hotels & other facilities (approx. 60% of residents & 70% of non-residents). Agritourism if available through lodging.

Methodology

• U.S. NW MN non-residents and Canadian residents were not significantly different from one another

• Combined in an analysis

• Use Choice Wave probabilistic demand analysis

• Orthogonalization of residents & non-residents

• Only respondents with a WTP > 0 were included in analysis

• Avg. WTP was used as DV

• Residual non-resident regression predictors:

  - Age
  - Married (0=not married, 1=married)
  - Households owned (0=rented, 1=owned)
  - INC_AVG_1000 (avg income in thousands of US$)
  - Warm (binary: 1 if preferred recreation during summer)
  - Horseback Riding, fishing, canoeing, tourism, etc.
  - EDUC_YEARS # of years of education

• Regression predictors unique to non-residents:

  - LONG_SHORES (binary: if preferred long or extended vacations in NW MN)

Results of Recruiting Use Analysis

• NW MN residents and non-residents were significantly different from one another.

• Table 2-recruitment regression model

• Table 3-non-resident regression model

Table 2: Resident Regression Results Using Average WTP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intercept</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Married</th>
<th>Household Size</th>
<th>INC_AVG_1000</th>
<th>Warm</th>
<th>Hotel</th>
<th>RES_VAC</th>
<th>TOTAL_TRAVEL_HOURS</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.339</td>
<td>-0.045</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>8.202</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.246</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Non-Resident Regression Results Using Average WTP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intercept</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Married</th>
<th>Household Size</th>
<th>INC_AVG_1000</th>
<th>Warm</th>
<th>Hotel</th>
<th>RES_VAC</th>
<th>TOTAL_TRAVEL_HOURS</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.144</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>24.046</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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