ECONOMICS OF PRESERVING EUCALYPT WOODLAND: DIEBACK CONTROL, PRESERVATION OF WOODLAND AND CHOICES

A Dissertation Presented in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Economics

> by ROHAN EKANAYAKE

University of New England Armidale, N.S.W. Australia

June 1985

I certify that:

- The substance of this dissertation has not already been submitted for any degree and is not being currently submitted for any other degree;
- 2. any help received in preparing this dissertation and all sources used have been acknowledged herein.

Rohan Ekanayake

'Man's Brain and Thoughts are the Products of Nature and Are in Correspondence with it' - Engels

ABSTRACT

Grazing properties in southern New England have approximately one third of their land as woodland. Half of this woodland is dying due to the set of diseases and conditions known as eucalypt dieback. There appear to be substantial external costs from the decline and the death of this woodland, and the control of the problem provides many public-good benefits.

The attitudes of a relevant segment of the public to eucalypt dieback have been sought, their preferences for different control measures have been elicited and analysed. The choices between alternative woodland types, and preservation benefits were also studied and analysed in the process.

The results in this study have been obtained by regression analyses of cross-sectional survey data. Relatively straight forward regression analyses helped determine the magnitudes of recreation, existence, and option values. To estimate the demand for alternative dieback control measures, a system of demand equations was estimated jointly by Zellner's method of seemingly unrelated regressions. A single equation estimated by ordinary least squares was used to choose between alternative types of eucalypt woodland to preserve.

The recreation, existence, and option values were estimated by the direct question method approved by the U.S. Water Resources Council in 1979. Respondents' willingness-to-pay determined these preservation values. The preferences for alternative control measures, and choice between alternative types of eucalypt woodland to preserve were determined through a budget-allocation game following Hardie and Strand (1978). This game appears to overcome the free-rider difficulty inherent in the demand for public goods.

This study indicates that the individuals who respond are very concerned to improve the health of the surrounding woodland. They would appear to be willing to help fund research into the dieback problem, and would benefit from the knowledge that dieback would be reduced. The demand for dieback control indicates preferences for eucalypt alternatives like preserving mature trees, and fencingout-stock from young eucalypt regeneration, rather than other plausible control measures. Apparently members of the sample had no consistent rational preferences for introduced tree species. Between the boilogical characteristics for choices between woodland types, they picked healthiness as the most important attribute of woodland.

PREFACE

The author is grateful for the supervisory assistance given by Associate Professor J.A. Sinden during the conduct of the research and the preparation of this dissertation.

Special thanks are due to the Australian Development Assistance Bureau for providing financial assistance under the Colombo Plan Technical Assistance Programme, and to the valuable contributions of Professor Bill Griffiths, Dr Howard Doran, and Dr Roley Piggott at various stages of this study.

The author is particularly appreciative of the time, patience, and the valuable information given to the study by the residents who participated in the interviews. The need to preserve the anonimity of these respondents prevents the author from acknowledging them all further. The assistance given by the staff of the Computer Centre in data entry and providing with the necessary computing facilities is also acknowledged. A special tribute goes to Pushpa Ekanayake for her valuable assistance in programming at crucial stages of the study.

Sue Lucas is to be thanked for typing this dissertation neatly, accurately and in appreciably quick time.

Finally, all residual errors or ommissions in the dissertation are the sole responsibility of the author.

iv

TABLE OF CONCENTS

ABST	ABSTRACT					
PREF.	PREFACE					
LIST	LIST OF TABLES					
LIST	IST OF FIGURES					
Chap	Chapter					
1	THE	NATURE OF THE PROBLEM	1			
	1.1	Introduction	1			
	1.2	Social Relevance of the Dieback Problem	2			
	1.3	Potential Solutions and Control Measures	3			
	1.4	The Centre of Research	6			
	1.5	Objectives of the Present Research	6			
	1.6	Plan of the Dissertation	7			
2	ECONOMIC THEORY OF BENEFIT ESTIMATION					
	2.1	Introduction	9			
	2.2	Social Benefits and Costs	9			
		2.2.1 The general model	9			
		2.2.2 Consumer's surplus concepts	10			
	2.3	Application of the Benefit Concepts	10			
		2.3.1 Recreational value (RV)	10			
		2.3.2 Existence value (EV)	11			
		2.3.3 Option value (OV)	11			
		2.3.4 Overall benefits	11			
	2.4	Some Relevant Aspects of Benefit Valuation	12			
		2.4.1 Do benefit values for preservation vary				
		with accessibility	12			
		2.4.2 Does benefit value vary with the species	12			
		2.4.3 Does benefit value vary with the rarity of				
		species	13			
		2.4.4 The new demand theory as applied to the				
		preservation problem	13			
	2.5	A Utility Model	14			
		2.5.1 Nature of the theory	14			
	2.6	Research Inquiry	16			

vi

Chapter

3	METHODS OF VALUATION AND DEMAND ESTIMATION						
	3.2	Choice of Valuation Method					
	3.3	3 Valuation of Benefits for Public Goods					
		3.3.1	Smith auction method	21			
		3.3.2	Bohm's method of estimating demand for				
			public goods	22			
		3.3.3	Johnston's willingness-to-pay surveys	23			
		3.3.4	Hardie and Strand's method	24			
	3.4	The Me	thodology of the Present Study	25			
4	METHODS OF ANALYSIS						
	4.1	introduction 27					
	4.2	The Se	tting	27			
	4.3	Specification of the Analytical Models					
		4.3.1	Application to choice between alternative				
			policies	29			
		4.3.2	The budget allocation game and free-rider				
			difficulty	29			
		4.3.3	Nature of regression analysis	31			
		4.3.4	Estimation of the system	35			
		4.3.5	Application to the choice between alternative				
			woodland types	36			
	4.4	Extension of the Direct Method to Benefit Valuations					
	4.5	Socio-	Economic Characteristics	38			
5	ESTIMATION OF RECREATION, EXISTENCE AND OPTION VALUES 4						
	5.1	Introduction 4					
	5.2	Attitudes to Characteristics of Dieback Problem 40					
	5.3	The Recreation Values					
		5.3.1	The values in aggregate	43			
		5.3.2	Disaggregated explanatory models	45			
		5.3.3	Aggregated model	48			
	5.4	4 Existence Value (EV)					
		5.4.1	Disaggregated explanatory models	49			
		5.4.2	Aggregated model	52			

	5.5	Total N	Value	53	
	5.6	Option	Value	56	
		5.6.1	Disaggregated model	56	
		5.6.2	Aggregated model	62	
	5.7	Extensi	ions to Existence Values	63	
	5.8	Conclus	sions and Policy Implications	67	
	5.9	Possibl	le Directions for Further Studies	69	
6	DEMAND FOR ALTERNATIVE MEASURES TO CONTROL DIEBACK				
	6.1	Introdu	action	71	
	6.2	Method	of Disaggregation	71	
		6.2.1	Results	73	
		6.2.2	Explanatory power of systems of equations	73	
		6.2.3	Explanatory power of the individual equations		
			in the systems	76	
		6.2.4	Signs of the coefficients, complementarity		
			and substitutability	76	
		6.2.5	Significance levels of the explanatory		
			variables	81	
	6.3	Method	of Aggregation	82	
		6.3.1	Results	86	
		6.3.2	Explanatory power of the systems and individual	1	
			equations	86	
	6.4	Conclus	sions and Policy Implications	86	
	6.5	Possibl	le Directions for Further Studies	89	
7	CHOI	CE BETWI	EEN ALTERNATIVE TYPES OF EUCALYPT WOODLAND		
	TO P	RESERVE		91	
	7.1	Introdu	action	91	
	7.2	Method	and Analysis	91	
	7.3	Results	5		
		7.3.1	Disaggregated models, signs and sizes of		
			the coefficients	93	
		7.3.2	Aggregated models, signs and sizes of the		
			coefficients	94	
	7.4	Policy	Implications	98	
	7.5	Conclus	sions	101	

.

8	DIEB	BACK CONTROL, PRESERVATION OF WOODLAND AND CHOICES	103			
	8.1	Introduction 10 Overview 1				
	8.2	2 Overview 8.2.1 Nature of the results				
		8.2.1 Nature of the results	104			
		8.2.2 Relative importance of recreation value	105			
	8.3	The Findings	107			
	8.4	The theoretical Setting	108			
		8.4.1 Recognising characteristics	109			
	8.5	Overall Implications of the Results	110			
	8.6	Suggestions for Further Research	110			
Appe	ndix					
1	ESTI	MATION OF SAMPLE SIZE	113			
2	CORR	ELATION COEFFICIENTS AMONG ALL PRICE VARIABLES	117			
3	CORR	ORRELATION COEFFICIENTS AMONG FIVE SOCIO-ECONOMIC				
	VARI	ABLES AND PRICE VARIABLES	118			
4	CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS AMONG THE SELECTED SOCIO-ECONOMIC					
	VARI	ABLES AND PRICES	119			
5	THE	SYSTEM OF EQUATIONS: RESTRICTED WITHOUT SOCIO-ECONOMIC				
	VARI	ABLES	120			
6	SUMM	ARY OF AGGREGATE PURCHASES	123			
7	MEAN	VALUE ALLOCATIONS AMONG CONTROL MEASURES	124			
8	SUMM	ARY OF QUANTITIES PURCHASED	125			
9	MEAN	VALUE ALLOCATIONS AMONG EUCALYPT WOODLAND TYPES	126			
10	LAND	USE SURVEY	127			
REFERENCES 13						

ix

LIST OF TABLES

Table		
5.1	Attitudes to Characteristics of Dieback of Eucalypt	41
	Woodland	
5.2	Recreation and Existence Values (\$ mean per household) 44
5.3	Recreation Value of Individuals	47
5.4	Existence Value of Individuals	51
5.5	Correlation Coefficients Among Measurement Variables	54
	and Socio-Economic Variables	
5.6	The Option Values	57
5.7	Estimated Option Values	59
5.8	Option Values of Different Groups	61
5.9	Aggregated Option Values	64
5.10	Valuation of Extra Benefits	66
6.1	The System of Equations: Restricted with Socio-	75
	economic Variables	
6.2	The More Important Equations Within Each System	77
6.3	The Significant Explanatory Variables in the Four	79
	Systems: with t-values	
6.4	Budget Shares of All Purchased Control Measures	83
6.5	Aggregated Demand for Control Measures	85
6.6	Results of Aggregated Models	87
7.1	Disaggregated Models	95
7.2	Aggregated Bids for Environmental Goods	96
7.3	Aggregated Models	99
8.1	The Relative Importance of Rcreation Values	106

•

 \mathbf{x}

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure

3.1 The Selection of a Valuation Method: The Relationship 20 of Some Groups of Methods to Net Social Benefit.