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NEW HAMPSHIRE MARINA INDUSTRY STUDY
by
George W. Shaw and William F. Henry ${ }^{1 /}$

## INTRODUCTION

During the 1960's there was a significant increase in boating in New Hampshire, and hand in hand with the rapid growth came increased demands for marina space and services. In several parts of the state at the time of this writing, buying a boat has second priority--number one priority is finding a place to keep it. (This does not refer to car-top or trailerable boats).

Also during the $1960^{\prime}$ 's, communities, the state, and the general public had all increased their awareness of ecology, pollution problems, clear water, and public use of public land and water, just to mention a few of the areas of concern.

This study of the marina/marine oriented industry within New Hampshire was carried out in the early spring of 1973. This study covers the entire state of New Hampshire, both fresh and salt waters, and has as its underlying purpose a sincere desire of giving an overview of the industry, its economic impact, services performed for both New Hampshire and out-of-state boaters, tax base generated, and other pertinent data useful to the industry and the state. An informed populace--the marine industry, legislators, and state agencies-should lead to better understanding and thereby better laws and mules and regulations.

[^0]This study is also aimed at being part of an area-wide report for the six New England states and the state of New York. Representatives of the seven state universities, the New England Marine Resources Information Program (NEMRIP), and the individual marine trade associations of several of the states had inputs into the forming of the marina questionnaire as used. After the seven individual state reports are completed, it is our expressed desire to be financially able to make a composite seven-state report.

In the past six years, boat registrations issued by the state of New Hampshire have increased 6 percent ${ }^{2 /}$, which is about equivalent to automobile registration increases in New Hampshire over this period ${ }^{3 /}$.

Boats used on the federally controlled waters of New Hampshire and issued certificates of number by the United States Coast Guard have increased 44 percent in the six years, 1967-1972. See Table 1.

In 1972 there were 360 documented vessels registered within the Portsmouth, New Hampshire, District. Information about size, type, or hull construction material on these was not available, but under weight and square footage regulations for documentation, with very few exceptions, these documented vessels would have to be 30 feet in length or longer.

In New Hampshire in 1972, there were 53,642 registered boats. This is the total of state registrations, and United States Coast Guard registered. The U.S. Coast Guard registers boats of 10 hp or more; this included all sailboats that use an auxiliary motor of

2/ Department of Safety, State of New Hampshire.
3/ Statistical Abstract of United States, 1971.
any kind of at least 10 hp (law in effect at time this survey was made). The New Hampshire Department of Safety registration includes all outboard motors and all inboard motors on aall or power boats. This does not include untold thousands of kayaks, canoes, paddleboats, rowboats, john boats, sunfish, sailfish, and other nonpowered sailboats.

TABLE 1
Total Boat Registrations in New Hampshire: State Department of Safety and United States Coast Guard; Boat Registrations, 1967-1972

| YEAR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1967 | 1968 | 1969 | 1970 | 1971 | 1972 | \% increase from 1967 |
| N.H. Dept. of Safety ${ }^{\text {B/ }}$ | 43,326 | 45,973 | 45,074 | 47,322 | 47,271 | 46,021 | 6.2 |
| U.S. Coast Guard | 5,295 | 5,725 | 6,438 | 7,162 | 7,928 | 7,621 | 43.9 |
| Total N.H. ${ }^{\text {/ }}$ | 48,621 | 51,698 | 51,512 | 54,484 | 55,199 | 53,642 | 10.3 |
| Total U.S. ${ }^{\text {/ }}$ | 58,893 |  |  | 5 | 510,092 |  | 23.6 |

a/ Total boats registered: private, comercial, and dealer registration.
b/ These numbers do not include vessels documented by the Department of Comerce, which in 1972 amounted to 360 vessels.
c/ Does not include boats located in Alaska, District of Columbia, New Hampshire, Washington, and Guam registered by the individual units of government as these five governments are not in compliance with the federal Boat Registration Act.

NOTE: The State Department of Safety, marina operators, and stores selling boat registrations all expressed the feeling that the 1972 drop in boat registration was due to the wet summer with an above average number of rainy weekends during the boating season.

$$
-4-
$$

## FIGURE 1

Boat Registrations, New Hampshire, 1967-1972


TABLE 2
Motorboat Registrations, New Hempshire, 1972
OUTBOARD MOTORS

| Horsepower | Number <br> Registered | Regulation Fee |  |  | Total <br> Fees Paid |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5 hp and under | 9,842 | 9 | \$4.00 | = | \$ 39,368.00 |
| 5.1 hp to 13.9 hp | 9,309 | 9 | 5.00 | = | 46,545.00 |
| 14 hp to 40 hp | 10,791 | e | 6.00 | = | 64,746.00 |
| Over 40 hp | 10,219 | 4 | 6.00 | = | 61,314.00 |
|  | 40,161 |  |  |  | \$211,973.00 |

INBOARD BOATS
Length

| $18^{\prime}$ and under | 2,165 | e | \$6.00 | = | \$ 12,990.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Over 18' through $26^{\prime}$ | 2,184 | @ | 9.00 | $=$ | 19,656.00 |
| Over 26' | 474 | 0 | 11.00 | $=$ | 5,214.00 |
| Inboard | 4,823 |  |  |  | \$ 37,860.00 |
| Total Pleasure boats | 44,984 |  |  |  | \$249,833.00 |

Commercial Boats and Motors 911
Dealer Registration $\quad 236$
Total Registration $\quad 46,131$
Initial Plates 194
Pilot Certificates 616

SOURCE: Adapted from New Hampshire Department of Safety, Division of Saf"ety Services.

TABLE 3
Motorboat Registrants in New Hampshire by State of Residence, 1972
Forty-four thousand, nine hundred eighty-four persons from 38 states, the District of Columbia, Canada, the Virgin Islands, and Japan registered private boats and motors in New Hampshire during the 1972 season. The following shows the number of registrants from each state or other location:

## State or Location

New Hampshire
Massachusetts
Connecticut
New York
New Jersey
Vermont
Phode Island
Pennsylvania
Maine
Florida
Number of Registrants

Maryland
Ohio
Virginia
Illinois
Delaware
Michigan

$$
23,476
$$

15,627
1,994
985
658
648
421
310
235
144
87

Canada
District of Columbia
California
North Carolina
Indiana
Georgia
Tennessee 73
73 73 31

South Caroling 9
Texas 7
Arizona 6
Missouri 6
Wisconsin 6
Kentucky 5
Alabama
Mississippi 4
Minnesota 4
Colorado 4
Louisiana 2
Arkansas
Virgin Islands 2
Japan 2
Kansas 1
Hebraska 1
Iowa 1
New Mexico
\% of Total
52.2
34.7
4.4
2.2
1.5
1.4
all others less than 1\%
(TABLE 3 Cont'd.)

| Summary by National Region | Number | \% of Total |
| :--- | ---: | :---: |
| New England | 42,401 | 94.3 |
| Middle Atlantic | 1,970 | 4.4 |
| South Atlantic | 368 | .8 |
| East North Central | 149 | .3 |
| South Central | 33 | .1 |
| Western | 27 | .1 |
| West North Central | 13 | -1 |
| Foreign | -23 | .1 |
| Total | 44,984 | 100.0 |

## MARINA SAMPLE

Personal interviews were made to 45 marinas in the state. A letter from the Marine Dealers Association of New Hampshire, Inc., was sent to each marina prior to the visit, and a news release with accompanying picture had state-wide coverage via the several news media. Most of the marinas gave complete cooperation with the survey questionnaire. For the four interviewed marinas that did not choose to answer the questionnaire completely, data from firms of like size that gave complete answers were used to develop a regression equation from which it was possible to predict the missing values with a fairly high order of accuracy.

The 45 marinas all performed some or all of the primary services such as dockage, supplies, repairs, winter storage, etc., for pleasure boats. They ranged from very large professionally managed yearround corporations to the very small fanily operated, part-time business.

Totals for the number of boats by type and size in the several
tables are accurate for marina-based water oraft for the calendar year of 1972 , but in no way can be reconciled with the 53,642 total registered boats. Total registered boats cover many car toppers and trailerable boats, as well as larger craft kept at private moorings and docks and at private clubs. This study made no attempt to inventory prams and yacht tenders of which there is a large number in the state.

In dealing with salt water and fresh water marine industry of the state we observe three scenes: (1) the water based and water oriented marina, (2) the boat building, i.e., manufacturing industry Within the state, and (3) the marine retail dealers who operate roadside along our busy highways.

Scene 1, the water based marina, is listed and reported as a unit. Scenes 2 and 3, the boat manufacturing and roadside marinas, are listed as one group to eliminate any chance of identification or disclosure.

As the tables in the report show, these make up reported gross receipts of over $\$ 16$ million for 1972.

Scene 1
$\$ 11,202,070.00$

Scenes 2 and 3
5,634,450.00
Total reported gross receipts $\$ 16,836,520.00^{4 /}$
Based upon answers given to the questionnaire, 78 pereent of the monfes received was from persons residing in other states. Worded another way, the marine trade industry in New Hampshire was responsible for the expenditure of $\$ 13,173,204$ by non-residents in 1972 via the marine, boat manufacturing industry, and the large by-the-side-of-the-road marine retail sales store.

State of New Harpshire boat registrations (44,984) brought into the state treasury the sun of $\$ 249,833$ in 1972. This figure is for pleasure boats only. According to state records as to state of

[^1]origin of applicant for registration, approximately 50 percent were from out of state.

The $\$ 249,833$ is recorded in the state treasury records as follows:

| Department of Safety | $\$ 204,849$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| State Water Resources Board | $\$ 44,984$ |
|  | $\$ 249,833$ |

Forty-four thousand, nine hundred eighty-four persons from 38 states, the District of Columbia, the Virgin Islands, Canada, and Japan registered private boats and motors in the 1972 season. (This is entirely separate from boats registered, mainly on salt water, with the United States Coast Guard). See Table 3 for listing of number of registrants from each state. In addition to the $\$ 249,833$, all field agents who sold boat registrations received a fee of $\$ .50$ for selling the registrations for the state. This $\$ .50$ fee remained with the Collecting Agent. This amounted to $\$ 20,618.50$.

Another source of revenue is boat tax monies received where boats are moored or stored as of April first of each year. These monies all stay in the towns and cities where collected, except for a very small administration cost which goes to the New Hampshire State Tax Comission. In 1972 the administration costs were approximately $\$ .42$ per boat taxed, which amounted to an infinitesimal fraction of the total taxes collected.

As can be seen in Table 4 from the list prepared by the State Tax Commission, a total of $\$ 241,187.48$ was collected in boat taxes in New Hampshire last year. Of this total, less than $\$ 4,800$ went to the state for administrative costs, and the balance was retained by the cities and towns where the tax was collected.

TABLE 4
Number of Boats Taxed, Boat Valuation, and Boat Taxes Assessed, Selected Cities and Towns, New Hampshire, 1972

| Town/Cily N | Number Boats Texed | Total Boat Valuation | Boat Taxes Assessed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Alton | 396 | \$ 172,850 | \$ 10,889.55 |
| Ash1and | 117 | 66,485 | 2,061.04 |
| Center Harbor | 209 | 118,059 | 3,777.89 |
| Gilford | 916 | 1,997,550 | 47,941.20 |
| Hempton | 86 | 95,150 | 3,710.85 |
| Holderness | 437 | 91,372 | 5,427.50 |
| Laconia | 923 | 913,245 | 41,643.97 |
| Meredith | 498 | 1,001,800 | 24,443.92 |
| Moultonboro | 148 | 80,800 | 3,716.80 |
| Newbury | 166 | 109,450 | 2,626.80 |
| Newington | 261 | 717,850 | 9,332.05 |
| Ossipee | 72 | 32,035 | 1,159.67 |
| Portsmouth | 214 | 185,500 | 6,863.50 |
| Sunapee | 605 | 431,349 | 10,352.38 |
| Tuftonboro | 510 | 287,100 | 15,503.40 |
| Wolfeboro | 212 | 103,835 | 7,683.79 |
| Sub-total 16 Towns/Cities | S 5,770 | \$6,404,430 | \$197,134.31 |
| Bal. 218 Towns/Cities | 5,606 | 2,399,161 | 44,053.17 |
| Total | 11,376 | \$8,803,591 | \$241,187.48 |

Source: New Hampshire State Tax Commission.

Of the 44,984 boats and motors registered in New Hampshire last year, 23,476 were New Hampahire resident owned. Add to that about 7,600 boats registered in New Hampshire with the United States Coast Guard, and it is evident that the 11,376 total number of boats taxed last year seams small. It is well known that each fall some boats are moved great distances for the obvious reason of avoiding the tax completely or to be where the tax is of a lesser amount.

Another source of revenue to the state of New Hampshire is unclaimed road toll tar on gasoline used for marine purposes. Individuals who purchase gasoline for marine use in the state of New Hampshire can apply on the official form RT 1225/ for . 09 cents per gailon refund. The form has to be properly filled out and all receipts for gasoline attached and filed within six months of use to be valid.

The retail dealer (the marina or boat yard operator) can file on official form ET 115 for a 1 percent refund on gross toll paid every six monthe. All applications for refund must be made under penalties of perfury and shall be made sem-annually within 90 days after June 30 and December 31 , respectively. This is known as a "spillage refund". The refund is figured: gross purchases of gas in gallons x 9 centa per gallon = total toll paid; refund is l percent of this total toll paid.

Each marina shall report on official form RT 120 the gallons of motor fuel sold and delivered direct to fuel tanks and supplementary fuel tanks. Unrefunded road tax used for marine use goes 50 percent to the Department of Safety Service and 50 percent to the Fish and Game Department.

5/ See Appendix for amples of Division of Motor Vehicles Road Toll Tax Forms.

As can be seen from Table 5, $\$ 66,349.26$ went into the state treasury as money that could have been refunded to individual purchasers of fuel for marine purposes, but was never applied for and therefore unrefunded. One-half went to the Department of Safety Service and one-half to the Fish and Game Department.

TABLE 5
Gallons of Fuel Delivered, Amount Refunded, and Amount Unrefunded in Gallons and in Dollars

Total gas delivered to wharf tanks \& pumps

Amount of gas for which refund was made to individual boat owners

Number of individual boat owners applying

Dollar amount refunded to
individuals*
Anount of gas for which refund was not claimed

Unrefunded dollars
$\begin{array}{cc}\underline{1971} \\ 1,175,146 \mathrm{gal} . & \underline{1972} \\ 1,082,245 \mathrm{gal} .\end{array}$

381,253 gal. 345,031 gal.
$381,253 \mathrm{~g}$
$1,455 \quad 1,288$
$\$ 29,690.10$
\$31,952.79
*Note: $\frac{1}{2}$ of 1971 refund was 7 c ents
$\frac{1}{2}$ of 1971 refund was 9 cents.
1972 was all at 9 cents per gallon.

SOURCE: State of New Hampshire, Department of Safety, Division of Motor Vehicles, Road Toll Section.

It is known that the gasoline consumption for marine use was a great deal more than shown. How much more is an unknown factor. It is known that many trailerable boats fill their tanks at a highway gas station. Also, many people with in-water boats bring their gas in cans from a highway gas station and refill their boat tanks In this manner. However, the accounting for delivery to wharf terks is accurate.

## TABLE 6

Summary of Marine Industry Economic Impact on the State of New Hampshire, 1972

Reported marine/marina trade
$\$ 16,836,520.00$
gross recelpts
State of New Hampshire Boat Registration fees

Property tax on boats in New Hampshire
241,187.48
as of April 1, 1972
Unrefunded non-road toll tax
$66,349.26$
$\$ 17,393,889.74$

According to state distribution of money received for boat registrations and unrefunded gas tax for the year 1972, the following departments received these monies directly related to the marina/ooating industry.

State Department of Safety $\$ 238,023.63$
State Water Resources Board 44,984.00
Fish and Game Department
33,174.63
\$316,182.26

There are a few banks in the state that provide bank loans on individual boat purchases and on floor planning of boats for dealers, but by and large the vast majority of banks in the state stay away from boat loans. It would appear from our discussions that the banks do not lend on boats for the simple reason that they do not understand the business and have never had the opportunity to learn about it.

Some loans are made directly between the boat purchaser and the bank, but very few. For these loans made directly from the bank at the time of our interviews with bankers, the going interest rate was 9-10 percent. Ordinarily these are five-year loans, but some loans on fiberglass larger boats are now being written for seven years.

Most all boat loans are through the dealer. The dealer sells the bogt, agreeing to finance it. He has the customer fill out a credit reference slip for the bank. If approved, the monthly payments are made directly to the bank. The dealer cosigns and in fact guarantees the loan to the banir. If the customer fails to keep up his payments with the bank, the bank contacts the dealer and asks him to repossess the boat and pay off the bank loan. With a loan financed through the dealer, the customer pays $11-12$ percent interest, and normally, signs for a loan for five years. The dealer picks up approximately 2 percent of the interest charged for his part in the transaction.

Several bankers mentioned that at least two large erecit corporations were doing a very large volume in loans in the recreation business, for both floor planing and retail paper. These credit corporations were not irterviewed, but it was reported that interest rates on their loans are considerably higher thar for banke and that such loans are easier to obtain.

## MARINA INTERVIEW RESPONSES

## I. Business Organization and Management

The first group of tables is concerned with the marina business as an industry and its management. Table 7 shows that by far the largest number of marinas, 66.7 percent, are incorporated with 10 or fewer stockholders. Individual proprietorship is the next largest type of ownership, having 26.7 percent; while marinas with 10 or more stockholders and partnerships together consist of a total of 6.6 percent.

Table 9 shows that of the 45 marinas interviewed, four have paid managers and the rest are owner operated.

Of all the marinas, 34 , or 75.6 percent, were operating on a year round schedule. Sixty percent, or 27 , of the marinas engaged in some other area of sales unrelated to the marine industry. Nine different types of businesses were listed, of which 31 percent, or 15 , sold snowrnobiles, which was by far the most common "other type" of extre business engaged in. This practice, in many respects, is natural for New Hampshire: water sports, boating etc., in the summer and a good snow cover in the winter, with winter sports and snow-mobiling. The marriage of the two types of businesses has been, from the standpoint of holding engine mechanics, a blessing. Except for a very large marina with a big backlog of repairing without the snowmobiles, it would be hard to keep and pay their mechanics on a year-round basis.

TABLE 7
Type of Business Organization

| Corporation: | Number | Percent |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 10 or less stockholders | 30 | 66.7 |
| More than 10 stockholders | 1 | 2.2 |
| Individual proprietorship | 12 | 26.7 |
| Partnership | 2 | 4.4 |
| Total | 45 | 100.0 |

TABLE 8
Type of Operation

|  | Number | Percent |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Marina | 43 | 95.6 |
| Boatyare | -2 | $\frac{4.4}{45}$ |
| Total | 400.0 |  |

TABLE 9
Type of Management

|  | Number | Percent |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Paid Manager | 4 | 8.9 |
| Owner | 41 | 91.1 |
|  | 45 | 100.0 |

TABLE 10
Length of Time Business Operated (Per Year)

|  | Number <br> All year | Percent |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Part of year | 34 | 75.6 |
| Total | il | $\frac{24.4}{45}$ |
| 100.0 |  |  |

TABLE 11

*One marina responded yes to operating another business, but did not specify what kind.
*Several reported two or more types of other businesses.

## II. Storage and Berthing Capacity

Tables $12,13,14,15$, and 16 give a view of the different types of berthing and storage, both summer and winter, that are available to the New Hampshire boatmari. As was stated in the beginning of this report, having a place to berth a boat in the summer and a place to store it in the winter have become critical; and as the boating industry grows, as it will continue to do, berthing and storage will grow in importance. The five main types of berthing in New Hampshire are moorings or stakes, breasted on docks, slips, tie-offs, and dry-stack storage.

When one thinks of a typical marina, he pictares oows of boats berthed in siips. This type of berthing accommodates many boats at New Hampshire marinas. Table 12 shows it as the most common berthing type utilized. Of the total 3,677 berthed boats during the summer of 1972, 3,061, or 83.2 percent, rented slips. All of the other types of berths did not even come close in frequency of use to matching slips. The others, when added together totalled 616, or 16.8 percent.

A common form of berthing for out-of-staters is dry-stack storage. This type is basically used for berthing boats belonging to customers who only use their boats on weekends or less frequently. Twenty-one, 46.7 percent, of the marinas interviewed have dry-stack storage. The average fee paid to marinas in both sumber and winter is $\$ 160$ per season or $\$ 8$ per linear foot in the summer and $\$ 6$ per linear foot in the winter. Many more boats $(2,423)$ are stored in drystack in the winter than those in the summer (202) which must be moved or transported by forklift or marine travel lift to the water each time the customer arrives.

On Table 14 , one can see that the largest number of boats stored inside in the winter are inboard-outboards in the size range of 16-26 feet in length. The outboards, as a group, are the largest category stored inside with 1,919 , or 37.2 percent, out of a total of 5,161 stored boats.

Two hundred and eight inboards are stored ouliside, with the most common length being $26-40$ feet long. Very few boats, comparatively, are kept in wet storage. of a total of 25, 13 are 26-40 foot inboards. Wi th one exception, all the boats in wet storage were on salt water. This is natural as all the fresh water lakes of New Hampshire (where 91 percent of the marinas are located) freeze over every winter. As the number of boats increase and land for marinas becomes harder and harder to obtain, more marinas will go to the use of air bubble systems to keep open water near their docks and slips, so they can both protect their installation from ice damage and store more boats in wet storage.

Accomnodating boating enthusiasts in New Hampshire is by far not oniy limited to New Hampshire residents. In fact, when weighted averages were made computing the out-of-state income coning to New Hampshire marinas, the authors arrived at a total of 78 percent as being the figure to represent the percent of this incoming money from out-of-state customers.6/

[^2]TABLE 12

Berthing Capacity in Use, Summer 1972

| Type | Number of Boats |  | Averege Sessonal Charge |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mooring on stakes | 170 | 98 |
| Breasted on docks | 201 | 77 |  |
| Slips | 3,061 | 195 |  |
| Tie-offs | 43 | 113 |  |
| Dry-stack | 202 | 160 |  |
| Total | 3,677 |  |  |

TABLE 13
Do you Presently Use Dry-Stack Storage?

| Response | Number | Percent |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | 21 | 46.7 |
| No | -24 | 53.3 |
| $\quad$ Total | 45 | 100.0 |


| Dry-Stack Storage Facilities |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Season | No. of Boats | Per Season | Average Fee Per Linear Foot | Square Foot |
| Summer | 202 | \$160 | \$8 | 0 |
| Winter | 2,423 | \$160 | \$6 | \$1 |

TABLE 14
Winter Storage (Boats Stored Inside at Marinas)
Length Sail Gutboard Inboard In/outboard All Boats

| Less then $16^{\prime}$ | 97 | 894 | 38 | 72 | 1,101 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $16-26^{\prime}$ | 100 | 1,025 | 762 | 1,552 | $3,439$. |
| $26-40^{\circ}$ | 5 | 0 | 582 | 6 | 593 |
| $40^{\prime}$ and over |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | $\frac{1}{203}$ | $\frac{0}{1,919}$ | $\frac{1,409}{28}$ | $\frac{27}{1,630}$ | $\frac{0}{5,161}$ |

TABLE 15
Winter Storage (Boats Stored Outside at Marinas)

| Length | Sail | Outboard | Inboard | In/outboard | All Boats |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number |  |  |  |  |
| Less than $16{ }^{1}$ | 11 | 73 | 5 | 0 | 89 |
| 16-26' | 66 | 107 | 99 | 55 | 327 |
| 26-40 | 76 | 0 | 278 | 3 | 357 |
| $40^{\prime}$ and over | 3 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 27 |
| Total | 156 | 180 | 406 | 58 | 800 |

TABLE 16


## III. Expansion

A new interest in the environment, additional numbers of boats, and on increase in govermmental involvement all have contributed to the need for marinas to expand their facilities recently in New Hampshire. Of the marinas in this study, 73.3 percent reported that they have expanded during the past five years. The two most common types of expansion were increased storage capacity and more dock space, having 41 percent and 27.9 percent, respectively. Ninetyseven percent said that their expansion incressed the number of boats that they could handle.

Thirty-three of the forty-five marinas have increased their capacities during the past five years. Where future expansion is planned, larger storage facilities and dry-stack storage are seen as especially important.

On Table 19 (past expansion), of those marinas which have enlarged their facilities, 781 additional boats were able to be handled or stored in summer and in winter 1,504 additional.

It is obvious that more marinas concentrated on winter storage capacity ( 25 rather than 19 which increased summer facilities).
of those 16 marinas which reported future expansion for operation, their plans allow for an additional berthing of 1,132 boats during the next five years. The majority of the boats are 16-26 feet in length. winter storage expansion plans for the next five years are proposed to accommodate 2,270 more boats.
of the 31 marinas which reported they would expand for winter storage during the next five years, 26 said they planned to build new or to erlarge present dry-stack storage space.

Dry-stack storage, in the opinion of many, is the space saver of the future for the marinas with limited land available or with the prospect of exorbitant land costs. For winter atorage, obviously many more boats can be stored under one roof by stacking them in racks, 4-6 boats or more high. For sumer in and out storage, costly slips and dock space can be kept to a minimum. Some of the seling points to the customer are no storm damage, no deterioration from sun on boat or canvas, underwater parts can be readily inspected, no chafing of lines or dock damage, no water accumulation, and no boat theft.

Some marina operators are envisioning a boat canal right into the stack storage building where an overhead crane fed the prover sequence of numbers like dialing a phone will pick up a boat at a certain spot in the canal and place it in, say, rack number 127. Obviously this process could be reversed, and boat in rack 127 or any other could be picked up and placed in the canal. Most all the written materials we have seen on this type of storage talks of boats up to 26 feet in length.

Twelve marinas reported that they could not expand their facilities within the next five years. The most commonly expressed restriction to expansion was financial limitations. Some responded that they had no more land or space, had a bad shoreline for possible expansion, or that the local laws and ordinances had put a freeze on marina expansion, therefore, no possible means of growth could be proposed.
rABLE 17

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { Did You Increase the Size of Your Marina } \\
\text { During the Past Five Years? }
\end{gathered}
$$

| Response | Number | Percent |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | 33 | 73.3 |
| No | $\underline{12}$ | $\frac{26.7}{2}$ |
| Total | 45 | 100.00 |


| Types of Expansions | Number* | of All Expansions |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 17 | 27.9 |
| Dock space | 4 | 6.5 |
| Added moorings | 3 | 4.9 |
| Expanded shoreline | 3 | 4.9 |
| Increase rail capacity | 25 | 41.0 |
| Increase storage capacity | 3 | 4.9 |
| Increase service capacity | 2 | 3.3 |
| Fork truck | 4 | 6.6 |
| Other | 61 | 100.0 |

*Note: Many marinas expanded in several of the categories listed.

TABLE 18
Did This Increase Your Capacity in Handling Boats?

| Response | Number | Percent |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | 32 | 97.0 |
| No | -1 | 3.0 |
| Total | 33 | 100.0 |

$$
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$$

TABLE 19
Increased Capacity, Past Expansion (Sumner)

| Size of Boat | No. of Marinas | No. of Boats |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 118 |
| Less than 16' 118 |  |  |
| 16-26' ${ }^{\text {r }}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  | 103 |
| 26-40' |  |  |
| $40^{\prime}$ and over |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Total | 19 | 781 |
| Increased Capacity, Past Expansion (Winter) |  |  |
| Size of Boat | No. of Marines | No. of Boats |
| Less than 16' 311 |  |  |
| 16-26' 905 |  |  |
| 26-40' 278 |  |  |
| $40^{\prime}$ and over - |  |  |
| Total | 25 | 1,504 |

TABLE 20
Do You Plan to Increase Your Capacity During the Next Five Years?

| Response | $\frac{\text { Number }}{}$ | Percent |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | 33 | 73.3 |
| No | $\underline{12}$ | $\underline{26.7}$ |
| Total | 45 | 100.0 |

$$
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TABLE 21
Proposed Increased Capacity, Future Expansion (Summer)

| Size of Boat | No. of Marinas | No. of Boats |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Less than $16^{\prime}$ |  | 102 |
| 16-26 ${ }^{\text {+ }}$ |  | 897 |
| 26-40 |  | 133 |
| 40' and over |  | 0 |
| Total | 16 | 1,132 |


| Proposed Increased Capacity, Future Expansion (Winter) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Size of Boat | No. of Marinas | No. of Boats |
| Less than $16^{\prime}$ |  | 539 |
| 16-26 ${ }^{\prime}$ |  | 1,428 |
| 26-40 ${ }^{\text { }}$ |  | 303 |
| $40^{\prime}$ and over | - | 0 |
| Total | 31 | 2,270 |

## IV. Limitations to Service

Questions 22 and 23 gave positive proof to a fact that we felt sure of before the start of the study. That, in essence, is that the demand for marina services is greater than the supply. of the marinas interviewed, 37, or 82.2 percent, said yes to the question "Last summer did you turn away customers for lack of dockage or moorings?" Worded another way, the question to the marina operators would have indicated that most of them could have had more sumer eustomers if they had had more factlities to handle the boats. The facilities could have been of many kinds or types; i.e., more dock space or slips, more moorings, dry-stack storage for in and out boat use, or in some cases just more suitable land where small boats could be taken out and stored on the lawn when not in use.

Ifkewise, 21, or 46.7 percent, of the marinas interviewed had to turn away winter storage customers for lack of facilities.

This shortage of facilities to meet the boating public need for both sumer and winter storage is fairly common. (See Section III, Expansion). Of the marinas in this study, 73.3 percent reported they had expanded their facilities within the past five years. Regarding future expansion covering the next five years, 26 marinas have plans to expand summer storage and 31 plan to expand winter storage.

It is interesting to note that of future summer and winter expansion plans, the operators are estimating space for 1,132 more boats in the summer and 2,270 in the winter. Or this total increase of 3,402 boats at existing marinss in the next five years, 2,324 of these spots are planned for boats $16-26$ feet in length.
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TABLE 22

Summer Boat Storage;
Last Summer Did You Turn Away Customers Because of Limitations?

| Response | Number | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | 37 | 82.2 |
| No | 8 | 17.8 |
| Total | 45 | 100.0 |

TABLE 23
Winter Boat Storage;
Last Winter Did You Tum Away Customers Because of Limitations?

Response

| Number <br> 21 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| 24 | 46.7 |
| 24 | 53.3 |

45
100.0

TABLE 24
Shoreline, Water Area, Storage Area Are Best Answered by Giving the Averages of the 45 Marinas Interviewed

| Marina Characteristics | Averages |
| :--- | :---: |
| Shore length | 504 feet |
| Total land area | 8 acres |
| Total water areas used | 2 acres |
| Inside storage | 38,078 square feet |
| Outside storage | 31,700 square feet |

77.8 pereent, or 35 marinas, had unused land for future use.
22.2 percent, or 10 marinas, hed no extra land.
V. Facilities and Services

Marina/marine facilities are of utmost importance for serving and satisfying all boat owners. In the past, a typical marina might have consisted of limited dock space, a launching ramp, and a small parking area. Today, with expansion in boat ownership and use and with the increasing evolution toward larger yachts and vessels, marina owners and managers have learned to adapt and enlarge their facilities to satisfy the many new needs of their customers. It is important to have safe and convenient moorings and adequate sized channels. Facilities such as electrical outlets dock-side, grocery stores, bath and shower houses, ice machines, convenient gas and oil locations, dockside sewage disposal, and adequate parking areas are just a few of the newly acquired necessities supplied for the many avid boaters.

From the information in Table 25 , it is apparent that practically all of the marinas interviewed have gas, oil, and marine supplies readily available to their customers. Showers, restaurants, and ice are the three least often supplied facilities or services.

## TABLE 25

Facilities and Services Supplied by Marinas

## Facility or Service

Marine supplies
$0 i 1$
Gas
Launching ramp
Restrooms
Fresh water (dock side)
Electricity (dock side)
Ice
Holding tank facilities
Showers
Restaurant

| Marinas Providing |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Number | $\frac{7}{7}$ of AII Marinas |
| 44 | 97.8 |
| 44 | 97.8 |
| 42 | 93.3 |
| 38 | 84.4 |
| 32 | 71.1 |
| 28 | 62.2 |
| 26 | 57.8 |
| 16 | 35.6 |
| 9 | 20.0 |
| 7 | 15.6 |
| 3 | 6.7 |

Most of the marinas, 38 out of 45, had a launching ramp for public use. Of those that said they charged a fee, the average launching fee was $\$ 1.75$.

With the state of New Hampshire having a holding tank law in effect on state controlled fresh water, we were surprised that only 9 , or 20.0 percent, of the marinas reported having purmp out facilities on their premises. At the time of this writing they are not required at the salt water marinas, and some of the marinas interviewed did not handle boats of "live-aboard-size," but undoubtedly more marinas in the state will have to consider holding tank, pump out facilities for the future.

TABIE 26
Marina Sewage and Water Facilities

| Type | Sewage Disposal System |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Numb | Percent |
|  | 8 | 17.8 |
| City | 8 |  |
| Septic tank | 33 | 73.3 |
| Other (gas toilets, holding tank) | 4 | 8.9 |
| Total | 45 | 100.0 |

TABLE 27
Source of Water

| Source | Number | Percent |
| :--- | :---: | ---: |
| City | 17 | 37.8 |
| Own well | 22 | 48.9 |
| Lake | -6 | 13.3 |
| Total | 45 | 100.0 |

Boat protection, management of automobile parking lots, and general security are becoming more and more important at marinas. Obviously if the customer has a choice, he will pick the spot with the seemingly least risk for his boat.

TABLE 28
Marina Security Measures

VI. Repairs

Doint repairs on boats constitutes a major portion of the gross income received by many of the marinas in New Hampshire. All but four of the marinas interviewed do repairs on the various types of boats which they serve. The number of marinas doing repairs on types of boats and engines is shown in the following table.

TABLE 29
Marinas Repairing Hulls and Engines

Type of Boat
Wooden boats
Fiberglass boats
Inboard engines
Outboard engines

Number
29
35
36
39

Percent of 41
70.7
85.4
87.8
95.1

One of the problems associated with doing repair jobs for their customers is for some marinas to keep their help. One-third reported that they had some difficulty in keeping adequate help, with the most difficult being engine mechanics. Some reasons for this problem are cited in Table 30.

TABLE 30
Difficulties Experienced by Marinas in Ootaining and Keeping Qualified Help

| Type | Number of Difficulties | Percent of All Difficulties |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Carpenters | 5 | 15.6 |
| Painters | 6 | 18.7 |
| Engine mechenics | 15 | 46.9 |
| Yard help | 6 | $\underline{18.8}$ |
| Total number of <br> difficulties | 32 | 100.0 |

$$
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The reasons for the difficulties in getting and keeping qualified help were mostly lack of training in the required skills for the marine business and the seasonal nature of employment. Well trained mechandos are hard to employ in New Hampshire since the actual boating season is very active for approximately five months, at the most, out of the year. The reasons for the afficulties and the number responding to each is as follows:

| Type | Feeson | Number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Carpenters | Need training schools moo seasonal | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \\ & 2 \\ & \hline 5 \end{aligned}$ |
| Painters | Not well trained Too seasonal No answer | $\begin{array}{r} 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ \hline 6 \end{array}$ |
| Engine mechanies | Not well trained--need in-state training schools <br> No answer <br> Too seasonal | $\begin{gathered} 7 \\ 2 \\ 6 \\ \hline 15 \end{gathered}$ |
| Yard help | ```Not well trained--need vocational training school No answer Too segsonal``` | $\begin{array}{r} 1 \\ 2 \\ -3 \\ \hline 6 \end{array}$ |

VII. Receipts and Employment

1. Gross Receipts

One way of deciding exactly how suecessful an industry is is by assessing its total gross income. Marinas of all sizes were interviewed in this report, therefore gross numbers vary widely. The figures below represent total sums of all of the 45 marinas contacted.

TABLE 31
Gross Receipts, 45 Marinas, New Hampshire, 1972
Number Marinas
Total Receipts Reporting Receipts
Services

| Summer dockage and moorings | $\$ 537,704$ | 43 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Winter storage | 906,374 | 42 |
| Launching and docking | 35,222 | 38 |
| Brokerage | 858,251 | 20 |
| Repairs | $1,084,287$ | 40 |

Sales and Rentals
Marine store $\quad 1,004,686 \quad 39$

Boat and engine salee (new and used) 6,011,966 37
Gas and oil 517,820 42
Charter/Rental 228,865 25
Restaurant
16,895
3

Total
\$11,202,070

Calculating each marina separately as to gross receipts and percentage the owner reported as having received from out-of-state customers the weighted average proporation of gross income is 78 percent. So, of the $\$ 11.2$ million of gross receipts for marinas, $\$ 8.7$ milion came from out-of-state boaters.
2. Marina Employment

Employment in the marinas for the two seasons--summer and winter-is shown in Table 32 by type of activity.

TABLE 32
Marina Employment

| Type | $\frac{\text { Sumner }}{}$ | Winter |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Yard | 148 | 69 |
| Office | 64 | 45 |
| Dock | 70 | -- |
| Sales | 21 | 10 |
| Mechanics | 54 | 37 |
| Repairs | 13 | 14 |
| Managers | -6 | -6 |
| Total | 376 | 181 |

Labor charges as given to the interviewers ran from $\$ 6.50$ per hour to $\$ 11.00$ per hour.
VIII. Other Marine Industries

In the Eeonomic Report section, these 11 manufacturing firms and roadside outlets were reported as generating total sales of $\$ 5.6 \mathrm{million}$. They are not considered to be marinas, so were not included in the analysis in the body of this report. However, they do provide considerable employment, seil a large number of boats, store some boats, and so have an appreciable economic impact on the state. The two tables below are a measure of two important activities--employment and winter storage-of these firms.

TABLE 33
Boat Marufacturers and Large by the Highway Marine Sales Outlets, 11 Firms Interviewed


Mr. Peter Horne and one of the writers, George Shaw, made a11 the marina interviews. while taking interviews and discussing marina business and problems in general, the interviewers heard the following ideas and suggestions expressed. In listing these no order of magnitude was used, but all things listed here were mentioned at least three or more times by different individuals being interviewed. They are listed here for one reason only: as food for thought for the marine dealers themselves.

1. Comments made that the Association attempt to increase membership. To have a closer rapport between "The Lakes Region" and the rest of the state. Hold meetings in different locations--stagger the meetings around the areas where marinas are located.
2. Heard many comments on marine trade workshop held in February of this year; all the remarks were in favor of the workshop, although several people would have liked different subjects discussed. This is normal. All who brought up the subject felt that now the ground was broken, let's not stop--let's plan more workshops!
3. It was suggested by some that perhaps the Association could have a central supply center in the Lake Winnipesaukee area for marinas to draw on for spare parts, etc.
It was also suggested that marinas attempt to work more closely together on types of equipment installed, i.e., marine heads (holding tanks), if the marina operators could agree to sell, install and service three or four good makes, and stock these
parts at one central location rather than selling and installing seven or eight different kinds with each dealer sending half way across the country or farther for replacement parts every time one is needed.
4. It has been mentioned that some sort of credit reference system be set up between marinas. Another way it was worded was establish a clearing house for bad customers, (noisy, bad credit, destructive drunks, etc.), so that they don't run from place to place and eventually cause grief for everyone.
5. We had many and varied comments regarding no ovemight anchoring in Lake Winnipesaukee other than following the now prescribed rules and regulations. Comments ran the gauntlet from "an excellent ruling" to "the rule is no damn good," the latter driving some boat owners to sell their boats or to move to the ocean. Several did say that they felt the state should be urged to put in several well marked and defined anchorages in the lake, preferably off state or town parks or other public lands. This practice, it was felt, would allow those so inclined, and those not out of necessity tied to the "electrical umbilicel cord," the opportunity to drop the hook and spend the night as cruising people have done for years.
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FIGIJRE 3
LOCATIONS OF MARINAS ON LAKE SUNAPEE, NENFOUND LAKE, AND LAKE OSSIPEE


Center 0ssipee

FTGURE 4
LOCATIONS OF MARINAS ON SQLUM TAKE AND TAKE WINNTSQUAM


FIGURE 5

LOCATIONS OF MARINAS IN THE SEACOAST REGLON


This report is concerned entirely with the business and physical characteristics of New Hampshire marinas and other major segments of the pleasure boat industry. The survey aid not deal with loeal community plaming or other political aspects of the marina industry, nor did it deal with environmental impacts of marinas and boat usage on the water and associated land areas. This latter is a subject of much concern to community leaders as well as to marina omners, but determination of ecological impacts requires detailed scientific investigation.

A recent study by the University of Phode Island Graduate School of Oceanography titled Ecology of Small Boat Marinas examined the biological effects of a marina through comparison with a marsh.

The abstract of the report is as follows:
In Wickford Harbor, Rhode Island, a yacht marina area and a salt marsh cove were considered as ecological systems and compared to evaluate biological populations and magnitudes of production and respiration. Volume and flushing characteristics of both areas were similar. Analyses were made in each cove on marsh grass production, suspended particulate matter, phytoplankton, nutrients, bacteria, dissolved organics, copper levels, fish and sediments. Biomass and metabolism measurements were made on the fouling communities present on floats and pilings in the marinas. Preliminary bioassays were performed with concentrations of outboard motor exhaust water on several species of estuarime organisms, Some additional comparative measurements were taken inside and outside other marinas located in Narragansett Bay.

No major differences were found in marsh grass production, concentrations of suspended particulate matter, nutrients, bacteria, dissolved organies, infauna, or sediment metabolism. Copper levels, while lower than toxic concentrations reported in the literature, were higher in the marina cove, ranging from $0.009 \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{g}$ in the water $\pm 0160 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{g}$ in the fouling community. Fish species reached the same levels of diversity in both the marina and the marsh cove, but abundance was greater in the marsh cove due to the presence of dense juvenile menhaden schools.

The fouling communities of the marinas, which appeared to be a food source for juvenile mumichogs (Fundulus heteroclitus), exerted a significant oxygen demand on the marina cove. Diurnal curves of dissolved oxygen showed lower concentrations at the end of the night in marina areas than in adjacent waters. For this reason, and because preliminary bioassays indicated some toxicity due to exhaust waters, it is suggested that marina sites be well flushed with oxygenated tidal waters. The luxurious fouling growths which developed in the marina cove may serve as additional food sources to complement the detritus input from the salt marsh.

In most respects the marina cove and the marsh cove appeared to be not only similar, but also compatible ecological systems.

SOURCE: Ecology of Small Boat Marinas, Scott W. Nixon, Candace A. Oviatt, Sharon L. Northby, Marine Technical Report Series No. 5, University of Fhode Island, 1973.

APPENDIX

## REGISTRATION FEES*

## READ CAREFULLY

Circle Below Fee Enclosed

| OUTBOARD MOTORS |  | INEOARD BOATS |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| 5 H.P. and under | $\$ 4.00$ | 18 ft . and under | 6.00 |
| 5.1 H.P. to 13.9 H.P. | 5.00 | Over 18 ft . thru 26 ft. | 9.00 |
| 14 H.P. and overo | 6.00 | Over 26 ft. | 11.00 |

Field Agent's Fee $\$ .50$
Not Applicable to Office Transactions
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A MESSAGE FROH THE GOVEPNOR
The people of New Hampahire welcome you ag a boat ownex to enjoy the recreational boating facilities of our atate, The Department of safety maintains hurdieda of navigational aids find waterways patrols for your
safety. You should become fanlliar with our laws to avoid a mishap to your family or others uging our water= ways. Dur waterways are one of our most important aricta.

Pleast help ur keep thert unpolluted.


STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
APP. NO. DEPARTMENT OF SAFETY

FOR OFFICE USE O
DIVISION OF MOTOR VEHICLES
ROAD TOLL SECTION
Concond, N. H. 03301
RETALL DEAL_ER
ROAD TOLL REFUND APPLICATION.
$\qquad$
AMOUNT OF REFGMD $\qquad$
EY $\qquad$

THE STATEMENT ON THE REVERSE SIDE MUST BE COMPLETED BY THE APPUCANT'S SUPPUER, ALL GALLONAGE FIGURES SHOULD BE CHECKED FOR ACCURACY.

Name of Applicant $\qquad$
Street Adoress $\qquad$
City or Town New Hampshine

All applications for mefunds must be made umof penalties of ferjury and bhall be made bemi-annua within 90 days aftem June 30 th ano December 31 st mespectively.

All applicationa muat be accompanieg oy a statement from the dibtributor, bupplier or wholesaler THE GROBS PURCHASEE OF MOTOR FUEL MADE BY RETAIL DEALERG BURING THE BIXAMONTH PEREOD,
(Onlr Statement Prescrieed And Funniahed To Suppler By Commissioneq Will Be Accepted)



# (CLAIM FORM ON THE REVERSE SIDE MUST BE COMPLETED BY THE APPLICANAT") 

## STATEMENT'

## MOTOR FUEL SALES TO NEW HAMPSHIRE RETAIL DEALERS

This statement is preparted for and furnished to New Hampshire Retail Dealems to gubstantiate Road Toll Refund claime ab authorizeo under Chapter 265 19a of the Motof Vehicle Law.

RETAIL DEALER - shall. Include any person or persons other than a licensed distributor who
 hetail level. provided further that retall dealer bhall. not include any person on perbons who RECEIVE MOTOR FUEL UPON WHICH THE ROAD TOLL MAB DEEN PAIO BY A LICENBED DISTRIPUTOR FOR BTORAGE OR SUBSEQUENT DISTRIGUTION AT THE WHOLEEALE LEVEL OR BOLEY FOR BTORAGE AND CONBUMPTION BY BUCH PERSON OR PERSOHS.

SUPPLER $\qquad$
ADDRESS
STREET CITY-TOWN STATE

Date
19 $\qquad$

## RETAIL DEALER

ADDRESS

## STREET

CITY-TOWN
STATE
 THE FENIOD INBICATEO.

| Regulan Gasoline | Gallons |
| :---: | :---: |
| Hit Tet Gaboline | Gallows |
| Total | Gallons |

Staner


Fon
(Supplier)

# STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE DEPARTMENT OF SAFETY DIVISION OF MOTOR VEHICLES <br> ROAD TOLL SECTION 

Conconn, N. H. 03301
WATERCRAFT REPORT


| FOR OFFICE USE ONLY | GALE. |
| :--- | :--- |
| SOLD |  |
| REFUNDED |  |
| UNREFUNDED EALANCE |  |
| DUE SAFETY DIVISION | 5 |
| BY |  |


|  | Gallona |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Inventony (TANK) on the finst of the month. |  | $\mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{X X}$ |
| 2. RxcEIPTE (LIST ONLY DELIVERIES TO WHARF TANKS AND PUMPS) |  | $\mathbf{X X X X}$ |
| 3. Total (LINE 1 mus LiNE 2) | $\mathbf{X X X X}$ |  |
| 4. Sold dincctuy to moat tanka and gupplemhntary futl tanem, |  | $\mathbf{X} \times \times \mathbf{}$ |
| 5. Usec in the pmofulsion of watemcmart. <br> (ALL CLAIMS FOR REFUND MUST AE FILED USING FORM R-1) |  | $\mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{X}$ |
|  EXPLANATION |  | $\mathbf{X X X X}$ |
| 7. Total (LiNES 4, 5 \& 6) | $\mathbf{X} \times \times \times$ |  |
| 8. Inventony (BCOK) on the iant of the munth. <br> (LINE 3LESSLINE 7) | XXXX |  |
| 9. Inventonv (TANK) On ThE Last of the month. | XXXX |  |
| 10. Stock oxin on Loes (DIFFERENCE LINES 8889$)$ | $\mathbf{X X X X}$ |  |
|  |  |  |

 meport ie tmut iw evenv panticulan.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Fon }
\end{aligned}
$$

Penalty - Amy Person Who Shall Fall To Makit A Repont So Requirid Small Bx Fined Not Mone Tman One Humonet Dollane. ( eounce ims. : )

# STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE. DEPARTMENT OF SAFETY DIVISION OF MOTOR VEHICLES <br> ROAD TOLL SECTION <br> 22 Bridee Street <br> Comcord, N. H. 03301 <br> ROAD TOLL REFUND APPLICATION 


(NAME OF APPLICANT)
(8TREET)
(CITY - TOWN)
Has purchased and used fon the purpose herein gtated Motor Fuel on whith Road Toll has been paid by the purchaser. All egutpment using Motor Fuel must be higted on the reverse gibe and Motor Fuel Consumed in same must pe accounted for.

QRIGINAL INYOICES OF ALL PUMCHASES BEARING NAME A ADDRESS OF BOTH SUPPLIER EAPPLICANT TOGETHED WI TH EVIDENCE OF PAYMENT MUST BE ATTACHED, EVIOENCE OF PAYMEMT - EACH INVOICE MUST RE RECEIPTED BY SUPPLIER AS 日EING PAID OR IF PAYMENT IS MADE EY CHECK, DATE OF PAYMENT TOGETMER WITH CHECK MO. MUST APPEAR ON INVOICE, IMVOICE MADE OUT TO CASH NOT ACEEPTIPLE - NO INYOIGEGAN RE RETURNED. IF THERE IS ANY EVIDEMEE OF ERASURES, OR CHANGES $T$ TN EITHER DATES OR AMOUNTS BHOWN ON INVOICES OM EVIOENCE OF PAYMENT OF ROAD TOLL. APPLICATION WILL BE DIGALLOWED IN ITS PORTION.

APPLICANT'S CLAIM

| 1. Total purchases, as per attacheo invotces | Gals. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2. Total used ON public mighway (col. 5 - gine 17- Reverse sioe) |  |
| Total used OFF publac highway <br> 3. (COL. 6 - LINE 17-REYERSE SIoE) | 1 |
| 4. Total on which claim is made. (Line 3) |  |
| 5. Amount of refund @ 9 cente pergal. |  |

6. Type of operation $\qquad$
7. Where used $\qquad$
8. Columns 1 tmmu 6 on the mivener gide must ae completed by all applicantib.
9. Stock Recond - REVEFBE side - MUBT EE COMPLETED IF APFLICANT HAS कtorage tanks on USEE DRUME.

SIGNATURE OF APPMCANT
sIGNED UNDEF PENALTIEB OF FEMJURY


ALLY



[^0]:    1/ Research Associate and Professor, respectively, Resources Development Center, University of New Hampshire.

[^1]:    4/ We asked for and believe we received only the marina/marine oriented gross receipts--not sales of camping equipment, truck campers, snownobiles, etc.

[^2]:    6/ More statistics relating to this figure can be found under "Economic
    Feport" on page of this report.

