

# **2019 MARICOPA COUNTY PARKS AND RECREATION SYSTEM REPORT**

## **Economic Impact of the Maricopa County Parks and Recreation System**

Prepared by:

Deepak Chhabra, Ph.D.

Linsi He, Ph.D. Student (Volunteer)

Project Contributors:

Joseph Quansah (Graduate Research Assistant)

Dale Larsen, Professor of Practice

School of Community Resources and Development

Watts College of Public Service and Community

Solutions

411 North Central Avenue

Suite 550

Arizona State University, Phoenix, USA

602-496-0172

Deepak.chhabra@asu.edu

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b> .....	1
<b>INTRODUCTION</b> .....	5
<b>DATA SOURCES AND METHODS</b> .....	8
<b>FINDINGS</b> .....	10
<b>REFERENCES</b> .....	17
<b>APPENDIX A: Description of Terms</b> .....	17
<b>APPENDIX B</b> .....	18
<b>APPENDIX C</b> .....	20
<b>APPENDIX D: CAVE CREEK PARK</b> .....	26
<b>APPENDIX E: ESTRELLA MOUNTAIN PARK</b> .....	29
<b>APPENDIX F: MCDOWELL MOUNTAIN PARK</b> .....	32
<b>APPENDIX G: SAN TAN PARK</b> .....	35
<b>APPENDIX H: SPUR CROSS RANCH</b> .....	38
<b>APPENDIX I: USERY MOUNTAIN PARK</b> .....	41
<b>APPENDIX J: WHITE TANK PARK</b> .....	44
<b>APPENDIX K: LAKE PLEASANT/DOC PARK</b> .....	47
<b>APPENDIX L: ADOBE DAM REGIONAL PARK</b> .....	50

## **LIST OF CONTENT TABLES**

<b>Table 1. Maricopa County Parks and Recreation System Visitations .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Table 2. Total Visitor Spending for Eight Parks .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Table 3. Breakdown of Visitor Spending by Different Categories .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Table 4. Breakdown Visitor Spending by Different Types of Visitors (\$) .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Table 5. Total Economic Impact of Visitor Spending across all Parks (\$) .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Table 6. Total Tax Contributions of Visitor Spending across all Parks (\$) .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Table 7. MCPRD Operating Expenses and Administration Costs (\$) .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Table 8. Total Economic Impact of Operating Expenses from all Parks (\$) .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Table 9. Total Tax Contributions of Operating Expenses from all Parks (\$) .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Table 10. Concessionaire Revenue by each Park (\$) .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Table 11. Economic Impact of Concessionaire Revenue (\$) .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Table 12. State, Local and Federal Tax Contribution of Concessionaire Revenue (\$) .....</b>	<b>16</b>

## LIST OF APPENDIX TABLES

<b>Table 1: Definition of Tax Types for State and Local Governments</b> .....	18
<b>Table 2: Definition of Tax Types for Federal Government</b> .....	19
<b>Table C1: Survey Respondents by Visitor Categories for each Park</b> .....	20
<b>Table C2: Local Visitations, Non-local visitation and Retained Local Visitations</b> .....	21
<b>Table C3: Breakdown of Day-Trippers and Overnight Retained Local and Non-local Visitors</b> .....	21
<b>Table C4.1: Average Spending Per Person Per Day of Retained Local Day-Trippers (\$)</b> .....	22
<b>Table C4.2: Total Spending of Retained Local Day-Trippers (\$)</b> .....	22
<b>Table C5.1: Average Spending Per Person Per Night of Retained Overnight Local Visitors (\$)</b> ....	23
<b>Table C5.2: Total Spending of Overnight Retained Visitors (\$)</b> .....	23
<b>Table C6.1: Average Spending Per Person Per Day of Non-local Day-Trippers (\$)</b> .....	24
<b>Table C6.2: Total Spending of Non-local Day-Trippers (\$)</b> .....	24
<b>Table C7.1: Average Spending Per Person Per Night of Non-local Overnight Visitors (\$)</b> .....	25
<b>Table C7.2: Total Spending of Overnight Non-local Visitors (\$)</b> .....	25
<b>Table D1: Total Direct Spending by sector for Cave Creek Park</b> .....	26
<b>Table D2: Impact of Cave Creek Park Visitor Spending</b> .....	26
<b>Table D3: Impact of Cave Creek Park Visitor Spending on State, Local and Federal Taxes</b> .....	26
<b>Table D4: Operating Expense and Administration Costs Breakdown for Cave Creek Park</b> .....	27
<b>Table D5: Impact of Cave Creek Park Operating Expenses</b> .....	28
<b>Table D6: Impact of Cave Creek Park Operating Expenses on State, Local and Federal Taxes</b> ....	28
<b>Table E1: Total Direct Spending by sector for Estrella Mountain Park</b> .....	29
<b>Table E2: Impact of Estrella Mountain Park Visitor Spending</b> .....	29
<b>Table E3: Impact of Estrella Mountain Park Visitor Spending on State, Local and Federal Taxes</b> .....	29
<b>Table E4: Operating Expense and Administration Costs Breakdown for Estrella Mountain Park</b>	30
<b>Table E5: Impact of Estrella Mountain Park Operating Expenses</b> .....	31
<b>Table E6: Impact of Estrella Mountain Park Operating Expenses on State, Local and Federal Taxes</b> .....	31
<b>Table F1: Total Direct Spending by sector for McDowell Mountain Park</b> .....	32
<b>Table F2: Impact of McDowell Mountain Park Visitor Spending</b> .....	32
<b>Table F3: Impact of McDowell Mountain Park Visitor Spending on State, Local and Federal Taxes</b> .....	32

<b>Table F4: Operating Expense and Administration Costs Breakdown for McDowell Mountain Park</b>	33
<b>Table F5: Impact of McDowell Mountain Park Operating Expenses</b>	34
<b>Table F6: Impact of McDowell Mountain Park Operating Expenses on State, Local and Federal Taxes</b>	34
<b>Table G1: Total Direct Spending by sector for San Tan Park</b>	35
<b>Table G2: Impact of San Tan Park Visitor Spending</b>	35
<b>Table G3: Impact of San Tan Park Visitor Spending on State, Local and Federal Taxes</b>	35
<b>Table G4: Operating Expense and Administration Costs Breakdown for San Tan Park</b>	36
<b>Table G5: Impact of San Tan Park Operating Expenses</b>	37
<b>Table G6: Impact of San Tan Park Operating Expenses on State, Local and Federal Taxes</b>	37
<b>Table H1: Total Direct Spending by sector for Spur Cross Ranch</b>	38
<b>Table H2: Impact of Spur Cross Ranch Visitor Spending</b>	38
<b>Table H3: Impact of Spur Cross Ranch Visitor Spending on State, Local and Federal Taxes</b>	38
<b>Table H4: Operating Expense and Administration Costs Breakdown for Spur Cross Ranch</b>	39
<b>Table H5: Impact of Spur Cross Ranch Operating Expenses</b>	40
<b>Table H6: Impact of San Tan Park Operating Expenses on State, Local and Federal Taxes</b>	40
<b>Table I1: Total Direct Spending by sector for Usery Mountain Park</b>	41
<b>Table I2: Impact of Usery Mountain Park Visitor Spending</b>	41
<b>Table I3: Impact of Usery Mountain Park Visitor Spending on State, Local and Federal Taxes</b>	41
<b>Table I4: Operating Expense and Administration Costs Breakdown for Usery Mountain Park</b>	42
<b>Table I5: Impact of Usery Mountain Park Operating Expenses</b>	43
<b>Table I6: Impact of Usery Mountain Park Operating Expenses on State, Local and Federal Taxes</b>	43
<b>Table J1: Total Direct Spending by sector for White Tank Park</b>	44
<b>Table J2: Impact of White Tank Park Visitor Spending</b>	44
<b>Table J3: Impact of White Tank Park Visitor Spending on State, Local and Federal Taxes</b>	44
<b>Table J4: Operating Expense and Administration Costs Breakdown for White Tank Park</b>	45
<b>Table J5: Impact of White Tank Park Operating Expenses</b>	46
<b>Table J6: Impact of White Tank Park Operating Expenses on State, Local and Federal Taxes</b>	46
<b>Table K1: Total Direct Spending by sector for Lake Pleasant/DOC Park</b>	47
<b>Table K2: Impact of Lake Pleasant Park/DOC Visitor Spending</b>	47

<b>Table K3: Impact of Lake Pleasant/DOC Park Visitor Spending on State, Local and Federal Taxes .....</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>Table K4: Operating Expense and Administration Costs Breakdown for Lake Pleasant /DOC Park .....</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>Table K6: Impact of Lake Pleasant/DOC Park Operating Expenses on State, Local and Federal Taxes .....</b>	<b>49</b>
<b>Table L1: Operating Expense and Administration Costs Breakdown for Adobe Dam Regional Park .....</b>	<b>50</b>
<b>Table L2: Impact of Adobe Dam Park Operating Expenses.....</b>	<b>51</b>
<b>Table L3: Impact of Adobe Dam Park Operating Expenses on State, Local and Federal Taxes...</b>	<b>51</b>

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Maricopa County is the nation's fastest-growing county, home to approximately four and a half million people, making up more than one-half of the population of the State of Arizona. The County includes 24 cities and towns and several unincorporated communities. The County as a whole covers 9,224 square miles and is larger than four U.S. states. The Maricopa County park system includes 12 parks encompassing approximately 120,000 acres, making it one of, if not the largest, county park system in the country.

The parks managed by the Maricopa County Parks and Recreation Department (MCPRD) in the state of Arizona are patronized by both local and non-local visitors. These regional parks offer both tangible and intangible benefits to the visitors and the host communities in the context of outdoor recreation, wellness, conservation and revenue (NRPA 2017). The core purpose of this study was to calculate the economic impact of visitors, for the year 2019, to eight iconic parks managed by MCPRD: Cave Creek Regional Park, Estrella Mountain Regional Park, Lake Pleasant Regional Park, McDowell Mountain Regional Park, San Tan Mountain Regional Park, Spur Cross Ranch Conservation Area, Utery Mountain Regional Park, and White Tank Mountain Regional Park. Additionally, it calculates the economic impact of concessionaire revenue at the listed parks. The economic impact of operating expenses and administrative costs at the Adobe Dam Regional Park are also assessed.

It is noted, that recreation spending by park visitors at the eight parks and the operating budget for the nine regional parks, are significant drivers of economic activity in the region and are a robust instrument of economic activity. Six parks offer economic benefits within Maricopa County and economic activity spreads beyond the County border to Yavapai County for Lake Pleasant Regional Park and Pinal County for San Tan Mountain Regional Park.

- The Maricopa County Parks and Recreation System has generated a total of \$93.36 million (around \$82.74 million in visitor expenditures and \$10.63 million in overall operating expenses of MCPRD) in 2019.
- The shared impact of visitor spending and operating costs on the local gateway regions has resulted in \$117.77 million in output, \$69.87 million in gross regional product (value-added), \$45.61 million in labor income, and 948 in jobs (full/part-time).
- Furthermore, the shared impact has generated \$9.5 million in federal taxes and \$5.84 million in state/local taxes.
- The park leverage ratio is 1:4.85. For each dollar invested in net operating costs by MCPRD in the eight parks, \$4.85 is generated in resident income. In other words, for every dollar invested in the eight regional parks, a local resident receives the economic benefits of \$4.85 in employee compensation and proprietor income.
- In addition to the park leverage ratio, the direct concessionaire revenue generated by private sector recreation operators in the parks (\$25.11 million) has created \$51.57 million in output, \$30.41 million in gross regional product, \$21.38 million in labor income, 557 jobs (full/part-time) and \$4.67 million and \$3.31 million in federal and state/local tax contributions.

Further breakdown of the key results is presented below:

- Approximately 1.67 million visitors patronized the eight parks for recreation purposes in 2019. The park visitors spent approximately \$82.74 million in local gateway regions. Out of these, on average, 30.6% are non-local visitors across all eight parks and they generate a total of \$31.32 million in direct spending. Total local visitors are 1.15 million (68.7%) out of which 78% (897,087) are retained visitors and their spending totals to \$51.41 million. Retained visitors refer to local patrons who would have otherwise traveled outside the gateway region (County) for recreation if the visited park had been absent. Retained local day-trippers and retained overnight visitors generated \$41.63 million and \$9.78 million in direct spending respectively. Non-local day-trippers and overnight visitors generated \$29.64 million and \$1.67 million in direct expenditures.

The impact of total visitor spending has resulted in 796 jobs (full time/part-time), \$36.64 million in labor income, \$56.99 million in gross regional product, \$7.68 million in federal tax contributions and \$5.17 million in state/local tax contributions. Top industries that have benefited the most from visitor spending, in terms of value-added impact, are museums, historical sites, zoos and parks, lodging, food and beverage retail stores, other real estate, owner-occupied dwellings, hospitals, offices of physicians and employment services, miscellaneous store retailers, gasoline retail stores, and hospitals.

- The MCPRD operating expenses (\$10.63 million) associated with the eight parks of focus, the DOC, and the Adobe Dam Regional Park generated \$19.24 million in output, \$12.88 million in gross regional product, and \$8.98 million in labor income. Nearly 151 full and part-time employees were employed and \$1.8 million in total federal tax contributions and \$.67 million in total state/local tax contributions were made. Top industries impacted by the MCPRD operating expenses in terms of value-added, are employment and payroll of local government/education followed by other government enterprises, owner-occupied dwellings, water, sewage and other systems, facilities support services, landscape and horticultural services, and other real estate maintenance and repair construction of nonresidential structures.
- It is also worth noting that Maricopa County Parks receives less than 10% of their operating budget from the County General Fund. The overwhelming majority of operating revenues are generated from entrance and camping fees, events, and concessionaire revenue sharing.
- The park leverage ratio (total labor income divided by total operating expenses (\$9.34 million minus operating expense for Adobe Dam Regional Park and the DOC)) is 1:4.85. This means that for each dollar invested in net operating costs by MCPRD in the eight parks, \$4.85 is generated in resident income. Therefore, an investment in the form of operating budget by the County delivers approximately five times return in investment in the local gateway regions. As recommended by NRPA (2017), the policymakers and elected government officials should note that investments made to local and regional parks, not only enhances the quality of life in the local and regional neighborhoods, it also sparks a ripple effect throughout the regional economy.
- Concessionaires earn a direct revenue of \$25.11 million. This revenue generates \$51.57 million in output, \$30.41 million in value-added, \$21.38 million in labor income and 557 jobs (full/part-time). Total federal tax and state/local tax contributions are \$4.67 million and \$3.31 million respectively. These concessionaires also help to add to the visitor experience within the parks by



offering goods and services that the County may not otherwise be able to offer.

- It is important to note that the concessionaire revenues and resultant impacts are in addition to the previously mentioned park leverage ratio. In essence, Maricopa County Parks generate a significant leverage ratio and millions in additional value-added impacts created by concessionaires that operate within the park boundaries.

## **Recommendations**

Based on the high leverage ratio (1:4.51) and other positive study findings, Maricopa County should expand internal County strategies to increase park visitation and develop additional external collaborative partnerships with ancillary sectors such as sporting good stores, lodging, attractions, restaurants, grocery stores, new concessionaires, and local tour companies to boost visitor spending. Because a significant portion of operating revenue is obtained from entrance and camping fees, events, and concessionaire revenue sharing, campground, concessionaire amenities, and other guest offerings should be further developed to increase the length of stay. For instance, more capital investment should be made to offer new or upgraded recreational/camping facilities in parks with comparatively less visitation to raise the average duration of visits. Also, County seed funding or tax incentives could be provided to help incubate long-term concession operations in the parks. Furthermore, collaborative marketing and programming should be planned with institutions and industries that benefit the most from park visitor expenditures. Those benefitting most, include local communities and their chambers of commerce, museums, historical sites, zoos, lodging, food and beverage retailers, local tour operators, and park concessionaires.

Maricopa County's park system makes significant contributions to the economy of Maricopa County as a whole, the Greater Phoenix region, and in particular, rural and suburban areas while providing valuable natural resource protection and a healthy outdoor environment that enriches the local quality of life. As such, the County should expand economic development investments in new capital projects, park renovations and major maintenance projects, marketing, and collaborative ventures with the private and non-profit sectors to boost visitor spending, increase the length of stay, improve visitor experiences, and protect and enhance park natural resources, which are the primary drivers of park visitation.

## **Limitations**

Like all studies, this study is also subject to logistical and methodological limitations. It used existing data with a limited number of tourist expenditure items. For instance, spending on car rental and vehicle repair could not be ascertained. Also, expenditures grouped under the 'other' category could not be analyzed, hence were excluded. Furthermore, dollars spent by visitors in the form of entrance fees, permits and licenses are forwarded to MCPRD and do not directly enter the local economy through visitor spending. Therefore, these items were excluded from economic impact calculations. Because of the above limitations, it is highly likely that the economic impact assessment is underestimated.

For comprehensive economic impact assessment, a future study is recommended. The study can collect primary data to offer a comprehensive view of visitor markets and their economic impact in the gateway regions. The new study can use online, onsite/mail-back surveys and conduct interviews of vendors/relevant stakeholders both inside and outside the park premises.

## **Acknowledgments**

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

# INTRODUCTION

Maricopa County is the nation's fastest-growing county, home to approximately four and a half million people, making up more than one-half of the population of the State of Arizona. The County includes 24 cities and towns and several unincorporated communities. The County as a whole covers 9,224 square miles and is larger than four U.S. states. The Maricopa County park system includes 12 parks encompassing approximately 120,000 acres, making it one, if not the largest, county park system in the country.

Maricopa County is home to ten regional parks and the Desert Outdoor Center for Environmental Education (DOC) which span approximately 120,000 acres of land. These parks are managed by the Maricopa County Parks and Recreation Department (MCPRD). These unique natural spaces serve as recreation destinations for visitors from across the nation and around the world and offer benefits to Maricopa County, Yavapai County, the Phoenix Metropolitan Service Area (MSA), and local residents in the form of open space, outdoor recreation, health and wellness, and outdoor educational opportunities. Additionally, these parks and their facilities, services and amenities, make economic contributions to local communities through expenditures by visitors (Crompton 2010; Chhabra, Steffey, Zhao, Larsen & Budruk 2016; Glupker 2019; Stynes 2010; Young 2017). In other words, spending by MCPRD visitors and retained locals generate and support a considerable amount of economic activity within park gateway communities (Stynes 2010). Expenses incurred by MCPRD to manage the parks also generate economic benefits for the local gateway regions. The economic impact of eight parks and the DOC (spanning 112,979 acres) is presented in this report.

Additionally, Commercial Management Concessionaire Agreements (CMCAs) produces notable benefits for the gateway communities. Concessionaires sign an agreement with MCPRD. The commercial concession agreements allow for annual use of the park(s), by a vendor or operator, for commercial recreation-related activities or business ventures. Examples include (but are not limited to): water parks, marinas, golf courses, scuba certifications, food and drink vendors, commercial sales and/or service offerings (i.e. guided tours for fishing, boating, hiking, kayaking, mountain biking, equestrian).

The purpose of this study is to document the economic impact of tourists and retained local spending (retained visitors refer to locals who would have visited a park outside the study area in the absence of the visited park). The data for this study is derived from the 2018-2019 'Maricopa County Park Visitor Study.' The economic impact analysis uses spending and travel behavior data from that study to measure how spending by the visitor circulates through local gateway economies, generating business sales, adding to gross regional product by supporting local jobs, resident income and taxes.

IMPLAN software is used, which is to date, the most commonly used software to determine the economic impacts of recreation and tourism in the United States. IMPLAN uses the input-output economic modeling technique. It is a form of economic analysis that relies on interdependencies between different economic sectors. Input-output modeling estimates the impacts of "shocks" (in the form of new spending) to an economy and examines the ripple effects of this spending (new demand). In other words, it helps 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 540 distinct sectors and can compute a summary of economic impact in the region in terms of changes in jobs, household income, tax impacts, and gross regional product as new expenditures are injected into the economy. This study uses IMPLAN 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 to manage and operate the regional parks and the DOC. There are two ways, in which, 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). The 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 in the region because of the park's existence and it would have been lost if it was incurred in a park outside the gateway region. Based on a meta-analysis of existing studies, it is ascertained that 22% of the local visitor spending is displaced. In other words, this spending would have incurred in the gateway region in the absence of the visited park. This implies that 78% of the local visitor spending is retained because of the existence of the iconic parks. This study also features the economic impact of concessionaire operations at the regional parks.

## **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 the host region economies. Extant literature confirms that natural resource-based attractions, such as public parks, are significant contributors to local economies (Chhabra et al. 2016; Glupker 2019; Greenwood and Vick 2008; National Resource Report 2012; NRPA 2017).

The economic impact of visitors and retained local expenditures in recreation and tourism is comprised of direct, indirect and induced effects. Direct impact captures money a tourism enterprise receives directly through user fees, its souvenirs or gift shops, its own snack shop sales, etc. Indirect impact refers to spending by vendors of local park and recreation agencies. 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. In other words, this means that the park or recreation facility generates indirect benefits for other suppliers. If these suppliers belong to the local region, then the local region will benefit. If the suppliers are based outside of the local or host region, then leakage will result. This leakage is captured by multipliers, the higher the multiplier, the lower the leakage and vice versa (Chhabra et al. 2016; Munn, Hussain, Spurlock & Henderson 2010; The Trust for Public Land 2010). Induced impact tracks consumer spending from wages by park and recreation agency employees and employees hired by the vendors of the park and recreation agencies. For instance, when a recreation agency or vendor of this recreation agency hires employees as a result of the direct economic benefits, these employees will benefit the local region by spending their income; this spending could be on groceries, housing, etc., but it will be part of the benefit generated by the park and/or recreation agency and the vendor.

Next, we have the economic impact of ancillary/support sectors. These support services refer to other supply-side components that contribute to recreation and/or tourism. For example, 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

offer a complete recreation/tourism product and/or experience (Crompton 2010; Chhabra, Steffey, Zhao & Larsen 2015). 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 park is facilitating expanded economic benefits through its support sectors (Chhabra 2006; Chhabra et al. 2015; Crompton 2010; Munn et al. 2010; Timothy 2003). These impacts again can be direct, indirect, and induced.

Multipliers capture indirect and induced effects. High multipliers (between 2.5 to 3:00), imply that the goods are produced locally instead of being imported from outside (Crompton 1999, 2011; Chhabra 2006; Chhabra, Steffey, Zhao, Larsen & Budruk. 2016).

## **Types of Economic Effects Measured**

Five types of economic impacts are calculated:

1. **Output:** can be described as the total value of production.
2. **Employment:** refers to the total number of jobs. This includes self-employed, wage and salary employees, and all full-time, part-time and seasonal jobs, based on a count of full- time/part-time average over a period of twelve months.
3. **Value-Added:** is the total equivalent of GDP and includes 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 with an industry's production.
4. **Labor Income:** includes wages and fringe benefits. It consists of 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.'
5. **Taxes:** 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 impacts and include two categories: Federal and State/local. The tax impact report provides information on tax collection by State/Local and Federal governments. The IMPLAN software does not segregate 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 different tax types for State and Local Governments. Table 2 (Appendix A) describes tax types for federal governments.

## **Economic Region- Study Area**

Appropriate study areas had to be mapped to compute the economic impact of non-local visitors and retained resident expenditures to the regional parks. Each park has its distinct set of characteristics and location. Several studies have defined local gateway communities (study area) as those lying within a 50 or 60-mile radius of each park. For instance, the National Park Service's economic impact report uses the 60-mile radius as its metric for drawing up local community parameters for each park within the U.S. (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 the impact of park 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.

## **DATA SOURCES AND METHODS**

Visitor expenditures are acquired from the 2018-2019 'Maricopa County Parks Visitor' report. Operating expenses 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 or the designated study areas, and regional economic multipliers that describe the economic effects of visitor spending in local economies. Park visitors, used in this study, are split into four distinct segments:

- Local retained day-trippers
- Local retained overnight visitors
- Non-local day-trippers (outside the gateway region, both within Arizona and outside of Arizona)
- Non-local overnight visitors: (outside the gateway region, both within Arizona and outside of Arizona)

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

- Gas and transportation costs
- Lodging (hotels and campgrounds)
- Food, meals and drinks (eating and drinking)
- Shopping and gifts (clothing, gifts, souvenirs, etc.)
- Recreation equipment purchase (camping gear, hiking/biking gear, etc.)
- Tourist services (jeep tours/rentals etc.)
- Entrance fees, permits and licenses

Entrance fees, permits and licenses are not included in the economic impact computation because these are collected by MCPRD and do not directly enter the local economy through visitor spending.

## **IMPLAN**

The IMPLAN software system uses the input/output modeling technique that is based on social accounting matrices, multipliers, and trade flows (Greenwood & Vick 2008; IMPLAN 2000, 2014, 2020):

*SAMs:* Social Accounting Matrices annually use real dollars of all business transactions and these are derived from the reports of 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 helps to identify different types of industries and households that benefit the most from the economic impact analysis (IMPLAN 2007; 2020).

*Multipliers:* help to show direct, indirect and induced impacts as a result of the visitor spending based on 540 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 the demand for recreation/tourism products and services

*Direct effects:* are determined by the initial visitor expenditures injected into the economy. The indirect effects relate to additional spending incurred by recreation/tourism businesses in the region to produce/supply required recreation/tourism products and services. 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 benefits).

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

## **FINDINGS**

Eight popular regional parks, managed by MCPRD, received a total of 1.67 million recreation visitors in 2019. These visitors generated approximately 796 jobs, \$36.64 million in labor income and \$56.95 million in value-added (gross regional product) impacts. MCPRD operating expenses produced a total of 151 jobs, \$8.97 million in labor income, \$12.88 million in gross regional product, and \$19.24 million in output. Tables 1-12 offer a further detailed breakdown of economic impact results.

The leverage ratio for each park is also calculated. It is: 1:2.20 for Cave Creek Regional Park, 1:2.81 for Estrella Mountain Regional Park, 1:5.76 for Lake Pleasant Regional Park, 1:7.46 for McDowell Mountain Regional Park, 1:4.00 for San Tan Mountain Regional Park, 1:4.17 for Spur Cross Ranch Conservation Area, 1:3.40 for Utery Mountain Regional Park, and 1:2.15 for White Tank Mountain Regional Park. As the results indicate, McDowell Mountain Regional Park has the highest leverage ratio. This means that for each County dollar invested in net operating costs by MCPRD in this park, \$7.46 is generated in resident income. Leverage ratio of 1:5.76 for Lake Pleasant Regional Park implies that for each dollar in net operating cost invested by MCPRD in the park, \$5.76 is generated in resident income. White Tank Mountain Regional Park generates the lowest leverage ratio (1:2.15).

The difference in leverage ratios between the eight parks can be attributed to several factors such as total visitations, total direct visitation spending, multiplier effects of some visitor spending items (for instance, although visitor spending for a certain item might be high, if the item has a low multiplier value, then most of the revenue is leaked out of the gateway region). Another reason for the low leverage ratio is the total operating expense. For instance, Lake Pleasant Regional Park has a high operating expense. Therefore, regardless of the high labor income impact of direct visitor spending, its leverage ratio is comparatively lower than the McDowell Mountain Regional Park.

## **VISITOR SPENDING**

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 White Tank Regional Park and Utery Mountain Regional Park.



**Table 1 Maricopa County Parks and Recreation System Visitations**

<b>Parks</b>	<b>Total visitation</b>	<b>Local Visitation</b>	<b>Retained local visitation</b>	<b>Non-local visitation</b>
<b>Cave Creek</b>	82,191.0	63,223.8	49,314.6	18,967.2
<b>Estrella</b>	83,924.0	55,421.5	43,228.8	28,502.5
<b>McDowell Mountain</b>	109,159.0	68,224.4	53,215.0	40,934.6
<b>San Tan</b>	168,168.0	111,249.6	86,774.7	56,918.4
<b>Spur Cross</b>	24,141.0	17,641.5	13,760.4	6,499.5
<b>Usery Mountain</b>	232,263.0	172,538.2	134,579.8	59,724.8
<b>White Tank</b>	288,504.0	196,707.3	153,431.7	91,796.7
<b>Lake Pleasant</b>	686,584.0	465,105.3	362,782.1	221,478.7
<b>Total (\$)</b>	<b>1,674,934.0</b>	<b>1,150,111.6</b>	<b>897,087.1</b>	<b>524,822.4</b>

Tables 2 and 3 present a detailed breakdown of visitor expenditures by park and by spending sector. Total visitor expenditures for all parks are \$82.74 million. Highest spending is at the Lake Pleasant Regional Park following by McDowell Mountain Regional Park and Usery Mountain Regional Park (see Table 2).

**Table 2. Total Visitor Spending for Eight Parks**

<b>Parks</b>	<b>Total (\$)</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Cave Creek Regional Park</b>	3,607,554.2	4.36
<b>Estrella Mountain Regional Park</b>	4,571,316.3	5.53
<b>McDowell Mountain Regional Park</b>	11,001,726.3	13.30
<b>San Tan Mountain Regional Park</b>	6,847,721.5	8.28
<b>Spur Cross Ranch Conservation Area</b>	2,491,489.2	3.01
<b>Usery Mountain Regional Park</b>	8,810,717.2	10.65
<b>White Tank Mountain Regional Park</b>	5,850,237.8	7.07
<b>Lake Pleasant Regional Park</b>	39,555,543.4	47.81
<b>Total (\$)</b>	<b>82,736,305.9</b>	100.00

As Table 3 reveals, recreation equipment purchase accounts for the largest share of visitor spending followed by the food, meals and drinks and the lodging sectors. Entrance fees, permits and licenses go to MCPRD, hence they are not factored into the visitor economic impact. Gas and transportation sector accounted for approximately 13.6% of the total spending.

**Table 3. Breakdown of Visitor Spending by Different Categories**

Spending Category	Total (\$)	Percentage
<b>Lodging (hotels, campgrounds, etc.)</b>	12,001,674.4	14.51
<b>Shopping &amp; Gifts (clothing, gifts, souvenirs, etc.)</b>	6,012,927.7	7.27
<b>Food, Meals &amp; Drinks (restaurants, taverns, groceries, snacks, etc.)</b>	18,225,284.5	22.03
<b>Tourist Services (jeep tours/rentals..., etc.)</b>	5,939,711.1	7.18
<b>Recreation Equipment Purchase (camping gear, hiking/biking gear, etc.)</b>	18,408,981.5	22.25
<b>Gas and Transportation Costs</b>	11,218,339.9	13.56
<b>Entrance fees, Permits and Licenses</b>	10,929,386.8	13.21
<b>Total (\$)</b>	<b>82,736,305.9</b>	100.00

Table 4 presents a breakdown of total spending by four categories of visitors. Highest spending (50.32%) is retained local day-trippers (\$41.63 million) followed by non-local day-trippers at 35.83% (\$29.65 million) and retained locals at 11.82% (\$9.78 million) who stayed overnight.

**Table 4. Breakdown Visitor Spending by Different Types of Visitors (\$)**

Park Name	Spending of Retained Local Day Trippers	Spending of Retained Local Overnights	Spending of Non-local Day Trippers	Spending of Non-local Overnight Visitors	Total (\$)
<b>Cave Creek</b>	2,220,439.2	65,687.0	1,187,343.8	134,084.1	3,607,554.2
<b>Estrella</b>	442,019.6	57,264.1	4,072,032.6	0.0	4,571,316.3
<b>McDowell Mtn</b>	3,517,512.3	0.0	7,484,213.9	0.0	11,001,726.3
<b>San Tan</b>	2,432,204.3	0.0	4,415,517.2	0.0	6,847,721.5
<b>Spur Cross</b>	711,731.0	7,061.2	1,772,697.0	0.0	2,491,489.2
<b>Usery Mountain</b>	6,138,516.3	0.0	2,463,315.0	208,885.9	8,810,717.2
<b>White Tank</b>	3,906,668.7	1,177,446.0	766,123.1	0.0	5,850,237.8
<b>Lake Pleasant</b>	22,263,925.8	8,474,339.2	7,484,714.8	1,332,563.6	39,555,543.4
<b>Total (\$)</b>	<b>41,633,017.2</b>	<b>9,781,797.6</b>	<b>29,645,957.5</b>	<b>1,675,533.6</b>	<b>82,736,305.9</b>

Table 5 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 McDowell Mountain Regional Park. Spur Cross Ranch Conservation Area makes the lowest contribution in terms of economic benefits. Approximately \$7.68 million in contributions is generated in federal tax and \$5.17 million in state and local taxes (see Table 6).

**Table 5. Total Economic Impact of Visitor Spending across all Parks (\$)**

<b>Park</b>	<b>Employment</b>	<b>Labor Income</b>	<b>Total Value Added</b>	<b>Output</b>
<b>Cave Creek</b>	29.4	1,318,772.6	2,136,714.0	3,572,313.8
<b>Estrella</b>	36.9	1,735,644.0	2,775,009.2	4,738,086.7
<b>McDowell Mountain</b>	117.3	5,326,234.5	8,799,582.2	14,589,451.4
<b>San Tan</b>	51.4	2,242,291.5	3,454,144.2	5,943,889.3
<b>Spur Cross</b>	23.9	1,104,789.1	1,813,343.5	3,034,868.1
<b>Usery Mountain</b>	79.5	3,503,896.8	5,246,704.1	9,110,455.0
<b>White Tank</b>	38.6	1,712,186.3	2,683,762.8	4,551,046.0
<b>Lake Pleasant</b>	419.3	19,699,366.5	30,085,413.2	52,988,987.6
<b>Total (\$)</b>	<b>796.3</b>	<b>36,643,181.3</b>	<b>56,994,673.2</b>	<b>98,529,097.9</b>

**Table 6. Total Tax Contributions of Visitor Spending across all Parks (\$)**

	<b>Employee Compensation</b>	<b>Proprietor Income</b>	<b>Tax on Production and Imports</b>	<b>Households</b>	<b>Corporations</b>	<b>Total (\$)</b>
<b>Total State and Local Tax</b>			4,444,189.0	660,054.0	65,334.0	<b>5,169,577.0</b>
<b>Total Federal Tax</b>	3,998,799.0	136,599.0	637,832.0	2,571,849.0	337,220.0	<b>7,682,299.0</b>

## OPERATING EXPENSES

Table 7 presents a breakdown of operating expenses and administration costs across nine parks and the DOC. As the table shows, the highest costs (42.6%) are incurred in the personnel category followed by park's oversight/administration (17.1%) and Utilities (7.6%).

**Table 7. MCPRD Operating Expenses and Administration Costs (\$)**

Category	Spending	Percentage
Personnel	4,529,744.0	42.6%
Supplies	325,680.0	3.1%
Souvenir Supplies	202,499.0	1.9%
Souvenir Taxes	19,091.0	0.2%
Fuel	65,502.0	0.6%
Non-capital Equipment	17,915.0	0.2%
Services	384,713.0	3.6%
Equipment Lease	22,424.0	0.2%
Repair/Maintenance	155,357.0	1.5%
Telecom/IT	219,899.0	2.1%
Vehicle Repair/Maintenance	149,474.0	1.4%
Travel	6,369.0	0.1%
Education	1,704.0	0.0%
Postage/Freight	3,147.0	0.0%
Utilities	810,412.0	7.6%
Capital Building	67,347.0	0.6%
Capital Equipment	46,658.0	0.4%
Park oversight/Administration	1,816,488.0	17.1%
Risk Charges	127,815.0	1.2%
CSCA	729,426.0	6.9%
Trades	563,938.0	5.3%
Trails	238,263.0	2.2%
MCSO Deputy	122,982.0	1.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>10,626,847.0</b>	<b>100%</b>

a: Out of these expenses, \$10.04 million are incurred directly in the eight parks which are the focus of economic impact analyses in this study. Table 8 includes operating costs of Adobe Dam Regional Park. Table 8 presents economic impact of MCPRD operating expenses from nine parks and the DOC. Approximately 151 employees are hired and operating expenditures produce approximately \$8.97 million in labor income and \$12.88 million in gross regional product. Tax contributions are presented in Table 9. As Table 9 shows, operating expenses generate \$1.8 million in federal taxes and \$.68 million in state/local taxes.

**Table 8. Total Economic Impact of Operating Expenses from all Parks (\$)**

<b>Park</b>	<b>Employment</b>	<b>Labor Income</b>	<b>Total Value Added</b>	<b>Output</b>
<b>Cave Creek</b>	13.4	792,866.3	1,139,694.2	1,702,556.2
<b>Estrella</b>	11.4	683,285.8	996,525.3	1,520,627.0
<b>McDowell Mountain</b>	10.7	632,779.3	917,606.3	1,406,365.8
<b>San Tan</b>	11.0	638,048.6	895,155.3	1,298,483.7
<b>Spur Cross</b>	5.8	341,591.5	463,589.0	623,570.5
<b>Usery Mountain</b>	18.9	1,118,665.8	1,602,432.1	2,409,762.6
<b>White Tank</b>	18.6	1,071,390.3	1,519,163.4	2,250,310.2
<b>Lake Pleasant/DOC</b>	56.5	3,340,350.0	4,734,803.6	6,978,238.1
<b>Adobe Dam</b>	5.1	352,970.4	608,833.7	1,053,338.5
<b>Total (\$)</b>	<b>151.5</b>	<b>8,971,947.9</b>	<b>12,877,802.9</b>	<b>19,243,252.5</b>

**Table 9. Total Tax Contributions of Operating Expenses from all Parks (\$)**

	<b>Employee Compensation</b>	<b>Proprietor Income</b>	<b>Tax on Production and Imports</b>	<b>Households</b>	<b>Corporations</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Total State and Local Tax</b>			499,534.0	161,266.0	14,413.0	<b>675,213.0</b>
<b>Total Federal Tax</b>	1,004,485.0	24,777.0	71,746.0	628,606.0	74,385.0	<b>1,803,999.0</b>

## Economic Impact of Concessionaires

The economic impact of Concessionaire revenue is presented in Table 11 and 12. Top ten industries impacted by spending are also listed. A total of 557 jobs are generated in the region. Total labor income and value-added impacts were \$21.38 million and approximately \$30.41 million respectively. Concessionaire revenue produces \$51.57 million in output.

**Table 10. Concessionaire Revenue by each Park (\$)**

Park	Revenue
Cave Creek	412,059.7
Estrella	692,161.1
San Tan	106,381.0
Spur Cross	78,683.3
Usery Mountain	29,939.1
White Tank	16,084.0
Lake Pleasant	4,494,387.0
Adobe Dam	18,095,272.2
Buckeye	48,593.4
Paradise Valley	1,132,712.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>25,106,273.4</b>

**Table 11. Economic Impact of Concessionaire Revenue (\$)**

Impact Type	Employment	Labor Income	Total Value Added	Output
Direct Effect	393.9	12,979,866.4	15,457,761.2	24,742,253.4
Indirect Effect	61.9	3,245,545.0	5,594,302.5	10,872,736.8
Induced Effect	101.7	5,154,444.1	9,355,550.4	15,960,130.7
<b>Total Effect</b>	<b>557.4</b>	<b>21,379,855.4</b>	<b>30,407,614.1</b>	<b>51,575,121.0</b>

Table 12 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 12. State, Local and Federal Tax Contribution of Concessionaire Revenue (\$)**

	Employee Compensation	Proprietor income	Tax on Production	Households	Corporations	Total
<b>Total State/Local Tax</b>			2,903,122.00	382,700.00	24,482.00	<b>3,310,304.00</b>
<b>Total Federal Tax</b>	2,360,225	76,312	411,426	1,493,229	126,173	<b>4,467,365.00</b>

## 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.
- Chhabra, D., Steffey, E., Zhao, S., Larsen, D. & Budruk, M. (2015). Economic Impact of Maricopa County Parks and Recreation Systems. Arizona State University, Phoenix.
- Chhabra, D., Steffey, E., Zhao, S., Larsen, D., & Budruk, M. (2016). Economic viability of park tourism. *Anatolia*, 27(4), 537-539.
- Crompton, J. (2010). *Measuring the Economic Impact of Park and Recreation Services*. National Park and Recreation Association.
- Glupker, C. (2019). Economic Impact Study: Kent County Parks.
- Greenwood, J. & Vick, C. (2008). *Economic Contribution of Visitors to North Carolina State Parks*. North Carolina State University: Raleigh (NC).
- IMPLAN (2000, 2014, 2020). 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.
- National Parks and Recreation Association (NRPA) (2017). Economic Impact of Local Parks. <https://www.nrpa.org/publications-research/research-papers/the-economic-impact-of-local-parks/>
- 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: For 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

## APPENDIX A: Description of Terms

- Retained locals refers to those local visitors who would have been visited an outside park if the Maricopa County park had not existed. This implies that the visited park retains outside spending and should be factored into the economic impact analysis.
- Gateway region refers to the county or counties (if a park spans more than one county) where the regional park is located.

## APPENDIX B

**Table 1 Definition of Tax Types for State and Local Governments**

Transaction Type	Description
Dividends	State and local government dividends refer 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, 2020)



**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: Employee 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 C

### Breakdown of Different Types of Respondents for Different Parks

Table C1. Survey Respondents by Visitor Categories for each Park

Parks	Total Visitors	Local Visitors	Non-local Visitors	Local Day Trippers	Local Overnight Visitors	Non-local Day Trippers	Non-local Overnight Visitors
<b>Cave Creek</b>	65.0	50.0	15.0	47.0	3.0	13.0	2.0
<b>Estrella Park</b>	53.0	35.0	18.0	33.0	2.0	18.0	0.0
<b>McDowell Mountain</b>	16.0	10.0	6.0	10.0	0.0	6.0	0.0
<b>San Tan</b>	65.0	43.0	22.0	43.0	0.0	22.0	0.0
<b>Spur Cross</b>	52.0	38.0	14.0	37.0	1.0	14.0	0.0
<b>Usery Mountain</b>	70.0	52.0	18.0	52.0	0.0	16.0	2.0
<b>White Tank</b>	22.0	15.0	7.0	13.0	2.0	7.0	0.0
<b>Lake Pleasant</b>	31.0	21.0	10.0	17.0	4.0	8.0	2.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>374.0</b>	<b>264.0</b>	<b>110.0</b>	<b>252.0</b>	<b>12.0</b>	<b>104.0</b>	<b>6.0</b>

Source: 2018-2019 'Maricopa County Park Visitor Study'

**Table C2. Local Visitations, Non-local visitation and Retained Local Visitations**

<b>Parks</b>	<b>Local visitations %</b>	<b>Non-local visitations %</b>	<b>Retained local visitations (78% of local visitors) %</b>
<b>Cave Creek</b>	76.9	23.1	60.0
<b>Estrella</b>	66.0	34.0	51.5
<b>MacDowell Mountain</b>	62.5	37.5	48.8
<b>San Tan Park</b>	66.2	33.8	51.6
<b>Spur Cross</b>	73.1	26.9	57.0
<b>Usery Mountain</b>	74.3	25.7	57.9
<b>White Tank</b>	68.2	31.8	53.2
<b>Lake Pleasant</b>	67.7	32.3	52.8
<b>Average Visitation %</b>	<b>69.4</b>	<b>30.6</b>	<b>54.1</b>

**Table C3. Breakdown of Day-Trippers and Overnight Retained Local and Non-local Visitors**

<b>Parks</b>	<b>Retained Locals</b>	<b>Non-locals</b>	<b>Day-trippers of Retained locals</b>	<b>Overnight of Retained locals</b>	<b>Day-trippers of Non-locals</b>	<b>Overnight of Non-locals</b>
<b>Cave Creek</b>	49,314.6	18,967.2	46,355.7	2,958.9	16,438.2	2,529.0
<b>Estrella</b>	43,228.8	28,502.5	40,758.6	2,470.2	28,502.5	0.0
<b>McDowell Mtn</b>	53,215.0	40,934.6	53,215.0	0.0	40,934.6	0.0
<b>San Tan P</b>	86,774.7	56,918.4	86,774.7	0.0	56,918.4	0.0
<b>Spur Cross</b>	13,760.4	6,499.5	13,398.3	362.1	6,499.5	0.0
<b>Usery Mountain</b>	134,579.8	59,724.8	134,579.8	0.0	53,088.7	6,636.1
<b>White Tank</b>	153,431.7	91,796.7	132,974.1	20,457.6	91,796.7	0.0
<b>Lake Pleasant</b>	362,782.1	221,478.7	293,680.8	69,101.4	177,183.0	44,295.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>897,087.1</b>	<b>524,822.4</b>	<b>801,736.9</b>	<b>95,350.1</b>	<b>471,361.6</b>	<b>53,460.8</b>

## Spending by Different Types of Local Visitors

**Table C4.1 Average Spending Per Person Per Day of Retained Local Day-Trippers (\$)**

Park Name	Party Size	Lodging	Shopping	Groceries	Tourist services	Recreation	Gas	Onsite Fees
Cave Creek	2.1	7.0	5.7	7.4	1.3	5.6	7.4	13.5
Estrella	2.6	0.0	1.6	1.5	0.0	1.5	2.8	3.5
McDowell Mtn	1.8	2.8	1.6	11.4	0.0	25.0	6.6	18.8
San Tan	2.6	0.0	2.8	3.3	0.0	0.2	12.0	9.7
Spur Cross	1.8	4.0	2.5	9.7	10.0	13.4	5.2	8.5
Usery Mountain	2.3	0.5	3.9	10.7	0.8	15.9	5.6	8.2
White Tank	2.7	0.0	6.4	1.6	3.1	0.9	4.8	12.6
Lake Pleasant	3.3	4.8	0.6	16.7	13.8	24.0	9.4	6.4

**Table C4.2 Total Spending of Retained Local Day-Trippers (\$)**

Park Name	Lodging	Shopping	Groceries	Tourist services	Recreation	Gas	Onsite Fees	Total (\$)
Cave Creek	324,490.1	265,618.3	343,959.5	57,944.7	260,519.2	343,495.9	624,411.6	2,220,439.2
Estrella	0.0	63,714.5	60,903.6	0.0	60,903.6	115,248.3	141,249.5	442,019.6
McDowell Mtn	149,667.2	83,813.6	604,655.6	0.0	1,330,375.3	349,223.5	999,777.0	3,517,512.3
San Tan	0.0	244,313.2	286,463.1	0.0	19,513.8	1,042,819.3	839,094.9	2,432,204.3
Spur Cross	53,351.6	32,831.8	129,788.1	133,379.0	178,933.1	69,972.7	113,474.8	711,731.0
Usery Mtn	67,515.0	524,647.5	1,436,943.4	112,524.9	2,137,973.7	758,418.0	1,100,493.8	6,138,516.3
White Tank	0.0	853,250.6	213,312.6	406,309.8	121,892.9	637,906.4	1,673,996.4	3,906,668.7
Lake Pleasant	1,423,222.2	180,726.6	4,890,914.3	4,055,053.7	7,059,633.9	2,767,376.5	1,886,998.6	22,263,925.8
<b>Total(\$)</b>	<b>2,018,246.0</b>	<b>2,248,916.1</b>	<b>7,966,940.2</b>	<b>4,765,212.1</b>	<b>11,169,745.5</b>	<b>6,084,460.7</b>	<b>7,379,496.6</b>	<b>41,633,017.2</b>

**Table C5.1 Average Spending Per Person Per Night of Retained Overnight Local Visitors (\$)**

Park Name	Party Size	Nights	Lodging	Shopping	Groceries	Tourist services	Recreation	Gas	Onsite Fees
Cave Creek	1.7	6.7	11.1	0.0	6.0	1.2	0.6	3.3	0.0
Estrella Park	5.5	2.0	13.64	0.91	0.91	0.00	0.00	4.55	3.18
McDowell Mtn	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
San Tan Park	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Spur Cross	1.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	13.0	1.5
Usery Mtn Park	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
White Tank	4.5	1.5	35.2	0.7	7.4	0.0	0.0	7.4	6.8
Lake Pleasant	3.0	2.8	18.2	4.8	19.4	3.8	66.7	4.8	4.9

**Table C5.2 Total Spending of Overnight Retained Visitors (\$)**

Park Name	Lodging	Shopping	Groceries	Tourist services	Recreation	Gas	Onsite Fees	Total (\$)
Cave Creek	32,843.5	0.0	17,753.3	3550.7	1,775.3	9,764.3	0.0	65,687.0
Estrella	33,684.8	2,245.7	2,245.7	0.0	0.0	11,228.25	7,859.8	57,264.1
McDowell Mtn	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
San Tan	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Spur Cross	0.0	0.0	1810.6	0.0	0.0	4,707.5	543.2	7,061.2
Usery Mtn	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
White Tank	719,802.9	15,153.8	151,537.5	0.0	0.0	151,537.5	139,414.5	1,177,446.0
Lake Pleasant	1,256,388.3	335,036.8	1,340,147.538	261747.6	4,606,757.2	335,036.9	339,224.8	8,474,339.2
<b>Total (\$)</b>	<b>2,042,719.5</b>	<b>352,436.3</b>	<b>1,513,494.5</b>	<b>265,298.2</b>	<b>4,608,532.5</b>	<b>512,274.4</b>	<b>487,042.3</b>	<b>9,781,797.6</b>

## Spending by Different Types of Non-local Visitors

**Table C6.1 Average Spending Per Person Per Day of Non-local Day-Trippers (\$)**

Park Name	Party Size	Lodging	Shopping	Groceries	Tourist services	Recreation	Gas	Onsite Fees
Cave Creek	2.0	31.3	3.8	13.1	0.0	4.8	7.1	12.0
Estrella	2.3	26.8	18.4	32.4	20.2	1.7	34.1	9.2
McDowell Mtn	2.0	116.7	16.7	30.0	0.0	3.8	13.9	1.8
San Tan	2.7	6.4	11.9	25.8	4.2	13.9	9.4	5.9
Spur Cross	2.8	124.4	28.8	54.4	1.3	0.8	59.2	3.9
Usery Moutain	2.2	0.0	11.3	8.1	1.4	4.5	10.9	10.1
White Tank	3.2	0.0	2.7	1.5	0.0	0.5	1.3	2.4
Lake Pleasant	4.4	2.3	2.3	18.1	0.0	7.1	4.6	7.8

**Table C6.2 Total Spending of Non-local Day-Trippers (\$)**

Park Name	Lodging	Shopping	Groceries	Tourist services	Recreation	Gas	Onsite Fees	Total(\$)
Cave Creek	515,274.3	63,223.8	214,961.1	0.0	79,029.8	116,964.1	197,890.6	1,187,343.8
Estrella	764,701.0	523,472.6	924,593.0	576,306.5	48,662.8	972,908.2	261,388.7	4,072,032.6
McDowell Mtn	4,775,706.3	682,243.8	1,228,038.8	0.0	153,504.8	569,673.5	75,046.8	7,484,213.9
San Tan	361,769.5	680,126.6	1,471,195.9	241,179.7	791,069.3	536,383.6	333,792.7	4,415,517.2
Spur Cross	808,271.2	187,485.6	353,306.2	8,332.7	4,999.6	384,970.4	25,331.4	1,772,697.0
Usery Mountain	0.0	599,143.7	432,293.6	75,841.0	241,174.3	580,941.9	533,920.5	2,463,315.0
White Tank	0.0	248,472.3	136,659.8	0.0	41,412.1	120,095.0	219,483.9	766,123.1
Lake Pleasant	404,989.6	404,989.6	3,214,605.3	0.0	1,265,592.6	809,979.3	1,384,558.3	7,484,714.8
<b>Total (\$)</b>	<b>7,630,711.8</b>	<b>3,389,158.1</b>	<b>7,975,653.5</b>	<b>901,659.8</b>	<b>2,625,445.3</b>	<b>4,091,915.9</b>	<b>3,031,412.9</b>	<b>29,645,957.5</b>

**Table C7.1 Average Spending Per Person Per Night of Non-local Overnight Visitors (\$)**

Park Name	Average Party Size	Average Nights	Lodging	Shopping	Groceries	Tourist services	Recreation	Gas	Onsite Fees
Cave Creek	1.5	8.5	20.8	5.9	16.1	0.0	0.6	9.4	0.3
Estrella	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
McDowell Mtn	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
San Tan	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Spur Cross	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Usery Mountain	2.0	22.0	14.3	1.1	9.7	1.1	0.6	3.9	0.7
White Tank	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Lake Pleasant	2.0	3.0	3.7	0.0	15.0	0.0	0.0	10.8	0.6

**Table C7.2 Total Spending of Overnight Non-local Visitors (\$)**

Park Name	Lodging	Shopping	Groceries	Tourist services	Recreation	Gas	Onsite Fees	Total
Cave Creek	52562.6	14876.2	40661.6	0.0	1487.6	23801.9	694.2	<b>134084.1</b>
Estrella	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	<b>0.0</b>
McDowell Mtn	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	<b>0.0</b>
San Tan Park	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	<b>0.0</b>
Spur Cross	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	<b>0.0</b>
Usery Mountain	95016.7	7541.0	64098.6	7541.0	3770.5	26016.5	4901.7	<b>208885.9</b>
White Tank	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	<b>0.0</b>
Lake Pleasant	162417.7	0.0	664436.1	0.0	0.0	479870.5	25839.2	<b>1332563.6</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>309997.0</b>	<b>22417.2</b>	<b>769196.3</b>	<b>7541.0</b>	<b>5258.1</b>	<b>529688.9</b>	<b>31435.1</b>	<b>1675533.6</b>

## APPENDIX D: CAVE CREEK PARK

### Visitor Expenditure

Table D1: Total Direct Spending by sector for Cave Creek Park

Item	Total (\$)	Percentage
Lodging	925,170.5	25.6
Shopping	343,718.3	9.5
Groceries	617,335.4	17.1
Tourist services	61,495.3	1.7
Recreation	342,811.9	9.5
Gas	494,026.2	13.7
Onsite Fees	822,996.5	22.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,607,554.2</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Table D2: Impact of Cave Creek Park Visitor Spending

Impact Type	Employment	Labor Income	Total Value Added	Output
Direct Effect	18.5	747,290.5	1,149,881.1	1,814,792.4
Indirect Effect	4.8	257,728.1	417,062.7	796,162.2
Induced Effect	6.1	313,754.0	569,770.1	961,359.2
<b>Total Effect</b>	<b>29.4</b>	<b>1,318,772.6</b>	<b>2,136,714.0</b>	<b>3,572,313.8</b>

Table D3: Impact of Cave Creek Park Visitor Spending on State, Local and Federal Taxes

	Employee Compensation	Proprietor Income	Tax on Production and Imports	Households	Corporations
<b>Total State and Local Tax</b>			200,430.0	23,787.0	2,518.0
<b>Total Federal Tax</b>	142,521.0	5,202.0	28,865.0	92,779.0	13,000.0



## Operating Expenses and Administration Costs

**Table D4: Operating Expense and Administration Costs Breakdown for Cave Creek Park**

Category	Spending	Percentage
Personnel	411,439.0	42.9
Supplies	24,483.0	2.6
Souvenir Supplies	18,870.0	2.0
Souvenir Taxes	2,066.0	0.2
Fuel	3,298.0	0.3
Non-capital Equipment	7,222.0	0.8
Services	34,244.0	3.6
Equipment Lease	2,613.0	0.3
Repair/Maint	7,979.0	0.8
Telecom/IT	24,148.0	2.5
Vehicle Repair/Maint	15,471.0	1.6
Travel	492.0	0.1
Education	0.0	0.0
Postage/Freight	894.0	0.1
Utilities	77,718.0	8.1
Capital Building	16,793.0	1.8
Capital Equipment	0.0	0.0
Park oversight/Administration	167,534.0	17.5
Risk Charges	12,847.0	1.3
CSCA	58,593.0	6.1
Trades	51,990.0	5.4
Trails	20,036.0	2.1
MCSO Deputy	0.0	0.0
<b>Total (\$)</b>	<b>958,730.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table D5: Impact of Cave Creek Park Operating Expenses**

<b>Impact Type</b>	<b>Employment</b>	<b>Labor Income</b>	<b>Total Value Added</b>	<b>Output</b>
<b>Direct Effect</b>	8.4	521,980.6	669,217.7	879,735.7
<b>Indirect Effect</b>	1.4	82,242.1	127,823.7	244,695.6
<b>Induced Effect</b>	3.7	188,643.6	342,652.8	578,124.9
<b>Total Effect</b>	<b>13.4</b>	<b>792,866.3</b>	<b>1,139,694.2</b>	<b>1,702,556.2</b>

**Table D6: Impact of Cave Creek Park Operating Expenses on State, Local and Federal Taxes**

	<b>Employee Compensation</b>	<b>Proprietor Income</b>	<b>Tax on Production and Imports</b>	<b>Households</b>	<b>Corporations</b>
<b>Total State and Local Tax</b>			43,922.0	14,261.0	1,269.0
<b>Total Federal Tax</b>	88,581.0	2,173.0	6,325.0	55,627.0	6,550.0

## APPENDIX E: ESTRELLA MOUNTAIN PARK

### Visitor Expenditures

Table E1: Total Direct Spending by sector for Estrella Mountain Park

	Total (\$)	Percentage
Lodging	798,385.7	17.5
Shopping	589,432.8	12.9
Groceries	987,742.2	21.6
Tourist services	576,306.5	12.6
Recreation	109,566.4	2.4
Gas	1,099,384.8	24.0
Onsite Fees	410,498.0	9.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,571,316.3</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Table E2: Impact of Estrella Mountain Park Visitor Spending

Impact Type	Employment	Labor Income	Total Value Added	Output
Direct Effect	22.2	952,021.6	1,436,905.9	2,358,444.7
Indirect Effect	6.7	370,697.1	588,304.7	1,114,505.1
Induced Effect	8.0	412,925.3	749,798.7	1,265,136.8
<b>Total Effect</b>	<b>36.9</b>	<b>1,735,644.0</b>	<b>2,775,009.2</b>	<b>4,738,086.7</b>

Table E3: Impact of Estrella Mountain Park Visitor Spending on State, Local and Federal Taxes

	Employee Compensation	Proprietor Income	Tax on Production and Imports	Households	Corporations
Total State and Local Tax			262,945.0	31,337.0	3,160.0
Total Federal Tax	185,251.0	7,612.0	37,868.0	122,231.0	16,311.0

## Operating Expenses and Administration Costs

**Table E4: Operating Expense and Administration Costs Breakdown for Estrella Mountain Park**

Category	Spending	Percentage
Personnel	326,049.0	37.9
Supplies	27,015.0	3.
Souvenir Supplies	7,662.0	0.9
Souvenir Taxes	1,536.0	0.2
Fuel	7,185.0	0.8
Non-capital Equipment	1,102.0	0.1
Services	15,219.0	1.8
Equipment Lease	2,613.0	0.3
Repair/Maintenance	39,389.0	4.6
Telecom/IT	17,238.0	2.0
Vehicle Repair/Maintenance	25,743.0	3.0
Travel	1,225.0	0.1
Education	0.0	0.0
Postage/Freight	243.0	0.0
Utilities	77,022.0	9.0
Capital Building	0.0	0.0
Capital Equipment	0.0	0.0
Park oversight/Administration	167,831.0	19.5
Risk Charges	12,817.0	1.5
CSCA	58,456.0	6.8
Trades	51,869.0	6.0
Trails	19,990.0	2.3
MCSO Deputy	0.0	0.0
<b>Total (\$)</b>	<b>860,204.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table E5: Impact of Estrella Mountain Park Operating Expenses**

<b>Impact Type</b>	<b>Employment</b>	<b>Labor Income</b>	<b>Total Value Added</b>	<b>Output</b>
<b>Direct Effect</b>	6.9	440,233.2	576,074.1	783,240.1
<b>Indirect Effect</b>	1.3	80,482.1	125,166.2	239,178.4
<b>Induced Effect</b>	3.2	162,570.5	295,285.0	498,208.4
<b>Total Effect</b>	<b>11.4</b>	<b>683,285.8</b>	<b>996,525.3</b>	<b>1,520,627.0</b>

**Table E6: Impact of Estrella Mountain Park Operating Expenses on State, Local and Federal Taxes**

	<b>Employee Compensation</b>	<b>Proprietor Income</b>	<b>Tax on Production and Imports</b>	<b>Households</b>	<b>Corporations</b>
<b>Total State and Local Tax</b>			40,157.0	12,295.0	1,144.0
<b>Total Federal Tax</b>	76,033.0	1,973.0	5,783.0	47,955.0	5,903.0

## APPENDIX F: MCDOWELL MOUNTAIN PARK

### Visitor Expenditures

**Table F1: Total Direct Spending by sector for McDowell Mountain Park**

Item	Total (\$)	Percentage
Lodging	4,925,373.5	44.8
Shopping	766,057.4	7.0
Groceries	1,832,694.3	16.7
Tourist services	0.0	0.0
Recreation	1,483,880.2	13.5
Gas	918,897.1	8.4
Onsite Fees	1,074,823.9	9.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>11,001,726.3</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table F2: Impact of McDowell Mountain Park Visitor Spending**

Impact Type	Employment	Labor Income	Total Value Added	Output
Direct Effect	73.7	3,031,756.8	4,841,031.3	7,558,457.3
Indirect Effect	19.0	1,027,270.0	1,657,139.1	3,147,937.1
Induced Effect	24.6	1,267,207.7	2,301,411.8	3,883,056.9
<b>Total Effect</b>	<b>117.3</b>	<b>5,326,234.5</b>	<b>8,799,582.2</b>	<b>14,589,451.4</b>

**Table F3: Impact of McDowell Mountain Park Visitor Spending on State, Local and Federal Taxes**

	Employee Compensation	Proprietor Income	Tax on Production and Imports	Households	Corporations
<b>Total State and Local Tax</b>			792,508.0	95,975.0	10,981.0
<b>Total Federal Tax</b>	582,505.0	18,736.0	114,132.0	374,350.0	56,684.0

## Operating Expenses and Administration Costs

**Table F4: Operating Expense and Administration Costs Breakdown for McDowell Mountain Park**

Category	Spending	Percentage
Personnel	281,462.0	37.9
Supplies	32,716.0	3.
Souvenir Supplies	15,180.0	0.9
Souvenir Taxes	2,041.0	0.2
Fuel	5,586.0	0.8
Non-capital Equipment	1,791.0	0.1
Services	43,263.0	1.8
Equipment Lease	2,613.0	0.3
Repair/Maintenance	9,780.0	4.6
Telecom/IT	15,415.0	2.0
Vehicle Repair/Maintenance	15,501.0	3.0
Travel	889.0	0.1
Education	0.0	0.0
Postage/Freight	239.0	0.0
Utilities	68,767.0	9.0
Capital Building	0.0	0.0
Capital Equipment	11,334.0	0.0
Park oversight/Administration	157,233.0	19.5
Risk Charges	12,055.0	1.5
CSCA	54,980.0	6.8
Trades	48,784.0	6.0
Trails	18,801.0	2.3
MCSO Deputy	0.0	0.0
<b>Total (\$)</b>	<b>798,430.0</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table F5: Impact of McDowell Mountain Park Operating Expenses**

<b>Impact Type</b>	<b>Employment</b>	<b>Labor Income</b>	<b>Total Value Added</b>	<b>Output</b>
<b>Direct Effect</b>	6.6	406,366.2	526,456.0	719,503.3
<b>Indirect Effect</b>	1.3	75,860.6	117,704.6	225,498.3
<b>Induced Effect</b>	2.9	150,552.4	273,445.7	461,364.1
<b>Total Effect</b>	<b>10.7</b>	<b>632,779.3</b>	<b>917,606.3</b>	<b>1,406,365.8</b>

**Table F6: Impact of McDowell Mountain Park Operating Expenses on State, Local and Federal Taxes**

	<b>Employee Compensation</b>	<b>Proprietor Income</b>	<b>Tax on Production and Imports</b>	<b>Households</b>	<b>Corporations</b>
<b>Total State and Local Tax</b>			37,576.0	11,391.0	1,035.0
<b>Total Federal Tax</b>	70,041.0	1,950.0	5,411.0	44,430.0	5,341.0



## APPENDIX G: SAN TAN PARK

### Visitor Expenditures

Table G1: Total Direct Spending by sector for San Tan Park

Item	Total (\$)	Percentage
Lodging	361,769.5	5.3
Shopping	924,439.8	13.5
Groceries	1,757,659.0	25.7
Tourist services	241,179.7	3.5
Recreation	810,583.1	11.8
Gasoline	1,579,202.9	23.1
Onsite Fees	1,172,887.5	17.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>6,847,721.5</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Table G2: Impact of San Tan Park Visitor Spending

Impact Type	Employment	Labor Income	Total Value Added	Output
Direct Effect	32.4	1,252,711.5	1,734,966.3	2,835,018.0
Indirect Effect	8.5	450,141.1	739,680.1	1,443,068.0
Induced Effect	10.6	539,438.9	979,497.8	1,665,803.3
<b>Total Effect</b>	<b>51.4</b>	<b>2,242,291.5</b>	<b>3,454,144.2</b>	<b>5,943,889.3</b>

Table G3: Impact of San Tan Park Visitor Spending on State, Local and Federal Taxes

	Employee Compensation	Proprietor Income	Tax on Production and Imports	Households	Corporations
<b>Total State and Local Tax</b>			333,893.0	40,260.0	3,558.0
<b>Total Federal Tax</b>	238,764.0	10,402.0	47,562.0	157,434.0	18,339.0

## Operating Expenses and Administration Costs

**Table G4: Operating Expense and Administration Costs Breakdown for San Tan Park**

Category	Spending	Percentage
Personnel	373,583.0	51.9
Supplies	16,456.0	2.3
Souvenir Supplies	14,865.0	2.1
Souvenir Taxes	1,878.0	0.3
Fuel	3,165.0	0.4
Non-capital Equipment	0.0	0.0
Services	23,857.0	3.3
Equipment Lease	2,613.0	0.4
Repair/Maintenance	547.0	0.1
Telecom/IT	12,979.0	1.8
Vehicle Repair/Maintenance	11,203.0	1.6
Travel	1,604.0	0.2
Education	0.0	0.0
Postage/Freight	615.0	0.1
Utilities	12,448.0	1.7
Capital Building	0.0	0.0
Capital Equipment	0.0	0.0
Park oversight/Administration	109,688.0	15.2
Risk Charges	8,398.0	1.2
CSCA	58,593.0	8.1
Trades	33,985.0	4.7
Trails	33,985.0	4.7
MCSO Deputy	0.0	0.0
<b>Total (\$)</b>	<b>720,462.0</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table G5: Impact of San Tan Park Operating Expenses**

<b>Impact Type</b>	<b>Employment</b>	<b>Labor Income</b>	<b>Total Value Added</b>	<b>Output</b>
<b>Direct Effect</b>	7.1	431,837.8	534,229.2	665,235.7
<b>Indirect Effect</b>	0.9	52,710.1	82,082.3	159,060.1
<b>Induced Effect</b>	3.0	153,500.8	278,843.9	474,187.9
<b>Total Effect (\$)</b>	<b>11.0</b>	<b>638,048.6</b>	<b>895,155.3</b>	<b>1,298,483.7</b>

**Table G6: Impact of San Tan Park Operating Expenses on State, Local and Federal Taxes**

	<b>Employee Compensation</b>	<b>Proprietor Income</b>	<b>Tax on Production and Imports</b>	<b>Households</b>	<b>Corporations</b>
<b>Total State and Local Tax</b>			31,231.0	11,392.0	949.0
<b>Total Federal Tax</b>	72,635.0	1,419.0	4,449.0	44,549.0	4,890.0

## APPENDIX H: SPUR CROSS RANCH CONSERVATION AREA

### Visitor Expenditures

Table H1: Total Direct Spending by sector for Spur Cross Ranch

Item	Total (\$)	Percentage
Lodging	861,622.8	34.6
Shopping	220,317.3	8.8
Groceries	484,904.8	19.5
Tourist services	141,711.7	5.7
Recreation	183,932.7	7.4
Gas	459,650.6	18.4
Onsite Fees	139,349.3	5.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,491,489.2</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Table H2: Impact of Spur Cross Ranch Visitor Spending

Impact Type	Employment	Labor Income	Total Value Added	Output
Direct Effect	14.7	619,149.9	980,008.8	1,555,329.3
Indirect Effect	4.1	222,793.9	356,005.9	674,155.9
Induced Effect	5.1	262,845.3	477,328.8	805,382.8
<b>Total Effect</b>	<b>23.9</b>	<b>1,104,789.1</b>	<b>1,813,343.5</b>	<b>3,034,868.1</b>

Table H3: Impact of Spur Cross Ranch Visitor Spending on State, Local and Federal Taxes

	Employee Compensation	Proprietor Income	Tax on Production and Imports	Households	Corporations
<b>Total State and Local Tax</b>			169,382.0	19,923.0	2,202.0
<b>Total Federal Tax</b>	119,668.0	4,268.0	24,393.0	77,711.0	11,369.0

## Operating Expenses and Administration Costs

**Table H4: Operating Expense and Administration Costs Breakdown for Spur Cross Ranch**

Category	Spending	Percentage
Personnel	129,119.0	37.2
Supplies	2,378.0	0.7
Souvenir Supplies	5,328.0	1.5
Souvenir Taxes	634.0	0.2
Fuel	1,884.0	0.5
Non-capital Equipment	1,615.0	0.5
Services	5,281.0	1.5
Equipment Lease	0.0	0.0
Repair/Maintenance	116.0	0.0
Telecom/IT	2,106.0	0.6
Vehicle Repair/Maintenance	9,805.0	2.8
Travel	0.0	0.0
Education	0.0	0.0
Postage/Freight	69.0	0.0
Utilities	3,270.0	0.9
Capital Building	0.0	0.0
Capital Equipment	0.0	0.0
Park oversight/Administration	25,566.0	7.4
Risk Charges	3,159.0	0.9
CSCA	22,515.0	6.5
Trades	7,858.0	2.3
Trails	3,067.0	0.9
MCSO Deputy	122,982.0	35.5
<b>Total (\$)</b>	<b>346,752.0</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table H5: Impact of Spur Cross Ranch Operating Expenses**

<b>Impact Type</b>	<b>Employment</b>	<b>Labor Income</b>	<b>Total Value Added</b>	<b>Output</b>
<b>Direct Effect</b>	4.0	245,358.0	292,842.0	330,594.5
<b>Indirect Effect</b>	0.3	14,956.7	23,088.6	43,854.5
<b>Induced Effect</b>	1.6	81,276.8	147,658.4	249,121.4
<b>Total Effect (\$)</b>	<b>5.8</b>	<b>341,591.5</b>	<b>463,589.0</b>	<b>623,570.5</b>

**Table H6: Impact of San Tan Park Operating Expenses on State, Local and Federal Taxes**

	<b>Employee Compensation</b>	<b>Proprietor Income</b>	<b>Tax on Production and Imports</b>	<b>Households</b>	<b>Corporations</b>
<b>Total State and Local Tax</b>			14,979.0	6,131.0	449.0
<b>Total Federal Tax</b>	39,138.0	615.0	2,157.0	23,914.0	2,316.0

## APPENDIX I: USERY MOUNTAIN PARK

### Visitor Expenditures

Table I1: Total Direct Spending by sector for Usery Mountain Park

Item	Total (\$)	Percentage
Lodging	162,531.6	1.8
Shopping	1,131,332.2	12.8
Groceries	1,933,335.5	21.9
Tourist services	195,906.9	2.2
Recreation	2,382,918.5	27.0
Gas	1,365,376.4	15.5
Onsite Fees	1,639,316.0	18.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>8,810,717.2</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Table I2: Impact of Usery Mountain Park Visitor Spending

Impact Type	Employment	Labor Income	Total Value Added	Output
Direct Effect	50.2	1,979,086.3	2,570,408.4	4,269,091.1
Indirect Effect	13.1	691,191.0	1,162,501.0	2,287,162.9
Induced Effect	16.2	833,619.5	1,513,794.7	2,554,201.0
<b>Total Effect</b>	<b>79.5</b>	<b>3,503,896.8</b>	<b>5,246,704.1</b>	<b>9,110,455.0</b>

Table I3: Impact of Usery Mountain Park Visitor Spending on State, Local and Federal Taxes

	Employee Compensation	Proprietor Income	Tax on Production and Imports	Households	Corporations
<b>Total State and Local Tax</b>			412,130.0	63,219.0	5,439.0
<b>Total Federal Tax</b>	377,241.0	14,292.0	59,353.0	246,585.0	28,077.0

## Operating Expenses and Administration Costs

**Table I4: Operating Expense and Administration Costs Breakdown for Usery Mountain Park**

Category	Spending	Percentage
Personnel	571,846.0	42.0
Supplies	40,067.0	2.9
Souvenir Supplies	30,010.0	2.2
Souvenir Taxes	3,258.0	0.2
Fuel	3,648.0	0.3
Non-capital Equipment	1,400.0	0.1
Services	44,532.0	3.3
Equipment Lease	2,590.0	0.2
Repair/Maintenance	31,315.0	2.3
Telecom/IT	30,315.0	2.2
Vehicle Repair/Maintenance	11,062.0	0.8
Travel	0.0	0.0
Education	516.0	0.0
Postage/Freight	797.0	0.1
Utilities	70,919.0	5.2
Capital Building	50,554.0	3.7
Capital Equipment	35,324.0	2.6
Park oversight/Administration	232,878.0	17.1
Risk Charges	17,873.0	1.3
CSCA	81,516.0	6.0
Trades	72,329.0	5.3
Trails	27,875.0	2.0
MCSO Deputy	0.0	0.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,360,624.0</b>	<b>100</b>



**Table I5: Impact of Usery Mountain Park Operating Expenses**

<b>Impact Type</b>	<b>Employment</b>	<b>Labor Income</b>	<b>Total Value Added</b>	<b>Output</b>
<b>Direct Effect</b>	11.8	735,867.6	936,452.2	1,245,786.5
<b>Indirect Effect</b>	1.9	116,638.8	182,532.0	348,299.8
<b>Induced Effect</b>	5.2	266,159.3	483,447.9	815,676.4
<b>Total Effect (\$)</b>	<b>18.9</b>	<b>1,118,665.8</b>	<b>1,602,432.1</b>	<b>2,409,762.6</b>

**Table I6: Impact of Usery Mountain Park Operating Expenses on State, Local and Federal Taxes**

	<b>Employee Compensation</b>	<b>Proprietor Income</b>	<b>Tax on Production and Imports</b>	<b>Households</b>	<b>Corporations</b>
<b>Total State and Local Tax</b>			61,881.0	20,124.0	1,767.0
<b>Total Federal Tax</b>	124,813.0	3,121.0	8,912.0	78,493.0	9,120.0

## APPENDIX J: WHITE TANK PARK

### Visitor Expenditures

**Table J1: Total Direct Spending by sector for White Tank Park**

Item	Total (\$)	Percentage
Lodging	719,802.9	12.3
Shopping	1,116,876.7	19.1
Groceries	501,509.9	8.6
Tourist services	406,309.8	6.9
Recreation	163,305.0	2.8
Gas	909,538.8	15.5
Onsite Fees	2,032,894.7	34.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>5,850,237.8</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table J2: Impact of White Tank Park Visitor Spending**

Impact Type	Employment	Labor Income	Total Value Added	Output
Direct Effect	24.4	959,910.6	1,390,848.3	2,248,349.2
Indirect Effect	6.3	344,941.5	553,350.5	1,054,803.6
Induced Effect	7.9	407,334.3	739,563.9	1,247,893.1
<b>Total Effect</b>	<b>38.6</b>	<b>1,712,186.3</b>	<b>2,683,762.8</b>	<b>4,551,046.0</b>

**Table J3: Impact of White Tank Park Visitor Spending on State, Local and Federal Taxes**

	Employee Compensation	Proprietor Income	Tax on Production and Imports	Households	Corporations
<b>Total State and Local Tax</b>			267,767.0	30,954.0	2,846.0
<b>Total Federal Tax</b>	179,773.0	8,490.0	38,562.0	120,737.0	14,692.0

## Operating Expenses and Administration Costs

**Table J4: Operating Expense and Administration Costs Breakdown for White Tank Park**

Category	Spending	Percentage
Personnel	563,978.0	43.6
Supplies	41,106.0	3.2
Souvenir Supplies	70,584.0	5.5
Souvenir Taxes	7,678.0	0.6
Fuel	8,636.0	0.7
Non-capital Equipment	752.0	0.1
Services	70,939.0	5.5
Equipment Lease	2,590.0	0.2
Repair/Maintenance	8,337.0	0.6
Telecom/IT	18,420.0	1.4
Vehicle Repair/Maintenance	20,367.0	1.6
Travel	722.0	0.1
Education	20.0	0.0
Postage/Freight	231.0	0.0
Utilities	60,188.0	4.7
Capital Building	0.0	0.0
Capital Equipment	0.0	0.0
Park oversight/Administration	225,871.0	17.5
Risk Charges	17,282.0	1.3
CSCA	78,817.0	6.1
Trades	69,935.0	5.4
Trails	26,952.0	2.1
MCSO Deputy	0.0	0.0
<b>Total (\$)</b>	<b>1,293,405.0</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table J5: Impact of White Tank Park Operating Expenses**

<b>Impact Type</b>	<b>Employment</b>	<b>Labor Income</b>	<b>Total Value Added</b>	<b>Output</b>
<b>Direct Effect</b>	12.0	712,424.6	894,141.8	1,157,237.9
<b>Indirect Effect</b>	1.7	104,054.2	162,000.5	311,861.4
<b>Induced Effect</b>	5.0	254,911.6	463,021.0	781,210.9
<b>Total Effect</b>	<b>18.6</b>	<b>1,071,390.3</b>	<b>1,519,163.4</b>	<b>2,250,310.2</b>

**Table J6: Impact of White Tank Park Operating Expenses on State, Local and Federal Taxes**

	<b>Employee Compensation</b>	<b>Proprietor Income</b>	<b>Tax on Production and Imports</b>	<b>Households</b>	<b>Corporations</b>
<b>Total State and Local Tax</b>			59,147.0	19,272.0	1,626.0
<b>Total Federal Tax</b>	119,658.0	2,949.0	8,518.0	75,170.0	8,394.0

## APPENDIX K: LAKE PLEASANT PARK

### Visitor Expenditures

**Table K1: Total Direct Spending by sector for Lake Pleasant Park**

Item	Total (\$)	Percentage
Lodging	3,247,017.9	8.2
Shopping	920,753.2	2.3
Groceries	10,110,103.3	25.6
Tourist services	4,316,801.3	10.9
Recreation	12,931,983.7	32.7
Gas	4,392,263.2	11.1
Onsite Fees	3,636,621.0	9.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>39,555,543.4</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table K2: Impact of Lake Pleasant Park Visitor Spending**

Impact Type	Employment	Labor Income	Total Value Added	Output
Direct Effect	249.2	10,821,872.1	14,666,546.6	25,075,512.8
Indirect Effect	78.2	4,178,253.8	6,890,014.8	13,472,623.4
Induced Effect	92.0	4,699,240.7	8,528,851.8	14,440,851.4
<b>Total Effect</b>	<b>419.3</b>	<b>19,699,366.5</b>	<b>30,085,413.2</b>	<b>52,988,987.6</b>

**Table K3: Impact of Lake Pleasant Park Visitor Spending on State, Local and Federal Taxes**

	Employee Compensation	Proprietor Income	Tax on Production and Imports	Households	Corporations
<b>Total State and Local Tax</b>			2,005,134.0	354,599.0	34,630.0
<b>Total Federal Tax</b>	2,173,076.0	67,597.0	287,097.0	1,380,022.0	178,748.0

## Operating Expenses and Administration Costs

**Table K4: Operating Expense and Administration Costs Breakdown for Lake Pleasant /DOC Park**

Category	Spending	Percentage
Personnel	1,872,268.0	46.8
Supplies	133,399.0	3.3
Souvenir Supplies	40,000.0	1.0
Souvenir Taxes		0.0
Fuel	32,100.0	0.8
Non-capital Equipment	4,033.0	0.1
Services	147,378.0	3.7
Equipment Lease	6,792.0	0.2
Repair/Maintenance	57,839.0	1.4
Telecom/IT	99,278.0	2.5
Vehicle Repair/Maintenance	40,322.0	1.0
Travel	1,437.0	0.0
Education	1,168.0	0.0
Postage/Freight	59.0	0.0
Utilities	277,474.0	6.9
Capital Building	0.0	0.0
Capital Equipment	0.0	0.0
Park oversight/Administration	665,376.0	16.6
Risk Charges	38,422.0	1.0
CSCA	293,326.0	7.3
Trades	207,108.0	5.2
Trails	79,818.0	2.0
MCSO Deputy	0.0	0.0
<b>Total (\$)</b>	<b>3,997,597.0</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table K5: Impact of Lake Pleasant/DOC Park Operating Expenses**

<b>Impact Type</b>	<b>Employment</b>	<b>Labor Income</b>	<b>Total Value Added</b>	<b>Output</b>
<b>Direct Effect</b>	35.6	2,229,163.1	2,803,621.9	3,602,915.9
<b>Indirect Effect</b>	5.3	314,368.7	484,788.7	926,388.2
<b>Induced Effect</b>	15.6	796,818.2	1,446,392.9	2,448,934.0
<b>Total Effect</b>	<b>56.5</b>	<b>3,340,350.0</b>	<b>4,734,803.6</b>	<b>6,978,238.1</b>

**Table K6: Impact of Lake Pleasant/DOC Park Operating Expenses on State, Local and Federal Taxes**

	<b>Employee Compensation</b>	<b>Proprietor Income</b>	<b>Tax on Production and Imports</b>	<b>Households</b>	<b>Corporations</b>
<b>Total State and Local Tax</b>			174,231.0	60,015.0	5,114.0
<b>Total Federal Tax</b>	376,773.0	8,745.0	24,947.0	233,565.0	26,397.0

## APPENDIX L: ADOBE DAM REGIONAL PARK

### Operating Expenses and Administration Costs

Table L1: Operating Expense and Administration Costs Breakdown for Adobe Dam Regional Park

Category	Spending	Percentage
Personnel	0.0	0.0
Supplies	8,060.0	2.8
Souvenir Supplies	0.0	0.0
Souvenir Taxes	0.0	0.0
Fuel	0.0	0.0
Non-capital Equipment	0.0	0.0
Services	0.0	0.0
Equipment Lease	0.0	0.0
Repair/Maintenance	55.0	0.0
Telecom/IT	0.0	0.0
Vehicle Repair/Maintenance	0.0	0.0
Travel	0.0	0.0
Education	0.0	0.0
Postage/Freight	0.0	0.0
Utilities	162,606.0	55.9
Capital Building	0.0	0.0
Capital Equipment	0.0	0.0
Park oversight/Administration	64,511.0	22.2
Risk Charges	4,962.0	1.7
CSCA	22,630.0	7.8
Trades	20,080.0	6.9
Trails	7,739.0	2.7
MCSO Deputy	0.0	0.0
<b>Total (\$)</b>	<b>290,643.0</b>	<b>100</b>



**Table L2: Impact of Adobe Dam Park Operating Expenses**

<b>Impact Type</b>	<b>Employment</b>	<b>Labor Income</b>	<b>Total Value Added</b>	<b>Output</b>
<b>Direct Effect</b>	2.1	177,484.1	316,650.9	533,197.6
<b>Indirect Effect</b>	1.4	91,514.4	139,728.9	262,897.7
<b>Induced Effect</b>	1.6	83,971.8	152,454.0	257,243.2
<b>Total Effect (\$)</b>	<b>5.1</b>	<b>352,970.4</b>	<b>608,833.7</b>	<b>1,053,338.5</b>

**Table L3: Impact of Adobe Dam Park Operating Expenses on State, Local and Federal Taxes**

	<b>Employee Compensation</b>	<b>Proprietor Income</b>	<b>Tax on Production and Imports</b>	<b>Households</b>	<b>Corporations</b>
<b>Total State and Local Tax</b>			36,410.0	6,385.0	916.0
<b>Total Federal Tax</b>	36,813.0	1,832.0	5,244.0	24,903.0	4,731.0