**FE700** 



# The Contribution of the Water LIFE Kids Cup Fishing Tournament to the Charlotte County, Florida Economy<sup>1</sup>

Chuck Adams, Betty Staugler, and Alan Hodges<sup>2</sup>

### Introduction

The Water LIFE Kids Cup Fishing Tournament is held annually in Punta Gorda, Florida (http://charlotte.ifas.ufl.edu/kidscup/index.html). The tournament is locally organized and held in conjunction with the ESPN2 Oh Boy! Oberto Redfish Cup. The tournament theme is "Teaching Kids about the Environment through Fishing". The 2007 tournament, which pairs young anglers ages 10 to 16 with adult captains, was the fourth year the event has been held. The Kids Cup tournament is designed to provide local youth anglers with a taste of competitive tournament fishing, without the distractions imposed by cash prizes. Though no money is awarded to the youth anglers, a host of tournament prizes are presented to the participants. These prizes are donated by numerous local and national sponsors. The tournament is the sole fund raising event for the Don Ball School of Fishing. Named after a local citizen committed to youth fishing and community support, the School functions as an extra-curricular program offered at Charlotte and Sarasota County middle schools.

Participants in the Water LIFE Kids Cup Fishing Tournament travel to Punta Gorda from places within and outside Charlotte County. The economic activities associated with the Tournament are thought to have a positive benefit on the Charlotte County economy. For example, participant expenses associated with the tournament might include lodging, vehicle and boat fuel, fishing gear, clothing, and other expenditures. In addition, a \$100 entry fee is required. As a result, these expenses may create a positive benefit to local businesses within Charlotte County, particularly if these local expenses are incurred by individuals who travel from outside Charlotte County to participate. This brief paper describes an assessment of the economic activities in Charlotte County associated with the Water LIFE Kids Cup Fishing Tournament. The findings from this analysis should help the planners of this and other similar tournaments better anticipate the economic benefits associated with such community activities.

#### **Methods**

A questionnaire was developed for distribution to all tournament participants. The questionnaire

The Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences (IFAS) is an Equal Opportunity Institution authorized to provide research, educational information and other services only to individuals and institutions that function with non-discrimination with respect to race, creed, color, religion, age, disability, sex, sexual orientation, marital status, national origin, political opinions or affiliations. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Cooperative Extension Service, University of Florida, IFAS, Florida A. & M. University Cooperative Extension Program, and Boards of County Commissioners Cooperating. Larry Arrington, Dean

<sup>1.</sup> This is EDIS document FE700, a publication of the Food and Resource Economics Department, Florida Cooperative Extension Service, Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL. Published October 2007. Please visit the EDIS website at http://edis.ifas.ufl.edu.

Chuck Adams, Professor, Food and Resource Economics Department, University of Florida; Betty Staugler, Marine Agent, Florida Sea Grant, Charlotte
County, Port Charlotte, Florida; and Alan Hodges, Associate In, Food and Resource Economics Department, Florida Cooperative Extension Service,
Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL.

solicited information from participants concerning the nature of their involvement in the tournament; county of residence; tournament-related expenditures by type; and, if a visitor was from outside of Charlotte County (non-local), the number of individuals in the travel party and the county/state of residence. In addition, for a non-local participant, the questionnaire sought to determine if participation in the tournament was the primary reason for visiting Charlotte County. If participation in the tournament was not the primary reason for visiting, respondents were asked to estimate the percentage of their total travel costs that were associated with the tournament. The self-administered questionnaire was field tested prior to survey implementation.

The questionnaire was distributed to participants at a mandatory pre-tournament banquet. Recipients of the survey were asked to complete the survey onsite, or immediately thereafter, and return it. Those preferring the latter option were asked to complete and return the questionnaire in a self-addressed, postage-paid envelope provided to them. A total of 122 questionnaires were distributed. The individuals targeted by the survey were the adult participants in the tournament, including guide captains and guardians serving as guides, and other individuals involved in the tournament. Thus a separate questionnaire was given to 122 individuals, each representing a party of one or more individuals participating in the tournament.

Evaluating the impact an activity, such as a fishing tournament, has on a county's economy requires distinguishing between expenditures incurred by county (local) residents and non-county (non-local) residents. Expenditures by local residents represent only transfers within that county's economy, which creates no new money for the county. Expenditures associated with non-local residents generate new revenue, which then generates additional economic activity through indirect and induced impacts, otherwise known as the "multiplier effect". Indirect impacts occur as local businesses purchase the necessary goods and services to meet the additional demands of non-local tournament participants. Induced impacts occur as households of employees, managers, and business owners spend their additional income generated by non-local

fishing tournament participants at other local businesses in the area for the everyday necessities of life

The tournament expenditure estimates provided by local and non-local adult tournament participants were entered into a regional economic modeling software package: IMPLAN Pro (Minnesota IMPLAN Group, 2002). IMPLAN includes a detailed county-level database of the U.S. economy, which makes it possible to quickly construct detailed input-output models for regional and county economies. Such models mathematically describe and quantify the economic relationships and interactions within a defined economic region. Once constructed, these models describe how new revenue (non-local expenditures) for specific types of events impact all types of businesses and institutions in a local economy. This study will focus on the Charlotte County, Florida economy.

# **Results**

The reader should be aware that each survey respondent provided information for a specific party, which may have contained more than one individual. Thus the information provided in this section for "respondents" represents the information for the party to which the survey respondent was making reference.

## Survey Findings

Nature of Participation: Of the 122 questionnaires distributed to tournament participants, a total of 35 were completed and returned (28.6% response rate). Of those respondents, 16 (47.5%) indicated that they were fishing participants (survey completed by an accompanying adult), 15 (42.9%) were fishing guides, and 5 (14.3%) were otherwise involved with the tournament (Table 1). Since at least one respondent chose more than one answer, the percentages do not sum to 100%.

Residence: The majority of the respondents were residents of Charlotte County (Table 1). Of the total number of respondents, 20 (57.1%) indicated a Charlotte County residence, while 15 (42.9%) were residents of some other county or state. For those who arrived from outside of Charlotte County (non-local),

the average number of persons in their party was approximately two. The majority of the non-local participants were from Lee County (eight), followed by three from Sarasota County and one each from Pinellas, Collier, De Soto and St. Lucie Counties. Those traveling from outside Charlotte County indicated that they would spend an average of 1.5 days in Charlotte County while participating in the tournament.

Expenditures: Respondents (local and non-local combined) indicated spending a total of \$15,461 on tournament-related expenses (Table 2). Of this total amount, the largest single expenditure type was "fishing gear/tackle", which totaled \$6,550, or 42% of the total. Of the remaining expenditures, \$3,170 (21%), \$2,715 (18%), \$1,546 (10%), \$1,070 (7%), and \$410 (2%) were spent on "other", gas/fuel/oil, supplies, food, and lodging, respectively. Taking into consideration only those values provided by respondents for each expenditure type (i.e., discounting zero values and missing responses), the average expenditure levels for the various expenditure categories were as follows: lodging (\$137), food (\$47), gas/fuel/oil (\$97), fishing gear (\$262), supplies (\$57), and other expenses (\$132).

The total and average values by expense category for both groups were estimated by disaggregating the expenses amongst local and non-local participants. The total expenditures for local participants, summed across all expense categories, were \$6,808. The greatest total expenses by categories included fishing gear (\$2,295), "other" (\$1,825), and gas/fuel/oil (\$1,235). The total expenditures for non-local participants, summed across all expense categories, were \$8,654. For non-local participants, the ranking was somewhat different, with greatest total expense categories including fishing gear (\$4,255), gas/fuel/oil (\$1,480) and "other" (\$1,345). Of the total expenditures reported by tournament participants (\$15,462), 44% was incurred by local participants and 56% was incurred by non-local tournament participants.

### Economic Impact

The economic impact analysis provides an assessment of the economic activities resulting from *all* participants in the Water LIFE Kids Cup Fishing

Tournament. There were 122 total participants. However, completed surveys were received from only 35 participants. Thus to estimate the economic impact for the entire population of participants, an extrapolation process was utilized to provide an estimate of the total expenditures for all 122 of the tournament participants.

Two key assumptions utilized in this extrapolation process were (1) that the average expenses by category, for both local and non-local participants measured for the 35 survey respondents, would remain constant across the entire population of 122 tournament participants and (2) the same percentage distribution for local and non-local within the 35 respondents would apply to the entire population of 122. Given these assumptions, total expenditures for all tournament participants were estimated to be \$53,938. Of this amount, \$23,649 (44%) and \$30,268 (56%) were estimated to have been incurred by local and non-local tournament participants, respectively.

These estimates for local and non-local tournament participant expenditures were then entered into the IMPLAN model. The model generated estimates of direct economic output associated with the expenditures for both participant groups, and the indirect and induced economic output associated with non-local expenditures (Table 3). The total county economic impacts were \$37,760, of which \$12,209 was associated with local participant expenditures and \$25,551 was associated with non-local expenditures. The latter non-local impact component is composed of direct outputs (\$13,811), indirect outputs (\$3,388), and induced outputs (\$8,352). The indirect and induced outputs are also known as "multiplier" effects. In addition, \$20,490 in value-added output was generated, which was composed of \$5,810 from local participant expenditures and \$14,680 from non-local expenditures.

# Summary

This analysis of expenditures associated with the Water LIFE Kids Cup Fishing Tournament indicates that the Charlotte County economy derived positive economic benefits from the event. Local participants

are estimated to have spent \$23,649 and non-local participants are estimated to have spent \$30,289. And as can be seen from the IMPLAN analysis, the non-local expenditures provided a greater impact on the local economy. This finding is expected, given that non-local expenditures bring in new dollars into the local economy. In addition, the non-local expenditures create direct economic output, and indirect and induced output effects. These latter effects represent the oft-referred to "multiplier" effect, which represents how these new dollars are circulated within the local economy once initially spent by visitors. Thus, the total regional impacts resulting from the Water LIFE Kids Cup Fishing Tournament were estimated to be \$37,760 in economic output and \$20,490 in value added output.

Although the Water LIFE Kids Cup Fishing Tournament creates positive, tangible economic benefits to the Charlotte County economy, other intangible benefits are likely to be generated. Recall that the purpose of the fishing tournament is to teach youth about the marine environment through the fishing experience. Although not specifically addressed by this study, events such as this are often credited with enhancing the awareness level of participants regarding the importance, complexity, and fragility of the coastal marine environment. The non-monetary benefit that hopefully will be generated by the continuance of this event, and others similar to it, is that the young participants will acquire a strong appreciation for the marine environment. Hopefully, these youngsters will, in turn, strive to become better stewards of this precious natural resource and utilize our coastal environment in a sustainable manner. If so, generations in the future will benefit from a stewardship ethic developed today.

**Table 1.** Responses to tournament survey questions.

Participant Captain ning Participant residence in Charlotte County?  If No State or Florida county of residence Pinellas Sarasota Lee Collier	20 15 1 3 8	45.7% 42.9% 11.4% 2.9% 57.1% 42.9% 6.7% 20.0%
Captain ning Participant residence in Charlotte County?  If No State or Florida county of residence Pinellas Sarasota Lee	15 4 1 20 15 1 3	42.9% 11.4% 2.9% 57.1% 42.9%
residence in Charlotte County?  If No State or Florida county of residence Pinellas Sarasota Lee	20 15 1 3	11.4% 2.9% 57.1% 42.9%
residence in Charlotte County?  If No State or Florida county of residence Pinellas Sarasota Lee	20 15 1 3	2.9% 57.1% 42.9% 6.7%
If No State or Florida county of residence Pinellas Sarasota Lee	20 15 1 3	57.1% 42.9% 6.7%
If No State or Florida county of residence Pinellas Sarasota Lee	15 1 3	42.9% 6.7%
Pinellas Sarasota Lee	15 1 3	42.9% 6.7%
Pinellas Sarasota Lee	1 3	6.7%
Pinellas Sarasota Lee	3	
Sarasota Lee	3	
Lee		20.0%
	8	
Collier		53.3%
	1	6.7%
De Soto	1	6.7%
St. Lucie	1	6.7%
any days will you and those who traveled with you spernament?	end in Charlotte cou	ınty while participating in
pent in Charlotte County	18	[1.5 days]
o you estimate to be your travel group's total expendit ted with the Kids Cup Tournament? <sup>2</sup>	tures, such as lodgir	ng, food, fuel, etc.,
	3	[\$136.67]
	23	[\$46.52]
el/Oil	28	[\$96.96]
Gear (tackle, equipment, etc.)	25	[\$262.00]
s (bait, clothing, etc.)	27	[\$57.26]
entry, fee, gratuity, etc.)	24	[\$132.08]
ave traveled from outside Charlotte County was the Charlotte County? <sup>3</sup>	he Tournament your	r primary reason for
	13	37.1%
	1	2.9%
	3	[83%]
2	ntry, fee, gratuity, etc.)  ave traveled from outside Charlotte County was to Charlotte County?	ntry, fee, gratuity, etc.)  ave traveled from outside Charlotte County was the Tournament your Charlotte County?  13

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Response percentages for **Q1** do not add to 100% due to one or more respondents selecting more than one choice.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Values shown for **Q4** represent the average values for those individiuals who responded with a non-zero amount for the specific expenditure type. Responses with missing values are not included.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Response percentages for **Q5** do not add to 100% due to poor response rate to question.

**Table 2.** Tournament expenditures by residence status and expense category.

Loc	al Participa	nts	Non-L	ocal Partici	pants	All Respondents		
N	Ave \$	Total \$	N	Ave \$	Total \$	N	Ave \$	Total \$
0	_	_	3	137	410	3	137	410
11	53	585	11	44	485	23	47	1,070
14	88	1,235	14	106	1,480	28	97	2,715
13	177	2,295	12	355	4,255	25	262	6,550
16	54	867	11	62	679	27	57	1,546
14	130	1,825	10	135	1,345	24	132	3,170
_	502	6,808	_	839	8,654	_	732	15,462
	N 0 11 14 13 16	N Ave \$ 0 — 11 53 14 88 13 177 16 54 14 130	0 — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — —	N Ave \$ Total \$ N  0 — 3  11 53 585 11  14 88 1,235 14  13 177 2,295 12  16 54 867 11  14 130 1,825 10	N         Ave \$         Total \$         N         Ave \$           0         —         —         3         137           11         53         585         11         44           14         88         1,235         14         106           13         177         2,295         12         355           16         54         867         11         62           14         130         1,825         10         135	N       Ave \$       Total \$       N       Ave \$       Total \$         0       —       —       3       137       410         11       53       585       11       44       485         14       88       1,235       14       106       1,480         13       177       2,295       12       355       4,255         16       54       867       11       62       679         14       130       1,825       10       135       1,345	N         Ave \$         Total \$         N         Ave \$         Total \$         N           0         —         —         3         137         410         3           11         53         585         11         44         485         23           14         88         1,235         14         106         1,480         28           13         177         2,295         12         355         4,255         25           16         54         867         11         62         679         27           14         130         1,825         10         135         1,345         24	N         Ave \$         Total \$         N         Ave \$         Total \$         N         Ave \$           0         —         —         3         137         410         3         137           11         53         585         11         44         485         23         47           14         88         1,235         14         106         1,480         28         97           13         177         2,295         12         355         4,255         25         262           16         54         867         11         62         679         27         57           14         130         1,825         10         135         1,345         24         132

N = Number of respondents who provided a non-zero value for the specific expense category.

Ave \$ = The summation of non-zero responses divided by the number of respondents providing non-zero values for the specific expense category. Responses with missing values are not included.

Table 3. Economic impacts of the Water LIFE Kids Cup Fishing Tournament in Charlotte County, Florida, 2007.

The Contribution of the Water LIFE Kids Cup Fishing Tournament to the Charlotte County,....

				Econor	Economic Output Expenditures (\$)	=xpenditure	s (\$)		Valı	ne Added E	Value Added Expenditures (\$)	
Industry Group	Output (\$)	Value Added (\$)	Direct Local	Direct Value Added Local	Direct Non Local	Indirect Non Local	Induced Non Local	Total Non Local	Direct Non Local	Indirect Non Local	Induced Non Local	Total Non Local
Ag, Forestry, Fish & Hunting	1,769	464	972	249	992	_	24	797	197	က	15	215
Mining	16	က	0	0	0	∞	80	16	0	~	_	7
Utilities	53	37	_	2	5	17	24	46	4	12	16	32
Construction	894	437	0	0	0	190	704	894	0	93	344	437
Manufacturing	150	28	9	7	4	62	78	144	~	28	27	26
Wholesale Trade	909	414	176	121	137	88	294	430	66	61	140	294
Transportation & Warehousing	377	225	40	17	33	202	103	337	13	136	28	207
Retail Trade	14,523	8,926	5,483	3,374	7,952	186	905	9,040	4,872	116	265	5,553
Information	586	237	45	19	33	276	232	542	4	109	92	218
Finance & Insurance	880	550	26	62	72	235	475	783	46	153	289	488
Real Estate & Rental	1,185	807	112	92	83	604	386	1,073	22	416	258	731
Professional, Scientific & Technical Services	983	533	36	23	27	268	351	946	17	297	196	511

Table 3. Economic impacts of the Water LIFE Kids Cup Fishing Tournament in Charlotte County, Florida, 2007.

The Contribution of the Water LIFE Kids Cup Fishing Tournament to the Charlotte County,....

425 1,228 825 Total Non Local 19 296 80 2,329 14,680 63 Value Added Expenditures (\$) 258 2,112 102 13 199 5,508 Induced Non 0 751 9 Local 320 1,962 Indirect Non Local  $\alpha$ 49 46 55 53 214 13 920 580 164 7,210 Local 0 Direct Non 715 1,618 128 2,919 Local 109 2,284 2,697 25,551 Total Non 35 1,250 Local 176 526 2,376 8,352 25 95 397 15 Induced Economic Output Expenditures (\$) 3,388 Local 109 Indirect Non 4 12 8 531 86 88 Estimates of regional economic impact based in Implan model for Charlotte County, Florida. 213 Local 0 က 363 1,659 2,434 13,811 / Direct Non 7 5,810 288 9 Local 0 2  $^{\circ}$ 547 Direct Value Added 781 221 12,209 Direct Local 489 1,140 286 0 10 4 28 3,277 430 1,255 1,775 20,490 98 1,607 2,550 63 Value Added 2 \$ 37,760 109 725 2,107 156 3,423 6,196 2,984 38 Output (\$) Accommodation & Administrative & Entertainment & Management of Waste Services Health & Social Other Services Government & Food Services Educational Companies Recreation Non-NAIC Services Services Total Industry Group 22 26 72 92 62 61 7 8