

ECONOMIC IMPACT OF PENNSYLVANIA'S HERITAGE AREAS, 2008

February 11, 2010

What are Heritage Areas?

State Heritage Areas are large geographic regions or corridors of the Commonwealth that span two or more counties. These areas contain a multitude of historic, recreational, natural and scenic resources of state and national significance that collectively exemplify the heritage of Pennsylvania. Through regional partnerships and public grassroots planning strategies, these resources are identified, protected, enhanced and promoted to strengthen regional economies through increased tourism, creation of new jobs and stimulation of public and private partnerships for new investment opportunities. This holistic and bottom-up approach to planning ensures that the legacy of a region and the natural, educational and recreational values inherent to it - are preserved for future generations.

A Pennsylvania Heritage Area is a process as well as a product. It is both the means and the end to substantially enrich the quality of life in Pennsylvania and the communities and regions of the state where these initiatives are pursued. It is also about partnerships. The foundation upon which a heritage area is structured involves building and strengthening regional coalitions of community leaders, non-profit interest groups, the private sector, state agencies and the federal government. Its success is dependent upon partners being able to erase governmental and institutional boundaries while planning, acting regionally and strategically.

The Heritage Areas Program has five goals: economic development, partnerships, cultural conservation, recreation and open space, and education and interpretation. Heritage areas were designated using a prudent, thoughtful approach which includes a feasibility study, a management action plan and an interpretive plan. These plans guide the work of those areas. The plans are developed with tremendous grassroots participation and input which is why the heritage areas are so effective in communities. They build the relationships from the beginning.

The Heritage Area program comprehensively plans and strategically invests in the second largest industry in the Commonwealth – Tourism.

Economic Impact: Introduction

In 2008, Pennsylvania's heritage areas conducted surveys to gather more information about their visitors¹. The information collected included the duration of the visitors' stay in the heritage area, the number of people in the travel party, and the home Zip code of the traveling party.

This analysis used data from the surveys to measure the economic impact of visitor spending in Pennsylvania heritage areas. The analysis paired the survey data with visitation statistics for specific sites within each heritage area and fed them into an economic impact model called Money Generation Model (MGM2).

MGM2 was developed for the National Park Service. For this analysis, MGM2 was used to estimate the economic impact of heritage area visitors on the local economy in terms of their

¹ Allegheny Ridge Heritage Area, Delaware and Lehigh National Heritage Corridor, Susquehanna Gateway Heritage Area, Lincoln Highway Heritage Corridor, Lumber Heritage Area, National Road Heritage Corridor, Oil Region National Heritage Area, and Pennsylvania Route 6 Heritage Corridor.

contribution to sales, income and jobs. This model, according to its developers², has proven quite helpful in fostering partnerships within communities and garnering support for heritage area policies and interests. The economic analysis also helps to identify the roles the local community and tourism businesses play in attracting and serving visitors.

According to the analysis, Pennsylvania heritage area visitors spent more than \$299 million. This spending directly supported more than 4,300 jobs and contributed more than \$95 million in local personal income.

FIGURE 1: Total Economic Impact of Visitor's Spending in Eight of Pennsylvania Heritage Areas

	Economic Impact
Total Visitors Spending	\$300,894,000
<u>Direct Economic Effects</u>	
Sales	\$255,760,220
Personal Income	\$95,807,160
Jobs	4,372
Value Added	\$145,524,080
<u>Total Economic Effect</u>	
Sales	\$416,889,160
Personal Income	\$156,448,230
Jobs	6,030
Value Added	\$247,194,420

Methodology

Following is the methodology used to conduct the analysis, which included the following three components: the heritage area visitor survey results; visitation statistics; and spending assumptions used for the MGM2 model.

A glossary of key terms used in the report is also included, as well as the data limitations.

Visitor Survey

In 2008, eight Pennsylvania heritage areas conducted intercept surveys, which are short, face-to-face interviews with visitors that gather details about their visit. Information was collected from visitor parties at 106 facilities and attractions.

The heritage area managers agreed to exclude surveys with visitor parties of 21 or more persons and overnight visitors who stay 15 or more nights. A total of 30 surveys were excluded or about 1 percent. In addition, the home Zip codes of 86 survey respondents, 2 percent, were either missing or inaccurately reported. This group was excluded from the analysis. The total usable surveys were 4,078.

Eighty-three percent of the surveys were conducted in August, September and October 2008. Sixty-nine percent of the surveys were conducted on Friday, Saturday and Sunday.

The visitor surveys for all eight heritage areas contained the same eight core questions. A sample copy of the survey is included in Appendix A. Each area had an option of including additional site-specific questions; those answers were not included in this composite report.

² National Park Service Money Generation Model was originally developed by Ken Horback in 1995. In 2001, Daniel Stynes and Dennis Propst at Michigan State University developed a new version of the model called MGM2.

Two questions in the survey were used to identify visitors as “day visitors” or “overnight visitors.”

Day visitors, who do not stay overnight in the heritage area, were further divided into two groups: local visitors and non-local visitors. Two methods were used to identify local day visitors: they identified themselves as such in the survey and their Zip code was in the same county as the heritage area. Similar methods were used to identify non-local day visitors: they identified themselves as such in the survey and their Zip code was from a county or state outside of the heritage area.

Overnight visitors were also subdivided into two groups. The first group included those who stayed in motels, hotels, bed-and-breakfasts and other similar lodging. The second group included those who stayed in campgrounds or with family and friends.

Visitation Statistics

Each manager from the participating heritage area gathered visitation statistics for 106 facilities and attractions. Total visitation at these facilities and attractions totaled 18 million. One of the limitations of the data collection was that some of the facilities and attractions reported annual data while others reported seasonal visitation.

Money Generation Model (MGM2)

Developed for the National Park Service, the Money Generation Model, second edition (MGM2), is an econometric model designed to provide an estimate of the economic impact that visitors have on the local economy in terms of their contribution to sales, income and jobs in the area. The MGM2 is akin to the IMPLAN model that was developed for the USDA Forest Service. Both models are based on a set of complex and interrelated economic assumptions.

The MGM2 model has a long form and short form. Both forms use spreadsheet software for their calculations.

The long form involves intercept and follow-up surveys, which are used to more accurately identify visitor spending. In addition, the long form allows for the development of customized visitor segments: 12 categories of itemized spending and sector-specific multipliers and ratios.

The short form uses data from one-time intercept surveys and has a set of generic spending estimates and multipliers. The short form allows for only four, fixed visitor types (day visitor local; day visitor non-local; overnight visitor, motel; and overnight visitor other). In addition, the short form examines spending as single aggregate total and it uses aggregate multipliers and ratios. The heritage area managers chose to use the short form because follow-up surveys were not part of the standard method used across the state.

The MGM2 short form requires researchers to select generic values for multipliers and ratios, and generic spending averages. The generic values for multipliers and ratios are based on four types of regions: rural (areas with populations less than 50,000); small metropolitan (areas with populations up to 500,000); large metropolitan (populations up to 1 million); and state (populations of 1 million or more). The generic multipliers increase as the population increases. Because data from eight heritage areas was examined, the analysis here used the state multiplier.

Next, the MGM2 short form requires researchers to select generic spending averages by visitor type. The model's six spending averages include low, medium, and high spending for heritage sites and low, medium and high spending for parks. These spending averages were based on

2005 data and were adjusted for inflation to 2008 dollars using the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics' Consumer Price Index with 2008 equaling 100.

This analysis used the historic site medium spending averages for each of the heritage areas. Figure 2 shows the generic spending averages for each visitor type and the inflation adjusted amount.

FIGURE 2: Average Generic Spending by Visitor Type, Unadjusted and Inflation Adjusted

	Average Generic Spending, 2005	Average Inflation Adjusted Generic Spending, 2008
Day Visitor, Local	\$40.75	\$44.92
Day Visitor, Non-Local	\$62.89	\$69.33
Overnight Visitor, Motel	\$182.41	\$201.10
Overnight Visitor, Other	\$65.20	\$71.88

Adjusted figures were adjusted using the CPI-U with 2008 = 100

For example, the typical 2005 overnight motel visitor spent an average of \$182.41 (adjusted for 2008, this becomes \$201.10) for food, gasoline, lodging, etc.

It is important to note that the MGM2 short-form model does not calculate spending by Day Visitor, Local. Spending by this group does not represent "new money" to the heritage area. It can be thought of as re-circulated money that already exists within the area. While spending by day visitors who are local residents can have a significant impact on specific businesses, this spending does not affect the overall wealth in the community.

The MGM2 short-form model requires three pieces of information from the intercept surveys, as follows:

1. Average number of day and night stays in the heritage areas: Day visitors (local and non-local) were assigned a "1," representing one day. Overnight visitors (motel and other) were assigned a number based on the average number of nights they reported staying in the heritage area. It is important to note that the participating heritage area managers agreed to exclude from the analysis survey respondents who spent 15 or more night in the region.
2. Average party-size: The average number of persons in the traveling party were calculated and added to the model. This average included both adults and children. Again, it is important to note that the participating heritage area managers agreed to exclude from the analysis survey respondents who were in visitor parties of 21 or more persons.
3. Park entries per trip: This was the average number of other facilities/attractions in the heritage area the visitor visited or planned to visit.

Definitions³

Visitors:

Persons, individuals and groups at a heritage-related facility or attraction within the heritage area. Based on the survey results, visitors were grouped into one of four categories:

1. Day Visitor, Local: visitors whose home Zip code was in the same county as the heritage area they were visiting or who indicated they were day trip local residents. Also included were visitors who live within the heritage area and: (a) did not specify whether they were day or overnight visitors; or (b) said that they were overnight visitors but staying outside the area. A total of 1,140 visitors, or 28 percent, were classified as Day Visitor, Local.
2. Day Visitor, Non-Local: visitors whose home Zip code was outside of the county of the heritage area in which they were visiting or who indicated they were day trip visitors from out of town. Also included in this category were international visitors who were only visiting the heritage area for one day. In addition, this group of visitors included those staying overnight, but outside the area. A total of 1,284 visitors, or 32 percent, were classified as Day Visitor, Non-Local.
3. Overnight Visitor, Motel: visitors who indicated they were staying overnight at a motel, hotel, or bed-and-breakfast within the heritage area. A total of 748 visitors, or 18 percent, were classified as Overnight Visitor, Motel.
4. Overnight Visitor, Other: visitors who indicated they were staying overnight at a campground within the heritage area or who said they were visiting friends or relatives and staying overnight. Also included were visitors staying overnight, but did not specify where they were staying where. A total of 906 visitors, or 22 percent, were classified as Overnight Visitors, Other.

Traveling Party:

Number of persons who are visiting the heritage facility/attraction together in the same family or group. The number of persons in the traveling party may range from one to 20 persons. Parties with 21 or more visitors were excluded from the analysis.

Jobs:

The number of jobs in the region supported by visitor spending. Job estimates are not full time equivalents, but include part-time and seasonal positions.

Personal Income:

Wage and salary income, proprietor's income and employee benefits.

Value-Added:

Personal income plus rents and profits and indirect business taxes. It is the value added by the region to the final good or service being produced. Value-added can also be defined as the final price of the good or service minus the costs of all of the non-labor inputs to production.

Direct Economic Effect:

Changes in sales, income and jobs in those businesses that directly sell goods or services to visitors.

³ Except for definitions of visitors and traveling party, all definitions came from Daniel Stynes, and Ya-Yen Sun, "Economic Impact of National Heritage Area Visitor Spending: Summary Results from Seven National Heritage Area Visitor Survey." June 2004.

Secondary Effects: Changes in economic activity in the region resulting from the recirculation of money spent by visitors. Secondary effects include both indirect and induced economic effects.

Indirect Economic Effects: Changes in sales, income and jobs within industries that supply goods and services to businesses that sell directly to visitors. For example, linen suppliers benefit from visitor spending at lodging establishments.

Induced Economic Effects: Changes in economic activity in the region resulting from household spending of income earned through direct or indirect effects. For example, motel and linen supply employees who live in the region spend their income on housing, groceries, education, clothing and other goods and services, thereby creating sales and jobs in these sectors.

Total Economic Effect: Sum of direct, indirect and induced economic effects.

Data Limitations

There are a number of factors that can affect the validity and reliability of survey data and MGM2 spending reports.

Intercept Surveys: Each participating heritage area conducted its own intercept survey. As a result, there may have been differences in data collection protocol and procedures. Some of these differences were observed in the way the data were recorded. Therefore, the survey results may not be generalized for all heritage areas.

MGM2: The MGM2 model was developed to measure the economic impact of National Parks, not heritage areas. National Parks have specific geographic boundaries and more precise methods for counting visitors. Sites and events in heritage areas are more geographically dispersed. It is also more difficult to count the total number of visitors to these areas. Because of these and other differences, the MGM2 model may not provide the same level of accuracy and detail as it does for National Parks. Therefore, the information presented here should be viewed as the baseline measure of economic impact. Future studies should focus on refining and developing more reliable and accurate methods to measure impact.

Visitor Coding: All usable survey responses were grouped into one of four categories: (1) Day Visitor, Local; (2) Day Visitor, Non-local; (3) Overnight Visitor, Motel; and (4) Overnight Visitor, Other. The criteria used to make these groupings are explained above. While the majority of survey responses could be easily categorized, there were approximately 300 responses that had incomplete or missing data. Properly coding these responses was a challenge and subjective. As a result, caution should be used in interpreting the results.

Findings

First-Time and Returning Visitors

- 39 percent of respondents were first-time visitors to the heritage areas and 61 percent were returning visitors.
- First-time visitors were nearly evenly divided between day visitors (48 percent) and overnight visitors (52 percent). Among day visitors, the average number of hours in the heritage area was 4.7. Among overnight visitors, the average number of nights in the heritage area was 2.6.
- 44 percent of first-time visitors were from outside Pennsylvania, 43 percent were from a county outside of the heritage area, and 13 percent were from the same county as the heritage area.
- Return visitors to heritage areas were predominately day visitors (68 percent). 44 percent of return visitors lived in the same county as the heritage area, 35 percent were from another county within Pennsylvania and 21 percent were from outside the state.
- Both first-time and return visitors were in similarly sized travel parties. First-time visitors were in a traveling party of 3.5 persons and return visitors were in a party of 3.4 persons. About 32 percent of both types of visitors had children in their travel party (persons under 18 years old).
- First-time visitors saw or planned to see fewer heritage attractions than return visitors (2.5 and 3.5 attractions, respectively).

Reason for Coming to the Heritage Area

- 62 percent of respondents said the attraction they were visiting or planned to visit was the primary reason for their trip to the heritage area. 38 percent said the attraction was not the primary reason for visiting the area.
- The analysis compared those who said the attraction was their primary reason for visiting the heritage area with those who said it was not the primary reason for visiting. It found that the group who identified the attraction as their main reason for visiting:
 - Were more likely to live outside the county where the heritage area was located (71 percent vs. 68 percent);
 - Had a higher level of familiarity with the heritage area (58 percent vs. 52 percent);
 - Were less likely to stay overnight (37 percent vs. 47 percent);
 - Were more likely to travel with children (36 percent vs. 26 percent); and
 - Spent more hours at the attraction (5.5 hours vs. 4.6 hours).

Familiarity with the Heritage Area

- 56 percent of survey respondents were somewhat to very familiar with the heritage area they were visiting, while 44 percent were either not sure or not familiar with the heritage area.
- First-time visitors were less familiar with the areas than those who had visited before. 19 percent of first-time visitors were somewhat to very familiar with the heritage area compared to 81 percent of return visitors. There was a similar pattern among local visitors and those from out-of-town.

- There was a significant difference among visitors who were and were not familiar with the heritage areas and the number of facilities/attraction they visited. Visitors who were somewhat to very familiar with the heritage area visited an average of 3.6 facilities/attractions, while those who were less familiar visited an average of 2.6 facilities/attractions.
- Among day visitors, familiarity with the heritage area also affected the number of hours they spent in the area. Those who were somewhat to very familiar with the heritage area spent an average of 5.3 hours, while those who were less familiar spent an average of 4.8 hours.
- Among overnight visitors, there was no significant difference in the number of nights spent at facilities/attractions and their level of familiarity with the heritage area.

Traveling Party

- Among all visitors, the average traveling party had 3.4 persons. Thirty-one percent of the traveling parties included children (persons under 18 years old) and 69 percent did not.
- There was a slight, but statistically significant, difference in the size of the traveling parties between local and out-of-town visitors. Local travel parties had an average of 3.2 persons while out-of-town parties had an average of 3.5 persons.
- The more hours the traveling party stayed in the heritage area the more people in the traveling party.
- For the following variables, there was no significant difference in the size of the traveling party:
 - Level of familiarity with the heritage area
 - First trip or repeat trip to the heritage area
 - Day or overnight visitor

Number of Hours Spent in Heritage Area (Day Visitors Only)

- The typical day visitor spent an average of 5.1 hours at the heritage area. Day visitors accounted for 60 percent of all heritage area visitors.
- Among day visitors, there was a significant difference in the number of hours spent in the heritage area and the following variables:
 - Local visitors spent an average of 4.6 hours in the heritage area, while non-local visitors spent 5.5 hours;
 - Those who were more familiar with the heritage area spent more time (5.3 hours) than those who were not (4.8 hours);
 - Traveling parties with children spent more hours in the heritage area (5.7 hours) than parties without children (4.8 hours); and
 - Those who said the attraction they were visiting or planned to visit was the primary reason for coming to the heritage area spent more time in the area (5.5 hours) than those who had other reasons for coming to the area (4.6 hours).

Number of Nights Spent in Heritage Area (Overnight Visitors Only)

- The typical overnight visitor spent an average of 2.6 nights in the heritage area. Overnight visitors accounted for 40 percent of all heritage area visitors. 47 percent stayed in a motel/hotel, 22 percent stayed at a campground, 22 percent stayed with friends or relatives, and 9 percent stayed outside the area.
- There was no significant difference in the number of nights spent in the area and whether the visitor was from Pennsylvania or out-of-state. There were also no significant differences in the number of nights spent in the area and if the traveling party had children present or the level of familiarity with the facility/attraction.

Number of Facilities/Attractions Visited

- The typical visitor to the heritage area visited or planned to visit an average of 3.1 facilities/attractions.
- There was a significant difference in the number of facilities/attractions visited and the following variables:
 - Local visitors typically visited more facilities/attractions (4.3) than non-local visitors (2.6).
 - First-time visitors went to fewer (2.5) facilities/attractions than returning visitors (3.5).
 - Day visitors went to an average of 3.4 facilities/attractions compared to overnight visitors, who went to an average of 2.8.
 - Visitors without children went to an average of 2.8 facilities/attractions compared to visitors with children, who went to 3.2.

Visitor Profile #1: Day Visitors, Local

- 28 percent of visitors were local visitors, or persons who lived in the same county as the heritage area they were visiting.
- 85 percent had been to the heritage area before and 75 percent were somewhat to very familiar with the heritage area.
- 60 percent said the heritage facility/attraction they were visiting was their primary reason for coming to the heritage area.
- The typical local day visitor spent an average of 4.7 hours at the facility/attraction. During this visit, they visited or planned to visit an average of 4.5 facilities/attractions.
- The typical local day visitor travel party had an average of 3.2 persons. 70 percent of these travel parties did not include children.
- Using the MGM2 estimates, local day visitors spent an average of \$44.92 on items such as food, gasoline and gifts.

Visitor Profile #2: Day Visitors, Non-Local

- 32 percent of visitors were non-local visitors, or persons who lived outside the home county of the heritage area. 68 percent of non-local, day visitors were from Pennsylvania and 32 percent were from outside the commonwealth.
- 45 percent were first-time visitors to the heritage area and 55 percent were returning visitors.
- 50 percent were somewhat to very familiar with the heritage area. 70 percent said the facility/attraction they were visiting was the primary reason for coming to the heritage area.
- The typical non-local day visitor spent an average of 5.5 hours at the facility/attraction. During this time, they visited or planned to visit an average of 2.4 facilities/attractions.
- The typical local day visitor travel party had an average of 3.7 persons. 63 percent of these travel parties did not include children.
- Using the MGM2 estimates, non-local day visitors spent an average of \$69.33 on items such as food, gasoline and gifts.

Visitor Profile #3: Overnight Visitors, Motel

- 18 percent of visitors stayed one or more nights in a motel, hotel, bed-and-breakfast, or similar type of lodging. 60 percent were not residents of Pennsylvania and 40 percent were residents of the commonwealth.
- 61 percent of overnight motel visitors were first-time visitors to the heritage area. 39 percent were returning visitors. 46 percent of all overnight motel visitors said that they were somewhat to very familiar with the heritage area. In addition, 65 percent said the attraction or facility they were visiting was the primary reason for coming to the heritage area.
- The typical overnight motel visitor spent an average of 2.2 nights in the heritage area. During this time, they visited or planned to visit an average of 2.9 facilities/attractions.
- The typical overnight motel visitor travel party had an average of 3.1 persons. 79 percent of these travel parties did not include children.
- Using the MGM2 estimates, overnight motel visitors spent an average of \$201.10 for items such as food, lodging, gasoline and gifts.

Visitor Profile #4: Overnight Visitors, Other

- 22 percent of overnight visitors stayed one or more nights in a campground or with family or friends. 42 percent of these visitors were not residents of Pennsylvania and 58 percent resided in the commonwealth.
- 43 percent of overnight visitors staying in campgrounds or with family or friends were first-time visitors to the heritage area. 57 percent were returning visitors. 50 percent of all overnight visitors were somewhat to very familiar with the heritage area. 51 percent said the facility/attraction they were visiting was the primary reason for their visit.

- The typical overnight visitor staying in a campground or with family or friends spent an average of 2.9 nights in the heritage area. During this time, they visited or planned to visit an average of 2.7 facilities/attractions.
- The typical overnight motel visitor travel party had an average of 3.5 persons. 66 percent of these travel parties did not include children.
- Using the MGM2 estimates, these overnight visitors spent an average of \$71.88 for items such as food, lodging, gasoline and gifts.

Total Visitors Spending

- According to the MGM2 model, visitors to the eight heritage areas spent a total of \$300.9 million in 2008.
 - 56 percent, or \$168.3 million, came from overnight visitors staying in motels, hotels, bed-and-breakfasts, and other lodging.
 - 29 percent, or \$88.0 million, came from persons staying at campgrounds, or with family and friends.
 - 15 percent, or \$44.6 million, came from out-of-town day visitors.

Note: Spending by day visitors who were local residents was not included in the calculation since their spending represents a recirculation of money already in the heritage area.

Direct Economic Effects

- Visitor spending at Pennsylvania's eight heritage areas generated an estimated \$255.8 million in direct sales.
- Among the heritage areas, a combination of a large number of visitors and a high percentage of overnight visitors produced higher direct sales. These sales supported 4,372 jobs. The jobs generated more than \$95.8 million in salary and wages.
- On average, every \$58,500 spent by visitors supported one job in the heritage area.
- The total value added of all visitor spending, or the personal income plus rent and profits and indirect business taxes, was \$145.5 million.

Total Economic Effect

- The total direct, indirect, and induced effects of visitor spending in the eight heritage areas was \$416.9 million in sales. These sales supported 6,030 jobs. The total payroll from these jobs was \$156.4 million.
- The total value added from visitor spending in heritage areas was \$247.2 million.

Conclusions

- Heritage areas are important economic engines. Visitors to the eight heritage areas participating in the survey had a direct economic impact of \$255.8 million in sales. These sales had a ripple effect throughout the local economy and had a total economic effect of \$416.9 million in sales. In addition, the MGM2 model showed that more than 6,000 jobs in Pennsylvania are directly and indirectly linked to visitor spending in the eight heritage areas.
- Although 2008 was a difficult economic period (for example, increasing unemployment, high gasoline prices, etc.) for the United States, Pennsylvania's eight heritage areas hosted more than 18.0 million visitors. Thirty-two percent of these visitors were from outside Pennsylvania.
- The economic impact of Pennsylvania heritage areas could grow by increasing the number of overnight visitors. For example, a 1 percentage point increase in overnight visitors staying in motels would generate an additional \$6.6 million in sales, which would support 113 new jobs.

APPENDIX A

Sample of Visitor Survey

Onsite Heritage Visitor Survey

Site/Location: _____

Date: _____

Surveyor: _____

1. Is this your first trip to the heritage area?
 Yes
 No

2. Are you familiar with the heritage area?
 Very familiar
 Somewhat familiar
 Not sure
 No

3. Is your trip to heritage area part of a:
 Day Trip, Local Visitor
 Day Trip, Out of Town Visitor
 Overnight Trip
 For overnight trips, what type of lodging are you using in the local area:
 Hotel, motel or Bed & Breakfast
 Campground
 Staying with friends or relatives in the area
 Staying overnight outside the local area

4. How long do you plan to stay in the local area?
 _____ hours if on a day trip _____ nights if an overnight trip

5. How many people are in your travel party:
 _____ adults _____ children (under 18)

6. What is the Zip code of your permanent residence (if non-US, indicate country of residence)? _____

7. Which of the following facilities/attractions in the X Heritage Region have you visited or plan to visit as a part of this trip:
 Name of facility/attraction _____
 Name of facility/attraction _____
 Name of facility/attraction _____

8. Was one or more of these attractions the primary reason for your trip to X Heritage Region?
 Yes
 No