Background Methods

Results

Conclusions

Where's the Meat? Exploring Changes in Game Management and Governance that BC Resident Hunters Value

Jesse Zeman¹, and John Janmaat¹

¹Department of Economics, Philosophy and Political Science The University of British Columbia - Okanagan Campus Kelowna, British Columbia

December 2, 2022



- Problem: Management of game species in BC is under resourced.
- Opportunity: Raise more funds from hunters to support management of game species.
- Question: What are some changes to hunting experience and governance of the resource that hunters are willing to pay for?
 - Big question! Focus on limited entry hunt (LEH) for moose.
- Answer: Hunters who participated in a LEH moose hunt are willing to pay for
 - all else equal, increased probability of harvesting an animal,
 - for constant total harvest, being able to hunt more often,
 - shifting governance to a commission of experts,
 - dedicating more licence fees to management of game species.





- Problem: Management of game species in BC is under resourced.
- Opportunity: Raise more funds from hunters to support management of game species.
- Question: What are some changes to hunting experience and governance of the resource that hunters are willing to pay for?
 - Big question! Focus on limited entry hunt (LEH) for moose.
- Answer: Hunters who participated in a LEH moose hunt are willing to pay for
 - all else equal, increased probability of harvesting an animal,
 - for constant total harvest, being able to hunt more often,
 - shifting governance to a commission of experts,
 - dedicating more licence fees to management of game species.





- Problem: Management of game species in BC is under resourced.
- Opportunity: Raise more funds from hunters to support management of game species.
- Question: What are some changes to hunting experience and governance of the resource that hunters are willing to pay for?
 - Big question! Focus on limited entry hunt (LEH) for moose.
- Answer: Hunters who participated in a LEH moose hunt are willing to pay for
 - all else equal, increased probability of harvesting an animal,
 - for constant total harvest, being able to hunt more often,
 - shifting governance to a commission of experts,
 - dedicating more licence fees to management of game species.





- Problem: Management of game species in BC is under resourced.
- Opportunity: Raise more funds from hunters to support management of game species.
- Question: What are some changes to hunting experience and governance of the resource that hunters are willing to pay for?
 - Big question! Focus on limited entry hunt (LEH) for moose.
- Answer: Hunters who participated in a LEH moose hunt are willing to pay for
 - all else equal, increased probability of harvesting an animal,
 - for constant total harvest, being able to hunt more often,
 - shifting governance to a commission of experts,
 - dedicating more licence fees to management of game species.



B



Results

Moose Harvest Trend

Background

Conclusions

Results

Conclusions

Regional Economics of Hunting

		Median	Net Inflow	
Region	Population	Income	Amount	Per Capita
Vancouver Island	773,788	75,843	-4,599,873	-5.94
Lower Mainland	2,846,546	84,451	-13,482,849	-4.74
Thompson Nicola	169,484	67,644	5,076,023	29.95
Kootenay	152,430	78,156	2,951,548	19.36
Cariboo	63,043	67,315	4,193,512	66.52
Skeena	77,040	74,193	998,528	12.96
Omineca	114,332	80,811	1,197,011	10.47
Peace	65,444	90,864	3,253,493	49.71
Okanagan	375,366	74,274	1,128,797	3.01



Conclusions

Geography of Moose Management

Methods

• Nine (7 + 2) hunting regions.

Background

00000000

- Regions divided into management units.
- Hunts established for zones within management units, defined by time, duration, type of animal that can be taken.
- LEH application for first and second choice hunts.





Introduction

Introduction

Background N 00000000 0

Methods

Conclusions

Geography of Moose Management







a place of mind

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

Introduction

Background N 00000000 00

Methods

Conclusions

Geography of Moose Management







Results

Individual Hunts

Background 00000●00

LIMITED ENTRY MOOSE SHARED HUNTS

SKEENA REGION 6 (See Maps 6E, 6G, 6I, 6L & 6M for boundaries)

Code	Area	M.U.	Zone	Season Dates	Class of Animal	Tentative # of Auth	2021 First Choice Odds
REGU	LAR HUNTS						
4245	Smithers	6-08		Sept 25-Oct 19	Bull	79	13.3:1
4246	Smithers	6-08		Oct 20-Nov 15	Bull	78	N/A
4247	Smithers	6-09		Sept 10-Sept 24	Bull	138	2.2:1
4248	Smithers	6-09		Sept 25-Oct 19	Bull	156	7.7:1
4249	Smithers	6-09		Oct 20-Nov 15	Bull	187	N/A
4250	Smithers	6-10	A *	Sept 10-Nov 15	Bull	141	N/A
4251	Smithers	6-15	Α	Sept 10-Nov 15	Bull	36	N/A
4252	Stikine	6-19	А	Sept 1-Sept 14	Bull	9	0.4:1
4253	Stikine	6-19	А	Sept 15-Sept 30	Bull	10	6.3:1
4254	Stikine	6-19	А	Oct 1-Oct 15	Bull	9	5.8:1
4255	Spatsizi	6-20	А	Aug 15-Oct 15	Bull	98	1.1:1
4256	Klappan	6-20	B**	Sept 15-Sept 30	Bull	24	1.3:1
4257	Klappan	6-20	B**	Oct 1-Oct 15	Bull	24	0.9:1
4258	Smithers	6-30	Α	Sept 10-Nov 15	Bull	66	N/A

Includes portions of M.U. 6-03 and 6-11. *

** Includes portions of M.U. 6-17 and 6-18. See Map 6G.



Results

Individual Hunts

Background

LIMITED ENTRY MOOSE SHARED HUNTS

SKEENA REGION 6 (See Maps 6E, 6G, 6I, 6L & 6M for boundaries)

Code	Area	M.U.	Zone	Season Dates	Class of Animal	Tentative # of Auth	2021 First Choice Odds
REGU	LAR HUNTS						
4245	Smithers	6-08		Sept 25-Oct 19	Bull	79	13.3:1
4246	Smithers	6-08		Oct 20-Nov 15	Bull	78	N/A
4247	Smithers	6-09		Sept 10-Sept 24	Bull	138	2.2:1
4248	Smithers	6-09		Sept 25-Oct 19	Bull	156	7.7:1
4249	Smithers	6-09		Oct 20-Nov 15	Bull	187	N/A
4250	Smithers	6-10	A*	Sept 10-Nov 15	Bull	141	N/A
4251	Smithers	6-15	А	Sept 10-Nov 15	Bull	36	N/A
4252	Stikine	6-19	Α	Sept 1-Sept 14	Bull	9	0.4:1
4253	Stikine	6-19	Α	Sept 15-Sept 30	Bull	10	6.3:1
4254	Stikine	6-19	А	Oct 1-Oct 15	Bull	9	5.8:1
4255	Spatsizi	6-20	A	Aug 15-Oct 15	Bull	98	1.1:1
4256	Klappan	6-20	B**	Sept 15-Sept 30	Bull	24	1.3:1
4257	Klappan	6-20	B**	Oct 1-Oct 15	Bull	24	0.9:1
4258	Smithers	6-30	А	Sept 10-Nov 15	Bull	66	N/A

Includes portions of M.U. 6-03 and 6-11. *

** Includes portions of M.U. 6-17 and 6-18. See Map 6G.



Introduction Background Methods Results Conclusions

Individual Hunts

- Hunts occur in a specific area, for a specific length of time, targeting a specific species, aiming for a specific number of hunters authorized.
- Hunt parameters chosen based on (limited) information about herds.
- Hunt parameters determine expected harvest, and thereby expected population after hunt.
- Declining moose numbers and increasing hunting demand resulting in greater share of hunts being limited entry.





Experimental Design









Introduction Background Methods Results

Conclusions

Choice Experiment





Methods •000000000

Results

Choice Experiment

Background





Introduction Background

Methods ●000000000

Conclusions

Choice Experiment





Choice Experiment



• Items 1, 2 and 3 connected

$$\begin{array}{l} \mathsf{Moose} \\ \mathsf{harvested} \end{array} = \left(\begin{array}{c} \mathsf{LEH} \\ \mathsf{applied for} \end{array} \right) \times \left(\begin{array}{c} \mathsf{Prob.} \\ \mathsf{drawn} \end{array} \right) \times \left(\begin{array}{c} \mathsf{Prob.} \\ \mathsf{harvest} \end{array} \right) \\ \mathcal{MRTS} = \left(\begin{array}{c} \mathsf{Prob.} \\ \mathsf{harvest} \end{array} \right) / \left(\begin{array}{c} \mathsf{Prob.} \\ \mathsf{drawn} \end{array} \right) \end{array}$$



Choice Experiment



• Items 1, 2 and 3 connected

$$\begin{array}{l} \mathsf{Moose} \\ \mathsf{harvested} \end{array} = \left(\begin{array}{c} \mathsf{LEH} \\ \mathsf{applied for} \end{array} \right) \times \left(\begin{array}{c} \mathsf{Prob.} \\ \mathsf{drawn} \end{array} \right) \times \left(\begin{array}{c} \mathsf{Prob.} \\ \mathsf{harvest} \end{array} \right) \\ \mathcal{MRTS} = \left(\begin{array}{c} \mathsf{Prob.} \\ \mathsf{harvest} \end{array} \right) / \left(\begin{array}{c} \mathsf{Prob.} \\ \mathsf{drawn} \end{array} \right) \end{array}$$



Methods Attribute Levels: Opportunity vs Success

Background



Results



Attribute Levels: Governance

- Who gets to supervise fish and wildlife management; establish regulations; approve budgets, conduct public consultations, and made decisions on wildlife management.
 - Political current:

Elected officials (Minister and Cabinet).

• Game commission:

An appointed group of representatives knowledgeable and interested in wildlife conservation, residing across the province.

 <u>Multi-government, multi-stakeholder commission</u>: A group of representatives from First Nations, provincial government, conservation organizations, and industry which are knowledgeable and interested in wildlife conservation.



Attribute Levels: Surplus, Share and Licence

- Harvestable surplus of moose: 5,000; 7,500; 10,000, 12,500
 - Current level to historic high.
- Share licence fee to wildlife management: 20%, 50%, 100%
 - Current level to all dedicated.
- Licence fee: \$25, \$35, \$50, \$75, \$100, \$140, \$200, \$500
 - Current level to almost complete choke (from focus groups).
- Design
 - Binary choice, status quo and one alternative,
 - D-efficient fractional factorial design choosing 75 choice cards from 1,440 member full factorial design, after cards strictly dominated by status quo removed.
 - Blocked as sets of 3 cards, maximum variation within sets.



Attribute Levels: Surplus, Share and Licence

- Harvestable surplus of moose: 5,000; 7,500; 10,000, 12,500
 - Current level to historic high.
- Share licence fee to wildlife management: 20%, 50%, 100%
 - Current level to all dedicated.
- Licence fee: \$25, \$35, \$50, \$75, \$100, \$140, \$200, \$500
 - Current level to almost complete choke (from focus groups).
- Design
 - Binary choice, status quo and one alternative,
 - D-efficient fractional factorial design choosing 75 choice cards from 1,440 member full factorial design, after cards strictly dominated by status quo removed.
 - Blocked as sets of 3 cards, maximum variation within sets.





Econometrics

• Random utility model (general version)

$$U_{ijt} = \alpha_{ij} + \beta_i \mathbf{x}_{ijt} + \varepsilon_{ijt}$$

 $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$
 $j \in \{S, A\}$
 $t \in \{1, 2, 3\}$
 $\alpha_{iS} = 0$
 $\alpha_{iA} = \alpha_A + \gamma_A \mathbf{z}_i + \eta_{iA}$
 $\beta_{ik} = \beta_k + \gamma_k \mathbf{z}_i + \eta_{ik}$

• Choose 'A' if

$$U_{iAt} - U_{iSt} > 0$$

- γ_A and γ_k for observable individual specific effects.
- η_{iA} and η_{ik} for unobservable individual specific effects.

Introduction Background Methods Conclusions Conclusions Conclusions Conclusions

Individual specific characteristics

$$U_{ijt} = \alpha_{ij} + \beta_i \boldsymbol{x}_{ijt} + \delta_i \boldsymbol{z}_i + \varepsilon_{ijt}$$

- utility level can vary by $\delta_i z_i$,
- differencing utility, $U_{iAt} U_{iSt}$, removes $\delta_i z_i$ effect,
- cannot estimate utility level effects of z_i.
- Interactions

• With ASC, $\alpha_{iA} = \alpha_A + \gamma_A z_i + \eta_{iA}$,

- Measures difference in value of having choice across individuals
- With choice attributes, $\beta_{ik} = \beta_k + \gamma_k z_i + \eta_{ik}$
 - Measures change in response to attribute levels across individuals
- Can predict choice probability (WTP) across individuals with different characteristics
 - sample (population) distribution of predicted WTP.



Introduction Background Methods Results Conclusions Conclusions

Individual specific characteristics

$$U_{ijt} = \alpha_{ij} + \beta_i \boldsymbol{x}_{ijt} + \delta_i \boldsymbol{z}_i + \varepsilon_{ijt}$$

- utility level can vary by $\delta_i \boldsymbol{z}_i$,
- differencing utility, $U_{iAt} U_{iSt}$, removes $\delta_i z_i$ effect,
- cannot estimate utility level effects of z_i.
- Interactions
 - With ASC, $\alpha_{iA} = \alpha_A + \gamma_A \boldsymbol{z}_i + \eta_{iA}$,
 - Measures difference in value of having choice across individuals
 - With choice attributes, $\beta_{ik} = \beta_k + \gamma_k z_i + \eta_{ik}$
 - Measures change in response to attribute levels across individuals
- Can predict choice probability (WTP) across individuals with different characteristics
 - sample (population) distribution of predicted WTP.



Introduction Background Methods Results Conclusions

Econometrics

Individual specific characteristics

$$U_{ijt} = \alpha_{ij} + \beta_i \boldsymbol{x}_{ijt} + \delta_i \boldsymbol{z}_i + \varepsilon_{ijt}$$

- utility level can vary by $\delta_i z_i$,
- differencing utility, $U_{iAt} U_{iSt}$, removes $\delta_i z_i$ effect,
- cannot estimate utility level effects of z_i.
- Interactions
 - With ASC, $\alpha_{iA} = \alpha_A + \gamma_A \boldsymbol{z}_i + \eta_{iA}$,
 - Measures difference in value of having choice across individuals
 - With choice attributes, $\beta_{ik} = \beta_k + \gamma_k \boldsymbol{z}_i + \eta_{ik}$
 - Measures change in response to attribute levels across individuals
- Can predict choice probability (WTP) across individuals with different characteristics
 - sample (population) distribution of predicted WTP.



Introduction Background Methods Results Conclusions Conclusions

• Individual specific characteristics

$$U_{ijt} = \alpha_{ij} + \beta_i \boldsymbol{x}_{ijt} + \delta_i \boldsymbol{z}_i + \varepsilon_{ijt}$$

- utility level can vary by $\delta_i \boldsymbol{z}_i$,
- differencing utility, $U_{iAt} U_{iSt}$, removes $\delta_i z_i$ effect,
- cannot estimate utility level effects of z_i.
- Interactions
 - With ASC, $\alpha_{iA} = \alpha_A + \gamma_A z_i + \eta_{iA}$,
 - Measures difference in value of having choice across individuals
 - With choice attributes, $\beta_{ik} = \beta_k + \gamma_k \boldsymbol{z}_i + \eta_{ik}$
 - Measures change in response to attribute levels across individuals
- Can predict choice probability (WTP) across individuals with different characteristics
 - sample (population) distribution of predicted WTP.



Introduction Background Methods Conclusions Conclusions Conclusions

• If ε_{ijt} follows as type I extreme value distribution (Gumbel), then choice probability follows multinomial logistic distribution

$$\mathsf{Pr}(\mathsf{alt}|i,t) = \frac{\exp(\alpha_{i\mathsf{A}} + \beta_i \boldsymbol{x}_{i\mathsf{A}t})}{\exp(\alpha_{i\mathsf{A}} + \beta_i \boldsymbol{x}_{i\mathsf{A}t}) + \exp(\alpha_{i\mathsf{S}} + \beta_i \boldsymbol{x}_{i\mathsf{S}t})}$$

- If η_{iA} and η_{ik} have a degenerate distribution, model estimated as multinomial logit.
- Otherwise, estimated as mixed multinomial logit.
 - Influence of η_{iA} and η_{ik} must be integrated out to solve multinomial logit estimation.
 - Integration approximated by simulated maximum likelihood.





• Utility space

$$U_{ijt} = lpha_{ij} + eta_i oldsymbol{x}_{ijt} - eta_c oldsymbol{c}_{ijt} + arepsilon_{ijt}$$

• cost as c_{ijt} , β_c marginal utility of income, • WTP as β_k/β_c , distribution not well defined.

• WTP space

$$U_{ijt} = \beta_c \left(\gamma_{ij} + \lambda_i \boldsymbol{x}_{ijt} - c_{ijt} \right) + \varepsilon_{ijt}$$

- β_c serves as scaling parameter,
- γ_{ii} and λ_i scaled by β_c , in units of WTP,
- convergence on solution may be more difficult



Utility space

$$U_{ijt} = lpha_{ij} + eta_i oldsymbol{x}_{ijt} - eta_c oldsymbol{c}_{ijt} + arepsilon_{ijt}$$

cost as c_{ijt}, β_c marginal utility of income,
WTP as β_k/β_c, distribution not well defined.

WTP space

$$U_{ijt} = \beta_c \left(\gamma_{ij} + \lambda_i \boldsymbol{x}_{ijt} - c_{ijt} \right) + \varepsilon_{ijt}$$

- β_c serves as scaling parameter,
- γ_{ii} and λ_i scaled by β_c , in units of WTP,
- convergence on solution may be more difficult

Introduction Background Methods October Results Conclusions October Results Conclusions October Random Utility




























- Two survey waves
 - Government partner sent invitation email with link to survey to 5,000 applicants to 2018 LEH moose hunts.
 - Link almost immediately shared on social media!
 - Survey adapted to use individualized link, invitation sent to new sample of 5,000.
 - Nested models estimated, with restriction of equality in parameters between samples tested. No significant information loss from pooling data.

• 2292 started survey, 2167 usable responses with complete data.



- Two survey waves
 - Government partner sent invitation email with link to survey to 5,000 applicants to 2018 LEH moose hunts.
 - Link almost immediately shared on social media!
 - Survey adapted to use individualized link, invitation sent to new sample of 5,000.
 - Nested models estimated, with restriction of equality in parameters between samples tested. No significant information loss from pooling data.
- 2292 started survey, 2167 usable responses with complete data.



Protest Votes

- Respondents choosing status quo for all three cards asked for level of agreement with statements:
 - I cannot afford to pay more,
 - 2 I am satisfied with the current moose population,
 - I do not believe anything can be done to enhance moose numbers,
 - The government cannot be trusted to apply any extra revenue to moose enhancement,
 - I do not believe this research will have any influence on government policy,
 - I do not believe the researchers understand hunters and hunting.
- Considered protest if agreement with 1. or 2. not stronger than agreement with others.
- Protest responses dropped, 2038 usable responses remain.



a place of mind

Protest Votes

- Respondents choosing status quo for all three cards asked for level of agreement with statements:
 - I cannot afford to pay more,
 - I am satisfied with the current moose population,
 - I do not believe anything can be done to enhance moose numbers,
 - The government cannot be trusted to apply any extra revenue to moose enhancement,
 - I do not believe this research will have any influence on government policy,
 - I do not believe the researchers understand hunters and hunting.
- Considered protest if agreement with 1. or 2. not stronger than agreement with others.
- Protest responses dropped, 2038 usable responses remain.



thods 00000000 Conclusions

Sample Characteristics

Variable	Group	Count	Percent	Province	Hunters
Income	< 50K	318	14.67	26.94	
	50K - 100K	690	31.84	32.65	
	> 100 K	913	42.13	40.42	
	Refuse	246	11.35		
Educ	Elementary	35	1.62	9.60	
	High	742	34.24	26.50	
	Coll/Uni	1390	64.14	63.90	
Age	< 45	589	27.18	43.19	41.97
	45 - 64	1030	47.53	33.22	38.38
	65+	548	25.29	23.58	19.65
Gender	Male	1996	92.11	45.64	92.29
	Female	163	7.52	53.79	7.71
	Other	8	0.37	0.28	



 Conclusions

Sample Characteristics

Variable	Group	Count	Percent	Province	Hunters
Urban	Rural	607	28.01	10.47	
	Urban	1560	71.99	89.53	
Home	Vancouver Island	353	16.29	16.69	14.64
	Lower Mainland	436	20.12	61.38	23.71
	Thompson	279	12.87	3.65	9.66
	Kootenay	220	10.15	3.29	12.61
	Cariboo	180	8.31	1.36	6.61
	Skeena	125	5.77	1.66	4.66
	Omineca	238	10.98	2.47	9.01
	Peace	85	3.92	1.41	6.01
	Okanagan	251	11.58	8.09	13.09



Background

Introduction

Variable	Group	Count	Percent	Province	Hunters
Days	<= 10	420	19.38		
	11 - 20	722	33.32		
	> 20	1025	47.30		
Skill	Beg	78	3.60		
	Int	907	41.86		
	Adv	1182	54.55		

Results

Conclusions

• Days per season spent hunting.

Methods

• Self assessed experience.

Background

Methods

Introduction

Variable	Group	Count	Percent	Province	Hunters
Reason	Food	978	45.13		
	Family	288	13.29		
	Nature	884	40.79		
	Trophy	17	0.78		
Region	Home	525	24.23		66.34
	Near	1047	48.32		22.89
	Far	595	27.46		10.78

Results

Conclusions

• Survey asks favorite region, hunter statistic for regions where hunt.

Introduction

Background Me

Methods 0000000000 Conclusions

Sample Characteristics

Variable	Group	Count	Percent	Province	Hunters
Leaning	Right	508	23.44		
	Neither	1549	71.48		
	Left	110	5.08		
Awareness	Limited	1140	52.61		
	Somewhat	811	37.43		
	Very	216	9.97		
Pretest	Poor	1337	61.70		
	Fair	616	28.43		
	Good	214	9.88		

- Neither includes weakly right and weakly left.
- Pretest asks all else equal attribute level preference. Good consistent with rational utility maximization.



Sample Characteristics

	Inco	Educ	Age	Gend	Urba	Home	Days	Skil	Reas	Regi	Lean	Awar
Educ	0.143											
Age	0.272	0.127										
Gender	0.113	0.028	0.073									
Urban	0.095	0.093	0.014	0.056								
Home	0.093	0.091	0.116	0.107	0.358							
Days	0.055	0.036	0.115	0.049	0.144	0.184						
Skill	0.058	0.044	0.111	0.168	0.076	0.122	0.275					
Reason	0.077	0.075	0.068	0.105	0.082	0.098	0.050	0.056				
Region	0.051	0.048	0.066	0.081	0.255	0.563	0.118	0.036	0.040			
Leaning	0.053	0.030	0.017	0.044	0.029	0.059	0.054	0.077	0.027	0.039		
Awareness	0.049	0.062	0.034	0.042	0.046	0.077	0.134	0.113	0.060	0.035	0.036	
Pretest	0.034	0.032	0.041	0.040	0.038	0.066	0.085	0.055	0.039	0.036	0.057	0.073

• Cramer's V,
$$V = \sqrt{(\chi^2/n) / \min(k-1, r-1)}$$
,

• Gray cells not significant at $\alpha = 0.01$.

Default Individual

Background

Introduction

• Characteristics of the default individual:

Methods

- Annual income less than \$50,000,
- No more than high school education,
- Below 45 years of age,
- Female (in models with gender),
- Lives outside urban area (in models with urban or rural),
- Lives in lower mainland (if models include region),

Results

- Does not consider their hunting skill advanced,
- Hunts primarily for food,
- Home region is favorite hunting region,
- Politically center or left leaning.
- Limited awareness.
- Pretest score not good.



Introduction Background Methods Conclusions Conclusion

	Model					
Measure	#1	#2	#3	#4		
Log-Likelihood:	-3296	-3234	-3207	-3186		
McFadden R2:	0.222	0.237	0.243	0.248		
Adj McFadden R2:	0.219	0.229	0.226	0.227		
AIC:	6622	6535	6558	6554		
BIC:	6722	6764	7042	7166		
Number of Observations:	6114	6114	6114	6114		
Number of Clusters:	2038	2038	2038	2038		
Number of Parameters:	15	34	72	91		
ASC Interactions	No	Yes	No	Yes		
Attribute Interactions	No	No	Yes	Yes		







Introduction Background Methods Results

Conclusions

Alternative Specific Constant

	Model 1		Model	2	Model 4		
Variable	Estimate	S.E.	Estimate	S.E.	Estimate	S.E.	
asc	108.41***	18.48	-17.78	39.75	30.89	59.76	
	-205.08***	14.71	199.35***	14.81	-190.36***	16.08	
\$50K - \$100K			72.93**	23.57	55.41	35.03	
\$100K +			134.27***	25.02	110.15**	36.20	
Refuse			10.26	30.06	21.93	43.63	
Coll/Uni			32.73*	15.72	26.41	23.75	
45 - 64			-13.97	18.26	-18.63	27.49	
65+			-32.57	22.91	-40.41	34.04	
11 to 20			-19.89	21.40	-32.39	48.46	
> 20			36.69+	21.66	27.93	48.94	



lr O	troduction Back	(ground 00000	Methods 0000000	000 0	esults ○○○○○○○○○○○○○○○○○○○○	000000000	000000000000000000000000000000000000000	Conclusion	I.S	
ŀ	Alternative Specific Constant									
	Variable	Est	Model imate	1 S.E.	Jeor-	S.Q.	Bad!!!)).E.		
	asc	108	.41***	18.48	-17.78	39.75	50.89	59.76		
		-205	.08***	14.71	199.35***	14.81	-190.36***	16.08		
	\$50K - \$100	K			72.93**	23.57	55.41	35.03		
	\$100K +				134.27***	25.02	110.15**	36.20		
	Refuse				10.26	30.06	21.93	43.63		
	Coll/Uni				32.73*	15.72	26.41	23.75		
	45 - 64				-13.97	18.26	-18.63	27.49		
	65+				-32.57	22.91	-40.41	34.04		
	11 to 20				-19.89	21.40	-32.39	48.46		
	> 20				36.69+	21.66	27.93	48.94		



Introduction Background Methods Concentration Concentratio

Alternative Specific Constant

	Model 1		Model	2	Model 4		
Variable	Estimate	S.E.	Estimate	S.E.	Estimate	S.E.	
asc	108.41***	18.48	-17.78	39.75	30.89	59.76	
	-205.08***	14.71	199.35***	14.81	-190.36***	16.08	
\$50K - \$100K			72.93**	23.57	55.41	35.03	
\$100K +			134.27***	25.02	110.15**	36.20	
Refuse			10.26	30.06	21.93	43.63	
Coll/Uni			32.73*	15.72	26.41	23.75	
45 - 64			-13.97	18.26	-18.63	27.49	
65+			-32.57	22.91	-40.41	34.04	
11 to 20			-19.89	21.40	-32.39	48.46	
> 20			36.69+	21.66	27.93	48.94	



Methods

Results

Conclusions

Alternative Specific Constant (continued)

Background

	Model 1	Model 2		Mode	4
Variable	Estimate S.E.	Estimate	S.E.	Estimate	S.E.
Advanced		14.97	16.02	34.26	32.08
Family		33.06	23.17	26.03	38.36
Nature		51.93**	16.41	37.57	26.59
Trophy		330.73***	91.21	117.61	125.77
Near		-7.10	18.99	-4.83	19.24
Far		-17.39	20.70	-18.78	21.04
Right		29.61+	17.59	20.63	35.65
Somewhat		-20.69	16.15	-17.07	36.58
Very		20.93	27.31	-51.62	62.30
Fair		25.97	17.31	-3.86	40.57
Good		-23.81	24.31	-154.85**	56.88



Methods

Results

Conclusions

Alternative Specific Constant (continued)

Background

	Model	1 Aodel	2		\sim
Variable	Estimate	S.E.	ິ ເ	O Bad	111 3
Advanced			<u> </u>		80.
Family		33.06	23.17	20.03	38.36
Nature		51.93**	16.41	37.57	26.59
Trophy		330.73***	91.21	117.61	125.77
Near		-7.10	18.99	-4.83	19.24
Far		-17.39	20.70	-18.78	21.04
Right		29.61+	17.59	20.63	35.65
Somewhat		-20.69	16.15	-17.07	36.58
Very		20.93	27.31	-51.62	62.30
Fair		25.97	17.31	-3.86	40.57
Good		-23.81	24.31	-154.85**	56.88



Introduction

a place of mind

Conclusions

Alternative Specific Constant (continued)

Methods

Background

	Model 1	Model 2		Mode	4
Variable	Estimate S.E.	Estimate	S.E.	Estimate	S.E.
Advanced		14.97	16.02	34.26	32.08
Family		33.06	23.17	26.03	38.36
Nature		51.93**	16.41	37.57	26.59
Trophy		330.73***	91.21	117.61	125.77
Near		-7.10	18.99	-4.83	19.24
Far		-17.39	20.70	-18.78	21.04
Right		29.61+	17.59	20.63	35.65
Somewhat		-20.69	16.15	-17.07	36.58
Very		20.93	27.31	-51.62	62.30
Fair		25.97	17.31	-3.86	40.57
Good		-23.81	24.31	-154.85**	56.88

Results



thods 000000000 Results ○○○○○○○○○○○○○○○○○○○○○○○○○○○○○○○○○○○

Conclusions

Harvestable Surplus

	Model 1		Model	3	Model 4	
Variable	Estimate	S.E.	Estimate	S.E.	Estimate	S.E.
Surplus	21.55***	2.86	-9.47	7.62	-0.92	9.37
	27.22***	4.29	-28.38***	3.93	-23.08***	5.67
\$50K - \$100K			12.62**	4.50	4.98	6.73
\$100K +			22.81***	4.76	7.20	6.97
Refuse			-0.19	5.61	-2.81	8.12
Coll/Uni			5.49+	3.04	2.08	4.65
45 - 64			-1.25	3.52	1.55	5.29
65+			-3.48	4.31	3.07	6.51

Results ○○○○○○○○○○○○○○○○○○○○○○○○○○○○○○○○○○○ Conclusions

Harvestable Surplus

	Model 1		Model	3	Model 4	
Variable	Estimate	S.E.	Estimate	S.E.	Estimate	S.E.
Surplus	21.55***	2.86	-9.47	7.62	-0.92	9.37
	27.22***	4.29	-28.38***	3.93	-23.08***	5.67
\$50K - \$100K			12.62**	4.50	4.98	6.73
\$100K +			22.81***	4.76	7.20	6.97
Refuse			-0.19	5.61	-2.81	8.12
Coll/Uni			5.49+	3.04	2.08	4.65
45 - 64			-1.25	3.52	1.55	5.29
65+			-3.48	4.31	3.07	6.51



 Conclusions

Harvestable Surplus (continued)

Background

	Model 1	Mode	3	Model	4	
Variable	Estimate S.E.	Estimate	S.E.	Estimate	S.E.	
Family		5.97	4.86	1.49	7.99	
Nature		10.26**	3.45	3.10	5.44	
Trophy		132.68**	44.92	105.72+	55.72	
11 to 20		-0.72	6.39	2.44	7.03	
> 20		6.02	6.24	3.42	6.83	
Somewhat		3.80	4.00	5.01	4.60	
Very		6.68	7.22	12.28	7.77	
Fair		12.82*	5.00	13.38*	5.77	
Good		18.69*	8.10	30.43***	8.80	



ntrod	uction Backg	round Methods	Results	000000000000000000000000000000000000000	000000000000000000000000000000000000000	00 00	lusions	
Har	vestable	Surplus (conti	nue					
		Model 1	e e					
	Variable	Estimate S.E.	Estimate	S.E.	Estimate	S.E.		
	Family		5.97	4.86	1.49	7.99		
	Nature		10.26**	3.45	3.10	5.44		
	Trophy		132.68**	44.92	105.72+	55.72		
	11 to 20		-0.72	6.39	2.44	7.03		
	> 20		6.02	6.24	3.42	6.83		
	Somewhat		3.80	4.00	5.01	4.60		
	Very		6.68	7.22	12.28	7.77		
	Fair		12.82*	5.00	13.38*	5.77		
	Good		18.69*	8.10	30.43***	8.80		



nt	roduction Back	ground Meth	ods 0000000	Results	000000000000000000000000000000000000000	000000000000000000000000000000000000000	Conclus 00
5	uccess / C	pportunit	сy				
		Mode	1	Mode	3	Model 4	
	Variable	Estimate	S.E.	Estimate	S.E.	Estimate	S.E.
	Succ,/Opp.	-23.26***	5.94	-55.65**	17.34	-51.20**	17.63
		64.18***	13.31	-69.48***	13.40	68.96***	11.93
	Near			26.78*	11.57	27.57*	11.80
	Far			11.16	12.90	14.31	13.08
	Family			17.58	15.42	7.86	16.21
	Nature			22.28*	10.98	10.96	11.81
	Trophy			231.92+	132.50	189.54	144.50
	11 to 20			6.96	16.35	8.25	16.54
	> 20			30.66+	16.49	24.25	16.61
	Advanced			-27.81**	10.26	-23.00*	10.62
	Fair			-5.97	13.56	-7.97	13.86
	Good			7.35	18.89	11.56	18.83

B

1

a place of mind

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

Introduction

Background

Success / Opportunity

		Mode	1	Mode	13	Model 4		
	Variable	Estimate	S.E.	Estinate			-------------	
	Succ,/Opp.	-23.26***	5.94			~>	3	
		64.18***	13.31	-6.			11.93	
	Near			26.78*	11.57	27.57*	11.80	
	Far			11.16	12.90	14.31	13.08	
	Family			17.58	15.42	7.86	16.21	
	Nature			22.28*	10.98	10.96	11.81	
	Trophy			231.92+	132.50	189.54	144.50	
	11 to 20			6.96	16.35	8.25	16.54	
	> 20			30.66+	16.49	24.25	16.61	
	Advanced			-27.81**	10.26	-23.00*	10.62	
	Fair			-5.97	13.56	-7.97	13.86	
	Good			7.35	18.89	11.56	18.83	
UBC	a place of mi	nd THEU	NIVERSITY O	F BRITISH COLUMBIA				

nt,	roduction Bac	c kground 000000	Metho 00000	ds 000000	Results	000000000000000000000000000000000000000		Conclus 00	
5	uccess / (Opport	unit	y					
		N	lodel	1	Mode	3	Model 4		
	Variable	Estim	nate	S.E.	Estimate	S.E.	Estimate	S.E.	
	Succ,/Opp	23.26)***	5.94	-55.65**	17.34	-51.20**	17.63	
		64.18	}***	13.31	-69.48***	13.40	68.96***	11.93	
	Near				26.78*	11.57	27.57*	11.80	
	Far				11.16	12.90	14.31	13.08	
	Family				17.58	15.42	7.86	16.21	
	Nature				22.28*	10.98	10.96	11.81	
	Trophy				231.92+	132.50	189.54	144.50	
	11 to 20				6.96	16.35	8.25	16.54	
	> 20				30.66+	16.49	24.25	16.61	
	Advanced				-27.81**	10.26	-23.00*	10.62	
	Fair				-5.97	13.56	-7.97	13.86	
	Good				7.35	18.89	11.56	18.83	



Governance: Game Commission

	Model 1		Mode	3	Model 4		
Variable	Estimate	S.E.	Estimate	S.E.	Estimate	S.E.	
Game Comm.	100.11***	19.71	98.54*	40.32	104.10*	43.20	
	163.18***	43.14	103.60*	47.95	136.77**	44.43	
Right			109.57**	33.95	109.66**	39.20	
11 to 20			-26.96	43.99	-16.64	46.94	
> 20			-29.42	44.73	-38.76	48.64	
Advanced			24.56	30.47	2.16	35.10	
Somewhat			-25.24	30.76	-16.15	34.06	
Very			73.34	50.64	95.57+	56.20	
Fair			-45.49	35.80	-43.31	38.19	
Good			-75.87	51.05	-26.81	54.05	



ntr C	oduction Backgroun	nd Methods 0 00000000	Re	sults	000000000	000000000000000000000000000000000000000	Conclusio 00	on
G	overnance: C	Game Com	nmissi	ion				
		Model	1		R	ኛ > 📒	3	
	Variable	Estimate	S.E.		ΛŊ		<u>́ S.E</u> .	
	Game Comm.	100.11***	19.71	98.54*	40.32	104.10*	43.20	
		163.18***	43.14	103.60*	47.95	136.77**	44.43	
	Right			109.57**	33.95	109.66**	39.20	
	11 to 20			-26.96	43.99	-16.64	46.94	
	> 20			-29.42	44.73	-38.76	48.64	
	Advanced			24.56	30.47	2.16	35.10	
	Somewhat			-25.24	30.76	-16.15	34.06	
	Very			73.34	50.64	95.57+	56.20	
	Fair			-45.49	35.80	-43.31	38.19	
	Good			-75.87	51.05	-26.81	54.05	



Background Methods

Results

Conclusions

Governance: Multi-Government, Multi-Stakeholder

	Model 1		Model	3	Model 4		
Variable	Estimate	S.E.	Estimate	S.E.	Estimate	S.E.	
Multi. Gov.	35.66*	17.64	85.88*	37.07	91.42*	40.85	
	209.41***	33.95	-208.55***	31.51	221.20***	30.39	
Right			39.81	32.65	29.62	37.49	
11 to 20			-42.60	40.29	-29.66	44.41	
> 20			-76.24+	40.79	-91.00*	45.93	
Advanced			28.26	28.75	8.77	33.55	
Somewhat			-16.78	29.11	-10.16	33.30	
Very			88.32+	50.57	111.29+	57.50	
Fair			-32.69	31.40	-29.07	36.07	
Good			-119.70*	49.04	-66.98	53.42	



lntr 0	oduction B	ackgro	und Metho	d s 00000	Results	000000000	000000000000000000000000000000000000000	Conclusi 00	ən
G	overnand	ce:	Multi-Gc	vernn	nent, Mult	i-Stak	eholder		
	Mariahla		Model	1) 		
	Multi Co		25 66*	3.⊏ . 17.64		37.07	01.42*	∕ ⊃.⊏. ⊿0.85	
	Multi. GC	JV.	209 41***	33.95	-208 55***	31 51	221 20***	30.30	
	Right		205.11	00.50	39.81	32.65	29.62	37.49	
	11 to 20				-42.60	40.29	-29.66	44.41	
	> 20				-76.24+	40.79	-91.00*	45.93	
	Advanced				28.26	28.75	8.77	33.55	
	Somewha	t			-16.78	29.11	-10.16	33.30	
	Very				88.32+	50.57	111.29+	57.50	
	Fair				-32.69	31.40	-29.07	36.07	
	Good				-119.70*	49.04	-66.98	53.42	



Methods

Background

Results

Conclusions

Governance: Multi-Government, Multi-Stakeholder

	Model	1	Model 3		Model 4	
Variable	Estimate	S.E.	Estimate	S.E.	Estimate	S.E.
Multi. Gov.	35.66*	17.64	85.88*	37.07	91.42*	40.85
	209.41***	33.95	-208.55***	31.51	221.20***	30.39
Right			39.81	32.65	29.62	37.49
11 to 20			-42.60	40.29	-29.66	44.41
> 20			-76.24+	40.79	-91.00*	45.93
Advanced			28.26	28.75	8.77	33.55
Somewhat			-16.78	29.11	-10.16	33.30
Very			88.32+	50.57	111.29+	57.50
Fair			-32.69	31.40	-29.07	36.07
Good			-119.70*	49.04	-66.98	53.42



Dedicated Licence Share: 50%

Background

	Mode	1	Model 3		Model 4	
Variable	Estimate	S.E.	Estimate	S.E.	Estimate	S.E.
50% Ded.	74.07***	17.13	69.32+	36.36	79.19*	39.77
	31.54	62.26	-36.45	28.25	34.02	26.89
Right			-66.36+	33.88	-79.32*	38.54
11 to 20			16.82	40.81	20.06	45.45
> 20			88.76*	42.10	72.74	46.18
Advanced			-25.83	31.10	-34.10	34.49
Somewhat			-18.75	31.06	-17.46	34.27
Very			-83.99	52.03	-80.24	58.98
Fair			19.13	31.91	15.42	35.70
Good			-36.46	52.03	26.25	55.45

Results



ntrodu	ction Backgr 00000	ound Method	ls 00000	Results	000000000	000000000000000000000000000000000000000	00 00	lusion
Ded	icated Li	cence Sha	are: 5	0%				
	Variable	Mode Estimate	l 1 S.E.	Esce	K	~~>	E.	
	50% Ded.	74.07***	17.13	69.32+	36.36	79.19*	39.77	
		31.54	62.26	-36.45	28.25	34.02	26.89	
	Right			-66.36+	33.88	-79.32*	38.54	
	11 to 20			16.82	40.81	20.06	45.45	
	> 20			88.76*	42.10	72.74	46.18	
	Advanced			-25.83	31.10	-34.10	34.49	
	Somewhat			-18.75	31.06	-17.46	34.27	
	Very			-83.99	52.03	-80.24	58.98	
	Fair			19.13	31.91	15.42	35.70	
	Good			-36.46	52.03	26.25	55.45	

Introduction Background Methods Results

Dedicated Licence Share: 50%

	Mode	1	Model 3		Model 4	
Variable	Estimate	S.E.	Estimate	S.E.	Estimate	S.E.
50% Ded.	74.07***	17.13	69.32+	36.36	79.19*	39.77
	31.54	62.26	-36.45	28.25	34.02	26.89
Right			-66.36+	33.88	-79.32*	38.54
11 to 20			16.82	40.81	20.06	45.45
> 20			88.76*	42.10	72.74	46.18
Advanced			-25.83	31.10	-34.10	34.49
Somewhat			-18.75	31.06	-17.46	34.27
Very			-83.99	52.03	-80.24	58.98
Fair			19.13	31.91	15.42	35.70
Good			-36.46	52.03	26.25	55.45



Introduction Background Methods Results OCOCCOOCO Dedicated Licence Share: 100%

COL	101	usi

Model 1 Model 3 Model 4 Variable Estimate S.E. Estimate S.E. Estimate S.F. 100% Ded. 60.65*** 16.0061.46+ 34.42 82.28 +42.13 11.4010.80 -5.62 12.60 -99.32*** 24.03 Right 6.14 27.31 -6.5336.98 11 to 20 11.84 36.50 19.9944.43 > 2043.89 30.67 36.87 45.48 Advanced -22.55 23.99 -39.0632.57Somewhat -23.25 26.53-22.4132.31Very -42.9045.02 -27.4055.75

- -13.85 28.32 -10.89 34.42
- 21.50 46.22 90.12+ 51.08



Fair

Good
ntrod	uction Backgr 00000	round Method	s 00000	Results	00000000	00000000000000000	0 00 Concl	usion			
Dedicated Licence Share: 100%											
	Model 1						33				
	Variable	Estimate	S.E.	E. ce		Ŋ,	<u>, Е.</u>				
	100% Ded.	60.65***	16.00	61.46+	34.42	82.28+	42.13				
		11.40	10.80	-5.62	12.60	-99.32***	24.03				
	Right			6.14	27.31	-6.53	36.98				
	11 to 20			11.84	36.50	19.99	44.43				
	> 20			43.89	36.87	30.67	45.48				
	Advanced			-22.55	23.99	-39.06	32.57				
	Somewhat			-23.25	26.53	-22.41	32.31				
	Very			-42.90	45.02	-27.40	55.75				
	Fair			-13.85	28.32	-10.89	34.42				
	Good			21.50	46.22	90.12+	51.08				





- Interactions between individual specific characteristics and alternative levels enables predicted WTP for each survey participant.
- Variables of interest:
 - Mean WTP,
 - Share made worse off (WTP below zero),
 - Confidence interval for mean WTP (bootstrap)



tion Background Met

Results

Conclusions

Alternative Specific Constant





a place of mind

Introduction Background Methods Conclusion Conclusion Conclusion Harvestable Surplus: 10,000





a place of mind

 Conclusions

Success / Opportunity: 19/100 and 1/5

Background

Introduction





a place of mind

Governance: Game Commission





a place of mind

Introduction Background Methods Results

Dedicated Licence Share: 100%





a place of mind

 Introduction
 Background
 Methods
 Results
 Conclusion
 Conclusion

 Combination:
 +5K surplus, game com., 100%
 Conclusion
 Conclusion





a place of mind

Results

Conclusions

Comparable Licence Fees

Jurisdiction	Licence (CAD)	Jurisdiction	Licence (CAD)
B.C.	\$25	B.C.	\$25
N.W.T.	\$22	Sask.	\$40 / \$65
Yukon	\$10	Alta	\$44.95
Alaska	\$0	Man.	\$57.25 / \$88.25
		Montana	\$167.81
		Idaho	\$268.16
		Colorado	\$336.97
		Wash.	\$445.71

• WTP for changes in line with licence fees in nearby Pacific Northwest US states.



Introduction

Background

Methods 0000000000 Results

Conclusions

Alternative Specific Constant





Introduction Background Methods Results Conclusion Conclusion Conclusion Harvestable Surplus: 10,000



GroupFac 🔁 Income 🔁 Reason 🔁 Home



Results

Conclusions

Success / Opportunity: 19/100 and 1/5

Methods

Background



THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA



Introduction

Introduction 0 Background

Methods 0000000000 Results

Conclusions

Governance: Game Commission



GroupFac 🔁 Income 🔁 Reason 🔁 Home



Introduction

Background

Methods 0000000000 Results

Conclusions

Dedicated Licence Share: 100%



E

 Conclusions

Combination: +5K surplus, game com., 100%



GroupFac 🔁 Income 🔁 Reason 🔁 Home

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA



Introduction

Background

 Introduction
 Background
 Methods
 Results
 Conclusions
 Conclusions

 Trophy Hunters
 Conclusions
 Conclusions
 Conclusions
 Conclusions
 Conclusions



- There are 17 trophy hunters in 2038 respondents (0.83%).
- Statistical difference: Refuse (P = 0.0807) and Rural/Urban (P = 0.0047).





- BC resident hunters who participated in the moose limited entry hunt have heterogeneous preferences.
 - Strong income effect on WTP for any alternative, weaker for income, age and hunting experience.
 - WTP for larger harvest numbers largely reflected in bias favoring alternative.
 - Those with favorite hunting region as home region WTP to hunt more often, even if less likely to be successful.
 - Even stronger for self assessed advanced hunters.
 - Much weaker for hunters with neigbouring favorite region (travel cost).





- BC resident hunters who participated in the moose limited entry hunt have heterogeneous preferences.
 - Reforming governance to an appointed game commission strongly favored by those leaning right politically, relative to no leaning.
 - Hunters strongly prefer dedicating more funding to game management.
 - Right leaning respondents double WTP with doubling of dedicated share.

