

Effectiveness of JPP Marketing Efforts FY2013

Prepared for

The New Hampshire Division of
Travel and Tourism Development

by

Dr. Mark J. Okrant
The Institute for New Hampshire Studies
Plymouth State University
Plymouth, New Hampshire
03264

May 2014



Effectiveness of JPP Marketing Efforts FY2013

Spending Comparison

There was a 31 percent increase in reported projects in the Joint Promotional Program during FY2013, as compared to FY2012 (21 funded projects vs. 16). Moreover, the amount of funding has increased, from \$663,788 to \$744,465, an increase of 12.2 percent [see Table 1]. However, the average JPP award decreased by 14.5 percent during FY2013 (\$35,450), compared to FY2011 (\$41,487) [see Table 1], reversing a recent trend of increasingly larger individual projects.

During FY2013, 67 percent of grantees expended JPP funds on **printing and distribution** of materials (11% less than FY2012, a continuing trend); but, the *average expenditure* on printing and distribution increased by 12 percent. 67 percent of FY2013 grantees expended money on **non-web advertising**, a 3 percent decrease compared to FY2012, while the average amount expended decreased by 5 percent. The proportion of grantees who expended JPP money on **public relations** increased by 3 percent, while the average amount expended increased by 11 percent relative to FY2012. The incidence of grantees' spending in the area of **web marketing** increased by 11 percent; moreover, participants' average amount expended increased by 20 percent. The incidence of participation in **website development** decreased by 43 percent; and, the average expenditure decreased by 55 percent. Finally, there was 56 percent decrease in participation among grantees using JPP funds for **direct mail fulfillment** initiatives, while the average amount expended decreased by 15 percent [see Table 1].

Return on Investment—JPP FY2013

FY2013 JPP spending (\$744,465) generated an estimated \$1,091,762 in private funding—a record amount. This is a 1:1.47 ratio. FY2013 activity produced a total of \$1,836,227 in JPP-related promotional spending.

By applying the figure for FY 2013 visitor spending generated by DTTD promotional dollars (\$77.43), INHS estimates that \$142,179,057 in visitor dollars were generated as a result of the total of \$1,836,227 in total JPP promotional spending (presuming that private funding generates the same amount of visitor spending on a per-dollar basis as DTTD funding does). Therefore, JPP total promotional spending resulted in approximately 27 percent of all visitor spending resulting from state funded promotional activities, and about 3.1 percent of total visitor spending in the state.

Table 1
Comparison of FY2012 and FY2013 JPP Spending

	<u>FY 2013</u>		<u>FY 2012</u>		FY2013 vs. FY2012	
	% particip.	ave. expend.	% particip.	ave. expend.	% chg. in particip.	% chg. in ave. expend.
Print&Dist	67	\$13,170	75	\$11,715	- 11	+12
Advertising	67	\$12,976	69	\$13,669	- 3	- 5
Public Relations	71	\$13,447	69	\$12,160	+ 3	+11
Website Develop	43	\$ 4,958	75	\$11,031	-43	-55
Website Marketing	62	\$ 9,256	56	\$ 7,709	+11	+20
DirectMail/Fulfi	19	\$ 2,946	43	\$ 5,334	-56	-45
	# projects	total expend.	# projects	total expend.	% chg. in particip.	tot.spend*
Total Expenditures*	21	\$744,465	16	\$663,788	+31.3%	+12.2%
Ave Award		\$ 35,450		\$ 41,487		-14.6%

* total spending by JPP

Geographic Range

The largest proportion of FY2013 JPP projects was directed at **New Hampshire** (63% of total projects), **New England** (56%), and the **Northeast** and **National** (50% each). There was a 33% increase in the number of grantees focusing on Canada, and a 9% increase in grantees focusing on New Hampshire—the only two markets experiencing increased attention compared to FY2012. See Tables 2 and 3 for a more detailed breakout of FY2013 market geography.

During FY2013, 82 percent of all projects were year-round marketing efforts, a dramatic increase compared to FY2012 (69%); 7% were directed at Winter visitation, while 6% were designed to attract a Summer audience (see Table 4).

**Table 2
Market Geography of Grantees**

	<u>FY2013</u>	<u>FY2012</u>	<u>% change '13 vs. '12</u>
New Eng.	56%	75%	-25%
national	50%	58%	-14%
other US regions	13%	33%	-61%
northeast	50%	66%	-24%
UK/overseas	38%	42%	-10%
NH	63%	58%	+ 9%
Canada	44%	33%	+33%

**Table 3
Market Geography of Funded Projects—FY2013**

<u>Reporting Grantees</u>	<u>Region></u>	<u>New Eng.</u>	<u>National</u>	<u>US regions</u>	<u>No.East</u>	<u>UK/Intern</u>	<u>NH*</u>	<u>Canada</u>	<u>Details</u>
Jackson CC.		<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>		<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>	
Laconia Motorcycle			<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>		<i>x</i>	MW,SE
Lakes Reg Tour Assoc		<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>		<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>			
League of NH Crafts		<i>x</i>					<i>x</i>		
Lincoln-Woodstock CC					<i>x</i>				
Lodging & Rest Assoc							<i>x</i>		
Mt Wash Val			<i>x</i>			<i>x</i>		<i>x</i>	
NH Campgr Owners		<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>		<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>	SE
Portsmouth CC		<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>			<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>	
Ski NH					<i>x</i>				
Waterville Val									
Res Asoc					<i>x</i>				
White Mts. Attr		<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>		<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>	
Gr Keene CC		<i>x</i>					<i>x</i>		
Lake Sunapee CC		<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>				<i>x</i>		
Androscoggin CC							<i>x</i>		

**Table 4
Seasonality of Participation—FY2013**

Year-round	82%
Winter	7
Summer	6
Fall	2
Spring	<u>3</u>
	100%

There was a 33 percent increase in participation relative to FY2012, with one new participant in JPP during FY2013 (see Table 5).

Table 5

**Total Participating Organizations and
New Participants in the Program ***

	<u>FY2007</u>	<u>FY2008</u>	<u>FY2009</u>	<u>FY2010</u>	<u>FY2011</u>	<u>FY2012</u>	<u>FY2013</u>
Total Participating Organiz.	20	17	13	14	14	12	16
New* Participating Organiz.	4	2	1	3	0	0	1

* programs that have never participated or have not participated in JPP within the last 10 year period

Successful vs. Less Successful JPP-Funded Marketing Efforts

In an effort to determine which JPP-funded marketing initiatives were most effective in attracting visitors to their respective areas, grantees were asked to utilize the Summary portion of the Evaluation Form to comment about their markets, and to identify the marketing tools that had been most successful, as well as those which did not produce as satisfactory results. All grantees were required to document carefully the reasons for labeling their efforts “successful” vs. “less successful.”

Since FY2004, nearly every grant recipient has based its promotional campaign upon that organization’s website. The only increases in expenditures during FY2013 relative to FY2012 were directed at website marketing, print and distribution, and public relations [see Table 1].