

# Impacts of Visitor Spending on the Local Economy: Golden Spike National Historic Site, 2006



Daniel J. Stynes  
Department of Community, Agriculture, Recreation and Resource Studies  
Michigan State University  
East Lansing, Michigan 48824-1222

May 2008



National Park Service  
Social Science Program

Department of Community, Agriculture,  
Recreation and Resource Studies  
Michigan State University



# **Impacts of Visitor Spending on the Local Economy: Golden Spike National Historic Site, 2006**

## **Executive Summary**

Golden Spike National Historic Site (NRA) hosted 45,381 recreation visits in 2006. Based on the 2006 visitor survey 9% of the visitors are local residents, 57% are visitors from outside the local area not staying overnight within an hour drive of the park, and 34% are visitors staying overnight in the local area. About 38% of the overnight visitors are camping, Fifty-six percent of the overnight visitors are staying in motels, 14% are camping and 30% are staying with friends or relatives or other unpaid lodging.

The average visitor party spent \$137 in the local area. Visitors reported expenditures of their group inside the park and within an hours drive of the park. On a party trip basis, average spending in 2006 was \$41 for local residents, \$52 for non-local day trips, \$419 for visitors in motels, \$177 for campers and \$59 for other overnight visitors. On a per night basis, visitors staying in motels spent \$235 in the local region compared to \$97 for campers and \$32 for other overnight visitors. The average per night lodging cost was \$107 per night for stays in motels and \$29 for campgrounds.

Total visitor spending in 2006 within an hours drive of the park was \$2.1 million. Overnight visitors staying in motels, cabins or B&B's accounted for 66% of the total spending. Visitors on day trips from beyond the local area accounted for 21% of the spending. Thirty percent of the spending was for lodging, 20% for restaurant meals and bar expenses, and 17% for gas and oil.

About sixty percent of the non-local visitors indicated the park visit was not the primary reason for coming to the area, so only a portion of their expenses can be attributed to the park visit. Omitting spending by local visitors and reducing spending attributed to the park visit for visitors in the area for other reasons yields a total of \$1.614 million in spending attributed to the park, about 77% of the \$2.1 million spent by park visitors on the trip.

The economic impact of park visitor spending is estimated by applying this spending to a model of the local economy. The local region was defined as a fourteen county area in south central Oklahoma. The tourism spending sales multiplier for the region is 1.54. Every dollar of direct sales to visitors generates another \$ .54 in secondary sales through indirect and induced effects.

Including secondary effects, visitor spending in 2006 supported 29 jobs in the area outside the park, generating \$709,000 in wages and salaries and \$1.05 million in value added. Value added includes wages and salaries as well as profits and rents to area businesses and sales taxes. Direct effects accrue primarily to hotel, restaurant and retail trade sectors.

The park itself employed 12 people in FY 2006 with a total payroll including benefits of \$702,491. Including secondary effects, the local impact of the park payroll in 2006 was 18 jobs, \$858,000 in labor income and \$980,000 total value added. Including both visitor spending and park operations, the total impact of the park on the local economy in 2006 was 47 jobs and \$2.0 million value added. The park payroll accounts for 38% of the employment effects and 48% of value added.

# **Impacts of Visitor Spending on the Local Economy: Golden Spike National Historic Site, 2006**

Daniel J. Stynes  
May 2008

## **Introduction**

The purpose of this study is to document the local economic impacts of visitors to Golden Spike National Historic Site (NHS) in 2006. Economic impacts are measured as the direct and secondary sales, income and jobs in the local area resulting from spending by park visitors. The economic estimates are produced using the Money Generation Model 2 (MGM2) (Stynes and Propst, 2000). Three major inputs to the model are:

- 1) Number of visits broken down by lodging-based segments,
- 2) Spending averages for each segment, and
- 3) Economic multipliers for the local region

Inputs are estimated from the Golden Spike NHS Visitor Survey, National Park Service Public Use Statistics, and IMPLAN input-output modeling software. The MGM2 model provides a spreadsheet template for combining park use, spending and regional multipliers to compute changes in sales, labor income, jobs and value added in the region.

## **Golden Spike NHS and the Local Region**

Golden Spike NHS is located north of the Great Salt Lake in northern Utah, about an hour's drive west of Logan. The park hosted 45,381 recreation visitors in 2006 (Table 1).

The local region was defined as a three county area, covering Box Elder, Cache and Weber counties. This region roughly coincides with the one hour driving radius of the park, for which visitor spending was reported in the visitor survey. The region had a population of about 334,000 in 2001.

A park visitor study was conducted at Golden Spike NHS from August 10-19, 2006 (Evans, Schuett and Hollenhorst, 2007). The study measured visitor demographics, activities, and travel expenditures. Questionnaires were distributed to a sample of 340 visitors. Visitors returned 264 questionnaires for a 78% response rate. Data generated through the visitor survey were used as the basis to develop the spending profiles, segment shares and trip characteristics for Golden Spike NHS visitors.

About ten percent of the respondents lived in the local area. Forty-five percent of the non-local visitors came to the area primarily to visit the Golden Spike NHS. Eight

percent of visitors came to visit other attractions in the area; fifteen percent were visiting friends or relatives in the area and 5% on business.

**Table 1. Recreation Visits to Golden Spike NHS, 2006-2007**

<b>Month</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>
January	709	662
February	811	1,016
March	1,685	2,265
April	3,878	3,304
May	8,268	9,513
June	6,916	6,242
July	7,686	6,772
August	6,200	6,003
September	4,472	4,025
October	2,543	2,368
November	1,371	2,083
<u>December</u>	<u>842</u>	<u>835</u>
<b>Total</b>	<b>45,381</b>	<b>45,088</b>

Source: NPS Public Use Statistics

## **MGM2 Visitor Segments**

MGM2 divides visitors into segments to help explain differences in spending across distinct user groups. Five segments were established for Golden Spike NHS visitors:

- Local day users:** Day visitors who reside within the local region, defined as one hour drive of the park.
- Non-local day users:** Visitors from outside the region, not staying overnight in the area. This includes day trips as well as pass-through travelers, who may be staying overnight on their trip outside the region.
- Motel:** Visitors staying in motels, hotels, cabins, or B&B's within a one hour drive of the park
- Camp:** Visitors staying in private or public campgrounds within a one hour drive of the park
- Other OVN:** Other visitors staying overnight in the area with friends or relatives or not reporting any lodging expenses

The 2006 visitor survey was used to estimate the percentage of visitors from each segment as well as spending averages, lengths of stay and party sizes for each segment. Nine percent of the visitors are local residents, 57% are visitors from outside the local area not staying overnight within a sixty minute drive of the park, and 34% are visitors staying overnight within a sixty minute drive of the park. Fifty-six percent of the overnight visitors (56%) are staying in motels, cabins or B&B's, 14% are camping and

30% are staying with friends or relatives or other unpaid lodging (Table 2)<sup>1</sup>. The average spending party size was about three people.

Local residents were assumed to be making the trip primarily to visit the park. Thirty-nine percent of non-local visitors made the trip primarily to visit the park. Non-local visitors on day trips and campers were more likely to make the trip primarily to visit the park than visitors staying in motels or with friends and relatives.

**Table 2. Selected Visit/Trip Characteristics by Segment, 2006**

Characteristic	Local	Day trip	Motel	Camp	Other OVN	Total
Segment share	9%	57%	19%	5%	10%	100%
Average Party size	3.36	2.99	2.65	2.92	3.20	2.96
Length of stay (days/nights)	1.00	1.00	1.78	1.83	1.83	1.29
Percent primary purpose trips	100%	43%	39%	25%	27%	39% <sup>a</sup>

a. Excludes local visitors.

Golden Spike NHS hosted 45,381 recreation visitors in 2006. Recreation visits were allocated to the five segments using the segment shares in Table 2. These visits are converted to 15,312 party trips by dividing by the average party size for each segment (Table 3).

**Table 3. Recreation Visits and Party Trips by Segment, 2006**

Measure	Local	Day trip	Motel	Camp	Other OVN	Total
Recreation visits	3,946	25,830	8,789	2,152	4,664	45,381
Party visits/trips	1,173	8,630	3,313	738	1,457	15,312
Percent of party trips	8%	56%	22%	5%	10%	100%
Party nights	1,173	8,630	5,906	1,353	2,661	19,723

## Visitor spending

Spending averages were computed on a party trip basis for each segment. The survey covered expenditures of the travel party within a one hour drive of the park.

The average visitor party spent \$137 in the local area<sup>2</sup>. On a party trip basis, average spending in 2006 was \$41 for local residents, \$52 for non-local day trips, \$419 for visitors in motels, \$177 for campers and \$59 for other overnight visitors (Table 4).

<sup>1</sup> These percentages vary slightly from the VSP report (Evans, Schuett and Hollenhorst. 2007) as some visitors listing motels or campgrounds as lodging types did not report any lodging expenses and are classified here in the other OVN category.

<sup>2</sup> The average of \$137 is lower than the \$164 spending average in the VSP report (Evans, Schuett, and Hollenhorst 2007) due to the omission of outliers and treatment of missing spending data.

**Table 4. Average Visitor Spending by Segment (\$ per party per trip)**

	Local	Day trip	Motel	Camp	Other OVN	Total
<b>In Park</b>						
Souvenirs	13.23	13.40	26.60	13.00	5.70	15.49
Admissions, fees, guide	2.45	3.97	3.16	3.00	1.62	3.41
<b>In Community</b>						
Motel, hotel cabin or B&B	0.00	0.00	190.10	0.00	0.00	41.13
Camping fees	0.00	0.00	0.00	54.01	0.00	2.60
Restaurants & bars	3.45	8.68	92.96	26.50	7.81	27.29
Groceries, take-out food/drinks	2.36	4.30	8.49	25.35	10.00	6.61
Gas & oil	11.91	15.14	44.33	37.83	22.23	22.98
Local transportation	2.27	1.73	22.35	10.83	6.38	7.11
Admissions & fees	0.45	0.68	10.94	0.58	1.62	2.97
<u>Souvenirs and other expenses</u>	<u>4.77</u>	<u>3.74</u>	<u>19.65</u>	<u>5.83</u>	<u>3.27</u>	<u>7.32</u>
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>40.91</b>	<b>51.63</b>	<b>418.58</b>	<b>176.93</b>	<b>58.63</b>	<b>136.91</b>
Total in park	15.68	17.37	29.77	16.00	7.32	18.90
Total Outside park	25.23	34.26	388.82	160.93	51.31	118.01

On a per night basis, visitors staying in motels spent \$235 in the local region compared to \$97 for campers and \$32 for other overnight visitors. The average per night lodging cost was \$107 per night for stays in motels and \$29 for campgrounds.

The sampling error (95% confidence level) for the overall spending average is 21%. A 95% confidence interval for the spending average is therefore \$137 plus or minus \$28 or (\$109, \$165).

**Table 5. Average Spending per Night for Visitors on Overnight Trips (\$ per party per night)**

	Motel	Camp	Other OVN
Motel, hotel cabin or B&B	106.64	0.00	0.00
Camping fees	0.00	29.46	0.00
Restaurants & bars	52.15	14.45	4.28
Groceries, take-out food/drinks	4.76	13.83	5.48
Gas & oil	24.87	20.64	12.17
Local transportation	12.54	5.91	3.50
Admissions & fees	7.91	1.95	1.77
<u>Souvenirs and other expenses</u>	<u>25.95</u>	<u>10.27</u>	<u>4.91</u>
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>234.81</b>	<b>96.51</b>	<b>32.10</b>

Golden Spike NHS visitors spent a total of \$2.1 million in the local area in 2006 (Table 6). Total spending was estimated by multiplying the number of party trips for each segment by the average spending per trip and summing across segments.

Overnight visitors staying in motels, cabins or B&B's accounted for 66% of the total spending. Visitors on day trips from beyond the local area accounted for 21% of the spending. Thirty percent of the spending was for lodging, 20% for restaurant meals and bar expenses, and 17% for gas and oil.

**Table 6. Total Visitor Spending by Segment, 2006 (\$000s)**

	Local	Day trip	Motel	Camp	Other OVN	Total
<b>In Park</b>						
Souvenirs	15.52	115.64	88.13	9.59	8.31	237.19
Admissions & fees	2.88	34.24	10.48	2.21	2.35	52.16
<b>In Community</b>						
Motel, hotel cabin or B&B	0.00	0.00	629.78	0.00	0.00	629.78
Camping fees	0.00	0.00	0.00	39.85	0.00	39.85
Restaurants & bars	4.05	74.89	307.96	19.56	11.38	417.84
Groceries, take-out food/drinks	2.77	37.10	28.13	18.70	14.57	101.28
Gas & oil	13.97	130.65	146.85	27.92	32.40	351.79
Local transportation	2.67	14.92	74.03	7.99	9.30	108.92
Admissions & fees	0.53	5.87	36.24	0.43	2.35	45.43
<u>Souvenirs and other expenses</u>	<u>5.60</u>	<u>32.26</u>	<u>65.11</u>	<u>4.30</u>	<u>4.76</u>	<u>112.03</u>
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>446</b>	<b>1,387</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>2,096</b>
Total excluding park admissions	45	411	1,376	128	83	2,044
Segment Percent of Total	2%	21%	66%	6%	4%	100%

Not all of this spending would be lost to the region in the absence of the park as 9% of the visitors are local residents and some non-residents came to the area for business, visiting friends and relatives, and other reasons. Spending directly attributed to the park visit was estimated by counting all spending for trips where the park was the primary reason for the trip<sup>3</sup>. Half of the spending outside the park was counted for day trips if the trip was not made primarily to visit Golden Spike NHS. The equivalent of one night of spending was attributed to the park visit for overnight trips made to visit other attractions, friends or relatives or on business.<sup>4</sup> All spending inside the park was counted, but all spending by local visitors outside the park was excluded.

These attributions yield a total of \$1.614 million in visitor spending attributed to the park visit, representing 77% of the overall visitor spending total (Table 7).

<sup>3</sup> Visitors who identified a recreation activity as their primary reason were also included as primary purpose trips.

<sup>4</sup> This assumes that these visitors spent an extra night in the area to visit Golden Spike NHS.

**Table 7. Total Spending Attributed to Park Visits, 2006 (\$000s)**

	Local	Day trip	Motel	Camp	Other OVN	Total
<b>In Park</b>						
Souvenirs	15.52	115.64	88.13	9.59	8.31	237.19
Admissions & fees	2.88	34.24	10.48	2.21	2.35	52.16
<b>In Community</b>						
Motel, hotel cabin or B&B		0.00	460.50	0.00	0.00	460.50
Camping fees		0.00	0.00	26.27	0.00	26.27
Restaurants & bars		53.56	225.18	12.89	7.62	299.25
Groceries, take-out food/drinks		26.54	20.57	12.33	9.76	69.19
Gas & oil		93.45	107.38	18.40	21.69	240.92
Local transportation		10.67	54.13	5.27	6.23	76.31
Admissions & fees		4.20	30.10	1.19	2.52	38.01
<u>Souvenirs and other expenses</u>		<u>23.07</u>	<u>77.88</u>	<u>6.76</u>	<u>6.51</u>	<u>114.23</u>
<b>Total Attributed to Park</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>361</b>	<b>1,074</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>1,614</b>
Excluding park admissions	16	327	1,064	93	63	1,562
Percent of spending attributed to the park	38%	81%	77%	73%	76%	77%

### Economic Impacts of Visitor Spending

The economic impacts of Golden Spike NHS visitor spending on the local economy are estimated by applying the spending attributed to the park (Table 7) to a set of economic ratios and multipliers representing the local economy. Multipliers for the region were estimated with the IMPLAN system using 2001 data. The tourism sales multiplier for the region is 1.54. Every dollar of direct sales to visitors generates another \$ .54 in secondary sales through indirect and induced effects<sup>5</sup>.

Impacts are estimated based on the visitor spending attributed to the park in Table 7, excluding park admission fees paid to the park<sup>6</sup>. Including direct and secondary effects, the \$1.562 million spent by park visitors<sup>7</sup> supports 29 jobs in the area and generates \$1.85 million in sales, \$709,000 in labor income and \$1.05 million in value added (Table 8).

Labor income covers wages and salaries, including payroll benefits. Value added is the preferred measure of the contribution to the local economy as it includes all sources

<sup>5</sup> Indirect effects result from tourism businesses buying goods and services from local firms, while induced effects stem from household spending of income earned from visitor spending.

<sup>6</sup> The local economic impact of all \$2.1million in visitor spending (Table 6) is reported in Appendix C.

<sup>7</sup> Revenues received by the park (park admissions and donations) are excluded in estimating visitor spending impacts as the impacts resulting from park revenues are covered as part of park operations.

of income to the area -- payroll benefits to workers, profits and rents to businesses, and sales and other indirect business taxes.

**Table 8. Economic Impacts of Visitor Spending Attributed to the Park, 2006**

<b>Sector/Spending category</b>	<b>Sales \$000's</b>	<b>Jobs</b>	<b>Labor Income \$000's</b>	<b>Value Added \$000's</b>
<b>Direct Effects</b>				
Motel, hotel cabin or B&B	461	7	201	326
Camping fees	26	0	2	5
Restaurants & bars	299	7	116	131
Admissions & fees	38	1	14	24
Local transportation	76	1	46	52
Grocery stores	18	0	7	9
Gas stations	54	1	21	27
Other retail	176	4	83	116
Wholesale Trade	22	0	13	15
<u>Local Production of goods</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>9</u>
<b>Total Direct Effects</b>	<b>1,203<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>21</b>	<b>509</b>	<b>714</b>
<u>Secondary Effects</u>	<u>643</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>199</u>	<u>340</u>
<b>Total Effects</b>	<b>1,846</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>709</b>	<b>1,054</b>

a. Total direct sales are less than visitor spending as direct sales excludes the cost of goods sold at retail unless the good is locally made.

The largest direct effects are in motels and restaurants and bars. Spending associated with park visits supports 7 jobs in hotels, 7 jobs in restaurants and 5 jobs in retail trade. The contribution to the local economy in terms of value added is \$326,000 in the hotel sector, \$131,000 in the restaurant sector and \$152,000 in retail trade.

### **Impacts of the NPS Park Payroll**

The park itself employed 12 people in FY 2006 with a total payroll including benefits of \$702,491. Including secondary effects, the local impact of the park payroll in 2006 was 18 jobs, \$858,000 in labor income and \$980,000 total value added. Including both visitor spending and park operations, the total impact of the park on the local economy in 2006 was 47 jobs and \$2.0 million value added. The park payroll accounts for 38% of the employment effects and 48% of value added.

### **Study Limitations and Error**

The accuracy of the MGM2 estimates rests on the accuracy of the three inputs: visits, spending averages, and multipliers. Recreation visit estimates rely on counting procedures at the park, which may miss some visitors and count others more than once during their visit. Recreation visits were adjusted for double counting based on the number of days respondents reported visiting the park during their stay in the area.

Spending averages are derived from the 2006 Golden Spike NHS Visitor Survey. Estimates from the survey are subject to sampling errors, measurement errors and seasonal/sampling biases. The overall spending average is subject to sampling errors of 21%.

Spending averages are also sensitive to decisions about outliers and treatment of missing data. To carry out the analysis incomplete spending data had to be completed and decisions had to be made about the handling of missing spending data and zero spending reports. Conservative assumptions were adopted.

Cases reporting some expenses but leaving other categories blank were completed with zeros. Fourteen cases had all missing spending data and 12 cases reported zero spending. Respondents that did not complete the spending question were assumed to spend no money on the trip. Dropping the missing cases instead of treating them as zeros would increase the overall spending average from \$137 to \$145.

Eight cases with party sizes of more than eight people and three cases reporting stays of more than seven nights were omitted in computing averages for spending, party size and length of stay<sup>8</sup>. The overall spending average was \$137 omitting outliers compared to \$154 with outliers (See Appendix B for details).

Although sample sizes are small for most segments, the spending averages are consistent with those at similar recreation areas. Estimated nightly room and campsite rates are also reasonable for the area. As the sample only covers visitors during a single week, we must assume these visitors are representative of visitors during the rest of the year to extrapolate to annual totals.

Multipliers are derived from an input-output model of the local economy using IMPLAN. Input-output models rest on a number of assumptions, however, errors due to the multipliers will be small compared to potential errors in visit counts and spending estimates.

Sorting out the contribution of the park in attracting visitors on multi-purpose or multi-destination trips is inherently difficult. As the park was not the primary reason for the trip to the region for all visitors, some of the spending would likely not be lost in the absence of the park. The procedures for attributing spending to the park are somewhat subjective, but reasonable. They result in 77% of all visitor spending being attributed to park visits.

---

<sup>8</sup> Reports of spending for long stays and large parties are deemed unreliable. Spending reported for large parties may not include everyone in the party. Recall of spending for very long stays may also be unreliable and such stays frequently involve multiple stops and activities, so that much of the spending is unrelated to the park visit. Since spending averages are applied to all visits, the procedures are equivalent to substituting the average of visitors in the corresponding visitor segment for these outliers.

## REFERENCES

- Evans, J. , Schuett, M.A. and Hollenhorst, S.J. (2007). Golden Spike National Historic Site Visitor Study. Summer 2006. Visitor Services Project Report #181. Moscow, ID: National Park Service and University of Idaho, Cooperative Park Studies Unit.
- National Park Service Public Use Statistic Office. (2006). Visitation DataBase. <http://www2.nature.nps.gov/stats/>. Data retrieved on March 30, 2008.
- Stynes, D. J., Propst, D.B., Chang, W. and Sun, Y. (2000). Estimating national park visitor spending and economic impacts: The MGM2 model. May, 2000. Final report to National Park Service. East Lansing, Michigan: Department of Park, Recreation and Tourism Resources, Michigan State University.

## Appendix A: Definitions of Economic Terms

Term	Definition
Sales	Sales of firms within the region to park visitors.
Jobs	The number of jobs in the region supported by the visitor spending. Job estimates are not full time equivalents, but include part time positions.
Labor income	Wage and salary income, sole proprietor's income and employee payroll benefits.
Value added	Labor income plus rents and profits and indirect business taxes. As the name implies, it is the net value added to the region's economy. For example, the value added by a hotel includes wages and salaries paid to employees, their payroll benefits, profits of the hotel, and sales and other indirect business taxes. The hotel's non-labor operating costs such as purchases of supplies and services from other firms are not included as value added by the hotel.
Direct effects	Direct effects are the changes in sales, income and jobs in those business or agencies that directly receive the visitor spending.
Secondary effects	These are the changes in the economic activity in the region that result from the re-circulation of the money spent by visitors. Secondary effects include indirect and induced effects.
Indirect effects	Changes in sales, income and jobs in industries that supply goods and services to the businesses that sell directly to the visitors. For example, linen suppliers benefit from visitor spending at lodging establishments.
Induced effects	Changes in economic activity in the region resulting from household spending of income earned through a direct or indirect effect of the visitor spending. For example, motel and linen supply employees live in the region and spend their incomes on housing, groceries, education, clothing and other goods and services.
Total effects	Sum of direct, indirect and induced effects. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Direct effects accrue largely to tourism-related businesses in the area</li> <li>▪ Indirect effects accrue to a broader set of businesses that serve these tourism firms.</li> <li>▪ Induced effects are distributed widely across a variety of local businesses.</li> </ul>

## Appendix B: Handling of Missing Spending Data and Outliers

To compute spending averages and to sum spending across categories, spending categories with missing spending data had to be filled. If spending was reported in any category, the remaining categories were assumed to be zero. This yielded 238 cases with valid spending data, 12 cases reporting zero spending and 14 cases not completing the spending question. Cases with no spending data were on day trips or overnight trips reporting no lodging expenses. It was assumed that these cases spent no money in the local area.

**Table B-1. Cases with Valid, Zero and Missing Spending Data by Segment**

	Local	Day trip	Motel	Camp	Other OVN	Total
Report some spending	19	131	52	14	22	238
Missing spending data	0	11	0	0	3	14
<u>Zero spending</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>12</u>
Total cases	22	148	52	14	28	264
Percent zero	14%	4%	0%	0%	11%	5%
Percent missing	0%	7%	0%	0%	11%	5%

Eleven cases were omitted from the spending analysis. Eight of these were large parties of more than eight people. Three cases reported stays of more than seven nights. The overall spending average is \$137 omitting outliers compared to \$154 with outliers.

**Table B-2. Spending Averages by Segment, with and without outliers**

Segment	With outliers			Without outliers			
	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Pct Error <sup>a</sup>
Local	41	22	39	41	22	39	40%
Day trip	58	148	104	52	144	63	20%
Motel	488	52	497	419	49	382	26%
Camp	235	14	187	177	12	113	36%
<u>Other OVN</u>	<u>91</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>190</u>	<u>59</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>75</u>	<u>49%</u>
Total	154	264	298	137	253	229	21%

Note: Spending averages exclude park fees.

a. Pct errors computed at a 95% confidence level

## Appendix C. Impacts of all Visitor Spending, 2006

Table C1 gives the impacts of \$2.1 million in visitor spending on the local economy. All visitor spending in the region except park fees and donations is included in this analysis. Impacts including all visitor spending are roughly 32% higher than those reported in Table 8, which count only spending directly attributable to the park visits.

**Table C-1. Impacts of all Visitor Spending on the Local Economy, 2006**

Sector/Spending category	Sales \$000's	Jobs	Labor Income \$000's	Value Added \$000's
<b>Direct Effects</b>				
Motel, hotel cabin or B&B	630	9	276	446
Camping fees	40	1	3	8
Restaurants & bars	418	10	162	183
Admissions & fees	45	1	17	28
Local transportation	109	1	66	75
Grocery stores	26	1	10	14
Gas stations	78	1	30	39
Other retail	175	4	82	115
Wholesale Trade	26	0	16	18
<u>Local Production of goods</u>	<u>49</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>13</u>
<b>Total Direct Effects</b>	1,595 <sup>a</sup>	27	670	938
<u>Secondary Effects</u>	<u>854</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>264</u>	<u>451</u>
<b>Total Effects</b>	2,450	38	935	1,389

a. Total direct sales are less than visitor spending as direct sales excludes the cost of goods sold at retail unless the good is locally made.