

# **The Value of a Wave**

## **An Analysis of the Mavericks Region and An Analysis of the Mavericks Wave from an Ecotourism Perspective**

### **Abstract:**

This report contains two studies commissioned by Save The Waves Coalition, examining the economic and social value of waves. Each study attempts to quantify the impact of the Mavericks wave on the local regional economy and identity, providing conclusions applicable to wave valuation studies and wave conservation efforts worldwide.

### **Part 1**

Study conducted by: Dr. Makena Coffman of the Department of Urban and Regional Planning, University of Hawaii at Manoa, and Dr. Kimberly Burnett of the University of Hawaii Economic Research Organization. The study uses data collected by Save The Waves Coalition, at the Mavericks Surf Break, in Half Moon Bay, California. The study constructs an Individual Travel Cost Model (ITCM) to assess the approximate economic value brought to the Half Moon Bay area by the presence of tourism and commercial activities focused around the world-famous Mavericks Surf Break. Different forms of valuation are explored, including use value, option value, and intrinsic value. Using the expression of “willingness to pay” as the sum of these forms of value, the true economic value to visitors of the Mavericks Surf Break is estimated at \$23.8 million annually, representing \$56.7 in value for each individual visitor.

### **Part 2**

Study conducted by: Dr. William H. Durham, Co-Executive Director of the Center for Responsible Travel at Stanford University, and Laura R. Driscoll, M.A., Coordinator of the Center for Responsible Travel at Stanford University. The study uses data collected during fieldwork by Save The Waves Coalition, and attempts to situate those data within the context of current ecotourism research. Background is given on current research and research needs in the assessment of coastal tourism’s economic, social and environmental impacts. Perspectives of local residents and visitors to the Mavericks Surf Break are compiled from field data, and short informational interviews conducted with local residents, members of the surf industry, and Half Moon Bay government officials. While few traveler decisions currently seem to be motivated specifically by a desire for environmentally sustainable tourism options, the Mavericks Wave is examined as a key part of local resident identity, and a potentially important opportunity for low-impact ecotourism and responsible marine recreation.

**The Value of a Wave**  
**An Analysis of the Mavericks Region**  
**Half Moon Bay, California**

This study was prepared by

Dr. Makena Coffman  
Department of Urban and Regional Planning, University of Hawaii at Manoa  
and  
Dr. Kimberly Burnett  
University of Hawaii Economic Research Organization

for

Save the Waves Coalition

October 2009

This study was commissioned by Save the Waves Coalition to assess the value of the Mavericks surf area. Survey instruments were developed jointly by Save the Waves Coalition and the authors. All data was collected by Save the Waves Coalition and provided to the University of Hawaii at Manoa.

“Mavericks is a great place to witness how awesome nature is  
– and how powerful man can be to preserve such a place.”  
- *Anonymous survey participant*

## **1. Introduction**

Surfing is one the most popular ocean sports worldwide. Surfing originated in Polynesia and, in particular, in Hawaii roughly 1,000 years ago (Finney and Houston 1966, 23). Surfing was “the sport of Hawaii’s kings” and was called “Hee Nalu” or “wave sliding.” In 1907, an Irish-Hawaiian by the name of George Freeth introduced the sport to southern California. In 1912, Duke Kahanamoku stopped in California on his way to the Olympic competition for swimming (Finney and Houston 1966, 90-91). Kahanamoku, who is known as the grandfather of modern surfing, further popularized the sport within the southern coastline. The advent of the wet suit allowed surfing to both flourish in northern California and in the wintertime, when waves are bigger. One of the most notorious big-wave surfing spots is Mavericks, in Half Moon Bay. Big-wave surfers travel from all over the globe to ride Mavericks up to 50-foot faces.

This study was commissioned by the Save the Waves Coalition to determine the value of the Mavericks surf area to the local community and beyond. All data was collected by Save the Waves and provided to the University of Hawaii. Data was collected over a five-month period and 358 people were surveyed at the Mavericks surf area.

The survey data collected was used to build an Individual Travel Cost Model (ITCM) to estimate the annual welfare accrued by visitors to the Mavericks surf area. The average visitor is estimated to receive \$56.7 in consumer surplus per trip to the Mavericks surf area. With an estimated 421,431 visitors annually,<sup>1</sup> the total annual net economic value to Mavericks visitors is estimated at \$23.8 million. In addition, surfers are estimated to visit the area nearly five times more often than non-surfers and thus accrue more value from the area.

## **2. Background**

There is a growing interest in understanding the value of surfing. A study on the Mundaka surf break in Mundaka, Spain estimates the economic impact of the wave to the local community through tourism revenue. The wave was of particular interest because it was a stop along the prestigious Billabong Pro surf contest prior to a 2004 river dredging project that negatively altered the dynamic of the wave (Murphy and Bernal, 2008). Similarly, a 2006 study on the Vans Triple Crown of Surfing contest on the North shore of the island of Oahu, Hawaii estimated the direct and indirect economic impacts of the 7,000 participants and spectators (Surfer Magazine, 2009).

---

<sup>1</sup> As no other data source is available, this is based on a very generalized estimation process using a headcount of beach visitors during survey days. Details on the population estimation are provided in section 4.

These prior studies focused on the *economic impacts* of the industry to local economies. Another aspect of economic value, however, comes from the welfare or benefit that surfing provides to surfers and observers. This perspective takes that of “consumer welfare” and thus focuses on economic *value* rather than economic *impact*.

## ***2.1 Valuation Techniques***

Economic valuation of environmental services and amenities is based on peoples’ willingness to pay for such environmental goods and services. There are three basic components of value, where an individual’s total willingness to pay is composed of willingness to pay for “use value,” “option value,” and “intrinsic value” (*Total Willingness to Pay = use value + option value + intrinsic value*). Use value is the direct benefit derived from consumption; option value is the benefit derived from having the choice to consume (i.e. the possibility of use in the future); and intrinsic value, also known as existence value, is the benefit from knowing a good exists (Tietenberg, 2007). Because markets are notoriously poor at properly valuing environmental amenities (due to issues of common property, public access, and a host of issues associated with externalities), the value of environmental goods and services must often be assessed using methods other than market observation.

Many valuation techniques are based on the tradeoffs or sacrifices that people make in their life choices; such as paying more for houses in areas that are perceived as of higher environmental quality, or accepting a reduction in income for living in such areas or traveling to visit these areas in lieu of other recreation activity.

Valuation techniques are either based on information revealed through consumer actions or inferred based on stated preferences. Revealed preference methods are based on peoples’ past behavior. Revealed preference methods assess “use value,” and, in some cases (hedonic pricing), “option value.” Stated preference methods can assess all three values. Stated preference methods are accompanied, however, by the challenges of positing hypothetical scenarios that people may or may not perceive as realistic.

This report uses the Individual Travel Cost Method (ITCM) to assess the value (welfare) accrued to the users of the Mavericks surf area. TCM is the most frequently used revealed preference method (Rosenberger and Loomis, 2000) and is widely used to establish recreational values of environmental amenities. It has been “commonly used for decades to estimate a recreation demand curve empirically” (Loomis and Keske, 2009, 428). It is considered a relatively conservative measure as it is based on a *minimum* willingness to pay assessment. This method is based in the assumption that how much people pay in their travel to a location must be, at a minimum, representative of their willingness to pay for the environmental amenity. Due to statistical inefficiency and problems with using aggregate averages associated with the Zonal Travel Cost approach, we chose to collect detailed information on individuals visiting the Mavericks region over a five-month period. Data were collected from early February through late June. This timeframe included both the end of the surf season at Mavericks beach as well as the beginning of the popular summer tourist season, which brings visitors to the Mavericks region to enjoy

the natural amenities. Details on data collection and model construction are provided in the next section.

### **3. Data Collection and Construction**

Although a combination of on-site and on-line data was collected, only the on-site data is used to inform the Individual TCM model and, ultimately, to estimate of the value of the Mavericks surf area. This decision was made because the on-line survey inherently suffers from selection bias, attracting those who are affiliated and/or familiar with Save the Waves Coalition rather than being more representative of the beach visitor population.

The on-site surveys were collected over nine survey days, ranging from February 7 through June 27, 2009. In this time, 359 surveys were conducted.<sup>2</sup> Survey questions ranged from modes of travel to reasons for visiting the Mavericks surf area to describing the primary reasons for the trip. These reasons included: to surf, to watch the surf, for the surfing community, to see the waves, and to visit family and friends. For the full survey instrument, see Appendix I.

In addition, zip codes and car types were collected in order to assess the distance and cost of travelling to visit the Mavericks surf area. If someone traveled through a mode other than a passenger vehicle, that information (e.g., cost of airline ticket) was also recorded. To assure that the entire value of the trip was not unduly attributed to the visit to Mavericks, participants were asked whether Mavericks was the primary purpose of their trip. If so, the entire cost of the trip was attributed within the “travel cost” estimate. Otherwise, only half the value of the trip was attributed as such.

For visitors using passenger vehicles, travel cost was calculated to be the two-way distance traveled divided by the fuel economy of the vehicle multiplied by the cost of gasoline. Passenger vehicles were divided into compact, sedan, and S.U.V. categories and the average fuel economy for each general type were taken from the Environmental Protection Agency (<http://www.fueleconomy.gov/>). The average price of gasoline in the Half Moon Bay area during the study period was \$2.95 (<http://www.eia.doe.gov/>).

Demographic variables were also recorded, as factors such as age, income, and gender are expected to influence the number of annual trips to the Mavericks region. Summary statistics for our variables of interest are provided in Table 1.

---

<sup>2</sup> For comparison, Loomis and Keske (2009) collect data on hiking in Pikes Peak over five separate days. A total of 206 surveys were distributed there was a response rate of 55% (due to the mail-back aspect). They had 89 usable observations.

**Table 1. Summary Statistics.**

Variable	No. of Observations	Mean	Standard deviation
Annual trips	359	17.64	48.23
Travel cost	359	19.18	114.60
Age	224	44.57	16.39
Income	195	94,297.08	91,280.96
Gender (female=1)	359	0.24	0.43
See Waves	359	0.08	0.28
Watch Surfing	359	0.03	0.18
To surf	359	0.07	0.26
Surfing Community	359	0.01	0.07
Family and Friends	359	0.14	0.35

Because there were incomplete responses for the age and income categories, these observations were dropped from the dataset (leaving 195 usable observations). Due to the large standard deviation associated with the travel cost variable, and because most responses were people from the local area, we truncated the data by including only those visitors with an average travel cost of \$100 or less. This decision was made to address those who flew to California, because it was difficult to determine what portion of the cost of their flight was attributable to their trip to Mavericks. This brought us to a final data set of 151 observations.

#### 4. Methodology: An Individual Travel Cost Model

The Individual Travel Cost Model uses annual trips per person as the dependent variable, and uses travel cost and other relevant factors as explanatory variables. The simplest version would use travel cost alone to estimate how many trips the average visitor makes to the Mavericks area. Other factors that are likely to explain visitation rate are characteristics such as the visitor's interests in the area (surfing, friends and family, etc.), and demographics such as age, income, and gender.

Once the appropriate explanatory variables have been assembled, the regression equation gives us the demand function for annual trips for the "average" visitor to the Mavericks region, and the area below this demand curve provides an estimate of the average consumer surplus. We then multiply average consumer surplus by the total relevant population to produce an estimate of total consumer surplus for the Mavericks region.

A general equation describing annual trips to the Mavericks region is given by Equation (1).

$$AnnualTrips_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1(TC_i) + \beta_2(X_i) + \beta_3(reasons_i) \quad (1)$$

where  $AnnualTrips_i$  is the number of trips made by visitor  $i$  in one year,  $TC_i$  is travel cost of visitor  $i$ ,  $X_i$  is a vector of demographic variables describing individual  $i$ , and  $reasons_i$  is a vector of reasons individual  $i$  visited the Mavericks surf region.

Functional forms often used to address count data (data in which the observations can take only non-negative integer values and where these integers arise from counting rather than ranking) are either Poisson or negative binomial models. These are commonly used functional forms associated with Travel Cost Models (Wang et al. 2009). We began our analysis with the Poisson model, but ran into issues with overdispersion— that is — greater variance than might be expected in this type of distribution, resulting in failures of standard goodness-of-fit tests.<sup>3</sup> The large value for chi-square in our goodness-of-fit test was another indicator that the Poisson distribution was not an adequate functional form. We followed the Poisson model with a negative binomial regression, as the negative binomial regression is often more appropriate in cases of overdispersion. The likelihood ratio test provided by Stata’s negative binomial command is a test of the overdispersion parameter alpha.<sup>4</sup> When the overdispersion parameter is zero the negative binomial distribution is equivalent to a Poisson distribution. In our case, alpha was significantly different from zero, reinforcing that the Poisson distribution was not appropriate. However, the negative binomial regression provided very poor Pseudo R<sup>2</sup>s in most sensible specifications. Following Loomis et al. 2009, we then turned to Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) using a semi-log model.

The semi-log functional form mimics the functional form associated with count data models (Loomis et al. 2009). The other benefit of using a semi-log functional form is that it simplifies the consumer surplus calculation in comparison to other OLS specifications. In this case, consumer surplus per trip is simply the reciprocal of the travel cost coefficient (Creel and Loomis 1990). The natural log of the dependent variable also allows for nonlinearity in the demand function. To correct for heteroskedasticity we use White’s heteroscedastic-consistent standard errors. Because the fewest number of trips per year was (by definition) one, the log form meant that the lowest dependent variable was zero. For this reason, we tried the specification with and without a constant term.<sup>5</sup>

The final specification of our individual travel cost model is given in Equation (2).

$$\begin{aligned} \ln annualTrips_i = & \beta_0 + \beta_1(TC_i) + \beta_2(Age_i) + \beta_3(Income_i) + \beta_4(Gender_i) \\ & + \beta_5(SeeWaves_i) + \beta_6(WatchSurf_i) + \beta_7(Surf_i) + \beta_8(FamFrnd_i) \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where  $\ln annualTrips_i$  is the natural log of the number of trips made by visitor  $i$  in one year,  $Age_i$  is an indicator variable representing individual  $i$ ’s age category<sup>6</sup>,  $Income_i$  is an indicator variable representing individual  $i$ ’s income category<sup>7</sup>,  $Gender_i$  is an indicator

<sup>3</sup> A significant ( $p < 0.05$ ) test statistic from the goodness-of-fit indicates that the Poisson model is inappropriate.

<sup>4</sup> All statistical estimations were performed in Stata 9.0 (StataCorp LP).

<sup>5</sup> In addition, an “opportunity cost” variable based on travel time was constructed. It was omitted, however, as travel time and travel cost were too highly correlated.

<sup>6</sup> The age categories were coded as 1: 18-25, 2: 26-29, 3: 30-39, 4: 40-55, 5: 56-70, and 6: 71+.

<sup>7</sup> The income categories were coded as 1: <\$10k, 2: \$10k-\$29.9k, 3: \$30k-\$59.9k, 4: \$60k-\$89.9k, 5: \$90k-\$119.9k, 6: \$120k-\$200k, and 7: \$200k+.

variable representing individual  $i$ 's gender<sup>8</sup>,  $SeeWaves_i$  is a dummy variable indicating whether individual  $i$  visited Mavericks to see the waves,  $WatchSurf_i$  is a dummy variable indicating whether individual  $i$  visited Mavericks to watch other people surfing,  $Surf_i$  is a dummy variable indicating whether individual  $i$  visited Mavericks to surf, and  $FamFrnd_i$  is a dummy variable indicating whether individual  $i$  visited Mavericks to see family and friends. All other variables are as described in Equation (1). The reason “Surf Community” was dropped from the model because it was too highly correlated with other reasons to the visit the Mavericks surf area.

#### 4.1 Population Projection Estimate

Total recreational visitor use is often quite difficult to calculate (English et al., 2002). This is particularly true in the case of an open-access amenity like the Mavericks surf area. In other such cases, like Loomis and Keske's (2009) analysis of the value of Pikes Peak in Colorado, they focus solely on individual consumer surplus and do not scale their findings to the general population. For this study, however, a headcount of beach goers was taken for each site visit, including the duration of time for which the headcount was valid (i.e. the amount of time spent surveying). For example, on February 7, 2009, a total of 56 people were surveyed during a three-hour period. In this same amount of time 450 individuals were at the beach. This allows for a very generalized estimation of the total number of visitors to the Mavericks surf area annually.

The ratio of survey participants to people on the beach was calculated and normalized by the number of hours the survey was conducted each day. This ratio was taken for each survey day. The average number of survey participants each hour was then multiplied by the average participant-to-population ratio, multiplied by 365 days per year and 8 hours per day. The 8 hours per day estimate is quite conservative, given that there are 10 hours of daylight in the winter months and 14 in the summer (US Navy, 2009).

$$V = \frac{\sum_{i=1, \dots, d} P}{d * t_i} * \frac{\sum_{i=1, \dots, d} H_i}{P_i} * \frac{days}{year} * \frac{hours}{day} \quad (3)$$

where  $V$  is total annual visitors (includes double-counting);  $i$  is the respective survey day 1, ...,  $d$  where  $d$  is the number of total survey days;  $t$  is the amount of time spent surveying on each day  $i$  in hours;  $H$  is the headcount taken on each survey day  $i$ ; and  $P$  is the survey participants on each survey day  $i$ .

Using this equation, there are an estimated 421,431 visits to the Mavericks surf area annually. This is clearly a very general estimate using a simple scaling process. Yet there is no other visitation data for the Mavericks surf area. For reference, Half Moon Bay State Beach Park, several miles down the coast, is estimated to have an annual visitation of 990,406 (California State Parks, 2008). From conversations with Save the Waves Coalition staff and representatives from the Half Moon Bay Chamber of Commerce, it

---

<sup>8</sup> Female=1.

seems consistent that the Mavericks surf area should have considerably fewer visitors than the larger State Beach Park.

It is also important to note that this study is estimating the annual economic benefit of the Mavericks surf region, not the Mavericks surf contest. Our annual calculation of 421,431 does not include contest activity, as the 2009 holding period did not result in conditions adequate for the Mavericks surf contest. In the past, the Mavericks surf contest has drawn between 10,000 and 50,000 visitors in a single day, depending on the year and the source.<sup>9</sup> For a template of how to estimate the consumer surplus of a one-time event such as the Mavericks surf contest, see Appendix II.

## **5. Findings**

The estimated demand functions are reported in Table 2. The first specification reports the demand function with no constant parameter and produces an  $R^2$  of 0.54. As expected, the coefficient on travel cost is negative and highly significant. Also statistically significant are the demographic variables age and gender, at the 5% level. Another useful aspect of the semi-log model is the ease of interpreting the coefficients. The slope coefficient is the ratio of the proportionate change in annual trips to the absolute change in the explanatory variable. For example, an additional dollar added to the cost of travel decreases annual trips to the Mavericks region by 1.76%. Moving up an age category increases annual visits by 21.9%. Our results suggest that females, on average, will visit 84% more often than males.

Notably, if an individual visits Mavericks specifically to surf, this increases both annual trips and annual individual welfare. People who come to surf Mavericks and the nearby wave breaks including Ross's Cove will visit 447.8% (nearly 5 times) more often than any other user group.

For completeness we also include an estimate including the constant parameter in the demand equation, though this model does not "fit" as well as the first specification. Nonetheless, the coefficient for Travel Cost remains statistically significant at the 1% level.

---

<sup>9</sup> Surfing Magazine reports 10,000 spectators to the March 2, 2005 contest (the Mavericks website reported 30,000 for the same contest). The 2006 Mavericks event drew between 40,000 (Surfing Magazine) and 50,000 spectators (Maverick's website).

**Table 2. Regression Results for Mavericks Demand Equation**

Variable	Dependent variable = <i>Log of Annual Trips</i> (no constant)		Dependent variable= <i>Log of Annual Trips</i> (with constant)	
	Coefficient	<i>T</i> statistics	Coefficient	<i>T</i> statistics
Travel cost	-0.01764***	-2.68	-0.0207***	-3.08
Age	0.2193**	2.15	0.0908	0.66
Income	0.0979	1.17	0.0592	0.70
Gender	0.6112**	2.34	0.5195*	1.83
SeeWaves	0.4331	1.08	0.3072	0.77
WatchSurfing	0.4637	0.61	0.3622	0.52
ToSurf	1.7008***	4.52	1.5869***	4.04
FamilyFriends	0.0742	0.26	0.01871	0.06
Constant			0.7235	1.48
R-squared	0.5398		0.1179	
F statistic	24.14		4.23	
Probability ( <i>F</i> statistic)	0.0000		0.0001	

\*Indicates statistical significance at the 10% level, \*\* at the 5% level, \*\*\* at the 1% level.

The average visitor is estimated to receive \$56.7 in consumer surplus per trip (calculated by the inverse of the coefficient for Travel Cost). With an estimated 421,431 visitors to the Mavericks surf area annually, the total annual net economic value to Mavericks visitors is estimated at \$23.8 million. In addition, surfers are estimated to visit Mavericks near five times more often than non-surfers. This means that surfers accrue more benefit from the surf area than non-surfers over the year.

In comparison, Loomis and Keske (2009) find that hikers at Pike's Peak have a mean value of \$31 per trip while Cog railway users at Pike's Peak have a mean value of \$98 per trip. Loomis et al. (2009) find that mean value of a round of golf in Colorado is \$18 and the "few available downhill skiing studies have a consumer surplus of \$33.50" (Loomis et al., 2009).

## 6. Conclusions

The Mavericks region of Half Moon Bay, California is famous for surf, whale watching, boating, and other recreational and ecotourism activities. This is the first study to quantify the benefits of visitors enjoying the natural amenities of the region, and the first study to evaluate the economic welfare that accrues to individuals associated with the sport of surfing. We develop an individual travel cost model to estimate the economic benefit for visiting the Mavericks surf area in Half Moon Bay, California. Results indicate that the average visitor to the area receives a benefit of \$56.7 per trip. This amounts to a total annual economic benefit from the Mavericks region of \$23.8 million.

## Bibliography

- California State Parks 2008. Calendar Year Attendance Report. Available at <http://coastsider.com/images/uploads/2009/stateparksattendance.pdf>, Accessed October 26, 2009.
- Creel, M. and Loomis, J. 1990. Theoretical and Empirical Advantages of Truncated Count Data Estimators for Analysis of Deer Hunting in California. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 72, 434-441.
- English, D., Kocis, S., Zarnoch, S., and Arnold, J. 2002. Forest Service National Visitor Use Monitoring process: research method documentation. Res. Pap. SRS-57. Asheville, NC: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Research Station. 14 p.
- Finney, B. and Houston, J. 1966. *Surfing: The Sport of Hawaiian Kings*. Charles E. Tuttle Company, Inc. Rutland, Vermont and Tokyo, Japan.
- Murphy, M. and Bernal, M. 2008. The Impact of Surfing on the Local Economy of Mundaka, Spain. Available at <http://www.limmatwave.ch/Presse/SurfonomicsStudieMundaka.pdf>, Accessed July 1, 2009.
- Surfer Magazine,  
<http://forum.surfermag.com/forum/showflat.php?Number=1467956&page=0>, Accessed September 1, 2009.
- Loomis, J. and Keske, C. 2009. The Economic Value of Novel Means of Ascending High Mountain Peaks: A Travel Cost Demand Model of Pikes Peak Cog Railway Riders, Automobile Users and Hikers. *Tourism Economics*, 15(2): 426-436.
- Loomis, J., Tadjion, O., Watson, P., Wilson, J., Davies, S., and Thilmany, D. 2009. A Hybrid Individual-Zonal Travel Cost Model for Estimating the Consumer Surplus of Golfing in Colorado. *Journal of Sports Economics*, 10(2): 155-167.
- Mavericks website, <http://www.maverickssurf.com/>, Accessed September 1, 2009.
- US Navy, 2009 [https://aa.usno.navy.mil/cgi-bin/aa\\_pap.pl](https://aa.usno.navy.mil/cgi-bin/aa_pap.pl), Accessed September 1, 2009.
- Rosenberger, R. and Loomis, J. 2000. Benefit transfer of outdoor recreation use values: A technical document supporting the Forest Service Strategic Plan. Gen. Tech. Rep. RMRS-GTR-72. Fort Collins, CO: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station. 59 p.
- Tietenberg, T. 2007. *Environmental Economic and Policy*, 5<sup>th</sup> edition. Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.

Wang, E., Li, Z., Little, B., and Yang, Y. 2009. The Economic Impact of Tourism in Xinghai Park, China: A Travel Cost Value Analysis Using Count Data Regression Models. *Tourism Economics*, 15(2): 413-425.

## Appendix I. Survey Instruments

### On-Site Survey

Please help us determine what the Mavericks surf break means to you in order to inform future development decisions that impact waves throughout the world. You can help by completing this survey about your experience travelling to Mavericks.

Please answer all questions as an individual (i.e. if you came to Mavericks with a group, answer for yourself only). No information provided will be individually attributed to the respondent.

- 1) Are you at least 18 years old?    Y    N
- 2) What is your zip code? \_\_\_\_\_
- 3) Tell us why you came to Mavericks: (circle all that apply)
  - A. To see the waves
  - B. To watch the surfing
  - C. To surf
  - D. To spend time with the surfing community
  - E. To spend time with family and friends
  - F. Other: \_\_\_\_\_
- 3a) Which of the above was the most important reason?    A    B    C    D    E    F
- 4) Did you fly to California or within California to travel here?    Y    N
- 4a) If "Y," what was the cost of your ticket? \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) Did you drive here?
- 5a) If "Y," what kind of vehicle do you drive? \_\_\_\_\_
- 5b) If "Y," is it a rental car?    Y    N
- 6) Is visiting Mavericks the primary reason for your trip to Half Moon Bay?
- 7) How many times have you traveled to Mavericks in the last month? \_\_\_\_\_
- 7a) In the last year? \_\_\_\_\_
- 8) Do you come to Half Moon Bay when there is no surf at Mavericks?    Y    N
- 9) By the time you leave, how many days will you have stayed in the area? \_\_\_\_\_
- 10) Where are you staying? (circle one) Hotel    Motel    With friends/relatives    Camping    Other \_\_\_\_\_
- 11) What was the most important factor in your choice of accommodations? (circle one)  
Price    Environmental-Concerns    Location    Other \_\_\_\_\_
- 12) Approximately how much do you think you spent per day on:
  - Lodging:    \$ \_\_\_\_\_
  - Meals:    \$ \_\_\_\_\_
  - Boat Tour:    \$ \_\_\_\_\_
  - Other expenses:    \$ \_\_\_\_\_

13) Do you consider surfing an ecotourism activity? Why or why not? \_\_\_\_\_

14) What forms of marine recreation are you actively involved in? (circle all that apply)

Surfing    Kayaking    Fishing    Waterskiing    Scuba Sailing    Other \_\_\_\_\_

**Background Information**

Note: The information you provide is confidential, and will only be used for demographic purposes.

15) Are you: (circle one)    Male    Female

16) What is your age range? (circle one)

18-25    26-29    30 – 39    40-55    56 – 70    71 or above

17) Do you travel outside the mainland US for the purpose of marine recreation?    Y    N

18) What is the highest level of education you completed? (circle one)

High School    Some College    Full College Degree  
Some Graduate School    Full Graduate Degree    Prefer not to answer

19) Which range includes your gross annual income? (circle one)

Under \$ 10k    \$10,000 - \$ 29,999    \$ 30,000 - \$ 59,999    \$ 60,000 - \$ 89,999  
\$90,000 - \$119,999    \$120,000 – \$200,000    More than \$200,000    Prefer not to answer

20) Other comments ?

\_\_\_\_\_

Thank you very much for taking the time to complete this survey! If you would like to be available for further questions, or if you would like us to share the results of the study with you, please leave your email address below.

This study is sponsored by the Save the Waves Coalition.

**Online Survey: Surfing Mavericks**

We are looking for feedback regarding your experiences at Mavericks in order to better protect it and other waves throughout the world.

Privacy Statement: No information provided in this survey will be individually attributed to the respondent.

- 1) **Are you at least 18 years old?**      Y      N
- 2) **How many times have you been to Mavericks in the last month?** \_\_\_\_\_
- 3) **Within the last year, how many times have you been to Mavericks?**
  - A. 0-5 times
  - B. 5-10 times
  - C. 10-15 times
  - D. More than 15 times
- 4) **Why do you visit Mavericks? (circle all that apply)**
  - A. To see the waves
  - B. To watch the surfing
  - C. To surf
  - D. To spend time with the surfing community
  - E. To spend time with family and friends
  - F. Other: \_\_\_\_\_
- 4a) **Which of the above is the most important reason?**    A    B    C    D    E    F
- 5) **What is your zip code?** \_\_\_\_\_
- 6) **When you go to Mavericks, do you also patron other services in Half Moon Bay (circle all that apply):**
  - A. Restaurants
  - B. Shops
  - C. Accommodations
  - D. Other \_\_\_\_\_
- 7) **What is surfing to you? (circle all that apply)**
  - A. Recreation/pleasure
  - B. Exercise/workout
  - C. Ecotourism
  - D. Competition/profession
  - E. Other \_\_\_\_\_
- 8) **What forms of marine recreation are you actively involved in? (circle all that apply)**  
Surfing    Kayaking    Fishing    Waterskiing    Scuba Sailing    Other \_\_\_\_\_

\*\*\*The same background information was collected for both the on-site and online surveys.

## **Appendix II. Template for Evaluating the Economic Benefit of a Surf Contest**

This template applies the simpler *Zonal Travel Cost Approach* to estimating the economic benefit of a one-time surfing event. The zonal travel cost method is applied by collecting information on the number of visits to the site from different distances. Because the travel and time costs will increase with distance, this information allows the researcher to calculate the number of visits “purchased” at different “prices.” This information is used to construct the demand function for the contest, and estimate the consumer surplus, or economic benefits, for the event.

### **Step 1: Define zones**

The easiest way to define zones is by zip codes surrounding the contest site. This will facilitate the calculation of distance to the site later in the analysis. Determine how far people are likely to travel to the contest, and make a chronological list of those zip codes. Group zip codes into “zones” organized by concentric circles around the contest location.

### **Step 2: Visitors per zone**

The second step is to collect information on the number of visitors from each zone. This is best accomplished by having as many volunteers as possible stand at the entrance of a contest site with the chronological list of those zip codes. They can survey visitors about their zip code, making tick marks by the appropriate zip code to be compiled later. Another option is to have volunteers walk around the contest and collect this information. Be sure that visitors do not respond twice to avoid double counting.

### **Step 3: Travel cost**

Step 3 is to calculate the average round-trip travel distance and travel time to the site for each zone. People in Zone 1 will have the lowest travel cost, with all other zones having increasing travel costs. Next, using average cost per mile, one can calculate the travel cost per trip. A standard cost per mile for operating an automobile is available from AAA or other sources.

### **Step 4: Regression analysis**

The fourth step is to estimate, using regression analysis, the equation that relates the number of event spectators to travel costs and other important variables. From this, one can estimate the demand function for the average visitor/spectator. The analysis might include demographic variables, such as age, income, gender, and education levels, using the average values for each zone. The simplest model includes only travel cost and spectators, i.e.,  $\text{Spectators} = \text{Constant} - \text{Coefficient} * (\text{Travel Cost})$ .

### **Step 5: Demand equation**

The fifth step is to construct the demand function for visits to the contest, using the results of the regression analysis. The first point on the demand curve is the total visitors to the site at current access costs (assuming there is no entry fee for the contest). The other points are found by estimating the number of visitors with different hypothetical entrance fees.

### **Step 6: Consumer surplus**

The final step is to estimate the total economic benefit of the site to visitors by calculating the consumer surplus, or the area under the demand curve.

**The Value of a Wave**  
**An Analysis of the Mavericks Wave from an Ecotourism Perspective**  
**Half Moon Bay, California**

Prepared by

Dr. William H. Durham, Co-Executive Director, Center for Responsible Travel  
and  
Laura Driscoll, M.A., Coordinator, Center for Responsible Travel

for

Save The Waves Coalition

February, 2010



This study was commissioned by Save The Waves Coalition to assess the social and economic value of the Mavericks surf area, from the perspective of ecotourism research. Survey instruments were developed jointly by Save The Waves Coalition and the Center for Responsible Travel. All field research data were collected by Save The Waves Coalition and provided to the Center for Responsible Travel.

## 1. Introduction

Tourism is the world's largest legal industry, currently accounting for 10% of global GDP and one in twelve jobs worldwide (CREST 2008; TIES and CESD 2005). A unique commercial product, tourism relies for its consumer appeal on the health of environments and social systems and can only be consumed at its source. As a result, the tourism industry's interests are often well-aligned with environmental conservation and sustainable development goals.

But tourism also presents a major paradox. On the one hand, it plays a key role in the economic health and growth of many destination regions, and brings opportunities for development both within and beyond the tourism sector. On the other hand, if not carefully managed, tourism can endanger the very beauty, natural resources, and recreation activities that draw tourists and strengthen the local economy in the first place. Common impacts of development include the conversion of open land to built environments or to agriculture, overexploitation of natural resources to meet increased local demand, overcrowding due to the influx of workers and consumers, and degradation of ecosystems due to pollution and land pressure.

As documented in earlier studies, the unique environments of coastal areas are especially at risk (CREST 2008, 2010). Coastal regions are commonly targeted for mass tourism infrastructure development, and are altered by the construction of jetties, wharves, piers, seawalls, and other constructions near the waterline. Such developments facilitate shipping, trade and certain types of tourism, but often have negative impacts on other aspects of tourism and industry, as well as on local flora and fauna. However, systematic studies of the impacts, magnitude and forms of coastal recreation activities and attendant development remain sparse in the academic literature. As a direct result of this lack of information, management and regulation of coastal recreation is often inadequate (NOAA 1998).

Thankfully, tourism and coastal development can take many forms, and can reduce most negative impacts with careful planning and execution. At the Center for Responsible Travel (CREST), we believe that well-managed low-impact travel and recreation activities can be important forces for sustainable development and environmental conservation, and we are dedicated to research that supports those objectives.

Surfing offers an important example of this last group of forces. Because surfing begins with an inevitable "endowment from nature," the surfing community logically finds itself at the intersection of conservation and tourism interests. Moreover the surfing community is large and its financial impact substantial. For example, estimates in recent years place the global surfing population at between 10 and 20 million individuals, with annual growth rates of 12-16% (Buckley 2002). Locally, practitioners also can make significant economic contributions as a number of recent studies have demonstrated (e.g., Lazarow 2007, Lazarow and Tomlinson 2009). Finally, since surfing is an activity with deep ties to coastal environments, the sport brings with it diverse kinds of value for residents and visitors. Careful study is therefore needed to correctly estimate the full economic and social worth of surfing locations (Coffman and Burnett 2009).

As explained below, this report is part of one such effort—a research project designed to explore the role of the surfing community in coastal tourism and conservation dialogues along the Half Moon Bay coastline in California.

## 2. Study Background and Methods

Accurate data on coastal recreation and its impacts has steadily grown more important in the past 15 years. Studies have shown that coastal tourism accounts for a large proportion of all tourism spending worldwide, as well as development and foreign exchange dollars. For example, visitation rates at popular US beaches such as Miami Beach dwarf other combined national park visitation rates, and government revenues from beach tourism spending vastly outweigh current spending to maintain beaches (Houston, 1996). Growing recognition of coastal tourism's environmental and economic importance contributed to an increase in the call for better coastal regulation and policy, by such international supervisory bodies as the WTO, NOAA, WTTC and UNEP (WTTC 1995; UNEP 1996).

Half Moon Bay, California, is a celebrated coastal tourism destination, appreciated for a range of marine recreation activities and fishing resources. According to city fact-sheets in 2004, Half Moon Bay hosted approximately 2,460,000 annual visitors, generating over \$73,820,000 for the local economy. Of those visitors, 197,000 stayed overnight and 2,265,520 visited only for the day. The Half Moon Bay Visitors Bureau advertises 80 miles of coastline as a prime visitation selling point, noting the many tourism highlights that can be found along the coastline and in its seaside communities. Aware of the need for conservation of its unique environment as a tourism treasure, the Visitors Bureau also emphasizes their commitment to sustainable "Eco-Cultural Tourism," a term they use to refer to low impact travel options that are unique to the Half Moon Bay area, such as farm tours, specific water sports, and visits to local historic sites. Resources are provided for agri-tourism, marine recreation, and sustainable fishing.


We at CREST (the Center for Responsible Tourism) were invited to participate in a study of one important aspect of Eco-Cultural Tourism: the surfing culture and recreation economy of Half Moon Bay, home of the Mavericks surf break, and the annual surfing event *The Mavericks Surf Contest*<sup>®</sup>. In partnership with Save The Waves Coalition and the University of Hawaii at Manoa, we undertook a study to understand the value of the Mavericks surf break to Half Moon Bay residents and visitors from an economic perspective *and* through the lens of ecotourism research. A survey instrument was developed with input from all three groups. Data were gathered via 370 surveys conducted with visitors to the wave. Interviews were conducted on site during 9 days of survey observation by Save The Waves staff, during which time subjects were recruited casually, but with full normal consent procedures, while standing on beaches, sidewalks, roadways and observation points nearby the Mavericks surf break.

The project was coordinated by the University of Hawaii, leading to their "Surfonomics" study assessing the economic value of Mavericks to Half Moon Bay businesses. The Center for Responsible Travel examined survey responses having to do with ecotourism and surfing's broader social impacts. Initially, our portion of the study attempted to answer a whole series of questions; as the study unfolded, a decision was made by the field team to cut back to just three questions: Do visitors to Mavericks

consider surfing and the enjoyment of surfing waves to be ecotourism? To what extent are visitors aware of the impacts of their recreation activities on local environments? And to what extent do their consumer choices while visiting Mavericks reflect a preference for sustainable options and low-impact goods and services? We hope that future research will fill-in and amplify what we have had to leave out.


### 3. Results

Because local lodging is normally a main source of tourism revenue, survey respondents viewing the Mavericks surf break were asked to indicate the most important factor in their choice of lodging. Response options included Location, Price, Sustainability, and Other (with a line to specify). Since surfing is so clearly a form of nature-based tourism, we had hypothesized that respondents would indicate a preference for sustainable lodging options. However, out of 370 respondents, only 43 (11.6%) even answered this question, suggesting that most respondents were on day trips and not staying overnight near Mavericks. Unfortunately, the scope of data collection in the current sample does not allow for a more complete analysis of answers received, as follow up lodging questions for additional detail were not asked by the surveyors. Taking the data at face value, then, the following graph represents the answers obtained. Twenty-seven<sup>27</sup> chose Location (which is 62.7% of the subsample who stayed overnight), twelve (27.9%) chose Price, zero (0%) chose Sustainability, and four (9.3%) chose Other, with varying specifics.



Respondents were then asked whether they considered surfing to be ecotourism, why or why not? We hypothesized that the majority of respondents would consider surfing to be ecotourism, and would cite low negative environmental impact as part of their explanation. Out of 370 total survey respondents, 197 (53.2%) said they believed that surfing did qualify as an ecotourism activity. 21 (5.6%) respondents claimed they did not believe surfing was ecotourism, 15 (4.1%) said they were unsure, and 137 (37.0%)

did not answer. The figure below shows the distribution of responses for those who did offer an answer to the question.





When asked to provide a reason for why they did or did not consider surfing to be an ecotourism activity, respondents offered a range of answers, which we analyzed by grouping responses into a handful of explanatory categories. Positive responses most often cited low impacts, low pollution, and the fact that surfing requires participants and spectators to be outdoors where their activities directly depend on the health of the natural environment. For example, one respondent said “Yes, surfers need clean air and water,” while another commented “Yes, people who are visiting the beach have a vested interest in the health of the environment.” Some respondents even cited the educational value of time spent in natural environments, a key element of classic ecotourism. To quote one respondent, “Yes, it educates people about the ocean.” These respondents claimed that surfing specifically promotes awareness of natural systems. Other responses revealed less of an understanding of ecotourism, citing simply that surfing is fun, that anecdotal evidence suggests surfers are eco-conscious, or that it brings visitorship to the Half Moon Bay area. One such respondent offered “Yes, my neighbors are surfers, and ride bikes down to the beach,” while another simply noted curiously “Yes, it’s better than golf” (possibly a reference to an environmentally controversial golf course near Half Moon Bay). One thoughtful respondent decided surfing was ecotourism, but made the following fine distinction: “Yes, surfing is ecotourism, but not all surfers are ecotourists.”

Negative responses tended to cite the opinion that surfing increases the amount of people and congestion in the local area, as well as pointing out that while surfing may not have negative impacts, it also has few direct positive effects on the natural environments involved. Said one respondent “No, it brings huge crowds and traffic to Half Moon Bay,” while another noted, “No, we do have an impact on the environment; wax has an impact and it comes off in the water. Break your board and part of it is still in the ocean. Also, there is sunscreen.” Some respondents were more critical, such as one interviewee who

answered “Absolutely not. It is a destructive and myopic activity.” Other answers seemed more multidimensional: “It could be [ecotourism], there is the potential... but that doesn’t seem to be the essence of surfing”.

The following two figures present answer totals by category for both positive and negative responses.



In addition to the collection of survey data, short informational interviews were conducted with a small sample of Half Moon Bay residents to gain perspective on popular views of the Mavericks surf break. In one interview, a member of the city's Chamber of Commerce stated that the Mavericks surf break "brings recognition from all over the world". She went on to say that "where any young people know of surfing, they know of Mavericks and Half Moon Bay. That's recognition. As for dollar amount, even when it's flat, people want to go to Mavericks. It brings people to Half Moon Bay". Half Moon Bay Mayor Marina Fraser agreed:

"My view as a civic leader is that the word Mavericks is now synonymous with Half Moon Bay. People of all ages, whether you are sports minded or not, if you follow the news to any degree, more than likely you have heard of Mavericks."

Local residents echoed these feelings; in the words of one local community member, Mavericks "defines Northern CA surfing, and has put Half Moon Bay on the map... The first thing people ask me when I say I'm from Half Moon Bay is 'do you surf?' 'Oh, do you know Mavericks?' People know surfing, and people know Mavericks. People are definitely proud that it breaks in their backyard. I've been in Mexico and Hawaii, everyone knows Half Moon Bay and Mavericks." Another interviewee agreed: "I believe that Mavericks for the local community is a precious and cherished location. It gives an identity to the community that is recognized all over the state and the world".

Surfers and non-surfers alike also seemed to agree on the importance of the wave as a symbol of the raw power of nature. There was wide agreement that this phenomenon contributed to tourism because of the fascination it holds for the human spirit, and that wave-related tourism provided valuable economic opportunities to the region. Mayor Fraser put it well:

"It's nature and big waves and fearless people who want to catch a ride- it has tremendous human interest because it can't be controlled. You can't schedule it... you can harness it. Waves are created on Mother Nature's own time and she will make you wait. That heightens the fascination. Which also draws people to the coast to see this. Which in turn, makes them visit, shop, eat and drink. So that brings jobs and commerce to the people who live here."

Sustainability also appeared important in the minds of local residents. In the words of one interviewee, the loss of the Mavericks wave would be "a tragedy. It benefits Half Moon Bay in many ways. From an economic standpoint it brings people to restaurants... even the swim team is named Mavericks; it's part of our community. From an environmental standpoint, we screwed up if it's not breaking how it should." Another interviewee compared the Mavericks surf break to other natural wonders: "We've learned the hard way that man-made attempts to create artificial waves have failed. Natural Wonders like Mavericks, the Grand Canyon, or Yosemite cannot be recreated or substituted...Mavericks must be preserved so that future generations can appreciate its natural beauty and power".

Some interviewees were aware of specific threats to the wave, while others focused on the more general dangers of climate change. In the words of one person, threats to the wave include "overdevelopment of the area, badly planned "improvements" to the area, ocean pollution, climate change... unfortunately there are multiple threats coming from different angles". While members of the Chamber of Commerce recognize

that Mavericks is part of the tourism draw of their region and a key element of the Half Moon Bay identity, one Chamber of Commerce interviewee also made sure to note that “the wave has huge value, but other parts of the coastal environment are just as important. Our mountains, our forests, our farms, keeping all of them sustainable is important”.

#### **4. Conclusions**

The results of our admittedly modest ecotourism survey were somewhat mixed. Originally, we had hoped to show that sustainability was a key concern for those participants and spectators traveling to Half Moon Bay in conjunction with Mavericks. Disappointingly, out-of-town respondents to the survey universally gave reasons other than sustainability for their choice of lodging. While we cannot conclude that sustainability is unimportant to the respondent pool, it is clear that sustainability is not the primary motivation. It is still useful to note that out of 370 respondents, 115 (31.1% of the total) stayed at least one full day in the Half Moon Bay area, and of that 115, a total of 33 individuals (28.7%, or 8.9% of all respondents) stayed overnight at least one night.

The results of our questions about respondents’ perspectives on surfing as an ecotourism activity, however, do indicate that a high percentage of those who take part in and enjoy surfing events consider surfing to be a low-impact, environmentally friendly pastime that relies on a healthy local environment, and is worthy of the ecotourism name. A high percentage of respondents were conscious of environmental impacts from marine recreation, and believed that surfing was a responsible way of enjoying the coastal environment. Interestingly, the Half Moon Bay Chamber of Commerce does not include surfing in its list of locally available ecotourism activities, although other marine recreation activities such as kayaking, whale watching and fishing are included in the list of ecotourism categories. That surfing should be so listed is a clear recommendation of this study. Only a small number of respondents (4.1%) did not consider surfing to be compatible with their idea of ecotourism, and the majority of those respondents declined to state why not. This result demonstrates both the importance of environmental conservation to the surfing community, as well as the potential for Half Moon Bay to benefit by including surfing in its list of ecotourism activities.

Attempts to assign a value to surfing as an ecotourism activity and a part of the identity of Half Moon Bay will need to take into account the full range of beliefs and values that contribute to a surf break’s overall meaning for a region. Short interviews conducted with stakeholders from the local area revealed that valuation of the wave can vary from economic values placed on the wave as a tourism draw, to the artistic value and beauty of skillful Mavericks surfing, to the emotional values of the wave as a part of their regional identity.

#### **5. Suggestions for Further Research**

Much remains unexplored about the Mavericks surf break. To complement the work of this brief study and its counterpart, additional research is needed on the gap in

knowledge between economic aspects of surfing and its environmental sustainability. Future studies of “willingness to pay” for sustainability would help elucidate fine-grained distinctions between the motivators for consumer choices at the site of a surfing event or a particular wave such as Mavericks, and would help establish the real importance of sustainability in the minds of visitors. If a broader “willingness to pay” study is undertaken, we also recommend testing willingness to pay for environmental upkeep in the area of the wave, in order to clarify the potential for surfing participants and visitors to act on their judgment of surfing as a low impact eco-friendly activity, and to demonstrate the potential importance of such events to the local tourism industry. Any such study would also do well to gauge the subject pool’s understanding of threats to waves, and their understanding of tourism and recreation’s potential negative effects and how to minimize them.

## Citations

“Half Moon Bay Coastside Chamber: Visiting Half Moon Bay: Eco-Tourism.”  
[http://www.halfmoonbaychamber.org/visiting\\_hmb/ecotourism.html](http://www.halfmoonbaychamber.org/visiting_hmb/ecotourism.html). Copyright 2001 - 2009 by Half Moon Bay Coastside Chamber of Commerce & Visitors' Bureau.

“Half Moon Bay Facts \* Half Moon Bay Facts and Information \* Half Moon Bay California Fact Sheet.” Accessed November 16, 2009.  
<http://www.visithalfmoonbay.org/fact-sheet-pk.html>.

Center for Responsible Travel. 2010 in preparation. Working title: “Coastal Tourism Development in Costa Rica: Environmental, Social & Economic Impacts”.

World Travel and Tourism Council (WTTC), World Tourism Organization, and Earth Council. 1995. *Agenda 21 for the Travel and Tourism Industry: Towards Environmentally Sustainable Development*. WTTC, London.

NOAA National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. 1998. 1998 Year of the Ocean: Coastal tourism and Recreation. Accessed December 10, 2009.  
[http://www.yoto98.noaa.gov/yoto/meeting/tour\\_rec\\_316.html](http://www.yoto98.noaa.gov/yoto/meeting/tour_rec_316.html).

Houston, James R. 1996. “International Tourism and US Beaches,” *Shore and Beach*.

United Nations Environment Programme, World Tourism Organization, and Foundation for Environmental Education in Europe. 1996. Awards for Improving the Coastal Environment: The Example of the Blue Flag. United Nations Environment Programme, Paris, France; World Tourism Organization, Madrid, Spain; and Foundation for Environmental Education in Europe, Copenhagen, Denmark.

Coffman, Makena and Kimberly Burnett. 2009. The Value of a Wave: An Analysis of the Mavericks Region, Half Moon Bay, California. Study commission for Save The Waves Coalition.

Center for Responsible Travel. 2008. “Global Trends in Coastal Tourism.” WWF Research Report by Martha Honey and David Krantz. Online at...

The International Ecotourism Society and Center on Ecotourism and Sustainable Development. 2005. “Ecotourism Fact Sheet”, Accessed November 12, 2009.  
<http://www.ecotourism.org/atf/cf/%7B82a87c8d-0b56-4149-8b0a-c4aaced1cd38%7D/TIES%20GLOBAL%20ECOTOURISM%20FACT%20SHEET.PDF>.  
Buckley, Ralf. 2002. Surf Tourism and Sustainable Development in Indo-Pacific Islands. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 10(5): 405-424.

Lazarow, N., 2007. The value of coastal recreational resources: a case study approach to examine the value of recreational surfing to specific locales. *Journal of Coastal Research*,

SI 50 (Proceedings of the 9th International Coastal Symposium), 12 – 20. Gold Coast, Australia, ISSN 0749.0208

Lazarow, N. and R. Tomlinson. 2009. Using observed market expenditure to estimate the value of recreational surfing to the Gold Coast, Australia. Queensland Coastal Conference, 12 – 15 May 2009, Sea World Resort, Gold Coast.