
The Economic Significance and Impact of Pennsylvania State Parks:

An Assessment of Visitor Spending on the State and Regional Economy



Submitted to the Department of
Conservation and Natural
Resources

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania



Submitted by the Department of
Recreation, Park and Tourism
Management

The Pennsylvania State University

May 2010

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements.....	ii
Table of Contents.....	ii
List of Figures and Tables.....	iii
Executive Summary.....	iv
Introduction.....	1
Methods.....	2
Results.....	8
Section One: Statewide Analyses.....	8
Section Two: Regional Analyses.....	12
Section Three: Park Specific Analyses.....	15
Conclusion.....	20
References.....	22
Appendices.....	23

Contributing Authors:

Andrew J. Mowen, Ph.D.
Daniel J. Stynes, Ph.D.
Alan R. Graefe, Ph.D.
Deborah L. Kerstetter, Ph.D.
Nate E. Trauntvein, M.S.

Acknowledgements:

This economic impact analyses would not have been possible without the feedback, technical support, and data provided the Pennsylvania DCNR, Bureau of State Parks. In particular, we thank John Norbeck, David Sariano, Greg Sassaman, Mary Lorah, Kevin Fazzini, Genevieve Volgstadt, and Keith Taylor for their input into the study design and their assistance in providing park visitation and reservation data.

LIST OF FIGURES AND TABLES

Figure 1. A Classification of Pennsylvania State Park Visitors: Nine Distinct Segments.....	3
Table 1. Average Visitor Spending Profiles by Segment	4
Table 2. Multipliers for Pennsylvania Tourism Regions; Hotel and Restaurant Sectors Only.....	6
Table 3. Adjusted Statewide Visitation Statistics by Segment	8
Table 4. Statewide Economic Significance of Visitor Spending	9
Table 5. Statewide Economic Impact of Visitor Spending (Local Resident Visitors Excluded).....	10
Table 6. Statewide Economic Impact of Visitor Spending (Out-of-State Visitors Only).....	11
Table 7. Party Visits by Segment and State Park Region	12
Table 8. Total Visitor Spending by Park Region	13
Table 9. Total Visitor Spending by Segment and State Park Region	13
Table 10. Regional Economic Significance.....	14
Table 11. Region 1 Spending Totals by Park and Segment.....	16
Table 12. Region 2 Spending Totals by Park and Segment.....	17
Table 13. Region 3 Spending Totals by Park and Segment.....	18
Table 14. Region 4 Spending Totals by Park and Segment.....	19
Table 15. A Comparison of PA State Parks Economic Impact vs. Other Park Systems	21

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Pennsylvania's vast network of state parks annually draws millions of visitors who contribute to the economic vitality of the Commonwealth. Recognition of these economic benefits is bolstered with sound data that documents the level of these economic impacts. However, almost 20 years have passed since the last economic impact study was conducted for Pennsylvania State Parks. Current economic conditions warrant a re-analysis of economic significance and impact of Pennsylvania State Parks at a statewide and regional level.

Pennsylvania's Department of Conservation and Natural Resources commissioned the Department of Recreation, Park and Tourism Management at Penn State to conduct an economic impact analysis of State Parks. This analysis estimates park visitor spending/ impacts using the Money Generation Model (MGM2). The economic significance and impact reported in this study is based upon local and non-local spending associated with state park visits. Existing Pennsylvania State Park visitation statistics, state/local multipliers, and estimated visitor expenditures were used to generate economic impact data based on visitor spending at a state, region, and park level. Key findings from this study indicated that:

- Pennsylvania State Parks (PSP) hosted 33.6 million visitors who spent \$738 million on their trips (\$563.2 million for resident visitors; \$167.2 million for non-resident or out-of-state visitors, and \$7.9 million in extra spending associated with marinas, whitewater, and ski areas).
- Direct contribution of visitor spending to the state economy was \$463.7 million in sales, 8,439 jobs, \$174.5 million in labor income, and \$257.9 million in value added effects.
- Including secondary effects, the total contribution of visitor spending to the state economy was \$818.3 million in sales, 10,551 jobs, 291.4 million in labor income, and \$464.7 million in value added effects.
- The statewide sales impact of out-of-state visitors was \$191.4 million. Out-of-state visitor spending contributed to 2,424 jobs, \$67.8 million in labor income, and \$108.6 million in value added effects.
- Comparing the income return (value added) from out-of-state visitor expenditures with reported General Fund expenditures of \$62,814,000 revealed a favorable return on investment for the Commonwealth. For every dollar invested in PSP in 2008, \$7.62 of income (value added) is returned to Pennsylvania. When projecting economic returns based on the increased park visitation of 2009, that return is estimated at \$9.63 for every \$1 invested.

- Restaurants/bars and gas/oil represented the largest percentage of visitor spending, followed by groceries and take out food/drinks. The smallest percentage of visitor spending was associated with marinas and camping fees.
- Visitor expenditures by PSP Region depend on visitation levels and spending opportunities provided near parks within each region. Combined, Regions 2 and 4 accounted for 72% of the total visitor spending. Specifically, visitor expenditures were approximately \$290 million for Region 2, \$247 million for Region 4, \$140 million for Region 3, and \$61 million for Region 1.
- Visits to the various PSP regions generated the following impacts...
 - Region 1 - \$53.7 million in sales, 865 jobs created, and \$28.6 million value added
 - Region 2 - \$278.3 million in sales, 4,198 jobs created, and \$153.8 million value added
 - Region 3 – \$132.6 million in sales, 2,017 jobs created, and \$72.8 million value added
 - Region 4 – \$252.2 million in sales, 3,396 jobs created, and \$144.4 million value added
- Economic significance and impacts were also estimated for individual parks...
 - For example, Pymatuning State Park hosted 3,004,508 visitors, spending \$77 million. The direct contribution to the local economy was 1,004 jobs and 1,177 jobs including secondary effects. Omitting spending by visitors from the local area, the impact of visitors from outside the local region was 633 direct jobs and 747 jobs including secondary effects.
- Individual parks associated with the highest estimated visitor spending were Pymatuning, Presque Isle, Prince Gallitzin, and Ohiopyle State Parks at \$77.2, \$67.6, \$36.8, and \$28.0 million, respectively.

INTRODUCTION

Parks and outdoor recreation facilities provide a wide variety of individual, community, environmental, and societal benefits for Americans. In particular, parks can generate substantial economic benefits for local businesses and for national, state, and local government. Pennsylvania's vast network of state parks annually draws millions of visitors who contribute to the economic vitality of the Commonwealth. For example, a 1987 study reported that the economic impact of state park recreation in Pennsylvania amounted to \$562 million in total sales and 10,000 jobs (Strauss & Lord, 1990). However, 20 years have passed since that study and current economic conditions warrant a re-analysis of economic significance and impact of Pennsylvania State Parks at a statewide and regional level.

To address this need, Pennsylvania's Department of Conservation and Natural Resources' Bureau of State Parks commissioned the Department of Recreation, Park and Tourism Management at Penn State to conduct an economic impact analysis of the State Park System. The analysis was completed by estimating park visitor spending and impacts using the National Park Service's Money Generation Model (MGM2). The MGM2 model was developed by the National Park Service to estimate spending of park visitors and the associated impacts on local economies. The model has been applied in recreation and tourism applications ranging from art exhibits and cultural tourism to snowmobiling and state park use. Dr. Daniel Stynes (Professor Emeritus at Michigan State) co-developed MGM2 and worked with Penn State in gathering, analyzing, and interpreting the data. The economic significance and impact reported in this study is based upon local and non-local spending associated with state park visits.

This report is divided into several key sections. First, the data, assumptions, and procedures used for generating economic impact estimates are discussed. This section also includes a summary of key visitation statistics, estimated visitor spending averages, and a review of the regional multipliers used in the impact analysis. Key terminology such as the distinction between significance and impact, and the definitions for sales, jobs, income, and value added are also included. Second, results are presented starting with statewide data, followed by park region data, and concluding with summary park-specific data. Detailed economic impact data for each individual state park is also provided in the Appendices. Finally, this report concludes by comparing PA State Park Economic Impact results with those of comparable state park systems and with a discussion of future data needs for more precise economic impact estimates.

METHODS

This section includes the key data, assumptions, and procedures used to generate economic impact estimates for Pennsylvania State Parks (PSP). Several types of data were used in order to generate economic impact estimates, including different park user types, park visitation by user type, visitor expenditures by user type, and multipliers at the regional and state level. Given the scope and size of the State Park system, it was difficult to generate precise estimates for all of this data. Thus, data from prior PSP surveys and from other comparable state park systems were used to estimate park visitor segments and expenditures and multipliers were extracted from input-output models estimated with IMPLAN. A description of key data and methods used to estimate this data follow.

Separating Day Use and Overnight Visitors

The PSP attendance counts (Pennsylvania State Parks, 2009), the Infospherix reservation data (Infospherix, 2008), and recent park surveys were used to identify and categorize park visitors into different segments. For example, attendance counts were used to assess both day and overnight visitation at the State Parks. These counts are estimated by the State Parks Bureau based on traffic counter data and other visitation adjustments made on a park-to-park basis. From this data, Total Visitor Days (TVD) is generated for each park and these counts separate visitation by activity type (e.g., camping, bicycling, fishing, swimming). However, there is the potential for overnight visitors (campers) to be double counted in the other activities. Thus, it was necessary to factor out overnight visitors from the TVD data in order to estimate the number of day users at each park. The Infospherix reservation system compiles overnight visitation data for each park. The number of nights visitors stayed in cabins, cottages, yurts, and at campsites was then subtracted from the TVD count for each State Park to estimate day use visitation.

The original TVD traffic counts estimated party size (typically 2.5 people per vehicle), but they did not account for park re-entries. While re-entry is not likely to occur for day users, overnight users may leave the park and re-enter several times per visit. To address this double-counting issue, the original TVD counts were reduced by assuming that overnight visitors left the park and returned at least once per day. Addressing these issues resulted in adjusted TVD counts that are less than the TVD counts originally reported by PSP at parks with overnight facilities, but are a more realistic indicator of actual park visitation.

State Park Visitor Segments and Spending Averages

The MGM2 model estimates visitor spending within a set of distinct visitor segments. Prior visitor expenditure studies (e.g., National Park Service) have found that non-local visitors and some overnight visitors have different spending profiles and, thus, economic impact. For this study, a total of nine state park visitor segments were identified (Figure 1). Park visitor segments were differentiated based upon their use status (day use vs. overnight) and locality (locals, non-locals, non-residents). For the purpose of estimating spending averages per day/night, the travel party was treated as the spending unit. The TVD counting procedure was also used to estimate

average party sizes for day users while the reservation data was used to estimate average party sizes for overnight users on a park to park basis.

Spending associated with visitor parties can be estimated by multiplying the volume of visits of each segment by the average daily spending per party. PSP has not recently assessed park visitor expenditures; thus, spending averages from comparable state park systems were used. State park visitor spending averages have been reasonably consistent across several studies in multiple states (Stynes, 2005). Therefore, the averages of the estimates from prior studies were adopted as a baseline (or typical) state park spending profile for Pennsylvania.

<i>Day User Segments</i>	
L-Day User	Pennsylvania Resident, Local Day Users (living within 50 miles of the park)
NL- Day User	Pennsylvania Resident, Non-Local Day Users (living more than 50 miles from the park)
NR- Day User	Non-Resident, Non-Local Day Users (living more than 50 miles from the park and residing out of state)
<i>Overnight User Segments</i>	
Cabin R	Pennsylvania Resident, Overnight Cabin Users
Yurt R	Pennsylvania Resident, Yurt/Cottage Users
Camp R	Pennsylvania Resident, Campsite Users
Cabin NR	Non-Resident, Overnight Cabin Users
Yurt NR	Non-Resident, Yurt/Cottage Users
Camp NR	Non-Resident, Campsite Users

Figure 1. A Classification of Pennsylvania State Park Visitors: Nine Distinct Segments

The statewide averages for parks were also adjusted for individual parks based on nearby spending opportunities. For example, spending profiles for high expenditure parks were set at 25% above the state averages and spending profiles for low expenditure parks were set at 75% of the state average. By way of example, Ohiopyle State Park was assigned high spending, Bald Eagle State Park was assigned the average spending, and Penn Roosevelt State Park was assigned low spending.

A classification of parks by high, average, and low spending is listed in column 2 in Table 10 of this report. Park visitation data was unavailable for 8 parks. As a result, economic impact data provided in this report was based on 109 parks, rather than the entire 117 parks within the PSP system. A summary of spending averages for the nine state park visitor segments is provided in Table 1. This table provides a detailed breakdown of spending across nine expenditure

categories for each visitor segment. A portion of NL and NR Day Users were assumed to incur lodging expenses outside of state parks (5% of NL Day Users and 10% of NR Day Users).

In terms of average spending patterns, local day users spend the least amount of money (\$35.00) and resident and non-resident cabin users spend the most money (\$169 and \$189, respectively). From these average spending totals (see bottom of Table 1), high and low adjustments were made depending on the park. Low spending parks were assigned 75% of average expenditures while high spending parks were assigned 125% of average expenditures. For example, for local day users at high spending parks, the average expenditure was adjusted up 25% from \$35 to \$43.75. Adjustments for overnight visitors were based on all categories except for overnight accommodations (motel, hotel, cabin, B&B, and camping fees) because these expenditures did not vary by the spending opportunities surrounding the park.

Table 1. Average Visitor Spending Profiles by Segment (\$ per party per day/night)

CATEGORY	Day Users			Overnight Users					
	L-Day User	NL-Day User	NR-Day User	Cabin R	Yurt R	Camp R	Cabin NR	Yurt NR	Camp NR
Motel, hotel cabin or B&B	0.00	3.20	6.4	99.00	44.00	0.00	119.00	51.00	0.00
Camping fees	0.00	0.20	0.4	0.00	0.00	20.00	0.00	0.00	37.00
Restaurants & bars	10.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	10.00	20.00	20.00	10.00
Groceries, take-out food/drinks	6.00	10.00	10.00	15.00	15.00	17.00	15.00	15.00	17.00
Gas & oil	9.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00
Admissions & fees	2.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
Clothing	2.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	4.00
Sporting goods	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	5.00	3.00	3.00	5.00
Souvenirs and other expenses	4.00	6.00	6.00	6.00	6.00	6.00	6.00	6.00	6.00
Average Spending Total	35.00	70.40	73.80	169.00	114.00	85.00	189.00	121.00	102.00
High Spending	43.75	88.00	92.25	186.50	131.50	101.25	206.50	138.50	118.25
Low Spending	26.25	52.80	55.35	151.50	96.50	68.75	171.50	103.50	85.75

* Marina, ski, golf, and whitewater data included on a park-to-park basis

Economic Multipliers

Most economic impact studies assess the direct effects of visitor spending. Direct effects capture the impact of businesses selling goods and services directly to visitors. In addition to these direct effects, numerous economic studies also report secondary effects from visitor spending. These studies typically use multipliers to estimate the secondary effects of park visitor spending. The concept of a multiplier is that an initial amount of spending (in this case by state park visitors) leads to added spending and results in an economic contribution greater than the initial amount. These secondary effects assess the impacts on backward linked industries that sell goods or services to tourism-related businesses (indirect effects) and the impacts from household spending of income earned from visitor spending (induced effects). Direct effects occur primarily in the

lodging, restaurants, amusements, retail stores, and transportation sectors, while secondary effects are scattered across a broader set of industries including utilities, banking, business services, and retail trade.

For studies that assess secondary effects, the most commonly cited multiplier is the Type II sales multiplier, which indicates the degree of interdependence of sectors within the economy. For example, the statewide multiplier for the hotel sector in Pennsylvania is 1.75, indicating that \$0.75 in secondary sales results from every dollar of direct hotel sales. In this study, input-output models were estimated for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and for local regions around each park using the IMPLAN system. IMPLAN is a widely used regional economic modeling system originally developed by the USDA Forest Service. Multipliers for key tourism related sectors were extracted from the IMPLAN models and entered into the MGM2 spreadsheet model.

The statewide multiplier (1.76) based on 2007 IMPLAN data was used to assess statewide impacts of the entire PSP system. For parks within each of the four PSP regions, multipliers were used based on data from the 7 tourism regions recognized within the Commonwealth. Each park was assigned multipliers for the tourism region in which it was located. Tourism region multipliers were estimated using 2001 county data and then adjusting this data to 2007 based on changes in the state multipliers between 2001 and 2007. Regional multipliers used for the regional and park-specific analyses were smaller than the statewide multiplier. As a result, the reported additive economic impact of the four state park regions is less than the total impact reported for the overall state park system. Since the vast majority of goods bought by visitors are not manufactured in Pennsylvania, only the retail margins on purchases of groceries, fuel, and other retail purchases are included in the impact calculations. This omits a small number of jobs in petroleum refining and other manufacturing sectors. Table 2 summarizes the multipliers used for each of the seven tourism regions of the state and the statewide multiplier using the hotel and restaurant sectors to illustrate.

Economic ratios and multipliers for key tourism-related sectors were used to convert spending into the associated jobs and income in the region and to estimate secondary effects. Economic impacts can be estimated for local regions around the parks or statewide. In this study, impacts were estimated for the system as a whole (Section 1), for the four different state park regions (Section 2), and for each state park (Appendix A).

Table 2. Multipliers for Pennsylvania Tourism Regions; Hotel and Restaurant Sectors Only

Region	Hotels and motels			Food services and drinking places		
	Sales I	Sales II	Direct Jobs/ Million	Sales I	Sales II	Direct Jobs/ Million Sales
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania	1.39	1.75	12.15	1.47	1.83	18.9
Pennsylvania's Great Lakes	1.29	1.53	13.79	1.31	1.51	21.42
Pittsburgh & Its Countryside	1.38	1.72	11.52	1.35	1.68	18.57
Pennsylvania Wilds	1.29	1.49	14.27	1.27	1.44	22.11
The Alleghenies & Her Valleys	1.3	1.52	9.51	1.3	1.52	19.34
Dutch Country Roads	1.33	1.6	13.7	1.4	1.66	19.63
Northeast Mountains	1.32	1.61	16.19	1.35	1.61	20.44
Philadelphia & the Countryside	1.39	1.7	10.74	1.4	1.72	17.99

Basic equations for estimating impacts at a Park, Region, and System level are:

Economic impacts for each individual State Park (e.g., Bald Eagle, Lackawanna, Ohiopyle) =

Party nights/days * Spending per night/day * Multiplier of its tourism region

Economic impacts for each PSP Region (e.g. Regions 1, 2, 3, and 4) =

Sum of spending across all parks within each PSP Region.

Economic impacts for the entire State Park system =

Sum of spending across all parks within the PSP system, applied to the statewide multipliers.

Economic Significance vs. Economic Impact

There are several ways to assess the economic contribution of park visitors. These depend on which visitors and what types of spending are included in the analysis as well as the regional scope of those impacts. Some studies include all spending of all visitors on their trips, including spending at home, en/route, and at the destination, while others restrict the analysis to spending near the park. Some economic impact studies exclude spending of visitors who live in the local area because they are not contributing “new dollars” to the economy, while other studies limit the spending attributed to park visits to trips where the park visit was the primary purpose. A true “impact” analysis attempts to identify spending that would be lost to the state or local region in the absence of the parks. Such a “with versus without” analysis requires considerable knowledge of trip purposes and potential substitution behaviors to assess which spending would be lost. Economic studies may stop at measures of visitor spending, report just the direct economic effects of this spending, or also include secondary/multiplier effects.

In the present study, the direct and secondary effects of spending for two alternative impact scenarios are presented. These estimates are based upon existing data (e.g., visitor counts, average expenditures, multipliers) from Pennsylvania and other comparable state park systems.

- **Statewide and Regional Significance:** The statewide economic significance covers the contribution of all visitor trip spending to the state economy. It measures all economic activity in the state associated with park visitor spending. The regional economic significance restricts all visitor spending away from home in the local area (a 50 mile radius). When estimating secondary effects, however, we let this spending circulate within the larger tourism region in which the park was located.

- **Statewide and Regional Impact:** Local impacts measure the likely loss in economic activity within the local region in the absence of the park. This analysis excludes spending by local residents and focuses on “new” money coming into the state/region from the outside by excluding the spending of local residents. For individual parks, spending of visitors from the immediate vicinity of the park (50 miles) were excluded. For the statewide impact, only the spending of out-of-state visitors was included.

For each of these scenarios, total visitor spending is reported as well as the direct and total (direct + secondary) economic effects of spending in terms of sales, jobs, income, and value added at a statewide and state park region level.

- **Sales** represent the sales of businesses in the region with the exception that sales in the retail trade sector are only the retail margins on retail sales and therefore exclude the cost of goods sold. Wholesale margins that accrue to Pennsylvania firms are included at the state level, but are excluded when estimating impacts on local regions.

- **Jobs** are not full time equivalents but include full and part time jobs, consistent with employment estimates of the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

- **Income** is measured as labor income which includes wages and salaries, payroll benefits, and income of sole proprietors.

- **Value added** includes labor income as well as profits and rents and indirect business taxes. Value added is the preferred measure of the contribution of an activity or industry to gross state product as it measures the value added by that activity/industry net of the costs of all non-labor inputs to production.

RESULTS

Section One: Statewide Analyses

Impacts of visitor spending are estimated first, followed by the state and local economic contributions from park payrolls and operational expenditures. Visitor spending impacts are estimated with the MGM2 model. Estimates of the three primary inputs to the MGM2 model (visits, spending averages and multipliers) are discussed first, followed by estimates of spending and results for the various impact scenarios.

Park Visitation, Visitor Segments, and Spending

The number of park visitors in 2008 was estimated from vehicle counts at state parks (Pennsylvania State Parks, 2009) and from overnight reservation data (Infospherix, 2008). After adjustments were made for park re-entries, there were 33,607,397 individual visitors representing 13,130,475 parties (vehicles) in 2008 (Table 3). Across the PSP system (the 109 parks for which data were available), 98% of the visitors were classified as day users (vs. overnight users who stayed in the park). To apportion day users into three segments (L-Day Users, NL-Day Users, NR-Day Users), prior visitor surveys were reviewed to estimate percentages. The reader is cautioned that these estimates and assumptions were derived from a limited survey of six state parks and it is likely that this distribution could vary significantly from park to park. Among day users, locals accounted for 56% and non-locals accounted for 28% of the usage. Furthermore, Pennsylvania non-residents made up 16% of day users. Of the 504,647 overnight visitors, the largest percent (68% of residents and 17% of non-residents) were staying at a campsite (Table 3). Two percent or less of non-residents stayed overnight in cabins or yurts. Similarly, only two and one-half percent of residents stayed overnight in yurts (Table 3).

Table 3. Adjusted Statewide Visitation Statistics by Segment

Segment	Total Visitors	%	Total Spending (\$000)	%
		% Day Users		% Day Users
L-Day User	18,537,540	56%	263,904	38%
NL-Day User	9,268,770	28%	265,412	39%
NR-Day User	5,296,440	16%	158,989	23%
Day User Subtotal	33,102,750		688,305	
		% Overnight Users		% Overnight Users
Cabin R	54,524	11%	9,227	22%
Yurt R	12,818	2.5%	1,394	3%
Camp R	341,951	68%	23,234	55%
Cabin NR	8,080	2%	1,529	4%
Yurt NR	2,781	0.5%	335	1%
Camp NR	84,493	17%	6,309	15%
Overnight User Subtotal	504,647		42,028	
Grand Totals	33,607,397		738,245*	

* Includes \$7.911 million extra in additional visitor spending associated with marinas, golf, whitewater, ski.

In addition to providing visitation totals by segment, Table 3 lists segment-specific and total visitor spending. Total spending of all park visitors (including extra spending on marinas, whitewater, and golf) was \$738.2 million (Table 3). Day users spent \$688.3 million and overnight users spent \$42 million during their visits (Table 3). Future surveys at Pennsylvania State Parks should validate the representation of these visitor segments, whether the state park visit was the primary trip purpose, the type of accommodation used (both in state parks and locally), and actual visitor trip expenditures across a wider variety of parks within each region.

Statewide Economic Significance

The overall contribution of visitor trip spending to the Pennsylvania economy was:

- \$818.3 million in sales
- 10,551 jobs
- \$291.4 million in wage and salary income
- \$464.7 million in value added effects

Direct effects are \$174.5 million in wage/salary income and 8,439 jobs. The \$463.7 million in direct sales generates another \$354.6 million in secondary sales for a total sales impact of \$818.3 million. An additional 2,112 jobs and \$116.9 million in wages/salaries are supported through secondary effects as the visitor spending circulates within Pennsylvania's economy (Table 4).

Table 4. Statewide Economic Significance of Visitor Spending

Sector/Spending category	Sales \$000's	Jobs	Labor Income \$000's	Value Added \$000's
Direct Effects				
Motel, hotel cabin or B&B	32,058	390	10,925	19,186
Camping fees	8,939	98	3,652	4,817
Restaurants & bars	198,881	3,758	66,916	94,325
Amusements	45,439	937	20,316	27,373
Marina	2,511	29	940	1,302
Grocery stores	28,202	523	13,100	19,059
Gas stations	43,430	679	16,832	32,178
Other retail	62,847	1,343	28,349	42,629
Wholesale trade	41,369	682	13,473	17,073
Total Direct Effects	463,675	8,439	174,503	257,942
Secondary effects	354,634	2,112	116,937	206,788
Total Effects	818,309	10,551	291,440	464,730

Statewide Economic Impacts

When spending by all Pennsylvanians (both local and non-local visitors) is omitted, it is possible to determine the impact of out-of-state visitors to Pennsylvania's economy. For the purpose of this analysis, survey and reservation data were used to determine the portion of out-of-state visitors for each state park. Using these estimates, sales, jobs, labor income, and value added from out-of-state visitor spending are provided in Table 6. Here, the sales impact was \$191.4 million, total jobs created were 2,424, labor income was \$67.8 million, and value added contributions were \$108.6 million (Table 5).

Table 5. Statewide Economic Impact of Visitor Spending (Out-of-State Visitors Only)

Sector/Spending category			Labor Income	Value Added
Direct Effects	Sales \$000's	Jobs	\$000's	\$000's
Motel, hotel cabin or B&B	14,120	172	4,812	8,450
Camping fees	2,988	33	1,221	1,610
Restaurants & bars	43,947	830	14,787	20,843
Amusements	9,706	200	4,340	5,847
Marina	402	5	150	208
Grocery stores	5,767	107	2,679	3,897
Gas stations	9,942	155	3,853	7,366
Other retail	12,730	271	5,742	8,633
Wholesale trade	8,804	145	2,867	3,633
Total Direct Effects	108,405	1,919	40,450	60,488
Secondary effects	82,964	505	27,398	48,149
Total Effects	191,368	2,424	67,848	108,638

Section Two: Regional Analyses

Park Visits by Visitor Segment and Region

A comparison of park visitation by Region indicates that Region 2 received the most visitors at 4,856,499 followed closely by Region 4 at 4,500,057 (Table 6). Local day use was highest in Regions 2 and 4 but there was greater variation in use when accounting for overnight visitation. Region 2 attracted the highest number of resident and non-resident cabin renters, Region 3 attracted the highest number of resident campers, and Region 4 attracted the highest number of non-resident campers (Table 6). Of these segments, day use, non-resident visitors typically spend the most during their trip because they tend to stay overnight in local accommodations. Again, the reader is reminded that the figures provided in Table 6 are based upon adjusted PSP visitation statistics, which correct for park re-entries.

Table 6. Party Visits by Segment and State Park Region

Party Days/Nights	State Park Regions				
	Region 1	Region 2	Region 3	Region 4	Total
L-Day Users	664,069	2,662,677	1,349,188	2,455,879	7,131,813 (54%)
NL-Day User	332,034	1,331,339	674,594	1,227,940	3,565,907 (27%)
NR-Day User	189,734	760,765	385,482	701,680	2,037,661 (16%)
Total Day Users	1,185,837	4,754,781	2,409,264	4,385,499	12,735,381
R - Overnight	61,156	81,188	91,357	92,122	325,823 (2%)
NR - Overnight	8,269	20,530	18,036	22,436	69,271 (1%)
Total Overnight	69,425	101,718	109,393	114,558	395,095
Grand Total	1,255,262	4,856,499	2,518,657	4,500,057	13,130,475 (100%)

Total Visitor Expenditures by Park Region

Table 7 illustrates total visitor expenditures for the 4 Pennsylvania State Park Regions. Across the entire Pennsylvania State Park system, park visitors spent \$738.2 million on trips in 2008. These expenditures were largely a function of the visitation levels and spending opportunities provided near the parks in each Region. Combined, Regions 2 and 4 accounted for 72% of the total visitor spending. Visitor expenditures were approximately \$290 million for Region 2, \$247 million for Region 4, \$140 million for Region 3, and \$61 million for Region 1 (Table 7). Visitor spending by category was also calculated. Restaurants & bars and gas & oil represented the largest percentage of visitor spending, followed by groceries and take out food/drinks. The smallest percentage of visitor spending was associated with marinas and camping fees.

Table 7. Total Visitor Spending by Park Region

Total Spending in (\$000's)	State Park Regions				
	Region 1	Region 2	Region 3	Region 4	Total
By Category					
Motel, hotel cabin or B&B	3,375	12,725	6,043	10,662	32,805
Camping fees	1,321	2,436	2,472	2,756	8,986
Restaurants & bars	15,818	79,013	37,011	67,039	198,881
Groceries, take-out food/drinks	9,129	43,681	21,189	37,470	111,469
Gas & oil	15,704	76,844	36,639	65,566	194,752
Marina	215	1,104	787	405	2,511
Amusements ^a	3,675	17,819	9,047	14,898	45,439
Clothing	3,244	15,945	7,590	13,600	40,379
Sporting goods	2,831	13,658	6,601	11,706	34,796
Souvenirs and other expenses	5,473	26,977	12,796	22,982	68,228
Total Spending	60,785	290,202	140,175	247,083	738,245
Percent	8%	39%	19%	33%	100%

^a includes extra expenses for skiing & whitewater trips

Visitor Segment Spending by State Park Region

Table 8 illustrates spending by the nine visitor segments across the 4 State Park Regions. Day user segments spent the most with combined expenditures of \$688.3 million. Of those visitors who stayed overnight within the State Parks, resident campers spent the most at \$23.2 million. PA resident cabin users spent \$9.2 million and campsite visitors who were non-residents spent \$6.3 million (Table 8).

Table 8. Total Visitor Spending by Segment and State Park Region

Total Spending (\$000's)	State Park Regions				Total
	Region 1	Region 2	Region 3	Region 4	
By Segment					
L-Day User	20,517	105,639	48,577	89,171	263,904
NL-Day User	20,634	106,243	48,855	89,680	265,412
NR-Day User	12,361	63,642	29,265	53,721	158,989
Sub-Total Day User Spending	53,512	275,524	126,697	232,572	688,305
Cabin R	1,729	3,136	1,703	2,660	9,227
Yurt R	316	467	287	324	1,394
Camp R	3,636	5,476	7,105	7,018	23,234
Cabin NR	235	528	302	463	1,529
Yurt NR	41	176	61	57	335
Camp NR	624	1,831	1,674	2,180	6,309
Sub-Total Overnight User Spending	6,581	11,614	11,132	12,702	42,028
Total – All Segments	60,092	287,139	137,830	245,273	730,334
Extra Spending*	693	3,063	2,345	1,811	7,911
Total w/ Extra Spending	60,785	290,202	140,175	247,083	738,245

* Extra spending includes marinas, ski areas, and whitewater activities that were not included in the general profiles but were added in the totals to each park and added up for each region.

Economic Significance of Individual State Park Regions

Tables 9 and 10 illustrate the economic significance and impact of the 4 State Park Regions in terms of sales, jobs, labor income, and value added. Given their higher visitation rates, it is not surprising that Regions 2 and 4 had higher sales, jobs, labor income, and value added estimates than Regions 1 and 3. For example, in terms of economic significance, Region 2 visits resulted in more than \$278 million in sales and 4,198 jobs created (Table 9). However, the economic significance of \$53.7 million in total sales and 865 jobs created from visits to Region 1 was still sizable. Thus, along with parks in Regions 2 and 4, parks within Regions 1 and 3 should be considered economic assets to the other community attractions and businesses. Please note that the aggregated total sales, jobs, labor income, and value added reported in Tables 9 and 10 are based upon the aggregated park data. Since this data was estimated from regional tourism

multipliers (rather than the larger state multiplier used for the state level analysis), totals do not directly correspond with the totals presented in Table 4 of this report.

Table 9. Regional Economic Significance

Spending Impacts All Visitors	State Park Regions				
	Region 1	Region 2	Region 3	Region 4	Total
Direct Effects					
Sales (\$000's)	36,734	177,349	85,734	153,370	453,187
Jobs	726	3,520	1,662	2,791	8,698
Labor Income (\$000's)	13,378	64,533	31,775	58,187	167,873
Value Added (\$000's)	19,957	95,894	47,056	86,200	249,107
Total Effects					
Sales (\$000's)	53,708	278,250	132,644	252,191	716,792
Jobs	865	4,198	2,017	3,396	10,476
Labor Income (\$000's)	18,516	98,139	46,917	91,233	254,804
Value Added (\$000's)	28,647	153,773	72,829	144,360	399,609

Table 10. Regional Economic Impact

Spending Impacts - Non-Residents	State Park Regions				
	Region 1	Region 2	Region 3	Region 4	Total
Direct Effects					
Sales (\$000's)	25,022	115,420	57,397	99,981	297,820
Jobs	479	2,235	1,084	1,789	5,587
Labor Income (\$000's)	9,130	41,875	21,282	37,775	110,062
Value Added (\$000's)	13,698	62,631	31,659	56,310	164,298
Total Effects					
Sales (\$000's)	36,658	181,579	88,876	164,448	471,561
Jobs	576	2,689	1,326	2,193	6,784
Labor Income (\$000's)	12,629	63,928	31,413	59,308	167,278
Value Added (\$000's)	19,623	100,446	48,889	94,064	263,022

Section Three: Park Specific Analyses

Visitor Segment Spending by Individual Park

In addition to regional comparisons, economic significance and impact is also reported for each individual State Park. Economic significance and impact are influenced heavily by overall visitation, spending opportunities at individual parks and in their surrounding communities, and the percent of park users who visit from outside each park's home range (e.g., those who travel more than 50 miles to visit the park and who stay overnight in the local area). Tables 11 through 14 provide summaries of individual park visitation by user segment, the assigned spending category level (low, average, high), and visitors' total park spending at each park within each of the four PSP regions. Parks that were associated with the highest estimated visitor spending were Pymatuning, Presque Isle, Prince Gallitzin, and Ohiopyle State Parks at \$77.2, \$67.6, \$36.8, and \$28.0 million, respectively (Tables 12 and 13). More detailed economic significance and impact tables for each State Park are provided in Appendix A (refer to the CD insert at the back of this report). Specifically, detailed visitor spending by industry sector, spending by different user segments, and direct/total effects for economic significance and impact (non-local spending) are provided in these park-specific tables.

Table 11. Region 1 Spending Totals by Park and Segment (Spending in \$000)

Park	Tourism Region	State Park Region	Total party days/nights	Spending Category	Day Users Spending	ON Users Spending	Total Park Spending	Signif. of Sales	Signif. of Jobs	Impact of Sales	Impact of Jobs
BALD EAGLE	Alleghenies	1	148869	Average	7127	846	7973	783	13	509	8
BENDIGO	Wilds	1	16985	Low	651	0	651	544	9	342	6
BLACK MOSHANNON	Alleghenies	1	106984	Average	5018	1095	6113	5662	85	4013	58
CHAPMAN	Wilds	1	62171	Low	2371	27	2398	2006	34	1274	22
CHERRY SPRINGS	Wilds	1	23736	Low	884	47	931	783	13	509	8
COLTON POINT	Wilds	1	25618	Average	1278	54	1332	1115	19	720	12
DENTON HILL	Wilds	1	39028	Average	1995	0	1995	2373	41	1757	30
ELK	Wilds	1	9980	Low	383	0	383	345	6	227	4
HILLS CREEK	Wilds	1	42117	Average	1788	837	2625	2370	38	1818	28
HYNER RUN	Wilds	1	25326	Low	915	126	1041	894	15	611	10
HYNER VIEW	Wilds	1	14428	Low	553	0	553	462	8	291	5
KETTLE CREEK	Wilds	1	38884	Low	1385	195	1580	1337	22	909	15
KINZUA BRIDGE	Wilds	1	15322	Low	588	0	588	490	8	309	5
LEONARD HARRISON	Wilds	1	72092	Average	3597	155	3752	3141	54	2030	34
LITTLE PINE	Wilds	1	43542	Average	1892	591	2483	2112	35	1528	25
LYMAN RUN	Wilds	1	39626	Low	1481	73	1554	1307	22	850	14
MCCALL'S DAM	Alleghenies	1	2446	Low	94	0	94	83	1	52	1
MT. PISGAH	NE Mtns.	1	24363	Low	934	0	934	893	14	561	9
OLE BULL	Wilds	1	31521	Low	1060	292	1352	1164	19	836	13
PARKER DAM	Wilds	1	56753	Low	1763	1079	2842	2658	42	2113	32
PATTERSON	Wilds	1	9605	Low	367	2	369	309	5	195	3
POE PADDY	Alleghenies	1	15391	Low	490	183	673	608	9	447	6
POE VALLEY	Alleghenies	1	609	Low	23	0	23	21	0	13	0
R.B. WINTER	Alleghenies	1	55067	Low	1886	454	2340	2126	32	1506	22
RAVENSBURG	Wilds	1	12193	Low	454	27	481	404	7	264	4
REEDS GAP	Alleghenies	1	25742	Average	1282	58	1340	1187	19	765	12
S.B. ELLIOT	Wilds	1	24194	Low	876	176	1052	941	15	671	11
SAND BRIDGE	Alleghenies	1	7005	Low	269	0	269	238	4	149	2
SHIKELLAMY	Alleghenies	1	160585	Average	8208	0	8208	7319	116	4622	71
SINNEMAHONING	Wilds	1	69260	Low	2568	182	2750	2325	39	1532	25
SIZERVILLE	Wilds	1	34735	Low	1286	83	1369	1151	19	754	13
U. PINE BOTTOM	Wilds	1	1085	Low	42	0	42	35	1	22	0
REGION 1 TOTAL	-	1	1,255,261	-	53512	6580	60092	53,708	865	36658	576

Table 12. Region 2 Spending Totals by Park and Segment (Spending in \$000)

Park	Tourism Region	State Park Region	Total party days/nights	Spending Category	Day Users Spending	ON Users Spending	Total Park Spending	Signif. of Sales	Signif. of Jobs	Impact of Sales	Impact of Jobs
CLEAR CREEK	Wilds	2	54946	Average	2635	425	3060	2656	44	1843	30
COOK FOREST	Wilds	2	202656	Average	9598	1597	11195	9604	160	6640	108
JENNINGS EE	Pittsburgh	2	38204	Low	1465	0	1465	1527	20	958	12
KEYSTONE	Pittsburgh	2	114075	Average	5416	912	6328	6789	85	4683	58
KOOSER	Pittsburgh	2	39077	Low	1406	280	1686	1854	23	1307	16
LAUREL HILL	Pittsburgh	2	113134	Average	5332	824	6156	6514	82	4440	55
LAUREL MOUNTAIN	Pittsburgh	2	43229	Average	2209	0	2209	2305	30	1445	18
LAUREL RIDGE	Alleghenies	2	65701	Low	2405	214	2619	2335	36	1545	23
LAUREL SUMMIT	Pittsburgh	2	9289	Low	356	0	356	371	5	233	3
LINN RUN	Pittsburgh	2	79232	Low	2939	396	3335	3645	45	2502	31
M. K. GODDARD	Great Lakes	2	118401	Average	6053	0	6053	5458	93	3482	59
MCCONNELL'S MILL	Pittsburgh	2	117740	Average	6019	0	6019	6277	81	3936	50
MORaine	Pittsburgh	2	516425	Average	26250	497	26747	28612	364	18403	231
OHIO PYLE	Pittsburgh	2	425986	High	26130	1914	28044	32806	415	22645	282
OIL CREEK	Great Lakes	2	49804	Low	1868	81	1949	1727	30	1117	19
POINT	Pittsburgh	2	308983	Average	15795	0	15795	16472	211	10329	131
PRESQUE ISLE	Great Lakes	2	1057376	High	67567	0	67567	60258	1037	38198	647
PYMATUNING	Great Lakes	2	1187446	High	74414	2761	77175	68586	1177	44290	747
RACCOON CREEK	Pittsburgh	2	213440	High	12811	1564	14375	15190	192	10208	127
RYERSON STATION	Pittsburgh	2	20031	Low	732	74	806	855	11	570	7
YELLOW CREEK	Pittsburgh	2	81323	Average	4124	76	4200	4407	56	2804	35
REGION 2 TOTAL	-	2	4,856,499	-	275,524	11,614	290,202	278,250	4,198	181,579	2,689

Table 13. Region 3 Spending Totals by Park and Segment (Spending in \$000)

Park	Tourism Region	State Park Region	Total party days/nights	Spending Category	Day Users Spending	ON Users Spending	Total Park Spending	Signif. of Sales	Signif. of Jobs	Impact of Sales	Impact of Jobs
BLUE KNOB	Alleghenies	3	205270	One	7775	208	7983	8962	147	6408	105
BOYD BIG TREE	Dutch	3	12589	One	482	0	482	474	7	298	4
BUCHANAN'S B'PL	Dutch	3	18598	One	713	0	713	701	10	440	6
CALEDONIA	Dutch	3	109207	Two	5070	946	6016	6551	97	4692	69
CANOE CREEK	Alleghenies	3	85617	One	3213	275	3488	3200	49	2144	32
CODORUS	Dutch	3	393037	Two	19437	1178	20615	21154	309	14031	201
COLONEL DENNING	Dutch	3	24597	One	843	183	1026	1025	15	716	10
COWANS GAP	Alleghenies	3	198595	Two	9507	1280	10787	9695	149	6571	98
FOWLER'S HOLLOW	Dutch	3	12133	Two	580	67	647	638	9	425	6
GIFFORD PINCHOT	Dutch	3	291907	Three	17264	2550	19814	19712	289	13386	193
GREENWOOD FURN.	Alleghenies	3	79730	One	2896	294	3190	2840	44	1888	29
JOSEPH E. IBBERSON C.	Dutch	3	4233	One	162	0	162	160	2	100	1
KINGS GAP EE	Dutch	3	26010	One	997	0	997	980	15	615	9
LITTLE BUFFALO	Dutch	3	105757	Two	5276	237	5513	5440	81	3507	51
MONT ALTO	Dutch	3	9922	One	381	0	381	374	6	235	3
PENN ROOSEVELT	Alleghenies	3	15132	One	550	54	604	539	8	358	5
PINE GROVE FURN.	Dutch	3	80535	Two	3805	589	4394	4387	64	2993	43
PRINCE GALLITZIN	Alleghenies	3	560835	Three	34561	2245	36806	33012	516	21658	330
SAMUEL LEWIS	Dutch	3	46943	One	1800	0	1800	1769	26	1110	16
SHAWNEE	Alleghenies	3	123127	Two	5850	804	6654	5942	92	4020	60
SUSQUEHANNOCK	Wilds	3	28554	Two	1460	0	1460	1218	21	768	13
TROUGH CREEK	Alleghenies	3	27799	Two	1304	224	1528	1372	21	944	14
WARRIORS PATH	NE Mtns.	3	17519	One	672	0	672	642	10	403	6
WHIPPLE DAM	Alleghenies	3	41011	Two	2096	0	2096	1856	29	1167	18
REGION 3 TOTAL	-	3	2,518,658	-	126,697	11,132	140,175	132,644	2,017	88,876	1,326

Table 14. Region 4 Spending Totals by Park and Segment (Spending in \$000)

Park	Tourism Region	State Park Region	Total party days/nights	Spending Category	Day Users Spending	ON Users Spending	Total Park Spending	Signif. of Sales	Signif. of Jobs	Impact of Sales	Impact of Jobs
ARCHBALD POTHOLE	NE Mtns.	4	20877	One	801	0	801	765	12	480	7
BELTZVILLE	NE Mtns.	4	202132	Two	10333	0	10333	9878	155	6205	97
BIG POCONO	NE Mtns.	4	45036	Two	2303	0	2303	2391	38	1573	25
DELAWARE CANAL	Philadelphia	4	208432	One	7991	0	7991	8360	103	5241	64
EVANSBURG	Philadelphia	4	188898	Three	12070	0	12070	14361	182	9649	122
FORT WASHINGTON	Philadelphia	4	213016	Two	10889	0	10889	11392	141	7142	87
FRANCES SLOCUM	NE Mtns.	4	190448	Three	11877	476	12353	11815	185	7593	118
FRENCH CREEK	Philadelphia	4	271389	Three	16056	2367	18423	19503	237	13236	158
GOULDSBORO	NE Mtns.	4	35716	Two	1826	0	1826	1746	27	1097	17
HICKORY RUN	NE Mtns.	4	101522	Three	5166	2183	7349	7071	106	5234	77
JACOBSBURG EE	Philadelphia	4	81842	Two	4183	0	4183	4377	54	2744	33
LACKAWANNA	NE Mtns.	4	129716	Two	6333	547	6880	6633	103	4382	67
LEHIGH GORGE	NE Mtns.	4	141189	Three	9022	0	9022	9087	145	5880	94
LOCUST LAKE	Alleghenies	4	60880	Two	2369	1267	3636	3243	48	2464	36
MARSH CREEK	Philadelphia	4	336161	Two	17184	0	17184	18015	222	11307	138
MEMORIAL LAKE	Dutch	4	62240	Two	3182	0	3182	3132	47	1966	29
NESCOPECK	NE Mtns.	4	35204	Two	1800	0	1800	1720	27	1080	17
NESHAMINY	Philadelphia	4	278129	Two	14217	0	14217	14875	184	9325	114
NOCKAMIXON	Philadelphia	4	356781	Two	18108	442	18550	20136	246	13069	157
NOLDE EE	Philadelphia	4	41164	One	1579	0	1579	1651	20	1035	13
PROMISED LAND	NE Mtns.	4	226354	Two	10763	1662	12425	12169	187	8343	126
PROMPTON	NE Mtns.	4	5500	One	211	0	211	202	3	127	2
RALPH STOVER	Philadelphia	4	80031	Two	4092	0	4092	4280	53	2683	33
RICKETTS GLEN	NE Mtns.	4	112733	Three	6151	2008	8159	8021	122	5835	87
RIDLEY CREEK	Philadelphia	4	355887	Two	18192	0	18192	19033	235	11932	146
SALT SPRINGS	NE Mtns.	4	12273	One	470	0	470	450	7	282	4
SWATARA	Dutch	4	25856	Two	1322	0	1322	1299	19	815	12
TOBYHANNA	NE Mtns.	4	81456	Two	4097	116	4213	4037	63	2580	40
TUSCARORA	Alleghenies	4	67896	Two	3400	159	3559	3187	50	2070	32
TYLER	Philadelphia	4	440360	Two	22511	0	22511	23551	291	14764	180
WHITE CLAY CREEK	Philadelphia	4	27216	Two	1390	0	1390	1456	18	913	11
WORLDS END	NE Mtns.	4	63722	Two	2682	1475	4157	4355	65	3401	50
REGION 4 TOTAL	-	4	4,500,057	-	232,571	12,701	247,083	252,191	3,396	164,448	2,193

CONCLUSION

Results of this economic impact analysis illustrate the importance of state park visitor spending to the economy of the Commonwealth and its local regions/communities. At a statewide level, park users spent over \$738 million dollars during their visits, resulting in \$818.3 million in sales, \$291.4 million in wage/salary income, 10,551 jobs, and \$ 464.7 million in value added effects.

Findings from the present study were compared with other recent state park economic impact studies as well as the 1987 PSP economic impact study (Table 14). While the various studies used different methodologies and expenditure categories, and prices change over time, this comparison demonstrates that Pennsylvania's State Park system contributes a considerable amount of economic benefit. The current results show an increase of \$256 million over the \$562 million in total sales reported in the earlier Pennsylvania State Park economic impact study. The estimate of 10,551 jobs created through state park visitor spending is similar to the previous study, which estimated 10,000 new jobs.

By way of comparison with recent economic reports from neighboring states, Pennsylvania's economic significance of \$818 million in sales is more than double that for New Jersey and approaches the lower estimate for New York's State Park system (New York's study reported a range of \$946 million to \$1.9 billion based on low and high estimates of visitor expenditures).

Some previous studies have compared the economic impact or significance of state park systems with the amounts spent to operate them (i.e. money appropriated in state budgets). For example, the previous study of the impact of state parks on Pennsylvania's economy (Strauss & Lord, 1990) stated that, "During 1987, the \$36 million identified with park operations contributed to the fifteen-fold increase in total economic activity realized throughout the state."

The recent study of New York's state park system concluded that the benefits (of the State Park System) exceed the direct costs of maintaining the state parks many times over. The benefit-to-cost ratio was more than 5 to 1 (\$341 million in state government expenditures versus \$1.9 billion in direct output and sales).

For every dollar spent on California State Parks, a study in 2002 conservatively estimated that \$2.35 is returned to the California State's General Fund from spending in the local communities. California's operating budget of \$227 million for park operations translated to \$6.7 billion in total output and new sales, a return of 30:1 on California State Parks expenditures.

All of these comparisons depict a very favorable return on investment for State Park systems. In this study, comparing the income return (value added) from non-resident visitor expenditures with reported 2008 calendar year General Fund expenditures of \$60,950,000 shows a favorable return on investment. For every dollar invested in PSP, \$7.62 of income (value added) is returned to Pennsylvania. Maintaining this level of economic impact will require sustaining visitation levels and ensuring spending opportunities within the parks and in the local communities surrounding each park. Future assessments of the PSPs economic contributions

could be improved by collecting new data on park visitor expenditures, travel patterns, and trip purposes.

Table 14. Comparison of PA State Parks Economic Impact vs. Other Park Systems

Pennsylvania (2008)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ \$818 million in total sales (\$463.7 million direct plus \$354.6 million secondary) ▪ 10,551 jobs, \$291 million in labor income, \$465 million in value added)
Pennsylvania (1987)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ \$562 million in total sales (\$263 million direct plus \$299 million secondary) ▪ 10,000 jobs plus 880 jobs within the Bureau
New Jersey (2004)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 304 million in recreation value from 14.2 million visits ▪ \$347 million in total sales (economic significance) ▪ 7,000 jobs ▪ Estimated value of \$498 million for ecosystem services (healthy forests, air and water quality, etc.), including qualitative assessment of property value enhancement, consumption goods (timber, fish and game, etc.), and non-use values (existence, option, bequest) - no quantitative estimates provided
New York (2009)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Range of \$946 million to \$1.9 billion based on low (\$17) and high (\$35) per person expenditures of 55.7 million state park visitors during 2007/2008 ▪ 20,000 jobs ▪ Also described other benefits attributable to the agency (like New Jersey report)
Minnesota (2002)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ \$218 million in visitor trip spending ▪ \$37 million in operations spending ▪ \$3 million in capital expenditures
Arizona (2002)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ \$126.4 million (26 state parks)
Michigan (1997)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ \$456.4 million in total state park trip spending
Missouri (2002)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ \$410 million total spending by state park visitors
North Carolina (2008)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ \$80 million (conservative estimate, includes only expenditures of non-local, primary purpose visitors)
Texas (2005)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ \$793 million in total sales ▪ 12,000 jobs
California (2002)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ \$6.65 billion in total output and new sales resulting from visitor spending ▪ \$2.6 billion visitor spending in local communities (85.2 million visitors) ▪ 100,625 jobs ▪ \$99,607,313 in gross sales and rentals for independently run concessions
Washington (2002)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ \$1.2 billion in total direct impact ▪ \$580 million in state park travel spending ▪ 8,000 jobs

REFERENCES

- Heintz, J., Pollin, R., & Garrett-Peltier, H. (2008). The New York State Park System: An Economic Asset to the Empire State. Available: http://www.ptny.org/pdfs/advocacy/peri_full_report.pdf
- Infospeherix, (2008). PA DCNR Statistics 2008. Unpublished report.
- Pennsylvania State Parks (2009). Bureau of State Park Attendance. Unpublished document.
- Strauss, C. H. & Lord, B. E. (1990). Impact of State Parks on Pennsylvania's Economy. Unpublished management report.
- Stynes, D. J. (1998). State and Regional Economic Impacts of Michigan State Park Visitors: Report to Michigan Department of Natural Resources and Public Policy Associates. Available: <https://www.msu.edu/course/prr/840/econimpact/pdf/mispecimpact2.PDF>
- Stynes, D. J. (2005). Contributions of Wyoming State Parks and Historic Sites to State and Local Economies. Available: http://wyoparks.state.wy.us/PlanningDocs/SPHS_impact_brochure.pdf
- Stynes, D. J. (2005).

APPENDICES:

1. Detailed Economic Data for Individual State Parks

2. Economic Studies from Other State Systems

(see CD insert or attached file)