

2016 Thunder Valley Rally Visitor Survey Executive Summary



Prepared by:

Northern Arizona University The W. A. Franke College of Business Alliance Bank Business Outreach Center

> Wayne Fox, MS, CPA Andrea Houchard, PhD Thomas Combrink, MS Melinda Bradford, BS



The Alliance Bank Business Outreach Center is an Economic Development Administration (EDA) University Center.



Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Festival Visitor Characteristics	1
Festival Experience:	4
Motorcycle Characteristics	
Old Town Cottonwood Visit	
Demographics	
Lodging	
Festival Expenditures	9
Thunder Valley Rally Economic Impact	10
APPENDIX – Questionnaire	12
List of Tables	
Table 1: State of Origin of Thunder Valley Rally Attendees	1
Table 2: City of Origin of Arizona Thunder Valley Rally Attendees	
Table 3: Number of People in Attendees Group	
Table 4: How Attendees Heard About the 2016 Thunder Valley Rally	3
Table 5: Levels of Satisfaction with Thunder Valley Rally (%)	
Table 6: Satisfaction of Attendees in Certain Areas	4
Table 7: Number of Merchant Booths Visited	
Table 8: Number of Attendees Who Purchased Something from Rally Vendors	
Table 9: Attendees Who Would Recommend the Rally to Friends and Family	
Table 10: Brand of Attendees Motorcycle	
Table 11: Attendees Who Visited Old Town Cottonwood Before	
Table 12: Number of Times Attendees Have Visited Old Town Cottonwood in the Last Year	
Table 13: Opinions Concerning Location of the Rally at Old Town Cottonwood	6
Table 14: How Much Attendees Spent at Old Town Main Street Businesses, NOT Including Rally Vendors	7
Table 15: Gender of Attendees	
Table 16: Ages of Attendees	
Table 17: Category That Best Describes Attendees Combined Household Income in 2015,	/
Before Taxes	8
Table 18: Attendees Staying Overnight in Northern Arizona	
Table 19: Number of Nights Attendees Stayed in Northern Arizona	
Table 20: Northern Arizona Communities Where Attendees Stayed Overnight	
Table 21: Type of Lodging Attendees Stayed In	
Table 22: Economic Impact from Attendees	
Table 23: IMPLAN Generated Effects	11

2016 Thunder Valley Rally Event Survey

Introduction

The Arizona Hospitality Research & Resource Center (AHRRC), a unit of The W. A. Franke College of Business, was asked to help the city of Cottonwood Recreation Services design and analyze a survey of visitors attending the 2016 Thunder Valley Rally held in Historic Old Town Cottonwood, Arizona on September 16 and 17. Professional staff from the AHRRC helped the Recreation Services Division develop a survey instrument that allowed them to not only measure visitor satisfaction with the event, but also collected demographic and expenditure information. A total of 102 completed surveys were obtained from event attendees. This included 64 paper surveys (62.7%) that were obtained at the event and 38 surveys (37.3%) obtained from an electronic survey sent out via Survey Monkey to the email addresses from attendees who registered for the Poker Run.

For the purpose of this study, nonlocals are considered to be any festival-goers who do not come from the immediate Verde Valley communities. Therefore, nonlocal visitors in this analysis includes visitors from Prescott, Prescott Valley, Chino Valley, Mayer, and other communities within Yavapai County but outside of the geographic region formed by the Verde Valley. This is important as it affects the overall calculation of the economic impact of the festival. Generally, in tourism surveys, only out-of-county money is considered when calculating economic contribution. However, in the case of Arizona counties, visitors who are more than 50 miles away from home in one direction are considered eligible to be included in the economic contribution analysis.

This report will summarize the data collected on the survey instrument and will report economic contribution.

Festival Visitor Characteristics

Most participants at Thunder Valley Rally were from Arizona (97%). Out-of-state visitors included two parties from California and one from Nevada. No international visitors appeared in the sample.

Table 1: State of Origin of Thunder Valley Rally Attendees

	Count	Percent (%)
Arizona	92	96.8%
California	2	2.1%
Nevada	1	1.1%
Total	95	100.0%

Most Arizona residents were from the Verde Valley (40%), and Maricopa County (32%), with the remaining one-fourth (29%) from other Arizona communities.

Table 2: City of Origin of Arizona Thunder Valley Rally Attendees

	Count	Percent (%)
Cottonwood	16	17.6%
Phoenix	8	8.8%
Cornville	6	6.6%
Peoria	5	5.5%
Tucson	4	4.4%
Prescott Valley	4	4.4%
Clarkdale	4	4.4%
Camp Verde	4	4.4%
Sedona	3	3.3%
Rimrock	3	3.3%
Glendale	3	3.3%
Chandler	3	3.3%
Tempe	2	2.2%
Sun City	2	2.2%
San Carlos	2	2.2%
Prescott	2	2.2%
Joseph City	2	2.2%
Gilbert	2	2.2%
Flagstaff	2	2.2%
Chino Valley	2	2.2%
Sun City	1	1.1%
Sierra Vista	1	1.1%
Sells	1	1.1%
Queen Creek	1	1.1%
Overgaard	1	1.1%
Mesa	1	1.1%
Mayer	1	1.1%
Litchfield Park	1	1.1%
Lakeside	1	1.1%
Fry	1	1.1%
Dewey	1	1.1%
Goodyear	1	1.1%
Total	91	100.0%

The average party size was 4.2 persons.

Table 3: Number of People in Attendees Group

	Mean	Median
How many people are in your group today, including yourself?	4.2	4.0

The largest number of festival-goers in the survey learned about the event by attending the rally previously (54%), indicating a high level of repeat participation.

Table 4: How Attendees Heard About the 2016 Thunder Valley Rally

	Count	Percent (%)
Attended previously	53	53.5%
Billboard	19	19.2%
Social Media (Facebook, Twitter, etc.)	18	18.2%
Posters or flyers	11	11.1%
Online	11	11.1%
Event	11	11.1%
Local radio	10	10.1%
Cycle Rides	8	8.1%
Thunder Press	7	7.1%
AZ Biker Info Guide	7	7.1%
Newspaper or magazine	5	5.1%
Radio	4	4.0%
94.7 Jack FM	4	4.0%
93.9 The Mountain	3	3.0%
Friend or family member told me	3	3.0%
The Noise	1	1.0%
Ride AZ Magazine	1	1.0%
KUPD	1	1.0%

Festival Experience:

Thunder Valley Rally visitors were asked about their level of satisfaction with the event. Using a scale from 1–10, where 1 is "Very Dissatisfied" and 10 is "Very Satisfied." The Thunder Valley Rally was an outstanding success for visitors, recording an extremely high overall mean score of 8.2 out of a possible 10, with over three quarters (76%) select a rating of 8 or above. Obviously the Rally met the expectations of its guests.

Table 5: Levels of Satisfaction with Thunder Valley Rally (%)

	Low (1)	2	3	4	Neutral (5)	6	7	8	9	High (10)	Mean
Overall, how well did Thunder Valley Rally meets your expectations?	1.0	0.0	3.0	1.0	2.0	9.1	8.1	26.3	25.3	24.2	8.2

1=Very Dissatisfied; 10=Very Satisfied

Participants were then asked about what they were satisfied with in particular by rating a list of festival features. These responses are based on a scale from 1–5, where 1 is "Very Dissatisfied" and 5 is "Very Satisfied." All mean scores are well above the midpoint of 2.5, indicating that the attendees are satisfied in each area.

Table 6: Satisfaction of Attendees in Certain Areas

	Totally Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied or Dissatisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Totally Satisfied	Mean
Poker run	13.4%	8.5%	11.0%	52.4%	14.6%	3.5
Parking logistics, shuttle	3.8%	10.3%	24.4%	48.7%	12.8%	3.6
Organization and layout of rally	2.2%	11.2%	28.1%	39.3%	19.1%	3.6
Friendliness and helpfulness of staff	2.0%	3.1%	13.3%	55.1%	26.5%	4.0
Rally atmosphere	0.0%	3.1%	13.3%	57.1%	26.5%	4.1
Beverage service	3.3%	6.6%	17.6%	56.0%	16.5%	3.8
Quality of vendors	2.2%	10.8%	28.0%	46.2%	12.9%	3.6
Musical performers and bands	2.2%	4.4%	13.2%	57.1%	23.1%	3.9
Old Town merchant experience	2.2%	7.6%	21.7%	50.0%	18.5%	3.8

1=Very Dissatisfied; 5=Very Satisfied

On average, attendees visited 15 different merchant booths and more than three-fourths (77%) purchased something from the rally vendors.

Table 7: Number of Merchant Booths Visited

Number of Booths	Number of Visitors	Percent (%)
0	4	4.4%
1	1	1.1%
2	3	3.3%
3	3	3.3%
4	6	6.6%
5	7	7.7%
6	5	5.5%
7	1	1.1%
8	4	4.4%
10	15	16.5%
12	4	4.4%
15	7	7.7%
20	14	15.4%
25	2	2.2%
30	2	2.2%
38	13	14.3%
Total	91	100.0%

Table 8: Number of Attendees Who Purchased Something from Rally Vendors

	Count	Percent (%)
Yes	75	77.3%
No	22	22.7%
Total	97	100.0%

Almost all visitors (94%) indicated that they would recommend the Thunder Valley Rally to family and friends.

Table 9: Attendees Who Would Recommend the Rally to Friends and Family

	Count	Percent (%)
Yes	92	93.9%
No	6	6.1%
Total	98	100.0%

Motorcycle Characteristics

When asked about the brand of the respondent's motorcycle, over half (66%) indicated that they ride a Harley Davidson. This comes as no surprise due to the extreme popularity of this brand.

Table 10: Brand of Attendees Motorcycle

	Count	Percent (%)
Harley Davidson	65	66.3%
Victory	12	12.2%
Kawasaki	10	10.2%
Honda	9	9.2%
Other	7	7.1%
Indian	5	5.1%

Old Town Cottonwood Visit

Visitors were asked if they had previously visited Old Town Cottonwood. Predictably, given the high number of Verde Valley area attendees and repeat Rally participants, over four in five (82%) had been to Old Town Cottonwood previously.

Table 11: Attendees Who Visited Old Town Cottonwood Before

	Count	Percent (%)
Yes	63	81.8%
No	14	18.2%
Total	77	100.0%

The average repeat visitor, most likely a local within 50 miles, visited Old Town Cottonwood an average of 8 times in the last year. This is a significant finding not just for this study, but for the city of Cottonwood overall.

Table 12: Number of Times Attendees Have Visited Old Town Cottonwood in the Last Year

	Mean	Median
If yes, how many times in the last year?	8.1	3.5

Visitors were split on their agreement with the question regarding if Old Town Cottonwood was a good place for the Rally. Forty-eight visitors said yes, and 43 individuals claimed they were neutral. Only 6 participants said no.

Table 13: Opinions Concerning Location of the Rally at Old Town Cottonwood

	Count	Percent (%)
Yes	48	49.5%
No	6	6.2%
Neutral	43	44.3%

Total	97	100.0%
-------	----	--------

Visitors were also asked to estimate their total spending at Old Town Main Street businesses, not including the rally vendors. Less than two-thirds of visitors indicated that they had expenditures at Old Town Main Street businesses, with an overall average of \$164 per party. This means that nonlocal visitors had an average per-person expenditure of \$85 at Old Town Main Street businesses, which is slightly higher than the average spending of locals (\$77).

Table 14: How Much Attendees Spent at Old Town Main Street Businesses, NOT Including Rally Vendors

	Mean	Median
Estimate how much <u>in total</u> you're spending at Old Town Main Street businesses, <u>NOT</u> including rally vendors?	\$163.9	\$100.0

Demographics

Almost two-thirds (64%) of survey respondents were males; females comprised roughly one-third (36%).

Table 15: Gender of Attendees

	Count	Percent (%)
Female	36	36.0%
Male	64	64.0%
Total	100	100.0%

The overall average age of visitors was 54.5. This is somewhat higher than the average age of an Arizona overnight visitor in 2015, which was 45. This figure was obtained using the Arizona domestic overnight visitors reported by the Arizona Office of Tourism.

Table 16: Ages of Attendees

	Count	Percent (%)
25 and under	1	1.1%
26-30 years	4	4.3%
31-35 years	2	2.2%
36-40 years	5	5.4%
41-45 years	5	5.4%
46-50 years	8	8.7%
51-55 years	15	16.3%
56-60 years	23	25.0%
61-65 years	17	18.5%
66-70 years	11	12.0%
71-75 years	1	1.1%
Total	92	100.0%

Mean=54.5 years old; Median=56.0 years old

The average household income of rally attendees before taxes in 2015 was \$98,730, while the median income (which is less affected by extreme values as seen in the mean) was \$87,000.

Table 17: Category That Best Describes Attendees Combined Household Income in 2015, Before Taxes

	Count	Percent (%)
Under \$25,000	1	1.1%
\$25,000-\$49,999	13	13.8%
\$50,000-\$74,999	25	26.6%
\$75,000-\$99,999	13	13.8%
\$100,000–\$124,999	9	9.6%
\$125,000–\$149,999	11	11.7%
Over \$150,000	12	12.8%
Declined to answer	10	10.6%
Total	94	100.0%

Mean=\$98,730; Median=\$87,000

Lodging

Half of all rally respondents indicated that they were staying away from home overnight in northern Arizona on this trip. This does not necessarily imply that all these attendees were staying because of the rally, but rather that the festival was a part of their trip experience while in the region.

Table 18: Attendees Staying Overnight in Northern Arizona

	Count	Percent (%)
Yes	50	49.5%
No	51	50.5%
Total	101	100.0%

The majority of overnight visitors spent two nights in northern Arizona (58%), one fourth (26%) spent one night, and 12% spent three nights, and 4% spent more than three nights.

Table 19: Number of Nights Attendees Stayed in Northern Arizona

	Mean	Median
If yes, how many nights in Northern AZ	2.0	2.0

The majority (66%) of those who stayed overnight stayed in the Cottonwood-Cornville-Clarkdale area, where the rally was held.

Table 20: Northern Arizona Communities Where Attendees Stayed Overnight

	Count	Percent (%)
Cottonwood-Cornville- Clarkdale	33	66.0%
Camp Verde	11	22.0%
Jerome	2	4.0%
Sedona	2	4.0%
Other	2	4.0%
Prescott	1	2.0%
Flagstaff	0	0.0%

More than half of all overnight visitors (57%) stayed in paid accommodations. Further lodging information is provided in table 21.

Table 21: Type of Lodging Attendees Stayed In

	Count	Percent (%)
Hotel or motel	20	38.5%
Home of friends or relatives	11	21.2%
Our second home	7	13.5%
RV park or camping	6	11.5%
Other	5	9.6%
Bed and breakfast inn	3	5.8%
Airbnb.com, VRBO.com etc.	1	1.9%
Resort or timeshare	0	0.0%

Festival Expenditures

The economic contribution of the out-of-town rally attendees was determined to be approximately \$1 million. This was calculated by first obtaining per-person expenditures by dividing the per-party expenditures with the median party size (2 persons) for those with expenditures. The median was used to estimate party size as the median is less affected by extreme values. Next, per-person expenditures were multiplied by the number of nonlocals who attended. It was estimated that of the 8,505 total rally attendees, that 5,503 persons (65%), were not from immediate Verde Valley communities, and are therefore eligible to be included in the economic contribution analysis. The expenditures were weighted by the nonlocal visitors based on the overnight stays. Table 22 describes the different types of expenditures.

Table 22: Economic Impact from Attendees

	Per-party Per-trip	Per-person per trip	% with expenditures	Total Expenditures
Rally vendor purchase	\$132	\$66	49.7%	\$180,000
Shopping-retail	\$124	\$62	45.4%	\$155,000
Restaurant, bar & grocery	\$150	\$75	68.5%	\$284,000
Lodging-camping	\$238	\$119	50.5%	\$331,000
Transportation (including gas)	\$49	\$24	60.0%	\$81,000
Other recreation-entertainment	\$96	\$48	25.9%	\$69,000
All other	\$93	\$46	13.9%	\$36,000
Weighted average per party and per person	\$128	\$64		\$1,136,000

Thunder Valley Rally Economic Impact

Three processes are integral in modeling expenditure impacts: direct, indirect, and induced effects.

Direct effects are that portion spent directly by visitors during their experience. For example, a tourist visits the Thunder Valley Rally in Yavapai county and spends \$150 at a hotel. This means that the money they spent there is the direct effect of their \$150 expenditure.

Indirect effects are when the hotel spends a portion of the direct expenditure described above on inputs necessary to run the operation (electricity, maid service, and so forth). Some of the hotel's spending may occur outside of Yavapai County, however, the portion that the hotel spends within the county contributes to the local economy.

Induced effects allow the changes in household income to be measured. One indirect effect is employee compensation. As employees are compensated, they use their income to purchase goods and services in the local economy.

The ratio of these three effects, combined with the initial expenditure, is labeled the multiplier for that expenditure. Therefore, in this example, an output multiplier is the sum of direct (tourist spending), indirect (hotel spending), and induced (employee consumption) divided by direct tourism spending.

Similarly, direct jobs are jobs that are supported by direct expenditures, while indirect and induced jobs are those supported by indirect and induced expenditures. It is important to remember that direct jobs are jobs supported by visitor expenditures in the county. These may include, but are not limited to, jobs at the specific event.

Direct expenditures from the last column of the previous table were modeled in the IMPLAN (**IM**pact analysis for **PLAN**ning) input-output model, which examines and models the flow of direct expenditures through the regional economy of Yavapai County. Please note that direct event expenditures are reduced by \$115,000, which is the result of direct leakage for goods and services purchased from outside the county and region. Table 23 illustrates this.

Table 23: IMPLAN Generated Effects

Impact Type	Direct Effect	Indirect Effect	Induced Effect	Multiplier	Total Effect
Output	\$1,021,000	\$124,000	\$167,000	1.3	\$1,312,000
Employment	13.9	1.2	1.4	1.2	16.5

The total expenditure of \$1.3 million supports 13.9 direct jobs in the region, as well as 1.2 indirect jobs, and 1.4 jobs in the induced sectors of the economy—a total of 16.5 jobs with an employment multiplier of 1.2.

The IMPLAN analysis also estimated that Thunder Valley Rally generated significant state and local tax revenue, that totaling \$109,000, as well as \$98,000 in federal tax revenue.

APPENDIX – Questionnaire

Thunder Valley R.	ally 201	6 - Old	Town Co	ottonwo	od 80	73260860	
1. How did you hear about the rally?	(mark all th	at apply)					
	Radio		Posters/fly	ers	O Attended Previously		
O The Noise			O Billboard		O Event		
O Cycle Rides			O Online/website				
O Thunder Press	0 93,9		O Social Media (Facebook, Twitter etc.)				
O Ride AZ Magazine	O Local R						
O AZ Biker Info Guide							
. What brand of bike do you ride? O	Harley Davi	idson O Hon	da O India	n O Yamah	a O Victor	ry O Other	
B. Roughly, how many different Mercl Did you purchase anything from ra k. Now, tell us how satisfied you are w	ally vendor	s? O No O	Yes	following a	reas:		
	Not applicable	TOTALLY	Somewhat	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied		TOTALLY Satisfied	
Poker Run	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Parking logistics, shuttle	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Organization/layout of rally	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Friendliness/helpfulness of staff	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Rally atmosphere	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Beverage service	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Quality of vendors	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Musical performers/bands	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Old Town merchant experience	0	0	0	0	0	0	
5. Overall, how well did Thunder Valle Choose a rating from one to ten wh Low 1 2 3 4 5	ere "1" is tl	ne LOWEST			г		
Would you recommend the rally to	your friend	ds and famil	y? O No C	Yes Yes			
7. Have you visited Old Town Cottony	vood before	e? (skip if a l	ocal)				
O No O Yes How many time	es in the las	st year?					
Is Old Town a good place for the ral	lly? O No	O Neutral	O Yes				
10. What category best describes you O Under \$25,000 per year O \$	hat year w r combined 50,000 - \$74	ere you bor I household 1,999 0 \$	income in 2	24,999 0	Over \$150,		
	75,000 - \$99		125,000 - \$1	(49,999 C	Decline to a	inswer	
11. What is your five-digit U.S. zip cod U.S. Residents:		ry of origin: tional Visitor				OVER	
A Desirents' I I	- internal	THE PROPERTY OF				>>>>>	

O No O Yes	If Yes, how many nights in Northern AZ?						
	In what community are you staying? (mark all that apply)						
	○ Camp Verde ○ Jerome ○ Flagstaff ○ Other: (specify)						
	○ Cottonwood/Cornville/Clarkdale ○ S	edona O Prescott					
	What type of lodging are you using? (mar	k all that apply)	<u></u>				
	O Home of friends or relatives O Bed &	Breakfast Inn O air	bnb.com, VRBO.com etc.				
		rk or Camping Otl	n <mark>e</mark> r				
	O Resort or Timeshare O Our Se	econd Home					
(Verde Valley I Use whole num Please tell us the Rally vendor pur Shopping Restaurant, bar & g	g/retail \$ Other Recreation	on (including gas) \$on/entertainment \$					
	s	<u></u>					
9							
9	Thanks!						
\$	Thanks!						
•	Thanks!						
•	Thanks!						
•	Thanks!						