

Impacts of Visitor Spending on the Local Economy: Effigy Mounds National Monument, 2004



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

May 2006



National Park Service
Social Science Program

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

MICHIGAN STATE
UNIVERSITY

Impacts of Visitor Spending on the Local Economy: Effigy Mounds National Monument, 2004

Executive Summary

Effigy Mounds National Monument (EFMO) hosted 93,575 recreation visits in 2004. Based on the 2004 visitor survey 12% of the visitors are local residents, 42% are visitors from outside the local area not staying overnight within a half hour drive of the park, and 45% are visitors staying overnight in the local area. About half of the overnight visitors (52%) are staying in motels, cabins or B&B's, 44% are camping and 5 % are staying with friends or relatives or other unpaid lodging.

The average visitor spent \$128 in the local area. Visitors reported expenditures of their group inside the park and within 50 miles of the park. On a party trip basis, average spending in 2004 was \$50 for local residents, \$44 for non-local day trips, \$287 for visitors in motels, \$171 for campers and \$69 for other overnight visitors. On a per night basis, visitors staying in motels spent \$156 in the local region compared to \$76 for campers and \$30 for other overnight visitors. The average per night lodging cost was \$72 per night for visitors staying in motels and \$15 for visitors in campgrounds.

Total visitor spending in 2004 within 50 miles of the park was \$4.5 million including \$270,000 spent in the park. Thirty-one percent of the spending was for lodging, 20% restaurant meals and bar expenses, 13% gas and oil and 14% souvenirs including the park gift shop. Overnight visitors staying in motels accounted for 52% of the spending.

Not all of this spending would be lost to the region in the absence of the park. Local residents would likely divert their spending to other activities in the area. The majority of non-local visitors did not come to the area primarily to visit Effigy Mounds NM, so only a portion of their expenses can be attributed to the park visit.

Spending directly attributed to the park was estimated by counting all spending for visitors whose primary reason for coming to the area was to visit the park. Half of the spending outside the park was counted if Effigy Mounds NM was one of several destinations on the trip and only spending inside the park was counted if the park was not a planned stop. All spending inside the park was attributed to the park, while all spending by local residents outside the park was excluded. These procedures yield a total of \$1.7 million in spending attributed to the park, about 38% of the \$4.5 million spent by park visitors in the area.

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 six county area in northeastern Iowa and southwestern Wisconsin.

Including direct and secondary effects, the \$1.72 million spent by park visitors supports 37 jobs in the area and generates \$1.7 million in sales, \$630,000 in personal

income and \$ 937,000 in value added. Value added includes wages and salaries as well as profits and rents to area businesses and sales taxes.

Recreation visits declined by about 5% in 2005. This drop was offset by a similar increase in spending per visitor. The park itself employed 24 people in FY 2005 with a total payroll of \$914,000. Including secondary effects, the local impact of park operations in 2005 was 30 jobs, \$1.03 million in personal income and \$1.14 total value added. Including both visitor spending and park operations, the total impact of the park on the local economy in 2005 was 67 jobs and \$1.97 million value added. Park operations account for 45% of the employment effects and 52% of value added.

Impacts of Visitor Spending on the Local Economy: Effigy Mounds National Monument, 2001

Daniel J. Stynes
May 2005

Introduction

The purpose of this study is to document the local economic impacts of visitors to Effigy Mounds National Monument (EFMO) in 2004. 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 Effigy Mounds NM 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, personal income, jobs and value added in the region.

Effigy Mounds National Monument and the Local Region

Effigy Mounds National Monument is located in northeastern Iowa along the western shore of the Mississippi River. The park was established in 1949 to preserve hundreds of examples of prehistoric American Indian mound building and to interpret the archeological resources on the site. The park hosted 93,575 recreation visitors in 2004 and 88,546 in 2005. About 70% of the visitation is between June and October (Table 1).

The local region covers a six county area in northeastern Iowa and southwestern Wisconsin including Allamakee, Clayton, Fayette, and Winneshiek counties in Iowa and Crawford and Grant counties in Wisconsin. This region roughly coincides with the fifty mile driving distance for which spending was reported in the visitor survey. The predominantly rural six county region had a population of 142,000 in 2004.

Table 1. Recreation Visits to Effigy Mounds NM, 2004-2005

Month	2004	2005
January	3,212	2,751
February	3,656	3,874
March	4,627	4,588
April	5,404	6,517
May	7,394	9,742
June	11,026	9,009
July	14,643	12,966
August	10,903	8,437
September	16,385	11,296
October	12,378	15,745
November	1,938	1,901
<u>December</u>	<u>2,009</u>	<u>1,720</u>
Total	93,575	88,546

Source: NPS Public Use Statistics

Effigy Mounds NM Visitor Survey, 2004

A park visitor study was conducted at Effigy Mounds NM from July 25-31, 2004 (Le, Morgan and Hollenhorst, 2005). The study measured visitor demographics, activities, and travel expenditures. Questionnaires were distributed to a sample of 380 visitors primarily at the park visitor center. Visitors returned 293 questionnaires for a 77% response rate. Data generated through the visitor survey were used as the basis to develop the spending profiles, segment shares and trip characteristics for EFMO visitors.

Most visitors spent two to three hours at the park. Only 24% of non-local visitors came to the area primarily to visit Effigy Mounds NM. Thirty percent came to visit other attractions in the area, 11% to visit friends or relatives in the area.

MGM2 Visitor Segments

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

Local day users: Day visitors who reside within the local region, defined as a 50 mile radius 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 50 miles of the park

Camp: Visitors staying in private or public campgrounds within 50 miles of the park

Other OVN: Other visitors staying overnight in the area with friends or relatives or not reporting any lodging expenses

The 2004 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. Twelve percent of the visitors are local residents, 42% are visitors from outside the local area not staying overnight within 50 miles of the park, and 46% are visitors staying overnight within 50 miles of the park. About half of the overnight visitors (52%) are staying in motels, cabins or B&B's, 44% are camping and 5% are staying with friends or relatives or other unpaid lodging (Table 2)¹. The average spending party ranged from 2.3 to 3.5 people across the five visitor segments.

Only twenty percent of visitors indicated that visiting the park was the primary reason for the trip to the area. Forty-eight percent indicated the park was one of several destinations and 32% had not planned to stop at 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. Less than ten percent of visitors on overnight trips made the trip primarily to visit the park.

Table 2. Selected Visit/Trip Characteristics by Segment, 2004

Characteristic	Local	Day trip	Motel	Camp	Other OVN	Total
Segment share	12%	42%	24%	20%	2%	100%
Average Party size	2.90	3.06	2.72	2.34	3.50	2.86
Length of stay (days/nights)	1.21	1.00	1.84	2.25	2.33	1.60
Percent primary purpose trips	58%	19%	10%	7%	7%	20%

Effigy Mounds NM hosted 93,575 recreation visitors in 2004. Recreation visits were allocated to the five segments using the segment shares in Table 1. These visits are converted to 33,460 party trips by dividing by the average party size for each segment (Table 3). Total visitor spending is estimated by multiplying the number of party trips of each segment by the average spending estimated in the survey.

Table 3. Recreation Visits and Party Trips by Segment, 2004

Measure	Local	Day trip	Motel	Camp	Other OVN	Total
Recreation visits	11,497	39,602	22,036	18,523	1,916	93,575
Party visits/trips	3,960	12,934	8,100	7,918	547	33,460

¹ These percentages vary slightly from the VSP report (Manni and Hollenhorst, 2005) 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.

Visitor spending

Spending averages were computed on a party trip basis for each segment. The survey covered expenditures of the travel party within 50 miles of the park.

The average visitor group in 2004 spent \$128 on the trip². On a party trip basis, average spending was \$50 for local residents, \$44 for non-local day trips, \$287 for visitors in motels, \$171 for campers and \$69 for other overnight visitors (Table 4). On a per night basis, visitors in motels spent \$156 in the local region compared to \$76 for campers and \$30 for other overnight visitors. The average per night lodging cost was \$72 per night for visitors in motels and \$15 for visitors staying in campgrounds.

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

	Local	Day trip	Motel	Camp	Other OVN	All Visitors
In Park						
Admissions	2.32	3.04	3.50	4.61	1.56	3.34
Gift shop	1.65	5.85	3.82	3.93	4.30	4.44
Donations	0.00	0.41	0.19	0.27	0.59	0.28
In Community						
Motel, hotel cabin or B&B	0.00	0.00	133.50	5.71	0.00	32.57
Camping fees	1.61	0.00	0.00	34.21	0.00	6.97
Restaurants & bars	12.81	13.39	56.21	27.02	25.63	26.35
Groceries, take-out food/drinks	12.42	2.19	18.29	26.02	7.85	12.07
Gas & oil	12.39	8.61	23.24	30.21	17.44	16.98
Local transportation	0.97	0.00	7.93	2.68	0.00	2.52
Admissions & fees	1.48	4.70	14.04	11.07	8.59	7.85
Souvenirs and other expenses	3.87	5.90	24.40	24.80	2.96	13.69
<u>Donations</u>	<u>0.00</u>	<u>0.22</u>	<u>2.12</u>	<u>0.38</u>	<u>0.37</u>	<u>0.68</u>
Grand Total	49.52	44.32	287.24	170.91	69.30	127.73
Total in park	3.97	9.30	7.51	8.80	6.44	8.07
Total Outside park	45.55	35.02	279.72	162.11	62.85	119.67

² The average of \$128 is lower than the \$149 spending average in the VSP report (Le, Morgan and Hollenhorst. al. 2005) due to the omission of some outliers and treatment of missing spending data.

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

	Motel	Camp	Other OVN
Spending In Community			
Motel, hotel cabin or B&B	72.41	2.55	0.00
Camping fees	0.00	15.24	0.00
Restaurants & bars	30.48	12.03	10.98
Groceries, take-out food/drinks	9.92	11.59	3.37
Gas & oil	12.60	13.46	7.48
Local transportation	4.30	1.19	0.00
Admissions & fees	7.62	4.93	3.68
Souvenirs and other expenses	13.23	11.05	1.27
<u>Donations</u>	<u>1.15</u>	<u>0.17</u>	<u>0.16</u>
Grand Total	155.79	76.12	29.70

The sampling error at a 95% confidence level for the overall spending average is 16%. A 95% confidence interval for the overall spending average is (\$108, \$148). The sampling error for the motel segment is 18%. Sampling errors for other segments with smaller sample sizes are higher.

Effigy Mounds NM visitors spent a total of \$4.5 million in the local area in 2004 (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.

Table 6. Total Visitor Spending by Segment, 2004 (\$000s)

	Local	Day trip	Motel	Camp	Other OVN	All Visitors
In Park						
Admissions	9.2	39.3	28.3	36.5	0.9	114.2
Gift shop	6.5	75.6	31.0	31.1	2.4	146.6
Donations	0.0	5.3	1.5	2.1	0.3	9.3
In Community						
Motel, hotel cabin or B&B	0.0	0.0	1,081.3	45.2	0.0	1,126.6
Camping fees	6.4	0.0	0.0	270.9	0.0	277.3
Restaurants & bars	50.7	173.2	455.3	213.9	14.0	907.1
Groceries, take-out food/drinks	49.2	28.4	148.2	206.0	4.3	436.1
Gas & oil	49.1	111.4	188.2	239.2	9.6	597.4
Local transportation	3.8	0.0	64.2	21.2	0.0	89.2
Admissions & fees	5.9	60.8	113.8	87.7	4.7	272.8
Souvenirs and other expenses	15.3	76.3	197.6	196.4	1.6	487.3
<u>Donations</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>2.9</u>	<u>17.2</u>	<u>3.0</u>	<u>0.2</u>	<u>23.2</u>
Grand Total	196.1	573.2	2,326.6	1,353.3	37.9	4,487.1
Total In park	15.7	120.2	60.9	69.7	3.5	270.1
Total Outside park	180.4	453.0	2,265.7	1,283.6	34.4	4,217.1
Segment Percent of Total	4%	13%	52%	30%	1%	100%

Overnight visitors staying in motels accounted for 52% of the total spending. Lodging accounted for 31% of the total spending, restaurants and bars 20% and gas and oil 13%.

Not all of this spending would be lost to the region in the absence of the park as most visitors did not make the trip primarily to visit the park. 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 and half of the spending outside the park if the park was one of several planned destinations. All spending inside the park was counted, but all spending by local visitors outside the park was excluded.

These attributions yield a total of \$1.72 million in visitor spending attributed to the park visit, representing 38% of the overall visitor spending total. Overnight trips account for the majority of spending attributed to park (Table 7).

Table 7. Total Spending Attributed to Park Visits, 2004 (\$000s)

	Local	Day trip	Motel	Camp	Other OVN	All Visitors
In Park						
Admissions	9.2	39.3	28.3	36.5	0.9	114.2
Gift shop		36.3	12.8	9.0	0.8	58.8
Donations	0.0	5.3	1.5	2.1	0.3	9.3
In Community						
Motel, hotel cabin or B&B		0.0	445.3	13.1	0.0	458.4
Camping fees		0.0	0.0	78.4	0.0	78.4
Restaurants & bars		83.1	187.5	61.9	4.7	337.1
Groceries, take-out food/drinks		13.6	61.0	59.6	1.4	135.7
Gas & oil		53.4	77.5	69.3	3.2	203.4
Local transportation		0.0	26.4	6.1	0.0	32.6
Admissions & fees		29.2	46.8	25.4	1.6	103.0
Souvenirs and other expenses		36.6	81.4	56.9	0.5	175.4
Donations		1.4	7.1	0.9	0.1	9.4
Total Attributed to Park	9.2	298.2	975.6	419.2	13.4	1,715.6
Percent of all spending attributed to the park	5%	52%	42%	31%	35%	38%

Economic Impacts of Visitor Spending

The economic impacts of Effigy Mounds NM 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 1.36. Every dollar of direct sales to visitors generates another \$.36 in secondary sales through indirect and induced effects³.

Impacts are estimated based on the visitor spending attributed to the park in Table 7⁴. Including direct and secondary effects, the \$1.72 million spent by park visitors⁵ supports 37 jobs in the area and generates \$1.7 million in sales, \$630,000 in personal income and \$ 937,000 in value added (Table 8). Personal 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 of income to the area, payroll benefits to workers, profits and rents to businesses, and sales and other indirect business taxes. The largest direct effects are in lodging establishments and restaurants.

Table 8. Economic Impacts of Visitor Spending Attributed to the Park, 2004.

Sector/Spending category	Sales \$000's	Jobs	Personal Income \$000's	Value Added \$000's
Direct Effects				
Motel, hotel cabin or B&B	458	14	200	325
Camping fees	78	1	8	18
Restaurants & bars	337	9	128	145
Admissions & fees	103	1	38	64
Local transportation	33	1	19	22
Retail Trade	197	4	90	118
Wholesale Trade	28	0	11	18
<u>Local Production of goods</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>
Total Direct Effects	1,246	31	495	711
<u>Secondary Effects</u>	<u>450</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>135</u>	<u>226</u>
Total Effects	1,696	37	630	937

³ 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.

⁴ The local economic impact of all \$4.5 million in visitor spending (Table 6) is reported in Appendix C.

⁵ 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.

2005 Update

The spending and impact estimates may be updated to 2005 based on reported recreation visits in 2005. Recreation visits declined slightly in 2005 to 88,546. The visitor segment mix, party sizes and lengths of stay were assumed unchanged from 2004. Spending averages measured in the 2004 visitor survey were price adjusted to 2005 using Bureau of Labor Statistics price indices for each spending category. Spending averages increased by about five percent in 2005 compared to 2004.

The five percent drop in visits was largely offset by the increase in spending averages to leave total spending and local impacts largely unchanged in 2005 (Table 9).

Table 9. Update of Spending Estimates to 2005

	Local	Day trip	Motel	Camp	Other OVN	Total
Average Spending (\$ per party)						
2004	50	44	287	171	69	132
2005	52	47	302	182	73	139
Total Spending (\$000's)						
2004	196	573	2,327	1,353	38	4,487
2005	196	570	2,316	1,364	38	4,486
Spending Attributed to the Park (\$000's)						
2004	9	298	976	419	13	1,716
2005	10	314	1,026	447	14	1,809

The park itself employed 24 people in FY 2005 with a total payroll of \$914,000. Including secondary effects, the local impact of park operations in 2005 was 30 jobs, \$1.03 million in personal income and \$1.14 total value added. Including both visitor spending and park operations, the total impact of the park on the local economy in 2005 was 67 jobs and \$1.97 million value added. Park operations account for 45% of the employment effects and 52% 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.

Spending averages are derived from the 2004 Effigy Mounds NM Visitor Survey. Estimates from the survey are subject to sampling errors, measurement errors and seasonal/sampling biases. Due to relatively small samples and considerable variation in spending, the overall spending average is subject to sampling errors of 16%.

Spending averages can also be sensitive to decisions about outliers and treatment of missing data. Outliers were not a major problem for Effigy Mounds as there was only one spending outlier (reporting more than \$1,000). Ten cases with large party sizes (more than 7 people) were also dropped (See Appendix B, Table B2)⁶.

To estimate spending averages incomplete spending data had to be filled and decisions had to be made about the handling of missing spending data and zero spending reports. Of the 293 respondents to the survey, 5 cases reported zero spending and 31 cases did not complete the spending question at all (see Appendix B, Table B1).

Spending averages were estimated under conservative assumptions. First, cases reporting some expenses but leaving other categories blank were filled with zeros. Respondents that did not complete the spending question were assumed to spend no money on the trip and those reporting zero spending were deemed valid responses. Respondents with zero or missing spending reports were all local residents or visitors on day trips. Omitting cases with missing spending data instead of treating them as zeros would increase the spending average from \$128 to \$143. This would increase overall spending totals and impacts by about 12%.

Although sample sizes are small for most segments, the spending averages are consistent with those at other historical sites. 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. Visits are taken from NPS public use statistics.

More problematic than the errors in visits, spending or multipliers is sorting out how much of the spending to attribute to the park. As the park was not the primary motivation for the trip to the region for most visitors, much 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. Thirty-eight percent of all visitor spending is attributed to park visits under the stated assumptions.

⁶ Reports of spending for long stays are deemed unreliable. Spending reported for large parties may not include everyone in the party. Since spending averages are applied to all visits, omitting these cases is equivalent to substituting the average spending of visitors in the corresponding visitor segment for these outliers.

REFERENCES

- Le, Y., Morgan, M. and Hollenhorst, S.J. (2005). Effigy Mounds National Monument Visitor Study. Summer 2004. Visitor Services Project Report #159. Moscow, ID: National Park Service and University of Idaho, Cooperative Park Studies Unit.
- National Park Service Public Use Statistics Office. (2006). Visitation DataBase. <http://www2.nature.nps.gov/stats/>. Data retrieved on May 1, 2006.
- 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.
Personal income	Wage and salary income, sole proprietor's income and employee payroll benefits.
Value added	Personal 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"> ▪ Direct effects accrue largely to tourism-related businesses in the area ▪ Indirect effects accrue to a broader set of businesses that serve these tourism firms. ▪ Induced effects are distributed widely across a variety of local businesses.

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 257 cases with valid spending data, 5 cases reporting zero spending and 31 cases not completing the spending question. All of the cases with missing or no spending reported were local residents or day trips. 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	26	98	69	58	6	257
Missing spending data	7	24	0	0	0	31
<u>Zero spending</u>	3	2	0	0	0	5
Total cases	36	124	69	58	6	293
Percent zero	8%	2%	0%	0%	0%	2%
Percent missing	19%	19%	0%	0%	0%	11%

One case reporting spending more than \$1,000 was dropped when computing spending averages. Another 10 cases with party sizes greater than seven were also omitted, yielding a final sample of 282 cases for the spending analysis. The overall spending average is \$128 omitting outliers compared to \$133 with outliers.

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

Segment	With outliers			Without outliers			Pct Error ^a
	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	
Local	45	36	93	50	31	100	71%
Day trip	48	124	127	44	122	78	31%
Motel	285	69	212	287	68	213	18%
Camp	175	58	165	171	56	166	25%
<u>Other OVN</u>	<u>251</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>101</u>	<u>69</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>43%</u>
Total	133	293	181	128	282	173	16%

a. Pct errors computed at a 95% confidence level

Appendix C. Impacts of all Visitor Spending, 2004

Table C1 gives the impacts of \$4.5 million in visitor spending on the local economy. All visitor spending in the region except park admissions and donations is included in this analysis. Impacts attributed to the park in Table 8 are about 70% of the impacts when all visitor spending is included.

Table C-1. Impacts of all Visitor Spending on Local Economy, 2004

Sector/Spending category	Sales \$000's	Jobs	Personal Income \$000's	Value Added \$000's
Direct Effects				
Motel, hotel cabin or B&B	609	19	266	431
Camping fees	150	1	14	34
Restaurants & bars	490	14	186	210
Admissions & fees	147	2	55	92
Local transportation	48	1	28	32
Retail Trade	303	6	139	182
Wholesale Trade	45	1	17	29
<u>Local Production of goods</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>
Total Direct Effects	1,811	44	706	1,013
<u>Secondary Effects</u>	<u>658</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>197</u>	<u>330</u>
Total Effects	2,469	53	904	1,343