



2025 Economic Contributions & Impacts of Arizona State Parks

Dari Duval and Claudia Montaña
University of Arizona Cooperative Extension

June 2026



THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
Cooperative Extension

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Arizona State Parks and Trails, particularly Katharine Schinzel, *Business Analyst*, and Dawn Collins, PhD, PMP, *Executive Project Manager*, for their ongoing partnership and the immense effort that went into coordinating and managing the 2025 Visitor Survey which informed this analysis.

We would also like to thank the interns and park personnel who were involved with in-person survey administration throughout 2025.

Finally, we would like to recognize the hard work of three Graduate Research Assistants, Nick Tennes, Joseph Lanser, and Grayson Alt, who were involved in survey digitization, and database cleaning and validation. This project would not have been possible without their support.

© 2026 University of Arizona Cooperative Extension

Any products, services or organizations that are mentioned, shown or indirectly implied in this publication do not imply endorsement by The University of Arizona. Issued in furtherance of Cooperative Extension work, acts of May 8 and June 30, 1914, in cooperation with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Edward Martin, Director, Extension & Economic Development, College of Agriculture Life Sciences, The University of Arizona. The University of Arizona is an equal opportunity, affirmative action institution. The University does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, disability, veteran status, or sexual orientation in its programs and activities.

Contents

Executive Summary.....	8
Introduction.....	10
Data & Methods	14
Visitor Survey	14
Visitor Spending Patterns	14
Economic Impact & Contribution Analysis	15
Park Visitor Spending Patterns	17
Alamo Lake State Park.....	17
Buckskin Mountain State Park.....	18
Catalina State Park.....	18
Cattail Cove State Park.....	19
Colorado River State Historic Park	19
Dead Horse Ranch State Park	20
Fool Hollow Lake Recreation Area.....	20
Fort Verde State Historic Park	21
Granite Mountain Hotshots Memorial State Park	21
Homolovi State Park.....	22
Jerome State Historic Park	22
Kartchner Caverns State Park	23
Lake Havasu State Park	23
Lost Dutchman State Park	24
Lyman Lake State Park.....	24
McFarland State Historic Park.....	25
Oracle State Park	25
Patagonia Lake State Park.....	26
Picacho Peak State Park	26
Red Rock State Park	27
Riordan Mansion State Park	27
River Island State Park.....	28
Rockin' River Ranch State Park.....	28

Roper Lake State Park.....	29
Slide Rock State Park.....	29
Tombstone Courthouse State Historic Park	30
Tonto Natural Bridge State Park.....	30
Tubac Presidio State Historic Park.....	31
Yuma Territorial Prison State Historic Park	31
County Economic Impact Analysis Results	32
Apache County	33
Cochise County	34
Coconino County	35
Gila County.....	36
Graham County.....	37
La Paz County	38
Mohave County	39
Navajo County	40
Pima County	41
Pinal County	42
Santa Cruz County	43
Yavapai County	44
Yuma County	45
State Economic Contribution Analysis Results	46
Trends in Visitor Spending	47
References	48

Figures

Figure 1. Summary of Economic Contribution & Impact Results	9
Figure 2. Map of Arizona State Parks.....	10
Figure 3. 2025 Monthly Visits by Arizona State Park, Top 5 Parks by Visits & All Other Parks.....	12
Figure 4. Arizona State Parks Annual Visits, 1997-2025	12
Figure 5. Data Sources & Estimation Process	14
Figure 6. Relationship between Sales, Value Added, and Labor Income	16

Tables

Table 1. Units in the Arizona State Park System by County Included in Report	11
Table 2. Annual Visits to Arizona State Parks, Calendar Years 2020 and 2025, and Percent Change	13
Table 3. Spending Category Mapping to IMPLAN Industries	15
Table 4. Alamo Lake State Park Visitor Spending Patterns, 2025	17
Table 5. Buckskin Mountain State Park Visitor Spending Patterns, 2025	18
Table 6. Catalina State Park Visitor Spending Patterns, 2025	18
Table 7. Cattail Cove State Park Visitor Spending Patterns, 2025	19
Table 8. Colorado River State Historic Park Visitor Spending Patterns, 2025	19
Table 9. Dead Horse Ranch State Park Visitor Spending Patterns, 2025.....	20
Table 10. Fool Hollow Lake Recreation Area Visitor Spending Patterns, 2025	20
Table 11. Fort Verde State Historic Park Visitor Spending Patterns, 2025.....	21
Table 12. Granite Mountain Hotshots Memorial State Park Visitor Spending Patterns, 2025	21
Table 13. Homolovi State Park Visitor Spending Patterns, 2025	22
Table 14. Jerome State Historic Park Visitor Spending Patterns, 2025	22
Table 15. Kartchner Caverns State Park Visitor Spending Patterns, 2025.....	23
Table 16. Lake Havasu State Park Visitor Spending Patterns, 2025.....	23
Table 17. Lost Dutchman State Park Visitor Spending Patterns, 2025.....	24
Table 18. Lyman Lake State Park Visitor Spending Patterns, 2025	24
Table 19. McFarland State Historic Park Visitor Spending Patterns, 2025	25
Table 20. Oracle State Park Visitor Spending Patterns, 2025	25
Table 21. Patagonia Lake State Park Visitor Spending Patterns, 2025	26
Table 22. Picacho Peak State Park Visitor Spending Patterns, 2025.....	26
Table 23. Red Rock State Park Visitor Spending Patterns, 2025.....	27
Table 24. Riordan Mansion State Historic Park Visitor Spending Patterns, 2025	27
Table 25. River Island State Park Visitor Spending Patterns, 2025	28
Table 26. Rockin' River Ranch State Park Visitor Spending Patterns, 2025	28
Table 27. Roper Lake State Park Visitor Spending Patterns, 2025	29
Table 28. Slide Rock State Park Visitor Spending Patterns, 2025	29
Table 29. Tombstone Courthouse State Historic Park Visitor Spending Patterns, 2025.....	30

Table 30. Tonto Natural Bridge State Park Visitor Spending Patterns, 2025	30
Table 31. Tubac Presidio State Historic Park Visitor Spending Patterns, 2025	31
Table 32. Yuma Territorial Prison State Historic Park Visitor Spending Patterns, 2025	31
Table 33. Apache County Non-Local Visitor Spending Economic Impact Estimates	33
Table 34. Cochise County Non-Local Visitor Spending Economic Impact Estimates	34
Table 35. Coconino County Non-Local Visitor Spending Economic Impact Estimates	35
Table 36. Gila County Non-Local Visitor Spending Economic Impact Estimates	36
Table 37. Graham County Non-Local Visitor Spending Economic Impact Estimates	37
Table 38. La Paz County Non-Local Visitor Spending Economic Impact Estimates	38
Table 39. Mohave County Non-Local Visitor Spending Economic Impact Estimates	39
Table 40. Navajo County Non-Local Visitor Spending Economic Impact Estimates	40
Table 41. Pima County Non-Local Visitor Spending Economic Impact Estimates	41
Table 42. Pinal County Non-Local Visitor Spending Economic Impact Estimates	42
Table 43. Santa Cruz County Non-Local Visitor Spending Economic Impact Estimates	43
Table 44. Yavapai County Non-Local Visitor Spending Economic Impact Estimates	44
Table 45. Yuma County Non-Local Visitor Spending Economic Impact Estimates	45
Table 46. Statewide Visitor Spending Economic Contribution Estimates.....	46
Table 47. Comparison of Arizona State Park Visitor Spending Economic Impact & Contribution Estimates Across Study Years, FY2007 to Calendar Year 2025.....	47

Glossary

CY – Calendar year

FY – Fiscal year

MSP – Memorial State Park

SHP – State Historic Park

SNA – State Natural Area

SP – State Park

Executive Summary

What is the issue?

Arizona State Parks and Trails offers a system of recreation, historic, conservation parks, and state natural areas for public use. The parks host a variety of amenities such as trails, camping facilities, cabins, park stores, and visitor centers. Parks engage in regular programming like tours and ranger-led activities, but also special events. Parks are located throughout the state, in all but 2 of Arizona's 15 counties. These parks attract local visitors, but also non-local visitors from in-state, out-of-state, and internationally. Non-local visitation supports regional outdoor recreation and tourism economies in the form of jobs, income, and tax revenues. This is especially important in rural areas of the state. This report quantifies the importance of Arizona State Parks to regional economies by estimating the economic contributions and impacts of state park visitor spending. This includes a statewide economic contribution estimate for total visitor spending as well as individual county-level economic impacts of non-local visitor spending for the year 2025.

What did the study find?

Visitors to Arizona State Parks had direct spending of \$355 million within 50 miles of the parks they visited, \$308 million of which was non-local spending

Of the \$355 million in direct visitor spending, approximately \$308 million came from non-local visitors – those residing outside the park's county and whose zip codes fall outside a 50-mile radius of the park. This means that visitor spending associated with state parks supports the infusion of revenues into regional economies, especially important to rural areas.

Arizona State Parks supported a total statewide economic contribution of \$555 million in sales and \$273 million in GDP in 2025


An estimated total of \$355 million in direct state park visitor spending in 2025 generated roughly \$99 million in indirect business-to-business economic activity and \$102 million in induced household-to-business transactions, supporting a total of roughly \$555 million in statewide economic activity. This supported an estimated \$273 million in gross state product (value added), \$151 million in labor income, and nearly 3,000 jobs statewide. An estimated \$18 million in state tax revenues and \$14 million in county and local tax revenues were supported.

On a per-visitor basis, inflation-adjusted non-local spending increased between FY2020 and 2025

On average, non-local visitors spent \$144.91 in the area surrounding state parks in 2025, compared to \$117.30 in 2020, an increase of roughly 24% when adjusted for inflation to 2025 dollars.

County-level economic impacts and the statewide economic contribution are summarized in Figure 1.

Figure 1. Summary of Economic Contribution & Impact Results



How was the study done?

Visitor spending patterns were developed using responses from the 2025 Arizona State Parks Visitor Survey (Duval et al., 2026, unpublished). The estimated visitor spending patterns were then applied to visitor counts (NAU EPI, 2026) to estimate the direct effects, or the total spending in and around Arizona state parks. Indirect and induced economic multiplier effects were estimated using the 2024 IMPLAN Pro Arizona model and data (IMPLAN Group, LLC, 2026).

Introduction

Arizona State Parks and Trails offers a system of recreation, historic, and conservation parks, and state natural areas for public use. The parks host a variety of amenities such as trails, camping facilities, cabins, park stores, and visitor centers. Parks engage in regular programming like tours and ranger-led activities, but also special events. Parks are located throughout the state, in all but 2 of Arizona's 15 counties (Figure 2). These parks attract local visitors, but also non-local visitors from in-state, out-of-state, and internationally. Non-local visitation supports regional outdoor recreation and tourism economies in the form of jobs, income, and tax revenues. This is especially important in rural areas of the state.

This report quantifies the importance of Arizona State Parks to regional economies by estimating the economic contributions and impacts of state park visitor spending in 2025. This includes a statewide economic contribution estimate as well as individual county-level economic impacts of non-local visitor spending.

Figure 2. Map of Arizona State Parks




This analysis considers visitor spending associated with individual parks. Table 1 presents the parks considered in this analysis, as well as the counties where each is located.

Table 1. Units in the Arizona State Park System by County Included in Report

Park Unit	County
Lyman Lake State Park	Apache
Kartchner Caverns State Park	Cochise
Tombstone Courthouse State Historic Park	Cochise
Riordan Mansion State Historic Park	Coconino
Slide Rock State Park	Coconino
Tonto Natural Bridge State Park	Gila
Roper Lake State Park (includes Dankworth Pond SP)	Graham
Alamo Lake State Park	La Paz
Buckskin Mountain State Park	La Paz
River Island State Park	La Paz
Cattail Cove State Park	Mohave
Lake Havasu State Park	Mohave
Fool Hollow Lake Recreation Area	Navajo
Homolovi State Park	Navajo
Catalina State Park	Pima
Lost Dutchman State Park	Pinal
McFarland State Historic Park	Pinal
Oracle State Park	Pinal
Picacho Peak State Park	Pinal
Patagonia Lake State Park (includes Sonoita Creek SNA)	Santa Cruz
Sonoita Creek State Natural Area	Santa Cruz
Tubac Presidio State Historic Park	Santa Cruz
Dead Horse Ranch State Park (includes Verde River Greenway SNA)	Yavapai
Fort Verde State Historic Park	Yavapai
Granite Mountain Hotshots Memorial State Park	Yavapai
Jerome State Historic Park	Yavapai
Red Rock State Park	Yavapai
Rockin' River Ranch State Park	Yavapai
Colorado River State Historic Park	Yuma
Yuma Territorial Prison State Historic Park	Yuma


There were over 2,847,000 visits to Arizona State Parks recorded in 2025. Visits were highest overall in the month of March, followed by April and January (Figure 3). The parks with the most visits were Lake Havasu State Park, Slide Rock State Park, Catalina State Park, and Patagonia Lake State Park. All four of these parks are recreation-oriented parks. Of these parks, only Slide Rock does not offer overnight camping.

Figure 3. 2025 Monthly Visits by Arizona State Park, Top 5 Parks by Visits & All Other Parks



Total annual visits to Arizona State Parks increased by over 50% between 2011 and 2018; since then, visitation has remained steady or declined slightly (Figure 4).

Figure 4. Arizona State Parks Annual Visits, 1997-2025



COVID had major impacts on visitation to Arizona's state parks in 2020 when the last visitor survey and economic contribution study were conducted. In particular, visitation to historic parks and other parks with confined or indoor settings was curtailed, while demand for open-air outdoor recreation opportunities increased. Since 2020, visitation has returned to more normal levels. This is reflected in a change in visitation between 2020 and 2025, with large increases in visitation to historic parks (which feature indoor facilities), and decreases in visitation to recreation and conservation parks (Table 2). Overall, visitation declined by 4% between calendar years 2020 and 2025.

Table 2. Annual Visits to Arizona State Parks, Calendar Years 2020 and 2025, and Percent Change

Park	2020 Visits	2025 Visits	Change
Alamo	72,244	79,113	10%
Buckskin Mountain	86,787	51,498	-41%
Catalina	247,018	241,606	-2%
Cattail Cove	116,822	85,255	-27%
Colorado River (Yuma Crossing)	7,323	14,336	96%
Dead Horse Ranch	231,202	189,662	-18%
Fool Hollow	160,370	108,405	-32%
Fort Verde	6,186	8,769	42%
Granite Mountain Hotshots	27,098	18,360	-32%
Homolovi	24,570	27,797	13%
Jerome	26,316	41,914	59%
Kartchner Caverns	82,390	122,055	48%
Lake Havasu	598,403	446,529	-25%
Lost Dutchman	201,737	188,842	-6%
Lyman Lake	79,554	29,809	-63%
McFarland	2,942	5,790	97%
Oracle	13,923	12,998	-7%
Patagonia Lake	237,999	237,284	0%
Picacho Peak	103,525	96,222	-7%
Red Rock	72,218	76,217	6%
Riordan Mansion	2,478	13,236	434%
River Island	33,308	27,722	-17%
Rockin' River Ranch*	N/A	5,672	N/A
Roper Lake	95,921	58,639	-39%
Slide Rock	290,186	435,086	50%
Tombstone	25,770	30,926	20%
Tonto	70,767	128,765	82%
Tubac	4,820	11,420	137%
Yuma Territorial Prison	39,894	53,094	33%
Arizona Total	2,961,771	2,847,021	-4%

* Rockin' River Ranch State Park opened to the public in 2024

The remainder of the report is structured as follows: we present the data and methods used for the analyses. We then provide estimated visitor spending patterns by park. County economic impact estimates and the estimated statewide economic contribution analysis follow. Finally, we conclude the report with a comparison of results from this study to previous studies to understand trends in visitor spending.

Data & Methods

This report presents the statewide economic contribution of Arizona's state parks, and individual county-level economic impacts of each county's state parks. Whereas the statewide economic contribution analysis presented in this report includes the spending of all visitors regardless of their county or state of origin, local economic impacts exclude the spending of local residents, which does not represent an influx of revenues into the local economy. Separate visitor spending patterns were constructed for each park: one for non-local visitors, and one for local visitors.

Visitor spending patterns were developed using responses from the 2025 Arizona State Parks Visitor Survey (Duval et al., 2026, unpublished). The estimated visitor spending patterns were then applied to visitor counts (NAU EPI, 2026) (Table 2) to estimate the direct effects, or the total spending in and around Arizona state parks. Indirect and induced economic multiplier effects were estimated using the 2024 IMPLAN Pro Arizona model and data (IMPLAN Group, LLC, 2026). Figure 5 illustrates the data and process used in estimating economic impacts and contributions in this study.

Figure 5. Data Sources & Estimation Process



Visitor Survey

This study relies on a survey of visitors to Arizona State Parks between January and December 2025 (Duval & Montaña, 2026). A total of 10,693 observations were collected from 30 of Arizona's state parks and natural areas. The survey asked visitors to report their spending in and within 50 miles of the state park. Other questions asked about visitor characteristics and their experience and satisfaction with their visit. Of the total 10,693 survey responses, 8,600 included usable visitor expenditure data, either information on whether or not expenditures were made in a particular category, or specific spending information by category.

Visitor Spending Patterns

Representative visitor spending patterns were developed for non-local visitors and local visitors for each park using visitor survey responses to questions on spending, reported visitor zip codes of origin, reported group size (Duval & Montaña, 2026), and Arizona State Parks and Trails annual visitation statistics (NAU EPI, 2026). These measures were combined to estimate total non-local spending within 50 miles of each park by non-local visitors, as well as total visitor spending regardless of visitor origin.

Economic Impact & Contribution Analysis

The benefits of parks can be measured in a variety of ways. Some measures are monetary in nature, while others cannot be easily monetized. Similarly, some measures are based on market transactions (the purchase or sale of a good or service), while others are not. This study measures two types of economic effects of state parks: local (county) economic impacts and statewide economic contributions. Both measures are rooted in visitor spending. State parks attract visitors, often from outside the local area, who spend money on lodging, meals, and incidental expenditures. This spending is important to local economies, supporting businesses and jobs. Many state parks are located in rural areas where visitor spending is an important source of livelihood for local residents.

For the economic impact and economic contribution analyses conducted in this study, economic multiplier effects were estimated using the IMPLAN Pro model and 2024 data (IMPLAN Group, LLC, 2026). County economic impact analyses were run using the IMPLAN county model corresponding to the county where the state park is located. Visitor spending by category was modeled as industry contribution analyses. The statewide economic contribution analysis used the state model and similarly modeled visitor spending by category as industry contribution analyses. Visitor spending by category was assigned to IMPLAN industries as detailed in Table 3.

Table 3. Spending Category Mapping to IMPLAN Industries

Spending Category	IMPLAN Industry
Admission, recreation, & entertainment fees	486 Other amusement & recreation industries
Camping fees & charges	490 Other accommodations
Lodging	489 Hotels & motels, including casino hotels
Groceries	389 Retail - Food & beverage stores*
Food & beverage	491 Full-service restaurants
Retail shopping	394 Retail - General merchandise stores*
Auto expenses	391 Gasoline stores
Any other expenses	395 Retail - Miscellaneous store retailers*


* For expenditures at retail (groceries, retail shopping, and other expenses), gross visitor spending was margined using IMPLAN published retail margins by industry for purposes of calculating multiplier effects. Direct spending was calculated as gross retail spending.

Both economic impacts and economic contributions are presented using different measures.

Sales, also referred to as output, measures the total value of transactions within the economy. In that sense, it may double-count some economic activity occurring within a region because the final sales value of a good or service includes all inputs to production. For example, if a restaurant sold food that was made using produce from a local farm, the cost of the produce from the local farm would get counted twice: once as the sale of produce, and once as part of the meal sold to the restaurant customer. **Value added** is a measure equivalent to gross domestic product (or GDP) that avoids double-counting inputs to production. It measures the net value of a good and service above and beyond the value of inputs. Value added includes labor income, profits and other rents, and

taxes. **Labor income**, a component of value added, measures wages, salaries, and benefits to employees, as well as business owner income. The relationship between these three measures is presented in Figure 6. Because these measures are components of one another, they are not additive and convention is to report them separately. Finally, beyond these measures, economic impacts and contributions can also be measured in terms of the number of **jobs** that are supported through direct, indirect, and induced multiplier effects. **Tax revenues**, a component of value added, are often presented separately because they are of interest to local governments as they consider policies that may impact businesses and industries, thereby influencing the local tax base.

Figure 6. Relationship between Sales, Value Added, and Labor Income



Economic impact and contribution analyses measure what are known as economic multiplier effects. When visitor spending (or “demand”) is generated within a particular industry or business (direct effect), in order to provide that good or service, the business or industry in turn requires inputs of goods and services to operate and provide the good or service demanded. Some of those inputs will be purchased within the local economy, and this effect continues, while dissipating due to non-local purchases of inputs. This cascade of business-to-business purchases, made in order to operate and serve customers, is known as **indirect multiplier effects**. Another effect occurs when individuals employed in businesses or industries spend their income on household goods and services within the local economy, known as **induced effects**. Again, the effect dissipates gradually in subsequent rounds of purchases due to purchases fulfilled from outside the local economy. Adding the direct, indirect, and induced effects, we obtain the **total economic impact or contribution**, which is typically larger than the direct effect. The ratio of the total economic contribution or economic impact to the direct effect is known as the **multiplier**.

Park Visitor Spending Patterns

The following section reports estimated average per-party visitor spending patterns, separated by park and by whether visitors are local or non-local. For each spending category, we report two things: how many visitor groups spent money in that category, and how much they spent on average. Readers may see occasional unexpected results, for example, higher spending on lodging by local visitors than non-local visitors. This likely reflects relatively small shares of local visitors at some parks, some of whom may have had high spending in individual categories, affecting the average. Nonetheless, because this is a small share of visitors, its influence on overall estimated visitor spending should be minimal.

Alamo Lake State Park

Alamo Lake State Park in La Paz County is located along the Bill Williams River, created by the Alamo Dam project constructed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. In addition to water-based recreation, the park offers fishing and overnight camping. Visitation in 2025 was 79,113, and an estimated 89% of visitors were non-local (from over 50 miles away). The average party size was 3.5 people for both local and non-local parties. Table 4 presents the estimated spending patterns for non-local and local visitors to Alamo Lake State Park.

Table 4. Alamo Lake State Park Visitor Spending Patterns, 2025

Expenditure Category	Percent of Parties with Expenditures		Average Amount per Party with Expenses	
	<i>Non-Local</i>	<i>Local</i>	<i>Non-Local</i>	<i>Local</i>
Admission, recreation, & entertainment fees	21%	24%	\$69	\$50
Camping fees & charges	77%	76%	\$178	\$167
Lodging	8%	3%	\$205	\$225
Groceries	47%	24%	\$108	\$86
Food & beverage	34%	41%	\$85	\$87
Retail shopping	28%	22%	\$97	\$29
Auto expenses	52%	24%	\$142	\$124
Any other expenses	6%	14%	\$163	\$101

Buckskin Mountain State Park

Buckskin Mountain State Park is a recreational state park situated on the Colorado River near Parker, Arizona, in La Paz County. Opened in 1967, the park provides recreational infrastructure like campgrounds, shaded picnic areas, showers, restrooms, and river access. In 2025, the park received 51,498 visits, of which an estimated 96% were non-local (from over 50 miles away). The average party size was 4.5 for local parties and 3.9 for non-local parties. Table 5 presents the estimated spending patterns for non-local and local visitors to Buckskin Mountain State Park.

Table 5. Buckskin Mountain State Park Visitor Spending Patterns, 2025

Expenditure Category	Percent of Parties with Expenditures		Average Amount per Party with Expenses	
	<i>Non-Local</i>	<i>Local</i>	<i>Non-Local</i>	<i>Local</i>
Admission, recreation, & entertainment fees	22%	40%	\$123	\$121
Camping fees & charges	80%	60%	\$225	\$344
Lodging	6%	10%	\$364	\$200
Groceries	68%	60%	\$175	\$242
Food & beverage	62%	50%	\$134	\$202
Retail shopping	35%	20%	\$87	\$60
Auto expenses	73%	30%	\$142	\$70
Any other expenses	6%	10%	\$286	\$50

Catalina State Park

Catalina State Park was created through legislative action in the 1970s to preserve an area north of Tucson in Pima County. The park opened in 1983 and today offers recreational opportunities such as camping and hiking. There were a total of 241,606 visitors in 2025, of which 51% were non-local (from over 50 miles away). The average party size was 2.5 for local parties and 2.7 for non-local parties. Table 6 presents the estimated spending patterns for non-local and local visitors to Catalina State Park.

Table 6. Catalina State Park Visitor Spending Patterns, 2025

Expenditure Category	Percent of Parties with Expenditures		Average Amount per Party with Expenses	
	<i>Non-Local</i>	<i>Local</i>	<i>Non-Local</i>	<i>Local</i>
Admission, recreation, & entertainment fees	54%	50%	\$74	\$42
Camping fees & charges	54%	14%	\$241	\$111
Lodging	15%	1%	\$670	\$263
Groceries	64%	33%	\$168	\$109
Food & beverage	65%	50%	\$159	\$78
Retail shopping	36%	13%	\$123	\$155
Auto expenses	62%	31%	\$141	\$44
Any other expenses	8%	0%	\$331	N/A

Cattail Cove State Park

Cattail Cove State Park is one of three state parks located along the shores of Lake Havasu. The park is located in Mohave County and offers lake access for recreation. The park received a total of 85,255 visits in 2025, of which 83% were non-local (from over 50 miles away). The average party size was 4.6 for local parties and 4.8 for non-local parties. Table 7 presents the estimated spending patterns for non-local and local visitors to Cattail Cove State Park.

Table 7. Cattail Cove State Park Visitor Spending Patterns, 2025

Expenditure Category	Percent of Parties with Expenditures		Average Amount per Party with Expenses	
	<i>Non-Local</i>	<i>Local</i>	<i>Non-Local</i>	<i>Local</i>
Admission, recreation, & entertainment fees	38%	58%	\$100	\$61
Camping fees & charges	67%	37%	\$252	\$116
Lodging	9%	2%	\$587	\$150
Groceries	69%	60%	\$200	\$140
Food & beverage	59%	50%	\$165	\$145
Retail shopping	34%	23%	\$109	\$55
Auto expenses	76%	60%	\$184	\$112
Any other expenses	9%	4%	\$289	\$200

Colorado River State Historic Park

Colorado River State Historic Park, located nearby in Yuma County, is located on the grounds of the U.S. Army Quartermaster Depot, built in 1864. The location served as a supply base for military operations in western states, transporting goods via the Colorado River. The park received 14,336 visits in 2025, 81% of which were non-local (from over 50 miles away). The average party size was 2.8 for local parties and 2.4 for non-local parties. Table 8 presents the estimated spending patterns for non-local and local visitors to Colorado River State Historic Park.

Table 8. Colorado River State Historic Park Visitor Spending Patterns, 2025

Expenditure Category	Percent of Parties with Expenditures		Average Amount per Party with Expenses	
	<i>Non-Local</i>	<i>Local</i>	<i>Non-Local</i>	<i>Local</i>
Admission, recreation, & entertainment fees	88%	89%	\$44	\$48
Camping fees & charges	12%	0%	\$300	N/A
Lodging	45%	7%	\$400	\$675
Groceries	38%	25%	\$164	\$212
Food & beverage	67%	47%	\$145	\$131
Retail shopping	38%	40%	\$105	\$101
Auto expenses	58%	23%	\$92	\$112
Any other expenses	6%	5%	\$478	\$262

Dead Horse Ranch State Park

Dead Horse Ranch State Park was first opened in 1977 and is located near the town of Cottonwood on the Verde River in Yavapai County. The park offers camping, cabins, hiking, and water-based recreation. The park received 189,662 visits in 2025, 57% of visitors were non-local (from over 50 miles away). The average party size was 2.6 for local parties and 3.1 for non-local parties. Table 9 presents the estimated spending patterns for non-local and local visitors to Dead Horse Ranch State Park.

Table 9. Dead Horse Ranch State Park Visitor Spending Patterns, 2025

Expenditure Category	Percent of Parties with Expenditures		Average Amount per Party with Expenses	
	<i>Non-Local</i>	<i>Local</i>	<i>Non-Local</i>	<i>Local</i>
Admission, recreation, & entertainment fees	52%	50%	\$82	\$53
Camping fees & charges	54%	24%	\$237	\$154
Lodging	12%	2%	\$476	\$88
Groceries	49%	32%	\$167	\$102
Food & beverage	58%	41%	\$160	\$91
Retail shopping	35%	13%	\$97	\$70
Auto expenses	58%	34%	\$139	\$46
Any other expenses	9%	11%	\$177	\$39

Fool Hollow Lake Recreation Area

Fool Hollow Lake Recreation Area was opened in 1994 as a partnership between Arizona State Parks, the City of Show Low, the U.S. Forest Service, and Arizona Game and Fish Department. The park received a total of 108,405 visits in 2025, of which 88% were non-local (from over 50 miles away). The average party size was 8.3 for local parties and 4.3 for non-local parties. Table 10 presents the estimated spending patterns for non-local and local visitors to Fool Hollow Lake Recreation Area.

Table 10. Fool Hollow Lake Recreation Area Visitor Spending Patterns, 2025

Expenditure Category	Percent of Parties with Expenditures		Average Amount per Party with Expenses	
	<i>Non-Local</i>	<i>Local</i>	<i>Non-Local</i>	<i>Local</i>
Admission, recreation, & entertainment fees	37%	61%	\$83	\$49
Camping fees & charges	64%	20%	\$234	\$108
Lodging	10%	7%	\$514	\$562
Groceries	66%	41%	\$134	\$141
Food & beverage	61%	44%	\$140	\$100
Retail shopping	34%	22%	\$96	\$109
Auto expenses	71%	34%	\$106	\$77
Any other expenses	8%	7%	\$179	\$51

Fort Verde State Historic Park

Fort Verde State Historic Park, located in Yavapai County, was opened and dedicated in 1970. The fort was established in the 1870s and served as a military base for the U.S. Army. The park received 8,769 visits in 2025, of which 85% were non-local (from over 50 miles away). The average party size was 2.6 for local parties and 2.5 for non-local parties. Table 11 presents the estimated spending patterns for non-local and local visitors to Fort Verde State Historic Park.

Table 11. Fort Verde State Historic Park Visitor Spending Patterns, 2025

Expenditure Category	Percent of Parties with Expenditures		Average Amount per Party with Expenses	
	<i>Non-Local</i>	<i>Local</i>	<i>Non-Local</i>	<i>Local</i>
Admission, recreation, & entertainment fees	89%	76%	\$48	\$29
Camping fees & charges	13%	4%	\$191	\$250
Lodging	33%	16%	\$598	\$368
Groceries	34%	8%	\$110	\$75
Food & beverage	56%	44%	\$168	\$94
Retail shopping	34%	20%	\$84	\$44
Auto expenses	48%	24%	\$102	\$45
Any other expenses	3%	0%	\$264	N/A

Granite Mountain Hotshots Memorial State Park

Granite Mountain Hotshots Memorial State Park was established to honor the lives of 19 wildland firefighters who perished during the Yarnell Hill Fire in 2013. The park includes a hiking trail and memorial. The park opened to the public in 2016 and is located in Yavapai County. The park received 18,360 visits in 2025, of which 84% were non-local (from over 50 miles away). The average party size was 2.5 for local parties and 3.3 for non-local parties. Table 12 presents the estimated spending patterns for non-local and local visitors to Granite Mountain Hotshots Memorial State Park.

Table 12. Granite Mountain Hotshots Memorial State Park Visitor Spending Patterns, 2025

Expenditure Category	Percent of Parties with Expenditures		Average Amount per Party with Expenses	
	<i>Non-Local</i>	<i>Local</i>	<i>Non-Local</i>	<i>Local</i>
Admission, recreation, & entertainment fees	11%	0%	\$66	N/A
Camping fees & charges	5%	0%	\$80	N/A
Lodging	26%	0%	\$417	N/A
Groceries	31%	17%	\$66	\$67
Food & beverage	66%	61%	\$127	\$84
Retail shopping	31%	17%	\$137	\$112
Auto expenses	64%	56%	\$59	\$45
Any other expenses	3%	6%	\$379	\$10

Homolovi State Park

Homolovi State Park opened in 1993 and was established to protect and conserve the Homolovi archaeological sites which were inhabited between AD 620 and 1400. The site, located in Navajo County, is of great cultural significance to the Hopi people. The park received 27,797 visits in 2025, of which 97% were non-local (from over 50 miles away). The average party size was 3.5 for local parties and 2.2 for non-local parties. Table 13 presents the estimated spending patterns for non-local and local visitors to Homolovi State Park.

Table 13. Homolovi State Park Visitor Spending Patterns, 2025

Expenditure Category	Percent of Parties with Expenditures		Average Amount per Party with Expenses	
	<i>Non-Local</i>	<i>Local</i>	<i>Non-Local</i>	<i>Local</i>
Admission, recreation, & entertainment fees	29%	67%	\$39	\$38
Camping fees & charges	77%	11%	\$77	\$150
Lodging	9%	0%	\$404	N/A
Groceries	39%	11%	\$84	\$200
Food & beverage	50%	33%	\$90	\$263
Retail shopping	36%	56%	\$93	\$71
Auto expenses	64%	33%	\$96	\$50
Any other expenses	4%	0%	\$63	N/A

Jerome State Historic Park

Jerome State Historic Park opened in 1965 and celebrates the state's mining history. The park consists of a museum located in the historic Douglas family mansion. The park received a total of 41,914 visits in 2025, 90% of which were non-local (from over 50 miles away). The average party size was 2.7 for local parties and 3.2 for non-local parties. Table 14 presents the estimated spending patterns for non-local and local visitors to Jerome State Historic Park.

Table 14. Jerome State Historic Park Visitor Spending Patterns, 2025

Expenditure Category	Percent of Parties with Expenditures		Average Amount per Party with Expenses	
	<i>Non-Local</i>	<i>Local</i>	<i>Non-Local</i>	<i>Local</i>
Admission, recreation, & entertainment fees	89%	89%	\$62	\$29
Camping fees & charges	7%	4%	\$234	\$28
Lodging	40%	11%	\$593	\$917
Groceries	31%	11%	\$180	\$138
Food & beverage	73%	52%	\$205	\$110
Retail shopping	51%	48%	\$142	\$84
Auto expenses	47%	37%	\$102	\$38
Any other expenses	3%	4%	\$388	\$20

Kartchner Caverns State Park

Kartchner Caverns State Park, located in Cochise County, was opened and dedicated in 1999 for the conservation of a network of living limestone caves discovered in the 1970s. The park offers cave tours, camping, and cabins. The park received a total of 122,055 visits in 2025, of which 78% were non-local (from over 50 miles away). The average party size was 3.8 for local parties and 3.6 for non-local parties. Table 15 presents the estimated spending patterns for non-local and local visitors to Kartchner Caverns State Park.

Table 15. Kartchner Caverns State Park Visitor Spending Patterns, 2025

Expenditure Category	Percent of Parties with Expenditures		Average Amount per Party with Expenses	
	<i>Non-Local</i>	<i>Local</i>	<i>Non-Local</i>	<i>Local</i>
Admission, recreation, & entertainment fees	77%	79%	\$100	\$97
Camping fees & charges	37%	23%	\$177	\$156
Lodging	22%	5%	\$375	\$243
Groceries	38%	27%	\$130	\$132
Food & beverage	53%	30%	\$121	\$89
Retail shopping	48%	40%	\$73	\$96
Auto expenses	60%	34%	\$93	\$69
Any other expenses	8%	4%	\$336	\$360

Lake Havasu State Park

Lake Havasu State Park, located in Mohave County, was acquired in 1965 and was the second water-based recreation park within the Arizona State Parks system. The park is one of three located on the shores of Lake Havasu and offers recreation facilities and camping. The park received a total of 446,529 visits in 2025, of which 75% were non-local (from over 50 miles away). The average party size was 4.0 for local parties and 4.6 for non-local parties. Table 16 presents the estimated spending patterns for non-local and local visitors to Lake Havasu State Park.

Table 16. Lake Havasu State Park Visitor Spending Patterns, 2025

Expenditure Category	Percent of Parties with Expenditures		Average Amount per Party with Expenses	
	<i>Non-Local</i>	<i>Local</i>	<i>Non-Local</i>	<i>Local</i>
Admission, recreation, & entertainment fees	41%	41%	\$77	\$95
Camping fees & charges	52%	27%	\$304	\$177
Lodging	24%	9%	\$519	\$383
Groceries	72%	61%	\$205	\$170
Food & beverage	75%	58%	\$218	\$169
Retail shopping	42%	28%	\$156	\$307
Auto expenses	67%	63%	\$184	\$159
Any other expenses	9%	5%	\$411	\$53

Lost Dutchman State Park

Lost Dutchman State Park is located in Pinal County outside the Phoenix metropolitan area and abuts the Tonto National Forest. The park offers hiking trails, outdoor recreation facilities, camping, and cabins. The park received 188,842 visits in 2025, of which 54% were non-local (from over 50 miles away). The average party size was 3.0 for local parties and 2.6 for non-local parties. Table 17 presents the estimated spending patterns for non-local and local visitors to Lost Dutchman State Park.

Table 17. Lost Dutchman State Park Visitor Spending Patterns, 2025

Expenditure Category	Percent of Parties with Expenditures		Average Amount per Party with Expenses	
	<i>Non-Local</i>	<i>Local</i>	<i>Non-Local</i>	<i>Local</i>
Admission, recreation, & entertainment fees	49%	66%	\$59	\$38
Camping fees & charges	55%	31%	\$208	\$161
Lodging	12%	3%	\$519	\$200
Groceries	56%	32%	\$138	\$87
Food & beverage	53%	31%	\$133	\$76
Retail shopping	34%	11%	\$112	\$134
Auto expenses	55%	32%	\$128	\$40
Any other expenses	7%	2%	\$202	\$534

Lyman Lake State Park

Lyman Lake State Park, located on the Little Colorado River in Apache County, opened in 1961. The park offers hiking, water-based recreation, and camping. The park received 29,809 visits in 2025, of which 70% were non-local (from over 50 miles away). The average party size was 3.6 for local parties and 3.5 for non-local parties. Table 18 presents the estimated spending patterns for non-local and local visitors to Lyman Lake State Park.

Table 18. Lyman Lake State Park Visitor Spending Patterns, 2025

Expenditure Category	Percent of Parties with Expenditures		Average Amount per Party with Expenses	
	<i>Non-Local</i>	<i>Local</i>	<i>Non-Local</i>	<i>Local</i>
Admission, recreation, & entertainment fees	31%	43%	\$83	\$42
Camping fees & charges	66%	52%	\$172	\$141
Lodging	9%	1%	\$329	\$210
Groceries	51%	60%	\$116	\$131
Food & beverage	38%	27%	\$78	\$74
Retail shopping	34%	26%	\$54	\$61
Auto expenses	61%	54%	\$94	\$69
Any other expenses	8%	6%	\$113	\$91

McFarland State Historic Park

McFarland State Historic Park was established in 1979 to preserve the original Pinal County Courthouse built in 1878. The park serves as a museum offering exhibits and events to visitors. The park received 5,790 visits in 2025, of which 38% were non-local (from over 50 miles away). The average party size was 5.7 for local parties and 3.3 for non-local parties. Table 19 presents the estimated spending patterns for non-local and local visitors to McFarland State Historic Park.

Table 19. McFarland State Historic Park Visitor Spending Patterns, 2025

Expenditure Category	Percent of Parties with Expenditures		Average Amount per Party with Expenses	
	<i>Non-Local</i>	<i>Local</i>	<i>Non-Local</i>	<i>Local</i>
Admission, recreation, & entertainment fees	67%	29%	\$13	\$19
Camping fees & charges	17%	0%	\$430	N/A
Lodging	0%	0%	N/A	N/A
Groceries	8%	47%	\$1,000	\$87
Food & beverage	67%	71%	\$54	\$33
Retail shopping	42%	29%	\$37	\$44
Auto expenses	25%	41%	\$75	\$30
Any other expenses	0%	0%	N/A	N/A

Oracle State Park

Oracle State Park opened in 2001 and was established to conserve the natural area, protect wildlife habitat, and preserve the Kannally Ranch house and other historic structures on the park. Located in Pinal County, the park offers outdoor recreation opportunities such as hiking and mountain biking, and the park offers access to the Arizona Trail which passes through the park. The park received 12,998 visits in 2025, 29% of which were non-local (from over 50 miles away). The average party size was 2.3 for both local and non-local parties. Table 20 presents the estimated spending patterns for non-local and local visitors to Oracle State Park.

Table 20. Oracle State Park Visitor Spending Patterns, 2025

Expenditure Category	Percent of Parties with Expenditures		Average Amount per Party with Expenses	
	<i>Non-Local</i>	<i>Local</i>	<i>Non-Local</i>	<i>Local</i>
Admission, recreation, & entertainment fees	71%	48%	\$63	\$61
Camping fees & charges	9%	0%	\$232	N/A
Lodging	22%	3%	\$679	\$138
Groceries	37%	23%	\$200	\$267
Food & beverage	65%	48%	\$106	\$122
Retail shopping	26%	17%	\$66	\$110
Auto expenses	50%	35%	\$127	\$44
Any other expenses	7%	1%	\$528	\$120

Patagonia Lake State Park

Patagonia Lake State Park, in Santa Cruz County, was built in the 1960s and became a state park in 1975. The park offers water-based recreation, hiking, and camping. Visitation to Sonoita Creek State Natural Area is included in visits to Patagonia Lake. The park received 237,284 visits in 2025, 67% of which were non-local (from over 50 miles away). The average party size was 6.1 for local parties and 5.1 for non-local parties. Table 21 presents the estimated spending patterns for non-local and local visitors to Patagonia Lake State Park.

Table 21. Patagonia Lake State Park Visitor Spending Patterns, 2025

Expenditure Category	Percent of Parties with Expenditures		Average Amount per Party with Expenses	
	<i>Non-Local</i>	<i>Local</i>	<i>Non-Local</i>	<i>Local</i>
Admission, recreation, & entertainment fees	56%	67%	\$40	\$44
Camping fees & charges	37%	21%	\$180	\$164
Lodging	7%	3%	\$490	\$456
Groceries	56%	57%	\$101	\$118
Food & beverage	37%	40%	\$83	\$120
Retail shopping	27%	21%	\$51	\$81
Auto expenses	54%	53%	\$75	\$60
Any other expenses	6%	6%	\$220	\$42

Picacho Peak State Park

Picacho Peak State Park, located in Pinal County, opened in 1968 and was established to conserve an area of geological, botanical, and historic significance. In addition to its iconic trail to the top of the peak, the park offers camping and wildlife viewing to visitors. The park received 96,222 visits in 2025, of which 72% were non-local (from over 50 miles away). The average party size was 3.5 for local parties and 2.7 for non-local parties. Table 22 presents the estimated spending patterns for non-local and local visitors to Picacho Peak State Park.

Table 22. Picacho Peak State Park Visitor Spending Patterns, 2025

Expenditure Category	Percent of Parties with Expenditures		Average Amount per Party with Expenses	
	<i>Non-Local</i>	<i>Local</i>	<i>Non-Local</i>	<i>Local</i>
Admission, recreation, & entertainment fees	39%	61%	\$48	\$26
Camping fees & charges	57%	39%	\$122	\$101
Lodging	7%	0%	\$331	N/A
Groceries	35%	30%	\$89	\$98
Food & beverage	39%	26%	\$78	\$54
Retail shopping	32%	14%	\$81	\$68
Auto expenses	51%	39%	\$101	\$50
Any other expenses	7%	3%	\$97	\$18

Red Rock State Park

Opened in 1991 in Yavapai County, Red Rock State Park was established to preserve public access to Oak Creek's riparian corridor. The park offers wildlife viewing and hiking to visitors. The park received 76,217 visits in 2025, 91% of which were non-local (from over 50 miles away). The average party size was 2.6 for local parties and 3.3 for non-local parties. Table 23 presents the estimated spending patterns for non-local and local visitors to Red Rock State Park.

Table 23. Red Rock State Park Visitor Spending Patterns, 2025

Expenditure Category	Percent of Parties with Expenditures		Average Amount per Party with Expenses	
	<i>Non-Local</i>	<i>Local</i>	<i>Non-Local</i>	<i>Local</i>
Admission, recreation, & entertainment fees	86%	72%	\$57	\$36
Camping fees & charges	7%	3%	\$413	\$1,300
Lodging	51%	3%	\$712	\$1,300
Groceries	46%	24%	\$216	\$142
Food & beverage	68%	62%	\$277	\$120
Retail shopping	43%	34%	\$142	\$369
Auto expenses	54%	48%	\$135	\$117
Any other expenses	5%	3%	\$471	\$12

Riordan Mansion State Park

Riordan Mansion State Historic Park, located in Coconino County, was opened to the public in 1983. The mansion was built in 1904 by Charles Whittlesey, the same architect behind the El Tovar Hotel at the Grand Canyon. The park offers tours of the mansion and grounds, which includes artifacts, architecture, and Flagstaff history. The park received a total of 13,236 visits in 2025, of which 85% were non-local (from over 50 miles away). The average party size was 2.5 for local parties and 3.4 for non-local parties. Table 24 presents the estimated spending patterns for non-local and local visitors to Riordan Mansion State Historic Park.

Table 24. Riordan Mansion State Historic Park Visitor Spending Patterns, 2025

Expenditure Category	Percent of Parties with Expenditure		Average Amount per Party with Expenses	
	<i>Non-Local</i>	<i>Local</i>	<i>Non-Local</i>	<i>Local</i>
Admission, recreation, & entertainment fees	89%	96%	\$80	\$42
Camping fees & charges	6%	0%	\$244	N/A
Lodging	54%	6%	\$571	\$305
Groceries	39%	17%	\$123	\$119
Food & beverage	73%	51%	\$230	\$110
Retail shopping	51%	26%	\$127	\$68
Auto expenses	57%	23%	\$99	\$47
Any other expenses	3%	0%	\$88	N/A

River Island State Park

River Island State Park is located in La Paz County on the shores of the Colorado River. The park offers river access for water-based recreation, camping, and hiking. The park received 27,722 visits in 2025, 94% of which were non-local (from over 50 miles away). The average party size was 2.9 for local parties and 3.6 for non-local parties. Table 25 presents the estimated spending patterns for non-local and local visitors to River Island State Park.

Table 25. River Island State Park Visitor Spending Patterns, 2025

Expenditure Category	Percent of Parties with Expenditures		Average Amount per Party with Expenses	
	<i>Non-Local</i>	<i>Local</i>	<i>Non-Local</i>	<i>Local</i>
Admission, recreation, & entertainment fees	22%	31%	\$126	\$80
Camping fees & charges	81%	62%	\$165	\$123
Lodging	4%	0%	\$343	N/A
Groceries	63%	46%	\$159	\$156
Food & beverage	57%	54%	\$145	\$86
Retail shopping	30%	15%	\$94	\$30
Auto expenses	70%	54%	\$123	\$86
Any other expenses	8%	0%	\$351	N/A

Rockin' River Ranch State Park

Rockin' River Ranch State Park is a former ranch that now offers day-use outdoor recreation activities around the confluence of West Clear Creek and the Verde River. The park first opened to visitors in 2024 and received a total of 5,672 visits in 2025, of which 50% were non-local (from over 50 miles away). The average party size was 2.3 for local parties and 2.6 for non-local parties. Table 26 presents the estimated spending patterns for non-local and local visitors to Rockin River Ranch State Park.

Table 26. Rockin' River Ranch State Park Visitor Spending Patterns, 2025

Expenditure Category	Percent of Parties with Expenditures		Average Amount per Party with Expenses	
	<i>Non-Local</i>	<i>Local</i>	<i>Non-Local</i>	<i>Local</i>
Admission, recreation, & entertainment fees	77%	68%	\$31	\$27
Camping fees & charges	9%	1%	\$460	\$50
Lodging	13%	0%	\$547	N/A
Groceries	29%	24%	\$109	\$61
Food & beverage	44%	44%	\$108	\$55
Retail shopping	29%	8%	\$85	\$68
Auto expenses	53%	42%	\$65	\$35
Any other expenses	4%	3%	\$57	\$13

Roper Lake State Park

Roper Lake State Park, of which Dankworth Pond is a sub-unit, offers water-based recreation and camping to visitors near the Safford area in Graham County. The park received 58,639 visits in 2025, of which 72% were non-local (from over 50 miles away). The average party size was 4.7 for local visitors and 3.8 for non-local visitors. Table 27 presents the estimated spending patterns for non-local and local visitors to Roper Lake State Park.

Table 27. Roper Lake State Park Visitor Spending Patterns, 2025

Expenditure Category	Percent of Parties with Expenditures		Average Amount per Party with Expenses	
	<i>Non-Local</i>	<i>Local</i>	<i>Non-Local</i>	<i>Local</i>
Admission, recreation, & entertainment fees	35%	71%	\$56	\$35
Camping fees & charges	65%	15%	\$172	\$94
Lodging	12%	3%	\$280	\$160
Groceries	62%	52%	\$108	\$74
Food & beverage	47%	27%	\$80	\$43
Retail shopping	29%	10%	\$56	\$45
Auto expenses	61%	39%	\$94	\$55
Any other expenses	9%	6%	\$90	\$95

Slide Rock State Park

Slide Rock State Park is a widely popular recreation site located in Oak Creek Canyon in Coconino County and is known for its natural beauty and water-based recreation opportunities. The park offers swimming, fishing, hiking, and other nature-based activities. The park received 435,086 visits in 2025, of which 96% were non-local (from over 50 miles away). The average party size was 3.6 for local parties and 4.5 for non-local parties. Table 28 presents the estimated spending patterns for non-local and local visitors to Slide Rock State Park.

Table 28. Slide Rock State Park Visitor Spending Patterns, 2025

Expenditure Category	Percent of Parties with Expenditures		Average Amount per Party with Expenses	
	<i>Non-Local</i>	<i>Local</i>	<i>Non-Local</i>	<i>Local</i>
Admission, recreation, & entertainment fees	89%	100%	\$56	\$38
Camping fees & charges	7%	13%	\$129	\$113
Lodging	38%	6%	\$538	\$1,000
Groceries	42%	50%	\$148	\$90
Food & beverage	61%	25%	\$175	\$85
Retail shopping	35%	31%	\$166	\$154
Auto expenses	51%	50%	\$102	\$43
Any other expenses	4%	0%	\$274	N/A

Tombstone Courthouse State Historic Park

Tombstone Courthouse State Historic Park preserves a historic building built in 1882. The structure originally served as the Cochise County Courthouse during the time when Tombstone was the county seat. Opened in 1959, the state park was the state's first operating state park. The park offers a museum with exhibits for visitors. The park received 30,926 visits in 2025, of which 93% were non-local (from over 50 miles away). The average party size was 3.7 for local parties and 3.2 for non-local parties. Table 29 presents the estimated spending patterns for non-local and local visitors to Tombstone Courthouse State Historic Park.

Table 29. Tombstone Courthouse State Historic Park Visitor Spending Patterns, 2025

Expenditure Category	Percent of Parties with Expenditures		Average Amount per Party with Expenses	
	<i>Non-Local</i>	<i>Local</i>	<i>Non-Local</i>	<i>Local</i>
Admission, recreation, & entertainment fees	88%	90%	\$60	\$43
Camping fees & charges	11%	0%	\$204	N/A
Lodging	40%	10%	\$352	\$185
Groceries	22%	10%	\$86	\$75
Food & beverage	70%	62%	\$129	\$70
Retail shopping	59%	62%	\$113	\$76
Auto expenses	46%	33%	\$107	\$61
Any other expenses	3%	5%	\$169	\$10

Tonto Natural Bridge State Park

Tonto Natural Bridge State Park, located in Gila County, opened in 1991 and its key features are a natural travertine bridge and historic lodge. The park received 128,762 visits in 2025, 94% of which were non-local (from over 50 miles away). The average party size was 3.7 for local parties and 3.5 for non-local parties. Table 30 presents the estimated spending patterns for non-local and local visitors to Tonto Natural Bridge State Park.

Table 30. Tonto Natural Bridge State Park Visitor Spending Patterns, 2025

Expenditure Category	Percent of Parties with Expenditures		Average Amount per Party with Expenses	
	<i>Non-Local</i>	<i>Local</i>	<i>Non-Local</i>	<i>Local</i>
Admission, recreation, & entertainment fees	90%	93%	\$30	\$37
Camping fees & charges	6%	0%	\$142	N/A
Lodging	14%	7%	\$465	\$350
Groceries	23%	18%	\$99	\$90
Food & beverage	50%	32%	\$85	\$76
Retail shopping	24%	29%	\$52	\$62
Auto expenses	42%	46%	\$61	\$43
Any other expenses	2%	4%	\$110	\$20

Tubac Presidio State Historic Park

Tubac Presidio State Historic Park was established to preserve the ruins of the San Ignacio de Tubac presidio, the oldest Spanish presidio in Arizona, constructed in 1752. The park is located in Santa Cruz County and offers museum exhibits, gardens, trails, and day use areas. The park received 11,420 visits in 2025, of which 71% were non-local (from over 50 miles away). The average party size was 2.6 for both local and non-local parties. Table 31 presents the estimated spending patterns for non-local and local visitors to Tubac Presidio State Historic Park.

Table 31. Tubac Presidio State Historic Park Visitor Spending Patterns, 2025

Expenditure Category	Percent of Parties with Expenditures		Average Amount per Party with Expenses	
	<i>Non-Local</i>	<i>Local</i>	<i>Non-Local</i>	<i>Local</i>
Admission, recreation, & entertainment fees	78%	79%	\$39	\$16
Camping fees & charges	3%	0%	\$425	N/A
Lodging	33%	0%	\$508	N/A
Groceries	23%	9%	\$106	\$85
Food & beverage	68%	50%	\$141	\$68
Retail shopping	51%	29%	\$83	\$51
Auto expenses	44%	21%	\$118	\$38
Any other expenses	3%	6%	\$88	\$475

Yuma Territorial Prison State Historic Park

Yuma Territorial Prison State Historic Park is dedicated to the preservation of the Yuma Territorial Prison, constructed in 1876. The park is located in Yuma County and includes a museum in addition to the prison facility. The park received 53,094 visits in 2025, of which 83% were non-local (from over 50 miles away). The average party size was 3.5 for local parties and 3.1 for non-local parties. Table 32 presents the estimated spending patterns for non-local and local visitors to Yuma Territorial Prison State Historic Park.

Table 32. Yuma Territorial Prison State Historic Park Visitor Spending Patterns, 2025

Expenditure Category	Percent of Parties with Expenditures		Average Amount per Party with Expenses	
	<i>Non-Local</i>	<i>Local</i>	<i>Non-Local</i>	<i>Local</i>
Admission, recreation, & entertainment fees	90%	89%	\$46	\$29
Camping fees & charges	7%	7%	\$308	\$50
Lodging	32%	7%	\$287	\$750
Groceries	27%	21%	\$193	\$162
Food & beverage	51%	36%	\$106	\$97
Retail shopping	27%	25%	\$85	\$75
Auto expenses	47%	36%	\$86	\$40
Any other expenses	1%	0%	\$24	N/A

County Economic Impact Analysis Results

The following section presents estimated economic impacts of state park non-local visitor spending at the county level in Arizona. This analysis measures the net new visitor spending that non-local visitors bring into a county economy when visiting state parks, including the regional multiplier effects that result from that spending circulating the local economy. Non-local visitors are defined as those who live outside the county where the state park is located, and those whose zip code falls outside a 50-mile radius of the park. Local visitors are excluded from the analysis because, had they not spent their income on activities related to a local state park visit, they would likely have spent it on something else within the same local economy.

Apache County

Table 33 presents estimated non-local visitor spending and county economic impacts in Apache County, which includes Lyman Lake State Park.

Table 33. Apache County Non-Local Visitor Spending Economic Impact Estimates

Impact	Lyman Lake	County Total
Non-Local Visitor Spending		
Admission, recreation, & entertainment fees	\$152,000	\$152,000
Camping fees & charges	\$676,000	\$676,000
Lodging	\$183,000	\$183,000
Groceries	\$352,000	\$352,000
Food & beverage	\$179,000	\$179,000
Retail shopping	\$109,000	\$109,000
Auto expenses	\$342,000	\$342,000
Any other expenses	\$52,000	\$52,000
County Economic Impacts		
Sales (Output)		
Direct	\$2,047,000	\$2,047,000
Indirect	\$295,000	\$295,000
Induced	\$100,000	\$100,000
TOTAL	\$2,441,000	\$2,441,000
Value Added (Gross Regional Product)		
Direct	\$756,000	\$756,000
Indirect	\$127,000	\$127,000
Induced	\$61,000	\$61,000
TOTAL	\$944,000	\$944,000
Labor Income		
Direct	\$397,000	\$397,000
Indirect	\$59,000	\$59,000
Induced	\$20,000	\$20,000
TOTAL	\$477,000	\$477,000
Jobs		
Direct	14	14
Indirect	2	2
Induced	0	0
TOTAL	16	16
Tax Impacts		
Federal Government	\$150,000	\$150,000
State & Local Government	\$173,000	\$173,000

* Totals may not sum due to rounding

Cochise County

Table 34 presents estimated non-local visitor spending and county economic impacts in Cochise County, which includes Kartchner Caverns State Park and Tombstone Courthouse State Historic Park.

Table 34. Cochise County Non-Local Visitor Spending Economic Impact Estimates

Impact	Kartchner Caverns	Tombstone Courthouse	County Total
Non-Local Visitor Spending			
Admission, recreation, & entertainment fees	\$2,052,000	\$467,000	\$2,518,000
Camping fees & charges	\$1,730,000	\$194,000	\$1,923,000
Lodging	\$2,215,000	\$1,253,000	\$3,468,000
Groceries	\$1,300,000	\$170,000	\$1,470,000
Food & beverage	\$1,703,000	\$802,000	\$2,505,000
Retail shopping	\$944,000	\$596,000	\$1,539,000
Auto expenses	\$1,476,000	\$437,000	\$1,913,000
Any other expenses	\$691,000	\$45,000	\$736,000
County Economic Impacts			
Sales (Output)			
Direct	\$12,109,000	\$3,964,000	\$16,073,000
Indirect	\$2,299,000	\$722,000	\$3,021,000
Induced	\$1,528,000	\$521,000	\$2,048,000
TOTAL	\$15,936,000	\$5,207,000	\$21,143,000
Value Added (Gross Regional Product)			
Direct	\$5,046,000	\$1,745,000	\$6,791,000
Indirect	\$1,105,000	\$353,000	\$1,458,000
Induced	\$932,000	\$318,000	\$1,250,000
TOTAL	\$7,083,000	\$2,415,000	\$9,499,000
Labor Income			
Direct	\$2,880,000	\$992,000	\$3,873,000
Indirect	\$716,000	\$230,000	\$946,000
Induced	\$386,000	\$132,000	\$518,000
TOTAL	\$3,982,000	\$1,354,000	\$5,336,000
Jobs			
Direct	90	28	119
Indirect	12	4	16
Induced	7	2	10
TOTAL	110	35	145
Tax Impacts			
Federal Government	\$993,000	\$337,000	\$1,329,000
State & Local Government	\$1,184,000	\$400,000	\$1,584,000

* Totals may not sum due to rounding

Coconino County

Table 35 presents estimated non-local visitor spending and county economic impacts in Coconino County, which includes Riordan Mansion State Historic Park and Slide Rock State Park.

Table 35. Coconino County Non-Local Visitor Spending Economic Impact Estimates

Impact	Riordan Mansion	Slide Rock	County Total
Non-Local Visitor Spending			
Admission, recreation, & entertainment fees	\$239,000	\$4,686,000	\$4,925,000
Camping fees & charges	\$50,000	\$797,000	\$847,000
Lodging	\$1,031,000	\$18,963,000	\$19,994,000
Groceries	\$159,000	\$5,763,000	\$5,922,000
Food & beverage	\$555,000	\$10,019,000	\$10,574,000
Retail shopping	\$215,000	\$5,406,000	\$5,621,000
Auto expenses	\$188,000	\$4,787,000	\$4,975,000
Any other expenses	\$8,000	\$1,045,000	\$1,053,000
County Economic Impacts			
Sales (Output)			
Direct	\$2,445,000	\$51,467,000	\$53,912,000
Indirect	\$416,000	\$8,011,000	\$8,427,000
Induced	\$431,000	\$8,408,000	\$8,838,000
TOTAL	\$3,292,000	\$67,885,000	\$71,177,000
Value Added (Gross Regional Product)			
Direct	\$1,285,000	\$25,054,000	\$26,339,000
Indirect	\$201,000	\$3,856,000	\$4,057,000
Induced	\$271,000	\$5,300,000	\$5,572,000
TOTAL	\$1,758,000	\$34,211,000	\$35,968,000
Labor Income			
Direct	\$727,000	\$14,232,000	\$14,959,000
Indirect	\$125,000	\$2,401,000	\$2,527,000
Induced	\$123,000	\$2,397,000	\$2,519,000
TOTAL	\$975,000	\$19,030,000	\$20,005,000
Jobs			
Direct	15	302	318
Indirect	2	44	47
Induced	2	40	43
TOTAL	20	387	407
Tax Impacts			
Federal Government	\$233,000	\$4,535,000	\$4,768,000
State & Local Government	\$238,000	\$4,669,000	\$4,907,000

* Totals may not sum due to rounding

Gila County

Table 36 presents estimated non-local visitor spending and county economic impacts in Gila County, which includes Tonto Natural Bridge State Park.

Table 36. Gila County Non-Local Visitor Spending Economic Impact Estimates

Impact	Tonto Natural Bridge	County Total
Non-Local Visitor Spending		
Admission, recreation, & entertainment fees	\$940,000	\$940,000
Camping fees & charges	\$292,000	\$292,000
Lodging	\$2,187,000	\$2,187,000
Groceries	\$775,000	\$775,000
Food & beverage	\$1,479,000	\$1,479,000
Retail shopping	\$431,000	\$431,000
Auto expenses	\$892,000	\$892,000
Any other expenses	\$64,000	\$64,000
County Economic Impacts		
Sales (Output)		
Direct	\$7,060,000	\$7,060,000
Indirect	\$981,000	\$981,000
Induced	\$606,000	\$606,000
TOTAL	\$8,647,000	\$8,647,000
Value Added (Gross Regional Product)		
Direct	\$3,081,000	\$3,081,000
Indirect	\$356,000	\$356,000
Induced	\$357,000	\$357,000
TOTAL	\$3,795,000	\$3,795,000
Labor Income		
Direct	\$1,737,000	\$1,737,000
Indirect	\$210,000	\$210,000
Induced	\$123,000	\$123,000
TOTAL	\$2,070,000	\$2,070,000
Jobs		
Direct	52	52
Indirect	6	6
Induced	3	3
TOTAL	60	60
Tax Impacts		
Federal Government	\$512,000	\$512,000
State & Local Government	\$683,000	\$683,000

* Totals may not sum due to rounding

Graham County

Table 37 presents estimated non-local visitor spending and county economic impacts in Graham County, which includes Roper Lake State Park (including Dankworth Pond State Park).

Table 37. Graham County Non-Local Visitor Spending Economic Impact Estimates

Impact	Roper Lake	County Total
Non-Local Visitor Spending		
Admission, recreation, & entertainment fees	\$215,000	\$215,000
Camping fees & charges	\$1,243,000	\$1,243,000
Lodging	\$381,000	\$381,000
Groceries	\$735,000	\$735,000
Food & beverage	\$419,000	\$419,000
Retail shopping	\$182,000	\$182,000
Auto expenses	\$633,000	\$633,000
Any other expenses	\$85,000	\$85,000
County Economic Impacts		
Sales (Output)		
Direct	\$3,893,000	\$3,893,000
Indirect	\$536,000	\$536,000
Induced	\$303,000	\$303,000
TOTAL	\$4,732,000	\$4,732,000
Value Added (Gross Regional Product)		
Direct	\$1,320,000	\$1,320,000
Indirect	\$251,000	\$251,000
Induced	\$187,000	\$187,000
TOTAL	\$1,758,000	\$1,758,000
Labor Income		
Direct	\$662,000	\$662,000
Indirect	\$145,000	\$145,000
Induced	\$72,000	\$72,000
TOTAL	\$878,000	\$878,000
Jobs		
Direct	28	28
Indirect	3	3
Induced	1	1
TOTAL	33	33
Tax Impacts		
Federal Government	\$234,000	\$234,000
State & Local Government	\$366,000	\$366,000

* Totals may not sum due to rounding

La Paz County

Table 38 presents estimated non-local visitor spending and county economic impacts in La Paz County, which includes Alamo Lake State Park, Buckskin Mountain State Park, and River Island State Park.

Table 38. La Paz County Non-Local Visitor Spending Economic Impact Estimates

Impact	Alamo Lake	Buckskin Mountain	River Island	County Total
Non-Local Visitor Spending				
Admission, recreation, & entertainment fees	\$300,000	\$347,000	\$206,000	\$854,000
Camping fees & charges	\$2,778,000	\$2,300,000	\$987,000	\$6,065,000
Lodging	\$320,000	\$274,000	\$101,000	\$695,000
Groceries	\$1,030,000	\$1,514,000	\$738,000	\$3,282,000
Food & beverage	\$582,000	\$1,051,000	\$610,000	\$2,243,000
Retail shopping	\$555,000	\$389,000	\$209,000	\$1,154,000
Auto expenses	\$1,510,000	\$1,319,000	\$632,000	\$3,462,000
Any other expenses	\$199,000	\$203,000	\$196,000	\$597,000
County Economic Impacts				
Sales (Output)				
Direct	\$7,275,000	\$7,398,000	\$3,680,000	\$18,352,000
Indirect	\$538,000	\$508,000	\$249,000	\$1,295,000
Induced	\$508,000	\$569,000	\$291,000	\$1,369,000
TOTAL	\$8,322,000	\$8,475,000	\$4,219,000	\$21,016,000
Value Added (Gross Regional Product)				
Direct	\$3,122,000	\$3,277,000	\$1,633,000	\$8,031,000
Indirect	\$239,000	\$221,000	\$105,000	\$565,000
Induced	\$337,000	\$378,000	\$193,000	\$908,000
TOTAL	\$3,699,000	\$3,875,000	\$1,931,000	\$9,504,000
Labor Income				
Direct	\$2,022,000	\$2,232,000	\$1,136,000	\$5,390,000
Indirect	\$155,000	\$140,000	\$66,000	\$361,000
Induced	\$102,000	\$114,000	\$58,000	\$274,000
TOTAL	\$2,278,000	\$2,486,000	\$1,260,000	\$6,024,000
Jobs				
Direct	35	34	17	85
Indirect	3	3	1	7
Induced	2	2	1	4
TOTAL	39	38	19	97
Tax Impacts				
Federal Government	\$552,000	\$589,000	\$296,000	\$1,436,000
State & Local Government	\$487,000	\$469,000	\$229,000	\$1,185,000

* Totals may not sum due to rounding

Mohave County

Table 39 presents estimated non-local visitor spending and county economic impacts in Mohave County, which includes Cattail Cove State Park and Lake Havasu State Park.

Table 39. Mohave County Non-Local Visitor Spending Economic Impact Estimates

Impact	Cattail Cove	Lake Havasu	County Total
Non-Local Visitor Spending			
Admission, recreation, & entertainment fees	\$553,000	\$2,292,000	\$2,845,000
Camping fees & charges	\$2,448,000	\$11,454,000	\$13,902,000
Lodging	\$769,000	\$9,106,000	\$9,875,000
Groceries	\$2,008,000	\$10,759,000	\$12,767,000
Food & beverage	\$1,414,000	\$11,972,000	\$13,386,000
Retail shopping	\$542,000	\$4,750,000	\$5,292,000
Auto expenses	\$2,030,000	\$9,017,000	\$11,047,000
Any other expenses	\$363,000	\$2,749,000	\$3,112,000
County Economic Impacts			
Sales (Output)			
Direct	\$10,127,000	\$62,098,000	\$72,226,000
Indirect	\$1,560,000	\$9,764,000	\$11,324,000
Induced	\$1,138,000	\$7,374,000	\$8,512,000
TOTAL	\$12,825,000	\$79,236,000	\$92,062,000
Value Added (Gross Regional Product)			
Direct	\$3,776,000	\$24,607,000	\$28,383,000
Indirect	\$701,000	\$4,409,000	\$5,109,000
Induced	\$704,000	\$4,561,000	\$5,265,000
TOTAL	\$5,181,000	\$33,577,000	\$38,758,000
Labor Income			
Direct	\$2,135,000	\$13,892,000	\$16,027,000
Indirect	\$412,000	\$2,595,000	\$3,007,000
Induced	\$281,000	\$1,824,000	\$2,105,000
TOTAL	\$2,829,000	\$18,311,000	\$21,140,000
Jobs			
Direct	59	381	440
Indirect	8	52	61
Induced	5	33	39
TOTAL	72	467	539
Tax Impacts			
Federal Government	\$779,000	\$5,029,000	\$5,808,000
State & Local Government	\$810,000	\$5,280,000	\$6,090,000

* Totals may not sum due to rounding

Navajo County

Table 40 presents estimated non-local visitor spending and county economic impacts in Navajo County, which includes Fool Hollow Recreation Area and Homolovi State Park.

Table 40. Navajo County Non-Local Visitor Spending Economic Impact Estimates

Impact	Fool Hollow	Homolovi	County Total
Non-Local Visitor Spending			
Admission, recreation, & entertainment fees	\$685,000	\$141,000	\$827,000
Camping fees & charges	\$3,328,000	\$738,000	\$4,066,000
Lodging	\$1,175,000	\$453,000	\$1,628,000
Groceries	\$1,970,000	\$404,000	\$2,374,000
Food & beverage	\$1,912,000	\$564,000	\$2,475,000
Retail shopping	\$730,000	\$414,000	\$1,145,000
Auto expenses	\$1,678,000	\$765,000	\$2,443,000
Any other expenses	\$323,000	\$32,000	\$355,000
County Economic Impacts			
Sales (Output)			
Direct	\$11,801,000	\$3,512,000	\$15,313,000
Indirect	\$2,028,000	\$543,000	\$2,571,000
Induced	\$1,340,000	\$362,000	\$1,702,000
TOTAL	\$15,169,000	\$4,417,000	\$19,586,000
Value Added (Gross Regional Product)			
Direct	\$4,851,000	\$1,333,000	\$6,183,000
Indirect	\$786,000	\$211,000	\$997,000
Induced	\$787,000	\$212,000	\$1,000,000
TOTAL	\$6,424,000	\$1,756,000	\$8,180,000
Labor Income			
Direct	\$2,766,000	\$747,000	\$3,513,000
Indirect	\$491,000	\$132,000	\$623,000
Induced	\$313,000	\$84,000	\$397,000
TOTAL	\$3,570,000	\$963,000	\$4,533,000
Jobs			
Direct	74	20	94
Indirect	12	3	15
Induced	7	2	8
TOTAL	93	25	118
Tax Impacts			
Federal Government	\$974,000	\$264,000	\$1,238,000
State & Local Government	\$1,012,000	\$288,000	\$1,300,000

* Totals may not sum due to rounding

Pima County

Table 41 presents estimated non-local visitor spending and county economic impacts in Pima County, which includes Catalina State Park.

Table 41. Pima County Non-Local Visitor Spending Economic Impact Estimates

Impact	Catalina	County Total
Non-Local Visitor Spending		
Admission, recreation, & entertainment fees	\$1,795,000	\$1,795,000
Camping fees & charges	\$5,758,000	\$5,758,000
Lodging	\$4,357,000	\$4,357,000
Groceries	\$4,834,000	\$4,834,000
Food & beverage	\$4,635,000	\$4,635,000
Retail shopping	\$1,995,000	\$1,995,000
Auto expenses	\$3,926,000	\$3,926,000
Any other expenses	\$1,110,000	\$1,110,000
County Economic Impacts		
Sales (Output)		
Direct	\$28,409,000	\$28,409,000
Indirect	\$5,328,000	\$5,328,000
Induced	\$5,179,000	\$5,179,000
TOTAL	\$38,916,000	\$38,916,000
Value Added (Gross Regional Product)		
Direct	\$12,084,000	\$12,084,000
Indirect	\$2,637,000	\$2,637,000
Induced	\$3,155,000	\$3,155,000
TOTAL	\$17,876,000	\$17,876,000
Labor Income		
Direct	\$6,755,000	\$6,755,000
Indirect	\$1,591,000	\$1,591,000
Induced	\$1,446,000	\$1,446,000
TOTAL	\$9,792,000	\$9,792,000
Jobs		
Direct	169	169
Indirect	29	29
Induced	26	26
TOTAL	224	224
Tax Impacts		
Federal Government	\$2,421,000	\$2,421,000
State & Local Government	\$2,416,000	\$2,416,000

* Totals may not sum due to rounding

Pinal County

Table 42 presents estimated non-local visitor spending and county economic impacts in Pinal County, which includes Lost Dutchman State Park, McFarland State Historic Park, Oracle State Park, and Picacho Peak State Park.

Table 42. Pinal County Non-Local Visitor Spending Economic Impact Estimates

Impact	Lost Dutchman	McFarland	Oracle	Picacho Peak	County Total
Non-Local Visitor Spending					
Admission, recreation, & entertainment fees	\$1,152,000	\$6,000	\$70,000	\$478,000	\$1,706,000
Camping fees & charges	\$4,545,000	\$48,000	\$32,000	\$1,794,000	\$6,420,000
Lodging	\$2,385,000	\$0	\$237,000	\$638,000	\$3,261,000
Groceries	\$3,034,000	\$56,000	\$116,000	\$815,000	\$4,022,000
Food & beverage	\$2,803,000	\$24,000	\$109,000	\$796,000	\$3,732,000
Retail shopping	\$1,489,000	\$10,000	\$28,000	\$657,000	\$2,184,000
Auto expenses	\$2,749,000	\$13,000	\$101,000	\$1,348,000	\$4,210,000
Any other expenses	\$530,000	\$0	\$62,000	\$166,000	\$758,000
County Economic Impacts					
Sales (Output)					
Direct	\$18,688,000	\$157,000	\$755,000	\$6,691,000	\$26,291,000
Indirect	\$1,965,000	\$15,000	\$80,000	\$696,000	\$2,756,000
Induced	\$1,064,000	\$8,000	\$46,000	\$362,000	\$1,480,000
TOTAL	\$21,718,000	\$180,000	\$880,000	\$7,750,000	\$30,527,000
Value Added (Gross Regional Product)					
Direct	\$7,426,000	\$57,000	\$321,000	\$2,537,000	\$10,341,000
Indirect	\$828,000	\$6,000	\$33,000	\$293,000	\$1,160,000
Induced	\$721,000	\$6,000	\$31,000	\$245,000	\$1,003,000
TOTAL	\$8,974,000	\$69,000	\$385,000	\$3,075,000	\$12,503,000
Labor Income					
Direct	\$4,165,000	\$32,000	\$179,000	\$1,414,000	\$5,790,000
Indirect	\$514,000	\$4,000	\$20,000	\$182,000	\$721,000
Induced	\$192,000	\$1,000	\$8,000	\$65,000	\$267,000
TOTAL	\$4,871,000	\$38,000	\$207,000	\$1,662,000	\$6,777,000
Jobs					
Direct	118	1	5	41	165
Indirect	11	0	0	4	16
Induced	5	0	0	2	6
TOTAL	134	1	6	46	187
Tax Impacts					
Federal Government	\$1,233,000	\$10,000	\$52,000	\$423,000	\$1,718,000
State & Local Government	\$1,483,000	\$11,000	\$64,000	\$521,000	\$2,079,000

* Totals may not sum due to rounding

Santa Cruz County

Table 43 presents estimated non-local visitor spending and county economic impacts in Santa Cruz County, which includes Patagonia Lake State Park and Tubac Presidio State Historic Park.

Table 43. Santa Cruz County Non-Local Visitor Spending Economic Impact Estimates

Impact	Patagonia Lake	Tubac Presidio	County Total
Non-Local Visitor Spending			
Admission, recreation, & entertainment fees	\$693,000	\$95,000	\$789,000
Camping fees & charges	\$2,072,000	\$36,000	\$2,108,000
Lodging	\$1,096,000	\$518,000	\$1,614,000
Groceries	\$1,759,000	\$76,000	\$1,835,000
Food & beverage	\$940,000	\$299,000	\$1,239,000
Retail shopping	\$420,000	\$130,000	\$550,000
Auto expenses	\$1,255,000	\$160,000	\$1,415,000
Any other expenses	\$398,000	\$7,000	\$406,000
County Economic Impacts			
Sales (Output)			
Direct	\$8,632,000	\$1,323,000	\$9,955,000
Indirect	\$1,484,000	\$222,000	\$1,706,000
Induced	\$746,000	\$137,000	\$883,000
TOTAL	\$10,862,000	\$1,682,000	\$12,544,000
Value Added (Gross Regional Product)			
Direct	\$3,432,000	\$640,000	\$4,072,000
Indirect	\$630,000	\$94,000	\$724,000
Induced	\$443,000	\$81,000	\$525,000
TOTAL	\$4,505,000	\$816,000	\$5,321,000
Labor Income			
Direct	\$1,997,000	\$379,000	\$2,376,000
Indirect	\$443,000	\$65,000	\$509,000
Induced	\$173,000	\$32,000	\$204,000
TOTAL	\$2,613,000	\$476,000	\$3,089,000
Jobs			
Direct	53	9	62
Indirect	10	1	11
Induced	4	1	5
TOTAL	67	11	78
Tax Impacts			
Federal Government	\$648,000	\$117,000	\$764,000
State & Local Government	\$731,000	\$126,000	\$857,000

* Totals may not sum due to rounding

Yavapai County

Table 44 presents estimated non-local visitor spending and county economic impacts in Yavapai County, which includes Dead Horse Ranch State Park, Fort Verde State Historic Park, Granite Mountain Hotshots Memorial State Park, Jerome State Historic Park, Red Rock State Park, and Rockin' River Ranch State Park.

Table 44. Yavapai County Non-Local Visitor Spending Economic Impact Estimates

Impact	Dead Horse Ranch	Fort Verde	Granite Mountain	Jerome	Red Rock	Rockin' River	County Total
Non-Local Visitor Spending							
Admission, recreation, & entertainment fees	\$1,469,000	\$128,000	\$35,000	\$662,000	\$1,009,000	\$26,000	\$3,329,000
Camping fees & charges	\$4,421,000	\$76,000	\$19,000	\$187,000	\$571,000	\$45,000	\$5,319,000
Lodging	\$1,966,000	\$596,000	\$518,000	\$2,819,000	\$7,448,000	\$77,000	\$13,424,000
Groceries	\$2,840,000	\$111,000	\$97,000	\$680,000	\$2,044,000	\$34,000	\$5,807,000
Food & beverage	\$3,228,000	\$281,000	\$392,000	\$1,803,000	\$3,881,000	\$52,000	\$9,638,000
Retail shopping	\$1,170,000	\$87,000	\$203,000	\$863,000	\$1,255,000	\$26,000	\$3,604,000
Auto expenses	\$2,806,000	\$147,000	\$179,000	\$582,000	\$1,508,000	\$38,000	\$5,259,000
Any other expenses	\$543,000	\$23,000	\$51,000	\$121,000	\$496,000	\$2,000	\$1,236,000
County Economic Impacts							
Sales (Output)							
Direct	\$18,444,000	\$1,448,000	\$1,493,000	\$7,718,000	\$18,213,000	\$300,000	\$47,616,000
Indirect	\$3,049,000	\$255,000	\$223,000	\$1,286,000	\$3,020,000	\$50,000	\$7,883,000
Induced	\$2,434,000	\$214,000	\$206,000	\$1,118,000	\$2,633,000	\$41,000	\$6,645,000
TOTAL	\$23,928,000	\$1,916,000	\$1,923,000	\$10,122,000	\$23,865,000	\$391,000	\$62,144,000
Value Added (Gross Regional Product)							
Direct	\$7,808,000	\$715,000	\$682,000	\$3,719,000	\$8,821,000	\$136,000	\$21,881,000
Indirect	\$1,401,000	\$117,000	\$103,000	\$589,000	\$1,393,000	\$23,000	\$3,626,000
Induced	\$1,501,000	\$132,000	\$127,000	\$689,000	\$1,623,000	\$25,000	\$4,097,000
TOTAL	\$10,709,000	\$965,000	\$912,000	\$4,997,000	\$11,838,000	\$185,000	\$29,605,000
Labor Income							
Direct	\$4,474,000	\$394,000	\$386,000	\$2,081,000	\$4,889,000	\$76,000	\$12,301,000
Indirect	\$907,000	\$77,000	\$67,000	\$383,000	\$911,000	\$15,000	\$2,359,000
Induced	\$635,000	\$56,000	\$54,000	\$292,000	\$687,000	\$11,000	\$1,734,000
TOTAL	\$6,016,000	\$527,000	\$506,000	\$2,756,000	\$6,487,000	\$102,000	\$16,394,000
Jobs							
Direct	114	10	9	51	118	2	304
Indirect	18	2	1	8	18	0	47
Induced	13	1	1	6	14	0	34
TOTAL	144	12	12	65	149	2	385
Tax Impacts							
Federal Government	\$1,568,000	\$138,000	\$131,000	\$718,000	\$1,691,000	\$27,000	\$4,273,000
State & Local Government	\$1,541,000	\$143,000	\$133,000	\$734,000	\$1,743,000	\$27,000	\$4,321,000

* Totals may not sum due to rounding

Yuma County

Table 45 presents estimated non-local visitor spending and county economic impacts in Yuma County, which includes Colorado River State Historic Park and Yuma Territorial Prison State Historic Park.

Table 45. Yuma County Non-Local Visitor Spending Economic Impact Estimates

Impact	Colorado River	Yuma Territorial Prison	County Total
Non-Local Visitor Spending			
Admission, recreation, & entertainment fees	\$187,000	\$583,000	\$770,000
Camping fees & charges	\$170,000	\$321,000	\$491,000
Lodging	\$872,000	\$1,290,000	\$2,162,000
Groceries	\$306,000	\$744,000	\$1,050,000
Food & beverage	\$472,000	\$777,000	\$1,249,000
Retail shopping	\$194,000	\$327,000	\$521,000
Auto expenses	\$263,000	\$571,000	\$834,000
Any other expenses	\$130,000	\$3,000	\$133,000
County Economic Impacts			
Sales (Output)			
Direct	\$2,595,000	\$4,615,000	\$7,209,000
Indirect	\$425,000	\$742,000	\$1,167,000
Induced	\$387,000	\$665,000	\$1,052,000
TOTAL	\$3,406,000	\$6,021,000	\$9,428,000
Value Added (Gross Regional Product)			
Direct	\$1,177,000	\$2,043,000	\$3,221,000
Indirect	\$209,000	\$361,000	\$570,000
Induced	\$242,000	\$417,000	\$659,000
TOTAL	\$1,629,000	\$2,821,000	\$4,450,000
Labor Income			
Direct	\$675,000	\$1,163,000	\$1,838,000
Indirect	\$137,000	\$236,000	\$372,000
Induced	\$106,000	\$181,000	\$287,000
TOTAL	\$917,000	\$1,580,000	\$2,497,000
Jobs			
Direct	17	29	46
Indirect	2	4	7
Induced	2	3	5
TOTAL	21	37	58
Tax Impacts			
Federal Government	\$226,000	\$391,000	\$617,000
State & Local Government	\$247,000	\$425,000	\$673,000

* Totals may not sum due to rounding

State Economic Contribution Analysis Results

While county-level economic impacts measure the effects of non-local visitor spending on regional economies, it may also be informative to consider all visitor spending associated with visitation to state parks. The following analyses include all visitor spending, whether by local or non-local visitors, and the economic multiplier effects of that spending on the state economy. While some of this visitor spending might have taken place regardless of state parks (for example, local visitor spending on food or gas), it provides a snapshot of economic activity associated with state park visitation.

Table 46 presents these statewide results. An estimated total of \$355 million in direct state park visitor spending in 2025 generated roughly \$99 million in indirect business-to-business economic activity and \$102 million in induced household-to-business transactions, supporting a total of roughly \$555 million in statewide economic activity. This supported roughly \$273 million in gross state product (value added), \$151 million in labor income, and nearly 3,000 jobs statewide.

Table 46. Statewide Visitor Spending Economic Contribution Estimates

Impact	Employment	Labor Income	Value Added	Output
Direct	2,050	\$88,201,000	\$156,378,000	\$354,630,000
Indirect	444	\$31,592,000	\$53,229,000	\$98,679,000
Induced	455	\$30,788,000	\$63,147,000	\$101,781,000
Total	2,948	\$150,582,000	\$272,754,000	\$555,090,000

* Totals may not sum due to rounding

In addition to these contributions, state and local tax revenues supported by this economic activity were \$18 million and \$14 million, respectively.

Trends in Visitor Spending

A comparison of economic impact and contribution analysis results over time reveals that overall visitor spending has generally increased, both in nominal terms and when adjusted for inflation. However, overall spending decreased slightly between fiscal years 2020 and 2025, due in part to a small drop in visitation during that period. On a per-visitor basis, inflation-adjusted non-local spending increased between FY2020 and 2025 (Table 47).

Table 47. Comparison of Arizona State Park Visitor Spending Economic Impact & Contribution Estimates Across Study Years, FY2007 to Calendar Year 2025

Measure	FY2007	FY2014	FY2020	CY2025
Parks	27	27	34*	30
Total Visits	2,298,155	2,294,420	2,971,844	2,847,021
NOMINAL (REPORTED) VALUES	FY2007	FY2014	FY2020	CY2025
Statewide Economic Impact (Output/Sales) (millions)	\$266.4	\$226.7	\$377.0	\$482.7
Statewide Economic Contribution (Output/Sales) (millions)	N/A	N/A	\$449.4	\$555.1
Direct Non-Local Visitor Spending (millions)	\$162.8	\$209.7	\$278.7	\$308.4
Direct Total Visitor Spending (millions)	N/A	N/A	\$332.1	\$354.6
Per Visitor Non-Local Spending	\$70.84	\$90.58	\$93.77	\$144.91
INFLATION-ADJUSTED VALUES (2025 USD)	FY2007	FY2014	FY2020	CY2025
Statewide Economic Impact (Output/Sales) (millions)	\$416.0	\$310.1	\$471.5	\$482.7
Statewide Economic Contribution (Output/Sales) (millions)	N/A	N/A	\$562.1	\$555.1
Direct Non-Local Visitor Spending (millions)	\$254.1	\$286.8	\$348.6	\$308.4
Direct Total Visitor Spending (millions)	N/A	N/A	\$415.4	\$354.6
Per Visitor Non-Local Spending	\$110.60	\$123.90	\$117.30	\$144.91
CHANGE FROM PREVIOUS STUDY		FY07-FY14	FY14-FY20	FY20-CY25
Change in Total Non-Local Expenditures		12.8%	21.5%	-11.1%
Change in Visits		-0.2%	29.5%	-3.8%
Change in Non-Local Expenditures per Visit		13.0%	-6.2%	24.2%

* Some parks were not open during this time, and some parks were temporarily closed during the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic

The methods used in this report are the same as those used in the FY2020 report (Duval et al., 2021). Prior reports calculated statewide economic impacts (AHRRC, 2009; AHRRC, 2014) using the sum of all non-local visitor spending, whereas the FY2020 and 2025 reports report a statewide economic contribution inclusive of all visitor spending, as well as county-level economic impacts of non-local visitor spending (Duval et al., 2021 and present report). For ease of comparison, both the FY2020 and 2025 reports provide an estimate equivalent to the statewide economic impact results from the FY2007 and FY2014 reports. These are presented in Table 47.

References

AHRRC (2009). The Economic Impact of Arizona State Parks: Executive Summary. Arizona Hospitality Research & Resource Center, Center for Business Outreach, The W.A. Franke College of Business, Northern Arizona University.

AHRRC (2015). The Economic Impact of Arizona State Parks FY14. Arizona Hospitality Research & Resource Center, Center for Business Outreach, The W.A. Franke College of Business, Northern Arizona University. Retrieved from https://d2umhuunwbec1r.cloudfront.net/gallery/asp-archive/publications/downloads/EIS_Final_09-09-15.pdf

Duval, D., Bickel, A., Frisvold, G. (2021). Economic Contributions & Impacts of Arizona's State Parks (FY2020). University of Arizona Cooperative Extension, Department of Agricultural & Resource Economics. Retrieved from <https://repository.arizona.edu/handle/10150/677044?show=full>

Duval, D. and Montaña, C. (2026). Arizona State Parks & Trails 2025 Visitor Survey Results. University of Arizona Cooperative Extension. Unpublished report for Arizona State Parks & Trails.

IMPLAN Group, LLC (2026). 2024 IMPLAN Model and Data.

NAU EPI (2026). 2025 Arizona State Park Visits. Economic Policy Institute, Northern Arizona University. Retrieved from <https://in.nau.edu/economic-policy-institute/data/>

[This page intentionally left blank]

