RECLAIMED WASTEWATER, WTP AND ENDOGENOUS FREE-RIDING BELIEFS

Diane P. Dupont Department of Economics, Brock University

Presented at the Western Economic Association International Conference, June 30, 2012, San Francisco



Overview

- 1. Background
- 2. Literature
- 3. Survey and Data
- 4. Model and WTP Estimates
- 5. Future



1. Background

World's Perception of Canada



Photo from Niagara Falls Tourism



- Canadian experience with summer water restrictions?
 - 42% each of last five years
 - 22% either 2 or 3 of last five years

Believe Future Droughts?
– 63% - Yes



2. Literature

- WTP to Avoid Water Restrictions
 - Stated Preference (SP)
 - Revealed Preference (Hedonic)



- Australian SP Studies
 - Blamey et al (1999)
 - Hensher et al (2006)
 - Tapsuwan et al (2007)
 - Cooper and Crase (2009)
 - WTP: \$12-\$59 per year (2011)
 - \$258 per year to avoid all restrictions



- American SP Studies
 - Howe and Smith (1994)
 - Griffin and Mjelde (2000)
 - Koss and Khawaja (2001)
 - -WTP \$9-\$20 per month (2011 \$)



3. Survey and Data

- Internet: April-June 2009
- Over 1100 Canadians

– 1. Acceptability of Reclaimed Water

 – 2.WTP to avoid summer outdoor water restrictions through supply augmentation



Scenario

• Option A:

summer outdoor water restrictions

- Option B:
 - augment water supply with reclaimed water to be used for toilet flushing



Use of Reclaimed Water for...

STRONGLY AGREE (%)

- Golf Courses 69 20
- Flowers in Garden 60 25
- Toilet Flushing 59 21
- Veg in Garden 36 28
- Tap Water 11 13



AGREE (%)

DB-DC WTP

 "Yes, I am willing to pay \$XX more on my water bill every month to pay for Option B that uses reclaimed water to supplement water supplies so that summer water use by myself and member of my community does NOT need to be reduced by 10% {30%}.



4. Model and WTP Estimates

- 2 Models
 - Interval Censored
 - Mixed Process: Probit and Interval Censored



Interval Censored

- Factors that probability of saying yes
 - Previously heard of RW
 - Believe drought predictions
 - Believe others in community will NOT reduce water use under Option A (free riding)
- Factors that probability of saying yes

 Factors that
 Probability of saying yes
 - Household Cost and Age
 - Distrust in utility to handle risk
 - Disagree with use of RW for toilet flushing



Mixed Process Model

 Account for possible endogeneity of free riding belief by allowing errors to be correlated

- Recursive (multi-stage process)
 - Probit to explain belief in other's free riding
 - Interval Censored to obtain WTP (with belief as explanatory variable)



• Errors neg correlated but not significant

 Endogeneity not a problem for this specification



- WTP to avoid 30% reduction in summer outdoor water use
 - \$9 per month (2011)
- \$8 per month to avoid 10% reduction



5. Future

Include health concerns

Investigate other factors in probit

 Climate information to investigate differences between dry and wet places



Thank you...

• Questions or suggestions?

