# A COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVE MOSQUITO ABATEMENT METHODS USING BENEFIT-COST ANALYSIS<sup>1</sup>

DOUGLAS D. OFIARA<sup>2</sup> AND JOHN R. ALLISON<sup>3</sup>

ABSTRACT. Benefit-cost analysis can be used to evaluate and compare projects that involve alternative mosquito control methods. A comparison of two such projects in Chatham County, GA indicated that source reduction was a contributing factor in the reduction of ground adulticide applications and quantities, and annual female densities per light-trap night of the predominant saltmarsh mosquito species in the area. Net benefits realized from source reduction were \$591,319 as opposed to \$409,823 and discounted net benefits were \$377,729 versus \$284,511 (source reduction project vs. chemical control project) demonstrating the relative effectiveness of the source reduction project in our application. Because of unique differences between areas and projects, generalizations of the above conclusion are cautioned, although the approach is easily adapted.

### INTRODUCTION

Interest and concern over the relative performance of alternative mosquito abatement methods was rekindled following publication of a somewhat controversial study in 1975 (DeBord et al. 1975, Carlson and DeBord 1976). The results contradicted commonly held beliefs among mosquito control district (MCD) directors and mosquito control researchers alike, concerning the cost efficacy of two basic control measures, chemical control and source reduction. The former relies upon larvicide and adulticide materials to reduce mosquito population densities, while the latter involves the physical alteration of wetland and other areas, e.g., ditching and pond construction to reduce mosquito breeding sites.

The conclusions reached by DeBord et al. (1975) were that chemical control measures were more cost effective in controlling mosquitoes than source reduction methods, based on their analysis of annual data for 30 MCDs along the East Coast. A similar study which examined three MCDs in California reached contrary results, concluding that source reduction methods (mainly ditch construction) were more cost effective than chemical control methods in controlling *Aedes nigromaculis* (Ludlow) and *Culex tarsalis* Coq. (Sarhan et al. 1979, 1981). In a review of the DeBord et al. study, Langham and Lanier (1981) pointed out

inadequacies in the use and interpretation of the data which caused the results to be biased towards chemical control, and hence, the reason why the conclusions were contradictory. In two other studies (Hansen et al. 1976, Shisler et al. 1979) average control costs (per unit costs) were compared between source reduction and larvicide control methods, illustrating the per-unit cost-effectiveness of source reduction over chemical control.

However, the above studies are limited in their usefulness when it comes to evaluating projects based on alternative control methods, although they provide point estimates of these control methods. The point we wish to emphasize is that information about point estimates of costs (e.g., annual per acre costs) are sometimes not sufficient to assist in the choice between projects that involve alternative control methods. To compare adequately and evaluate projects the focus should encompass the control technology, anticipated costs, effective life of the control methods, and project outcomes, involving both project effectiveness and expected benefits.

The approach in this paper differs from the previous research in that we evaluate both benefits and costs to compare a project involving chemical control with one involving source reduction over the life of the projects. Special attention is paid to the quality of project outcomes. A traditional benefit-cost approach is used to compare and evaluate both projects. The concept of economic benefit measures is also examined and our earlier treatment of economic benefits (Ofiara and Allison 1985) is advanced in this paper.

# **BENEFIT-COST METHODOLOGY**

In order to evaluate benefits and costs among projects that involve capital outlays, i.e., investment decisions, benefit-cost analysis is commonly used among economists. It is most appropriate when both benefits and costs

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Financial support of the research in this report has been provided by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency under Assistance Agreement No. CR-809369-02-0 to the University of Georgia. It has not been subjected to the Agency's required peer and administrative review and therefore does not necessarily reflect the views of the Agency and no official endorsement should be inferred.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Bureau of Economic Research, Winants Hall, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ 08903.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Department of Agricultural Economics, University of Georgia, Georgia Experiment Station, Experiment, GA 30212.

associated with a project are considered. The corresponding decision criteria allow for a rational judgment in choosing one project over another. Cost-effectiveness, on the other hand, ignores economic benefits and is used to determine the least-cost way to achieve a given objective.

Benefit-cost analysis allows evaluation of present and future dollars via discounting since most projects involve a time period. The basic present-value (PV) formula for benefit-cost analysis is:

1) PV = 
$$-C_o + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{(B - C)_i}{(1 + r)^i}$$
,

where  $C_0$  refers to the initial cost outlay (e.g., purchase of necessary machinery), B the benefits in each period, C the costs in each period, r the discount rate, and n the time stream (Just et al. 1982:297, Gittinger 1972:98, Mishan 1976:175). The present value of net benefits (benefits less costs, discounted) is the appropriate measure for comparing projects (e.g., chemical control versus source reduction) over time given equal scale (project size) and time period. The decision criterion is to select that project with the maximum of net benefits over time.

Benefit-cost analysis is quite flexible in handling a variety of situations that can occur in comparing projects. When time streams among projects are not equal, the procedure is to transform the time streams so that they are equivalent. This is easily accomplished by using a least common denominator (LCD), (e.g., a 3-year and 5-year project have a LCD of 15 years). When projects differ in scale, comparisons become complicated, and the use of a ratio of discounted benefits to discounted costs then becomes useful only when no extreme variation in scale is present (see Eckstein 1958, Mishan 1976 for a treatment of the scale issue).

Choice of an appropriate discount rate is also a concern to the analyst and has received considerable attention from economists (Bohm 1976, Mishan 1976, Just et al. 1982). Generally, real discount rates are used when net benefits are specified in constant dollars (i.e., after inflationary effects are removed); and nominal discount rates correspond to net benefits specified in current dollars (Just et al. 1982). Real rates of discount from empirical economic studies range 0–4% and nominal rates range 8–16% (Just et al. 1982:305–306). In distinguishing between constant dollars (real terms) and current dollars (nominal terms), it is helpful to note that constant dollars are current dollars *adjusted* for inflation. In sum, the tasks facing the analyst are to identify benefit and cost items, quantify and value these benefit-cost items, choose a time horizon and discount rate, and face an investment constraint.

#### CONCEPT AND MEASURE OF BENEFITS

Identification of benefit and cost items as well as valuation can become difficult. Benefits and costs can be both direct and indirect. The former refers to any benefits and costs that result from the project (e.g., mosquito control) to the investment company (here, the MCD). Indirect benefits and costs are more subtle and can be thought of as any effects that result from mosquito control and do not accrue to the MCD, that is, only benefits and costs that accrue to society. Additionally, economists sometimes consider both private and social benefits and costs. These arise when economists consider the resulting effects a project will have on society. If these effects are equivalent to the effects that accrue to the MCD, then, there is no divergence. An example of social costs (negative benefits) could arise where insecticides have detrimental effects on the environment, e.g., pollution (for further discussion of these concepts see Bohm 1976, Mishan 1976, Gittinger 1972).

Both chemical control and source reduction projects can realize benefits. Benefits in an economic sense are usually measured by the area under a demand curve for a market good. Points along a demand curve reflect amounts people would be willing to pay (WTP) rather than forgo consumption of the good in question, thus, the area under demand is a representative measure of total benefits (Bohm 1976, Mishan 1976, Just et al. 1982). Considering a specific price-quantity combination, total costs are represented by the area under demand where the demand curve is intersected by a price line. In economics theory, market price of a commodity is synonymous to costs for an individual consumer. The difference between total benefits and costs define net benefits, and is referred to as consumers surplus, that is, a surplus that accrues to consumers as a net economic benefit (the above concepts were illustrated in an earlier paper, see Ofiara and Allison 1986:280-281). Although, the concept of consumer surplus may appear straightforward, economists have debated over its appropriateness as a benefit measure for some time (Just et al. 1982 and Willig 1976 summarize this debate). Recent work has focused on operational techniques to calculate exact welfare measures from demand

curves (Hausman 1981, Bergland and Randall 1984).

However, for goods such as public mosquito control that are characterized by an absence of market conditions, the WTP concept is still appropriate although benefit estimation becomes more complicated. Demand and the associated value for this type of good are not determined in the usual manner as for market goods because price-quantity data are absent. Economists have labored over the past two decades in devising and testing various techniques that can be used to assess the value and determine demand for nonmarket goods (see Hueth and Strong 1984, Cummings et al. 1986 for recent evaluations of nonmarket techniques).

The contingent market valuation (CMV) approach is but one technique. This technique is based on the premise of a realistically designed, though hypothetical market. An individual is asked to reveal preferences in the form of a bid (maximum amount willing to pay) contingent on the availability of the good in question. Commonly the level of the good is changed in increments and the individual is asked to reveal a corresponding bid at each increment. In a previous demonstration project, the CMV technique was used to value public mosquito control (Ofiara and Allison 1986).

# CASE STUDY

Two areas were selected for this comparison with similar characteristics (e.g., proximity to saltmarsh areas, size, population, etc.) and with mosquito density influences from internal sources with minimal influence from external sources. Cost data, ground adulticide records and female mosquito population densities were obtained from the Chatham County Mosquito Control Commission (CCMCC), Savannah, GA. The community of Thunderbolt served to represent a chemical control project and Isle of Hope a source reduction project.

In this application, benefits were measured on the basis of WTP criteria (i.e., the area under a demand curve), and represent direct benefits to society. Costs represent direct, private costs only (i.e., program costs, maintenance costs), not external costs that arise when private and social costs diverge, e.g., pollution of the saltmarsh environment from pesticides. Because MCDs presently use low impact pesticides: insect growth regulators, ultra low volume formulations, and biological control material, we expect current impacts on the saltmarsh environment to be negligible in recent times. However, this issue would require a separate study to address and is beyond the scope of this paper. Additionally, the PV of net benefits formula, equation (1), used in this application was modified, whereby  $C_o$  was assumed zero, i.e., the necessary machinery and equipment have been already acquired and the costs realized, hence, there were no initial cost outlays in either project.

During the period 1962-83, Thunderbolt mainly underwent chemical control efforts. while Isle of Hope received both chemical control and source reduction efforts (see Fig. 1, Ofiara and Allison 1985). Isle of Hope is located across a tidal river from the leeward side of Skidaway Island so that source reduction projects on Skidaway Island assisted in controlling saltmarsh mosquitoes at Isle of Hope. Ditching projects of saltmarsh areas on Skidaway Island commenced in 1962, then continued off-and-on and were completed in 1968. Maintenance costs were only realized during the 1962-68 period with tidal flushing occurring, so as not to require further maintenance activities. Isle of Hope additionally, received chemical control (ground adulticides) on a spot-treatment basis.

Annual female mosquito densities per lighttrap night serve as the measure of effectiveness of the projects, and illustrate the differences among project outcomes and areas. Examining all female mosquito species collected over the 1962-83 period indicates that the observed mean density differed significantly across areas; 5.6 for Isle of Hope as opposed to 20.4 for Thunderbolt (5% level, t-test) (see Table 4, Ofiara and Allison 1985). A comparison of mean densities across time periods (1962-72 versus 1973-83) further revealed that for Isle of Hope only, mean densities were significantly different (5% level) prior to 1973 (the beginning of when the source reduction project is believed to demonstrate effectiveness) versus post-1972 (1973-83).

Further examination of light-trap data for the two primary target saltmarsh species, Aedes sollicitans (Walker) and Ae. taeniorhynchus (Wied.) identified by the CCMCC director provided results consistent with those of the total species counts. Observed mean densities were significantly different (5% level) across areas for both time periods and both species, and mean densities associated with Ae. sollicitans differed significantly (5% level) across pre-1973 and post-1972 periods for Isle of Hope. Considering the proportion of Ae. sollicitans and Ae. taeniorhynchus combined relative to total species per light-trap night indicated: 1) the observed mean proportion for the 1962-72 and 1973-83 period for Thunderbolt (82.1 and 70.6%, respectively) versus Isle of Hope (38.4 and

19.0%, respectively) were significantly different across areas at the 5% level; and 2) the mean proportion of these primary target species differed significantly (5% level) prior to 1973 as opposed to post-1972 for Isle of Hope.

A comparison of annual ground adulticide spray applications data revealed that the observed mean number of annual applications was  $10.5 \pm 2.9$  and  $24.3 \pm 8.0$  for 1962 - 72 and 1973-83 periods, respectively, for Thunderbolt and those corresponding to Isle of Hope were  $10.3 \pm 2.8$  and  $10.9 \pm 2.6$ , respectively. The mean application level for the 1962–72 period was not significantly different across areas, implying that both areas received similar ground adulticide control measures prior to 1973; after 1972, mean ground adulticide applications were significantly different across areas (5% level), and the observed mean level of these spray patterns prior to 1973 versus post-1972 differed at the 5% level only for Thunderbolt.

Total costs associated with the source reduction project consist of fuel, labor, machinery and equipment operation costs for the ditching activity; labor costs for maintenance activities; and pesticide, fuel, labor, machinery and equipment operation expenses for spot treatment activities. Costs associated with the chemical control project comprise pesticide, fuel, labor, machinery and equipment operational costs.

Total costs of both projects, presented in Table 1, represent deflated (constant) costs for all the above activities (1967 = 100, U.S. Department of Commerce 1980, 1983, 1984). Although the source reduction project was almost twice the cost (\$32,999) of the chemical control project (\$16,513), it appears it was more effective in controlling adult densities of female mosquitoes as measured by light-trap data.

The approach used to measure benefits of mosquito control was based on a CMV technique described earlier. Maximum WTP measures for improvements in mosquito control served to represent benefits of the two projects, for the purpose of this paper. The main criterion in selecting a CMV approach was that it allowed for differences in mosquito concentration levels to be easily valued, thus reflecting differences in the quality among the two projects. Average benefits per capita were adjusted to constant dollars by the Consumer Price Index (1967 = 100, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1980, 1983, 1984) and projected on the basis of population estimates for both areas. Estimated total benefits were \$624,318 for the source reduction project and \$426,336 for the chemical control project in 1967 dollars

(Table 1). Net benefits, benefits less costs, were \$591,319 and \$409,823 for the source reduction and chemical control projects, respectively. Discounted net benefits based on a 4% real discount rate were \$377,729 associated with source reduction, a factor of 1.3 times larger than discounted net benefits for chemical control (\$284,511).

#### DISCUSSION

Benefit-cost analysis is a methodology that can assist in establishing decision criteria useful in 1) the evaluation of alternative projects, and 2) comparisons between projects that involve alternative control methods. Benefits and costs of alternative control projects can differ among projects because of differences in project outcomes as well as differences in project scale. However, decisions involved with choosing a project over another can be complicated for goods that are normally exchanged in a market.

The complexity of decisions and benefit-cost applications increases when alternative projects involve goods or public services that are not exchanged in a market, i.e., nonmarket goods. This is the case with public mosquito control. In spite of these difficulties benefit-cost analysis is indeed useful and can be applied as illustrated in this paper.

The two areas selected in our example were meant to represent alternative control projects that would allow comparisons across projects. Because our study design was not based on an experimental design (unfortunately infeasible, involving projects such as these), areas were chosen that possessed fairly equal characteristics with the aid of the CCMCC director. Although the two areas selected were the best representative areas within the Chatham County MCD, the mosquito population and adulticide spray data suggest that relative population densities differed among areas at the outset of the projects.

The data indicate that ground adulticide spray patterns remained constant for Isle of Hope when relative mosquito densities declined significantly, while the number of spray applications more than doubled for Thunderbolt with relative densities remaining constant (20.0–1962–72, 20.8–1973–83). Also, for the pre-1973 period, average annual spray applications were essentially constant across both areas. This is significant because it is in the post-1972 period that source reduction activities begin to demonstrate effectiveness. Although both areas encountered fairly similar Costs and Benefits for Comparison of a Source Reduction Project (Isle of Hope) with a Chemical Control Project (Thunderbolt), Chatham County, Georgia, 1962-83, Table 1.

Tetal Voy. Popula- Group Met <u>Hacontred's Freedrics Fre</u>					ADIA DENETTER			4	ſ	Chei	nical Con	LTOL Project	Chemical Control Project Costs and Benefits	nd bener	its	
First Tion meeting a met wet wet we have the medite medite and menting amerits outs hencing and the formanic amerits and the formation and the forma	E			ç	:		Discounte	•							Discounte	4 p
<pre>circle interfier benefite lenefite lenefite action benefite aften benefites fores benefites actes benefites benefit</pre>	Total			Gross	Net			Net	Total	Avg.	Popul-	Gross				
25 1,37 <sup>6</sup> 13,913 11,377 2,440 13,373 10,939 MA MA 1,925 <sup>8</sup> MA MA 1,928 13,957 14,860 771 18,006 771 18,006 771 13,023 13,03 2,913 9,06 5,041 2,020 13,042 23,05 5,013 2,045 25,013 2,045 23,055 5,013 2,025 24,025 5,013 2,025 24,025 5,013 2,025 24,025 2				Benefits	Benefits	1	Benefits	Benefits	costs	Benefits	ation	Benefits		Costs	Benefits	Benefits
(79) 1.30; 1.37; 1.41, 1.41, 1.41, 1.4, 1.4, 1.4, 1.4, 1	, 530		1 2570	1.00							a					
<pre>13 1,37 1,37 3,429 1,014 7,04 7,04 7,04 2,43 1,541 7,72 469 10,11 1,92 19,37 11,728 4,54 4,54 4,54 1,39 3,55 3,31 2,53 1,391 1,</pre>			/00.1	13, 212	11,11	2,440	13,379	10,939	NA	NA	1,925	NA	NA	NA	NA	AN.
<ul> <li>1.97</li> <li>1.97</li> <li>1.97</li> <li>1.97</li> <li>1.93</li> <li>1.94</li> <li>1.94</li> <li>1.94</li> <li< td=""><td>1,022</td><td></td><td>1,300</td><td>24,290</td><td>16,674</td><td>7,047</td><td>22,463</td><td>15,416</td><td>769</td><td>10.13</td><td>1,932</td><td>19,573</td><td>18.804</td><td>711</td><td>18.096</td><td>17 385</td></li<></ul>	1,022		1,300	24,290	16,674	7,047	22,463	15,416	769	10.13	1,932	19,573	18.804	711	18.096	17 385
<pre>19 1,39 2,3,53 2,3,13 3,38 2,3,73 24,95 3,1 25,58 1,950 3,277 3,232 4,45 2,556 1,412 1,302 3,469 30,346 2,372 2,400 23,114 24,607 3,31 5,58 1,950 1960 17,237 13,237 14,420 31,238 30,346 2,324 2,570 23,408 20,447 393 4,54 2,516 1,420 31,238 30,347 166 23,471 24,607 3,31 5,58 1,58 2,593 9,969 9,017 37 11, 77 20 1,420 31,238 30,347 166 23,471 24,607 3,481 1,56 1,11 1,570 11,377 11,372 20 1,528 31,939 22,036 20,471 24,607 23,108 20,411 16,58 2,7708 47,971 47,911 17,790 36 166 23,477 31,300 11,28 30,998 22 2,006 20,933 111 16,58 2,7708 47,911 17,790 36 11,428 33,995 32,999 32,293 21,293 21,079 21,079 21,077 11,57,077 11,373 20,469 20 1,991 37,379 31,391 128 17,300 17,402 560 7,56 2,677 13,026 19,011 14,911 242 33 20,993 33,995 32,995 32,595 15,700 11,18,099 400 5,56 2,59 2,677 11,779 36 11,28 0,393 30,995 32,595 15,700 11,309 400 5,56 2,59 2,677 11,779 36 11,28 0,993 30,995 32,799 11,390 11,402 560 7,56 2,677 11,250 11,200 127 2,519 30 2,503 30,995 32,799 30,499 20,500 130 2,512 11,222 11,22 30 2,503 30,995 24,599 24,500 13,024 11,399 400 5,52 4,776 2,457 11,250 13,002 11,23 34 1,395 32 2,930 30,939 24,599 24,520 11,250 11,200 11,200 2,718 39,91 303 5,397 30 2,503 25,637 24,500 13,003 11,30 2,477 2,460 11,200 2,718 39,91 303 5,397 30 2,503 25,637 24,500 13,003 11,30 2,516 11,200 2,718 39,91 303 5,397 30 2,503 25,637 24,500 13,003 11,30 2,516 11,200 2,718 39,91 303 5,397 30 2,503 25,637 24,500 13,003 11,30 2,516 11,200 2,718 39,91 303 5,397 30 2,503 25,637 24,500 13,003 2,516 7,000 2,718 2,500 13,003 2,500 13,003 2,500 13,003 2,500 1,300 2,500 2,500 1,300 2,5</pre>	1,55,1		1,3/2	13,750	6,413	6,522	12,224	5,702	480	10.00	1,939	19,390	18,910	427	17.238	16.811
<pre>1. 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1,</pre>	396		1,384	29,555	29,159	338	25,263	24,925	531	25.58	1.946	49.772	49.241	454	47 546	110,01
20 1,420 33,860 30,946 2,324 36,731 24,437 912 9,29 1960 19500 17,337 711 73,377 137 3737 737 737 737 737 737 737 737	4,703		1,393	34,639	29,935	3,866	28,471	24,605	543	16.78	1,953	32.771	37, 778	999	26 035	160'74 76 480
01 1420 32.753 31,301 1,063 22,640 20,442 586 17,53 1,557 16,750 515 11,372 02 1442 32,646 29,646 22,640 20,442 586 17,53 1,750 47,711 47,111 42,33,53 03 1469 20,946 22,946 29 20,66 22,449 17 3,946 21,269 2,647 15,649 15,000 143 2,866 1,289 2,949 143 1,397 30,446 20,200 2,731 10,590 2,500 15,393 27,393 29,999 2,999 2,094 13,1397 21,390 2,866 20,449 22,049 15,600 2,849 17 3,246 29,999 2,049 13,1397 2,1393 2,290 15,500 15,599 15,500 15,599 15,600 2,667 15,640 19,600 2,86 20,449 29 2,999 2,049 13,1397 2,1393 2,290 15,500 15,599 15,500 15,599 2,050 11,500 2,516 2,547 2,567 15,640 19,600 2,86 20,449 29 2,999 2,049 13,1397 2,1393 2,290 15,599 15,500 15,599 15,500 15,599 15,000 5,76 2,567 11,500 11,500 2,516 2,547 2,500 11,522 2,900 15,799 15,500 15,599 15,000 5,56 2,562 11,292 2,290 13,460 22,546 59 2,647 15,640 2,211 1,292 2,22 2,500 13,430 22,546 5,29 15,500 15,599 15,000 5,52 2,550 11,500 12,62 2,560 15,292 2,500 15,299 2,569 15,500 15,292 14,292 15,22 2,500 15,299 2,548 13,340 2,56 2,544 19,20 2,516 2,544 5,99 2,548 10,20 2,516 2,544 2,99 2,548 10,20 2,516 2,544 2,59 2,548 10,20 2,516 1,20 2,518 1,300 12,212 2,548 1,300 1,300 1,300 1,317 2,322 2,500 15,299 1,300 15,291 1,300 12,212 2,99 2,548 10,20 2,516 1,20 2,518 1,300 1,202 2,516 2,544 2,59 11,300 12,512 2,548 11,200 2,516 1,20 2,718 9,541 2,947 2,941 1,202 2,566 2,544 1,202 2,548 11,200 2,516 2,59 11,300 1,300 1,300 2,516 2,947 2,941 2,94	2,941		1,402	33,886	30,946	2,324	26,781	24,457	912	9.29	1,960	18 208	17 207	102	006 11	10 610
<pre>78 1,426 31,258 30,347 666 23,042 32,14 973 4,25 7305 4,7717 45,101 44,991 73 34,257 23,689 29,086 22,493 24,497 23,405 22,743 24,571 17,759 23,689 143 123 34,557 16 1,528 31,195 24,793 15,372 15,091 13,969 143 123 34,557 16 1,528 31,195 26,793 24,497 133 22,109 15,091 13,969 143 123 34,578 15,991 13,979 13,193 124 133 123 14,44 991 2,227 14,197 14,991 13,979 143 123 13,557 15 2,597 1499 2,904 13,997 143 23,129 11,044 20,557 5,2567 15,411 14,941 221 18,999 36,439 24,999 2,904 143 23,228 15,193 12,593 11,540 24,05 5,29 5,667 15,541 14,941 221 18,999 39,999 2,904 2,904 31,397 21,399 115,393 15,539 115,423 24,53 15,700 128 17,939 115,239 115,239 115,230 11,448 20,256 29,458 10,712,809 149,23 24,999 30,833 30,469 25,51 15,239 115,239 15,539 15,539 15,539 15,539 15,539 15,539 15,539 15,539 15,539 15,539 15,539 15,539 15,539 15,539 15,539 15,539 15,539 15,239 11,202 2,528 13,100 22,528 24,57 24,501 12,939 24,539 24,53 24,939 24,539 24,539 24,539 15,539 11,332 1,332 2,437 2,439 24,539 24,539 24,539 24,539 12,241 13,922 1,332 1,333 2,437 2,132 9,999 24,999 27,139 2,1392 1,303 1,332 2,437 2,132 9,999 24,599 10,926 1,133 2,535 1,333 2,437 2,439 24,539 24,539 24,539 24,539 24,539 24,539 24,539 11,332 1,332 1,332 2,133 2,133 2,139 2,1339 1,332 2,133 2,139 2,1309 1,2106 24,54 144 144 144 144 144 144 144 144 144 1</pre>	1,399		1,411	32,729	31,330	1,063	24,872	23,808	757	8.92	1,967 <sup>f</sup>	17.537	16,780	15	14,070	10,0/0
73 1,42° 23,596 32,096 423 20,665 20,442 506 20,442 567 13, 51,77 47,131 412 33,557 33,469 173 30,469 173 30,469 16,00 32,449 173 30,469 16,00 32,449 173 30,469 16,00 32,449 173 30,469 16,00 32,449 173 30,469 11,0750 389 11,474 10,191 10,100 14,110 10,100 11,000 10,00 5,76 2,647 15,647 15,647 15,701 14,991 75 30,469 11,242 20 2,094 11,297 2,102 2,572 11,242 20 15,793 20,499 20,049 11,397 20,133 11,397 12,817 13,999 20,094 11,397 20,133 11,397 12,812 11,242 20 15,793 20,469 20,949 16,000 20,400 5,76 2,667 15,649 16,000 20,400 20,999 20,094 20,048 20,400 25,610 11,242 20,130 2,527 20,507 20,503 11,242 20 15,590 17,424 500 17,500 17,424 500 17,424 500 17,242 20 11,299 20,949 16,000 20,017 20,1140 20 11,242 20,1140 20 15,526 20,176 20,124 10,124 20 20,1140 20 11,242 20,1140 20 12,242 20,1120 2,252 2,1156 11,240 20 227 11,242 20,1140 20 11,242 20,1120 2,252 2,1156 11,260 20,124 20	911		1,420	31,258	30,347	666	22,840	22,174	973	4.24	2.358	9.986	9 013	55	120,01	7C/ '7T
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	602		1,429	29,698	29,096	423	20,866	20,442	586	17.35	2.7508	47.717	47.131	110	33 575	232112
29 1,005 3,005 3,445 163 21,299 21,005 220 7,41 2,677 19,811 19,500 143 174,805 99 2,094 11,973 11,770 388 11,474 15 10,101 13,001 13,001 13,000 15,00 2,000 7,000 15,000 15,00 2,000 7,000 15	136		1,562	31,124	30,988	92	21,026	20,935	н	16.64	2.711	45,101	77 901	12	120 000	50, 204
16 1,83 3,195 3,595 3,75 20,734 20,399 621 6,98 2,637 11,750 388 11,474 65 1,961 3,579 3,542 10,05 399 999 999 10,051 31,370 11,349 123 10,105 300 17,402 5,662 15,341 14,941 231 8,959 15 2,260 11,342 13,270 14,240 12,200 15,839 15,639 15,630 15,520 15,630 15,520 15,630 15,520 15,630 15,520 15,630 15,520 15,630 15,630 15,630 15,630 15,630 15,720 13,270 13,250 13,050 12,126 9,999 10 2,526 29,155 29,149 10 2,520 20,108 11,390 12,112,99 9,995 9,995 4,970 2,720 2,718 24,899 2,4697 2,496 25,447 2,496 12,109 40,193 14,302 11,302 1,302 11,129 9,660 7,904 9,29 4,970 2,720 2,718 24,899 2,4697 2,499 2,4697 2,496 25,449 2,469 2,469 15,000 12,112,99 2,4697 2,993 2,903 2,994 2,993 2,994 2,993 2,994 2,992 2,994 2,992 2,994 2,992 2,994 2,992 2,994 2,992 2,994 2,992 2,994 2,992 2,994 2,992 2,994 2,992 2,994 2,992 2,994 2,992 2,994 2,992 2,994 2,992 2,994	251		1,695	32,696	32,445	163	21,239	21,076	220	7.41	2.672	119,811	19,590	571	17 860	10, 174
66         1,961         26,793         26,423         26,913         367         5,567         16,51         15,941         319,942         311,942         317         311,397         31,340         128         17,350         11,8109         367         5,568         15,567         15,567         15,501         31,340         321         14,323         347         5,999         322         11,423         347         5,999         345         5,999         5,508         31,502         31,543         341         5,999         5,999         5,999         5,999         5,999         341         5,999         341         5,999         341         5,999         341         5,999         341         5,999         5,608         1,19,109         341         15,939         13,003         351         11,193         5,613         5,133         4,130         13,399         13,399         13,399         5,941         1335         5,931         5,133         5,143         5,156         351         13,399         13,399         13,399         13,399         13,399         13,399         13,399         13,459         5,941         14,592         5,641         13,399         13,459         29,4459         5,941         13,399	600		1,828	33,195	32,595	375	20,734	20,359	621	6.98	$2.632^{h}$	18.371	17 750	and a	11 676	11 006
9 2,094 31.397 31.85 12. 18,131 18,009 400 5.76 2,662 15,34 14,941 231 8,59 32 2,360 31,528 30,449 255 16,700 15,330 15,639 15,550 15,341 14,941 231 8,559 32 2,360 31,528 30,449 255 16,700 15,639 15,659 15,56 2,428 11,550 10,817 376 5,929 32 2,562 29,155 28,784 133 14,922 14,503 1,303 5.22 2,1156 11,298 9,995 6,18 5,563 32 2,563 29,153 28,628 167 12,803 11,392 1,302 1,71 2,334 4,200 2,718 994 9,395 38 2,563 29,158 26,628 167 12,803 11,392 1,302 1,71 2,334 4,200 2,718 994 1,835 38 2,564 29,25,649 24,659 10,020 1,148 2,569 10,602 1,382 5,54 1,329 3,356 39 2,550 22,504 92 24,629 10,056 10,002 1,382 5,48 2,3354 4,020 2,718 994 1,835 3,092 2,5,048 224,639 24,639 27,109 404,837 377,729 16,913 - 426,335 409,823 9,947 294,459 2 424,319 24,512 40 Pt he FOUCET PICE Adar (PT = 1967) for selected cost categories (e.g. pesticides, fuel, i econstant (real) dollars deflated by the producer Pice aggregated cost. Average benefits represent per capita benefit. 1, 1 0,07 = 1000. Population estimates for inbetween years calculated from the annual percent change between 2 years with census reage benefits (\$Person) and population. Tage are discount rate of YM. Meighbrhood Survey Chathan County - Swannah Metropolitan Planning Commission. Meighbrhood Survey Chathan County - Swannah Metropolitan Planning Commission. Meighbrhood Survey Chathan County - Swannah Metropolitan Planning Commission. Gene to 2011. U.S. Gensus of Population: 1960. Number of Inhabitants, Georgia. Final Report PC(1)-B12. Washington, DC: U. Gene to 2011. U.S. Gensus of Population: 1970. Number of Inhabitants, Georgia. Final Report PC(1)-B12. Washington, DC: U. Gene to 2011. U.S. Gensus of Population: 1970. Number of Inhabitants, Georgia. Final Report PC(1)-B12. Washington, DC: U. Gene to 2011. U.S. Gensus of Population: 1970. Number of Inhabitants, Georgia. Final Report PC(1)-B12. Washington, DC : U. Gene to 2011. U.S. Gensus of Population: 1970. Number of Inhabitants, Georgia. Final Report PC(1)-B12. Washington, DC : U. Gene to 2011. U.S. Ge	370		1,961	26,793	26,423	222	16,091	15,869	645	6.29	2.647	16.649	16,005	200	0000	000,11
18 2,227 31,570 31,340 128 17,530 17,402 580 7.56 2,678 20,346 13,666 522 11,342 959 959 95 959 2,300 31,428 30,949 259 16,570 15,639 15,650 13,052 12,413 341 6,969 37 2,566 7,986 7,984 929 4,970 12,650 12,650 13,052 12,413 341 6,969 3,929 3,953 10 2,565 20,915 25,915 25,915 25,915 3,915 3,915 3,953 3,915 2,550 13,052 12,413 341 5,929 4,970 12,719 2,719 1,903 2,949 2,995 6,18 5,958 2,973 2,489 2,548 1,09 12,609 1,902 10,008 1,143 5,55 2,312 0,050 12,166 5,27 13,83 1,302 2,563 13,309 12,166 5,02 5,941 2,335 1,302 2,503 13,002 2,118 9,1095 10,092 10,008 1,143 5,55 2,355 13,309 12,166 5,02 5,941 2,33 2,973 2,469 2,469 10,008 1,143 5,55 2,355 13,309 12,166 5,02 5,941 2,309 2,093 5,387 2,973 2,503 2,503 2,503 2,503 10,022 2,109 9,995 6,19 2,459 2,459 2,100 10,021 2,100 10,021 10,026 10,020 1,143 5,55 2,355 13,309 12,166 5,02 5,941 2,419 1,02 2,000 12,06 2,468 10,022 1,339 2,403 1,309 12,166 5,02 5,941 2,419 1,02 2,000 12,02 2,000 10,021 10,020 10,020 10,020 10,020 10,020 10,020 10,020 10,020 10,020 10,020 10,020 10,020 10,020 10,020 12,02 2,550 10,000 1,143 5,55 2,355 13,309 12,166 5,02 5,941 2,419 1,02 2,000 11,000 12 10,000 11,020 10,020 10,020 10,020 10,020 10,020 10,020 10,020 10,020 10,020 10,020 10,020 10,020 10,020 10,020 10,000 12,0000 12,000 12	212		2,094	31,397	31,185	122	18,131	18,009	400	5.76	2.662 <sup>h</sup>	15 341	14 941	) - C	0 050	770 .
22 2.360 31,428 30,949 255 16,780 16,524 539 512 2,550 15,07 12,413 341 6,669 $(1981 - 30, 292)$ $(1981 - 30, 292)$ $(1981 - 30, 292)$ $(1981 - 30, 292)$ $(1981 - 30, 292)$ $(1981 - 30, 292)$ $(1981 - 30, 292)$ $(1981 - 30, 292)$ $(1981 - 30, 292)$ $(1981 - 30, 292)$ $(1981 - 30, 292)$ $(1981 - 30, 292)$ $(1981 - 30, 292)$ $(1981 - 30, 292)$ $(1981 - 30, 292)$ $(1981 - 30, 292)$ $(1981 - 30, 292)$ $(19, 20, 21, 20, 20, 21, 20)$ $(19, 20, 21, 20)$ $(19, 20, 21, 20)$ $(19, 20, 21, 20)$ $(19, 20, 21, 20)$ $(19, 20, 21, 20)$ $(19, 20, 21, 20)$ $(19, 20, 21, 20)$ $(19, 20, 21, 20)$ $(19, 20, 21, 20)$ $(19, 20, 21, 20)$ $(19, 20, 21, 10)$ $(19, 20, 21, 10)$ $(19, 20, 21, 10)$ $(19, 20, 24, 653)$ $(10, 10, 20, 21, 30)$ $(12, 30, 21, 20)$ $(12, 30, 24, 652)$ $(10, 10, 20)$ $(12, 30)$ $(12$	230		2,227	31,570	31,340	128	17,530	17,402	580	7.56	2,6781	20.246	10 666	107	670 60	070 01
38 2,493 30,953 30,664 200 15,339 15,639 732 $\frac{1}{6}$ ,75 $\frac{1}{2}$ ,428 11,550 10,817 376 5,929 39 2,626 7,998 26,628 167 12,805 15,939 1,302 1,71 2,346 4,020 2,718 594 1835 39 2,869 25,457 24,961 227 11,618 11,392 1,302 1,71 2,346 4,020 2,718 594 1835 30 2,969 24,653 167 10,569 10,402 1,343 5.65 2,355 13,500 12,166 502 5,841 31 2,972 2,5,048 24,653 167 10,569 10,402 1,342 5.68 2,356 13,309 12,166 502 5,844 30 2,650 2,5,431 591,319 27,109 404,837 377,729 16,513 - 48 2,328 12,767 11,335 5,33 5,33 5,33 5,33 5,33 7,337 5,005 and then aggregated. Costs presented are aggregated costs. Average benefits represent per capita benefits adjusted by th are 1967 = 100). Fouliarts defiated by the producer price index (PPI = 1967) for selected cost categories (e.g. pesticides, fuel, 1 are 1067 = 100). Fouliation estimates for inbetween years calculated from the annual percent change between 2 years with census are a rail discount rate of 41. And deally commercial Arias, various years. A discount rate of 42. A discount rate of 42. A discount rate of 42. A discount rate of 42. A discount rate of 43. A discount rate o	479		2,360	31,428	30,949	255	16,780	16.524	639	5.12	2.550	13 052	12 613	176	247,11 6 060	076'0T
10 2,626 29,155 28,784 183 14,392 14,208 1,882 4.27 2,312 9,66 7,964 9,95 618 5,363 38 2,457 24,661 227 11,618 11,392 1,303 5,22 2,165 11,298 9,995 618 5,363 37 2,973 24,899 24,628 119 10,926 10,808 1,143 5.55 2,354 1,309 12,166 594 1,833 5,387 2,973 2,458 25,499 24,628 119 10,926 10,808 1,143 5.5 2,328 1,3,09 12,166 594 1,833 5,387 2,377 - 624,318 591,319 27,109 404,837 377,729 15,513 - 426,336 4,09,823 9,947 294,459 2 2,55 2,387 2,5,09 10,400 1,143 5.5,13 - 624,318 591,319 27,109 404,837 377,729 15,513 - 426,336 4,09,823 9,947 294,459 2 2,56 2,387 2,5,040 20 2,5109 404,837 377,729 15,513 - 624,318 591,319 27,109 404,837 377,729 15,513 - 426,336 11,305 583 5,383 5,387 2,377 - 624,318 591,319 27,109 404,837 377,729 15,513 - 426,336 4,09,823 9,947 294,459 2 2,567 - 624,318 591,319 27,109 404,837 377,729 15,513 - 426,336 4,09,823 9,947 294,459 2 2,567 - 624,318 591,319 27,109 404,837 377,729 15,513 - 426,366 7,984 506 7,949 506 - 626,516 204 2,567 2,594 7,594 506 7,594 506 7,594 506 7,500 - 524,318 751,319 27,109 404,837 377,729 15,513 - 426,366 7,998 24,567 24,998 24,595 25,598 5,59	389		2,493	30,853	30,464	200	15,839	15,639	732	4.76	2.428	11.550	10 817	12	5 020	170'0
79 $2,757$ $26,978$ $26,628$ $167$ $12,805$ $12,639$ $1,303$ $5.22$ $2,165$ $11,239$ $9,995$ $518$ $5,353$ 88 $2,068$ $25,447$ $24,628$ $119$ $10,926$ $10,808$ $1,143$ $5.65$ $2,354$ $4,020$ $2,718$ $594$ $1,835$ 2,702 $2,704$ $24,639$ $24,639$ $10,926$ $10,902$ $1,143$ $5.65$ $2,354$ $4,020$ $2,718$ $594$ $1,8352,937$ $2,932$ $24,999$ $24,633$ $10,926$ $10,902$ $1,143$ $5.65$ $2,325$ $4,020$ $2,718$ $594$ $1,835$ $5,3972,929$ $25,048$ $24,639$ $10,926$ $10,902$ $1,9402$ $1,942$ $10,926$ $10,802$ $1,143$ $5.65$ $2,325$ $4,020$ $2,718$ $9,947$ $294,499$ $225,048$ $24,959$ $24,639$ $24,633$ $377,729$ $16,513$ $ 425,336$ $4,09,823$ $9,947$ $294,499$ $220037$ $10$ $100$ $120$ $1000$ $100$ $100$ $100$ $1000$ $100$ $100$ $100$ $100$ $100$ $100$ $100$ $100$ $100$ $100$ $100$ $1000$ $1000$ $100$ $100$ $100$ $100$ $100$	372		2,626,	29,155	28,784	183	14,392	14,208	1.882	4.27	2,312	9 866	7 084	0,0	010 Y	
88 2,686 2,5,457 24,961 227 11,618 11,392 1,302 1.71 2,354 4,020 2,718 594 1,835 13 2,972 2,974	351		2,757	26,978	26,628	167	12,805	12,639	1,303	5.22	2,165	11.298	9995	618	7,0/0	14660
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	496		2,868	25,457	24,961	227	11,618	11,392	1,302	1.71	2.354 <sup>d</sup>	4.020	2,718	765	1 825	1 240
13 3,022 25,048 24,653 167 10,569 10,402 1,382 5,48 2,323 12,767 11,385 583 5,397 - 0624,318 591,319 27,109 404,837 377,729 16,513 - 482, 2, 2, 26, 316, 409,823 9,947 294,459 - 000110 and then aggregated. Costs presented are aggregated costs. Average benefits represent per capita benefits adjusted by test (196/ = 100). Population estimates for inbetween years calculated from the annual percent change between 2 years with census and model montage out available. Tage benefits (\$/person) and population. Tage benefits (\$/person) and population. Neighborhood Survey, Chatham County - Savannah Metropolitan Planning Commission. Neighborhood Survey, Chatham County - Savannah Metropolitan Planning Commission. Commerce. 1961. U.S. Census of Population: 1960. Number of Inhabitants, Georgia. Final Report PC(1)-12A. Washington, DC: Commerce. 1970. 1973 "Revised," and 1973 Percent Conty - Savannah Metropolitan Planning Commission. Commerce. 1970. 1973 "Revised," and 1975 Population Estimates for Content of Linkates and 1974 Revised," and 1974 Per Capita Income Estimates for Contanence. 1970. 1976 Population Estimates and Hot. Commerce. 1970. 1976 Population Estimates and Parta Data and 1972 "Revised," and 1974 Per Capita Income Estimates for Contanence. 1977. 1976 Population Estimates and Per Capita Income Estimates for Contanence. 1977. 1976 Population Estimates and Per Capita Income Estimates for Contanence. 1977. 1976 Population Estimates and Per Capita Income Estimates for Contanence. 1977. 1976 Population Estimates and Per Capita Income Estimates for Contanence. 1977. 1976 Population Estimates for Contanence. 1977. 1976 Population Estimates and Per Capita Income Estimates for Contanence. 1977. 1976 Population Estimates and Per Capita Income Estimates for Contanence. 1977. 1976 Population Estimates and Per Capita Income Estimates for Contanence. 1977. 1976 Population Estimates and Per Capita Income Estimates for Contanence. 1977. 1976 Population Estimates and Per Capita Income	270		2,973	24,899	24,628	119	10,926	10,808	1,143	5.65	2,355 <sup>d</sup>	13, 309	12,166	55	1,00,1	1,24U
- 624,318 591,319 27,109 404,837 37,729 16,513 - 426,336 409,823 9,947 294,459 - 426,336 409,823 9,947 294,459 - 426,336 409,823 9,947 294,459 - 426,336 409,823 9,947 294,459 - 426,336 409,823 9,947 294,459 - 426,336 409,823 9,947 294,459 - 426,336 409,823 9,947 294,459 - 426,356 - 426,336 409,823 9,947 294,459 - 426,356 - 426,336 - 426,336 - 426,336 - 426,336 - 426,336 - 426,336 - 426,336 - 426,336 - 426,336 - 426,336 - 426,336 - 426,336 - 426,336 - 426,336 - 426,336 - 426,336 - 426,336 - 426,345 - 426,356 - 426,352 - 426,352 - 426,352 - 426,352 - 426,352 - 426,352 - 426,352 - 426,352 - 426,352 - 426,352 - 426,352 - 426,356 - 426,556 - 426,566 - 426,556 - 426,56 - 40,566 - 40,566 - 40,566 - 40,566 - 40,566 - 40,566 - 40,56	395		3,082	25,048	24,653	167	10,569	10,402	1, 382	5.48	2,328 <sup>d</sup>	12.767	11 385		1,041	400 Y
<pre>constant (real) dollars deflated by the producer price index (PPI = 1967) for selected cost categories (e.g. pesticides, fuel, pment) and then aggregated. Costs presented are aggregated costs. Average benefits represent per capita benefits adjusted by ex (196/ = 100). Population estimates for inbetween years calculated from the annual percent change between 2 years with census es. MA refers to not available. es. MA refers to not available. arga benefits (\$/person) and population. arga tead discount rate of 4%. Rand McNally Commercial Atlas, various years. Neighborhood Survey, Chatham County - Savannah Metropolitan Planning Commission. Neighborhood Survey, Chatham County - Savannah Metropolitan Planning Commission. Commerce. 1961. U.S. Census of Population: 1960. Number of Inhabitants, Georgia. Final Report PC(1)-12A. Washington, DC: ded by Chatham County - Savannah Metropolitan Planning Commission. Commerce. 1976. 1973 "Revised," and 1975 Population Estimates, and 1972 "Revised," and 1974 Per Capita Income Estimates for Co laces in Georgia. Gurrent Population Estimates and 1972 "Revised," and 1974 Per Capita Income Estimates for Co laces in Georgia. 1977. 1976 Population Estimates and Per Capita Income Estimates for Co demerce. 1977. 1976 Population Estimates and Per Capita Income Estimates for Co amerce. 1977. 1976 Population Estimates and Per Capita Income Estimates for Counterce. 1977. 1976 Population Estimates and Per Capita Income Estimates and Per Capita Income Estimates for Co amerce. 1977. 1976 Population Estimates and Per Capita Income Estimates for Counterce. 1977. 1976 Population Estimates and Per Capita Income Estimates and Incorporated Flaces in Georgia. Co amerce. 1977. 1976 Population Estimates and Per Capita Income Estimates for Counterce. 1977. 1976 Population Estimates and Incorporated Flaces in Georgia. Co amerce. 1977. 1976 Population Estimates and Per Capita Income Estimates for Counterce. 1977.</pre>	32,999	1	1	624,318	591, 319	27,109	404,837	377,729	16,513	ı	1	426.336	409,823	9.947	294.459	284 511
chinery/equipment) and then aggregated. Costs presented are aggregated costs. Average benefits represent per capita benefits adjusted by the er price index (1967 = 100). Population estimates for inhetween years calculated from the annual percent change between 2 years with census tion estimates. NA refers to not available. oduct of average benefits (\$/person) and population. itimates from Rand MeNally Commercial Atlas, various years. timates from Rand MeNally Commercial Atlas, various years. timates from Neighborhood Survy Charlam County - Savanah Metropolitan Planning Commission. S. bept: of Commerce. 1961. U.S. Census of Population: 1960. Number of Inhabitants, Georgia. Final Report PC(1)-12A. Washington, DC: U.S. timates from Neighborhood Survy Charlam County - Savannah Metropolitan Planning Commission. S. Dept: of Commerce. 1961. U.S. Census of Population: 1960. Number of Inhabitants, Georgia. Final Report PC(1)-12A. Washington, DC: U.S. timates provided by Charham County - Savannah Metropolitan Planning Commission. S. Dept: of Commerce. 1971. U.S. Census of Population: 1970. Number of Inhabitants, Georgia. Final Report PC(1)-B12. Washington, DC: U.S. S. Dept: of Commerce. 1971. U.S. Census of Population: 1970. Number of Inhabitants, Georgia. Final Report PC(1)-12A. Washington, DC: U.S. S. Dept: of Commerce. 1971. U.S. Census of Population: 1970. Number of Inhabitants, Georgia. Final Report PC(1)-B12. Washington, DC: U.S. S. Dept: of Commerce. 1976. 1973 "Revised," and 1975 Population Estimates and Incorporated Places in Georgia. Gormerce. 1977. 1976 Population Estimates and Price Estimates for Counties S. Dept: of Commerce. 1977. 1976 Population Estimates and Incorporated Places in Georgia. Gormerce. 1977. 1976 Population Estimates and Proves for Counters and Contrels of Commerce. 1977. 1976 Population Estimates and Proves do Commerce. 1977. 1976 Population Estimates and Proves and Proves and Proves and Price Commerce. 1977. 1976 Population Estimates and Procome Estimates for Commerce. 1977. 1976 Populatio	Dolla	rs are cons	stant (real	L) dollars de	flated by	the pro	ducer pri	ce index ()	PPI = 196	7) for se	lected co	st categor	les (e.e.	Desticid	es. fuel.	1ahor
<pre>es. NA refers to rage benefits (\$/; mg a real discount Rand McNally Comme Rand McNally Count Rand McNally Count et by Chatham Cou ded by Chatham Cou ded by Chatham Cou counterce. 1971. Counterce. 1975. documerce. 1977. documerce. 1977.</pre>	achiner Mer pris	y/equipment ce index (1	t) and ther 1967 = 100)	1 aggregated.	Costs p	resented	are aggr	egated cost	ts. Aver	age benef	its repre	sent per c	apita bene	fits adj	usted by t	the the
rage benefits (\$/ mg a real discount Rand McNally Com- Rand McNally Com- Neighborhood Sur Commerce. 1961. ded by Chatham Cou ded by Chatham Cou ded by Chatham Cou det by Counterce. 1977. Commerce. 1977.	ation e	stimates.	NA refers	to not avail	able.			ACATS CATC	JT nanetn	um true an	пиал регс	ent cnange	between 2	years w	ith census	_
mg a real discount Rand McNally Common Neighborhood Sur Commerce. 1961. ded by Chatham Cou ded by Chatham Cou Commerce. 1971. Laces in Georgia. Commerce. 1977.	coduct	of average	benefits (	(\$/person) an	id populat	ion.										
Neighbornary come Neighbornary come commerce. 1961. ded by Chatham Cou Commerce. 1971. laces in Georgia. commerce. 1977.	LSCOUNT	ed using a	Feal disco	ount rate of	4Z.											
commerce. 1961. ded by Chatham Cou Commerce. 1971. Commerce. 1976. laces in Georgia. Commerce. 1977.	stimates	s from Nets	thorhood S	UNTVAV. Chath	Las, vari am Conntv	ous year	8. Aah Matro	Id mail for	and and and							
ded by Chatham Cou Coumerce. 1971. Commerce. 1976. laces in Seorgia. Commerce. 1977.	.S. Dept	t. of Comme	rce. 1961	U.S. Cens	us of Pop	ulation:	1960.	Number of 1	inhahitan	Te Cecro		1 Pencet D	.(1)-19A	11		
ded by Chatham Cou Commerce. 1971. Commerce. 1976. laces in Seorgia. Commerce. 1977.	Printin	g Off.	1							91000 (00		ד אבלהחדר דו	·W7T_(T)	BUTUSPA		U.S.
Commerce. 1971. Commerce. 1976. laces in Georgia. Commerce. 1977.	stimate	provided t	y Chatham	County - Sav	annah Met	ropolitan	n Plannin	g Commissio	n.							
Commerce. 1976. laces in Georgia. Commerce. 1977.	S. Depi	t. of Counse		U.S.	us of Pop	ulation:	1970.	Number of ]	[nhabitan	is, Georg		l Report P(	:(1)-B12.	Washing		u.s.
	S. Dept	t. of Comme	rce. 1976		ised," an	d 1975 Pc	pulation	Estimates.	and 197;	"Revised	1." and 10	976 Per Car	dte Troome	Pat 4mo	-0	
7. 1976 Population Estimates and Per Capita Income Estimates for Counties and Incorporated Places in Georgia.	corport	ated Places	i in Georgi		Populatio	n Report	Series P	25-658.							00 101 001	anria
	S. Dept	t. of Comme	rce. 1977		lation Es	timates a	and Per C	upita Incom	ie Estimat	ces for Co	ounties an	nd Incorpor	ated Place	a in Geo		rrent

JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MOSQUITO CONTROL ASSOCIATION

weather and tidal conditions, as well as other control activities such as larviciding, the differences in population counts among areas during the 1962–72 period suggest that the areas were not equal in potential mosquito abundance.

Suspected reasons for the difference if adulticide activities were equally effective for both areas over time are: 1) Thunderbolt historically had a greater relative abundance of mosquitoes prior to mosquito control in Chatham County; or 2) mosquito abundance at Thunderbolt was influenced more from external sources than from internal sources hence, mosquito populations were continually replenished from outside sources. If the assumption of equal effectiveness across areas and time is dropped, then the data suggest that mosquito populations in Thunderbolt required increasingly more frequent spray applications to achieve a constant population density level. This implies diminishing adulticide effectiveness (or equivalently increased mosquito resistance to adulticides), that spray applications were consistently poorly timed, or mosquito populations were recharged from untreated sources outside of Thunderbolt.

Overall, the data suggest that source reduction was a contributing factor in the reduction of ground adulticide applications and quantities, adult densities of female mosquitoes per light-trap night, and the proportion of primary target saltmarsh species relative to total species per light-trap night for Isle of Hope. Additionally, source reduction yielded net benefits of \$591,319 (1967=100), \$164,983 more than a strict chemical control project (a factor of 1.4 times greater). In discounted terms, net benefits were \$377,729 or \$93,218 more than the chemical control project. This evidence clearly demonstrates that the appropriate decision was selected in developing a mosquito control program for the Isle of Hope area and suggests that Thunderbolt could benefit from source reduction activities if source reduction is a feasible option for the Thunderbolt area.

### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors gratefully acknowledge the Chatham County Mosquito Control Commission in Savannah, GA, and especially T. Oscar Fultz for providing the data and valuable assistance concerning the case study. In addition, special thanks are extended to Dr. J. C. Headley (University of Missouri-Columbia), Dr. Arnold L. Aspelin, Chief (Economic Analysis Branch, OPP, U.S. EPA), Dr. Al McGartland (Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, U.S. EPA) and Dr. Ron M. North (University of Georgia) for commenting on earlier versions of this paper. Any remaining errors are the sole responsibility of the authors.

#### **References** Cited

- Bergland, O. and A. J. Randall. 1984. Operational techniques for calculating the exact hicksian variations from observable data. Staff Paper 177. Dept. Agric. Econ., Univ. Kentucky, Lexington, KY.
- Bohm, P. 1976. Social efficiency: A concise introduction to welfare economics. Macmillan Press Ltd., Surrey, Great Britain, 150 p.
  Carlson, G. A. and D. V. DeBord. 1976. Public
- Carlson, G. A. and D. V. DeBord. 1976. Public mosquito abatement. J. of Environ. Econ. Manag. 3:142–153.
- Cummings, R. G., D. S. Brookshire and W. D. Schulze. 1986. Valuing public goods: The contingent valuation method. Rowman and Allenheld Publ., Totowa, NJ.
- DeBord, D. V., G. A. Carlson and R. C. Axtell. 1975. Demand for and cost of coastal salt marsh mosquito abatement. Tech. Bull. 232. North Carolina Agric. Exp. Stat., Raleigh, NC.
- Eckstein, O. 1958. Water resource development-The economics of project evaluation. Harvard Univ. Press, Cambridge, MA, 300 p.
- Gittinger, J. P. 1972. Economic analysis of agricultural projects. Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, Baltimore, MD, 221 pp.
- Hansen, J. A., F. H. Lesser, R. W. Lombardi, J. K. Shisler and P. Slavin. 1976. The economics of marsh water management—A New Jersey view. Proc. N.J. Mosq. Exterm. Assoc. 63:77–81.
- Hausman, J. A. 1981. Exact consumer's surplus and deadweight loss. Am. Econ. Rev. 71:662-676.
- Hueth, D. L. and E. J. Strong. 1984. A critical review of the travel cost, hedonic travel cost, and household production models for measurement of quality changes in recreational experiences. Nor. J. Agr. Res. Econ. 13:187–198.
- Just, R. E., D. L. Hueth and A. Schmitz. 1982. Applied welfare economics and public policy. Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 491 p.
- Langham, M. R. and R. Lanier, 1981. Public mosquito abatement: Comment. J. of Environ. Econ. and Manag. 8:97–99.
- Mishan, E. J. 1976. Cost-benefit analysis. Praeger Publ., New York, NY, 454 p.
- Ofiara, D. D. and J. R. Allison. 1985. The use of present value criterion applications in making mosquito control decisions. J. Am. Mosq. Control Assoc. 1:284-294.
- Ofiara, D. D. and J. R. Allison. 1986. On assessing the benefits of public mosquito control practices. J. Am. Mosq. Control Assoc. 2:280–288.
- Sarhan, M. E., R. E. Howitt, and C. V. Moore. 1979. Pesticide resistance externalities and optimal mosquito management. J. Environ. Econ. Manag. 6:69-84.
- Sarhan, M. E., R. E. Howitt, C. V. Moore and C. J. Mitchell. 1981. Economic evaluation of mosquito control and narrow spectrum mosquitocide development in California. Giannini Found. Res. Rep. No. 330, Univ. of Calif., Berkeley, CA.

- Shisler, J. K., F. Lesser and T. Candeletti. 1979. An approach to the evaluation of temporary versus permanent measure in saltmarsh mosquito control operations. Mosq. News 39:776-780.
- U.S. Department of Commerce. 1980. Business statistics, 1979. A supplement to the survey of current business. Bur. Econ. Anal., Washington, DC, 75 p.
- U.S. Department of Commerce. 1983. Business

statistics, 1982. A supplement to the survey of current business. Bur. Econ. Anal., Washington, DC, 27-28, 57 p.

- U.S. Department of Commerce. 1984. The survey of current business. Bur. Econ. Anal., Washington, DC, S-5, 6 and 12 p.
- Willig, R. D. 1976. Consumer's surplus without apology. Am. Econ. Rev. 66:589–597.

# ILLINOIS MOSQUITO ABATEMENT ASSOCIATION

1984–1985 MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

President Donald W. Webb, Ph.D. II. Natural History Survey Urbana, IL.

*Vice-President* Steven Hill, DVM Macon Mosq. Abate. Dist. Decatur, IL. \* \* \*

MEMBERS

Donald Oemick—Northwest M.A.D. James Binnell—North Shore M.A.D. Lee Phipps—Desplaines Valley M.A.D. Secretary-Treasurer Rosemarie Climpson South Cook County M.A.D. Harvey, IL.

Past President Linn Haramis, Ph.D. IL. Dept. of Public Health Springfield, IL.

# MID-ATLANTIC MOSQUITO CONTROL ASSOCIATION Vector Control Branch/NCDHR, Box 2091, Raleigh, NC 27602-2091

OFFICERS

President: M. G. Hyatt (Charleston, SC) Vice-President: M. J. Shockley (Franklin, VA) Sec.-Treas.: N. H. Newton (Raleigh, NC)

Board of Directors: C. W. Burton (West Virginia) D. L. Cashman (Virginia) R. T. Barden (North Carolina) P. Wright (South Carolina) J. H. Carter (Georgia) R. A. Berry (Maryland) C. J. Stachecki (Delaware) Sustaining Members: Abbott Laboratories American Cyanamid ARDCO Industries, Inc. Beecomist Systems, Inc. Biochem Products CESSCO, Inc. Chevron Chemical Co.

GEMCO Equipment Co. Helena Chemical Co. I.C.I. Americas Northeast Vector Mgt. Penick BioUclaf Prentiss Drug & Chemical Co. Smalley Excavators, Inc.

Southern Mill Creek Products Wm. F. Strickhouser Summit Chemical Co. ULV Equip. & Chemical Co., Inc. Vector Management, Inc. Vector Supply, Inc. Zoecon Industries

The 12th Annual Meeting will be held in Williamsburg, VA, on Feb. 18-20, 1987.