



2018 National Park Visitor Spending Effects

Economic Contributions to Local Communities, States, and the Nation

Natural Resource Report NPS/NRSS/EQD/NRR—2019/1922



ON THE COVER

Visitors at Golden Gate Bridge Welcome Center. Golden Gate National Recreation Center was the most visited National Park in 2018 with 15,223,697 visitors. Photo Credit: Kirke Wrench NPS.

2018 National Park Visitor Spending Effects

Economic Contributions to Local Communities, States, and the Nation

Natural Resource Report NPS/NRSS/EQD/NRR—2019/1922

Catherine Cullinane Thomas,¹ Lynne Koontz,² and Egan Cornachione¹

¹ U.S. Geological Survey
Fort Collins Science Center
Fort Collins, Colorado

² National Park Service
Environmental Quality Division
Fort Collins, Colorado

May 2019

U.S. Department of the Interior
National Park Service
Natural Resource Stewardship and Science
Fort Collins, Colorado

The National Park Service, Natural Resource Stewardship and Science office in Fort Collins, Colorado, publishes a range of reports that address natural resource topics. These reports are of interest and applicability to a broad audience in the National Park Service and others in natural resource management, including scientists, conservation and environmental constituencies, and the public.

The Natural Resource Report Series is used to disseminate comprehensive information and analysis about natural resources and related topics concerning lands managed by the National Park Service. The series supports the advancement of science, informed decision-making, and the achievement of the National Park Service mission. The series also provides a forum for presenting more lengthy results that may not be accepted by publications with page limitations.

All manuscripts in the series receive the appropriate level of peer review to ensure that the information is scientifically credible, technically accurate, appropriately written for the intended audience, and designed and published in a professional manner.

This report received formal peer review by subject-matter experts who were not directly involved in the collection, analysis, or reporting of the data, and whose background and expertise put them on par technically and scientifically with the authors of the information.

Views, statements, findings, conclusions, recommendations, and data in this report do not necessarily reflect views and policies of the National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior. Any use of trade, firm, or product names is for descriptive purposes only and does not imply endorsement by the U.S. Government.

This report is available from the [Social Science Program website](#) and the [Natural Resource Publications Management website](#). If you have difficulty accessing information in this publication, particularly if using assistive technology, please email irma@nps.gov.

Please cite this publication as:

Cullinane Thomas, C., L. Koontz, and E. Cornachione. 2019. 2018 national park visitor spending effects: Economic contributions to local communities, states, and the nation. Natural Resource Report NPS/NRSS/EQD/NRR—2019/1922. National Park Service, Fort Collins, Colorado.

Contents

	Page
Contents	iii
Figures.....	iv
Tables	iv
Executive Summary	v
Acknowledgments.....	v
Introduction.....	1
Overview of Economic Effects Analyses	2
Data Sources and Methods.....	4
Visitor Survey Data	5
Visitation Data.....	8
Regional Economic Multipliers.....	9
Results.....	10
Visitation	10
Visitor Spending.....	11
Economic Contributions.....	13
Limitations	14
VSE profiles and visitor survey data	14
Visitation data.....	16
Regional multipliers	16
References.....	18
Appendix.....	19

Figures

	Page
Figure 1. How NPS visitor spending supports jobs and business activity in local economies.	2
Figure 2. The Visitor Spending Effects Model.	4
Figure 3. Proportion of total party days/nights by visitor segment.....	10
Figure 4. System-wide visitor spending by spending group	11
Figure A-1. National Park Service Regions.....	52

Tables

	Page
Table 1. Park units with new profiles in 2018.....	7
Table 2. Total NPS Visitor Spending by Segment.....	12
Table 3. Change in visitor spending for parks with new survey data.....	12
Table 4. Economic contributions to the national economy of NPS visitor spending - 2018.....	13
Table A-1. Visits, spending, and economic contributions to local economies - 2018.	19
Table A-2. Percent of visitor spending made by non-local visitors - 2018.....	38
Table A-3. Visits, spending and economic contributions to state economies - 2018.....	49
Table A-4. Visits, spending and economic contributions to regional economies - 2018.....	51
Table A-5. Park unit type abbreviations.....	52
Table A-6. Visit allocation for multi-state parks.....	53
Table A-7. IMPLAN sector bridge - 2018	55

Executive Summary

The National Park Service (NPS) manages the Nation's most iconic destinations that attract millions of visitors from across the Nation and around the world. Trip-related spending by NPS visitors generates and supports economic activity within park gateway communities. This report summarizes the annual economic contribution analysis that measures how NPS visitor spending cycles through local economies, generating business sales and supporting jobs and income.

In 2018, the National Park System received an estimated 318.2 million recreation visits. Visitors to national parks spent an estimated \$20.2 billion in local gateway regions. The contribution of this spending to the national economy was 329,000 jobs, \$13.6 billion in labor income, \$23.4 billion in value added, and \$40.1 billion in economic output. The lodging sector saw the highest direct effects, with \$6.8 billion in economic output directly contributed to this sector nationally. The restaurants sector saw the next greatest effects, with \$4.0 billion in economic output directly contributed to this sector nationally.

Results from the Visitor Spending Effects report series are available online via an interactive tool. Users can view year-by-year trend data and explore current year visitor spending, jobs, labor income, value added, and economic output effects by sector for national, state, and local economies. The interactive tool is available at <https://www.nps.gov/subjects/socialscience/vse.htm>.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to acknowledge and thank Adam Urpsis and Sanjay Advani with the U.S. Geological Survey Information Science Branch for their help with the VSE model this year.

Introduction

The National Park System includes 419 areas covering more than 84 million acres. Park units can be found in every state, the District of Columbia, American Samoa, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands. Lands managed by the National Park Service (NPS) serve as recreation destinations for visitors from across the Nation and around the world. On vacations or on day trips, NPS visitors spend time and money in the communities surrounding NPS sites. Spending by NPS visitors generates and supports economic activity within these gateway economies. The NPS has been measuring and reporting visitor spending and economic effects for more than 30 years: early analyses estimated economic contributions at individual units using the Money Generation Model; beginning in 2005, the first NPS system-wide estimates were developed using the Money Generation Model version 2 (MGM2); since 2012, annual system-wide analyses have been developed using the Visitor Spending Effects (VSE) model (Koontz et al., 2017). This report summarizes VSE estimates associated with 2018 NPS visitation.

Visitation to America's national parks in 2018 exceeded 300 million recreation visits for the fourth consecutive year. While down 12.67 million visits (3.8%) from 2017, the 318,211,833 recreation visits in 2018 is the third highest since record keeping began in 1904 (Ziesler, 2019). In 2018, twenty-eight parks set new records for annual recreation visits, and three parks received more than 10 million recreation visits. Several factors influenced NPS visitation in 2018: lingering closures from 2017 hurricanes affected visitation at parks in the Caribbean and in Florida; wildfires affected visitation to many California parks, especially Whiskeytown National Recreation Area, Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area, and Yosemite National Park; and Kilauea volcano at the heart of Hawai'i Volcanoes National Park had a major eruption which caused closures to most of the park mid-May through mid-September.

This report begins with an overview of economic effects analyses, visitor spending effects methodology, and data sources. Estimates of 2018 NPS system-wide visitor spending and resulting economic effects at the national level are then summarized. The report concludes with a description of current data limitations. Park, state, and regional-level spending and economic effects estimates are included in the appendix.

Results from the Visitor Spending Effects report series are also available online via an interactive tool. Users can view year-by-year trend data and explore current year visitor spending, jobs, labor income, value added, and economic output effects by sector for national, state, and local economies. The interactive tool is available at <https://www.nps.gov/subjects/socialscience/vse.htm>.

New this year - The NPS is establishing feasible approaches for implementing a socioeconomic monitoring (SEM) program that would provide a standard visitor survey instrument and a long-term, systematic sampling design for in-park visitor surveys. This year's VSE analysis incorporates new VSE spending profiles derived from SEM pilot surveys. For more information on the SEM program and the new VSE profiles, see Resource Systems Group (2019) and Cullinane Thomas et al. (2019).

Overview of Economic Effects Analyses

Visitors to NPS lands spend money in local gateway regions, and these expenditures generate and support economic activity within these local economies. Economies are complex webs of interacting consumers and producers in which goods produced by one sector of an economy become inputs to other sectors, and the goods produced by those sectors can become inputs to yet other sectors. Thus, a change in the final demand for a good or service can generate a ripple effect throughout an economy as businesses purchase inputs from one another. For example, when visitors come to an area to visit a park or historic site, these visitors spend money to purchase various goods and services. The business activity resulting from these direct purchases from local businesses represent the *direct* effects of visitor spending within an economy. To provide supplies to local businesses to produce their goods and services, input suppliers must purchase inputs from other industries, thus creating additional *indirect* effects of visitor spending within the economy. Additionally, employees of directly affected businesses and input suppliers use their income to purchase goods and services in the local economy, generating further *induced* effects of visitor spending. The sums of the indirect and induced effects give the *secondary* effects of visitor spending; and the sums of the direct and secondary effects give the total economic effect of visitor spending in a local economy. Economic input-output models capture these complex interactions between producers and consumers within a defined regional economy and describe the secondary effects of visitor spending through regional economic multipliers. Figure 1 illustrates how NPS visitor spending supports jobs and business activity in local economies.




Figure 1. How NPS visitor spending supports jobs and business activity in local economies.

Economic contribution analyses describe the gross economic activity associated with NPS visitor spending in a regional economy. Results can be interpreted as the relative magnitude and importance of the economic activity generated through NPS visitor spending in the regional economy. Economic contributions are estimated by multiplying *total visitor spending* by regional economic multipliers. Total visitor spending includes spending by both local visitors who live in gateway regions and non-local visitors who travel to NPS sites from outside gateway regions.

An economic contributions analysis should not be confused with an economic impact analysis. Economic impact analyses estimate the net changes to the economic base of a regional economy that can be attributed to the inflow of new money to the economy solely from non-local visitors. Economic impacts can be interpreted as the economic activity that would likely be lost from a local economy if the national park unit was not there. VSE reports prior to the 2016 analysis included both park-level economic contribution estimates and park-level economic impact estimates which created confusion between the results. To minimize this confusion, only park level economic contributions are provided in this report. Table A-2 in the appendix provides estimates of the percent of visitor spending for each park that is made by non-local visitors.

Four types of regional economic effects are described in this report:

- **Jobs** measure annualized full and part time jobs that are supported by NPS visitor spending.
- **Labor Income** includes employee wages, salaries and payroll benefits, as well as the incomes of sole proprietors that are supported by NPS visitor spending.
- **Value Added** measures the contribution of NPS visitor spending to the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) of a regional economy. Value added is equal to the difference between the amount an industry sells a product for and the production cost of the product.
- **Economic Output** is a measure of the total estimated value of the production of goods and services supported by NPS visitor spending. Economic output is the sum of all intermediate sales (business to business) and final demand (sales to consumers and exports).

Data Sources and Methods

Three key pieces of information are required to estimate the economic effects of NPS visitor spending: visitor spending patterns in local gateway regions, the number of visitors who visit each park, and regional economic multipliers that describe the economic effects of visitor spending in local economies (Figure 2). Steps for visitor spending estimation include: segmenting visitors into distinct lodging-based segments that describe differences in spending patterns (e.g., day-trips, staying overnight in local lodging, or camping); transforming visitor count data and spending data into common units of measure; and determining the portion of time and trip expenditures spent in local gateway areas that can be attributed to national park visitation (see Cullinane Thomas et al., 2019 for additional details).




Figure 2. The Visitor Spending Effects Model.

Visitor Survey Data

Visitor survey data are used to derive VSE profiles that describe visitor spending patterns and trip characteristics (see Cullinane Thomas et al., 2019 for additional details). VSE profiles are developed for lodging-based visitor segments to help account for differences in spending across trip types. NPS recreation visitors are split into the following seven visitor segments:

- *Local day trip*: local visitors who visit the park for a single day and return home,
- *Non-local day trip*: non-local visitors who visit the park for a single day and leave the area or return home,
- *NPS Lodge*: local or non-local visitors who stay at a lodge or motel within the park,
- *NPS Campground*: local or non-local visitors who stay at campgrounds or at backcountry camping sites within the park,
- *Lodge Outside Park*: local or non-local visitors who stay at motels, hotels, bed and breakfasts, or other specialty lodging located outside of the park,
- *Camp Outside Park*: local or non-local visitors who camp outside of the park, and
- *Other*: non-local visitors who stay overnight in the local region but do not have any lodging expenses. This segment includes visitors staying in private homes, with friends or relatives, or in other unpaid lodging.

Visitor spending profiles describe average expenditures made by national park visitors within local gateway regions surrounding parks and are expressed in terms of spending per party per day for visitors on day trips and spending per party per night for visitors on overnight trips. Spending profiles are reported for the following eight spending categories:

- Lodging (includes hotels, motels, and specialty lodging),
- Camping fees,
- Restaurants,
- Groceries,
- Gas,
- Transportation (includes local transportation only),
- Recreation Industries (includes equipment rental, amusement activities, and guides and tour fees), and
- Retail (includes souvenirs, sporting goods, and other retail purchases).

For previous VSE analyses, all VSE profiles were derived from survey data collected through the NPS Visitor Services Project (VSP). Spending data from 57 VSP surveys administered between 2003 and 2015 were used to develop park-specific spending patterns for the surveyed park units. Generic profiles were developed from the 57 VSP surveys to estimate visitor spending for non-surveyed park units. Generic profiles represent four park types: parks that have both camping and lodging available within the park (Camp and Lodge), parks that have only camping available within the park (Camp

Only), parks with no overnight stays (No Stay), and parks with high day use, including National Recreation Areas, National Seashores and National Lakeshores (Recreation Areas). Some NPS units are not well represented by the generic profiles; for these parks, profiles were constructed using the best available data. These units include parks in Alaska, parks in the Washington, D.C. area, parkways with recreation visitation, parks in highly urban areas, and several other parks.¹ Additional information on data limitations for these parks is included in the Limitations section of this report.

The 2018 VSE analysis incorporates new spending profile data for 19 park units (Table 1), increasing the number of units with primary survey data to 73.² These data are derived from surveys conducted as part of the Socioeconomic Monitoring (SEM) pilot effort; 14 park units were selected for the 2015-2016 SEM pilot, and 5 additional parks conducted visitor surveys that included the spending questions developed for the SEM surveys.³ Data from the new surveys were used to develop site-specific spending profiles for each of the surveyed parks (Cullinane Thomas et al. 2019).⁴

¹Including Aniakchak National Monument and Preserve, Big Cypress National Preserve, Denali National Park and Preserve, Everglades National Park, George Washington Memorial Parkway, Isle Royale National Park, John D Rockefeller Jr Memorial Parkway, Manhattan Project National Historical Park, Minidoka National Historic Site, Natchez Trace Parkway, Rio Grande Wild and Scenic River, Valley Forge National Historical Park, and Yukon-Charley Rivers National Preserve.

² New survey data for three park units update older VSP survey data: Grand Canyon National Park, Yosemite National Park, and Monocacy National Battlefield.

³ One park included in the SEM pilot, Biscayne NP, is in the process of updating park level visitor counting procedures. The new SEM spending profiles for Biscayne NP will be incorporated in future VSE analyses after the implementation of the new counting procedures.

⁴ Several new visitor segments were defined for parks with new visitor surveys. A new **Backcountry segment** is included for Acadia National Park, Blue Ridge Parkway, Canaveral National Seashore, Glacier National Park, Glen Canyon National Recreation Area, Yosemite National Park, Grand Canyon National Park, Glacier Bay National Park & Preserve, and Klondike Gold Rush Alaska National Historical Park. A **Houseboat segment** is included for Glen Canyon National Recreation Area. **Tour boat and cruise segments** are included for Glacier Bay National Park & Preserve, and Klondike Gold Rush Alaska National Historical Park. For this VSE analysis, visitation, spending, and economic contributions for these new segments are rolled into the seven main visitor segments: Backcountry is included in the NPS Campground segment; Houseboat is included in the NPS Campground segment; Boat and Cruise are included in the Lodge Outside Park segment.

Table 1. Park units with new profiles in 2018.

Park Unit	Previous Profile
Acadia National Park	Camp and Lodge
Blue Ridge Parkway	Camp Only
Cape Cod National Seashore	Recreation Area
Canaveral National Seashore	Camp Only
Colonial National Historical Park	No Stay
Cuyahoga Valley National Park	Camp Only (modified to reflect high local day use)
Gateway National Recreation Area	Urban Park (modified version of Recreation Area profile)
Glacier National Park	Camp and Lodge
Glacier Bay National Park & Preserve	AK Cruise profile (based on McDowell Group, 2010 and Fay and Christensen, 2010)
Glen Canyon National Recreation Area	Camp Only (modified to reflect high in-park camping use)
Golden Gate National Recreation Area	Urban Park (modified version of Recreation Area profile)
Grand Canyon National Park	Primary data: Grand Canyon VSP survey, 2003
Klondike Gold Rush AK National Historical Park	AK Cruise profile (based on McDowell Group, 2010 and Fay and Christensen, 2010)
Monocacy National Battlefield	Primary data: Monocacy VSP survey, 2006
Muir Woods National Monument	No Stay
Niobrara National Scenic River	Recreation Area
San Antonio Missions National Historical Park	No Stay
World War II Valor in the Pacific National Monument	No Stay
Yosemite National Park	Primary data: Yosemite VSP survey, 2009

Visitation Data

The NPS Visitor Use Statistics Office⁵ compiles detailed park-level visitation data for 382 of the 419 National Park units and publishes this data in an annual Statistical Abstract (Ziesler, 2019). The abstract reports total recreation visits and the number of overnight camping and lodging stays within the parks. This analysis estimates visitor spending and associated economic effects for NPS units that collect visitation data; annual NPS recreation visitation estimates published in the 2018 Statistical Abstract are used.

For each park, visitation is measured as *visits*⁶. Visitor spending profiles are in terms of spending per party per day (for visitors on day trips) and spending per party per night (for visitors on overnight trips). To estimate visitor spending, it is necessary to convert visit data to party days and party nights. Party days are the combined number of days that parties on day trips spend in the local area surrounding the park. Party nights are the combined number of nights that parties on overnight trips spend in the local area surrounding the park. A party is defined as a group that is traveling together and sharing expenses (e.g., a party could be a family, a couple, or an individual on a solo trip).

To estimate total party days/nights, park visit data from the NPS Statistical Abstract are combined with trip characteristic information derived from visitor surveys. VSE profiles describe trip characteristics by visitor segment, and include average party size, re-entry rate (i.e., the average number of days parties enter the park over the course of a trip), and length of stay (i.e., the average number of days or nights that parties spend in the local area). Visitation data are converted to total party days/nights using the following conversion:

For day-trip segments, **party days** = (visits ÷ party size);

For overnight segments, **party nights** = (visits ÷ re-entry rate ÷ party size) × nights in local area.

⁵ <https://irma.nps.gov/Stats/>

⁶ Parks count visits as the number of individuals who enter the park each day. For example, a family of 4 taking a week-long vacation to Yellowstone National Park and staying at a lodge outside of the park would be counted as 28 visits (4 individuals who enter the park on 7 different days). A different family of 4, also taking a week-long vacation to Yellowstone National Park but lodging within the park, would be counted as 4 visits (4 individuals who enter the park on a single day and then stay within the park for the remainder of their trip). These differences are a result of the realities of the limitations in the methods available to count park visits.

Regional Economic Multipliers

The multipliers used in this analysis are derived from the IMPLAN software and data system (IMPLAN Group LLC). The underlying IMPLAN data are derived from multiple Federal and state data sources, including the Bureau of Economic Analysis, Bureau of Labor Statistics, and the U.S. Census Bureau. This analysis uses IMPLAN version 3.0 software with 2017 county, state, and national-level data. Economic effects are reported on an annual basis in 2018 dollars (\$2018). Where necessary, dollar values have been adjusted to \$2018 using IMPLAN output deflators. Table A-7 in the appendix shows how spending categories are bridged to IMPLAN sectors.

To assess the economic effects of NPS visitor spending, appropriate local regions need to be defined for each park unit. Only direct spending that takes place within the regional area is included as supporting economic activity. For most NPS units in this analysis, local gateway regions contain all counties within or intersecting a 60-mile radius around each park boundary.⁷ This year, local area definitions were updated for all park units with new visitor surveys (all parks listed in Table 1).⁸ For these parks, local gateway regions were identified through conversations with park staff who were asked to identify the nearby towns and cities where visitors typically stop and make purchases or spend the night while visiting the park. Local gateway regions were then defined as the set of counties that include the identified towns and cities visited by park visitors.

This analysis reports economic contributions at the park-level, state-level, NPS region-level, and national level. Park-level contributions use county-level IMPLAN models comprised of all counties contained within the local gateway regions; state-level contributions use state-level IMPLAN models; regional-level contributions use regional IMPLAN models comprised of all states contained within the NPS region;⁹ and the national-level contributions use a national IMPLAN model. The size of the region included in an IMPLAN model influences the magnitude of the economic multiplier effects. As the economic region expands, the amount of secondary spending that stays within that region increases, which results in larger economic multipliers. Thus, contributions at the national level are larger than those at the regional, state, and local levels. Local, state, and national contribution estimates should not be summed.

⁷ For parks with the 60-mile local area radius, geographic information systems (GIS) data were used to determine the local gateway region by spatially identifying all counties partially or completely contained within a 60-mile radius around each park boundary. Economic regions for parks in Hawaii and for some parks in Alaska are defined as the State of Hawaii and the State of Alaska, respectively. Due to data limitations, the island economy of the State of Hawaii is used as a surrogate economic region for the U.S. territories of American Samoa, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

⁸ Through consultation with park staff, the local area was also updated for Zion National Park to be consistent with the 2006 visitor survey data used to develop the Zion spending profiles; the original 60-mile radius ten-county local area setting was modified to only include the four counties within an hour drive of the park.

⁹ The regional IMPLAN model for the National Capital Region includes the state of D.C. and all counties included in the gateway regions for the National Capital Region park units.

Results

Visitation

A total of 318,211,833 NPS recreation visits are reported in the 2018 NPS Statistical Abstract (Ziesler, 2019). This is down 12.67 million visits (3.8%) from 2017 visitation.

Total party days/nights are estimated for each park unit and for each visitor segment (as described in the *visitation data* section). In 2018, visitor parties accounted for an estimated 128.1 million party days/nights. Lodging outside the park accounted for the largest portion of party days/nights (33%), followed by local day trips (21%) and non-local day-trips (21%); camping and lodging inside NPS units accounted for just over 3% of total party days/nights spent in local gateway regions (Figure 3).




Figure 3. Proportion of total party days/nights by visitor segment. Total party days/nights measure the number of days (for day trips) and nights (for overnight trips) that visitor groups spend in gateway regions while visiting NPS sites. In 2018, visitor groups accounted for 128.1 million party days/nights.

Visitor Spending

In 2018, park visitors spent an estimated \$20.2 billion in local gateway regions while visiting NPS sites (Figure 4, Table 2). Visitor spending was estimated for each park unit and for each visitor segment based on park and segment specific expenditure profiles (as described in the *visitor survey data* section). Total visitor spending is equal to total party days/nights multiplied by spending per party per day/night. Lodging expenses account for the largest share of visitor spending. In 2018, park visitors spent \$6.8 billion on lodging in hotels, motels, bed and breakfasts, and other specialty lodging, and an additional \$0.5 billion on camping fees. Food expenses account for the next largest share of expenditures. In 2018, park visitors spent \$4.0 billion dining at restaurants and bars and an additional \$1.4 billion purchasing food at grocery and convenience stores. Food expenses account for the next largest share of expenditures. In 2018, park visitors spent \$4.0 billion dining at restaurants and bars and an additional \$1.4 billion purchasing food at grocery and convenience stores.




Figure 4. System-wide visitor spending by spending group. In 2018, national park visitors spent an estimated total of \$20.19 billion dollars in local gateway economies.

Table 2. Total NPS Visitor Spending by Segment

Visitor Segment	Total Spending (\$Billions, \$2018)	Percent of Total Spending	Avg Spending per Party per Day/Night (\$2018)
Local Day Trip	\$1.02	5.1%	\$37.67
Non-Local Day Trip	\$2.31	11.4%	\$86.80
NPS Lodge	\$0.42	2.1%	\$439.16
Lodge Outside Park	\$13.97	69.2%	\$328.79
NPS Camp	\$0.40	2.0%	\$126.51
Camp Outside Park	\$1.25	6.2%	\$134.81
Other	\$0.82	4.1%	\$44.27
Total	\$20.19	100%	\$157.58

Total visitor spending estimates increased by 11% in 2018 compared to 2017 estimates. This increase is partially due to inflation but is mostly due to improved VSE profiles for parks with new survey data. Table 3 shows how visitor spending estimates changed for parks with new survey data; percent changes were calculated by applying 2018 visitation data to each park's new profile and previous profile.

Table 3. Effect of new spending profiles on visitor spending estimates for parks with new survey data.

Park Unit	Percent Change in Visitor Spending: Old to New Profile
Acadia National Park	32%
Blue Ridge Parkway	15%
Canaveral National Seashore	-42%
Cape Cod National Seashore	183%
Colonial National Historical Park	70%
Cuyahoga Valley National Park	-40%
Gateway National Recreation Area	7%
Glacier Bay National Park & Preserve	66%
Glacier National Park	36%
Glen Canyon National Recreation Area	12%
Golden Gate National Recreation Area	171%
Grand Canyon National Park	36%
Klondike Gold Rush AK National Historical Park	-15%
Monocacy National Battlefield	-58%
Muir Woods National Monument	92%
Niobrara National Scenic River	131%
San Antonio Missions National Historical Park	23%
World War II Valor in the Pacific National Monument	197%
Yosemite National Park	18%

Economic Contributions

In 2018, NPS visitor spending directly supported an estimated 197,400 jobs, \$6.0 billion in labor income, \$10.3 billion in value added, and \$16.6 billion in economic output in the national economy. The secondary effects of visitor spending supported an estimated additional 131,600 jobs, \$7.5 billion in labor income, \$13.1 billion in value added, and \$23.6 billion in economic output in the national economy. Combined, NPS visitor spending supported an estimated total of 329,000 jobs, \$13.6 billion in labor income, \$23.4 billion in value added, and \$40.1 billion in economic output in the national economy (Table 4).

Table 4. Economic contributions to the national economy of NPS visitor spending - 2018.

Sector	Jobs	Labor Income (\$Billions, \$2018)	Value Added (\$Billions, \$2018)	Output (\$Billions, \$2018)
Lodging	58,300	\$2.23	\$4.42	\$6.81
Restaurants	61,600	\$1.47	\$2.27	\$4.03
Recreation Industries	28,100	\$0.77	\$1.18	\$1.98
Transportation	11,000	\$0.44	\$1.02	\$1.60
Retail	20,300	\$0.52	\$0.62	\$0.94
Camping	8,900	\$0.27	\$0.32	\$0.46
Groceries	5,300	\$0.18	\$0.25	\$0.38
Gas	3,900	\$0.16	\$0.22	\$0.34
Total Direct Effects	197,400	\$6.04	\$10.30	\$16.55
Secondary Effects	131,600	\$7.54	\$13.09	\$23.57
Total Effects	329,000	\$13.58	\$23.39	\$40.12

Contributions to local gateway economies are provided in the appendix in Table A-1. Economic contributions are estimated by multiplying total (local and non-local) visitor spending by park-level (local gateway region) economic multipliers. Table A-2 provides estimates of the percent of visitor spending for each park that is made by non-local visitors. Park unit type abbreviations are included in Table A-5.

Contributions to state and regional economies are provided in the appendix in Tables A-3 and A-4, respectively. Figure A-1 in the appendix provides a map of states included in each NPS region. For parks that fall within multiple states, park spending is proportionally allocated to each state based on the share of park visits that occur within each state. Visit shares for multi-state parks are listed in Table A-6 in the appendix.

Limitations

The accuracy of spending and contribution estimates rests largely on the input data, namely (1) VSE profile data which include party size, length of stay, park re-entry conversion factors, visitor segment shares, and spending averages; (2) public use recreation visit and overnight stay data; and (3) regional multipliers.

VSE profiles and visitor survey data

The generic profiles derived from VSP data should be reasonably accurate for many park units; however, some parks are not well represented by these profiles. For these parks, profiles were constructed using the best available data. These units include parks in Alaska, parks in the Washington, D.C. area, parkways with recreation visits, and parks in highly urban areas. It is expected that park unit specific data will be more prevalent through future SEM surveying efforts.

Parks in Alaska- Visit characteristics and spending at Alaska parks are unique. Spending opportunities near Alaska parks are limited and for many visitors a park visit is part of a cruise or guided tour, frequently purchased as a package. Most visitors are on extended trips to Alaska, making it difficult to allocate expenses to a particular park visit. Lodging, vehicle rentals, and air expenses frequently occur in Anchorage, many miles from the park. Also, many Alaska parks are only accessible by air or boat, thus, spending profiles estimated from visitor surveys at parks in the lower 48 states do not provide good approximations for Alaska parks. Visitor trip characteristics and spending profiles for non-surveyed Alaska parks were adopted from two reports on visitor spending and impacts in Alaska: a 2010 report on visitor spending and economic significance of visitation to Katmai National Park and Preserve (Fay and Christensen, 2010), and a 2010 report on the economic impacts of visitors to southeast Alaska (McDowell Group, 2010).

Two Alaska parks were surveyed as part of the SEM pilot: Klondike Gold Rush National Historical Park and Glacier Bay National Park and Preserve. Primary data collected from these surveys were incorporated into the 2018 VSE analysis for these two parks. The new profiles are described in Cullinane Thomas et al. (2019). Profiles for other Alaska parks remain unchanged for this analysis.

Parks in the Washington, D.C. area- The many monuments and parks in the Washington, D.C. area each count visits separately. To avoid double counting of spending across many national capital parks, we must know how many times a single visitor has been counted as a visit at park units during their trip to the area. For parks in Washington, D.C., we assume an average of 1.7 park visits are counted for day trips by local visitors, 3.4 park visits for day trips by non-local visitors, and 5.1 park visits for visitors on overnight trips (Stynes, 2011). A study is currently being conducted by the NPS Social Science Program that will provide better data on visitor trip patterns in the Washington, D.C. area and will improve the accuracy of spending and economic effects for these parks.

In addition to the Washington, D.C. area parks, there are several other parks that are subject to similar double counting issues due to close proximity. This includes Castle Clinton National Monument and the Statue of Liberty National Monument in New York and parks in the Boston area. There are currently no adjustments made for these parks.

Parkways and urban parks- Parkways with recreation visits and urban parks present special difficulties for economic contribution analyses. These units have some of the highest numbers of visits while posing the most difficult problems for estimating recreation visits, spending, and economic contributions. Based on their proximity to urban areas and the activities available at these parks, most recreation visits to parkways and urban parks are assumed to be day trips by local or non-local visitors. NPS visitor statistics parse out the potentially high number of non-recreation visits on parkways (e.g., commuters using the George Washington Memorial Parkway are not counted as recreation visits). This analysis only includes visitors driving on parkways for recreation purposes, but even so, individual visits to parkways like the George Washington Memorial Parkway are not likely to account for a substantial amount of visitor spending in the local area. For this reason, only a small amount of spending per party (\$12.61, \$2018) is counted for the John D Rockefeller Jr. Memorial Parkway and the George Washington Memorial Parkway. Improved data on parkway and urban park spending patterns and trip characteristics are needed. Due to the high numbers of recreation visits at these units, small changes in assumed spending averages or segment splits can have large effects on spending estimates.

Visitor segment splits defined in VSE profiles determine how many visits are attributed to each visitor segment (local day trip, non-local day trip, NPS lodge, NPS campground, lodge outside park, camp outside park, and other), and can have a substantial effect on visitor spending estimates. There are two main limitations with the segment split data currently available for VSE estimation:

- Segment splits tend to vary substantially from park to park. Therefore, it is difficult to transfer segment split data from one park to another. We currently have primary segment split data for 73 of 382 park units. Segment splits for the other park units are based on averages from similar parks and are reflected in the generic profiles (Camp & Lodge, Camp Only, No Stay, and Recreation Area profiles); these averages may or may not be good representations of actual segment splits at non-surveyed park units.
- Visitor segment splits derived from Visitor Services Project (VSP) data, which were used to develop the generic profiles, overestimate the percent of visits that fall into the ‘Other’ segment. The ‘Other’ segment is defined as non-local visitors who stay overnight in the local area but do not have any lodging expenses; this segment includes visitors staying in private homes, with friends or relatives, or in other unpaid lodging, but may also include some visitors who failed to answer the spending question for VSP surveys. New VSE profiles derived from new visitor survey data more accurately describe the share of visitors who fall into the ‘Other’ category.

Another limitation of the VSE profiles derived from VSP data is that they do not account for visitors’ trip purpose. Many visitors come to local gateway regions primarily to visit NPS lands. However, some visitors are primarily in the area for business, visiting friends and relatives, or for some other reason, and visiting the NPS unit is not the primary purpose for their trip. For these visitors, it may not be appropriate to attribute all of their trip expenditures to the presence of the NPS unit. To address this issue, the SEM pilot survey asked visitors about the purpose of their trip away from home. This data was used to allocate only a portion of time and spending in the local area for visitors

for whom the NPS site was not the primary purpose of their trip. The methods used to attribute a portion of overall time and expenditures in a park's local areas are described in Cullinane Thomas et al. (2019).

Accurate estimation of visitor spending requires quality survey data that is representative of the variety of visitor uses and demographics from across the park system. There has been a great need for increased sampling rigor across park types and geographic regions to address the lack of data for non-surveyed parks and thus improve the accuracy of visitor spending analyses. Full implementation of the SEM program will result in a greater number of parks having primary survey data updated regularly, and the SEM sampling design will ensure that sampled parks are statistically representative of the system.

Visitation data

Public use data provide estimates of visitor entries for most parks. Various counting instructions consider different travel modes within the context of each park unit to derive recreation and non-recreation visitation at both a monthly and annual resolution. Re-entry rates, vehicle occupancy rates, and other corrections are collected using travel surveys that increase the accuracy of these estimates. While the methods are well established in the visitor use estimation literature, these are still estimates.

Regional multipliers

The economic effects of visitor spending are estimated by multiplying visitor spending estimates by regional multipliers. Regional multipliers are derived using county-level IMPLAN models comprised of all counties contained within the local gateway regions. The original VSE setting for local gateway regions contained all counties within or intersecting a 60-mile radius around each park boundary. This method results in some relatively large local gateway regions. As a result, there is potential for including some areas that are not intrinsically linked to the local economies surrounding each park. For the new SEM visitor surveys, local gateway region definitions were improved by working directly with staff at each park to identify the nearby towns and cities (and counties) where visitors typically stop and make purchases or spend the night while visiting the park (Cullinane Thomas et al. 2019). The new, smaller, local area definitions typically result in smaller secondary effects due to increased leakages from the local area (spending that doesn't stay in the local economy). The effect of changed local area definitions is mixed for direct effects, which are highly influenced by output and labor income per worker ratios. For example, the change from a ten-county local area for Zion National Park to a four-county local area resulted in an increase in estimated direct jobs for this park; this change was driven by a lower output per worker ratio in the four-county model compared to the ten-county model.

The 2018 VSE analysis uses the IMPLAN 2017 data set; the previous 2017 VSE analysis used the IMPLAN 2015 data set. IMPLAN data reflect the structure of the economy in the year of the data, and thus change over time. The most notable effects of the IMPLAN model update on contribution results are changes in direct employment effects, which are highly variable in 2018. These changes are especially variable for the camping fees spending group (modeled as IMPLAN Sector 500 – Other accommodations). Direct employment effects are dependent on output per worker ratios which

can vary widely between years and geographies. Overall, direct employment per dollar of visitor spending in 2018 was mostly lower for restaurant, hotel, entertainment, and retail spending; was mostly higher for local transportation spending; and was highly variable for spending on camping fees. Because of the relative importance of restaurant and lodging expenditures in visitor spending, there are many parks that see employment increasing at a slower rate (or decreasing) compared to other VSE metrics.

References

- Cullinane Thomas, C., Cornachione, E., Koontz, L., and Keyes, C. 2019. National Park Service Socioeconomic Pilot Survey- Visitor Spending Analysis. Natural Resource Report NPS/NRSS/EQD/NRR—2019/1924. National Park Service, Fort Collins, Colorado.
- Fay, G. and Christensen, J. 2010. Katmai National Park and Preserve Economic Significance Analysis and Model Documentation. Prepared for: National Park Conservation Association and National Park Service, Katmai National Park and Preserve, 60 pp.
- IMPLAN Group LLC, IMPLAN System (data and software), 16740 Birkdale Commons Parkway Suite 206, Huntersville, NC 28078 www.implan.com.
- Koontz, L., C. Cullinane Thomas, P. Ziesler, J. Olson, and B. Meldrum. 2017. “Visitor Spending Effects: Assessing and Showcasing America’s Investment in National Parks.” *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, September, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2017.1374600>.
- McDowell Group. 2010. Economic Impact of Visitors to Southeast Alaska, 2010-11. Prepared for: Alaska Wilderness League, 33 pp.
- Resource Systems Group (RSG). 2019. Implementation plan for a socioeconomic monitoring program in the national park system. Natural Resource Report NPS/NRSS/EQD/NRR—2019/1891. National Park Service, Fort Collins, Colorado.
- Stynes, D. J. 2011. Economic Benefits to Local Communities from National Park Visitation and Payroll, 2010. Natural Resource Report NPS/NRSS/EQD/NRR—2011/481. National Park Service, Fort Collins, Colorado.
- Ziesler, P. S. 2019. Statistical abstract: 2018. Natural Resource Data Series NPS/NRSS/EQD/NRDS—2019/1219. National Park Service, Fort Collins, Colorado. National Park Service, Fort Collins, Colorado.

Appendix

Table A-1. Visits, spending, and economic contributions to local economies - 2018.

Park Unit	Total Recreation Visits	Total Visitor Spending (\$000s, \$2018)	Jobs	Labor Income (\$000s, \$2018)	Value Added (\$000s, \$2018)	Economic Output (\$000s, \$2018)
Abraham Lincoln Birthplace NHP	260,964	\$15,411	229	\$6,896	\$12,031	\$20,784
Acadia NP * !	3,537,575	\$387,654	5,602	\$171,668	\$304,982	\$521,454
Adams NHP	121,007	\$7,146	94	\$3,954	\$6,492	\$10,196
African Burial Ground NM	45,036	\$2,660	31	\$1,466	\$2,478	\$3,698
Agate Fossil Beds NM *	16,238	\$1,206	17	\$380	\$660	\$1,263
Alibates Flint Quarries NM	7,415	\$438	6	\$173	\$295	\$539
Allegheny Portage Railroad NHS	189,048	\$11,164	177	\$5,557	\$8,982	\$15,654
Amistad NRA	1,111,770	\$49,308	637	\$15,645	\$27,515	\$50,454
Andersonville NHS	138,164	\$8,159	134	\$2,992	\$5,247	\$10,193
Andrew Johnson NHS	50,670	\$2,992	44	\$1,326	\$2,205	\$3,866
Aniakchak NM&PRES	100	\$71	1	\$30	\$67	\$101
Antietam NB	326,197	\$19,258	255	\$10,290	\$17,069	\$26,931
Apostle Islands NL *	252,921	\$40,440	576	\$14,718	\$26,200	\$48,164
Appomattox Court House NHP	103,045	\$6,085	91	\$2,454	\$4,225	\$7,585
Arches NP *	1,663,556	\$200,337	3,079	\$81,408	\$144,434	\$262,845
Arkansas Post NMEM	30,126	\$1,779	25	\$706	\$1,250	\$2,188
Arlington House, The Robert E. Lee Memorial NMEM	49,500	\$2,923	38	\$1,560	\$2,597	\$4,069
Assateague Island NS	2,136,889	\$94,476	1,192	\$37,169	\$62,216	\$105,594

* For these parks, results are based on a visitor survey at the designated park. For other parks, visitor characteristics and spending averages are from generic profiles or best available data.

! Trip characteristic data, spending data, and/or local area definitions were updated for these parks in 2018.

(x) Areas that were closed in 2018.

Table A-1 (continued). Visits, spending, and economic contributions to local economies - 2018.

Park Unit	Total Recreation Visits	Total Visitor Spending (\$000s, \$2018)	Jobs	Labor Income (\$000s, \$2018)	Value Added (\$000s, \$2018)	Economic Output (\$000s, \$2018)
Aztec Ruins NM	54,932	\$3,244	48	\$1,147	\$2,045	\$3,803
Badlands NP	1,008,942	\$65,840	924	\$25,954	\$44,838	\$82,542
Bandelier NM	198,442	\$12,468	179	\$5,167	\$8,957	\$15,991
Belmont-Paul Women's Equality NM	9,081	\$174	2	\$94	\$160	\$250
Bent's Old Fort NHS	23,562	\$1,391	20	\$560	\$981	\$1,711
Bering Land Bridge NPRES	2,642	\$4,014	49	\$1,880	\$3,518	\$5,706
Big Bend NP	440,091	\$38,865	567	\$12,734	\$23,309	\$43,775
Big Cypress NPRES	794,349	\$63,918	849	\$32,028	\$56,205	\$91,724
Big Hole NB * !	56,943	\$4,026	53	\$1,464	\$2,232	\$4,154
Big South Fork NRRRA * !	760,907	\$23,702	288	\$8,720	\$14,666	\$25,590
Big Thicket NPRES	221,514	\$14,340	181	\$6,767	\$11,652	\$18,822
Bighorn Canyon NRA	235,569	\$10,409	147	\$4,248	\$6,842	\$12,526
Biscayne NP	469,254	\$30,309	398	\$15,004	\$25,993	\$42,347
Black Canyon Of The Gunnison NP	308,962	\$19,315	241	\$8,192	\$14,317	\$23,677
Blue Ridge PKWY * !	14,690,418	\$1,096,235	15,943	\$430,067	\$733,915	\$1,332,187
Bluestone NSR	31,315	\$1,390	19	\$534	\$902	\$1,604
Booker T Washington NM	22,732	\$1,342	21	\$567	\$969	\$1,748
Boston African American NHS	410,893	\$24,264	319	\$13,468	\$22,101	\$34,698
Boston NHP	3,053,240	\$180,302	2,367	\$100,103	\$164,240	\$257,798
Brown V Board Of Education NHS	24,083	\$1,422	23	\$735	\$1,235	\$2,169
Bryce Canyon NP	2,679,478	\$227,305	3,288	\$85,163	\$150,944	\$274,654

* For these parks, results are based on a visitor survey at the designated park. For other parks, visitor characteristics and spending averages are from generic profiles or best available data.

! Trip characteristic data, spending data, and/or local area definitions were updated for these parks in 2018.

(x) Areas that were closed in 2018.

Table A-1 (continued). Visits, spending, and economic contributions to local economies - 2018.

Park Unit	Total Recreation Visits	Total Visitor Spending (\$000s, \$2018)	Jobs	Labor Income (\$000s, \$2018)	Value Added (\$000s, \$2018)	Economic Output (\$000s, \$2018)
Buck Island Reef NM	31,410	\$1,956	21	\$871	\$1,587	\$2,441
Buffalo NR	1,240,119	\$54,919	797	\$19,495	\$33,958	\$62,767
Cabrillo NM	842,105	\$49,729	654	\$25,839	\$42,593	\$67,481
Canaveral NS * !	1,657,855	\$62,541	820	\$28,286	\$49,940	\$82,971
Cane River Creole NHP	26,880	\$1,587	22	\$603	\$1,102	\$1,948
Canyon De Chelly NM	439,306	\$29,577	422	\$9,729	\$17,883	\$34,549
Canyonlands NP	739,450	\$45,776	646	\$17,081	\$29,852	\$54,529
Cape Cod NS * !	3,926,462	\$494,995	6,098	\$227,131	\$394,776	\$638,641
Cape Hatteras NS	2,591,056	\$166,369	2,397	\$66,036	\$116,534	\$208,362
Cape Krusenstern NM	15,087	\$22,917	282	\$10,732	\$20,085	\$32,574
Cape Lookout NS	408,399	\$18,755	262	\$6,436	\$10,781	\$20,269
Capitol Reef NP *	1,227,626	\$89,216	1,178	\$31,022	\$55,530	\$100,955
Capulin Volcano NM *	67,410	\$2,054	28	\$652	\$1,099	\$2,067
Carl Sandburg Home NHS	72,048	\$4,255	62	\$1,806	\$3,052	\$5,346
Carlsbad Caverns NP	465,912	\$30,238	404	\$10,985	\$18,580	\$33,994
Carter G. Woodson Home NHS	1,953	\$37	0	\$20	\$34	\$54
Casa Grande Ruins NM	62,995	\$3,720	54	\$1,932	\$3,316	\$5,533
Castillo De San Marcos NM	748,057	\$44,175	670	\$19,844	\$34,457	\$60,094
Castle Clinton NM	4,533,564	\$113,780	1,148	\$53,525	\$88,247	\$132,616
Catoctin Mountain P	299,860	\$18,912	240	\$9,894	\$16,461	\$25,947
Cedar Breaks NM	644,515	\$41,746	579	\$15,044	\$26,602	\$48,316

* For these parks, results are based on a visitor survey at the designated park. For other parks, visitor characteristics and spending averages are from generic profiles or best available data.

! Trip characteristic data, spending data, and/or local area definitions were updated for these parks in 2018.

(x) Areas that were closed in 2018.

Table A-1 (continued). Visits, spending, and economic contributions to local economies - 2018.

Park Unit	Total Recreation Visits	Total Visitor Spending (\$000s, \$2018)	Jobs	Labor Income (\$000s, \$2018)	Value Added (\$000s, \$2018)	Economic Output (\$000s, \$2018)
Cesar E. Chavez NM	12,769	\$754	10	\$405	\$657	\$1,043
Chaco Culture NHP	57,781	\$3,366	49	\$1,349	\$2,349	\$4,241
Chamizal NMEM	66,480	\$3,926	58	\$1,565	\$2,663	\$4,924
Channel Islands NP	366,249	\$22,907	286	\$12,537	\$20,543	\$32,437
Charles Pinckney NHS	34,354	\$2,029	27	\$881	\$1,541	\$2,555
Charles Young Buffalo Soldiers NM	31,448	\$1,857	29	\$829	\$1,385	\$2,457
Chattahoochee River NRA	2,873,866	\$127,558	1,824	\$62,750	\$106,087	\$178,967
Chesapeake & Ohio Canal NHP	4,438,818	\$84,471	1,140	\$45,291	\$76,569	\$122,217
Chickamauga & Chattanooga NMP	945,961	\$55,839	837	\$22,280	\$38,020	\$69,247
Chickasaw NRA *	1,477,906	\$24,229	241	\$6,330	\$10,279	\$18,951
Chiricahua NM	60,578	\$3,630	51	\$1,101	\$1,983	\$3,847
Christiansted NHS	107,495	\$6,348	71	\$2,944	\$5,266	\$8,150
City Of Rocks NRES	142,249	\$8,400	122	\$3,143	\$5,315	\$9,699
Clara Barton NHS	425	\$25	0	\$13	\$22	\$35
Colonial NHP * !	3,294,224	\$331,575	5,020	\$125,346	\$232,672	\$415,802
Colorado NM	375,467	\$23,722	332	\$9,122	\$16,096	\$28,929
Congaree NP *	145,928	\$7,415	93	\$2,844	\$5,072	\$8,730
Coronado NMEM	103,217	\$6,095	93	\$2,407	\$4,310	\$7,734
Cowpens NB	189,411	\$12,289	174	\$5,940	\$9,990	\$16,938
Crater Lake NP	720,658	\$62,399	903	\$29,473	\$48,410	\$83,368
Craters Of The Moon NM&PRES *	263,506	\$9,191	131	\$3,272	\$5,536	\$10,509

* For these parks, results are based on a visitor survey at the designated park. For other parks, visitor characteristics and spending averages are from generic profiles or best available data.

! Trip characteristic data, spending data, and/or local area definitions were updated for these parks in 2018.

(x) Areas that were closed in 2018.

Table A-1 (continued). Visits, spending, and economic contributions to local economies - 2018.

Park Unit	Total Recreation Visits	Total Visitor Spending (\$000s, \$2018)	Jobs	Labor Income (\$000s, \$2018)	Value Added (\$000s, \$2018)	Economic Output (\$000s, \$2018)
Cumberland Gap NHP	684,191	\$44,120	603	\$18,790	\$32,320	\$56,375
Cumberland Island NS	55,649	\$2,330	32	\$1,010	\$1,676	\$2,875
Curecanti NRA	931,511	\$40,976	501	\$16,147	\$27,812	\$46,337
Cuyahoga Valley NP * !	2,096,053	\$36,811	540	\$18,481	\$30,864	\$53,263
Dayton Aviation Heritage NHP *	93,541	\$5,566	91	\$3,011	\$5,071	\$8,680
De Soto NMEM	210,993	\$12,460	187	\$6,114	\$10,566	\$17,947
Death Valley NP	1,678,659	\$141,260	1,743	\$67,734	\$114,308	\$182,390
Delaware Water Gap NRA *	3,261,921	\$113,209	1,557	\$64,540	\$107,481	\$166,325
Denali NP&PRES !	594,661	\$602,445	7,368	\$282,255	\$530,916	\$858,582
Devils Postpile NM	139,724	\$9,069	113	\$3,830	\$6,345	\$10,618
Devils Tower NM	468,215	\$30,016	414	\$12,209	\$21,125	\$38,170
Dinosaur NM	304,468	\$18,273	223	\$6,942	\$11,985	\$20,300
Dry Tortugas NP	56,810	\$3,426	39	\$1,380	\$2,379	\$3,849
Edgar Allan Poe NHS	16,314	\$963	14	\$547	\$887	\$1,428
Effigy Mounds NM *	55,576	\$3,583	58	\$1,418	\$2,430	\$4,464
Eisenhower NHS	42,036	\$2,482	33	\$1,325	\$2,180	\$3,443
El Malpais NM	154,368	\$9,116	142	\$3,795	\$6,559	\$11,974
El Morro NM	65,453	\$4,155	59	\$1,168	\$2,167	\$4,329
Eleanor Roosevelt NHS	54,649	\$3,227	39	\$1,634	\$2,758	\$4,251
Eugene O'Neill NHS	3,432	\$203	2	\$116	\$183	\$278
Everglades NP	597,124	\$58,664	803	\$30,497	\$53,840	\$87,604

* For these parks, results are based on a visitor survey at the designated park. For other parks, visitor characteristics and spending averages are from generic profiles or best available data.

! Trip characteristic data, spending data, and/or local area definitions were updated for these parks in 2018.

(x) Areas that were closed in 2018.

Table A-1 (continued). Visits, spending, and economic contributions to local economies - 2018.

Park Unit	Total Recreation Visits	Total Visitor Spending (\$000s, \$2018)	Jobs	Labor Income (\$000s, \$2018)	Value Added (\$000s, \$2018)	Economic Output (\$000s, \$2018)
Federal Hall NMEM	230,633	\$13,619	159	\$7,515	\$12,690	\$18,921
Fire Island NS	305,710	\$13,470	144	\$6,791	\$11,454	\$17,033
First Ladies NHS	11,448	\$676	11	\$347	\$577	\$998
Flight 93 NMEM	381,448	\$22,526	354	\$11,212	\$18,192	\$31,621
Florissant Fossil Beds NM	79,568	\$4,699	66	\$2,443	\$4,185	\$6,853
Ford's Theatre NHS	533,410	\$10,204	133	\$5,545	\$9,384	\$14,692
Fort Bowie NHS	8,400	\$496	8	\$193	\$346	\$621
Fort Caroline NMEM	203,276	\$12,004	182	\$5,676	\$9,789	\$16,897
Fort Davis NHS	49,532	\$2,925	40	\$979	\$1,738	\$3,156
Fort Donelson NB	168,985	\$10,968	134	\$5,178	\$8,680	\$14,024
Fort Frederica NM	183,591	\$10,842	159	\$4,919	\$8,372	\$14,381
Fort Laramie NHS	52,415	\$3,095	45	\$1,105	\$1,989	\$3,655
Fort Larned NHS *	29,173	\$1,783	26	\$581	\$1,026	\$2,001
Fort Matanzas NM	608,102	\$35,910	546	\$16,265	\$28,259	\$49,211
Fort McHenry NM&SHRINE	486,113	\$28,706	382	\$15,356	\$25,629	\$40,380
Fort Necessity NB	280,971	\$16,586	263	\$8,527	\$13,908	\$24,062
Fort Point NHS	1,400,491	\$82,703	971	\$47,227	\$74,851	\$113,614
Fort Pulaski NM	419,931	\$27,257	355	\$11,386	\$20,097	\$33,606
Fort Raleigh NHS	261,199	\$15,425	231	\$6,370	\$11,057	\$19,669
Fort Scott NHS *	26,482	\$479	7	\$149	\$242	\$478
Fort Smith NHS	136,568	\$8,065	128	\$2,898	\$5,283	\$9,982

* For these parks, results are based on a visitor survey at the designated park. For other parks, visitor characteristics and spending averages are from generic profiles or best available data.

! Trip characteristic data, spending data, and/or local area definitions were updated for these parks in 2018.

(x) Areas that were closed in 2018.

Table A-1 (continued). Visits, spending, and economic contributions to local economies - 2018.

Park Unit	Total Recreation Visits	Total Visitor Spending (\$000s, \$2018)	Jobs	Labor Income (\$000s, \$2018)	Value Added (\$000s, \$2018)	Economic Output (\$000s, \$2018)
Fort Stanwix NM *	90,507	\$5,037	66	\$1,867	\$3,698	\$6,115
Fort Sumter NM	859,881	\$50,778	684	\$22,047	\$38,575	\$64,031
Fort Union NM *	10,860	\$740	10	\$283	\$473	\$830
Fort Union Trading Post NHS *	13,552	\$1,098	12	\$405	\$637	\$1,075
Fort Vancouver NHS	1,098,552	\$64,873	935	\$33,561	\$56,037	\$93,458
Fort Washington P	316,052	\$18,664	239	\$9,932	\$16,550	\$25,784
Fossil Butte NM *	21,349	\$1,076	14	\$392	\$661	\$1,152
Franklin Delano Roosevelt MEM	3,288,299	\$62,906	817	\$34,185	\$57,851	\$90,570
Frederick Douglass NHS	70,869	\$1,356	18	\$736	\$1,246	\$1,947
Frederick Law Olmsted NHS	9,855	\$582	8	\$322	\$528	\$831
Fredericksburg & Spotsylvania NMP	926,464	\$54,710	701	\$28,457	\$47,233	\$74,073
Friendship Hill NHS	41,678	\$2,461	39	\$1,253	\$2,049	\$3,542
Gates Of The Arctic NP&PRES	9,591	\$14,567	179	\$6,821	\$12,767	\$20,705
Gateway NRA * !	9,243,305	\$248,857	2,945	\$98,293	\$174,064	\$280,258
Gauley River NRA	97,779	\$4,300	59	\$1,639	\$2,742	\$4,838
General Grant NMEM	73,336	\$4,331	51	\$2,390	\$4,038	\$6,026
George Rogers Clark NHP	121,187	\$7,157	108	\$2,688	\$4,734	\$8,699
George Washington Birthplace NM *	111,058	\$5,126	64	\$2,623	\$4,310	\$6,716
George Washington Carver NM *	44,412	\$828	12	\$308	\$507	\$937
George Washington MEM PKWY	7,288,623	\$48,373	773	\$26,879	\$43,134	\$70,675
Gettysburg NMP	949,989	\$61,494	778	\$32,062	\$53,313	\$84,098

* For these parks, results are based on a visitor survey at the designated park. For other parks, visitor characteristics and spending averages are from generic profiles or best available data.

! Trip characteristic data, spending data, and/or local area definitions were updated for these parks in 2018.

(x) Areas that were closed in 2018.

Table A-1 (continued). Visits, spending, and economic contributions to local economies - 2018.

Park Unit	Total Recreation Visits	Total Visitor Spending (\$000s, \$2018)	Jobs	Labor Income (\$000s, \$2018)	Value Added (\$000s, \$2018)	Economic Output (\$000s, \$2018)
Gila Cliff Dwellings NM	79,107	\$4,671	71	\$1,309	\$2,374	\$4,779
Glacier Bay NP&PRES * !	597,916	\$217,161	2,582	\$106,863	\$188,142	\$354,389
Glacier NP * !	2,965,310	\$344,287	5,225	\$163,216	\$269,031	\$484,016
Glen Canyon NRA * !	4,219,441	\$411,015	5,032	\$160,409	\$279,473	\$483,384
Golden Gate NRA * !	15,223,696	\$1,038,368	10,614	\$610,397	\$978,212	\$1,394,523
Golden Spike NHS *	60,129	\$3,467	53	\$1,629	\$2,752	\$4,874
Governors Island NM	589,799	\$34,829	407	\$19,219	\$32,453	\$48,388
Grand Canyon NP * !	6,380,494	\$947,119	12,558	\$376,702	\$673,460	\$1,156,748
Grand Portage NM	94,137	\$6,109	77	\$1,773	\$3,298	\$5,990
Grand Teton NP *	3,491,151	\$628,933	8,624	\$273,462	\$460,520	\$791,628
Grant-Kohrs Ranch NHS	26,676	\$1,575	25	\$725	\$1,124	\$2,058
Great Basin NP	153,094	\$8,795	122	\$2,703	\$4,710	\$9,023
Great Sand Dunes NP&PRES	442,906	\$27,414	372	\$10,767	\$18,850	\$33,160
Great Smoky Mountains NP	11,421,201	\$953,130	13,737	\$434,943	\$743,083	\$1,288,291
Greenbelt P	85,260	\$4,961	61	\$2,558	\$4,252	\$6,631
Guadalupe Mountains NP	172,347	\$10,710	150	\$4,028	\$7,017	\$12,863
Guilford Courthouse NMP	236,016	\$13,937	218	\$6,683	\$11,115	\$19,464
Gulf Islands NS	4,229,968	\$186,918	2,481	\$78,771	\$136,111	\$231,955
Hagerman Fossil Beds NM	26,477	\$1,564	24	\$716	\$1,188	\$2,103
Haleakala NP	1,044,083	\$67,459	714	\$30,261	\$55,313	\$84,872
Hamilton Grange NMEM	66,216	\$3,910	45	\$2,151	\$3,636	\$5,415

* For these parks, results are based on a visitor survey at the designated park. For other parks, visitor characteristics and spending averages are from generic profiles or best available data.

! Trip characteristic data, spending data, and/or local area definitions were updated for these parks in 2018.

(x) Areas that were closed in 2018.

Table A-1 (continued). Visits, spending, and economic contributions to local economies - 2018.

Park Unit	Total Recreation Visits	Total Visitor Spending (\$000s, \$2018)	Jobs	Labor Income (\$000s, \$2018)	Value Added (\$000s, \$2018)	Economic Output (\$000s, \$2018)
Hampton NHS	29,615	\$1,749	23	\$945	\$1,571	\$2,478
Harpers Ferry NHP *	265,737	\$13,210	188	\$7,546	\$12,454	\$19,619
Harry S Truman NHS	32,878	\$1,942	32	\$1,016	\$1,698	\$2,985
Hawaii Volcanoes NP	1,116,890	\$94,118	1,035	\$43,374	\$80,559	\$123,476
Herbert Hoover NHS	138,087	\$8,154	125	\$3,368	\$5,844	\$10,526
Home Of Franklin D Roosevelt NHS	154,000	\$9,094	111	\$4,653	\$7,823	\$12,073
Homestead NM *	68,091	\$2,274	34	\$807	\$1,371	\$2,572
Hopewell Culture NHP	57,336	\$3,386	52	\$1,689	\$2,836	\$4,866
Hopewell Furnace NHS	46,407	\$2,741	41	\$1,538	\$2,485	\$4,099
Horseshoe Bend NMP	48,491	\$2,864	45	\$1,229	\$2,114	\$3,815
Hot Springs NP	1,506,887	\$97,291	1,451	\$37,263	\$69,654	\$126,546
Hovenweep NM	40,574	\$2,582	36	\$927	\$1,682	\$3,089
Hubbell Trading Post NHS	39,361	\$2,324	35	\$774	\$1,399	\$2,714
Independence NHP	4,576,455	\$270,253	3,863	\$153,508	\$248,798	\$400,726
Indiana Dunes NL	1,756,080	\$77,852	936	\$40,147	\$67,960	\$105,893
Isle Royale NP	25,798	\$5,655	85	\$1,806	\$3,404	\$6,454
James A Garfield NHS *	40,835	\$1,480	24	\$743	\$1,240	\$2,180
Jean Lafitte NP&PRES	529,878	\$31,291	449	\$13,819	\$24,420	\$41,599
Jefferson NEM *	2,016,179	\$202,653	3,409	\$108,440	\$181,307	\$319,322
Jewel Cave NM	142,355	\$8,407	122	\$3,480	\$5,862	\$10,732
Jimmy Carter NHS	51,680	\$3,052	50	\$1,116	\$1,958	\$3,794

* For these parks, results are based on a visitor survey at the designated park. For other parks, visitor characteristics and spending averages are from generic profiles or best available data.

! Trip characteristic data, spending data, and/or local area definitions were updated for these parks in 2018.

(x) Areas that were closed in 2018.

Table A-1 (continued). Visits, spending, and economic contributions to local economies - 2018.

Park Unit	Total Recreation Visits	Total Visitor Spending (\$000s, \$2018)	Jobs	Labor Income (\$000s, \$2018)	Value Added (\$000s, \$2018)	Economic Output (\$000s, \$2018)
John D Rockefeller Jr MEM PKWY	1,504,561	\$8,831	111	\$3,419	\$6,001	\$9,545
John Day Fossil Beds NM *	204,622	\$9,894	131	\$4,013	\$6,586	\$11,487
John F Kennedy NHS	24,077	\$1,422	19	\$786	\$1,290	\$2,030
John Muir NHS	46,956	\$2,773	33	\$1,584	\$2,510	\$3,812
Johnstown Flood NMEM *	146,269	\$9,132	149	\$4,703	\$7,641	\$13,360
Joshua Tree NP *	2,942,381	\$146,479	1,823	\$71,879	\$122,394	\$195,883
Kalaupapa NHP	72,145	\$4,260	48	\$1,976	\$3,534	\$5,470
Kaloko-Honokohau NHP	218,015	\$12,874	144	\$5,971	\$10,680	\$16,529
Katmai NP&PRES	37,818	\$57,441	707	\$26,899	\$50,342	\$81,645
Kenai Fjords NP	321,596	\$58,752	1,004	\$31,995	\$48,971	\$84,499
Kennesaw Mountain NBP	2,549,164	\$150,535	2,314	\$79,863	\$135,660	\$228,008
Keweenaw NHP	20,416	\$1,206	18	\$337	\$655	\$1,274
Kings Canyon NP	699,023	\$61,146	809	\$27,293	\$44,792	\$75,433
Kings Mountain NMP *	287,635	\$11,631	169	\$5,714	\$9,363	\$15,878
Klondike Gold Rush AK NHP * !	1,017,297	\$158,376	2,401	\$83,314	\$121,249	\$198,591
Klondike Gold Rush WA NHP	82,646	\$4,881	56	\$2,347	\$4,240	\$6,481
Knife River Indian Villages NHS	11,682	\$690	10	\$308	\$502	\$910
Kobuk Valley NP	14,937	\$22,686	279	\$10,624	\$19,882	\$32,245
Korean War Veterans MEM	4,107,521	\$78,578	1,021	\$42,702	\$72,263	\$113,134
Lake Chelan NRA	38,839	\$2,685	28	\$1,268	\$2,323	\$3,478
Lake Clark NP&PRES	14,479	\$21,992	271	\$10,298	\$19,274	\$31,259

* For these parks, results are based on a visitor survey at the designated park. For other parks, visitor characteristics and spending averages are from generic profiles or best available data.

! Trip characteristic data, spending data, and/or local area definitions were updated for these parks in 2018.

(x) Areas that were closed in 2018.

Table A-1 (continued). Visits, spending, and economic contributions to local economies - 2018.

Park Unit	Total Recreation Visits	Total Visitor Spending (\$000s, \$2018)	Jobs	Labor Income (\$000s, \$2018)	Value Added (\$000s, \$2018)	Economic Output (\$000s, \$2018)
Lake Mead NRA	7,578,958	\$336,122	3,986	\$149,489	\$246,533	\$396,596
Lake Meredith NRA	1,106,232	\$48,845	652	\$18,287	\$30,430	\$55,236
Lake Roosevelt NRA	1,276,723	\$56,413	689	\$21,703	\$39,677	\$65,953
Lassen Volcanic NP	499,435	\$30,328	406	\$11,645	\$19,321	\$34,285
Lava Beds NM *	127,771	\$5,476	66	\$2,000	\$3,246	\$5,710
Lewis and Clark NHP	286,349	\$16,910	233	\$8,532	\$14,498	\$23,796
Lincoln Boyhood NMEM *	133,850	\$6,440	98	\$2,897	\$5,019	\$8,726
Lincoln Home NHS *	197,717	\$12,143	175	\$4,528	\$8,652	\$15,121
Lincoln MEM	7,804,683	\$149,306	1,940	\$81,138	\$137,307	\$214,966
Little Bighorn Battlefield NM	272,591	\$16,097	248	\$7,227	\$11,530	\$21,117
Little River Canyon NPRES	441,177	\$26,053	404	\$11,146	\$19,133	\$34,465
Little Rock Central High School NHS	149,098	\$8,805	140	\$3,538	\$6,494	\$11,814
Longfellow NHS	60,528	\$3,574	47	\$1,983	\$3,254	\$5,112
Lowell NHP	507,276	\$29,956	395	\$16,542	\$27,208	\$42,784
Lyndon B Johnson NHP	121,500	\$7,175	102	\$3,601	\$6,120	\$10,234
Lyndon Baines Johnson Memorial Grove on the Potomac NMEM	261,225	\$15,426	201	\$8,235	\$13,704	\$21,475
Maggie L Walker NHS	10,961	\$647	10	\$292	\$508	\$882
Mammoth Cave NP	533,206	\$45,094	598	\$21,969	\$37,614	\$61,621
Manassas NBP	542,005	\$32,007	412	\$17,029	\$28,383	\$44,349
Manhattan Project (New Mexico) NHP	14,161	\$836	11	\$343	\$572	\$978

* For these parks, results are based on a visitor survey at the designated park. For other parks, visitor characteristics and spending averages are from generic profiles or best available data.

! Trip characteristic data, spending data, and/or local area definitions were updated for these parks in 2018.

(x) Areas that were closed in 2018.

Table A-1 (continued). Visits, spending, and economic contributions to local economies - 2018.

Park Unit	Total Recreation Visits	Total Visitor Spending (\$000s, \$2018)	Jobs	Labor Income (\$000s, \$2018)	Value Added (\$000s, \$2018)	Economic Output (\$000s, \$2018)
Manhattan Project (Tennessee) NHP	31,640	\$607	8	\$256	\$402	\$684
Manhattan Project (Washington) NHP	23,742	\$788	9	\$289	\$531	\$863
Manzanar NHS *	104,080	\$11,026	137	\$4,751	\$7,747	\$12,790
Marsh - Billings - Rockefeller NHP	63,886	\$3,773	50	\$1,650	\$2,926	\$4,788
Martin Luther King Jr NHS	641,800	\$37,900	582	\$20,184	\$34,301	\$57,535
Martin Luther King, Jr. MEM	3,567,434	\$68,246	887	\$37,087	\$62,762	\$98,258
Martin Van Buren NHS	18,642	\$1,101	14	\$523	\$900	\$1,424
Mary McLeod Bethune Council House NHS	109	\$2	0	\$1	\$2	\$3
Mesa Verde NP *	563,421	\$58,513	828	\$22,283	\$40,058	\$72,444
Minidoka (Idaho) NHS	5,666	\$100	2	\$33	\$53	\$103
Minidoka (Washington) NHS	5,900	\$348	4	\$118	\$232	\$381
Minute Man NHP	1,014,802	\$59,927	790	\$33,180	\$54,526	\$85,770
Minuteman Missile NHS *	139,273	\$10,455	151	\$4,369	\$7,220	\$13,306
Mississippi NRR	417,021	\$18,510	261	\$8,996	\$15,314	\$25,952
Missouri NRR	128,657	\$5,711	80	\$2,238	\$3,730	\$6,740
Mojave NPRES	787,405	\$46,482	588	\$22,188	\$36,650	\$58,792
Monocacy NB * !	84,902	\$2,973	42	\$1,186	\$2,081	\$3,542
Montezuma Castle NM	390,151	\$23,040	332	\$11,904	\$20,385	\$33,761
Moore's Creek NB	58,531	\$3,799	52	\$1,397	\$2,531	\$4,509
Morristown NHP	279,393	\$16,499	199	\$9,238	\$15,450	\$23,286

* For these parks, results are based on a visitor survey at the designated park. For other parks, visitor characteristics and spending averages are from generic profiles or best available data.

! Trip characteristic data, spending data, and/or local area definitions were updated for these parks in 2018.

(x) Areas that were closed in 2018.

Table A-1 (continued). Visits, spending, and economic contributions to local economies - 2018.

Park Unit	Total Recreation Visits	Total Visitor Spending (\$000s, \$2018)	Jobs	Labor Income (\$000s, \$2018)	Value Added (\$000s, \$2018)	Economic Output (\$000s, \$2018)
Mount Rainier NP *	1,518,491	\$54,896	597	\$25,091	\$44,787	\$68,415
Mount Rushmore NMEM	2,311,272	\$136,487	2,010	\$57,345	\$96,308	\$176,843
Muir Woods NM * !	957,932	\$108,376	1,073	\$63,587	\$103,511	\$147,066
Natchez NHP	234,785	\$13,865	207	\$5,525	\$9,872	\$17,575
Natchez Trace PKWY	6,362,439	\$156,873	1,908	\$57,590	\$93,398	\$162,263
National Capital Parks Central	1,800,329	\$34,441	449	\$18,721	\$31,674	\$49,658
National Capital Parks East	1,447,273	\$27,687	371	\$15,107	\$25,716	\$40,603
National Park of American Samoa	28,625	\$1,690	19	\$784	\$1,402	\$2,170
Natural Bridges NM	103,118	\$6,537	84	\$2,301	\$4,093	\$7,277
Navajo NM	61,194	\$3,871	50	\$1,327	\$2,380	\$4,258
New Bedford Whaling NHP *	186,937	\$10,132	140	\$5,886	\$9,680	\$15,072
New Orleans Jazz NHP	54,483	\$3,217	46	\$1,480	\$2,599	\$4,374
New River Gorge NR	1,232,628	\$54,681	769	\$21,085	\$35,660	\$63,545
Nez Perce NHP	307,645	\$18,167	244	\$7,232	\$13,264	\$22,389
Nicodemus NHS *	2,738	\$154	2	\$47	\$79	\$153
Ninety Six NHS	95,551	\$5,643	83	\$2,434	\$4,205	\$7,347
Niobrara NSR * !	61,638	\$6,312	102	\$1,973	\$3,392	\$7,056
Noatak NPRES	16,387	\$24,892	307	\$11,656	\$21,816	\$35,381
North Cascades NP	30,085	\$1,375	14	\$623	\$1,059	\$1,576
Obed W&SR *	217,530	\$4,038	46	\$1,481	\$2,286	\$3,957
Ocmulgee NM	133,007	\$7,855	126	\$2,868	\$5,031	\$9,601

* For these parks, results are based on a visitor survey at the designated park. For other parks, visitor characteristics and spending averages are from generic profiles or best available data.

! Trip characteristic data, spending data, and/or local area definitions were updated for these parks in 2018.

(x) Areas that were closed in 2018.

Table A-1 (continued). Visits, spending, and economic contributions to local economies - 2018.

Park Unit	Total Recreation Visits	Total Visitor Spending (\$000s, \$2018)	Jobs	Labor Income (\$000s, \$2018)	Value Added (\$000s, \$2018)	Economic Output (\$000s, \$2018)
Olympic NP	3,104,455	\$261,607	2,972	\$127,188	\$234,553	\$357,063
Oregon Caves NM	67,417	\$4,793	67	\$1,988	\$3,302	\$5,849
Organ Pipe Cactus NM	260,376	\$16,191	226	\$8,101	\$14,054	\$23,448
Ozark NSR	1,264,658	\$55,438	840	\$17,909	\$30,118	\$60,029
Padre Island NS	616,033	\$26,989	367	\$10,151	\$17,124	\$30,953
Palo Alto Battlefield NHP	82,487	\$4,871	74	\$1,949	\$3,313	\$6,148
Paterson Great Falls NHP	143,605	\$8,480	99	\$4,694	\$7,459	\$11,241
Pea Ridge NMP	101,969	\$6,022	96	\$2,475	\$4,230	\$7,808
Pecos NHP	39,130	\$2,311	35	\$1,002	\$1,703	\$3,031
Pennsylvania Avenue NHS	119,616	\$2,288	30	\$1,243	\$2,104	\$3,294
Perry's Victory & International Peace MEM *	150,558	\$13,623	226	\$7,621	\$12,979	\$21,659
Petersburg NB	204,322	\$12,066	184	\$5,453	\$9,506	\$16,664
Petrified Forest NP	644,921	\$41,835	542	\$13,858	\$25,392	\$46,072
Petroglyph NM	268,613	\$15,862	242	\$6,794	\$11,587	\$20,826
Pictured Rocks NL	815,308	\$35,941	451	\$11,040	\$20,353	\$36,087
Pinnacles NP	222,152	\$13,119	153	\$6,600	\$10,456	\$16,135
Pipe Spring NM	25,180	\$1,487	22	\$551	\$960	\$1,744
Pipestone NM	73,268	\$4,327	64	\$1,885	\$3,144	\$5,627
Piscataway P	146,364	\$8,643	111	\$4,601	\$7,665	\$11,941
Point Reyes NS	2,397,721	\$107,435	1,145	\$56,692	\$89,197	\$134,063

* For these parks, results are based on a visitor survey at the designated park. For other parks, visitor characteristics and spending averages are from generic profiles or best available data.

! Trip characteristic data, spending data, and/or local area definitions were updated for these parks in 2018.

(x) Areas that were closed in 2018.

Table A-1 (continued). Visits, spending, and economic contributions to local economies - 2018.

Park Unit	Total Recreation Visits	Total Visitor Spending (\$000s, \$2018)	Jobs	Labor Income (\$000s, \$2018)	Value Added (\$000s, \$2018)	Economic Output (\$000s, \$2018)
Port Chicago Naval Magazine NMEM	652	\$39	0	\$22	\$35	\$53
President's Park	1,035,737	\$19,814	257	\$10,768	\$18,222	\$28,528
President William Jefferson Clinton Birthplace Home NHS	10,845	\$641	9	\$229	\$430	\$770
Prince William Forest P	313,628	\$17,890	219	\$9,199	\$15,295	\$23,808
Pu'uhonua O Honaunau NHP	462,975	\$27,340	307	\$12,679	\$22,679	\$35,101
Puukohola Heiau NHS	145,585	\$8,597	96	\$3,987	\$7,131	\$11,037
Rainbow Bridge NM	110,905	\$6,549	89	\$2,318	\$4,101	\$7,337
Redwood NP	482,535	\$31,071	423	\$12,668	\$20,886	\$36,783
Richmond NBP	199,345	\$11,772	177	\$5,250	\$9,164	\$16,035
Rio Grande W&SR !	330	\$230	4	\$72	\$136	\$269
River Raisin NB	240,548	\$14,205	201	\$7,005	\$12,129	\$19,997
Rock Creek P	2,395,342	\$45,823	599	\$24,926	\$42,166	\$66,166
Rocky Mountain NP *	4,590,493	\$305,593	4,363	\$163,899	\$282,015	\$463,860
Roger Williams NMEM	60,709	\$3,585	46	\$1,954	\$3,226	\$5,032
Rosie the Riveter WWII Home Front NHP	57,852	\$3,416	40	\$1,951	\$3,092	\$4,693
Ross Lake NRA	892,043	\$40,114	404	\$17,979	\$31,751	\$47,586
Russell Cave NM	21,620	\$1,277	19	\$517	\$875	\$1,590
Sagamore Hill NHS	39,969	\$2,360	27	\$1,289	\$2,185	\$3,238
Saguaro NP	957,405	\$62,099	866	\$31,267	\$54,459	\$90,857

* For these parks, results are based on a visitor survey at the designated park. For other parks, visitor characteristics and spending averages are from generic profiles or best available data.

! Trip characteristic data, spending data, and/or local area definitions were updated for these parks in 2018.

(x) Areas that were closed in 2018.

Table A-1 (continued). Visits, spending, and economic contributions to local economies - 2018.

Park Unit	Total Recreation Visits	Total Visitor Spending (\$000s, \$2018)	Jobs	Labor Income (\$000s, \$2018)	Value Added (\$000s, \$2018)	Economic Output (\$000s, \$2018)
Saint-Gaudens NHS *	35,218	\$1,764	25	\$938	\$1,615	\$2,590
Saint Croix Island IHS	12,000	\$709	10	\$281	\$493	\$861
Saint Croix NSR	724,643	\$31,744	447	\$15,272	\$25,846	\$43,779
Saint Paul's Church NHS	21,631	\$1,277	15	\$699	\$1,186	\$1,757
Salem Maritime NHS	300,475	\$17,744	232	\$9,930	\$16,277	\$25,439
Salinas Pueblo Missions NM	34,630	\$2,045	31	\$874	\$1,488	\$2,663
Salt River Bay EHP	4,884	\$288	3	\$134	\$239	\$370
San Antonio Missions NHP * !	1,208,104	\$87,957	1,295	\$44,091	\$77,617	\$130,985
San Francisco Maritime NHP	4,223,542	\$106,000	1,066	\$50,791	\$79,735	\$121,445
San Juan Island NHP	255,032	\$15,060	165	\$7,141	\$12,827	\$19,321
San Juan NHS	910,405	\$53,762	603	\$24,933	\$44,596	\$69,023
Sand Creek Massacre NHS	6,006	\$355	6	\$90	\$173	\$359
Santa Monica Mountains NRA	867,153	\$38,488	476	\$20,160	\$32,748	\$52,229
Saratoga NHP	135,445	\$7,998	105	\$3,299	\$5,956	\$9,849
Saugus Iron Works NHS	10,661	\$629	8	\$352	\$578	\$903
Scotts Bluff NM	142,028	\$8,387	118	\$3,092	\$5,378	\$9,627
Sequoia NP *	1,229,594	\$94,431	1,186	\$39,587	\$65,779	\$110,349
Shenandoah NP	1,264,880	\$86,905	1,077	\$44,522	\$74,222	\$116,074
Shiloh NMP	376,100	\$22,210	341	\$7,749	\$13,312	\$25,647
Sitka NHP	197,017	\$35,366	608	\$19,311	\$29,435	\$50,865
Sleeping Bear Dunes NL *	1,643,599	\$180,424	2,467	\$66,087	\$125,353	\$217,080

* For these parks, results are based on a visitor survey at the designated park. For other parks, visitor characteristics and spending averages are from generic profiles or best available data.

! Trip characteristic data, spending data, and/or local area definitions were updated for these parks in 2018.

(x) Areas that were closed in 2018.

Table A-1 (continued). Visits, spending, and economic contributions to local economies - 2018.

Park Unit	Total Recreation Visits	Total Visitor Spending (\$000s, \$2018)	Jobs	Labor Income (\$000s, \$2018)	Value Added (\$000s, \$2018)	Economic Output (\$000s, \$2018)
Springfield Armory NHS	20,105	\$1,187	15	\$620	\$1,025	\$1,610
Statue Of Liberty NM	4,335,431	\$256,020	2,989	\$141,368	\$238,659	\$355,718
Steamtown NHS *	97,949	\$5,364	78	\$2,669	\$4,361	\$7,312
Stones River NB	266,502	\$15,738	212	\$8,009	\$13,200	\$21,565
Stonewall NM	511,220	\$30,189	354	\$16,662	\$28,151	\$42,006
Sunset Crater Volcano NM	104,583	\$6,176	87	\$2,169	\$3,864	\$6,923
Tallgrass Prairie NPRES	27,715	\$1,637	25	\$688	\$1,155	\$2,097
Thaddeus Kosciuszko NMEM	2,077	\$123	2	\$70	\$113	\$182
Theodore Roosevelt Birthplace NHS	23,155	\$1,367	16	\$755	\$1,275	\$1,903
Theodore Roosevelt Inaugural NHS	27,507	\$1,624	22	\$673	\$1,269	\$2,089
Theodore Roosevelt Island P	151,500	\$8,946	117	\$4,776	\$7,948	\$12,455
Theodore Roosevelt NP	749,389	\$47,862	611	\$18,174	\$30,622	\$54,011
Thomas Edison NHP	47,298	\$2,793	33	\$1,549	\$2,598	\$3,886
Thomas Jefferson NMEM	3,198,859	\$61,195	795	\$33,255	\$56,277	\$88,107
Thomas Stone NHS	8,255	\$488	6	\$260	\$432	\$672
Timpanogos Cave NM	121,311	\$7,164	112	\$3,589	\$6,045	\$10,624
Timucuan EHP	1,134,856	\$67,016	1,016	\$31,468	\$54,294	\$93,894
Tonto NM	39,823	\$2,352	34	\$1,217	\$2,088	\$3,476
Tumacacori NHP	40,809	\$2,408	37	\$951	\$1,702	\$3,055
Tuskegee Airmen NHS	26,830	\$1,584	25	\$588	\$1,028	\$1,948
Tuskegee Institute NHS	37,486	\$2,214	35	\$822	\$1,437	\$2,722

* For these parks, results are based on a visitor survey at the designated park. For other parks, visitor characteristics and spending averages are from generic profiles or best available data.

! Trip characteristic data, spending data, and/or local area definitions were updated for these parks in 2018.

(x) Areas that were closed in 2018.

Table A-1 (continued). Visits, spending, and economic contributions to local economies - 2018.

Park Unit	Total Recreation Visits	Total Visitor Spending (\$000s, \$2018)	Jobs	Labor Income (\$000s, \$2018)	Value Added (\$000s, \$2018)	Economic Output (\$000s, \$2018)
Tuzigoot NM	98,089	\$5,793	83	\$3,008	\$5,145	\$8,505
Ulysses S Grant NHS	43,601	\$2,575	41	\$1,323	\$2,200	\$3,838
Upper Delaware NSR&NRR	220,965	\$9,808	104	\$4,707	\$7,919	\$11,815
Valley Forge NHP *	1,881,362	\$24,097	382	\$13,704	\$22,205	\$36,581
Vanderbilt Mansion NHS	340,870	\$20,129	245	\$10,294	\$17,303	\$26,692
Vicksburg NMP	474,387	\$28,014	452	\$11,415	\$20,085	\$37,270
Vietnam Veterans MEM	4,719,148	\$90,278	1,173	\$49,060	\$83,024	\$129,980
Virgin Islands NP *	112,287	\$16,322	188	\$7,858	\$14,810	\$22,550
Voyageurs NP	239,657	\$19,541	283	\$7,365	\$13,156	\$23,914
Waco Mammoth NM	106,932	\$6,315	91	\$2,566	\$4,507	\$7,905
Walnut Canyon NM	167,736	\$9,905	139	\$3,479	\$6,198	\$11,104
War In The Pacific NHP	387,855	\$22,904	257	\$10,622	\$18,999	\$29,406
Washington Monument (X)	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Washita Battlefield NHS	13,437	\$793	12	\$261	\$455	\$890
Weir Farm NHS	35,383	\$2,089	24	\$1,136	\$1,928	\$2,858
Whiskeytown NRA	585,768	\$25,810	329	\$10,020	\$16,142	\$28,018
White House	485,975	\$9,297	121	\$5,052	\$8,550	\$13,385
White Sands NM *	603,008	\$32,192	443	\$11,731	\$20,017	\$37,145
Whitman Mission NHS	49,274	\$2,910	37	\$1,065	\$1,991	\$3,317
William Howard Taft NHS	30,201	\$1,784	27	\$883	\$1,477	\$2,543
Wilson's Creek NB	220,276	\$13,008	205	\$5,392	\$9,020	\$16,670

* For these parks, results are based on a visitor survey at the designated park. For other parks, visitor characteristics and spending averages are from generic profiles or best available data.

! Trip characteristic data, spending data, and/or local area definitions were updated for these parks in 2018.

(x) Areas that were closed in 2018.

Table A-1 (continued). Visits, spending, and economic contributions to local economies - 2018.

Park Unit	Total Recreation Visits	Total Visitor Spending (\$000s, \$2018)	Jobs	Labor Income (\$000s, \$2018)	Value Added (\$000s, \$2018)	Economic Output (\$000s, \$2018)
Wind Cave NP *	656,398	\$66,631	1,009	\$28,728	\$48,468	\$88,760
Wolf Trap National Park for the Performing Arts	365,539	\$21,586	283	\$11,551	\$19,213	\$30,186
Women's Rights NHP *	42,783	\$3,131	40	\$1,295	\$2,478	\$4,020
World War II Memorial	4,652,866	\$89,010	1,157	\$48,371	\$81,858	\$128,155
World War II Valor in the Pacific NM * !	1,779,142	\$312,110	3,475	\$154,837	\$301,842	\$457,646
Wrangell - St Elias NP&PRES	79,450	\$120,679	1,486	\$56,512	\$105,764	\$171,530
Wright Brothers NMEM	360,669	\$21,298	319	\$8,838	\$15,429	\$27,417
Wupatki NM	205,122	\$13,314	176	\$4,657	\$8,384	\$14,922
Yellowstone NP *	4,115,001	\$512,566	7,089	\$223,866	\$375,210	\$647,091
Yosemite NP * !	4,009,438	\$495,245	6,184	\$220,522	\$376,018	\$624,129
Yukon - Charley Rivers NPRES	1,272	\$1,103	9	\$457	\$1,032	\$1,557
Zion NP * !	4,320,032	\$246,236	4,130	\$95,644	\$168,265	\$327,236

* For these parks, results are based on a visitor survey at the designated park. For other parks, visitor characteristics and spending averages are from generic profiles or best available data.

! Trip characteristic data, spending data, and/or local area definitions were updated for these parks in 2018.

(x) Areas that were closed in 2018.

Table A-2. Percent of visitor spending made by non-local visitors - 2018.

Park Unit	Percent Visitor Spending from Non-Local Visitors
Abraham Lincoln Birthplace NHP	95.6%
Acadia NP	97.8%
Adams NHP	95.6%
African Burial Ground NM	95.6%
Agate Fossil Beds NM	99.3%
Alibates Flint Quarries NM	95.6%
Allegheny Portage Railroad NHS	95.6%
Amistad NRA	88.3%
Andersonville NHS	95.6%
Andrew Johnson NHS	95.6%
Aniakchak NM&PRES	100.0%
Antietam NB	95.6%
Apostle Islands NL	98.5%
Appomattox Court House NHP	95.6%
Arches NP	100.0%
Arkansas Post NMEM	95.6%
Arlington House, The Robert E. Lee Memorial NMEM	95.6%
Assateague Island NS	88.5%
Aztec Ruins NM	95.6%
Badlands NP	98.7%
Bandelier NM	98.7%
Belmont-Paul Women's Equality NM	91.6%
Bent's Old Fort NHS	95.6%
Bering Land Bridge NPRES	100.0%
Big Bend NP	98.8%
Big Cypress NPRES	99.0%
Big Hole NB	98.7%
Big South Fork NRRRA	81.0%
Big Thicket NPRES	98.7%
Bighorn Canyon NRA	88.5%
Biscayne NP	98.7%
Black Canyon Of The Gunnison NP	98.7%
Blue Ridge PKWY	94.9%
Bluestone NSR	88.3%
Booker T Washington NM	95.6%

Table A-2 (continued). Percent of visitor spending made by non-local visitors - 2018.

Park Unit	Percent Visitor Spending from Non-Local Visitors
Boston African American NHS	95.6%
Boston NHP	95.6%
Brown V Board Of Education NHS	95.6%
Bryce Canyon NP	98.4%
Buck Island Reef NM	98.7%
Buffalo NR	88.8%
Cabrillo NM	95.6%
Canaveral NS	67.4%
Cane River Creole NHP	95.6%
Canyon De Chelly NM	98.8%
Canyonlands NP	98.8%
Cape Cod NS	97.9%
Cape Hatteras NS	98.7%
Cape Krusenstern NM	100.0%
Cape Lookout NS	88.8%
Capitol Reef NP	99.6%
Capulin Volcano NM	98.5%
Carl Sandburg Home NHS	95.6%
Carlsbad Caverns NP	98.7%
Carter G. Woodson Home NHS	91.6%
Casa Grande Ruins NM	95.6%
Castillo De San Marcos NM	95.6%
Castle Clinton NM	61.4%
Catoctin Mountain P	98.7%
Cedar Breaks NM	98.7%
Cesar E. Chavez NM	95.6%
Chaco Culture NHP	98.8%
Chamizal NMEM	95.6%
Channel Islands NP	98.7%
Charles Pinckney NHS	95.6%
Charles Young Buffalo Soldiers NM	95.6%
Chattahoochee River NRA	88.3%
Chesapeake & Ohio Canal NHP	91.6%
Chickamauga & Chattanooga NMP	95.6%
Chickasaw NRA	63.2%

Table A-2 (continued). Percent of visitor spending made by non-local visitors - 2018.

Park Unit	Percent Visitor Spending from Non-Local Visitors
Chiricahua NM	98.8%
Christiansted NHS	95.6%
City Of Rocks NRES	95.6%
Clara Barton NHS	95.5%
Colonial NHP	98.1%
Colorado NM	98.7%
Congaree NP	94.4%
Coronado NMEM	95.6%
Cowpens NB	98.7%
Crater Lake NP	98.5%
Craters Of The Moon NM&PRES	98.7%
Cumberland Gap NHP	98.7%
Cumberland Island NS	90.9%
Curecanti NRA	88.7%
Cuyahoga Valley NP	71.9%
Dayton Aviation Heritage NHP	92.5%
De Soto NMEM	95.6%
Death Valley NP	98.4%
Delaware Water Gap NRA	84.1%
Denali NP&PRES	100.0%
Devils Postpile NM	98.7%
Devils Tower NM	98.7%
Dinosaur NM	98.8%
Dry Tortugas NP	98.8%
Edgar Allan Poe NHS	95.6%
Effigy Mounds NM	95.8%
Eisenhower NHS	95.6%
El Malpais NM	95.6%
El Morro NM	98.7%
Eleanor Roosevelt NHS	95.6%
Eugene O'Neill NHS	95.6%
Everglades NP	97.3%
Federal Hall NMEM	95.6%
Fire Island NS	88.6%
First Ladies NHS	95.6%

Table A-2 (continued). Percent of visitor spending made by non-local visitors - 2018.

Park Unit	Percent Visitor Spending from Non-Local Visitors
Flight 93 NMEM	95.6%
Florissant Fossil Beds NM	95.6%
Ford's Theatre NHS	91.6%
Fort Bowie NHS	95.6%
Fort Caroline NMEM	95.6%
Fort Davis NHS	95.6%
Fort Donelson NB	98.7%
Fort Frederica NM	95.6%
Fort Laramie NHS	95.6%
Fort Larned NHS	97.9%
Fort Matanzas NM	95.6%
Fort McHenry NM&SHRINE	95.6%
Fort Necessity NB	95.6%
Fort Point NHS	95.6%
Fort Pulaski NM	98.7%
Fort Raleigh NHS	95.6%
Fort Scott NHS	75.0%
Fort Smith NHS	95.6%
Fort Stanwix NM	97.0%
Fort Sumter NM	95.6%
Fort Union NM	99.8%
Fort Union Trading Post NHS	97.1%
Fort Vancouver NHS	95.6%
Fort Washington P	95.6%
Fossil Butte NM	100.0%
Franklin Delano Roosevelt MEM	91.6%
Frederick Douglass NHS	91.6%
Frederick Law Olmsted NHS	95.6%
Fredericksburg & Spotsylvania NMP	95.6%
Friendship Hill NHS	95.6%
Gates Of The Arctic NP&PRES	100.0%
Gateway NRA	65.2%
Gauley River NRA	88.7%
General Grant NMEM	95.6%
George Rogers Clark NHP	95.6%

Table A-2 (continued). Percent of visitor spending made by non-local visitors - 2018.

Park Unit	Percent Visitor Spending from Non-Local Visitors
George Washington Birthplace NM	95.2%
George Washington Carver NM	95.1%
George Washington MEM PKWY	10.4%
Gettysburg NMP	98.7%
Gila Cliff Dwellings NM	95.6%
Glacier Bay NP&PRES	98.7%
Glacier NP	94.2%
Glen Canyon NRA	96.2%
Golden Gate NRA	89.4%
Golden Spike NHS	97.9%
Governors Island NM	95.6%
Grand Canyon NP	98.9%
Grand Portage NM	98.7%
Grand Teton NP	98.9%
Grant-Kohrs Ranch NHS	95.6%
Great Basin NP	98.9%
Great Sand Dunes NP&PRES	98.8%
Great Smoky Mountains NP	98.3%
Greenbelt P	98.8%
Guadalupe Mountains NP	98.7%
Guilford Courthouse NMP	95.6%
Gulf Islands NS	88.5%
Hagerman Fossil Beds NM	95.6%
Haleakala NP	98.7%
Hamilton Grange NMEM	95.6%
Hampton NHS	95.6%
Harpers Ferry NHP	92.2%
Harry S Truman NHS	95.6%
Hawaii Volcanoes NP	98.3%
Herbert Hoover NHS	95.6%
Home Of Franklin D Roosevelt NHS	95.6%
Homestead NM	93.4%
Hopewell Culture NHP	95.6%
Hopewell Furnace NHS	95.6%
Horseshoe Bend NMP	95.6%

Table A-2 (continued). Percent of visitor spending made by non-local visitors - 2018.

Park Unit	Percent Visitor Spending from Non-Local Visitors
Hot Springs NP	98.7%
Hovenweep NM	98.7%
Hubbell Trading Post NHS	95.6%
Independence NHP	95.6%
Indiana Dunes NL	88.4%
Isle Royale NP	100.0%
James A Garfield NHS	91.4%
Jean Lafitte NP&PRES	95.6%
Jefferson NEM	99.0%
Jewel Cave NM	95.6%
Jimmy Carter NHS	95.6%
John D Rockefeller Jr MEM PKWY	93.1%
John Day Fossil Beds NM	98.6%
John F Kennedy NHS	95.6%
John Muir NHS	95.6%
Johnstown Flood NMEM	91.6%
Joshua Tree NP	99.1%
Kalaupapa NHP	95.6%
Kaloko-Honokohau NHP	95.6%
Katmai NP&PRES	100.0%
Kenai Fjords NP	100.0%
Kennesaw Mountain NBP	95.6%
Keweenaw NHP	95.6%
Kings Canyon NP	98.7%
Kings Mountain NMP	89.9%
Klondike Gold Rush AK NHP	98.9%
Klondike Gold Rush WA NHP	95.6%
Knife River Indian Villages NHS	95.6%
Kobuk Valley NP	100.0%
Korean War Veterans MEM	91.6%
Lake Chelan NRA	94.3%
Lake Clark NP&PRES	100.0%
Lake Mead NRA	88.8%
Lake Meredith NRA	88.5%
Lake Roosevelt NRA	88.7%

Table A-2 (continued). Percent of visitor spending made by non-local visitors - 2018.

Park Unit	Percent Visitor Spending from Non-Local Visitors
Lassen Volcanic NP	98.8%
Lava Beds NM	95.5%
Lewis and Clark NHP	95.6%
Lincoln Boyhood NMEM	98.5%
Lincoln Home NHS	98.1%
Lincoln MEM	91.6%
Little Bighorn Battlefield NM	95.6%
Little River Canyon NPRES	95.6%
Little Rock Central High School NHS	95.6%
Longfellow NHS	95.6%
Lowell NHP	95.6%
Lyndon B Johnson NHP	95.6%
Lyndon Baines Johnson Memorial Grove on the Potomac NMEM	95.6%
Maggie L Walker NHS	95.6%
Mammoth Cave NP	98.4%
Manassas NBP	95.6%
Manhattan Project (New Mexico) NHP	95.6%
Manhattan Project (Tennessee) NHP	57.2%
Manhattan Project (Washington) NHP	80.2%
Manzanar NHS	99.2%
Marsh - Billings - Rockefeller NHP	95.6%
Martin Luther King Jr NHS	95.6%
Martin Luther King, Jr. MEM	91.6%
Martin Van Buren NHS	95.6%
Mary McLeod Bethune Council House NHS	90.6%
Mesa Verde NP	99.7%
Minidoka (Idaho) NHS	44.0%
Minidoka (Washington) NHS	95.5%
Minute Man NHP	95.6%
Minuteman Missile NHS	100.0%
Mississippi NRRRA	88.3%
Missouri NRR	88.3%
Mojave NPRES	95.6%
Monocacy NB	93.3%
Montezuma Castle NM	95.6%

Table A-2 (continued). Percent of visitor spending made by non-local visitors - 2018.

Park Unit	Percent Visitor Spending from Non-Local Visitors
Moores Creek NB	98.7%
Morristown NHP	95.6%
Mount Rainier NP	96.2%
Mount Rushmore NMEM	95.6%
Muir Woods NM	96.2%
Natchez NHP	95.6%
Natchez Trace PKWY	39.8%
National Capital Parks Central	91.6%
National Capital Parks East	91.6%
National Park of American Samoa	95.6%
Natural Bridges NM	98.7%
Navajo NM	98.7%
New Bedford Whaling NHP	95.3%
New Orleans Jazz NHP	95.6%
New River Gorge NR	88.3%
Nez Perce NHP	95.6%
Nicodemus NHS	97.8%
Ninety Six NHS	95.6%
Niobrara NSR	99.8%
Noatak NPRES	100.0%
North Cascades NP	99.3%
Obed W&SR	76.1%
Ocmulgee NM	95.6%
Olympic NP	98.4%
Oregon Caves NM	98.8%
Organ Pipe Cactus NM	98.7%
Ozark NSR	88.8%
Padre Island NS	88.9%
Palo Alto Battlefield NHP	95.6%
Paterson Great Falls NHP	95.6%
Pea Ridge NMP	95.6%
Pecos NHP	95.6%
Pennsylvania Avenue NHS	91.6%
Perry's Victory & International Peace MEM	89.6%
Petersburg NB	95.6%

Table A-2 (continued). Percent of visitor spending made by non-local visitors - 2018.

Park Unit	Percent Visitor Spending from Non-Local Visitors
Petrified Forest NP	98.7%
Petroglyph NM	95.6%
Pictured Rocks NL	88.6%
Pinnacles NP	95.6%
Pipe Spring NM	95.6%
Pipestone NM	95.6%
Piscataway P	95.6%
Point Reyes NS	88.6%
Port Chicago Naval Magazine NMEM	95.5%
President's Park	91.6%
President William Jefferson Clinton Birthplace Home NHS	95.6%
Prince William Forest P	98.9%
Pu'uhonua O Honaunau NHP	95.6%
Puukohola Heiau NHS	95.6%
Rainbow Bridge NM	95.6%
Redwood NP	98.7%
Richmond NBP	95.6%
Rio Grande W&SR	100.0%
River Raisin NB	95.6%
Rock Creek P	91.6%
Rocky Mountain NP	96.9%
Roger Williams NMEM	95.6%
Rosie the Riveter WWII Home Front NHP	95.6%
Ross Lake NRA	89.2%
Russell Cave NM	95.6%
Sagamore Hill NHS	95.6%
Saguaro NP	98.7%
Saint-Gaudens NHS	91.7%
Saint Croix Island IHS	95.6%
Saint Croix NSR	88.9%
Saint Paul's Church NHS	95.6%
Salem Maritime NHS	95.6%
Salinas Pueblo Missions NM	95.6%
Salt River Bay EHP	95.6%
San Antonio Missions NHP	90.1%

Table A-2 (continued). Percent of visitor spending made by non-local visitors - 2018.

Park Unit	Percent Visitor Spending from Non-Local Visitors
San Francisco Maritime NHP	61.4%
San Juan Island NHP	95.6%
San Juan NHS	95.6%
Sand Creek Massacre NHS	95.6%
Santa Monica Mountains NRA	88.3%
Saratoga NHP	95.6%
Saugus Iron Works NHS	95.5%
Scotts Bluff NM	95.6%
Sequoia NP	97.9%
Shenandoah NP	99.0%
Shiloh NMP	95.6%
Sitka NHP	100.0%
Sleeping Bear Dunes NL	97.5%
Springfield Armory NHS	95.6%
Statue Of Liberty NM	95.6%
Steamtown NHS	93.7%
Stones River NB	95.6%
Stonewall NM	95.6%
Sunset Crater Volcano NM	95.6%
Tallgrass Prairie NPRES	95.6%
Thaddeus Kosciuszko NMEM	95.5%
Theodore Roosevelt Birthplace NHS	95.6%
Theodore Roosevelt Inaugural NHS	95.6%
Theodore Roosevelt Island P	95.6%
Theodore Roosevelt NP	98.7%
Thomas Edison NHP	95.6%
Thomas Jefferson NMEM	91.6%
Thomas Stone NHS	95.6%
Timpanogos Cave NM	95.6%
Timucuan EHP	95.6%
Tonto NM	95.6%
Tumacacori NHP	95.6%
Tuskegee Airmen NHS	95.6%
Tuskegee Institute NHS	95.6%
Tuzigoot NM	95.6%

Table A-2 (continued). Percent of visitor spending made by non-local visitors - 2018.

Park Unit	Percent Visitor Spending from Non-Local Visitors
Ulysses S Grant NHS	95.6%
Upper Delaware NSR&NRR	88.3%
Valley Forge NHP	46.4%
Vanderbilt Mansion NHS	95.6%
Vicksburg NMP	95.6%
Vietnam Veterans MEM	91.6%
Virgin Islands NP	100.0%
Voyageurs NP	98.6%
Waco Mammoth NM	95.6%
Walnut Canyon NM	95.6%
War In The Pacific NHP	95.6%
Washington Monument	–
Washita Battlefield NHS	95.6%
Weir Farm NHS	95.6%
Whiskeytown NRA	88.6%
White House	91.6%
White Sands NM	98.4%
Whitman Mission NHS	95.6%
William Howard Taft NHS	95.6%
Wilson's Creek NB	95.6%
Wind Cave NP	99.8%
Wolf Trap National Park for the Performing Arts	95.6%
Women's Rights NHP	100.0%
World War II Memorial	91.6%
World War II Valor in the Pacific NM	98.6%
Wrangell - St Elias NP&PRES	100.0%
Wright Brothers NMEM	95.6%
Wupatki NM	98.7%
Yellowstone NP	99.5%
Yosemite NP	96.6%
Yukon - Charley Rivers NPRES	100.0%
Zion NP	97.8%

Table A-3. Visits, spending and economic contributions to state economies - 2018.

State	Total Recreation Visits	Total Visitor Spending (\$Millions, \$2018)	Jobs	Labor Income (\$Millions, \$2018)	Value Added (\$Millions, \$2018)	Economic Output (\$Millions, \$2018)
Alabama	1,020,976	\$45.0	679	\$17.8	\$30.5	\$55.9
Alaska	2,920,250	\$1,362.5	17,760	\$658.4	\$1,179.2	\$1,980.2
American Samoa	28,625	\$1.7	19	\$0.8	\$1.4	\$2.2
Arizona	12,850,194	\$1,349.8	19,780	\$700.4	\$1,249.4	\$2,099.1
Arkansas	3,175,612	\$177.5	2,690	\$64.4	\$119.5	\$222.4
California	39,908,515	\$2,672.1	35,720	\$1,597.8	\$2,653.7	\$4,221.4
Colorado	7,565,056	\$496.6	7,096	\$258.3	\$446.1	\$742.6
Connecticut	35,383	\$2.1	25	\$1.1	\$1.8	\$2.8
District of Columbia	40,159,095	\$768.1	6,746	\$353.4	\$586.2	\$833.4
Florida	9,646,722	\$530.3	7,654	\$266.3	\$464.8	\$782.4
Georgia	7,519,833	\$403.4	6,130	\$198.1	\$337.2	\$581.2
Guam	387,855	\$22.9	257	\$10.6	\$19.0	\$29.4
Hawaii	4,838,835	\$526.8	5,819	\$253.1	\$481.7	\$734.1
Idaho	745,543	\$37.4	569	\$15.6	\$26.6	\$48.5
Illinois	197,717	\$12.1	162	\$6.5	\$11.5	\$18.0
Indiana	2,011,117	\$91.4	1,304	\$39.5	\$65.9	\$115.4
Iowa	193,663	\$11.7	184	\$5.0	\$8.5	\$15.3
Kansas	110,191	\$5.5	81	\$2.4	\$4.0	\$7.2
Kentucky	1,742,441	\$111.3	1,564	\$46.3	\$81.9	\$142.5
Louisiana	611,241	\$36.1	511	\$15.5	\$27.9	\$47.4
Maine	3,549,575	\$388.4	5,820	\$188.6	\$336.2	\$571.1
Maryland	6,006,442	\$202.5	2,573	\$101.4	\$171.9	\$271.2
Massachusetts	9,646,318	\$831.9	10,526	\$479.2	\$793.1	\$1,226.2
Michigan	2,745,669	\$237.4	3,383	\$112.5	\$203.8	\$339.5

*Delaware does not include any National Park System units that collect visitor data.

Table A-3 (continued). Visits, spending and economic contributions to state economies - 2018.

State	Total Recreation Visits	Total Visitor Spending (\$Millions, \$2018)	Jobs	Labor Income (\$Millions, \$2018)	Value Added (\$Millions, \$2018)	Economic Output (\$Millions, \$2018)
Minnesota	1,186,405	\$64.4	925	\$31.2	\$53.4	\$91.1
Mississippi	6,863,044	\$214.4	2,987	\$72.2	\$123.5	\$230.3
Missouri	3,622,004	\$276.4	4,612	\$138.5	\$227.8	\$411.2
Montana	5,547,379	\$633.0	9,536	\$302.6	\$489.2	\$880.8
Nebraska	287,995	\$18.2	289	\$8.5	\$14.3	\$25.5
Nevada	5,837,312	\$260.9	2,981	\$119.6	\$200.2	\$317.8
New Hampshire	35,218	\$1.8	26	\$0.9	\$1.6	\$2.6
New Jersey	4,488,759	\$154.0	2,088	\$82.6	\$135.3	\$215.2
New Mexico	2,113,807	\$123.3	1,766	\$49.5	\$84.4	\$152.4
New York	19,291,392	\$737.1	7,918	\$358.4	\$619.8	\$923.3
North Carolina	18,121,306	\$1,342.9	20,559	\$659.8	\$1,113.7	\$1,952.2
North Dakota	774,623	\$49.6	696	\$20.7	\$35.2	\$63.5
Ohio	2,511,420	\$65.2	1,032	\$34.1	\$56.5	\$98.5
Oklahoma	1,491,343	\$25.0	265	\$7.9	\$12.8	\$23.0
Oregon	1,279,046	\$94.0	1,352	\$47.3	\$78.8	\$132.6
Pennsylvania	9,708,443	\$467.1	7,381	\$256.1	\$406.3	\$693.0
Puerto Rico	910,405	\$53.8	603	\$24.9	\$44.6	\$69.0
Rhode Island	60,709	\$3.6	48	\$1.7	\$3.0	\$4.8
South Carolina	1,612,760	\$89.8	1,259	\$38.5	\$67.7	\$115.5
South Dakota	4,386,897	\$293.5	4,288	\$130.4	\$216.1	\$386.7
Tennessee	9,256,332	\$652.6	8,872	\$322.0	\$542.4	\$904.4
Texas	5,310,767	\$302.9	4,254	\$156.3	\$267.2	\$447.5
Utah	15,125,729	\$1,207.2	18,687	\$604.6	\$1,040.7	\$1,838.5
Vermont	63,886	\$3.8	51	\$1.5	\$2.8	\$4.7

*Delaware does not include any National Park System units that collect visitor data.

Table A-3 (continued). Visits, spending and economic contributions to state economies - 2018.

State	Total Recreation Visits	Total Visitor Spending (\$Millions, \$2018)	Jobs	Labor Income (\$Millions, \$2018)	Value Added (\$Millions, \$2018)	Economic Output (\$Millions, \$2018)
Virgin Islands	256,076	\$24.9	283	\$11.8	\$21.9	\$33.5
Virginia	22,171,018	\$1,140.3	16,765	\$547.4	\$953.0	\$1,616.6
Washington	8,375,782	\$505.9	5,826	\$234.9	\$431.1	\$669.5
West Virginia	1,627,459	\$73.6	1,049	\$29.0	\$48.3	\$85.8
Wisconsin	615,243	\$56.3	869	\$25.2	\$43.4	\$77.3
Wyoming	7,662,402	\$927.9	12,305	\$359.0	\$650.5	\$1,123.1

*Delaware does not include any National Park System units that collect visitor data.

Table A-4. Visits, spending and economic contributions to regional economies - 2018.

Region	Total Recreation Visits	Total Visitor Spending (\$Billions, \$2018)	Jobs	Labor Income (\$Billions, \$2018)	Value Added (\$Billions, \$2018)	Economic Output (\$Billions, \$2018)
Alaska	2,920,250	\$1.36	17,760	\$0.66	\$1.18	\$1.98
Intermountain	55,714,994	\$4.98	73,560	\$2.66	\$4.62	\$7.85
Midwest	21,818,555	\$1.36	21,133	\$0.72	\$1.25	\$2.17
National Capital	54,174,139	\$1.07	14,984	\$0.58	\$0.98	\$1.58
Northeast	57,039,307	\$3.29	45,852	\$1.93	\$3.29	\$5.24
Pacific West	63,353,196	\$4.21	56,245	\$2.48	\$4.19	\$6.70
Southeast	63,191,386	\$3.92	59,242	\$2.01	\$3.51	\$6.08



Figure A-1. National Park Service Regions.

Table A-5. Park unit type abbreviations.

Park Unit Type	Abbreviation
Ecological & Historic Preserve	EHP
International Historic Site	IHS
Memorial	MEM
Memorial Parkway	MEM PKWY
National & State Parks	NP
National Battlefield	NB
National Battlefield Park	NBP
National Expansion Memorial	NEM
National Historic Site	NHS
National Historical Park	NHP
National Historical Park and Preserve	NP&PRES
National Lakeshore	NL
National Memorial	NMEM

Table A-5 (continued). Park unit type abbreviations.

Park Unit Type	Abbreviation
National Military Park	NMP
National Monument	NM
National Monument & Preserve	NM&PRES
National Monument and Historic Shrine	NM&SHRINE
National Monument of America	NM
National Park	NP
National Park & Preserve	NP&PRES
National Preserve	NPRES
National Recreation Area	NRA
National Recreational River	NRR
National Reserve	NRES
National River	NR
National River & Recreation Area	NRRA
National Scenic River	NSR
National Scenic Riverways	NSR
National Seashore	NS
National Wild and Scenic River	W&SR
Park	P
Parkway	PKWY
Scenic & Recreational River	NSR&NRR
Wild & Scenic River	W&SR

Table A-6. Visit allocation for multi-state parks.

Park Unit	State	Share
Assateague Island NS	Maryland	33.0%
Assateague Island NS	Virginia	67.0%
Big South Fork NRRRA	Kentucky	41.0%
Big South Fork NRRRA	Tennessee	59.0%
Bighorn Canyon NRA	Montana	54.0%
Bighorn Canyon NRA	Wyoming	46.0%
Blue Ridge PKWY	North Carolina	62.0%
Blue Ridge PKWY	Virginia	38.0%
Chesapeake & Ohio Canal NHP	District of Columbia	24.0%
Chesapeake & Ohio Canal NHP	Maryland	76.0%
Chickamauga & Chattanooga NMP	Georgia	50.0%

Table A-6 (continued). Visit allocation for multi-state parks.

Park Unit	State	Share
Chickamauga & Chattanooga NMP	Tennessee	50.0%
Cumberland Gap NHP	Kentucky	93.0%
Cumberland Gap NHP	Virginia	7.0%
Delaware Water Gap NRA	New Jersey	71.0%
Delaware Water Gap NRA	Pennsylvania	29.0%
Dinosaur NM	Colorado	74.0%
Dinosaur NM	Utah	26.0%
Gateway NRA	New Jersey	18.4%
Gateway NRA	New York	81.6%
Glen Canyon NRA	Arizona	20.5%
Glen Canyon NRA	Utah	79.5%
Great Smoky Mountains NP	North Carolina	44.0%
Great Smoky Mountains NP	Tennessee	56.0%
Gulf Islands NS	Florida	74.8%
Gulf Islands NS	Mississippi	25.2%
Hovenweep NM	Colorado	44.0%
Hovenweep NM	Utah	56.0%
Lake Mead NRA	Arizona	25.0%
Lake Mead NRA	Nevada	75.0%
Natchez Trace PKWY	Alabama	7.0%
Natchez Trace PKWY	Mississippi	80.0%
Natchez Trace PKWY	Tennessee	13.0%
National Capital Parks East	District of Columbia	90.0%
National Capital Parks East	Maryland	10.0%
Saint Croix NSR	Minnesota	50.0%
Saint Croix NSR	Wisconsin	50.0%
Upper Delaware NSR&NRR	New York	50.0%
Upper Delaware NSR&NRR	Pennsylvania	50.0%
Yellowstone NP	Montana	51.0%
Yellowstone NP	Wyoming	49.0%

Table A-7. IMPLAN sector bridge - 2018

Spending Group	IMPLAN Sector	Sector Name	Weight
hotels	499	Hotels and motels, including casino hotels	1.00
camping fees	500	Other accommodations	1.00
restaurants	501	Full-service restaurants	0.50
restaurants	502	Limited-service restaurants	0.50
groceries !	3400	Retail - Food and beverage stores	1.00
gas !	3402	Retail - Gasoline stores	1.00
local transportation	412	Transit and ground passenger transportation	0.25
local transportation	442	Automotive equipment rental and leasing	0.75
public transportation *	412	Transit and ground passenger transportation	1.00
rental cars *	442	Automotive equipment rental and leasing	1.00
local air transportation	408	Air transportation	1.00
local water transportation *	410	Water transportation	1.00
scenic and sightseeing transportation *	414	Scenic and sightseeing transportation and support activities for transportation	1.00
recreation and entertainment	496	Other amusement and recreation industries	1.00
guides and tour fees *	496	Other amusement and recreation industries	1.00
equipment rental *	443	General and consumer goods rental except video tapes and discs	1.00
sporting goods * !	3404	Retail - Sporting goods, hobby, musical instrument and book stores	1.00
souvenirs and other retail !	3406	Retail - Miscellaneous store retailers	1.00
cruise package *	410	Water transportation	0.45
cruise package *	499	Hotels and motels, including casino hotels	0.55

* Spending group added for new SEM survey data.

! Retail margins are applied for these spending groups. For retail purchases, only retail margins are modeled as stimulating economic activity in the local economy.

The Department of the Interior protects and manages the nation's natural resources and cultural heritage; provides scientific and other information about those resources; and honors its special responsibilities to American Indians, Alaska Natives, and affiliated Island Communities.

NPS 999/152851, May 2019

National Park Service
U.S. Department of the Interior



[Natural Resource Stewardship and Science](#)

1201 Oakridge Drive, Suite 150
Fort Collins, CO 80525