

2014 MARICOPA COUNTY PARKS AND RECREATION DEPARTMENT STUDY REPORT

Economic Impact of the Maricopa County Parks and Recreation System

Prepared by:

Deepak Chhabra, Ph.D.

Project Contributors:

Eric Steffey, Graduate Research Assistant

Shengnan Zhao, Ph.D. (Volunteer)

School of Community Resources and Development

College of Public Programs

411 North Central Avenue

Suite 550

Arizona State University, Phoenix, USA

602-496-0172

Deepak.chhabra@asu.edu

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	5
2. INTRODUCTION	7
3. DATA SOURCES AND METHODS	10
4. FINDINGS	13
5. REFERENCES	22
6. APPENDIX A: Tax Tables	24
7. APPENDIX B: Estrella Mountain Regional Park	26
8. APPENDIX C: White Tank Mountain Regional Park	28
9. APPENDIX D: McDowell Mountain Regional Park	30
10. APPENDIX E: San Tan Mountain Regional Park	32
11. APPENDIX F: Spur Cross Ranch Conservation Area	34
12. APPENDIX G: Utery Mountain Regional Park	36
13. APPENDIX H: Cave Creek Regional Park	38
14. APPENDIX I: Lake Pleasant Regional Park	40

LIST OF CONTENT TABLES

Table 1 Maricopa County Parks and Recreation Visitations	13
Table 2 Total Visitor Expenditures for all Parks	14
Table 3 Economic Impact of Visitor Spending	14
Table 4 Economic Impact of MCPRD Operating Expenses	15
Table 5 Local Economic Contributions and Impact of Visitor Spending.....	16
Table 6 Local impacts of Visitor– Federal and State/Local Taxes	17
Table 7 Local impacts of Visitor Spending in the Phoenix MSA.....	17
Table 8 Visitor Impact on State, Local and Federal Taxes	18
Table 9 MCPRD Expenses	18
Table 10 Local impacts of Operating Expenses	19
Table 11 Local Impact of Operating Expenses on State, Local and Federal Tax.....	20
Table 12 Impact of Operating Expenses in the Phoenix MSA.....	20
Table 13 Impact of Operating Expenses on State, Local and Federal Taxes in the Phoenix MSA	21

List of APPENDIX TABLES

Table A.1 Definition of Tax Types for State and Local Governments	24
Table A.2 Definition of Tax Types for Federal Government	25
Table B.1: Estrella Mountain Regional Park Visitor Expenditures	26
Table B.2: Impact of Estrella Mountain Regional Park Visitor Spending.....	26
Table B.3: Impact of Estrella Mountain Regional Park Visitor Spending on State, Local and Federal Taxes	26
Table B.4: Impact of Estrella Mountain Regional Park Operational Expenses	27
Table B.5: Impact of Estrella Mountain Regional Park Operational Expenses on Local, State tax and Federal taxes	27
Table C.1: White Tank Mountain Regional Park Expenditures.....	28
Table C.2: Impact of White Tank Mountain Regional Park Visitor Spending	28
Table C.3: Impact of White Tank Mountain Regional Park Visitor Spending on State, Local and Federal Taxes	28
Table C. 4: Impact of White Tank Mountain Regional Park Operational Expenses	29
Table C.5: Impact of White Tank Mountain Regional Park Operational Expenses on Local, State tax and Federal taxes	29
Table D.1: McDowell Mountain Regional Park	30
Table D.2: Impact of McDowell Mountain Regional Park Visitor Expenditures	30
Table D.3: Impact of McDowell Mountain Regional Park Visitor Expenditures on State, Local and Federal Taxes	30
Table D.4: Impact of McDowell Mountain Regional Park Operating Expenses	31
Table D.5: Impact of McDowell Mountain Regional Park Operating Expenses on Local, State tax and Federal taxes	31
Table E.1: San Tan Mountain Regional Park	32
Table E.2: Impact of San Tan Mountain Regional Park Visitor Expenditures.....	32
Table E.3: Impact of San Tan Mountain Regional Park Visitor Expenditures on State, Local and Federal Taxes	32
Table E.4: Impact of San Tan Mountain Regional Park Operating Expenses.....	33
Table E.5: Impact of San Tan Mountain Regional Park Operating Expenses on Local, State tax and Federal taxes	33
Table F.1: Spur Cross Ranch Conservation Area	34
Table F.2: Impact of Spur Cross Ranch Conservation Area Visitor Expenditures.....	34
Table F.3: Impact of Spur Cross Ranch Conservation Area Visitor Expenditures on State and Local/Federal Taxes.....	34
Table F.4: Impact of Spur Cross Ranch Conservation Area Operating Expenses.....	35
Table F.5: Impact of Spur Cross Ranch Conservation Area Operating Expenses on Local, State tax and Federal taxes	35
Table G.1: Usery Mountain Regional Park	36
Table G.2: Impact of Usery Mountain Regional Park Visitor Expenditures	36
Table G.3: Impact of Usery Mountain Regional Park Visitor Expenditures on State, Local and Federal Taxes	36
Table G.4: Impact of Usery Mountain Regional Park Operating Expenses	37
Table G.5: Impact of Usery Mountain Regional Park Operating Expenses on Local, State Tax and Federal Taxes	37
Table H.1: Cave Creek Regional Park	38

Table H.2: Impact of Cave Creek Regional Park Visitor Expenditures.....	39
Table H.3: Impact of Cave Creek Regional Park Visitor Expenditures on State, Local and Federal Taxes	39
Table H.4: Impact of Cave Creek Regional Park Operating Expenses.....	39
Table H.5: Impact of Cave Creek Regional Park Operating Expenses on Local, State tax and Federal taxes	39
Table I.1: Lake Pleasant Regional Park	40
Table I.2: Impact of Lake Pleasant Regional Park Visitor Expenditures	40
Table I.3: Impact of Lake Pleasant Regional Park Visitor Expenditures on State, Local and Federal. Taxes	41
Table I.4: Impact of Lake Pleasant Regional Park Operating Expenses	41
Table I.5: Impact of Lake Pleasant Regional Park Operating Expenses on Local, State tax and Federal taxes	41

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Maricopa County Parks and Recreation Department manages ten regional parks. These parks attract both local and non-local visitors from Arizona and beyond. They provide important benefits to visitors and the local community in terms of conservation, outdoor recreation and education opportunities, and economic contributions. The purpose of this study was to calculate economic impact of visitors to eight iconic parks managed by the Department: those are Cave Creek Regional Park, Estrella Mountain Regional Park, Lake Pleasant Regional Park, McDowell Mountain Regional Park, San Tan Mountain Regional Park, Spur Cross Regional Park, Userly Mountain Regional Park, and White Tank Mountain Regional Park.

Analysis of data for the year 2014 shows that recreation spending by park visitors to the parks and the operating budget supports a considerable amount of economic activity within Maricopa County for eight regional parks and spreads to Yavapai County for Lake Pleasant Regional Park and Pinal County for San Tan Mountain Regional Park. The Maricopa County Parks and Recreation Department (MCPRD) generated a total of \$24.2 million (\$13.7 million in visitor expenditures and \$10.5 million in overall operating expenses). Total economic contribution of the Maricopa County Parks and Recreation Department on the local gateway regions is \$24.2 million in output, \$17 million in gross regional product (value added), \$11.7 million in labor income, 255 in full time jobs, and \$2.2 million in federal taxes and \$1.2 million in state and local taxes. Further breakdown of the key results are presented below:

- The eight parks received approximately 1.42 million recreation visits in 2014. The park visitors spent \$13.7 million in local gateway regions (within roughly 10 miles of each park). Out of these, on an average, 14.7% were non-local visitors across all eight parks and they incurred a total of \$7.2 million. Total number of retained visitors was 365,308 and their spending was approximately \$6.3 million. The contribution of this spending to the local economy is 139 full time jobs, \$4.6 million in labor income, \$7.3 million in gross regional product, \$.9 million in federal tax contributions and \$.7 million in state/local tax contributions. The top five industries significantly impacted by visitor spending in terms of gross regional product and labor income are wholesale trade businesses, retail stores (food & beverage), hotels and motels, equipment rental companies, and misc. retail stores (souvenir vendors).
- The MCPRD operating expenses associated with the eight parks (\$8.2 million) generated \$12.9 million in output, \$9.7 in gross regional product, \$7.1 million in labor income, 116 full time jobs, \$1.3 million in total federal tax contributions and \$.5 million in total state/local tax contributions. Top industries impacted by the MCPRD expenses include employment and payroll, commercial and industrial machinery and equipment repair and maintenance, food services and drinking places, real estate establishments, facilities support services, miscellaneous retail stores, general merchandise retail stores, office of physicians, dentists and other health practitioners, private hospitals and employment services.
- The park leverage ratio (calculated by dividing total labor income generated for all eight parks by total operating expenses for the eight parks (\$8.2 million) is 1:1.42. This means that for each county dollar invested in net operating cost by MCPRD in the eight parks, \$1.42 is

generated in resident income. Therefore, an investment in the form of operating budgets by the county delivers little over 40% return in investment in the local gateway regions.

- Total spending by the Maricopa County Parks and Recreation Department (visitor expenditures and operational expenses) in the Phoenix MSA (comprising of Pinal and Maricopa counties) supported \$24.2 million in output, \$20.8 million in gross regional product, \$14.2 million in labor income and 301 jobs. The park leverage ratio for the Phoenix MSA is 1:72. Further breakdown of economic contributions shows that visitor spending generated \$12.5 million in sales, \$8.1 million in gross regional product, \$5.1 million in labor income, 153 full time jobs, \$1.0 million in total federal tax contributions, \$.8 million in total State/local tax contributions. Economic contributions of operational expenses are \$16.7 million in sales, \$12.7 million in value added, \$9.1 million in labor income, 148 full time jobs, \$1.7 million in total federal tax contributions, and \$.6 million total in State/local tax contribution.

Limitations

Like all studies, this study is also subject to logistical and methodological limitations. It is highly likely that the economic impact of visitor spending at all eight parks is underestimated. The study used existing data which was focused on a limited number of tourist expenditure items. For instance, spending on groceries, car rental, and vehicle repair could not be ascertained. Also the existing data grouped lodging into a ‘camping and other lodging’ category. Expenditures grouped under the ‘other’ category could not be analyzed through the economic impact software, hence were excluded.

For comprehensive economic impact results, a future study based on primary data collection is recommended and a proposal for this study has already been submitted to MCPRD by Arizona State University. The proposed research study will collect primary data to provide a comprehensive view of visitor markets and their economic impact in the gateway region/s including the region that lies within a 45 minute drive of each park. It will require usage of online, onsite, and mail-back visitor surveys and interviews of vendors/relevant stakeholders inside the park grounds.

Acknowledgements

The project team would like to acknowledge the study team headed by Megha Budruk (Associate Professor) for providing raw data on Maricopa County Parks and Recreation Department. This study could not have been completed without the generous sharing of the existing data by the previous study team.

This study also acknowledges Dale Larsen (Professor of Practice) for his editing suggestions. Dale’s forty year career in municipal parks and recreation has provided great practitioner and management insights.

INTRODUCTION

The Maricopa County Parks and Recreation Department covers approximately 119,403 acres and is comprised of ten parks across the greater Phoenix region. Eight of these parks (spanning 112,979 acres) are included in the economic impact analyses. These parks, managed by MCPRD, serve as recreation destinations for visitors from across the nation and around the world and offer benefits to Maricopa County, Yavapai County, the Phoenix MSA, and their local residents in the form of conservation, outdoor recreation and educational opportunities. Additionally, these parks and their facilities, services and amenities make economic contributions to local communities through expenditure of visitors (Crompton 2010). In other words, spending by MCPRD visitors and retained locals generates supports a considerable amount of economic activity within park gateway communities. Expenses incurred by MCPRD to manage the parks also generate economic benefits for the local gateway regions.

The purpose of this study is to document the economic impact of tourists and retained local spending (primary purpose non-local visitors and locals who would have visited a park outside the study area in the absence of the visited park). The study's method is based on surveys of park visitors in the 'Maricopa County Park Visitor Study' during the 2013-2014 financial year. The data was collected to gather information from visitors to understand travel and recreation motivations, travel and visit behavior, activity preferences, spending and satisfaction levels of visitors so that MCPRD can improve future service. The economic impact analysis uses spending and travel behavior data from that study to measure how spending by MCPRD visitor circulates through local gateway economies, generating business sales and supporting local jobs and resident income.

For the purpose of this study, a visitor is defined as a non-local or a local who would have traveled outside the local region if the existing park had been absent. Visitor expenditure data is taken from an existing Maricopa County Parks Visitor study. IMPLAN modeling software is used and is to date, is the most commonly used software to determine economic impacts of recreation and tourism in the United States. It uses an input/output modeling technique to understand how a local economy functions and the economic benefits of tourism and recreation activities/facilities. The currently available IMPLAN Version 3 modeling system uses 440 distinct sectors and can offer a summary of economic impact in the county in terms of changes in jobs, household income, tax impacts, and gross regional product as new expenditures are injected into the economy. It is used to measure the impact of visitor expenditures and park operating expenses on local economies in terms of output, value added, labor income, federal and state/local taxes. The operating budget for the Maricopa County Parks and Recreation Department denotes an investment by Maricopa County. There are two ways return on this investment can be measured: 1) economic impact generated by visitors and 2) the leverage ratio- or the number of dollars generated for local residents for every dollar invested by the MCPRD in the annual operating expenses (Greenwood & Vick 2008). Leverage ratio is calculated by dividing labor income with operating expenses.

This study is unique because it also includes retained spending of locals residing in the study area for each park. It is argued that spending of residents, who would have gone to a substitute park outside the study area if the regional park had been absent, is retained spending. This spending is retained by the park and its absence would have made this resident segment incur spending

outside the study area.

Dollars spent by visitors in the form of entrance fees, permits and licenses and camping fees are forwarded to MCPRD and do not directly enter the local economy through visitor spending. Therefore, these items are excluded from economic impact calculations. Camping revenue goes to MCPRD whereas other lodging expenses benefits area businesses. Through cross tabs, other lodging expenses for only two parks could be ascertained. It was not possible to calculate other lodging expenditures for other parks. Moreover, Lake Pleasant Regional Park has a Desert Outdoor Center; economic impact of the center and its events could not be ascertained because of lack of data.

Because of the above limitations, it is highly likely that the economic impact assessed by the study is underestimated.

Impact on Phoenix MSA is also ascertained. Phoenix MSA comprises of Maricopa and Pinal counties. However, caution needs to be exercised in considering the impact of Maricopa County Parks and Recreation Department on the Phoenix MSA because most parks and their employees reside in Maricopa County with the exception of the Lake Pleasant Regional Park and San Tan Mountain Regional Park..

Overview of Economic Effects Analyses

Visitors to Maricopa County parks incur spending money in local gateway regions, and these expenditures create ripple effects and facilitate economic production within host region economies. Extant literature confirms that natural resource-based attractions such as public parks are significant contributors to local economies (Greenwood and Vick 2008; National Resource Report 2012).

Economic impact of visitor and retained local expenditures in recreation and tourism comprises of direct, indirect and induced effects. *Direct impact* refers to whatever money a tourism enterprise receives directly through user fees, its souvenir or gift shop, its own snack shop sales, etc. *Indirect impact* happens when an attraction uses the direct money it receives to buy other goods to operate its attraction. For example, souvenirs purchased from another company, food and beverage or office supplies purchased from other companies or shops, building/site/artifact maintenance or operation expenses (tools purchased from outside the attraction), etc. So this means that this attraction generates indirect benefits for other suppliers. If these suppliers belong to the local region, then the local region will earn that money. If the suppliers are based outside the local or host region, then most of the money will be leaked out. This leakage is captured by multipliers where the higher the multiplier the lower the leakage and vice versa (Gunthar, Parr, Graziano & Carstensen 2011; Munn, Hussain, Spurlock & Henderson 2010; The Trust for Public Land 2010). *Induced impact* happens when the attraction hires employees through the direct economic benefits and these employees spend their income within the local region- it could be on groceries, housing, etc. but it will be part of the benefit generated by the attraction.

Next, we have economic impact of ancillary/support sectors. These support services would be the other supply side components that help make tourism happen. Parks need transportation, services such as restaurants, lodging, shops, and even other nearby attractions (as sometimes visitors like to

visit other places along with the primary visit to the heritage attraction) to make tourism happen (Crompton 2010). If visitors spend money on these support services, similar kind of economic impacts will be expected from each of the support sectors and this will indicate that the heritage attraction is producing economic impacts of its support sectors (Chhabra 2006; Crompton 2010; Munn et al. 2010). These impacts again can be: direct; indirect; and induced.

Multipliers capture indirect and induced effects. Higher multiplier values (normally range from 1:00 to 3:00) generate higher economic benefits. Higher multipliers mean goods are not imported from outside and are being produced locally (Crompton 1999, 2011; Chhabra 2006); in other words, there are less leakages or less money leaves the local gateway regions. Use/non-use of heritage implies measurement of a person's willingness to pay to use the park or willingness to pay even if one does not use it. In the latter case, a person may value the park in their mind and believe it provides benefit for the community and makes them feel nice to know it is there- so there is a value for it although the person may never visit it (Timothy & Boyd 2003). If a person has a non-use value, then they might not be willing to pay for use of the park.

Types of Economic Effects Measured

The economic effects of visitor spending to local economies are estimated by multiplying visitor spending by regional economic multipliers. Five types of economic impacts are calculated:

1. **Output:** can be described as the total value of production.
 2. **Employment:** refers to annual average jobs. This includes self-employed and wage and salary employees, and all full-time, part-time and seasonal jobs, based on a count of full-time/part-time average over twelve months.
 3. **Value Added:** is the combination of labor income, other property type income and indirect business taxes. Other property type income includes corporate profits, interest income and rental payments. Value added accounts for all non-commodity payments associated to an industry's production.
 4. **Labor Income:** is composed of two components. These are employee compensation and proprietor income. Employee compensation is total income to the labor factor of production. From the point of view of a business, employee compensation is the total cost of labor including wages and salaries, other labor related income like health and retirement benefits, and both employee and employer contributions to social insurance. Proprietor income is the total income to a sole proprietor or self-employed 'employee.'
- Indirect business taxes are taxes collected by businesses on behalf of the government. These include sales tax, excise tax, property tax, fees, fines, and licenses

Tax Impacts

These belong to the fifth category of impact and are categorized as Federal and State/local. The tax impact report provides information on tax collection by State/Local and Federal governments. The software used does not break out state taxes from county taxes in a region but if the impact region is local, then state/local tax implies local tax contributions and jobs. Table 1 (Appendix A) offers descriptions of tax types for State and Local Governments. Table 2 (Appendix A) describes tax types for federal governments.

Economic Regions

Appropriate study areas have to be mapped to compute economic impact of Maricopa County Park and Recreation Department non-local visitor and retained resident expenditures. Each park has its distinct set of characteristics and location. Several studies have defined local gateway communities as those lying within 50 or 60 mile radius of each park. For instance, the National Park Service economic impact report uses the 60-mile radius as its metric for drawing up local community parameters for each park within the US (Greenwood & Vick 2008; National Resource Report 2011). GIS data can assist in spatially determining counties located completely or partially within the mapped local boundaries. For the purpose of this study, county boundaries define the local gateway region for each park. For instance, McDowell Mountain Regional Park is located in Maricopa County. Hence, Maricopa County is considered the study area or the gateway community for this park and impact of parks visitors on Maricopa County is determined. If a park's boundary spans two counties, a two county region is used as the gateway region. The San Tan Mountain Regional Park spans two Counties: Pinal and Maricopa, hence its study area is a combination of these two counties. Lake Pleasant Regional Park is located in Maricopa and Yavapai Counties. Therefore, Maricopa and Yavapai Counties form the study area for Lake Pleasant Regional Park. The study area for the remaining six parks is Maricopa County. Table 1 lists study regions for all eight parks

DATA SOURCES AND METHODS

Visitor expenditures are acquired from an existing 'Maricopa County Parks Visitor' report provided by ASU. Operating expenses for the Department are provided by MCPRD. With regard to visitor spending, three key pieces of information are required to estimate economic impact: number of visitors who visit each park, visitor spending patterns in local gateway regions, and regional economic multipliers that describe the economic effects of visitor spending in local economies. Visitation source data are derived from a variety of efforts by the MCPRD. The data sources and methods used to estimate these inputs and the resultant economic effects are described below:

Recreation Visitor Estimates

Total visitation estimates are provided by the MCPRD. These are computed based on party size per car.

Visitor Spending Estimates

Conversion formula used by the National Resource Report (2010, 2012) is employed in this study:

$$\text{Total party days/nights} = \text{visits/party size} * 1/\text{ReEntry Rate} * \text{length of stay}$$

Where

Party is defined as a group that is traveling together and sharing expenses (e.g. family). Party days/nights are defined as the number of days (for day trips) and the number of nights (for overnight trips) that parties spend visiting a park. To estimate total party days/nights, park visit

data from the MCPRD report are combined with trip characteristic information received from the visitor study report. Trip characteristics data includes average party size, re-entry rate and length of stay. Visitation data are converted to total party days/nights using the above conversion formula.

The visitor data is also used to segment visitors to type of trip. Park visitors are split into the following four distinct visitor segments in order to help explain difference in spending across user groups.

- Local visitors
- Local retained visitors
- Non-local visitors: outside the gateway region within Arizona
- Non-local visitors: outside of Arizona State University

Based on the existing visitor report data, spending is broken into the six spending categories:

- Gas and transportation
- Camping and other lodging fees
- Eating and drinking (food, meals and drinks)
- Entrance fees, permits and licenses
- Shopping and gifts
- Recreation equipment

Items not included in the visitor economic impact analyses are entrance fees, permits and licenses and camping and other lodging fees because these are forwarded to MCPRD and do not directly enter the local economy through visitor spending.

IMPLAN

IMPLAN software is used which, to date, is the most commonly used software to determine economic impacts of recreation and tourism in the United States. The IMPLAN software system is created by MIG and it uses the input/output modeling technique to understand how a local economy functions and the economic benefits of Maricopa County's parks and recreational facilities. Additionally, it makes use of an input/output modeling technique focused on social accounting matrices, multipliers, and trade flows. More information on these terms is offered below (Greenwood & Vick 2008; IMPLAN 2007; 2014):

SAMs: Social Accounting Matrices take into account real dollars of all business transactions happening annually in the economy as reported by businesses and governmental agencies. SAMs also factors in 'non-market' transactions such as taxes and unemployment benefits. This type of analysis provides an in-depth look at the economic impact of visitor expenditures on the local economy and can identify different types of industries and households that benefit the most from the economic impact analysis (IMPLAN 2007).

Multipliers: help to show direct, indirect and induced impacts as a result of the visitor spending based on 440 different industries. Multipliers improve the accuracy of economic impacts studies

by calculating how the initial expenditures injected in the region can spur additional/indirect purchases of goods and services to meet demand for tourism products.

Direct effects: are determined by the initial visitor expenditures injected into the economy. The indirect effects relate to additional spending incurred by tourism businesses in the region to produce/supply the tourism products. Examples include expenditures incurred by restaurants on groceries, services, other supplies and labor. Finally, the induced effect measures the money that is re-spent in the study area as a result of employee spending (drawn from income earned as a result of direct and indirect effects).

Trade Flows method: helps to capture regional purchase coefficients and can perform a multi-regional analysis to show an organization's product is capable to generating additional effects in the surrounding areas.

FINDINGS

MCPRD received a total of 1.4 million recreation visitors in 2014. These visitors generated approximately 139 full time jobs, \$4.6 million in labor income and \$7.3 million in value added (gross regional product) impacts. MCPRD operating expenses produced a total of 116 full time jobs, 7.1 million in labor income and \$9.7 million in gross regional product. Tables 1-13 offer a further detailed breakdown of economic impact results.

Leverage ratio for each park is also calculated. It is: 1:1.13 (Cave Creek Regional Park), 1:0.89 (Estrella Mountain Regional Park), 1:1.26 (Lake Pleasant Regional Park), 1:1.49 (McDowell Mountain Regional Park), 1:1.0 (San Tan Mountain Regional Park), 1:1.11 (Spur Cross Regional Park), 1:2.51 (Usery Mountain Regional Park), and 1:1.06 (White Tank Mountain Regional Park). As the results indicate, Usery Mountain Regional Park has the highest leverage ratio. This means that for each county dollar invested in net operating cost by MCPRD in this park, \$2.51 is generated in resident income. Leverage ratio of 1:1.26 for Lake Pleasant Regional Park implies that for each dollar in net operating cost invested by MCPRD in the park, \$1.26 is generated in resident income.

A breakdown of each park visitor segment is offered in Table 1. As Table 1 shows, Lake Pleasant Regional Park received the largest share of visitors followed by the White Tank Mountain Regional Park. Cave Creek Regional Park received the maximum number of out of state visitors. Lake Pleasant Regional Park received the most retained local visitations followed by Usery Mountain Regional Park. Economic impact generated by non-local and retained-local visitor segments from the eight parks is presented in Tables 2 and 3.

Table 1 Maricopa County Parks and Recreation System Visitations

Park	Study area	Total Visitations	Out of state %	Total non-locals %	Locals %	Retained locals %	Retained locals
Estrella	Maricopa	71,137	6.2	7.2	92.8	3.2	1,193
White Tank	Maricopa	202,458	13.7	16.2	83.8	12.2	20,698
Lake Pleasant	Maricopa/ Yavapai	732,128	9.9	17.6	82.4	28.6	172,536
Spur Cross	Maricopa	18,298	19.2	19.7	80.3	6.7	1,793
Cave Creek	Maricopa	59,784	20.5	22.4	77.6	33.8	15,681
McDowell	Maricopa	81,986	15.9	22.4	77.6	10.8	6,871
Usery	Maricopa	176,516	18.8	25.3	74.7	19.4	25,580
San Tan	Maricopa/ Pinal	76,151	13.6	14.7	85.3	0.0	0.0

Table 2 presents a detailed breakdown of visitor expenditures per spending sector. Total visitor expenditures for all parks are \$13.7 million. As the table reveals, gas and transportation account for the largest share of visitor spending followed by the eating and drinking sector. The park visitors spent \$13.72 million in the local gateway region surrounding all eight parks. Camping revenue and entrance fees, permits and licenses go to MCPRD, hence are not factored into the visitor economic impact. It was only possible to compute other lodging revenue for Cave Creek and McDowell Regional Parks (\$240,137.80). Gas and transportation sector and eating and drinking each account for about one-third of the spending. Recreation equipment and fees account for approximately 12% followed by shopping (approximately 9%).

Table 2 Total Maricopa County Park and Recreation System Visitor Expenditures

Spending Category	Total \$	Percentage %
Eating & Drinking	4,344,339.24	31.67
Gas and Transportation	4,688,229.29	34.18
Shopping	1,264,503.59	9.22
Recreation Equipment	1,590,138.24	11.59
Tourist Services	14,423.75	0.11
Lodging	240,137.80	1.75
Entrance fees, permits and licenses	1,575,634.89	11.49
Total	13,717,406.80	100.00

Table 3 shows that the Lake Pleasant Regional Park generated the highest economic benefit in terms of full time jobs, labor income, and gross regional product and output followed by Utery Mountain Regional Park. Estrella Mountain Regional Park make the lowest contribution in terms of economic benefits.

Table 3 Economic Impact of Visitor Spending

Park	Full Time Jobs	Labor Income	Value Added	Output
Cave Creek	5.8	217,377.5	348,173.9	549,325.3
Estrella	.3	10,802.2	16,939.9	24,783
Lake Pleasant	64.1	2,156,565.3	3,359,573.7	5,313,606.4
McDowell	16.0	546,454.4	860,500.4	1,374,465.1
San Tan	0.9	27,797.6	43,242.5	70,085.6
Spur Cross	0.5	16,126.1	24,939.5	40,032.1
Utery	40.2	1,290,142.3	2,009,898.6	3,036,530.6
White Tank	11.1	381,897.6	612,414.4	901,456.0
TOTAL	138.9	4,647,163.00	7,275,682.90	11,310,284.10

Table 4 presents economic impact of MCPRD operating expenses across all eight parks. Total full time jobs generated are 116 and the operating expenditures produce approximately 7.1million in labor income and \$9.7 million in gross regional product.

Table 4: Economic Impact of Operating Expenses

Park	Full Time Jobs	Labor Income	Value Added	Output
Cave Creek	12.8	819,904.4	1,107,315.4	1,492,529.5
Estrella	11.8	756,748.0	1,036,450.7	1,373,890.6
Lake Pleasant	37.5	2,274,150.2	3,139,881.4	3,946,435.5
McDowell	12.4	788,881.9	1,066,796.0	1,430,856.1
San Tan	3.7	216,962.9	307,026.2	392,287.5
Spur Cross	4.1	247,367.7	329,011.7	391,985.3
Usery	11.6	724,963.0	982,339.8	1,278,751.0
White Tank	22.5	1,268,776.1	1,755,691.2	2,557,582.5
TOTAL	116.4	7,097,754.20	9,724,512.40	12,864,318.00

Economic Contributions of Visitor Spending (based on each gateway region)

Table 5 presents a breakdown of direct, indirect and induced impacts in terms of output, full time jobs, labor income and value added (gross regional product). Top ten industries impacted by economic impact are also listed. Visitor expenditures generated a total of \$11.3 million in total output, approximately 139 full time jobs, \$4.6 million in labor income and approximately \$7.3 million in gross regional product.

Table 5 Local Economic Contributions and Impacts of Visitor Spending

Spending Category	Output	Jobs	Labor income	Value Added
Direct Effects				
Food services and drinking places	240781.4	1.8	81831.0	135,941.7
Hotels and motels, including casino hotels	646519.4	10.7	231518.8	550,383.0
Retail Stores - Miscellaneous	410205.9	4.4	196012.4	330,255.9
Retail Stores - Gasoline stations	29197.2	0.5	14902.6	23,712.0
Retail Stores - General merchandise	277.2	0.0	158.9	207.5
Retail Stores - Food and beverage	1092654.4	20.0	516963.6	736,491.2
Other amusement and recreation industries	435180.8	3.1	53954.3	338,127.2
Real estate establishments	64520.2	1.1	28035.9	36,271.2
Services to buildings and dwellings	60003.8	1.3	43650.9	51,180.8
Employment services	169418.3	1.2	101754.7	113,885.1
Offices of physicians, dentists, and other health practitioners	174379.8	1.1	84128.3	100,822.8
Private hospitals	255678.7	1.2	99487.2	175,166.5
Wholesale trade businesses	4559615.9	71.8	1770797.2	2,673,391.9
Total Direct Effects	6,696,330.0	105.0	2,946,088.2	4,268,900.2
Indirect Effects	1,757,001.3	12.1	641895.0	1,128,848.4
Induced Effects	2,861,398.6	21.8	1061010.5	1,880,861.1
Total Effects	11,314,739.9	138.9	4,648,993.6	7,278,609.7

Furthermore, visitor expenditures generated a total of \$.9 million in state and local taxes and \$.7 in federal tax. Employee compensation make the highest contribution. With regard to federal tax, production accounts for the largest share of contribution.

Table 6 Local Impacts of Visitor– Federal and State/Local Taxes

Tax Category	Employee Compensation	Proprietor income	Tax on Production	Households	Corporations
Total State and Local Tax	\$364,379	\$20,924	\$134,655	\$248,910	\$114,014
Total Federal Tax	\$54,798	\$2,918	\$541,791	\$99,395	\$26,342

Phoenix MSA Contribution of Visitor Spending

Economic impact of visitor expenditures on the Phoenix MSA are presented in Table 8. Top ten industries impacted by spending are also listed. A total of 153 full time jobs were generated in the region. Total labor income and value added impacts were \$5.1 million and approximately \$8.1 million respectively.

Table 7 Local impacts of Visitor Spending in the Phoenix MSA- Output and Value Added

Spending Category	Output	Jobs	Labor income	Value Added
Direct Effects				
Other amusement and recreation industries	4,587,825.5	72.3	1,920,089.9	2,689,573.3
Food services and drinking places	485,437.2	3.5	64,933.3	377,109.7
Real estate establishments	69,249.8	1.5	54,062.2	59,015.7
Employment services	193,671.9	1.4	126,493.6	130,061.7
Services to buildings and dwellings	190,332.9	1.3	99,892.2	109,881.8
Private hospitals	298,414.3	1.4	125,994.8	204,322.6
Retail Stores - Food and beverage	590,032.7	9.8	300,415.1	502,060.8
Retail Stores - Miscellaneous	540,107.8	5.8	289,042.4	435,462.7
Retail Stores - Gasoline stations	244,629.5	2.0	82,664.8	137,806.9
Hotels and motels, including casino hotels	1,599,577.0	29.5	752,513.1	1,075,579.7
Total Direct Effects	7,275,944.7	114.8	3,219,877.0	4,662,192.8
Indirect Effects	1,981,680.2	13.5	711,408.9	1,259,104.1
Induced Effects	3,290,848.5	24.9	1,208,157.1	2,152,790.9
Total Effects	12,548,473.4	153.2	5,139,443.0	8,074,087.7

Table 8 shows that the majority of the state and local tax contribution was from production. With regard to federal tax, households constituted a major contribution. Total State and Local tax contributions were approximately \$.8 million and federal tax contributions were \$1.0 million

Table 8 Visitor Impact on State, Local and Federal Taxes

	Employee Compensation	Proprietor income	Tax on Production	Households	Corporations
Total State & Local Tax	\$7,464		\$677,391	\$84,783	\$13,181
Total Federal Tax	\$458,681	\$25,408	\$81,708	\$305,154	\$143,157

Local Contribution of MCPRD Operating Expenses

MCPRD also impacts local and regional economies through their operating expenses. Table 9 presents a breakdown of operating expenses. Personnel costs account for the largest share of the operating expense budget followed by major repair and maintenance costs.

Table 9 MCPRD Operating Expenses and Administration Costs

Expenditure Item	Spending (\$)	Percentage (%)
MCSO Deputy	84,122.82	0.80
Park oversight	32,499.21	0.31
Personnel	3,614,599.55	34.49
Administrative oversight	904,758.82	8.63
General Supplies	233,549.52	2.23
Souvenir Supplies	235,207.39	2.24
Souvenir taxes	16,433.83	0.16
Fuel	171,443.01	1.64
Non capital Equipment	175,198.24	1.67
Services	414,196.58	3.95
Rent/Leases	20,426.80	0.19
Repairs & Maintenance	433,163.14	4.13
Major Repair & Maint.	1,823,988.00	17.40
Equipment Services	186,835.28	1.78
Central Services Cost Allocation	673,039.59	6.42
Education	3,008.42	0.03
Travel	3,145.71	0.03
Postage & Freight	793.69	0.01
Utilities	723,721.54	6.91
Building Improvements	644,758.50	6.15
Capital Equipment	181,169.98	1.73
TOTAL FY14 EXPENDITURES^a	10,480,446.18	100.00

a: Out of the these expenses. \$8.2 million are incurred directly in the eight parks

Table 10 presents top industries in the Phoenix MSA region that benefited from the operating expenses. As the table shows, MCPRD operating expenses in eight parks created 264 full time jobs, total labor income of \$7.1 million and value added impact of \$9.7 million.

Table 10 Local impacts of Operating Expenses - Output and Value Added

Spending Category	Sales	Jobs	Labor income	Value Added
Direct Effects				
Automotive repair and maintenance, except car washes	638,020.4	7.5	388,009.7	414,817.8
Employment and payroll only (state & local govt., non-education)	3,578,300.9	46.8	3,052,745.1	3,514,449.5
Commercial and industrial machinery and equipment repair and maintenance	1,382,497.8	10.7	888,813.6	989,464.0
Maintenance and repair construction of nonresidential structures	536,186.8	3.0	216,905.7	301,297.8
Food services and drinking places	272,208.0	4.3	114,075.4	159,686.8
State and local government electric utilities	336,475.7	1.0	127,187.8	241,478.9
Real estate establishments	346,795.0	2.5	46,549.7	269,445.8
Facilities support services	429,498.1	2.6	131,510.8	280,059.6
Retail Stores - Miscellaneous	154,086.0	2.2	64,429.8	128,362.0
Retail Stores - General merchandise	147,321.2	2.5	75,190.1	119,642.8
Offices of physicians, dentists, and other health practitioners	258,570.6	1.9	169,116.1	173,866.7
Private hospitals	266,902.4	1.8	140,329.2	154,308.5
Employment services	26,288.8	0.6	20,547.9	22,420.1
Retail Stores - Food and beverage	2,416.4	0.0	1,385.2	1,808.7
Wholesale trade businesses	7,870.8	0.0	3,337.7	5,397.3
Nursing and residential care facilities	2,225.6	0.0	1,302.1	1,501.9
Total Direct Effects	7,659,416.2	172.2	5,124,869.8	6,303,176.5
Indirect Effects	838,547.8	14.3	353,600.5	551,100.3
Induced Effects	4,366,353.9	77.4	1,619,284.0	2,870,235.6
Total Effects	12,864,317.9	264.0	7,097,754.3	9,724,512.3

Table 11 presents tax contributions as a result of visitor expenditures. Approximately \$1.3 million were generated in state and local taxes and \$.5 million in federal taxes in the Phoenix MSA region.

Table 11 Total Impact of Operating Expenses per Park and on Administration on State, Local and Federal Taxes

	Employee Compensation	Proprietor income	Tax on Production	Households	Corporations
Total State and Local Tax	\$644,649	\$31,191	\$42,942	\$415,752	\$147,196
Total Federal Tax	\$9,909	\$0	\$346,888	\$115,511	\$13,553

Contribution of Operating Expenses in Phoenix MSA

Table 12 presents economic impact generated by MCPRD operating expenses. The expenditure generated 9.1 million in labor income and \$12.7 million in valued added impacts. Total full time jobs created were approximately 148.

Table 12 Impact of Operating Expenses on the Phoenix MSA

Spending Category	Output	Jobs	Labor income	Value Added
Direct Effects				
Automotive repair and maintenance, except car washes	4,635,980.6	61.2	3,949,958.8	4,553,255.6
Employment and payroll only (state & local govt., non-education)	2,275,398.3	17.8	1,456,232.4	1,623,251.2
Commercial and industrial machinery and equipment repair and maintenance	700,193.5	4.0	280,475.5	391,396.4
Maintenance and repair construction of nonresidential structures	362,878.8	5.7	151,871.5	212,734.6
State and local government electric utilities	648,091.7	4.7	86,690.4	503,467.1
Real estate establishments	682,278.9	4.1	219,252.0	449,984.9
Facilities support services	153,758.5	2.6	78,286.1	130,833.6
Retail Stores - Miscellaneous	209,888.6	3.5	107,504.0	170,605.7
Retail Stores - General merchandise	342,853.8	2.5	223,929.3	230,245.8
Offices of physicians, dentists, and other health practitioners	336,942.4	2.2	176,837.2	194,521.6
Total Direct Effects	9,839,161.1	95.4	6,496,386.8	8,168,625.0
Indirect Effects	1,089,450.0	8.0	454,623.5	713,725.6
Induced Effects	5,822,347.0	44.1	2,137,460.3	3,808,883.9
Total Effects	16,750,958.1	147.6	9,088,470.6	12,691,234.5

Table 13 presents tax contributions as a result of operating expenses. Approximately \$.6 million were generated in state and local taxes and \$ 1.7 million in federal taxes in the Phoenix MSA region.

Table 13 Total Impact on State, Local and Federal Taxes in the Phoenix MSA

	Employee Compensation	Proprietor income	Tax on Production	Households	Corporations
Total State and Local Tax	\$13,487.00		\$450,358.00	\$149,688.00	\$18,770.00
Total Federal Tax	\$828,857	\$38,634	\$54,323	\$538,763	\$203,862

REFERENCES

- Chhabra, D. (2006). Analyzing the Travel Behavior of Daytrippers and their Economic Impact: A Case Study of Sacramento County, CA. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 12(1): 93-97.
- Crompton, J. (2010). *Measuring the Economic Impact of Park and Recreation Services*. National Park and Recreation Association.
- Fletcher, J. (1989). Input-Output Analysis and Tourism Impact Studies. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 16, 514-529.
- Greenwood, J. & Vick, C. (2008). *Economic Contribution of Visitors to North Carolina State Parks*. North Carolina State University: Raleigh (NC).
- Gunthar, P., Parr, K., Graziano, M. & Carstensen, F. (2011). *The Economic Impact of State Parks, Forests and Natural Resources under the Management of Department of Environmental Protection*. Connecticut Center for Economic Analysis: University of Connecticut, CT.
- IMPLAN Professional (2000). IMPLAN PRO: User's Guide. MIG, Inc.: Stillwater, MN
- IMPLAN (2014). Principles of Impact Analysis and IMPLAN Application. IMPLAN GROUP, LLC: Huntersville, NC
- Munn, I., Hussain, A., Spurlock, S. & Henderson, J. (2010). Economic Impact of Fishing, Hunting, and Wildlife- Associated Recreation Expenditures on the Southeast U.S. Regional Economy: An Input-Output Analysis. *Human Dimension of Wildlife*, 15: 433-449.
- Stynes, D. (2010). *Economic Benefits to Local Communities from National Park Visitation and Payroll, 2010*. Michigan State University: East Lansing (MI).
- National Resource Report (2012). *2012 National Park Visitor Spending Effects*. US Department of the Interior: Fort Collins, Colorado.
- The Trust for Public Land (2010). *The Economic Benefits of Denver's Park and Recreation Systems*. The Trust for Public Land's Center for City Park Excellence: Colorado
- Timothy, D. J., & Boyd, S. W. (2003). *Heritage tourism*. Pearson Education.

APPENDIX

Description of Terms

- Small ‘n’ denotes respondents who responded to all or at least one spending item.
- Retained locals mean those locals who listed an alternative park outside their study area they would have been interested in visiting if the Maricopa County parks had not existed. This implies that the park retains outside spending and should be factored into the economic impact.
- Items: The spending items listed in the tables are as follows (please note – short terms are used for some of the survey items; their full names as listed in the survey are provided in parentheses):
 - Eating and drinking (food, meals and drinks);
 - Gas and transportation (gas and transportation costs);
 - Shopping (shopping & gifts);
 - Recreation equipment;
 - Fees (entrance, fees, permits and licenses) and;
 - Tourist services.
 - Camping and other lodging information is offered below each table (where needed)
- Spending pattern- this term implies that dollar amounts entered by day-use visitors for spending sectors were consistently different from those staying overnight. There are no outliers. The overall spending pattern is different.
- Outliers mean unusual values that can skew the data and consequentially the overall average spending values. These have to be substituted or removed for accuracy and to eliminate bias. Outliers are noted for some spending figures and substituted/treated with average values wherever necessary. For instance, only one retained visitor offered spending information for the Cave Creek Regional Park. The spending amount per sector was very high such as \$500 for gas, \$ 1000 for recreation equipment and \$200 for fees but the respondent claimed to travel a distance of 4 miles only with a party size of 2. Average based on one observation cannot be computed and this is the case of an outlier or some lack of understanding on the part of the visitor when they were filling-in the survey. Because there was a substantial percentage of visitors who belonged to the retained category, average values for popular spending items were computed. Also, for Estrella Mountain Regional Park, retained visitors provided spending information on fees only. They did not offer spending information on gas and transportation and eating and drinking. Hence average value from the across the parks was used to estimate spending for these two sectors.

APPENDIX A

Table 1 Definition of Tax Types for State and Local Governments

Transaction Type	Description
Dividends	State and local government dividends refers to investment-based dividends paid by corporations to government.
Social Insurance Taxes: Employee Contribution	The social insurance contribution is paid by state employees towards State sponsored pensions instead of social security.
Social Insurance Taxes: Employer Contribution	The social insurance contribution is paid by the State towards State sponsored pensions instead of social security.
Indirect Business Tax: Sales Tax	Sales taxes payment to State and Local government.
Indirect Business Tax: Property Tax	Levied on Real Estate, property taxes are paid by corporations to State and Local governments. Due to the special situation associated with Sector 361, this category involves payments of property taxes based on homes.
Indirect Business Tax: Motor Vehicle	Taxes levied by State and Local governments on motor vehicle license.
Indirect Business Tax: Severance	Taxes imposed by a State on extracting natural resources.
Indirect Business Tax: Other taxes	Other taxes collected by State and Local governments, such as business licenses, documentary and stamp taxes.
Indirect Business Tax: S/L Non-taxes	This category consists of fines (such as parking and speeding tickets), fees (State and County park passes or day fees) and donated funds.
Corporate Profits Tax	Corporate profits taxes paid to State and Local governments.
Personal Tax: Income Tax	Individuals' income taxes payments to State and Local Government through withholding, declarations and final settlement, less refunds.
Personal Tax: Non-tax (fines and fees)	Household personal non-tax paid to State and Local Governments, including fines, donations, passport and immigration fees, and migratory bird-hunting stamps.
Personal Tax: Motor Vehicle Licenses	Household personal motor vehicle fee paid to State and Local governments.
Personal Tax: Property Taxes	Household personal property tax paid to State and Local governments. Dividend, interest, and rental income of persons with capital consumption adjustment sometimes fall under the category of property income.
Personal Tax: Other Taxes (fishing/hunting)	Other miscellaneous fees and licenses paid to State and Local governments, such as hunting and fishing licenses, marriage licenses, registration of pleasure boats, and licenses for pets.

Source: IMPLAN (2014)

Table 2 Definition of Tax Types for Federal Government

Transaction Type	Description
Social Insurance Taxes: Employee Contribution	The employee paid portion for Federal social insurance, including payments by employees, the self-employed, and other individuals who take part in the government programs of hospital insurance, supplementary medical insurance; old-age, survivors, and disability insurance (social security, FICA); unemployment insurance, railroad retirement; veteran's life insurance, and temporary disability insurance.
Social Insurance Taxes: Employer Contribution	The employer paid portion for Federal social insurance, including social security, unemployment insurance, medical and retirement plans
Indirect Business Tax: Excise Taxes	Excise taxes collected by Federal government on alcohol, tobacco, telephones, coal, fuels, air transportation, vehicles, and so on.
Indirect Business Tax: Custom Duty	This category refers to gross collections net refunds.
Indirect Business Tax: Non-Taxes	This category includes petroleum royalties, fines, regulatory fees, forfeitures and donated funds.
Corporate Profits Tax:	Corporate profits tax payment to Federal governments.
Personal Tax: Income Tax	Individuals' income taxes payment to the Federal Government through withholding, declarations and final settlement, less refunds.

Source: IMPLAN (2014)

APPENDIX B: ESTRELLA MOUNTAIN REGIONAL PARK

Visitor Expenditures

Table A.1: Estrella Mountain Regional Park Visitor Expenditures

Item	Average \$ expenditure per person per day	Retained	Non-local AZ & Out of State	Total
Eating & Drinking	Retained=3.79 Non-local=.8	4,521.47	4,097.60	8,619.07
Gas & Transportation	Retained=2.00 Non-local=10.83	2,386.00	55,471.26	57,857.00
Fees	Retained= 3 Non-local=2	3,579.00	10,244.00	13,823.00
Total		10,486.47	69,812.86	80,299.07

n=2 (non-locals); n=1 (Retained); Part Size: 3 (Non-locals), 2 (Retained)

Total Retained locals: 1193; Non-locals: 5122;

For those staying overnight- average nights- 2.5 but no information offered on expenditures

Table A.2: Impact of Estrella Mountain Regional Park Visitor Spending

	Employment	Labor Income	Value Added	Output
Direct	.2	7018.0	10,222.2	14,743
Indirect	.0	1,332.9	2,377.7	3,589
Induced	.1	2451.1	4,339.9	6,452
Total	.3	10,802.2	16,939.9	24,783

Table A.3: Impact of Estrella Mountain Regional Park Visitor Spending on State, Local and Federal Taxes

	Employee Compensation	Proprietor income	Tax on Production	Households	Corporations
Total State and Local Tax	14.0		1,669.0	178.0	26.0
Total Federal Tax	885.0	81.0	207.0	639.0	280.0

M CPRD Spending

Total operating Expenses: \$859,575.08

Table A.4: Impact of Estrella Mountain Regional Park Operational Expenses

	Employment	Labor Income	Value Added	Output
Direct	7.7	549,407.3	675,422.1	825,023.9
Indirect	0.6	35,469.9	56,665.5	86,101.1
Induced	3.5	171,870.8	304,363.0	462,765.6
Total	11.8	756,748.0	1,036,450.7	1,373,890.6

Table A.5: Impact of Estrella Mountain Regional Park Operational Expenses on Local, State tax and Federal taxes

	Employee Compensation	Proprietor income	Tax on Production	Households	Corporations
Total State and Local Tax	\$1,027.00		\$38,703.00	\$12,356.00	\$1,431.00
Total Federal Tax	\$67,229	\$3,818	\$4,805	\$44,474	\$15,542

APPENDIX C: WHITE TANK MOUNTAIN REGIONAL PARK

Visitor Expenditures

Table B.1: White Tank Mountain Regional Park Expenditures

Item	Average \$ per person per day	Retained	Non-local AZ & Out of State	Total
Eating and Drinking	Retained= 4 Non-local=7	82,794.00	229,587.40	312,381.00
Gas & Transportation	Retained=5.13 Non-local= 8.00	106,252.30	262,385.60	368,637.90
Shopping	Retained=0.00 Non-local=13.00	0.00	426,376.60	426,376.60
Fees	Retained=1.6 Non-local=2.20	33,117.60	72,256.04	105,373.64
Total		222,164	990,605.64	1,212,770.00

n=6 (Non-locals); n=6 (Retained); Party size: 3 (Non-locals) & 3.0 (Retained)
Total Retained Visitors: 20,698.5; Total Non-local Visitors: 32,798.20

Table B.2: Impact of White Tank Mountain Regional Park Visitor Spending

	Employment	Labor Income	Value Added	Output
Direct	8.5	250,330.4	378,902.9	544,321.3
Indirect	0.8	44,908.9	80,075.7	123,834.0
Induced	1.8	86,658.4	153,435.8	233,300.7
Total	11.1	381,897.6	612,414.4	901,456.0

Table B.3: Impact of White Tank Mountain Regional Park Visitor Spending on State, Local and Federal Taxes

	Employee Compensation	Proprietor income	Tax on Production	Households	Corporations
Total State and Local Tax	479.0		51,306.0	6,281.0	1,047.0
Total Federal Tax	31,317.0	2,855.0	6,370.0	22,606.0	11,373.0

MCPRD Spending

Total operating Expenses: \$1,557,878.44

Table B. 4: Impact of White Tank Mountain Regional Park Operational Expenses

	Employment	Labor Income	Value Added	Output
Direct	14.5	862,381.8	1,061,871.0	1,500,885.2
Indirect	2.1	118,408.0	183,886.3	281,350.5
Induced	5.9	287,986.2	509,933.8	775,346.9
Total	22.5	1,268,776.1	1,755,691.2	2,557,582.5

Table B.5: Impact of White Tank Mountain Regional Park Operational Expenses on Local, State tax and Federal taxes

	Employee Compensation	Proprietor income	Tax on Production	Households	Corporations
Total State and Local Tax	\$1,637.00		\$80,615.00	\$20,814.00	\$2,401.00
Total Federal Tax	\$107,109	\$8,395	\$10,008	\$74,914	\$26,077

APPENDIX D: MCDOWELL MOUNTAIN REGIONAL PARK

Visitor Expenditures

Table C.1: McDowell Mountain Regional Park

Item	Average per person per day	Retained	Non-local AZ & Out of State	Total
Eating and Drinking	Retained=3.78 Non-local=28.03	25,972.38	581,477	607,449.38
Gas & Transportation	Retained=3.40* Non-local=53.30	23,661.40	1,105,603	1,129,264.40
Shopping	Retained=0 Non-local=2.30	0.00	47,792.63	47,792.63
Fees	Retained=2.5 Non-local=7.14	17,177.50	63,723.5	80,901.00
Total		66,811.28	1,798,596	1,865,407.41

n=2 (Retained); n=7 (Non-locals); Total Retained visitors- 6,871; Total non-visitors-20,742
Party size-1.86 (non-locals) & 1.67 (retained)

Table C.2: Impact of McDowell Mountain Regional Park Visitor Expenditures

	Employment	Labor Income	Value Added	Output
Direct	11.9	338,650.5	495,953.1	813,207.2
Indirect	1.5	83,672.3	144,726.9	227,033.4
Induced	2.5	124,131.6	219,820.5	334,224.5
Total	16.0	546,454.4	860,500.4	1,374,465.1

Table C.3: Impact of McDowell Mountain Regional Park Visitor Expenditures on State, Local and Federal Taxes

	Employee Compensation	Proprietor income	Tax on Production	Households	Corporations
Total State and Local Tax	\$738.00		\$67,101.00	\$8,927.00	\$1,446.00
Total Federal Tax	\$48,321	\$2,837	\$8,331	\$32,129	\$15,701

MCPRD Spending

Total Operating Expenses: \$895,851.82

Table C.4: Impact of McDowell Mountain Regional Park Operating Expenses

	Employment	Labor Income	Value Added	Output
Direct	7.9	568,011.0	682,296.3	846,280.5
Indirect	0.7	41,765.0	67,343.6	102,350.8
Induced	3.7	179,105.9	317,156.2	482,224.8
Total	12.4	788,881.9	1,066,796.0	1,430,856.1

Table C.5: Impact of McDowell Mountain Regional Park Operating Expenses on Local, State tax and Federal taxes

	Employee Compensation	Proprietor income	Tax on Production	Households	Corporations
Total State and Local Tax	\$1,041.00		\$44,694.00	\$12,915.00	\$1,379.00
Total Federal Tax	\$68,148	\$4,668	\$5,549	\$46,482	\$14,981

APPENDIX E: SAN TAN MOUNTAIN REGIONAL PARK

Visitor Expenditures

Table D.1: San Tan Mountain Regional Park

Item	Average \$ per person per day	Non-local AZ & Out of State
Eating and Drinking	3.47	38,868.10
Gas & Transportation	1.85	20,729.63
Shopping	.39	4,318.67
Fees	2.70	30,223.80
Total		94,140.20

n=7; non-locals: 11,194; party size: 2.16;

Table D.2: Impact of San Tan Mountain Regional Park Visitor Expenditures

	Employment	Labor Income	Value Added	Output
Direct	0.6	17,251.9	24,432.3	40,802.9
Indirect	0.1	4,012.6	7,169.1	11,487.6
Induced	0.1	6,533.2	11,641.1	17,795.2
Total	0.9	27,797.6	43,242.5	70,085.6

Table D.3: Impact of San Tan Mountain Regional Park Visitor Expenditures on State, Local and Federal Taxes

	Employee Compensation	Proprietor income	Tax on Production	Households	Corporations
Total State and Local Tax	40.0		3,299.0	459.0	71.0
Total Federal Tax	2,463.0	144.0	398.0	1,651.0	773.0

MCPRD Spending

Total operating expenses: \$248,309.39

Table D.4: Impact of San Tan Mountain Regional Park Operating Expenses

	Employment	Labor Income	Value Added	Output
Direct	2.5	155,339.7	200,888.7	230,395.0
Indirect	0.2	10,520.5	15,063.6	22,679.3
Induced	1.1	51,102.7	91,073.8	139,213.2
Total	3.7	216,962.9	307,026.2	392,287.5

Table D.5: Impact of San Tan Mountain Regional Park Operating Expenses on Local, State tax and Federal taxes

	Employee Compensation	Proprietor income	Tax on Production	Households	Corporations
Total State and Local Tax	\$338.00		\$8,817.00	\$3,560.00	\$486.00
Total Federal Tax	\$20,769	\$574	\$1,064	\$12,814	\$5,276

APPENDIX F: SPUR CROSS RANCH CONSERVATION AREA

Visitor Expenditures

Table E.1: Spur Cross Ranch Conservation Area

Item	Average \$ per person per day	Retained	Non-local AZ & Out of State	Total
Eating and Drinking	Retained=.83 Non-local=5.54	1493.83	19,991.36	21,485.19
Gas & Transportation	Retained=1.00 Non-local=3.48	1,792.6	12,562.88	14,355.48
Recreation Equipment	Retained=0.00 Non-local=1.06	0.00	3,823.49	3,823.49
Registration	Retained=2.57 Non-local=2.6	3,585.2	9,285.61	12,780.81
Total		6,871.63	45,663.34	52,434.97

n=2 (Retained); n= 10 (Non-locals)

Total Retained Visitors: 1792.6; Total Non-local Visitors: 3605

Retained Party Size- 3.00; Non-local party size: 3.00 (all day use)

Table E.2: Impact of Spur Cross Ranch Conservation Area Visitor Expenditures

	Employment	Labor Income	Value Added	Output
Direct	0.4	10,141.4	14,349.3	23,743.9
Indirect	0.0	2,321.7	4,103.6	6,425.7
Induced	0.1	3,663.0	6,486.6	9,862.5
Total	0.5	16,126.1	24,939.5	40,032.1

Table E.3: Impact of Spur Cross Ranch Conservation Area Visitor Expenditures on State and Local/Federal Taxes

	Employee Compensation	Proprietor income	Tax on Production	Households	Corporations
Total State and Local Tax	22.0		2,015.0	264.0	40.0
Total Federal Tax	1,421.0	85.0	250.0	948.0	431.0

MCPRD Spending

Total operating expenses: \$237505.71

Table E.4: Impact of Spur Cross Ranch Conservation Area Operating Expenses

	Employment	Labor Income	Value Added	Output
Direct	2.9	188,831.2	225,852.9	235,262.3
Indirect	0.0	2,273.2	3,497.5	5,204.7
Induced	1.2	56,263.2	99,661.3	151,518.3
Total	4.1	247,367.7	329,011.7	391,985.3

Table E.5: Impact of Spur Cross Ranch Conservation Area Operating Expenses on Local, State tax and Federal taxes

	Employee Compensation	Proprietor income	Tax on Production	Households	Corporations
Total State and Local Tax	\$375.00		\$7,606.00	\$3,995.00	\$443.00
Total Federal Tax	\$24,551	\$333	\$944	\$14,378	\$4,810

APPENDIX G: USERY MOUNTAIN REGIONAL PARK

Visitor Expenditures

Table F.1: Usery Mountain Regional Park

Item	Average per person per day	Retained	Non-local AZ & Out of State	Total
Eating and Drinking	Retained=3.13 Non-local=3.26/21.24	79,937.50	446,675	526,612.50
Gas & Transportation	Retained=2.25*** Non-local=2.51/13.65	57,555	228,573	286,128.00
Recreation Equipment	Retained=33.75 Non-local=6.89/1.92	863,325	208,465.7	1,071,791.00
Shopping	Retained=.63 Non-local=.31/19.22	15,987.5	330,677.9	346,665.00
Fees	Retained=3.0 Non-local=3.76/0	76,740	104,928.6	181,669
Total		1,093,545.00	1,319,320	2,412,865.20

n=4 (Retained) & n= 7 (Non-locals); Total Retained visitors: 25,580; Total Non-locals: 46,809
Party size: 2 (Retained) and 2 (Non-locals)

18.2% used lodging; average lodging \$: 9.61 per person per day; those staying overnight had a distinct spending pattern compared to other parks (except for Lake Pleasant), hence the first non-local average is for day use visitors and the second average for those who stayed overnight.

Table F.2: Impact of Usery Mountain Regional Park Visitor Expenditures

	Employment	Labor Income	Value Added	Output
Direct	30.9	824,222.2	1,189,320.3	1,785,473.5
Indirect	3.4	172,650.0	301,165.8	461,349.0
Induced	6.0	293,270.1	519,412.6	789,708.1
Total	40.2	1,290,142.3	2,009,898.6	3,036,530.6

Table F.3: Impact of Usery Mountain Regional Park Visitor Expenditures on State, Local and Federal Taxes

	Employee Compensation	Proprietor income	Tax on Production	Households	Corporations
Total State and Local Tax	1,851.0		172,719.0	20,953.0	3,184.0
Total Federal Tax	121,147.0	4,188.0	21,443.0	75,416.0	34,585.0

MCPRD Spending

Total operating expenses: \$801,428.02

Table F.4: Impact of Usery Mountain Regional Park Operating Expenses

	Employment	Labor Income	Value Added	Output
Direct	7.7	530,071.8	642,776.3	762,622.1
Indirect	0.5	30,205.1	47,913.2	72,696.7
Induced	3.4	164,686.1	291,650.3	443,432.3
Total	11.6	724,963.0	982,339.8	1,278,751.0

Table F.5: Impact of Usery Mountain Regional Park Operating Expenses on Local, State Tax and Federal Taxes

	Employee Compensation	Proprietor income	Tax on Production	Households	Corporations
Total State and Local Tax	\$1,000.00		\$35,208.00	\$11,819.00	\$1,320.00
Total Federal Tax	\$65,464	\$3,281	\$4,371	\$42,540	\$14,332

APPENDIX H: CAVE CREEK REGIONAL PARK

Visitor Expenditures

Table G.1: Cave Creek Regional Park

Item	Average per person per day	Retained \$	Non-local AZ & Out of State \$	Total \$
Eating and Drinking	Retained=3.17 Non-local=23.56/13.75	49,656.50	86,542.50	136,199.00
Transportation	Retained=2.61 Non-local=16.06/11	40,901.28	183,245.60	224,146.88
Shopping	Retained=.51 Non-local=3.44/4.17	7,997.31	50,624.38	58,621.69
Equipment	Retained=0 Non-local=0/.625	0.00	3,933.75	3,933.75
Tourist Service	Non-locals=0/2.29	0.00	14,423.75	14,423.75
Fees	Retained=2.56 Non-local=9.44/2.64	40,169.50	83,627.14	123,796.64
Total		138,724.60	422,397.12	561,121.71

- Retained Total visitors: 15,681; Non-local total visitors: 13,392 (53% day use and 47% staying overnight)
- n=6 (Non-locals staying overnight); n= 8 (day use non-locals); Party size-2:00 (non-locals & day use)
- Lodging average for non-.locals: \$10.39 per person per night (average number of nights-8)
- Those staying overnight had a distinct spending pattern, hence the first non-local average is for day use visitors and the second average for those who stayed overnight.
- Retained data was n=2 (one did not offer spending figures and the second respondent's spending figures were too high (outliers); average from the park data was not possible, hence an average value was computed from retained values on items across the other parks. This value was used to estimate retained spending estimate; only the most frequently used expenditure items are included in retained spending)
- Please note the fees \$ for non-locals (day use) are higher than the overall average. Based on the non-local data- this average appeared modest. Let me know- if you wish me to use average value across all parks (\$3) for fees.

Table G.2: Impact of Cave Creek Regional Park Visitor Expenditures

	Employment	Labor Income	Value Added	Output
Direct	4.1	131,609.1	199,773.0	320,983.0
Indirect	0.7	36,378.6	60,936.2	95,358.1
Induced	1.0	49,389.8	87,464.6	132,984.2
Total	5.8	217,377.5	348,173.9	549,325.3

Table G.3: Impact of Cave Creek Regional Park Visitor Expenditures on State, Local and Federal Taxes

	Employee Compensation	Proprietor income	Tax on Production	Households	Corporations
Total State and Local Tax	297.0		29,458.0	3,548.0	592.0
Total Federal Tax	19,403.0	1,064.0	3,657.0	12,770.0	6,428.0

MCPRD Spending

Total operating expenses: \$ 918,378.66

Table G.4: Impact of Cave Creek Regional Park Operating Expenses

	Employment	Labor Income	Value Added	Output
Direct	8.2	588,995.0	705,310.3	881,290.3
Indirect	0.8	44,784.4	72,426.8	110,123.9
Induced	3.8	186,125.1	329,578.3	501,115.3
Total	12.8	819,904.4	1,107,315.4	1,492,529.5

Table G.5: Impact of Cave Creek Regional Park Operating Expenses on Local, State tax and Federal taxes

	Employee Compensation	Proprietor income	Tax on Production	Households	Corporations
Total State and Local Tax	\$1,071.00		\$47,528.00	\$13,435.00	\$1,418.00
Total Federal Tax	\$70,101	\$5,110	\$5,901	\$48,356	\$15,397

APPENDIX I: LAKE PLEASANT REGIONAL PARK

Visitor Expenditures

Table H.1: Lake Pleasant Regional Park

Item	Average per person per day	Retained \$	Non-local AZ & Out of State \$	Total \$
Eating and Drinking	Retained=11.39/9.30 Non-local=7.74	1,694,875.00	997,850.30	2,692,725
Gas & Transportation	Retained=9.84/10.13 Non-local=6.61	1,734,936	852,174.10	2,587,110
Shopping	Retained=0.00/1.58 Non-local=1.37	204,708.42	176,020.80	380,729
Recreation Equipment	Retained=5.56/1.23 Non-local=.87	398,830.50	111,759.20	510,590
Fees	Retained=2.59/4.52 Non-local=2.56	696,978.00	330,088.90	1,027,067
Total		4,730,327.72	2,467,893.30	7,198,221

- n=19 (Retained), 75% stayed overnight; n=15 (Non-locals); Total Retained visitors- 172,536 (day use visitors- 43,124 (party size-2.57), overnight use- 129,402 (party size- 2.75); Total non-local visitors-128,855
- Party size-3.73 (non-locals)
- Lodging average for retained locals: \$10.20 per person per night (average number of nights-3.78)
- Lodging average for non-locals-\$ 7.04 per person per night (average number of nights- 5.77)
- Retained- first value for day use and second value for those staying overnight

Table H.2: Impact of Lake Pleasant Regional Park Visitor Expenditures

	Employment	Labor Income	Value Added	Output
Direct	48.4	1,365,633.2	1,954,092.1	3,150,465.8
Indirect	5.5	296,446.7	527,983.8	827,381.3
Induced	10.2	494,485.4	877,497.8	1,335,759.3
Total	64.1	2,156,565.3	3,359,573.7	5,313,606.4

Table H.3: Impact of Lake Pleasant Regional Park Visitor Expenditures on State, Local and Federal Taxes

	Employee Compensation	Proprietor income	Tax on Production	Households	Corporations
Total State and Local Tax	2,901.0		274,097.0	35,092.0	5,423.0
Total Federal Tax	187,744.0	12,568.0	33,724.0	126,303.0	58,906.0

MCPRD Spending

Total Operating Expenses: \$2,723,862.67

Table H.4: Impact of Lake Pleasant Regional Park Operating Expenses

	Employment	Labor Income	Value Added	Output
Direct	25.5	1,681,832.1	2,108,758.9	2,377,657.0
Indirect	1.2	70,174.3	104,303.8	158,040.9
Induced	10.8	522,143.9	926,818.7	1,410,737.6
Total	37.5	2,274,150.2	3,139,881.4	3,946,435.5

Table H.5: Impact of Lake Pleasant Regional Park Operating Expenses on Local, State tax and Federal taxes

	Employee Compensation	Proprietor income	Tax on Production	Households	Corporations
Total State and Local Tax	\$3,420.00		\$83,717.00	\$36,617.00	\$4,675.00
Total Federal Tax	\$221,278	\$5,012	\$10,300	\$131,794	\$50,781