



**NORTHERN ARIZONA
UNIVERSITY**
The W. A. Franke College of Business

Cochise County Visitor Study 2012–2013



Prepared for the
Cochise County Tourism Council

by the
**Arizona Hospitality Research & Resource Center
Center for Business Outreach**
The W. A. Franke College of Business
Northern Arizona University

January 2014

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank all the people who helped to make this study possible. First, thanks go to the Cochise County Tourism Council and Glenn Schlottman, Community Relations Manager at the Arizona Office of Tourism, for recognizing the critical role that these local visitor studies play in understanding tourism in rural Arizona communities. Without this market research, Arizona cities and towns outside the Phoenix and Tucson areas would have little or no data on which to base their marketing placement decisions.

Next, we want to recognize the tourism “champions” in Cochise County. Following are members of the Cochise County Tourism Council whose work with community partners on the ground during the year enabled the collection of these completed visitor surveys: Gussie Motter, Cochise County; Bob Nilson, City of Benson; Ilona Smerekanich, City of Bisbee; Patricia Ortiz, City of Douglas; Judy Hector, City of Sierra Vista; Steve Troncale, City of Tombstone; and Alan Baker, City of Willcox.

Finally, special thanks to all the visitors to Cochise County who agreed to complete visitor surveys as part of their trips to the area. Without their help this report would not have been possible.

The Arizona Hospitality Research and Resource Center (AHRRC) team:

Cheryl Cothran, AHRRC Director

Thomas Combrink, Senior Research Specialist

Melinda Bradford, Research Specialist

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	ii
Table of Contents.....	iii
List of Tables.....	iv
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	5
Cochise County Visitor Study 2012-2013.....	7
Introduction.....	7
Methods.....	7
Survey Results.....	9
Communities.....	10
How Did You Hear about Cochise County?.....	11
Type of Trip.....	12
Number of Nights you plan to spend in Cochise County.....	12
Number of Nights Spent by Trip Purpose.....	14
Domestic or International Origins of Visitors to Cochise County.....	16
Origins of Domestic Visitors to Cochise County.....	16
Origins of Arizona Visitors to Cochise County.....	17
Origins of International Visitors to Cochise County.....	19
Primary Purpose of Visitors to Cochise County.....	20
Visitor Interest in Activities in Cochise County.....	22
Visitor Expenditures in Cochise County.....	24
Demographics of Visitors to Cochise County.....	27
Party Size.....	27
Gender.....	29
Age.....	29
Age by Gender.....	30
Annual Household Income.....	31
Appendix A: Visitor Questionnaire.....	33
Appendix B: Economic Contribution of Tourism in Cochise County.....	35
Introduction.....	36
Economic Impact Analysis Methods.....	36
Regional Expenditure Results.....	37
Regional Economic Impact Analysis Results.....	39
Discussion.....	40
Appendix C: Complete Lists of Visitor Origins.....	41
Appendix D: Comparison of Primary Trip Purpose-All Questions.....	46
Appendix E: Community Comparisons-All Questions.....	55
Appendix F: Seasonal Comparisons-All Questions.....	62

List of Tables

TABLE 1. SURVEY COUNTS BY MONTH	9
TABLE 2. SURVEY COUNTS BY CALENDAR QUARTER	9
TABLE 3. SURVEY COUNTS BY COMMUNITY	10
TABLE 4. HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT COCHISE COUNTY?	11
TABLE 5. IS THIS A DAY TRIP OR OVERNIGHT EXCURSION?	12
TABLE 6. IF OVERNIGHT, HOW MANY NIGHTS DO YOU PLAN TO STAY IN COCHISE COUNTY?	13
TABLE 7. IF OVERNIGHT, MEAN AND MEDIAN NUMBER OF NIGHTS IN COCHISE COUNTY BY PRIMARY TRIP PURPOSE	14
TABLE 8. IF OVERNIGHT, NUMBER OF NIGHTS IN COCHISE COUNTY BY PRIMARY TRIP PURPOSE	15
TABLE 9. VISITOR ORIGINS-DOMESTIC OR INTERNATIONAL?	16
TABLE 10. DOMESTIC VISITOR ORIGINS FOR COCHISE COUNTY	17
TABLE 11. ORIGINS OF ARIZONA VISITORS TO COCHISE COUNTY	18
TABLE 12. COUNTY OF ORIGIN OF ARIZONA VISITORS TO COCHISE COUNTY	18
TABLE 13. INTERNATIONAL VISITORS TO COCHISE COUNTY BY SEASON.....	19
TABLE 14. PRIMARY PURPOSE OF VISITORS TO COCHISE COUNTY	21
TABLE 15. ACTIVITY INTEREST FOR VISITORS TO COCHISE COUNTY.....	23
TABLE 16. AVERAGE EXPENDITURES FOR OVERALL VISITORS TO COCHISE COUNTY (PER PARTY/PER DAY)	24
TABLE 17. AVERAGE EXPENDITURES FOR VISITORS TO COCHISE COUNTY: DAY TRIP VS. OVERNIGHT EXCURSION (PER PARTY/PER DAY)	25
TABLE 18. AVERAGE EXPENDITURES BY PRIMARY TRIP PURPOSE FOR VISITORS TO COCHISE COUNTY....	26
TABLE 19. PARTY SIZE OF VISITORS TO COCHISE COUNTY	27
TABLE 20. PARTY SIZE BY PRIMARY TRIP PURPOSE FOR VISITORS TO COCHISE COUNTY	28
TABLE 21. GENDER OF RESPONDENTS VISITING COCHISE COUNTY	29
TABLE 22. AGE RANGES OF VISITORS TO COCHISE COUNTY	29
TABLE 23. AGE RANGES BY GENDER FOR VISITORS TO COCHISE COUNTY	30
TABLE 24. ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME OF VISITORS TO COCHISE COUNTY	31
TABLE 25. ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME OF ARIZONA VISITORS TO COCHISE COUNTY	32
TABLE B1. ESTIMATE OF PER PERSON/PER DAY EXPENDITURES FOR COCHISE COUNTY	38
TABLE B2. ESTIMATE OF TOTAL EXPENDITURES FOR DAY AND OVERNIGHT VISITORS TO COCHISE COUNTY.....	39
TABLE B3. EFFECTS AND MULTIPLIERS OF \$279.2 MILLION OF REGIONAL EXPENDITURES BY COCHISE COUNTY VISITORS (THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)	40
TABLE C1. STATE OF ORIGIN FOR VISITORS TO COCHISE COUNTY	42
TABLE C2. CITY OF ORIGIN FOR ARIZONA RESIDENTS VISITING COCHISE COUNTY	44
TABLE D1. PRIMARY TRIP PURPOSE OF VISITORS TO COCHISE COUNTY-ALL VARIABLES (PERCENT AND AVERAGES)	47
TABLE D2. PRIMARY TRIP PURPOSE OF VISITORS TO COCHISE COUNTY-ALL VARIABLES (FREQUENCY VALUES).....	51
TABLE E1. WHERE DID YOU RECEIVE THE SURVEY?-ALL QUESTIONS (PERCENT AND AVERAGES)	56
TABLE E2. WHERE DID YOU RECEIVE THE SURVEY?-ALL QUESTIONS (FREQUENCY VALUES)	59
TABLE F. SEASONAL DIFFERENCES-ALL QUESTIONS (PERCENT AND AVERAGES).....	63

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In 2012, the Cochise County Tourism Council (CCTC), with financial backing from the Arizona Office of Tourism (AOT), contracted with the Arizona Hospitality Research and Resource Center (AHRRC) at Northern Arizona University to conduct a survey of visitors to the county. A survey instrument was created in consultation with representatives of participating CCTC communities, a distribution schedule was established, and surveying of visitors to attractions and destinations within the county began in July of 2012 and ended in June 2013. A total of 4,591 completed surveys were collected. This report is a summary of the results of this year-long visitor study. The major findings of the study are the following:

- Word-of-mouth referrals from friends and family was the top information source used by more than half of all visitors (52.1%); it was followed by information gained in previous visits (31.7%); websites or online information sources were used by 19.8% of visitors.
- A majority of visitors (56.3%) were day visitors only, while 43.7% of visitors stayed overnight in the county.
- Those who spent the night stayed an average of 3.1 nights in Cochise County; median was 2.0 nights.
- By trip purpose, vacation/leisure visitors spent an average of 2.6 nights, while visitors just passing through spent 1.6 nights. Those on military training/business had the longest stays (11.8 nights) followed by those on combination business/leisure trips (6.9 nights); however, these latter two represented only 11.7% of all overnight visitors.
- Nine of 10 visitors (90.5%) originated from within the United States, while 9.5% were international visitors.
- Among US states, Arizona residents accounted for 36.6% of all county visitors. Other top ten states included: California (11%), Texas (4.8%), Wisconsin (3.9%), Washington (3.9%), Illinois (2.9%), Colorado (2.3%), Michigan (2.3%), Ohio (2.3%), and Oregon (2.1%).
- By season, more Arizonans visited Cochise County in the fall (October to December), while more Californians visited the county in the summer (July to September).
- Within Arizona, the various cities of the Phoenix metropolitan area provided the largest number of visitors to Cochise County at 39.3%, but were closely followed by visitors from the Tucson metropolitan area (32.6%). Thus, Arizona's two largest population centers provided 72% or roughly three-fourths of all county visitors.
- By season, visitors from Maricopa County had a strong presence in all seasons but were most likely to visit in the winter (January to March), while Pima County visitors had a slightly greater propensity to visit in the summer (July to September).

- Canada was the source of the vast majority of international visitors (49.5%), followed by the United Kingdom (17.7%), Germany (6.8%), France (6.2%), and Australia (4.7%).
- By trip purpose, two-thirds of all visitors were on leisure vacations (66.5%), followed by those on day trips (28.9%), visiting friends and relatives (17.6%), weekend excursions (10.9%), or passing through (10.7%).
- Using a one to five rating scale, visitors were most interested in experiencing Old West sites (3.9 mean rating) and national and state parks (3.9), followed by interest in visiting ghost towns (3.6), visiting sites of mining history (3.5), and in photography (3.3).
- Visitors had an average per-party/per-day expenditure of \$461. Overnight visitor parties averaged slightly higher spending at \$484 per day while day visitor parties averaged \$333 per day. Overall spending by category was:
 - Lodging \$107 (38% reported lodging expenditures)
 - Restaurants and groceries \$85 (77% reported restaurant/grocery expenditures)
 - Transportation/gasoline expenditures \$73 (69% reported transportation spending)
 - Recreation, tours, permits \$80 (65% reported recreation expenditures)
 - Shopping \$61 (65% reported spending money on retail shopping)
 - Other \$56 (29% reported other expenditures outside the standard categories).
- Travel parties had an average of 1.8 persons, one man and one woman; the median was 1.3 people; one-fifth of parties (21%) traveled with children under age 18 and the average number of children in parties with children was two.
- By gender, survey respondents were 59.4% female and 40.6% male; this finding may represent a greater willingness on the part of female travelers to complete survey forms.
- The average age of respondents was 59 years and the median age was 55 years, indicating an older visitor population relative to the statewide average overnight domestic visitor age of 46 years in 2012.
- The average annual household income of domestic visitors to Cochise County was \$73,298, which is slightly higher than the average income of visitors statewide at \$72,340 in 2012.

Cochise County Visitor Study 2012-2013

Introduction

Tourism is very important to the economic wellbeing of Cochise County. Visitors from Arizona, other states, and international countries are drawn to the area by its beautiful scenery, historic sites, mining towns, wild west history, vineyards, national and state parks and relaxed atmosphere. The county also benefits from its close proximity to Tucson, Arizona's second largest city. The increasing volume of visitors from Tucson has resulted in a robust weekend and short-stay market in the county. New tourism niches have developed around wine tourism in the Willcox and Kansas Settlement areas, while new western-themed tourist attractions have been developed near historic Tombstone. Birding sites are abundant in the county – the Huachuca Mountains in the south provide a haven for hummingbirds, while the San Pedro Riparian National Conservation Area provides a sanctuary for migrating birds and birdwatchers alike. The town of Bisbee with a rich mining history has morphed into a vibrant artists' colony and overnight destination. Sierra Vista and Fort Huachuca have a long history with the wild west and the Buffalo Soldiers, while Tombstone reverberates with the story of the gunfight at the OK Corral. Benson is closely linked with the world-class Kartchner Caverns State Park and railroad history, while Douglas has a Mexican-American heritage and the Slaughter Ranch. Hiking and mountain biking are available in the mountainous areas of the county, while wine tasting and vineyard visits can be found in the east. Thus, tourism and recreation opportunities abound for visitors to Cochise County.

Cochise County has long benefitted from an active tourism council comprised of elected county officials and industry members from all communities. The Cochise County Tourism Council (CCTC hereafter) is to be applauded for its efforts to promote tourism as a regional effort with a focus on the benefits of tourism for all communities. The Arizona Hospitality Research & Resource Center (AHRRC hereafter) has partnered with the CCTC in prior years to conduct primary research on visitors to the county. In early 2012, the CCTC approached the AHRRC to conduct a year-long survey of tourists in the county with the assistance of the Arizona Office of Tourism, which provided half of the funding for this project.

Methods

Representatives of the AHRRC met with the CCTC at their monthly meetings to discuss the survey instrument and questions to be included. It was decided to reduce the prior survey instrument of two pages down to a single page. The major reason for this was the difficulty of getting visitors to slow down long enough to complete a two-page survey. The reduction of the survey from two pages to one necessitated the removal of a large number of questions. This

process was accomplished by Iona Smerekanich and Gussie Motter who made the final decision as to what questions were retained. The final one-page survey contained the following sections:

- Information Sources: How did you hear about Cochise County?
- Trip Characteristics: Day or overnight trips, length of stay, domestic or international origins
- Purpose of Travel: Primary purpose
- Activity/Interest: Questions on visitor interests focused on attractions in the county
- Trip Expenditures: Visitor spending by tourist categories
- Demographics: Age, gender, party size, and income.

The limited set of questions asked precludes deeper analysis that would be valid if more questions were asked. Nonetheless, the data collected about visitors is substantial and will prove very helpful for marketing and future tourism product development.

Once the survey form was completed, a distribution schedule was developed detailing how many surveys were to be collected at each survey location during the calendar year from July 2012 through June 2013. The year-long survey period is important to ensure that data is collected during all seasons of the year. Surveys were distributed through the official DMO's in the communities, usually a visitor center or a chamber of commerce. The survey was distributed by DMO staff or volunteers according to a predetermined survey schedule and all surveys collected for a given month were returned to the AHRRC for scanning and data tabulation.

The hard work of survey staff at the designated sites resulted in a very good sample. A total of 4,591 surveys were collected for the year, providing a 95% confidence level and 4% margin of error for the validity of the results. Individual communities that participated included: Benson, Bisbee, Douglas, Sierra Vista, Tombstone, Willcox, and Pearce-Sunsites. Individual tabular profiles for these communities and their data tables can be found in the Appendix of this document. If sample sizes were too small to be representative, individual tabular profiles were not run for a community.

The remainder of this report presents the survey results for the Cochise County Visitor Study 2012-2013.

Survey Results

A total of 4,591 surveys were collected during the year-long survey with April (16.4%) being the most active individual month in the survey period. See Table 1.

Table 1. Survey counts by month

Survey Month	Frequency	%
July 2012	237	5.2%
August 2012	246	5.4%
September 2012	318	6.9%
October 2012	295	6.4%
November 2012	246	5.4%
December 2012	240	5.2%
January 2013	345	7.5%
February 2013	480	10.5%
March 2013	690	15.0%
April 2013	751	16.4%
May 2013	388	8.5%
June 2013	355	7.7%
Total	4,591	100.0%

By quarter, the largest number of surveys (33%) were collected during the January to March period, or the winter season, which coincides with peak visits to the county. The winter quarter was followed closely by spring (April to June), which accounted for a further 32.5% of all surveys. See Table 2.

Table 2. Survey counts by calendar quarter

Calendar quarters	Frequency	%
July - September, 2012	804	17.5%
October - December, 2012	781	17.0%
January - March, 2013	1,515	33.0%
April - June, 2013	1,491	32.5%
Total	4,591	100.0%

Communities

The major communities that participated in the 2012-2013 Cochise County tourism survey were Benson, Bisbee, Douglas, Sierra Vista, Tombstone, Willcox, and Pearce-Sunsites. An "other" community designation was included but a relatively insignificant number of surveys were turned in for "other" communities, although they are included in the analysis.

The largest number of surveys were collected by Bisbee (2,103 or 46.1%), followed by Tombstone (1,237 or 27.1%), Sierra Vista (740 or 16.2%), and Benson (156 or 3.4%).

Table 3. Survey counts by community

Town where survey was received	Calendar quarters					Total	
	July - September 2012	October - December 2012	January - March 2013	April - June 2013			
	Frequency	Frequency	Frequency	Frequency	Frequency	%	
Benson	47	52	33	24	156	3.4%	
Bisbee	400	514	656	533	2,103	46.1%	
Douglas	41	35	19	31	126	2.8%	
Sierra Vista	178	111	363	88	740	16.2%	
Tombstone	46	0	436	755	1,237	27.1%	
Willcox	78	33	1	18	130	2.9%	
Pearce-Sunsites	1	0	5	3	9	0.2%	
Other	12	36	0	12	60	1.3%	
Total	803	781	1,513	1,464	4,561	100.0%	

How Did You Hear about Cochise County?

Visitors get information about a destination in a variety of ways. It is, therefore, very important for tourism businesses and destination marketing organizations, such as the CCTC, to understand which information sources are used most often. The survey asked visitors to indicate the information sources they used. The list of information sources included: newspapers, magazines, radio, TV, online-website, social networking sites (i.e., Facebook), word-of-mouth, and been here before/previous visit.

Word-of-mouth referrals from friends and family (52.1%) were the most frequently cited information source. Those who heard about the county from others was followed by those who had previously visited Cochise County (31.7%). When combined, these two information sources (word-of-mouth and previous visit) accounted for the vast majority of visitors (83.8%).

Visitors using online-websites (19.8%) for information on Cochise County were the only other significant information source. The fact that a majority of visitors either heard about Cochise County from someone else or had previously been there speaks well for Cochise County's identity as a tourism destination. The next question in the survey will tell us whether the visitors are on a day trip or an overnight excursion. See Table 4.

Table 4. How did you hear about Cochise County?

How did you hear about Cochise County?	Frequency	%
Word-of-mouth	2,210	52.1%
Been here before	1,345	31.7%
Online-website	840	19.8%
Magazine	333	7.8%
TV	185	4.4%
Newspaper	131	3.1%
Social networking site	104	2.5%
Radio	31	0.7%

*Does not sum to 100% because of multiple responses

Type of Trip

Do visitors come to Cochise County for a day trip or do they come to spend more time, making the county an overnight destination? A majority of visitors (56.3%) visited the county on day trips, while the remainder (43.7%) were on overnight trips. The large number of day trip visitors suggests that the Metro Tucson and Phoenix areas are rich markets for the county. See Table 5.

Table 5. Is this a day trip or overnight excursion?

Is this a day trip or overnight excursion?	Frequency	%
Day trip	2,583	56.3%
Overnight excursion	2,008	43.7%
Total	4,591	100.0%

Cochise County's location within a one hour drive of Tucson, the state's second largest city, is the biggest factor in day trip visits. Almost three-fourths (72.7%) of Arizona day visitors to the county come from the greater Tucson Area, including Pima (43.8%) and Santa Cruz (1.4%) counties. The next largest single group of visitors was from Maricopa County (27.5%), including Phoenix, Scottsdale, Mesa, and surrounding communities.

Number of Nights you plan to spend in Cochise County

For overnight visitors it is important to establish average length-of-stay in the county, which highlights important differences between day and overnight visitors with respect to activities and expenditures. The primary reason visitors are in the county strongly affects length-of-stay. For example, visitors staying in Sierra Vista, whose primary purpose is military training/business tend to stay much longer than those on a weekend excursion. Visitor lengths-of-stay in the county are also impacted by winter visitors or snowbirds who come to Arizona for the warm weather and tend to have relatively long lengths-of-stay. While there are fewer winter visitors actually residing in Cochise County than in the greater Tucson area, these winter visitors take day trips to Cochise County for recreation and other purposes. Therefore, arriving at an average length-of-stay is confounded by these two visitor cohorts - military business and long-stay winter visitors - both of which have extended lengths-of-stay and inflate the length of time spent in the county. To ensure a clearer picture of visitor length-of-stay, overall or average length-of-stay is reported as the mean by range, i.e., most visitors spent one week in the county, and the mean for that range is 2.51 nights.

On average, overnight visitors spent 3.1 nights in Cochise County during the survey period, with a median of 2.0 nights. More than four-fifths (89%) of all visitors spent one week or less in

Cochise County. Those spending a single night accounted for a quarter (25.3%) of overnight visitors, while another third (31.8%) spent two nights. See Table 6 for a complete profile.

Table 6. If overnight, how many nights do you plan to stay in Cochise County?

# Nights	Frequency	%	Cumulative %
1 night	486	25.3%	
2 nights	611	31.8%	57.0%
3 nights	277	14.4%	71.4%
4 nights	136	7.1%	78.5%
5 nights	91	4.7%	83.2%
6 nights	41	2.1%	85.3%
7 nights	70	3.6%	89.0%
2 weeks	106	5.5%	94.5%
3 weeks	19	1.0%	95.5%
1 month	23	1.2%	96.7%
2 months	42	2.2%	98.9%
3 months	18	0.9%	99.8%
More than 3 months	4	0.2%	100.0%
Total	1,924	100.0%	

Mean = 3.1 nights
 Median = 2.0 nights

Number of Nights Spent by Trip Purpose

Trip purpose and length-of-stay are highly correlated. It stands to reason that weekend visitors are likely to have two or fewer nights in the county whereas those staying at Fort Huachuca for military training/business are going to stay for more nights. Thus, average length-of-stay in nights was correlated to primary trip purpose to show this relationship. For this analysis, primary purpose was determined by using only those who selected one purpose (i.e., military training/business) for their trip. This reduced the overall total but provides more detail on the actual intent of visitors.

Vacation/Leisure visitors have the greatest tourism impact on the county. They accounted for the majority of overnight visitors (57.3%) and had an average stay of 2.6 nights. Those who self-identified as weekend excursion visitors represented 13.7% of overnight visitors to the county with an average length-of-stay of 1.7 nights. Visiting friends and relatives were next with 12% spending three nights for this purpose. Those on military training/business had the largest average stay (11.8 nights) but only represented a small fraction of visitors to the county (5%) and were clustered in the Sierra Vista/Fort Huachuca area. Business visitors or those on a combination of business and pleasure were combined for reporting purposes; they had longer than average lengths of stay (6.9 nights), but also accounted for only a small portion (6.7%) of total overnight guests. See Table 7.

Table 7. If overnight, mean and median number of nights in Cochise County by primary trip purpose

Single Primary Trip Purpose	Number of nights in Cochise County				
	Mean	Median	% of each purpose with overnight stays	Frequency	% of overnights in sample
Vacation/leisure	2.6	1.0	50.5%	1,412	57.26%
Passing through	1.6	0.0	30.1%	132	5.35%
Weekend excursion	1.7	1.0	71.1%	337	13.67%
Visiting friends/relatives	3	0.0	40.3%	296	12.00%
Military training/business	11.8	0.0	100.0%	125	5.07%
Business & combo business and pleasure	6.9	1.0	52.9%	164	6.65%
Averages & Totals	4.6	1.0	57.5%	2,466	100.00%

In a similar analysis, the length-of-stay of various groups was broken down into periods of one, two and three week, and one, two and three month intervals to provide an overall picture of length-of-stay in the county. As can be seen in Table 8, a majority of visitors stay either one or two nights in the county. Only those visitors whose primary purpose was military training/business stayed significantly longer than two weeks. See Table 8.

Table 8. If overnight, number of nights in Cochise County by primary trip purpose

# Nights	What best describes the primary purpose of your stay in Cochise County?							
	Vacation/ leisure	Passing through	Business/ combo	Visiting friends and relatives	Weekend excursion	Military training/ business	Day trip	Customs/ border patrol
1 night	26%	33%	19%	16%	31%	2%	0%	50%
2 nights	33%	27%	17%	26%	48%	11%	0%	0%
3 nights	14%	14%	22%	16%	16%	15%	0%	50%
4 nights	7%	6%	7%	10%	4%	11%	0%	0%
5 nights	5%	5%	6%	8%	0%	5%	0%	0%
6 nights	2%	1%	2%	3%	0%	3%	0%	0%
7 nights	4%	3%	2%	4%	0%	3%	0%	0%
2 weeks	5%	6%	10%	10%	0%	8%	0%	0%
3 weeks	1%	0%	4%	2%	0%	5%	0%	0%
1 month	1%	1%	3%	3%	0%	8%	0%	0%
2 months	1%	1%	7%	1%	0%	19%	0%	0%
3 months	1%	2%	1%	2%	0%	9%	0%	0%
More than 3 months	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	3%	0%	0%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	0%	100%

Domestic or International Origins of Visitors to Cochise County

Where do visitors come from to experience Cochise County's history and dramatic scenery?

Respondents were asked to include their ZIP codes if they were domestic visitors and their country of origin if they were international visitors. A vast majority of visitors (90.5%) were from within the U.S., while 9.5% were international travelers, visiting the U.S. from other countries, as shown in Table 9. In this section each group of visitors will be analyzed further to identify top markets for Arizona visitors, other domestic visitors, and international visitors.

Table 9. Visitor origins-domestic or international?

Origin	Frequency	%
Domestic	4,157	90.5%
International	434	9.5%
Total	4,591	100.0%

Origins of Domestic Visitors to Cochise County

In all, visitors from 46 states and one dominion (Puerto Rico) visited Cochise County and participated during the 2012-2013 survey. Arizona residents (36.6%) accounted for the largest cohort of visitors, which is consistent with statewide visitation figures that show Arizonans traveling in-state account for about one-third of the state's visitors. The next largest origin state for Cochise County was California (11.0%), providing about one in 10 visitors. California consistently ranks as one of the prime visitor markets for Arizona and Cochise County is well positioned to capture these visitors moving eastward on I-10. California was followed by Texas (4.8%), another staple market providing travelers to Arizona. Texas was followed by Wisconsin (3.9%), Washington (3.9%), Illinois (2.9%), Michigan (2.3%), Colorado (2.3%), Ohio (2.3%), and Oregon (2.1%). These Top Ten states accounted for almost three-fourths of all visitors to Cochise County (72%) in the survey period. See data for top states in Table 10 and a complete list in Appendix C.

Table 10. Domestic visitor origins for Cochise County

Origin: Top Ten States	Calendar quarter				Average
	July - September 2012	October - December 2012	January – March 2013	April – June 2013	
Arizona	42.8%	46.4%	26.8%	30.2%	36.6%
California	13.1%	9.4%	9.4%	12.1%	11.0%
Texas	7.3%	2.9%	3.8%	5.2%	4.8%
Wisconsin	1.5%	2.8%	7.8%	3.5%	3.9%
Washington	2.7%	2.5%	5.3%	4.9%	3.9%
Illinois	1.6%	2.4%	5.0%	2.6%	2.9%
Colorado	1.8%	1.8%	3.3%	2.3%	2.3%
Michigan	1.1%	2.4%	3.6%	2.2%	2.3%
Ohio	1.8%	2.4%	2.1%	2.7%	2.3%
Oregon	1.2%	1.9%	2.7%	2.7%	2.1%
Top Ten States	74.9%	74.9%	69.8%	68.4%	72.0%
Other States	25.1%	25.1%	30.2%	31.6%	28.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Seasonality plays an important role in domestic visitation to Arizona. Just looking at the top ten visitor markets for Cochise County shows that more Arizonans visit the county in the fall season (October to December), whereas more Californians visit in the summer (July to September). Most states have fairly even visitation across quarters, but states in the upper mid-west tend to send more visitors during the winter months (January to March), such as Wisconsin with 62% of its total visitation in the winter.

Origins of Arizona Visitors to Cochise County

Arizona residents account for one-third of visitors to Cochise County. Looking at city and town data, the greatest percentage of these visitors are from the Phoenix Metro area (39.3%), understandable since such a disproportionate share of the state’s residents live in Maricopa County. The greater Tucson Metro area (and its suburbs), however, contributed an impressive one-third of all the in-state visitors to Cochise County (32.6%), with the remaining communities in the state providing no more than about 2% each. See Table 11 which follows and Appendix C for the complete list.

Table 11. Origins of Arizona visitors to Cochise County

Origin: Arizona Resident	Frequency	%
Tucson	192	13.9%
Phoenix	161	11.7%
Mesa	69	5.0%
Oro Valley	46	3.3%
Scottsdale	45	3.3%
Chandler	43	3.1%
Glendale	40	2.9%
Fry	37	2.7%
Peoria	35	2.5%

Seasonality also plays a role in when Arizona visitors go to Cochise County. At the county level, visitors from Maricopa County are as likely to visit relatively equally in all seasons, with slightly greater propensity to visit during the January to March or July to September quarters. Pima County visitors were active in all quarters, although strongest in the July to September quarter and weakest in the October to December quarter. Residents of Cochise County traveling within the county itself ranked third among all counties and were represented most often in the fall quarter. Pinal County, geographically positioned as a neighbor, ranked fourth and again contributed more visitors during October to December. See Table 12.

Table 12. County of origin of Arizona visitors to Cochise County

Arizona County	July - September 2012	October - December 2012	January - March 2013	April - June 2013	Average
Maricopa	39.0%	35.7%	45.0%	37.6%	39.3%
Pima	36.8%	28.8%	32.6%	32.3%	32.6%
Cochise	10.8%	18.0%	6.8%	12.9%	12.1%
Pinal	3.8%	6.3%	5.1%	5.3%	5.1%
Yavapai	1.9%	3.0%	3.1%	2.9%	2.7%
Coconino	0.6%	1.8%	1.7%	1.2%	1.3%
Graham	3.2%	1.2%	0.3%	0.7%	1.4%
Santa Cruz	0.3%	1.2%	2.0%	0.7%	1.1%
Yuma	0.6%	0.9%	0.8%	1.9%	1.1%
Gila	0.3%	1.2%	0.8%	0.7%	0.8%
Navajo	1.0%	0.6%	0.8%	1.0%	0.9%
Mohave	0.3%	0.0%	0.6%	1.2%	0.5%
Apache	0.6%	0.3%	0.4%	0.7%	0.5%
Greenlee	0.4%	1.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.5%
La Paz	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.2%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Origins of International Visitors to Cochise County

Canada (49.5%) is a perennial Arizona market and provided half of all international visitors. The next largest international market was the United Kingdom (17.7%), followed by Germany (6.8%), France (6.2%), and Australia (4.7%). Therefore, Canada and the UK together accounted for two-thirds (67.2%) of total internationals. A total of 30 countries were represented in the sample.

Seasonal patterns tended to be different for Canadians in comparison to those from other parts of the world. Visitors in winter were overwhelmingly from Canada (81%) and are more than likely to be snowbirds or long-stay visitors. The United Kingdom provided most of its visitors (27%) in the fall (October to December), while Germans traveled most in the summer through fall quarters. French were more exclusively summer visitors (19%). See Table 13.

Table 13. International visitors to Cochise County by season

If you are not from the US please list your country of origin:	Calendar quarter				Total
	July - September 2012	October - December 2012	January - March 2013	April - June 2013	
Canada	20.3%	50.8%	81.1%	45.7%	49.5%
United Kingdom	18.8%	27.1%	5.8%	19.0%	17.7%
Germany	9.4%	8.5%	2.6%	6.7%	6.8%
France	18.8%	0.0%	1.1%	4.8%	6.2%
Australia	7.8%	1.7%	3.7%	5.7%	4.7%
New Zealand	1.6%	5.1%	0.5%	1.9%	2.3%
Italy	6.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.6%
Ireland	3.1%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%	1.0%
Mexico	1.6%	0.0%	0.5%	1.9%	1.0%
Netherlands/Holland	3.2%	0.0%	0.5%	1.0%	1.2%
Philippines	3.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%
Japan	1.6%	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	0.7%
Belgium	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	1.9%	0.6%
Israel	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.9%	0.5%
Switzerland	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%	0.4%
Chile	0.0%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%
Denmark	0.0%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%
Colombia	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%
Spain	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%
Thailand	0.0%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%
Ukraine	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%
Republic Of Korea	0.0%	1.7%	0.5%	2.0%	1.0%

Table 13 (continued)	Calendar quarter				Total
	July - September 2012	October - December 2012	January – March 2013	April – June 2013	
Poland	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	0.3%
Algeria	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%	0.3%
Hungary	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%	0.3%
Turkey	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%	0.3%
Zimbabwe	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%	0.3%
Portugal	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%	0.3%
Kuwait	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%	0.1%
South Africa	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%	0.1%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Primary Purpose of Visitors to Cochise County

Visitors to Cochise County have many and often overlapping reasons for why they travel. To determine the *primary* reasons for Cochise County trips, respondents were asked to select *all* the reasons for their visits to the county. These trip purpose categories included:

- Vacation/Leisure
- Passing through
- Weekend excursion
- Day trip
- Visiting friends and relatives
- Business
- Combination of business and leisure travel
- Military training/business, and
- Customs/Border patrol.

Visitors could choose multiple reasons for visiting the county, although one purpose is generally more important than the others. For example, visitors on military training/business may have also considered themselves as being vacation/leisure visitors or weekend visitors at other times. This analysis, however, focuses on the primary purposes as indicated by the overall frequency of responses.

Vacation/Leisure visitors (66.5%) accounted for a majority of visitors to the county, followed by those on day trips (28.9%), those visiting friends and relatives (VFR) (17.6%), visitors on weekend excursions (10.9%), or those passing through (10.7%). Other reasons for visiting the county each accounted for less than 5% of responses and combined provided the remaining 10.3% of the sample. Clearly, the most important purpose was for leisure vacations.

Table 14. Primary purpose of visitors to Cochise County

Primary trip purpose	Frequency	%
Vacation/leisure	3,000	66.5%
Day trip	1,305	28.9%
Visiting friends and relatives	793	17.6%
Weekend excursion	490	10.9%
Passing through	482	10.7%
Business	180	4.0%
Military training/business	144	3.2%
Combination of business and pleasure	130	2.9%
Customs/border patrol	8	0.2%

*Does not sum to 100% because of multiple responses

Visitor Interest in Activities in Cochise County

Next, visitors were asked about their interest in activities and experiences available in the county. These activities comprise a good cross-section of recreational and tourist opportunities and are representative of the most common attractions. The activity choices offered included:

- Visiting sites of Old West history
- Visiting Mexican cultural heritage sites
- Visiting sites of mining history
- Visiting ghost towns
- Visiting national and state parks
- Visiting wineries and wine-tasting rooms
- Touring agriculture/U-pick operations
- Photography
- Bird watching/observing wildlife
- Hiking/mountain biking/rock climbing

A majority of visitors indicated that visiting sites of the Old West along with state and national parks were the activities in which they were most interested. These activities had the highest mean scores at 3.9 each. The highest interest ratings, based on those who indicated on the survey that they were either “very” or “extremely” interested, was also for visiting national and state parks (70.9%) and Old West history (70.2%). Cochise County is well-positioned for the former, encompassing Kartchner Caverns State Park and Coronado National Monument. Cochise County is also very much identified with sites of the Old West through Tombstone and the Slaughter Ranch near Douglas. The activity that ranked third in visitor interest was visiting ghost towns (59.8%), of which there are a number within the county. Visitors interested in the county's rich mining history, such as that found in Bisbee, was the fourth strongest attraction with a moderately high level of interest (57%) and a mean score of 3.5. These four activities were of the most interest to a majority of visitors, with “very” or “extremely” high interest ratings by more than 50% of all respondents.

The following activities were of lesser but still significant interest to visitors. Again, when adding the “very” and “extremely” interested ratings from Table 15, photography proved popular (46.8% expressed such interest), and the county abounds in photo opportunities with the historic sites of Bisbee, Tombstone, and the dramatic backdrop of the Dragoon Mountains. Photography was followed by an interest in visiting Mexican cultural heritage sites (33.4%), primarily found in Douglas.

The final four activities had mid-level mean scores of less than 3.0, or “somewhat interested.” While overall interest levels for these activities were not as high as for others they are still valid and important tourism niches. The first of these final activities was bird watching and observing

wildlife (36.9%), another strong market for the county with its many birding trails and great opportunities to view wildlife at Ramsey Canyon and in the San Pedro Riparian National Conservation Area. Hiking, mountain biking, and rock climbing, in which 36.3% were interested followed very closely; the county abounds with such opportunities on public lands administered by the U.S. Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management. This niche, however, appeals to relatively active visitors and a slightly younger demographic than was seen in this survey. The next activity with a relatively low level of interest was visiting wineries and wine tasting rooms (31.7%), which may be due to a relatively low level of visitor awareness about Cochise County wine production. Opportunities, therefore, exist to promote the wine tasting rooms in Willcox and the wine production in the Kansas Settlement area since interest in wine tourism in Arizona is on the rise. The final activity was touring agricultural and U-pick operations (18.0%), which is a seasonal activity centered in the Willcox area. See Table 15.

Table 15. Activity Interest for visitors to Cochise County

Interested in:	Not at all	A little	Somewhat	Very	Extremely	Mean
Visiting sites of Old West history	3.4%	7.1%	19.4%	41.4%	28.8%	3.9
Visiting national and state parks	4.0%	7.1%	18.0%	37.3%	33.6%	3.9
Visiting ghost towns	7.0%	11.3%	21.9%	35.0%	24.8%	3.6
Visiting sites of mining history	5.7%	10.8%	26.5%	37.1%	19.9%	3.5
Photography	11.7%	16.5%	25.0%	26.5%	20.3%	3.3
Visiting Mexican cultural heritage sites	12.9%	21.8%	31.9%	22.8%	10.6%	3.0
Bird watching/observing wildlife	19.3%	20.1%	23.7%	22.0%	14.9%	2.9
Hiking/mountain biking/rock climbing	22.9%	18.6%	22.2%	20.8%	15.5%	2.9
Visiting wineries and wine-tasting rooms	26.8%	19.2%	22.3%	19.4%	12.3%	2.7
Touring agriculture/U-Pick operations	33.2%	26.4%	22.4%	11.6%	6.4%	2.3

1 = Not at all Interested
5 = Extremely Interested

Visitor Expenditures in Cochise County

Visitor spending is critical to rural destination communities in Cochise County, bringing “new money” to communities and increasing tax revenues. Most tourists spend money on lodging if they stay overnight. They may also consume food from restaurants or grocery stores, pay fees for entrance to museums, tours, etc., have transportation costs including gas, and go shopping. Not all visitors, however, spend money in every expenditure category. Expenditures among overnight and day visitors may vary. For example, only 38% of all visitors reported lodging expenditures. In this analysis we will first look at overall spending for all visitors followed by a break-out of day versus overnight visitor expenditures.

The highest expenditures were recorded for lodging, where the average travel party spent \$107 per day; however, as previously mentioned only 38% of all visitors indicated that they had this expenditure. The next highest expenditures were recorded for food purchased at restaurants or grocery stores (\$85 per party); three-fourths of visitors indicated that they had restaurant and grocery expenditures (77%). Transportation had the third highest level of expenditures with the average party spending \$73 per day on transportation/gas; 69% of tourists indicated that they had transportation/gas expenditures. Recreation, tours, entrance fees and permits averaged \$80 per party and were reported by 65% of visitors. Tourist retail shopping (arts and crafts, etc.) had the fifth highest average at \$61 per party, with 65% indicating that they had expenditures in this category. Finally, “other” or miscellaneous expenditures averaged \$56 per party, with fewer respondents (29%) reporting expenditures in this category. See all figures in Table 16.

Table 16. Average expenditures for overall visitors to Cochise County (per party/per day)

	Mean	Median	% with expenditures
Lodging/camping	\$106.80	\$100.00	37.9%
Restaurant and grocery	\$85.42	\$60.00	77.0%
Shopping/arts and crafts	\$60.68	\$50.00	64.5%
Transportation (including gas)	\$72.56	\$50.00	68.8%
Recreation/entrance fees	\$79.69	\$50.00	64.6%
Other expenditures	\$56.29	\$40.00	28.6%
Total	\$461.44	\$350.00	

While these travel expenditures document significant economic activity in the county this doesn't tell the whole story. Recall that a majority of survey respondents were day visitors (56.3%). Even though day visitors had expenditures in all categories (with the exception of lodging) the percent who did was lower in all cases when compared to overnight visitors. The average amount of spending was also lower for day visitors in all cases with the exception of “other” expenditures which were equal to overnight visitors. Appreciating and welcoming day

visitors is important. Encouraging people to stay overnight clearly reaps additional economic benefits for communities. See Table 17 for these differences.

Table 17. Average expenditures for visitors to Cochise County:
Day trip vs. overnight excursion (per party/per day)

	Day Trip			Overnight		
	Mean	Median	% with expenditures	Mean	Median	% with expenditures
Lodging/camping	\$0.00	\$0.00	0.0%	\$106.80	\$100.00	86.6%
Restaurant and grocery	\$74.98	\$50.00	69.8%	\$96.27	\$70.00	86.4%
Shopping/arts and crafts	\$59.44	\$50.00	59.5%	\$62.01	\$50.00	71.0%
Transportation (including gas)	\$66.06	\$50.00	61.7%	\$79.15	\$50.00	78.0%
Recreation/entrance fees	\$75.78	\$50.00	59.8%	\$83.94	\$50.00	70.8%
Other expenditures	\$56.29	\$30.00	26.0%	\$56.29	\$40.00	31.8%
Total	\$332.55	\$230.00		\$484.46	\$360.00	

The question is often asked, who are the best tourists for our economy? Who spends the most, who stays the longest and, therefore, who has the greatest potential impact? From the previous discussion we know that visitors who are on military training or military business had the longest stays (12 days on average), but they account for a very small percent of visitors (3.2%). Visitors in the county on business had the second longest stays on average (7 days) but also had a low volume of visits (4%). Visitors in the county on vacation/leisure trips accounted for the largest number of visitors (66%) but had some of the lowest lengths of stay (2.6 days) along with weekend excursionists (1.7 days). So which visitor group is most beneficial for the economy? To answer this question Table 19 looks at single-purpose visitors, those who listed only one primary purpose, and then expands their per-party expenditures to a weighted average per-party/per-day expenditure.

Results show that weekend excursionists had the highest weighted average per-party/per-day spending (\$412), but represented only 9% of overall visits. Weekend excursion visitors were followed by vacation/leisure visitors with weighted average per party/per day expenditures of \$285, representing 66% of all county visitors. This was closely followed by those visiting friends and relatives (\$278). Not surprisingly, those on day trips (\$172) or only passing through (\$170) had the lowest, although still significant, expenditures. See Table 18.

Table 18. Average expenditures by primary trip purpose for visitors to Cochise County

	Lodging/ camping		Restaurant/ grocery		Recreation/tour/ entrance fees		Transportation (incl gas)		Shopping/ arts & crafts		Other expenditures		Weighted average per party expenditures
	Mean	% with exp	Mean	% with exp	Mean	% with exp	Mean	% with exp	Mean	% with exp	Mean	% with exp	
Vacation/leisure	\$106.75	55%	\$82.08	82%	\$58.36	71%	\$69.03	72%	\$78.21	68%	\$51.46	28%	\$285.36
Pass through	\$114.42	24%	\$66.84	59%	\$52.73	47%	\$79.52	54%	\$60.69	45%	\$33.00	24%	\$170.24
Business/combination	\$102.51	46%	\$79.21	74%	\$42.58	49%	\$75.06	66%	\$66.58	52%	\$59.93	33%	\$230.43
Visit friends and relatives	\$95.80	29%	\$154.61	69%	\$57.57	51%	\$88.25	61%	\$86.24	54%	\$56.37	25%	\$277.62
Weekend excursion	\$123.55	68%	\$121.51	78%	\$96.81	69%	\$96.07	77%	\$101.00	72%	\$65.19	29%	\$412.07
Military training/business	\$95.89	36%	\$76.76	71%	\$48.94	51%	\$66.06	63%	\$83.28	54%	\$68.82	41%	\$228.89
Day trip	\$0	0%	\$67.66	67%	\$62.47	56%	\$61.71	58%	\$76.54	58%	\$52.65	23%	\$172.30
Average expenditure	\$106.49		\$92.67		\$59.92		\$76.53		\$78.93		\$55.35		\$253.84

Demographics of Visitors to Cochise County

The final section of this report describes the demographics of the visitor sample, their travel party size, as well as the gender, average age, and annual household income of the respondent. Demographic data are useful for comparing the county's visitors to the overall population and to the target markets identified by the county. Each demographic question is considered separately in this section.

Party Size

Respondents were asked to indicate how many people including themselves were in their travel party. Respondents were asked to indicate the number of men, women, and children under age 18 in the travel party. About one in five parties (21%) traveled with children, lower than the state average of 30%. For those parties traveling with children the average number of children was 2.1 (representing 75% of all parties traveling with children). Larger parties consisted of five children to a high of 66 children (on a field trip to Bisbee), but parties with large numbers of children accounted for only 10% of the sample with children.

The majority of the sample consisted of one or two person parties. The median party size was 1.3; the median is used here to avoid inflation, such as from a military training group of 42 persons or a group of 20 females traveling on a weekend excursion who were captured in the sample. The average or arithmetic mean is higher at 1.8 persons, reflecting an upward bias due to a few large groups. See Table 19.

Table 19. Party size of visitors to Cochise County

	Mean	Median	Number of Cases
Number of women	1.7	1.0	4,139
Number of men	1.6	1.0	3,915
Number of children under 18 years of age	2.1	2.0	963
Total & Average	1.8	1.3	9,017

We have already seen the effect of large party size on the average visitor party with military groups of 44 persons or parties of 66 children on field trips. Are there other differences in party size by primary purpose of visit? The weighted average for party size differs by primary purpose of trip, as does the number of parties that are traveling with children under age 18. Military training has the largest weighted average party size (2.1 persons), followed by business (2.0 persons). On the other hand vacation/leisure had the smallest weighted average party size (1.6 persons) but is by far the largest visitor group. Other parties traveling with children were found on weekend excursions or visiting friends and relatives. (Customs and Border Patrol were excluded because only 8 cases were reported.) See Table 20.

Table 20. Party size by primary trip purpose for visitors to Cochise County

	Weighted average party size	Percent of all parties	Percent of parties with children
Military training/business	2.1	3%	0%
Business	2.0	4%	8%
Weekend excursion	1.9	11%	13%
Combination of business and pleasure	1.9	3%	6%
Visiting friends and relatives	1.8	18%	14%
Day trip	1.8	29%	13%
Vacation/leisure	1.6	67%	10%
Passing through	1.6	11%	8%
* does not add up to 100% because of multiple responses			

Gender

More female respondents (59.4%) than male respondents (40.6%) appeared in the sample. This may mean there were more females visiting but may also simply indicate a greater willingness on the part of females vs. males to complete the survey. See Table 21.

Table 21. Gender of respondents visiting Cochise County

	Frequency	%
Female	2,541	59.4%
Male	1,736	40.6%
Total	4,277	100.0%

Age

Respondents were next asked to indicate the year in which they were born. This data reported by year was used to calculate the average age of visitors to Cochise County, producing an average age for visitors of 59.1 years, somewhat higher than the 2012 state domestic overnight average of 46 years reported by the Arizona Office of Tourism; the median age for Cochise County visitors in this report was 55 years. See Table 22.

Table 22. Age ranges of visitors to Cochise County

	Frequency	%
20 and under	16	0.4%
21 - 25 years	12	0.3%
26 - 30 years	17	0.5%
31 - 35 years	72	2.0%
36 - 40 years	222	6.1%
41 - 45 years	424	11.7%
46 - 50 years	587	16.3%
51 - 55 years	461	12.8%
56 - 60 years	330	9.1%
61 - 65 years	275	7.6%
66 - 70 years	253	7.0%
71 - 75 years	231	6.4%
76 years and older	711	19.7%
Total	3,611	100.0%

Mean = 59.1 years

Median = 55 years

Age by Gender

Were there differences in age according to gender? To determine this, the two data sets of age and gender were cross-tabulated. No significant differences appeared between the ages of males (59.3 years) and females (59.4 years). There were more males in the age cohorts between 26 and 50 years of age and in the 76 and older cohort. On the other hand, there were more females in the 51 to 75 year age cohort. See Table 23.

Table 23. Age ranges by gender for visitors to Cochise County

	Gender	
	Female	Male
	%	%
20 years and under	0.5%	0.3%
21 - 25 years	0.4%	0.2%
26 - 30 years	0.4%	0.6%
31 - 35 years	1.3%	2.8%
36 - 40 years	5.8%	6.4%
41 - 45 years	11.2%	12.3%
46 - 50 years	15.2%	17.4%
51 - 55 years	14.0%	11.2%
56 - 60 years	10.4%	7.6%
61 - 65 years	7.9%	7.5%
66 - 70 years	7.5%	6.3%
71 - 75 years	6.4%	6.3%
76 years and older	19.3%	21.1%
Total	100.0%	100.0%

Mean (female) = 59.4 years

Mean (male) = 59.3 years

Annual Household Income

The final question on the survey asked respondents to indicate total annual household income, reported on a range from less than \$14,999 to \$125,000+. Getting respondents to report income information is notoriously difficult, for many reasons primarily related to privacy, but a large number of respondents did complete this question, with only 16.8% of respondents refusing. Overall, the weighted average household income for visitors to Cochise County, based on mid-points of the ranges, is \$73,298 – a figure that is slightly higher than the 2012 domestic average of \$72,340 reported by the Arizona Office of Tourism. In this Cochise County analysis one-fifth of overall visitors (21%) had annual incomes in excess of \$110,000.

Table 24. Annual household income of visitors to Cochise County

Annual household income	Frequency	%
less than \$14,999	138	3.6%
\$15,000 - \$19,999	103	2.7%
\$20,000 - \$29,999	190	5.0%
\$30,000 - \$39,999	336	8.8%
\$40,000 - \$49,999	363	9.5%
\$50,000 - \$69,999	766	20.1%
\$70,000 - \$89,999	645	16.9%
\$90,000 - \$109,999	467	12.2%
\$110,000 - \$124,999	323	8.5%
\$125,000+	488	12.8%
	3,819	100%

Mean = \$73,298

Breaking this income data out further by visitor origin, one-fifth of visitors from Arizona (17%) and 27% of California visitors had annual household incomes in excess of \$110,000. Within Arizona, one fourth (25%) of all visitors from Maricopa County reported incomes in excess of \$110,000, while less than one fifth (17%) of visitors from Pima County fell into this income category. See Table 25 below for a complete breakout by Arizona county.

Table 25. Annual household income of Arizona visitors to Cochise County

County	What best describes your annual household income?										
	less than \$14,999	\$15,000 - \$19,999	\$20,000 - \$29,999	\$30,000 - \$39,999	\$40,000 - \$49,999	\$50,000 - \$69,999	\$70,000 - \$89,999	\$90,000 - \$109,999	\$110,000 - \$124,999	\$125,000+	% greater than \$110K
Apache	0%	0%	17%	0%	17%	33%	0%	17%	0%	17%	17%
Cochise	6%	9%	14%	13%	8%	13%	12%	10%	9%	5%	14%
Coconino	0%	0%	6%	13%	25%	19%	25%	6%	0%	6%	6%
Gila	0%	0%	0%	0%	9%	18%	27%	27%	9%	9%	18%
Graham	11%	6%	6%	22%	11%	17%	28%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Greenlee	0%	0%	0%	0%	25%	25%	0%	50%	0%	0%	0%
La Paz	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	0%	0%	50%	50%
Maricopa	3%	2%	5%	7%	9%	21%	16%	13%	10%	15%	25%
Mohave	0%	0%	0%	20%	20%	0%	20%	20%	20%	0%	20%
Navajo	0%	0%	0%	33%	0%	22%	0%	33%	11%	0%	11%
Pima	7%	3%	8%	9%	10%	20%	16%	11%	5%	12%	17%
Pinal	0%	8%	3%	11%	15%	26%	9%	15%	11%	3%	14%
Santa Cruz	0%	0%	17%	17%	0%	25%	17%	0%	17%	8%	25%
Yavapai	4%	4%	0%	4%	9%	9%	35%	26%	4%	4%	9%
Yuma	8%	8%	8%	15%	8%	23%	8%	0%	8%	15%	23%
Total	3%	3%	5%	11%	11%	18%	17%	15%	7%	10%	17%

Appendix A: Visitor Questionnaire

**COCHISE COUNTY
VISITOR STUDY**

Month Year
 / 2012

Be Bi Do Si To Wi P-S Oth

Hello! Welcome to Cochise County, the *Land of Legends!* By taking a few minutes to complete this survey, you will be helping to create a better experience for future visitors. Please complete and return it to the surveyor. Your response will be held in the strictest confidence and results will be analyzed so that your answers on any single question cannot be identified.

1. How did you hear about Cochise County? Mark all that apply.

- Newspaper Radio Online/Website Word-of-mouth
 Magazine TV Social Networking Sites Been here before

2. Is this a day-trip or an overnight excursion?

If overnight, how many nights do you plan to spend in Cochise County?

3. If you are from the U.S. please write in your 5-digit ZIP-CODE

If you are not from the U.S. please list your country of origin:

4. Indicate all the boxes that **best** describe the primary purpose of your stay in Cochise County.

- Vacation/Leisure Day Trip Visiting friends and relatives
 Passing through Business Military training/business
 Weekend excursion Customs/Border Patrol Combination of Business and Leisure Travel

5. How interested are you in spending part of your vacation time on the following activities?

	Not at all	A little	Some- what	Very	Extremely
Visiting sites of Old West History.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Visiting Mexican cultural heritage sites.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Visiting sites of mining history.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Visiting Ghost Towns.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Visiting National Parks or State Parks).....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Visiting wineries/wine tasting rooms.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Touring agriculture/U-Pick operations.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Photography.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Birdwatching/Observing wildlife.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Hiking/Mountain Biking/Rock climbing.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

6. Please estimate as closely as possible the amount of money that **your travel party** is spending per day in the community where you received the survey for the following categories (in U.S. dollars):

Lodging/camping \$	<input type="text"/>	Recreation/Tour / Entrance /Permit fees \$	<input type="text"/>	Shopping/Arts & Crafts \$	<input type="text"/>
Restaurant & grocery \$	<input type="text"/>	Transportation (incl gas) \$	<input type="text"/>	Other expenditures \$	<input type="text"/>

7. How many people including yourself are in your travel party?

Number of: Women Men Children under 18

8. What is your gender? Female

Male In what year were you born? 19

9. Which of the following categories best describes your annual household income?

- Less than \$14,999 \$30,000 - \$39,999 \$70,000 - \$89,999 \$125,000+
 \$15,000 - \$19,999 \$40,000 - \$49,999 \$90,000 - \$109,999
 \$20,000 - \$29,999 \$50,000 - \$69,999 \$110,000 - \$124,999

Thank You For Taking The Time To Complete The Survey

3983621091

Appendix B: Economic Contribution of Tourism in Cochise County

Introduction

Question six in the survey of visitors to Cochise County asked respondents to detail their regional expenditures in each of the following categories: lodging/camping, restaurant & grocery, transportation (including gas), shopping/arts & crafts, recreation/tour/entrance/permit fees, and miscellaneous other expenditures. Understanding the regional economic impacts of visitors can illustrate the economic importance of tourism and recreational activities to Cochise County, and can be compared to the impacts of other economic sectors.

Expenditures by Cochise County visitors were entered into the Input-Output model Impact analysis for PLANing (IMPLAN) and economic impacts and multiplier effects were calculated for Cochise County. Economic impact analysis (EIA) measures the direct and extended effects of expenditures related to a tourist activity by detailing industry response and multiplier effects on many regional economic indicators such as output, income, and employment.

Economic Impact Analysis Methods

Input-Output (I-O) models are an important tool used in assessing the economic impacts of specific activities. The I-O model incorporates transaction tables to keep track of inter-industry sales and purchases, as well as exogenous sectors of final demand such as households, government, and international trade. The name, “I-O Model,” is a result of each industrial sector in the model being both a buyer and a seller of inputs and outputs.

The I-O model can be used to conduct economic impact analysis. Economic impact analysis involves applying a final demand change to the economic I-O model, and then analyzing the resulting changes in the economy (IMPLAN Analysis Guide, 1999). Impacts can be one-time impacts, such as the construction of a new factory, or they can be recurring impacts, such as the arrival of a new industry. Often, the impact analysis is concerned with multiplier effects, or the amount of money that is re-circulated through the economy after an initial expenditure.

Visitors were asked to estimate daily trip expenditures in the categories listed above. The visitors are assumed to be concentrated in Cochise County. Visitors from outside of the region purchased regional lodging, food, transportation, entertainment, etc., and this importation of expenditures represents an influx of “new” money to the region. This analysis does not include respondents who live in Cochise County as they do not represent “new” output to the region, assuming that regional residents would have allocated those expenditures to industrial sectors within the county anyway.

Thus, direct, indirect, and induced effects of visitor expenditures were calculated for Cochise County. The direct effects of expenditures capture the amount of purchases made by participants in each industrial category. Commodity purchases contributing to direct effects need to be margined to effectively allocate economic impacts. For example, many commodities available in Cochise County were not necessarily manufactured within the county (e.g. gasoline, souvenirs,

etc.). By margining commodities, producer and purchaser prices are separated. IMPLAN uses regional purchasing coefficients (RPCs) to estimate gross regional trade flows (gross exports and imports), and incorporates the RPCs into the allocation of direct effects attributable to the defined study area. A regional purchasing coefficient represents the proportion of the total demands for a given commodity that is supplied by the region to itself (IMPLAN Analysis Guide, 1999).

Indirect effects are a measure of economic activity in other industrial sectors that is spurred by the direct effects. For example, Cochise County visitors provided an economic boost to local food/beverage and lodging sectors (a direct effect). These hotels and restaurants require a number of inputs from other industries such as utilities, bulk food and beverage ingredients, and equipment. Indirect effects are the increased economic activity in these other industrial sectors caused by additional hotel and restaurant patrons.

Induced effects are an estimate of increased economic activity resulting from wages and income attributed to the direct and indirect effects. Staying with the previous example, a portion of wages earned by workers in the food/beverage and lodging sectors are then locally re-spent in other industrial sectors. IMPLAN uses Personal Consumption Expenditures (PCEs) to model induced effects. PCEs provide estimates of consumer expenditures on goods and services by different income classes (IMPLAN Analysis Guide, 1999).

Regional Expenditure Results

For the economic analysis, each survey represents a travel party. Expenditure questions asked respondents to estimate their expenditures for the travel party, i.e., each survey comprised one group or party. To estimate the number of visitors to Cochise County, a population estimate was developed to use in expanding per-party expenditures to all potential visitors to Cochise County. It is estimated that approximately 1,367,700 out-of-region people visited the region during the period of the survey. This estimate is derived from attractions visitation (museums, national and state parks, visitor centers), lodging supply (hotels and time share properties) as well as average occupancy and attendance at private attractions and visitation to secondary attractions. The population estimate, however, is still relatively conservative as traffic volumes were not used for any visitor segments. The researchers, however, prefer to err on the side of conservative population estimates.

As discussed previously, only out-of-region visitors are included in this analysis. Therefore, only these 1,367,700 out-of-region visitors are included in the economic impact analysis. The mean was used for all expenditure data in the calculation of economic impact. The mean can be adversely affected by the extreme ends of the range. Therefore, to lessen the impact of respondents who had extreme values, the data were cleaned to remove outliers or expenses that were not considered to be reasonable (i.e., \$3,000 for lodging for one night in Willcox).

The first step is to apportion the population estimate of 1,367,700 between day and overnight visitors. This yields 770,017 day visitors, and 597,683 overnight visitors. These numbers will be used to develop the total expenditures for each visitor type. Table B1 illustrates the first steps in developing the total expenditures by spending category. In column one, per-party/per-day expenditures are listed; as can be seen, day visitors do not have any lodging expenditures so the value per-party/per-day is \$0. The next column is the per-person/per-day visitor expenditures, calculated by dividing the average party size (2.9 for day and overnight visitors) by the per-party expenditures. This is a necessary step as the population estimate is measured as visitors, and the expenditures need to be in per-person expenditures. The final column in Table B1 for day visitors is the percentage of visitors with expenditures in any specific category, for example 69.8% of day visitors have restaurant and grocery expenditures. The percentage with expenditures column will be used to adjust the population estimate to reflect that percentage of the visitor population who had valid expenditures in any category. Overnight visitors' per-person expenditures and percentages of the population with expenditures are derived in a similar manner. See Table B1.

Table B1. Estimate of per person/per day expenditures for Cochise County

	Day visitors			Overnight visitors		
	Per-party exp.	Per-person exp.	Percent with exp.	Per-party exp.	Per-person exp.	Percent with exp.
Lodging/camping	\$0.0	\$0.0	0.0%	\$106.8	\$36.8	86.6%
Restaurant & grocery	\$75.0	\$25.9	69.8%	\$96.3	\$33.2	86.4%
Transportation (including gas)	\$59.4	\$20.5	59.5%	\$62.0	\$21.4	71.0%
Shopping/arts/antiques	\$66.1	\$22.8	61.7%	\$79.2	\$27.3	78.0%
Recreation/tour/event ticket fees	\$75.8	\$26.1	59.8%	\$83.9	\$28.9	70.8%
Other	\$56.3	\$19.4	26.0%	\$56.3	\$19.4	31.8%

Table B2 illustrates total visitor expenditures by each specific expenditure category. Per-person expenditures in column one are from column two and five of Table B1. The population estimate in the next column is calculated by multiplying the percentage of those with expenditures, 69.8% in the example of restaurant/grocery expenditures, by the day visitor population estimate (770,017) to yield a population estimate of 537,491. Expenditures are derived by multiplying the population estimate by per-person/per-day expenditures from column one. Overnight visitor expenditures are calculated in a similar manner, however, overnight expenditures are expanded by length of stay to account for the average number of overnight stays in the county, 3.1 nights in this case. Finally, total expenditures are arrived at by summing day and overnight visitors' expenditures. The total expenditures listed in the last column were used for the subsequent economic impact analysis.

Table B2. Estimate of total expenditures for day and overnight visitors to Cochise County

	Day visitors			Overnight visitors			Total
	Per-person/ per-day	Population estimate	Per-person/ per-day expenditures	Per- person/ per-day	Population estimate	Per-person/ per-trip expenditures	
Lodging/camping	\$0.0	-	\$0	\$36.8	517,317	\$59,059,764	\$59,059,764
Restaurant & grocery	\$25.9	537,491	\$13,896,942	\$33.2	516,126	\$53,114,213	\$67,011,154
Transportation (including gas)	\$20.5	458,194	\$9,391,409	\$21.4	424,450	\$28,135,325	\$37,526,734
Shopping/arts/antiques	\$22.8	474,888	\$10,817,637	\$27.3	466,419	\$39,463,046	\$50,280,683
Recreation/tour/event ticket fees	\$26.1	460,579	\$12,035,417	\$28.9	423,259	\$37,978,626	\$50,014,043
Other	\$19.4	200,329	\$3,888,469	\$19.4	190,199	\$11,444,657	\$15,333,126
Total	\$115		\$50,029,873	\$167		\$229,195,631	\$279,225,504

The totals from each expenditure category were entered into the operationalized Input-Output model IMPLAN. Visitor expenditures entered into IMPLAN’s Impact Analysis require bridging from survey expenditure categories into IMPLAN industry sectors. Most survey expenditure categories link directly to IMPLAN industry sectors (e.g., “Grocery Store Purchases” directly corresponds with IMPLAN sector #413 “Food and Beverage Stores”). Only one survey expenditure category, “Transportation,” was allocated to multiple IMPLAN industrial sectors. Because the “Transportation” survey question asked participants to include gas, oil, and auto expenses, the overall expenditures were allocated to sector #326 “Gasoline Stations” (85%) and to sector #414 “Automotive Repair and Maintenance” (15%).

Regional Economic Impact Analysis Results

The total number of out-of-region visitors to Cochise County during the study period was estimated at 1,367,700 visitors. As shown in Table B2, these visitors were responsible for some \$279.2 million of expenditures in Cochise County, with an average regional expenditure of \$115 per-person/per-day for day visitors and \$167 per-person/per-day for overnight visitors. Expenditures recorded for each industrial category were entered into IMPLAN’s impact analysis.

Table B3 shows the direct, indirect, and induced effects of regional expenditures made by non-local visitors. Type SAM multipliers are presented for each of the economic impact categories. Type SAM multipliers are similar to Type III multipliers in that they represent the ratio of total effects to direct effects and include indirect and induced effects. They are also similar in incorporating employment-based Personal Consumption Expenditures (PCEs) to model overall induced effects. IMPLAN’s Type SAM multipliers differ from traditional multipliers because IMPLAN uses all social accounting matrix information to generate a model that captures the inter-institutional transfers (IMPLAN Analysis Guide, 1999).

Table B3. Effects and multipliers of \$279.2 million of regional expenditures by Cochise County visitors (thousands of dollars)

Impact type	Direct effect	Indirect effect	Induced effect	Multiplier	Total effect
Direct output	\$279,226	\$42,302	\$97,025	1.5	\$418,553
Employment	3,055	399	841	1.4	4,294
Labor income	\$56,835	\$12,228	\$47,485	2.1	\$116,548

If regional expenditures are substantial, increased tax revenues will be generated. These tax revenues can also be substantial, particularly in tourism and service-oriented industries, where additional tax collections occur. Visitor spending in Cochise County resulted in state and local taxes of \$53.5 million and federal taxes of \$42.7 million. Much of this money is re-invested into infrastructure and community needs that further support tourism and recreation industries. The majority of tax revenue coming from Cochise County visitors are the result of sales taxes paid to restaurants, hotels, and retail stores. Other fee and excise taxes are common in the lodging industry.

Discussion

In 2012-2013 visitors to Cochise County stimulated significant input to businesses in the regional economy of the county. Approximately \$279.2 million of regional purchases were made by out-of-region visitors, contributing to a total economic output of \$418.6 million for Cochise County. This economic activity supported some 4,294 full-time equivalent (FTE) jobs and tax revenue of \$96.2 million. The total economic impact of visitors to the county is substantial and contributes significantly to the greater regional economy, further strengthening the role of tourism in economic development.

Appendix C: Complete Lists of Visitor Origins

Table C1. State of origin for visitors to Cochise County

State of origin	July - September 2012	October - December 2012	January - March 2013	April – June 2013	Average
Arizona	42.8%	46.4%	26.8%	30.2%	36.6%
California	13.1%	9.4%	9.4%	12.1%	11.0%
Texas	7.3%	2.9%	3.8%	5.2%	4.8%
Wisconsin	1.5%	2.8%	7.8%	3.5%	3.9%
Washington	2.7%	2.5%	5.3%	4.9%	3.9%
Illinois	1.6%	2.4%	5.0%	2.6%	2.9%
Colorado	1.8%	1.8%	3.3%	2.3%	2.3%
Michigan	1.1%	2.4%	3.6%	2.2%	2.3%
Ohio	1.8%	2.4%	2.1%	2.7%	2.3%
Oregon	1.2%	1.9%	2.7%	2.7%	2.1%
Florida	2.2%	2.2%	1.4%	2.6%	2.1%
New Mexico	1.2%	1.5%	2.1%	2.6%	1.9%
Pennsylvania	1.9%	2.1%	1.4%	1.4%	1.6%
North Carolina	1.1%	0.8%	1.3%	2.2%	1.5%
New York	1.9%	1.0%	1.4%	1.5%	1.4%
Indiana	1.1%	0.1%	1.2%	2.5%	1.4%
Virginia	1.5%	1.5%	1.6%	0.8%	1.3%
Iowa	0.1%	0.4%	2.1%	1.2%	1.2%
New Jersey	1.8%	1.1%	0.7%	0.8%	1.0%
Georgia	0.8%	0.3%	1.2%	1.1%	0.9%
Utah	0.4%	0.6%	1.5%	0.8%	0.9%
Maryland	1.1%	1.1%	0.8%	0.6%	0.8%
Idaho	0.3%	0.6%	1.2%	0.8%	0.8%
Massachusetts	0.9%	0.7%	0.6%	0.9%	0.8%
Nevada	1.1%	1.0%	0.2%	0.9%	0.7%
Alabama	0.9%	0.8%	0.4%	0.9%	0.7%
Alaska	0.3%	1.0%	1.1%	0.4%	0.7%
Kansas	0.7%	0.6%	0.8%	0.7%	0.7%
South Dakota	0.1%	0.7%	1.1%	0.7%	0.7%
Connecticut	0.5%	0.3%	0.5%	0.9%	0.6%
Tennessee	0.1%	0.4%	0.5%	0.9%	0.6%
Oklahoma	0.1%	1.0%	0.3%	0.8%	0.6%
Montana	0.4%	0.4%	0.8%	0.4%	0.6%
South Carolina	0.4%	0.6%	0.5%	0.6%	0.5%
Kentucky	0.7%	0.8%	0.2%	0.6%	0.5%
Wyoming	0.1%	0.4%	0.9%	0.2%	0.5%
New Hampshire	0.1%	0.4%	0.8%	0.4%	0.5%
Louisiana	0.5%	0.7%	0.0%	0.7%	0.4%

Table C1 (continued)	July - September 2012	October - December 2012	January - March 2013	April – June 2013	Average
Nebraska	0.3%	0.4%	0.8%	0.1%	0.4%
Arkansas	0.1%	0.1%	0.5%	0.6%	0.4%
North Dakota	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	0.4%	0.4%
Vermont	0.0%	0.3%	0.5%	0.3%	0.3%
Mississippi	0.3%	0.1%	0.3%	0.4%	0.3%
West Virginia	0.5%	0.4%	0.2%	0.0%	0.2%
Maine	0.1%	0.3%	0.1%	0.4%	0.2%
Delaware	0.5%	0.3%	0.0%	0.1%	0.2%
APO East Coast	0.1%	0.0%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%
Rhode Island	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.1%
Hawaii	0.1%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.1%
District of Columbia	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%
Puerto Rico	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%
APO West Coast	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table C2. City of origin for Arizona residents visiting Cochise County

AZ Resident-City of origin	Frequency	%	AZ Resident-City of origin	Frequency	%
Tucson	192	13.9%	South Tucson	8	0.6%
Phoenix	161	11.7%	Prescott	8	0.6%
Mesa	69	5.0%	Cottonwood	8	0.6%
Oro Valley	46	3.3%	Buckeye	8	0.6%
Scottsdale	45	3.3%	Tombstone	7	0.5%
Chandler	43	3.1%	Safford	7	0.5%
Glendale	40	2.9%	Anthem - Desert Hills	7	0.5%
Fry	37	2.7%	Turkey Creek	6	0.4%
Peoria	35	2.5%	Prescott Valley	6	0.4%
Rincon	28	2.0%	Paul Spur	6	0.4%
Fort Lowell	27	2.0%	Goodyear	6	0.4%
Green Valley	26	1.9%	Avondale	6	0.4%
Gilbert	25	1.8%	Payson	5	0.4%
Sun	23	1.7%	Mission	5	0.4%
Queen Creek	21	1.5%	Guadalupe	5	0.4%
Pearce	21	1.5%	Groom Creek	5	0.4%
Corona De Tucson - Vail	20	1.5%	Goodyear	5	0.4%
Tempe	19	1.4%	El Mirage	5	0.4%
Sun City	18	1.3%	Cave Creek	5	0.4%
Kino	18	1.3%	Sedona	4	0.3%
Hereford	18	1.3%	Lake Havasu City	4	0.3%
Saddlebrooke	17	1.2%	Cochise	4	0.3%
Sahuarita	16	1.2%	Wickenburg	3	0.2%
Marana	16	1.2%	Waddell	3	0.2%
Yuma	15	1.1%	Show Low	3	0.2%
Surprise	15	1.1%	Pinetop	3	0.2%
Flagstaff	15	1.1%	Paradise Valley	3	0.2%
Bisbee	15	1.1%	New River	3	0.2%
Sierra Vista	13	0.9%	Mcneal	3	0.2%
Fort Huachuca	13	0.9%	Litchfield Park	3	0.2%
Coronado	13	0.9%	Globe	3	0.2%
Nogales	12	0.9%	Bullhead City	3	0.2%
Casa Grande	10	0.7%	Youngtown	2	0.1%
Benson	10	0.7%	Willcox	2	0.1%
Sun Lakes	9	0.7%	Wenden	2	0.1%
Maricopa	9	0.7%	Saint David	2	0.1%
Huachuca City	9	0.7%	Pima	2	0.1%
Thatcher	8	0.6%	Oracle	2	0.1%
			Morenci	2	0.1%

AZ Resident-City of origin	Frequency	%	AZ Resident-City of origin	Frequency	%
Laveen	2	0.1%	Chino Valley	1	0.1%
Kingman	2	0.1%	Centra	1	0.1%
Joseph City	2	0.1%	Ash Fork	1	0.1%
Eagar	2	0.1%	Arizona Medical Center	1	0.1%
Davis Monthan AFB	2	0.1%	Apache Junction	1	0.1%
Cornville	2	0.1%	Alpine	1	0.1%
Allentown	2	0.1%	Ash Fork	1	0.1%
Aguila	2	0.1%	Total	1,375	100%
Yarnell	1	0.1%			
Wittmann	1	0.1%			
White Mountain Lake	1	0.1%			
Tumacacori	1	0.1%			
Tsaile	1	0.1%			
Tolleson	1	0.1%			
Sonoita	1	0.1%			
Snowflake	1	0.1%			
Saint Johns	1	0.1%			
Rillito	1	0.1%			
Pine	1	0.1%			
Pima Community College	1	0.1%			
Overgaard	1	0.1%			
Naco	1	0.1%			
Munds Park	1	0.1%			
Mount Lemmon	1	0.1%			
Mammoth	1	0.1%			
Kirkland	1	0.1%			
Jerome	1	0.1%			
Heber	1	0.1%			
Happy Jack	1	0.1%			
Greenehaven	1	0.1%			
Elgin	1	0.1%			
Elfrida	1	0.1%			
Eleven Mile Corner	1	0.1%			
Dudleyville - Winkelman	1	0.1%			
Dragoon	1	0.1%			
Dateland	1	0.1%			
Cortaro	1	0.1%			
Congress	1	0.1%			
Clifton	1	0.1%			
Claypool	1	0.1%			

Appendix D: Comparison of Primary Trip Purpose-All Questions

Table D1. Primary trip purpose of visitors to Cochise County-All variables (percent and averages)

	What best describes the primary purpose of your stay in Cochise County?								
	Vacation/leisure	Passing through	Business	Visiting friends and relatives	Weekend excursion	Military training/business	Day trip	Customs/border patrol	Combination of business and pleasure
How did you hear about Cochise County?									
Newspaper	3.3%	3.3%	4.2%	2.0%	3.4%	2.3%	3.3%	0.0%	4.2%
Magazine	9.1%	12.8%	4.2%	4.5%	7.4%	3.9%	8.5%	0.0%	4.2%
Radio	0.4%	0.7%	1.8%	0.1%	0.8%	0.8%	0.9%	0.0%	2.5%
TV	4.7%	6.2%	2.4%	2.7%	4.0%	3.1%	5.6%	12.5%	5.8%
Online-website	22.2%	19.0%	15.6%	12.0%	20.0%	18.0%	15.8%	0.0%	20.0%
Social networking site	2.5%	3.1%	4.2%	1.7%	2.5%	2.3%	2.3%	12.5%	6.7%
Word-of-mouth	54.2%	52.0%	36.5%	59.8%	54.4%	44.5%	53.6%	62.5%	46.7%
Been here before	28.6%	25.4%	46.7%	35.7%	35.2%	40.6%	32.4%	37.5%	43.3%
Is this a day trip or overnight excursion?									
Day trip	49.1%	69.5%	43.3%	57.6%	29.4%	52.1%	98.1%	75.0%	48.5%
Overnight excursion	50.9%	30.5%	56.7%	42.4%	70.6%	47.9%	1.9%	25.0%	51.5%
# Nights	4.0	3.7	9.4	5.9	2.1	17.9	0.0	2.0	7.3
Top 10 states of origin									
Arizona	28.2%	17.0%	28.9%	18.3%	65.5%	19.7%	44.5%	50.0%	32.2%
California	12.0%	12.1%	12.7%	13.8%	8.5%	9.5%	7.6%	0.0%	9.1%
Texas	5.2%	10.5%	6.9%	4.5%	3.0%	5.1%	4.3%	12.5%	5.0%
Wisconsin	4.8%	6.3%	1.2%	6.4%	1.1%	5.1%	5.3%	0.0%	2.5%
Washington	5.3%	4.4%	2.9%	4.7%	2.5%	3.6%	3.1%	0.0%	0.0%
Illinois	3.8%	2.3%	1.7%	4.0%	1.5%	5.1%	2.4%	12.5%	2.5%
Michigan	2.6%	3.3%	1.2%	4.7%	0.4%	3.6%	2.3%	12.5%	3.3%
Colorado	2.6%	2.1%	4.0%	3.8%	1.1%	2.9%	1.6%	0.0%	3.3%
Oregon	2.5%	2.3%	1.7%	2.7%	0.6%	1.5%	1.8%	0.0%	1.7%
Ohio	2.7%	2.1%	0.6%	3.6%	1.3%	0.7%	2.1%	0.0%	0.8%

Table D1 (continued)	Vacation/leisure	Passing through	Business	Visiting friends and relatives	Weekend excursion	Military training/business	Day trip	Customs/border patrol	Combination of business and pleasure
Top 10 Arizona communities of origin									
Tucson	11.0%	18.6%	20.8%	10.9%	11.7%	0.0%	21.0%	25.0%	7.9%
Phoenix	14.6%	11.4%	10.4%	8.0%	12.8%	7.4%	7.3%	25.0%	18.4%
Mesa	5.3%	5.7%	4.2%	8.0%	7.4%	7.4%	3.3%	0.0%	5.3%
Oro Valley	2.9%	2.9%	0.0%	2.2%	2.7%	0.0%	4.6%	0.0%	0.0%
Scottsdale	4.7%	2.9%	2.1%	2.9%	6.4%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%
Chandler	3.3%	1.4%	2.1%	2.9%	3.0%	0.0%	2.3%	0.0%	2.6%
Glendale	3.6%	1.4%	2.1%	3.6%	6.0%	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%
Fry	0.8%	0.0%	2.1%	5.1%	0.7%	37.0%	3.8%	0.0%	10.5%
Peoria	3.1%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	3.7%	0.0%	2.3%	0.0%	0.0%
Rincon	1.1%	1.4%	4.2%	3.6%	1.3%	0.0%	3.3%	0.0%	2.6%
If you are not from the US please list your country of origin									
Canada	61.2%	65.4%	44.4%	34.6%	69.6%	0.0%	60.2%	0.0%	55.6%
United Kingdom	13.7%	7.7%	11.1%	19.2%	13.0%	0.0%	13.6%	0.0%	22.2%
Germany	4.2%	7.7%	22.2%	3.8%	0.0%	50.0%	3.4%	0.0%	11.1%
Australia	4.5%	7.7%	0.0%	11.5%	0.0%	0.0%	2.3%	0.0%	11.1%
France	4.5%	5.8%	0.0%	3.8%	0.0%	0.0%	5.7%	0.0%	0.0%
New Zealand	2.1%	1.9%	0.0%	3.8%	4.3%	0.0%	2.3%	0.0%	0.0%
Mexico	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.3%	0.0%	2.3%	0.0%	0.0%
Italy	0.9%	1.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%
Japan	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	7.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Ireland	0.6%	1.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.3%	0.0%	0.0%

Table D1 (continued)	Vacation/ leisure	Passing through	Business	Visiting friends and relatives	Weekend excursion	Military training/ business	Day trip	Customs/ border patrol	Combination of business and pleasure
Interest in spending time doing these activities (average rating)									
Visiting sites of Old West history	3.9	3.7	3.5	3.8	4.0	3.6	3.9	3.4	3.7
Visiting Mexican cultural heritage sites	3.0	2.9	2.8	3.0	3.0	2.8	3.0	2.9	3.0
Visiting sites of mining history	3.6	3.4	3.2	3.6	3.8	3.3	3.5	3.9	3.3
Visiting ghost towns	3.6	3.5	3.4	3.6	3.8	3.4	3.7	4.1	3.6
Visiting national and state parks	4.0	3.9	3.5	3.9	3.9	3.6	3.9	3.4	3.8
Visiting wineries and wine-tasting rooms	2.6	2.6	2.8	2.8	2.9	3.0	2.8	2.5	2.6
Touring agriculture/U-Pick operations	2.2	2.3	2.4	2.4	2.5	2.4	2.5	3.3	2.3
Photography	3.3	3.3	2.9	3.3	3.3	2.8	3.3	3.9	3.2
Bird watching/observing wildlife	3.0	2.9	2.5	3.0	2.8	2.5	2.9	3.0	3.1
Hiking/mountain biking/rock climbing	2.8	2.8	2.9	2.8	3.0	3.3	2.9	2.9	3.0
Travel party spending per day									
Lodging/camping	\$121	\$120	\$114	\$125	\$135	\$105	\$67	\$133	\$122
Restaurant and grocery	\$96	\$82	\$98	\$113	\$117	\$107	\$79	\$100	\$129
Shopping/arts and crafts	\$63	\$59	\$53	\$68	\$102	\$61	\$57	\$100	\$72
Transportation (including gas)	\$71	\$97	\$77	\$67	\$78	\$66	\$64	\$30	\$133
Recreation/entrance fees	\$93	\$87	\$70	\$99	\$97	\$125	\$89	\$50	\$114
Other expenditures	\$58	\$91	\$60	\$71	\$59	\$71	\$61	\$200	\$64
Gender									
Female	61.0%	54.6%	35.1%	64.6%	57.7%	37.3%	62.3%	37.5%	46.7%
Male	39.0%	45.4%	64.9%	35.4%	42.3%	62.7%	37.7%	62.5%	53.3%
Number of women	1.6	1.5	1.8	1.8	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.5	1.8
Number of men	1.5	1.5	2.1	1.7	1.7	2.4	1.7	2.8	1.9
Number of children <18 years of age	2.1	2.6	1.8	2.1	2.3	1.6	2.1	0	2.1

Table D1 (continued)	Vacation/ leisure	Passing through	Business	Visiting friends and relatives	Weekend excursion	Military training/ Business	Day trip	Customs/ border patrol	Combination of business and pleasure
Average Age (years)	55.2	54.3	47.0	53.8	48.6	35.9	51.4	39.0	53.5
Cochise County visitor ages coded into ranges									
20 years and under	2.7%	4.1%	0.0%	4.4%	5.0%	12.0%	4.4%	12.5%	0.9%
21 - 25 years	2.7%	6.2%	6.0%	4.4%	6.0%	13.6%	5.3%	12.5%	3.5%
26 - 30 years	4.1%	4.9%	8.7%	4.4%	7.9%	20.8%	5.1%	0.0%	7.0%
31 - 35 years	5.0%	4.1%	9.3%	5.5%	7.2%	14.4%	6.6%	25.0%	6.1%
36 - 40 years	4.9%	3.9%	10.7%	5.0%	8.7%	12.0%	6.9%	12.5%	4.3%
41 - 45 years	6.4%	6.7%	8.7%	5.5%	8.9%	3.2%	8.0%	12.5%	7.8%
46 - 50 years	7.0%	5.7%	13.3%	6.6%	7.2%	7.2%	7.3%	0.0%	6.1%
51 - 55 years	8.3%	5.4%	18.0%	9.4%	9.2%	5.6%	8.4%	0.0%	8.7%
56 - 60 years	12.4%	9.5%	8.7%	11.4%	8.2%	5.6%	10.8%	12.5%	14.8%
61 - 65 years	16.1%	16.0%	7.3%	13.9%	11.2%	0.8%	11.9%	12.5%	18.3%
66 - 70 years	15.8%	18.0%	2.7%	12.9%	11.9%	1.6%	13.4%	0.0%	12.2%
71 - 75 years	9.9%	11.3%	4.7%	11.3%	5.7%	1.6%	7.9%	0.0%	8.7%
76 years and older	4.6%	4.1%	2.0%	5.3%	3.0%	1.6%	4.0%	0.0%	1.7%
What best describes your annual household income?									
less than \$14,999	2.8%	3.9%	2.5%	4.1%	4.5%	3.1%	5.7%	0.0%	7.6%
\$15,000 - \$19,999	2.6%	3.7%	2.5%	3.8%	2.6%	1.6%	2.6%	0.0%	1.7%
\$20,000 - \$29,999	4.5%	3.9%	5.0%	5.9%	4.5%	5.5%	6.1%	28.6%	7.6%
\$30,000 - \$39,999	8.1%	8.8%	8.7%	11.2%	8.2%	11.8%	10.1%	0.0%	9.3%
\$40,000 - \$49,999	9.5%	9.3%	5.6%	9.7%	7.5%	11.8%	9.9%	0.0%	8.5%
\$50,000 - \$69,999	20.2%	23.8%	21.7%	18.9%	21.1%	21.3%	20.3%	0.0%	21.2%
\$70,000 - \$89,999	17.9%	18.1%	16.1%	16.8%	15.5%	13.4%	16.1%	42.9%	13.6%
\$90,000 - \$109,999	12.6%	12.5%	11.2%	10.8%	13.6%	13.4%	11.5%	14.3%	9.3%
\$110,000 - \$124,999	8.9%	6.1%	8.7%	7.4%	7.5%	11.8%	7.0%	0.0%	9.3%
\$125,000+	13.0%	9.8%	18.0%	11.5%	15.0%	6.3%	10.8%	14.3%	11.9%

Table D2. Primary trip purpose of visitors to Cochise County-All variables (frequency values)

	What best describes the primary purpose of your stay in Cochise County?								
	Vacation/ leisure	Passing through	Business	Visiting friends and relatives	Weekend excursion	Military training/ business	Day trip	Customs/border patrol	Combination of business and pleasure
How did you hear about Cochise County?									
Newspaper	91	14	7	15	16	3	40	0	5
Magazine	252	54	7	34	35	5	104	0	5
Radio	12	3	3	1	4	1	11	0	3
TV	130	26	4	20	19	4	69	1	7
Online-website	614	80	26	90	94	23	194	0	24
Social networking site	68	13	7	13	12	3	28	1	8
Word-of-mouth	1,502	219	61	449	256	57	659	5	56
Been here before	792	107	78	268	166	52	399	3	52
Is this a day trip or overnight excursion?									
Day trip	1,474	335	78	457	144	75	1,280	6	63
Overnight excursion	1,526	147	102	336	346	69	-	2	67
# Nights	4.0	3.7	9.4	5.9	2.1	17.9	0.0	2.0	7.3
Top 10 states of origin									
Arizona	748	73	50	141	309	27	540	4	39
California	318	52	22	106	40	13	92	0	11
Texas	137	45	12	35	14	7	52	1	6
Wisconsin	128	27	2	49	5	7	64	0	3
Washington	140	19	5	36	12	5	37	0	0
Illinois	100	10	3	31	7	7	29	1	3
Colorado	68	9	7	29	5	4	20	0	4
Michigan	68	14	2	36	2	5	28	1	4
Oregon	66	10	3	21	3	2	22	0	2
Ohio	71	9	1	28	6	1	25	0	1

Table D2 (continued)	What best describes the primary purpose of your stay in Cochise County?								
	Vacation/ leisure	Passing through	Business	Visiting friends and relatives	Weekend excursion	Military training/ business	Day trip	Customs/ border patrol	Combination of business and pleasure
Top 10 Arizona communities of origin									
Tucson	79	13	10	15	35	0	110	1	3
Phoenix	105	8	5	11	38	2	38	1	7
Mesa	38	4	2	11	22	2	17	0	2
Oro Valley	21	2	0	3	8	0	24	0	0
Scottsdale	34	2	1	4	19	0	3	0	0
Chandler	24	1	1	4	9	0	12	0	1
Glendale	26	1	1	5	18	0	6	0	0
Fry	6	0	1	7	2	10	20	0	4
Peoria	22	2	0	0	11	0	12	0	0
Rincon	8	1	2	5	4	0	17	0	1
If you are not from the US please list your country of origin									
Canada	205	34	4	9	16	0	53	0	5
United Kingdom	46	4	1	5	3	0	12	0	2
Germany	14	4	2	1	0	2	3	0	1
Australia	15	4	0	3	0	0	2	0	1
France	15	3	0	1	0	0	5	0	0
New Zealand	7	1	0	1	1	0	2	0	0
Mexico	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0
Italy	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Japan	3	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
Ireland	2	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0

Table D2 (continued)	What best describes the primary purpose of your stay in Cochise County?								
	Vacation/ leisure	Passing through	Business	Visiting friends and relatives	Weekend excursion	Military training/ business	Day trip	Customs/ border patrol	Combination of business and pleasure
Interest in spending time doing these activities (average rating)									
Visiting sites of Old West History	3.9	3.7	3.5	3.8	4.0	3.6	3.9	3.4	3.7
Visiting Mexican cultural heritage sites	3.0	2.9	2.8	3.0	3.0	2.8	3.0	2.9	3.0
Visiting sites of mining history	3.6	3.4	3.2	3.6	3.8	3.3	3.5	3.9	3.3
Visiting ghost towns	3.6	3.5	3.4	3.6	3.8	3.4	3.7	4.1	3.6
Visiting national and state parks	4.0	3.9	3.5	3.9	3.9	3.6	3.9	3.4	3.8
Visiting wineries and wine-tasting rooms	2.6	2.6	2.8	2.8	2.9	3.0	2.8	2.5	2.6
Touring agriculture/U-Pick operations	2.2	2.3	2.4	2.4	2.5	2.4	2.5	3.3	2.3
Photography	3.3	3.3	2.9	3.3	3.3	2.8	3.3	3.9	3.2
Bird watching/observing wildlife	3.0	2.9	2.5	3.0	2.8	2.5	2.9	3.0	3.1
Hiking/mountain biking/rock climbing	2.8	2.8	2.9	2.8	3.0	3.3	2.9	2.9	3.0
Travel party spending per day									
Lodging/camping	\$121	\$120	\$114	\$125	\$135	\$105	\$67	\$133	\$122
Restaurant and grocery	\$96	\$82	\$98	\$113	\$117	\$107	\$79	\$100	\$129
Shopping/arts and crafts	\$63	\$59	\$53	\$68	\$102	\$61	\$57	\$100	\$72
Transportation (including gas)	\$71	\$97	\$77	\$67	\$78	\$66	\$64	\$30	\$133
Recreation/entrance fees	\$93	\$87	\$70	\$99	\$97	\$125	\$89	\$50	\$114
Other expenditures	\$58	\$91	\$60	\$71	\$59	\$71	\$61	\$200	\$64
Gender									
Female	1,712	244	59	487	269	50	765	3	56
Male	1,095	203	109	267	197	84	463	5	64
Number of women	1.6	1.5	1.8	1.8	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.5	1.8
Number of men	1.5	1.5	2.1	1.7	1.7	2.4	1.7	2.8	1.9
Number of children < 18 years of age	2.1	2.6	1.8	2.1	2.3	1.6	2.1	0	2.1
Average Age	55.2	54.3	47.0	53.8	48.6	35.9	51.4	39.0	53.5

Table D2 (continued)	What best describes the primary purpose of your stay in Cochise County?								
	Vacation/ leisure	Passing through	Business	Visiting friends and relatives	Weekend excursion	Military training/ business	Day trip	Customs/ border patrol	Combination of business and pleasure
Cochise County visitor ages coded into ranges									
20 years and under	64	16	0	28	20	15	45	1	1
21 - 25 years	65	24	9	28	24	17	54	1	4
26 - 30 years	97	19	13	28	32	26	52	0	8
31 - 35 years	118	16	14	35	29	18	67	2	7
36 - 40 years	117	15	16	32	35	15	70	1	5
41 - 45 years	152	26	13	35	36	4	81	1	9
46 - 50 years	167	22	20	42	29	9	74	0	7
51 - 55 years	198	21	27	60	37	7	85	0	10
56 - 60 years	295	37	13	73	33	7	110	1	17
61 - 65 years	381	62	11	89	45	1	121	1	21
66 - 70 years	375	70	4	82	48	2	136	0	14
71 - 75 years	234	44	7	72	23	2	80	0	10
76 years and older	110	16	3	34	12	2	41	0	2
What best describes your annual household income?									
less than \$14,999	70	16	4	28	19	4	62	0	9
\$15,000 - \$19,999	64	15	4	26	11	2	28	0	2
\$20,000 - \$29,999	112	16	8	40	19	7	67	2	9
\$30,000 - \$39,999	201	36	14	76	35	15	110	0	11
\$40,000 - \$49,999	235	38	9	66	32	15	108	0	10
\$50,000 - \$69,999	501	97	35	128	90	27	221	0	25
\$70,000 - \$89,999	444	74	26	114	66	17	175	3	16
\$90,000 - \$109,999	313	51	18	73	58	17	125	1	11
\$110,000 - \$124,999	221	25	14	50	32	15	76	0	11
\$125,000+	324	40	29	78	64	8	118	1	14

Appendix E: Community Comparisons-All Questions

Table E1. Where did you receive the survey?-All questions
(percent and averages)

	Town where survey was received						
	Benson	Bisbee	Douglas	Sierra Vista	Tombstone	Willcox	Pearce-Sunsites
How did you hear about Cochise County?							
Newspaper	5.0%	3.3%	0.9%	2.3%	3.1%	3.6%	0.0%
Magazine	12.9%	8.0%	10.8%	5.4%	7.9%	12.5%	22.2%
Radio	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	1.0%	0.7%	3.6%	0.0%
TV	2.9%	1.9%	2.7%	0.9%	10.7%	2.7%	11.1%
Online-website	17.9%	18.8%	23.4%	21.5%	20.2%	21.4%	22.2%
Social networking site	2.1%	1.8%	2.7%	3.6%	2.8%	2.7%	0.0%
Word-of-mouth	44.3%	57.3%	31.5%	42.4%	53.3%	39.3%	55.6%
Been here before	37.9%	27.8%	41.4%	46.2%	26.5%	46.4%	44.4%
Is this a day trip or overnight excursion?							
Day trip	53.2%	59.4%	60.3%	26.2%	68.2%	53.8%	77.8%
Overnight excursion	46.8%	40.6%	39.7%	73.8%	31.8%	46.2%	22.2%
# of Nights	5.4	3.1	5.1	8.4	3.0	2.3	1.0
Top ten states of origin							
Arizona	32.6%	40.1%	23.2%	25.2%	26.9%	62.5%	45.5%
California	9.6%	10.2%	17.9%	10.8%	12.6%	6.2%	7.6%
Texas	7.4%	4.0%	1.8%	3.8%	6.4%	7.0%	1.5%
Wisconsin	2.2%	3.4%	2.7%	6.0%	5.9%	0.0%	6.1%
Illinois	5.2%	2.5%	3.6%	4.4%	3.6%	2.3%	1.5%
Colorado	4.4%	2.1%	6.2%	4.1%	1.3%	3.9%	0.0%
Washington	3.0%	4.3%	2.7%	5.2%	4.6%	0.8%	0.0%
Florida	2.2%	1.9%	2.7%	1.8%	2.2%	2.3%	4.5%
Michigan	0.7%	2.5%	3.6%	2.8%	2.6%	0.0%	3.0%
Oregon	3.0%	1.9%	3.6%	2.5%	3.0%	0.8%	0.0%
Top Ten Arizona communities							
Tucson	11.9%	14.2%	11.5%	16.2%	11.8%	17.9%	6.7%
Phoenix	14.3%	13.3%	23.1%	11.4%	10.1%	3.8%	0.0%
Mesa	4.8%	4.3%	0.0%	4.8%	7.3%	5.1%	3.3%
Oro Valley	0.0%	3.0%	3.8%	5.4%	4.2%	2.6%	0.0%
Scottsdale	2.4%	4.1%	0.0%	4.8%	1.7%	1.3%	0.0%
Chandler	0.0%	3.0%	3.8%	3.0%	4.2%	2.6%	3.3%
Glendale	2.4%	3.5%	0.0%	0.0%	4.2%	1.3%	0.0%
Fry	2.4%	3.4%	0.0%	2.4%	1.0%	5.1%	0.0%
Peoria	2.4%	2.3%	3.8%	0.0%	4.9%	2.6%	0.0%
Rincon	2.4%	1.8%	0.0%	4.2%	1.7%	2.6%	0.0%

Town where survey was received							
Table E1 (continued)	Benson	Bisbee	Douglas	Sierra Vista	Tombstone	Willcox	Pearce-Sunsites
If you are not from the US please list your country of origin							
Canada	75.0%	60.7%	46.7%	52.6%	59.6%	25.0%	0.0%
United Kingdom	15.0%	13.1%	0.0%	15.8%	16.2%	0.0%	0.0%
Germany	0.0%	3.3%	13.3%	15.8%	4.4%	0.0%	0.0%
France	0.0%	4.9%	13.3%	1.8%	4.4%	0.0%	50.0%
Australia	0.0%	4.4%	0.0%	7.0%	4.4%	25.0%	0.0%
New Zealand	0.0%	1.6%	0.0%	3.5%	0.7%	0.0%	50.0%
Mexico	0.0%	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%
Italy	0.0%	1.6%	6.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Netherlands	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%
Japan	0.0%	1.1%	6.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Interest level in spending time doing these activities (average rating)							
Visiting sites of Old West history	3.7	3.8	4.0	3.5	4.0	3.7	3.9
Visiting Mexican cultural heritage sites	3.1	3.0	3.3	2.9	2.9	2.7	3.0
Visiting sites of mining history	3.4	3.8	3.3	3.2	3.5	3.2	3.7
Visiting ghost towns	3.4	3.6	3.4	3.3	3.8	3.5	4.1
Visiting national and state parks	3.9	3.9	3.7	3.8	3.9	3.6	3.7
Visiting wineries and wine-tasting rooms	2.6	2.7	2.5	2.7	2.6	3.4	2.8
Touring agriculture/U-pick operations	2.3	2.4	2.4	2.1	2.2	2.9	2.1
Photography	3.2	3.3	3.2	3.1	3.3	3.1	3.3
Bird watching/observing wildlife	2.9	2.9	3.1	3.4	2.8	2.6	2.8
Hiking/mountain biking/rock climbing	2.8	3.0	2.8	3.0	2.7	2.6	2.5
Per-party/Per-day expenditures							
Lodging/camping	\$74	\$116	\$64	\$99	\$107	\$103	\$104
Restaurant and grocery	\$63	\$89	\$71	\$89	\$81	\$81	\$97
Shopping/arts and crafts	\$56	\$67	\$50	\$39	\$62	\$43	\$88
Transportation (including gas)	\$67	\$73	\$110	\$63	\$71	\$89	\$111
Recreation/entrance fees	\$57	\$85	\$65	\$61	\$83	\$84	\$70
Other expenditures	\$49	\$55	\$96	\$46	\$57	\$95	\$74

Town where survey was received							
Table E1 (continued)	Benson	Bisbee	Douglas	Sierra Vista	Tombstone	Willcox	Pearce-Sunsites
Travel party characteristics							
Number of women	1.5	1.7	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.4	1.4
Number of men	1.4	1.6	1.4	1.7	1.5	1.2	1.3
Number of children < 18 years	3	2.1	1.6	2.5	2	2.1	2.1
Gender							
Female	56.9%	61.3%	45.0%	56.9%	58.4%	60.2%	78.3%
Male	43.1%	38.7%	55.0%	43.1%	41.6%	39.8%	21.7%
Average Age (years)	53.3	59.9	52.5	56.3	61.5	57.5	54.6
Cochise County visitor ages recoded into ranges							
20 years and under	0.8%	4.0%	0.0%	3.1%	3.0%	0.0%	0.0%
21 - 25 years	1.6%	4.0%	2.5%	4.1%	4.1%	0.0%	3.3%
26 - 30 years	3.2%	4.2%	0.0%	5.5%	6.6%	5.5%	3.3%
31 - 35 years	2.4%	5.2%	3.8%	5.2%	6.7%	6.4%	3.3%
36 - 40 years	4.0%	5.6%	5.0%	4.9%	7.1%	6.4%	13.3%
41 - 45 years	7.3%	7.8%	6.2%	3.2%	8.4%	7.3%	10.0%
46 - 50 years	3.2%	8.4%	5.0%	3.7%	8.1%	8.2%	10.0%
51 - 55 years	8.9%	9.1%	7.5%	5.2%	8.4%	12.7%	10.0%
56 - 60 years	7.3%	12.1%	15.0%	8.8%	11.9%	15.5%	13.3%
61 - 65 years	18.5%	12.3%	13.8%	17.3%	15.9%	13.6%	16.7%
66 - 70 years	19.4%	15.0%	13.8%	19.0%	10.8%	13.6%	0.0%
71 - 75 years	17.7%	8.4%	13.8%	12.6%	6.4%	8.2%	10.0%
76 years and older	5.6%	3.8%	13.8%	7.5%	2.7%	2.7%	6.7%
What best describes your annual household income?							
less than \$14,999	3.4%	4.3%	1.0%	2.0%	3.6%	2.7%	3.0%
\$15,000 - \$19,999	3.4%	3.0%	1.0%	1.0%	3.2%	1.8%	0.0%
\$20,000 - \$29,999	3.4%	5.1%	1.9%	4.3%	5.7%	3.6%	3.0%
\$30,000 - \$39,999	6.0%	8.0%	8.7%	9.1%	10.3%	11.6%	3.0%
\$40,000 - \$49,999	8.6%	9.1%	9.6%	9.6%	10.6%	6.2%	15.2%
\$50,000 - \$69,999	23.3%	19.0%	29.8%	20.8%	20.3%	17.9%	15.2%
\$70,000 - \$89,999	20.7%	15.6%	19.2%	18.1%	17.2%	21.4%	21.2%
\$90,000 - \$109,999	11.2%	13.2%	19.2%	13.0%	9.9%	7.1%	21.2%
\$110,000 - \$124,999	8.6%	9.6%	6.7%	7.5%	6.8%	11.6%	15.2%
\$125,000+	11.2%	13.1%	2.9%	14.6%	12.5%	16.1%	3.0%

Table E2. Where did you receive the survey?-All questions
(frequency values)

	Town where survey was received						
	Benson	Bisbee	Douglas	Sierra Vista	Tombstone	Willcox	Pearce-Sunsites
How did you hear about Cochise County?							
Newspaper	7	66	1	16	36	4	0
Magazine	18	158	12	37	91	14	2
Radio	0	11	0	7	8	4	0
TV	4	38	3	6	123	3	1
Online-website	25	372	26	148	233	24	2
Social networking site	3	36	3	25	32	3	0
Word-of-mouth	62	1,137	35	292	614	44	5
Been here before	53	551	46	318	305	52	4
Is this a day trip or overnight excursion?							
Day trip	83	1,250	76	194	844	70	7
Overnight excursion	73	853	50	546	393	60	2
# of Nights	5.4	3.1	5.1	8.4	3.0	2.3	1.0
Top ten states of origin							
Arizona	44	768	26	171	294	80	30
California	13	196	20	73	138	8	5
Texas	10	77	2	26	70	9	1
Wisconsin	3	65	3	41	65	0	4
Illinois	7	47	4	30	39	3	1
Colorado	6	41	7	28	14	5	0
Washington	4	83	3	35	50	1	0
Florida	3	36	3	12	24	3	3
Michigan	1	48	4	19	28	0	2
Oregon	4	36	4	17	33	1	0
Top Ten Arizona communities							
Tucson	5	105	3	27	34	14	2
Phoenix	6	98	6	19	29	3	0
Mesa	2	32	0	8	21	4	1
Oro Valley	0	22	1	9	12	2	0
Scottsdale	1	30	0	8	5	1	0
Chandler	0	22	1	5	12	2	1
Glendale	1	26	0	0	12	1	0
Fry	1	25	0	4	3	4	0
Peoria	1	17	1	0	14	2	0
Rincon	1	13	0	7	5	2	0

Table E2 (continued)	Town where survey was received						
	Benson	Bisbee	Douglas	Sierra Vista	Tombstone	Willcox	Pearce-Sunsites
If you are not from the US please list your country of origin?							
Canada	15	111	7	30	81	1	0
United Kingdom	3	24	0	9	22	0	0
Germany	0	6	2	9	6	0	0
France	0	9	2	1	6	0	1
Australia	0	8	0	4	6	1	0
New Zealand	0	3	0	2	1	0	1
Mexico	0	3	0	0	1	0	0
Italy	0	3	1	0	0	0	0
Netherlands	0	2	0	0	0	1	0
Japan	0	2	1	0	0	0	0
Interest in spending time doing these activities (average rating)							
Visiting sites of Old West History	3.7	3.8	4.0	3.5	4.0	3.7	3.9
Visiting Mexican cultural heritage sites	3.1	3.0	3.3	2.9	2.9	2.7	3.0
Visiting sites of mining history	3.4	3.8	3.3	3.2	3.5	3.2	3.7
Visiting ghost towns	3.4	3.6	3.4	3.3	3.8	3.5	4.1
Visiting national and state parks	3.9	3.9	3.7	3.8	3.9	3.6	3.7
Visiting wineries and wine-tasting rooms	2.6	2.7	2.5	2.7	2.6	3.4	2.8
Touring agriculture/U-Pick operations	2.3	2.4	2.4	2.1	2.2	2.9	2.1
Photography	3.2	3.3	3.2	3.1	3.3	3.1	3.3
Bird watching/observing wildlife	2.9	2.9	3.1	3.4	2.8	2.6	2.8
Hiking/mountain biking/rock climbing	2.8	3.0	2.8	3.0	2.7	2.6	2.5
Per Party/Per-day expenditures							
Lodging/camping	\$74	\$116	\$64	\$99	\$107	\$103	\$104
Restaurant and grocery	\$63	\$89	\$71	\$89	\$81	\$81	\$97
Shopping/arts and crafts	\$56	\$67	\$50	\$39	\$62	\$43	\$88
Transportation (including gas)	\$67	\$73	\$110	\$63	\$71	\$89	\$111
Recreation/entrance fees	\$57	\$85	\$65	\$61	\$83	\$84	\$70
Other expenditures	\$49	\$55	\$96	\$46	\$57	\$95	\$74

Table E2 (continued)	Town where survey was received						
	Benson	Bisbee	Douglas	Sierra Vista	Tombstone	Willcox	Pearce-Sunsites
Travel party characteristics							
Number of women	1.5	1.7	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.4	1.4
Number of men	1.4	1.6	1.4	1.7	1.5	1.2	1.3
Number of children <18 years	3.0	2.1	1.6	2.5	2.0	2.1	2.1
Gender							
Female	56.9%	61.3%	45.0%	56.9%	58.4%	60.2%	78.3%
Male	43.1%	38.7%	55.0%	43.1%	41.6%	39.8%	21.7%
Average Age	53.3	59.9	52.5	56.3	61.5	57.5	54.6
Cochise County visitor ages recoded into ranges							
20 years and under	1	67	0	19	28	0	0
21 - 25 years	2	67	2	25	39	0	1
26 - 30 years	4	70	0	34	62	6	1
31 - 35 years	3	87	3	32	63	7	1
36 - 40 years	5	93	4	30	67	7	4
41 - 45 years	9	129	5	20	79	8	3
46 - 50 years	4	139	4	23	77	9	3
51 - 55 years	11	152	6	32	79	14	3
56 - 60 years	9	202	12	54	113	17	4
61 - 65 years	23	204	11	107	150	15	5
66 - 70 years	24	249	11	117	102	15	0
71 - 75 years	22	140	11	78	61	9	3
76 years and older	7	64	11	46	26	3	2
What best describes your annual household income?							
less than \$14,999	4	77	1	12	38	3	1
\$15,000 - \$19,999	4	54	1	6	34	2	0
\$20,000 - \$29,999	4	91	2	26	60	4	1
\$30,000 - \$39,999	7	142	9	55	108	13	1
\$40,000 - \$49,999	10	161	10	58	111	7	5
\$50,000 - \$69,999	27	338	31	125	213	20	5
\$70,000 - \$89,999	24	277	20	109	181	24	7
\$90,000 - \$109,999	13	234	20	78	104	8	7
\$110,000 - \$124,999	10	171	7	45	71	13	5
\$125,000+	13	232	3	88	131	18	1

Appendix F: Seasonal Comparisons-All Questions

Table F. Seasonal differences-All questions (percent and averages)

Seasonal differences	Calendar quarter			
	July - September 2012	October - December 2012	January - March 2013	April – June 2013
How did you hear about Cochise County?				
Newspaper	2.7%	3.4%	3.6%	2.6%
Magazine	6.1%	7.6%	9.2%	7.5%
Radio	0.4%	1.1%	0.6%	0.9%
TV	2.8%	2.3%	3.9%	6.7%
Online-website	20.9%	16.3%	19.4%	21.4%
Social networking site	3.1%	2.4%	2.3%	2.3%
Word-of-mouth	48.1%	52.8%	54.0%	51.8%
Been here before	37.1%	35.5%	29.9%	28.7%
Is this a day trip or overnight excursion?				
Day trip	53.0%	54.5%	52.0%	63.2%
Overnight excursion	47.0%	45.5%	48.0%	36.8%
How many nights are you staying in Cochise County?				
# of Nights	2.4	2.3	3.7	1.5
State of origin				
Arizona	42.8%	46.3%	26.8%	30.2%
California	13.1%	9.4%	9.4%	12.1%
Texas	7.3%	2.9%	3.8%	5.2%
Wisconsin	1.5%	2.8%	7.8%	3.5%
Washington	2.7%	2.5%	5.3%	4.9%
Illinois	1.6%	2.4%	5.0%	2.6%
Colorado	1.8%	1.8%	3.3%	2.3%
Michigan	1.1%	2.4%	3.6%	2.2%
Oregon	1.2%	1.9%	2.7%	2.7%
Ohio	1.8%	2.4%	2.1%	2.7%
Arizona community of origin				
Tucson	12.7%	13.7%	14.9%	14.3%
Phoenix	13.0%	9.3%	14.9%	9.9%
Mesa	4.2%	5.0%	5.0%	5.7%
Oro Valley	4.5%	1.6%	3.5%	3.7%
Scottsdale	3.9%	3.7%	3.5%	2.2%
Chandler	3.9%	2.5%	2.6%	3.4%
Glendale	2.9%	3.1%	2.9%	2.7%
Fry	3.6%	2.5%	2.0%	2.7%
Peoria	2.3%	1.9%	2.6%	3.2%
Rincon	1.9%	2.8%	1.5%	2.0%

Table F (continued)	Calendar quarter			
	July - September 2012	October –December 2012	January - March 2013	April - June 2013
If you are not from the US please list your country of origin				
Canada	20.3%	50.8%	81.1%	45.7%
United Kingdom	18.8%	27.1%	5.8%	19.0%
Germany	9.4%	8.5%	2.6%	6.7%
France	18.8%	0.0%	1.1%	4.8%
Australia	7.8%	1.7%	3.7%	5.7%
New Zealand	1.6%	5.1%	0.5%	1.9%
Mexico	1.6%	0.0%	0.5%	1.9%
Italy	6.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Netherlands	1.6%	0.0%	0.5%	1.0%
Japan	1.6%	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%
Interest level in spending time doing these activities (average rating)				
Visiting sites of Old West history	3.7	3.8	3.8	4.0
Visiting Mexican cultural heritage sites	2.8	3.0	3.0	2.9
Visiting sites of mining history	3.5	3.7	3.5	3.6
Visiting ghost towns	3.4	3.6	3.5	3.7
Visiting national and state parks	3.8	3.9	3.9	3.9
Visiting wineries and wine-tasting rooms	2.7	2.9	2.7	2.6
Touring agriculture/U-Pick operations	2.3	2.4	2.3	2.3
Photography	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.4
Bird watching/observing wildlife	3.0	2.9	3.0	2.9
Hiking/mountain biking/rock climbing	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.8
Per-party/per-day expenditures				
Lodging/camping	\$113	\$109	\$102	\$107
Restaurant and grocery	\$90	\$86	\$79	\$89
Shopping/arts and crafts	\$63	\$65	\$57	\$61
Transportation (including gas)	\$77	\$78	\$67	\$73
Recreation/entrance fees	\$85	\$87	\$75	\$79
Other expenditures	\$60	\$64	\$50	\$56

Table F (continued)	Calendar quarter			
	July - September 2012	October – December 2012	January - March 2013	April - June 2013
Party size				
Number of women	1.7	1.6	1.6	1.7
Number of men	1.5	1.6	1.5	1.5
Number of children < 18 years	2.1	2.1	2.2	2.1
Gender and age				
Female	59.1%	60.4%	59.5%	59.0%
Male	40.9%	39.6%	40.5%	41.0%
Average Age (years)	61.6	57.8	56.5	61.4
Visitor age by ranges				
20 years and under	0.2%	0.8%	0.6%	0.3%
21 - 25 years	0.3%	0.7%	0.3%	0.2%
26 - 30 years	0.5%	0.8%	0.4%	0.3%
31 - 35 years	0.8%	2.8%	2.6%	1.6%
36 - 40 years	5.8%	6.1%	7.6%	4.9%
41 - 45 years	9.3%	11.6%	14.7%	10.2%
46 - 50 years	14.0%	15.9%	20.0%	13.8%
51 - 55 years	13.0%	13.8%	12.9%	12.0%
56 - 60 years	9.0%	9.5%	8.6%	9.6%
61 - 65 years	9.0%	7.5%	5.6%	9.0%
66 - 70 years	9.00%	6.50%	6.00%	7.20%
71 - 75 years	7.3%	5.8%	4.9%	7.7%
76 years and older	21.8%	18.2%	15.9%	23.2%
What best describes your annual household income?				
less than \$14,999	3.9%	3.1%	3.5%	3.8%
\$15,000 - \$19,999	2.3%	3.3%	1.5%	3.8%
\$20,000 - \$29,999	4.4%	5.0%	4.7%	5.6%
\$30,000 - \$39,999	8.4%	9.2%	7.8%	9.8%
\$40,000 - \$49,999	9.2%	10.5%	8.2%	10.5%
\$50,000 - \$69,999	20.1%	20.3%	20.6%	19.4%
\$70,000 - \$89,999	17.9%	13.1%	18.6%	16.6%
\$90,000 - \$109,999	11.9%	12.7%	13.5%	11.0%
\$110,000 - \$124,999	8.0%	9.8%	9.0%	7.4%
\$125,000+	14.0%	13.0%	12.7%	12.2%