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Abstract: In inland areas water is an important resource for attracting tourists as is the case in Extremadura. For this reason this research aims to determine its attraction capacity for travelers from other parts of Spain. In 2017, 13,848 surveys were carried out in the tourist offices of the region, from which 3403 were selected from those practicing tourism related to water. This has allowed us to find out the type of tourist who visits the area and his/her origin. By means of a geographical information system, a network analysis was applied to determine the attraction capacity of certain infrastructures. This result confirms that the most frequently visited areas coincide with the presence of natural swimming pools, although reservoirs do not act as centers of attraction for tourists although they do for visitors. At the same time, it was found that tourists practicing activities related to water resources come from neighboring areas but their attraction capacity extends to distant areas which coincide with areas that were the destination for regional emigration. Moreover, we advocate the need for establishing tourist policies involving greater tourist exploitation of reservoirs and the deseasonalization of tourism in the northern area, where most areas prepared for bathing are to be found.
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1. Introduction

Traditionally tourist resources have been considered to be the whole of the assets and services which by means of human intervention make tourist activities possible [1]. In other words, they make up the “raw material” of tourism [2] and consequently are the most important element for designing the tourist product [3]. In short, we are concerned with all forms of heritage capable of attracting demand [4] and which manage to meet its needs [3]. Nevertheless, it should be emphasized that there are numerous definitions of resources and attractions as is made clear by part of the conceptual literature on tourism [5,6]. In addition to this plurality of definitions, numerous classifications of resources have been carried out which aim to order them to make it easier, among things, to measure the attraction capacity they have for the demand [7,8]. This generates peculiar patterns in the distribution of supply with the consequent shaping of differentiated tourist spaces [9–11] and specific mobility rules [12].

The most accepted classifications of tourist resources include that designed by Defert [13], who indicates the prominent role played by “hidromo” resources as an element of attraction related to
water, either in its natural state or modified by man. Another very widespread classification is that of the Organisation of American States (OAS) [14], which provides an important list of natural resources among which water is a very important one.

As can be seen, there is considerable agreement in the literature when considering water as a top tourist resource, in particular, if it is taken into account that this includes beaches, rivers, lakes, and bathing areas, among others. This attraction capacity is revealed when one resorts to a mere spatial analysis of the tourist supply of both accommodation and complementary elements, as there is a notable territorial coincidence between both aspects even in inland areas [7,15]. It can be inferred that water and the tourist landscapes it generates can be a source of socio-economic development that affects not only coastal areas but also inland areas, which tend to look to the former to implement development practices that aim to obtain almost immediate tourist success. Naturally coastal areas have nothing to do with inland areas from a tourist perspective; it may seem presumptuous to compare them as the attraction of a beach cannot be equaled by that of a reservoir [7]. Nevertheless, they have an interesting attraction capacity within inland areas which can encourage the development of the rural milieu [16], in particular, if faith is placed in sustainable tourist planning [17].

In the Spanish context, one of the essential resources is that of coasts and more specifically of sand, which has promoted the specific tourist category of “sun and beach” as the result of its consideration as a true model of tourist development [18]. The identification of beaches as the tourist spaces most desired by the demand, which has been pointed out by numerous authors in various fields and periods [19,20], has generated a growing interest in the development of tourism linked to water in inland areas [16,17,21,22] and at the same time has encouraged the appearance of activities of active and adventure tourism [23].

There is a certain agreement among experts in that Spain is seen as a tourist space that goes beyond the typical sun and beach offerings [24–26]; more and more tourist types are arising either as substitutes or as complements. At times an attempt is made to emulate the coastal tourist development model based on sun and beach in inland areas [27] as a response to the need to develop these areas and thus mitigate their huge problems (depopulation, aging, abandonment, etc.). This circumstance has aroused the interest of the institutions in revitalizing these spaces, which has culminated with the enactment of Law 45/2007 of 13th December on the sustainable development of the rural milieu [28]. This Law proposes in its Article 20 the encouraging of rural tourism and in its Article 21 the sustainable management of resources, among which water is a priority. More recently, faith has been placed in promoting the circular economy by means of the resource of water [29], in such a way that numerous activity companies aim to exploit the resources of the territory and the outstanding landscapes generated by water, although unfortunately in most cases the huge tourist potential of these spaces is not being made use of [15].

A priori the water resources of inland areas have been used for various activities linked to tourism, such as fishing, water sports, bathing, or cruises in three well-differentiated tourist spaces: rivers, reservoirs, and areas prepared for bathing (river beaches and natural swimming pools). In this way, they shape a territory rich in heritage in which tourism can be consolidated as an economic alternative of the first magnitude [30,31] if it is complemented by other superimposed attractions such as natural spaces, gastronomy, culture, etc.

In this context of inland spaces river tourism is of particular relevance, at least as a tourist attraction on which to base the development of the activity. In recent decades this type has evolved in common with the remainder in such a way that it has encouraged the development of active tourism, as is stated in some studies of bibliographical analysis on this subject [32] or others analyzing sports tourism and big data [33]. Given this situation, river tourism is an interesting alternative for encouraging tourism activities and economic development in adjacent areas [34,35]. It can be complemented with other spaces linked to water such as reservoirs, which little by little are beginning to emerge as true centers of tourist attraction in which to carry out sporting activities, cultural activities, etc. Indeed there are recent studies that highlight these areas for the practice of ecotourism [36] or which concentrate on the
role they play in the development of policies to coordinate rural tourism and sustainability [37]. At the same time, the literature stresses the need for planning in areas near reservoirs considering the resident population, which increases their attraction to tourists owing to the social implications [38] and also affects a wide concept of sustainability. In this respect some authors affirm that for certain spaces no studies exist to stress their potential for the development of tourism activities, owing to which they deduce that the management of these spaces leaves room for improvement [39].

This lack of treatment by the scientific literature, which concentrates largely on aspects of water quality [40], conservation [41], resilience [42], or management [43,44], justifies the need for carrying out studies which from a tourist perspective are capable of valuing water resources as tourist resources, analyzing whether they are attractive to the demand. It should not be forgotten that the tourist development that can be generated around water is very important in inland areas; it makes use of the reservoirs and rivers and also those infrastructures which facilitate bathing as occurs in natural swimming pools, one of the tourist elements most in demand by rural tourists in areas such as Extremadura [7]. In this sense, it is possible to find some references in the international literature which study reservoirs as tourist landscapes, as centers of tourist attraction, and as areas that encourage the socio-economic development of rural and inland areas [45–48]. At the same time, there are also numerous references to the analysis of river tourism [49–52]. In contrast, there is a lack of studies on the role played by natural swimming pools in the rural tourism system. Moreover, and despite the highly relevant role which water may play as a tourist resource in inland areas, there is a dearth of studies that allow knowledge of the profile of the tourist who visits these spaces and therefore considers them as tourist spaces. To this can be added a lack of knowledge of the places of origin of the tourists; this would allow us to find out their attraction capacity.

Considering these limitations, the study aims to find out the profile of the tourists visiting these areas and above all to determine the extent of their attraction capacity. For this reason, it starts with the following hypotheses:

**Hypothesis 1 (H1).** There is no standard tourist profile for water tourism in Extremadura as this is mixed because tourists are attracted by other resources present in the territory.

**Hypothesis 2 (H2).** The attraction capacity is not restricted to the adjacent provinces but depends to a large extent of the amount of the population living in them and on other determinants such as whether they have been destinations of the emigration which occurred from Extremadura some decades ago.

**Hypothesis 3 (H3).** Travel time may act as a limitation, owing to which accessibility is a factor that must be taken into account.

**Hypothesis 4 (H4).** Of all available water resources it is natural swimming pools that are most attractive to tourists, while reservoirs tend to go unnoticed.

In order to corroborate these hypotheses, the main objective of the article is getting to know the demand and its mobility; these aspects have been treated little in the literature on a specific case, the autonomous region of Extremadura.

2. **Materials and Methods**

2.1. **The Case under Study**

Tourism has developed in Extremadura as from two well-defined types of resources; cultural and natural [27,53] (Figure 1).
These areas coincide with a number of tourist spots and areas as can be inferred from the main tourist magnitudes published by the National Institute of Statistics (Instituto Nacional de Estadística, INE) for 2018 which publishes its data on the portal http://www.ine.es (Table 1).

Table 1. Main tourist parameters in the main centers of tourist attraction in Extremadura (2018).

| Area                        | Travelers | Spanish Travelers | Foreign Travelers | Overnight Stays | Average Stay |
|-----------------------------|-----------|-------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| World Heritage Cities ¹     | 536,348   | 437,571           | 98,777            | 836,046         | 1.56         |
| Other cultural cities ¹     | 449,525   | 363,666           | 85,859            | 737,253         | 1.64         |
| Hotels                      | 267,803   | 228,587           | 39,216            | 544,814         | 2.03         |
| Rural accommodation         | 123,302   | 117,733           | 5569              | 283,149         | 2.30         |
| Camping                     | 71,875    | 62,511            | 9364              | 213,062         | 2.96         |

¹ tourist spots; ° tourist areas.

According to this source, national tourists predominate (83.5%) over foreigners (16.5%). Cultural tourism is highly developed in some tourist attraction spots which concentrate on the historic centers of Cáceres and Mérida, both of which are World Heritage Sites [54], together with Badajoz, Plasencia, Trujillo, and Zafra if we confine ourselves to the number of tourists who visit them [55]. In this sense the National Institute of Statistics (Instituto Nacional de Estadística, INE) published that in 2018 and only taking the hotel sector into account 289,496 tourists stayed in Cáceres; 246,852 in Mérida; and 209,509 in Badajoz; while Plasencia was visited by 94,665 tourists; Trujillo by 79,167; and Zafra by 67,194. This volume of tourists generated in these six centers a total of 1,573,299 overnight stays, ranging from the 461,629 of Cáceres to the 103,367 of Zafra [56].
Despite the great importance of these centers in the tourist sector of Extremadura and their being part of the tourist spots analyzed by the INE at a national level, they are only reflected in hotel accommodation; no other center in Extremadura is among the most outstanding at a national level in non-hotel or rural accommodation.

In contrast, when rural tourism is mentioned extensive areas do stand out which coincide with the vicinities of the highest elevations of the region, as occurs in the north and east of the province of Cáceres and the south of the province of Badajoz [10,54]. These areas concentrate a large proportion of the supply of rural accommodation in Extremadura as they exploit the huge attraction of one of their elements most frequently required by tourists, natural swimming pools, which are combined with spectacular landscapes [27,57]. These infrastructures become true centers of attraction for those visiting the region owing to the possibility of combining nature, culture, and the rural milieu with bathing in summer, which is necessary when in July and August the maximum temperatures vary between 35 and 40 degrees centigrade [58]. From this can be inferred the strong seasonality of rural tourism as July and August account for 10.7% and 15.9% of the overnight stays registered, while in winter the figure scarcely reaches 4% [59]. However, not all rural accommodation is located in these privileged spaces in the vicinity of the most important mountainous relief (Table 2). There are others in areas which in principle have less capacity for attracting tourists as is the case in the vicinity of the main reservoirs of Extremadura. Despite this, it must be recognized that with the implementation of infrastructures and the generation of tourist products linked to sports and sailing they are attractive to a proportion of those practicing rural tourism [7].

| Table 2. Tourist attractions of Extremadura as a tourist destination. |
|-------------------------------------------------|
| **Area Type** | **Characteristics** | **Accommodation Vacancies** * |
| Reservoirs (>500 hectares) | 63,811 hectares and 1859 miles of perimeter | 3732 |
| Rivers (principal) | 387 miles of length | 7087 |
| Bathing sites | 68 areas | 14,504 |
| Northern area of Extremadura | 396,151 hectares | 15,447 |
| World Heritage Sites | 2 cities and 1 Monastery | 6680 |
| Other Cultural Towns | 4 cities | 4869 |

* Radius ≤ 3 miles.

From all this, it can be inferred that the region has a dual tourist situation. On the one hand, we have the areas which hold important cultural and natural attractions and on the other spaces with huge potential based on water resources, although they are not those preferred by the demand owing to a peculiar casuistry such as the lack of tourism products.

2.2. Data

The data have been obtained from two well-differentiated sources, i.e., cartographic or alphanumeric information. To obtain the cartography we resorted to the National Geographical Institute (Instituto Geográfico Nacional, IGN) [60] and the Territorial Information System of Extremadura (Sistema de Información Territorial de Extremadura, SITEX) [61]. Both sources operate under a Creative Commons CC-BY 4.0 International license which supports their free use for legitimate purposes with the sole obligation of acknowledging and mentioning their origin and ownership. All the cartography used is of the scale 1:100,000, owing to which its spatial resolution of 20 m is sufficiently precise to attain the objectives of this research.

In order to obtain the alphanumeric data, in the first place, we decided to resort to the official information of the Register of Tourist Companies of Extremadura [62] updated on 31st December 2018 which can be accessed on the URL https://www.turismoextremadura.com/. The information forms the database corresponding to the offer of tourist accommodation previously georeferenced by the authors. Secondly, this information was complemented with the carrying out of 13,848 surveys in tourist offices all over Extremadura during the whole of the year 2017. The objective pursued was that of getting to
know the characteristics of the demand, among which origin plays an important part; knowledge of the latter allows the detection of mobility patterns. These surveys were selected by using the criterion that motivation to travel includes the practising of tourism in rivers, reservoirs, or bathing areas. This reduced their number to 3403, although their reliability as shown on their data sheet is considerable even in a worst-case scenario (Table 3).

Table 3. Data sheet of the survey.

| Sample Characteristics | Parameters |
|------------------------|------------|
| Universe:              | 1,843,175 travellers in Extremadura (2017) |
| Size of sample:        | 3403 surveys |
| Level of confidence:   | 95% |
| Sample error for the worst-case scenario (pq = 50) and the best scenario (pq = 90%) | 1.68%/1.01% |

Date: 1st January 2017 to 31st December 2017; Source: Own material.

The information compiled has been added to a Geographical Information System using the ArcGIS 10.5. The result combines the main attractions related to water and the road network which links the capitals of the Spanish provinces with the main overnight stay centers of Extremadura (Table 4), which allows the obtaining of mobility patterns and therefore the measuring of the attraction capacity of the main overnight destinations of the autonomous region.

Table 4. GIS design project.

| Data type | Source          | Cartographic Information | Alphanumeric Information |
|-----------|-----------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Cartographic | IGN             | Administrative units     | Area                     |
|           | SITEX           | Altimetry                | Altitude                 |
|           |                 | Hydrography              | Order                    |
|           |                 | Population centers       | Type                     |
|           |                 | Transport system         | Characteristics          |
|           |                 | Bathing sites            |                          |
| Alphanumeric | Extremadura Tourism | Georeferencing information on Google Maps | Type of accommodation |
|           |                 |                          | Address                  |
|           |                 |                          | Municipality             |
|           |                 |                          | Accommodation            |
|           |                 |                          | vacancies                |

2.3. Methods of Analysis

In order to achieve the objectives marked, a methodology has been designed which consists of six different stages ranging from data acquisition to the discussion of the results obtained in line with that indicated below (Figure 2).

The first stage concentrated on the compiling of the cartographic data at the National Centre for Geographical Information (Centro Nacional de Información Geográfica, CNIG), which is available on its website [http://centrodescargas.cnig.es/CentroDescargas/](http://centrodescargas.cnig.es/CentroDescargas/), and of the Regional Government of Extremadura which is provided on its URL [http://sitex.gobex.es/SITEX/centrodescargas/view/2](http://sitex.gobex.es/SITEX/centrodescargas/view/2). These sources have allowed us to obtain the base cartography referring to the administrative units, the hydrography, and the road network. Nevertheless, it has been necessary to georeference all the accommodation of Extremadura as this cartographic information did not exist. On the other hand, the information on the tourist demand was gathered by the means of surveys carried out during the whole of 2017 at the network of tourist offices in the region. The latter compiles information on the socio-economic profile of the visitors, their motivation to make their journey, and their origin, which has allowed the generating of an alphanumeric database which not only allows the obtaining of a profile of the tourists but also the determining of their mobility.
During the second stage a statistical analysis of a descriptive nature was carried out of the alphanumeric database, basically, distributions of frequency and crosstabs, accompanied by the most frequently used control techniques such as the Chi-square or symmetrical measures such as Phi, Kendall’s Tau-b, and Pearson’s R interval by interval. This has allowed us to get to know the relationships established between the motivations mentioned by tourists for traveling to a destination. In addition to this, the results obtained by the crosstabs of the socioeconomic variables and those of origin have been implemented in a Geographical Information System (GIS) using the ArcGIS software (v.10.5).

Then the third stage concentrated on the use of the GIS tool to perform a territorial analysis on the supply of establishments which is linked to three types of water resources: reservoirs, major rivers, and natural swimming pools. This tool has been shown to be effective for carrying out numerous territorial analyses of tourism [9,11,15,63,64] and has allowed at the outset the detection of certain problems when the average occupation levels of the accommodation of the areas analyzed are compared.

The fourth stage concentrated on performing a statistical analysis which links the preferences declared by the tourist in order to travel to a destination and its socioeconomic characteristics. At the same time, by means of an analysis of networks, we calculated the space-time pattern of mobility which characterizes them. In order to calculate the routes, the decision was taken to use as the point of origin the capital of the province from which the tourist comes and the place of the overnight stay at the destination point. However, to make the study more precise we have considered the 10 Spanish provinces issuing the largest number of tourists and the 39 most important overnight stay destinations. Despite this reduction, it has to be considered that a representation of 64.4% of the tourist demand is addressed.

The fifth stage shows the results obtained, and finally the sixth consists of a discussion of the essential results obtained from the research.

3. Results

3.1. Tourism of Inland Waters and Its Relation with Other Tourism Types

Tourists travel to Extremadura for very different reasons which in the main are complementary; this is a clear indication that several activities are carried out simultaneously. Despite this, the predominant reasons are those related to the enjoyment of cultural and nature tourism (Table 5). In this sense, it should be stressed that 79.2% of tourists acknowledge that they travel to make cultural visits.
and 48.4% do so to practice rural tourism, while 39.0% enjoy the gastronomy of the area they visit. In contrast, those who travel to enjoy tourism on inland waters visiting rivers, gorges, or reservoirs represent only 24.6%, with the level of motivation falling to 11.7% for those who travel to watch birds.

Table 5. Motivations for travel.

| Motivation                                                        | Replies | %    |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|------|
| Cultural visits                                                 | 10,974  | 79.2%|
| Rural tourism                                                    | 6708    | 48.4%|
| Gastronomy                                                       | 5403    | 39.0%|
| Tourism in rivers and gorges or reservoirs                      | 3402    | 24.6%|
| Birdwatching                                                     | 1618    | 11.7%|
| Visiting mines or caves and geological formations               | 966     | 7.0%|
| Practicing sport                                                | 958     | 6.9% |
| Visiting wine cellars                                           | 708     | 5.1% |
| Participating in events (congresses or meetings)                | 638     | 4.6% |
| Observing the sky                                               | 418     | 3.0% |
| Visiting scenarios of films or TV series                        | 169     | 1.2% |
| Learning Spanish                                                | 148     | 1.1% |
| Hunting                                                          | 82      | 0.6% |

When the association between variables, which are dichotomous in this case, is analyzed by means of the contingency table and some statistical parameters deriving from it (Table 6), it can be observed that tourists who travel to Extremadura to practice tourism in rivers, gorges, or reservoirs also use their stay to make cultural visits, practice generic rural tourism, watch birds, and visit mines, caves, or geological formations. Meanwhile, the remainder of associations prevents the rejection of the null hypothesis, which implies independence between them. All this is confirmed both by the Chi-squared test and by the various asymmetry measurements considered such as Phi, Kendall’s Tau-b, or Pearson’s R interval by interval. If the value obtained by Tau-b is specifically analyzed, a certain degree of positive dependence can be observed between visiting areas of inland waters and the practicing of other activities having strong links to nature with the practicing of rural tourism, and also with birdwatching or observing the sky or visiting geological formations.

Table 6. Relationships between tourist motivation. Chi-square and symmetrical measures.

| Motivation                                      | Tourism in Rivers and Gorges or Reservoirs | Chi-Square | Symmetric Measurements |
|------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|------------|------------------------|
| Learning Spanish                               | Yes                                       | 1.40%      | 98.60%                 | 4995 1 0.025 0.019 0.019 0.019 |
|                                               | No                                        | 1.00%      | 99.00%                 | 3402 1 0.228 0.034 0.034 0.034 |
| Hunting                                        | Yes                                       | 0.60%      | 99.40%                 | 42.272 1 0.228 0.004 0.004 0.004 |
|                                               | No                                        | 0.60%      | 99.40%                 | 0.228 1 0.004 0.004 0.004 0.004 |
| Gastronomy                                     | Yes                                       | 43.70%     | 56.30%                 | 343.302 1 0.000 0.055 0.055 0.055 |
|                                               | No                                        | 37.50%     | 62.50%                 | 343.302 1 0.000 0.055 0.055 0.055 |
| Birdwatching                                   | Yes                                       | 20.50%     | 79.50%                 | 189.490 1 0.000 0.117 0.117 0.117 |
|                                               | No                                        | 6.50%      | 93.50%                 | 189.490 1 0.000 0.117 0.117 0.117 |
| Observing the sky                              | Yes                                       | 1.90%      | 98.10%                 | 189.490 1 0.000 0.117 0.117 0.117 |
|                                               | No                                        | 2.50%      | 97.50%                 | 189.490 1 0.000 0.117 0.117 0.117 |
| Participating in events (congresses or meetings)| Yes                                      | 5.30%      | 94.70%                 | 45.627 1 0.000 −0.057 −0.057 −0.057 |
|                                               | No                                        | 5.30%      | 94.70%                 | 45.627 1 0.000 −0.057 −0.057 −0.057 |
| Practising sport                               | Yes                                       | 3.620%     | 96.40%                 | 36.488 1 0.000 0.051 0.051 0.051 |
|                                               | No                                        | 6.20%      | 93.80%                 | 36.488 1 0.000 0.051 0.051 0.051 |
| Rural tourism                                  | Yes                                       | 2.10%      | 97.90%                 | 21.00% 1 0.105 0.014 0.014 0.014 |
|                                               | No                                        | 6.20%      | 93.80%                 | 21.00% 1 0.105 0.014 0.014 0.014 |
| Visiting wine cellars                          | Yes                                       | 11.90%     | 88.10%                 | 168.852 1 0.000 0.110 0.110 0.110 |
|                                               | No                                        | 5.40%      | 94.60%                 | 168.852 1 0.000 0.110 0.110 0.110 |
| Visiting scenarios of films or TV series       | Yes                                       | 77.30%     | 22.70%                 | 9.996 1 0.002 −0.027 −0.027 −0.027 |
|                                               | No                                        | 79.90%     | 20.10%                 | 9.996 1 0.002 −0.027 −0.027 −0.027 |
There is a clear link between those who indicate as a reason for traveling all activities linked to nature to a greater or lesser degree. Nevertheless, it is surprising that there are not stronger links with the practicing of sport, which may be indicative of the lack of development of spaces of inland waters so as to maximize their power of attraction by means of complementary aquatic activities.

### 3.2. The Profile of the Tourist of Inland Waters

When the profile of the tourist who mentions as a reason for traveling to Extremadura the enjoyment of its rivers, reservoirs, and bathing areas is analyzed, no major differences are observed with which to characterize the visitors of the region as a whole, except evidently the motivations for travel (Table 7). In this sense, it is noteworthy that the predominant age group is that of between 36 and 55 years old (54.7%) who tend to travel as a couple (49.9%) or with relatives (28.2%). They are mainly Spaniards (89.3%) staying in hotels (38.5%), rural establishments (21.1%) and camp sites (8.8%).

#### Table 7. Characteristics of the visitor to inland waters.

| Sex         | Will You Stay in Extremadura? | Accommodation Used |
|-------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|
| Female      | Yes                           | Tourist albergue   |
| Male        | No                            | Tourist apartment  |
| DK/NA       | DK/NA                         | Camp site          |

| Age                  | Number of overnight stays |
|----------------------|---------------------------|
| Between 18 and 25    | 4.6% 1 5.6%              |
| Between 26 and 35    | 15.0% 2 20.5%            |
| Between 36 and 45    | 28.3% 3 15.4%            |
| Between 46 and 55    | 26.4% 4 12.6%            |
| Between 56 and 65    | 18.7% 5 35.2%            |
| Over 65              | 6.6% No overnight stay 10.7% |

| Companions           |                                |
|----------------------|--------------------------------|
| With a partner       | 49.9%                          |
| With relatives       | 28.2%                          |
| With Friends         | 14.3%                          |
| Alone                | 4.7%                           |
| In a group (organised trip) | 2.8% |
| DK/NA/REF            | 0.4%                           |

| Origin               |                                |
|----------------------|--------------------------------|
| Other accommodation  | 5.4%                           |
| DK/NA/REF            | 1.1%                           |
| Spain                | 92.4%                          |
| Other countries      | 7.3%                           |
| DK/NA                | 0.3%                           |

### 3.3. The Mobility of the Tourist of Inland Waters and the Attraction Capacity of the Destinations

Extremadura has a strong capacity for attracting tourists interested in its attractions, among which all those linked to the resource of water are particularly noteworthy. This affirmation is corroborated when the origin of the visitors is analyzed since tourists come from all over Spain (Table 8 and Figure 3). Nevertheless, their percentage is very variable owing to two essential factors: the number of inhabitants living in the province and the proximity of the area of study in line with that observed in the specific literature [12,64].

In keeping with the following, the province providing the largest number of tourists in Madrid, as is acknowledged by 24.8% of those polled. This is obvious giving its proximity and the 6.5 million inhabitants [56] of the city in 2018. Moreover, it so happens that the nearest areas have strongly developed rural tourism based on the landscape and above on bathing areas.

Although figures are significantly lower, numerous tourists also come from the province of Barcelona as these represent 7.2% of those polled. This province has a population of 5.6 million inhabitants, although it must be taken into account that it is a long way from Extremadura; this is partly compensated by the fact that it was the destination of many emigrants to the region in the 1960s who now take advantage of their holidays to return to their villages of origin. This circumstance can also be observed in the provinces of Vizcaya (4.3%), Guipúzcoa (2.5%), and to a lesser extent Álava (1.6%), which were also destination centers for immigrants originating from Extremadura as the Basque Country was a center of development which required a great deal of labor.
Table 8. Origin of Spanish tourists.

| Provinces Issuing Most Visitors Attracted by Water Masses | Percent |
|----------------------------------------------------------|---------|
| Madrid                                                   | 24.8%   |
| Barcelona                                                | 7.2%    |
| Seville                                                  | 5.4%    |
| Vizcaya                                                  | 4.3%    |
| Valencia                                                 | 2.5%    |
| Guipúzcoa                                                | 2.5%    |
| Toledo                                                   | 2.4%    |
| Cadiz                                                    | 2.2%    |
| Salamanca                                                | 2.0%    |
| Valladolid                                               | 1.9%    |
| Badajoz                                                  | 8.3%    |
| Cáceres                                                  | 4.9%    |
| Rest of provinces                                        | 31.6%   |

Figure 3. Origin of Spanish tourists attracted by water masses.

The peripheral provinces also account for significant percentages. Among these, Seville stands out as 5.4% of tourists come from here, together with Toledo with 2.4% and Salamanca, the contribution of which is limited to 2%.
On the other hand, the residents of Extremadura who practice tourism related to the resource of water represent 13.2%. The remainder of the provinces do not account for 2% of the visitors and in most cases not even 1%.

This generic situation is complemented with a much more detailed vision that reflects mobility from each of the provincial capitals to the various overnight stay points. Nevertheless, in order to illustrate mobility and the flows of tourists, the study has been restricted to the 10 Spanish provinces which provide the largest number of visitors to Extremadura, not taking into account the data from the provinces of Cáceres and Badajoz as they are part of tourism within Extremadura and generate 13.2% of travel. The provinces as a whole represent 55.2% of tourists. Moreover, the overnight stay areas have been limited to 38 which accounts for the highest number of visitors (Table 9). With all this, we have managed to generate a matrix of 10 points of origin per 38 points of destination, which makes it possible to obtain a very rough idea of mobility and the attraction capacity.

| Population Centres and Accommodation Places |
|---------------------------------------------|
| Alange                                      |
| 458                                         |
| Don Benito                                  |
| 333                                         |
| Mérida                                      |
| 2505                                        |
| Alburquerque                                |
| 84                                          |
| Fuentes de León                             |
| 88                                          |
| Monesterio                                  |
| 391                                         |
| Alcántara                                   |
| 152                                         |
| Guadalupe                                   |
| 759                                         |
| Navaconcejo                                 |
| 660                                         |
| Almendralejo                                |
| 503                                         |
| Herrera del Duque                           |
| 149                                         |
| Olivenza                                    |
| 341                                         |
| Azuaga                                      |
| 143                                         |
| Hervás                                      |
| 1976                                        |
| Plasencia                                   |
| 1498                                        |
| Badajoz                                     |
| 1884                                        |
| Hornachos                                   |
| 85                                          |
| Torrejón el Rubio                           |
| 295                                         |
| Baños de Montemayor                         |
| 657                                         |
| Jaraíz de la Vera                           |
| 215                                         |
| Trujillo                                    |
| 1213                                        |
| Cabezuela del Valle                        |
| 207                                         |
| Jarandilla de la Vera                       |
| 1624                                        |
| Valencia de Alcántara                       |
| 359                                         |
| Cáceres                                     |
| 3609                                        |
| Jerez de los Caballeros                    |
| 323                                         |
| Villafranca de los Barros                  |
| 187                                         |
| Caminomorisco                               |
| 566                                         |
| Jerte                                       |
| 739                                         |
| Villanueva de la Serena                    |
| 182                                         |
| Cañamero                                    |
| 106                                         |
| Llerena                                     |
| 200                                         |
| Villanueva de la Vera                      |
| 196                                         |
| Castuera                                    |
| 133                                         |
| Malpartida de Plasencia                    |
| 667                                         |
| Zafra                                       |
| 715                                         |
| Coria                                       |
| 193                                         |
| Medellín                                    |
| 46                                          |
| TOTAL                                       |
| 24,441                                      |

The travelers who make their way to each of these population centers are variables if one takes into account the province of origin, from which the travel time can be deduced taking the capital of the same as a reference (Figure 4).

These centers account for a high percentage of the population resident in the province and naturally, one of the motivations of the trip is considered to be the enjoyment of the areas linked to the resource of water, as can be seen from Appendix A (Table A1). The latter indicates the time devoted exclusively to the outward journey.

The relation established between the travel time calculated in one direction (origin-destination) is inverse in most cases, since as it increases the percentage of visitors to a given space falls. It is however observed that there is a positive relation regarding those from the provinces of Cadiz or Seville; this circumstance can be attributed to the fact that their preferred destinations are to be found in the north of the province of Cáceres, the area the furthest away from the provincial capitals mentioned.
The relation established between the travel time calculated in one direction and the percentage of visitors who practise tourism in rivers, gorges, and reservoirs, according to their provinces of origin, is shown in Figure 4.

Among the motivations of the trip, the enjoyment of the areas linked to the resource of water is one of the most cited reasons, as can be seen from Table 9.

Figure 4. Percentage of visitors practicing tourism in rivers, gorges, and reservoirs according to their provinces of origin: (a) Barcelona, (b) Vizcaya, (c) Cadiz, (d) Madrid, (e) Salamanca, (f) Guipúzcoa, (g) Seville, (h) Toledo, (i) Valencia, and (j) Valladolid.
A priori the interpretation of this situation is rather ambiguous, as although it is true that interest decreases with the distance it is also true that in the case of a journey exceeding 6–7 hours one extra hour should not represent an obstacle. For this reason, other possible factors conditioning the journey are put forward, among which the following stand out: the attraction of the destination, the size of the population resident in the province, and even if the area of origin has been a center of attraction for the emigrants who abandoned Extremadura in the 1960s. With the aim of elucidating which factors may be more important, we decided to outline the main determinants characterizing the provinces which provide a greater number of tourists (Table 10).

### Table 10. Characteristics of the main provinces providing visitors.

| Origin (Province) | Origin (City) | Minimum Distance to Destinations (Minutes) | Minimum Distance to Destinations (Minutes) | Population (Province) 1 January 2019 | Percentage of Travelers (Average) | Centre of Attraction for Emigrants from Extremadura | R |
|-------------------|--------------|------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|---|
| Barcelona         | Barcelona    | 514                                      | 660                                      | 5.663.284                           | 7.2%                            | Yes                                           | −0.576 |
| Vizcaya           | Bilbao       | 298                                      | 492                                      | 1.152.200                           | 4.3%                            | Yes                                           | −0.616 |
| Cadiz             | Cadiz        | 137                                      | 329                                      | 1.240.020                           | 2.2%                            | No                                            | 0.444  |
| Madrid            | Madrid       | 142                                      | 288                                      | 6.661.949                           | 24.8%                           | Yes                                           | −0.559 |
| Salamanca         | Salamanca    | 62                                       | 256                                      | 329.866                             | 2.0%                            | No                                            | 0.315  |
| San Sebastián     | Guipúzcoa    | 332                                      | 526                                      | 723.412                             | 2.5%                            | Yes                                           | −0.538 |
| Seville           | Seville      | 62                                       | 254                                      | 1.941.804                           | 5.4%                            | No                                            | 0.419  |
| Toledo            | Toledo       | 123                                      | 353                                      | 694.395                             | 2.4%                            | No                                            | −0.160 |
| Valencia          | Valencia     | 329                                      | 485                                      | 2.563.887                           | 2.5%                            | No                                            | −0.178 |
| Valladolid        | Valladolid   | 135                                      | 329                                      | 519.444                             | 1.9%                            | No                                            | −0.399 |

As can be appreciated, there is a clear association between the volume of the population living in a province and the number of visitors it provides to the inland water destinations of Extremadura. Moreover, distance acts as a corrective element, which also occurs when it is taken into account whether they have been reception centers for emigrants from Extremadura.

The centers which attract the highest number of inland water tourists are located in areas of the north of the province of Cáceres. To be precise these are the areas of La Vera. Valle del Jerte, Valle del Ambroz, and also the Sierra de Gata and Las Hurdes. These are areas in which numerous natural swimming pools have been built; these installations are very popular with summer tourists [7,10,27,54]. Among these areas, certain municipalities stand out (Table 11).

### Table 11. Most attractive municipalities for the tourist of inland waters.

| Municipalities and Accommodation Places |
|----------------------------------------|
| Plasencia                              |
| 1498 Caminomorisco                     |
| 566 Cabezuela del Valle                |
| 207                                    |
| Jerte                                  |
| 739 Alcántara                          |
| 152 Baños de Montemayor                |
| 657                                    |
| Jaraíz de la Vera                      |
| 215 Malpartida de Plasencia            |
| 667 Torrejón el Rubio                  |
| 295                                    |
| Jarandilla de la Vera                  |
| 1624 Guadalupe                         |
| 759 Villanueva de la Vera              |
| 196                                    |
| Hervás                                 |
| 1976 Navaconcejo                       |
| 660 TOTAL                              |
| 10,211                                 |

A detailed analysis of the most popular destinations from each province reflects perfectly the configuration of the most attractive areas. In this sense, if we take into account the detailed analysis of the routes followed from the origin to the destination (Figure 5) it is possible to detect the mobility patterns which were anticipated but which up to now had not been demonstrated.
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The preferred destinations for carrying out activities related to the resource of water for tourists from the province of Barcelona are those located in the northern part of the region, mainly the districts of La Vera, the Valle del Jerte, and the Valle del Ambroz. To be precise, the municipalities of Villanueva de la Vera, Jaraíz de la Vera, Jarandilla de la Vera, Jerte, and Hervás stand out as they contain numerous natural swimming pools.

- Those from the province of Vizcaya choose equally the district of La Vera and the Valle del Jerte, although given their origin their holiday destination is also the district of Las Hurdes. Likewise, they visit the area of Monfragüe National Park.
- Tourists from the southern provinces of Cadiz and Seville coincide in choosing above all the destinations located in the north of the province of Cáceres. They clearly put their faith in the municipalities of La Vera, the Valle del Jerte, Valle del Ambroz, and Las Hurdes. However, some reservoir destinations are beginning to appear such as Herrera del Duque and Olivenza.
- Visitors from Madrid choose the areas nearest to those of their origin, which moreover account for an important part of the bathing areas, as is the case in the districts of La Vera and the Valle del Jerte, and they even put their faith in areas in the vicinity of the large reservoirs on the River Guadiana.
- Those coming from Salamanca and Guipúzcoa choose equally the districts of La Vera and the Valle del Jerte, i.e., the areas which are nearest to and have better communications with the cities of Salamanca and San Sebastián.
- Tourists arriving from Valencia mainly coincide in the destinations located in the Valle del Jerte and the district of La Vera, although noteworthy flows to Hervás and Baños de Montemayor in the Valle del Ambroz are also observed.
- On the other hand, visitors from Valladolid prefer Las Hurdes and the Valle del Jerte as their destinations; another important destination is the district of La Vera.
- In contrast, those from the province of Toledo tend to choose the destinations of Guadalupe and the Valle del Ambroz, although their representation never exceeds 15%, the threshold which we have established as significant for drawing up the routes.

4. Discussion

This research has revealed that there is no specific tourist profile in the areas where the resource of water is present; on the contrary, the characteristics of these tourists tend to be very similar to those of the remainder. Taking into account this result it can be observed that Hypothesis 1 is therefore confirmed.

It has likewise been observed that the attraction capacity depends not only on the presence of a resource of great value but also on other aspects such as the volume of the population resident in the province of origin. In addition to this, it is also observed that there are certain links with those provinces which were the preferred destinations for emigration from Extremadura in the 1960s, which reveals that Hypothesis 2 is also proven.

On the other hand, travel time plays an important part in conditioning in most cases the percentage of tourists traveling from other provinces, which confirms Hypothesis 3.

Moreover, Hypothesis 4 has also been confirmed according to which in Extremadura the tourist exploitation of the water resources is concentrated in a very specific area, i.e., the north of the province of Cáceres. The capacity of attraction of this area for tourists who carry out activities linked to water is considerable, although it is strongly related to the existence of specific infrastructures for bathing such as natural swimming pools or other spaces specially prepared for the purpose, as is reflected by the specific literature on the study area [7]. Such is the success of the same that they are capable of attracting visitors from areas as far away as Barcelona, Vizcaya, and Guipúzcoa. However, it has also been found that not all the territories with spaces specially prepared for bathing enjoy the same attraction capacity despite the efforts of local administrators to promote their development, as is the case in the area of the Villuercas–Ibores–Jara Geopark, the attraction capacity of which lies in the municipality of Guadalupe [65].

This attraction capacity contrasts with the lack of tourist exploitation of the large reservoirs as the nearby settlements record very few overnight stays, which is a faithful reflection of their lack of interest to tourists despite their undeniable attraction for the practicing of water sports or other activities linked to water [66].

All this takes the form of the very limited use by tourists of the resources available, as their concentration in the north of Extremadura is combined with the fact that they are used almost exclusively in the summer months. However, this situation may change if it is possible to generate a water sports tourist product on the large reservoirs, as it has been confirmed that with initiatives such as river cruises space can be revitalized and its resources can be exploited to the full. This tourist segment has been developed in various countries and scientific literature attaches more and more important to its analysis from very different perspectives [67–70]. The success of river cruise tourism has led to the setting up in Extremadura of different tourist products of this kind in the three emblematic areas of the Tajo-Internacional Nature Reserve, the Special Conservation Area of Canchos de Ramiro, and the Monfragüe Biosphere Reserve. Nevertheless, their attraction capacity is limited to tourists staying in other areas of Extremadura.

The above aspects stress the need for implementing tourist policies capable of encouraging the sustainable use of inland waters for their tourist exploitation, especially if it is taken into account that it has been detected that there is no standard profile of the tourism practiced on inland waters as other forms of tourism are practiced at the same time.

In accordance with this necessary tourism policy, specific promotion campaigns adapted to the various territories should be set in motion which are based on the origin of most of the tourists, as it has been found that flows of tourists exist from areas over 5 hours away by car. This is precisely one of
the aspects that must also be improved as accessibility is not always satisfactory and this is a restricting factor. As has been seen, travel time is a limitation regarding the attracting of visitors.

The situation which has been described indicates that future research should point towards the functional reassessment of large reservoirs as an alternative for the development of the surrounding spaces. At the same time, it is necessary to implement tourist products linked to nature in areas focusing on summer tourism as these areas include many ecosystems of high quality that enjoy special protection.

5. Conclusions

The analysis carried out on the water in inland spaces and its capacity to become a tourist attraction for travelers from other parts of Spain has allowed the drawing of the following conclusions:

- The areas linked to the tourist exploitation of water are very attractive to tourists. Indeed, this resource is the fourth reason given for traveling to Extremadura.
- Tourists who practice activities linked to rivers, reservoirs, and bathing areas make up a demand of a mixed type as they combine these activities with others such as cultural visits, generic rural tourism, birdwatching, and even visits to caves, mines, and places with outstanding geological formations.
- There is a clear predominance of Spaniards over visitors from other countries. Moreover, we are concerned with middle-aged people who travel with their partner or as a family and stay in rural establishments or in camp sites and hotels in accordance with the type of mixed demand they represent.
- The origin of those who are attracted by the water resources of Extremadura is varied with a clear predominance of residents in the large Spanish cities such as Madrid, Barcelona, and Seville, although 13.2% of visitors are residents in the autonomous region itself.
- Accessibility and travel time are important factors for attracting tourists to these spaces, although these are not the only decision-making factors.
- The territory most frequently visited is the northern part of the province of Cáceres which coincides with the areas with the highest number of natural swimming pools; this implies that the resource is mainly exploited in summer.
- Reservoirs are revealed as a potential tourist space as they are capable of attracting visitors spending the night in other spaces, but they do not manage to persuade tourists to stay in the establishments of the surrounding areas.
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### Appendix A

#### Table A1. Percentage of tourists (origin-destination) who visit rivers, gorges and reservoirs *

| Origin               | Destination                  | Distance (Miles) | Traveling Time (Minutes) | Rivers, Gorges and Reservoirs Tourism |
|----------------------|------------------------------|------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Barcelona            | Alange                       | 606              | 593                      | 10.3%                                 |
| Barcelona            | Alcántara                    | 601              | 594                      | 25.0%                                 |
| Barcelona            | Almendralejo                 | 620              | 595                      | 10.0%                                 |
| Barcelona            | Badajoz                      | 639              | 615                      | 5.8%                                  |
| Barcelona            | Baños de Montemayor          | 570              | 548                      | 11.1%                                 |
| Barcelona            | Cabezuela del Valle          | 562              | 558                      | 14.3%                                 |
| Barcelona            | Cáceres                      | 575              | 558                      | 14.9%                                 |
| Barcelona            | Cañamero                     | 560              | 564                      | 15.8%                                 |
| Barcelona            | Don Benito                   | 588              | 568                      | 4.0%                                  |
| Barcelona            | Guadalupe                    | 541              | 548                      | 10.9%                                 |
| Barcelona            | Herrera del Duque            | 508              | 529                      | 7.7%                                  |
| Barcelona            | Hervás                       | 569              | 546                      | 20.7%                                 |
| Barcelona            | Hornachos                    | 626              | 620                      | 6.7%                                  |
| Barcelona            | Jaraíz de la Vera            | 527              | 515                      | 30.0%                                 |
| Barcelona            | Jarandilla de la Vera        | 526              | 521                      | 26.7%                                 |
| Barcelona            | Jerez de los Caballeros      | 664              | 654                      | 14.3%                                 |
| Barcelona            | Jerte                        | 525              | 559                      | 25.5%                                 |
| Barcelona            | Llerena                      | 624              | 634                      | 4.8%                                  |
| Barcelona            | Malpartida de Plasencia      | 536              | 514                      | 21.4%                                 |
| Barcelona            | Medellín                     | 592              | 571                      | 12.9%                                 |
| Barcelona            | Mérida                       | 602              | 583                      | 10.6%                                 |
| Barcelona            | Plasencia                    | 542              | 528                      | 19.9%                                 |
| Barcelona            | Torrejón el Rubio            | 548              | 533                      | 11.1%                                 |
| Barcelona            | Trujillo                     | 548              | 528                      | 11.0%                                 |
| Barcelona            | Villanueva de la Serena      | 590              | 568                      | 14.3%                                 |
| Barcelona            | Villanueva de la Vera        | 516              | 516                      | 33.3%                                 |
| Barcelona            | Zafra                        | 641              | 617                      | 7.9%                                  |
| Bilbao (Vizcaya)     | Alange                       | 434              | 423                      | 12.5%                                 |
| Bilbao (Vizcaya)     | Alcántara                    | 392              | 399                      | 23.1%                                 |
| Bilbao (Vizcaya)     | Almendralejo                 | 435              | 422                      | 14.3%                                 |
| Bilbao (Vizcaya)     | Badajoz                      | 454              | 440                      | 7.3%                                  |
| Bilbao (Vizcaya)     | Baños de Montemayor          | 303              | 298                      | 13.6%                                 |
| Bilbao (Vizcaya)     | Cáceres                      | 374              | 367                      | 12.3%                                 |
| Bilbao (Vizcaya)     | Caminomorisco                | 334              | 343                      | 27.3%                                 |
| Bilbao (Vizcaya)     | Coria                        | 354              | 346                      | 18.8%                                 |
| Bilbao (Vizcaya)     | Don Benito                   | 443              | 432                      | 20.0%                                 |
| Bilbao (Vizcaya)     | Guadalupe                    | 408              | 423                      | 6.3%                                  |
| Bilbao (Vizcaya)     | Hervás                       | 310              | 305                      | 12.9%                                 |
| Bilbao (Vizcaya)     | Hornachos                    | 460              | 455                      | 3.7%                                  |
| Bilbao (Vizcaya)     | Jaraíz de la Vera            | 351              | 361                      | 28.6%                                 |
| Bilbao (Vizcaya)     | Jarandilla de la Vera        | 361              | 381                      | 17.9%                                 |
Table A1. Cont.

| Origin                        | Destination                  | Distance (Miles) | Traveling Time (Minutes) | Rivers, Gorges and Reservoirs Tourism |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Bilbao (Vizcaya)              | Jerte                        | 324              | 340                      | 31.6%                                 |
| Bilbao (Vizcaya)              | Malpartida de Plasencia      | 338              | 330                      | 21.4%                                 |
| Bilbao (Vizcaya)              | Mérida                       | 418              | 409                      | 9.1%                                  |
| Bilbao (Vizcaya)              | Monesterio                   | 478              | 460                      | 11.1%                                 |
| Bilbao (Vizcaya)              | Navalconcejo                 | 329              | 352                      | 14.3%                                 |
| Bilbao (Vizcaya)              | Plasencia                    | 330              | 328                      | 17.2%                                 |
| Bilbao (Vizcaya)              | Torrejón el Rubio            | 355              | 367                      | 25.0%                                 |
| Bilbao (Vizcaya)              | Trujillo                     | 403              | 391                      | 8.7%                                  |
| Bilbao (Vizcaya)              | Villanueva de la Vera        | 334              | 379                      | 33.3%                                 |
| Bilbao (Vizcaya)              | Zafra                        | 455              | 442                      | 3.2%                                  |
| Cadiz                         | Alange                       | 191              | 196                      | 9.1%                                  |
| Cadiz                         | Azuaga                       | 170              | 196                      | 14.3%                                 |
| Cadiz                         | Badajoz                      | 225              | 226                      | 16.0%                                 |
| Cadiz                         | Cabezuela del Valle          | 304              | 314                      | 33.3%                                 |
| Cadiz                         | Cáceres                      | 237              | 240                      | 10.7%                                 |
| Cadiz                         | Caminomorisco                | 312              | 323                      | 50.0%                                 |
| Cadiz                         | Don Benito                   | 223              | 228                      | 18.2%                                 |
| Cadiz                         | Guadalupe                    | 271              | 291                      | 13.3%                                 |
| Cadiz                         | Herrera del Duque            | 283              | 303                      | 23.1%                                 |
| Cadiz                         | Hervás                       | 305              | 298                      | 9.5%                                  |
| Cadiz                         | Jaraíz de la Vera            | 304              | 302                      | 33.3%                                 |
| Cadiz                         | Jarandilla de la Vera        | 308              | 313                      | 33.3%                                 |
| Cadiz                         | Jerez de los Caballeros      | 165              | 199                      | 12.5%                                 |
| Cadiz                         | Jerte                        | 307              | 320                      | 25.0%                                 |
| Cadiz                         | Mérida                       | 191              | 194                      | 9.2%                                  |
| Cadiz                         | Navalconcejo                 | 302              | 309                      | 27.3%                                 |
| Cadiz                         | Plasencia                    | 284              | 282                      | 14.3%                                 |
| Cadiz                         | Trujillo                     | 248              | 243                      | 15.2%                                 |
| Cadiz                         | Zafra                        | 158              | 164                      | 7.1%                                  |
| Madrid                        | Alburquerque                 | 235              | 246                      | 14.3%                                 |
| Madrid                        | Alcántara                    | 212              | 222                      | 13.4%                                 |
| Madrid                        | Almendralejo                 | 231              | 223                      | 5.4%                                  |
| Madrid                        | Badajoz                      | 249              | 242                      | 2.5%                                  |
| Madrid                        | Baños de Montemayor          | 181              | 176                      | 9.9%                                  |
| Madrid                        | Cabezuela del Valle          | 172              | 186                      | 23.5%                                 |
| Madrid                        | Cáceres                      | 186              | 186                      | 8.9%                                  |
| Madrid                        | Caminomorisco                | 186              | 199                      | 16.2%                                 |
| Madrid                        | Cañamero                     | 171              | 192                      | 13.0%                                 |
| Madrid                        | Castuera                     | 224              | 233                      | 21.7%                                 |
| Madrid                        | Coria                        | 173              | 169                      | 8.2%                                  |
| Madrid                        | Don Benito                   | 199              | 196                      | 7.3%                                  |
| Madrid                        | Fuentes de León              | 286              | 288                      | 11.1%                                 |
| Madrid                        | Guadalupe                    | 151              | 176                      | 6.6%                                  |
| Madrid                        | Herrera del Duque            | 145              | 192                      | 17.4%                                 |
| Origin                | Destination                  | Distance (Miles) | Traveling Time (Minutes) | Rivers, Gorges and Reservoirs Tourism |
|----------------------|------------------------------|------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Madrid               | Hervás                       | 179              | 174                      | 12.2%                                |
| Madrid               | Jaraíz de la Vera            | 138              | 143                      | 28.3%                                |
| Madrid               | Jarandilla de la Vera        | 137              | 149                      | 22.8%                                |
| Madrid               | Jerez de los Caballeros      | 275              | 282                      | 3.4%                                 |
| Madrid               | Jerte                        | 137              | 182                      | 23.0%                                |
| Madrid               | Llerena                      | 273              | 269                      | 5.1%                                 |
| Madrid               | Malpartida de Plasencia      | 147              | 142                      | 19.4%                                |
| Madrid               | Medellín                     | 203              | 199                      | 5.0%                                 |
| Madrid               | Mérida                       | 213              | 210                      | 6.8%                                 |
| Madrid               | Navaconcejo                  | 170              | 181                      | 21.7%                                |
| Madrid               | Olivenza                     | 265              | 270                      | 2.9%                                 |
| Madrid               | Plasencia                    | 153              | 156                      | 10.7%                                |
| Madrid               | Serradilla                   | 170              | 176                      | 12.3%                                |
| Madrid               | Torrejón el Rubio            | 158              | 161                      | 4.7%                                 |
| Madrid               | Trujillo                     | 158              | 155                      | 9.1%                                 |
| Madrid               | Valencia de Alcántara        | 248              | 262                      | 14.3%                                |
| Madrid               | Villafranca de los Barros    | 240              | 232                      | 8.6%                                 |
| Madrid               | Villanueva de la Serena      | 200              | 196                      | 12.5%                                |
| Madrid               | Villanueva de la Vera        | 127              | 144                      | 26.2%                                |
| Madrid               | Zafra                        | 252              | 245                      | 3.9%                                 |
| Salamanca            | Alcántara                    | 140              | 163                      | 16.7%                                |
| Salamanca            | Cáceres                      | 125              | 130                      | 6.3%                                 |
| Salamanca            | Don Benito                   | 168              | 212                      | 14.3%                                |
| Salamanca            | Guadalupe                    | 159              | 186                      | 18.8%                                |
| Salamanca            | Hervás                       | 60               | 69                       | 11.1%                                |
| Salamanca            | Jaraíz de la Vera            | 100              | 124                      | 33.3%                                |
| Salamanca            | Jerte                        | 75               | 103                      | 30.8%                                |
| Salamanca            | Malpartida de Plasencia      | 85               | 97                       | 16.7%                                |
| Salamanca            | Mérida                       | 170              | 174                      | 3.0%                                 |
| Salamanca            | Olivenza                     | 196              | 231                      | 14.3%                                |
| Salamanca            | Plasencia                    | 79               | 92                       | 14.8%                                |
| Salamanca            | Villanueva de la Serena      | 170              | 212                      | 4.3%                                 |
| San Sebastián (Guipúzcoa) | Alange                  | 469              | 457                      | 5.3%                                 |
| San Sebastián (Guipúzcoa) | Alburquerque             | 449              | 456                      | 20.0%                                |
| San Sebastián (Guipúzcoa) | Alcántara                 | 426              | 433                      | 18.2%                                |
| San Sebastián (Guipúzcoa) | Almendralejo              | 469              | 454                      | 4.3%                                 |
| San Sebastián (Guipúzcoa) | Baños de Montemayor         | 337              | 332                      | 12.5%                                |
| San Sebastián (Guipúzcoa) | Cabezuela del Valle       | 362              | 381                      | 100.0%                               |
| San Sebastián (Guipúzcoa) | Cáceres                   | 409              | 401                      | 7.9%                                 |
| San Sebastián (Guipúzcoa) | Caminomorisco              | 368              | 377                      | 100.0%                               |
| San Sebastián (Guipúzcoa) | Castuera                 | 503              | 502                      | 16.7%                                |
| San Sebastián (Guipúzcoa) | Guadalupe                | 443              | 457                      | 11.1%                                |
| San Sebastián (Guipúzcoa) | Hervás                    | 344              | 339                      | 12.8%                                |
| San Sebastián (Guipúzcoa) | Jaraíz de la Vera          | 385              | 394                      | 33.3%                                |
| Origin                          | Destination                      | Distance (Miles) | Traveling Time (Minutes) | Rivers, Gorges and Reservoirs Tourism |
|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| San Sebastián (Guipúzcoa)      | Jarandilla de la Vera            | 395              | 414                      | 13.0%                                 |
| San Sebastián (Guipúzcoa)      | Jerte                            | 359              | 374                      | 26.7%                                 |
| San Sebastián (Guipúzcoa)      | Malpartida de Plasencia          | 372              | 364                      | 14.3%                                 |
| San Sebastián (Guipúzcoa)      | Mérida                           | 452              | 443                      | 7.5%                                  |
| San Sebastián (Guipúzcoa)      | Navaconcejo                      | 364              | 386                      | 16.7%                                 |
| San Sebastián (Guipúzcoa)      | Olivenza                         | 504              | 502                      | 6.7%                                  |
| San Sebastián (Guipúzcoa)      | Plasencia                        | 364              | 362                      | 13.4%                                 |
| San Sebastián (Guipúzcoa)      | Torrejón el Rubio                | 390              | 401                      | 22.2%                                 |
| San Sebastián (Guipúzcoa)      | Trujillo                         | 437              | 425                      | 5.1%                                  |
| Seville                        | Almendralejo                     | 100              | 103                      | 10.0%                                 |
| Seville                        | Badajoz                          | 150              | 151                      | 3.1%                                  |
| Seville                        | Baños de Montemayor              | 232              | 225                      | 7.7%                                  |
| Seville                        | Cáceres                          | 163              | 165                      | 8.9%                                  |
| Seville                        | Caminomorisco                    | 237              | 248                      | 33.3%                                 |
| Seville                        | Guadalupe                        | 196              | 216                      | 9.1%                                  |
| Seville                        | Hervás                           | 231              | 223                      | 10.4%                                 |
| Seville                        | Jaraíz de la Vera                | 229              | 227                      | 20.0%                                 |
| Seville                        | Jarandilla de la Vera            | 234              | 238                      | 16.7%                                 |
| Seville                        | Jerte                            | 232              | 245                      | 33.3%                                 |
| Seville                        | Mérida                           | 117              | 119                      | 2.7%                                  |
| Seville                        | Olivenza                         | 130              | 156                      | 16.7%                                 |
| Seville                        | Plasencia                        | 209              | 207                      | 10.4%                                 |
| Seville                        | Trujillo                         | 173              | 168                      | 8.3%                                  |
| Seville                        | Zafra                            | 83               | 89                       | 8.3%                                  |
| Toledo                         | Alcántara                        | 190              | 203                      | 12.5%                                 |
| Toledo                         | Baños de Montemayor              | 159              | 157                      | 11.1%                                 |
| Toledo                         | Cáceres                          | 164              | 167                      | 3.7%                                  |
| Toledo                         | Guadalupe                        | 129              | 157                      | 13.6%                                 |
| Toledo                         | Hervás                           | 157              | 155                      | 6.1%                                  |
| Toledo                         | Mérida                           | 191              | 191                      | 5.3%                                  |
| Valencia                       | Alange                           | 425              | 424                      | 5.3%                                  |
| Valencia                       | Alburquerque                     | 442              | 449                      | 20.0%                                 |
| Valencia                       | Alcántara                        | 419              | 424                      | 18.2%                                 |
| Valencia                       | Almendralejo                     | 439              | 425                      | 4.3%                                  |
| Valencia                       | Baños de Montemayor              | 388              | 379                      | 12.5%                                 |
| Valencia                       | Cabezuela del Valle              | 380              | 389                      | 100.0%                                |
| Valencia                       | Cáceres                          | 393              | 388                      | 7.9%                                  |
| Valencia                       | Caminomorisco                    | 394              | 402                      | 100.0%                                |
| Valencia                       | Castuera                         | 336              | 386                      | 16.7%                                 |
| Valencia                       | Guadalupe                        | 359              | 378                      | 11.1%                                 |
| Valencia                       | Hervás                           | 386              | 377                      | 12.8%                                 |
| Valencia                       | Jaraíz de la Vera                | 345              | 345                      | 33.3%                                 |
| Valencia                       | Jarandilla de la Vera            | 345              | 352                      | 13.0%                                 |
Table A1. Cont.

| Origin    | Destination          | Distance (Miles) | Traveling Time (Minutes) | Rivers, Gorges and Reservoirs Tourism |
|-----------|-----------------------|------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Valencia  | Jerte                 | 383              | 394                      | 26.7%                                |
| Valencia  | Malpartida de Plasencia | 354              | 345                      | 14.3%                                |
| Valencia  | Mérida                | 420              | 413                      | 7.5%                                 |
| Valencia  | Navaconcejo           | 378              | 384                      | 16.7%                                |
| Valencia  | Olivenza              | 473              | 473                      | 6.7%                                 |
| Valencia  | Plasencia             | 360              | 358                      | 13.4%                                |
| Valencia  | Torrejón el Rubio     | 366              | 364                      | 22.2%                                |
| Valencia  | Trujillo              | 367              | 358                      | 5.1%                                 |
| Valladolid| Almendralejo          | 263              | 257                      | 10.0%                                |
| Valladolid| Badajoz               | 258              | 277                      | 3.1%                                 |
| Valladolid| Baños de Montemayor   | 132              | 135                      | 7.7%                                 |
| Valladolid| Cáceres               | 203              | 204                      | 8.9%                                 |
| Valladolid| Caminomorisco         | 162              | 180                      | 33.3%                                |
| Valladolid| Guadalupe             | 237              | 259                      | 9.1%                                 |
| Valladolid| Hervás                | 138              | 142                      | 10.4%                                |
| Valladolid| Jaraíz de la Vera     | 178              | 197                      | 20.0%                                |
| Valladolid| Jarandilla de la Vera | 187              | 217                      | 16.7%                                |
| Valladolid| Jerte                 | 152              | 177                      | 33.3%                                |
| Valladolid| Mérida                | 247              | 247                      | 2.7%                                 |
| Valladolid| Olivenza              | 274              | 305                      | 16.7%                                |
| Valladolid| Plasencia             | 156              | 164                      | 10.4%                                |
| Valladolid| Trujillo              | 208              | 239                      | 8.3%                                 |
| Valladolid| Zafra                 | 284              | 279                      | 8.3%                                 |

* Values below 1% are excluded.
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