

**Missouri State Park Economics and Benefits:
An Update Based on 2011 Visitation**
White Paper Prepared for Missouri Department of Natural Resources
Division of State Parks

May, 2012



D.J. Case & Associates
317 E. Jefferson Blvd.
Mishawaka, IN 46545
574-258-0100 - phone
574-258-0189 - fax

Communication Specialists in Natural Resources Conservation

Daniel J. Witter, Ph.D
Research Director
dan@djcase.com
www.djcase.com

Executive Summary

Prior estimates of the economic impact of Missouri State Parks were updated and revised using 2011 visitation estimates and newly-calculated 2011 average daily expenditures per visitor at different types of State Parks (state park, historic site, museum, old home/mansion).

- Total 2011 expenditures for visits to Missouri State Parks were estimated at \$778 million.
- When considering the multiplier effect—money spent by State Park visitors re-spent again and again—Missouri State Park visitors in 2011 had an overall impact on the state economy of:
 - \$1.02 billion in sales,
 - \$307 million in income (wage and salary income, proprietor's income and employee benefits),
 - 14,535 jobs in employment, and
 - \$123 million in federal, state, and local taxes.
- Economics tell only part of the story of how State Parks contributes to Missouri's economy and culture.
 - Growing scientific evidence confirms that nature, wildlife, and the outdoors, rather than recreational amenities appealing to relatively narrow interest groups, are essential to human fitness, health, and the very quality of life today and for future generations.
 - Data increasingly demonstrate the connection to nature and the outdoors is necessary in all human habitats, whether country or city, natural or built environment, or in wild or domesticated settings.
 - Understood in this light, the services of State Parks—and indeed, all services that make nature, the outdoors, and wildlife available to Missourians—are comparable in stature (in fact, integral) to major state enterprises such as health, education, social services, and transportation.

RECOMMENDATION: State Parks should develop a cooperative agreement with Division of Tourism to regularly access Tourism data—a large database that is updated quarterly with annual summations, representing an extraordinarily powerful marketing and social research tool for State Parks. Such use also will require training one or several State Park staff—likely staff with planning or research background—to use and understand the mechanics of accessing and analyzing Tourism data. This report, as the saying goes, merely “scratches the surface” of this database.

Introduction

This report has 2 objectives:

- Estimate economic impact from visitation during 2011 to facilities managed by the Division of State Parks (State Parks) within the Missouri Department of Natural Resources. State Parks manages 51 state parks, 34 historic sites, and the Missouri State Museum in the State Capitol, offering a wide range of recreational and educational benefits, while showcasing a broad array of Missouri's natural and cultural facets.
- Discuss the emotional and physical health benefits of outdoor activity, and by extension, the restorative and therapeutic health benefits of facilities managed by State Parks. Scientific evidence grows that outdoor recreation and nature, rather than recreational amenities appealing to narrow visitor groups, are essential to human fitness, health, and the very quality of life today and for future generations.

Economic Impact of State Parks

Economic impact is the net economic change in Missouri that results from the spending of visitors to state parks and historic sites. These impacts help enhance Missourians' way of life, the economy, and the health and well-being of visitors.

Basically, the magnitude of economic impact depends on:

- total number of parties visiting at different types of State Park facilities (state park, historic site, mansion/old home, museum);
- average party size;
- average duration of stay (usually recorded as visitor "nights"—but more intuitively understood as "visitor days");
- average spending of each party at each type of facility (which allows calculation of average expenditure per visitor per day); and
- circulation of tourism expenditures throughout the area or country.

"Circulation of tourism expenditures" is the multiplier effect, normally explained in terms of direct and total effects that expenditures have on Missouri's economy. Dollars churn or are re-spent within the economy, thus multiplying the economic effect of the original expenditure.

Methods

Estimates of economic impact reported here used "secondary data." The term secondary in no way implies that the data are of lesser quality or less trustworthy than primary or original data. Rather, "secondary" means merely that statistics reported here were calculated from earlier, pre-existing studies. Secondary data analysis affords significant benefits over primary research:

- Substantial savings in time and money required for primary research;
- Pre-established databases and studies generally have an accepted degree of validity and reliability—that is, some measure of prior review and vetting;
- The search for secondary data sometimes reveals heretofore unanalyzed or under-analyzed data; and
- Comparison of estimates of the same statistics calculated from different datasets improves the search for the actual or real population values.

Seven data sources were consulted to calculate statistics in this report:

1. Cole, S.T., C.D. Vessell, and T. Zhu. 2002. 2002 State Economic Impacts of Missouri State Park Visitors. Department of Parks, Recreation, & Tourism, School of Natural Resources, University of Missouri-Columbia, 7pp.
2. Katy Trail State Park 2011 Economic Impact Study. Synergy Group, Pragmatic Research Inc., and James Pona Associates. In preparation.
3. Missouri Department of Conservation. 1995. Public Use of August A. Busch Memorial Conservation Area: 1989-1990 and 1992-1993. Public Profile 8-95. Jefferson City, Missouri Conservation Commission, 104 pp+.
4. Missouri Division of State Park 2011 attendance estimates, <http://mostateparks.com/sites/default/files/attend%202011.pdf>
5. Missouri Division of Tourism 2011 visitation data.
6. Witter, D.J. 2007. Missouri Department of Natural Resources: State Park Visitor Study, 2005-2006. D.J. Case & Associates, 184 pp.
7. Witter, D.J. 2010. Impacts of participant spending on the local economy: Katy Trail Rides 2007-2009. D.J. Case & Associates, 14 pp.

Extraordinarily helpful in these analyses were data provided by the Missouri Division of Tourism (hereafter, Tourism data) that reported household trips to and within Missouri, 50 miles or more (oneway), of 1 or more days during fiscal year 2011. These data included:

- Leisure activities engaged during the trip;
- Length of trip in days;
- Number of trip party members; and
- Party expenditures in the following categories:
 - Transportation
 - Gasoline
 - Parking/tolls
 - Lodging
 - Food/beverage/dining
 - Groceries
 - Entertainment
 - Shopping/gifts/souvenirs
 - Amenities (fees, passes)

These data were used to calculate average expenditure per visitor per day for the following destinations:

- State/national park;
- Historic site/churches;
- Museum; and
- Old homes/mansions.

These destination designations are particularly important because State Parks manages a wide variety of natural and cultural sites—a selection of destinations far more diverse than the stereotypical setting that might come to mind upon hearing the term “state park,” with a tent site, restrooms and shower-house, and perhaps a lake or some central park feature. Each park, historic site, museum, and mansion offers a varying selection of facilities, amenities, and a wide range of expenditure opportunities. Obviously, it is cost-prohibitive to conduct a primary study or original investigation at each facility managed by State Parks to document visitor expenditures. But when secondary data are available distinguishing among a Missouri state/national park, historic site, museum, and mansion, such as the Tourism trip data reported here, expenditure estimates should take advantage of these more specific designations.

Limitation

Though secondary data analysis has significant advantages in convenience and cost-efficiency in creating top-line reports, one limitation is that the data may not be captured in sufficient detail to populate economic tools such as IMPLAN or Money Generation Model, Version 2—MGM2. For example, MGM2 (Stynes et al. 2000, Stynes, 2010) is a set of Microsoft Excel workbooks for estimating the economic impacts of park visitor spending on a local region. Though tailored for National Park Service areas, the model can be applied to other park settings and geographies. MGM2 divides visitors into segments to help explain differences in spending in specific expenditure categories across distinct user groups.

Lacking dependable detail (i.e., expenditures by category across specific visitor segments¹), secondary data analysis must retreat to proportional analysis. Here, the rationale is that by calculating a new, essential data point—in this case, *total expenditures for visitation at all Missouri State Parks in 2011*, this essential data point can be the start for proportionally re-calculating additional variables that flow from this original data point and that are reported in prior, original research; specifically, the 2002 report on State Economic Impacts of Missouri State Park Visitors. Here, the critical assumption to the credibility of these proportional estimates is, “*all else being equal.*”

¹ See for example “Impacts of participant spending on the local economy: Katy Trail Rides 2007-2009, D.J.Case & Associates, 14 pp.

Results and Discussion

Expenditures Per Visitor Per Day

Expenditure estimates for 4 types of destinations are presented in Table 1. Estimates were calculated for Missouri resident households taking trips *in Missouri* (“Missourians in-state”) as well as all U.S. households (“All travelers”) reporting visits to and within Missouri, which of course captures Missouri households.

Table 1. Mean (average) expenditures per person per day to selected Missouri destinations for trips of 50 miles or more during 2011 (Tourism data).

Destination:		2011 Trip Data Within Missouri and "All" (to and within Missouri)				
		N	Mean party expenditure	Mean party size	Mean trip length (days)	Mean \$/visitor/day ^a
State/national park	Missourians in-state	63	\$773	2.98	4.65	\$56
	All travelers	415	\$977	3.44	6.56	\$43
Historic site/church	Missourians in-state	49	\$1,521	4.49	4.94	\$69
	All travelers	362	\$1,321	3.52	6.48	\$58
Museum	Missourians in-state	59	\$1,687	4.17	4.20	\$96
	All travelers	359	\$1,330	3.80	6.04	\$58
Old home/mansion	Missourians in-state	21	\$593	4.14	3.57	\$40
	All travelers	159	\$1,207	3.21	6.16	\$61

a. Mean \$/visitor/day = Mean party expenditure divided by mean trip length; and that result divided by mean party size.

At this stage, comparisons with prior data are appropriate for corroborative purposes. For example, the 2011 mean daily expenditure of \$43 per visitor to “State/national park” compares quite favorably with the 2002 (Cole et al. 2002) daily expenditure per State Parks visitor of \$38 (adjusted for inflation, 2002 to 2011). Moreover, the 2011 mean daily expenditure of \$58 per visitor to “Historic site/church” is nearly identical to the 2002 (Cole et al. 2002) daily expenditure per Historic site visitor of \$60 (adjusted for inflation, 2002 to 2011), and confirms the Cole et al. finding that visitors to Historic sites spent considerably more than “over-night park visitors.”²

Total Expenditures, Missouri State Parks, 2011

A 4-step process was used to calculate total expenditures related to Missouri State Parks.

STEP 1. Total visitation to each Missouri State Park facility for 2011 was retrieved from State Parks’ website.

STEP 2. For purposes of estimating total expenditures at all State Parks, *the most conservative average expenditure per visitor per day was selected*; in all cases but one (“Old home/mansion”) this estimate was based on data from “All travelers” within and to Missouri (the shaded averages in Table 1 above).

² Another remarkable corroborative data point—specific to one state park, but relevant to the discussion at hand—comes from a recently completed study (2011, in preparation) of visitation at Katy Trail State Park, where mean expenditure per visitor per day was estimated at \$45. Screening Tourism data for “biking” at a Missouri “State/national park” yielded a mean expenditure per visitor per day of \$55.

To calculate total expenditures at all State Parks, each facility first was assigned a “mean \$/visitor/day” value on the basis of the facilities formal designation (see Appendix A). For example, all “state parks” (SP) were assigned a mean \$/visitor/day value of \$43. All “state historic sites” (SHS) were assigned a mean \$/visitor/day value of \$58. The Missouri State Museum was assigned a mean \$/visitor/day value of \$58³. And where it was possible to identify a state historic site as an “Old home/mansion,” a mean \$/visitor/day value of \$61 was assigned: These included:

- Benton Home and Studio
- Bothwell Lodge
- Felix Valle House
- Harry S Truman Birthplace
- Mark Twain Birthplace
- Nathan Boone Homestead
- Pershing Boyhood Home
- Scott Joplin SHC.

The net effect of assigning the \$61 average expenditure for “Old home/mansion” visit versus the \$58 average expenditure for “Historic site” visit was negligible, but acknowledged the ability that Tourism data afforded to distinguish the two.

State Parks reported visitation estimates or visitor counts for 8 concessions, but these visits were *not* assigned an average expenditure and thus *were not* included in the calculation of total expenditures. Excluded concessions were:

- Bennett Spring
- Big Lake
- Lake Wappapello
- Meramec
- Montauk
- Roaring River
- Stockton
- Thousand Hills

STEP 3. Total visitation at each facility was then multiplied by the average daily expenditure per visitor per day.

STEP 4. These sub-totals for each park facility were summed to arrive at a **grand total for State Park expenditures in 2011 of \$777.62 million.**

³ An immediate reaction of someone residing in or familiar with the Jefferson City area might judge this \$58 average as “not normal” or “too high” based on their personal experiences with visiting the State Capitol Museum. One might respond by reminding the Jefferson City observer that just the opposite is true—their local Jefferson City experience is “not the normal.” Tens of thousands of visitors travel long distances, making substantial trip expenditures to visit the Capitol—in fact, \$58 per visitor per day on average.

Impact of Visitor Spending

Economic impact commonly is characterized, first, as direct effects, and then because these direct expenditures “churn” in the economy—that is, dollars are re-spent, thus multiplying the economic impact of direct expenditures—total effects. It must be reemphasized that the 2011 estimates are calculated based on 2011 total visitor expenditures, and made proportional to 2002 estimates (*“all else being equal”*).

In summary, based on updated 2011 State Park visitation and expenditure data—and assuming all else being equal with Coe et al.’s 2002 economic impact study (Table 2):

- In 2011, visitors spent a total of \$778 million on trips to Missouri State Parks.
- Of the \$778 million total visitor spending, \$702 million stayed within Missouri, and about \$76 million leaked from Missouri’s economy (purchase of products manufactured outside Missouri account for this leakage).
- When considering the multiplier effect—money spent by State Park visitors re-spent again and again—Missouri State Park visitors had an overall impact on the state economy of \$1.02 billion in sales, \$307 million in income (wage and salary income, proprietor’s income and employee benefits), 14,535 jobs in employment, and \$123 million in federal, state, and local taxes.

Table 2. Direct and total effects of expenditures at Missouri State Parks, 2002 and 2011.

All visitors to Missouri State Parks		2002 ^a	2011 ^b
Total visitor expenditures ^c		\$410 million	\$778 million
Direct effects	Sales	\$370 million	\$702 million
	Income	\$99 million	\$187 million
	Jobs	5,480	10,399
Total effects	Sales	\$538 million	\$1.02 billion
	Income	\$162 million	\$307 million
	Jobs	7,660	14,535
	Tax (federal, state, local)	\$65 million	\$123 million

a. Cole et al. 2002

b. Updated 2011 estimates based on State Park attendance estimates and Tourism expenditure data, with direct and total effects proportional to 2002 data,

c. Each measure of economic activity provides a somewhat different picture of impacts, and should not be summed, but rather used in the appropriate context. Many recreation and tourism impact studies focus on sales and jobs; personal income and taxes generated are preferred impact measures in other situations (see Stynes et al. 2000).

Health Benefits of Missouri State Parks

“Humanity is the product of its relationship to nature (Kellert, In preparation).

With this bold statement, Dr. Stephen Kellert of Yale University builds the case in his soon to be released book (2012) that nature, outdoors, and wildlife—rather than

recreational amenities appealing to relatively narrow interest groups—are essential to human fitness, health, and the very quality of life today and for future generations.

Kellert asserts that our dependence on nature is not just a matter of raw materials, clean water, and productive soils. Instead, this dependence,

...is more fundamentally related to our capacity to think, to feel, to communicate, to create, to problem solve, to form a secure and meaningful identity, to mature and develop, to heal, to be healthy and productive.... (Kellert, In preparation).

Skeptics might assert that these are charming, poetic claims, but lack substance for everyday life and are non-quantifiable.

If the foregoing estimates of the economic contribution of State Parks are not impressive enough, consider just a few examples of the health and cultural benefits of State Parks and the outdoors (Kellert, In preparation; Louv 2005, Louv 2011).

- Sick persons who experience greater contact with nature recover faster and require fewer painkillers.
- Rates of obesity, diabetes, and myopia decrease when children spend more time outdoors.
- The productivity of manufacturing and office workers improves when they experience greater natural lighting and ventilation, restored landscapes, and other natural features.
- People who work in windowless offices have lower blood pressure and show better attention when plants and depictions of nature are inserted into their work places.
- Residents of public housing projects with trees and grass cope better, show less stress, and have lower crime and drug rates than persons living in identical buildings where the grass and trees have been removed and replaced by concrete.
- Our language and personality development rely heavily on images and representations of nature, wildlife, and the outdoors.
- Many of the world's (and Missouri's!) most revered buildings reflect shapes and forms that draw on design principles found in nature.
- It has been demonstrated without doubt in health and personality research that outdoor activities such as camping, hiking, fishing, and other outdoor activities and adventures lead to better physical and mental health, increased self-esteem, and positive character development.

But profound changes are occurring in America's and Missouri's relations to nature and wildlife. These shifts reflect an increasingly urban nation, where now more than three-quarters of Americans live, and an ever more indoor-oriented public, where Americans now spend an average 90% of their time (Kellert 2005). Reflecting this increasing separation from the outdoors, American children now devote 52 hours each week to

electronic media, while spending less than 40 minutes outside (more than 4 hours outdoors just a generation ago (Children and Nature website)).

Author Richard Louv (2005) popularized the term “nature-deficit disorder” several years ago. Though not a clinically recognized diagnosis, the idea has resonated in the health community—the premise that children grow emotionally and physically impoverished absent meaningful contact with nature.

But Louv (2011) has gone further in his new book, arguing that American adults have grown physically and emotionally duller—less physically fit (witness the nation’s obesity epidemic) and less mentally sharp—absent the therapeutic and restorative qualities of “outdoor places.” *Park Prescriptions* is a movement to create a healthier population by strengthening the connection between the healthcare system and public lands across the country. The goal is to...

...increase the prescription of outdoor physical activity to prevent (or treat) health problems resulting from inactivity and poor diet (Institute at the Golden Gate, No date, p. 1).

Louv, Kellert, and *Park Prescriptions* have joined a chorus of concerned citizens, writers, health-care providers, park and recreation professionals, government officials and many others emphasizing the importance of the American citizenry reconnecting with nature—for our own health and the health of generations to come.

What better place to reconnect than Missouri’s State Parks?

References

Children and nature website. Annotated bibliographies, volumes 1-5, www.childrenandnature.org.

Cole, S.T., C.D. Vessell, and T. Zhu. 2002. 2002 State Economic Impacts of Missouri State Park Visitors. Department of Parks, Recreation, & Tourism, School of Natural Resources, University of Missouri-Columbia, 7pp.

Institute at the Golden Gate. No date. Park prescriptions. www.instituteatgoldengate.org, 40 pp+.

Katy Trail State Park 2011 Economic Impact Study. Synergy Group, Pragmatic Research Inc., and James Pona Associates. In preparation.

Kellert, S.R. In preparation. The birthright of a true humanity: people and nature in the modern world. Yale University Press, New Haven, Connecticut.

Kellert, S.R. 2005. Building for life: understanding and designing the human-nature connection. Washington, D.C., Island Press. 250pp.

Louv, R. 2005. Last child in the woods. Algonquin Press of Chapel Hill, 323 pp.

Louv, R. 2011. *The nature principle: human restoration and the end of nature-deficit disorder*. Algonquin Press of Chapel Hill, 317 pp.

Missouri Division of State Park 2011 attendance estimates,
<http://mostateparks.com/sites/default/files/attend%202011.pdf>

Missouri Division of Tourism 2011 Visitation Data.

Stynes, D., D.B. Propst, W. Chang, and Y. Sun 2000. *Estimating National Park visitor spending and economic impacts; the MGM2 Model*. Department of Community, Agriculture, Recreation and Resource Studies, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan 48824-1222.

Stynes, D. 2010. *MGM2: Money Generation Model, Version 2*. Department of Community, Agriculture, Recreation and Resource Studies, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan 48824-1222, <http://web4.canr.msu.edu/mgm2/> (Retrieved, January 4, 2010).

Witter, D.J. 2007. *Missouri Department of Natural Resources: State Park Visitor Study, 2005-2006*. D.J. Case & Associates, 184 pp.

Witter, D.J. 2010. *Impacts of participant spending on the local economy: Katy Trail Rides 2007-2009*. D.J. Case & Associates, 14 pp.

Appendix A:
Attendance and Expenditure Estimates, Missouri State Parks 2011

<u>MO DNR Facility</u>	<u>2011 Visitation</u>	<u>\$/Visitor/Day</u>	<u>Expenditures</u>
ARROW ROCK SHS	98,163	\$58.00	\$5,693,454.00
BATTLE OF ATHENS SHS	73,282	\$58.00	\$4,250,356.00
BATTLE OF CARTHAGE SHS	14,004	\$58.00	\$812,232.00
BATTLE OF LEXINGTON SHS	33,416	\$58.00	\$1,938,128.00
BENNETT SPRING CONCESSION	32,443	\$0.00	\$0.00
BENNETT SPRING SP	716,761	\$43.00	\$30,820,723.00
BENTON HOME & STUDIO SHS	2,870	\$61.00	\$175,070.00
BIG LAKE CONCESSION	1,300	\$0.00	\$0.00
BIG LAKE SP	140,839	\$43.00	\$6,056,077.00
BIG OAK TREE SP	30,855	\$43.00	\$1,326,765.00
BIG SUGAR CREEK SP	13,464	\$43.00	\$578,952.00
BOLLINGER MILL SHS	38,309	\$58.00	\$2,221,922.00
BOTHWELL LODGE SHS	43,632	\$61.00	\$2,661,552.00
CASTLEWOOD SP	527,800	\$43.00	\$22,695,400.00
CLARKS HILL-NORTON SHS	3,270	\$58.00	\$189,660.00
CONFEDERATE MEMORIAL SHS	145,722	\$58.00	\$8,451,876.00
CROWDER SP	188,248	\$43.00	\$8,094,664.00
CUIVRE RIVER SP	360,284	\$43.00	\$15,492,212.00
DEUTSCHHEIM SHS	3,174	\$58.00	\$184,092.00
DILLARD MILL SHS	39,785	\$58.00	\$2,307,530.00
DR. EDMUND A BABLER SP	307,465	\$43.00	\$13,220,995.00
TED & PAT JONES-CONFLUENCE POINT SP	18,220	\$43.00	\$783,460.00
ELEPHANT ROCK SP	300,237	\$43.00	\$12,910,191.00
FELIX VALLE HOUSE SHS	14,084	\$61.00	\$859,124.00
FINGER LAKES SP	128,138	\$43.00	\$5,509,934.00
FIRST MISSOURI STATE CAPITOL SHS	51,567	\$58.00	\$2,990,886.00
FORT DAVIDSON SHS	55,865	\$58.00	\$3,240,170.00
GRAHAM CAVE SP	96,477	\$43.00	\$4,148,511.00
GRAND GULF SP	58,808	\$43.00	\$2,528,744.00
HA HA TONKA SP	523,531	\$43.00	\$22,511,833.00
HARRY S TRUMAN BIRTHPLACE SHS	5,983	\$61.00	\$364,963.00
HARRY S TRUMAN SP	231,074	\$58.00	\$13,402,292.00
HAWN SP	4,903	\$43.00	\$210,829.00
HUNTER-DAWSON SHS	2,264	\$58.00	\$131,312.00
ILINIWEK VILLAGE SHS	18,729	\$58.00	\$1,086,282.00
JOHNSONS SHUT-INS SP	309,755	\$43.00	\$13,319,465.00
KATY TRAIL SP	400,000	\$45.00	\$18,000,000.00
KNOB NOSTER SP	230,638	\$43.00	\$9,917,434.00

MO DNR Facility	2011 Visitation	\$/Visitor/Day	Expenditures
LAKE OF THE OZARKS SP	2,188,586	\$43.00	\$94,109,198.00
LAKE WAPPAPELLO CONCESSION	3,157	\$0.00	\$0.00
LAKE WAPPAPELLO SP	52,731	\$43.00	\$2,267,433.00
LEWIS & CLARK SP	95,962	\$43.00	\$4,126,366.00
LOCUST CREEK COVERED BRIDGE SHS	8,654	\$58.00	\$501,932.00
LONG BRANCH SP	338,490	\$43.00	\$14,555,070.00
MARK TWAIN BIRTHPLACE SHS	36,763	\$61.00	\$2,242,543.00
MARK TWAIN SP	282,838	\$43.00	\$12,162,034.00
MASTODON SHS	164,174	\$58.00	\$9,522,092.00
MERAMEC CONCESSION	8,392	\$0.00	\$0.00
MERAMEC SP	476,459	\$43.00	\$20,487,737.00
MISSOURI MINES SHS	29,336	\$58.00	\$1,701,488.00
MISSOURI STATE MUSEUM	458,746	\$58.00	\$26,607,268.00
MONTAUK CONCESSION	23,610	\$0.00	\$0.00
MONTAUK SP	443,667	\$43.00	\$19,077,681.00
MORRIS SP	8,627	\$43.00	\$370,961.00
NATHAN BOONE HOMESTEAD SHS	14,500	\$61.00	\$884,500.00
ONONDAGA CAVE SP	233,804	\$43.00	\$10,053,572.00
OSAGE VILLAGE SHS	1,067	\$58.00	\$61,886.00
OZARK CAVERNS (Lake Ozark SP)	8,108	\$8.00	\$64,864.00
PERSHING BOYHOOD HOME SHS	6,081	\$61.00	\$370,941.00
PERSHING SP	53,304	\$43.00	\$2,292,072.00
POMME DE TERRE SP	379,740	\$43.00	\$16,328,820.00
PRAIRIE SP	43,233	\$43.00	\$1,859,019.00
ROARING RIVER CONCESSION	19,706	\$0.00	\$0.00
ROARING RIVER SP	557,115	\$43.00	\$23,955,945.00
ROBERTSVILLE SP	65,678	\$43.00	\$2,824,154.00
ROCK BRIDGE SP	292,044	\$43.00	\$12,557,892.00
ROUTE 66 SP	183,070	\$43.00	\$7,872,010.00
SAM A BAKER CONCESSION	8,603	\$0.00	\$0.00
SAM A BAKER SP	711,361	\$43.00	\$30,588,523.00
SANDY CREEK COVERED BRIDGE SHS	111,471	\$58.00	\$6,465,318.00
SAPPINGTON CEMETERY SHS	4,488	\$58.00	\$260,304.00
SCOTT JOPLIN SHS	3,924	\$61.00	\$239,364.00
ST. FRANCOIS SP	317,481	\$43.00	\$13,651,683.00
ST. JOE SP	629,737	\$43.00	\$27,078,691.00
STOCKTON CONCESSION	4,751	\$0.00	\$0.00
STOCKTON SP	271,342	\$43.00	\$11,667,706.00
TABLE ROCK SP	1,194,027	\$43.00	\$51,343,161.00
TAUM SAUK MOUNTAIN SP	83,007	\$43.00	\$3,569,301.00

<u>MO DNR Facility</u>	<u>2011 Visitation</u>	<u>\$/Visitor/Day</u>	<u>Expenditures</u>
THOUSAND HILLS CONCESSION	5,296	\$0.00	\$0.00
THOUSAND HILLS SP	422,837	\$43.00	\$18,181,991.00
TOWOSAHGY SHS	399	\$58.00	\$23,142.00
TRAIL OF TEARS SP	211,561	\$58.00	\$12,270,538.00
UNION COVERED BRIDGE SHS	30,729	\$58.00	\$1,782,282.00
VAN METER SP & SHS	19,123	\$43.00	\$822,289.00
WAKONDA SP	91,848	\$43.00	\$3,949,464.00
WALLACE SP	208,461	\$43.00	\$8,963,823.00
WASHINGTON CONCESSION	3,838	\$0.00	\$0.00
WASHINGTON SP	798,757	\$43.00	\$34,346,551.00
WATKINS MILL SP	482,813	\$43.00	\$20,760,959.00
WESTON BEND SP	132,902	\$43.00	\$5,714,786.00
TOTALS	17,491,757		\$777,624,444.00