

The University of Tennessee conducted a series of surveys for various user groups of Tennessee's parks and outdoor recreation facilities. These and additional resources are included in the following pages.

APPENDIX



NATIONAL OUTDOOR TRENDS

NRPA Top 2020 Park Trends

In a January feature article in NRPA's national monthly magazine, the Association identified several park trends for 2020 within three overall categories. These predictions for the year highlight areas of advancement in the park and recreation field that are essential to consider and study, particularly in how they will shape recommendations over the next ten years.

Technology

"Prediction: More than one-third of park and rec agencies will have video surveillance in their facilities and parks in 2020, and the public will want more."

Video camera surveillance in parks and facilities is on the rise, especially given the fast pace of improving surveillance technology and mass production economies available at larger scales, contributing to the growing affordability of this technology advancement. Another barrier, access to a power source, is no longer prohibiting communities from jumping on the trend, since solar-powered cameras can be utilized at even the most remote locations. Generally, the public has embraced this trend and requested additional cameras instead of resisting the change.

"Prediction: In 2020, at least 25 drone businesses will deliver pizza and beer to beachgoers and picnickers in local and State Parks."

Some parks and recreation agencies have been hesitant to embrace the idea of recreational and commercial drones in parks. However, the notion of using drones for natural resources inventory, inspection of remote park areas, and search and rescue operations generally is widely accepted.

This prediction would depend on additional pending FAA approvals. However, with companies such as Amazon, UPS, FedEx and others competing for the projected billions of packages that could be delivered by drones to consumers, it may only be a matter of time before parks and recreation agencies are faced with developing new policies surrounding its park patrons, who also happen to be drone delivery consumers.

Prediction: It's a no-brainer to predict that parks and recreation agencies will begin to contract with esports coaches and offer recreation classes or personal training opportunities at community and rec centers. At least 50 esports programs with coaching will be offered in park and recreation centers in 2020.

Mirroring a parallel trend where parents of aspiring elite youth athletes supplement their children through "pay to play" participation, esports gamers have begun hiring coaches so that players can improve their performance. Esports gaming is now a more than half-billion dollar per-year entertainment industry. Some park and recreation agencies have begun to construct esports gaming rooms and for a few, larger facilities.

Health

Prediction: While only a handful of agencies, cities and counties presently ban the use of glyphosate, in a stunning reversal of business as usual, more than 250 jurisdictions and agencies will ban it in 2020, causing a wholesale change in landscape management practices to control weeds in parks.

Parks and recreation agencies are going to be faced with the challenge of how to keep outdoor facility landscapes in top shape without the use of glyphosate, the ingredient commonly found in most weed killers—including the most well known, Roundup. The International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) classified glyphosate as "probably carcinogenic to humans" in 2015, which has led to more than 18,000 lawsuits alleging that the herbicide causes cancer. In 2019, the EPA declared the pesticide "safe." However, controversy over the safety of glyphosate persists, aided by the growing evidence of its negative effects on human health as well as on wildlife.

Cities and counties have begun banning the use of glyphosate already, forcing agencies to turn to alternative measures to control invasive species and aggressive weeds, sometimes corresponding to an increase in staff time or other expense.

Prediction: Park and recreation agencies will re-evaluate their parkland inventory in light of its ability to reduce urban heat island effects through the natural cooling of tree canopy and shade. New parks, linear green spaces, and trail corridors will be designed to cool communities, as well as to provide recreational benefits.

Bonus prediction: A dozen park and recreation agencies will open parks for all night use to accommodate the demand for recreation access when temperatures fall enough to permit outdoor activities.

Climate change impacts already are having effects on parks and recreation agencies around the nation, and Tennessee's agencies are no exception. With record high temperatures and unpredictable weather patterns on the rise, ideal times of the day and year for outdoor recreation have become less regular and structured. The southwest United States, for example, now have in excess of 100 days annually where the temperature exceeds 100 degrees Fahrenheit.

An unsustainable future for our world is not so distant anymore. According to data from Climate Central, Las Vegas has been identified as the fastest-warming U.S. city. Unfortunately, extreme heat issues have a disproportionate effect on impoverished people and those on fixed incomes, making environmental justice and the equitable spread of negative environmental consequences an issue at the forefront.

Parks can help with community adaptation to extreme heat through their natural cooling and tree canopy qualities to combat urban heat islands. In a 2018 study by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), parks in Washington, D.C. were found to cool the city by as much as 17 degrees Fahrenheit. Not only are trees and green infrastructure a nice amenity to have, but they also are becoming essential in the toolkit in the fight against the negative effects of climate change.

Prediction: Twenty park and recreation agencies will enter into Community Hub agreements with other public-sector service providers in 2020. Funding from nonprofit funders and foundations will grow to support these innovative

collaborations as models of best practices for the public sector.

Parks and recreation agency impact has expanded beyond the realm of typical recreation programming that has been offered in the past. Today's agencies have grown into new spheres of influence, including providing after-school care to helping promote drug-free communities, educating on food and nutrition, and assisting with the challenges of homelessness. A multi-faceted approach as public-sector service providers is what forward-thinking agencies are tackling in 2020 and beyond, creating the new community wellness hub that is flexible enough to serve a diverse community but stable enough to be well-equipped to pivot when needs change. NRPA has been an early supporter of agencies wishing to invest in the community wellness hub model.

Quick Takes

Adult Recess

Adult recess games, including tetherball, hopscotch, and kickball, are all the rage in New York City, with leagues being formed and even having multiweek seasons.

"Cause-related programming is a big draw," says Ann Beck, marketing and communications manager for Mansfield Texas Parks and Recreation. One particularly popular program she identified was where a local animal shelter sponsors a 5K run/walk that pairs shelter dogs with program participants. Not only did it raise revenue, but it gave participants a sense of meaning and impact. She also noted the draw to "Insta-worthy" programming/events, because people "want to take a cool photo and show the cool things they are doing, so they can share their experiences on social media."

Micromobility Devices

The landscape of urban design and transportation is changing because of the quick uptick of availability and popularity of these devices, including escooters, emountain bikes, and other motorized personal mobility devices. While these bridge an important gap in community equity and

access by providing physical connectivity to populations without access to transit or car ownership, they have downstream effects on park rules, trail user conflicts, and legal implications that each city and county must respond to reactively, as many of these devices showed up on streets overnight. Furthermore, park planning and design standards that anticipate a certain number of cars based on the number of patrons are already becoming outdated. On the upside, this change might potentially create new opportunities for re-purposing excess parking and re-channeling funds once associated with accommodating the automobile into more equitable causes that benefit all community members regardless of socioeconomic status. Overall, the impacts of micromobility devices fully remain to be seen, as many agencies and governments are still evaluating their legality and what guidelines and ordinances need to be in place for their successful integration into the existing landscape and urban environment.

Barkless Dog Parks

Dog parks are the fastest growing type of park in the U.S., which is home to approximately 90 million dogs. However, not everyone wants a dog park where they live. After the Town of Chevy Chase, Maryland, spent \$134,000 to purchase land for a public dog park, some neighbors began to object to the barking dogs in the park, resulting in signage reading “No Excessive Barking.” After several contentious public meetings, the town voted to remove the dog park, a disappointment to dog owners. While dog parks are small enough to be sited on more compact pieces of land than a typical sports park or larger park facility, this example shows that we cannot ignore the noise impacts to adjacent uses, especially residential neighborhoods, and the inclusion of an adequate public involvement strategy early in dog park planning is critical to the longevity of these assets.

Human Composting

The state of Washington passed landmark legislation in 2019 to legally permit the green burial practice of natural organic reduction, more commonly known as human composting. This practice is growing quickly and the public is taking notice. This burial method passes on the fancy metal or rare wood coffins and looks to place the remains of

loved ones in natural landscapes. Using natural composting methods and the addition of natural fiber, such as wood chips and straw along with some heat, a University of Washington pilot study showed that a human body could be fully composted in about four weeks.

Not only are public lands a protected and permanent fixture, but they also can offer people a sense of peace that their loved ones were reconnected with the earth in a highly natural manner.

Sports and Fitness Industry Association (SFIA) Topline Participation Report 2019

This study was performed to establish levels of activity and key participatory trends in recreation in the United States, and its foundation is in survey data collected in 2018 by the Physical Activity Council (PAC), which produced over 20,000 web-based interviews. Survey methodology was inclusive to all genders, ages, income levels, regions, and ethnicities. Using a weighting technique, survey results were generalized to the total United States population of over three million people (ages six and older).

General Sports

The most popular sports in the United States were basketball (24.2 million) and golf (23.8 million in 2017), which both have participation levels far above other general sports. These were followed by tennis (17.8 million), baseball (15.9 million), and soccer (11.4 million).

Although golf has experienced a recent decrease in participation, it draws a wide age segment and appeals to many as a life-long sport. Basketball’s popularity is partially attributed to its limited space requirements and easily accessible equipment—making it the only traditional sport that took place at homes in residential driveways instead of full courts, fields, or course properties.

When analyzing the five-year trends for general sports, roller hockey (33.6%) and rugby (31.9%) rank as the overall fastest growing sports. During the last five-year period since 2013, baseball (19.5%), cheerleading (18.7%), and flag

football (17.1%) also have grown substantially. Extrapolated into the future and based on the past five-year trend, the most rapidly declining sports include ultimate frisbee (-46.6%), touch football (-22.7%), tackle football (-16.4%), badminton (-11.4%), and outdoor soccer (-10.4%).

General Fitness

National participation in general fitness activities have grown strongly in recent years, in part due to an increased awareness by many Americans of the importance of healthy living and enhancing their quality of life by engaging in an active lifestyle. Furthermore, general fitness activities have minimal barriers to entry and often are low commitment on the front end, requiring only a pair of athletic shoes, outdoor space, or a free trial at a local fitness club or studio. The most popular general fitness categories amongst the U.S. population include: Fitness walking (111.1 million), treadmill (53.7 million), free weights (51.3 million), running/jogging (49.5 million), and stationary cycling (36.7 million).

Between 2013 and 2018, the activities gaining in popularity the most include trail running (47.4%), aerobics (24.8%), barre (21.8%), stair climbing machine (18.8%), and yoga (18.2%). However, it is important to caveat these statistics with the understanding that many of these rapidly growing categories are recently begun, still have relatively low user bases, or both, allowing for the data to show more drastic increases in percentage that could be misleading if trying to apply to actual population numbers. At the same time, activities experiencing the largest declines include dumbbell free weights (-12.0%), running/jogging (-8.7%), fitness walking (-5.3%), traditional triathlon (-4.2%), and boot camps-style cross training (-3.1%).

Another factor important to take into account when reviewing the trends for General Fitness is the SFIA's notion of core versus casual users. Core users are defined as being more committed long-term to their particular activity, while casual users have tendencies to migrate from one activity to the next with a lower commitment to the specific activity, although not necessarily a low commitment to

physical activity itself. For General Fitness, almost all of the categories are characterized by casual participants, meaning the statistics presented above are only as reliable as the commitment of the user. Thus, even though the percentages may remain relatively stable over the course of a month-long period, the specific users that make up that percentage may not be as consistently the same as activities characterized by core participants.

Outdoor Recreation

Similar to general fitness activities, outdoor recreation categories encourage an active lifestyle, have the flexibility to be done individually or within a group, and do not have the more restrictive time constraints by which general sports and other categories are hampered. The 2018 most popular outdoor recreation categories included day hiking (47.9 million), road bicycling (39.0 million), freshwater fishing (39.0 million), camping within ¼ mile of vehicle/home (27.4 million), and recreational vehicle camping (16.0 million). In terms of the five-year growth trends, BMX bicycling (58.6%), day hiking (39.2%), fly fishing (18.1%), backpacking overnight (16.2%), and recreational vehicle camping (9.8%) have all experienced the largest gains in participation. The most significant losses were in the categories of in-line roller skating (-17.8%), birdwatching (-12.8%), camping within ¼ mile of home/vehicle (-6.3%), and road bicycling (-4.5%). Much like general fitness activities, a large portion of participation growth for Outdoor Recreation stemmed from an increase in casual users.

Aquatics

Swimming is nationally understood to be a lifetime activity and can be done indoors or outdoors, both of which contribute to its strong participation. In 2018, fitness swimming was by far the leader in overall participation (27.6 million) amongst aquatic activities, followed by aquatic exercise (10.5 million) and competition swimming (3.0 million). In terms of growth, aquatic exercise has experienced the most growth over the past five-year period at 24.0%, which can likely be attributed to the ongoing research about its therapeutic benefits for the overall public,

but specifically those recovering from a sports-related injury or the elderly.

Water Sports/Activities

The highest ranking water sports/activities were recreational kayaking (11.0 million), canoeing (9.1 million), and snorkeling (7.8 million). A caveat to the data in this category is that activity participation tends to vary based on regional, seasonal, and environmental factors. For example, regions having inherently warmer climates or greater access to water bodies tend to have higher participation rates in water activities than similar regions that has long winter seasons or limited water access. Thus, we must understand that environmental and geographic barriers are at play beyond the typical user desire, access to activity, and awareness of activity to guide participation.

By Age Segment

Fitness and Outdoor Sports were the most common activities across all generations. When analyzing by generation, there is a converse correlation between age and healthy activity rates. Specific breakdowns per segment produced by SFIA can be viewed on the facing page.

Non-Participant Interest by Age Segment



In addition to participation rates by generation, SFIA also tracks non-participant interests, defined as activities in which people do not currently participate due to physical or financial barriers. If these barriers did not exist or could be overcome, these people would choose to participate, adding to the overall popularity of those respective activity categories. In the graphic on the facing page, SFIA has presented the top activities that each age segment would be most likely to participate in, if they were available.

Participation by age segment/generation (ages 6+)



Generation Z (born 2000+)

Generation Z are the most active, with only 17.9% of the population identifying as inactive. Approximately 81% of individuals within this generation were deemed high calorie burning participants in 2018. There are 36.7% active high calorie participants and 34.1% being casual high calorie participants.





Millennials (born 1980-1999)

Almost half (42.0%) of millennials were active high calorie participants, while 23.4% claimed they were inactive. Even though this inactive rate is much higher than Generation Z's (17.9%), it is still below the national inactive rate (28%).

Generation X (born 1965-1979)

Generation X has the second highest active to a healthy level rate (35.0%) among all generations at 0.4% less than Millennials. At the same time, they also have the second highest inactive rate, with 28.1% that are not active at all.



The Boomers (born 1945-1964)

The Boomers were the least active generation with an inactive rate of 33.7%. This age group tends to participate in less intensive activities. Approximately 34% claimed to engage in casual high (10.2%) along with low/medium (24.8%) calorie participants.

Definitions: Active (three times per week), Casual (one two times per week), High Calorie (20+ minutes of elevated heart rate), Low/Med Calorie (>20 minutes of elevated heart rate), and Inactive (no physical activity in 2018)

Non-participant interest by age segment



Overall, the activities most age segments are interested in include: camping, bicycling, fishing, and swimming for fitness, all being low-impact activities, making them obtainable for any age segment to enjoy.

Targeted Programs for Children, Seniors, and People with Disabilities

For a better understanding of targeted programs, or programs that target specific interest segments, NRPA tracks program activities offered that are dedicated specifically to children, seniors, and people with disabilities. The top three most-offered core program areas include summer camp, senior programs, and disability programs for the southern U.S. These program areas also are the most offered for the U.S. as a whole.

Southern (% of agencies offering)

- Summer Camp (86%)
- Senior Programs (80%)
- Disability Programs (66%)

U.S. (% of agencies offering)

- Summer Camp (82%)
- Senior Programs (78%)
- After School Programs (77%)

It is worth noting that agencies in the Southern Region tend to offer targeted programs at a lower rate than the national average. For example, Southern agencies currently are offering after school programs, preschool programs, and before school programs at a significantly lower rate than the national average.

This page intentionally left blank.

Barriers to Outdoor Recreation

RESULTS OF A SURVEY OF TENNESSEANS, 2020

MARCH 19, 2021

prepared for

KIMLEY-HORN & THE TENNESSEE STATEWIDE COMPREHENSIVE OUTDOOR
RECREATION PLAN

Susan Schexnayder

Lillia Poveda

J. Mark Fly

UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE
HUMAN DIMENSIONS RESEARCH LAB

*Corresponding author: schexnayder@utk.edu; 2505 EJ Chapman Drive, Rm 427, Knoxville, TN 37996-4563

BARRIERS TO OUTDOOR RECREATION: RESULTS OF A SURVEY OF TENNESSEANS, 2020

Susan Schexnayder, Lillia Poveda, J. Mark Fly
University of Tennessee Human Dimensions Research Lab

Introduction

Outdoor recreation resources provided by public agencies are best planned and evaluated with input from the constituencies for whom the resources exist. Especially important to the process is an awareness of the current and likely future recreation patterns of the constituents, as well as knowledge of their perceptions of existing recreation resources, their motivations for participating in outdoor recreation, and barriers that limit it. In the context of the State of Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation's Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan, the University of Tennessee Human Dimensions Research Lab conducted a survey of Tennesseans to provide information essential to the plan. This report specifically addresses the issue of barriers to Tennesseans' participation in outdoor recreation.

Methods

The Human Dimensions Research Lab conducted a survey of Tennesseans in 2020. Administered online with data collection occurring between October 27 and December 11, 2020, the survey collected data from 1,135 respondents. Quotas and limits were imposed to assure participation of hard-to-reach populations, including low-income, minority, and non-urban populations.

To assure the survey results represent Tennesseans, the demographic characteristics of respondents were compared to those of the Tennessee adult population. Tennesseans from 89 of the state's 95 counties participated. Respondents roughly match Tennessee population on age, race and ethnicity, community density (urban vs. nonurban), and income. A significant difference in gender distribution occurred. Seventy percent (70%) of survey respondents and 52% of the adult population in Tennessee are female. To discount this overrepresentation of females, we applied proportional weighting, which allows all analyses to reflect the actual gender distribution in Tennessee.

Data gathered through the survey furthers our understanding of the barriers that limit participation in outdoor recreation and focuses specifically on the current situation as perceived by adult residents of Tennessee. A set of potential barriers to outdoor recreation was presented and respondents could select "Not like me," "Somewhat like me," or "Totally like me", with values being 1, 2, and 3 respectively. The barriers included on the survey are factors that might be mitigated with information, policies or programs to reduce the barrier. The barriers people could affiliate with included the following:

- Nothing prevents me from participating in outdoor recreation
- I am not interested in outdoor recreation
- Finding places that are not crowded is an issue
- Health problems limit my outdoor recreation
- I or someone I would recreate with has a disability that limits access to outdoor recreation

- I have nobody to go with
- Cost to participate (travel, user fees, or equipment) is an issue
- Getting access to places to do outdoor recreation is an issue
- Mosquitoes, ticks or other pests are an issue
- I have safety concerns about outdoor recreation
- I don't feel confident in my skill or know how to do outdoor activities
- I don't feel welcome at places where I could participate in outdoor recreation
- Something else (participant asked to specify the barrier)

In the listing above, the wording is exactly as it occurred in the survey. In charts and tables that follow, shortened versions of the wording are sometimes used because of space limitations.

In statistical analysis of data, researchers subject the data to significance testing to assure that the findings are not due to chance. When findings are found to be “statistically significant,” it means we are confident the result is real and is associated with a factor we are studying. Statistical significance is presented as p values. If $p = .05$, it means there is only a 5% likelihood that the result is due to chance, and a 95% chance that the result is associated with the factor we have tested.

Findings

Overall

The overall findings are presented in Figure 1.1. A value of 1.0 would indicate all respondents had selected “This is not like me,” while a value of 3.0 would indicate all respondents had selected “This is totally like me.” The statement “Nothing prevents me from participating” with a mean score of 1.86 indicates that overall Tennesseans do perceive some limitations, but not extreme limitations, to their participation in outdoor recreation. Twenty percent of Tennesseans indicated that nothing prevented them from recreating outdoors.

Interest in outdoor recreation is a prerequisite to participation, thus a statement about interest was included among the potential barriers. The mean score for the statement “I am not interested in outdoor recreation” is 1.52. This indicates Tennesseans generally are interested in outdoor recreation. Only 12.5% of Tennesseans—or 665,000 adult Tennesseans—report having no interest in outdoor recreation (Table 1). Another 27% of Tennesseans—or 1.4 million adult Tennesseans—express only a moderate interest in outdoor recreation, saying lack of interest is “somewhat like [them].” To assess whether disinterest is associated with young adults in Tennessee, we compared mean age of Tennesseans who expressed no interest in outdoor recreation with mean age of other Tennesseans. Survey respondents identified themselves by age category rather than providing a specific numerical age. Categories were (1) 18 – 24; (2) 25 – 34; (3) 35 – 44; (4) 45 – 54; (5) 55 – 64; (6) 65 – 74; (7) 75+. The mean age category for Tennesseans having no interest in outdoor recreation is 3.55, and the mean age category for Tennesseans who have interest in outdoor recreation it is 3.49, making the mean age for both groups roughly 40 years old. The difference is slight and not significant ($p = .69$).




Figure 1.1 Barriers to Outdoor Recreation

Table 1. Barriers to Tennesseans' outdoor recreation: % who say the barrier is "totally like me"	
Barriers*	% who say it is totally like me
Finding places that are not crowded	30.8
Mosquitoes, ticks or other pests	26.0
Health problems	19.1
Cost to participate	17.7
Safety concerns	14.8
Getting access to places	15.0
Nobody to go with	14.4
Disability (self or a recreation partner)	18.1
Lack confidence in skill or know-how	12.0
Don't feel welcome	8.5
Not interested in outdoor recreation	12.5
Nothing prevents me from participating	20.4
*Barriers are ordered consistently with Figure 1.1 to facilitate comparison.	
Note: each 10% is equal to 532,000 Tennessee adults.	

Of the other factors that could be barriers to outdoor recreation, “finding places that are not crowded is an issue” was scored highest (2.07) making it the barrier perceived by Tennesseans to be significantly greater than all other variables ($p < .0005$). Mosquitoes, ticks and other pests were the second greatest barrier with a value of 1.91 ($p < .0005$, relative to all other barriers). Health problems, cost to participate, safety, access, lacking someone to recreate with, and disability of self or a recreation partner have scores ranging from 1.68 to 1.60, respectively, indicating their similarity as barriers to outdoor recreation. However, health problems and cost of participation are significantly different from and a greater barrier than lack of a recreation partner or having a disability. Conditions that present the least obstacle to outdoor recreation are lack of confidence or know-how (1.52) and feeling unwelcome (1.40). Scores for these barriers are significantly different from one another and all other barriers ($p < .0005$).

Further assessment was conducted to determine what differences in barriers to recreation there were among different population segments. Tennesseans are compared by gender, community type in which they live (such as downtown and suburban), race and ethnicity, and income.

Gender

Tennesseans could report themselves as male, female, or non-binary. The number of non-binary persons included among the survey respondents is too small for analysis. This section compares the barriers to outdoor recreation as perceived by males vs. females.

Mean scores on responses to questions about barriers reveal some significant differences between genders (Figure 1.2). Females’ mean score shows less agreement than males with the statement “nothing prevents my outdoor recreation” (1.79 vs. 1.93 respectively). Females find mosquitoes and other pests, as well as safety concerns to be a greater barrier than do men (2.05 vs. 1.76, and 1.73 vs. 1.57, respectively). No significant differences were found for any other barrier, including interest in outdoor recreation.




Figure 1.2 Barriers to Outdoor Recreation: Comparison by Gender

Community Type

Tennesseans who participated in the survey identified the area in which they live as either 1) downtown or inner city, 2) residential area close to downtown, 3) suburbs, or 4) out in the country. Although survey respondents were not provided with definitions of these four categories of community types, the categories generally are interpreted as proximity to or location within a city.

There were not significant differences in some barriers including “nothing prevents my outdoor recreation,” “health problems,” and “getting access.” However, significant differences in barriers to recreation among community types were found for some of the named barriers (Figure 1.3). In the chart, short-hand labels of the barriers are used. Refer to the “Methods” section for the complete wording presented to survey respondents.




Figure 1.3 Barriers to Outdoor Recreation: Comparison by Community Type

Significant differences among community types' assessment of barriers do exist. In most cases, the differences are between downtown/inner city residents and other populations, either suburban, in the country, or, in one case, close-to-downtown Tennesseans. Barriers assessed significantly different by downtown/inner city Tennesseans are a) having a disability or a recreation partner with a disability; b) having nobody to go with; c) cost to participate; d) mosquitoes, ticks and other pests; e) safety concerns; f) lack of confidence in skill; and g) not feeling welcome at places for outdoor recreation. For each of these barriers, the downtown/inner city Tennesseans perceive the barrier to be greater than do all other Tennesseans. Other cases of significant differences occur in assessment of safety, where inner city, close-to-downtown, and suburban Tennesseans all perceive safety to be a greater barrier than do rural Tennesseans (mean scores are 1.84, 1.68, 1.68 and 1.53, respectively). Mosquitos, ticks and other pests are assessed similarly by downtown and suburban Tennesseans, who both assess it as a more significant barrier than do rural Tennesseans. Downtown/inner city Tennesseans also assess not feeling welcome more significantly than both suburban and rural Tennesseans (1.56 vs. 1.38 and 1.33, respectively).

Race and Ethnicity

There are significant differences in Tennesseans' assessment of barriers based on race and ethnicity. A comparison was made of white, non-Hispanic Tennesseans to Tennesseans of other races/ethnicities — including blacks, Hispanics, mixed race persons, and Native Americans. Here we will use the term BIPOC (black, indigenous, and people of color) to represent this group. Barriers and factors found to have statistically significant differences are shown in Figure 1.4.

BIPOC Tennesseans express less interest in outdoor recreation than do white, non-Hispanic Tennesseans, although the average scores of both population groups fall well below the statement

“having no interest” is “somewhat like me” (values of 1.65 vs. 1.46, respectively). BIPOC Tennesseans also are less likely than white, non-Hispanic Tennesseans to assess themselves as having no barriers to outdoor recreation.

The specific barriers that BIPOC Tennesseans experience more or perceive to be greater than white, non-Hispanic Tennesseans are having no one to recreate with (1.7 vs. 1.56), mosquitoes and other pests (2.07 vs. 1.83), concerns about safety (1.78 vs. 1.59), and feeling unwelcome (1.51 vs. 1.35).




Figure 1.4 Barriers to Outdoor Recreation: Comparison by Race and Ethnicity

Income

Analysis of differences in barriers to outdoor recreation revealed that significant differences existed between the lowest income category and other categories, but not among other income categories, with very few exceptions. Here we present differences between the lowest income category, i.e. Tennesseans with 2019 household income below \$25,000, and all other categories combined (Figure 1.5). No significant differences were observed for these variables: interest in outdoor recreation; nothing prevents my outdoor recreation; mosquitoes, ticks and pests; getting access; confidence in skill; or finding places that are not crowded.

Significant differences are observed for all other barriers, including health, disability, having no one to go with, cost, safety concerns, and not feeling welcome. For each of these, Tennesseans with household incomes below \$25,000 perceive the barrier to be greater than do Tennesseans with higher income. The mean differences range from 0.13 to 0.3 on the three-point scale, and all differences are statistically significant.



Figure 1.5 Barriers to Outdoor Recreation: Comparison by Income Categories

Discussion

Overall, Tennesseans do not evaluate barriers to their outdoor recreation to be extreme, in that no barrier received an average score greater than 2.07 on a three-point scale. A score of three equates to “this is totally like me” compared to “this is somewhat like me” having a value of two and “this is not like me” having a value of one. Because we find no significant difference in the age of persons who express no interest in outdoor recreation and those who express some interest, it is not likely that the aging of the current population will reduce outdoor recreation interest and, thus, demand.

The barrier “not able to find places that are not crowded” received the highest mean score. The survey was implemented during the COVID-19 (SARS-CoV-2) crisis of 2020 when many types of indoor recreation facilities were closed or avoided to reduce opportunities for transmission of the virus. In 2020, Tennessee State Parks reported record visitation, as did many other outdoor recreation locations. Having few indoor recreation opportunities, Tennesseans may have experienced crowds larger than usual or crowds larger than novice outdoor recreationalists might have expected. It is possible that finding outdoor recreation places that are not crowded is an issue only in the non-typical 2020 year. *Discerning whether perceived crowding is a temporary issue associated with COVID precautions is possible only with follow-up research during a time not affected by COVID limitations on indoor recreation.*

“Mosquitoes, ticks and other pests” show that outdoor nuisances and discomforts are perceived as a barrier to outdoor recreation to some extent by all segments of the Tennessee population, although the comparison by community type shows that rural Tennesseans have higher tolerances or better coping mechanisms for this barrier than do members of other community types in Tennessee.

A cluster of other potential barriers—including health issues, having a disability or a disabled recreation partner, having safety concerns, having no partner for recreation, and issues gaining access—score in the range from 1.68 to 1.60, far less than being considered “somewhat like me.” *Some of these barriers, like having health issues or a having a disability or a disabled recreation partner might be addressed by promoting the benefits of passive recreation in the outdoors or by improving information about outdoor recreation resources, such as ADA compliant greenway segments. Others such as concerns over safety and perceptions of access issues might require assessment of existing policies and procedures to assure safety and address access.* Some additional examination of the data might shed more light on access issues, especially to determine whether they are associated with specific recreation activities, such as hunting or alternative sports for which access could be intentionally restricted for reasons of safety or multi-purpose resource management.

The comparisons among specific population segments revealed, in some cases, few differences in barriers, and, in other cases, many significant differences. In the gender assessment, we found few differences. Males and females are different only in their assessment of barriers overall, mosquitoes and other pests, and concerns about safety. In each of these cases, females, on average, perceive these factors to be greater than males do. Tennessee Wildlife Recreation Association offers a program to instruct women in outdoor recreation skills and opportunities, and Tennessee State Parks offers Girls Outdoors workshops for the same purpose. Although confidence in outdoor skill was not assessed differently by males and females, skills programs attract women to specific outdoor recreation types while also addressing fundamentals of outdoor recreation including basics of outdoor safety and minimizing exposure to pests.

The comparison of Tennesseans by community type revealed those who live in downtown/inner city areas experience or perceive barriers to be greater than their counterparts elsewhere. Among those barriers is having a disability or a recreation partner with a disability. A possible explanation is that persons with disabilities are more likely to live in urban settings where services such as public transportation are available. Downtown dwellers also perceive the barrier “having no one to go with” to be greater than do other Tennesseans. The preponderance of barriers—concerns about safety, not feeling welcome, and cost, as well as health and disability—for inner city dwellers could suppress the frequency of their recreation outdoors. While inner city dwellers express interest in outdoor recreation similar to Tennesseans in other community types, we do observe significant differences in the frequency of their outdoor recreation and their expected frequency of outdoor recreation in the next 12 months compared to all other Tennesseans ($p = .056$ and $p = .005$, respectively). However, the difference is largely due to “out in the country” dwellers reporting current and expected frequency of outdoor recreation.

Differences by race and ethnicity are observed, as well. White Tennesseans express greater interest in outdoor recreation, on average, than do BIPOC Tennesseans. However, it is possible that the greater barriers—such as not feeling welcome and having safety concerns—perceived by BIPOC Tennesseans suppress their interest in outdoor recreation.

Differences in income correlate with experiencing or perceiving barriers to outdoor recreation differently. As with inner city dwellers and BIPOC Tennesseans, low-income Tennesseans (persons in households with annual income less than \$25,000) report experiencing greater barriers than persons having household income of \$25,000 or more. Again, for low-income Tennesseans, a suite of barriers are

evaluated to be more significant: health, disability, nobody to recreate with, cost, concerns about safety, and not feeling welcome.

Table 2 presents a summary of survey findings about the experience or perception of barriers to outdoor recreation, comparing inner city/downtown, low-income, and BIPOC Tennesseans to other Tennesseans. The barriers addressed here are those where we observed some difference. Barriers are 1) lack of interest, 2) nobody to go with, 3) pests, 4) safety, 5) not feeling welcome, 6) health issues, 7) having a disability or a recreation partner with a disability, 8) cost and 9) lack of confidence in skill. The Xs indicate there is a difference in barriers or perception of barriers. The number of Xs indicates the magnitude of the difference between the populations compared, with each X representing is a 0.1 point difference on a three-point scale. All differences noted here—even if it is only one X—are statistically significant, meaning there is very little chance that the difference is random. In all cases with an X, the inner city, low income, and BIPOC populations' barrier is greater than others. When reviewing this, one should not assume the Xs are cumulative because there are some overlaps among these populations. But there is also not 100% overlap, with BIPOC community members existing across the entire income spectrum, and Tennessee downtowns having high- and low-income residents.

Among low-income Tennesseans, we observe barriers that are often correlated with low-income: health, disability and cost concerns. Disability and cost also are greater barriers to inner-city/downtown Tennesseans than persons in other community types. Members of the BIPOC community experience lack of interest and issues with mosquitoes, ticks and other pests more than the white population. Having nobody to go with is a barrier perceived greater by inner-city, low-income and BIPOC community members and could result from the combined presence of all other barriers.

Safety is reported to be a greater barrier to outdoor recreation by low-income and BIPOC community members than other Tennesseans. The survey did not specify what components of safety were included in the statement “I have safety concerns about outdoor recreation.” Thus, respondents' assessment of this variable could include the minor risks inherent in outdoor recreation activities, e.g., slipping when hiking or being outdoors in adverse weather conditions, as well as perceptions of risk to personal safety because of the location in which outdoor recreation would occur. Thus, interpreting the reported differences in safety as a barrier requires additional research. However, because all persons experience the same safety risk in a recreational activity, a conservative interpretation of the safety barrier would focus on personal safety in outdoor recreation places. Reputable media sources¹ and the research literature² both address African Americans' ongoing concern about personal safety in outdoor

¹ There are many articles addressing participation of African Americans in outdoor recreation and perceptions of safety. These are only recent, relevant citations.

A. Machado. “Why people of color often feel unsafe in the outdoors.” *Sierra*, July 30, 2020. The Sierra Club. <https://www.sierraclub.org/sierra/why-people-color-often-feel-unsafe-outdoors>

R. Askew and M. Walls. “Diversity in the great outdoors: Is everyone welcome in America's parks and public lands?” *Resources*, May 24, 2019. Resources for the Future. <https://www.resources.org/common-resources/diversity-in-the-great-outdoors-is-everyone-welcome-in-americas-parks-and-public-lands/>

² M.C. Goodrid. Racial complexities of outdoor spaces: An analysis of African American's lived experiences in outdoor recreation. University of the Pacific Theses and Dissertations, 2018.

D. Theriault and R.A. Mowatt. Both sides now: Transgression and oppression in African Americans' historical relationships with nature. *Leisure Sciences*, 2020 42(1)15-31. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01490400.218.1448024>

recreation, and incidents that justify their concern. Survey results demonstrate that Tennesseans' experiences are consistent with the literature and not an exception to the national narrative.

Table 2. Summary of differences in barriers experienced and perceived by inner city/downtown, low-income, and BIPOC community members compared to other Tennesseans			
Barrier	Inner-City / Downtown vs. others	Income <\$25,000 vs. others	BIPOC vs. White
Not Interested			XX
Nobody to go with	XX	XX	X
Mosquitoes, ticks, pests			XX
Safety concerns	*	X	XX
Don't feel welcome	XX	XX	XX
Health		XXX	
Disability	XX	XX	
Cost	XX**	XXX	
Lack confidence in skill	X		
Access			
* All community types perceive greater safety concerns than do "out in the country" dwellers.			
** Only compared to suburbs; no significant difference between inner city and "out in the country"			

Perhaps of most concern for Tennessee recreation planners is the pattern for the "don't feel welcome" barrier. Inner-city, low income and BIPOC community members in Tennessee experience this barrier more than other Tennesseans. Elsewhere components of "feeling welcome" have included seeing persons like themselves among rangers, other staff and other visitors, having persons of color

S.L. Powers, K.J. Lee, N.A. Pitas, A.R. Graefe and A.J. Mowen. Understanding access and use of municipal parks and recreation through an intersectionality perspective. *Journal of Leisure Research* 2020 51(4):377-396.

represented in programming and interpretive materials, and acknowledging all people whose lives and work have shaped the character of the land.³

We observe no significant difference in perceptions of access and posit that other factors—safety, feeling welcome, health, and cost—are more fundamental and, thus, are pre-requisites to either seeking or gaining access to the recreation place. If one perceives there to be safety concerns, or one does not have the financial resources to participate, or one’s health does not allow outdoor recreation, then access may be a secondary limitation.

Additional analysis is warranted to determine whether Tennesseans who experience or perceive these greater barriers are coping or overcoming them so they are able to capture the benefits of outdoor recreation generally, and the greater benefits of outdoor recreation in natural places such as those conserved by Tennessee State Parks, as well as national parks and forests. *Better understanding the disparity in barriers can be achieved through outreach and additional research directly with communities of persons who experience the barrier disproportionately, particularly low-income, BIPOC, urban Tennesseans. The necessary outreach should be accompanied by a critical examination of programs and policies to make all Tennesseans feel welcome and safe in our outdoor recreation areas.*

³ J.E. Mills. Here’s how national parks are working to fight racism. *National Geographic* June 23, 2020. <https://www.nationalgeographic.com/travel/national-parks/article/more-diversity-how-to-make-national-parks-anti-racist>

ECONOMIC IMPACTS OF TENNESSEE STATE PARKS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND DETAILED ASSESSMENT

FEBRUARY 14, 2021

prepared for

KIMLEY-HORN & THE TENNESSEE STATEWIDE COMPREHENSIVE OUTDOOR
RECREATION PLAN

Susan Schexnayder*

UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE | HUMAN DIMENSIONS RESEARCH LAB

Paul Scheuren

IMPACT DATASOURCE

Brian Clifford

TENNESSEE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENT & CONSERVATION | BUREAU OF PARKS & CONSERVATION

*Corresponding author: schexnayder@utk.edu; 2505 EJ Chapman Drive, Rm 427, Knoxville, TN 37996-4563

Economic Impacts of Tennessee State Parks: Executive Summary and Detailed Assessment

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report assesses the economic impact of Tennessee State Parks. It combines information generated by the University of Tennessee’s Human Dimensions Research Lab, visitation data and operating and capital budget information provided by Tennessee State Parks, modeling and analysis by Texas-based consultant Impact DataSource, and analysis by the Human Dimensions Research Lab at The University of Tennessee.

This Executive Summary provides summary findings along with observations that are particularly relevant for the Tennessee Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan. The detailed analysis contained as Appendix A (pages 1 – 151) was generated by Impact DataSource and provides the detailed economic and fiscal impact assessment that addresses impacts from visitor expenditures and Tennessee State Park operational and capital budgets in state fiscal year 2020.¹ The visitor expenditures section relies upon a survey focused on expenditures of visitors to Tennessee State Parks, conducted by the Human Dimensions Research Lab in 2020, and annual visitor counts provided by Tennessee State Parks.


The economic impact of Tennessee State Parks is derived from visitor expenditures, park operations and maintenance, and capital expenditures. For each dollar the State of Tennessee invests in state parks generates \$33.48 in economic impact in the state. The economic activity is the visitor spending and its spin-off effects and the economic impact from operations and capital expenditures. Considering the value-added economic output, rather than total economic output that can include duplicative counting of intermediate products, the ratio is \$1 of state investment for \$25.16 of economic impact.

Economic effects of visitor spending at Tennessee State Parks

- ***The total economic impact of visitor spending includes visitor expenditures, the economic output and related value-added, and the associated state and local sales taxes (see Figure 1).*** Total visitor spending on trips to Tennessee State Parks in 2020 is estimated at \$1.37 billion. Total economic output—the indirect and induced economic activity that is spawned by the visitor spending—is \$1.70 billion, while the actual value-added is \$958 million. Sales tax totals \$131.2 million. For economic output and sales tax, the values capture the secondary impacts of visitor spending and of spending by employees of visitor-supported businesses. Because economic output includes some double counting of intermediate inputs, we present also the “value-added,” which is the gross economic output less the intermediate outputs.²

¹ Use of findings and data presented in Appendix A, the Impact DataSource report, should be cited as Impact DataSource, A Report of the Economic & Fiscal Impact of Tennessee State Parks, Dec 2020. Prepared for Tennessee State Parks.

² See the Impact Data Source document page 5, included herein, for more detailed description.




- Economic benefits occur primarily within 25 miles of the park, but other areas of the state benefit as well.** Spending by Tennessee State Park visitors in 2020 is estimated at \$1,373,740,283. Of this \$1.4 billion total, roughly 72% of these expenditures occur locally, i.e., within 25 miles of the park. While visitor spending mostly benefits the area close to the park, State Parks visitor spending also provides some direct economic impact to areas more than 25 miles from the park, with just under \$387 million in visitor expenditures occurring more than 25 miles from the park.
- All types of State Parks generate economic impact from visitor spending.** Visitors who are on single-day trips spend more when visiting State Parks with significant development – such as resorts, marinas, and parks with cabins and campgrounds – rather than state parks without camping or other amenities. However, for visitors traveling overnight, total expenditures in Tennessee are greater when trips involve state parks that don’t offer camping or other amenities. The difference is largely due to greater expenditures for accommodations. Expenditures include purchases within Tennessee, including those at the state park or anywhere else in Tennessee while on the trip that includes the visit to the state park. Per-trip expenditures by park type, for both single-day and multi-day trips, are shown in Table E-1.

Park Type	Day Trip	Overnight Trip
Resort	\$ 49.25	\$ 432.30
Marina	\$ 58.93	\$ 412.98
Cabins/Camping	\$ 53.68	\$ 421.64
No camping, has amenities	\$ 44.00	\$ 459.81
No camping, no amenities	\$ 44.78	\$ 548.03

* Total expenditures reported here include local (within 25 miles) and beyond 25 miles of the park.

- State parks visitors' expenditures can generate significant economic impacts for rural counties in Tennessee.** Visitor expenditures—including only local expenditures, i.e., within 25 miles of the park—relative to the population of the county which is the park is primarily located provides a measure of the economic benefit of Tennessee State Parks to rural Tennessee Counties. Although visitors' local expenditures vary widely by park (Table E-2)—a difference based primarily on park visitation rather than differences in visitor spending—we observe that economies of rural counties benefit from visitor expenditures. Figure 2 shows the total visitor expenditures within 25 miles of the park in 2020 relative to the county population.³ The average visitor group expenditure per county resident in counties with populations less than 20,000 is \$2,330. The figure drops to \$51 of visitor expenditures per county resident for Tennessee counties with populations above 200,000.



³ Total visitor expenditures within 25 miles of the park divided by county population. Total visitor expenditures are calculated as the product of average visitor group expenditures within 25 miles (by park type) and the total estimated visitor groups to the park in 2020. Visitors include county residents and out-of-county visitors to the state park.

Table E-2. Spending by visitors to Tennessee State Parks relative to population size of county that is primary host of the park

County Population	Average Visitor Spending per County Resident	Range of Visitor Spending per County Resident
>200,000	50.67	\$5 - \$80
100,00 - 200,000	196.21	\$30 - \$358
50,000 - 100,000	321.09	\$15 - \$586
20,000 - 50,000	533.54	\$10 - \$1,515
<20,000	2,330.26	\$28 - \$5,525

- Economic impact estimates are based on data collected in 2020. The effect of the Covid-19 epidemic cannot be estimated.** In 2020, travel was significantly affected by the Covid-19 epidemic. Indoor recreation opportunities were extremely limited, so Tennessee State Parks, as well as other locations that offered outdoor recreation opportunities, experienced higher than usual visitation. Visitor spending might also have been affected in different ways as well. On the one hand, many people became unemployed. This unemployment, despite the supplemental unemployment provided in Federal government relief packages, could have reduce disposable income available for recreational spending. On the other hand, out-of-state travel was restricted by business closings and other factors, making it possible that recreational dollars that would have been spent out-of-state were repurposed for in-state travel.


Ecosystem Services Value

- Non-market ecosystem services are provided by Tennessee State Park lands.** The formal assessment of the economic impact of Tennessee State Parks does not provide an estimate of the economic value of the ecosystem services. However, state park lands do provide services such as water filtration and wildlife habitat that provide economic benefits to Tennessee.

Economic Impact of Operations, Maintenance and Capital Expenditures

State expenditures, totaling \$102.5 million for operations, maintenance and capital expenditures combined, produce an additional \$228.1 million in economic output, or \$116.1 when accounting for only value-added (Figure 3).

Figure 3. Total Economic Impact of State Park Operations, Maintenance, and Capital Expenditures (FY 2020)



* Economic output includes that derived employment totalling 4,995 including direct state park employment, and indirect and induced employment from operations and capital expenditures.

A REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC & FISCAL IMPACT OF TENNESSEE STATE PARKS

December 21, 2020

Prepared for:



Prepared by:



PURPOSE &
LIMITATIONS

This report presents the results of an analysis undertaken by Impact DataSource, an Austin, TX based economic consulting firm. The analysis relies on visitor estimates and visitor expenditure data. Impact DataSource and Tennessee State Parks made reasonable efforts to ensure that the information used in the analysis is accurate and reasonable.

The analysis presented in this report incorporates estimates, assumptions, and other information developed by Impact DataSource from its independent research effort.



CONTENTS

- Study Highlights..... 4
- Overview
 - Introduction..... 6
 - Data Sources..... 6
- State Expenditures
 - Tennessee State Parks Employment & Expenditures..... 7
 - Operations Activity Impact..... 7
 - Park Maintenance & Capital Expenditures Impact..... 8
- Visitor Spending
 - Total Visitor Spending Estimates..... 9
- Economic Impact
 - Economic Impact of Visitor Spending..... 17
 - Local Economic Impact Results by Region..... 22
- Fiscal Impact
 - Fiscal Impact of Tennessee State Parks..... 23
- Methodology
 - Overview of Methodology 26
 - About Impact DataSource..... 29
- Appendix A
 - Visitor Group Expenditures Summary..... 30
- Appendix B
 - Statewide Impact Summary - All Parks..... 33
- Appendix C
 - Individual State Park Impact Reports..... 36
- Appendix D
 - Retail Margins..... 149

Study Highlights

- This report estimates the economic and fiscal impact of Tennessee's State Parks during fiscal year 2020. The analysis presents the impact of the (1) state's annual operating expenditures, (2) maintenance and capital expenditures, and (3) the impact of state park visitors' spending in the local region and the state of Tennessee.
- Importantly, visitor spending includes some revenues spent directly at the state parks - representing operating revenue for Tennessee State Parks. These visitor expenditures could not be separated from visitor spending taking place at private businesses. Therefore, the visitor spending impact is inclusive of both the state's operation impact and the impact of private businesses serving park visitors. The main take away is that the state's impact from operating expenditures and capital expenditures can be combined however, visitor impacts must be reported separately and not added to the state's impact.
- The analysis relies on Tennessee State Parks expenditure data for fiscal year 2020 as well as state park visitor counts for fiscal year 2020. Additionally, visitor spending estimates by expenditure type were collected by the University of Tennessee's Human Dimensions Research Lab through a survey conducted at state parks during the summer of 2020.
- Tennessee State Parks reported \$89.3 million in annual operating expenditures for fiscal year 2020 and employed 1,494 workers during the year. This operations activity supports additional indirect and induced economic impacts throughout the state economy resulting in the following total economic impact:
 - 4,806 total jobs,
 - \$140.1 million in wages (household earnings), and
 - \$196.8 million in spending (economic output).
- Tennessee State Parks reported \$13.2 million in annual maintenance and capital expenditures for fiscal year 2020. This spending for maintenance and capital investments supports additional indirect and induced economic impacts throughout the state economy resulting in the following total economic impact:
 - 189 total jobs,
 - \$10.3 million in wages (household earnings), and
 - \$31.3 million in spending (economic output).
- Based on park-specific visitor information provided by Tennessee State Parks and survey results compiled by the University of Tennessee's Human Dimensions Research Lab, visitors to Tennessee state parks are estimated to have spent \$1.4 billion in the state.

Table 1. Total Spending by Tennessee State Park Visitors

	Expenditures		Total
	Local Area Expenditures	Outside the Local Area but inside Tennessee	
Restaurants, snack bars	\$153,689,341	\$43,047,520	\$196,736,861
Groceries	\$231,741,464	\$154,764,647	\$386,506,111
Gasoline and oil	\$112,622,996	\$93,854,697	\$206,477,693
Recreation use fees	\$64,951,168	\$3,389,322	\$68,340,491
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$53,294,345	\$54,205,287	\$107,499,632
Retail Shopping	\$66,234,967	\$7,508,853	\$73,743,820
Other expense	\$1,511,138	\$232,114	\$1,743,252
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$40,772,236	\$1,988,355	\$42,760,592
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$27,429,691	\$21,072,138	\$48,501,830
Camping fees	\$234,832,262	\$6,597,739	\$241,430,001
Total	\$987,079,609	\$386,660,674	\$1,373,740,283

Appendix C presents estimates for each of the state's 56 individual state parks.

Study Highlights - Continued

- It is likely that the on-going coronavirus pandemic influenced visitation and spending patterns of state park visitors. Therefore, the results here represent estimates of spending and economic impact during 2020 and it may be difficult to extrapolate these results to previous or future years.
- Local area spending by park visitors has a substantial impact on the local economies around the state parks. In aggregate - totaling all local area impact occurring around each state park - the state park visitor spending supports 10,856 jobs, \$391.5 million in household earnings, and contributes \$770.7 million to state gross product.
- Spending by visitors to state parks that occurs outside of the local area surrounding the parks supports 2,772 jobs, \$96.1 million in household earnings, and contributes \$187.3 million to state gross product.
- In total, the statewide impact of local and non-local area visitor spending within Tennessee supports 13,629 jobs, \$487.6 million in household earnings, and contributes \$958.0 million to state gross product.
- All economic impact estimates include the total economic impact inclusive of the direct spending impact as well as indirect and induced impacts.

Table 2. Total Economic Impact of Visitor Spending

	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Local Area Impact	10,856.4	\$391,497,112	\$1,367,945,080	\$770,667,993
Outside Local Area Impact	2,772.3	\$96,097,328	\$331,091,646	\$187,315,083
<u>Total Statewide Impact</u>	<u>13,628.6</u>	<u>\$487,594,441</u>	<u>\$1,699,036,726</u>	<u>\$957,983,076</u>

- With total visitor spending of \$1.4 billion and total employment estimated at 13,629 jobs, Tennessee State Parks, through their visitors' spending impact, support 9.9 jobs for every \$1.0 million spent.
- Nearly all of the visitor expenditures analyzed in this analysis are subject to state and local sales tax. So, in addition to the significant economic impact generated, state park visitors also generate millions in taxes for the state and local governments.
- Including spending by visitors and the spending by workers employed in visitor-supported businesses, the state is estimated to collect \$109.4 million in sales taxes.

Table 3. State Sales Taxes Supported

	Total
Taxes on State Park Visitor Spending	\$98,400,642
Taxes on Worker Spending	\$11,019,634
<u>Total</u>	<u>\$109,420,276</u>

- In total, counties are estimated to receive \$21.8 million in local sales taxes from the state park visitor spending in the local area.

Indirect and induced impacts represent the spin-off economic activity resulting from the business-to-business expenditures initiated by the company and the consumer-to-business expenditures initiated by workers spending a portion of their earnings on goods and services in the economy. Economic output is gross output and is the sum of the intermediate inputs and final use. This is a duplicative total in that goods and services will be counted multiple times if they are used in the production of other goods and services. Economic output can be thought of as the value of goods and services sold in the economy or revenues for businesses in the economy. Value added is defined as the value of gross output less intermediate inputs. Household earnings or earnings consist of wages and salaries, employer provided benefits, and proprietors' income. Employment consists of a count of jobs that include both full-time and part-time workers.

Introduction

This report presents the results of an analysis undertaken by Impact DataSource, LLC, an Austin, Texas economic consulting firm. The report estimates the economic and fiscal impact of Tennessee's State Parks during fiscal year 2020. The analysis presents the impact of the (1) state's annual operating expenditures, (2) maintenance and capital expenditures, and (3) the impact of visitors to Tennessee's 56 state parks.

The impact associated with the direct expenditures of Tennessee State Parks is the sum of (1) operating expenditure activity and (2) maintenance and capital expenditures activity. Importantly, visitor spending includes some revenues spent directly at the state parks - representing operating revenue for Tennessee State Parks. These visitor expenditures could not be separated from visitor spending taking place at private businesses. Therefore, the visitor spending impact is inclusive of both the state's operation impact and the impact of private businesses serving park visitors. Ultimately, the state's impact from operating expenditures and capital expenditures can be combined however, visitor impacts must be reported separately and not added to the state's impact.

Data Sources

Tennessee State Parks provided much of the information required to prepare this analysis. The main data sources are described below:

State Expenditures

The state provided operating expenditures and employment data for each park as well as operating expenditures and employment data for administrative and marketing operations activities. In addition, the state provided maintenance and capital expenditures for each park. All data was provided for fiscal year 2020..

Visitor Spending

The state provided visitor count estimates collected from each state park. Park visitor counts were combined with visitor spending estimates and other information collected and summarized by the University of Tennessee's Human Dimensions Research Lab.

Tennessee State Parks Employment & Expenditures

State expenditures by Tennessee State Parks can be divided into two main categories (1) operating expenditures and (2) maintenance and capital expenditures. The tables below summarize the operations employment and spending during fiscal year 2020.

Tennessee State Parks employs 1,494 workers and spends \$55.2 million on payroll. Tennessee State Parks spends a total of \$89.3 million on operating expenditures.

Table 4. Park Operating Expenditures and Employment

	Amount
Employment	1,494.0
Payroll	\$55,169,900
Operating Expenditures, Excluding Payroll	\$34,168,123
<u>Total Operating Expenditures</u>	<u>\$89,338,023</u>

In addition, in fiscal year 2020 Tennessee State Parks reported spending \$13.2 million in maintenance expenditures, capital expenditures, and grants.

Table 5. Park Maintenance & Capital Expenditures

	Percentage
Maintenance Expenditures	\$4,911,945
Capital Expenditures	\$7,979,992
Grants	\$290,138
<u>Total Maintenance & Capital Expenditures</u>	<u>\$13,182,075</u>

Operations Activity Impact

Tennessee State Parks operations throughout the state generates an impact based on the annual operating employment and spending activity. In total, Tennessee State Parks employs 1,494 workers and supports \$89.3 million in direct operating expenditures. The impact of this spending and employment ripples through the state economy supporting additional economic impacts in the form of indirect and induced jobs, household earnings, and economic output.

The operations activity supports 1,494 direct jobs and 3,312 indirect and induced jobs for a total of 4,806 jobs. The workers are estimated to receive \$140.1 million in household earnings. Additionally, the activity supports \$196.8 million in economic output, and contribute \$99.6 million in value added or gross area product.

Table 6. Economic Impact of Operations Activity

	Operations Impact
Economic Output:	
Direct	\$89,338,023
Indirect & Induced	\$107,455,774
	<u>Total Economic Output</u> <u>\$196,793,797</u>
Value Added:	
	<u>Total Value Added</u> <u>\$99,620,830</u>
Employment:	
Direct	1,494.0
Indirect & Induced	3,312.3
	<u>Total Employment</u> <u>4,806.3</u>
Household Earnings:	
Direct	\$55,169,900
Indirect & Induced	\$84,961,646
	<u>Total Household Earnings</u> <u>\$140,131,546</u>

Park Maintenance & Capital Expenditures Impact

Expenditures by Tennessee State Parks for maintenance and capital expenditures generates an impact throughout the state as well. In total, Tennessee State Parks spent \$13.2 million in maintenance and capital expenditures - including grant funds. The impact of this spending ripples through the state economy supporting additional economic impacts in the form of indirect and induced jobs, household earnings, and economic output.

The park maintenance and capital expenditures activity supports 83 direct jobs and 106 indirect and induced jobs for a total of 189 jobs. The workers are estimated to receive \$10.3 million in household earnings. Additionally, the activity will support \$31.3 million in economic output, and contribute \$16.5 million in value added or gross area product.

Table 7. Economic Impact of Maintenance & Capital Expenditures Activity

	Maintenance Impact	Capital Expenditures Impact	Total Impact
Economic Output:			
Direct	\$4,911,945	\$8,270,130	\$13,182,075
Indirect & Induced	\$6,503,416	\$11,627,802	\$18,131,218
<u>Total Economic Output</u>	<u>\$11,415,361</u>	<u>\$19,897,932</u>	<u>\$31,313,293</u>
Value Added:			
<u>Total Value Added</u>	<u>\$5,593,724</u>	<u>\$10,863,642</u>	<u>\$16,457,366</u>
Employment:			
Direct	21.4	61.7	83.2
Indirect & Induced	37.6	68.1	105.7
<u>Total Employment</u>	<u>59.1</u>	<u>129.8</u>	<u>188.9</u>
Household Earnings:			
Direct	\$1,311,725	\$4,052,599	\$5,364,324
Indirect & Induced	\$1,762,171	\$3,201,959	\$4,964,129
<u>Total Household Earnings</u>	<u>\$3,073,895</u>	<u>\$7,254,558</u>	<u>\$10,328,453</u>

Maintenance impact is calculated using the RIMS II multipliers for the "Maintenance and Repair" industry.

Capital Expenditures impact is calculated using the RIMS II multipliers for the "Nonresidential structures" industry.

Visitor Spending Overview

The park visitor impacts presented in this report rely on (1) visitor estimates from Tennessee State Parks and (2) visitor spending estimates and other information collected and summarized by the University of Tennessee’s Human Dimensions Research Lab.

Visitor Estimates

The Tennessee State Parks provided fiscal year 2020 visitor estimates for each park. The visitor estimates are an extrapolation of vehicle counts at each park. The total visitor count reported by Tennessee State Parks utilizes a 3.2-visitor multiplier to estimate the number of visitors based on vehicle count. In total, Tennessee State Parks reported 34.7 million visitors to the state’s 56 state parks during fiscal year 2020. Important adjustments to this visitor count, described in the next section, were made prior to incorporating visitor estimates into the analysis.

Visitor Spending & Other Attributes

The University of Tennessee’s Human Dimensions Research Lab surveyed visitors during the summer of 2020 to estimate spending by state park visitors. The full details of the survey can be found in a separately prepared document.

The 56 state parks were categorized based on "park type" and survey results were then summarized on this basis. Park types include the following five categories:

Table 8. Park Types and Number of Parks within Each Type

Park Type	Count	Percentage
Resort	6	10.7%
Marina	5	8.9%
Cabins/Camping	25	44.6%
No Camping/Has Amenities	12	21.4%
No Camping/No Amenities	8	14.3%
<u>Total</u>	<u>56</u>	<u>100.0%</u>

Expenditure data was captured by day use visitor group as well as overnight use visitor group. Additionally, respondents were asked to identify local expenditures (occurring within 25 miles of the park) and non-local expenditures occurring elsewhere within Tennessee. The tables below summarize the spending estimates by visitor group based on park type and day or overnight use visitor group.

Table 9. Spending Estimates for Day Use Visitor Groups

Park Type	Local Spending*	Non-Local Spending**	Total Spending
Resort	\$45.76	\$3.50	\$49.26
Marina	\$55.10	\$3.83	\$58.93
Cabins/Camping	\$47.24	\$6.44	\$53.68
No Camping/Has Amenities	\$39.99	\$4.01	\$44.00
No Camping/No Amenities	\$38.83	\$5.95	\$44.78

* Local spending is defined as within 25 miles of the state park.

** Non-local spending is defined as beyond 25 miles of the state park but still in Tennessee.

Table 10. Spending Estimates for Overnight Use Visitor Groups

Park Type	Local Spending*	Non-Local Spending**	Total Spending
Resort	\$293.41	\$138.89	\$432.30
Marina	\$338.56	\$74.41	\$412.98
Cabins/Camping	\$298.73	\$122.90	\$421.64
No Camping/Has Amenities	\$178.45	\$281.36	\$459.81
No Camping/No Amenities	\$359.54	\$188.48	\$548.03

* Local spending is defined as within 25 miles of the state park.

** Non-local spending is defined as beyond 25 miles of the state park but still in Tennessee.

Additional tables, provided in Appendix A, show these total spending estimates broken down by specific spending categories such as restaurants, grocery stores, accommodations, and other categories.

The spending estimates summarized above serve as the basis for the total spending estimates and economic impact calculations in this study. However, several additional critical pieces of information were obtained through the survey or by the survey takers.

Recreational vs. Commercial Vehicle Estimate

University of Tennessee researchers counted the number of recreational vehicles and commercial vehicles visiting the park during their surveys. This information allows our study to adjust the total vehicle count to exclude commercial vehicles and focus solely on the recreational visitor vehicles entering the park.

A majority of vehicles were identified as recreational. Researchers estimate recreational vehicles represented approximately 91% to 96% of all vehicles counted depending on the type of park.

Table 11. Recreational Vehicles as Percent of All Vehicles Counted

Park Type	Percent
Resort	91.3%
Marina	95.4%
Cabins/Camping	95.7%
No Camping/Has Amenities	95.6%
No Camping/No Amenities	95.8%

Number of Vehicles per Visitor Group

Researchers surveyed expenditures by visitor group and critically asked visitors “How many vehicles is your group traveling in today?” The average number of vehicles per group ranged from 1.1 to 1.4 vehicles depending on the type of park.

Table 12. Number of Vehicles per Visitor Group

Park Type	Vehicles
Resort	1.40
Marina	1.32
Cabins/Camping	1.41
No Camping/Has Amenities	1.13
No Camping/No Amenities	1.21

Day Use vs. Overnight Visitor Groups

The raw count of expenditure survey respondents provide the information to estimate what percent of visitor groups are day use visitor groups versus overnight use visitor groups.

Day use visitor groups compose approximately 43% of resort park visitors although day use visitor groups compose more than 80% of visitors at parks without camping.

Table 13. Percent of Visitor Groups by Day Use or Overnight Use

Park Type	Day Use Groups	Overnight Use Groups	Total Respondents
Resort	43.4%	56.6%	100.0%
Marina	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%
Cabins/Camping	50.6%	49.4%	100.0%
No Camping/Has Amenities	83.3%	16.7%	100.0%
No Camping/No Amenities	87.9%	12.1%	100.0%

State Park as Primary Purpose of Trip

Researchers surveyed included a question that asked visitors:

To what extent is this state park the primary purpose of your trip to this area? "0%" indicates the park had no influence and "100%" means the park is the entire reason for your trip.

On average, day use visitor groups reported a 95% - meaning the park visit was nearly the entire purpose of their trip. Overnight use visitor groups reported a slightly lower percentage on average at 85%. These percentages were used to reduce or deflate the individual per group expenditures to represent spending attributable to the state parks specifically.

Table 14. Extent to which the State Park was the primary Purpose of the Trip

	Percent
Day Use Visitor Groups	95.4%
Overnight Use Visitor Groups	85.2%

Total Visitor Spending Estimates

The information described in the preceding Data Sources section serves as the basis to first, estimate the total number of Day Use and Overnight Use Visitor Groups and second, estimate total visitor spending. The table below steps through the calculations applied to estimate the total number of visitor groups. The following calculations are presented at a summary level by park type. See Appendix C for individual park estimates.

Total Visitor Count

The total visitor count ("FY20 Visitor Count") reported by Tennessee State Parks utilizes a 3.2-visitor multiplier to estimate the number of visitors based on vehicle count. Therefore, dividing this value by 3.2 will obtain the Total Vehicle Count.

Next the Total Vehicle Count is multiplied by the Recreational Vehicle Share to obtain the Recreational Vehicle Count.

To obtain Total Visitor Groups, the Recreational Vehicle Count is divided by the estimated number of Vehicles per Visitor Group.

Finally, Total Visitor Groups is split between Day Use and Overnight Use Visitor Groups based on proportion of responses from the two visitor group types.

Table 15. Derivation of Total Day Use and Overnight Visitor Groups

	Resort	Marina	Cabins/Camping	No Camping/Has Amenities	No Camping/No Amenities	Total
FY20 Visitor Count	5,931,666	3,582,770	17,634,473	5,711,042	1,866,423	34,726,374
Total Vehicle Count	1,853,646	1,119,616	5,510,773	1,784,701	583,257	10,851,992
Recreational Vehicle Share	91.3%	95.4%	95.7%	95.6%	95.8%	
Recreational Vehicle Count	1,693,031	1,068,239	5,274,673	1,706,311	558,496	10,300,751
Vehicles Per Visitor Group	1.40	1.32	1.41	1.13	1.21	
Total Visitor Groups	1,212,187	810,811	3,740,943	1,507,829	460,674	7,732,444
% Day Use Visitor Groups	43.4%	60.0%	50.6%	83.3%	87.9%	
% Overnight Use Visitor Groups	56.6%	40.0%	49.4%	16.7%	12.1%	
Day Use Visitor Groups	526,089	486,486	1,892,917	1,256,021	404,933	4,566,447
Overnight Use Visitor Groups	686,098	324,324	1,848,026	251,807	55,742	3,165,997
Total Visitor Groups	1,212,187	810,811	3,740,943	1,507,829	460,674	7,732,444

Figure 1. Total Visitor Groups by Park Type





Figure 2. Total Visitor Groups by Day or Overnight Use



Total Visitor Spending

Visitor Spending is estimated for day use and overnight visitor groups. Additionally, total visitor spending includes expenditures made in the local area as well as expenditures made outside of the local area but within Tennessee.

The table below summarizes the estimated total visitor spending by all visitor groups and in the local area of the park as well as elsewhere in Tennessee. The spending estimates incorporate the deflator to adjust spending based on the primary purpose of the trip.

Table 16. Total Spending by Day Use and Overnight Visitor Groups

	Resort	Marina	Cabins/Camping	No Camping/Has Amenities	No Camping/No Amenities	Total
Day Use Visitor Groups	526,089	486,486	1,892,917	1,256,021	404,933	4,566,447
Overnight Use Visitor Groups	686,098	324,324	1,848,026	251,807	55,742	3,165,997
Total Visitor Groups	1,212,187	810,811	3,740,943	1,507,829	460,674	7,732,444
<i>Total Day & Overnight Use Group Spending</i>						
Restaurants, snack bars	\$32,330,366	\$20,864,909	\$96,789,203	\$35,881,584	\$10,870,799	\$196,736,861
Groceries	\$71,358,782	\$39,301,116	\$240,234,133	\$27,069,396	\$8,542,683	\$386,506,111
Gasoline and oil	\$43,031,500	\$18,775,177	\$109,169,183	\$28,416,790	\$7,085,044	\$206,477,693
Recreation use fees	\$12,632,063	\$12,010,327	\$35,805,041	\$2,902,365	\$4,990,695	\$68,340,491
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$28,944,382	\$8,776,649	\$52,657,349	\$15,082,495	\$2,038,756	\$107,499,632
Retail Shopping	\$14,384,626	\$3,432,327	\$41,162,018	\$12,359,270	\$2,405,578	\$73,743,820
Other expense	\$0	\$0	\$1,557,871	\$185,382	\$0	\$1,743,252
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$8,722,429	\$10,731,836	\$20,264,838	\$2,419,618	\$621,870	\$42,760,592
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$6,460,142	\$1,600,656	\$13,451,180	\$21,769,740	\$5,220,112	\$48,501,830
Camping fees	\$59,424,072	\$25,903,581	\$149,361,082	\$5,211,213	\$1,530,052	\$241,430,001
Total	\$277,288,363	\$141,396,580	\$760,451,899	\$151,297,853	\$43,305,588	\$1,373,740,283

State park visitor spending is estimated to be \$1.4 billion in total. Visitor spending on groceries represents the largest expenditure category, accounting for 28% of all expenditures. Recreation equipment and sporting goods equipment accounts for 8% of all visitor spending. Camping fees represent 18% of all visitor spending. When camping spending is combined with two similar accommodation expenditure categories, the broader accommodation spending category represents 24% percent of all spending.

Similarly, when spending at restaurants, snack bars, and grocery stores is combined, the broad spending category corresponding to food purchases represents approximately 42% of all expenditures.

Figure 3. Percent of Total Visitor Spending by Category





Figure 4. Percent of Total Visitor Spending by Aggregated Category



The following pages present tables for visitor spending within the local area and spending outside the local area, but inside Tennessee. In each case, the total spending is determined by multiplying the number of visitor groups by the per visitor group spending amount for the expenditure category. A summary of per-group expenditures was presented in Tables 3 and 4. Appendix A shows the per-group expenditures by expenditure category.

TENNESSEE STATE PARKS | VISITOR SPENDING

Table 16. Total Spending by Day Use and Overnight Visitor Groups Within Local Area

	Resort	Marina	Cabins/Camping	No Camping/Has Amenities	No Camping/No Amenities	Total
Day Use Visitor Groups	526,089	486,486	1,892,917	1,256,021	404,933	4,566,447
Overnight Use Visitor Groups	686,098	324,324	1,848,026	251,807	55,742	3,165,997
<u>Total Visitor Groups</u>	<u>1,212,187</u>	<u>810,811</u>	<u>3,740,943</u>	<u>1,507,829</u>	<u>460,674</u>	<u>7,732,444</u>
<i>Day Use Visitor Group Spending</i>						
Restaurants, snack bars	\$6,930,423	\$7,419,109	\$21,350,362	\$14,013,597	\$4,857,544	\$54,571,034
Groceries	\$4,715,992	\$4,611,260	\$21,850,321	\$9,136,961	\$2,929,151	\$43,243,686
Gasoline and oil	\$4,018,250	\$4,090,350	\$15,666,349	\$9,211,762	\$2,662,819	\$35,649,529
Recreation use fees	\$4,460,076	\$5,875,674	\$7,753,295	\$1,758,721	\$3,028,119	\$22,875,885
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$1,911,170	\$2,886,975	\$13,001,322	\$9,343,182	\$1,317,525	\$28,460,173
Retail Shopping	\$919,751	\$676,397	\$4,631,524	\$4,308,720	\$198,212	\$10,734,603
Other expense	\$0	\$0	\$1,019,490	\$128,199	\$0	\$1,147,690
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<u>Total</u>	<u>\$22,955,661</u>	<u>\$25,559,765</u>	<u>\$85,272,662</u>	<u>\$47,901,143</u>	<u>\$14,993,369</u>	<u>\$196,682,601</u>
<i>Overnight Use Visitor Group Spending</i>						
Restaurants, snack bars	\$19,570,383	\$12,179,560	\$56,926,769	\$7,372,720	\$3,068,875	\$99,118,307
Groceries	\$38,977,753	\$24,181,370	\$117,202,922	\$5,190,546	\$2,945,187	\$188,497,778
Gasoline and oil	\$17,387,433	\$8,582,697	\$43,555,259	\$5,328,519	\$2,119,559	\$76,973,467
Recreation use fees	\$7,757,469	\$6,134,653	\$25,778,350	\$543,231	\$1,861,579	\$42,075,283
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$3,710,207	\$2,386,616	\$16,784,543	\$1,715,466	\$237,341	\$24,834,172
Retail Shopping	\$12,734,544	\$2,755,930	\$33,216,112	\$4,802,176	\$1,991,601	\$55,500,364
Other expense	\$0	\$0	\$306,266	\$57,182	\$0	\$363,448
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$8,722,429	\$10,731,836	\$20,115,403	\$738,925	\$463,643	\$40,772,236
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$5,797,320	\$821,096	\$9,959,163	\$7,819,666	\$3,032,446	\$27,429,691
Camping fees	\$56,771,058	\$25,732,904	\$146,283,867	\$4,697,781	\$1,346,653	\$234,832,262
<u>Total</u>	<u>\$171,428,595</u>	<u>\$93,506,662</u>	<u>\$470,128,654</u>	<u>\$38,266,213</u>	<u>\$17,066,884</u>	<u>\$790,397,008</u>
<i>Total Day & Overnight Use Group Spending</i>						
Restaurants, snack bars	\$26,500,806	\$19,598,669	\$78,277,130	\$21,386,317	\$7,926,419	\$153,689,341
Groceries	\$43,693,745	\$28,792,630	\$139,053,243	\$14,327,507	\$5,874,338	\$231,741,464
Gasoline and oil	\$21,405,683	\$12,673,047	\$59,221,608	\$14,540,281	\$4,782,378	\$112,622,996
Recreation use fees	\$12,217,545	\$12,010,327	\$33,531,646	\$2,301,952	\$4,889,698	\$64,951,168
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$5,621,376	\$5,273,590	\$29,785,864	\$11,058,648	\$1,554,866	\$53,294,345
Retail Shopping	\$13,654,295	\$3,432,327	\$37,847,636	\$9,110,896	\$2,189,813	\$66,234,967
Other expense	\$0	\$0	\$1,325,756	\$185,382	\$0	\$1,511,138
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$8,722,429	\$10,731,836	\$20,115,403	\$738,925	\$463,643	\$40,772,236
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$5,797,320	\$821,096	\$9,959,163	\$7,819,666	\$3,032,446	\$27,429,691
Camping fees	\$56,771,058	\$25,732,904	\$146,283,867	\$4,697,781	\$1,346,653	\$234,832,262
<u>Total</u>	<u>\$194,384,257</u>	<u>\$119,066,427</u>	<u>\$555,401,316</u>	<u>\$86,167,355</u>	<u>\$32,060,254</u>	<u>\$987,079,609</u>

TENNESSEE STATE PARKS | VISITOR SPENDING

Table 17. Total Spending by Day Use and Overnight Visitor Groups Outside the Local Area, but inside TN

	Resort	Marina	Cabins/Camping	No Camping/Has Amenities	No Camping/No Amenities	Total
Day Use Visitor Groups	526,089	486,486	1,892,917	1,256,021	404,933	4,566,447
Overnight Use Visitor Groups	686,098	324,324	1,848,026	251,807	55,742	3,165,997
Total Visitor Groups	1,212,187	810,811	3,740,943	1,507,829	460,674	7,732,444
<i>Day Use Visitor Group Spending</i>						
Restaurants, snack bars	\$185,808	\$99,127	\$1,505,268	\$1,145,348	\$311,550	\$3,247,101
Groceries	\$465,633	\$727,033	\$4,483,055	\$1,495,429	\$860,513	\$8,031,664
Gasoline and oil	\$775,327	\$796,039	\$4,585,582	\$2,120,351	\$667,650	\$8,944,947
Recreation use fees	\$15,020	\$0	\$41,979	\$0	\$0	\$56,999
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$315,429	\$155,793	\$1,016,115	\$37,082	\$458,641	\$1,983,059
Retail Shopping	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total	\$1,757,217	\$1,777,992	\$11,631,999	\$4,798,209	\$2,298,354	\$22,263,771
<i>Overnight Use Visitor Group Spending</i>						
Restaurants, snack bars	\$5,643,752	\$1,167,113	\$17,006,805	\$13,349,919	\$2,632,830	\$39,800,418
Groceries	\$27,199,404	\$9,781,453	\$96,697,835	\$11,246,460	\$1,807,832	\$146,732,984
Gasoline and oil	\$20,850,490	\$5,306,092	\$45,361,994	\$11,756,158	\$1,635,016	\$84,909,750
Recreation use fees	\$399,497	\$0	\$2,231,416	\$600,413	\$100,996	\$3,332,323
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$23,007,577	\$3,347,266	\$21,855,370	\$3,986,766	\$25,249	\$52,222,228
Retail Shopping	\$730,331	\$0	\$3,314,383	\$3,248,374	\$215,765	\$7,508,853
Other expense	\$0	\$0	\$232,114	\$0	\$0	\$232,114
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$0	\$149,435	\$1,680,693	\$158,227	\$1,988,355
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$662,822	\$779,560	\$3,492,017	\$13,950,074	\$2,187,665	\$21,072,138
Camping fees	\$2,653,015	\$170,677	\$3,077,215	\$513,432	\$183,400	\$6,597,739
Total	\$81,146,888	\$20,552,161	\$193,418,584	\$60,332,288	\$8,946,981	\$364,396,902
<i>Total Day & Overnight Use Group Spending</i>						
Restaurants, snack bars	\$5,829,560	\$1,266,240	\$18,512,073	\$14,495,267	\$2,944,380	\$43,047,520
Groceries	\$27,665,037	\$10,508,486	\$101,180,890	\$12,741,889	\$2,668,345	\$154,764,647
Gasoline and oil	\$21,625,817	\$6,102,131	\$49,947,575	\$13,876,509	\$2,302,666	\$93,854,697
Recreation use fees	\$414,518	\$0	\$2,273,395	\$600,413	\$100,996	\$3,389,322
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$23,323,006	\$3,503,059	\$22,871,485	\$4,023,848	\$483,890	\$54,205,287
Retail Shopping	\$730,331	\$0	\$3,314,383	\$3,248,374	\$215,765	\$7,508,853
Other expense	\$0	\$0	\$232,114	\$0	\$0	\$232,114
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$0	\$149,435	\$1,680,693	\$158,227	\$1,988,355
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$662,822	\$779,560	\$3,492,017	\$13,950,074	\$2,187,665	\$21,072,138
Camping fees	\$2,653,015	\$170,677	\$3,077,215	\$513,432	\$183,400	\$6,597,739
Total	\$82,904,106	\$22,330,153	\$205,050,583	\$65,130,498	\$11,245,334	\$386,660,674

Economic Impact of Visitor Spending

Expenditures made by visitors to state parks result in economic impacts in the local area around the park as well as and across the entire state. This section explains the metrics measured and the methodology to apply the economic impact model.

The economic impact associated with visitor spending was measured in employment, household earnings (or compensation to employees), economic output and value added. This is to say that spending by visitors supports employment, salaries, and other impacts at various business establishments serving the visitors. The economic impacts are defined as followed:

Employment consists of a count of jobs that include both full-time and part-time workers.

Household earnings or earnings consist of wages and salaries, employer provided benefits, and proprietors’ income

Economic output is gross output and is the sum of the intermediate inputs and final use. This is a duplicative total in that goods and services will be counted multiple times if they are used in the production of other goods and services. Economic output can be thought of as the value of goods and services sold in the economy or revenues for businesses in the economy.

Value added is defined as the value of gross output less intermediate inputs.

The total economic impact of the visitor activity goes beyond the initial expenditures at restaurants, grocery stores, hotels, and other establishments. The economic activity ripples through the local and state economies supporting additional economic impacts in the form of indirect and induced jobs, household earnings, and economic output. Indirect impacts represent the spin-off economic activity resulting from the business-to-business expenditures initiated when visitors purchase goods and services from businesses. Induced impacts represent the consumer-to-business expenditures initiated by workers spending a portion of their earnings on goods and services in the economy.

Economic Impact Calculations

The economic impact estimates in this report are based on the Regional Input-Output Modeling System (RIMS II), a widely used regional input-output model developed by the U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis.

Expenditure Categories

To estimate the economic impact of visitor spending, industry-specific multipliers are applied to the appropriate expenditure categories. The table below identifies the visitor expenditure category and the corresponding RIMS II industry group.

Table 18. Expenditure Categories and Corresponding RIMS II Industry Group

Visitor Expenditure Category	RIMS II Industry Group
Restaurants, snack bars	722211 Limited-service restaurants
Groceries	445000 Food and beverage stores
Gasoline and oil	447000 Gasoline stations
Recreation use fees	713900 Other amusement and recreation industries
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	452000 General merchandise stores
Retail Shopping	480000 All other retail
Other expense	480000 All other retail
Other expense 2	480000 All other retail
State park resort room or cabin	721000 Accommodation
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	721000 Accommodation
Camping fees	721000 Accommodation

Several expenditure categories are mapped to the same RIMS II industry group. For example, retail shopping and the two "Other expense" categories are mapped to "All other retail". Additionally, all of the accommodation expenditure categories - resort, cabin, motel, and camping fees - are mapped to "Accommodation".

Retail Margins

Many of the expenditure categories will equate the visitor expenditure with output. For the retail trade categories, output is measured as gross profit or sales minus the costs of goods sold. Several expenditure categories represent retailers that re-sell products. Therefore, in order to estimate the economic impact from expenditures in these categories, the visitor's expenditure must be multiplied by the retail margin to determine the output. The table below summarizes the estimated retail margins applied to the various spending categories. Additional detail on the retail margins is provided in Appendix D.

Table 19. Expenditure Categories and Corresponding RIMS II Industry Group

Visitor Expenditure Category	RIMS II Industry Group	Retail Margin
Restaurants, snack bars	722211 Limited-service restaurants	100.0%
Groceries	445000 Food and beverage stores	26.9%
Gasoline and oil	447000 Gasoline stations	14.2%
Recreation use fees	713900 Other amusement and recreation industries	100.0%
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	452000 General merchandise stores	37.9%
Retail Shopping	480000 All other retail	33.3%
Other expense	480000 All other retail	35.6%
Other expense 2	480000 All other retail	35.6%
State park resort room or cabin	721000 Accommodation	100.0%
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	721000 Accommodation	100.0%
Camping fees	721000 Accommodation	100.0%

Source: PCE Bridge Table 2012, Bureau of Economic Analysis

Economic Impact Results

Local area spending by park visitors has a substantial impact on the local economies around the state parks. In aggregate - totaling all local area impact occurring around each state park - the state park visitor spending supports 10,856 jobs, \$391.5 million in household earnings, and contributes \$.8 billion to state gross product.

Spending by visitors to state parks that occurs outside of the local area surrounding the parks supports 2,772 jobs, \$96.1 million in household earnings, and contributes \$187.3 million to state gross product.

In total, the statewide impact of local and non-local area visitor spending within Tennessee supports 13,629 jobs, \$487.6 million in household earnings, and contributes \$1.0 billion to state gross product.

Table 20. Total Economic Impact of Visitor Spending

	Employment	Household		
		Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Local Area Impact	10,856.4	\$391,497,112	\$1,367,945,080	\$770,667,993
Outside Local Area Impact	2,772.3	\$96,097,328	\$331,091,646	\$187,315,083
<u>Total Statewide Impact</u>	<u>13,628.6</u>	<u>\$487,594,441</u>	<u>\$1,699,036,726</u>	<u>\$957,983,076</u>

The employment, earnings and other impacts are supported by both day use and overnight visitor groups; however, overnight visitor groups support a significantly larger share of the impacts within the local area and statewide.

As noted above, retail spending categories - such as grocery stores, gas and oil, recreational equipment and sporting goods, retail shopping, and other expenses - require the application of retail margins so that we focus on the portion of the spending that truly has an impact. Therefore, the impact-per-dollar of visitor spending in retail spending categories is generally less the impact-per-dollar of visitor spending in categories like restaurants, recreation use fees, or accommodations.

The following pages show the economic impact of (1) visitor spending within the local area and (2) visitor spending outside of the local but within Tennessee.

Table 21. Total Economic Impact of Day Use and Overnight Visitor Groups Within Local Area

	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
<i>Day Use Visitor Group Spending</i>				
Restaurants, snack bars	1,035.5	\$30,647,093	\$121,966,262	\$61,392,414
Groceries	225.9	\$7,890,360	\$24,786,641	\$14,823,360
Gasoline and oil	87.1	\$3,351,705	\$11,060,473	\$6,360,696
Recreation use fees	513.7	\$15,322,268	\$50,194,267	\$27,846,815
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	200.3	\$6,900,064	\$22,603,992	\$13,625,388
Retail Shopping	73.9	\$2,647,366	\$7,801,257	\$4,667,028
Other expense	8.4	\$302,593	\$891,680	\$533,439
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<u>Total</u>	<u>2,144.8</u>	<u>\$67,061,447</u>	<u>\$239,304,571</u>	<u>\$129,249,139</u>
<i>Overnight Use Visitor Group Spending</i>				
Restaurants, snack bars	1,880.7	\$55,664,841	\$221,529,416	\$111,508,096
Groceries	984.9	\$34,393,813	\$108,044,136	\$64,614,531
Gasoline and oil	188.1	\$7,236,907	\$23,881,465	\$13,733,837
Recreation use fees	944.8	\$28,182,024	\$92,321,586	\$51,218,242
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	174.8	\$6,020,953	\$19,724,104	\$11,889,429
Retail Shopping	381.9	\$13,687,489	\$40,334,290	\$24,129,605
Other expense	2.7	\$95,824	\$282,375	\$168,928
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	558.9	\$24,104,546	\$83,758,405	\$48,995,996
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	376.0	\$16,216,433	\$56,348,815	\$32,962,260
Camping fees	3,218.9	\$138,832,833	\$482,415,916	\$282,197,929
<u>Total</u>	<u>8,711.6</u>	<u>\$324,435,665</u>	<u>\$1,128,640,509</u>	<u>\$641,418,854</u>
<i>Total Day & Overnight Use Group Spending</i>				
Restaurants, snack bars	2,916.2	\$86,311,934	\$343,495,678	\$172,900,509
Groceries	1,210.9	\$42,284,173	\$132,830,777	\$79,437,892
Gasoline and oil	275.2	\$10,588,611	\$34,941,938	\$20,094,533
Recreation use fees	1,458.4	\$43,504,292	\$142,515,853	\$79,065,057
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	375.0	\$12,921,017	\$42,328,095	\$25,514,817
Retail Shopping	455.8	\$16,334,854	\$48,135,547	\$28,796,632
Other expense	11.1	\$398,417	\$1,174,055	\$702,367
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	558.9	\$24,104,546	\$83,758,405	\$48,995,996
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	376.0	\$16,216,433	\$56,348,815	\$32,962,260
Camping fees	3,218.9	\$138,832,833	\$482,415,916	\$282,197,929
<u>Total</u>	<u>10,856.4</u>	<u>\$391,497,112</u>	<u>\$1,367,945,080</u>	<u>\$770,667,993</u>

Table 22. Total Economic Impact by Day Use and Overnight Visitor Groups Outside the Local Area, but inside TN

	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
<i>Day Use Visitor Group Spending</i>				
Restaurants, snack bars	61.6	\$1,823,572	\$7,257,272	\$3,652,989
Groceries	42.0	\$1,465,479	\$4,603,631	\$2,753,147
Gasoline and oil	21.9	\$840,988	\$2,775,222	\$1,595,984
Recreation use fees	1.3	\$38,178	\$125,068	\$69,385
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	14.0	\$480,785	\$1,575,010	\$949,395
Retail Shopping	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total	140.7	\$4,649,003	\$16,336,203	\$9,020,902
<i>Overnight Use Visitor Group Spending</i>				
Restaurants, snack bars	755.2	\$22,351,915	\$88,953,935	\$44,775,471
Groceries	766.7	\$26,773,296	\$84,105,175	\$50,298,115
Gasoline and oil	207.5	\$7,983,062	\$26,343,742	\$15,149,852
Recreation use fees	74.8	\$2,231,990	\$7,311,783	\$4,056,437
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	367.5	\$12,661,086	\$41,476,585	\$25,001,538
Retail Shopping	51.7	\$1,851,832	\$5,456,978	\$3,264,585
Other expense	1.7	\$61,198	\$180,338	\$107,885
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	27.3	\$1,175,516	\$4,084,678	\$2,389,407
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	288.8	\$12,457,848	\$43,288,494	\$25,322,389
Camping fees	90.4	\$3,900,583	\$13,553,735	\$7,928,503
Total	2,631.6	\$91,448,326	\$314,755,443	\$178,294,181
<i>Total Day & Overnight Use Group Spending</i>				
Restaurants, snack bars	816.8	\$24,175,487	\$96,211,207	\$48,428,460
Groceries	808.6	\$28,238,775	\$88,708,805	\$53,051,263
Gasoline and oil	229.4	\$8,824,050	\$29,118,964	\$16,745,837
Recreation use fees	76.1	\$2,270,168	\$7,436,851	\$4,125,822
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	381.4	\$13,141,871	\$43,051,595	\$25,950,933
Retail Shopping	51.7	\$1,851,832	\$5,456,978	\$3,264,585
Other expense	1.7	\$61,198	\$180,338	\$107,885
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	27.3	\$1,175,516	\$4,084,678	\$2,389,407
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	288.8	\$12,457,848	\$43,288,494	\$25,322,389
Camping fees	90.4	\$3,900,583	\$13,553,735	\$7,928,503
Total	2,772.3	\$96,097,328	\$331,091,646	\$187,315,083

State park visitor spending is estimated to support 13,629 jobs in total. The impact associated with restaurant spending supports the largest number of jobs, accounting for 27% of all jobs supported. Spending for camping fees is estimated to support 24% of all visitor-spending supported jobs.

When camping-supported jobs are combined with jobs supported two similar accommodation expenditure categories, the broader accommodation spending category supports 33% percent of all jobs supported.

Similarly, combining jobs supported at restaurants, snack bars, and grocery stores results in 42% of all jobs supported by food expenditure categories.

Figure 5. Percent of Total Employment Impact by Visitor Spending by Category





Figure 6. Percent of Total Employment Impact by Aggregated Visitor Spending Category



Local Economic Impact Results by Region

Tennessee State Parks are categorized into three different regions - East, Middle, and West. The East Region includes 18 parks and accounts for 2.3 million visitor groups. The Middle Region includes 26 parks and saw an estimated 3.7 million visitor groups. The West Region includes 12 parks and accounts for 1.7 million visitor groups.

Table 23. Total Economic Impact by Day Use and Overnight Visitor Groups Within Local Area


	Park Count	Percent of Parks	Visitor Groups	Percent of Visitor Groups
East Region	18	32%	2,318,690	30%
Middle Region	26	46%	3,698,334	48%
West Region	12	21%	1,715,421	22%
Total	56	100%	7,732,444	100%

The tables below summarize the economic impact by state region. In general, the distribution of impact follows the park concentration. The employment impact is slightly more heavily concentrated in the West Region and slightly less concentrated in the Middle region when comparing the distribution of employment impact to the overall concentration of parks.

Table 24. Total Economic Impact by Day Use and Overnight Visitor Groups Within Local Area

	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
East Region	3,462.9	\$124,763,214	\$435,632,042	\$245,511,883
Middle Region	4,563.7	\$163,336,259	\$572,053,089	\$321,352,073
West Region	2,829.8	\$103,397,640	\$360,259,950	\$203,804,037
Total	10,856.4	\$391,497,112	\$1,367,945,080	\$770,667,993

Figure 7. Percent of Local Area Employment Impact by Region



Fiscal Impact of Tennessee State Parks

The spending and additional economic impacts associated with state park visitors in Tennessee results in direct fiscal impacts for the state and local tax jurisdictions. Businesses serving state park visitors may contribute a wide range of taxes for the state or local jurisdictions; however, this analysis will focus on the sales tax benefit from visitor spending and worker spending.

Including spending by visitors and the spending by workers employed in visitor-supported businesses, the state is estimated to collect \$109.4 million in sales taxes.

Table 25. State Sales Taxes Supported

	Total
Taxes on State Park Visitor Spending	\$98,400,642
Taxes on Worker Spending	\$11,019,634
<u>Total</u>	<u>\$109,420,276</u>

State Sales Tax on State Park Visitor Spending

The state's 7% sales tax rate applies to nearly all visitor expenditures included in this analysis. The state applies a lower sales tax rate of 4% to "food and food ingredients". Therefore, the lower 4% tax rate is applied to grocery expenditures. Importantly, prepared food is taxed the state's 7% sales tax rate. Accordingly, the 7% tax rate is applied to "restaurants, snack bars". Gasoline and oil is subject to several motor fuel taxes on a per gallon basis. This analysis estimates motor fuel taxes based on an effective tax rate. The per-gallon tax on gasoline is \$0.274 and assuming the average cost of a gallon of gas in Tennessee during the period surveyed is approximately \$2.00, the effective motor fuel tax is 13.7%.

Table 26. State Sales Taxes Supported by Visitor Spending

	Spending	State Tax Rate	Total Tax
Restaurants, snack bars	\$196,736,861	7.0%	\$13,771,580
Groceries	\$386,506,111	4.0%	\$15,460,244
Gasoline and oil	\$206,477,693	13.7%	\$28,287,444
Recreation use fees	\$68,340,491	7.0%	\$4,783,834
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$107,499,632	7.0%	\$7,524,974
Retail Shopping	\$73,743,820	7.0%	\$5,162,067
Other expense	\$1,743,252	7.0%	\$122,028
Other expense 2	\$0	7.0%	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$42,760,592	7.0%	\$2,993,241
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$48,501,830	7.0%	\$3,395,128
Camping fees	\$241,430,001	7.0%	\$16,900,100
<u>Total</u>	<u>\$1,373,740,283</u>		<u>\$98,400,642</u>

State Sales Tax on Worker Spending

As detailed in previous sections, the visitor spending supports a significant number of workers earning millions in household earnings. Additional sales tax revenues are generated for the state when these workers re-spend a portion of their earnings on taxable goods and services. On average, the 13,629 workers supported by visitor spending earn \$487.6 million in household earnings or an average of \$35,777 per worker

According to IRS Sales Tax Deduction estimates, Tennessee residents earning between \$30,000 and \$40,000 spend approximately 37% of their earnings on taxable goods and services. Furthermore, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics' Consumer Expenditure Survey, households in this income category spend approximately 11% of their earnings on "Food at home".

Table 27. State Sales Taxes Supported by Worker Spending

	Amount	State Tax Rate	Total Tax
Total Household Earnings paid to Supported Workers	\$487,594,441		
<i>% of Household Earnings spent on Food at Home</i>	11.0%		
"Food at home" Spending by Supported Workers	\$53,635,388	4.0%	\$2,145,416
<i>% of Household Earnings on spent on Other Taxable</i>	26.0%		
Other Taxable Spending by Supported Workers	\$126,774,555	7.0%	\$8,874,219
Total			\$11,019,634

Sources: IRS Sales Tax Deduction Estimates: <https://apps.irs.gov/app/stdc/>

Bureau of Labor Statistics, Table 3124. Southern region by income before taxes: Average annual expenditures and characteristics, Consumer Expenditure Survey, 2018-2019. Households between \$30,000 and \$39,999.

Local Sales Tax on State Park Visitor Local Area Spending

Local sales taxes - of varying rates - apply to the state park visitor spending occurring in the local area. The local area county sales tax rate was identified for each park and applied to all local area expenditures (excluding gasoline and oil). In total, counties are estimated to receive \$21.8 million in local sales taxes from the state park visitor spending in the local area.

Table 28. Local Sales Taxes Supported by Visitor Spending in Local Area

County	Number of Parks	Total Tax
Benton	1	\$1,125,213
Bradley	1	\$73,327
Campbell	4	\$662,050
Carter	2	\$873,456
Cheatham	1	\$248,508
Chester	1	\$272,645
Coffee	1	\$240,920
Cumberland	1	\$490,373
Davidson	3	\$1,030,423
DeKalb	1	\$303,519
Dickson	1	\$754,891
Fentress	1	\$102,624
Franklin	1	\$699,807
Greene	1	\$307,818
Grundy	1	\$301,811
Hamblen	1	\$494,797
Hamilton	2	\$354,166
Hardin	1	\$953,129
Henderson	1	\$481,113
Henry	1	\$863,067
Humphreys	1	\$11,868
Jackson	1	\$122,660
Knox	1	\$48,015
Lake	1	\$997,317
Lauderdale	1	\$319,094
Lawrence	1	\$386,912
Madison	1	\$36,255
Marshall	1	\$394,393
McNairy	1	\$101,931

Monroe	1	\$40,908
Montgomery	2	\$282,780
Morgan	1	\$120,993
Overton	1	\$341,902
Perry	1	\$121,235
Pickett	2	\$373,520
Polk	1	\$1,867,421
Putnam	1	\$82,177
Shelby	2	\$951,879
Sullivan	1	\$1,131,210
Sumner	1	\$344,606
Unicoi	1	\$15,326
Union	1	\$605,810
Van Buren	1	\$1,222,675
Warren	1	\$386,323
Weakley	1	\$8,109
Wilson	1	\$831,757
<u>Total</u>	<u>56</u>	<u>\$21,780,732</u>

Overview of Methodology

This report presents the results of an analysis undertaken by Impact DataSource, an Austin, TX based economic consulting firm. The analysis relies on visitor estimates and visitor expenditure data. Impact DataSource and Tennessee State Parks made reasonable efforts to ensure that the information used in the analysis is accurate and reasonable.

The following RIMS II multipliers were used to estimate the economic impacts in this analysis. More information about the RIMS II model is provided below.

Industry	Type II Multiplier
722211 Limited-service restaurants	
<i>Final-demand Output</i>	2.2350
<i>Final-demand Earnings</i>	0.5616
<i>Final-demand Employment</i>	19.7413
<i>Final-demand Value-added)</i>	1.1250
<i>Direct-effect Earnings</i>	2.5390
<i>Direct-effect Employment</i>	1.6043
445000 Food and beverage stores	
<i>Final-demand Output</i>	2.1308
<i>Final-demand Earnings</i>	0.6783
<i>Final-demand Employment</i>	20.2086
<i>Final-demand Value-added)</i>	1.2743
<i>Direct-effect Earnings</i>	1.8609
<i>Direct-effect Employment</i>	1.5642
447000 Gasoline stations	
<i>Final-demand Output</i>	2.1849
<i>Final-demand Earnings</i>	0.6621
<i>Final-demand Employment</i>	17.9060
<i>Final-demand Value-added)</i>	1.2565
<i>Direct-effect Earnings</i>	1.9907
<i>Direct-effect Employment</i>	1.7677
713900 Other amusement and recreation industries	
<i>Final-demand Output</i>	2.1942
<i>Final-demand Earnings</i>	0.6698
<i>Final-demand Employment</i>	23.3611
<i>Final-demand Value-added)</i>	1.2173
<i>Direct-effect Earnings</i>	1.9768
<i>Direct-effect Employment</i>	1.4787
452000 General merchandise stores	
<i>Final-demand Output</i>	2.0956
<i>Final-demand Earnings</i>	0.6397
<i>Final-demand Employment</i>	19.3166
<i>Final-demand Value-added)</i>	1.2632
<i>Direct-effect Earnings</i>	2.0117
<i>Direct-effect Employment</i>	1.5732

Industry	Type II Multiplier
4B0000 All other retail	
<i>Final-demand Output</i>	2.1824
<i>Final-demand Earnings</i>	0.7406
<i>Final-demand Employment</i>	21.5009
<i>Final-demand Value-added</i>	1.3056
<i>Direct-effect Earnings</i>	1.8267
<i>Direct-effect Employment</i>	1.5599
721000 Accommodation	
<i>Final-demand Output</i>	2.0543
<i>Final-demand Earnings</i>	0.5912
<i>Final-demand Employment</i>	14.2608
<i>Final-demand Value-added</i>	1.2017
<i>Direct-effect Earnings</i>	2.1570
<i>Direct-effect Employment</i>	1.9574

Regional Input-Output Modeling System (RIMS II)

The economic impact estimates in this report are based on the Regional Input-Output Modeling System (RIMS II), a widely used regional input-output model developed by the U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis. The RIMS II model is a standard tool used to estimate regional economic impacts. The economic impacts estimated using the RIMS II model are generally recognized as reasonable and plausible assuming the data input into the model is accurate or based on reasonable assumptions. The RIMS II model is described in basic detail below.

Generally speaking, input-output modeling attempts to estimate the changes that occur in all industries based on a change in the demand for the output of an industry. An input-output model allows an analyst to identify the subsequent changes occurring in various industries within a regional economy in order to estimate the total impact on the economy. Total economic impact is the sum of three components: (1) direct, (2) indirect, and (3) induced impacts.

If the demand for the output of an industry, measured by industry sales or revenue, increases by \$1.0 million, total regional output increases by \$1.0 million. This initial change in output is called the change in direct economic output and also referred to as the direct expenditure effect. The change in total economic output in the region resulting from the initial change does not stop with the change in direct economic output. Businesses in a variety of industries within the region will be called upon to increase their production to meet the needs of the industry where the initial increase in demand occurs. Further, other suppliers must also increase production to meet the needs of the group of initial supplier firms to the industry. This increase in expenditures by regional suppliers is considered the indirect economic impact of the initial \$1.0 million in sales, and is classified as indirect expenditures of the total economic impact or the change in indirect economic output.

The total economic impact of the \$1.0 million in sales includes one more component, the induced impact. All economic activity, whether direct or indirect, that results from the initial increase in demand of \$1.0 million, requires workers, and these workers must be paid for their labor. This means that part of the direct and indirect expenditures is actually in the form of wages and salaries paid to workers in the various affected industries. These wages and salaries will in turn be spent in part on goods and services produced locally in the region. This spending is another part of the regional economic impacts referred to as induced impacts and is classified as induced expenditures or the change in induced economic output.

Based on the initial direct impact, the RIMS II model can be used to estimate the direct, indirect and induced impacts on economic output, value added, earnings and employment in a given region. Economic output is gross output and is the sum of the intermediate inputs and final use. This is a duplicative total in that goods and services will be counted multiple times if they are used in the production of other goods and services. Value added is defined as the value of gross output less intermediate inputs. Workers’ earnings or earnings consist of wages and salaries, employer provided benefits and proprietors’ income. Employment consists of a count of jobs that include both full-time and part-time workers.

The RIMS II model is based on regional multipliers, which are summary measures of economic impacts generated from changes in direct expenditures, earnings, or employment. Multipliers show the overall impact to a regional economy resulting from a change in demand in a particular industry. Multipliers can vary widely by region. Multipliers are higher for regions with a diverse industry mix. Industries that buy most of their materials from outside the state or region tend to have lower multipliers. Multipliers tend to be higher for industries located in larger areas because more of the spending by the industry stays within the area.

The RIMS II model generates six types of multipliers for approximately 400 industrial sectors for any region in the United States. The multipliers include four “final-demand” multipliers and two “direct-effect” multipliers. Final demand multipliers indicate the impact of changes in final demand for the output of a particular regional industry on total regional output, earnings, employment and value added. Direct-effect multipliers indicate the impact of changes in regional earnings or employment within a particular industry on total employment or earnings within a region.

Final-demand output multipliers indicate the total regional output (direct, indirect and induced expenditures) that results from an increase in direct expenditures for a good produced by a particular regional industry. For example, if an industry in a particular region is said to have a final demand output multiplier of 2, this tells us that a \$1 increase in final demand for the good produced by that industry results in a \$2 increase in total output or expenditures within the regional economy. Final-demand earnings multipliers indicate the impact of an increase in final demand for the good of a particular regional industry on the total earned income of households within the region. Final-demand employment multipliers indicate the increase in total regional employment that results from a \$1.0 million increase in final demand for the good produced by a particular regional industry. Final-demand value-added multipliers indicate the increase in total regional value added that results from a \$1.0 million increase in final demand for the good produced by a particular regional industry. Direct-effect earnings multipliers indicate the impact of a \$1 change in earnings within a particular regional industry on total earnings in all industries within a region. Direct-effect employment multipliers indicate the impact of a change in employment in a particular regional industry on total employment in all industries within a region.

Theoretically, changes in final demand drive the total change in economic output, earnings, and employment. However, these multiplier relationships can be used to estimate impacts in other ways if only limited information is known about a project. For example, the multiplier relationships can be used to estimate the increase in direct economic output based on a given level of employment in a specific industry.

Additional Notes on RIMS II

RIMS II multipliers are based on the average relationships between the inputs and outputs produced in a local economy. The multipliers are a useful tool for studying the potential impacts of changes in economic activity. However, the relative simplicity of input-output multipliers comes at the cost of several limiting assumptions.

- Firms have no supply constraints—Input-output based multipliers assume that industries can increase their demand for inputs and labor as needed to meet additional demand.
- Firms have fixed patterns of purchases—Input-output based multipliers assume that an industry must double its inputs to double its output.
- Firms use local inputs when they are available—The method used by RIMS II to develop regional multipliers assumes that firms will purchase inputs from firms in the region before using imports.

RIMS II, like all input-output models, is a “static equilibrium” model. This means that there is no specific time dimension associated with the results using the model. For the RIMS II model, it is customary to assume that the impacts occur in one year because the model is based on annual data.

About Impact DataSource

Impact DataSource is an Austin economic consulting, research, and analysis firm founded in 1993. The firm has conducted over 2,500 economic impact analyses of firms, projects, and activities in most industry groups in Tennessee and in more than 35 other states.

In addition, Impact DataSource has prepared and customized more than 100 economic impact models for its clients to perform their own analyses of economic development projects. These clients include the New Mexico Economic Development Department and the Tennessee Department of Economic and Community Development.

The New Mexico Department of Economic Development uses Impact DataSource's computer model to project the economic impact of new or expanding firms in the state, including costs and benefits for the State of New Mexico, as well as each local taxing district. The model also analyzes the amount of eligible state and local incentives and calculates a rate of return and payback period for these incentives.

Appendix A
Visitor Group Expenditures Summary

Visitor Group Expenditures Summary

Resort

Per Visitor Group Expenditures by Visitors Within Local Area		
Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$13.81	\$33.50
Groceries	\$9.40	\$66.71
Gasoline and oil	\$8.01	\$29.76
Recreation use fees	\$8.89	\$13.28
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$3.81	\$6.35
Retail Shopping	\$1.83	\$21.80
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$14.93
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$9.92
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$97.17
Total	\$45.76	\$293.41

Per Visitor Group Expenditures by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN		
Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$0.37	\$9.66
Groceries	\$0.93	\$46.55
Gasoline and oil	\$1.55	\$35.69
Recreation use fees	\$0.03	\$0.68
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$0.63	\$39.38
Retail Shopping	\$0.00	\$1.25
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$0.00
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$1.13
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$4.54
Total	\$3.50	\$138.89

Marina

Per Visitor Group Expenditures by Visitors Within Local Area		
Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$15.99	\$44.10
Groceries	\$9.94	\$87.55
Gasoline and oil	\$8.82	\$31.08
Recreation use fees	\$12.67	\$22.21
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$6.22	\$8.64
Retail Shopping	\$1.46	\$9.98
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$38.86
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$2.97
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$93.17
Total	\$55.10	\$338.56

Per Visitor Group Expenditures by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN		
Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$0.21	\$4.23
Groceries	\$1.57	\$35.42
Gasoline and oil	\$1.72	\$19.21
Recreation use fees	\$0.00	\$0.00
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$0.34	\$12.12
Retail Shopping	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$0.00
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$2.82
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$0.62
Total	\$3.83	\$74.41

Cabins/Camping

Per Visitor Group Expenditures by Visitors Within Local Area		
Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$11.83	\$36.17
Groceries	\$12.10	\$74.47
Gasoline and oil	\$8.68	\$27.68
Recreation use fees	\$4.30	\$16.38
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$7.20	\$10.67
Retail Shopping	\$2.57	\$21.11
Other expense	\$0.56	\$0.19
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$12.78
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$6.33
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$92.95
Total	\$47.24	\$298.73

Per Visitor Group Expenditures by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN		
Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$0.83	\$10.81
Groceries	\$2.48	\$61.44
Gasoline and oil	\$2.54	\$28.82
Recreation use fees	\$0.02	\$1.42
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$0.56	\$13.89
Retail Shopping	\$0.00	\$2.11
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.15
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$0.09
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$2.22
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$1.96
Total	\$6.44	\$122.90

Visitor Group Expenditures Summary

No Camping/Has Amenities

Per Visitor Group Expenditures by Visitors Within Local Area			Per Visitor Group Expenditures by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN		
Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$11.70	\$34.38	Restaurants, snack bars	\$0.96	\$62.26
Groceries	\$7.63	\$24.21	Groceries	\$1.25	\$52.45
Gasoline and oil	\$7.69	\$24.85	Gasoline and oil	\$1.77	\$54.82
Recreation use fees	\$1.47	\$2.53	Recreation use fees	\$0.00	\$2.80
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$7.80	\$8.00	Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$0.03	\$18.59
Retail Shopping	\$3.60	\$22.39	Retail Shopping	\$0.00	\$15.15
Other expense	\$0.11	\$0.27	Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00	Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$3.45	State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$7.84
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$36.47	Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$65.06
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$21.91	Camping fees	\$0.00	\$2.39
Total	\$39.99	\$178.45	Total	\$4.01	\$281.36

No Camping/No Amenities

Per Visitor Group Expenditures by Visitors Within Local Area			Per Visitor Group Expenditures by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN		
Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$12.58	\$64.65	Restaurants, snack bars	\$0.81	\$55.47
Groceries	\$7.59	\$62.05	Groceries	\$2.23	\$38.09
Gasoline and oil	\$6.90	\$44.65	Gasoline and oil	\$1.73	\$34.44
Recreation use fees	\$7.84	\$39.22	Recreation use fees	\$0.00	\$2.13
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$3.41	\$5.00	Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$1.19	\$0.53
Retail Shopping	\$0.51	\$41.96	Retail Shopping	\$0.00	\$4.55
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.00	Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00	Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$9.77	State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$3.33
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$63.88	Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$46.09
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$28.37	Camping fees	\$0.00	\$3.86
Total	\$38.83	\$359.54	Total	\$5.95	\$188.48

Appendix B

Statewide Impact Summary - All Parks

Statewide Impact Summary

All Parks

Spending & Impact Within Local Area

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	7,732,444	
Day Visitor Groups	4,566,447	59.1%
Overnight Visitor Groups	3,165,997	40.9%

Per Visitor Group, Per Day Expenditures by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Overnight	
	Day Visitors	Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$11.95	\$31.31
Groceries	\$9.47	\$59.54
Gasoline and oil	\$7.81	\$24.31
Recreation use fees	\$5.01	\$13.29
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$6.23	\$7.84
Retail Shopping	\$2.35	\$17.53
Other expense	\$0.25	\$0.11
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$12.88
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$8.66
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$74.17
Total	\$43.07	\$249.65

Total Spending by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Overnight		Total
	Day Visitors	Visitors	
Restaurants, snack bars	\$54,571,034	\$99,118,307	\$153,689,341
Groceries	\$43,243,686	\$188,497,778	\$231,741,464
Gasoline and oil	\$35,649,529	\$76,973,467	\$112,622,996
Recreation use fees	\$22,875,885	\$42,075,283	\$64,951,168
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$28,460,173	\$24,834,172	\$53,294,345
Retail Shopping	\$10,734,603	\$55,500,364	\$66,234,967
Other expense	\$1,147,690	\$363,448	\$1,511,138
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$40,772,236	\$40,772,236
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$27,429,691	\$27,429,691
Camping fees	\$0	\$234,832,262	\$234,832,262
Total	\$196,682,601	\$790,397,008	\$987,079,609

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	1,035.5	\$30,647,093	\$121,966,262	\$61,392,414
Groceries	225.9	\$7,890,360	\$24,786,641	\$14,823,360
Gasoline and oil	87.1	\$3,351,705	\$11,060,473	\$6,360,696
Recreation use fees	513.7	\$15,322,268	\$50,194,267	\$27,846,815
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	200.3	\$6,900,064	\$22,603,992	\$13,625,388
Retail Shopping	73.9	\$2,647,366	\$7,801,257	\$4,667,028
Other expense	8.4	\$302,593	\$891,680	\$533,439
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	2,144.8	\$67,061,447	\$239,304,571	\$129,249,139

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	1,880.7	\$55,664,841	\$221,529,416	\$111,508,096
Groceries	984.9	\$34,393,813	\$108,044,136	\$64,614,531
Gasoline and oil	188.1	\$7,236,907	\$23,881,465	\$13,733,837
Recreation use fees	944.8	\$28,182,024	\$92,321,586	\$51,218,242
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	174.8	\$6,020,953	\$19,724,104	\$11,889,429
Retail Shopping	381.9	\$13,687,489	\$40,334,290	\$24,129,605
Other expense	2.7	\$95,824	\$282,375	\$168,928
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	558.9	\$24,104,546	\$83,758,405	\$48,995,996
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	376.0	\$16,216,433	\$56,348,815	\$32,962,260
Camping fees	3,218.9	\$138,832,833	\$482,415,916	\$282,197,929
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	8,711.6	\$324,435,665	\$1,128,640,509	\$641,418,854

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	2,916.2	\$86,311,934	\$343,495,678	\$172,900,509
Groceries	1,210.9	\$42,284,173	\$132,830,777	\$79,437,892
Gasoline and oil	275.2	\$10,588,611	\$34,941,938	\$20,094,533
Recreation use fees	1,458.4	\$43,504,292	\$142,515,853	\$79,065,057
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	375.0	\$12,921,017	\$42,328,095	\$25,514,817
Retail Shopping	455.8	\$16,334,854	\$48,135,547	\$28,796,632
Other expense	11.1	\$398,417	\$1,174,055	\$702,367
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	558.9	\$24,104,546	\$83,758,405	\$48,995,996
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	376.0	\$16,216,433	\$56,348,815	\$32,962,260
Camping fees	3,218.9	\$138,832,833	\$482,415,916	\$282,197,929
Total Visitor Impact	10,856.4	\$391,497,112	\$1,367,945,080	\$770,667,993

Statewide Impact Summary

All Parks

Spending & Impact Outside Local Area, but inside TN

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	7,732,444	
Day Visitor Groups	4,566,447	59.1%
Overnight Visitor Groups	3,165,997	40.9%

Per Visitor Group, Per Day Expenditures by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Overnight	
	Day Visitors	Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$0.71	\$12.57
Groceries	\$1.76	\$46.35
Gasoline and oil	\$1.96	\$26.82
Recreation use fees	\$0.01	\$1.05
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$0.43	\$16.49
Retail Shopping	\$0.00	\$2.37
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.07
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$0.63
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$6.66
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$2.08
Total	\$4.88	\$115.10

Total Spending by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Overnight		Total
	Day Visitors	Visitors	
Restaurants, snack bars	\$3,247,101	\$39,800,418	\$43,047,520
Groceries	\$8,031,664	\$146,732,984	\$154,764,647
Gasoline and oil	\$8,944,947	\$84,909,750	\$93,854,697
Recreation use fees	\$56,999	\$3,332,323	\$3,389,322
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$1,983,059	\$52,222,228	\$54,205,287
Retail Shopping	\$0	\$7,508,853	\$7,508,853
Other expense	\$0	\$232,114	\$232,114
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$1,988,355	\$1,988,355
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$21,072,138	\$21,072,138
Camping fees	\$0	\$6,597,739	\$6,597,739
Total	\$22,263,771	\$364,396,902	\$386,660,674

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	61.6	\$1,823,572	\$7,257,272	\$3,652,989
Groceries	42.0	\$1,465,479	\$4,603,631	\$2,753,147
Gasoline and oil	21.9	\$840,988	\$2,775,222	\$1,595,984
Recreation use fees	1.3	\$38,178	\$125,068	\$69,385
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	14.0	\$480,785	\$1,575,010	\$949,395
Retail Shopping	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	140.7	\$4,649,003	\$16,336,203	\$9,020,902

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	755.2	\$22,351,915	\$88,953,935	\$44,775,471
Groceries	766.7	\$26,773,296	\$84,105,175	\$50,298,115
Gasoline and oil	207.5	\$7,983,062	\$26,343,742	\$15,149,852
Recreation use fees	74.8	\$2,231,990	\$7,311,783	\$4,056,437
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	367.5	\$12,661,086	\$41,476,585	\$25,001,538
Retail Shopping	51.7	\$1,851,832	\$5,456,978	\$3,264,585
Other expense	1.7	\$61,198	\$180,338	\$107,885
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	27.3	\$1,175,516	\$4,084,678	\$2,389,407
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	288.8	\$12,457,848	\$43,288,494	\$25,322,389
Camping fees	90.4	\$3,900,583	\$13,553,735	\$7,928,503
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	2,631.6	\$91,448,326	\$314,755,443	\$178,294,181

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	816.8	\$24,175,487	\$96,211,207	\$48,428,460
Groceries	808.6	\$28,238,775	\$88,708,805	\$53,051,263
Gasoline and oil	229.4	\$8,824,050	\$29,118,964	\$16,745,837
Recreation use fees	76.1	\$2,270,168	\$7,436,851	\$4,125,822
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	381.4	\$13,141,871	\$43,051,595	\$25,950,933
Retail Shopping	51.7	\$1,851,832	\$5,456,978	\$3,264,585
Other expense	1.7	\$61,198	\$180,338	\$107,885
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	27.3	\$1,175,516	\$4,084,678	\$2,389,407
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	288.8	\$12,457,848	\$43,288,494	\$25,322,389
Camping fees	90.4	\$3,900,583	\$13,553,735	\$7,928,503
Total Visitor Impact	2,772.3	\$96,097,328	\$331,091,646	\$187,315,083

Appendix C
Individual State Park Impact Reports

Bicentennial Capitol Mall

No Camping/Has Amenities

Spending & Impact Within Local Area

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	190,906	
Day Visitor Groups	159,024	83.3%
Overnight Visitor Groups	31,881	16.7%

Per Visitor Group Expenditures by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$11.16	\$29.28
Groceries	\$7.27	\$20.61
Gasoline and oil	\$7.33	\$21.16
Recreation use fees	\$1.40	\$2.16
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$7.44	\$6.81
Retail Shopping	\$3.43	\$19.07
Other expense	\$0.10	\$0.23
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$2.93
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$31.05
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$18.66
Total	\$38.14	\$151.97

Total Spending by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$1,774,257	\$933,457	\$2,707,714
Groceries	\$1,156,827	\$657,173	\$1,814,001
Gasoline and oil	\$1,166,298	\$674,642	\$1,840,940
Recreation use fees	\$222,671	\$68,778	\$291,449
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$1,182,937	\$217,195	\$1,400,131
Retail Shopping	\$545,526	\$608,002	\$1,153,527
Other expense	\$16,231	\$7,240	\$23,471
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$93,555	\$93,555
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$990,045	\$990,045
Camping fees	\$0	\$594,784	\$594,784
Total	\$6,064,747	\$4,844,872	\$10,909,618

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	33.7	\$996,422	\$3,965,463	\$1,996,039
Groceries	6.0	\$211,078	\$663,076	\$396,545
Gasoline and oil	2.9	\$109,653	\$361,851	\$208,094
Recreation use fees	5.0	\$149,145	\$488,585	\$271,057
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	8.3	\$286,799	\$939,527	\$566,334
Retail Shopping	3.8	\$134,537	\$396,455	\$237,175
Other expense	0.1	\$4,279	\$12,611	\$7,544
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	59.8	\$1,891,914	\$6,827,567	\$3,682,789

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	17.7	\$524,230	\$2,086,277	\$1,050,140
Groceries	3.4	\$119,910	\$376,682	\$225,270
Gasoline and oil	1.6	\$63,429	\$209,312	\$120,372
Recreation use fees	1.5	\$46,068	\$150,913	\$83,724
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	1.5	\$52,658	\$172,503	\$103,982
Retail Shopping	4.2	\$149,945	\$441,859	\$264,338
Other expense	0.1	\$1,909	\$5,625	\$3,365
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	1.3	\$55,310	\$192,190	\$112,425
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	13.6	\$585,315	\$2,033,850	\$1,189,737
Camping fees	8.2	\$351,637	\$1,221,866	\$714,752
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	53.1	\$1,950,409	\$6,891,076	\$3,868,105

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	51.4	\$1,520,652	\$6,051,741	\$3,046,178
Groceries	9.5	\$330,987	\$1,039,758	\$621,815
Gasoline and oil	4.5	\$173,082	\$571,162	\$328,466
Recreation use fees	6.5	\$195,213	\$639,498	\$354,781
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	9.9	\$339,457	\$1,112,030	\$670,317
Retail Shopping	7.9	\$284,483	\$838,314	\$501,513
Other expense	0.2	\$6,188	\$18,236	\$10,909
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	1.3	\$55,310	\$192,190	\$112,425
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	13.6	\$585,315	\$2,033,850	\$1,189,737
Camping fees	8.2	\$351,637	\$1,221,866	\$714,752
Total Visitor Impact	112.9	\$3,842,323	\$13,718,644	\$7,550,895

Bicentennial Capitol Mall

No Camping/Has Amenities

Spending & Impact Outside Local Area, but inside TN

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	190,906	
Day Visitor Groups	159,024	83.3%
Overnight Visitor Groups	31,881	16.7%

**Per Visitor Group Expenditures
by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN**

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$0.91	\$53.02
Groceries	\$1.19	\$44.66
Gasoline and oil	\$1.69	\$46.69
Recreation use fees	\$0.00	\$2.38
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$0.03	\$15.83
Retail Shopping	\$0.00	\$12.90
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$6.67
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$55.40
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$2.04
Total	\$3.82	\$239.60

Total Spending by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$145,012	\$1,690,228	\$1,835,241
Groceries	\$189,336	\$1,423,910	\$1,613,246
Gasoline and oil	\$268,457	\$1,488,443	\$1,756,900
Recreation use fees	\$0	\$76,018	\$76,018
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$4,695	\$504,763	\$509,458
Retail Shopping	\$0	\$411,275	\$411,275
Other expense	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$212,792	\$212,792
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$1,766,214	\$1,766,214
Camping fees	\$0	\$65,005	\$65,005
Total	\$607,500	\$7,638,650	\$8,246,149

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	2.8	\$81,439	\$324,102	\$163,139
Groceries	1.0	\$34,547	\$108,524	\$64,902
Gasoline and oil	0.7	\$25,240	\$83,290	\$47,899
Recreation use fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.0	\$1,138	\$3,729	\$2,248
Retail Shopping	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	4.4	\$142,364	\$519,646	\$278,187

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	32.1	\$949,232	\$3,777,661	\$1,901,507
Groceries	7.4	\$259,811	\$816,164	\$488,098
Gasoline and oil	3.6	\$139,941	\$461,798	\$265,572
Recreation use fees	1.7	\$50,917	\$166,799	\$92,537
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	3.6	\$122,378	\$400,899	\$241,657
Retail Shopping	2.8	\$101,429	\$298,890	\$178,808
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	2.9	\$125,803	\$437,139	\$255,712
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	24.2	\$1,044,186	\$3,628,333	\$2,122,459
Camping fees	0.9	\$38,431	\$133,541	\$78,117
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	79.3	\$2,832,127	\$10,121,223	\$5,624,467

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	34.8	\$1,030,671	\$4,101,763	\$2,064,646
Groceries	8.4	\$294,357	\$924,689	\$552,999
Gasoline and oil	4.3	\$165,181	\$545,088	\$313,471
Recreation use fees	1.7	\$50,917	\$166,799	\$92,537
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	3.6	\$123,516	\$404,628	\$243,904
Retail Shopping	2.8	\$101,429	\$298,890	\$178,808
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	2.9	\$125,803	\$437,139	\$255,712
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	24.2	\$1,044,186	\$3,628,333	\$2,122,459
Camping fees	0.9	\$38,431	\$133,541	\$78,117
Total Visitor Impact	83.7	\$2,974,490	\$10,640,869	\$5,902,654

Big Cypress Tree

No Camping/No Amenities

Spending & Impact Within Local Area

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	4,980	
Day Visitor Groups	4,377	87.9%
Overnight Visitor Groups	603	12.1%

Per Visitor Group Expenditures by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Overnight	
	Day Visitors	Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$12.00	\$55.06
Groceries	\$7.23	\$52.84
Gasoline and oil	\$6.58	\$38.02
Recreation use fees	\$7.48	\$33.40
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$3.25	\$4.26
Retail Shopping	\$0.49	\$35.73
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$8.32
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$54.40
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$24.16
Total	\$37.03	\$306.18

Total Spending by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Overnight		Total
	Day Visitors	Visitors	
Restaurants, snack bars	\$52,507	\$33,173	\$85,680
Groceries	\$31,663	\$31,836	\$63,498
Gasoline and oil	\$28,784	\$22,911	\$51,695
Recreation use fees	\$32,732	\$20,123	\$52,855
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$14,242	\$2,566	\$16,807
Retail Shopping	\$2,143	\$21,528	\$23,671
Other expense	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$5,012	\$5,012
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$32,779	\$32,779
Camping fees	\$0	\$14,557	\$14,557
Total	\$162,070	\$184,484	\$346,554

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	1.0	\$29,488	\$117,354	\$59,071
Groceries	0.2	\$5,777	\$18,148	\$10,853
Gasoline and oil	0.1	\$2,706	\$8,930	\$5,136
Recreation use fees	0.7	\$21,924	\$71,821	\$39,845
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.1	\$3,453	\$11,311	\$6,818
Retail Shopping	0.0	\$528	\$1,557	\$932
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	2.1	\$63,877	\$229,122	\$122,655

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	0.6	\$18,630	\$74,141	\$37,319
Groceries	0.2	\$5,809	\$18,248	\$10,913
Gasoline and oil	0.1	\$2,154	\$7,108	\$4,088
Recreation use fees	0.5	\$13,478	\$44,153	\$24,495
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.0	\$622	\$2,038	\$1,228
Retail Shopping	0.1	\$5,309	\$15,645	\$9,360
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.1	\$2,963	\$10,296	\$6,023
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.4	\$19,379	\$67,338	\$39,391
Camping fees	0.2	\$8,606	\$29,904	\$17,493
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	2.2	\$76,950	\$268,871	\$150,309

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	1.6	\$48,118	\$191,495	\$96,390
Groceries	0.3	\$11,586	\$36,396	\$21,766
Gasoline and oil	0.1	\$4,860	\$16,039	\$9,224
Recreation use fees	1.2	\$35,402	\$115,974	\$64,340
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.1	\$4,075	\$13,349	\$8,047
Retail Shopping	0.2	\$5,838	\$17,202	\$10,291
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.1	\$2,963	\$10,296	\$6,023
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.4	\$19,379	\$67,338	\$39,391
Camping fees	0.2	\$8,606	\$29,904	\$17,493
Total Visitor Impact	4.3	\$140,827	\$497,993	\$272,964

Big Cypress Tree

No Camping/No Amenities

Spending & Impact Outside Local Area, but inside TN

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	4,980	
Day Visitor Groups	4,377	87.9%
Overnight Visitor Groups	603	12.1%

Per Visitor Group Expenditures by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$0.77	\$47.23
Groceries	\$2.13	\$32.43
Gasoline and oil	\$1.65	\$29.33
Recreation use fees	\$0.00	\$1.81
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$1.13	\$0.45
Retail Shopping	\$0.00	\$3.87
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$2.84
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$39.25
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$3.29
Total	\$5.68	\$160.51

Total Spending by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$3,368	\$28,459	\$31,827
Groceries	\$9,302	\$19,542	\$28,843
Gasoline and oil	\$7,217	\$17,674	\$24,891
Recreation use fees	\$0	\$1,092	\$1,092
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$4,958	\$273	\$5,231
Retail Shopping	\$0	\$2,332	\$2,332
Other expense	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$1,710	\$1,710
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$23,647	\$23,647
Camping fees	\$0	\$1,982	\$1,982
Total	\$24,844	\$96,712	\$121,556

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	0.1	\$1,891	\$7,527	\$3,789
Groceries	0.0	\$1,697	\$5,332	\$3,188
Gasoline and oil	0.0	\$679	\$2,239	\$1,288
Recreation use fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.0	\$1,202	\$3,938	\$2,373
Retail Shopping	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	0.2	\$5,469	\$19,035	\$10,638

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	0.5	\$15,983	\$63,607	\$32,017
Groceries	0.1	\$3,566	\$11,201	\$6,699
Gasoline and oil	0.0	\$1,662	\$5,483	\$3,153
Recreation use fees	0.0	\$731	\$2,395	\$1,329
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.0	\$66	\$217	\$131
Retail Shopping	0.0	\$575	\$1,695	\$1,014
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$1,011	\$3,514	\$2,055
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.3	\$13,980	\$48,579	\$28,417
Camping fees	0.0	\$1,172	\$4,073	\$2,382
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	1.1	\$38,746	\$140,763	\$77,197

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	0.6	\$17,874	\$71,134	\$35,806
Groceries	0.2	\$5,263	\$16,533	\$9,887
Gasoline and oil	0.1	\$2,340	\$7,722	\$4,441
Recreation use fees	0.0	\$731	\$2,395	\$1,329
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.0	\$1,268	\$4,154	\$2,504
Retail Shopping	0.0	\$575	\$1,695	\$1,014
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$1,011	\$3,514	\$2,055
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.3	\$13,980	\$48,579	\$28,417
Camping fees	0.0	\$1,172	\$4,073	\$2,382
Total Visitor Impact	1.3	\$44,215	\$159,798	\$87,836

Big Hill Pond

Cabins/Camping

Spending & Impact Within Local Area

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	34,156	
Day Visitor Groups	17,283	50.6%
Overnight Visitor Groups	16,873	49.4%

Per Visitor Group Expenditures by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Overnight	
	Day Visitors	Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$11.28	\$30.80
Groceries	\$11.54	\$63.42
Gasoline and oil	\$8.28	\$23.57
Recreation use fees	\$4.10	\$13.95
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$6.87	\$9.08
Retail Shopping	\$2.45	\$17.97
Other expense	\$0.54	\$0.17
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$10.88
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$5.39
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$79.16
Total	\$45.05	\$254.40

Total Spending by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Overnight		Total
	Day Visitors	Visitors	
Restaurants, snack bars	\$194,935	\$519,758	\$714,694
Groceries	\$199,500	\$1,070,098	\$1,269,598
Gasoline and oil	\$143,038	\$397,673	\$540,711
Recreation use fees	\$70,790	\$235,364	\$306,154
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$118,706	\$153,248	\$271,954
Retail Shopping	\$42,287	\$303,273	\$345,560
Other expense	\$9,308	\$2,796	\$12,105
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$183,660	\$183,660
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$90,930	\$90,930
Camping fees	\$0	\$1,335,615	\$1,335,615
Total	\$778,565	\$4,292,415	\$5,070,980

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	3.7	\$109,476	\$435,680	\$219,302
Groceries	1.0	\$36,401	\$114,350	\$68,386
Gasoline and oil	0.3	\$13,448	\$44,379	\$25,521
Recreation use fees	1.6	\$47,415	\$155,327	\$86,173
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.8	\$28,780	\$94,280	\$56,831
Retail Shopping	0.3	\$10,429	\$30,732	\$18,385
Other expense	0.1	\$2,454	\$7,232	\$4,326
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	7.9	\$248,403	\$881,980	\$478,924

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	9.9	\$291,896	\$1,161,660	\$584,728
Groceries	5.6	\$195,253	\$613,364	\$366,815
Gasoline and oil	1.0	\$37,388	\$123,380	\$70,954
Recreation use fees	5.3	\$157,647	\$516,436	\$286,509
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	1.1	\$37,154	\$121,714	\$73,368
Retail Shopping	2.1	\$74,793	\$220,400	\$131,852
Other expense	0.0	\$737	\$2,173	\$1,300
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	2.5	\$108,580	\$377,292	\$220,704
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	1.2	\$53,758	\$186,798	\$109,271
Camping fees	18.3	\$789,616	\$2,743,755	\$1,605,009
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	47.0	\$1,746,823	\$6,066,972	\$3,450,509

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	13.6	\$401,372	\$1,597,340	\$804,030
Groceries	6.6	\$231,654	\$727,715	\$435,201
Gasoline and oil	1.3	\$50,837	\$167,759	\$96,475
Recreation use fees	6.9	\$205,062	\$671,763	\$372,681
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	1.9	\$65,934	\$215,995	\$130,199
Retail Shopping	2.4	\$85,222	\$251,132	\$150,237
Other expense	0.1	\$3,191	\$9,404	\$5,626
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	2.5	\$108,580	\$377,292	\$220,704
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	1.2	\$53,758	\$186,798	\$109,271
Camping fees	18.3	\$789,616	\$2,743,755	\$1,605,009
Total Visitor Impact	54.8	\$1,995,226	\$6,948,952	\$3,929,434

Big Hill Pond

Cabins/Camping

Spending & Impact Outside Local Area, but inside TN

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	34,156	
Day Visitor Groups	17,283	50.6%
Overnight Visitor Groups	16,873	49.4%

Per Visitor Group Expenditures by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$0.80	\$9.20
Groceries	\$2.37	\$52.32
Gasoline and oil	\$2.42	\$24.55
Recreation use fees	\$0.02	\$1.21
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$0.54	\$11.83
Retail Shopping	\$0.00	\$1.79
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.13
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$0.08
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$1.89
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$1.67
Total	\$6.15	\$104.66

Total Spending by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$13,744	\$155,277	\$169,021
Groceries	\$40,932	\$882,880	\$923,812
Gasoline and oil	\$41,868	\$414,169	\$456,036
Recreation use fees	\$383	\$20,373	\$20,757
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$9,277	\$199,546	\$208,823
Retail Shopping	\$0	\$30,261	\$30,261
Other expense	\$0	\$2,119	\$2,119
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$1,364	\$1,364
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$31,883	\$31,883
Camping fees	\$0	\$28,096	\$28,096
Total	\$106,204	\$1,765,969	\$1,872,173

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	0.3	\$7,718	\$30,717	\$15,461
Groceries	0.2	\$7,468	\$23,461	\$14,031
Gasoline and oil	0.1	\$3,936	\$12,990	\$7,470
Recreation use fees	0.0	\$257	\$841	\$467
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.1	\$2,249	\$7,368	\$4,442
Retail Shopping	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	0.7	\$21,629	\$75,377	\$41,871

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	2.9	\$87,204	\$347,045	\$174,687
Groceries	4.6	\$161,093	\$506,054	\$302,640
Gasoline and oil	1.0	\$38,939	\$128,498	\$73,897
Recreation use fees	0.5	\$13,646	\$44,704	\$24,801
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	1.4	\$48,379	\$158,486	\$95,533
Retail Shopping	0.2	\$7,463	\$21,992	\$13,157
Other expense	0.0	\$559	\$1,647	\$985
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$807	\$2,803	\$1,640
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.4	\$18,849	\$65,498	\$38,314
Camping fees	0.4	\$16,610	\$57,717	\$33,763
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	11.5	\$393,549	\$1,334,442	\$759,415

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	3.2	\$94,922	\$377,761	\$190,148
Groceries	4.8	\$168,561	\$529,515	\$316,670
Gasoline and oil	1.1	\$42,876	\$141,488	\$81,367
Recreation use fees	0.5	\$13,903	\$45,545	\$25,267
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	1.5	\$50,628	\$165,854	\$99,975
Retail Shopping	0.2	\$7,463	\$21,992	\$13,157
Other expense	0.0	\$559	\$1,647	\$985
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$807	\$2,803	\$1,640
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.4	\$18,849	\$65,498	\$38,314
Camping fees	0.4	\$16,610	\$57,717	\$33,763
Total Visitor Impact	12.1	\$415,178	\$1,409,820	\$801,286

Big Ridge

Cabins/Camping

Spending & Impact Within Local Area

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	203,000	
Day Visitor Groups	102,718	50.6%
Overnight Visitor Groups	100,282	49.4%

Per Visitor Group Expenditures by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Overnight	
	Day Visitors	Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$11.28	\$30.80
Groceries	\$11.54	\$63.42
Gasoline and oil	\$8.28	\$23.57
Recreation use fees	\$4.10	\$13.95
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$6.87	\$9.08
Retail Shopping	\$2.45	\$17.97
Other expense	\$0.54	\$0.17
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$10.88
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$5.39
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$79.16
Total	\$45.05	\$254.40

Total Spending by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Overnight		Total
	Day Visitors	Visitors	
Restaurants, snack bars	\$1,158,564	\$3,089,097	\$4,247,661
Groceries	\$1,185,694	\$6,359,946	\$7,545,640
Gasoline and oil	\$850,125	\$2,363,500	\$3,213,625
Recreation use fees	\$420,728	\$1,398,847	\$1,819,574
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$705,509	\$910,803	\$1,616,312
Retail Shopping	\$251,327	\$1,802,452	\$2,053,779
Other expense	\$55,322	\$16,619	\$71,941
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$1,091,550	\$1,091,550
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$540,428	\$540,428
Camping fees	\$0	\$7,938,005	\$7,938,005
Total	\$4,627,269	\$25,511,247	\$30,138,516

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	22.0	\$650,650	\$2,589,392	\$1,303,385
Groceries	6.2	\$216,345	\$679,623	\$406,440
Gasoline and oil	2.1	\$79,927	\$263,756	\$151,682
Recreation use fees	9.4	\$281,804	\$923,161	\$512,152
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	5.0	\$171,048	\$560,338	\$337,764
Retail Shopping	1.7	\$61,982	\$182,649	\$109,268
Other expense	0.4	\$14,586	\$42,982	\$25,713
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	46.8	\$1,476,342	\$5,241,900	\$2,846,405

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	58.6	\$1,734,837	\$6,904,131	\$3,475,234
Groceries	33.2	\$1,160,453	\$3,645,427	\$2,180,105
Gasoline and oil	5.8	\$222,212	\$733,290	\$421,703
Recreation use fees	31.4	\$936,947	\$3,069,349	\$1,702,816
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	6.4	\$220,821	\$723,389	\$436,050
Retail Shopping	12.4	\$444,520	\$1,309,913	\$783,643
Other expense	0.1	\$4,382	\$12,912	\$7,725
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	15.0	\$645,324	\$2,242,372	\$1,311,716
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	7.4	\$319,501	\$1,110,201	\$649,432
Camping fees	108.8	\$4,692,949	\$16,307,045	\$9,539,101
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	279.1	\$10,381,946	\$36,058,028	\$20,507,523

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	80.6	\$2,385,486	\$9,493,523	\$4,778,619
Groceries	39.4	\$1,376,798	\$4,325,049	\$2,586,545
Gasoline and oil	7.9	\$302,139	\$997,046	\$573,385
Recreation use fees	40.9	\$1,218,751	\$3,992,510	\$2,214,968
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	11.4	\$391,869	\$1,283,727	\$773,814
Retail Shopping	14.1	\$506,503	\$1,492,562	\$892,911
Other expense	0.5	\$18,968	\$55,894	\$33,438
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	15.0	\$645,324	\$2,242,372	\$1,311,716
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	7.4	\$319,501	\$1,110,201	\$649,432
Camping fees	108.8	\$4,692,949	\$16,307,045	\$9,539,101
Total Visitor Impact	325.9	\$11,858,288	\$41,299,928	\$23,353,928

Big Ridge

Cabins/Camping

Spending & Impact Outside Local Area, but inside TN

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	203,000	
Day Visitor Groups	102,718	50.6%
Overnight Visitor Groups	100,282	49.4%

Per Visitor Group Expenditures by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$0.80	\$9.20
Groceries	\$2.37	\$52.32
Gasoline and oil	\$2.42	\$24.55
Recreation use fees	\$0.02	\$1.21
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$0.54	\$11.83
Retail Shopping	\$0.00	\$1.79
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.13
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$0.08
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$1.89
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$1.67
Total	\$6.15	\$104.66

Total Spending by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$81,682	\$922,864	\$1,004,546
Groceries	\$243,270	\$5,247,249	\$5,490,520
Gasoline and oil	\$248,834	\$2,461,541	\$2,710,375
Recreation use fees	\$2,278	\$121,086	\$123,364
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$55,139	\$1,185,968	\$1,241,107
Retail Shopping	\$0	\$179,853	\$179,853
Other expense	\$0	\$12,596	\$12,596
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$8,109	\$8,109
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$189,492	\$189,492
Camping fees	\$0	\$166,983	\$166,983
Total	\$631,203	\$10,495,742	\$11,126,946

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	1.5	\$45,873	\$182,560	\$91,893
Groceries	1.3	\$44,388	\$139,439	\$83,390
Gasoline and oil	0.6	\$23,395	\$77,202	\$44,398
Recreation use fees	0.1	\$1,526	\$4,998	\$2,773
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.4	\$13,368	\$43,793	\$26,398
Retail Shopping	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	3.9	\$128,550	\$447,993	\$248,851

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	17.5	\$518,280	\$2,062,601	\$1,038,222
Groceries	27.4	\$957,427	\$3,007,646	\$1,798,687
Gasoline and oil	6.0	\$231,430	\$763,707	\$439,196
Recreation use fees	2.7	\$81,104	\$265,688	\$147,399
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	8.3	\$287,534	\$941,935	\$567,786
Retail Shopping	1.2	\$44,355	\$130,706	\$78,194
Other expense	0.1	\$3,321	\$9,786	\$5,854
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.1	\$4,794	\$16,658	\$9,745
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	2.6	\$112,028	\$389,274	\$227,713
Camping fees	2.3	\$98,720	\$343,034	\$200,664
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	68.3	\$2,338,993	\$7,931,034	\$4,513,458

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	19.1	\$564,153	\$2,245,161	\$1,130,115
Groceries	28.7	\$1,001,815	\$3,147,085	\$1,882,077
Gasoline and oil	6.6	\$254,825	\$840,910	\$483,593
Recreation use fees	2.8	\$82,629	\$270,686	\$150,172
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	8.7	\$300,902	\$985,728	\$594,184
Retail Shopping	1.2	\$44,355	\$130,706	\$78,194
Other expense	0.1	\$3,321	\$9,786	\$5,854
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.1	\$4,794	\$16,658	\$9,745
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	2.6	\$112,028	\$389,274	\$227,713
Camping fees	2.3	\$98,720	\$343,034	\$200,664
Total Visitor Impact	72.2	\$2,467,543	\$8,379,027	\$4,762,309

Bledsoe Creek

Cabins/Camping

Spending & Impact Within Local Area

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	115,474	
Day Visitor Groups	58,430	50.6%
Overnight Visitor Groups	57,044	49.4%

**Per Visitor Group Expenditures
by Visitors Within Local Area**

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$11.28	\$30.80
Groceries	\$11.54	\$63.42
Gasoline and oil	\$8.28	\$23.57
Recreation use fees	\$4.10	\$13.95
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$6.87	\$9.08
Retail Shopping	\$2.45	\$17.97
Other expense	\$0.54	\$0.17
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$10.88
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$5.39
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$79.16
Total	\$45.05	\$254.40

Total Spending by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$659,032	\$1,757,187	\$2,416,219
Groceries	\$674,465	\$3,617,761	\$4,292,225
Gasoline and oil	\$483,581	\$1,344,442	\$1,828,023
Recreation use fees	\$239,325	\$795,713	\$1,035,038
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$401,318	\$518,097	\$919,415
Retail Shopping	\$142,964	\$1,025,298	\$1,168,262
Other expense	\$31,469	\$9,454	\$40,923
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$620,912	\$620,912
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$307,414	\$307,414
Camping fees	\$0	\$4,515,416	\$4,515,416
Total	\$2,632,153	\$14,511,694	\$17,143,847

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	12.5	\$370,112	\$1,472,937	\$741,411
Groceries	3.5	\$123,065	\$386,593	\$231,198
Gasoline and oil	1.2	\$45,465	\$150,034	\$86,282
Recreation use fees	5.4	\$160,300	\$525,126	\$291,330
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	2.8	\$97,298	\$318,740	\$192,132
Retail Shopping	1.0	\$35,258	\$103,897	\$62,156
Other expense	0.2	\$8,297	\$24,449	\$14,627
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	26.6	\$839,795	\$2,981,777	\$1,619,135

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	33.3	\$986,836	\$3,927,312	\$1,976,835
Groceries	18.9	\$660,106	\$2,073,647	\$1,240,120
Gasoline and oil	3.3	\$126,402	\$417,121	\$239,879
Recreation use fees	17.9	\$532,969	\$1,745,954	\$968,622
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	3.6	\$125,611	\$411,489	\$248,040
Retail Shopping	7.1	\$252,859	\$745,124	\$445,764
Other expense	0.1	\$2,492	\$7,345	\$4,394
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	8.5	\$367,083	\$1,275,540	\$746,150
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	4.2	\$181,743	\$631,521	\$369,420
Camping fees	61.9	\$2,669,514	\$9,276,020	\$5,426,176
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	158.8	\$5,905,616	\$20,511,073	\$11,665,400

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	45.8	\$1,356,949	\$5,400,249	\$2,718,246
Groceries	22.4	\$783,171	\$2,460,240	\$1,471,318
Gasoline and oil	4.5	\$171,867	\$567,155	\$326,161
Recreation use fees	23.2	\$693,268	\$2,271,080	\$1,259,952
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	6.5	\$222,909	\$730,229	\$440,173
Retail Shopping	8.0	\$288,116	\$849,022	\$507,919
Other expense	0.3	\$10,789	\$31,794	\$19,021
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	8.5	\$367,083	\$1,275,540	\$746,150
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	4.2	\$181,743	\$631,521	\$369,420
Camping fees	61.9	\$2,669,514	\$9,276,020	\$5,426,176
Total Visitor Impact	185.4	\$6,745,411	\$23,492,850	\$13,284,535

Bledsoe Creek

Cabins/Camping

Spending & Impact Outside Local Area, but inside TN

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	115,474	
Day Visitor Groups	58,430	50.6%
Overnight Visitor Groups	57,044	49.4%

**Per Visitor Group Expenditures
by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN**

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$0.80	\$9.20
Groceries	\$2.37	\$52.32
Gasoline and oil	\$2.42	\$24.55
Recreation use fees	\$0.02	\$1.21
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$0.54	\$11.83
Retail Shopping	\$0.00	\$1.79
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.13
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$0.08
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$1.89
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$1.67
Total	\$6.15	\$104.66

Total Spending by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$46,464	\$524,957	\$571,421
Groceries	\$138,381	\$2,984,820	\$3,123,201
Gasoline and oil	\$141,545	\$1,400,211	\$1,541,757
Recreation use fees	\$1,296	\$68,878	\$70,174
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$31,365	\$674,621	\$705,985
Retail Shopping	\$0	\$102,307	\$102,307
Other expense	\$0	\$7,165	\$7,165
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$4,613	\$4,613
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$107,790	\$107,790
Camping fees	\$0	\$94,986	\$94,986
Total	\$359,051	\$5,970,347	\$6,329,398

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	0.9	\$26,094	\$103,847	\$52,272
Groceries	0.7	\$25,249	\$79,318	\$47,435
Gasoline and oil	0.3	\$13,308	\$43,915	\$25,255
Recreation use fees	0.0	\$868	\$2,843	\$1,577
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.2	\$7,604	\$24,911	\$15,016
Retail Shopping	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	2.2	\$73,123	\$254,834	\$141,555

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	10.0	\$294,816	\$1,173,280	\$590,577
Groceries	15.6	\$544,618	\$1,710,855	\$1,023,157
Gasoline and oil	3.4	\$131,645	\$434,424	\$249,830
Recreation use fees	1.5	\$46,135	\$151,133	\$83,845
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	4.7	\$163,559	\$535,805	\$322,976
Retail Shopping	0.7	\$25,231	\$74,350	\$44,479
Other expense	0.1	\$1,889	\$5,567	\$3,330
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.1	\$2,727	\$9,476	\$5,543
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	1.5	\$63,725	\$221,433	\$129,531
Camping fees	1.3	\$56,156	\$195,130	\$114,145
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	38.9	\$1,330,502	\$4,511,451	\$2,567,414

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	10.8	\$320,910	\$1,277,127	\$642,849
Groceries	16.3	\$569,868	\$1,790,172	\$1,070,592
Gasoline and oil	3.8	\$144,953	\$478,339	\$275,085
Recreation use fees	1.6	\$47,003	\$153,976	\$85,423
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	5.0	\$171,164	\$560,717	\$337,993
Retail Shopping	0.7	\$25,231	\$74,350	\$44,479
Other expense	0.1	\$1,889	\$5,567	\$3,330
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.1	\$2,727	\$9,476	\$5,543
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	1.5	\$63,725	\$221,433	\$129,531
Camping fees	1.3	\$56,156	\$195,130	\$114,145
Total Visitor Impact	41.1	\$1,403,625	\$4,766,285	\$2,708,969

Booker T. Washington

No Camping/Has Amenities
Spending & Impact Within Local Area

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	91,885	
Day Visitor Groups	76,540	83.3%
Overnight Visitor Groups	15,345	16.7%

**Per Visitor Group Expenditures
by Visitors Within Local Area**

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$11.16	\$29.28
Groceries	\$7.27	\$20.61
Gasoline and oil	\$7.33	\$21.16
Recreation use fees	\$1.40	\$2.16
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$7.44	\$6.81
Retail Shopping	\$3.43	\$19.07
Other expense	\$0.10	\$0.23
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$2.93
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$31.05
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$18.66
Total	\$38.14	\$151.97

Total Spending by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$853,972	\$449,285	\$1,303,256
Groceries	\$556,795	\$316,306	\$873,101
Gasoline and oil	\$561,354	\$324,714	\$886,067
Recreation use fees	\$107,174	\$33,104	\$140,278
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$569,362	\$104,538	\$673,901
Retail Shopping	\$262,568	\$292,639	\$555,207
Other expense	\$7,812	\$3,485	\$11,297
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$45,029	\$45,029
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$476,521	\$476,521
Camping fees	\$0	\$286,277	\$286,277
Total	\$2,919,038	\$2,331,897	\$5,250,935

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	16.2	\$479,590	\$1,908,627	\$960,718
Groceries	2.9	\$101,594	\$319,147	\$190,862
Gasoline and oil	1.4	\$52,777	\$174,163	\$100,158
Recreation use fees	2.4	\$71,785	\$235,162	\$130,463
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	4.0	\$138,040	\$452,206	\$272,584
Retail Shopping	1.8	\$64,755	\$190,819	\$114,155
Other expense	0.1	\$2,060	\$6,070	\$3,631
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	28.8	\$910,602	\$3,286,193	\$1,772,572

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	8.5	\$252,318	\$1,004,151	\$505,445
Groceries	1.7	\$57,714	\$181,302	\$108,425
Gasoline and oil	0.8	\$30,529	\$100,744	\$57,936
Recreation use fees	0.7	\$22,173	\$72,636	\$40,297
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.7	\$25,345	\$83,028	\$50,048
Retail Shopping	2.0	\$72,171	\$212,672	\$127,229
Other expense	0.0	\$919	\$2,707	\$1,620
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.6	\$26,621	\$92,504	\$54,112
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	6.5	\$281,719	\$978,917	\$572,635
Camping fees	3.9	\$169,247	\$588,099	\$344,019
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	25.6	\$938,756	\$3,316,760	\$1,861,767

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	24.7	\$731,909	\$2,912,778	\$1,466,163
Groceries	4.6	\$159,308	\$500,449	\$299,287
Gasoline and oil	2.2	\$83,306	\$274,907	\$158,095
Recreation use fees	3.1	\$93,958	\$307,798	\$170,761
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	4.7	\$163,385	\$535,234	\$322,632
Retail Shopping	3.8	\$136,925	\$403,491	\$241,384
Other expense	0.1	\$2,978	\$8,777	\$5,251
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.6	\$26,621	\$92,504	\$54,112
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	6.5	\$281,719	\$978,917	\$572,635
Camping fees	3.9	\$169,247	\$588,099	\$344,019
Total Visitor Impact	54.3	\$1,849,358	\$6,602,953	\$3,634,339

Booker T. Washington

No Camping/Has Amenities

Spending & Impact Outside Local Area, but inside TN

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	91,885	
Day Visitor Groups	76,540	83.3%
Overnight Visitor Groups	15,345	16.7%

**Per Visitor Group Expenditures
by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN**

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$0.91	\$53.02
Groceries	\$1.19	\$44.66
Gasoline and oil	\$1.69	\$46.69
Recreation use fees	\$0.00	\$2.38
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$0.03	\$15.83
Retail Shopping	\$0.00	\$12.90
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$6.67
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$55.40
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$2.04
Total	\$3.82	\$239.60

Total Spending by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$69,796	\$813,528	\$883,324
Groceries	\$91,130	\$685,346	\$776,475
Gasoline and oil	\$129,212	\$716,406	\$845,618
Recreation use fees	\$0	\$36,588	\$36,588
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$2,260	\$242,949	\$245,208
Retail Shopping	\$0	\$197,952	\$197,952
Other expense	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$102,419	\$102,419
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$850,101	\$850,101
Camping fees	\$0	\$31,288	\$31,288
Total	\$292,397	\$3,676,577	\$3,968,974

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	1.3	\$39,198	\$155,994	\$78,521
Groceries	0.5	\$16,628	\$52,234	\$31,238
Gasoline and oil	0.3	\$12,148	\$40,089	\$23,054
Recreation use fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.0	\$548	\$1,795	\$1,082
Retail Shopping	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	2.1	\$68,521	\$250,112	\$133,895

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	15.4	\$456,877	\$1,818,235	\$915,219
Groceries	3.6	\$125,050	\$392,830	\$234,927
Gasoline and oil	1.8	\$67,355	\$222,269	\$127,823
Recreation use fees	0.8	\$24,507	\$80,282	\$44,539
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	1.7	\$58,902	\$192,958	\$116,312
Retail Shopping	1.4	\$48,819	\$143,859	\$86,063
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	1.4	\$60,550	\$210,400	\$123,077
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	11.7	\$502,580	\$1,746,362	\$1,021,566
Camping fees	0.4	\$18,497	\$64,275	\$37,599
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	38.1	\$1,363,138	\$4,871,470	\$2,707,126

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	16.8	\$496,075	\$1,974,229	\$993,740
Groceries	4.1	\$141,678	\$445,064	\$266,165
Gasoline and oil	2.1	\$79,503	\$262,358	\$150,878
Recreation use fees	0.8	\$24,507	\$80,282	\$44,539
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	1.7	\$59,450	\$194,752	\$117,394
Retail Shopping	1.4	\$48,819	\$143,859	\$86,063
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	1.4	\$60,550	\$210,400	\$123,077
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	11.7	\$502,580	\$1,746,362	\$1,021,566
Camping fees	0.4	\$18,497	\$64,275	\$37,599
Total Visitor Impact	40.3	\$1,431,659	\$5,121,582	\$2,841,021

Burgess Falls

No Camping/No Amenities

Spending & Impact Within Local Area

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	50,466	
Day Visitor Groups	44,360	87.9%
Overnight Visitor Groups	6,106	12.1%

Per Visitor Group Expenditures by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$12.00	\$55.06
Groceries	\$7.23	\$52.84
Gasoline and oil	\$6.58	\$38.02
Recreation use fees	\$7.48	\$33.40
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$3.25	\$4.26
Retail Shopping	\$0.49	\$35.73
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$8.32
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$54.40
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$24.16
Total	\$37.03	\$306.18

Total Spending by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$532,140	\$336,193	\$868,332
Groceries	\$320,886	\$322,643	\$643,529
Gasoline and oil	\$291,709	\$232,196	\$523,905
Recreation use fees	\$331,728	\$203,934	\$535,662
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$144,334	\$26,001	\$170,334
Retail Shopping	\$21,714	\$218,178	\$239,892
Other expense	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$50,792	\$50,792
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$332,202	\$332,202
Camping fees	\$0	\$147,525	\$147,525
Total	\$1,642,510	\$1,869,662	\$3,512,173

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	10.1	\$298,850	\$1,189,332	\$598,657
Groceries	1.7	\$58,550	\$183,927	\$109,995
Gasoline and oil	0.7	\$27,426	\$90,505	\$52,048
Recreation use fees	7.4	\$222,191	\$727,877	\$403,812
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	1.0	\$34,993	\$114,635	\$69,100
Retail Shopping	0.1	\$5,355	\$15,780	\$9,440
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	21.1	\$647,365	\$2,322,056	\$1,243,053

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	6.4	\$188,806	\$751,390	\$378,217
Groceries	1.7	\$58,870	\$184,934	\$110,598
Gasoline and oil	0.6	\$21,831	\$72,040	\$41,429
Recreation use fees	4.6	\$136,595	\$447,473	\$248,249
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.2	\$6,304	\$20,650	\$12,448
Retail Shopping	1.5	\$53,807	\$158,559	\$94,856
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.7	\$30,028	\$104,341	\$61,036
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	4.6	\$196,398	\$682,442	\$399,207
Camping fees	2.0	\$87,217	\$303,060	\$177,280
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	22.2	\$779,855	\$2,724,890	\$1,523,320

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	16.5	\$487,655	\$1,940,723	\$976,874
Groceries	3.4	\$117,420	\$368,861	\$220,593
Gasoline and oil	1.3	\$49,257	\$162,545	\$93,477
Recreation use fees	12.0	\$358,787	\$1,175,350	\$652,062
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	1.2	\$41,297	\$135,285	\$81,548
Retail Shopping	1.7	\$59,162	\$174,339	\$104,297
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.7	\$30,028	\$104,341	\$61,036
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	4.6	\$196,398	\$682,442	\$399,207
Camping fees	2.0	\$87,217	\$303,060	\$177,280
Total Visitor Impact	43.3	\$1,427,220	\$5,046,945	\$2,766,373

Burgess Falls

No Camping/No Amenities

Spending & Impact Outside Local Area, but inside TN

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	50,466	
Day Visitor Groups	44,360	87.9%
Overnight Visitor Groups	6,106	12.1%

Per Visitor Group Expenditures by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$0.77	\$47.23
Groceries	\$2.13	\$32.43
Gasoline and oil	\$1.65	\$29.33
Recreation use fees	\$0.00	\$1.81
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$1.13	\$0.45
Retail Shopping	\$0.00	\$3.87
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$2.84
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$39.25
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$3.29
Total	\$5.68	\$160.51

Total Spending by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$34,130	\$288,424	\$322,554
Groceries	\$94,268	\$198,046	\$292,315
Gasoline and oil	\$73,140	\$179,115	\$252,255
Recreation use fees	\$0	\$11,064	\$11,064
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$50,244	\$2,766	\$53,010
Retail Shopping	\$0	\$23,637	\$23,637
Other expense	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$17,334	\$17,334
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$239,657	\$239,657
Camping fees	\$0	\$20,091	\$20,091
Total	\$251,783	\$980,134	\$1,231,917

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	0.6	\$19,167	\$76,281	\$38,396
Groceries	0.5	\$17,200	\$54,033	\$32,314
Gasoline and oil	0.2	\$6,877	\$22,692	\$13,050
Recreation use fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.4	\$12,181	\$39,905	\$24,054
Retail Shopping	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	1.7	\$55,426	\$192,911	\$107,814

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	5.5	\$161,979	\$644,628	\$324,477
Groceries	1.0	\$36,136	\$113,517	\$67,888
Gasoline and oil	0.4	\$16,840	\$55,571	\$31,958
Recreation use fees	0.2	\$7,411	\$24,277	\$13,468
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.0	\$671	\$2,197	\$1,324
Retail Shopping	0.2	\$5,829	\$17,178	\$10,276
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.2	\$10,248	\$35,609	\$20,830
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	3.3	\$141,685	\$492,327	\$287,996
Camping fees	0.3	\$11,878	\$41,274	\$24,144
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	11.2	\$392,677	\$1,426,577	\$782,361

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	6.1	\$181,146	\$720,909	\$362,873
Groceries	1.5	\$53,337	\$167,551	\$100,202
Gasoline and oil	0.6	\$23,717	\$78,264	\$45,008
Recreation use fees	0.2	\$7,411	\$24,277	\$13,468
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.4	\$12,852	\$42,102	\$25,379
Retail Shopping	0.2	\$5,829	\$17,178	\$10,276
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.2	\$10,248	\$35,609	\$20,830
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	3.3	\$141,685	\$492,327	\$287,996
Camping fees	0.3	\$11,878	\$41,274	\$24,144
Total Visitor Impact	12.8	\$448,102	\$1,619,489	\$890,176

Cedars Of Lebanon

Cabins/Camping

Spending & Impact Within Local Area

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	278,712	
Day Visitor Groups	141,028	50.6%
Overnight Visitor Groups	137,684	49.4%

**Per Visitor Group Expenditures
by Visitors Within Local Area**

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$11.28	\$30.80
Groceries	\$11.54	\$63.42
Gasoline and oil	\$8.28	\$23.57
Recreation use fees	\$4.10	\$13.95
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$6.87	\$9.08
Retail Shopping	\$2.45	\$17.97
Other expense	\$0.54	\$0.17
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$10.88
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$5.39
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$79.16
Total	\$45.05	\$254.40

Total Spending by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$1,590,669	\$4,241,224	\$5,831,894
Groceries	\$1,627,918	\$8,731,988	\$10,359,906
Gasoline and oil	\$1,167,193	\$3,245,005	\$4,412,197
Recreation use fees	\$577,645	\$1,920,569	\$2,498,214
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$968,640	\$1,250,501	\$2,219,141
Retail Shopping	\$345,063	\$2,474,705	\$2,819,769
Other expense	\$75,955	\$22,818	\$98,773
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$1,498,661	\$1,498,661
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$741,989	\$741,989
Camping fees	\$0	\$10,898,611	\$10,898,611
Total	\$6,353,083	\$35,026,071	\$41,379,154

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	30.2	\$893,320	\$3,555,146	\$1,789,503
Groceries	8.5	\$297,034	\$933,099	\$558,029
Gasoline and oil	2.9	\$109,737	\$362,128	\$208,254
Recreation use fees	13.0	\$386,907	\$1,267,469	\$703,167
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	6.8	\$234,843	\$769,325	\$463,739
Retail Shopping	2.4	\$85,099	\$250,771	\$150,021
Other expense	0.6	\$20,026	\$59,012	\$35,304
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	64.3	\$2,026,967	\$7,196,950	\$3,908,017

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	80.5	\$2,381,872	\$9,479,136	\$4,771,377
Groceries	45.6	\$1,593,262	\$5,005,046	\$2,993,209
Gasoline and oil	7.9	\$305,089	\$1,006,781	\$578,983
Recreation use fees	43.1	\$1,286,397	\$4,214,112	\$2,337,908
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	8.8	\$303,179	\$993,189	\$598,681
Retail Shopping	17.0	\$610,311	\$1,798,465	\$1,075,915
Other expense	0.2	\$6,016	\$17,728	\$10,606
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	20.5	\$886,008	\$3,078,700	\$1,800,941
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	10.2	\$438,664	\$1,524,268	\$891,648
Camping fees	149.4	\$6,443,259	\$22,389,016	\$13,096,860
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	383.3	\$14,254,058	\$49,506,442	\$28,156,130

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	110.7	\$3,275,192	\$13,034,282	\$6,560,880
Groceries	54.1	\$1,890,296	\$5,938,145	\$3,551,238
Gasoline and oil	10.8	\$414,827	\$1,368,910	\$787,237
Recreation use fees	56.1	\$1,673,303	\$5,481,580	\$3,041,075
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	15.6	\$538,023	\$1,762,514	\$1,062,420
Retail Shopping	19.4	\$695,411	\$2,049,236	\$1,225,936
Other expense	0.7	\$26,042	\$76,740	\$45,909
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	20.5	\$886,008	\$3,078,700	\$1,800,941
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	10.2	\$438,664	\$1,524,268	\$891,648
Camping fees	149.4	\$6,443,259	\$22,389,016	\$13,096,860
Total Visitor Impact	447.5	\$16,281,025	\$56,703,391	\$32,064,146

Cedars Of Lebanon

Cabins/Camping

Spending & Impact Outside Local Area, but inside TN

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	278,712	
Day Visitor Groups	141,028	50.6%
Overnight Visitor Groups	137,684	49.4%

**Per Visitor Group Expenditures
by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN**

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$0.80	\$9.20
Groceries	\$2.37	\$52.32
Gasoline and oil	\$2.42	\$24.55
Recreation use fees	\$0.02	\$1.21
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$0.54	\$11.83
Retail Shopping	\$0.00	\$1.79
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.13
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$0.08
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$1.89
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$1.67
Total	\$6.15	\$104.66

Total Spending by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$112,147	\$1,267,061	\$1,379,208
Groceries	\$334,002	\$7,204,294	\$7,538,296
Gasoline and oil	\$341,640	\$3,379,612	\$3,721,252
Recreation use fees	\$3,128	\$166,248	\$169,375
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$75,704	\$1,628,294	\$1,703,998
Retail Shopping	\$0	\$246,932	\$246,932
Other expense	\$0	\$17,293	\$17,293
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$11,133	\$11,133
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$260,166	\$260,166
Camping fees	\$0	\$229,262	\$229,262
Total	\$866,621	\$14,410,296	\$15,276,917

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	2.1	\$62,982	\$250,649	\$126,166
Groceries	1.7	\$60,943	\$191,445	\$114,491
Gasoline and oil	0.8	\$32,120	\$105,996	\$60,956
Recreation use fees	0.1	\$2,095	\$6,863	\$3,807
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.5	\$18,354	\$60,126	\$36,243
Retail Shopping	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	5.3	\$176,494	\$615,079	\$341,664

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	24.0	\$711,581	\$2,831,881	\$1,425,443
Groceries	37.6	\$1,314,515	\$4,129,395	\$2,469,536
Gasoline and oil	8.3	\$317,745	\$1,048,544	\$603,001
Recreation use fees	3.7	\$111,353	\$364,780	\$202,373
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	11.5	\$394,774	\$1,293,244	\$779,550
Retail Shopping	1.7	\$60,898	\$179,455	\$107,357
Other expense	0.1	\$4,559	\$13,436	\$8,038
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.2	\$6,582	\$22,871	\$13,379
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	3.6	\$153,810	\$534,460	\$312,642
Camping fees	3.1	\$135,540	\$470,973	\$275,504
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	93.8	\$3,211,358	\$10,889,040	\$6,196,824

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	26.2	\$774,563	\$3,082,530	\$1,551,609
Groceries	39.4	\$1,375,458	\$4,320,840	\$2,584,028
Gasoline and oil	9.1	\$349,865	\$1,154,540	\$663,957
Recreation use fees	3.8	\$113,447	\$371,643	\$206,180
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	12.0	\$413,128	\$1,353,370	\$815,794
Retail Shopping	1.7	\$60,898	\$179,455	\$107,357
Other expense	0.1	\$4,559	\$13,436	\$8,038
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.2	\$6,582	\$22,871	\$13,379
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	3.6	\$153,810	\$534,460	\$312,642
Camping fees	3.1	\$135,540	\$470,973	\$275,504
Total Visitor Impact	99.1	\$3,387,852	\$11,504,118	\$6,538,488

Chickasaw

Cabins/Camping

Spending & Impact Within Local Area

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	74,749	
Day Visitor Groups	37,823	50.6%
Overnight Visitor Groups	36,926	49.4%

**Per Visitor Group Expenditures
by Visitors Within Local Area**

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$11.28	\$30.80
Groceries	\$11.54	\$63.42
Gasoline and oil	\$8.28	\$23.57
Recreation use fees	\$4.10	\$13.95
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$6.87	\$9.08
Retail Shopping	\$2.45	\$17.97
Other expense	\$0.54	\$0.17
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$10.88
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$5.39
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$79.16
Total	\$45.05	\$254.40

Total Spending by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$426,610	\$1,137,475	\$1,564,085
Groceries	\$436,599	\$2,341,875	\$2,778,475
Gasoline and oil	\$313,035	\$870,294	\$1,183,329
Recreation use fees	\$154,921	\$515,087	\$670,008
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$259,784	\$335,378	\$595,162
Retail Shopping	\$92,544	\$663,704	\$756,248
Other expense	\$20,371	\$6,120	\$26,490
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$401,933	\$401,933
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$198,998	\$198,998
Camping fees	\$0	\$2,922,953	\$2,922,953
Total	\$1,703,865	\$9,393,816	\$11,097,681

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	8.1	\$239,584	\$953,472	\$479,936
Groceries	2.3	\$79,663	\$250,252	\$149,660
Gasoline and oil	0.8	\$29,431	\$97,121	\$55,853
Recreation use fees	3.5	\$103,766	\$339,929	\$188,586
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	1.8	\$62,984	\$206,329	\$124,372
Retail Shopping	0.6	\$22,823	\$67,256	\$40,235
Other expense	0.1	\$5,371	\$15,827	\$9,468
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	17.2	\$543,622	\$1,930,186	\$1,048,110

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	21.6	\$638,806	\$2,542,257	\$1,279,659
Groceries	12.2	\$427,305	\$1,342,328	\$802,764
Gasoline and oil	2.1	\$81,823	\$270,014	\$155,280
Recreation use fees	11.6	\$345,005	\$1,130,204	\$627,015
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	2.4	\$81,311	\$266,368	\$160,563
Retail Shopping	4.6	\$163,682	\$482,339	\$288,555
Other expense	0.0	\$1,613	\$4,755	\$2,844
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	5.5	\$237,623	\$825,692	\$483,003
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	2.7	\$117,647	\$408,801	\$239,136
Camping fees	40.1	\$1,728,050	\$6,004,622	\$3,512,512
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	102.8	\$3,822,867	\$13,277,379	\$7,551,333

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	29.7	\$878,390	\$3,495,729	\$1,759,595
Groceries	14.5	\$506,968	\$1,592,581	\$952,424
Gasoline and oil	2.9	\$111,254	\$367,135	\$211,133
Recreation use fees	15.0	\$448,772	\$1,470,132	\$815,601
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	4.2	\$144,295	\$472,697	\$284,936
Retail Shopping	5.2	\$186,506	\$549,595	\$328,790
Other expense	0.2	\$6,984	\$20,581	\$12,313
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	5.5	\$237,623	\$825,692	\$483,003
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	2.7	\$117,647	\$408,801	\$239,136
Camping fees	40.1	\$1,728,050	\$6,004,622	\$3,512,512
Total Visitor Impact	120.0	\$4,366,489	\$15,207,565	\$8,599,443

Chickasaw

Cabins/Camping

Spending & Impact Outside Local Area, but inside TN

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	74,749	
Day Visitor Groups	37,823	50.6%
Overnight Visitor Groups	36,926	49.4%

**Per Visitor Group Expenditures
by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN**

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$0.80	\$9.20
Groceries	\$2.37	\$52.32
Gasoline and oil	\$2.42	\$24.55
Recreation use fees	\$0.02	\$1.21
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$0.54	\$11.83
Retail Shopping	\$0.00	\$1.79
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.13
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$0.08
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$1.89
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$1.67
Total	\$6.15	\$104.66

Total Spending by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$30,077	\$339,819	\$369,897
Groceries	\$89,578	\$1,932,156	\$2,021,733
Gasoline and oil	\$91,626	\$906,395	\$998,021
Recreation use fees	\$839	\$44,587	\$45,426
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$20,303	\$436,700	\$457,004
Retail Shopping	\$0	\$66,226	\$66,226
Other expense	\$0	\$4,638	\$4,638
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$2,986	\$2,986
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$69,775	\$69,775
Camping fees	\$0	\$61,487	\$61,487
Total	\$232,423	\$3,864,769	\$4,097,192

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	0.6	\$16,891	\$67,223	\$33,837
Groceries	0.5	\$16,345	\$51,345	\$30,706
Gasoline and oil	0.2	\$8,615	\$28,428	\$16,348
Recreation use fees	0.0	\$562	\$1,840	\$1,021
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.1	\$4,922	\$16,126	\$9,720
Retail Shopping	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	1.4	\$47,335	\$164,961	\$91,633

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	6.4	\$190,843	\$759,496	\$382,297
Groceries	10.1	\$352,546	\$1,107,483	\$662,317
Gasoline and oil	2.2	\$85,218	\$281,214	\$161,722
Recreation use fees	1.0	\$29,864	\$97,832	\$54,275
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	3.1	\$105,876	\$346,842	\$209,072
Retail Shopping	0.5	\$16,333	\$48,129	\$28,793
Other expense	0.0	\$1,223	\$3,603	\$2,156
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$1,765	\$6,134	\$3,588
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	1.0	\$41,251	\$143,339	\$83,849
Camping fees	0.8	\$36,351	\$126,313	\$73,889
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	25.2	\$861,270	\$2,920,386	\$1,661,957

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	7.0	\$207,734	\$826,719	\$416,134
Groceries	10.6	\$368,891	\$1,158,828	\$693,023
Gasoline and oil	2.4	\$93,832	\$309,642	\$178,070
Recreation use fees	1.0	\$30,426	\$99,673	\$55,297
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	3.2	\$110,799	\$362,967	\$218,792
Retail Shopping	0.5	\$16,333	\$48,129	\$28,793
Other expense	0.0	\$1,223	\$3,603	\$2,156
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$1,765	\$6,134	\$3,588
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	1.0	\$41,251	\$143,339	\$83,849
Camping fees	0.8	\$36,351	\$126,313	\$73,889
Total Visitor Impact	26.6	\$908,605	\$3,085,347	\$1,753,590

Cordell Hull Birthplace

No Camping/Has Amenities
Spending & Impact Within Local Area

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	12,452	
Day Visitor Groups	10,372	83.3%
Overnight Visitor Groups	2,079	16.7%

Per Visitor Group Expenditures by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Overnight	
	Day Visitors	Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$11.16	\$29.28
Groceries	\$7.27	\$20.61
Gasoline and oil	\$7.33	\$21.16
Recreation use fees	\$1.40	\$2.16
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$7.44	\$6.81
Retail Shopping	\$3.43	\$19.07
Other expense	\$0.10	\$0.23
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$2.93
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$31.05
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$18.66
Total	\$38.14	\$151.97

Total Spending by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Overnight		
	Day Visitors	Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$115,725	\$60,884	\$176,609
Groceries	\$75,453	\$42,864	\$118,317
Gasoline and oil	\$76,071	\$44,003	\$120,074
Recreation use fees	\$14,524	\$4,486	\$19,010
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$77,156	\$14,166	\$91,323
Retail Shopping	\$35,582	\$39,657	\$75,238
Other expense	\$1,059	\$472	\$1,531
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$6,102	\$6,102
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$64,575	\$64,575
Camping fees	\$0	\$38,794	\$38,794
Total	\$395,569	\$316,004	\$711,573

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	2.2	\$64,991	\$258,645	\$130,190
Groceries	0.4	\$13,767	\$43,249	\$25,864
Gasoline and oil	0.2	\$7,152	\$23,601	\$13,573
Recreation use fees	0.3	\$9,728	\$31,868	\$17,680
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.5	\$18,706	\$61,280	\$36,939
Retail Shopping	0.2	\$8,775	\$25,859	\$15,470
Other expense	0.0	\$279	\$823	\$492
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	3.9	\$123,399	\$445,324	\$240,208

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	1.2	\$34,193	\$136,076	\$68,495
Groceries	0.2	\$7,821	\$24,569	\$14,693
Gasoline and oil	0.1	\$4,137	\$13,652	\$7,851
Recreation use fees	0.1	\$3,005	\$9,843	\$5,461
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.1	\$3,435	\$11,251	\$6,782
Retail Shopping	0.3	\$9,780	\$28,820	\$17,241
Other expense	0.0	\$125	\$367	\$219
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.1	\$3,608	\$12,535	\$7,333
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.9	\$38,177	\$132,657	\$77,600
Camping fees	0.5	\$22,935	\$79,695	\$46,619
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	3.5	\$127,214	\$449,466	\$252,295

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	3.4	\$99,184	\$394,721	\$198,685
Groceries	0.6	\$21,588	\$67,818	\$40,558
Gasoline and oil	0.3	\$11,289	\$37,254	\$21,424
Recreation use fees	0.4	\$12,733	\$41,711	\$23,140
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.6	\$22,141	\$72,531	\$43,721
Retail Shopping	0.5	\$18,555	\$54,678	\$32,711
Other expense	0.0	\$404	\$1,189	\$712
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.1	\$3,608	\$12,535	\$7,333
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.9	\$38,177	\$132,657	\$77,600
Camping fees	0.5	\$22,935	\$79,695	\$46,619
Total Visitor Impact	7.4	\$250,613	\$894,790	\$492,503

Cordell Hull Birthplace

No Camping/Has Amenities

Spending & Impact Outside Local Area, but inside TN

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	12,452	
Day Visitor Groups	10,372	83.3%
Overnight Visitor Groups	2,079	16.7%

**Per Visitor Group Expenditures
by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN**

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$0.91	\$53.02
Groceries	\$1.19	\$44.66
Gasoline and oil	\$1.69	\$46.69
Recreation use fees	\$0.00	\$2.38
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$0.03	\$15.83
Retail Shopping	\$0.00	\$12.90
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$6.67
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$55.40
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$2.04
Total	\$3.82	\$239.60

Total Spending by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$9,458	\$110,244	\$119,702
Groceries	\$12,349	\$92,874	\$105,223
Gasoline and oil	\$17,510	\$97,083	\$114,593
Recreation use fees	\$0	\$4,958	\$4,958
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$306	\$32,923	\$33,229
Retail Shopping	\$0	\$26,825	\$26,825
Other expense	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$13,879	\$13,879
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$115,200	\$115,200
Camping fees	\$0	\$4,240	\$4,240
Total	\$39,624	\$498,226	\$537,850

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	0.2	\$5,312	\$21,139	\$10,641
Groceries	0.1	\$2,253	\$7,078	\$4,233
Gasoline and oil	0.0	\$1,646	\$5,433	\$3,124
Recreation use fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.0	\$74	\$243	\$147
Retail Shopping	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	0.3	\$9,286	\$33,894	\$18,145

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	2.1	\$61,913	\$246,396	\$124,025
Groceries	0.5	\$16,946	\$53,234	\$31,836
Gasoline and oil	0.2	\$9,128	\$30,121	\$17,322
Recreation use fees	0.1	\$3,321	\$10,879	\$6,036
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.2	\$7,982	\$26,148	\$15,762
Retail Shopping	0.2	\$6,616	\$19,495	\$11,663
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.2	\$8,205	\$28,512	\$16,679
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	1.6	\$68,106	\$236,656	\$138,436
Camping fees	0.1	\$2,507	\$8,710	\$5,095
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	5.2	\$184,724	\$660,151	\$366,852

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	2.3	\$67,225	\$267,535	\$134,665
Groceries	0.5	\$19,199	\$60,312	\$36,069
Gasoline and oil	0.3	\$10,774	\$35,553	\$20,446
Recreation use fees	0.1	\$3,321	\$10,879	\$6,036
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.2	\$8,056	\$26,392	\$15,909
Retail Shopping	0.2	\$6,616	\$19,495	\$11,663
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.2	\$8,205	\$28,512	\$16,679
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	1.6	\$68,106	\$236,656	\$138,436
Camping fees	0.1	\$2,507	\$8,710	\$5,095
Total Visitor Impact	5.5	\$194,009	\$694,044	\$384,997

Cove Lake

Cabins/Camping

Spending & Impact Within Local Area

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	106,401	
Day Visitor Groups	53,839	50.6%
Overnight Visitor Groups	52,562	49.4%

**Per Visitor Group Expenditures
by Visitors Within Local Area**

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$11.28	\$30.80
Groceries	\$11.54	\$63.42
Gasoline and oil	\$8.28	\$23.57
Recreation use fees	\$4.10	\$13.95
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$6.87	\$9.08
Retail Shopping	\$2.45	\$17.97
Other expense	\$0.54	\$0.17
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$10.88
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$5.39
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$79.16
Total	\$45.05	\$254.40

Total Spending by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$607,255	\$1,619,132	\$2,226,386
Groceries	\$621,475	\$3,333,528	\$3,955,002
Gasoline and oil	\$445,588	\$1,238,814	\$1,684,402
Recreation use fees	\$220,522	\$733,197	\$953,719
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$369,788	\$477,392	\$847,180
Retail Shopping	\$131,731	\$944,745	\$1,076,476
Other expense	\$28,997	\$8,711	\$37,708
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$572,130	\$572,130
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$283,262	\$283,262
Camping fees	\$0	\$4,160,658	\$4,160,658
Total	\$2,425,356	\$13,371,568	\$15,796,923

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	11.5	\$341,034	\$1,357,214	\$683,161
Groceries	3.2	\$113,396	\$356,220	\$213,033
Gasoline and oil	1.1	\$41,893	\$138,246	\$79,503
Recreation use fees	5.0	\$147,706	\$483,869	\$268,441
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	2.6	\$89,654	\$293,698	\$177,037
Retail Shopping	0.9	\$32,488	\$95,734	\$57,272
Other expense	0.2	\$7,645	\$22,529	\$13,477
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	24.5	\$773,816	\$2,747,511	\$1,491,926

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	30.7	\$909,304	\$3,618,759	\$1,821,523
Groceries	17.4	\$608,244	\$1,910,729	\$1,142,689
Gasoline and oil	3.0	\$116,471	\$384,349	\$221,033
Recreation use fees	16.5	\$491,095	\$1,608,781	\$892,521
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	3.4	\$115,742	\$379,160	\$228,553
Retail Shopping	6.5	\$232,993	\$686,583	\$410,742
Other expense	0.1	\$2,297	\$6,768	\$4,049
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	7.8	\$338,243	\$1,175,326	\$687,528
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	3.9	\$167,465	\$581,905	\$340,396
Camping fees	57.0	\$2,459,781	\$8,547,240	\$4,999,863
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	146.3	\$5,441,635	\$18,899,600	\$10,748,896

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	42.2	\$1,250,338	\$4,975,973	\$2,504,684
Groceries	20.7	\$721,640	\$2,266,949	\$1,355,722
Gasoline and oil	4.1	\$158,364	\$522,596	\$300,536
Recreation use fees	21.4	\$638,801	\$2,092,650	\$1,160,962
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	6.0	\$205,396	\$672,858	\$405,590
Retail Shopping	7.4	\$265,480	\$782,317	\$468,014
Other expense	0.3	\$9,942	\$29,296	\$17,526
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	7.8	\$338,243	\$1,175,326	\$687,528
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	3.9	\$167,465	\$581,905	\$340,396
Camping fees	57.0	\$2,459,781	\$8,547,240	\$4,999,863
Total Visitor Impact	170.8	\$6,215,451	\$21,647,110	\$12,240,822

Cove Lake

Cabins/Camping

Spending & Impact Outside Local Area, but inside TN

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	106,401	
Day Visitor Groups	53,839	50.6%
Overnight Visitor Groups	52,562	49.4%

**Per Visitor Group Expenditures
by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN**

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$0.80	\$9.20
Groceries	\$2.37	\$52.32
Gasoline and oil	\$2.42	\$24.55
Recreation use fees	\$0.02	\$1.21
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$0.54	\$11.83
Retail Shopping	\$0.00	\$1.79
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.13
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$0.08
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$1.89
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$1.67
Total	\$6.15	\$104.66

Total Spending by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$42,813	\$483,714	\$526,527
Groceries	\$127,509	\$2,750,314	\$2,877,823
Gasoline and oil	\$130,425	\$1,290,202	\$1,420,627
Recreation use fees	\$1,194	\$63,467	\$64,661
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$28,901	\$621,618	\$650,519
Retail Shopping	\$0	\$94,269	\$94,269
Other expense	\$0	\$6,602	\$6,602
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$4,250	\$4,250
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$99,321	\$99,321
Camping fees	\$0	\$87,523	\$87,523
Total	\$330,841	\$5,501,281	\$5,832,122

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	0.8	\$24,044	\$95,688	\$48,165
Groceries	0.7	\$23,266	\$73,086	\$43,708
Gasoline and oil	0.3	\$12,262	\$40,465	\$23,271
Recreation use fees	0.0	\$800	\$2,620	\$1,453
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.2	\$7,007	\$22,954	\$13,836
Retail Shopping	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	2.0	\$67,378	\$234,813	\$130,434

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	9.2	\$271,654	\$1,081,100	\$544,178
Groceries	14.4	\$501,830	\$1,576,440	\$942,771
Gasoline and oil	3.2	\$121,302	\$400,293	\$230,202
Recreation use fees	1.4	\$42,510	\$139,259	\$77,258
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	4.4	\$150,709	\$493,709	\$297,601
Retail Shopping	0.6	\$23,249	\$68,509	\$40,985
Other expense	0.0	\$1,741	\$5,129	\$3,069
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.1	\$2,513	\$8,731	\$5,108
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	1.4	\$58,719	\$204,036	\$119,354
Camping fees	1.2	\$51,744	\$179,799	\$105,177
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	35.8	\$1,225,969	\$4,157,004	\$2,365,702

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	10.0	\$295,698	\$1,176,788	\$592,343
Groceries	15.0	\$525,095	\$1,649,526	\$986,479
Gasoline and oil	3.5	\$133,565	\$440,758	\$253,473
Recreation use fees	1.5	\$43,310	\$141,879	\$78,711
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	4.6	\$157,716	\$516,663	\$311,438
Retail Shopping	0.6	\$23,249	\$68,509	\$40,985
Other expense	0.0	\$1,741	\$5,129	\$3,069
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.1	\$2,513	\$8,731	\$5,108
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	1.4	\$58,719	\$204,036	\$119,354
Camping fees	1.2	\$51,744	\$179,799	\$105,177
Total Visitor Impact	37.8	\$1,293,348	\$4,391,817	\$2,496,136

Cumberland Mountain

Cabins/Camping

Spending & Impact Within Local Area

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	134,442	
Day Visitor Groups	68,028	50.6%
Overnight Visitor Groups	66,414	49.4%

Per Visitor Group Expenditures by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$11.28	\$30.80
Groceries	\$11.54	\$63.42
Gasoline and oil	\$8.28	\$23.57
Recreation use fees	\$4.10	\$13.95
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$6.87	\$9.08
Retail Shopping	\$2.45	\$17.97
Other expense	\$0.54	\$0.17
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$10.88
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$5.39
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$79.16
Total	\$45.05	\$254.40

Total Spending by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$767,291	\$2,045,838	\$2,813,129
Groceries	\$785,258	\$4,212,047	\$4,997,306
Gasoline and oil	\$563,018	\$1,565,292	\$2,128,311
Recreation use fees	\$278,639	\$926,424	\$1,205,063
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$467,242	\$603,204	\$1,070,447
Retail Shopping	\$166,448	\$1,193,723	\$1,360,171
Other expense	\$36,639	\$11,007	\$47,645
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$722,909	\$722,909
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$357,913	\$357,913
Camping fees	\$0	\$5,257,160	\$5,257,160
Total	\$3,064,535	\$16,895,518	\$19,960,054

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	14.6	\$430,911	\$1,714,895	\$863,202
Groceries	4.1	\$143,280	\$450,099	\$269,176
Gasoline and oil	1.4	\$52,934	\$174,680	\$100,455
Recreation use fees	6.3	\$186,632	\$611,389	\$339,187
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	3.3	\$113,281	\$371,099	\$223,694
Retail Shopping	1.1	\$41,049	\$120,964	\$72,366
Other expense	0.3	\$9,660	\$28,466	\$17,029
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	31.0	\$977,747	\$3,471,591	\$1,885,109

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	38.8	\$1,148,943	\$4,572,449	\$2,301,568
Groceries	22.0	\$768,542	\$2,414,283	\$1,443,834
Gasoline and oil	3.8	\$147,166	\$485,641	\$279,284
Recreation use fees	20.8	\$620,519	\$2,032,760	\$1,127,736
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	4.2	\$146,245	\$479,084	\$288,786
Retail Shopping	8.2	\$294,396	\$867,525	\$518,989
Other expense	0.1	\$2,902	\$8,551	\$5,116
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	9.9	\$427,384	\$1,485,072	\$868,720
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	4.9	\$211,598	\$735,261	\$430,104
Camping fees	72.1	\$3,108,033	\$10,799,785	\$6,317,530
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	184.9	\$6,875,727	\$23,880,412	\$13,581,666

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	53.4	\$1,579,853	\$6,287,344	\$3,164,770
Groceries	26.1	\$911,822	\$2,864,382	\$1,713,010
Gasoline and oil	5.2	\$200,100	\$660,321	\$379,740
Recreation use fees	27.1	\$807,151	\$2,644,149	\$1,466,923
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	7.5	\$259,526	\$850,183	\$512,479
Retail Shopping	9.4	\$335,445	\$988,490	\$591,355
Other expense	0.4	\$12,562	\$37,017	\$22,145
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	9.9	\$427,384	\$1,485,072	\$868,720
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	4.9	\$211,598	\$735,261	\$430,104
Camping fees	72.1	\$3,108,033	\$10,799,785	\$6,317,530
Total Visitor Impact	215.9	\$7,853,474	\$27,352,003	\$15,466,775

Cumberland Mountain

Cabins/Camping

Spending & Impact Outside Local Area, but inside TN

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	134,442	
Day Visitor Groups	68,028	50.6%
Overnight Visitor Groups	66,414	49.4%

Per Visitor Group Expenditures by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$0.80	\$9.20
Groceries	\$2.37	\$52.32
Gasoline and oil	\$2.42	\$24.55
Recreation use fees	\$0.02	\$1.21
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$0.54	\$11.83
Retail Shopping	\$0.00	\$1.79
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.13
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$0.08
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$1.89
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$1.67
Total	\$6.15	\$104.66

Total Spending by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$54,096	\$611,192	\$665,288
Groceries	\$161,112	\$3,475,134	\$3,636,246
Gasoline and oil	\$164,797	\$1,630,223	\$1,795,020
Recreation use fees	\$1,509	\$80,193	\$81,701
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$36,517	\$785,440	\$821,957
Retail Shopping	\$0	\$119,113	\$119,113
Other expense	\$0	\$8,342	\$8,342
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$5,370	\$5,370
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$125,496	\$125,496
Camping fees	\$0	\$110,589	\$110,589
Total	\$418,032	\$6,951,091	\$7,369,123

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	1.0	\$30,381	\$120,906	\$60,858
Groceries	0.8	\$29,397	\$92,347	\$55,227
Gasoline and oil	0.4	\$15,494	\$51,129	\$29,404
Recreation use fees	0.0	\$1,010	\$3,310	\$1,836
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.3	\$8,853	\$29,003	\$17,483
Retail Shopping	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	2.6	\$85,135	\$296,695	\$164,808

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	11.6	\$343,245	\$1,366,014	\$687,591
Groceries	18.2	\$634,082	\$1,991,895	\$1,191,230
Gasoline and oil	4.0	\$153,271	\$505,786	\$290,869
Recreation use fees	1.8	\$53,713	\$175,959	\$97,619
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	5.5	\$190,427	\$623,822	\$376,032
Retail Shopping	0.8	\$29,376	\$86,564	\$51,786
Other expense	0.1	\$2,199	\$6,481	\$3,877
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.1	\$3,175	\$11,032	\$6,454
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	1.7	\$74,193	\$257,807	\$150,809
Camping fees	1.5	\$65,380	\$227,183	\$132,895
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	45.3	\$1,549,062	\$5,252,544	\$2,989,161

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	12.6	\$373,626	\$1,486,919	\$748,449
Groceries	19.0	\$663,479	\$2,084,243	\$1,246,457
Gasoline and oil	4.4	\$168,765	\$556,915	\$320,273
Recreation use fees	1.8	\$54,724	\$179,269	\$99,455
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	5.8	\$199,280	\$652,825	\$393,514
Retail Shopping	0.8	\$29,376	\$86,564	\$51,786
Other expense	0.1	\$2,199	\$6,481	\$3,877
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.1	\$3,175	\$11,032	\$6,454
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	1.7	\$74,193	\$257,807	\$150,809
Camping fees	1.5	\$65,380	\$227,183	\$132,895
Total Visitor Impact	47.8	\$1,634,197	\$5,549,239	\$3,153,969

Cumberland Trail

No Camping/No Amenities

Spending & Impact Within Local Area

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	27,108	
Day Visitor Groups	23,828	87.9%
Overnight Visitor Groups	3,280	12.1%

**Per Visitor Group Expenditures
by Visitors Within Local Area**

Expenditure Category	Overnight	
	Day Visitors	Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$12.00	\$55.06
Groceries	\$7.23	\$52.84
Gasoline and oil	\$6.58	\$38.02
Recreation use fees	\$7.48	\$33.40
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$3.25	\$4.26
Retail Shopping	\$0.49	\$35.73
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$8.32
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$54.40
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$24.16
Total	\$37.03	\$306.18

Total Spending by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Overnight		Total
	Day Visitors	Visitors	
Restaurants, snack bars	\$285,835	\$180,584	\$466,419
Groceries	\$172,362	\$173,305	\$345,667
Gasoline and oil	\$156,690	\$124,722	\$281,412
Recreation use fees	\$178,185	\$109,542	\$287,727
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$77,528	\$13,966	\$91,494
Retail Shopping	\$11,663	\$117,193	\$128,856
Other expense	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$27,282	\$27,282
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$178,440	\$178,440
Camping fees	\$0	\$79,242	\$79,242
Total	\$882,263	\$1,004,276	\$1,886,540

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	5.4	\$160,525	\$638,842	\$321,565
Groceries	0.9	\$31,450	\$98,795	\$59,083
Gasoline and oil	0.4	\$14,732	\$48,614	\$27,957
Recreation use fees	4.0	\$119,349	\$390,974	\$216,905
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.5	\$18,796	\$61,575	\$37,117
Retail Shopping	0.1	\$2,876	\$8,476	\$5,071
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	11.3	\$347,728	\$1,247,277	\$667,698

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	3.4	\$101,416	\$403,604	\$203,157
Groceries	0.9	\$31,622	\$99,336	\$59,407
Gasoline and oil	0.3	\$11,726	\$38,696	\$22,253
Recreation use fees	2.5	\$73,371	\$240,357	\$133,345
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.1	\$3,386	\$11,092	\$6,686
Retail Shopping	0.8	\$28,902	\$85,169	\$50,951
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.4	\$16,129	\$56,046	\$32,785
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	2.4	\$105,494	\$366,569	\$214,431
Camping fees	1.1	\$46,848	\$162,787	\$95,225
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	11.9	\$418,894	\$1,463,656	\$818,241

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	8.9	\$261,941	\$1,042,446	\$524,721
Groceries	1.8	\$63,071	\$198,131	\$118,490
Gasoline and oil	0.7	\$26,458	\$87,310	\$50,210
Recreation use fees	6.5	\$192,720	\$631,331	\$350,250
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.6	\$22,182	\$72,667	\$43,803
Retail Shopping	0.9	\$31,779	\$93,645	\$56,022
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.4	\$16,129	\$56,046	\$32,785
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	2.4	\$105,494	\$366,569	\$214,431
Camping fees	1.1	\$46,848	\$162,787	\$95,225
Total Visitor Impact	23.2	\$766,622	\$2,710,933	\$1,485,939

Cumberland Trail

No Camping/No Amenities

Spending & Impact Outside Local Area, but inside TN

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	27,108	
Day Visitor Groups	23,828	87.9%
Overnight Visitor Groups	3,280	12.1%

**Per Visitor Group Expenditures
by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN**

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$0.77	\$47.23
Groceries	\$2.13	\$32.43
Gasoline and oil	\$1.65	\$29.33
Recreation use fees	\$0.00	\$1.81
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$1.13	\$0.45
Retail Shopping	\$0.00	\$3.87
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$2.84
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$39.25
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$3.29
Total	\$5.68	\$160.51

Total Spending by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$18,333	\$154,925	\$173,258
Groceries	\$50,636	\$106,379	\$157,015
Gasoline and oil	\$39,287	\$96,210	\$135,497
Recreation use fees	\$0	\$5,943	\$5,943
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$26,988	\$1,486	\$28,474
Retail Shopping	\$0	\$12,696	\$12,696
Other expense	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$9,311	\$9,311
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$128,730	\$128,730
Camping fees	\$0	\$10,792	\$10,792
Total	\$135,243	\$526,472	\$661,716

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	0.3	\$10,296	\$40,974	\$20,624
Groceries	0.3	\$9,239	\$29,024	\$17,357
Gasoline and oil	0.1	\$3,694	\$12,189	\$7,010
Recreation use fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.2	\$6,543	\$21,435	\$12,921
Retail Shopping	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	0.9	\$29,772	\$103,621	\$57,912

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	2.9	\$87,006	\$346,258	\$174,291
Groceries	0.6	\$19,410	\$60,975	\$36,465
Gasoline and oil	0.2	\$9,046	\$29,850	\$17,166
Recreation use fees	0.1	\$3,981	\$13,040	\$7,234
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.0	\$360	\$1,180	\$711
Retail Shopping	0.1	\$3,131	\$9,227	\$5,520
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.1	\$5,504	\$19,127	\$11,189
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	1.8	\$76,105	\$264,450	\$154,695
Camping fees	0.1	\$6,380	\$22,170	\$12,969
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	6.0	\$210,924	\$766,276	\$420,240

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	3.3	\$97,302	\$387,231	\$194,915
Groceries	0.8	\$28,649	\$89,999	\$53,823
Gasoline and oil	0.3	\$12,739	\$42,039	\$24,176
Recreation use fees	0.1	\$3,981	\$13,040	\$7,234
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.2	\$6,903	\$22,615	\$13,632
Retail Shopping	0.1	\$3,131	\$9,227	\$5,520
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.1	\$5,504	\$19,127	\$11,189
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	1.8	\$76,105	\$264,450	\$154,695
Camping fees	0.1	\$6,380	\$22,170	\$12,969
Total Visitor Impact	6.9	\$240,695	\$869,897	\$478,152

Cummins Falls

No Camping/No Amenities

Spending & Impact Within Local Area

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	75,327	
Day Visitor Groups	66,213	87.9%
Overnight Visitor Groups	9,115	12.1%

Per Visitor Group Expenditures by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Overnight	
	Day Visitors	Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$12.00	\$55.06
Groceries	\$7.23	\$52.84
Gasoline and oil	\$6.58	\$38.02
Recreation use fees	\$7.48	\$33.40
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$3.25	\$4.26
Retail Shopping	\$0.49	\$35.73
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$8.32
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$54.40
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$24.16
Total	\$37.03	\$306.18

Total Spending by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Overnight		Total
	Day Visitors	Visitors	
Restaurants, snack bars	\$794,283	\$501,809	\$1,296,092
Groceries	\$478,961	\$481,584	\$960,545
Gasoline and oil	\$435,412	\$346,581	\$781,993
Recreation use fees	\$495,144	\$304,397	\$799,541
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$215,436	\$38,809	\$254,245
Retail Shopping	\$32,411	\$325,658	\$358,068
Other expense	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$75,813	\$75,813
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$495,852	\$495,852
Camping fees	\$0	\$220,199	\$220,199
Total	\$2,451,648	\$2,790,699	\$5,242,347

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	15.1	\$446,070	\$1,775,224	\$893,569
Groceries	2.5	\$87,393	\$274,534	\$164,182
Gasoline and oil	1.1	\$40,937	\$135,089	\$77,688
Recreation use fees	11.1	\$331,648	\$1,086,445	\$602,739
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	1.5	\$52,232	\$171,106	\$103,140
Retail Shopping	0.2	\$7,993	\$23,554	\$14,091
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	31.5	\$966,271	\$3,465,952	\$1,855,409

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	9.5	\$281,816	\$1,121,542	\$564,535
Groceries	2.5	\$87,871	\$276,037	\$165,080
Gasoline and oil	0.8	\$32,585	\$107,529	\$61,838
Recreation use fees	6.8	\$203,885	\$667,908	\$370,542
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.3	\$9,409	\$30,823	\$18,580
Retail Shopping	2.2	\$80,314	\$236,668	\$141,584
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	1.0	\$44,821	\$155,742	\$91,104
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	6.8	\$293,148	\$1,018,628	\$595,865
Camping fees	3.0	\$130,181	\$452,354	\$264,613
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	33.1	\$1,164,029	\$4,067,231	\$2,273,742

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	24.6	\$727,885	\$2,896,766	\$1,458,103
Groceries	5.0	\$175,264	\$550,570	\$329,262
Gasoline and oil	1.9	\$73,522	\$242,618	\$139,525
Recreation use fees	18.0	\$535,533	\$1,754,353	\$973,282
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	1.8	\$61,641	\$201,929	\$121,720
Retail Shopping	2.5	\$88,307	\$260,222	\$155,675
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	1.0	\$44,821	\$155,742	\$91,104
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	6.8	\$293,148	\$1,018,628	\$595,865
Camping fees	3.0	\$130,181	\$452,354	\$264,613
Total Visitor Impact	64.6	\$2,130,300	\$7,533,183	\$4,129,150

Cummins Falls

No Camping/No Amenities

Spending & Impact Outside Local Area, but inside TN

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	75,327	
Day Visitor Groups	66,213	87.9%
Overnight Visitor Groups	9,115	12.1%

Per Visitor Group Expenditures by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$0.77	\$47.23
Groceries	\$2.13	\$32.43
Gasoline and oil	\$1.65	\$29.33
Recreation use fees	\$0.00	\$1.81
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$1.13	\$0.45
Retail Shopping	\$0.00	\$3.87
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$2.84
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$39.25
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$3.29
Total	\$5.68	\$160.51

Total Spending by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$50,943	\$430,508	\$481,452
Groceries	\$140,707	\$295,608	\$436,316
Gasoline and oil	\$109,171	\$267,350	\$376,521
Recreation use fees	\$0	\$16,514	\$16,514
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$74,995	\$4,129	\$79,124
Retail Shopping	\$0	\$35,281	\$35,281
Other expense	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$25,873	\$25,873
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$357,717	\$357,717
Camping fees	\$0	\$29,989	\$29,989
Total	\$375,816	\$1,462,970	\$1,838,786

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	1.0	\$28,610	\$113,858	\$57,311
Groceries	0.7	\$25,674	\$80,651	\$48,233
Gasoline and oil	0.3	\$10,264	\$33,871	\$19,479
Recreation use fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.5	\$18,182	\$59,563	\$35,904
Retail Shopping	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	2.5	\$82,730	\$287,944	\$160,926

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	8.2	\$241,774	\$962,186	\$484,322
Groceries	1.5	\$53,938	\$169,438	\$101,331
Gasoline and oil	0.7	\$25,136	\$82,947	\$47,701
Recreation use fees	0.4	\$11,061	\$36,236	\$20,103
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.0	\$1,001	\$3,279	\$1,977
Retail Shopping	0.2	\$8,701	\$25,640	\$15,339
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.4	\$15,296	\$53,150	\$31,091
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	4.9	\$211,482	\$734,858	\$429,869
Camping fees	0.4	\$17,729	\$61,606	\$36,037
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	16.7	\$586,118	\$2,129,341	\$1,167,770

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	9.1	\$270,383	\$1,076,044	\$541,633
Groceries	2.3	\$79,611	\$250,090	\$149,563
Gasoline and oil	0.9	\$35,400	\$116,818	\$67,180
Recreation use fees	0.4	\$11,061	\$36,236	\$20,103
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.6	\$19,183	\$62,842	\$37,881
Retail Shopping	0.2	\$8,701	\$25,640	\$15,339
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.4	\$15,296	\$53,150	\$31,091
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	4.9	\$211,482	\$734,858	\$429,869
Camping fees	0.4	\$17,729	\$61,606	\$36,037
Total Visitor Impact	19.2	\$668,848	\$2,417,285	\$1,328,696

David Crockett

Cabins/Camping

Spending & Impact Within Local Area

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	106,077	
Day Visitor Groups	53,675	50.6%
Overnight Visitor Groups	52,402	49.4%

**Per Visitor Group Expenditures
by Visitors Within Local Area**

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$11.28	\$30.80
Groceries	\$11.54	\$63.42
Gasoline and oil	\$8.28	\$23.57
Recreation use fees	\$4.10	\$13.95
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$6.87	\$9.08
Retail Shopping	\$2.45	\$17.97
Other expense	\$0.54	\$0.17
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$10.88
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$5.39
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$79.16
Total	\$45.05	\$254.40

Total Spending by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$605,405	\$1,614,199	\$2,219,604
Groceries	\$619,581	\$3,323,372	\$3,942,953
Gasoline and oil	\$444,230	\$1,235,040	\$1,679,271
Recreation use fees	\$219,850	\$730,963	\$950,814
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$368,662	\$475,938	\$844,599
Retail Shopping	\$131,330	\$941,866	\$1,073,197
Other expense	\$28,908	\$8,684	\$37,593
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$570,387	\$570,387
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$282,399	\$282,399
Camping fees	\$0	\$4,147,983	\$4,147,983
Total	\$2,417,967	\$13,330,832	\$15,748,799

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	11.5	\$339,995	\$1,353,079	\$681,080
Groceries	3.2	\$113,050	\$355,135	\$212,384
Gasoline and oil	1.1	\$41,766	\$137,825	\$79,261
Recreation use fees	4.9	\$147,256	\$482,395	\$267,624
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	2.6	\$89,381	\$292,803	\$176,498
Retail Shopping	0.9	\$32,389	\$95,443	\$57,098
Other expense	0.2	\$7,622	\$22,460	\$13,436
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	24.5	\$771,458	\$2,739,140	\$1,487,381

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	30.6	\$906,534	\$3,607,735	\$1,815,974
Groceries	17.4	\$606,391	\$1,904,908	\$1,139,208
Gasoline and oil	3.0	\$116,116	\$383,178	\$220,360
Recreation use fees	16.4	\$489,599	\$1,603,880	\$889,802
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	3.3	\$115,389	\$378,005	\$227,856
Retail Shopping	6.5	\$232,283	\$684,491	\$409,490
Other expense	0.1	\$2,290	\$6,747	\$4,036
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	7.8	\$337,213	\$1,171,745	\$685,433
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	3.9	\$166,954	\$580,133	\$339,359
Camping fees	56.9	\$2,452,287	\$8,521,201	\$4,984,631
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	145.9	\$5,425,057	\$18,842,023	\$10,716,150

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	42.1	\$1,246,529	\$4,960,814	\$2,497,054
Groceries	20.6	\$719,442	\$2,260,043	\$1,351,592
Gasoline and oil	4.1	\$157,882	\$521,003	\$299,621
Recreation use fees	21.3	\$636,855	\$2,086,275	\$1,157,425
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	5.9	\$204,770	\$670,808	\$404,354
Retail Shopping	7.4	\$264,672	\$779,934	\$466,588
Other expense	0.3	\$9,911	\$29,207	\$17,473
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	7.8	\$337,213	\$1,171,745	\$685,433
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	3.9	\$166,954	\$580,133	\$339,359
Camping fees	56.9	\$2,452,287	\$8,521,201	\$4,984,631
Total Visitor Impact	170.3	\$6,196,516	\$21,581,163	\$12,203,531

David Crockett

Cabins/Camping

Spending & Impact Outside Local Area, but inside TN

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	106,077	
Day Visitor Groups	53,675	50.6%
Overnight Visitor Groups	52,402	49.4%

**Per Visitor Group Expenditures
by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN**

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$0.80	\$9.20
Groceries	\$2.37	\$52.32
Gasoline and oil	\$2.42	\$24.55
Recreation use fees	\$0.02	\$1.21
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$0.54	\$11.83
Retail Shopping	\$0.00	\$1.79
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.13
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$0.08
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$1.89
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$1.67
Total	\$6.15	\$104.66

Total Spending by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$42,683	\$482,240	\$524,923
Groceries	\$127,120	\$2,741,936	\$2,869,056
Gasoline and oil	\$130,027	\$1,286,272	\$1,416,299
Recreation use fees	\$1,190	\$63,273	\$64,464
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$28,813	\$619,725	\$648,537
Retail Shopping	\$0	\$93,982	\$93,982
Other expense	\$0	\$6,582	\$6,582
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$4,237	\$4,237
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$99,019	\$99,019
Camping fees	\$0	\$87,257	\$87,257
Total	\$329,834	\$5,484,521	\$5,814,355

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	0.8	\$23,971	\$95,396	\$48,018
Groceries	0.7	\$23,195	\$72,863	\$43,575
Gasoline and oil	0.3	\$12,225	\$40,342	\$23,200
Recreation use fees	0.0	\$797	\$2,612	\$1,449
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.2	\$6,986	\$22,884	\$13,794
Retail Shopping	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	2.0	\$67,173	\$234,097	\$130,036

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	9.2	\$270,826	\$1,077,806	\$542,520
Groceries	14.3	\$500,301	\$1,571,637	\$939,899
Gasoline and oil	3.1	\$120,933	\$399,073	\$229,500
Recreation use fees	1.4	\$42,381	\$138,834	\$77,023
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	4.4	\$150,250	\$492,205	\$296,695
Retail Shopping	0.6	\$23,178	\$68,300	\$40,860
Other expense	0.0	\$1,735	\$5,114	\$3,059
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.1	\$2,505	\$8,705	\$5,092
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	1.4	\$58,540	\$203,414	\$118,991
Camping fees	1.2	\$51,586	\$179,251	\$104,856
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	35.7	\$1,222,234	\$4,144,340	\$2,358,495

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	10.0	\$294,797	\$1,173,203	\$590,538
Groceries	15.0	\$523,496	\$1,644,500	\$983,474
Gasoline and oil	3.5	\$133,158	\$439,415	\$252,700
Recreation use fees	1.4	\$43,178	\$141,446	\$78,472
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	4.6	\$157,235	\$515,089	\$310,489
Retail Shopping	0.6	\$23,178	\$68,300	\$40,860
Other expense	0.0	\$1,735	\$5,114	\$3,059
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.1	\$2,505	\$8,705	\$5,092
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	1.4	\$58,540	\$203,414	\$118,991
Camping fees	1.2	\$51,586	\$179,251	\$104,856
Total Visitor Impact	37.7	\$1,289,408	\$4,378,438	\$2,488,532

David Crockett Birthplace

Cabins/Camping

Spending & Impact Within Local Area

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	84,392	
Day Visitor Groups	42,703	50.6%
Overnight Visitor Groups	41,690	49.4%

Per Visitor Group Expenditures by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$11.28	\$30.80
Groceries	\$11.54	\$63.42
Gasoline and oil	\$8.28	\$23.57
Recreation use fees	\$4.10	\$13.95
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$6.87	\$9.08
Retail Shopping	\$2.45	\$17.97
Other expense	\$0.54	\$0.17
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$10.88
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$5.39
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$79.16
Total	\$45.05	\$254.40

Total Spending by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$481,645	\$1,284,217	\$1,765,862
Groceries	\$492,924	\$2,643,993	\$3,136,917
Gasoline and oil	\$353,419	\$982,568	\$1,335,987
Recreation use fees	\$174,907	\$581,537	\$756,444
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$293,298	\$378,644	\$671,943
Retail Shopping	\$104,483	\$749,326	\$853,809
Other expense	\$22,999	\$6,909	\$29,908
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$453,786	\$453,786
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$224,670	\$224,670
Camping fees	\$0	\$3,300,034	\$3,300,034
Total	\$1,923,675	\$10,605,684	\$12,529,359

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	9.1	\$270,492	\$1,076,477	\$541,851
Groceries	2.6	\$89,940	\$282,537	\$168,968
Gasoline and oil	0.9	\$33,228	\$109,650	\$63,058
Recreation use fees	3.9	\$117,153	\$383,782	\$212,915
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	2.1	\$71,109	\$232,947	\$140,417
Retail Shopping	0.7	\$25,768	\$75,932	\$45,426
Other expense	0.2	\$6,064	\$17,869	\$10,690
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	19.5	\$613,753	\$2,179,193	\$1,183,324

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	24.4	\$721,216	\$2,870,225	\$1,444,744
Groceries	13.8	\$482,430	\$1,515,498	\$906,326
Gasoline and oil	2.4	\$92,379	\$304,847	\$175,313
Recreation use fees	13.1	\$389,513	\$1,276,008	\$707,905
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	2.7	\$91,801	\$300,732	\$181,277
Retail Shopping	5.2	\$184,799	\$544,565	\$325,781
Other expense	0.1	\$1,822	\$5,368	\$3,211
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	6.2	\$268,278	\$932,212	\$545,314
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	3.1	\$132,825	\$461,539	\$269,986
Camping fees	45.2	\$1,950,980	\$6,779,259	\$3,965,651
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	116.0	\$4,316,043	\$14,990,253	\$8,525,507

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	33.5	\$991,708	\$3,946,702	\$1,986,595
Groceries	16.4	\$572,370	\$1,798,035	\$1,075,294
Gasoline and oil	3.3	\$125,607	\$414,498	\$238,371
Recreation use fees	17.0	\$506,666	\$1,659,790	\$920,819
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	4.7	\$162,910	\$533,679	\$321,694
Retail Shopping	5.9	\$210,566	\$620,496	\$371,206
Other expense	0.2	\$7,885	\$23,236	\$13,901
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	6.2	\$268,278	\$932,212	\$545,314
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	3.1	\$132,825	\$461,539	\$269,986
Camping fees	45.2	\$1,950,980	\$6,779,259	\$3,965,651
Total Visitor Impact	135.5	\$4,929,796	\$17,169,446	\$9,708,831

David Crockett Birthplace

Cabins/Camping

Spending & Impact Outside Local Area, but inside TN

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	84,392	
Day Visitor Groups	42,703	50.6%
Overnight Visitor Groups	41,690	49.4%

Per Visitor Group Expenditures by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$0.80	\$9.20
Groceries	\$2.37	\$52.32
Gasoline and oil	\$2.42	\$24.55
Recreation use fees	\$0.02	\$1.21
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$0.54	\$11.83
Retail Shopping	\$0.00	\$1.79
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.13
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$0.08
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$1.89
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$1.67
Total	\$6.15	\$104.66

Total Spending by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$33,958	\$383,658	\$417,616
Groceries	\$101,134	\$2,181,417	\$2,282,551
Gasoline and oil	\$103,447	\$1,023,326	\$1,126,773
Recreation use fees	\$947	\$50,339	\$51,286
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$22,923	\$493,038	\$515,960
Retail Shopping	\$0	\$74,770	\$74,770
Other expense	\$0	\$5,236	\$5,236
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$3,371	\$3,371
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$78,777	\$78,777
Camping fees	\$0	\$69,419	\$69,419
Total	\$262,408	\$4,363,351	\$4,625,758

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	0.6	\$19,071	\$75,895	\$38,202
Groceries	0.5	\$18,453	\$57,968	\$34,667
Gasoline and oil	0.3	\$9,726	\$32,095	\$18,457
Recreation use fees	0.0	\$634	\$2,078	\$1,153
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.2	\$5,558	\$18,206	\$10,974
Retail Shopping	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	1.6	\$53,441	\$186,242	\$103,454

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	7.3	\$215,463	\$857,476	\$431,616
Groceries	11.4	\$398,027	\$1,250,356	\$747,761
Gasoline and oil	2.5	\$96,211	\$317,493	\$182,585
Recreation use fees	1.1	\$33,717	\$110,453	\$61,277
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	3.5	\$119,535	\$391,587	\$236,043
Retail Shopping	0.5	\$18,440	\$54,338	\$32,507
Other expense	0.0	\$1,381	\$4,068	\$2,434
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$1,993	\$6,925	\$4,051
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	1.1	\$46,573	\$161,831	\$94,666
Camping fees	1.0	\$41,041	\$142,608	\$83,421
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	28.4	\$972,380	\$3,297,136	\$1,876,361

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	7.9	\$234,533	\$933,371	\$469,818
Groceries	11.9	\$416,480	\$1,308,324	\$782,428
Gasoline and oil	2.8	\$105,937	\$349,588	\$201,042
Recreation use fees	1.2	\$34,351	\$112,531	\$62,430
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	3.6	\$125,093	\$409,792	\$247,017
Retail Shopping	0.5	\$18,440	\$54,338	\$32,507
Other expense	0.0	\$1,381	\$4,068	\$2,434
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$1,993	\$6,925	\$4,051
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	1.1	\$46,573	\$161,831	\$94,666
Camping fees	1.0	\$41,041	\$142,608	\$83,421
Total Visitor Impact	30.0	\$1,025,821	\$3,483,378	\$1,979,815

Dunbar Cave

No Camping/Has Amenities

Spending & Impact Within Local Area

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	149,842	
Day Visitor Groups	124,819	83.3%
Overnight Visitor Groups	25,024	16.7%

Per Visitor Group Expenditures by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$11.16	\$29.28
Groceries	\$7.27	\$20.61
Gasoline and oil	\$7.33	\$21.16
Recreation use fees	\$1.40	\$2.16
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$7.44	\$6.81
Retail Shopping	\$3.43	\$19.07
Other expense	\$0.10	\$0.23
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$2.93
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$31.05
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$18.66
Total	\$38.14	\$151.97

Total Spending by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$1,392,619	\$732,673	\$2,125,292
Groceries	\$907,997	\$515,817	\$1,423,814
Gasoline and oil	\$915,430	\$529,528	\$1,444,959
Recreation use fees	\$174,775	\$53,984	\$228,759
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$928,490	\$170,477	\$1,098,967
Retail Shopping	\$428,184	\$477,222	\$905,407
Other expense	\$12,740	\$5,683	\$18,423
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$73,432	\$73,432
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$777,089	\$777,089
Camping fees	\$0	\$466,848	\$466,848
Total	\$4,760,236	\$3,802,753	\$8,562,990

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	26.4	\$782,095	\$3,112,503	\$1,566,696
Groceries	4.7	\$165,676	\$520,450	\$311,249
Gasoline and oil	2.2	\$86,067	\$284,018	\$163,334
Recreation use fees	3.9	\$117,064	\$383,492	\$212,754
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	6.5	\$225,109	\$737,437	\$444,517
Retail Shopping	2.9	\$105,599	\$311,178	\$186,160
Other expense	0.1	\$3,359	\$9,898	\$5,921
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	46.9	\$1,484,969	\$5,358,977	\$2,890,632

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	13.9	\$411,469	\$1,637,525	\$824,257
Groceries	2.7	\$94,117	\$295,659	\$176,815
Gasoline and oil	1.3	\$49,785	\$164,289	\$94,480
Recreation use fees	1.2	\$36,159	\$118,452	\$65,715
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	1.2	\$41,331	\$135,398	\$81,616
Retail Shopping	3.3	\$117,692	\$346,816	\$207,479
Other expense	0.0	\$1,498	\$4,415	\$2,641
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	1.0	\$43,413	\$150,851	\$88,243
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	10.7	\$459,415	\$1,596,374	\$933,828
Camping fees	6.4	\$276,000	\$959,046	\$561,011
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	41.7	\$1,530,881	\$5,408,825	\$3,036,087

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	40.3	\$1,193,564	\$4,750,028	\$2,390,954
Groceries	7.4	\$259,793	\$816,109	\$488,065
Gasoline and oil	3.5	\$135,852	\$448,307	\$257,814
Recreation use fees	5.1	\$153,223	\$501,944	\$278,469
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	7.7	\$266,440	\$872,835	\$526,134
Retail Shopping	6.2	\$223,291	\$657,995	\$393,639
Other expense	0.1	\$4,857	\$14,313	\$8,563
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	1.0	\$43,413	\$150,851	\$88,243
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	10.7	\$459,415	\$1,596,374	\$933,828
Camping fees	6.4	\$276,000	\$959,046	\$561,011
Total Visitor Impact	88.6	\$3,015,850	\$10,767,801	\$5,926,718

Dunbar Cave

No Camping/Has Amenities

Spending & Impact Outside Local Area, but inside TN

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	149,842	
Day Visitor Groups	124,819	83.3%
Overnight Visitor Groups	25,024	16.7%

Per Visitor Group Expenditures by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$0.91	\$53.02
Groceries	\$1.19	\$44.66
Gasoline and oil	\$1.69	\$46.69
Recreation use fees	\$0.00	\$2.38
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$0.03	\$15.83
Retail Shopping	\$0.00	\$12.90
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$6.67
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$55.40
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$2.04
Total	\$3.82	\$239.60

Total Spending by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$113,820	\$1,326,665	\$1,440,485
Groceries	\$148,610	\$1,117,631	\$1,266,241
Gasoline and oil	\$210,713	\$1,168,283	\$1,378,996
Recreation use fees	\$0	\$59,667	\$59,667
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$3,685	\$396,190	\$399,875
Retail Shopping	\$0	\$322,811	\$322,811
Other expense	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$167,021	\$167,021
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$1,386,306	\$1,386,306
Camping fees	\$0	\$51,023	\$51,023
Total	\$476,828	\$5,995,597	\$6,472,425

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	2.2	\$63,922	\$254,389	\$128,048
Groceries	0.8	\$27,116	\$85,181	\$50,942
Gasoline and oil	0.5	\$19,811	\$65,375	\$37,596
Recreation use fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.0	\$893	\$2,927	\$1,764
Retail Shopping	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	3.5	\$111,742	\$407,871	\$218,350

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	25.2	\$745,055	\$2,965,096	\$1,492,498
Groceries	5.8	\$203,926	\$640,610	\$383,109
Gasoline and oil	2.9	\$109,840	\$362,467	\$208,449
Recreation use fees	1.3	\$39,965	\$130,921	\$72,632
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	2.8	\$96,055	\$314,667	\$189,677
Retail Shopping	2.2	\$79,612	\$234,600	\$140,347
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	2.3	\$98,743	\$343,111	\$200,709
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	19.0	\$819,584	\$2,847,889	\$1,665,924
Camping fees	0.7	\$30,165	\$104,816	\$61,314
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	62.2	\$2,222,944	\$7,944,176	\$4,414,660

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	27.3	\$808,977	\$3,219,485	\$1,620,546
Groceries	6.6	\$231,042	\$725,791	\$434,051
Gasoline and oil	3.4	\$129,651	\$427,841	\$246,045
Recreation use fees	1.3	\$39,965	\$130,921	\$72,632
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	2.8	\$96,948	\$317,594	\$191,441
Retail Shopping	2.2	\$79,612	\$234,600	\$140,347
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	2.3	\$98,743	\$343,111	\$200,709
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	19.0	\$819,584	\$2,847,889	\$1,665,924
Camping fees	0.7	\$30,165	\$104,816	\$61,314
Total Visitor Impact	65.7	\$2,334,686	\$8,352,048	\$4,633,009

Edgar Evins

Marina

Spending & Impact Within Local Area

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	84,112	
Day Visitor Groups	50,467	60.0%
Overnight Visitor Groups	33,645	40.0%

**Per Visitor Group Expenditures
by Visitors Within Local Area**

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$15.25	\$37.55
Groceries	\$9.48	\$74.56
Gasoline and oil	\$8.41	\$26.46
Recreation use fees	\$12.08	\$18.92
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$5.93	\$7.36
Retail Shopping	\$1.39	\$8.50
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$33.09
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$2.53
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$79.34
Total	\$52.54	\$288.31

Total Spending by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$769,645	\$1,263,485	\$2,033,130
Groceries	\$478,364	\$2,508,531	\$2,986,895
Gasoline and oil	\$424,325	\$890,353	\$1,314,679
Recreation use fees	\$609,532	\$636,398	\$1,245,929
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$299,489	\$247,583	\$547,073
Retail Shopping	\$70,168	\$285,895	\$356,063
Other expense	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$1,113,301	\$1,113,301
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$85,179	\$85,179
Camping fees	\$0	\$2,669,484	\$2,669,484
Total	\$2,651,523	\$9,700,210	\$12,351,733

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	14.6	\$432,233	\$1,720,156	\$865,850
Groceries	2.5	\$87,284	\$274,191	\$163,977
Gasoline and oil	1.0	\$39,894	\$131,649	\$75,709
Recreation use fees	13.7	\$408,264	\$1,337,434	\$741,983
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	2.1	\$72,610	\$237,864	\$143,381
Retail Shopping	0.5	\$17,305	\$50,994	\$30,507
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	34.4	\$1,057,590	\$3,752,289	\$2,021,407

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	24.0	\$709,573	\$2,823,890	\$1,421,421
Groceries	13.1	\$457,713	\$1,437,853	\$859,891
Gasoline and oil	2.2	\$83,709	\$276,237	\$158,859
Recreation use fees	14.3	\$426,259	\$1,396,384	\$774,687
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	1.7	\$60,026	\$196,639	\$118,531
Retail Shopping	2.0	\$70,507	\$207,771	\$124,297
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	15.3	\$658,184	\$2,287,054	\$1,337,854
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	1.2	\$50,358	\$174,983	\$102,360
Camping fees	36.6	\$1,578,199	\$5,483,922	\$3,207,919
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	110.3	\$4,094,529	\$14,284,733	\$8,105,820

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	38.6	\$1,141,806	\$4,544,046	\$2,287,271
Groceries	15.6	\$544,997	\$1,712,044	\$1,023,868
Gasoline and oil	3.2	\$123,604	\$407,887	\$234,569
Recreation use fees	28.0	\$834,523	\$2,733,818	\$1,516,670
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	3.8	\$132,636	\$434,503	\$261,913
Retail Shopping	2.5	\$87,812	\$258,765	\$154,804
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	15.3	\$658,184	\$2,287,054	\$1,337,854
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	1.2	\$50,358	\$174,983	\$102,360
Camping fees	36.6	\$1,578,199	\$5,483,922	\$3,207,919
Total Visitor Impact	144.7	\$5,152,118	\$18,037,022	\$10,127,227

Edgar Evins

Marina

Spending & Impact Outside Local Area, but inside TN

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	84,112	
Day Visitor Groups	50,467	60.0%
Overnight Visitor Groups	33,645	40.0%

**Per Visitor Group Expenditures
by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN**

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$0.20	\$3.60
Groceries	\$1.49	\$30.16
Gasoline and oil	\$1.64	\$16.36
Recreation use fees	\$0.00	\$0.00
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$0.32	\$10.32
Retail Shopping	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$0.00
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$2.40
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$0.53
Total	\$3.65	\$63.37

Total Spending by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$10,283	\$121,074	\$131,357
Groceries	\$75,421	\$1,014,710	\$1,090,131
Gasoline and oil	\$82,580	\$550,444	\$633,024
Recreation use fees	\$0	\$0	\$0
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$16,162	\$347,239	\$363,401
Retail Shopping	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$80,870	\$80,870
Camping fees	\$0	\$17,706	\$17,706
Total	\$184,446	\$2,132,044	\$2,316,489

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	0.2	\$5,775	\$22,983	\$11,569
Groceries	0.4	\$13,762	\$43,230	\$25,853
Gasoline and oil	0.2	\$7,764	\$25,621	\$14,734
Recreation use fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.1	\$3,918	\$12,836	\$7,737
Retail Shopping	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	0.9	\$31,219	\$104,670	\$59,894

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	2.3	\$67,995	\$270,601	\$136,208
Groceries	5.3	\$185,147	\$581,617	\$347,829
Gasoline and oil	1.3	\$51,752	\$170,779	\$98,212
Recreation use fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	2.4	\$84,187	\$275,789	\$166,242
Retail Shopping	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	1.1	\$47,810	\$166,131	\$97,182
Camping fees	0.2	\$10,468	\$36,373	\$21,277
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	12.7	\$447,359	\$1,501,289	\$866,950

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	2.5	\$73,770	\$293,584	\$147,777
Groceries	5.7	\$198,908	\$624,847	\$373,682
Gasoline and oil	1.5	\$59,516	\$196,399	\$112,946
Recreation use fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	2.6	\$88,105	\$288,625	\$173,979
Retail Shopping	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	1.1	\$47,810	\$166,131	\$97,182
Camping fees	0.2	\$10,468	\$36,373	\$21,277
Total Visitor Impact	13.6	\$478,578	\$1,605,959	\$926,843

Fall Creek Falls

Resort

Spending & Impact Within Local Area

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	311,570	
Day Visitor Groups	135,221	43.4%
Overnight Visitor Groups	176,349	56.6%

Per Visitor Group Expenditures by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Overnight	
	Day Visitors	Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$13.17	\$28.52
Groceries	\$8.96	\$56.81
Gasoline and oil	\$7.64	\$25.34
Recreation use fees	\$8.48	\$11.31
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$3.63	\$5.41
Retail Shopping	\$1.75	\$18.56
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$12.71
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$8.45
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$82.74
Total	\$43.63	\$249.86

Total Spending by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Overnight		Total
	Day Visitors	Visitors	
Restaurants, snack bars	\$1,781,336	\$5,030,202	\$6,811,537
Groceries	\$1,212,158	\$10,018,504	\$11,230,661
Gasoline and oil	\$1,032,816	\$4,469,115	\$5,501,931
Recreation use fees	\$1,146,379	\$1,993,913	\$3,140,292
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$491,231	\$953,639	\$1,444,870
Retail Shopping	\$236,405	\$3,273,177	\$3,509,582
Other expense	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$2,241,937	\$2,241,937
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$1,490,093	\$1,490,093
Camping fees	\$0	\$14,591,940	\$14,591,940
Total	\$5,900,324	\$44,062,520	\$49,962,844

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	33.8	\$1,000,398	\$3,981,285	\$2,004,003
Groceries	6.3	\$221,174	\$694,791	\$415,512
Gasoline and oil	2.5	\$97,104	\$320,437	\$184,278
Recreation use fees	25.7	\$767,845	\$2,515,386	\$1,395,488
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	3.5	\$119,097	\$390,151	\$235,178
Retail Shopping	1.6	\$58,302	\$171,805	\$102,780
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	73.5	\$2,263,919	\$8,073,855	\$4,337,238

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	95.4	\$2,824,961	\$11,242,501	\$5,658,977
Groceries	52.3	\$1,828,003	\$5,742,458	\$3,434,210
Gasoline and oil	10.9	\$420,178	\$1,386,569	\$797,393
Recreation use fees	44.8	\$1,335,523	\$4,375,043	\$2,427,190
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	6.7	\$231,206	\$757,411	\$456,557
Retail Shopping	22.5	\$807,230	\$2,378,746	\$1,423,062
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	30.7	\$1,325,433	\$4,605,612	\$2,694,136
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	20.4	\$880,943	\$3,061,098	\$1,790,645
Camping fees	200.0	\$8,626,755	\$29,976,223	\$17,535,135
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	483.9	\$18,280,233	\$63,525,661	\$36,217,305

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	129.2	\$3,825,359	\$15,223,786	\$7,662,980
Groceries	58.7	\$2,049,177	\$6,437,249	\$3,849,721
Gasoline and oil	13.4	\$517,282	\$1,707,006	\$981,671
Recreation use fees	70.5	\$2,103,368	\$6,890,429	\$3,822,677
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	10.2	\$350,303	\$1,147,562	\$691,735
Retail Shopping	24.2	\$865,532	\$2,550,551	\$1,525,843
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	30.7	\$1,325,433	\$4,605,612	\$2,694,136
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	20.4	\$880,943	\$3,061,098	\$1,790,645
Camping fees	200.0	\$8,626,755	\$29,976,223	\$17,535,135
Total Visitor Impact	557.4	\$20,544,153	\$71,599,516	\$40,554,543

Fall Creek Falls

Resort

Spending & Impact Outside Local Area, but inside TN

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	311,570	
Day Visitor Groups	135,221	43.4%
Overnight Visitor Groups	176,349	56.6%

Per Visitor Group Expenditures by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$0.35	\$8.23
Groceries	\$0.89	\$39.64
Gasoline and oil	\$1.47	\$30.39
Recreation use fees	\$0.03	\$0.58
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$0.60	\$33.53
Retail Shopping	\$0.00	\$1.06
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$0.00
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$0.97
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$3.87
Total	\$3.34	\$118.27

Total Spending by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$47,759	\$1,450,621	\$1,498,380
Groceries	\$119,682	\$6,991,099	\$7,110,781
Gasoline and oil	\$199,283	\$5,359,229	\$5,558,512
Recreation use fees	\$3,861	\$102,683	\$106,544
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$81,075	\$5,913,668	\$5,994,743
Retail Shopping	\$0	\$187,718	\$187,718
Other expense	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$170,366	\$170,366
Camping fees	\$0	\$681,908	\$681,908
Total	\$451,660	\$20,857,293	\$21,308,953

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	0.9	\$26,821	\$106,740	\$53,728
Groceries	0.6	\$21,838	\$68,600	\$41,025
Gasoline and oil	0.5	\$18,736	\$61,829	\$35,557
Recreation use fees	0.1	\$2,586	\$8,471	\$4,700
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.6	\$19,656	\$64,392	\$38,815
Retail Shopping	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	2.7	\$89,637	\$310,033	\$173,825

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	27.5	\$814,669	\$3,242,138	\$1,631,949
Groceries	36.5	\$1,275,615	\$4,007,195	\$2,396,456
Gasoline and oil	13.1	\$503,865	\$1,662,732	\$956,210
Recreation use fees	2.3	\$68,777	\$225,308	\$124,996
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	41.6	\$1,433,747	\$4,696,827	\$2,831,185
Retail Shopping	1.3	\$46,295	\$136,422	\$81,613
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	2.3	\$100,720	\$349,983	\$204,729
Camping fees	9.3	\$403,144	\$1,400,843	\$819,449
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	134.0	\$4,646,832	\$15,721,448	\$9,046,587

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	28.4	\$841,490	\$3,348,878	\$1,685,677
Groceries	37.2	\$1,297,452	\$4,075,795	\$2,437,481
Gasoline and oil	13.6	\$522,601	\$1,724,561	\$991,766
Recreation use fees	2.4	\$71,363	\$233,779	\$129,696
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	42.2	\$1,453,403	\$4,761,219	\$2,870,000
Retail Shopping	1.3	\$46,295	\$136,422	\$81,613
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	2.3	\$100,720	\$349,983	\$204,729
Camping fees	9.3	\$403,144	\$1,400,843	\$819,449
Total Visitor Impact	136.7	\$4,736,470	\$16,031,480	\$9,220,412

Fort Loudoun

No Camping/Has Amenities
 Spending & Impact Within Local Area

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	38,273	
Day Visitor Groups	31,882	83.3%
Overnight Visitor Groups	6,392	16.7%

**Per Visitor Group Expenditures
 by Visitors Within Local Area**

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$11.16	\$29.28
Groceries	\$7.27	\$20.61
Gasoline and oil	\$7.33	\$21.16
Recreation use fees	\$1.40	\$2.16
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$7.44	\$6.81
Retail Shopping	\$3.43	\$19.07
Other expense	\$0.10	\$0.23
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$2.93
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$31.05
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$18.66
Total	\$38.14	\$151.97

Total Spending by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$355,709	\$187,143	\$542,851
Groceries	\$231,924	\$131,752	\$363,677
Gasoline and oil	\$233,823	\$135,254	\$369,078
Recreation use fees	\$44,642	\$13,789	\$58,431
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$237,159	\$43,544	\$280,703
Retail Shopping	\$109,369	\$121,894	\$231,263
Other expense	\$3,254	\$1,451	\$4,706
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$18,756	\$18,756
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$198,487	\$198,487
Camping fees	\$0	\$119,244	\$119,244
Total	\$1,215,880	\$971,315	\$2,187,195

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	6.7	\$199,766	\$795,009	\$400,172
Groceries	1.2	\$42,318	\$132,936	\$79,501
Gasoline and oil	0.6	\$21,984	\$72,545	\$41,719
Recreation use fees	1.0	\$29,901	\$97,953	\$54,342
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	1.7	\$57,498	\$188,359	\$113,541
Retail Shopping	0.8	\$26,972	\$79,483	\$47,550
Other expense	0.0	\$858	\$2,528	\$1,512
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	12.0	\$379,297	\$1,368,813	\$738,337

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	3.6	\$105,099	\$418,264	\$210,535
Groceries	0.7	\$24,040	\$75,518	\$45,163
Gasoline and oil	0.3	\$12,716	\$41,963	\$24,132
Recreation use fees	0.3	\$9,236	\$30,256	\$16,785
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.3	\$10,557	\$34,584	\$20,847
Retail Shopping	0.8	\$30,062	\$88,585	\$52,995
Other expense	0.0	\$383	\$1,128	\$675
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.3	\$11,089	\$38,531	\$22,539
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	2.7	\$117,346	\$407,753	\$238,522
Camping fees	1.6	\$70,497	\$244,964	\$143,296
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	10.6	\$391,024	\$1,381,545	\$775,490

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	10.3	\$304,865	\$1,213,272	\$610,708
Groceries	1.9	\$66,357	\$208,454	\$124,664
Gasoline and oil	0.9	\$34,700	\$114,508	\$65,852
Recreation use fees	1.3	\$39,137	\$128,209	\$71,128
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	2.0	\$68,055	\$222,943	\$134,387
Retail Shopping	1.6	\$57,034	\$168,068	\$100,545
Other expense	0.0	\$1,241	\$3,656	\$2,187
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.3	\$11,089	\$38,531	\$22,539
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	2.7	\$117,346	\$407,753	\$238,522
Camping fees	1.6	\$70,497	\$244,964	\$143,296
Total Visitor Impact	22.6	\$770,321	\$2,750,358	\$1,513,828

Fort Loudoun

No Camping/Has Amenities

Spending & Impact Outside Local Area, but inside TN

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	38,273	
Day Visitor Groups	31,882	83.3%
Overnight Visitor Groups	6,392	16.7%

**Per Visitor Group Expenditures
by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN**

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$0.91	\$53.02
Groceries	\$1.19	\$44.66
Gasoline and oil	\$1.69	\$46.69
Recreation use fees	\$0.00	\$2.38
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$0.03	\$15.83
Retail Shopping	\$0.00	\$12.90
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$6.67
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$55.40
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$2.04
Total	\$3.82	\$239.60

Total Spending by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$29,072	\$338,862	\$367,935
Groceries	\$37,959	\$285,470	\$323,429
Gasoline and oil	\$53,821	\$298,408	\$352,229
Recreation use fees	\$0	\$15,240	\$15,240
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$941	\$101,197	\$102,138
Retail Shopping	\$0	\$82,454	\$82,454
Other expense	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$42,661	\$42,661
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$354,096	\$354,096
Camping fees	\$0	\$13,032	\$13,032
Total	\$121,793	\$1,531,421	\$1,653,215

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	0.6	\$16,327	\$64,977	\$32,707
Groceries	0.2	\$6,926	\$21,757	\$13,012
Gasoline and oil	0.1	\$5,060	\$16,698	\$9,603
Recreation use fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.0	\$228	\$748	\$451
Retail Shopping	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	0.9	\$28,542	\$104,180	\$55,772

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	6.4	\$190,305	\$757,358	\$381,220
Groceries	1.5	\$52,088	\$163,627	\$97,855
Gasoline and oil	0.7	\$28,056	\$92,583	\$53,243
Recreation use fees	0.3	\$10,208	\$33,440	\$18,552
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.7	\$24,535	\$80,374	\$48,448
Retail Shopping	0.6	\$20,335	\$59,922	\$35,848
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.6	\$25,221	\$87,639	\$51,266
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	4.9	\$209,342	\$727,420	\$425,517
Camping fees	0.2	\$7,705	\$26,773	\$15,661
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	15.9	\$567,794	\$2,029,135	\$1,127,611

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	7.0	\$206,632	\$822,335	\$413,927
Groceries	1.7	\$59,014	\$185,385	\$110,867
Gasoline and oil	0.9	\$33,116	\$109,281	\$62,846
Recreation use fees	0.3	\$10,208	\$33,440	\$18,552
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.7	\$24,763	\$81,121	\$48,899
Retail Shopping	0.6	\$20,335	\$59,922	\$35,848
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.6	\$25,221	\$87,639	\$51,266
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	4.9	\$209,342	\$727,420	\$425,517
Camping fees	0.2	\$7,705	\$26,773	\$15,661
Total Visitor Impact	16.8	\$596,335	\$2,133,316	\$1,183,383

Fort Pillow

Cabins/Camping

Spending & Impact Within Local Area

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	87,484	
Day Visitor Groups	44,267	50.6%
Overnight Visitor Groups	43,217	49.4%

**Per Visitor Group Expenditures
by Visitors Within Local Area**

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$11.28	\$30.80
Groceries	\$11.54	\$63.42
Gasoline and oil	\$8.28	\$23.57
Recreation use fees	\$4.10	\$13.95
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$6.87	\$9.08
Retail Shopping	\$2.45	\$17.97
Other expense	\$0.54	\$0.17
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$10.88
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$5.39
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$79.16
Total	\$45.05	\$254.40

Total Spending by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$499,289	\$1,331,261	\$1,830,550
Groceries	\$510,981	\$2,740,849	\$3,251,830
Gasoline and oil	\$366,365	\$1,018,562	\$1,384,927
Recreation use fees	\$181,315	\$602,840	\$784,154
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$304,042	\$392,515	\$696,557
Retail Shopping	\$108,311	\$776,775	\$885,086
Other expense	\$23,841	\$7,162	\$31,003
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$470,409	\$470,409
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$232,900	\$232,900
Camping fees	\$0	\$3,420,922	\$3,420,922
Total	\$1,994,144	\$10,994,194	\$12,988,338

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	9.5	\$280,401	\$1,115,911	\$561,700
Groceries	2.7	\$93,235	\$292,887	\$175,157
Gasoline and oil	0.9	\$34,445	\$113,667	\$65,368
Recreation use fees	4.1	\$121,445	\$397,841	\$220,714
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	2.1	\$73,714	\$241,480	\$145,561
Retail Shopping	0.7	\$26,712	\$78,713	\$47,090
Other expense	0.2	\$6,286	\$18,523	\$11,081
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	20.2	\$636,237	\$2,259,022	\$1,226,672

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	25.3	\$747,636	\$2,975,368	\$1,497,669
Groceries	14.3	\$500,103	\$1,571,014	\$939,527
Gasoline and oil	2.5	\$95,763	\$316,015	\$181,735
Recreation use fees	13.5	\$403,782	\$1,322,751	\$733,837
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	2.8	\$95,164	\$311,748	\$187,918
Retail Shopping	5.3	\$191,568	\$564,513	\$337,715
Other expense	0.1	\$1,888	\$5,565	\$3,329
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	6.4	\$278,106	\$966,361	\$565,290
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	3.2	\$137,690	\$478,447	\$279,876
Camping fees	46.9	\$2,022,449	\$7,027,599	\$4,110,922
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	120.3	\$4,474,150	\$15,539,380	\$8,837,816

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	34.7	\$1,028,037	\$4,091,279	\$2,059,369
Groceries	17.0	\$593,338	\$1,863,901	\$1,114,684
Gasoline and oil	3.4	\$130,208	\$429,682	\$247,103
Recreation use fees	17.6	\$525,227	\$1,720,592	\$954,551
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	4.9	\$168,878	\$553,228	\$333,479
Retail Shopping	6.1	\$218,280	\$643,227	\$384,804
Other expense	0.2	\$8,174	\$24,088	\$14,410
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	6.4	\$278,106	\$966,361	\$565,290
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	3.2	\$137,690	\$478,447	\$279,876
Camping fees	46.9	\$2,022,449	\$7,027,599	\$4,110,922
Total Visitor Impact	140.5	\$5,110,386	\$17,798,402	\$10,064,488

Fort Pillow

Cabins/Camping

Spending & Impact Outside Local Area, but inside TN

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	87,484	
Day Visitor Groups	44,267	50.6%
Overnight Visitor Groups	43,217	49.4%

**Per Visitor Group Expenditures
by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN**

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$0.80	\$9.20
Groceries	\$2.37	\$52.32
Gasoline and oil	\$2.42	\$24.55
Recreation use fees	\$0.02	\$1.21
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$0.54	\$11.83
Retail Shopping	\$0.00	\$1.79
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.13
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$0.08
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$1.89
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$1.67
Total	\$6.15	\$104.66

Total Spending by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$35,201	\$397,713	\$432,914
Groceries	\$104,838	\$2,261,327	\$2,366,166
Gasoline and oil	\$107,236	\$1,060,813	\$1,168,049
Recreation use fees	\$982	\$52,183	\$53,164
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$23,762	\$511,099	\$534,861
Retail Shopping	\$0	\$77,509	\$77,509
Other expense	\$0	\$5,428	\$5,428
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$3,495	\$3,495
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$81,663	\$81,663
Camping fees	\$0	\$71,962	\$71,962
Total	\$272,020	\$4,523,191	\$4,795,211

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	0.7	\$19,769	\$78,675	\$39,602
Groceries	0.5	\$19,129	\$60,092	\$35,937
Gasoline and oil	0.3	\$10,082	\$33,271	\$19,133
Recreation use fees	0.0	\$658	\$2,154	\$1,195
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.2	\$5,761	\$18,873	\$11,376
Retail Shopping	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	1.7	\$55,399	\$193,065	\$107,244

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	7.5	\$223,355	\$888,888	\$447,427
Groceries	11.8	\$412,608	\$1,296,159	\$775,153
Gasoline and oil	2.6	\$99,736	\$329,123	\$189,273
Recreation use fees	1.2	\$34,952	\$114,499	\$63,522
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	3.6	\$123,914	\$405,931	\$244,690
Retail Shopping	0.5	\$19,115	\$56,328	\$33,698
Other expense	0.0	\$1,431	\$4,217	\$2,523
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$2,066	\$7,179	\$4,199
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	1.1	\$48,279	\$167,759	\$98,134
Camping fees	1.0	\$42,544	\$147,832	\$86,477
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	29.4	\$1,008,000	\$3,417,917	\$1,945,097

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	8.2	\$243,125	\$967,563	\$487,028
Groceries	12.4	\$431,737	\$1,356,251	\$811,090
Gasoline and oil	2.9	\$109,818	\$362,394	\$208,407
Recreation use fees	1.2	\$35,610	\$116,654	\$64,717
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	3.8	\$129,675	\$424,804	\$256,066
Retail Shopping	0.5	\$19,115	\$56,328	\$33,698
Other expense	0.0	\$1,431	\$4,217	\$2,523
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$2,066	\$7,179	\$4,199
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	1.1	\$48,279	\$167,759	\$98,134
Camping fees	1.0	\$42,544	\$147,832	\$86,477
Total Visitor Impact	31.1	\$1,063,399	\$3,610,982	\$2,052,340

Frozen Head

Cabins/Camping

Spending & Impact Within Local Area

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	45,611	
Day Visitor Groups	23,079	50.6%
Overnight Visitor Groups	22,532	49.4%

Per Visitor Group Expenditures by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Overnight	
	Day Visitors	Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$11.28	\$30.80
Groceries	\$11.54	\$63.42
Gasoline and oil	\$8.28	\$23.57
Recreation use fees	\$4.10	\$13.95
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$6.87	\$9.08
Retail Shopping	\$2.45	\$17.97
Other expense	\$0.54	\$0.17
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$10.88
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$5.39
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$79.16
Total	\$45.05	\$254.40

Total Spending by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Overnight		Total
	Day Visitors	Visitors	
Restaurants, snack bars	\$260,314	\$694,079	\$954,393
Groceries	\$266,410	\$1,428,995	\$1,695,404
Gasoline and oil	\$191,012	\$531,047	\$722,058
Recreation use fees	\$94,532	\$314,302	\$408,834
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$158,518	\$204,645	\$363,164
Retail Shopping	\$56,470	\$404,987	\$461,457
Other expense	\$12,430	\$3,734	\$16,164
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$245,257	\$245,257
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$121,427	\$121,427
Camping fees	\$0	\$1,783,563	\$1,783,563
Total	\$1,039,685	\$5,732,035	\$6,771,721

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	4.9	\$146,192	\$581,802	\$292,853
Groceries	1.4	\$48,610	\$152,702	\$91,322
Gasoline and oil	0.5	\$17,959	\$59,262	\$34,081
Recreation use fees	2.1	\$63,317	\$207,422	\$115,074
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	1.1	\$38,432	\$125,900	\$75,891
Retail Shopping	0.4	\$13,927	\$41,039	\$24,551
Other expense	0.1	\$3,277	\$9,657	\$5,777
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	10.5	\$331,714	\$1,177,785	\$639,549

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	13.2	\$389,795	\$1,551,266	\$780,838
Groceries	7.5	\$260,738	\$819,079	\$489,840
Gasoline and oil	1.3	\$49,928	\$164,760	\$94,751
Recreation use fees	7.1	\$210,520	\$689,642	\$382,600
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	1.4	\$49,615	\$162,536	\$97,974
Retail Shopping	2.8	\$99,878	\$294,320	\$176,074
Other expense	0.0	\$985	\$2,901	\$1,736
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	3.4	\$144,996	\$503,831	\$294,725
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	1.7	\$71,788	\$249,447	\$145,919
Camping fees	24.4	\$1,054,443	\$3,663,974	\$2,143,308
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	62.7	\$2,332,684	\$8,101,756	\$4,607,766

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	18.1	\$535,987	\$2,133,067	\$1,073,692
Groceries	8.9	\$309,348	\$971,781	\$581,162
Gasoline and oil	1.8	\$67,887	\$224,023	\$128,832
Recreation use fees	9.2	\$273,837	\$897,064	\$497,674
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	2.6	\$88,048	\$288,436	\$173,866
Retail Shopping	3.2	\$113,804	\$335,359	\$200,625
Other expense	0.1	\$4,262	\$12,559	\$7,513
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	3.4	\$144,996	\$503,831	\$294,725
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	1.7	\$71,788	\$249,447	\$145,919
Camping fees	24.4	\$1,054,443	\$3,663,974	\$2,143,308
Total Visitor Impact	73.2	\$2,664,398	\$9,279,540	\$5,247,315

Frozen Head

Cabins/Camping

Spending & Impact Outside Local Area, but inside TN

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	45,611	
Day Visitor Groups	23,079	50.6%
Overnight Visitor Groups	22,532	49.4%

Per Visitor Group Expenditures by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$0.80	\$9.20
Groceries	\$2.37	\$52.32
Gasoline and oil	\$2.42	\$24.55
Recreation use fees	\$0.02	\$1.21
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$0.54	\$11.83
Retail Shopping	\$0.00	\$1.79
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.13
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$0.08
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$1.89
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$1.67
Total	\$6.15	\$104.66

Total Spending by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$18,353	\$207,355	\$225,708
Groceries	\$54,660	\$1,178,987	\$1,233,646
Gasoline and oil	\$55,910	\$553,075	\$608,985
Recreation use fees	\$512	\$27,207	\$27,718
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$12,389	\$266,471	\$278,860
Retail Shopping	\$0	\$40,411	\$40,411
Other expense	\$0	\$2,830	\$2,830
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$1,822	\$1,822
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$42,576	\$42,576
Camping fees	\$0	\$37,519	\$37,519
Total	\$141,823	\$2,358,253	\$2,500,076

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	0.3	\$10,307	\$41,019	\$20,647
Groceries	0.3	\$9,973	\$31,330	\$18,737
Gasoline and oil	0.1	\$5,257	\$17,346	\$9,976
Recreation use fees	0.0	\$343	\$1,123	\$623
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.1	\$3,004	\$9,840	\$5,931
Retail Shopping	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	0.9	\$28,883	\$100,658	\$55,914

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	3.9	\$116,451	\$463,439	\$233,275
Groceries	6.2	\$215,121	\$675,778	\$404,141
Gasoline and oil	1.4	\$51,999	\$171,595	\$98,681
Recreation use fees	0.6	\$18,223	\$59,697	\$33,118
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	1.9	\$64,605	\$211,640	\$127,574
Retail Shopping	0.3	\$9,966	\$29,368	\$17,569
Other expense	0.0	\$746	\$2,199	\$1,315
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$1,077	\$3,743	\$2,189
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.6	\$25,171	\$87,465	\$51,164
Camping fees	0.5	\$22,181	\$77,075	\$45,086
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	15.4	\$525,540	\$1,781,997	\$1,014,114

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	4.3	\$126,758	\$504,458	\$253,922
Groceries	6.4	\$225,094	\$707,108	\$422,878
Gasoline and oil	1.5	\$57,256	\$188,941	\$108,657
Recreation use fees	0.6	\$18,566	\$60,820	\$33,742
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	2.0	\$67,609	\$221,480	\$133,505
Retail Shopping	0.3	\$9,966	\$29,368	\$17,569
Other expense	0.0	\$746	\$2,199	\$1,315
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$1,077	\$3,743	\$2,189
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.6	\$25,171	\$87,465	\$51,164
Camping fees	0.5	\$22,181	\$77,075	\$45,086
Total Visitor Impact	16.2	\$554,424	\$1,882,655	\$1,070,027

Harpeth River

No Camping/No Amenities

Spending & Impact Within Local Area

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	186,527	
Day Visitor Groups	163,957	87.9%
Overnight Visitor Groups	22,570	12.1%

Per Visitor Group Expenditures by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$12.00	\$55.06
Groceries	\$7.23	\$52.84
Gasoline and oil	\$6.58	\$38.02
Recreation use fees	\$7.48	\$33.40
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$3.25	\$4.26
Retail Shopping	\$0.49	\$35.73
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$8.32
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$54.40
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$24.16
Total	\$37.03	\$306.18

Total Spending by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$1,966,818	\$1,242,586	\$3,209,404
Groceries	\$1,186,012	\$1,192,505	\$2,378,517
Gasoline and oil	\$1,078,174	\$858,209	\$1,936,383
Recreation use fees	\$1,226,084	\$753,753	\$1,979,837
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$533,465	\$96,099	\$629,565
Retail Shopping	\$80,256	\$806,399	\$886,655
Other expense	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$187,729	\$187,729
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$1,227,836	\$1,227,836
Camping fees	\$0	\$545,259	\$545,259
Total	\$6,070,810	\$6,910,375	\$12,981,185

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	37.3	\$1,104,565	\$4,395,838	\$2,212,670
Groceries	6.2	\$216,403	\$679,805	\$406,549
Gasoline and oil	2.6	\$101,368	\$334,510	\$192,371
Recreation use fees	27.5	\$821,231	\$2,690,274	\$1,492,512
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	3.8	\$129,337	\$423,696	\$255,398
Retail Shopping	0.6	\$19,793	\$58,325	\$34,892
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	78.0	\$2,392,696	\$8,582,447	\$4,594,393

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	23.6	\$697,837	\$2,777,181	\$1,397,910
Groceries	6.2	\$217,588	\$683,526	\$408,775
Gasoline and oil	2.1	\$80,687	\$266,264	\$153,124
Recreation use fees	16.9	\$504,864	\$1,653,885	\$917,543
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.7	\$23,299	\$76,325	\$46,008
Retail Shopping	5.5	\$198,874	\$586,041	\$350,594
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	2.6	\$110,985	\$385,651	\$225,594
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	16.8	\$725,897	\$2,522,344	\$1,475,491
Camping fees	7.5	\$322,357	\$1,120,126	\$655,238
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	81.9	\$2,882,387	\$10,071,344	\$5,630,276

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	60.9	\$1,802,401	\$7,173,018	\$3,610,580
Groceries	12.4	\$433,991	\$1,363,331	\$815,324
Gasoline and oil	4.7	\$182,055	\$600,774	\$345,495
Recreation use fees	44.5	\$1,326,095	\$4,344,159	\$2,410,056
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	4.4	\$152,636	\$500,021	\$301,406
Retail Shopping	6.1	\$218,667	\$644,367	\$385,486
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	2.6	\$110,985	\$385,651	\$225,594
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	16.8	\$725,897	\$2,522,344	\$1,475,491
Camping fees	7.5	\$322,357	\$1,120,126	\$655,238
Total Visitor Impact	159.9	\$5,275,084	\$18,653,791	\$10,224,669

Harpeth River

No Camping/No Amenities

Spending & Impact Outside Local Area, but inside TN

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	186,527	
Day Visitor Groups	163,957	87.9%
Overnight Visitor Groups	22,570	12.1%

Per Visitor Group Expenditures by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$0.77	\$47.23
Groceries	\$2.13	\$32.43
Gasoline and oil	\$1.65	\$29.33
Recreation use fees	\$0.00	\$1.81
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$1.13	\$0.45
Retail Shopping	\$0.00	\$3.87
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$2.84
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$39.25
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$3.29
Total	\$5.68	\$160.51

Total Spending by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$126,146	\$1,066,032	\$1,192,178
Groceries	\$348,421	\$731,991	\$1,080,412
Gasoline and oil	\$270,331	\$662,017	\$932,349
Recreation use fees	\$0	\$40,893	\$40,893
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$185,704	\$10,223	\$195,927
Retail Shopping	\$0	\$87,363	\$87,363
Other expense	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$64,066	\$64,066
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$885,785	\$885,785
Camping fees	\$0	\$74,259	\$74,259
Total	\$930,603	\$3,622,629	\$4,553,232

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	2.4	\$70,844	\$281,937	\$141,915
Groceries	1.8	\$63,574	\$199,710	\$119,434
Gasoline and oil	0.7	\$25,416	\$83,872	\$48,233
Recreation use fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	1.3	\$45,023	\$147,492	\$88,906
Retail Shopping	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	6.2	\$204,857	\$713,011	\$398,488

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	20.2	\$598,684	\$2,382,581	\$1,199,286
Groceries	3.8	\$133,561	\$419,566	\$250,917
Gasoline and oil	1.6	\$62,242	\$205,395	\$118,119
Recreation use fees	0.9	\$27,390	\$89,728	\$49,779
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.1	\$2,479	\$8,120	\$4,894
Retail Shopping	0.6	\$21,545	\$63,490	\$37,982
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.9	\$37,876	\$131,611	\$76,988
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	12.1	\$523,676	\$1,819,668	\$1,064,448
Camping fees	1.0	\$43,902	\$152,549	\$89,237
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	41.3	\$1,451,354	\$5,272,709	\$2,891,651

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	22.6	\$669,527	\$2,664,518	\$1,341,201
Groceries	5.6	\$197,135	\$619,276	\$370,351
Gasoline and oil	2.3	\$87,658	\$289,267	\$166,352
Recreation use fees	0.9	\$27,390	\$89,728	\$49,779
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	1.4	\$47,502	\$155,612	\$93,801
Retail Shopping	0.6	\$21,545	\$63,490	\$37,982
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.9	\$37,876	\$131,611	\$76,988
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	12.1	\$523,676	\$1,819,668	\$1,064,448
Camping fees	1.0	\$43,902	\$152,549	\$89,237
Total Visitor Impact	47.5	\$1,656,211	\$5,985,720	\$3,290,139

Harrison Bay

Marina

Spending & Impact Within Local Area

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	86,694	
Day Visitor Groups	52,016	60.0%
Overnight Visitor Groups	34,677	40.0%

Per Visitor Group Expenditures by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Overnight	
	Day Visitors	Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$15.25	\$37.55
Groceries	\$9.48	\$74.56
Gasoline and oil	\$8.41	\$26.46
Recreation use fees	\$12.08	\$18.92
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$5.93	\$7.36
Retail Shopping	\$1.39	\$8.50
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$33.09
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$2.53
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$79.34
Total	\$52.54	\$288.31

Total Spending by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Overnight		Total
	Day Visitors	Visitors	
Restaurants, snack bars	\$793,268	\$1,302,267	\$2,095,535
Groceries	\$493,047	\$2,585,528	\$3,078,574
Gasoline and oil	\$437,350	\$917,682	\$1,355,031
Recreation use fees	\$628,241	\$655,931	\$1,284,172
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$308,682	\$255,182	\$563,864
Retail Shopping	\$72,322	\$294,670	\$366,992
Other expense	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$1,147,473	\$1,147,473
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$87,794	\$87,794
Camping fees	\$0	\$2,751,421	\$2,751,421
Total	\$2,732,909	\$9,997,947	\$12,730,856

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	15.1	\$445,499	\$1,772,954	\$892,427
Groceries	2.6	\$89,963	\$282,607	\$169,010
Gasoline and oil	1.1	\$41,119	\$135,690	\$78,033
Recreation use fees	14.1	\$420,796	\$1,378,485	\$764,757
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	2.2	\$74,839	\$245,165	\$147,782
Retail Shopping	0.5	\$17,836	\$52,559	\$31,443
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	35.5	\$1,090,051	\$3,867,461	\$2,083,452

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	24.7	\$731,353	\$2,910,566	\$1,465,050
Groceries	13.5	\$471,762	\$1,481,986	\$886,284
Gasoline and oil	2.2	\$86,279	\$284,716	\$163,736
Recreation use fees	14.7	\$439,343	\$1,439,244	\$798,465
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	1.8	\$61,868	\$202,674	\$122,169
Retail Shopping	2.0	\$72,672	\$214,149	\$128,112
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	15.7	\$678,386	\$2,357,253	\$1,378,918
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	1.2	\$51,904	\$180,354	\$105,501
Camping fees	37.7	\$1,626,640	\$5,652,245	\$3,306,383
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	113.7	\$4,220,206	\$14,723,187	\$8,354,619

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	39.8	\$1,176,852	\$4,683,520	\$2,357,477
Groceries	16.1	\$561,725	\$1,764,593	\$1,055,294
Gasoline and oil	3.3	\$127,398	\$420,406	\$241,769
Recreation use fees	28.8	\$860,138	\$2,817,730	\$1,563,222
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	4.0	\$136,707	\$447,839	\$269,952
Retail Shopping	2.5	\$90,508	\$266,708	\$159,555
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	15.7	\$678,386	\$2,357,253	\$1,378,918
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	1.2	\$51,904	\$180,354	\$105,501
Camping fees	37.7	\$1,626,640	\$5,652,245	\$3,306,383
Total Visitor Impact	149.1	\$5,310,257	\$18,590,648	\$10,438,071

Harrison Bay

Marina

Spending & Impact Outside Local Area, but inside TN

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	86,694	
Day Visitor Groups	52,016	60.0%
Overnight Visitor Groups	34,677	40.0%

Per Visitor Group Expenditures by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$0.20	\$3.60
Groceries	\$1.49	\$30.16
Gasoline and oil	\$1.64	\$16.36
Recreation use fees	\$0.00	\$0.00
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$0.32	\$10.32
Retail Shopping	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$0.00
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$2.40
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$0.53
Total	\$3.65	\$63.37

Total Spending by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$10,599	\$124,790	\$135,389
Groceries	\$77,736	\$1,045,855	\$1,123,591
Gasoline and oil	\$85,114	\$567,340	\$652,454
Recreation use fees	\$0	\$0	\$0
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$16,658	\$357,897	\$374,555
Retail Shopping	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$83,352	\$83,352
Camping fees	\$0	\$18,249	\$18,249
Total	\$190,107	\$2,197,484	\$2,387,591

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	0.2	\$5,952	\$23,689	\$11,924
Groceries	0.4	\$14,184	\$44,557	\$26,647
Gasoline and oil	0.2	\$8,002	\$26,407	\$15,186
Recreation use fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.1	\$4,039	\$13,230	\$7,975
Retail Shopping	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	0.9	\$32,177	\$107,883	\$61,732

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	2.4	\$70,082	\$278,906	\$140,389
Groceries	5.5	\$190,830	\$599,469	\$358,505
Gasoline and oil	1.4	\$53,340	\$176,020	\$101,226
Recreation use fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	2.5	\$86,771	\$284,254	\$171,344
Retail Shopping	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	1.1	\$49,278	\$171,231	\$100,165
Camping fees	0.3	\$10,789	\$37,489	\$21,930
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	13.1	\$461,090	\$1,547,369	\$893,560

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	2.6	\$76,035	\$302,595	\$152,313
Groceries	5.9	\$205,014	\$644,026	\$385,152
Gasoline and oil	1.6	\$61,343	\$202,428	\$116,413
Recreation use fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	2.6	\$90,809	\$297,484	\$179,319
Retail Shopping	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	1.1	\$49,278	\$171,231	\$100,165
Camping fees	0.3	\$10,789	\$37,489	\$21,930
Total Visitor Impact	14.1	\$493,267	\$1,655,253	\$955,292

Henry Horton

Resort

Spending & Impact Within Local Area

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	122,836	
Day Visitor Groups	53,311	43.4%
Overnight Visitor Groups	69,525	56.6%

Per Visitor Group Expenditures by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Overnight	
	Day Visitors	Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$13.17	\$28.52
Groceries	\$8.96	\$56.81
Gasoline and oil	\$7.64	\$25.34
Recreation use fees	\$8.48	\$11.31
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$3.63	\$5.41
Retail Shopping	\$1.75	\$18.56
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$12.71
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$8.45
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$82.74
Total	\$43.63	\$249.86

Total Spending by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Overnight		Total
	Day Visitors	Visitors	
Restaurants, snack bars	\$702,286	\$1,983,140	\$2,685,426
Groceries	\$477,889	\$3,949,762	\$4,427,651
Gasoline and oil	\$407,184	\$1,761,934	\$2,169,118
Recreation use fees	\$451,956	\$786,093	\$1,238,050
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$193,666	\$375,969	\$569,635
Retail Shopping	\$93,202	\$1,290,439	\$1,383,641
Other expense	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$883,876	\$883,876
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$587,464	\$587,464
Camping fees	\$0	\$5,752,825	\$5,752,825
Total	\$2,326,183	\$17,371,504	\$19,697,687

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	13.3	\$394,404	\$1,569,609	\$790,072
Groceries	2.5	\$87,197	\$273,919	\$163,814
Gasoline and oil	1.0	\$38,283	\$126,331	\$72,651
Recreation use fees	10.1	\$302,720	\$991,682	\$550,166
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	1.4	\$46,954	\$153,816	\$92,718
Retail Shopping	0.6	\$22,985	\$67,733	\$40,521
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	29.0	\$892,543	\$3,183,091	\$1,709,942

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	37.6	\$1,113,732	\$4,432,319	\$2,231,033
Groceries	20.6	\$720,684	\$2,263,945	\$1,353,926
Gasoline and oil	4.3	\$165,654	\$546,650	\$314,370
Recreation use fees	17.7	\$526,525	\$1,724,846	\$956,912
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	2.6	\$91,152	\$298,607	\$179,996
Retail Shopping	8.9	\$318,248	\$937,813	\$561,038
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	12.1	\$522,548	\$1,815,747	\$1,062,154
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	8.1	\$347,309	\$1,206,828	\$705,956
Camping fees	78.9	\$3,401,070	\$11,818,027	\$6,913,169
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	190.8	\$7,206,922	\$25,044,783	\$14,278,553

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	51.0	\$1,508,135	\$6,001,928	\$3,021,105
Groceries	23.1	\$807,881	\$2,537,864	\$1,517,740
Gasoline and oil	5.3	\$203,937	\$672,982	\$387,021
Recreation use fees	27.8	\$829,246	\$2,716,529	\$1,507,078
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	4.0	\$138,106	\$452,423	\$272,714
Retail Shopping	9.5	\$341,233	\$1,005,546	\$601,558
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	12.1	\$522,548	\$1,815,747	\$1,062,154
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	8.1	\$347,309	\$1,206,828	\$705,956
Camping fees	78.9	\$3,401,070	\$11,818,027	\$6,913,169
Total Visitor Impact	219.7	\$8,099,465	\$28,227,874	\$15,988,495

Henry Horton

Resort

Spending & Impact Outside Local Area, but inside TN

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	122,836	
Day Visitor Groups	53,311	43.4%
Overnight Visitor Groups	69,525	56.6%

Per Visitor Group Expenditures by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$0.35	\$8.23
Groceries	\$0.89	\$39.64
Gasoline and oil	\$1.47	\$30.39
Recreation use fees	\$0.03	\$0.58
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$0.60	\$33.53
Retail Shopping	\$0.00	\$1.06
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$0.00
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$0.97
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$3.87
Total	\$3.34	\$118.27

Total Spending by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$18,829	\$571,903	\$590,731
Groceries	\$47,184	\$2,756,218	\$2,803,402
Gasoline and oil	\$78,567	\$2,112,858	\$2,191,425
Recreation use fees	\$1,522	\$40,483	\$42,005
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$31,964	\$2,331,444	\$2,363,408
Retail Shopping	\$0	\$74,007	\$74,007
Other expense	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$67,166	\$67,166
Camping fees	\$0	\$268,840	\$268,840
Total	\$178,065	\$8,222,919	\$8,400,985

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	0.4	\$10,574	\$42,082	\$21,182
Groceries	0.2	\$8,609	\$27,045	\$16,174
Gasoline and oil	0.2	\$7,387	\$24,376	\$14,018
Recreation use fees	0.0	\$1,019	\$3,340	\$1,853
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.2	\$7,749	\$25,387	\$15,303
Retail Shopping	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	1.1	\$35,339	\$122,229	\$68,530

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	10.9	\$321,181	\$1,278,202	\$643,390
Groceries	14.4	\$502,907	\$1,579,823	\$944,795
Gasoline and oil	5.2	\$198,647	\$655,527	\$376,983
Recreation use fees	0.9	\$27,115	\$88,827	\$49,279
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	16.4	\$565,250	\$1,851,709	\$1,116,185
Retail Shopping	0.5	\$18,252	\$53,784	\$32,176
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.9	\$39,709	\$137,980	\$80,714
Camping fees	3.7	\$158,938	\$552,278	\$323,065
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	52.8	\$1,831,998	\$6,198,129	\$3,566,587

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	11.2	\$331,755	\$1,320,284	\$664,573
Groceries	14.6	\$511,516	\$1,606,869	\$960,969
Gasoline and oil	5.4	\$206,034	\$679,902	\$391,001
Recreation use fees	0.9	\$28,135	\$92,167	\$51,132
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	16.6	\$572,999	\$1,877,095	\$1,131,488
Retail Shopping	0.5	\$18,252	\$53,784	\$32,176
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.9	\$39,709	\$137,980	\$80,714
Camping fees	3.7	\$158,938	\$552,278	\$323,065
Total Visitor Impact	53.9	\$1,867,338	\$6,320,358	\$3,635,117

Hiwassee/Ocoee Rivers

Cabins/Camping

Spending & Impact Within Local Area

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	625,751	
Day Visitor Groups	316,630	50.6%
Overnight Visitor Groups	309,121	49.4%

**Per Visitor Group Expenditures
by Visitors Within Local Area**

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$11.28	\$30.80
Groceries	\$11.54	\$63.42
Gasoline and oil	\$8.28	\$23.57
Recreation use fees	\$4.10	\$13.95
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$6.87	\$9.08
Retail Shopping	\$2.45	\$17.97
Other expense	\$0.54	\$0.17
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$10.88
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$5.39
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$79.16
Total	\$45.05	\$254.40

Total Spending by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$3,571,296	\$9,522,198	\$13,093,494
Groceries	\$3,654,925	\$19,604,650	\$23,259,576
Gasoline and oil	\$2,620,526	\$7,285,532	\$9,906,058
Recreation use fees	\$1,296,901	\$4,311,971	\$5,608,872
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$2,174,744	\$2,807,567	\$4,982,311
Retail Shopping	\$774,720	\$5,556,092	\$6,330,812
Other expense	\$170,531	\$51,229	\$221,761
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$3,364,724	\$3,364,724
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$1,665,879	\$1,665,879
Camping fees	\$0	\$24,469,049	\$24,469,049
Total	\$14,263,644	\$78,638,892	\$92,902,536

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	67.8	\$2,005,640	\$7,981,848	\$4,017,708
Groceries	19.1	\$666,888	\$2,094,949	\$1,252,860
Gasoline and oil	6.4	\$246,377	\$813,033	\$467,562
Recreation use fees	29.1	\$868,665	\$2,845,661	\$1,578,718
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	15.3	\$527,259	\$1,727,252	\$1,041,165
Retail Shopping	5.3	\$191,061	\$563,019	\$336,821
Other expense	1.3	\$44,961	\$132,492	\$79,262
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	144.3	\$4,550,850	\$16,158,254	\$8,774,096

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	180.7	\$5,347,666	\$21,282,112	\$10,712,472
Groceries	102.4	\$3,577,117	\$11,237,095	\$6,720,213
Gasoline and oil	17.8	\$684,973	\$2,260,379	\$1,299,906
Recreation use fees	96.8	\$2,888,158	\$9,461,326	\$5,248,962
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	19.8	\$680,684	\$2,229,861	\$1,344,131
Retail Shopping	38.2	\$1,370,242	\$4,037,830	\$2,415,593
Other expense	0.4	\$13,507	\$39,802	\$23,811
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	46.1	\$1,989,225	\$6,912,152	\$4,043,388
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	22.8	\$984,868	\$3,422,216	\$2,001,887
Camping fees	335.4	\$14,466,102	\$50,266,768	\$29,404,457
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	860.5	\$32,002,542	\$111,149,540	\$63,214,821

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	248.4	\$7,353,306	\$29,263,959	\$14,730,181
Groceries	121.5	\$4,244,005	\$13,332,044	\$7,973,073
Gasoline and oil	24.2	\$931,350	\$3,073,412	\$1,767,469
Recreation use fees	125.9	\$3,756,822	\$12,306,987	\$6,827,680
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	35.1	\$1,207,943	\$3,957,113	\$2,385,296
Retail Shopping	43.6	\$1,561,304	\$4,600,849	\$2,752,414
Other expense	1.6	\$58,468	\$172,293	\$103,073
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	46.1	\$1,989,225	\$6,912,152	\$4,043,388
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	22.8	\$984,868	\$3,422,216	\$2,001,887
Camping fees	335.4	\$14,466,102	\$50,266,768	\$29,404,457
Total Visitor Impact	1,004.7	\$36,553,392	\$127,307,794	\$71,988,917

Hiwassee/Ocoee Rivers

Cabins/Camping

Spending & Impact Outside Local Area, but inside TN

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	625,751	
Day Visitor Groups	316,630	50.6%
Overnight Visitor Groups	309,121	49.4%

Per Visitor Group Expenditures by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$0.80	\$9.20
Groceries	\$2.37	\$52.32
Gasoline and oil	\$2.42	\$24.55
Recreation use fees	\$0.02	\$1.21
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$0.54	\$11.83
Retail Shopping	\$0.00	\$1.79
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.13
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$0.08
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$1.89
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$1.67
Total	\$6.15	\$104.66

Total Spending by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$251,788	\$2,844,745	\$3,096,533
Groceries	\$749,885	\$16,174,744	\$16,924,629
Gasoline and oil	\$767,035	\$7,587,746	\$8,354,781
Recreation use fees	\$7,022	\$373,251	\$380,273
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$169,967	\$3,655,770	\$3,825,736
Retail Shopping	\$0	\$554,400	\$554,400
Other expense	\$0	\$38,826	\$38,826
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$24,996	\$24,996
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$584,113	\$584,113
Camping fees	\$0	\$514,729	\$514,729
Total	\$1,945,696	\$32,353,321	\$34,299,017

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	4.8	\$141,404	\$562,745	\$283,261
Groceries	3.9	\$136,826	\$429,823	\$257,051
Gasoline and oil	1.9	\$72,115	\$237,977	\$136,857
Recreation use fees	0.2	\$4,703	\$15,407	\$8,548
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	1.2	\$41,208	\$134,993	\$81,372
Retail Shopping	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	11.9	\$396,256	\$1,380,946	\$767,088

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	54.0	\$1,597,609	\$6,358,006	\$3,200,339
Groceries	84.5	\$2,951,287	\$9,271,124	\$5,544,487
Gasoline and oil	18.5	\$713,386	\$2,354,142	\$1,353,828
Recreation use fees	8.4	\$250,004	\$818,988	\$454,359
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	25.7	\$886,328	\$2,903,531	\$1,750,210
Retail Shopping	3.8	\$136,726	\$402,904	\$241,034
Other expense	0.3	\$10,237	\$30,165	\$18,046
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.3	\$14,778	\$51,350	\$30,038
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	8.0	\$345,328	\$1,199,944	\$701,929
Camping fees	7.1	\$304,308	\$1,057,408	\$618,550
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	210.6	\$7,209,990	\$24,447,561	\$13,912,819

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	58.8	\$1,739,013	\$6,920,751	\$3,483,600
Groceries	88.4	\$3,088,114	\$9,700,947	\$5,801,538
Gasoline and oil	20.4	\$785,501	\$2,592,119	\$1,490,685
Recreation use fees	8.5	\$254,707	\$834,395	\$462,906
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	26.9	\$927,536	\$3,038,524	\$1,831,582
Retail Shopping	3.8	\$136,726	\$402,904	\$241,034
Other expense	0.3	\$10,237	\$30,165	\$18,046
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.3	\$14,778	\$51,350	\$30,038
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	8.0	\$345,328	\$1,199,944	\$701,929
Camping fees	7.1	\$304,308	\$1,057,408	\$618,550
Total Visitor Impact	222.6	\$7,606,246	\$25,828,507	\$14,679,907

Indian Mountain

Cabins/Camping

Spending & Impact Within Local Area

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	83,725	
Day Visitor Groups	42,365	50.6%
Overnight Visitor Groups	41,360	49.4%

Per Visitor Group Expenditures by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$11.28	\$30.80
Groceries	\$11.54	\$63.42
Gasoline and oil	\$8.28	\$23.57
Recreation use fees	\$4.10	\$13.95
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$6.87	\$9.08
Retail Shopping	\$2.45	\$17.97
Other expense	\$0.54	\$0.17
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$10.88
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$5.39
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$79.16
Total	\$45.05	\$254.40

Total Spending by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$477,836	\$1,274,061	\$1,751,898
Groceries	\$489,026	\$2,623,084	\$3,112,110
Gasoline and oil	\$350,624	\$974,798	\$1,325,422
Recreation use fees	\$173,524	\$576,938	\$750,462
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$290,979	\$375,650	\$666,629
Retail Shopping	\$103,657	\$743,400	\$847,057
Other expense	\$22,817	\$6,854	\$29,671
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$450,197	\$450,197
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$222,893	\$222,893
Camping fees	\$0	\$3,273,937	\$3,273,937
Total	\$1,908,463	\$10,521,812	\$12,430,275

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	9.1	\$268,353	\$1,067,964	\$537,566
Groceries	2.6	\$89,229	\$280,302	\$167,631
Gasoline and oil	0.9	\$32,965	\$108,783	\$62,559
Recreation use fees	3.9	\$116,227	\$380,747	\$211,231
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	2.0	\$70,547	\$231,105	\$139,307
Retail Shopping	0.7	\$25,564	\$75,331	\$45,066
Other expense	0.2	\$6,016	\$17,727	\$10,605
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	19.3	\$608,900	\$2,161,960	\$1,173,966

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	24.2	\$715,513	\$2,847,527	\$1,433,319
Groceries	13.7	\$478,615	\$1,503,513	\$899,158
Gasoline and oil	2.4	\$91,649	\$302,437	\$173,926
Recreation use fees	13.0	\$386,433	\$1,265,917	\$702,306
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	2.6	\$91,075	\$298,353	\$179,843
Retail Shopping	5.1	\$183,337	\$540,258	\$323,204
Other expense	0.1	\$1,807	\$5,325	\$3,186
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	6.2	\$266,156	\$924,840	\$541,002
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	3.1	\$131,774	\$457,889	\$267,851
Camping fees	44.9	\$1,935,551	\$6,725,648	\$3,934,290
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	115.1	\$4,281,911	\$14,871,708	\$8,458,086

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	33.2	\$983,866	\$3,915,491	\$1,970,885
Groceries	16.3	\$567,844	\$1,783,815	\$1,066,790
Gasoline and oil	3.2	\$124,614	\$411,220	\$236,486
Recreation use fees	16.9	\$502,659	\$1,646,664	\$913,537
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	4.7	\$161,622	\$529,458	\$319,150
Retail Shopping	5.8	\$208,901	\$615,589	\$368,271
Other expense	0.2	\$7,823	\$23,053	\$13,791
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	6.2	\$266,156	\$924,840	\$541,002
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	3.1	\$131,774	\$457,889	\$267,851
Camping fees	44.9	\$1,935,551	\$6,725,648	\$3,934,290
Total Visitor Impact	134.4	\$4,890,811	\$17,033,667	\$9,632,052

Indian Mountain

Cabins/Camping

Spending & Impact Outside Local Area, but inside TN

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	83,725	
Day Visitor Groups	42,365	50.6%
Overnight Visitor Groups	41,360	49.4%

Per Visitor Group Expenditures by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$0.80	\$9.20
Groceries	\$2.37	\$52.32
Gasoline and oil	\$2.42	\$24.55
Recreation use fees	\$0.02	\$1.21
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$0.54	\$11.83
Retail Shopping	\$0.00	\$1.79
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.13
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$0.08
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$1.89
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$1.67
Total	\$6.15	\$104.66

Total Spending by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$33,689	\$380,624	\$414,313
Groceries	\$100,334	\$2,164,166	\$2,264,500
Gasoline and oil	\$102,629	\$1,015,234	\$1,117,862
Recreation use fees	\$940	\$49,941	\$50,880
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$22,741	\$489,139	\$511,880
Retail Shopping	\$0	\$74,178	\$74,178
Other expense	\$0	\$5,195	\$5,195
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$3,344	\$3,344
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$78,154	\$78,154
Camping fees	\$0	\$68,870	\$68,870
Total	\$260,332	\$4,328,845	\$4,589,177

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	0.6	\$18,920	\$75,295	\$37,900
Groceries	0.5	\$18,307	\$57,510	\$34,393
Gasoline and oil	0.3	\$9,649	\$31,841	\$18,311
Recreation use fees	0.0	\$629	\$2,061	\$1,144
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.2	\$5,514	\$18,062	\$10,887
Retail Shopping	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	1.6	\$53,019	\$184,769	\$102,636

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	7.2	\$213,759	\$850,695	\$428,202
Groceries	11.3	\$394,880	\$1,240,468	\$741,847
Gasoline and oil	2.5	\$95,450	\$314,982	\$181,141
Recreation use fees	1.1	\$33,450	\$109,580	\$60,793
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	3.4	\$118,590	\$388,490	\$234,177
Retail Shopping	0.5	\$18,294	\$53,908	\$32,250
Other expense	0.0	\$1,370	\$4,036	\$2,415
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$1,977	\$6,871	\$4,019
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	1.1	\$46,205	\$160,551	\$93,917
Camping fees	0.9	\$40,716	\$141,480	\$82,761
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	28.2	\$964,690	\$3,271,061	\$1,861,523

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	7.9	\$232,678	\$925,990	\$466,102
Groceries	11.8	\$413,187	\$1,297,978	\$776,240
Gasoline and oil	2.7	\$105,099	\$346,823	\$199,452
Recreation use fees	1.1	\$34,080	\$111,641	\$61,936
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	3.6	\$124,103	\$406,552	\$245,064
Retail Shopping	0.5	\$18,294	\$53,908	\$32,250
Other expense	0.0	\$1,370	\$4,036	\$2,415
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$1,977	\$6,871	\$4,019
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	1.1	\$46,205	\$160,551	\$93,917
Camping fees	0.9	\$40,716	\$141,480	\$82,761
Total Visitor Impact	29.8	\$1,017,709	\$3,455,831	\$1,964,158

Johnsonville

No Camping/Has Amenities
 Spending & Impact Within Local Area

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	9,085	
Day Visitor Groups	7,568	83.3%
Overnight Visitor Groups	1,517	16.7%

**Per Visitor Group Expenditures
 by Visitors Within Local Area**

Expenditure Category	Overnight	
	Day Visitors	Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$11.16	\$29.28
Groceries	\$7.27	\$20.61
Gasoline and oil	\$7.33	\$21.16
Recreation use fees	\$1.40	\$2.16
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$7.44	\$6.81
Retail Shopping	\$3.43	\$19.07
Other expense	\$0.10	\$0.23
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$2.93
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$31.05
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$18.66
Total	\$38.14	\$151.97

Total Spending by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Overnight		Total
	Day Visitors	Visitors	
Restaurants, snack bars	\$84,434	\$44,422	\$128,856
Groceries	\$55,052	\$31,274	\$86,326
Gasoline and oil	\$55,502	\$32,105	\$87,608
Recreation use fees	\$10,597	\$3,273	\$13,870
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$56,294	\$10,336	\$66,630
Retail Shopping	\$25,961	\$28,934	\$54,895
Other expense	\$772	\$345	\$1,117
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$4,452	\$4,452
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$47,115	\$47,115
Camping fees	\$0	\$28,305	\$28,305
Total	\$288,613	\$230,560	\$519,173

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	1.6	\$47,418	\$188,711	\$94,989
Groceries	0.3	\$10,045	\$31,555	\$18,871
Gasoline and oil	0.1	\$5,218	\$17,220	\$9,903
Recreation use fees	0.2	\$7,098	\$23,251	\$12,899
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.4	\$13,648	\$44,711	\$26,951
Retail Shopping	0.2	\$6,402	\$18,867	\$11,287
Other expense	0.0	\$204	\$600	\$359
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	2.8	\$90,033	\$324,914	\$175,259

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	0.8	\$24,947	\$99,283	\$49,975
Groceries	0.2	\$5,706	\$17,926	\$10,720
Gasoline and oil	0.1	\$3,018	\$9,961	\$5,728
Recreation use fees	0.1	\$2,192	\$7,182	\$3,984
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.1	\$2,506	\$8,209	\$4,948
Retail Shopping	0.2	\$7,136	\$21,027	\$12,579
Other expense	0.0	\$91	\$268	\$160
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.1	\$2,632	\$9,146	\$5,350
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.6	\$27,854	\$96,788	\$56,618
Camping fees	0.4	\$16,734	\$58,147	\$34,014
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	2.5	\$92,817	\$327,936	\$184,078

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	2.4	\$72,366	\$287,994	\$144,963
Groceries	0.5	\$15,751	\$49,481	\$29,591
Gasoline and oil	0.2	\$8,237	\$27,181	\$15,631
Recreation use fees	0.3	\$9,290	\$30,433	\$16,884
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.5	\$16,154	\$52,920	\$31,899
Retail Shopping	0.4	\$13,538	\$39,894	\$23,866
Other expense	0.0	\$294	\$868	\$519
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.1	\$2,632	\$9,146	\$5,350
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.6	\$27,854	\$96,788	\$56,618
Camping fees	0.4	\$16,734	\$58,147	\$34,014
Total Visitor Impact	5.4	\$182,851	\$652,850	\$359,336

Johnsonville

No Camping/Has Amenities

Spending & Impact Outside Local Area, but inside TN

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	9,085	
Day Visitor Groups	7,568	83.3%
Overnight Visitor Groups	1,517	16.7%

**Per Visitor Group Expenditures
by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN**

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$0.91	\$53.02
Groceries	\$1.19	\$44.66
Gasoline and oil	\$1.69	\$46.69
Recreation use fees	\$0.00	\$2.38
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$0.03	\$15.83
Retail Shopping	\$0.00	\$12.90
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$6.67
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$55.40
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$2.04
Total	\$3.82	\$239.60

Total Spending by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$6,901	\$80,436	\$87,336
Groceries	\$9,010	\$67,762	\$76,772
Gasoline and oil	\$12,775	\$70,833	\$83,608
Recreation use fees	\$0	\$3,618	\$3,618
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$223	\$24,021	\$24,244
Retail Shopping	\$0	\$19,572	\$19,572
Other expense	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$10,126	\$10,126
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$84,052	\$84,052
Camping fees	\$0	\$3,094	\$3,094
Total	\$28,910	\$363,512	\$392,422

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	0.1	\$3,876	\$15,424	\$7,764
Groceries	0.0	\$1,644	\$5,165	\$3,089
Gasoline and oil	0.0	\$1,201	\$3,964	\$2,279
Recreation use fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.0	\$54	\$177	\$107
Retail Shopping	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	0.2	\$6,775	\$24,729	\$13,239

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	1.5	\$45,173	\$179,773	\$90,490
Groceries	0.4	\$12,364	\$38,840	\$23,228
Gasoline and oil	0.2	\$6,660	\$21,976	\$12,638
Recreation use fees	0.1	\$2,423	\$7,938	\$4,404
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.2	\$5,824	\$19,078	\$11,500
Retail Shopping	0.1	\$4,827	\$14,224	\$8,509
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.1	\$5,987	\$20,803	\$12,169
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	1.2	\$49,691	\$172,667	\$101,005
Camping fees	0.0	\$1,829	\$6,355	\$3,717
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	3.8	\$134,777	\$481,654	\$267,660

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	1.7	\$49,048	\$195,197	\$98,254
Groceries	0.4	\$14,008	\$44,005	\$26,316
Gasoline and oil	0.2	\$7,861	\$25,940	\$14,918
Recreation use fees	0.1	\$2,423	\$7,938	\$4,404
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.2	\$5,878	\$19,256	\$11,607
Retail Shopping	0.1	\$4,827	\$14,224	\$8,509
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.1	\$5,987	\$20,803	\$12,169
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	1.2	\$49,691	\$172,667	\$101,005
Camping fees	0.0	\$1,829	\$6,355	\$3,717
Total Visitor Impact	4.0	\$141,552	\$506,384	\$280,899

Long Hunter

No Camping/Has Amenities
Spending & Impact Within Local Area

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	346,199	
Day Visitor Groups	288,384	83.3%
Overnight Visitor Groups	57,815	16.7%

Per Visitor Group Expenditures by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$11.16	\$29.28
Groceries	\$7.27	\$20.61
Gasoline and oil	\$7.33	\$21.16
Recreation use fees	\$1.40	\$2.16
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$7.44	\$6.81
Retail Shopping	\$3.43	\$19.07
Other expense	\$0.10	\$0.23
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$2.93
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$31.05
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$18.66
Total	\$38.14	\$151.97

Total Spending by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$3,217,536	\$1,692,784	\$4,910,320
Groceries	\$2,097,856	\$1,191,755	\$3,289,610
Gasoline and oil	\$2,115,030	\$1,223,433	\$3,338,463
Recreation use fees	\$403,804	\$124,726	\$528,530
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$2,145,204	\$393,873	\$2,539,077
Retail Shopping	\$989,286	\$1,102,585	\$2,091,871
Other expense	\$29,435	\$13,129	\$42,564
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$169,658	\$169,658
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$1,795,403	\$1,795,403
Camping fees	\$0	\$1,078,615	\$1,078,615
Total	\$10,998,151	\$8,785,961	\$19,784,112

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	61.1	\$1,806,968	\$7,191,193	\$3,619,728
Groceries	11.0	\$382,780	\$1,202,460	\$719,117
Gasoline and oil	5.2	\$198,851	\$656,200	\$377,370
Recreation use fees	9.1	\$270,468	\$886,027	\$491,551
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	15.1	\$520,097	\$1,703,790	\$1,027,022
Retail Shopping	6.8	\$243,978	\$718,953	\$430,107
Other expense	0.2	\$7,761	\$22,869	\$13,681
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	108.4	\$3,430,903	\$12,381,493	\$6,678,576

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	32.1	\$950,667	\$3,783,372	\$1,904,382
Groceries	6.2	\$217,451	\$683,096	\$408,518
Gasoline and oil	3.0	\$115,025	\$379,577	\$218,289
Recreation use fees	2.8	\$83,542	\$273,675	\$151,829
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	2.8	\$95,493	\$312,826	\$188,568
Retail Shopping	7.6	\$271,919	\$801,291	\$479,365
Other expense	0.1	\$3,462	\$10,200	\$6,102
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	2.3	\$100,302	\$348,528	\$203,878
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	24.6	\$1,061,442	\$3,688,297	\$2,157,536
Camping fees	14.8	\$637,677	\$2,215,799	\$1,296,172
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	96.3	\$3,536,980	\$12,496,663	\$7,014,638

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	93.2	\$2,757,636	\$10,974,565	\$5,524,110
Groceries	17.2	\$600,231	\$1,885,556	\$1,127,635
Gasoline and oil	8.2	\$313,876	\$1,035,778	\$595,659
Recreation use fees	11.9	\$354,010	\$1,159,702	\$643,380
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	17.9	\$615,590	\$2,016,617	\$1,215,590
Retail Shopping	14.4	\$515,897	\$1,520,245	\$909,472
Other expense	0.3	\$11,222	\$33,069	\$19,783
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	2.3	\$100,302	\$348,528	\$203,878
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	24.6	\$1,061,442	\$3,688,297	\$2,157,536
Camping fees	14.8	\$637,677	\$2,215,799	\$1,296,172
Total Visitor Impact	204.7	\$6,967,883	\$24,878,155	\$13,693,215

Long Hunter

No Camping/Has Amenities

Spending & Impact Outside Local Area, but inside TN

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	346,199	
Day Visitor Groups	288,384	83.3%
Overnight Visitor Groups	57,815	16.7%

Per Visitor Group Expenditures by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$0.91	\$53.02
Groceries	\$1.19	\$44.66
Gasoline and oil	\$1.69	\$46.69
Recreation use fees	\$0.00	\$2.38
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$0.03	\$15.83
Retail Shopping	\$0.00	\$12.90
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$6.67
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$55.40
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$2.04
Total	\$3.82	\$239.60

Total Spending by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$262,973	\$3,065,155	\$3,328,128
Groceries	\$343,352	\$2,582,198	\$2,925,550
Gasoline and oil	\$486,835	\$2,699,226	\$3,186,060
Recreation use fees	\$0	\$137,855	\$137,855
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$8,514	\$915,365	\$923,879
Retail Shopping	\$0	\$745,830	\$745,830
Other expense	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$385,889	\$385,889
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$3,202,951	\$3,202,951
Camping fees	\$0	\$117,884	\$117,884
Total	\$1,101,674	\$13,852,354	\$14,954,028

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	5.0	\$147,686	\$587,745	\$295,845
Groceries	1.8	\$62,649	\$196,804	\$117,696
Gasoline and oil	1.2	\$45,771	\$151,043	\$86,862
Recreation use fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.1	\$2,064	\$6,762	\$4,076
Retail Shopping	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	8.0	\$258,170	\$942,354	\$504,480

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	58.2	\$1,721,391	\$6,850,621	\$3,448,299
Groceries	13.5	\$471,155	\$1,480,078	\$885,143
Gasoline and oil	6.6	\$253,776	\$837,450	\$481,604
Recreation use fees	3.1	\$92,336	\$302,482	\$167,811
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	6.4	\$221,927	\$727,013	\$438,234
Retail Shopping	5.1	\$183,936	\$542,024	\$324,261
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	5.3	\$228,137	\$792,731	\$463,723
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	43.9	\$1,893,585	\$6,579,822	\$3,848,986
Camping fees	1.6	\$69,693	\$242,170	\$141,662
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	143.7	\$5,135,937	\$18,354,392	\$10,199,723

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	63.2	\$1,869,077	\$7,438,366	\$3,744,144
Groceries	15.3	\$533,804	\$1,676,882	\$1,002,840
Gasoline and oil	7.8	\$299,548	\$988,494	\$568,466
Recreation use fees	3.1	\$92,336	\$302,482	\$167,811
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	6.5	\$223,991	\$733,775	\$442,310
Retail Shopping	5.1	\$183,936	\$542,024	\$324,261
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	5.3	\$228,137	\$792,731	\$463,723
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	43.9	\$1,893,585	\$6,579,822	\$3,848,986
Camping fees	1.6	\$69,693	\$242,170	\$141,662
Total Visitor Impact	151.8	\$5,394,107	\$19,296,747	\$10,704,203

Meeman-Shelby Forest

Cabins/Camping

Spending & Impact Within Local Area

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	178,956	
Day Visitor Groups	90,552	50.6%
Overnight Visitor Groups	88,404	49.4%

**Per Visitor Group Expenditures
by Visitors Within Local Area**

Expenditure Category	Overnight	
	Day Visitors	Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$11.28	\$30.80
Groceries	\$11.54	\$63.42
Gasoline and oil	\$8.28	\$23.57
Recreation use fees	\$4.10	\$13.95
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$6.87	\$9.08
Retail Shopping	\$2.45	\$17.97
Other expense	\$0.54	\$0.17
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$10.88
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$5.39
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$79.16
Total	\$45.05	\$254.40

Total Spending by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Overnight		Total
	Day Visitors	Visitors	
Restaurants, snack bars	\$1,021,341	\$2,723,215	\$3,744,555
Groceries	\$1,045,257	\$5,606,654	\$6,651,911
Gasoline and oil	\$749,434	\$2,083,560	\$2,832,993
Recreation use fees	\$370,896	\$1,233,163	\$1,604,059
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$621,946	\$802,925	\$1,424,871
Retail Shopping	\$221,559	\$1,588,964	\$1,810,523
Other expense	\$48,770	\$14,651	\$63,420
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$962,264	\$962,264
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$476,418	\$476,418
Camping fees	\$0	\$6,997,804	\$6,997,804
Total	\$4,079,201	\$22,489,617	\$26,568,818

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	19.4	\$573,585	\$2,282,696	\$1,149,008
Groceries	5.5	\$190,720	\$599,126	\$358,300
Gasoline and oil	1.8	\$70,460	\$232,516	\$133,716
Recreation use fees	8.3	\$248,426	\$813,819	\$451,491
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	4.4	\$150,789	\$493,970	\$297,758
Retail Shopping	1.5	\$54,641	\$161,016	\$96,326
Other expense	0.4	\$12,858	\$37,891	\$22,668
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	41.3	\$1,301,479	\$4,621,033	\$2,509,268

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	51.7	\$1,529,357	\$6,086,385	\$3,063,616
Groceries	29.3	\$1,023,005	\$3,213,651	\$1,921,886
Gasoline and oil	5.1	\$195,893	\$646,436	\$371,755
Recreation use fees	27.7	\$825,973	\$2,705,806	\$1,501,129
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	5.6	\$194,666	\$637,709	\$384,402
Retail Shopping	10.9	\$391,870	\$1,154,763	\$690,826
Other expense	0.1	\$3,863	\$11,383	\$6,810
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	13.2	\$568,890	\$1,976,778	\$1,156,352
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	6.5	\$281,658	\$978,706	\$572,512
Camping fees	95.9	\$4,137,102	\$14,375,588	\$8,409,261
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	246.1	\$9,152,277	\$31,787,205	\$18,078,550

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	71.1	\$2,102,942	\$8,369,081	\$4,212,625
Groceries	34.8	\$1,213,726	\$3,812,777	\$2,280,187
Gasoline and oil	6.9	\$266,353	\$878,953	\$505,471
Recreation use fees	36.0	\$1,074,398	\$3,519,625	\$1,952,620
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	10.0	\$345,455	\$1,131,679	\$682,161
Retail Shopping	12.5	\$446,511	\$1,315,778	\$787,152
Other expense	0.5	\$16,721	\$49,273	\$29,477
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	13.2	\$568,890	\$1,976,778	\$1,156,352
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	6.5	\$281,658	\$978,706	\$572,512
Camping fees	95.9	\$4,137,102	\$14,375,588	\$8,409,261
Total Visitor Impact	287.3	\$10,453,756	\$36,408,238	\$20,587,818

Meeman-Shelby Forest

Cabins/Camping

Spending & Impact Outside Local Area, but inside TN

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	178,956	
Day Visitor Groups	90,552	50.6%
Overnight Visitor Groups	88,404	49.4%

Per Visitor Group Expenditures by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$0.80	\$9.20
Groceries	\$2.37	\$52.32
Gasoline and oil	\$2.42	\$24.55
Recreation use fees	\$0.02	\$1.21
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$0.54	\$11.83
Retail Shopping	\$0.00	\$1.79
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.13
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$0.08
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$1.89
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$1.67
Total	\$6.15	\$104.66

Total Spending by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$72,008	\$813,557	\$885,565
Groceries	\$214,457	\$4,625,749	\$4,840,206
Gasoline and oil	\$219,361	\$2,169,989	\$2,389,350
Recreation use fees	\$2,008	\$106,745	\$108,753
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$48,608	\$1,045,499	\$1,094,107
Retail Shopping	\$0	\$158,551	\$158,551
Other expense	\$0	\$11,104	\$11,104
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$7,149	\$7,149
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$167,048	\$167,048
Camping fees	\$0	\$147,205	\$147,205
Total	\$556,442	\$9,252,595	\$9,809,036

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	1.4	\$40,440	\$160,937	\$81,009
Groceries	1.1	\$39,130	\$122,923	\$73,513
Gasoline and oil	0.5	\$20,624	\$68,058	\$39,139
Recreation use fees	0.0	\$1,345	\$4,406	\$2,445
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.3	\$11,785	\$38,606	\$23,271
Retail Shopping	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	3.4	\$113,324	\$394,931	\$219,376

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	15.4	\$456,894	\$1,818,300	\$915,252
Groceries	24.2	\$844,027	\$2,651,411	\$1,585,645
Gasoline and oil	5.3	\$204,018	\$673,252	\$387,176
Recreation use fees	2.4	\$71,498	\$234,219	\$129,940
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	7.4	\$253,477	\$830,369	\$500,535
Retail Shopping	1.1	\$39,102	\$115,225	\$68,932
Other expense	0.1	\$2,928	\$8,627	\$5,161
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.1	\$4,226	\$14,685	\$8,590
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	2.3	\$98,759	\$343,167	\$200,742
Camping fees	2.0	\$87,028	\$302,404	\$176,897
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	60.2	\$2,061,956	\$6,991,658	\$3,978,870

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	16.8	\$497,333	\$1,979,238	\$996,260
Groceries	25.3	\$883,157	\$2,774,334	\$1,659,158
Gasoline and oil	5.8	\$224,642	\$741,310	\$426,315
Recreation use fees	2.4	\$72,843	\$238,625	\$132,385
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	7.7	\$265,262	\$868,975	\$523,807
Retail Shopping	1.1	\$39,102	\$115,225	\$68,932
Other expense	0.1	\$2,928	\$8,627	\$5,161
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.1	\$4,226	\$14,685	\$8,590
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	2.3	\$98,759	\$343,167	\$200,742
Camping fees	2.0	\$87,028	\$302,404	\$176,897
Total Visitor Impact	63.7	\$2,175,279	\$7,386,590	\$4,198,247

Montgomery Bell

Resort

Spending & Impact Within Local Area

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	192,366	
Day Visitor Groups	83,487	43.4%
Overnight Visitor Groups	108,879	56.6%

Per Visitor Group Expenditures by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Overnight	
	Day Visitors	Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$13.17	\$28.52
Groceries	\$8.96	\$56.81
Gasoline and oil	\$7.64	\$25.34
Recreation use fees	\$8.48	\$11.31
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$3.63	\$5.41
Retail Shopping	\$1.75	\$18.56
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$12.71
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$8.45
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$82.74
Total	\$43.63	\$249.86

Total Spending by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Overnight		
	Day Visitors	Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$1,099,813	\$3,105,693	\$4,205,506
Groceries	\$748,397	\$6,185,517	\$6,933,915
Gasoline and oil	\$637,670	\$2,759,273	\$3,396,943
Recreation use fees	\$707,785	\$1,231,060	\$1,938,845
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$303,290	\$588,786	\$892,076
Retail Shopping	\$145,958	\$2,020,890	\$2,166,848
Other expense	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$1,384,193	\$1,384,193
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$919,997	\$919,997
Camping fees	\$0	\$9,009,199	\$9,009,199
Total	\$3,642,915	\$27,204,608	\$30,847,523

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	20.9	\$617,655	\$2,458,083	\$1,237,290
Groceries	3.9	\$136,555	\$428,970	\$256,541
Gasoline and oil	1.6	\$59,953	\$197,841	\$113,775
Recreation use fees	15.9	\$474,075	\$1,553,022	\$861,587
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	2.1	\$73,532	\$240,883	\$145,201
Retail Shopping	1.0	\$35,996	\$106,074	\$63,458
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	45.4	\$1,397,765	\$4,984,873	\$2,677,851

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	58.9	\$1,744,157	\$6,941,224	\$3,493,905
Groceries	32.3	\$1,128,626	\$3,545,447	\$2,120,313
Gasoline and oil	6.7	\$259,422	\$856,080	\$492,318
Recreation use fees	27.6	\$824,564	\$2,701,192	\$1,498,570
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	4.1	\$142,749	\$467,633	\$281,883
Retail Shopping	13.9	\$498,391	\$1,468,660	\$878,612
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	19.0	\$818,335	\$2,843,548	\$1,663,385
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	12.6	\$543,902	\$1,889,950	\$1,105,561
Camping fees	123.5	\$5,326,239	\$18,507,598	\$10,826,355
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	298.8	\$11,286,386	\$39,221,332	\$22,360,900

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	79.8	\$2,361,812	\$9,399,307	\$4,731,195
Groceries	36.2	\$1,265,181	\$3,974,417	\$2,376,854
Gasoline and oil	8.3	\$319,374	\$1,053,921	\$606,093
Recreation use fees	43.5	\$1,298,639	\$4,254,215	\$2,360,156
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	6.3	\$216,281	\$708,516	\$427,084
Retail Shopping	14.9	\$534,388	\$1,574,734	\$942,069
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	19.0	\$818,335	\$2,843,548	\$1,663,385
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	12.6	\$543,902	\$1,889,950	\$1,105,561
Camping fees	123.5	\$5,326,239	\$18,507,598	\$10,826,355
Total Visitor Impact	344.1	\$12,684,150	\$44,206,205	\$25,038,751

Montgomery Bell

Resort

Spending & Impact Outside Local Area, but inside TN

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	192,366	
Day Visitor Groups	83,487	43.4%
Overnight Visitor Groups	108,879	56.6%

Per Visitor Group Expenditures by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$0.35	\$8.23
Groceries	\$0.89	\$39.64
Gasoline and oil	\$1.47	\$30.39
Recreation use fees	\$0.03	\$0.58
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$0.60	\$33.53
Retail Shopping	\$0.00	\$1.06
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$0.00
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$0.97
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$3.87
Total	\$3.34	\$118.27

Total Spending by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$29,487	\$895,627	\$925,113
Groceries	\$73,893	\$4,316,369	\$4,390,262
Gasoline and oil	\$123,039	\$3,308,838	\$3,431,877
Recreation use fees	\$2,384	\$63,398	\$65,781
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$50,057	\$3,651,153	\$3,701,210
Retail Shopping	\$0	\$115,899	\$115,899
Other expense	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$105,186	\$105,186
Camping fees	\$0	\$421,016	\$421,016
Total	\$278,859	\$12,877,486	\$13,156,345

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	0.6	\$16,560	\$65,902	\$33,172
Groceries	0.4	\$13,483	\$42,354	\$25,330
Gasoline and oil	0.3	\$11,568	\$38,174	\$21,953
Recreation use fees	0.1	\$1,597	\$5,230	\$2,902
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.4	\$12,136	\$39,757	\$23,965
Retail Shopping	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	1.7	\$55,343	\$191,417	\$107,321

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	17.0	\$502,984	\$2,001,726	\$1,007,580
Groceries	22.6	\$787,576	\$2,474,079	\$1,479,594
Gasoline and oil	8.1	\$311,091	\$1,026,586	\$590,373
Recreation use fees	1.4	\$42,464	\$139,107	\$77,174
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	25.7	\$885,209	\$2,899,864	\$1,748,000
Retail Shopping	0.8	\$28,583	\$84,228	\$50,389
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	1.4	\$62,186	\$216,083	\$126,401
Camping fees	5.8	\$248,905	\$864,894	\$505,935
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	82.8	\$2,868,997	\$9,706,568	\$5,585,446

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	17.6	\$519,544	\$2,067,629	\$1,040,753
Groceries	22.9	\$801,059	\$2,516,433	\$1,504,924
Gasoline and oil	8.4	\$322,659	\$1,064,760	\$612,326
Recreation use fees	1.5	\$44,060	\$144,337	\$80,076
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	26.0	\$897,345	\$2,939,621	\$1,771,965
Retail Shopping	0.8	\$28,583	\$84,228	\$50,389
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	1.4	\$62,186	\$216,083	\$126,401
Camping fees	5.8	\$248,905	\$864,894	\$505,935
Total Visitor Impact	84.4	\$2,924,340	\$9,897,985	\$5,692,768

Mousetail Landing

Cabins/Camping

Spending & Impact Within Local Area

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	36,562	
Day Visitor Groups	18,500	50.6%
Overnight Visitor Groups	18,062	49.4%

Per Visitor Group Expenditures by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$11.28	\$30.80
Groceries	\$11.54	\$63.42
Gasoline and oil	\$8.28	\$23.57
Recreation use fees	\$4.10	\$13.95
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$6.87	\$9.08
Retail Shopping	\$2.45	\$17.97
Other expense	\$0.54	\$0.17
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$10.88
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$5.39
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$79.16
Total	\$45.05	\$254.40

Total Spending by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$208,667	\$556,372	\$765,039
Groceries	\$213,553	\$1,145,479	\$1,359,033
Gasoline and oil	\$153,115	\$425,686	\$578,801
Recreation use fees	\$75,777	\$251,944	\$327,721
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$127,068	\$164,043	\$291,111
Retail Shopping	\$45,266	\$324,637	\$369,903
Other expense	\$9,964	\$2,993	\$12,957
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$196,597	\$196,597
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$97,336	\$97,336
Camping fees	\$0	\$1,429,701	\$1,429,701
Total	\$833,410	\$4,594,788	\$5,428,198

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	4.0	\$117,187	\$466,371	\$234,751
Groceries	1.1	\$38,966	\$122,406	\$73,203
Gasoline and oil	0.4	\$14,396	\$47,505	\$27,319
Recreation use fees	1.7	\$50,755	\$166,269	\$92,243
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.9	\$30,807	\$100,922	\$60,834
Retail Shopping	0.3	\$11,164	\$32,897	\$19,680
Other expense	0.1	\$2,627	\$7,741	\$4,631
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	8.4	\$265,901	\$944,110	\$512,661

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	10.6	\$312,459	\$1,243,492	\$625,919
Groceries	6.0	\$209,007	\$656,572	\$392,655
Gasoline and oil	1.0	\$40,022	\$132,072	\$75,952
Recreation use fees	5.7	\$168,752	\$552,815	\$306,691
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	1.2	\$39,772	\$130,288	\$78,536
Retail Shopping	2.2	\$80,062	\$235,926	\$141,141
Other expense	0.0	\$789	\$2,326	\$1,391
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	2.7	\$116,228	\$403,870	\$236,251
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	1.3	\$57,545	\$199,956	\$116,968
Camping fees	19.6	\$845,239	\$2,937,035	\$1,718,072
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	50.3	\$1,869,875	\$6,494,352	\$3,693,576

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	14.5	\$429,646	\$1,709,863	\$860,669
Groceries	7.1	\$247,973	\$778,977	\$465,858
Gasoline and oil	1.4	\$54,418	\$179,576	\$103,271
Recreation use fees	7.4	\$219,507	\$719,084	\$398,934
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	2.0	\$70,579	\$231,210	\$139,370
Retail Shopping	2.5	\$91,225	\$268,823	\$160,821
Other expense	0.1	\$3,416	\$10,067	\$6,022
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	2.7	\$116,228	\$403,870	\$236,251
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	1.3	\$57,545	\$199,956	\$116,968
Camping fees	19.6	\$845,239	\$2,937,035	\$1,718,072
Total Visitor Impact	58.7	\$2,135,777	\$7,438,462	\$4,206,237

Mousetail Landing

Cabins/Camping

Spending & Impact Outside Local Area, but inside TN

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	36,562	
Day Visitor Groups	18,500	50.6%
Overnight Visitor Groups	18,062	49.4%

Per Visitor Group Expenditures by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$0.80	\$9.20
Groceries	\$2.37	\$52.32
Gasoline and oil	\$2.42	\$24.55
Recreation use fees	\$0.02	\$1.21
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$0.54	\$11.83
Retail Shopping	\$0.00	\$1.79
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.13
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$0.08
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$1.89
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$1.67
Total	\$6.15	\$104.66

Total Spending by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$14,712	\$166,216	\$180,927
Groceries	\$43,815	\$945,073	\$988,888
Gasoline and oil	\$44,817	\$443,344	\$488,161
Recreation use fees	\$410	\$21,809	\$22,219
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$9,931	\$213,603	\$223,534
Retail Shopping	\$0	\$32,393	\$32,393
Other expense	\$0	\$2,269	\$2,269
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$1,460	\$1,460
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$34,129	\$34,129
Camping fees	\$0	\$30,075	\$30,075
Total	\$113,685	\$1,890,371	\$2,004,056

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	0.3	\$8,262	\$32,881	\$16,551
Groceries	0.2	\$7,995	\$25,114	\$15,019
Gasoline and oil	0.1	\$4,214	\$13,905	\$7,996
Recreation use fees	0.0	\$275	\$900	\$499
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.1	\$2,408	\$7,887	\$4,754
Retail Shopping	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	0.7	\$23,153	\$80,687	\$44,820

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	3.2	\$93,347	\$371,492	\$186,992
Groceries	4.9	\$172,441	\$541,702	\$323,959
Gasoline and oil	1.1	\$41,682	\$137,550	\$79,103
Recreation use fees	0.5	\$14,607	\$47,853	\$26,548
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	1.5	\$51,787	\$169,650	\$102,263
Retail Shopping	0.2	\$7,989	\$23,541	\$14,083
Other expense	0.0	\$598	\$1,763	\$1,054
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$863	\$3,000	\$1,755
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.5	\$20,177	\$70,111	\$41,013
Camping fees	0.4	\$17,780	\$61,783	\$36,141
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	12.3	\$421,272	\$1,428,446	\$812,912

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	3.4	\$101,609	\$404,372	\$203,543
Groceries	5.2	\$180,435	\$566,816	\$338,978
Gasoline and oil	1.2	\$45,896	\$151,455	\$87,099
Recreation use fees	0.5	\$14,882	\$48,753	\$27,047
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	1.6	\$54,195	\$177,538	\$107,017
Retail Shopping	0.2	\$7,989	\$23,541	\$14,083
Other expense	0.0	\$598	\$1,763	\$1,054
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$863	\$3,000	\$1,755
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.5	\$20,177	\$70,111	\$41,013
Camping fees	0.4	\$17,780	\$61,783	\$36,141
Total Visitor Impact	13.0	\$444,425	\$1,509,133	\$857,732

Natchez Trace

Resort

Spending & Impact Within Local Area

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	122,600	
Day Visitor Groups	53,209	43.4%
Overnight Visitor Groups	69,392	56.6%

Per Visitor Group Expenditures by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Overnight	
	Day Visitors	Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$13.17	\$28.52
Groceries	\$8.96	\$56.81
Gasoline and oil	\$7.64	\$25.34
Recreation use fees	\$8.48	\$11.31
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$3.63	\$5.41
Retail Shopping	\$1.75	\$18.56
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$12.71
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$8.45
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$82.74
Total	\$43.63	\$249.86

Total Spending by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Overnight		Total
	Day Visitors	Visitors	
Restaurants, snack bars	\$700,941	\$1,979,343	\$2,680,284
Groceries	\$476,974	\$3,942,199	\$4,419,173
Gasoline and oil	\$406,405	\$1,758,560	\$2,164,965
Recreation use fees	\$451,091	\$784,588	\$1,235,679
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$193,295	\$375,249	\$568,544
Retail Shopping	\$93,023	\$1,287,968	\$1,380,991
Other expense	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$882,184	\$882,184
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$586,339	\$586,339
Camping fees	\$0	\$5,741,808	\$5,741,808
Total	\$2,321,729	\$17,338,239	\$19,659,968

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	13.3	\$393,648	\$1,566,603	\$788,559
Groceries	2.5	\$87,030	\$273,394	\$163,500
Gasoline and oil	1.0	\$38,209	\$126,089	\$72,512
Recreation use fees	10.1	\$302,141	\$989,784	\$549,113
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	1.4	\$46,864	\$153,521	\$92,541
Retail Shopping	0.6	\$22,941	\$67,604	\$40,443
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	28.9	\$890,834	\$3,176,995	\$1,706,668

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	37.6	\$1,111,599	\$4,423,832	\$2,226,761
Groceries	20.6	\$719,304	\$2,259,610	\$1,351,333
Gasoline and oil	4.3	\$165,337	\$545,603	\$313,768
Recreation use fees	17.6	\$525,517	\$1,721,543	\$955,079
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	2.6	\$90,978	\$298,035	\$179,652
Retail Shopping	8.9	\$317,638	\$936,017	\$559,963
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	12.1	\$521,547	\$1,812,270	\$1,060,120
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	8.0	\$346,644	\$1,204,517	\$704,604
Camping fees	78.7	\$3,394,557	\$11,795,397	\$6,899,931
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	190.4	\$7,193,121	\$24,996,825	\$14,251,211

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	50.9	\$1,505,247	\$5,990,435	\$3,015,319
Groceries	23.1	\$806,334	\$2,533,004	\$1,514,834
Gasoline and oil	5.3	\$203,546	\$671,693	\$386,279
Recreation use fees	27.7	\$827,658	\$2,711,327	\$1,504,192
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	4.0	\$137,841	\$451,556	\$272,192
Retail Shopping	9.5	\$340,580	\$1,003,621	\$600,406
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	12.1	\$521,547	\$1,812,270	\$1,060,120
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	8.0	\$346,644	\$1,204,517	\$704,604
Camping fees	78.7	\$3,394,557	\$11,795,397	\$6,899,931
Total Visitor Impact	219.3	\$8,083,955	\$28,173,820	\$15,957,879

Natchez Trace

Resort

Spending & Impact Outside Local Area, but inside TN

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	122,600	
Day Visitor Groups	53,209	43.4%
Overnight Visitor Groups	69,392	56.6%

Per Visitor Group Expenditures by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$0.35	\$8.23
Groceries	\$0.89	\$39.64
Gasoline and oil	\$1.47	\$30.39
Recreation use fees	\$0.03	\$0.58
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$0.60	\$33.53
Retail Shopping	\$0.00	\$1.06
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$0.00
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$0.97
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$3.87
Total	\$3.34	\$118.27

Total Spending by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$18,793	\$570,807	\$589,600
Groceries	\$47,094	\$2,750,940	\$2,798,034
Gasoline and oil	\$78,416	\$2,108,813	\$2,187,229
Recreation use fees	\$1,519	\$40,405	\$41,924
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$31,902	\$2,326,980	\$2,358,882
Retail Shopping	\$0	\$73,866	\$73,866
Other expense	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$67,038	\$67,038
Camping fees	\$0	\$268,325	\$268,325
Total	\$177,724	\$8,207,173	\$8,384,898

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	0.4	\$10,554	\$42,001	\$21,142
Groceries	0.2	\$8,593	\$26,994	\$16,143
Gasoline and oil	0.2	\$7,373	\$24,329	\$13,991
Recreation use fees	0.0	\$1,018	\$3,333	\$1,849
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.2	\$7,735	\$25,338	\$15,273
Retail Shopping	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	1.1	\$35,272	\$121,995	\$68,399

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	10.8	\$320,565	\$1,275,755	\$642,158
Groceries	14.4	\$501,944	\$1,576,798	\$942,986
Gasoline and oil	5.2	\$198,267	\$654,271	\$376,261
Recreation use fees	0.9	\$27,063	\$88,657	\$49,185
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	16.4	\$564,168	\$1,848,163	\$1,114,048
Retail Shopping	0.5	\$18,217	\$53,681	\$32,114
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.9	\$39,633	\$137,715	\$80,559
Camping fees	3.7	\$158,634	\$551,220	\$322,446
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	52.7	\$1,828,490	\$6,186,260	\$3,559,757

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	11.2	\$331,119	\$1,317,756	\$663,300
Groceries	14.6	\$510,537	\$1,603,792	\$959,129
Gasoline and oil	5.3	\$205,639	\$678,600	\$390,252
Recreation use fees	0.9	\$28,081	\$91,990	\$51,034
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	16.6	\$571,902	\$1,873,501	\$1,129,321
Retail Shopping	0.5	\$18,217	\$53,681	\$32,114
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.9	\$39,633	\$137,715	\$80,559
Camping fees	3.7	\$158,634	\$551,220	\$322,446
Total Visitor Impact	53.8	\$1,863,762	\$6,308,256	\$3,628,156

Nathan Bedford Forrest

Cabins/Camping

Spending & Impact Within Local Area

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	308,492	
Day Visitor Groups	156,097	50.6%
Overnight Visitor Groups	152,395	49.4%

**Per Visitor Group Expenditures
by Visitors Within Local Area**

Expenditure Category	Overnight	
	Day Visitors	Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$11.28	\$30.80
Groceries	\$11.54	\$63.42
Gasoline and oil	\$8.28	\$23.57
Recreation use fees	\$4.10	\$13.95
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$6.87	\$9.08
Retail Shopping	\$2.45	\$17.97
Other expense	\$0.54	\$0.17
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$10.88
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$5.39
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$79.16
Total	\$45.05	\$254.40

Total Spending by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Overnight		Total
	Day Visitors	Visitors	
Restaurants, snack bars	\$1,760,631	\$4,694,396	\$6,455,027
Groceries	\$1,801,860	\$9,664,994	\$11,466,854
Gasoline and oil	\$1,291,906	\$3,591,731	\$4,883,637
Recreation use fees	\$639,366	\$2,125,780	\$2,765,146
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$1,072,138	\$1,384,117	\$2,456,254
Retail Shopping	\$381,933	\$2,739,126	\$3,121,058
Other expense	\$84,071	\$25,256	\$109,327
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$1,658,792	\$1,658,792
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$821,270	\$821,270
Camping fees	\$0	\$12,063,118	\$12,063,118
Total	\$7,031,905	\$38,768,578	\$45,800,482

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	33.4	\$988,770	\$3,935,011	\$1,980,710
Groceries	9.4	\$328,772	\$1,032,799	\$617,654
Gasoline and oil	3.2	\$121,463	\$400,821	\$230,506
Recreation use fees	14.4	\$428,247	\$1,402,897	\$778,300
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	7.5	\$259,936	\$851,527	\$513,289
Retail Shopping	2.6	\$94,192	\$277,566	\$166,051
Other expense	0.6	\$22,166	\$65,318	\$39,076
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	71.1	\$2,243,546	\$7,965,938	\$4,325,585

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	89.1	\$2,636,373	\$10,491,974	\$5,281,195
Groceries	50.5	\$1,763,501	\$5,539,831	\$3,313,031
Gasoline and oil	8.8	\$337,688	\$1,114,355	\$640,847
Recreation use fees	47.7	\$1,423,847	\$4,664,386	\$2,587,712
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	9.7	\$335,574	\$1,099,310	\$662,650
Retail Shopping	18.9	\$675,523	\$1,990,630	\$1,190,875
Other expense	0.2	\$6,659	\$19,622	\$11,739
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	22.7	\$980,678	\$3,407,656	\$1,993,370
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	11.3	\$485,535	\$1,687,135	\$986,920
Camping fees	165.3	\$7,131,715	\$24,781,264	\$14,496,249
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	424.2	\$15,777,092	\$54,796,164	\$31,164,589

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	122.5	\$3,625,143	\$14,426,985	\$7,261,905
Groceries	59.9	\$2,092,273	\$6,572,631	\$3,930,685
Gasoline and oil	11.9	\$459,151	\$1,515,177	\$871,353
Recreation use fees	62.1	\$1,852,095	\$6,067,283	\$3,366,012
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	17.3	\$595,510	\$1,950,837	\$1,175,939
Retail Shopping	21.5	\$769,715	\$2,268,196	\$1,356,926
Other expense	0.8	\$28,824	\$84,940	\$50,814
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	22.7	\$980,678	\$3,407,656	\$1,993,370
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	11.3	\$485,535	\$1,687,135	\$986,920
Camping fees	165.3	\$7,131,715	\$24,781,264	\$14,496,249
Total Visitor Impact	495.3	\$18,020,638	\$62,762,102	\$35,490,174

Nathan Bedford Forrest

Cabins/Camping

Spending & Impact Outside Local Area, but inside TN

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	308,492	
Day Visitor Groups	156,097	50.6%
Overnight Visitor Groups	152,395	49.4%

**Per Visitor Group Expenditures
by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN**

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$0.80	\$9.20
Groceries	\$2.37	\$52.32
Gasoline and oil	\$2.42	\$24.55
Recreation use fees	\$0.02	\$1.21
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$0.54	\$11.83
Retail Shopping	\$0.00	\$1.79
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.13
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$0.08
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$1.89
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$1.67
Total	\$6.15	\$104.66

Total Spending by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$124,130	\$1,402,445	\$1,526,575
Groceries	\$369,690	\$7,974,067	\$8,343,757
Gasoline and oil	\$378,144	\$3,740,721	\$4,118,865
Recreation use fees	\$3,462	\$184,011	\$187,473
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$83,793	\$1,802,276	\$1,886,069
Retail Shopping	\$0	\$273,316	\$273,316
Other expense	\$0	\$19,141	\$19,141
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$12,323	\$12,323
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$287,965	\$287,965
Camping fees	\$0	\$253,759	\$253,759
Total	\$959,218	\$15,950,024	\$16,909,243

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	2.4	\$69,711	\$277,431	\$139,646
Groceries	1.9	\$67,455	\$211,901	\$126,725
Gasoline and oil	0.9	\$35,552	\$117,321	\$67,470
Recreation use fees	0.1	\$2,319	\$7,596	\$4,214
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.6	\$20,315	\$66,551	\$40,116
Retail Shopping	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	5.9	\$195,352	\$680,799	\$378,171

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	26.6	\$787,613	\$3,134,465	\$1,577,751
Groceries	41.7	\$1,454,970	\$4,570,617	\$2,733,404
Gasoline and oil	9.1	\$351,696	\$1,160,580	\$667,431
Recreation use fees	4.1	\$123,251	\$403,757	\$223,997
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	12.7	\$436,955	\$1,431,426	\$862,845
Retail Shopping	1.9	\$67,405	\$198,630	\$118,828
Other expense	0.1	\$5,047	\$14,871	\$8,897
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.2	\$7,285	\$25,315	\$14,809
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	3.9	\$170,245	\$591,566	\$346,047
Camping fees	3.5	\$150,022	\$521,297	\$304,942
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	103.8	\$3,554,489	\$12,052,524	\$6,858,950

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	29.0	\$857,325	\$3,411,896	\$1,717,397
Groceries	43.6	\$1,522,424	\$4,782,518	\$2,860,129
Gasoline and oil	10.1	\$387,248	\$1,277,902	\$734,900
Recreation use fees	4.2	\$125,569	\$411,353	\$228,211
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	13.3	\$457,270	\$1,497,977	\$902,961
Retail Shopping	1.9	\$67,405	\$198,630	\$118,828
Other expense	0.1	\$5,047	\$14,871	\$8,897
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.2	\$7,285	\$25,315	\$14,809
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	3.9	\$170,245	\$591,566	\$346,047
Camping fees	3.5	\$150,022	\$521,297	\$304,942
Total Visitor Impact	109.7	\$3,749,841	\$12,733,324	\$7,237,120

Norris Dam

Marina

Spending & Impact Within Local Area

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	19,829	
Day Visitor Groups	11,897	60.0%
Overnight Visitor Groups	7,932	40.0%

**Per Visitor Group Expenditures
by Visitors Within Local Area**

Expenditure Category	Overnight	
	Day Visitors	Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$15.25	\$37.55
Groceries	\$9.48	\$74.56
Gasoline and oil	\$8.41	\$26.46
Recreation use fees	\$12.08	\$18.92
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$5.93	\$7.36
Retail Shopping	\$1.39	\$8.50
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$33.09
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$2.53
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$79.34
Total	\$52.54	\$288.31

Total Spending by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Overnight		Total
	Day Visitors	Visitors	
Restaurants, snack bars	\$181,441	\$297,863	\$479,304
Groceries	\$112,773	\$591,378	\$704,151
Gasoline and oil	\$100,033	\$209,898	\$309,931
Recreation use fees	\$143,695	\$150,029	\$293,724
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$70,604	\$58,367	\$128,971
Retail Shopping	\$16,542	\$67,399	\$83,941
Other expense	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$262,457	\$262,457
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$20,081	\$20,081
Camping fees	\$0	\$629,322	\$629,322
Total	\$625,088	\$2,286,793	\$2,911,881

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	3.4	\$101,897	\$405,521	\$204,121
Groceries	0.6	\$20,577	\$64,640	\$38,657
Gasoline and oil	0.2	\$9,405	\$31,036	\$17,848
Recreation use fees	3.2	\$96,247	\$315,296	\$174,920
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.5	\$17,118	\$56,076	\$33,802
Retail Shopping	0.1	\$4,080	\$12,022	\$7,192
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	8.1	\$249,323	\$884,590	\$476,540

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	5.7	\$167,280	\$665,723	\$335,095
Groceries	3.1	\$107,904	\$338,969	\$202,717
Gasoline and oil	0.5	\$19,734	\$65,122	\$37,451
Recreation use fees	3.4	\$100,489	\$329,193	\$182,630
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.4	\$14,151	\$46,357	\$27,943
Retail Shopping	0.5	\$16,622	\$48,981	\$29,303
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	3.6	\$155,165	\$539,166	\$315,395
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.3	\$11,872	\$41,252	\$24,131
Camping fees	8.6	\$372,055	\$1,292,817	\$756,257
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	26.0	\$965,272	\$3,367,579	\$1,910,921

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	9.1	\$269,177	\$1,071,244	\$539,217
Groceries	3.7	\$128,481	\$403,609	\$241,374
Gasoline and oil	0.8	\$29,139	\$96,158	\$55,299
Recreation use fees	6.6	\$196,736	\$644,489	\$357,550
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.9	\$31,268	\$102,433	\$61,745
Retail Shopping	0.6	\$20,701	\$61,003	\$36,494
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	3.6	\$155,165	\$539,166	\$315,395
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.3	\$11,872	\$41,252	\$24,131
Camping fees	8.6	\$372,055	\$1,292,817	\$756,257
Total Visitor Impact	34.1	\$1,214,595	\$4,252,169	\$2,387,461

Norris Dam

Marina

Spending & Impact Outside Local Area, but inside TN

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	19,829	
Day Visitor Groups	11,897	60.0%
Overnight Visitor Groups	7,932	40.0%

**Per Visitor Group Expenditures
by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN**

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$0.20	\$3.60
Groceries	\$1.49	\$30.16
Gasoline and oil	\$1.64	\$16.36
Recreation use fees	\$0.00	\$0.00
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$0.32	\$10.32
Retail Shopping	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$0.00
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$2.40
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$0.53
Total	\$3.65	\$63.37

Total Spending by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$2,424	\$28,543	\$30,967
Groceries	\$17,780	\$239,215	\$256,995
Gasoline and oil	\$19,468	\$129,765	\$149,233
Recreation use fees	\$0	\$0	\$0
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$3,810	\$81,861	\$85,671
Retail Shopping	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$19,065	\$19,065
Camping fees	\$0	\$4,174	\$4,174
Total	\$43,482	\$502,622	\$546,105

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	0.0	\$1,361	\$5,418	\$2,727
Groceries	0.1	\$3,244	\$10,191	\$6,095
Gasoline and oil	0.0	\$1,830	\$6,040	\$3,474
Recreation use fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.0	\$924	\$3,026	\$1,824
Retail Shopping	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	0.2	\$7,360	\$24,676	\$14,120

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	0.5	\$16,030	\$63,793	\$32,111
Groceries	1.2	\$43,648	\$137,114	\$82,000
Gasoline and oil	0.3	\$12,200	\$40,260	\$23,153
Recreation use fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.6	\$19,847	\$65,016	\$39,191
Retail Shopping	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.3	\$11,271	\$39,165	\$22,910
Camping fees	0.1	\$2,468	\$8,575	\$5,016
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	3.0	\$105,463	\$353,924	\$204,381

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	0.6	\$17,391	\$69,211	\$34,838
Groceries	1.3	\$46,892	\$147,306	\$88,094
Gasoline and oil	0.4	\$14,031	\$46,301	\$26,627
Recreation use fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.6	\$20,771	\$68,042	\$41,015
Retail Shopping	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.3	\$11,271	\$39,165	\$22,910
Camping fees	0.1	\$2,468	\$8,575	\$5,016
Total Visitor Impact	3.2	\$112,823	\$378,600	\$218,500

Old Stone Fort

Cabins/Camping

Spending & Impact Within Local Area

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	66,051	
Day Visitor Groups	33,422	50.6%
Overnight Visitor Groups	32,629	49.4%

**Per Visitor Group Expenditures
by Visitors Within Local Area**

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$11.28	\$30.80
Groceries	\$11.54	\$63.42
Gasoline and oil	\$8.28	\$23.57
Recreation use fees	\$4.10	\$13.95
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$6.87	\$9.08
Retail Shopping	\$2.45	\$17.97
Other expense	\$0.54	\$0.17
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$10.88
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$5.39
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$79.16
Total	\$45.05	\$254.40

Total Spending by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$376,969	\$1,005,118	\$1,382,087
Groceries	\$385,796	\$2,069,373	\$2,455,169
Gasoline and oil	\$276,610	\$769,026	\$1,045,636
Recreation use fees	\$136,895	\$455,151	\$592,046
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$229,556	\$296,353	\$525,909
Retail Shopping	\$81,776	\$586,474	\$668,250
Other expense	\$18,000	\$5,408	\$23,408
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$355,164	\$355,164
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$175,842	\$175,842
Camping fees	\$0	\$2,582,836	\$2,582,836
Total	\$1,505,602	\$8,300,745	\$9,806,347

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	7.2	\$211,706	\$842,526	\$424,090
Groceries	2.0	\$70,393	\$221,133	\$132,246
Gasoline and oil	0.7	\$26,006	\$85,820	\$49,354
Recreation use fees	3.1	\$91,692	\$300,374	\$166,642
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	1.6	\$55,655	\$182,320	\$109,900
Retail Shopping	0.6	\$20,168	\$59,430	\$35,553
Other expense	0.1	\$4,746	\$13,985	\$8,366
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	15.2	\$480,366	\$1,705,588	\$926,152

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	19.1	\$564,474	\$2,246,438	\$1,130,757
Groceries	10.8	\$377,583	\$1,186,134	\$709,354
Gasoline and oil	1.9	\$72,302	\$238,595	\$137,212
Recreation use fees	10.2	\$304,860	\$998,692	\$554,055
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	2.1	\$71,850	\$235,373	\$141,880
Retail Shopping	4.0	\$144,636	\$426,214	\$254,978
Other expense	0.0	\$1,426	\$4,201	\$2,513
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	4.9	\$209,973	\$729,614	\$426,801
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	2.4	\$103,958	\$361,233	\$211,310
Camping fees	35.4	\$1,526,972	\$5,305,919	\$3,103,794
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	90.8	\$3,378,035	\$11,732,413	\$6,672,654

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	26.2	\$776,180	\$3,088,963	\$1,554,847
Groceries	12.8	\$447,977	\$1,407,267	\$841,599
Gasoline and oil	2.6	\$98,309	\$324,415	\$186,566
Recreation use fees	13.3	\$396,552	\$1,299,067	\$720,697
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	3.7	\$127,505	\$417,694	\$251,780
Retail Shopping	4.6	\$164,804	\$485,644	\$290,532
Other expense	0.2	\$6,172	\$18,186	\$10,880
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	4.9	\$209,973	\$729,614	\$426,801
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	2.4	\$103,958	\$361,233	\$211,310
Camping fees	35.4	\$1,526,972	\$5,305,919	\$3,103,794
Total Visitor Impact	106.1	\$3,858,401	\$13,438,001	\$7,598,805

Old Stone Fort

Cabins/Camping

Spending & Impact Outside Local Area, but inside TN

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	66,051	
Day Visitor Groups	33,422	50.6%
Overnight Visitor Groups	32,629	49.4%

Per Visitor Group Expenditures by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$0.80	\$9.20
Groceries	\$2.37	\$52.32
Gasoline and oil	\$2.42	\$24.55
Recreation use fees	\$0.02	\$1.21
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$0.54	\$11.83
Retail Shopping	\$0.00	\$1.79
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.13
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$0.08
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$1.89
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$1.67
Total	\$6.15	\$104.66

Total Spending by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$26,578	\$300,278	\$326,855
Groceries	\$79,154	\$1,707,328	\$1,786,483
Gasoline and oil	\$80,965	\$800,926	\$881,891
Recreation use fees	\$741	\$39,399	\$40,140
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$17,941	\$385,886	\$403,826
Retail Shopping	\$0	\$58,520	\$58,520
Other expense	\$0	\$4,098	\$4,098
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$2,638	\$2,638
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$61,656	\$61,656
Camping fees	\$0	\$54,332	\$54,332
Total	\$205,378	\$3,415,062	\$3,620,440

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	0.5	\$14,926	\$59,401	\$29,900
Groceries	0.4	\$14,443	\$45,370	\$27,133
Gasoline and oil	0.2	\$7,612	\$25,120	\$14,446
Recreation use fees	0.0	\$496	\$1,626	\$902
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.1	\$4,350	\$14,249	\$8,589
Retail Shopping	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	1.3	\$41,827	\$145,766	\$80,970

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	5.7	\$168,636	\$671,121	\$337,812
Groceries	8.9	\$311,524	\$978,615	\$585,249
Gasoline and oil	2.0	\$75,302	\$248,492	\$142,904
Recreation use fees	0.9	\$26,389	\$86,448	\$47,960
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	2.7	\$93,557	\$306,483	\$184,744
Retail Shopping	0.4	\$14,432	\$42,529	\$25,442
Other expense	0.0	\$1,081	\$3,184	\$1,905
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$1,560	\$5,420	\$3,171
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.8	\$36,451	\$126,660	\$74,092
Camping fees	0.7	\$32,121	\$111,615	\$65,291
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	22.2	\$761,052	\$2,580,567	\$1,468,571

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	6.2	\$183,562	\$730,521	\$367,712
Groceries	9.3	\$325,966	\$1,023,985	\$612,383
Gasoline and oil	2.2	\$82,914	\$273,612	\$157,350
Recreation use fees	0.9	\$26,886	\$88,075	\$48,862
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	2.8	\$97,906	\$320,732	\$193,333
Retail Shopping	0.4	\$14,432	\$42,529	\$25,442
Other expense	0.0	\$1,081	\$3,184	\$1,905
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$1,560	\$5,420	\$3,171
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.8	\$36,451	\$126,660	\$74,092
Camping fees	0.7	\$32,121	\$111,615	\$65,291
Total Visitor Impact	23.5	\$802,879	\$2,726,333	\$1,549,541

Panther Creek

Cabins/Camping

Spending & Impact Within Local Area

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	135,655	
Day Visitor Groups	68,642	50.6%
Overnight Visitor Groups	67,014	49.4%

**Per Visitor Group Expenditures
by Visitors Within Local Area**

Expenditure Category	Overnight	
	Day Visitors	Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$11.28	\$30.80
Groceries	\$11.54	\$63.42
Gasoline and oil	\$8.28	\$23.57
Recreation use fees	\$4.10	\$13.95
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$6.87	\$9.08
Retail Shopping	\$2.45	\$17.97
Other expense	\$0.54	\$0.17
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$10.88
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$5.39
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$79.16
Total	\$45.05	\$254.40

Total Spending by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Overnight		Total
	Day Visitors	Visitors	
Restaurants, snack bars	\$774,214	\$2,064,297	\$2,838,511
Groceries	\$792,343	\$4,250,051	\$5,042,394
Gasoline and oil	\$568,098	\$1,579,415	\$2,147,513
Recreation use fees	\$281,153	\$934,783	\$1,215,935
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$471,458	\$608,647	\$1,080,105
Retail Shopping	\$167,950	\$1,204,493	\$1,372,443
Other expense	\$36,969	\$11,106	\$48,075
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$729,431	\$729,431
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$361,142	\$361,142
Camping fees	\$0	\$5,304,593	\$5,304,593
Total	\$3,092,185	\$17,047,958	\$20,140,143

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	14.7	\$434,798	\$1,730,368	\$870,990
Groceries	4.1	\$144,573	\$454,160	\$271,605
Gasoline and oil	1.4	\$53,412	\$176,256	\$101,362
Recreation use fees	6.3	\$188,316	\$616,905	\$342,247
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	3.3	\$114,303	\$374,447	\$225,712
Retail Shopping	1.2	\$41,420	\$122,056	\$73,019
Other expense	0.3	\$9,747	\$28,723	\$17,183
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	31.3	\$986,569	\$3,502,914	\$1,902,118

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	39.2	\$1,159,309	\$4,613,704	\$2,322,334
Groceries	22.2	\$775,476	\$2,436,066	\$1,456,861
Gasoline and oil	3.9	\$148,494	\$490,023	\$281,804
Recreation use fees	21.0	\$626,118	\$2,051,101	\$1,137,911
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	4.3	\$147,564	\$483,407	\$291,391
Retail Shopping	8.3	\$297,052	\$875,353	\$523,671
Other expense	0.1	\$2,928	\$8,629	\$5,162
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	10.0	\$431,240	\$1,498,471	\$876,558
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	5.0	\$213,507	\$741,895	\$433,985
Camping fees	72.7	\$3,136,076	\$10,897,226	\$6,374,530
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	186.5	\$6,937,763	\$24,095,873	\$13,704,207

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	53.9	\$1,594,108	\$6,344,072	\$3,193,325
Groceries	26.3	\$920,049	\$2,890,226	\$1,728,466
Gasoline and oil	5.2	\$201,905	\$666,278	\$383,166
Recreation use fees	27.3	\$814,434	\$2,668,006	\$1,480,158
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	7.6	\$261,867	\$857,854	\$517,103
Retail Shopping	9.4	\$338,472	\$997,408	\$596,690
Other expense	0.4	\$12,675	\$37,351	\$22,345
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	10.0	\$431,240	\$1,498,471	\$876,558
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	5.0	\$213,507	\$741,895	\$433,985
Camping fees	72.7	\$3,136,076	\$10,897,226	\$6,374,530
Total Visitor Impact	217.8	\$7,924,332	\$27,598,786	\$15,606,324

Panther Creek

Cabins/Camping

Spending & Impact Outside Local Area, but inside TN

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	135,655	
Day Visitor Groups	68,642	50.6%
Overnight Visitor Groups	67,014	49.4%

**Per Visitor Group Expenditures
by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN**

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$0.80	\$9.20
Groceries	\$2.37	\$52.32
Gasoline and oil	\$2.42	\$24.55
Recreation use fees	\$0.02	\$1.21
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$0.54	\$11.83
Retail Shopping	\$0.00	\$1.79
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.13
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$0.08
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$1.89
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$1.67
Total	\$6.15	\$104.66

Total Spending by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$54,585	\$616,706	\$671,291
Groceries	\$162,566	\$3,506,488	\$3,669,054
Gasoline and oil	\$166,284	\$1,644,931	\$1,811,215
Recreation use fees	\$1,522	\$80,916	\$82,439
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$36,847	\$792,527	\$829,373
Retail Shopping	\$0	\$120,187	\$120,187
Other expense	\$0	\$8,417	\$8,417
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$5,419	\$5,419
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$126,629	\$126,629
Camping fees	\$0	\$111,587	\$111,587
Total	\$421,803	\$7,013,808	\$7,435,611

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	1.0	\$30,655	\$121,996	\$61,408
Groceries	0.8	\$29,662	\$93,180	\$55,725
Gasoline and oil	0.4	\$15,634	\$51,591	\$29,669
Recreation use fees	0.0	\$1,020	\$3,340	\$1,853
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.3	\$8,933	\$29,265	\$17,640
Retail Shopping	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	2.6	\$85,904	\$299,372	\$166,295

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	11.7	\$346,342	\$1,378,339	\$693,795
Groceries	18.3	\$639,803	\$2,009,867	\$1,201,978
Gasoline and oil	4.0	\$154,653	\$510,349	\$293,494
Recreation use fees	1.8	\$54,198	\$177,547	\$98,499
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	5.6	\$192,145	\$629,450	\$379,424
Retail Shopping	0.8	\$29,641	\$87,345	\$52,253
Other expense	0.1	\$2,219	\$6,539	\$3,912
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.1	\$3,204	\$11,132	\$6,512
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	1.7	\$74,863	\$260,133	\$152,170
Camping fees	1.5	\$65,970	\$229,233	\$134,094
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	45.7	\$1,563,038	\$5,299,935	\$3,016,130

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	12.7	\$376,997	\$1,500,335	\$755,202
Groceries	19.2	\$669,466	\$2,103,048	\$1,257,703
Gasoline and oil	4.4	\$170,287	\$561,940	\$323,162
Recreation use fees	1.9	\$55,217	\$180,887	\$100,353
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	5.8	\$201,078	\$658,715	\$397,065
Retail Shopping	0.8	\$29,641	\$87,345	\$52,253
Other expense	0.1	\$2,219	\$6,539	\$3,912
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.1	\$3,204	\$11,132	\$6,512
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	1.7	\$74,863	\$260,133	\$152,170
Camping fees	1.5	\$65,970	\$229,233	\$134,094
Total Visitor Impact	48.3	\$1,648,942	\$5,599,307	\$3,182,426

Paris Landing

Resort

Spending & Impact Within Local Area

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	219,932	
Day Visitor Groups	95,451	43.4%
Overnight Visitor Groups	124,482	56.6%

**Per Visitor Group Expenditures
by Visitors Within Local Area**

Expenditure Category	Overnight	
	Day Visitors	Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$13.17	\$28.52
Groceries	\$8.96	\$56.81
Gasoline and oil	\$7.64	\$25.34
Recreation use fees	\$8.48	\$11.31
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$3.63	\$5.41
Retail Shopping	\$1.75	\$18.56
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$12.71
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$8.45
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$82.74
Total	\$43.63	\$249.86

Total Spending by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Overnight		Total
	Day Visitors	Visitors	
Restaurants, snack bars	\$1,257,417	\$3,550,740	\$4,808,157
Groceries	\$855,643	\$7,071,904	\$7,927,546
Gasoline and oil	\$729,049	\$3,154,678	\$3,883,726
Recreation use fees	\$809,211	\$1,407,471	\$2,216,682
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$346,752	\$673,159	\$1,019,911
Retail Shopping	\$166,874	\$2,310,484	\$2,477,358
Other expense	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$1,582,548	\$1,582,548
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$1,051,833	\$1,051,833
Camping fees	\$0	\$10,300,220	\$10,300,220
Total	\$4,164,946	\$31,103,037	\$35,267,982

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	23.9	\$706,165	\$2,810,327	\$1,414,594
Groceries	4.5	\$156,123	\$490,442	\$293,303
Gasoline and oil	1.8	\$68,544	\$226,192	\$130,079
Recreation use fees	18.2	\$542,010	\$1,775,571	\$985,053
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	2.4	\$84,069	\$275,402	\$166,008
Retail Shopping	1.1	\$41,155	\$121,274	\$72,551
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	51.9	\$1,598,065	\$5,699,207	\$3,061,588

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	67.4	\$1,994,096	\$7,935,904	\$3,994,582
Groceries	37.0	\$1,290,359	\$4,053,510	\$2,424,154
Gasoline and oil	7.7	\$296,597	\$978,757	\$562,867
Recreation use fees	31.6	\$942,724	\$3,088,274	\$1,713,315
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	4.7	\$163,205	\$534,645	\$322,277
Retail Shopping	15.9	\$569,811	\$1,679,119	\$1,004,517
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	21.7	\$935,602	\$3,251,029	\$1,901,748
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	14.4	\$621,844	\$2,160,781	\$1,263,988
Camping fees	141.2	\$6,089,490	\$21,159,742	\$12,377,775
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	341.6	\$12,903,728	\$44,841,761	\$25,565,223

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	91.2	\$2,700,261	\$10,746,230	\$5,409,176
Groceries	41.4	\$1,446,482	\$4,543,952	\$2,717,457
Gasoline and oil	9.5	\$365,141	\$1,204,949	\$692,946
Recreation use fees	49.8	\$1,484,734	\$4,863,845	\$2,698,368
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	7.2	\$247,274	\$810,046	\$488,285
Retail Shopping	17.0	\$610,966	\$1,800,393	\$1,077,068
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	21.7	\$935,602	\$3,251,029	\$1,901,748
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	14.4	\$621,844	\$2,160,781	\$1,263,988
Camping fees	141.2	\$6,089,490	\$21,159,742	\$12,377,775
Total Visitor Impact	393.4	\$14,501,793	\$50,540,967	\$28,626,811

Paris Landing

Resort

Spending & Impact Outside Local Area, but inside TN

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	219,932	
Day Visitor Groups	95,451	43.4%
Overnight Visitor Groups	124,482	56.6%

**Per Visitor Group Expenditures
by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN**

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$0.35	\$8.23
Groceries	\$0.89	\$39.64
Gasoline and oil	\$1.47	\$30.39
Recreation use fees	\$0.03	\$0.58
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$0.60	\$33.53
Retail Shopping	\$0.00	\$1.06
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$0.00
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$0.97
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$3.87
Total	\$3.34	\$118.27

Total Spending by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$33,712	\$1,023,971	\$1,057,683
Groceries	\$84,482	\$4,934,906	\$5,019,388
Gasoline and oil	\$140,671	\$3,782,995	\$3,923,666
Recreation use fees	\$2,725	\$72,483	\$75,208
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$57,230	\$4,174,365	\$4,231,594
Retail Shopping	\$0	\$132,507	\$132,507
Other expense	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$120,259	\$120,259
Camping fees	\$0	\$481,348	\$481,348
Total	\$318,820	\$14,722,833	\$15,041,653

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	0.6	\$18,933	\$75,346	\$37,926
Groceries	0.4	\$15,415	\$48,424	\$28,959
Gasoline and oil	0.3	\$13,226	\$43,644	\$25,099
Recreation use fees	0.1	\$1,825	\$5,980	\$3,317
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.4	\$13,875	\$45,454	\$27,399
Retail Shopping	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	1.9	\$63,274	\$218,847	\$122,700

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	19.4	\$575,062	\$2,288,574	\$1,151,967
Groceries	25.8	\$900,436	\$2,828,615	\$1,691,620
Gasoline and oil	9.2	\$355,670	\$1,173,696	\$674,973
Recreation use fees	1.6	\$48,549	\$159,041	\$88,233
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	29.4	\$1,012,059	\$3,315,416	\$1,998,489
Retail Shopping	0.9	\$32,679	\$96,298	\$57,609
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	1.6	\$71,097	\$247,047	\$144,515
Camping fees	6.6	\$284,573	\$988,833	\$578,436
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	94.6	\$3,280,125	\$11,097,521	\$6,385,843

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	20.1	\$593,994	\$2,363,920	\$1,189,893
Groceries	26.2	\$915,851	\$2,877,039	\$1,720,580
Gasoline and oil	9.6	\$368,896	\$1,217,340	\$700,072
Recreation use fees	1.7	\$50,374	\$165,021	\$91,550
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	29.8	\$1,025,934	\$3,360,869	\$2,025,888
Retail Shopping	0.9	\$32,679	\$96,298	\$57,609
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	1.6	\$71,097	\$247,047	\$144,515
Camping fees	6.6	\$284,573	\$988,833	\$578,436
Total Visitor Impact	96.5	\$3,343,399	\$11,316,369	\$6,508,543

Pickett

Cabins/Camping

Spending & Impact Within Local Area

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	97,946	
Day Visitor Groups	49,561	50.6%
Overnight Visitor Groups	48,385	49.4%

**Per Visitor Group Expenditures
by Visitors Within Local Area**

Expenditure Category	Overnight	
	Day Visitors	Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$11.28	\$30.80
Groceries	\$11.54	\$63.42
Gasoline and oil	\$8.28	\$23.57
Recreation use fees	\$4.10	\$13.95
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$6.87	\$9.08
Retail Shopping	\$2.45	\$17.97
Other expense	\$0.54	\$0.17
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$10.88
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$5.39
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$79.16
Total	\$45.05	\$254.40

Total Spending by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Overnight		Total
	Day Visitors	Visitors	
Restaurants, snack bars	\$558,998	\$1,490,464	\$2,049,462
Groceries	\$572,088	\$3,068,622	\$3,640,710
Gasoline and oil	\$410,178	\$1,140,369	\$1,550,548
Recreation use fees	\$202,998	\$674,932	\$877,930
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$340,402	\$439,455	\$779,857
Retail Shopping	\$121,263	\$869,668	\$990,932
Other expense	\$26,692	\$8,019	\$34,711
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$526,664	\$526,664
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$260,752	\$260,752
Camping fees	\$0	\$3,830,023	\$3,830,023
Total	\$2,232,620	\$12,308,968	\$14,541,587

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	10.6	\$313,933	\$1,249,360	\$628,873
Groceries	3.0	\$104,385	\$327,912	\$196,104
Gasoline and oil	1.0	\$38,564	\$127,260	\$73,185
Recreation use fees	4.6	\$135,968	\$445,418	\$247,109
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	2.4	\$82,529	\$270,358	\$162,969
Retail Shopping	0.8	\$29,906	\$88,127	\$52,721
Other expense	0.2	\$7,038	\$20,738	\$12,406
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	22.6	\$712,323	\$2,529,174	\$1,373,367

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	28.3	\$837,044	\$3,331,187	\$1,676,772
Groceries	16.0	\$559,909	\$1,758,889	\$1,051,883
Gasoline and oil	2.8	\$107,215	\$353,806	\$203,468
Recreation use fees	15.2	\$452,069	\$1,480,936	\$821,595
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	3.1	\$106,544	\$349,029	\$210,390
Retail Shopping	6.0	\$214,477	\$632,022	\$378,101
Other expense	0.1	\$2,114	\$6,230	\$3,727
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	7.2	\$311,364	\$1,081,926	\$632,892
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	3.6	\$154,157	\$535,663	\$313,346
Camping fees	52.5	\$2,264,309	\$7,868,016	\$4,602,538
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	134.7	\$5,009,204	\$17,397,703	\$9,894,712

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	38.9	\$1,150,978	\$4,580,547	\$2,305,644
Groceries	19.0	\$664,294	\$2,086,801	\$1,247,987
Gasoline and oil	3.8	\$145,780	\$481,066	\$276,653
Recreation use fees	19.7	\$588,037	\$1,926,354	\$1,068,704
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	5.5	\$189,074	\$619,388	\$373,359
Retail Shopping	6.8	\$244,383	\$720,149	\$430,822
Other expense	0.3	\$9,152	\$26,968	\$16,134
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	7.2	\$311,364	\$1,081,926	\$632,892
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	3.6	\$154,157	\$535,663	\$313,346
Camping fees	52.5	\$2,264,309	\$7,868,016	\$4,602,538
Total Visitor Impact	157.3	\$5,721,527	\$19,926,877	\$11,268,079

Pickett

Cabins/Camping

Spending & Impact Outside Local Area, but inside TN

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	97,946	
Day Visitor Groups	49,561	50.6%
Overnight Visitor Groups	48,385	49.4%

**Per Visitor Group Expenditures
by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN**

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$0.80	\$9.20
Groceries	\$2.37	\$52.32
Gasoline and oil	\$2.42	\$24.55
Recreation use fees	\$0.02	\$1.21
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$0.54	\$11.83
Retail Shopping	\$0.00	\$1.79
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.13
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$0.08
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$1.89
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$1.67
Total	\$6.15	\$104.66

Total Spending by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$39,411	\$445,274	\$484,685
Groceries	\$117,376	\$2,531,755	\$2,649,131
Gasoline and oil	\$120,060	\$1,187,673	\$1,307,734
Recreation use fees	\$1,099	\$58,423	\$59,522
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$26,604	\$572,220	\$598,824
Retail Shopping	\$0	\$86,778	\$86,778
Other expense	\$0	\$6,077	\$6,077
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$3,913	\$3,913
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$91,428	\$91,428
Camping fees	\$0	\$80,568	\$80,568
Total	\$304,550	\$5,064,110	\$5,368,660

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	0.7	\$22,133	\$88,084	\$44,338
Groceries	0.6	\$21,417	\$67,278	\$40,235
Gasoline and oil	0.3	\$11,288	\$37,249	\$21,422
Recreation use fees	0.0	\$736	\$2,412	\$1,338
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.2	\$6,450	\$21,130	\$12,737
Retail Shopping	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	1.9	\$62,024	\$216,153	\$120,069

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	8.4	\$250,066	\$995,188	\$500,934
Groceries	13.2	\$461,951	\$1,451,164	\$867,852
Gasoline and oil	2.9	\$111,663	\$368,483	\$211,908
Recreation use fees	1.3	\$39,132	\$128,192	\$71,119
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	4.0	\$138,733	\$454,476	\$273,952
Retail Shopping	0.6	\$21,401	\$63,065	\$37,728
Other expense	0.0	\$1,602	\$4,722	\$2,825
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.1	\$2,313	\$8,037	\$4,702
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	1.3	\$54,052	\$187,821	\$109,870
Camping fees	1.1	\$47,632	\$165,511	\$96,819
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	33.0	\$1,128,545	\$3,826,659	\$2,177,707

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	9.2	\$272,199	\$1,083,272	\$545,271
Groceries	13.8	\$483,368	\$1,518,443	\$908,087
Gasoline and oil	3.2	\$122,951	\$405,732	\$233,330
Recreation use fees	1.3	\$39,868	\$130,604	\$72,457
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	4.2	\$145,183	\$475,606	\$286,689
Retail Shopping	0.6	\$21,401	\$63,065	\$37,728
Other expense	0.0	\$1,602	\$4,722	\$2,825
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.1	\$2,313	\$8,037	\$4,702
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	1.3	\$54,052	\$187,821	\$109,870
Camping fees	1.1	\$47,632	\$165,511	\$96,819
Total Visitor Impact	34.8	\$1,190,569	\$4,042,812	\$2,297,775

Pickwick Landing

Resort

Spending & Impact Within Local Area

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	242,883	
Day Visitor Groups	105,411	43.4%
Overnight Visitor Groups	137,472	56.6%

**Per Visitor Group Expenditures
by Visitors Within Local Area**

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$13.17	\$28.52
Groceries	\$8.96	\$56.81
Gasoline and oil	\$7.64	\$25.34
Recreation use fees	\$8.48	\$11.31
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$3.63	\$5.41
Retail Shopping	\$1.75	\$18.56
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$12.71
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$8.45
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$82.74
Total	\$43.63	\$249.86

Total Spending by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$1,388,630	\$3,921,265	\$5,309,895
Groceries	\$944,931	\$7,809,868	\$8,754,798
Gasoline and oil	\$805,126	\$3,483,873	\$4,288,999
Recreation use fees	\$893,654	\$1,554,343	\$2,447,997
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$382,936	\$743,404	\$1,126,340
Retail Shopping	\$184,288	\$2,551,586	\$2,735,874
Other expense	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$1,747,690	\$1,747,690
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$1,161,593	\$1,161,593
Camping fees	\$0	\$11,375,064	\$11,375,064
Total	\$4,599,564	\$34,348,688	\$38,948,252

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	26.3	\$779,855	\$3,103,589	\$1,562,209
Groceries	4.9	\$172,415	\$541,620	\$323,910
Gasoline and oil	2.0	\$75,696	\$249,795	\$143,653
Recreation use fees	20.1	\$598,569	\$1,960,855	\$1,087,844
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	2.7	\$92,841	\$304,140	\$183,332
Retail Shopping	1.3	\$45,449	\$133,929	\$80,122
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	57.3	\$1,764,825	\$6,293,928	\$3,381,070

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	74.4	\$2,202,183	\$8,764,028	\$4,411,423
Groceries	40.8	\$1,425,010	\$4,476,501	\$2,677,119
Gasoline and oil	8.5	\$327,547	\$1,080,892	\$621,603
Recreation use fees	34.9	\$1,041,099	\$3,410,540	\$1,892,102
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	5.2	\$180,236	\$590,436	\$355,907
Retail Shopping	17.6	\$629,272	\$1,854,338	\$1,109,340
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	24.0	\$1,033,234	\$3,590,279	\$2,100,199
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	15.9	\$686,734	\$2,386,261	\$1,395,887
Camping fees	155.9	\$6,724,938	\$23,367,795	\$13,669,415
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	377.2	\$14,250,252	\$49,521,069	\$28,232,995

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	100.8	\$2,982,037	\$11,867,616	\$5,973,632
Groceries	45.7	\$1,597,424	\$5,018,121	\$3,001,028
Gasoline and oil	10.5	\$403,244	\$1,330,687	\$765,256
Recreation use fees	55.0	\$1,639,668	\$5,371,395	\$2,979,946
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	7.9	\$273,077	\$894,576	\$539,238
Retail Shopping	18.8	\$674,721	\$1,988,267	\$1,189,462
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	24.0	\$1,033,234	\$3,590,279	\$2,100,199
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	15.9	\$686,734	\$2,386,261	\$1,395,887
Camping fees	155.9	\$6,724,938	\$23,367,795	\$13,669,415
Total Visitor Impact	434.5	\$16,015,078	\$55,814,997	\$31,614,064

Pickwick Landing

Resort

Spending & Impact Outside Local Area, but inside TN

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	242,883	
Day Visitor Groups	105,411	43.4%
Overnight Visitor Groups	137,472	56.6%

**Per Visitor Group Expenditures
by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN**

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$0.35	\$8.23
Groceries	\$0.89	\$39.64
Gasoline and oil	\$1.47	\$30.39
Recreation use fees	\$0.03	\$0.58
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$0.60	\$33.53
Retail Shopping	\$0.00	\$1.06
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$0.00
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$0.97
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$3.87
Total	\$3.34	\$118.27

Total Spending by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$37,230	\$1,130,823	\$1,168,053
Groceries	\$93,298	\$5,449,872	\$5,543,169
Gasoline and oil	\$155,350	\$4,177,757	\$4,333,107
Recreation use fees	\$3,010	\$80,046	\$83,056
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$63,202	\$4,609,966	\$4,673,168
Retail Shopping	\$0	\$146,335	\$146,335
Other expense	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$132,808	\$132,808
Camping fees	\$0	\$531,577	\$531,577
Total	\$352,089	\$16,259,184	\$16,611,273

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	0.7	\$20,908	\$83,209	\$41,884
Groceries	0.5	\$17,023	\$53,477	\$31,981
Gasoline and oil	0.4	\$14,606	\$48,198	\$27,718
Recreation use fees	0.1	\$2,016	\$6,604	\$3,664
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.4	\$15,323	\$50,197	\$30,258
Retail Shopping	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	2.1	\$69,876	\$241,684	\$135,504

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	21.5	\$635,070	\$2,527,390	\$1,272,176
Groceries	28.5	\$994,398	\$3,123,786	\$1,868,144
Gasoline and oil	10.2	\$392,785	\$1,296,173	\$745,408
Recreation use fees	1.8	\$53,615	\$175,637	\$97,440
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	32.4	\$1,117,669	\$3,661,385	\$2,207,034
Retail Shopping	1.0	\$36,089	\$106,347	\$63,621
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	1.8	\$78,516	\$272,827	\$159,595
Camping fees	7.3	\$314,269	\$1,092,020	\$638,797
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	104.5	\$3,622,412	\$12,255,565	\$7,052,215

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	22.2	\$655,979	\$2,610,599	\$1,314,060
Groceries	29.0	\$1,011,422	\$3,177,263	\$1,900,125
Gasoline and oil	10.6	\$407,391	\$1,344,372	\$773,126
Recreation use fees	1.9	\$55,631	\$182,241	\$101,104
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	32.9	\$1,132,992	\$3,711,581	\$2,237,292
Retail Shopping	1.0	\$36,089	\$106,347	\$63,621
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	1.8	\$78,516	\$272,827	\$159,595
Camping fees	7.3	\$314,269	\$1,092,020	\$638,797
Total Visitor Impact	106.6	\$3,692,288	\$12,497,250	\$7,187,720

Pinson Mounds

No Camping/Has Amenities
 Spending & Impact Within Local Area

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	27,753	
Day Visitor Groups	23,118	83.3%
Overnight Visitor Groups	4,635	16.7%

**Per Visitor Group Expenditures
 by Visitors Within Local Area**

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$11.16	\$29.28
Groceries	\$7.27	\$20.61
Gasoline and oil	\$7.33	\$21.16
Recreation use fees	\$1.40	\$2.16
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$7.44	\$6.81
Retail Shopping	\$3.43	\$19.07
Other expense	\$0.10	\$0.23
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$2.93
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$31.05
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$18.66
Total	\$38.14	\$151.97

Total Spending by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$257,931	\$135,700	\$393,631
Groceries	\$168,173	\$95,536	\$263,708
Gasoline and oil	\$169,549	\$98,075	\$267,625
Recreation use fees	\$32,371	\$9,999	\$42,369
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$171,968	\$31,574	\$203,543
Retail Shopping	\$79,305	\$88,388	\$167,693
Other expense	\$2,360	\$1,052	\$3,412
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$13,600	\$13,600
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$143,927	\$143,927
Camping fees	\$0	\$86,466	\$86,466
Total	\$881,656	\$704,318	\$1,585,975

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	4.9	\$144,854	\$576,475	\$290,172
Groceries	0.9	\$30,685	\$96,394	\$57,647
Gasoline and oil	0.4	\$15,941	\$52,604	\$30,252
Recreation use fees	0.7	\$21,682	\$71,028	\$39,405
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	1.2	\$41,693	\$136,583	\$82,330
Retail Shopping	0.5	\$19,558	\$57,634	\$34,479
Other expense	0.0	\$622	\$1,833	\$1,097
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	8.7	\$275,035	\$992,551	\$535,382

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	2.6	\$76,209	\$303,290	\$152,663
Groceries	0.5	\$17,432	\$54,760	\$32,748
Gasoline and oil	0.2	\$9,221	\$30,428	\$17,499
Recreation use fees	0.2	\$6,697	\$21,939	\$12,171
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.2	\$7,655	\$25,077	\$15,116
Retail Shopping	0.6	\$21,798	\$64,235	\$38,428
Other expense	0.0	\$277	\$818	\$489
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.2	\$8,041	\$27,939	\$16,344
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	2.0	\$85,090	\$295,669	\$172,957
Camping fees	1.2	\$51,119	\$177,627	\$103,906
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	7.7	\$283,539	\$1,001,783	\$562,322

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	7.5	\$221,063	\$879,766	\$442,835
Groceries	1.4	\$48,117	\$151,154	\$90,396
Gasoline and oil	0.7	\$25,162	\$83,032	\$47,750
Recreation use fees	1.0	\$28,379	\$92,966	\$51,576
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	1.4	\$49,348	\$161,660	\$97,447
Retail Shopping	1.2	\$41,356	\$121,869	\$72,907
Other expense	0.0	\$900	\$2,651	\$1,586
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.2	\$8,041	\$27,939	\$16,344
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	2.0	\$85,090	\$295,669	\$172,957
Camping fees	1.2	\$51,119	\$177,627	\$103,906
Total Visitor Impact	16.4	\$558,574	\$1,994,334	\$1,097,704

Pinson Mounds

No Camping/Has Amenities

Spending & Impact Outside Local Area, but inside TN

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	27,753	
Day Visitor Groups	23,118	83.3%
Overnight Visitor Groups	4,635	16.7%

**Per Visitor Group Expenditures
by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN**

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$0.91	\$53.02
Groceries	\$1.19	\$44.66
Gasoline and oil	\$1.69	\$46.69
Recreation use fees	\$0.00	\$2.38
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$0.03	\$15.83
Retail Shopping	\$0.00	\$12.90
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$6.67
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$55.40
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$2.04
Total	\$3.82	\$239.60

Total Spending by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$21,081	\$245,715	\$266,796
Groceries	\$27,524	\$207,000	\$234,524
Gasoline and oil	\$39,027	\$216,381	\$255,408
Recreation use fees	\$0	\$11,051	\$11,051
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$683	\$73,379	\$74,062
Retail Shopping	\$0	\$59,789	\$59,789
Other expense	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$30,934	\$30,934
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$256,762	\$256,762
Camping fees	\$0	\$9,450	\$9,450
Total	\$88,315	\$1,110,461	\$1,198,776

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	0.4	\$11,839	\$47,116	\$23,716
Groceries	0.1	\$5,022	\$15,777	\$9,435
Gasoline and oil	0.1	\$3,669	\$12,108	\$6,963
Recreation use fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.0	\$165	\$542	\$327
Retail Shopping	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	0.6	\$20,696	\$75,543	\$40,441

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	4.7	\$137,994	\$549,174	\$276,430
Groceries	1.1	\$37,770	\$118,649	\$70,957
Gasoline and oil	0.5	\$20,344	\$67,133	\$38,607
Recreation use fees	0.2	\$7,402	\$24,248	\$13,452
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.5	\$17,791	\$58,280	\$35,131
Retail Shopping	0.4	\$14,745	\$43,451	\$25,994
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.4	\$18,288	\$63,549	\$37,174
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	3.5	\$151,797	\$527,465	\$308,550
Camping fees	0.1	\$5,587	\$19,413	\$11,356
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	11.5	\$411,718	\$1,471,363	\$817,651

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	5.1	\$149,833	\$596,290	\$300,146
Groceries	1.2	\$42,792	\$134,426	\$80,392
Gasoline and oil	0.6	\$24,013	\$79,242	\$45,571
Recreation use fees	0.2	\$7,402	\$24,248	\$13,452
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.5	\$17,956	\$58,822	\$35,457
Retail Shopping	0.4	\$14,745	\$43,451	\$25,994
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.4	\$18,288	\$63,549	\$37,174
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	3.5	\$151,797	\$527,465	\$308,550
Camping fees	0.1	\$5,587	\$19,413	\$11,356
Total Visitor Impact	12.2	\$432,413	\$1,546,905	\$858,092

Port Royal

No Camping/No Amenities

Spending & Impact Within Local Area

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	70,815	
Day Visitor Groups	62,246	87.9%
Overnight Visitor Groups	8,569	12.1%

**Per Visitor Group Expenditures
by Visitors Within Local Area**

Expenditure Category	Overnight	
	Day Visitors	Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$12.00	\$55.06
Groceries	\$7.23	\$52.84
Gasoline and oil	\$6.58	\$38.02
Recreation use fees	\$7.48	\$33.40
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$3.25	\$4.26
Retail Shopping	\$0.49	\$35.73
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$8.32
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$54.40
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$24.16
Total	\$37.03	\$306.18

Total Spending by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Overnight		Total
	Day Visitors	Visitors	
Restaurants, snack bars	\$746,703	\$471,748	\$1,218,451
Groceries	\$450,270	\$452,735	\$903,005
Gasoline and oil	\$409,329	\$325,819	\$735,148
Recreation use fees	\$465,483	\$286,162	\$751,646
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$202,530	\$36,484	\$239,014
Retail Shopping	\$30,469	\$306,149	\$336,619
Other expense	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$71,271	\$71,271
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$466,148	\$466,148
Camping fees	\$0	\$207,008	\$207,008
Total	\$2,304,784	\$2,623,526	\$4,928,310

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	14.2	\$419,348	\$1,668,881	\$840,041
Groceries	2.4	\$82,157	\$258,088	\$154,347
Gasoline and oil	1.0	\$38,484	\$126,997	\$73,034
Recreation use fees	10.5	\$311,781	\$1,021,363	\$566,633
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	1.4	\$49,103	\$160,856	\$96,962
Retail Shopping	0.2	\$7,514	\$22,143	\$13,247
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	29.6	\$908,388	\$3,258,328	\$1,744,262

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	9.0	\$264,934	\$1,054,357	\$530,717
Groceries	2.4	\$82,607	\$259,501	\$155,191
Gasoline and oil	0.8	\$30,633	\$101,087	\$58,134
Recreation use fees	6.4	\$191,672	\$627,898	\$348,346
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.3	\$8,845	\$28,977	\$17,467
Retail Shopping	2.1	\$75,503	\$222,491	\$133,103
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	1.0	\$42,136	\$146,413	\$85,647
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	6.4	\$275,587	\$957,609	\$560,170
Camping fees	2.8	\$122,383	\$425,256	\$248,761
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	31.1	\$1,094,299	\$3,823,588	\$2,137,536

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	23.1	\$684,282	\$2,723,238	\$1,370,757
Groceries	4.7	\$164,765	\$517,589	\$309,538
Gasoline and oil	1.8	\$69,117	\$228,084	\$131,167
Recreation use fees	16.9	\$503,452	\$1,649,261	\$914,978
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	1.7	\$57,948	\$189,833	\$114,429
Retail Shopping	2.3	\$83,017	\$244,634	\$146,350
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	1.0	\$42,136	\$146,413	\$85,647
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	6.4	\$275,587	\$957,609	\$560,170
Camping fees	2.8	\$122,383	\$425,256	\$248,761
Total Visitor Impact	60.7	\$2,002,687	\$7,081,916	\$3,881,798

Port Royal

No Camping/No Amenities

Spending & Impact Outside Local Area, but inside TN

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	70,815	
Day Visitor Groups	62,246	87.9%
Overnight Visitor Groups	8,569	12.1%

**Per Visitor Group Expenditures
by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN**

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$0.77	\$47.23
Groceries	\$2.13	\$32.43
Gasoline and oil	\$1.65	\$29.33
Recreation use fees	\$0.00	\$1.81
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$1.13	\$0.45
Retail Shopping	\$0.00	\$3.87
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$2.84
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$39.25
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$3.29
Total	\$5.68	\$160.51

Total Spending by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$47,892	\$404,719	\$452,611
Groceries	\$132,278	\$277,900	\$410,179
Gasoline and oil	\$102,631	\$251,335	\$353,966
Recreation use fees	\$0	\$15,525	\$15,525
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$70,502	\$3,881	\$74,384
Retail Shopping	\$0	\$33,167	\$33,167
Other expense	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$24,323	\$24,323
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$336,288	\$336,288
Camping fees	\$0	\$28,192	\$28,192
Total	\$353,303	\$1,375,332	\$1,728,636

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	0.9	\$26,896	\$107,038	\$53,878
Groceries	0.7	\$24,136	\$75,820	\$45,343
Gasoline and oil	0.3	\$9,649	\$31,842	\$18,312
Recreation use fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.5	\$17,093	\$55,995	\$33,753
Retail Shopping	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	2.3	\$77,774	\$270,695	\$151,286

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	7.7	\$227,290	\$904,548	\$455,309
Groceries	1.5	\$50,706	\$159,288	\$95,261
Gasoline and oil	0.6	\$23,630	\$77,978	\$44,844
Recreation use fees	0.3	\$10,399	\$34,065	\$18,899
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.0	\$941	\$3,083	\$1,858
Retail Shopping	0.2	\$8,180	\$24,104	\$14,420
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.3	\$14,380	\$49,966	\$29,229
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	4.6	\$198,814	\$690,837	\$404,118
Camping fees	0.4	\$16,667	\$57,915	\$33,879
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	15.7	\$551,007	\$2,001,785	\$1,097,816

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	8.6	\$254,186	\$1,011,585	\$509,187
Groceries	2.1	\$74,842	\$235,108	\$140,604
Gasoline and oil	0.9	\$33,279	\$109,820	\$63,156
Recreation use fees	0.3	\$10,399	\$34,065	\$18,899
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.5	\$18,034	\$59,078	\$35,611
Retail Shopping	0.2	\$8,180	\$24,104	\$14,420
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.3	\$14,380	\$49,966	\$29,229
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	4.6	\$198,814	\$690,837	\$404,118
Camping fees	0.4	\$16,667	\$57,915	\$33,879
Total Visitor Impact	18.0	\$628,781	\$2,272,480	\$1,249,102

Radnor Lake

No Camping/Has Amenities
 Spending & Impact Within Local Area

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	426,964	
Day Visitor Groups	355,661	83.3%
Overnight Visitor Groups	71,303	16.7%

**Per Visitor Group Expenditures
 by Visitors Within Local Area**

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$11.16	\$29.28
Groceries	\$7.27	\$20.61
Gasoline and oil	\$7.33	\$21.16
Recreation use fees	\$1.40	\$2.16
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$7.44	\$6.81
Retail Shopping	\$3.43	\$19.07
Other expense	\$0.10	\$0.23
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$2.93
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$31.05
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$18.66
Total	\$38.14	\$151.97

Total Spending by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$3,968,157	\$2,087,695	\$6,055,852
Groceries	\$2,587,266	\$1,469,780	\$4,057,046
Gasoline and oil	\$2,608,447	\$1,508,849	\$4,117,296
Recreation use fees	\$498,008	\$153,824	\$651,832
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$2,645,660	\$485,760	\$3,131,420
Retail Shopping	\$1,220,078	\$1,359,807	\$2,579,885
Other expense	\$36,302	\$16,192	\$52,494
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$209,238	\$209,238
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$2,214,254	\$2,214,254
Camping fees	\$0	\$1,330,246	\$1,330,246
Total	\$13,563,917	\$10,835,644	\$24,399,561

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	75.3	\$2,228,517	\$8,868,831	\$4,464,177
Groceries	13.5	\$472,079	\$1,482,982	\$886,880
Gasoline and oil	6.4	\$245,241	\$809,286	\$465,407
Recreation use fees	11.2	\$333,566	\$1,092,729	\$606,225
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	18.6	\$641,430	\$2,101,269	\$1,266,617
Retail Shopping	8.4	\$300,895	\$886,678	\$530,447
Other expense	0.3	\$9,571	\$28,204	\$16,873
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	133.7	\$4,231,301	\$15,269,980	\$8,236,626

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	39.6	\$1,172,449	\$4,665,997	\$2,348,656
Groceries	7.7	\$268,180	\$842,456	\$503,821
Gasoline and oil	3.7	\$141,859	\$468,129	\$269,213
Recreation use fees	3.5	\$103,031	\$337,520	\$187,250
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	3.4	\$117,771	\$385,806	\$232,559
Retail Shopping	9.4	\$335,355	\$988,225	\$591,196
Other expense	0.1	\$4,269	\$12,580	\$7,526
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	2.9	\$123,701	\$429,837	\$251,441
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	30.4	\$1,309,067	\$4,548,742	\$2,660,869
Camping fees	18.2	\$786,442	\$2,732,725	\$1,598,557
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	118.8	\$4,362,125	\$15,412,018	\$8,651,088

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	114.9	\$3,400,966	\$13,534,829	\$6,812,833
Groceries	21.2	\$740,259	\$2,325,439	\$1,390,701
Gasoline and oil	10.1	\$387,101	\$1,277,415	\$734,620
Recreation use fees	14.6	\$436,597	\$1,430,249	\$793,475
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	22.0	\$759,201	\$2,487,075	\$1,499,176
Retail Shopping	17.8	\$636,251	\$1,874,904	\$1,121,643
Other expense	0.4	\$13,840	\$40,784	\$24,399
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	2.9	\$123,701	\$429,837	\$251,441
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	30.4	\$1,309,067	\$4,548,742	\$2,660,869
Camping fees	18.2	\$786,442	\$2,732,725	\$1,598,557
Total Visitor Impact	252.4	\$8,593,425	\$30,681,998	\$16,887,714

Radnor Lake

No Camping/Has Amenities

Spending & Impact Outside Local Area, but inside TN

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	426,964	
Day Visitor Groups	355,661	83.3%
Overnight Visitor Groups	71,303	16.7%

Per Visitor Group Expenditures by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$0.91	\$53.02
Groceries	\$1.19	\$44.66
Gasoline and oil	\$1.69	\$46.69
Recreation use fees	\$0.00	\$2.38
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$0.03	\$15.83
Retail Shopping	\$0.00	\$12.90
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$6.67
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$55.40
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$2.04
Total	\$3.82	\$239.60

Total Spending by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$324,322	\$3,780,227	\$4,104,549
Groceries	\$423,453	\$3,184,601	\$3,608,054
Gasoline and oil	\$600,409	\$3,328,930	\$3,929,339
Recreation use fees	\$0	\$170,016	\$170,016
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$10,500	\$1,128,912	\$1,139,412
Retail Shopping	\$0	\$919,825	\$919,825
Other expense	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$475,913	\$475,913
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$3,950,170	\$3,950,170
Camping fees	\$0	\$145,386	\$145,386
Total	\$1,358,684	\$17,083,980	\$18,442,664

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	6.2	\$182,139	\$724,860	\$364,863
Groceries	2.2	\$77,264	\$242,717	\$145,154
Gasoline and oil	1.5	\$56,449	\$186,280	\$107,127
Recreation use fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.1	\$2,546	\$8,340	\$5,027
Retail Shopping	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	9.9	\$318,399	\$1,162,197	\$622,170

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	71.7	\$2,122,975	\$8,448,807	\$4,252,755
Groceries	16.6	\$581,071	\$1,825,366	\$1,091,639
Gasoline and oil	8.1	\$312,980	\$1,032,820	\$593,958
Recreation use fees	3.8	\$113,877	\$373,049	\$206,960
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	7.9	\$273,700	\$896,618	\$540,470
Retail Shopping	6.3	\$226,847	\$668,473	\$399,908
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	6.5	\$281,360	\$977,668	\$571,905
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	54.1	\$2,335,340	\$8,114,834	\$4,746,919
Camping fees	2.0	\$85,952	\$298,666	\$174,710
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	177.3	\$6,334,103	\$22,636,302	\$12,579,223

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	77.9	\$2,305,115	\$9,173,667	\$4,617,618
Groceries	18.9	\$658,335	\$2,068,083	\$1,236,793
Gasoline and oil	9.6	\$369,429	\$1,219,100	\$701,084
Recreation use fees	3.8	\$113,877	\$373,049	\$206,960
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	8.0	\$276,246	\$904,958	\$545,497
Retail Shopping	6.3	\$226,847	\$668,473	\$399,908
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	6.5	\$281,360	\$977,668	\$571,905
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	54.1	\$2,335,340	\$8,114,834	\$4,746,919
Camping fees	2.0	\$85,952	\$298,666	\$174,710
Total Visitor Impact	187.2	\$6,652,502	\$23,798,499	\$13,201,394

Red Clay

No Camping/Has Amenities
 Spending & Impact Within Local Area

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	56,131	
Day Visitor Groups	46,757	83.3%
Overnight Visitor Groups	9,374	16.7%

**Per Visitor Group Expenditures
 by Visitors Within Local Area**

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$11.16	\$29.28
Groceries	\$7.27	\$20.61
Gasoline and oil	\$7.33	\$21.16
Recreation use fees	\$1.40	\$2.16
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$7.44	\$6.81
Retail Shopping	\$3.43	\$19.07
Other expense	\$0.10	\$0.23
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$2.93
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$31.05
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$18.66
Total	\$38.14	\$151.97

Total Spending by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$521,679	\$274,462	\$796,141
Groceries	\$340,139	\$193,227	\$533,365
Gasoline and oil	\$342,923	\$198,363	\$541,286
Recreation use fees	\$65,471	\$20,223	\$85,694
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$347,815	\$63,861	\$411,676
Retail Shopping	\$160,399	\$178,769	\$339,168
Other expense	\$4,772	\$2,129	\$6,901
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$27,508	\$27,508
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$291,100	\$291,100
Camping fees	\$0	\$174,883	\$174,883
Total	\$1,783,199	\$1,424,523	\$3,207,723

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	9.9	\$292,975	\$1,165,953	\$586,889
Groceries	1.8	\$62,063	\$194,962	\$116,595
Gasoline and oil	0.8	\$32,241	\$106,394	\$61,185
Recreation use fees	1.5	\$43,853	\$143,657	\$79,698
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	2.4	\$84,327	\$276,246	\$166,518
Retail Shopping	1.1	\$39,558	\$116,568	\$69,736
Other expense	0.0	\$1,258	\$3,708	\$2,218
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	17.6	\$556,274	\$2,007,489	\$1,082,840

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	5.2	\$154,138	\$613,422	\$308,769
Groceries	1.0	\$35,257	\$110,755	\$66,236
Gasoline and oil	0.5	\$18,650	\$61,543	\$35,393
Recreation use fees	0.5	\$13,545	\$44,373	\$24,617
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.4	\$15,483	\$50,721	\$30,574
Retail Shopping	1.2	\$44,088	\$129,918	\$77,722
Other expense	0.0	\$561	\$1,654	\$989
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.4	\$16,263	\$56,509	\$33,056
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	4.0	\$172,098	\$598,007	\$349,815
Camping fees	2.4	\$103,391	\$359,261	\$210,157
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	15.6	\$573,473	\$2,026,163	\$1,137,327

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	15.1	\$447,113	\$1,779,375	\$895,659
Groceries	2.8	\$97,319	\$305,717	\$182,830
Gasoline and oil	1.3	\$50,891	\$167,937	\$96,578
Recreation use fees	1.9	\$57,398	\$188,030	\$104,315
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	2.9	\$99,809	\$326,967	\$197,091
Retail Shopping	2.3	\$83,646	\$246,487	\$147,458
Other expense	0.1	\$1,820	\$5,362	\$3,208
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.4	\$16,263	\$56,509	\$33,056
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	4.0	\$172,098	\$598,007	\$349,815
Camping fees	2.4	\$103,391	\$359,261	\$210,157
Total Visitor Impact	33.2	\$1,129,747	\$4,033,652	\$2,220,167

Red Clay

No Camping/Has Amenities

Spending & Impact Outside Local Area, but inside TN

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	56,131	
Day Visitor Groups	46,757	83.3%
Overnight Visitor Groups	9,374	16.7%

**Per Visitor Group Expenditures
by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN**

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$0.91	\$53.02
Groceries	\$1.19	\$44.66
Gasoline and oil	\$1.69	\$46.69
Recreation use fees	\$0.00	\$2.38
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$0.03	\$15.83
Retail Shopping	\$0.00	\$12.90
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$6.67
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$55.40
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$2.04
Total	\$3.82	\$239.60

Total Spending by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$42,637	\$496,973	\$539,610
Groceries	\$55,670	\$418,668	\$474,338
Gasoline and oil	\$78,934	\$437,642	\$516,576
Recreation use fees	\$0	\$22,351	\$22,351
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$1,380	\$148,414	\$149,794
Retail Shopping	\$0	\$120,926	\$120,926
Other expense	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$62,567	\$62,567
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$519,315	\$519,315
Camping fees	\$0	\$19,113	\$19,113
Total	\$178,621	\$2,245,969	\$2,424,591

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	0.8	\$23,945	\$95,295	\$47,967
Groceries	0.3	\$10,158	\$31,909	\$19,083
Gasoline and oil	0.2	\$7,421	\$24,490	\$14,084
Recreation use fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.0	\$335	\$1,096	\$661
Retail Shopping	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	1.3	\$41,859	\$152,790	\$81,794

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	9.4	\$279,100	\$1,110,734	\$559,094
Groceries	2.2	\$76,391	\$239,974	\$143,514
Gasoline and oil	1.1	\$41,146	\$135,781	\$78,085
Recreation use fees	0.5	\$14,971	\$49,043	\$27,208
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	1.0	\$35,982	\$117,875	\$71,054
Retail Shopping	0.8	\$29,823	\$87,882	\$52,574
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.9	\$36,989	\$128,531	\$75,186
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	7.1	\$307,019	\$1,066,828	\$624,060
Camping fees	0.3	\$11,300	\$39,265	\$22,969
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	23.3	\$832,722	\$2,975,913	\$1,653,745

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	10.2	\$303,045	\$1,206,029	\$607,062
Groceries	2.5	\$86,549	\$271,883	\$162,597
Gasoline and oil	1.3	\$48,568	\$160,271	\$92,169
Recreation use fees	0.5	\$14,971	\$49,043	\$27,208
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	1.1	\$36,317	\$118,972	\$71,714
Retail Shopping	0.8	\$29,823	\$87,882	\$52,574
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.9	\$36,989	\$128,531	\$75,186
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	7.1	\$307,019	\$1,066,828	\$624,060
Camping fees	0.3	\$11,300	\$39,265	\$22,969
Total Visitor Impact	24.6	\$874,580	\$3,128,703	\$1,735,540

Reelfoot Lake

Cabins/Camping

Spending & Impact Within Local Area

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	273,428	
Day Visitor Groups	138,354	50.6%
Overnight Visitor Groups	135,073	49.4%

Per Visitor Group Expenditures by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Overnight	
	Day Visitors	Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$11.28	\$30.80
Groceries	\$11.54	\$63.42
Gasoline and oil	\$8.28	\$23.57
Recreation use fees	\$4.10	\$13.95
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$6.87	\$9.08
Retail Shopping	\$2.45	\$17.97
Other expense	\$0.54	\$0.17
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$10.88
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$5.39
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$79.16
Total	\$45.05	\$254.40

Total Spending by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Overnight		Total
	Day Visitors	Visitors	
Restaurants, snack bars	\$1,560,510	\$4,160,811	\$5,721,321
Groceries	\$1,597,053	\$8,566,430	\$10,163,483
Gasoline and oil	\$1,145,063	\$3,183,479	\$4,328,542
Recreation use fees	\$566,693	\$1,884,155	\$2,450,848
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$950,274	\$1,226,792	\$2,177,066
Retail Shopping	\$338,521	\$2,427,785	\$2,766,306
Other expense	\$74,515	\$22,385	\$96,900
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$1,470,247	\$1,470,247
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$727,921	\$727,921
Camping fees	\$0	\$10,691,974	\$10,691,974
Total	\$6,232,629	\$34,361,980	\$40,594,609

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	29.6	\$876,383	\$3,487,741	\$1,755,574
Groceries	8.3	\$291,403	\$915,407	\$547,448
Gasoline and oil	2.8	\$107,657	\$355,262	\$204,306
Recreation use fees	12.7	\$379,571	\$1,243,438	\$689,835
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	6.7	\$230,390	\$754,739	\$454,946
Retail Shopping	2.3	\$83,486	\$246,016	\$147,177
Other expense	0.5	\$19,646	\$57,893	\$34,634
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	63.0	\$1,988,535	\$7,060,496	\$3,833,921

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	79.0	\$2,336,711	\$9,299,413	\$4,680,912
Groceries	44.8	\$1,563,054	\$4,910,151	\$2,936,458
Gasoline and oil	7.8	\$299,305	\$987,693	\$568,006
Recreation use fees	42.3	\$1,262,007	\$4,134,212	\$2,293,582
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	8.6	\$297,431	\$974,358	\$587,330
Retail Shopping	16.7	\$598,740	\$1,764,367	\$1,055,516
Other expense	0.2	\$5,902	\$17,392	\$10,404
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	20.2	\$869,210	\$3,020,328	\$1,766,795
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	10.0	\$430,347	\$1,495,368	\$874,743
Camping fees	146.6	\$6,321,095	\$21,964,522	\$12,848,545
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	376.0	\$13,983,802	\$48,567,803	\$27,622,292

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	108.6	\$3,213,094	\$12,787,154	\$6,436,487
Groceries	53.1	\$1,854,457	\$5,825,558	\$3,483,907
Gasoline and oil	10.6	\$406,962	\$1,342,955	\$772,311
Recreation use fees	55.0	\$1,641,578	\$5,377,650	\$2,983,417
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	15.3	\$527,822	\$1,729,097	\$1,042,277
Retail Shopping	19.0	\$682,226	\$2,010,383	\$1,202,692
Other expense	0.7	\$25,548	\$75,285	\$45,039
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	20.2	\$869,210	\$3,020,328	\$1,766,795
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	10.0	\$430,347	\$1,495,368	\$874,743
Camping fees	146.6	\$6,321,095	\$21,964,522	\$12,848,545
Total Visitor Impact	439.0	\$15,972,338	\$55,628,300	\$31,456,213

Reelfoot Lake

Cabins/Camping

Spending & Impact Outside Local Area, but inside TN

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	273,428	
Day Visitor Groups	138,354	50.6%
Overnight Visitor Groups	135,073	49.4%

Per Visitor Group Expenditures by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$0.80	\$9.20
Groceries	\$2.37	\$52.32
Gasoline and oil	\$2.42	\$24.55
Recreation use fees	\$0.02	\$1.21
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$0.54	\$11.83
Retail Shopping	\$0.00	\$1.79
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.13
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$0.08
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$1.89
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$1.67
Total	\$6.15	\$104.66

Total Spending by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$110,021	\$1,243,037	\$1,353,058
Groceries	\$327,669	\$7,067,702	\$7,395,371
Gasoline and oil	\$335,163	\$3,315,535	\$3,650,698
Recreation use fees	\$3,068	\$163,096	\$166,164
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$74,268	\$1,597,422	\$1,671,690
Retail Shopping	\$0	\$242,250	\$242,250
Other expense	\$0	\$16,965	\$16,965
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$10,922	\$10,922
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$255,234	\$255,234
Camping fees	\$0	\$224,915	\$224,915
Total	\$850,190	\$14,137,078	\$14,987,268

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	2.1	\$61,788	\$245,897	\$123,774
Groceries	1.7	\$59,787	\$187,815	\$112,321
Gasoline and oil	0.8	\$31,511	\$103,986	\$59,801
Recreation use fees	0.1	\$2,055	\$6,732	\$3,735
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.5	\$18,006	\$58,986	\$35,556
Retail Shopping	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	5.2	\$173,148	\$603,417	\$335,186

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	23.6	\$698,090	\$2,778,189	\$1,398,417
Groceries	36.9	\$1,289,592	\$4,051,102	\$2,422,714
Gasoline and oil	8.1	\$311,721	\$1,028,664	\$591,568
Recreation use fees	3.7	\$109,241	\$357,864	\$198,536
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	11.2	\$387,289	\$1,268,724	\$764,770
Retail Shopping	1.7	\$59,744	\$176,053	\$105,322
Other expense	0.1	\$4,473	\$13,181	\$7,885
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.1	\$6,457	\$22,438	\$13,125
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	3.5	\$150,894	\$524,326	\$306,714
Camping fees	3.1	\$132,970	\$462,044	\$270,281
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	92.0	\$3,150,471	\$10,682,584	\$6,079,333

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	25.7	\$759,878	\$3,024,085	\$1,522,191
Groceries	38.6	\$1,349,379	\$4,238,917	\$2,535,035
Gasoline and oil	8.9	\$343,232	\$1,132,650	\$651,368
Recreation use fees	3.7	\$111,297	\$364,597	\$202,271
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	11.8	\$405,295	\$1,327,711	\$800,326
Retail Shopping	1.7	\$59,744	\$176,053	\$105,322
Other expense	0.1	\$4,473	\$13,181	\$7,885
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.1	\$6,457	\$22,438	\$13,125
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	3.5	\$150,894	\$524,326	\$306,714
Camping fees	3.1	\$132,970	\$462,044	\$270,281
Total Visitor Impact	97.3	\$3,323,619	\$11,286,001	\$6,414,519

Roan Mountain

Cabins/Camping

Spending & Impact Within Local Area

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	213,710	
Day Visitor Groups	108,137	50.6%
Overnight Visitor Groups	105,573	49.4%

**Per Visitor Group Expenditures
by Visitors Within Local Area**

Expenditure Category	Overnight	
	Day Visitors	Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$11.28	\$30.80
Groceries	\$11.54	\$63.42
Gasoline and oil	\$8.28	\$23.57
Recreation use fees	\$4.10	\$13.95
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$6.87	\$9.08
Retail Shopping	\$2.45	\$17.97
Other expense	\$0.54	\$0.17
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$10.88
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$5.39
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$79.16
Total	\$45.05	\$254.40

Total Spending by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Overnight		Total
	Day Visitors	Visitors	
Restaurants, snack bars	\$1,219,689	\$3,252,073	\$4,471,762
Groceries	\$1,248,250	\$6,695,488	\$7,943,738
Gasoline and oil	\$894,976	\$2,488,195	\$3,383,171
Recreation use fees	\$442,925	\$1,472,648	\$1,915,573
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$742,731	\$958,856	\$1,701,586
Retail Shopping	\$264,586	\$1,897,547	\$2,162,134
Other expense	\$58,241	\$17,496	\$75,737
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$1,149,139	\$1,149,139
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$568,940	\$568,940
Camping fees	\$0	\$8,356,804	\$8,356,804
Total	\$4,871,398	\$26,857,185	\$31,728,583

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	23.1	\$684,977	\$2,726,004	\$1,372,150
Groceries	6.5	\$227,759	\$715,478	\$427,884
Gasoline and oil	2.2	\$84,144	\$277,672	\$159,684
Recreation use fees	9.9	\$296,671	\$971,866	\$539,172
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	5.2	\$180,072	\$589,901	\$355,584
Retail Shopping	1.8	\$65,252	\$192,285	\$115,033
Other expense	0.4	\$15,355	\$45,249	\$27,070
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	49.3	\$1,554,231	\$5,518,455	\$2,996,577

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	61.7	\$1,826,364	\$7,268,383	\$3,658,582
Groceries	35.0	\$1,221,677	\$3,837,754	\$2,295,124
Gasoline and oil	6.1	\$233,936	\$771,977	\$443,951
Recreation use fees	33.1	\$986,380	\$3,231,284	\$1,792,654
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	6.7	\$232,471	\$761,554	\$459,055
Retail Shopping	13.1	\$467,973	\$1,379,022	\$824,987
Other expense	0.1	\$4,613	\$13,593	\$8,132
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	15.8	\$679,371	\$2,360,676	\$1,380,920
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	7.8	\$336,357	\$1,168,774	\$683,695
Camping fees	114.5	\$4,940,542	\$17,167,382	\$10,042,371
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	293.9	\$10,929,683	\$37,960,400	\$21,589,472

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	84.9	\$2,511,341	\$9,994,388	\$5,030,732
Groceries	41.5	\$1,449,436	\$4,553,233	\$2,723,008
Gasoline and oil	8.3	\$318,080	\$1,049,648	\$603,636
Recreation use fees	43.0	\$1,283,051	\$4,203,150	\$2,331,827
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	12.0	\$412,543	\$1,351,455	\$814,639
Retail Shopping	14.9	\$533,225	\$1,571,307	\$940,020
Other expense	0.6	\$19,968	\$58,843	\$35,202
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	15.8	\$679,371	\$2,360,676	\$1,380,920
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	7.8	\$336,357	\$1,168,774	\$683,695
Camping fees	114.5	\$4,940,542	\$17,167,382	\$10,042,371
Total Visitor Impact	343.1	\$12,483,915	\$43,478,855	\$24,586,049

Roan Mountain

Cabins/Camping

Spending & Impact Outside Local Area, but inside TN

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	213,710	
Day Visitor Groups	108,137	50.6%
Overnight Visitor Groups	105,573	49.4%

Per Visitor Group Expenditures by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$0.80	\$9.20
Groceries	\$2.37	\$52.32
Gasoline and oil	\$2.42	\$24.55
Recreation use fees	\$0.02	\$1.21
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$0.54	\$11.83
Retail Shopping	\$0.00	\$1.79
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.13
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$0.08
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$1.89
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$1.67
Total	\$6.15	\$104.66

Total Spending by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$85,992	\$971,553	\$1,057,545
Groceries	\$256,105	\$5,524,087	\$5,780,192
Gasoline and oil	\$261,962	\$2,591,409	\$2,853,371
Recreation use fees	\$2,398	\$127,475	\$129,873
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$58,048	\$1,248,539	\$1,306,586
Retail Shopping	\$0	\$189,342	\$189,342
Other expense	\$0	\$13,260	\$13,260
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$8,537	\$8,537
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$199,490	\$199,490
Camping fees	\$0	\$175,793	\$175,793
Total	\$664,505	\$11,049,483	\$11,713,988

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	1.6	\$48,293	\$192,192	\$96,741
Groceries	1.3	\$46,730	\$146,796	\$87,789
Gasoline and oil	0.6	\$24,629	\$81,275	\$46,740
Recreation use fees	0.1	\$1,606	\$5,262	\$2,919
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.4	\$14,073	\$46,104	\$27,791
Retail Shopping	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	4.1	\$135,332	\$471,628	\$261,980

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	18.4	\$545,624	\$2,171,421	\$1,092,997
Groceries	28.9	\$1,007,940	\$3,166,325	\$1,893,584
Gasoline and oil	6.3	\$243,640	\$804,000	\$462,367
Recreation use fees	2.9	\$85,383	\$279,705	\$155,175
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	8.8	\$302,704	\$991,630	\$597,741
Retail Shopping	1.3	\$46,695	\$137,602	\$82,319
Other expense	0.1	\$3,496	\$10,302	\$6,163
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.1	\$5,047	\$17,537	\$10,259
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	2.7	\$117,938	\$409,811	\$239,727
Camping fees	2.4	\$103,929	\$361,132	\$211,250
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	71.9	\$2,462,395	\$8,349,465	\$4,751,582

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	20.1	\$593,917	\$2,363,613	\$1,189,738
Groceries	30.2	\$1,054,669	\$3,313,121	\$1,981,373
Gasoline and oil	7.0	\$268,269	\$885,275	\$509,107
Recreation use fees	2.9	\$86,989	\$284,967	\$158,094
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	9.2	\$316,777	\$1,037,733	\$625,532
Retail Shopping	1.3	\$46,695	\$137,602	\$82,319
Other expense	0.1	\$3,496	\$10,302	\$6,163
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.1	\$5,047	\$17,537	\$10,259
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	2.7	\$117,938	\$409,811	\$239,727
Camping fees	2.4	\$103,929	\$361,132	\$211,250
Total Visitor Impact	76.0	\$2,597,727	\$8,821,093	\$5,013,562

Rock Island

Cabins/Camping

Spending & Impact Within Local Area

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	105,916	
Day Visitor Groups	53,593	50.6%
Overnight Visitor Groups	52,322	49.4%

**Per Visitor Group Expenditures
by Visitors Within Local Area**

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$11.28	\$30.80
Groceries	\$11.54	\$63.42
Gasoline and oil	\$8.28	\$23.57
Recreation use fees	\$4.10	\$13.95
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$6.87	\$9.08
Retail Shopping	\$2.45	\$17.97
Other expense	\$0.54	\$0.17
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$10.88
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$5.39
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$79.16
Total	\$45.05	\$254.40

Total Spending by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$604,483	\$1,611,742	\$2,216,226
Groceries	\$618,638	\$3,318,314	\$3,936,953
Gasoline and oil	\$443,554	\$1,233,161	\$1,676,715
Recreation use fees	\$219,516	\$729,851	\$949,367
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$368,101	\$475,213	\$843,314
Retail Shopping	\$131,130	\$940,433	\$1,071,563
Other expense	\$28,864	\$8,671	\$37,536
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$569,518	\$569,518
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$281,969	\$281,969
Camping fees	\$0	\$4,141,670	\$4,141,670
Total	\$2,414,287	\$13,310,544	\$15,724,831

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	11.5	\$339,478	\$1,351,020	\$680,044
Groceries	3.2	\$112,878	\$354,594	\$212,061
Gasoline and oil	1.1	\$41,702	\$137,615	\$79,140
Recreation use fees	4.9	\$147,032	\$481,661	\$267,216
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	2.6	\$89,245	\$292,357	\$176,229
Retail Shopping	0.9	\$32,339	\$95,298	\$57,011
Other expense	0.2	\$7,610	\$22,426	\$13,416
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	24.4	\$770,284	\$2,734,972	\$1,485,117

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	30.6	\$905,154	\$3,602,244	\$1,813,210
Groceries	17.3	\$605,469	\$1,902,009	\$1,137,474
Gasoline and oil	3.0	\$115,940	\$382,595	\$220,024
Recreation use fees	16.4	\$488,854	\$1,601,439	\$888,448
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	3.3	\$115,214	\$377,430	\$227,510
Retail Shopping	6.5	\$231,929	\$683,450	\$408,867
Other expense	0.1	\$2,286	\$6,737	\$4,030
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	7.8	\$336,699	\$1,169,962	\$684,390
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	3.9	\$166,700	\$579,250	\$338,843
Camping fees	56.8	\$2,448,555	\$8,508,233	\$4,977,045
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	145.6	\$5,416,801	\$18,813,348	\$10,699,841

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	42.1	\$1,244,632	\$4,953,264	\$2,493,254
Groceries	20.6	\$718,347	\$2,256,603	\$1,349,535
Gasoline and oil	4.1	\$157,642	\$520,211	\$299,165
Recreation use fees	21.3	\$635,886	\$2,083,100	\$1,155,664
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	5.9	\$204,458	\$669,787	\$403,739
Retail Shopping	7.4	\$264,269	\$778,747	\$465,878
Other expense	0.3	\$9,896	\$29,163	\$17,446
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	7.8	\$336,699	\$1,169,962	\$684,390
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	3.9	\$166,700	\$579,250	\$338,843
Camping fees	56.8	\$2,448,555	\$8,508,233	\$4,977,045
Total Visitor Impact	170.1	\$6,187,085	\$21,548,319	\$12,184,958

Rock Island

Cabins/Camping

Spending & Impact Outside Local Area, but inside TN

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	105,916	
Day Visitor Groups	53,593	50.6%
Overnight Visitor Groups	52,322	49.4%

**Per Visitor Group Expenditures
by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN**

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$0.80	\$9.20
Groceries	\$2.37	\$52.32
Gasoline and oil	\$2.42	\$24.55
Recreation use fees	\$0.02	\$1.21
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$0.54	\$11.83
Retail Shopping	\$0.00	\$1.79
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.13
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$0.08
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$1.89
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$1.67
Total	\$6.15	\$104.66

Total Spending by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$42,618	\$481,506	\$524,124
Groceries	\$126,927	\$2,737,763	\$2,864,690
Gasoline and oil	\$129,830	\$1,284,314	\$1,414,144
Recreation use fees	\$1,189	\$63,177	\$64,366
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$28,769	\$618,781	\$647,550
Retail Shopping	\$0	\$93,839	\$93,839
Other expense	\$0	\$6,572	\$6,572
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$4,231	\$4,231
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$98,868	\$98,868
Camping fees	\$0	\$87,124	\$87,124
Total	\$329,332	\$5,476,174	\$5,805,506

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	0.8	\$23,934	\$95,251	\$47,945
Groceries	0.7	\$23,159	\$72,753	\$43,509
Gasoline and oil	0.3	\$12,206	\$40,280	\$23,165
Recreation use fees	0.0	\$796	\$2,608	\$1,447
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.2	\$6,975	\$22,849	\$13,773
Retail Shopping	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	2.0	\$67,071	\$233,741	\$129,839

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	9.1	\$270,414	\$1,076,166	\$541,694
Groceries	14.3	\$499,540	\$1,569,245	\$938,469
Gasoline and oil	3.1	\$120,749	\$398,466	\$229,151
Recreation use fees	1.4	\$42,316	\$138,623	\$76,905
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	4.4	\$150,021	\$491,456	\$296,243
Retail Shopping	0.6	\$23,142	\$68,196	\$40,798
Other expense	0.0	\$1,733	\$5,106	\$3,055
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.1	\$2,501	\$8,692	\$5,084
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	1.4	\$58,451	\$203,104	\$118,810
Camping fees	1.2	\$51,508	\$178,978	\$104,697
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	35.7	\$1,220,374	\$4,138,033	\$2,354,906

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	9.9	\$294,348	\$1,171,417	\$589,640
Groceries	15.0	\$522,699	\$1,641,998	\$981,977
Gasoline and oil	3.5	\$132,955	\$438,746	\$252,316
Recreation use fees	1.4	\$43,112	\$141,231	\$78,352
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	4.6	\$156,996	\$514,305	\$310,016
Retail Shopping	0.6	\$23,142	\$68,196	\$40,798
Other expense	0.0	\$1,733	\$5,106	\$3,055
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.1	\$2,501	\$8,692	\$5,084
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	1.4	\$58,451	\$203,104	\$118,810
Camping fees	1.2	\$51,508	\$178,978	\$104,697
Total Visitor Impact	37.7	\$1,287,445	\$4,371,774	\$2,484,744

Rocky Fork

No Camping/No Amenities

Spending & Impact Within Local Area

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	9,412	
Day Visitor Groups	8,273	87.9%
Overnight Visitor Groups	1,139	12.1%

Per Visitor Group Expenditures by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Overnight	
	Day Visitors	Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$12.00	\$55.06
Groceries	\$7.23	\$52.84
Gasoline and oil	\$6.58	\$38.02
Recreation use fees	\$7.48	\$33.40
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$3.25	\$4.26
Retail Shopping	\$0.49	\$35.73
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$8.32
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$54.40
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$24.16
Total	\$37.03	\$306.18

Total Spending by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Overnight		Total
	Day Visitors	Visitors	
Restaurants, snack bars	\$99,242	\$62,699	\$161,941
Groceries	\$59,844	\$60,172	\$120,016
Gasoline and oil	\$54,403	\$43,304	\$97,706
Recreation use fees	\$61,866	\$38,033	\$99,899
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$26,918	\$4,849	\$31,767
Retail Shopping	\$4,050	\$40,689	\$44,739
Other expense	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$9,472	\$9,472
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$61,954	\$61,954
Camping fees	\$0	\$27,513	\$27,513
Total	\$306,322	\$348,685	\$655,008

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	1.9	\$55,734	\$221,806	\$111,647
Groceries	0.3	\$10,919	\$34,302	\$20,514
Gasoline and oil	0.1	\$5,115	\$16,879	\$9,707
Recreation use fees	1.4	\$41,438	\$135,746	\$75,310
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.2	\$6,526	\$21,379	\$12,887
Retail Shopping	0.0	\$999	\$2,943	\$1,761
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	3.9	\$120,731	\$433,055	\$231,825

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	1.2	\$35,212	\$140,132	\$70,536
Groceries	0.3	\$10,979	\$34,490	\$20,626
Gasoline and oil	0.1	\$4,071	\$13,435	\$7,726
Recreation use fees	0.9	\$25,475	\$83,452	\$46,298
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.0	\$1,176	\$3,851	\$2,321
Retail Shopping	0.3	\$10,035	\$29,571	\$17,690
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.1	\$5,600	\$19,459	\$11,383
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.8	\$36,627	\$127,273	\$74,451
Camping fees	0.4	\$16,266	\$56,520	\$33,062
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	4.1	\$145,440	\$508,182	\$284,094

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	3.1	\$90,946	\$361,938	\$182,184
Groceries	0.6	\$21,898	\$68,791	\$41,140
Gasoline and oil	0.2	\$9,186	\$30,314	\$17,433
Recreation use fees	2.2	\$66,912	\$219,199	\$121,607
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.2	\$7,702	\$25,230	\$15,208
Retail Shopping	0.3	\$11,034	\$32,514	\$19,451
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.1	\$5,600	\$19,459	\$11,383
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.8	\$36,627	\$127,273	\$74,451
Camping fees	0.4	\$16,266	\$56,520	\$33,062
Total Visitor Impact	8.1	\$266,171	\$941,237	\$515,919

Rocky Fork

No Camping/No Amenities

Spending & Impact Outside Local Area, but inside TN

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	9,412	
Day Visitor Groups	8,273	87.9%
Overnight Visitor Groups	1,139	12.1%

Per Visitor Group Expenditures by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$0.77	\$47.23
Groceries	\$2.13	\$32.43
Gasoline and oil	\$1.65	\$29.33
Recreation use fees	\$0.00	\$1.81
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$1.13	\$0.45
Retail Shopping	\$0.00	\$3.87
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$2.84
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$39.25
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$3.29
Total	\$5.68	\$160.51

Total Spending by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$6,365	\$53,790	\$60,155
Groceries	\$17,581	\$36,935	\$54,516
Gasoline and oil	\$13,640	\$33,404	\$47,045
Recreation use fees	\$0	\$2,063	\$2,063
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$9,370	\$516	\$9,886
Retail Shopping	\$0	\$4,408	\$4,408
Other expense	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$3,233	\$3,233
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$44,695	\$44,695
Camping fees	\$0	\$3,747	\$3,747
Total	\$46,957	\$182,792	\$229,748

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	0.1	\$3,575	\$14,226	\$7,161
Groceries	0.1	\$3,208	\$10,077	\$6,026
Gasoline and oil	0.0	\$1,282	\$4,232	\$2,434
Recreation use fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.1	\$2,272	\$7,442	\$4,486
Retail Shopping	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	0.3	\$10,337	\$35,977	\$20,107

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	1.0	\$30,209	\$120,221	\$60,514
Groceries	0.2	\$6,739	\$21,171	\$12,661
Gasoline and oil	0.1	\$3,141	\$10,364	\$5,960
Recreation use fees	0.0	\$1,382	\$4,528	\$2,512
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.0	\$125	\$410	\$247
Retail Shopping	0.0	\$1,087	\$3,204	\$1,917
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$1,911	\$6,641	\$3,885
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.6	\$26,424	\$91,817	\$53,710
Camping fees	0.1	\$2,215	\$7,697	\$4,503
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	2.1	\$73,233	\$266,052	\$145,908

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	1.1	\$33,783	\$134,447	\$67,675
Groceries	0.3	\$9,947	\$31,248	\$18,687
Gasoline and oil	0.1	\$4,423	\$14,596	\$8,394
Recreation use fees	0.0	\$1,382	\$4,528	\$2,512
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.1	\$2,397	\$7,852	\$4,733
Retail Shopping	0.0	\$1,087	\$3,204	\$1,917
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$1,911	\$6,641	\$3,885
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.6	\$26,424	\$91,817	\$53,710
Camping fees	0.1	\$2,215	\$7,697	\$4,503
Total Visitor Impact	2.4	\$83,570	\$302,029	\$166,015

Sergeant Alvin C. York

No Camping/Has Amenities
 Spending & Impact Within Local Area

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	86,414	
Day Visitor Groups	71,983	83.3%
Overnight Visitor Groups	14,431	16.7%

**Per Visitor Group Expenditures
 by Visitors Within Local Area**

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$11.16	\$29.28
Groceries	\$7.27	\$20.61
Gasoline and oil	\$7.33	\$21.16
Recreation use fees	\$1.40	\$2.16
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$7.44	\$6.81
Retail Shopping	\$3.43	\$19.07
Other expense	\$0.10	\$0.23
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$2.93
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$31.05
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$18.66
Total	\$38.14	\$151.97

Total Spending by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$803,125	\$422,533	\$1,225,658
Groceries	\$523,643	\$297,472	\$821,115
Gasoline and oil	\$527,930	\$305,379	\$833,309
Recreation use fees	\$100,793	\$31,133	\$131,926
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$535,461	\$98,314	\$633,775
Retail Shopping	\$246,934	\$275,215	\$522,149
Other expense	\$7,347	\$3,277	\$10,624
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$42,348	\$42,348
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$448,148	\$448,148
Camping fees	\$0	\$269,232	\$269,232
Total	\$2,745,233	\$2,193,051	\$4,938,284

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	15.2	\$451,035	\$1,794,983	\$903,515
Groceries	2.7	\$95,545	\$300,144	\$179,498
Gasoline and oil	1.3	\$49,635	\$163,793	\$94,195
Recreation use fees	2.3	\$67,511	\$221,160	\$122,695
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	3.8	\$129,821	\$425,281	\$256,354
Retail Shopping	1.7	\$60,899	\$179,457	\$107,358
Other expense	0.1	\$1,937	\$5,708	\$3,415
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	27.0	\$856,383	\$3,090,527	\$1,667,030

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	8.0	\$237,295	\$944,362	\$475,350
Groceries	1.6	\$54,278	\$170,507	\$101,970
Gasoline and oil	0.7	\$28,711	\$94,746	\$54,487
Recreation use fees	0.7	\$20,853	\$68,312	\$37,898
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.7	\$23,836	\$78,084	\$47,068
Retail Shopping	1.9	\$67,873	\$200,009	\$119,654
Other expense	0.0	\$864	\$2,546	\$1,523
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.6	\$25,036	\$86,996	\$50,890
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	6.1	\$264,945	\$920,631	\$538,540
Camping fees	3.7	\$159,170	\$553,083	\$323,536
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	24.0	\$882,861	\$3,119,274	\$1,750,914

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	23.3	\$688,330	\$2,739,346	\$1,378,865
Groceries	4.3	\$149,823	\$470,651	\$281,467
Gasoline and oil	2.0	\$78,346	\$258,539	\$148,682
Recreation use fees	3.0	\$88,364	\$289,471	\$160,593
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	4.5	\$153,656	\$503,365	\$303,422
Retail Shopping	3.6	\$128,772	\$379,466	\$227,012
Other expense	0.1	\$2,801	\$8,254	\$4,938
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.6	\$25,036	\$86,996	\$50,890
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	6.1	\$264,945	\$920,631	\$538,540
Camping fees	3.7	\$159,170	\$553,083	\$323,536
Total Visitor Impact	51.1	\$1,739,243	\$6,209,801	\$3,417,944

Sergeant Alvin C. York

No Camping/Has Amenities

Spending & Impact Outside Local Area, but inside TN

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	86,414	
Day Visitor Groups	71,983	83.3%
Overnight Visitor Groups	14,431	16.7%

**Per Visitor Group Expenditures
by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN**

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$0.91	\$53.02
Groceries	\$1.19	\$44.66
Gasoline and oil	\$1.69	\$46.69
Recreation use fees	\$0.00	\$2.38
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$0.03	\$15.83
Retail Shopping	\$0.00	\$12.90
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$6.67
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$55.40
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$2.04
Total	\$3.82	\$239.60

Total Spending by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$65,640	\$765,089	\$830,729
Groceries	\$85,704	\$644,539	\$730,243
Gasoline and oil	\$121,518	\$673,750	\$795,268
Recreation use fees	\$0	\$34,410	\$34,410
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$2,125	\$228,483	\$230,608
Retail Shopping	\$0	\$186,166	\$186,166
Other expense	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$96,321	\$96,321
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$799,484	\$799,484
Camping fees	\$0	\$29,425	\$29,425
Total	\$274,987	\$3,457,667	\$3,732,654

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	1.2	\$36,864	\$146,706	\$73,845
Groceries	0.4	\$15,638	\$49,124	\$29,378
Gasoline and oil	0.3	\$11,425	\$37,702	\$21,682
Recreation use fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.0	\$515	\$1,688	\$1,017
Retail Shopping	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	2.0	\$64,441	\$235,220	\$125,922

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	14.5	\$429,674	\$1,709,974	\$860,725
Groceries	3.4	\$117,604	\$369,440	\$220,939
Gasoline and oil	1.6	\$63,345	\$209,035	\$120,212
Recreation use fees	0.8	\$23,048	\$75,502	\$41,887
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	1.6	\$55,395	\$181,469	\$109,387
Retail Shopping	1.3	\$45,912	\$135,294	\$80,938
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	1.3	\$56,945	\$197,873	\$115,749
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	11.0	\$472,655	\$1,642,380	\$960,740
Camping fees	0.4	\$17,396	\$60,448	\$35,360
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	35.9	\$1,281,974	\$4,581,414	\$2,545,938

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	15.8	\$466,538	\$1,856,680	\$934,570
Groceries	3.8	\$133,242	\$418,564	\$250,317
Gasoline and oil	1.9	\$74,770	\$246,737	\$141,894
Recreation use fees	0.8	\$23,048	\$75,502	\$41,887
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	1.6	\$55,910	\$183,157	\$110,404
Retail Shopping	1.3	\$45,912	\$135,294	\$80,938
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	1.3	\$56,945	\$197,873	\$115,749
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	11.0	\$472,655	\$1,642,380	\$960,740
Camping fees	0.4	\$17,396	\$60,448	\$35,360
Total Visitor Impact	37.9	\$1,346,415	\$4,816,634	\$2,671,861

Seven Islands

No Camping/No Amenities

Spending & Impact Within Local Area

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	36,039	
Day Visitor Groups	31,679	87.9%
Overnight Visitor Groups	4,361	12.1%

Per Visitor Group Expenditures by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Overnight	
	Day Visitors	Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$12.00	\$55.06
Groceries	\$7.23	\$52.84
Gasoline and oil	\$6.58	\$38.02
Recreation use fees	\$7.48	\$33.40
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$3.25	\$4.26
Retail Shopping	\$0.49	\$35.73
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$8.32
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$54.40
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$24.16
Total	\$37.03	\$306.18

Total Spending by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Overnight		Total
	Day Visitors	Visitors	
Restaurants, snack bars	\$380,015	\$240,084	\$620,100
Groceries	\$229,153	\$230,408	\$459,561
Gasoline and oil	\$208,318	\$165,817	\$374,135
Recreation use fees	\$236,896	\$145,635	\$382,531
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$103,073	\$18,568	\$121,640
Retail Shopping	\$15,507	\$155,807	\$171,313
Other expense	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$36,272	\$36,272
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$237,234	\$237,234
Camping fees	\$0	\$105,351	\$105,351
Total	\$1,172,961	\$1,335,176	\$2,508,138

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	7.2	\$213,417	\$849,334	\$427,517
Groceries	1.2	\$41,812	\$131,347	\$78,551
Gasoline and oil	0.5	\$19,586	\$64,632	\$37,169
Recreation use fees	5.3	\$158,673	\$519,797	\$288,373
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.7	\$24,990	\$81,864	\$49,346
Retail Shopping	0.1	\$3,824	\$11,269	\$6,742
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	15.1	\$462,301	\$1,658,243	\$887,698

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	4.6	\$134,831	\$536,588	\$270,095
Groceries	1.2	\$42,041	\$132,066	\$78,981
Gasoline and oil	0.4	\$15,590	\$51,446	\$29,586
Recreation use fees	3.3	\$97,546	\$319,552	\$177,282
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.1	\$4,502	\$14,747	\$8,889
Retail Shopping	1.1	\$38,425	\$113,231	\$67,739
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.5	\$21,444	\$74,513	\$43,588
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	3.3	\$140,253	\$487,350	\$285,084
Camping fees	1.4	\$62,284	\$216,423	\$126,601
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	15.8	\$556,916	\$1,945,918	\$1,087,844

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	11.8	\$348,248	\$1,385,923	\$697,612
Groceries	2.4	\$83,853	\$263,414	\$157,531
Gasoline and oil	0.9	\$35,175	\$116,078	\$66,754
Recreation use fees	8.6	\$256,219	\$839,349	\$465,655
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.9	\$29,491	\$96,611	\$58,236
Retail Shopping	1.2	\$42,249	\$124,500	\$74,481
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.5	\$21,444	\$74,513	\$43,588
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	3.3	\$140,253	\$487,350	\$285,084
Camping fees	1.4	\$62,284	\$216,423	\$126,601
Total Visitor Impact	30.9	\$1,019,216	\$3,604,161	\$1,975,542

Seven Islands

No Camping/No Amenities

Spending & Impact Outside Local Area, but inside TN

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	36,039	
Day Visitor Groups	31,679	87.9%
Overnight Visitor Groups	4,361	12.1%

**Per Visitor Group Expenditures
by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN**

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$0.77	\$47.23
Groceries	\$2.13	\$32.43
Gasoline and oil	\$1.65	\$29.33
Recreation use fees	\$0.00	\$1.81
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$1.13	\$0.45
Retail Shopping	\$0.00	\$3.87
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$2.84
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$39.25
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$3.29
Total	\$5.68	\$160.51

Total Spending by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$24,373	\$205,972	\$230,345
Groceries	\$67,320	\$141,430	\$208,750
Gasoline and oil	\$52,232	\$127,911	\$180,142
Recreation use fees	\$0	\$7,901	\$7,901
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$35,880	\$1,975	\$37,856
Retail Shopping	\$0	\$16,880	\$16,880
Other expense	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$12,378	\$12,378
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$171,145	\$171,145
Camping fees	\$0	\$14,348	\$14,348
Total	\$179,805	\$699,940	\$879,745

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	0.5	\$13,688	\$54,474	\$27,420
Groceries	0.4	\$12,283	\$38,587	\$23,076
Gasoline and oil	0.1	\$4,911	\$16,205	\$9,319
Recreation use fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.3	\$8,699	\$28,497	\$17,178
Retail Shopping	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	1.2	\$39,581	\$137,763	\$76,993

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	3.9	\$115,674	\$460,346	\$231,718
Groceries	0.7	\$25,806	\$81,066	\$48,480
Gasoline and oil	0.3	\$12,026	\$39,685	\$22,822
Recreation use fees	0.2	\$5,292	\$17,337	\$9,618
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.0	\$479	\$1,569	\$946
Retail Shopping	0.1	\$4,163	\$12,267	\$7,339
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.2	\$7,318	\$25,429	\$14,875
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	2.3	\$101,181	\$351,584	\$205,665
Camping fees	0.2	\$8,482	\$29,475	\$17,242
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	8.0	\$280,421	\$1,018,757	\$558,705

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	4.4	\$129,362	\$514,820	\$259,138
Groceries	1.1	\$38,089	\$119,652	\$71,557
Gasoline and oil	0.4	\$16,937	\$55,890	\$32,142
Recreation use fees	0.2	\$5,292	\$17,337	\$9,618
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.3	\$9,178	\$30,066	\$18,124
Retail Shopping	0.1	\$4,163	\$12,267	\$7,339
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.2	\$7,318	\$25,429	\$14,875
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	2.3	\$101,181	\$351,584	\$205,665
Camping fees	0.2	\$8,482	\$29,475	\$17,242
Total Visitor Impact	9.2	\$320,002	\$1,156,521	\$635,699

South Cumberland

Cabins/Camping

Spending & Impact Within Local Area

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	101,133	
Day Visitor Groups	51,174	50.6%
Overnight Visitor Groups	49,960	49.4%

Per Visitor Group Expenditures by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$11.28	\$30.80
Groceries	\$11.54	\$63.42
Gasoline and oil	\$8.28	\$23.57
Recreation use fees	\$4.10	\$13.95
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$6.87	\$9.08
Retail Shopping	\$2.45	\$17.97
Other expense	\$0.54	\$0.17
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$10.88
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$5.39
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$79.16
Total	\$45.05	\$254.40

Total Spending by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$577,190	\$1,538,970	\$2,116,160
Groceries	\$590,706	\$3,168,488	\$3,759,194
Gasoline and oil	\$423,527	\$1,177,482	\$1,601,009
Recreation use fees	\$209,604	\$696,897	\$906,501
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$351,480	\$453,757	\$805,237
Retail Shopping	\$125,210	\$897,971	\$1,023,181
Other expense	\$27,561	\$8,280	\$35,841
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$543,804	\$543,804
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$269,238	\$269,238
Camping fees	\$0	\$3,954,668	\$3,954,668
Total	\$2,305,279	\$12,709,556	\$15,014,834

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	11.0	\$324,150	\$1,290,020	\$649,339
Groceries	3.1	\$107,782	\$338,584	\$202,486
Gasoline and oil	1.0	\$39,819	\$131,402	\$75,567
Recreation use fees	4.7	\$140,393	\$459,914	\$255,151
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	2.5	\$85,215	\$279,157	\$168,272
Retail Shopping	0.9	\$30,879	\$90,995	\$54,437
Other expense	0.2	\$7,267	\$21,413	\$12,810
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	23.3	\$735,505	\$2,611,484	\$1,418,062

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	29.2	\$864,286	\$3,439,598	\$1,731,341
Groceries	16.6	\$578,131	\$1,816,130	\$1,086,116
Gasoline and oil	2.9	\$110,705	\$365,321	\$210,090
Recreation use fees	15.6	\$466,782	\$1,529,132	\$848,333
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	3.2	\$110,012	\$360,388	\$217,237
Retail Shopping	6.2	\$221,457	\$652,591	\$390,406
Other expense	0.1	\$2,183	\$6,433	\$3,848
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	7.5	\$321,497	\$1,117,137	\$653,489
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	3.7	\$159,174	\$553,096	\$323,543
Camping fees	54.2	\$2,338,000	\$8,124,075	\$4,752,325
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	139.1	\$5,172,226	\$17,963,901	\$10,216,729

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	40.2	\$1,188,436	\$4,729,618	\$2,380,680
Groceries	19.6	\$685,913	\$2,154,714	\$1,288,602
Gasoline and oil	3.9	\$150,524	\$496,722	\$285,657
Recreation use fees	20.4	\$607,175	\$1,989,046	\$1,103,484
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	5.7	\$195,227	\$639,545	\$385,510
Retail Shopping	7.0	\$252,337	\$743,586	\$444,843
Other expense	0.3	\$9,450	\$27,846	\$16,659
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	7.5	\$321,497	\$1,117,137	\$653,489
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	3.7	\$159,174	\$553,096	\$323,543
Camping fees	54.2	\$2,338,000	\$8,124,075	\$4,752,325
Total Visitor Impact	162.4	\$5,907,730	\$20,575,385	\$11,634,792

South Cumberland

Cabins/Camping

Spending & Impact Outside Local Area, but inside TN

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	101,133	
Day Visitor Groups	51,174	50.6%
Overnight Visitor Groups	49,960	49.4%

Per Visitor Group Expenditures by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$0.80	\$9.20
Groceries	\$2.37	\$52.32
Gasoline and oil	\$2.42	\$24.55
Recreation use fees	\$0.02	\$1.21
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$0.54	\$11.83
Retail Shopping	\$0.00	\$1.79
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.13
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$0.08
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$1.89
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$1.67
Total	\$6.15	\$104.66

Total Spending by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$40,694	\$459,765	\$500,459
Groceries	\$121,196	\$2,614,149	\$2,735,345
Gasoline and oil	\$123,968	\$1,226,326	\$1,350,293
Recreation use fees	\$1,135	\$60,325	\$61,459
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$27,470	\$590,843	\$618,312
Retail Shopping	\$0	\$89,602	\$89,602
Other expense	\$0	\$6,275	\$6,275
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$4,040	\$4,040
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$94,404	\$94,404
Camping fees	\$0	\$83,190	\$83,190
Total	\$314,462	\$5,228,918	\$5,543,380

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	0.8	\$22,854	\$90,950	\$45,780
Groceries	0.6	\$22,114	\$69,468	\$41,544
Gasoline and oil	0.3	\$11,655	\$38,462	\$22,119
Recreation use fees	0.0	\$760	\$2,490	\$1,381
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.2	\$6,660	\$21,817	\$13,151
Retail Shopping	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	1.9	\$64,043	\$223,187	\$123,976

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	8.7	\$258,204	\$1,027,576	\$517,236
Groceries	13.7	\$476,985	\$1,498,392	\$896,096
Gasoline and oil	3.0	\$115,297	\$380,475	\$218,805
Recreation use fees	1.4	\$40,405	\$132,364	\$73,433
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	4.2	\$143,248	\$469,266	\$282,868
Retail Shopping	0.6	\$22,098	\$65,117	\$38,956
Other expense	0.0	\$1,654	\$4,875	\$2,917
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.1	\$2,388	\$8,299	\$4,855
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	1.3	\$55,812	\$193,934	\$113,445
Camping fees	1.1	\$49,182	\$170,897	\$99,970
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	34.0	\$1,165,273	\$3,951,195	\$2,248,579

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	9.5	\$281,058	\$1,118,526	\$563,017
Groceries	14.3	\$499,098	\$1,567,859	\$937,640
Gasoline and oil	3.3	\$126,952	\$418,936	\$240,923
Recreation use fees	1.4	\$41,166	\$134,854	\$74,815
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	4.4	\$149,908	\$491,084	\$296,019
Retail Shopping	0.6	\$22,098	\$65,117	\$38,956
Other expense	0.0	\$1,654	\$4,875	\$2,917
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.1	\$2,388	\$8,299	\$4,855
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	1.3	\$55,812	\$193,934	\$113,445
Camping fees	1.1	\$49,182	\$170,897	\$99,970
Total Visitor Impact	36.0	\$1,229,316	\$4,174,383	\$2,372,555

Standing Stone

Cabins/Camping

Spending & Impact Within Local Area

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	103,111	
Day Visitor Groups	52,174	50.6%
Overnight Visitor Groups	50,937	49.4%

**Per Visitor Group Expenditures
by Visitors Within Local Area**

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$11.28	\$30.80
Groceries	\$11.54	\$63.42
Gasoline and oil	\$8.28	\$23.57
Recreation use fees	\$4.10	\$13.95
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$6.87	\$9.08
Retail Shopping	\$2.45	\$17.97
Other expense	\$0.54	\$0.17
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$10.88
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$5.39
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$79.16
Total	\$45.05	\$254.40

Total Spending by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$588,474	\$1,569,056	\$2,157,530
Groceries	\$602,254	\$3,230,431	\$3,832,685
Gasoline and oil	\$431,807	\$1,200,501	\$1,632,308
Recreation use fees	\$213,702	\$710,521	\$924,223
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$358,352	\$462,628	\$820,979
Retail Shopping	\$127,657	\$915,526	\$1,043,184
Other expense	\$28,100	\$8,442	\$36,541
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$554,435	\$554,435
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$274,502	\$274,502
Camping fees	\$0	\$4,031,981	\$4,031,981
Total	\$2,350,346	\$12,958,023	\$15,308,370

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	11.2	\$330,487	\$1,315,239	\$662,033
Groceries	3.1	\$109,889	\$345,203	\$206,445
Gasoline and oil	1.1	\$40,598	\$133,971	\$77,044
Recreation use fees	4.8	\$143,138	\$468,905	\$260,139
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	2.5	\$86,881	\$284,615	\$171,562
Retail Shopping	0.9	\$31,483	\$92,774	\$55,501
Other expense	0.2	\$7,409	\$21,832	\$13,061
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	23.8	\$749,884	\$2,662,538	\$1,445,785

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	29.8	\$881,182	\$3,506,841	\$1,765,189
Groceries	16.9	\$589,433	\$1,851,635	\$1,107,349
Gasoline and oil	2.9	\$112,869	\$372,462	\$214,197
Recreation use fees	16.0	\$475,907	\$1,559,026	\$864,918
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	3.3	\$112,162	\$367,434	\$221,484
Retail Shopping	6.3	\$225,787	\$665,349	\$398,039
Other expense	0.1	\$2,226	\$6,559	\$3,924
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	7.6	\$327,782	\$1,138,976	\$666,265
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	3.8	\$162,285	\$563,909	\$329,869
Camping fees	55.3	\$2,383,707	\$8,282,898	\$4,845,231
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	141.8	\$5,273,341	\$18,315,089	\$10,416,463

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	40.9	\$1,211,669	\$4,822,081	\$2,427,222
Groceries	20.0	\$699,322	\$2,196,838	\$1,313,794
Gasoline and oil	4.0	\$153,467	\$506,433	\$291,241
Recreation use fees	20.8	\$619,045	\$2,027,931	\$1,125,057
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	5.8	\$199,043	\$652,048	\$393,046
Retail Shopping	7.2	\$257,270	\$758,122	\$453,540
Other expense	0.3	\$9,634	\$28,390	\$16,984
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	7.6	\$327,782	\$1,138,976	\$666,265
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	3.8	\$162,285	\$563,909	\$329,869
Camping fees	55.3	\$2,383,707	\$8,282,898	\$4,845,231
Total Visitor Impact	165.6	\$6,023,225	\$20,977,627	\$11,862,248

Standing Stone

Cabins/Camping

Spending & Impact Outside Local Area, but inside TN

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	103,111	
Day Visitor Groups	52,174	50.6%
Overnight Visitor Groups	50,937	49.4%

**Per Visitor Group Expenditures
by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN**

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$0.80	\$9.20
Groceries	\$2.37	\$52.32
Gasoline and oil	\$2.42	\$24.55
Recreation use fees	\$0.02	\$1.21
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$0.54	\$11.83
Retail Shopping	\$0.00	\$1.79
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.13
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$0.08
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$1.89
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$1.67
Total	\$6.15	\$104.66

Total Spending by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$41,489	\$468,754	\$510,243
Groceries	\$123,565	\$2,665,255	\$2,788,820
Gasoline and oil	\$126,391	\$1,250,300	\$1,376,691
Recreation use fees	\$1,157	\$61,504	\$62,661
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$28,007	\$602,393	\$630,400
Retail Shopping	\$0	\$91,353	\$91,353
Other expense	\$0	\$6,398	\$6,398
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$4,119	\$4,119
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$96,249	\$96,249
Camping fees	\$0	\$84,816	\$84,816
Total	\$320,609	\$5,331,142	\$5,651,751

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	0.8	\$23,300	\$92,729	\$46,675
Groceries	0.6	\$22,546	\$70,826	\$42,357
Gasoline and oil	0.3	\$11,883	\$39,214	\$22,551
Recreation use fees	0.0	\$775	\$2,539	\$1,408
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.2	\$6,790	\$22,244	\$13,408
Retail Shopping	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	2.0	\$65,295	\$227,551	\$126,400

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	8.9	\$263,252	\$1,047,665	\$527,348
Groceries	13.9	\$486,310	\$1,527,685	\$913,614
Gasoline and oil	3.1	\$117,551	\$387,913	\$223,082
Recreation use fees	1.4	\$41,195	\$134,952	\$74,869
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	4.2	\$146,048	\$478,440	\$288,398
Retail Shopping	0.6	\$22,530	\$66,390	\$39,717
Other expense	0.0	\$1,687	\$4,971	\$2,974
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.1	\$2,435	\$8,461	\$4,950
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	1.3	\$56,903	\$197,725	\$115,663
Camping fees	1.2	\$50,143	\$174,238	\$101,924
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	34.7	\$1,188,054	\$4,028,440	\$2,292,538

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	9.7	\$286,552	\$1,140,393	\$574,023
Groceries	14.6	\$508,856	\$1,598,511	\$955,971
Gasoline and oil	3.4	\$129,434	\$427,126	\$245,633
Recreation use fees	1.4	\$41,970	\$137,491	\$76,277
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	4.4	\$152,838	\$500,684	\$301,806
Retail Shopping	0.6	\$22,530	\$66,390	\$39,717
Other expense	0.0	\$1,687	\$4,971	\$2,974
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.1	\$2,435	\$8,461	\$4,950
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	1.3	\$56,903	\$197,725	\$115,663
Camping fees	1.2	\$50,143	\$174,238	\$101,924
Total Visitor Impact	36.7	\$1,253,348	\$4,255,991	\$2,418,938

Sycamore Shoals

No Camping/Has Amenities
 Spending & Impact Within Local Area

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	71,924	
Day Visitor Groups	59,913	83.3%
Overnight Visitor Groups	12,011	16.7%

**Per Visitor Group Expenditures
 by Visitors Within Local Area**

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$11.16	\$29.28
Groceries	\$7.27	\$20.61
Gasoline and oil	\$7.33	\$21.16
Recreation use fees	\$1.40	\$2.16
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$7.44	\$6.81
Retail Shopping	\$3.43	\$19.07
Other expense	\$0.10	\$0.23
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$2.93
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$31.05
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$18.66
Total	\$38.14	\$151.97

Total Spending by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$668,454	\$351,682	\$1,020,136
Groceries	\$435,837	\$247,591	\$683,428
Gasoline and oil	\$439,405	\$254,173	\$693,577
Recreation use fees	\$83,892	\$25,912	\$109,804
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$445,674	\$81,828	\$527,502
Retail Shopping	\$205,528	\$229,066	\$434,593
Other expense	\$6,115	\$2,728	\$8,843
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$35,247	\$35,247
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$373,001	\$373,001
Camping fees	\$0	\$224,086	\$224,086
Total	\$2,284,904	\$1,825,314	\$4,110,218

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	12.7	\$375,404	\$1,493,995	\$752,011
Groceries	2.3	\$79,524	\$249,815	\$149,399
Gasoline and oil	1.1	\$41,312	\$136,328	\$78,400
Recreation use fees	1.9	\$56,191	\$184,075	\$102,121
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	3.1	\$108,052	\$353,968	\$213,367
Retail Shopping	1.4	\$50,687	\$149,365	\$89,356
Other expense	0.0	\$1,612	\$4,751	\$2,842
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	22.5	\$712,782	\$2,572,298	\$1,387,497

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	6.7	\$197,504	\$786,009	\$395,642
Groceries	1.3	\$45,176	\$141,916	\$84,871
Gasoline and oil	0.6	\$23,897	\$78,858	\$45,350
Recreation use fees	0.6	\$17,356	\$56,857	\$31,543
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.6	\$19,839	\$64,991	\$39,176
Retail Shopping	1.6	\$56,492	\$166,471	\$99,590
Other expense	0.0	\$719	\$2,119	\$1,268
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.5	\$20,838	\$72,408	\$42,356
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	5.1	\$220,518	\$766,256	\$448,236
Camping fees	3.1	\$132,480	\$460,340	\$269,284
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	20.0	\$734,820	\$2,596,225	\$1,457,315

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	19.4	\$572,908	\$2,280,004	\$1,147,653
Groceries	3.6	\$124,700	\$391,731	\$234,270
Gasoline and oil	1.7	\$65,209	\$215,186	\$123,750
Recreation use fees	2.5	\$73,547	\$240,932	\$133,664
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	3.7	\$127,891	\$418,959	\$252,543
Retail Shopping	3.0	\$107,179	\$315,836	\$188,946
Other expense	0.1	\$2,331	\$6,870	\$4,110
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.5	\$20,838	\$72,408	\$42,356
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	5.1	\$220,518	\$766,256	\$448,236
Camping fees	3.1	\$132,480	\$460,340	\$269,284
Total Visitor Impact	42.5	\$1,447,602	\$5,168,523	\$2,844,813

Sycamore Shoals

No Camping/Has Amenities

Spending & Impact Outside Local Area, but inside TN

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	71,924	
Day Visitor Groups	59,913	83.3%
Overnight Visitor Groups	12,011	16.7%

**Per Visitor Group Expenditures
by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN**

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$0.91	\$53.02
Groceries	\$1.19	\$44.66
Gasoline and oil	\$1.69	\$46.69
Recreation use fees	\$0.00	\$2.38
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$0.03	\$15.83
Retail Shopping	\$0.00	\$12.90
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$6.67
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$55.40
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$2.04
Total	\$3.82	\$239.60

Total Spending by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$54,634	\$636,796	\$691,430
Groceries	\$71,333	\$536,461	\$607,793
Gasoline and oil	\$101,142	\$560,773	\$661,915
Recreation use fees	\$0	\$28,640	\$28,640
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$1,769	\$190,170	\$191,939
Retail Shopping	\$0	\$154,949	\$154,949
Other expense	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$80,170	\$80,170
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$665,424	\$665,424
Camping fees	\$0	\$24,491	\$24,491
Total	\$228,877	\$2,877,874	\$3,106,751

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	1.0	\$30,682	\$122,106	\$61,463
Groceries	0.4	\$13,016	\$40,887	\$24,452
Gasoline and oil	0.2	\$9,509	\$31,380	\$18,046
Recreation use fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.0	\$429	\$1,405	\$847
Retail Shopping	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	1.7	\$53,636	\$195,777	\$104,807

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	12.1	\$357,625	\$1,423,240	\$716,396
Groceries	2.8	\$97,884	\$307,491	\$183,892
Gasoline and oil	1.4	\$52,723	\$173,983	\$100,055
Recreation use fees	0.6	\$19,183	\$62,842	\$34,863
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	1.3	\$46,106	\$151,039	\$91,045
Retail Shopping	1.1	\$38,213	\$112,607	\$67,366
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	1.1	\$47,396	\$164,693	\$96,340
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	9.1	\$393,399	\$1,366,981	\$799,640
Camping fees	0.3	\$14,479	\$50,312	\$29,431
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	29.9	\$1,067,009	\$3,813,188	\$2,119,028

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	13.1	\$388,307	\$1,545,346	\$777,859
Groceries	3.2	\$110,900	\$348,378	\$208,343
Gasoline and oil	1.6	\$62,232	\$205,363	\$118,101
Recreation use fees	0.6	\$19,183	\$62,842	\$34,863
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	1.4	\$46,535	\$152,444	\$91,891
Retail Shopping	1.1	\$38,213	\$112,607	\$67,366
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	1.1	\$47,396	\$164,693	\$96,340
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	9.1	\$393,399	\$1,366,981	\$799,640
Camping fees	0.3	\$14,479	\$50,312	\$29,431
Total Visitor Impact	31.5	\$1,120,644	\$4,008,966	\$2,223,835

T.O. Fuller

Cabins/Camping

Spending & Impact Within Local Area

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	140,008	
Day Visitor Groups	70,844	50.6%
Overnight Visitor Groups	69,164	49.4%

**Per Visitor Group Expenditures
by Visitors Within Local Area**

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$11.28	\$30.80
Groceries	\$11.54	\$63.42
Gasoline and oil	\$8.28	\$23.57
Recreation use fees	\$4.10	\$13.95
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$6.87	\$9.08
Retail Shopping	\$2.45	\$17.97
Other expense	\$0.54	\$0.17
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$10.88
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$5.39
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$79.16
Total	\$45.05	\$254.40

Total Spending by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$799,054	\$2,130,529	\$2,929,583
Groceries	\$817,765	\$4,386,411	\$5,204,177
Gasoline and oil	\$586,325	\$1,630,090	\$2,216,415
Recreation use fees	\$290,173	\$964,775	\$1,254,948
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$486,585	\$628,175	\$1,114,759
Retail Shopping	\$173,338	\$1,243,139	\$1,416,477
Other expense	\$38,155	\$11,462	\$49,617
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$752,835	\$752,835
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$372,729	\$372,729
Camping fees	\$0	\$5,474,789	\$5,474,789
Total	\$3,191,396	\$17,594,934	\$20,786,330

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	15.2	\$448,749	\$1,785,886	\$898,936
Groceries	4.3	\$149,212	\$468,731	\$280,319
Gasoline and oil	1.4	\$55,125	\$181,911	\$104,614
Recreation use fees	6.5	\$194,358	\$636,698	\$353,228
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	3.4	\$117,971	\$386,461	\$232,954
Retail Shopping	1.2	\$42,749	\$125,972	\$75,361
Other expense	0.3	\$10,060	\$29,644	\$17,734
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	32.3	\$1,018,223	\$3,615,303	\$1,963,146

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	40.4	\$1,196,505	\$4,761,732	\$2,396,845
Groceries	22.9	\$800,356	\$2,514,226	\$1,503,603
Gasoline and oil	4.0	\$153,258	\$505,745	\$290,846
Recreation use fees	21.7	\$646,206	\$2,116,909	\$1,174,421
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	4.4	\$152,299	\$498,917	\$300,740
Retail Shopping	8.6	\$306,583	\$903,438	\$540,473
Other expense	0.1	\$3,022	\$8,905	\$5,328
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	10.3	\$445,076	\$1,546,548	\$904,682
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	5.1	\$220,358	\$765,698	\$447,909
Camping fees	75.0	\$3,236,695	\$11,246,858	\$6,579,053
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	192.5	\$7,160,358	\$24,868,977	\$14,143,900

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	55.6	\$1,645,254	\$6,547,618	\$3,295,781
Groceries	27.2	\$949,568	\$2,982,957	\$1,783,923
Gasoline and oil	5.4	\$208,383	\$687,656	\$395,459
Recreation use fees	28.2	\$840,564	\$2,753,607	\$1,527,648
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	7.8	\$270,269	\$885,378	\$533,694
Retail Shopping	9.7	\$349,331	\$1,029,410	\$615,835
Other expense	0.4	\$13,082	\$38,550	\$23,062
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	10.3	\$445,076	\$1,546,548	\$904,682
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	5.1	\$220,358	\$765,698	\$447,909
Camping fees	75.0	\$3,236,695	\$11,246,858	\$6,579,053
Total Visitor Impact	224.8	\$8,178,581	\$28,484,280	\$16,107,046

T.O. Fuller

Cabins/Camping

Spending & Impact Outside Local Area, but inside TN

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	140,008	
Day Visitor Groups	70,844	50.6%
Overnight Visitor Groups	69,164	49.4%

**Per Visitor Group Expenditures
by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN**

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$0.80	\$9.20
Groceries	\$2.37	\$52.32
Gasoline and oil	\$2.42	\$24.55
Recreation use fees	\$0.02	\$1.21
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$0.54	\$11.83
Retail Shopping	\$0.00	\$1.79
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.13
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$0.08
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$1.89
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$1.67
Total	\$6.15	\$104.66

Total Spending by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$56,336	\$636,493	\$692,829
Groceries	\$167,782	\$3,618,992	\$3,786,774
Gasoline and oil	\$171,619	\$1,697,708	\$1,869,327
Recreation use fees	\$1,571	\$83,513	\$85,084
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$38,029	\$817,954	\$855,983
Retail Shopping	\$0	\$124,043	\$124,043
Other expense	\$0	\$8,687	\$8,687
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$5,593	\$5,593
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$130,691	\$130,691
Camping fees	\$0	\$115,167	\$115,167
Total	\$435,337	\$7,238,842	\$7,674,179

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	1.1	\$31,638	\$125,911	\$63,378
Groceries	0.9	\$30,614	\$96,170	\$57,513
Gasoline and oil	0.4	\$16,135	\$53,246	\$30,621
Recreation use fees	0.0	\$1,052	\$3,447	\$1,912
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.3	\$9,220	\$30,204	\$18,206
Retail Shopping	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	2.7	\$88,660	\$308,978	\$171,631

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	12.1	\$357,454	\$1,422,562	\$716,055
Groceries	18.9	\$660,331	\$2,074,353	\$1,240,542
Gasoline and oil	4.1	\$159,615	\$526,724	\$302,910
Recreation use fees	1.9	\$55,937	\$183,243	\$101,660
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	5.8	\$198,310	\$649,646	\$391,598
Retail Shopping	0.9	\$30,592	\$90,147	\$53,930
Other expense	0.1	\$2,290	\$6,749	\$4,038
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.1	\$3,306	\$11,489	\$6,721
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	1.8	\$77,265	\$268,480	\$157,052
Camping fees	1.6	\$68,087	\$236,588	\$138,396
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	47.1	\$1,613,188	\$5,469,981	\$3,112,902

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	13.1	\$389,093	\$1,548,473	\$779,432
Groceries	19.8	\$690,945	\$2,170,523	\$1,298,056
Gasoline and oil	4.6	\$175,751	\$579,970	\$333,531
Recreation use fees	1.9	\$56,989	\$186,690	\$103,572
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	6.0	\$207,530	\$679,850	\$409,804
Retail Shopping	0.9	\$30,592	\$90,147	\$53,930
Other expense	0.1	\$2,290	\$6,749	\$4,038
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.1	\$3,306	\$11,489	\$6,721
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	1.8	\$77,265	\$268,480	\$157,052
Camping fees	1.6	\$68,087	\$236,588	\$138,396
Total Visitor Impact	49.8	\$1,701,847	\$5,778,958	\$3,284,532

Tims Ford

Marina
Spending & Impact Within Local Area

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	237,029	
Day Visitor Groups	142,217	60.0%
Overnight Visitor Groups	94,811	40.0%

**Per Visitor Group Expenditures
by Visitors Within Local Area**

Expenditure Category	Overnight	
	Day Visitors	Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$15.25	\$37.55
Groceries	\$9.48	\$74.56
Gasoline and oil	\$8.41	\$26.46
Recreation use fees	\$12.08	\$18.92
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$5.93	\$7.36
Retail Shopping	\$1.39	\$8.50
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$33.09
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$2.53
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$79.34
Total	\$52.54	\$288.31

Total Spending by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Overnight		Total
	Day Visitors	Visitors	
Restaurants, snack bars	\$2,168,867	\$3,560,515	\$5,729,382
Groceries	\$1,348,034	\$7,069,067	\$8,417,101
Gasoline and oil	\$1,195,754	\$2,509,025	\$3,704,778
Recreation use fees	\$1,717,667	\$1,793,375	\$3,511,042
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$843,965	\$697,692	\$1,541,656
Retail Shopping	\$197,735	\$805,656	\$1,003,390
Other expense	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$3,137,294	\$3,137,294
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$240,035	\$240,035
Camping fees	\$0	\$7,522,635	\$7,522,635
Total	\$7,472,021	\$27,335,294	\$34,807,315

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	41.2	\$1,218,036	\$4,847,418	\$2,439,976
Groceries	7.0	\$245,966	\$772,673	\$462,088
Gasoline and oil	2.9	\$112,423	\$370,989	\$213,350
Recreation use fees	38.6	\$1,150,493	\$3,768,904	\$2,090,916
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	5.9	\$204,616	\$670,304	\$404,050
Retail Shopping	1.4	\$48,765	\$143,702	\$85,968
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	97.0	\$2,980,299	\$10,573,990	\$5,696,348

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	67.6	\$1,999,585	\$7,957,751	\$4,005,579
Groceries	36.9	\$1,289,841	\$4,051,885	\$2,423,182
Gasoline and oil	6.1	\$235,894	\$778,440	\$447,668
Recreation use fees	40.3	\$1,201,203	\$3,935,024	\$2,183,076
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	4.9	\$169,153	\$554,130	\$334,022
Retail Shopping	5.5	\$198,691	\$585,501	\$350,271
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	43.0	\$1,854,768	\$6,444,943	\$3,770,086
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	3.3	\$141,909	\$493,105	\$288,451
Camping fees	103.1	\$4,447,382	\$15,453,749	\$9,039,951
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	310.8	\$11,538,426	\$40,254,528	\$22,842,285

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	
		Earnings	Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	108.7	\$3,217,621	\$12,805,169	\$6,445,555
Groceries	44.0	\$1,535,807	\$4,824,558	\$2,885,270
Gasoline and oil	9.1	\$348,317	\$1,149,429	\$661,018
Recreation use fees	78.8	\$2,351,696	\$7,703,928	\$4,273,991
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	10.8	\$373,769	\$1,224,433	\$738,072
Retail Shopping	6.9	\$247,456	\$729,203	\$436,239
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	43.0	\$1,854,768	\$6,444,943	\$3,770,086
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	3.3	\$141,909	\$493,105	\$288,451
Camping fees	103.1	\$4,447,382	\$15,453,749	\$9,039,951
Total Visitor Impact	407.7	\$14,518,724	\$50,828,518	\$28,538,633

Tims Ford

Marina

Spending & Impact Outside Local Area, but inside TN

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	237,029	
Day Visitor Groups	142,217	60.0%
Overnight Visitor Groups	94,811	40.0%

**Per Visitor Group Expenditures
by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN**

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$0.20	\$3.60
Groceries	\$1.49	\$30.16
Gasoline and oil	\$1.64	\$16.36
Recreation use fees	\$0.00	\$0.00
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$0.32	\$10.32
Retail Shopping	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$0.00
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$2.40
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$0.53
Total	\$3.65	\$63.37

Total Spending by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$28,978	\$341,188	\$370,167
Groceries	\$212,537	\$2,859,463	\$3,072,001
Gasoline and oil	\$232,710	\$1,551,158	\$1,783,868
Recreation use fees	\$0	\$0	\$0
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$45,544	\$978,524	\$1,024,068
Retail Shopping	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$227,893	\$227,893
Camping fees	\$0	\$49,895	\$49,895
Total	\$519,770	\$6,008,121	\$6,527,891

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	0.5	\$16,274	\$64,767	\$32,601
Groceries	1.1	\$38,780	\$121,823	\$72,855
Gasoline and oil	0.6	\$21,879	\$72,200	\$41,521
Recreation use fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.3	\$11,042	\$36,172	\$21,804
Retail Shopping	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	2.5	\$87,975	\$294,962	\$168,781

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	6.5	\$191,611	\$762,556	\$383,837
Groceries	14.9	\$521,745	\$1,639,002	\$980,186
Gasoline and oil	3.8	\$145,837	\$481,256	\$276,762
Recreation use fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	6.9	\$237,239	\$777,175	\$468,471
Retail Shopping	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	3.1	\$134,730	\$468,160	\$273,859
Camping fees	0.7	\$29,498	\$102,499	\$59,959
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	35.9	\$1,260,661	\$4,230,648	\$2,443,074

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	7.0	\$207,886	\$827,322	\$416,437
Groceries	16.1	\$560,526	\$1,760,825	\$1,053,041
Gasoline and oil	4.4	\$167,716	\$553,455	\$318,283
Recreation use fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	7.2	\$248,281	\$813,348	\$490,275
Retail Shopping	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	3.1	\$134,730	\$468,160	\$273,859
Camping fees	0.7	\$29,498	\$102,499	\$59,959
Total Visitor Impact	38.4	\$1,348,637	\$4,525,611	\$2,611,855

Warriors' Path

Marina

Spending & Impact Within Local Area

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	383,147	
Day Visitor Groups	229,888	60.0%
Overnight Visitor Groups	153,259	40.0%

**Per Visitor Group Expenditures
by Visitors Within Local Area**

Expenditure Category	Overnight	
	Day Visitors	Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$15.25	\$37.55
Groceries	\$9.48	\$74.56
Gasoline and oil	\$8.41	\$26.46
Recreation use fees	\$12.08	\$18.92
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$5.93	\$7.36
Retail Shopping	\$1.39	\$8.50
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$33.09
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$2.53
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$79.34
Total	\$52.54	\$288.31

Total Spending by Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Overnight		Total
	Day Visitors	Visitors	
Restaurants, snack bars	\$3,505,888	\$5,755,431	\$9,261,319
Groceries	\$2,179,043	\$11,426,866	\$13,605,909
Gasoline and oil	\$1,932,888	\$4,055,739	\$5,988,627
Recreation use fees	\$2,776,540	\$2,898,920	\$5,675,460
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$1,364,235	\$1,127,791	\$2,492,026
Retail Shopping	\$319,630	\$1,302,310	\$1,621,941
Other expense	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$5,071,311	\$5,071,311
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$388,008	\$388,008
Camping fees	\$0	\$12,160,041	\$12,160,041
Total	\$12,078,224	\$44,186,418	\$56,264,642

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	Value-Added
		Earnings	Output	
Restaurants, snack bars	66.5	\$1,968,906	\$7,835,659	\$3,944,124
Groceries	11.4	\$397,594	\$1,248,995	\$746,947
Gasoline and oil	4.7	\$181,727	\$599,690	\$344,872
Recreation use fees	62.3	\$1,859,726	\$6,092,284	\$3,379,882
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	9.6	\$330,754	\$1,083,520	\$653,131
Retail Shopping	2.2	\$78,827	\$232,288	\$138,964
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	156.8	\$4,817,535	\$17,092,436	\$9,207,920

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	Value-Added
		Earnings	Output	
Restaurants, snack bars	109.2	\$3,232,250	\$12,863,388	\$6,474,860
Groceries	59.7	\$2,084,977	\$6,549,710	\$3,916,978
Gasoline and oil	9.9	\$381,313	\$1,258,317	\$723,637
Recreation use fees	65.1	\$1,941,697	\$6,360,810	\$3,528,855
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	7.9	\$273,429	\$895,728	\$539,933
Retail Shopping	9.0	\$321,175	\$946,440	\$566,199
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	69.5	\$2,998,159	\$10,417,995	\$6,094,195
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	5.3	\$229,390	\$797,084	\$466,269
Camping fees	166.7	\$7,189,016	\$24,980,372	\$14,612,721
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	502.3	\$18,651,407	\$65,069,845	\$36,923,647

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Within Local Area

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household	Economic	Value-Added
		Earnings	Output	
Restaurants, snack bars	175.7	\$5,201,156	\$20,699,047	\$10,418,983
Groceries	71.1	\$2,482,571	\$7,798,706	\$4,663,925
Gasoline and oil	14.6	\$563,040	\$1,858,006	\$1,068,509
Recreation use fees	127.4	\$3,801,423	\$12,453,094	\$6,908,737
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	17.5	\$604,183	\$1,979,248	\$1,193,065
Retail Shopping	11.2	\$400,003	\$1,178,728	\$705,163
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	69.5	\$2,998,159	\$10,417,995	\$6,094,195
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	5.3	\$229,390	\$797,084	\$466,269
Camping fees	166.7	\$7,189,016	\$24,980,372	\$14,612,721
Total Visitor Impact	659.1	\$23,468,941	\$82,162,281	\$46,131,567

Warriors' Path

Marina

Spending & Impact Outside Local Area, but inside TN

	Amount	Percentage
Total Visitor Groups	383,147	
Day Visitor Groups	229,888	60.0%
Overnight Visitor Groups	153,259	40.0%

**Per Visitor Group Expenditures
by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN**

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors
Restaurants, snack bars	\$0.20	\$3.60
Groceries	\$1.49	\$30.16
Gasoline and oil	\$1.64	\$16.36
Recreation use fees	\$0.00	\$0.00
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$0.32	\$10.32
Retail Shopping	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other expense	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other expense 2	\$0.00	\$0.00
State park resort room or cabin	\$0.00	\$0.00
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0.00	\$2.40
Camping fees	\$0.00	\$0.53
Total	\$3.65	\$63.37

Total Spending by Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Day Visitors	Overnight Visitors	Total
Restaurants, snack bars	\$46,843	\$551,517	\$598,360
Groceries	\$343,558	\$4,622,209	\$4,965,768
Gasoline and oil	\$376,167	\$2,507,385	\$2,883,552
Recreation use fees	\$0	\$0	\$0
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	\$73,620	\$1,581,745	\$1,655,365
Retail Shopping	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	\$0	\$368,380	\$368,380
Camping fees	\$0	\$80,653	\$80,653
Total	\$840,187	\$9,711,889	\$10,552,076

Economic Impact of Day Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	0.9	\$26,307	\$104,693	\$52,698
Groceries	1.8	\$62,687	\$196,923	\$117,767
Gasoline and oil	0.9	\$35,367	\$116,708	\$67,117
Recreation use fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	0.5	\$17,849	\$58,471	\$35,246
Retail Shopping	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Camping fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total - Day Visitors Impact	4.1	\$142,209	\$476,795	\$272,827

Economic Impact of Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	10.5	\$309,732	\$1,232,641	\$620,457
Groceries	24.2	\$843,381	\$2,649,382	\$1,584,432
Gasoline and oil	6.1	\$235,740	\$777,931	\$447,375
Recreation use fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	11.1	\$383,488	\$1,256,273	\$757,265
Retail Shopping	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	5.0	\$217,786	\$756,763	\$442,682
Camping fees	1.1	\$47,682	\$165,686	\$96,921
Total - Overnight Visitors Impact	58.0	\$2,037,809	\$6,838,675	\$3,949,132

Total Economic Impact of Day & Overnight Visitors Outside Local Area, but inside TN

Expenditure Category	Employment	Household Earnings	Economic Output	Value-Added
Restaurants, snack bars	11.4	\$336,039	\$1,337,334	\$673,155
Groceries	25.9	\$906,067	\$2,846,304	\$1,702,199
Gasoline and oil	7.0	\$271,106	\$894,639	\$514,492
Recreation use fees	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	11.6	\$401,337	\$1,314,744	\$792,510
Retail Shopping	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other expense 2	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State park resort room or cabin	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Motel, condo, Airbnb, etc.	5.0	\$217,786	\$756,763	\$442,682
Camping fees	1.1	\$47,682	\$165,686	\$96,921
Total Visitor Impact	62.2	\$2,180,018	\$7,315,470	\$4,221,959

Appendix D
Retail Margins

Retail Margins

Source: PCE Bridge Table 2012, Bureau of Economic Analysis

Expenditure	Retail Margin
Groceries	26.9%
Gasoline and oil	14.2%
Recreational equip. & sporting goods	37.9%
Retail Shopping	33.3%
Other expense	35.6%
Other expense 2	35.6%

Average of "Recreational equip. & sporting goods" and "Retail Shopping" margin.
Average of "Recreational equip. & sporting goods" and "Retail Shopping" margin.

Expenditure: Groceries

RIMS II Industry: Food and beverage stores

NIPA Line	PCE Category	Commodity Code	Commodity Description	Producers' Value	Transportation Costs	Trade Margins		Purchasers' Value	Year	Retail Margin %
						Wholesale	Retail			
75	Cereals	111180	Grain farming	1,020	128	12	0	1,160	2012	0.0%
75	Cereals	311210	Flour milling and malt manufacturing	3,817	227	622	1,653	6,319	2012	26.2%
75	Cereals	311224	Soybean and other oilseed processing	193	10	32	84	319	2012	26.3%
75	Cereals	311230	Breakfast cereal manufacturing	8,821	188	1,437	3,819	14,264	2012	26.8%
75	Cereals	311420	Fruit and vegetable canning, pickling, and drying	833	23	136	361	1,353	2012	26.7%
75	Cereals	3118A0	Cookie, cracker, pasta, and tortilla manufacturing	14,216	290	2,316	6,155	22,976	2012	26.8%
75	Cereals	311990	All other food manufacturing	127	4	21	55	207	2012	26.6%
76	Bakery products	311810	Bread and bakery product manufacturing	41,058	759	6,688	17,776	66,282	2012	26.8%
76	Bakery products	3118A0	Cookie, cracker, pasta, and tortilla manufacturing	8,837	181	1,439	3,826	14,283	2012	26.8%
78	Beef and veal	31161A	Animal (except poultry) slaughtering, rendering, and process	26,372	544	2,333	11,174	40,424	2012	27.6%
79	Pork	31161A	Animal (except poultry) slaughtering, rendering, and process	19,116	397	1,704	8,276	29,493	2012	28.1%
80	Other meats	114000	Fishing, hunting and trapping	435	33	17	0	485	2012	0.0%
80	Other meats	31161A	Animal (except poultry) slaughtering, rendering, and process	18,527	385	1,802	8,021	28,736	2012	27.9%
81	Poultry	311615	Poultry processing	31,992	615	1,388	13,851	47,846	2012	28.9%
82	Fish and seafood	112A00	Animal production, except cattle and poultry and eggs	132	10	5	57	205	2012	27.8%
82	Fish and seafood	114000	Fishing, hunting and trapping	2,455	186	193	1,024	3,859	2012	26.5%
82	Fish and seafood	311700	Seafood product preparation and packaging	5,336	102	436	2,310	8,185	2012	28.2%
84	Fresh milk	31151A	Fluid milk and butter manufacturing	13,738	259	1,578	5,948	21,523	2012	27.6%
85	Processed dairy products	311513	Cheese manufacturing	13,361	269	1,535	5,785	20,949	2012	27.6%
85	Processed dairy products	311514	Dry, condensed, and evaporated dairy product manufacturin	3,618	70	589	1,566	5,843	2012	26.8%
85	Processed dairy products	31151A	Fluid milk and butter manufacturing	8,281	156	951	3,585	12,974	2012	27.6%
85	Processed dairy products	311520	Ice cream and frozen dessert manufacturing	1,845	34	212	799	2,890	2012	27.6%
86	Eggs	112300	Poultry and egg production	4,757	373	206	2,060	7,396	2012	27.9%
86	Eggs	311990	All other food manufacturing	2,365	74	385	1,024	3,848	2012	26.6%
87	Fats and oils	311221	Wet corn milling	235	15	38	102	390	2012	26.2%
87	Fats and oils	311225	Fats and oils refining and blending	5,005	94	815	2,167	8,082	2012	26.8%
87	Fats and oils	311224	Soybean and other oilseed processing	1,319	67	215	571	2,171	2012	26.3%
87	Fats and oils	31151A	Fluid milk and butter manufacturing	1,250	24	144	541	1,959	2012	27.6%
87	Fats and oils	31161A	Animal (except poultry) slaughtering, rendering, and process	18	0	2	8	28	2012	28.6%
87	Fats and oils	311910	Snack food manufacturing	1,690	31	275	732	2,728	2012	26.8%
87	Fats and oils	311940	Seasoning and dressing manufacturing	2,986	70	486	1,293	4,835	2012	26.7%
89	Fruit (fresh)	111300	Fruit and tree nut farming	16,809	1,481	5,447	7,277	31,015	2012	23.5%
90	Vegetables (fresh)	111200	Vegetable and melon farming	16,974	1,678	5,501	7,349	31,501	2012	23.3%
90	Vegetables (fresh)	111400	Greenhouse, nursery, and floriculture production	1,199	106	48	519	1,872	2012	27.7%
90	Vegetables (fresh)	111900	Other crop farming	2,773	239	111	1,200	4,322	2012	27.8%
91	Processed fruits and vegetables	111180	Grain farming	975	172	11	422	1,581	2012	26.7%
91	Processed fruits and vegetables	311210	Flour milling and malt manufacturing	52	3	8	22	86	2012	25.6%
91	Processed fruits and vegetables	311410	Frozen food manufacturing	5,177	144	843	2,242	8,407	2012	26.7%
91	Processed fruits and vegetables	311420	Fruit and vegetable canning, pickling, and drying	9,261	256	1,509	3,993	15,019	2012	26.6%
92	Sugar and sweets	311221	Wet corn milling	317	21	52	137	526	2012	26.0%
92	Sugar and sweets	311300	Sugar and confectionery product manufacturing	22,393	485	3,201	9,695	35,774	2012	27.1%
92	Sugar and sweets	311420	Fruit and vegetable canning, pickling, and drying	549	15	89	238	891	2012	26.7%
92	Sugar and sweets	311990	All other food manufacturing	1,068	33	174	462	1,738	2012	26.6%
93	Food products, not elsewhere classified	111300	Fruit and tree nut farming	2,538	217	101	1,099	3,955	2012	27.8%
93	Food products, not elsewhere classified	111900	Other crop farming	40	3	2	17	62	2012	27.4%
93	Food products, not elsewhere classified	2123A0	Other nonmetallic mineral mining and quarrying	14	5	0	6	25	2012	24.0%
93	Food products, not elsewhere classified	311230	Breakfast cereal manufacturing	98	2	16	42	158	2012	26.6%
93	Food products, not elsewhere classified	311410	Frozen food manufacturing	17,650	492	2,875	7,642	28,659	2012	26.7%
93	Food products, not elsewhere classified	311420	Fruit and vegetable canning, pickling, and drying	11,184	310	1,822	4,842	18,158	2012	26.7%
93	Food products, not elsewhere classified	311514	Dry, condensed, and evaporated dairy product manufacturin	4,420	86	720	1,914	7,139	2012	26.8%
93	Food products, not elsewhere classified	311910	Snack food manufacturing	23,718	433	3,345	10,269	37,766	2012	27.2%
93	Food products, not elsewhere classified	311940	Seasoning and dressing manufacturing	7,239	169	1,179	3,134	11,723	2012	26.7%
93	Food products, not elsewhere classified	311990	All other food manufacturing	14,703	457	2,395	6,366	23,921	2012	26.6%
93	Food products, not elsewhere classified	325190	Other basic organic chemical manufacturing	328	10	26	142	506	2012	28.1%
93	Food products, not elsewhere classified	3259A0	All other chemical product and preparation manufacturing	170	4	14	74	262	2012	28.2%
95	Coffee, tea, and other beverage materials	311920	Coffee and tea manufacturing	6,450	136	1,051	2,793	10,430	2012	26.8%
95	Coffee, tea, and other beverage materials	311930	Flavoring syrup and concentrate manufacturing	260	5	37	112	414	2012	27.1%
95	Coffee, tea, and other beverage materials	311940	Seasoning and dressing manufacturing	754	18	123	327	1,221	2012	26.8%
95	Coffee, tea, and other beverage materials	312110	Soft drink and ice manufacturing	1,541	29	483	667	2,720	2012	24.5%
95	Coffee, tea, and other beverage materials	S00401	Scrap	-611	0	0	0	-611	2012	0.0%
96	Mineral waters, soft drinks, and vegetable juices	311410	Frozen food manufacturing	1,214	34	198	526	1,971	2012	26.7%
96	Mineral waters, soft drinks, and vegetable juices	311420	Fruit and vegetable canning, pickling, and drying	3,847	107	627	1,666	6,246	2012	26.7%
96	Mineral waters, soft drinks, and vegetable juices	312110	Soft drink and ice manufacturing	38,507	721	6,273	16,672	62,173	2012	26.8%
TOTAL				455,366	13,489	66,293	196,489	731,642		26.9%

Expenditure: Gasoline and oil

RIMS II Industry: Gasoline stations

NIPA Line	PCE Category	Commodity Code	Commodity Description	Producers' Value	Transportation Costs	Trade Margins		Purchasers' Value	Year	Retail Margin %
						Wholesale	Retail			
113	Gasoline and other motor fuel	324110	Petroleum refineries	265,146	6,209	61,224	54,984	387,563	2012	14.2%
TOTAL				265,146	6,209	61,224	54,984	387,563		14.2%

Retail Margins

Source: PCE Bridge Table 2012, Bureau of Economic Analysis

Expenditure: Recreational equipment and sporting goods

RIMS II Industry: General merchandise stores

NIPA Line	PCE Category	Commodity Code	Commodity Description	Producers' Value	Transportation Costs	Trade Margins		Purchasers' Value	Year	Retail Margin %
						Wholesale	Retail			
50	Sporting equipment, supplies, guns, and ammunition	331200	Steel product manufacturing from purchased steel	7	0	1	7	15	2012	46.7%
50	Sporting equipment, supplies, guns, and ammunition	332200	Cutlery and handtool manufacturing	508	15	194	474	1,191	2012	39.8%
50	Sporting equipment, supplies, guns, and ammunition	33299A	Ammunition, arms, ordnance, and accessories manufacturing	5,636	152	2,236	5,154	13,178	2012	39.1%
50	Sporting equipment, supplies, guns, and ammunition	336999	All other transportation equipment manufacturing	3,340	35	142	1,450	4,966	2012	29.2%
50	Sporting equipment, supplies, guns, and ammunition	339113	Surgical appliance and supplies manufacturing	1,006	10	356	1,302	2,675	2012	48.7%
50	Sporting equipment, supplies, guns, and ammunition	339920	Sporting and athletic goods manufacturing	12,281	1,848	4,954	11,408	30,491	2012	37.4%
50	Sporting equipment, supplies, guns, and ammunition	339990	All other miscellaneous manufacturing	81	12	48	75	216	2012	34.7%
50	Sporting equipment, supplies, guns, and ammunition	314900	Other textile product mills	1,087	61	593	1,015	2,756	2012	36.8%
50	Sporting equipment, supplies, guns, and ammunition	316000	Leather and allied product manufacturing	126	6	75	117	324	2012	36.1%
50	Sporting equipment, supplies, guns, and ammunition	3259A0	All other chemical product and preparation manufacturing	809	21	98	755	1,683	2012	44.9%
50	Sporting equipment, supplies, guns, and ammunition	S00402	Used and secondhand goods	-16	0	0	0	-16	2012	0.0%
TOTAL				24,865	2,160	8,697	21,757	57,479		37.9%

Expenditure: Retail Shopping

RIMS II Industry: All other retail

NIPA Line	PCE Category	Commodity Code	Commodity Description	Producers' Value	Transportation Costs	Trade Margins		Purchasers' Value	Year	Retail Margin %
						Wholesale	Retail			
104	Women's and girls' clothing	339920	Sporting and athletic goods manufacturing	21	3	8	31	64	2012	48.4%
104	Women's and girls' clothing	313300	Textile and fabric finishing and fabric coating mills	7	0	1	11	20	2012	55.0%
104	Women's and girls' clothing	314900	Other textile product mills	350	17	207	528	1,102	2012	47.9%
104	Women's and girls' clothing	315000	Apparel manufacturing	55,408	2,599	18,914	83,729	160,650	2012	52.1%
105	Men's and boys' clothing	339920	Sporting and athletic goods manufacturing	13	2	5	12	33	2012	36.4%
105	Men's and boys' clothing	313300	Textile and fabric finishing and fabric coating mills	2	0	0	1	3	2012	33.3%
105	Men's and boys' clothing	314900	Other textile product mills	21	1	12	20	54	2012	37.0%
105	Men's and boys' clothing	315000	Apparel manufacturing	38,835	1,841	14,708	36,267	91,651	2012	39.6%
106	Children's and infants' clothing	314900	Other textile product mills	128	6	76	198	409	2012	48.4%
106	Children's and infants' clothing	315000	Apparel manufacturing	3,178	148	1,078	4,804	9,208	2012	52.2%
106	Children's and infants' clothing	322291	Sanitary paper product manufacturing	2,826	142	309	4,343	7,620	2012	57.0%
108	Clothing materials	339990	All other miscellaneous manufacturing	124	19	31	211	384	2012	54.9%
108	Clothing materials	313100	Fiber, yarn, and thread mills	48	2	6	83	140	2012	59.3%
108	Clothing materials	313200	Fabric mills	772	36	103	1,318	2,230	2012	59.1%
108	Clothing materials	313300	Textile and fabric finishing and fabric coating mills	296	14	40	507	857	2012	59.2%
108	Clothing materials	314900	Other textile product mills	62	3	37	106	208	2012	51.0%
136	Hair, dental, shaving, and miscellaneous personal care pr	332200	Cutlery and handtool manufacturing	1,949	58	746	1,852	4,605	2012	40.2%
136	Hair, dental, shaving, and miscellaneous personal care pr	333318	Other commercial and service industry machinery manufactu	9	0	4	9	22	2012	40.9%
136	Hair, dental, shaving, and miscellaneous personal care pr	33399A	Other general purpose machinery manufacturing	190	5	34	207	436	2012	47.5%
136	Hair, dental, shaving, and miscellaneous personal care pr	335911	Storage battery manufacturing	1,232	13	354	757	2,356	2012	32.1%
136	Hair, dental, shaving, and miscellaneous personal care pr	339113	Surgical appliance and supplies manufacturing	8	0	3	8	20	2012	40.0%
136	Hair, dental, shaving, and miscellaneous personal care pr	339990	All other miscellaneous manufacturing	4,280	645	2,407	4,067	11,399	2012	35.7%
136	Hair, dental, shaving, and miscellaneous personal care pr	314900	Other textile product mills	230	11	136	218	595	2012	36.6%
136	Hair, dental, shaving, and miscellaneous personal care pr	315000	Apparel manufacturing	130	6	44	124	304	2012	40.8%
136	Hair, dental, shaving, and miscellaneous personal care pr	322120	Paper mills	311	17	34	191	553	2012	34.5%
136	Hair, dental, shaving, and miscellaneous personal care pr	322291	Sanitary paper product manufacturing	2,991	151	328	4,616	8,087	2012	57.1%
136	Hair, dental, shaving, and miscellaneous personal care pr	325610	Soap and cleaning compound manufacturing	1,352	26	547	1,285	3,209	2012	40.0%
136	Hair, dental, shaving, and miscellaneous personal care pr	325620	Toilet preparation manufacturing	13,112	253	5,084	12,458	30,906	2012	40.3%
136	Hair, dental, shaving, and miscellaneous personal care pr	326290	Other rubber product manufacturing	581	10	175	776	1,542	2012	50.3%
137	Cosmetic/perfumes/bath/nail preparations and impleme	332200	Cutlery and handtool manufacturing	79	2	30	75	188	2012	39.9%
137	Cosmetic/perfumes/bath/nail preparations and impleme	325610	Soap and cleaning compound manufacturing	2,452	47	195	2,330	5,024	2012	46.4%
137	Cosmetic/perfumes/bath/nail preparations and impleme	325620	Toilet preparation manufacturing	15,571	299	6,285	14,751	36,906	2012	40.0%
20	Accessories and parts	339990	All other miscellaneous manufacturing	170	25	55	176	425	2012	41.4%
20	Accessories and parts	327200	Glass and glass product manufacturing	63	8	9	65	145	2012	44.8%
31	Dishes and flatware	327100	Clay product and refractory manufacturing	1,395	211	667	692	2,966	2012	23.3%
31	Dishes and flatware	327200	Glass and glass product manufacturing	1,956	257	841	1,555	4,609	2012	33.7%
31	Dishes and flatware	332200	Cutlery and handtool manufacturing	372	11	172	185	740	2012	25.0%
31	Dishes and flatware	332999	Other fabricated metal manufacturing	133	4	27	66	230	2012	28.7%
31	Dishes and flatware	339910	Jewelry and silverware manufacturing	152	2	88	76	318	2012	23.9%
31	Dishes and flatware	326190	Other plastics product manufacturing	4,414	81	485	2,188	7,169	2012	30.5%
TOTAL				102,091	4,833	35,535	132,169	397,387		33.3%

Visitors to Tennessee State Parks

ACTIVITIES, MOTIVATIONS, AND DISTANCE TRAVELED

MARCH 21, 2021

prepared for

TENNESSEE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENT & CONSERVATION
STATE PARKS DIVISION

Susan Schexnayder*

Ethan Marks

Kara Jones

Peyton Snyder

Lillia Poveda

J. Mark Fly

UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE | HUMAN DIMENSIONS RESEARCH LAB

*Corresponding author: schexnayder@utk.edu; 2505 EJ Chapman Drive, Rm 427, Knoxville, TN 37996-4563

VISITORS TO TENNESSEE STATE PARKS: ACTIVITIES, MOTIVATIONS AND DISTANCE TRAVELED

The 56 state parks in Tennessee, managed by the Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation, State Parks Division, provide diverse recreation opportunities for Tennessee residents and visitors to the state. What motivates visitors to go to the parks, the activities they participate in while there, and the distance they travel to get to the park are the focus of this report. Knowledge of these factors assists Park managers in providing the type of outdoor recreational experiences visitors enjoy and benefit from at State Parks.

To gather information about Tennessee State Park visitors and visits, the University of Tennessee Human Dimensions Research Lab conducted a survey of visitors from May to August, 2020. Surveyors engaged visitors while they were visiting the park and administered a brief survey. University of Tennessee researchers were assisted in this data collection by Tennessee State Parks seasonal rangers and the Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation Parks and Technical Assistance Service staff. Altogether, we surveyed 2,485 travel groups at 43 state parks. Data collected in this survey form the basis of the information presented in this report. The survey questionnaire is included in Appendix A.

The motivating factor for the survey data collection was an assessment of the expenditures of visitors to Tennessee State Parks. To be able to assess the economic impact of visits to all state parks without collecting large numbers of survey at every park, we sorted parks into categories that had relevance to opportunities for expenditures. Table 1 presents these categories and number of State Parks in each category. Survey effort was concentrated at representative parks within each category, with parks selected because of their geographic distribution and differences in proximity to densely populated areas, and differences in types of amenities available (e.g., historic structure/museum, developed beach, golf course (not at a resort). Table 1 identifies the parks from which 79% of the survey data was collected. Park types may also affect the type of visitor and the activities in which the visitors participate.

Table 1. Park categories and parks intensively surveyed		
Park category	Number of parks	Representative parks intensively surveyed
Resort*	6	Henry Horton; Natchez Trace
Parks with a marina	5	Tims Ford; Warrior's Path
Parks with campgrounds and amenities**	25	Big Ridge; Cumberland Mountain; Meeman Shelby; T.O. Fuller;
Parks without camping, but with amenities	12	Fort Loudon; Long Hunter
Parks without camping or amenities	8	Harpeth River; Seven Islands
* Two popular State Park resorts were undergoing renovations during 2020 so were not selected for intensive survey. However, supplemental surveying (n=70) was conducted one of these parks, Fall Creek Falls State Park, to assure that visits to "destination" parks were included in the sample.		
** Amenities include developed waterfront areas, swimming pools, museums, and other resources.		

Results related to expenditures and economic impact are presented separately as a part of a comprehensive economic impact assessment of Tennessee State Parks that addressed visitor expenditures, maintenance costs and capital investments, and tax and secondary impacts of these economic inputs. That economic impact assessment and report combined state park visitor expenditure information generated by the University of Tennessee’s Human Dimensions Research Lab, visitation data and operating and capital budget information provided by Tennessee State Parks, modeling and analysis by Texas-based consultant Impact DataSource, and analysis by the Human Dimensions Research Lab.¹

In this report, we address the recreational activities of state park visitors and what motivates their visits to the state park. The report also presents information about the distance visitors’ travel to reach state parks, and correlations between distance and other factors.

Distance Traveled

Visitors to Tennessee State Parks come from near and far. Surveyors encountered visitors who walked to the park from their home “just down the street,” as well as visitors who traveled from other regions of the country. Because previous survey implementations demonstrated that people often struggle to report actual or approximate distance traveled, we recorded zip codes of visitor homes rather than ask for an estimate of how far they had traveled.

To calculate distance traveled, we used the distance between the zip codes reported by visitors and the zip code of the state park. Although some parks have multiple access points that are in different zip codes, we applied the zip code of the primary park access point. A Microsoft Excel add-in provides access to longitude and latitudes of central polygons within each zip code in the United States. We then calculated distance between the visitor’s home coordinates and the park’s coordinates using this formula:

$$\text{Distance} = \text{ACOS}(\text{COS}(\text{RADIANS}(90-[@\text{Park Latitude}]))*\text{COS}(\text{RADIANS}(90-[@\text{VisitorLatitude}]))+\text{SIN}(\text{RADIANS}(90-[@\text{Park Latitude}]))*\text{SIN}(\text{RADIANS}(90-[@\text{VisitorLatitude}]))*\text{COS}(\text{RADIANS}([@\text{Park Longitude}]-[@\text{VisitorLongitude}]))) * 3958.8$$

Calculated distances are “straight line” distances and do not account for the variation that roads would introduce. Nevertheless, the calculated distance provide a consistent means of comparing and analyzing distance traveled by visitors. Calculated travel distances also were categorized into four groups: Local (<= 25 miles); Nearby (between 25 and 100 miles); Regional (100 to 249 miles); and National (250 or more miles).

The variability in how far visitors travel to visit Tennessee State Parks is shown in Table 2. The mean (average) distance traveled is 96 miles. Because a small number of visitors traveling very long distances can significantly affect the mean, we also report the median distance traveled. The median is the middle point of the distribution in distances traveled, a point at which half of the

¹ S. Schexnayder, P. Scheuren, and B. Clifford. Economic Impacts of Tennessee State Parks: Executive Summary and Detailed Assessment. University of Tennessee Human Dimensions Research Lab. Feb. 14, 2021.

visitors traveled less and half of the visitors traveled more. The median distance is 24 miles, indicating that one-half of all visitors to Tennessee State Parks are local visitors.

Table 2 also presents the mean and median distance visitors travel by park type. Visitors travel the greatest distance to resorts. Across all other park types, one-half of visitors are local visitors. Among park types, marinas see the greatest share of local users, with the mean distance traveled being 65 miles and the median being 20 miles. Figure 1 provides a visual representation of distribution of visitor distance by park type and shows that more than 60% of visitors to parks with no campgrounds are local visitors.

Park Type	Mean	Median
All Parks	96.3	24.2
Resort	135.7	43.7
No Camping/No Amenities	97.9	19.4
No Camping/Has Amenities	94.5	21.9
Cabins/Camping	93.7	25.9
Marina	64.8	19.7
All	96.3	24.2




Figure 1. Distribution of visitors to each type of state park, by distance category

Activities

Visitors to Tennessee State Parks have many recreational activities in which they can participate. The survey asked visitors to report their participation in 15 specific activities and allowed them to report other activities, not in the questionnaire. Although not all activities are available at each state park, the data do indicate which activities are most common (Figure 2). Hiking/walking, relaxing/hanging out, and viewing nature or wildlife are the most frequent activities of State Park visitors and are opportunities available at most State Parks. The least common activities are horseback riding, motorized boating, golfing, and dining at park restaurants. The activities not included in the survey, but most frequently mentioned by visitors, include playground activity, ranger-led programs, splash pad play, photography (not related to nature or wildlife), and disc golf.




Figure 2. Visitor activities at Tennessee State Parks

Participation in a specific activity type is not age dependent: visitors in all age categories engaged in each activity type. Age categories were 18-24, 25-34, 35-44, 45-54, 55-64, 65-74, and 75+. Charts depicting the participation in each activity, by age group, are included in the Appendix B. The charts group activities into categories: passive land-based; active land-based, water-based, and amenity-based. The passive land-based category includes relaxing/hanging out, viewing nature or wildlife, picnicking, and camping. The active land-based category includes hiking/walking, bicycling/mountain biking, golfing, and horseback riding. The water-based category includes fishing, kayaking/canoeing/paddling, swimming at a lake or creek, motorized boating, and the hypothetical activity would you have gone swimming in the state park pool. The last activity was asked as a hypothetical because all state park pools were closed throughout the survey period due to Covid 19 precautions. Table 3 presents observations about variability in activities in Tennessee State Parks differs by visitor age category.

Category	Findings
Passive land-based	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hanging out and viewing nature or wildlife is mostly consistent across age categories • Picnicking peaks among 35-44 year olds (43% participation) and then declines. • Fewer younger adults participate in camping (10-20%) than middle and older age adults (28-32%)
Active land-based	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although well more than half of visitors in each age category participate in hiking or walking during their visit, a larger share of older adults, including visitors 75+, hike/walk than the 18-24 y/o group.
Water-based	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fishing participation is similar across all age groups. • Participation in kayaking, canoeing and paddle sports declines with age. Nearly 30% of park visitors 18-24 y/o engage in paddling. • In contrast to paddling, it is adults 25-54 y/o who are most likely to swim or play in a lake or creek, 30% or more engaging in this activity. • This same age group also were those more likely to indicate they would have used a State Park pool if it had not been closed. • Participation in swimming (lake or pool) by adults age 25-54 might be associated with this group more likely to be traveling with children.
Amenity-based	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visiting a historic site is the one activity that increases with age, with one-quarter of visitors 75+ y/o participating. That’s double the share of 18-24 y/o who visit a historic site. • 7 – 9% of State Park visitors age 18-74 dine in the park’s restaurant, but only 3% of visitors 75+ dine while at the park.
Overall	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The pattern among several types of activities is for participation to be greater among 35-55 y/o visitors than other age groups, indicating these visitors are likely engaging in more activities per trip than other age groups. Interest, fitness levels, and being accompanied by children could be contributing factors.

Motivations

People are motivated to visit Tennessee State Parks for many reasons. The survey asked visitors to assess the importance of several specific reasons they might have had for visiting the state park on the date of the survey. Motivations involved fun and family connections, getting away from crowds, connecting to nature, improving health, and learning about Tennessee history. The specific wording of each assessed motivation is presented in Figure 3. Visitors assigned importance to each reason, using a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 was not at all important and 5 was extremely important. Because we addressed motivations for the specific State Park trip—rather than general benefits that State Parks provide—we posed the “Connecting children with nature” motivation only to survey respondents who had children in their travel group.

Notably, none of the reasons for visits to State Parks scored below an average score of 3, indicating that motivations to visit State Parks are diverse, and none of the listed motivations




Figure 3. Motivations for visits to Tennessee State Parks

would be considered of little importance. As with most surveys that explore why people recreate outdoors, “Having fun” scores highest among motivating factors for trips to State Parks. Parks as a respite is evidenced in the high scores for “being with family and friends” (4.63), “improving mental health” (4.51), and “getting away from crowds...” (4.36). Opportunities to improve physical and mental health is evidenced in those scores, 4.16 and 4.51 respectively.

The motivation scoring lowest is “learning about Tennessee heritage and history.” Because not all parks have significant resources or interpretation that align with this motivation, we separately analyzed this motivation for visitors at Tennessee State Historic Parks or Tennessee State Archeological Parks (e.g., Sergeant Alvin York Park, Fort Loudon State Park and Pinson Mounds State Archaeological Park). At these parks, visitors on average rate “learning about Tennessee heritage and history” 4.24, whereas visitors to other parks with less significant historical resources and interpretation rated the motivation 2.97. When visitors to Fort Loudoun Historic State Park—which includes an early British fortification, but also hosts local walking groups and waterfront activities like fishing and paddling—is excluded in the analysis, the score for “learning about Tennessee heritage and history increases to 4.42. Furthermore, visitors to the historic and archaeological parks traveled an average of 124 miles, 27 miles more than visitors to other parks who travel an average 97 miles. While the rural nature of some of the historic and archaeological parks could contribute to the distances visitors travel, it is also likely that these parks offer resources and experiences not available at more local parks.

Further assessment of motivations for trips to Tennessee State Parks showed that there are very few appreciable differences among visitors who travel different distances to the park (Figure 4). However, we do observe that National visitors (those traveling 250 miles or more) are more motivated by learning about Tennessee history and heritage. National visitors also are less motivated than others by improving health (mental and physical) and connecting children with nature than other visitors perhaps because these objective could be met closer to home.




Figure 4. Motivations for visiting a Tennessee State Park, by visitor distance traveled

We observe some differences in motivations for visiting state parks among visitors of different ages (Figure 5). As visitor age increases, learning about Tennessee history and heritage becomes a more important motivation. Improving physical health is a more important motivation for the youngest (ages 18-24) and oldest adults (ages 75+). Connecting children with nature is least important for adults aged 18-24, perhaps because children of adults in this age group are more likely to be very young. Adults aged 25-34 express the greatest degree of motivation to connect children with nature, and then motivation declines with increasing age of adults. Improving mental health is slightly less important to the youngest and oldest adults, and the youngest adults express slightly less motivation to be with family and friends than do adults age 35 and up. Other motivations show little or no appreciable trend in motivation based on age.




Figure 5. Motivations for visiting a Tennessee State Park, by visitor age

Visitor attributes

In this last section of the report, we provide some demographic and trip-type information. Of the groups that visit Tennessee State Parks, 47.6% have children in the group. The mean number of children in a group with children is 2.6; the median is 2. The age distribution of visitors to state parks shows that nearly one-half of the adult visitors to Tennessee State Parks are age 44 and younger (Figure 6).




Figure 6. Age distribution of adult visitors to Tennessee State Parks

Most trips (63% of all trips) to Tennessee State Parks are day trips where the visitor is not staying away from home overnight (Figure 7). Thirty-seven percent (37%) of trips are by people staying away from home overnight. These overnight stays are not necessarily in Tennessee State Parks; the overnight visitors can be visiting a park while also visiting and staying in the home of family or friends or staying away from home in other non-state park accommodations.




Figure 7. Distribution of Tennessee State Park visitors, by single day and overnight trips

APPENDIX A – SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

Interviewer: _____

Date: _____

State Park: _____

1. What is the zip code of your primary residence? _____
2. What's the primary reason for today's visit to the State Park? Recreation Meeting Other
(if "Meeting," end survey) _____

3. In which of these activities have you or will you participate on today's visit to the State Park?

<input type="radio"/> Viewing nature or wildlife	<input type="radio"/> Fishing	<input type="radio"/> Visiting a museum or visitor center
<input type="radio"/> Hiking/walking	<input type="radio"/> Kayaking/canoeing/paddling	<input type="radio"/> Visiting a historic site
<input type="radio"/> Bicycling/mountain biking	<input type="radio"/> Motorized boating	<input type="radio"/> Dining at a Park restaurant or snack bar
<input type="radio"/> Horseback riding	<input type="radio"/> Swimming at a lake or creek	Other:
<input type="radio"/> Camping	<input type="radio"/> Would have gone swimming in the State Park pool? → Had you or would you have bought an annual Pool Pass? Y N	Other:
<input type="radio"/> Picnicking		
<input type="radio"/> Relaxing, hanging out		
<input type="radio"/> Golfing → Do you have an annual Golf Pass? Y N		

4. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with your visit to ____ State Park? Would you say
 very dissatisfied
 dissatisfied
 neither dissatisfied or satisfied
 satisfied
 very satisfied

5. On a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is not at all important and 5 is extremely important, please tell me how important each of the following reasons were for visiting ____ State Park.

Reasons	1 Not at all important	2	3	4	5 Extremely important	N/A
Getting away from crowds and developed areas	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
Experiencing nature	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
Learning about Tennessee heritage and history	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
Improving physical health	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
Improving mental health	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
Having fun	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
Being with family and friends	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
Connecting children with nature	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

6. Are you staying overnight away from home on this trip? (away from primary residence)
 No
 Yes Number of nights at this park or within 25 miles of it _____
 Number of nights in Tennessee but beyond 25 miles of this park _____
7. A. How many people, including yourself, are in your traveling group? This would include the people for whom you pay meals, etc. _____
 B. (if traveling group is >1) How many vehicles is your group traveling in today? _____
 C. How many in the group are under 18 years old? _____

APPENDIX A – SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

8. To assess what economic impact Tennessee State Parks have on their local economies, I’m going to ask a bit about your expenditures while on [this trip / your entire trip away from home]. I’ll read off some types of expenditures. For each, please estimate how much you will have spent in that category by the end of your trip. We’re interested in expenditures in the local area and those outside the local area, but still in Tennessee. The local area is roughly 25 miles from here. (**estimates are acceptable**)

Type of Expenditure	\$ spent within 25 miles of park	\$ spent in TN, but beyond 25 miles
ALL visitors:		
a. Restaurants, snack bars, and bars for food and beverages	\$ _____	\$ _____
b. Groceries	\$ _____	\$ _____
c. Gasoline and oil	\$ _____	\$ _____
d. Recreation use fees (include fees for boat rental; marina slip; swimming pool; golf green and cart)	\$ _____	\$ _____
e. Recreational equipment and sporting goods	\$ _____	\$ _____
f. Retail shopping (gifts, souvenirs, clothing, etc.)	\$ _____	\$ _____
g. Other expense 1: _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
h. Other expense 2: _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
Overnight Trip visitors:		
i. State park resort room or cabin	\$ _____	\$ _____
j. Motel, condo, Air BNB, etc.	\$ _____	\$ _____
k. Camping fees	\$ _____	\$ _____

9. To what extent is this state park the primary purpose of your trip to this area? “0%” indicates the park had no influence and “100%” means the park is the entire reason for your trip. [If you are visiting family or other places on this trip away from home, use the number of days spent at each to allocate reasons for the trip, for example if 1 day of your 5-day-long trip is spent at the state park, then you would select 20%.]

0%	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100%
State park had no influence on my trip										State park is my only reason for this trip

10. In which age group do you fall?

- | | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| <input type="radio"/> 18 – 24 | <input type="radio"/> 55 – 64 |
| <input type="radio"/> 25 - 34 | <input type="radio"/> 65 – 74 |
| <input type="radio"/> 35 - 44 | <input type="radio"/> 75 + |
| <input type="radio"/> 45 - 54 | <input type="radio"/> Prefer not to answer |



11. What is your gender?

- Male Female Prefer not to answer



12. In what category did your total household income in 2019 fall?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="radio"/> Under \$25,000 | <input type="radio"/> \$100,000 - \$149,999 |
| <input type="radio"/> \$25,000 - \$49,999 | <input type="radio"/> \$150,000 or over |
| <input type="radio"/> \$50,000 - \$74,999 | <input type="radio"/> Prefer not to answer |
| <input type="radio"/> \$75,000 - \$99,999 | |

APPENDIX B – SUPPORTING FIGURES



APPENDIX B – SUPPORTING FIGURES



INVENTORY OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE OUTDOOR RECREATION RESOURCES IN TENNESSEE

JUNE 6, 2021

prepared for
KIMLEY-HORN
for the TENNESSEE STATEWIDE COMPREHENSIVE OUTDOOR RECREATION PLAN

Susan Schexnayder*
Lillia Poveda
Gavin Simone
J. Mark Fly

UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE | HUMAN DIMENSIONS RESEARCH LAB

*Corresponding author: schexnayder@utk.edu; 2505 EJ Chapman Drive, Rm 427, Knoxville, TN 37996-4563

INVENTORY OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE OUTDOOR RECREATION RESOURCES IN TENNESSEE

Outdoor recreation needs of Tennesseans are met by an array of recreation resources managed by public entities, as well as resources that exist through public-private partnership and those owned and operated by private businesses. This report addresses the abundance of resources in Tennessee, and identifies some potential shortcomings. The report updates findings about Tennessee counties lacking recreation delivery systems previously noted in the state’s 2009 comprehensive outdoor recreation report, *Tennessee 2020: Vision for Parks, People & Landscapes*.¹ This is followed by an overview of the process and findings of an inventory of public outdoor recreation resources. Public-private partnerships and private businesses in Tennessee also play a significant role of meeting the recreation needs of Tennesseans and our visitors, and these resources are addressed in the final sections of this report.

Planning and Delivery of Recreation by Smaller Tennessee Counties

The 2009 inventory identified 24 counties that had neither a county-wide parks and recreation department nor a municipality within the county that had a parks and recreation department to serve as a recreation delivery system. These counties might have a park or ballfields, but no system (other than the county commissioners broadly) to provide for the planning and delivery of recreation services to their citizens. In the decade since the state’s previous 10-year recreation plan, some improvement in recreation delivery systems has occurred at the county level: in 2020 only 16 Tennessee counties still lack this structure (Table 1). This is roughly 17% of all Tennessee counties. All the counties reported in 2009 to lack a recreation delivery system were counties with small populations, each having less than 20,000 people. In 2021, 15 of the 16 counties lacking recreation delivery systems have populations under 20,000, and the sixteenth in the set has a population just above 20,000.

Other small-population Tennessee counties that do have recreation delivery systems are using varied approaches to provide this function (Table 2). Some have prioritized parks and recreation and support a parks department. In other small counties—as well as several larger counties—it is the municipality(ies) within them that provide recreation delivery. Access to the recreation places the municipality provides, such as parks and greenways, is not constrained by residency, thus allowing county residents to benefit from the municipality’s recreation places. Participation in recreation programs, for example sports leagues or fitness classes, may be available only to municipal residents or be provided on a cost basis to non-municipal residents. One novel approach to planning for outdoor recreation is the three-county, public-private partnership—Northeast Tennessee Regional Economic Partnership (NeTREP)—that focuses on outdoor recreation as a component of economic development. Other counties have designated a parks “Board” or “Committee” which includes, minimally, a subset of county elected officials who focus on recreation, and in some cases also includes either business development agency representatives, public works departments, or non-profit recreation organization leaders.

¹ Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation, 2009. *Tennessee 2020: Vision for Parks, People & Landscapes*.

County	Population (2019, estimated)	County	Population (2019, estimated)
Bledsoe	15,064	Humphreys	18,582
Cannon	14,678	Jackson*	11,786
Chester	17,297	Meigs*	12,422
Crockett	14,230	Perry	8,076
DeKalb	20,490	Pickett	5,048
Grundy*	13,427	Sequatchie*	15,026
Hancock	6,620	Trousdale	11,284
Houston	8,201	Van Buren	5,872

* These counties were not identified in 2009 as lacking recreation delivery system.

County	Population (2019, estimated)	Approach
Benton	16,160	Developing a comprehensive recreation plan through TDEC grant funding
Clay	7,615	A Parks Board, composed of county officials
Decatur	11,663	Parks/recreation department
Fentress	18,523	Municipality provides recreation planning and delivery
Haywood	17,304	County – municipality shared parks and recreation department
Henderson	28,117	Developing a comprehensive recreation plan through TDEC grant funding; Municipality provides recreation planning and delivery
Johnson	17,788	Municipality provides recreation planning and delivery
Lake	7,016	Municipality provides recreation planning and delivery
Lewis	12,268	Municipality provides recreation planning and delivery
Moore	6,488	Parks/recreation department
Overton*	22,241	Municipality provides recreation planning and delivery
Polk	16,832	A Parks Board, composed of county officials
Smith*	20,157	A Parks Board, composed of county officials; municipality provides recreation planning and delivery
Stewart	13,715	Municipality provides recreation planning and delivery
Unicoi	17,883	Part of a three-county economic partnership with a focus on outdoor recreation; Municipality provides recreation planning and delivery
Union	19,972	A Parks Board, composed of county officials
Wayne	16,673	Municipality provides recreation planning and delivery

* Although population now exceeds 20,000, this county is listed here because it was identified in 2010 as having no recreation delivery system

Table 3 presents current (as of 2019) recreation projects under construction or in planning or conceptual stages.^{2,3} This information demonstrates that some counties without a structured system for recreation delivery are identifying recreational needs and carrying through with recreation projects. A \$0 value in the local per capita cost indicates the project has been funded through means other than local funding, such as a grant. Table 2 expands this information to include the reported recreation planning over a four-year period – 2016 through 2019 – including projects on the horizon through 2024. Those data show that several of the counties without recreation delivery systems have either identified no recreation needs or have recreation projects at a conceptual level that during the four-year timeframe did not advance to the planning stage. These counties are Bledsoe, Cannon, Crockett, Hancock, Perry, Pickett, and Trousdale.

County	Conceptual 2016 - 2024	Planning 2016 - 2024		Construction 2016 – 2024	
		Number of projects	\$ (millions)	Number of projects	\$ (millions)
Bledsoe	Yes	0	-	0	-
Cannon	No	0	-	0	-
Chester	Yes	8	\$ 8.4	5	\$ 7.2
Crockett	Yes	0	-	0	-
DeKalb	Yes	1	\$ 2.2	1	\$ 2.2
Grundy*	Yes	10	\$ 2.3	6	\$ 1.4
Hancock	Yes	0	-	0	-
Houston	Yes	1	\$ 0.5	1	\$ 0.5
Humphreys	Yes	0	-	1	\$ 0.6
Jackson*	No	1	\$3.0	1	\$ 3.0
Meigs*	Yes	1	\$ 0.3	1	\$ 0.3
Perry	Yes	0	-	0	-
Pickett	Yes	0	-	0	-
Sequatchie*	Yes	3	\$ 2.3	2	\$ 1.8
Trousdale	No	0	-	0	-
Van Buren	Yes	3	\$ 7.8	2	\$ 43.4

² Tennessee Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, *Infrastructure Needs Inventory July 2019 through June 2024*. (The report only includes recreation infrastructure projects of \$50,000 or more.)

³ Planning means a set of drawings has been produced or other activities are underway. Conceptual means a need and an associated cost has been identified, but planning is not underway.

County	Conceptual		Planning		Construction		Local per capita cost \$
	Number of projects	\$ (millions)	Number of projects	\$ (millions)	Number of projects	\$ (millions)	
Bledsoe	1	\$0.1	0	-	0	-	\$ 3
Cannon	0	-	0	-	0	-	\$ 0
Chester	3	\$ 6.4	1	\$ 0.3	1	\$ 2.2	\$ 43
Crockett	4	\$ 1.3	0	-	0	-	\$93
DeKalb	2	\$ 2.9	0	-	0	-	\$ 0
Grundy*	3	\$ 27.6	2	\$ 0.9	2	\$ 0.5	\$ 150
Hancock	2	\$ 2.1	0	-	0	-	\$ 313
Houston	3	\$ 0.8	0	-	0	-	\$ 103
Humphreys	2	\$ 5.8	0	-	0	-	\$ 13
Jackson*	1	\$ 2.5	0	-	1	\$ 3.0	\$ 212
Meigs*	1	\$ 0.1	0	-	0	-	\$ 0
Perry	1	\$ 0.1	0	-	0	-	\$ 0
Pickett	3	\$ 6.2	0	-	0	-	\$ 0
Sequatchie*	1	\$ 0.1	-	-	1	\$ 1.5	\$ 109
Trousdale	0	-	0	-	0	-	\$ 0
Van Buren	3	\$ 15.7	0	-	2	\$ 43.4	\$ 0

* In 2010, these counties were not reported as lacking a recreation delivery system

** Tennessee Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, *Infrastructure Needs Inventory July 2019 through June 2024*. (Inventory includes only projects with expected cost greater than \$50,000.)

Inventory of Outdoor Public Recreation Resources in Tennessee

An intensive effort was undertaken to gather information about all public, outdoor recreation resources in Tennessee. Public resources include those owned and managed by municipal, county, state and federal government departments and agencies. Municipalities, counties, the State of Tennessee provided data using a spreadsheet that captured the resources available at each park and similar recreation resource within the jurisdiction's ownership or management. Federal entities either used the spreadsheet or shared data through their existing system of cataloging outdoor recreation resources. Data collected focus on parks and related resources like greenways, trails, waterfront areas not located within parks (e.g., boat launch areas without any park resources), and golf courses. Recreation centers, senior centers, and nature centers also were included.

Fifty-seven of Tennessee's 95 counties provided inventory data, as did 141 of the 216 municipalities from which we sought data. The Tennessee Recreation and Parks Association (TRPA) previously offered an online "Parks Finder" that included data from 23 counties and 74 municipalities. These data include 6 counties and 16 municipalities that did not respond to our current inventory request. Although the TRPA data are older and do not include details sought in the current inventory, such as ADA accessibility, the data do provide an indication of available outdoor recreation resources. Another 14 counties (in addition to the 57 who provided data for the inventory) are represented only by the data shared by one

or more municipality within the county. Municipality data exists from the older TRPA dataset for 19 municipalities that did not provide data in 2021. Figure 1 identifies the 17 counties for which we have no data about city or county parks and related resources.




Figure 1. Tennessee counties with no data in the 2021 public recreation resources inventory.

Fifty-six state parks in Tennessee offer residents and visitors opportunities to discover the natural, cultural and historic heritage of the state. The State Parks, managed by the State Parks Division of the Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation, are the primary recreation places offered by the State of Tennessee. With parks located across the entire state, Tennessee residents are within an hour's drive from a state park. In 2020, Tennessee State Parks estimated a visitor count of 34.7 million.⁴ Recreational opportunities at Tennessee State Parks are numerous and diverse. Various parks offer activities that engage visitors physically, like hiking; biking; OHV riding; climbing; paddling; swimming and water play; archery; horseshoe tossing, and traditional sports like volleyball and basketball. Those seeking more passive recreation can picnic, camp, view nature and wildlife, or learn about the culture of indigenous peoples of the area and European settlers and the state's history.

While Tennessee State Parks are the only state lands managed primarily by recreation, other State lands such as Tennessee State Forests and some Tennessee State Natural Areas provide limited recreation opportunities. All 15 Tennessee State Forests allow hunting and fishing (if waterbodies are present), and bird watching. Most State Forests have trails that allow hiking and horseback riding; seven state forests allow ATV riding (some with restrictions), mountain biking, and camping. A summary of recreation on Tennessee State Forests is included as Appendix A. Full public access is allowed to 54 of the 84 State Natural Areas, some of which are contiguous or within State Parks or properties managed by the National Park Service. Full access is associated with presence of a parking area and a hiking trail. Only those properties to which full access is allowed are included in a summary table (Appendix B) of recreation opportunities on State Natural Areas

The inventory also includes data from federal entities that manage natural or developed areas for recreation and for multiple uses. Data are included for Cherokee National Forest; US Army Corps of Engineers, Nashville District; Great Smoky Mountains National Park; Big South Fork National River &

⁴ Tennessee State Parks. 2020. A Report of the Economic & Fiscal Impact of Tennessee State Parks. Prepared by Impact DataSource.

Recreation Area; and the Tennessee Valley Authority. Some federal entities provided detailed information online about their recreation resources and have their recreation resources mapped through various online tools, e.g., Arc GIS layers built into Google Earth or available through their own online mapping tools.

Inventory data are submitted as an electronic-file addendum to this report. An overview of the data are provided in Figure 2 which includes municipal, county and state parks. Additional, finer-scale views of the mapped park data within different regions of the state are provided in Appendix D. The data from federal agencies is excluded from the figures. Although the inventory also includes trail data, those data are not included on the map since most trailheads are within parks.

Figure 2 suggests what a user will see when first accessing the inventory data in a map. Each “pin” represents a park. Data associated with the pin, if provided by the managing entity, include the park’s address, acreage, and resources available within the park, such as children’s playgrounds, picnic tables and pavilions, the type and number sports fields, skateboarding areas, etc.. Presence of ADA-compliant resources is also noted.

The mapping also allows one to observe areas where park resources seem to be absent. In some cases, the absence could be due to the county and its municipalities not providing data for the inventory. In other cases, the absence of resources identifies an area that lacks a park. Figure 3 provides side-by-side examples of these two conditions. In one case identified by a red circle—the Seymour community, a “bedroom community” of large urban areas around it – the location has no community park although the metropolitan areas around it, primarily Knoxville, Maryville and Sevierville, Tennessee, all report significant numbers of parks. In the other case identified in Figure 3 by the purple circle, neither Cocke County nor its primary municipalities of Dandridge and Newport provided data for the inventory. Although data collection efforts will continue beyond the publication of this report, the absence of data should not be presumed to indicate absence of parks. However, we do observe that most of the non-reporting entities are rural counties with small cities, and there does exist some overlap between these entities and those reported above as lacking a recreation delivery system. Any named community without a park resource identified in the inventory suggests an area in need of local recreation opportunities for its residents. The large cities in Tennessee report an abundance of park resources. However, it is possible that specific areas within these cities also lack resources accessible by residents, particularly if transportation to them is unavailable.

State Parks do help to fill some gaps when municipal and county governments do not provide recreation resources. An example is rural southeastern Tennessee, where the communities of Monteagle, Altamont, Pikeville and Dunlap are located. In this area, neither the municipalities nor their counties reported data, but online research identifies only state parks in the area and reveals little in the way of municipal parks. With Fall Creek Falls State Park and the Cumberland Trail State Park in the area, residents are provided some recreational resources; however, driving distances could prohibit residents of these rural areas from using the state park resources routinely.



Municipal and county parks

All items

Counties providing no data

All items

TN State Parks (primary entrance)

All items

Figure 2. Mapping of municipal, county, and state parks in the parks inventory: statewide view.




Figure 3. Examples of communities with no parks vs. communities for which no data are reported.

Public-Private Partnerships for Recreation


Tennessee is host to world-class recreation resources that result from some form of public-private partnerships. In some cases the land remains in public ownership, but its management, including planning and maintenance, is undertaken by a private commercial or non-profit entity. A prime example of this relationship is Shelby Farms in the Memphis area. In another case of public-private partnership, Ijams Nature Center in Knoxville, Tennessee, the land is owned by a non-profit and management directed by the non-profit, but the entity's status as the equivalent of "city park" garners it a minor share of funding from the city of Knoxville. Ijams Nature Center is a highly visited park, providing recreation opportunities and environmental interpretation and education that benefits the city. These two examples of public-private partnerships for public recreation have historical ownerships that facilitated their transitions to public-private partnerships. Similar examples may exist elsewhere in Tennessee, and these two examples serve as models for other partnerships in the state. The Shelby Farms Case Study below offers an example of the recreation opportunities provided by private entities in private-public recreation arrangements.

Shelby Farms Park

Memphis, Tennessee

“We don’t need anything else. We’ve got Shelby Farms.” – *Memphis resident’s response to survey question: What additional recreation resource does your community need?*

Land once farmed by residents of the Shelby Farm Penal Colony is now a 4,500 acre, destination, multi-use park in Memphis. The park has 40 miles of trails and connects to the heart of Memphis by a 10-mile paved greenway. Children stretch their bodies and imaginations in a woodland play area and splash in a watery playground. Core outdoor offerings—pavilions, lakes for fishing and boating, an off-leash dog park, horse stables, tree-canopy adventure course, and a paintball area –accompanied by an indoor visitor center and eateries make the park a destination for residents of Memphis and west Tennessee. The Shelby Farms Park Conservancy was the entity that led the park’s development and still provides, through donations and park revenue, 80% of the park’s budget.



Private Outdoor Recreation Resources

Privately-owned businesses play a significant role in providing recreation opportunities and resources for some types of outdoor recreation in Tennessee. Recreation types in which the commercial private sector plays a significant role include golf courses, marinas, off-highway vehicle trails (ATV, singletrack, etc.), and shuttle services/equipment rental providers. Zoos (other than “petting zoos”) and nature centers are mostly maintained by private non-profit entities. Table 5 presents summary data about private recreation businesses in Tennessee reported in the U.S. Census Bureau’s Economic Census. In 2019, there were 516 Tennessee businesses who reported to the Census that their business was primarily involved in outdoor recreation. Another 367 identified as a recreation business that fell outside the listed categories, and thus reported in the category “All other amusement and recreation industries.” Some businesses may span categories, having sales that fall into several categories because their revenues involve, for example, camping sites, recreational equipment rental, shuttle service, and instruction or guides. However, each business entity reports only in one self-selected business category. The business categories used in U.S. Census reporting are those of the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS). Some business categories in the NAICS classification system are associated specifically with outdoor recreation, such as marinas and campgrounds. The category “all other amusement businesses” can include both indoor and outdoor recreation and amusement types.

Table 5. Private recreation businesses by type, employment, and payroll in Tennessee and Tennessee Counties.*†			
Type of outdoor recreation business	Number of businesses	Number of employees	Annual payroll (\$1,000)
Hunting and trapping	4	4	32
Scenic and sightseeing transportation: land	23	236	7,142
Davidson	6	110	3285
Shelby	4	7	197
Scenic and sightseeing transportation: water	9	585	33,891
Scenic and sightseeing transportation: Other	5	19	720
Sevier	4	11	571
Golf and country clubs	174	4,359	123,199
Blount	4	71	1538
Davidson	9	703	26,230
Greene	4	35	809
Hamblen	3	48	1,009
Hamilton	8	289	8,404
Jefferson	4	60	1,025
Knox	12	466	12,274
Loudon	3	88	2,306
McMinn	4	41	578
Madison	6	79	2,033
Maury	4	56	1,164
Montgomery	3	66	1,633
Obion	3	80	1,659
Roane	3	17	221
Robertson	3	33	783
Rutherford	4	28	584
Sevier	4	134	3,123
Shelby	3	7	362
Sullivan	14	692	20,492
Sumner	3	59	1,050
Washington	4	229	6,533
Williamson	3	107	2,705
Wilson	8	416	13,298
Marinas	112	613	24,891
Anderson	3	15	898
Campbell	11	55	2,440
Claiborne	3	17	843
Clay	4	50	1,548
Davidson	4	22	1,441
DeKalb	6	47	1,609
Franklin	3	29	1,424

Hamilton	11	76	3,024
Henry	5	19	698
Knox	5	30	1,111
Pickett	3	22	777
Roane	3	30	796
Shelby	3	2	243
Sullivan	6	37	1,582
Sumner	3	10	661
Union	4	22	969
Washington	3	8	355
Recreational vehicle parks and campgrounds	98	499	13,016
Cumberland	3	6	152
Davidson	6	52	2,056
Grainger	4	5	270
Hamilton	3	7	130
Hickman	3	2	129
Jefferson	3	5	211
Rutherford	3	9	319
Sevier	21	115	3,526
Sullivan	4	7	173
Wilson	3	12	323
Recreational and vacation camps	67	433	12,310
Zoos and botanical gardens	10	1,201	29,206
Nature parks and similar institutions	14	310	1,716
All other amusement and recreation industries	367	4,203	89,675
Blount	12	40	1,167
Bradley	4	21	399
Cocke	8	66	1,790
Davidson	51	1,371	32,605
Hamilton	22	216	3,874
Henry	3	3	38
Knox	25	229	3,076
Lawrence	3	7	40
Madison	6	80	797
Montgomery	11	52	517
Polk	16	39	2,193
Putnam	4	7	59
Rutherford	12	133	1,651
Sevier	51	975	22,982
Shelby	38	367	4,724
Sullivan	13	35	798
Sumner	6	65	949
Washington	8	71	778

Williamson	22	135	4,081
Wilson	7	56	1,125
* Source is U.S. Census Bureau. County Business Patterns: 2019.			
† The U.S. Census Bureau withholds some county-level data to avoid disclosing data for individual companies. These data are included in the statewide totals.			

The relationships between private recreation businesses and recreation areas managed by public agencies vary. Marinas provide recreation services to support water-based activities including fuel, docks, and launch sites for motor boats and bait for fishing. Some marinas are private businesses on privately owned land, while others provide services on a lease or concessionaire basis on Tennessee Valley Authority and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers reservoirs and land adjacent to the reservoir. Private recreation providers in the transportation sector include bus tour and water tour companies whose tours navigate to or through publicly owned and managed recreation areas or tour waterways managed by a Federal entity. In the case of private recreation services involving OHVs, some private entities run commercial operations in the vicinity of a public recreation area to offer recreation equipment, sell user permits, and provide recreation services that complement the experience available on the public land. Notable examples are the outfitters who provide guides, kayaks, and rafts on the Harpeth Scenic River, Obed Wild and Scenic River, and several whitewater rivers in east Tennessee. Some off highway vehicle (OHV)⁵ businesses, like OHV staging areas and campgrounds, are adjacent to and provide access via connector trails to the Sundquist OHV Riding Area of the North Cumberland Wildlife Management Area (see the Ride Royal Blue ATV Resort case study below). Other OHV-related recreation businesses provide riding opportunities on land they own and trails they maintain.

Tennessee is well known for its many OHV riding opportunities. Extensive trail systems exist on public lands, such as the North Cumberland Wildlife Management Area, several Tennessee State Forests, the Doe Mountain Recreation Area, and the Buffalo Mountain area of Cherokee National Forest. Private businesses also offer thousands of trail miles for different vehicle types on owned or leased land. Some locations allow single-day, multi-day, or annual passes, while others are owned by and maintained by riding clubs and require club membership. A summary of public and private OHV recreation areas in Tennessee is provided in Appendix C. The extensive list was compiled from available resources but is not necessarily comprehensive.

⁵ OHV is used here to include all OHV vehicle types, ATVs, side-by-sides, single-track vehicles, high-clearance etc.

Ride Royal Blue Resort

Pioneer, Tennessee

“Dedicated to helping families create mountain memories.” – *Ride Royal Blue mission statement*

Ride Royal Blue Resort is a commercial “ATV resort,” providing cabins, camping, dining and equipment for off-highway vehicle riders. The Ride Royal Blue facility provides access, via a connecting trail, to the 600 miles of trails on the adjacent North Cumberland Wildlife Management Area’s Sundquist Unit Off Highway Vehicle (OHV) riding area, managed by the Tennessee Wildlife Resources Agency (TWRA). The “park/camp and ride” access and large staging area for trailers and vehicles are main draws to OHV riders. In addition to the “park/camp and ride” access to trails, Ride Royal Blue provides guided rides, offers special events, sells the safety gear necessary for riding the trails, and is a TWRA permitting entity.



APPENDIX A: Tennessee State Forests, recreation summary

Name of TN State Forest	Trail(s) present?	Hunting allowed?	Fishing allowed?	Camping allowed?	OHV use	Latitude	Longitude
Bledsoe	hiking, horseback riding, ATV	Yes	Yes	Yes (assumed)	Allowed	35.681907	-85.269735
Cedars of Lebanon	types not specified	Yes	Yes (assumed)	Yes (assumed)	Disallowed	36.091767	-86.33074
Chickasaw	horseback riding, hiking.	Yes	Yes (assumed)	Yes	Allowed (assumed)	35.393399	-88.772311
Chuck Swan	fishing, horseback riding, and mountain biking	Yes	Yes	Yes (assumed)	Disallowed (assumed)	36.374126	-83.891218
Franklin	hiking, horseback riding, off-road and ATV riding	Yes	Yes (assumed)	Yes	Allowed	35.117740	-85.865076
Lewis	types not specified	Yes	Yes (assumed)	Yes (assumed)	Allowed	35.521859	-87.600300
Lone Mountain	horseback riding, hiking	Yes	Yes (assumed)	Yes (assumed)	Disallowed	36.070478	-84.546575
Martha Sundquist	types not specified	Yes	Yes	Yes (assumed)	Disallowed	35.810194	-83.035089
Natchez Trace	hiking, horseback riding	Yes	Yes (assumed)	Yes	Allowed	35.823665	-88.249869
Natchez Trace (southern portion)	hiking, horseback riding	Yes	Yes (assumed)	Yes	Allowed	35.727426	-88.313785
Pickett	hiking, horseback riding, OHVs on unimproved trails.	Yes	Yes (assumed)	Yes (assumed)	Allowed (unimproved roads)	36.550844	-84.796395
Prentice Cooper	Hiking, OHV (100 trail miles)	Yes	Yes (assumed)	Yes	Allowed (certain roads)	35.165084	-85.417630
Scott	hiking, horseback riding	Yes	Yes (assumed)	Yes (assumed)	Disallowed	36.478424	-84.680107
Standing Stone	hiking, horseback riding.	Yes	Yes (assumed)	Yes (assumed)	Disallowed except on main roads	36.483925	-85.406779

Stewart	hiking, mountain biking.	Yes	Yes (assumed)	Yes (assumed)	Allowed	36.418056	-87.738487
John Tully	types not specified	Yes	Yes	Yes (assumed)	Disallowed	35.657079	-89.803333
* (assumed) indicates that the information available did not indicate the activity was prohibited. Camping does not indicate availability of a developed campground. Coordinates are typically for the Forest's managing office							

APPENDIX B: Tennessee State Natural Areas, recreation summary of areas that allow full public access

Name of TN State Natural Area	Parking available?	Trail(s) present?	Hunting allowed?	Fishing allowed?	Camping allowed?	Owner
Bays Mountain	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	City of Kingsport
Beaman Park	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Metro Davidson County Dep. Of Parks and Recreation
Big Cypress Tree	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No, allowed on state park with permission	State
Burgess Falls	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	State
Carroll Cabin Barrens	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	State
Mr and Mrs Harry Lee Center	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	State
Coldiz Cove	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	State
Couchville Cedar Glade	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	State
Devils Backbone	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	State
Duck River Complex	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	State
Dunbar Cave	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	State
Fall Creek Falls	Yes	Yes	Specific regulations	Yes	Specific Regulations	State
Falling Water Falls	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	State
Flat Rock Cedar Glades & Barrens	Yes	yes	No	No	No	State
Frozen Head	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	State
Ghost River	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	State
Grundy Forest	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	State
Hampton Creek Cove	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	State
Honey Creek	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	National Park Service
House Mountain	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	State
John Noel at Bon Aqua	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	State
Laurel Snow	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	State
Lost Creek	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	State
Lucius Burch Jr. Forest	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Shelby County
Meeman-Shelby	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	State

Montgomery Bell	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	State
Mount View Glade	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	State
Natural Bridge	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	State
North Chickamagua Creek Gorge	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	State
Old Forest	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	City of Memphis
Ozone Falls	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	State
Piney Falls	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	State
Pogue Creek	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	State
Powell River	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	State
Radnor Lake	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	State
Reelfoot Lake	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	State
Riverwoods	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	State
Roundtop Mountain	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	National Park Service
Rugby	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	State
Savage Gulf	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	State
Sequatchie Cave	Yes	No	No	No	No	State
Sherwood Forest	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	State
Short Springs	Limited	Yes	No	No	No	State, TVA, City of Tullahoma
Stillhouse Hollow Falls	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	State
Stinging Fork Falls	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	State
Stones River Cedar Glade	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	National Park Service
Sunk Lake	Yes	Yes	South tract only	Yes	No	State
Twin Arches	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	National Park Service
Vesta Cedar Glade	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	State
Virgin Falls	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	State
Walls of Jericho	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	State
Watauga River Bluffs	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	State
William B. Clark Conservation Area	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	The Nature Conservancy
Window Cliffs	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	State

APPENDIX C: View of mapped municipal, county and state parks represented in the parks inventory, by geographic region.




Figure 3. Inventory map of upper east Tennessee.




Figure 4. Inventory map of central east Tennessee.




Figure 5. Inventory map of middle Tennessee.




Figure 6. Inventory map of west Tennessee.

APPENDIX D: OHV riding locations in Tennessee**UTV, ATV trails:*****Public lands:***

Big South Fork National Recreation Area – Oneida, TN

Buffalo Mountain, Cherokee National Forest - south of Johnson City, Tennessee.

Tennessee State Forests (with exceptions; see Appendix A) – throughout Tennessee

Doe Mountain Recreation Area (State of Tennessee, managed by Doe Mountain Recreation Authority) - Mountain City, TN. 60 miles of trails amid 8,600 acres.

North Cumberland WMA Sundquist Unit OHV riding area (in TWRA North Cumberland Wildlife Management Area, north of Jacksboro, TN). 600 miles of trails.

Pickett State Park – Jamestown, TN

Southern Gulf Off Road Park – Coalmont, TN. Not opened as of April 2021. County land, 1300 acres.

Private trails:

Adventure Off Road Park – South Pittsburg, TN. 120 miles of trail amid 500 acres.

Aetna Mountain Off-Road Park – Chattanooga, TN. 700 acres of trails. Membership and guests.

Bell Ridge Retreat – Monterey, TN. 700 acres. (only Four wheelers, utvs and SxSs permitted)

Brimstone – Huntsville, TN. 300 miles of OHV trails amid 19,000 acres.

Bikini Bottoms Off-Road Park – Dyersburg, TN. All OHVs

Circle E Guest Ranch – Belvidere, TN. 120 miles of trails.

Golden Mountain OHV Park – Sparta, TN

R and D Campground – Mountain City, TN. 8,600 acres

Ride Royal Blue – Pioneer, TN. Trails connect to TWRA Sundquist OHV riding area.

Muddy Creek Raceway – Blountville, TN

Snooper’s Rock – Chattanooga, TN

Windrock Mountain – North –Oliver Springs, TN. 250 miles of off-road trails in 72,000 acres owned by Coal Creek Mining and maintained by Windrock ATV club.

Windrock Mountain – South –Oliver Springs, TN. (see above)

Woolys Off Road Park – Lynnville, TN. 500+ acres.

Single track (dirt bike) trails:***Public lands -Trails:***

Buffalo Mountain (in Cherokee National Forest) -south of Johnson City and north of Erwin, Tennessee).
13 mile dirtbiking route.

Doe Mountain Recreation Area (State of Tennessee, managed by Doe Mountain Recreation Authority) -
Mountain City, TN. 60 miles of trails amid 8,600 acres.

North Cumberland WMA Sundquist Unit OHV riding area (in TWRA North Cumberland Wildlife
Management Area, north of Jacksboro, TN).

Unicoi Motorcycle Trail (in Cherokee National Forest) – Coker Creek, TN

Private locations - Trails:

i-81 Motorsports MX Park – Jearoldstown, TN

Loretta Lynn’s Ranch – Hurricane Mills, TN. Riding only during scheduled races.

Trails End Campground – Huntsville, TN. Motocross track. (also accesses North Cumberland WMA OHV
trails)

Wheelin in the Country – Summertown, TN. 700 acres. All vehicle types.

Windrock Mountain – North –Oliver Springs, TN. 250 miles of off-road trails in 72,000 acres owned by
Coal Creek Mining and maintained by Windrock ATV club.

Windrock Mountain – South –Oliver Springs, TN. (see above)

Woolys Off Road Park – Lynnville, TN. 500+ acres.

Motocross Tracks:

Christiana Motocross Track – Christiana, TN

Fast Farms MX – Altamont, TN

I-81 Motorsports MX Park – Jearoldstown, TN

Little Valley MX – Maynardville, TN (Club track)

Meadow Creek Motocross – Crossville, TN

Muddy Creek Raceway – Blountville, TN

MXWildFlower Motor Sports Park – Spring Hill, TN

Powerline Supercross – Atwood, TN. Supercross track

Thunder Valley Motocross – Rickman, TN.

Tumbling Creek Motocross – McEwen, TN

WMMX – Sweetwater, TN. One mile track.

Outdoor Recreation Patterns, Preferences and Motivations

RESULTS OF A SURVEY OF TENNESSEANS, 2020

APRIL 29, 2021

prepared for
KIMLEY-HORN
for the TENNESSEE STATEWIDE COMPREHENSIVE OUTDOOR RECREATION PLAN

Susan Schexnayder*
Lillia Poveda
J. Mark Fly

UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE | HUMAN DIMENSIONS RESEARCH LAB

*Corresponding author: schexnayder@utk.edu; 2505 EJ Chapman Drive, Rm 427, Knoxville, TN 37996-4563

OUTDOOR RECREATION PATTERNS, PREFERENCES, and MOTIVATIONS: Results of a Survey of Tennesseans, 2020

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Visits to parks and similar outdoor recreation areas such as greenways are determined by a suite of factors, including personal preferences, early life experiences, media and other cultural messages, perceptions of benefits and barriers to recreation in parks, and the availability of parks and other places in which to recreate. Recreation patterns, and some of the factors influencing them, were the focus of a 2020 survey of Tennesseans, the results of which are presented here and intended to provide current information for the Tennessee Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan.

The survey addressed Tennesseans' frequency of recreation in parks and similar outdoor places,¹ the activities in which they are engaged, their motivations for recreating in parks, their perceptions of needed resources, and their assessment of funding priorities for parks. Survey methods were successful at achieving participation of hard-to-reach populations (minorities and persons in low-income households) and assuring representation of the Tennessee population. Data were collected from adults only, and findings related to children are revealed only by differences noted between households with and without children.

It is a positive finding that more than half of Tennesseans reported that they recreated in a park and similar place four or more times in the prior 12 months, and about 13% visited at least weekly. However, it is concerning to observe that 22% Tennesseans did not visit a park at all. Even more troubling is that when asked to identify the specific park types they visited, we found that 39% had not visited any of the park types named, revealing that some of those who reported recreating “in a park or similar place”—roughly 17% of Tennesseans—were likely reporting recreation that occurred in an outdoor space—such as a home or apartment’s yard or a sidewalk or street—not designed and designated for public (non-commercial) recreation and lacking diverse or safe recreational opportunities.

Among those who did not recreate in a park, we find disproportionate representation of Blacks/African Americans and persons in low-income households. In an assessment of barriers to outdoor recreation—a companion report to this report—these subsets of the Tennessee population also reported experiencing more barriers and more significant barriers to outdoor recreation than did other population segments.² These barriers include safety concerns for Blacks/African Americans and health issues for low-income households. These findings together suggest that either the barriers experienced by these populations or factors not examined in our assessment are limiting the recreational participation of these population segments.

¹ The survey asked about recreation in parks and similar outdoor recreation areas such as greenways, trails, and outdoor public pools, but excluding their own homes.

² Barriers to Tennesseans' outdoor recreation at parks and similar places is addressed in detail in a separate report, “Barriers to Outdoor Recreation: Results of a Survey of Tennesseans, 2020,” by Schexnayder et al. of the University of Tennessee’s Human Dimensions Research Lab, March 2021.

Blacks/African Americans in Tennessee do report being less interested in recreation in parks than other population segments do; however, disinterest could be a result of pervasiveness of barriers or could be related to other factors not assessed here, including media and cultural influences.

Older Tennesseans (over 65 years old) are disproportionately present in the no-recreation group, and limitations such as health are a known contributor to lower frequency of outdoor recreation. More women than men are in the no-recreation group and that could be cause for concern for Tennessee women who are not capturing the benefits of parks. It also is of concern in that women's lower participation in parks recreation could constrain recreation opportunities for their children, especially children in households with only a female as head-of-household. However, we find that households with children do visit parks more than households without children, which might provide a counter-balance to the effect on children from women's less frequent outdoor recreation.

A considerable share of Tennesseans indicated they would like to recreate in parks and similar places more in the next 12 months than they actually did in the last 12 months, indicating a general desire for more outdoor recreation in parks. Four in ten Tennesseans—equating to 1.8 million Tennessee adults—indicated they want to recreate more frequently. Only one in ten indicated they want to recreate less frequently. The largest share—48%—want their recreation frequency to remain the same. Within this group are those Tennesseans—12%—who had no visits to parks in the last 12 months and want to make no visits in the next 12 months. Just over one-third of these non-recreationalists express some interest in outdoor recreation in parks and similar places, yet still do not want to recreate in parks in the coming year, suggesting they may not perceive the benefits of parks significant enough to make the effort to go to them or they may perceive barriers such as safety or limited mobility to be too great to visit a park, and thus they limit their outdoor recreation—if they recreate outdoors at all—to their homes or neighborhoods.

Of all the types of parks—categorized by type of management, e.g., city/county, state, federal, and commercial—it is city and county parks that are both visited by most Tennesseans (44%) and visited most frequently by Tennesseans. We posit that proximity to one's home is most certainly a contributing—or perhaps the primary—factor that makes city and county parks most visited. Given equal interest in recreation in parks and equal opportunity and access to parks—enabled by absence of barriers such as time, transportation, financial resources, and safety considerations—Tennesseans of all races and ethnicities could be expected to visit all park types at the same rate. We observe this to be roughly true for city and county parks, with 41 to 48% of White, Black, and Hispanic Tennesseans having recreated in a city or county park in the last 12 months. This parity was found not to be true for Tennessee's state parks, which were visited by 20% of White Tennesseans, but only 6% and 7% of Blacks and Hispanics, respectively. Equal shares of White and Hispanic Tennesseans visited national parks, but far fewer Blacks (7%) visited them. Examining the correlation between household income and who visit parks also reveals a glaring pattern. The share of the population who visit all types of parks increases with income, and, conversely, smaller shares of low-income Tennesseans visited each type of park. Barriers that could suppress visitation to parks include lack of interest, which was slightly greater

for Black Tennesseans than Tennesseans identifying as other racial and ethnic categories, but lack of interest is not greater among low-income Tennesseans. Other barriers experienced by Black and other people of color in Tennessee include safety concerns, not feeling welcome and mosquitos, ticks and other pests. Other barriers experienced disproportionately greater by low-income Tennesseans include nobody to go with, not feeling welcome, health issues, disability of themselves or a recreation partner, and cost.

Knowing the motivations of visitors helps policy makers and park managers understand what is important to their visitors and what benefits they might highlight in promoting their parks to future visitors. Tennesseans are motivated to recreate in parks by a number of factors and assigned moderate or greater importance to each motivation assessed in the survey. Having fun and being with family and friends are the most important motivation for visits to parks. These are closely followed by health and wellness motivations: improving mental health, such as reducing anxiety or depression; restoring a sense of well-being and elevating overall mood; and improving physical health. Tennesseans who expressed no interest in recreating in parks assessed health benefits and connecting to nature as far less important motivations than did Tennesseans who are interested in recreation, suggesting that Tennesseans not interested in recreation may not value nature experiences as highly and, compared to other Tennesseans, may be less aware of the health benefits of nature-based recreation or may believe that these benefits will not accrue to them because of other factors such as poor health or disability.

While there are several avid recreational groups in Tennessee whose recreational activities, such as paddling and single-track or ATV riding, seem to be increasing in popularity, just over 2% of Tennesseans engage in these activities. Many other recreation types remain more popular, and walking or running is the outdoor recreational activity in which the largest share of Tennesseans (58%) engage. Fishing; picnicking; swimming in pools; viewing, studying, and photographing wildlife; and bicycling are activities which follow walking in popularity, with 10 – 13% of Tennesseans participating in each of these activities.

Although only adults participated in the survey, a focus on youth is evident in Tennesseans' identification of "the one recreational resource most needed in their community." Playgrounds for children, swimming pools, sports areas, skate parks, and something for older children to do—all resources that have a youth focus—were among the needed resources frequently mentioned. Parks in general, as well as neighborhood parks and safe and well-maintained parks, were the resource type most frequently named. In keeping with Tennesseans' high rates of participation in walking, another recreation resource type frequently mentioned were paths, trails, and greenways for walking. Given that 12% of Tennesseans report swimming in pools as a current recreational activity and 5% identify swimming pools as the one resource most needed, maintaining and adding community pools is an expressed preference of Tennesseans. And, recognizing that some municipalities and counties are doing well at providing for the outdoor recreational needs of their citizens, notably, five percent of survey respondents did not identify a needed outdoor recreational resource and instead noted that the recreational resources in their area were adequate or abundant and meet community needs.

Knowing what objectives for park funding are important to Tennesseans is an important precursor to resource allocation decisions made by local and state funding bodies and park professionals. The integral relationship between parks and related recreation resources and the environments in which they are placed is evident in the Tennesseans' valuation of natural resource-focused priorities for funding objectives for parks. Habitat protection and restoring damaged waterways were assessed to be the highest priorities for park funding, along with maintaining existing parks. Acquiring new lands for developed or undeveloped areas was assessed as the lowest funding priority, despite so many people identifying the need for a park in their area. Women evaluated all park funding objectives higher than men did, and among survey respondents a greater share of women than men had children in their household (42% vs. 37%). This, along with the finding that households with children report visiting parks more than households without children, points to the importance of parks for children.

Evaluations of park funding objectives by low-income Tennesseans were the opposite of the pattern observed among women. Low-income Tennesseans assigned lower importance to all funding objectives than did higher income Tennesseans. This could indicate a general perception among this segment of the Tennessee population that other community needs must be met before funding for parks takes priority. It could also suggest that this segment of the Tennessee population is less aware of the role parks can play in meeting other needs such as physical and mental health improvements and the value of parks to neighborhood livability and appeal for residents and businesses alike.

Introduction

Outdoor recreation patterns and preferences, such as the frequency of recreation and the type of recreation people engage in, change over time as they are influenced by early life experience, media and other cultural messages, availability of recreation places and resources, and factors that afford or constrain access to them. Identifying current recreation patterns and preferences of Tennessee adults was a goal of a survey of Tennesseans conducted in 2020. The findings of the survey are an important consideration in the State of Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan.

Methods

The Human Dimensions Research Lab at the University of Tennessee conducted a survey of Tennesseans in 2020. Administered online with data collection occurring between October 27 and December 11, 2020, the survey collected data from 1,135 respondents. Participant quotas and limits were imposed to assure participation of hard-to-reach populations, including low-income, minority, and non-urban populations.

To assure the survey results represent Tennessee adults, we compared the demographic characteristics of respondents to those of the Tennessee adult population. Tennesseans from 89 of the state's 95 counties participated. Respondents roughly match Tennessee adult population on age, race and ethnicity, community density (urban vs. nonurban), and income. The demographic breakdown of respondents is included as Appendix A of this report. A significant difference in gender distribution occurred. Seventy percent (70%) of survey respondents and 52% of the adult population in Tennessee are female. To discount this overrepresentation of females, we applied proportional weighting, which allows all analyses to reflect the actual gender distribution in Tennessee. Only adults could participate in the survey, so data reflect their recreation patterns and preferences. Children are not represented in the data except as household members of survey respondents. In this report we refer to the population as Tennesseans.

Frequency of outdoor recreation in parks or similar outdoor places

The survey asked respondents how frequently they recreated outdoors in parks or similar outdoor places in Tennessee in the last 12 months and how frequently they planned to recreate in these places in the next 12 months. The question focused on recreation in outdoor parks and other places, rather than all outdoor recreation. The survey question does not capture recreation that occurred in people's own yards or neighborhood streets. Respondents reported their frequency of recreation by selecting from these categories: Not at all; 1 – 3 times, 4 – 11 times; 12 – 23 times; 24 – 51 times; 52 – 103 times; 104 – 259 times; and 260+ times. The categories are based on frequencies in weekly or monthly time periods: for example 12 – 23 times is at least once a month but not quite as frequently as twice a month, while 52 – 103 is at least once a week but not quite as frequently as twice a week.

The distribution of responses is shown in Figure 1. About 1 in 5 Tennessee adults (22%) did not recreate in parks or similar outdoor places in the last 12 month. About 1 in 4 Tennessee adults (24%) recreated in parks between 1 – 3 times. Taken together, 46% of Tennessee adults recreated outdoors three or fewer times in the last 12 months. The share of Tennessee adults who are frequent users of parks, i.e., recreate in them at least once a week, is 13%.




Figure 1. Frequency of Tennesseans' outdoor recreation in parks and similar outdoor recreation places, past 12 months and next 12 months.

Gender and age are both correlated with the frequency of recreation in the last 12 months (Figure 2). Average frequency of outdoor recreation is highest among 25 – 44 year olds and lowest among older adults. Males are recreating more frequently outdoors in parks than are females. Comparing Tennesseans' outdoor recreation frequency by race and ethnicity shows that Black and Hispanic Tennesseans recreate in parks less than other population segments. Among all population segments, those who recreate least in parks and other outdoor places are Black females age 18 – 24 and 25 – 34. Mean scores for frequency of outdoor recreation in parks for these groups are 2.4 and 2.1, respectively, equating to an estimated 2 and 1 times per year. For comparison, the mean scores for frequency of recreation for all Tennesseans is 2.8 and for Tennesseans other than Black females under age 35 is 3.1, equating to roughly 3 and 4 times per year, respectively.

Additional focus on Tennesseans who do not recreate outdoors in parks reveals that this group has disproportionate representation of females, who are 51.5% of the total population but 59.2% of the population who did not recreate in a park in the last 12 months, for a difference of 7.7 percentage points. Other population segments also are disproportionately high in the no-recreation population, including Tennesseans age 65 and older, persons in households with no children, persons whose annual household income is below \$25,000, and Black/African Americans. The magnitude of differences is shown in Figure 3 in which the baseline (zero

position on the graph) is the survey population in that category, and the bars represent the difference between the survey population and the non-recreating population.




Figure 2. Differences, by age and gender, in mean frequency of outdoor recreation in parks and similar places in the prior 12 months.




Figure 3. Differences between survey population and respondents who do not recreate outdoors in parks and similar places. Tennesseans who do not recreate outdoors include higher representations of females, elderly adults, households without children, persons in low-income households, and Black/African Americans.

Figure 1 also shows how frequently Tennesseans would like to recreate outdoors in parks and similar places in the next 12 months. The figure shows some movement toward more recreation in the future. While 22% of Tennesseans report having no recreation in parks in the last year, only 14% report they would like to have no recreation in the next year. Figure 4 delves deeper into the difference between frequency in the last 12 months' and desired frequency in the next 12 months. This breakdown reveals that about 42% of Tennesseans want to recreate in parks and similar places more than they did last year, and only about 10% of Tennesseans would like to recreate less than they did last year. The largest share (48%) want their recreation to be the same as it was in the last 12 months. One-quarter of the people in this group currently do not recreate in park and similar places at all. This equates to 12% of Tennesseans who did not recreate last year and do not want to recreate next year in parks and similar outdoor places. Among this group of non-recreationalists, more than one-third (34.6%) still express some interest in outdoor recreation. These people who have some interest in outdoor recreation but do not want to recreate in parks or similar places may not perceive the benefits of parks significant enough to make the effort to go to them and may limit their recreation to their homes or neighborhoods, or they may perceive barriers such as safety or limited mobility to be too great to visit a park.




Figure 4. Tennesseans’ expected change in frequency of outdoor recreation in parks, and recreation frequency of those who would like their next year recreation to be the same as last year.

Locations of outdoor recreation

To learn where Tennesseans were spending their outdoor recreation time, we asked survey respondents to identify which of several types of outdoor recreation areas they visited in the previous 12 months. The areas were classified by the managing type, for example city or county, state, national, and private/commercial recreation areas. We also asked about recreation on

privately owned land, including hunting lease and family land, but excluding their own home. The aim was to determine what parks and other recreation areas were destinations for Tennesseans who recreate outdoors.

More than one-third of Tennesseans (39%) had not visited any of the recreation areas identified in the survey in the last 12 months (Figure 5). This is a larger share of the population than the 22% who said they did not recreate outdoors in parks and similar outdoor recreation places. In contrast, we might have expected the share of “did not visit any of these recreation areas” to be less than the share who reported no outdoor recreation in parks and similar places because the listed areas included private/commercial recreation areas and privately owned land. A mix of factors could contribute to the difference. Survey respondents could have not perceived the type of outdoor places in which they recreate to be included in the survey’s listed types of outdoor recreation areas. It is also possible that when addressing the question about frequency of outdoor recreation in parks and similar places, respondents reported all recreation including outdoor recreation that occurred at their homes or in their neighborhoods, e.g., walking on neighborhood streets or sidewalks or visiting an apartment’s pool which might not be perceived as their home rather than a private pool. The findings do suggest that a share of Tennesseans—about 17%—are recreating outdoors in places not designated for public recreation or designed for public recreation (e.g., sidewalks and streets).




Figure 5. Types of recreation areas visited by Tennesseans in the past 12 months.

(Sum is greater than 100% because respondents identified all types visited.)

With more than 44% of Tennesseans visiting city or county parks, greenways, trails, public pools and recreation areas, this is the type of recreation area used by the largest share of Tennesseans (Figure 5).³ City and county parks are also the type of recreation area visited most frequently; 70% of Tennesseans who visit a park or other outdoor recreation place indicate city or county parks are the park type they visit most frequently (Figure 6). State parks, forests, and wildlife management areas are visited by 8% of Tennesseans, and national parks, forest and recreation areas are visited by 5% of Tennesseans. They are the preferred destinations of 13% and 7%, respectively, of Tennesseans who visited any park type in the last 12 months.




Figure 6. Type of recreation areas visited most frequently by Tennesseans who have visited any of these types of recreation areas in the past 12 months

Analysis of survey data shows that Tennesseans who visit any of the park types are disproportionately from households with children. In Tennessee, 29.7% of households have children.⁴ In comparison, one-half (50%) of the Tennesseans who visited a city or county park in the last 12 months are in households with children. Similarly, 44% of Tennesseans who visited state parks and 45% who visited a national park in the last 12 month are from households with children. From this disproportionate representation of households with children, we can infer that the share of the total population—children included—who visited one of the park types is greater than the share of adults alone.

Given equal opportunity, access, and interest, Tennesseans of all races and ethnicities could be expected to visit all park types at the same rate. We observe this to be roughly true for city and county parks, where 41 – 48% of non-Hispanic Whites, Blacks/African Americans, and

³ For brevity and to reduce redundancy, we subsequently sometimes use the term “city and county parks” to include the entire category of city or county parks, greenways, trails, public pools, and recreation areas. Similar labels will be used for state parks (to include state parks, forests, or wildlife management areas) and national parks (to include national parks, forests or recreation areas, including TVA- and Corps of Engineers-managed recreation areas).

⁴ U.S. Census Bureau. 2019. ACS 1 Year Estimates. Data Profiles, Table DP02 “Selected Social Characteristics.”

Hispanics visited a city or county park in the last year (Figure 7). A slightly smaller share of Hispanics (41%) visited city and county parks, compared to Whites (46%) and Blacks/African Americans (48%). The biggest differences in shares of population visiting a park type is observed for Tennessee’s state parks, forests and wildlife management areas which were visited by 20% of Whites, but only 6% and 7% of Blacks and Hispanics, respectively. The number of Whites who visit state parks, relative to total population of Whites, is three times greater than Blacks and Hispanics. The pattern is different for national parks, forests and recreation areas, where roughly 12% of non-Hispanic Whites and an equal share of Hispanics visited, but just slightly more than half that share of Blacks, about 7%, visited national parks. Private/commercial recreation areas are visited by far fewer Hispanics (proportional to total Hispanic population); and privately owned/leased land is visited far more by Whites. Barriers that could suppress visitation to state and national parks include lack of interest, which was slightly greater for BIPOC Tennesseans than White Tennesseans. Black Tennesseans reported having greater barriers overall than White Tennesseans as well as having no one to recreate with, greater concerns about safety, and feeling unwelcome.⁵




Figure 7. Percent of Tennesseans who visited each type of recreation area in the last 12 months, by race and ethnicity

Examining the correlation between household income and who visit parks reveals a glaring pattern. The share of the population who visit all types of parks increases with income (Figure 8). This pattern might be expected for private/commercial recreation areas which are fee-based and privately owned land, ownership of which would be income- or wealth-based. However, the pattern holds for city and county parks, state parks, and national parks. For city and county parks, the difference is 15 percentage points: 37% of low-income Tennesseans and 62% of upper-income Tennesseans visited a city or county park in the last 12 months. The low-income category is household incomes of \$25,000 or less in 2019. The upper-income category is household incomes of \$100,000 or more in 2019. For state parks, there is a difference of 30 percentage points, with 8% of low-income Tennesseans and 38% of upper-income Tennesseans

⁵ Barriers to Tennesseans’ outdoor recreation at parks and similar places is addressed in detail in a separate report, “Barriers to Outdoor Recreation: Results of a Survey of Tennesseans, 2020,” by Schexnayder et al. of the University of Tennessee’s Human Dimensions Research Lab, March 2021.

having visited a state park. For national parks, the difference between the low- and upper-income categories is 25 percentage points. This study's examination of barriers to outdoor recreation found interest in outdoor recreation did not vary by income, but low-income Tennesseans did perceive or experience other barriers more than Tennesseans in other income categories. These barriers included health, disability, having no one to go with, cost, safety concerns, and not feeling welcome.




Figure 8. Percent of Tennesseans who visited each type of recreation area in the last 12 months, by income category

Motivations for outdoor recreation

People often are motivated by multiple factors for their outdoor recreation, so the survey asked respondents to evaluate the importance of several different potential motivations. The set of motivations is similar to other assessments of outdoor recreation and a separate 2020 survey of visitors at Tennessee State Parks. Knowing the motivations of visitors helps policy makers and park managers understand what is important to their visitors and what benefits they might highlight in promoting their parks to future visitors.

Survey respondents evaluated the importance of each motivation using a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being not important and 5 being very important. The higher the average score, the more important the motivation is to Tennesseans. The average score of each motivation is shown in Figure 9. These scores are the averages of scores assigned by Tennesseans who visited a park of any type in the last 12 months. All motivations have average scores greater than 3, indicating all motivations have at least moderate importance for park visitors, on average. Of the motivations evaluated, having fun and being with family and friends are the most important motivation for visits to parks. These are closely followed by health and wellness motivations: improving mental

health, such as reducing anxiety or depression; restoring a sense of well-being and elevating overall mood; and improving physical health.

We also examined the importance of these motivations among Tennesseans who indicated they had no interest in recreating outdoors in parks, and compared them to the average scores assigned by Tennesseans who indicated they had high interest in outdoor recreation in parks. The “no interest” group evaluated each motivation as having moderate or greater importance, assigning, on average, scores of 3 or higher to each. Their assessments of the importance are most similar to the “high interest” group for “being with family and friends,” “getting away from crowds,” and “learning about Tennessee history and heritage.” The “no interest” group scores health benefits and connecting to nature significantly less important than the “high interest” group does. While it is possible that lack of interest overrides all potential motivations that the “no interest” group might feel, it could also be the case that the “no interest” group is less familiar with the benefits associated with health and nature-connectivity motivations or that barriers, such as health issues or disability, lead them to believe the benefits would not accrue to them.




Figure 9. Importance of motivations for spending time outdoors in a park or similar outdoor places, average score assigned by Tennesseans who visited a park in last 12 months




Figure 10. Importance of motivations for spending time outdoors in a park, comparing Tennesseans with no interest in outdoor recreation to those with high interest

Outdoor recreational activities

The outdoor recreational activities of Tennesseans and the share of people who engaged in them in the last 12 months are listed in Table 1. Walking or running is the one recreational activity in which a majority (58%) of Tennesseans participated. This exceeds the next most common activity by 40 percentage points. Between 10% and 15% of Tennesseans went fishing, picnicking, swimming in pools, viewing wildlife or nature, and bicycling on roads, sidewalks or greenways in the last 12 months. Activities in which fewer than 10% of Tennesseans participated are listed in Table 1.

Funding objectives for parks and other outdoor recreational areas

Knowing what objectives for park funding are important to Tennesseans is an important precursor to resource allocation decisions. Furthermore, knowing what objective are important to different population segments can help when developing recreation plans for different community types, for example, urban areas vs. rural areas. The survey asked respondents to evaluate the importance of each of several objective for funding parks and other public outdoor recreation places in Tennessee. Respondents assigned importance using a 5-point scale, where 1 is "Not at all important" to 5 is "Very important." Respondents also selected the one objective they believed to be the most important. These evaluations of funding objectives are shown in Figure 11, which uses abbreviated versions of the wording in each funding objectives. The exact language of each objective is presented in Table 2.

Activity	Percent who did this activity (last 12 months)
Walking or running (on greenways, sidewalks or through neighborhoods)	55.7
Fishing	14.3
Picnicking or similar gatherings	12.9
Swimming or water play in pool	12.4
Viewing, photographing or studying wildlife or nature	12.2
Bicycling (on roads, sidewalks, or greenways)	10.7
Hiking or backpacking on trails	8.8
Playing traditional sports	8.5
Camping	6.9
Swimming or water play in lakes, creeks, or ponds	4.9
Playing "alternative" sports	2.9
Kayaking, paddle boarding, canoeing	2.6
Hunting	2.6
OHV riding (including side-by-side, 4 wheelers, or other off-road vehicles)	2.3
Motorized boating	2.0
Golfing	1.9
Horseback riding	1.6
Mountain biking	1.0
Rock climbing	0.8

Maintain and improve existing parks and recreation areas
Build new parks and recreation areas
Protect wildlife and fish habitat
Restore damaged rivers and streams
Provide environmental and conservation programs
Protect existing open spaces (as undeveloped, conserved land)
Build walking and bicycle paths or greenways between places of work, parks, schools, and shopping areas
Provide recreation programs at parks and recreation areas
Acquire additional land and waterfront areas for developed recreation
Acquire additional land and waterfront areas for undeveloped, conserved land




Figure 11. Importance of funding objectives for parks and similar recreation resources, average score and most important objectives

The two objectives that were assessed as most important relate to the condition of the natural environment: protecting wildlife and fish habitat (average score 4.0), and restoring damaged rivers and streams (average score 3.9). Because the question asked specifically about funding objectives for park and other public outdoor recreation places in Tennessee, we conclude that Tennesseans perceive an integral relationship between their objectives for recreating outdoors and the condition of the environment within which those recreation experiences happen.⁶ The third highest rated objective is maintaining and improving existing parks and recreation areas. This objective also was selected by 30% of Tennesseans as the top funding priority. Protecting habitat was selected as top priority by 19% of Tennesseans. The next “top priority” objective is building walking and biking paths or greenways, selected by 11% yet having an average score of 3.6. Other funding objectives that involve building new resources (parks) or acquiring land for developed recreation areas or for undeveloped, conserved areas were the lowest scored objectives, although 9% of respondents did select new parks as their top priority. Discrepancies between an average score and a “top priority” selection can occur when the evaluations of importance cluster at the top (5) and also near the bottom (1 or 2).

Some differences are observed in the evaluations of funding objectives by different segments of the Tennessee population. On every objective, low-income Tennesseans assigned the objective a

⁶ This relationship is recognized in parks planning guides and tools developed by ChangeLab Solutions (funded by Kaiser Permanente) and is consistent with the NRPA parks engagement survey finding that most Americans believe conservation (along with health and social equity) should be a priority for park and recreation funding. https://www.changelabsolutions.org/sites/default/files/Complete-Parks-Indicators_FINAL_20180530_0.pdf <https://www.nrpa.org/contentassets/257fe28053c6420786927fcffc2f9996/engagement-survey-report-2017.pdf>

lower importance than other Tennesseans (and differences are statistically significant,⁷ except for “acquiring land and water for additional developed recreation”). This level of importance remains the same when analysis excludes persons who express no interest in outdoor recreation, however the differences are significant for only two objectives, i.e., maintain and improve existing parks and build walking and biking paths to connect parks, schools, and shopping areas. In identifying the highest priority funding objective, inner city residents ranked walking and biking paths as the third. This pattern of low-income Tennesseans assigning lower importance to all funding objective could indicate a general perception among this population that outdoor recreation is less important than other community needs.

Some differences are observed between women’s and men’s assessment of funding objectives. Women assigned higher importance than men did to all funding objectives. This finding is unexpected and there does not seem to be a similar finding in the research literature. However, results of a 2020 survey by the National Recreation and Parks Association (NRPA) showed that parents support funding for parks more strongly than non-parents and other research found women evaluated park characteristics as more important than men did.^{8,9} More female than male respondents to our survey were in households with children (42% vs. 37%), making our findings consistent with the NRPA findings. These findings, coupled with our findings that a greater share of households with children visit parks than households without children, convey the importance of parks for children.

Tennesseans who identify the area in which they live as “Out in the country” assigned higher priority than others did to protecting wildlife habitat. Possible reasons could be the proximity of their homes in rural communities to wildlife habitat areas or their greater rates of participation in hunting and fishing.

Another assessment of funding priorities is provided by responses to the survey question “what one type of outdoor public recreation space is most needed in your area.” As expected, answers were wide ranging, but a few items dominate responses. More than 80% of survey respondents provided meaningful input to this question. Answers such as “I don’t know” are not included in the assessment. Five percent (5%) of respondents noted that the resources in their area are adequate or abundant and meet community needs. Other needed resources and the percentage of people who identified that specific need are provided in Table 3. Paralleling the large share of Tennesseans who report walking as an outdoor activity, walking (and running) paths, trails, and greenways are positioned near the top of the list; trails of unspecified nature and hiking trails are combined but reported separately from walking. A place to walk is surpassed only by parks and playgrounds or play areas for children.

Table 3. “The one outdoor recreation resource my community needs is...”

⁷ Statistically significant means that the difference has a very low likelihood – less than 5% chance—of the difference occurring randomly.

⁸ NRPA Park Pulse. Public support for dedicated park and recreation funding. <https://www.nrpa.org/publications-research/park-pulse/strong-support-for-park-and-recreation-funding/>

⁹ C. Ho, V. Sasidharan, W. Elmendorf et al. Gender and ethnic variations in urban park preferences, visitation, and perceived benefits. *Journal of Leisure Research*. 2005. 37(3): 281-306.

Needed resource	Percent who identified this need
Parks (general, neighborhood, fitness, safe, improvements)	14.0
Playgrounds or play areas for children, including 0.5% who focused on safety	10.0
Walking path, trail, greenways (including 0.7% who mentioned sidewalks)	8.9
Sports areas (traditional), including unspecified, basketball, baseball, soccer, tennis and volleyball)	6.3
Swimming pool	5.0
Trails; hiking trails	3.8
Fishing area/access	2.4
ADA accessible areas (paths, fishing dock) for adults and resources for children	2.3
Skate park	2.3
Dog park	1.8
Something for older children/teens (adventure/challenge park, rock wall, youth center)	1.2

APPENDIX A: Demographics of survey respondents

Gender		
	Frequency	Percent
Male	305	27.9
Female	781	71.4
Non-binary	8	0.7
* 41 respondents did not provide gender		

Racial/Ethnic Identify		
	Frequency	Percent
White alone, not Hispanic	714	65.2
Black	258	23.6
American Indian/ Native American	9	0.9
Asian	14	1.2
Native Hawaiian	2	0.2
Bi- or Multi-Racial	43	4.0
Hispanic	56	5.1
* 39 respondents did not provide race or ethnicity information		

Children in the Household		
	Frequency	Percent
No	668	60.7
Yes	432	39.3
* 36 respondents did not provide household composition		

Total household income in 2019		
Income Category	Frequency	Percent
Under \$25,000	265	24.7
\$25,000 - \$49,999	360	33.7
\$50,000 - \$74,999	187	17.5
\$75,000 - \$99,999	130	12.1
\$100,000 - \$149,999	96	9.0
\$150,000 or over	32	3.0
* 64 respondents did not provide income		

Age categories		
Age category	Frequency	Percent
18 - 24	151	13.7
25 - 34	191	17.4
35 - 44	236	21.4
45 - 54	209	19.0
55 - 64	157	14.2
65 - 74	120	10.9
75+	37	3.4
* 33 respondents did not provide race or ethnicity information		

The Tennessee Wildlife Resources Agency
“Protecting, preserving, and perpetuating Tennessee’s wildlife and ecosystems.”

STRATEGIC PLAN 2021-2027



March 2021

Table of Contents

Page No.

Introduction.....	2
Economics of Wildlife.....	3
History.....	3
Who we are.....	4
What we do.....	4
Vision.....	4
Mission.....	4
Statutory Authority.....	4
Strategic Planning.....	5
The Challenge - Developing a New Plan.....	5
Core Functions.....	6
Developing the Plan.....	8
Using this Plan.....	9
Wildlife Resource Management Core Function #1.....	10
GRASSLANDS.....	12
FORESTLANDS.....	17
WETLANDS.....	24
KARST.....	29
STREAMS AND RIVERS.....	33
IMPOUNDMENTS.....	39
URBAN.....	46
EXTRINSIC FACTORS ON WILDLIFE POPULATIONS.....	50
Outdoor Recreation Core Function #2.....	57
Law Enforcement Core Function #3.....	68
Outreach & Communication Core Function #4.....	73
Definitions.....	80
Contributors to this Document.....	82
Literature Cited.....	83

The Tennessee Wildlife Resources Agency

“Protecting, preserving, and perpetuating Tennessee’s wildlife and ecosystems.”

STRATEGIC PLAN 2021-2027



Introduction:

Tennessee’s natural resources are among the most diverse in the nation. From the rugged Appalachian Mountains in the east to the Mississippi River floodplain in the west, the changes in elevation, land use, geology and topography create a wide range of habitat types that give rise to a great diversity of wildlife. Currently there are 330 species of fish, 77 mammals, 56 reptiles, 70 amphibians, and 340 birds known to inhabit or migrate through Tennessee. The number of invertebrate species, many of which are endemic to Tennessee, is equally impressive with 256 land snails, 99 aquatic snails, over 120 mussels, 96 crayfish and many insects. New species are also still being discovered.

Protecting these diverse habitats and the associated wildlife is a quality-of-life issue for many Tennesseans. Both the traditional, consumptive users of wildlife (hunters and anglers) and the non-consumptive users (wildlife watchers) have a stake in the proper management of wildlife. Recreational boaters expect to find clean water, sufficient access to water resources, adequate boating facilities, and a dedication to boating safety. The same standards are expected from those pursuing outdoor recreational activities on our Wildlife Management Areas (WMAs), refuges, and other Agency properties. Due to the extreme pressures exerted on our natural resources by numerous and diverse outdoor users, the Agency must remain vigilant and prepared to ensure our wildlife resources are not exploited or irrevocably impaired. Thus, decisions must be made to manage wisely and to protect the resources.

This Strategic Plan strives to anticipate and balance the needs of the wildlife and the public, and to develop strategies that will protect, enhance, and effectively manage our wildlife resources over the next six years.

Economics of Wildlife:

Every five years the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service conducts a national survey to determine the number of users and the economic impact of hunting, fishing, and wildlife-associated recreation. In the 2011 report, data were provided at the state level, however, state level data were not provided in the 2016 report. According to their 2011 report, there were 923,000 hunters and anglers in Tennessee in 2011 (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 2012) comprising almost 20% of the State's entire population. When non-residents are included, almost one million people hunted or fished in Tennessee that year. Those same sportsmen and women generate 1.9 billion dollars annually in hunting and fishing related expenditures (trips and equipment). Add in Tennessee's two million wildlife watchers who spend almost 1 billion dollars annually, and it brings total annual wildlife-related expenditures in Tennessee to almost three billion dollars. Although the most recent report from 2016 did not provide data at the state level, a 5-year comparison of estimates from 2011 to 2016 shows a 16 percent increase in the total number of people 16 years and older participating in wildlife-related recreation activities in the United States.

History:

In 1949, the Tennessee Game and Fish Commission (TGFC) separated from the Department of Conservation and became a self-supporting agency. A board of commissioners guided the TGFC which was headed by the Executive Director. In 1974 the TGFC became the Tennessee Wildlife Resources Agency (TWRA), reflecting its responsibility for all wildlife. In 1977 the first Strategic Plan was developed, and the Agency began administering its Federal Aid program through a comprehensive management system. The Agency's Strategic Plan has been revised and updated several times with a new Plan published in 1982, 1987, 1994, 2000, 2006, 2014 and 2021.

The Agency continues to have a board of commissioners (see Statutory Authority) as the governing body with the Executive Director in charge of day-to-day activities. TWRA has approximately 700 employees, of which about one-fourth are full-time enforcement officers. The Agency owns or has conservation easements on approximately 600,000 acres of WMAs, refuges, and Agency fishing lakes. TWRA's funding mechanisms are divided into three broad areas: wildlife (terrestrial and aquatic), boating, and wetlands. Funding for the wildlife program is generated primarily by license sales and federal sources (federal sources include grants and excise taxes on certain sporting equipment). The boating safety program is funded through boat registration fees and federal funding. The wetland acquisition program is funded by a transfer tax on Tennessee real estate transactions.

Who we are:

The Tennessee Wildlife Resources Agency is the agency responsible for managing all wildlife species in the State of Tennessee and for enforcing and promoting the safe use of our lands and waters. We are an organization comprised of over 700 professionals dedicated to protecting and managing Tennessee's natural resources for the benefit of all citizens.

What we do:

The Tennessee Wildlife Resources Agency manages wildlife habitat on its Wildlife Management Areas and promotes habitat improvement on private lands; operates fish hatcheries that provide fish to stock public waters throughout the State; monitors fish and wildlife populations and recommends appropriate management actions; enforces wildlife laws; provides boating education and enforces boating safety laws; and provides opportunities for the public to hunt, fish, watch wildlife, and participate in outdoor recreational opportunities that are consistent with realistic conservation principles.

Vision:

The Tennessee Wildlife Resources Agency envisions wildlife populations and their associated habitats that fulfill their diverse ecological roles while also providing a broad range of recreational opportunities throughout the state.

Mission:

The mission of the Tennessee Wildlife Resources Agency is to protect, preserve, and perpetuate Tennessee's wildlife and ecosystems for the sustainable use and recreational benefits for our state's residents and visitors.

Statutory Authority:

Title 70 of Tennessee Code Annotated contains the laws governing the Wildlife Resources Agency.

Chapter 1, "Part 3 – Wildlife Resources Agency" includes:

70-1-301. Creation – Statement of Policy – (a) There is hereby created a wildlife resources agency which shall have full and exclusive jurisdiction of the duties and functions relating to wildlife formerly held by the game and fish commission or of any other law relating to the

management, protection, propagation, and conservation of wildlife, including hunting and fishing, except those powers and duties conferred upon the fish and wildlife commission as provided in § 70-1-206. *(Note: 70-1-206 defines the duties of the Commission, which includes appointing the executive director, approving the budget, and promulgating rules, regulations, and proclamations)*

(b) It is the policy of the state that the agency shall be nonpartisan and shall place first and foremost the welfare of the wildlife and its environment in the agency's planning and decisions, and to encourage, by every appropriate means, the full development of the state's natural resources to the benefit of all citizens of Tennessee, including, but not limited to, the creation of a comprehensive long-range management plan to integrate the wildlife resources agency's efforts and to implement and encourage full utilization of Tennessee's wildlife resources consistent with realistic conservation principles.

Chapter 4 of Title 70 includes:

70-4-101. Ownership and title to wildlife vested in state.-(a) The ownership of and title to all forms of wildlife within the jurisdiction of the state, as are not individual property under the laws of the land, are hereby declared to be in the state.

Strategic Planning:

The basic concept of strategic planning is that knowledgeable people will develop ambitious but realistic goals and objectives for an organization to strive for. They will identify potential problems or issues that may hinder the realization of those desired outcomes. Conversely, the planners may also identify opportunities that may help realize those same goals and objectives. Lastly, the planners will develop strategies to overcome the problems and issues or take advantage of the opportunities before them. The Strategic Plan, therefore, is meant to serve as a guiding document for the Agency to meet its current goals and objectives. If properly constructed and well thought-out, the plan should ensure success.

The Challenge - Developing a New Plan:

In 2019, the Tennessee Wildlife Resources Agency began a revision of our strategic plan to guide the next 6 years. In 2012, the Agency made a huge overhaul of our strategic plan. The Agency's long and storied existence centered on species management, therefore, historically the Agency developed and utilized a species-based strategic plan that focused primarily on game management. The primary programs identified in past Strategic Plans included White-tailed Deer, Turkey, Black Bear, Ruffed Grouse, Squirrel, etc. with only a few programs that captured all species under one platform, including Reservoirs, Large Rivers, Streams, Farm Game, and Non-game. The species-based focus served the Agency well in the early decades, especially since numerous game animals were in decline or even completely extirpated from their historic range.

Within the last few decades, many game populations recovered to the point where their persistence is no longer in question. In addition to the recovery of popular game animals, in 2005, the Agency developed and released their State Wildlife Action Plan (SWAP) which identifies species of Greatest Conservation Need (GCN). The SWAP plan was updated in 2015. This comprehensive plan identifies and ranks all species whose existence or viability is or may be threatened. Fortunately, the 1,400+ species found in Tennessee rely on similar environments that can be addressed using habitat as an umbrella program. The obvious platform to capture the multiple needs of these species is to develop habitat-based plans which, when given the proper attention, should ensure the persistence of the animals reliant upon those habitats. Hence, for the first time in the history of the Agency, the primary focus of the Wildlife Resource Program was to create a habitat-based approach to managing and protecting our State's wildlife resources.

In addition to creating a new habitat-based plan for resource management, the Agency was challenged with incorporating all the major functions of the Agency into one strategic plan. After long deliberations and much debate, it was determined that the Agency had four core functions that serve our one common mission. With the new plan we now have four core functions. The four core functions are: Wildlife Resource Management, Outdoor Recreation, Law Enforcement and Outreach and Communications. In addition to the four core functions, it should be noted that the TWRA also administers business management systems which support the primary core functions on a day-to-day basis. While these processes do not relate directly to the program goals within the Strategic Plan, they are essential to achieving many of the Agency's goals.

Core Functions:

As with most state wildlife agencies, there are more responsibilities given the Agency than simply resources management. Although resource management is the primary duty of the Agency, many citizens of Tennessee expect the Agency to provide other services as well. Fortunately, those services are closely tied to the Agency's primary purpose and are considered core functions. The four core functions of the Agency and their associated goals are:

- Wildlife Resource Management - To conserve and manage wildlife resources to provide diverse wildlife communities at appropriate levels.
- Outdoor Recreation - To increase opportunities for hunting, fishing, and boating and accommodate other outdoor recreation that is safe for users and the environment yet consistent with conservation principles. To supply both the public and Agency personnel with a constant flow of multimedia information necessary for attaining the management and conservation goals of the Agency, as well as the most current rules and regulations relating to the education and recruitment of outdoor participants.

- Law Enforcement - To protect and conserve Tennessee's wildlife resources and provide public safety through proactive and responsive law enforcement services.
- Outreach and Communication - To supply both the public and Agency personnel with a constant flow of multimedia information necessary for attaining the management and conservation goals of the Agency, as well as the most current rules and regulations relating to the education and recruitment of outdoor participants.

With many organizations, an overarching strategic plan does provide direction for on-the-ground management. Therefore, the Agency will use a step-down approach utilizing three distinct levels of planning; this is known as the planning hierarchy (Figure 1). They include:


Strategic Plan – provides an over-arching vision with broad-based goals and strategies for achieving these goals. One can consider this level as the “30,000 foot” level.

Operational Plan – provides more specific focus on a shorter timeframe and outlines exact strategies to accomplish specific objectives. There are two basic types of operational plans utilized by TWRA, regionalized habitat plans (i.e. Wildlife Management Area plans, Tailwater plans, Habitat Conservation Plans, or other area plans) and species plans (i.e. State Wildlife Action Plan, white-tailed deer, quail, cormorant, trout management, etc.). One can consider this level the “15,000 foot” level.

Implementation Plan – provides guidance to personnel conducting the work. These plans include but are not limited to project proposals, budget plans, field orders, procedures, and any other daily guidance issued by the Director's staff. These plans are developed internally. One can consider this the on-the-ground management level.

Although many of the operational plans have been written, all require constant attention and are in perpetual need of update. The Agency will strive to keep the existing plans updated and to develop plans where specific direction is lacking.

Figure 1. Planning Hierarchy



Developing the Plan:

In March 2020, a core team of individuals began the process of revising our new strategic plan. Over the next few months, multiple meetings were held to review the plan and develop a strategy for how it might be updated after the last major overhaul.

In May 2020, committee chairpersons were selected for each of the programs in this Strategic Plan. Chairpersons selected their committee members and conferred in-person, by phone, and by e-mail to develop their program goals and objectives. After those goals and objectives were reviewed by the Director’s staff, the committees reconvened to identify problems and issues that may negatively affect their programs. They also identified opportunities that may positively affect those same programs. After all the problems/issues/opportunities were identified, the committees developed strategies to address each situation.

Upon receiving the outlines from each of the programs within this plan, the core strategic planning team reviewed all program outlines for consistency. The core strategic planning team then submitted a revised plan that was reviewed and revised by the Director’s staff. The third draft was subjected to public review. The fourth draft was submitted to the Commission for review and approval, resulting in the final Strategic Plan.

Using this Plan:

Historically, the Tennessee Wildlife Resources Agency has been enrolled in a Comprehensive Management Strategy (CMS) with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. This CMS, once approved, allows the Agency more discretion in deciding how to utilize and spend federal aid monies that are allocated through various programs (i.e. Pittman-Robertson, Dingell-Johnson/Wallop-Breaux,).

The Tennessee Wildlife Resources Agency's Strategic Plan is an important part of the Agency's comprehensive management system. The Plan informs the public of Agency' goals and objectives, imparts evaluative criteria for project proposals forming the Agency's work plan and budget; and, every three years, evaluates objective success and strategic effectiveness outlined in the Strategic Plan.

Goal:

To conserve and manage wildlife resources to provide diverse wildlife communities at appropriate levels.

Definition:

Tennessee Code Annotated (T.C.A.) defines wildlife as, "...wild vertebrates, mollusks, crustaceans, and fish," and it is the Agency's directive to manage the state's wildlife resources. The only way Tennessee's wildlife resources can be properly managed is if all basic requirements for life for each species are met and they are afforded the protection that ensures sustainability. This plan will focus on meeting the habitat requirements for all wildlife in Tennessee and will guide resource protection so all citizens of Tennessee can benefit and enjoy our renewable wildlife resources.

Wildlife Resources Management in Tennessee:

Historically, Tennessee has been home to a multitude of wildlife species. These species along with their associated habitats created a diverse, yet balanced, ecosystem that flourished for tens of thousands of years. Natural disturbances were part of that delicate balance which resulted in constant change to the landscape; hence, the perpetual cycle of natural succession was the driving force behind the diversity of species. These species, whether terrestrial or aquatic, were extremely resilient and barring catastrophic natural events, extinctions or extirpations were few and far between. That is of course, until recent times.

It is well documented that Native Americans helped perpetuate disturbance through the periodic use of fire. Whether or not their ecological contributions were meant for the betterment of the ecosystem or simply to flush game to the arrow or spear, their actions appeared to do little to upset the balance of nature. Much of that changed, however, with the coming of the European settlers in the 1600s. In a little over four centuries, a mere instant in geologic time, the balance of nature shifted. Many of the stresses placed on wildlife appeared when habitats were modified, or natural succession was "frozen in time". The agricultural revolution created town-sized monocultures of unchanging, unnatural vegetation while the "Smokey the Bear" era created huge expanses of even-aged, over-stocked forests that became increasingly unproductive for many native species.

The aquatic world was also not immune to extreme ecological disturbances. The Industrial Revolution and the ever-increasing need for energy resulted in the creation of the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) and the rapid proliferation of hydro-electric dams. TVA and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) reservoirs now lay where free-flowing streams once meandered. In West Tennessee slow, winding streams were channelized for irrigation and improved agricultural production. Some say modern man's impact on wildlife resources has been catastrophic, while others argue they are simply a part of nature's delicate web. Regardless of their position, all agree that modern man's contributions have tremendously impacted our wildlife resources.

To make sense and use of this plan, it was decided that the state's wildlife resources could not be managed for the past; rather, they must be managed for the present and future. Though historical documents reveal landscapes that were vastly different, it is impractical to think that we can return to the times when American bison roamed free in savannah-like areas on the Cumberland Plateau or when native bobwhite shot out from underfoot on every farm across the valley or when canoe length sturgeon were pulled from the Tennessee River. Instead, for the benefit of our wildlife resources, we need to focus on what we have, what we can save, and in rare instances, what we can restore.

The “Field of Dreams” Approach:

Much like the famous saying in the award-winning movie “Field of Dreams,” wildlife management uses the same mantra in that, “If you build it, he will come.”

In the world of wildlife, the “it” is the habitat, while the “they” are the species that thrive in those habitats. Thus, the Agency's core function of Wildlife Resource Management is changing its focus to a habitat-first strategy since habitat is the cornerstone of providing healthy populations of animals. Provided that public and private lands and waters can provide ample quality habitat, species should be self-supporting if given the proper protection.

In development of this plan, it was determined that Tennessee could be broken out into seven major “habitats”. Those habitats are: Grassland, Forestland, Wetland, Karst, Streams & Rivers, Impoundments, and Urban. The following chapters will describe in greater detail the meaning and importance of those habitats for our wildlife resources. It was also determined that an additional chapter needed to be added for the multitude of extrinsic factors that affect wildlife populations. That too is described in greater detail and is equally important for the successful management of our wildlife.

Importance:

As stated earlier, the economic impact of wildlife in Tennessee is immense with almost 3 billion dollars spent annually on wildlife-related endeavors. Besides its enormous economic impact, it is argued that being in nature provides health benefits and an increased quality of life for all that partake, especially the younger generations (Louv 2005). Fortunately, the government of Tennessee recognizes the tremendously important role wildlife plays in everyday life and has mandated that, “...the agency shall be nonpartisan and shall place first and foremost the welfare of the wildlife and its environment in the agency's planning and decisions, and to encourage, by every appropriate means, the full development of the state's natural resources to the benefit of all citizens of Tennessee.” Given the role and status wildlife plays in the everyday life of Tennessee citizens, there is no denying the important task set before the Agency in protecting and managing our valuable wildlife resources.

GRASSLANDS

Definition:

The term “Grassland” describes lands that are predominately native, perennial grass-dominated habitats intermixed with low woody vegetation (shrubs), forbs and varying percentages of bare ground. This chapter addresses the management of grasslands by focusing on six grassland habitat groups identified in the Tennessee State Wildlife Action Plan (TNSWAP).

GRASSLANDS AT A GLANCE		
Habitat Groups	Prairie/Barrens Glade/Barrens Bald/Summit	Old Field Pasture Row Crop
Species	Native grassland ecological systems are among the most imperiled in Tennessee. Grassland ecological systems provide primary habitat for 74 Greatest Conservation Need species identified in the TNSWAP.	
Threats	Fire Suppression Agricultural Conversion Incompatible Grazing/Pasture Management Incompatible Row Crop Agricultural Practices Residential/Commercial Development	
Strategic Objectives	Maintain or increase acreage of native grassland and other early successional habitats to provide productive wildlife habitat. Maintain or increase acreage of marginal agricultural lands converted to native wildlife habitats on private lands.	

Prairie/Barrens

TNSWAP identified six individual grassland ecological systems that comprise the Prairie/Barrens habitat group (Table 1-1). In Tennessee, most Prairie/Barrens systems exist as small patch habitats within predominately forested areas and are represented by plant communities with open canopies, ranging from herbaceous-dominated barrens through savanna and woodland types. The Prairie/Barrens habitat group is also represented by larger grassland systems that are similar in composition to the tall-grass prairies of the Midwest - being dominated by tall species of grasses, forbs, and small trees. The Prairie/Barrens habitat group is also represented by "The Barrens" of the Southeast Highland Rim of Tennessee with a variety of relatively open habitats including prairie-like areas, as well as savanna woodlands with open ponds and other wetlands scattered throughout the landscape.

Glade/Barrens

TNSWAP identified seven individual grassland ecological systems that comprise the Glade/Barrens habitat group (Table 1-1). In Tennessee, Glade/Barrens systems are typically associated with shallow soils overlying either limestone or sandstone bedrock. They almost always include areas of exposed bedrock within vegetative coverage that ranges from herbaceous grass dominated landscapes to dry savanna woodland habitats. The most prominent example of the Glade/Barrens habitat group in Tennessee is found in the Nashville Basin, associated with underlying limestone geology. The vegetation of this system includes sparsely vegetated rock outcrops, perennial grasslands, as well as woodlands dominated by eastern red cedar - hence the common referral to these systems as “cedar glades”. A similar Glade/Barrens system is found primarily on the Cumberland Plateau and is associated with underlying sandstone geology. In this setting eastern red cedar is replaced by various scrub oaks on sparsely vegetated sandstone rock outcrops.

Bald/Summit

This habitat group is represented by two ecological systems in Tennessee (Table 1-1). The Southern Appalachian Grass and Shrub Bald ecological system consists of dense herbaceous and shrubland communities in the highest elevation zone of the southern Appalachians. Vegetation consists either of dense shrub-dominated areas (heath balds) or dense herbaceous cover dominated by grasses or sedges (grassy balds). The Southern Appalachian Rocky Summit ecological system represents treeless rock outcrops of the southern Appalachian Mountains, primarily in western North Carolina and eastern Tennessee. The vegetation component of this system is generally characterized by a mixture of low-growing lichens, mosses, and low shrubs.

Old Field

The Old Field habitat group refers to lands that are recovering from disturbance such as timber harvest, agriculture, pasturing, mining, and other disturbances that remove the original plant cover. These are transitional open lands and in Tennessee most will ultimately become forest if not regularly disturbed. Old field succession begins with establishment of a wide variety of forbs and grasses depending on the land use history of the site and proceeds to establishment of woody plants. Woody plant development proceeds to a scrub/shrub stage where woody plants begin to dominate the site. Eventually trees invade and the site develops into forest.

Pasture

This habitat group refers to lands that are being pastured by livestock or that are being used to produce hay. In Tennessee these pasture lands are typically vegetated with tame grasses – primarily cool season grasses such as fescue. The wildlife value of pasture lands is seriously compromised when managed solely for livestock grazing or hay production. When grazing or haying ceases on these lands they form an old field community as described above.

Cropland

This habitat group refers to lands cultivated for agricultural crops such as corn, soybeans, cotton, wheat, etc. Like pasture lands, the wildlife value of croplands is seriously compromised when managed solely for crop production. When cropping ceases on these lands they succeed to an old field community as described above.

History:

In Tennessee, native grassland communities were most prominent prior to European settlement. Native peoples burned the forests, for thousands of years, to create and maintain necessary grasslands and open woodlands for game animals and food producing plants. After European settlement, the frequency of the fires ended, and thick forests replaced open grasslands in many places. As farming became mechanized in the 20th century, land became more intensively farmed with the result that small patches of residual native grasslands and especially old fields became cultivated. The ultimate result of this land use was that historic grassland communities in Tennessee have been gradually replaced by forests and the remaining open lands in the state are predominately pasture, hay, and crop lands.

Importance:

Grassland ecological systems provide primary habitat for 74 Greatest Conservation Need (GCN) species identified in the TNSWAP. Native grassland ecological systems are among the most imperiled in Tennessee. In particular, grassland songbird populations are experiencing more severe declines than any other songbird guild in North America. Quality old field habitats are especially scarce and are critical to species such as northern bobwhite, turkey, deer, and numerous nongame species. Small open grassland communities such as glades and balds contribute to habitat diversity in extensive forested landscapes and provide essential habitat for many species that would not be present otherwise. Native grasses/grasslands are beneficial since they are long-lived, deep rooted, well adapted to poor soils and local soil types, drought tolerant, require less soil amendments in fertilizer and lime, and require less annual maintenance. They can provide increased benefit to agricultural producers due to their high-quality hay and forage for livestock and at the same time provide good wildlife habitat.

Additionally, grasslands have other environmental benefits such as carbon sequestration and soil erosion control. Aquatic habitat and water quality are improved as intact grasslands reduce runoff and increase infiltration - preventing sediments, fertilizers, animal waste, and pesticides from entering streams, rivers, and other water bodies.

Threats:

The top five threats identified by the TNSWAP for grassland habitat groups were: fire suppression, agricultural conversion, incompatible grazing/pasture management, incompatible row crop agricultural practices, residential/commercial development. Other threats identified by TNSWAP for grassland communities included: forest type conversion, incompatible mining practices, and invasive exotic species. Combined, these threats lead to strategic issues of direct loss of grassland habitats, fragmentation of existing grassland habitats, and degradation of existing grasslands as good wildlife habitat.

Table 1-1. Grassland habitat groups and associated natural ecological systems (TNSWAP)

GRASSLAND HABITAT GROUPS	NATURAL ECOLOGICAL SYSTEMS
Prairie/Barrens	1) East Gulf Coastal Plain Black Belt Calcareous Prairie and Woodland, 2) East Gulf Coastal Plain Jackson Plain Prairie and Barrens, 3) Eastern Highland Rim Prairie and Barrens, 4) Pennyroyal Karst Plain Prairie and Barrens, 5) Southern Ridge and Valley Patch Prairie, 6) Western Highland Rim Prairie and Barrens
Glade/Barrens	1) Appalachian Shale Barrens, 2) Central Interior Highlands Calcareous Glade and Barrens, 3) Central Interior Highlands Dry Acidic Glade and Barrens, 4) Cumberland Sandstone Glade and Barrens, 5) Nashville Basin Limestone Glade, 6) Ridge and Valley Calcareous Valley Bottom Glade and Woodland, 7) Southern and Central Appalachian Mafic Glade and Barrens
Bald/Summit	1) Southern Appalachian Grass and Shrub Bald, 2) Southern Appalachian Rocky Summit
Old Field	Not Applicable
Pasture	Not Applicable
Cropland	Not Applicable

Objectives:

1. Maintain or increase acreage of native grassland and other early successional habitats on TWRA controlled lands to provide productive wildlife habitat.
2. Maintain or increase acreage of marginal agricultural lands converted to native wildlife habitats on private lands.

OBJECTIVE 1 Maintain or increase acreage of native grassland and other early successional habitats on TWRA controlled lands to provide productive wildlife habitat.

Issue 1 Native grassland habitats are at risk of degradation.

Strategy 1 Conduct inventories of grassland species to measure function of existing grasslands

Strategy 2 Utilize burning techniques to reduce duff accumulation and woody vegetation

Strategy 3 Utilize soil disturbance to increase bare ground component in grasslands

Strategy 4 Utilize adequate techniques to prevent the encroachment of or eliminate exotic invasive plants

Strategy 5 Educate TWRA personnel on latest grassland management techniques involving fire, mechanical, or chemical treatments

Issue 2 Quantity of native grassland habitat is declining.

Strategy 1 Convert croplands on TWRA lands to quality grasslands where feasible

Strategy 2 Convert exotic pasture/hay lands on TWRA lands to quality grasslands where feasible

Strategy 3 Convert forestland on TWRA lands to quality savanna and grasslands where feasible

Strategy 4 Convert marginal and disturbed habitat on TWRA lands to quality grassland where feasible

OBJECTIVE 2 Maintain or increase acreage of marginal agricultural lands converted to native wildlife habitats on private lands.

Issue 1 Barriers exist for management of native grasslands on private lands.

Strategy 1 Work with partners (NRCS, TDEC, TNC, etc.) to enhance grassland habitat on lands not controlled by the Agency

Strategy 2 Work with partners to help educate private landowners in grassland management

Strategy 3 Develop programs that may encourage the maintenance or creation of native grasslands on private lands

FORESTLANDS

Definition:

The term “Forestland” describes land that is predominately covered by trees. However, forests are highly varied ecosystems that, from the forest floor to the forest canopy, support an incredibly complex web of life. This chapter addresses the management of forestlands by focusing on five upland forestland habitat groups identified in the Tennessee State Wildlife Action Plan (TNSWAP).

Upland Deciduous Forest

The Upland Deciduous Forest habitat group is the most extensive and diverse of the five forestland habitat groups in Tennessee.

TNSWAP identified thirteen individual forested ecological systems that comprise

the Upland Deciduous Forest habitat group. Upland Deciduous Forests are often characterized as either xeric (dry) or mesic (wet), depending on moisture availability. In Tennessee, the more xeric deciduous forest types are typically found on upper slopes, especially those that are south and southwest facing. Xeric forest systems in Tennessee are commonly referred to as dry Oak-Hickory forests where oaks and hickories persist as dominant members of the forest due to drought tolerance and site conditions sufficient for regeneration of relatively shade-intolerant species. Mesic deciduous forest types are typically restricted to north and east facing slopes in mountainous parts of the state or in fertile lowlands of the coastal plain and central basin and are often referred to as cove or mixed-mesophytic hardwood forests.

Upland Coniferous Forest

TNSWAP identified three individual forested ecological systems that comprise the Upland Coniferous Forest habitat group (Table 1). The Central and Southern Appalachian Spruce-Fir Forest is a unique biotic community and the dominant forest type found almost exclusively at higher elevations in the Southern Blue Ridge Mountains. Southern Appalachian Low Mountain Pine Forest and Southern Appalachian Montane Pine Forest and Woodland systems are typically found in extreme conditions (i.e. xeric ridge-tops, poor soils) allowing pine species to dominate.

FORESTLANDS AT A GLANCE	
Habitat Groups	Upland Deciduous Forest Upland Coniferous Forest Upland Mixed Forest Forested Rock Outcrop Forest Plantation
Species	Upland forest habitats support more species of wildlife than any other terrestrial habitat in Tennessee. Forestland ecological systems provide primary habitat for 173 Greatest Conservation Need species identified in the TNSWAP.
Threats	Residential/Commercial Development Construction of Roads and Utilities Agricultural Conversion Incompatible Forestry Practices Invasive Exotic Species
Strategic Objectives	Manage lands to attain desired forest conditions that provide productive wildlife habitat. Protect key ecological features found within forest communities.

Upland Mixed Forest

TNSWAP identified two individual forested ecological systems that comprise the Upland Mixed habitat group (Table 1). Like spruce-fir forest systems in the Southern Blue Ridge Mountains, Appalachian Hemlock-Hardwood forest is another unique habitat group that occupies a small niche within a larger forest matrix. It is often associated with gorge and ravine systems and in many cases has a close association with riparian systems. As such, it supports a diverse biotic community of both aquatic and terrestrial species. The East Gulf Coastal Plain Interior Shortleaf Pine –Oak Forest system primarily occupies xeric and semi-mesic sites and vegetation composition is strongly related to fire frequency and intensity.

Forested Rock Outcrop

TNSWAP identified 10 individual forested ecological systems that comprise the Forested Rock Outcrop habitat group (Table 1). These small patch systems are imbedded features within the overall forest matrix provided by the preceding habitat groups. As such, they range from xeric cliffs, bluffs, and talus slopes to mesic gorge and riparian situations. These small patch habitats are predominantly found within the Cumberland Plateau and Mountains and Southern Blue Ridge physiographic regions and provide for much of the diversity within larger forestlands.

Forest Plantation

The Forest Stewardship Council describes forest plantations as “forest areas lacking most of the principal characteristics and key elements of native ecosystems, which result from the human activities of planting, sowing or intensive silvicultural treatments,” and the Society of American Foresters defines a plantation as “a stand composed primarily of trees established by planting or artificial seeding.” Likewise, TNSWAP identified Forest Plantations as a semi-natural habitat, denoting that this habitat type exists because of human activities on the landscape. In Tennessee, forest plantations primarily consist of coniferous species planted by forest industry. Industrial plantations are actively managed for the commercial production of forest products, are usually large-scale and consist of even-aged management of one species. The trees used for plantations are often genetically altered for desired traits such as growth and resistance to pests and diseases. Plantation management and goals dictate the diversity of plantation forests and their value to wildlife.

History:

Forestlands have always been a predominant feature on the Tennessee landscape. However, they are dynamic in nature, often changing in response to a variety of disturbances including climate change, insect pests and disease, fire, and human activities. The history of forestland habitats in Tennessee reflects this dynamic nature.

Tennessee forestlands have been shaped by the dramatic changes in climate associated with major glacial periods (ice-ages). During peak glacial periods, Tennessee forestlands resembled the boreal forests found today in more northern climes and were dominated by coniferous tree species including spruces, firs, and pines. As glacial periods declined and the climate warmed, deciduous forestlands became dominant on the landscape with pockets of boreal elements (spruce-fir forest) remaining at high elevations in the Appalachian Mountains.

Contrary to popular belief, the New World, including the Southeast and Tennessee, was not a pristine wilderness prior to European settlement. Native American use of fire in land management significantly affected the structure of forest stands and the relative abundance of tree species over large portions of the region. Early white settlers adopted these same practices - burning the forests as well as clearing them for agriculture. These activities resulted in open habitats such as savannas, barrens, and prairies, scattered within the overall forestland in Tennessee at the time.

At the turn of the 20th century, the logging industry in Tennessee was producing lumber at its historical peak, with large tracts of forest being clear-cut to supply the ever-growing demand for forest products. In addition, forests were converted to agricultural fields and pastures and large areas were cleared in strip mining operations. As a result, Tennessee's forests and forestlands were diminished in area, productivity, and quality. However, this gross over-exploitation of the state's and nation's forest resources was cause for the growing alarm that gave birth to the conservation movement, resulting in the establishment of state and national parks, forests, wildlife management areas and reserves. An additional factor that helped restore Tennessee's upland forests in the 20th century was the abandonment of farming by many who left to find work in the city, and the consequent return of fields and pastures to forestland.

Another milestone in the history of Tennessee's forests was the emergence of the pine pulp industry in the early 1950's. This created a greater market for pines and low-value hardwoods and resulted in the conversion of thousands of acres of hardwood-dominated forests into pine plantations to supply the paper industry.

According to the latest Forest Inventory and Analysis report, in 2019, forests covered nearly 53 percent, or slightly greater than 14 million acres, of the land base in Tennessee. Only about 5 percent of the pre-settlement old-growth forest on the Cumberland Plateau remains, and no more than 20 percent of the forest of Tennessee's Blue Ridge Province can be classified as old growth. Those few tracts of old growth not on public land are mostly in fragments of 100 acres or less. Most of the forest types classified as old growth today are second or third-growth forests that have or are developing the structural characteristics of old growth. On TWRA managed lands approximately 85% of all lands owned (500,000 acres) and controlled (1.5 million acres) by TWRA are forested, proper management of forestlands offer a tremendous tool to impact and improve wildlife habitat.

Importance:

Upland forest habitats support more species of wildlife than any other terrestrial habitat in the state. Forestland ecological systems provide primary habitat for 173 Greatest Conservation Need species

identified in the TNSWAP. While some species are permanent residents and depend on the forest throughout their entire lives, other species only utilize the forest during certain times of their annual life cycle. The diversity within upland forests provide a tremendous variety of food and water resources as well as habitats for breeding, post-breeding dispersal, and migratory and/or over-winter sites.

The ability of upland forests to support a great diversity of wildlife is due in part to the variety of different habitats and niches found within a structurally diverse forest system. A biologically and ecologically functional upland forest contains a heterogeneous vegetation structure with varying levels of canopy closure and basal area of canopy trees that results in diverse understory and mid-story communities. Diverse and structurally complex upland forests provide for thousands of species of plants, animals, and fungi, including many rare and threatened species.

Upland forests benefit citizen stakeholders in a variety of direct and indirect ways. Direct benefits of managing and maintaining upland forests include opportunities for residents to participate in hunting and fishing, wildlife viewing, hiking, and other outdoor recreational activities. Indirect benefits of upland forests include reducing soil runoff which maintains higher water quality in bodies of water ranging from ephemeral and first order streams to the larger lakes and rivers across the state. Forests also filter pollutants and improve water absorption and retention, which increases groundwater recharge. Forest cover influences local temperatures, improves air quality, and, may play an important role in mitigating climate change via carbon sequestration. Upland forests also provide income and jobs by providing a variety of timber products and related management activities.

Threats:

The top five threats identified by the TNSWAP for upland forest habitats were: residential/commercial development, construction of roads and utilities, agricultural conversion, incompatible forestry practices, and invasive exotic species. Other significant threats identified by TNSWAP for forestland ecological systems included forest type conversion and incompatible mining practices. Combined, these threats contribute to strategic issues of direct loss of forestland habitats, forest fragmentation, and degradation of forestland habitat for wildlife.

Table 1. Forestland habitat groups and associated natural ecological systems (TNSWAP)

FORESTLAND HABITAT GROUPS	NATURAL ECOLOGICAL SYSTEMS
Upland Deciduous Forest	1) Allegheny-Cumberland Dry Oak Forest and Woodland, 2) Southern Appalachian Northern Hardwood Forest, 3) East Gulf Coastal Plain Limestone Forest, 4) East Gulf Coastal Plain Northern Dry Upland Hardwood Forest, 5) East Gulf Coastal Plain Northern Loess Bluff Forest, 6) East Gulf Coastal Plain Northern Loess Plain Oak-Hickory Upland, 7) East Gulf Coastal Plain Northern Mesic Hardwood Slope Forest, 8) South-Central Interior / Upper Coastal Plain Flatwoods, 9) South-Central Interior Mesophytic Forest, 10) Southern Interior Low Plateau Dry-Mesic Oak Forest, 11) Southern and Central Appalachian Cove Forest, 12) Southern Appalachian Oak Forest, 13) Southern Ridge and Valley / Cumberland Dry Calcareous Forest
Upland Coniferous Forest	1) Central and Southern Appalachian Spruce-Fir Forest, 2) Southern Appalachian Low-Elevation Pine Forest, 3) Southern Appalachian Montane Pine Forest and Woodland
Upland Mixed Forest	1) Appalachian (Hemlock)-Northern Hardwood Forest, 2) East Gulf Coastal Plain Interior Shortleaf Pine-Oak Forest
Forested Rock Outcrop	1) Allegheny-Cumberland Sandstone Box Canyon and Rockhouse, 2) Central Interior Acidic Cliff and Talus, 3) Central Interior Calcareous Cliff and Talus, 4) Cumberland Acid Cliff, 5) North-Central Appalachian Acidic Cliff and Talus, 6) North-Central Appalachian Circumneutral Cliff and Talus, 7) Southern Appalachian Montane Cliff & Talus, 8) Southern Appalachian Spray Cliff, 9) Southern Interior Calcareous Cliff, 10) Southern Interior Sinkhole Wall
Forest Plantation	Not Applicable

Objectives:

1. Manage TWRA controlled lands to attain desired forest conditions that provide productive wildlife habitat.
2. Protect key ecological features found within forest communities.

OBJECTIVE 1 Manage TWRA controlled lands to attain desired forest conditions that provide productive wildlife habitat.

Issue 1 Forest monocultures, even-aged, over-stocked forests, and other forests in poor condition due to lack of management provide marginal wildlife habitat.

Strategy 1 Conduct inventories of upland forest species to measure function of existing forests

Strategy 2 Implement forest inventory and develop forest management plans to assess, restore, improve, and/or create native upland forest systems

Strategy 3 Implement silvicultural treatments to improve wildlife habitat, through thinning (commercial or pre-commercial), forest regeneration, and/or prescribed fire that influence stocking rate, increase structural diversity, and enhance regeneration of desirable tree species and other vegetation

Strategy 4 Increase or maintain key elements of stand structural complexity, i.e. hollow/den trees, snags, downed woody debris, understory thickets, mid-story structure

Strategy 5 Develop and implement monitoring programs to assess usage by wildlife, i.e. bird counts, within forest stands being managed to restore, improve and/or create native upland forest systems

Strategy 6 Continue working with partner agencies and organizations to promote implementation of forest and wildlife habitat management based on biological and ecological principals, on both private and public lands

Strategy 7 Cooperate with planning efforts and support and promote existing programs that improve forest habitat through technical support and financial assistance

Strategy 8 Utilize partnerships and other affiliations to influence forest lands management policy and program decision-making and funding at the local, regional, and national level

OBJECTIVE 2. Protect key ecological features found within forest communities.

Issue 1 Many Greatest Conservation Need (GCN) species utilize limited, local, or specialized habitats within the forest.

Strategy 1 Increase or maintain buffers to rock outcrops and other key ecological features during management activities

Strategy 2 Increase or maintain key elements of stand structural complexity (i.e. hollow trees, down woody debris, understory thickets, mid-story structure)

Strategy 3 Improve or maintain habitats of fire dependent GCN species through use of prescribed fire

Issue 2 Lack of forest connectivity across the landscape limits wildlife population sustainability and expansion.

Strategy 1 Identify focal areas for conservation of upland forests; use all available partnerships, planning tools, and technologies to identify areas of common interest where partners can pool resources to benefit forest and wildlife resources most efficiently

Strategy 2 Target land acquisition, easement opportunities, and landowner outreach efforts in strategically identified conservation focal areas

Strategy 3 Foster relationships with partners to facilitate planning and funding for land acquisition and sustainable forest habitat management

Strategy 4 Target restoration efforts of native upland forest systems in areas in need of conservation

Strategy 5 Increase use of planning tools (such as Joint Venture (JV) and other landscape cooperative modeling, to identify and address potential impacts of climate change, urbanization, and low-density development on GCN and other priority species in upland forest communities

WETLANDS

Definition:

Wetlands may be defined as low-lying areas of land that are saturated with moisture, often with standing water, especially when regarded as the natural habitat of wildlife.

Floodplain forests, swamps, marshes, bogs, forest seeps are all examples of wetlands found in Tennessee. This chapter addresses the management of wetlands by focusing on three wetland habitat groups identified in the Tennessee State Wildlife Action Plan (TNSWAP).

WETLANDS AT A GLANCE	
Habitat Groups	Riparian Wetlands Isolated Wetlands Converted Wetlands
Species	in Tennessee more than 90% of our historic wetlands have been lost. Wetland ecological systems provide primary habitat for 97 Greatest Conservation Need species identified in the TNSWAP.
Threats	Agricultural Conversion Residential/Commercial Development Construction of Ditches/Dikes/Drainage/Diversion Systems Incompatible Row Crop Agricultural Practices Incompatible Forestry Practices
Strategic Objectives	Maintain or increase acreage of wetland habitats. Manage wetlands to provide productive wildlife habitat.

Riparian Wetlands

TNSWAP identified eight individual riparian wetland ecological systems that comprise the Riparian Wetlands habitat group (Table 1-3). The most extensive riparian wetland habitats in Tennessee are bottomland hardwood floodplain forests that occur along small streams and broad river bottoms in West Tennessee. These wetland ecosystems support unique forest communities of bald cypress, water tupelo, black gum, and numerous species of oak, as well as a variety of other deciduous tree species. Moving east across the state, forest communities encompassing riparian wetland habitats become more variable as streams and rivers flow through various forested ecological systems. Another unique wetland floodplain habitat occurs along high gradient streams and in river gorges of East Tennessee. Forest communities that are found in these riparian wetland ecosystems include a tree and shrub species mix of eastern hemlock, white pine, rhododendron, mountain laurel, and various hardwood tree species.

Isolated Wetlands

TNSWAP identified six individual isolated wetland ecological systems that comprise the Isolated Wetlands habitat group (Table 1-3). These isolated wetland ecological systems exist as small patch habitats within predominately forested areas. Forested seeps, swamps, and wet flatwoods most often occur in stream head swales or on broad sandstone or limestone ridges where soils are saturated due to a combination of perched water table and seepage flow. Examples of seeps and swamps range in condition from open woodlands to forests, and some may lack a canopy and then will be dominated by shrubs or herbs. Bog wetlands in Tennessee are associated with flat sites in the Southern Blue Ridge and Cumberland Mountains. These sites occur at elevations below 1220 m (4000 feet) in poorly drained bottomlands on soils which are often saturated. Vegetation is a complex of vegetative zones – at least partially open, with herbaceous-dominated areas as well as shrub thickets and often forested zones.

Converted Wetlands

The Converted Wetlands habitat group represents wetland habitats that have either been converted or altered to accommodate other land use activities. In Tennessee these are most commonly wetlands that have been drained, dredged, filled, leveled, or otherwise manipulated for the purpose of producing an agricultural commodity. Wetlands may also be altered to accommodate development – both residential and commercial/industrial development. In almost all cases where wetlands are converted and/or altered the benefit of the wetland as wildlife habitat is degraded.

History:

Wetlands are one of the most critically imperiled habitats in the United States. In Tennessee, more than 90% of our historic wetlands have been lost, primarily due to draining for agriculture or development. This includes eighty percent of bottomland hardwood wetland forests in the Mississippi Alluvial Valley of Tennessee and other southern states that were converted to agricultural lands by 1978. In 1986 an international plan was developed to manage habitat across this vast landscape. The North American Waterfowl Management Plan (NAWMP) is a partnership of federal, provincial/state, and municipal governments, non-governmental organizations, private companies, and many individuals. All these organizations are working towards achieving better wetland habitat for the benefit of migratory birds, other wetland-associated species, and people.

In 1986, Tennessee's Legislature enacted the "Tennessee Wetland Acquisition Act" which authorizes TWRA to acquire wetlands containing hydric soils, a dominance of obligate hydrophytes and bottomland hardwood forest. Funding for the Tennessee Wetland Acquisition Act is derived from a portion of the Property Transfer Tax. TWRA has acquired over 200,000 acres through the Wetland Acquisition Fund and continues to use the fund in acquiring and maintaining important habitat.

Shortly thereafter, TWRA initiated strategic efforts to restore, protect, and enhance wetland habitat across the state that continue to this day. The federal government has been our most significant financial partner for the restoration of wetlands by providing more than \$4 million for wetland projects. Ducks Unlimited has also been a major partner with Tennessee by providing cash and in-kind services (estimated at almost \$1 million) for about 30 completed wetland projects.

Importance:

Wetland ecological systems provide primary habitat for 97 Greatest Conservation Need species identified in the TNSWAP. Where wetland ecological systems are present on the landscape, they are an integral part of the life cycle of most wildlife species. While some species are permanent residents and depend on wetlands throughout their entire lives, other species only utilize wetlands during certain times of their annual life cycle. Wetlands are especially critical habitat for waterfowl and shorebird species. The diversity within wetland ecosystems provide a tremendous variety of food and water resources as well as habitats for breeding, post-breeding dispersal, and migratory and/or over-winter sites for both waterfowl and shorebirds in Tennessee.

Wetlands provide many environmental and economic benefits to the citizens of Tennessee. Wetlands enhance water quality by removing sediments and other pollutants from surface water. Wetlands also provide for groundwater recharge - ensuring that clean quality groundwater is available for the future. Recreational opportunities provided by wetlands include hunting, fishing, hiking, boating, etc. that not only add to the quality of life, but also have a significant economic impact on the state.

Threats:

The top five threats identified by the TNSWAP for the Wetlands habitat group were: agricultural conversion, residential/commercial development, construction of ditches/dikes/drainage/diversion systems, incompatible row crop agricultural practices, and incompatible forestry practices. Other threats identified by TNSWAP for wetland ecological systems included incompatible grazing/pasture management practices, and construction of roads/railroads/utilities. Combined, these threats contribute to the strategic issues of direct loss of wetland habitat and the degradation of existing wetlands as good wildlife habitat.

Table 1-3. Wetland habitat groups and associated natural ecological systems (TNSWAP)

WETLAND HABITAT GROUPS	NATURAL ECOLOGICAL SYSTEMS
Riparian Wetlands	1) Cumberland River scour, 2) East Gulf Coastal Plain Large River Floodplain Forest, 3) East Gulf Coastal Plain Northern Seepage Swamp 4) East Gulf Coastal Plain Small Stream and River Floodplain Forest, 5) Lower Mississippi River Bottomland and Floodplain Forest, 6) Lower Mississippi River Bottomland Depressions, 7) South-Central Interior Large Floodplain, 8) South-Central Interior Small Stream and Riparian
Isolated Wetlands	1) Central Interior Highlands and Appalachian Sinkhole and Depression Pond, 2) Cumberland Seepage Forest, 3) South-Central Interior / Upper Coastal Plain Wet Flatwoods, 4) Southern and Central Appalachian Bog and Fen, 5) Southern Appalachian Seepage Wetland, 6) Western Highland Rim Seepage Fen
Converted Wetlands	Non-Applicable

Objectives:

1. Maintain or increase acreage of wetland habitats.
2. Manage wetlands on TWRA controlled lands to provide productive wildlife habitat.

OBJECTIVE 1. Maintain or increase acreage of wetland habitats.

Issue 1 Wetland habitats are at risk of degradation.

Strategy 1 Conduct inventories of wetland species to measure function of existing wetlands

Strategy 2 Restore, enhance, or create wetlands on lands TWRA already owns or controls

Strategy 3 Continue restoration of bottomland hardwood forests on former agricultural lands through artificial and natural regeneration methods, at current rate or higher, to achieve objectives of the West Tennessee Wildlife Resources Conservation Plan (see Forestland, Objective 2, Issue 2, and associated strategies)

Strategy 4 Utilize real estate data to determine how many acres of current wetlands are under TWRA control and determine where additional wetlands are needed by identifying habitat goals in various regional plans (i.e. NAWMP, JV, etc.)

Strategy 5 Support non-Agency programs that promote wetland restoration, enhancement, creation, and protection where appropriate and feasible

Opportunity 1 Funding sources are available to purchase wetland habitats.

Strategy 1 Utilize and leverage the Wetland Fund and associated grant opportunities to support TWRA regional wetland objectives

Strategy 2 Cultivate relationships with funding partners to support TWRA regional wetland objectives

OBJECTIVE 2 Manage wetlands on TWRA controlled lands to provide productive wildlife habitat.

Issue 1 Barriers exist for management of wetlands to provide productive wildlife habitat.

Strategy 1 Manage current wetlands to meet existing JV habitat goals for wetland birds and habitat requirements for wetland dependent GCN species as identified in the TNSWAP where feasible

Strategy 2 Investigate managing for more moist-soil habitat on refuges to provide benefits to waterfowl and GCN species as identified in the TNSWAP where feasible

Strategy 3 Plant more hydric soil tolerant crops (millet, rice, chufas) instead of dry crops (corn, milo) to benefit a broader range of wetland wildlife

Opportunity 1 Regulations, partners, and permitting processes are in place to ensure wetland acquisition and mitigation maintains ecological integrity.

Strategy 1 Support wetland protection through the enforcement of regulations, acquisition, and the placement of easements to maintain ecological integrity of identified wetlands

Strategy 2 Seek partners willing to assume long-term management responsibility of acquired sensitive wetlands

KARST

Definition:

Landforms produced primarily through the dissolving of rock, such as limestone, dolomite, marble, and gypsum, are collectively known as karst. Features of karst landscapes include sinkholes, caves, surge springs, dry valleys and sinking streams (Veni et al. 2001). This chapter focuses on these “features”; however, the primary emphasis is on caves and the wildlife that utilize them. Tennessee subterranean regions extend from the Tennessee River in the western part of the state to the Southern Blue Ridge Mountains in the east (Figure 1-1). With more than 9,000 documented caves, Tennessee has

more caves than any other state in the country. These regions do not however have an even distribution of caves. The region with the highest density of caves is the Cumberland-Rim (Cumberland Escarpment –Eastern Highland Rim, Cumberland Plateau and Southern Cumberland Sequatchie Valley sub-regions) (Figure 1-2). Caves and karst were included in the TNSWAP and the TWRA participated in a subsequent Nature Conservancy (TNC) planning process to refine the karst section of TNSWAP. The protection of caves and cave dwelling wildlife is a high priority for the TWRA.

History:

Humans have been using Tennessee caves for a very long time. In the Archaic period, caves were explored, mined, and decorated with art. The same range of activities occurred during the Woodland Period, with the probable use of pit caves for burial. The mining of mineral salts was also an emphasis. Mississippian peoples decorated caves and may have performed limited mining. In the 19th century (War of 1812 and Civil War), saltpeter was mined to produce gunpowder. Caves have been used as tourist attractions since the early and mid-20th century and today you can go see a bluegrass show at Cumberland Caverns in McMinnville or tour the underground lake at the Lost Sea in Sweetwater. Caving (or spelunking) is a recreational pursuit with a rich tradition with several grotto clubs across the state. The Tennessee Cave Survey, Inc. (TCS) is an internal organization of the National Speleological Society (NSS) dedicated to surveying and mapping of Tennessee caves. With the cave resources found in Tennessee it is no surprise that people come from all parts of the country to visit these sites.

CAVES AND KARST AT A GLANCE		
Habitat Features	Caves Sinkholes Surge Springs	Dry Valleys Sinking Streams
Species	Tennessee has more caves than any other state in the country. Cave and karst ecological systems provide habitat for many Greatest Conservation Need species identified in the TNSWAP.	
Threats	Pollution from Surface Activities Alteration of Hydrology Incompatible Recreational Use Invasive Exotic Species	
Strategic Objectives	Protect and restore ecological integrity of karst resources. Protect and restore karst dependent species or communities.	

Importance:

Tennessee caves provide habitat for a globally significant wildlife resource. Tennessee has several cave dwelling bats. Some of these bats use caves for hibernation only and some use them year-round for summer and winter habitat. Half of the bats that inhabit Tennessee utilize caves. While some animals such as bats are seasonal or daily visitors to caves many are uniquely adapted for living in an environment devoid of light. There are fish, crayfish, shrimp, isopods, arachnids, and beetles that are adapted to live in caves. These animals have no eyes, often lack pigment, and have long antennae and legs. Like the surface world, there are aquatic fauna (stygobitic) and terrestrial fauna (troglotic). Because these systems are isolated there is a high degree of endemism associated with cave fauna. This endemism greatly enhances Tennessee’s biodiversity. There is also potential for caves to serve as refugia for terrestrial fauna such as salamanders during dry periods. Species such as long-tailed, slimy, northern red and cave salamanders are often encountered in caves. There is no doubt that we are still learning about the ecological significance and diversity associated with caves.

To understand the importance of karst systems, many municipalities in Tennessee rely on springs for their water supply. Ground water produced from wells and springs in Middle and East Tennessee and from wells in West Tennessee provides 36 percent (about 321 Mgal/d) of the public water supplies. Springs in Middle and East Tennessee provided about 14 percent (about 42 Mgal/d) of ground-water supplies used in the State (USGS, 2003).

Threats:

Threats to wildlife in caves include pollution from surface activities, alteration of hydrology, incompatible recreational use, and invasive exotic species. Combined, these threats lead to strategic issues of degradation of existing cave and karst ecological systems and imperilment of wildlife species utilizing cave and karst features.

Figure 1-1. Tennessee karst regions and sub-regions





Figure 1-2. Patterns of cave density in Tennessee



Objectives:

1. Protect and restore ecological integrity of karst resources.
2. Protect and restore karst dependent species or communities.

OBJECTIVE 1 Protect and restore ecological integrity of karst resources.

Issue 1 Incompatible land-use practices and human activities can have negative impacts on karst ecosystems.

Strategy 1 Include karst resources in environmental reviews

Strategy 2 Incorporate karst resources in lands management planning

Strategy 3 Determine appropriate use levels in caves

Strategy 4 Discourage inappropriate use in caves

Strategy 5 Develop recreational plans

Strategy 6 Manage research efforts to minimize impacts on cave ecosystems

OBJECTIVE 2 Protect and restore karst dependent species or communities.

Issue 1 The biodiversity contained in karst systems is poorly understood.

Strategy 1 Identify and engage key partners to assist with karst conservation projects

Strategy 2 Determine needs and leverage funding for karst research through grants and partnerships

Strategy 3 Responsibly increase inventory and research efforts through Agency and partnering organization efforts

Strategy 4 Maintain existing monitoring projects and identify future monitoring needs

Opportunity 1 Many caves in Tennessee provide habitat for unique and globally significant communities that can benefit from protection and restoration actions.

Strategy 1 Identify cave locations and determine level of use

Strategy 2 Acquire priority karst habitat

Strategy 3 Support exclusion gating at priority caves

Strategy 4 Support research that benefits cave dependent species

Strategy 5 Support karst clean-up projects

STREAMS AND RIVERS

Definition:

Streams and rivers are waters that flow across the landscape within channels. Streams and rivers are categorized by size based on an order system in which smaller systems converge to form larger ones. Two first order streams (the smallest) converge to form a second order stream, two second order streams converge to form a third order stream, and so on. When a smaller stream converges with a larger (higher order) stream, order does not change below the confluence. For this chapter, streams and rivers will be categorized as headwaters/small streams (orders 1-3), medium rivers (orders 4-6), and large rivers (orders >6). We will also address two special classifications (channelized rivers and tailwaters) that differ in ecological function because of altered hydrology.

Headwaters/Small Streams

Headwaters and small streams are the origins of larger streams and rivers and are usually associated with higher elevations. These waters are characterized by typically low productivity, highly variable habitat conditions, and low species richness.

Medium Rivers

Medium-sized rivers are found in each physiographic region of Tennessee and make up most of the flowing water. These water bodies are typically more productive than headwater streams and are likely home to the greatest number of species.

Large Rivers

There are three large river systems in Tennessee: the Mississippi, the Tennessee, and the Cumberland. The Mississippi River (10th order) is the largest riverine ecosystem in North America and the third largest in the world. This dynamic, large-flood-plain river ecosystem flows 167 miles along Tennessee's western border. Over 45% of the Tennessee River's 886 miles flow through both eastern and western Tennessee and it is the largest tributary of the Ohio River. The Cumberland River is also a tributary of the Ohio River and a similar proportion of its 686 miles flow through the northern section of middle Tennessee. Much of the riverine habitat in the Tennessee and Cumberland rivers was converted to reservoirs with the construction of dams during the early 20th century. Despite their impoundment, these two systems still have valuable riverine sections in the upper ends of most reservoirs.

STREAMS AND RIVERS AT A GLANCE

Habitat Categories	Headwaters/ Small Streams Medium Rivers Large Rivers
Classifications	Channelized Rivers Tailwaters
Species	Tennessee streams are home to more species of fish (325) and mussels (460) than any other state in the country. The highly diverse streams of Tennessee provide habitat for 244 Greatest Conservation Need species identified in the TNSWAP.
Threats	Pollution Alteration of Hydrology Incompatible Recreational Use Increased Withdrawals Invasive Exotic Species
Strategic Objectives	Maintain and restore stocks of desired aquatic species. Protect and restore the ecological integrity of streams and rivers.

Channelized Rivers

Channelization of streams and rivers is the alteration of the natural flow by straightening their naturally winding courses across the landscape. This process has occurred on every size stream in Tennessee, mostly for the purpose of protecting land from flooding (e.g. to gain land for agricultural production). This results in increased current velocities, increased down cutting of the channel, decreased bank stability, loss of habitat, and poor water quality.

Tailwaters

Tailwaters are the river segment below water control structures, such as hydroelectric dams, that have altered flows, habitats, and water quality. In Tennessee, the construction of hydroelectric dams on medium to large rivers has affected the natural riverine habitat to the extent that native fish assemblages may be altered or are no longer present. Where native sportfish populations have been substantially reduced or eliminated, suitable non-native species have been introduced to provide recreational fishing opportunities.

History:

Historically, the landscape of Tennessee has been dominated by streams and rivers that have, over millions of years, sculpted out six physiographic regions that provide a diversity of aquatic habitats and fauna. These six physiographic regions (Mississippi Alluvial Plain, Upper Gulf Coastal Plain, Interior Low Plateau, Cumberland Plateau & Mountains, Ridge & Valley, and Southern Blue Ridge) encompass five independent river drainages or aquatic regions (Mississippi River, Tennessee River, Cumberland River, Barren River, and Conasauga River).

Since the time of the first human habitation of Tennessee by Paleo-Indians, streams and rivers have served as water sources for people and crops, routes of travel and trade, and supplied sources of food and raw materials for civilizations. Native Americans settled along many of the rivers throughout Tennessee and began altering the landscape along the rivers by clearing lands with fire to create open areas for wildlife and subsistence farming. Early European settlers adopted these same practices of clearing land for agriculture. Some of the first permanent European settlers to Tennessee developed a settlement in the Watauga River valley of east Tennessee in 1769. By 1779, the European settlers had moved westward into the Cumberland River valley, and by the early 1800's the landscape was being altered greatly by their agricultural practices, building of settlements, and development of routes for transportation.

At the turn of the 20th century, the commercial harvest of timber began to drastically alter the landscape of Tennessee as large amounts of forest were cleared to meet the demand for wood products. In addition to the deforestation from agricultural practices and timber harvest, mining of iron ore, coal, lead, zinc, copper, manganese, and phosphate, severely transformed many of the watersheds draining into Tennessee's streams and rivers. As a result of all the landscape changes, many of Tennessee's streams and rivers received massive amounts of sediment and pollutants that devastated habitat or completely extirpated aquatic fauna.

Another time of great change for Tennessee's streams and rivers was the passage of the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) Act of 1933. This formed a federally owned corporation to improve navigability, provide flood control, reforest, and improve marginal farmland, assist in industrial and agricultural development, and assist in the creation of a government nitrate and phosphorus production facility within the Tennessee Valley region. The modernization of the Tennessee Valley began with the construction of 16 hydroelectric dams and a coal fired steam plant between 1933 and 1944. Agricultural programs developed by TVA began to address some of the issues with land erosion and sedimentation of streams and rivers. Today, TVA operates dams at 47 reservoirs, 19 fossil fuel power plants, and 3 nuclear power production facilities. While these projects have benefited the Tennessee Valley, they have also changed streams and rivers by creating large reservoirs that fragment rivers, altering flow regimes and water quality.

Just as damaging to river ecosystems as dams, channelization of rivers in west Tennessee throughout the 19th and 20th centuries forever changed the landscape there. Channelization, used primarily for flood control and agricultural production, allowed for the movement of coarse sediments from uplands, gullies, and associated tributaries into the main channel of many of the river systems throughout the Coastal Plain. Accelerated sedimentation associated with erosion and channelization in alluvial systems has resulted in the formation of atypical geomorphic features (Happ et al. 1940). This type of sediment load resulting in large-scale landscape changes understandably has had tremendous ramifications to river systems.

Importance:

There are approximately 60,000 miles of streams and rivers that flow through Tennessee's diverse landscape. Six physiographic regions and five independent river drainages provide an incredible variety of habitats. Consequently, Tennessee's streams and rivers are recognized as having the richest freshwater biological diversity of any state in the U.S. They are home to some 330 species of fish, 120 species of mussels, 99 species of aquatic snails, 96 species of crayfish, and 70 species of amphibians. While Tennessee is home to many aquatic organisms, there are many species in jeopardy. TNSWAP lists 244 of these organisms as species of Greatest Conservation Need (GCN).

Tennessee's streams and smaller rivers are home to many sportfish species such as trout (brook, brown, and rainbow), catfish, black bass, crappie, sauger, white bass, striped bass, and sunfish. Until the 1930's, nearly all the public fisheries in Tennessee were in streams and rivers. In 2010, it was estimated that 397,515 anglers took a total of 3,214,303 trips to fish in Tennessee streams (Schexnayder and Fly, 2012). Tennessee's large rivers also provide important recreational and commercial resources. These rivers and their floodplain lakes currently have sport fisheries for catfish, black bass, crappie, sauger, white bass, striped bass, and sunfish. Commercial fisheries exist for catfish, paddlefish, buffalo, and other riverine fishes. Other public uses of rivers include water supply, aggregate dredging, waste dilution, navigation, and power generation.

Threats:

The biggest threat to productivity and biodiversity across the state is habitat loss or degradation due to past and ongoing activities throughout these watersheds. According to TDEC, the most common causes of pollution in rivers and streams are pathogens, habitat alteration, sedimentation, and nutrients. The sources for this are agriculture, hydrologic modification, and municipal dischargers. While best management practices can control sedimentation and excessive nutrients by reducing habitat alteration many streams are still negatively affected by sediment by continual and past land use practices. In addition, many dams and culverts also continue to limit movement of aquatic species and reduce water quality. Natural hydrologic functions have been altered by dam operations and water withdrawals. Besides limiting physical habitat in reduced channels, the lower flow rates also exacerbate water quality issues and fragment usable habitats.

The productivity and diversity of stream and river habitat is threatened by past and ongoing activities throughout the state. The most common water quality issue is sedimentation from past and current land use that creates excessive erosion. While best management practices can control sedimentation, many streams are still negatively affected by sediment. Many dams and culverts also continue to limit movement of aquatic species and reduce water quality. Natural hydrologic functions have been altered by dam operations and water withdrawals. Besides limiting physical habitat in reduced channels, the lower flow rates also exaggerate water quality issues. Climate change predictions suggest that Tennessee will experience a 2° C increase in temperature and an increased frequency of extreme weather events, such as intense rains and droughts. These conditions will further exacerbate the ongoing problems mentioned above.

In addition to the threat of habitat loss, stream and river species are also vulnerable to invasive species and over exploitation. Current regulations are designed to protect species, but these regulations must be continually evaluated to balance protection of species and recreational and commercial benefits.

Invasive species such as silver carp, Kentucky River crayfish, *Didymo* and many others continue to threaten native species through direct and indirect competition. Because invasive species are such a large threat to our sport and native aquatic wildlife, this plan dedicates a section to address them. See page 51, Extrinsic Factors on Wildlife Populations.

Objectives:

1. Manage and restore stocks of desired aquatic species.
2. Protect and restore the ecological integrity of streams and rivers.

OBJECTIVE 1. Manage and restore stocks of desired aquatic species.

Issue 1 Successful management of aquatic resources requires frequent monitoring, routinely updated operational plans, research, comprehensive data management, and regulations adjustments.

Strategy 1 Integrate surveys for non-game aquatics into existing programs

Strategy 2 Review data for priority watersheds and conduct inventories to fill gaps

Strategy 3 Consolidate and integrate databases housed within TWRA

Strategy 4 Evaluate and adapt data collection strategies to increase efficiency, improve data resolution, and reduce sampling bias

Strategy 5 Develop management plans for sport fisheries where needed and periodically update these plans

Opportunity 1 Populations of native aquatic species can be enhanced or restored to sustainable levels.

Strategy 1 Support or lead new development of enhancement and reintroduction projects

Strategy 2 Participate in U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service recovery planning processes

Strategy 3 Identify and engage key partners to assist with conservation projects

Strategy 4 Expand propagation facilities for species of Greatest Conservation Need

Strategy 5 Expand or renovate propagation facilities for sport fish species

Issue 2 Some species do not have adequate legal protection.

Strategy 1 Review state listings twice during this plan cycle

Strategy 2 Conduct a review of existing regulations related to non-game species and implement necessary changes as needed

OBJECTIVE 2. Protect and restore the ecological integrity of rivers and streams.

Issue 1 Incompatible land use and other human activities have impaired many streams and rivers.

- Strategy 1 Identify and prioritize watersheds in need of conservation or restoration, particularly on TWRA lands and headwaters which may greatly affect downstream reaches
- Strategy 2 Support non-Agency conservation/restoration efforts for priority streams and rivers
- Strategy 3 Support non-Agency efforts to reduce point and nonpoint source pollutants for priority streams and rivers by providing review and comment during the regulatory process
- Strategy 4 Identify and engage key partners to assist with stream and river conservation projects
- Strategy 5 Ensure that all management activities on TWRA lands follow BMP's for watershed protection
- Strategy 6 Ensure that abandoned coal mine reclamation projects restore streams and rivers degraded by past mining activities

Issue 2 Connectivity is limited by channel structures such as culverts and dams.

- Strategy 1 Address connectivity issues associated with dams and road systems. Participate in at least one dam removal project

Issue 3 Altered flows from dam operations and water withdrawals reduce habitat for riverine species.

- Strategy 1 Establish instream flow requirements for priority aquatic systems

IMPOUNDMENTS

Definition:

Impoundments are man-made lakes and ponds that were formerly free-flowing streams and rivers but are now blocked by a dam. Water trapped behind the dam often lacks flow and develops ecological functions and fish communities like those of a natural lake. Many larger reservoirs (>600 acres), especially those impounded on major rivers, display a continuum of conditions and fish species from the upstream (riverine) reaches to the dam, where they more closely resemble lake habitat. Because most reservoirs are built for purposes like flood control, hydropower production, and water storage, aquatic species are subject to dynamic habitat conditions such as changing flows, water level fluctuation, and water quality changes. Smaller impoundments (ponds and small lakes <600 acres) are usually not subject to rapidly changing habitat conditions and tend to have more stable fisheries.

RESERVOIRS AT A GLANCE	
Habitat Categories	Reservoirs Small Impoundments (less than 500 acres) Ponds (typically less than 5 acres and private)
Species	Hundreds of species of fish, mussels, and turtles Priority sport fish: black bass, crappie, catfish, sauger, walleye, white bass, striped bass, and trout Priority commercial fish: catfish, paddlefish, and buffalo
Threats	Water level fluctuations Habitat loss Incompatible use Invasive exotic species Erosion and Sedimentation
Strategic Objectives	Maintain and restore stocks of desired fish, mussel and turtle species. Maintain or enhance reservoir and lake fish habitats.

Impoundments in Tennessee:

Reservoirs provide a variety and abundance of fishing opportunities across Tennessee. The Agency manages fisheries in 32 man-made impoundments, representing 500,618 surface acres and one natural lake (Reelfoot Lake), representing 10,427 acres (Table 1-4). The reservoirs range in size from 541 acres to 108,217 acres within state boundaries and include an additional 202,380 acres outside the state (Figure 1-3). There are an estimated 99,250 additional acres of ponds in Tennessee (Tom Cross - UT Extension Service, personal communication).

Large Tennessee reservoirs consist of mainstream impoundments, tributary impoundments, and Reelfoot Lake, formed by an earthquake in the early 19th century. Most reservoirs are located within the Cumberland or Tennessee River drainages. Reelfoot Lake is in the Mississippi River drainage. Large reservoir and lake resources range from shallow, highly productive Reelfoot Lake in northwestern Tennessee to deep, clear, and much less productive Watauga Reservoir in the northeastern corner of the state. Tennessee's small impoundments are usually fairly to highly productive, while spring-fed lakes tend to be moderately productive.

Fish communities within Tennessee impoundments vary greatly in quality and abundance. Watershed characteristics influence the character of ponds and reservoirs. Sport and commercial fishing opportunities are limited by available habitat, predator-prey balance, potential for overexploitation of

fish stocks, and productivity of each system. The biological potential of individual impoundments; fishing opportunities desired by the public; and potential for unintended harvest are the primary factors driving which species will be managed in a particular fish community.

History:

Tennessee River reservoirs were impounded by the TVA from the late 1930s through the 1970s. Cumberland River Reservoirs were constructed by the USACE during the 1940s through the 1960s. All reservoirs in Tennessee provide public fishing and access. Boat and bank access areas are provided by several federal and state agencies, including TVA, USACE, TDEC and TWRA, as well as city and county governments. Reservoirs provide self-sustaining sport fisheries that include black bass (largemouth, smallmouth, and spotted), crappie (white and black), catfish (blue, channel, and flathead), sunfish (primarily bluegill and redear), sauger, walleye, and white bass. Stocked sport fisheries include trout (rainbow, brown, and lake), muskellunge, striped bass, and Cherokee bass (hybrid striped bass). Supplemental stockings of black crappie, Florida strain largemouth bass, walleye, and sauger have been used to enhance fisheries or provide unique fishing experiences in some reservoirs. In contrast, ponds and small lakes may allow free fishing or pay fishing but are usually privately owned and managed. Commercial fishing for paddlefish, catfish, carp, and buffalo occurs at several riverine impoundments of the Cumberland and Tennessee rivers. Most commercial fishing occurs on the lower Tennessee River (Kentucky Lake), lower Cumberland River (Barkley Lake) and the Mississippi River.

During recent decades, considerable effort has been aimed at providing optimal sport fishing through implementation of harvest restrictions. TWRA fishery biologists have been diligent in making daily creel limits and size limits as uniform as possible. Length limits have been tailored for high-harvest fisheries such as crappie and walleye, and to provide a higher level of protection for fisheries that are largely catch-and-release such as largemouth bass and smallmouth bass. Poudyal, Silwal and Watkins (2020) found that angler satisfaction with TWRA's reservoir fisheries management has remained high with 76% of anglers indicating they were somewhat satisfied or very satisfied with their most recent fishing experiences in Tennessee. Private ponds and small lakes have not been a significant TWRA management focus in recent years unless public access is allowed.

Importance:

During a recent survey by Poudyal, Silwal and Watkins (2020), Tennessee anglers were asked to indicate all the area types where they had spent time fishing. Anglers responded that they had fished in large impoundments (69%), small lakes (50%), state park lakes (35%), agency lakes (19%) and private ponds and lakes (17%). The most recent statewide creel survey, Black (2020), indicated that black bass continued to be the most sought species group accounting for 30.2 % of the angler effort followed by black and white crappie (17.8%). There are a vast number of fishing lakes throughout the state of Tennessee many of which were created and managed by the Agency (Figure 1-4). Although similar values for ponds and small lakes were not attainable, the values cited above indicate that fishing at impoundments provides significant recreation and local economic input.

Threats:

Variations in annual rainfall can influence habitat factors such as water quality, flows, water levels, and aquatic vegetation which, in turn, have influenced spawning success and recruitment of several fish species. Some fish populations such as crappie and sauger have cyclical recruitment due to environmental and density dependent factors. Productivity measured in standing crop (pounds per acre) or density (catch per unit effort) varies across the state, within each reservoir, and from year to year. Nutrient inflow from watersheds is the primary determinant of reservoir productivity. Habitat degradation, water pollution, and water level fluctuations also adversely affect reservoir fish populations and must be addressed by this plan.

Habitat enhancement and fish attractor projects that strive to enhance fish survival and recruitment as well as bring anglers and fish together will become increasingly important components of TWRA's reservoir management program. Demands for stocked fish from TWRA hatcheries can be expected to increase as natural stock recruitment decreases from habitat loss, sedimentation and interactions with invasive species increases (for more on invasive species, see page 51, Extrinsic Factors on Wildlife Populations).

Objectives:

1. Maintain, restore, and enhance stocks of desired fish, mussel, and turtle species.
2. Maintain or enhance reservoir and lake fish habitats.
3. Monitor invasive organisms and develop methods to control their impacts on native species.

OBJECTIVE 1. Maintain and restore stocks of desired fish, mussel, and turtle species.

Issue 1 Fish, mussel, and turtle populations are dynamic, requiring adaptive management, frequent monitoring, and detailed research.

Strategy 1 Use established techniques to evaluate population size, structure, growth, mortality and density for sport and commercial fisheries for a minimum of 20 impoundments per year and report results and recommend management strategies annually

Strategy 2 Evaluate existing fisheries, identify management needs, and as needed develop new assessment and monitoring programs

Strategy 3 Routinely evaluate existing harvest regulations for fish, mussels, and turtles

Strategy 4 Enhance and restore sport fish through stocking and harvest restrictions as needed, using biologically and sociologically feasible means

Strategy 5 Enhance and manage existing fish hatchery facilities to increase annual production to meet current and future program needs

Strategy 6 Evaluate stocking success and refine stocking numbers and locations as needed

Strategy 7 Develop two research projects to answer complex management questions

Strategy 8 Continue to provide technical assistance for private ponds using print and web-based informational materials. Conduct on-site surveys as feasible when proper assistance cannot be provided via phone, text, email, or other outlets

Strategy 9 Conduct at least one research project on commercially harvested turtle populations

OBJECTIVE 2. Maintain or enhance reservoir and lake fish habitats.

Issue 1 Dam operations directly affect fish habitat. Flood control demands rapid fluctuations of reservoir elevations resulting in loss of critical habitat for reservoir species during critical stages. Dam releases can have both negative and positive effects on water quality.

Strategy 1 Continue to provide reservoir operations recommendations to TVA and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) for at least 20 reservoirs during the plan period

Strategy 2 Participate in outreach to educate the public about TVA and USACE water level management

Issue 2 Inshore and offshore physical habitat is relatively scarce on large reservoirs. Over the decades, much of the submerged vegetation (smaller diameter) has decayed and shoreline aquatic plants cannot be established due to water level fluctuations.

Strategy 1 Maintain or expand habitat enhancement and fish attractor programs including small woody debris, stake beds, rock, and artificial structures in 10 or more impoundments per year

Strategy 2 Monitor or improve beneficial aquatic vegetation in impoundments where feasible

Strategy 3 Work with agencies and NGO partners when feasible to improve aquatic habitat in at least 10 large and small impoundments

Strategy 4 Provide reservoir fish habitat maps or coordinates on TWRA website or mobile application

Strategy 5 Stabilize eroding reservoir and tributary stream banks following BMP guidelines

Issue 3 Productivity of Tennessee's reservoirs changes as a function of time and watershed condition. Such changes affect trophic states and critical habitat, and ultimately management options.

Strategy 1 Collect and review physical and water quality conditions at a minimum of 20 reservoirs and lakes per year (using data from TVA or USACE if available) and develop appropriate management recommendations if necessary

OBJECTIVE 3. Monitor invasive organisms and develop methods to control their impacts on native species.

Issue 1. Asian carp have invaded the Tennessee and Cumberland river systems and have the potential to alter habitat and displace native aquatic organisms.

Strategy 1 Use established techniques to evaluate leading edge expansion, population size, structure, growth, mortality, recruitment, and density for Asian carp fisheries and report results and recommend management strategies annually

Strategy 2 Support, utilize, and monitor mass removal efforts (including commercial fishing) to reduce Asian carp density and propagule pressure

Strategy 3 Work with state and federal partners to support research and implementation of barrier technology to limit or mitigate migration of Asian carp into and through Tennessee waterways

Strategy 4 Increase public awareness through frequent engagement via social media, outreach events, informational press releases, and web updates

Strategy 5 Annually review bait regulations to prevent the further spread of Asian carp as bait

Table 1-4. Surface acres of Tennessee Reservoirs greater than 500 acres. Reelfoot Lake is included.

Acreage in Tennessee		Total Acres		Data Source*
Barkley	10,350	57,420		4
Boone	4,520			1
Calderwood	541			1
Center Hill	18,220			2
Ceatham	7,450			2
Cherokee	30,300			1
Chickamauga	34,500			1
Chilhowee	1,750			1
Cordell Hull	11,960			2
Dale Hollow	23,200	27,700		3
Douglas	30,600			1
Ft. Loudoun	14,600			1
Ft. Patrick Henry	872			1
Great Falls	3,080			1
Guntersville	1,156	67,900		4
John Sevier	786			4
J. Percy Priest	14,200			2
Kentucky	108,217	160,300		4
Melton Hill	5,690			1
Nickajack	10,370			1
Normandy	3,048			4
Norris	34,200			1
Old Hickory	22,500			2
Parksville	1,890			1
Pickwick	6,159	43,100		4
Reelfoot L.	10,427			4
South Holston	6,336	7,580		4
Tellico	16,056			4
Tims Ford	10,600			1
Watauga	6,430			1
Watts Bar	39,000			1
Woods	3,660			4
<i>Total</i>	<i>492,668</i>			

¹TVA 1980

²U.S. Army Corps of Engineers 1978

³-----, H. Phillips, personal communication 1993

⁴TWRA 2006

Figure 1-3 Distribution of major reservoirs (including Reelfoot Lake) in Tennessee





Figure 1-4. Distribution of TWRA Fishing Lakes (excludes lakes managed by TDEC).



- ¹Brown's Creek Lake (Henderson County) 167 acres;
- ²Carroll Lake (Carroll County) 100 acres;
- ³Coy Gaither/Bedford Lake (Bedford County) 47 acres;
- ⁴Davy Crockett Lake (Crockett County) 87 acres;
- ⁵Garrett Lake (Weakley County) 183 acres;
- ⁶Gibson County Lake (Gibson County) 560 acres;
- ⁷Glenn Springs Lake (Tipton County) 310 acres;
- ⁸Herb Parsons Lake (Fayette County) 177 acres;
- ⁹Lake Graham (Madison County) 500 acres;
- ¹⁰Laurel Hill Lake (Lawrence County) 325 acres;
- ¹¹Maples Creek Lake (Carroll County) 90 acres;
- ¹²Marrowbone Lake (Davidson County) 60 acres;
- ¹³VFW Lake (Lawrence County) 22 acres;
- ¹⁴Whiteville Lake (Hardeman County) 158 acres;
- ¹⁵⁻¹⁸Williamsport Lakes (Maury County) - Whippoorwill - 25 acres; Blue Cat - 80 acres; Goldeneye - 13 acres; and Shellcracker - 46 acres;
- *Bridgestone/Firestone WMA Youth Fishing Ponds (White County) 15 acres

URBAN

Habitat Groups – Urban Forest, Urban Grassland, Manmade Structures, Impervious Landscape

Definition:

Urban habitats and the animals which reside within them elicit many thoughts among people, both positive and negative. Urban areas provide altered but unique ecological systems that present a variety of opportunities for a wildlife management agency. Therefore, given their impacts on native plant and animal communities, the inclusion of urban areas is an important part of the Agency's strategic planning process. The Tennessee State Wildlife Action Plan (TNSWAP) identifies urban habitat groups and associated habitat alliances (see above) but does not provide a definition of these mapped habitats presumably because of the poor affiliation of species of greatest conservation need (GCN) and these habitat types.

The definition of urban habitats is complex and, within the context of a strategic plan, inextricably linked to the process of urbanization. Adams and Lindsey (2010) provide a good discussion of urban habitats:

Americans may like to think of themselves as a primarily rural nation, but nearly 80 percent of those who dwell in the 48 lower states live in areas classified by the U.S. Census Bureau as urban: "a large central place and adjacent densely settled census blocks that together have a total population of at least 50,000." Also known as the "built environment," the urban wildlife management landscape includes places where most of the land is devoted to all things man-made and/or maintained: buildings of all shapes and sizes, manicured lawns and landscaped office parks, cemeteries and vacant lots, strip malls and high schools and warehouse districts. A substantial portion of this land is covered with impervious surfaces, in the form of both structures and pavement. The plant life is mostly native to other parts of the world or highly hybridized, and thus in need of a lot of caretaking, in the form of sprinkler systems, herbicides, pesticides, and fertilizers. Urban in this context includes both the cities and the suburbs.

The Adams and Lindsey (2010) definition is robust to most urban areas but they did not include parks or similar areas in their definition. For the purposes of this document, parks and other open greenspaces embedded within the urban/suburban landscape are considered under the definition of urban habitats.

Urban habitats can be quantified to provide a static estimate of what is currently present, but an equally important factor is the process of urbanization. If urban habitats were static, they might be managed to maximize opportunities and minimize impacts, but human populations continue to grow and associated impacts to the landscape must be considered. Urbanization can be defined from a human population perspective as rural persons moving to urban areas with subsequent shifts in the demographics from rural to urban. A more complete consideration of urbanization from a habitat perspective would include the impact of this shift in demographics on the local landscapes. In this vein, the Tennessee Department of Agriculture (2010) defines urbanization from a forestry perspective, as:

Urbanization refers to the spread of urban land uses (residential, commercial, or industrial) into forested areas. The fringes of expanding urban areas, where forest and agricultural uses are interacting with increasing urban development, identify the wildland urban interface (WUI). The WUI is a zone of dynamic land use change activity that brings on complex challenges for residents, natural resource professionals and local governments.

The forestry-based definition can easily be expanded to any native habitat and introduces the concept of the WUI. The WUI is ambiguously defined but is best left vague as the dynamic nature does not allow a precise definition. The WUI is where most land-use conversion will take place and sets the stage for the necessary discussion of urbanization and associated management complexities. Tennessee is expected to have a 90% increase in converted lands before 2030 with a projected 2.4 million acres of rural land being developed (White et al. 2005) which emphasizes the importance of discussing urban habitats and urbanization.

History:

The southeastern US is undergoing consistent, rapid urban growth, with North Carolina, Georgia and Florida leading the way and Tennessee experiencing similar trends (White et al. 2009). Recent estimates indicate areas impacted by urban growth in Tennessee increased by 58% between 1982 and 1997 with 865,000 acres of land developed (White et al. 2009). Nowak et al. (2005) estimated that 4.4% of Tennessee was urbanized in 1990 and increased to 5.8% by 2000 with the urban expansion taking approximately 358,000 acres during the decade and making Tennessee the 19th most urban state in the US. Future urban expansion is estimated to have Tennessee as the 15th most urbanized state by 2050, with approximately 15.3% of the state considered urban (Nowak and Walton 2005).

The TWRA has little to no history with active management of urban habitats and traditionally focuses its efforts on rural landscapes. This strategic plan is the first known attempt to formally consider urban habitats and their associated positive and negative impacts on the wildlife habitats and human populations in Tennessee. While urban issues are not new to the TWRA, the Agency has typically taken a passive stance regarding urban habitats and urbanization. The TWRA's future direction should seek to actively engage management within existing urban habitats while considering the impacts of future urbanization on the state's natural resources.

Importance:

Urban habitats do not fit easily into a single discussion of importance like other habitat chapters because there are positive and negative implications of urban areas. Existing urban areas provide wildlife habitats, albeit not what are considered traditional habitats. Public lands within the urban matrix offer opportunities for outdoor recreation and education. Such programs to engage the urban public in these areas for education and hunting/fishing opportunities are more thoroughly addressed in the Outdoor Recreation and Information & Education chapters, respectively.

The importance of urban habitats differs from that of other habitats discussed in this plan in that the urbanization process permanently eliminates native/natural habitats directly and indirectly. Conversion of acres from rural uses to residential, commercial, or industrial uses in many traditional development scenarios destroys all-natural function of the converted habitat and leaves no large-scale habitat. Cultural paradigm shifts are trending toward green growth initiatives that have ecological considerations built into the growth plans. Working within existing initiatives or helping to develop new initiatives is an untapped management mechanism for the TWRA. The Agency has assisted in several efforts but to date no personnel are designated specifically to these tasks. While this plan does not recommend adding staff to perform such tasks, the long-term benefits of engaging in such new endeavors may be a worthy effort to help minimize the impact of urbanization.

Threats:

Urban habitats are not threatened in the usual sense, but they (and the urbanization process) do constitute a threat to other habitats. Existing urbanized areas are very unlikely to be converted back to part of a larger functioning ecosystem and future urbanization will continue to usurp native habitats. Such habitat loss, along with indirect impacts of pollution and other factors can degrade nearby natural habitats as well and ultimately affect large portions of the Tennessee landscape.

The TNSWAP developed prioritized sources of stress for each of the six terrestrial regions in Tennessee. Primary residential development and commercial/industrial development were listed among the top three stresses associated with all six terrestrial habitat types. Urban stresses to aquatic systems were also identified in TNSWAP but the types of stress were not as clear for each river system. Dams and impoundments, residential development, and residential sewage/septic systems were all important, but their importance varied dramatically among watersheds. However, urban-related issues (particularly sewer septic systems) were among the top three stressors in all physiographic regions. Such high prioritization of urban stresses in terrestrial, aquatic, and subterranean habitats indicates that management/policy action directed at reducing the impacts of urbanization should have positive impacts on all terrestrial GCN species.

Objective:

1. Maximize management opportunities within the urban landscape to enhance productive wildlife habitat.

Objective 1 Maximize management opportunities within the urban landscape to enhance productive wildlife habitat.

Opportunity 1 Initiatives that focus on urban planning and green growth often seek diverse partners to integrate urban growth with natural resource conservation.

Strategy 1 Increase participation in or formation of strategic alliances that promote the improvement of land-use planning and zoning practices affecting urban wildlife species and their habitats

Strategy 2 Increase urban wildlife management opportunities on private lands by providing technical assistance and encouraging the use of incentive programs

Strategy 3 Support outreach efforts promoting conservation or management of urban wildlife and their habitats

EXTRINSIC FACTORS ON WILDLIFE POPULATIONS

Habitat Groups: Implications to all habitats

This chapter captures several factors that are ubiquitous to all habitats and wildlife populations in Tennessee and therefore require discussion separate from each habitat group. The primary foci are human/wildlife conflicts, problem populations (overabundant, invasive, extirpated native etc.), diseases, and climate change. These are, on the surface, disparate issues but drawn together they represent important external stresses impacting the wildlife populations and habitats of Tennessee. In most cases these extrinsic factors are independent of wildlife populations. Examples of this are urbanization changing the landscape with unintended consequences resulting in an increased need for animal damage control, new or expanding diseases (chronic wasting, white-nose syndrome etc.) emerging from within the state, or the global impacts of climate change played out on a local scale in Tennessee.

Definition:

Nuisance or overabundant flora and fauna – Nuisance animals are often immediately and sometimes erroneously categorized as overabundant. Whether an individual animal problem or a true population problem, management actions should address these as separate issues. State laws are written such that landowners determine if an animal is a nuisance and these animals are often single individuals rather than members of a burgeoning population. Traditional management of nuisance animals, as defined by the landowner, is handled through big game depredation permits or the animal damage control (ADC) permit process.

Nuisance wildlife calls from the public appear to be increasing and handling them is an ever-present duty for the TWRA throughout the State. While traditionally concentrated in urbanized areas the nuisance complaints are expanding beyond raccoons in attics to include rural problems with otters, beavers, deer, bear, coyotes, and other species. Additionally, species that are naturally expanding their ranges (e.g., armadillo) are resulting in nuisance problems in both urban and rural areas.

Overabundant wildlife populations are an increasing concern for the Agency and overabundance is often defined by social carrying capacity. Schexnayder et al. (2012) estimated one in four Tennesseans (26%) experience property damage from nuisance wildlife. Social Carrying capacity is a moving target that is not well-suited to traditional wildlife management methods or objectives. Species restored by the TWRA (e.g., deer, turkey, otter) are reaching overabundant levels in many parts of the state. Other species entering the state (e.g., coyote and armadillo) are similarly at population levels beyond social carrying capacity. The Agency needs to consider the implications of allowing populations to grow beyond social carrying capacity or other species (e.g., bear and elk) may follow a similar path to overabundance. The efficacy of programs designed to address species that exceed social carrying capacity should be evaluated and ultimately redesigned to ensure maximum relief and benefit to landowners with nuisance animals, while encouraging co-existence.

Invasive flora or fauna – Invasive species are an increasing problem that spans a variety of species from multi-flora rose to *Hydrilla* to Asian carp to wild hogs and covers all major biotic classes. Invasive species are not new to Tennessee, but their impacts may become more significant.

Transforming the management status of wild hogs from a big game species to a species deemed destructive is a leading example of a population growing beyond the desired levels (albeit with illegal transportation aiding the spread). The economic and environmental damage potential of this population is extraordinarily large if the TWRA does not continue aggressive management actions.

The ultimate importance of invasive species on the native flora and fauna cannot be accurately estimated because the populations are constantly in flux, as is our understanding of their impacts to native ecosystems. The costs associated with these invasive species are socio-economic as well as ecological. For example, Asian carp in our nation's waterways may impact native fish stocks on which sport-fishing communities rely into the billions of dollars. Nationally, wild hogs cause damages to agricultural production that reach easily into the hundreds of millions of dollars annually. The impacts in Tennessee, though unknown at this time, may be staggering; however, given the early stages of Asian carp populations and wild hog range expansion, negative impacts may be reduced with proper management actions.

The Agency dedicates a great deal of resources to invasive species, but consistent management direction is often lacking. The Tennessee Aquatic Nuisance Species Management Plan provides guidance for managing invasive species in aquatic settings, but no such plan exists for terrestrial organisms. A plan to manage terrestrial invasive populations needs to be developed to provide a cohesive management message and direction for all major invasive species.

Diseases of flora and fauna – Endemic diseases are a normal component of natural systems and typically do not have large impacts on native populations. These diseases are often noticed by the public (e.g., Epizootic Hemorrhagic Disease outbreak in deer) but are most often inconsequential to native populations or their management. In contrast, introduced diseases may have dramatically different impacts and have the potential to completely alter natural systems (e.g., chestnut blight). Historically, new diseases were introduced infrequently so they had little impact to these systems (with the chestnut blight exception) but with a more globalized society there appears to be new disease threats appearing regularly. Chronic wasting, white-nose syndrome, whirling disease, avian influenza, and numerous other diseases are becoming increasingly common.

Emerging diseases that are novel to the native flora and fauna on Tennessee are the largest threats. Chronic Wasting Disease (CWD), detected in Tennessee in 2018, is an always-fatal disease of cervids (deer and elk) and may cause significant declines in native cervid populations. It is possible that the numbers of hunters pursuing those animals may also decrease. Game animals are not the only fauna at risk. White-nose syndrome in bats may fundamentally change the structure of the bat population assemblage in Tennessee and ultimately alter how we manage bats and their habitat on public lands. Similar impacts can be seen with forest management strategies that now must consider emerald ash

borer, 1000 cankers of walnut, or hemlock woolly adelgid and their attempts to restrict the expansion of these diseases/pests.

Whirling disease has the potential to significantly impact native and wild trout populations as well as numerous Agency programs that utilize stocked trout. Impacts to hatchery operations and reduced production would likely strain current stocking regimes, meaning fewer opportunities for Tennessee anglers. Game animals are not the only fauna at risk. White-nose syndrome in bats may fundamentally change the structure of the bat population assemblage in Tennessee and ultimately alter how we manage bats and their habitat on public lands. Similar impacts can be seen with forest management strategies that now must consider emerald ash borer, 1000 cankers of walnut, or hemlock woolly adelgid and their attempts to restrict the expansion of these diseases/pests.

Climate change – The TWRA’s first formal treatment of climate change was published in 2009 (TWRA 2009) and addressed the impacts of climate change on Tennessee’s native wildlife populations and habitats. As an update to the TNSWAP, this document provides a solid background for the potential problems that may arise if climate change persists and was based on the best available knowledge of the time. This effort and the Agency’s involvement in joint ventures (JV) and other landscape conservation cooperatives shows commitment to the issue and concern for the impacts but the Agency does not currently have personnel devoted to developing a formal program to implement climate related strategies.

The discussion of climate change within the context of a six-year strategic plan is an important step, but what can realistically occur in this limited time span must also be considered. Many national and international organizations are in the planning processes for what should be done with groups like the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC, United Nations), established in the last 10 years. The threat of accelerating climate change on native populations can be minimized by replicated habitat protection for rare species, creating north-south travel corridors and many other management strategies. However, for an agency with few resources directly assigned to climate change policy, expectations for dealing with climate change need to be realistic, especially in the timeframe allowed for this plan. The Agency recognized the importance of accelerating climate change in their 2009 report (TWRA 2009). Our steps toward implementing climate change policies within our management strategies and land acquisition strategies may be better addressed in the Agency’s core beliefs and mission rather than assuming we can meet the objectives laid out by national and international planners. Continued engagement with JVs and other landscape cooperatives, as well as efforts to remain current on management and planning will be critical. Changing information about accelerating climate change and its potential impacts to native flora and fauna should be the basis of how the Agency plans large-scale management initiatives and land acquisitions.

Objectives:

1. Minimize flora and fauna having negative impacts on native species, habitats, water quality and socioeconomics.
2. Restore extirpated native terrestrial and aquatic species where feasible.
3. Minimize impacts of diseases on desired flora and fauna.
4. Stay current and proactive in addressing resource issues that are impacted by climate change.
5. Agency personnel seek opportunities to learn new information about the effects of climate change and how it impacts wildlife and their associated habitats.

OBJECTIVE 1 Minimize negative impacts of non-native flora and fauna on native species, habitats, water quality and socioeconomics

Issue 1 Exotic, invasive, nuisance or other species deemed destructive or over-abundant are an increasing threat to desired populations and habitats.

Strategy 1 Implement Tennessee Aquatic Nuisance Species (ANS) management plan

Strategy 2 Develop and implement Tennessee nuisance species plans for terrestrial wildlife and plants

Strategy 3 Support existing and develop new programs to help control invasive species through non-traditional methods (e.g. commercial value)

Strategy 4 Work with other management agencies and NGOs to evaluate and install barrier deterrent system at strategic locations

Strategy 5 Develop an in-house program that would direct and implement control strategies for invasive species

Strategy 6 Continue to seek funding sources to support existing and new control programs

Strategy 7 Enact and/or support development of regulations that restrict the potential to introduce/spread invasive within Tennessee

Strategy 8 Continue to document presence and spread of invasive species

Issue 2 Negative interactions between humans and wildlife continue to increase.

Strategy 1 Maximize hunting, fishing, and trapping to manage problem wildlife populations

Strategy 2 Create and utilize innovative programs that educate the public on problem wildlife and their habitat (e.g., coexisting with wildlife and/or providing tools/information to alleviate human/wildlife conflicts)

Strategy 3 Increase effectiveness of the ADC program by expanding services and information provided by the Agency and approved permittees

Strategy 4 Increase partnerships that address solutions to common human/ wildlife conflicts

Strategy 5 Utilize hunting, fishing, and trapping opportunities to address excess social carrying capacity issues when appropriate

OBJECTIVE 2 Restore extirpated native terrestrial and aquatic species where feasible

Issue 1 Some native wildlife populations have become extirpated from their historic ranges.

Strategy 1 Evaluate the feasibility of restoring native terrestrial and aquatic species on lands where natural populations have been extirpated and restore populations if possible

Strategy 2 Monitor native species in decline and determine if management strategies can be implemented to reverse or prevent further decline

OBJECTIVE 3 Minimize impacts of diseases on desired flora and fauna

Issue 1 Emerging and recurring diseases pose threats to existing populations.

Strategy 1 Review and update if necessary, Hazard Analysis Critical Control Points (HACCP) plans for fish hatcheries once during the cycle

Strategy 2 Enact and/or support development of regulations that restrict the potential to introduce emerging diseases to Tennessee

Strategy 3 Enact and/or support development of regulations that restrict the potential to spread diseases within Tennessee

Strategy 4 Create a Task Force to identify training needs, information gaps, monitoring protocols or other concerns for diseases

Strategy 5 Proactively monitor and prioritize high risk areas/populations and respond to diseases as appropriate through eradication and/or control

OBJECTIVE 4. Adaptively manage Tennessee's wildlife resources to address a changing climate

Issue 1 Uncertainty of future climatic conditions makes it difficult to develop long term wildlife management strategies.

Strategy 1 Review and update the potential impacts of Climate Change to Wildlife in Tennessee and incorporate into the TNSWAP

Strategy 2 Participate in regional initiatives such as Joint Ventures and Southeast Conservation Adaptation Strategy

Strategy 3 Increase adaptive management practices that make wildlife habitat and populations more resilient to climate change

Strategy 4 Monitor such diseases as White-nosed Syndrome, Snake Fungal Disease, Ranavirus and Chytrid fungi including Batrachochytrium salamandrivorans (Bsal) throughout the state

Goal:

To increase and maintain opportunities for hunting, fishing, and boating and accommodate other outdoor recreation that is safe for users and the environment yet consistent with conservation principles.

Definition:

Outdoor recreation is broadly defined as any leisure activity that takes place outside. TWRA actively promotes fishing, hunting, trapping, wildlife viewing, and boating. While these activities remain the Agency's primary focus, this plan will address other activities that are, or could be, welcomed on TWRA lands. These include but are not limited to camping, hiking, caving, horseback riding, off-highway vehicles, bicycle riding, rock climbing and geo-caching. Wildlife Management Area managers have identified at least 20 varieties of outdoor recreation occurring on TWRA lands (Table 1-5). This plan will focus on outdoor recreation associated with publicly held wildlife and waterways, and at TWRA-managed lands. Recreation on TWRA lands will be limited to those activities that will not harm the resource or impair the enjoyment of license-holding users. This is oftentimes difficult since TWRA lands must continue to serve the purpose for which they were acquired, and hunting and fishing license funds cannot be used for non-wildlife activities.

Outdoor Recreation in Tennessee:

Tennessee's natural resources provide numerous and diverse opportunities for outdoor recreation. In 2011, five million people participated in outdoor activities such as fishing, hunting and wildlife viewing in Tennessee (USFWS 2012). Approximately 246,000 people have motorboats for Tennessee's waterways. Millions more are hiking, paddling, and just getting outside. TWRA's mission statement recognizes this value of recreation and motivates staff to manage resources for the enjoyment of citizens and visitors.

Recreation is an objective of many land-managing municipalities and agencies such as Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation (TDEC), United States Forest Service (USFS), Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA), National Park Service (NPS), and United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). TWRA partners with several agencies, municipalities, and non-government organizations (NGOs) to provide land and wildlife for outdoor recreation. Many entities provide outdoor recreation without TWRA involvement. TWRA is unique in that it not only offers recreation on the over 1 million acres of land that we manage, but it also manages and promotes recreation associated with the publicly owned populations of wildlife wherever they occur. Likewise, TWRA provides access to public waterways while it owns relatively little aquatic habitat.

TWRA promotes recreational opportunity through a variety of its core functions. Through the decades TWRA has acquired large tracts of land for wildlife habitat. Nearly all these areas are open to the public, except during big game hunts. TWRA also owns smaller parcels located along public waterways which provide parking, ramps, and other amenities for a variety of water users. TWRA manages populations of

game species for recreation through habitat enhancement, by setting hunting and fishing regulations, and by stocking desirable fish species for anglers, and by providing an established and focused law enforcement presence. The primary role of TWRA's management is to maintain populations of species, but they also enhance recreational aspects of hunting or fishing. TWRA promotes safe recreation on land and water through educational programs and enforcement of regulations. TWRA also recruits new outdoors enthusiasts through educational programs and specialized events. We also provide support for other entities encouraging outdoor participation through educational programs and events.

Primarily it has been hunters, anglers, and registered-boat owners that have funded the acquisition and management of TWRA lands and access to waterways, but this paradigm may not be sustainable. TWRA relies on revenue from hunting and fishing licenses, boat registration, federally collected taxes on hunting, fishing and boating gear, real estate taxes (for wetlands) and donations to its license plate funds to maintain its programs. These funding sources have been reliable, but they are not growing in proportion to Tennessee's population. With time more people are discovering the outdoor opportunities at TWRA lands, but many of them pursue activities that do not require any license or contribution to TWRA. For example, people regularly use TWRA ramps to go kayaking (a growing sport) or visit a WMA to ride their horse or an ATV. Both activities generate costs, as the Agency provides law enforcement, litter pickup, and maintains roads. In addition, some of these activities can conflict with hunting or fishing opportunities that arguably should have a priority due to the funding history. TWRA is trying to accommodate non-paying users as much as possible, but it adds to the cost of management.

With proper funding and planning, many WMAs could support much more outdoor recreation. While WMAs are well known to traditional users, these areas are generally unknown to many other recreational groups. The WMA managers focus on wildlife populations, their habitats, and the hunting seasons. TWRA does not actively promote additional activities at most of its WMAs. Some are designed to host multi-use management (e.g. North Cumberland with hunting, wildlife viewing and OHV), but many have yet to plan and promote for more types of recreation. Despite the lack of advertising, WMA managers already have numerous multi-user conflicts. While the WMAs do have much more to offer the public, the Agency needs public support in finding more reliable streams of revenue for our wildlife resources. Such public support would also be useful in acquiring more habitats for wildlife and users.

Importance:

Outdoor recreation provides benefits to individuals, society, and wildlife. People participate to have fun, and there also health benefits associated with both activity and relaxation. Fishing and hunting provide meat that is a valued supplement to store-bought foods. Outdoor recreation delivers revenue and jobs to regions that support daytrips and vacationers. Nationally, recreation generates \$887 billion in sales supporting 7.6 million jobs (Outdoor Industry Association 2017). Outdoor recreation is also a valued component in quality-of-life indices used to recruit potential employers. Outdoor recreation connects people with wildlife. In well-managed, positive settings, this connection will motivate citizens to support wildlife programs.

TWRA's ability to conserve wildlife relies on funding from outdoor recreation. At present we are primarily funded by hunting, fishing, and boating, but there are other outdoor recreationists that could be charged for use of TWRA lands or TWRA services. For example, the use-permit charged at North Cumberland WMA is applied to all users. Other WMAs, shooting ranges, and water access areas could reasonably ask for similar fees. Increased funding would allow managers to better maintain existing areas and possibly expand opportunities.

TWRA would like to have more hunters and anglers continue these traditions that fund the management of the state's wildlife populations. Many outdoor activities, such as kayaking or hiking, are known to be gateway interests that lead to other activities. Outdoor recreationists that use TWRA lands would have an opportunity to learn about hunting and fishing as a sport. This recruiting opportunity would be a great benefit to TWRA and wildlife resources.

Objectives:

1. Recruit, retain, and reactivate lapsed hunters and anglers as continued and increased participation in outdoor recreation is critical to promote wildlife conservation.
2. Identify types of outdoor recreation that can be supported on TWRA managed lands, while maintaining high satisfaction among existing and expanding user groups.
3. Identify, maintain and/or improve programs that promote high user satisfaction for hunters, anglers, and boaters.

OBJECTIVE 1. Recruit, retain and reactivate lapsed hunters and anglers because continued and increased participation in outdoor recreation is critical to promote wildlife conservation as well as being mission centric.

Issue 1 Decrease barriers to participation in Agency-sanctioned outdoor recreation allowing for the increased recruitment of new participants, retention of current participants, and the reactivation (R3) of lapsed participants into the outdoor recreation community.

Strategy 1 Emphasize programs that promote the introduction of young adults and families to hunting and angling as well as other outdoor activities and promote pond and small lake fishing opportunities in public urban areas, municipal parks, TWRA lakes, and WMAs by the end of the plan period (State Parks fishing programs should be expanded through training of staff and free tackle programs active at a minimum of 10 parks over the plan period)

Strategy 2 Create opportunities to introduce diverse cultures and societies into the hunting, fishing, and shooting sports community

Strategy 3 Create educational opportunities for new participants, current participants, and lapsed participants to promote increased knowledge in outdoor recreation with a focus on hunting and fishing

Strategy 4 Encourage all agency employees to pursue projects in their communities that stress the importance of the recruitment, retention and reactivation of hunting, angling, and shooting sports

Issue 2 TWRA needs to improve partnerships among agencies, organization, and industry to collaboratively implement R3 efforts.

Strategy 1 Host an annual R3 summit for agencies, NGO's, and outdoor industry Stakeholders

Strategy 2 Participate in industry wide 60 in 60 campaign for making 60 million new anglers in 60 months

Strategy 3 Disseminate timely information on Tennessee's efforts to recruit, retain, and reactivate lapsed hunters/anglers, and shooters highlighting successes and opportunities

Strategy 4 Provide grant opportunities to partners to hold TWRA approved R3 events

Strategy 5 Encourage TWRA staff to be involved with partner groups and partner R3 events

Issue 3 TWRA needs to identify existing barriers to participation in hunting/fishing/shooting sports gaining an understanding of how these barriers limit or exclude stakeholder participation in hunting and angling and what strategies can best remove these barriers to participation.

Strategy 1 Review published research on barriers to public participation in outdoor recreation activities

Strategy 2 Gain additional input from stakeholders at a state R3 meeting where all views of the barriers and possible removal of these barriers can be discussed

Strategy 3 Develop partnerships with outdoor recreational organizations to identify issues, solutions, and opportunities for barrier reduction

Strategy 4 Produce an R3 plan providing a roadmap to recruit, retain and reactivate lapsed hunters/anglers/sport shooters which will support the overall strategic vision of the Tennessee Wildlife Resources Agency "to preserve, conserve, manage, protect, and enhance the fish and wildlife of the state and their habitats for the

use, benefit, and enjoyment of the citizens of Tennessee and its visitors. The Agency will foster the safe use of the state's waters through a program of law enforcement, education, and access”

Issue 4 Outdoor recreation opportunities for stakeholders are often limited by external societal factors such as a general lack of time, multiple jobs per family, and travel distance from home. TWRA should seek to minimize these barriers to participation.

Strategy 1 Increase the delivery of special outdoor recreation events targeted at special times and locations designed to minimize external societal barriers

Strategy 2 Design special outdoor recreation events to be more inclusive of families and that provide diverse outdoor activities in one location

Strategy 3 Continue existing programs and expand/develop new programs that will make it easier for people to try outdoor recreation activities (possibilities include: Blue Ribbon Streams, Becoming an Outdoor Woman Events, hunter/angler mentor programs for adults and children, combination programs with 4-H and Boy Scouts, and Hunter Education)

Issue 5 A lack of physical public access (i.e. parking, ramps, and trails) is a limiting factor on many public lands and waterways that could support outdoor recreation activities. New public access areas are difficult to acquire because tracts become available unpredictably and they are often priced above fair market value.

Strategy 1 Increase stakeholder access to public lands and waterways through direct land acquisitions, leases, and partnerships with controlling agencies (i.e. MOAs, MOUs)

Strategy 2 Broaden TWRA acquisition opportunities by developing new partnerships with controlling agencies on public lands and waterways and by continuing to foster existing partnerships

Strategy 3 Continue to ensure existing public access points are maintained year-round and existing leases or MOAs/MOUs are properly updated/renewed

Strategy 4 Provide fishing access (piers, ramps, etc.) and repair existing facilities at a minimum of 20 impoundments over the plan period

Issue 6 The existing TWRA license structure, proclamations, and rules and regulations are perceived by stakeholders as being overly complicated. This perception may be an unintentional

barrier limiting participation in outdoor recreation activities on TWRA managed lands and waterways.

Strategy 1 Continue to review TWRA proclamations and rules/regulations annually to look for opportunities to simplify and clarify both

Strategy 2 Review TWRA land management policies to see if opportunities exist to increase opportunities for diverse outdoor recreation activities

Strategy 3 Facilitate the ability of stakeholders' to efficiently navigate, understand, and select the correct license requirement through a web-based application which would select the correct license/permits based on user inputs

Strategy 4 Consider allowing hunters the flexibility to transfer quota hunt permits to another user and develop policy that would require hunters to check in prior to hunts to validate participation

Issue 7 Existing TWRA public access areas often do not have adequate facilities or existing facilities need upgrade and maintenance to support diverse outdoor recreation activities. Minimum facility requirements need to be established for various outdoor recreation activities that may be provided at given locations.

Strategy 1 Develop policy that establishes minimum access and facility requirements for the various outdoor recreation activities that may be offered on TWRA managed lands and waterways

Strategy 2 Assess the condition of current TWRA access sites and produce a report that addresses current and potential outdoor recreation activities offered, any need for new facilities, and any facilities that require upgrade or maintenance issues on all TWRA managed access sites

Strategy 3 Maintain or improve 16 TWRA public access sites per year at established minimum requirements

Issue 8 Existing TWRA access areas are not completely documented and often not adequately advertised to the public.

Strategy 1 Review TWRA access database for completeness and accuracy once a year

Strategy 2 Promote TWRA access database and maps through TWRA and other partnering media outlets

Strategy 3 Produce mobile applications for public use for locating access areas

Issue 9 Public lands and waterways in Tennessee are controlled and managed by various municipalities, and state and federal agencies. Many of these agencies, either intentionally or unintentionally, often restrict public access to quality fishing, hunting, and boating opportunities.

Strategy 1 Establish working partnerships with agencies controlling access to public lands and waterways and lead efforts within these partnerships to develop plans that promote outdoor recreation activities – primarily fishing, hunting, and boating activities

Issue 10 Tennessee’s land base is largely held under private ownership. A lack of public access to private lands is a limiting factor on many lands and waterways that could support outdoor recreation activities.

Strategy 1 Explore programs that would provide technical and financial assistance to private landowners for wildlife habitat improvement in exchange for short-term or perpetual public access agreements such as the NRCS Voluntary Public Access (VPA) and Habitat Incentive Program (VPA-HIP)

Strategy 2 Increase opportunities for public access to private lands by establishing long-term conservation easements with private landowners

Issue 11 In some waterways, contaminants are present in fish tissue at concentrations that restrict consumptive sport and commercial fishing opportunities. There are also anglers that lack an understanding of contaminant issues and they unnecessarily avoid safe fisheries.

Strategy 1 Continue participating in valley-wide contaminant survey (TDEC, TVA, etc.) for monitoring contaminants in fish, mussels, snapping turtles, etc.

Strategy 2 Report current contaminant advisories in the Tennessee Fishing Guide

Table 1-5. Non-traditional outdoor recreation occurring on TWRA lands

ATV Riding	Geocaching	Photography
Camping	Hiking	SCUBA Diving
Wildlife Watching	Horseback Riding	Sight Seeing
Mountain Bike Riding	Jeeping/Mud Buggies	Skeet Shooting
Target Shooting	Maintaining Cemeteries (Family access)	Swimming

OBJECTIVE 2. Identify types of outdoor recreation that can be supported on TWRA managed lands, while maintaining high satisfaction among existing and expanding user groups.

Issue 1 Predicting which kinds of programs will satisfy new and current users is difficult. Developing new programs or changing existing programs may need to occur to maintain current user satisfaction and recruit new users.

Strategy 1 Assess existing outdoor recreation activities that occur on TWRA managed lands and explore the potential to expand current TWRA programs/management to provide additional outdoor recreation opportunities and produce a report that provides guidance to address current and future outdoor recreational activities on TWRA managed Lands

Strategy 2 Develop partnerships with outdoor recreational organizations to identify issues, solutions, and opportunities for program development

Strategy 3 Foster communication with commercial entities utilizing TWRA lands and facilities for outdoor recreation activities then use these relationships to identify opportunities for partnerships and aid in evaluating issues specific to their industry

Strategy 4 Maintain or develop programs or facilities that increase participation in the shooting sports.

Issue 2 There is an increased demand for TWRA to provide opportunities for a greater diversity of outdoor recreation activities on TWRA managed lands and access areas. To meet this demand additional funding sources will be necessary.

Strategy 1 Investigate costs and revenue associated with existing and expanded recreational activities on TWRA managed lands

Strategy 2 Evaluate non-license holder's willingness to pay for current recreation opportunities and expansion of programs

Strategy 3 Identify areas suitable for the implementation of user fees and evaluate administrative cost to the Agency

Strategy 4 If appropriate, develop user fee structure for WMA's, access areas, non-motorized vessels, special events, and marine events

Strategy 5 Increase partnerships with outdoor recreation groups to develop and maintain facilities and infrastructure necessary to support various outdoor recreation activities (develop long-term MOAs and MOUs)

Issue 3 Conflicts among users and wildlife resource/habitat integrity will increase as the outdoor recreational user base expands and diversifies.

Strategy 1 Evaluate current user base and determine appropriate levels for opportunity expansion or moderation if current use is unacceptable

Strategy 2 Develop strategies to partition use among groups so that conflicts are minimized

Strategy 3 Create partnerships through MOA's and other agreements to reduce or eliminate user conflicts

Strategy 4 Develop policies and procedures that aid in the identification, prioritization, and resolution of user conflict

Strategy 5 Establish communication programs to educate recreational users of potential conflicts and suggest ways that conflicts can be avoided or minimized

OBJECTIVE 3. Maintain or improve programs that promote high user satisfaction for hunters, anglers, and boaters.

Issue 1 Data-driven and science-based management is needed to maintain or increase populations of wildlife that are desired by hunters and outdoor recreationists.

Strategy 1 Develop, implement, and update wildlife species plans as needed to provide direction on management programs

Strategy 2 Conduct wildlife population surveys to provide population estimates or indices using the best available techniques and analyses including counts, banding, hunter harvest surveys, and telemetry; analyze and interpret this data and conduct population modeling as appropriate

Strategy 3 Design, fund, and conduct research necessary to support science-based management

Strategy 4 Prepare and disseminate reports and other technical publications that document the results of scientific research and monitoring activities

Strategy 5 Participate in national and regional working groups that share research and management experience to improve agency species programs

Strategy 6 Provide professional excellence and quality management recommendations through a well-trained, specialized, and dedicated workforce which strengthens the Agency's reputation

Issue 2 Because of habitat limitations or increased demand, many populations of desired species are insufficient to supply consistent and satisfying opportunities to hunters, anglers, and other outdoor recreation users.

Strategy 1 Evaluate current regulations and recommend changes needed to maintain populations of desired species that provide quality hunting, fishing, and other outdoor recreation experiences

Strategy 2 Produce sport fish at desired levels for stocking and evaluate stocking programs to better utilize available resources

Strategy 3 Collect data on participation, satisfaction, opinions, and economic value of programs for TWRA and Tennessee Fish and Wildlife Commission (TFWC) consideration

Strategy 4 Identify new locations or seasons to develop hunting and fishing opportunities or alter management strategies at existing locations to create opportunities

Strategy 5 Develop approaches to allocate hunting opportunities using special hunt drawings, permit drawings, blind drawings, and other techniques that provide equitable distribution of hunters and harvest

Strategy 6 Construct and maintain wildlife management tools (such as nest boxes and other artificial habitat structures) that support and provide benefits to wildlife on TWRA lands

Issue 3 There is a need to ensure that boating education, media/outreach material and learning opportunities address current and emerging issues.

Strategy 1 Use all available media sources to provide timely information on boating safety

Strategy 2 Strengthen TWRA education/learning opportunities

Strategy 3 Develop programs that address specific topics by using current data to determine what the emerging issues are and share with all groups

Strategy 4 Identify all partners and stakeholders, developing shared ideas to accomplish common goals or expand programs

Strategy 5 Provide avenues for emerging user groups to voice boating concerns to TWRA

Issue 4 There is a need to review laws, rules and regulations, and Agency policy regarding boating safety to ensure the boating public has access to safe and enjoyable waterways.

Strategy 1 Annually review boating enforcement procedures to determine if they meet the needs of the Agency and the public in the current legal environment. Make changes as necessary

Strategy 2 Annually review the Boating rules and regulations and TCA Title 69 to determine if they are addressing the current issues in boating safety and are consistent with federal law. Make recommendations for changes to the TFWC and Legislature as appropriate

Issue 5 User groups compete for the same space and resources.

Strategy 1 Take advantage of wildlife management options and identify available natural resources that have not yet been identified for compatible outdoor recreation

Goal:

To protect and conserve Tennessee's fish, wildlife habitats, and public boating opportunities by providing public safety through proactive and responsive law enforcement services.

History:

Agency law enforcement personnel have continuously played a critical role in both protection and conservation of the State's natural resources. It is well known that the main responsibility of the wildlife officer is to enforce the wildlife and boating laws of the State. What is oftentimes not known by those outside the agency is wildlife officers must possess a minimum of a Bachelor's of Science in wildlife or fish management or a closely related field, thus providing the agency with a robust team of highly skilled and knowledgeable wildlife professionals. In the early days of the TWRW, wildlife officers often provided the manpower necessary to complete major restoration projects such as white-tailed deer and wild turkey. Today they are often called upon to conduct biological surveys as well as provide technical assistance to private landowners. Given their versatility, the wildlife officer continues to maintain a presence in all 95 counties of Tennessee. Likewise, as societal needs and expectations have changed the role of the wildlife officer has expanded to include a general enforcement and public safety presence upon public lands and waterways.

Tennessee's waterways were once used as an important means of transportation by the State's earliest residents. As trade developed, vessels of all description and size utilized the rivers as a means of commerce. As the need for flood control and guaranteed channels for commercial navigation increased, two major Federal Agencies became acutely involved in the management of the State's river systems. The Tennessee Valley Authority and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers impounded streams and guaranteed navigation on the Tennessee, Cumberland, and Mississippi Rivers. Several smaller tributaries were also dammed for flood control, recreation, and hydroelectric power generation. Recreational boating increased as the number of reservoirs increased and in 1965 the Tennessee Game and Fish Commission (now the Wildlife Resources Agency) was designated the sole State Agency charged with managing the State boating program. In that initial year there were 70,899 registered boats. In 1965, a total of 13 accidents were reported including 6 injuries and 2 fatalities. Today, there are over 260,000 registered boats and accidents are averaging 200 per year with fatalities averaging 18 per year. Funding for the Boating program is derived primarily from boat numbering (registration) fees. Other income is generated from a small percentage of the tax on fuel sold at marinas, Federal assistance, fines, and the interest on the boating reserve fund. By law, all boating and wildlife monies must be kept separately and may only be expended within their respective programs. Currently, there are over 84,000 boating safety compliance inspections conducted annually by wildlife officers.

The Tennessee Hunter Education Program (THEP) was established as a formal hunter education program in 1972. Since the Agency's inception, hunting and firearm related accidents in Tennessee have declined dramatically. Hunter safety certification via the THEP is recognized by all states, Canada, and Mexico.

Since 1985, Tennessee has required by law the completion of the THEP as a prerequisite to obtaining a hunting permit in the state for all persons born on or after January 1, 1969. All hunters age 10 and older are required to be in possession of a Hunter Education certificate while in the field, and those under 10 must be accompanied by an adult of at least 21 years of age who has completed the course and who must remain in a position to take immediate control of the hunting device. The course is offered free of charge and consists of a minimum of 10 hours of classroom participation; although most courses generally last 12-16 hours. Students are then required to successfully pass a written examination and a live firing exercise. The course contains instruction on ethics, marksmanship, history of hunting and firearms, wildlife management and identification, laws, knowledge of firearms and ammunition, wilderness survival, emergency first aid, etc. TWRA currently certifies over 15,000 students each year and has certified over 723,000 students since 1972.

A mandatory boating education law was passed in the Tennessee General Assembly in 2004 and went into effect in January 2005. The law affects any Tennessee resident born after January 1, 1989 who operates a vessel alone and who is at least twelve years old. The law requires that a student pass a monitored exam administered by an approved representative of TWRA. In addition, many county libraries across the state administer the exam via a secure Internet web site. Classes are offered across the state by TWRA personnel, School Resource Officers, U.S. Coast Guard Auxiliary, U.S. Power Squadrons, driver education teachers, boy scouts, and many more. TWRA currently certifies over 7,500 students each year and has certified over 79,000 students since 2005.

Objectives:

1. Provide public safety, resource protection, and technical assistance which enhance the public's quality of life.
2. Provide a diverse, well-trained, and equipped professional workforce that is dedicated to wildlife and resource protection which strengthens the Agency's reputation.
3. Enhance the public's outdoor experiences in Tennessee through recruitment, retention, and reactivation.
4. Provide emergency responses during critical incidents such as environmental and natural disasters through mutual aid efforts with our local, state, and federal partners.
5. Develop and enforce needed changes in Tennessee's fish, wildlife, and boating regulations to ensure currency for resource protection and the public's necessities.

OBJECTIVE 1. Provide public safety, resource protection, and technical assistance which enhance the public's quality of life.

Issue 1 Population growth has resulted in increased pressures on resources and has created increased calls for wildlife officer services.

Strategy 1 Prioritize wildlife officers work efforts to meet the increased number of calls for service

Strategy 2 Develop external funding sources to establish full time Sergeant positions and hire additional county officers

Issue 2 Changes in population dynamics have increased the calls for wildlife officer services for nuisance wildlife.

Strategy 1 Establish funding for commissioned nuisance wildlife/captive wildlife positions

Strategy 2 Provide technical advice to private landowners regarding wildlife resource management

Issue 3 Cultural changes have increased the threat to public safety non-related to hunting/fishing/boating showing the need for non-traditional training and equipment

Strategy 1 Identify the need and availability and provide specialized training

Strategy 2 Evaluate the need for specialized investigative teams based on current law enforcement, and criminal trends

OBJECTIVE 2. Provide a diverse, well-trained, and equipped professional workforce that is dedicated to wildlife and resource protection which strengthens the Agency's reputation.

Issue 1 Expected losses in workforce due to retirement may lead to significant loss of institutional knowledge.

Strategy 1 Initiate and implement a succession plan for the Agency's future law enforcement leadership

Strategy 2 Improve the law enforcement hiring process by conducting a more detailed and comprehensive background investigation prior to officer candidate selection to ensure the best candidates are offered positions

Strategy 3 Continue to fund training opportunities with established leadership training academies

Strategy 4 Improve and maintain the initial officer training/indoctrination process to better establish the tenor of a new employee's career as it relates to development of a professional ethos

Issue 2 There is a trend that there are less qualified candidates interested in Conservation Law Enforcement.

Strategy 1 Identify a wider range of degrees that would be acceptable for Wildlife Officer candidates

Strategy 2 Establish recruitment tools to be used at high schools, universities, outdoor shows and other recruitment opportunities

Issue 3 Wildlife Officers encounter a wide variety of user groups which have a higher expectation level of the officer's responsibilities.

Strategy 1 Maintain and improve current law enforcement training

Strategy 2 Identify additional training needs and establish through documentation a training record for all mandatorily commissioned personnel

Strategy 3 Identify and facilitate the use where applicable of non-traditional training opportunities (distance learning) for all enforcement personnel

Strategy 4 Develop a law enforcement website for public access which will highlight officer actions and provide a greater understanding of officer duties

Issue 4 Advancement in equipment technologies is constantly changing and there is a need for officers to stay current with these changes.

Strategy 1 Identify new and replacement equipment needs

Strategy 2 Budget for new and replacement equipment

Strategy 3 Initiate and fund a research and development committee to identify new equipment needs for officers

OBJECTIVE 3. Enhance the public’s outdoor experiences in Tennessee through recruitment, retention, and reactivation.

Issue 1 There is an increased demand for Wildlife Officers to provide outreach programs.

Strategy 1 Provide more opportunities for the public to attend a hunter education course; specifically, increase the number of available hunter education field days

Strategy 2 Increase educational and testing opportunities for boating education through the increased development of a cadre of volunteers

Strategy 3 Coordinate with other agency divisions to provide updated and current educational materials

OBJECTIVE 4. Provide emergency responses during critical incidents, environmental and natural disasters through mutual aid efforts with our local, state, and federal partners.

Issue 1 Activation and deployment of our manpower and assets are a constant unknown.

Strategy 1 Remain an active member in emergency response organizations such as Tennessee Emergency Management Agency (TEMA), Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), Homeland Security Administration (HSLA), etc.

Strategy 2 Establish and monitor activation plans

Strategy 3 Maintain a high level of readiness with our equipment and training

Strategy 4 Conduct annual review of Agency’s operations manual to ensure the Agency’s role is within acceptable guidelines

Strategy 5 Provide advanced incident command system training

Strategy 6 Identify recurring events throughout the State which currently require or are likely to require involvement of agency personnel in the future (concerts, fireworks, races, sporting events etc.) to develop and maintain detailed contingency plans for each event

Issue 2 Constant and emerging technologies in radio communications have superseded available funding.

Strategy 1 Budget future dollars

Strategy 2 Apply for grant funding

Strategy 3 Establish a priority list and criteria to identify locations where communications must be installed and/or replaced

OBJECTIVE 5. Develop and enforce needed changes in Tennessee’s fish, wildlife, and boating regulations to ensure currency for resource protection and the public’s necessities.

Issue 1 Hunting and fishing regulations can be confusing and complicated to the public.

Strategy 1 Conduct annual review of regulations to address areas that could be combined and/or simplified to increase compliance

Strategy 2 Develop platforms that user groups can easily access to obtain current information on regulations

Issue 2 There is a need for wildlife officers to provide informed and educated recommendations for wildlife/fisheries management and public access to Agency-controlled properties and public waters.

Strategy 1 Participate in the Agency’s evaluation and decision-making process

Strategy 2 Present officer recommendations for wildlife/fish management changes through appropriate meetings and season settings

Goal:

Recruit, Retain, and Reactivate hunters, anglers, target shooters, and boaters through quality communications and information as well as relevancy themed communications efforts to educate the public about work that TWRA does to benefit all Tennesseans. To supply the public and agency personnel with a constant flow of information necessary for attaining the management and conservation goals of the Agency, as well as the most current rules and regulations.

Introduction:

The Outreach and Communications (O&C) and Multimedia Divisions work to enhance the Agency's public image by highlighting the quality work of its dedicated, professional staff of Wildlife and Boating Officers, Biologists, Land Managers, and administrative support personnel.

The O&C Division also strives to be a conduit for public information from the various divisions of the Agency. By working with the Wildlife, Fisheries, Law Enforcement and other Divisions within the Agency, O&C has been able to promote Agency messages through news releases, demonstration videos and personal appearances with TV and radio media outlets. The increased popularity of electronic messaging has also become a primary conduit for information sharing. The TWRA's website hosts a wealth of information for anyone interested in learning about Tennessee's wildlife resources. To go along with standard web pages, the site also offers produced educational webcasts, recorded TFWC meetings, access to all of the Agency's big game data, and a complete network of contact information allowing the public to find and reach the best source of wildlife information.

Objectives:

1. Be a constant source of easily accessible and accurate information to the public regarding the Tennessee Wildlife Resources Agency and the management of Tennessee's wildlife resources.
2. Implement and/or facilitate programs to maintain and recruit new stakeholders in Tennessee's wildlife resources.
3. Provide information to the public to enhance and increase their knowledge and participation in outdoor recreational activities such as hunting, fishing, boating, and wildlife watching.
4. Work closely with the Tennessee Wildlife Resources Foundation (TWRFF) and other groups to market various Agency assets and initiatives with a goal of creating revenue to help offset costs.
5. Continue and expand internal agency information sharing
6. Shining a positive light on hunting, fishing, target shooting, and boating to maintain or increase agency relevancy

OBJECTIVE 1. Be a constant source of easily accessible and accurate information to the public regarding the Tennessee Wildlife Resources Agency and the management of Tennessee’s wildlife resources.

Issue 1 The public may not understand or be aware of wildlife management issues and/or outdoor recreational opportunities (e.g., boating, wildlife watching) in Tennessee.

Strategy 1 Develop new and support existing outreach efforts to inform the public about wildlife management issues especially the extrinsic factors that may negatively impact our resources (invasive species, diseases, climate change)

Strategy 2 Use tools such as the Tennessee Wildlife Magazine and Tennessee’s Wild Side TV program to showcase the many facets and scope of the work TWRA does beyond selling hunting and fishing licenses

Strategy 3 Participate in outdoor shows, boat shows, county fairs and other strategic venues that allow our personnel to interact with the public

Strategy 4 Take advantage of public speaking opportunities at schools, civic groups, and other venues

Strategy 5 Offer training (e.g., public speaking) for those TWRA personnel who will be in direct contact with the public

Strategy 6 Consistently assess needs of the Agency and develop printed materials to distribute at venues described above

Strategy 7 Develop and keep current topic-specific presentations depicting specific agency operations, projects, and global initiatives suitable for a variety of community outreach activities

Issue 2 TWRA’s role in managing wildlife and boating in Tennessee is sometimes misunderstood by other government entities.

Strategy 1 Work closely with our legislative liaison to provide tools to inform Senators and Representatives about issues concerning TWRA

Strategy 2 Help with logistical support, audio/visual needs for any events TWRA may host where legislators are invited to attend

Strategy 3 Create specific multimedia projects, as needed, to educate legislators and other political decision makers as issues arise

OBJECTIVE 2. Implement and/or facilitate programs to maintain and recruit new stakeholders in Tennessee’s wildlife resources

Issue 1 As our society becomes more urban, fewer young people get exposed to outdoor activities, or know of TWRA and its mission. Many have no mentor to introduce them to hunting or fishing.

Strategy 1 Conduct human dimension surveys to ascertain which recruitment programs are most successful and to identify potential stakeholders that are yet untapped

Strategy 2 Continue and develop programing aimed at educating potential participants, current participant and lapsed participants in hunting, fishing, and the shooting sports

Strategy 3 Continue and develop targeted promotion to young adults and families to move them to participate in hunting, angling, and the shooting sports

Strategy 3 Continue or develop programs which target individuals interested in the shooting sports (e.g., National Archery in the Schools program and Scholastic Clays Target Program), and that promote knowledge of wildlife and TWRA's mission to teachers and students (e.g., Project Wild)

Strategy 4 Continue to support the rising generations of wildlife professionals by providing volunteer opportunities that educate and give experience in wildlife management practices and principles to university students pursuing conservation majors

Strategy 5 Seek opportunities to present outdoor related programs to school administrators and decision makers to maximize efforts to grow the programs within Tennessee's educational system

Strategy 6 Publicize the urban trout stocking program and other fish stocking efforts

Strategy 7 Continue or develop outdoor related programs which target minorities and other non-traditional user groups (e.g., Becoming an Outdoors Woman)

Strategy 8 Implement a system to allow officers to report local outdoor events so they can be more efficiently advertised to the public

Strategy 9 Use social media to promote events mentioned above and promote the sharing of information with their friends

OBJECTIVE 3. Provide information to the public to enhance and increase their knowledge and participation in outdoor recreational activities such as hunting, fishing, and boating

Issue 1 Outdoor recreation opportunities for stakeholders are often limited by external societal factors such as a general lack of time, multiple jobs, and travel distance from home. TWRA should seek to minimize those barriers to participation.

Strategy 1 Use various media including but not limited to print, television, radio, and internet to showcase the many opportunities we must participate in outdoor recreation

Strategy 2 Strive to present regulations in the simplest and most understandable way

Strategy 3 Generate news releases on a regular basis, informing media outlets about changes in regulations and policies that affect the hunting and angling public

Strategy 4 Increase the delivery of special outdoor recreation events targeted at special times and locations designed to minimize external societal barriers

Strategy 5 Maintain and improve customer service by constantly updating information to personnel answering front-line phone calls, emails, and social media requests from the public

Strategy 6 Develop a budget to buy media such as radio and TV spots to publicize license buying, and encourage participation in outdoor activities

Strategy 7 Continue to produce a webcast of the TFWC meetings, providing the public a window into the decision-making process

Issue 2 Existing TWRA access areas are not completely documented and often not adequately advertised to the public.

Strategy 1 Create and review TWRA access database (to include fishing and hunting access points) for completeness and accuracy at least once per year

Strategy 2 Promote TWRA access database and maps through TWRA's website and other partnering media outlets

OBJECTIVE 4. Work closely with the Tennessee Wildlife Resources Foundation (TWRP) and other groups to market various Agency assets and initiatives with a goal of creating revenue to help offset costs

Issue 1 The Agency lacks the services of a full-time marketing Director.

Strategy 1 Take an active role in the selection of the person who will handle the marketing of TWRA assets as the Foundation Marketing Director

Strategy 2 Work closely with the TWRP Marketing Director and other Foundation staff to help facilitate success

Strategy 3 Conduct strategy and brainstorming sessions aimed at seeking new, innovative marketing ideas on a quarterly basis

Issue 2 There is a lack of information regarding Agency assets that can be marketed.

Strategy 1 Assess complete inventory of Agency assets which have value to a potential corporate contributor (e.g., space in our Tennessee Wildlife Magazine or our hunting/fishing guides and sponsorship of our TV program)

Strategy 2 Work to incorporate this marketing approach within the Agency as we produce future print, TV, web, and other I&E assets

Strategy 3 O&C Chief and Assistant Chief should assist TWRP Marketing Director in developing the overall marketing plan

Issue 3 Allow TWRP to facilitate the production of Agency publications.

Strategy 1 Assess complete inventory of Agency publications with a goal of turning over the production of these to the TWRP

Strategy 2 Allow the dollars generated through the marketing efforts of the TWRP to cover total cost or greatly reduce our costs of production

Strategy 3 Work closely with TWRP to maintain creative control of the editorial content of publications mentioned above

OBJECTIVE 5: Continue and expand internal agency information sharing

Issue 1 Provide materials and avenues for internal communications

Strategy 1 Continue internal publications such as Shoptalk

Strategy 2 Evaluate new technologies and assess their effectiveness in the dissemination of information to employees

Issue 2 Standardize law enforcement news releases

Strategy 1 Standardize the format of all news releases relative to enforcement and or investigatory situations, developing one for both juveniles and adults

Strategy 2 Evaluate and develop a web-based application to provide the required information from field personnel to Multimedia and O&C personnel for time sensitive news releases, and press conferences

OBJECTIVE 6: Shining a positive light on hunting, fishing, target shooting, and boating to maintain or increase agency relevancy

Issue 1 Feature outdoor recreation and work that the agency does on all owned media channels

Strategy 1 Continue to use the Making It Last Toolkit for reaching people that don't hunt or fish

Strategy 2 Use the relevancy roadmap created by AFWA to assist the agency in becoming more relevant to the general populous

Strategy 3 Form internal committee for relevancy/diversity/inclusion tactics to prioritize tactics for the agency to accomplish

Definitions:

Agency	The Tennessee Wildlife Resources Agency. (Defined by T.C.A. 70-1-101)
Big Game	Deer, bear, wild turkey, and all species of large mammals that may be introduced or transplanted into this state for hunting. (Defined by T.C.A. 70-1-101)
Commission	The Tennessee Fish and Wildlife Commission, and "Commissioner" means a member of the Fish and Wildlife Commission. (Defined by T.C.A. 70-1-101)
Conserve	To keep in a safe or sound state; especially to avoid wasteful or destructive use of. (Merriam-Webster)
Enhance	To increase or improve in value, quality, desirability, or attractiveness. (Merriam-Webster)
Executive Director	The executive director of the Tennessee Wildlife Resources Agency. (Defined by T.C.A. 70-1-101)
Fish	All species of trout, salmon, walleye, northern pike, bass, crappie, bluegill, catfish, perch, sunfish, drum, carp, sucker, shad, minnow, and such other species of fish that are presently found in the state or may be introduced or transplanted into this state for consumptive or non-consumptive use. (Defined by T.C.A. 70-1-101)
Fishing	Any effort made to take, kill, injure, capture, or catch any fish and every act of assistance in any effort. (Defined by T.C.A. 70-1-101)
Furbearer	Beaver, raccoon, skunk, groundhog, coyote, gray fox, red fox, mink, muskrat, otter, weasel, bobcat, and opossum, and all subspecies or variations of the foregoing, and any other animals that may be declared by the commission under regulation to be a fur bearer. (Defined by T.C.A. 70-1-101)
Hunting	Chasing, driving, flushing, attracting, pursuing, worrying, following after or on the trail of, searching for, trapping, shooting at, stalking, or lying in wait for, any wildlife, whether or not such wildlife is then or subsequently captured, killed, taken, or wounded and every act of assistance to any other person, but "hunting" does not include stalking, attracting, searching for, or lying in wait for, wildlife by an unarmed person solely for the purpose of watching wildlife or taking pictures of wildlife. (Defined by T.C.A. 70-1-101)
Maintain	To keep in an existing state: preserve from failure or decline. (Merriam-Webster)

Nongame bird	All species of birds not classified as game birds. (Defined by T.C.A. 70-1-101)
Nongame Mammal	All species of wild mammals not classified as big game, small game, or fur bearers. (Defined by T.C.A. 70-1-101)
OHV	Off-highway vehicle
Perpetuate	To cause (something that should be stopped, such as a mistaken idea or a bad situation) to continue (Merriam-Webster)
Protect	To shield from exposure, injury, damage, or destruction: guard. (Merriam-Webster)
Refuge	A specific land or water area, or both, that is established for the protection of one (1) or more species of wildlife with no, or limited forms of, consumptive uses, and limited non-consumptive use to the degree compatible with desired wildlife protection. (Defined by T.C.A. 70-1-101)
Small Game	Furbearers, game birds, swamp rabbits, bullfrogs, cottontail rabbits, fox squirrels, gray squirrels, red squirrels, and all species of small mammals and birds that may be introduced into this state for hunting. (Defined by T.C.A. 70-1-101)
TNSWAP	Tennessee State Wildlife Action Plan
Trapping	Taking, killing, and capturing wildlife by the use of any trap, snare, deadfall, or other device commonly used to capture wildlife, and the shooting or killing of wildlife lawfully trapped, and includes all lesser acts such as placing, setting, or staking such traps, snares, deadfalls, and other devices, whether or not such acts result in taking of wildlife, and every attempt to take and every act of assistance to any other person in taking or attempting to take wildlife with traps, snares, deadfalls, or other devices. (Defined by T.C.A. 70-1-101)
Wildlife	Wild vertebrates, mollusks, crustaceans, and fish (Defined by T.C.A. 70-1-101)
Wildlife Management Area (WMA)	A specific land or water area, or both, that is established for the intensive management of both habitat and wildlife species for optimum enhancement and use by both consumptive and non-consumptive users (Defined by T.C.A. 70-1-101)

Contributors to this Document:

Case and Wallace (2011) concluded that if the Agency were to change from a species-based strategic plan to a habitat-based approach, it must embrace the need for transformational change. It was decided that the best way to get the Agency believing, accepting, and trusting in this new approach is to get everyone involved. Therefore, this document was created from input from all divisions and regions as well as all levels of professional staff. We graciously thank the following contributors:

Akins, Wally (Wildlife and Forestry Division)
Allen, Todd (Captain, Law Enforcement Division)
Applegate, Roger (Wildlife and Forestry Division)
Bishop, Jeff (Captain, Region III, Law Enforcement)
Black, Pat (Fisheries Division)
Boyd, Clark (Region I, Fisheries)
Bramlett, Mike (Fisheries Division)
Broadbent, Tim (Region I, Fisheries)
Brown, Bobby (Environmental Services Division)
Campbell, Josh (Environmental Services Division)
Carter, Bart (Region IV, Fisheries)
Churchill, Tim (Federal Aid and Real Estate Division)
Clark, Michael (Region I, Fisheries)
Colvin, Rob (Environmental Services Division)
Crawford, Don (Multimedia Division)
Dykes, Scott (Environmental Services Division)
Elkins, Joe (Wildlife and Forestry Division)
Elkins, Brian (Major, Region I Law Enforcement)
English, Pandy (Environmental Services Division)
Feddersen, Jamie (Wildlife and Forestry Division)
Fiss, Frank (Fisheries Division)
Flock, Brian (Environmental Services Division)
Ganus, Eric (Fisheries Division)
Gibbs, Dan (Region IV, Wildlife)
Grandstaff, Dale (Captain, Region II, Law Enforcement)
Gudlin, Mark (Wildlife and Forestry Division)
Habera, Jim (Region IV, Fisheries)
Hammonds, John (Region IV, Fisheries)
Hammonds, Shelley (Major, Region IV Law Enforcement)
Harden, Chad (Region I, Wildlife)
Hendren, Wade (Captain, Region I, Law Enforcement)
Henegar, Jason (Fisheries Division)
Henley, Hunter (Region I, Fisheries)
Hollis, Damon (Wildlife and Forestry Division)
Jaynes, CJ (Major, Region III, Law Enforcement)
Jolley, Mike (Region III, Fisheries)
Kelly, James (Wildlife and Forestry Division)
King, Don (Multimedia Division)
Lemons, Patrick (Region I, Wildlife)
Layton, Ben (Region III, Wildlife)
Mike, John (Region IV, Wildlife)
Miller, Brad (Wildlife and Forestry Division)
Moates, Glenn (Lieutenant Colonel, Law Enforcement Division)
Parks, John (Captain, Region II, Law Enforcement)
Parsley, Mike (Outreach and Communications Division)
Penland, Tiffany (Region I, Fisheries)
Pipas, Jim (Region II, Fisheries)
Pyburn, Allen (Region I, Environmental Services)
Rider, Darren (Colonel, Law Enforcement Division)
Roddy, David (Fisheries Division)
Simpson, Chris (Environmental Services Division)
Singer, Nathan (Region II, Fisheries)
Shields, Roger (Wildlife and Forestry Division)
Smith, Mike (Region IV, Fisheries)
Smith, Travis (Region III, Fisheries)
St. John, Todd (Region II, Fisheries)
Taylor, Cape (Lieutenant Colonel, Law Enforcement Division)
Thurman, Mark (Region III, Fisheries)
Todd, Robb (Environmental Services Division)
Wear, Brandon (Wildlife and Forestry Division)
White, Timothy (Federal Aid and Real Estate Division)
Wisniewski, Jenifer (Outreach and Communications Division)
Yoest, Chuck (Wildlife and Forestry Division)

Literature Cited:

- Adams, C.E. and K.J. Lindsey. 2010. *Urban Wildlife Management*. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, USA.
- Black, W.P. 2020. *Tennessee Reservoir Creel Report 2020*. Fisheries Report 12-05. Tennessee Wildlife Resources Agency, Nashville, TN, USA.
- Case, D.J. and G. Wallace. 2011. *Strategic Plan Assessment, A Strategic Plan Assessment for the Tennessee Wildlife Resources Agency*. D.J. Case and Associates. Mishawaka, IN, USA.
- Happ, S.C., Rittenhouse, G., Dobson, G.C., 1940. Some principles of accelerated stream and valley sedimentation. Technical Bulletin No. 695. U.S. Department of Agriculture, , Washington, DC, USA., 133 pp.
- Louv, R. 2005. *Last Child in the Woods*. Algonquin Books, New York, New York.
- Nowak, D.J., J.T. Walton, J.F. Dwyer, L.G. Kaya, and S. Myeong. 2005. The increasing influence of urban environments on US forest management. *Journal of Forestry* 103(9):377-382.
- Nowak, D.J., and J.T. Walton. 2005. Projected urban growth (2000-2050) and its estimated impact on the US forest resource. *Journal of Forestry* 103(9): 383-389.
- Outdoor Industry Association. 2017. *The Outdoor Recreation Economy*.
https://outdoorindustry.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/OIA_RecEconomy_FINAL_Single.pdf
- Schexnayder, S.M. and J.M. Fly. 2012. *Anglers in Tennessee: Fall 2010*. University of Tennessee. Department of Forestry, Wildlife and Fisheries, Knoxville, TN, USA.
- Schexnayder, S.M., A. Griffin and J.M. Fly. 2012. *Nuisance Wildlife in Tennessee: Spring 2012*. University of Tennessee, , Department of Forestry, Wildlife and Fisheries, Knoxville, TN, USA.
- Tennessee Valley Authority. 1980. *Engineering data, TVA water control projects*. Technical monograph #55, Volume 1, parts 1 and 2. Tennessee Valley Authority, Knoxville, TN, USA.
- Tennessee Wildlife Resources Agency. 2006. *Strategic wildlife resources management plan for the start of a new millennium*. Reservoir Plan, Chapter 15. Nashville, TN, USA.
- Tennessee Department of Agriculture. 2010. *Tennessee Forest Resource Assessment and Strategy*. Tennessee Department of Agriculture, Nashville, TN, USA.
- Tennessee Wildlife Resources Agency. 2009. *Climate Change and Potential Impacts to Wildlife in Tennessee*. Tennessee Wildlife Resources Agency, Wildlife Technical Report 09-09, Nashville, TN, USA.
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. 1978. *Project maps and data sheets covering authorized projects*. U.S. Army Engineer District, Nashville, TN, USA.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2016. 2016 National survey of fishing, hunting, and wildlife-associated recreation. Washington D.C., USA.

U.S. Geological Survey. 2003. Water-Resources Investigations Report 03-4264, Reston, VA, USA.

Veni, G, H. DuChene, N. C. Crawford, C. G. Groves, G. N. Huppert, E. H. Kastning, R. Olson, B. J. Wheeler. 2001. Living with karst a fragile foundation. American Geological Institute Environmental Awareness Series 4.

White, E.M., A.T. Morzillo, and R.J. Alig. 2009. Past and projected rural landscape conversion in the US at state, regional, and national levels. *Landscape and Urban Planning* 89:37-48.



Sinking Pond State Natural Area, Coffee County, Tennessee

Tennessee Wetland Program Plan

TN Department of Environment and Conservation



Wetland Program Plan
2019-2025



Tennessee Wetland Program Plan

2019-2025

Funded by a US EPA Wetland Program Development Grant CD OOD09413

Primary Contact:

Jimmy Smith

Jimmy.R.Smith@tn.gov

***Manager, Natural Resources Unit
Division of Water Resources***

Jennifer Dodd
Director, Division of Water Resources
TN Department of Environment and Conservation

5-16-19
Date

Acknowledgements

The Tennessee Wetland Program Plan (TN WPP) is a visioning document designed to outline program goals and objectives the state of Tennessee would like to accomplish in the next six years. This is a voluntary plan built around the US EPA Core Element Framework (CEF) and funded by the USEPA Region 4 through a Wetland Program Development Grant facilitated by Diana Woods of the US EPA.

The TN WPP is the collaborative result of state and federal agencies, a wide array of stakeholders, non-governmental organizations, universities, and consultants. In 2014 TDEC's Division of Water Resources held a summit bringing together stakeholders from across the state to offer the citizens an opportunity to broadly outline the priorities of the TN WPP within the CEF. The results of that summit are presented here in this document.

Primary contributors include Caitlin Elam, Vena Jones, Mike Lee, Meghan Ploch, Jimmy Smith, Robert Wayne, Debbie Arnwine, Jason Dees, Amy Fritz, Mark Jordon, Michelle Owenby, and Chip Walton with the TN Department of Environment and Conservation (TDEC).

Volunteers from the summit who comprised the working groups that developed the outline for this document include, John McFadden, Tennessee Environmental Council; Sally Palmer, The Nature Conservancy; Mekayle Houghton, Cumberland River Compact; Sharon Kington; Dennis Gregg, Obed Watershed Community Association; Nick Biasini, Ducks Unlimited; Dana Wright, Tennessee Clean Water Network; Ben Brown, Rita Thompson, and Brandon Chance with TN Department of Transportation; Tom Roberts, Tennessee Tech University; the Nashville District US Army Corps of Engineers; Rob Todd, TN Wildlife Resources Agency (TWRA), and Robbie Sykes with the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS).

Finally, TDEC would like to thank the numerous citizens, practitioners, and academics that came to discuss and provide suggestions during the 2014 summit.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	3
Executive Summary.....	5
2019-2025 Tennessee Wetland Program Plan	5
Core Element 1: Monitoring and Assessment.....	6
Introduction	6
Goals	6
Monitoring and Assessment Activities	8
Objective I:	8
Objective II:	11
Objective III	13
Current Monitoring and Assessment Tools:.....	15
Core Element 2: Regulatory Tools.....	19
Introduction	19
Goals	20
Regulatory Tools.....	24
Objective I	24
Objective II	24
Objective III	28
Core Element 3: Volunteer Restoration and Protection.....	32
Introduction	32
Goals	32
Volunteer Wetland Restoration and Protection.....	33
Objective I:	33
Core Element 4: Water Quality Standards	35
Introduction	35
Goals	35

Water Quality Standards for Wetlands36
Objective I.....36

Executive Summary

2019-2025 Tennessee Wetland Program Plan

The Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation (TDEC) Division of Water Resources' Wetland Program Plan (TN WPP) is designed as an implementable and iterative document focused on building aquatic resource program capacity through action.

Tennessee has a wealth of water resources with over 60,000 miles of rivers and streams, more than 570,000 lake and reservoir acres and at least 787,000 acres of wetlands. Protection of these streams, rivers, reservoirs and wetlands requires efficient use of Tennessee's resources.

TN WPP Goals

- Establish a scientifically based monitoring and assessment strategy
- Encourage collaboration with potential partners
- Operate a strong regulatory program
- Promote volunteer restoration projects
- Develop defensible water quality standards for both streams and wetlands

The state of Tennessee considers stakeholder input to be a priority. Therefore, the Division of Water Resources (the Division or DWR) views the need for a Wetland Program Plan as an opportunity to collaborate with other stakeholder groups from private and public sectors to enhance the strength and stability of our program. In 2014, stakeholders from state and federal agencies, universities, and non-profits came together in a day-long summit to map out and prioritize actions for DWR based on EPA Core Elements. Stakeholders identified priorities from a predetermined list proposed by DWR. Each priority and action item connected to the US EPA Core Element Framework. In addition, volunteers formed working groups that built on our short term objectives by outlining specific actions and additional steps we might take to solidify our Core Element foundation.

This document reflects the progress the Division has made to reach the objectives of EPA Core Elements prior to this Plan and the priorities which are the action items of this Plan for the next six years.

Core Element 1: Monitoring and Assessment

Introduction

Monitoring is the systematic observation and recording of current and changing conditions, while assessment is the use of that data to evaluate water resources to support decision-making and planning processes. Wetlands and streams can be characterized both by their condition and by functions. Wetland and stream



Lacustrine fringe wetlands with American lotus Reelfoot Lake State Park, Lake County, Tennessee


condition is the *current state* as compared to reference standards for physical, chemical, and biological characteristics of these features. Functions represent the *processes* that characterize wetland and stream ecosystems.

Goals

The Monitoring and Assessment Working Group evaluated the goals and objectives of the current grant and reflected on the progress reached over the last decade to map out objectives for streams and wetlands concerning monitoring and

assessment over the next six years. Strategic priorities for improving monitoring and assessment of wetlands focused on evaluating existing resources. The Division goals are to continue to build and refine our **wetlands identification, classification, and assessment** and **tracking methods**, maintain, enhance and develop our **database** capacity for delineated and reference wetland locations and data throughout Tennessee, and **establish baseline data and criteria for high quality and valuable wetland sites**. The primary purpose is to create a foundation and framework for future monitoring and assessment of wetlands. DWR staff will crosswalk these priorities with the CEF objectives to establish our proposed action items for the next 6years.

The Wetlands Working Group also evaluated the goals and objectives concerning streams and identified priorities for creating **functional assessments, enforcement and compliance** of impact and mitigation sites, and **solid success criteria**. These goals were accomplished in 2018. This has allowed DWR to refocus monitoring and assessment efforts on streams to validate the tools and success criteria developed during the 2013-2018 WPP cycle. Strategic priorities for improving monitoring and assessment of streams will be focused on validating newly developed tools and protocols. The primary purpose is to create a foundation and framework for future monitoring and assessment of the physical characteristics of streams to complement our water quality and biological monitoring. DWR staff will crosswalk these priorities with CEF objectives to establish our proposed action items for the next 6years.



Monitoring and Assessment Activities

The Division will strive to develop monitoring and assessment programs for wetlands and streams by defining and establishing methods and procedures to determine reference conditions, wetland and stream quality, track ecological and hydrological changes through time, and store data associated with field procedures. DWR staff will seek to establish baseline stream and wetland information and expand on aquatic resource reference data that includes resource extent, condition, function, temporal changes, relative resource value, and trends over time. In addition, other wetland monitoring and assessment techniques created, utilized, and tested by southeastern states within the same physiographic provinces as Tennessee will also be evaluated for use in expanding Tennessee’s monitoring program.

Objective I: Develop a monitoring and assessment strategy consistent with *Elements of a State Water Monitoring and Assessment Program for Wetlands* (EPA, 2006) that states and tribes can use to manage wetlands according to their objectives.

Action: The primary goals for wetlands are baseline data collection, storage and analysis, and defining a methodology to inform a future monitoring strategy. The overarching theme is to collect baseline data in order to define “reference condition” in Tennessee from ecological, water quality, and landscape context perspectives for wetlands.

Action: The primary goals for streams are to integrate newly established morphological assessment methodologies into TN’s Water Quality and Monitoring Program. Create an annual schedule of assessment, document the results, and update assessment protocols as needed.

Specific Activities:

- Continue to participate in the EPA’s National Wetland Condition Assessment in Tennessee to build equipment capacity, contribute to national wetland data to inform national standards, and learn nationally recognized methods to allow for comparable data to be collected through state efforts [2020]
- Identify high quality reference standard wetlands in conjunction with state, federal, and non-profit partners to use in an ecoregionally based sampling effort [2025]
- Work with partners to locate and document additional reference wetland sites to further calibrate and investigate established wetland assessment methods (e.g. TRAM, TVARAM, Floristic Quality Assessment) for efficacy and sensitivity to regional variation within the state [2020]
- Refine and promote Tennessee reference wetland site selection methodology and a process of reference site identification review to ensure repeatability [2025]



Materials used for vegetation monitoring plot sampling

Wetland Program Plan
2019-2025

- Locate and collect intensive sampling data from permanent plots in target reference wetland types which will include both common and uncommon wetland communities to aid in reference standard development and encourage wetland species richness and ecological diversity which will correlate with ecological resiliency [2025]
- Identify other internal and external agencies to promote partnerships with to collect stream and wetland assessment data for mutual benefit [2025]
- Adopt a Tennessee wetlands natural community non-HGM classification system and associated reference site data through online publication [2019]
- Evaluate correlation between wetland soils, hydrology, vegetation and quality of condition to refine resource value assessments and mitigation success criteria and methods at reference sites [2025]
- Disseminate reference site data for streams and wetlands through the development of geospatial and/or online tools. [2022]
- Evaluate data sources for geospatial data and models to investigate a landscape scale evaluation and tracking of wetlands in Tennessee [2025]
- Facilitate a mutli-agency team to review existing databases, and investigate the potential for a centralized database of protected lands[2020]
- Facilitate a mutli-agency team to review existing databases, and investigate the potential for a centralized database of wetland features[2020]
- Promote investigations of pollinator assemblages in various wetland ecological systems and associations [2025]



National Wetland Condition Assessment monitoring
Mississippi Valley Alluvial Plain, Shelby County, Tennessee

- Establish stream riparian vegetation monitoring and assessment protocol that will complement the TN Stream Quantification Tool (TN SQT) riparian vegetation parameter [2021]
- Obtain baseline data for stream riparian vegetation at established ecomorphological reference sites. [2022]
- Obtain bedform diversity reference data for bedrock channels and Highland Rim systems. [2021]
- Evaluate hydrology parameters and expand measurement methods in the TN SQT. [2020]
- Promote potentiometric surface mapping in reference stream valleys to gain a better understanding of groundwater hydrology contributions and implications for climate resiliency. [2025]
- Refine rapid ecomorphological monitoring methods for inclusion into established Water Quality Monitoring Program. [2022]
- Coordinate with DWR Watershed's unit to work on incorporating ecomorphological monitoring during assessment cycle [2023]
- Establish a formalized stream ecomorphological methodology for use in the Water Quality Monitoring Program that is a companion to the methods outlined in the TN SQT. [2024]

Objective II: Implement a sustainable monitoring program consistent with the streams and wetlands monitoring strategy

Action: The primary goal for wetlands in Tennessee will be to build a knowledge base, build a stakeholder and partner base, consistently store collected data for future use, and evaluate potential methods for efficacy and effort level in order to be prepared when a wetland monitoring program can be fully implemented.

Action: The primary goal for streams in Tennessee will be to develop a system for storing collected ecomorphological data for future use. Establish reference data sets for stream riparian vegetation and bedform of carbonate dominated channels and validation of the newly developed TN SQT assessment methods

and develop training. Establish additional ecomorphological reference sites and build a reference data set with partners throughout the state.

Specific Activities:

- Establish internal agency focused wetland trainings on wetland delineation skills, state regulations, and wetland resource value determination [2020]
- Continue to populate and enhance functionality of a database of reference wetland site data and location information in conjunction with national standards that will be useable by other agencies or entities that work with wetlands in Tennessee [2025]
- Continually identify sites and accept outside site suggestions that can be repeatedly sampled as part of State, Regional, and National monitoring networks [2025]



Pollinator on wetland dependent netted chain fern
Hampton's Crossroads, White County, Tennessee



USFS Cherokee National Forest rare Southern Appalachian Seepage Wetland "Bioblitz" biological inventory with TDEC, Nature Conservancy, and TWRA Shady Valley, Johnson County, Tennessee

- Refine the assignment of wetlands to a categorical scale such as "good", "fair", or "poor" to qualify wetland condition and assess the appropriate mitigation based on the condition and resource value determination [2025]
- Continue to participate in the EPA's National Wetland Condition Assessment and other state and federal wetland inventories to build data and capacity [2020]

- Encourage the consistent documentation of locational/spatial information for all wetlands delineated through permit applications and investigate geospatial methods for tracking wetland area along with location [2025]
- Evaluate and/or develop tools to quantify landscape condition including isolation, connectivity, forest cover, and land use category [2020]
- Investigate modeling of wetland locations and condition based existing geospatial datasets (e.g. Heritage species data, NRCS hydric soils, National Elevation Data or LiDAR, National Wetlands inventory data). Partner with other organizations to investigate modeling efforts [2025]
- Validate the TN Debit Tool functional loss ranges on impact sites through monitoring and assessment of permitted activities [2024]
- Validate functional lift of all known historic compensatory mitigation sites with the TN SQT [2025]
- Evaluate all ecoregion reference sites for ecomorphological functions using newly developed assessment methods [2025]
- Develop ecoregionally based reference data on bedform metrics in bedrock dominated channels [2023]
- Develop ecoregionally based reference data sets for riparian vegetation [2021]
- Develop ecoregionally based reference data sets for hydrology [2025]
- Train regulatory community on how to use the newly developed TN SQT for monitoring and assessment of impact sites and compensatory mitigation sites. [2020]
- Establish a georeferenced database of all ecomorphological reference sites [2021]
- Encourage the consistent documentation of locational/spatial information for all ecomorphological reference streams [2023]

Objective III: Incorporate monitoring data into agency decision-making

Action: The primary goal for streams and wetlands in Tennessee will be to identify aquatic resource stakeholders within and outside of TDEC and actively disseminate products, data, and information to those stakeholders through trainings, meetings and other appropriate venues to encourage the use of data for decision making, collaboration, consistency and sustainability as well as learn from other stream and



Nashville Basin Limestone Glade and Woodland wetland with state listed endangered Yellow Sunnybells Cedars of Lebanon State Park, Wilson County, Tennessee

wetland stakeholders to further refine TDEC methodology. TDEC will also begin to use available data to analyze gaps in stream and wetland protection in Tennessee.

Specific Activities:

- Establish internal agency focused wetland trainings on wetland delineation skills, state regulations, and wetland resource value determination [2020]
- Establish internal agency focused stream ecomorphological trainings to enhance skills, enforcement of state regulations, and stream resource value

determinations [2019]

- Implement the use of assessment data to support regulatory permitting and mitigation decisions and continue the collection reference site data to support mitigation targets and inform the Interagency Review Team when reviewing projects [2019-2025]
- Investigate wetland and stream mitigation bank service area coverage gaps and solutions [2020]
- Evaluate data storage and processing methods for long term storage through existing databases and RDA's [2020]
- Refine the assignment of wetlands to a categorical scale such as "good", "fair", or "poor" to qualify wetland condition and assess the appropriate mitigation based on the condition and resource value determination [2025]

- Facilitate a multi-agency team to review existing databases, and investigate the potential for a centralized database of protected lands[2020]
- Facilitate a multi-agency team to review existing databases, and investigate the potential for a centralized database of wetland features[2020]
- Refine data storage and data dissemination of reference stream and wetland sites to correlate with Exceptional Tennessee Waters and enhance data collection capacity [2025]

Current Monitoring and Assessment Tools:

Wetland assessment is currently conducted by DWR in support of the Anti-degradation Rule (0400-40-03-.06). Applicants applying for coverage under an Aquatic Resource Alteration Permit (ARAP) to alter wetlands must submit a wetland delineation completed by a wetland scientist utilizing the United States Army Corps of Engineers 1987 Wetland Delineation Manual and the applicable Regional Supplement. The Division may then conduct an assessment of the wetlands resource using the Tennessee Rapid Assessment Methodology (TRAM) for wetlands that was developed and refined through past and current Wetland Program Development grants. This assessment is used as a rapid analogue to determine the condition of the resource relative to a reference standard. Information on the condition of the wetland is then used to evaluate a proposed impact justification and assess mitigation needs such as the priority of proximity. Wetland Program Development Grant funded training has provided cursory training to TDEC field office staff, who verify wetland delineations and are the first to observe field conditions at potential impact sites, in both wetland delineation methods and proper use of the TRAM. Due to high turnover and a predominance of stream ecology backgrounds additional more intensive trainings would be extremely valuable for wetland assessment moving forward.

DWR is using the Tennessee Rapid Assessment Methodology (TRAM), developed through a Wetland Program Development Grant by Tennessee Technological University, to rapidly determine the condition of a wetland in the field based solely on hydrogeomorphic classification (Appendix 1 -TRAM Document). Classifying the wetland using the hydrogeomorphic (HGM) approach has the additional benefit of contributing to a thorough understanding of how landforms and hydrologic regimes interact to create and maintain wetlands, and to the functions the wetland performs. The procedure was designed to be used by regulatory personnel and wetland consultants in the Section 401/404 permitting process for regulated projects reflecting the wetland condition at the current point in time. Data from reference sites collected using standard HGM methods are used as the standard against which other wetlands are compared using this method which produces a quantitative score on a scale of 1-100, representing relative condition. The reference sites used to develop this protocol are currently located throughout central and western Tennessee. Most of the sites are located on public lands at places such as Arnold Air Force Base, Hatchie National Wildlife Refuge, Black Swamp Wildlife Management




National Wetland Condition Assessment soil sampling
East Gulf Coastal Plain Northern Seepage Swamp,
Henry County, Tennessee

Area, and numerous state parks, natural areas, and wildlife management areas. The reference sites are few, are all forested wetlands, and these sites were not selected based on ecoregion. Despite the paucity of reference standard baseline data collection locations this assessment method has proven to be very rapid, effective and accurate but still only captures a broad overview. The TRAM has been proposed by the IRT and Army Corps of Engineers to use to determine functional lift and restoration targets, however, this method was not designed for this use and is meant to be a “snapshot” of current condition based on on-site and external influences and variables. This highlights the need for baseline data that can be used for restoration targets and assist with functional lift predictions for mitigation credit

generation. These data can be collected and analyzed with the help of stakeholder partners as part of the monitoring and assessment objectives of TDEC.

Previous Wetland Program Development Grants provided DWR with needed wetland identification and rapid assessment training to field staff, produced guidance and tracking for mitigation projects, created a database to track wetland permitting data, and developed a protocol for identification of as well as began documenting wetlands that qualify as Exceptional Tennessee Wetlands in accordance with TDEC rules.

TDEC seeks to further establish capacity, methods and procedures necessary to monitor, compile and analyze data on the current and target conditions of wetlands in Tennessee and, in so doing, expand the reference site calibration for the TRAM as well as determine appropriate conservation priority and restoration target data for the full diversity of wetland ecological types in Tennessee. Data collected will be used to calibrate the Tennessee wetland assessment of 303d waters and to determine what assessment methods are most appropriate for the various regulatory functions performed by TDEC. Establishment of a standardized ecological assessment methodology based on the NatureServe National Vegetation



Classification System based dichotomous key to and descriptions of the *Reference Wetlands of Tennessee* 1st draft developed through the current Wetland Program Development Grant to complement the HGM methodology will aid in the collection of a robust and ecoregionally accurate data set as well as collaboration with and the contribution of other governmental and non-governmental organizations (Appendix 2 – TN Reference Wetlands key and ecological classification). When a wetlands assessment method has been accepted by TDEC and appropriately calibrated the Division will collect wetland monitoring data on an established schedule. Improved integration with other applicable programs

will provide more comprehensive water quality protection through monitoring and assessment along with regulation, restoration and protection, mapping, planning, and education/outreach.

TDEC intends to implement the three-tier framework for wetlands monitoring and assessment suggested by EPA concurrently and over time. These are described in the Core Element Framework as follows:

Level 1 or landscape assessments rely entirely on GIS data, utilizing landscape disturbance indices to assess wetland condition. This approach involves characterizing the lands that surround wetlands through the use of landscape metrics (e.g., percent forest cover and land use category). Assessment results can provide a coarse gauge of wetland condition within a watershed.

Level 2 or rapid assessments use relatively simple metrics to assess wetland condition. They are customarily based on the readily observable hydrogeomorphic and plant community attributes of wetlands. They also can employ the use of a "stressor checklist." Rapid assessment methods typically produce a single score that describes where a wetland generally falls along a gradient of human disturbance and with respect to ecological integrity.

Level 3 or intensive site assessments provide a more thorough and rigorous measure of wetland condition by gathering direct and detailed measurements of biological taxa and/or hydrogeomorphic functions. Two examples of the type of indicators that might be used in Level 3 assessment are plant composition/structure and soil organic matter content.



Monitoring well and IRIS tube soil hydrology study
NRCS study site, Coffee County, Tennessee

Assessment activities at all three levels will be effectively integrated with other surface water monitoring efforts such as stream or habitat assessments, providing a more integrated understanding of watershed health and a foundation for developing more effective management approaches. TDEC's focus during the initial stages of developing a monitoring and assessment program is to set standards for assessment comparison by finding a robust set of reference locations and to collect baseline data through a combination of Level 2 and Level 3 assessments. Data collected in databases developed to store these data will be georeferenced and can be used to contribute to a broad

Level 1 assessment in the future when the baseline data, software, and staff or contractors are available to TDEC through grants or collaborations. Also sampling and developing data storage methods will create a foundation for future assessment work as the program grows. Meanwhile, other programs such as the Tennessee Wildlife Resources Agency State Wildlife Action Plan analyses can be used as a surrogate for a Level 1 tier activities specific to wetlands and water resources. Evaluation of the potential data sources is part of the TDEC Level 1 objectives.

Core Element 2: Regulatory Tools

Introduction

The Division has a long history of resource protection in the state. Throughout the past forty years the Division has worked to protect and ensure the future of water


resources in Tennessee. The Water Quality Control Act was the initial step in that protection. The purpose of the act is to recognize waters of the state held in public trust, exert legal authority over those waters, and restore and maintain those waters. Through the Act and supporting rules, TDEC takes an active role in regulating aquatic resource impacts. The Division manages and protects these resources, in part, through permitting (Aquatic Resource Alteration Permits and 401 Water Quality Certification). These regulatory tools give the state authority to require compensatory mitigation and ensure “no net loss” of resources and resource value occurs. Current and past EPA WPDG efforts have enabled the state to build on and broaden our regulatory scope. Recently the Division recognized the need for updated stream and wetland compensatory mitigation guidelines along with enforcement and compliance of mitigation sites. These program deficiencies are a central theme of our action steps for this Core Element.

Goals

The Regulatory Tools working group evaluated the goals and objectives of the current grants and reflected on the progress reached over twenty years to map out objectives for streams and wetlands concerning regulatory tools. The strategy for building on and refining our current regulatory tools focuses on compensatory mitigation for streams and wetlands. The working group placed the highest priority on improving compensatory mitigation by **developing solid, regionalized success**



criteria. These success criteria should be built into **functional assessments.** Finally, the working group ranked mitigation follow up as a priority. **Compliance on mitigation sites** was important, including developing protocols for **site inspections during the monitoring phase.** These priorities will be cross walked with Core Element objectives to establish our proposed action items for the next 6 years.



Definition of the jurisdictional scope of the program: The State’s regulatory program has a dual implementation strategy. TDEC operates a CWA Sect. 401 Water Quality program that requires federal permits and licenses to receive certification from TDEC before receiving CWA Sect. 404 coverage and the state has developed laws requiring ARAP permits for impacts to aquatic resources. State regulatory tools concerning alterations to streams and wetlands often extend state review to resources and activities not regulated under the Clean Water Act. TDEC jurisdictional coverage of aquatic resources is clear and concisely outlined in these rules for both streams and wetlands.

Administration of regulatory activities: The Division outlines regulated activities, limitations for authorization, and regulatory requirements for permit coverage through a series of rules, policy, and guidance documents. These documents include Water Quality Criteria (designated uses, water quality standards, and anti-degradation), Aquatic Resource Alteration Permits (ARAP), and Stream Mitigation Guidelines. To

identify regulated aquatic resources applicants are required to determine the jurisdictional status of a feature. For streams, applicants use the Hydrologic Determination methodology. For wetlands, they must submit a wetland delineation completed by a wetland scientist utilizing the United States Army Corps of Engineers 1987 Wetland Delineation Manual and the applicable Regional Supplement.

Currently stream and wetland impact data is stored in Waterlog, the Division's assessment tracking software. Sites for each impact to waters of the state (e.g. streams and wetlands) are documented and data on

hydrologic determinations for these resources are also documented. In 2015 the Division reissued our Aquatic Resource Alteration General Permits. These permits effectively outlined new thresholds for de minimis degradation. Coverage under a General Permit does not require mitigation. The Division also improved the language of specific permit conditions, added to the list of authorized activities, and coordinated with stakeholders on determination of these limitations.

Our Wetland Program Development Grant enabled the Division to critically evaluate our program requiring compensatory mitigation, guidance for mitigation,



Wetland violation leading to successful corrective action
Clifty Bog, White County, Tennessee

Eastern Highland Rim Prairie and Barrens wetland
May Prairie State Natural Area, Coffee County, Tennessee



assessments used to determine credits and debits, and how this aligned with our permitting rules. We have been working diligently to improve all aspects of compensatory mitigation. Over the past two years the Division has been working to create regulatory updates to compensatory mitigation. New thresholds have been established for when mitigation is needed and

where mitigation should occur. The Division has recently issued guidance for cumulative impacts in a Common Plan of Development. An in-system mitigation policy has been developed. We have also been working closely with the IRT for multi-agency consensus on compensatory mitigation requirements and have begun to gather data for success criteria regionalization efforts.

Evaluation, inspection, and enforcement of regulatory activities to ensure environmental results: Our well-developed program works to re-evaluate process, limitations, agency coordination, guidance and regulation on a regular basis. We are currently in a cycle of regulatory update needs. TDEC plans to compose a comprehensive Application Guidance Document that details all of the current limits and procedures that have been updated in the past year. We are working to develop comprehensive policy documents that outline de minimis threshold limitations in special situations, clarify how Anti-degradation applies to stream and wetland impacts and modernize our compensatory mitigation guidelines. Finally, it is critical that the division make these documents accessible to the public, train TDEC employees on how to apply these regulatory tools, and officially implement them in the permitting process.

Follow-up for these regulations, enforcement, inspection, and compliance of sites, is also a focus of our regulatory program. The state has room to improve on the

overall effectiveness and public perception of our mitigation compliance requirements. We plan to focus on compliance monitoring and enforcement efforts to ensure site performance and bring underperforming sites into compliance. The division views this aspect of mitigation a critical piece of an effective mitigation program. Further, these efforts help to support the goal of “no net loss” of aquatic resources and deter permit violations from the added risk of enforcement.

Regulatory Tools

Objective I: Clearly define the jurisdictional scope of the program

Action: DWR has recently updated our application and permitting limitations. New guidance for the public, Division staff, and other agencies will provide clear guidance on how to identify jurisdictional waters, what activities require authorization, and thresholds for compensatory mitigation.

Schedule of Achievement: 2025

Specific Activities:

1. Develop an application guidance document that outlines specific regulated activities, including activities covered under general and individual permits, de minimis thresholds, Anti-degradation evaluations, and when compensatory mitigation is required. This document will be accessible online through TDEC’s website [2020]
2. Release and implement updated stream mitigation guidelines [2019]

Objective II: Administer regulatory activities efficiently and consistently

Action: TDEC has recently re-evaluated the 401 regulatory processes and determined there was a high need for permit consistency. The division is working on formalizing a suite of policy documents that outlines a clear and effective set of criteria for review and assessing permits, determining cumulative impacts, requirements for compensatory mitigation, and when impacts are required to be offset in-system.

Schedule of Achievement: 2025

Specific Activities:

- Continue to evaluate and create policies in collaboration with federal agencies concerning authorized impacts that will provide regulatory consistency. [2025]
- Investigate a standardized and defensible water resource assessment unit and scale statewide for use in assessing cumulative impacts on a sub-watershed scale (e.g. partnering with USGS to delineate HUC-14 scale waterbodies) [2025]
- Establish internal agency focused wetland trainings on wetland delineation skills, state regulations, and wetland resource value determination [2020]

Action: State programs often work with local communities for economic development, improve system wide water and wastewater infrastructure, and address issues like flooding. Frequently, the permitting process becomes a regulatory hurdle for communities needing assistance. Lack of early coordination among agencies, programs and industry groups can slow down the process. The division aims to coordinate with state programs to ensure a streamlined permitting process for applicants and ensure appropriate protection of aquatic resources.

Schedule of Achievement: 2025

Specific Activities:

Wetland Program Plan
2019-2025


- Continue collaboration with State Revolving Fund, NPDES, and other units within TDEC to map out the roles and responsibilities of these units within the Division of Water Resources for permitting activities and coordinate with other agencies and departments including Economic and Community Development, National Resource Conservation Service, Tennessee Valley Authority, U.S Army Corps of Engineers and others. This coordination will improve the timelines and permitting process for applicants.

[2023]

- Evaluate how projects move through the department and build a framework for a streamlined permitting process with transparency. This transparency will highlight what DWR programs are authorizing and how those activities have consideration for, and compliment the rules and guidance of all State of Tennessee programs. [2023]

Action: DWR will update our stream compensatory mitigation guidelines. Compensatory mitigation has been a requirement to offset losses of aquatic resources from permitting activity for nearly 20 years. The division established stream mitigation guidelines in 2004. Recent advancement in restoration science, the 2008 Federal Compensatory Mitigation rule and need for a significant improvement in success of mitigation sites highlights the needs for guideline updates.

Schedule of Achievement: 2019



Specific Activities:

- Investigate pre and post impact effects for specific categories of impacts to continue to validate the TN Debit Tool and establish no net resource loss thresholds [2025]
- Develop an application guidance document that establishes thresholds for appreciable loss of water resource value and *de minimis* degradation by activity. [2020]
- Continue to work with the TN IRT to implement financial assurance documentation on mitigation projects. [2025]
- Continue to work with the TN IRT to implement and enhance recently developed checklists and guidance for minimum requirements for review criteria concerning compensatory mitigation. [2025]
- Continue to work with the TN IRT to implement and enhance Stream and Wetland Mitigation Guidelines, incorporating documents developed with the IRT. [2025]
- Incorporate potential updates for reference standards in the TN SQT [2020]
- Develop specific criteria for Permittee Responsible Mitigation that is required at the state level only through the 2019 Stream Mitigation Guidelines [2019]
- Refine and regionalize mitigation performance standards and success criteria through stream and wetland reference site data collection and analysis [2020]
- Develop performance standards on compensatory mitigation sites for stream hydrology [2025]

Action: The division currently tracks all permits requiring coverage using an Oracle platform. We plan to improve our database format for inputting and tracking compensatory mitigation projects. These updates will enable real-time tracking and provide a broad view of historic activities.

Schedule of Achievement: 2020

Specific Activities:

- Develop a geospatial database cataloging protected lands including mitigation sites 2006- present [2020]
 - Continue to convert site information entered from Nov of 2014-present into a mitigation application on the Division's Oracle database.

This will allow for a comprehensive review of mitigation sites and monitoring requirements. [2019]

- Track historic sites to determine if condition and acreage associated with mitigation are successful; validate conditions using recent assessment methodology. Identify sites with inadequate property protection instruments to provide opportunity to external partners for long-term oversight or protection. [2021]
- Update Waterlog to improve state-facing and publicly accessible tracking system for impacts and mitigation. [2019]

Objective III: Evaluate Regulatory Activities to Ensure Environmental Results

Action: TDEC proposes to improve our evaluation of regulatory activities to ensure proper implementation of permit conditions and successful environmental results.



Cobalt crayfish in wetland Montgomery Bell State Park, Dickson County, Tennessee

Schedule of Achievement [2025]

Specific Activities:

- Continue to improve success criteria for compensatory mitigation sites using regionalized success criteria stratified by ecoregion and covering multiple stream functions [2020]
- Improve internal monitoring review consistency by generating functional oracle application to track pending report review. [2019]
- Design data management tool that will automatically track mitigation monitoring report due dates and issue auto-generated reminder emails to permittees for improved compliance tracking. [2020]
- Administer and regularly update publicly accessible tracking system for impacts and mitigation [2020]
- Investigate incorporating mitigation data into a public geospatial data viewer.

Wetland Program Plan
2019-2025

- Investigate the development of a public interface application which allows public involvement by reporting potential violations. [2020]
- Develop internal guidance document(s) to establish standard activity based mitigation success criteria and permit conditions [2021]
- Develop internal guidance document(s) to clarify processes in permittee responsible mitigation site inspection, permit compliance and enforcement actions. [2019]

Action: Implement enforcement and compliance mechanisms to evaluate mitigation and monitoring compliance, and administer an enforcement protocol to ensure appropriate aquatic resource protection.

Schedule of Achievement [2025]

Specific Activities:

- Train environmental field office staff of mitigation inspection methods for permittee responsible mitigation sites. [2019]
- Coordination with Environmental Field Offices to implement post-construction site monitoring inspection checklist. [2019]
- Conduct pilot projects for mitigation sites on year-one and final-year of monitoring to measure implementation and result of permits. [2021]
- Utilize monitoring and assessment data to examine which conditions or performance standards need additional focus during monitoring period to avoid enforcement actions. [2021]
- Schedule routine inspections and appropriate enforcement mechanisms to deter permit violations. Track number of mitigation sites visited, percent of monitoring reports reviewed and percent of monitoring reports submitted to prioritize enforcement actions and populate compliance status to ensure environmental results. [2021]
- Improve compliance and enforcement consistency by identifying defensible enforcement pathways and procedures, and coordination division's enforcement unit. [2020]
- Investigate new remote monitoring methods such as the use of unmanned aerial vehicle (UAVs) for mapping and data collection of mitigation sites. [2020]

Action: Ensure impact assessments and mitigation crediting lead to replacement of aquatic resources with similar structural, functional or condition attributes. The division has a goal of adopting and regionalizing functional assessments as part of our compensatory mitigation guidelines for streams and wetlands.

Schedule of Achievement [2025]



Specific Activities:

- Continue to participate in the EPA's National Wetland Condition Assessment in Tennessee to build equipment capacity, contribute to national wetland data to inform national standards, and learn nationally recognized methods to allow for comparable data to be collected through state efforts [2020]
 - Identify high quality reference standard wetlands in conjunction with state, federal, and non-profit partners to use in an ecoregionally based sampling effort [2025]
 - Work with partners to locate and document additional reference wetland sites to further calibrate and investigate established wetland assessment methods (e.g. TRAM, TVARAM, Floristic Quality Assessment) for efficacy and sensitivity to regional variation within the state [2020]
- Refine and promote Tennessee reference wetland site selection methodology and a process of reference site identification review to ensure repeatability [2025]
- Work with the IRT to investigate methodologies to determine wetland and site restoration potential [2025]
- Regionalize additional functional assessment parameters based on available data and needs; this will be an iterative process as statewide data becomes available. [2019-2025]]

Wetland Program Plan
2019-2025

- Analyze data collected at ecomorphological reference sites for habitat, macroinvertebrates, and physiochemical field parameters. Determine what parameters may correlate. [2020]
- Develop database of baseline data on stream ecomorphological reference sites to inform and improve success criteria for compensatory mitigation. [2020]
- Locate and collect intensive sampling data from permanent plots in target reference wetland types which will include both common and uncommon wetland communities to aid in reference standard development and encourage wetland species richness and ecological diversity

Action: Measure environmental results.

Schedule of Achievement [2025]

Specific Activities:

- Validate stream ecomorphological sampling methodology for evaluation of sites for ecological success. [2019-2025]
- Start tracking of sites monitored and establish level of compliance. [2019]
- Develop a mechanism to track increases/decreases of monitored sites compliance levels over time, i.e. are more sites or less sites in compliance over time [2020]
- Improve TDEC's enforcement of aquatic resource protections; create a framework of action steps for permit writers to take when a violation may have occurred. [2020]
- Establish a dedicated position or 50% time of employee dedicated to enforcement and compliance of permittee responsible mitigation projects [2023]
 - Outline prioritized sites
 - Develop E & C site visit forms
 - Establish protocols
 - Establish benchmarks for quantity of sites visited annually
 - Establish bench marks for EFOs that is dedicated to enforcement and compliance inspections on minor mitigation projects
 - Establish baseline timeframes for project compliance

Core Element 3: Volunteer Restoration and Protection

Introduction

The EPA definition of wetland restoration is the manipulation of a degraded wetland to improve the physical, chemical and/or biological characteristics such that the system may return to its natural functions. These systems help limit flooding in communities, contribute to and moderate groundwater for base flow, help control erosion, and assimilate nutrients. Voluntary efforts to restore and protection these important resources are those that the division promotes outside of statutes or regulations. These volunteer protection, re-establishment, and rehabilitation sites help stem the loss of aquatic ecosystems and create a gain in natural spaces. These efforts are also beneficial in developing public/private partnerships with agencies that share mission goals of resource conservation. Wetland protection can aid in state education and outreach goals on the benefits of wetlands. Volunteer efforts to protect natural wetland systems have the added benefit of providing critical habitat and breeding grounds for fish, birds, amphibians, and a host of other organisms. Proper wetland restoration can return targeted plant communities to historic ranges. These efforts can in the protection of state species listed as threatened, endangered, and deemed-in-need of

management.




TWRA and TDEC Division of Natural Areas joint Mill Creek crayfish stream survey with volunteer partners Nashville, Davidson County, Tennessee

Goals

The division proposes to clearly and consistently define volunteer restoration and protection goals throughout the state and track the progress of these resources over time. We plan to create a distinct policy of protection and restoration for Tennessee wetlands. TDEC plans to accomplish this through agency partners will collaborate with TDEC to

develop guidance, GIS overlays, and priority areas for wetland protection.



Volunteer Wetland Restoration and Protection

Objective I: Clearly and consistently define restoration and protection goals throughout state or tribal territory.

Actions: Establish goals that are consistent or compatible across relevant agencies.

Schedule of Achievement [2025]

Specific Activities:

- Develop multi-agency body to coordinate protection efforts. [2023]
- Develop an official volunteer protection of wetlands mission statement that is vetted with TDEC policy office and is distributed to other agencies for comment. [2020]

Wetland Program Plan
2019-2025

- Connect volunteer protection webpage with other agencies that have programs that promote the protection, conservation and restoration of wetlands. [2019]
- Partner with universities to gather information on wetland locations, classification, and biological data [2025]



Lakewood wetland mitigation site and city greenway
Cumberland River floodplain, Davidson County, Tennessee

Action: Consider watershed planning, wildlife habitat, and other objectives when selecting restoration/protection sites.

Schedule of Achievement [2025]

Specific Activities:

- Create a prioritized list of vulnerable or important wetland ecological systems and specific sites through interagency collaboration. [2025]
- Gather data with the intent of establishing GIS layer representing prioritized areas. This information could be used in the regulatory process. [2020]
- Implement consideration of watershed planning, wildlife habitat, resource rarity and other objectives when reviewing sites [2025]

Core Element 4: Water Quality Standards

Introduction

In the state of Tennessee the Water Quality Control Act, T.C.A., § 69-3-101, et seq., makes it the duty of the Board of Water Quality, Oil and Gas to study and investigate all problems concerned with the pollution of the Waters of the State and with its prevention, abatement, and control; and to establish such standards of quality for any Waters of the State in relation to their reasonable and necessary use as the Board shall deem to be in the public interest; and establish general policies



Dragonfly in headwater wetland
Big South Fork National Recreation Area,
Pickett County, Tennessee


relating to pollution as the Board shall deem necessary to accomplish the purposes of the Act. The Water Quality Criteria general considerations and criteria shall be used to determine the permissible conditions of waters with respect to pollution and preventative or corrective measures required to control pollution in various waters or in different sections of the same waters. These standards provide a scientific basis for the division's regulatory tools, monitoring, assessments and restoration potential relating to stream functions. Tennessee is required to have specific water quality standards and designated uses for all classes as part of the criteria for streams. The division does not have specific water quality standards for wetlands. The state

considers wetlands as waters of the state. However, the division has not adopted an official definition for wetlands. The state also lacks wetland use classifications for surface waters.

Goals

The division views these numeric criteria as integral to water quality based pollution control. Therefore, through support from the EPA, DWR is prepared to better define wetland specific standards for the state of Tennessee through the collection of

baseline data. TDEC will work to adapt and adopt definitions and, potentially, use classifications and insert them into the state Water Quality Criteria during the next triennial review period. The working group prioritized working on understanding the **hurdles for establishing criteria, reference reach data, and defining Exceptional Tennessee Waters.**



Water Quality Standards for Wetlands

Objective I:

Ensure that wetlands are treated as waters within the state and tribal water quality programs. Actions related to rule changes would be presented for Board consideration at the next triennial review of Water Quality Standards.

Action: Enhance capacity for adopting new state definition of wetlands

Schedule of Achievement [2025]

Specific Activities:

- TDEC will work with the Board to propose a narrative definition, congruent with the federal definition, of wetlands which is as follows: *Wetlands are those areas that are inundated or saturated by surface or ground water at a frequency and duration sufficient to support, and that under normal circumstances do support, a prevalence of vegetation typically adapted for life in saturated soil conditions. Wetlands generally include swamps, marshes, bogs, and similar areas.* [2021]
- TDEC will identify TDEC rules where wetlands are and are not mentioned and provide recommendations to leadership as to how wetlands can be included in Tennessee regulatory water quality standards. [2020]
- TDEC proposes to investigate qualifiers for classified uses that outline wetland functions as a narrative in our water quality standards. These functions may be, but are not limited to:[2021]
 - Groundwater Recharge/Discharge
 - Flood Flow Alteration
 - Sediment Stabilization
 - Sediment/Toxin Retention
 - Nutrient Removal/Transformation
 - Ecological Diversity/Abundance
 - Recreation
- Investigate possible qualitative narrative criteria that describes the condition/function that must be achieved to support a designated use(s). This narrative criteria may be determined through the calibration of rapid assessment scores for wetlands to a categorical scale such as "good", "fair", or "poor" to indicate their condition and assist with use support [2020]
- Continue to document and establish reference wetland sites and store reference wetland data for use in the development of wetland criteria [2020]
- Collaborate to collect baseline data to provide a scientific basis for numeric criteria based specific values for chemical, physical, and biological wetland parameters through participation in the National Wetland Condition Assessment and other grant funded partnerships. [2025]

TENNESSEE WILDLIFE RESOURCES AGENCY



2017

TWRA WILDLIFE LEGACY PLAN



October 2017

State of TN Grant Tracking #32801-00761

PREPARED BY

THE NATURE CONSERVANCY



Tennessee Wildlife Resources Agency
2017 Wildlife Legacy Plan
Final Report

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements.....3

Executive Summary.....5

Introduction.....6

 Wildlife Habitat Conservation in Tennessee – For the People and Our Economy
 Wildlife Legacy Plan – Purpose and Rationale
 Plan Development Leaders and Stakeholders
 Plan Goals, Objectives and Intended Uses
 Plan Relationship to TWRA Strategic Plan 2014-2020

Methods.....10

 Technical Assessment Approach
 Stakeholder Review

Summary of TWRA Priority Wildlife Habitat Protection Needs.....12

 Maps and Acreage Summaries
 Description of Notable Regional Wildlife Habitat Protection Priorities
 Information Gaps and Additional Data Considerations

Citations.....18

Appendices.....19

 APPENDIX 1. GIS Assessments Designed Specifically for TWRA Wildlife Legacy Plan
 APPENDIX 2. TWRA Wildlife Legacy Plan GIS Metadata Sources and Descriptions
 APPENDIX 3. Priority Protection Area Maps - Statewide and by TWRA Region

Recommended Citation:

Tennessee Wildlife Legacy Plan Team. 2017. TWRA Wildlife Legacy Plan. Tennessee Wildlife Resources Agency and The Nature Conservancy. Nashville, TN.

Acknowledgements

The Tennessee Wildlife Resources Agency's (TWRA) Office of the Director and Federal Aid & Real Estate Division acknowledge the following individuals who contributed time and expertise to the 2017 TWRA Wildlife Legacy Plan process:

Core Planning Team

Tim Churchill, Project Lead, TWRA Chief, Federal Aid & Real Estate Division
Gabby Lynch, Project Manager, The Nature Conservancy (TNC) Director of Protection
Sally Palmer, TNC Director of Science & Policy
Joey Wisby, TNC GIS Manager

TWRA Project Team Members

Greg Wathen – UEGCPO Landscape Conservation Cooperative Coordinator
Bill Reeves – Biodiversity Division Chief (retired)
Pandy English – Assistant Chief of Biodiversity
Jeanette Jones – GIS Operations Manager
Brandon Simcox – Streams, Rivers & Trout Coordinator
Joy Sweeney – Wildlife Management Area Coordinator
Regional Wildlife Diversity Coordinators:

Region I - Rob Colvin

Region II - Josh Campbell

Region III - Chris Simpson

Region IV - Scott Dykes

Regional Wildlife Program Managers:

Region I – Jim Hamlington

Region II – Richard Kirk

Region III – Kirk Miles

Region IV – John Mike

The Nature Conservancy Project Team Members

Alex Wyss, Director of Conservation Programs
Cory Holliday, Cave & Karst Program Director
Jeff Fore, West TN Program Director
Corey Giles, Agriculture/Stewardship Manager
Brittany Hoback, Wetland Ecologist

Land Acquisition Partners

Keith Cole & Ryan Hall, Wolf River Conservancy

Emily Parish & Stephen Kirk, The Land Trust for Tennessee

Christie Henderson, Tennessee Parks & Greenways Foundation

Mike Butler & Chris Roberts, Tennessee Wildlife Federation

Ralph Knoll, The Conservation Fund

Executive Summary

Protecting and restoring Tennessee's diverse and scenic wildlife habitats bring positive impacts to our economy and our citizens' quality of life. Public opinion research shows time and again that Tennesseans - and our out-of-state visitors - want expanded services and funding for outdoor recreation, hunting, and fishing opportunities (Southwick Associates, Inc. 2007 and Weigel & Metz 2015). The state's outdoor recreation sector provides many tens of thousands of jobs and billions of dollars in direct and indirect revenue annually (Land and Water Conservation Fund Coalition 2017).

The Tennessee Wildlife Resources Agency's (TWRA) mission is to preserve, conserve, manage, protect, and enhance the fish and wildlife of the state and their habitats for the use, benefit, and enjoyment of the citizens of Tennessee and its visitors. To achieve that mission, TWRA employs a suite of wildlife habitat conservation tools, including restoration of degraded ecosystems, land and easement acquisition, private lands habitat protection initiatives, State Wildlife Action Plan (SWAP) implementation, and public education.

For over a decade, TWRA has relied upon two primary data sources when prioritizing its wildlife habitat conservation projects: the SWAP and the Tennessee Heritage Conservation Trust Fund: Preliminary Assessment of Needs (HCTF). As the passage of time has rendered some of this data obsolete, TWRA sought a new prioritization tool to incorporate the best available science and Geographical Information Systems (GIS) mapping of important wildlife habitats across the state. From October 2016 until October 2017, TWRA contracted with The Nature Conservancy (TNC) to facilitate an internal TWRA planning process and create a multi-tiered GIS data package. Divisional and regional TWRA staff participated, and a nongovernmental partners review session was conducted to solicit external feedback.

The resulting 2017 TWRA Wildlife Legacy Plan (TWLP) will guide TWRA's wildlife habitat conservation project selection, pursuant to the agency's Strategic Plan 2014-2020. The TWLP's foundational data layers still include both SWAP and HCTF information, although the SWAP information is now updated to the 2015 plan edition. 2015 SWAP updates include the expansion of statewide mapping efforts to include priority problems affecting habitats, the identification of Conservation Opportunity Areas, integration of climate change vulnerability assessments, and the targeting of priority conservation actions with both government agency and non-governmental organization (NGO) partners. The TWLP also connects wildlife habitat conservation with human co-benefits such as drinking water supply and ease of public access to both hunting and non-hunting outdoor recreation venues. The TWLP is intended to serve the TWRA Federal Aid & Real Estate Division for a period of 10 years.

Introduction

Wildlife Habitat Conservation in Tennessee – For the People and Our Economy

From the Mississippi bottomlands in the west to the Great Smoky Mountains in the east, Tennessee contains a wealth of biological diversity, freshwater resources, wild forestlands, grasslands, native and endemic animals and plants, and subterranean cave and karst communities. Our state's wildlife habitats are not only known for their beauty - just as importantly, residents and non-residents alike want access to them for enriching, outdoor recreation activities. In these times of shrinking open space, rising population, public health awareness, and accelerated economic development, Tennessee's natural assets will continue to play a critical role in our quality of life.

Public opinion research shows time and again that Tennesseans want expanded services and funding for outdoor recreation opportunities. A 2007 survey of Tennessee residents rated the loss of wildlife habitat as the second most severe problem facing the state's fish and wildlife resources, behind the top-ranked and related issue, water quality (Southwick Associates, Inc.). In a 2015 statewide survey that randomly polled 600 registered Tennessee voters, four out of five (80%) respondents supported the Tennessee Legislature dedicating additional funds for conservation. From the period between 2012-2014, one in three Tennessee voters purchased a hunting or fishing license (Weigel & Metz 2015).

The positive impacts of wildlife habitat conservation are economic as well as social. The 2011 National Survey of Fishing, Hunting, and Wildlife-Associated Recreation found that in 2011, Tennessee residents and non-residents spent:

- \$2.9 billion on wildlife-related recreation
- \$1.1 billion on fishing-related activities
- \$494 million on hunting-related activities
- \$943 million on wildlife-watching activities (food, lodging, transportation, equipment, materials, dues, etc.)

In addition to outdoor recreationists' direct spending impacts, Tennessee's outdoor recreation venues support 83,000 jobs generating over \$2.5 billion in salaries and wages (Land and Water Conservation Fund Coalition 2017).

Purpose and Rationale

For over a decade, the Tennessee Wildlife Resources Agency's (TWRA) Federal Aid & Real Estate Division has relied upon two primary sources when considering wildlife habitat conservation opportunities: the 2005 and 2015 State Wildlife Action Plans (SWAP) and the 2006 Tennessee

Heritage Conservation Trust Fund Act of 2005: A Preliminary Assessment of Needs (HCTF). While both sources have maintained their relevance over time, several factors contributed to TWRA's decision to conduct a new planning project internal to the agency: the 2017 TWRA Wildlife Legacy Plan:

- Portions of the HCTF plan and its underlying data foundations have become outdated;
- The SWAP misses certain habitat protection project assessment criteria that are important to TWRA divisional and regional personnel;
- TWRA land conservation projects are often reactive rather than proactive, therefore;
- To practice the utmost fiscal responsibility when investing State resources in land and water conservation, new TWRA conservation projects should be justifiable by the best available scientific data and Geographic Information Systems (GIS) mapping.

From October 2016 to October 2017, TWRA contracted with The Nature Conservancy (TNC) to facilitate Project Team planning meetings in order to produce a TWRA Wildlife Legacy Plan (TWLP) that incorporates the agency's highest priority habitat protection criteria with the best available science. This contract will benefit the citizens of Tennessee by providing the TWRA with a habitat conservation blueprint based upon highest priority conservation and recreation values. The TWLP will provide advanced GIS tools from which new habitat conservation projects may be prioritized to provide the best outcomes for wildlife, sportsmen, non-hunting recreationists, and habitat. The TWLP is intended to serve the TWRA's Federal Aid & Real Estate Division for ten years (2017-2027).

Plan Development Leaders and Stakeholders

TWRA and TNC designed a team process focused on the following objectives:

- Take advantage of TWRA's statewide staff skills and competencies;
- Engage TWRA divisional and regional leadership;
- Solicit feedback from TWRA's key, nongovernmental land conservation partners.

A Core Planning Team comprised of TWRA Federal Aid & Real Estate Division Chief and key TNC staff facilitated two, day-long planning sessions with the larger Project Team in October 2016 and February 2017. The Project Team consisted of 19 TWRA and TNC staff representing all TWRA Regions and multiple areas of expertise, including: fisheries, game and nongame species, caves & karst, wildlife management area operations, GIS, and regional wildlife conservation initiatives. The Core Planning Team then convened an external, nongovernmental partners' plan review meeting in August 2017.

TWLP stakeholders external to TWRA include:

- Tennessee Fish & Wildlife Commission

- Tennessee State Legislature
- Public & private funders of wildlife habitat conservation projects;
- Nongovernmental organizations that partner with TWRA to achieve its fish and wildlife conservation objectives
- Tennessee resident and non-resident outdoor recreationists

Plan Goals, Objectives and Intended Uses

An overarching TWLP goal statement was developed by the Project Team at its first of two planning sessions, conducted in October 2016:

Use the 2017 TWRA Wildlife Legacy Plan to create larger, connected blocks of priority wildlife habitats.

The following objectives were articulated as part of the overarching TWLP goal, and these objectives guided the team’s choices and application of available spatial data layers:

- Protect and expand existing TWRA Wildlife Management Areas;
- Connect existing public lands base to best bolster Tennessee’s natural lands’ ability to adapt to a changing climate;
- Increase protection of habitats for threatened and endangered species, species of Greatest Conservation Need, and notable habitat types;
- Increase opportunities to expand the restoration of priority habitats;
- Invest TWRA resources in high-recreational-value lands that align with TWRA’s ability to manage them, and;
- Enable the incorporation of drinking water and water quality values into the habitat conservation decision-making process.

The primary intended use of the TWLP is to provide the TWRA Federal Aid & Real Estate, Wildlife, and Fisheries Divisions with an updatable habitat conservation project prioritization tool that integrates the best available science with the agency’s internal land ownership and management goals, pursuant to the TWRA Strategic Plan 2014-2020. Other uses of the TWLP include but are not limited to:

- Ensure fiscal responsibility when investing State resources in new wildlife habitat conservation projects by justifying each project’s merit, using the best available scientific data and connection to TWRA’s Strategic Plan;
- Facilitate clear communication with the Tennessee Fish & Wildlife Commission, State of Tennessee Real Estate Asset Management Division, Tennessee State Building

Commission, and Tennessee State Legislature regarding TWRA's habitat conservation activities;

- Foster greater and more highly leveraged collaboration with TWRA's nongovernmental land conservation partners.

Plan Relationship to TWRA Strategic Plan 2014-2020

The TWLP effort helps to address two of TWRA's core functions as defined in the agency's current Strategic Plan: Wildlife Resource Management and Outdoor Recreation. Related to the Wildlife Resource Management function, the Strategic Plan identifies the following seven major habitat types:

- Forestlands
- Grasslands
- Wetlands
- Karst (Caves)
- Streams & Rivers
- Impoundments
- Urban

The data presented in this TWLP report is organized around three of these major natural habitat types – Forestlands, Grasslands and Wetlands. The methodology utilized in identifying the land-based conservation priorities incorporates both karst and watershed-based attributes related directly to species and habitat conservation values (see Section II, Methods). This process allows for the identification of terrestrial areas which make important contributions to the health of Karst and Streams & Rivers habitats so that protection with the potential to improve the ecological integrity of those habitats can be readily identified.

To address TWRA's Outdoor Recreation mission, the project team described the need to improve our understanding of where Tennessee's citizens have access to different recreational areas, especially those places providing hunting and fishing access. The recreational access data compiled for the TWLP project, in addition to a new mapping assessment of public lands and their driving distance access to citizens (see Appendix 1), will help TWRA and its partners determine where more land protection investments can help improve public access for recreational opportunities.

Methods

Technical Assessment Approach

After establishing the overall project goal and primary objectives, the Project Team completed two phases of discussion to identify the criteria and spatial datasets that would form the foundation for identifying priority habitat conservation areas. In addition, the team identified a suite of secondary data layers which will be highly useful for describing the co-benefits of TWRA's habitat conservation efforts. For an example of co-benefits, protecting drinking water supplies is not a primary mission for TWRA; however, having information on drinking water sources available as part of the TWLP data package allows the agency to identify when a habitat conservation project may offer the additional benefit of assisting in the protection of a watershed that provides drinking water resources.

Another example of a secondary data layer is with respect to the available datasets defining "special wildlife or habitat focal areas," *e.g.*, quail. While conserving land to assist in the protection of wildlife is part of TWRA's core mission, several datasets defining these areas are regional in scale and are intended to be interpreted broadly. They tend to cover large acreages of land, and not all of this acreage would be realistically targeted for State resources. These spatial coverages are also provided as part of the overall TWLP data package but are not incorporated into the foundational priority maps. Table 1 provides a summary of the criteria and data layers chosen by the Project Team for foundational and secondary, or co-benefit, purposes.

The habitat priorities identified in the 2015 Tennessee State Wildlife Action Plan (SWAP), which foster biodiversity and climate change resiliency values for terrestrial, karst, and aquatic systems, were chosen as the foundational criteria for TWLP conservation priorities (Tennessee State Wildlife Action Plan Team 2015). Since the publication of the 2015 SWAP, TNC developed a scoring method for combining the biodiversity and resiliency scores into a single metric. This single scoring process allows for areas of land to be identified as habitat conservation priorities either for their existing biodiversity value or expected capacity to foster habitat resilience given projected precipitation and temperature changes (Tennessee State Wildlife Action Plan Team 2015). A major benefit of this approach is that many areas of natural habitat in Tennessee remain under-surveyed by biologists, and gaps exist in documented biodiversity values. The methodology for this scoring method is described in Appendix 1.

The Project Team also emphasized the importance of understanding the current state of public lands access, particularly for Tennessee citizens. To address these questions, TNC developed a new spatial assessment approach to identify where and what type of public lands are available for recreational purposes, with an emphasis on hunting vs. non-hunting recreational access. The methodology for this assessment is provided in Appendix 1.

Table 1. TWLP foundational and secondary mapping criteria. Metadata and source details are provided in Appendix 2.

Criteria	Summary of Criteria & Data Sources
2015 Tennessee State Wildlife Action Plan Areas of Biodiversity Significance	Biodiversity and climate resilient habitat priorities as defined in the 2015 TN SWAP were chosen as the foundational base map criteria. Data is summarized in two ways – overall Conservation Priority on a Low to Very High 5-class score; and Priority Land, which includes any area rated High or Very High.
Special Wildlife or Habitat Focal Areas	Secondary data layers including the 100-year floodplain maps, priority headwater stream zones, Great River Birding Trail Sites, Least Tern Islands, Important Stream Fisheries, Bluffs, Important Aquatic Habitat Areas, West TN Priority Lakes, Elk Restoration Zone, and Quail Focus Areas.
Fishing Access Points	Secondary data layer, provided by TWRA Fisheries Division.
Public Lands Access	Secondary data layer. This assessment identifies access to public lands for various recreational purposes within a 75-minute driving range. Public lands are rated by general type of access & recreational opportunity (<i>i.e.</i> state park vs military land), as well as by hunting vs non-hunting uses. The number of acres/person available in an area is also summarized.
Public Drinking Water Supply Protection	Secondary data layers, including information on well point and buffer locations, source water point locations including Zone A and Zone B buffers.
Urban Population Growth Zones	Secondary data layer. Boundaries defined by Tennessee cities and counties to delineate the expected footprint of future development in their respective jurisdiction(s).
Probability of Alternative Resource Development Patterns	Secondary data layers from the Appalachian Landscape Conservation Cooperative.
State of Tennessee Water Quality Data	Secondary data layer from the 2014 State of TN 303(d) water quality information.
Complete Inholdings within TWRA Property	Secondary data layer developed by identifying those parcels wholly contained within an existing TWRA ownership boundary.

Stakeholder Review

In August 2017, the Core Planning Team hosted an external, nongovernmental partners meeting that included five organizations selected by the Federal Aid & Real Estate Division Chief. These long-term, partner organizations fulfill key partnership roles for TWRA by assisting the agency’s statewide wildlife habitat conservation activities. In attendance were staff representing: Wolf River Conservancy, the Land Trust for Tennessee, the Tennessee Parks & Greenways Foundation (TennGreen), the Tennessee Wildlife Federation, and The Conservation Fund. In addition to providing feedback to the Core Planning Team’s TWLP data package and plan narrative, multiple missing data sets were identified for inclusion.

Summary of TWRA Priority Wildlife Habitat Protection Needs

Maps and Acreage Summaries

Determining where additional public lands investments are needed to help protect habitat conservation values and ensure public access also requires an understanding of how much habitat is currently in some type of protected status and where those lands are distributed across the state. Tables 2, 3 and 4 provide this summary information organized by ownership and the three classes of the priority natural habitats identified in TWRA's 2014-2020 Strategic Plan: Forestlands, Grasslands, and Wetlands.

At present, about 7%, or just over 2 million acres, of Tennessee is classified as public land across all categories (local, state, & federal). There are also approximately 145,000 acres of privately held protected conservation land (Table 2). The definition of "privately protected conservation lands" being used in this context covers those lands which are currently held by non-governmental conservation groups or otherwise have some form of legally binding instrument (such as a conservation easement) intended to preserve natural resource conservation values on the property.

The acreage values provided in Tables 3 and 4 are summaries of the priority habitat conservation lands displayed visually in the maps accompanying this report (see Appendix 3). As explained in more detail in Appendix 1, the TWLP scoring system identifies any land acreage which scores either High or Very High in habitat conservation value. A location is captured as a priority with a High or Very High score in any one of the four categories – terrestrial, aquatic, or karst biodiversity, or landscape feature resiliency. The accompanying geospatial data provided with this report allows a user to identify what specific category or categories are contributing to a given location's High or Very High score.

When looking strictly through a conservation priority lens, over 8.5 million acres of non-public lands across Tennessee's landscape provide significant conservation resource values for native species and wildlife habitats (Tables 3 and 4). This information highlights the gap between our current public and privately held conservation lands (at approximately 2.2 million acres) and the overall conservation need. The data also suggests that both increased public land conservation and management, combined with conservation-oriented management practices on privately held lands, will be critical to ensuring Tennessee's native species and habitats are conserved into the future. The long-term conservation of wildlife species also averts federal restrictions pursuant to the Endangered Species Act, because once species are placed on the list, both public and private landowners are subject to land use limitations if a covered species' habitat is present.

The TWRA Strategic Plan 2014-2020 and the 2015 SWAP also discuss the conservation value of lands in agricultural production as cropland or pastureland and those acreages in "old field" or successional land cover types which are generally recovering forest habitats. These land cover types are classified as "semi-natural" and are not included in the Tables 2, 3 and 4 summaries.

Together these land types cover approximately 9.6 million acres of Tennessee’s landscape, and 1.7 million – or 17% -- of these lands also have documented conservation value because of their important connections to high quality stream and river habitats, wetlands, grasslands or nearby forestlands. While lands in active production are not necessarily habitat conservation priorities, this data emphasizes the importance of implementing high-quality land management practices which can complement species and habitat conservation objectives.

TWRA can use the TWLP to help clarify where public lands conservation promotes the agency’s Wildlife Resource Management and Outdoor Recreation core functions in the context of existing public and privately held lands in Tennessee. In addition, TWRA and its many conservation partners can use the TWLP to help define where more emphasis is needed to help private landowners make conservation-oriented investments on their properties to promote healthy habitats, species populations, and other important resource values such as water quality.

Table 2. Overview of existing public and private protected lands acreages. *Note that the total TWRA Regional Jurisdiction acres equal the land area within Tennessee’s political boundary.

TWRA Region	TWRA Regional Jurisdiction Acres	Public Protected Lands (Municipal, State, Fed)	Privately Protected Conservation Lands
I	8,054,710	344,990	9,143
II	7,502,778	177,575	33,407
III	6,094,683	587,219	52,944
IV	5,322,951	926,811	49,293
Total Acreages	26,975,122*	2,036,596	144,787

Table 3. Overview of priority conservation acreages not in public ownership, summarized by major habitat type, as distributed across TWRA’s Administrative Regions. *Note that the GAP 2001 ecological systems categorized as “Natural Sparsely Vegetated” are organized within the “Forested Rock Outcrop” habitat group in the TWRA 2014-2020 Strategic Plan.

		Priority Conservation Acreages, Non-public Lands				
Major Habitat Type	Major Natural Habitat Sub-type (GAP 2001)	Total Statewide Acreage	TWRA Region I	TWRA Region II	TWRA Region III	TWRA Region IV
Forestlands						
	Natural Forest	7,751,772	1,303,067	2,352,321	2,485,001	1,611,383
	Natural Sparsely Vegetated*	10,214	224	2,574	6,578	837
Grasslands						
	Natural Savanna	117,917		117,917		
	Natural Grassland	58,391		48,215	10,168	7
Wetlands						
	Natural Wetland	533,191	392,188	26,039	59,135	55,829
	Natural Riverine	92,373	33,766	10,621	25,093	22,893
Total Acreages		8,563,858	1,729,245	2,557,688	2,585,975	1,690,949

Table 4. Overview of priority conservation acreages not in public ownership, summarized by major habitat type, as distributed across Tennessee’s terrestrial ecoregions. *Note that the GAP 2001 ecological systems categorized as “Natural Sparsely Vegetated” are organized within the “Forested Rock Outcrop” habitat group in the TWRA 2014-2020 Strategic Plan.

		Priority Conservation Acreages, Non-public Lands						
Major Habitat Type	Major Natural Habitat Sub-type (GAP 2001)	Total Statewide Acreage	MS Alluvial Plain	Upper East Gulf Coastal Plain	Interior Low Plateau	Cumberland Plateau & Mountains	Southern Ridge & Valley	Southern Blue Ridge
Forestlands								
	Natural Forest	7,751,772		618,085	3,408,758	1,970,647	1,310,211	444,071
	Natural Sparsely Vegetated*	10,214			5,148	4,355	498	214
Grasslands								
	Natural Savanna	117,917			117,917			
	Natural Grassland	58,391			58,383			7
Wetlands								
	Natural Wetland	533,191	74,256	305,411	56,221	32,414	55,931	8,958
	Natural Riverine	92,373	11,496	8,729	42,511	2,487	23,816	3,333
Total Acreages		8,563,858	85,752	932,225	3,688,939	2,009,903	1,390,456	456,583

Description of Notable Regional Habitat Conservation Priorities

Forestlands and wetlands are the predominant habitats of conservation need across the state in terms of overall extant acreages, with specific regional differences. Wetlands and floodplain conservation in west Tennessee within the Mississippi River Alluvial Plain and the Upper East Gulf Coastal Plain ecoregions will be critical to maintaining the wildlife and biodiversity values, as well as water quality and quantity, in the region. The forestland habitats of the Central Hardwood region in the Interior Low Plateau and the forests of the Cumberland Plateau & Mountains support populations of many significant wildlife species and species of Greatest Conservation Need as identified in the 2015 Tennessee State Wildlife Action Plan. While smaller in extant acreages across the state, Tennessee’s native grassland and savanna habitats have extremely high conservation values and should be a focus of conservation efforts across the state, particularly in the Interior Low Plateau ecoregion of middle Tennessee.

Information Gaps and Additional Data Considerations

While the spatial information used in this planning effort is comprehensive, both data gaps and attributes of the selected data can contribute to the absence of locations from the prioritization scheme. For example, the 2015 SWAP incorporated the most recent data available from the Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation (TDEC) regarding the distribution of plant species of Greatest Conservation Need. However, the 2015 Tennessee SWAP team recognized that the incorporation of both plant and animal species records into the SWAP databases is a dynamic and continuous process which should be guided by the results of ongoing field surveys. Data gaps in plant and animal species observations can contribute to a lower priority score of a given location at the time of the TWLP planning effort. This issue can be especially acute for locations containing remnant grassland habitats, which have the potential to harbor high biodiversity values. Examples of locations exhibiting these data challenges include grassland remnants in Robertson and Montgomery counties as well as eastern Coffee County.

As previously discussed, the TWLP effort is aligned with TWRA's 2014-2020 Strategic Plan, which is the agency's first habitat-based planning approach to managing and protecting Tennessee's wildlife resources. An important element of the plan is a vision statement that emphasizes the significance of both wildlife populations and habitats fulfilling diverse ecological roles. Incorporating ecological community types and plant biodiversity data in the TWLP prioritization helps achieve the agency's vision of accounting for the many ecological roles and functions wildlife habitats provide; indeed, the health of our state's forests, grasslands, and other natural communities is inextricably linked to the health of our wildlife populations.

The decision to use natural land cover types as the habitat priority definitions for the TWLP also influences which locations exhibit a priority score in the final maps. The agricultural areas surrounding remnant grassland or prairie barren habitats - for example, the Bark Camp Fork Barrens Wildlife Management Area in Coffee County - may have lower conservation priority scores, because cropland and pastureland are semi-natural habitat types. However, lands adjacent to this particular WMA are a recognized priority for TWRA's Region II personnel. Another example of where this land cover attribute situation may occur is the landscape surrounding the Elk Valley wetlands complex in Campbell County.

A third and particularly notable example is the Elk River watershed in southern middle Tennessee. The Elk River watershed is a highly biodiverse freshwater system and a conservation priority for TWRA and many partners (Tennessee State Wildlife Action Plan Team 2015). A substantial percentage of the land cover type in the watershed is in cropland and pasture, both of which are semi-natural land cover types. Therefore, on the TWLP maps and data summaries, these semi-natural land cover types in agricultural production would not be displayed as habitat conservation priorities. It is important to note that the lack of identification as a TWLP priority in no way reflects on the biodiversity significance of the river and many of its tributaries. The Elk River watershed is an excellent example of a productive agricultural area which also harbors significant biodiversity values – an area where investments in agricultural best management

practices and public lands conservation can improve land productivity, water quality, and habitat values simultaneously.

Finally, as previously discussed, another land cover type which does not present as a habitat priority in the TWLP maps and summaries is the “old field/successional” type as defined in the 2001 GAP ecological system classification. In the GIS data coverages, land areas which are classified as this type are often locations in transition following removal of timber from a forested land cover type. Several locations in Tennessee have experienced active timber management in the last decade, and this transitional land cover can occupy tens of thousands of land acres in any given calendar year. Because they are classified as a semi-natural land cover type, the TWLP data summaries do not incorporate them as habitat conservation priorities. Western Wayne County is an area which may be exhibiting gaps in the prioritization scores because of the semi-natural habitat type designation. Largely a forested landscape, this area of Tennessee has experienced widespread, commercial timber management, and the land cover classification shows many locations in this transitional type. These examples of where gaps exist in species observations and use of natural land type cover in the TWLP prioritization scores may represent conservation opportunities – furthermore, the gaps emphasize the importance of using the most current field-based survey information available in making any final habitat protection investment decisions.

These and other data gap issues, many of which were identified by TWRA personnel during the Project Team meeting in February 2017, underscore the need for flexibility when analyzing a prospective habitat conservation project. While the TWLP provides an updated roadmap using the best available science, local knowledge of a given habitat priority or land management issue should always be considered.

Citations

Anderson, M.G., A. Barnett, M. Clark, C. Ferree, A.O. Sheldon, and J. Prince. 2014. *Resilient Sites for Terrestrial Conservation in the Southeast Region*. The Nature Conservancy, Eastern Conservation Science.

de Smith, M. J., M. F. Goodchild and P.A. Longley. 2009. *Geospatial Analysis: A Comprehensive Guide to Principles, Techniques and Software Tools*. Third Edition. Matador, on behalf of The Winchelsea Press. Leicester, UK.

Land and Water Conservation Fund Coalition. 2017. "Our Land, Our Water, Our Heritage: LWCF in Tennessee." Fact Sheet publication. Accessed June 20, 2017.
<https://static1.squarespace.com/static/58a60299ff7c508c3c05f2e1/t/59973838e6f2e1213d0e6853/1503082552975/Tennessee+fact+sheet+8.18.17.pdf>

Smith, M.P., Schiff, R., Olivero, A. and MacBroom, J.G., 2008. *THE ACTIVE RIVER AREA: A Conservation Framework for Protecting Rivers and Streams*. The Nature Conservancy, Boston, MA.

Southwick Associates, Inc., 2007. *Enhanced Fish and Wildlife Management in Tennessee: Public Support and Potential Benefits*. Nashville, TN.

Tennessee State Wildlife Action Plan Team. 2015. *Tennessee State Wildlife Action Plan 2015*. Tennessee Wildlife Resources Agency. Nashville, TN.

Weigel, L. and Metz, D., 2015. *Tennessee Voters Views of Conservation Funding*. Public Opinion Strategies and Fairbank, Maslin, Maullin, Metz, and Associates. Nashville, TN.

Wisby, J.P. and S.R. Palmer. 2015. *Database development and spatial analyses in support of Tennessee's State Wildlife Action Plan*. The Nature Conservancy. Nashville, TN. 23 pp.

APPENDIX 1

GIS Assessments Designed Specifically for TWRA Wildlife Legacy Plan

Habitat Biodiversity and Resiliency Metric Development

The 10-year update of the 2015 Tennessee State Wildlife Action Plan (SWAP) was required to address the potential impacts of a changing climate on Tennessee's native species and habitats. One of the resources utilized by TWRA and TNC to help identify habitats across the state which may be less adaptive to change over time is a methodology that looks at landscape features and existing natural habitat cover (Anderson et al. 2014). To assist with the TWLP project's primary goal of identifying priority habitat conservation areas, TNC developed a new scoring system that allows TWRA and others to examine the biodiversity and resiliency values of a given location within the same map projection. A major benefit of this approach is that many areas of natural habitat in Tennessee remain under-surveyed by biologists, and gaps exist in documented biodiversity values.

In order to calculate the combined biodiversity and resiliency score for the TWLP foundational maps, the landscape climate resilience score was first converted from a standard deviation format (see Anderson, et al. 2014) to a 0-100 points scale for every 30-meter cell unit across the state. This information was then combined with the SWAP terrestrial priority score, also on a 0-100 scale, and the maximum of either the resilience or the terrestrial biodiversity score was selected as the combined "TR" score for each 30-meter cell. Therefore, locations that may have a lower terrestrial biodiversity habitat priority in SWAP due to lack of species data, but which have high projected climate change resilience, are retained as priority locations. Conversely, areas identified as having lower resilience, but high current terrestrial habitat value, are also retained in the prioritization.

The next step was to take the TR scores and combine them with the SWAP assessments of watershed areas important for aquatic species of concern as well as landscapes in proximity to priority cave and karst features. The SWAP karst area score is based on distance proximity to priority cave habitats. To generate watershed area scores for aquatic significance, each 10.4 m cell is scored relative to its position adjacent to and upstream of aquatic habitat priorities identified in SWAP. The concept of the "Active River Area" (Smith et. al. 2008) was used to define lateral proximity to the stream network, and the SWAP hydrologic model built using NHDPlusV2 flowlines and catchments were used to score cells based on relative drainage area contribution and mean annual flow travel time to downstream aquatic habitat priorities (Tennessee State Wildlife Action Plan Team 2015, Wisby and Palmer 2015).

To interpret the aquatic and karst scores through a common lens as the terrestrial scores, all three scores – aquatic (A), karst (K) and the combined TR scores – were overlaid together on the Southeast GAP 2001 landuse/landcover dataset, and the general land use category at each cell was scored based on a range related to its natural condition, with wetlands and natural habitat categories getting higher scores and semi-natural and non-natural classes receiving lower scores. The component TR, A, and K scores were then added together at each cell to give an overall TRAK

score with a theoretical maximum of 300 points. The TRAK scores were then grouped into 6 classes – Very High, High, Medium, Low, Very Low, and None – based on Jenk’s natural breaks for mapping and tabular summarization (de Smith, Goodchild and Longley 2009).

Because its component scores are additive, the TRAK score is valuable for identifying areas with high conservation value for multiple habitats types, but the inclusion of all three habitat types into one scoring system can inadvertently mask the value of locations that have high conservation value in only 1 or 2 habitats. This situation is especially apparent in areas of Tennessee which have high aquatic conservation value but are not located in geographies which also contain high cave and karst diversity. To address this situation, a 2-class overall conservation priority was also derived by assigning an overall conservation priority score to cells containing High or Very High priorities in any one of the individual terrestrial/resilience, aquatic, or karst habitat components.

Public Lands Access

To help understand areas of the state that might most benefit by new public lands, an analysis was conducted to assess areas of the state that are underserved by access to existing public lands. To serve as the units of analysis, Block Groups, Incorporated Places, and Census Defined Places from the 2016 US Census TIGER dataset for the State of Tennessee were overlaid with each other. Using the Network Analyst extension in ArcGIS, centroids from the block group units were then snapped to the Esri Streetmap dataset, and used as facilities in a service area analysis. This analysis generated concentric service area polygons, at 15-minute automobile travel time intervals, out to 75 minutes from the block group centroids. The service area polygons were then overlaid with the block group centroids, using the Pairwise Intersect tool in ArcGIS Pro, which yielded a dataset of drive times between block group units, out to the 75-minute maximum.

Polygons of public lands in Tennessee and surrounding states were assessed for relative recreation opportunity, as well as whether or not they provided hunting opportunities. The public land polygons in Tennessee were then overlaid with the block groups, and the results were used in conjunction with the block-group-to-block-group drive times to generate a dataset of the accessibility of various public lands, at 15-minute drive intervals. Public lands outside Tennessee were overlaid with the service area polygons, using Pairwise Intersect, to assess accessibility of public lands in surrounding states. Acres of accessible public lands in and around Tennessee were weighted by drive time, as well as their relative recreation opportunity, and totaled for each block group, resulting in an index of public land recreation accessibility. This index value was then weighted by the population of the block group, from the 2010 census, to give an index of per-person public land recreation accessibility for that block group. The block-group-to-block-group drive time dataset was then used to total the index values of surrounding block groups, again weighting by drive time, to give an index of relative need for new public lands, given the existing per-person accessibility for block groups in the area. These results were then mapped, using quantile classification, to identify areas of the state that are relatively underserved.

APPENDIX 2
TWRA Wildlife Legacy Plan GIS Metadata Sources and Descriptions

Layer List Name	Layer Type	Source	Data Format	Description
Tennessee	Base Data	ESRI Detail	vector polygons	Tennessee state boundary.
TN-SWAP15 Karst Habitat Priorities	Habitat Priorities	2015 Tennessee State Wildlife Action Plan	vector points	Cave systems with documented GCN species. Priorities based on number, rarity, and dependence of species on karst environment
TN-SWAP15 Aquatic Habitat Priorities	Habitat Priorities	2015 Tennessee State Wildlife Action Plan	vector lines	Streams with documented GCN species, as well as potential habitats upstream and downstream of documented occurrence streams. Priorities based on number and rarity of species, time since last observation, and proximity and similarity of stream to nearby occurrence streams.
Great River Birding Trail Sites	Observation Site	2005 Mississippi River Natural and Recreation Corridor project	vector points	Developed during the 2005 Mississippi River Natural and Recreation Corridor project conducted by TWRA, TN Parks and Greenways Foundation, and the Memphis Area Chamber of Commerce. For more information, see project file online at http://www.tnwatchablewildlife.org/files/Birding-Final%20online%20version.pdf

Layer List Name	Layer Type	Source	Data Format	Description
Least Tern Islands	Habitat Location	2005 Tennessee Heritage Conservation Trust Fund (THCTF) plan	vector points	Data developed by TWRA for the Tennessee Heritage Conservation Trust Fund (THCTF) plan. Identified in THCTF plan as part of Important Nesting Site data.
Fishing Needed Access Points	Recreation Priorities	2005 Tennessee Heritage Conservation Trust Fund (THCTF) plan	vector points	Data developed by TWRA Fisheries Division for the Tennessee Heritage Conservation Trust Fund (THCTF) plan.
Important Stream Fishery	Recreation Priorities	2005 Tennessee Heritage Conservation Trust Fund (THCTF) plan	vector lines	Data developed by TWRA Fisheries Division for the Tennessee Heritage Conservation Trust Fund (THCTF) plan.
Areas of Interest	Acquisition Priorities (legacy)	2005 Tennessee Heritage Conservation Trust Fund (THCTF) plan	vector polygons	Areas of Interest identified by state agency collaborative effort under the Tennessee Heritage Conservation Trust Fund (THCTF) plan to identify important conservation, wildlife, and other natural and cultural heritage lands.
Bluffs	Recreation Priorities	2005 Mississippi River Natural and Recreation Corridor project and the 2005 Tennessee Heritage Conservation Trust Fund (THCTF) plan	vector polygons	Developed during the 2005 Mississippi River Natural and Recreation Corridor project conducted by TWRA, TN Parks and Greenways Foundation, and the Memphis Area Chamber of Commerce.

Layer List Name	Layer Type	Source	Data Format	Description
Important Aquatic Habitat Areas	Habitat Priorities (legacy)	2005 Tennessee Heritage Conservation Trust Fund (THCTF) plan	vector polygons	2004 Project of TWRA fisheries; data included in 2005 the Tennessee Heritage Conservation Trust Fund (THCTF) plan. A prioritized list of stream reaches or sites considered crucial for fishes and aquatic invertebrates were established in preparation for an opportunity of land acquisition or easement for imperiled aquatic resources in Tennessee.
WTN Priority Lakes	Recreation Priorities	2005 Tennessee Heritage Conservation Trust Fund (THCTF) plan	vector polygons	Data developed by TWRA Fisheries Division for the Tennessee Heritage Conservation Trust Fund (THCTF) plan.
Elk Restoration Zone	Special Habitat Focal Area	Tennessee Wildlife Resources Agency, 1999	vector polygons	Created by TWRA with stakeholder review prior to the release of the first elk reintroduction in December 2000.
Quail Focus Areas	Special Habitat Focal Area	Tennessee Wildlife Resources Agency, 2005	vector polygons	Data developed by TWRA Wildlife Division for the Tennessee Heritage Conservation Trust Fund (THCTF) plan.
Bobwhite Response to Mgmt	Special Habitat Focal Area	National Bobwhite Conservation Initiative, 2011	vector polygons	Areas rated for bobwhite quail restoration priority. Based on combination of satellite imagery, landscape-level geodatabases and professional biological judgement.

Layer List Name	Layer Type	Source	Data Format	Description
Well Points	Drinking Water Withdrawal Sites	Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation, 2013	vector points	Permitted wells for public drinking water.
Source Water Points	Drinking Water Withdrawal Sites	Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation, 2013	vector points	Permitted surface water withdrawal points for public drinking water.
Well Buffers	Drinking Water Withdrawal Buffers	Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation, 2013	vector polygons	Protection buffers around source wells.
Source Water Buffers: Zone A	Drinking Water Withdrawal Buffers	Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation, 2013	vector polygons	Primary protection buffers around stream network upstream of surface drinking water withdrawals.
Source Water Buffers: Zone B	Drinking Water Withdrawal Buffers	Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation, 2013	vector polygons	Secondary protection buffers around stream network upstream of surface drinking water withdrawals.
Protected Lands	Base Data	The Nature Conservancy, data compilation, 2016	vector polygons	Public and private protected lands, as compiled from various agency and organization sources.
Counties	Base Data	Environmental Systems Research Institute (ESRI) Detail	vector polygons	Tennessee county boundaries.
Highways	Base Data	Environmental Systems Research Institute (ESRI)	vector lines	Major roads in Tennessee, as mapped by ESRI
Incorporated Places	Base Data	U.S. Department of Transportation, TIGER data, 2016	vector polygons	Incorporated cities and towns in Tennessee.
Other Census Designated Places	Base Data	U.S. Department of Transportation, TIGER data, 2016	vector polygons	Unincorporated towns and developments, as identified by US Census Bureau.

Layer List Name	Layer Type	Source	Data Format	Description
Urban Growth Boundaries	Development	Tennessee Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, 2014	vector polygons	Urban growth boundaries, as well as potential growth areas, identified
8-Digit HUC	Hydrology	U.S. Geological Survey, Watershed Boundary Dataset, 2011	vector polygons	12-Digit Hydrologic Unit Code watersheds.
12-Digit HUC	Hydrology	U.S. Geological Survey, Watershed Boundary Dataset, 2011	vector polygons	8-Digit Hydrologic Unit Code watersheds.
Waterbodies	Hydrology	National Hydrography Dataset Plus, Version 2, 2014	vector polygons	Reservoirs, lakes, and large river systems.
Flowlines	Hydrology	National Hydrography Dataset Plus, Version 2, 2014	vector lines	Stream network
Hillshade	Base Data	U.S. Geological Survey National Elevation Dataset, 2009	raster ~25m	Hillshade from 1:100,000 NED elevation data
Maximum Gas Probability	Energy Development	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service - Appalachian LCC, 2014	raster 1km	Likelihood of future shale gas development, forecasted from spatial models created for the Appalachian LCC project area.
Wind Probability	Energy Development	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service - Appalachian LCC, 2014	raster 1km	Likelihood of future wind turbine development, forecasted from spatial models created for the Appalachian LCC project area.
Surface Mining Probability	Energy Development	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service - Appalachian LCC, 2014	raster 1km	Likelihood of surface coal mining, forecasted from spatial models created for the Appalachian LCC project area.

Layer List Name	Layer Type	Source	Data Format	Description
Priority Acquisition Land	Acquisition Priorities	2017 Tennessee Wildlife Legacy Plan	raster ~10m	Areas rated as overall acquisition priority conservation lands in current T-LAP project. Based on simplification of more detailed 2015 TENNESSEE STATE WILDLIFE ACTION PLAN habitat conservation priorities for terrestrial, aquatic, and karst GCN species. Includes any habitats rated as High or Very High in SWAP prioritization for terrestrial, aquatic, or karst GCNs.
Conservation Acquisition Priorities	Acquisition Priorities	2017 Tennessee Wildlife Legacy Plan	raster ~10m	Detailed acquisition priorities, with 5 class breaks based on number of co-occurring High and Very High habitat priorities for individual terrestrial, aquatic, and karst environments in 2015 TENNESSEE STATE WILDLIFE ACTION PLAN. Terrestrial priorities include terrestrial climate resilience priorities, with the maximum of SWAP terrestrial and resilience scores used at a given location.

Layer List Name	Layer Type	Source	Data Format	Description
Combined RTAK Conservation Priorities (5-class)	Habitat Priorities	2017 Tennessee Wildlife Legacy Plan	raster ~10m	Combined climate resilience, and TN-SWAP terrestrial, aquatic, and karst habitat priorities. Climate resilience is converted to 0-100 point score from native standard deviation, and then combined with 100-point SWAP terrestrial habitat priorities by taking maximum of resilience and terrestrial priorities. RT score is added to aquatic and karst conservation priorities, as described below, and then grouped into 5 Very High to Low classes based on Jenk's natural breaks.
Terrestrial Habitat Priorities (5-class)	Habitat Priorities	2015 Tennessee State Wildlife Action Plan	raster ~10m	100-point habitat priorities for terrestrial GCN species. Scores based on number, rarity, viability, proximity, and preferences of GCN occurrences in or nearby ecological system habitats, as mapped in SE-GAP 2001.

Layer List Name	Layer Type	Source	Data Format	Description
Conservation Priorities for Downstream Aquatic Habitats (5-class)	Habitat Priorities	2015 Tennessee State Wildlife Action Plan	raster ~10m	100-point conservation priorities for downstream aquatic habitats, based on type of landuse/landcover, lateral proximity to stream habitat as assessed by active river area class, and longitudinal proximity as expressed by instream travel time and relative drainage area contribution from NHDPlusV2. Scores are grouped into 5 Very High to Low classes based on Jenk's natural breaks.
Conservation Priorities for Nearby Karst Habitats (5-class)	Habitat Priorities	2015 Tennessee State Wildlife Action Plan	raster ~10m	100-point conservation priorities for nearby karst habitats, based on type of landuse/landcover and proximity to karst priorities. Scores are grouped into 5 Very High to Low classes based on Jenk's natural breaks.
Combined RTAK Conservation Priorities (9-class)	Habitat Priorities	2017 Tennessee Wildlife Legacy Plan	raster ~10m	RTAK priorities, as described above, grouped into 9 classes based on Jenk's natural breaks.
Terrestrial Habitat Priorities (9-class)	Habitat Priorities	2015 Tennessee State Wildlife Action Plan	raster ~10m	100-point terrestrial habitat priorities, as described above, grouped into 9 classes based on Jenk's natural breaks.
Conservation Priorities for Downstream Aquatic Habitats (9-class)	Habitat Priorities	2015 Tennessee State Wildlife Action Plan	raster ~10m	100-point conservation priorities for downstream aquatic habitats, as described above, grouped into 9 classes based on Jenk's natural breaks.

Layer List Name	Layer Type	Source	Data Format	Description
Conservation Priorities for Nearby Karst Habitats (9-class)	Habitat Priorities	2015 Tennessee State Wildlife Action Plan	raster ~10m	100-point conservation priorities for nearby karst habitats, as described above, grouped into 9 classes based on Jenk's natural breaks.
Resilient and Connected Networks	Terrestrial Climate Resilience	Anderson, et al. 2014. Resilient Sites for Terrestrial Conservation in the Southeast Region. The Nature Conservancy.	raster 30m	TNC climate resilience for terrestrial habitats, grouped into 3 classes: Resilient, Climate Flow Zones, and Climate Corridors.
Final Resilience Scores, Stratified by Setting and Ecoregion	Terrestrial Climate Resilience	Anderson, et al. 2014. Resilient Sites for Terrestrial Conservation in the Southeast Region. The Nature Conservancy.	raster 30m	Overall TNC climate resilience for terrestrial habitats, stratified by ecological setting and ecoregion, and grouped into 7 classes based on standard deviation.
Landscape Diversity, Stratified by Setting and Ecoregion	Terrestrial Climate Resilience	Anderson, et al. 2014. Resilient Sites for Terrestrial Conservation in the Southeast Region. The Nature Conservancy.	raster 30m	Landscape diversity component of overall TNC climate resilience for terrestrial habitats, stratified by ecological setting and ecoregion, and grouped into 7 classes based on standard deviation.
Local Connectivity, Stratified by Setting and Ecoregion	Terrestrial Climate Resilience	Anderson, et al. 2014. Resilient Sites for Terrestrial Conservation in the Southeast Region. The Nature Conservancy.	raster 90m	Local connectivity component of overall TNC climate resilience for terrestrial habitats, stratified by ecological setting and ecoregion, and grouped into 7 classes based on standard deviation.

APPENDIX 3

Priority Protection Area Maps - Statewide and by TWRA Region

STATEWIDE WILDLIFE HABITAT CONSERVATION PRIORITIES

TWRA REGION I PRIORITIES

TWRA REGION II PRIORITIES

TWRA REGION III PRIORITIES

TWRA REGION IV PRIORITIES

Tenn. Code Ann. § 11-14-401

Copy Citation

Current through the 2020 Regular and Second Extraordinary Sessions

- [TN - Tennessee Code Annotated](#)
- [Title 11 Natural Areas and Recreation](#)
- [Chapter 14 Natural Areas Preservation](#)
- [Part 4 Wetlands](#)

11-14-401. Short title — Acquisition of **wetlands** and forests — Part definitions.

(a) This part, as well as § 67-4-409(g), shall be known and may be cited as the "U.A. **Moore Wetlands** Acquisition **Act**."

(b) The general assembly finds and declares that it is in the general interest of the people of Tennessee:

(1) To preserve certain **wetlands** and bottomland hardwood forests in our state, those being defined as follows:

(A) "Bottomland hardwood forests" means forests occurring on alluvial soils in floodplains in which tupelo, blackgum, sweetgum, oaks, southern cypress, elm, ash, cottonwood, singly or in combination, comprise a plurality of the stocking except where pines comprise twenty-five percent (25%) to fifty percent (50%), in which case the stand would be classified as oak pine; and

(B) "**Wetlands**" means lands which have hydric soils and a dominance (fifty percent (50%) or more of stem count based on communities) of obligate hydrophytes. They include the following generic types:

(i) Fresh water meadows;

(ii) Shallow fresh water marshes;

(iii) Shrub swamps with semipermanent water regimes most of the year;

(iv) Wooded swamps or forested **wetlands**;

(v) Open fresh water except farm ponds; and

(vi) Bogs;

(2) That the director of the wildlife resources agency be authorized to acquire **wetlands** and bottomland hardwood forests, and lands which are capable of supporting hydrophytes or bottomland hardwood forests of a composition normally occurring in that area of the state, including adjacent tracts of land and tracts of land which are significant for the protection of **wetlands** and bottomland hardwood forests, the acquisition of which may be necessary and desirable to ensure the proper management of such **wetlands** and forests, on behalf of the state using the proceeds from the increase in revenues resulting from the 1986 increase in the tax levied in § 67-4-409. The director is also authorized to purchase any lands adjacent to Reelfoot Lake which may be necessary for the management and preservation of such lake from such revenues, and to purchase areas meeting the definition of "converted" **wetlands** as defined by the United States department of agriculture within the Food Security **Act** of 1985, and amendments thereto; and

(3) To establish a partnership between the state and private, nonprofit corporations, qualifying under § 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code (26 U.S.C. § 501(c)(3)), for the purpose of implementing the expeditious acquisitions of interests in **wetlands** and bottomland hardwood forests should the director or state choose to use such corporations.

(c) Notwithstanding this part, § 67-4-409, or any other law to the contrary, the director of the wildlife resources agency is authorized to make expenditures from the 1986 **wetland** acquisition fund for the purpose of acquiring certain upland hardwood forests which are located within Scott and Campbell counties and are known as the "Koppers Properties," including lands adjacent thereto.

(d) Notwithstanding this part, § 67-4-409 or any other law to the contrary, the director of the wildlife resources agency is authorized to make expenditures from the 1986 **wetland** acquisition fund for the purpose of assisting in the acquisition of certain uplands and canyon which are located within White, Cumberland and Van Buren counties and are known as "Scott's Gulf." Nothing in this subsection (d) shall be construed to obligate the wildlife resources agency to fully fund the purchase of this real

property either from the 1986 **wetland** acquisition fund or from any other state fund under the control of the agency.

(e) Notwithstanding this part, § 67-4-409 or any other law to the contrary, the executive director of the wildlife resources agency is authorized to make expenditures from the 1986 **wetland** acquisition fund for the purpose of acquiring certain upland hardwood forests which are located within Scott, Campbell, Morgan and Anderson counties known as "International Paper Company Properties," including lands adjacent thereto.

(f) Notwithstanding this part, § 67-4-409 or any other law to the contrary, the executive director of the wildlife resources agency is authorized to make expenditures from the 1986 **wetland** acquisition fund for the purpose of acquiring certain upland hardwood forests which are located within Monroe County and known as "Turkey Pen," including lands adjacent thereto.

(g) Notwithstanding this part, § 67-4-409, or any other law to the contrary, the executive director of the wildlife resources agency is authorized to make expenditures from the 1986 **wetland** acquisition fund for the purpose of acquiring certain upland hardwood forests which are located within Morgan County and known as the "McCartt Tract," including lands adjacent thereto.

History

Acts 1986, ch. 833, § 1; 1989, ch. 458, § 1; 1989, ch. 461, § 5; 1991, ch. 140, § 1; 1997, ch. 542, §§ 1, 2; 1998, ch. 955, § 1; 1998, ch. 956, § 1; 2002, ch. 864, § 1; 2014, ch. 702, § 1; 2016, ch. 1027, § 3.