
Pennsylvania State Parks Visitor Use Monitoring (VUM) Study – Year 1 Survey Results



Submitted to the Department of
Conservation and Natural
Resources
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania



Submitted by the Department of
Recreation, Park and Tourism
Management
The Pennsylvania State University

November 1, 2013

Pennsylvania State Parks Visitor Use Monitoring (VUM) Study – Year 1 Survey Results

by:

Andrew J. Mowen, Ph.D.

Alan R. Graefe, Ph.D.

Michael D. Ferguson, M.S.

Department of Recreation, Park and Tourism Management
The Pennsylvania State University

and

David A. Graefe, Ph.D.

Marshall University

Acknowledgements:

The cooperation provided by the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, Bureau of State Parks was instrumental in the successful completion of this study. DCNR employees were extremely helpful in identifying appropriate sampling locations and discussing site-specific management issues. The organization, technical assistance, interviewing, and data processing provided by Penn State RPTM graduate students and VUM project staff were also helpful in the completion of this project. Finally, the authors wish to thank the study participants who took the time to share information concerning their use and evaluation of Pennsylvania State Parks.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements.....	ii
Table of Contents	iii
List of Tables	iv
Introduction	1
Study Background and Purpose.....	1
State Park Visitor Survey Methods	3
Results.....	5
Visitor Profile	5
Trip Visitation Patterns	6
Activity Participation.....	8
Evaluation of State Park Quality and Overall Satisfaction	10
Visitor Perceptions of the Recreation Experience	11
Visitor Economic and Expenditure Questions	12
Visitor Response to Marcellus Shale Related Activities.....	16
Summary and Conclusions.....	17
Appendices.....	20
Appendix A Comparisons of Survey Variables across the Six State Parks	20
Appendix B Synthesis of Open-ended Responses	34
Appendix C Survey Instrument	63

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Survey Sample Size and Response Rate	4
Table 2. State Park Visitor Socio-Demographic Profile	5
Table 3. State Park Trip Visitation Patterns	7
Table 4. Recreation Activity Participation and Primary Activity at the State Park	9
Table 5. Quality Ratings and Overall Satisfaction for State Parks.....	10
Table 6. Reasons or Motivations for Visiting the State Park.....	11
Table 7. Perceptions of Place Attachment at the State Park.....	11
Table 8. State Park Recreation Trip Profile (for Economics Section)	13
Table 9. Summary of Specific Trip Expenditure Percentages for State Park Visitors	14
Table 10. Summary of Specific Trip Expenditure Costs for State Park Visitors.....	15
Table 11. Perceived Impact of Marcellus Shale-Related Activity at the State Park.....	16
Table 12. State Park Visitor Socio-Demographic Profile - Comparisons across the Six State Parks	21
Table 13. State Park Trip Visitation Patterns - Comparisons across the Six State Parks	22
Table 14. Recreation Activity Participation and Primary Activity across the Six State Parks	24
Table 15. Quality Ratings and Overall Satisfaction across the Six State Parks	26
Table 16. Reasons or Motivations for Visiting - Comparisons across the Six State Parks	28
Table 17. Perceptions of Place Attachment - Comparisons across the Six State Parks.....	29
Table 18. State Park Recreation Trip Profile - Comparisons across the Six State Parks	30
Table 19. Summary of Trip Spending Patterns - Comparisons across the Six State Parks.....	31
Table 20. Summary of Specific Trip Expenditures - Comparisons across the Six State Parks.....	32
Table 21. Summary of Specific Trip Expenditures - Comparisons across the Six State Parks-All Visitors ..	32
Table 22. Response to Marcellus Shale-related Activity by State Park	33

INTRODUCTION

Study Background and Purpose

The Pennsylvania Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, Bureau of State Parks have identified a need to better understand the characteristics, behaviors, expenditures, attitudes, and evaluations of visitors to State Parks. Relevant questions asked by managers of State Parks include:

Who are our visitors?

- What are the socio-demographic characteristics of State Park visitors?
- What are their patterns of use including their travel distance, frequency of use, length of stay, type of overnight accommodation, activity type, and group size?

What are our visitors looking for out of their State Park visits and experiences?

- What are their satisfaction levels for specific State Park resources, amenities, and services and what is their overall level of satisfaction with State Parks?
- What types of recreation experiences do they value or desire?
- To what extent do visitors personally value or are attached to State Parks?
- How much do visitors spend on their State Park trips, both overall and for specific expenditure categories?
- What are their suggestions for improving the management of State Parks?
- To what extent have visitors been impacted by oil and gas drilling operations surrounding the State Parks and, for those who indicate an impact, how have they been impacted?

To respond to these questions, DCNR has commissioned a multi-year study to gather answers to these questions for both State Park and State Forest visitors. The purpose of this study is to develop a long-term, systematic approach for answering such questions about Pennsylvania State Forest and State Park visitors. The study will survey visitors to selected State Forests and Parks over a five year period to measure recreational use and gather data to provide a profile of recreational visitors. Sampling will be designed to measure and describe recreation use on two State Forests and six State Parks per year over

a five-year study period. In total, 10 forests and 30 parks will be surveyed during the five-year duration of the project. After the initial study period, additional surveying may be conducted on other forests or parks, or previously surveyed public lands, depending on the data needs and financial resources available.

Study objectives for the overall project (for both State Parks and State Forests) are as follows:

1. To conduct surveys of visitors to selected Pennsylvania State Forest and State Park areas and develop a visitor profile, including information on the origin of visitors (e.g. local, non-local resident, out of state), trip context and purpose (e.g. day versus overnight visitor, primary purpose versus casual visitor), length of stay in the area, spending patterns, size and type of visiting groups, previous visitation history, activities pursued, and different patterns of visitation across seasons.
2. To measure overall recreation use and specific visitation patterns within the selected State Forests and State Parks, including the number of visitors per vehicle and the distribution of use across different types of sites within the area.
3. To develop a demographic profile of visitors at the designated State Forests/Parks.
4. To identify visitor expectations and levels of satisfaction with various aspects of their visit.
5. To examine visitor opinions about possible future area management and facility development decisions.
6. To examine visitor reactions to oil and gas activities and the impacts of these activities on recreational visitation patterns and experiences.
7. To measure visitor expenditures and levels of economic impact on surrounding communities.

This project builds on earlier State Forest and State Park surveys and will incrementally create a database that can be used immediately to better understand their visitors. It will also provide a longitudinal database for tracking trends in State Forest and State Park use. For example, results can be used to annually fine tune and extend participation patterns and economic impact estimates from ongoing studies. Findings can be extrapolated to the entire state systems as the database grows and will ultimately represent most of the major State Forests and State Parks within the commonwealth by the end of the five-year study.

This report summarizes the findings from the Year 1 data collection effort (description of the State Forest visitors is provided in a separate report). Surveys were conducted in six State Parks (Bald

Eagle, Kettle Creek, Hyner Run, Lyman Run, Cherry Springs, and Sinnemahoning), which are located adjacent to or near two State Forests (Sproul State Forest - District #10 and Susquehannock State Forest - District #15). These six State Parks were selected as study sites because they were determined by DCNR to be representative of those parks within close proximity to the two State Forest study sites.

State Park Visitor Survey Methods

A systematic sampling plan was developed to survey State Park visitors at different days of the week (weekday vs. weekend) and at different locations within each park (overnight areas and day-use areas). The overall survey methodology, sampling design, and questioning strategies were generally comparable and consistent with procedures used in prior State Park visitor studies (e.g., 2008 State Park Visitor Study, 2010 Hickory Run/Lehigh Gorge Visitor Study). A detailed sampling schedule, which identified the site, day, and time of day for on-site interviewing, and survey locations within each park was established for in consultation with Bureau of State Parks personnel. The sampling schedule provided for a total of 120 sampling days throughout the study period, with approximately 20 sampling days per State Park (2 sampling days in winter, 4 in fall and spring, and 10 in summer). Survey sampling shift times were distributed across the various parks and generally followed AM (8A-2P), NOON (10A-4P), and PM (2P-8P) sampling shifts. Specific shift times were also adjusted to fit the season (e.g., winter sampling was during daylight hours). Sampling at Cherry Springs State Park focused on evening shifts to assure capture of the night sky viewing activities at this park.

All on-site interviewing, data entry, and analysis were conducted by trained project staff. On-site face-to-face interviews were used to obtain data from a sample of recreationists visiting the six State Parks. This on-site survey took approximately 15 minutes to complete and, unlike the State Forest surveys which included different modules/versions, State Park survey questions were asked in a single module, which gathered data on key variables of interest to the Bureau of State Parks (e.g., trip behaviors, activities, satisfaction, expenditures, and oil/gas perceptions). Only adults over the age of 18 were eligible to participate in these surveys.

This report summarizes the results of visitor surveys conducted in the State Parks during the period October 22, 2011 through October 13, 2012. Across all State Parks, interviewers approached a total of 1,231 visitors to request their participation in the study. Among these visitors, 1,046 people were willing to participate resulting in an overall study response rate of 85.0%. Response rates for each of the six State Parks are provided in Table 1. Study results are organized by topic area (e.g., visitor

profile, trip visitation patterns, etc.). Each section follows a consistent format, with the key findings illustrated by bullet points, followed by the relevant tables. Comparisons of key study variables across the six different State Parks are provided in Appendix A. Appendix B includes a synthesis of visitor responses to the open-ended survey questions while Appendix C includes the actual survey instrument.

Table 1. Survey Sample Size and Response Rate

State Park	Number of Surveys	Response Rate
Hyner Run/Hyner View	197	83.8
Cherry Springs	117	83.6
Sinnemahoning	173	86.5
Bald Eagle	207	80.9
Lyman Run	165	83.3
Kettle Creek	187	92.6
Total	1,046	85.0

RESULTS

Visitor Profile

- Over three-fifths (64%) of the survey respondents were males and about 36% were females (Table 2).
- The average age of this adult sample was 49 years with 20% representing the 18-35 year age group, 31% representing the 36-50 year age group, 35% representing the 51-64 year age group, and 14.5% representing the 65 and older age group.
- Approximately 62% reported household incomes less than \$74,999.
- A large majority of the State Park visitors surveyed (98%) reported their race/ethnicity as White/Caucasian. Other ethnicities reported included Asian, Hispanic, and African-American.
- Approximately nine out of ten (89%) visitors were residents of Pennsylvania.

Table 2. State Park Visitor Socio-Demographic Profile

Variable	% or Mean	n
<i>Income</i>		
under 25,000	7.2	65
25,000 - 49,999	25.9	234
50,000 - 74,999	29.3	264
75,000 - 99,999	18.4	166
100,000 - 149,999	13.2	119
150,000 or over	6.0	54
<i>Age</i>		
Average Age	49 years	
18-35	19.7	200
36-50	31.4	319
51-64	34.5	351
65 and Older	14.5	147
<i>Race/Ethnic Background</i>		
White	97.6	966
Black or African American	<1%	6
Hispanic	<1%	4
Asian	1.4%	14
<i>Gender</i>		
Male	64.4%	655
Female	35.6%	367
<i>Residency Status</i>		
Pennsylvania Resident	89.2%	910

Trip Visitation Patterns

- Over three-fifths (63%) of all visits to these State Parks were part of an overnight stay, and about 37% were day trips only (Table 3).
- For overnight visitors, the average length of stay in the park was 3.2 nights. For day use visitors, the average length of stay in the park was 3.6 hours.
- Among those who indicated that their visit was part of an overnight trip, about 7 out of 10 (72%) indicated that they were staying at a State Parks accommodation, while 28% indicated that they were staying overnight outside of the State Park.
- Of those who were staying overnight in State Parks, most (95%) indicated that they were staying at an RV campsite (58.6%) or a tent campsite (36.4%).
- Of those who were staying overnight outside of State Parks, a majority indicated that they were staying at a private camp or cabin (64.8%).
- Visitors traveled an average of 124.5 miles from their home to the State Park. Almost 7 out of 10 visitors (69.7%) reported traveling more than 50 miles from their home to the State Park.
- Visitors in this study reported that they made an average of 6.1 trips to that State Park (where they were surveyed) over the last 12 months. About 43% reported visiting only once, about 31% reported visiting two to four times, and about 26% reported visiting 5 or more times.
- Visitors reported an average group size of 4.4 people. Only 9.3% visited alone, while 33.6% visited in groups of 2 people, 37.8% visited in groups of 3 to 5 people, and 19.4% visited in groups of 6 or more people.
- About 62% of visitors to these State Parks indicated that there were no children under 16 years of age in their group. Among those visiting with children (n=400), 35% reported 1 child, 31% reported two children, and 34% reported three or more children.

Table 3. State Park Trip Visitation Patterns

Variable	% or Mean	n
<i>Trip Type - Overnight Trip</i>	63.4%	656
<i>Trip Type - Day Trip</i>	36.6%	378
<i>Length of Stay</i>		
Overnight Trip	3.2 Nights	666
Day Trip	3.6 Hours	354
<i>Type of Overnight Accommodation</i>		
State Park	71.6	478
Non-State Park	28.4	190
<i>State Park Accommodation Type</i>		
RV Campsite	58.6	277
Tent Campsite	36.4	172
Inn or Lodge	1.9	9
Cabin	1.7	8
Cottage/Yurt	<1	4
Group Campsite	<1	3
<i>Non-State Park Accommodation Type</i>		
Private Camp/Cabin	64.8	125
Hotel/Motel	9.8	19
Private Campground	8.8	17
Friend/Family House (free)	3.6	7
Bed & Breakfast	1.6	3
Other	11.4	22
<i>Distance Traveled from Home to State Park</i>		
Total Distance Traveled	124.5 miles	1037
Travel Distance of 50 Miles or More	69.7	729
<i>Number of Trips to the State Park</i>		
Average Trips Per Year	6.1 trips	1032
1 Trip Only	43.4	448
2 to 4 Trips	30.9	319
5 or More Trips	25.7	265
<i>Group Size</i>		
Average Group Size	4.4 people	1046
Visited Alone	9.3	97
2 People Per Group	33.6	351
3 to 5 People Per Group	37.8	395
6 or More People Per Group	19.4	203
<i>Children Under 16 in Group</i>		
No Children in Group	61.8	646
1 Child in Group	13.4	140
2 Children in Group	11.7	122
3 or More Children in Group	13.2	138

Activity Participation

State Park visitors were asked to identify each activity that they had participated in (or planned to participate in) during their visit, as well as their primary activity on this trip (Table 4). The first column (activity participation) shows the range in valid percentages of visitors participating in the various activities, while the primary activity column reflects what the visitors considered their primary or most important activity for this visit to the State Park. Appendix A provides the results for activity variables (participation, primary activity) across the six different State Parks.

- Relaxing/hanging out (61%), sightseeing (61%), viewing natural features (60%), walking (49%), fishing (41%), and picnicking (39%) were activities mentioned with the most frequency among these State Park visitors.
- Fishing (22%), relaxing/hanging out (13%), sightseeing (12%), other (9%), RV camping (8%), and picnicking (7%) were most frequently mentioned as visitors' primary or most important State Park activities.
- Fishing was one of the more popular activities in State Parks (40.7%) and visitors who participated in fishing also tended to cite this as one of their primary activities (22.1%).
- There are several activities in which primary participation is low relative to overall participation, suggesting that they are ancillary activities for participants. These include viewing natural features (2.5%), visiting a nature center, nature trail, or visitor center (0.6%), hiking (1.5%), and driving for pleasure on roads (3.3%).
- Almost half of all State Park visitors (48.8%) reported camping (RV, tent, or other) as an activity, but relatively fewer visitors reported camping (11.4%) as their primary State Park Activity.

Table 4. Recreation Activity Participation and Primary Activity at the State Park

Type of Activity (Note: top six activities in each column are bolded for ease of reference)	Activity Participation*	Primary Activity
	Valid %	
Consumptive Activities		
Fishing	40.7	22.1
Hunting	2.6	<1
Viewing, Learning about Nature & Culture		
Sightseeing	60.7	12.3
Viewing natural features (e.g. scenery, wildlife, birds, flowers, fish, etc.)	59.6	2.5
Visiting historic and pre-historic sites/areas	16.3	<1
Viewing wayside exhibits, interpretive kiosks	13.2	--
Visiting a nature center, nature trail, or visitor center	24.1	<1
Non-motorized Activities		
Hiking	31.5	1.5
Walking	48.6	2.1
Horseback Riding	0.6	<1
Bicycling, including mountain bikes	12.2	<1
Non-motorized boating (canoeing, kayaking, rafting, sailing, etc.)	9.8	1.7
Downhill skiing or snowboarding	--	--
Cross-country skiing, snowshoeing	--	--
Motorized Activities		
Driving for pleasure on roads	34.2	3.3
Snowmobile use	2.2	<1
ATV use	0.8	<1
Motorized boating	5.8	1.4
Camping or Other Overnight		
RV camping	26.7	8.0
Tent camping	16.3	3.3
Other camping	5.8	<1
Other Activities		
Picnicking and family gatherings	38.9	6.5
Relaxing, hanging out	61.0	13.0
Swimming	20.0	4.5
Beach Use (no swimming)	10.5	1.2
Attending a program offered at the park (environmental, historic, outdoor recreation)	6.8	1.1
Visiting a special event or festival	6.5	2.5
Other activity	13.5	9.0

* Percentages do not equal 100% because respondents could report more than one activity

Evaluation of State Park Quality and Overall Satisfaction

Visitors were asked to evaluate the quality of a number of State Park features, resources, programs, and services as well as their overall level of satisfaction with their visit to the State Park (Table 5).

- The State Parks were rated extremely high for each of the thirteen quality attributes with over 80% of the scores in the “good” or “very good” categories.
- State Park visitors were most satisfied with the feeling of safety, scenery, condition of the natural environment, park cleanliness, and value of money invested in the visit (95% or more reporting good/very good).
- Attributes receiving lower ratings (< 90% good/very good) included restroom availability, condition of trails, adequacy of signage, and restroom cleanliness.
- The items that received the most “not applicable” responses included quality of the park programs, conditions of trails, and helpfulness of employees. Generally, these responses reflect the fact that the respondents did not encounter these attributes during their visits.
- Overall satisfaction was also extremely high with almost 98% indicating they were satisfied or very satisfied. This evaluation was consistent with prior surveys conducted in State Parks.

Table 5. Quality Ratings and Overall Satisfaction for State Parks

State Park Feature/Attribute ^a	Mean	% Good or Very Good	% Not Applicable
Feeling of safety	4.76	97.4	0.6
Scenery	4.76	97.3	0.5
Value for the money invested in this State Park visit	4.72	95.0	4.6
Cleanliness of this park	4.69	95.8	0.3
Condition of the natural environment	4.65	95.9	1.0
Helpfulness of employees	4.60	92.9	36.1
Restroom availability	4.56	89.7	5.1
Quality of park programs	4.55	91.7	67.1
Condition of developed recreation facilities	4.46	90.4	10.9
Maintenance of facilities (roads, shelters, buildings)	4.44	90.8	2.0
Condition of trails in this State Park	4.41	88.7	50.1
Adequacy of signage	4.39	89.4	2.3
Restroom cleanliness	4.39	84.9	19.5
Overall Satisfaction ^b	4.72	97.7	--

a – measured on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 = poor and 5 = very good

b – Measured on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 = very dissatisfied and 5 = very satisfied.

Visitor Perceptions of the Recreation Experience

Outdoor recreationists have a variety of reasons for visiting parks and have varying levels of attachment to parks. In this study, State Park visitors were also asked to indicate their level of attachment to the State Park and the importance of various reasons for visiting the State Park.

- In general, “to get away from the regular routine,” “to be outdoors,” “for relaxation,” and “to experience natural surroundings” were the primary reasons for visiting with over 90% of visitors citing these reasons as either important or very important (Table 6).
- However, “for physical exercise,” “for the challenge or sport,” and “to develop my skills” were less likely to be important reasons for visiting with about 50% or less citing these reasons as important or very important to their State Park visit (Table 6).
- Visitors were moderately attached to the State Park with a majority agreeing or strongly agreeing that the park meant a lot to them, that they were attached to the park, and that they enjoyed recreating at and got more satisfaction from visiting the State Park more than other places (Table 7).

Table 6. Reasons or Motivations for Visiting the State Park

Reason for Visiting...	Mean	% Very or Extremely Important
To get away from the regular routine	4.68	95.2
To be outdoors	4.65	95.1
For relaxation	4.65	94.7
To experience natural surroundings	4.59	93.5
For family recreation	4.19	80.2
To be with my friends	4.04	74.7
For physical exercise	3.46	53.0
For the challenge or sport	3.30	46.2
To develop my skills	3.20	45.1

Table 7. Perceptions of Place Attachment at the State Park

Place Attachment Item...	Mean	% Agree or Strongly Agree
This place means a lot to me	4.20	76.2
I enjoy recreating at this place more than other places I could visit	3.97	68.3
I get more satisfaction out of visiting this place than from visiting most places	3.81	60.6
I am very attached to this place	3.68	54.2

Visitor Economic and Expenditure Questions

Economic Questions

One goal of this research was to gather a more accurate profile of visitor expenditures for future economic impact analyses. In this survey, visitors were asked a range of questions about their monetary expenditures during their State Park trip. Additional economics questions focused on the respondents' trip itinerary (see Table 8). These questions were asked to establish a context for evaluation of the reported trip expenditures. What follows in this section of the report is a description of economics data across all 6 State Parks. More detailed park-specific comparisons of these economic findings are provided in Appendix A.

- When asked what they would have done if, for some reason, they had been unable to go to the State Park on this visit, the most common response (47.8%) was that they would have gone somewhere else to pursue the same activity.
- About one-fourth of visitors said that they would have stayed home and about one-tenth responded that they would have gone somewhere else for a different activity (12.4%) or stayed home (9.5%).
- Overnight visitors were mostly on trips of 3-5 days (58.4%).
- A slight majority of day users were more likely to indicate spending 6 or more hours away from home (52.5%) with only a minority (12%) indicating that they would be spending 1-2 hours away from home.
- A majority of respondents (85.5%) indicated that the State Park was their primary trip destination.
- When queried about how many people their reported expenditures were covering, the most typical response (43.4%) was 4 or more people and only one in ten visitors (9.9%) said that their expenditures covered just one person (themselves). Furthermore, about 34% said that their expenditures covered two people.

Table 8. State Park Recreation Trip Profile (for Economics section)

Economics Questions	%	n
What visitor would have done if unable to visit the State Park		
Gone elsewhere for the same activity	47.8	499
Gone elsewhere for a different activity	12.4	129
Come back another time	9.5	99
Stayed home	24.8	259
Gone to work at your regular job	2.2	23
None of these	3.3	34
Total	100	1043
Time Away from Home (Days)		
1-2	25.5	171
3-5	58.4	391
6 or more	16.1	108
Total	100	670
Time Away from Home (Hours)		
1-2	12.0	45
3-5	35.5	133
6 or more	52.5	197
Total	100	375
Was State Park the Primary Destination for this Trip?		
Yes	85.5	894
No	14.5	152
Total	100	1046
Number of People Covered by Expenses		
1	9.9	84
2	34.1	288
3	12.7	107
4 or more	43.4	366
Total	100	845

Specific Trip Expenditures – Proportion of Spending and Spending Amounts

In addition to these contextual economics questions, visitors were asked how much they spent on this trip for ten categories of expenditures within 50 miles of the State Park visited (Table 9). The results from the following tables provide the proportion of visitors reporting spending any money on their trip within 50 miles of the State Park, the percentage reporting expenditures in each category, and the average amount spent in each category. A brief summary of these findings is now provided:

- Most of the respondents (78%) indicated that they did spend some money within 50 miles of the State Park on their current trip.
- Many respondents, however, indicated that they spent no money on many of the specific expenditure categories listed on the survey instrument.
- Across the 10 expenditure categories, groceries (46.2%), gasoline and oil (46.4%), and restaurants and bar (30.2%) received the highest proportion of expenditures among those visitors who reported spending something in each category.
- About 30% of State Park visitors reported spending something in the camping fees category.
- Few visitors reported spending any spending on “local transportation,” “outfitter related expenses,” and “motel, lodge, cabin, bed & breakfast” expenditure categories.
- A majority of respondents (85.5%) indicated that the State Park was their primary trip destination.

Table 9. Summary of Specific Trip Expenditure Percentages for State Park Visitors

Proportion of visitors spending any money within 50 miles of this State Park	78.0 %
Economic Expenditure Items	Proportion of Visitors Spending Something in Each Category (%)
Motel, Lodge, Cabin, B&B, etc.	3.8
Camping Fees	28.3
Restaurants and Bars	30.2
Groceries	46.2
Gasoline and oil	46.4
Local Transportation (bus, shuttles, etc.)	0.1
Outfitter Related Expenses (guide fees and equipment rentals)	3.4
Outdoor Recreation & Entertainment (park fees, movies, mini-golf)	4.6
Sporting Goods	14.9
Souvenirs, Clothing, Other Misc.	12.3

- The first data column in Table 10 shows the average amount spent among only those visitors reporting spending something in each category. These numbers cannot be totaled because they are based on a varying number of individuals making the various types of purchases.
- The second data column in Table 10 shows the average amount spent among all visitors in the survey. These averages include those spending nothing in various categories, and therefore can be totaled to indicate the average total amount spent for all categories.
- The average total amount spent on State Park trips (across all visitors) was \$123.95.
- Motel, lodge, cabin, and B&B expenditures were made by only about 4% of State Park visitors, but the average amount spent in this category was \$213.48.
- Outfitter related expenses (including guide fees and equipment rentals) were made by only about 3% of State Park visitors, but the average amount spent in this category was \$46.31.
- The most frequently indicated expenses (groceries and gas/oil) averaged \$60.65 for groceries and \$66.03 for gas and oil.

Table 10. Summary of Specific Trip Expenditure Costs for State Park Visitors

Economic Expenditure Items	Average Amount Spent – Among Visitors Spending Something in Each Category	Average Amount Spent – All Visitors
Motel, Lodge, Cabin, B&B, etc.	\$213.48	\$8.19
Camping Fees	\$87.75	\$24.82
Restaurants and Bars	\$54.38	\$16.42
Groceries	\$60.65	\$28.03
Gasoline and oil	\$66.03	\$30.64
Local Transportation (bus, shuttles, etc.)	\$100.00	\$0.10
Outfitter Related Expenses (guide fees and equipment rentals)	\$46.31	\$1.55
Outdoor Recreation & Entertainment (park fees, movies, mini-golf)	\$35.60	\$1.64
Sporting Goods	\$45.92	\$6.82
Souvenirs, Clothing, Other Misc.	\$46.66	\$5.73
Total	N/A	\$123.95

Visitor Response to Marcellus Shale-Related Activity

Visitors were also asked a series of questions about Marcellus shale-related activity in the region. First, they were asked the question, “Has Marcellus shale-related activity changed your recreation use of this state park?” If the visitor indicated, “Yes,” they were then asked how their recreation had changed. If the visitor indicated, “No,” they were asked the follow-up question, “why not?” In addition to recreation use, visitors were asked about the impact of Marcellus shale-related activity on recreation experiences and these questions were asked in the same manner.

Results indicate that Marcellus shale-related activity did not change recreation use or experiences among most of these State Park visitors (Table 11). Less than 1 in 10 visitors indicated that this activity had changed their use (6.4%) and experiences (8.6%) at the park they were visiting. These results are not surprising given that Marcellus shale-related activity was not occurring within the parks themselves. However, there were slight variations in response to these questions by State Park (see Table 22 in Appendix A). For example, Cherry Springs and Hyner Run State Park visitors were slightly more likely than visitors from the other four parks to indicate changed recreation experiences (24.1%% and 10.9%, respectively) as a result of Marcellus activity (Table 22). Among those reporting that their use of the State Park had been impacted by shale-related operations, the most common responses reflected traffic-related issues, concerns with hunting, and general environmental concerns including pollution, habitat destruction, and water quality as well as changes in landscape, noise pollution, and crowdedness and loss of a relaxing and serene environment.

Table 11. Perceived Impact of Marcellus Shale-Related Activity at the State Park

Question...		n	%
Has Marcellus activity changed your recreation use of this state park?	Yes	67	6.4
	No	974	93.6
Has Marcellus activity changed your recreation experience at this state park?	Yes	89	8.6
	No	941	91.4

Summary and Conclusions

The results published in this report are a compilation of the data collected at numerous State Parks during the period of October 22, 2011 through October 13, 2012 (n = 1,395 interviews with State Park visitors). A summary of the collective user characteristics, behaviors, and attitudes across the six State Parks in north central Pennsylvania was provided in the main body of this report and park-by-park comparisons are provided in Appendix A. This summary provides a brief review of these findings and also discusses notable differences between some of the State Parks (see Appendix A for more detailed comparisons across the different State Parks).

In terms of their socio-demographic characteristics, visitors to these north central region State Parks were more likely to be white (97.6%), male (64.4%) and older (only 19.7% reported that they were 18-35 years). The average age across all visitors was 49 years with 49% indicating that they were 51 years or older. When combining the initial household income categories, nearly half (48%) reported incomes between \$50,000 and \$99,999, 33% reported incomes of \$49,999 or less, and 19% reported incomes of \$100,000 or more.

With regard to trip characteristics, results indicate that State Parks were the primary destination for most visitors surveyed, that a majority of the trips involved an overnight stay in the region, and that most overnight visitors stayed at a State Park facility (e.g., RV site, tent site, etc.). Among non-State Park overnight accommodations, private campgrounds or cabins were mentioned with the most frequency. Visitation frequency was modest with an average of 6.1 trips to the State Park over the last 12 months and about 43% indicating that they visited only once. While a large majority of visitors (89%) were Pennsylvania residents, a majority of visitors traveled more than 50 miles to get to the State Park. Visitors were more likely to come in groups of 3 or more people (57%) and only 9% said that they were visiting by themselves (alone). A majority (62%) also reported that there were no children under 16 in their party.

There were several notable differences in the user characteristics and visitation patterns of visitors across the six State Parks. For example, Cherry Springs State Park was more likely than the other parks to attract visitors from outside of Pennsylvania (30%), overnight use in the area (83%), males (75%), visitors coming to the park alone (27%), and visitors without children under 16 in their party (79.5%). Cherry Springs State Park visitors also reported the least frequent visits to this park (an average of 2.53 trips over the last 12 months). With respect to the other parks in the sample, Bald Eagle State

Park visitors were less likely than the others to be overnight visitors (42.4%), but more likely to be female (47.3%), to visit in larger groups (5.34 people), and to have children under 16 in their group (53.1%). Bald Eagle State Park visitors also reported the most frequent visitation to this park (an average of 10.9 trips over the last 12 months). Overnight visitors to Lyman Run State Park were more likely to report non-State Park accommodations compared to the other parks (38.8%) and this typically involved private camps/cabins. Similar to Cherry Springs State Park visitors, those surveyed at Kettle Creek State Park were also more likely to report overnight use (79.5%) as opposed to day use.

In terms of their primary activities across the different State Parks, Kettle Creek, Lyman Run, and Sinnemahoning State Park visitors were more likely to cite “fishing” as their most important activity, (40.9%, 28.8%, and 26.7%, respectively). Hyner Run/View visitors were more likely to report “sightseeing” as their primary State Park activity (30.6%) and Cherry Springs State Park visitors were more likely to cite “other” as their primary activity type (44.9%). Not surprisingly, this “other” category included night sky viewing.

Overall visitor satisfaction was extremely high, and this is consistent with prior studies conducted in State Parks. Likewise, visitor evaluations of State Park amenities, services, and resources were also very favorable with over 80% rating these items as good or very good. The most favorably evaluated items included “scenery,” “feeling of safety,” “value for the money invested in the visit,” and “park cleanliness.” There was some limited room for improvement (although reviews were still favorable) for signage, condition of trails and restroom cleanliness. These results are consistent with the findings from the Year 1 PA-VUM Forestry study.

The economics section of the study asked visitors about their monetary expenditures in and near the State Parks. Nearly half of visitors indicated that they would have gone somewhere else to do the same activity if they had not been able to visit the State Park, indicating that they were serious about pursuing their recreation activities on that trip. Most of the respondents (78%) indicated that they spent some money within 50 miles of the State Park on their current trip. The largest expenditures reported were for gasoline and oil, food/drink at restaurants and bars, and groceries. In general, Lyman Run and Kettle Creek State Park visitors spent more across all spending categories for their trip (averages = \$156.40 and \$141.87, respectively) than Hyner Run and Cherry Springs State Parks visitors (averages = \$95.35 and \$99.11, respectively).

The recreation experience questions provided data about visitor motivations and place perceptions. The data clearly show that visitors are interested in experiencing the outdoor natural surroundings available in the State Parks. Being out of doors, getting away from the routine, and relaxation are very important to these recreationists. Findings also indicate that State Park visitors are attached to and dependent on these places for their outdoor activities.

A large majority of visitors across all six State Parks reported that Marcellus shale-related activity had not affected their use of (93.6%) or recreation experience at (91.4%) the State Park where they were surveyed. Among those reporting that their use of the State Park had been impacted by shale-related operations, the most common responses reflected traffic-related issues, concerns with hunting, concerns over light pollution of the night sky, and general environmental concerns including pollution, habitat destruction, and water quality as well as changes in landscape, noise pollution, and crowdedness and loss of a relaxing and serene environment. Responses to the experiential impacts of Marcellus shale-related activity tended to reflect the same themes as the answers to the questions about the impacts of shale-related activity on visitors' use of the State Parks. Cherry Springs and Hyner Run State Park visitors were slightly more likely than visitors from the other four parks to indicate changed recreation use and experiences as a result of Marcellus activity.

This report provides a representative snapshot of recreational use across the six Pennsylvania State Parks surveyed in the north-central Pennsylvania region in 2011 and 2012. It thus provides a start on building a profile of Pennsylvania State Park visitors. Surveys are currently continuing in other parks (in other regions of the Commonwealth) and the overall database will include a total of thirty State Parks by the completion of the five-year project. It should also be noted that prior studies at Hickory Run/Lehigh Gorge State Parks (2010) and an on-going study at Presque Isle State Park will provide similar data for the Bureau of State Parks. Future reports will provide yearly summaries of the individual parks studied as well as comparative and targeted data analyses aimed at assisting Bureau of State Parks managers in their efforts to meet the needs of their recreation users.

Appendix A.

Comparisons of Survey Variables across the Six State Parks

Table 12. State Park Visitor Socio-Demographic Profile: A Comparison across the Six State Parks

Variable	Hyner Run	Cherry Springs	Sinnemahoning	Bald Eagle	Lyman Run	Kettle Creek
<i>Income</i>	Valid Percentages					
under 25,000	8.3	8.3	6.1	7.9	5.6	7.0
25,000 - 49,999	27.8	20.8	19.7	29.3	24.6	29.9
50,000 - 74,999	27.8	28.1	36.1	27.2	33.8	23.6
75,000 - 99,999	21.9	18.8	17.7	16.8	12.7	22.3
100,000 - 149,999	10.1	14.6	15.0	12.6	16.9	11.5
150,000 or over	4.1	9.4	5.4	6.3	6.3	5.7
<i>Age</i>						
Average Age (Mean)	49	45	52	49	50	48
18-35	21.6	33.6	12.0	19.1	14.1	21.2
36-50	28.9	26.7	28.3	38.2	32.5	31.3
51-64	36.6	28.4	42.8	27.6	36.2	34.6
65 and Older	12.9	11.2	16.9	15.1	17.2	12.8
<i>Race/Ethnic Background</i>						
White	97.4	96.5	99.4	95.1	97.6	100.0
Black or African American	1.0	<1%	---	1.5	---	---
Hispanic	---	---	<1%	1.5	---	---
Asian	1.6	2.7	---	2.0	2.4	---
<i>Gender</i>						
Male	61.6	75.2	67.5	52.7	66.1	69.2
Female	38.4	24.8	32.5	47.3	33.9	30.8
<i>Residency Status</i>						
Pennsylvania Resident	91.6	69.9	91.0	94.6	87.8	92.3

Table 13. State Park Trip Visitation Patterns: A Comparison across the Six State Parks

Variable	Hyner Run	Cherry Springs	Sinnemahoning	Bald Eagle	Lyman Run	Kettle Creek
<i>Type of Trip (Valid %)</i>						
Overnight Trip	51.5	83.6	66.5	42.4	68.5	79.5
Day Trip	48.5	16.4	33.5	57.6	31.5	20.5
<i>Length of Stay (Mean)</i>						
Overnight Trip	4.29	2.78	2.82	2.53	2.21	4.29
Day Trip	2.21	5.00	3.42	4.08	4.45	4.49
<i>Type of Overnight Accommodation (Valid %)</i>						
State Park	61.4	82.7	60.3	93.3	51.7	82.4
Non-State Park	38.6	17.3	39.7	6.7	48.3	17.6
<i>State Park Accommodation Type (Valid %)</i>						
RV Campsite	39.6	18.4	44.0	49.4	26.7	62.8
Tent Campsite	20.8	64.3	12.1	27.0	24.1	14.9
Inn or Lodge	---	---	---	9.0	<1.0	---
Cabin	1.0	---	2.6	---	---	2.7
Cottage/Yurt	---	---	---	4.5	---	---
Group Campsite	---	---	---	2.2	---	<1.0
<i>Non-State Park Accommodation Type (Valid %)</i>						
Private Camp/Cabin	20.8	4.1	29.3	1.1	38.8	13.5
Hotel/Motel	8.9	---	5.2	1.1	1.7	<1.0
Private Campground	5.9	1.0	1.7	---	6.0	<1.0
Friend/Family House (free)	2.0	---	---	2.2	1.7	<1.0
Bed & Breakfast	---	---	---	---	---	2.0
Other	1.0	12.2	4.3	3.4	---	<1.0

Table 13 (continued). State Park Trip Visitation Patterns – A Comparison across the Six State Parks

Variable	Hynes Run	Cherry Springs	Sinnemahoning	Bald Eagle	Lyman Run	Kettle Creek
	Valid % or Mean					
<i>Distance Traveled from Home to State Park</i>						
Average Distance Traveled	125.47mi	193.17mi	135.64mi	58.39mi	139.62mi	129.47mi
Travel Distance of 50 Miles or More	67.0	91.5	82.7	35.3	72.7	82.4
<i>Number of Trips to the State Park</i>						
Average Trips Per Year	3.43 trips	2.53 trips	7.91 trips	10.90 trips	3.98 trips	5.98 trips
1 Trip Only	49.7	59.1	39.8	29.5	48.2	41.8
2 to 4 Trips	35.8	22.6	34.5	26.6	31.1	32.4
5 or More Trips	14.5	18.3	25.7	44.0	20.7	25.8
<i>Group Size</i>						
Average Group Size	4.16	4.00	3.91	5.34	4.44	4.13
Visited Alone	7.1	27.4	6.9	7.2	5.5	8.0
2 People Per Group	39.6	29.1	32.9	31.9	32.7	33.2
3 to 5 People Per Group	35.5	27.4	43.9	36.2	40.6	40.1
6 or More People Per Group	17.8	16.2	16.2	24.6	21.2	18.7
<i>Children Under 16 in Group</i>						
No Children in Group	69.0	79.5	62.4	46.9	60.6	59.9
1 Child in Group	8.1	6.8	13.9	17.4	15.8	16.0
2 Children in Group	10.7	6.8	15.0	15.0	8.5	11.8
3 or More Children in Group	12.2	6.8	8.7	20.8	15.2	12.3

Table 14. Recreation Activity Participation and Primary Activity across the Six State Parks (Valid %)

* % ≠100% because respondents could report > one	Hyner Run		Cherry Springs		Sinnemahoning	
Type of Activity	Participation*	Primary	Participation*	Primary	Participation*	Primary
Consumptive Activities						
Fishing	15.7	5.4	6.0	<1.0	44.5	26.7
Hunting	3.0	<1.0	1.7	---	4.0	<1.0
Viewing, Learning about Nature & Culture						
Sightseeing	77.7	30.6	70.1	17.8	69.4	15.2
Viewing natural features	66.0	2.7	62.4	3.7	67.6	5.5
Visiting historic and pre-historic sites/areas	23.9	2.2	23.1	---	23.7	---
Viewing wayside exhibits, interpretive kiosks	11.2	---	23.9	---	20.2	---
Visiting a nature center, nature trail, or visitor center	16.2	---	23.1	---	43.4	1.2
Non-motorized Activities						
Hiking	25.4	2.2	48.7	<1.0	27.7	1.8
Walking	44.2	1.1	58.1	<1.0	44.5	1.2
Horseback Riding	<1.0	---	---	---	<1.0	---
Bicycling, including mountain bikes	7.1	---	1.7	---	17.9	1.8
Non-motorized boating	1.5	1.6	2.6	---	12.7	1.8
Downhill skiing or snowboarding	---	---	---	---	---	---
Cross-country skiing, snowshoeing	---	---	---	---	---	---
Motorized Activities						
Driving for pleasure on roads	47.7	11.3	25.6	<1.0	52.0	4.2
Snowmobile use	2.0	---	---	---	<1.0	---
ATV use	---	---	<1.0	---	<1.0	---
Motorized boating	---	---	---	---	2.9	---
Camping or Other Overnight						
RV camping	21.8	7.5	17.1	---	30.1	7.9
Tent camping	10.7	2.7	51.3	4.7	9.2	1.8
Other camping	6.6	---	5.1	---	7.5	1.2
Other Activities						
Picnicking and family gatherings	36.5	5.9	32.5	2.8	39.9	6.1
Relaxing, hanging out	59.4	14.0	62.4	8.4	60.1	15.2
Swimming	21.3	6.5	5.1	---	11.0	1.8
Beach Use (no swimming)	<1.0	---	1.7	---	3.5	---
Attending a program offered at the park	3.0	---	22.2	8.4	6.4	<1.0
Visiting a special event or festival	5.6	1.6	14.5	7.5	3.5	1.2
Other activity	10.2	4.3	50.4	44.9	8.7	4.2

Table 14 (continued). Recreation Activity Participation and Primary Activity across the Six State Parks (Valid %)

* % ≠100% because respondents could report > one	Bald Eagle		Lyman Run		Kettle Creek	
Type of Activity	Participation*	Primary	Participation*	Primary	Participation*	Primary
Consumptive Activities						
Fishing	47.3	22.7	47.9	28.8	71.7	40.9
Hunting	1.4	---	3.6	<1.0	1.6	---
Viewing, Learning about Nature & Culture						
Sightseeing	43.0	2.0	55.2	7.5	53.5	3.3
Viewing natural features	51.7	1.0	52.7	1.9	58.3	1.1
Visiting historic and pre-historic sites/areas	6.8	1.0	12.7	---	11.2	---
Viewing wayside exhibits, interpretive kiosks	8.7	---	8.5	---	11.2	---
Visiting a nature center, nature trail, or visitor center	20.8	---	16.4	---	25.7	<1.0
Non-motorized Activities						
Hiking	30.4	2.0	32.7	<1.0	31.0	1.1
Walking	53.1	4.9	48.5	1.3	46.0	2.2
Horseback Riding	---	---	<1.0	---	1.6	1.1
Bicycling, including mountain bikes	16.4	1.0	13.3	1.3	13.4	1.1
Non-motorized boating	9.7	2.5	15.2	1.3	16.0	2.2
Downhill skiing or snowboarding	---	---	---	---	---	---
Cross-country skiing, snowshoeing	---	---	---	---	---	---
Motorized Activities						
Driving for pleasure on roads	16.4	---	24.8	<1.0	36.9	1.7
Snowmobile use	1.0	---	6.7	3.8	2.7	1.1
ATV use	---	---	2.4	2.5	1.1	---
Motorized boating	20.3	6.9	<1.0	---	7.0	---
Camping or Other Overnight						
RV camping	22.2	10.3	19.4	6.3	46.0	12.2
Tent camping	13.0	4.9	17.0	2.5	9.6	3.3
Other camping	2.4	1.0	9.1	<1.0	4.8	1.1
Other Activities						
Picnicking and family gatherings	42.5	9.4	34.5	8.1	44.4	5.0
Relaxing, hanging out	57.0	13.3	67.3	10.6	61.5	15.5
Swimming	28.0	3.9	37.6	10.0	11.8	3.3
Beach Use	24.6	2.0	27.9	4.4	2.1	<1.0
Attending a program offered at the park	5.3	<1.0	4.8	---	4.8	---
Visiting a special event or festival	5.8	3.4	8.5	2.5	4.3	<1.0
Other activity	10.1	7.4	10.3	5.0	4.8	2.2

Table 15. Quality Ratings and Overall Satisfaction across the Six State Parks

State Park Feature/Attribute	Hyner Run		Cherry Springs		Sinnemahoning	
	Mean*	% Good or Very Good	Mean*	% Good or Very Good	Mean*	% Good or Very Good
Feeling of safety	4.79	99.0	4.66	92.2	4.82	98.2
Scenery	4.80	98.4	4.66	95.6	4.80	98.3
Value for the money invested in this State Park visit	4.73	95.1	4.71	93.7	4.70	93.1
Cleanliness of this park	4.76	98.5	4.78	98.3	4.73	97.0
Condition of the natural environment	4.69	96.9	4.56	92.3	4.71	95.2
Helpfulness of employees	4.72	93.5	4.66	91.7	4.63	93.1
Restroom availability	4.67	92.5	4.79	96.4	4.49	87.4
Quality of park programs	4.38	83.4	4.60	94.6	4.68	97.5
Condition of developed recreation facilities	4.55	92.6	4.49	92.1	4.42	88.2
Maintenance of facilities (roads, shelters, buildings)	4.49	92.1	4.41	87.2	4.33	86.9
Condition of trails in this State Park	4.42	90.3	4.34	84.0	4.65	96.7
Adequacy of signage	4.52	90.9	4.23	84.5	4.42	89.3
Restroom cleanliness	4.27	78.4	4.46	89.5	4.40	86.2
Overall Satisfaction	4.76	97.4	4.72	98.2	4.74	98.8

* Rating score on a five-point scale were 1 = poor, 2 = fair, 3 = average, 4 = good, and 5 = very good; highest % of “good” or “very good” are highlighted in green text, lowest % of “good” or “very good” are highlighted in red text.

Table 15 (continued). Quality Ratings and Overall Satisfaction across the Six State Parks

State Park Feature/Attribute	Bald Eagle		Lyman Run		Kettle Creek	
	Mean*	% Good or Very Good	Mean*	% Good or Very Good	Mean*	% Good or Very Good
Feeling of safety	4.74	96.0	4.76	98.2	4.75	99.0
Scenery	4.71	96.6	4.81	98.8	4.77	96.3
Value for the money invested in this State Park visit	4.74	95.0	4.72	95.0	4.74	97.2
Cleanliness of this park	4.63	93.2	4.72	97.6	4.59	91.9
Condition of the natural environment	4.65	98.1	4.69	95.7	4.59	95.2
Helpfulness of employees	4.61	88.7	4.55	93.2	4.50	91.7
Restroom availability	4.46	86.3	4.50	88.5	4.52	89.1
Quality of park programs	4.61	94.6	4.58	95.0	4.51	88.5
Condition of developed recreation facilities	4.48	90.3	4.51	94.0	4.33	86.9
Maintenance of facilities (roads, shelters, buildings)	4.49	92.1	4.48	92.5	4.44	92.3
Condition of trails in this State Park	4.48	90.4	4.30	85.1	4.20	82.5
Adequacy of signage	4.49	93.2	4.35	91.2	4.28	85.1
Restroom cleanliness	4.21	81.3	4.67	91.7	4.43	83.6
Overall Satisfaction	4.69	97.0	4.72	98.2	4.69	96.8

* Rating score on a five-point scale were 1 = poor, 2 = fair, 3 = average, 4 = good, and 5 = very good; highest % of “good” or “very good” are highlighted in green text, lowest % of “good” or “very good” are highlighted in red text.

Table 16. Reasons or Motivations for Visiting the State Park –Comparisons across the Six State Parks

Reason for Visiting...	Hyner Run		Cherry Springs		Sinnemahoning	
	Mean	% Very or Extremely Important	Mean	% Very or Extremely Important	Mean	% Very or Extremely Important
To get away from the regular routine	4.63	95.0	4.64	96.5	4.73	95.9
To be outdoors	4.56	90.9	4.61	97.4	4.73	97.1
For relaxation	4.54	90.9	4.61	93.1	4.74	98.9
To experience natural surroundings	4.58	91.4	4.65	95.7	4.64	95.3
For family recreation	4.06	76.7	3.44	54.4	4.33	85.3
To be with my friends	4.14	76.0	4.26	82.8	3.71	64.9
For physical exercise	3.46	53.3	3.14	34.8	3.51	55.6
For the challenge or sport	3.22	44.2	3.34	44.4	3.26	43.9
To develop my skills	3.06	42.6	3.65	56.9	3.10	39.2

Table 16 (continued). Reasons or Motivations for Visiting the State Park – Comparisons across the Six State Parks

Reason for Visiting...	Bald Eagle		Lyman Run		Kettle Creek	
	Mean	% Very or Extremely Important	Mean	% Very or Extremely Important	Mean	% Very or Extremely Important
To get away from the regular routine	4.67	95.2	4.65	93.3	4.74	95.7
To be outdoors	4.60	95.1	4.70	95.7	4.73	95.7
For relaxation	4.67	97.1	4.68	94.5	4.69	93.9
To experience natural surroundings	4.45	91.8	4.64	94.5	4.60	94.1
For family recreation	4.30	84.4	4.31	83.0	4.45	88.2
To be with my friends	3.95	73.7	4.06	75.6	4.16	77.8
For physical exercise	3.47	56.1	3.63	61.2	3.46	50.5
For the challenge or sport	3.13	42.6	3.36	51.5	3.53	51.0
To develop my skills	2.93	38.4	3.41	53.3	3.31	45.7

Table 17. Perceptions of Place Attachment at the State Park – Comparisons across the Six State Parks

Place Attachment Item...	Hyner Run		Cherry Springs		Sinnemahoning	
	Mean	% Agree or Strongly Agree	Mean	% Agree or Strongly Agree	Mean	% Agree or Strongly Agree
This place means a lot to me	4.10	70.9	4.21	73.1	4.26	77.8
I enjoy recreating at this place more than other places I could visit	3.83	60.2	4.00	64.4	3.96	70.8
I get more satisfaction out of visiting this place than from visiting most places	3.69	56.6	3.95	60.6	3.80	60.8
I am very attached to this place	3.54	51.0	3.74	53.1	3.74	57.3

Table 17 (continued). Perceptions of Place Attachment at the State Park – Comparisons across the Six State Parks

Place Attachment Item...	Bald Eagle		Lyman Run		Kettle Creek	
	Mean	% Agree or Strongly Agree	Mean	% Agree or Strongly Agree	Mean	% Agree or Strongly Agree
This place means a lot to me	4.13	74.4	4.26	78.0	4.29	82.8
I enjoy recreating at this place more than other places I could visit	3.95	68.6	3.97	68.9	4.11	76.3
I get more satisfaction out of visiting this place than from visiting most places	3.75	56.0	3.77	61.3	3.97	69.2
I am very attached to this place	3.59	50.2	3.63	49.4	3.87	63.7

Table 18. State Park Recreation Trip Profile for Economics section – A Comparison across the Six State Parks (Valid %)

	Hyner Run	Cherry Springs	Sinnemahoning	Bald Eagle	Lyman Run	Kettle Creek
Economics Question:	%	%	%	%	%	%
What visitor would have done if unable to visit the State Park						
Gone elsewhere for the same activity	42.6	36.8	50.9	46.9	55.8	51.6
Gone elsewhere for a different activity	16.2	14.5	9.4	12.1	13.9	8.6
Come back another time	14.2	10.3	9.9	6.3	4.8	11.3
Stayed home	21.3	29.9	24.6	29.5	21.2	23.7
Gone to work at your regular job	2.0	6.8	1.2	1.4	1.2	2.2
None of these	3.6	1.7	4.1	3.9	3.0	2.7
Time Away from Home (Days)						
1-2	28.3	31.5	18.3	39.1	21.3	21.3
3-5	59.6	45.7	66.7	49.4	62.3	60.7
6 or more	12.1	22.8	15.0	11.5	16.4	18.0
Time Away from Home (Hours)						
1-2	20.4	16.0	13.5	9.2	2.3	5.4
3-5	29.6	12.0	38.5	40.0	48.8	32.4
6 or more	50.0	72.0	48.1	50.8	48.8	62.2
State Park the Primary Destination for this Trip?						
Yes	76.1	92.3	80.9	96.1	80.8	88.2
No	23.9	7.7	19.1	3.9	20.0	11.8
Number of People Covered by Expenses						
1	7.3	28.0	6.9	9.8	7.1	7.3
2	41.7	28.0	33.3	31.4	35.0	32.9
3	13.2	6.5	12.5	14.4	13.6	13.4
4 or more	37.7	37.6	47.2	44.4	44.3	46.3

Table 19. Summary of Trip Spending Patterns – A Comparison across the Six State Parks

	Hyner Run	Cherry Springs	Sinnemahoning	Bald Eagle	Lyman Run	Kettle Creek
	(Valid %)					
Proportion of visitors spending any money within 50 miles of this State Park	73.1	79.5	80.7	70.0	80.6	86.6
Economic Expenditure Items	Proportion of Visitors Spending Something in Each Category (Valid %)					
Motel, Lodge, Cabin, B&B, etc.	3.6	<1.0	4.1	4.3	6.7	6.3
Camping Fees	21.3	35.0	32.2	21.7	24.8	43.0
Restaurants and Bars	37.6	27.4	26.9	21.3	32.1	30.6
Groceries	44.0	46.2	41.5	40.6	60.6	57.0
Gasoline and oil	40.6	38.5	49.7	40.6	55.8	52.7
Local Transportation	---	---	<1.0	---	---	---
Outfitter Related Expenses	1.5	0.4	<1.0	6.8	4.2	3.2
Outdoor Recreation & Entertainment	1.5	15.4	3.5	6.3	1.8	2.7
Sporting Goods	5.1	4.3	10.5	80.2	20.6	25.3
Souvenirs, Clothing, Other Misc.	8.6	16.2	18.7	5.8	18.8	9.1

Table 20. Summary of Specific Trip Expenditures – A Comparison across the Six State Parks

	Hyner Run	Cherry Springs	Sinnemahoning	Bald Eagle	Lyman Run	Kettle Creek
Economic Expenditure Items	Average Amount Spent – Among Visitors Spending Something in Each Category					
Motel, Lodge, Cabin, B&B, etc.	156.43	100.00	297.14	188.33	255.27	152.20
Camping Fees	91.19	60.24	101.83	81.73	87.48	95.49
Restaurants and Bars	51.69	46.78	60.07	53.95	69.09	53.28
Groceries	56.04	45.04	56.69	77.52	69.35	52.57
Gasoline and oil	54.91	54.44	74.25	56.42	68.54	79.18
Local Transportation	---	---	100.00	---	---	---
Outfitter Related Expenses	101.67	21.25	20.00	61.50	24.43	29.83
Outdoor Recreation & Entertainment	46.00	36.33	20.50	40.54	17.67	42.78
Sporting Goods	90.50	28.00	91.67	39.24	44.62	27.60
Souvenirs, Clothing, Other Misc.	31.59	93.05	43.88	55.42	35.42	29.47
Total	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Table 21. Summary of Specific Trip Expenditures – A Comparison across the Six State Parks – All Visitors

	Hyner Run	Cherry Springs	Sinnemahoning	Bald Eagle	Lyman Run	Kettle Creek
Economic Expenditure Items	Average Amount Spent – ALL VISITORS					
Motel, Lodge, Cabin, B&B, etc.	5.56	0.85	12.16	8.19	17.02	4.09
Camping Fees	19.44	21.11	27.39	17.77	21.74	41.07
Restaurants and Bars	19.42	12.79	19.32	11.47	22.19	13.26
Groceries	19.06	20.79	23.54	31.46	42.03	29.96
Gasoline and oil	22.30	20.94	36.91	22.89	38.22	41.72
Local Transportation	---	---	0.58	---	---	---
Outfitter Related Expenses	1.55	0.73	0.12	4.16	1.04	0.96
Outdoor Recreation & Entertainment	0.70	5.59	0.72	2.55	0.32	1.15
Sporting Goods	4.59	1.20	9.65	7.77	9.19	6.97
Souvenirs, Clothing, Other Misc.	2.73	15.11	8.21	3.21	6.65	2.69
Total	95.35	99.11	138.6	109.47	158.4	141.87

Table 22. Response to Marcellus Shale-related Activity by State Park

Item		Hyner Run		Cherry Springs		Sinnemahoning		Bald Eagle		Lyman Run		Kettle Creek	
		%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n
Marcellus Use	Yes	11.7	23	13.8	16	3.5	6	3.4	7	1.2	2	7.0	13
	No	88.3	174	86.2	100	96.5	165	96.6	199	99.8	163	173	93.0
Marcellus Experience	Yes	10.9	21	24.1	28	4.1	7	3.5	7	6.7	11	8.1	15
	No	89.1	172	88	75.9	163	95.9	195	96.5	93.3	152	91.9	171

APPENDIX B.

**SYNTHESIS OF OPEN-ENDED RESPONSES:
SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVING PARK MANAGEMENT**

State Park 2012 Qualitative Coding Summary

If you could ask Pennsylvania State Parks to improve some things about the management of this state park, what would you ask them to do? (Q18)

State Park	Number of Responses
Hyner Run/Hyner View	197
Cherry Springs	117
Sinnemahoning	173
Bald Eagle	207
Lyman Run	165
Kettle Creek	187
TOTAL	1046

*Note: Some responses addressed multiple topics and are coded in multiple categories

Hyner Run/Hyner View State Park (n=197)

No Suggestions (84)

Satisfied (14)

Improve Recreation Facilities (106)

Improve road maintenance (21)

- Road maintenance (4)
- Road too narrow/ Widen Road (10)
- Repave the roads (3)
- Pave road in from Highway 44
- Install pull-offs
- Install speed limit signs
- Replace guard rails

General trails (3)

- Improvement of trails (2)
- Improve signage on hiking trail

Restrooms (20)

- Fix doors
- Higher quality (3)
- Needs cleaning (2)
 - Cleaning conducted at wrong time
- Roof leaks in Men's restroom
- Add sink
- More restrooms (3)
 - More restrooms to campground (2)
 - More restroom to pool
 - Closer changing room to pool
- Add hand sanitizer
- More screens
- Increase heat of showers
 - Install more showers

Campground (19)

- Keep open longer
- More restrooms in campground (2)
- More electrical use
- Cost is too much for overnight camping
- Improper fire ring placement (2)
 - Clean out fire ring
- Try to make campsites more private
 - Camp sites too close
- Camp host would not enforce noise ordinance
- Some campsites need additional gravel
 - More comfortable tent sites
- Outline RV pads and make more level (2)
- More restrooms in campground
- Cut grass at sites before guests arrive

Full hook ups electric/water/sewer
Allow pets in the campground

Parking (7)

More parking spaces (6)
Repave the parking lot- lots of potholes

Trash (4)

Clean up litter (2)
More trash receptacles (2)

Improve facilities (16)

Repair picnic tables (3)
More picnic tables
Fix grills (2)
Add more grills
Update playground with more equipment
 Add more playground equipment (2)
Would like to see pavilion on site (4)
Keep facilities open
Make changing rooms closer to the pool

Signage (11)

Improve sign quality (3)
Improve trail signage (2)
Drive from Hwy 44 is not well marked
More accurate trail signage
Reinstate the mountain statistics and elevation sign (2)
Post a schedule of events
Announce when hang-gliders are here so we can see them

Firewood (3)

Increase firewood accessibility
Drier firewood - It's green and wet
Stop selling private wood in camp

Misc. (2)

Add a dog park
Add disc golf

Park Management (30)

Park Employees (5)

Campground host- Would not enforce noise ordinance
Hire full time maintenance employee
More ranger patrols (2)
More staff presence

Access (5)

Open the seasons earlier in the year
Unlock gates so you can drive to pavilions
Increase winter access
More access to dump station
Trees need to be removed from around the dumping station- hard to maneuver

Programming (3)

More programs

More youth programming (2)

Park programs not kid friendly enough

Alcohol (3)

Take no alcohol sign out

Would like alcohol to be allowed here

Regulate alcohol use

Misc.(14)

Better deer management

 Would like to see more deer

Cut some trees out

Cut grass at campsites before guests arrive

Too much focus on timber not enough on ecosystem management

Flags need to be replaced

Ride ATV's on trails or dirt roads through the park

Use snowmobile trails for ATV's

General store selling food

Is there anything that can be done about the black fish?

Do more for insect control

Coffee shop nearby would be nice

Cell service would be nice

More marketing

Natural Gas Drilling (1)

Do not drill gas wells here

Cherry Springs State Park (n= 117)

No Suggestions (25)

Satisfied (15)

Improve Recreation Facilities (51)

Improve road maintenance (3)

- Improve campground road
- More access to astronomy field
 - Too much dust from astronomy access road

General trails (2)

- Add more trails
- Increase signage on hiking trails

Restrooms (24)

- Add shower facilities (14)
 - Add eco-friendly shower
 - Either lower fees or improve facilities by adding showers
- Improve bathroom quality (2)
- Install rotating nozzle on hand drier
- Install composting toilet
- Add additional restrooms in astronomy area
- Add lights in bathrooms
 - Install red lights in bathroom
- Refill hand sanitizer

Campground (22)

- Move campground exit to avoid light pollution (4)
- Improve campground road
- Very rustic- Add more comfort features
 - Add electricity
- Add hot showers to campground- Even pay showers would be okay
- Level place to camp (2)
- Add sign "no electricity or cell service"
- Replace trees in sites (2)
- Closer instructions on the general camping rules/regulations
- Safer work equipment out in camping area- not safe for a child
- Price of camping too high
- Would like to see water source in campground
- Initiate reservation system for sites (3)
- Install organized group tent sites
- Increase size of camp sites

Trash (2)

- More trash cans (2)

Improve facilities (10)

- Modernize park
- Add more telescope cement pads to the field
- Picnic tables need to be updated (3)
- Improve fire pit condition (4)

More ladder hooks

Signage (5)

Add sign "no electricity or cell service"
More information on observation pods
Mark green sign better
Add signs and directions from nearby towns
Increase signage for hiking trails

Light Issues (17)

Move campground exit to avoid light pollution (4)
Better fence along road to block light (2)
Plant some barrier shrubs to obscure car headlight on route 44 (8)
Have better entrance and exits for leaving so that the car lights do not pollute astrology field
More control of users of white light on the astronomy field

Park Management (36)

Park Employees (4)

More ranger patrols for safety (2)
Rangers are a little abrasive
Would like to see more employees and a station

Programming (3)

More programs
Some sort of astronomy lessons
Continue with night programs- But really try to separate vehicles

Alcohol (3)

Please allow alcohol (3)

Internet (8)

Wider availability of wi-fi/more reliable (4)
More information online, better website (3)
Put weather info on website for here

Pets (2)

Allow dogs
Pet allowance on leash

Wildlife (2)

Do not eliminate deer
I'd like to see more elk

Misc. (16)

Trees block view
Add more trees to open areas
Listen to the people that use the park and make suggestions (3)
Maintain grass before events (3)
Decrease speed limit through the park on RT 44
Lower fees so that more people will come out more often
Consider spraying bees (got string)
Re-supply the maps more often
Enlarge state park to accommodate more people for star parties (2)
Give more funding
Availability of telescopes and bear boxes

Natural Gas Drilling (2)

Get frackers to put light shields on their wells (2)

Sinnemahoning State Park (n=173)

No Suggestions (115)

Satisfied (13)

Improve Recreation Facilities (91)

Improve road maintenance (7)

Access road not wide enough or make it one way (2)

Improve road (4)

Improve campground road

Parking (3)

More parking

Secondary car parking could be closer

Should not have to pay for parking at campground

Access (5)

More access to fishing areas (2)

Better handicapped accessibility to good fishing areas

More access ability to remote areas

Accessibility should be increased

General trails (3)

Better snowmobile trails

More trails

Better trail markers

Restrooms (18)

Flushing toilets and sinks

Add more showers to bath houses (5)

Port-a-Potties cleaned more regularly

Improve bathroom facilities (2)

More bathroom facilities (3)

Modernize bathrooms (2)

The vault toilets are starting to smell

Restrooms near the day use area need serviced badly

Control temperature of hot water in shower

Put a restroom at the dam

Campground (23)

Water hookups needed at RV sites (2)

Water more readily available at each site

Campfire areas not clean

Better directions to campground

Lower camp fee

More secluded campsites

More area in between campsites

Dog/pet sites for tents need more grass and less gravel

Put more gravel on campsites- sites too muddy (5)

No camp host and few staff come around

Install emergency telephone

Campsites fit well with location

- Internet access at campground
- Add more camp sites
- Reservation system is not adequate
- Do not charge extra for additional parking
- Should accommodate all vehicles up front (boat, camper and two vehicles)
- More areas for satellite dish reception. Pet areas are not able to get TV satellite

Trash (6)

- Park cleaned regularly
- Garbage cans are locked at the boat ramp
- More garbage bins/recycling areas (3)
- Add garbage cans to the overlook

Improve facilities (10)

- Boat ramp could be nicer-could be concrete rather than steep drop-off
- Better playgrounds- more equipment (4)
- Swing sets need replaced
- Fewer buildings/ Do not develop (2)
- Place to dump ashes
- Better picnic tables

Signage (7)

- Improve entrance sign for museum
- Put better signs at campsites entrance
- Have a better displayed map at 1st entrance off 872
- Develop a better park map (2)
- Bigger sign at entrance to campground
- Better signage on main road

Marina/ Swimming (9)

- No swimming available
 - Open up the swimming area again
- Boat ramp could be nicer-could be concrete rather than steep drop-off
- Dredge the lake
- More access to swimming areas
- Better lake access for young children and elderly
- Clean the beach
- Allow small motors on lake
- Fill the dam back up

Park Management (30)

Park Employees (6)

- Bring back Janet Caldwell
- Employees at the visitor center were not friendly
- No camp host and few staff come around
- Fish and game checked the fishing licenses multiple times- it felt like over-kill
- More park employees visible
- Training for employees- have not been helpful

Wildlife (2)

- More food plots for white-tailed deer
- Install a blind in addition to the gazebo at wildlife viewing area

Fishing (4)

- Better handicapped accessibility to good fishing areas
- Stock more fish in the stream more often
- Stock more trout (2)
- Do not eliminate fall fish stocking

Pets (2)

- Dog/pet sites for tents need more grassy areas and less gravel
- More dog sites

Misc. (16)

- Cut the grass more often (3)
- Cut down rotted trees
- River access permits are no good
- Lower bike and kayaking rates likes senior discount
- Finish displays inside nature center
- No cell service
- Better marketing
- Replace the bridge behind the visitor's center
- Get rid of the bugs (4)
- Internet access at campground
- More information on how to get involved

Natural Gas Drilling (1)

- Forced to slow down for drilling employee

Bald Eagle State Park (n=207)

No Suggestions (67)

Satisfied (16)

Improve Recreation Facilities (142)

Improve road maintenance (8)

- Add a walking lane on the road
- Speed limit needs to be enforced
- Road from Route 26 is in bad condition
- Improve road condition (3)
- Fix main road to campground- needs better black top
- Improve road to primitive campground

Parking (3)

- Better signage for no parking zone
- Not enough parking for shoreline fishing
- More parking at campsites

Water (4)

- Water hook ups for RV campers (2)
- Water fountains did not work
- More availability of water at pavilions

Access (7)

- More shoreline fishing access
- More beach access
- Increase boater accessibility to the lake for fishing
- No areas that is handicapped accessible in the winter
- No access for fishing on other side of the lake (2)
- Install family restrooms for better accessibility

General trails (9)

- Better trail maintenance (2)
- Need to develop more trails
- Improve trail design
- Really enjoying having more trails- needs more interpretive signs
- More hiking trails
- Add bike trails and designate for bike use
- Trim back some of the trails
- Some trails signs are missing- Just post left

Restrooms (19)

- Need more restroom availability in the winter
- Restrooms hard to find- signs not accurate
- Showers are poor quality- not reliable (2)
- Add showers- allow use of other showers for free if camping
- Shower drains on floor need individual drains
- Add bag holder in the showers (3)
- Bathroom improvements – add shower curtains (2)
- More bathrooms
- More bathrooms in primitive sites

- Add lights in the bathroom
- Cleaner bathrooms
- Add stone pathway to the bathrooms
- Install family restrooms for better accessibility
- Install doors on the bathroom stalls at Bald Eagle Launch
- Use better toilet paper

Campground (27)

- Forced to pay for pet site because the rest were closed
- Too much gravel for comfortable camping
- Would like to see more grassy or sandy pads for tent setup
- Add pull through camping
- Need water and sewage hook ups for campers (3)
- Control people in campsites- illegal alcohol consumption and noise
- More bathrooms in primitive campsites
- Allow use of other showers for free if camping here
- Sign to primitive campground
- Slippery grass on northern part of the RV camping loop
- Space campsites out- crowded (2)
- Have dishwashing area in campgrounds
- Fix main road to campground-needs better black top
- Positioning fire pits to level ground (2)
 - Fire pits too close to camp pad
- Put campsites closer to beach
- More trees in the campground (2)
- More trash cans in the campground
- More cottages for rent (2)
- Extend the "quiet hours"- 9 o'clock is too early
- Add more clothesline for cabin/yrurts

Trash (14)

- More trash receptacles- help to maintain pet waste disposals
- More trash receptacles (9)
- Monitor Hunter Run Access- excessive littering
- Place trash cans by waters
- Clean up beaches - dead fish and trash
- More trash receptacle signs directing us to trash

Improve facilities (13)

- Add dog park or trails
- Put electric in pavilions
- Update benches
 - More water front benches
- More pavilions
 - More pavilions by beach
- More volleyball nets
- More trees (2)
- Add tennis court
- Repair picnic tables
- More grills near tables
- Add dish washing basin

Signage (12)

- Better signage (2)
- Better signage for no parking zone
- Trails need more interpretive signs
- Better trails markings- update information
- Bathroom signs are not accurate
- Add a sign to primitive campground
- Better traffic markers for campground loops
 - Install camp loop traffic signs- do not enter sign or arrows
- Add a map of outside businesses- directory
- Some trails signs are missing- Just post left
- More signs directing us to trash

Marina/ Lake/ Swimming (26)

- Add marina service for boats
 - Add boating rental
 - More diverse boat rentals- better advertising
- Water is very clean
- Clean up the lake
- Clean up beaches - dead fish and trash (2)
- More beach access
- Water level are were too low
 - Don't drain the lake so low- Makes fishing more difficult
- Better boater accessibility to the lake for fishing
 - No area that is handicapped accessible in the winter
- No access for fishing on other side of the lake
- Better swimming conditions
- More water front benches
- Put in more docks
 - Add power on the docks (2)
- More rules about motors on boats (2)
 - Enforce "no wake zones"
 - Maybe sections of the lake for non-motorized use only (2)
- Allow responsible alcohol use- especially for boating
- Install waterfront cabins
- Boat patrol can be rude at times

*Park Management (48)***Park Employees (4)**

- Keep staffing adequate
- Boat patrol can be rude at times
- More park ranger presence (2)

Alcohol (3)

- Control people in campsites- illegal alcohol consumption and noise
- Allow alcohol
- Allow responsible alcohol use- especially for boating

Concessionaries (12)

- Add marina service for boats
 - Add boating rental

More diverse boat rentals- better advertising
More concession facilities
Better food concessions (7)
Maybe some more healthy choices

Pets (6)

More trash receptacles -Helps to maintain pet waste disposal (2)
Forced to pay for pet site - don't have a pet
Don't have a problem with pets being here
Ensure pet regulations are followed
More accommodation for off leash pets

Wildlife (3)

Set up areas that have binoculars or telescopes for viewing wildlife
Bring wildlife back- no hunting in park (2)

Fishing (16)

Stock more fish (4)
More shoreline fishing access
Not enough parking for shoreline fishing
Don't drain the lake so low- Makes fishing more difficult (3)
Reconsider size limits- not many large fish in the lake (2)
Increase boater accessibility to the lake for fishing
No access for fishing on other side of the lake
Hunter Run Access- fish poaching by minority groups
Make fisherman clean up after themselves- more trash cans by waters
Management of crappie population - there are too many

Misc. (4)

Offer discount coupons for the Nature Inn
More opportunities for handicapped
Sometimes wish park was less crowded
More sunshine

Lyman Run State Park (n=165)

No Suggestions (46)

Satisfied (10)

Improve Recreation Facilities (133)

Improve road maintenance (5)

- Improve road condition
- Use smaller stones-too bumpy
- Main road from Galeton needs work
- Dirt road after maintenance area needs improvement
- We know they're working on the roads so that is good

Water (5)

- Running water at sites
- Easier way to get water to refill bottles
- Heat up water in the pool so that older visitors can enjoy it
- Need water at campsite
- The water connects and stands rather than run-off

Access (9)

- Better lakeside access
- Better trails around the lake for fishing access
- Open waters for access
- Tie in campground and ATV trail system so you don't have to load ATV on trailer to drive 1/4 mile from campground to ATV trail (2)
- Open up snowmobile trails for ATV use
- Better trails around the lake for fishing access
- Create less accessible areas

General trails (14)

- Continue path to walk over dam along the edge of the water
- Better trails around the lake for fishing access
 - Finish the walking trail around lake
- Create a paved hiking trail
- Create mountain bike trails (3)
 - 15 miles of biking trail at least
- More information on mileage for the hiking trails
- Some of the hiking trails are not well marked
- More work on hike/bike trail maintenance
- Too much money and time spent on ATV trails
- Keep ATV trails open longer
- More hiking and ATV trails and specify when closed

Restrooms (15)

- Clearly post restroom locations
- Leave bathrooms open during winter
- More restrooms (2)
 - More restrooms/port-o-potties at other end of lake
- Larger port-o-potties
- Add more port-o-potties along parking areas

- Bathrooms/showers potentially crowded
- Add a restroom near picnic pavilions
- Bathrooms with electricity- not a good idea in a remote park setting
- Maintain the ATV restrooms
- More showers
- Install a restroom at the beach
- Better pit toilets at the campground
- No heat in the restrooms

Campground (20)

- Better pit toilets at campground
- Running water at sites (2)
- Easier way to get water to refill water bottles
- Sewer hookup at campsite or at least water
- The water connects and stands rather than run-off
- Space #30 in the lower campground needs the gravel built back up
- Incorporate campground and ATV trail system- easier access
- Expand campgrounds and make sites larger (3)
 - Used to be fewer campsites in the same area
- Try to keep more natural campsites
- Better camping information availability
- Add privacy hedge to the Dagget campground
- Add some trees for additional shade
- Fewer rocks under tents- softer/grassier areas for tent (maybe sand)
- More dog campsites
- Lower price of camping
- Better descriptions of campsites- use experience rating, etc.

ATV (24)

- Convert snowmobile trail into year round ATV trail (2)
- Open ATV trails earlier in the season
 - Keep ATV trail open longer
- More ATV trails (3)
 - Specify ATV trail closures (2)
- Too much money spent on ATV trails
- Tie in campground and ATV trail system- so you don't have to load ATV on trailer to drive 1/4 mile from campground to ATV trail (2)
 - Hatfield-McCoy State Park, WV allows this
- Make exception for closed ATV trail for handicapped use
- Offer more info about the ATV trails
- Increase ATV access (3)
- Restrict ATV speed
- Cover the hole near the bathhouse- potentially hazards
- Maintain the ATV restrooms
- Clearly marked trails- ATV vs. hiking
- Move ATV trails further away from campsite

Trash (3)

- Cleaner beach
- Clean up after dogs on beach/beach area- not sanitary
- Should have animal proof trash bins- save on pollution

Improve facilities (7)

- Playground swing set area needed for kids (2)
 - Playground area needs replaced
- Heat up water in the pool
- More picnic tables- they tend to be filled up
- Maintain the facilities
- Information center closer to swimming area

Signage (11)

- Signage in general is needed
- Clearly post restroom locations
- More signs needed at park entrance (3)
- An interpretive kiosk on the dam would be really great
- Some of the hiking trails are not well marked (2)
- Posted activities would be nice
- Clearly marked trails- ATV vs. hiking
- Listing of where to get supplies- local feed meal, firewood, etc.

Marina/Lake/Swimming (20)

- Offer swimming on days other than Sunday
- Cleaner beach
- Maintain the beach area a little better
 - Extend sand further into the lake (2)
- Better lakeside access
- Clean up the lake (2)
 - Get rid of the algae in the lake
 - Dredge the swimming area- excessive vegetation (3)
- Leave beach open when electricity is out- even after storms
- Eliminate gas motor for park use if no one else can have one
- Install beach playground
- Add a restroom/bathroom at the beach
- Lifeguards are needed at the swim area
- Kayak restriction information
- Lifejacket information was poor
- Canoe information could be better

*Park Management (35)***Park Employees (2)**

- Employees are very helpful
- Help law enforcement ranger's work well with visitors

Alcohol (3)

- Enforce rules about alcohol
- Allow responsible use of alcohol
- Pot smell in the bathhouse near the pavilion

Pets (9)

- Provide doggy-poop pick up at the entrance
 - Many people do not clean up after their pet
 - Clean up after dogs on beach/beach area-not sanitary
- More pet camping areas (3)
- Have only one pet campground- loud barking dogs in this camp

Allow pets in areas other than the pool

Allow dogs at the beach

Fishing (13)

Stock more fish (5)

 Stock more trout (2)

 Stock the fish year round- not just during fishing season

Develop opposite lake shore for fishing (2)

Difficult to find area to fish along lake because of grass

Would like to see the seaweed thinned- difficult to cast

Regulate bass to trout ratio- too many bass

Misc. (8)

Soda machine had warm soda in it

Pest control for the black flies

Wasn't aware of the existence of this park- increase advertising

More accessible phone numbers for cabins

More shade would be welcome

Offer weekday programs during vacation months

Add youth adventure shops like at Hickory Run State Park

On opening trout weekend open the concession with sandwiches and coffee

Kettle Creek State Park (n=187)

No Suggestions (51)

Satisfied (13)

Improve Recreation Facilities (123)

Improve road maintenance (3)

Road from 120 is overgrown -branches denting and scraping campers
Widen upper campground road- difficult to turn campers into the site
Roads need a little work

Parking (1)

Allow additional parking at the different campsites

Water (6)

Water quality in restroom was poor (2)
Would like running water in campground
Maintenance of water system,-always hot or cold
Clean up the water a little bit- looks polluted
Address acid mine damage that is still coming in from Kettle Creek

Access (2)

More places to fish
Access to ATV trails from park

General trails (7)

Trails to stream could be improved
Mark the trails better (2)
 Mark the equestrian trails better (2)
Maps are inaccurate-need updated
Better trail maintenance

Restrooms (23)

Put a shower in upper campground
Add more showers
Pleased they didn't improve upper campground restrooms
 Open more restrooms in Lower campsite (3)
 Add another toilet in bathhouse at upper campground (2)
Add more restrooms (2)
Modernize restrooms (3)
Maintenance of water system- always hot or cold (7)
One restroom is too far from all campsites
Install a back-up generator for the restroom facilities
Maintain the beach bathrooms better

Campground (29)

Keep grass cut in campsites (2)
Put a shower in upper campground
Pleased they didn't improve upper campground restrooms
 Open more restrooms in Lower campsite (3)
 Add another toilet in bathhouse at upper campground (2)
Increase camp site size
Get a different host- she is a nuisance

Sunday check out time could be later
Campground should be cleaned more
Fire pit need to be maintained
Upper half of this campground needs modernized (4)
Do not make it any less primitive- tent sites only
Allow dogs in lower campground
Would like running water and electricity for RV (2)
Widened upper campground road- makes it hard to turn campers
Widen out campsites- flatter and more grass
Camp sites need to be improved - more gravel (2)
Pruning of trees in the campground- too much dead wood
Allow pets in campground
Lower campsite "grill"- difficult to cook/use (too high)

Trash (5)

Cleanliness could use some assistance
Add trashcan to lower dam parking lot
More recycling
The beach area is absolutely disgusting and unsanitary
Animal scat is everywhere

Improve facilities (11)

Add more ranger stations on to mountain
Fix benches and picnic tables (5)
More child areas
Handicapped access limited
Clean up fences near the beach
Swing sets are a tetanus shot waiting to happen
Picnic pavilions/shelters should be installed

Signage (15)

Provide maps- couldn't find any at campground
More signs to park office
Mark the trails better (3)
 Mark the equestrian trails better (2)
Better signage to drive by car to Whiskey Springs
Maps are inaccurate-need updated (3)
Bigger signs for lower campground (4)

Marina/ Lake/ Swimming (21)

Bring beach back for swimming (10)
Swimming area needs improved
Clean up fences near the beach
Have lights on to help boats at night for safety
Lake needs to be dredged (4)
Clean up the water a little bit- looks polluted
Take out the flowers at boat launch
Fixing up boat launch area
Add another boat ramp

Park Management (62)

Park Employees (6)

Get a different campground host- she is a nuisance
Rangers are not as friendly as they used to be
Park ranger was "peeling out" in his mini-van- needs to be safer
Would like to see more rangers at this park (2)
New superintendent would be nice- not treating parks equally

Alcohol (1)

Allow alcohol in the state park

Concessionaries (3)

Make available kayak/boat/bike rentals
More cost effective with vending machines with bait and ice
Need a place to purchase firewood

ATV (2)

Let 4 wheelers ride from park to 2-way mile road
Access to ATV trails from park

Pets (5)

Allow dogs in lower campground (3)
Install dog parks
Shouldn't have to pay extra fee for pet site if you don't have a pet

Wildlife (16)

Canadian goose poop problem throughout the day-use area (14)
Manage the game
Open the park during bear season

Fishing (17)

I want to know the stocking schedule-more specific
Stock more fish in the stream (12)
Provide more places to fish
Trails to stream could be improved
Why did they re-introduce otters- they eat trout!
Introduce predatory fish to take care of stunted fish population

Misc. (12)

It would be nice to have cell service (4)
Price is getting to high- better rates for senior citizens
Provide more space
Trees need to be topped at the scenic visitor overlooking the lake
Instate an emergency plan.
Free admission if you are a tax paying citizen
More money allocated
Noise from maintenance
Bigger turn around- year round facilities

APPENDIX C.

MARCELLUS SHALE OPEN-ENDED CODING

Has Marcellus shale-related activity changed your recreational use of this State Park? If yes, why?*(Q19a)

Has Marcellus shale-related activity changed your recreational use of this State Park? If no, why not?*(Q19b)

Has Marcellus shale-related activity changed your recreational experience at this State Park? If yes, why?*(Q20a)

Has Marcellus shale-related activity changed your recreational experience at this State Park? If no, why not?*(Q20b)

Question	Number of Responses
Marcellus Shale: Use- Yes (Q19a)	65
Marcellus Shale: Use- No (Q19b)	628
Marcellus Shale: Experience- Yes (Q20a)	97
Marcellus Shale: Experience- No (Q20b)	516
TOTAL	1,306

*Note: Some responses addressed multiple topics and are coded in multiple categories

*Note²: Many respondents provided a 'yes or no' answer, but did not provide an open-ended response

Has Marcellus shale-related activity changed your recreational use of this State Park? If yes, why?*

Yes = 65

No Comment (984)

Road/ Traffic Issues (19)

Traffic (9)

Poor Road Conditions (6)

Improved road conditions (2)

Dangerous (2)

Visible Impacts (3)

Equipment (3)

Astronomy (11)

Light Pollution (7)

Well flare (4)

Displaced/ Closed Areas (11)

Drilling elsewhere keeps me here (3)

Could not reach primary destination (2)

Seeking refuge in park (6)

Visiting More (6)

Other areas are inaccessible (4)

Drilling brought me here (2)

Visiting Less (9)

Lack of access (3)

Poor road conditions & traffic (2)

Lack of hotels (1)

Visit less - Generic (3)

General Concerns (6)

Water quality (1)

Land sold (1)

Anti-Drilling (4)

Has Marcellus shale-related activity changed your recreational use of this State Park? If no, why not?*

No = 628

No Comment (419)

No Effect on Use (236)

Don't Notice/ Haven't Seen Activity (105)

Have not seen it (81)

No visible impact (18)

Have not encountered it (6)

Don't Know About It (56)

Unfamiliar- generic (30)

Not aware of it (15)

Don't know about it (11)

New to Area/ Unable to Assess (34)

First visit (20)

Don't visit often (5)

New to area (4)

Not familiar with area (5)

Pro-Drilling (25)

All for it (10)

Doesn't bother me (5)

Employed by industry (4)

Economic development (8)

Not Drilling Here (114)

No activity here (67)

Not drilling close to here (25)

Not drilling directly in park (22)

Not Drilling Here Yet (Implies concern for future) (19)

No impact yet (14)

Not yet- could change (5)

General Concerns (39)

Worry about what I can't see (4)

Going to ruin the future (5)

Apprehensive (6)

Pollution (2)

Stay out of the parks (9)

Water concerns (6)

Completely against it (6)

Has Marcellus shale-related activity changed your recreational experience at this State Park?

If yes, why?*

Yes = 97

No Comment (962)

No Effect on Experience (7)

Effects on Wildlife (6)

Less wildlife (3)

Habitat destruction (3)

Traffic Issues (15)

Too many trucks (4)

Traffic increase (5)

Truck noise (4)

Dangerous drivers (2)

Road Quality Issues (8)

Poor road conditions (6)

Road usage increase (1)

Road condition increase (1)

Environmental Degradation (10)

Destroying environment (5)

Decreasing water quality (4)

Pollution (1)

Noise Impacts (9)

Traffic noise annoyance (4)

General noise increase (6)

Visual Impacts (4)

Scenery degradation (3)

Equipment visibility (1)

Astronomy (20)

Light pollution (14)

No light protection/ buffer (1)

A need for light regulations (1)

Well flares (5)

Displaced/ Closed Areas (7)

Noticeably less park visitors (1)

Displaced from other area(s) to here (1)

Will not come back again because of gas development (2)

Anti-Drill (7)

General anti-drill (4)

Increase the drilling tax (2)

Downgrade of the park system (1)

General Concerns (4)

Less people visiting park (1)

General concern (1)

Eventual destruction (2)

**Has Marcellus shale-related activity changed your recreational experience at this State Park?
If no, why not?***

No = 516

No Comment (529)

No Effect on Experience (187)

New to Area/ Unable to Assess (67)

First visit (15)

Wasn't aware of it (19)

Don't know about it (28)

I wouldn't know (5)

Don't Notice/ Haven't Seen Any Activity (109)

Don't notice (11)

Not seen (32)

No obvious impacts (20)

No visible impacts (46)

Not Drilling Here (or in areas I care about) (102)

No activity here (56)

No drilling around area (40)

Not prevalent (14)

Not Yet (implies concern for future) (7)

Not drilling here yet (7)

General Concerns (28)

Ruining experience (5)

Environmental concern- general (4)

Visitors leaving the park (4)

This will bite the park in the a\$\$ (1)

Water concerns (5)

Waiting for impacts to show (4)

No drilling in parks (3)

Travel time to park too long now (3)

Pro-Drilling (16)

No pollution under Governor Corbett (1)

Employed by industry (3)

All speculation (1)
Economic incentive (4)
Utilize the resource (2)
Proponent- generic (6)

APPENDIX D.

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

2011-2012 PENNSYLVANIA STATE PARK VISITOR SURVEY (PA-VUM)

Date, Time, & Weather _____ ID NUM _____

State Park # ____ (1 = ~~Hwyer Run/View~~, 2 = Cherry Springs, 3 = Sinnemahoning, 4 = Bald Eagle, 5 = Lyman Run, 6 = Kettle Creek)
Location _____ (Refer to sitalist) Interviewer _____

Hello, my name is _____, I'm from Penn State and we are doing a survey of State Park visitors. The information collected will help State Parks better serve visitors. May I have about fifteen minutes of your time to complete this survey?

1. ~~Yes~~ (If refusal, thank them for their time and complete the refusal sheet). They must be at least 18 yrs. to participate in this survey.

The first series of questions are about your use of this State Park..

2. Was this State Park your primary destination for this recreation trip? ____ Yes ____ No

3. How far did you travel from home to this park? ____ miles (ask respondent for their best estimate if they are unsure)

4. Is your visit to this state park today part of an Overnight Trip or is it a Day Trip only? (check only one)

____ Day Trip (Complete question 4a, then skip to question 5)

4a. How many total hours will you be spending at this State Park during today's visit?
____ Hours

~~Part of an Overnight Trip (Complete Questions 4b - 4d, then proceed to question 5)~~

4b. When did you first arrive at this park on your trip? Date _____ Time _____

4c. When do you plan on leaving this park on your trip? Date _____ Time _____

(NOTE TO INTERVIEWER: 4c. refers to leaving this park for the final time on that trip)

4d. What type of accommodations are you (or will you) be using as part of this overnight trip?

- ____ State Park Tent Campsites ____ State Park Cottage or Yurt ____ State Park Inn or Lodge
- ____ State Park RV Campsites ____ State Park Cabin ____ State Park Group Tent/Camping Areas

~~Non-State Park Accommodations (e.g., local camps, hotels, bed and breakfasts, with friends, etc.)~~

If non-State Park Accommodation, what type?

- ____ Hotel/Motel ____ Private Campground ____ Private Camp/Cabin
- ____ Bed & Breakfast ____ At a Friend's or Family House (FREE) ____ Other (list) _____

5. About how much time, in total, will you be away from your home on this recreation trip?
____ Days or ____ Hours

6. Over the last 12 months, how many different trips have you made to this State Park? (include both overnight and day trips)
____ Trips to this State Park (If it is their first trip, put in a "1")

7a. Including yourself, how many people are visiting this park with you today? Number _____

7b. How many of these people are less than 16 years old? Number _____

8. If for some reason you had been unable to go to this State Park for this visit, what would you have done instead?

- ____ Gone elsewhere for the same activity ____ Come back another time ____ Gone to work at your regular job
- ____ Gone elsewhere for a different activity ____ Stayed home ____ None of these: _____

What activities on this list did you participate in during this visit to this State Park? (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)		Which of these is your primary recreation activity for this visit to this State Park? (CHOOSE ONLY ONE)
Q 9 Answer	Q 10 Answer	
	Fishing – all types	
	Hunting – all types	
	Viewing & Learning Nature & Culture	
	Sightseeing	
	Viewing natural features such as scenery, wildlife, birds, flowers, fish, etc.	
	Visiting historic and pre-historic sites/areas	
	Viewing wayside exhibits, interpretive kiosks	
	Visiting a nature center, nature trail, or visitor center	
	Non-motorized Activities	
	Hiking	
	Walking	
	Horseback Riding	
	Bicycling, including mountain bikes	
	Non-motorized boating (canoeing, kayaking, rafting, sailing, etc.)	
	Downhill skiing or snowboarding	
	Cross-country skiing, snowshoeing	
	Motorized Activities	
	Driving for pleasure on roads	
	Snowmobile or ATV use (circle one)	
	Motorized boating	
	Camping or Other Overnight	
	RV camping	
	Tent camping	
	Other camping	
	Other Activities	
	Picnicking and family gatherings	
	Relaxing, hanging out	
	Swimming	
	Beach Use (no swimming)	
	Attending a program offered at the park (environmental, historic, outdoor recreation)	
	Visiting a special event or festival	
	Other activity (List)	

The next questions will ask about your expenses on this trip...

11. Did you or other members of your party spend any money on this trip within 50 miles of this park?
 Yes (Go to Question 12) No (Skip to Question 14)

12. For the following categories, how much will you and others within your group spend **within 50 miles of here on this trip**?

Motel, Lodge, Cabin, B&B, etc.	Restaurants & Bars	Groceries	Outfitter Related Expenses (guide fees & equipment rentals)	Sporting Goods
\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
Camping	Local Transportation (bus, shuttles, etc.)	Gasoline & Oil	Outdoor Recreation or Entertainment (park fees, movies, mini-golf, etc.)	Souvenirs, Clothing Other Misc.
\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____

13. How many people do these trip expenditures cover? _____ group members

14. The following items assess your satisfaction with the recreation services and facilities at this State Park. Please rate the following attributes of this State Park.

State Park Feature/Attribute	Poor	Fair	Average	Good	Very Good	N/A
Scenery	1	2	3	4	5	9
Restroom cleanliness	1	2	3	4	5	9
Condition of the natural environment	1	2	3	4	5	9
Condition of developed recreation facilities	1	2	3	4	5	9
Condition of trails in this State Park	1	2	3	4	5	9
Adequacy of signage	1	2	3	4	5	9
Helpfulness of employees	1	2	3	4	5	9
Maintenance of facilities (roads, shelters, buildings)	1	2	3	4	5	9
Cleanliness of this park	1	2	3	4	5	9
Feeling of safety	1	2	3	4	5	9
Restroom availability	1	2	3	4	5	9
Quality of park programs	1	2	3	4	5	9
Value for the money invested in this State Park visit	1	2	3	4	5	9

15. Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with this visit to this Park?

Very Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neither Dissatisfied nor Satisfied	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
1	2	3	4	5

16. Please indicate your feelings about this State Park by indicating your level of agreement with the following statements.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
This place means a lot to me	1	2	3	4	5
I enjoy recreating at this place more than other places I could visit	1	2	3	4	5
I am very attached to this place	1	2	3	4	5
I get more satisfaction out of visiting this place than from visiting most places	1	2	3	4	5

17. Here is a list of possible reasons why people recreate at state parks. Please tell me how important each of the following benefits is to you as a reason for visiting this particular State Park. (1 = Not at all Important to 5 = Extremely Important)

Reason...	Not at all Important	Somewhat Important	Moderately Important	Very Important	Extremely Important
To be outdoors	1	2	3	4	5
For relaxation	1	2	3	4	5
To get away from the regular routine	1	2	3	4	5
For the challenge or sport	1	2	3	4	5
For family recreation	1	2	3	4	5
For physical exercise	1	2	3	4	5
To be with my friends	1	2	3	4	5
To experience natural surroundings	1	2	3	4	5
To develop my skills	1	2	3	4	5

18. If you could ask Pennsylvania State Parks to improve some things about the management of this State Park, what would you ask them to do?

The next series of questions are about Marcellus shale-related activity in the region...

19. Has Marcellus shale-related activity changed your recreation use of this state park?

.....YES (If yes, how?)

.....NO (If no, why not?)

20. Has Marcellus shale-related activity changed your recreation experience at this state park?

.....YES (If yes, how?)

.....NO (If no, why not?)

In order to serve all of its constituents, State Parks would like to know a little bit about its visitors...

21. What is your home Zip Code _____

22. Into which income group would you say your household falls?

___ Under \$25,000

___ \$75,000-\$99,999

___ Don't Know

___ \$25,000-\$49,999

___ \$100,000-\$149,999

___ Refused to Answer

___ \$50,000-\$74,999

___ \$150,000 or over

23. In what year were you born? _____

24. Which of the following categories best describes your race and/or ethnic background? (check all that apply)

___ White

___ American Indian or Alaskan Native

___ Asian

___ Black or African American

___ Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander

___ Refused

___ Hispanic/Chicano/Latino

___ Other, specify _____

25. INTERVIEWER - Record Sex/Gender (check one)

.....Male ___ Female

That is the end of the survey. Thank you very much for your participation!