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**Abstract.** Tourism is one of the most dynamically developing branches of economy in the Russian Federation in general and on the Black Sea coast in particular, in this regard, the assessment of tourism potential is one of the most important tasks of regional management.
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Analysis of tourist and recreational potential of the territory represents a rather urgent problem. Despite the relatively large number of different evaluation methods in the field, in the scientific literature there is no single approach that would allow a comprehensive analysis of the various components of the tourism potential of the region. Therefore, we have devised a comprehensive analysis and evaluation of recreational resources based on the construction of integral models [1, 2, 3]. Based on this model, we propose to use two types of indicators: indicators of natural environmental and socio-economic component of tourism and recreational potential of the territory, which in the end are reduced to a single integral indicator of tourist and recreational potential [4, 5, 6]. Approbation of this method was carried out on the example of urban and rural settlements included in the municipality Tuapse district, based on the data of official statistics and administrative sources [7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14].

The objects of analysis we select only those administrative units which is located on the Black sea coast, because the aspect of data creates a distinct advantage in comparison with the mountain areas do not have access to the marine resource.

Therefore, the objects of our analysis will be [15]:

* urban settlement of Dgubga;
* rural settlement of Tenginka;
* urban settlement of Novomikhailovsky;
* rural settlement of Nebug;
* urban settlement of Tuapse;
* rural settlement of Shepsi.

1. The indicator of the length of the cost ILC (1) (table 1):

(1)

LBS – the value of the length of the beaches of settlement with a width of more than 10m, km;

LBM – he value of the length of the beaches of municipality with a width of more than 10m, km;

LS – the coastline of the settlement, km;

LM – the coastline of the municipality, km.

Table 1. The indicator of the length of the cost

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **The name of the settlement** | **LBS** | **LS** | **ILC** |
| Dgubga | 6 | 12 | 0.1594 |
| Tenginka | 4.5 | 6 | 0.7391 |
| Novomikhailovsky | 8 | 16 | 0.1594 |
| Nebug | 15 | 18 | 0.9324 |
| Tuapse | 3.5 | 6 | 0.3527 |
| Shepsi | 4 | 8 | 0.1594 |
| **TOTAL** | 41 | 66 | - |

2. The indicator of the level of solar activity (2) (table 2) [16]:

(2)

– the number of days with clear Sunny weather in the settlement, days.;

– min number of days with clear, Sunny weather at the municipality, days;

- max number of days with clear, Sunny weather at the municipality, days.

Table 2. The indicator of the level of solar activity

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **The name of the settlement** | **The indicator of the level of solar activity** | |
| **The number of days of sunshine in year** | **The value of the indicator** |
| Dgubga | 238 | -1,00 |
| Tenginka | 238 | -1,00 |
| Novomikhailovsky | 239 | 0,00 |
| Nebug | 240 | 1,00 |
| Tuapse | 240 | 1,00 |
| Shepsi | 240 | 1,00 |

3. Indicator of forest area of the territory IFA (3) (table 3):

(3)

– the forest area of the settlement, km2;

– the forest area of the municipality, km2;

– the area of settlement, km2;

– the area of municipality, km2.

Table 3. Indicator of forest area of the territory

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **The name of the settlement** |  |  | **IFA** |
| Dgubga | 12.5 | 36.7 | -0.6 |
| Tenginka | 14.8 | 18.2 | -0.0449 |
| Novomikhailovsky | 21 | 47.4 | -0.4797 |
| Nebug | 51.4 | 55.3 | 0.0917 |
| Tuapse | 3.1 | 17.4 | -0.7908 |
| Shepsi | 18.6 | 22.6 | -0.0334 |
| **TOTAL** | 121.4 | 197.6 | - |

4. The indicator of the magnitude of wastewater discharges IWD (4) (table 4):

(4)

WDS – the inflow of waste dumps in the surrounding area of the settlement, kt.;

WDM – the inflow of waste dumps in the surrounding area of the municipality, kt.

Table 4. The indicator of the magnitude of wastewater discharges

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **The name of the settlement** | **WDS** | **LS** | **IWD** |
| Dgubga | 2324 | 12 | 0.1727 |
| Tenginka | 375 | 6 | 0.7330 |
| Novomikhailovsky | 1894 | 16 | 0.4943 |
| Nebug | 1149 | 18 | 0.7273 |
| Tuapse | 9392 | 6 | -1 |
| Shepsi | 316 | 8 | 0.8313 |
| **TOTAL** | 15450 | 66 | - |

5. The indicator of the magnitude of the emissions IEM (5) (Table 5):

(5)

QES  – the quantity of emissions released to the atmosphere for settlement, kt.;

QEM – the quantity of emissions released to the atmosphere for municipality, kt.

Table 5. The indicator of the magnitude of the emissions

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **The name of the settlement** | **QES** | **SS** | **IEM** |
| Dgubga | 4.805 | 36.7 | -0.5234 |
| Tenginka | 0.553 | 18.2 | 0.6464 |
| Novomikhailovsky | 3.324 | 47.4 | 0.1840 |
| Nebug | 1.895 | 55.3 | 0.6013 |
| Tuapse | 6.419 | 17.4 | -1 |
| Shepsi | 2.886 | 22.6 | -0.4859 |
| **TOTAL** | 19.882 | 197.6 | - |

6. The indicator of receipt of solid waste ISW (6) (table 6):

(6)

SWS – the income amount of solid waste in the surrounding area of the settlement, kt.;

SWM – the income amount of solid waste in the surrounding area of the municipality, kt. [17].

Table 6. The indicator of receipt of solid waste

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **The name of the settlement** | SWS | **SS** | ISW |
| Dgubga | 108982 | 36.7 | -0.1351 |
| Tenginka | 21786 | 18.2 | 0.5424 |
| Novomikhailovsky | 97563 | 47.4 | 0.2132 |
| Nebug | 37567 | 55.3 | 0.7403 |
| Tuapse | 231250 | 17.4 | -1 |
| Shepsi | 19792 | 22.6 | 0.6652 |
| **TOTAL** | 516940 | 197.6 | - |

7. The indicator of volume of production per capita (7) (table 7):

(7)

– the volume of production per capita in settlement, RUB;

- the minimum volume of production per capita in municipality, RUB.;

- the maximum volume of production per capita in municipality, RUB.

Table 7. The indicator of volume of production per capita

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **The name of the settlement** | **The indicator of volume of production per capita** | |
| **The volume of production per capita, RUB.** | **The value of the indicator** |
| Dgubga | 41130,29 | -0,803 |
| Tenginka | 14753,26 | -1,000 |
| Novomikhailovsky | 69742,67 | -0,589 |
| Nebug | 54542,34 | -0,703 |
| Tuapse | 282547,22 | 1,0 |
| Shepsi | 31741,86 | -0,873 |

8. The indicator of the average income level of the population (8) (table 8):

(8)

– the average income level of the population in the settlement, RUB;

- the minimum average income level of the population of municipality, RUB.;

- the maximum average income level of the population of municipality, RUB.

Table 8. The indicator of the average income level of the population

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **The name of the settlement** | **The indicator of the average income level of the population** | |
| **The average monthly salary, RUB.** | **The value of the indicator** |
| Dgubga | 28567,4 | 0,104 |
| Tenginka | 26984,3 | -1,0 |
| Novomikhailovsky | 28754,6 | 0,235 |
| Nebug | 29745,8 | 0,926 |
| Tuapse | 29851,2 | 1,000 |
| Shepsi | 27671,2 | -0,521 |

9. The indicator of employment (9) (table 9):

(9)

– the average level of employment in the settlement, %;

- the minimum level of employment of municipality, %;

- the maximum level of employment of municipality, %. [18].

Table 9. The indicator of employment

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **The name of the settlement** | **The indicator of employment** | |
| **The share of employment in economy, %** | **The value of the indicator** |
| Dgubga | 45,46 | -0,057 |
| Tenginka | 44,55 | -1,0 |
| Novomikhailovsky | 45,65 | 0,140 |
| Nebug | 45,1 | -0,430 |
| Tuapse | 46,48 | 1,0 |
| Shepsi | 44,82 | -0,720 |

10. The indicator of level of development of transport infrastructure (10-14) (table 10):

(10)

(11)

(12)

(13)

(14)

ILR – indicator of length of roads, ed.;

ILRW – indicator of length of railways, ed.;

LRFS – the length of paved roads of Federal importance in the settlement, km;

LRRS – the length of paved roads of regional significance in the settlement, km;

LRLS – the length of roads localities in the settlement, km;

LRFM – the length of paved roads of Federal importance in the whole municipality, km;

LRRM – the length of paved roads of regional significance in the whole municipality, km;

LRLM – the length of roads localities in the whole municipality, km;

LRWS – the length of railways in the settlement, km;

LRWM – the length of railways in General at the municipality, km;

0.8, 0.6 – weighting factors that take into account different importance of roads and railways [19].

Table 10. The indicator of level of development of transport infrastructure

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **The name of the settlement** | LRF,  km | LRR,  km | LRL,  km | LRW, km | S, km2 |  |  |  |
| Dgubga | 40 | 10 | 225 | 0 | 36.7 | -1.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 |
| Tenginka | 10 | 5 | 28 | 0 | 18.2 | 0.2982 | 1.0 | 0.6491 |
| Novomikhailovsky | 24.5 | 20 | 57 | 0 | 47.4 | 0.3465 | 1.0 | 0.6732 |
| Nebug | 18 | 6 | 35 | 0 | 55.3 | 0.6715 | 1.0 | 0.8358 |
| Tuapse | 9 | 0 | 134 | 6 | 17.4 | -1.0 | -1.0 | -1.0 |
| Shepsi | 15 | 7 | 37 | 11 | 22.6 | 0.2147 | -1.0 | -0.3927 |
| **TOTAL** | 116.5 | 48 | 516 | 17 | 197.6 | – |  |  |

11. The indicator of collective accommodation (15) (table 11):

(15)

– the total number of collective accommodation facilities on the territory of the settlement, ed.;

– the number of collective accommodation facilities in the territory of municipality, ed.

Table 11. The indicator of collective accommodation

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **The name of the settlement** |  | **SS** |  |
| Dgubga | 28 | 36,70 | -0,17 |
| Tenginka | 11 | 18,20 | -0,34 |
| Novomikhailovsky | 62 | 47,40 | 0,43 |
| Nebug | 44 | 55,3 | -0,131 |
| Tuapse | 14 | 17,40 | -0,122 |
| Shepsi | 22 | 22,60 | 0,063 |
| **TOTAL** | **181** | **197,6** | **-** |

12. The indicator of download of collective accommodation (16) (table 12):

(16)

- the number of tourists rested in the settlement of collective means of accommodation, people.

- the number of tourists rested on the territory of the municipality in collective accommodation facilities, people.

– the total number of bed-places in collective accommodation facilities on the territory of the settlement, ed.;

– the total number of bed-places in collective accommodation facilities on the territory of the municipality, ed.;

Table 12. The indicator of download of collective accommodation

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **The name of the settlement** |  |  |  |
| Dgubga | 37294,00 | 5038 | -0,227 |
| Tenginka | 18762,00 | 2159 | -0,092 |
| Novomikhailovsky | 122193,00 | 11156 | 0,144 |
| Nebug | 81264,00 | 7917 | 0,072 |
| Tuapse | 21186,00 | 2519 | -0,121 |
| Shepsi | 32746,00 | 3959 | -0,136 |
| **TOTAL** | **313445** | **32748** | - |

13. The indicator of returns from the performance of collective accommodation facilities (17) (table 13):

(17)

где,

– income derived from the activities of collective means of accommodation on the territory of the settlement district, RUB mln.

- income derived from the activities of collective means of accommodation on the territory of the municipality, RUB mln. [20].

Table 13. The indicator of returns from the performance of collective accommodation facilities

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **The name of the settlement** |  |  |  |
| Dgubga | 731,00 | 28 | 0,056 |
| Tenginka | 294,00 | 12 | -0,009 |
| Novomikhailovsky | 1769,00 | 62 | 0,154 |
| Nebug | 1134,00 | 44 | 0,042 |
| Tuapse | 234,00 | 14 | -0,324 |
| Shepsi | 338,00 | 22 | -0,379 |
| **TOTAL** | **4500** | **182** | **-** |

14. The indicator of room fund (18) (table 14):

(18)

– the number of room fund in the settlement, ed.;

– the number of room fund in the municipality, ed.;

Table 14. The indicator of room fund

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **The name of the settlement** |  | SS |  |
| Dgubga | 1858 | 36,70 | -0,172 |
| Tenginka | 796 | 18,20 | -0,284 |
| Novomikhailovsky | 4115 | 47,40 | 0,420 |
| Nebug | 2920 | 55,3 | -0,136 |
| Tuapse | 929 | 17,40 | -0,126 |
| Shepsi | 1460 | 22,60 | 0,057 |
| **TOTAL** | **12080** | **197,6** | - |

15. The indicator of number of specialized accommodation facilities (19) (table 15):

(19)

– the total number of specialized accommodation facilities on the territory of the settlement, ed.;

– the total number of specialized accommodation facilities on the territory of the municipality, ed.;

Table 15. The indicator of number of specialized accommodation facilities

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **The name of the settlement** |  | SS |  |
| Dgubga | 29 | 36,70 | -0,024 |
| Tenginka | 11 | 18,20 | -0,254 |
| Novomikhailovsky | 46 | 47,40 | 0,199 |
| Nebug | 58 | 55,3 | 0,295 |
| Tuapse | 1 | 17,40 | -0,929 |
| Shepsi | 15 | 22,60 | -0,180 |
| **TOTAL** | 160 | **197,6** | **-** |

16. The indicator of download specialized accommodation facilities (20) (table 16):

(20)

- the number of tourists rested in the settlement in a specialized accommodation facilities, thousand people

- ко the number of tourists rested in the municipality in a specialized accommodation facilities, thousand people.

– the total number of bed-places in specialized accommodation facilities on the territory of the settlement, ed.;

– the total number of bed-places in specialized accommodation facilities on the territory of the municipality, ed.

Table 16. The indicator of download specialized accommodation facilities

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **The name of the settlement** |  |  |  |
| Dgubga | 32,45 | 4,59 | -0,276 |
| Tenginka | 12,74 | 1,74 | -0,251 |
| Novomikhailovsky | 75,47 | 7,27 | 0,061 |
| Nebug | 111,25 | 9,17 | 0,240 |
| Tuapse | 0,84 | 0,16 | -0,457 |
| Shepsi | 14,65 | 2,37 | -0,368 |
| **TOTAL** | **247,4** | **25,3** | **-** |

17. The indicator of hotels and similar accommodation facilities (21) (table 17):

(21)

– the total number of hotels and similar accommodation facilities on the territory of the settlement, ed.;

– the total number of hotels and similar accommodation facilities on the territory of the municipality, ed.;

Table 17. The indicator of hotels and similar accommodation facilities

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **The name of the settlement** |  | SS |  |
| Dgubga | 3 | 36,70 | -0,266 |
| Tenginka | 3 | 18,20 | 0,481 |
| Novomikhailovsky | 6 | 47,40 | 0,137 |
| Nebug | 5 | 55,3 | -0,188 |
| Tuapse | 4 | 17,40 | 1 |
| Shepsi | 1 | 22,60 | -0,603 |
| **TOTAL** | **22** | **197,6** | **-** |

18. The indicator of the level of download of hotels and similar accommodation facilities s (22) (table 18):

(22)

- the number of tourists accommodated in hotels, on the territory of the settlement, thousand people

- the number of tourists accommodated in hotels, on the territory of the, thousand people

– the total number of bed-places in hotels on the territory of the settlement, ed.;

– the total number of bed-places in hotels on the territory of the municipality, ed.;

Table 18. The indicator of the level of download of hotels and similar accommodation

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **The name of the settlement** |  |  |  |
| Dgubga | 9,84 | 1014,55 | -0,132 |
| Tenginka | 10,28 | 1014,55 | -0,093 |
| Novomikhailovsky | 24,87 | 2029,09 | 0,097 |
| Nebug | 20,06 | 1690,91 | 0,062 |
| Tuapse | 17,2 | 1352,73 | 0,139 |
| Shepsi | 0,84 | 338,182 | -0,778 |
| **TOTAL** | **9,84** | **7440** | - |

19. The indicator of tax revenues from tourist and recreational industry (23) (table 19):

(23)

– tax deductions to the municipal budget from the tourism industry in settlement, bln. RUB;

- tax deductions to the municipal budget from the tourism industry, bln. RUB;

– the total amount of tax payments to the municipal budget from the settlement, bln. RUB;

– the total amount of tax payments to the municipal budget, bln. RUB.

Table 19. The indicator of tax revenues from tourist and recreational industry

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **The name of the settlement** |  |  |  |
| Dgubga | 77,72 | 725 | 0,396 |
| Tenginka | 35,28 | 402 | 0,143 |
| Novomikhailovsky | 202,28 | 915 | 1,0 |
| Nebug | 126,08 | 843 | 0,947 |
| Tuapse | 28,08 | 3406 | -0,893 |
| Shepsi | 40,56 | 349 | 0,513 |
| **TOTAL** | **510** | **6640** | **-** |

In the process of analysing the main indicators of tourism and recreational potential of the territory, we obtained various indicators of development of the region. Previously, we divided all indicators in two groups. We reduce the resulting indicators in two generalized index of natural environmental () and socio-economic () components of the tourist-recreational potential (24, 25) [20] (tables 20, 21).

(24)

(25)

Table 20. The index of natural environmental component of tourism and recreation potential of urban and rural settlements of Tuapse area

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **The name of the settlement** | *ILC* |  | *IFA* | IWD | IEM | *ISW* |  |
| Dgubga | 0.1594 | -1,0 | -0.6 | 0.173 | -0.523 | -0.135 | -0,321 |
| Tenginka | 0.7391 | -1,0 | -0.0449 | 0.733 | 0.646 | 0.542 | 0,269 |
| Novomikhailovsky | 0.1594 | 0,0 | -0.4797 | 0.494 | 0.184 | 0.213 | 0,095 |
| Nebug | 0.9324 | 1,0 | 0.0917 | 0.727 | 0.601 | 0.74 | 0,682 |
| Tuapse | 0.3527 | 1,0 | -0.7908 | -1.0 | -1,0 | -1.0 | -0,406 |
| Shepsi | 0.1594 | 1,0 | -0.0334 | 0.831 | -0.486 | 0.665 | 0,356 |

Table 21. The index of socio-economic component of tourist-recreational potential of urban and rural settlements of Tuapse area

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicator** | Dgubga | Tenginka | Novomikhailovsky | Nebug | Tuapse | Shepsi |
|  | -0,803 | -1 | -0,589 | -0,703 | 1 | -0,873 |
|  | 0,104 | -1 | 0,235 | 0,926 | 1 | -0,521 |
|  | -0,057 | -1 | 0,14 | -0,43 | 1 | -0,72 |
|  | 0.0 | 0.649 | 0.673 | 0.836 | -1.0 | -0.393 |
|  | -0,17 | -0,34 | 0,43 | -0,131 | -0,122 | 0,063 |
|  | -0,227 | -0,092 | 0,144 | 0,072 | -0,121 | -0,136 |
|  | 0,056 | -0,009 | 0,154 | 0,042 | -0,324 | -0,379 |
|  | -0,172 | -0,284 | 0,420 | -0,136 | -0,126 | 0,057 |
|  | -0,024 | -0,254 | 0,199 | 0,295 | -0,929 | -0,18 |
|  | -0,276 | -0,251 | 0,061 | 0,24 | -0,457 | -0,368 |
|  | -0,266 | 0,481 | 0,137 | -0,188 | 1 | -0,603 |
|  | -0,132 | -0,093 | 0,097 | 0,062 | 0,139 | -0,778 |
|  | 0,396 | 0,143 | 1 | 0,947 | -0,893 | 0,513 |
|  | -0,121 | -0,235 | 0,306 | 0,141 | 0,013 | -0,332 |

From the received indices to derive the single integral index of tourist-recreational potential ( (26) (table 22).

(24)

Table 22. The integral index of tourist-recreational potential of urban and rural settlements of Tuapse area

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **The name of the settlement** |  |  |  |
| Dgubga | -0,321 | -0,121 | -0,221 |
| Tenginka | 0,269 | -0,235 | 0,017 |
| Novomikhailovsky | 0,095 | 0,306 | 0,201 |
| Nebug | 0,682 | 0,141 | 0,411 |
| Tuapse | -0,406 | 0,013 | -0,197 |
| Shepsi | 0,356 | -0,332 | 0,012 |

On the basis of the analysis and the extracted index of tourist and recreational potential, it is possible to draw the following conclusions.

The highest index value in rural settlement of Nebug. This area has the most balanced development of the tourism industry, and there are all prospects for further development and growth in this direction. Nebug’s settlement has the highest indicator on the ecological status and the protection of the environment that suggests significant potential in the field of Spa treatment, the development of tourism throughout the year.

With small lag there is urban settlement of Novomikhailovsky. This district also has considerable recreational potential, well-developed services sector. However, the presence of such large enterprises, as, for example state farm «Novomikhailovsky» Ltd. had a negative impact on the environmental status of the district, that hinders the further development of tourism, attracting large investors.

Rural settlements of Shepsi and Tenginka have almost the same indicator values, which is understandable. Both areas have good prospects for the development of tourism and recreation. In areas of developing agriculture, particularly small farms.

In the urban settlement of Tuapse, few prospects for development of sanatorium-resort in connection with the presence of large industrial enterprises, however well-developed economic and social sectors can contribute to the development of business tourism.

Urban settlement of Dgubga has received the lowest value of the indicator. A significant part of the region territory is located in mountainous, unsuitable for recreation area. Existing recreation facilities for the most part, are small businesses. A large part of the basic production assets are obsolete and require significant investment to upgrade. It is necessary to improve the quality of service and provision of tourist services, increase competitiveness and attract more holidaymakers with a high level of income.

Thus, we can conclude that the proposed model of integrated assessment allows us to provide a comprehensive assessment of tourist-recreational potential of territories most effectively to analyze trends in the development of the tourism industry. This method can be successfully applicable for the purposes of strategic planning of development of the whole region and separate entity.
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