

0024619

**From:** [Cyndy Holda](#)  
**To:** [atmmhgm@aol.com](mailto:atmmhgm@aol.com)  
**Cc:** [Mike Murray](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Fwd: NPS visitor spending report 2008  
**Date:** 11/09/2009 01:55 PM

---

Thank you Mary Helen for this information. I will pass it along for Mike Murray's review.

Cyndy M. Holda  
Public Affairs Specialist  
Cape Hatteras NS/Fort Raleigh NHS/Wright Brothers NM  
252-473-2111 ext. 148  
252-216-6455 cell  
252-473-2595 fax  
Email: [cyndy\\_holda@nps.gov](mailto:cyndy_holda@nps.gov)

▼ [atmmhgm@aol.com](mailto:atmmhgm@aol.com)

**atmmhgm@aol.com**

11/09/2009 12:26 PM

To: [Cyndy\\_Holda@nps.gov](mailto:Cyndy_Holda@nps.gov)  
cc  
Subject: Fwd: NPS visitor spending report 2008

FYI

-----Original Message-----

From: [stynes <stynes@msu.edu>](mailto:stynes@msu.edu)  
To: [atmmhgm@aol.com](mailto:atmmhgm@aol.com)  
Sent: Mon, Nov 9, 2009 11:50 am  
Subject: Re: NPS visitor spending report 2008

The "payroll spending" column in Table A4 is not the sum of salary and benefits from Table A2, but instead an estimate of household spending in the local area associated with the NPS salary. It is less than the NPS salary as only a portion of the salary earned by NPS employees is spent in the local area supporting local jobs. In table A4 we add the sales associated with visitor spending to the sales associated with park payroll and should probably label this total sales rather than total spending. We will likely modify Table A4 next year as this is confusing. Problem is NPS wanted to add the visitor spending and payroll impacts. This can be done for income and jobs, but sales (or spending) is messier, as payroll figures represent income while visitor spending represents sales (only about a third of sales goes to income).

The increase in visitor spending compared to 2007 is due to updating of the spending averages for CAHA. Since we do not have a visitor survey with spending data for CAHA, the spending averages are estimated based on VSP studies at other parks.

Thru 2007, the averages were based on some rough estimates made by park managers in 2001 that were price adjusted each year. In 2008, the MGM2 high spending averages were assigned to CAHA. These averages come from VSP surveys. Old averages in 2007 on a party night basis were \$45 for locals, \$72 for non-local day trips, \$79 for campers in the park, \$210 for motels, and \$76 for campers outside the park. The updated figures for 2008 are : \$59 for locals, \$98 for non-local day trips, \$120 for campers in park, \$312 for motel stays, and \$149 for campers outside the park. The new figures are based on visitor surveys at other national park units. If you are aware of any recent visitor surveys at CAHA with spending data or feel the new averages are too high, please let me know. I've classified CAHA as a high spending area based on tourism development and room rates in the area.

At 10:53 AM 11/8/2009, you wrote:

Greetings:

<?xml:namespace prefix = o ns = "urn:schemas-microsoft-com:office:office" />

Please check the 2008 visitor statistics and income generated as reported for Cape Hatteras National Seashore in Tables A-1 and A-4.

When compared to 2007, recreational visits decreased but non-local visitor spending increased.

Additionally, on Table A-4 for 2008, NPS payroll spending is not the total of salary and payroll benefits as reported on Table A-2.

Thank you,  
Mary Helen Goodloe-Murphy  
The Coastland Times  
Manteo, NC  
[atmmhgm@aol.com](mailto:atmmhgm@aol.com)  
252-987-1303