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# Recreation and the Zebra Mussel in Lake Erie, Ohio <br> Jorge V. Vilaplana and Leroy J. Hushak 

The state of Ohio offers a wide variety of recreational opportunities to its residents and tourists. With several state parks, large amusement parks, many inland lakes and rivers, as well as a long shore along Lake Erie, people find choices to satisfy almost all tastes.

Ohio's Lake Erie coastal area supports a range of recreational activities. Fishing, pleasure boating, swimming, and sightseeing are among the many water-based attractions. These attractions, along with amusement parks, new and improved shopping areas, and parks, represent the core of the region's growing tourism industry.

For the past few years, increasing concern for the non-native zebra mussel has motivated researchers to take a closer look at its potential impact on recreational activities and other water-based industries. Inadvertently introduced to the Great Lakes in the mid-eighties, the zebra mussel reproduces very rapidly and has few natural enemies in the local ecosystem. Although some ducks and some fish species feed on the zebra mussel, their impact on the mussel population is very small.

In addition to disrupting the food chain and destroying spawning habitats, the zebra mussel will attach to anything, causing damage to boats, water intakes, and other aquatic structures. These characteristics portray the zebra mussel as a potential threat to Ohio's north coast economy, despite the beneficial side effect of the organism's ability to filter water at a rate of 1 liter each day, increasing water clarity.

To begin an examination of the conomic costs of the zebra mussel, a survey was developed in 1991 to explore behavioral responses of Lake Erie those recreating to the zebra mussel. The purpose of this study was to set the stage for a more comprehensive analysis of the recreational costs of the zebra mussel; that study is currently in progress. The two objectives of the 1991 preliminary survey were:

1) To gather information on recreation participation in Ohio and particularly at Lake Erie.
2) To assess current perceptions of the zebra mussel and its effects on recreational activities.
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A random sample of licensed Ohio drivers was obtained from the Ohio Bureau of Motor Vehicles. A questionnaire was developed and mailed to two thousand Ohio residents by July 1991. As a reminder, a second round of questionnaires was mailed in August 1991. From the original number, 141 questionnaires were returned by the U.S. Postal Service as not deliverable. This resulted in a total of 1,859 questionnaires delivered, of which 460 were returned. We used 439 of these giving a response rate of 24 percent. Unless otherwise specified, any reference to the sample size will be to those 439 respondents.

## Characteristics of the Sample

A large proportion of those responding to the survey reside within an hour's drive of Lake Erie. Forty-cight percent of the respondents reported residing in a contiguous 20 -county area clustered about the lake's shore. Of these northern Ohio residents, 65 percent reside in the urban areas of greater Cleveland, Lorain, Akron, Youngstown, and Toledo. An additional 19 percent of the respondents reside in the urban areas of Columbus and Cincinnati. About 40 percent of the respondents reported visits to Lake Erie in 1989. A similar number was obtained for visits in 1990.

Slightly more men responded than women ( $55 \%$ ). A majority of those responding were married ( $69 \%$ ), and the mean age of respondents was 41 years. On the average, respondents had two years of education beyond high school and reported an average income of $\$ 41,300$ for each household. Further information on income, occupation, education, and number of dependents is shown in Figures 1, 2, 3, and 4.

Twenty-five percent of respondents, or 109 , reported owning a boat, with 60 percent of the boats suitable for use on Lake Erie. Boats averaged 11.5 years old, with the mean year of purchase being 1984 at a mean cost $\$ 7,266$. This suggests that some of the boats purchased were used. Seventy-eight percent of the boat owners use their boats for fishing.

## Recreation in Ohio

Respondents were asked how often they had participated in various recreation activities in Ohio during 1990. The most popular activities were shopping ( $80 \%$ of the respondents reported at least one outing in 1990), sightseeing ( $68 \%$ ), and picnicking ( $68 \%$ ). Moderate participation was reported for amusement parks ( $56 \%$ reported at least one outing in 1990), swimming ( $49 \%$ ), sunbathing ( $47 \%$ ), fishing ( $45 \%$ ), and pleasure boating ( $44 \%$ ). When classified by gender, 433 usable responses for this question were obtained, of which 193 were female and 240 were mate. Table 1 describes participation in the activities mentioned above by gender.

Local sites were the most popular choice for water-based activities, with 26 percent of the respondents visiting local sites on a frequent or exclusive basis over the past three years, as shown in Table 2. Nineteen percent of the respondents reported frequent or exclusive use of
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Lake Erie for their water-based recreation. Also, Ohio state parks were a very close third choice with 18 percent visiting them frequently. Inland lakes and private ponds were used frequently or exclusively by 15 and 11 percent of the respondents, respectively.

Table 1. Recreation Participation in Ohio for 1990*

| Activity | Participated one or more times (\%) |  | Participated ten or more times (\%) |  | Participated thirty or more tirnes (\%) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Fernale |
| Shopping | 76.7 | 83.9 | 47.9 | 63.2 | 22.1 | 32.6 |
| Sightseeing | 71.3 | 65.3 | 20.4 | 32.1 | 5.4 | 3.6 |
| Picnicking | 69.2 | 65.8 | 14.6 | 30.4 | 2.1 | 4.2 |
| Amusement Parks | 54.6 | 58.0 | 4.6 | 1.6 | 1.3 | 0.0 |
| Swimming | 51.7 | 45.1 | 17.1 | 18.1 | 4.2 | 6.7 |
| Sunbathing | 43.8 | 46.6 | 17.9 | 35.8 | 5 | 4.7 |
| Fishing | 55.4 | 32.1 | 25.8 | 9.3 | 10.8 | 3.1 |
| Pleasure Boating | 46.7 | 34.7 | 14.2 | 7.8 | 4.6 | 2.6 |

* Based on a sample of 193 females and 240 males.

Table 2. Frequency of Participation at Selected Water-Based Sites*

| Site | Frequency of Use |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Frequent or always | Seldom or <br> sometimes |  | Never |  |  |
|  | Total | $\%$ | Total | $\%$ | Total | $\%$ |
| Local Sites | 113 | $26 \%$ | 174 | $40 \%$ | 152 | $35 \%$ |
| Lake Erie | 82 | $19 \%$ | 169 | $38 \%$ | 188 | $43 \%$ |
| Ohio State Parks | 80 | $18 \%$ | 206 | $47 \%$ | 153 | $35 \%$ |
| Inland Lakes | 67 | $15 \%$ | 152 | $35 \%$ | 220 | $50 \%$ |
| Private Ponds | 48 | $11 \%$ | 154 | $35 \%$ | 237 | $54 \%$ |

* Based on 439 respondents.
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By and large, people were satisfied or neutral about the outdoor recreation opportunities available in Ohio. Of the six most popular outdoor activities -- sightseeing, picnicking, swimming, fishing, sunbathing, and pleasure boating -- two showed relatively higher levels of dissatisfaction. Seventeen percent of 408 respondents were dissatisfied with swimming opportunities and 13 percent of 416 reported dissatisfaction with the availability of fishing opportunities. Pienicking and sightseeing were the most highly rated - 68 percent of 414 were satisfied with pienicking opportunities and 62 percent of 408 were satisfied with sightseeing opportunities.

Generally, respondents planned to continue participating in their favorite activities at the same or greater frequencies in 1991 as suggested by a typical sixty percent response in most activities. Not surprisingly, the two activities with which respondents were most satisfied, sightseeing and picnicking, showed the greatest increases in planned participation. On the other hand, there are more fishing and pleasure boating participants planning to decrease their participation in 1991 than to increase it. While 20 percent of 408 had indicated dissatisfaction with the swimming opportunities available in Ohio, $\mathbf{2 6}$ percent of 408 indicated that they planned to increase swimming participation in 1991. Some activities, according to the survey, that will experience a large decrease in participation are trapping, sailing, hunting, and sunbathing.

## Recreation and Lake Erie

As presented in Table 2, 19 percent of respondents reported visiting Ohio's Lake Erie sites on a frequent-to-always basis, with an additional 38 percent visiting the lake sometimes or seldom during the three years prior to the survey. Other Lake Erie sites (in Michigan, Pennsylvania, and New York) were visited by 19 percent of the population sample at least sometimes. Canadian Iake Eric sites were visited by only 6 percent of the respondents in the sample on a sometimes, frequent, or always basis. Table 3 summarizes visiss to Lake Erie for the years 1989 and 1990 and expected visits in 1991. Forty-one percent of the sample population had visited Lake Erie in 1989. Eighty-four percent of these visitors returned in 1990, and 86 percent expected to visit Lake Erie in 1991.

The results indicate a 5.5 percent increase in recreational visitors from 1989 to 1990 and an expected increase of 18.2 percent from 1990 to 1991. The mean number of trips remained fairly constant during 1989 and 1990, with a slight decrease reflected in trips expected in 1991. Mean length of stay increased from 1.84 days to 2.35 days in 1990.

Respondents who had visited Lake Erie, or planned to visit in 1991, were asked to assess some selected amenities. Picnic areas, restaurants, visits to the Islands, and swimming beaches were often rated as very important or somewhat important in making a decision about places to visit at the lake. On the other hand, fish cleaning facilities, lounges, launch facilities, bait stores, and marinas were less often rated as very or somewhat important.
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Table 3. Visits to Lake Erie, 1989-1991

| Group |  | $\begin{array}{r} \text { in } 1989 \\ \% \end{array}$ | Visits | $\begin{array}{r} \text { in } 1990 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Sample ( $\mathrm{n}=439$ ) | 182 | 41.5\% | 192 | 43.7\% | 227 | 51.7\% |
| Visitors in 1989 ( $\mathrm{n}=182$ ) | 182 | 100\% | 153 | 84.1\% | 154 | 86.2\% |
| Visitors in 1990 ( $\mathrm{n}=192$ ) | 153 | 79.7\% | 192 | 100\% | 165 | 85.9\% |
| Expected 1991 visitors ( $\mathrm{n}=227$ ) | 154 | 67.8\% | 165 | 72.7\% | 227 | 100\% |
| Mean number of trips | 11.19 |  | 11.16 |  | 9.65 |  |
| Mean number of days per trip | 1.84 |  | 2.35 |  | Not Asked |  |

Sightseeing ( $70 \%$ ), picnicking ( $63 \%$ ), shopping ( $57 \%$ ), amusement parks ( $56 \%$ ), swimming $(52 \%)$, and fishing ( $51 \%$ ) were the most frequent activities engaged in at Lake Erie. Differences in the number of respondents to these questions and those who reported visits in 1989 and/or 1990 suggest that people who did not visit Lake Eric during those two years answered the question, perhaps recalling earlier visits.

Activities in all of Ohio in general, receive similar preference except for shopping, which takes first place ( $80 \%$ ). Even though the Lake Erie area's amusement parks were attended by 56 percent of the respondents, only 6 percent made more than five return trips. For 1990, participants in water-based activities such as fishing, sailing, swimming, and pleasure boating reported making more than fifty percent of their trips to Lake Erie.

Two-hundred-seventy-six of the respondents reported their frequency of visits to Lake Erie as "none" or "seldom," and 163 responded visiting the lake on a sometimes-to-always basis. The proportion of those who reported ten or more outdoor recreational trips is two times higher for those who visited Lake Eric, suggesting that those who visit the lake are also lovers of the outdoors.

Also, when classifying respondents by whether they go to Lake Erie to fish, or not, there is no major difference in their plans to increase or decrease participation. However, those who do fish at Lake Erie are more likely to fish at other U.S. and Canadian Lake Erie sites, as well at other Great Lakes.

The average respondent had been visiting Lake Erie since 1969, with 45 percent returning every year and 63 percent returning or all most years. Twenty-five percent reported visiting Lake Erie "about half the years" or "occasionally" since their first visit, and 25 percent reported "very seldom." Responding visitors travelied anywhere from 0 to 360 miles to get to their favorite Lake Erie site, with a mean distance of 79 miles. Figure 5 shows the distribution
of the distance travelled by Lake Erie's visitors, and Figure 6 shows the distribution of trips' length for these same visitors.

The questionnaire did not request any information on origin and destination for the trips to Lake Erie. However, it is possible to estimate the distance to certain counties with shore on. Lake Erie using the zip codes reported by the respondents. A region comprising Ottawa and Erie counties shows the smallest deviation from the distances reported in the answers to the survey. The distribution of distances between zip codes of the respondents and this two-county region, reported by visitors and non-visitors to Lake Erie, is presented in Figure 7.

As can be seen in Figure 7, up to 100 miles from the lake, the proportion of respondents who visited Lake Erie in 1990 is larger than for those who did not. However, beyond the 100 mile mark, there is a shift and non-visitors to the lake become the larger share among respondents.


Figure 5


Figure 6


Figere 7
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## Zebra Mussel and Recreation

Respondents were asked about their knowledge of and contact with the zebra mussel in lake Ene. Out of 285 who responded, 76 pereent had heard of the zebra mussel. Also, 43 percent of 225 had personally seen one. Of those having only heard of the zebra mussel, two respondents indicated that the organism was responsible for a decrease in how much time they spent recreating at Lake Erie. Of those having actually seen a zebra mussel, 11 respondents ( $11 \%$ ) indicated that their amount of time spent at Lake Eric had decreased. These 11 respondents cited an average decrease in time spent of 38 percent. Two respondents who had seen a zebra mussel indicated that they had increased the amount of time spent at Lake Erie by an average of 10 percent.

Boat owners (109 or 25 percent of the sample) were asked to document any expenses that were explicitly caused by the zebra mussel. Fourteen respondents ( $13 \%$ ) reported expenditures for protective paints, with an average cost of $\$ 94$. Another four people cited additional maintenance at an average cost of $\$ 171$. A single respondent reported $\$ 50$ in damages directly attributable to the zebra mussel. Finally, increases in insurance costs were reported by three boat owners at an average increase of $\$ 207$.

Respondents were then asked to rate how the quality of various recreation activities had changed based upon what they had seen or heard regarding the zebra mussel. Table 4 summarizes their responses for six water-based activities (in order of frequency of participation).

## Table 4. Perceived Change in Quality of Selected Water-Based Activitiea Due to the Zebra Mustel

| Activity | Quality |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Worse |  | Same |  | Better |  |
|  | n | share | n | share | n | share |
| Sightseeing ( $\mathrm{N}=171$ ) | 17 | $10.0 \%$ | 151 | $88.3 \%$ | 3 | $1.8 \%$ |
| Swimming (N=17) | 55 | $32.2 \%$ | 112 | $65.5 \%$ | 4 | $2.3 \%$ |
| Fishing (N=185) | 94 | $50.8 \%$ | 90 | $48.6 \%$ | 3 | $0.5 \%$ |
| Pleasure boating (N=77) | 23 | $29.9 \%$ | 51 | $66.6 \%$ | 3 | $3.9 \%$ |
| Sailing (N=170) | 46 | $27.1 \%$ | 123 | $72.4 \%$ | 1 | $0.6 \%$ |
| Watersking $(\mathbb{N}=170)$ | 50 | $29.4 \%$ | 118 | $69.4 \%$ | 2 | $1.2 \%$ |

## Summary

Based on this sample, people recreating in Ohio seem to be satislied with the opportunities available to them. The respondents' participation in most of the activities evaluated shows a tendency to grow. Some attention, however, should be paid to swimming facilities, as respondents indicated dissatisfaction with the current choices available.

The results of the survey show that more than fifty percent of those who use Lake Erie as a recreational site live within fifty miles of the lake. This may explain the mean number of 11 trips at an average trip duration of approximately two days, suggesting visits during the weekends through late spring and summer (Table 3). Also, the results show that within 100 miles of the lake, the proportion of respondents who visit is larger than the proportion of those who do not go to the lake. This situation is reversed for distances beyond 100 miles.

Lake Erie seems to be highly valued by those who love the outdoors, as indicated by the doubling of the number of outdoor recreational trips in absolute and relative terms as compared to those who do not visit the lake.

Approximately fifty percent of those who reported fishing in Ohio fish at Lake Erie. This result highlights the importance of Lake Erie's fisheries and the importance of their adequate management. Also, close to fifty percent of the lake visitors reported a worsening of the quality of fishing at the lake, as indicated in Table 4.

Despite its beneficial impact as a water filter, the zebra mussel is negatively perceived by a large number of respondents who had knowledge about the mussel's impact on water-based activities. However, it appears that few visitors' have changed their visits to the lake in response to perceived lower quality of activities or have incurred increased recreational costs. Further study of visitors perceptions and behavior, and study of the economic effects of the zebra mussel on other users of Lake Erie are required to understand the full economic impact of the zebra mussel.
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 ectivity well mort.

|  | Tinel | $15$ | $\begin{gathered} 6-14 \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11-15 \\ \text { T1 } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $16-90$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 21-2 } \\ \text { 7! } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 163 \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 31 \text { Thet } \\ & \text { cer Mere } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Praher | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 1 |
| 2. Huatias | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 1. Compity | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 4. Sailiay | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 5. Swinetare (bath, eevib) | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 6. Suabathiot | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 7. Picaintige | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | \$ | 6 | 7 |
| 6. Water-biing | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | \$ | 6 | 7 |
|  aleding) | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 10. Fiemare boutan | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | \$ | 6 | 7 |
| 12 Truppiey | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 13. styduedet | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 14. Anumemet parts | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 15. shoppios | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 16. Other | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

 activities done on or in witer). Picate circle the number upder the reppose that bex ecpremente BOW FRDQUXNILY you pariciplated at enct place durtry the pan 3 years.

|  | M | S+1400 | Sampatinut | Froquestly | Abays |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Latre Bric | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 2. Ohio River | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 3. Iblued liltos | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 4. Inland rivers | 0 | I | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| S. Owios Stac Prity | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 6. Private poede | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 7. Miction, Peongtumin, New Yort, Latre Erie elees | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| E. Conodion Latre Eric eites | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 9. Ofere Oreat Lalves ritet | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 10. Lectl sites (Lem thof 20 mibutes from home) | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 11. Minrien (foll meter cites) | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 12. Other mides | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

3. How antirisd are you mith the enisting outdoor opportunitier annilable IN OfIO? Circle the number that best represents your feeling. We would like for you to evalunte all of the sctivitien listed below, even those in which you do not participate.

|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cennelatoly } \\ & \text { pleretisfiod } \end{aligned}$ | Dusatisfed | Neteler <br> smetried ar <br> Dinametriod | Swistied | Conepiletely Sandified |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Fenting | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 2. Huathes | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 4. Seiling | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| S Smimata | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 6. Sunberthing -.... | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 7. Fiericht\% | 0 | 1 | $2 \times$ | 3 | 4 |
| 8. Water-ationt | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 2. Whinter apone | 0 | 1 | 2 \% | 3 | . 4 \% |
| 10. Pleasure boating | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 11. Trall ectitice. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 12. Truppinf | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 12. Sturacts | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 14. Other | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

4. Compared to your participation in recreation activiticer during 1990, how oftea do you INIEND to participate in each of the following ectividies dering 1991 ? Cirele the reapone to each wetivity that best representa your future participation.

|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mech } \\ & \text { Lens } \end{aligned}$ | tepa | Anont the Sina | Mens | Mwel <br> More |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Putioc ${ }^{\text {a }}$ S | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 2 Huatinf : ... | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 3 Comatas | 0 | 1 | 2. | 3 | 4 |
| 4. Seritiof | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|  | 0 | 1 | 2. | 3 | 4 |
| 6. Sunballint | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 7. Pumetrin | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 8. Weser-atian | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 9. Wimuraporm. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 10. Fremure boating | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 12. Tmil exivition | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 12 Trepping | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 13. Stab-mexte | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 14. Amuement part | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 15. Seoppiat | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 16. Other | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

5. Do you or may membere of your bourebold own a bout? $\qquad$ Yes $\qquad$ No
A. If yet, what is the age of the bont? If your housebole owns more that oae boat, plente tell ut bout the boin wed most frequeatly by houshold member. $\qquad$ Age in years
B. In what year did you or enembers of your howtehold purchece the boat? $\qquad$ Yent of purchate
C. What whit the coat of the boat ethen it was purchwed? $\qquad$
D. Is the boal adequate for we on large bodies of water anct a Lake Erie? $\qquad$ Yet $\qquad$ No
E. Do you ute the boll for fishing ectivities? $\qquad$ Yen $\qquad$ No
 question complenty.
6. A. Did you mite ood or more recreational tripe or vipity to LAEE CPIE dutife $1950 ?$
$\qquad$ Mo, please go to quextion 7 $\qquad$ Yet
B. If yen, how many tript did you mate? $\qquad$ Number of trips
C. How maty deyt, on average, were your trips? $\qquad$ Number of taye
7. A. Did you make one or more recreational rips or visits to LATE ERIE during 1989 ?
$\qquad$ $\mathrm{NO}_{1}$, pleape go to question 8 $\qquad$ Yes
B. If yec, bow many trips did you malre? $\qquad$ Number of trips
C. How may diya, on sverate, were your trips? $\qquad$ Number of days
B. How many tecrentional trip do you expect to mate in 19917 $\qquad$ Number of tripe

8. When you are malking decisions about PLACES to visit at LAKE ERE; bow important are the following facilities? Circle the number that bept represents how important each is to you

9. How often did you participate in the following ectivities during your trips to Late Erie?

|  | Tont |  | $\begin{gathered} 6-10 \\ 7 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11+15 \\ & 71 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16.21 \\ \text { Thentin } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21-25 \\ & \text { Thinet } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 26-39 \\ & \text { Then } \end{aligned}$ | 31 TImes or More |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Prihto | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | .6 | 7 |
| 2. Huating | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 3. Campint | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 4. Sailing | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 5. Smimming (beach, ecoble) | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 6. Surbuthiof | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 7. Picuicting | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 8. Water-fthint | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|  teddint | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 10. Pleaswre boating | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 11. Trail activiter (hiting bltime) | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 12. Traping | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 13. Sighteecing | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 14. Amumement parts | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 15. Sbopping | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 16. Other | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

11. In what year was your firter recreational trip to Lake Erie? 19 $\qquad$
12. Since you firat bepe visiting Lake Erie, how regulaty howe you been poing? (Circle one.)
a. Ive gone to Lake Erie every year since 1 stanted.
b. I've gone to Lake Erie mond yeirt tince I ctarted.
c. I've pote to Late Erie about half the years since I mapted.
d. I've gone to Lalue Erie only occasionally cituce I atarted.
e. I've gone to Lake Erie very neldom cince I fturted.
13. How far do you hive to travel to your FAVORIIE rocrestion fite on Ithe Erie? $\qquad$ Number of miles
14. How many private-boat, charter and other finhing tripe fid you take during the year 1900 to the following locations? (A private-bout fithing trip in a trip where you went fithint in your or your friend's privitely owned boat for the purpose of recreation or sport. A charter fiahing trip is a trip where you or any member of your party rented the erevices of a cherter captain and his boat for the purpoce of fishing. Other lishins tripf are thowe where you fithed from thore of which otherwise do not qualify as private-boet or charter trips.)

| Lacations | Nuthet of Trims |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Privato-poot Finturn | Charter Pishine | Other Fithint |
| 1. Otio Lake Eric tites |  | - | - |
| 2. Michipon, Penrrykunia, and New York Linte Erie sites |  |  | $\because$ |
| 3. Cuman Late Erie tiles | - |  | - - - + |
| 4. Other Great Late cites | - |  |  |
| S. Incal atos (Lewf than 20 minuter from home) |  |  | -- |
| 6. Marine (ealt water) eites |  |  | - |
|  |  |  |  |

 quespions ath about your wiows ard repponer to the Zebra Muppol
15. The Zebra Mustel is a recently introduced apecies to Lake Erie. Have you beard of Zebra Murel?
$\qquad$ No, pleare so to quertion 20 $\qquad$ Yes
16. Hewe gou pertotally meen a Zebrat Mured? $\qquad$ No $\qquad$ $\mathbf{Y}$ あ
17. How the the Zebri Mryel affected the amownt of time you dpeat recreating at Lite Eric? (Circke one) a. Decreased th by percent.
b. It har exyed about the ande.
c. Incretwed is by $\qquad$ pervedt.

12 If you own bont, phit empenger hove you ineurred which ase eqpicity coused by the Zebra Muster? (Circle one.)
a Do not own ebot
b. Protective pairts, cont $\$$ $\qquad$
e. Additional maintenance, cott S $\qquad$
d. Pepeir of Zebri Mienel durages to hiny boat, cose $\$$ $\qquad$ e. locrease in insurnice cont, cont $\$$ $\qquad$
19. Bered on mbt you hrve eecn and beard about the Zobri Mrobel, plenee rute how the quality of the following recreation activities has changed?

20. What is your current rexidence? City $\qquad$ State $\qquad$ Zip Code $\qquad$
21. What is your current employmeat etatus? (Circle one.)
a. Employed fulltime
b. Enployed part-time
c. Retired
d. Uneniployed
22. Pletse circle below the approrinate total annul gross or befor tax income of your boutebold (this includes libor eaming of you end abs other income earaing members, plus emping from business and irventments plas income from retircment, family public


| a. Lems than $\$ 10,000$ | C. $\$ 90,000$ to 34,999 | j. $\$ 50,000$ to $\$ 9,999$ | n. $\$ 90,000$ to 99,999 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| b. $\$ 10,000$ to 14,999 | t $\$ 55,000$ to 39,999 | L $\$ 60,000$ to 69,999 | $0 . \$ 100,000$ to 119,999 |
| f. $\$ 15,000$ to 19,999 | h. $\$ 40,000$ to 44,999 | L $\$ 70,000$ to 79,999 | p. $\$ 120,000$ to 139,999 |
| 4. $\$ 20,000$ to 24,999 | i. $\$ 5,000$ to 49,999 | m. $\$ 80,000$ to $\$ 9,999$ | 4. $\$ 140,000$ and above |

c 57000
23. Whyt is your ace? $\qquad$ Yeari
24. What is your sex? $\qquad$ Mate $\qquad$ Female
25. How mulay yearr of echooling hive you fompleted? $\qquad$ Yeatt of setrooling
26. What it yone marital 由atus? (Circle one.)
a. Single
b. Mrried
c. Widened

4 Divorted
27. How many depeadencs are liviat at home with you? (Circle ope.)
a. Nope
b. Ore
c. Two
d. Thite or four
c. Five or more

Pleme indicate the afis of your dependents mentioned above

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey.

Sponsored by:
The Ohlo Sea Grant Project
Department of Agricultural Economics and Aural Sociology
Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center
The Ohio State University

